EOS CVI fasc. 1
2019

EOS

ORGAN
POLSKIEGO TOWARZYSTWA FILOLOGICZNEGO

UKAZUJE SIĘ OD ROKU 1894

REDAKTORZY

JAKUB PIGOŃ (REDAKTOR NACZELNY)
KRZYSZTOF NAWOTKA

Rocznik CVI 2019
Zeszyt 1

WROCŁAW
POLSKIE TOWARZYSTWO FILOLOGICZNE
I UNIWERSYTET WROCŁAWSKI
2019

EOS

COMMENTARII
SOCIETATIS PHILOLOGAE
POLONORUM

EDUNTUR INDE AB ANNO MDCCCXCIV

COMMENTARIOS EDENDOS CURAVERUNT

IACOBUS PIGOŃ (EDITOR PRINCIPALIS)
CHRISTOPHORUS NAWOTKA

Volumen CVI 2019
Fasciculus 1

WRATISLAVIAE
SUMPTIBUS SOCIETATIS PHILOLOGAE POLONORUM
ET UNIVERSITATIS WRATISLAVIENSIS
2019

EDITORUM CONSILIUM

GEORGIUS AXER, VARSOVIAE
MARGARITA BOROWSKA, VARSOVIAE
SILVESTER DWORACKI, POSNANIAE
SOPHIA GŁOMBIOWSKA, GEDANI
CASIMIRUS KORUS, CRACOVIAE
LESCUS MROZEWICZ, POSNANIAE
CATHARINA OCHMAN, WRATISLAVIAE (ex officio)
HENRICUS PODBIELSKI, LUBLINI
GEORGIUS STYKA, CRACOVIAE
MARIANUS SZARMACH, TORUNII

COMMENTARII EDUNTUR ADMINISTRANTUR

PL-50-451 WROCŁAW, UL. KOMUNY PARYSKIEJ 21
INSTYTUT STUDIÓW KLASYCZNYCH, ŚRÓDZIEMNOMORSKICH I ORIENTALNYCH
UNIWERSYTETU WROCŁAWSKIEGO
INSCRIPTIO ELECTRONICA: eos@uni.wroc.pl

COMMENTARIORUM PAGINA DOMESTICA
www.ptf.edu.pl/eos

EDITORUM ADIUTRIX

CATHARINA OCHMAN

Wersją pierwotną (referencyjną) czasopisma jest wersja drukowana

Wydano ze środków Ministerstwa Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego
przeznaczonych na działalność upowszechniającą naukę
w ramach umowy nr 654/P-DUN/2019

przy wsparciu finansowym Wydziału Filologicznego
Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego

© Copyright by Polskie Towarzystwo Filologiczne, Wrocław 2019

CONSPECTUS MATERIAE

COMMENTATIONES

Kenneth R. MOORE, Alexander the Great and Scipio Africanus 7–21
Radosław PIĘTKA, Catullus 64: The Game of Names 23–29
Nicholas Victor SEKUNDA, Two Greek Military Writers in Aelianus Tacticus: Eupolemus of Hypata and Euangelus af Tanagra 31–45
Boris HOGENMÜLLER, Die Sphragis-Epistel des dritten Buches. Bemerkungen zur Intertextualität von Plin. *Ep*. III 21 47–57
Danuta OKOŃ, Military Tribunate in the Careers of Roman Senators of the Severan Period. Part I: Introductory Issues 59–76
Dariusz BRODKA, Priskos von Panion, Chrysaphios und die Macht der Eunuchen 77–95
Barbara BIBIK, Should the Reader Really Pay no Attention to the Stage Directions Supplied in the Translations of Ancient Greek Tragedies? (The Case of Aeschylus' *Oresteia* in Polish Renditions) 97–111

SUMMARIA DISSERTATIONUM INAUGURALIUM

Magdalena MYSZKOWSKA-KASZUBA, Images of Mothers of Classical and Hellenistic Sparta 113–121
Tomasz MAKÓLSKI-ŚWIERCZ, The Spartan Army in ihe Reign of Agesilaos II 123–129
Joanna WILIMOWSKA, Priests and Support Temple Staff in the Fayum Oasis in the Ptolemaic Period 131–139

CENSURAE LIBRORUM

The Cup of Songs or the Universe of Sympotic Poetry. Review of Vanessa Cazzato, Dirk Obbink, Enrico Emanuele Prodi (eds.), *The Cup of Song. Studies on Poetry and the Symposion*, Oxford 2016 (Marek WĘCOWSKI) 141–149
Mary Emerson, *Greek Sanctuaries and Temple Architecture: An Introduction*, 2nd edn., London 2018 (Agnieszka KOTLIŃSKA-TOMA) 150–151
Laurel Fulkerson, *Ovid: A Poet on the Margins*, London 2016 (Radosław PIĘTKA) 152–154
The Power to Inspire: Classical Antiquity and Modern Imagination. Review of Brett M. Rogers, Benjamin Eldon Stevens (eds.), *Classical Traditions in Modern Fantasy*, New York 2017, Jesse Weiner, Benjamin Eldon Stevens, Bret M. Rogers (eds.), *Frankenstein and its Classics. The Modern Prometheus from Antiquity to Science Fiction*, London 2018, Brett M. Rogers, Benjamin Eldon Stevens (eds.), *Once and Future Antiquities in Science Fiction and Fantasy*, London 2019 (Elżbieta OLECHOWSKA) 155–160

Eos CVI 2019
ISSN 0012-7825

ALEXANDER THE GREAT AND SCIPIO AFRICANUS

by

KENNETH R. MOORE

ABSTRACT: This article explores some literary and historical connections between the representation of the Roman general and statesman Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus and the famous world-conqueror Alexander III of Macedon (the Great) in Polybius of Megalopolis' fragmentary Book X of the *Histories*. Recourse is made to Polybius' source material, as we understand it, as well as other borrowings that he appears to have used in his writings that deal with Alexander. The inquiry delves further into the primary source material available to Polybius and considers some epistemological issues concerning the order in which the Alexander subject-matter was produced, the agendas and circumstances of those who produced it, along with the political and other agendas influencing both its production and its later reception by the time of Polybius. It is clear that Polybius has used the Alexander material as a kind of template for eulogising his Scipio, but he has had to do so carefully, and not un-problematically, due to the sensibilities of his contemporaries and target audience in the Roman Republic.

As part of his interwoven, biographical material on the character of Publius Cornelius Scipio "Africanus" in fragmentary Book X of his *Histories*, the Greek historian, and erstwhile military leader, Polybius of Megalopolis (c. 200–c. 118 BC) offers often digressive episodes that illustrate the moral superiority of his subject. These will have doubtless been pleasing to those who had a keen interest in his legacy and memory, not the least of which being the Scipio branch of the *gens Cornelia* who were Polybius' patrons in Rome. This article examines the depiction of Scipio Africanus in Polybius' *Histories*, focusing on Book X 2–20, in which the character and behaviour of that famous Roman general are related in terms very similar to those of Alexander the Great after the battle of Issus in 333 BC. A major source of information on Alexander, and one with which Polybius may have had some familiarity, was the now lost histories of Callisthenes of Olynthus (c. 360–327 BC), Alexander's court historian and his first biographer. The work of Cleitarchus of Alexandria (mid to late 4th century BC) and of Ptolemy and Aristobulus may too have supplied Polybius with source material. Versions of this episode have survived in other, later sources, namely Arrian, Plutarch, Diodorus Siculus and Quintus Curtius Rufus and it is through

these that we may trace links between authors. This article considers, in part, the epistemology of that tradition of transmission in the light of more recent scholarship about it, and most notably the ground-breaking work undertaken by N.G.L. Hammond and Andrew Chugg. The ultimate aims of this inquiry are twofold. Firstly, it seeks to discover, with relative certainty, whether Polybius was deliberately overlaying characteristics of Alexander onto Scipio, derived perhaps from Callisthenes, Cleitarchus or others, in order to produce a specifically dramatic "effect" and/or to appeal to his patrons and their contemporaries. Secondly, it considers some of the major historiographical trends and debates on this subject in order to determine, as near as possible, from which source(s) Polybius obtained such tales, which is the more difficult and speculative of the twain.

* * *

It is fair to say that Alexander the Great presented a topic with which Polybius was concerned and which greatly interested his audience. Both Polybius and Livy (Titus Livius, 64 or 59 BC–AD 12 or 17) had argued for the superiority of Rome over the accomplishments of the great Macedonian; but, this also meant considerable recourse to Alexander's historical legacy, if only to cast shade upon it. There are numerous passages in Polybius, consequently, that discuss him, not least about his *fortuna*, as well as Theopompus' negative portrayals with which Polybius took issue[1]. Indeed, something like the "fortune vs. virtue" debate around Alexander seems to have haunted the legacy of Scipio too and Polybius is at pains in Book X to demonstrate that Scipio's success was largely down to his own innate cleverness and calculation rather than his good luck.

The description of Scipio's early career, as Overtoom writes, "appears to nearly parallel Alexander's"[2]. Scipio, unlike most Roman commanders, lead from the front, like Alexander; although, he was demonstrably more cautious and calculating in his actions[3]. As if to illustrate this very point, at the siege of New Carthage, Polybius has his Scipio being critical of incautious behaviour when the survival of the state was in jeopardy, adding that "such conduct is not the mark of a general who trusts to luck, but of one who possesses intelligence"[4]. This is an instance demonstrating Roman superiority with a clear reference (albeit implicitly) to what was perceived as Alexander's more reckless approach. In his explicit descriptions, Polybius (II 8–13) has compared Scipio to the Spartan legislator Lycurgus, rather than to Alexander. One might rightly ask, if he really wanted to model Scipio on Alexander,

---

[1] See Polybius VIII 8, 7.

[2] Overtoom 2011: 21. See Livy XXVI 19, 7, where he mentions rumours that Scipio, like Alexander, was a favourite of the gods and the son of Jupiter, who had sexual relations with his mother in the form of a large snake.

[3] Goldsworthy 1998: 150–163.

[4] Polybius X 3.

why compare the latter with Lycurgus? I suspect that this is due to prevailing Roman, Republican attitudes towards Alexander in Polybius' era, which were fairly negative. Livy, by contrast, does explicitly compare Scipio to Alexander[5]. And this appears to be an illustration of how Roman attitudes towards Alexander had changed by the early Principate. Polybius does give the impression that he is using Alexander as his model for Scipio but had to do so in a less than overt way. The episodes discussed below self-consciously, if tacitly, recollect Alexander – or, at least they would to any who are familiar with his *Histories*[6].

The two key passages that shall be considered in terms of this potential "borrowing" are presented here and will be discussed throughout. The first is X 18, after Scipio has taken Nova Carthago by a clever stratagem:

> After this he set apart Mago and the Carthaginians who were with him, two of them being members of the council of elders and fifteen members of the senate. He committed these to the custody of Laelius, ordering him to pay them due attention. Next he invited the hostages, over three hundred altogether, to visit him, and calling the children to him one by one and caressing them bade them be of good cheer, as in a few days they would again see their parents. He also bade the rest to take heart and asked them all to write to their relations at home, firstly, that they were safe and well, and secondly, that the Romans were willing to restore them all in safety to their homes if their relatives chose to become allies of Rome. After speaking thusly, having reserved from the booty the most suitable objects for this purpose, he gave them such gifts as were appropriate for their sex and age, presenting the girls with earrings and bracelets and the young men with poniards and swords. When one of the captive women, the wife of Mandonius, who was the brother of Andobales, King of the Ilergetes, fell at his feet and entreated him with tears to treat them with more proper consideration than the Carthaginians had done, he was touched and asked her what they stood in need of. The lady was indeed of advanced age, and bore herself with a certain majestic dignity. Upon her making no reply he sent for the officials appointed to attend upon the women. When they presented themselves and informed him that they kept the women generously supplied with all they required, the lady again clasped his knees and addressed him in the same words, upon which Scipio was still more puzzled, and conceiving the idea that the officials who attended them were neglecting them and had now made a false statement, he again bade the ladies to be of good cheer, for he said he would himself appoint other attendants who would see to it that they were in want of nothing. The old lady after some hesitation said, "General, you do not take me rightly if you think that our present situation is about our food". Scipio then understood what the lady meant, and noticing the youth and beauty of the daughters of Andobales and other princes he was forced to tears, recognising in how few words she had pointed out to him the dangers to which they were exposed. So now he made it clear to her that he had taken her meaning, and grasping her by the right hand bade her and the rest be of good cheer, for he would look after them as if they were his own sisters and children and would accordingly appoint trustworthy men to attend on them.

---

[5] XXVI 19, 6 f.; according to Livy both men were believed by the "common folk as being the offspring of a divine serpent".

[6] See Chaplin 2010.

Livy too details these same events in his *Ab Urbe Condita* (XXVI 49, 11–16). It is very similar but gives somewhat more speech to Scipio:

> ...then Scipio said: "thanks to my own training and that of the Roman people I would see to it that nothing which is anywhere sacred should suffer violence among us. But as it is, I am moved to an even stricter care in that respect by the courage and dignity of you women also, who even in misfortune have not forgotten what is seemly for a matron". He then handed them over to a man of proved uprightness, and ordered him to protect them with no less respect and modesty than the wives and mothers of guest-friends.

Livy's version emphasises traditional Roman values (perhaps *vis-à-vis* the Augustan moral reforms) regarding women even more so; but it no less portrays the *clementia* and *moderatio* of Scipio, albeit extended to the whole of the Roman people. One gets the impression that he had Polybius' treatise close to hand (and see below). The next passage from Polybius occurs at X 19, 3–7, shortly after the first one above:

> It was at this time that some young Romans came across a girl of surpassing bloom and beauty, and being aware that Scipio was fond of women, brought her to him and introduced her, saying that they wished to make a present of the maiden to him. He was overcome and astonished by her beauty, but he told them that had he been in a private position, no present would have been more welcome to him, but as he was their general it would be the least welcome of any, giving them to understand, I suppose, by this answer that sometimes, during seasons of repose and leisure in our life, such things afford young men most delightful enjoyment and entertainment, but that in times of activity they are most prejudicial to the body and the mind alike of those who indulge in them. So he expressed his gratitude to the young men, but called the girl's father and delivering her over to him at once bade him give her in marriage to whomever of the citizens that he preferred. The self-restraint and moderation he displayed on this occasion secured him the warm approbation of his troops.

Livy also details these events, like Polybius, almost immediately after the previous ones. However, he has his Scipio address the young man to whom he learns that the attractive girl has been betrothed (XXVI 50, 4–8):

> "...as a young man", he said, "I speak to you as a young man so as to lessen embarrassment between us in this conversation. It was to me that your betrothed was brought as a captive by our soldiers, and I learned of your love for her and her beauty made that easy to believe. Therefore, since in my own case, if it were only permitted me to enjoy the pleasures of youth, especially in a proper and legitimate love, and had not the state preoccupied my attention, I should wish to be pardoned for an ardent love of a bride, I favour what is in my power: your love. Your betrothed has been in my camp with the same regard for modesty as in the house of your parents-in-law, her own parents. She has been kept for you, so that she could be given you as a gift, unharmed and worthy of you and of me. This is the only price that I stipulate in return for that gift: be a friend to the Roman people, and if you believe me to be a good man, such as these tribes formerly came to know in

> my father and uncle, be assured that in the Roman state there are many like us, and that no people in the world can be named to-day which you would be less desirous of having as an enemy to you and yours, or more desirous of having as a friend".

Once more, Livy has added extra lines for Scipio and, for a second time, he has extended Scipio's own virtues to the whole of the Romans. Again, it seems he had Polybius as his guide here. And there are further parallels between Livy and Polybius on Scipio. While that is not the subject of this inquiry, it is no less interesting that we might observe an example of one of Livy's sources which he has neglected to cite as well as seeing how an original source has found its way along a chain of scholarly transmission.

In these passages from Polybius, as with Livy, we are presented with evidences of the victorious Roman general's *clementia*, *enkrateia* and *sophrosyne*, the latter two being Greek concepts with which Polybius would have been well-acquainted, highly compatible with Roman attitudes and sensibilities. Scipio's self-restraint in the second passage (albeit troublingly circumstantial to modern readers), in particular, would have demonstrated his adherence to traditional Roman values and both passages conspicuously illustrate his *virtus*, *dignitas* and *honos* and, crucially, his *continentia*, *moderatio* or *temperantia*[7]. Both episodes also prominently recollect similar descriptions of Alexander the Great. And these appear too similar to be coincidence which then begs a range of additional questions about the veracity of each account as well as the motivations of their authors.

The sources on Alexander that resonate along similar lines shall next be given and I shall then move on to some analysis of all of these and their prospective relationships. As we shall see, pinning down the precise origin of these accounts is complicated, although HAMMOND has concluded that they ultimately derive from the lost work of Cleitarchus[8]. That however remains to be seen. And Callisthenes and Ptolemy perhaps play a greater role. Let us begin with Diodorus Siculus' (fl. 1st cent. BC) version from his *Bibliotheca Historica*. According to this, after first enjoying a bit of sport with the Persian Queen Mother Sysigambes'[9] misapprehension of his and Hephaestion's identity, and then informing her that she and the other captured Persian royals would be treated as his own family, we are told the following (XVII 38, 1–5):

> He decked her out in royal jewellery and restored her to her former dignity, with its proper honours. He made over to her all of her former retinue of servants which she had been given by Dareius and added more in addition, no less in number than previously. He promised to provide for the marriage of the king's daughters even

---

[7] X 19, 7: τὰ τῆς ἐγκρατείας καὶ τὰ τῆς μετριότητος ἐμφαίνων.

[8] HAMMOND 1993: 52.

[9] Diodorus uniquely, and rather oddly, calls her "Sisyngambris".

> more generously than Dareius had done and to bring up the boy as his own son and to show him royal honour. [...] As to the wife of Dareius, he said he would see that her dignity should be maintained so that she would experience nothing inconsistent with her former happiness. He added many other assurances of consideration and benevolence, such that the women broke out into uncontrolled weeping, so great was their unexpected joy. He gave them his hand as pledge of all this and was not only showered with praise by those who had been helped, but won universal recognition throughout his own army for his exceeding propriety of conduct.

There are clear parallels between this from Diodorus and Polybius' account of Scipio with the Spanish nobles above, granted that Alexander's version is somewhat more extravagant, perhaps in keeping with his own grandness (or Greek "decadence" as perceived by Roman Republican sensibilities) and that of his accomplishments by contrast to Scipio's. Plutarch's (c. AD 46–120) account form his *Life of Alexander* is slightly less embellished but imparts essentially the same message. Alexander discovers that the family of Dareius are amongst his prisoners and, having seen Dareius' bow and chariot, they believe him dead and are lamenting. Alexander sends Leonnatus (so too in Diodorus) to inform them that the Persian King is not dead. Plutarch omits the identity trick with Hephaestion but states (*Alex*. 21):

> ...they should be provided with everything they had been accustomed to regard as their own when Dareius was king. This kindly and reassuring message for Dareius' womenfolk was followed by still more generous acts. Alexander gave them leave to bury as many of the Persian dead as they wished and to take from the plunder any clothes and ornaments that they thought appropriate and to use them for this purpose. He also allowed them to keep the same attendants and privileges which they had previously enjoyed and he even increased their income. But the most honourable and truly regal service which he rendered unto these chaste and noble women was to ensure that they should never hear, suspect nor have reason to fear anything which could disgrace them: for they lived out of sight and earshot of the soldiers, as though they were guarded in some inviolable retreat set aside for virgin priestesses rather than in the camp of their enemy.

Both Plutarch and Diodorus are especially praising of Alexander for his moderation and self-restraint and how this affected his army's admiration of him (as is Justin in his epitome of Pompeius Trogus, XI 9, 16, which recounts the same tale). Both indicate that the women's chastity would be maintained, as with Polybius' Scipio, with Plutarch emphasising it to an even greater extent. It is as if they had provided a ready-made template for promoting the virtues of a noble and honourable man for Polybius to use for his own ends.

Arrian (Lucius Flavius Arrianus "Xenophon", c. AD 86/89–c. after 146/160) too gives a very similar account of this, with many of the details repeated, including the misidentification of Hephaestion and Leonnatus being sent in initially, with an albeit much more "bare bones" version of the kindly treatment of the Persian women. He, however, does add a note of uncertainty whilst commenting on how these deeds promoted Alexander's good character (*Anab*. II 12 f.):

> If these were indeed the facts, I cannot but admire Alexander both for treating these women with such compassion and for showing such respect and confidence towards his friends; but if the story is apocryphal, then it was at least inspired by Alexander's character: thus he would have acted, thus he would have spoken – and on that account I admire him no less[10].

It is interesting that Arrian alone questions the authenticity of this material and it suggests that he might have had some reason to do so; although he does not tell us what that is. I suspect that it is because he knows that the original source was Callisthenes, albeit used by Ptolemy. If it indeed came from Callisthenes that would seem reasonable enough for Arrian to doubt it, bearing in mind that Arrian has explicitly placed his trust in Ptolemy and Aristobulus (*Anab*. I 1, 1–5) – even regarding such fantastical things as the hissing snakes guiding Alexander to Siwah, given by Ptolemy. Hammond is convinced that these events with the Persian women in Arrian must come from Ptolemy, who was present and would have been conversant with these details[11]. Yet, given that it is also in Vulgate sources, the account was most probably in both Cleitarchus' and in Ptolemy's lost histories. For many years, it was assumed that Cleitarchus wrote his version first and that Ptolemy produced his afterwards in order to "set the record straight" but recent evidence has come to light to the effect that Ptolemy in fact wrote his account first, that it was suppressed by his heirs for reasons of their own, and Cleitarchus wrote his afterwards, possibly using Ptolemy's unedited memoires as a source but relying also on his interviews with Alexander's veterans[12]. I shall return to that point below. For now, it is clear that Diodorus, Curtius Rufus, Plutarch and Arrian all recount a similar tale, probably derived from the same source or sources (at least Cleitarchus and Ptolemy), to that of Polybius in his account of Scipio with the Spanish nobles. It is somewhat rare that Vulgate and Official sources both agree so completely on precise details, such as these, about a specific episode. And, when they do, it seemingly points to a common source.

There are further, telling points of connection between Polybius' account and the Alexander historians. The second extract from Polybius, quoted above, in which Scipio manfully refused the offer of an attractive young woman whom his soldiers have taken as a war prize likewise recollects a similar event reported about Alexander which was also seen to indicate his self-restraint. This one is found in Plutarch, located just after the incident with the Persian women, where he writes (*Alex*. 22):

---

[10] To add further uncertainty to this episode is a letter allegedly to Parmenion, quoted in Plutarch's *Life of Alexander* (22, 5), in which Alexander claims never to have seen the wife of Dareius.

[11] Hammond 1993: 53.

[12] See Chugg 2013: 572 ff.

> When Philoxenus, the commander of his forces on the sea coast, wrote to say that he had with him a slave merchant from Tarentum named Theodorus who was offering exceptionally handsome boys for sale and asked whether Alexander wished to buy them, the king was furious and angrily demanded of his friend what signs of degeneracy Philoxenus had ever noticed in him that he should waste his time procuring such debased creatures.

And this is not the only such example. Another such offering of a handsome youth is mentioned after the above one, this time by a Companion named Hagnon, who is similarly rebuked for it. Also, immediately thereafter is recounted how Alexander then hears of some of his soldiers having seduced the wives of some Greek mercenaries and orders an investigation saying that if they were found guilty, they should be put to death. It is not quite the same as Scipio restoring the captured girl to her father etc. rather than ravishing her, but it is along much the same lines and with a similar import about the leading figure's character. If Polybius borrowed this episode for his Scipio, then he appears to have sanitised it somewhat for Roman sensibilities, omitting any prospect of same-sex relations, implicit or otherwise; however, the import is more than comparable.

Tales such as this of people in positions of power showing similar mercies to their captives are effectively commonplace in Plutarch's works[13]. Even so, the refusal of the handsome youths by Alexander does not appear in Diodorus and neither does HAMMOND comment on its origin for Plutarch. Arrian does not mention it but, like Diodorus, moves onto other military matters. While Curtius Rufus does recount the episode with the Persian women more or less the same as Diodorus, he too omits the refusal of the handsome youths (III 11 f.) as does, unsurprisingly, Justin. It is possible that the original comes from Cleitarchus' version of Alexander but that seems unlikely, given its absence in Vulgate sources. We can almost certainly exclude Ptolemy's *History* as the source for these refusals.

There are other similar episodes in anecdotal accounts of Alexander's *sophrosyne* by diverse sources. They are all much later than Polybius but may derive from sources of which he knew. For example, in his *Dialogue on Love* (*Amat.* 16 = *Mor.* 760D) and *Sayings of Kings and Commanders* (*Reg. et imp. apophth*. Alex. 19 = *Mor.* 180F), Plutarch reports that Antipatrides had a female lyre-player whom Alexander found attractive but he restrained himself "and did not touch the woman". We get a similar story in Athenaeus (*Deipn.* XIII 603B–C) who reports an account by Carystius, from his *Historical Notes*, in which Alexander refuses to kiss an attractive youth when offered to do so by Charon of Chalcis. Carystius (by way of Athenaeus) next comments on the king's self-mastery and then, conveniently enough, recounts the story of his encounter with the Persian

---

[13] See Plut. *Per.* 38, 4; *De Alex. fort.* I 7 (= *Mor*. 329D); I 11 (= *Mor*. 332C); II 7 (= *Mor*. 339A–E).

women. Carystius of Pergamum was a 2nd century BC writer described by Jacoby as a *Literatur-historiker*[14]. The fact that he is more or less contemporary with Polybius is telling but inconclusive, especially given the uncertainty over Carystius' dates. Both authors may have obtained this information originally from the same source or sources.

To summarise thus far, Polybius has presented his Scipio as being magnanimous to captured Spanish nobles and refusing a local girl from Nova Carthago who had been proffered to him for sexual gratification. In doing so, he exemplifies a range of positive characteristics, notably clemency, moderation and self-restraint. We also find very similar accounts in the histories of Alexander the Great, which have been presented above. The similarities, I argue, are too great to be coincidence. It appears that Polybius has "borrowed" the basic paradigm for such actions from the Alexander historians to use for his Scipio. The next questions that I am asking are: what is/are the source(s) for these paradigms and by what means did they find their way into the works of Polybius? Laterally, the question of their veracity remains a topic under consideration.

* * *

The business of chasing down lost sources on Alexander, much less determining who read whom, is tricky at best. If we can say that Polybius used Alexander as his model for Scipio, which seems fairly apparent, then whence is he deriving this borrowed material? One particular lost source about which we have some information seems to connect with many of our extant ones in these matters. It is clear that Polybius had read Callisthenes of Olynthus and was fairly critical of his work, the battle narratives in particular, although he also praised him for admiring Alexander[15]. But did he in fact also read Cleitarchus or Ptolemy and might there be a connection between them here[16]? Errington has argued that Polybius' knowledge of Alexander derived from Callisthenes alone and it is the case that he is the only Alexander historian mentioned by name in Polybius' *Histories*[17]. That seems to go too far but no less entails a kernel of truth. Polybius certainly used Callisthenes for his account of the Battle of Issus, in Book XII, after which the above quotes about the Persian women come in Arrian, Diodorus, Curtius Rufus and Plutarch. But the refusal of the handsome youths from Philoxenus and Hagnon are only to be found in Plutarch. This suggests the possibility that

---

[14] See F. Jacoby, *Karystios von Pergamon*, *RE* X 2, 1919, col. 2054, which builds upon C. Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, vol. IV, Parisiis 1851 [reprinted Frankfurt 1975], pp. 356 f. = Athenaeus XI 115 (506E–F).

[15] Billows 2000: 291–293.

[16] See Walbank 1967: 64–68 and 193 f., where he discusses Callisthenes and Timaeus of Tauromenium, amongst others, as possible sources as well as providing some extensive scholarship on Polybius' sources. See too Meister 1975: 81–91 and Scullard 1970: 237, 282.

[17] Errington 1976: 178.

these moral refusals were originally in Callisthenes' account, given that all extant Alexander historians, and Plutarch in particular, used Callisthenes to some extent. Billows has demonstrated that Polybius likely obtained his material on the fortune of Alexander from the peripatetic philosopher/statesman Demetrius of Phaleron (c. 350–c. 280 BC), so it is apparently the case that he was using at least one original Alexander source other than Callisthenes, contrary to Errington[18]. Demetrius' treatise can be reasonably dated to around 318 BC, making it the earliest source on Alexander to our knowledge apart from that of Callisthenes (and the Attic orators)[19]. Diodorus' and Curtius Rufus' emphasis on Alexander's fortune appears to derive from Demetrius' work as well which suggests that Cleitarchus likely accessed it in his research. This paper chase does not, however, demonstrate that Polybius read Cleitarchus, only that they perhaps used some of the same source material, with that namely being Callisthenes.

What about Ptolemy? His lost *History of Alexander* was profoundly influential on later scholarship. I had alluded earlier that Cleitarchus might have had access to it (or, at least to Ptolemy's memoires) and it seems almost beyond a doubt that the tale of the Persian women was also present in his account thanks to it being preserved in Arrian. Along with this is the fact that Arrian is taking the somewhat unusual step of doubting the authenticity of the account. The relationship between Ptolemy's work and that of Cleitarchus bears some consideration. Chugg has re-examined Oxyrhynchus papyrus 4808 "On Hellenistic Historians" in relation to this. Lines 15–17 assert that, shortly before his death, Cleitarchus was the tutor to Ptolemy IV Philopator (born c. 244 BC)[20]. We know that Cleitarchus' accounts (by way of Diodorus and Curtius Rufus) contradict Ptolemy's on a number of key points, not least being the blame of Thais, Ptolemy's later mistress, over the burning of Persepolis along with Perdiccas' role in the destruction of Thebes. It seems unlikely that Cleitarchus, active in court life, would have dared to write such a contradictory account after Ptolemy's work had been officially published and so the tentative consensus had been that his version must have come first (about 300 or 310 BC)[21]. The precise time of the publication of Ptolemy's *History* is hotly debated. Young, for example, reports a date of about 305–295 for it[22]. Yet Chugg argues that Ptolemy (c. 367 BC–282 BC) produced

---

[18] Billows 2000: 297 f.

[19] *Ibidem*. Billows (2000: *passim*) has also demonstrated that Polybius (along with Diodorus later) was using Hieronymus of Cardia (contemporary and friend of Eumenes of Cardia) as a source as well, with Hieronymus having taken material from Eumenes. The Attic Orators notwithstanding.

[20] Chugg 2013: 573–577.

[21] Pandi 2012.

[22] Young 2014: 11. Young also concludes that the source of the tale of the Persian women was Ptolemy (p. 61).

his memoirs earlier than Cleitarchus' history but that they remained unpublished until they were later released, having been edited and likely sanitised, under his successors, possibly Ptolemy II or III[23]. These efforts may account for some of the inconsistencies with other traditions. If that were the case, it would remedy the issue of Cleitarchus' contradictions and, being a court insider writing on Alexander, Cleitarchus would likely have had access to Ptolemy's work which he then used in his own writings on Alexander. The presence of the treatment of the Persian women in Arrian, Diodorus, Curtius Rufus and Plutarch (along with the above mentioned scholarship) is more than highly suggestive that this episode was likewise present in both Ptolemy and Cleitarchus, which lends some credibility to Cleitarchus also using Ptolemy as a source, assuming Chugg's dating is correct. So, a line may be drawn from Ptolemy to all of the Official *and* Vulgate sources, at least on the transmission of this tale of the treatment of the Persian royal family.

But does that line begin with Callisthenes rather than with Ptolemy? The court historian from Olynthus' presence looms large here, despite a tendency in modern scholarship to dismiss his now lost work as having been overly flattering and inaccurate. As stated, it will have had a correct chronology at least up to the point that it terminated, probably after Gaugamela. Could Callisthenes, as we have already seen, likely the source for the refusals of the handsome youths, also be the original source for the treatment of the Persian women? Callisthenes of Olynthus was either Aristotle's nephew or grand-nephew. He was known for an inclination towards antiquarianism but was also well-published on historical subjects and the natural sciences, in keeping with both Aristotle's and Alexander's interests, prior to taking up his post as royal historian. Callisthenes had been either a fellow student or more likely Aristotle's "teaching assistant" at the Shrine of the Nymphs at Mieza (between c. 343 and 340 BC) when Alexander was receiving his tutelage. His role was that of the official historian on the Asiatic expedition. The mystery surrounding his death in 328 BC, after being accused of fomenting treason, haunts us to this day[24]. Tarn argued that, in the propaganda wars that accompanied the Wars of the Diadochi, the Peripatetic School, patronised by Cassander of Macedon, had sought revenge for Callisthenes' treatment through advancing the invective argument of Alexander the "lucky tyrant"[25]. And this resonates well with the position of Demetrius of Phaleron, another peripatetic whom Polybius, as we have observed, seems to have used as a source on Alexander.

There is also fairly un-equivocal evidence of Ptolemy and Aristobulus, amongst others, "borrowing" from Callisthenes elsewhere. The prevailing view

---

[23] Chugg 2013: 576.

[24] See Moore 2018.

[25] Tarn 1930: 255 f.

is that the court historian sent back approved instalments of his *opus* throughout the expedition, up to Gaugamela, but that he must have kept copies which Ptolemy and Aristobulus obtained after his somewhat mysterious and suspicious demise[26]. I have already mentioned that his chronology and nomenclature were probably used by any successor historians who had access to them. One example of more detailed borrowing is of Callisthenes' description of a statue of an Assyrian king at Archiale, observed by Alexander's army in 333. It is quoted in the *Suda* under the entry for Sardanapalus (probably Ashur-bani-apal), attributed to Callisthenes. It is also quoted from a fragment of Aristobulus found in Athenaeus (XII 39) and in Strabo (XIV 5, 9). There is a third depiction in Arrian (II 5, 3 f.), apparently coming from Ptolemy. The descriptions are nearly identical, including the reported inscription on the statue, apart from the orientation of the statue's hands[27]. We have three slightly different versions of that. Callisthenes himself appears to have obtained the information about the statue's inscription from an earlier text, either the *Persica* of Hellanicus or, perhaps more likely, from Ctesias of Cnidus, a 5th century Greek physician in Caria who also wrote a treatise called the *Persica*. And this description also finds its way into both Diodorus of Sicily and Plutarch[28]. Another example is that of the capture of the Sogdian Rock in Arrian VI 18 ff. which is also in Curtius Rufus VII 11. Callisthenes seems to have obtained much of his detail of this locality from Ctesias as well[29]. The visit to the Siwah Oasis too, present in both Vulgate and Official sources, with surprising consistency, except for what the oracle actually said, appears derived from Callisthenes and he himself probably gleaned much of the geographic and other physical and ethnographic details from Herodotus. So too is there remarkable consistency between the various accounts of the battle of Issus in the extant Alexander historians, apart from the purported speeches, and "that the source was Callisthenes is made fairly clear by Polybius"[30].

Yet Hammond is convinced, and unequivocally states, that "Callisthenes' version was not adopted by Ptolemy and Aristobulus and was not transmitted through them to Arrian"[31]. He cites Arrian's contempt for Callisthenes as a "flatterer", a tactless and boorish man of little scruple (*Anab*. IV 12, 6 ff.). And it is true that Arrian does not mention Callisthenes as a source whereas he does name Ptolemy and Aristobulus. To be fair, Arrian does sometimes refer to "others"

---

[26] Prentice 1923: 76.

[27] Prentice (1923: 77 f.) considers the possibility that Ptolemy and Aristobulus may have seen different statues but the consistency of the inscription suggests a single source.

[28] Diodorus II 21, 8 ff.; Athenaeus XII 38 (528E–529D); Plutarch, *De Alexandri fortuna aut virtute*, II 3 (= *Mor*. 336C).

[29] Much of the material from Ctesias on this is present in Book II of Diodorus.

[30] Prentice 1923: 83.

[31] Hammond 1993: 34.

who are not named and Hammond himself has postulated the identities of some of these such as Chares of Mytilene (via the *Royal Diary*) who was probably used by Arrian as well as by Plutarch[32]. It is possible, as Young has argued, that Callisthenes also made entries in the *Royal Diary*, acting for a time as secretary, and that Eumenes of Cardia may have taken over after his death[33]. The fact that Arrian has not named Callisthenes as his source and that he seemingly held him in disdain are not sufficient reasons to exclude him as a possible source, directly or indirectly, for Arrian's *Anabasis Alexandrou*. Polybius was also highly critical of Callisthenes but still explicitly used him as a source, if sometimes discrediting his historical acumen[34]. Indeed, he appears to have read Callisthenes work very closely.

Others have been more circumspect. Young argues that Ptolemy must have used Callisthenes[35]. And Devine has made a case for Callisthenes' description of the Battle of Issus, along with other details, having been "passed on through Ptolemy and Aristobulus and enshrined in the *Anabasis* of Arrian", which Hammond had largely dismissed[36]. The placement of the description of Alexander's generosity and self-restraint, which I am arguing that Polybius has "borrowed", directly after Issus seems to support those items coming from Callisthenes. Significantly, as Nawotka has asserted, this "romantic tale [...] regarding Alexander's first contact with Darius' family" was "originally ascribed to Callisthenes"[37]. He does not comment further on the matter of the sources as that was not the aim of his argument; but the fact that Callisthenes had been thought to be the source for this episode is telling. Perhaps that original ascription was correct. Again, the presence of the account of the Persian women in both Vulgate and Official traditions does suggest a common origin. And if that was not Ptolemy, and even if he also reported it as he seems to have done, it may well have been Callisthenes who originated the tale and both Cleitarchus and Ptolemy then utilised Callisthenes' account. Invented or otherwise, it certainly depicts Alexander in a flattering light.

* * *

We are left with several possibilities concerning Polybius' "borrowing": either (a) Scipio Africanus just happened to act in very similar ways to Alexander under similar circumstances and Polybius, though not an eye-witness, reported it, or (b) he was deliberately imitating Alexander, having read some of these very

---

32 Hammond 1993: 97.

33 Young 2014: 109, 200.

34 See e.g. Polybius XII 17–22.

35 Young 2014: 19 *et passim*.

36 Devine 1985: 25. See Hammond 1992.

37 Nawotka 2010: 174.

descriptions that I have been discussing, or (c) Polybius purposefully chose to pattern elements of his biographical excursus on Scipio after events described by Alexander historians in order to enhance his subject's character. Given the historiography on these matters, it is the latter interpretation that I am supporting here. We do not know for certain whether Polybius read Cleitarchus or Ptolemy from which he then obtained his paradigm for Scipio, derived from moralising descriptions of Alexander. The similarity of those accounts, however, appears too great to be coincidence. We only know for certain that Polybius read Callisthenes and probably Hieronymus of Cardia and Demetrius of Phaleron, with the latter giving anything but a flattering presentation of his subject. If Polybius read these, being a relatively thorough scholar, it seems likely that he must have also read others as well. Ptolemy and Cleitarchus almost certainly used Callisthenes to some extent – to what extent remains a subject of scholarly debate. Even if Polybius only read Callisthenes (which to me seems doubtful) then he may have lifted elements from the encounter with the Persian royals at least from there, which would account for the similarity with Diodorus, Curtius Rufus, Arrian and Plutarch – all derived to some extent from Callisthenes, whether directly or second-hand through Ptolemy and Cleitarchus.

The case of the Persian women seems almost certainly to have come down to us via just such a route. The refusals of the attractive youths are harder to explain although, as suggested, they also appear to have been derived from Callisthenes, falling just after the description of the Persian women. Given Polybius' frequent recourse to Callisthenes, he seems the most likely candidate for any "borrowing" on the former's part in shaping his virtuous image of Scipio. Did any of these episodes actually happen, whether Alexander and the Persian royal women or the refusal of the attractive youths, or Scipio's treatment of the Spanish nobles and the similar refusal of the beautiful maiden? If they did all derive from Callisthenes, as I strongly suspect, then, like Arrian, I too am inclined to take them with a "grain of salt". That is not to say that they did not happen or that these men would not have behaved in just such a manner under those circumstances. But we can at least observe how an historical agenda from one era may have evolved into a *topos* to be transmitted down the generations to suit the exigencies of a writer in another.

Teesside University
k.r.moore@tees.ac.uk

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Billows 2000: R. Billows, *Polybius and Alexander Historiography*, in: A.B. Bosworth, E.J. Baynham (eds.), *Alexander the Great in Fact and Fiction*, Oxford 2000, pp. 286–306.

Chaplin 2010: J. Chaplin, *Scipio the Matchmaker*, in: C.S Kraus, J. Marincola, C. Pelling (eds.), *Ancient Historiography and Its Contexts: Studies in Honour of A.J. Woodman*, Oxford 2010, pp. 60–72.

Chugg 2013: A.M. Chugg, *Concerning Alexander the Great: A Reconstruction of Cleitarchus*, Bristol 2013.

Devine 1985: A.M. Devine, *Grand Tactics at the Battle of Issus*, AncW XII 1985, pp. 39–59.

Errington 1976: R.M. Errington, *Alexander in the Hellenistic World*, in: E. Badian (ed.), *Alexandre le Grand. Image et réalité. Sept exposés suivis de discussions*, Vandœuvres–Genève 1976 (Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique 22), pp. 137–179.

Goldsworthy 1998: A.K. Goldsworthy, *The Roman Army at War 100 BC–AD 200*, New York 1998.

Hammond 1992: N.G.L. Hammond, *Alexander's Charge at the Battle of Issus in 333 B.C.*, Historia XLI 1992, pp. 395–406.

———— 1993: N.G.L. Hammond, *Sources for Alexander the Great*, Cambridge 1993.

Meister 1975: K. Meister, *Historische Kritik bei Polybios*, Wiesbaden 1975.

Moore 2018: K.R. Moore, *Framing the Debate*, in: K.R. Moore (ed.), *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Alexander the Great*, Leiden 2018, pp. 3–40.

Nawotka 2010: K. Nawotka, *Alexander the Great*, Newcastle-upon-Tyne 2010.

Overtoom 2011: N.L. Overtoom, *Contesting the Greatness of Alexander the Great: The Representation of Alexander in the Histories of Polybius and Livy*, MA thesis, University of Maryland, College Park, 2011.

Pandi 2012: L. Pandi, *New Evidence for the Dating of Cleitarchus (POxy LXXI.4808)?*, Histos VI 2012, pp. 13–26.

Prentice 1923: W.K. Prentice, *Callisthenes, the Original Historian of Alexander*, TAPhA LIV 1923, pp. 74–85.

Scullard 1970: H.H. Scullard, *Scipio Africanus: Soldier and Politician*, London 1970.

Tarn 1930: W.W. Tarn, *Hellenistic Civilisation*, 2nd edn., London 1930.

Walbank 1967: F.W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, vol. II: *Commentary on Books VII–XVIII*, Oxford 1967.

Young 2014: A. Young, *The Lost Book of Alexander*, Westholme, PA 2014.

Eos CVI 2019
ISSN 0012-7825

CATULLUS 64: THE GAME OF NAMES

by

RADOSŁAW PIĘTKA

The abundance of themes in Catullus' famous poem is astounding: the journey, love, time, memory, war, death, bliss and mourning, the wedding and the funeral, men and gods... And it cannot pass unnoticed that these diverse threads are connected together by specific bonds of divergences, ambivalence, and similarities emphasised by some recurring motifs, such as images of the sea, uprooted trees, slain bulls or the contrasted colours of white and red[1]. There are numerous considerations relating to the very structural pattern of the whole poem as well; scholars and readers use the metaphors of a labyrinth[2] (or a dream-like labyrinth[3]), a mirror[4], a ring[5], a Chinese box[6], and fractals[7]. They have also divided the poem into seven parts (or

---

[1] On *poikilia* in poem 64 see F. Klingner, *Catulls Peleus-Epos*, in: idem, *Studien zur griechischen und römischen Literatur*, Zürich 1964, pp. 213–216. Cf. also G.W. Most, *On the Arrangement of Catullus' Carmina Maiora*, Philologus CXXV 1981, p. 120. For other examples of diversity in the poem see, e.g., D. Konstan, *Catullus' Indictment of Rome: The Meaning of Catullus 64*, Amsterdam 1977, pp. 89–99 (chapter IX: "Some Imagery: Flowers, Trees, Wind and Light"); J.M. Duban, *Verbal Links and Imagistic Undercurrent in Catullus 64*, Latomus XXXIX 1980, pp. 777–802.

[2] See J.H. Gaisser, *Threads in the Labyrinth: Competing Views and Voices in Catullus 64*, AJPh CXVI 1995, pp. 579–616; E. Theodorakopulos, *Catullus 64: Footsteps in the Labyrinth*, in: A.R. Sharrock (ed.), *Intratextuality: Greek and Roman Textual Relations*, Oxford 2000, pp. 115–141; M. Schmale, *Bilderreigen und Erzähllabyrinth. Catulls Carmen 64*, München–Leipzig 2004, esp. pp. 42 f. One may even notice some textual bends in that labyrinth: the first turn in the plot, for instance, is marked by the extremely strong poetical effect of triple anaphora and polyptoton in lines 19–21 (on which see J. Evrard-Gillis, *La récurrence lexicale dans l'œuvre de Catulle: étude stylistique*, Paris 1976, pp. 201 f.).

[3] See Ch. Higgins, *In Love's Labyrinth*, The Guardian, 6 Oct. 2007 (http://www.guardian.co.uk/books/2007/oct/06/featuresreviews.guardianreview34).

[4] See Klingner, *op. cit.* (n. 1), p. 207.

[5] See D.A. Traill, *Ring-Composition in Catullus 64*, CJ LXXVI 1981, pp. 232–241.

[6] See D.F.S. Thomson, *Catullus. Edited with a Textual and Interpretative Commentary*, Toronto 1997, p. 387.

[7] See Theodorakopulos, *op. cit.* (n. 2), p. 120.

more), mentioning the structure of a diptych (even with the axis of symmetry) and a triptych or cyclic/concentric composition[8]. All these different observations and interpretations have at least one feature in common; namely, they provide encouragement to seek further hidden associations and symmetries in the text of the Catullan epyllion. It seems, however, that one kind of linkage concerning the main characters of the poem has not yet been remarked upon.

The poem describes three main "marriage" stories in three different time dimensions (the present time of Peleus and Thetis associated with the apparently older[9] story of Theseus and Ariadne as well as with the prophecy about the future fate of Achilles and Polyxena); one of these relationships seems to be successful, while the other two are not. A supernatural being is significantly involved in the first of these, while the latter two are uniformly "human" (Achilles is of course a semi-divine being, but in the world Catullus creates, the hero's eminently human traits are decisive[10]).

One may think about some kind of gradation here: the couples described in the poem are in turn good, worse and, finally, the worst; it is indeed hard to envision a more lurid metaphor of a disastrous relationship than the image of the beheaded corpse of a young woman lying next to the tomb. This is chronologically the last of the poem's affairs and the one that was the least prosperous of all; in fact, it was completely "lifeless" from the beginning because it does not even come into effect until the death of the groom[11]. Other recurrent motifs are ordered according to a similar rule of gradation, above all the motif of nude breasts (which features in the cheerful encounter of Thetis and sea nymphs with the ship[12], then the helpless Ariadne, and at the end mourning mothers) as well

---

[8] See Thomson, *op. cit.* (n. 6), p. 387.

[9] Problems with the chronology of mythical events in the poem are a subject of persistent debate; for a sketch of the issue and a possible explanation, see C. Weber, *Two Chronological Contradictions in Catullus 64*, TAPhA CXIII 1983, pp. 263–271. Other ways of dealing with the controversial chronological scheme can be found in S.G.P. Small, *Catullus: A Reader's Guide to the Poems*, Lanham–London 1983, pp. 178 f., n. 8. Cf. also D. Feeney, *Caesar's Calendar: Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History*, Berkeley 2007, pp. 123–127 (subsection "Catullus's Chronological Anomie"); J.J. O'Hara, *Inconsistency in Roman Epic. Studies in Catullus, Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid and Lucan*, Cambridge 2006, pp. 34–41. This question will be addressed below.

[10] According to the particularly telling comments made by D.P. Harmon (*Nostalgia for the Age of Heroes in Catullus 64*, Latomus XXXII 1973, p. 325), "Achilles, the fulfilment of human and divine hopes, will incarnate aspirations toward unity between men and gods. But the worst of the heroic ideal gets the upper hand in this exceptional child born to excel and be 'best'".

[11] On the sacrifice of Polyxena on Achilles' grave styled in Catullus 64 as a kind of marriage, see E.E. Beyers, *The Refrain in the Song of the Fates in Catullus C. 64 (v. 323–381)*, AClass III 1960, pp. 86–89; L. Curran, *Catullus 64 and the Heroic Age*, YClS XXI 1969, p. 189. For this concept as a Hellenistic invention, see D.D. Hughes, *Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece*, London 1991, p. 62.

[12] On this topic, see Curran, *op. cit.* (n. 11), p. 188; J. Griffin, *Latin Poets and Roman Life*, Chapel Hill 1986, p. 93 (chapter V: "The Pleasures of Water and Nakedness"); R. Hunter, *'Breast is Best': Catullus 64.18*, CQ XLI 1991, pp. 254 f.

as red/white colours (symbolising and describing, respectively, the glamour of the matrimonial bed at Peleus' palace, the grief of Ariadne, the grotesque group of the Parcae and finally Polyxena's ruthless death)[13]. Besides, not only are the distinctions between mortal and immortal similarly styled, but also those between the human and the monstrous: in the first part of the poem, the monstrosity is only alluded to by labelling the Argo ship as *monstrum* ("marvel", but also "monster"; 15), the second part comprises a struggle between a man (Theseus) and a genuine monster (i.e. the Minotaur, called *monstrum* again; 101)[14], and in the final part it is Achilles who becomes a kind of monster through his mass-murdering of innocent youngsters – just like the Minotaur himself.

But the intriguing and so far unnoticed part of the Catullan *tour de force* is the fact that the above couples are linked together not only by the progress of the narrative and, additionally, by the abrupt leap made by the Parcae in their song (from nuptial praise to the martial scenes of the Trojan war and from the cruel episode of Polyxena back again to the wedding), but also by means of some textual signs, specifically the initials of the names of the protagonists: **P**eleus/**Th**etis – **Th**eseus/**A**riadne – **A**chilles/**P**olyxena[15]. This strange game of initials plays with the very idea of (different) beginnings, the idea that is undoubtedly crucial to the understanding of the poem.

The first letter of Polyxena's name seemingly leads to the beginning of the story by pointing at Peleus. Can it also be understood as moving Polyxena back to the beginning? If so, it can once more disturb the order of events in the story, but at the same time may solve some chronological problems. Let us see how it works. Accepting FEENEY's reading of the poem, one may safely conjecture that in 64 Catullus attempts to establish the starting point of chronology (the very first recognisable moment in the human history) in a decisive way, taking into consideration different solutions known from the Greek tradition. As FEENEY claims,

[13] On the red/white contrast in 64, see CURRAN, *op. cit.* (n. 11), p. 190; HARMON, *op. cit.* (n. 10), pp. 324 f.; Ph.L. THOMAS, *Red and White: A Roman Color Symbol*, RhM CXXII 1979, pp. 313 f.; J. CLARKE, *Imagery of Colour and Shining in Catullus, Propertius and Horace*, New York 2003, pp. 113 f., 129 and 131.

[14] On the "monstrosity" of the ship, see FEENEY, *op. cit.* (n. 9), p. 123.

[15] On a smaller scale, Catullus employed similar effect in his poem 68, where an affinity of two people, Laodamia and Lesbia, is suggested by the initials being identical. See C.W. MACLEOD, *A Use of Myth in Ancient Poetry (Cat. 68; Hor. Od. III, 27; Theoc. 7; Prop. III, 15)*, CQ XXIV 1974, pp. 83–86; cf. also R. WHITAKER, *Myth and Personal Experience in Roman Love-Elegy. A Study in Poetic Technique*, Göttingen 1983, pp. 60 f. WISEMAN, however, believes that Laodamia in poem 68 can be compared with Catullus himself; see T.P. WISEMAN, *Catullus and His World: A Reappraisal*, Cambridge 1985, p. 176. An analogous idea occurs later on also in Seneca, *Apocolocyntosis* 3; although the connection is alphabetical (**A**ugurinus – **B**aba – **C**laudius), the context looks quite similar, because we are dealing here, as in Catullus 64, with trichotomy, Parcae and spindles (*fusi*). More generally on the "decorative" way Catullus deploys proper nouns in poem 64, involving euphony and the specific rhythm of repetitions, see M. GEYMONAT, *Onomastica decorativa nel carme LXIV di Catullo*, M&D VII 1982, pp. 173–175.

> [h]ere we see Catullus enacting the phenomenal difficulty of reaching back to a definitively originary moment. Such moments can appear definitive and sharp, but they are always blurred on closer inspection and less primary than they appear at first[16].

In contrast to Feeney, however, I would argue that after reassessing some Greek "originary moments", connected, as he explains, with the mythic conquest of the sea (Argo, the Minoan thalassocracy, the Cretan quest of Theseus), Catullus does fix on one real point of departure for (particularly Roman) chronology: the fall of Troy. The idea can be tracked back to Eratosthenes, but was accepted by Roman poets as early as in the time of Naevius[17]. In some other poems (65, 68, 101) Catullus elaborates the Trojan theme as part of his private history related to the death of his brother in the Troad, yet in this case it is universal history that is certainly at stake. Additionally, the *truncum corpus* (370) of the Trojan Polyxena introduces, perhaps for the first time in Roman poetry (albeit implicitly), the idea of *caput* as a symbol of a town, adopted subsequently by Vergil in his description of the traumatic beginnings of Roman history in the Trojan scenes of the *Aeneid*[18].

What other consequences (if any) for the reading of the whole poem could this pattern of joined initials have? Firstly, the letters establishing the link between Polyxena and Peleus highlight the "cyclical" features of the poem. As we can see now, these features are strikingly placed on different levels of the text; the "ring" pattern lurks everywhere, not only within the very structure of the poem, within the refrains of the song of the Parcae, or within the imagery of recurrence and surrounding (which consists, e.g., of waves, a whirlwind, clothes wrapped around the body, an arm around the neck, weaving and spinning) – but also among the poetic effects concerning games with letters. It is interesting to observe that the main characters in this "chain of beings" are often engaged in some "minor circles" which are part of the intricate plot which resembles a vicious circle or, to use an equally appropriate word here, a labyrinth. For instance, Ariadne forgets (in a way) her father, then Theseus forgets Ariadne, and in the end, Theseus forgets his father's admonitions and so brings death on him[19]. The idea of different "circular connections" between the protagonists is apparently something we are encouraged to constantly think of when reading the poem.

---

[16] Feeney, *op. cit.* (n. 9), p. 125.

[17] See, e.g., L. Canfora, *L'inizio della storia secondo i Greci*, QS XXXIII 1991, pp. 16–18. Cf. also Feeney, *op. cit.* (n. 9), pp. 82–84.

[18] On Troy as the 'beheaded' city in connection with Priam's decapitation in the *Aeneid*, see E.N. Genovese, *Deaths in the Aeneid*, Pacific Coast Philology X 1975, pp. 22 f.; R.J. Sklenar, *The Death of Priam: Aeneid 2.506–558*, Hermes CXVIII 1990, pp. 67–75; A.M. Bowie, *The Death of Priam. Allegory and History in the Aeneid*, CQ XL 1990, pp. 470–481.

[19] See Traill, *op. cit.* (n. 5), pp. 135 f.; Schmale, *op. cit.* (n. 2), pp. 191–199.

Secondly, the "initials-game" allows us to see those three main stories in the poem as a single story, or, more exactly, as three phases of the same story. Not inevitably, yet rather naturally, it leads us to the interpretation that sees incessant allusions to Catullus' own changeable relationship with Clodia-Lesbia in Catullus' mythological poetry[20]. Ariadne in particular, being the embodiment of the famous motto *odi et amo* (as Theseus' lover and, at the same time, an originator of the curses against him), is regarded as a character with whom Catullus' poetical persona has a special affinity[21]. But this is not the only point; the three mythological love stories taken at face value are contrasted or composed according to the pattern of gradation (from the best to the worst one), but the secret bond of the initials forces us to look for some undercurrent that is common to all the three couples. This highly ambivalent framework of contrasts and similarities is, after all, one of the main topics of current debate on the poem[22].

