from Ida." So at any time it would be possible for the Persians to construct a fleet at Adramyttium or any other Aegean port under their control or in Lycia west of Phaselis. This seems to be the sort of activity contemplated by Alcibiades and feared by the Athenians rather than the delivery of ship timber from the Aegean area to Phoenicia. It is worth considering the possibility, then, that the Peace of Callias did explicitly forbid the Persians to construct a fleet in any port west of Phaselis. In giving only τὰ κεφάλαια Diodorus omits such an article, if it existed.

II

Recent discussions of the Peace do not include two important testimonia. First we have Livy 33. 20. 1–3:

Multa egregie Rhodii pro fide erga populum Romanum proque universo nomine Graecorum terra marique ausi sunt, nihil magnificentius quam quod

ea tempestate non territi tanta mole imminentis belli legatos ad regem (sc. Antiochum) miserunt ne Chelidonias—promunturium Ciliciae est, inclutum foedere antiquo Atheniensium cum regibus Persarum—superaret: si eo fine non contineret classem copiasque suas, se obviam ituros, non ab odio ullo sed ne coniungi eum Philippo paterentur et impedimento esse Romanis liberantibus Graeciam.

We can compare this with a fragment of Polybius from the Suda:[3] κωλύειν δὲ τὸν Ἀντίοχον παραπλεῖν, οὐκ ἀπεχθείας χάριν, ἀλλ᾽ ὑφορώμενοι μὴ Φιλίππῳ συνεπισχύσας ἐμπόδιον γένηται τῇ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐλευθερίᾳ. Did Livy know enough Greek history to insert a reference to the Peace of Callias into Polybius' narrative, or is Polybius himself responsible for it? I for one think that it must have been Polybius, who therefore accepted the authenticity of the Peace.

WESLEY E. THOMPSON
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS

3. Polyb. 18. 41a. 1, from the Suda, s.v. συνεπισχύσας.

SOME RECOLLECTIONS OF VIRGIL'S DRANCES IN LATER EPIC

It is probable that most readers of the Aeneid find the Heepish parliamentarian Drances the most repellent personage of the poem, and this was evidently the intention of his creator. His Homeric analogue is Thersites, and Virgil designedly evokes the fracas at the Homeric assembly that led to the wholesome drubbing administered to Thersites by Odysseus; but Drances is incomparably more sophisticated than Homer's ingenuously oafish antiwar protester, and correspondingly more odious. He first appears as spokesman of a delegation sent by the Latins to Aeneas to ask for a truce so that the dead slain in the great battle of the tenth Aeneid may be buried. In granting the truce Aeneas deplores the slaughter and suggests settling the conflict by single combat between Turnus the young champion of the Latins and himself. This proposal delights Drances. The poet prefaces Drances' reply: "Tum senior semperque odiis et crimine Drances / infensus iuveni Turno sic ore vicissim / orsa refert" (Aen. 11. 122–24); Drances then engages

to do his utmost to persuade King Latinus to accept Aeneas' proposal and fawningly concludes "quin et fatalis murorum attollere moles / saxaque subvectare umeris Troiana iuvabit" (ibid. 130–31). Not long thereafter an embassy King Latinus has sent to Diomedes, now established in southern Italy, to ask for help returns with the report of Diomedes' refusal. Latinus at once convokes an assembly and proposes to come to terms with the Trojans and to grant them land where they may build a city. Drances, however, opposes this solution. Virgil characterizes him thus, as he rises to speak:

tum Drances idem infensus, quem gloria Turni
obliqua invidia stimulisque agitabat amaris,
largus opum et lingua melior, sed frigida bello
dextera, consiliis habitus non futtilis auctor,
seditione potens (genus huic materna superbum
nobilitas dabat, incertum de patre ferebat)
surgit et his onerat dictis atque aggerat iras
                                        [Aen. 11. 336–42].

Drances blames Turnus for obdurately pro-longing the war and adjures him, if he will not admit defeat and go home, to fight Aeneas man to man and thus decide the issue (*ibid.* 343–75). In his angry reply Turnus denounces Drances as a cowardly windbag and signifies his willingness to accept single combat if Aeneas challenges him, as he hopes he will (*ibid.* 378–444). He has hardly finished when the approach of the Trojan forces causes the Latins to rush to arms to defend their city. Drances does not appear again in the poem.

