

AELIAN, *VARIA HISTORIA* 5.5

Ἐπαμεινώνδας ἓνα εἶχε τρίβωνα καὶ αὐτὸν ῥυπῶντα· εἴ ποτε δὲ αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν εἰς γναφεῖον, αὐτὸς ὑπέμενεν οἴκοι δι' ἀπορίαν ἑτέρου. (Ael. *VH* 5.5)

Epaminondas had just one coat, and a dirty one at that; and whenever he sent it to the cleaner's, he stayed at home because he did not have another.

(N. G. Wilson, *Aelian, Historical Miscellany* [Loeb Classical Library, 1997])

This translation of καὶ αὐτὸν ῥυπῶντα ('and a dirty one at that') gives the sense we need. But the words mean something different: 'and it too was dirty (like Epaminondas)'. Cf. *VH* 12.1 πενομένη δὲ ἐκείνη καὶ τρεφομένη ὑπὸ πατρὶ καὶ αὐτῷ πένητι ('she was poor and was looked after by her father who was poor too'). See LSJ αὐτός I.8, KG 1.653 (f).

For αὐτόν (a slip induced by the following αὐτόν . . . αὐτός) read τοῦτον. This is an example of 'καὶ οὗτος . . . added to heighten the force of a previous word' (LSJ οὗτος C.V). LSJ gives three examples in illustration; KG 1.647.8 adds two more; Denniston (*GP* 291–2) repeats one of LSJ's. Here are fifty-two, from various authors, beginning with Aelian, who is rather fond of this turn of phrase.

Ael. *VH* 3.19 κουράν . . . καὶ ταύτην ἀηδῇ (Wilson: ἀήθη codd.) Πλάτωνι, *NA* 4.8 πῶλον καὶ τοῦτον καλόν, 4.27 ὄνυχας καρτεροῦς . . . καὶ τούτους μέντοι τοῖς τῶν λεόντων παραπλησίους, 6.58 ὀλίγοι . . . καὶ οὗτοι τῶν ἱερέων, 12.44 ὀργάνωι τινὶ καὶ τούτῳι συνήθει, 14.20 παῖδας νεανίας . . . καὶ τούτους ἀλίεας, 14.26 ἀντακαῖον καὶ τοῦτον ἀπαλόν, 16.15 οἰκίσκους τινὰς συμφορητοῦς . . . καὶ τούτους γε οὐκ ἐν χωρίοις ὑπτίοις, 16.41 ὄφεις . . . καὶ τούτους πτηνοῦς, fr. 148 φόρτον . . . καὶ τοῦτον εὐάγκαλον.

Hdt. 7.129.2 ἐνὸς αὐλῶνος καὶ τούτου στεινοῦ, 1.147.2, 3.73.1, 5.44.2, 6.11.2, 9.122.2; Th. 4.55.2; X. *Cyr.* 5.3.33 ἐνὸς ἀνδρὸς καὶ τούτου οὕτω διακειμένου, 1.5.5, 4.2.40, 5.5.16, *Ages.* 1.2, *An.* 2.5.21, *HG* 6.4.28, *Mem.* 2.6.27, *Oec.* 2.5, 3.4; D. 24.16 νόμῳ . . . ἐνὶ . . . καὶ τούτῳι τῶν πώποτ' ἐν ὑμῖν τεθέντων αἰσχίστῳ καὶ δεινοτάτῳ, 18.20, 19.120, 21.73, 54.22; Aeschin. 3.229; Arist. *EN* 1122^a3, *HA* 523^b28, 622^b3, *PA* 688^a33; Thphr. *HP* 4.7.4; Plb. 2.12.3; D.S. 11.81.6, 19.13.3; D.Chr. 32.40 ἐνὸς . . . κιθαρωιδοῦ καὶ τούτου συνήθους, 62.1 ἐνὸς ἀνδρὸς . . . καὶ τούτου σφόδρα ἐγγυὲς ὄντος, 2.45, 31.2, 31.64, 36.4, 55.20, 66.18; Luc. *Scyth.* 4; Hld. 10.21; D.L. 7.140 ἓνα τὸν κόσμον . . . καὶ τοῦτον πεπερασμένον.

