

had set forth the incident in its entirety in the lost *Life of Epameinondas*, where the whole story is important to illustrate the philosophic calm of Epameinondas, even when confronted by weak friends and ungrateful countrymen. In the *Epameinondas* Plutarch will have inserted the timorousness of Pelopidas as a necessary, if unfortunate, detail—but one that he could mercifully omit from the *Pelopidas*.

JOHN BUCKLER  
*University of Illinois*

#### A NOTE ON P. LEPIDUS

A small bronze coin issued in the administrative region of Crete and Cyrene during the last years of the Roman Republic raises some intriguing questions. Despite the lack of clear inscriptions on any of the few remaining examples of the coin, recent scholarship has established that it was issued jointly by a P. Licinius and a P. Lepidus.<sup>1</sup> The coin portrays a bust of the goddess Creta-Artemis on one side and one of Libya on the other. The inscription on the latter side refers to a P. LEPID., who was apparently a proquaestor in Cyrene.<sup>2</sup>

The first difficulty raised by the coin is the identity of P. Lepidus. In all of the sources relating to the Aemilii Lepidi, there is no record of their use of the *praenomen* Publius.<sup>3</sup> While it is possible that a P. Lepidus could belong to a *gens* other than the Aemilian, it is not likely for the Republican period. A second problem is the possibility that the moneyer of the coin was the same Lepidus credited by Appian with bringing Crete under subjection to Brutus.<sup>4</sup> The coin was a joint issue for both Crete and Cyrene, which at that time were administered as one province. On the basis of style and fabric, as well as the location of finds, Michael Grant ascribed the production of the coin to Crete and speculated that it was issued there jointly before a separate mint could be established in Cyrene.<sup>5</sup> Licinius and Lepidus may have been lieutenants of Brutus and Cassius in the region and as proquaestors may merely have subdivided their responsibilities for financial affairs in the province.<sup>6</sup> The combination of a common name, region, and time period makes it a strong possibility that the moneyer P. Lepidus and the Lepidus described by Appian were the same man.

1. Michael Grant, *From Imperium to Auctoritas* (Cambridge, 1946), pp. 35–36, first proposed that the coin should read P. LEPID. on one side instead of P. LICIN. on both. E. A. Sydenham, *The Coinage of the Roman Republic* (London, 1952), p. 214, accepted Grant's alternate reading, but misinterpreted him as having replaced P. LICIN. with P. LEPID. on both sides. Recent articles by A. E. Chapman, "Some First Century B.C. Bronze Coins of Knossos," *NC*, ser. 7, 8 (1968): 13–26, esp. 15–16; and by G. Perl, "Die römischen Provinzbeamten in Cyrene und Creta zur Zeit der Republik," *Klio* 52 (1970): 319–54, esp. 336–38, have pointed out Grant's error in ascribing the Creta-Artemis, instead of the Libya, side to P. Lepidus.

2. The exact title must remain uncertain, unless finer copies of the coin are found. Plates of the coin can be seen in the *British Museum Catalogue* on Cyrenaica, pl. 39, figs. 5–6 and in Grant, *Imperium*, pl. 2, fig. 15.

3. For a full account of the Aemilii Lepidi, see my "Aemilii Lepidi" (Ph.D. diss., University of Delaware, 1973 [University Microfilms #74-8754]).

4. App. BC 5. 2.

5. Grant, *Imperium*, p. 36.

6. Another possible candidate for Appian's Lepidus is Q. Aemilius Lepidus, probably the son of Manius Lepidus (cos. 66) and himself a consul in 21. W. Caland, "Ein neuer Cistophor," *ZN* 13 (1885): 113–19, attributes a cistophoric tetradrachm of Asia to Quintus as a propraetor in the period 43–42. Both Caland, "Cistophor," p. 117, and Perl, "Die römischen Provinzbeamten . . . : Nachträge," *Klio* 53 (1971): 375, are, I believe, incorrect in accepting Quintus as the son of the triumvir, however.