The first post-Virgilian references to Drances and his clash with Turnus occur in the eighth book of Lucan's epic on the Roman civil wars. The survivors of Pharsalia who have joined Pompey on his flight have assembled at the Cilician port Syhedra to deliberate on future action. Pompey proposes to send his client, King Deiotarus of Cappadocia, to seek support from the monarch of Parthia. This proposal is coldly received, particularly by Lentulus, one of the consuls of the previous year. Lucan describes the reaction of the assembly and introduces Lentulus thus:

> sic fatus [Pompey] murmure sensit
> consilium damnasse viros; quos Lentulus omnis
> virtutis stimulis et nobilitate dolendi
> praecessit dignasque tulit modo consule voces
> [*BC* 8. 327–30].

Lucan here contrasts Lentulus with Drances by echoing (*kat' antiphrasin*) in his verse 329 Virgil's description of Drances' character in *Aen.* 11. 337. He continues to intimate that Lentulus is no Drances by adapting parts of Turnus' reply to Drances at the Latin assembly. Lentulus' opening words,

> sicine Thessalicae mentem fregere ruinae?
> una dies mundi damnavit fata? secundum
> Emathiam lis tanta datur? iacet omne cruenti
> volneris auxilium? [*BC* 8. 331–34],

are Lucan's version of Turnus' refusal to despair after the first battle that begins:

> si nullam nostris ultra spem ponis in armis,
> si tam deserti sumus et semel agmine verso
> funditus occidimus neque habet Fortuna regressum,
> oremus pacem et dextras tendamus inertis
> [*Aen.* 11. 411–14].

The poet solemnizes Lentulus' intransigence in defeat by thus evoking Turnus' resolute speech of defiance.

Neither Valerius Flaccus nor Statius owes anything to Virgil's portrait of Drances. Silius Italicus, on the other hand, draws heavily upon this portrait for his characterizations both of Hanno, the leader of the antiwar faction at Carthage, and of Varro, the impulsive dema-gogue whose temerity, Silius and Livy be-lieved, was responsible for the rout of the Roman legions at Cannae. Before giving Hanno's plea to the Carthaginian senate for maintenance of peace with Rome, Silius de-scribes the speaker as an enemy of long standing of Hannibal and his stock, "olim / ductorem [Hannibal] infestans odiis gentilibus, Hannon" (*Pun.* 2. 276–77); this recalls Drances' hostility toward the young Turnus (Silius has just mentioned Hannibal's youth in *coeptantis magna iuventae*) as expressed in Virgil's *infensus iuveni Turno* (*Aen.* 11. 123) and *Drances . . . infensus* (to Turnus, *Aen.* 11. 336). Hanno's protestation, "premunt formidine vocem. / haud tamen abstiterim, mortem licet arma propinquent" (*Pun.* 2. 280–81), all but re-peats Drances' "dicam equidem, licet arma mihi mortemque minetur" (*Aen.* 11. 348) in his speech to the Latin assembly. Drances' "nulla salus bello, pacem te poscimus omnes" (*Aen.* 11. 362) is reflected by Hanno's insistence that peace is what "postrema salus rerum patriaeque" demands (*Pun.* 2. 283), and his proposal that Hannibal be handed over to the Romans corresponds to Drances' desire that Turnus fight Aeneas in single combat and be killed. (This correspondence suggests that *Pun.* 2. 275–77, where reference is made to the surrendering of Hannibal, should not be rejected as interpolated, as they are in Bauer's 1890 Teubner edition.) Further Drancean traits are attributed by Silius to Hanno upon the latter's reappearance in the eleventh book of the *Punica*. Mago has been sent from Italy to Carthage to report Hannibal's great victory at Cannae and to ask for more troops and supplies. Hanno opposes these requests. As Silius pictures the scene, Hanno, in Drancean fashion, has long been exercised by the in-creasing fame of the young Hannibal, "quem

gliscens gloria pravum / ductoris studio iam dudum agitabat acerbo" (*Pun.* 11. 543), and answers Mago "simul invidia atque ira stimulantibus" (*ibid.* 554). Hanno's speech advocating bringing the war to an end is modeled upon Drances' similar plea. Hanno's outburst (introduced by *scilicet* and *ut*) that the manpower and wealth of Carthage are being sacrificed to maintain Hannibal's supremacy (*Pun.* 11. 384 ff.) is calqued on Drances' "scilicet ut Turno contingat regia coniunx, / nos animae viles ... sternamur campis" (*Aen.* 11. 371–73), as is Hanno's concluding "si tanta libido / armorum tenet" (*Pun.* 11. 597–98) on Drances' "si adeo dotalis regia cordi est" (*Aen.* 11. 369). Silius' allusions are almost painfully clear, but artistically their effect is deplorable. The similarity they suggest between the characters of Hanno and Drances does not exist. Who, for instance, can imagine such an opportunist as Drances refusing to support Hannibal at the pinnacle of his career?