Queens' College, Cambridge

JAMES DIGGLE

PIETAS AND POLITICS: EUSEBIA AND CONSTANTIUS AT COURT

The history of Ammianus Marcellinus states that Constantius II (337–61) renamed the Pontic diocese *Pietas*, in honour of his second wife, Aurelia Eusebia (353–60?).¹ *pietas* refers to sacred dutiful conduct toward all, specifically gods, state, and family. Constantius' purpose in renaming the diocese poses an interesting question because it holds an important key to understanding the role Eusebia played in supporting her husband's position as emperor. In other words, what kind of part could an empress play in the Late Empire? Constantius may indeed have been honouring his wife. Why, however, would he honour her so? Is *pietas* just a play on the empress's name, which means 'piety' in Greek, or is there a deeper meaning? A search of late Imperial evidence on this woman and etymology on this word is needed.

¹ Amm. Marc. 17.7.6. See also A. H. M. Jones, *PLRE* 1, 300.

Emperors communicated their themes and propaganda primarily in coinage. Only two references to *pietas* in the coinage of the reign exist. In the first, a bronze issued between September 337 and Spring 340, the coin is struck in the name of Constantius, his two brothers, his sister, and the dowager empress Theodora.² The figure of *pietas* on the obverse is a woman suckling a child, above which is inscribed *Pietas Romana*. The second coin, a gold medallion issued sometime between 353 and 361, shows Constantius in military garb while being crowned by Victory. The inscription above reads *Pietas Augusti Nostri*. Other coins contained many references to consistent themes like *Victoria* and *Gloria Republicae*, while *pietas* is only on these two coins.³ The bronze was a joint issue from a time before Constantius married Eusebia. The gold medallion refers to the emperor himself. The military nature of the image suggests that Constantius was referring to his piety in protecting the Roman state, something well attested too in the literary sources.⁴ Numerous coins generally display other themes; therefore *pietas* appears not to be a consistent and general theme of Constantius' reign.

The coins reveal little, yet an examination of literary references to Eusebia reveals her role at court. The discordant picture of the empress that we see in the pages of Ammianus is a good example. On two separate occasions, Ammianus records the way in which Eusebia, out of her wisdom, patriotism, or divine inspiration, acted on Julian's behalf at Constantius' court in Milan.⁵ In the first instance, she saved Julian when he was assailed by courtiers before Constantius. Ammianus states that she alone stood between Julian and destruction. In the second instance, it is Eusebia's insistence which overcomes the united objection of the court to Constantius' decision to make Julian a Caesar. Ammianus gives us an obituary of Eusebia which restates these views.⁶

Julian himself notes only kindness, virtue, and a love of philosophy as reasons for Eusebia's support.⁷ Julian's portrait of the empress is that of a fourth-century Penelope or Arete; she is the idealized aristocrat's wife who shares a special bond with her kinsman because of her appreciation of philosophers and her Macedonian heritage. For Julian, she is Constantius' wife and a Hellenic.

How shocking then for the reader of Ammianus to discover that the woman who went out of her way to protect Julian, before a very paranoid emperor, is also the

² See Jones (n. 1), 895 on Theodora.

³ J. Kent, *Roman Imperial Coinage* 7 (London, 1981), 294 and H. Cohen, *Description historique des Monnaies frappées sous l'Empire romain* (Paris, 1955), 463.

⁴ Apparently the urban folk living in the Roman East, particularly in Mesopotamia, thought well of Constantius' efforts to defend the frontier in spite of his defeats. Constantius had ruled this region for a lengthy period and his personal attention here contrasts with his refusal to personally oversee the restoration of the Rhine frontier and his sending Caesar Julian. See Amm. Marc. 15.8.1, 20.11.21, and 25.9.3.

⁵ Eusebia and the courtiers are the driving force in both of these passages, Constantius being swayed one way then another. This is typical of Ammianus' opinion of the emperor and is highly misleading. See Amm. Marc. 15.2.8, 15.8.2–3. For further discussion, see S. Tougher, 'The advocacy of an empress: Julian and Eusebia', *CQ* 48 (1998), 595–9.

