

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 *ἐσπατήγει* to describe the jobs of Leontiades (7. 205. 2) and Demophilus (7. 222), instead of *ἐβρωτιάρχει*. 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).

period between 80 and 85;<sup>12</sup> not long after 83 Domitian sent the I Adiutrix from Upper Germany to the east;<sup>13</sup> and he also transferred five of the seven Dalmatian cohorts to the Lower Danube.<sup>14</sup> Very probably, it was he rather than Vespasian or Titus who moved the IV Flavia felix to the east; according to some,<sup>15</sup> this occurred as late as 86, but it could have been a few years earlier since the emphasis on the Moesian area was a consistent feature of the first years of the reign. It is not unlikely, then, that Domitian sent the Dalmatian legion to the east quite early in the reign and, at the same time, reduced the province to praetorian status.

One of the most serious objections to this view is Fitz's argument that the Q. Pomponius Rufus who was consul in 95 was not the governor attested in Dalmatia in 94, but rather a son of the same name, that the father's consulship is to be assigned "au milieu des années 80," that the latter then governed Dalmatia as a consular, and that therefore the province retained that status throughout Domitian's reign.<sup>16</sup> But despite Fitz's opinion that Q. Pomponius Rufus would have been too old to have received the *fasces* in 95, it should be noted that, in an attempt to win supporters in the senate, Domitian often granted consulships to men who had been praetors for well beyond the usual term and who could not normally have expected to receive the honor.<sup>17</sup> One might, in particular, consider the career of C. Antius A. Julius Quadratus,<sup>18</sup> who had been a praetor for over twenty years and was promoted first to a legateship in a praetorian province and subsequently to the consulship. Q. Pomponius Rufus' career was similar to his; there is no

need to posit two Pomponii Rufi, or to doubt that the same Pomponius was praetorian *legatus* of Dalmatia from approximately 92 to 94 and consul in 95.

The major difficulty, however, is C. Cilnius Proculus, attested as consul in 87 and as *legatus* of Moesia Superior in 100.<sup>19</sup> Two very fragmentary inscriptions<sup>20</sup> give slight hints of his career, and, in one, the word *-almatia* survives. Of the numerous attempts to restore these inscriptions, the most recent is that of Fitz,<sup>21</sup> who admits that even the highly conjectural restored *cursus* is "fort fragmentaire."<sup>22</sup> Jagenteufel, in order to show that the province was consistently praetorian under Domitian, assumed that Cilnius governed it as a consular from 96 to 99. However, Martial refers to a certain Macer as arriving there as governor in 98,<sup>23</sup> which not only invalidates Jagenteufel's date for Cilnius' tenure, but has also led to the conclusion<sup>24</sup> that the latter governed Dalmatia from 95 to 97/98. One would then have to conclude that Domitian first reduced the province to praetorian status in 92 and then, three years later, reintroduced consular *legati*; yet there is no other evidence for such an unusual series of maneuvers. A far simpler solution is that Cilnius governed Dalmatia before his consulship, perhaps from 84 to 86. Certainly there is nothing in the fragmentary inscriptions of his career to gainsay such a possibility.

Soon after his accession, then, Domitian transferred the IV Flavia felix and most of Dalmatia's auxiliary forces to the Lower Danube, and as there was now no logical reason for the province to retain consular status, he appointed praetorian *legati* there for the duration of his reign. So, assuming that

12. R. Syme, *CAH*, XI, 169.

13. For the date, compare the views of Syme, *op. cit.* (n. 12), p. 171, n. 4 (soon after 83) and of E. Ritterling, *s.v.* "Legio (I adiutrix)," *RE*, XII (1925), 1388 (85/86).

14. Wilkes, p. 141.

15. Syme, *op. cit.* (n. 2), p. 512; Ritterling, *op. cit.*, 1542.

16. Fitz, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

17. E.g., D. Plotius Grypus (praetor 70, consul 88); Q. Junius Arulenus Rusticus (praetor before 70, consul 92); T. Avidius Quietus (praetor before 79, consul 93); T. Pomponius Bassus (praetor before 79, consul 94); L. Antistius Rusticus (praetor 74, consul 90); C. Caristanius Fronto (praetor 74, consul 90); Ti. Julius Celsus Polemaeanus

(praetor before 77, consul 92); and C. Manlius Valens (praetor under Nero, consul 96). See Eck, *op. cit.*, pp. 65–67.

18. *PIR*<sup>2</sup> J 507. He was praetor in 73/74, *legatus* of Lycia-Pamphylia in 90, and consul in 94.

