

'MENELAOS' IN THE SPARTAN AGIAD KING-LIST¹

	V	Dorystheus	ann. XXVIII
	VI	Agisilaus	ann. XXX
	VII	Cemenelaus	ann. XLIII
	VIII	Archelaus	ann. LX
10	VIII	Celeclus	ann. XL
	X	Alcamanus	ann. XXVII
	XI	Automedus	ann. XXV

(Excerpta Latina Barbari, f. 42 b 6–12)²

This is the latter part of the Spartan Agiad king-list as given by the late Latin source nicknamed 'Barbarus' by J. J. Scaliger who detected under the seventh name in our list, Cemenelaus, the Greek *καὶ Μενέλαος* which appeared to provide a well-known name in place of something obscure or very corrupt.³ Its importance lies in the fact that Barbarus has been heavily relied upon to reconstruct the lists of the chronographers Africanus and Eusebios as well as Hippolytos;⁴ in particular Jacoby, following H. Gelzer and J. Brandis, accepted that such a king 'Menelaos' was found in Eusebios' Agiad list taken from Diodoros.⁵ Since Diodoros seemed to derive his list from Apollodoros, 'Menelaos' was given a place in his Agiad list as well.⁶ So short a step it was from Dark Age Gaul to Hellenistic Athens!

Against the introduction of 'Menelaos' it has often been pointed out that the name does not occur in the Agiad lists of either Herodotos or Pausanias, nor is it found in any list which derives from Africanus or Eusebios.⁷ There is also a notable corruption in Jerome's Latin version of Eusebios' Canons. The name of the last Agiad king, Alkamenes, is given as 'Thalcamenes' or variants of this in the oldest manuscripts which clearly suggests the Greek Θ ΑΛΚΑΜΕΝΗC, Θ representing the placing of the king as ninth in the list.⁸ Thus it is certain that

¹ I am grateful to W. G. Forrest and the Editors for criticism of an earlier draft of this note. I would also like to thank Professor J. M. Wallace-Hadrill for discussing some Frankish matters with me.

² The text is given as Appendix VI by A. Schoene, *Eusebii Chronicorum Libri Duo*, vol. 1, and in C. Frick, *Chronica Minora* i (1892), 184–371.

³ *Thesaurus Temporum Eusebii Pamphili Chronicorum Canonum* (Leiden, 1606), p.63 (of appendix containing Barbarus etc.). C. Müller, *Frag. Hist. Graec.* v, p. xxxvii (n.) suggested more ingeniously 'Ἀγεσίλαος λ' ἡ κεῖμένη ἄλλως μδ'.

⁴ Frick's edn. gives a useful comparison of sources pp. lxxxiii–ccv and there is also a full account in Jacoby, *RE* vi (1906), 1566–76. For two of the main uses of Barbarus, see E. Schwarz, 'Die Königslisten des Eratosthenes und Kastor', *Abhand. der königl. Gesell. der Wissen. zu Göttingen*,

Phil. -Hist. Klasse, xl (1895), 3, 43 ff.; R. Helm, *Hippolytus, Die Chronik* (Griech. Christl. Schrift. 46, 1955), pp. x ff.

⁵ J. Brandis, *Commentatio de temporum Graecorum antiquissimorum rationibus* (Bonn, 1857), p. 30; H. Gelzer, *Sextus Julius Africanus und die Byzantinische Chronographie*, i. 141–4; Jacoby, *Apollodoros Chronik* (Berlin, 1902), pp. 85–7.

⁶ *FGrHist* 244 F 62.

⁷ C. Müller, loc. cit.; E. Meyer, *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte*, i. 181 n.; Schwartz, loc. cit., p. 62; A. von Gutschmid, *Kleine Schriften* iv. 20 f.; A. Bauer, 'Die Agiadenlisten der Chronographen' in 'Eine Alexandrinische Weltchronik', *Denkschr. der Akad. Wien*, 51 (1905), 105–14; G. L. Huxley, *Early Sparta* (1962), p. 102 n. 71; W. G. Forrest, *CQ* N.S. 19 (1969), 109.

⁸ R. Helm, *Die Chronik des Hieronymus* (Griech. Christl. Schrift. 47), p. 83b; J. K.

in Jerome's Greek original, that is in Eusebios' Canons, Alkamenes was the ninth Agiad king and 'Menelaos' could not have been included since this would have made Alkamenes tenth. Therefore it does not appear that 'Menelaos' was included in either Eusebios' *Chronographia* or his Canons.

