

The present article was published in a Festschrift for Prof Antonio Piñero, entitled *In Mari Via Tua: Philological Studies in Honour of Antonio Piñero* (Estudios de Filología Neotestamentaria 11), Edited by I. M. Gallarte & Jesús Peláez, Córdoba 2016

## “Greco-Roman”

### A Term of Convenience or of Uncertainty?

Chrys C. Caragounis

Sometime before the year 2000, I was requested by the editors of the *Dictionary of New Testament Background*, IVP 2000, C.A. Evans and S.E. Porter, to contribute the article on ancient scholarship. The assignment I was given bore the title “Greco-Roman Scholarship”. I changed the title to “Greek *and* Roman Scholarship”. It is to the credit of the Editors that they accepted the change without demur. I do not know whether they perceived the implications of the change, or whether anybody else does, but my proposal averred a very different way of looking at things. It implied that I was questioning the very idea that there is such a thing as “Greco-Roman Scholarship”!

Now “Greco-Roman scholarship” is just one of a multitude of “Greco-Roman” things that one meets in present-day New Testament scholarly writing. The very same volume in which my “Greek and Roman Scholarship” appeared uses the term “Greco-Roman” so ubiquitously, that, as I once pointed out,<sup>1</sup> I would not be surprised if my contributions turned out to be the only ones in that volume that took exception to that term.<sup>2</sup> I mention this work only as a convenient

---

<sup>1</sup> Chrys C. Caragounis, *The Development of Greek and the New Testament*, p. 438 n. 138.

<sup>2</sup> A quick look through this volume gives the following words/concepts that are expressly designated as “Greco-Roman” (page in parentheses): life (122); world

example. The same is the case almost everywhere else. For example, of the innumerable doctoral dissertations that are turned out one after the other each year, most of which are not deemed to have achieved publishable standard, those which are published use the term “Greco-

---

(136); society (136); sources (144); eras (150); period (150); biography (169); culture (197); antiquity (197); papyri (206); inscriptions (206); cities (212); coinage (220); taxation (222); religions (291); education (309); practice (312); attitudes (323); letters (327); rhetoric (329); festivals (368); holidays (368); times (368); background (389); milieu (402); historiography (405); geographic conceptions (411); context (478); discussions of inspiration (510); elements (510); manuals of rhetoric (519); philosophers (520); virtues (521); social context (632); household codes (687); multi-cultural environment (716); goddess (723); mysteries (723); associations (800); polytheism (815); manner of education (839); names (846); temples (920); prophecy (921); classical rhetorical theory (956); rhetorical handbooks (957); rhetorical convention (957); rhetorical practice (958); rhetorical discourse (958); prejudice (980); philosophical influence (1273); literary culture (1284); literature (1284); literary criticism (1284); religious genre (1284); authors (1284); texts (1284); literary devices (1286); biographical literature (1286); epic narrative (1286); literary moral forms (1286).

Now, what sense does it make to speak of “Greco-Roman papyri” or “Greco-Roman inscriptions”? Were not Hellenic and Latin inscriptions written in two different languages? If one were to read this long article (529–39), one would find that, in spite of the title, the article deals entirely with Hellenic inscriptions and papyri, with a bare mention of two publications of Latin (and Jewish) inscriptions without any quotations or discussion! On p. 212, the discussion revolves around the “Classical Greek *polis*”, and while speaking of the Vth century B.C. city planning, the author slips in his favorite “Greco–Roman city”! On p. 526, the author first speaks of “Greek and Roman periods”, evidently viewing them as distinct from one another, but a few lines further down, he reverts to the inevitable “Greco-Roman period”. On p. 917, the entry is “Greco-Roman religion” but the body of the article discusses Hellenic religion and Roman religion separately. On p. 1273, on the Wisdom of Solomon, the author has a section on “Greco-Roman influence” (1273–4), but to our astonishment, not one single Roman author is mentioned! I thus wonder why “Greco-Roman”? On p. 1284, the author mentions that a number of early XXth century scholars made an appeal for the production of “as complete a collection as possible of Hellenistic [Greco-Roman] texts”. It is interesting how our author corrects the original appeal for “Hellenistic texts” to “Greco-Roman” texts! – one more proof of the obsession of modern NT scholars with this erratic term “Greco-Roman”.