⁶ Amm. Marc. 21.6.4. The year of Eusebia's death cannot be determined with certainty. Constantius remarried in 361 to Faustina.

⁷ Julian, *Or.* 3, 118B–C and 121B–C, and *Ep. ad Ath.* 273A–D. See also N. Aujoulat, 'Eusebie, Hélène et Julien I. Le témoignage de Julien', *Byzantion* 58 (1983), 79–81 and 92–3. Aujoulat clearly believes that while Julian is painting a literary portrait of the empress, his sentiments are genuine. Eusebia's Macedonian birth and generous treatment of Julian translate into esteem for the philosopher. This accords well with Julian's own Hellenism. Eusebia is not merely pitying him out of compassion but showing respect in her aid.

person who rendered him childless. Ammianus claims that Eusebia used drugs to cause Julian's wife, Helena, to miscarry; and that earlier she had caused the death of Helena's first child, a boy, when she bribed the midwife to cut the umbilical cord too short.⁸ Ammianus implies that Eusebia's envy because of own childlessness was the cause of these acts. These claims could merely be court gossip, but Ammianus certainly believed them. No other author, including Julian himself, corroborates these events.

Evidence from the fifth-century historian Zosimus offers an explanation of Ammianus' picture of Eusebia, and answers the question concerning Constantius' use of *pietas*. Zosimus recounts Eusebia's recommendation of Julian for the position of Caesar.⁹ While also characterizing Eusebia as exceptionally wise and learned, Zosimus contradicts Ammianus on two issues. First, Zosimus states she that initiated the proposal of Julian's appointment, as opposed to merely seconding a motion by Constantius. Also, in this account Eusebia's action is motivated far less by altruism than from pragmatism. Eusebia states that Julian's appointment would support the emperor's position. Whether or not Julian succeeded or failed, she argues, the emperor benefited. If Julian succeeded, the credit would go to Constantius; if he failed they could remove him, and Constantius would have no other family rival for power.¹⁰ For Zosimus, Eusebia was merely using Julian to bolster her husband's power, with affection playing no part.

Zosimus alone provides such a cynical picture of Eusebia and as such must be suspect, especially when considering his pagan prejudice against all members of the House of Constantine aside from Julian. Nevertheless, it is the only information which might explain the apparent contradiction in Ammianus' testimony and the reason for the renaming of the diocese. Could Constantius have used *pietas* in recognition of Eusebia's services to him as a dutiful wife, one of many forms of this quality? A proper Roman wife would not only love, but also have an interest in her husband's work and welfare. Being much younger than her husband, Eusebia could not be his equal and thus any action on her part would have been directed by Constantius himself.¹¹ By proposing or supporting the idea that Julian be used as a Caesar to support Constantius' rule in the Gauls and by disposing of Julian's children, Eusebia was putting herself to work in bolstering her husband's regime. Constantius was at once eliminating a major potential threat to his position by neutralizing Julian and putting him to use, rather than agreeing to his execution. Execution would have been a waste; Constantius could use Julian as a showpiece to restore imperial prestige in the Gauls.¹² Constantius was using his family to serve his public ends. *pietas* implied duty to one's

⁸ Amm. Marc. 16.10.18–19. That Eusebia was capable and willing to carry out these acts has not been doubted. See also Aujoulat, 'Eusebie, Hélène et Julien II. Le témoignage des historiens', *Byzantion* 58 (1983), 438; Tougher (n. 5); F. Paschoud, *Zosime. Histoire Nouvelle* (Paris, 1979), 62.

⁹ Zosimus 3.1.

¹⁰ Constantius did in fact claim credit for Julian's victory at Argentoratum. See Amm. Marc. 16.12.70.

¹¹ The relationship between the younger Pliny and his Calpurnia demonstrate, for example, the kind of devotion and service that could be expected of a young Roman wife to her husband's public affairs. See P. Garnsey, R. Saller, *The Roman Empire: Economy, Society and Culture* (Berkeley, 1987), 130–6. Eusebia's political and religious outlook would have been dominated by her older husband. For a discussion on Eusebia's age see Aujoulat (n. 7), 85–6.

