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The Role of Quintus Dellius in the meeting of Antony and Cleopatra at Tarsus

The meeting of Mark Antony and Cleopatra at Tarsus in 41 BCE is one of the fabled events of ancient history. Whether the rendezvous between Egypt's queen and Rome's triumvir is encountered in the dramatic narrative of Plutarch, the poetry of Shakespeare, or the epic 1963 Mankiewicz movie, this iconic moment leaves a lasting impact. Given the larger than life personalities of the main protagonists involved in this encounter, the theatrics and exuberance of the meeting at Tarsus may well seem entirely expected. However, there remains the possibility that there was a third significant contributor to the dynamics of this event. A man, whose role was more behind the scenes, but who nevertheless helped to orchestrate this celebrated occasion. This man was Quintus Dellius.

Quintus Dellius was one of those colourful characters from the ancient world who is perhaps most recognised from the verbal tag that was attached to him by Seneca the Elder in his Suasoriae (Sen. Suas. 1.7), where Messala Corvinus describes him as the desultor bellorum civilium (the horse vaulter of the civil wars).¹ This description of Dellius was due to the number of times that he switched sides during the course of these conflicts: he changed allegiance from Dolabella to Cassius, and then from Cassius to Antony and finally from Antony to Octavian (Sen. Suas. 1.7; Vell. Pat. 2.84).² The term was not, of course, intended as a complement, but rather as a wry observation on Dellius’ capacity for self-preservation. A desultor, a leaper, was a term applied particularly to a type of horse rider in a circus who jumped from horse to horse.³ This mutability on Dellius’ part was also remarked upon by the younger Seneca (Sen. Clem. 1.10.1), who includes Dellius in a list of notable members of the Augustan inner circle who were recruited from the enemy camp. We can gather from these references that Dellius was a survivor, an astute and timely reader of the rapid tides of change in troubled times, if perhaps not someone you could count on to be at your side in a moment of crisis.

1
Dellius, was the person that Antony chose to send to Cleopatra in Alexandria in early 41 BCE to summon her to a meeting in Tarsus (App. B Civ. 5.8; Dio Cass. 48.24; Plut. Ant. 25.1). At this point Dellius cannot long have been a member of Antony’s entourage. For, before this he had been attached to Cassius who committed suicide at the battle of Philippi in October 42 BCE. Presumably, Dellius, with his penchant for timely switches to the winning side had abandoned Cassius before this point, though it may well have been not long before. It might then seem a little odd that Antony chose Dellius so soon for this important mission. There was though prior history between Dellius and Antony. For, although we know little of Dellius’ movements and attachments prior to his appearance in the east in the company of Dolabella, we are nevertheless informed by a passing reference to later events in Dio (Dio Cass. 49.39.2) that he believed Dellius was once a παιδικά, ‘boyfriend’, of Antony’s. Dio also places this aspect of the relationship between Dellius and Antony in the past. Elsewhere, Dellius is described simply as Antony’s ‘friend’, φίλος (Strabo 11.523; Joseph AJ. 15.29). From this we may surmise that whatever the earlier relationship between Dellius and Antony may have been, by the time of his involvement in the Tarsus affair, Dellius was no longer Antony’s παιδικά but he was still his ‘friend’. So in choosing Dellius, Antony elected to send to Cleopatra a man who had a long and intimate knowledge of himself.

Dellius’ role as the emissary of Antony to Cleopatra is typically either not remarked upon in recent modern historical accounts, or is thought worthy of only a passing mention. This is perhaps a bit curious given that our central (indeed only detailed) source for the meeting at Tarsus, Plutarch (Plut. Ant. 25), specifically names Dellius as Antony’s messenger, and also attributes to him a leading role in both persuading Cleopatra to go to Tarsus and also suggesting the manner in which she should go.
Plutarch provides us with the only narrative on the meeting between Dellius and Cleopatra in Alexandria. In his account, when Dellius arrives and meets Cleopatra for the first time, we are told that he was immediately struck by what he perceived her potential impact on Antony might be:

< gk >ὡς εἶδε τὴν ὃψιν καὶ κατέμαθε τὴν ἐν τοῖς λόγοις δεινότητα καὶ πανουργίαν, εὐθὺς αἰσθόμενος ὦτι κακὸν μὲν οὐδὲ μελλήσει τι ποιεῖν γυναῖκα τοιαύτην Ἀντώνιος, ἔσται δὲ μεγίστη παρ᾽ αὐτῷ, τρέπεται πρὸς τὸ θεραπεύειν καὶ προτρέπεσθαι τὴν Αἰγυπτίαν, τούτῳ δὴ τὸ ὸμημοῖκόν, ἐλθεῖν εἰς Κιλικίαν εὐ ἐντύνασαν ἔ αὐτὴν < /gk > (Plut. Ant. 25.3.)

