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OBSERVATIONS ON THE PERCEPTION OF 'RACE' IN IMPERIAL ROME
by L.A. THOMPSON
University of Ibadan

THIS article¹ poses the question of the degrees of somatic distance which, in the perception of Romans of the principate, separated certain other peoples from the Romans themselves. A fairly satisfactory answer to this question can be deduced from Petronius Sat. 101-102 and Pliny H.N. VII. 12 in respect of Jews, Arabs, northern Europeans, black Africans, persons of mixed black and white parentage, and a variety of 'dark-skinned' types. The information contained in these two Latin passages throws light on the allied question of the way the Romans thought, felt, and behaved towards members of ethnic groups that they perceived as somatically different from themselves. This second topic is too vast and too intricate to be explored adequately in a single article,² but it is appropriate to observe here that the bulk of the pertinent modern literature clearly demonstrates the extreme difficulty which the modern mind finds in comprehending the truth about Roman attitudes and behaviour towards 'non-whites'.³ Finley's brief obiter dicta on the subject, though not entirely satisfactory, come closer than anything else I have read towards establishing an appropriate perspective.⁴ Since the right perspective and conceptualization are important even for an appreciation of the two Latin passages mentioned above, it is appropriate to devote a few of the present pages to that problem before turning to the passages themselves.
Implicit in Finley's brief observation\(^5\) is the vital awareness that what is today popularly called 'race' (in relation to the opposition of 'white' and 'non-white') has to do with particular patterns of power and privilege established by modern colonialism. It would indeed be a matter for surprise if one were to discover that the Roman world had more or less anticipated the modern colonial era in regard to relations between 'whites' and 'non-whites'; for our familiar 'race-relations situations' owe their existence to a number of factors that are historically unique.\(^6\)

At no time before the modern colonial era did the \textit{oecumene} bear a configuration in which conquerors and imperial masters were \textit{all} 'white', and subjects and slaves \textit{all} 'non-white'. It is precisely this historical peculiarity that lies at the root of the racism that has so deeply permeated our world and has helped to shape modern habits of mind for generations. A consequence of this historically peculiar pattern of power-distribution has been a general prejudice which associated and equated 'non-white' with inferior and colonial-subject status. Again, at no previous epoch had conquerors and conquered been separated by such enormous gaps in technological and military power. A corollary of this is that, whereas ancient imperial powers, in order to maintain their dominance, depended on some form of power-sharing with a section of the conquered population, no such necessity was felt by their counterparts in the 19th century. This difference in needs and interests explains another, which is a difference in imperial attitudes: to the Romans, the preferred kind of subject was definitely the Romanized kind; the modern tendency has been to prefer one's 'natives' in the 'unspoiled' form.\(^7\) In either case the attitude was in harmony...
with the particular needs and interests of the imperial masters. Another closely allied peculiarity of modern times has been the separation of rich (white) countries from poor (non-white) by previously unimaginable extremes of what we call gross national product per caput.∗

Awareness of these peculiarities makes it relatively easy to grasp certain elusive truths about Roman antiquity and to understand (for instance) why it should be that familiar concepts like the white man and the European were alien to the Roman world. In Roman antiquity 'Europe' and 'European' were purely geographical concepts, of interest only to geographers. One spoke of 'the European shore of the Bosphorus', but never of 'the European' or of 'a European'. This familiar modern concept was unknown before the 18th century. It could not have arisen earlier for the simple reason that the cultural and other conditions making for its genesis were previously non-existent. ∗ Even in the 16th century Englishmen perceived black Africans 'merely as another sort of men' - different in physical appearance, religion, and way of life. The Anglo-Saxon perception of the black man before he became pre-eminently the slave was therefore of a very different order from the one that dominated subsequent times. † Yet there are scholars who blandly assume that this latter-day kind of perception (or something very similar) must have been a fact of Roman life; and so they can say with shameless assurance that a piece of ancient art represents 'an African of the lowest kind of intelligence', or (in the language of the American south) draw our reluctant attention to 'uppity' black behaviour in the presence of Roman whites, or tell us that, in Roman minds, blacks (as a race) were the natural inferiors of 'the white man', and even that 'to receive one's cup from the hand of a black man' was 'to
sustain a grave insult'.

In recognition of the fact that, in popular parlance, 'race' is a sort of synonym of 'somatic distance', I have used this popular term in the title of this article. But I have deliberately enclosed it in inverted commas. Forty years ago Norman Baynes confessed that he had 'never been able to understand the precise significance of that ambiguous term'. Not many classical scholars have appeared willing or humble enough to follow Baynes into the confessional box. To be sure, the biological scientists are adamant that 'race' has no meaning outside their own field; but their voice has never been the vox populi. In its very much older and popular usage 'race', like Latin genus, has two sometimes overlapping connotations: on the one hand, a somatic type; on the other hand, an ensemble of ethnic, national and socio-cultural characteristics; indeed, an ethnic group or nation. Thus it was that an older generation of Britons fondly spoke of themselves as 'this island race'. Thus it is that the British media can employ a single term, 'race riots', to cover violent confrontations between citizens of a Scandinavian country and their white 'guest-workers', between Asians and white Englishmen in Southall, and between whites and blacks in Brixton.

In Roman literature genus can similarly refer to a national group like the Egyptians or the Romans themselves, to an ethnic group like the Numidians or the blond Usipi of Germany, and to representatives of a somatic type like black Africans; thus the anonymous poem Moretum presents us with a picture of a peasant whose helpmeet is Afra genus (a woman of the black African somatic type), with 'tightly curled hair, puffy lips, black complexion, broad chest, heavy low-swinging breasts, belly somewhat pinched, slim legs, and big broad feet'.

4
Adherence to this ancient and still popular concept of 'race' makes it easy to use phrases like 'racial prejudice', 'race prejudice', and 'race relations'; but this is also apt to lead one into the error of confusing and equating different kinds of human attitudes and behaviour and essentially distinct sociological phenomena; class prejudice and snobbery, cultural prejudice and ethnocentrism, xenophobia, racial discrimination, and racism. It is idle, for instance, to pretend that the 'immigrant problem' in contemporary Britain, the 'Gästarbeiter problem' in contemporary Europe, and the 'Jewish problem' in 19th century England represent manifestations of one and the same social phenomenon. For the student of society, 'race' is in fact meaningful only as a complex social reality and as a sociological concept. Nor does this concept have any necessary connection with our familiar opposition of 'white' and 'non-white'. Indeed it is legitimate to speak of an 'invisible' race, referring to a group which is a victim of racism and is perceived by its oppressors as a different species of humanity, but is in fact indistinguishable from the dominant group in physical appearance: for example, the Burakumin of Japan and the Conversos of 16th and 17th century Spain. The precision about 'race' needed by students of attitudes and social-psychological atmospheres is offered by contemporary sociology. In sociological theory a race is conceived as a human group which is socially defined on the basis of visible or 'invisible' somatic characteristics, and which, on that same basis, is ascribed certain roles and rights in society. On this definition a race exists only when such somatic differences are recognized by the society concerned as socially significant or relevant. Where that is not the case, the society is non-racial; but where physical characteristics like skin-colour are socially significant (that is, where some form of
discrimination on that basis is practised), the society is racialist and the discrimination is known as racialism. Where such a discriminatory system is also justified by the dominant group in terms of some kind of deterministic ideology according to which an individual, by virtue of his membership of a given group, necessarily has particular desirable or undesirable qualities, and 'there is nothing that he can do either for himself or his descendants to alter this situation', then we are in the presence of racism. 20

Untidiness, confusion and error can be avoided only if one restricts the application of the word race and its cognates to the phenomena here described as racialism and racism. To my knowledge, the major contributions on the theme of blacks in Roman society have come from American (or American-based) scholars. 21 But, despite the (sometimes profound) differences in the conclusions at which these studies have arrived, they all share a common failing in that they all (explicitly or implicitly) ask the wrong question: namely, what was the position of the black race in Roman society? That is to say, the status ascribed to blacks as a group. To ask that question is to assume that Roman society was racist or racialist, for it is only in such societies that a status is ascribed to an ethnic or national group or one defined in terms of physical characteristics. 22 An ascribed group-status does not, of course, preclude the existence of an internal stratification within the racized group itself; but a non-racial society (unless it is a 'plural' society) has a single hierarchy relating to the whole population. Accordingly, since the evidence shows blacks in different socio-economic strata in Roman society, 23 it must be understood that this stratification was the system that applied to Roman society as a whole (as might be expected in a situation where no equation of black with slave and colonial-
subject had ever been known or possible). It is thus absurd to claim a discovery in Roman society of attitudes akin to racism, or to say that the position of blacks in the Roman world was that of an 'unequal race' and similar to 'what has often been the case with black Americans until recently'.

In the delicate task of studying ancient attitudes and behaviour, the watchwords must be open-mindedness and propriety of conceptualization; not 'common-sense'. For, as Finley reminds us, common-sense always rests upon a set of unconscious prejudices. In seeking to discover how Romans felt and behaved towards blacks (for instance), we cannot treat Roman remarks about blacks as though they were familiar voices expressing familiar concepts and attitudes. They are voices and signals very distant in terms of time and of cultural context. The two important Latin passages earlier mentioned, to which I shall now turn, confirm the need for such caution.

II

Petronius (Sat. 101-102) offers an interesting little scene in which three characters (Encolpius, Giton and Eumolpus) are aboard ship on the high seas and the first two are desperately looking for a means of escaping recognition and punishment by the ship's captain, Lichas, and by a woman passenger, the prostitute Tryphaena. After a number of possibilities have been considered and rejected, Encolpius suggests that he and Giton dye themselves with ink 'from hair right down to toe nails' so as to be able to pass as black African slaves (servi Aethiopes) in the service of Eumolpus who is not himself in any danger. However, Giton sarcastically retorts:

Why not circumcise us to enable us to pass as Jews, or pierce our ears in imitation of the Arabs, or whiten our faces with chalk so that Gauls would take us for their own kind? As if colouring by itself can change our physiognomy (figura)! As if we wouldn't need a lot of matching details to make the deception
Then he lists the sort of details that constituted the somatic stereotype of the black African slave: horrible puffy lips (labra tumore taeterrimo), a type of tightly curled hair that cannot quite be faked by him and his companions even with the use of a curling-iron, a forehead that somehow looks knife-scarred (though, of course, it is natural), bow legs with outer ankles almost touching the ground, and an alien kind of beard (ibid. 102. 13-15).

In this passage Petronius has given us some vital information on the way in which contemporary Romans perceived somatic distance in certain peoples. It is implied that male Jews or Arabs, if they adopted Roman styles of dress, speech and deportment, would be indistinguishable from Romans except for their circumcision and pierced ears respectively. In other words, Jews and Arabs, apart from these artificial and culturally imposed marks, conform to the Roman somatic norm. There was, of course, never any idea of turning Jews into a race (that is, subjecting them to racial discrimination). Had that been the case, it would have been necessary to impose a special 'uniform' on them - the refuge of Hitler's Germany and of the Spanish Inquisition.

The passage, however, indicates that Romans perceived 'Galli' as somatically distant from themselves. 'Galli' is shorthand for 'the peoples of northern Europe', and here Petronius reflects a popular stereotype of these northern peoples, who were evidently perceived as 'palefaces' in much the same way as their distant descendants were to be seen by the Indians of North America. The details of this somatic stereotype are given by other classical writers: while the Mediterranean norm is albus, the 'paleface' is candidus - marked by
a very white, frosty complexion, blond or very fair hair, piercing blue or blue-grey eyes, and an almost obscenely large frame and tall stature (or, as Sherwin-White puts it, a 'beastly and atrocious size').

For a joke, a Roman male might play the paleface by whitening his face with a chalk-based cosmetic and wearing a lady's blonde wig. But achieving the 'Gallic' look was evidently not a serious proposition. The eyes and stature of the typical 'paleface' were as much beyond imitation as were the black African nose and lips. These two somatic types (the Aethiops and the 'Gallus') indeed represented the two poles of somatic distance from the Roman norm. Nevertheless, the Petronian passage shows that, in the contemporary Roman vision, a greater distance separated the norm from the Aethiops appearance than from the 'Gallic' look; and because the context demands it, Petronius makes Giton give the details of this somatic distance: black colour, thick lips, and so on - details which are also noted by several other Roman writers.

Latin literature frequently refers to another somatic category which is neither albus, candidus, nor Aethiops. Individuals and groups of this category are described as 'swarthy' or 'dark': fuscus, subfuscus, coloratus; or even (loosely) as ater or niger. It is evident that only a slight distance separated this swarthy category from the Mediterranean somatic norm. Egyptians and Indians, as well as Moors, are placed in this category of the 'dark'; so is Zenobia, queen of Palmyra in the Syrian desert; also the emperor Constantius, and the peoples of some Italian districts. It is easy to see why this category does not figure in the Petronius passage: Encolpius and Giton could very easily have achieved this swarthy appearance by the use of a little make-up, but that would have been no disguise.

Pliny (H.N. VII. 12) offers an equally interesting and informative
passage on the theme of hereditary transmission of somatic resemblance. It is in this context that Pliny recalls the case of a famous boxer named Nicaeus who was born in Byzantium. This man's mother was *adulterio Aethiops nata*; that is, the product of her own mother's adultery with a black African. It is clearly implied that the adulteress was a Byzantine woman with a physiognomy of the type perceived by Romans as 'normal' (*albus*). Her daughter by the black African is, however, described as *nihil a ceteris colore differente* ('having a complexion no different from the rest'). But the son of this daughter 'regenerated his black African grandfather' (*avum regeneravit Aethiopem*).

Three questions arise. First, what does Pliny mean by saying that this daughter of a black African and a Mediterranean white woman had 'a complexion no different from the rest (*a ceteris*)'? Rackham's Loeb translation reads 'no different from that of other women'; but he also suggests two other possibilities: first, 'no different from the rest of her family' (that is, her white mother, her mother's white husband, and the genuine children of that marriage); second, 'no different from other half-breeds'. This last suggestion must however be rejected as an absurd interpretation, in view of Pliny's context. 'Half-breed', like Latin *hybrida*,

is a single category resting on descent. But Pliny is not concerned with categories of descent. He is dealing with categories of somatic appearance. As we shall soon see, Romans perceived children of mixed black and white parentage as falling into different categories of somatic appearance. Pliny's focus here is on two somatic categories: the Mediterranean norm, and the black African. Logically, therefore, his *ceteris* can refer only to the 'normal'. It hardly needs to be said that what matters here is not whether the report reproduced by Pliny is historically true or false, but Pliny's own thinking on the matter. His
thinking is in accord with a common Graeco-Roman belief that some children of mixed black and white parentage conformed to the Mediterranean somatic norm, even though signs of their partly black ancestry might show up later in some of their descendants despite the fact of the latter having no further black element in their lineage.  

Pliny obviously intends us to understand that this particular product of a white woman's mating with a black African had a 'color' no different from the Mediterranean norm.

The second question concerns the precise meaning of Pliny's term colore. The context in which the history of this particular family is related (and mentioned as an indubitatum exemplum) is one of general physical resemblance, not merely colour. We must therefore suppose that color is here a kind of shorthand for what Romans often called figura - physiognomy. It is only too natural to use color in this sense when, in one's perception, the most striking thing about the Aethiops is his colour. For instance, we find elsewhere a Latin description of a woman as in aspectu Ethiopissimam, neque Aegyptam, sed totam nigrum ('in appearance very much a black African; not Egyptian, but completely black') - a description in which blackness evidently sums up the total appearance. Even in more recent white perceptions this focus on colour has been apparent. Thus an early English voyager to West Africa could briefly comment: 'although the people were blacke and naked, yet they were civill'. In a report of 1578 another English observer similarly concentrates on colour: 'I my self have seene an Ethiopian as blacke as cole brought into England, who taking a faire English woman to wife, begat a sonne in all respects as blacke as the father was'.

Though fully aware of other details of the sub-Saharan African physiognomy, such observers could yet proclaim human somatic diversity
in statements like 'the tawney Moore, blacke Negro, duskie Libyan, ash-coloured [Asian] Indian, olive-coloured [American] Indian .... the whiter European'. Pliny is no doubt doing something like this in his use of the word colore - presenting a picture of a white Mediterranean woman with a black African (Aethiops) father and a white Mediterranean mother.

The third question concerns the precise meaning of the statement that the boxer's mother (who was perceived as conforming to the Mediterranean somatic norm, and who, it is implied, mated with a white man) produced a son who 'regenerated his black African grandfather'. Even if we take this account on the level of belief as opposed to historical fact, it is obvious that Pliny intends this 'regeneration' as a reference to a somatic appearance which, in the Roman perception, was a closer approximation to what Romans recognized as the black African look than to what they described as 'dark-skinned'.

The full picture arising from the Pliny passage is accordingly that of a black boxer both of whose parents were white and whose paternal grandfather was black, with 'black' referring to the black African physiognomy and 'white' to the Mediterranean norm. Put differently, Pliny's account shows us two white parents with a black son, and a white woman with a black father and a white mother. This must mean that, in Roman society, classification as 'black African' (Aethiops), or 'dark-skinned' (fuscus, etc.), or 'white' (albus), or 'paleface' (candidus) was purely and simply a matter of the observer's optical perception - a simple perception of somatic distance or 'normality', uncomplicated by any operative link with social distance. The boxer, Nicaeus, is classified as 'black African', not because he is a carbon copy of his African grandfather.
(that can hardly have been the case), but because his somatic appearance places him in that category rather than in the category of the 'dark-skinned' which, as we have seen, included some Italians and Moors as well as the 'typical' Egyptian and Indian. Evidently, however, some children of mixed black and white parentage will have fallen into the 'swarthy' category, since some were perceived as 'white'. As Petronius' Giton explains, a black skin alone did not make one a black African.

In the parts of our world where such things matter, Pliny's boxer would probably be described by some ridiculous term like 'half-caste' or 'half-breed'; and his mother would be perceived as 'coloured', certainly by those aware of her descent, and probably also by most people who knew nothing about her. This is because perception is no longer simple, but complicated by a recognition of some social significance in the appearance that meets one's eyes. Hence the shock and trauma endured by a young white working class woman in Britain some ten years ago (documented on British television) when her white husband suddenly acquired a Pakistani look as a result of some drugs taken in the course of medical treatment. Hence also the invention of terms like mulatto and quadroon to serve as labels of the precise degree of 'white blood' in the genetic composition of people who, though physically swarthy or white (in the Roman sense), are socially black. Naturally such labels have meaning or relevance only in societies in which physical characteristics are socially significant; that is, only in racialist and racist societies.

By contrast, ancient Romans were simple in their perception and classification; and the obvious implication of this is that, in their society, there was no operative link between status and somatic appearance. It is therefore ridiculous to speak of mulatto and
quadroon in Roman society, as some scholars have done.\textsuperscript{34} Indeed, it is worth noting that some items in Snowden's catalogue of Roman portraits of blacks (or Negroes) would not have been so classified by Romans, but as swarthy or white.\textsuperscript{35} Snowden has unwarrantedly projected into the Roman past a modern (and racist) concept of black as a category determined by descent. Hence he can speak of blacks in the Roman world who were no longer physically black.\textsuperscript{36} An altogether absurd notion in the context of ancient Rome. That familiar concept of the black man is racist and must be regarded as alien to Roman society; for, in the Roman vision, there was no such thing as a black man (Aethiops) except in the obvious physical sense.\textsuperscript{37} In that vision, descent from a black African, however recent, did not necessarily make one a black African (Aethiops). That is the message of Pliny and of Plutarch's report about 'a certain Greek woman who, having given birth to a 'black' baby, and having been accused of adultery, discovered that her own great-grandfather had been a black African'.\textsuperscript{38} Pliny's boxer, Nicaeus, in terms of descent, is further removed than his mother from their common black ancestor; yet he is black and she is white.

The foregoing represents part of the background against which Roman remarks about blacks (as about 'palefaces') must be set if they are not to be misinterpreted; for example, remarks indicating a distaste for blackness or extreme whiteness, or descriptions of black and 'paleface' physical characteristics as flaws (vitia) and as conspicuous deviations from what may be called the Roman somatic norm image,\textsuperscript{39} or references to the mocking of blacks by whites,\textsuperscript{40} or sentiments like 'black but great' and 'black but beautiful',\textsuperscript{41} or negative stereotypes of blacks, palefaces and other ethnic groups.\textsuperscript{42} The rest of the required background or frame of reference for inter-
preting such remarks must be constituted by our knowledge of the structures of Roman society, of the Romans' view of the universe and of their own place in it, and of Roman social psychology. It cannot be a frame of reference consciously or unconsciously founded upon, or influenced by, images of a racist order.
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In this paper I try to show by an analysis of the tradition concerning the second message sent from Themistocles to Xerxes that Herodotus' account (8.108.1-109.1) of the council of strategoi held at Andros is spurious, and, therefore, that Themistocles' public speech to the Athenian sailors (8.109.2-4) should be accepted as reflecting his real views on strategy, not those imposed on him by defeat in the council of strategoi. Since these views coincide substantially with the strategy planned for 479 B.C., we may not postulate unpopular strategic proposals as a reason for Themistocles' absence from the record of military leadership in 479 B.C.

The idea of a second message to Xerxes from Themistocles has not unnaturally aroused modern suspicion, and it might have been safe to deny its historicity outright were it not for Thucydides' account of part of Themistocles' letter to Artaxerxes (1.137.4). The interpretation of the passage I offer is not the only one possible. Themistocles admits that he did the royal house great harm so long as he was forced to defend himself. He claims, however, that while Xerxes was retreating in danger the services he rendered him were much greater. 
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favour. One is to be a new claim, but before he makes it Themistocles adroitly prepares the ground by reminding Artaxerxes of the two Themistoclean services already known at court, for which, independent of the new claim, he deserves favour. The first is the warning he sent Xerxes from Salamis that the Greeks intended to retreat. This cannot be included in the ὁγαδη referred to earlier by Themistocles (Thuc. 1.137.4) because he says these were performed when he was safe and the King retreating in danger. The second action cited and also known at court is the message sent from Salamis concerning the bridges. This message and the claim made to the royal house for the first time now that Themistocles had prevented the destruction of the bridges are the ὁγαδη performed while Xerxes was retreating in danger. Thucydides rejects the truth of Themistocles' new claim. Hignett said Thucydides' reference to Salamis as the geographical origin of the second message 'looks like a mere slip'. Before we consider this judgement let us look at the other important sources for the second message.

Plutarch (Them. 16.1-5) has Themistocles, clearly still at Salamis, propose sailing to the Hellespont and breaking the bridges to Aristides, but not, however, in earnest. Aristides uses arguments reminiscent of those of Herodotus' Eurybiades (Hdt. 8. 108. 2 - 4) concerning the effect this would have on the King to counter the proposal successfully. Themistocles then sends the captured eunuch Arnakes to tell the King that out of goodwill Themistocles wishes to warn him that the Greeks had decided to sail to the Hellespont and break the bridges, and that he should depart in all haste, but that Themistocles would cause the Greeks delays. The effect of this ἄρκμης of Aristides and Themistocles was to reduce the enemy numbers at Plataea, and its motives were patriotic (Them. 16. 5). In the
Aristides (9.3 - 10.1) Plutarch gives substantially the same account, except that the contents of the message are that the Greeks had started to sail for the bridges but that Themistocles, wishing to save the King, had caused them to turn back. It would be difficult and unwarranted to propose two distinctly different sources for the two accounts in Plutarch. The Themistocles should take precedence. It is probable that in the Aristides Plutarch had in mind the obviously non-Herodotean source he used in the Themistocles but has been unconsciously influenced by Herodotus' second message (Hdt. 8. 110. 3).

If Diodorus (11. 19. 5-6) preserves Ephorus accurately, the latter also interpreted Themistocles' second message as patriotically motivated (cf. 11. 59. 2). The context suggests the message originated from Salamis. There are close verbal similarities between Diodorus' and Plutarch's (Themistocles) accounts. But Diodorus' account - let us assume it is also Ephorus' - does differ from Plutarch's in two points of substance. In Ephorus Themistocles is alone in perceiving the advantages to be had from encouraging Xerxes' escape; and in Ephorus it is the teacher of his own sons (i.e. Sicinnus: Hdt. 8. 75. 1) whom Themistocles sends as messenger. Nonetheless, Bauer rather surprisingly found that Plutarch's incorporation of Aristides 'looks most like Ephorus'. Now Ctesias (F.Gr.Hist. 688 F13 (30)) says: ΦΕΩΓΕΙ ΧΕΡΧΗΣ ΒΟΛΗ ΠΆΛΙΝ ΚΑΙ ΤΕΧΝΗ 'ΑΡΙΣΤΕΙΔΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΘΕΜΙΣΤΟ- ΚΛΕΟΥΣ, and in the epitome of Photius a few lines further a royal eunuch is mentioned whose names (Μάτωκας, Μάτωκας (cf. F13 (24) Νάτωκας, Νατωκας) is suspiciously similar to 'Arnakes'. The complete text may well have mentioned, or meant, the eunuch referred to by Plutarch. Uxkull had pointed to Plutarch's use of Aristides to support the conclusion that he must have been drawing on Ctesias,
which is more logical than Bauer's deduction, and recently Podlecki has found 'the similarity of wording between Plutarch, Themistocles 16.6 ... Ctesias' grounds for suggesting that Plutarch was drawing on Ctesias. The suggestion is acceptable, and with it the corollary that Ctesias most probably located the geographical origin of the message, as Plutarch did, at Salamis.

There is good reason to deny that Plutarch was drawing on Ephorus. And there seems equally good reason to deny that Ephorus was drawing on Ctesias here. The one has Themistocles working alone and sending Sicinnus, the other involves Aristides and has Themistocles send Arnakes. And yet the correspondence in the setting, contents, motive and effect of the message, and in language, between Plutarch and Diodorus is striking and does require explanation. The use of a common source by Ctesias and Ephorus would help to explain both the similarities and differences in their accounts, as preserved by Plutarch and Diodorus.

The differences between the version reflected in Thucydides, Ctesias (Plutarch) and Ephorus (Diodorus) and the account of Herodotus are fundamental and significant, not merely the result of incidental alterations in the process of transmission. Take, for example, the introduction of Aristides into the tradition, as we know it from Plutarch. Aristides has been recognized as a substitution for Eurybiades, for it is quite clear that his arguments are modelled on those of Herodotus' Eurybiades at Andros. In the anti-Themistoclean, Herodotean account the implication is clear that Themistocles is not expressing his own opinion which had previously been set out in the council of strategoi, but is adopting the convincing arguments of Eurybiades to win a (therefore undeserved) reputation for being εὐθυμοῦλος (see text below). This device, however, when transplanted
to the tradition favourable to Themistocles, loses its raison d'être. Plutarch, at least, offers the rather clumsy explanation that since Themistocles, as the ultimate source probably indicated, was himself fully aware of the advantages of encouraging the King's retreat, he must have been 'just testing' (ἀποφυσάμενος) Aristides in suggesting breaking the bridges. Our putative common source behind Ctesias and Ephorus has probably been more accurately reproduced by the latter in having Themistocles perceive unaided the advantages of the King's swift retreat.

Two fundamentally different traditions can also be detected in the different geographical origins of the message, Salamis and Andros, and this is connected with its contents. From Salamis the Greek fleet sailed off in the direction of the Hellespont. Had this action followed a message to the King 'concerning the bridges' it is very difficult to imagine that it should have claimed that Themistocles 'had thwarted the Greeks' desire to pursue your ships and to destroy the Hellespont bridges' (Hdt. 8. 110. 3). Such a claim would have appeared to be contradicted by the Greek fleet's departure. No, the contents of the message as sent from Salamis were consistent with the actions of the Greeks: they intended to break the bridges. From Salamis a message, made convincing by the action of the Greeks, which warned the King of the danger he would be in by remaining could only have encouraged his departure. The message's effect, and so, arguably, purpose, was to reduce the danger to the Greeks at Plataea (cf. Thuc. 1. 73. 5; Plut. Them. 16. 5; Diod. 11. 19. 6; 59. 2).¹⁸

Behind these non-Herodotean versions it is reasonable to see ultimately a source which gave a coherent account of the second message in which Themistocles perceived unaided the advantages of making the King believe that his line of communications and retreat was in danger,
and in which a message was sent to Xerxes while the Greek fleet was still at Salamis. The message will have warned Xerxes of a Greek intention to break the bridges, advising him to head for the Hellespont, and will have promised that Themistocles would try to cause the Greeks delays out of goodwill for the King. Its main motive and effect were patriotic.\(^\text{19}\) The account may or may not have named the messenger. On to this core accreted elements based on Herodotus (the introduction of Aristides, assuming Eurybiades' role, and perhaps Sicinnus) or simply invented (Arnakes as messenger).\(^\text{20}\)

So in view of the existence of an alternative fifth century version of the second message which most probably located its geographical origin at Salamis, it would seem preferable to assume that Thucydides' apparent location of it there was deliberate and to reject Hignett's opinion that he has made a slip. And since the Salamis origin logically requires a message to warn the King of an intended destruction of the bridges, which must have had the effect of encouraging his withdrawal, Thucydides would seem to support the patriotically motivated version of the second message.\(^\text{21}\)

Conversely, a narrator who wished to exclude from the second message a possible patriotic interpretation of its intention and effect had to supply the appropriate accompanying details. Thus in Herodotus' selfishly motivated message Xerxes is told that the Greeks had decided not to break the bridges, thereby giving him no reason to hurry out of Greece.\(^\text{22}\) And, as we saw, whether the Greeks 'intended to break the bridges' or 'had decided not to' depended, to all appearances, on whether the message originated from Salamis or from Andros, where the Athenians publicly renounced pursuit (Hdt. 8. 110. 1) and the Greeks settled down to a siege (Hdt. 8. 111. 1).