Roman” of just about anything they happen to discuss that relates to the period around the New Testament.

This ubiquitous use of our phrase today would naturally lead us into thinking that the expression “Greco-Roman” was a well-established concept in antiquity. Our surprise is, however, great when we discover that the ancients were totally unaware of such a notion as “Greco-Roman”. The Hellēnes thought of themselves simply as Hellenic authors and the Latins as Latin authors. But the two never mixed.

As far as the Hellenic language goes, the term ἑλληνορωμαϊκός was apparently coined by the renowned philologist, Adamantios Koraës, in 1782.<sup>3</sup> Within the modern Hellenic context, the term has had a limited use, the most obvious application being ἑλληνορωμαϊκὴ πάλη, “Greco-Roman wrestling”. Since the wrestling of the ancient Hellēnes was adopted and practiced also by the Romans, who followed the same rules, without much of any appreciable distinction between the two, it might perhaps be permissible to speak of ἑλληνορωμαϊκὴ πάλη. It would refer to a type of wrestling that was common to both Hellēnes and Romans, although the expression gives no further information.

With respect to the English language, the *lemma* “Graeco-Roman” is taken up both by the *Oxford English Dictionary* and *Webster’s Third New International Dictionary*. The *OED* in Vol. VI (1989), p. 731, offers no definition but exemplifies the use of our term by “spec.[*ificaly*] of a style of wrestling, resembling that used by the ancient Greeks and Romans, in which attacks are directed at the upper part of the body”. It then gives three references to its use with dates:

---

<sup>3</sup> See Στ. Κουμανούδης, *Συναγωγή νέων λέξεων ὑπὸ τῶν λογίων πλασθεισῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀλώσεως μέχρι τῶν καθ’ ἡμᾶς χρόνων*, 2 Vols., Ἐν Ἀθήναις 1900; rp. in one Vol., Ἀθήνα 1998.

1888: “Graeco-Roman literature”; 1901: “Graeco-Roman wrestling”; and 1968: “Graeco-Roman championship”! Thus, in the *OED* we are given no definition but only three examples of its application, none of which really helps us know whether the phrase means “Greek *and* Roman” as applied to two different things or “partly Greek and partly Roman” as applied to one and the same thing. If the meaning is “common to Hellēnes and Romans”, this might be used of “wrestling that is common to the Hellēnes and the Romans”, but it could not apply to literature, since there is no literature that is “common to the Hellēnes and the Romans”.

*Webster’s Dictionary* (1993), on the other hand, defines “Graeco-Roman” as “having characteristics that are partly Greek and partly Roman; *specif.[ically]*: having the characteristics of Roman art done under strong Greek influence”, and then offers a separate entry on “Graeco-Roman wrestling”. Webster’s definition is clear: “characteristics that are *partly Greek and partly Roman*”. The illustrative example, however, says something different: “Roman art *done under Greek influence*”. Now “partly Greek and partly Roman” and “done under Greek influence” are two quite dissimilar conceptions.

Thus, these standard dictionaries of the English language have failed to give clear information as to what exactly is meant by our phrase. This may well have contributed to the current confusion as seen in the wide variety of its present usage.

Today we find that the term “Greco-Roman” is being used so indiscriminately of just about anything that obtained in the three-four centuries around the NT (II B.C.–III A.D.). Thus, one author speaks of

the “Greco-Roman empire”.<sup>4</sup> Surprised, we may ask: “Which is this empire?”, “When was it established?” and “Where was it located?” I have only heard of a Roman empire which was saturated by Hellenic civilization and culture, but the Romans ruled alone! The empire, i.e. the power exercised, was not shared equally by the Romans and the Hellēnes.<sup>5</sup> How, then, can we speak of a “Greco-Roman empire”?