Thirdly, the connection between the protagonists in that chain of alliterations can be seen as a kind of pointer indicating the main thread in the textual labyrinth, since beside the three main couples in the poem we can find two others hidden in the background, namely Ariadne and Bacchus along with Juno and Jupiter. These couples are both complementary in relation to the main characters: the happy marriage of a man (Peleus) and a goddess (Thetis) finds its equivalent in the relationship of a woman with a god as well as in the marriage of two divine beings (this one being complementary in the sense of "completing" the schemes according to which entities from the mythical world can be tied). One may also argue that the allusion to the Argo suggests the presence in the text of an additional unsuccessful marriage, i.e. that between Medea and Jason. This means that another example of a disastrous man-and-woman relationship has been added here[23]. Regarding the letter associations, it may also be noted that

[20] See P.W. Harkins, *Autoallegory in Catullus 63 and 64*, TAPhA XC 1959, pp. 102–116; M.C.J. Putnam, *The Art of Catullus 64*, HSCPh LXV 1961, pp. 165–205; D.F.S. Thomson, *Aspects of Unity in Catullus 64*, CJ LVII 1961, pp. 49–57; M.L. Daniels, *Personal Revelation in Catullus LXIV*, CJ LXII 1967, pp. 351–356. *Contra*: R. Jenkyns, *Three Classical Poets: Sappho, Catullus, and Juvenal*, Cambridge (Mass.) 1982, pp. 88–90. Cf. also the recent discussion in Schmale, *op. cit.* (n. 2), pp. 25 f. Despite the doubts raised by Jenkyns, Catullus' poem 68 seems to be still valid as proof of the poet's tendency to associate some "personal" experiences with mythological themes.

[21] See Small, *op. cit.* (n. 9), p. 144; Konstan, *op. cit.* (n. 1), p. 60.

[22] See, e.g., J. Warden, *Catullus 64: Structure and Meaning*, CJ XCIII 1998, p. 397. It is worthwhile mentioning that the (presumably) Catullan invention of a plot based on contrasted juxtapositions of different love couples turned out to be particularly fruitful and convenient in the history of the European narrative arts, both in literature (a classical example being Leo Tolstoy's novel *Anna Karenina*) and, above all, in modern cinema: sharply contrasted couples constitute the basic plot in such feature movies as, for instance, Robert Altman's *Shortcuts*, Krzysztof Kieślowski's *Blind Chance*, Roman Polański's *Bitter Moon*, Pedro Almodóvar's *High Heels*, Joel and Ethan Coen's *Fargo*, or David Lynch's *Mulholland Drive*.

[23] However unnamed in the poem, Jason and Medea play an important role in the Catullan story of the love affairs in the heroic past; on that topic, see e.g., Konstan, *op. cit.* (n. 1), p. 68; W. Clausen,

Dionysus is called 'Iacchus' in the poem; the first letter of the name makes him the counterpart (in fact the opposition) of Jason.

Finally, seen as a part of a highly "artificial" construction, a well-controlled, perfectly "sewn" fabric, this concealed thread or a "weft" in the text can support the view of poem 64 as a primarily metapoetic utterance[24]. If so, old values and old events, which, according to some critics, Catullus is trying to cast doubt on, could mean in the first place "old poetry". It is precisely for this reason that the ancient *virtutes* are connected in the poem with *par excellence* "epic" themes, i.e. the expedition of the Argonauts and the Trojan war[25]. At this point, Catullan contrariness in choosing the valuable elements from the poetic tradition manifests itself: the optimistic story (differing from many ancient accounts) of the Argonaut Peleus may serve as yet another sign of approval for the Apollonius of Rhodes' epic poem written in an Alexandrian manner (and, perhaps, also for its Latin version created by the neoteric poet Varro of Atax)[26]. At the same time, the grim depiction of the massacre committed by Achilles, his subsequent death and funeral (all scenes known from the non-Homeric Greek epic), might be seen as proof of Catullus' alleged aversion to cyclic poems, inferred from his affinity with Callimachus[27]. It could even be argued that he furnishes his own version of

---

Ariadne's Leave-taking: Catullus 64.116–20, ICS II 1977, pp. 219–221; J.E.G. Zetzel, *Catullus, Ennius, and the Poetics of Allusion*, ICS VIII 1983, pp. 251–266 [= J.H. Gaisser (ed.), *Catullus. Oxford Readings in Classical Studies*, Oxford 2007, pp. 198–216]; R.J. Clare, *Catullus 64 and the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius: Allusion and Exemplarity*, PCPhS XLII 1996, pp. 60–88; J.H. Gaisser, *Catullus*, Malden 2009, pp. 150–161, the section entitled "Time after Time (Medea and Ariadne in Poem 64)". Being involved in scrutinising the hidden presence of Jason along with the overt presence of Peleus has caused a characteristic slip in Zetzel's paper (p. 260 in ICS and p. 209 in *Oxford Readings*...): here it is Jason, instead of the correct Peleus, that became the object of Thetis' love.

[24] See A. Laird, *Sounding out Ecphrasis. Art and Text in Catullus 64*, JRS LXXXIII 1993, pp. 18–30; G. Iversen, *The Text and the Tapestry. Three Remarks on the Composition of the Catulli Veronensis Liber*, C&M LII 2001, pp. 269–275; T.J. Robinson, *Under the Cover of Epic: Pretexts, Subtexts and Textiles in Catullus' Carmen 64*, Ramus XXXV 2006, pp. 29–62. But it is not only the matter of the famous tapestry or other cloths described in the poem: as it has been pointed out, even Athena (the winner of the famous weaving contest, after all) builds the ship for the Argonauts by "weaving" it like a textile (see W. Fitzgerald, *Catullan Provocations. Lyric Poetry and the Drama of Position*, Berkeley–Los Angeles 1995, p. 151). That is because the sea journey in 64 can be interpreted as a metatextual metaphor as well; see S. Harrison, *The Primal Voyage and the Ocean of Epos: Two Aspects of Metapoetic Imagery in Catullus, Virgil and Horace*, Dictynna IV 2007, pp. 3–5 (http://dictynna.revues.org/146).

[25] On the complexities concerning the notion of *virtus* in poem 64, see e.g., S.E. Knopp, *Catullus 64 and the Conflict between Amores and Virtutes*, CPh LXXI 1976, pp. 207–213; Konstan, *op. cit.* (n. 1), p. 40; O'Hara, *op. cit.* (n. 9), pp. 44–54.

[26] About Apollonius' *Argonautica* in the Catullan poem, see, above all, Clare, *op. cit.* (n. 23), and J.B. Debrohun, *Catullan Intertextuality: Apollonius and the Allusive Plot of Catullus 64*, in: M.B. Skinner (ed.), *A Companion to Catullus*, Malden 2007, pp. 293–313.

[27] On this affinity, see, e.g., W. Clausen, *Catullus and Callimachus*, HSCPh LXXIV 1970, pp. 85–94; O.D. Byars, *Myth Management: The Nature of the Hero in Callimachus' Hecale and*

the new “heroic” poetry, along with a new heroine, because no other story but Ariadne’s dominates the plot of 64 and, as we have seen, her name is pivotal to the scheme analysed here. The Minoan princess is thus bonded together as an opposing character with two “villains” of the poem, i.e. Theseus (explicitly – through the narrative order) and Achilles (in a clandestine manner – through the “letter-game”) and consequently becomes the main “hero” of the work designed as a new love epic[28], or rather, as Feeney has ironically put it, “a divorce poem”[29].

Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań
platon@amu.edu.pl

Catullus' Poem 64, Diss. University of South Florida 2009, *passim*. These literary critical ambitions in Catullus' poetry can be acknowledged as an answer to some difficulties with the proper assessment of the author's attitude to ancient, heroic times in poem 64; for a discussion of this question, see Curran, *op. cit.* (n. 11), pp. 171–192, and Harmon, *op. cit.* (n. 10), pp. 311–331. Nevertheless, at least one problem remains: the harsh, moralistic epilogue of the poem does not exactly square with this metapoetic interpretation; on this discrepancy as a part of the deliberate strategy, see Schmale, *op. cit.* (n. 2), pp. 279 f.

[28] Much in the manner of Callimachus' female protagonist Hecale. For Ariadne in 64 as a new type of hero, see Ch.P. Brown, *Ariadne as the Exemplum of the Virtutes of Heroes in Catullus Carmen 64*, Diss. Marshall University 2008, *passim*.

[29] Feeney, *op. cit.* (n. 9), p. 123.

Eos CVI 2019
ISSN 0012-7825

TWO GREEK MILITARY WRITERS IN AELIANUS TACTICUS: EUPOLEMUS OF HYPATA AND EUANGELUS OF TANAGRA

by

NICHOLAS VICTOR SEKUNDA

ABSTRACT: The first chapter of Aelian's *Tactics* contains a list, which seems to be in roughly chronological order, of previous writers on the military art. Following Alexander II of Epirus (272–*c.* 240 BC) and coming before Polybius (200–118 BC), Aelian lists Clearchus, Pausanias and Euangelus. Later in the same list after Polybius but before Poseidonius the Stoic (135–51 BC) come Eupolemus and Iphicrates. This paper attempts firstly, to identify Euangelus with Euangelus of Tanagra, *archōn* of the Boeotian League *c.* 240–225 BC. Secondly, it attempts to identify Eupolemus with Eupolemus of Hypata, who held the post of *stratēgos* of the Aetolian League in 176/175 BC, fought at Cynoscephalae in 197 BC and was possibly the eyewitness source of information for Polybius on that battle. Other possible identifications of authors in Aelian's list are then discussed.

INTRODUCTION

The composition of the work usually termed the *Taktikē theōria*, or more simply *Taktika* (Brodersen 2017: 10), written by an otherwise unknown author, one Aelian "The High Priest", known to us as Aelian "Tacticus" in order to distinguish him from other authors of the same name. Whilst it is certainly dedicated to the Emperor Trajan (AD 98–117), it is dated differently by various authorities; to AD 101 (Wheeler 1978: 354), to between AD 106 or 107 and 113 (Dain 1946: 19), after AD 106 (Brodersen 2017: 11), or to circa AD 110 (Stadter 1980: 40). The first Chapter of this work contains a list of previous writers on the military art (at 1, 2; transl. by Devine 1989: 44). It runs as follows:

> The theory has been elaborated by Aeneas (who also composed a considerable number of strategic books, of which Cineas the Thessalian made an epitome) in great detail, and by Pyrrhus of Epirus, who composed a treatise on tactics, and by Alexander his son, and by Clearchus, as well as by Pausanias, by Euangelus, and by Polybius of Megalopolis, a man of multi-faceted learning and the companion of Scipio, by Eupolemus and by Iphicrates. The Stoic Poseidonius also wrote a tactical theory, and many others, some in introductions, like Bryon, others in large-scale works. All of these we have consulted and consider too commonplace to be worthy of particular mention.

The *Technē taktikē* of Arrian seems to have been composed somewhat later, in AD 136/137 (Wheeler 1978: 354). The first folio of this work is missing, but the corresponding passage (1, 1) is partially preserved, beginning with Alexander the son of Pyrrhus, and repeats the list of the passage in Aelian, but supplying some further information. Arrian adds that the Clearchus named in the list is not to be identified with the Clearchus who was the leader of the Ten Thousand, but another person of the same name; he confirms that Polybius is the famous historian bearing that name; and finally he states that the Iphicrates named in the list is not the Athenian general of that name, but another person.

Both lists seem to be arranged in approximate chronological order. Arrian does not, like Aelian, mention Bryon in his list. It has been suggested (Sekunda 1992: 333) that this individual bearing the name Bryon, which is extremely rare, who was a writer of an introductory work on the military art, is to be identified with an Athenian of the same name (*LGPN* II, p. 91 s.v. 1 = ? = 2) active at the very end of the fourth century BC. It should be noted that Aelian adds Bryon to his list, at the end, almost as an afterthought, as a writer of another type of work, shorter and introductory. Therefore, it could be argued, the chronological order of the list is not broken.

The Aeneas named is Aeneas Tacticus, whose only surviving work *How to Survive under a Siege*, was composed in the latter half of the 350s (Whitehead 1990: 8 f.). Cineas the Thessalian, born around 355 BC, who was engaged at the Epirote court, probably made an epitome of Aeneas' works for the needs of Pyrrhus' sons, around 285 BC. He died soon after 278 BC. Pyrrhus of Epirus died in 272 BC: he probably wrote in the 280s BC. King Alexander II of Epirus was born shortly after 295 BC, when Pyrrhus married Lanassa, the daughter of Agathokles tyrant of Syracuse. He assumed the throne of Epirus in his early twenties in 272 BC when Pyrrhus met his death in battle at Argos. He died around 240 (Hammond 1967: 590) in his mid-fifties. Polybius was born "it would appear, about 200 B.C., or a year or two before" and he is reputed to have died from a fall from a horse in 118 BC at the age of 82 (Walbank 1972: 6 f., 13). Poseidonius the Soic Philosopher was born about 135 BC and died around 51 BC.

Of the writers named in the list, five are otherwise unknown to us, and have not been convincingly identified to date: Clearchus, Pausanias and Euangelus before Polybius; and Eupolemus and Iphicrates after.

If more than two centuries of classical scholarship have been unable to identify these five military writers, then it goes without saying that this article does not seek to do more than propose suitable candidates for identification. If the process was that easy or obvious it would have been done a long time ago.

This article proposed one candidate to be identified with Euangelus, who should be placed after Alexander of Epirus but before Polybius, and a second candidate to be identified with Eupolemus, who should be placed after Polybius

but before Poseidonius. The first identification proposed, of Euangelos, I regard as being "possible", while the second one, that of Eupolemos, I regard as being "probable".

EUANGELUS OF TANAGRA

A firmer *terminus ante quem* is provided for Euangelos by Plutarch, who writes in his *Life of Philopoemen* (4, 4) that the future general of the Achaean League, among other writings, was most devoted to the *Tactics* of Euangelus (τοῖς Εὐαγγέλου τακτικοῖς). The action is set when Philopoemen was a young man, and probably in this section of his *Life* Plutarch relied heavily on the earlier biography of Philopoemen written by Polybius (Pédech 1951; cf. Walbank 1972: 14). Plutarch begins the next chapter of his *Life* with the words "He was now thirty years of age". Philopoemen was born in 252 BC (Errington 1969: 246 f.) and so he would have been aged thirty in 222. It seems to follow, therefore, that Euangelus most probably wrote his work in the third quarter of the third century BC.

The personal name Euangelos, spelt either Εὐάνγελος or Εὐάγγελος (the second form tends to be used later on) is not uncommon. The name is overwhelmingly popular at Delphi. *LGPN* (III B, p. 146 Εὐάγγελος) lists more than thirty examples, some undoubtedly referring to the same individuals. Only one of these individuals, however, can be dated before the last decade of the third century BC. Some held the post of eponymous archon at Delphi. Delphi, epigraphically well represented, was a small city-state, however, so one did not have to be a particularly important person to hold the office.

A total of 9 entries under Euangelus are listed in Pauly–Wissowa (*RE*), of which the first three are given to a god, a hero and a figure of myth, the fourth, fifth and sixth are known from inscriptions to have held the post of archon at Delphi. The seventh held the office of *archōn* at Tanagra. The eighth was a writer during the New Comedy attested in Athenaeus (XIV 644 C). The ninth (Kirchner 1909b) is our military writer.

As we have seen Euangelus the military writer is to be placed in the third quarter of the third century BC: a period only very scantily covered by our historical sources. Consequently, perforce we have to search for a possible match for Euangelus in the epigraphic record.

Euangelus is only attested as being the Boeotian federal *archon* in the dating formula of one inscription from Oropus (*IG* VII 322, 1). He is not included in the list of people holding that name in Pauly–Wissowa, because his name was first read as Euarestes. The name was later correctly re-read as Euangelus by Pétrarchos (cf. Roesch 1965: 92 f.), and appears as such (Ἄρχοντος ἐν τῶι κοινῶι Εὐαγγέλου) in the corpus of Oropian inscriptions published by Pétrarchos (1997: 116, no. 147). The inscription records a decree of the

Oropians, at that time members of the Boeotian League, awarding *proxenia* to the Athenian Menekles son of Pythodoros. The *stratēgeia* of Euangelus was at first dated to 202–199? BC by Roesch (1965: 90), but Etienne & Knoepfler (1976: 313 f., no. 3) later suggested an earlier date. His date is recorded to be ?*c.* 240–230 BC in *LGPN* (III B, p. 146, no. 1).

There are good reasons to think that Euangelus came from Tanagra. One Εὐάγγελος Βοιώτιος ἐκ Ταναγρας is awarded a *proxenia* at Delphi (*FD* III (3) 104) in an inscription which is dated to the archonate of Aristion. The archonate of Aristion was formerly dated to 215/214 (?) BC by Flacelière (1937: 486, II, 80), but subsequently to 256/255 (?) BC by Daux (1943: 37, no. G 22), which dating is followed in *LGPN* (III B, p. 146 Εὐάγγελος no. 4). The dating of the archonate of Aristion, however, remains uncertain.

Etienne and Knoepfler (1976: 314, n. 186) have already drawn attention to the possibility that this individual, Euangelus of Tanagra, is to be identified with the Boeotian federal *archōn* Euangelus. The patronymic of Euangelus is, unfortunately, damaged in the inscription, which complicates the identification of other members of his family. Bourguet read ΙΙΝΩ and proposed the restoration Ῥίνω[νος]? The inscription is reported to be now completely illegible (Roesch 1982: 456 = *SEG* XXXII 1985, 534).

A tombstone from Tanagra which only bears the name Euangelus carved in epichoric letters (Vénencie 1960: 594, no. 10; *SEG* XIX 1963, 349 k) has been dated to the fifth century BC (*LGPN* III B, p. 147 Εὐάγελος no. 2). The name Euangelus, without further text, is recorded on two further funerary inscriptions from Tanagra, one (*IG* VII 982), written in the form Εὐάνγελος, has been dated tentatively to the third century BC (*LGPN* III B, p. 147 Εὐάνγελος no. 3), the other (*IG* VII 981), written in the form Εὐάγγελος, to the second or first centuries BC (*LGPN* III B, p. 146 Εὐάγγελος no. 5). All three individuals could belong to different generation of the same family.

One Euangelus is attested as a local *archōn* (Εὐανγέλω ἄρχοντος) in an inscription (*IG* VII 508, 6) from Tanagra dating to the late third century BC. This Euangelus was one of the individuals bearing this name listed in Pauly–Wissowa, referred to above (Kirchner 1909a). The inscription records the award of *proxenia* to Xanthippos son of Kendebas, a Pisidian (Ξάνθιππον Κενδήρα Πισίδαν).

Etienne & Knoepfler (1976: 314, n. 186) have connected the two homonymous individuals, and remarked: "On aurait donc le cas vraisemblable d'un archonte local devenant archonte fédéral". Fossey (1984: 124, no. 6) assigned this inscription, on the basis of the letter forms used, to his Group A, which he dated to the period *c.* 245/240–*c.* 210 BC, and the archonate of Euangelus to around 240–210 BC. The inscription is dated to *c.* 240–225 BC in *LGPN* (III B, p. 146 Εὐάγγελος no. 4). In other words this Euangelus meets the dating criteria for the Euangelus mentioned by Aelian in his list of military writers.

This inscription (*IG* VII 508) is carved on the left side of a marble base. On the right side of the same base is carved *IG* VII 507, which also records the award of the *proxenia* of the city of Tanagra, this time to Sosibios son of Dioskourides of Alexandria. The same individual is honoured with an award of *proxenia* in the city of Orchomenus (*IG* VII 3166, 3–4), and is honoured with a statue, along with Agathoboulus son of Neon also an Alexandrian, at Cnidus (*OGIS* 79). Agathoboulus son of Neon an Alexandrine (*PP* IV 15784) is otherwise unknown.

It seems to have been Foucart (1880: 98) who first identified the individual honoured with the *proxenia* at Tanagra and Orchomenus with Sosibius the minister of Ptolemy IV Philopator (222–205 BC), on whom see Walbank (1957: 567), and noted that the kings of Egypt raised considerable forces of mercenary troops in Greece for the Fourth Syrian War that started in 219 BC and culminated in the Battle of Raphia in 217 BC. "Ces rapports entre les rois d'Égypte et les Béotiens furent peut-être l'occasion des deux décrets de Tanagre et d'Orchomène" (Foucart 1880: 98, n. 4). Foucart also noted that one of the commanders of the troops so raised was Socrates the Boeotian. So the inscription *IG* VII 507 probably dates to circa 218 BC.

It follows that the inscription *IG* VII 508, though inscribed on the same block as the inscription which has been dated to 218 BC seems to be somewhat earlier. Barratt (1932: 111) has demonstrated that "the eponymous magistrates of the Boeotian towns were often men of fifty and more". Even so the award of a *proxenia* at Delphi in the archonate of Aristion in ?256/255 BC must have come relatively early in the political life of Euangelus. Maybe he was about thirty at the time, in which case *IG* VII 508 might have been inscribed about 235 BC, and the federal archonate of Euangalus might have fallen sometime in the 240s.

The Boeotian army was involved in halting the Gallic invasion of Greece in 279 BC. After that military event the infantry of the Boeotian League adopted shields of the *thureos* type from their Gallic opponents. The *thureophoros* was better suited to the tactical needs of many smaller Greek armies than was the less mobile phalangite (Ma 2000: 357). Boeotian funerary monuments dating to the second quarter of the third century show *thureoi* and Boeotian helmets (Fraser, Rönne 1957: pl. 1.1, pl. 2.4), and Boeotian military catalogues (inscribed on stone stelae) list troops called θυρεαφόροι.

At some point towards the middle of the third century BC the Boeotian military catalogues stop listing θυρεαφόροι, start listing troops called πελτοφόροι instead. This seems to have been noted first by Beloch (1906: 44), who considered it to be a reaction to the military defeat inflicted on the armed forces of the Boeotian League by the Aetolians at the battle of Chaironeia in 245 BC, which is mentioned by Plutarch (*Vit. Arat.* 16, 1). After studying the catalogues in detail Feyel (1942: 197) proposed a slightly earlier date: "Donc la réforme de l'armement a dû être décrétée entre 250 et 240. Nous sommes ainsi ramenés à la

date de 245, proposée déjà par Beloch, ou peut-être à une date comprise entre 250 et 245". Roesch (1982: 353) suggested that the decision to reform the army was taken in either 252 or 251 BC. On the other hand, following a detailed study of the most recent epigraphical evidence available, Kalliontzis suggests that the introduction of *peltophoroi* into the army of the Boeotian league could be as late as the 230s BC (Kalliontzis 2020 – *non vidi*; cf. Juhel 2017: 55).

We do not know what the precise nature of the work written by Euangelus might have been. It is not quite clear from the preface of Aelian whether Euangelus' work was entitled *Tactica*, as was the work of Pyrrhus mentioned before it in the list, or was a more general work on military theory. On the other hand, Plutarch (*Vit. Philop.* 4, 4) quite clearly calls the works *Tactica*. So, despite the title, the work of Euangelus might have had a broader remit. However, our idea of what a book termed a *Tactica* should contain is based on the works of Asclepiodotus, Aelian and Arrian which are the only works of this genre to have survived before the Byzantine compendia. Perhaps earlier works of this genre were more diverse in their contents. On this point it might be worth quoting the words of Wheeler (1988a: 8, n. 30) "One of the works read by Philopoemen was the *Tactica* of Evangelus [...]. Treatises entitled *Tactica* were not collections of stratagems, but nothing precludes a work of this title from containing a discussion of stratagems or a few examples". It is tempting to associate Euangelus with the military reforms of the Boeotian League in 245 BC, and to propose that this may have given him the stimulus for writing such a work, but this would be pure speculation.

According to Polybius (V 63, 11–13), Agathokles and Sosibius entrusted the preparation of the Ptolemaic army to Echekrates the Thessalian, Phoxidas of Meliteia, assisted by Eurylochos the Magnesian, Socrates the Boeotian, and Knopias of Allaria, adding the information that these men had served under Demetrius and Antigonus, by which he would mean the Macedonian kings Demetrius II (239–229 BC) and Antigonus III Doson (229–221 BC). Polybius later informs us (V 65, 2) that Socrates the Boeotian was put in command of the 2,000 peltasts. It might have been the case that Agathokles and Sosibios intended to make use of the experience of Socrates gained in training the πελτοφόροι of the Boeotian infantry phalanx, perhaps only a little more than a decade beforehand, and that the presence of Sosibius in Boeotia can be explained by the desire to recruit troops trained in this type of fighting, including Socrates himself and other Boeotians.

This Socrates the Boeotian (Polyb. V 63, 12; 65, 2; Schoch 1927) has no obvious connection with the other holders of that name listed in Pauly–Wissowa. *LGPN* (III B, p. 390) lists 34 individuals holding the same name coming from Boeotia, again with no obvious connection to our individual.

In summary, from the textual evidence in Aelian and Plutarch we can place Euangelus the military writer in the third quarter of the third century BC. As

stated above, due to the lack of historical sources for the period we have to rely on the epigraphic record to provide us with a possible candidate. Around the years *c*. 245/240–*c*. 210 BC Euangelos of Tanagra was appointed *proxenos* at Delphi, held the post of *archōn* of the Boeotian League, and *archōn* in his home city of Tanagra.

Whilst it is true that both the post of federal and civic *archōn* were of a civil and not of a military nature, the elite families of the Hellenistic federal states tended to occupy both civil and military posts alternately. During the Hellenistic period the army of the Boeotian League was under the overall command of a college of Boeotarchs. The federal and civic archonate were both eponymous posts, and this is the reason why attestations of Euangelus have survived at all in the epigraphic record at all. It is highly probable that Euangelus also held the military post of Boeotarch repeatedly during the same period, but attestations to Boeotarchs do not survive as readily in the epigraphic record. No more suitable candidate exists, and if the reader only considers it to be "possible" that Euangelus "Tacticus" is to be identified with Euangelus of Tanagra, the aim of the author will have been accomplished.

EUPOLEMUS OF HYPATA

Eupolemus the military writer (Jacoby 1907) comes after Polybius in Aelian's list. We must, therefore, on chronological grounds, resist the temptation to identify this Eupolemus "Tacticus" with, arguably, the most prominent individual who bore this name, which would be Eupolemus the son of Potalos, who was a *stratēgos* of Cassander, active in Caria and Lycia *circa* 315–313 BC (Willrich 1907; *LGPN* IV, p. 134, nos. 3 & 4). This Eupolemus is known from passages in Diodorus (XIX 68, 5 f.; 77, 6), a number of inscriptions, and from the coinage he struck. The most complete treatment of his career is that of Descat (1998).

Eupolemus the military writer can, however, almost certainly be identified with a later Eupolemus, a military officer of the Aetolian *koinon*, who is attested as being active between 197 and 170 BC (Wissowa 1909; *LGPN* III B, p. 163, no. 10; Grainger 2000: 171 Eupolemus [5]).

According to Polybius (XVIII 19, 9–11), before the battle of Cynoscephalae in 197 BC Flamininus, the Roman commander, sent a force out to reconnoitre the battlefield, including two Aetolian *oulamoi* of cavalry commanded by Eupolemus. The force commanded by Eupolemus "fought with great vigour" and called upon the Italians to take part in the action. Later, in the opening phases of the battle the Macedonians pressed hard on the enemy, however, according to Polybius (XVIII 22, 4 f.; transl. by Paton, Walbank, Habicht 2012: 153):

> But the chief obstacle to their putting the enemy entirely to rout was the high spirit of the Aetolian cavalry who fought with desperate gallantry. For by as much as the Aetolian infantry is inferior in the equipment and discipline required for a general

> engagement, by so much is their cavalry superior to that of other Greeks in detached and single combats. Thus on the present occasion they so far checked the spirit of the enemy's advance.

Walbank (1967: 575) in commenting on this passage suggests of Eupolemus: "Can he have been one of P.'s verbal sources for this battle, and especially for those parts where the Aetolians appear in a very favourable light?", and (Walbank 1967: 580): "It is significant for P.'s sources on the battle that he knows the names of the two Aetolians, but not those of the Roman military tribunes [...] Eupolemus, who had been deported to Rome three years before P. [...]". We shall return to this point later.

Eupolemus the Aetolian is next mentioned in our sources in the year 190/189 BC as one of the officers involved in an unsuccessful operation carried out in defence of the city of Ambracia against a Roman army commanded by M. Fulvius. In this account Nicander the Aetolian is termed *praetor* by Livy (XXXVIII 4, 6). This is the standard Latin equivalent for the Greek *stratēgos*, and so it would seem that Nicander held the office of *stratēgos* of the Aetolian League for the year 190/189 BC. (On Nicander son of Bithes of Trichonium see Walbank 1979: 83). Later in the account of the siege of Ambracia given by Livy (XXXVIII 6, 5) both Eupolemus and Nicodamus (not otherwise known) are given the Latin term *duces*. Perhaps Eupolemus at least, held the office of *hipparchos*.

Three emancipation decrees from Delphi (*SGDI* 1745, 1863, 1864) are all dated to the year when Eupolemus held the office of *stratēgos* of the Aetolians, and the year in which Xenochares (*LGPN* [volume?], p. 319, no. 10) was *archōn* at Delphi, which had once been put in the year 261/260? BC by Flacelière (1937: 451, II 37), but was plausibly re-dated to 176/175 BC (?) by Daux (1943: 51, no. L 23).

The missing *stratēgos* name in an inscription recording a manumission from Physcus in East Locris was plausibly restored by Mastrokostas (Arch. Eph. 1955, 52; *SEG* XVI 1959, 355) as:

> Στ[ρα]ταγέ[ον]τος [τῶν Αἰτωλῶν Εὐπολέμο] | Ὑπαταίου

on the basis of the ethnic which was still preserved in the second line of the inscription. This restoration was subsequently accepted by Klaffenbach (*IG* IX 1^2, 3672, 27) who dated the inscription to 176/175 BC when Eupolemus is known to have held the office of *stratēgos* for sure.

Eupolemus is later attested in a passage which comes in Livy (XLI 25, 4) dealing with events of 174 BC. In that year, the Romans sent a delegation to deal with *stasis* connected with debt that had broken out at some time previously in Aetolia.

> When exiles from Hypata, who belonged to the party of Proxenus, had been promised restoration to their city and a public safeguard had been promised them by Eupolemus, the chief of the city, eighty distinguished men, whom Eupolemus with

> the rest of the population had even gone out to meet on their return, although they were received with courteous addresses and hand-clasps, as they entered the gate appealing in vain to the assurances of safety given and to the gods, were slain. In consequence of this a more serious war flared up afresh.

The Proxenus referred to in the text is probably Πρόξενος Τριχονεύς, who held the office of *stratēgos* in the year 183/182 BC (Meloni 1953: 142). The Latin formula *princeps civitatis*, which is used to describe the office which Eupolemus was holding at the time, is equivocal. The translators of the Loeb Classical Library text (Sage, Schlesinger 1957: 271–273) have chosen to translate it as "the chief of the city", even though they note (p. 271, n. 1) that "Eupolemus was *strategus* in 176–175 B.C., and the trouble may have occurred then, not in 174 B.C., when Livy reports it". Briscoe (2012: 132) comments in the following way on the passage:

> He was the Aetolian strategos in 176/5, but the events here described clearly belong to 175/4 and W–M [Weissenborn–Müller], therefore, are wrong to say that the meaning is not "a leading man in the state". He was evidently himself from Hypata.

So in 175/174 BC Eupolemus was chief magistrate, probably holding the office of *archōn* (Meloni 1953: 142 f.), in his native city of Hypata, and this is what the formula *princeps civitatis* refers to. The personal name Eupolemus is otherwise not attested in Hypata, and so we have no information on his family background.

Gillischewski (1896: 55 ff., *non vidi*) suggested that Eupolemus of Hypata had held the office of *stratēgos* of the Aetolians once previously in the year 189/188 BC. Klaffenbach in *IG* IX (1)² (1), p. LI, places a prior *stratēgia* of Eupolemus of Hypata in the year189/188 B.C., whereas he places the *stratēgia* of Δικαίαρχος Ἀλεξάνδρου Τριχονεύς (which is likewise uncertain) in 187/186 BC. The probability of Eupolemos holding the office of *stratēgos* in the year 189/188 BC has been contemplated by Wissowa (1909; "wahrscheinlich") and Briscoe (2008: 38; "probably"), but Meloni (1953: 143) dates the earlier *stratēgia* of Eupolemos a year later in 187/186 BC, following Levi (1921–1922: 184), who under the year 187–186 notes: "Solo per ipotesi si può riferire a quest'anno la prima strategia del Eupolemo". Without seeing the arguments of Gillischewski it is hard to form an opinion on this matter, but it would appear that there is no real need to suggest that Eupolemus held the office of *stratēgos* more than once. Only the term of office held by Eupolemus in 176/175 BC is certain (thus Meloni 1953: 143, n. 1).

The fact that, indeed, Eupolemus was from Hypata is confirmed by a fifth inscription from Thermus (*IG* IX 1² 1 4 b, 3–5) where his ethnic is preserved. This inscription records the award of the *proxenia* of the Aetolians to the Athenian Lysikles, son of Phaidros when Eupolemus of Hypata was *stratēgos*. In a note to this inscription (on p. 6) Klaffenbach discusses the reasons why it should

be dated to the putative first period when Eupolemus held the post. I hold that it could as easily be dated to 176/175 BC. Fortunately this question is of but marginal relevance to the identification of Eupolemus proposed in this article.

The political career of Eupolemus came to an end in 171 BC. In a passage covering the events of the year 170/169 BC (Walbank 1979: 329), Polybius (XXVIII 4, 6) reports that Eupolemus and Nicander had already been deported to Rome. This seems to have taken place in 171 BC (Polyb. XXVII 15, 14; Walbank 1979: 315 f.), when, following the Macedonian victory at the Battle of Kallinikos, it was alleged that the panic and defeat sustained on the Roman side was due to the Aetolians (Livy XLII 60, 8 f.; transl. Sage, Schlesinger 1957: 479):

> And in the conference before the consul each in his own defence assigned the blame to the Aetolians; the beginning, they said, of the flight and panic had been made by them; the other allies from the peoples of Greece had also followed the rout of the Aetolians. Five chiefs of the Aetolians, who were the first said to have been seen turning their backs, were sent to Rome.

The handful of Aetolians exiled in 171 BC probably remained in detention in Rome. Eupolemus must have been well advanced in his middle age at the time of his exile in 171 BC. He may well have been in overall command of the Aetolian cavalry at Cynoscephalae in 197 BC, but is only attested as being in independent command of the two Aetolian *oulamoi* sent out to reconnoitre by Flamininus. It would be reasonable to suppose that he was at least in his early thirties at the time. He certainly held senior military command in operations in Ambracia in 190/189 BC. If he was aged 40 in 190 BC, and in his early thirties in 197 BC, he would have been born about 230 BC.

Polybius, on the other hand, was born in about 200 BC "or a year or two before" (Walbank 1972: 6 f.). He began his period of exile in Rome together with a thousand other Achaean deportees in 167 BC. According to Walbank (1972: 8), "His fellows were banished to the country towns of Italy for safe keeping; but [...] Polybius was allowed to remain at Rome'. The Achaeans who were deported numbered two thousand, but only five Aetolians were deported three years before, and there is no need to think that they were transported "to the country towns of Italy for safe keeping". The two men surely met in Rome. It is hard to think otherwise if the suggestion of Walbank (1967: 575) that Eupolemus was a verbal source for Polybius' description of the battle of Cynoscephalae has any merit at all.

Polybius would have been in his early to mid-thirties, Eupolemus in his mid-sixties. As well as the respect bred by the difference in age, Polybius may have had further reasons to treat Eupolemus with respect. Both were writers of works dealing with the military art. Polybius mentions in IX 20, 4 of his *Histories* that he has written a work entitled τὰ περὶ τὰς τάξεις ὑπομνήματα, *An Enquiry into Tactics*. As Walbank (1972: 33, n. 3) writes, "It is generally regarded that Polybius's *Tactica* was an early work, written before his exile", indeed it is "more probable that he

wrote the *Tactics* in the 170's before he was hipparch" (Walbank 1967: 148). Both men had held commands in the cavalry. Polybius "displays a special interest in cavalry [...]. In his account of Philopoemen's reform of the Achaean cavalry he goes into considerable detail" (Walbank 2002: 27).

We return to Polybius' account of the Battle of Cynoscephalae, in which Eupolemus fought (XVIII 22, 4 f.; transl. Paton, Walbank, Habicht 2012: 153):

> But the chief obstacle to their putting the enemy entirely to rout was the high spirit of the Aetolian cavalry who fought with desperate gallantry. For by as much as the Aetolian infantry is inferior in the equipment and discipline required for a general engagement, by so much is their cavalry superior to that of other Greeks in detached and single combats. Thus on the present occasion they so far checked the spirit of the enemy's advance.

Similar sentiments are expressed in the account of the same battle in Livy (XXXIII 7, 13; transl. Sage 1961: 295), which was based on that of Polybius.

> The Aetolian cavalry was the greatest safeguard to prevent their utter rout. At that time their cavalry was by far the best in Greece; in infantry they were inferior to their neighbours.

Walbank has already suggested that Eupolemus was the eyewitness source on which Polybius based his account. I would further suggest that it was probably under the influence of Eupolemus that Polybius gives such a complimentary account of the Aetolian cavalry. At IV 8, 10 we hear more from Polybius on the subject (Paton, Walbank, Habicht 2010: 349):

> For example the Thessalian cavalry are irresistible when in squadrons and brigades, but slow and awkward when dispersed and engaging the enemy single-handed as they chance to encounter them. The Aetolian horse are just the reverse.

The context is important. Polybius expresses this opinion shortly before his account of the defeat inflicted on the Achaean forces by the Aetolians at the Battle of Caphyae in 219 BC, in which the Achaean forces were badly handled by their commanders. Polybius had a generally low opinion of the Aetolians (Sacks 1975: 92, n. 1 for earlier bibliography; Mendels 1984–1986; Eckstein 1995: 212 f.), so one wonders if the conversations held with Eupolemus in Rome might have had some influence on the opinion Polybius expressed on the prowess of the Aetolian cavalry, at least. To some extent Polybius might have been expressing what he took to be a generally known fact (cf. Mendels 1984–1986: 65). So perhaps we should not exaggerate the influence which I have suggested Eupolemus might have had on Polybius. I believe that the identification of Eupolemus 'Tacticus' with Eupolemus of Hypata to be "probable".

It is only fair to point out that everything points to Eupolemus of Hypata, if indeed he is to be identified with the Eupolemus in Aelian's list, having written

his *œuvre* before, not after Polybius. Polybius seems to have written his *Tactica* in the 170s BC. Aelian may have known that Polybius and Eupolemus were contemporaries, and may have known that the *Tactica* of Polybius was an early work of his. He may have assumed that Polybius wrote before Eupolemus. It is even possible that he did not know who Eupolemus was, although this is difficult to believe.

OTHER IDENTIFICATIONS IN AELIAN'S LIST

The aim of this article has been to give plausible identifications to two of the five unidentified military writers in the list given in the preface the Aelian's *Tactica*: three remain; Clearchus not the leader of the Ten Thousand, Pausanias, and Iphicrates not the Athenian general of that name.

It would be tempting at first glance to identify Clearchus 'Tacticus' with Clearchus I the tyrant of Heraclea on Pontus (Lenschau 1921). Born 391/390 BC, Clearchus was a pupil of Isocrates and Plato, and therefore highly literate. After being exiled from his home city, he served as a mercenary in Persian service, where he acquired military experience. However, he seized power in Heraclea in 364/363 BC and died in 353/352 BC. Therefore any such identification has to be rejected on chronological grounds, because Clearchus 'Tacticus' comes immediately after Pyrrhus of Epirus and Alexander his son in Aelian's list.

Clearchus 'Tacticus' does not have a separate entry in the *Real-Encyclopädie* of Pauly–Wissowa. Rather the reference in Aelian's *Tactics* is listed under the entry for the Peripatetic philosopher Clearchus of Soloi, a pupil of Aristotle, by Kroll (1921: 583, ll. 15– 18), only to be rejected by the latter, on the grounds that a work of that title is not sufficiently appropriate to be attributed to a philosopher. But other philosophers are known to have written on the military art, and not just Poseidonius; moreover an attribution to Clearchus of Soloi (*c.* 340–*c.* 250 BC) would also fit chronologically, just. Wheeler (1988b: 161–165) supports the identification of Clearchus 'Tacticus' with Clearchus of Soloi, pointing out that the latter is known to have written a work entitled Περὶ τοῦ πανικοῦ, of which only a fragment has survived, but which presumably was also of a military nature.

Pausanias comes immediately after Clearchus in Aelian's list, followed by Euangelus and then by Polybius. Loretto (1995: 569) has tentatively identified the Pausanias 'Tacticus' (Lambertz 1949) with one Pausanias who is mentioned by Livy XXXII 10, 2 as holding the office of *stratēgos* (*praetor*) of the Epirote League for 198 BC (Lenschau 1949). This suggestion deserves consideration. Nevertheless, even though the chronology of the list cannot be relied on completely, we would expect Pausanias to have been active sometime in the middle of third century BC, and not during the early second century.

As far as Iphicrates is concerned, we have nothing more for the late second or early first century BC than sporadic occurrences of the name in the epigraphic

record, none of them with any literary, philosophical or military associations. Jacoby (1916) attributes to this Iphicrates 'Tacticus' an excerpt from Plutarch's *Life of Pelopidas* 2, 1 (transl. Perrin 1917: 343):

> For if, as Iphicrates analyzed the matter, the light-armed troops are like the hands, the cavalry like the feet, the line of men-at-arms itself like chest and breastplate, and the general like the head, then he, in taking undue risks and being over bold, would seem to neglect not himself, but all, inasmuch as their safety depends on him, and their destruction too.

This 'aphorism', or 'parable' as Parke (1933: 74, n. 2, cf. 113) would have it, is repeated in a slightly different form in Polyaenus, *Strategemata* III 9, 22 (transl. Krenz, Wheeler 1994: 247):

> Iphicrates likened the formation of armies to the body. He called the phalanx a trunk, the light-armed the hands, the cavalry the feet, and the general the head. "Whenever the other parts are missing, the army is lame and disabled. But when the general is killed, the entire army is useless".

In the *Strategemata* of Polyaenus Iphicrates is credited with 63 stratagems, more than any other general. By way of comparison, Agesilaos is credited with 33, Alexander with 32, and Philip with 22. Furthermore, many of these 63 stratagems are of a very general nature. Perhaps more than the one mentioned above are taken from the manual written by Iphicrates 'Tacticus' and do not belong to the Athenian general Iphicrates at all.

University of Gdańsk
sekunda@ug.edu.pl

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barratt 1932: C. Barratt, *Chronology of the Eponmous Archons of Boeotia*, JHS LII 1932, pp. 72–155.

Beloch 1906: J. Beloch, *Griechische Aufgebote II. 3. Beotien, 4. Der Peloponnes*, Klio VI 1906, pp. 34–78.

Briscoe 2008: J. Briscoe, *A Commentary on Livy Books 38–40*, Oxford 2008.

——— 2012: J. Briscoe, *A Commentary on Livy Books 41–45*, Oxford 2012.

Brodersen 2017: K. Brodersen, *Ailianos: Antike Taktiken, Taktika. Zweisprachige Ausgabe*, Wiesbaden 2017.

Dain 1946: A. Dain, *Histoire du texte d'Élien le Tacticien des origines à la fin du Moyen Âge*, Paris 1946.

Daux 1943: G. Daux, *Fouilles de Delphes*, III: *Épigraphie*, Supplément: *Chronologie delphique*, Paris 1943.

Descat 1998: R. Descat, *La carrière d'Eupolemus, stratège macédonien en Asie Mineure. Appendice: Note sur une inscription caro-grecque de Caunos*, REA C 1998, pp. 167–190.

Devine 1989: A.M. Devine, *Aelian's Manual of Hellenistic Military Tactica. A New Translation from the Greek with an Introduction*, AncW XIX 1989, pp. 31–64.

ECKSTEIN 1995: A.M. ECKSTEIN, *Moral Vision in the Histories of Polybius*, Berkeley 1995.
ERRINGTON 1969: R.M. ERRINGTON, *Philopoemen*, Oxford 1968.
ÉTIENNE, KNOEPFLER 1976: R. ÉTIENNE, D. KNOEPFLER, *Hyettos de Béotie et la chronologie des archontes fédéraux entre 250 et 171 avant J.-C.*, Athènes–Paris 1976 (Bulletin de Correspondance Héllenique, Suppl. 3).
FEYEL 1942: M. FEYEL, *Polybe et l'histoire de Béotie au IIIe siècle avant notre ère*, Paris 1942.
FLACELIÈRE 1937: R. FLACELIÈRE, *Les Aitoliens à Delphes: contribution à l'histoire de la Grèce centrale au IIIe siècle av. J.-C.*, Paris 1937.
FOSSEY 1984: J.M. FOSSEY, *The Proxenia Decrees of Tanagra*, Horos II 1984, pp. 119–135.
FOUCART 1880: P. FOUCART, *Inscriptions d'Orchomène (1)*, BCH IV 1880, pp. 77–99.
FRASER, RÖNNE 1957: P.M. FRASER, T. RÖNNE, *Boeotian and West Greek Tombstones*, Lund 1957 (Acta Instituti Atheniensis Regni Sueciae 6).
GILLISCHEWSKI 1896: H. GILLISCHEWSKI, *De Aetolorum praetoribus intra annos 221 et 168 a. Chr. n. munere functis*, diss. Erlangen, Berlin 1896.
GRAINGER 2000: J.D. GRAINGER, *Aitolian Prosopographical Studies*, Leiden 2000.
HAMMOND 1967: N.G.L. HAMMOND, *Epirus. The Geography, the Ancient Remains, the History and the Topography of Epirus and Adjacent Areas*, Oxford 1967.
JACOBY 1907: F. JACOBY, *Eupolemus (12)*, *RE* VI 1, 1907, col. 1229.
——— 1916: F. JACOBY, *Iphikrates (4)*, *RE* IX 2, 1916, col. 2022.
JUHEL 2017: P.O. JUHEL, *Autour de l'infanterie d'élite macédonienne à l'époque du royaume antigonide. Cinq études militaires entre histoire, philologie et archéologie*, Oxford 2017.
KALLIONTZIS 2020: Y. KALLIONTZIS, *Contribution à l'épigraphie et l'histoire de la Béotie hellénistique, de la destruction de Thèbes à la bataille de Pydna*, Paris 2020 (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome).
KIRCHNER 1907a: J. KIRCHNER, *Euangelus (7)*, *RE* VI 1, 1907, col. 844.
——— 1907b: J. KIRCHNER, *Euangelus (9)*, *RE* VI 1, 1907, col. 844.
KRENZ, WHEELER 1994: P. KRENZ, E.L. WHEELER (ed., transl.), Polyaenus: *Stratagems of War*, vol. I: *Books I–V*, Chicago 1994.
KROLL 1921: W. KROLL, *Klearchos (11)*, *RE* XI 1, 1921, cols. 580–583.
LAMBERTZ 1949: M. LAMBERTZ, *Pausanias (20)*, *RE* XVIII 2, 1949, col. 2405.
LENSCHAU 1921: T. LENSCHAU, *Klearchos I (4)*, *RE* XI 1, 1921, cols. 577–579.
——— 1949: T. LENSCHAU, *Pausanias (10)*, *RE* XVIII 2, 1949, col. 2401.
LEVI 1921–1922: M. LEVI, *La cronologia degli strateghi etolici negli anni 221–168 a. C.*, Atti Accad. Torino LVII 1921–1922, pp. 179–185.
LORETTO 1995: L. LORETTO, *Il generale e la biblioteca. La trattatistica militare greca da Democrito di Abdera ad Alessio I Comneno*, in: G. CAMIANO, L. CANFORA, D. LANZA (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica*, vol. II: *La ricezione e l'attualizzazione del testo*, Roma 1995, pp. 563–589.
MA 2000: J. MA, *Fighting Poleis of the Hellenistic World*, in: H. VAN WEES (ed.), *War and Violence in Ancient Greece*, Swansea 2000, pp. 337–376.
MELONI 1953: P. MELONI, *Perseo e la fine della monarchia macedone*, Roma 1953 (Annali delle Facoltà di Lettere, Filosofia e Magistero della Università di Cagliari, vol. 20).
MENDELS 1984–1986: D. MENDELS, *Did Polybius Have 'Another' View of the Aetolian League? A Note*, AncSoc XV–XVII 1984–1986, pp. 63–72.
PARKE 1933: H.W. PARKE, *Greek Mercenary Soldiers*, Oxford 1933.
PATON, WALBANK, HABICHT 2010: Polybius: *The Histories*, vol. II: *Books 3–4*, transl. by W.R. PATON, rev. by F.W. WALBANK, C. HABICHT, Cambridge, MA–London 2010 (Loeb Classical Library 137).
——— 2012: Polybius: *The Histories*, vol. V: *Books 16–27*, transl. by W.R. PATON, rev. by F.W. WALBANK, C. HABICHT, Cambridge, MA–London 2012 (Loeb Classical Library 160).
PÉDECH 1951: P. PÉDECH, *Polybe et l'Éloge de Philopoemen*, REG LXIV 1951, pp. 82–103.
PERRIN 1917: B. PERRIN (transl.), Plutarch: *Lives*. With an English translation, vol. V: *Agesilaus and*

Pompey, Pelopidas and Marcellus, London–New York 1917 (Loeb Classical Library 87).
Pétrarchos 1997: C.B. Pétrarchos, *Hoi epigraphes tou Ōrōpou*, Athinai 1997.
Roesch 1965: P. Roesch, *Thespies et la confédération béotienne*, Paris 1965.
——— 1982: P. Roesch, *Études béotiennes*, Paris 1982.
Sacks 1975: K.S. Sacks, *Polybius' Other View of Aetolia*, JHS XCV 1975, pp. 92–106.
Sage 1961: E.T. Sage (transl.), Livy. With an English Translation, vol. IX: *Books XXXI–XXXIV*, Cambridge, MA–London 1961 (Loeb Classical Library 313).
Sage, Schlesinger 1957: E.T. Sage, A.C. Schlesinger (transl.), Livy. With an English Translation, vol. XII: *Books XL–XLII*, Cambridge, MA–London 1957 (Loeb Classical Library 332).
Schoch 1927: Schoch, *Sokrates (1)*, *RE* III 1, 1927, col. 804.
Sekunda 1992: N.V. Sekunda, *Athenian Demography and Military Strength 338–322 B.C.*, Annual of the British School at Athens LXXXVII 1992, pp. 311–355.
Stadter 1980: P.A. Stadter, *Arrian of Nicomedia*, Chapel Hill 1980.
Vénencie 1960: J. Vénencie, *Inscriptions de Tanagra en alphabet épichorique*, BCH LXXXIV 1960, pp. 589–616.
Walbank 1957: F.W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, vol. I: *Commentary on Books I–VI*, Oxford 1967.
——— 1967: F.W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, vol. II: *Commentary on Books VII–XVIII*, Oxford 1967.
——— 1972: F.W. Walbank, *Polybius*, Berkeley 1972.
——— 1979: F.W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, vol. II: *Commentary on Books XIX–XL*, Oxford 1979.
——— 2002: F. Walbank, *Polybius as a Military Expert*, in: P.R. Hill (ed.), *Polybius to Vegetius. Essays on the Roman Army and Hadrian's Wall Presented to Brian Dobson to Mark His 70th Birthday*, [Durham] 2002, pp. 19–30.
Wheeler 1978: E.L. Wheeler, *The Occasion of Arrian's Tactica*, GRBS XIX 1978, pp. 351–365.
——— 1988a: E.L. Wheeler, *Stratagem and the Vocabulary of Military Trickery*, Leiden 1988 (Mnemosyne, Suppl. 108).
——— 1988b: E.L. Wheeler, *Polla kena tou polemou: The History of a Greek Proverb*, GRBS XXIX 1988, pp. 153–184.
Whitehead 1990: D. Whitehead, Aineias the Tactician: *How to Survive Under Siege*. Translated with Introduction and Commentary, Oxford 1990.
Willrich 1907: H. Willrich, *Eupolemus (8)*, *RE* VI 1, 1907, col. 1227.
Wissowa 1909: G. Wissowa, *Eupolemus (8a)*, *RE* VI 2, 1909, col. 2878 (Nachträge).

Eos CVI 2019
ISSN 0012-7825

DIE SPHRAGIS-EPISTEL DES DRITTEN BUCHES. BEMERKUNGEN ZUR INTERTEXTUALITÄT VON PLIN. *EP*. III 21

von

BORIS HOGENMÜLLER

TITLE: The *Sphragis* Epistle of Book Three. Remarks on the Intertextuality of Plin. *Ep*. III 21.
ABSTRACT: The relationship between Pliny and Tacitus is an often-discussed topic in modern research. A great number of letters is addressed to the friend and famous historian in order to praise Pliny's own actions and duties. A brilliant example of the so-called 'self-praise' can be seen in *Ep*. III 21, the *sphragis* epistle of Pliny's third book of letters. Therein while mourning the death of Martial and repeating some verses of a poem which Martial dedicated to him, Pliny obviously refers to the last chapter of Tacitus' *Agricola* using different forms of intertextual allusions. In the following study I will demonstrate how Pliny tried to apply Tacitus' thoughts in the *Agricola* to achieve eternal memory.

HINFÜHRUNG

Die Briefe des jüngeren Plinius, die er bereits zu seinen Lebzeiten herausgab, zeichnen nicht allein ein eindrucksvolles Bild des Zeitgeschehens des endenden ersten und beginnenden zweiten nachchristlichen Jahrhunderts. Vielmehr bieten sie darüber hinaus tiefe Einblicke in die Selbstwahrnehmung der Handlungen und die mit den Briefen intendierten Absichten ihres Verfassers, wie dies Rex Winsbury nachdrücklich formuliert hat:

> Reading the letters, you get the impression of Pliny as a rather prim and slightly vain man [...]. He is anxious about his public image, keen to advertise the good things about himself, and worried about what posterity might think about him (as well he might, given the subsequent arguments about his political and private morality)[1].

Dass die positive Wahrnehmung der eigenen Leistungen in späteren Zeiten durch das Mittel des Selbstlobs für Plinius im Vordergrund seines literarischen Schaffens gestanden haben könnte, ist gerade in der modernen Forschung der

[1] Winsbury 2014: 217.

vergangenen 20 Jahre immer wieder herausgearbeitet worden[2]. Nicht selten werden zur Unterstützung dieser These die Briefe des dritten Buches und die darin enthaltenen Selbstaussagen herangezogen[3]. Neben *Ep*. III 4, worin Plinius erstmals ausführlich von sich selbst spricht, *Ep*. III 9 – ein Bericht über die Fortsetzung seines Wirkens im Repetundenprozess gegen Classicus – und *Ep*. III 18 – die ausführliche Erwähnung der dreitägigen Lesung des *Panegyricus* – ist häufig der als Sphragis[4] bezeichnete 21. Brief besonders bemerkenswert im Rahmen des *self-praise*. Dieses scheint im Zusammenhang mit Plinius' Konsulat im Jahr 100 n. Chr. zu stehen.

Ähnlich *Ep*. III 7, der Würdigung des Epikers Silius Italicus, widmet sich Epistel III 21 thematisch dem Nachruf auf den Dichter und Freund Martial, der in Spanien verstorben war. In den zu diesem Brief verfassten Studien[5] wurde mehrfach erwähnt, dass es sich nur vordergründig um eine durch Plinius vorgebrachte *laudatio* des Dichters handelte[6]; hintergründig jedoch intendierte Plinius durch die Teilzitation des Gedichtes[7], das Martial auf Plinius verfasst hatte (*Epigr*. X 20), das eigene Andenken zu fördern. Plinius' Verhalten gegenüber Martial und dessen finanzielle Unterstützung will er als Freundschaftsdienst verstanden wissen, den er dem Dichter gerade für das ihm gewidmete Gedicht erweisen möchte („dederam hoc amicitiae, dederam etiam versiculis, quos de me composuit"). Der Rückbezug auf die *mores antiqui* und die Gegenüberstellung dieser panegyrischen Tradition mit der eigenen Zeit, die es nicht nur aufgegeben habe, Lobenswertes zu vollbringen („desiimus facere laudanda"), sondern es auch für unschicklich erachte, gelobt zu werden („laudari quoque ineptum putamus"), verbindet Plinius' eigentümliche Intention des Briefes intertextuell mit der Rechtfertigung für schriftstellerische Tätigkeit, wie sie Sallust im Proöm des *Catilina* (*Cat*. 3, 1)[8] niedergeschrieben hat.

---

[2] Vgl. dazu u. a. Ludolph 1997; Radicke 1997; Hoffer 1999; Henderson 2002; K. Zelzer, M. Zelzer 2002; Gibson 2003; Vogt-Spira 2003; Marchesi 2008; Neger 2015. Eine kritische Sicht auf diese Tendenz bietet Lefèvre 2009: 14–16.

[3] Vgl. Radicke 1997.

[4] Vgl. Henderson 2002; Mayer 2003; Marchesi 2008: 67, Anm. 22 mit Lefèvre 1989: 125; Tzounakas 2014: 248 f.

[5] Hervorzuheben sind insbesondere Lefèvre 1989 (bes. 123–126), und Tzounakas 2014.

[6] Plinius beschreitet mit der Thematik seines Briefes kein Neuland. Das prominenteste Beispiel dafür, dass ein vom sozialen Rang niedriger gestellter Dichter durch das Werk eines höherstehenden Senators geehrt wird, dürfte in Ciceros Rede *Pro Archia poeta* vorliegen.