I think there is sufficient reason to believe that Herodotus'
version of the message is not true and that it represents a modification of an already existing account. Herodotus' account initially arouses suspicion because of its implausibility: is it really credible that in his greatest hour Themistocles was making contingency plans for his downfall? Possibly. But since the account is certainly formulated with a conscious awareness of subsequent events (Hdt. 8.109.5), suggesting that it was composed in the light of the allegations against Themistocles, it is easier to believe it represents an attempt by those with a vested interest to supply an example of the selfish uses to which Themistocles put his famous and admired wiliness. It was in the interest of families who were associated with pressing for Themistocles' condemnation on Medism charges to perpetuate and reinforce a belief in Themistocles' pursuit of his private interests in the exercise of his genius, for such a belief will have increased the perceived credibility of his guilt.

Herodotus' account of the situation following Salamis could comfortably accommodate the version of the second message found in other sources. He notes that the King was worried by the possibility of the bridges being broken (8.107.2; cf. 7.10.8.2; 8.97.1) and that despite the fleet's withdrawal the land forces showed no sign of retreating (8.108.1). Now would have been the time when a message intending to dupe the King into retreating could have been conceived and sent - as it was in the alternative tradition. Herodotus' sources seem to have been at pains to pass over this period, to judge by the striking emphasis which is laid on the immediacy of the Greek decision to pursue (8.108.1). Yet it has long been recognized that between the awareness of the Persian fleet's withdrawal and the Greek decision to proceed to Andros, Herodotus 'has assuredly omitted to report a debate at Salamis'. This omission may be a sign that Herodotus'
sources have tampered with the historical record in order to create a version of the second message less creditable to Themistocles.

But most damaging to the possibility of the historicity of Herodotus' account is the fact that it is impossible to locate a reliable source for it. It could not have become known in the form in which he presents it. There is nothing in it which would encourage Themistocles to disclose details. Herodotus (8.110.2) indicates that those involved in delivering the message were later tortured in an unsuccessful attempt to confirm the contents of the message as given by Herodotus.²⁸ So Herodotus' version was either invented out of the blue or is a corruption of a different version which could have become known.

Herodotus' indication that the messengers were interrogated may be cited further to establish the strong probability that Herodotus' version is not pure invention but a modification of an earlier account of the second message. It is just conceivable that in the 460s those investigating Themistocles' earlier career sought to elicit a statement from Themistocles' former aides in support of an account of a second message which the investigators had invented. But were this the case they could have invented a much more incriminating message. The account they produced would seem to have been constrained by limitations imposed by familiar and generally accepted elements in an already existing version. It is much more likely that the idea of creating a selfish second message was prompted by the existence of a widely known report of a patriotic second message. If Herodotus' version is indeed a modification of another tradition, it is economical to identify the latter with the alternative tradition first alluded to by Thucydides, and, to judge by his abbreviated reference, well-known at the time.²⁹
Does the non-Herodotean version deserve credence? I see no reason to treat lightly Thucydides' evidence in his excursus on the fate of Themistocles, and believe the most likely ultimate main source for the excursus is Themistocles himself.\textsuperscript{30} Themistocles' authorship of an account of a patriotic second message would not automatically guarantee its historicity.\textsuperscript{31} But unless positive objections can be raised against the plausibility of the despatch of such a message in the reconstruction of the circumstances following the naval victory, I think we should give Themistocles the benefit of the doubt, especially since Thucydides, in possession of more information than we are, did so. Our reconstruction will also explain how Herodotus' sources might hope that a false account could find acceptance with an Athenian audience.

Shortly before the Greek decision to proceed to Andros, there was, as we noted, almost certainly a debate at Salamis, and it was most probably held within a council of strategoi.\textsuperscript{32} The fact that the Persian land forces, unlike the fleet, appeared not to be withdrawing (Hdt. 8. 108. 1) should have focused Greek attention on the possibility of their trying to ignore the naval defeat by attacking the Peloponnesian forthwith, or, by some modified plan, of carrying on the land war (cf. Hdt. 8. 100. 2-5). The fact of such a potential danger should have been combined with the knowledge of Xerxes' probably genuine fear of the destruction of the bridges (Hdt. 7.10β.2; 8.97.1; 8.107.2; Plut.Them. 16.5; Arist. 10.1; Diod. 11.9.6) to produce in the council of strategoi a device to encourage Xerxes' withdrawal with at least some of his land forces. So it is entirely plausible that a plan, perhaps Themistoclean, was accepted to despatch a message purporting to come secretly from Themistocles in which Xerxes was warned of an alleged Greek intention to break the bridges, and was
urged to make a hasty escape while Themistocles attempted to cause the Greeks delays. Its purpose of encouraging Xerxes' withdrawal might be achieved, and there was nothing to lose (except perhaps the messenger's head). Such a ploy by the council would, of course, exclude any genuine plan to break the bridges and to harass Xerxes' withdrawal.\textsuperscript{33} Burn comments that 'if such a new deception was practised, it would be desirable to support it by letting the Greek fleet ... disappear from Xerxes' sight in an easterly direction; and if some of the men, in the elation of victory, indulged in loose talk on the theme 'on to the Hellespont' - and Herodotus says the Athenians did so ... - there was no reason for the generals to 'play down' the idea until it had served its turn'.\textsuperscript{34} The sailors will have been led to believe that they were, eventually, going to the Hellespont. The promise of delays will have led Xerxes to believe he might have a chance of reaching Asia before the Greek fleet could harass his crossing. The start of the Persian land forces' northward movement 'within a few days' of the naval victory (Hdt. 8.113.1) could have been interpreted as a sign that the ruse was working. The halt at Andros would have looked like the fulfilment of Themistocles' promise of delays. I am prepared to believe this was the historical course of events.\textsuperscript{35}

During the 470s Themistocles laid claim to the credit due to him both for the first message and, to a lesser extent, this one.\textsuperscript{36} He had reduced the enemy numbers at Plataea (Thuc. 1.73.5) and sent Xerxes scuttling off with all the panic described by Aeschylus (Persae 480 - 514). The sailors' delight at this may have made them choose to ignore as unimportant the fact that in so doing Themistocles had had to trick them into believing, for a few days, in the flush of victory, that they were in fact off to the Hellespont. But the charges of Medism encouraged his enemies to put into a suspicious light whichever actions
of his would sustain it. For Themistocles to have been able to represent as patriotic a message warning the King to anticipate the Greeks in arriving at the bridges it was necessary to understand that a decision against breaking the bridges had been taken prior to its despatch.\(^{37}\)

Now, as far as the sailors were concerned, and as far as they could remember, the decision to break the bridges was taken at Andros. It was thus particularly easy for Herodotus' informants to blur the distinction between the secret Salamis decision and the public 'decision' at Andros. The secret decision and the duping of the sailors it implied will not have been dwelt upon by Themistocles or the sailors, and may have been quickly forgotten. But the false location allowed a simple change, conforming to the actions of the Greeks, in the contents of the message from 'I shall try to delay the Greeks' to 'I have stopped the Greeks', while keeping the central 'Themistocles bids you leave'. The changes were slight, none conflicting with public events or statements made at the time, but sufficient to cast the message in a completely different, discreditable, if not quite traitorous, light.\(^ {38}\)

If the alternative version of the second message and the circumstances surrounding it sketched above are accepted as historical, it follows that Herodotus' account of Themistocles' proposal to break the bridges in a council of strategoi held at Andros must be apocryphal, for it is logically incompatible with the purpose of the message. As well as having its place in Herodotus' version of the message the fabrication of this debate serves in a further way to rob Themistocles of credit. Fifth century Greeks believed that the withdrawal of Persian land forces after Salamis, made possible by the non-harassment of Xerxes' retreat, contributed to their final delivery from danger (Thuc. 1.73.5). It follows that to have prevented this
withdrawal would have been unhelpful and unwise. The 'revelation' that Themistocles had originally opposed this well-advised course of action and had adopted it only under the necessity of circumstances deprived him of one justification of his reputation for naturally supplying good advice (cf. Thuc. 1. 138. 3).

Let us examine the contents of the two speeches to try to discern what Themistocles actually said. Here is a summary of the appropriate section of Herodotus (8. 108. 2 - 109. 4). Eurybiades' speech is in response to Themistocles' alleged proposal to proceed, with a view ultimately to reaching the Hellespont and destroying the bridges. Eurybiades argues that to cut off Xerxes' retreat would be the worst course of action (8. 108. 2) because if Xerxes were forced to remain in Europe he would not remain inactive since this would neither advance his cause nor provide him with a means of returning home, but would, rather, cause the destruction of his force by starvation. He would take firm action and set to work. The cities and tribes of Europe would go over to him by either conquest or agreement. The yearly produce of Hellas would provide the enemy with food (8. 103. 1) (I). Eurybiades adds that he does not believe that the Persian will (choose to) remain in Europe after his naval defeat (II) and proposes that he be allowed to flee until he reaches his own land, calling for the battle to be for the King's land in future (8. 108. 4) (III).

Themistocles is said to have argued his case again, but unsuccessfully, and, going then to the Athenians, he dissuades them from sailing to the Hellespont, using the following arguments (8. 109. 1). Beaten and terrified men will rally and salvage their earlier defeat (A). He counsels against the pursuit of fleeing men, and his reasons are religious: our victory, he says, was a piece of luck (8. 109. 2) and was achieved not by ourselves but by the gods and heroes who were
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envious that one man should rule both Asia and Europe, especially a rash and impious one (8. 109. 3) (B). Finally he advises the Athenians to remain in Europe, and, once the Barbarian is wholly driven away (C), to take thought for themselves and their families, to rebuild their dwellings and to be busy with sowing. Then, next spring, they should sail to the Hellespont and Ionia (8. 109. 4) (D).

It is obvious that the bulk of these two speeches could come from one delivery with a logical development, thus: compelling strategic reasons for not hindering the enemy retreat (I and A), further religious grounds for not pursuing (B), an assessment of the immediate strategic situation (II and C) and a suggestion of the action to be taken next season (III and D). I believe that Themistocles' speech to the Athenians at Andros followed this pattern and that Herodotus' sources have created the 'Eurybiades' speech in order to supply an external source not only for the basic Themistoclean idea of not breaking the bridges but also for the lucid arguments used to support it, and that some other elements have been included for the sake of verisimilitude.

In A Themistocles merely repeats in generalized form the conclusions of the specific arguments set out by 'Eurybiades' in I. We have already noted that Themistocles' earlier alleged proposal to break the bridges robs him of any credit for having perceived the wisdom of allowing the King to retreat. Now the implication is made that the persuasive arguments used by Themistocles were not his own. It is probable that Themistocles elaborated on why Xerxes would rally, and that he specified the likely consequences, in much the same way as 'Eurybiades' is made to. Since the substance of Themistocles' speech was probably still remembered at Athens, Herodotus' sources (and perhaps Herodotus) may have felt that the accusation of plagiarism
need not be made explicitly, and, rather, they have left it to be deduced by an audience who will have recognized the source of Themistocles' good counsel in 'Eurybiades' speech.\(^1\) The Mnesiphilus incident (Hdt. 8.57.1 - 58.2) is less subtle. The arguments used by 'Eurybiades' seem to me wholly applicable to the strategic situation, and so I accept them as likely to have been spoken in reality by Themistocles to dissuade the over-enthusiastic Athenians.\(^2\)

It is possible that the religious arguments set out by Themistocles in B were too firmly attributable to his own world-view for Herodotus' sources to attempt to rob him of his piety as well as his good counsel by denying his authorship of them. The authenticity of this section has been unwisely doubted. Bauer thought it evinced a 'sonst nicht charakterisierenden Bescheidenheit' and that it looked Herodotean rather than Themistoclean.\(^3\) Themistocles' attention, at least publicly, to the role of the gods in the war is, of course, well attested.\(^4\) And so, while Herodotus is perhaps not reproducing Themistocles' exact words, the only grounds for rejecting this element in the speech would be to demonstrate that the 'Denkformen' are anachronistic, which passages in Aeschylus' *Persae* prove to be not the case.\(^5\) If Themistocles can be taken as minimizing his personal achievement in favour of thankful piety it is not difficult to understand this as an attempt to minimize the envy\(^6\) which his outstanding contribution to victory might draw upon him. His outrage at Xerxes' impious destructions (among other hubristic acts) may have served as a declaration of sympathy for what the Athenians were soon to feel on their return home (cf. Hdt. 8.144.2), and have been intended as a pre-emptive defence against any suggestion that he weighed too lightly the consequences of abandoning Attica. His words also had the effect of presenting the destruction itself as one of the reasons for Xerxes' defeat, and, thus, easier to
bear. Themistocles claims that one of the reasons for Xerxes' defeat was the envy of the gods and heroes that one man should rule both Asia and Europe. The belief that the two continents should remain politically separate is one which fits well with what can be gleaned of Themistocles' attitudes in the 470s (see text below). We should also mention that Themistocles may have been expressing a genuine piety.

In C Themistocles offers his opinion on the immediate strategic situation arising from the victory of Salamis. He notes that for the moment the Athenians are in a good position, by which he must be referring to the naval situation. He lists the pressing tasks of reconstruction which the men can begin if they remain in Europe. But most significantly Themistocles says that these tasks can only be turned to once the Barbarian has been driven wholly away. This is an implicit warning that Persian land forces may remain and that the Greeks will have to face them in battle. There is nothing in this section which could arouse suspicion as to its authenticity.

Themistocles' suggestion to sail to the Hellespont and Ionia in the following spring, after the beginnings of reconstruction and after the Persians have been completely expelled, makes it clear that he is envisaging the land battle being fought before the season is over. That the battle was in fact delayed until 479 B.C. is a strong indication that the substance of this part of the speech was not composed with a knowledge of events subsequent to 480 B.C.

There was no way in which Herodotus' sources could suggest Themistocles' opinions here were derived from Eurybiades, because it was widely believed that the Spartans had been reluctant in 479 B.C. to engage Mardonius (Hdt.9.6.1.-11.3). The expression of 'Eurybiades' opinion that the Persian would not remain in Europe (II) is perhaps
best explained as an attempt to add verisimilitude to this fictional speech by putting into 'Eurybiades' mouth what may have seemed to be the assumption upon which Spartan inertia in 479 B.C. had been based. Verisimilitude is also sought by having 'Eurybiades' propose fighting the Persian when his own land is at stake (III), in language almost identical to that used to describe Pausanias' 478 B.C. campaign. The analogy with Pausanias' actions (Thuc.1.94.2; 128.5) shows that 'King's land' must mean, surprisingly, Greek areas under Persian control. His proposals, then, are, in substance, the same as Themistocles', whose appeal to the Athenians to sail to the Hellespont and Ionia with the coming of spring (D) differs only in its greater temporal and local precision, and in that the one assumes that the King's forces will have withdrawn from Greece, the other that they will have been expelled.

While Themistocles' proposals were possibly in part designed to encourage acceptance of his advice not to pursue the enemy, there is no need to doubt that he was, in fact, hoping for their realization. Interpreted correctly they fit with what we know of Themistocles' post-war policy, and so we need not suspect their authenticity. There is no evidence that Themistocles was ever interested in the Athenians assuming the responsibility of liberating and protecting Ionian (or other) states on the Asiatic mainland. Furthermore, his well attested anti-Spartan policy of the 470s (Thuc. 1.90.1 – 93.2; 93.7; 135.3; Plut. Them. 20.1 – 4; Arist. 22.2; Cim. 16.2) excludes the possibility of believing that he favoured at the same time Athenian leadership of an aggressive war against Persian control of the Aegean coast of mainland Asia, for to do so 'makes Themistocles into an utter fool'. On the other hand, the suggestion that Themistocles' post-war policy included the aim of achieving Athenian 'arche' over
the Aegean islands and control of the Hellespont has a degree of support in the sources,\(^5\) conflicts with no evidence and makes good sense. In view of this, we should interpret Themistocles' proposals as referring to operations aiming at securing control of the Hellespont and the Aegean islands, but not of the Aegean coast of the Asiatic mainland.

So there is nothing in Themistocles' public speech recorded by Herodotus which could warrant our doubting its essential authenticity. The speech may also have included the arguments marshalled in the first part of 'Eurybiades' speech. If the tradition of a patriotic second message reflected in Thucydides, Ephorus (Diodorus) and Ctesias (Plutarch) is accepted as historical the corollary is that Themistocles cannot have proposed sailing to the Hellespont to break the bridges. There are, therefore, no grounds for wondering whether in the debates on strategy held in autumn and winter 480-79 B.C. Themistocles reverted to his alleged original opinion that the whole fleet should begin operations on the other side of the Aegean even while Persian forces remained in Greece. In fact, Themistocles' views on strategy expressed publicly at Andros coincide substantially with the planned strategy for 479 B.C. At Andros Themistocles had advocated concentrating on achieving a land victory before further naval operations be undertaken to secure control of the eastern Aegean islands (Ionia) and the Hellespont. His detailed plans would certainly also have included a minimal naval defence against the remote possibility of a return of the enemy fleet. That the land battle was postponed until 479 B.C. did not alter the strategic situation fundamentally, and I see no reason why Themistocles should have altered his views fundamentally. The chance, however, of the enemy fleet returning was less remote in spring 479 B.C. than it had been in autumn 480 B.C., and the
proposed size of the Greek fleet was probably increased. But the basic strategy remained intact, for in 479 B.C. the Greek concentration on a powerful land force allowed only a relatively small fleet of 110 ships to be launched (Hdt. 8.131.1). The actions planned for the Greek fleet in 479 B.C. were also in line with Themistocles' view expressed in 480 B.C., allowing for modifications necessitated by the new season. Herodotus does not specify the tasks allocated to the fleet in 479 B.C. but he provides sufficient incidental comment to allow us to reconstruct them confidently. The fleet was to remain on the defensive, but should a large proportion of the enemy attack and be beaten, it was to proceed to secure control of the eastern Aegean islands and the Hellespont. The Greeks, however, must have hoped that the Persians would not attack, and, once the land victory had been achieved, those who had recently served as hoplites could be used to man additional ships to augment the fleet which would seek out and destroy its enemy, securing the objectives noted above.

There would appear, then, to be no conflict between the strategy favoured by Themistocles and that actually planned for 479 B.C. Since the Athenians vigorously supported these plans (Hdt. 8. 4-5; 9. 6. 1 - 11. 3), unpopular strategic views cannot be offered as a possible solution to the problem of why Themistocles was not chosen as a military leader in 479/8 B.C. Our understanding of the nature of Athenian politics in this period must be influenced strongly by our reconstruction of Themistocles' fortunes in the decade following Salamis, and the first step in such a reconstruction is to explain why Themistocles is not mentioned as one of the generals in either of the two battles of 479 B.C.
NOTES

1 μεταβαλόν (Hdt. 8.109.1) signifies 'an actual change of place' (R.W. Macan, Herodotus. The Seventh, Eighth and Ninth Books, Vol. I, Part II, London 1908, 527) and so the Athenian sailors were not present at what must, then, have been a debate of strategoi in closed council (cf. Hdt. 8.108.4).

2 Recently, e.g., by J.Hart, Herodotus and Greek History, London 1982, 151. Herodotus' version (8.110.2-3) claims that after the Greek decision at Andros to forgo pursuit of the Persian fleet had been accepted, Themistocles sent Sicinnus and others with a message to Xerxes in Attica to claim that he, wishing to assist Xerxes, had stopped the Greeks who had wanted to pursue the Persian fleet and destroy the Hellespont bridges, and that now Xerxes could go at his leisure.


4 The 'unfortunate result of the battle' (Gomme (op. cit. n.3) 441) was not Themistocles' fault - he had to defend himself - and in no way diminished his right to claim thanks for having tried to help the King: see too J.W. Cole's comment, A.C. 47 (1978), 37-49, 45.


6 It is safer to see a reference here to a second message (cf., e.g., Gomme (op. cit. n.3), 441; A.J. Podlecki, The Life of Themistocles, Montreal and London 1975, 27, 41; F.J. Frost, Plutarch's Themistocles. A Historical Commentary, Princeton 1980, 162 and n.50) and that it was sent from Salamis (cf., e.g., W. How and J. Wells, A Commentary on Herodotus, Vol. II (Books V - IX), Oxford 1912, 272;
C. Hignett, *Xerxes' Invasion of Greece*, Oxford 1963, 242). If Thucydides is the source of P. Oxy. 1610, fr. 1, 7-12 (so Gomme (op. cit. n.3) 441; Frost (op. cit. above) 162) its author arguably offers some support for this interpretation of Thucydides. Although such a message would have been sent while Xerxes was still in Attica, his fleet had already begun its retreat (see text below). An explanation of why Thucydides rejects Themistocles' claim is offered at n.33 below.

Op. cit. n.6, 242; cf. How and Wells (op. cit. n.6) 271.

References to Plutarch are according to the system used in the Loeb edition, London and Cambridge, Mass., 1968.

The message according to Plutarch (Them. 16.4) was as follows:

```
tούτης δὲ κατὰ τὴν γαύραν καὶ λύειν τὴν γέφυραν, θεμιστοκλῆς δὲ κηδόμενος βασιλέως πασανεῖτε σπεύδειν ἐπὶ τὴν έαυτὸν ἀλάτταν καὶ περαλοῦσαι ... ταῦτα δὲ δαβδάρος ἀκούσας καὶ γενόμενος περίφοβος διὰ τάχους ἐποιεῖτο τὴν ἀναχώρησιν; according to Diodorus (11.19.5-6): μέλλουσιν οἱ Ἑλληνες πλεύσαντες ἐπὶ τῷ Ἕλεγχῳ λυεῖν τὴν γέφυραν. διότι ὁ βασιλεύς πιστεύσας τοῖς λόγοις διὰ τὴν πιθανότητα, περίφοβος ἐγένετο μὴ τῆς εἰς τὴν Ἱστίαν ἐπανόδου στερηθῇ, τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀλαττοκρατοῦντων, ἐγὼ δὲ τὴν ταχύτητα διαβάλειν ἐκ τῆς ἑβρούς εἰς τὴν Ἱστίαν.
```


Bauer (op. cit. n.11) 159.


14 Uxkull (op. cit. n.13) 69; Podlecki (op. cit.n.6) 26 and n.26.
15 See Uxkull (op. cit. n.13) 65.
16 Alternatively, though, it is not impossible to believe that Ephorus was here following Ctesias in the main, but that his account has been 'contaminated' with another source, as Uxkull (op. cit. n.13) 67-9 did (accepting von Mess' contention that Ephorus used Ctesias elsewhere).
17 Cf. Row and Wells (op. cit. n.6) 271; G.Gottlieb, Das Verhältnis der ausserherodoteischen Überlieferung zu Herodot, Bonn 1963, 109 and n.42 ('Adeimantos' a slip for Eurybiades).
18 See further nn. 37, 39, 41.
19 Contrast Gottlieb (op. cit. n.17) 109-10. The source could have been Hellanicus: for Ephorus' use of Hellanicus, see G.I. Barber, The Historian Ephorus, Cambridge 1935, 113, 122-3; J.H. Schreiner, s.o. 51 (1976), 19-63, 55 n.7. F.Jacoby (R.E. XI, 2, col. 2061) said of Ctesias' evidence: 'einiges, was neben Herodotos über Salamin brauchbar erscheint, kann aus Hellanikos stammen'.
20 If the original source failed to name the second messenger, it is possible that Ephorus took over Sicinnus from the Herodotean version and in consequence 'rationalized' the first messenger (Hdt. 8.75.1) into a deserter (Diod. 11.71.1). Ctesias may simply have named Arnakes to fill the silence of his source, or, also disliking the use of Sicinnus on both occasions, have supplied Arnakes as the second messenger; cf. Macan (op. cit. n.1) 533; A.R.Burn, Persia and the Greeks, London 1962, 469.
The fact that Themistocles was able, apparently, to portray the message as a favour to the King does not imply that its motive was unpatriotic: see, e.g., Podlecki (op. cit. n.6) 26; R.J. Lenardon, *The Saga of Themistocles*, London 1978, 84. How and Wells (op. cit. n.6) 272 find it odd.

G.B. Grundy, *The Great Persian War*, London 1901, 415, and Hignett (op. cit. n.6) 242 note that the Herodotean message does not encourage the King's departure. On the anti-Themistoclean tendency of the Herodotean message see below n.25.

G. B. Grundy, *The Great Persian War*, London 1901, 415, and Hignett (op. cit. n.6) 242 note that the Herodotean message does not encourage the King's departure. On the anti-Themistoclean tendency of the Herodotean message see below n.25.

Cf. Macan (op. cit. n.1) 531; Hart (op. cit. n.2) 152.


So even though the message in Herodotus does not indicate an obviously traitorous intention (as Fornara (op. cit. n.24) 71 and Hart (op. cit. n.2) 151 emphasize) it nonetheless increases the general credibility of the allegations of Medism, and so can only be considered hostile. While it is true that the case against Herodotus for unfair treatment of Themistocles has been overstated (see H. Strasburger, *Historia* 4 (1955), 1-25, 21-4; C. Guratzsch, *Klio* 39 (1961), 48-65, 49-51; Fornara (op. cit. n.24) 66-74; Lenardon (op. cit. n.21) 84) this is one among other incidents which seek to disparage Themistocles' contribution and character (cf. Guratzsch (op. cit. above) 52; F. Schachermeyr, 'Das Bild des Themistokles in der antiken Geschichtsschreibung', *XII Internationaler Kongress der Geschichtswissenschaften, Rapports 6, IV*, Vienna 1965, 81-91, 83-4; Podlecki (op. cit. n.6) 68-72; Lenardon (op. cit. above) 85). The anti-Themistoclean tendency of Herodotus' version is particularly striking when compared with the other version. In the latter Themistocles' wiliness is used to
serve the cause of Greek freedom, with no hint at this stage of personal advantage ever accruing from it. In Herodotus it is calculated to serve only Themistocles' personal advantage, and could have damaged the patriotic cause by divulging Greek plans to the enemy. In the non-Herodotean version the implication is that Themistocles' message caused Xerxes to drop his plans to stay and fight (Plut. Them. 16.1 and 5). In Herodotus (8.97.1) the decision to withdraw was made independently of Themistocles' message. See below n.39.

16 ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐπόθοντο τὰς νέας οἰχωμαλίας, οὕτως μετὰ ταῦτα εὐδόκει ἐπιδεῖχεν.

26 Μακαν (op. cit. n.1) 525; cf., e.g., How and Wells (op. cit. n.6) 271. Macan's belief ((op. cit. n.1) 524, 533; Herodotus. The Seventh, Eighth and Ninth Books, Vol. 2, London 1908, 324-5, 329, 330; cf. E. Meyer, Geschichte des Altertums, IV2 1, 4th ed., Stuttgart 1944, 372 n.1) that before leaving Salamis the Greek fleet had to await the withdrawal of the Persian land forces, is, however, erroneous: see Grundy (op. cit. n.22) 413; How and Wells (op. cit. n.6) 271; Hignett (op. cit. n.6) 240-1; Burn (op. cit. n.20) 469 n.52.

27 Cf. Macan (op. cit. n.1) 532.

29 If the excursus on Pausanias and Themistocles (Thuc. 1.128.3 - 138.6) is accepted as the product of the early part of Thucydides' career (see the references at M.P. Wilton, Historia 28 (1979), 257 - 75, 264 n.44) it may be earlier than Herodotus' work (on the date of the latter's appearance, see, recently, J.A.S. Evans, Athenaeum, 57 (1979), 145-9).


31 See below n.35.
The actions of the Greeks after Salamis show that Herodotus' Andros debate is not a merely misplaced but substantially correct account of the Salamis debate.