Another author speaks of “Greco-Roman sources” as well as of “Greco-Roman literature”!<sup>6</sup> Astounded, we may ask: “In what language is this ‘Greco-Roman literature’ written?” Are these books “partly Greek and partly Roman”? As we read further on, we discover that the author refers to such Latin authors as Horace, Tacitus, and Juvenal and such Hellenic authors as Epiktētos<sup>7</sup> and Cassius Diōn. When these authors write in two distinct languages, Hellenic and Latin, it is confusing to speak of “Greco-Roman literature”, as though this literature was “partly in Hellenic and partly in Roman” (*sc.* Latin), or that it was a literature that Hellenic and Roman children could study at school. This would imply a hybrid Helleno-Latin language. Of such we know nothing. The problem could easily be solved by writing “Hellenic *and* Latin literature”! – thus properly distinguishing the one from the other. Even if these bodies of literature in some respects shared certain characteristics, this is no reason to confuse them.

---

<sup>4</sup> And that in no less a journal than the very journal of our society! — M. A. Powell (Columbus, Ohio), “The Magi as Wise Men: Re-examining a Basic Supposition”, *NTS* 46 (2000), p. 1–20, p. 5.

<sup>5</sup> Which is demanded according to *Webster’s* definition as “partly Greek and partly Roman”.

<sup>6</sup> P. E. Stuehrenberg (New Haven, Connecticut), art. “Proselyte” in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, V, 504.

<sup>7</sup> Epiktētos was actually a Phrygian slave, but he wrote in Hellenic.

The same author finds it convenient to refer to the “Greco-Roman world” (ibid., p. 505) — convenient, but hardly correct. The fact is that the Romans were very few in comparison with the Hellēnes, and if we include all the other barbarians, who had been subsumed under the empire of Alexander and his *diadochoi* and been Hellenized, plus those in the West who were subjugated by the Romans, the Roman element would shrink to almost a negligible percentage in the population of the empire. Was it, then, a Roman world? — NB! world refers to human beings. The answer is a categorical No! Nevertheless, the Romans were the rulers over what had been the (strictly speaking) Hellenic world with their subject peoples as well as the various peoples of the West! There is a difference between an empire (= power, rule) and a world (human beings).

Yet another author speaks of “Greco-Roman comedy”.<sup>8</sup> Again, we are compelled to ask: “Which are these authors who write their comedies in Hellenic and Roman (presumably we are to understand Latin)?” For as a matter of fact, we have Hellenic comedies and we have comedies written by Roman authors in Latin. But “Greco-Roman comedy”? — what is it?

This careless way of using the term “Greco-Roman” when writing about anything that relates to the time of the Roman empire, can at times take unheard of proportions, as when one other author includes even Aristotelēs (along with Horatius) under “Greco-Roman”!<sup>9</sup> This time, the excessive zeal in using the convenient term “Greco-Roman”

---

<sup>8</sup> J. A. Harrill (Chicago, Illinois.), “The Dramatic Function of the Running Slave Rhoda (Acts 12:13–16): A Piece of Greco-Roman Comedy”, *NTS* 46 (2000), 150–157.

<sup>9</sup> A. Eriksson, *Traditions as Rhetorical Proof. Pauline Argumentation in 1 Corinthians*, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell 1998, Ch. 1, note 24.

outdid itself and played havoc with chronology. Aristoteles (384–322 B.C.), not only does not belong to the Hellenistic period, which preceded the Roman conquest of Hellas, but has his place properly in the classical period, when there was no sign of Rome anywhere on the horizon of Hellas.

It ought to be clear by now that the term ἑλληνορωμαϊκός, etc. is greatly misused in modern New Testament literature. This is one of several infelicitous creations that have managed to entrench themselves in the scientific vocabulary of classical and New Testament studies.

