ἴετ' ἀναινομένη **δ̣ῶρα̣** [χρυσῆς Ἀφροδίτης,
τῶι δὲ περὶ ψυχῆς πέλε[το δρόμος, ἠὲ ἁλῶναι
ᾗὲ φυ̣γεῖν· τῶι καί ῥα **δολο̣[φρονέων** προσέειπεν·
"ὦ̣ θύγατερ Σχοινῆος, ἀμ[είλιχον ἦτορ ἔχουσα,
δ]έ̣ξο τάδ' ἀγλα̣[ὰ] **δ̣ῶ̣ρα̣** θ̣ε̣[ᾶς χρυσῆς Ἀφροδίτης

She ran, spurning the gifts of golden Aphrodite,
while for him the race was for his life, either to die
or to escape. And he spoke to her, intent on trickery:
"Daughter of Schoeneus, with a relentless heart,
accept these shining gifts of the goddess, golden Aphrodite. . . .

Just as Zeus succeeded in tricking Epimetheus with Pandora, a δῶρον who is actually a δόλος, so too in these last two examples both Periclymenus and Atalanta are tricked by δῶρα that prove to be δόλοι. In isolation, any of these passages could be interpreted as a likely case of *paronomasia,* playing with the contrast between a gift and a trick. But taken as a group, together with the passage from the *Works and Days,* they suggest that the poet—or the poetic tradition—was particularly fond of word-play involving these two terms. Pandora, who judging by her name ought to be all δῶρον, proves instead to be all δόλος.[13]

Peter S. Mazur
Yale University

13. Perhaps the combination of these two terms would have reminded the Greek listener of another δῶρον that was a δόλος: the Trojan Horse, which Homer calls a δόλος at *Od.* 8.494. W. Moskalew ("Myrmidons, Dolopes, and Danaans: Wordplay in *Aeneid* 2," *CQ* 40 [1990]: 275–79) has demonstrated that Virgil, in *Aen.* 2 (esp. 2.44), plays with the notion of the Trojan Horse as a *donum* and a *dolus*—precisely the play on words that I am suggesting for the Hesiod passages. This raises the possibility that Hesiod's δῶρον / δόλος is the ultimate source for Virgil's play on *donum* and *dolus*.

BELUS IN THE *SACRED HISTORY* OF EUHEMERUS

Euhemerus of Messene (fl. c. 300 B.C.E.) wrote a fictitious narrative called the *Sacred History* (*Hiera Anagraphe*) in which he claimed to have sailed to Panchaea, an island beyond Arabia on the Ocean, and there discovered a stele on which was written the story of the time when the gods were mortal men and rulers of the whole earth. Ever since, there have been arguments over whether Euhemerus was an atheist or a revolutionary philosopher, whether he was an historian or a theologian, and whether he wrote in response to the political, or the religious reality of his day. Although the discusssion of Zeus in the *Sacred History* is known to us only at third hand (from Eusebius' summary of Diodorus' rendition,[1] and from Lactantius' citations of Ennius' Latin translation[2]), it seems clear that Belus of Babylon held a place of importance in the story, and may help us to answer some of our questions in regard to Euhemerus.

1. *Praep. evang.* 2.2.59B–61A; Diod. Sic. 6, fragmenta.
2. *Div. inst.* 1.11 (and 13, 14, 17, 22).

The narratives of Euhemerus and his followers are united by the basic theory that the gods of myth were ancient human kings and by certain consistent features, including travels throughout the world by the "gods" to encourage civilization and their own worship.[3] In Euhemerus' own narrative the first item of note on Zeus' itinerary is a visit to Belus in Babylon:[4]

> ἐλθόντα δὲ εἰς Βαβυλῶνα ἐπιξενωθῆναι Βήλῳ, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα εἰς τὴν Παγχαίαν νῆσον πρὸς τῷ ὠκεανῷ κειμένην παραγενόμενον Οὐρανοῦ τοῦ ἰδίου προπάτορος βωμὸν ἱδρύσασθαι. κἀκεῖθεν διὰ Συρίας ἐλθεῖν πρὸς τὸν τότε δυνάστην Κάσιον, ἐξ οὗ τὸ Κάσιον ὄρος. ἐλθόντα δὲ εἰς Κιλικίαν πολέμῳ νικῆσαι Κίλικα τοπάρχην, καὶ ἄλλα δὲ πλεῖστα ἔθνη ἐπελθόντα παρὰ πᾶσιν τιμηθῆναι καὶ θεὸν ἀναγορευθῆναι.
>
> He [Zeus] went to Babylon and was entertained as a guest by Belus. After this he arrived at the island of Panchaea, which lies near the Ocean, and raised an altar to Uranus, his own grandfather. From there he went through Syria to Casius, who was then the ruler, after whom Mount Casius is named. Coming to Cilicia, he defeated in war Cilix, the ruler of that place. He visited a number of other peoples, by all of whom he was honored and proclaimed a god.

While precedents for the association of Belus with Babylon can be identified, Euhemerus appears to be the first writer who made Belus the human ruler of Babylon. The real significance of Belus for Euhemerus, however, lies in the fact that the Babylonian god Belus was regularly identified with Zeus. Euhemerus justified the syncretism of various local and regional cults by positing that they had a common origin in the worship of this "traveling" Zeus; the example of Belus demonstrates that this syncretism also encompassed foreign cults.

THE LITERARY BACKGROUND

There was sufficient material for Euhemerus' composition in the Greek literature of the fifth century. Hellanicus of Lesbos (c. 480–395 B.C.E.) made Cepheus, if not Belus, the ruler of Babylon,[5] but Herodotus was to confirm the relation of Belus to Cepheus, and by extension to Babylon, by stating that Belus was the father of Cepheus.[6] Moreover, Herodotus' description of Babylon laid the foundation in popular tradition for the association of Belus with Babylon. Herodotus dedicates some amount of space to the temple of Belus-Zeus as one of the most prominent buildings in Babylon,[7] and he mentions no other sanctuary of Belus. This passage eventually entered the realm of *topoi,* since later writers often refer to the temple of Belus when

3. Euhemerus: Diod. Sic. 6.1.10; Lactant. *Div. inst.* 1.11.45; 22.21–24. Diodorus' "Cretan account" of the gods: Diod. Sic. 5.66.4, 71.2; Dionysius Scytobrachion: Diod. Sic. 3.73.6; cf. Heracles in Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.41.1. Euhemerus' putative model is the account of the Egyptian gods by Hecataeus of Abdera (Diod. Sic. 1.17.3–20.6).