But when he saw her appearance and perceived the cleverness and sleight of hand in her discourse, he immediately understood that Antony would not do such a woman any harm but that she would rather have the greatest influence over him, so he turned to flatter and persuade the Egyptian to go to Cilicia having turned herself out in all her finery, as Homer put it.

Dellius’ opinion is based both on the physical appearance of Cleopatra but also his assessment of her verbal capabilities and her talent for manipulative verbal artistry. The words < gk >δεινότης < /gk > and < gk >πανουργία < /gk > suggest cleverness but also, particularly < /gk >πανουργία < /gk >, a certain unscrupulous ingenuity.8 In this way, Dellius senses in Cleopatra precisely the kind of person who could hold sway over an Antony, whose central characteristic Plutarch has just described (Plut. Ant. 24.9) as < gk >ἁπλότης < /gk >, simplicity.9 This inclines Dellius to immediately dismiss any notion that
Antony would visit any retribution on Cleopatra; she will more likely lead than be led by him.

This is in keeping with the general sentiment of Plutarch’s narrative on Antony and Cleopatra, where Cleopatra is presented as Antony’s τελευταίον κακόν, ‘final evil’, (Plut. Ant. 25.1). For Plutarch, the point at which the love of Cleopatra enters Antony’s life is the moment that his true downfall commences, and the beginning of his end will come with the meeting at Tarsus. We must remember, though, that Plutarch is casting his overall narrative with the sure hindsight of his own moralistic judgement of Antony’s character.

Dellius, however, remains a diplomatic participant in this drama rather than an omniscient narrator and although he is cast in the role of facilitating Antony’s ultimate demise, that was presumably not his motivation at this particular moment. Dellius’ ostensible mission was to secure Cleopatra’s cooperation in going to Tarsus to meet Antony in order to answer charges of aiding and abetting his enemies. It was surely in Dellius’ best interests to present a case to Cleopatra that minimised the risks involved in such an enterprise.10 When he met Cleopatra and had the chance to personally assess her character, appearance and capabilities, then drawing on his own intimate knowledge of Antony, he saw what seemed to him the best way forward. So, he chose to present the meeting as a potential golden opportunity rather than an overdue past reckoning. Of course, he may also have had an eye on what was best for himself too. After all, if Dellius served Antony, but he thought Antony in turn would end up serving Cleopatra, then he needed to find a solution that would be in Cleopatra’s interests too. So, ideally, as a political opportunist and survivor, he needed to produce a triangulation of mutual benefit.

How this meeting between Antony and Cleopatra was to be achieved, and the manner in which it was to be conducted, is made clear enough in Plutarch’s narrative and through his
choice of literary allusion. Plutarch says that Dellius resorted to flattery and persuasion (one verbal artist sparring with another), to incline Cleopatra, as Homer put it, έλθειν εἰς Κιλικίαν ἐντύνασαν ἑαυτήν (Plut. Ant. 25.3), ‘to go to Cilicia having turned herself out in all her finery’. The original passage of Homer (Hom. Iliad 14. 157ff.) refers to Hera and her scheme to seduce Zeus and to lull him into a post-coital sleep thus allowing Poseidon to assist the Greeks against the Trojans. The plan is conceived as a form of erotic seduction expressly designed to deceive Zeus and further Hera’s own interests. Plutarch’s implication is surely that the trip to Tarsus was to entail a similar role for Cleopatra.

It was Dellius, according to Plutarch, who was the instigator of this plan. To not only satisfy Antony, but also to potentially gain influence with Cleopatra as well, Dellius would need to suggest a means by which she could see the meeting at Tarsus not as simple compliance with the directive of a Roman magistrate, but as an opportunity to build a new influential relationship with Rome. If Plutarch’s account is accurate, then Cleopatra’s arrival in Tarsus, and the manner in which she arrived, would appear to be a triumph of Dellius’ diplomacy.