¹² Julian, *Ep. ad Ath.* 278A and Amm. Marc. 15.8.1–12. Using Julian in Gaul may also have been an attempt to revive family prestige, if we may believe Zosimus' assertion that Constantius bribed the Germans to attack in order to distract Magnentius. See Zosimus 2.53. Considering

country and devotion to one's family; Constantius, as emperor and *paterfamilias*, was the epitome of both.

All this theory fully accounts for the facts. Being extremely wary of subversion and threats to his rule, Constantius would very well appreciate a wife who had aided him in eliminating potential rivals. Why would Eusebia protect Julian against detractors at court and support, if not actually propose, Julian as Caesar unless it was ultimately for Constantius' benefit? The emperor had no regard for family when it came to treason. Constantius had his own cousin, Gallus, executed on such grounds.¹³ If Eusebia was as wise as all our sources say, then she certainly would not court her husband's wrath by supporting a rival. Eusebia's kindness toward Julian will have been based on Constantius' policy to use and control his cousin. He used Eusebia to bring Julian into harness; he used such characters as Gaudentius and Florentius to keep him there.¹⁴ The renaming of the Pontic diocese was then a compliment and a description of Eusebia's part in the restoration of the Gauls.

Eusebia did not live to see the fruit of the seed she planted. Julian's phenomenal success in the field and care for the provincials at home was to inspire his soldiers to proclaim him Augustus in 360, but Eusebia had probably already died. In the end, civil war between Julian and Constantius was only averted by the latter's sudden death in the following year. Eusebia's efforts to aid her husband only served eventually to make Julian sole Augustus of the empire.

Loyola University, New Orleans

J. JUNEAU

how often Constantius campaigned on the Eastern and Danube frontiers, his decision, as recorded in Ammianus, not to go personally to Gaul because of its remoteness seems false.

¹³ Amm. Marc. 14.9.11.

¹⁴ On Gaudentius and Florentius, see Amm. Marc. 16.12.14, 17.3.2, and 17.9.7. Gaudentius was an *agens* used to spy on Julian; Florentius was praetorian prefect for the Gauls. He and Julian had frequent disagreements on administrative issues.

AUSONIUS, *EP.* 4 AND HORACE, *EP.* 1.14.9*

Bentley's emendation in Horace, *Ep.* 1.14.9 (*avet* for *amat*)¹ has been accepted by many scholars as correct² and harmonizes with the tone of Horace's letter, in which he expresses his impatience to go back to the countryside and at the same time his inability to fulfil his desire (*Ep.* 1.14.6–9: *Me quamvis Lamiae pietas et cura moratur, / fratrem maerentis, raptō de fratre dolentis / insolabiliter, tamen istuc mens animusque / fert et avet spatiis obstantia rumpere claustra*). This article suggests a parallel with an epistle by Ausonius which corroborates Bentley's emendation, *Ep.* 4 (Green = 10 Schenkl, 6 Peiper, 4 Prete),³ and in particular lines 17–18: *Nos etenim primis sanctum*

* I wish to thank the former editor of *CQ*, Dr Stephen Heyworth, for his suggestions, and my supervisor and friend, Dr Duncan F. Kennedy, who read a first version of this article and, with his advice, improved it. This work is dedicated to the memory of Prof. Mario Martina.

¹ R. Bentley (ed.), *Q. Horatius Flaccus* (London, 1714), 2, 46.

² Among the others by Kießling and Heinze (edd.), *Q. Horatius Flaccus. Opera*, 3, Briefe, re-edited by Erich Burck (Berlin, 1957); E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford, 1957); F. Klingner (ed.), *Q. Horati Flacci Opera* (Lipsiae, 1959); D. R. Shackleton Bailey (ed.), *Q. Horati Flacci Opera* (Stuttgartiae, 1985); R. Mayer (ed.), *Horace. Epistles Book I* (Cambridge, 1994).

³ R. P. H. Green (ed.), *The Works of Ausonius* (Oxford, 1991); C. Schenkl (ed.), *D. Magni Ausonii Opuscula* (Berolini, 1883); R. Peiper (ed.), *D. Magni Ausonii Burdigalensis Opuscula* (Lipsiae, 1886); S. Prete (ed.), *Decimi Magni Ausonii Burdigalensis Opuscula* (Leipzig, 1978);