Somewhat more effective is Silius' use of Drancean allusion to portray Varro, the demagogic consul defeated at Cannae. In contrast to the prudent Fabius, Varro urges attacking Hannibal without delay. Silius characterizes him in these words:

... illi sine luce genus surdumque parentum
nomen, et immodice vibrarat in ore canoro
lingua procax. hinc auctus opes largusque rapinae,
. . . .
idem, ut turbarum sator atque accendere sollers
invidiam pravusque togae, sic debilis arte
belligera Martemque rudis versare nec ullo
spectatus ferro, lingua sperabat adire
ad dextrae decus atque e rostris bella ciebat
                                    [*Pun.* 8. 246–62].

Silius' echoes of *Aen.* 11. 338–41 in these lines hardly need to be pointed out. By assimilating Varro in several respects to Drances, Silius makes him even more unsavory a personage

for traditionalist Romans than had Livy, without however rendering him incredible.[1]

Claudian in his facile manner uses Virgil's *invidiae stimulis* of Allecto, who "invidiae quondam stimulis incanduit atrox" (*In Ruf.* 1. 25), and his *stimulis ... malignis* (*Cons. Stil. III* 37) and *ardet stimulis* (*Pan. Manl. Theod.* 226), both of envy, reflect the Virgilian figure, but the passages referred to give no indication that Claudian had Drances in mind. Joseph of Exeter, in contrast, is surely thinking of Drances and intending to remind his readers of the Virgilian scoundrel when he describes the villainous Meriones in these terms: "impia praecipitem natura Meriona mergit / invidiae cinctum stimulis" (*Bell. Troian.* 4. 148–49).

The long fifteenth-century epic *Hesperis* by Basinio of Parma extolling the deeds of Sigismondo Malatesta, ruler of Rimini, several times echoes the language of Virgil's description of Drances. The only real allusion has to do with the traitorous Labienus, who according to the poet "sensit ... iniquis / invidiae incensus stimulis sua coepta referri / in peius variis studiis" (*Hesp.* 4. 153–55), which gives his intrigues an appropriately Drancean aura. Virgil's description of Drances has also inspired "stupuit Perusinus amaris / concussus mentem stimulis" (*ibid.* 4. 407–8), "iniquis / Phorciadae stimulis odii permotus acerbi" (*ibid.* 4, 551–52), and "invidia ... obliqua ... invidisti animas procerum" (*ibid.* 6. 260–61); in each instance the Virgilian expressions are deftly employed, although without precise evocation of Drances. Less felicitous is Basinio's literal use of Virgil's figurative language in "Rymphus Herum ut vidit, stimulis agitatus acerbis, evolat" (*ibid.* 6. 433–34), for Rymphus is a horse and *stimuli*, his rider's spurs.[2]

Drances plays a role of some importance in Maphaeus Vegius' *Supplementum* to the *Aeneid*, the so-called "Thirteenth Book." Drances is overjoyed with the downfall of Turnus, and addressing Aeneas declares that all the trouble

1. In *Pun.* 7. 511–12 Silius with reference to Juno declares "patrum ... mentes / invidiae stimulo fodit et popularibus auris," combining the diction of *Aen.* 6. 816, "nimium gaudens popularibus auris" (King Ancus) with that of Virgil's characterization of Drances in 11. 337. (A curious parallel is found in Vida *Chr.* 4. 348: "largus opum, pollens lingua et popularibus auris.")

2. Basinio's portrait of Antiphates: "qui maximus uni / ante

alios comes usque fuit per maxima regi / bella, bonus dextra, claris qui gloria factis / parta dabat magnum magnae virtutis honorem; / consiliis haud inferior, cui fama nec usquam / futilis, est vanis primum quod crimen Iberis. / isque, ubi magnanimum conspexit in agmine regem / Alphonsum, alloquitur dictis securus acerbis" (*Hesp.* l. 340–47), employs on a much larger scale the device adumbrated by Lucan in *BC* 8. 327 ff., also with reference to Virgil's portrait of Drances.

is to be blamed on Turnus' madness, ". . . quicquid tanto armorum flagrante tumultu, / tantorum furiisque operum, atque laboribus actum est; / id rabidus Turni, et stimulis incensus iniquis, / confectusque odiis furor attulit" (339–42), where the phrase Virgil had applied to Drances is neatly adapted by Drances himself to stigmatize his hated adversary. Aeneas naïvely accepts Drances' explanations and the latter is next seen among the distinguished guests celebrating the marriage of Aeneas with Lavinia.[3]