Some reasons why sailing to the Hellespont in September 480 was probably never seriously proposed are discussed by Grundy (op. cit. n.22) 414; Macan (op. cit. n.27) 330; How and Wells (op. cit. n.6) 272. See too below n.39; pace, recently, T.J.Quinn, Athens and Samos, Lesbos and Chios 478-404 B.C., Manchester 1981, 62 n.16. The fact that the Greeks never intended to break the bridges is, I believe, why Thucydides (1.137.4) castigates as deceitful Themistocles' claim to have been responsible for the non-destruction of the bridges.

It is not impossible that Themistocles himself invented the story of a patriotic second message, either before his flight or in an embellished account of his flight (including the letter to Artaxerxes (Thuc. 1.137.4) which he made known in exile (cf. P.J. Rhodes, Historia 19 (1970), 387-400, 394 n.43: though I cannot believe that Themistocles would have created embellishments which conflicted with known public events; cf. Milton (loc. cit. n.29) 265 n.51). Were this the case, though, the fact would remain that Herodotus' informants have apparently gone to some lengths to create an alternative non-patriotic version of the story (cf. Macan (op. cit. n.1) 532) betraying their interest in minimizing Themistocles' reputation. This would have to be borne in mind when assessing the credibility of the account of the council of strategoi at Andros, and the hostile implications it creates for Themistocles' plagiarism of Eurybiades' arguments (see text below). And while the non-existence of a patriotic second message would remove the
necessity of rejecting Themistocles' alleged proposal to break the bridges, we should still have to note the improbability of his suggesting such a harebrained plan; see further n.39 below and the references at n.33 above.

36 To a lesser extent, I feel, because the need for the ruse questioned whether Salamis had in fact been the devastating blow to Xerxes' power which Themistocles doubtless wished to claim.

37 It was less attractive (for reasons apparent in n.41 below) for Themistocles' detractors to allege that Themistocles had been largely responsible for a decision, made first at Andros, not to break the bridges, and that his action had been in fulfilment of the promise to delay a real Greek intention to destroy the bridges sent from Salamis to Xerxes out of genuine goodwill, and only according to Themistocles as a ploy.

38 See above n.25.

39 I agree with the implication of E. Schulte's remarks, *Herodots Darstellung der grossen Feldherren*, Lahn 1966, 119, that Herodotus is expressing the opinion of the Athenians in describing Themistocles as ὁ ὁμόφως τε καὶ εὖθελος because of his advice not to break the bridges (contrast Macan (*op. cit.* n.1) 532).

I am unconvinced by Fornara's attempt (*op. cit.* n.24) 70 and n.13) to show that Herodotus intends Themistocles' alleged proposal to break the bridges to illustrate once again his capacity to hit upon exactly what the situation required. It is true that Xerxes feared this possibility (cf. Macan (*op. cit.* n.1) 526). The fact that Xerxes would be put in a desperate situation does not mean that to create such a situation would be strategically advisable for the Greeks. The prognostications of 'Eurybiades' show why Xerxes was right to fear being trapped; they also show
vividly why the Greeks would have been foolhardy to carry out such a plan. To have done so would have created an extremely dangerous situation for both sides: for Xerxes because he would have no line of retreat and would lack supplies, for the Greeks because they would be forcing battle while they were heavily outnumbered. Such an idea can only have been entertained in the unreflecting flush of victory, and Xerxes took it seriously probably because of Persian experience in the past of Greek irrational behaviour; pace Schulte (op. cit. above) 120.

Presumably recognizing the folly of such a proposal Hignett (op. cit. n.6) 243 believes Themistocles only intended to disrupt Xerxes' communications and not to hinder his retreat, and that 'Eurybiades' objections, which assume Themistocles meant both (cf. the motive for destroying the bridges in Plutarch (Them.16.1; Arist. 9.3) and other late writers (see Bauer-Frost (op. cit. n.13) 58), were based on a misunderstanding. There is, therefore, no evidence for such an interpretation, and its acceptance would require the rejection of both the alternative tradition of the second message and Herodotus' representation of Themistocles' views. The mere non-existence of the bridges would not prevent (and did not: Hdt. 8.117.1-2; 130.1) Xerxes' escape. Strategically, not breaking the bridges also meant abstaining from harassing Xerxes' passage to Asia - and so Macan's second objection to the cogency of 'Eurybiades' arguments ((op. cit. n.1) 526), that the bridges were broken without disaster to Greece, misses the point; cf. Aesch. Persae 736, where Xerxes' ability to reach Asia unmolested is expressed by the historically inaccurate reference to his reaching the still intact bridges. (No conclusions applicable to 480 B.C. can be drawn from the Greek intention to destroy the
bridges in late 479 B.C. (Hdt. 9.114.1) since the strategic situation was entirely different.)

It is striking that despite his apparent confidence about the contents of 'Eurybiades' speech in the debate, Herodotus fails to elaborate on the thinking behind Themistocles' alleged proposals either when they are first made or when he was supposed to have defended them against 'Eurybiades' criticisms. It is hard to imagine what defence he could have offered for hindering Xerxes' retreat. See too n.41 below.

40 See n.47 below.
41 The adoption of arguments used by 'Eurybiades' is noted by G.L. Cawkwell, 'The Fall of Themistocles', in Auckland Classical Essays, Festschrift for E.M.Blaiklock, Oxford 1970, 39-58, 42; Schulte (op. cit. n.39) 115 and D.W.Knight, Some Studies in Athenian Politics in the Fifth Century B.C. (Historia Einzelschrift 13), Wiesbaden 1970, 37. This implied accusation of plagiarism seems to me the predominant means of minimizing Themistocles' contribution at Andros, but a different approach, not fully synthesized with the other, and, indeed, logically incompatible, can be detected. As Macan (op. cit. n.1) 531 noted, there is an assumption - or rather a hint - that Themistocles did wrong to dissuade the Athenians (cf. Bauer (op. cit. n.11) 20). This is least veiled in the almost defensive tone of Herodotus' explanation that in part the Athenians followed Themistocles' advice because of the wisdom he had previously shown. It is also implied by the fact that he should use this act as a potential and real source of Persian gratitude. The argument that Themistocles did wrong in allowing Xerxes to escape and fight another day (cf. Hdt. 8.102.3) may have been used in the neurotic atmosphere following the news of Persian
preparations for the offensive which culminated at Eurymedon (cf. Cawkwell (op. cit. above) 48). That this element is only faintly detectable shows that in Athens at the time Herodotus was absorbing his anti-Themistoclean sources it was generally believed that Themistocles had, in fact, been εὐθυγράμτως in his advice at Andros, and so it was more important to deny his authorship of it than to try to deny its wisdom; cf. n.39 above.

42 I cannot see why Macan (op. cit. n.1) 526 thinks the arguments ignore the Greek naval superiority.

43 Op. cit. n.11, 21 and n.2; cf. the doubts of Macan (op. cit. n.1) 530 on the whole parenthesis; Schulte (op. cit. n.39) 116-8.

44 Hdt. 7.143.1-3 (oracle); 8.41.2-3 with Plut. Them. 10.1 (Acropolis snake); Plut. Them. 22.1-2 (temple of Artemis Aristoboule; in view of this personal interest in Artemis one wonders whether Themistocles did not play a prominent role in the Athenian dedication to Artemis (Plut. Them. 8.3). Note, too, Wilamowitz' suggestion that the official hymn sung at the dedication of the Boreas shrine was 'The Sea Fight off Artemision', written by Themistocles' friend Simonides: see Podlecki (op. cit. n.6) 50-1 for references).

45 See Schulte (op. cit. n.39) 116-7 and n.77, and A.J.Podlecki, The Political Background of Aeschylean Tragedy, Ann Arbor 1966, 21-3 for the Aeschylus references and discussion.


47 παντελέως ἀπελάδος τοῦ βαρβαροῦ cannot mean 'since he has driven the Barbarian wholly away' because the tasks to which Themistocles exhorts each man require Greek lands, not just the seas, to be wholly rid of the enemy, and patently this had not been achieved since the Persians occupied large parts of Greece, and, even after the enemy land forces' movement northwards had begun, there could
be no certainty what they would ultimately do (cf. Hdt. 8.97.2; 100.2-5; 108.1). The possibility that some kind of land force would remain was not remote. If it were to be a reduced force it could live off the land and Greek command of the sea would not render its position untenable: a land battle would have to be won. Macao (op. cit. n.1) 530 produced no trenchant argument against taking the participle in this way; correctly, H. Stein, ed., Herodotos Vol. 5, 6th ed. (reprint of the 5th ed., 1893), Berlin 1962, 86.

48 Cf. Bauer (op. cit. n.11) 20.

49 Cf. Stein (op. cit. n.47) 86.

50 Hdt. 8.108.4: τὸ ἐνθαῦταν ὅτε περὶ τῆς ἐκείνου ποιέωσαν ἡδη τὸν ἀγώνα ἐκέλευε. Hdt. 8.3.2: διωκόμενοι τὸν Πέρσην περὶ τῆς ἐκείνου ἡδη τὸν ἀγώνα ἐποίευσαν.

51 Macao (op. cit. n.1) 531 says they were 'a concession to gain the Athenians'.

52 We do not know enough about the date or intentions of Phrynichus' Capture of Miletus to cite it as evidence of a Themistoclean 'Ionian policy'. Nor can Themistocles' tactical ploy at Artemision (Hdt. 8.22.1-3) be saddled with such long-term implications. An analogy with Leotychides' use of the same ploy at Mycale (Hdt. 9.98.2-4) and the subsequent Peloponnesian refusal to accept responsibility for protecting mainland Ionians is instructive. Diodorus' claim (11.41.4) that Themistocles expected Ionian support in a war whose objectives included freeing mainland Asiatic Greeks is quite valueless, for his considerations are said to have been top secret (11.42.1), and the section in which it occurs (11.41.3 – 43.2) looks like a mere elaboration of the simple fact that Themistocles had the Piraeus fortified after Xerxes' defeat.

Thuc. 1.93.4 (see J. de Romilly, *Thucydide et l'impérialisme athénien*, 2nd ed., Paris 1951, 107 n.1, cf. 57); Plut. Them. 20.1-2, cf. 7.3 (cf. Aelius Aristides 46.186-7 (Dindorf II p.252)), 4.3; (Diod. 41.3-5 does not deserve credence - see n.52 above).

Cf., e.g., Hignett (op. cit. n.6) 249-50; Burn (op. cit. n.20) 500 n.34, 547.

This is supported by the fact that the fleet stood guard at Delos for some five months. See too below n.58.

That these were the most optimistic aims of naval operations for 479 B.C. is most clear from Hdt. 9.101.3 - the islands and Hellespont were the prizes of victory at sea - but is also implied in several other passages; they require, however, comment for which I have no space here; see, though, Quinn (op. cit. n.33) 4, 6, 7. (Diod. 11.37.1 does not deserve credence: see, e.g., How and Wells (op. cit. n.6) 333; Hignett (op. cit. n.6) 260).

This possibility of proceeding across the Aegean was probably not paralleled in Themistocles' plans for late 480 B.C., mainly because it would have been too late in the season, but also because with an even smaller fleet than in 479 B.C. such action would have been dangerous if enemy ships regrouped or if some had been left on guard in eastern waters.

The decision to proceed east and seek out the enemy fleet before a land victory had been won was strategically irrational. To have waited would have enabled more ships to be manned, and news of a Persian defeat in Greece would have encouraged revolt in the east. No scholar has convincingly demonstrated any advantages accruing
from the timing of the advance. The fleet's action, then, should not be seen as part of the strategy planned for 479 B.C., but, rather, as the result of five months' inactivity which must have produced eagerness for battle and may have served as a barometer of enemy fear, apparently confirming Samian claims (Hdt. 9.90.2-3) of Ionian readiness to revolt and of the Persian fleet's debilitated condition.

59 Scholars who suggest Themistocles' views on strategy were unpopular include E. Meyer (op. cit. n.27) 380-1; Burn (op. cit. n.20) 490-1 with 504; Hignett (op. cit. n.6) 278; Podlecki (op. cit. n.6) 30. (The reference to the gods and heroes (Hdt. 8.143.2) and to outrage at Persian sacrilege (Hdt. 8.144.2) may suggest Themistocles drew up the Athenian reply in early 479 B.C. to Persian overtures and the appeal to the Spartans to despatch their forces for the envisaged land battle (Hdt. 8.144.5); pace Plutarch (Arist. 10.4); cf. Podlecki (op. cit. n.6) 29.)
et quibus ipsa modis tractetur blanda voluptas, id quoque permagni refert; nam more ferarum quadrupedumque magis ritu plerumque putantur concipere uxores, quia sic loca sumere possunt, pectoribus positis, sublatis semina lumbis. nec molles opus sunt motus uxoribus hilum. nam mulier prohibet se concipere atque repugnat, clunibus ipsa uiri Venerem si laeta retractat atque exossato ciet omni pectore fluctus; eicit enim sulcum recta regione uiaque uomeris atque locis auertit seminis ictum. idque sua causa consuerunt scorta moueri, ne completerunt crebro grauidaeque iacerent et simul ipsa uiris Venus ut concinnior esset; coniugibus quod nil nostris opus esse uidetur.

The Epicurean poet advises the man with a barren wife not to pray and sacrifice to the gods but rather to try intercourse from behind in the way of certain quadrupeds. This was a σχήμα ουνοοιας much practised in Greek and Roman brothels. Hence an abundant illustration on works of art. The prostitute moved her buttocks about, partly in order to excite her partner and partly in order to prevent herself becoming impregnated. The barren wife however
had to keep her buttocks still, both for the maintenance of propriety and for the achievement of insemination.

What Epicurus himself said on this topic does not survive, but we may guess that he expressed himself with bluntness, even crudity. Lucretius wrote in a poetic tradition which from the very beginning avoided any words of the ordinary language, particularly those relating to sexuality. Thus in the passage under discussion we get voluptatem tractare rather than futuere, loca rather than uterus, pectora rather than mammae, lumbi rather than corendices, clunes rather than nates, venus rather than mentula, fluctus ciere rather than crisare. The clarity for which Epicurus was famed goes by the board but the poet's Latin style does not degenerate to a mere cover for nonsense. Accordingly W.V. Clausen altered

\[
\text{clunibus ipsa uiri Venerem si laeta retractat atque exossato ciet omni pectore fluctus}
\]

to

\[
\text{clunibus ipsa uiri uenerem si laeta retractat atque exossato ciet omni corpore fluctus.}
\]

Quite rightly. It is the hip and thigh bones, not those of the rib-cage that a mulier crisans would seem to lack. In any case this one has her breasts firmly planted on a cushion (pectoribus positis) and thus away from her partner's sight.

Clausen's conjecture has enjoyed little approval. Editors as diverse as Karl Büchner and Konrad Müller ignored it. The reviser of W.H.D. Rouse's Loeb edition, M.F. Smith, mentioned it in his apparatus criticus but kept the transmitted text of Lucretius' verses, translating: 'if in her delight she aids the man's action with her buttocks, making undulating movements with all her breast
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limp' (Rouse's 'if she aids the man's actions by the movement of her hips and by the flexible movement of her breast'). A recent attempt to give students of Juvenal sexual instruction cites the verses in the form in which they are transmitted.

Clausen pointed out the frequency with which corpore and words of similar metrical shape, like pectore, are interchanged in the first and fifth feet of transmitted hexameters and the proximity of pectoribus (in v. 1267) to the phrase questioned. I suggest that we have to do with something more than the mere confusion of similarly shaped words. The scribe responsible for the obviously nonsensical pectore had his attention less on what was before him and more on some experience, literary or actual, of a κελητίζουσα, of one presenting her front rather than her back.

NOTES
1 See Aristot. Hist. An. 5. 2 - 3, 539 b 17 - 540 a 32, Artemidor. 1. 79, p.94. 16 - 20 Pack.
   According to Artemidorus only the 'missionary' posture was natural to humans. All the others were discovered δι' ὄρθν. καὶ ἀκολογίαν καὶ πασχοῦλαν (p. 94. 14). Aristoph. Plut. 149-52 and Machon 226-30 seem to have to do with anal intercourse. An ancient commentator took Hor. Serm. 2. 7. 48 - 9 to refer to the 'missionary' posture; not, I think, rightly.
3 Cf. F. Oswald, Index of Figure-Types in Terra Sigillata. Vol. 2 (Liverpool, 1937), plate XC fig. V, J. Boardman, Athenian Black Figure Vases (London, 1974), fig. 61, Athenian Red Figure Vases


6 See Plut. *Mor.* 139 c, 140 c, 144 f. Deduction about the normal behaviour expected of Athenian wives ought not to be drawn too hastily from Aristoph. *Lys.* 227; or indeed about Roman matrons from Martial 11. 104. 11.


9 For Lucretius the final three syllables of the plural *coxendices* probably formed a molossus rather than a cretic (cf. Plaut. *Bacch.* 1159, Lucil. 949). The word was, nevertheless, not one easy to accommodate in dactylic hexameters in any of its forms.


12 *A.J.Ph.* 84 (1963), 415-16.

13 Cf. the way Apuleius applies the adjective *exossis* to the dancer ( *Apol.* 34, *Met.* 1. 4).
15 Zürich, 1975.
17 The reviser displays here and in his own independent translation (London, 1969 [Sphere Books Ltd.]) an amusing ignorance of physiology as well as of Latin usage. The ancient authors were more knowledgeable (cf. Plaut. *Pseud.* 68).
18 *L.C.M.* 7. 5 May (1982), 68 – 9.
21 For the female displaying her breasts to her male partner see,
among the literary references, Dioscorides, A.P. 5. 55. 5 - 6.
She could of course also display her buttocks.
FACTA DICTIS AEQVARE: SALLUST, HIST. II fr. 98
by JAMES DIGGLE
Queens' College, Cambridge

Sall. Hist. II fr. 98 fin. (p.103 Maurenbrecher, p.158 Kurfiess);
adnitente maxime nobilitate, cuiuspleriqueiam tum
lingua ferociam suam et dicta factis seque[

This passage has been discussed briefly by D.R. Shackleton Bailey in Mnem. ser. 4, 34 (1982), 356. He writes: 'Sallust may
have written ferociam suam <ostentabant n>ec dicta. If he did not
write that, he wrote something equivalent. Perhaps he thought of
Cato, whose threats were apt to end in air (Cic. Att. IV. 18, 4).'
The essential point (I am grateful to Professor Shackleton Bailey
for offering this gloss in correspondence) is that to say that the
nobles were as bold in deeds as in words is praise, and Sallust is
the last man to be found praising the nobles of any period, least
of all his own (who are involved by iam tum). I accept his in-
terpretation, and the need to introduce the final phrase by a
negative. But I wonder whether all is well with a word which his
conjecture does not touch.

This passage comes at the end of the fragment and is preserved
only by the Orleans palimpsest. There is some doubt over the identi-
fication of the final letters: 'postremae incertae, aut Q'E aut
Q'E (que e) aut M lectae sunt', says Maurenbrecher. Haußler, who
brought this text to light, proposed sequ[ban]tur, and later editors
have accepted it. This is not the verb which I should expect to
find here. The Oxford Latin Dictionary, s.u. sequor 4c, does indeed
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quote this passage under the heading '(of persons, deeds, etc.)
to follow up (an action)', alongside a few other passages, all
from imperial Latin (e.g. Sen. Med. 895 quid, anime, cessas?
sequere felicem impetum), and in only one of them is an ablative
present (Apul. Met. 6.30 uerbum manu secutus). Our passage will
mean (with Shackleton Bailey's conjecture) 'they showed their
ferocia with their tongue and did not follow up their words with
their actions'. Possible Latin, no doubt. But what I should ex-
pect is not sequebantur but aequabant: 'they did not match their
words with their actions'. This will then be an elegant variation
on the common expression facta dictis aequare: see Sall. Cat. 3.2
facta dictis exaequanda sunt, Liv. 6. 20. 8 facta dictis aequando,
Plin. Ep. 8. 4. 3 haec aequare dicendo; similarly Plin. Pan. 72. 4
has precationes tuas laudibus adaequare, St. Theb. 4. 145-6 quis ...
robora dictu / aequarit? (cf. ibid. 8. 514-5, 12.797-9, Sil. 12. 389).
Behind these expressions lies a Greek rhetorical topos: Isoc. 4.13
χαλεπόν ἐστιν ἵπτως τοὺς λόγους τῷ μεγάλῳ τῶν ἔργων ἔξευρεῖν, 6.100
tοὺς ἐπαίνους ἔξευρε καὶ ἐπείδη τῶν ἐργάτων ἀρεταῖς, Lys. 2. 1 λόγον ἵπτως
παρασκευάσατο τοῖς τούτων ἔργοις (cf. Isoc. 5. 36, 14. 4). For pre-
cisely the same inversion which I impute to Sallust, dicta factis
aequare, see Sil.7.235-6 tunc ista ferocia dicta / aequentur factis.

It is unnecessary to assume that Hausler misread the letters
sequ[e, although, as Maurenbrecher indicates, there is a clear
possibility that he did. It is no less possible that factis
sequ[bant(ur), if that was written in the palimpsest, is simply a
corruption of factis aequabant, for almost the same corruption has
occurred at Cat. 3. 2 facta dictis exaequanda, where some manuscripts
of Sallust, and some of Gellius 4.15.2, who quotes the passage, have
exequenda for exaequanda.
Livy describes how the Campanians and Carthaginians only just held off a Roman attack on Capua:

\[\text{neque tam armati inrumpentibus Romanis resistebant quam [quo]}\]
\[\text{porta ballistis scorpionibusque instructa missilibus procul}
\[\text{hostes arcebat.}\]

This is how all recent editors treat this passage, citing J.F. Gronovius as their authority for the deletion of quo, which is found in the codex Puteaneus, our sole authority for the text at this point. The result is respectable Latin, but why should anyone have wishes to insert quo? An obvious conjecture is quo<ed>, which is an easier corruption to explain and also gives good sense.

With quad Livy does not contrast resistebant and arcebat, but rather tam armati is contrasted with the whole clause quam quod... arcebat. In other words the notion of resistebant is felt in the quam quod clause. Although not particularly common this idiom may be paralleled: xxxvii. 11. 4-5 \textit{cum diem non tam apparatu absumpsisset, quam quod conspici proficiscentem classem nolebat, post solis occasum prefectus ... portum tenuit}, where it is not absumpsisset but tam apparatu that is contrasted with quam quod...nolebat; Cic. \textit{diu. Caec. 24 is non tam propter Verrem laborat quam quod eum minime res tota delectat}, where it is not laborat but tam propter Verrem that is contrasted with quam quod ... delectat. Closely analogous, but with tantum rather than tam, is vii. 15. 10 \textit{nec in}
acie tantum ibi cladis acceptum quam quod trecentos septem milites Romanos captos Tarquinienses immolarunt. Also closely analogous are the following passages where the sense not of a verb but of an adjective or verbal adjective is carried over into the second clause: ii. 44. 7; ix. 23. 17; xxvii. 37. 5 infantem ... nec magnitudine tam mirandum quam quod is ... incertus mas an femina esset natus erat; xxviii. 22. 2; xxxviii. 18. 8 Sangarius ... non tamen tam magnitudine memorabilis, quam quod piscium accolis ingentem uim praebet.

If parallels are wanted for the corruption of quod to quo see xxvii. 5. 15 and Val. Max. i. 1. 2.

In fact quod may have been found as a correction in the famous codex Aginnensis of Petrarch and Valla (if the critical apparatus of the Oxford text is reliable; Walsh is silent in his new Teubner edition) and was certainly the standard reading in Gronovius' day. It was this that he deleted as unwanted. However he had failed to understand the idiom as illustrated above and did not account for the quo of the paradosis.

* I am grateful to James Diggle for help in the preparation of this note.
me quoque qui totiens merui sub amore puellae
defunctum placide uivere tempus erat.

As G.P. Goold notes in the course of his discussion of this passage (H.S.C.P. 69 (1965), 36-7), Bentley, Burman and Markland were all agreed in regarding puellae as corrupt (it has manifestly come in from verse 15) and defunctum as in need of a qualifying ablative (it would otherwise mean 'dead'). The three conjectures they advanced, periclis Bentley, puella Burman, and duello Markland, are judiciously assessed by Goold, who concludes by offering a slight variation on Bentley's proposal, namely periclo.

Doubtless periclum, whether in the singular or plural ablative, is a possible solution, but it is not, to my mind, certain. As an alternative I suggest palaestra, and refer to J.N. Adams' section on amatory wrestling in The Latin Sexual Vocabulary, 158-9, where, inter al., Mart.10.55.4 post opus et suas palaestras and Suet.Dom. 22 (referring to Domitian's 'bed wrestling') are especially pertinent; cf. also Mart.14.201 where both the inscription Palaestrita and the couplet as a whole turn on 'double entendre'.
THOUGH the text of the *Astronomica* contains a multitude of corruptions, these have now been to a large extent definitively repaired by conjectural emendation. When, for example, Housman at 5. 689 unscrambles *detonsa* from the incoherent *sed nota* of the manuscripts, we thrill to the unmistakable recovery of the poet’s original word and are so much the more justified in expecting that those cruces which remain will some day be solved. At one place, however, we are compelled to acknowledge that the fabric of the text has been permanently disfigured. After line 709 of the fifth book the chapter on extra-zodiacal signs abruptly breaks off in the middle of the sentence and we are pitchforked without warning into the middle of a catalogue of stellar magnitudes. For Housman not only was the existence of the great lacuna unarguable, but further speculation about it was futile: 'we have no true certainty that these verses are in fact a portion of book V and not of some later book .... the dimensions of the gap after 709 are undiscoverable.'

This is unwarrantably pessimistic. The poet tells us plainly enough in the proem that this is to be his last book: here would another have finished (1), terminating his work by returning to earth via the seven planets (4-7), that is, another would have concluded with a section on the planets; but he, Manilius, will also make a tour of the extra-zodiacal constellations (8), that
is, write upon that topic. We therefore expect a long chapter on these constellations (which duly follows 32–709...) and a chapter on the seven planets (which must have been lost in the lacuna). As for the subject-matter of 5.710ff., the magnitudes of the stars, this has no connection with astrology, but Housman observes that the passage is, like the section on tropic signs at the end of Book 3, 'terminal ornament'; and style and phraseology (for example, the handling of the numerals in 716f. and the vocabulary of 737 vulgus... sine nomine turbam, cf. 1.471) adequately pronounce these verses to be authentic Manilius.

Happily a clue survives to prove that in the lacuna Manilius did actually deal with the planets. At the end of his planetary section—logic will not allow any other possibility—he indited two verses, now read as 5.30f., 'These (Has Scaliger: ab mss) are the special powers and times of influence which the creator of the mighty firmament long ago appointed for the planets': accidentally omitted they were in some ancestor of the archetype replaced not at the end of the chapter on the planets but at the end of the proem (where of course they do not belong). Nor should we be too swift to concur that the extent of the lacuna is undiscoverable. Thanks to an extraordinary pair of displacements of verses in Book I H.W. Garrod (piloted by a note of Jacob's) succeeded in proving that the manuscript in which this occurred was made up of quaternions containing pages of 22 lines each; and subsequently, following up Garrod's work, I was able to reconstruct the complete pagination of this ancestral manuscript, in particular showing that 5.709 was the last line of the second leaf of the thirteenth quaternion. Clearly, the lacuna consisted of the two inner bifolia of the quire, which must have become
first loose, then disjoined, and finally lost. So I maintained.

Here, however, the application of a little common-sense will cause the truth to be brightly illuminated. If we discover that in a Roman Missal the pages containing the Canon of the Mass are missing, or that a one-volume Shakespeare is defective in lacking the whole of Hamlet, or that from a copy of Eminent Victorians the life of Cardinal Manning announced in the table of contents has utterly vanished, we shall infer, not that such a loss is due to the fortuitous loosening of the stitched quires, but that those pages, being in each case portions of sovereign preciousness, have been detached by design and purposely abstracted. So it must be with the great lacuna in Manilius. An astrologer was bound to regard Manilius' disquisition on the planets as the most important section of the poem; it passes belief that it dropped out of the manuscript by chance: it must have been deliberately taken. The matter we are dealing with is a case of larceny. Someone, not possessing the codex himself and yet coveting the indispensable pages, surreptitiously removed them.