[7] Dass nicht allein in *Ep*. III 21 Martials ‚Echo' zu hören ist, hat Alberto Canobbio (2015) am Beispiel von *Ep*. IV 14 herausgearbeitet.

[8] „Pulchrum est bene facere rei publicae, etiam bene dicere haud absurdum est; vel pace vel bello clarum fieri licet; et qui fecere et qui facta aliorum scripsere, multi laudantur. Ac mihi quidem, tametsi haudquaquam par gloria sequitur scriptorem et actorem rerum, tamen in primis arduum videtur res gestas scribere: primum, quod facta dictis exaequanda sunt; dehinc, quia plerique, quae delicta reprehenderis, malevolentia et invidia dicta putant, ubi de magna virtute atque

Ebenso offensichtlich liegt eine Reminiszenz zu den Ausführungen des von Plinius geschätzten Freundes und Historikers Tacitus im *Agricola* über die Feindseligkeit der gegenwärtigen Zeit gegenüber mannhafter Bewährung (*virtutes*) vor (Tac. *Agr*. 1)[9]:

> Clarorum virorum facta moresque posteris tradere, antiquitus usitatum, ne nostris quidem temporibus quamquam incuriosa suorum aetas omisit, quotiens magna aliqua ac nobilis virtus vicit ac supergressa est vitium parvis magnisque civitatibus commune, ignorantiam recti et invidiam. Sed apud priores ut agere digna memoratu pronum magisque in aperto erat, ita celeberrimus quisque ingenio ad prodendam virtutis memoriam sine gratia aut ambitione bonae tantum conscientiae pretio ducebatur. Ac plerique suam ipsi vitam narrare fiduciam potius morum quam adrogantiam arbitrati sunt, nec id Rutilio et Scauro citra fidem aut obtrectationi fuit: adeo virtutes isdem temporibus optime aestimantur, quibus facillime gignuntur. At nunc narraturo mihi vitam defuncti hominis venia opus fuit, quam non petissem incusaturus: tam saeva et infesta virtutibus tempora.

Somit können sowohl Sallust als auch Tacitus einvernehmlich als Plinius' Vorlagen bei der Abfassung des Briefes angesehen werden.

In meinen Augen allerdings scheint dieses Urteil unvollständig, da bei genauerer Betrachtung des *Agricola*[10] zwei weitere deutliche intertextuelle Dependenzen gegeben zu sein scheinen. Diese analytisch herauszuarbeiten und dadurch die Bedeutung von *Ep*. III 21 als Sphragis des dritten Buches hervorzuheben, ist Ziel der vorliegenden Studie.

DAS MOTIV DER *AMICITIA* UND DIE EIGENTLICHE INTENTION DER EPISTEL

Der Zeitpunkt der Entstehung von *Ep*. III 21[11] wird übereinstimmend in das Jahr 103 oder 104, dem Todesjahr des Dichters Martial[12], gesetzt. Mit ihm war Plinius freundschaftlich verbunden, wie er selbst mehrfach innerhalb des Briefes zu verstehen gibt: Aufgrund der *amicitia*, die zwischen Martial und Plinius bestand[13], habe Plinius dem Dichter das *viaticum* gegeben („dederam hoc amicitiae“), diesen höchst freundschaftlich nach Spanien[14] ziehen lassen („amicissime

gloria bonorum memores, quae sibi quisque facilia factu putat, aequo animo accipit, supra ea veluti ficta pro falsis ducit“.

[9] Vgl. Tzounakas 2013: 254; vgl. zu Sallust auch Lefèvre 1989: 124 f.; Ussani 1970: 284–290 und 1971.

[10] Vgl. dazu allgemein Soverini 2004; Woodman 2014; Audano 2017.

[11] Vgl. Sherwin-White 1966: 99–101.

[12] Vgl. dazu Holzberg 2002: 14.

[13] Zum Motiv der *amicitia* vgl. u. a. Verboven 2002: 35; Germerodt 2015.

[14] Ob Martial in Bilbilis gestorben ist, scheint möglich, jedoch kaum beweisbar. Kritisch Holzberg 2002: 14 f.

demisi“) und betrauere nun dessen Tod als den eines sehr engen Freundes („ut amicissimum defunctum esse doleo“)[15].

Die mehrfache explizite Erwähnung der *amicitia* umfasst im ersten und dritten Teil des Briefes als umrahmende Begründung den Mittelteil, der als Kern der Epistel gelten dürfte: die Teilzitation des auf Plinius verfassten Epigramms des Martial. Darin wird Plinius als äußerst geschäftiger und gewissenhafter Staatsdiener präsentiert, der mit seinem Schaffen einem Cicero gleichzusetzen sei (*Epigr*. X 20, 14–17: „totos dat tetricae dies Minervae/ dum centum studet auribus virorum/ hoc, quod saecula posterique possint/ Arpinis quoque comparare chartis“). Einen Dichter für solche Worte mit Geld zu ehren, sei in alter Zeit durchaus üblich gewesen („fuit moris antiqui eos, [...], aut honoribus aut pecunia honorare“); in der gegenwärtigen Zeit aber habe man nicht nur diese Gewohnheit abgeschafft („ita hoc in primis exolevit“).

Dass hierin eine versteckte Kritik an der allerdings zum Zeitpunkt der Abfassung des Briefes wie auch des Epigramms[16] einige Jahre zurückliegenden Zeit unter Kaiser Domitian vorliegt, wie sie beispielsweise Tacitus[17] an mehreren Stellen seines Werkes vorbringt[18], erscheint möglich. Vor dem Hintergrund der Situation, in der sich Plinius während Domitians Prinzipat befunden hat, ist diese These jedoch kritisch zu sehen. Unter dem letzten Flavier nämlich hatte Plinius Karriere gemacht und war bis zur Prätur aufgestiegen[19]. Spyridon Tzounakas sieht daher in Plinius’ Bemerkung vielmehr einen geschickten Schachzug, um das eigene Andenken zu bewahren:

> At the same time, since, as Pliny mentions, past expressions of praise were associated with *facere laudanda*, his own association with them implies that he too acted in a way that deserves praise and was therefore praised by Martial. Consequently, Pliny may also be considered to be an important historical figure, one who deserves to survive the ravages of time[20].

[15] Plinius gibt sich somit den Anschein eines *verus amicus*, vgl. dazu White 1978: 83 f.; Guillemin 1929: 23–26; Marchesi 2013: 105–108; Tzounakas 2013: 253 f. Zu Plinius und Martial vgl. auch Cova 1966: 108–116.

[16] Martial hatte das Gedicht wohl Mitte 98/Anfang 99 vor seiner Abreise aus Rom geschrieben, vgl. dazu Damscher, Heil 2004: 7.

[17] Vgl. dazu Nesselhauf 1952: 222–245.

[18] Vgl. u. a. *Hist*. IV 2; IV 40.

[19] Vgl. dazu Germerodt 2015: 83 f.: „Entgegen seiner Aussagen befand sich Plinius nie in wirklicher Gefahr. Vielmehr begünstigte Domitian ihn bei mehr als einer Gelegenheit, wie ein Blick auf den cursus honorum des Plinius deutlich macht: [...] Aus dieser Aufzählung wird ersichtlich, dass Plinius in der Regierungszeit Domitians eine schnelle und vorbildliche Karriere absolviert“. Vgl. auch White 1978: 157 u. 362. Zur Problematik auch Whitton 2015.

[20] Tzounakas 2014: 255.

Die Intention der Epistel sei somit weniger darauf ausgerichtet, um vom Tod Martials zu berichten[21], als das Plinius gewidmete Gedicht zu wiederholen[22]: Das Erlangen von *aeternitas* insbesondere durch *studia*, um, wie in *Ep*. III 7 zu lesen ist, einen Beweis für das eigene Leben der Nachwelt zu hinterlassen (*Ep*. III 7, 14: „...certe studiis proferamus, et quatenus nobis denegatur diu vivere, relinquamus aliquid, quo nos vixisse testemur"), war das Ziel, das zu erreichen Plinius durch Wiederholung der Verse anstrebte, wohl aus der Überlegung heraus, dass Martials Werk die Jahrhunderte nicht überdauern könnte[23]. Dieses Streben jedoch ist, wie mir scheint, in diesem Kontext nicht originär auf Plinius' Denken zurückzuführen, sondern findet sich bereits zuvor an zwei bisher kaum bzw. nicht beachteten Kapiteln in Tacitus' *Agricola* ausformuliert. Diese wie überhaupt das Konzept des *Agricola* als solches sehe ich als Plinius' gedankliche Vorlage, an der er sich orientierte.

DIE RECHTFERTIGUNG DER EHRERBIETUNG UND DER WUNSCH NACH *AETERNITAS* (PLIN. *EP*. III 21 – TAC. *AGR*. 3 UND 46)

Plin. *Ep*. III 21, 1–3 und Tac. *Agr*. 3, 3

Richtet man im Hinblick auf die eigentliche Intention des vorliegenden Briefes – dieser ist ohne Zweifel[24] an Sextus Subrius Dexter Cornelius Priscus[25] adressiert – den Fokus auf Tacitus' frühestes Werk, das, erschienen im Jahr 98 n. Chr.[26], dem lobenden Andenken des Schwiegervaters Julius Agricola gewidmet ist, fällt zunächst eine Passage besonders auf. Darin ist einerseits die Intention

---

[21] Dass möglicherweise Kritik an Martial geäußert werden sollte, gibt Matthias Ludolph (1997: 78 f.) zu verstehen: „In beiden Fällen steckt hinter der Oberfläche einer Würdigung de facto vernichtende Kritik, am schärfsten in dem gönnerhaften: *Dedit ... mihi ... potuisset*. So zeigt sich, daß selbst Verstorbenen gegenüber nur dann uneingeschränkt Anerkennung ausgesprochen wird, wenn nicht mit einem wirklich fortdauernden Ruhm zu rechnen ist, während Plinius Männern wie Silius Italicus oder Martial, deren Werke tatsächlich unsterblichen Ruhm gewonnen haben, noch nach dem Tode die Anerkennung versagt".

[22] Vgl. Tzounakas 2014: 256: „It is most likely that Pliny did not intend to inform the addressee, but merely to repeat the complimentary poem".

[23] *Ibid*.: „In other words, as Martial's work will possibly fail to achieve immortality and his poem about Pliny may well be lost, by quoting it in his own work Pliny is hoping for greater possibilities of survival, implying that the Epistles is a work that will defeat time, while Martial's poetry will probably not". Vgl. auch Merrill 1935: 296; Henderson 2001: 61.

[24] Möglicherweise sind *Ep*. VI 8 und IX 1 ebenfalls an Cornelius Priscus adressiert, absolute Sicherheit besteht jedoch nicht; vgl. Schwerdtner 2015: Anm. 272.

[25] Dieser war wohl in demselben Jahr 104, in dem der Brief entstanden ist, Suffektkonsul und bekleidete 120/121 das Prokonsulat der Provinz Asia, vgl. Eck 1997: 195.

[26] Vgl. dazu u. a. Ogilvie, Richmond 1967: 10 f.; Beck 1998: 63–123; Tscherniak 2005: 105–107.

des Historikers sehr treffend umschrieben, andererseits hat sie Plinius höchst wahrscheinlich als Orientierung bei der Abfassung von *Ep*. III 21 gedient.

In *Agr*. 3, 3 heißt es nach der geradezu topischen Herabsetzung der eigenen Fähigkeiten („vel incondita ac rudi voce"), Tacitus habe den *liber* dem ehrenden Andenken des Schwiegervaters Agricola gewidmet („honori Agricolae soceri mei destinatus") – ein Handeln, das aufgrund der *professio pietatis*, der moralischen und dadurch geradezu heiligen Verpflichtung, die er gegenüber dem *socer* habe, zu loben oder zu entschuldigen sei („aut laudatus erit aut excusatus"). Tacitus' Ziel war es seinen eigenen Worten zufolge, den Lebensleistungen des Agricola durch die eigene schriftstellerische Tätigkeit jene Ehre zu erweisen, die diesem nach dem Tod die *memoria* der Nachwelt garantieren würde[27].

Darin ähnelt Tacitus deutlich der von Plinius gezeichneten Person des Dichters Martial, der das auf Plinius verfasste Gedicht ja zu demselben Zweck – für die von Plinius' erbrachten Leistungen und die ihm entgegengebrachte freundschaftliche Unterstützung im Sinne derselben *professio pietatis* – verfasst habe, obgleich Martial das *viaticum* erst später erhalten sollte. Und so wie Tacitus, dem man offensichtlich ebenso wenig einen Vorwurf für sein Lob des Agricola gemacht hat wie dem Agricola selbst, dem dieses Lob galt, dürfte man es folglich weder dem Martial negativ anrechnen, dass er Plinius gepriesen habe, noch Plinius, dass er von Martial gelobt worden sei. Es scheint mir daher durchaus plausibel, dass Plinius – obgleich noch ohne direkten wörtlichen Bezug – diese Passage in Tacitus' Monographie vor Augen hatte, um durch die versteckte intertextuelle Anspielung in der Art einer Reminiszenz die Rechtmäßigkeit eines solchen Schaffens, wie es Martial vollbracht hat, zu beweisen. Noch deutlicher zeigt sich der Rückgriff auf Tacitus' Kleinschrift jedoch in einer Allusion des Schlussteils der Epistel auf das Schlusskapitel des *Agricola*.

Plin. *Ep*. III 21, 6 und Tac. *Agr*. 46

Auf die, so beginnt der Epilog des Briefes, fiktive Frage, ob er Martial verdientermaßen („meritone") so freundschaftlich habe ziehen lassen („tunc dimisi amicissime") und ihn nun so tief betrauere („ut amicissimum defunctum esse doleo") – denn Martial habe dem Freund so viel erwiesen („dedit mihi"), wie er konnte („quantum maximum potuit"), und noch mehr („daturus amplius"), wenn er es gekonnt hätte („potuisset") –, antwortet Plinius mit einer rhetorischen Gegenfrage:

> Tametsi, quid homini potest dari maius quam gloria et laus et aeternitas? At non erunt aeterna, quae scripsit; non erunt fortasse, ille tamen scripsit, tamquam essent futura.

[27] Vgl. zum Ende des taciteischen *Agricola* aus der Vielzahl von Veröffentlichungen insbesondere SCHWINGE 1963; DÖPP 1985; HARRISON 2007; HARDIE 2012: 273–329; WOODMAN 2014: 323–330. Zum Verhältnis zu Domitian vgl. VON FRITZ 1957.

Nichts Größeres könne es Plinius' Aussage nach für einen Menschen geben als Ruhm (*gloria*), Lob (*laus*) und dadurch Unsterblichkeit (*aeternitas*), die durch die ehrenvolle Erinnerung, wie sie Martial mit seinen Versen zu schaffen versucht hat, erreicht werden soll. Dieses Streben nach Ewigkeit ist es, das Plinius in seinem Wirken und seinen Bemühungen antreibt. Eine Unsterblichkeit, wie sie auch Tacitus' Gedenkschrift auf den Schwiegervater intendiert. Im Schlusskapitel des *Agricola* nämlich ist *expressis verbis* zu lesen (*Agr*. 46, 4):

> Quidquid ex Agricola amavimus, quidquid mirati sumus, manet mansurumque est in animis hominum in aeternitate temporum, fama rerum; nam multos veterum velut inglorios et ignobilis oblivio obruit: Agricola posteritati narratus et traditus superstes erit.

Was auch immer, so schreibt Tacitus, an Agricola geliebt („amavimus") und bewundert würde („mirati sumus"), das bliebe in den Herzen der Menschen („in animis hominum") bis in alle Ewigkeit („in aeternitate temporum") durch den Nachruhm seiner Taten („fama rerum") erhalten. Das Vergessen („oblivio"), dem viele Vorgänger zum Opfer gefallen sind, als wären sie ruhmlos („inglorios") und unbekannt („ignobilis"), werde Agricola daher nicht überkommen, da er, der Nachwelt berichtet und überliefert („posteritati narratus et traditus"), überleben werde („superstes erit").

Vergleicht man die Aussagen der beiden Schriftsteller miteinander, sticht ein Aspekt besonders hervor. Sowohl für Tacitus als auch für Plinius gilt es, durch schriftstellerische Ehrung und Verherrlichung der Taten und Leistungen der zu rühmenden Person dessen ewiges Andenken zu bewahren. Interessanterweise teilen sich beide Autoren diesbezüglich dieselbe Begrifflichkeit zur Umschreibung der Unsterblichkeit: Während Tacitus den Präpositionalausdruck *in aeternitate temporum* setzt, verwendet Plinius das Substantiv *aeternitas* als zentralen Bestandteil des Trikolons, das als *obiectum comparationis* im Nebensatz steht.

Wäre die spezielle Semantik des Substantivs zu Beginn des zweiten Jahrhunderts in der Literatur weit verbreitet, so läge hierin wohl keinerlei Besonderheit vor. Der Begriff *aeternitas* in der Semantik von ‚ewige Fortdauer im Gedächtnis', ‚ewiges Gedächtnis' und ‚Unsterblichkeit' ist jedoch in der lateinischen Literatur der klassischen und der silbernen Latinität relativ selten belegt – das *OLD* nennt lediglich Cicero (u. a. *Pis*. 3; *Phil*. 14, 13), Sueton (*Ner*. 55) und Tacitus als Belegstellen für diese Bedeutung; dies deckt sich auch mit der Auflistung im von Karl E. Georges besorgten Handwörterbuch[28] wie auch dem Eintrag im *ThLL* (I 1139, 47)[29]. Tacitus selbst verwendet *aeternitas* im

---

[28] Georges 1913: 214.

[29] Vgl. dazu Moon 1955: 193: „*Aeternitas* is cited only for Cic. in Classical Latin; it becomes frequent in Silver and more so in Late Latin, especially among Christian writers".

Gegensatz zu Plinius[30] neben der angegebenen Stelle im *Agricola* an nur zwei weiteren Stellen – in den *Historiae* (I 84, 4: „aeternitas rerum“) und den *Annales* (XI 7, 1: „aeternitatem famae“) – in derselben Konnotation zum Ausdruck der Fortdauer im Gedenken der Nachwelt.

Dass zwei Autoren, die in unmittelbarer zeitlicher Nähe zueinander standen – Suetons Verwendung von *aeternitas* in der Biographie des Nero fällt in dieser Betrachtung aufgrund der Publikation der Schrift nach 120 aus zeitlichen Gründen heraus – und darüber hinaus engen, freundschaftlichen Kontakt unterhielten, auf dieselbe Vokabel in einem fast identischen Kontext zurückgriffen, ist meines Erachtens ein bemerkenswertes Detail[31]. Der Gedanke scheint mir zulässig, dass es zwischen den Schriften der beiden Autoren somit eine stärkere intertextuelle Verbindung gibt, als bisher angedacht[32]. Dass Plinius als der zeitlich Spätere im Hinblick auf die Publikation des *Agricola*[33] die erwähnte Passage in Tacitus’ Monographie gekannt[34] und bei der Abfassung des Schlussteils seines Briefes verwendet hat, scheint mir plausibel. Möglicherweise wollte er durch die vorliegende lexikalische Anspielung zu verstehen geben, dass er ebenso große Hoffnung habe, durch Martials Verse Unsterblichkeit zu erreichen, wie sie der zum Paradebeispiel der *virtus* stilisierte Agricola[35] durch die gleichnamige Schrift des Tacitus erlang hat.

Dies verstärkt sich, richtet man nochmals den Blick auf die Verwendung des Begriffes *aeternitas* im Gesamtwerk des Briefcorpus. Insgesamt setzt Plinius an fünf weiteren Stellen das Substantiv in der Semantik von ‚Unsterblichkeit‘, konkret zunächst im dritten Buch im Mittelteil von *Ep*. 16 („gloria aeternitatis ante oculos erant“; „quo maius est sine praemio aeternitatis“), in Buch V in *Ep*. 8 („quibus aeternitas debeatur“), in Buch IX in *Ep*. 3 („praemium aeternitatis“)

---

[30] Als Beispiele seien *Ep*. III 16, 6; V 8, 1; VI 16, 3; IX 3, 1 angeführt (siehe unten).

[31] Lexikalische Gemeinsamkeiten als Kennzeichen der intertextuellen Dependenz gelten als Phänomen, das bereits als Beweis der engen Verbindung zwischen Plinius und dem Neoteriker Catull angeführt wurde, wie Matthew Roller (1998: 267) zu verstehen gibt: „Pliny’s particularly close engagement with Catullus is easy to demonstrate. Besides praising Catullus by name and quoting him [...], Pliny also shares with Catullus no less than six of the terms by which he labels his own poetry – far more than he shares with any other earlier poet whose works survive“. Bei diesen sechs gemeinsamen Termini handelt es sich um die Substantive *nugae* (Catull. 1, 4), *ineptiae* (4b, 1), *versiculi* (16, 3 u. 6), *poema* (22, 15 f.) und *hendecasyllabi*, die Plinius in *Ep*. IV 14 thematisiert, sowie das Verbum *ludere* (Catull. 2, 2 u. 9), womit sowohl Catull als auch Plinius das spielerische Erschaffen von Versen charakterisieren.

[32] Bereits Matthias Ludolph (1997: 82–88) hat sich mit dem Phänomen der *fama* und *immortalitas* in Tacitus’ *Agricola* und dessen Bezüge zu Plinius befasst, dies jedoch weder auf *Ep*. III 21 allgemein noch speziell auf den Schlussteil bezogen.

[33] Dass Plinius’ Briefe erst nach dem Erscheinen des *Agricola* publiziert wurden, steht sicher fest, vgl. dazu Radice 1975: 127; Griffin 1999: 144.

[34] Vgl. zu Plinius’ Verhältnis zur Historiographie Tzounakas 2007.

[35] Vgl. dazu Tzounakas 2007: 52 mit Anm. 49.

und in Buch X in *Ep*. 41 („non minus aeternitate tua"). Besonders auffällig ist der Gebrauch in *Ep*. VI 16. Dieser ist an Tacitus adressiert, von dessen Werk sich Plinius darin die Unsterblichkeit bzw. den ewigen Nachruhm (*aeternitas*) für den zu Tode gekommenen Onkel verspricht („multum tamen perpetuitati eius scriptorum tuorum aeternitas addet") – eine Unsterblichkeit, wie sie Tacitus nach Plinius' Auffassung zweifellos mit Hilfe des *Agricola* für den Schwiegervater erreichen wird (bzw. erreicht hat).

Vor diesem Hintergrund erhält – auf *Ep*. III 21 bezogen – die als Sphragis angesehene Epistel eine weitere Aufwertung im Gesamtkonzept des dritten Buches. In *Ep*. III 21 bilden Plinius' Reflexionen über das ewige Gedächtnis den Abschluss der Epistel und besiegeln durch die Nähe zu Tacitus' finalem Kapitel im *Agricola* explizit das Ziel von Plinius' (schriftstellerischer) Tätigkeit. So wie Agricola, der von Tacitus zum Protagonisten seiner Monographie gemacht worden ist und dadurch im ewigen Gedächtnis der Nachwelt verweilen soll, hofft auch Plinius darauf, zunächst durch Martials Verse, letztlich aber durch deren Teilzitation im Brief an Priscus Unsterblichkeit zu erreichen. Im Rahmen des dem Cäcilier häufig nachgesagten Selbstlobs[36] stellt *Ep*. III 21 somit ein besonders interessantes Beispiel dar, das durch die intertextuelle Anspielung auf das Schlusskapitel des *Agricola* und die Imitation der dort formulierten Gedanken im vorliegenden Kontext an Bedeutung gewinnt. Innerhalb der Diskussion über die Stellung des Briefes als Sphragis des dritten Buches kann daher gefolgert werden, dass nicht allein durch die dem Brief innewohnende Thematik, sondern gerade durch den Schlussteil der Epistel der Charakter des Siegels besonderes Gewicht erhält[37]. Plinius' Gedanken bezüglich der *aeternitas* vollenden – ähnlich wie die Ausführungen des Tacitus im 46. Kapitel des *Agricola* – die Konzeption des dritten Epistelbuches in seiner Gesamtheit mit dem Wunsch nach Ewigkeit und Unsterblichkeit des Verfassers.

Universität Würzburg
boris.hogenmueller@gmail.com

LITERATURVERZEICHNIS

AUDANO 2017: Sergio AUDANO, *Tacito: Agricola. Saggio intoduttivo, nuova traduzione e note*, Santarcangelo di Romagna 2017.

BECK 1998: Jan-Wilhelm BECK, *Germania – Agricola: zwei Kapitel zu Tacitus' zwei kleinen Schriften: Untersuchungen zu ihrer Intention und Datierung sowie zur Entwicklung ihres Verfassers*, Hildesheim 1998.

[36] Vgl. RUDD 1992; GIBSON 2003.

[37] Vgl. u. a. Hor. *Carm*. III 30; *Epist*. I 20; Prop. I 22; vgl. dazu die Studie von KRANZ 1961.

CANOBBIO 2015: Alberto CANOBBIO, *Echi di Marziale nell'epistola 4.14 di Plinio il Giovane*, Prometheus XLI 2015, S. 189–207.

COVA 1966: Pier V. COVA, *La critica letteraria di Plinio il Giovane*, Brescia 1966.

DAMSCHER, HEIL 2004: Gregor DAMSCHER, Andreas HEIL, *Martial: Epigrammaton liber decimus. Text, Übersetzung, Interpretationen*, Frankfurt am Main 2004.

DÖPP 1985: Siegmar DÖPP, *Zur Darstellungsweise in cap. 39–43 des ‚Agricola'*, WüJbb XI 1985, S. 151–167.

ECK 1997: Werner ECK, *Cornelius II, 39*, in: *DNP* III (1997), Sp. 195.

VON FRITZ 1957: Kurt VON FRITZ, *Tacitus, Agricola, Domitian, and the Problem of the Principate*, CPh LII 1957, S. 73–97.

GEORGES 1913: Karl E. GEORGES, *Ausführliches lateinisch-deutsches Handwörterbuch*, Bd. 1, Hannover–Leipzig [8]1913 [ND Darmstadt 1998].

GERMERODT 2015: Fabian GERMERODT, *Amicitia in den Briefen des jüngeren Plinius*, Speyer 2015.

GIBSON 2003: Roy K. GIBSON, *Pliny and the Art of (In)offensive Self-Praise*, Arethusa XXXVI 2003, S. 235–253.

GRIFFIN 1999: Miriam T. GRIFFIN, *Pliny and Tacitus*, SCI XXVIII 1999, S. 139–159.

GUILLEMIN 1929: Anne-Marie GUILLEMIN, *Pline et la vie littéraire de son temps*, Paris 1929.

HARDIE 2012: Philip HARDIE, *Rumour and Renown: Representations of ‚Fama' in Western Literature*, Cambridge–New York 2012.

HARRISON 2007: Stephen HARRISON, *From Man to Book: The Close of Tacitus' Agricola*, in: Stephen J. HEYWORTH (Hg.), *Classical Constructions. Papers in Memory of Don Fowler, Classicist and Epicurean*, Oxford 2007, S. 310–319.

HENDERSON 2001: John HENDERSON, *On Pliny on Martial on Pliny on Anon... (Epistles 3.21/ Epigrams 10.19)*, Ramus XXX 2001, S. 56–87.

——— 2002: John HENDERSON, *Pliny's Statue: The Letters, Self-Portraiture and Classical Art*, Exeter 2002.

HOFFER 1999: Stanley E. HOFFER, *The Anxieties of Pliny the Younger*, Atlanta 1999.

HOLZBERG 2002: Niklas HOLZBERG, *Martial und das antike Epigramm*, Darmstadt 2002.

KRANZ 1961: Walther KRANZ, *Sphragis – Ichform und Namensiegel als Eingangs- und Schlußmotiv antiker Dichtung*, RhM CIV 1961, S. 3–46.

LEFÈVRE 1989: Eckard LEFÈVRE, *Plinius-Studien V: Vom Römertum zum Ästhetizismus. Die Würdigungen des älteren Plinius (3,5), Silius Italicus (3,7) und Martial (3,21)*, Gymnasium LXXXXVI 1989, S. 113–128.

——— 2009: Eckard LEFÈVRE, *Vom Römertum zum Ästhetizismus: Studien zu den Briefen des jüngeren Plinius*, Berlin 2009.

LUDOLPH 1997: Matthias LUDOLPH, *Epistolographie und Selbstdarstellung. Untersuchungen zu den „Paradenbriefen" Plinius des Jüngeren*, Tübingen 1997.

MARCHESI 2008: Ilaria MARCHESI, *The Art of Pliny's Letters: A Poetics of Allusion in the Private Correspondence*, Cambridge 2008.

——— 2013: Ilaria MARCHESI, *Silenced Intertext: Pliny on Martial on Pliny (on Regulus)*, AJPh CXXXIV 2013, S. 101–118.

MAYER 2003: Roland MAYER, *Pliny and Gloria Dicendi*, Arethusa XXXVI 2003, S. 227–234.

MERRILL 1903: Elmer T. MERRILL, *Selected Letters of the Younger Pliny*, London 1903 [ND 1935].

MOON 1955: Albion Anthony MOON, *The De Natura Boni of Saint Augustine. A Translation with an Introduction and Commentary*, Washington 1955.

NEGER 2015: Margot NEGER, *„Neque enim vereor, ne iactantior videar...". Plinius und der kaiserzeitliche Diskurs über das Selbstlob*, Gymnasium CXXII 2015, S. 315–338.

NESSELHAUF 1952: Herbert NESSELHAUF, *Tacitus und Domitian*, Hermes LXXX 1952, S. 222–245.

OGILVIE, RICHMOND 1967: Robert M. OGILVIE, Ian RICHMOND (Hgg.), *Cornelii Taciti De Vita Agricolae*, Oxford 1967.

RADICE 1975: Betty RADICE, *The Letters of Pliny*, in: Thomas A. DOREY (Hg.), *Empire and Aftermath: Silver Latin II*, London 1975, S. 119–142.

RADICKE 1997: Jan RADICKE, *Die Selbstdarstellung des Plinius in seinen Briefen*, Hermes CXXV 1997, S. 447–469.

ROLLER 1998: Matthew ROLLER, *Pliny's Catullus: The Politics of Literary Appropriation*, TAPhA CXXVIII 1998, S. 265–304.

RUDD 1992: Niall RUDD, *Stratagems of Vanity: Cicero, Ad familiares 5.12 and Pliny's Letters*, in: Tony WOODMAN, Jonathan POWELL (Hgg.), *Author and Audience in Latin Literature*, Cambridge 1992, S. 26–32.

SCHWERDTNER 2015: Katrin SCHWERDTNER, *Plinius und seine Klassiker. Studien zur literarischen Zitation in den Pliniusbriefen*, Berlin 2015.

SHERWIN-WHITE 1966: Adrian N. SHERWIN-WHITE, *The Letters of Pliny: A Historical and Social Commentary*, Oxford 1966.

SOVERINI 2004: Paolo SOVERINI (Hg.), *Cornelio Tacito: Agricola*, Alessandria 2004.

TSCHERNIAK 2005: Alexander TSCHERNIAK, *Tacitus in schwerer Zeit: Zur Entstehung des Agricola*, Hyperboreus XI 2005, S. 86–113.

TZOUNAKAS 2007: Spyridon TZOUNAKAS, *„Neque enim historiam componebam: Pliny's First Epistle and his Attitude towards Historiography"*, MH LXIV 2007, S. 42–54.

——— 2014: Spyridon TZOUNAKAS, *Martial's Pliny as Quoted by Pliny (Epist. 3.21)*, C&M LXIV 2014, S. 247–268.

USSANI 1970: Vincenzo USSANI, *Leggendo Plinio il Giovane, I (Historia – nomen inertiae)*, RCCM XII 1970, S. 271–348.

——— 1971: Vincenzo USSANI, *Leggendo Plinio il Giovane, II (Oratio – historia)*, RCCM XIII 1971, S. 70–135.

VERBOVEN 2002: Koenraad VERBOVEN, *The Economy of Friends: Economic Aspects of amicitia and Patronage in the Late Republic*, Bruxelles 2002.

VOGT-SPIRA 2003: Gregor VOGT-SPIRA, *Die Selbstinszenierung des jüngeren Plinius im Diskurs der literarischen Imitatio*, in: Luigi CASTAGNA, Eckard LEFÈVRE (Hgg.), *Plinius der Jüngere und seine Zeit*, München 2003, pp. 51–65.

WHITE 1978: Peter WHITE, *Amicitia and the Profession of Poetry in Early Imperial Rome*, JRS LXVIII 1978, S. 74–92.

WHITTON 2015: Christopher WHITTON, *Pliny's Progress: On a Troublesome Domitianic Career*, Chiron XLV 2015, S. 1–22.

WINSBURY 2014: Rex WINSBURY, *Pliny the Younger: A Life in Roman Letters*, London 2014.

WOODMAN 2014: Anthony J. WOODMAN (Hg.), *Tacitus: Agricola* (with Christina S. KRAUS), Cambridge 2014.

WOOLF 2015: Greg WOOLF, *Pliny/Trajan and the Poetics of Empire*, CPh CX 2015, S. 132–151.

K. ZELZER, M. ZELZER 2002: Klaus ZELZER, Michaela ZELZER, *„Retractationes" zu Brief und Briefgenos bei Plinius, Ambrosius und Sidonius Apollinaris*, in: Wilhelm BLÜMER, Rainer HENKE, Markus MULKE (Hgg.), *Alvarium. Festschrift für Christian Gnilka*, Münster 2002, S. 393–405.

Eos CVI 2019
ISSN 0012-7825

MILITARY TRIBUNATE IN THE CAREERS OF ROMAN SENATORS OF THE SEVERAN PERIOD. PART I: INTRODUCTORY ISSUES*

by

DANUTA OKOŃ

ABSTRACT: During the 42 years of the rule of the Severan dynasty (193–235), several thousand people with the title of military tribune probably served in troops of the Roman Empire. Some of them then entered the Roman Senate, starting a public career (often a long-term career) and forming the core of the State government. The aim of this paper is to answer the following questions: What were the terms used in the inscriptions for military tribunate? How were tribunes appointed and how long did they hold their offices? How many military tribunes were there in the Severan Period? How many of them are currently known and what territorial and social circles did they come from?

I. PRELIMINARY REMARKS

What we find in the *cursus honorum* of Roman senators are offices of a religious, civil and military nature. Much as the religious offices were important and prestigious, they remained outside the basic course of promotions, regardless of whether they were of local or higher rank. Other offices (civil and military) often intertwined with each other, creating different individual structures (relevant to a specific person), which lays the foundation for contemporary researchers to generalise and construct various typologies of senatorial careers[1]. In my latest publication, *Album senatorum*, I suggested a typology based on the criteria of social origin and the course of subsequent stages of a given career, with a particular focus on the praetorian stage (terminated with a consulship, because it is only then that

* This article opens a series of publications dedicated to military offices in the *cursus honorum* of Roman senators. Papers about the influence of military tribunate on subsequent senatorial career are being prepared. I would like to extend my gratitude to Anthony R. Birley for email correspondence and sending me one of his papers (Birley 2003) as well as to Leszek Mrozewicz for consultations regarding the present study.

[1] See, for instance, Alföldy 1977; Barbieri 1952; A.R. Birley 1981: 4 f.; Eck 2015; Leunissen 1989; Okoń 2016 and 2018.

we know the total number of offices of the praetorian rank that had been held by a given senator)[2]. I find searching the source material of *viri militares*, which was initiated by R. Syme[3] and B. Campbell[4], inspiring, although I must agree that the Romans did not distinguish between civil and military careers, considering all these functions simply as public service. Equally inspiring is the analysis of senatorial careers from the point of view of one office, as has recently been done by R. Duncan-Jones[5] focusing on the vigintivirate – although it should be noted that this was an optional office, held only by some of the *clarissimi viri*. Analyses done by these authors cast interesting light on senatorial careers, although I think that creating a classification based on their observations is unjustified.

In this article, an effort will be made to analyse the group of senators of the Severan period who before their promotion to the Senate held military tribunate, although I am fully aware of the fact that it was an optional office, held at a young age. However, the significance of this office and the experience gained along with the indispensable favouritism of influential people at this stage make it, in my opinion, important to the future career of these people[6]. I will take into account all tribunes, both senatorial and equestrian (the latter only if they were subsequently awarded *adlectio in amplissimum ordinem*). I will make an attempt to answer, among others, the following questions: what terms were used in inscriptions for military tribunate, how tribunes were appointed and how long they served in office, how many military tribunes there were in the Severan Period, how many of them are currently known and what territorial and social circles they came from.

II. NOMENCLATURE OF MILITARY TRIBUNES IN INSCRIPTIONS

In the inscriptions presenting the *cursus honorum* of senators from the Severan period, those holding military tribunate[7] are most frequently referred to

[2] Okoń 2018, particularly ch. 4. Okoń 2017 is a collection of the careers of 1682 senators of the Severan period, which became the basis of the analyses contained in Okoń 2018.

[3] Syme 1957 and 1958.

[4] Campbell 1975.

[5] Duncan-Jones 2016.

[6] I do not agree with the opinion expressed, for instance, by B. Dobson about the very little impact of holding the tribunate on someone's future career, especially on promotion to the post of legionary legate. See Dobson 1993a: 123: "Deliberate selection of individuals to command legions involved in present or planned campaign is very difficult to demonstrate. It is even harder to show that such selection was a direct result of military ability demonstrated as much as 10 years previously". This general statement, without detailed analyses of careers, is in my opinion unsubstantiated.

[7] According to Varro (*Ling.* V 81) the word *tribunus* is derived from the term *tribus* 'tribe' and is referred by the author to three major Roman tribes: Ramnes, Tities, Luceres, who selected officers (tribunes) to lead troops.

as *tribunus militum*, *tribunus legionis* or *tribunus laticlavius*[8]. These terms cannot be treated as synonyms. The differences are quite significant:

– *tribunatus militum* (i.e., generally, military tribunate) could be held in various types of military units, while *tribunatus legionis* and *laticlavius* only in legions,
– the post of *tribunus militum* and *tribunus legionis* could be awarded to people of senatorial or equestrian rank, whereas *tribunus laticlavius* was a title awarded only to people from the senatorial order.

Interestingly, I have not come across the title of *tribunus angusticlavius* in the inscriptions of senators (promoted from the equestrian order). From a formal standpoint, there should be many inscriptions with such a title, since *equites* served as tribunes in legions (in legions commanded by senators – five[9] equestrian *angusticlavii* as opposed to one senatorial *laticlavius*), auxiliary troops, the praetorian guard, *cohortes urbanae*, *cohortes vigilum* and *numeri*[10] troops. It can therefore be assumed that they can be found among *tribuni militum* or *tribuni legionis*. Let me add that these titles were also used by members of the senatorial order, who were obviously *laticlavii*[11] – in their case the use of the title *tribunus militum* or *legionis* could have been due to the fact that they came from well-known families (and there was no need to additionally emphasise that their representative served as *tribunus laticlavius*). This meant that those promoted from the equestrian order, owing to the use of the same wording, had an opportunity to conceal their origins. It is worth adding that most of the honorific inscriptions were given at the final stages of careers, when meritorious senators

---

[8] As a rule, the name *tribunus* was shortened in inscriptions to the letters TR or TRIB, *militum* to MIL or MILIT, *legionis* to LEG or L, *laticlavius* to LATICL, LATIC, LATI, LAT, LC. Other forms were rare, e.g. *tribunus militum laticlavius* (e.g. Iulius Pompilius Piso T. Vibius [...]atus Laevillus Berenicianus: *CIL* VIII 2582 = *ILS* 1111); *tribunus militum legionis* (e.g. C. Iulius Septimius Castinus: *CIL* III 10471 = *AE* 1972, 378; P. Catius Sabinus: *AE* 1956, 204). It is possible that in the Severan period the title *tribunus sexmenstris/semestris*, mentioned indirectly in the inscription from Thorigny (*CIL* XIII 3162 = Pflaum 1948), was also used. For more details, see n. 27 below.

[9] Assuming that *tribunus sexmenstris/semestris*, found in a few inscriptions, was not identical to that of the *tribuni angusticlavii*, there would be six of them.

[10] For an inscription mentioning *tribunus numeri*, see Hošek 1985: 41 f. (no. 14). The inscription contains the notation TR N, which was expanded by the author as *tr(ibunus) n(umeri)*.

[11] In the Severan period: Claudius Pompeianus, son of a consul for the second time, *tribunus militum* (*CIL* XIII 1766); T. Flavius Victorinus Philippianus, son of a legate of Gallia Lugdunensis, *tribunus militum* (*CIL* XIII 1673 = *ILS* 1152 – an inscription which featured him with his father the legate and his brother); Q. Hedius Rufus Lollianus Gentianus, son of an ordinary consul, *tribunus legionis* (*CIL* II 4121 = *ILS* 1145 = *RIT* 139); M. Iuventius Secundus Rixa Postumius Pansa Valerianu[s ...] Severus, son of a consul, *tribunus legionis* (*CIL* V 4335); L. Valerius Publicola Messalla Helvidius Thrasea Priscus Minicius Natalis, a descendant of an old consular family, *tribunus militum* (*AE* 1998, 280); C. Vettius Gratus Sabinianus, son of a consul, *tribunus militum legionis* (*CIL* VIII 823 cf. 12346); (H)aterius Latronianus, son of a legate of Pannonia, *tribunus militum* (*AE* 1962, 118 – mentioned along with his father); M. Roscius Lupus Murena, grandson of the proconsul of Pontus-Bithynia, *tribunus legionis* (*IGR* I 909 = *ILS* 8834 a = *I. Cret*. IV 296): Q. Servilius Pudens, son of an ordinary consul, *tribunus militum* (*CIL* VIII 5354 = 17492 = *ILAlg* I 281 = *ILS* 1084).

(for propaganda reasons) were particularly interested in showing their *cursus honorum* in the most positive light. In view of the above conditions, it is understandable why the title of *tribunus angusticlavius* is not found in honorific inscriptions, as opposed to the term *tribunus laticlavius*.

Another possibility is to assume that only the titles *tribunus militum* or *tribunus legionis* were commonly used and given to tribunes regardless of their social status. The title *tribunus laticlavius*, on the other hand, started to be used by those concerned as a way of emphasising their senatorial status[12]. In such a case, the term *tribunus angusticlavius* would merely be an opposition to the term *laticlavius* and would be of a formal nature; in practice, since it was not used, it was not found in inscriptions. It is found only in literary sources[13], a circumstance which provides a (sometimes unjustified) basis for contemporary researchers to use it in the literature of the subject. In my opinion, this term can be used in literature analysing Roman social structure, but it should be approached with caution in the case of research on the Roman army.

To sum up, in the case of the title *tribunus laticlavius*, we are certain as to the social status of the honoured person. In the case of other titles (e.g. *tribunus militum*, *tribunus legionis*), additional information about the family background is needed. Only in the case of tribunes who subsequently served equestrian functions is it possible to determine with certainty (without the verification of their *gens*) that we are dealing with an *eques*.

Despite the differences in terms of social status and functions in the army, they all later formed a group of senators with military experience, and were thus potentially human resources for appointments to command legions and to take governorships of provinces.

III. APPOINTMENTS OF TRIBUNES

It is worth considering how the recruitment and appointment of tribunes was carried out. As a rule, this office was held by people of the senatorial order after the vigintivirate[14], while people of the equestrian order held it after a cohort prefec-

---

[12] *Equites* who became *adlecti in ordinem senatorium* at an early age and then served as military tribunes (e.g. the brothers L. Marius Maximus Perpetuus Aurelianus and L. Marius Perpetuus) appeared in inscriptions already as *tribuni laticlavii*, which emphasises their new, senatorial social status.

[13] Velleius Paterculus (II 88, 2) mentions Maecenas, an equestrian, who “erat tunc urbis custodiis praepositus” and “vixit *angusti clavi* paene contentus” (perhaps “honore contentus”), while Suetonius (*Otho* 10, 1) speaks about his father: “interfuit huic bello pater meus Suetonius Laetus, tertiae decimae legionis tribunus angusticlavius”. It should be noted that in the case of Maecenas, the point was to emphasise the fact that he did not want to become a senator, and in the case of Suetonius’ father, to indicate his high (equestrian) rank. In both cases, the term was used to point to the social status of the characters described.

[14] The vigintivirate has been attested in the case of the vast majority of the tribunes in the Severan period. It is missing in the inscriptions of some tribunes: Ti. Cl(audius) Me[vius? P]riscus

ture as a part of *tres/quattuor militiae*. In both cases, the office was held by young people without much experience or merit. Thus, external factors such as the support of the *gens* and the patronage of influential people were decisive with regard to their promotion[15]. The official appointment was made by the emperor[16] who knew some of those keen to obtain *tribunatus laticlavius* from the office of the vigintivirate which they had previously held in Rome. This fact could have influenced the choice. Given the fact that he was unfamiliar with all the candidates, the emperor probably relied on the opinion of his entourage[17] or the administrative staff of the province (its legate, to be more specific)[18]. The choice of the candidates for the post

---

Ruf[inus I]unior (*tribunus militum*); M. Domitius Valerianus (*tribunus laticlavius*); T. Flavius Secundus Philippianus (*tribunus militum*); L. Iulius Apronius Maenius Pius Salamallianus (*tribunus laticlavius*); C. Iulius Septimius Castinus (*tribunus militum*); C. Luxilius Sabinus Egnatius Proculus (*tribunus laticlavius*); L. Marius Perpetuus (*tribunus laticlavius*); [... Bassidius?] [Cor]nelianus Agrippinus (*tribunus militum*); C. Mar(i)us Etruscus Gal(l)ianus (*tribunus laticlavius*); M. Roscius Lupus Murena *(tribunus legionis*); Q. Servilius Pudens (*tribunus militum*); [...]Tursidius (*aut* T. Ursidius) [...] ManilianusTitule[ius] Aelianus (*tribunus laticlavius*). The lack of a reference to the vigintivirate may be due to two reasons: the office was not mentioned (not enough space available on the stone) or it had not been held. In the case of one anonymous senator, an inscription (*CIL* VI 1541 = 41133) provides a reverse sequence ("[trib. la]t. leg. V Maced., III vir a. a. a. f. f."), which may (but does not have to) be the stonecutter's mistake.

[15] This is well illustrated by Pliny the Younger's letters (from the times of Traianus), e.g. *Epist.* VII 22 to Q. Pompeius Falco, the legate of the province of Iudaea and the Legio X Fretensis, with a request for the tribunate (*angusticlavius*) for his fellow countryman and friend, C. Cornelius Minicianus; III 8 to Suetonius Tranquillus who asks Pliny to substitute Caesennius Silvanus (described as Suetonius' *propinquus*) for the post of military tribune, which was given to Suetonius by the legate Neratius Priscus; IV 4, in which the author requests that the legate Sosius Senecio give a six-month tribunate to Varisidius Nepos, a friend's nephew. In a similar fashion, Fronto, when writing to the provincial legate Claudius Iulianus (*Ad amicos* I 5), praises Faustinianus, a friend's son, to aid his promotion. – For the promotion of tribunes see, for example, E. Birley 1953 and 1988; A.R. Birley 1981: 3 and 2005: 10 and 2003; Cotton 1981; Dobson 1993b: 131; Eck 1995: 138 f.; Handy 2009: 204; Saller 1982: 45, 132; Syme 1988: 564.

[16] It is worth recalling that even centurions were appointed by the emperor – see, for example, the reference to the refusal to appoint a centurion which was to lead to the murder of Emperor Caracalla by the offended soldier, Iulius Martialis (Cass. Dio LXXVIII 5, 4). However, this took place during an expedition which was personally commanded by the emperor. Under different circumstances, centurions were probably promoted by the legionary legate, and the emperor approved the appointments.

[17] From the circle of relatives of the closest collaborators of the emperors, the office of military tribune was held by Q. Hedius Rufus Lollianus Gentianus and L. Marius Perpetuus, whose fathers were members of Septimius Severus' *consilium principis*. The mechanism of such favouritism is also revealed by Pliny, a trusted associate of Emperor Traianus, asking him in one of his letters (*Epist.* X 87) for the office of tribune to be given to Nymphidius Lupus, son of his former comrade-in-arms. Thus, the system of favouritism included not only people from close and distant families, but also a wide circle of friends and their children. – For the appointment procedure of officers of legions and auxiliary troops, see A.R. Birley 2003; Devijver 1992: 66 ff.; Dobson 1993b; Saller 1982; Syme 1988.

[18] Pliny the Younger (*Epist.* II 13) openly writes to the legate Neratius Priscus: "Regis exercitum amplissimum: hinc tibi beneficiorum larga materia, longum praeterea tempus, quo amicos tuos

of *tribunatus angusticlavius* could have been determined by factors similar to those of the *laticlavii*, although it must be borne in mind that *equites* could have been more closely related to both the province in which they served and the legate who supported them. In the case of a transfer of a legate to another province, what sometimes happened was that his equestrian officers went along with him[19]. Thus, legateships of provinces and legions were in the immediate area of interest of the emperor. The remaining people had to be awarded appointments to lower officer functions (with the formal approval of the princeps).

The source material provides evidence that province legates had a large impact on the appointments of legionary tribunes. What sometimes happened was that a governor aided the promotion of his son, nephew or cousin. In the biographical data relating to the senators of the Severan period, I have found 10 cases of coincidences pointing to such an appointment model.

Table 1: Military tribunes holding office in provinces governed by their relatives

No.	*Nomen* of the tribune	*Nomen* of the province legate	Province
1.	M. Caecilius Rufinus Marianus	Q. Caecilius Rufinus Crepereianus	Pannonia Inferior
2.	Cass[ius ...]ens *vel* Cass[ius ...]nus	L. Cassius Marcellinus	Pannonia Inferior
3.	Iulius Maximianus	C. Iulius Maximinus	III Daciae
4.	C. Iulius Septimius Castinus	L. Septimius Severus ---------------------------- P. Septimius Geta	Pannonia Superior ---------------------- III Daciae
5.	C. Luxilius Sabinus Egnatius Proculus	Egnatius (Victor) Marinianus	Moesia Superior
6.	(Pomponius) Bassus	Pomponius Bassus	Moesia
7.	M. Valerius Florus	M. Valerius Senecio	Numidia
8.	L. Calpurnius Proculus	P. Calpurnius Proculus Cornelianus	Dacia Superior
9.	(H)aterius Latronianus	Ti. Haterius Saturninus	Pannonia Inferior
10.	C. Postumius Africanus	C. Iunius Faustinus Postumianus	Hispania

exornare potuisti", emphasising the great impact the legate has on the appointment to the tribunate. Significant words, addressed to the legate Neratius Marcellus, are also contained on one of the tablets from Vindolanda: "ut beneficio tuo militiam possim iucundam experiri" (*TV* II no. 21, 225).

[19] See, for example, the career of M. Statius Priscus Licinius Italicus (cos. ord. a. 159), who served in Britain under Sex. Iulius Severus as *praefectus cohortis*, and later moved with him to Syria, where he is already found as holding the rank of *tribunus militum*.

The above list was based on literary and epigraphic data, the convergence of family nomenclature and of dates of stays of tribunes and legates in the same province (see Okoń 2017). Similar cases can be found in the epigraphic material (including relatives and kinsmen in the feminine line[20]); it seems that the cited examples sufficiently illustrate the general mechanisms and conditions. It is worth noting that in the praetorian provinces with one legion (e.g., Arabia, Pannonia Inferior until the times of Caracalla, Dacia Superior until Marcus Aurelius, Raetia and Noricum under Marcus Aurelius, Syria Phoenicia under Septimius Severus, Britannia Inferior under Caracalla, Numidia) the governor was also the commander of the legion and therefore the tribune's immediate superior. Given this situation, it should be surmised that commanders of the legions had an influence on the appointment of military tribunes. It may be assumed, following E. Birley and H. Devijver, that the appointments were handed over to the emperor through the imperial secretariat *ab epistulis*[21] which was responsible for archiving military documents[22].

From a formal standpoint, the tribune *laticlavius* was the officer who was second-in-rank in the legion and who, if circumstances required, commanded the legion or its detachments (*vexillationes*) in place of the legate. This is openly stated in reference to one of the senators from the Severan period [...]us L.f. Fab. Annian[us]: "in [quo honore vi]c(es) legati sustinuit"[23]; these words show that senatorial tribunes had a high position in the legion and might play an important role in it.

It had not always been the case that the service of one's relative in a province brought such results. Tacitus (*Ann.* I 19 f.) provides an account of a situation (under Tiberius) when rebellious soldiers forced the governor Iunius Blaesus to send a young tribune, his son, to Rome as an envoy to present their demands to the emperor a young tribune – his son a young tribune – his son. We also know (from the times of Macrinus) the case of a young tribune (Pomponius) Bassus accused by an informer, Sulpicius Arrenianus, who wished to take revenge on his father, the legate of Moesia (Cass. Dio LXXVIII 21, 2). These cases, provided in literary sources, complement the picture of the appointments known from epigraphic material.

---

[20] For instance, C. Calpurnius Ceius Aemilianus served in the Legio II Adiutrix, in the province of Pannonia Inferior, probably during the term of office of his father-in-law C. Memmius Fidus Iulius Albius. It is not known, however, whether he was already then the husband of the legate's daughter or whether the legate noticed the promising young man during his service. The case of L. Iulius Apronius Maenius Pius Salamallianus, who commanded the Legio I Adiutrix in Pannonia Inferior during the governorship of his father-in-law L. Alfenius Avitianus, was probably similar.

[21] Devijver 1992: 69. He follows E. Birley in this respect.

[22] See A.R. Birley 2003: 3 f.

[23] *CIL* XIII 6763 = *ILS* 1188 = Alföldy 1967: 61 f. An example of such a replacement had been previously attested, for example, in the inscriptions from Cordoba (1st cent. AD) to honour the senator P. Axius Naso as *trib(unus) milit(um) proleg(atus)* (*AE* 1981, 495).

IV. NUMERICAL LISTINGS

In the Severan period, the Empire had 32 legions, of which 28[24] were commanded by senatorial legates and 4[25] by equestrian prefects. Each of the senatorial legions included lower-ranking officers: one from the senatorial order (*tribunus laticlavius*) and five from the equestrian order (*tribuni angusticlavii*). In other types of troop groupings, there were no senatorial tribunes, only equestrian ones.

In the senatorial *cursus honorum*, especially in the case of lower-ranking functions (*quaestor*, *tribunus plebis*/*aedilis*, *praetor*), the principle of a one year term of office had been in force since republican times. However, the tribunate was a pre-senatorial function and did not belong to the group of municipal magistratures. Even if it was a one year appointment during the Republic, the expansion of the army during the Empire forced a change in this state of affairs. It is worth noticing that the term *tribunus militum bis* is found in honorary inscriptions from the beginnings of the Principate[26], which evidently testifies to the lack of staff and ways to deal with this problem by iterating the tribune's term of service. In fact, this resulted in the extension of this term (by one year). Thus, it can be assumed that the title *tribunus militum bis* with no indication of two specific legions defined a tribune serving two years in the same legion. During the Severan period we do not find a similar phrase recorded, which may mean that the two-year term of service became the norm. One should notice that if the tribune served in two legions successively, it was marked in his inscription by enumerating their names (see below).

The conclusion on the extension of the tribunes' period of service is based on other premises as well. It is hard to assume that a tribune sent to the *limes* (often far away) served there for only one year[27]. Taking into account the duration of the journey, such an appointment would have been ineffective.

---

[24] This number does not include the Legio VI Hispana, whose existence in the Severan period has not been attested in our sources.

[25] These were the following legions: I, II, III Parthica and II Traiana.

[26] *CIL* III 14707; *CIL* VI 31596 = *CIL* I 198 = *InscrIt* XIII 3, 6 = *ILS* 48; *CIL* VI 40955; *CIL* VI 40978; *CIL* IX 5838; *CIL* XI 1054; *CIL* XI 4359 = *Supplementa Italica* NS XVIII 2000, p. 224 ad no; *Inscriptions de la Mésie Supérieure* VI 24.

[27] A similar conclusion was reached by A.R. Birley (2005: 73 f.) based on the information provided by Tacitus, *Agr.* 5, 1–3, and epigraphical sources. According to the British scholar, it is highly probable that tribunes without the vigintivirate held the military tribunate longer. A list of such tribunes was provided in A.R. Birley 2000: 104 ff. – Found in some inscriptions (*CIL* III 101; *CIL* III 6233; *CIL* VIII 2586 = *ILS* 2381; *CIL* IX 4886 = *ILS* 2744; *CIL* IX 4485 = *ILS* 2745; *ILS* 2405), the title *tribunus sexmenstris/semestris* is usually interpreted on the basis of the inscription from Thorigny (*CIL* XIII 3162) as referring to positions held in legions for the period of six months. In my opinion, however, it should be seen as evidence for the permanent rotation (every six months) of equestrian tribunes in the legion as part of a two-year appointment. Thus I disagree with the opinion held by A.R. Birley (2003: 2 f.) that equestrian tribunes served approximately one year and did not command soldiers directly ("[a tribunate] not involving direct command

Assuming hypothetically that the average duration of the tribunes' term of service was two years, with 28 legions there would be 14 tribunes *laticlavii* appointed annually[28]. With 28 legions and 42 years of Severan rule, we should know of 588 *laticlavii* and five times as many *angusticlavii*. Bearing in mind that *angusticlavii* also served in other formations, it must be assumed that there were thousands of people with the title of the tribune, although only a part of them later held senatorial offices. Currently, I can list the names of 123 senators from the Severan period (of the 1682 that are known) whose preserved *cursus* features the above-mentioned tribunate (see the Appendix)[29]. Objectively speaking this is not a significant number, but it must be remembered that it was a low-ranking and non-obligatory office, which explains why it did not always feature in honorific inscriptions, particularly in the case of people with a long and full career.