Appian's Lepidus has generally been identified as Paullus Aemilius Lepidus, who was the nephew of the triumvir Lepidus and who later became a *consul suffectus* in 34 B.C. Paullus apparently held the Republican sympathies of his father, L. Aemilius Paullus (Lepidus), the consul of 50, who was proscribed by the triumvirs in 43.<sup>7</sup> It would have been natural for the young Paullus to leave Rome to join his father at the camp of Brutus in Greece. Paullus' activities between 43 and 36 are not recorded, and he could well have fought with the Republican forces early in that period.<sup>8</sup> A difficulty now arises in trying to reconcile the unidentified moneyer P. Lepidus with Paullus, since both could fit in with the general situation of Appian's Lepidus.

Two ostensible solutions exist for the identification of P. Lepidus. First of all, there may have been an otherwise unknown Publius Aemilius Lepidus, despite the complete absence of such a *praenomen* in a family that can be traced through a period of almost four centuries. Second, the P. may stand for Paullus instead of Publius and therefore identify Paullus Aemilius Lepidus as the proquaestor in Cyrene. The standard use of P. as an abbreviation for Publius has led some historians to accept the first solution, perhaps without adequate consideration of the possibility of the second. T. R. S. Broughton lists the legate as P. Aemilius P.f. Lepidus, while admitting that the *nomen* is uncertain because the Aemilii Lepidi were never known to have used the *praenomen* Publius.<sup>9</sup> Sir Ronald Syme suggests that Publius may have been an Aemilius Lepidus who passed by adoption into another *gens*. However, the usual system for changing a name after adoption would give such a person his adoptive father's complete name with the addition of Aemilianus. In normal practice he would not retain his former *cognomen*.<sup>10</sup>

Admittedly, the use of P. in an inscription would usually designate a Publius. However, Jan Gruter cited consular *fasti* which listed Paullus as P. AEMILIVS for his suffect consulship in 34.<sup>11</sup> In a similar case, a *praefectus cohorti* in England

7. Plut. *Ant.* 19, 2, *Cic.* 46, 4; App. *BC* 4, 12; Dio 47, 6, 3; Vell. Pat. 2, 67, 3-4; Livy *Per.* 120; Florus 2, 16, 4.

8. Paullus next turns up as a lieutenant of Octavian in the Sicilian campaign against Sextus Pompey (Suet. *Aug.* 16, 3). Perl's statement, "Provinzbeamten," p. 338, n. 2, that Paullus "... stand jedoch nach Philippi auf der Seite Octavians ..." is misleading. There is no evidence that Paullus supported Octavian before 36. It would not have been at all unusual for Paullus to have fought with the forces of L. Domitius Ahenobarbus or Sextus Pompey after Philippi, as Appian's Lepidus did, and then to have returned to Rome after the triumvirs' treaty with Sextus in 39 restored full property rights to exiles and one-quarter of their property to the proscribed (App. *BC* 5, 71-72; Dio 48, 36). Paullus must have served as praetor during this period in order to qualify for his later consulship in 34. Perhaps he was one of the sixty-seven men who reportedly received the praetorship in 38 (Dio 48, 43, 1-2). Many of these individuals must have been former enemies newly converted to Octavian's rule. Perl, "Provinzbeamten," pp. 336-38, dates the coin in the period 41-36, but believes Licinius and Lepidus to have been agents for Antony. Chapman, "Bronze Coins of Knossos," pp. 15-16, places it in the late 40s. I view 43-39 as the period when Paullus could have been fighting on the Republican side and 43/42 as the likely date for the coin.

9. *MRR*, 2: 342, and *Supplement*, p. 3. Perl, "Provinzbeamten," pp. 336, n. 7 and 337, n. 2, states that the filiation P.f. belongs to Licinius and not to Lepidus.

10. Syme, review of Broughton, *CP* 50 (1955): 133. In defense of Syme's explanation, it should be noted that there are exceptions to the general rule for changing one's name after adoption. For example, P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica became Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius Scipio (cos. 52) and was often referred to as Scipio. Also, M. Iunius Brutus (the tyrannicide) became Q. Servilius Caepio Brutus after adoption by his uncle. These men, of course, had particular reasons for wanting to retain their former *cognomina*. Syme's example of *Scipio Lepidi filius*, relating to an Aemilius who became a Cornelius by adoption, should be viewed as a description by Orosius (5, 22, 17) of Scipio, son of Lepidus (cos. 78), not as the official name Scipio might have used in an inscription.