4. Diod. Sic. 6.1.10 = M. Winiarczyk, ed., *Euhemerus Messenius, Reliquiae* (Leipzig, 1991), 38, 39 (test. 61, 63).

5. *FGrH* 4 F 59 = Steph. Byz., s.v. Χαλδαῖοι; cf. frag. 60 = Steph. Byz., s.v. Ἀρταία. Later mythographers set the kingdom of Cepheus in Ethiopia (Apollod. *Bibl.* 2.4.3) or in Palestine (Tzetz. *Schol. in Lycoph.* 836; Conon *Narr.* 40). See W. How and J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus* (Oxford, 1912), 2:153; R. Drews, *The Greek Accounts of Eastern History* (Washington, D.C.,1973), 16, 22.

6. Hdt. 7.61.3; see Drews, *Greek Accounts* (n. 5 above), 28.

7. Hdt. 1.181.

they describe Babylon.[8] Herodotus also mentions Belus as a descendant of Heracles in the genealogy of Candaules the Lydian.[9] Herodotus had no single, consistent idea of the legendary personage, human or divine, going under the name of Belus, but he never suggested that Belus was the *king* of Babylon. It was, nevertheless, Herodotus' identification of Belus with Zeus that was most important to the ideas of Euhemerus.

Euhemerus demonstrates little interest in the puportedly historical account of Assyria and Babylon by Ctesias of Cnidos (c. 390 B.C.E.). Ctesias held that Semiramis, the wife of Ninus, founded Babylon.[10] Reference to Herodotus might have shown that Ninus was the son of Belus,[11] making Belus the father-in-law and predecessor of Semiramis.[12] The account of Euhemerus, in which Belus lived in Babylon, and that of Ctesias, in which Semiramis built Babylon, cannot, therefore, be reconciled. The identification of Belus (the god to whom the greatest temple in Babylon is dedicated) with Zeus found in Ctesias[13] is, nevertheless, germane to the purposes of Euhemerus. Euhemerus' neglect of Ctesias suggests that he was more interested in questions of religion, cults, and gods, than in questions of history.

Euhemerus may have been aware of the work of Berossus, a Babylonian priest of Bel who prepared redactions of Mesopotamian literature for consumption by the region's new Greek rulers (c. 350–after 281 B.C.E.),[14] but we cannot say how quickly a history of Babylon that was never to gain much popularity in the Graeco-Roman world[15] spread to the various Hellenistic courts and held currency amongst its author's contemporaries. There was, nevertheless, material in Berossus' *Babyloniaca* that might have contributed to the ideas of Euhemerus. Berossus asserted that Belus had built a wall around Babylon.[16] Although this passage is in a mythological context, similar to the biblical separation of the water and the dry land on the second and third days of Creation,[17] it has parallels in human activity, for the rebuilding of the

8. Ctesias (Diod. Sic. 2.8–9); Diod. Sic. 17.112.3; Strabo, 16.1.5; Plin. *HN* 6.30 (121); Joseph. *AJ* 10.11.1 (224), from Berossus, *Ap*. 1.22 (192), from Ps.-Hecataeus; Curt. 5.1.24; Arr. *Anab*. 3.16.4, 7.17.1; Paus. 1.16.3, 7.33.3. It may not have been until the first century B.C.E. that a description of Babylon included some mention of the temple of Belus-Zeus as a matter of course, but it is also possible that this association developed hard on the heels of Herodotus, and was known to Euhemerus and his contemporaries.

9. Hdt. 1.7.2.

10. Diod. Sic. 2.7.2–11; Curt. 5.1.24. Cf. Hdt. (1.184–86), who ascribes the building of flood embankments to Semiramis and extensive construction projects to Nitocris, the other queen of Babylon whom he discusses; see S. Burstein, *The "Babyloniaca" of Berossus: Sources from the Ancient Near East,* vol. 1, fasc. 5 (Malibu, 1978), p. 28, n. 107; see also Dionys. Per. 1005–7.

11. Hdt. 1.7.2.

12. Castor of Rhodes, writing after 60 B.C.E., is the first surviving writer to identify Belus explicitly as the father-in-law of Semiramis (*FGrH* 250 F 1).

13. Diod. Sic. 2.8.7, 9.4.

14. Burstein, "*Babyloniaca*" (n. 10 above), 5–6; A. Kuhrt, "Berossus' *Babyloniaka* and Seleucid Rule in Babylonia," in *Hellenism in the East,* ed. A. Kuhrt and S. Sherwin-White (London, 1987), 32–56; G. Verbrugghe and J. Wickersham, *Berossos and Manetho, Introduced and Translated: Native Traditions in Ancient Mesopotamia and Egypt* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1996), 13.

15. Burstein, "*Babyloniaca,*" 6, 9–10; Verbrugghe and Wickersham, *Berossos and Manetho* (n. 14 above), 27.

16. As cited by Abydenus in Euseb. *Praep. evang*. 9.41.5 = *FGrH* 3C1, 685, F 1; see Burstein, "*Babyloniaca,*" 17. Euhemerus does not seem purposefully to contradict Ctesias, but for Berossus a polemic against the errors of earlier Greek versions of Babylonian history was one of the objectives of the *Babyloniaca;* see Joseph. *Ap*. 1.142 (*FGrH* 3C1, 680, F 8).