In 1887 H. Usener introduced to Western scholarship a new literary genre, which he called by the ancient term διατριβή (= Diatribe).<sup>10</sup> This term was adopted by Rudolf Bultmann in his attempt to explain St Paul's argumentation, which he thought followed along the lines of the Cynic and Stoic "Diatribe".<sup>11</sup> Already before Bultmann, J. Weiss had made one of the earliest applications of this term.<sup>12</sup>

Now, if διατριβή was a contemporary term for the type of argumentation practiced by the Cynics and Stoics, there ought to have been at least some traces of it in ancient literature. But as I have shown, in my discussion of this term,<sup>13</sup> διατριβή never occurs in Hellenic literature with the meaning and content which New Testament scholars have ascribed to it. As the literary *Gattung* that is used today to investigate Paul's argumentation, it is a thoroughly modern construct

---

<sup>10</sup> H. Usener, *Epicurea*, Leipzig 1887, Preface p. lxix.

<sup>11</sup> R. Bultmann, *Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe*. Göttingen 1910.

<sup>12</sup> J. Weiss, *Beiträge zur paulinischen Rhetorik*, Göttingen 1897.

<sup>13</sup> Chrys C. Caragounis, *Development of Greek*, pp. 433–438. See also Th. Schmeller, *Paulus und die "Diatribe". Eine vergleichende Stilinterpretation*, Aschendorff, Münster 1987, *passim*, who although aware that there was no Diatribe *Gattung* in antiquity, acquiesces to its use today, since it is so widespread. Evidently, science must learn to live with positions that have been proved wrong.

with no correspondence among the recognized literary *Gattungen* of antiquity, let alone the various uses of διατριβή in Hellenic literature. What a Diatribe is has been based on the rhetorical analysis of Paul's letters, in which the elements found there, have been used to concoct the content of the so-called Diatribe concept, which is presumed to have existed in ancient times and been practiced by the Stoics and the Cynics. But there never was such a concept in ancient times. This means that the Diatribe literary correspondences between the Cynics and Stoics on the one hand and the Pauline method of argumentation, on the other are simply a myth.

The misapplication of “Koinē” to post-classical Hellenic is another unfortunate invention of modern scholarship. A. N. Jannaris showed quite convincingly that when the ancient Hellēnes used this term, it was to draw attention to elements that were common among Attic, Ionic, Aiolic, and Doric.<sup>14</sup> The ancients never used this term as a designation of the post-classical form of Hellenic. Departing from the proper use of this term, modern scholars (following Hatzikadis, Thumb, Dieterich, Schweitzer, Kretschmer) use it of the post-classical or later (μεταγενεστέρα) development of Hellenic, which they often have described as colloquial, vernacular, vulgar, *volkstümlich*, etc. and have considered it mainly in its spoken form, being oblivious of the fact that the ancient Hellēnes expressed themselves only of the *written form* of the language, not the spoken.<sup>15</sup> Thus, κοινή was what were common

---

<sup>14</sup> A. N. Jannaris, “The True Meaning of the Κοινή”, *Classical Review* March 1908, pp. 93–96.

<sup>15</sup> Dionysios Hal., *Isokrates 2*: ἡ δὲ λέξις (style) ἢ κέχρηται, τοιοῦτόν τινα χαρακτήρα ἔχει. καθαρὰ μὲν ἐστὶν οὐχ ἥττον τῆς Λυσίου καὶ οὐδὲν εἰκῆ τιθεῖσα ὄνομα τὴν τε διάλεκτον ἀκριβοῦσα ἐν τοῖς πάνυ τὴν κοινήν καὶ συνηθεστάτην. See also *Lysias 2* and *3*. The Loeb translators have missed the

elements to all Hellēnes along their various dialects.<sup>16</sup> Jannaris concludes: “Whenever the ancients refer to the κοινή διάλεκτος they always mean that national literary Greek which is free from all dialectal and even poetical admixture, a form of style best represented in the orators” (*op. cit.* p. 96).