There is a passage in Malalas (p.90, 4) which both Gelzer and Jacoby tried to use to support their case because it appeared to count ten Agiad kings in Africanus' list and thus would allow room for 'Menelaos':¹ Ἐν αὐτοῖς δὲ τοῖς χρόνοις ἐβασίλευσε τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων πρῶτος Εὐρυσθέης ἔτη μβ', καὶ ἄλλοι βασιλεῖς μετ' αὐτὸν ἡ' ὁμοῦ ἐβασίλευσαν ἔτη σμξ'. καὶ ὁ Ἀλκμανος ἔτη λξ'. καὶ κατέσχευ ἡ βασιλεία Λακεδαιμονίων τὰ πάντα ἔτη τκε', ὡς Ἀφρικανὸς ὁ σοφώτατος συνεγράψατο. The totals of 246 (σμξ') and 325 (τκε') years match those found in Eusebios,² and Gelzer argued that these totals were not part of what Malalas took from Africanus but that he got them from Eusebios or a derivative source. However this does not seem very plausible. The two reign-lengths that are given are also the same as those given by Eusebios and are consistent with the totals.³ There seems to be no reason to doubt that the whole passage does come from Africanus and the explanation for the apparent count of ten kings is much more likely to be a double count of Eurystheus, that is an inclusive count of the eight μετ' αὐτὸν which includes Eurystheus himself too.⁴

If we can reject the support that has been claimed from this piece of evidence the argument for the addition of 'Menelaos' is solely that he appears to fill an awkward gap of thirty or so years in the reconstructions of the Agiad list.⁵ And because he seemed such a convenient *interrex* the dubious elements of his pedigree have been, I think, too hastily brushed aside.

If we look more closely at Barbarus' list we can see for a start that 'Cemenelaus' is not the only odd name. We also have an eleventh king 'Automedus' after 'Alcamanus' (Alkamenes). This may be a mistaken duplication of 'Automenes' from the Korinthian list; it is also close to 'Automidus' the name of the second Sikyon priest.⁶ The Sikyon list is some distance before the Agiad list but the Korinthian list follows it immediately and some confusion here is likely enough. The reign-length given to 'Automedus' may easily be a repeat of the first three letters (XXV) of Alcamanus' XXVII. We notice that Alkamenes has lost ten years and there are a few other oddities in the reign-lengths,⁷ but something more interesting has happened with Agisilaus who precedes Cemenelaus. In Eusebios' list he has forty-four years, but here he is given the round figure of thirty and it is Cemenelaus who achieves forty-four years' reign. This certainly looks like a deliberate piece of interpolation. But whose work was it and when was it done?

Fotheringham, *The Bodleian Manuscript of Jerome's version of Eusebius' Chronicle* (Oxford, 1905), pp.13 f.

¹ Gelzer, op. cit., p.142; Jacoby, *Apollodors Chronik*, p.86.

² Cf. Jacoby, *ibid.*, p.84 with the second and third lists of his table and also the fifth (Synkellos). Cedrenus (i.215, 23) also gives the same details as Malalas without the subtotal and reign-length of Alkamenes.

³ Most sources give thirty-seven years for Alkamenes and all give forty-two for Eurysthenes.

⁴ The explanation for the total of 350 years of Spartan rule given at the end of

Barbarus' list and also by Synkellos and Jerome must certainly be connected with the start of the Ephor list in 754/3: Schwarz, loc. cit., p.64, and Jacoby, op. cit., p.138. In any case the total for Barbarus' reigns as they stand is 370 years.

⁵ So Jacoby still pleaded in *FGrHist* ii D, pp.745–6.

⁶ Brandis, op. cit., p.29, suggested a link with Automenes. The Sikyon list (40a) is found on p.217 of Schoene's edition.

⁷ Agis has two years instead of one year; Echestratos has thirty-four instead of thirty-five years.