17. Gen. 1:6–10.

wall of Babylon by the historical Nabouchodonosoros[18] is recorded immediately after the initial building by Belus in the same fragment. The parallel of divine and human undertakings is consistent with Euhemerus' treatment of the mortal gods, even if unintentionally. But Berossus essentially portrayed Belus as a deity of myth with a role in cosmogony.[19] Even if the suggestive material in the *Babyloniaca* did not contribute to the ideas in the *Sacred History,* Berossus might have proven most useful to Euhemerus as another source who, like Herodotus and Ctesias, identified Belus with Zeus.[20]

If it is uncertain whether or not Euhemerus was aware of Berossus, he certainly knew the work of Hecataeus of Abdera[21] (who wrote in the fourth century B.C.E.),[22] which included an account of Belus leading a group of Egyptian colonists to found Babylon: Οἱ δ' οὖν Αἰγύπτιοί φασι . . . ἀποικίας πλείστας ἐξ Αἰγύπτου κατὰ πᾶσαν διασπαρῆναι τὴν οἰκουμένην. εἰς Βαβυλῶνα μὲν γὰρ ἀγαγεῖν ἀποίκους Βῆλον τὸν νομιζόμενον Ποσειδῶνος εἶναι καὶ Λιβύης ("The Egyptians say that a great number of colonies from Egypt were scattered across the entire world. For Belus, reputed to be the son of Poseidon and Libya, led colonists to Babylon").[23] The accounts of Egyptian colonization seem to have held a much more prominent place in Hecataeus' original composition,[24] and appear to have been based on Greek legend.[25] This particular report of the Egyptian colonization of Babylon obviously depends on the Greek tradition that held that Belus, the father of Cepheus, was the son of Poseidon and Libya, and that he was an inhabitant of Egypt.[26] While Euhemerus agrees with

18. That is, Nebukadnezzar II; see Burstein, "*Babyloniaca,*" p. 17, n. 23. The epic of Gilgamesh, of which Greeks such as Euhemerus would almost certainly not have been aware in detail, offers another example of a human, albeit a ruler of heroic status, building a wall around his city (Uruk, in this case); J. Pritchard, *The Ancient Near East: An Anthology of Texts and Pictures,* vol. 1 (Princeton, 1958), 40; A. George, *The Epic of Gilgamesh: The Babylonian Epic Poem and Other Texts in Akkadian and Sumerian* (London, 1999), 1–2. Although the epic of Gilgamesh can have only tenuous implications for Euhemerus' possible reading of Berossus, coming as it does from a Mesopotamian context, it does raise questions, for this very reason, about how Berossus himself understood the wall-building of Belus: as the other wall-builders were human, did wall-building imply human activity, if not humanity, on the part of Belus?

19. *FGrH* 680, F 1.8, 9.

20. *FGrH* 680, F 1.8, 9; F 12. This identification may actually have been made by an epitomizer in the process of transmission; Burstein ("*Babyloniaca*") does not include F 12 in his work, but Verbrugghe and Wickersham (*Berossus and Manetho*) do (as their frag. 13).

21. O. Murray, "Hecataeus of Abdera and Pharaonic Kingship," *JEA* 56 (1970): p. 151 and n. 4. M. Winiarczyk (*Euhemeros von Messene: Leben, Werk und Nachwirkung* [Munich and Leipzig, 2002], 69–71, cf. 28–29) concedes that Euhemerus might have known Hecataeus of Abdera, but disputes the importance of Hecataeus' influence on Euhemerus.

22. Murray, "Hecataeus of Abdera" (n. 21 above), 144.

23. Diod. Sic. 1.28.1. In this same passage, Danaus, according to Apollodorus (2.1.4) the son of Belus, is said to have led an expedition from Egypt that settled Argos; cf. Steph. Byz., s.v. Βαβυλών, who notes that there is also a city by this name in Egypt.

24. Murray, "Hecataeus of Abdera," 145, 152.

25. A. Burton (*Diodorus Siculus, Book I: A Commentary* [Leiden, 1972]) suggests that Hecataeus is an unlikely source for the accounts of Egyptian colonization (11, 18), and that these accounts represent native Egyptian traditions (117–18). In so doing, she ignores the obvious references to Greek legend. For example, she connects the Belus in Diodorus, Book 1, directly to Ba'al (known, she says, as the god of the Semites in Egypt [*sic,* actually a god of Canaan specifically]), without comment on the interposition of Belus, the son of Poseidon and Libya, from Greek legend. Moreover, the fragments of Manetho never mention Belus, making the derivation of Belus' story from Egyptian tradition somewhat dubious.

26. Apollod. *Bibl.* 2.1.4; cf. Aesch. *Supp.* 316–24; Hyg. *Fab.* 157.1, 274.22; *Myth. Vat.* 1.45; *Schol. vet. in Pind. Pyth.* 4.25a; Tzetz. *Chil.* 7.349–58; see Drews, *Greek Accounts* (n. 5 above), 9.

Hecataeus inasmuch as he situates Belus in Babylon and makes him a mortal, we must note a difference in method between the two authors. On the one hand, Hecataeus brought Belus of Babylon into the Greek understanding of the world by identifying him with a Greek hero of the same name, and transferring this hero to Babylon. The evidence suggests that Euhemerus, on the other hand, did not make Belus any less divine than the gods of the Greeks, nor connect him with any place other than Babylon, and that he fit Belus into the Greek scheme, not by referring to legends, but by explaining why he was equated with Zeus.

By the first century C.E.,[27] Quintus Curtius Rufus claims that it was the general opinion that Belus had founded Babylon.[28] This consensus was probably formed on the basis of the sources we have just discussed and perhaps became accepted as established fact by the time of Euhemerus. However, such legendary and historical material does not seem to have concerned Euhemerus much.

LOCAL CULTS, LOCAL EPITHETS, AND THE TRAVELING ZEUS

There was, as we have seen, plenty of literature in Euhemerus' time that associated Belus with Babylon and suggested that Belus was more of a human or heroic than a divine character. This literature should not, however, be viewed as the source material for the assertions of Euhemerus, but rather as a corroboration of a conclusion based on a principle of his interpretation of the gods. This principle explained how numerous cults with distinct cult names could represent the worship of a single god. Euhemerus related that as Zeus traveled throughout the earth he established cults to himself, and shared the honor of these cults with the local ruler of the place in which he set up his shrine by combining both of their names in the dedication. Lactantius describes this process in a passage based on Ennius (*Div. inst.* 1.22.21–23):[29]

> *Historia* vero *Sacra* testatur ipsum Iovem postquam rerum potitus sit, in tantum venisse insolentiam ut ipse sibi fana in multis locis constituerit. Nam cum terras circumiret, ut in quamque regionem venerat, reges principesve populorum hospitio sibi et amicitia copulabat et, cum a quoque digrederetur, iubebat sibi fanum creari hospitis sui nomine, quasi ut posset amicitiae ac foederis memoria conservari. Sic constituta sunt templa Iovi

27. Curtius certainly wrote under the Empire and probably completed his work during the reign of Claudius (41–54 C.E.). The most accessible and up-to-date discussion of the dating of Curtius is W. Heckel's introduction to the Penguin translation (trans. J. Yardley) of Quintus Curtius Rufus, *The History of Alexander* (London, 1984), 1–4.