However, as noted above, despite the centrality of Dellius in Plutarch’s account, there seems to be a general reluctance in the secondary sources on the subject to acknowledge his influence. Chauveau (2002: 41), for instance, remarks, ‘the manipulative role that Plutarch imputes to Dellius on this occasion seems highly exaggerated.’ He prefers to present the agency for Cleopatra’s particular manifestation at Tarsus all to her, ‘Cleopatra was surely the sole originator of the sumptuous production that would transport her destiny to the level of myth’ (2002: 41). This seems to have become a general orthodoxy; Hölbl (2001: 240-241), for example, remarks, ‘Her intention was to conquer the Roman general by a display of Ptolemaic tryphé and through her feminine charms’, and Tyldesley (2008: 149), ‘Her
personal knowledge of Antony the man allowed Cleopatra to settle on a tactic that would give her genius for showmanship full rein.12

While we should be wary of seemingly taking agency away from Cleopatra and handing it to a Roman male, there are a couple of issues here that are worth exploring. First, we might consider that Plutarch is far from averse from presenting Cleopatra in a negative way. So, what motivation would he have in attributing the initial plan for the nature of the Tarsus encounter to Dellius rather than to Cleopatra herself? Secondly, there seems to be a tendency, as demonstrated by Tyldesley above, to attribute the character of the meeting at Tarsus to Cleopatra’s knowledge of the character of Antony.

However, the degree to which Antony and Cleopatra were already acquainted to any significant degree before their meeting at Tarsus is debatable. Certainly, the evidence for any direct contact between before this point is extremely limited. Appian’s assertion (App. BC 5.8) that Antony conceived a passion for Cleopatra in 55 BCE when he helped restore her father, Ptolemy XII, to the throne is surely questionable.13 It is possible that Cleopatra came into contact with Antony during the time that she spent in Rome, continually or intermittently, between 46 and 44 BCE.14 However, the extent, and nature of any contact, between them during this period must remain a matter of speculation. What is surely the case, though, is that, as he entered Alexandria in 41 BCE, Dellius knew a great deal more about Antony the man than Cleopatra did. This certainly seems to be the implication of Plutarch’s narrative, as Chauveau suggests (2002:41), ‘Plutarch’s account presents a Dellius informing Cleopatra of Antony’s character and dispositions, which implies that she hardly knew him.’ Surely, if Cleopatra’s detailed knowledge of Antony and his character came from anywhere prior to Tarsus, it must have been from Dellius. To convey such knowledge and to allow it to inform the nature of the meeting at Tarsus may well have been the reason that Dellius was chosen for this mission in the first place.
It, therefore, seems not unreasonable to assume that the suggestion for Cleopatra to go to Tarsus in Homeric style, \( \text{εὖ ἐντύνασαν} \), did indeed come from Dellius. The proposition was based on his knowledge of Antony, but also on the capabilities that he saw in Cleopatra to influence Antony and establish a future relationship with him. Cleopatra would certainly have known her Homer well enough to understand the implication of the adapted quote. In this way, Dellius may well have sown the seed of the plan, and then allowed, and encouraged, Cleopatra to nurture its growth into the scenario that eventually played out at Tarsus. The Ptolemies were, of course, masters of ostentatious regal display and putting on a grand entrance for Antony’s benefit at Tarsus was but a continuation of this family tradition. Cleopatra would surely not have needed any advice from Dellius on how to go about constructing a dazzling incarnation of herself. However, there is one central aspect of her self-presentation where we might again suspect that Dellius did make a contribution and at least helped to steer Cleopatra in a certain direction.