Hieronymus Vida, poet, critic, and Bishop of Cremona (†1566) was a thorough Virgilian.[4] In his *Christias* he aspired to write a Christian *Aeneid*, and he by no means failed in his attempt. Vida is hardly less skilled than Virgil himself in his use of poetic allusion; his Virgilian allusions and echoes are perhaps the most remarkable feature of his poem. Vida repeatedly recalls Virgil's Drances, invariably to good effect. The flaw in Peter's character later to manifest itself in his denial of Christ is suggested by the opening words of *Chr.* 1. 62, "tum senior Petrus haud linguae vocive pepercit," which repeat those with which Virgil introduces Drances in *Aen.* 11. 122: "tum senior . . . Drances." (The rest of the verse echoes *Aen.* 2. 533–34, "Priamus . . . non . . . abstinuit nec voci iraeque pepercit," thereby indicating that Peter like Priam had an irascible strain.) In denouncing Jesus to the people of Jerusalem Caiphas stigmatizes Jesus as *seditione potens* (*Chr.* 2. 242), an expression Virgil had used of Drances in *Aen.* 11. 340, and the reaction of the people is one of fury, *furiis stimulantibus intus* (*Chr.* 2. 253, also of Virgilian inspiration). We may also note with respect to Peter, again called *senior* (*Chr.* 2. 704), his indignant cry, "non adeo effugit cum sanguine vivida virtus / pulsa annis, nec dextra mihi tam frigida languet" (*ibid.* 2. 708–9), with its echoes of Turnus' reply to Drances, especially *vivida virtus* (*Aen.* 11. 386) and "non adeo has exosa manus Victoria fugit" (*ibid.* 11. 436) in combination with the *frigida . . . dextera* attributed to Drances in *Aen.* 11. 338–

39. Later in this book Peter is reproached by Jesus for the Drancean trait *copia fandi* (*Chr.* 2. 716; cf. Turnus' "larga quidem, Drance, semper tibi copia fandi," *Aen.* 11. 378) and told that when Jesus is taken "quaeres latebras, iaciesque salutem / mendaci in lingua, pedibusque fugacibus acer" (*Chr.* 2. 720–21; cf. Turnus to Drances in *Aen.* 11. 389–91: "an tibi Mavors / ventosa in lingua pedibusque fugacibus istis / semper erit?").

Drancean references are plain in the first two phrases of Vida's description of the ruler of the synagogue Iarus as "largus opum, pollens lingua et popularibus auris" (*Chr.* 4. 348; the verse also occurs in *Ars poet.* 2. 188, with specific reference to Drances), as they are in his treatment of a personage even more villainous from the poet's point of view, the High Priest Annas who denounces Christ before Pilate and demands that He be put to death. Annas is thus introduced, "tum senior surgit fandi doctissimus Annas" (*Chr.* 5. 103), and repeats Caiphas' charge that Jesus is *seditione potens* (*Chr.* 5. 115). Pilate recognizes that Annas, like Drances, is motivated by jealous hatred, "Romulus at dictis nequicquam flectitur ullis, / nec nova primum audit nunc crimina; cuncta nefando / scit fabricata odio, dum Christi gloria et ingens / sacrilegos stimulis virtus exercet amaris" (*Chr.* 5. 153–56).

Some sixty years ago E. C. Baldwin noted in "An Instance of Milton's Debt to Vergil" (*JEGP*, VII [1908], 85–86) that "memories of Vergil may have furnished him with at least one example of the type he had embodied under the name of Belial." The author then cites *Aen.* 11. 336–42 and *PL* 2. 108–16 without comment. Milton's characterization of Belial is as follows:

> On the other side up rose
> Belial, in act more graceful and humane.
> A fairer person lost not Heaven; he seemed   110
> For dignity composed, and high exploit.
> But all was false and hollow; though his tongue
> Dropt manna, and could make the worse appear
> The better reason, to perplex and dash
> Maturest counsels: for his thoughts were low—

3. *Suppl.* 406–7: "ante omnes pius Aeneas, post ordine Drances / multa duci senior memorans."
4. See M. A. Di Cesare, *Vida's "Christiad" and Vergilian*

Epic (New York and London, 1964), rev. R. T. Bruère in *CP*, LXI (1966), 21–43.