If this be so, we may no longer mechanically calculate the loss as being the two inner bifolia of a quire, though this remains a possibility. That whole leaves were detached is guaranteed by the concomitant loss of the very end of the paranatellonta and the very beginning of the stellar magnitudes; and the coincidence with the pagination of that codex which contained 22 lines to the page virtually confirms that we are correct in seeking to explain the loss as a loss of leaves, that is, as a multiple of 44 lines. Unless Book 5 of Manilius exceeded a thousand lines (which seems most unlikely), its possible dimensions would seem to be one or other of these alternatives: 745 (the number of the extant verses) + 176
(44 \times 4) = 921 \text{ or } 745 + 220 \ (44 \times 5) = 965. \text{ For simplicity's sake I ignore complications introduced by the occasional verse possibly interpolated or omitted and by possible chapter-headings: these do not significantly affect the alternative totals given above. In favour of the first (which agrees nicely with the 925 of Book I and the 935 of Book 4) is the consideration that two bifolia were probably easier to detach from the codex, a detachment which would, after all, most naturally account for the preservation of the leaf containing the end of the book (710-745); against, that the 140 odd lines taken up by the poet's planetary doctrine seem much too few. Recommending the second is that 220 or so lines, though still exiguous for an orthodox account, at least afford close on 60 per cent more scope, and 965 is paralleled by the 967 of Book 2; this alternative will require the despoiler to have cut out the pages with a knife and the end of Book 5 to have filled all sixteen pages of the final quire, too neat a piece of tailoring to be what one would expect. Yet these observations are scarcely charged with any logical force, and a judgement in favour of one or other alternative seems not to be justified.

However, what is important is not the precise measurement of the lacuna but the explanation of it which has emerged. We may now assert with confidence that planetary doctrine was indeed dealt with in Manilius' fifth book and that he did definitively complete his poem.\[6\] Dare we hope to learn even more? Is there a chance that these four or five leaves, without author's name or indication of his work, stealthily removed from the text of Manilius a millennium ago, but removed to be preserved, are still extant today, secreted in some unobvious hiding-place,
between the pages, it may be, of some long since discredited manual of the black arts unthumbed this many a year?

NOTES

2 Ibid.
3 Housman would transpose these verses before 3.156, where (provided we emend *ab* to *nam*), they agree with the context perfectly, though in point of style the fit is less than perfect, for they weakly repeat the ideas of the preceding two lines and the grandiloquence of 5.31 (suited to the climax of the poem) is quite out of place. Moreover, the corruption of *nam* to *ab* and the alleged transposition are difficult to account for. Scaliger's *has*, on the other hand, is paralleled by many verses in Manilius (3.154, for instance), and if the first letter was marked for rubrication and hence omitted (as at 1.809 *Ne*, i.e. *Nunc*, Bentley: *c LM*), the puzzling *as* before a dative-ablative plural would inevitably turn into *ab*.

6 As against the 'probably unfinished' of the new Cambridge History of Latin Literature (pp. 480 and 864, penultimate lines): the spectre of an eight-book work which haunted Housman, referred to in the latter place, I had earlier laid on page cviii of my edition in the Loeb Classical Library.
CRITICS have for many years been reluctant to admit that Statius' Silvae have any literary merit. A.J. Gossage typifies the general view when he says Statius satisfied 'his social and political superiors with poems that flattered but sometimes lacked spontaneity and exhibited the required graces without profundity of thought or feeling'. Of the three leues libellae (II Sal. 21-2 Klotz) in Book II of the Silvae he asserts that they 'demonstrate both the poet's technical skill and the limitations of this type of writing, with its commonplaces, its mythical allusions and its rhetorical flourishes'. I hope to show that Silv. II.iv is a more complex and original piece than has previously been supposed, first by examining its relationship, on the one hand, to Statius' other epicedia, and, on the other, to Ovid's similar effort, Am. II.vi, then by looking at Statius' attitude to parrots, and finally by considering whether the poem has a second level of meaning.

The epicedion was originally a song of mourning chanted over a corpse; later the term became more general and was applied to any honorific poem for a dead person. Its constituent elements, on analysis of extant examples, included lamentation and eulogy, with consolatory reflections on the irrevocability of fate, the necessity of submission, faith in survival etc. Other customary features were frequent mythological allusion, apostrophes and invocations, indignation against destiny or the gods, thoughts on the vanity of
birth or youth or merit, the author's justification of the composition, and finally, in Statius, an account of the last hours and obsequies of the subject.

Silv. II.i contains all these elements and more. But in Statius' other epicedia there is some variation according to the emphasis the poet hopes to achieve. For example, in V.iii almost half the poem is laudatio, but there is no comment about Statius' qualification to write (if anything, his grief has rendered him less capable: see 3-40), or any invective against fate or philosophical observation. When it is broken down into its component topoi II.iv can hardly be distinguished from the human epicedia, except by the omission of an account of Melior's grief. It has apostrophes and invocations, details of the parrot's life-style and funeral, and passages of laudatio and consolatio.

The close similarity in form between the human epicedia and the epicedion for Melior's parrot shows that Statius felt the genre could be used for such an unusual subject without much structural modification, if he handled his material carefully. This he achieved by consistently anthropomorphizing the parrot. meditataque verba (7) echoes II.i.74 meditataque verba locutus, though the sentiments of the two passages conflict; the method of gaining popularity with the master is scorned in the slave but highly praised in the bird. silentia Lethes (8) recurs at II.vi.100, but again with subtly different connotations. For Ursus' favourite the silentia will be amoena, but for the parrot it means he will no longer be able to be canorus. The doctae aues (16) are recalled in the invocation of the docti cohors Heliconia Phoebi at V.iii.91.

The closest correspondences with the other epicedia occur in
the description of the parrot's pyre. The parrot's ashes
Assyrio ... adolentur amomo (34) just as Ursus' slave's pyre
is dressed with Assyrio manantes gramine sucos (II.vi.88) and
the urn of Claudius Etruscus' father is perfumed with Assyrios ...
liquores (III.iii.212). Its feathers Arabum respirant gramine
(35) just as Glaucias' hair is anointed with Arabes Phariique
Palaestinique liquores (II.i.161) and uer Arabum Cilicumque
(V.i.211) are among Priscilla's funeral gifts. Its feathers are
also perfumed with Sicaniis ... crocis (36), a phrase which recurs
at V.iii.42-3.

It is not, however, simply a question of Statius adapting one
or two choice motifs and phrases from his stock of epicedian topoi
and language. Taken out of context, 3-10 could almost be a descrip-
tion of some lamented friend with a talent for singing, the anthropo-
morphism is so successful. carpentem (5) would perhaps be surprising
in a human context, but the usage is not unparalleled (cf. Ov. A.A.
III.755 carpe cibos digitis, in advice on etiquette at feasts, Met.
XV.478 alimentaque mitia carpant, in the instructions given to Numa
on killing wild animals, Luc. VI.111 carpere dumos, of the miserabile
uulgus). errantemque toris (6) is no more problematic, although
normal practice for Roman diners was to stay reclining on couches
for the duration of the meal, since both art and literature provide
ample evidence for attendants moving around from table to table.

The portrayal of the parrot as a surrogate person also underlies
Statius' description of the cage as a domus with limina and fores
(11,13,14), and becomes dominant again in the account of the parrot's
friendship with Melior. Here too some of Statius' observations would
be equally applicable to a human (gueruli quondam uice functus amici,/
nunc conuiua leuis, 30'-1), but he undercuts them with ideas such as
monstrata que... verba (31) and particularly recluso (32).

There seem to be two possible interpretations of such treatment. Statius may have been so enslaved to the rules of the genre that his decision to write an epicedion for Melior's parrot sparked off a spontaneous literary reflex: he may have written II.iv following those rules with as much consciousness as an automaton, blissfully unaware of the incongruity that would result. But the persistent cross-references to his other epicedia suggest that, on the contrary, he was perfectly aware of what he was doing and aimed to stress the humour of the piece to the fullest extent. Why? On a personal level, he was probably making fun, in a kindly way, of Melior's devotion to his nonsensical little pet, which he obviously spoilt to a fault in life and death. Maybe Melior himself saw the absurdity of his behaviour and enjoyed the spirit of Statius' poem: this could explain why Statius chose to omit the traditional description of grief. But Statius may also have been inhibited by a natural reluctance to ridicule a theme which was normally more intense and personal than any other aspect of the genre. Despite the general tone of the poem, his sense of propriety seems to have led him to preserve the integrity of this one topos.

To understand why Statius might wish to burlesque his own serious epicedia is more difficult and calls for a reassessment of his whole approach to occasional poetry. It would be perverse to question the sincerity of his motives for writing an epicedion for his father or his favourite slave. Again, his friendship with Melior was probably close enough for him to feel genuine sadness and sympathy at the death of Glauclias (the Salutatio of Book II creates this impression, even if Statius handles his emotions rather heavy-handedly). This leaves the epicedia written for presentation to Ursus, Claudius
Etruscus and Abascantus. These poems (II.vi, III.iii and V.i) are as grave and carefully crafted as the other three, and though the personal touches found in II.i, V.iii and V.v are absent from them, the recipients no doubt found them perfectly satisfactory and of suitable sentiment.

Claudius Etruscus also appears as a recipient in I.v, a description of the baths he had built. This is a superb display of the poet's descriptive powers and imaginative deployment of the stock of mythological themes at his disposal. Its quality as a virtuoso performance must be appreciated for what it is, the more so because it avoids extended and distracting eulogy of the patron. He is only mentioned by name once, in passing at 14, and the final address is restricted to two and a half lines. Such restraint in Statius is very unusual and implies that Claudius Etruscus was little more than a chance acquaintance whose interest in Statius rested on 'a determination to get [himself] publicised rather than any substantive rapport'. Nothing said in the Salutationes of Books I and III conflicts with this assessment of their relationship.

II.vi provides the only evidence from which we can judge Statius' connection with Ursus. His emphatic assertion, uidi et adhuc video (II.vi.30), may suggest rather closer contact than with Claudius Etruscus, but this could simply be the result of more frequent visits to Ursus' literary dinner parties, if it is not merely a conceit. Similarly, Abascantus commissioned no other poems from Statius, and the letter prefacing Book V reveals that this was not a personal relationship. Here Statius states plainly that it was their wives who were friends, amavit enim uxorem meam Priscilla (V Sal. 10-11), and it is partly out of deference to his wife's feelings that he feels obliged to write. He may express a desire
for a propriorem usum (V. Sal. 15-16) of Abascantus' friendship, but at the time of writing his main motive is to keep well in with the Emperor's familiars, praeterea latus omne divinae domus semper demereri pro mea mediocritate conitor (V. Sal. 13-14).

I suggest that in writing Silu. II.iv, a perfect epitome of the epicedion in structure and detail yet the precise antithesis in mood of most such pieces, Statius is consciously undercutting his less personal commissioned poems. Without wishing to imply that he found anything particularly entertaining in the deaths of Ursus' favourite, Claudius Etruscus' father or Abascantus' wife, it would seem that Statius sensed an inherent irony in his ability to produce grief-stricken, heart-rending poems of consolation for anyone who cared to ask him, be they close friends, acquaintances or people useful to impress. He reduces this ability ad absurdum by showing that even a parrot could provide him with enough inspiration.

I bow to the convention of comparing Silu. II.iv with Am. II.vi, if only to dispute Vollmer's claim that Statius' poem is thoroughly influenced by Ovid's in layout, points of detail and expression. The first point is most easily refuted by an analysis of the two poems:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Am. II.vi</th>
<th>Silu. II.iv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-12 Invitation of birds to funeral: Philomela: ends with the dove.</td>
<td>1-3 Address to Parrot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-16 Parrot's friendship with Dove.</td>
<td>16-23 Invocation of birds to sing his dirge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-36 Laudatio looks, life-style,</td>
<td>24-33 (Dirge Pt 1) Laudatio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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character and talents, of looks and manners. with contrasting exempla. 34-37 (Dirge Pt 2) The pyre.

37-43 The good die young.

43-48 The final hours.

49-58 Consolatio: heaven for birds.

59-62 The tomb.

Ovid's treatment of the form is fuller, containing some traditional elements which Statius chooses to omit: a description of the mourners' grief (3-6), invective (19-20), philosophical comments (39-40). But the structure is more straightforward. Statius' inclusion of the dirge enables him to interweave motifs and introduce ideas expressed from a different viewpoint. There is a close degree of correspondence in function between 1-3 and 24-5, between 4-8 and 26-33 and between 9-11 and 33-7, passages where the birds pick up Statius' original comments and restate them in their own terms.

The few verbal reminiscences of Ovid cannot be denied (imitatrix vi.1 / imitator iv.2, plangite vi.3 / plangat iv.17, auium gloria vi.20 / gloria gentis iv.24, aue docta vi.62 / doctae aues iv.16) and, predictably, Philomela crops up in both. Naturally both discuss the parrot's looks and loquaciousness but Statius would have referred to these even without Ovid's example. The evidence alleged for substantial dependence on Ovid is far from convincing.

As to moods and attitudes, the two works have less in common than might appear at first. Both are humorous but they achieve their humour by different means. Ovid recasts the epicedian topoi to make them particularly appropriate for a bird: mourning, the parrot's life-style and even its heaven are all seen in exclusively avian terms. Statius is subtler, adapting the parrot to the genre
rather than vice versa by his emphatic anthropomorphism of the bird.

By portraying the parrot in characteristically human terms Statius articulates a theme detectable in several of the Silvae, notably I.v, the tension in a civilised society between man / art and nature. The parrot, with its anomalous ability to speak, is an innately ambiguous creature. A wild thing which nonetheless shares peculiarly human characteristics would cause considerable anxiety over its definition; and Statius says it is Natura who has granted some birds the nobile fandi / ius (16-17). In so doing she has consciously overstepped her own boundaries and created an interstitial type which deprives man of the reassuring ability to classify.³ Statius' treatment reflects this imprecise status. It also reflects man's desire to dominate and control the uncivilised natural world. By encouraging the inclination of some birds to mimic, man can enjoy the fascinating illusion that he wields great influence over irrational powers and can mould them in his own image.

This conflict is highlighted in the description of the parrot's cage (11-15). Set in the midst of details about the supremely civilised and man-made domus is uirgarum (12). It is true that some uirgae, in the secondary sense of 'rods, wands', were made of metal, but the word primarily signifies branches in their natural context or at least something made from them.¹⁰ A strong recollection of the bird's natural habitat is inherent in uirgarum. Thus there is a striking paradox in the use of this word to describe the silver bars of its cage, since these are the very things confining it in an unnatural situation. Moreover, the cage may be an exquisite example of man's art but it is still a carcer (15). Despite any affection Melior may have for the bird it is still only a commodity, imprisoned in an alien environment and kept under strict control for its owner's
entertainment.

Finally I suggest the intriguing possibility that in some respects Statius is constructing a web of correspondences between the parrot and Domitian. The parallel is not sustained consistently throughout the poem, but certain phrases are singularly unfortunate if Statius used them without any ulterior motive. He continually stresses that the parrot is supreme among birds and addresses it as *dux volucrum* (1): Domitian is *dux hominum* at IV.iii.139, and *dux* is a term he regularly uses for the Emperor.\(^\text{11}\) Again, both parrot and Emperor are called *regnator*: *plagae* ... *r. Eose* (25) / *r. terrarum* (IV.ii.14). *dapes inisti* is used both of the parrot at the previous night's meal (4) and of Domitian at his banquet (I.vi.48). Add to this the fact that the full phrase at II.iv.4 is *dapes moriturus inisti* and one has to wonder whether Statius is being remarkably insensitive or making a veiled, but dangerously radical, prediction. The luxury of the parrot's cage is comparable to any royal palace, and if *augusti* is accepted as correct in 15\(^\text{12}\) the comparison is made overt.

Less tangible is the parallel which may underlie Statius' closing comparisons of the parrot to a *felicior phoenix* (37), the feathered embodiment of apotheosis. A writer of Statius' intelligence and imagination might see the bold analogue for apotheosis which the resurrection of the phoenix could provide (it is only surprising that such symbolism was not exploited elsewhere). Domitian fully expected to take up his place beside his immortalised predecessors, and his hopes provided a theme for enthusiastic predictions (cf. IV.iii.139-40). If the parrot is seen as an analogue of Domitian, then the topos of 'outdoing' Statius uses in the comparison of parrot and phoenix must convey an ironic comment on apotheosis in the imperial cult.
Some may find the idea that Statius expressed an attitude to Domitian less than totally favourable too absurd to consider seriously. After all, in the rest of his works he seems to be toeing the party line scrupulously. Practical-minded critics might argue that, for many good reasons, Statius would not have published anything the slightest bit compromising. Suspicion of doubtful loyalty could, at that time, have led to the poet's death. It could at least have jeopardised his career and livelihood, since those of his patrons who were sincerely devoted to Domitian or prepared to sacrifice their love of letters to keep up the charade of such devotion to preserve their own status and skins would want nothing to do with anything at all tainted.

Clever parodists, though, especially those with as much to lose as Statius, have the sense to make their point with intricately related details, harmless enough in themselves, set in a context few would suspect. The subtle art of statement by implication was an important element in rhetorical training and Quintilian discusses it at length (IX.ii.65-75). He says the device is frequentissimum and defines it thus: in quo per quandam suspicionem quod non dicimus accipi volumus, non utique contrarium, ut in €Ïïîì€ï, sed aliud latens et auditori quasi inueniendum. The device is most useful si dicere palam parum tutum est. Of particular relevance to the argument here is a passage in IX.ii.67: quamlibet enim apertum, quod modo et aliter intellegi possit, in illos tyrannos bene dixeris, quia periculum tantum, non etiam offensa uitatur. quod si ambiguitate sententiae possit eludi, nemo non illi furto fauet. His comment, in 74, that this device could be used in foro quoque indicates it was also employed elsewhere. Censorship is not infallible and even someone as paranoid as Domitian would probably not dream of combing through an epicedion
on a parrot, dismissed by the author as a *leuis libellus*, for camouflaged political witticisms.

Why should Statius bother to go to so much trouble? It may have been purely an act of bravado and self-indulgence, an outlet for his own dissatisfaction with the grovelling he had to produce in most of the *Silvae*. There was a risk that Melior would detect the under-currents and withdraw his patronage, which would incline other patrons to do the same, whether or not they knew his motives. But if Statius felt strongly enough he might risk discovery. Another explanation (more likely in my view) is that Melior was either in on the joke from the outset or had it pointed out to him over a cup or two of good Falernian at one of his select dinner parties. It is a great shame that we have no information about Melior, apart from the references in Statius and Martial, which could help determine his political stance. All that the poems tell us for sure is that he was an active and wealthy literary patron who avoided the limelight. Statius addresses him as *nec minus in iudicio litterarum quam in omni uita colore tersissime* (*II Sal.* 2-3).\(^\text{15}\) White properly draws attention to Statius' stress in II.iii on the harmlessness and moderation of Melior's life and views. Certainly the plain-speaking defence of Melior and his household in lines 15-16 and 64-69 sounds suspiciously like an answer to accusations of disloyalty. Any close-knit circle might be exposed to such charges in the political climate of the time. To White, they 'hint that Melior had experienced a scare at about this time [i.e. the period of oppression following Saturninus' attempted coup] ... Probably this situation lies behind Statius' denial that his friend would allow traitorous hopes to flourish at his gatherings'.\(^\text{16}\) Of course Statius would deny it, to help his friend and avoid any implication himself, and he would deny it all the more vigorously
if there was a grain of truth behind the rumour.

I do not wish to suggest that Melior's literary circle was a hotbed of revolutionary activists or that Silu. IV.iv is an allegory of deep political significance. The likelihood is, though, that Domitian in his fragile state of mind would have had a rather idiosyncratic idea of what was 'traitorous'. That, coupled with the burgeoning of the ranks of informers and the gossip they fed off, could lead to the most grotesque distortions of the truth. Private parties where ridicule was gently aimed at the Emperor might easily be misrepresented as something more sinister. Circumstantial though the evidence may be, it is possible to view the protestations in II.iii in close conjunction with II.iv - a denial to the outside world that Melior's group was up to anything questionable, followed by an example of the 'innocent' little pieces produced by the members of his circle. The fact that their own private joke could survive imperial scrutiny undetected would have been extremely satisfying to Statius, Melior and all their friends.

NOTES

1 This paper started life as fodder for a meeting of the Latin Postgraduate Seminar at the Institute of Classical Studies in London, in May 1981. I should like to thank the members of the seminar for their useful comments then. I should also like to thank Prof. F.R.D.Goodyear and Dr J.B.Hall, who read later versions of the paper and made some wise criticisms of it. My main debt, though, is to Dr K.M.Coleman, who has devoted much time to helping me get my ideas into a presentable form and who has patiently endured all my inquiries - sine qua non! But none of them should
be held responsible for any errors and misconceptions preserved in the final version: they are my fault.


Gossage, op. cit. 215.

See S.Reinach, Répertoire de peintures grecques et romaines, Paris 1922, 256, figs. 3, 6, 7. Cf. Petronius passim.

5 Statius speaks of this boy in terms of extreme fondness and it is often asserted that he legally adopted him, but there is no proof of this.


Statius, Siluae, ed. F.Vollmer, Leipzig 1898, 360: 'Von Ovids Totenlied auf den Sittich (Am. II.6) ist das Gedicht ausserdem in Anlage, Einzelzügen und Ausdrücken völlig beeinflusst'.

9 The status of ambiguous animals in human society, and human perception of ambiguity generally, is a fundamental theme in modern anthropological thought. The locus classicus for the subject is Mary Douglas' Purity and danger: an analysis of the concepts of pollution and taboo, London 1966. Since then the study of the significance of animal classification has been deepened and extended: I think particularly of Douglas' more recent book, Implicit meanings: essays in anthropology, London 1965, and Rules and meanings: the anthropology of everyday knowledge, ed. M.Douglas, London 1973, which gathers together the major articles produced in the interim; also Dan Sperber's article 'Pourquoi les animaux parfaits, les hybrides et les monstres sont-ils bons à penser
symboliquement?", *L'Homme* 15.2 (1975), 5-34.

9 See Lewis and Short, *s.v. uīrga*.

10 In the *Silvae*, Statius refers to Domitian as *dux* sixteen times. On its other appearances the word describes Alexander (I.i.86), Caesar (II.vii.67), Jupiter (IV.ii.55), monarchs in general (III.iii.52 and 83), a foreign chieftain (IV.iii.5), Corbulo (V.ii.45), and Calliope, as Queen of the Muses (V.iii.15).

11 I accept *augusti*, the reading of the *codex Matritensis*, as correct here. Its corruption to *angusti*, which the later manuscripts have, may be a simple visual error. Or *angusti* may have been substituted by a scribe who felt *augustus* was an inappropriate adjective for a bird cage: *angustus* is far more obvious and would be suggested by the similarity of the *ductus* of the two words. In the light of the luxurious construction of the cage I would argue that *augustus* is singularly appropriate and consonant with the rest of the passage. If the sense of *augustus* is accepted as superior *per se* it may then take its place in the projected scheme of imperial allusions. A comparable use of *augustus* seems only to occur once elsewhere, in Vergil's description of a bee-hive (*Geo.* IV.228; see also Seru. *ad loc.*), with the same corruption in the manuscripts. But naturally there can be no question of imperial allusion there.

12 In a persuasive article, 'Atedius Melior's tree; *Silvae* II.iii', *C.P.* 76.1 (1981), 47, D.W.T.C. Vessey gives a perceptive, though verbose, assessment of the use of allegory: 'The world of nature, the actions of mythic deities, the deeds and creations of men: all may serve their turn in figuring forth, under the veils of parallel, similitude and allegory, verities worth pondering. Indeed, as Renaissance poets knew well, the advantage of allegory — especially
in a politically closed society - is that it enables man both to speak and to keep silent. It may be as clear as crystal or as obscure as a maze; it may be simple or ambiguous; its presence may be affirmed or denied depending on circumstances' (my italics). And what he says (52) about II.iii is equally applicable, mutatis mutandis, to II.iv: 'The jeu d'esprit has, like the pool itself, a hidden depth, a cautionary moral for the wise. History denies us the chance to unravel subtler facets of the secondary level of meaning in the poem. But enough remains for us to detect its presence. It is a telling instance of Statius' ability in the Silvae not to regard the immediate purpose of his compositions as a limitation on their scope and his refusal to be trammeled by the restraints imposed by individual circumstances'.

Dr Coleman draws my attention to the abstract of a paper given at the most recent Congress (1982) of the American Philological Association by F.M.Ahl, 'The limits of "safe" criticism under Domitian'. From this summary it seems clear that Ahl has been thinking along much the same lines as I have. He challenges the assumption that criticism was unthinkable under Domitian's regime, noting the passages in Quintilian and other writers on rhetoric which instruct students in the art of concealing their meaning, and suggests that Flavian poets 'knew as well as Quintilian, Dio and 'Demetrius' the techniques for writing, surviving and criticizing under Domitian'.

tersissime in an extended sense applicable to a life-style is hard to translate, but 'faultless' (Mozley) carries too many moral overtones to be suitable here. Most commonly it is a term of literary criticism, used mainly by Quintilian (X.i.93, X.i.94, XII.x.20, XII.x.50; also Plin. Ep. II.iii.1, IX.xxii.2), conveying

83
notions of sophistication, polish and sensibility. Perhaps 'refined' would be a less emotive rendering.

White, op. cit. 272-3. Vessey, op. cit. 52, suggests that on one level Silu. II.iii may be seen as an extended allegory of Melior's escape from a dangerous political situation and refuge in a world of tranquil detachment: 'an allegorical validation of Melior's chosen way of life'.

16
A namesake of the emperor Septimius Severus was an acquaintance of the poet Statius. The only extant alcaics by Statius are addressed to him (*Silvae 4.5*). His story is important for contemporary Roman attitudes towards émigrés from Africa. Septimius was born at Lepcis Magna in Libya (4.5.29-30). The first question is whether he was a native or of Italian stock. The second is whether the emperor Septimius Severus was connected with him, and, if so, how. The two issues have bearing upon one another.

Statius' poem and the preface to the book yield the following facts about Septimius. He was still a boy when he came to Rome (4.5.39-40): *adoptatusque Tuscis / gurgitibus puer innatasti.* He was a *condiscipulus* of Vitorius Marcellus, dedicatee of Bk. 4 (4 Praef. 12-13). He was equestrian (4 Praef. 12): *inter ornatissimos secundi ordinis.* In A.D. 95 he could be described as a *iuuenis* (4 Praef. 11). He was an orator, but he only accepted commissions upon private request (4.5.50-52): *uenale sed non eloquium tibi, / ensisque vagina quiescit / stringere ni iubeant amici.* He wrote prose and poetry (57-60) and his literary interests extended to his attendance at the Alban Games when Statius won the contest (25-28). His family owned property at Veii (54-55), which means that he conforms to the pattern of landed gentry who comprise Statius' circle of addressees.

The gist of the tenth stanza is that although Septimius was
brought up amongst senators' sons and worked as hard as a true aristocrat, his aspirations were nevertheless more modest (41-44). The metre of line 42 indicates a lacuna of two syllables, healed by Burman's conjecture artae: when he came of age, Septimius was satisfied with the equestrian tunic, identified by the angustus clausus (42-43): contentus artae lumine purpurae / crescis. From inter ornatissimos secundi ordinis it has been surmised⁵ that Septimius was an eques equo publico. The reference to turmae at line 47 may refer specifically to the turmae equorum publicorum; at 4.1.25 turmae represents the equester ordo. But it is also possible that inter ornatissimos secundi ordinis is not a periphrasis for a precise technical term, but a vague, yet effusive, compliment;⁶ most of the people whom Statius mentions in the prefaces are enhanced by superlative adjectives. It would be consistent with Statius' techniques of flattery for him to impute to Septimius greater potential than he actually possessed; hence contentus would disguise the fact that Septimius was not eligible for senatorial status. The probability however is that he was eques equo publico, and that Statius wishes to imply that he could have had the latus clausus, which gave him the right to stand for office, had he asked for it.

