auspices on behalf of the army. In short, the Greek phrase used in the *Res Gestae* is a makeshift translation. Given that this is so, it would be surprising to find Augustus dropping into Greek in order to express this idea. Nor is it clear that 'You are fighting under my auspices' – even if it accurately reflects the legal situation – meets the demands of the context as an expression of affection and encouragement.

E. Malcovati (*Athenaeum* NS 50 [1972], 385–9) reverted to the vulgate reading *ταῖς Μούσαις*, and suggested that 'warring for the Muses' meant fighting with an eye on the poetic celebration which Horace was preparing for Tiberius' return. If so, the mode of expression is rather obscure; and again one wonders whether it is really the appropriate thing for Augustus, writing to Tiberius at this point, to say.

Those who have discussed the passage do not, on the whole, seem to have paid attention to the origin of the phrase *ἐμοὶ καὶ ταῖς Μούσαις*. Cicero, in *Brutus* 187 (whence, presumably, Valerius Maximus 3.7, ext. 2) narrates the story of Antigenidas the music-teacher, who told a pupil who was unsuccessful in public to 'sing for me and the Muses'. This meant, clearly, that the pupil was not to worry about his lack of popularity, but was to perform (a) in order to gain approval from Antigenidas himself, and (b) for the Muses, i.e. in plain prose, for the satisfaction of doing the job properly.

Cicero quotes Antigenidas in Latin, 'mihi cane et Musis'. The Greek for this would be *ἐμοὶ καὶ ταῖς Μούσαις ᾄδε*. This provides us with an emendation of Augustus' Greek which is very near to the paradosis: *ἐμοὶ καὶ ταῖς Μούσαις ᾄδε στρατηγῶν*. The participle *στρατηγῶν* is sufficient to cancel any literal reference to literature or music, and to make it clear that the advice Augustus is giving to Tiberius in the field of generalship is the same as that given, in the field of music, by Antigenidas to his pupil. The meaning is that Tiberius is not to worry about popularity, but to concentrate on pleasing Augustus, and on doing his job well merely for the satisfaction of doing so.

This, surely, provides us with a sentiment and an expression appropriate to the situation and to the personality of Augustus. It is a genuine Greek quotation, so that there is no problem in accounting for Augustus' lapse into Greek; doubtless Tiberius would appreciate it as such. As for the content, it conveys a reassuring message to Tiberius on his departure: Augustus has confidence in him, and nobody else's opinion really matters.

*University of Newcastle upon Tyne* J. G. F. POWELL

## OCTAVIAN AND ORESTES AGAIN

In an earlier paper[1] it was argued that in the famous chariot simile at the end of the first Georgic, Virgil imitates a passage from the *Choephoroi* of Aeschylus describing the onset of Orestes' madness. It was also suggested that Virgil may have been intentionally drawing a parallel between Octavian and the son of Agamemnon. Orestes avenged his father by murdering his mother Clytemnestra, but in so doing he deepened the guilt that afflicted Argos and thus gave new life to the curse that lay on the house of Tantalus. So too, perhaps, Virgil is warning Octavian that in seeking to avenge his 'father' Caesar by killing his murderers at Philippi he is precipitating civil

[1] 'Octavian and Orestes in the Finale of the First Georgic', CQ 38 [1988], 563–5. For the identification of the charioteer with Octavian cf. Servius *ad loc.*: 'hoc vult dicere: res publica quidem habet optimum imperatorem, sed tanta sunt vitia temporum praeteritorum, quae in dies singulos aucta sunt, quemadmodum in processu equorum cursus augetur, ut ea, licet optimus rector refrenare non possit, sicut et auriga ferventi cursu equos non potest plerumque revocare.'

war, and so continuing the cycle of blood-guilt which similarly afflicts the Roman people. If such a suggestion seems fantastic it can now be supported by analogy from an explicit parallelism of Octavian and Orestes in a passage of Claudian. The first part of the passage in question reads as follows:

> Maurusius Atlas
> Gildonis Furias, Alaricum barbara Peuce
> nutrierat, qui saepe tuum sprevere profana
> mente patrem. Thracum venienti e finibus alter
> Hebri clausit aquas; alter praecepta vocantis
> respuit auxiliisque ad proxima bella negatis
> abiurata palam Libyae possederat arva
>
> (*De Sexto Consulatu Honorii* 104–10)

In 394 Gildo, Count of Africa, refused to aid Theodosius the Great against the rebel Eugenius: subsequently, in 397, he threw off his nominal allegiance to Theodosius' son Honorius, Emperor of the West. The revolt was crushed within a year by troops led on behalf of Honorius and Stilicho by Gildo's loyal brother Mascezel.[2] This victory was, of course, formally attributed to the thirteen-year-old emperor, and so Claudian portrays him as the pious avenger of the many insults offered his father by both Gildo and Alaric.[3] This piety is then compared to that of Orestes and Octavian (Augustus), to their disadvantage:

> quorum nunc meritam repetens non inmemor iram
> suppliciis fruitur natoque ultore triumphat.
> ense Thyestiadae poenas exegit Orestes,
> sed mixtum pietate nefas dubitandaque caedis
> gloria, materna laudem cum crimine pensat;
> pavit Iuleos inviso sanguine manes
> Augustus, sed falsa pii praeconia sumpsit
> in luctum patriae civili strage parentans:
> at tibi causa patris rerum coniuncta saluti
> bellorum duplicat laurus, isdemque tropaeis
> reddita libertas orbi, vindicta parenti.
>
> (*De Sexto Consulatu Honorii* 111–21)