28. Curt. 5.1.24. An interesting variation of this account is found in Philo of Byblos (Steph. Byz., s.v. Βαβυλών = *FGrH* 790, F 30): κτίσμα Βαβυλῶνος, ἀνδρὸς σοφωτάτου, παιδὸς Βήλου, παλαίτατον, οὐχ ὡς Ἡρόδοτος ὑπὸ Σεμιράμιδος· ταύτης γὰρ ἦν ἀρχαιοτέρα ἔτεσι χιλίοις δύο, ὡς Ἑρέννιος ("[Babylon was] an extremely ancient foundation of Babylon, a very wise man, the son of Belus; it was not [founded] by Semiramis as Herodotus [would have it], for, as Herennius states, it was two thousand years older than her"); cf. Eust. ad Dionysium Periegetem, 1005. Since he separates Belus and the founding of Babylon from Semiramis by two thousand years, Philo demonstrates his independence from Castor, who set Belus, Ninus, and Semiramis in direct succession. Neither is he dependent upon Euhemerus, as he assigns the foundation of Babylon to Belus' son, therefore supposedly too late for Belus himself to be associated with the city. Philo does not appear to have been familiar with either Herodotus or Ctesias, otherwise he would not have mistaken Herodotus for Ctesias as the source of the claim that Semiramis founded Babylon. I am indebted to Professor Fergus Millar for saving me from some embarassment over the attribution of this fragment.

29. Lactantius notes that the same is true in the cases of Jupiter Laprius (perhaps a variant of Λάφριος, an epithet of Apollo and Hermes) and Jupiter Molio (perhaps to be identified with the Ζεὺς Μυλεύς of Lycoph. 435), but these epithets of Zeus/Jupiter are only attested in Lactantius and we know nothing of the cults connected with them; see E. Laughton, "The Prose of Ennius," *Eranos* 49 (1951): 48; Winiarczyk, *Euhemeros* (n. 21 above), 39 (test. 64A).

> Ataburio, Iovi Labryandio: Ataburus enim et Labryandus hospites eius atque adiutores in bello fuerunt.
>
> Indeed, the *Sacred History* attests that after he came to power Jupiter became so immoderate that he established sanctuaries to himself in many places. For when he traveled about the world, as he came to each land, he bound the kings or princes of the different peoples to himself by hospitality and friendship. And as he was about to take his leave of each one, he ordered a shrine to be raised to himself in the name of his host, so that a memorial of friendship and fidelity might be preserved. Thus temples were established to Jupiter Ataburius and Jupiter Labryandius; for Ataburus and Labryandus were his hosts as well as his allies in war.

This is consistent with our first passage of Euhemerus,[30] in which Zeus traveled across the world, was received by local potentates (who bear the names of the regional manifestations of Zeus), and was worshipped as a god wherever he went. When we take into account the existence of the cults of Zeus Ataburius, Zeus Labryandius or Labrandius, Zeus-Belus, and Zeus-Casius (see below), the characters who are mentioned in these fragments suggest that Euhemerus was not only more interested in the religious practice of his own day than in history or legend, but that he also believed that current cultic nomenclature had more to say about the time of the gods upon the earth and the origins of their worship than did history. The narrative of Euhemerus is intended not as history, but as an explanation of the local and regional epithets of Zeus, and as a justification of his identification with certain foreign gods, all contributing to the idea of a single, universal cult of Zeus.

The titles of Ataburius and Labryandius, noted by Lactantius, are the epithets under which Zeus was worshipped at two local shrines. The cult of Zeus at Labranda (or Labraunda) in Caria took a distinctly Carian form.[31] His cult statue depicted Zeus holding an axe (rather than the usual scepter or thunderbolt), his cult name was supposed to be derived from *labrys,* the Carian word for axe,[32] and the shrine was dedicated to Zeus Stratius,[33] to whom, Herodotus tells us, only the Carians made offerings.[34] The temple of Zeus Ataburius was built on Mount Atabyris, the highest mountain on Rhodes.[35] This cult seems to have had strong affinities with Crete, the original home, according to Euhemerus, of the traveling Zeus:[36] certain traditions held that it had been founded by the Cretan Althaemenes,[37] the shrine included two bronze bulls (which reportedly lowed in times of danger to the state)[38] reminiscent of the bull motif common on Crete, and Crete could be seen from Mount Atabyris.[39] The cult of Zeus Ataburius, with a number of its peculiar features, was introduced

30. Diod. Sic. 6.1.10.

31. Ael. *NA* 12.30; cf. Plin. *HN* 32.2.7 (6). See *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum* 2691e, 2750, 2896.

32. Plut. *Quaest. Graec.* 45 (*Mor.* 301F–302A). On the double axe and Zeus Labryandius, in the fuller context of the cult of the sky god, see A. Cook, *Zeus: A Study in Ancient Religion,* vol. 2, part 1 (Cambridge, 1925), 559–99. Ael. *NA* 12.30 suggests rather that the cult name was taken from the "furious" (*labros*) rainstorms sent by Zeus.

33. Hdt. 5.119.2; Strabo 14.2.23 (659); Ael. *NA* 12.30.

34. Hdt. 5.119.2.

35. Pind. *Ol.* 7.87; Strabo 14.2.12 (655); see Cook, *Zeus* (n. 32 above), 2.2:922–25.

36. Diod. Sic. 5.46.3.

37. Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.2.1; Diod. Sic. 5.59.2.

38. *Schol. vet. in Pind. Olymp.* 7.159; Tzetz. *Chil.* 4.390; cf. Cyril. *Adv. Iul.* 3.88 (Migne, *PG* 76 636A); see Cook, *Zeus,* vol. 1 (Cambridge, 1914), 643; T. J. Dunbabin, *The Western Greeks* (Oxford, 1948), 320.

39. Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.2.1; Diod. Sic. 5.59.2.

to Sicily by Rhodian settlers at their colony of Acragas (Agrigentum).[40] For all their distinctive features, and their isolation to a limited number of locations, both of these cults represent the worship of the one Zeus, the chief god of the Greek pantheon. Euhemerus' explanation of the traveling Zeus and a local ruler jointly initiating their own worship accounted for not only the local epithet, but also for the peculiar practices of a local cult to a universal god.