The Greek composite chronicle which Barbarus translated was a version of the 'Chronica Alexandrina' extended at some time in the sixth century since it included the reign of Anastasios down to 518.¹ If we can safely assume that 'Menelaos' was not found in the lists of Eusebios or Africanus or Apollodoros he may still have been introduced into the Greek antecedent of Barbarus at some stage. Admittedly he does not occur in the Goleniščev papyrus which also belongs to the sixth century as Bauer pointed out, but this may be because Barbarus' source followed a slightly different tradition of the 'Chronica Alexandrina'.² There were of course particular links between the name 'Menelaos' and Egypt. The legendary visit of the Homeric Menelaos clearly made some impression and lasting influence. Plutarch claimed there were many cults of Helen and Menelaos in Egypt while criticizing Herodotos' account of Menelaos' activities there.³ The brother of Ptolemy I Soter, son of Lagos and Arsinoe, was also called Menelaos and was the first holder of the priesthood of the Alexander cult as well as having an area named after him in north-west Delta.⁴ Not surprisingly the name Menelaos continued to be quite popular in Egypt and is still found in late papyri.⁵ There may therefore have been sufficient local pride in the connection with the Homeric and Spartan Menelaos to induce the interpolation of this name into the Spartan Agiad king-list by an Alexandrian chronicler or copyist at some date. Perhaps a fairly late date some time in the fourth century or the fifth century is more likely than an early one if such an interpolation was made but there is not a great deal to argue either way.

There is however one point which makes me uneasy about this explanation. It does seem rather naïve for an interpolator to leave such a clear sign of his interpolation as the *καὶ* which is supposed to precede the name *Μενέλαος*. Except where there are joint reigns there is clearly no need for such a connection in a list of this kind. It also seems odd that a Greek interpolator should have included the *καὶ* if he was conscientious enough to transpose the reign-lengths of Agesilaos and 'Menelaos'.

There remains the alternative possibility that the name 'Cemenelaus' was added by Barbarus and does not derive from his Greek source. He does introduce the Franks at two places. In the Alban king-list the third king is 'Francus Silvius' and in the Latin king-list which closely precedes the Agiad list the fifth king is also 'Francus Silvius'.⁶ These 'improvements' in the text suggest that Barbarus was giving his own version of the legend that the Franks had an Homeric pedigree. The more or less contemporary writings of 'Fredegar' and the *Liber Historiae Francorum* claim that the Franks were descended from the Trojans just as the Goths were also linked to the Trojan saga via the Scythians and Amazons.⁷ If

¹ Frick, p.330, 3; f. 48b. Cf. his introduction, pp.lxxxvii ff.

² Bauer, loc. cit.; Helm, *Hippolytus, Die Chronik*, p.xiv gives an account of the relationship of this papyrus to Barbarus as far as the text of Hippolytos is concerned.

³ Plut. *Mor.* 857 b (*De Herod. mal.* 12) on Hdt. 2. 119; L. R. Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults and ideas of immortality* (Oxford, 1921), pp.322–3. However I can find no evidence that Menelaos was worshipped in Egypt as well as Helen. For the use of her name see *FGrHist* 1 F 305–9 with P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford,

1972), ii. 122 n.55 and e.g. *S.G.U.* 10397, 16.

⁴ Diod. 19. 62–20. 52; Strabo 17.1.18 (801); P. M. Fraser, op. cit. ii. 365 n.215.

⁵ See, e.g. *S.G.U.* 7542, 10; 7620, 11; 9870 *passim*; 10019 (23); 10132, 6; 10309; and 9146 dated sixth/seventh cent.

⁶ f. 23a = Frick, p.242; f. 41b = Frick, p.302.

⁷ Jordanes's summary of Cassiodorus' *Getica*, in *Patr. Lat.* lxix, col. 1259 and on Cassiodorus, A. Momigliano, *Studies in Historiography*, 1966, pp.183, 191–6. 'Fredegar' belongs to the first half of the

'Cemenelaus' was also an interpolated name he could be adding some local flavour and asserting a prestigious link in a similar way. The name does readily suggest the Roman *civitas* Cemenelum, once the capital of Alpes Maritimae, though overshadowed from the sixth century onwards by near-by Nicaea which was more accessible to the sea and, it seems, better defended against the barbarian invasions.¹

Admittedly this precise name does not appear to occur in any other source but there is the localizing adjective 'Cemenelus' which is found as an epithet of Mars.² The ending -aus could easily be copied from the surrounding names 'Agisilaus' and 'Archelaus' in Barbarus' list and therefore be unique as such. There is no very obvious reason that I can see why the name should have been added to the Spartan list. Since Nicaea was after all a Greek foundation it might have seemed appropriate to insert the name in a Greek list and some traces of Spartan history or legend did percolate to the Franks.³ Also the Agiad list is the first Greek list after the Latin list in which we find 'Francus Silvius'.