19. *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 732; *CIL* XVI. 46 (Moesia Superior, May 100).

20. *CIL* XI. 1833 (Dalmatia not mentioned) and *AE* 1926, 123.

21. Fitz, *op. cit.*, pp. 72–73.

22. *Ibid.*, p. 73.

23. 10. 78; *PIR* M 6; Fluss, *s.v.* "Macer (4)," *RE*, XIV (1928), 135. See also the discussion by Syme, *op. cit.* (n. 2), p. 515.

24. E.g., Wilkes, p. 445.

Funisulanus Vettonianus governed it as a consular from 79 to 81, one might suggest the following tentative list of the subsequent *legati* of the province:

<i>Legatus</i>	Term	<i>Cos.</i>	Status
Ignotus A <sup>25</sup>	782–83	?	Praetorian or consular
C. Cilnius Proculus	84–86	87	Praetorian
Ignotus B <sup>25</sup>	87–91	93 <sup>26</sup>	Praetorian
Q. Pomponius Rufus	92–94	95	Praetorian
Ignotus C <sup>25</sup>	95–97	98 or later	Praetorian
Macer	98–	?	Praetorian

BRIAN W. JONES

UNIVERSITY OF QUEENSLAND

25. If one cared to accept Fitz's rather adventurous reconstruction of a Dalmatian-Moesian career structure (*op. cit.*, pp. 69–71, on which see Eck's pertinent comments, *op. cit.*, p. 223, n. 465), one might identify Ignotus A with Sex. Octavius Fronto (*cos.* 86), Ignotus B with (L.) Julius Mar(inus)

(*cos.* 93 or 97) and Ignotus C with A. Caecilius Faustinus (*cos.* 99?).

26. The *fasti* for the latter half of Domitian's reign are complete except for 93.

#### A NOTE ON THE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION OF PLATO *PARMENIDES* 132A1–4

Parmenides is made to introduce his celebrated "Third Man" argument (*Parm.* 132A1–B2) as follows:

Οἱμαί σε ἐκ τοῦ τοιοῦδε ἐν ἑκάστον εἶδος οἶεσθαι εἶναι·  
ὅταν πόλλ' ἅττα μεγάλα σοι δόξῃ εἶναι, μία τις ἴσως  
δοκεῖ ἰδέα ἢ αὐτὴ εἶναι ἐπὶ πάντα ἰδόντι, ὅθεν ἐν τῷ μέγα  
ἡγῇ εἶναι.

There has been a certain amount of controversy, among translators and commentators, over the exact sense of these lines. Looking over the various versions produced in the last hundred years or so, one may divide the disputants into three main groups, the division being made on the basis of their treatment of the ubiquitous infinitive *εἶναι*. For the sake of convenience, I shall designate the four occurrences of this infinitive by Roman numerals: I designate as I the *εἶναι* of 132A1, as II that of 132A2, and so on. Now, one group (e.g., Burges and Fowler)<sup>1</sup> has I, II, and IV function in a copulative, III in an existential, capacity. Another group (e.g.,

Taylor and Cornford)<sup>2</sup> has I and III in the existential, II and IV in the copulative, mode. Finally, the most recent group (so far represented only by Professor Vlastos)<sup>3</sup> would cast all four in an existential role.

I outline the three groups primarily as an introduction to the version I wish to recommend, not for polemical considerations. The version I shall offer is based on our taking all four occurrences of *εἶναι* to be copulative. Obviously, I cannot claim originality for this version. Nor can its grammatical possibility be used to recommend it over the other versions, for they too (excepting the last) are grammatically possible. What really recommends this version is that it opens, whereas the others tend to obstruct, the way to a complete and deeper understanding of the philosophical content of the passage and hence, to that of the entire argument. In Section I, I shall briefly comment on each occurrence of *εἶναι*. I shall deal first with II, III, and IV, then with I. I deal with the *εἶναι*

1. G. Burges, *The Works of Plato*, III (London, 1850), 41; H. N. Fowler's version is in the LCL edition of the *Parmenides* (Cambridge, Mass. and London, 1953).

2. A. E. Taylor, *Philosophical Studies* (London, 1934), p. 43; F. M. Cornford, *Plato and Parmenides* (London, 1939), pp. 87–88.

3. G. Vlastos, "Plato's 'Third Man' Argument (*Parm.* 132A1–B2): Text and Logic," *Philos. Q.*, XIX (1969), 289–301, esp. 290 and 298, n. 12.