It might not even have been necessary for Euhemerus to deduce the names of his putative local rulers from the epithets of Zeus, since there are late attestations of traditional figures from the lower orders of divinity (if not humanity) who gave their names to Labranda and Atabyris, and whose names correspond to those of the hosts of Jupiter in Lactantius. Labrandus was said to be one of the Curetes, who went to Caria in response to an oracle.[41] Mount Atabyris, or Atabyron, was supposed to be named for Ataburius, a Telchine.[42] The local rulers and hosts of Zeus in Euhemerus might have been based on such legendary, eponymous characters.

According to Euhemerus, Zeus was worshipped on his fictional island of Panchaea as "Zeus Triphylius,"[43] and it is tempting to see in this name a further example of Euhemerus explaining Zeus' local epithets as a combination of his own name and that of his host. As in the case of Zeus Ataburius and Zeus Labryandius, there is a geographical location from which the epithet might be derived: the region of Triphylia on the coast of the Peloponnese, between Elis and Messenia. Likewise, there is a legendary character, Triphylus, the son of Arcas, who reputedly gave his name to the region,[44] and might have served as the putative host of Zeus. But there is no evidence for an actual cult of "Zeus Triphylius," whose existence Euhemerus might be trying to explain.[45] Euhemerus himself explains the epithet Triphylius as being given on account of the three peoples or tribes who made up the population of Panchaea: the Panchaeans, Oceanites, and Doians.[46] There is, moreover, no reason, according to Euhemerus' explanation of the epithets of Zeus, why a (possible) local Peloponnesian cult name should be used of Zeus on an island off Arabia in the distant Ocean (Casius and Belus, for instance, are not transported, but located at the sites of the cults of Zeus-Casius and Zeus-Belus). We should, therefore, hesitate to add Triphylius to the list of Zeus' epithets that Euhemerus derived from the names of his hosts, and

40. Polyb. 9.27.7; see Cook, *Zeus,* 2.2:910; Dunbabin, *Western Greeks* (n. 38 above), 178, 311, 316, 320. There is also evidence that the cult of Zeus Ataburius spread to Scythia, see Cook, *Zeus,* 2.2:925.

41. *Etym. Magn.,* s.v. Εὔδωνος (ed. T. Gaisford, 389.55). Strabo (10.3.7) says that the divine Curetes of Crete and Phrygia were confused with the Curetes of Acharnania and Aetolia, a mortal people mentioned by Homer (*Il.* 9.529), because they bore the same name.

42. Steph. Byz., s.v. Ἀτάβυρον.

43. Diod. Sic. 5.42.5, 44.5, 6.1.6; Lactant. *Div. inst*. 1.11.33.

44. Polyb. 4.77.8; cf. Paus. 10.9.5.

45. Euhemerus, and authors who obviously depend on him, offer the only attestation of "Triphylius" as an epithet of Zeus.

46. Diod. Sic. 5.44.6. Strabo (8.337) says that Triphylia was named for the three tribes of peoples in that country. Euhemerus' epithet for Zeus might also be derived from Homer's lines on Tlepolemus in the Catalogue of Ships (*Il.* 2.667–70): αὐτὰρ ὅ γ' ἐς Ῥόδον ἶξεν ἀλώμενος, ἄλγεα πάσχων. / τριχθὰ δὲ ᾤκηθεν καταφυλαδόν, ἠδὲ φίληθεν / ἐκ Διός, ὅς τε θεοῖσι καὶ ἀνθρώποισιν ἀνάσσει, / καί σφιν θεσπέσιον πλοῦτον κατέχευε Κρονίων ("But taking flight they came to Rhodes, suffering hardships. / And they settled themselves in three divisions, according to their tribes, and were beloved / Of Zeus, who is lord of gods and men; / And the son of Cronus shed abundant wealth upon them.") Note that the triple division by tribes is associated with the patronage of Zeus, at least by proximity, and might have suggested a more substantial connection of the two ideas.

be cautioned that this origin of cult names which Euhemerus hypothesized explains only so much of the mechanics of his fiction.

BELUS AND CASIUS

Even if the story of Zeus the traveler and his establishment of joint cults to himself and his hosts cannot account for all of the features of Euhemerus' narrative, it certainly explains the appearance of Belus. At least from the time of Herodotus, Belus, the god of Babylon, was identified with Zeus, the chief god of the Greeks.[47] *Bel* or *Ba'al* (meaning "lord") was the title given to several deities throughout the Near East (who were also identified with Zeus),[48] but in the Greek imagination Belus was overwhelmingly associated with Babylon[49] (and it seems that the other cults of Bel might have in fact depended on that at Babylon[50]). Modern scholarship might understand the Bel of Babylon as a distinct god, who was, as a result of syncretism, identified with Zeus, but to the Greeks Belus was simply the local epithet at Babylon of the universal Zeus. Just as Ataburius was Zeus' particular name on Mount Atabyris (or the cult sites derived from it) and Labryandius at Labranda, so Belus was his name at Babylon. And Euhemerus explained the origin of this local cult of Zeus precisely as he did others: Belus was the host of Zeus at Babylon.[51] Diodorus' excerpt does not explicitly state that a joint cult to "Zeus-Belus" was established at Babylon, but the case of Belus fits the pattern. Diodorus does say that all of the peoples visited by Zeus proclaimed him a god, and that Belus hospitably received him,[52] just as Ataburus

47. Hdt. 1.181.2, 3.158.2; Ctesias in Diod. Sic. 2.8.7, 9.4; Berossus in *FGrH* 680, F 1.8, 9, F 12; Plin. *HN* 6.30 (121); Dio Cass. 79.8.5, 40.4; Philo of Byblos, *FGrH* 790 F 2 = Euseb. *Praep. evang.* 1.10.38a; Nonnus *Dion.* 3.291; Agathias *Hist.* 2.24.8; see Cook, *Zeus* (n. 38 above), p. 756, n. 6, p. 757, n. 1; J. Teixidor, *The Pantheon of Palmyra* (Leiden, 1979), 9, 11, 93; G. McEwan, *Priest and Temple in Hellenistic Babylonia* (Wiesbaden, 1981), 187.