This hyphenated construction is used quite often today also with other national names than those of the Hellēnes and the Romans. For example, “Irish-American” means an American citizen of Irish extraction. We may also speak of the “Anglo-American War”, where the meaning is a war in which the English and the Americans fought each other, or a war between the English and the Americans, or of the English against the Americans, or vice versa. None of these examples,

---

point when they translate κοινή διάλεκτος with “ordinary” and “standard”, instead of “common dialect”.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. e.g. Klemes Alex. *Stromateis* I. 21: φασὶ δὲ οἱ Ἑλληνας διαλέκτους εἶναι τὰς παρὰ σφίσι πέντε, Ἀτθίδα Ἰάδα Δωρίδα Αἰολίδα, καὶ πέμπτην τὴν κοινήν and see *Scholion in Dionysios Thrax*, 14, 14: διάλεκτοι δὲ εἰσι πέντε Ἀτθὶς Δωρὶς Αἰολὶς Ἰὰς καὶ κοινή ... κοινή ἢ πάντες (authors) χρῶνται; 469 ff.: ὅτι μήτηρ ἢ κοινή. Cf. also *Etymologicum Magnum* 21, 7: ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι κατὰ τὴν κοινήν διάλεκτον τὰ ἀπαθῆ οὐ λέγεται, οἷον τὸ πατέρος καὶ μητέρος καὶ ἀνέρος, ἀλλὰ τὰ πεπονθότα, οἷον τὸ πατρός; 760, 20: καὶ τῷ μὲν πρῶτῳ (προσώπῳ τύψεια) χρῶνται οἱ Αἰολεῖς, τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς προσώποις (τύψειας τύψειε) ἢ κοινή συνήθεια καὶ διάλεκτος. That κοινή here refers to the classical period is shown by the example of Moiris, *Attic Lexicon* 195, 6: διήρης Ἀττικοί, ὑπερῶν κοινόν. The fact that this word occurs four times in the NT (e.g. Acts 1:13) does not make it a late, post-classical word, for it occurs in Sophoklēs, Antiphōn, Aristophanēs, Platōn, Lysias, *et al.* Cf. also Philoxenos, *Fragments* 323, 7: ἀλλ’ οὔτε δὲ <ἡ κοινή> διάλεκτος ἔχει δυϊκά, ἀλλ’ εἰς πάντα τῷ πληθυντικῷ ἀριθμῷ κέχρηται ἀντὶ τοῦ δυϊκοῦ ἀριθμοῦ, μὴ ἔχουσα δυϊκά. εἰκότως οὖν, ἐπειδὴ τελευταῖον ἐπενοήθησαν τὰ δυϊκά. It is evident that Philoxenos [I B.C.] is speaking of very early times, not Hellenistic; Ailios Herodianos, *Peri Pathōn* 3, 2 319: ἀλλ’ ὡς εἴρηται κρᾶσις Δωρικὴ τοῦ α καὶ ε εἰς η. τοιοῦτόν ἐστι καὶ τὸ ἐν τῇ κοινή διαλέκτῳ ἐπικρατήσαν, λέγω δὲ τὸ ζῆς; 3, 2 338, 17: ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι τῇ μὲν διὰ τοῦ οὐς γενικῆ κέχρηται οἱ Ἰῶνες οἷον τῆς Σαπφῶος τῆς Λητούος, τῇ δὲ εἰς οὐς οἱ Ἀττικοὶ καὶ ἡ κοινή διάλεκτος οἷον Σαπφῶος Λητούος.

however, explain our phrase, since this is, obviously, not the meaning of “Graeco-Roman”, when used in connection with such words as literature, comedy, poetry, rhetoric, etc. The reason for this is that these things were not common between the Hellēnes and the Romans; each had their own literature, their own poetry and their own rhetoric, even though, as Suetonius<sup>17</sup> and other Romans make clear, the Romans had borrowed all of these genres of writing from the Hellēnes.