Twelve tribunes (out of the 123) were definitely *angusticlavii*, i.e. they started their careers as *equites* and later advanced to the senatorial order. Their *cursus* was of a mixed type – it started with equestrian offices which were followed by *adlectio* and senatorial offices[30]. Of the remaining 111, almost half (53) are described with the term *tribunus laticlavius*, so they belonged to the senatorial order from the start. The rest are referred to with such words as *tribunus militum* or *tribunus legionis*; among them were descendants of old senatorial families (9)[31], but also individuals whose provenance remains uncertain (49). Thus, the analysis of the sources leads to the conclusion that in the case of 74 tribunes (60.1%) we can determine their social status at the time when they served this

---

of troops"). Approaching the subject from the point of view of logic, tribunes must have changed in the command of individual cohorts (each commanded two of them at the same time), so as to get to know legionaries and the specifics of being in command of teams undergoing change. The post of *tribunus sexmenstris/semestris* would not be an additional or exceptional office in the Roman army. In exceptional cases, six-month rotations gave an officer who was inept or unwilling to serve the opportunity to resign (see the famous case of Columella). Also Zehetner (2015: 20) is wrong when he claims that these were only tribunes found in equestrian legions in Egypt. It is worth adding that inscriptions attesting the title *tribunus sexmenstris/semestris* refer also to the legions of XXII Primigenia, VIII Augusta and III Augusta, commanded by senators. – For *tribunus sexmenstris/semestris*, see e.g von Domaszewski 1908: 47 f.; Mattingly 1910; Dobson 1972; Pflaum 1948; Devijver 1999; Le Bohec 2002; Syvänne 2016.

[28] In this way, more than half (14 out of 20) of the *vigintiviri* had a chance to be awarded the military tribunate in a given year. The fact that the careers of some of the tribunes did not include the vigintivirate is evidence that various paths could lead to the quaestorship. For problems with appointments to the tribunate, see, for example, A.R. Birley 1981: 8; Syme 1981.

[29] Up-to-date biographical entries on people listed in the Appendix can be found in Okoń 2017.

[30] This applies to the following people: Q. Cerellius Apollinaris, Tib. Claudius Candidus, Ti. Claudius Claudianus, Ti. Claudius Subatianus Proculus, L. Didius Marinus, C. Domitius Antigonus, C. Iulius Avitus, [L.? S]ept(imius) Maria[nus], C. Vettius Sabinianus Iulius Hospes, M. Macrinius Avitus Catonius Vindex, M. Valerius Maximianus, Anonymus legatus Aquitaniae (*AE* 1992, 1794).

[31] See n. 11 above.

function. Out of this number, 62 held the office as members of the senatorial order[32] and 12 had an equestrian background.

It should be noted that the office of the tribune *laticlavius* was usually held in one legion, although for the Severan period I can cite cases of 13[33] senators whose inscriptions feature tribunates in two legions. This provides the basis for determining the probable duration of the tribunate. It could not have been longer than three years because then (with the vigintivirate, two tribunates and the necessary interval) people holding the office would not have been able to run for the quaestorship at the required age of 25–26 years and should have been *adlecti inter quaestorios*. However, the low number of these *adlecti* excludes such a possibility[34]. It could not have been a one-year term of office either, because then the Empire would have needed so many tribunes that most of them would have served this office in two or three legions[35]. Undoubtedly, the status of the tribunate would have increased, and the number of preserved *cursus* featuring this office would have been definitely greater. Thus, the average duration for holding the office of *tribunus laticlavius* was two years. In the case of *tribunatus angusticlavius* it should be noted that, as an element of *tres/quattuor militiae*, it was held only once. The entire military service had to end before the age of 25–26, as we know of *equites* who, after its completion, were promoted to the senatorial order and held the quaestorship in the ordinary way[36]. It is likely that the length

[32] This group comprises both those who were born in the senatorial order and those who were promoted to it prior to the tribunate.

[33] C. Aemilius Berenicianus, [...]us L.f. Fab. Annian[us], T. Clodius Aurelius Saturninus, Clodius Marcellinus, C. Iulius Septimius Castinus, L. Marius Maximus Perpetuus Aurelianus, P. Plotius Romanus Cassianus Neo, Anonymus (*AE* 1922, 38 = *ILJug* 2080), P. Flavonius Paulinus, P. Iulius Geminius Marcianus, Iulius Pompilius Piso T. Vibius [...]atus Laevillus Berenicianus, [...]anus S[...], Anonymus (*CIL* VI 1553 = 41200). In some cases, this may have been connected with personal relations between tribunes and provincial governors. For example, C. Iulius Septimius Castinus served as a tribune successively in two legions stationed in the provinces of his cousins: L. Septimius Severus (Pannonia) and P. Septimius Geta (III Daciae).

[34] Among the senators of the Severan period, the following became *adlecti inter quaestorios*: Ti. Cl(audius) Me[vius? P]riscus Ruf[inus I]unior, Cuspidius Flaminius Severus, L. Iulius Apronius Maenius Pius Salamallianus, Anonymus consul (*PIR*[1] P–Z, incerti 24; Barbieri, n. 439, Okoń, n. 1076). The last of these was also created a patrician, but due to the fact that it is impossible to identify him with certainty, we cannot determine in what circumstances such a distinction was made.

[35] Otherwise, inevitable vacancies and problems with staffing would have arisen. However, Pliny's correspondence proves that the tribunate was achieved thanks to the support of influential people, and such support would have been completely unnecessary if places were waiting for those willing to serve. See n. 15 above.

[36] See, for instance, the case of Ti. Claudius Subatianus Proculus, who became quaestor after *quattuor militiae*. Another *eques*, C. Vettius Sabinianus Iulius Hospes, was transferred to the senatorial order after serving two functions featuring *tres/quattuor militiae* and he also held a regular quaestorship. Epigraphical material attests to numerous cases of the *adlectio* of *equites* to the higher levels of a senatorial career, which was due to the fact that after completing their military

of service for the office of *tribunus angusticlavius* in a legion was similar to that of *tribunus laticlavius*.

V. TERRITORIAL AND SOCIAL ORIGINS OF TRIBUNES

We know the territorial origins of 89 (out of the 123) tribunes and it is as follows: 35[37] came from Italy, 24[38] from the East, 22[39] from Africa, and 8[40] from the West. Such a numerical distribution reflects the structure of the Senate – under the Severans, the most numerous among its members were representatives of Italy, senators from the East ranked second, those from Africa third, and the fewest representatives came from the Western provinces[41]. Thus, the relationship between the position of the regions and the appointments to military tribunate is clearly visible – and this should be interpreted as a result of the system of favouritism.

---

service they held various types of procuratorial offices; such a solution was necessary due to the age of the individuals who were promoted and the general conditions.

[37] L. Aconius Callistus, Ti. Attius Iulianus, C. Caerellius Fufidius Annius Ravus Pollitianus, C. Caesonius Macer Rufinianus, P. Catius Sabinus, Ti. Cl(audius) Me[vius? P]riscus Ruf[inus I]unior, Q. Cerellius Apollinaris, T. Clodius Aurelius Saturninus, M. Gavius Crispus Num[isi]us Iunior, Q. Hedius Lollianus Plautius Avitus, Q. Hedius Rufus Lollianus Gentianus, M. Herennius Faustus [...] Iulius Clemens Tadius Flaccus, [Iasdius], M. Iuventius Secundus Rixa Postumius Pansa Valerianu[s...] Severus, C. Luxilius Sabinus Egnatius Proculus, M. Marius Titius Rufinus, Q. Petronius Melior, (Pomponius) Bassus, C. Praecellius Augurinus Vettius Festus Crispinianus Vibius Verus Cassianus, [Rubrenus], Saevinius Proculus, L. Valerius Publicola Messalla Helvidius Thrasea Priscus Minicius Natalis, M. Umbrius Primus, Anonymus consul, [L. Allius...], L. Allius Volusianus, M. Cassius (Agrippa Sanctus?) Paullinus (Augustanius Alpinus?), L. Cestius Gallus Cerrinius Iustus Lutatius Natalis, [...] Egr[ilius Plarianus Larcius Lep]idus [Flavius ...?], T. Marcius [C]le[mens?], [...] P. Neratius M[acer *aut* -arcellus], C. Novius Rusticus Venuleius Apronianus, C. Vesnius Vindex, Anonymus legatus Pannoniae aut Thraciae, Anonymus legatus Aquitaniae.

[38] Aelius Diodotus, P. Aelius Symmachus, C. Aemilius Berenicianus, (M?) Antonius Memmius Hiero, Ti. Cl(audius) Pompeianus, L. Didius Marinus, C. Domitius Antigonus, M. Domitius Valerianus, T. Fl(avius) Claudianus, T. Flavius Secundus Philippianus, T. Flavius Victorinus Philippianus, L. Iulius Apronius Maenius Pius Salamallianus, C. Iulius Avitus, Iulius Maximianus, Pompe[ius Cassianus?], Tib. Pontius Pontianus, [L.? S]ept(imius) Maria[nus], L. Calpurnius Proculus, [...]us Claud[ius] Corneli[anus *vel* Cornelia (tribu)?], Sex. Cornelius Felix Pacatus, (Fabius?), P. Flavonius Paulinus, Tib. Iulius Frugi, Ulpius Flavius Claudius Ponticus.

[39] C. Arrius Calpurnius Longinus, M. Caecilius Rufinus Marianus, C. Calpurnius Ceius Aemilianus, Tib. Claudius Candidus, Ti. Claudius Claudianus, Ti. Claudius Subatianus Proculus, C. Iulius Septimius Castinus, L. Marius Maximus Perpetuus Aurelianus, L. Marius Perpetuus (cos. suff. ante a. 203–205), L. Marius Perpetuus (cos. ord. a. 237), C. Memmius Fidus Iulius Albius, P. Mevius Saturninus Honoratianus, P. Septimius Geta, Anonymus praeses Pannoniae inferioris, M. Annaeus Saturninus Clodianus Aelianus, Q. Gargilius Macer Aufidianus, P. Iulius Geminius Marcianus, L. Iunius Aurelius Neratius Gallus Fulvius Macer, [Lusius Laberius? S]eptius [Ruti]lianus, C. Postumius Africanus, [P. P]os[t]umius Romulus, Q. Servilius Pudens.

[40] L. Aurelius Gallus, L. Fabius Cilo Septiminus Catinius Acilianus Lepidus Fulcinianus, M. Macrinius Avitus Catonius Vindex, Petronius Priscus, M. Valerius Maximianus, Anonymus, senator et consul? (*AE* 1922, 38 = *ILJug* 2080), L. Matucius Maximus, [...]ius T[...].

[41] See Okoń 2018 (ch. 2).

We also know of the social origins of 84 tribunes (out of the 123), of whom 45[42] were descended from *gentes senatoriae*, and the remaining 39 from lower social classes (mostly of equestrian origin). Members of old families dominated (although slightly), the ratio being approximately 1.1: 1. This does not reflect the balance of power in the Senate, in which the proportion (identified in this respect) of members of *gentes senatoriae* to *homines novi* exceeded 2: 1[43]. Thus, it is evident that for the *clarissimi viri* the path through the military tribunate was only one of the ways of getting promotion to the Senate. It is interesting that as many as 23[44] tribunes (out of the 45) were descendants of consuls who, as a rule, were guaranteed quick promotion to consulship at the minimum age of 32 without the need for military service. Therefore it can be concluded that the military tribunate, despite its inconveniences, was an important stage in one's career and that senatorial families, owing to their connections, aided in the promotion of their youth to this office. In this way, a young man was taught to take important responsibilities and his good reputation in the eyes of the emperor was developed – service impeccably fulfilled could reflect positively not only on the tribune himself, but also on his relatives. As can be seen, military service was not an inferior route for promotion – convincing evidence is provided by the statistical information presented above.

---

[42] C. Arrius Calpurnius Longinus, L. Aurelius Gallus, M. Caecilius Rufinus Marianus?, C. Caerellius Fufidius Annius Ravus Pollitianus, Cass[ius ...]ens *vel* Cass[ius ...]nus, P. Catius Sabinus, Ti. Cl(audius) Pompeianus, Clodius Marcellinus?, M. Fabius Magnus Valerianus, T. Flavius Victorinus Philippianus, M. Gavius Crispus Num[isi]us Iunior, Q. Hedius Lollianus Plautius Avitus, Q. Hedius Rufus Lollianus Gentianus, M. Herennius Faustus [...] Iulius Clemens Tadius Flaccus, Iulius Maximianus?, C. Iulius (Scapula?) Lepidus Tertullus, M. Iuventius Secundus Rixa Postumius Pansa Valerianu[s ...] Severus, L. Marius Perpetuus (cos. ord. 237), P. Mevius Saturninus Honoratianus, Pompe[ius Cassianus?], (Pomponius) Bassus, Saevinius Proculus, M. Valerius Florus, L. Valerius Publicola Messalla Helvidius Thrasea Priscus Minicius Natalis, C. Vettius Gratus Sabinianus, L. Calpurnius Proculus, M. Cassius (Agrippa Sanctus?) Paullinus (Augustanius Alpinus?), [...]us Claud[ius] Corneli[anus *vel* Cornelia (tribu)?], Sex. Cornelius Felix Pacatus, [...] Egr[ilius Plarianus Larcius Lep]idus [Flavius ...?], (H) aterius Latronianus, Tib. Iulius Frugi, Iulius Pompilius Piso T. Vibius [...]atus Laevillus Berenicianus, L. Iunius Aurelius Neratius Gallus Fulvius Macer, L. Iunius Rufinus Proculianus, [Lusius Laberius ? S]eptius [Ruti]lianus, L. Matucius Maximus, [...]P. Neratius M[acer *aut* -arcellus], C. Novius Rusticus Venuleius Apronianus, [P. P]os[t]umius Romulus, M. Roscius Lupus Murena, Q. Servilius Pudens, Anonymus consul (*CIL* VI 1553 = 41200), Anonymus praetor (*CIL* VI 31780 = 41202/41203), Anonymus tribunus militum (*CIL* VI 1541 = 41133).

[43] See OKOŃ 2018 (ch. 3).

[44] L. Aurelius Gallus, C. Arrius Calpurnius Longinus, Ti. Cl(audius) Pompeianus, M. Gavius Crispus Num[isi]us Iunior, Q. Hedius Lollianus Plautius Avitus, Q. Hedius Rufus Lollianus Gentianus, M. Herennius Faustus [...] Iulius Clemens Tadius Flaccus, C. Iulius (Scapula?) Lepidus Tertullus, M. Iuventius Secundus Rixa Postumius PansaValerianu[s ...] Severus, L. Marius Perpetuus (cos. ord. a. 237), (Pomponius) Bassus, Saevinius Proculus, M. Valerius Florus, L. Valerius Publicola Messalla Helvidius Thrasea Priscus Minicius Natalis, C. Vettius Gratus Sabinianus, M. Cassius (Agrippa Sanctus?) Paullinus (Augustanius Alpinus?), [...]us Claud[ius] Corneli[anus *aut* Cornelia (tribu)?], Iulius Pompilius Piso T. Vibius [...]atus Laevillus Berenicianus, L. Iunius Rufinus Proculianus, [Lusius Laberius? S]eptius [Ruti]lianus, L. Matucius Maximus, C. Novius Rusticus Venuleius Apronianus, Q. Servilius Pudens.

Summing up, both the *origo* and the *ordo* of people holding the military tribunate prove the dominant role of favouritism in people's efforts to obtain this office.

CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions of this article are as follows:

- the following terms were generally used in the inscriptions to refer to the office of military tribune: *tribunus militum*, *tribunus legionis*, *tribunus laticlavius*,
- the title of *tribunus angusticlavius* is not found in the epigraphic material, but only in literary sources,
- the appointment to the tribunate was formally made by the emperor, following the recommendations of people from his entourage and staff from the provinces (governors),
- during the Severan Period, about 588 *tribuni laticlavii* and five times as many *angusticlavii* served in the legions,
- the majority of the tribunes served in one legion, but 13 tribunes are attested who served in two legions,
- sources do not document the length of the tribunes' term of service, but there are indications that in the Severan times the period was two years,
- we know of 123 senators from the Severan period whose *cursus* featured the military tribunate; 62 of them served in this office as members of the senatorial order and 12 as equestrians,
- 23 military tribunes were descendants of consuls,
- the territorial structure of the group of tribunes is in line with the structure of the Senate,
- the social structure of the group of tribunes is not in line with the structure of the Senate, because the ratio of people from the senatorial order to those from the equestrian order in the group of tribunes is approx. 1.1: 1, and among the senators that have been identified it exceeds 2: 1, which means that for future senators the tribunate was one of many career paths,
- both the *origo* and the *ordo* of tribunes prove the dominant role of favouritism in efforts to be promoted to this office.

University of Szczecin
danuta.okon@wp.pl

APPENDIX

1. L. Aconius Callistus (*PIR*² A 94; Barbieri, nn. 922 et 1404; Okoń, n. 5) – tribunus militum.
2. Aelius Diodotus (*PIR*² A 168; Barbieri, nn. 8 et 1213; Okoń, n. 14) – tribunus?
3. P. Aelius Symmachus (*PIR*² A 268; Okoń, n. 22) – syngletikos (laticlavius?).
4. C. Aemilius Berenicianus (*PIR*² A 336; Barbieri, nn. 13 et 927 et 1797; Okoń, n. 26) – cos. suff. aetate Severi Alexandri – tribunus laticlavius.

5. [...]us L.f. Fab. Annian[us] (*PIR*[2] A 622; Barbieri, nn. 1219 et 1428; Okoń, n. 58) – tribunus militum.
6. (M?) Antonius Memmius Hiero (*PIR*[2] A 851; Barbieri, nn. 1225 et 1439; Okoń, n. 84) – cos. suff. ca a. 244 – tribunus [legionis ...].
7. C. Arrius Calpurnius Longinus (*PIR*[2] A 1096; Barbieri, nn. 951 et 1448; Okoń, n. 109) – cos. suff. aetate Gordiani III – tribunus legionis.
8. Ti. Attius Iulianus (*PIR*[2] A 1357; Barbieri, n. 65; Okoń, n. 134) – tribunus militum.
9. L. Aurelius Gallus (*PIR*[2] A 1517; Barbieri, nn. 76 et 1976; Okoń, n. 158) – cos. ord. a. 198 – tribunus laticlavius.
10. M. Caecilius Rufinus Marianus (*PIR*[2] C 77; Barbieri, nn. 97 et 1239; Okoń, n. 205) – tribunus laticlavius.
11. C. Caerellius Fufidius Annius Ravus Pollitianus (*PIR*[2] C 157; Barbieri, nn. 101 et 976; Okoń, n. 205) – tribunus laticlavius.
12. C. Caesonius Macer Rufinianus (*PIR*[2] C 210; Barbieri, nn. 106 et 979; Okoń, n. 205) – cos. suff. ca a. 197–198 – tribunus legionis.
13. C. Calpurnius Ceius Aemilianus (*AE* 1998, 1058; Okoń, n. 226) – tribunus laticlavius leg(ionis).
14. Cass[ius ...]ens *vel* Cass[ius ...]nus (*AE* 1990, 814; Okoń, n. 247) – tribunus laticlavius leg(ionis).
15. P. Catius Sabinus (*PIR*[2] C 571; Barbieri, nn. 126 et 1245; Okoń, n. 261) – cos. suff. ante a. 210, cos. II ord. a. 216 – tribunus militum legionis.
16. Q. Cerellius Apollinaris (*PIR*[2] C 665; Okoń, n. 265) – tribunus cohortis V praetoriae.
17. Tib. Claudius Candidus (*PIR*[2] C 823; Barbieri, n. 143; Okoń, n. 291) – cos. suff. post a. 195 – tribunus militum.
18. Ti. Claudius Claudianus (*PIR*[2] C 834; Barbieri, n. 147; Okoń, n. 296) – cos. suff. ca a. 199 – tribunus legionis.
19. Ti. Cl(audius) Me[vius? P]riscus Ruf[inus I]unior (*PIR*[2] C 935; Barbieri, n. 998; Okoń, n. 316) – tribunus militum.
20. Ti. Cl(audius) Pompeianus (*PIR*[2] C 974; Barbieri, n. 169; Okoń, n. 330) – tribunus militum.
21. Ti. Claudius Subatianus Proculus (*PIR*[2] S 938; Barbieri, nn. 173 et 1252; Okoń, n. 342) – cos. suff. a. 210 aut 211 – tribunus cohortis.
22. T. Clodius Aurelius Saturninus (*I.Eph*. III 657 et 817; Okoń, n. 353) – cos. suff. ca a. 223 – tribunus militum.
23. Clodius Marcellinus (*PIR*[2] C 1171; Barbieri, nn. 178 et 1255; Okoń, n. 354) – tribunus laticlavius?
24. T? Cuspidius Flaminius Severus (*PIR*[2] C 1633; Barbieri, nn. 1011 et 1545; Okoń, n. 393) – cos. suff. ante a. 238 – tribunus [militum?].
25. L. Didius Marinus (*PIR*[2] D 71; Barbieri, nn. 199, 1013 et 1836; Okoń, n. 396) – tribunus cohortis primae praetoriae.
26. C. Domitius Antigonus (*PIR*[2] A 736; Barbieri, nn. 33 et 1017 et 1222 et 1553; Okoń, n. 401) – cos. suff. ca a. 225 – tribunus militum.
27. M. Domitius Valerianus (*PIR*[2] D 168; Barbieri, n. 1019 et 1554; Okoń, n. 407) – cos. suff. a. 238–239 – tribunus militum laticlavius.
28. L. Fabius Cilo Septiminus Catinius Acilianus Lepidus Fulcinianus (*PIR*[2] F 27; Barbieri, n. 213; Okoń, n. 424) – cos. suff. a. 193, cos. II ord. a. 204 – tribunus militum laticlavius.
29. M. Fabius Magnus Valerianus (*PIR*[2] F 43; Barbieri, n. 215; Okoń, n. 428) – cos. suff. ca a. 180 – tribunus laticlavius.
30. Q. Flavius Balbus (*PIR*[2] F 227; Barbieri, nn. 228 et 1041; Okoń, n. 454) – cos. suff. sub Severis – tribunus laticlavius.
31. T. Fl(avius) Claudianus (*PIR*[2] F 236; Barbieri, n. 230; Okoń, n. 458) – tribunus militum legionis.
32. T. Flavius Secundus Philippianus (*PIR*[2] F 362; Barbieri, n. 241; Okoń, n. 480) – tribunus militum.
33. T. Flavius Victorinus Philippianus (*PIR*[2] F 400; Barbieri, n. 245; Okoń, n. 491) – tribunus militum.
34. M. Gavius Crispus Num[isi]us Iunior (*PIR*[2] N 208; Barbieri, n. 2036; Okoń, n. 522) – cos. suff. ante a. 200 – tribunus laticlavius.
35. Hedius Lollianus Plautius Avitus (*PIR*[2] H 36; Barbieri, nn. 330 et 1311; Okoń, n. 534) – cos. ord. a. 209 – tribunus laticlavius.

36. Q. Hedius Rufus Lollianus Gentianus (*PIR*² H 42; Barbieri, n. 267; Okoń, n. 536) – cos. suff. ante a. 193 – tribunus legionis.
37. M. Herennius Faustus [...] Iulius Clemens Tadius Flaccus (*PIR*² H 107; Barbieri, nn. 270 et 1282; Okoń, n. 543) – cos. suff. ca a. 205 – tribunus militum.
38. [Iasdius] (*PIR*² I 10; Barbieri, nn. 274 et 1284; Okoń, n. 547) – cos. suff. sub Severis – tribunus laticlavius.
39. L. Iulius Apronius Maenius Pius Salamallianus (*PIR*² I 161; Barbieri, nn. 1065 et 1866; Okoń, n. 557) – cos. suff. a. 226 aut 227 – tribunus laticlavius.
40. C. Iulius Avitus (*PIR*² I 190; Barbieri, nn. 281 et 286 et 1287 et 1288; Okoń, n. 563) – cos. suff. sub Septimio Severo – tribunus legionis.
41. Iulius Maximianus (*PIR*² I 416; Barbieri, n. 765; Okoń, n. 587) – tribunus militum (laticlavius?).
42. C. Iulius (Scapula?) Lepidus Tertullus (*PIR*² I 554; Barbieri, n. 298; Okoń, n. 601) – cos. suff. ca a. 195–197 – tribunus laticlavius.
43. C. Iulius Septimius Castinus (*PIR*² I 566; Barbieri, nn. 308 et 1075; Okoń, n. 604) – cos. suff. ca a. 212–213 – tribunus militum legionis.
44. M. Iuventius Secundus Rixa Postumius Pansa Valerianu[s ...] Severus (*PIR*² I 888; Barbieri, nn. 319 et 1080; Okoń, n. 630) – cos. suff. sub Severo Alexandro – tribunus legionis.
45. C. Luxilius Sabinus Egnatius Proculus (*PIR*² L 452; Barbieri, nn. 1091 et 1637; Okoń, n. 657) – tribunus laticlavius.
46. L. Marius Maximus Perpetuus Aurelianus (*PIR*² M 308; Barbieri, nn. 356 et 1100; Okoń, n. 699) – cos. suff. ca a. 199, cos. II ord. a. 223 – tribunus laticlavius.
47. L. Marius Perpetuus **(***PIR*² M 311; Barbieri, nn. 357 et 1320; Okoń, n. 700**)** – cos. suff. ante a. 203–205 – tribunus laticlavius.
48. L. Marius Perpetuus (*PIR*² M 312; Barbieri, n. 1101; Okoń, n. 701) – cos. ord. a. 237 – [trib. mil. leg.., ...].
49. M. Marius Titius Rufinus (*PIR*² M 320; Barbieri, nn. 792 et 1104 et 1891; Okoń, n. 704) – cos. suff. post a. 231 – tribunus laticlavius.
50. C. Memmius Fidus Iulius Albius (*PIR*² M 462; Barbieri, n. 367; Okoń, n. 718) – cos. suff. a. 191 aut a. 192 – tribunus laticlavius.
51. P. Mevius Saturninus Honoratianus (*PIR*² M 579; Barbieri, nn. 801 et 1325; Okoń, n. 727) – tribunus laticlavius.
52. Q. Petronius Melior (*PIR*² P 290; Barbieri, nn. 1126 et 1689; Okoń, n. 796) – cos. suff. post a. 240 – tribunus laticlavius.
53. Petronius Priscus (*PIR*² P 298 et 299; Barbieri, n. 407; Okoń, n. 798) – tribunus laticlavius.
54. P. Plotius Romanus Cassianus Neo (*PIR*² P 515; Barbieri, n. 2077; Okoń, n. 808) – cos. suff. ante Alexandrum Severum – tribunus militum.
55. Pompe[ius Cassianus?] (*PIR*² P 596; Barbieri, n. 2258 c; Okoń, n. 820) – tribunus laticlavius.
56. (Pomponius) Bassus (*PIR*² P 701; Barbieri, nn. 422 et 1340; Okoń, n. 828) – tribunus militum?
57. Tib. Pontius Pontianus (*PIR*² P 816; Barbieri, nn. 427 et 428 et 1136; Okoń, n. 842) – cos. suff. sub Antonino (Elagabalo) – tribunus laticlavius.
58. C. Praecellius Augurinus Vettius Festus Crispinianus Vibius Verus Cassianus (*PIR*² P 919; Barbieri, nn. 435 et 1345; Okoń, n. 853) – tribunus legionis.
59. [Rubrenus] (*PIR*² R 117; Barbieri, n. 2090; Okoń, n. 876) – tribunus militum.
60. (Iunius) Rufinus (*PIR*² R 141; Okoń, n. 880) – tribunus laticlavius.
61. Saevinius Proculus (*PIR*² S 62; Barbieri, nn. 457 et 1354; Okoń, n. 898) – tribunus laticlavius.
62. P. Septimius Geta (*PIR*² S 453; Barbieri, n. 469; Okoń, n. 914) – cos. suff. ante a. 191, cos. II ord. a. 203 – tribunus laticlavius.
63. [L.? S]ept(imius) Maria[nus] (*PIR*² S 469; Okoń, n. 916) – cos. suff. saec. II exeunte aut saec. III ineunte – [tribunus angusticlavius *vel* praefectus alae] tert[iae...].
64. T. Statilius Barbarus (*PIR*² S 819; Barbieri, n. 483; Okoń, n. 937) – cos. suff. a. 198 aut 199 – tribunus militum laticlavius.
65. M. Valerius Florus (*PIR*² V 85; Okoń, n. 981) – tribunus militum.

66. L. Valerius Publicola Messalla Helvidius Thrasea Priscus Minicius Natalis (*PIR*[2] V 182; Barbieri, n. 511; Okoń, n. 988) – cos. ord. a. 196 – tribunus militum.
67. C. Vettius Gratus Sabinianus (*PIR*[2] V 473; Barbieri, nn. 523 et 1182; Okoń, n. 1010) – cos. ord. a. 221 – tribunus militum legionis.
68. M. Umbrius Primus (*PIR*[2] V 897; Barbieri, nn. 539 et 605; Okoń, n. 1046) – cos. suff. ca a. 185–190 – tribunus legionis.
69. Anonymus, consul (*PIR*[1] P–Z, incerti 24; Barbieri, n. 439; Okoń, n. 1076) – cos. suff. sub Septimio Severo? – tribunus laticlavius legionis.
70. Anonymus, senator et consul? (Barbieri, n. 895 a; Okoń, n. 1077) – cos. suff. sub Septimio Severo? – [trib. mil. bi?]s leg(ionis).
71. Anonymus (Barbieri, n. 550 a; Okoń, n. 1119) – cos. suff. sub Septimio Severo? – [tribunus legionis...].
72. Anonymus (*AE* 2003, 365; Okoń, n. 1125) – tribunus laticlavius.
73. Anonymus (*PIR*[2] V 701; Barbieri, n. 895; Okoń, n. 1135) – [trib. la]t. leg(ionis)
74. T. Aelius Naevius Antonius Severus (*PIR*[2] N 5; Barbieri, n. 1410; Okoń, n. 1206) – tribunus laticlavius.
75. [L. Allius...] (*PIR*[2] A 542; Barbieri, n. 1421; Okoń, n. 1225) – tribunus legionis.
76. L. Allius Volusianus (*AE* 1972, 179; Okoń, n. 1226) – tribunus laticlavius legionis.
77. M. Annaeus Saturninus Clodianus Aelianus (*PIR*[2] A 615; Barbieri, n. 640; Okoń, n. 1231) – tribunus legionis.
78. M. Aureli[us ...] (*PIR*[2] A 1433; Barbieri, n. 1975; Okoń, n. 1257) – tribunus laticlavius.
79. [...] Axilius [H]onoratus (*PIR*[2] A 1684; Barbieri, n. 1485; Okoń, n. 1265) – tribunus laticlavius.
80. [... Bassidius?] [Cor]nelianus Agrippinus (*AE* 2007, 256; Okoń, n. 1266) – tribunus legionis.
81. M. Caelius Flavus Proculus (*PIR*[2] C 133; Barbieri, n. 673; Okoń, n. 1276) – tribunus laticlavius.
82. L. Calpurnius Proculus (*PIR*[2] C 303; Barbieri, n. 1987; Okoń, n. 1282) – tribunus militum.
83. M. Cassius (Agrippa Sanctus?) Paullinus (Augustanius Alpinus?) (*PIR*[2] C 513; Barbieri, n. 2225; Okoń, n. 1289) – tribunus militum.
84. L. Cestius Gallus Cerrinius Iustus Lutatius Natalis (*PIR*[2] C 692; Okoń, n. 1298) – cos. suff. saec. II/III – tribunus laticlavius.
85. [...]us Claud[ius] Corneli[anus *vel* Cornelia (*tribu*)?] (*PIR*[2] C 843; Barbieri, n. 694; Okoń, n. 1309) – tribunus [...].
86. Sex. Cornelius Felix Pacatus (*PIR*[2] C 1358; Barbieri, n. 715; Okoń, n. 1336) – tribunus laticlavius.
87. Sex. Decimius Verus Barbarus (*AE* 1990, 819; Okoń, n. 1345) – tribunus legionis.
88. [...] Egr[ilius Plarianus Larcius Lep]idus [Flavius ...?] (*AE* 1969/1970, 87 = *AE* 2003, 284; Okoń, n. 1352) – cos. suff. sub Commodo? – [tribunus legionis].
89. (Fabius?) (*PIR*[2] F 14; Barbieri, n. 728; Okoń, n. 1354) – tribunus militum.
90. P. Flavonius Paulinus (*PIR*[2] F 448; Barbieri, n. 747; Okoń, n. 1386) – tribunus laticlavius.
91. Q. Gargilius Macer Aufidianus (*PIR*[2] G 81; Okoń, n. 1393) – tribunus militum.
92. (H)aterius Latronianus (*PIR*[2] H 28; Barbieri, nn. 750/751; Okoń, n. 1398) – tribunus militum.
93. Tib. Iulius Frugi (*PIR*[2] I 330; Okoń, n. 1414) – cos suff. sub Severis? – [tribunus militum?].
94. P. Iulius Geminius Marcianus (*PIR*[2] I 340; Barbieri, n. 764; Okoń, n. 1415) – cos. suff. ca a. 165–167 – tribunus laticlavius.
95. Iulius Pompilius Piso T. Vibius [...]atus Laevillus Berenicianus (*PIR*[2] I 477; Barbieri, n. 767; Okoń, n. 1421) – cos. suff. ca a. 178 – tribunus militum laticlavius.
96. L. Iunius Aurelius Neratius Gallus Fulvius Macer (*PIR*[2] I 732; Barbieri, n. 2047; Okoń, n. 1432) – tribunus militum.
97. L. Iunius Rufinus Proculianus (*PIR*[2] I 810; Barbieri, n. 776; Okoń, n. 1437) – cos. suff. ca a. 180 – tribunus laticlavius.
98. [Lusius Laberius ? S]eptius [Ruti]lianus (*PIR*[2] L 437; Barbieri, n. 2253; Okoń, n. 1447) – tribunus laticlavius.
99. M. Macrinius Avitus Catonius Vindex (*PIR*[2] M 22; Barbieri, n. 633; Okoń, n. 1451) – cos. suff. ca a. 175 – tribunus militum.

100. T. Marcius [C]le[mens?] (*PIR*^{2} M 225; Barbieri, n. 791; Okoń, n. 1458) – tribunus militum.
101. Mar(i)us Etruscus Gal(l)ianus (*TitAq*, n. 198; Okoń, n. 1460) – tribunus militum laticlavius legionis.
102. L. Matucius Maximus (*ILN* II, Antibes, 4; Okoń, n. 1465) – tribunus militum.
103. Cn. Minicius Ticidianus Annius Faustus (*AE* 1990, 818; Okoń, n. 1472) – tribunus laticlavius legionis.
104. [...]P. Neratius M[acer *aut* -arcellus] (*PIR*^{2} N 54; Barbieri, n. 2065; Okoń, n. 1480) – tribunus laticlavius.
105. C. Novius Rusticus Venuleius Apronianus (*PIR*^{2} N 191; Barbieri, n. 806, Okoń, n. 1483) – tribunus laticlavius.
106. C. Postumius Africanus (*AE* 1988, 1119; Okoń, n. 1505) – tribunus legionis.
107. [P. P]os[t]umius Romulus (*PIR*^{2} P 891; Barbieri, n. 829; Okoń, n. 1506) – tribunus militum.
108. [P]riscus (*PIR*^{2} P 959; Okoń, n. 1509) – tr[ibunus militum].
109. M. Roscius Lupus Murena (*PIR*^{2} R 95; Barbieri, n. 838; Okoń, n. 1519) – tribunus militum.
110. Q. Servilius Pudens (*PIR*^{2} S 596; Okoń, n. 1547) – tribunus militum.
111. [...]ius T[...] (*PIR*^{2} T 1; Okoń, n. 1559) – tribunus militum.
112. [...]Tursidius (*aut* T. Ursidius) [...] Manilianus Titule[ius] Aelianus (*PIR*^{2} V 1013; Barbieri, n. 2124 a; Okoń, n. 1566) – tribunus laticlavius legionis.
113. Ulpius Flavius Claudius Ponticus (*AE* 1976, 664; Okoń, n. 1572) – tribunus laticlavius legionis.
114. M. Valerius Maximianus (*PIR*^{2} V 125; Barbieri, n. 873; Okoń, n. 1578) – cos. suff. ca a. 185 – tribunus cohortis.
115. C. Vesnius Vindex (*PIR*^{2} V 435; Barbieri, n. 876; Okoń, n. 1582) – tribunus militum.
116. C. Vettius Sabinianus Iulius Hospes (*PIR*^{2} V 485; Barbieri, n. 524; Okoń, n. 1012) – cos. suff. ca a. 175–176 – tribunus militum.
117. [...]anus S[...] (*AE* 2003, 1189 = *AE* 2004, 930 = *AE* 2011, 764; Okoń, n. 1593) – tr[ibunus] leg(ionis).
118. Anonymus (Barbieri, n. 1771; Okoń, n. 1606) – cos. suff. saec. II exeunte aut saec. III ineunte – tribunus militum legionis.
119. Anonymus (*AE* 1950, 91 = *AE* 1974, 344; Okoń, n. 1618) – tribunus militum legionis.
120. Anonymus (Barbieri, n. 1775; Okoń, n. 1620) – [tribunus] laticlavius l[egionis].
121. Anonymus, legatus Aquitaniae (*AE* 1992, 1794; Okoń, n. 1611) – [trib(unus)] mi[l(itum) leg(ionis) ...].
122. Anonymus, praetor (*CIL* VI 31780 = 41202/41203; Okoń, n. 1623) – [trib(unus) mil(itum)] leg(ionis).
123. Anonymus, praetor (*CIL* VI 1554 = 41215; Okoń, n. 1624) – [trib(unus) mil(itum) leg(ionis)].

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alföldy 1967: G. Alföldy, *Die Legionslegaten der römischen Rheinarmeen*, Köln 1967.

———— 1977: G. Alföldy, *Konsulat und Senatorenstand unter den Antoninen. Prosopographische Untersuchungen zur senatorischen Führungsschicht*, Bonn 1977.

Barbieri 1952: G. Barbieri, *L'albo senatorio da Settimio Severo a Carino (193–285)*, Roma 1952.

A.R. Birley 1981: A.R. Birley, *The Fasti of Roman Britain*, Oxford 1981.

———— 2000: A.R. Birley, *Senators as Generals*, in: G. Alföldy, B. Dobson, W. Eck (eds.), *Kaiser, Heer und Gesellschaft in der Römischen Kaiserzeit. Gedenkschrift für Eric Birley*, Stuttgart 2000, pp. 97–119.

———— 2003: A.R. Birley, *The Commissioning of Equestrian Officers*, in: J.J. Wilkes (ed.), *Documenting the Roman Army. Essays in Honour of Margaret Roxan*, London 2003, pp. 1–18.

———— 2005: A.R. Birley, *The Roman Government in Britain*, Oxford 2005.

E. Birley 1953: E. Birley, *The Equestrian Officers of the Roman Army*, in: E. Birley, *Roman Britain and the Roman Army. Collected Papers*, Kendal 1953, pp. 122–153.

——— 1988: E. Birley, *Promotions and Transfers in the Roman Army: Senatorial and Equestrian Officers*, in: E. Birley, *The Roman Army Papers 1929–1985*, Amsterdam 1988, pp. 93–114 [originally published in 1958].

Breeze, Dobson 1993: D.J. Breeze, B. Dobson, *Roman Officers and Frontiers*, Stuttgart 1993.

Campbell 1975: B. Campbell, *Who Were the "Viri Militares"?*, JRS LXV 1975, pp. 11–31.

Cotton 1981: H.M. Cotton, *Military Tribunates and the Exercise of Patronage*, Chiron XI 1981, pp. 229–238.

Devijver 1992: H. Devijver, *The Equestrian Officers of the Roman Imperial Army*, vol. II, Stuttgart 1992.

——— 1999: H. Devijver, *Les relations sociales des chevaliers romains*, in: S. Demougin, H. Devijver, M.-Th. Raepsaet-Charlier (eds.), *L'ordre équestre. Histoire d'une aristocratie (IIe siècle av. J.-C. – IIIe siècle ap. J.-C.)*, Rome 1999, pp. 237–269.

Dobson 1972: B. Dobson, *Legionary Centurion or Equestrian Officer? A Comparison of Pay and Prospects*, Ancient Society III 1972, pp. 193–207.

——— 1993a: B. Dobson, *The Roman Army: Wartime or Peacetime Army?*, in: Breeze, Dobson 1993, pp. 113–128.

——— 1993b: B. Dobson, *The 'Rangordnung' of the Roman Army*, in: Breeze, Dobson 1993, pp. 129–204.

von Domaszewski 1908: A. von Domaszewski, *Die Rangordnung des römischen Heeres*, BJ CXVII 1908, pp. 1–278.

Duncan-Jones 2016: R. Duncan-Jones, *Power and Privilege in Roman Society*, Oxford 2016.

Eck 1995: W. Eck, *Die Verwaltung des Römisches Reiches in der Hohen Kaiserzeit. Ausgewählte und erweiterte Beiträge*, Basel 1995.

——— 2015: W. Eck, *Die Amtsträger: Instrumente in den Händen des Princeps und Begrenzung der Autokratie. Traditioneller Cursus und kaiserliche Ernennung*, in: J.-L. Ferrary, J. Scheid (eds.), *Il princeps romano: autocrate o magistrato? Fattori giuridici e fattori sociali del potere imperiale da Augusto a Commodo*, Pavia 2015, pp. 659–678.

Handy 2009: M. Handy, *Die Severer und das Heer*, Berlin 2009.

Hošek 1985: R. Hošek, *Tituli Latini Pannoniae superioris annis 1967–1982 in Slovacia reperti*, Praha 1985.

Le Bohec 2002: Y. Le Bohec, *L'armée romaine sous le Haut-Empire*, Paris 2002.

Leunissen 1989: P.M.M. Leunissen, *Konsuln und Konsulare in der Zeit von Commodus bis Severus Alexander (180–235 n. Chr.). Prosopographische Untersuchungen zur senatorischen Elite im römischen Kaiserreich*, Amsterdam 1989.

Mattingly 1910: H. Mattingly, *The Imperial Civil Service of Rome*, Cambridge 1910.

Okoń 2016: D. Okoń, *Senatorial Cursus Honorum in the Period of the Republic and in the Early Empire. Selected Issues*, Mnemon XVI 2016, fasc. 2, pp. 97–118.

——— 2017: D. Okoń, *Album senatorum*, vol. I: *Senatores ab Septimii Severi aetate usque ad Alexandrum Severum (193–235 AD)*, Szczecin 2017.

——— 2018: D. Okoń, *Album senatorum*, vol. II: *Senators of the Severan Period (193–235 AD). A Prosopographic Study*, Szczecin 2018.

Pflaum 1948: H.-G. Pflaum, *Le Marbre de Thorigny*, Paris 1948.

Saller 1982: R.P. Saller, *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire*, Cambridge 1982.

Syme 1957: R. Syme, *The Friend of Tacitus*, JRS XLVII 1957, pp. 131–135.

——— 1958: R. Syme, *Tacitus*, Oxford 1958.

——— 1981: R. Syme, *Governors Dying in Syria*, ZPE XLI 1981, pp. 125–144.

——— 1988: R. Syme, *Praesens the Friend of Hadrian*, in: R. Syme, *Roman Papers*, vol. V, Oxford 1988, pp. 563–578 [originally published in 1985].

Syvänne 2016: I. Syvänne, *Military History of Late Rome 284–361*, Barnsley 2016.

Zehetner 2015: S. Zehetner, *The Equites Legionis and the Roman Cavalry*, Journal of Ancient History and Archeology II–III 2015, pp. 17–24.

Eos CVI 2019
ISSN 0012-7825

PRISKOS VON PANION, CHRYSAPHIOS UND DIE MACHT DER EUNUCHEN

von

DARIUSZ BRODKA

ABSTRACT: The aim of the article is to analyse the sources of the black legend of the eunuch Chrysaphius, the powerful minister of the emperor Theodosius II. Unquestionably, in most sources (e.g. Suda, John of Antioch, Theophanes, Malalas, Evagrius Scholasticus, Theodor Lector) biased reporting and introduction of fabricated and exaggerated facts are found, directed against Chrysaphius with the intention of creating a distorted and negative image of him as a powerful eunuch. These historical texts present him as a wicked creature that controlled everything, seizing everyone's possessions and being hated by everyone. It is generally accepted that this historiographical tradition originated mainly from the historian Priscus of Panium. However, the careful analysis of Priscus' extant fragments shows that this view cannot be correct. From the famous account of the failed assassination attempt against Attila one can conclude that Priscus deemed Chrysaphius as a far-sighted politician who could count on strong support by his friends and other important figures of the Eastern Roman Empire.

Unter den Texten, die laut der modernen Forscher ihren Ursprung im Geschichtswerk des Priskos von Panion haben, gibt es eine Anzahl Fragmente, die die Herrschaft des Theodosius II. sehr negativ charakterisieren. Sie zeichnen ein Bild eines schwachen Kaisers, der eine Marionette in den Händen der Hofeunuchen war. Dieser Überlieferung gemäß sei er unkriegerisch gewesen und habe von den Hunnen den Frieden für viel Geld gekauft. Die Ursache allen Übels sei damals die Herrschaft der Eunuchen gewesen, und eben diese Eunuchen hätten viele Probleme im politischen und militärischen Bereich verursacht. Der mächtigste dieser Eunuchen sei Chrysaphios gewesen – er habe damals das Reich faktisch regiert. Er sei habgierig gewesen und von allen Menschen gehasst worden.

Gemeint sind mit diesen Texten zwei konstantinische Exzerpte aus dem Geschichtswerk des Johannes von Antiochia und ein Artikel aus dem Suda-Lexikon. Es handelt sich hier insbesondere um den Johannes-Auszug *Excerpta de virtutibus et vitiis* 72. Auf Johannes von Antiochia geht wahrscheinlich auch der Eintrag zu Theodosius II. in dem Suda-Lexicon (Θ 145) zurück. Die modernen Editoren des Johannes von Antiochia sind sich nicht gänzlich einig, welcher dieser beiden Passagen ein glaubwürdigerer Textzeuge des Johannes ist. So

betrachtet ROBERTO den Text aus der Suda als das Fragment des Johannes von Antiochia (Ioh. Ant. fr. 288 ROBERTO), während MARIEV dem Auszug aus den konstantinischen Exzerpten den Vorzug gibt. So ist bei ihm das Exzerpt aus *de virtutibus et vitiis* 72 als „das Johannes-von-Antiochia-Fragment" verzeichnet (Ioh. Ant. fr. 220 MARIEV). Die Forschung geht dabei davon aus, dass Johannes von Antiochia hier das Geschichtswerk des Priskos als Vorlage verwendete. Bei BLOCKLEY stehen somit beide Passagen als wahrscheinliche Priskos-Fragmente (Prisc. fr. [3, 1] und [3, 2] BLOCKLEY). Bei CAROLLA steht hingegen nur der Suda-Eintrag als mögliche Entlehnung aus Priskos (Prisc. fr. *52 CAROLLA). Für unsere Untersuchung ist noch ein weiterer Johannes-Auszug wichtig – *Excerpta de insidiis* 83, der eine knappe Charakteristik des Chrysaphios gibt (Ioh. Ant. fr. 291 ROBERTO, fr. 222 MARIEV). Obwohl es sich dabei um den Auszug aus dem Werk des Johannes von Antiochia handelt, geht BLOCKLEY davon aus, dass sich Johannes hier auf Priskos stützte. In seiner Priskos-Ausgabe fungiert dieser Auszug als ein Priskos-Fragment (Prisc. fr. 15, 5 BLOCKLEY).

Daraus resultiert die Meinung, dass das negative Bild des Chrysaphios sowie die Vorstellung von Theodosius II. als einem Herrscher, der völlig vom Willen der Eunuchen abhängig gewesen sei, letztlich auf Priskos von Panion zurückgehe[1]. Anzuführen ist hier die Meinung von R. BLOCKLEY: „Whenever Chrysaphius is mentioned it is with contempt [...]. His greed for gold, the favourite charge against eunuchs, is remarked, as is the hatred, which all felt for him"[2].

Die Behauptung von BLOCKLEY bedarf aber meines Erachtens einer Revision. Es stellt sich nämlich die Frage danach, inwiefern diese Meinung in den sicheren Priskos-Fragmenten ihre Begründung findet. Darf man wirklich die Auszüge aus Johannes von Antiochia und den Suda-Artikel für zuverlässige Textzeugen des Priskos halten? Gehen die Anklagen gegen Chrysaphios auf konkrete Tatsachen, die von Priskos dargestellt wurden, zurück, oder sind sie eher literarische Topoi? Es ist zu bedenken, was Priskos über Chrysaphios und den Entscheidungsfindungprozess am oströmischen Hof in seinem umfangreichen Bericht über die Gesandtschaft an den Hunnenkönig Attila spricht. In folgendem geht es um die Frage danach, ob und inwieweit das negative Chrysaphios-Bild in der Historiographie auf Priskos von Panion zurückgehen kann.

Zunächst soll man einen Blick auf den Inhalt der drei oben erwähnten Passagen werfen und einen ersten inhaltlichen Vergleich wagen. Der Auszug aus Johannes von Antiochia *EV* 72 (*Excerpta de virtutibus et vitiis*, S. 204 f. BÜTTNER-WOBST)[3]

---

[1] Anders BALDWIN (1980: 34 ff.), der meint, Priskos habe die Handlungen des Chrysaphios positiv betrachten können.

[2] BLOCKLEY 1981: 63.

[3] Ὅτι Θεοδόσιος, τὴν ἀρχήν παρὰ Ἀρκαδίου τοῦ πατρὸς δεξάμενος, ἀπόλεμος ἦν καὶ δειλίᾳ συνέζη καὶ τὴν εἰρήνην χρήμασιν οὐκ ὅπλοις ἐκτήσατο, καὶ ὑπὸ τοῖς εὐνούχοις πάντα ἔπραττεν. Καὶ ἐς τοσοῦτον τὰ πράγματα ἀτοπίας φέρεσθαι οἱ εὐνοῦχοι παρεσκεύασαν, ὡς

charakterisiert Theodosius II. als einen schwachen, feigen und unkriegerischen Herrscher[4]. Betont wird die Tatsache, dass er den Frieden für viel Geld kaufte. Im Fokus steht aber der erhebliche Einfluss der Eunuchen auf den Kaiser. Alles, was Theodosius gemacht habe, habe er unter dem Einfluss der Hofeunuchen getan. Diese hätten alle Staatsangelegenheiten in so große Unordnung gebracht, bzw. so sinnlos und absurd gelenkt, dass sie den Kaiser wie ein Kind behandelt hätten: Ähnlich wie man ein Kind mit einem Spielzeug ablenkt, hätten sie ihn nichts Wichtiges tun lassen. Diese Eunuchen, wobei nur Chrysaphios namentlich genannt wird, hätten in der Praxis die Kaisermacht ausgeübt. Das Exzerpt erwähnt auch, dass Chrysaphios nach dem Tod des Kaisers von dessen Schwester Pulcheria hingerichtet worden sei.

Die Charakteristik der Herrschaft des Theodosius II., die der Suda-Artikel Θ 145 enthält[5], deckt sich inhaltlich weitgehend mit dem negativen Urteil über Theodosius in dem konstantinischen Auszug aus Johannes von Antiochia. Es geht dabei offensichtlich nicht um eine bloße Wiederholung des Johannes-Exzerpts, selbst wenn sich einige Sätze beinahe wörtlich mit Johannes decken, weil die Suda stellenweise über das Johannes-von-Antiochia-Exzerpt hinausgeht. Im Suda-Artikel wird Theodosius II., ähnlich wie im Johannes-Exzerpt, als feige und unkriegerisch dargestellt. Erwähnt wird auch, dass er, anstatt zu kämpfen,

---

συνελόντι εἰπεῖν ἀποβουκολοῦντες τὸν Θεοδόσιον, ὥσπερ τοὺς παῖδας ἀθύρμασιν, οὐδὲν ὅ τι καὶ ἄξιον μνήμης διαπράξασθαι συνεχώρησαν, καίτοι ἀγαθῆς ὑπάρχοντα φύσεως. ἀλλ' ἐς ν΄ ἐνιαυτοὺς συνέλασαντα βαναύσους τέ τισι τέχναις καὶ θήραις προσκαρτερεῖν παρέπεισαν· ὥστε αὐτούς τε καὶ τὸν Χρυσάφιον ἔχειν τὸ τῆς βασιλείας κράτος. ὅνπερ ἡ Πουλχερία μετῆλθε, τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ τελευτήσαντος.

[4] Zur Vorstellung vom schwachen Kaiser Theodosius II. vgl. Ilski 2005.

[5] Θεοδόσιος, βασιλεὺς Ῥωμαίων, ὁ μικρός. οὗτος διαδεξάμενος παρὰ πατρὸς τὴν ἀρχήν, ἀπόλεμος ὢν καὶ δειλίᾳ συζῶν καὶ τὴν εἰρήνην χρήμασιν οὐχ ὅπλοις κτησάμενος, πολλὰ προεξένησε κακὰ τῇ Ῥωμαίων πολιτείᾳ. ὑπὸ γὰρ τοῖς εὐνούχοις τραφεὶς πρὸς πᾶν σφίσιν ἐπίταγμα εὐπειθὴς ἦν: ὥστε καὶ τοὺς λογάδας τῆς ἐκείνων δεῖσθαι ἐπικουρίας καὶ πολλὰ νεοχμεῖσθαι ἐν τοῖς πολιτικοῖς καὶ στρατιωτικοῖς τάγμασι, μὴ παριόντων ἐς τὰς ἀρχὰς ἀνδρῶν τῶν διέπειν ταύτας δυναμένων, ἀλλὰ τῶν χορηγούντων χρυσίον, διὰ δὲ τὴν τῶν εὐνούχων πλεονεξίαν καὶ τῶν Σεβαστιανοῦ δορυφόρων πειρατικὸν συστὰν τόν τε Ἑλλήσποντον καὶ τὴν Προποντίδα διαταράξαι. ἐς τοῦτο τὰ πράγματα ἀτοπίας οἱ εὐνοῦχοι παρεσκεύασαν ἀποβουκολοῦντες τὸν Θεοδόσιον, ὥσπερ τοὺς παῖδας ἀθύρμασιν, οὐδὲν ὅ τι καὶ ἄξιον μνήμης διαπράξασθαι παρεσκεύασαν· ἀλλ' εἰς ν΄ ἐτῶν ἡλικίαν ἐληλυθὼς διετέλεσε, βαναύσους τέ τινας μετιὼν τέχνας καὶ θήρᾳ προσκαρτερῶν· ὥστε τοὺς εὐνούχους καὶ τὸν Χρυσάφιον ἔχειν τὸ τῆς βασιλείας κράτος. ὅνπερ ἡ Πουλχερία μετῆλθε, τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ τελευτήσαντος. ὅτι ἐν τῷ Μιλίῳ Θεοδοσίου ἵστατο στήλη ἐφ' ἵππου χαλκῆ, ἣν ἀνεγείρας πολλὰ σιτηρέσια τῇ πόλει ἐχαρίσατο. ζητητέον δὲ ὁποίου Θεοδοσίου. ὅτι Θεοδόσιος ὁ μικρὸς καταλύσας Ἀντίοχον τὸν πραιπόσιτον ἐν τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις κατέταξεν. ὁ αὐτὸς Κῦρον τὸν τούτου διαδεξάμενον τὴν δυναστείαν καὶ τὰς δύο μεγίστας τῶν ἐπάρχων ἀρχὰς κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν διανύοντα χρόνον. ὃς τὴν τοσαύτην εὐπραγίαν θαυμάσας ἀπεφθέγξατο τόδε: οὐκ ἀρέσκεις μοι τύχη πολλὰ γελῶσα. καθαιρεῖται γοῦν καὶ αὐτὸς ὡς Ἕλλην καὶ βασιλείαν ἐλπίζων, καὶ τῆς οὐσίας αὐτοῦ δημευθείσης γέγονεν ἐπίσκοπος ἐν Κοτυαείῳ τῆς Φρυγίας. μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον ἐδυνάστευσε μόνος Χρυσάφιος, ὁ ἐπίκλην Ζούμμας.

den Frieden für Geld kaufte. Die Suda übt am Kaiser noch schärfere Kritik als Johannes, indem offen festgestellt wird, dass Theodosius im Römischen Reich viele Schäden verursacht habe. Ähnlich wie im Johannes-Exzerpt wird hier auch die Abhängigkeit des Theodosius von den Eunuchen thematisiert, die ihn wie ein Kind behandelt und ihm es nicht erlaubt hätten, sich mit ernsthaften Angelegenheiten zu beschäftigen. Dieses Problem wird aber ausführlicher als im Johannes-Exzerpt behandelt: Die höchsten zivilen und militärischen Ämter hätten nicht die kompetenten Personen erhalten, sondern nur diejenigen, die imstande gewesen seien, dafür den Eunuchen viel Geld zu zahlen. Den Grund für diese Missstände habe die Habgier der Eunuchen gebildet. Die Macht der Eunuchen habe darüber hinaus zu vielen Neuerungen in zivilem und militärischem Bereich geführt. Die Suda stimmt mit dem Johannes-Exzerpt insofern überein, dass die Eunuchen, vor allem Chrysaphios, die Kaisermacht ausgeübt hätten, und dass Chrysaphios von Pulcheria nach dem Tod ihres Bruders bestraft worden sei. Über das Johannes-Exzerpt gehen hingegen die Informationen über Cyrus hinaus. Auch die Bemerkung, dass Chrysaphios‘ Aufstieg nach dem Fall des Cyrus erfolgte, findet keine Parallele im Johannes-Exzerpt.