48. The equivalence of Zeus with Ba'al Shamîn ("the Lord of the Heavens") is noted by Cook (*Zeus,* 1:191–92); F. Cumont (*Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*[4] [Paris, 1929], 118–19, 121–22); J. Teixidor (*The Pagan God: Popular Religion in the Greco-Roman Near East* [Princeton, N.J. 1977], 139). Noted in Phoenicia by R. du Mesnil du Buisson (*Nouvelles études sur les dieux et les mythes de Canaan* [Leiden, 1973], 41–42, 50, 194); Teixidor (*Pagan God,* 26–29, 35). Noted at Palmyra by Cook, *Zeus,* vol. 3 (1940), part 2, 1112); Teixidor (*Pagan God,* 115, 123, 133, 135, 143); Teixidor (*Pantheon* [n. 47 above], 20–21, 25, 38, 49 [see *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum,* 4482, 4485]). On the temple of Bel in Palmyra Belus is depicted in the role of Zeus in the Titanomachy, combatting anguipedal giants; E. Will, "Bel," *LIMC* 3.1:91, relief 11. The chariot in which Belus rides in the Palmyrene relief is also associated with Zeus in the temple of Zeus Theos in Dura-Europos; see M. Rostovtzeff, *Dura-Europos and Its Art* (Oxford, 1938), 63.

49. In addition to the references in n. 47, see also Diod. Sic. 17.112.3 (738); Joseph. *AJ* 10.11.1 (224), from Berossus, *Ap.* 1.192, from Ps.-Hecataeus; Arr. *Anab.* 3.16.4, 7.17.1; Paus. 1.16.4, 8.33.3; Dionys. Per. 1005–7.

50. S. Dalley ("Bel at Palmyra and Elsewhere in the Parthian Period," *Aram* 7 [1995]: 137–51) shows that the character and cult of Bel at Palmyra in the Roman period are connected—by far more than remote linguistic affinities—to the worship of Bel in Babylon, as well as to that in Assyria, which had survived through Seleucid and into Roman times; see also Teixidor, *Pagan God,* 138.

51. It is possible that in Euhemerus' system Belus was accorded worship not simply because he had been the host of Zeus, but also because of certain benefactions to mankind. Pliny (*HN* 6.30 [121]) describes Belus as *inventor sideralis scientiae* (cf. Sen. *Q Nat.* 3.29.1). In Diodorus' précis of Euhemerus it is noted that Uranus observed the stars from "Triphylian Olympus" on Panchaea (Diod. Sic. 5.44.6), and Dionysius Scytobrachion says that the common people considered Uranus a god and worshipped him because of his benefactions (which included the introduction of the calendar) and his knowledge of the stars (Diod. Sic. 3.56.4–5). Winiarczyk (*Euhemeros,* 143–46, 167) distinguishes a "Stoic Euhemerism," which relied heavily on the theory that *euergesia* led to apotheosis, from a Euhemerism dependent on the *Sacred History;* he would probably not associate these benefactions of Belus with the writing of Euhemerus himself.

52. Diod. Sic. 6.1.10.

and Labryandus (with whom he did establish joint cults) served as his hosts.[53] Euhemerus included Babylon in the itinerary of Zeus in order to suggest that even the most exotic examples of syncretism were manifestations of a single cult of the universal Zeus.

Euhemerus' point seems to be reiterated in a passage from Pausanias' *Description of Greece*. Pausanias is discussing the conquest of Zancle on Sicily by the Messenians and the foundation by Manticlus, one of the Messenian leaders, of the temple of Heracles Manticlus at Sicilian Messene:[54]

> Μάντικλος δὲ καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν Μεσσηνίοις τοῦ Ἡρακλέους ἐποίησε, καὶ ἔστιν ἐκτὸς τείχους ὁ θεὸς ἱδρυμένος, Ἡρακλῆς καλούμενος Μάντικλος, καθάπερ γε καὶ Ἄμμων ἐν Λιβύῃ καὶ ὁ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι Βῆλος ὁ μὲν ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς Αἰγυπτίου Βήλου τοῦ Λιβύης ὄνομα ἔσχεν, Ἄμμων δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱδρυσαμένου ποιμένος.
>
> Manticlus also built for the Messenians the temple of Heracles. The god's temple is outside the walls, and he is called Heracles Manticlus, just as Ammon in Libya and Belus in Babylon. Belus has his name from the Egyptian man, the son of Libya, and Ammon from the shepherd who founded the shrine.

Pausanias does not mention the name of Zeus, but in the explanation of a cult whose god had a composite name, he is quite obviously referring to the fact that at Babylon Zeus was worshipped as Zeus-Belus and in Libya as Zeus-Ammon. It is intriguing that Pausanias should bring up joint cults and the names of two gods (both traditionally equated with Zeus) mentioned by Euhemerus in a discussion of the city that might very well have been the birthplace of Euhemerus.[55] Ammon appears in the *Sacred History*[56] as the destroyer of Euhemerus' fictional people, the Doians, who laid waste their cities and drove them out of the island of Panchaea.[57] There may seem to be every reason to see the case of Ammon as parallel to that of Belus. Like Belus, Ammon was a local god, most often associated specifically with Libya,[58] and identified with Zeus.[59] There is, however, not enough evidence to confirm that Pausanias borrowed from Euhemerus in this passage, or to indicate that Ammon was another host of Zeus in the *Sacred History.* The fragments of Euhemerus suggest that Ammon was a ruler or general—sufficiently powerful, at any rate, to expel an entire people

53. Lactant. *Div. inst.* 1.22.23.

54. Paus. 4.23.10.

55. Eusebius (*Praep. evang*. 2.2.59B; Diod. Sic. 6.1.1) says only that Euhemerus was Messenian. Scholarly opinion leans toward identifying Sicilian, rather than Peloponnesian, Messene as his hometown; see Winiarczyk, *Euhemeros,* 7–8, and, more fully, F. De Angelis and B. Garstad, "Excavating an Ancient Writer: Euhemerus in Time and Space," a paper presented at the meeting of the Classical Association of the Canadian West, Calgary, March 2003.

56. Ammon may have appeared in the context of a discussion of Egypt in the Sacred History, since Pliny (*HN* 36.12 [79]) tells us that Euhemerus also discussed the Pyramids, but it is impossible to confirm this. Winiarczyk's notes (*Reliquiae* [n. 4 above], 24 [test. 34]), suggest—baselessly, in my opinion—that Euhemerus' Ammon is to be equated with Zeus Ammon, and that the Doians were expelled because of their hostility to the other inhabitants.

