

blunder of his. On p. 129.1 he mistakes Heraclitus again, this time for Homer: *ὡς αὐτὸς οὐτὸς φησιν ὁ Ἡράκλειτος* (*sequitur* *Il.* 18. 109–10). But Aspasius (*in EN* 2, p. 44.9 Heylbut) has it correct: *δηλοῖ δὲ καὶ Ὀμηρος* (*seq. Il.* 18. 109).

(5) If my suggestion is correct, then it

follows that both the *Anonymus Byzantinus* and Heliodorus of Prusa must be subsequent in time to Eustratius, the Metropolitan of Nicaea (*ca.* 1050–*ca.* 1120).<sup>3</sup>

MIROSLAV MARCOVICH

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

3. Cf. the literature adduced by Klaus Oehler, "Aristotle in Byzantium," *GRBS*, V (1964), 133–46 = Paul Moraux (ed.), *Aristoteles in der neueren Forschung* (Darmstadt, 1968), pp.

381–99; and F. Fuchs, *Die höheren Schulen von Konstantinopel im Mittelalter* (*Byz. Archiv*, VIII [1926]), pp. 34 and 50.

### BOEOTARCHS AT THERMOPYLAE

Paul Roesch has stated that four Boeotarchs commanded the Boeotian forces at Thermopylae in 480 B.C.<sup>1</sup> The evidence he cites<sup>2</sup> refers to the four Boeotarchs named as commanders in the battle of Thermopylae against the Galatians in the third century B.C. It has nothing to do with the Thermopylae of 480 B.C. and implies nothing for the state of affairs in that battle.

Four Boeotian commanders in the early stages of the Persian Wars are, however, named in the sources. Herodotus gives us Demophilus, son of Diadromes, as commander of the Thespians (7. 222) at Thermopylae, and Leontiades, son of Eurymachus, as commander of the Thebans (7. 205. 2, 233). Plutarch,<sup>3</sup> contradicting Herodotus, says that Anaxandros was the *strategos* of the Thebans, and elsewhere he notes one Mnamias as the *strategos* of a Theban contingent of four hundred in the expedition to Tempe,<sup>4</sup> a force not mentioned by Herodotus.

Since, presumably, the sending out of contingents was the business of the Boeotian League rather than of individual cities, it is strange that no Boeotarchs are mentioned. Later in the war, on the Persian side, the Boeotarchs played a role in the movements of

Mardonius' forces (Hdt. 9. 15); this implies both the continued existence of the Boeotian League, and the military importance of the Boeotarchs.

Quite possibly Plutarch, in correcting Herodotus, has misled us. His major point is that the Theban commander was not Leontiades but Anaxandros. The work he cites, *Τὰ κατ' ἄρχοντας ἀναμνήματα* of Aristophanes, is concerned with a Theban, not a federal, list of magistrates,<sup>5</sup> the *archontes* of the title being the eponymous Theban officials, not Boeotarchs or the *archontes* at Onchestus.<sup>6</sup> Since subordinate officials would be subsumed under the headings of the annual *archontes*, Anaxandros must have been a Theban, not a federal, officer, probably the polemarch of the Theban contingent.<sup>7</sup>

Leontiades, whose son was behind the attempt to capture Plataea at the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War,<sup>8</sup> was clearly of a prominent Theban family and was one whose connection with the Battle of Thermopylae would be remembered, even if it was distorted by Athenian sources. He and the Thespian Demophilus are the commanders of the Boeotians at Thermopylae. Since the Boeotian League was in being, clearly they were the

1. *Thespies et la confédération béotienne* (Paris, 1965), p. 95.

2. Paus. 10. 20. 3.

3. *De Hdt. mal.* 33, *Mor.* 867A, from Aristophanes of Boeotia, *FGrH* 379 F 6 and, he says, Nicander of Colophon *FGrH* 271–72 F 35.

4. *De Hdt. mal.* 31, *Mor.* 864E, perhaps also from Aristophanes, Jacoby, *Comm.* III, b, p. 160.

5. A point that Jacoby, *loc. cit.* (n. 4), makes clear. The proper title may be *Θηβαίων ἄρχοντες*, but, whatever the title, the work dealt with Theban magistrates.

6. The *archontes* at Onchestus seem not to have been used as eponymous officials before 379, a little late for Aristophanes. The earliest inscriptions using them come from the late 360's, *IG* VII. 2407, 2408; see C. Barratt, *JHS*, LII (1932), 72; and Roesch, *Thespies*, pp. 73–79.

7. The title of polemarch seems to be old, and is mentioned in the literature solely for Thebes. See Schaefer, *RE*, Supp. VIII (1956), 1097–1134; and Roesch, *Thespies*, p. 162.