11. Gruter, *Inscriptiones antiquae totius orbis romani* (Heidelberg, 1602 and Amsterdam, 1707),

during the reign of Antoninus Pius is described in one inscription as PAVLVVS. P.F. PALATINA POSTVMIVS. ACILIANVS and apparently in another as P. POSTVMIVS ACILIANVS.<sup>12</sup> Although the coins attributed to Paullus Lepidus as a *triumvir monetalis* in about 55 B.C. do spell out his name in full, they were larger than the bronze issue of Crete and were thus able to include a longer inscription.<sup>13</sup> They also were high-quality silver denarii of the excellent Roman mints intended for large-scale circulation throughout the empire, instead of crude, provincial, bronze issues of very limited circulation, probably intended only for paying local troops. The small size of the Cretan coin precluded the use of the full name Paullus Lepidus. PA. LEP. or PAVL. LEP. probably should have been used to avoid confusion, but this may not have been necessary in the first century B.C., given the rarity of the *praenomen* Paullus. Because his name was well known, Paullus may have felt that P. was enough to identify him, especially when he needed the additional space to squeeze in more of his title. There is also always the possibility that the mint worker erred in his preparation of the coin die.

If one can admit the possibility that P. could be used to represent Paullus instead of Publius, then the second solution to the identity of P. Lepidus is the more logical one.<sup>14</sup> First, it resolves the difficulty of accounting for an unknown Publius in a family that regularly used only the *praenomina* Marcus, Manius, Lucius, and Quintus. Second, it allows for the connection of the moneyer with Brutus' lieutenant in the region. Paullus had the motive and the opportunity for Republican activity in the area of Crete and Cyrene in about 43/42 B.C. Without further evidence, one cannot state decisively that Paullus Lepidus was the proquaestor who issued the bronze coin, or that he gained control of Crete for Brutus; but these

p. 299. 1 and 2, p. 1087. 2. Gruter's inscription is also cited by J. Eckhel, *Doctrina nummorum veterum*, vol. 5.2 (Vienna, 1828), p. 128. The Codex Ambrosianus of these same *Fasti Venusini* lists PAVLVVS and Mommsen's reconstruction shows PAVL. (see *CIL*, 1.1:66-67). The evidence is far from conclusive. Gruter may have erred, but his interpretation is by itself worth noting.

12. *CIL*, 7. 400 and 367 respectively. On these inscriptions, see E. Hübner, "Römische Epigraphik," in Iwan Müller (ed.), *Handbuch der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, vol. 1 (Berlin, 1886), p. 502; and M. Lambert, s.v. "Postumius (70)," *RE* 22.1 (1953): 950. J. K. Orelli, in *Inscriptionum latinarum selectarum amplissima collectio*, vol. 1 (Zurich, 1828), p. 474, suggests the possibility that the two inscriptions refer to a father, Publius, and a son, Paulus; but the fact that they would both have had to serve as prefects of the same cohort in the same region casts doubt on this view. For evidence that S. occasionally stood for Servius (Sergius) or Sextus instead of the more common Spurius, see G. Henzen (ed.), *Inscriptionum . . . amplissima collectio*, vol. 3: *Collectionis Orellianae supplementa emendationesque exhibens* (Zurich, 1856), nos. 6227 and 6996, 6939, see also 6226; Hübner, "Römische Epigraphik," p. 500; and Dessau, *ILS*, vol. 2.1 (Berlin, 1906), nos. 6404a and 7177.

13. M. Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, 1974), p. 441, ascribes these earlier issues to Paullus' father, the consul of 50. However, the inclusion of the name Paullus Lepidus on these coins applies more to the son, who, unlike his father, used Paullus as a *praenomen* rather than as a *cognomen*. The joint coin-issue with L. Scribonius Libo also very neatly parallels the joint consulship of Libo and Paullus in 34 and an apparent marriage alliance between the two families. See my article, "The Joint Issue of L. Libo and Paullus Lepidus," *San* (1973-74): 3-4. Crawford also refers to the father's "spurious claim to descent from L. Aemilius Paullus." The use of the name as either a *cognomen* or a *praenomen* need not mean any more than a feeling of kinship with one of the most respected products of the Aemilian gens. The end of L. Aemilius Paullus' family line was well known, and any claim to lineal descent would thus have been regarded as ludicrous.