57. Diod. Sic. 5.44.6–7 (τοὺς δὲ Δώρους, οὓς ὕστερον ὑπ' Ἄμμωνος ἐκβληθῆναι) must mean that the Doians were driven *from* Panchaea, not as refugees *to* Panchaea, since they do not appear in the list of current inhabitants of Panchaea (Diod. Sic. 5.42.4). Ammon also appears, quite prominently, in the narrative of Dionysius Scytobrachion, a successor to Euhemerus (Diod. Sic. 3.68–73).

58. See, in addition to the references in the next note, Hdt. 1.46.3, 2.54; Pl. *Plt*. 257b; Diod. Sic. 17.49, 50; Strabo 17.1.42, 43; Paus. 3.18.3, 9.16.1, 10.13.1; Plut. *Lys*. 20.5; Macrob. *Sat*. 1.21.19.

59. Pind. *Pyth*. 4.1–16, cf. frag. 36; Hdt. 2.42.5, cf. 2.55.3; Hecataeus of Abdera (Diod. Sic. 1.13.2); Curt. 4.7.23; Nonnus *Dion*. 13.371–73; see Cook, *Zeus,* 1:348–61, 3.1:882–84, n. 2.

and raze their cities—and not a shepherd, as in Pausanias.[60] Moreover, not only is Ammon not explicitly said to have been a host of Zeus, but he also seems, according to the *Sacred History,* to have lived somewhat later than Zeus.[61] And in Pausanias (as in Hecataeus of Abdera) Belus of Babylon is connected with the character of the same name from Greek legend, Belus, the son of Libya and Poseidon, although we have no reason to believe that this connection was made by Euhemerus. There is also a subtle distinction in the principles of Euhemerus and of Pausanias. Whereas Euhemerus suggests that Zeus and his hosts (who provided his epithets) were both historical figures and cofounders of their joint cults, Pausanias seems to indicate that the epithets of the gods (understood in the traditional sense) in certain places were derived from the names of the human founders of their cults in those particular places, and only the founders should be considered mortal. While Pausanias may not be indebted to Euhemerus in this passage, he does demonstrate a similar approach, using at least one of the same examples, to the problem of local cults to a supposedly universal deity and the peculiar epithets or native names used at those cult sites. Pausanias also shows that it was a problem of reasonably broad interest, which was dealt with by more than one mythologist.

The case of Casius presents a close parallel to that of Belus (even if that of Ammon does not), and confirms a number of the principles that led Euhemerus to include Belus in his narrative. Zeus was worshipped as Zeus Casius (or Cassius) on Mount Casius in the vicinity of Antioch,[62] as well as on another Mount Casius, a sandy hill between Lake Sirbonis and Pelusium in Egypt.[63] The cult of Zeus Casius was also introduced to the town of Cassiope on Corcyra (Corfu),[64] perhaps gaining popularity there on account of the fortuitous similarity in names.[65] Euhemerus makes Casius a local ruler, who gave his name to the mountain (almost certainly the one in Syria), and entertained Zeus.[66] He is once again explaining the origin of a local cult in which Zeus is worshipped under a specific name. As in the case of Ataburius and Labryandius, Euhemerus has taken an epithet derived from the geographical location of the cult and created from it a personal name for the host of Zeus in his narrative.[67] And as with Belus, the name and attributes of the Greek Zeus were in actuality grafted

60. The idea that the shrine of Zeus Ammon in Libya had been established by a shepherd by the name of Ammon seems to be attested only in Pausanias.

61. Presumably, in the narrative of Euhemerus, the Doians were resident on Panchaea when Zeus received the epithet "Triphylius" there (see n. 45 above), and were *later* (ὕστερον in Diod. Sic. 5.44.6) driven away by Ammon.

62. Theoph. *Ad Autol.* 1.10; Amm. Marc. 22.14.4; Lib. 18.172; *Anth. Pal.* 6.332; *Suda,* s.v. Κάσιοι (K 454); cf. SHA *Hadr.* 14.3; Plin. *HN* 5.22 (80); see Cook, *Zeus,* 2.2:981–83.

63. Strabo, 16.2.33 (760); Luc. 8.858; Plin. *HN* 5.14 (68); Sext. Emp. *Pyr.* 3.24 (224); Steph. Byz., s.v. Κάσιον; *Suda,* s.v. Κάσιοι (K 454); see Cook, *Zeus,* 2.2:984–85; cf. *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum* 7044b.

64. Suet. *Ner.* 22; Plin. *NH* 4.12 (52); Procop. *Goth.* 8.22.25–26; see *CIL* 3.576, 577; see also Cook, *Zeus,* 2.2:906–7. There is also evidence of a dedication to Zeus Casius at Epidaurus (Cook, *Zeus,* 2.2:894).

65. Cook, *Zeus,* 2.2:907.

66. Diod. Sic. 6.1.10, as quoted above, p. 247. Philo of Byblus also includes an eponymous giant, Cassius, who gave his name to the mountain (Euseb. *Praep. evang.* 1.10.19 = *FGrH* 790, F 1). Stephanus Byzantius (s.v. Κάσιον) says that the temple of Zeus Casius (presumably the one near Pelusium) was named for a "Casus, the son of Cleochus." Malalas *Chron.* 2.6, 8.14, mentions a Casus, the son of Inachus, who was associated with the region of Antioch.

67. Lactant. *Div. inst.* 1.22.23 notes that the example of Jupiter Casius is a parallel to those of Jupiter Ataburius and Jupiter Labryandius.

onto an older native deity,[68] and the worship of Zeus Casius represented a reasonably well known, but—in the Greek imagination, at least—highly localized cult. The example of Casius, along with that of Belus, demonstrated for Euhemerus that all examples of the cult of Zeus were in fact manifestations of the worship of a single god.

THE INFLUENCE OF EUHEMERUS' BELUS

Euhemerus' treatment of Belus certainly changed the way in which Belus was understood by many Greek writers, but perhaps not entirely as he had intended. Diodorus and Strabo refer not to "the temple of Zeus-Belus" (τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Βήλου τὸ ἱρὸν),[69] as Herodotus has it, but rather to "the tomb of Belus" (ὁ τοῦ Βήλου τάφος).[70] Quintus Curtius Rufus notes that the palace of Belus was still a landmark in Babylon (*Belus, cuius regia ostenditur*[71]), obviously referring to the temple. Aelian relates the story that when Xerxes broke into "the monument of ancient Belus" (τοῦ Βήλου τοῦ ἀρχαίου τὸ μνῆμα) he found a glass sarcophagus containing a body in olive oil,[72] presumably the body of Belus himself. Each of these later writers follows the literal sense of the *Sacred History* in carefully distinguishing the identities of Zeus and of Belus (the composite name "Zeus-Belus" is not used), and in treating Belus as a mortal (he has a tomb or palace, not a temple). In so doing, however, they assume that the narrative of Euhemerus meant to set the historical record straight concerning the so-called gods and their time on earth. But Euhemerus never suggests that a god's cult was invalid because he had been a mortal. Indeed, he describes without comment or criticism the elaborate temples and sumptuous worship of the Panchaeans, who knew full well the mortal origins of the gods.[73] Nor does he insist on a separation of Zeus from those men who provided him with epithets. Rather he indicates a unity of all of the cults of Zeus under whatever name. Euhemerus would most likely have endorsed the cult of Zeus-Belus, and sought only to explain its origin.