Bei der letzten zu analysierenden Passage geht es wieder um den Auszug aus Johannes von Antiochia – diesmal um *De insidiis* 83 (S. 123 f. De Boor). Hier haben wir es mit einer knappen Charakteristik der politischen Tätigkeit des Chrysaphios zu tun: Er habe alles kontrolliert, das Vermögen aller Menschen geraubt und sei von allen gehasst worden. Dieses Exzerpt erwähnt auch die Affäre um die Tochter des Saturnilus (Saturninus), die Forderung Attilas nach der Auslieferung des Chrysaphios und die Gesandtschaft des Nomus und des Anatolius an Attila (Ioh. Ant. fr. 291 Roberto, fr. 222 Mariev = Prisc. fr 15, 5 Blockley = *EI* 83)[6].

2. MACHT DER EUNUCHEN: TOPIK

Das Bild der Eunuchen ist in der antiken Literatur sehr negativ[7]. Sie werden von den griechischen und römischen Autoren als verstümmelte und minderwertige Menschen verachtet. Ein solches Verhalten resultiert in erster Linie aus der Wahrnehmung der Kastraten als eine effeminierte und impotente Art von Menschen[8]. Die spätantiken Autoren kritisieren an den Eunuchen vor allem die

---

[6] Ὅτι ἐπὶ Θεοδοσίου τοῦ νεοῦ Χρυσάφιος διῴκει τὰ πάντα, τὰ πάντων ἁρπάζων καὶ ὑπὸ πάντων μισούμενος. τότε μὲν οὖν Ἀττήλας πρόφασιν τὴν Κωνσταντίου προβαλλόμενος ἄιτησιν, ἣν αὐτὸν περὶ τοῦ γάμου τῆς Σατορνίλου θυγατρὸς ᾔτει, ἐπανίσταται τῇ Ῥωμαίων ἀρχῇ καὶ τὸν εὐνοῦχον Χρυσάφιον ἐκδοθῆναι οἱ παρεκελεύτο, ὡς φωραθέντα τῆς κατ‘ αὐτοῦ ἐπιβουλῆς. ἐντεῦθεν πάλιν Ἀνατόλιος καὶ Νόμος πρὸς τὸν Ἀττήλαν παραγίνονται, καὶ πείθουσιν αὐτὸν δώροις ἀποσχέσθαι τῆς κατ‘ εὐνοῦχου ὀργῆς.

[7] Grundlegend dazu Guyot 1980: 37 ff., 157 ff.

[8] Guyot 1980: 37–41.

Gier nach Reichtum. Wenn die Hofeunuchen auf einen Kaiser maßgeblichen Einfluss ausüben, wird seine Herrschaft als schlecht wahrgenommen – Zosimos, Ammian, Libanios und die *Historia Augusta* zeichnen ironische Bilder von Kaisern, die nicht selbständig sind, sich vom Urteil der Hofeunuchen leiten lassen und das römische Reich ins Verderben stürzen[9]. Die Folgen „der Macht der Eunuchen" sind immer beklagenswert. Ammian lässt z. B. den Heermeister Ursicin feststellen, dass solange sich Constantius vom Urteil der Eunuchen leiten lasse, er nicht imstande sei, die militärischen Probleme im Osten zu lösen[10]. Zosimos wollte hingegen in den Hofeunuchen eine Art Interessengruppe sehen, die imstande war, die Meinungen des Kaisers zu beeinflussen. So behauptet er, dass die Hofeunuchen zur Zeit des Theodosius I. das Reich regiert hätten, und dies zum Niedergang des römischen Reiches geführt habe (Zos. IV 28, 2). Es verwundert also nicht, dass ein mächtiger Eunuch, Chrysaphios, in der Überlieferung einen schlechten Ruf hat.

3. CHRYSAPHIOS

Chrysaphios übte das Amt des *spatharius* aus. Es kommt in den Quellen erst im 5. Jahrhundert vor, wobei seine Kompetenzen in dieser Periode nicht klar sind[11]. Nicht ausgeschlossen ist, dass Chrysaphios in den letzten Monaten seines Lebens zu einem *praepositus sacri cubiculi* erhoben wurde, denn Prosper von Tiro bezeichnet ihn als einen *praepositus*. Zu Macht und Einfluss gelangte er entweder schon Ende der 430er Jahre oder Anfang der 440er Jahre. Sehr geschickt schloss er Pulcheria, die Schwester des Theodosius II., aus dem innersten Kreis der kaiserlichen Berater aus, indem er Eudocia, die Frau des Kaisers, gegen Pulcheria aufstachelte (Theoph. AM 5940, p. 98). Durch diese Intrige gelang es ihm, die politische Position der Pulcheria zu schwächen, so dass sich diese zwischen 439 und 443 für einige Jahre aus dem politischen Leben zurückzog[12]. Um 441 führte er zum Sturz des Stadtpräfekten und *praefectus praetorio Orientis* Cyrus (Dan. 31)[13]. Man spekuliert, dass Chrysaphios hinter der Verbannung der Eudocia nach Jerusalem gestanden habe[14]. Die Quellen aus dem 6. Jahrhundert überliefern, dass er Eutyches' Taufkind und Freund gewesen sei und dessen theologischen Ansichten geteilt habe (vgl. z. B. Liberat. 11; Evagr.

---

[9] Scholten 1994: 1 ff., Guyot 1980: 159 ff.

[10] Amm. XX 2, 4: „dumque ad spadonum arbitrium trahitur, defrustandae Mesopotamiae proximo vere ne ipse quidem cum exercitus robore omni opitulari poterit praesens".

[11] Zum Spatharius-Amt Brodka 2018: 44 f.

[12] *PLRE* II 295. Cameron (2016: 61) plädiert für das Jahr 439.

[13] Vgl. dazu Cameron 2016: 56 ff.; Holum 1982: 192 f.

[14] Holum 1982: 193 f.

HE II 2; *Coll. Avel.* 99, 5)[15]. Er sollte auch maßgeblichen Einfluss auf den Verlauf der sogenannten Räubersynode von 449 ausüben. Während der zweiten Synode von Ephesos habe Chrysaphios aus der Feindschaft gegen Flavian bewerkstelligt, dass Dioskur zum Vorsitzenden der Synode ernannt worden sei (Evagr. *HE* I 10). Die jüngere Forschung bezweifelt aber die Glaubwürdigkeit dieser Informationen und plädiert für die These, dass Chrysaphios' Rolle in den religionspolitischen Konflikten von den Autoren des 6. Jahrhunderts übertrieben worden sei[16]. Im Jahr 449 organisierte er ein misslungenes Attentat auf den Hunnenkönig Attila. Nach dem Tod des Kaisers Theodosius II. nahm Pulcheria blutige Rache an dem Eunuchen, der auf ihren Befehl noch vor dem Regierungsantritt Marcians oder kurz danach getötet wurde. Einige Quellen, vor allem Theophanes, überliefern hingegen, dass der Fall des Chrysaphios noch zu Lebzeiten von Theodosius II. erfolgte: Theodosius soll ihn zur Verbannung verurteilt haben. Weil aber die zeitgenössischen Quellen über einen solchen Wechsel innerhalb der höchsten Reichsverwaltung Ostroms schweigen, muss man den Bericht des Theophanes für wenig zuverlässig halten[17]. Es muss in diesem Fall um einen apologetischen Versuch gegangen sein, den schwachen Kaiser, wenn auch trotzdem Bezwinger des Nestorios, zu rechtfertigen: Für die Räubersynode und andere kontroverse politische Entscheidungen wäre nicht Theodosius verantwortlich gewesen, sondern der böse Eunuch Chrysaphios. Letztendlich habe der Kaiser den Eunuchen durchschaut und verstanden, dass er viele Fehler auf Anregung des Chrysaphios begangen habe. So beweist Theodosius II. seine Rechtsgläubigkeit gemäß Theophanes dadurch, dass er den Eunuchen bestraft.

In den erhaltenen Quellen wird Chrysaphios sehr negativ dargestellt[18]. Zum einen greifen die einzelnen Autoren auf gängige Eunuchen-Topoi zurück, um die Bosheit des Chrysaphios zu veranschaulichen, zum anderen betonen sie seine eifrige Unterstützung für Eutyches und machen ihn zu einem der Hauptschuldigen für die Räubersynode. Seine politische Tätigkeit wird in meisten Fällen aus der Perspektive der Anhänger Chalcedons bewertet. Die zeitgenössischen Texte bezeugen zwar, dass er eine mächtige Figur am Hof war, sind aber weit davon entfernt, ihn als den tatsächlichen Regenten zu betrachten. Zu verweisen ist hier

---

[15] Bevan, Gray (2008: 623 ff.) verweisen auf die zeitgenössischen Quellen (den Brief des Theodoret (*Ep.* 110) und den *Liber Heraclidis* des Nestorios), die über den vermeintlichen Einsatz des Chrysaphios für Eutyches nichts wissen. Sie meinen, dass die späteren orthodoxen Autoren für ihre Sache sinnvollerweise Chrysaphios zum wichtigsten Anhänger des Eutyches am Kaiserhof gemacht hätten, um die Schuld für die Religionspolitik auf ihn zu schieben und den schwachen Kaiser von aller Schuld freizusprechen. Ihre Meinung wird von Pfeilschifter (2013: 403 f., s. insbesondere s. 403, Anm. 97) abgelehnt.

[16] Bevan, Grey 2008.

[17] Gegen Holum (1982: 207) und Chew (2006: 224 f.), die den Bericht des Theophanes für glaubwürdig halten.

[18] Zu Chrysaphios vgl. *PLRE* II 295–297; Laniado 1995: 122; Scholten 1995: 248 f.

auf den Brief Theodorets von Kyrrhos an den Bischof Domnus aus Antiochia aus dem Jahr 448. Es geht hier um Irenaeus, Bischof von Tyr, den der Kaiser von seinem Bischofsamt abberufen wollte. Theodoret spricht darüber, dass ein Spatharius – es muss hier um Chrysaphios gehen – die Entscheidung des Kaisers zu verändern versuche. Als Lohn für seine Bemühungen erwarte er nur das Gebet (Theod. *Ep*. 110). Diese Bemühungen blieben aber ohne Erfolg und im September 448 wurde Photios zum neuen Bischof von Tyr.

Zu den zeitnahen Zeugnissen gehört auch der Eintrag in der Chronik von Prosper Tiro. Diese Notiz wurde schon einige Jahre nach dem Tod des Chrysaphios verfasst. Prosper geht davon aus, dass Chrysaphios die Freundschaft des Kaisers missbraucht habe: „amicitia principis male usus fuerat" (Prosp. *Chron*. 1361). Dies zeugt davon, dass man schon in den 450er Jahren, also bald nach dem Tod des Theodosius II., den politischen Kurs des Theodosius aus dem Einfluss des „bösen" Chrysaphios erklärte.

Bei Prosper tragen noch der Kaiser selbst und seine Hofleute die Verantwortung für die Räubersynode[19]. Bei Theodor Lector, dessen Kirchengeschichte im 6. Jahrhundert entstand, wurden die Akzente anders gesetzt: Er stellte Theodosius als einen schwachen und dummen Herrscher dar, der sich sehr leicht beeinflussen ließ[20]. Dementsprechend verwies Theodor Lector auf Chrysaphios und Nomus als eifrige Anhänger des Eutyches. Sie spielen die Hauptrolle bei der Auseinandersetzung des Eutyches mit Flavian, denn auf ihre Veranlassung versammelte der Kaiser das Konzil von Ephesos (Theod. Lect. 346). Ebenfalls auf Chrysaphios' Veranlassung verteidigte Theodosius die Beschlüsse des Konzils vor dem Westkaiser Valentinian III. (Theod. Lect. 350). Laut Theodor Lector wurde Chrysaphios später auf Befehl Pulcherias hingerichtet.

Von besonderer Bedeutung ist hier der Bericht des Malalas, der die Zeit des Theodosius II. als die Herrschaft der Eunuchen deutet. In Malal. XIV 19 wird eine knappe Charakteristik des Chrysaphios formuliert: Betont wird die Schönheit des Chrysaphios und die Zuneigung, die Theodosius zu ihm empfand. Im Fokus steht aber die politische Position des Chrysaphios: Er habe großen Einfluss auf den Kaiser gehabt. Chrysaphios habe sich vor Theodosius frei aussprechen dürfen, und der Kaiser habe ihm vieles gewährt, um was er ihn nur gebeten habe. So konkludiert Malalas, dass Chrysaphios alles kontrolliert habe[21], und verweist auf seine Habgier, indem er sagt, Chrysaphios habe allen alles abgenommen[22]. Darüber hinaus sei er Anhänger der Grünen gewesen. Malalas stellt

---

19 Vgl. Prosp. *Chron*. 1358: „fidens amicitia regia et aulicorum favore" (*scil*. Eutyches).

20 Vgl. z. B. die Anekdote über den Verkauf seiner Frau durch den Kaiser (Theod. Lect. 352).

21 Malal. XIV 19: κατῆρχε παντῶν τῶν πραγμάτων; Malal. *Fr. Tusc*. 3: κατεῖχεν τῶν πραγμάτων.

22 Malal. XIV 19: ἦγε καὶ ἥρπαζε πάντα; Malal. *Fr. Tusc*. 3: (πρὸς) ἑαυτὸν ἄγων καὶ ἁρπάζων πάντα.

die Umstände des Todes von Chrysaphios anders als Theodor Lector dar: Er schweigt über Pulcheria und überliefert, Marcian, der neue Kaiser, habe den *cubicularius* Chrysaphios enthaupten und sein Vermögen konfiszieren lassen, weil dieser vielen Menschen Schaden zugefügt habe, und die Geschädigten nun gegen ihn aufgetreten seien, und ferner, weil er Patron der Grünen gewesen sei. Malalas deutet also den Fall des Chrysaphios als eine gerechte Strafe für dessen Missetaten. Allerdings weiß er über keine konkreten verbrecherischen Aktivitäten des Chrysaphios zu berichten. Beachtenswert ist dabei die Tatsache, dass Chrysaphios nicht der einzige Eunuch ist, der laut Malalas zur Zeit des Theodosius II. über große Macht verfügte: Schon der *praepositus sacri cubiculi* Antiochus sollte das römische Reich lange verwalten, bis er in Ungnade fiel und von Theodosius II. zum Priester gemacht wurde[23]. Das Bild des Theodosius II. ist bei Malalas durchaus negativ: Er wird als schwacher und unselbständiger Herrscher dargestellt, der unter dem Einfluss anderer mächtiger Personen immer steht, die in der Praxis das Reich kontrollieren. Gemeint sind damit sowohl die Eunuchen Antiochus und Chrysaphios als auch Theodosius‘ Schwester Pulcheria.

Die Habgier wird im 6. Jahrhundert zum Hauptmerkmal des Chrysaphios. So berichtet Marcellinus Comes 449, 3: „Chrysafius eunuchus Pulcheriae Theodosii sororis nutu sua cum avaritia interemptus est“. Noch ein düstereres Bild zeichnet der Kirchenhistoriker Euagrios. Er verweist auf die Macht des Chrysaphios, indem er feststellt, dass dieser den Kaiserpalast beherrscht habe (Evagr. *HE* I 10). Chrysaphios ist bei ihm Häretiker und Feind der Orthodoxen und teilt die theologischen Ansichten des Eutyches (II 2). Aufgrund seiner Intrigen seien Eusebius von Doryleum und Flavian abgesetzt worden (*ibidem*), und Dioskur sei zum Vorsitzenden der Synode von Ephesos gemacht worden (I 10). Chrysaphios ist bei Euagrios habgierig und rachsüchtig. Seine Feindschaft gegen Flavian resultiert daraus, dass er sich durch das Verhalten des Flavian beleidigt fühlte. Unmittelbar nach der Bischofswahl Flavians sollte nämlich Chrysaphios von ihm Geld fordern – Flavian habe ihm aber heilige Geräte geschickt, um ihn zu beschämen (II 2)[24]. Von den Geldforderungen, die an Flavian gestellt wurden, wusste auch Nestorios, der allerdings als Zeitgenosse glaubwürdiger zu sein scheint. Laut Nestorios wurde diese Forderung nicht von Chrysaphios, sondern von Theodosius selbst erhoben (Nest. *Liber Heraclidis* 467–469 [Hodgson/Driver pp. 341 f.; Nau p. 299]).

Die meisten Details über Chrysaphios kennt Theophanes. Sein Bericht ist sehr parteilich und baut diejenigen Aspekte des schwarzen Chrysaphios-Bildes aus, die schon bei Theodor Lector und Malalas präsent waren – es bleibt allerdings unbekannt, woher er sein Wissen über den Konflikt des Chrysaphios mit Pulcheria schöpft. Bei Theophanes ist Chrysaphios für die größten Probleme der Herrschaft des Theodosius verantwortlich. Bereits im ersten Eintrag, der den Tod

[23] Zu Antiochus vgl. Greatrex, Bardill 1996.

[24] Dazu Bevan, Grey 2008: 622 f.; Pfeilschifter 2013: 408, Anm. 106.

des Rebellen Johannes thematisiert, wird Chrysaphios als eidbrüchig charakterisiert, indem er Johannes auf verräterische Weise tötet. Theophanes fügt aber hinzu, dass den Eunuchen später eine gerechte Strafe getroffen habe (Teoph. AM 5938). Chrysaphios sei auch habgierig – Theophanes berichtet über den Streit mit dem Bischof Flavian, der die Geldforderungen des Eunuchen ablehnte (Theoph. AM 5940). Darüber hinaus wird Chrysaphios als ein Häretiker bezeichnet, der sich darum bemüht, Frieden und Eintracht in der Kirche zu stören. (Theoph. AM 5940, p. 98). Aus einer solchen Perspektive ist Theodosius II. völlig unschuldig – er trägt keine Verantwortung für die Handlungen seines Ministers. Als es zum Konflikt zwischen Chrysaphios und Flavian gekommen sei, habe der Kaiser nichts darüber gewusst, denn er habe sich damals in Chalcedon aufgehalten. Für den Verlauf und die Entscheidungen der Räubersynode ist der Kaiser ebenfalls nicht verantwortlich: Weil Chrysaphios imstande gewesen sei, die Naivität des Kaisers auszunutzen, habe er den Bischof Dioskur als Vorsitzenden der Synode von Ephesos durchgesetzt und die Verurteilung Flavians bewerkstellig (Theoph. AM 5941). Dies weist allerdings die Schwäche des Theodosius II. auf. Er kann die Tatsachen nicht angemessen bewerten und einordnen und schätzt andere Menschen falsch ein. Theophanes stilisiert hingegen die Schwester des Kaisers, Pulcheria, zur vernünftigsten Figur am Hof von Konstantinopel. Solange sie das Reich regiert habe, habe sie gut regiert (Theoph. AM 5901, p. 81), wobei ihre Regierung erst dem Fall des *praepositus sacri cubiculi* Antiochus folgte, wie Theophanes an einer anderen Stelle vermerkt (Theoph. AM 5905). Dementsprechend gibt er den Intrigen des Chrysaphios gegen Pulcheria viel Platz. Desweiteren sind in diesem Bericht chronologische Verschiebungen und Erfindungen zu erkennen. Chrysaphios habe den Bischof Flavian durch den Häretiker Eutyches ersetzen wollen. Er sei aber gescheitert, weil Pulcheria die Staatsangelegenheiten kontrolliert habe. So griff er Pulcheria an. Um diese auszuschalten, spielte er Eudocia, die Frau des Theodosius, gegen sie aus (Theoph. AM 5940, pp. 98 f.)[25]. Ähnlich wie viele frühere Autoren, äußert Theophanes den Gedanken, dass Chrysaphios den Kaiserhof kontrolliert habe (Theoph. AM 5940, p. 99). Das Ende der Chrysaphios-Geschichte in der Chronik des Theophanes findet aber keine Parallelen in der früheren Überlieferung. Bei Theophanes setzt sich noch Theodosius selbst mit dem bösen Eunuchen auseinander: Zum Schluss habe Theodosius eingesehen, dass der Eunuch ihn getäuscht habe – vor allem habe der Kaiser bereut, dass er Flavian und viele Orthodoxe ungerecht behandelt habe. Deswegen habe er Chrysaphios zur Verbannung verurteilt. Auf ähnliche Weise bestrafte er auch seine Frau Eudocia (Theoph. AM 5942, p. 101). Weil keine der früheren Quellen über die Verbannung des Chrysaphios durch Theodosius berichtet, halte ich seinen Bericht an diesem Punkt für wenig glaubwürdig. Es

[25] Zur Chronologie und Reihenfolge dieser Ereignisse vgl. Cameron 2016: 58 ff. (die ursprüngliche Version dieses Aufsatzes erschien 1982).

scheint, dass Theophanes die Tatsachen absichtlich manipuliert, um Theodosius II. zwar als naiven und schwachen, aber auch als rechtgläubigen und am Ende gerechten Herrscher darstellen zu können. Bei der Darstellung des Todes des Chrysaphios weicht Theophanes von der sonstigen Überlieferung nicht mehr ab: Der „allgemein verhasste" Eunuch wurde auf Befehl Pulcherias getötet, die ihn Jordanes, dem Sohn des Rebellen Johannes, auslieferte (Theoph. AM 5943).

In der späteren byzantinischen Historiographie erscheint häufig das Bild des Theodosius II., der von den Eunuchen kontrolliert wurde, und immer wieder wird betont, dass das Reich aus diesem Grund großen Schaden erlitten habe (Cedr. 587; Zonar. XIII 44).

Diesen Überblick über die wichtigsten Quellen ergänzen die am Anfang besprochenen Passagen aus dem Geschichtswerk des Johannes von Antiochia und aus der Suda. Es bleibt dahingestellt, inwiefern Johannes von Antiochia in der Darstellung des Theodosius II. konsequent war. Neben dem negativen Bild des durch die Eunuchen beherrschten schwachen Kaisers, findet man bei ihm auch die Stellen, die auf den Kirchenhistoriker Sokrates zurückgehen und den Herrscher in sehr positivem Licht erscheinen lassen: Sie loben Klugheit, Vernunft, Frömmigkeit und Sieghaftigkeit des Kaisers (*EV* 71 = Ioh. Ant. fr. 287 Roberto / fr. 219 Mariev, vgl. Socr. *HE* VII 22).

4. PRISKOS UND CHRYSAPHIOS

Was hat hingegen Priskos über Theodosius II. und Chrysaphios zu sagen? Er charakterisiert die Herrschaft des Theodosius II. als eine Periode des totalen moralischen Zusammenbruchs von Ostrom[26]. Deutlich äußert er diesen Gedanken in dem bekannten Gespräch mit einem Griechen, den er am Hof Attilas getroffen hatte. Hier wird festgestellt, dass die Gesetze im römischen Reich gut seien. Die Machthaber (*archontes*) seien hingegen nicht so klug wie ihre Vorfahren und richteten großen Schaden an (Prisc. fr. 11, 2, vv. 508–510 Blockley)[27]. Die zeitgeschichtliche Krise nimmt Priskos in moralischen Kategorien wahr, d. h. als einen Mangel an jenen Tugenden, die zur Einrichtung der aktuellen Staatsverfassung des römischen Reiches beitrugen. Priskos stellt mit großer Ironie die Beschwichtigungspolitik des Theodosius gegenüber Attila dar und deutet darauf hin, dass das politische Geschehen zu diesem Zeitpunkt über das Wirken und Wollen der Römer hinausgriff. Statt frei zu agieren, waren sie gezwungen, nur auf die Umstände zu reagieren und mussten sich der Notwendigkeit anpassen[28]. Obwohl Priskos auf die gängigen moralischen Topoi zurückgreift, um die Dekadenz des römischen Reiches unter

---

[26] Brodka 2009; Blockley 1981: 63–65.

[27] Vgl. dazu Kelly 2008: 152.

[28] Brodka 2009: 14 ff.

Theodosius II. darstellen zu können, übt er auch vielsagende Kritik an konkreten Personengruppen. Für die Hauptursache der damaligen Krise hält er die militärische Schwäche, wobei diese in erster Linie aus dem niedrigen Niveau der militärischen Führung resultiert. Priskos denkt hier wohl an den Hunneneinfall von 447, als die oströmische Armee eine schwere Niederlage erlitt, und man einen hunnischen Angriff auf Konstantinopel fürchtete[29]. Die Gründe für die militärische Schwäche sah er in personalen Faktoren: Die römische Armee sei unfähig gewesen, militärisch effektiv zu agieren, weil ihre Kommandeure von Furcht gelähmt gewesen seien (Prisc. fr. 9, 3, vv. 11–12 BLOCKLEY = *Exc*. 5, 5 CAROLLA; vgl. auch fr. 11, 2, vv. 440–442 BLOCKLEY = *Exc*. 8, 101 CAROLLA)[30].

Priskos‘ Einschätzung oströmischer militärischer Elite ist somit durchaus negativ – sie ist wenig effektiv, passiv und feige. Durch ihr Versagen gerät Ostrom in eine tiefe politische und ökonomische Krise, und der Kaiser, der ebenfalls für das niedrige Niveau seiner Generäle die Verantwortung trägt, muss die Machtstellung der Hunnen anerkennen. Durch das Nachgeben der oströmischen Regierung gegenüber den Hunnen wurden nicht nur günstige Ausgangsbedingungen für immer neuere Forderungen von Attila geschaffen, sondern vor allem die Grundlagen für den daraus resultierenden Verlust der politischen Vormachtstellung durch das Römische Reich gelegt. Es geht also weniger um eine strukturelle, als vielmehr um eine moralische Krise.

Vor diesem Hintergrund gewinnt die Initiative des Chrysaphios ein neues Aussehen, indem der Eunuch die Schwäche der Generäle durch den Mordanschlag kompensieren will. Aus dieser Perspektive muss das Publikum des Priskos diesen Plan als einen vielversprechenden Versuch gedeutet haben, die Krise zu bewältigen. Eine solche Deutung hat es mit dem Gedanken, dass die Eunuchen unter Theodosius II. den Staat ins Verderben gestürzt hätten, wie Johannes von Antiochia dies kommuniziert, nichts zu tun.

Priskos hält den Eunuchen Chrysaphios tatsächlich für eine der einflussreichsten Figuren im Römischen Reich, da er sagt, Edeco sei mit Chrysaphios ins Gespräch gekommen, weil dieser eine sehr mächtige Person gewesen sei: Χρυσαφίῳ [...], οἷα δὴ τὰ μέγιστα δυναμένῳ. Der Historiker bezeugt, dass Chrysaphios im Jahr 449 das Amt des *spatharius* innehatte, indem er auf ihn den klassizistischen Begriff ὑπασπιστής anwendet. In den erhaltenen Fragmenten bietet Priskos keine direkte Charakteristik des Chrysaphios, sondern er bezeichnet ihn stellenweise nur als εὐνοῦχος. Diese Bezeichnung löst in den erhaltenen

---

29 Zum Verlauf der Kämpfe im Jahr 447 vgl. KELLY 2008: 104 ff.

30 Vgl. THOMPSON 1948: 188; BRODKA 2009: 14 ff. Das negative Verhältnis des Priskos zu Aspar und Areobindus kommt auch in einer Aussage des Maximinus zum Ausdruck, der ihre militärische Fähigkeiten gering schätzte und gleichzeitig den Ausmaß ihrer Niederlage und folglich des Sieges der Hunnen minimierte, wobei er diese Feldherren als leichtfertige Barbaren bezeichnete (Prisc. fr. 14 BLOCKLEY). Zur Interpretation dieser Stelle überzeugend ZUCKERMAN 1994: 169–172.

Fragmenten keine negativen bzw. ironischen Assoziationen aus, und scheint einen neutralen Inhalt zu haben[31]. Beachtenswert sind hingegen die Art und Weise, wie Priskos den Eunuchen in dem Gespräch mit Edeco darstellt. Das Gespräch, über dessen Inhalt und Ablauf der Historiker vom Dolmetscher Vigilas informiert wurde, stellt Chrysaphios als einen fähigen und scharfsinnigen Politiker dar, der sich mit dem hunnischen Gesandten trifft, nicht um seine privaten Angelegenheiten zu erledigen, sondern weil er im Interesse des römischen Reiches handelt. Er wollte Edeco für das römische Reich gewinnen. Chrysaphios handelt vorsichtig. Er versucht sich zuerst über die wirkliche Position Edecos am Hof Attilas und über seine tatsächlichen Möglichkeiten erkundigen. Erst als Edeco erklärt, er gehöre zu den engsten Vertrauten Attilas, und an gewissen Tagen sei ihm der persönliche Schutz des Königs anvertraut, fängt Chrysaphios mit der Intrige gegen Attila an. Er verspricht Edeco große Reichtümer, wenn er den Hunnenkönig tötet. Edeco zeigt sich bereit, das Attentat auf Attila zu begehen. Seine Ratschläge, wie der Geldtransport organisiert werden sollte, könnten darauf verweisen, dass er ursprünglich wirklich vorhatte, das Attentat zu verüben. So kommuniziert Priskos, dass das Mordkomplott realisierbar war. Von besonderer Bedeutung ist die Tatsache, dass der Historiker den Mordplan nicht kritisiert[32]. Ich erkenne in seinem Bericht keine Verlegenheit – „embarrassment", die R. Blockley (1981: 63 f.) hier zu sehen glaubt. Bestechung oder List werden von Priskos als wirksames politisches Mittel nicht abgelehnt. Er selbst greift während seiner Gesandtschaftsreise dazu: Er verspricht z. B. einem Scotas, er werde von Maximinus reich beschenkt werden, wenn er den Gesandten Zutritt zu Attila verschaffe (Prisc. 11, 2, vv. 151–152 Blockley)[33].

Aus dem Bericht des Priskos geht nicht hervor, dass Chrysaphios in der Praxis den Staat regiert, den Kaiser kontrolliert oder ihn als Kind behandelt und ihm es nicht erlaubt, sich mit ernsthaften Angelegenheit zu beschäftigen – ganz im Gegenteil, der Eunuch legt den Plan dem Kaiser vor, und Theodosius berät sich zusätzlich mit dem *magister officiorum* Martialis, der aufgrund seiner Amtsposition in alle Pläne des Kaisers eingeweiht war. Der Vorschlag des Chrysaphios zur Lösung des hunnischen Problems wird also von Theodosius und Martialis diskutiert und akzeptiert und erst danach nimmt der Plan feste und endgültige Formen an (Prisc. fr. 11, 2 Blockley). Der Kaiser und seine Berater beschlossen Vigilas und Maximinus als Gesandte an Attila zu schicken.

---

[31] Gegen Blockley 1981: 63.

[32] Baldwin 1980: 35. Die jüngere Forschung hält den Plan des Chrysaphios für eine rationale Maßnahme, die zum Zerfall der hunnischen Konföderation führen konnte. Vgl. dazu Meier 2015, 2017 und 2019: 422 ff.; Blockley 1992: 66.

[33] Vgl. auch Prisc. fr. 11, 2, v. 530 Blockley (Maximinus besticht Onegesios). Vgl. auch die Rettung der Römer durch die Einwohner von Asemus: Sie brachen einen Eid, um die Römer zu retten – Priskos schätzt ihre Tat sehr positiv ein. Auf diese Art und Weise zeigt er, dass er im Kampf gegen die Feinde verschiedene Methoden für akzeptabel hält.

Vigilas agierte dabei unter dem Deckmantel eines Dolmetschers und sollte Edeco bei der Verübung des Attentats helfen, indem er 50 Pfund Gold transportierte, die Edeco an seine Komplizen verteilen musste. Maximinus, der an der Spitze der Gesandtschaft stand, wusste laut Priskos nicht von dem Mordanschlag. Die Darstellung des Entscheidungsfindungsprozesses am Kaiserhof ist sehr aufschlussreich – obwohl die Handlungspläne von Chrysaphios ausgehen, ist der Kaiser es, der nach Beratungen mit anderen Würdenträgern die Entscheidung trifft (vgl. insbesondere Prisc. fr. 11, 1, vv. 56–66; fr. 11, 2, vv. 1–6 Blockley). Ein solches Bild der oströmischen Regierung steht mit demjenigen bei Johannes von Antiochia oder in der Suda nicht in Einklang. Priskos stellt also den Kaiser Theodosius II. nicht als eine Marionette in den Händen der Eunuchen dar.

Der Bericht über die Gesandtschaftsreise des Maximinus und des Priskos setzt sich zum Ziel zu zeigen, dass Maximinus und Priskos keine Verantwortung für das Scheitern des Attentats tragen. Hervorgehoben wird der Umstand, dass weder Maximinus noch Priskos von dem tatsächlichen Ziel ihrer Reise wussten (Prisc. fr. 11, 2, vv. 6–7 und 211–213 Blockley = *Exc*. 8, 1 und 8,50 Carolla). Trotzdem übt Priskos keine Kritik an Chrysaphios, obwohl dieser sie einer großen Gefahr aussetzte[34]. Vigilas wird auch nicht kritisiert, obwohl betont wird, dass er seine Kollegen mehrmals täuschte. Alle Details, die sich auf den Mordplan bezogen, erfuhr Priskos von Vigilias – er sagt offen, Vigilas habe ihm und Maximinus später alles erklärt (Prisc. fr. 11, 2, v. 215 Blockley). Es ist aber nicht ausgeschlossen, dass sich zumindest Maximinus dessen bewusst war, dass Vigilas mit einer zusätzlichen geheimen Aufgabe beauftragt worden war.

Priskos markiert sehr geschickt die Ereignisse, die auf das Schicksal der Gesandtschaft dezisiven Einfluss nahmen. Es geht dabei in erster Linie um das Gespräch des Maximinus mit Orestes, der seine Unzufriedenheit damit, wie er in Konstantinopel behandelt worden war, offen zum Ausdruck brachte. Orestes war ein Sekretär Attilas und nahm neben Edeco an der hunnischen Gesandtschaft an Theodosius teil. Orestes fühlte sich gekränkt und war neidisch darauf, dass nur Edeco in Konstantinopel von Chrysaphios zu Mahle geladen und mit Geschenken geehrt wurde, während er übergangen wurde. Gerade das Verhalten des Orestes, eines Römers im Dienst Attilas, scheint Priskos für die Hauptursache des Scheiterns des Mordanschlags gegen Attila zu halten. Edeco musste nämlich damit rechnen, dass der unzufriedene Orestes ihn vor Attila des Verrats anklagen könne, weil er geheime Gespräche mit Hofleuten im Palast in Konstantinopel geführt habe (Prisc. fr. 11, 2, vv. 125–131 Blockley). Priskos schließt allerdings nicht aus, dass der Hunne von vornherein Chrysaphios habe täuschen wollen und nur zum Schein auf seinen Vorschlag eingegangen sei. Dies scheint ihm aber wohl weniger plausibel, denn er betont an einer anderen Stelle, dass schon

[34] Vgl. Baldwin 1980: 35, gegen Blockley 1981: 64. Zu den Attentaten als Mittel der Außenpolitik vgl. Lee 2009.

das bloße Gespräch über ein Attentat, ungeachtet seiner wirklichen Intentionen, für Edeco gefährlich sein könnte (Prisc. fr. 11, 2, vv. 218–221 Blockley). Aufschlussreich ist hier auch die Reaktion des Edeco auf die Nachricht, dass Orestes neidisch darauf ist, dass sich Edeco alleine mit Chrysaphios traf: Er ärgert sich über das Verhalten des Orestes (Prisc. fr. 11, 2, vv. 45–50 Blockley) – aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach fühlte sich er nun verunsichert und ernsthaft bedroht und dies könnte davon zeugen, dass er wirklich bereit war, Attila zu verraten.

Priskos betont auch absichtlich seine eigenen Verdienste: Er überliefert, dass er den Hunnen Scottas bestach, und auf diese Weise, durch dessen Vermittlung, den Gesandten Zutritt zu Attila verschaffte (Prisc. 11, 2, vv. 139–171 Blockley). Damit kommuniziert er, dass er als Diplomat seine Pflichten gut erfüllte, obwohl er über das wirkliche Ziel der Mission nichts wusste. Weder er noch sein Freund Maximinus haben also versagt.

Aus dem Bericht des Priskos geht hervor, dass der Versuch, Attila zu beseitigen, eine Maßnahme von höchster Rationalität war. Wie M. Meier dies jüngst bewiesen hat, hätten Chrysaphios und seine Zeitgenossen über ein hinreichendes Maß an Wissen über die Hunnen verfügt, so dass sie imstande gewesen seien, den Herrscher als strukturellen Schwachpunkt des Hunnenreiches zu identifizieren. Deswegen hätten sie die Konsequenzen eines erfolgreichen Attentats absehen können[35]. Chrysaphios muss erwartet haben, dass die Beseitigung Attilas zum Zerfall oder zumindest zur Abschwächung des hunnischen Verbandes führen würde[36]. Dass diese Erwartungen zutreffend waren, bestätigten die Ereignisse nach dem Tod Attilas, als es zu den Nachfolgekämpfen kam, und sich mehrere Ethnien von der hunnischen Herrschaft lossagten. Ohne die Führung Attilas brach sein Reich bald in sich zusammen. Als Priskos sein Geschichtswerk verfasste, wusste er gut darüber Bescheid, wie sich das Geschehen nach dem Tod Attilas entwickelt hatte. Zweifelsohne stellte er ausführlich den Niedergang des Hunnenreiches dar, und dadurch lieferte er seinem Publikum einen schlüssigen Beweis, der die Richtigkeit des politischen Kalküls von Chrysaphios und die Zweckmäßigkeit der im Jahr 449 getroffenen Maßnahmen bestätigte[37]. Die Rezipienten, die sein Geschichtswerk lasen, konnten leicht erkennen, dass der Eunuch Chrysaphios im Jahr 449 Maßnahmen traf, die die Bedrohung seitens der Hunnen längerfristig neutralisieren konnten. So kommunizierte Priskos,

---

[35] Meier 2017: 31–37. Vgl. auch Stein 1959: 293; Blockley 1992: 66.

[36] Vgl. dazu Meier 2015, 2017 und 2019: 422 ff.

[37] Meier (2017: insbesondere 54 f.) verweist nicht nur auf die außenpolitischen Ziele des geplanten Mordanschlags (Entlastung der Donauprovinzen, Befreiung Konstantinopels von der unmittelbaren Bedrohung), sondern auch auf die innenpolitischen: „Die Wirkungskreise des Isauriers Zenon hätten sich einschränken lassen, den Polemiken eines Nestorios hätte die Grundlage entzogen werden können, für das anstehende Konzil von Ephesos wäre ein Signal der Stärke der kaiserlichen Führung zu erwarten gewesen“ (S. 55).

dass Chrysaphios eine angemessene Lösung für ein ernsthaftes außenpolitisches Problem fand. Gleichzeitig zeigt er, dass er und sein Freund Maximinus, wegen ihren Unwissens, keine Verantwortung für das Scheitern des geheimen Unternehmens trugen.

Wegen der Aufdeckung des Mordanschlags befand sich Chrysaphios in einer kritischen Situation. Attila forderte die Auslieferung des Chrysaphios, um ihn bestrafen zu können (Prisc. fr. 15, 2 Blockley). Gleichzeitig wurde der Eunuch von dem *magister militum* Zenon angegriffen, der eine Intrige gegen ihn spann. Der Kaiser versprach nämlich einem Constantius, dem Sekretär von Attila, eine reiche Frau zu geben. Ursprünglich sollte Constantius die Tochter des Saturnilus (Saturninus) heiraten. Dies wurde aber von Zenon vereitelt, der das Mädchen heimlich entführen ließ und mit seinem Freund Rufus vermählte[38]. Darüber beschwerte sich Constantius bei Attila, und der Hunnenkönig forderte von Theodosius die Erfüllung des Versprechens (vgl. Prisc. fr. 14, vv. 25–32 Blockley). Rufus verstarb gleich nach der Hochzeit, aber die Witwe wurde mit einem anderen Gefolgsmann Zenons verheiratet. Diese Affäre bedeutete eine große Demütigung für den Kaiser und zeugte von seiner Schwäche. Sie hätte sich zu einem ernsthaften Problem entwickeln können, wenn Attila sie als den Vorwand für militärisches Eingreifen benutzt hätte. Attila forderte die Bestrafung Zenons und stellte sogar fest, sei der Kaiser zu schwach, sich mit seinem Sklaven auseinanderzusetzen, könne er selbst ihn bei der Bekämpfung Zenons unterstützen. Priskos ist der Meinung, dass sich diese Handlungen Zenons in erster Linie gegen Chrysaphios richteten (Prisc. fr. 15, 2 und 15, 3 Blockley)[39]. Weil Chrysaphios aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach hinter den massiven Geldzahlungen an Attila stand, muss Zenon bestrebt gewesen sein, einen neuen Krieg gegen die Hunnen zu provozieren, um auf diese Weise die Politik des Eunuchen zu desavouieren und dessen machtpolitische Position abzuschwächen. Theodosius blieb nicht völlig passiv und ließ, vielleicht unter dem Einfluss des Chrysaphios, das Vermögen der Witwe des Rufus konfiszieren. Chrysaphios überstand die Krise. Theodosius gab dem Druck seitens Attila nicht nach und lieferte ihm den Eunuchen nicht aus. In dieser Hinsicht wurde er von anderen Beratern bekräftigt. Wie Priskos überliefert, fand Chrysaphios damals eine allgemeine Unterstützung: „Weil alle ihn damals unterstützten und ihm Wohlwollen zeigten, beschloss man Anatolius und Nomus als Gesandte an Attila zu schicken“ (Prisc. fr. 15, 3 Blockley = *Exc*. 13 Carolla)[40]. Entgegen der Deutung

[38] Zu Zenon vgl. Zuckerman 1994: 172 ff.; Feld 2005: 214 ff. Man spekuliert, dass Zeno in seiner antihunnischen, harten Linie auf die Unterstützung aus Senatoren- und Hofkreisen hätte rechnen können, die mit der Annäherungspolitik des Chrysaphios an Attila nicht einverstanden gewesen seien (so Friel, Willimas 1999: 81; Feld 2005: 218).

[39] Vgl. Feld 2005: 219.

[40] ὁ Χρύσαφιος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ καθεστήκει· πάντων δὲ αὐτῷ εὔνοιαν τε καὶ σπουδὴν συνεισφερόντων...

von BLOCKLEY sehe ich keine Ironie in dieser Aussage des Priskos[41]. Priskos betont hier, dass sich die oströmische Regierung in einer komplizierten Lage alle Konsequenzen auf sich nahm und das Problem auf diplomatischem Weg lösen wollte, ohne Chrysaphios zu opfern. Wenn er sagt, alle hätten den Eunuchen unterstützt, muss das bedeuten, dass auch die Teilnehmer an der Gesandtschaft – Maximinus und Priskos – den Eunuchen rechtfertigten. Darüber hinaus erfahren wir in diesem Kontext, dass Nomus ein enger Freund von Chrysaphios war und sein eigenes Vermögen für die Rettung des Eunuchen einsetzte. Aus der Theodor-Lector-Epitome geht hervor, dass Chrysaphios und Nomus auch in Religionsfragen zusammenarbeiteten (Theod. Lect. 346). Anatolius und Nomus gelang es, Attila zu besänftigen, und der Hunnenkönig erklärte sich bereit, die Friedensbedingungen von 448 einzuhalten. Constantius sollte hingegen nicht mehr mit der Tochter des Saturnilus, sondern mit einer anderen hochrangigen Frau verheiratet werden. Es ging dabei um die Witwe des Armatus (Prisc. fr. 15, 3–4 BLOCKLEY). Zu diesem Zeitpunkt hielt schon der Kaiser den Isaurier Zenon für gefährlich und fürchtete dessen Rebellion[42]. Mit Zenon sollte sich Priskos‘ Freund, Maximinus, auseinandersetzen[43].

Zum Schluss soll man noch auf das am Anfang erwähnte dritte Fragment aufmerksam machen: Es geht um ein Exzerpt aus Johannes von Antiochia, das in den *Excerpta de insidiis* erhalten ist (Ioh. Ant. 291 ROBERTO / 222 MARIEV (*EI* 83) = Prisc. fr. 15, 5 BLOCKLEY). Johannes von Antiochia geht hier ohne Zweifel auf Priskos zurück. In diesem Fall lässt sich erkennen, wie Johannes bzw. der konstantinische Exzerptor ihre Quelle modifiziert und verändert. Dieselben Ereignisse thematisieren die Auszüge aus Priskos in *Excerpta de legationibus*: *ELG* 6 und *ELR* 4–5. Der Auszug aus Johannes stellt die Situation nach der Aufdeckung des Mordanschlags gegen Attila kurz dar und übt scharfe Kritik an Chrysaphios, der alles kontrollieren und das Vermögen aller Menschen rauben würde und deswegen von allen gehasst worden sei. Erwähnt werden hier auch die Affäre um die Tochter des Saturnilus und die Forderung Attilas, Chrysaphios solle ihm ausgeliefert werden. Zum Schluss ist die Rede von der Gesandtschaft des Anatolius und des Nomus. In dieser kurzen Darstellung gibt es aber gewisse Abweichungen von dem parallelen Bericht, den die direkten Auszüge aus Priskos bieten. In den parallelen Priskos-Fragmenten kommt der Gedanke, Chrysaphios habe alles kontrolliert, das Vermögen aller Menschen geraubt und sei von allen

---

[41] Vgl. auch THOMPSON 1948: 197; BALDWIN 1980: 35 ff. Gegen BLOCKLEY 1983: 389, Anm. 96. Der Meinung BLOCKLEYS, dass Priskos zu Chrysaphios sehr negativ eingestellt sei, liegen aber vor allem die Stellen aus Johannes von Antiochia zugrunde, und nicht die genuinen Priskos-Fragmente.

[42] HOLUM (1982: 207) spekuliert, dass Zenon vom Kaiser nur die Entlassung des Chrysaphios gefordert habe und diese bloße Forderung als „Rebellion“ gedeutet worden sei.

[43] Vgl. dazu ZUCKERMAN 1994, 172 f. FELD (2005: 219) vermutet aufgrund des engen Zeitrahmens, dass die Offensive gegen Zenon über das Planungsstadium nicht hinausgekommen sei.

gehasst worden, nicht zum Ausdruck. Ganz im Gegenteil – im Kontext der Aufdeckung des Mordanschlags gegen Attila betont Priskos, wie oben gesagt, dass Chrysaphios von allen unterstützt wurde. Johannes von Antiochia – oder der konstantinische Exzerptor – verändert, wie es scheint, den Tonart des ursprünglichen Priskos-Berichtes, indem er seine Vorlage um die Kritik an Chrysaphios ergänzt. Johannes konnte dabei entweder auf die schon bestehende schwarze Legende des Chrysaphios oder auf die Eunuchen-Topik zurückgreifen. Bei der Untersuchung des Umgangs des Johannes von Antiochia mit Priskos soll man also die wichtige Tatsache nicht verkennen, dass selbst wenn Johannes sein Faktenmaterial relativ quellennah ausarbeitete, er es ganz individueller Wertung unterzog. Deswegen ist Johannes von Antiochia nicht an jedem Punkt ein glaubwürdiger Textzeuge des Priskos.

Obwohl Priskos die Herrschaft des Theodosius II. als die Krisenzeit darstellte, muss seine Analyse ziemlich nuanciert gewesen sein und sich nicht auf einfache moralische Topoi beschränkt haben. Priskos, der mit dem hochrangigem Würdenträger Maximinus verbunden war, war persönlich in einige wichtige Ereignisse dieser Periode verwickelt, und folglich kann sein Bericht nicht völlig unparteiisch sein. Das Verhältnis des Priskos zu Chrysaphios ist nicht völlig klar. In den erhaltenen Priskos-Fragmenten, d. h. in den konstantinischen Auszügen aus Priskos, gibt es keine eindeutige Kritik an Chrysaphios‘ Handlungen. Es bleibt dahingestellt, inwiefern der Historiker ihn für die harte Finanzpolitik verantwortlich machte, die er so scharf kritisierte[44]. Priskos bezeugt, dass der Eunuch zu den mächtigsten Figuren am Hof in Konstantinopel gehörte und auf die politischen Entscheidungen wesentlichen Einfluss ausübte. Der Kaiser Theodosius ist es aber, der diese Entscheidungen trifft, und folglich wird er nicht zu einer willenlosen Figur stilisiert. Chrysaphios ist in den genuinen Priskos-Fragmenten ein mächtiger und skrupelloser Politiker, der in Krisensituationen Initiative entfalten kann. Er muss aber seine Machtposition gegen die starke innere Opposition behaupten. Keine Stelle in den erhaltenen Priskos-Auszügen kann als Ansatzpunkt für die schwarze Legende des Chrysaphios dienen. Aus diesen Auszügen geht nicht hervor, dass Chrysaphios besonders habgierig oder allgemein verhasst war. Vielmehr überliefert Priskos, dass der Eunuch eine starke Gruppe politischer Anhänger und Freunde hatte, auf die er sich verlassen konnte. Darüber hinaus dient er in gewissem Maß als eine „Kontrastfolie“ zu den wenig effektiven hohen Militärs: Mut und Initiative weisen nicht die Generäle, sondern ein Hofeunuch auf. Die schwarze Legende des Chrysaphios hat also meines Erachtens ihren Ursprung nicht im Geschichtswerk des Priskos. Ihre Entstehung

---

[44] Baldwin (1980: 36) erwägt zwei Möglichkeiten: „the historian may have distinguished the eunuch, who was in his own limited [...] and ruthless way at least trying to rid Byzantium of its chief threat“ oder „Priscus simply disliked certain other officials more than Chrysaphius“. Meines Erachtens kommen beide infrage.

lässt sich hingegen durch das politische Geschehen nach dem Regierungswechsel von 450 erklären. Sowohl für Pulcheria und die neue Regierung als auch für die Feinde des Nestorios und Eutyches wäre es bequemer, einen Eunuchen, und nicht den Kaiser, für alle kontroversen religiösen Entscheidungen in den 440er Jahren verantwortlich zu machen. Das wäre eine leichte Aufgabe, denn die Eunuchen wurden häufig als Wesen behandelt, die verächtlich, schlecht und böswillig sind. Deswegen ist das Bild des Eunuchen Chrysaphios in der späteren, nicht zeitgenössischen Überlieferung so archetypisch – alle negativen Merkmale, die als Charaktereigenschaften der Eunuchen galten, findet man bei Chrysaphios.

Man darf also meines Erachtens vermuten, dass der böse Eunuch Chrysaphios in erster Linie ein historiographisches und politisches Konstrukt ist, dessen Ursprung nicht im Geschichtswerk des Priskos liegt. Am Beispiel der Ausführungen des Johannes von Antiochia, der das Werk des Priskos als Vorlage für seine eigene Darstellung des 5. Jahrhunderts benutzte, lässt sich aber erkennen, dass die einzelnen historiographischen Traditionen relativ früh in wechselnde Abhängigkeiten geraten sind, sich vermischt und vermengt sowie partiell spätere Ergänzungen erfahren haben. Deswegen soll die Abgrenzung dieser Traditionen voneinander die Aufgabe der modernen Forschung sein.

Jagellonen-Universität, Krakau
dariusz.brodka@uj.edu.pl

LITERATUR

Baldwin 1980: B. Baldwin, *Priscus of Panion*, Byzantion L 1980, S. 18–61.

Bevan, Gray 2008: G. Bevan, P.T.R. Gray, *The Trial of Eutyches: A New Interpretation*, BZ CI 2008, S. 617–657.

Blockley 1981–1983: R.C. Blockley, *The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire. Eunapius, Olympiodorus, Priscus and Malchus*, Bd. I–II, Liverpool 1981–1983.

——— 1992: R.C. Blockley, *East Roman Foreign Policy. Formation and Conduct from Diocletian to Anastasius*, Leeds 1992.

Brodka 2009: D. Brodka, *Pragmatismus und Klassizismus im historischen Diskurs des Priskos von Panion*, in: A. Goltz, H. Leppin, H. Schlange-Schöningen (Hgg.), *Jenseits der Grenzen. Geschichtsschreibung in Spätantike und Frühmittelater*, Berlin–New York 2009 (Millennium-Studien), S. 11–24

——— 2018: D. Brodka, *Narses. Politik, Krieg und Historiographie*, Berlin 2018.

Cameron 2016: A. Cameron, *The Empress and the Poet*, in: idem, *Wandering Poets and Other Essays on Late Greek Literature and Philosophy*, Oxford 2016, S. 37–80.

Carolla 2008: P. Carolla (Hg.), Priscus Panita: *Excerpta et fragmenta*, Berlin 2008.

Chew 2006: K. Chew, *Virgins and Eunuchs: Pulcheria, Politics and the Death of Emperor Theodosius II*, Historia LV 2006, s. 207–227.

Feld 2005: K. Feld, *Barbarische Bürger. Die Isaurier und das Römische Reich*, Berlin–New York, 2005.

Friell, Williams 1999: G. Friell, S. Williams, *The Rome that Did Not Fall: The Survival of the East in the Fifth Century*, Abindgdon 1999.

GREATREX, BARDILL 1996: G. GREATREX, J. BARDILL, *Antiochus, the Praepositus: A Persian Eunuch at the Court of Theodosius II*, DOP L 1996, S. 171–197.

GUYOT 1980: P. GUYOT, *Eunuchen als Sklaven und Freigelassene in der griechisch-römischen Antike*, Stuttgart 1980.

HOLUM 1982: K. HOLUM, *Theodosian Empress. Women and Imperial Dominion in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley–Los Angeles 1982.

ILSKI 2005: K. ILSKI, *Der schwache Kaiser Theodosios*, in: L.M. HOFFMANN (Hg.), *Zwischen Polis, Provinz und Peripherie. Beiträge zur byzantinischen Geschichte und Kultur*, Mainz 2005, S. 3–23.

KELLY 2008: Ch. KELLY, *Attila the Hun. Barbarian Terror and the Fall of the Roman Empire*, London 2008.

LANIADO 1995: A. LANIADO, *Some Addenda to the Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, Historia XLIV 1995, S. 121–128.

LEE 2009: A.D. LEE, *Abduction and Assassination: The Clandestine Face of Roman Diplomacy in Late Antiquity*, The International History Review XXXI 2009, S. 1–23.

MARTINDALE 1980: J.R. MARTINDALE, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, Bd. II: *A.D. 395–527*, Cambridge 1980.

MEIER 2015: M. MEIER, *Dealing with Non-State Societies: The Failed Assassination Attempt against Attila (449 CE) and Eastern Roman Hunnic Policy*, in: J. BEMMANN, M. SCHMAUDER (Hgg.), *Complexity of Interaction along the Eurasian Steppe Zone in the First Millennium CE*, Bonn 2015, S. 635–658.

——— 2017: M. MEIER, *Das oströmische Mordkomplott gegen den Hunnenherrscher Attila (449 n. Chr.): Verzweiflungstat, Wagnis oder rationales Kalkül?*, in: S. BRAKENSIEK, Ch. MARX, B. SCHELLER (Hgg.), *Wagnisse. Risiken eingehen, Risiken analysieren, von Risiken erzählen*, Frankfurt am Main 2017, S. 19–61.

——— 2019: M. MEIER, *Geschichte der Völkerwanderung. Europa, Asien und Afrika vom 3. bis zum 8. Jahrhundert n. Chr*., München 2019.