Cleopatra’s entry into Tarsus (Plut. Ant. 26.2) consisted of many striking elements, but at its heart was a visual tableau with Cleopatra at its centre, reclining under a gold decorated canopy like a painting of the goddess Aphrodite. There might appear to be nothing particularly unusual in Cleopatra taking this form. There was, after all, a long tradition of Ptolemaic royal women identifying with Aphrodite and her Egyptian equivalent Isis. However, there was surely an added significance in Cleopatra taking this particular form for her meeting with Antony, because of the latter’s own developing divine affiliations at this time. During the thirties BCE, it seems to be clear that Antony increasingly associated himself with the god Dionysus. However, there is also evidence that this identification started somewhat earlier with Antony’s entry into Ephesus in early 41 BCE. In Plutarch’s account of this event (Plut. Ant. 24.4) Antony is cast in the role of Dionysus as he enters the city: he is preceded by a procession of women dressed as bacchanals and men and boys.
dressed as satyrs and pans, the city is full of ivy, thyrsus wands, harps, pipes and flutes, and Antony is hailed as Dionysus <gk> χαριδότην καὶ μειλίχιον</gk>, ‘The Giver of Joy and The Beneficent’. As there are evident parallels between Antony’s entry into Ephesus and Cleopatra’s arrival into Tarsus in terms of the scale of pageantry and the theatrics involved, there can be little doubt that Plutarch wants readers to see the resemblances between these two events. This symmetry then leads with a certain inevitability in Plutarch’s narrative to the meeting between Cleopatra and Antony at Tarsus, where Cleopatra’s appearance as Aphrodite culminated, he says in the pervasive rumour (Plut. Ant. 26.3) of how ‘Aphrodite had come to revel with Dionysus for the good of Asia’, <gk> ὡς ἡ Ἀφροδίτη κωμάζοι παρὰ τὸν Διώνυσον ἐπ᾽ ἀγαθῷ τῆς Ἀσίας</gk>.

In Plutarch’s account there is surely little doubt that the meeting at Tarsus was a carefully orchestrated event where Cleopatra played Aphrodite precisely to complement Antony’s Dionysus. Certainly, this manoeuvre by Cleopatra turned out to be an astute tactical move. Nor, can there be any doubt that the success of its implementation was due to Cleopatra herself. However, we might also consider the basis upon which this policy was instituted and what information would have induced Cleopatra to take it forward. If the decision to go to Tarsus as Aphrodite was indeed based on the knowledge of Antony’s entry to Ephesus as Dionysus, then where did Cleopatra’s information about this event come from? Although Alexandria was a busy port and news travelled (albeit a little slower) even in the ancient world, surely the most detailed source of information available to Cleopatra about these events would have been Dellius. As a member of Antony’s entourage, certainly at the point that he was dispatched to Cleopatra, it seems highly likely that he was also with Antony during the procession into Ephesus. If so, then Dellius would have been ideally placed to report on Antony’s entry to the city. Again, we might then suspect that Dellius had at least a
formative influence, through his recounting of events at Ephesus, on the decisions that Cleopatra subsequently made with respect to the choreography of her arrival at Tarsus. In Plutarch’s account, then, the impetus for how the Tarsus meeting unfolds comes from Dellius and its execution rests with Cleopatra. Where then does the agency in this tale rest and whose diplomatic triumph does Tarsus represent? Ultimately, the answer to these questions is that perhaps Tarsus in the end served the purposes of all the main protagonists involved and the agencies of the various participants coalesced into a harmonious synergy of their various interests. Dellius’ role was to effect Cleopatra’s voyage to Tarsus to meet with Antony. To do this he needed to persuade Cleopatra that the summons by Antony posed no real threat to her and that she had the necessary tools to turn the occasion to her advantage. From Antony’s perspective, Cleopatra came to Tarsus in response to his summons, the brilliance of her incarnation as Isis served to bolster his own emerging ambitions as a Dionysus, and he could now engage her in the matter of his upcoming Parthian campaign. From Cleopatra’s point of view, she managed a potentially difficult situation effectively. The threat of retribution from Antony was dissipated and the prospect of future cooperation and alliance, and the symbolic way such a relationship could be managed, had all been cemented. This was surely a significant diplomatic success. As such it may well have formed the basis for Antony’s continued used of Dellius on high profile diplomatic missions in subsequent years, though his may well have been his finest, and most high-profile moment.

There is no doubt that the meeting at Tarsus paved the way for an association between Antony and Cleopatra that proved successful in the years that followed, allowing her to ally herself again to a powerful representative of Rome, and further expand the bounds and scope of the Ptolemaic empire. In the end, of course, the alliance proved to be a failure and its ultimate lack of success, accompanied by Antony’s demise, allowed it to be transmuted into a salutary morality tale in our Roman sources. Dellius, of course, by this point, *semper*
mutabile, had moved on to greener pastures, as his political survival instincts kicked in; changing horses in midstream was after all his speciality.