Thus, it is a terminological inexactitude to refer, for example, to such writers as Dionysios Hal. or Ploutarchos or Dion or Aelius Aristeides or Loukianos and call them “Greco-Roman”. These were purely Hellenic authors and should never be referred to as “Greco-Roman” in sober scientific discussions. There might be some justification for labeling such Latin authors as Cicero, Horace, Tacitus, and Quintillian “Greco-Roman”, on account of the heavy Hellenic influence on them, but it would be preferable to let them remain simply as Latin authors.

The objectionable character of the term “Greco-Roman” when applied, for example, to literature is shown also by the following circumstance. The centuries that followed the downfall of the various Hellenic kingdoms witnessed the inevitable consequences of war:

“The various states were barbarously treated, plundered and crushed, and measures were taken to thwart any future restoration. Their wealth was looted (Plut., *Aem. Paul.*, XXXVIII. 1), their technical and scientific achievements were taken from them, their works of art were scattered all over Italy (Paus., VII.16.8), and their libraries were carried off to Rome

---

<sup>17</sup> E.g. Suetonius, *De Grammatici* I, IV; *De Rhetoribus* I. See also *De Poetis* (Terence, Virgil, Horace), for similar dependence on their Hellenic counterparts.

(Dion Cass., *Hist.* 43.38; Plut., *Caes.* 49; *id.*, *Lucul.* 42; Aul. Gel., *Noct. Att.* 7.17.3; Frazer, 1972, I, 326).<sup>18</sup> “Greek literary works were now being copied wholesale, adapted to, plagiarized and even pilfered by Latin authors”.<sup>19</sup>

It is, however, to the credit of the Romans (in contrast to the Turks who had their own chance) that they treasured these fruits of civilization and culture, built libraries to house the books and applied themselves to their study. The Romans’ interest in literature was awakened (particularly after Pergamese scholar Kratēs of Mallus’ visit to Rome) and they took up writing.

Here we witness an interesting phenomenon. Following their literary awaking, the Latin authors became busy adopting from the Hellenic originals the one literary genre after the other; competing with each other in who first would introduce into Latin a new genre of Hellenic literature; and quoting copiously from Hellenic authors and discussing their views. Indeed, the subject-matter of their books was made up of perennial Hellenic themes/problems from tragedy, comedy, myth, history, grammar and sciences in general – as one would discover, if he

---

<sup>18</sup> Chrys C. Caragounis, “Atticism” in G. Giannakis (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, Leiden: Brill 2014, pp. ). The last reference is to P. M. Frazer, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, Oxford, 1972, Vol. I, p. 326.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Chrys C. Caragounis, “Atticism. Agenda and Achievement” in Chrys C. Caragounis (ed.), *Greek. A Language in Evolution*, Hildesheim, 2010, p.159. Cf. also Chrys C. Caragounis, “Scholarship, Greek and Latin”, in *Dictionary of New Testament Background*, pp. 1081 f.: “Virgil was repeatedly accused of pilfering from Homer, to which he replied ‘Why don’t my critics try the same thefts?’. Virgil is not the only plagiarist. Various degrees of plagiarism were practiced by all Romans. But so far from considering it ignoble, the Romans ‘made it a proud boast to have been the first to introduce a particular Greek genre into Latin poetry’ (R. L. Palmer, “Plagiarism” in *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 1<sup>st</sup> ed. s.v.)”.

were to cast a cursory look at Latin literature.<sup>20</sup> Over against this barage of Hellenic literary influence on the Romans stands the total absence of interest among the Hellenic literati for Latin literature. While Hellenic themes were lively discussed and debated by Latin authors, who often took sides for one Hellenic author against another, the Hellēnes, on their part, ignored the Romans' debates and continued to write their own books in debate and dialogue among themselves.<sup>21</sup> It might almost be said that the only literary contact they had with the Romans was when the latter came to attend their schools of grammar, philosophy or rhetoric in such centra as Athens, Rhodos, and Pergamon.