All these facts could fit either the son of an Italian equestrian family living at Lepcis or the son of a newly enfranchised native who had been granted equestrian status. The most recent study devoted to this poem does not mention the issue.⁷ To these facts must be added the subjective judgements in Statius' presumably complimentary remarks at 45-48: non sermo Poenus, non habitus tibi, / externa non mens: Italus, Italus. / sunt Vrbe Romanisque turmis / qui Libyam decent alumni. These lines are capable of various interpretations;
broadly, Statius is saying that Septimius fits so well into Roman society that he does not seem like a native of Africa. As Birley and Syme have pointed out, this notion would not be a compliment if Septimius was born of Italian parents. The second half of the stanza is at best a back-handed compliment; among the equestrian class at Rome there are people who do Libya credit; in other words, ex-Libyans. Statius' attitude is typical of the mainland in that he assumes the superiority of Roman-ness over provincialism: non externa mens. The individual details of sermo, habitus and mens must be analysed. If sermo means 'language', Statius is being very unsubtle, pointing out that Septimius does not speak Punic in Rome. 'Manner of speaking' seems more natural: intonation, inflection, idiom perhaps were singular among the Latin-speakers of Lepcis; 'dialect' may go too far. Septimius' Latin does not betray the ancient equivalent of Americanisms in modern English. Habitus cannot mean 'clothing', because the three aspects mentioned must be innate characteristics if by them a man is capable of betraying his origins involuntarily. It could be argued that it cannot mean 'physical features' because, if Septimius is of Italian stock, then non habitus [Poenus] tibi states the obvious, whereas if he is Punic then a remark in tones of astonishment along the lines of 'But Mr. X doesn't look like a ...' would sound naive in the extreme, if not downright false. And yet habitus cannot here mean personality because that would trespass on the domain of mens, 'outlook'. But it could make sense in its most common meaning of 'physical features' if Septimius could possibly have looked Punic but actually didn't; this would be the case if one parent was Punic and the other Italian. A paradigm may be provided by the Seneca family. The Elder Seneca's
wife, Helvia, bears a name which is common in both Spain and Italy, and so her father may have been either Hispanus or Hispaniensis. Their second son, the future politician and philosopher, was born in Spain between 4 and 1 B.C., but by A.D. 5 he had arrived in Rome with his brothers, to be educated. The pattern is repeated in the next generation: the youngest son, Annaeus Mela, married a woman from Corduba and their son, the poet Lucan, was born there; he came to Rome at eight months.

It seems more likely for Septimius to have been educated at Rome if at least one parent was Italian, as was the case in both generations of Senecas. Likewise, paternis sedibus (54), while meaning strictly 'estates belonging to Father' (i.e. conceivably estates which Septimius' father, as an immigrant to Italy, had bought), more naturally implies 'estates which were his father's inheritance'. Barnes deduces that Septimius' father had bought the property at Veii, because he takesquia Lepcis to mean that it was Septimius' family seat; this is an error resulting from wrong scansion ofquia, followed also by Birley.

If Septimius was born in Africa, then presumably his father had property there. There seems no difficulty in assuming that the family owned land both at Lepcis and in Italy. It may not have been Septimius' father who brought him to Italy; indeed, had he not been known as a personality at Rome, then probably Statius would have managed to compliment him on having introduced Septimius to the city. The young Septimius may have come to Italy in the care of another relative; Seneca came with his aunt, although admittedly either his father was there already or else he arrived soon afterwards.

The estate at Veii suggests a link between this generation and the next: a lead pipe inscribed P. Septimi Geta (sic) was found eight
kilometres from Veii;\(^{21}\) Septimius Geta was the name of the emperor's father\(^{22}\) and brother.\(^{23}\) S.H.A. Seu. 4.5 records: *hortos spatiotos com-
parauit, cum antea aedes breuissimas Romae habuisset et unum fundum
inuenit etiam.* The meaningless *unum fundum inuenit etiam* has been
emended by Mason Hammond,\(^{24}\) surely rightly, to *unum fundum Veientem*
(or Veientanem).

Statius' Septimius also spent time *nunc frondosa super / Hernica,
nunc Curibus uetustis* (55-56). It must be assumed that he owned
property at these places. The only\(^{25}\) estate which he inherited, how­
ever, was the property at Veii which Statius expressed by the hendiadys
*nunc in paternis sedibus et solo / Veiente* (54-55). The phrase *frondosa
super Hernica* suggests an elevated position, and so Frère identifies
Septimius' retreat as Capitulum Hircicum, in the neighbourhood of
modern Piglio.\(^{26}\) An undatable inscription from Praeneste\(^{27}\) records a
Septimius Severus who was *patronus municipii.* Frère identifies this
man with Statius' Septimius as *patronus* of Capitulum Hircicum; but
since Praeneste and Capitulum Hiscicum are twenty kilometres apart, he
is unable to account for the apparent dislocation. Barnes (89) ob­
serves that the Septimius of this inscription may belong to a different
generation.

The Praeneste inscription, however, contains a crucial piece of
evidence: the tribe of this Septimius Severus was the Pupinia.
Barnes\(^{28}\) notes that this tribe is almost exclusively attested within
Italy, and that natives of Lepcis who gained citizenship while the
town was a *municipium* were enrolled in the Quirina, while those who
were enfranchised after it became a *colonia* were enrolled in the
Papiria. This would mean that Septimius Severus was of Italian ex­
traction. Birley,\(^{29}\) however, ingeniously suggests that the father of
Statius' addressee was a native of Lepcis who was enfranchised *circa*
A.D. 79, adopting the name of the legate of Legio III Augusta whom he postulates may be the Septimius Severus on campaign in the Sahara in the first century A.D.; he believes that this citizen would have been enrolled in the tribe Quirina, conforming to the pattern at pre-colonial Lepcis, and would be the father of Statius' Septimius. This accommodates an identification with the forebears of the emperor who were said to be equites Romani before the general grant of citizenship (i.e. before A.D. 110). But Birley's thesis conflicts with the likelihood (discussed above) that the father of Statius' friend was Italian, whereas this Italian origin is upheld if the inscription from Praeneste is taken as proof that the tribe of the Septimii was Pupinia.

Was Statius' amicus the grandfather of the emperor? An inscription from the forum vetus at Lepcis records that the emperor's grandfather was L. Septimius Severus, a sues of Lepcis (i.e. a holder of the highest municipal magistracy) and had served in decurii et inter iudices selectos at Rome. Statius' acquittance had possessed equestrian rank from childhood (41-43); doubt has been raised as to whether equites were eligible to be iudices selecti. However, demonstrates that by legislation of A.D. 23 the equestrian gold ring could be acquired by jury-service, and she argues that iudices selecti could serve in all the decuriae and possess equestrian rank. The problem nevertheless remains that jury-service under Augustus was unpopular, and when Gaius added a fifth decuria it was flooded with hitherto ineligible men, including even liberti; it seems improbable that Statius' amicus, an acknowledged orator (49), wealthy (55) and cultured (26, 60), would serve in decurii with this motley crowd of opportunists engaged in a traditionally unpopular activity. And yet, provincials might regard it as worthwhile in order to obtain the
equestrian gold ring. Birley (39) suggests that Statius' Septimius was obstructed in his career by the change of regime in A.D. 96, only achieved the minor post of a juryman, and returned to Lepcis. But Statius' Septimius does not appear to have been ambitious for public life:36 pursuing his wealth and his hobbies in rural seclusion, he deployed his forensic skill only to favour his amici. Quies et otium was his aim, as was that of Atedius Melior.37 Besides, there is some continuity between the Who's Who of the Flavian era and the reigns of Nerva and Trajan.38

So it seems that Statius' Septimius and the emperor's grandfather were not the same person. How then were they related? Apparently the emperor ultimately inherited a farm at Veii where Statius' amicus owned property. In A.D. 95 in his early thirties Statius' Septimius appears to have had no heir; it seems highly unlikely that Statius would have failed to mention a child: it is one of his standard themes in complimenting addressees.39 If he remained childless, he may have left his property to the L. Septimius Severus who did jury-service at Rome. Perhaps this was not the only benefit he conferred on his namesake: Statius' Septimius may have exerted his influence to recommend a relative in Lepcis for equestrian status, and it was this man who served inter iudices selectos at Rome;40 Pliny41 assisted his compatriot Romatius Firmus with a similar recommendation and financial assistance. How were these two Septimii related? A brother of Statius' Septimius would, like him, have been equestrian; a cousin who was equestrian by census but not necessarily by formal rank might well have needed a leg-up from his well-established kinsman.

Septimius' relative, as a sufes, was evidently a leading citizen at Lepcis. Despite his sojourn in Rome where he obtained the rank of eques equo publico, he may well have felt that he would best realise
his ambitions by returning to his family estates at Lepcis.

There is an underlying parallel between Septimius and Statius himself: for both of them the rural environs of Rome were a cherished second home (21-22, 29ff.). Imagery from adoption and the rearing of children is prominent in Silvae 4.5. Elsewhere too in Statius, adoption denotes physical resettlement: Naples takes as her alumni Pollius Felix from Puteoli (2.2.97) and Statius' own father from Velia (5.3.106). In the first of three aquatic images, Statius personifies the lacus Iuturnae in Rome suckling the young Septimius with the sacred water of the Fons Iuturnae in Latium; Septimius has left behind his alma mater (relictis uberibus, 35-36). Statius here intensifies the assumption of a new nationality by attaching the metaphor of adoption to the ancient topos which designates foreigners as drinking from their local rivers. His attitude contrasts with Martial's xenophobic use of the same topos at Epig. 11.96, where he accuses a German immigrant of drinking from the Aqua Marcia at Rome as though it is the Rhine.

Bonjour has demonstrated that harbours represent the immigrant's first contact with his new territory and its promise of security and rest; Septimius, oblivious of the implicitly treacherous shallows of the Syrtes and that area of the Mediterranean in general, has reached dock in Italy: Ausonum portus ... / intras (37-39). Vessey has conjectured that the epic tone of Ausonum portus draws a parallel between Septimius' migration and the arrival of Aeneas and Iulus from Carthage; but he does not stress that the association is with the founders of Rome as a nation, not with Italy as a geographical concept. The last aquatic metaphor sustains the epic tone: the young Septimius floats on the waves of Tuscany (Tuscis / gurgitibus, 39-40), an elevated periphrasis for the Mare Tyrrhenum, the sea at the mouth of the
Tiber.

The metaphor of adoption and upbringing, with the overtones of Rome as a surrogate mother (35-36), points in a different direction from *in paternis sedibus* (54): Rome has welcomed as her *alumnus* an offspring born on alien soil; adopted into his spiritual home (46), he has entered into his proper inheritance (54). Statius' compliments depend upon the attitudes of the *amici* whom he is addressing. Septimius has become naturalised; his fellow Romans displayed generally patronising superiority with regard to provincials; in the case of Septimius, nouveau arrivé, this attitude takes the form of pride in his own integration.

Underlying Statius' attitudes to Septimius are the assumptions of *urbanitas*: the remoteness of Lepcis (29-30), with the implicit boorishness of its inhabitants, is contrasted with the urbane sophistication of Rome (*vrbe*, 47). A similar illustration is provided by Martial 4.55, playing on the traditional Roman disdain for small provincial towns and villages (in this case, in Spain), and at the same time ridiculing the boorishness of rustic Italy. But Romans had long held an ambivalent attitude towards the country: a rustic refuge, not too far from Rome, a haven of *quies et otium*, was de rigueur for an *urbanus*, and Septimius' taste for secluded country retreats conforms to this pattern (53-56). The villa at Tibur owned by Manilius Vopiscus is a similar gauge of civilised refinement (*silu. 1.3*); in a sense, Pollius Felix creates a paradigm of Roman *urbanitas* in Campania, pursuing Epicurean tranquillity in his villa at Surrentum.

So Septimius has triumphed over his origins and displays the hallmarks of *urbanitas*. But Statius' insistence on his Italian-ness is a striking development: *Italus, Italus* (45), metonymy for
Romanus,⁵⁰ implies that with the increasing cosmopolitanism of the empire the territorial delineation of the Italian peninsula developed as a symbol for Roman identity. Augustus' pragmatic tota Italia policy⁵¹ had been reflected in Vergil's declaration that Italian ancestry qualified an individual to be regarded as Roman (Aen.12. 826f.): sit Latium, sint Albani per saecula reges, / sit Romana potens Italia virtute propago. By the Domitianic era Quintilian could draw a distinction between the Latin spoken within Italy and outside it (1.5.55-56): verba aut Latina aut peregrina sunt .... licet omnia Italica pro Romanis habeam. The association of Roman-ness with a wider Italian identity may be rooted in a sense of separation generated by the Mediterranean crossing between Libya and Italy; if Septimius had been from Germany or Gaul, would Statius have contrasted his origins as a foreigner with his life-style as an Italian - or as a Roman?

Septimius' transplant was successful. Statius could remind the up-and-coming Vitorius Marcellus that he and Septimius had been at school together; if that reminder could in any way have been embarrassing, Statius would not have included Septimius' poem in a book dedicated to Marcellus. His father's fortunes and apparently Roman aspirations for his son (like an English public-school education for the son of a Burmese tea-planter eighty years ago) established Septimius' credentials. Instead of mentioning his mother, Statius speaks of Rome herself as Septimius' wet-nurse. If his mother was Punic, the fact did not want advertising. So successful was Septimius' assimilation into Roman society that he remained there; if he helped a relative at Lepcis towards equestrian rank, then he played a part in the ultimate elevation of his namesake to become emperor.
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The following works are cited according to the abbreviations given:


C.I.L. = Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum. Berlin, 1863-.


* I am very grateful to Mrs. Miriam Griffin and Sir Ronald Syme, whose guidance has strengthened this paper.

1 His case is not discussed by J.P.V.D.Balsdon, Romans and Aliens (London, 1979).

2 Birley (1971), 36 and 37 n., assumed that Vitorius Marcellus, dedicatee of the Institutio Oratoria, was a pupil of Quintilian, and hence assumes that Quintilian taught Septimius too. This is only a guess; we cannot even know whether Statius is referring to the school of a grammaticus or a rhetor; but in view of Septimius' excellence at oratory, it is tempting to suppose that he had been taught by Quintilian. Birley goes further (42) and suggests that Septimius may have been influential in getting his contemporary Pliny, another pupil of Quintilian, to prosecute Marius Priscus, proconsul of Africa 97-98, in the trial of A.D. 100.

3 Vitorius Marcellus was praetor in 95 (designated curator Viae Latinae for 96; see Silu. 4.4.60); the minimum age for a praetor was thirty, but a year or two older was normal (see R.Syme, Tacitus (Oxford, 1958), App. 17). He was suffect consul from September to December 105 (Fasti Ostienses); thirty two was the minimum age,
but a *novus homo* usually had to wait at least ten years. Hence he was probably born in A.D. 63. His *condiscipulus* Septimius can also therefore be assumed to have been born c. A.D. 63.

5 Between A.D. 90 and 93. Statius' subject was Domitian's triumphs in A.D. 89 (4.2.66-67, cf. Dio 67.7) and did not include his victory over the Sarmatae in 93.


6 *Ornatus* is frequently used of general distinction accruing from innate qualities of excellence: *O.L.D.* s.v. *ornatus* 4.


9 The alternative interpretation (offered by J.H.Mozley in a note to the Loeb edition, 1928), that Rome produces people who deserve to live in Libya, implies an insult both to Rome and to Libya; it is inconceivable that the urbane Statius would be so heavy-handed. It is just possible, however, that Statius means that there are people in Rome who seem less Roman than Septimius, and so they are the ones who should be living in Libya, not him.

10 Apparently the assumption of F.Millar, 'Local cultures in the Roman Empire: Libyan, Punic and Latin in Roman Africa', *J.R.S.* 58 (1968), 130.

11 Compare Cicero's remark about his daughter (*Ad Q. fr.* 1.3.3.): *effigiem oris, sermonis, animi mei*.

12 The emperor Septimius Severus apparently did sound as though he came from Africa (S.H.A. *Seu.* 19.9): *Afrum quiddam usque ad senectutem sonans*. But the allegation that his sister could
scarcely speak Latin (S.H.A. Seu. 15.7) may be a slanderous exaggeration (so Barnes, 96); less plausibly, Birley (1971), 204, suggests that if she was married to a Greek-speaker she might have forgotten most of her Latin.

13 So the three aspects in which Septimius belies his origins are the same as the resemblances between Cicero and his daughter (see note 11), perhaps a convention of the 'family-likeness' topos.


16 P.I.R.2 A 611.

17 O.L.D. s.v. paternus 1 b.

18 Barnes, 87; Birley (1971), 37.


20 Griffin (see note 15), 36.

21 C.I.L. 11. 3816.

22 I.R.T. 607.

23 I.R.T. 541.

24 M. Hammond, 'Septimius Severus, Roman bureaucrat', H.S.C.Ph. 51 (1940), 142ff.

25 Pace Frère (see note 5), who assumes that Statius' father owned land in all three places.

26 See H. Nissen, Italische Landeskunde 2 (Berlin, 1902), 651.

27 C.I.L. 14. 3004.

28 Barnes 89, following W. Kubitschek, Imperium Romanum tributim discriptum (Vienna, 1889), 271.


30 Ptol. Geog. 1.8.4.
31 S.H.A. Seu. 1.2.
32 I.R.T. 412.
36 Statius is quick to point to the advancement of his addressees: e.g. Vitorius Marcellus' curatorship (4.4.60); Plotius Grypus' commission to organise annona and stationes for Domitian's journeys (4.9.17-19).
37 But Vessey, 'Atedius Melior's tree: Statius Silvae 2.3', C.Ph. 76 (1981), 46-52, divines that Melior had treasonable intent to hide.
39 He dwells on the promise exhibited by Vitorius Marcellus' son Geta (4.4.70-77), Vibius Maximus' heir (4.7.29-56), Julius Mene- crates' sons and daughter (4.8.59-62).
40 This is presumably also Barnes' view (91): '... the established man [Statius' amicus] encouraged his young provincial relative, freshly arrived in Rome, whose father had been content with municipal honours.' Guey (see note 33), 179, denies that the emperor's grandfather was an eques, because I.R.T. 412 does not say so.
41 Plin. Epist. 1.19.
42 Observed by M. Bonjour, Terre natale (Paris, 1975), 327.
uadosae nescius Africae (38); implicit is the traditional Punica fides.

Art. cit. (see note 7), 515.

See Balsdon, op. cit. (see note 1), 24-5.

Attitudes towards city- and country-life at this period are discussed by E.S. Ramage, Urbanitas: ancient sophistication and refinement (Oklahoma, 1973), 118-143.


There is a literary influence at work here. Italus, Italus is a reminiscence of Hor. Odes 3.3.18 Ilion, Ilion. The position in the stanza, the initial assonance and the reference to nationality are features common to both, but the contexts are opposite: Troy has suffered ignominious defeat, whereas Italian qualities represent kinship with Rome's empire which rules the world.

The influence of Vergil's poetry on Tacitus is 'pervasive', but the study of this influence is complicated. There are some poetical expressions, phrases, and particular grammatical structures used by Tacitus which are definitely verbal echoes from Vergil, but it is often difficult to tell whether Tacitus was consciously influenced by Vergil or not, and whether the expression is merely a verbal echo, not intended as a direct allusion to the original Vergilian passage in which the expression occurred. There is the further difficulty that in many instances other authors than Vergil can be cited for the use of a particular expression, and 'Who can tell which passage (if either or not both) was in Tacitus' mind?'

This article is concerned with the influence of Vergil's Georgics on Tacitus. There are poetic echoes from them as well as from the Eclogues and the Aeneid, but did Tacitus quote from the Georgics? Did he make any special use of, or allusion to, any particular passage? The questions arise from a wider study of the literary attitudes to these poems in antiquity. The method followed is partly that outlined by Goodyear: 'We may establish, by counting quotations and echoes, that certain books of the Aeneid, and indeed certain parts of certain books were in antiquity, as today, specially famous.' Pliny the Younger provides important testimony for this somewhat unbalanced interest in literary works. In a letter in which he defends himself for sending only part of a speech to a
friend, he writes: *nec alia ex causa principiorum* (of selected extracts') *libri circumferuntur, quam quia existimatur pars aliqua etiam sine ceteris esse perfecta* (Ep. 2.5.12).

There are numerous verbal echoes and borrowings from the *Georgics* in Tacitus. 'In general', however, as Goodyear comments concerning all of Vergil's poems, 'when Tacitus quite clearly uses phrases from Vergil, he does so primarily to enhance his expression, not to suggest the circumstances in which these phrases originally occurred.'

There are two passages, however, one in the *Germania* (45.5), and the other in the *Dialogus de oratoribus* (12-13), in which passages from the second *Georgic* come to mind, and not just isolated verbal echoes. These two passages deserve closer study.

In *Germania* (45.2-5) Tacitus describes the *Aestiorum gentes* who live on the right-hand shore of the Suebic Sea. These people gather *succinum, amber, quod ipsi glesum uocant* (45.4). In 45.5 when Tacitus compares amber, *succum arborum*, with other products which are exuded from trees, he writes *ubi tura balsamaque sudantur* and commentators cite for the balsam *Georgics* 2.118-9, *quid tibi odorato referam sudantia ligno / balsamaque*. But a closer look at the entire comparison proves very interesting. Consider Tacitus: *fecundiora igitur nemora lucosque, sicut Orientis secretis, ubi tura balsamaque sudantur, ita Occidentis insulis terrisque inesse crediderim, .....* (Germ. 45.5). Now compare his passage with Vergil's very descriptive list of the different products from trees in different parts of the world:

*divisae arboribus patriae. sola India nigrum fert ebenum, solis est turea uiirga Sabaeis.*

*quid tibi odorato referam sudantia ligno balsamaque et bacas semper frondentis acanthi?*
The verbal echoes from Vergil in Tacitus are: nemora lucosque (cf. Dial. 9.6, 12.1) from nemora (120) and lucos (122); and tura from turea virga (117); but for balsamaque sudantur, Ovid's sudataque ligno / tura from Metamorphoses 10 (308-9) should be cited in addition to G.2.118-9.8

The significance of these passages together goes beyond verbal poetic borrowing. The following points are important: Vergil lists and describes the products of different trees from different parts of the world, while Tacitus describes amber, succum arborum, a product of trees. Both Vergil and Tacitus specifically name tura and balsama in their descriptions, as products which are exuded from trees. Vergil compares products far from Rome in the east among the Sabaeans (Sabaeis) and Ethiopians (Aethiopum), the far east, in India and among the Seres (India, Seres), and in the extreme north among the Geloni (Gelonus, 2.115).9 Tacitus does not use such specific place-names but he still makes the comparison between products from the distant east and the west in the phrases Orientis secretis and Occidentis insulis terrisque. And the force of his crediderim seems to enhance the idea of comparison of far away places: 'I imagine', he writes, or 'I should have thought that ...'

Amber is not mentioned in Vergil's list, but this is not the decisive factor. There is so much correspondence between these two passages that there is no doubt about Vergil's influence on Tacitus. There is little point in trying to argue whether or not he consciously had this passage from the Georgics in mind. But his poetic comparison
evokes for the reader its Vergilian inspiration.

*Georgics* 2.109-35 on the variety of lands and the products they offer, from which the above passage was quotes, serves as an introduction to the famous *Laudes Italiae*. There are numerous *testimonia* for the imitation of separate lines and phrases by poets including Juvenal, Valerius Flaccus, Avienus, Ausonius, and especially Grattius Faliscus. His imitation in the *Cynegeticicon* (127-33) where he begins his list of trees which can be used for strong spears resembles this one passage in the second *Georgic* (cf. 110-22) just as Tacitus' individual recollection in the *Germania* does. This sort of evidence for a particular interest in one descriptive passage can be documented from prose authors like Pliny the Elder and Macrobius as well as from poets for the entire passage leading to the *Laudes Italiae*, and for the *Laudes Italiae* itself. Because of this *Georgics* 2.109-35 on the variety of lands should be regarded as a purple passage, like the *Laudes Italiae*, both distinct and memorable set-pieces of the *Georgics*.

Another purple passage from the second *Georgic* receives special attention from Tacitus. The *Laudes vitae rusticae* begin *O fortunatos nimium, sua si bona norint, / agricolas!* (2.458-9). The passage is strongly recalled in the *Dialogus* 12-13 through the references to Vergil by name, the partial quotation of line 475, and numerous verbal echoes. This imitation is better known than the one in the *Germania*.

In the *Dialogus*, Maternus speaks for poets and their life of quiet and solitude, so different from the frantic, unsettled and even dangerous life of orators. *Nemora vero et luci et secretum ipsum* are the places most dear to him for writing poetry (*Dialog.12.1*). Tacitus says that this is a commonplace of the poets, *utque ipsi dicunt, in nemora et lucos* ... (*Dialog.9.6*). Maternus thinks primarily of Vergil, and his words *malo securum et quietum Vergili secessum* (*Dialog.
13.1; cf. Donat. 13) recall Vergil’s *at secura quies* (G.2.467), a combination of words used elsewhere by Tacitus (Dial.10.7), and by other authors (Pliny *Ep.* 6.8.2, *Pan.* 40.1; Ov. *A.A.* 1.639; Livy 39.1.6, Sen. *Dial.* 10.10.5; Sen. *Suas.* 2.2; Donat. 13; cf. Lucr. 3.211, 939). A series of questions on the supposed *potentia* of orators as compared with the reputation of Vergil and other poets culminates in a quotation from the *Georgics*: *'Me uero dulces'* (ut Vergilius ait) *'Musae', remotum a sollicitudinibus et curis et necessitate cotidie aliquid contra animum faciendi, in illa sacra illosque fontis ferant, nec insanum ultra et lubricum forum famamque pallentem trepidus experiar* (Dial.13.5).

Tacitus quotes from *Georgics* 2.475 *'Me uero primum dulces ante omnia Musae*. Vergil asks the Muses to show him ‘the caeli uias and all the movements of the earth because, above all, he wants to write poetry about natural science. But if he is not capable of this, may the Muses grant him the *rura* and *rigui in vallibus amnes* (2.485) as subjects for his poetry. Maternus too wants to be taken to quiet places away from the forum so that he may write poetry. The phrase *in illa sacra illosque fontis ferant* is probably due to influence from the continuation of Vergil’s prayer to the Muses, *quarum sacra fero* (2.476), but also to the overall picture of lines 467 to 474.

There are several verbal echoes from *Georgics* 2.458 sqq. in the *Dialogus* 12.2 – 13.6, which combine with the evidence of the quotation and naming of Vergil to show that Tacitus knew this passage well and probably liked it. They are Tacitus’ *felix* (12.3)¹¹ and *fortunam quidem uatum et illud felix contubernium* (13.1) from Vergil’s *O fortunatos nimium* (458), *felix* (490), and *fortunatus et ille* (493); *securum et quietum Vergili secessum* (13.1) from *at secura quies* (467); *sollicitudinibus* (13.5) from *sollicitant* (503); *insanum ... forum*
(13.5) from insanumque forum (502); and fremitus salutantium (13.6) from ingentem ... / ... salutantium ... undam (461-2). (There may also be a possible recollection of Me uero dulces Musae in the beginning of Messala's next speech, 'Me uero' inquit ... 14.3)

Tacitus not only quotes in part from Vergil, but it is clear from the Dialogus that the Laus uitae rusticae was in his mind. The noticeable frequency and concentration of Vergil's name in this part of the Dialogus support this impression.

The Laus uitae rusticae was considered a purple passage in antiquity, a descriptive set-piece which had its own title and which could be enjoyed on its own apart from the Georgics as a whole (cf. Macrobr. Sat. 5.16.5 laudatio uitae rusticae and Serv. ad g. 2.458 laus uitae rusticae). The extensive testimonia for the closing passage of the second Georgic reflect the popularity of the passage. They include poetic imitation, the quotations in prose writings (particularly in the Saturnalia), and the notes in the ancient commentaries. In this later category there is even the unique occasion of an eight-line citation from At secura quies on, in the Georgicorum Breuis Expositio.

In summary then, in two passages in the Germania and the Dialogus, the evidence of verbal echoes, quotation, and the repetition of Vergil's name, as well as a similar subject makes it very clear that Tacitus was influenced by two well known passages of the second Georgic (2.116 sqq. and 458 sqq.). Tacitus knew these passages so well that quotation would be by memory and the verbal echoes the result of an unforced or unconscious recollection of the original stimulated by a common subject. In these cases, where both passages from the Georgics are well known, the verbal echoes in Tacitus allude to the original poem, and the reader of Tacitus in antiquity, also
familiar with Vergil, would have grasped the poetic allusion and appreciated the prose account all the more.\textsuperscript{16}

NOTES


\textsuperscript{4} Goodyear, vol.I (n.3), 325, \textit{ad Ann.} 1.53.2 \textit{inopia ... peremit.}
See also N.P.Miller, 'Virgil and Tacitus', \textit{P.V.S.} (1961-2), 30.

\textsuperscript{5} \textit{g.} 3.349 sqq., the description of the Scythians, is one of several combined sources for the description of barbarian peoples in the \textit{Germania}, a commonplace of the rhetorical school exercises; see Karl Müllenhof, \textit{Die Germania des Tacitus} (Berlin, 1900; rpt. Amsterdam, 1970), 21-2.

\textsuperscript{6} Müllenhof (n.5), 509, \textit{ad Germ.} 45.5. For the use of the verb he also cites \textit{g.} 1.88 \textit{exsudat inutilis umor.}


\textsuperscript{8} Miller (n.4), 30, who also cites Justin. 36.3.4.