The scandal of several Zeuses, with various localities or parentages, was brought to light by a number of ancient authors, particularly Christians seeking to demonstrate the errors of paganism.[74] Euhemerus' story of Zeus traveling the world and founding joint cults with his hosts was an attempt to salvage the unity of pagan godhead and worship by showing that there was only one Zeus at the bottom of local cults with peculiar epithets and customs.[75] More than just fighting a rearguard action against the excesses of rationalism and the embarrassing discoveries of erudite

68. The cult of Zeus Casius, in Syria, at any rate, probably developed from the Semitic worship of a stele (or *baetyl*) associated with the god of the mountain, as illustrated on the coins of Seleucia Pieria (see Cook, *Zeus,* 2.2:982, figs. 880–84); see Teixidor, *Pagan God,* 38–39.

69. Hdt. 1.181.2, 3.158.2.

70. Diod. Sic. 17.112.3; Strabo, 16.1.5.

71. Curt. 5.1.24.

72. Ael. *VH* 13.3. This story is undoubtedly related to that told by Ctesias of Xerxes' request to see the tomb of "Belitanas" (Phot. *Bibl*. 72, 39A). Perhaps it was the influence of Euhemerus that made Belus of Belitanas.

73. Diod. Sic. 5.44, 46.2, 5–7.

74. Xen. *Symp*. 8.9; Plaut. *Cas.* 334; Cic. *Nat.D.* 3.21 (53); Diod. Sic. 3.61.1; Plin. *HN* 2.53 (140); Theoph. *Ad Autol*. 1.10; Clem. Al. *Protr.* 2.28.1; Tert. *Apol*. 14, *Ad nat*. 1.10; Min. Fel. *Oct*. 22.6; Ampelius *Liber memorialis* 9.1; Arn. *Adv. nat*. 4.13; Lactantius, *Div. inst*. 1.11.48; August. *De civ. D.* 7.11–12, *Quaestiones in Heptateuchem* 7.16; Lydus *Mens*. 4.71.

75. A. Pease, in his commentary on Cicero's *De natura deorum* (*M. Tulli Ciceronis "De natura deorum" libri III* [Cambridge, Mass., 1957], 2:1092), notes that while the mythological digression in Book 3 of that work should, according to its introduction, address the problem of Euhemerism, it is, in fact, "concerned with a quite different matter, the plurality of homonymous gods." (The introduction is directed "against those

mythologists, Euhemerus promoted a benign internationalism that knit the peoples of the world together in the worship of a single Zeus.[76] His theological explanations cannot be read without his utopian vision, and Panchaea is home to numerous peoples, ancient (Panchaeans, Oceanites, and Doians[77]) and modern (Panchaeans, Oceanites, Indians, Scythians, and Cretans[78]), from all over the world, who are unified through the worship of Triphylian Zeus. Perhaps Euhemerus self-consciously encouraged the syncretism of the universal Zeus with the Zeuses of local cults and with the chief gods of other nations; perhaps he sought only to explain the results of such syncretism, which had, by his day, been going on for centuries.[79] In either case, Euhemerus demonstrates a positive attitude to the religion of his time. He may have had little respect for traditional myth, and was willing to create "new myths"[80] to protect and promote traditional cult, but Euhemerus was not a destructive atheist, as he has often been portrayed by so many ancient and modern writers.[81]

Benjamin Garstad
Brooklyn College

---

who say that those gods from the human race were translated into the heaven not in fact but in belief only," *Nat.D.* 3.21 [53]). Our present investigation should have demonstrated that a discussion of many gods. with the same name *is* indeed a discussion of Euhemerism.

76. Whether this internationalism gave expression to ideas that had been fermenting throughout the fourth century B.C.E., or was inspired by the career of Alexander the Great, must await a lengthier discussion. See F. De Angelis and B. Garstad, "Excavating an Ancient Writer," read to CACW/CAPN (March, 2003).

77. Diod. Sic. 5.44.6.

78. Diod. Sic. 5.42.4.

79. Winiarczyk (*Euhemeros,* 107–17) argues that the *Sacred History* was intended to be an explanation of the origin of religion, and as such also a contribution to the discussion of early Hellenistic ruler cults. Winiarczyk is similarly unsure whether Euhemerus meant to promote, or simply to explain, the ruler cult.

80. An aspect of his writing sharply criticized by Plutarch (*De Is. et Os.* 23 [360A]).

81. This paper is gratefully dedicated to the memory of Rev. Charles Armour (1915–2004), minister, teacher, friend, *contubernalis secundum patriam*.

BEST OF BROTHERS: FRATERNAL IMAGERY IN PANEGYRICS ON MAXIMIAN HERCULIUS

> *Everyone likes flattery; and when you come to Royalty, you should lay it on with a trowel.*
>
> —Benjamin Disraeli

In 364, the new Augustus Valentinian raised his younger brother Valens to his own rank of Augustus. The contemporary observer Ammianus Marcellinus wrote of this the following:

> in hoc tamen negotio, Valentinianus morem institutum antiquitus supergressus, non Caesares sed Augustos germanum nuncupavit et filium, benevole satis. nec enim quisquam antehac adscivit sibi pari potestate collegam, praeter principem Marcum, qui Verum, adoptivum fratrem, absque diminutione aliqua maiestatis imperatoriae, socium fecit.[1]

The author is most grateful to C. E. V. Nixon for his advice on an earlier version of this article. It is the latest courtesy in a twenty-five-year association as teacher, supervisor, colleague, and friend. Thanks are also owed to the anonymous reviewer for alerting the author to further points of evidence.

1. Amm. Marc. 27.6.16.