14. Perl, "Provinzbeamten," p. 338 and n. 2, believes that the abbreviation of Paullus with P. is unacceptable, citing the silver issues with the name spelled out. His article does not weigh any other evidence for or against the idea, however.

speculations seem more logical than the creation of an incorporeal Publius Lepidus.<sup>15</sup>

RICHARD D. WEIGEL  
Western Kentucky University

15. Thanks are extended to the journal referees for several helpful suggestions. I would also like to express my appreciation to Dr. Sabine Schultz of the Staatliche Museen zu Berlin for sending me enlargements of the coin.

### THE MEANING OF ΠΕΛΟΠΟΝΝΗΣΟΣ IN THUCYDIDES

In volume 4 of the monumental *Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, A. W. Gomme's continuators, A. Andrewes and K. J. Dover, express the following view: "whereas Πελοπόννησος in Thucydides is a geographical term, Πελοποννήσιοι means not 'the inhabitants of the Peloponnese' but 'Sparta and her allies.'" <sup>1</sup> That Πελοποννήσιοι *always* means "Sparta and her allies" (i.e., the Peloponnesian League), *never* "the inhabitants of the Peloponnese," is very much open to doubt;<sup>2</sup> and it is equally doubtful that Πελοπόννησος is invariably "a geographical term." Examination of the contexts of Thucydides' 155 instances of Πελοπόννησος<sup>3</sup> suggests that the term, though regularly geographical, is sometimes a synonym for Πελοποννήσιοι, with the result that it, too, sometimes signifies "Sparta and her allies" or "the Peloponnesian League." Sufficient for consideration here are five passages in which this meaning seems both likely and open to reasonable demonstration.

(1) 1. 71. 7. At the end of their speech to the Lacedaemonians in mid-432 B.C., the Corinthians admonish: "In light of what has been said, deliberate well and endeavor to ensure that τὴν Πελοπόννησον be not less under your leadership than it was when your fathers bequeathed it to you." In a parallel admonition to the Athenians in 1. 144. 4—again in a speech which concerns justification for war, and in the final sentence of the speech—Pericles says: "It is necessary that we not fall short of our fathers, but defend ourselves in every way from our enemies and endeavor to bequeath to our successors imperial power not lessened." It is characteristic of Thucydides' *History* generally, and perhaps of Book 1 most of all, that parallels are not only important, but very close. One is therefore justified in thinking that the parallelism of the two admonitions extends to the things which the hearers are urged to uphold; and as the Athenians are exhorted to preserve and hand on their empire, it seems beyond reasonable doubt that the Lacedaemonians are admonished to pass undiminished to their successors leadership of their nearest equivalent to the Athenian empire—the Peloponnesian League. (Conceivably this parallelism was an important factor in the decision of C. F. Smith, in

For constructive criticisms, I am indebted to Professor J. Balcer and to the journal's referees.

1. (Oxford, 1970), p. 249. The view is perhaps more Dover's than Andrewes' (cf. Dover's edition of Thucydides Book 6 [Oxford, 1965], p. 27), but Andrewes may be thought to share it (see *Comm.*, vol. 4, p. v).

2. That Πελοποννήσιοι as used by Thucydides sometimes—but "verhältnismässig selten"—means "inhabitants of the Peloponnese" is the view of J. Steup (J. Classen and J. Steup [eds.], *Thukydides*, vol. 2<sup>8</sup> [Berlin, 1914], p. 296). Cf. the remarks of Gomme (*Comm.*, vol. 2 [Oxford, 1956], p. 10), which suggest his agreement. Other writers who have noted this geographical usage include J. A. O. Larsen ("The Constitution of the Peloponnesian League, II," *CP* 29 [1934]: 7, n. 80) and G. E. M. de Ste. Croix (*The Origins of the Peloponnesian War* [London, 1972], pp. 103, 188).

3. These are conveniently listed in M. H. N. von Essen, *Index Thucydidicus* (Berlin, 1887). Under Πελοπόννησον, γ 96 is a typographical error for γ 86, and ε "52 24. 29 32." (suggesting two citations) should read "52 24, 29, 32." (three citations).