\textsuperscript{9} The entire passage, 2.109-35, rich in faraway place-names, should be kept in mind in this discussion.

\textsuperscript{10} On \textit{nemora et lucos} and Tacitus, see A.N.Sherwin-White, \textit{The Letters of Pliny, A Historical and Social Commentary} (Oxford, 1966), 488-9 and \textit{Ep.} 9.10.2; see also \textit{Ep.} 1.6.2 and 1.9.6. (For the phrases in Tacitus, cf. \textit{Germ.} 45.5)
felix aureum saeculum: see Rudolf Güng erich, Kommentar zum *Dialogus des Tacitus* (Göttingen, 1980), 50, *ad Dial.* 12.3 for parallel references.


15 See Sherwin-White (n.10), 17.

16 This article was presented at the meeting of the Classical Association of Canada, 3 June 1982, Ottawa, Ont., Canada. I am very grateful to Susan Treggiari and Colin Wells for reading and commenting on drafts of the article, and for their encouragement.
A BLACK NOTE IN JUVENAL: SATIRE V 52-55

by JENNIFER HALL

Westfield College, London

... tibi pocula cursor
Gaetulus dabit aut nigri manus ossea Mauri
et cui per medium nolis occurrere noctem,
cliuosae uerberis dum per monumenta Latinae.

AMONG the slights suffered by the rich man's clients at the ghastly dinner-party described by Juvenal in his Fifth Satire, along with the inferior food, inferior wine, even inferior water to that which is provided for the mean host himself and his favoured guests, is included inferior service. A slave boy costing a king's ransom dances attendance upon milord, the prettiest pansy ever to bloom upon the coast of Asia Minor (flōs Asiae 56), while the lowly client has his drink served by a dark-skinned African slave, whether Gaetulian or Moor or Ethiopian is immaterial: Wiesen is surely correct in arguing that Juvenal in using the term 'Gaetulian' is speaking in no narrow or technical sense, but, like other poets, simply means an African.¹ The man has been brought in to wait at table upon the unimportant guests, obliged to leave his normal duties in the stables, where African slaves were often employed as drivers or as cursores to run in front of their master's carriage.² The sullen demeanour and reluctant service (61-5) of this 'Gaetulian Ganymede' (59) proclaim all too clearly that he prefers his master's horses to his hangers-on.
Juvenal obviously intends the client's cupbearer to be in every way a contrast to the beautiful *flos Asiae*; but why would one not care to meet him, specifically, at midnight when driving past the tombs on the Latin Way? 'The meaning is', says Duff, 'either that he is so ugly as to be alarming; or, as the darkness would make his ugliness less striking, that he looks like a dangerous ruffian', and Courtney similarly comments that 'his ugliness makes him seem villainous', and that 'robbers would hide among the tombs', (cf. Duff on Juv. 10: 22: 'After the civil war, the public roads, even in Italy, were beset by armed highwaymen; both Augustus and Tiberius found it necessary to plant military posts throughout the country, to keep down *grassatura* and *latrocinium* (Suet. Aug. 32; Tib. 37).') There is certainly truth in this explanation: not to want to meet a villainous looking person 'on a dark night' is a familiar idiom in English, and the Romans said much the same (cf. Sen. *Apoc.* 13: *sane non quem uelis tibi in tenebris occurrere*).

Mayor and other critics, however, lay stress not so much on the villainous appearance of the surly slave as on the fact that to meet an Ethiopian was considered by the superstitious to be an unlucky omen, just as a cat or a monkey or a eunuch or a man lame in the right foot crossing his path would send the superstitious ancient scurrying back indoors when he set out on his morning business, even if he were duly sprinkled with water from a sacred spring and munching an apotropaic bayleaf. Mayor refers to the three accounts of how, just before the battle of Philippi, Brutus' soldiers, when marching out of their camp, encountered an Ethiopian and slaughtered the unfortunate man, because they took his appearance as a bad omen (Plut. *Brut.* 48, *Flor.* II. 17, *App. B.C.* IV. 134). Septimius Severus, likewise, shortly before his death, was perturbed by various ominous
events, including an encounter with an Ethiopian soldier, his alarm being heightened by the accidental provision of some black victims for a sacrifice, which, to make matters worse, escaped from the attendants, when he abandoned the sacrifice, and followed him back to the imperial residence (S.H.A. XXII. 4-7). 7

Black was the colour associated with death and with creatures of the underworld: the dead Claudius in the Apocolocyntosis trembles at the sight of Cerberus, the black and hairy hound (canem nigrum, villosum, Apoc. 13); while Hecate's dogs, in another underworld tale, are described as bigger than Indian elephants, black and shaggy (μέλανες ... καὶ λάσιον, Luc. Philops. 24). Domitian's death was foreshadowed by his dreaming that a statue of Minerva left her post in his bedroom and plunged into an abyss on a chariot drawn by black horses (D.C. LXXVII. 16), and Alexander the Great dreamt of four dead friends, all dressed in black (Plut. Alex. 50).

Ghosts also, and other spirits, seem to have been thought of by the ancients as black. We picture ghosts today as white and vapoury: our poets talk of the moon as a 'ghostly galleon tossed upon cloudy seas' or of how 'with her one ghost eye / the Moon shone white'; 8 and every schoolchild knows that the simplest way of dressing up as a spook is to throw a white sheet over one's head and emit horrible groans. Ancient ghosts, however, while sharing with their modern counterparts the habit of appearing at the dead of night, to the accompaniment of moans and groans and sometimes the added refinement of rattling chains, 9 appear to have been black: in Lucian's version of the celebrated story of the Haunted House the ghost is described as 'blacker than the darkness' (μελάντερος τοῦ ζωφου, Philops. 31), while elsewhere a Platonist philosopher describes how he saw a Syrian exorcist expelling an evil spirit from a man, and states that it was
black and smoky in colour (ἔγδυ γούν καὶ εἰδον ἐξένυτα <sc. τῶν δαίμονα>, μέλανα καὶ καπνώδη τὴν χρόναν, ibid. 16); and Menippus, encountering Empedocles on the moon (Luc. Icar. 13), at first takes him in some alarm for a lunar daemon, because he is so charred and sooty from his leap into the crater of Mt. Etna. The fly-stabbing Domitian, who liked to ensure that his courtiers kept on their faces miserae magnaeque ... / pallor amicitiae (Juv. IV. 74-5), amused himself one night by summoning various notables to a bizarre dinner party, in a black room, with black couches, where the guests found their places marked by slabs shaped like tombstones, and were served, on black dishes, all the food usually offered in sacrifice to the dead, the atmosphere of doom being increased not only by the emperor's grim conversation but also by the entrance of the servants who were to wait on them: 'handsome naked boys, also painted black, came in like ghosts, and encircled them in a terrifying dance ...' (D.C. LXVII. 9. 2). Similarly, when some youths sought to frighten the intrepid Democritus of Abdera, who used to demonstrate his conviction that there was no such thing as ghosts by composing his philosophical treatises by day and night in a tomb outside the city gates, they danced round him, dressed in black robes and skull masks (Luc. Philops. 32).10

So the superstitious Roman, journeying by night to avoid the heat of the day, rattling in his raeda down the road, between the tombs of those dead noblemen quorum Flaminia tegitur cinis atque Latina (Juv. I. 171), if suddenly confronted by a gentleman of dark complexion, might well take his appearance as an omen of impending doom; he might, indeed, fear also for the silver plate upon his waggon, and wish he were a uacuus ... uiator (Juv. X. 22); but he would probably not have time to worry about his silver: he would be too busy covering
his head with his toga, and calling, like the haunted Theopropides in the *Mostellaria*, upon the supreme Averter of Evil, *Hercules, tecto!*, as he took to his heels.

**NOTES**


5 Thphr. *Char.* XVI; Luc. *Eun.* 8 and Pseudol. 8; and on the γαλά as a cat, and not a 'white-breasted pine-marten' (or 'weasel' etc. L.S.J. s.v.), cf. Rogers on *Ar. Ach.* 255.

6 Mayor 254; cf. E.G. Hardy, *The Satires of Juvenal*, London 1965, 174, somewhat garbled, since he confuses the story of the ghost who appeared to Brutus with the Ethiopian who met the soldiers; and J. Ferguson, *Juvenal, The Satires*, New York 1979, 177: 'an encounter with any black creature by night was portentous: we still have superstitions about black cats'; although, of course, for us it is lucky to meet a black cat, and for the ancients the encounter with something black did not necessarily have to be by night to be taken as an evil omen: Brutus' soldiers would have been sallying forth at dawn, and Septimius Severus was not sacrificing by night.

7 Cf. F.M. Snowden, 'The Negro in Classical Italy', *A.J.P.* 68 (1947), 266-92, 288: 'There was a belief in certain circles among the Romans that the colour of the Negro's skin was ominous. Roman historians, in recounting these omens presaging disaster, observed
that ill-starred individuals were known to have seen a Negro just before their misfortune.'


10 Cf. also the flesh-eating daemon Eurynomus in Polynotus' painting at Delphi of the underworld, described by Pausanias (κυνοῦ τῆς χρόνας μεταξὺ ἔστι καὶ μελανος, X. 28. 4). On the dispute as to whether the child-devouring ghoul, Lamia, was represented in art as a negress cf. C.T. Seltman, 'Two Heads of Negresses', *A.J.A.* 1920, 15-6, and Grace Beardsley, *The Negro in Greek and Roman Civilisation*, Baltimore 1929, 35 and 59.
MITRAIC CONVERTS IN ARMY SERVICE -
A GROUP WITH SPECIAL PRIVILEGES
by I.D. POTTS
Bedford College, London

Proxime factum est. liberalitas praestantissimorum imperatorum expungebatur in castris, milites laureati adibant. adhibetur quidam illic magis Dei miles, ceteris constantior fratribus qui se duobus dominis servire posse praesumpserant. solus libero capite, coronamento in manu otioso, uulgato iam et ista disciplina christiano, relucaet. denique singuli designare et eludere eminus, infrendere comminus. continuo murmuri; tribuno defertur et persona: iam ex ordine decesserat. statim tribunus: 'cur, inquit, tam diversus habitus?' negauit ille sibi cum ceteris licere. causas expostulatus 'christianus sum' respondit. o militem gloriosum in Deo!

TERTULLIAN, De Cor. I, 1-2

Exinde sententiae super illo.—nescio an christianorum: non enim aliae ethnicorum —, ut de abrupto et praecipiti et mori cupidio, qui de habitu interrogatus nominis negotium fecerit, solus scilicet fortis inter tot fratres commilitones, solus christianus.

TERTULLIAN, De Cor. I, iv

quid tibi cum flore morituro? habes florem ex uirga Iesse, super quem tota divini spiritus gratia requieuit, florem incorruptum, immarcescibilem, sempiternum. quem et bonus miles eligendo in caelesti ordinatione profecit. erubescite, commilitones eius, iam non
If Tertullian is to be trusted in the three passages cited, - which passages, because of the close interdependence of their subject-matter, stand or fall together in their entirety -, then Mithraic converts in army service at the beginning of the Third Century received extraordinary privileges and special treatment during the enactment of religious ceremonies. Once a soldier had been initiated into the Mithraic mysteries, and had performed a symbolic casting away of a corona, thereafter, unlike ordinary pagans and Christians, he had no need to wear the corona at special religious rites:

\[
\text{atque exinde numquam coronatur, idque in signum habet ad probationem sui, sicubi temptatus fuerit de sacramento. statimque creditur Mithrae miles, si deiecerit coronam, si eam in deo suo esse dixerit. (XV)}
\]

This privilege appears all the more extraordinary when it is remembered that the soldier in question was arrested for carrying
the *corona*, rather than not having one at all, and although Ter-tullian does not describe the soldier’s fate, the inference is that he was executed; he refused to take part in religious ceremonies, openly declared himself a Christian and would probably have refused to perform the sacrifice test. Tertullian twice refers to the possibility of the death sentence; in I, iv, the soldier’s companions condemn him as *abrupto et praecipiti et mori cupido*, and at the beginning of XV he asks *quid tibi cum flore morituro?*

Enquiry must be made to as why it was necessary for Mithraic converts to be granted exemption from wearing the *corona*. The casting away of the *corona* at the Mithraic initiation ceremony would appear to symbolize the rejection of ordinary paganism, with its reliance on physical trappings, in favour of the more metaphysical cult of Mithras. The initiate casts his *corona* aside, declaring *Mithran esse coronam suam* (XV). However, it must be emphasized that Mithraic converts never condemned ordinary paganism; they appear to have been quite content to exist alongside the state religion.

Thus it would appear that the higher military authorities had given specific permission for Mithraic soldiers not to wear *coronae* at religious ceremonies, whereas ordinary pagans and Christians had to wear regulation ceremonial dress. The Christian soldier in question did not wear the *corona*, because to have done so would have indicated his acceptance of the ordinary pagan rites, and did not appear on parade without a *corona*, since he would at once have been thought a Mithraic convert; rather, he held the *corona* to shew himself to be a Christian on an occasion when his action would have most impact.

It is most interesting that the Emperor appears to have sanctioned a *collegium* in the army, when throughout civilian society they were utterly banned; indeed, fearing that it would turn into a *hetaeria*,
Trajan forbade Pliny to form a fire brigade (Plin. Ep. X, xxxiv).

It would appear that the Emperor sought an alliance with a powerful faction in the army; by granting special status to Mithraic converts he assured himself of their firm loyalty in an increasingly unstable world. Mithraism had been rendered respectable by the initiation of Nero (Dio Cass. LXII, 1, 7, Suet. Nero 13, 30) and of Commodus (S.H.A. Comm. 9); its elevation to special status in military life was, therefore, not altogether surprising.

The reluctance of the Christians to seek special religious exemptions for themselves is perhaps indicative of the strength and influence of the Mithraic faction. Indeed they not only witnessed the pagan ceremonies wearing coronae, but condemned their colleague as being too eager to die and because nomini negotium fecerit. The ordinary pagans reviled the Christian soldier, and reported him to the tribune, probably because they were anxious to prevent a profaning of the sacred rites prior to distribution of the donative - the soldier's carrying of the corona could not have gone on very long unnoticed by the officers.

NOTE

1 I should like to thank Prof. F.R.D. Goodyear and Prof. F.G.B. Millar for their help and advice.
SEVERIANA AS A TITLE FOR ARMY UNITS
AND THE THREE LEGIONES PARTHICAES OF SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS
by M.P. SPEIDEL
University of Hawaii

The special relation of an army unit with an emperor could be expressed by a title derived from the emperor's name. Following traditional phrases like Tacitus' cohortes Vitellianae (Hist.III.6.2), Domitian honored the faithful units of the German army with the title Domitiana. And as Commodus honored some units with the title Commodiana, so Septimius Severus honored some of his units with the imperial title Severiana.¹ This latter title has been observed especially in the case of cohors I (?) Concordia Severiana mentioned in an inscription of A.D. 208 - 211² but one may add to the documentation also cohors V Afrorum Severiana, mentioned in an inscription of A.D. 212 - 214, i.e. early in the reign of Caracalla.³ As a consequence one must now concede that an urban Roman inscription of A.D. 201 with the letters SECVND PARTHICA SEVER refers to legio II Parthica Severiana.⁴

Since it is known that during the joint reign of Septimius Severus and Caracalla certain units received the title Antoniniana,⁵ one may wonder whether some units were perhaps awarded both titles, especially since a city could get these titles conjointly, as in the case of municipium Septimium Aurelium Severianum Antoninianum Frugiferum Concordium Libereum Thibursicensium Bure.⁶ There is indeed an example of such a double title in an inscription from Aphrodisias in Caria, the fragmentary first line of which reads: ⁷ ...[Σ]Εριωνης ['Αντ] ων[Σ]υνης and which continues: ης ης έξιν ἐν κυριακας ους ης
If correct, E. Ritterling said, this title would refer to Septimius Severus and Caracalla, date the inscription to their reigns, and prove that *legio I Parthica* was stationed at Singara (Sinjar/Iraq) from the outset, i.e. from the time that Septimius Severus added Mesopotamia as a province to the Empire.

Ritterling’s suggestion has now been partly confirmed by a new inscription from the base of *legio II Parthica* at Alba near Rome:

\[ D(is) M(anibus). M(arci) Auriel(i) Iuliani m(i)l(itis) \]
\[ leg(ionis) II P(arthicae) Se(vertianae) Ant(oninianae) \]
\[ q(ui) vix(it) an(nos) XXXII, [m(ilitavit)] an(nos) XI, \]
\[ Sep(timius) Brescu et Aureli(us) Herculanus hered(es) \]
\[ b(ene) m(ereni) pos(u)erunt. \]

Here *legio II Parthica* is given the same title as *legio I Parthica*. This has been disputed, and the letters ANT have been explained as belonging to the name of the centurion in whose unit Aurelius Iulianus served - wrongly so, for the men of *legio II Parthica* indicate their *centuriae* by title, not by the names of the centurions.⁹ *Legio I Parthica* and *legio II Parthica* thus both at one time had the title *Severiana Antoniniana*. It follows that the Aphrodisias and the Alba texts date to the reigns of Septimius Severus and Caracalla,¹⁰ and that *legio I Parthica* was stationed at Singara early on.

The history of the whereabouts of *legio II Parthica* may now need some reconsideration because of the early date of the title *Severiana*. It is known that the unit had its winter camp at Apamea in Syria in the years around A.D. 217/218.¹¹ A second stay of the legion at Apamea has been assumed for the years 231 - 233 solely because tombstones of its soldiers were found there that give the legion the title *Severiana*, a title that was believed to refer to
the emperor Severus Alexander. This may indeed be so, but it is no longer a necessary assumption, and a single stay at Apamea (around 217/218) is a simpler hypothesis.

As for *legio III Parthica*, E. Birley has shown that two of its centurions who both died at Lambaesis in Numidia probably never went to Mesopotamia but were engaged in the original formation and training of the legion (or parts thereof) in North Africa before it was transferred to Mesopotamia. If so, the legion must also have been awarded the title *Severiana* early in the reign of Septimius Severus, for the *legiones Parthicae* were most likely raised in preparation for the second Parthian war of Septimius Severus in A.D. 197. The epitaphs of the two centurions read as follows:

(C.I.L. VIII, 2877 Lambaesis) *D(is) M(anibus). T(itus)*
Fl(avius) Virilis 7(centurio) leg(ionis) II Aug(ustae),
7(centurio) leg(ionis) XX V(aleriae) V(ictricis),
7(centurio) leg(ionis) VI Vic(tricis), 7(centurio)
leg(ionis) XX V(aleriae) V(ictricis), 7(centurio)
leg(ionis) III Aug(ustae), 7(centurio) leg(ionis)
III Parth(icae) Sever(ianae) VIII(nonus)
hast(atus) poster(ior), etc.

(C.I.L. VIII, 2891 Lambaesis) *D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum).*
I.Bassus Sulpicianus, 7(centurio) leg(ionis) II
Tr(aianae) For(tis), item 7(centurio) leg(ionis)
P(rimi)g(eniae) P(iae) F(idelis), item 7(centurio)
leg(ionis) XIII Gem(inae), item 7(centurio) leg(ionis)
III Aug(ustae) p(iae) v(indicis), item 7(centurio)
leg(ionis) III Parthicae Severianae, etc.

Coins of Rhesaena, the base of legio III Parthica, minted in the reign of Caracalla, likewise have the legend leg(io) III P(arthica) S(everiana).¹⁵

Since all three legiones Parthicae and a number of auxilia received the title Severiana one may conclude that there existed an unbroken tradition of honoring army units with titles derived from the names of the ruling emperors at least since the time of Commodus.¹⁶

NOTES

¹ G.M.Bersanetti, I soprannomi imperiali variabili degli auxilia dell' esercito Romano, Athenaeum n.s. 18 (1940), 105-35, esp. 111 and 114; M.Mirković, Septimius Severus und die Legio VII Claudia, Arheološki Vestnik 28 (1977), 183-7. Contra: J.Fitz, Epigraphica IX, Alba Regia 16 (1978), 371f., no.4
² A.F. 1934, 212, cf. Bersanetti loc. cit. 114, n.4
⁶ I.L.Afr. 506. As Prof.E.Birley points out to me, a double title 121
referring to both emperors is also found in R.I.B. 1545:

*colon(ia) Sept(ima) Aurel(ia) L(arinum).*


8 A.E. 1975, 170.


10 Even the reign of Elagabalus cannot be excluded if one regards *Severiana* as referring to the founder of the unit in the same way as earlier units were called Flavia or Aelia. Such founder's titles, however, as a rule, stand before the proper name of the unit (e.g. *R.I.U.* III, 840), not after them as in the cases discussed here. I know of no exception to this rule, but obviously the line cannot be drawn too rigidly between the two concepts or their application.


14 Ritterling, *loc. cit.* 1308.

15 K.O. Castelin, *The coinage of Rhesaena in Mesopotamia*, New York 1964, esp. p.16ff. and p.23. There is a coin with a faulty legend from the reign of Decius which Castelin (no. 145, cf. p.77) reads *P2L*, i.e. *l(egio) S(everiana) P(arthica)*. If that legend could be trusted it would suggest that *Severiana* was not a variable
title of the legion, but a founder's title. The reading, how­
ever, is not beyond doubt, and the legend is faulty elsewhere, 
from the coins of Caracalla and Severus Alexander, not on 
the few of Elagabalus and the many of Decius.

16 For Commodiana see Ritterling, loc. cit. 1307f. For continuity 
also A.Passerini, Legio, in: E.de Ruggiero, Dizionario epi­
grafico, vol. 4, Roma 1949-50, 549-629, esp. 559. Discontinuity: 
J.Fitz, 'Les premières epithètes honorifiques Antoniniana', 

[The editors have received from Prof. Speidel the following revision 
of note 15 above]

15 K.O. Casterlin, The Coinage of Rhesaina in Mesopotamia, New York, 
1964, esp. p. 16 ff. and p. 23. Castelin reports that a coin 
from the reign of Decius (No. 145, cf. p. 77) has the legend 
l(egio) S(everiana) P(arthica). If so, this would suggest that 
Severiana was not a variable title of the legion, but a founder's 
name. However, Prof. Göbl / Wien checked the original for me and 
categorically states that the legend in question is l(egio) III 
P(arthica). Caracalla, understandably, did not abolish honorific 
titles awarded by his father.
REVIEWS AND DISCUSSIONS


A new dictionary issued under the imprint of the Clarendon Press claims authority and challenges rigorous scrutiny. The O.L.D. has enjoyed ecstatic praise from some quarters and from others encountered only muted or gentle criticism. It is time for someone to express in plain terms what most Latinists know to be the truth. I shall assess the pretensions and value of the work under four headings, (i) scope, (ii) collection of material, (iii) selection and arrangement of material, (iv) appraisal of material.

First, then, scope. The work is boldly entitled Oxford Latin Dictionary, not, for instance, The Oxford Dictionary of Republican and Early Imperial Latin. That would more closely, though not accurately, have described the commodity which the Clarendon Press is marketing.¹ No doubt the first fascicle had been printed before the Trade Descriptions Act of 1968 came into force. The publisher, in an introductory note riddled with obscurities and evasion, informs us that the O.L.D. aims to 'treat classical Latin from its beginnings to the end of the second century A.D.': a proposal to extend the dictionary to include 'Christian Latin', had been rejected. Can any good reason be discerned for setting a limit at A.D. 200²? I can discern no reason whatsoever and note that no justification is attempted. Again, the notion 'classical' (a value-judgement) is here irrelevant and unhelpful: it cannot define a stage or stages in the history of the Latin language. Even if the notion is applied only to literature, opinions
will differ widely on what it may mean. A.D. 200 marks no turning-point in the history of Latin literature. If a turning-point had to be found, A.D. 130 would have made a little sense: the 'archaizing movement' does mark a change, though not so distinct a change as some suppose. But why should a lexicographer look for such turning-points at all? The editors of the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* have been absolutely right in following and recording the language of ancient Rome as far as it was still recognizably the same language, albeit gradually changing, and as far as it was preserved in an unbroken educational and literary tradition. Lewis and Short, for all their faults, were also right: they tried to present Latin as a whole. The compilers of the *O.L.D.* erred from the start in imposing a terminal limit devoid of linguistic or literary validity. Their whole endeavour is misconceived.

Let us perpend the matter of 'Christian Latin'. Was there such a thing? Only in the very restricted sense that various words were coined to express distinctly Christian ideas. For the rest Christians, like others, had arms, legs, etc., wore clothes, lived in houses, owned utensils, ate, drank and produced offspring, and used the same words as the pagans to denote these objects, accoutrements and activities. Further, many Christian writings contain a wealth of material drawn from influential works now lost, though this material cannot always clearly be separated out: the works of Varro spring to mind as a conspicuous example. Again, because of the bulk of Christian writing which has survived and the very patchy survival of pagan writing much of the evidence for ordinary Latin, spoken and written by Christians and pagans alike, exists in Christian texts alone. Why should we be deprived of so much precious material? More than a third of basic Latin vocabulary has been omitted in the *O.L.D.*, I should surmise.
Now let us take a literary point of view. Can we regard as adequate to the needs of students of literature a dictionary which ignores, along with scores of other writers, the second of all Rome's historians, Ammianus, Rome's finest composer of verse invective, Claudian, three of the most eloquent and forceful of all Roman controversialists, Tertullian, Lactantius and Augustine, and, not least important, a mass of grammatical writing and commentary which alone can supply us with the terminology which the Romans used in literary debate and criticism? In its whole conception the O.L.D. is founded on an extremely narrow and old-fashioned view of what constitutes Latin literature. At present the study of writers of later Antiquity, Christian and pagan, is one of the most flourishing areas of our subject. For those working in this field the O.L.D. is very largely useless.

Next collection of material. A lexicographer must ensure that it is collected from reliable sources. Since the small portion of Latin literature which we possess has come down through a long process of copying from manuscript to manuscript, open to the intrusion of human error at every stage, it is crucial that citations in a Latin dictionary should be drawn from the best available edition, if only one edition is used, but far preferable that all editions of any merit should be consulted. And so we ought to look closely at the list of authors and works set out on pp. ix-xxi of the O.L.D., for here, we are told, are the editions 'used for the original excerpting of material'. A very ambiguous remark follows: 'important changes in later editions have been taken into account wherever possible'. What does that mean? Later editions by the same editor or later editions by any editor? Both, I hope, but feel far from sure. What of the original list? One can only contemplate parts of it with disquiet, indeed horror: an
Oxonian parochialism infects this dictionary and saps all confidence. The compilers appear to use Oxford Classical Texts without any regard to merit or demerit. Here are two flagrant examples. Ellis' *Appendix Vergiliana*, sprung from 'the mind of an idiot child', is preferred to Vollmer's unduly conservative, but generally sane and responsible edition. Owen's appalling Juvenal, which no reputable publisher should ever have printed, is preferred to Housman's. But the matter is by no means confined to parochial bias. Take Lucilius. Marx is listed as the source for excerption. He was the most exciting and arguably the most intelligent of Lucilius' editors, but he was also (unarguably) the wildest. His edition provides no firm basis on which a lexicographer can even hope to depend. The extremely difficult fragments of Lucilius demand eclecticism: I am not satisfied that it has been exercised in the *O.L.D.* To use eccentric editions simply for reference (line numbers and the like) is tolerable, but to use them for excerption is blame-worthy in the extreme. Perhaps the compilers of the *O.L.D.* have in detail been more judicious than their list of editions excerpted suggests. It is a pity that we have no preface from Glare or any other scholar to explain what has been done. Anonymous publishers should not introduce scholarly works: they should content themselves with blurbs.

Thus some well founded doubts about the sources from which material in the *O.L.D.* has been collected. Greater anxiety arises from the omission of material which should have been collected. Some of this material falls clearly within the artificial limit set. For instance, the first two words which I sought in fascicle 2, *calyba* and *calybita* (*Copa* 7 and 25), both appear to be missing. Other material in abundance, though not *prima facie* falling within the artificial limit, should have been included, if the compilers had taken the trouble to find and
properly evaluate it. I found several interesting items in four hours, perusing a single author, Arnobius: they had forty years.

Justin produced his *florilegium* of Trogus' *Historiae Philippicae*\(^3\) at a date as yet undetermined. Some place his activity at around A.D. 200. If they are right, he comes just within the terms of reference of the *O.L.D.* But, even if he was later, his work should still in some way have been included, since it is demonstrably, as he declares, an assemblage of excerpts, not an independent composition.\(^4\) Careful judgement would have been required: in stringing together and sometimes contracting pieces of Trogus Justin has introduced a few expressions of his own. Is careful judgement too much to ask of lexicographers? The total exclusion of Justin from the *O.L.D.* was a very bad blunder. The exclusion of Just. 38. 4-7, which, as Justin explicitly attests, presents a speech in Trogus' own words, is inexcusable. Hence several misleading statements in the *O.L.D.*, as I have shown elsewhere.\(^5\) Further, minor fragments of Trogus are ignored or misrepresented, for Trogus' words are sometimes ascribed to the authors who cite him, not to Trogus himself. In general the compilers of the *O.L.D.* have not taken enough care to separate fragments from the texts in which they appear. This applies conspicuously to such works as Pliny's *Naturalis Historia* and Suetonius' *Vitae Caesarum*.