8. Hdt. 7. 233. 2 and Thuc. 2. 1–7.

two federal commanders, the Boeotarchs, with Anaxandros and his unnamed Thespian counterpart as the local officers under the Boeotarchs' over-all command. Herodotus, it is true, uses the term *ἐσπατήρ* to describe the jobs of Leontiades (7. 205. 2) and Demophilus (7. 222), instead of *ἐβρωπάρχης*. But he uses the same term elsewhere to describe the duties of a Spartan polemarch (7. 173. 2), a hyparch (7. 194. 1), and numerous Persian officials. In fact he uses it in the general sense of "was in command." He is not one to be too exact over the titulature or precise roles of various officials, but he does indicate clearly that Demophilus and Leontiades were the responsible military commanders, in other words, the Boeotarchs. If this is so, then Plutarch is technically correct

that Leontiades was not the Theban commander—he was a Boeotian commander—but Plutarch has, in fact, distorted his case to score another point against Herodotus.

The evidence from Herodotus and Plutarch should indicate the presence of two Boeotarchs, Leontiades and Demophilus, at Thermopylae, and two local officers, the Theban one named Anaxandros, the Thespian one unknown, directly in charge of local contingents. Mnemias in Tempe is probably another Theban officer (if Plutarch is copying Aristophanes here), in charge of the Theban component of an otherwise unreported Boeotian contingent for the Tempe expedition, under the general command of unnamed Boeotarchs.

ROBERT J. BUCK

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

### THE STATUS OF DALMATIA UNDER DOMITIAN<sup>1</sup>

The precise status of Dalmatia during Domitian's reign has been the subject of some dispute, owing mainly to the fact that the only governor of this usually consular province who can be dated precisely to the years 81 to 96 is Q. Pomponius Rufus,<sup>2</sup> attested there in July 94, and as suffect consul in the following year.<sup>3</sup> Recently, A. Jagenteufel<sup>4</sup> has argued for praetorian, J. Fitz<sup>5</sup> for consular, *legati* throughout the reign, while J. Wilkes<sup>6</sup> claims that the only governor of praetorian status to be appointed was Q. Pomponius Rufus. In this paper, it is suggested that Jagenteufel's view is to be preferred, though not for the reasons advanced by him.

Whatever its legionary complement<sup>7</sup> under Domitian, the province was certainly consular during Titus' reign, for L. Funisulanus

Vettonianus, consul in 78, was governor first there and then in Pannonia.<sup>8</sup> It is unlikely that he could have been appointed to Dalmatia by Domitian if he was in Pannonia by 84, and so his consular legateship in Dalmatia can be assigned to either 79 or 80.<sup>9</sup>

However, there was a valid reason for the province to be reduced to praetorian status. The IV Flavia felix, the only legion to be stationed there after 70, was moved to Moesia during the Flavian era; unfortunately, we have no evidence of when it left Dalmatia.<sup>10</sup> Now Domitian's policy during the first years of the reign was to strengthen the garrisons on the Lower Danube with units from other fronts: as early as 82, three Upper German auxiliary units were serving in Moesia;<sup>11</sup> Pannonia received additional forces in the

1. I am particularly indebted to Professor R. D. Milns for his comments on various points in this paper; the responsibility for the errors and misconceptions that remain is mine alone.

2. For his career, see R. Syme, *Gnomon*, XXXI (1959), 512, replacing R. Hanslik, s.v. "Pomponius (68)," *RE*, XXI (1953), 2347 f.; for the tenure of C. Cilnius Proculus see n. 19.

3. *CIL* XVI. 38 (of 13 July 94); A. Degraffi, *I Fasti Consolari dell' Impero Romano* (Rome, 1952), p. 28 (cos. 95).

4. A. Jagenteufel, *Die Statthalter der römischen Provinz Dalmatien von Augustus bis Diokletian* (Vienna, 1959), pp. 58 ff.

5. J. Fitz, "Contribution à la carrière d'un proconsul d'Afrique," *Latomus*, XXVII (1968), 45–74, esp. 60–61.

6. J. Wilkes, *Dalmatia* (London, 1969), p. 85 (afterwards referred to as Wilkes); also Syme, *loc. cit.* (n. 2).

7. Two legions were stationed there under Nero, but none by the middle of Domitian's reign (n. 10).

8. *PIR*<sup>2</sup> F 570 and W. Eck, *Senatoren von Vespasian bis Hadrian* (Munich, 1970), pp. 127–35. He is attested in Pannonia in September 84 (*CIL* XVI. 30).

9. Eck, *op. cit.*, p. 127 suggests 79, while Wilkes, p. 445, prefers 80.

10. The history of this legion is discussed by Wilkes, p. 97, n. 2.

11. *CIL* XVI. 28 (September 82).