PFEILSCHIFTER 2013: R. PFEILSCHIFTER, *Der Kaiser und Konstantinopel. Kommunikation und Konfliktaustrag in einer spätantiken Metropole*, Berlin–Boston 2013.

SCHOLTEN 1995: H. SCHOLTEN, *Der Eunuch in Kaisernähe. Zur politischen und sozialen Bedeutung des praepositus sacri cubiculi im 4. und 5. Jahrhundert n. Chr.*, Frankfurt am Main 1995.

STEIN 1959: E. STEIN, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, Bd. I: *De l'État romain à l'État byzantin (284–476)*, Paris 1959.

THOMPSON 1948: E.A. THOMPSON, *A History of Attila and the Huns*, Oxford 1948.

ZUCKERMAN 1994: C. ZUCKERMAN, *L'Empire d'Orient et les Huns. Notes sur Priscus*, T&MByz XII 1994, S. 159–182.

Eos CVI 2019
ISSN 0012-7825

SHOULD THE READER REALLY PAY NO ATTENTION TO THE STAGE DIRECTIONS SUPPLIED IN THE TRANSLATIONS OF ANCIENT GREEK TRAGEDIES? (THE CASE OF AESCHYLUS' *ORESTEIA* IN POLISH RENDITIONS)*

by

BARBARA BIBIK

ABSTRACT: Some scholars claim that neither the reader nor the stage director should pay any attention to the stage directions supplied in modern renditions of ancient Greek tragedies because there were none in the Greek originals. Such an attitude, they claim, will get both the reader and the stage director closer to the interpretation intended by the author of the play in question. But is it really that simple? In my paper I would like to focus on the stage directions supplied by Polish translators of Aeschylus' *Oresteia* as a vehicle for the translators' alleged interpretation, the staging plan designed in a rendition, and the history of classical scholarship, and thus to show that when paying some attention to them, both the reader and the stage director may find relevant, interesting or unexpected information there.

1. INTRODUCTION

There were no stage directions[1] in ancient Greek tragedies. This is a well-known fact, together with the fact (brought to light thanks to the research and publications of Oliver Taplin) that these plays were devised by their authors – Aeschylus, Sophocles or Euripides – to be performed on an Athenian stage in the fifth century BC. Moreover, their authors were not only playwrights, but were actually the creators of the whole performance as they themselves were stage directors and stage managers of their plays. The plays were indeed theatre- and performance-oriented. Therefore, as some scholars claim[2], they should be

* This paper was partly prepared in London during the scholarship given by the Lanckoroński de Brzezie Foundation. I am very grateful to the Foundation for making my stay in London possible.

1 As understood today, cf. P. Pavis, *Słownik terminów teatralnych*, transl. by S. Świontek, Wrocław 2002 [*Dictionnaire du théâtre*, Paris [3]1996], p. 102.

2 Cf. J. Axer, *Teksty tragików greckich jako scenariusze*, in H. Podbielski (ed.), *Literatura Grecji starożytnej*, vol. I: *Epika – Liryka – Dramat*, Lublin 2005, pp. 647–668; R.R. Chodkowski,

considered theatre scripts. However, in the following centuries they started to be regarded rather as pieces to be read than to be staged. Such an attitude was quite common among both Polish scholars and the general public in the nineteenth century, when the first complete translations of ancient Greek tragedies started to be published in periodicals or in separate volumes. By that time the way of writing drama had also changed. At around the time of the eighteenth century, the close connection between creating and staging a piece of drama ceased to be as obvious as it had been in the case of ancient dramas or those by Shakespeare or Molière. Playwrights were not sure any longer whether, and when, if at all, their works would find their way onto a theatre stage. Therefore, because they usually could not have any direct influence on a performance when working in a theatre or with a group of actors, if they wanted to leave any suggestions about how they imagined the piece being staged, or a blueprint for the future staging, this had to be included within the text in the supplied stage directions. Although not every playwright included them, stage directions started to appear in published dramas at more or less about that time. In the nineteenth century – the century of realism and illusion on the theatre and opera stage – their presence in dramas was at last established, and today it seems to be a common practice[3]. This holds true even in the case of the translations of ancient Greek tragedies, both into Polish (which will be my main concern in this paper) and into other foreign languages.

There were no stage directions in ancient Greek tragedies though, to repeat my opening sentence. Therefore any stage direction that is supplied is always the translator's decision and is literally an addition given by him/her. That is why this issue – whether a translator should or should not insert stage directions into his/her translation – divides scholars. There are some who strongly oppose their inclusion and propose getting rid of them, or not taking them into consideration – as they are part of the translator's, not the author's interpretation – while reading any ancient Greek dramas. But, whether they want to accept it or not, every translation is an interpretation. So, should the reader really pay no attention to the stage directions in translations of ancient Greek tragedies?[4]

Funkcja obrazów scenicznych w tragediach Ajschylosa, Wrocław 1975, pp. 5–11; R. Nünlist, *The Ancient Critic at Work. Terms and Concepts of Literary Criticism in Greek Scholia,* Cambridge 2009, p. 345; O. Taplin, *Greek Tragedy in Action*, London 1978; J.M. Walton, *The Greek Sense of Theatre. Tragedy and Comedy Reviewed*, London–New York 2015, p. 25.

[3] Pavis, *op. cit*. (n. 1), pp. 101 f., 592–595; W.B. Worthen, *Drama. Between Poetry and Performance*, Chichester 2010, p. XV.

[4] Bearing in mind the notion that these plays may be regarded as theatre scripts and being aware of their theatre- and performance-oriented role, my focus in this paper will be on the Polish translations of ancient Greek plays as written texts with all the paratexts to be read and/or analysed by the reader, whoever (s)he may be (since even a stage director is firstly a reader).

The stage directions supplied in translations of ancient Greek tragedies are undoubtedly paratexts, to use the term coined by Gérard GENETTE[5], which have been added by someone other than the author of the work in question. These paratexts mediate between the author and the reader, between an alien past and an apparently familiar modernity[6], which results in an imaginative and creative dialogue. But this mediation concerns two very distant cultures: the ancient and the modern one (of the nineteenth, twentieth or twenty-first century). The latter one, the receiving culture, will be my main focus of interest in this paper, in agreement with the claim upheld by the proponents of culture-oriented approaches to translation studies that any translation belongs to the target culture rather than to the source one[7]. Actually any drama from the past, which scholars agree will have a double nature, consequently, as part of the receiving culture, undergoes an adjustment from antiquity to the contemporary world, because in one way or the other it needs to be re-imagined and re-fashioned for the audience which is not original and never will be, because the audience's mindset from the time of the original staging cannot be reconstructed[8]. Perhaps the stage directions therefore reveal something of the complex relation and mediation between the cultures and thus are of some significance?

The actual aim of my paper is to present what kind of information the reader may find if (s)he pays at least some attention to the stage directions that are provided. Given that it is impossible to present all the Polish translations of ancient Greek tragedies (there have been more than one hundred renditions since the beginning of the nineteenth century), I have decided to narrow my paper to the renditions of Aeschylus' *Oresteia*, which I have studied thoroughly[9]. I will take into account the following translations, which I am listing in chronological order[10]: by Zygmunt WĘCLEWSKI[11], Józef SZUJSKI[12], Kazimierz KASZEWSKI[13], Jan

---

[5] G. GENETTE, *Paratexts. Threshold of Interpretation*, transl. by J.E. LEVIN, Cambridge 1997.

[6] D. HOPKINS, *Colonization, Closure or Creative Dialogue?: The Case of Pope's* Iliad, in: L. HARDWICK, Ch. STRAY (eds.), *A Companion to Classical Receptions*, Malden 2008, p. 131.

[7] Cf. M. HEYDEL, *Zwrot kulturowy w badaniach nad przekładem*, Teksty Drugie 2009, fasc. 6, pp. 21–33.

[8] Cf. J. ZIOMEK, *Powinowactwa literatury. Studia i szkice*, Warszawa 1980, p. 117; J.M. WALTON, *Translating Classical Plays. Collected Papers*, London–New York 2016, p. 11; J. BALMER, *What Comes Next? Reconstructing the Classics*, in: S. BASSNETT, P. BUSH (eds.), *The Translator as Writer*, New York 2006, pp. 184–195; HOPKINS, *op. cit*. (n. 6), pp. 129–140.

[9] B. BIBIK, *Translatoris vestigia. Projekcje inscenizacyjne wybranych polskich tłumaczy "Orestei" Ajschylosa*, Toruń 2016. This paper refers to the ideas expanded on in the book.

[10] To acquaint the reader with the Polish translators mentioned in this paper, an appendix with short biographical notes has been added at the end.

[11] Z. WĘCLEWSKI (transl.), Eschylos: *Tragedye*, Poznań 1873.

[12] J. SZUJSKI, *Dzieła*, Kraków 1887.

[13] K. KASZEWSKI (transl.), Eschilos: *Tragedye*, Warszawa 1895.

KASPROWICZ[14], Stefan SREBRNY[15], Artur SANDAUER[16], Maciej SŁOMCZYŃSKI[17], and Robert CHODKOWSKI[18].

2. STAGE DIRECTIONS AS A VEHICLE OF THE TRANSLATOR'S INTERPRETATION

The first issue that I would like to discuss concerning stage directions that are provided is the notion that they are the only vehicle for the translator's interpretation. But it is the text as a whole given by a translator that presents the interpretation; it is this text that has its emphases and stresses, that nuances the details, that has its own key words, allusions and references, that enlightens or overshadows some parts of the original. Jerzy ŁANOWSKI[19] and Ewa SKWARA[20] (both Polish classicists and translators of Euripides, and Plautus and Terence, respectively) rightly argue in their papers that translators usually give in the stage directions they insert pieces of information which have been extracted from the original and which concern names (or the addressees of the utterances), places, gestures, behaviours, props, or costumes. Sometimes, adding one stage direction is a way to render the original more comprehensible to the modern reader, or more concise, transferring information (or abundant information) from the words given by a character into the stage directions, or may reveal the stage action encoded within words. In a comedy, sometimes it is the only way to save the comic nature of a joke (which needs to be explained or otherwise stays incomprehensible). Therefore, neglecting the stage directions will not necessarily get the reader any closer to the ideas or 'pure' interpretation of what the author was conveying, but may sometimes deprive him/her of some information extracted from the original (which may be of some importance at least for a stage director when designing the stage action). After having scrutinised the stage directions in Polish translations of the *Oresteia*, I have to admit that additional information

---

14 J. KASPROWICZ (transl.), Ajschylos: *Dzieje Orestesa*, Lwów 1908.

15 S. SREBRNY (transl.), Aischylos: *Tragedie*, Kraków 1952.

16 A. SANDAUER (transl.), *Dramaty greckie: wybór*, Warszawa 1977.

17 This rendition remains unpublished; it was used for the first time in the staging of the *Oresteia* in 1982 by Zygmunt Hübner in the Helena Modrzejewska National Stary Theatre in Cracow.

18 R.R. CHODKOWSKI (transl.), Ajschylos: *Tragedie*, Lublin 2016.

19 J. ŁANOWSKI, *Przekłady dramatu antycznego. Z doświadczeń tłumacza*, in: J. AXER, Z. OSIŃSKI (eds.), *Siew Dionizosa. Inspiracje Grecji antycznej w teatrze i dramacie XX wieku w Europie Środkowej i Wschodniej: rekonesans*, Warszawa 1997, pp. 179–185.

20 E. SKWARA, *Skąd się biorą didaskalia w przekładach dramatów antycznych? Exemplum:* Asinaria *Plauta w tłumaczeniu Ewy Skwary*, Symbolae Philologorum Posnaniensium Graecae et Latinae XVI 2004, pp. 67–76; EADEM, *Spektakl zaklęty w tekście. Wizja antycznego przedstawienia "Captivi" Plauta*, in: J. OLKO (ed.), *Obrzęd, teatr, ceremoniał w dawnych kulturach*, Warszawa 2008, pp. 243–260.

not extracted from the original or clearly modifying the interpretation of the play is rare. This does not mean that it does not happen, but it is quite rare and usually reduced to adjectives or verbs which precisely inform the reader how a character looks, behaves or reacts. Thus the reader finds (for example) the following adjectives or information describing a character: that Cassandra in the *Agamemnon* turns away from Clytaemnestra proudly and with disgust (Węclewski[21]); or that Orestes is eighteen years old when appearing on stage in the *Libation Bearers* (Kasprowicz[22]). The information the reader gets about the behaviour of a character may differ slightly in various renditions, for example: whether the Watchman from the opening part of the *Oresteia*, after having spotted the fire, goes down from the roof of the palace calmly (Kaszewski[23]) or in a hurry (Węclewski[24]); or whether Clytaemnestra in the *Libation Bearers*, before being murdered by her son, is introduced or pushed by him into the palace; or whether Orestes at the end of the same play goes out or runs off the stage; or whether at the beginning of the *Eumenides* Pythia re-enters the stage leaning against the walls of the temple (Węclewski[25]), or leaning against a stick (Kaszewski[26]), or rushes off the temple (Szujski[27]), or steps back terrified when seeing the inside image (Chodkowski[28]); or whether the Erinyes when re-entering the stage in the *Eumenides* run onto it quickly (Węclewski[29]), or appear in a row (Kasprowicz[30]), or just enter (Słomczyński), or enter tracking Orestes' footprints (Srebrny, Chodkowski[31]); or whether Athena in the third part of the *Oresteia* enters the stage (Szujski, Kaszewski, Srebrny, Słomczyński, Chodkowski[32]), or runs onto it (Kasprowicz[33]), or appears above the stage on a chariot pulled by horses (Węclewski[34]). The reader is also given some hints about the psychology of a character or how they react in a given situation, for example: that Electra in the *Libation Bearers* hesitates before offering sacrifices

---

21 Węclewski, *op. cit*. (n. 11), p. 76.

22 Kasprowicz, *op. cit*. (n. 14), p. 91.

23 Kaszewski, *op. cit*. (n. 13), p. 226.

24 Węclewski, *op. cit*. (n. 11), p. 45.

25 *Ibidem*, p. 150.

26 Kaszewski, *op. cit*. (n. 13), p. 340.

27 Szujski, *op. cit*. (n. 12), p. 196.

28 Chodkowski, Ajschylos... (n. 18), p. 189.

29 Węclewski, *op. cit*. (n. 11), p. 157.

30 Kasprowicz, *op. cit*. (n. 14), p. 158.

31 Srebrny, *op. cit*. (n. 15), p. 453; Chodkowski, Ajschylos... (n. 18), p. 199.

32 Szujski, *op. cit*. (n. 12), p. 206; Kaszewski, *op. cit*. (n. 13), p. 353; Srebrny, *op. cit*. (n. 15), p. 459; Chodkowski, Ajschylos... (n. 18), p. 206.

33 Kasprowicz, *op. cit*. (n. 14), p. 165.

34 Węclewski, *op. cit*. (n. 11), p. 162.

on her father's tomb (Srebrny[35]); or that, when having recognised Orestes in the same play, she is amazed (Węclewski[36]), moved (Kaszewski[37]), or full of joy (Srebrny, Chodkowski[38]); or that Clytaemnestra, still in the same play, having heard of her son's alleged death, loses control over herself and Orestes feels really restless on hearing her mourning him (Srebrny[39]). Sometimes an added stage direction may clarify the ambiguity of Aeschylus' play, for example when it comes to the disappearance of Apollo in the *Eumenides* after the trial: whether he leaves the stage before Orestes' final speech, as it is in the renditions by Węclewski and Kaszewski[40], or during it, as in Kasprowicz's translation[41], or afterwards together with Orestes, as the stage directions given by Srebrny and Chodkowski say[42].

3. STAGE DIRECTIONS AS A VEHICLE FOR THE STAGING PLAN DESIGNED IN A RENDITION

What some stage directions actually present is the assumed staging plan designed in a rendition by one translator or another, although this may vary considerably[43]. Ancient Greek tragedies were clearly devised to be performed on stage. It is believed by drama and theatre scholars that such works – devised with a certain stage in mind – have some potential staging included within them[44]. It goes without saying then that to some extent they reflect the theatre stage they were created for, as well as the theatrical, literary and cultural conventions that were contemporary to the author[45]. But the theatre stage of the nineteenth, twentieth

---

[35] Srebrny, *op. cit*. (n. 15), p. 398.

[36] Węclewski, *op. cit*. (n. 11), p. 114.

[37] Kaszewski, *op. cit*. (n. 13), p. 294.

[38] Srebrny, *op. cit*. (n. 15), p. 403; Chodkowski, Ajschylos... (n. 18), p. 131.

[39] Srebrny, *op. cit*. (n. 15), p. 422.

[40] Węclewski, *op. cit*. (n. 11), p. 176; Kaszewski, *op. cit*. (n. 13), p. 365.

[41] Kasprowicz, *op. cit*. (n. 14), p. 182.

[42] Srebrny, *op. cit*. (n. 15), p. 476; Chodkowski, Ajschylos... (n. 18), p. 225.

[43] Cf. B. Bibik, *Didaskalia w przekładzie tekstu dramatycznego (na przykładzie* Orestei *Ajschylosa)*, Między Oryginałem a Przekładem XIX 2013, fasc. 4 (22), pp. 57–75; eadem, *Didaskalia w "Orestei" Ajschylosa jako projekt inscenizacji tłumacza (na przykładzie "Agamemnona")*, Symbolae Philologorum Posnaniensium Graecae et Latinae XXVI 2016, pp. 53–75; eadem, *Didaskalia w "Orestei" Ajschylosa jako projekt inscenizacji tłumacza (na przykładzie "Ofiarnic")*, Przekładaniec XXXI 2016, pp. 75–89.

[44] Cf. B. Schultze, *Przekład dramatu i przekład teatru. Rozważania nad problemami tłumaczenia sztuk teatralnych*, Ruch Literacki XXXI 1990, p. 139; A. Cetera, *Enter Lear. The Translator's Part in Performance*, Warszawa 2008, p. 65; D. Ratajczakowa, *W krysztale i w płomieniu. Studia i szkice o dramacie i teatrze*, vol. I, Wrocław 2006, pp. 40 f.

[45] T. Hermans, *Norms and the Determination of Translation: A Theoretical Framework*, in: R. Álvarez, M.C.-Á. Vidal (eds.), *Translation, Power, Subversion*, Clevedon 1996, pp. 25–51.

and twenty-first centuries was and is completely different to that of ancient times, for which these plays were created. This obviously raises the question of whether it is a translator's task to adjust the performative values of an ancient text to the contemporary stage. J. Michael WALTON[46] once wrote, however, that better translators are those who are aware of the performative values of a translated text, and not those who focus only on the words. Some Polish translators wanted to highlight the staging features of ancient dramas and render the plays performable on a contemporary stage, even though there were no stagings in the nineteenth century and only a few at the turn of the twentieth century based on ancient dramas that were performed in theaters and thus these texts were regarded mainly as literature. The staging plan proposed by one translator or another, who is in this way taking up the role of a stage director (the case of translators of classical texts is not exceptional[47]), is usually the outcome of many intertwined factors that influenced him (there are no women among the Polish translators of ancient Greek tragedies) and created his 'horizon', to borrow a phrase from Antoine BERMAN[48]. These factors include the text he is translating and the knowledge he has about the author of the play in question and the time in which he was writing, but also the translator's linguistic and theatrical intuition as well as his knowledge of the theatre practice of the Ancients and of his contemporaries. In a way, as the reader may see in the Polish translations, it is usually a question of choosing between realism/illusion and symbolism, as Arthur Wallace PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE rightly noticed long ago:

> Unfortunately scholars are far from being agreed as to the interferences to be drawn from the plays, and there may always remain differences of opinion on the fundamental question of the amount of illusion which an Athenian audience expected. Did they require a considerable degree of realism in the representation, or were they content to take a good deal for granted, and to see only with the mind's eye much of what poet described or hinted at, just as in vase-painting and sculpture a very few figures might stand for many, and much might be conveyed by very simple symbols? This question must inevitably complicate the discussion at many points[49].

Therefore, in nineteenth century renditions (by WĘCLEWSKI and KASZEWSKI) the reader can observe to what degree their authors were influenced by contemporary tendencies in theatre and opera, especially those which were particularly instrumental in producing a sense of (theatrical) illusion. Stage directions in these renditions are packed with precise information describing stage settings: places,

---

[46] WALTON, *Translating...* (n. 8), p. 22.

[47] Cf. A. CETERA, *Lear w "reżyserii" Stanisława Barańczaka*, Poznańskie Studia Polonistyczne. Seria Literacka VI 1999, pp. 115–128.

[48] A. BERMAN, *Pour une critique des traductions: John Donne*, Paris 1995, pp. 64–83.

[49] A.W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE, *The Theatre of Dionysos in Athens*, Oxford 1946, p. 31.

props, supernumeraries[50], and machines. They are definitely the most elaborated ones when it comes to giving a sense of theatrical illusion: not only do they incorporate everything that is mentioned in words, but even more, including the change of stage setting in the third part of the *Oresteia*, *Eumenides*, when the action moves from Delphi to Athens. Setting aside the current state of knowledge and looking more thoroughly, taking account of the theatre or even more importantly of the opera stage of the time, it is obvious that all the pieces of information given in the stage directions, although making reference to the ancient stage[51] as well, could be realised on a stage of the time with its theatrical devices and arrangements like painted scenery, wings, blackcloths, trapdoors, etc. All of these stage directions render the translations really spectacular. Even though we now know that theatre and its arrangements in Aeschylus' time were much simpler than what translators of the time imagined, they strongly believed then that it was the way that theatre had looked (which, unsurprisingly, was in line both with scholars' knowledge about ancient theatre and its performances and the cultural tendency of the time). Renditions given at the turn of the twentieth century (by Kasprowicz[52] in this case) were definitely limited in the stage directions as far

[50] Actually, if these staging plans had been staged, there would have been quite a crowd on stage; for example, Agamemnon in the first part of the *Oresteia* comes back from the Trojan War together with carts full of war-brides, war booty and soldiers (Węclewski, *op. cit*. [n. 11], p. 68), or in the *Eumenides* the chorus consists of fifty [sic!] Erinyes (Kaszewski, *op. cit*. [n. 13], p. 239). Such directions also prove that translators thought rather of the contemporary than the ancient theatre stage as the latter, according to knowledge at the time, was believed to be quite narrow (on which see the following section).

[51] Węclewski (*op. cit*. [n. 11]) retains Greek theatre terminology in the inserted stage directions: the names of *orchestra*, *thymele*, and *ekkyklema*. Such an attitude may be considered to be a strategy of foreignisation. Węclewski also retains the distance between the actors performing their roles on stage and choreutes performing theirs in the *orchestra*, as he believed it was the case in Aeschylus' time (later in my paper, I will discuss how he was influenced by the classical scholarship of his period). In any case, it is possible, although controversial, to imagine such a realisation on a contemporary stage with the *orchestra* pit well below the level of the stage. Srebrny (*op. cit*. (n. 15)], however, although retaining the ancient name of *orchestra* in his rendition, actually devises actors' and choreutes' performance on the same level (as it probably was on the Athenian stage, according to current knowledge about ancient Greek theatre, and that of Srebrny's generation as well). Nevertheless, it proves that looking attentively at the proxemics (how characters are located on stage and in relation to one another) devised in the stage directions may lead the reader to interesting observations about what one translator or another really thought about the stage.

[52] Jan Kasprowicz was widely acknowledged as one of the greatest Polish poets of his days. His translations (and he rendered an astonishing number of works from Greek, English, German, Italian, French and Latin) illustrate the ways and the extent to which a personality of his stature leaves their own traces on someone else's work. However, this attitude was not exclusively characteristic of him, as it was also in line with the conventions of translating at that period. It was at the turn of the twentieth century when translators came to be regarded as artists who were entitled to leave their own mark on the works they translated, a signature of their own personality, aesthetic sense, and ideas; cf. E. Balcerzan, *Literatura z literatury (strategie tłumaczy)*, Katowice 1998, p. 200; T. Brzostowska-Tereszkiewicz, *Wczesnomodernistyczna krytyka przekładu*

as the staging plan was concerned and focused more on the characters of the play (and their gestures, costumes, behaviours, all given sometimes in great details), which was in line with the conventions of the time and the public's interests, which shifted from the staging and theatre arrangements towards the actors and their performances[53]. In turn, renditions from the first half of the twentieth century (by Srebrny in this case[54]) responded to the new ways of staging introduced into European theatre by such artists as André Antoine, Adolphe Appia, Edward Gordon Craig, Georg Fuchs, Otto Brahm, Konstantin Stanislavski, and in Poland by Stanisław Wyspiański. Among other significant changes, those reformers rejected the painted scenery so commonly used in nineteenth century theatre in order to shape the whole theatre space and instead of illusion and realism they promoted symbolism. All those elements may be found in the stage directions provided by Srebrny in his rendition[55], with the additional psychological information about the characters' behaviour (which I partly mentioned in the previous section among the examples given; anyway, it should be remembered that the role of psychology increased greatly at the time thanks to, to mention only one name, Sigmund Freud). The unmentioned translations usually have limited amounts of such information (especially the one rendered by Szujski where there is only a little, but also those by Sandauer, Słomczyński and Chodkowski) in the stage directions provided when compared to the above-mentioned ones.

The staging plan proposed in one rendition or another is usually based on the design of the author of the play in question, but, as I have tried to point out, it may also convey some of the translator's own ideas for the staging or his/her contemporary cultural background of which any reader should be aware. Nevertheless, I would not neglect the stage directions that are provided, because they indeed bring the reader closer to the translator and his/her work, cultural background and imagination. But above all, they reveal both the creativity of the translators who tried to render these plays performative and alive on contemporary stages and the ways of re-fashioning and re-imagining of an ancient drama in different times, and thus broaden our knowledge about the reception of ancient drama in general.

(w Polsce), in: P. Fast, A. Car, W.M. Osadnik (eds.), *Historyczne oblicza przekładu*, Katowice 2011, p. 46; M. Heydel, *Gorliwość tłumacza. Przekład poetycki w twórczości Czesława Miłosza*, Kraków 2013, p. 103. And this is probably the most important role of Kasprowicz as a translator.

[53] Cf. A. Marszałek, *Prowincjonalny teatr stołeczny (trzy spojrzenia na scenę lwowską lat 1864–1887)*, Kraków 2011, pp. 110, 270.

[54] Although his rendition was published in 1952, it was carried out mainly in 1938 (see the following footnote), and finalised during World War II.

[55] Srebrny prepared both the new translation and the staging plan for the performance at the Municipal Theatre in Vilnius, the so-called Pohulanka Theatre, in April 1938. Part of the staging in which he was really involved during the rehearsals is still 'visible' to an attentive reader in the published rendition.

4. STAGE DIRECTIONS AS A VEHICLE FOR THE HISTORY OF CLASSICAL SCHOLARSHIP

The last issue I would like to discuss is the fact that the stage directions provided (translations included) may be testimonies of the history of classical scholarship.

In the nineteenth century, before the archaeological excavations (led mainly by Wilhelm Dörpfeld, who published the results in his book of 1896, entitled *Das griechische Theater*) that proved him wrong, it was commonly believed that ancient Greek theatre looked like Vitruvius presented it in his work *De architectura* (V 7). And definitely what the reader gets from both the stage directions and the introductions to the translations of that period is a round orchestra (the greater part of which was dedicated to the choreutes and a smaller, rather shallow one which formed the stage) situated well below the raised stage (*proskenion*) with the painted *skene* building. Translations which appeared after the results of the excavations were published responded to them and adjusted the image of the ancient theatre to the updated knowledge (which may be more noticeable in the paratexts such as introductions or in academic books and papers given by translators than in the renditions themselves). Nonetheless, although scholars argue as to how many entrances there were in the *skene* building in Aeschylus' time, Polish translators – following so-called common knowledge about the ancient theatre – are quite unanimous: there were three entrances and the reader gets such an image from the renditions. One scene in the *Libation Bearers* also proves how strongly Polish translators adhere to the commonly believed 'ancient theatrical rules'. Oliver Taplin argues that in the crucial scene from the second part of the *Oresteia*, the *Libation Bearers*, the scene when Orestes is going to murder his mother, "...were it not for the scholion and the three-actor 'rule', no one would have supposed for a moment that Pylades entered later than Orestes" and, since "everything points to Pylades' entry at 892", thus "it is by no means impossible that Aeschylus was allowed a fourth actor with just three lines of speech"[56]. Nevertheless, Polish translators, who are quite unanimous that Orestes enters the stage together with Pylades[57], remove the servant Clytaemnestra calls to bring her the weapon with which she killed her husband off-stage before Orestes' and Pylades' appearance on it – just to be faithful to the 'ancient rule' of no more than three speaking actors on stage at the same time[58].

---

[56] O. Taplin, *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus. The Dramatic Use of Exits and Entrances in Greek Tragedy*, Oxford 2001, p. 354; cf. T.G. Rosenmeyer, *The Art of Aeschylus*, Berkeley 1982, p. 48; G. Ley, *The Theatricality of Greek Tragedy: Playing Space and Chorus*, Chicago 2007, p. 35.

[57] Węclewski, *op. cit*. (n. 11), p. 136; Kaszewski, *op. cit*. (n. 13), p. 316; Szujski, *op. cit*. (n. 12), p. 183; Kasprowicz, *op. cit*. (n. 14), p. 132; Srebrny, *op. cit*. (n. 15), p. 431.

[58] Kasprowicz (*op. cit*. [n. 14], p. 132), Srebrny (*op. cit*. [n. 15], p. 431) and Chodkowski (Ajschylos... [n. 18], p. 160), insert stage directions to make it even more clear.

One of the moot points in Aeschylus' *Oresteia* are lines 205–211[59] from the *Libation Bearers*, when Electra, after having offered sacrifices, notices the footprints on the tomb of Agamemnon. The question of whether the lines are genuine or spurious divides (or, more precisely, divided) scholars[60]. Translators, usually when they are academics as well, have to respond to this, unless they use the newest edition and base their rendition on it without further consideration[61]. Węclewski, then, included the translation of this passage with a critical commentary (admitting that the lines are controversial[62]), while Srebrny did not include them at all, which resulted in changing subsequent lines as well[63]. It has to be noted that the lines were included in the editions by Hermann[64] and Wilamowitz-Moellendorff[65] on which Węclewski and Srebrny, respectively, based their translations. In translations rendered by Szujski[66], Kaszewski[67] and Kasprowicz (with stage directions provided in this case)[68] the reader finds the lines without any comment, while in the translation by Chodkowski[69] the passage in question is supplemented with a remark in the commentary that the reader should not take Electra's words literally as they reflect her state of mind.

Other lines that once raised some questions are 691–699[70], also from the *Libation Bearers*. These are lines which are now commonly attributed to Clytaemnestra, but once were given to Electra, as recalled by Albin Lesky[71].

---

[59] U. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (ed.), Aeschylus: *Tragoediae*, Berlin 1914, p. 254.

[60] A. Lesky, *Greek Tragic Poetry*, transl. by M. Dillon, New Haven–London 1983, p. 83; Chodkowski, *Funkcja*... (n. 2), p. 82.

[61] Actually, this is usually the case in modern translations; translators from the past were far more critical towards their sources and thus their renditions are part of the history of textual criticism. For example, when considering the *amoibaion* scene between Orestes, Electra and the choreutes in the *Libation Bearers*, the reader finds that in the translations by Węclewski (*op. cit*. [n. 11], pp. 117–124), Kasprowicz (*op. cit*. [n. 14], p. 107–115) and Srebrny (*op. cit*. [n. 15], p. 407–415) different lines are attributed to Orestes, Electra and the choreutes. Obviously, the edition on which a rendition was based was the main reason for that changed attribution; however, both Węclewski and Srebrny questioned their sources and made some changes in their translations when compared with the editions by, respectively, Hermann and Wilamowitz.

[62] Węclewski, *op. cit*. (n. 11), p. 409.

[63] Srebrny, *op. cit*. (n. 15), pp. 504 f.

[64] G. Hermannus (ed.), Aeschylus: *Tragoediae*, Lipsiae 1852.

[65] Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *op. cit*. (n. 59).

[66] Szujski, *op. cit*. (n. 12), p. 161.

[67] Kaszewski, *op. cit*. (n. 13), p. 293.

[68] Kasprowicz, *op. cit*. (n. 14), p. 102.

[69] Chodkowski, *op. cit*. (n. 18), p. 129.

[70] Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *op. cit*. (n. 59), p. 272.

[71] Lesky, *op. cit*. (n. 60), p. 84; for the description of the controversy, see W.A. McDonald, *A Dilemma: Choephori 691–99*, CJ LV 1959–1960, pp. 366–370.

From among the translations that I analysed, only in that by Węclewski it is actually Electra instead of Clytaemnestra who is lamenting over the alleged death of Orestes[72]; remarkably, he does not follow his source, the edition by Hermann, in this respect. Attributing these lines to Electra justifies her presence on the stage[73] and thus contributes to Węclewski's overall interpretation of the play: Electra's exaggerated grief is feigned, as she knows very well that Orestes is alive, but at the same time Clytaemnestra has no opportunity to express her genuine grief over her son.

The last passage which reveals something about the history of the textual criticism of Aeschylus' *Oresteia* is the scene in the *Eumenides* when the goddess Athena appears on stage for the first time[74]. In Węclewski's rendition, in the stage directions[75], the reader learns that Athena, armed with a shield and a spear, appears standing on a horse chariot above the stage (which is obviously really spectacular). This is the only rendition that describes the appearance of Athena in this way. The translated text (that is Athena's words) is in line with this description. It has to be noted that the Greek line: πώλοις ἀκμαίοις τόνδ' ἐπιζεύξασ' ὄχον ("yoking this chariot to colts in their prime"[76]) is included both in the editions by Hermann (as line 397)[77], and Wilamowitz (as line 405)[78]; the latter one, though, puts the line in square brackets and adds in the critical apparatus: "delevi". Neither in Kasprowicz's nor Srebrny's translation, both of whom based their renditions on either Wilamowitz's edition (Srebrny) or his previously published translation (Kasprowicz), does the reader find this line; as a consequence, in accordance with the words she speaks, the goddess Athena enters the stage on foot. In the renditions by Szujski[79] and Kaszewski[80], the goddess Athena also enters the stage on foot, but the words in question are retained; the translations are slightly modified, though, to be in agreement with the stage

[72] Węclewski, *op. cit.* (n. 11), p. 131.

[73] Although he is not the only one who introduces Electra on stage in the second part of the *Libation Bearers*. Srebrny, in the stage directions, does the same, even if Electra stays silent during the whole encounter between her mother and her brother in disguise. This is also part of Srebrny's interpretation of the play: Electra knows very well that it is Orestes himself standing in front of his mother and lying, but she says not one word. Her presence proves that she belongs only to the world of her father and of Orestes, but not to the one of her mother; cf. Srebrny, *op. cit.* (n. 15), pp. 316 f. (his introduction to the *Oresteia*).

[74] About the disputed lines, see L. Himmelhoch, *Athena's Entrance at "Eumenides" 405 and Hippotrophic Imagery in Aeschylus's "Oresteia"*, Arethusa XXXVIII 2005, pp. 263–302.

[75] Węclewski, *op. cit.* (n. 11), p. 162.

[76] Tansl. by H.W. Smyth (Loeb).

[77] Hermannus, *op. cit.* (n. 64), p. 285.

[78] Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *op. cit.* (n. 59), p. 307.

[79] Szujski, *op. cit.* (n. 12), p. 206.

[80] Kaszewski, *op. cit.* (n. 13), p. 353.

action. CHODKOWSKI, for his part, puts them in brackets, as they are in the edition by Martin L. WEST[81] on which CHODKOWSKI's translation is based, and the goddess Athena enters the stage on foot as well[82].

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Gérard GENETTE proved in his book that paratexts deserve attention as they reveal relevant information about the relations between various factors at play and thus form the book's history. In my paper I wanted to show that stage directions do the same (which is much easier to notice when one takes into account and compares a whole series of translations of the same work). They should be given more credit, as they are part of the history: of literature, of theatre, and of classical scholarship as well. Therefore no reader should be too quick to neglect them or too hasty to label a translation in which they appear an obsolete one. Each rendition with stage directions (and other paratexts) provided is the outcome of the very careful and perceptive work of a translator, who is visible and proposes his/her own contribution to the interpretation of the ancient play. And this definitely enriches our knowledge about the classical reception of the work. In every rendition a careful and sensitive reader may sense some traces of the translator's personality, linguistic skills and creativity, traces of the process of translation, and of various historical, political or cultural circumstances that might have had an impact on his/her work. It is absolutely natural for all translations that they become outdated, because they are "inevitably re-visions from the perspective of their own moments in time and space"[83]. But even then they are still snapshots of the language, culture, and imagination at some particular moment in history and of some people – translators, so often underestimated and even neglected, who worked for their fellow citizens to give them the possibility of becoming acquainted with some of Europe's most important and influential literary works. Briefly concluding, every reader should at least pay some attention to the stage directions in translations of ancient Greek tragedies as (s)he may find relevant, interesting, or unexpected information therein.

Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń
bb@umk.pl

[81] M.L. WEST (ed.), Aeschylus: *Tragoediae cum incerti poetae Prometheo*, Stutgardiae 1990, p. 365.

[82] CHODKOWSKI, *op. cit.* (n. 18), pp. 206 f.

[83] P. BURIAN, *Translation, the Profession, and the Poets*, AJPh CXXI 2000, p. 302.

APPENDIX:

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES ON THE TRANSLATORS REFERRED TO IN THIS PAPER

Robert Chodkowski (b. 1938): Polish classicist, professor emeritus at the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin; his academic interests are centred on ancient Greek theatre and playwrights. He published numerous works on this subject. He is currently finalising his major project of translating all extant tragedies by Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides.

Jan Kasprowicz (1860–1923): one of the greatest Polish poets of his day; playwright, literary and theatre critic and reviewer; translator from Greek, English, German, Italian, French, and Latin. He studied philosophy and literature in Leipzig and Wrocław (Breslau); he held (since 1908) the chair of comparative literature at the John II Casimir University in Lviv (Lwów) and was rector of that university (in 1921/1922). He was active in the theatrical life of Lviv, collaborating with Tadeusz Pawlikowski, the director of the Lviv Municipal Theatre.

Kazimierz Kaszewski (1825–1910): an acclaimed Polish literary and theatre critic and reviewer, renowned for his vast knowledge of philosophy and literature; educator; translator from Greek, French and German; he took part in the January Uprising against Tzarist Russia (1863–1864).

Artur Sandauer (1913–1989): Polish literary critic and writer; translator from Greek, Russian and German; from 1963 a lecturer (and from 1974 professor) of Polish literature at Warsaw University. He studied classical philology at the John II Casimir University in Lviv (Lwów). During the Stalinist period he openly criticised socialist realism (then the only officially sanctioned method of literary composition) and, as a consequence, was not allowed to publish.

Maciej Słomczyński (1920–1998): Polish writer and prominent translator, renowned for his detective stories, scripts and plays (written under the pen-names of Joe Alex and Kazimierz Kwaśniewski) as well as for translating all the works of Shakespeare into Polish (at least two of them were commissioned by theatre directors). As a member of the Polish resistance movement, the Home Army, during World War II, he was later persecuted by the communist authorities.

Stefan Srebrny (1890–1962): one of the most eminent Polish classicists of his time, professor at the Stefan Batory University in Vilnius (Wilno) in 1923–1939 and, from 1945, at the Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń. A skilled translator of ancient Greek poetry and drama (Aeschylus and Aristophanes), regarded as a leading specialist in the field of ancient Greek theatre. He was

interested in theatre in general and had a profound knowledge of theatre studies and European drama; he was particularly fascinated by artistic movements and literary works which were far removed from the tendencies towards realism or illusion. In the 1930s he prepared the stagings of Sophocles' *Oedipus the King* and Aeschylus' *Oresteia* in the Vilnius Municipal Theatre; in 1944–1945 he was active as a director at the Polish Drama Theatre in Vilnius.

Józef Szujski (1835–1883): a distinguished Polish historian and politician, one of the founders of the acclaimed Cracow Historical School; he was also a poet and playwright. He took part in the January Uprising (1863–1864). Professor at the Jagiellonian University in Cracow.

Zygmunt Węclewski (1824–1887): one of the most distinguished Polish classicists of his time; he studied in Wrocław (Breslau) and Halle; in 1863–1869 he was professor at the Main School (Szkoła Główna) in Warsaw, from 1872 at the University of Lviv (Lwów); rector of that university in 1877/1878. He translated into Polish all extant tragedies by Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides. Renowned for his Latin-Polish and Greek-Polish dictionaries. One of his research fields was the Latin poetry of Polish humanists (Klemens Janicki, Andrzej Krzycki).

Eos CVI 2019
ISSN 0012-7825

IMAGES OF MOTHERS OF CLASSICAL AND HELLENISTIC SPARTA*

by

MAGDALENA MYSZKOWSKA-KASZUBA

The legendary allure of Sparta and its enduring place in historiography up to the modern day stems largely from it being perceived as a *polis* that bred the best of the Greeks – paragons of traditional virtue and patriotism. Such virtues were said to be bred into Spartan men by their mothers: formidable, self-sacrificing women who prioritised the good of the state over their children. The legend of Spartan mothers, of their courage and virtue, lives on in the European tradition as a literary, cultural and historical phenomenon[1]. The aim of my doctoral dissertation was to analyse this motif: its rise, development and deployment in ancient Greek literature. My other aim was to assess whether the legendary virtue and demeanour of Spartan mothers reflected in any measure the social milieu of classical and Hellenistic Sparta.

---

* This paper is a summary of a PhD dissertation that was written as part of the Project "The Eastern Mediterranean from the 4th Century BC until Late Antiquity". The project was coordinated by Professor Krzysztof Nawotka (Uniwersity of Wrocław) and ran between 2011 and 2015 within the International PhD Projects Programme of the Foundation for Polish Science, co-financed by the European Union from the Regional Development Fund within the framework of Measure 1.2 "Strengthening the Human Potential within the Science Sector", part of the Operational Programme "Innovative Economy". The dissertation was supervised by Professor Ryszard Kulesza (University of Warsaw) and Professor Christopher Tuplin (University of Liverpool) and defended at the Department of History, University of Wrocław, on January 29, 2019. The dissertation was reviewed by Professor Danuta Musiał (Nicolaus Copernicus University, Toruń) and Professor Gościwit Malinowski (University of Wrocław).

[1] About Sparta in Western thought, see e.g. E. Rawson, *The Spartan Tradition in European Thought*, Oxford 1969; V. Metha, *Sparta in the Enlightenment*, PhD diss., The George Washington University, 2009; S. Hodkinson, I.M. Morris (eds.), *Sparta in Modern Thought: Politics, History and Culture*, Swansea 2012; M. Borowska *et al*. (eds.), *Sparta w kulturze polskiej* ["Sparta in Polish Culture"], vols. I–II, Warszawa 2014–2015; A. Powell (ed.), *A Companion to Sparta*, vol. II, Hoboken, NJ 2018.

Any serious study on ancient Spartan mothers, either factual or fictionalised, needs to acknowledge and address two major research obstacles concerning Sparta. The first is the dearth of sources on the Spartan motherhood: our not entirely trustworthy evidence on this matter comprises non-contemporaneous literary accounts by non-Spartan authors, showing tell-tale traces of distortion and embellishment. The second obstacle, the so-called 'Spartan mirage', stems from the first one: many scholars, unsatisfied by the paucity of dependable sources on ancient Sparta, extrapolated wildly from the available material, allowing their own prejudices and ideas to colour and misshape their understanding of Sparta. To name but one example: Spartan women, said to enjoy relative independence from men, were occasionally interpreted through the lens of feminist theory as paragons of women's liberation, a far-fetched interpretation with very little basis in fact. Sparta, more than any other *polis*, was thought to remain wholly exceptional among the Greek city-states – politically, economically, socially and educationally – a militaristic state that controlled every aspect of her citizens' lives. Accordingly, in this exceptional society women were believed to reject their 'natural' feminine traits in favour of civic-mindedness and a focus on military service, their chief contribution being to rear future generations of warriors. So much for the 'Spartan mirage': however, some surviving evidence does not support such interpretations and suggests that Spartan exceptionalism was little more than a carefully crafted illusion. From the 1980s onwards, historians such as P. Cartledge, A. Powell, and S. Hodkinson began to question Sparta's exceptional position among other *poleis*, conducting more nuanced studies on Spartan society and its complexities. Nevertheless, these scholars were not the first to cast doubt on the veracity of the Spartan legend – that distinction belonging to F. Ollier[2] and E.N. Tigerstedt[3]. Relevantly to the topic at hand, these researchers re-examined the social status of Spartan women. Further works in that vein followed, with the most significant contributions in the field including studies by A. Bradford[4], P. Cartledge[5], M. Dettenhofer[6], M. Dillon[7],

[2] F. Ollier, *Étude sur l'idéalisation de Sparte dans l'antiquité grecque du début de l'école cynique jusqu'à la fin de la cité*, Paris 1943.

[3] E.N. Tigerstedt, *The Legend of Sparta in Classical Antiquity*, vols. I–II, Stockholm 1974.

[4] A. Bradford, *Gynaikokratoumenoi: Did Spartan Women Rule Spartan Men?*, AncW XIV 1986, pp. 13–18.

[5] P. Cartledge, *Spartan Wives: Liberation or Licence?*, CQ XXXI 1981, pp. 84–105.

[6] M.H. Dettenhofer, *Die Frauen von Sparta. Ökonomische Kompetenz und politische Relevanz*, in: M.H. Dettenhofer (ed.), *Reine Männersache? Frauen in Männerdomänen der antiken Welte*, Köln 1994, pp. 15–40; idem, *Die Frauen von Sparta. Gesellschaftliche Position und politische Relevanz*, Klio LXXV 1993, pp. 61–75.

[7] M. Dillon, *Were Spartan Women who Died in Childbirth Honoured with Grave Inscriptions?*, Hermes CXXXV 2007, pp. 149–165.

T.J. Figueira[8], S. Hodkinson[9], R. Kulesza[10], E. Millender[11], A. Powell[12], J. Redfield[13], and L. Thommen[14]. They grounded the fictionalised Spartan female in the quotidian life, exploring women's roles and activities in Spartan religion, economy, politics, war, and domestic life. Regrettably, some scholars seem unable to ignore the siren call of the 'Spartan mirage': remaining unable or unwilling to untangle fact from fiction, they accept aspects of the Spartan legend at face value and put forward unlikely hypotheses, the most striking examples of which can be found in S. Pomeroy's writings[15].

The purpose of the dissertation was to re-examine and re-interpret sources concerning mothers in classical and Hellenistic Sparta. Discussing divergent images of Spartan mothers in ancient literature, I re-examined women of Sparta in their maternal roles. Adopting a multidisciplinary approach, I addressed complexities of the Spartan reality, searching for historical facts while sifting through layers of ever-changing and negotiable Spartan customs and beliefs. My chief intention, however, was to gauge the extraordinariness of Spartan mothers – or lack thereof – among other Greek women.

The dissertation was divided into two main parts, the first analysing the surviving literary sources and the second re-analysing them in the light of modern methodological approaches to historical Sparta. The first section was devoted to a thorough analysis of the literary sources, crucial for understanding the cultural

---

[8] T.J. Figueira, *Gynaecocracy: How Women Policed Masculine Behaviour in Archaic and Classical Sparta*, in: A. Powell, S. Hodkinson (eds.), *Sparta: The Body Politic*, Swansea 2010, pp. 265–296.

[9] S. Hodkinson, *Female Property Ownership and Empowerment in Classical and Hellenistic Sparta*, in: T.J. Figueira (ed.), *Spartan Society*, Swansea 2004, pp. 103–136.

[10] R. Kulesza, *The Women of Sparta*, Anabasis. Studia Classica et Orientalia IV 2013, pp. 7–36.

[11] E. Millender, *Spartan Women*, in: Powell (ed.), *A Companion...* (n. 1), pp. 500–524; idem, *Athenian Ideology and the Empowered Spartan Woman*, in: S. Hodkinson, A. Powell (eds.), *Sparta: New Perspectives*, Swansea 1999, pp. 355–391.

[12] A. Powell, *The Women of Sparta – and of the Other Greek Cities – at War*, in: Figueira (ed.), *Spartan...* (n. 9), pp. 137–150; idem, *Spartan Women Assertive in Politics? Plutarch's Lives of Agis and Kleomenes*, in: Hodkinson, Powell (eds.), *Sparta...* (n. 11), pp. 393–419.

[13] J. Redfield, *The Women of Sparta*, CJ LXXIII 1978, pp. 146–161.

[14] L. Thommen, *Spartanische Frauen*, MH LVI 1999, pp. 129–149.

[15] E.g. S.B. Pomeroy, *Spartan Women*, Oxford 2002. See also e.g. V. French, *The Spartan Family & the Spartan Decline: Changes in Child-Rearing Practices and Failure to Reform*, in: Ch.D. Hamilton, P. Krentz (eds.), *Polis and Polemos: Essays on Politics, War, and History in Ancient Greece in Honour of Donald Kagan*, Claremont 1997, pp. 241–274; E. Fantham, *Spartan Women: Women in a Warrior Society*, in: E. Fantham (ed.), *Women in the Classical World: Image and Text*, New York 1995, pp. 56–67; B. Zweig, *The Only Women Who Give Birth to Men: A Gynocentric, Cross-Cultural View of Women in Ancient Sparta*, in: M. de Forest (ed.) *Woman's Power, Man's Game: Essays on Classical Antiquity in Honor of Joy K. King*, Wauconda 1993, pp. 32–53.

wellsprings of the Spartan legend. Having defined the research problem and possible risks, I highlighted and classified problems to be addressed within the dissertation. The main research question for this part of the dissertation was how the legend of the Spartan mother arose and what purpose it served as a motif. To that end, I carefully read and dissected all references to mothers in classical and Hellenistic Sparta: the corpus comprised texts by Greek authors from the classical, Hellenistic and Roman periods, occasionally including earlier and later authors. My interpretations showcased the fact that the motif of the Spartan mother was employed in diverse manners across a range of texts, authors and genres. I described in full the surviving accounts of Spartan mothers, identifying their affiliation, status and the expectations they were meant to fulfil: in other words, their role models and desirable traits to be emulated. Building upon particular issues of praxis and performance appearing in the context of Spartan motherhood, I developed an ideology of 'Spartan' motherhood: the system of ideas, ideals, and norms of conduct, obeyed to produce excellence and sound moral fibre. This constructed model of the ideal Spartan mother formed the basis for the next stage of research: to juxtapose the idealised image of the Spartan motherhood against the historical reality (as far as we are able to reconstruct it).

I opened my analysis with a chapter devoted to the literary portrayal of the Spartan mother as a mother of a warrior. Recasting the mother–son dyad onto the war domain, such discourse sought to prioritise military prowess and national glory over family matters: a mother's behaviour, roles and status were shaped and restricted by the warrior code. This type of reconceptualisation had a Spartan mother serve her *polis* through birthing new generations of citizens and rearing them as elite warriors; to promote excellence, she had to be harsh and show no mercy to her sons. This interpretation of Spartan motherhood surfaces in a limited number of sources, mostly in Plutarch's *Sayings of Spartan Women* and in Hellenistic epigrams. In turn, the following chapter examined writings that interpret Spartan mothers as primarily fulfilling the role of aids to statesmen and kings; integrally related to the political domain, a mother's role was once again to promote the public affairs of her *polis* over her familial interests. A politically motivated figure with considerable clout, this type of idealised Spartan mother was an affluent woman of style who used her connections and wealth to support her son's political ambitions, in turn sacrificing her own. Such politicised readings of Spartan mothers appear chiefly in examples drawn from Plutarch's *Lives of Agesilaus*, *Agis and Cleomenes*. The chapter juxtaposes figures of famous Spartan queen-mothers, mostly Hellenistic women, with other (primarily Roman) renowned mothers, with Plutarch delving into the exploration of cross-cultural notions of motherhood. The subsequent, third, chapter focused on Spartan women as begetters of children in the light of the 'laws' of the legendary Lycurgus. The textual sources for this chapter come by and large from Xenophon's *The Constitution of the Lacedaemonians*, as contrasted with

passages from Plutarch's *Life of Lycurgus*. This part of my dissertation investigated the relation between the role of women in concepts of the ideal state and the image of Spartan mothers, with the body of the chapter comprising a careful reading of Xenophon's work against Plutarch's. The passages read demonstrate clearly that any ancient Greek authors attempting to design a perfect *polis* knew that city-states require both excellent men and excellent women to produce new generations of citizens; thus, women in their capacity as child-bearers played the central part in the making of the best *politeia*. The fourth chapter of this dissertation was devoted to the analysis of the roles of mothers and motherhood in Plato and Aristotle's ideal states, as well as to these authors' remarks about Spartan women. In turn, the fifth chapter examined assorted ancient Greek narratives and sayings concerning general beliefs held about Spartan women. Drawing from works of Attic dramatists, Herodotus, Pausanias, and Spartan poets Alcman and Tyrtaeus, this chapter considered select stories about the imaginary past of Sparta, her origins and nature and also patterns of female behaviour that made a *polis* successful.

My comprehensive analysis of the writings of authors on Spartan mothers and motherhood revealed the existence of several images of Spartan motherhood in antiquity. Such images, appearing in surviving sources from the 4th century BC onwards, shifted and evolved over the centuries, being creatively adapted by writers to new political, social and literary contexts. A Spartan mother depicted by the Athenian authors of the 5th and 4th century BC was not exactly the same as the one represented by Hellenistic writers; then again, the one which appeared in post-Hellenistic Greek authors differed from the figure employed by Latin writers. Intertextually, it appears that Plutarch's depictions of Spartan mothers exerted the strongest cultural influence over later Latin authors, who admired many Spartans customs and who related the patriotism of idealised Spartan women to that of Roman matrons. In general, the authors of the classical Greek era consciously moulded the image of Spartan women as outliers among the Greeks, categorising them conceptually by juxtaposition. The unusual way of living of Spartan women was pitted against the normative one of Athenian women and then compared against non-Greek women and idealised Greek women in utopian *poleis*. In turn, authors of the Hellenistic era were less interested in prototypical categories and more in extremes of behaviour: not only did they highlight heroic and utopian images of Spartan mothers as completely devoted to their *polis*, but they also delighted in describing them as merciless, harsh and unwomanlike. Later authors tempered the more vicious aspects of Spartan mothers, painting them as epitomes of maternal love and devotion towards their sons. Such bowdlerised depictions came from various texts associated with the so-called Spartan legend, such as the propaganda of the 3rd century BC, depictions of Spartan Helen and other warrior women, and, last but not least, Lycurgus' 'laws'. All these literary depictions stressed that Spartan mothers supposedly held the good of their

polis and obeying her laws in higher esteem than the good of their families, with maternal love expressed chiefly through unswerving loyalty to their city-state. Due to the aforementioned tendency to depict Spartan women as exceptional in Greece, the mothers' contribution to the Spartan *oikos* and *polis* were seen as outstanding among other Greek women. In literary portrayals, Spartan women were endowed with male traits and qualities, which they used to excel at their natural and traditional duties as mothers. Taking all of the above into consideration, in my dissertation I argued that literary depictions of Spartan women/mothers simultaneously employed three types of characterisation: the real, the fictive, and the semi-fictive. Some women were historical individuals whose deeds were recorded relatively faithfully, some were fictional characters, created by authors for moral edification, whereas others were historical characters whose biographies yielded well to being fictionalised, passing into the realms of storytelling and legend. As such, a portrayal of a Spartan mother is a composite image, a mélange of historical facts, consciously fabricated fiction, and unconsciously transmitted stereotypes about women in general and Spartan mothers in particular. Such depictions shifted in time to prioritise different aspects of the Spartan mother persona and thus to fulfil whichever role was required of these women in particular historical contexts. Nevertheless, such depictions were more or less fabricated, with the realities of life in ancient Sparta often proving incompatible with the visions of ancient authors.

The first part of this dissertation explored how ancient authors imagined Spartan mothers; in turn, the second part of my analysis meant to uncover the historical system of beliefs, behaviours and rights by which the concept of Spartan motherhood was construed and regulated. Building on current research, I engaged critically with often unreliable ancient sources to re-examine commonly held scholarly preconceptions and beliefs about the position of women in Sparta. Of particular use to my analysis were critical junctures when historical sources hinted at conflicts between Spartan ideals of motherhood and historical realities of life in this *polis*. Such junctures and conflicts were uncovered through careful juxtaposition of the idealising literary passages analysed in the first part of this work with other types of sources. Certain literary passages paint Sparta and her mothers in a more critical light; similarly, much can be gleaned from available archaeological evidence and from comparing what we know about Sparta with data coming from Athens, Gortyn and Rome in selected contexts. Using these types of evidence, I reconstrued the lives of Spartan women, considering economic, social, political and religious aspects of motherhood in Sparta. Also significant were other categories such as social status and the roles played by Spartan mothers, as individuals and communities, in specific timeframes. It was vitally important for this study to not examine women by focusing on the exceptional and extraordinary but to look for the commonplace and quotidian. Among the questions considered were whether: Spartan women wielded any

considerable authority within the family and society; they directly influenced the politics of the day; they prioritised the good of their *polis* over their families; they were used primarily for reproductive purposes or played other roles in the society.