To vice industrious, but to nobler deeds
Timorous and slothful. Yet he pleased the ear
[PL 2. 108–17];
that Milton had Drances in mind and wished
his fit audience to think of him seems evident.
We may further note Belial's "'Wherefore
cease we then?' / Say they who counsel war"
(ibid. 2. 159–60), which reflects Turnus'
taunting question to Drances, quid cessas?
(Aen. 11. 389)—Moloch, whose speech in
favor of war preceded that of Belial, had not
asked this question. Again, Belial's "Shall we,
then, live thus vile" (ibid. 2. 194) reflects, more
remotely it is true, Drances' nos animae viles
(Aen. 11. 372). Whether Milton's readers could

be expected to recognize an allusion to Vida's
Christias is a nice question, but it is perhaps
not unduly fanciful to suppose that as Milton
here evoked Virgil's Drances he thought of
Vida's Drancean Annas, and incorporated the
description of Christ (itself recalling Drances)
that Vida attributes to Annas: "hic auctor
fandi multos sermone fefellit; / et facie (ne
cede dolis) mentitur honesta / virtutem; scele-
rum tegit alto in pectore amorem" (Chr. 5.
110–12) in lines 110–12 of his characterization
of the fallen angel.[5]

RICHARD T. BRUÈRE

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

5. The writer is obliged to Professor Lynette Thompson of
Florida State University for pertinent observations regarding

Vida and Milton.

THE VERBAL GROUP πυκτεύω πυκταλίζω πυκταλεύω

In Gk. πύξ πυγμή πυγμαῖος, Lat. pugil
pugnus, etc., lies a root pug-, which with an
assimilated root-final appears again in πύκτης
πυκτικός πυκτοσύνη πυκτεύω πύκτευσις πυκ-
τευτής πυκτεῖον. Beside the denominative
πυκτεύω are found two other semantically
undifferentiated verbs πυκταλίζω πυκταλεύω,
which show a -λ- extension and whose for-
mation is less clear.

The verbal suffix -εύω witnesses two kinds
of development, formational and functional.
Originally belonging largely to denominatives
based on masculine nouns in -εύς and, in
relation to the noun, carrying the meaning
'be what the noun denotes' or 'perform an
action proper to what the noun denotes' (e.g.,
βασιλεύω = 'I am βασιλεύς, reign,' ἱερεύω = 'I
am ἱερεύς, sacrifice'), it was extended, through
functional associations, to nouns of various
stems (πτωχεύω:πτωχός, μνηστεύω:μνηστήρ,
etc.). Parallel with this analogical extension
ran the development of new functions beside
the original one: one finds, for example, the
signification 'be engaged in or perform what
the noun denotes' (ἀεθλεύω = 'I am engaged
in ἄεθλος') or 'employ what the noun denotes'
(τοξεύω = 'I employ τόξα'), a new reference,

that is, to an action or an object beside the
old one to a person in his official or profes-
sional capacity. Within the first kind of develop-
ment falls πυκτεύω 'box, strike with the fist'
based on πύκτης; cf. ἀλητεύω (:ἀλήτης),
ἐποπτεύω (:ἐπόπτης[1]).

However, for πυκταλίζω and πυκταλεύω no
nominal bases are attested. In the circumstances
that the suffix -ζω, like -εύω, became very
productive and -ζω formations are found, by
analogical extension, derived from nouns other
than guttural and dental stems,[2] a single
nominal basis would have done for both
πυκταλίζω and πυκταλεύω: cf., e.g., ἀληθίζομαι
ἀληθεύω (:ἀληθής), μυθίζω μυθεύω (:μῦθος).
This, in fact, is the case with two of the other
three sets of collateral -αλίζω/-αλεύω forms
found: σκυβαλίζω σκυβαλεύω (: σκύβαλον),
νωγαλίζω νωγαλεύω (:νώγαλα); not so with
the third set: σκαλίζω (:σκαλίς, -ίδος) and
σκαλεύω (: σκαλεύς).

In the absence of a nominal basis, then, one
is compelled to look outside the πυκτ- group
for the source of derivation of πυκταλίζω and
πυκταλεύω. As it is, none of the other three
-αλίζω/-αλεύω sets just quoted provides a clue;
nor do, it seems, schematically or functionally,

1. Cf. E. Fraenkel, Griech. Denom. (Göttingen, 1906),
p. 182; M. Leumann, Hom. Wörter (Basle, 1950), p. 113.

2. See, e.g., E. Schwyzer, Mél. H. Pedersen (Aarhus, 1937),
pp. 63 ff.