Now to Arnobius, *Adversus Nationes*, which dates from about A.D. 300. Arnobius' vocabulary is rich and variously interesting, not least because he preserves (a) many designations for everyday objects, *instrumenta ... quibus vita succingitur et continetur humana* (as he says himself), not earlier attested, and (b) many words pertaining to Roman religious ritual, again not earlier attested. As to (a), while some novelties doubtless appeared during the third century A.D., it is highly unlikely that numerous everyday objects had designations in A.D. 128.
300 different from those they bore in A.D. 200. As to (b), it is virtually inconceivable that the terminology of religious ritual should have undergone a substantial change: this is a very conservative area of the Latin language. Had the compilers of the O.L.D. been scrupulous in the discharge of their task, they would have perceived that, while observing their limit of A.D. 200, they were still required to read many later texts in search of what may be called 'evidence relating back'. The Adversus Nationes should have held a high priority amongst such texts, but they probably never turned its pages. Consider 6.6. polyandria illa Varronis. Is this not evidence that Varro used polyandriion? Yet the word is absent from the O.L.D. Or take 2.38 mimulos. In the O.L.D. we find mimula, which happens to be attested in Cicero, but not mimulus. Are we really expected to believe that mimula was Latin in the first century B.C. and that mimulus was never used before A.D. 200? Common sense cries out in protest. This example points as well as any the absurdity of the procedure followed. Again, consider the accumulation at 7.24 of words concerning sacrifice, such as palasea. Much of this material must derive from a comparatively early source, possibly Varro. There should be a way to present such evidence and at the same time express doubt about its origin. It could, for instance, be presented thus: palasea Arn. 7.24 [Varro?]. Similarly in a multitude of other cases.

Having shown that in collection of material the O.L.D. is deficient and far from trustworthy I proceed to selection and arrangement of material. The publisher informs us that in general the O.L.D. follows the principles of the O.E.D. and that its formal layout of articles is similar. Whether this layout is appropriate or sensible seems much in question. The common words naturally pose the worst problems. Thus, since the compilers of the O.L.D. attempt to set out all different
senses and sub-senses, ago has forty-four sections, some divided into as many as six sub-sections. But there is no such division of articles into larger blocks as we find in the Th.L.L. As a result many of the major articles are hard to grasp. Again, and more serious, the distinctions embodied in sections and sub-sections can be artificial, indeed illusory, as H. Wieland showed in *Gnomon* 41 (1969), 746ff. He gave a nice instance from the treatment of anceps, asking how 2(b) 'having two meanings' really differs from 9 'admitting two different interpretations, equivocal, ambiguous', or why the words *animus inter fidenum Romanamque rem ancipitem* should appear under 10(a) 'of doubtful allegiance' while the words *anceps inter utrumque animus* appear under 10(b) 'unreliable' etc. Such unreal distinctions not only falsify the truth, but they also make this dictionary very damaging to those who would learn the language. Latin is far less difficult than, thus falsely analysed, it may seem to be. Lexicographers have been called 'harmless drudges'. Drudges perhaps, but not always harmless.

False distinctions can pass into the realms of farce. Here is a pleasant example,\(^6\) the first section of the article on *amo*. The rubric reads thus: '1 To love, be or fall in love with. b (w. unnatural passion)'. Reflect a moment. If a male says *amo puerum* the words fall under 1(b), if a female says them they fall under 1(a). Conversely, if a male says *amo puellam* the words fall under 1(a), if a female says them they fall under 1(b). This is lexicographical lunacy. Still, if we are to be mad, why not go the whole way? Let us have more sub-sections, i(c), (d), (e) *et ad infinitum*, to distinguish all objects of passion, natural and unnatural. Surely the last passage listed under 'love with unnatural passion' deserves its own sub-section, for it concerns the orator Passienus Crispus who fell
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in love with a tree. Further, since these delightful distinctions are provided for amo, why are they not available for ardeo? Yet there, all together under 7(b) 'be in love with (w. acc.)', we find hanc ardere coepit perdite (natural passion), Corydon ardebat Alexim [sic] (unnatural passion), and delphini ... pueros arserunt (inverse bestiality). The treatment of amo in the O.L.D. is the silliest thing which has appeared in a Latin dictionary since Lewis and Short discovered in Cato a new meaning for the noun anulus.

A lexicographer should pay most careful attention to the need to cite the first attestation of any word or meaning or usage. I have already touched on this matter in connexion with Trogus,⁷ and I have also made random tests more widely. It seems, from my sample, that the compilers of the O.L.D. have usually found the first attestation, but overlooked it in an appreciable minority of cases. Here are five instances:

exhibere = 'support, maintain (a person)'. Ulpian and Paulus are cited, but the first citations should have been Pius apud Ulp. Dig. 25.3.5.6, 14.

impossibilis = 'impossible'. Quintilian is the earliest writer cited. Rather Serv. Sulp. apud Alf. Dig. 28.5.46.

matrimonium = 'wife' (abstract for concrete). The earliest examples given are Tac. Ann. 2.13.3 and [Quint.] Decl. 2.3 We need rather Val. Max. 2.1.5 and, very probably, Liv. 10.23.6.


ordinare = 'appoint (to an office)'. The earliest citation is Suet. iul. 76.3. It should have been S.c. apud Frontin. Ag. 100.1, which is Augustan.

One could easily add to this list,⁸ and easily record other errors in
the layout of articles. A little more thought and a little more care might greatly have improved the selection and presentation of material.

On the structure of the O.L.D. we ought perhaps to be charitable. No one has yet devised a form of dictionary adequate to encompass the full range of any language, and I guess that, even with the aid of computers, no one ever will. The big blocks in the larger articles of the Th.L.L. have advantages, but they too, like the myriad subdivisions of the O.L.D., often prove very artificial. As to Lewis and Short, the very idea of arrangement seems to have been abandoned in despair: most of their articles are quite amorphous. We should not condemn the compilers of the O.L.D. for failing to solve a problem perhaps insoluble. We must continue to regret that the complex and imperfect method they have borrowed may have very bad effects.

Now to appraisal of material. Any scholar who has concentrated for years on a single author can readily find faults in the treatment of that author by lexicographers who have had to deal with hundreds of authors. It would be astonishing if there were no misplacement and no misunderstanding of individual passages in a work as large as the O.L.D. Let that be granted. Many errors in detail may be pardoned, but somewhere a line has to be drawn. I draw it where errors crowd thick and fast and where we encounter complete failure to comprehend the meaning or use of a word or phrase. Unhappily such grave faults are to be found in the O.L.D. Here is a shattering example, the second section of the article on insulato. This section has the rubric 'to spring or leap in, enter with a leap' and, to support this alleged meaning, seven passages are mustered: three with the dative, three with the verb used absolutely, one with the accusative. Of these seven passages the first six wholly exclude the meaning alleged and the seventh, while just admitting it, in no way requires it. I conclude,
on such evidence, that the meaning does not exist. Let us briefly examine the passages: Luc. 10. 538 tergo insultant pedites (they press hard on the enemy's rear), Sil. 14. 363 insultant [classes] pariter pelago (the two fleets ride proudly on the sea), Tac. Ann. 2.8 insultant aquis artemque nandi ostentant (they are swimming, not diving), Enn. Sc. 127 alacris Bacchico insultans modo (a wild dance), Verg. Aen. 6. 571 sontis ... Tisiphone quatit insultans (see the whole context - she has her lash and snakes with which she rushes at and harries the sinners), Apul. Met. 10. 31 Terror et Metus, nudis insultantem gladiis (a similar picture to that in the preceding passage. It concerns the Judgement of Paris, before whom Terror and Fear support Minerva. They could menace Paris and they did: they could not, I submit, enter him with a leap.), Verg. Aen. 7.581 nemoa avia matres insultant thiasis (they could repeatedly have entered the groves with a leap, but a frenzied dance within the groves seems much more likely). Faced with error on this scale (seven passages in a row misinterpreted) one feels a numbed indignation. How did it all slip through? Was no one responsible for inspecting each article before it received an imprimatur? If seven faulty products came in succession off the production line of a factory, the workmen would be reprimanded and the inspectors sacked.

What in Latin is the designation of the domesticated house cat? Housman's immortal attack on the ergastulum at Munich makes this question an acid test of any Latin dictionary. The compilers of the O.L.D. have not entirely failed, but they are somewhat muddled. aelurus, which they correctly report, was certainly a literary designation at least from the early empire, but, on the evidence we have, the word seems to have struck no firm roots in the spoken language. As to feles, the rubric in the O.L.D. reads thus: 'any of several small
carnivora, prob. including the marten, polecat, and wild cat'. So the
domesticated house cat, though not plainly excluded, is not plainly
included. That is rather misleading. Consider Cic. Leg. 1.32 qui
canem et felem ut deos colunt and Juv. 15.7 illic aeluros ... oppida
tota ... venerantur. That similarity in thought strongly supports the
contention of Wulff (Th.L.L., s.v.) that feles, while not denoting the
domesticated cat, could be applied to it. If aelurus was not in
popular use and if, as I admit, feles was a rather general term, then
we should look for a specific term by which an ordinary Roman would
have denoted our puss, an animal which must have been familiar enough
in Rome after centuries of contact with Egypt. It is readily found,
cattus / catta. The survival of this word in romance languages shows
that by some stage it was as well established in spoken Latin as, for
instance, caballus. When it first entered the language is disput­
able: we have no secure attestation before A.D. 200, but it is poss­
ible that the word occurs with the meaning 'cat' at Mart. 13.69.1
Pannonicas nobis numquam dedit Umbria cattas. The compilers of the
O.L.D. should have noted that possibility.

Now let us put a hypothetical question. Suppose someone were to
try to compose an English-Latin dictionary, using only the material
provided in the O.L.D. Could he succeed? He could not. Multitudinous
words, denoting common objects and occupations, to say nothing of
living creatures, would not be available to him. Many objects, un­
questionably in common use, have been discovered at Pompeii and
Herculaneum: they existed in A.D. 79. Some of their designations are
known, but not preserved in literature earlier than A.D. 200. Con­
sequently they are not recorded in the O.L.D. It is sad that its
compilers did not permit themselves a little more latitude and show
themselves more conscious that it is often the play of mere chance
which has determined the survival of such ancient Latin as we have.

_Humanum est errare_ and lexicographers, I should concede, though some might not, are human. The _O.L.D._ is frequently, and in some important ways, far superior to Lewis and Short, but it has not superseded that old and unhappy compilation even for Latin before A.D. 200. It cannot remotely vie with the _Th.L.L._ So in 1983, in spite of the expenditure at Oxford of much time, energy and money, we still have no complete Latin dictionary to which a student or scholar can confidently resort. Yet I console myself with a sort of paradox. A very good dictionary acquires very great authority, and authority is inimical to independent enquiry and scholarship. This is not a very good dictionary.

Bedford College, London
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NOTES

1 The most accurate description I can frame is _An Oxford Dictionary of some Latin found in sources earlier than A.D. 200._

2 The limit is left a little blurred, at least for jurists, but that does not affect the main issue.

3 If this was the complete title, which I much doubt.

4 See _P.A.C.A._ 16 (1982), 1-3.

5 _L.C.M._ 7 (1982), 13-14.

6 I am most grateful to Dr J.N.Adams and Prof. H.D.Jocelyn, who called my attention to it.

7 See note 5 above.

8 Sometimes with marginal cases, such as _admittere_ = 'direct, send (to)', a sense tenuously attested. _Aetna_ 86 may be the first
occurrence, but Luc. 6. 650 should also be mentioned, in spite of doubts over the text.

Nevertheless the form of dictionary represented by the O.E.D. and O.L.D. seems ripe for fundamental revision.

Various remarks on the treatment of Tacitus in the O.L.D. will be reserved for the appropriate places in my commentary.

I touched on it briefly in commenting on Tac. Ann. 2.8.3.

Wulff valiantly attempts to distinguish between places where martens or whatever are intended, places where the domesticated cat is intended, and places where the meaning must remain uncertain. I doubt whether he has succeeded, but applaud his efforts.

As to romance languages, one obviously cites 'chat', 'gato', 'gatto'. But the word was widely spread: 'cat' in English, 'Katze' in German, κάττα in later Greek. Whence it spread is not at all clear. It could have come into Latin from the North, not from Greece or anywhere in the East.

A difficult line. Heraeus says that, since cattus / catta = 'cat' does not appear before the fourth century A.D., catta here denotes a bird, and the compilers of the O.L.D. hesitantly follow his view. Yet it is fatally flawed by its circularity. Are there no other words attested only once in the first century A.D. which fail to surface again until the fourth? The later attestation of cattus / catta = 'cat' is secure enough, in Palladius, the Anth. Lat. and glossaries. See further Isid. Orig. 12.2.38 and K.Sittl, A.L.L. 5 (1888), 133-5. The trouble with the meaning 'cat' at Mart. 13:69.1 is that it does not seem aptly to fit the context: lack of contemporary attestation is irrelevant. So I suspend judgement on the line, quite uncertain whether Martial's cattae are cats or birds or fish or a textual corruption.
The influence of Ignazio Cazzaniga, who did so much to foster classical research in Italy, is instantly recognized in this latest volume of papers produced by his pupils, and their pupils, in Milan University's Institute of Classical Philology. His classical interests were wide ranging; and the collection of papers now published in the third volume of \textit{Scripta Philologa} is as much a testimony to his inspiration as it is a commendation of the work of his successors. Such diversity of activity in classical research as we have in the present collection of papers seemed to warrant a commensurate diversity of response; and the editors of \textit{P.A.C.A.}, who received this volume shortly before their own was due for completion, accordingly decided that a collection of papers by various members of the University of Milan should be reviewed by various members of the University of London, which has close, and much valued, connections with Milan. Fittingly, research students and staff play their part on both sides, as authors and reviewers.

F.R.D.G., J.B.H., D.B.S.

ARRIGONI, G., 'Alla ricerca della \textit{Mete} tebana e dei \textit{veteres di} (a proposito della metamorfosi di Atalanta ed Ippomene)', pp. 7-69.

Arrigoni's work on the legends of Atalanta has moved from the hunt for the Caledonian boar (\textit{Scripta Philologa} I, 1977, 9-47) to the metamorphosis of Atalanta and Hippomenes into lions. Ovid (\textit{Met.} X, 681-707) tells how Hippomenes forgot to thank Venus for the golden
apples which defeated Atalanta; the goddess therefore filled him with desire so powerful that he made love to his bride on ground sacred to the veteres di. The punishment for this second crime was immediate, for Cybele, 'the mother of the gods', whose temple was nearby, turned both into lions to draw her chariot.

The metamorphosis has a Theban setting, but A. suggests that the chaste Cybele guarding sacred space owes more to the goddess' image in Ovid's time, as a respectable poliad deity, than to the Theban Cybele described by Propertius, Pausanias and (possibly) Pindar. A number of anomalous features of Ovid's goddess are listed, leading A. to search behind the 'Roman' and 'Theban' Cybeles for a third goddess. This is the 'Theban Mother of the Gods', the goddess of Ovid's Greek source, who was identified with Cybele by Ovid because her attributes fitted the Roman Cybele, but who should in fact be identified with another Theban deity.

In order to discover more about Ovid's source, A. examines variants of the metamorphosis ending in the Latin scholiasts. Here the Mother is sometimes Cybele, but in one case is identified with Ceres-Demeter. A. looks at the meaning of mater deum/deorum in a Greek and in a Roman context, concluding that only in the Greek world could this identification be made. It is therefore the missing piece of the pattern: the Theban Mother behind Ovid's text is neither Rhea nor Gaia, but Demeter, and the sanctuary described that of Demeter Kabeiraia outside Thebes. Only this identification accounts for the veteres di - finally revealed to be the Cabiri - and permits the metamorphosis ending to be dated. As the title 'Mother of the Gods' is not attested for Demeter in mainland Greece before the late fifth century, the ending cannot be Hesiodic but was instead added to show that sacrilege is a sin beyond sacrificial expiation.
This closely-argued and well-documented paper is of particular interest for its largely successful attempts to weave together evidence from art, literature, cult and archaeology without losing sight of historical changes in the period covered.

University College London

HELEN KING

COLTRI, E., 'Per una nuova edizione della Vita Genovefae virginis Parisiensis', pp. 71-118.

This study concentrates exclusively on the MS tradition of the Vita Genovefae, a biography originally dating from the sixth century. Each of the three branches of the tradition is of a quite distinct character. I, generally regarded as closest to the original, is written in a barbarous style sharing many features of language with writers such as Gregory of Tours. II is far more correct and C. attributes this classicising to the Carolingian Renaissance. III is in a still more elevated style, and in parts has been fundamentally revised. Unlike previous editors, C. studies all three groups and their relationship to each other and to the original. The identification of the three main families is easy and beyond argument; C.'s sub-groups of these families are less clear-cut. Her classification of these is enormously detailed and subtle, but sometimes the variants she uses as the bases of classification are too similar to provide firm evidence of independent origin. The stemma constructed by C. accurately illustrates her arguments, though it gives the reader no idea about the extent of contamination within and between the families. It is also disconcerting to find MSS of the fifteenth century several levels
higher than tenth century ones. The methodology is basically sound throughout, but in the end the reader is left with a very unclear picture of the nature of the original text which gave rise to three versions of completely different character.

Bedford College, London

FIONA CAWSEY


In this article G. examines two sets of sixth century fragments from the Ambrosian Library in Milan. He discusses the three leaves of a MS of Cassiodorus' orations which are preserved in Milan. Although these are now in poor condition, due to ninth century damage and nineteenth century chemical treatment, he has provided a new transcription and a more closely defined date, as well as a detailed analysis of previous work.

He then considers two narrow columns cut from a sixth century uncial copy of St Paul's 'Letter to the Thessalonians', which until now have received no comprehensive study. He demonstrates the impressive dimensions of the original codex by comparison with the Vulgate text of the letter. Photographs of the fragments described are provided.

King's College, London

H. FORTE

GRILLI, A., 'Cultura e filosofia nel proemio della 'Catilinaria'
Through a meticulously researched inspection of the text G. examines and unravels the principal philosophical influences contained in the proemium of the *Catilinae Coniuratio* of Sallust, who presents a formidable challenge to the modern enquirer, both in the diversity of his sources and the concentration of his thought.

In his analysis of the opening lines of the proemium G. rightly highlights the towering influence of the Platonic concepts, particularly the fundamental dualism between the nature of the intelligence whose aspect is akin to the divine and whose task it is to command, and that of the body, mortal and subordinate to the dictates of the mind. He locates passages from major Platonic works and investigates further the antitheses between *hominem* - *pecora*, *ingenium* - *vires*, in which he observes strong traces of Antiochene influence.

Indeed, the importance of the eclectic Academic philosopher Antiochus of Ascalon, both in the way he fused and filtered differing strands of Platonic, Peripatetic and Stoic thought, is given special prominence by G. because of the considerable influence he exerted on Sallust and Cicero. Antiochus' relentless attack on the Epicurean injunction *λάθε βιώσοι* is evidenced in *cat.* 2. 7-8 and his attempt to bridge the gap between the *βίος θεωρητικός* and the *βίος πρακτικός* is well noted.

How successfully Sallust imparts his own striking unity on such a wide-ranging complex of ideas is itself a testimony to the positive contribution that eclecticism can furnish to human knowledge.
That Avienus' text represents a free translation, or reworking, of Dionysius Periegetes is manifest even on a cursory inspection; but to explain why Avienus differs from Dionysius (where he does so) is anything but easy, if one is not content with the hasty solution of ascribing such differences to caprice or ignorance.

Both in the present paper and in a second one (published in *Studi in onore di A. Colonna*, Perugia 1982) G. is concerned to search for possible sources which may have occasioned Avienus' departures from Dionysius and, in general, to see whether there is any rhyme or reason in what at first seems chaotic disorder. In her other paper she advances the hypothesis that in certain cases Avienus may have been influenced by the rich body of scholia to Dionysius: here she considers certain passages which have a 'certain unity of theme', namely, those concerned with precious stones and precious metals. Detailed analysis of these passages reveals no certain source for Avienus' innovations, but the consistency with which he eliminates or changes details in the Dionysian original suggests to G., very plausibly I think, that amongst the apparent disorder there is some method, even though its rationale is as yet obscure.

Bedford College, London

J.B.HALL

LEHNUS, L., 'Verso una nuova edizione de commento virgiliano attribuito a Probo, la *vita Vergili*, pp. 179-211.

This paper amounts more or less to an edition with introduction and
commentary of the *vita Vergilii* ascribed to Probus. In his introductory section Lehnus establishes that Egnatius' edition (Venice 1507) is by no means such an impeccable witness as some have supposed: Egnatius may often refrain from conjecture and interpolation, but occasionally he succumbs to those temptations. It follows that editors of the *vita* should be both cautious and eclectic. The text and apparatus which Lehnus provides are less than satisfactory. The apparatus, in particular, is ill constructed and uncritical. Why record such things as 22 *aedidisset* for *edidisset*? Why waste space on useless voting-lists? For the location of a comma at 26 no fewer than nineteen authorities are cited, eleven in one cavalcade: 'Hagen Nettleship Baehrens Riese Diehl Brummer Conway Janell Rostagni Bayer 1952 Brugnoli'. Should not T. Cobleigh be added? A commentary follows, full, learned and instructive. Lehnus gets to grips with several knotty problems, contributes to their elucidation and supplies an abundance of bibliography. One may welcome a valuable paper, in spite of certain flaws, and hope that Lehnus will have more to offer us soon.

Bedford College, London
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Claudian's poetry has a firm basis in the contemporary political scene, 'of that there is ... no possible doubt whatever'; but how the poet intended his compositions to be received by the cultured audiences who attended his recitations, and how those audiences in
fact received them, 'who can tell, who can tell?'. Flattery comports with the courtier and panegyrist (whether commissioned to write or not), suppression of unflattering facts is only common sense on a festal occasion, and an unflagging exploitation of the expression of, above all, Virgil and Lucan is a mark of the literary virtuoso. Much has been written in recent years (conspicuously by Cameron, Gnilka and Düpp, though others too have made their contribution) on the subject of Claudian as a writer drawing his inspiration, or taking his cue, from the course of contemporary events; and Moroni's thesis, though not entirely novel (as she notes, Balzert had already drawn attention to the possible political relevance of allusion to the great classics), deserves some consideration. In her view allusive reference to the wording of the older epicists, so as to suggest that Stilicho is, variously, a reincarnation of Aeneas, Cato or Julius Caesar, and Honorius a second Iulus, has a certain 'valore politico', or even 'ideologico'. Her thesis is well documented and, though not to my mind convincing, prompts once again the questions with which I began. Intimate knowledge of what actually happened precludes blind acceptance on the part of members of the court of what Claudian has to say; day-by-day indoctrination is incompatible with the infrequency of Claudian's recitations and the (comparatively) slow speed of ancient communications; and the conventions of panegyric and invective had nothing to do with truthfulness. So what did Claudian intend by his use of Virgil, Lucan and the rest? Anything more than poetical embellishment of mostly uninspiring subject matter? I wish I knew the answer.

Bedford College, London  
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From Herodotus to Eustathius one encounters allusions to the Scythian gentleman Anacharsis who supposedly visited Greece in the archaic age and reacted to what he found with illuminating criticisms. He came to learn, but was in the end more instructive than instructed. He hobnobbed with or was included among the Seven Sages, and some of his wisdom is indistinguishable from theirs; but as a barbarian he was particularly well qualified to deliver general observations on Greek customs. He was naturally a figure dear to fourth-century and Hellenistic romancers and the Second Sophist.

In this full-length study J.F. Kindstrand surveys the legend under various headings with a view to defining its origins and the contributions made to it by different writers and schools. He also provides a collection of some fifty sayings attributed to Anacharsis in ancient authors and gnomologies, with a commentary, and appends two further groups of apophthegms - twenty-five from cod. Vat. Ottob. gr. 192 and nine from Vat. Pal. gr. 297 - regarded as 'wrongly attributed to Anacharsis', that is, originally anonymous or ascribed to other sages. Completeness is not claimed, however, in view of the existence in manuscripts of considerable quantities of unpublished gnomological material.

As one would expect from Kindstrand's previous publications, this is a learned and thorough work. But I have some reservations about the concept of it and the methods of argument employed in it. Anacharsis is not much more than a name upon which apophthegms are hung. He has,
certainly, one individual feature from the beginning, his foreign origin, and he acquired one or two others in the course of time. It is worth while to watch his progress through antiquity. But there is not much point in a composite biography in this style:

Anacharsis belonged to the royal family of Scythia, being the son of a King named Gnurus (Herodotus 4.76, Diog.Laertios.1.101,\textsuperscript{1} Schol. ad Pl. R. 10.600A and Suda s.v. A, 2130 and s.v. Γ, 360) or Daucetes (Lucian Scytha 4). His mother was Greek (Diog. Laertios. 1.101, Schol. ad Pl. R. 10.600A, Suda, s.v. A, 2130, s.v. Π, 360, s.v. Δ, 854 and s.v. Σ, 704) and as a result he was bilingual (Diog. Laertios. 1.101, Schol. ad Pl. R. 10.600A, Suda, s.v. Δ, 854 and s.v. Σ, 704; cf. also Eustathius Ep. 19 (= P.G. 136 col. 1278C)) ...

(and so on for four pages). It is at least on a more scholarly level than what is presented as historical fact by Tamara Talbot Rice in her book \textit{The Scythians}.\textsuperscript{2} But there is rather a difference between Herodotus as a source (however far one goes along with D.Fehling's view of his mendacity) and Lucian or Diogenes Laertius (on whom, of course, the Suda and the Plato scholiast are dependent). It is a pity that Kindstrand did not devote some of the space in this book to printing Herodotus' testimony in full, followed by that of the other sources in chronological order, Plato, Ephorus, Aristotle, Dicaearchus, Hermippus, and so on, with a running commentary on their interrelationships and innovations. The ten Letters composed in Anacharsis' name in the Hellenistic period might well have been included.

Putting Anacharsis together with others who came to Greece from the north, such as Orpheus, Olen, and Abaris, Kindstrand suggests that he was originally a shaman-figure, but had been thoroughly rationalized by the time of Herodotus. There is a hint of support for this idea in the story that he implicated himself in the rites of the Great Mother, drumming and festooning himself with amulets (Hdt. 4.76), and perhaps in the story that he was killed (conveyed to the other world) by an arrow (ibid.; Kindstrand 22). The inference would be that an Anacharsis
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legend was current in Greece at least by the late sixth century (Kindstrand would say the early sixth). This is quite possible. But Kindstrand goes too far in his contention that Anacharsis may already have been counted among the Seven Sages at that early date. There is no reason to think that the concept of such a group existed long before Plato's Protagoras, where it is first mentioned, or that anyone before Ephorus included Anacharsis among the seven. And if he had become assimilated to the Greek Sages by the sixth century, how far back shall we have to go to find the shaman? When Kindstrand tells us (77) that 'there is good reason to assume' that the Seven Sages figured in literary works of a popular character in the archaic period, probably 'in the form of agon or symposium, since these elements predominate in the traditions', one asks what this 'good reason' is. We can trace the theme of the Sages' Symposium back to the fourth century, but no further. It presupposes the rise of dialogue literature, after all, perhaps the Symposium of Plato. Kindstrand might have applied here the same standard of scepticism as he shows towards Gigon's theory of a fourth-century Anacharsis dialogue.3

Of course not all that existed is attested. One may agree with Kindstrand that Sophistic use of Anacharsis is likely although it is unrecorded. He assumes similar use by Cynic writers, while criticizing the view of Heinze, Joël, and others, that their influence on the legend was of special importance. In general terms this assessment seems fair. But I should like to enter a mild protest at the habit of speaking of 'the Sophists' and 'the Cynics' as if they formed coherent groups in the way that the earlier Stoics did. When one talks of 'the Sophists' using the Anacharsis motif, one ought to have some specific names in mind. Prodicus? Hippias? Critias? Were Herodotus and Plato not Sophists of a kind? Was Antisthenes a Sophist or a Cynic? Which other

147
Cynics come into question?

Some notes on the Apophthegms. A4-5 the point is the relativity of cultural values. The world is not to be measured simply by Greek or Athenian standards. To the older material on ὀλοκληρώματι should be added a reference to Anacreon in Page, Supplementum Lyricis Graecis, no. 313. A8 read ἔξωμισακανόν. A10 it is ridiculous to argue from the presence of this saying in Herodotus, who puts it in Amasis' mouth, that it probably belonged already to the archaic Anacharsis. A11 Eustathius is of course dependent on Athenaeus. A13 Kindstrand rightly says that πολέμιον need not be changed to πολεμιῶνατον, but should have cited A20 as a parallel. A15 the point in Sextus Sent. 241 is quite different. A22 part of an iambic trimeter? Cf. Men. Monost. 137, 425. A23 I cannot find here any disparagement of ὀλοις. (When will people stop translating this word as 'flute'?) Antiphanes fr. 56, quoted on A24, is an adaptation of A23. A26 I see no reason to consider ὀναθαρσεως corrupt. The word means 'being tiresome'. A27 κρινομένου κρατήρος ἔφεστιον looks like the relic of a verse formulation. A40 I take the meaning to be that a wise ruler is only appreciated by wise subjects. If all his subjects are fools, they will think him a fool, just as the one sober man at the party is taken by the rest to be supremely drunk (Lucianus, A.P. 11.429). A42 'criticism of the Greek lack of consistency' is not quite the point; demonstration of the inconsistency of an opponent's position is a standard form of argument from the fifth century on. The emphasis is on the absurdity of judgment by the untrained.