The first chapter of the second part of my dissertation listed 101 women from classical and Hellenistic Sparta, with information provided concerning their lifespan, name, familial affiliation, activities, and reasons for being well-known which led to their appearance in the surviving source material. Among the 101 women I analysed, I found 42 mothers, all from royal or elite families. In turn, the second chapter examined roles played by women in the religious rites of Sparta: I enumerated known cults with female celebrants and discussed hypotheses that the dominance of fertility cults and the absence of private rituals was characteristic of Spartan religious life. The following, third, chapter focused on the status of Spartan mothers, their legal rights, economic activities, and their contributions to family and community life, my focus being to look for signs of maternal 'independence' and authority over children. The fourth chapter was concerned with the official and customary laws promoting the *teknopoiia* or begetting of children, examining the supposedly extraordinary significance of reproductive success in Sparta. The fifth and final chapter traced social changes that occurred in Spartan society between the 5th and 2nd centuries BC. It showcased how general expectations towards Spartan mothers and motherhood were changed in specific historical realities.

Having analysed the available evidence, I must stress that reconstructing the everyday lives of Spartan mothers is an exercise in speculation. Our evidence on mothers in classical and Hellenistic Sparta comes from sparse written sources scattered across time and space. What survives reveals a carefully curated set of information about exceptional Spartan mothers – queens and aristocrats, enjoying unique economic, financial, and educational privileges, women of power and presence, upholders of the social order and beacons of patriotism. In contrast, my enquiry into the social status of Spartan women unveiled that ordinary Spartan mothers, just like their counterparts in other *poleis*, held relatively little power over the affairs of men, their alleged liberation being a figment of corrective feminist imagination. Apparently, in gender-segregated Spartan society women did rise in status after childbirth, becoming guardians of their households and primary socialising agents (together with fathers, grandmothers, nurses, and other members of the household). The Spartans, as other Greeks, entered into monogamous marriages by betrothal, followed diverse marriage practices and promoted eugenics; however, certain discrepancies existed. As for women's rights in classical and Hellenistic Sparta, the available source material suggests that Spartan women held a measure of authority, since they could inherit wealth and manage their households in their husbands' absence. This privilege influenced marriage practices and, in time, led to the concentration of property and land

in the hands of a few individuals and, consequently, to the demographic crisis among the elites, who could not replenish their dwindling numbers. Arguably, Spartan mothers of the time period under discussion played crucial roles in socialising their children, although available evidence comes chiefly from data on aristocratic mothers and may not reflect the everyday custom. The highest social status was attained by widowed queen mothers (especially in the Hellenistic period), who apparently had a measurable influence on the political decisions of their next of kin. It is possible that because of the aforementioned demographic crisis, in order to increase the number of citizens the Spartan men practiced marriage by seizure, the 'love hut', and polygamy from the classical period onwards. In that period, women of reproductive age became a coveted asset among the Spartans. Characteristically for that *polis*, the age of brides at their first marriage was at the upper limit of what was customary in Greece and neared the age of grooms; this narrowing of the age gap between spouses most probably served to uphold the balance between generations. The inheritance laws in Sparta necessitated marrying fertile and healthy childbearers who would produce legitimate offspring for the elites, successors of kings and heirs to landed estates. Despite the crucial significance of marriage and the begetting of children in Sparta, however, not enough evidence surfaced to support the opinion that the fertility and motherhood of Spartan women actually conferred any special privileges on them in comparison to other Greek mothers. Furthermore, my study demonstrated that many peculiar beliefs, rituals, and customs ascribed to Spartans and their exceptional attitude towards motherhood were fiction rather than fact: no reliable source confirms that Spartan women were actually superior to other Greek women in terms of their fertility, military courage, moderation, simplicity in life, great wisdom, or sense of justice. In contrast to the opinion of some scholars, Spartan girls probably did not follow a special diet, were not commonly taught how to write and read, and did not exercise as men did. Similarly, the notion that the Spartan state promoted having as many children as humanly possible does not appear historically accurate. Last but not least, what I argued we can accept as pure fabrication are beliefs that Spartan mothers killed their children, sent letters to their sons on the battlefield and examined their wounds. The sphere of life where Spartan mothers wielded real influence was inheritance customs and politics, and even there their power becomes visible chiefly by the Hellenistic period.

To conclude, the main argument of my dissertation was to demonstrate that the legend of the Spartan mother overshadowed and continues to overshadow the Spartan reality of the classical and Hellenistic times. I made a case that the apparently extraordinary position of Spartan mothers among their peers is not a fact but a mirage that grew out of such influences as the stylistic constraints of specific literature genres depicting Spartan mothers, the accidents of source survival that limit our data to evidence on royal and elite women, the promulgation of archaic and heroic ideals about women, and, crucially, modern wishful

thinking among scholars. As the very first monograph on mothers in classical and Hellenistic Sparta, this dissertation is part of a greater research project designed to deepen our understanding of the social status of women in Sparta, their family relations and the general *modus operandi* of Spartan society. In other words, it constitutes an introductory treatise on the origins and rise of the motif of the Spartan mother in Western culture.

University of Wrocław
magdalena.myszkowskakaszuba@gmail.com

Eos CVI 2019
ISSN 0012-7825

THE SPARTAN ARMY IN THE REIGN OF AGESILAOS II*

by

TOMASZ MAKÓLSKI-ŚWIERCZ

My PhD dissertation, entitled *The Spartan Army in the Reign of Agesilaos II*, is devoted to studying problems associated with the internal organisation, social structure, equipment and training of the Spartan army. Analysing all these elements allows for a better understanding of how the land army was used by the Lacedaemonian state as a tool for shaping the political world around it. The period of the reign of king Agesilaos II was chosen to fix the chronological boundaries of this thesis. The relatively abundant source material concerning this period allows us deeper insight into questions related to the Spartan army of his age. Agesilaos himself was an able general who led his armies in numerous combats, fighting on three continents, in differing circumstances, in open battles, sieges and skirmishes, deploying a multitude of troop types in different combinations, executing complicated manoeuvres and employing varying tactics. Due to his skilful command, Agesilaos was able to secure and maintain his extraordinary position in Spartan politics. He was one of the Spartan kings who enjoyed the greatest prestige and political influence in his *polis* for decades, arguably making him the most prominent king in the whole of Spartan history.

Moreover, Agesilaos' reign itself forms an epoch in the history of Sparta, covering most of the period between two crucial events of the classical period: the end of the Peloponnesian war and the second battle of Mantinea. During this time, Sparta reached the pinnacle of her political and military power, gaining

* This paper is a summary of a PhD thesis that was completed as part of the project "The Eastern Mediterranean from the 4th Century BC until Late Antiquity". The project was coordinated by Professor Krzysztof NAWOTKA (University of Wrocław, Institute of History) and took place between 2011 and 2015 within the International PhD Projects Programme of the Foundation for Polish Science, co-financed by the European Union from the Regional Development Fund within the framework of Measure 1.2 "Strengthening the Human Potential within the Science Sector" which was part of the Operational Programme "Innovative Economy". The thesis was supervised by Professor Ryszard KULESZA (University of Warsaw) and defended at the Department of History, University of Wrocław, on 13th December 2017. The dissertation was reviewed by Professor Nicholas SEKUNDA (University of Gdańsk) and Professor Gościwit MALINOWSKI (University of Wrocław).

hegemony over Greece and showing unprecedented imperial ambitions. Yet the Spartans were not able or fortunate enough to maintain this status – Agesilaos saw his *polis*' army shattered on the battlefield of Leuctra, leaving Sparta's political position in tatters, her territory severely reduced and her status diminished to a second-grade level.

My thesis is divided, apart from preliminary remarks about sources and modern scholarship, into three chapters describing, respectively, the three main branches of the Spartan army – heavy infantry, cavalry and light infantry. In each case I tried to gather all the source material about the usage of each troop type and offer an analysis of its organisation, social structure and equipment. Due to the predominant position of hoplite warriors in Greek warfare and the fact that they were the centre of attention in the sources, the chapter concerning heavy infantrymen is much longer and more detailed than the remaining two, clearly showing the ancillary role of cavalrymen and skirmishers in the Lacedaemonian army.

The first chapter of the dissertation begins with an overview and a short description of the available literary sources, with particular emphasis on their usefulness in the study of the issues connected to the Spartan army, distinguishing authors and works that are most important for research on this topic. Obviously Xenophon is most prominent, as his main work, the *Hellenica*, is a basic source providing an account of this period. Apart from the *Hellenica*, Xenophon's other works are also very important for my dissertation. The *Anabasis* is of particular importance as it describes in detail the way the Greek army operated, while the *Lakedaimonion Politeia*, a treaty on the constitution of the Lacedaemonians, is largely devoted to the description of the Spartan army. Although the great historical works of Herodotus and Thucydides refer to the times before the reign of Agesilaos, they are still important comparative material for Xenophon and the foundation for any attempt at reconstruction focusing on the evolution of the Lacedaemonian army, which makes them crucial to my work. Apart from these, some later sources, notably biographies and apophthegms of Plutarch and the historical narrative of Diodorus, are important, as well as multitudinous sections of ancient works of varying provenance.

After discussing the sources, I try to outline the state of research on the organisation of the Lacedaemonian army. Facing an enormous amount of literature dealing with this subject, I risked presenting the issue in an unconventional way. I chose to describe six highly influential, coherent and thorough visions of the organisation of the Lacedaemonian forces in order to show how differently our sources were interpreted in the past and which direction the ideas of modern historians have taken in the last hundred years[1]. I believe that these outlines show

[1] These six synopses outline the following works: J.K. Anderson, *Military Theory and Practice in the Age of Xenophon*, Berkeley–Los Angeles 1970; G. Busolt, *Spartas Heer und Leuktra*, Hermes XL 1905, pp. 387–449; J.T. Figueira, *Population Patterns in Late Archaic and*

the scale and character of the problems facing anyone who wishes to devote their time to studing the organisation of the Spartan army. The set of historians was chosen in accordance with their importance and influence on other scholars, as well as to precisely reflect the multiple possible outcomes of analysing the same source material – outcomes which demonstrably can be poles apart, following completely different principles of how to interpret the source material. In most cases, however, individual scholars see certain details in a different light from that of their predecessors and interpret them in another way, modifying existing theories and models. Unfortunately, full reconstruction is often not possible.

The next three chapters, constituting the core of the work, are constructed in a similar way. They are devoted to, respectively, heavy infantry, cavalry and auxiliary units. In each of these chapters I try to outline the origins of the types of units and the way they were used prior to Agesilaos' ascension; afterwards, I attempt to give a comprehensive description of the activities of each of these formations during his reign. Each chapter also contains an analytical part, in which I endavour to present, in the light of the available sources, issues and questions related to the Spartan army. Later, if possible, I propose feasible reconstructions and their likely variants.

Considering the dominant position of the hoplites in the Greek military and the fact that sources understandably focus on them, the chapter dedicated to heavy infantry is definitely more elaborate and detailed than the other two. I start with a short outline of the beginning of this formation and the issue of the so-called 'hoplite revolution'. At first, I recapitulate traditional 'orthodox' views on the hoplites' origins and their way of fighting, which place the adoption of the phalanx formation in an early phase of the archaic era and posit subsequent major social changes, elevating the hoplite-class to greater political significance and replacing the aristocracy to some extent. I then present some more recent opinions of the so-called 'revisionists', who are critical of these assumptions[2]. Although many elements of the 'orthodoxy' can be successfully contested, especially its ideas concerning the hoplite army's impact on archaic social relations, in my work I oppose the revisionists' ideas of placing the adoption of the phalanx in a late period, believing that the hoplites' way of fighting in the archaic and the classical epoch did not differ significantly.

After a brief outline of the history of the usage of the Spartan heavy infantry prior to Agesilaos' ascension, I try to describe the hoplite phalanx as

---

Classical Sparta, TAPhA CXVI 1986, pp. 165–213; J.F. Lazenby, *The Spartan Army*, Warminster 1985; A.F. Toynbee, *Some Problems of Greek History*, London 1969; H. van Wees, *Greek Warfare. Myths and Realities*, Bristol 2004.

[2] A coherent outline of the emergence and evolution of 'hoplite orthodoxy' theories, as well as the arguments of their critics, can be found in: D. Kagan, G.F. Viggiano, *The Hoplite Debate*, in: D. Kagan, G.F. Viggiano (eds.), *Men of Bronze. Hoplite Warfare in Ancient Greece*, Princeton–Oxford 2013, pp. 1–56.

a formation. I start with analysing its role on the battlefield, underlining its dominant role in the Greek army as the main offensive and defensive asset. The hoplite phalanx was an essential element of the Greek military, also in a symbolic sense. The ideal of a soldier and a model of masculinity was embodied by a hoplite-citizen. On the battlefield, a tight formation constituted the front of the battle line. It was the most important element and keeping it in order was a key to victory. Although I rather adhere to the traditional vision of the phalanxes' clash as a group fight rather than a series of individual duels, I try to emphasise the universality of the hoplites on the battlefield. Apart from fighting in close formation, the hoplites were able to perform surprising charges, which allowed them to catch up with opposing skirmishers or gain momentum for an attack. They also fought as marines on board ships, or served as storm troops during sieges.

Next I try to describe various elements of the hoplites' equipment and its use in combat, especially highlighting the specifics of the hoplite shield, the *aspis*, for fighting in the close formation of the phalanx, as well as presenting the discussion concerning the gradual reduction in the weight of the equipment during the 5th and 4th centuries BC. I then present the available information on the training and drill of the Lacedaemonian hoplites, as well as the description of manoeuvres used by them on the battlefield, such as counter-marching or wheeling.

The main element of the chapter comes next, i.e. an account of the internal organisation of the Lacedaemonian army. Despite the ancient Greeks' generally positive opinion on the Spartan phalanx, our sources provide us with surprisingly little information on its structure; it seems that this element was crucial to Sparta's many successes on the battlefield.

When attempting any reconstruction, we encounter three major problems:

(1) First of all, our most important sources, namely Xenophon, Thucydides and Herodotus, differ significantly in their description of the organisational details of the Spartan army. In fact, they sometimes even seem to contradict their own accounts. This situation leads to a deliberation: it is possible that our sources describe several chronological moments in the constantly changing organisation of the army, and that they should be considered as true, although showing only separate points in the evolution process of the Lacedaemonian army. The other possible answer is that the army was not constantly changing and we must assume that our sources are sometimes erroneous and make an inappropriate interpretation of its structure, which forces us to reject assumed distortions and reconstruct a proper model from available shreds of evidence. Personally, I believe that justifying all source divergences by subsequent reforms of the Spartan army is not very plausible. I do not think that frequent changes made without an explicit purpose were common in one of the most important institutions of Sparta, especially considering the fact that this community was generally perceived as conservative and boasted about its immutability.

(2) Another significant issue raised in this chapter is the fact that the most basic reconstructions of the organisation of Lacedaemonian hoplite units, based on Thucydides' description of the battle of Mantinea and the chapter concerning the army in Xenophon's *Lakediamonion Politeia*, lead us to the conclusion that after full mobilisation the Lacedaemonian army numbered around 3.500–4.000 soldiers. Such a low number, taking into account data about the armed forces of other Greek states, makes it doubtful that with such a force Sparta could have achieved the status of a superpower in the Greek world. There are two ways of solving this riddle: the acceptance of the low number as true and an attempt to explain it, or doubling the number of Spartan soldiers, which can be achieved by synthesising one coherent model from several available sources. Although such a merger seems to be quite convincing[3], it contradicts the evidence of some very important sources and is consequently highly uncertain.

(3) A third major issue described in this chapter is the social composition of the Lacedaemonian phalanx. There is no doubt that *Spartiatai*, or full citizens, were too low in number during Agesilaos' time to fully fill the ranks of the Lacedaemonian units. They had to be supplemented by members of some lower social classes, e.g. impoverished citizens, *hypomeiones*. The vast majority of historians indicates *perioikoi* as the backbone of the Spartan forces, but there is no agreement as to whether they fought in separate units, or whether they mixed with citizens. Sources allow to argue convincingly for both possibilities, and I see no reason to definitely choose one of the options – it seems quite plausible that *perioikoi* generally served in separate contingents, but some of them were privileged to join citizen units as well[4].

The third chapter of my dissertation is centred on the cavalry. Although such a formation was present in Sparta during the archaic period, at some point the Lacedaemonians ceased to use it. The term *hippeis*, meaning literally 'horsemen', refers in the classical age to an elite unit of hoplites – it seems that the aristocratic cavalry evolved at some point into a band of heavy infantry. It was not until the Peloponnesian War that the Lacedaemonians re-created their cavalry corps, as they were facing plundering raids on their territory. The Spartan cavalry did not have a long tradition in Agesilaos' time.

---

[3] Thus, several scholars back this theory, e.g. Figueira, *op. cit.* (n. 1), pp. 187–191; W.G. Forrest, *A History of Sparta*, London 1968, pp. 132–137; A.W. Gomme, A. Andrewes, K.J. Dover, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. IV, Oxford 1970, pp. 115–117; Lazenby, *op. cit.* (n. 1), pp. 5–10; Toynbee, *op. cit.* (n. 1), p. 379; H.T. Wade-Gery, *Essays in Greek History*, Oxford 1958, pp. 80 f. Against it: e.g. Anderson, *op. cit.* (n. 1), pp. 239 f.; Busolt, *op. cit.* (n. 1), pp. 420–424; C. Hawkins, *Spartans and Perioikoi: The Organization and Ideology of the Lakedaimonian Army in the Fourth Century B.C.E.*, GRBS LI 2011, pp. 401–434, at p. 410; P.J. Stylianou, *A Historical Commentary on Diodorus Siculus Book 15*, New York 1998, pp. 288 f.; van Wees, *op. cit.* (n. 1), p. 99.

[4] Similarly Hawkins, *op. cit.* (n. 3), pp. 410–415.

Cavalrymen served mainly as scouts, looking out for ambushes. On the battlefield, the cavalry was most often placed on both sides of the battle line, harassing the opponents with their projectiles and protecting the hoplites from being flanked. After breaking the opponent's forces riders were also used to great effect as pursuers.

I try to present what we know about the organisation of the Lacedaemonian cavalry. This formation is quite often perceived by historians as originating from the lower social classes, being poorly trained and generally not being very useful. This assessment is mainly based on a short description of the battle of Leuctra in Xenophon's *Hellenica*. In this chapter I tried to show that such an opinion is not necessarily justified in its entirety, pointing out examples of the cavalry's effectiveness and the fact that even *Spartiatai* served among its ranks. Still, the Lacedaemonian state never made any real effort, unlike the Athenian one, for its cavalry to achieve supreme quality.

Light infantry is the subject of my analysis in the last chapter. The main task of such a formation was to scout and secure the march of the entire army. On the battlefield skirmishers harassed the enemy with missiles, avoiding, thanks to their agility, mêlée combat with the opponent. They were extremely useful in difficult, mountainous terrain and during siege warfare, significantly facilitating both defensive and offensive actions. They were also well suited to 'guerrilla' skirmishes and plundering expeditions into the enemy's territory.

With the significant size of the helot population, it would seem prudent to assume that the Spartans would have used their subjects quite often as light infantry. However, only at the direst moment before the battle of Plataea can we find (in Herodotus' work) traces of helots armed as skirmishers. With this exception, the Spartans entrusted such tasks to mercenaries and *Skiritai*. The latter were residents of the Skiritis region, located on the border of Laconia and Arcadia. A separate subsection of the chapter is devoted to them. Their unique social status is indicated by the fact (corroborated by accounts of both Thucydides and Xenophon) that a permanent place in the structure of the Lacedaemonian army was assigned to them. In Thucydides they appear as hoplites, but in the *Hellenica* and *Lakediamonion Politeia*, describing the period of Agesilaos' reign, they fulfil the role of light troops, possibly specialising in cooperation with the cavalry. After the defeat at Leuctra, Skiritis was no longer under the influence of Sparta and our sources fell silent about the *Skiritai* in the Lacedaemonian army. From that point only mercenaries were used by the Spartans as light auxiliaries.

The available source material concerning particular types of armed forces and the resulting length disparity between the chapters of my dissertation is significant, clearly indicating the auxiliary nature of cavalry and light infantry. The Lacedaemonians paid great attention to hoplites in their army; their own cavalry remained very average, while light units were really non-existent.

In my dissertation I tried to reconsider some key issues concerning the organisation of the Lacedaemonian army, illustrating them with source examples

connected to the reign of Agesilaos. My aim was to gather the data on the heavy infantry, as well as the cavalry and the light infantry, as both auxiliary formations have been quite often completely ignored or overlooked by scholars. The detailed results of the analysis concern specific subchapters, but there seems to be a general conclusion resulting from the whole work: It is the inclusion rather than the exclusion of possibilities that seems more appealing to me. *Perioikoi* possibly could have provided both separate contingents and could have also been included in citizen units (*morai)*, together with *hypomeiones* and *Spartiatai*. *Skiritai* could have formed both hoplite units and lightly armed detachments of skirmishers. The Spartan cavalry was not necessarily composed of just a particular lower class of Spartan society, but could rather have been a mix of many. In these and many other cases, the inclusion and combination of explanations actually better fits our diverging sources than preferring one option to another and disregarding some accounts which we have.

University of Wrocław

Eos CVI 2019
ISSN 0012-7825

PRIESTS AND SUPPORT TEMPLE STAFF IN THE FAYUM OASIS IN THE PTOLEMAIC PERIOD*

by

JOANNA WILIMOWSKA

In antiquity, religion was an essential sphere of human life. Over the years it has therefore been of great interest to historians. The majority of publications devoted to religion in ancient Egypt are focused primarily on myths, beliefs, cult, and especially on funerary rituals and mummies (of both men and animals) that were discovered *en masse* during archaeological excavations. Additionally, there is particular interest in the art and architecture of the greatest and most impressive monuments of ancient Egypt such as the Great Pyramids at Giza, the necropolis complex at Thebes and famous sanctuaries of Medinet Habu, Abu Simbel, Karnak and Luxor, and so forth[1]. However, among the most significant works on religious life in ancient Egypt, there is a lack of up-to-date and

---

* This paper is a summary of a PhD dissertation accomplished and financed (especially in its final stage) within the doctoral scholarship Etiuda 5 of the Polish National Science Centre (NCN, project no. 2017/24/T/HS3/00206). The dissertation was supervised by Professor Krzysztof Nawotka and Doctor Agnieszka Wojciechowska and defended at the Department of History, University of Wrocław, on 18th June 2019. It was reviewed by Professor Tomasz Derda (University of Warsaw) and Professor Danuta Musiał (Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń).

[1] It is sufficient to mention several relatively recent works, e.g. F. Kampp, *Die thebanische Nekropole: zum Wandel des Grabgedankens von der XVIII. bis zur XX. Dynastie*, Mainz 1996; D. Arnold, *Temples of the Last Pharaohs*, New York–Oxford 1999; R.H. Wilkinson, *The Complete Temples of Ancient Egypt*, New York 2000; N. Kanawati, *The Tomb and Beyond: Burial Customs of Ancient Egyptian Officials*, Warminster 2001; R.A. David, *Religion and Magic in Ancient Egypt*, London–New York 2002; R.A. David (ed.), *Egyptian Mummies and Modern Science*, Cambridge 2008; A. Dodson, *The Pyramids of Ancient Egypt*, London 2003; F. Dunand, Ch. Zivie-Coche, *Gods and Men in Egypt 3000 BC to 395 CE*, transl. by D. Lorton, Ithaca–London 2004; M. van de Mieroop, *The Eastern Mediterranean in the Age of Ramesses II*, Malden, MA–Oxford 2007; A. Dodson, S. Ikram, *The Tomb in Ancient Egypt. Royal and Private Sepulchres from the Early Dynastic Period to the Romans*, London 2008; C. Graves-Brown, *Dancer for Hathor. Women in Ancient Egypt*, London 2010; S. Snape, *Ancient Egyptian Tombs: The Culture of Life and Death*, Malden, MA–Oxford 2011; S. Ikram, *Death and Burial in Ancient Egypt*, New York 2015.

comprehensive studies devoted to the activity of temples and temple personnel and this dissertation aims to fill this gap in the research on Egyptian religion.

Priests were one of the most important groups in ancient Egyptian society and a close investigation of temple personnel is essential for the study of ancient Egyptian history, society, and culture. They were responsible for performing religious rituals, but they also played a pivotal political, social, and economic role within the Egyptian State. In the face of social and political changes in Egypt, temples and their functionaries invariably acted as wardens of old traditions and customs. Over the centuries, priests continued to perform sacred rituals, guard knowledge, and cultivate old customs. Thanks to them native Egyptian religion, beliefs, culture and even scripts, such as the sacred hieroglyphs, were able to survive through the centuries.

The most important work devoted to priests and temples in Hellenistic Egypt was published by Walter OTTO at the beginning of 20th century: volume 1 in 1905 and volume 2 in 1908[2]. This work constituted an extended version of OTTO's dissertation, defended in 1904 at the Königliche Universität zu Breslau – Universitas litterarum Vratislaviensis in Wrocław. Although the aforementioned publication is considered as a fundamental study concerning priests and temples in the Hellenistic period, the considerable number of papyrological documents published during the past century made OTTO's work outdated. Therefore, the dissertation entitled *Priests and Support Temple Staff in the Fayum Oasis in the Ptolemaic Period* may be seen as a continuation of the research undertaken by OTTO over a century ago.

The scope of this thesis has been limited to the Fayum Oasis under the Ptolemies for two main reasons: (a) the significance of this area in the Ptolemaic monarchy, and (b) a uniquely rich source basis that originated from this region. In the Ptolemaic period, the Fayum was a principal centre of Greek and Macedonian settlement. The first immigrants that were brought to the area were military settlers, and in the mid-third century BC they constituted the majority of newcomers in the Fayum[3]. The process of settlement probably began under Ptolemy I Soter, but the evidence for this period remains obscure. Documented phases of the Ptolemaic settlement took place in the second half of the third century BC and in the second century BC[4]. Remarkably, the Fayum was intensively developed in the Ptolemaic period. The Ptolemies exploited the natural potential of this region: a favourable environment, good irrigation, and fertile

---

[2] W. OTTO, *Priester und Tempel im Hellenistischen Ägypten*, vols. I–II, Leipzig–Berlin 1905–1908.

[3] R.S. BAGNALL, *The Origin of Ptolemaic Cleruchs*, BASP XXI 1984, p. 10.

[4] J.G. MANNING, *Land and Power in Ptolemaic Egypt. The Structure of Land Tenure*, Cambridge 2003, p. 108; K. MUELLER, *Settlement of the Ptolemies. City Foundation and New Settlement in the Hellenistic World*, Leuven 2006, p. 149.

soils. Rulers of the new dynasty undertook a large-scale irrigation project that consisted in improving drainage and irrigations system, building up a network of canals, and constructing new dykes. Consequently, previously uncultivated parts of the region were transformed into arable land, which led to a significant extension of the land under cultivation in the Fayum[5]. This impressive reclamation project, carried out primarily by Ptolemy II Philadelphus and Ptolemy III Euergetes, led to an increase in agricultural production, making the Fayum a significant and wealthy region within the Ptolemaic monarchy. Therefore, apart from military veterans, people seeking new economic opportunities offered by the region also came to the Fayum. Newcomers brought their own culture and religion, facilitating the investigation of the activity of priests engaged in different cults and beliefs; for example, material collected from the Ptolemaic Fayum provides us with information about the personnel engaged in the native Egyptian religion, Greek and Asian cults, and Jewish synagogues.

The unique character of the Fayum has been determined also by its extraordinarily rich source material. The most idiosyncratic sources for Egypt are papyri and ostraca which (with several exceptions) were not preserved outside Egypt. It is estimated that approximately 30% (19,232 documents out of 65,130) of all surviving papyri and ostraca found in Egypt originates from the Fayum area and the majority of these documents (ca. 16,396) are dated to the Graeco-Roman period (332 BC–AD 395)[6]. At least 5,682 papyri are dated to the Hellenistic period, which makes the Fayum the best-documented region in Egypt under the Ptolemies, while other significant places in Egypt are less well represented by the source material. For comparison, the damper costal climate meant that only 252 papyri dated to the Ptolemaic period have survived from the capital city, Alexandria.

Another important feature of the source material from the Fayum is its variety and the fact that it consists of different types and categories of evidence. Although epigraphic material from the Fayum region is significantly less numerous than papyrological evidence, inscriptions served as another source of information for this study[7]. Papyri and inscriptions constitute the primary types

---

[5] D. Rathbone, *Villages, Land and Population in Graeco-Roman Egypt*, PCPhS XXVI 1990, pp. 110–115; D.J. Thompson, *Irrigation and Drainage in the Early Ptolemaic Fayyum*, in: A.K. Bowman, E. Rogan (eds.), *Agriculture in Egypt: From Pharaonic to Modern Times*, Oxford 1999 (Proceedings of the British Academy 96), p. 109.

[6] All the data that refer to a number of documents is based on the Trismegistos database, www.trismegistos.org (accessed in June 2019); see M. Depauw, T. Gheldof, *Trismegistos. An Interdisciplinary Platform for Ancient World Texts and Related Information*, in: Ł. Bolikowski *et al*. (eds.), *Theory and Practice of Digital Libraries – TPDL 2013 Selected Workshops*, Cham 2014, pp. 40–52.

[7] The total number of inscriptions from the Fayum is 747, and they are dated between 2000 BC and AD 800.

of evidence for this research and together they amount to a minimum of 7,863 texts that have been analysed within the thesis. Additionally, papyrological and epigraphic texts that provide us with information about the activity of temple personnel are written in Greek and in Demotic and (to a lesser degree) there are hieroglyphic scripts in the Egyptian language. The Fayum under the Ptolemies was strongly influenced by Greek speaking people; therefore the majority of the texts from the Fayum are written in Greek (around 7,056 texts), while "only" 901 texts have been preserved in Demotic script. This unequal distribution of Greek and Egyptian material is due to the fact that official documents generated by the Ptolemaic bureaucracy were written primarily in Greek. Consequently, much more texts in the Ptolemaic Fayum were produced in Greek than in Egyptian. Additionally, Greek is more commonly known among modern scholars and in general Greek is considered easier to learn than Egyptian and its scripts. For this reason, over the past decades scholars have edited and published mostly Greek documents, which has resulted in the disproportion between the number of Greek and Egyptian texts available for research. Hence, scholars of antiquity have at their disposal a considerably greater number of texts inscribed in Greek than in Egyptian scripts.

On the other hand, the number of documents given above includes mostly texts that have been already published[8]. Many Greek and Egyptian documents are still waiting to be read and edited. The number of newly published or re-edited Demotic texts in particular has gradually increased in the past few decades, a fact related to the development of Demotic studies. To date, due to the wider availability of Greek texts, many older publications concerning the activity of temples and their personnel in ancient Egypt were based for the most part on Greek sources, showing the Greek perspective on how the temples functioned. For research on temple personnel, it is crucial to include Demotic texts, which enable us to also consider the Egyptian point of view. As has been already noted, Greek was used primarily by lay bureaucracy and Greek papyri concerning priests and temple workers primarily provide information about relations between temples and the government. Demotic papyri that provide us with information about temple functionaries were inscribed mostly by or for temple personnel; for example the archive of the temple at Soknopaiou Nesos and the archive of the Hawara undertakers[9]. Based on Demotic documents, it is possible to identify the original

[8] The Trismegistos database also occasionally includes unpublished texts.

[9] Demotic texts from the temple archive at Soknopaiou Nesos: *P.Oxf.Griffith* 1–75; some Greek texts from this archive were published in *P.Amh.Gr*. 2. Documents of the undertakers archive at Hawara were published primarily in *P.Ashm*., *P.Chic.Haw*., *P.Hawara*. Papyri and ostraca editions in this paper are abbreviated according to J.F. Oates *et al*. (eds.), *Checklist of Editions of Greek, Latin, Demotic and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets*, http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/texts/clist.html, accessed on 10th May 2018. For a comprehensive description of the archive of the Hawara undertakers, see I. Uytterhoeven, *Hawara in the Graeco-Roman Period.*

Egyptian titles of priestly functions and categories of temple workers. Moreover, Demotic texts provide us with crucial information about the functioning and organisation of the temples, as well as about many aspects of priestly life; in addition, they show the temple hierarchy and, finally, they provide information about the property of priests.

The significant development of Demotic studies which has been taking place over the past few decades has triggered a gradual growth in the number of publications of Demotic texts. Demotic documents have contributed to broadening the range of knowledge about the organisation and activity of temple personnel and specific functions carried out in the sacred space. Temple functionaries that have been investigated in this research were engaged primarily in cults of the native Egyptian deities such as Sobek, Osiris, Isis, Anubis and Bastet. Remarkably, the majority of titles and functions analysed in this dissertation are known from Demotic texts. The great significance of Demotic material is also reflected by the fact that without Demotic texts it would not be possible to explore the activity of workers engaged in the funerary business because almost all functions linked to the funerary cult in the Fayum area are mentioned only in Demotic texts.

This research also involves other types of evidence, mainly narrative sources and archaeological findings, that serve as a support for the information provided by papyrological and epigraphic material. Although the works of ancient historians – Herodotus, Strabo and Diodorus of Sicily – offer primarily a non-Egyptian point of view, they nevertheless present a general description of the native Egyptian religion, its beliefs, tradition, sacred rituals and the daily habits of the priesthood. Finally, archaeological material has occasionally been used in this study in order to get the full picture of temple workers in the Ptolemaic Fayum. This study refers to information concerning temples, which may shed light on temple organisation and especially on the location and appearance of temple buildings, objects in everyday use, sculptures, statues and reliefs.

All types of sources used in this research: papyri, inscriptions, narrative texts, and archaeological findings, provide us with different information as well as complementing one another, thus shedding light on various aspects of temple organisation. More significantly, thanks to the variety and abundance of sources in the Fayum, it was possible to identify many priestly titles and the functions performed in temples belonging to different cults and beliefs. Undeniably, the source material of the Fayum is exceptionally unique and evidence from outside the Fayum is not as varied and numerous as the material that comes from this area. Sources that originate from other regions of Egypt usually provide us with information that is restricted to a single priestly group and category of temple workers, and they mostly give us details related to the organisation of a single sanctuary.

Life and Death in a Fayum Village, Leuven 2009 (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 174), pp. 259–265, 330–358, 822–901.

While most publications concerning temples and priests in Egypt are devoted mainly to the cults and beliefs of the ancient Egyptian religion, this dissertation had other goals to achieve. It aimed to explore the activity of temple personnel, focusing primarily on the non-religious aspects of temple life. Extant sources mostly of an official nature, such as population registers, tax records and all sorts of agreements, official notes and petitions, allowed for an investigation of the social and economic role of temple functionaries within the society and the state. Hence, this dissertation explores both the non-religious functions fulfilled in temples by priests who simultaneously performed sacred rituals, and lay functions carried out by them outside temples, which were not related to their regular religious duties and their activity in the temple. As evidence shows, agricultural production constituted an additional source of income for temple workers. Priests whose main task was to perform cult rituals in temples, were sometimes also involved in the cultivation of temple land, which constituted a part of their regular duties. They also leased and farmed royal land, which provided them with an additional source of income[10]. Moreover, documents from the Ptolemaic Fayum attest that priests also acted on behalf of the royal administration by controlling the temple finances in the region. For example, texts from the temple archive at Soknopaiou Nesos mention a prophet of Bastet who probably carried out religious duties and at the same time was in charge of the financial condition of temples in the Fayum area[11]. Finally, the most prominent priests in the Fayumic temples are attested as members of the army, for example a certain prophet of Sobek named Apollonios, son of Hermias, who was also a cavalryman[12]. The presence of priests in the Ptolemaic army was related to the Ptolemaic strategy aimed at integrating society on the one hand by recruiting new soldiers from the priesthood, and, on the other, granting priestly offices to Greek soldiers[13].

The major goal of this dissertation was also to collect all the functions and titles of temple functionaries attested in Greek and Demotic sources. As evidence shows, temples employed an army of functionaries who carried out various functions and duties. Among them it is possible to distinguish priests who served a deity by performing the most crucial religious functions, minor priests who fulfilled subsidiary religious functions (usually on a part time basis), and lay workers such as artisans who were not related to the cult. Sources from the Ptolemaic Fayum attest a minimum of 64 different titles used to describe temple functions, out of which 35 are preserved in Demotic texts, while 29 come from

---

[10] For priests as land cultivators, see for example *P.Amh.Gr* II 35 = *Chrest.Wilck*. 68 = *Sel. Pap.* II 274 (132 BC), or *P.Tebt*. I 62 (119–118 BC).

[11] *P.Oxf.Griffith* I 39 (156 BC).

[12] *P.Berlin Dem*. 13683 (146 BC).

[13] This phenomenon has been investigated by Ch. Fischer-Bovet, *Army and Society in Ptolemaic Egypt*, New York 2014, pp. 303–328.

Greek documents. It was possible to indicate a Greek equivalent of a Demotic title in ten cases. For example, the Greek title θεαγός corresponds to the Demotic *tꜢy ntr.w*, and both titles were used to designate a temple official who was in charge of carrying an image of a god during religious festivals and processions.

This dissertation consists of six chapters. In the first two, a broader context for the subject under discussion is provided. The first chapter entitled "The Fayum and Its Sources" gives a brief overview of the Fayum oasis, its natural conditions and its history, with a particular focus on this area under the Ptolemies. More significantly, in the second part of the chapter evidence is presented relating to temple personnel, their functions and activities in the Fayum. The second chapter, "Temples under the Ptolemies", offers an insight into the condition of temples in the Ptolemaic period, with particular emphasis on places of cult in the Fayum area. In this chapter the main aspects of the political and socio-economic role within the society and the state are presented along with crucial spheres of non-religious activities undertaken by sanctuaries, such as agriculture and animal husbandry, trade and craft. Moreover, it briefly considers the role of temples as places of learning and local courts.

The occupations of temple officials have been divided into four categories in this study: (a) clergy and higher ranking temple personnel, (b) subaltern temple staff, (c) workers of the animal cult, and (d) undertakers. The next four chapters constitute the main part of the dissertation and the content of subsequent chapters corresponds to the aforementioned priestly categories. The third chapter "The Clergy and the Higher Rank Temple Staff" explores the activity of temple officials who fulfilled the most significant religious duties. This chapter considers the priest who was in charge of the daily rituals performed in the inner sanctuary of the temple, such as the prophet and the *wꜤb*-priest. Additionally, priests who held high administrative offices in temples are included in this chapter, for example the *lesonis*, the sacred scribe and the *epistates*.

The fourth chapter, „Subaltern Temple Personnel", is devoted to the temple support staff and considers minor priests involved in religious rituals and lay workers as well as people whose position within the sanctuaries was uncertain. Among the priests who fulfilled a subsidiary role during sacred rituals, it was possible to distinguish dancers, singers and various attendants at religious ceremonies, such as *pastophoroi*, bearers of the gods, and so forth. These functionaries were usually not allowed to enter the inner sanctuary of the temple, and they often performed their duties only temporarily during temple festivals and processions, for example priests whose main task was to carry images of the gods or shrines or priests who waved palm-fronds. However, as this study shows, for example *pastophoroi* or *isionomoi*, who nominally belonged to the cultic personnel, were frequently also engaged in non-religious activities in the temple and presumably carried out the role of temple caretakers or custodians. Additionally, this chapter investigates temple occupations that were not directly related to religious

activities, such as builders, potters, bakers, sculptors, and so forth. Finally, this chapter also discusses religious titles whose relation to temples and cults were unclear, trying to reveal the real character of these functions. It explores the role of people who are described in documents by the Greek term ἱερόδουλος, which probably corresponds to the Demotic title of *b3k* of a god, with both of these terms being translated as a "servant" or "slave of a god". However, as evidence from the Fayum and recent research show, these people were not employed in temples and it is highly probable that they acted as volunteers.

The next two chapters comprise functions related to specific aspects of the native Egyptian religion. The cult of sacred animals such as crocodiles, ibises, falcons, scarabs, cats, dogs, baboons, and so forth, flourished, especially in the Graeco-Roman period. Selected individual specimens, for example the Apis bull and the sacred crocodiles in the Fayumic temples, were often worshipped in sanctuaries; they took part in religious rituals and most of them were considered as the living incarnation of a deity. Additionally, sacred animals were bred in special temples and after their death (which was usually violent), were embalmed by the relevant personnel, after which the animal mummies were sold to believers and served them as votive offerings. Hence, the fifth chapter aims to explore workers engaged in the animal cult, who can by divided into two main groups according to the duties they performed. The first group comprised functionaries responsible for keeping animals alive (primarily by providing them with food), while the second group consisted of people who were in charge of animals after their death, which practically meant that their basic task was to carry out the mummification process and interment.

The cult of the dead was the most idiosyncratic aspect of ancient Egyptian religion. According to the ancient Egyptians, preserving the body after death was an essential condition for eternal life. Beliefs in the afterlife led to the development of the art of mummification practiced from the Predynastic period onwards. Complicated funerary rituals required an army of workers responsible for different phases of preparing the deceased for life in the next world. The sixth chapter of this dissertation entitled "The Undertakers and Other Funerary Priests" is devoted to embalmers and various funerary workers in the Fayum area. As evidence shows, the majority of them were attached to the great necropolis of the village of Hawara and only a few texts inform us about the activity of undertakers from outside this site. Generally, funerary workers occupied a low position among the priesthood and society, and, because they had contact with dead bodies, they were considered as unclean. For example, they lived outside villages and usually were not allowed to enter temples. On the other hand, because the funeral industry was a quite lucrative business, mortuary workers earned a large salary. Hence, although undertakers belonged to religious personnel of a lower rank, they were quite a wealthy group. Remarkably, they guarded their domains jealously, a fact which is reflected by a number of disputes that took place between

certain undertakers over their rights to perform mortuary practices and to derive income from this activity.

Finally, this dissertation includes two appendices. Appendix 1 is a catalogue of temple functionaries attested by Greek and Egyptian texts originating from the Ptolemaic Fayum and it constitutes the most essential element of this dissertation. The list comprises 636 records and involves both individuals and groups of temple workers whose titles and functions were mentioned by the sources. Appendix 2 is devoted to acts of benefaction toward temples in the Ptolemaic Fayum and is mostly based on my recently published article[14]. This appendix discusses the special character of euergetism in Graeco-Roman Egypt and explores the amount of financial support benefactors contributed to temples, which had a significant impact on the financial situation of temples and the priesthood. However, the chief aim of this appendix was to collect and present all attestations of acts of euergetism toward temples of various cults in the Fayum and, remarkably, it included texts that had not been taken into consideration by previous studies.

In conclusion, this dissertation provides a fresh perspective on the study of temples and priests in Ptolemaic Egypt. It took under consideration sources published relatively recently, as well as integrating and examining information given both by Greek and Demotic material, which offers a valuable insight into many aspects of temple life. This study, based on material coming from one of the most important regions of Egypt, opens a discussion on the socio-economic position of temple personnel.

University of Wrocław
joanna.wilimowska@gmail.com

[14] This appendix has already been published as a separate paper: J. Wilimowska, *Benefactions toward Temples in the Ptolemaic Fayum*, JARCE LIV 2018, pp. 103–118.

C E N S U R A E   L I B R O R U M

Eos CVI 2019
ISSN 0012-7825

THE CUP OF SONGS OR THE UNIVERSE OF SYMPOTIC POETRY

Vanessa Cazzato, Dirk Obbink, Enrico Emanuele Prodi (eds.), ***The Cup of Song. Studies on Poetry and the Symposion*****,** Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016, XVII, 329 pp., ISBN 978-0-19-968768-8, £88.00[1].

This handsomely produced volume is an handy appendix to the lively tradition of "sympotic studies", triggered by the pathbreaking conference organised in Oxford in 1984 by Oswyn Murray and subsequently published in 1990[2], a tradition recently solidified by several monographs and syntheses on the subject[3], and most conspicuously rounded off, in 2018, by Murray's long awaited collection of *Essays on Greek Pleasure, 1983–2017*[4]. This last book was edited by Vanessa Cazzato, the *spiritus movens* of the collection of papers under review here and of its underlying conference, also held in Oxford, in 2011. Although *The Cup of Songs*, with very few exceptions, is more about sympotic poetry (broadly speaking) and its "afterlife" than about the symposion itself, it is nevertheless so rich that it is fair to say that "sympotic studies" have thus come full circle.

Unlike traditional introductions to collective volumes, Vanessa Cazzato and Enrico Emanuele Prodi ("Introduction: Continuity in the Sympotic Tradition"; pp. 1–16) offer a self-standing and very important paper on formal, intellectual, and performative continuities in sympotic discourse. It begins with the earliest convivial songs inscribed on early archaic Greek vessels, i.e. "from the earliest utterances and gestures and inscriptions through poetry and then onto [literary] criticism", to culminate in Poseidippus' erudite epigram (140 Austin–Bastianini = 9 Gow–Page) filling the poet's cup with metaphorical draughts of songs of his predecessors. Cazzato and Prodi repeat this very gesture, as they put it, by passing their "cup of songs", stemming from "a long and rich tradition of sympotic scholarship", to the reader (p. 16).

The collection duly begins with Oswyn Murray's essay (Chapter 1; pp. 17–27) on "The Symposion between East and West", which sets the symposion in the context of Mediterranean cultural history rather than that of Greek history, while reflecting on his own original characterisation of the symposion and elegantly reassessing developments in "sympotic studies" since the aforementioned Oxford conference of 1984[5]. One of the crucial points here is the question of the "origins of the practices of the symposion" (p. 18) and what is at stake in all such discussions is the issue of the extent of Near Eastern influences on archaic Greek drinking customs. Theoretically,

---

[1] The author apologises for the lateness of this review.

[2] O. Murray (ed.), *Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposion*, Oxford 1990.

[3] M.L. Catoni, *Bere vino puro: Immagini del simposio*, Milano 2010; K. Lynch, *The Symposium in Context: Pottery from a Late Archaic House Near the Classical Agora*, Princeton, N.J. 2011 (Hesperia Suppl. 46); K. Topper, *The Imagery of the Athenian Symposium*, Cambridge 2012; F. Hobden, *The Symposium in Ancient Greek Society and Thought*, Cambridge 2013; M. Węcowski, *The Rise of the Greek Aristocratic Banquet*, Oxford 2014. Cf. also W. Filser, *Die Elite Athens auf der attischen Luxuskeramik*, Berlin 2017.

[4] O. Murray, *The Symposion: Drinking Greek Style. Essays on Greek Pleasure 1983–2017*, ed. by V. Cazzato, Oxford 2018.

[5] This paper, originally delivered in 2009, is also reprinted in Murray, *The Symposion...* (n. 4), pp. 77–88.

to establish this it would be enough to uncover conceivable archaeological or pictorial material to this effect. For Murray, the fundamental aspect, indeed the yardstick, of the (hypothetical) Near Eastern borrowing here would be the well-attested Levantine custom of reclining while banqueting. To put it coarsely perhaps, the problem would have been solved had we been able to identify it securely attested in an Aegean context early enough. However, this is not possible before the late seventh century BC, when the iconography of several Corinthian kraters and explicit literary references to the symposion in a poem by Alcman provide unambiguous evidence of reclining. True, Murray himself recognised the earliest attested proof of the existence of the symposion more than a century earlier, in a convivial epigram inscribed on a Late Geometric cup from Pithekoussai outside the Bay of Naples (the so-called "Cup of Nestor"), the poem he ingenuously interpreted "as the first clear evidence of a culture centred on the pursuit of the pleasures of the symposion". However, his arguments (first formulated in 1994) that the inscription also attests to "the practice of reclining at the feast" are less persuasive (p. 20). Therefore, the problem becomes a thorny and multifaceted methodological challenge, involving, as Murray shows well, such fundamentally debated issues as the "historicity" of the "Homeric world" – in order to be able to contrast its modes of élite conviviality in their social context with later historical developments in the Aegean (and beyond).

Murray's study takes into account more recent developments, such as the spectacular discovery of a large number of late-eighth- and seventh-century convivial graffiti in a Euboean settlement in Methone Pierias (one of them, once again, poetic), found alongside numerous transport amphorae, some of which were also inscribed. This new evidence seems to strengthen Murray's old theory of the "Euboean connection" in long distance trade but also in cultural connectivity between East and West, in this case also featuring the Greek influence on the luxurious life-style of the Etruscan élites, including that of their new customs of wine-drinking. Later in this chapter, Murray discusses the fate of the Greek iconographical motif – not doubt originating in the Near East – featuring a reclining banqueter and later groups of reclining diners, as well as scholarly hypotheses about the date and conceivable place of its adoption by the Greeks. Unlike scholars who would look for the origins in Crete, where Phoenician influences were strongly felt, Murray would prefer to emphasise the importance of the Greek settlements in the West. In the final step of his argument in this chapter, he brings the symposion "into connection with the group-drinking practice that seems to lie behind the word *marzeah*, as it appears in Near Eastern texts from the third millennium BC to the sixth century AD" (p. 24). One famous text (hypothetically) suggestive of such a connection is a passage from the Biblical prophet Amos (6, 4–7). To conclude, O. Murray adduced a spectacular North-Syrian seal-stone of the so-called "Lyre-Player Group" excavated at Monte Vetrano and published in 2009. Its iconography is packed with elements of Levantine drinking culture, alluding to music, dance and wine-consumption (if the drink drawn from a racked amphora using long straws indeed represents wine). Now, as one of the characters depicted here may be a reclining figure (but may equally be a fallen or even a dead person as well), Murray takes it as a representation of the *marzeah*. "Quite what local Greeks and indigenous peoples made of these images is obscure, but they were clearly popular. Nevertheless, the seal-stone from Monte Vetrano surely offers the most explicit example of a link between Near Eastern and Greek drinking customs, showing that the first Western Greeks were indeed aware of eastern styles of group drinking" (p. 27).

Ewen Bowie's paper (Chapter 2: "*Quo usque tandem...?* How Long Were Sympotic Songs?"; pp. 28–41) belongs to a series of extremely helpful chapters in this book that explore fundamental problems concerning the actual poetic performances at archaic and classical symposia. I am confident that it will serve henceforth as an invaluable reference work for future scholarship. The general idea is to assess "how long an individual's performance at a symposion might be expected (or allowed?) to last" (p. 30). Understandably, one important qualification here is that in fact "some symposia may have been more hospitable than others to melic and elegiac song" (p. 31). Additionally, for melic performances, Bowie rightly assumes rather different expectations of the

audiences in public *agones*, on the one hand, and at symposia, on the other. The audience's tolerance for a more repetitive metric (and so musical) pattern of elegy must also be taken into account, as must that of iambic performances, of which we are incomparably worse informed. After careful examination, it appears that performances of sympotic melic poetry most probably did not exceed ca. fifty lines, while that of elegiac poetry might usually reach ca. forty lines (conceivably also as long as 76 or even 100 lines in Solon); performances in iambic trimeters and perhaps also in tetrameters extended to over 100 lines, whereas in epodes one cannot reasonably go beyond sixty lines (p. 36). BOWIE also refers his reader to the evidence of Plato's and Xenophon's sympotic speeches in their respective *Banquets* and compares their word-length with Pindar's and Bacchylides' epinicians. All in all, there seems to have been a rather big disparity in length between various poems performed at symposia. While the two-liner could have been standard for a melic and an elegiac performance, particularly eminent guests may of course have been given more space, more time, and more tolerance. Nevertheless, the aforementioned line-numbers for melic, elegiac, and iambic performances seem to hold, whereas some epinicians and dithyrambs might have been a little longer when performed, or reperformed, at symposia. BOWIE's paper concludes with an appendix (p. 40 f.) that conveniently lists word-counts of the sympotic speeches in Plato, Xenophon, and some archaic and early classical poems conceivably performed in the context of a symposion.

Now, if one was to add to BOWIE's argument the relatively solid evidence for rules precluding monopolising sympotic entertainment by individual performers as well as that of the technical contrivances supposed to ensure the "performative equality", so to say, of the diners (including the rule of doing things *epidexia*, "to the right"), the overall picture one gets is that of a fairly flexible performative occasion. On the one hand, it must have been in constant danger of being dominated by more ambitious or more skilled performers, on the other, the space given to such participants must have ultimately been determined by the common consent of the diners and to some extent by the arbitrary decision of the symposiarch. One can only imagine the resulting social interplay at such gatherings, in particular in relation to the growing level of intoxication in the potential performers and their potential public.

Gauthier LIBERMAN's "Some Thoughts on the Symposiastic Catena, *Aisakos*, and *Skolia*" (Chapter 3; pp. 42–62) is a dense and erudite paper dealing with "the phenomenon of connecting several units in a sequence within a sympotic performance" (p. 42). As such, it touches upon the highly debated issue of the etymology, the origin, and the function of the *skolion*. When studying the nature and the hypothetical origin of the word *aisakos*, the technical term for the myrtle (or perhaps laurel?) branch circulating among the symposiasts singing *skolia*, LIBERMAN refers the reader to the famous lines by Pindar (fr. 125 SNELL–MAEHLER). Commenting on this fragment, he argues that "Pindar seems to have credited Terpander not only with inventing the *barbitos*, but also with inventing the *skolia*" (p. 48). Although a Near Eastern (Phrygian or perhaps middle-Persian) etymology of *barbitos*, well established in classical scholarship, and perhaps also of *aisakos* (as posited by LIBERMAN) may be suggestive of the origins of the two important elements of the Greek symposion being Near Eastern, it is much more difficult, as the author himself concedes, "to draw a coherent picture including all three items [i.e. *aisakos*, *barbitos*, and *skolion* – M.W.] in a Near Eastern symposiastic context, whether profane or sacred" (p. 51). In his interpretation of *skolion*, LIBERMAN questions not only its famous "zigzag etymology" based, to put it briefly, on Dicaearchus (fr. 88 WEHRLI) and Aristoxenus (fr. 125 WEHRLI), but also other and metaphorical scholarly interpretations of this type of song based on its connection with the adjective *skolios*. And although he cannot deny that, unlike *dithyrambos*, *iambos*, *ithymbos*, or *thriambos*, *skolion* "is prima facie a Greek word", LIBERMAN tentatively opts for "a 'semantic calque' of a Lydian word" or for the original interpretation of Lydian songs in Lydian symposia by the first Greeks who happened to hear them as "winding" "because of their melody or for some other reason" (all quotes on p. 59), which in due time would have given rise to the substantive *skolion*. The "zigzag interpretation" by Dicaearchus and Aristoxenus would be a late erudite attempt at coming to terms with this strange

term. The author himself is fully aware of the highly speculative nature of his hypothesis (p. 60). To conclude his paper, LIBERMAN returns to the symposiastic catena and tentatively suggests that Hellenistic and post-Hellenistic "architecture of a collection of shorter poems" might have had its predecessor in "the symposiastic catena which might create more or less improvised and transitory collections with a variety of links (subject, metre, verbal echoes...) between poetic units" (p. 60). This practice, hypothetically rooted in the symposiastic reperformance of archaic poets, might have given rise to the arrangement of the Alexandrian editions of Alcaeus and Sappho (p. 60–62).

Giovan Battista D'ALESSIO's paper "Bacchylides' Banquet Songs" (Chapter 4; pp. 63–84) goes beyond the promise of its title and deals in fact with both Bacchylides' and (briefly) Pindar's sympotic poems that did not fit easily within the category of the "victory odes" (thus completing to some extent L. ATHANASSAKI's paper in the same collection), with a special focus on Bacchylides' "Marpessa poem" (fr. 20A MAEHLER). Its "unexplained 'non-Doric' veneer" (p. 67) and possible connections with Archilochus' attacks against Lycambes and his daughters have already been emphasised by B. SNELL, with later scholars additionally pointing to its similarities with Anacreon and Alcaeus. All in all, this song would be a perfect candidate for inclusion in a book of sympotic poems (*skolia*? or *paroinia*? or perhaps *erotika*?). Several other poems by Bacchylides also seem to present some "Anacreontic" characteristics, such as fr. 17 MAEHLER, featuring a courtesan playing *kottabos*. Interestingly, it is argued, here and in other fragments of Bacchylides' convivial poetry, we find clearly non-Doric dialectal forms pointing to no less than "a predominantly *Attic* dialect" (p. 77). All this might have been due to the fates of transmission of these fragments, but D'ALESSIO ingeniously observes that some papyri offer Bacchylides' "Dorising" "praise poems" side by side with "Atticising" songs "dealing with mocking themes typical of the symposion, love and luxury" (p. 80 f.). (Incidentally, the formal and thematic range of Bacchylides' convivial poetry seems wider than that of Pindar.) Furthermore, some songs such as the "Marpessa poem" seem to combine the "Doric" and the "Atticising" traditions, so D'ALESSIO suggests that they were designed for the Athenian milieu where, he argues, the influence of Anacreontic banquet songs was strongly felt. "If more of these texts had been preserved, it would have been interesting to observe how topoi and paradigms of the archaic *hetaireiai* were appropriated and modified in the contested field of early democratic Athens" (p. 84).