This state of affairs argues eloquently against the legitimacy of applying the label of "Greco-Roman" on such Hellenic authors as Dionysios Hal., 'Longinos', Ploutarchos, Dion of Proussa, Ailios Aristeides, Loukianos, *et al.*

Dionysios Hal. had certainly learned Latin during his near three-decade stay in Rome, needed for composing his *Roman Antiquities*.<sup>22</sup> But his literary works – like e.g. his *Art of Composition*, in which he had plenty of opportunity to cite them – are devoid of any quotes from and discussions of the views of Latin authors. 'Longinos' dedicated his *Peri Hypsous* to a Roman youth and also gave a positive evaluation of

---

<sup>20</sup> Even Cicero, the greatest Roman literatus, had borrowed from innumerable Hellenic authors, while in his letter to Atticus he admitted that what he was writing then were "copies" ("*apographa sunt*"). Fabius Quintilianus, who wrote the most comprehensive system of Roman rhetoric, the *Institutio Oratoria*, essentially summarized Hellenic principles of rhetoric, brought Cicero's attempts to a culmination, added his own observations, and thus produced what has been called a monument to Latin rhetoric.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Chrys C. Caragounis, *Development of Greek*, 121 and *Greek. A Language in Evolution*, 163.

<sup>22</sup> Dionysios Hal., *Roman Antiquities* I, 7.2.

Cicero, but never quotes any Latin author or discusses his views. Instead he excuses himself politely for his lack of reference to Latin authors (cf. his delicately ironic evasion: ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ὑμεῖς [sc. you Romans] ἄν ἄμεινον ἐπικρίνοιτε).<sup>23</sup> This lack of reference to Latin authors and Latin literature is all the more telling in view of his quotation of a Jewish author! – (Moses’ “Let there be light!” [9.9]).

Ploutarchos wrote many Roman biographies, but in his literary works no Latin torches are ablaze. The same is the case with Dion of Proussa, Ailios Aristeides, Loukianos, and others. The reader will look in vain to find quotations and discussions of the views of Latin authors. Hellenic literature stands aloof from Latin literature. Many centuries will elapse before Hellenic authors find it worthwhile to refer to a Latin author.

The question now is: How, in the light of these facts, are we to explain this indiscriminate use of the term “Greco-Roman” as exemplified in footnote 2, above? The answer is surely to be found in that very footnote itself. This footnote contains over 60 cases in which “Greco-Roman” is applied to such a wide variety of things, that makes one’s head spin. At the same time, this note seems to betray the real reason behind this practice. It would have taken a considerable scholarly effort and time to read Hellenic and Latin literature, to find

---

<sup>23</sup> Germane to this issue is his polite understatement in 12. 4: λέγω δέ, <εἰ> καὶ ἡμῖν ὡς Ἑλλησιν ἐφεῖταί τι γινώσκειν (12.4), in reality a deeply ironical remark, in the face of Roman behaviour, who “perhaps ... felt that as the masters of the empire, they were entitled to everything their subjects had produced or invented” (Caragounis, “Scholarship, Greek and Roman”, *DNTB*, 1082). This alone shows the aloofness of Hellenic authors from the emergent Latin ones. This was also the time of Atticism, which, as I have shown (*op. cit.* above), had not only literary pursuits but political concerns as well.

out the contents of each of them, to study the differences between them and to present the evidence with proper scientific exactness.

At the present time, when classical learning no longer forms a basic element in education, many NT scholars, brought up with the so-called “*New Testament Greek*”, are often tempted to look for shortcuts. Why bother with the time-consuming and exacting task of finding out what is Hellenic and what is Roman, when one may use the convenient cloak of “Greco-Roman”? Naturally, a scrupulous scholar, who takes the time to investigate, would find it unacceptable to confuse the two and jumble everything under the convenient label of “Greco-Roman”.

Regrettably, the above analysis leaves the uncomfortable impression that the label “Greco-Roman” is used by many to cover their inability to distinguish between things Hellenic and things Roman.