1 On Dellius more generally, see Wissowa 1901: RE 4, 2447-8; Smith 2013: 424-25.

2 On the occasion of his final switch from Antony to Octavian, Velleius, 2.84, notes sardonically that at this point Dellius, exempli sui tenax, was merely sticking to his habitual mutability.

3 Perhaps the best-known use of this unusual word in a literary context appears in Ovid’s Amores at 1.13.15, non mihi mille placent, non sum desulter amoris, ‘A thousand different girls don’t please me, I’m not a switch-rider of love.’ The evident irony of this phrase in the mouth of the Ovidian narrator demonstrates how this Latin word functions as a powerful metaphor for fickleness. See further, Barnsby 1975:44-45, who discusses the relationship between Ovid’s use of the term in Amores 1.3 and Messalla’s description of Quintus Dellius in Seneca the Elder.

4 The implication in Dio is surely that as an adolescent/young man, Dellius had been a sexual partner of Antony’s. Williams 1999: 76, notes, ’pedicare is said to be derived from the Greek < gk > paidika < /gk > (“boyfriend”). See also Adams 1982: 123-5.

5 The Greek term, < gk > φίλος < /gk >, is presumably used as the equivalent for the Latin term, ‘amicus’. The word, like the English, ‘friend’, allows for a wide semantic range. Amici were the advisers of a Roman governor in the provinces in the republican period, and later the amici principis were the inner circle of influential advisers around the emperor. The term could also signify a patron or a client, or more loosely refer to an ally, a friend or a more
intimate physical connection between two people, a lover. So, although the term has more potential shades of meaning than \( \text{παιδικά} \), nevertheless it does not entirely remove the aura of intimacy between the two men. It does, however, suggest that this intimacy had evolved in its nature over time.

6 For example, Hölbl 2001: 240-241, makes no mention of Dellius at all, nor does Ashton 2008: 147-148; Tyldesley 2008: 149, mentions only that Dellius was Antony’s emissary but offers no evaluation of his role; Roller 2010: 76-77, provides a bit more detail but stops short of a full analysis of Dellius’ role and the extent to which he may have been in a position to inform Cleopatra’s planning for the meeting at Tarsus.

7 Although, both App. BC 5.8 and Dio Cass. 48.24 reference the meeting at Tarsus, neither mention Dellius in this context.

8 So, Pelling 1988:185, says of \( \text{πανουργία} \), that the term ‘is often used of ingenious speakers who will ‘do anything’: it suggests both the ‘resourcefulness’ of their style and their ‘lack of principle’ in applying their skills. Cf. Lys. 30.5, 26a, 27f.’ He suggests ‘cunning’ as having ‘the right undertone of unease’.


10 The extent to which Cleopatra had any case to answer to, with regards to assisting Cassius, or Antony believing she did, is debatable. This is certainly the ostensible reason for the meeting as presented in our sources, Plut. Ant. 25.1; App. BC 5.8, but Hölbl 2001: 240, for instance, sees support for the planned upcoming war against Parthia as the real purpose of Antony’s summons and Cleopatra’s alleged support of Cassius as an ‘official pretext for her visit’.

11
This phrase is a very slight adaptation of *Iliad* 14.162, <gk>ἐλθεῖν εἰς Ἴδην ἐντύνασαν ἑστήν < /gk >, ‘to go to Ida having turned herself out in all her finery’.

12 So, too Burstein 2004: 23.

13 Chauveau, 2002:41, remarks that Appian’s narrative ‘seems to be nothing more than a fiction invented after the fact.’ Burstein, 2004: 23, refers to this account as a ‘Roman legend’ and considers it ‘unlikely’.

14 On the question of how long and how continuously Cleopatra stayed in Rome during this period, see Gruen 2011 and Peek 2000: 134ff.

15 The Grand Procession of Ptolemy II in the late third century is probably the most high-profile example of such Ptolemaic display, Hazard 2000: chapter 4; Rice 1983, but the notion of royal display was so ingrained that it spread even into the nomenclature of the Ptolemies with the adoption of the epithet of ‘Tryphon’ (‘the displayer of magnificence’). As Hölbl, 2001: 92, remarks this epithet ‘promulgated the notion of tryphé, splendour and magnificence, as the ideal image of the wealth and good fortune produced by Ptolemaic rule.’ The wealth and resources of the later Ptolemies may not have matched those of their early ancestors but the symbolic importance of wealth was not lost on them.