If this conjecture has any plausibility it would seem to suggest that the author known to us as Barbarus had some special link with the area of Provence and was perhaps of mixed Frankish descent but still felt the effects of Romanization. This area of southern Gaul preserved quite a high degree of culture in the fourth century and later thanks to a large extent to the influence of the monastery on the island of Lérins.⁴ It does not seem inconceivable that the translation of the 'Chronica Alexandrina' was made by Barbarus in this region perhaps in the seventh century, to be eventually copied by the transitional Corbie hand which gives us our Paris manuscript.⁵ Scaliger was really unfair to label his 'excerpta' as

seventh and the *Liber Hist. Franc.* to the early eighth century but they have independent versions of the Trojan legend: ed. B. Krusch, *Mon. Germ. Hist. Script. Rerum Merov.* ii (1889), 42, 45, 47, 93–4, 194 ff.; H. Hommel, 'Die trojanische Herkunft der Franken', *RbM* 99 (1956), 323–41; J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, *The Fourth Book of the Chronicle of Fredegar* (1960), esp. pp. xi–xii and *The Long-Haired Kings* (1962), pp. 79–83; Roger Grand, *Recherches sur l'origine des Francs* (Paris, 1965), pp. 6–14. The Gothic legend may be no earlier than the Frankish version which could be quite independent and have started as early as the fifth century. Our Paris manuscript which preserves Barbarus is dated to the latter half of the eighth century (see below, n. 5) but it might have been a copy of a somewhat earlier original.

¹ A. Longnon, *Géographie de la Gaule au VI^e siècle* (Paris, 1878), p. 460; R. Latouche, 'Nice et Cimiez (V^e–XI^e siècle)' in *Mélanges . . . offerts à M. Ferdinand Lot* . . . (Paris, 1925), pp. 331–58; P. M. Duval, 'Rapport préliminaire sur les fouilles de Cemenelum (Cimiez)', *Gallia* 4 (1946), 77 ff. with frequent reports of later finds in subsequent issues; R. Latouche, 'Cimiez à travers les âges' in *Études*

Médiévales (Univ. of Grenoble, Publ. de la. fac. des lettres et sciences hum. 42), 1966, pp. 165–75 (with some reconsiderations).

² C. B. Pascal, *The Cults of Cisalpine Gaul* (Collections Latomus vol. lxxv, 1964), p. 156 (*CIL* v. 7871).

³ Nicaea was reputedly founded by Massilia, though perhaps quite a late foundation: Strabo 4.1.5 (180), 4.1.9. (184); *RE* xvii.1 (1936), col. 167. On Spartan survivals, see E. Rawson, *The Spartan Tradition in European Thought* (Oxford, 1969), pp. 125–6 who refers to Gregory of Tours's strange Spartan king 'Festus' (? a corruption of Iphitos) and adds the comment, 'To other writers Menelaus might be the only Spartan king worth mentioning.'

⁴ *Histoire de la Provence*, ed. É. Baratier (Toulouse, 1969), pp. 83–6; R. Buchner, *Die Provence in Merowingischer Zeit* (1933), pp. 60 ff.

⁵ Paris Bibl. Nat. Lat. 4884 given as No. 560 in E. A. Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores*, Vol. v (Paris, 1950), and described as a curious mixture of uncial and half-uncial elements of a type found in northern France and dated to the second half of the eighth century.

'conversa ab homine barbaro, inepto, hellenismi et latinitatis imperitissimo'. If the author of this translation did not know much Greek he was by no means unique in this in the seventh and eighth centuries and, as Frick pointed out, for his time he was truly a *doctus homo*;¹ it may therefore not be unreasonable to credit him with some ingenuity in adapting these chronographic lists to suit the political needs of his own age.

In any case whether this explanation of 'Cemenelaus' is near the truth of the matter, or whether it does conceal the Greek 'Menelaos' which was added to the original Greek chronicle, this name has no place in the Agiad lists of Apollodoros or Eusebios. Whenever it was made, it is a curious interpolation which must certainly have deceived more readers than its author ever intended or expected.

University of Ibadan, Nigeria

R. BALL

¹ In his introduction, p.lxxxv.