

the divine Augustus, and all that these meant to people and soldiers alike.

His brother Drusus, however, five years his senior, was already in Rome, albeit under detention; and in view of the feelings which Tiberius was later to express about him, he was probably regarded as expendable. But he had the family connection, which had already caused Sejanus anxiety, which would almost certainly undermine the *praefectus*' hold on the senate and people, and which might also release his grip on the troops. That surely was to be his function: Suetonius and Tacitus agree that Drusus was to be *dux*, not a word frequently associated with the emperor's constitutional position. Drusus, it may be surmised, was not to be *princeps*, but rather a kind of temporary Praetorian Prefect, who would have authority to take charge of all troops in Rome. If things had gone so

badly, this course was about the only chance left to Tiberius. What he would have done with Drusus had success attended such a plan can only be a matter of speculation.

In both of these suggested interpretations, then, are indications that, when Tiberius learned the truth about Sejanus, he was far from being driven out of his mind. On the contrary, the evidence shows the careful nature of his tactics, and his provision of a well thought-out emergency plan. The *verbosa et grandis epistola* was not, as Suetonius appears to imagine, a squalid and pathetic thing; it was the culmination of the tactician's art—the sort of planning that Tiberius will have learned years before in Germany, in happier times.

D. C. A. SHOTTER

UNIVERSITY OF LANCASTER

ZENO, NOT HERACLITUS

(1) While commenting on Aristotle *EN* 7. 5, p. 1146b29 (ἐνιοι γὰρ πιστεύουσιν οὐδὲν ἦττον οἷς δοξάζουσιν ἢ ἕτεροι οἷς ἐπίστανται· δηλοῖ δ' Ἡράκλειτος), the *Anonymus Byzantinus* (in *EN*, p. 417.35 Heylbut, *Comm. in Aristot. Gr.* XX) attributed to Heraclitus denial of the existence of movement: δηλοῖ δὲ καὶ Ἡράκλειτος ὅτι ἐστὶ βέβαιος καὶ ἰσχυρὰ δόξα καὶ οὐ πᾶσα δόξα ἐστὶν ἀσθενής· ἐκεῖνος γὰρ δοξάζων ὅτι κίνησις οὐκ ἔστιν, ἔλεγεν ὅτι ἀκριβῶς οἶδα (B: οἶδε Ald.)... The same denial is repeated in another Byzantine commentary, attributed to Heliodorus of Prusa (in *EN*, p. 139.33 Heylbut, *CAG* XIX): ὥσπερ ὁ Ἡράκλειτος ἂ ἐδόξαζεν ᾧετο ἐπίστασθαι ἀκριβῶς, οἷον ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι κίνησις καὶ τᾶλλα ὅσα ἐτίθει.¹

(2) However, Plato *Cratylus* 402A8 (λέγει που Ἡράκλειτος ὅτι πάντα χωρεῖ καὶ οὐδὲν μένει) and *Theaetetus* 160D6 (κατὰ μὲν Ὅμηρον καὶ Ἡράκλειτον καὶ πᾶν τὸ τοιοῦτον φύλον οἷον ρεύματα κινεῖσθαι τὰ πάντα . . .)

attest Heraclitus as an unchallenged advocate of the theory of constant flux and movement of all things.² No doubt, both Byzantine commentators must be wrong.

(3) I think they have mistaken Heraclitus for Zeno, the source of their error being Eustratius' commentary on *EN* (p. 37.28 Heylbut, *CAG* XX): θέσις γάρ ἐστι παράδοξος ὑπόληψις τινος τῶν κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν γνωρίμων (as opposed to either tradition, παράδοσις, or experience, αὐτὰ τὰ φαινόμενα), ὡς Ἡράκλειτος ἔλεγεν ἐν εἶναι τὰ ἐναντία καὶ Παρμενίδης ἐν τὸ ὄν καὶ Ζήνων μὴ εἶναι κίνησιν. The *Anonymus Byzantinus* has overlooked one line in the text of Eustratius, jumping from the words Ἡράκλειτος ἔλεγεν to the words μὴ εἶναι κίνησιν. Most probably he *did* use Eustratius' commentary on *EN*, Books 1 and 6, for he was trying to complete it by producing commentary on Books 2–5 and 7.

(4) That our *Anonymus* was indeed capable of such a mistake can be proved by another

1. As the part dealing with chapters 4. 15–7. 6 of the *Commentary on EN* (Books 1–8) attributed to Aspasius is not preserved (pp. 126 f. Heylbut, *CAG* XIX), we do not know whether the same mistake was shared by Aspasius as well.

2. The full evidence about the universal flux as attributed to Heraclitus is to be found now in M. Marcovich, *Heraclitus, editio maior* (Oxford, 1967), pp. 194–205.

blunder of his. On p. 129.1 he mistakes Heraclitus again, this time for Homer: *ὡς αὐτὸς οὐτός 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).³

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.¹ The evidence he cites² 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,³ 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,⁴ 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,⁵ the *archontes* of the title being the eponymous Theban officials, not Boeotarchs or the *archontes* at Onchestus.⁶ 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.⁷

Leontiades, whose son was behind the attempt to capture Plataea at the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War,⁸ 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.