Fraser 1972: 1:205 and 2:348-349. Among them are Dio 48.39.2; Sen. Suas. 1.6; App. BC 5.76; Vell. Pat. 2.82.4; Plut. Ant. 60. 3-5, 75. 4-6; BMC, Rom. Rep. II, 502-503.


19 Some historians have cast doubt on the accuracy of Antony’s self-identification with Dionysus as early as 41 BCE, Michel 1967: 126-129; Pelling 1988: 179. However, it is surely possible that this did mark the first steps of Antony towards this identification, perhaps orchestrated by the Ephesians rather than himself. The genius of Cleopatra’s appearance as Aphrodite at Tarsus was then that it built on this incipient moment to construct the basis of a future complementary relationship between herself and Antony in terms that were suitably grandiose and flattering towards Antony, but also maintained her own regal divinity and status. The ability of their relationship to be mapped onto, and developed by, the Aphrodite/Isis and Dionysus/Osiris dyad into the 30s BCE amply demonstrated the success of this initial move.

20 This is certainly the image of the event that is typically narrated in modern historical accounts, where Cleopatra’s bold move is inevitably highlighted. For example, Burstein, 2004: 23, ‘she boldly assumed the role of the Egyptian royal goddess Isis in the guise of the Greek goddess Aphrodite coming to visit her husband Osiris in his manifestation as Dionysos’; Tyldesley, 2008: 149, ‘If Antony was Dionysos, she would greet him as Isis, consort of Dionysos-Osiris’.

21 Jeanmaire, 1924, long ago proposed that Cleopatra herself shaped Antony’s association with Dionysus and orchestrated the manner of his entry into Ephesus. Pelling, 1988: 180, notes the parallels between the Dionysiac elements of Antony’s entry into Ephesus and those at the grand procession of Ptolemy II. This might appear to lend some credence to a
Ptolemaic influence in the proceedings. One does have to wonder, though, to what extent Cleopatra would have been in a position at this point to either dictate Antony’s particular style of divine aspirations, or to orchestrate a Bacchic event in a city on the other side of the eastern Mediterranean. It is possible that aspirations to a quasi-divine style of Hellenistic kingship were starting to take shape in Antony’s mind at this point. Plutarch makes it clear, *Ant. 24. 10-12*, that at this time Antony was surrounded by flattery he found hard to resist. Dellius may have been one of those flattering voices, encouraging an ambition in Antony to divine assimilation. Whether an active participant, or an observer, Dellius would then have been in a position to share this with Cleopatra and strategize about how this might impact on the manner of her meeting with Antony.

It is perhaps notable that it is only in Plutarch that there is any detail of both Antony’s entry into Ephesus and Cleopatra’s into Tarsus. Both of these events find little narrative space elsewhere in our existing sources. With regard to the entry to Tarsus, App. *BC 5.8*, simply says that Cleopatra came to meet him in Cilicia, Dio Cass. 48.24.2, only mentions the after-effects of the meeting in Tarsus; App. *BC 5.4*, only remarks that when Antony entered Ephesus he offered a splendid sacrifice to the city’s goddess and pardoned nearly everyone who had fled to the temple as suppliants. The similarities in the accounts of these two occasions in Plutarch might well suggest that he was drawing on a common source for both and that could well have been Dellius’ own narratives of these events, see Pelling, 1988: 28; Roller, 2010: 78; Smith, 2013: 425. In this case, Dellius was not only a participant in the events himself but an influential raconteur of them too.

Although, some have cast doubt on the accuracy of Antony’s self-identification with Dionysus as early as 41 BCE, Michel 1967: 126-29; Pelling 1988: 179, the effectiveness of Cleopatra’s incarnation as Aphrodite at this point may well have been that it built on this
incipient moment of Antony’s association with Dionysus. This then constituted the basis for a future relationship that was developed further in the thirties BCE.

24 Dellius was involved in the restoration of Herod in Judaea, Joseph. AJ 14.25; the events concerning the appointment of Aristobulus to the office of High Priest in Jerusalem, Joseph. AJ. 15.24-29, and the negotiations with Artaxes, the king of Armenia, prior to Antony’s expedition there, Dio Cass. 49.39. 2-3.
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