Those interested in the survival of classical themes in the Latin Middle Ages and after the Renaissance should have their attention drawn to the succinct but wide-ranging survey of our hero's later career on pp. 83-95. It culminates in an account of that curious minor figure
of the French Revolution who, discarding his given name of Jean-Baptiste, chose to be known as Anacharsis Cloots.

Bedford College, London
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NOTES

1 'It can be noted that Diog. Laert. 1.101-102 is quoted in Eudocia Augusta Violarium 182 p. 126 Flach.' (It can indeed, if anyone is interested in that Renaissance forgery, long ago shown to be the work of Constantine Palaeocappa. M.L.W.)

2 P. 83: 'That they [the Scythians] might have been no less fascinated by speculative thought, had they been given the opportunity to indulge in it, is shown by the life of Prince Anacharsis, brother of King Saulius, who was sent to Athens as his sovereign's ambassador. No sooner had he reached his post in 598 B.C., that he began to frequent the society of Solon and his circle of philosophers. Within a short time Anacharsis had forsaken politics to spend several years in searching for wisdom and divine truth', etc.

3 P. 81: 'The literary works which are preserved from the Imperial period and which have Anacharsis more or less as their main character do not impel us to believe in the existence of works in the classical period, similar in content, which the later writers could copy'.
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L.P. Wilkinson with his book *Ovid Recalled* may have precipitated to some degree the scholarly attention which has been heaped upon Ovid's text over the last twenty-five years or so, and if this is true, he will have a lot to answer for. As the pages of past issues of this and other journals have amply shewn, a large proportion of this attention has been of an extremely varied quality; and the present volume under consideration wins no accolades, either.

The only truly original part of Henderson's (hereafter H) introduction of 12 pages is his complicated, almost tortuous structural analysis (pp. xx-xxiii), which also includes for good measure a 'numerical scheme' for the *Ars Amatoria*. Now there is no doubt that structuralism has its place in the study of ancient literature, but it is tricky ground, and Peter Green's words in the introduction to his new translation of Ovid's (hereafter O) love poetry are salutary. ¹ Certainly when the application of such principles involves the expulsion of verses hitherto regarded as genuine, whether the expulsion be premeditated or not (p. xx: 'I should add that I expelled these verses before I began to look at the 'arithmetic' of the poem, and not vice versa.'), it becomes a serious business. I consider the deletions briefly elsewhere in this review, but I must say that I find H's complicated calculations unhelpful and even misleading: I do not think that O composed his poetry with a pocket calculator in front of him, and yet H's theories seem to posit just such a scheme. His fear that such a numerical scheme may not win general acceptance is probably justified.

But to more important matters. On p. xx we are promised a new
text, to which I now turn. H's text differs from the O.C.T. in nearly 60 places, though well over half of these changes are orthographical; and of the 23 alternative readings which H prints, 13 or so have already been advocated, and in some cases printed by Goold (hereafter G). First his independent offerings: 112 debuerat celeri: What Philoctetes requires is accuracy and sureness more than swiftness, and the right word and order here is certa debuerat, which moreover seems likelier to have given rise to the variants; 143 amori: Why dative? Compare, as the first example that comes to mind, remedia amoris; 185 compositos: It may be right, but the evidence seems inconclusive (see comm. p. 65); 477 concedet (contrary to H's apparatus not supported by G, who rather defends sentiet at 478): In his comm. H says of this line that in conditionals of this type a pres. subj. in the protasis and a fut. indl. in the apodosis is the 'regular' construction. I would like to see him prove this by examples, and I should rather say, if I felt the need to say anything, that pres. subj. and imperatives too are 'regularly' found in the apodosis in this construction; and so the choice must rest on other grounds. I might be persuaded by concedet in 477 followed by sentiet in 478 as being an elegant variation typical of O within the same couplet and construction, but I need better evidence that a line from a schoolboy's grammar book; 566 adesse makes little sense, but as H brackets the verse as spurious, he perhaps does not think sense important in the circumstances; 632 multum is in no way superior to multam; 651 acrior is one of Riese's less convincing conjectures: still water may run deep, but so too does a flood; 658 desinit: The present seems distinctly weak here; 732 uiuit: Why this fear of futures? si sulphure tangas favours uiueit. Of the readings advocated by G which H adopts, in at 268 I would
This brings us on conveniently to a consideration of the apparatus. In any edition boasting a 'new text', whatever the palaeographical ability of the editor (see H's disclaimer on p. xix), the apparatus must be full and accurate, or the benefit of establishing a 'new text' is set at naught. H's apparatus is neither. Much that is desirable is omitted; and of the information vouchsafed to us, much is incompletely or inaccurately recorded. I notice error or incompleteness or both in the apparatus at 9-10 (twice), 13, 19, 82, 88, 97, 111, 112, 119, 123, 143, 161, 180, 185, 189-90, 210, 282, 284, 333, 351, 379, 383, 392, 394, 415, 417, 435, 446, 464, 473, 492, 537, 582, 605, 611, 612, 632, 651, 677, 683, 700, 704, 724, 727, 729 and 774, which is, on average, just over two mis-statements a page in an apparatus averaging four lines to the page. Such frequency is alarming.

Nor can it be said that H is scrupulously honest: he claims for himself a change of punctuation at 8 and minor orthographical changes at 64, 379 and 456 which, for what they are worth, really belong wholly to G. There are misprints: 45-8 habet [Plan.] for 44-8 habet [Plan.] and 343-5 habet [Plan.] for 343-6 habet [Plan.]; and while we are on the subject of the pseudo-Planudes text, it is as well to mention that H omits references at 463-4, 475-6, 615-6 and 631-2.

Yet, what makes H's apparatus worthless, if after recounting such
a leaning towards inaccuracy 'worth' is the right word, is the plain fact that it has been constructed on no critical principles at all, with the result that, as an author once said, it becomes such dangerous water that one has to take soundings before one can navigate it. What is there of importance and interest is so bogged down with prob. this person and prob. that one, and with suchlike announcements as at 357 'Veneris pro veneris scripsi (item 407 venerem; 800, 802, 805 veneri)' and at 487 'Artes, non artes, edendum', that the apparatus also fails to possess, after accuracy, its most important aspects: clarity and ease of consultation. In an edition without a comm. much more of this kind of thing may perhaps rightly be included at the bottom of the page: but H would have improved his apparatus enormously by relegating most of this stuff to the second part of the book. There is only a handful of instances at most in this poem where it is conceivable possible that the reader will need or desire a prob. in the apparatus. And more: not only has much useful information escaped the apparatus, and not only does it contain untruths by the dozen and other rubbish besides, there are also recorded conjectures which have no claim to perpetuation, of which Némethy's uetita at 251 and Borneaque's tuis at 426 are eminent examples. Both of these entries, with their attendant prob. and comment take up nearly half a line each of space in the apparatus which had better been employed otherwise. And to H's sole offering at 687 tucked away amidst all this stuff and tentatively suggested, one can most kindly say 'unlikely'.

A word about H's sigla: he freely employs E² and K¹ throughout, though we are not told precisely what these witnesses are; space is wasted where this information ought to be on p. 2 with an irrelevant list of MSS for the Ars and the Amores. Nor does H record anywhere the existence or the readings of the excerpta Puteani, though the
The question of deletions, to which I have already referred, is a touchy one. On pp. xix-xx of the introduction we are told that H has bracketed as interpolation a 'far larger number of couplets than usual', viz. 25-6, 391-2, 405-6, 565-5, 669-70 and 745-6. Interpolation does occur in the MS tradition of the amatoria, it is true, and if a verse or couplet is spurious, we will be so persuaded by argument, which in some cases is not difficult. But what is unacceptable is this: 'The ultimate touchstone in each case must be the editor's opinion of the Latinity, sense and aptness of the couplet. All six here seem to me to fail on all counts.' (p. xx). I hope to deal with deletions in the Remedia in detail elsewhere, but let it suffice here to say that one may be credulous enough to believe that an editor that will write these words will also include some explanation of the expulsion of these verses, however brief, in his comm., especially when one of the deletions was made 'without reasons' by Bornecque, whose poor critical judgement is notorious. After all, spurious couplets have a bearing on the poem from every angle, literary, stylistic and textual, and some account of them should have found itself in this book, not in some projected monograph which may or may not appear. And yet, when one turns to the comm. with some expectation, there is nothing, not one single condescending remark, squeak or twiddle. That fact is heavy judgement of itself on this edition, designed we are told for 'professional scholars and advanced students'.

But to be fair, I must add that it is in the comm. that any useful information is likely to be found. There are occasionally helpful or illuminating notes, e.g. part of his introductory note on p. 28, and on verses 1, 23, 71-2 and 553; and there are copious references to other parts of the Ovidian corpus and to other ancient authors.
for those who delight in them. But there is pedestrian stuff here too, e.g. on verses 2, 175 and on 57, 514, 667 and 689f., where we have 'murmuringly insistent m's and n's' and 'booming u's'; and had this nonsense been omitted, H would have been able to discuss matters of import. (Indeed had the text in its entirety been excluded, and that space given over to serious examination of textual and other matters rather than to a useless text, the book would have been a better one.) It is a comm., in short, less for the professional and advanced student than it is for the sixth-former and the undergraduate.

It must be said, I think, that this book, at whatever time it had been produced, would never rank among the outstanding or even important contributions to Ovidian studies; but at a time when financial cuts are in danger of doing irreparable harm to scholarship in general and to classical studies in particular, it is incumbent upon those in academic positions such as H enjoys not to waste time and money for little or nothing. This poor quality of production simply will not do.

S. George's Church, Paris

P. D. EATON

NOTES


2 For the record, there are over 195 changes in punctuation from the O.C.T., none of them dramatic except that at v. 8 (which is G's anyway). Indeed they consist for the most part of the alteration of Kenney's colons to semi-colons and vice versa. There are also more paragraphings than in the O.C.T., at 75, 151, 169, 213,
249, 291, 357, 399, 441, 489, 523, 549, 579, 609, 655, 673, 683, 699, 715, 751, 767 and 795. And because of his 'numerical schemes', H inflicts on us a halfhearted attempt at renumbering the lines of the poem, which is of no help at all.

'Advocated by' and 'printed by' G are not necessarily the same thing, and it should be noted that G's revision of Mozley (which H lists in his bibliography but does not appear to have consulted) does not incorporate all the corrections for which he so passionately argued in the Amatoria Critica and elsewhere: 64 Phaedran (in Amatoria Critica), Phaedram (Loeb); 221 nec (in Am. Crit.), et (Loeb); 379 Elegea (in Am. Crit.), Elegia (Loeb); 383 ferat (in Am. Crit.), feret (Loeb); 415 malle (in Am. Crit.), malle (Loeb); 467 et (in Am. Crit.), ut (Loeb); and 478 sentet (in Am. Crit.), sentiat (Loeb). Indeed, on p. 98 of Am. Crit. G says 'that it took a thousand years and discover and correct the error' of 221, but it took him less than a decade to forget it again; and the et of the revised Loeb is certainly wrong, whatever the relative merits of nec and sed.

The volume is riddled with misprints, and some that have caught my eye are 1976 for 1977 for Holliis' edition of Ars i (p. xi); Tib. I.8.77 for I.4.77 (p. xv); Prop. 4.1.37 for 4.1.137 (p. 30); Tr. 2.456 for 2.465 (p. 31); Her. 16.207 for 16.209 (p. 34); submersas ubue pupperes for submersasqae ubue pupperes (p. 36); non for not twice, on pp. 85 and 98. There are doubtless more.

Dio of Prusa has enjoyed a certain popularity in recent years. 1978 was the *annus mirabilis*, seeing the appearance of substantial and important books by C.P.Jones (*The Roman World of Dio Chrysostom*) and P.Desideri (*Dione di Prusa. Un intellettuale greco nell' impero romano*), and a major article by J.L.Moles ('The Career and Conversion of Dio Chrysostom', *J.H.S.* 98 (1978), 79-100). The attention is timely; not only is Dio a prime witness to the political and social history of his age, but he is a writer of force and subtlety. Even when his argument is shallow, or his subject matter less than wholly serious, the expression is ingenious and the choice of words carefully weighed. The nick-name 'Golden Mouthed', attested for the first time in the third century by Menander Rhetor, was not lightly earned, and, in itself, provides sufficient justification for study of his language and usage.

The genesis of this index goes back to the end of the Second World War when its two compilers, Estonian clergymen, reached Sweden apparently as refugees, and were set to their task by Professor Anton Fridrichsen at Uppsala. This book, the fruit of their toil, was edited for publication in the late 1970s by another Swedish scholar who has been active in the study of the Second Sophistic movement, Jan Fredrik Kindstrand. As this account of its composition might suggest, this is essentially a work of thorough compilation, not of analytical scholarship, an index, as its title proclaims, not a lexicon. It attempts to account for every occurrence of every word in Dio, excepting only twenty five very common words which would be of little or no interest.
to lexicographers or students of style. The entries are lemmatised only according to the grammatical form of the word; no context is provided, and there is no attempt to distinguish different meanings and usages. Given such thoroughness it seems a pity that proper names are not included, although these may be traced through the index to the Teubner edition of G.de Budé, whose text forms the basis of this compilation. Occasionally this is more than simply regrettable, as, for instance, the omission of the personified ἄμουςια in or. 32.61, which complements the entry for ἄμουσικα. Note that ἄμουςια, not personified, occurs frequently in Plutarch. Another decision that one may regret was to exclude emendations and conjectures not received into de Budé's text. Some progress has been made with the readings in Dio since the Teubner edition appeared between 1915 and 1919, and de Budé occasionally overlooked conjectures that deserve consideration. Although most of the suggestions made by W.B.Anderson in his note on the text of the Euboicus are unnecessary (C.R. 19 (1905), 347), οὐτουργοῖς for οὐκ ὀργοῖς in or. VII.92 is tempting, and κηρυγμάτων ὀνόμα for κηρυγμάτων ἐνώμα is almost certainly correct. Furthermore the editor seems to have taken only partial note of the articles by T.F. Higget and J.N.O'Sullivan in G.R.B.S. 15 (1974), 247-53, 17 (1976), 153-6, and 18 (1977), 147-51, with the result that some suggested new readings are passed over, and subtleties such as παρέθνη (or.31.27), second aorist infinitive of παρέθνη rather than present infinitive of παρέθη, are missed (cf. G.R.B.S. 1977, 150). But these are trivial complaints to set against the sterling merits of nearly five hundred pages of patient and accurate indexing. Swedish scholarship has served Greek literature of the Imperial and early Byzantine periods well, and this is a worthy addition to the series of Greek studies from Uppsala, edited by Jonas Palm.
The deficiencies of Liddell and Scott in the field of later Greek have often been observed, and Hightet, following W.B. Anderson, has made the point with specific reference to Dio Chrysostom (G.R.B.S. 1974, 247). This book will doubtless ensure that Dio's language and usage are not so neglected in the future. It should be considered alongside other recent contributions to our knowledge of the Greek language in the first three centuries A.D. The language of inscriptions of the period has been elucidated time and again by L. Robert, and many of his observations have been usefully collected by T. Drew-Bear, Glotta 50 (1972), 61-96, 182-228. In the literary field there is J.N. O'Sullivan's *Lexicon to Achilles Tatius* (1980), and information may be derived, by those with sufficient patience and energy, from the computer-generated indexes of Classical texts compiled by the University of California. However, the starting point for explorations of Greek language and usage in this period remains the same as it did before the first edition of Liddell and Scott was published at all, the eighth volume of Daniel Wyttenbach's edition of Plutarch's *moralia*, the *index Graecitatis*, published in 1829 after the author's death, over a thousand pages of magisterial scholarship, illustrating and analysing Plutarch's language, and including not only exhaustive citations from the *moralia*, but comparative material from all the other major authors of the period, including Dio. A project is afoot to produce a revised supplement to L.S.J. (see C.Q. 32 (1982), 241). Let us hope that, unlike most of their predecessors, its editor and contributors do not neglect their duty to the language of the early Empire.

University College of Swansea

STEPHEN MITCHELL
This is the second volume of Professor Goodyear's magisterial commentary on the first half of the *Annals*. There is a change of emphasis: greater attention is paid to historical matters and the commentary can now be called 'historical, as well as textual, linguistic and literary' (p. vii).

The Text (60 pp.) follows the Preface. The bulk of the volume is occupied by the Commentary. There are 3 Appendixes (Further Critical Notes, The Fragment of Albinovanus Pedo and The Speech and Two Edicts of Germanicus preserved on papyri). There is a List of Works Cited and 3 Indexes (Lexical, Passages Discussed and General). There are a few Addenda at the end. The work is beautifully printed: I noticed only one misplaced letter in 1.63.5 (p.8, 1.15).

The main strength of the edition is its fine and discriminating analysis of matters of vocabulary, language and style. To this others have drawn sufficient attention, although particular note should be taken of the adduction of parallels from near contemporary, but less 'literary' figures like the Elder Pliny or Valerius Maximus. (For the possible influence of Trogus on Tacitus, cf. G's appendix 'Trogus, Tacitus and Justin' in his article on Trogus in *P.A.C.A. XVI, 1982*, 23f.) Here it is not possible to give detailed comment. Only a few brief general observations will be made, largely from the point of view of those whose main interest lies in ancient history, even provincial history.

This is uncompromisingly a scholar's commentary. It may however
have been written at too austerely learned a level. No concession is made to 'the undergraduate' or to the historian who is not well versed in Latin. In the current state of classics, it may be wise to take at least some account of such readers. The sort of general introductions and relatively straightforward information provided by Furneaux are largely absent.

There are valuable introductory discussions to the various sections of T.'s narrative, but these are not on the scale, say, of Heubner's *Vorbemerkungen* in the *Histories*. Their main, and proper, purpose is to assess T. as an author and an historian on such broad themes as his portrayal of Germanicus or his presentation of relations between Tiberius and Germanicus.

The notes are extraordinarily detailed, full of vigorous analysis of the problems raised. There is constant reference to modern works of reference such as *R.E.* and *P.I.R.* In fact one cannot make full use of the commentary elsewhere than in a well-stocked library. However, pedestrian information can be of use to the non-specialist. G. can write a succinct note on a prominent Roman such as L. Apronius (76), but even on him the reader might wish to know his precise status in Germany during the campaigns under Tiberius. Can we call him a senior *legatus pro praetore* or would it be safer to designate him as *comes* of Germanicus? Domitianus Ahenobarbus (104) was indeed Nero's grandfather, but what was his position in Germany at this time? The case of a minor figure like L. Stertinius is more difficult. He appears to have been more than a *praefectus equitum*. Is there a 'technical term' that can be assigned to him (such as the rare *praefectus equitatus* or even *et leuis armaturae*)? Is T. avoiding the standard vocabulary of Roman administration or was there no standardized terminology at this early date in the principate?
Non-Romans, too, can receive illuminating comment, as the note on Tacfarinas shows (348). But in II, 42 only references are given for Archelaus and Antiochus, and Pyrrhus and Antiochus in II, 63 do not appear in the commentary at all. A geographical area, such as Thrace (400) or the 'insula Batauorum' (204) can be economically and precisely designated, as can tribes, like the Musulamians (349). Accordingly it is disappointing to find only references to ancient authors for many foreigners and peregrine peoples, such as the Cheruscans (78) or Batavians (212). In these two cases perhaps the ancient references could have been confined to the *Germania* and a short note inserted in each case, such as 'a Germanic people living at the mouth of the Rhine with a special relationship to Rome. They were famous for the auxiliaries they supplied who were noted for being able to cross rivers by swimming next to their horses in full armour'. No doubt references to such works as *R.E.* and *P.I.R.* and to relevant passages elsewhere in T. or in other ancient authors save much space, but perhaps some of the more mechanical of these could have been left out. If more has to be excluded, some of the polemic on more ephemeral scholarship, as for example that concerned with speculative tracing of Virgilian echoes in T., could be omitted. Is a footnote damning an unnamed article on Arminius and Thusnelda by an unspecified author as an historical novelette (73) essential?

But mainly G. quite rightly confines his explication to what is essential for understanding the text. His main strength remains his unrivalled knowledge of Latinity and his textual acumen, laced with strong common sense. Historians will benefit as much from the analysis of a crux like 'Visurgin' (133) as philologists. What in fact G. has done is to put first things first, concentrating on establishing as accurately as possible what T. wrote and elucidating the author's
frequently difficult and ambivalent Latin. Correct historical analysis of T. cannot ignore considerations of style. On this aspect, too, regular and judicious help is offered. Without an awareness of all these factors, the historian can seriously misinterpret the 'historical information' he extracts from T. Professor Goodyear has provided the full means for working in this area. It is a splendid achievement.

University of Zimbabwe

D.B. SADDINGTON


In fourteen chapters and two appendixes Dr Maxfield traces the development of formal military decorations from their origins to the sixth century A.D. As she herself points out (14), the evidence is slight and difficult to interpret. Her treatment of her subject is very competent. She discusses the evidence with great thoroughness and regularly mentions alternative explanations to those she advocates.

The first chapter, The Military Background, is a rapid description of the Roman army in some twenty pages: this is not at the same level as the rest of the book. Presumably the publisher asked for such an introduction but one wonders whether those who need this sort of information can appreciate the technical material that follows. There is some uncertainty of approach in the handling of technical terms throughout the work: sometimes they are explained, often in brief parentheses, sometimes not. The Decorations themselves are discussed in Chapter IV and Triumphs and Triumphal Ornaments in V.
There are useful observations here, but one would have welcomed more detail on the imperial *ornamenta triumphalia* (one misses a reference to those of A. Didius Gallus). VI is on The Awarding of *dona*. Here one could add a suggestion that has been made that Jos. B.J. VI, 6, 54-7 sound like an account by military scribes to headquarters on the basis of which a decoration might be considered. In this chapter problems connected with the award of decorations to auxiliaries are surveyed and M. comes to the sensible conclusion that there is no definite proof of their having been granted to serving peregrine auxiliaries. The next chapters provide a clear analysis of the scale of awards to senators, equestrians and professional soldiers during the principate. The inclusion of 'euoc. aux.' in Table L on p. 211 may be queried. As M. herself makes clear (97; 312), Macer's awards were unofficial, having been bestowed on him by his fellow-soldiers. The 'dona' given to Antiochus, an auxiliary not known to have received citizenship, may also have been unofficial. The first evidence for imperial *dona* to *euocati* thus appears to be Claudian. In XI (Battle Honours of the Roman Army) the conferring of titles such as Civium Romanorum and Torquata on whole regiments is discussed. Appendix II is a useful list of republican and imperial recipients of *dona*, together with references. There is a Select Bibliography and a full Index. The photographs are of a high quality and the diagrams and sketches are marked by exemplary simplicity and clarity. There are occasional typographical errors, especially in the Greek. On 80 pl. 5b should be pl. 5a, 'latter' for 'ladder' surprises on 241 and on 244 'elected' should be 'adlected'. But generally the printing is good.

Two desiderata: one would have liked more detail on the Xanten or Lauersfort *phalerae* (94; 98) and a reference to the one ascribed
to Pliny the Elder (C.I.L. XIII, 10026, 22), especially as he is an important source for military decorations. It would have been useful to extend the discussion on the granting of triumphal decorations to Roman allies to include Juba II and Ptolemy of Mauretania and the inscription A.E. 1966, 595 (as emended by P. Leveau, B.A.A. VI, 1975/6, 84, no. 1), possibly a reference to honours for them.

M.'s method has been to concentrate on the various types of award and to place less emphasis on the circumstances in which they were made. There are some good discussions of the factors leading to awards, as on those made by Vespasian soon after his accession, possibly for political support rather than military prowess alone (154ff.). The latter approach could have been adopted more often: significant aspects could have emerged from discussions of grants made at particular periods to all ranks. This would have made it easier for the reader to grasp the evolution of the *dona*, at least for the senatorial and equestrian orders, against their historical background and provided a framework for assessing the significance of particular awards. Appendix I (Chronological Table, although usefully incorporating the main awards of *dona*) is too brief for this purpose. To take the case of Claudius' British triumph, the following emerges. Crassus Frugi was awarded the *orn. tr.* for a second time, a rare honour, and allowed to ride in the triumphal procession on an 'equus phaleratus'. It should also be noted that he was attired in distinctive dress (Suet. Cl. 17,3).

For the first time the *orn. tr.* were awarded to senators who had not yet reached the consulship. (Some years afterwards Aulus Plautius was granted an *ouatio*, the last person not a member of the imperial family so to be honoured) A senator, whose name has not survived, perhaps a consular, was given three *coronae*, one the *classica*: perhaps this signalled the emergence of what became the standard pattern of
award for consulars. The decorations of the equestrian Stlaccius Coranus may be considered standard or military, but it should be noted that those of the other equestrians were not. Ti. Claudius Barbillus (for whose inscription M. proposes a convincing new reading, 161) was decorated, as praefectus fabrum, as was Claudius' doctor Stertinius Xenophon, also probably as pr. fabr. rather than as trib. mil. It is obvious that this was for other than purely military services. As M. argues, the corona aurea awarded (together with other dona) to Gavius Silvanus and Vettius Valens (132; 189), almost certainly suocati at the time, seems to have been an innovation for that rank. Even the auxilia benefited: the Ala Vettonum was given the title of Civium Romanorum. This all points to the systematization, development and alteration of tradition, characteristic of other aspects of military administration under Claudius.

Dr Maxfield is to be congratulated on her fine book, likely to remain the standard work on the subject for a long time.

University of Zimbabwe
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This is a German introduction to the world of the Etruscans. The headings of its twelve chapters may be translated as follows: 1. From the Villanovan culture to the formation of the Etruscan people; 2. Caere - the history of the town in the light of its tombs; 3. Treasures from the early Etruscan period - the discovery of the Regolini-Galassi tomb; 4. The tablet of Marsiliana d'Albegna - on the Etruscan language and script; 5. Populonia - and Etruscan 'Pittsburgh'; 6. The gold plates of Pyrgi; 7. The murals of Tarquinia; 8. The discovery of the 'Tomb of the Olympic Games' - a triumph of modern research methods; 9. Apollo of Veii; 10. Marzobotto - the birth of a town; 11. Spina - a forgotten lake town re-surfaces; 12. The 'Sarcofago degli Sposi'. On the position of women in the Etruscan world; 13. The bronze liver of Piacenza; 14. Aristocratic family pride: the sarcophagus of the 'magnate' and the 'Elogia Tarquiniensia'; 15. The fascinating world of the rock necropoleis. There is a Bibliography, a Chronological Table and an Index.

The book gives advice to the tourist on how to find the sites discussed, and is pitched at the lay level. But it is a scholarly and competent piece of work with useful descriptions of archaeological sites and objects as the basis of up-to-date introductions to features of Etruscan civilization and history. It holds the reader's attention throughout.
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The Great Zimbabwe complex is not classical, either in period or in style, but it does comprise the largest man-made structures in Africa south of the Sahara. These great walls of granite stones sprawl over a valley and crown a hill, and are the largest of hundreds of such structures to be found throughout the country.

This is, of course, only one reason for visiting Zimbabwe — others are one of the world’s finest climates, wild-life reserves, the Victoria Falls, Lake Kariba, scenery and wide open spaces, and a colourful flora. All this, and well-run hotels and transport services, too.
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