In avenging his father Orestes showed *pietas*, but, through the murder of his mother, he spoiled his glory by mixing that *pietas* with *nefas*. Similarly, Octavian avenged Julius but placated his ghost with the loathsome offering of his countrymen's blood: his crime, it is implied, is greater than Orestes' because he was a hypocrite[4] and because he slaughtered his fellow-citizens (*civili strage*) and brought the evil of civil war down on his native city. Honorius surpasses both his predecessors, since his crushing of Gildo not only gives Theodosius revenge untainted by guilt, but also gives the world not the chaos of civil war but rather *libertas*, that is constitutional rule guaranteed by the force of the emperor's arms.

This comparison is in part specious or, to say the least, inadequate, because Theodosius was not, of course, murdered. Possibly, however, comparing Octavian to Orestes was a well-known literary or rhetorical topos of anti-Caesarian propaganda,

[2] For the war against Gildo see Claudian, *De Bello Gildonico*, esp. 1.241–52, J. B. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire* (repr. New York, 1958), i. 121–6, and A. Cameron, *Claudian. Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius* (Oxford, 1970), pp. 93–123.

[3] Honorius thus exacts the penalty Theodosius would have inflicted on Gildo had death not raised him to Heaven (*Bell. Gild.* 1.253–5), and fulfils the sacred task entrusted to him by his father's ghost (*Bell. Gild.* 1.314).

[4] Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.10 'dicebatur contra: pietatem erga parentem et tempora rei publicae obtentui sumpta.'

and Claudian could be seen as trying to accommodate it to his theme as best he can.[5] Alternatively, he may have taken his inspiration from his own reading of Virgil. At the very least the association of Octavian with Orestes in the later poet makes the conscious use of the idea in the first Georgic likelier: typically what is made explicit by Claudian is merely suggested by Virgil.

*The University of Calgary* MICHAEL DEWAR

[5] If so, it may have a left a trace in Lucan too. At *De Bello Civili* 7.777f., during the night after Pharsalus, Caesar is tormented by the ghosts of his slain fellow-citizens, and is compared to Orestes hounded by the Furies: 'haud alios nondum Scythica purgatus in ara / Eumenidum vidit voltus Pelopeus Orestes.' Claudian's contemporary Prudentius similarly manifests considerable hostility to Augustus on the grounds of sexual immorality (something of an obsession for Prudentius) at *c. Symm.* 1.245–61.

## THE FALL OF EUTROPIUS

concidit *exiguae* dementia vulnere *chartae*;
confecit saevum *littera* Martis opus,
(Claudian, *In Eutropium 2.Praef.* 19f.)

The eunuch Eutropius began his ascendancy over Arcadius, Emperor of the East, in late 395, following the murder of the Praetorian Prefect Rufinus. Eutropius, despite his physical shortcomings, 'sullied the Fasti'[1] by holding the consulate in 399. By the end of that same year, however, collusion between the barbarian general Gainas and Tribigild, leader of a rebellion of Ostrogoths in Asia Minor, resulted in Eutropius' fall from power. He was exiled to Cyprus and executed shortly afterwards.[2]

Not only did Eutropius, in the view of his enemies, disgrace the Roman state by his consulship, but he also earned himself the political enmity of the western court by opposing Stilicho's claims to be the legal regent for *both* Honorius, Emperor of the West, and his elder brother Arcadius. This opposition was not limited to a war of words: Eutropius encouraged Gildo, Count of Africa, to revolt, and even had Stilicho declared *hostis publicus*.[3] Stilicho accordingly put his propagandist Claudian to work and the poet produced a two-volume invective *In Eutropium*. The preface to the second volume of this work joyfully announces the eunuch's deposition and exile.

What, though, is the *exigua charta* that is said to have hurled Eutropius down from his fortress in the women's quarters of the palace?[4] One possibility is the letter which was sent to Arcadius by Gainas, on behalf of Tribigild, and which demanded the removal of Eutropius from office. Another is a letter in which Stilicho supposedly answered Eutropius' plea for help. As Cameron shows, the latter hypothesis rests on the assumption that Stilicho was deeply involved in the fall of Eutropius, 'yet Claudian, the decisive witness on such a matter, lends no support to it',[5] and Gainas would appear to have been working not for Stilicho but for himself. Similarly, it is unlikely that Claudian is referring to Gainas' own letter. For all Gainas' crucial importance in the affair, Claudian does not 'either name or even allude indirectly to

[1] *In Eutr.* 1.1–23, esp. 9f., 'trabeata per urbes / ostentatur anus titulumque effeminat anni', 26.

[2] *In Eutr. 2.Praef.* 10 'annus qui trabeas hic dedit exilium'. For a general account of Eutropius' rise and fall see J. B. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire* (repr. New York, 1958), i. 115ff., 126, and A. Cameron, *Claudian. Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius* (Oxford, 1970), pp. 124–55.

[3] The decree was promulgated in the summer of 397; see Cameron, op. cit., pp. 86, 93, 124.

[4] *In Eutr. 2.Praef.* 21f. 'mollis feminea detruditur arce tyrannus / et thalamo pulsus perdidit imperium.'

[5] Cameron, op. cit., p. 144.