The starting point for Lucia ATHANASSAKI (Chapter 5: "The Symposion as Theme and Performance Context in Pindar's Epinicians"; pp. 85–112) is the widespread idea of "a close relationship between sympotic imagery and performance context" and so the hypothesis according to which sympotic imagery in a given poem by Pindar would be indicative of its "composition for a sympotic première", with differing scholarly views "on the nature of the sympotic celebration that hosts epinician performance" (p. 86). Were such celebrations just small élite gatherings or "big public events indoors or outdoors"? It must be said that this debate is of course deeply rooted in a more general controversy about the validity of discerning "public" and "private" celebrations, including feasts and banquets, as occasions for poetic performances. Whereas some scholars would argue that in truly lavish circumstances, such as epinician feasts at Olympia (cf., famously, Ps.-And. IV 30 f. and Plutarch, *Alc.* 11 f.), this difference was actually collapsed, others, including the author herself, would still take this distinction as valid, without denying "the permeability of the boundary between symposion and public festival". For ATHANASSAKI, this distinction is also "a useful hermeneutical tool for the study of the political agenda, the ideological apparatus, and the emotional impact of Pindar's representations of performance settings" (all quotations on p. 87).

Before discussing ATHANASSAKI's subtle argument in this paper, let me add yet another qualification or one additional complication here. In Greek sanctuaries, the aforementioned distinction was neither "collapsed" nor "permeable", but solid enough. Nevertheless, the question still holds if one tries to visualise such sanctuaries as performance contexts of archaic and early classical Greek poetry. Namely, I would argue that in many Greek sanctuaries (be they local, "poliadic", regional or Panhellenic) after the main or public section of the festival (be it a sacrificial feast,

a sumptuous "epinician feast", public performances such as choral songs etc.) members of élite circles attending usually withdrew to more secluded venues (permanent *hestiatoria* or improvised tents, huts etc.) to hold their symposia in private. This is to say that ideally each public occasion featuring poetic performances would be combined with private banquets at which sympotic poetry would be performed. Occasionally, but perhaps often enough, songs by the same renowned poets, or even the very same poems (or at least excerpts from the same songs) might then be performed, or reperformed, side by side. Hypothetically, the ensuing social and performative dynamics would be extremely difficult to assess, but ought to be borne in mind when tackling the set of problems discussed in this paper. "[T]he permeability of the boundary between symposion and public festival (and vice versa)" (p. 112) as studied by Athanassaki was then a fact of life deeply rooted in the social practices accompanying Greek public rituals.

In her paper, Athanassaki studies both epinician sympotic metaphors and similes and representations of the *deipnon* and of the symposion "as performance and/or entertainment venues" based on two criteria: "the identity and political status of the honorand" and the nature of the envisaged feasts or symposia (small private events or big public venues). Her conclusions are truly striking. First, "sympotic similes and metaphors are mainly found in songs for private citizens [...], whereas brief descriptions of symposia as entertainment or performance venues are mainly found in songs for tyrants, kings, and their circle [...]". Secondly, Pindar clearly "distinguishes between public festival [...] and elite symposion, which is represented as a tranquil, sophisticated, and, as a rule, indoor gathering around the table of the krater" and additionally "Pindar's depictions of the symposia of kings and tyrants" do not show particularly big or luxurious parties, contrary to what we would expect in reality (p. 87). And since the theme of symposion in Pindar "evokes a common, egalitarian, and emotionally reciprocal experience of various local elites", describing banquets of kings and tyrants in this manner consciously contradicted their public perception as "embattled, friendless, suspicious, fearful, and fearsome autocrats" (p. 88). This strategy was not only rewarding for Pindar's honorands, but, as Athanassaki puts it, was "potentially significant for the survival of Pindar's songs in the cradle of aristocratic lifestyle and song-diffusion, the elite symposion in and after his own time" (p. 112).

Guy Hedreen's paper (Chapter 6: "Smikros. Fictional Portrait of an Artist as a Symposiast by Euphronios"; pp. 113–139) deals with the vexing problem of the relationship between Euphronios and Smikros. (The latter's signatures can be found, or tentatively restored, on vases presenting remarkable stylistic similarities to the work of the former.) To resolve this celebrated aporia, after studying some striking formal characteristics of Smikros' signatures in their pictorial context, Hedreen suggests an interesting parallel. He argues that "the vase-painter Smikros belongs to the fictional realm of art and not to the real world of late archaic Athens" and that vases bearing his name "correspond closely, in genre, to forms of poetic discourse" that "fictionalize the persona of the poet or artist and showcase his originality through humour of an often self-mocking nature". And that such "forms of discourse" are "best known from the archaic poetry of Archilochos and Hipponax" (all quotes on p. 114). To put it simply, the role of Archilochos or even better that of Hipponax was assumed, in late archaic vase-painting as immersed in the playful world of the symposion, by the painter Euphronios.

It seems fair to say that this ingenious hypothesis was not born solely from the aforementioned scholarly conundrum and does not rely entirely on purely art-historical considerations. At least equally important, I dare to say, was a series of scholarly assumptions and generalisations pertaining to the realm of archaic Greek social history. Without being able to do justice to the ingenious formal analyses by Hedreen, let me briefly comment on them, although it must be said right away that his argument seems to suffer because of the not entirely convincing binary opposition between "documentary realism" and the "fictional genre" in his reading of Greek vase-painting. The underlying problem of a socio-historical nature is that Smikros (or "Smikros") is sometimes "portrayed" on vases as a character participating in élite symposia. This fact can be interpreted in two radically different manners. Some scholars would take it "as primary evidence of the possibility of upward

social mobility of Athenian potters in the late archaic period", when allegedly "they really did attend aristocratic symposia" (p. 116). Other scholars tend to "fictionalise" such images and inscribed names on Attic vases in one way or another – as HEDREEN does in his paper. The problem, however, is the need to define more precisely "aristocratic symposia" and simply the term "aristocracy" before one starts to argue, adducing pertinent Greek testimonia, for the low social esteem or "low assessment of the artist", or of "men skilled in *technē* or 'craft'" (p. 116), and so for the implausibility of the "scenarios" depicted on such vases. If, following HEDREEN, one was to rely on parallels drawn from archaic Greek poetry, incessant attacks on social arrivistes as unworthy of mingling with "good families" most certainly did not preclude such characters from participating in "élite symposia". And what if we decided to include successful Athenian potters in this very category? To illustrate the far-reaching consequences of this interpretive problem, it is enough to point out that HEDREEN's own hypothesis would logically favour this interpretation if we realise that his "genre" parallel here, the fictional personae of iambic Greek poets, is most certainly due to social insiders of élite symposia of the archaic period and was meaningful exactly as such when performed and reperformed in the playful atmosphere of a particular symposion by its participants.

Ralph M. ROSEN's chapter (Chapter 7: "Symposia and the Formation of Poetic Genre in Aristophanes' *Wasps*"; pp. 140–158), alongside that of L. ATHANASSAKI (see above), D. STEINER, and A. SENS (see below), is a remarkable witness to the importance of the symposion as a formal and intellectual "matrix" of other, often non-sympotic, literary genres in Greek antiquity. The main thesis of this paper runs as follows. "[T]he symposion played a critical role in the evolution of satirical genres" and "functioned as a kind of testing-ground for the limits of permissible speech, and helped calibrate the point at which socially transgressive discourse ceases to be comic" and thus it "helped to establish protocols of comedy for poetic genres that privileged satirical content, such as iambus or Old Comedy" (p. 141) in that it accommodated aggressive and intentionally malevolent things being uttered on stage with impunity. ROSEN argues that satirical poetry was comfortably at home at symposia, where freedom of speech was encouraged but also mitigated by the intoxicating effects of wine. The famous lines of Aristophanes' *Wasps* (1299–1325), Xanthias' narrative on Philocleon's participation at an élite symposion, wonderfully prove this point. What scholars usually take as the character's appalling behaviour, in ROSEN's interpretation proves to be no less than successful satirical performance analogous to the Sausage-seller's verbal sparring with Paphlagon in Aristophanes' *Knights* (cf. 338–481). And the immediate context of these lines in *Wasps* shows Aristophanes' awareness of the connection between the sympotic and the comic environment of such satirical utterances.

As with some other papers in this collection, Deborah T. STEINER's "Parting Shots. Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 1384–98 and Symposia in the Visual Repertoire" (Chapter 8; pp. 159–183) relies on possible methodological parallels between our interpretation of sympotic themes and images in archaic and classical poetry on the one hand, and the study of the sympotic imagery of Greek vase painting on the other. In this case, Clytemnestra's lines re-enacting the death of Agamemnon, with their "rapid-fire and complex sequence of images" (p. 160), are interpreted through sympotic lenses. STEINER argues that these lines "form a coherent whole [...] centred around the symposion", although Clytemnestra consciously distorts the sympotic practices alluded to. Finally, "the queen's introduction of sympotic tropes positions her in a sphere where [...] her presence signals the transgressions and reversals of social norms broadly explored in the drama" (all quotes on p. 160). In other words, in her straightforwardly sympotic and allegedly highly eroticised speech she positions herself not so much on the side of a sympotic prostitute, as one may expect at face value, but rather signals "(an impossible) female appropriation of leadership in the polis for which the symposion stands as metonym" (cf. p. 176). STEINER's novel and ingenious interpretation proves entirely persuasive, but although Agamemnon's and Clytemnestra's associations in Aeschylus with a hubristic and elitist politics, nay tyranny, seem clear, I am less convinced by the idea that "surrounding Agamemnon with sympotic motifs which had their heyday in the visual imagery of an earlier, less democratic age, the queen links Agamemnon with the hierarchical, reactionary, and

regressive politics which the trilogy's conclusion goes some way to replacing" (p. 182). This having been said, it is fair to admit that the ideological but also the purely formal transformation of the symposion in democratic Athens are still to be explored, whether we interpret them as a "democratisation of the symposion" or quite the contrary, as an "aristocratisation" of the Athenian demos and its new political élites after the reforms of Cleisthenes[6].

Among the well-known sympotic *jeux d'esprit* that contributed to the playfulness of archaic and classical symposia, the "symposion at sea" and the "symposion of satyrs" featured prominently. In her highly original paper (Chapter 9: "Symposia *en plein air* in Alcaeus and Others"; pp. 184–206), Vanessa CAZZATO studies one that she has freshly discovered, the "symposion *en plein air*". Like the aforementioned ones, this one too, she argues, is to be taken as "a kind of imaginative mental scenography which could inform the sympotic experience"; moreover, she asserts that "[o]nce we are aware of it, and of its implications, it can become a useful tool for interpreting sympotic poetry" (both quotations on p. 191). What CAZZATO has in mind is sympotic representations in pottery with diners reclining on the ground, sometimes surrounded by animals, such as birds, sheep or goats, and vegetation such as vines. Usually, the pictorial shortcut for this *jeu d'esprit* will be the absence of sympotic couches. Incidentally, symposia *en plein air* were famously interpreted by K. TOPPER as reflecting Athenian visions of Athens' "primitive past"[7], but CAZZATO, rightly I believe, does not subscribe to this idea. Instead, she suggests that this was "one of the many twists which could be given to representations of the symposion, and that the theme of outdoor symposion could be conjured up as an imaginative foil with which the user of the cup could compare his own manner of drinking" (p. 192). This understanding of the pictorial motif of painted pottery informs CAZZATO's refined reading of Alcaeus, whose surviving fragments astonishingly often evoke an outdoor setting or weather phenomena. Besides his famous contrivance likening the sympotic group to a ship endangered by a storm, he was also prepared to transform the symposion into an outdoor gathering (cf. fr. 347 VOIGT, often related by scholars to Hesiod's *Erga*, 582–596). In Alcaeus, we may also surmise an ironic contrast between this rustic scenography and the actual context of performance implied by the poet, i.e. the (élite) symposion. In sum, then, his "poetic expression of his reality [...] is not as direct" as often thought (especially since W. RÖSLER's seminal analyses in his *Dichter und Gruppe*[8]) and is "striking for its close weaving of the imaginative elements into the fabric of the sympotic 'here and now'" (p. 206)[9]. On a more general level, CAZZATO's interpretation is a sober reminder of the futility of efforts to straightforwardly translate both the pictorial and the poetic imagery of the symposion into conceivable social contexts of Greek conviviality. I for one would take it as one more argument against the more and more widespread scholarly idea of "non-aristocratic" or "popular" symposia in the archaic period[10].

Renaud GAGNÉ contributed to this volume with the paper entitled "The World in a Cup. Ekpomastics in and out of the Symposion" (Chapter 10: pp. 207–229). It is conceived as a counterpart of the "Lausanne and Paris schools" of reading "the semantic universe of the sympotic

---

[6] Cf., for the time being, M. WĘCOWSKI, *When Did the Symposion Die? On the Decline of the Greek Aristocratic Banquet*, in: F. VAN DEN EIJNDE *et al.* (eds.), *Feasting and Polis Institutions*. Leiden–Boston 2018, pp. 257–272.

[7] Cf. TOPPER, *op. cit*. (n. 3).

[8] W. RÖSLER, *Dichter und Gruppe: Eine Untersuchung zu den Bedingungen und zur historischen Funktion früher griechischer Lyrik am Beispiel Alkaios*, München 1980.

[9] One mildly striking element in CAZZATO's reading of Alcaeus is her slightly dismissive mention of Sappho, with whom Alcaeus is, allegedly, "unfairly" compared in this context (p. 206).

[10] Cf. e.g. D. YATROMANOLAKIS, *Symposia, Noses, Πρόσωπα: A Kylix in the Company of Banqueters on the Ground*, in: D. YATROMANOLAKIS (ed.), *An Archaeology of Representations: Ancient Greek Vase-Painting and Contemporary Methodologies*, Athens 2009, pp. 414–464.

image painted on the cup" (p. 229) when an analogous study is applied to the poetic text. GAGNÉ's subject here is "a metonymic symbol of the symposion in the symposion", where "the vessel functions as a uniquely self-reflective instrument of reference" in literature (p. 220). This is an extraordinarily rich and sophisticated paper studying "the range of semantic fields associated with the sympotic vessel in Greek poetry" (p. 208), thus laying the foundation for future work in this field of erudite scholarship, where both the diversity of sympotic vessels (their shapes and their names) and a "plurality of sympotic cultures" (regional and social diversities as well as "the diachronic diversity of historical change") can potentially undermine our study of "*the* symposion" (cf. p. 221). Nevertheless, GAGNÉ's reading of sympotic verse shows well that such a mental (and social) universe as *the* symposion did exist across the archaic and the classical periods, with its peculiar "rules of engagement" dominated by "the notions of participation, sharing and exchange, group, friendship, and their complementary opposite, transgression" and by such themes as "travel and passage through worlds; mixture, the combination of difference, and transformation" (p. 219). Therein, "[s]ympotic verse can establish direct links between the vessels of song and the vessels of the event" (p. 227) and thus, as in the famous fr. 5 W. of Archilochus, when singing about the shield abandoned on the battlefield while holding a cup in hand, "[t]he future [or the past – M.W.] of the narrative is met in the present of the enunciation" (p. 229).

In a way, Alexander SENS' paper (Chapter 11: "Party or Perish. Death, Wine, and Closure in Hellenistic Sympotic Epigram"; pp. 230–246) is a neat conclusion to this collection, adducing the literary motif likening the end of a party to the end of life and exploring the treatment of such themes in Hellenistic epigram. The typically sympotic opposition between the pleasures of drinking and the empty sadness of death is combined here with another poetic trope linking the symposion with poetic activity and artistic creativity as such. This set of poetic motifs and images, and archaic exhortations to drink resulting from them, are given brilliant twists in Callimachus, Asclepiades, Hedylus, anonymous Hellenistic poets, and even later in Antipater of Thessalonica, with all their mutual intertextual links involved. Inebriation and poetic inspiration fuse with Homer, Hesiod, and in particular Anacreon hovering in the background, with this last poet paradoxically still enjoying the pleasures of the symposion in the Underworld.

Gregory O. HUTCHINSON's essay (Chapter 12: "Hierarchy and Symposiastic Poetry, Greek and Latin"; pp. 247–270) reminds us that, for all its egalitarian characteristics, the symposion was also, and perhaps above all, a hierarchical social and mental reality. The main section of this chapter (part II) is an (interim) catalogue of relevant passages from archaic and classical sympotic poetry (Pindar and Bacchylides, thoroughly dealt with in other chapters of this volume, are not taken into account, but Horace's *Odes* and *Epodes* are interestingly included as developing Greek sympotic poetry). HUTCHINSON's paper collects evidence for (social and mental) hierarchies in the following sections: "Gods, and Animals", "City, and Cities", "Friends, and 'Friends'," "Love, Age, Gender", "Remembering, and Forgetting", and "Party Actions, and Performance". Although at first sight the reader may be mildly surprised by the combination of some of the motifs (or entries, 132 in total in all sections) listed in this paper (especially in its first section, which includes hierarchies of gods and mortals, individual divinities alluded to, religious festivals, personifications, 'giving' and 'taming' by gods etc.), the catalogue is extremely valuable and even eye-opening since taken as a whole it adds another dimension to our usual reading of the symposion. One hierarchy, though, might have been explored in more detail, namely the moral one. This would be particularly rewarding in our study of Theognis and the Theognidean corpus. True, HUTCHINSON sees here "not the outpourings of a blustering and brainless reactionary (or reactionaries), but intelligent and penetrating cynicism..." (p. 251), but he does not go as far as to trace a moral hierarchy suggested by Theognis within the group of *agathoi* and so the potential ethical ambiguity of "good birth".

By cataloguing an abundant collection of elements and motifs of "the universe of symposiastic poetry" (p. 247), and by systematically comparing it with its "afterlife" in Horace, G. HUTCHINSON's essay forms a worthy coda to this rich volume, the cup of songs, no doubt, but also a cornucopia

of sympotic scholarship AD 2016. A must-read for every student of this important branch of classical scholarship of our time.

Marek Węcowski
University of Warsaw
m.wecowski@uw.edu.pl

Eos CVI 2019
ISSN 0012-7825

Mary Emerson, *Greek Sanctuaries and Temple Architecture: An Introduction*, 2nd edn., London: Bloomsbury, 2018, XX, 270 pp., ISBN 978-1-4725-7528-9, £18.99.

Just over a decade after the publication of *Greek Sanctuaries: An Introduction*, Mary Emerson [= E.] has produced an updated and corrected version of her very popular book. This new work differs from the original not only because it has an altered and more suitable title, but also due to the broader scope of her discussion (she has added chapters 15: "The Age of Greek Expansion to the West: Paestum", and 16: "The Temple of Olympian Zeus at Akragas, Sicily"). In addition, the texts analysed previously have been re-examined. The book has been divided into 17 chapters as well as a glossary, index and bibliography. Chapters 1–4 contain a general discussion and serve as an introduction to the specific details of Greek sacral architecture. In short subsections E. explains the most important issues, beginning with ancient sources on temple construction and associated cults, on the characteristic pan-Hellenic aesthetic relating to such construction and on the ancients' sensitivity to the beauty of the landscape and the proper situating of cultic locations. At this point it must be emphasised that this book is aimed above all at those without prior knowledge of ancient architecture and archaeology but who are interested in Greek culture and who seek a comprehensive introduction to the subject. Next we find a discussion of many fundamental issues and difficulties connected with both Greek religiosity and the history of the construction of these edifices (chapter 3: "From Mud Hut to Marble Temple: Doric and Ionic Orders"). We should note that in this introductory section the author has also included an explanation of the role of sculpture in Greek architecture (chapter 4) as an element of construction essential to it, although in the present day this mostly no longer exists, or else has been transferred to museums. Other important architectural elements are similarly elucidated, among them colour, which is almost completely absent from universal modern ideas of ancient temples. Subsequent chapters (5–16) focus on the discussion of selected sacral buildings; here the representative examples are mainly found in Athens (the Parthenon, Propylaia, the Sanctuary of Athene Nike, the Erechtheion and the Hephaisteion). Yet this is supplemented by discussion of buildings in Delphi, Olympia, Bassae, Paestum and Akragas. The book concludes with a short reflection on how sacral architecture was received by the ancients, illustrated mainly by several passages from the *Ion* of Euripides. It is worth noting here that E. often recalls ancient sources and establishes her narrative while giving a voice to the ancients, demonstrating the real-life circumstances under which these constructions were built before they became the ruins with which we are familiar. In addition to Pausanias and Diodorus Siculus, she also discusses other authors including Plato, Sophocles, Plutarch and – as mentioned above – Euripides (and supplies her own translation of the texts quoted). While discussing sacral decorations she refers to and briefly elucidates associated myths, as well as, occasionally, historical or literary events: even short allusions, such as Herodotus reading his *History* at Olympia (p. 67), lend the whole argument on the theme of architecture a certain light-heartedness.

Books which are aimed mainly at readers without a good understanding of the subject should be evaluated not only on the basis of their scholarship but equally on their instructive accessibility. In this regard, E.'s volume has many advantages. It is written in an elegant, concise and appealing style, easily understood by an untrained readership. The book is not only fluently written but also encourages the reader to want to expand his/her knowledge without being intimidating. For this reason the author decided not to include footnotes. Most (though not all) of the academic terms used are explained in the glossary (pp. 262–266).

In some sense this is not merely a work on architecture. E.'s book also enables us to understand the ancients' mindset in relation to national symbols, political ideology and even propaganda through succinct interpretation of selected iconographic images (e.g. the Battle of the Centaurs with the Lapiths on the west pediment of the temple of Zeus in Olympia, pp. 75–77). Of course,

in such a short introduction there is no space for an in-depth analysis of the complexities of ancient religion and the specific details of cults, any more than there is for an account of the history of the locations discussed, especially in situations where, as the author herself writes, the traditions of most temples are rooted in the Neolithic period. E. is obliged to make simplifications and abbreviations and select the elements of sculpture and architecture that are in her opinion most interesting, and their associated myths. These choices are often highly subjective. However, it is difficult to understand why many sacral complexes located in the eastern part of the ancient Greek world are omitted from an introductory volume of this kind. She mentions only very briefly a temple on Samos (p. 22) and complexes at Didyma and Ephesus (pp. 243 ff.). It is true that the extant temples at Didyma, Ephesus, Priene and Sardes do not originate in the archaic or classical periods, but even so they are interesting examples of Ionian style. A methodical introduction to Greek architecture would require, for the benefit of the reader, the inclusion of the entirety of ancient Hellas, whose major places of cult and culture were located precisely on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean.

The discussion is illustrated through the use of 119 images (black-and-white photographs and line drawings as well as two maps of the Greek world). In order not to make the book overly expensive, too lengthy or of less than textbook quality, the author and publisher decided on a supplementary online publication of colour photographs[1]. Taking into account the book's aim to be a primary textbook, this was a very good idea, as it encourages younger readers to pursue further online study. At this point, however, we must ask whether, given that the technological possibilities of such an interactive publication allow for virtually unlimited illustrations of the issues raised in the book, this could not also have included at least a handful of technologically reconstructed examples of temples and sculptures in their original colours? After all, the generation at which the book is aimed absorbs information to a large extent through the use of images. On the other hand, we should emphasise that the black-and-white photographs included in the book have both their charm and their educational value. For example, a photograph taken *in situ* (fig. 45) best illustrates how the changing light of the sun and the movement of shadow can enliven a bas-relief. The inclusion of historical engravings was also a good decision. The seventeenth-century drawing by Jacque Carrey (fig. 51) shows the west pediment of the Parthenon in all its beauty and in the state in which it was found before its barbaric denudation by Thomas Bruce, and allows us to appreciate the ingenuity of the original construction, which was irremediably ruined in 1802. It is also interesting that while E. discusses the Parthenon's reliefs for 13 pages and points out that most of the frieze is currently held in the British Museum and "can be closely examined" (p. 109), she omits the subject of the controversies associated with the despoiling of the most important temple in Athens. In a book aimed mainly at students and interested travellers, a short account of the spoliation of the Parthenon could have been a good pretext for a discussion of the ethical aspects of excavation and the responsibility of the current generation to preserve works of art for future generations.

E.'s book is worth recommending, especially to undergraduates interested in the architecture, archaeology, history of art, and Hellenic culture in broad terms. Its convenient size, weight and the paper's adequate resistance to damage also make it a practical and stimulating travel companion for curious tourists. It seems that in the age of easy access to a great deal of detailed information, the main advantage of such a volume is its ability to inspire interest and stimulate further study.

Agnieszka Kotlińska-Toma
University of Wrocław
agnieszka.toma@gmail.com

[1] See https://www.bloomsbury.com/cw/greek-sanctuaries-and-temple-architecture-2nd-edition/galleries/.

Eos CVI 2019
ISSN 0012-7825

Laurel Fulkerson, *Ovid: A Poet on the Margins*, London: Bloomsbury, 2016 (Classical World), XIV, 104 pp., ISBN 978-1-4725-3134-6, £15.99.

The "Preface" to the Ovidian book by Laurel Fulkerson [=F.] assures us that her main aim was to furnish the reader with the "most compelling interpretative tools for understanding Ovid"; at first sight, the word "compelling" seems particularly apt here, given the slightly sensational way the titles of the chapters and subchapters in the book are phrased (most evidently: "Truth Stranger than Fiction: Poet Exiled Under Suspicious Circumstances!"). But it is not only the decoy that matters; the "attractive" attitude fits neatly in the book with a much less frivolous and more demanding approach, and this is but one of the paradoxes that marks this study. After all, we are dealing with a tiny volume trying to investigate one of the most prolific poetic corpora in Roman literature; the well-known book of almost three hundred pages (by Karl Galinsky) dubbed as "an introduction to the **basic** aspects" [emphasis added] of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* can bring to mind the scale of the risk of the endeavour. As regards the set of tools gathered by F., it is of course not new and she offers rather a rearrangement of previous statements and queries, situating them in a context that is supposedly most appealing for the modern reader.

The very first sentence ("Let us begin at the end"; p. 1) of the introductory chapter of the book (entitled "Life on the Margins") indicates clearly some of its strategic premises, which consists in delivering paradoxes, along with emphasising some contradictions and ambiguities allegedly permeating the poetry of Ovid. (Interestingly, at least one scholarly paper concerning Ovid opens with the opposite declaration: "we start at the beginning..."[1].) "The end" from the above quoted sentence means of course the final stage of Ovid's biography, his mysterious banishment to the foreign land far from Rome by order of emperor Augustus. The key word in the title of the book (i.e. "margins") also alludes to this fact, and margins will serve throughout F.'s text as one of the capacious metaphors describing the core features of Ovidian poetry, namely its multifaceted "marginality" (being one of the first specimens of colonial literature, Ovid's exilic poetry is of course remarkably rewarding material for this kind of study). Some bafflement concerning topography should be noted: Ovid was made even more "marginal" than he in fact was, because despite being a resident of the town of Tomis, identified correctly on p. 1 with the Romanian city of Constanța, some suggestions in the book apparently situate him on the verge of the Graeco-Roman world, that is in Asia Minor or even in Colchis (!); see the combined information on pp. 1 (about Tomis "in the Roman province of Pontus"), 2 (the map on which the town of Tomis is not shown, although we can recognise the province of Pontus in Asia Minor), and 97 (where the entry concerning Pontus in the glossary informs us that it was a Roman province in modern-day Northern Turkey, and part of it was Colchis, "homeland of Medea").

Setting aside the initial statement, F. duly returns to the proper chronological order in dealing with Ovid's biography and historical events, briefly characterising all the Ovidian works and touching upon the political atmosphere of Augustan Rome and the question of artistic patronage. The topic ends with a provocative statement about the puzzling similarity between Ovid and Augustus. As regards the interference between Roman history and the poet's biography, maybe it would be convenient to add to the list of important historical events (p. 4) the date of Augustus' first consulate; after all, it was also the year of Ovid's birth and Ovid is probably alluding to this coincidence at the beginning of the *Metamorphoses* in the phrase announcing *mea tempora*.

---

[1] See S. Casali, *Quaerenti Plura Legendum: On the Necessity of "Reading More" in Ovid's Exile Poetry*, Ramus XXVI 1997, p. 80.

From the series of questions concerning the poet's exile posed at the beginning of the book, perhaps the most interesting one is expressed in this way: "How do we read the literally alienated stance Ovid presents in the poetry from exile in light of the figurative alienation discernible across all of his work?" (p. 3). Another of these questions, in turn, is not only difficult to answer, but it is even problematic to think about a way of gathering the proper data to deal with the dilemma it indicates (I mean the question about "a change of heart": "If a work reflects its author, does revision entail a change of heart?"). As it is easy to notice, the exilic experience is treated here as the most important factor shaping the entire artistic personality of the Roman poet; besides, such aspects of the poetic discourse as the inclination to generic experiments, as well as irony, playfulness, ambiguity (for instance, in mingling together fiction and reality), unreliability (of the people speaking in the texts), contradictions, inconclusiveness, and complexity, are underscored throughout. We are constantly encouraged (and at times not without some exaggeration) to think about Ovidian poetry as a kind of "open work" (in the sense of *opera aperta* from Umberto Eco's famous essay), full of "deceptive surfaces", insolvability, incongruency, vagueness, multivalency... Perhaps sometimes the notions of "incongruity" and "insolvability" may serve as an excuse for some sort of critical escapism, but in most cases F. proves convincingly that the Ovidian textual tactic of creating the aura of intricacy demands even more detailed scrutiny. And what would be worth considering here (given the fact that Ovid chose Pythagoras to be the patron of the **material** instability of his world of changes) is the possible philosophical background of the epistemological issues concerning the "instability of meanings" or "plurality of truths", discernible, according to F., in Ovid's works.

After the first chapter about "Life on the Margins", we encounter two main parts of the book arranged according to a theoretical frame based on two "structural metaphors" (p. 3): repetition and exile (a synonym for marginality). The chapters are entitled, respectively, "Repetition-Compulsion and Ovidian Excess", and "Romans at Home and Abroad: Identity and the Colonial Subject".

Some stylistic features of Ovid's poetry and his poetic technique are addressed in successive parts of the second chapter; F. lays stress on the rhetorical components in Ovidian style along with the variable narrative patterns, and, once more, recalls Ovidian "incongruity" – with reference, e.g., to his ambiguous sense of humour, sometimes labelled as the (in)famous "gruesome wit". By the way, calling the second, pentametric part of the elegiac couplet "distich" (p. 30) is somewhat confusing, since "distich" is usually synonymous with the couplet itself. Another part of the chapter is devoted to some metapoetic, intertextual (referring to the relationship with Vergil in particular) and intratextual elements in the Ovidian œuvre. Maybe not coincidentally, F. inserts some repetitions and revisions into her own text; for example, almost the same statement about ethnographical literature and its influence on Ovidian descriptions of Tomis can be found on pp. 15 and 17. As an example of revision, in turn, we can perceive two somewhat different interpretations of the pair of elegies from the *Amores* collection (II 7 and II 8) on pp. 6 and 46; the second interpretation more convincingly refers to the amusement caused by the story instead of treating it as a text that "frustrates the reader's desire to know where to stand" (p. 6).

The last chapter focuses on the question of how different versions of displacement are depicted (both literally and figuratively) in the works of Ovid and thus demonstrates the utmost interest devoted to refugees and outsiders in his poetry (especially in the *Metamorphoses*) – in the context of the "colonial subject" recognisable in his texts. We are reminded that the poet existed on the borders of times and political systems (in the transitional period marking the shift from Republic to Empire) and on the geographical periphery of the Roman world. Part of this chapter could be labelled as the Ovidian "victimology", and the last pages, with the title "Empire and Colonialism", apply the idea of "liminality" to the different borderlines in the poet's life and work. Finally, the author tries once more to examine some political issues by drawing further parallels between the poet and the prince.

The final, and by no means accidental paradox is manifest: it turns out that by emphasising his "marginality", F. tries to make Ovid in fact more "central" and accessible to the modern public (as she asserts on p. 6, "Ovid is both a poet of his own time and of ours"; the phrase "our own"

relating to ancient times is subsequently repeated twice on the final page of the study; moreover, on p. 58, we can find the opinion of some "contemporaries" claiming that we may easily "call our own times another 'age of Ovid'").

As regards some shortcomings, the concise form of the book comes at a price: sometimes the reader is left without any examples illustrating a given statement (see, for instance, the comment about the similarities between elegy and epic on p. 30). Some omissions are more evident than others; curiously enough, although the myth of Pygmalion from the *Metamorphoses* is discussed (p. 70), there is no mention about any films influenced by this myth (and there are many of them, as the long list at the end of Paula James' book, *Ovid's Myth of Pygmalion on Screen*, undoubtedly confirms). Another strange omission concerns the eclogues, excluded from the discussion of the forms of hexameter poetry in Augustan times (p. 31). Generalisations and oversimplifications are probably also inevitable in a book offering a "synoptic view" in a condensed way (one of them I cannot but quote: "Most readers will find sex a more interesting topic than exile, but that is perhaps merely our prejudice"; pp. 16 f.), but the overall impression is that F. managed to create a coherent, balanced view of the entire world of Ovidian poetry, avoiding an overt presentism. Additionally, most of the examples were carefully chosen, and indeed illustrate perfectly the crucial features of Ovidian poetry.

There are, however, some noticeable errors of a different kind. Books published in English speaking countries are notorious for the misspelling of foreign words; the reviewed book, unfortunately, is no exception, so we should read "discussioni" instead of "Discuzione" in the title of an Italian periodical (p. 90), "Ransmayr" instead of "Ransmyer" (twice), and, in the title of a poem by Ovid, "*faciei*" instead of "*facei*" (thrice) as well as "*femineae*" instead of "*femina*" or "*feminae*". One may also wonder why a person as important to the Augustan period as Horace does not deserve his own entry in the glossary. In the index, oddly enough, only one modern person among the few listed has been given his first name (James Joyce, p. 102; why him?), whereas Seneca the Younger, mentioned (albeit adjectivally) on p. 8 in the context of the Ovidian tragedy *Medea*, is missing, and the elegiac poet Tibullus (absent from the index although referred to in the main text) seemingly yielded his place to Tiberius (indexed with Tibullus' page numbers; p. 104).

Despite the aforementioned remarks, F.'s study is an inspiring and insightful introduction to Ovid, especially for a non-professional reader; the whole book's tag line (which seems to be more universal, not only "Ovidian") could read as follows: "repeated readings are richly repaid" (p. 16). They surely are. Vote for Caesar! And read Ovid...

Radosław Piętka
Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań
platon@amu.edu.pl

Eos CVI 2019
ISSN 0012-7825

THE POWER TO INSPIRE: CLASSICAL ANTIQUITY AND MODERN IMAGINATION

Brett M. Rogers, Benjamin Eldon Stevens (eds.), ***Classical Traditions in Modern Fantasy***, New York: Oxford University Press, 2017, X, 367 pp., ISBN 978-0-1906-1006-7 (pbk.), £86.00 (hb.)/29.49 (pbk.).

Jesse Weiner, Benjamin Eldon Stevens, Bret M. Rogers (eds.), ***Frankenstein and Its Classics. The Modern Prometheus from Antiquity to Science Fiction***, London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2018 (Bloomsbury Studies in Classical Reception), XII, 233 pp., ISBN 978-1-3500-5487-5 (pbk.), £65.00 (hb.)/21.00 (pbk.).

Brett M. Rogers, Benjamin Eldon Stevens (eds.), ***Once and Future Antiquities in Science Fiction and Fantasy***, London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2019 (Bloomsbury Studies in Classical Reception), XIV, 273 pp., ISBN 978-1-3500-7488-0 (pbk.), £65.00 (hb.)/19.99 (pbk.).

These three impressive volumes, appearing one per year like clockwork, were preceded by an earlier one in 2015, *Classical Traditions in Science Fiction* produced by the same editors Rogers and Stevens, in the series *Classical Presences* directed by reception experts, Lorna Hardwick and James I. Porter. They may be followed by a fifth volume (or more) in the future, on yet undisclosed themes, judging by the "(...and counting?)" comment in the preface to *Once and Future Antiquities in Science Fiction and Fantasy* (p. XII). As it would be difficult to exclude the first book from the present review, especially since it has never been reviewed in "Eos", I will treat the four publications first as a multivolume opus, and then provide brief information about the content of each volume.

THE SERIES AS A WHOLE

Rogers and Stevens conceived and edited the four books; for the volume on Frankenstein they were joined by another editor, Jesse Weiner, who had already contributed a chapter on Frankenstein to the 2015 *Classical Traditions in Science Fiction*, an essay comparing modern fantasy to classical epic to the 2017 *Classical Traditions in Modern Fantasy*, and a chapter in *Once and Future Antiquities in Science Fiction and Fantasy* on an early twentieth-century German novella by Wilhelm Jensen, one of many modern variations of the myth of Pygmalion and Galatea inspired by the tragedy of Pompeii and a Roman bas-relief of a walking woman.

All four volumes display fantastic artwork on the covers, and while the first two, from Oxford University Press, are of a marginally smaller format, they are a good one hundred pages longer than the more recent two from Bloomsbury. In spite of this slight variance in format, they look good standing together on a library shelf, having appeared there in a timely manner and having been received with considerable interest by reception scholars and other readers.

The series allows us to observe the creation of a remarkable network of scholars who have contributed to the volumes during the four years of their production (2015–2019). The two editors (joined by the third one for the book on Frankenstein) brought together thirteen researchers for SF, twelve for fantasy, eleven for Frankenstein and thirteen for *Once and Future Antiquities*... There were four different teams of scholars, with minor overlaps: one scholar participated in all four groups, and three scholars in two of the groups. An amazingly diverse and creative crowd of, all together, fifty-one contributors, whom the editors managed to coordinate successfully. It is impressive to observe how editorial experience accumulates and the learning curve progresses from volume to volume.

The entire series is composed of collections of papers stemming – at least in part – from conferences debating the theme of each volume and bearing the same titles. While this is a universal

model of the research cycle in today's scholarship, conference volumes rarely do justice to their titles and seldom provide comprehensive treatment of the subject. Gathered according to the larger theme and then grouped in sections, the contributions included in a conference book appear every now and then to be randomly selected and resulting from external circumstances rather than from a purposeful design; occasionally, conference books take the form of a set of case studies with an introduction but without a conclusion. They may leave the reader, especially a fellow scholar, with a feeling of discontent and a longing for a solid monograph. On the other hand, a series of conference volumes provides a satisfying accumulation of various aspects of the general theme discussed by different authors from various points of view, which is a huge advantage in itself.

The titles *Classical Traditions in Science Fiction* and *Classical Traditions in Modern Fantasy* imply a comprehensive treatment of the subject, while *Once and Future Antiquities in Science Fiction and Fantasy* sounds poetic but is vague enough not to create expectations of a definitive inclusiveness. *Frankenstein and Its Classics. The Modern Prometheus from Antiquity to Science Fiction* by its clear focus on the fictional bicentennial character[1] and its classical roots is the most precise and appropriate title in the series. Tony Keen[2] in *Once and Future Antiquities...* (p. 11) declares the vastness of the field of science fiction (and presumably fantasy) as the first methodological challenge – and says: "There is really nothing we can do about this. No study can be comprehensive". Clearly, the challenge is real, but it is nothing new in scholarship, where various solutions have been advanced and attempted in the past. Keen's comment sounds curiously defeatist.

Keen provides access (http://tinyurl.com/ctsfmfdatabase) to a database of classically inspired science fiction and fantasy compiled by Rogers and Stevens; it contains (as of September 30, 2019) 801 entries, theoretically in alphabetical order of genres and within genres, of the authors', or creators' names, but in fact, the order is not fully maintained, which may be confusing; there are well over 500 literary entries, 35 or so films, about 200 games including videogames, and a marginal numbers of television series, theatre and opera. Surprisingly, the database lists only three television series, *The Adventures of the Wonder Woman* (1976–1979), *The Man from Atlantis* (1977–1978), and *Stargate Atlantis* (2004–2009).

A year before *Classical Traditions in Science Fiction...*, a French collection of texts on classical antiquity in fantasy and science fiction came out, thematically corresponding to the four Rogers' and Stevens' volumes, and even sharing one of the authors[3]. In the preface to their volume on science fiction (p. VIII), the editors briefly acknowledge the existence of Bost-Fiévet's and Provini's book and single out the introductions to each section without mentioning that they provide an impressive rationale for the structure and contents of the collection. Regrettably, Rogers and Stevens were content with one general introduction for each volume and did not follow the French editors' example; it would have made their publications more cohesive if the division in sections and the choice of essays were convincingly substantiated.

Keen, a contributor to the French volume, lists as methodological challenge #4[4] the problem of Anglophone scholars ignoring research in other languages, and gives Bost-Fiévet's and Provini's publication as an example of such unfairly disregarded scholarship. The book is included

---

[1] The first edition of Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein; or the Modern Prometheus* appeared in London in 1818.

[2] In *Classical Traditions in Science Fiction*, he authored a chapter on Lucian and H.G. Wells using Antony as his first name.

[3] Tony Keen, *Femme parfaite sur commande: Le mythe de Pygmalion dans deux romans de science-fiction et de fantasy*, in: Mélanie Bost-Fiévet, Sandra Provini (eds.), *L'Antiquité dans l'imaginaire contemporain: Fantasy, science-fiction, fantastique*, Paris 2014, pp. 205–213. In his paper Keen compares Chris Beckett's *The Holy Machine* and Jeffrey Ford's *The Cosmology of the Wider World*.

[4] In *Once and Future Antiquities...*, p. 14.

in the *Works Cited* in all the volumes, and in the last one its general introduction is listed separately, but is not discussed in any detail. The footnotes in the four volumes, not having been fully indexed[5], make any verification time-consuming and soporific – I may have easily missed a mention or two, for which I apologise. This particular shortcoming (of ignoring scholarship in languages other than English) is of course hardly an issue limited to this series, and in any case, the editors are conscious of it and make an effort to correct it.

A last minor observation is that occasionally the editors and some of the authors use cumbersome academic jargon, making the text difficult to follow, certainly for an average reader, but also for a fellow scholar.

THE ORPHAN OF THE SERIES: TELEVISION

The volume on science fiction discusses four TV shows: *Battlestar Galactica*, *Doctor Who*, *Rome* (HBO), and four series of *Star Trek – The Original Series*, *The Next Generation*, *Deep Space Nine*, and *Voyager* – no *Enterprise* (George KOVACS' chapter on *Star Trek* is a delight to read). In the preface to the volume on fantasy, the editors try to pre-empt censure, echoing KEEN's disarming comment that "Diverse as its chapters are, the present volume is only a chapter to an entire world of rapidly burgeoning scholarly interest in the topic" (p. VII). The television series mentioned in this volume are *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* and *Game of Thrones*, both reduced to minor footnotes.

The last volume, *Once and Future Antiquities...*, includes an analysis by Claire KENWARD (pp. 32–37) of the four-episode segment of *Doctor Who* series 3, 3 (BBC 1965), *Myth Makers*, now preserved in audio-only. The story takes place in Troy besieged by the Greeks; it begins during Achilles' and Hector's duel and ends with *Doctor Who*'s characters helping Odysseus build the Trojan horse. Analysing a television series based only on the audio (with some stills and clips of footage) theoretically presents an unsurmountable handicap, a bit like assessing a painting based on its black and white photograph. Curiously, it does not prevent the author from treating the mutilated show as a complete work. On the other hand, not many people who watched the show in 1965 are still active enough to contest KENWARD's interpretation which, preceding comments notwithstanding, remains quite stimulating. Classical scholars are, after all, fairly skilled in dealing with fragmentary texts.

Another Trojan figure, Cassandra, is compared – let me say, rather surprisingly – to the strong female character of Kiera Cameron from the time-travel series *Continuum* (2012–2015) by Jennifer C. RANCK (pp. 135–145); both characters are presented as women of vision, having knowledge of the future, which is met with disbelief by the people around them. Two other shows are mentioned by title: *Firefly* (2002–2003) by RANCK (p. 135) and *Star Trek The Original Series* (besides KOVACS' excellent chapter in the volume on science fiction, the title is brought up *passim* by several authors).

Given the importance of SF and fantasy television series in popular culture, the predominant focus on literature produces a slanted picture of classical reception. The reasons for the decision to disregard to a large extent television's contribution to classical reception are not explained or discussed in any of the prefaces to the four volumes. The fact that film is also present to a much lesser degree than literature appears legitimate in view of the large number of studies published on Classics in films during the last two decades[6]. One can only hope that volume five, if it does

---

[5] This should really be banned in scholarly books, especially the ones coming out in print. Another annoying practice is the use, preferred by some publishers, of endnotes instead of footnotes; in this case in volumes three and four by Bloomsbury. The ease of reading or consulting a publication should be a primary consideration for the book industry.

[6] For a bibliography, see for instance, Alastair J.L. BLANSHARD, Kim SHAHABUDIN, *Classics on Screen. Ancient Greece and Rome on Film*, London 2011, pp. 248–256; or Pantelis MICHELAKIS, Maria WYKE (eds.), *The Ancient World in Silent Cinema*, Cambridge 2013, pp. 347–368.

materialise, will target this gap and be devoted to classical traditions in audiovisual fantasy and science fiction beyond *Battlestar Galactica* and *Star Trek.* In fact, if the present contents of the editors' database are any indication, they point rather to a focus on games as the theme of the future volume, and quite a legitimate focus at that.

SCIENCE FICTION & CLASSICS

ROGERS and STEVENS begin their introduction to the volume taking *Frankenstein*, the traditionally "first" SF novel, and its links to Antiquity as a point of departure and reference. Like every single SF book, this one deals with the longstanding lack of a generally accepted definition of science fiction combined with a plethora of attempts at defining the subject. The editors' solution is to talk about *modern* SF and treat SF's "rosy-fingered dawn" like Lucan and later Johannes Kepler, as kinds of precursors, or rather sources of inspiration and influence. On the other hand, the preface engages in a long reasoning leading to a complex justification for selecting Classics and science fiction for a joint scholarly inquiry. As if a wide-open door needed forcing. Any science fiction fan is familiar with the links between the two, and even half-expects them. Some reception scholars have no doubts about it either, judging for instance by the 2008 (2011 in paperback) Blackwell *Companion to Classical Receptions*, edited by Lorna HARDWICK and Christopher STRAY, and in particular, chapter 25 by Marianne MCDONALD (pp. 327–335), and chapter 31 by Sarah Annes BROWN (pp. 415–427). Some others (SILK, GILDENHARD, and BARROW in their 2014 Wiley Blackwell *The Classical Tradition*), consider that "in atomistic terms, most science fiction, or the 'drip and slash' paintings of Jack Pollock, or the categories of contemporary genetics, are, in their different ways, so remote from the tradition that only an all-embracing discussion [...] would even bring the (non-)relationship into view" (p. 242). One wonders what kind of science fiction shows have they been watching, or what their definition of SF is.

A brief overview of classical authors and creators of science fiction included in the volume may give a better understanding of its rationale. Set up in chronological order, the contributions discuss Plutarch's *De facie quae in orbe lunae apparet* and Lucian's *True History* as sources of Johannes KEPLER's *Somnium* (Dean SWIFORD); Lucretius' *De rerum natura* and Lucan's *Bellum civile* as influences on Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* (Jesse WEINER); Virgil's influence on Jules Verne's *Journey to the Centre of the Earth* (Benjamin Eldon STEVENS); Lucian's *True History* again, this time as a primary source for H.G. Wells' *The First Men in the Moon*, as opposed to its secondary sources, Kepler's *Somnium* and Francis Goodwin's *The Man in the Moone* (Antony KEEN).

The next section, *SF Classics*, consist of chapters on Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex* and Aristotle's *Poetics* as influencing the 1956 movie *Forbidden Planet* (Gregory S. BUCHER); the concept of the degradation of the ages of men as an inspiration for Walter M. Miller, Jr's *A Canticle for Leibowitz* (Erik GRAYSON); Homer's *Iliad* lending epic characteristics to Frank Herbert's *Dune* (Joel P. CHRISTENSEN); classical myths about artificial life forms influencing Philip K. Dick's *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?* and its film adaptation, *Blade Runner* (Rebecca RAPHAEL).

Section III, *Classics in Space*, starts with *Star Trek: The Original Series*' exploration of specific Greek myths (George KOVACS); goes on to the connections between Homer's *Odyssey* and the 1997 *Alien Resurrection* (Brett M. ROGERS); and ends with evocations of ancient Greek religion in the second *Battlestar Galactica* (2003–2009) (Vincent TOMASSO).

Section IV, *Ancient Classics for a Future Generation*, discusses the "capacity for other worlds, whether future, past, or simply alternative" (p. 23) in three papers: Homer's *Iliad* as retold by Dan Simmon in *Illium* (Gaël GROBÉTY); Petronius' and Tacitus' critical portrayals of imperial excesses, combined with Juvenal's satires, influencing Suzanne Collins' painting in *The Hunger Games Trilogy*, a sinister picture of future America closer to modern interpretations than to antiquity (Marian MANKINS); the final chapter is devoted to Jonathan Hickman's four-issue comic book *Pax Romana*, a time-travel story about how, in the mid-twenty-first century, genetically enhanced Vatican troops armed with super-tech weapons go back to the times of Constantine the Great before

Christianity becomes the state religion, to fix the young Christian church and prevent the Roman Empire from "decline-ing and fall-ing", a clear echo of Gibbon and his interpretation of history rather than the reception of antiquity (C.W. Marshall, the editor, with George Kovacs, of *Classics and Comics* 2011 and *Son of Classics and Comics* 2016).

The volume ends with an oddly meagre set of suggestions (each title provided with a mini-summary) for further reading and viewing by Rober A. Cape, some of which have been already discussed in the volume and look out of place on such a list.

FANTASY & CLASSICS

As in the case of science fiction, the question of definition and scope returns with a vengeance in the volume on fantasy, especially since these two elusive concepts frequently overlap. The editors distinguish SF from MF (Modern Fantasy), calling the former Promethean and the latter Protean. Theoretical reflections fill the first section of the book, starting with Jesse Weiner on the presence in MF of the classical epics, analysing the case of George R.R. Martin's *A Song of Ice and Fire*, followed by Cecilie Flugt on parodic reception of various ancient texts present in E.T.A. Hoffmann's *Brambilla* and *Master Flea*, on classical and Nordic myths in Christian Andersen's stories, and on the concept of enchantment and disenchantment. In the only paper about fine arts in the volume, Genevieve S. Gessert discusses classical inspiration in "Pre-Raphaelites and Victorian Illustration". Robinson Peter Krämer writes about Howard Philips Lovecraft's longstanding fascination with Antiquity, which bordered on obsession. He most often takes inspiration from Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey* and Virgil's *Aeneid*, but also Lucian's *True History*.

Part II regroups papers about the two giants of fantasy literature, J.R.R. Tolkien and C.S. Lewis. The first paper centres on the Underworlds in *The Hobbit* (Benjamin Eldon Stevens); the second explores the links between Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* and C.S. Lewis' *The Voyage of the "Dawn Treader"* (Jeffrey T. Winkle); the third tackles Apuleius again retold in C.S. Lewis' *Till We Have Faces* (Marcus Folch).

Part III begins with Sarah Annes Brown's paper on the place of ancient gods of various origin in children's literature, featuring the following authors: C.S. Lewis, E. Nesbit, P.L. Travers, Joan Aiken, Diana Wynne Jones, Rick Riordan. Kelly McCullough, John C. Wright, and two authors for older readers, Marie Phillips and Neil Gaiman. It is followed by Brett M. Rogers' analysis of "ghosts of Aeschylus" in the *Harry Potter* Series. Antonia Syson discusses Harpies in Philip Pullman's *His Dark Materials* Trilogy. The section ends with a comparison of Disney/Pixar's *Brave* with Greek myth and legends about girls and bears (Elizabeth A. Manwell).

Part IV brings Anne Carson's translations of Mimnermos, and a fictional interview with this seventh-century BCE elegiac poet is discussed by Sasha-Mae Eccleston. Joe Graham's novel *Black Ships*, an American version of the *Aeneid*, is analysed by Jennifer A. Rea as a story of a war hero who is out of place in the post-war reality he fought for. In the last paper, we revisit George R.R. Martin's *A Song of Ice and Fire* and read about the Virgilian themes developed there (Ayelet Haimson Lushkov).

FRANKENSTEIN & CLASSICS

The smallest of the four volumes, *Frankenstein and Its Classics. The Modern Prometheus from Antiquity to Science Fiction* is composed of two parts, each numbering six papers. The first part deals with Mary Shelley's use of ancient sources and discusses Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (Genevieve Liveley), variants of Prometheus' myth – in Hesiod, Aeschylus, and Ovid directly and via Benjamin Franklin, Immanuel Kant, and Erasmus Darwin (Martin Priestman), links to Lucan's *Bellum Civile* (Andrew McClellan), Mary Shelley's influence on Romantic Prometheism (Suzanne L. Barnett); David A. Gapp provides a context for the circumstances surrounding the conception of the novel in 1816, based on the weather resulting from Mount Tambora's eruption

in 1815. Concluding the first part, Matthew GUMPERT presents Victor Frankenstein as Prometheus and the creature as Pandora.

Section 2, entitled *Hideous Progeny*, includes papers by Benjamin Eldon STEVENS (on the Apuleian version of Cupid and Psyche); Carl A. RUBINO (on echoes of Aristotle and Lucretius); Neşe DEVENOT (on the Promethean figure of Timothy Leary and his links to Frankenstein); Jesse WEINER (on Horace and Cicero in Morrison's *Spark of Being*); Emma HAMMOND (on *Frankenstein*'s legacy in Alex Garland's 2015 film *Ex Machina*); while the final paper of the section discusses Frankenstein's influence on Riddley Scott's 2012 film *Prometheus* and Matt Fraction's and Christian Ward's 2014 comic book *Ody-C* (Brett M. ROGERS). The volume ends with Samuel COOPER's set of "Further Reading and Viewing" which briefly describes the listed titles of literary, film and television works (quoting only three series: *Star Trek*, *The X-Files*, and *Penny Dreadful*).

SCIENCE FICTION, FANTASY, AND CLASSICS

When, after a book on science fiction and a book on fantasy, comes a third one combining the two areas, a logical assumption would be that the editors intended to compare the two in their treatment of antiquity. However, a suspicious reader could think that it is an attempt to complete what was missed – for whatever reason – in the initial offerings. Neither guess is correct. *The Once and Future Antiquity...* focuses on a concept shared by Classics, SF and fantasy, that of *displacement*, and then discusses different varieties of this concept, making it the theme and anchor of the collection. It is an original idea resulting on the one hand in the better cohesion of the essays, and on the other, being well suited to the unexpected and appealing contribution ending the volume: a personal view of ancient heritage from a popular and prolific SF and fantasy writer, Catherynne M. VALENTE (*The Labyrinth* 2004, *The Ice Puzzle* 2004, *Yume No Hon: The Book of Dreams* 2005, *The Grass-Cutting Sword* 2006, *The Orphan Tales* series 2006–2007, *Palimpsest* 2009, *Deathless* 2011, *Fairyland* series 2011–2016, *Radiance* 2015, *The Glass Town Game* 2017, *Space Opera* 2018, *Mass Effect Andromeda: Annihilation* 2018).

Some of the essays in this volume have been discussed above. All of the essays are grouped in four sections: (1) displacing points of origin: Tony KEEN, Jesse WEINER, Claire KENWARD, Laura ZIENTEK (Jack McDevitt's *The Engines of God* and "a 'displacement' of perspective on academic disciplines that imagine themselves as *simply* factual or true", p. 3); (2) displaced in space: Ortwin KNORR (Pullman's *Dark Materials* seen as Lyra's Odyssey), Suzanne LYE (the classical concepts of *nostoi* and *katabasei*s in Hayao Miyazaki's 2001 animated fantasy *Spirited Away*), Benjamin Elton STEVENS (classical motifs in Helen Oyeyemi's novels); (3) displaced in time: Stephen B. MOSES and Brett M. ROGERS (Jim Sharman's 1975 musical horror comedy *The Rocky Horrors Picture Show* seen in classical reception terms), Frances FOSTER (the influence of Odysseus' meeting with the dead on Diana Wynne Jones' *The Time of the Ghost*), Jennifer C. RANCK; and (4) displacing genre: C.W. MARSHALL (classical monsters in *Dungeons & Dragons* Monster Manuals), Vincent TOMASSO (the mixture of 'mythologising' and 'rationalising' modes of explanation in Gene WOLFE's novel *Soldier of the Mist*), and Alex MCAULEY (Virgil and Augustus in *Warhammer 40K* universe of games and novels).

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate my initial comment that the four books look good on the shelf and that there is a place reserved there for the fifth one. The diversity of topics and the originality of the authors' approach make sure that the books will often be off the shelf, being read and consulted.

Elżbieta Olechowska
University of Warsaw
elzbieta.olechowska@gmail.com