

phon is a conspicuously passive and unheroic figure.⁵ Achilles uses the construction in an erotic context four more times, in each case turning some slight variation on the motif: when Cleitophon's amorous campaign makes only limited progress in its first few days, he asks Leucippe (2.19.1): *Μέχρι τίνος ἐπὶ τῶν φιλημάτων ιστάμεθα, φιλάττη*; The sexually frustrated Melite similarly exhorts Cleitophon (5.21.3–4): *... Μέχρι τίνος με ἀπολλύεις*; *... Μέχρι τίνος ὡς ἐν ἱερῷ συγκαθεύδομεν*; and Leucippe angrily responds to Sosthenes' recommendation of Thersander as a lover thus (6.12.3): *... μέχρι τίνος μαινείς τὰ ὦτα*.

On another level, Achilles' redeployment of Callinus reflects the elasticity of elegiac poetry itself,⁶ whose subjects included (among many others) both the military protreptics of Callinus and Tyrtæus and later erotic epigram.⁷ Achilles' grammatical quotation of Callinus here thus assumes considerable literary sophistication on the part of his readers. Recent scholarship⁸ has rightly sought to expunge the persistent notion that Greek novels were aimed at a poorly educated audience, and it is hoped that this note offers a concrete demonstration (*paucis*) of how much a Greek novelist expected his audience to bring to his text.

University of Arizona

DAVID CHRISTENSON
christed@u.arizona.edu

⁵ In the opening book he conceives of himself as love's δούλος (1.7.3), and the victim of love's all-out assault (δλος γάρ μοι προσέπεσεν ὁ ἔρως, 1.9.1). He in fact passively endures several physical assaults in the novel, in one instance ridiculously claiming victory when his assailant injures his hand on Cleitophon's teeth (καὶ οἱ ὀδόντες ἀμύνουσι τὴν τῶν ῥινῶν ὕβριν, 8.1.4). G. Anderson, *Ancient Fiction: The Novel in the Greco-Roman World* (London and Sydney, 1984), 63–4, captures his essential character: '... Clitophon is indeed cast as a refined and slightly cynical opportunist. ... He has some of the ineptitudes, and some of the duplicity, of the exquisitely over-educated, a *pepaideumenos* in love'.

⁶ Of which, according to ancient tradition, Callinus was sometimes considered to be the 'father': cf. Hudson-Williams (n. 1), 9–12.

⁷ Erotic elements are present already in the elegiacs of Mimnermus (fr. 1 W).

⁸ See, for example, S. Stephens, 'Who read ancient novels?' and E. Bowie, 'The readership of Greek novels in the ancient world', in J. Tatum (ed.), *The Search for the Ancient Novel* (Baltimore and London, 1994), 405–18 and 435–59, respectively.

JUSTIN ON TRIBUNATES AND GENERALSHIPS, CAESARES, AND AUGUSTI

Little, if anything, in Justin scholarship has been as controversial as the dating of the so-called *Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus*. Suggested dates have varied from the time of Antoninus Pius through the third century to the end of the fourth. The latter was proposed in 1988 by Sir Ronald Syme,¹ but has in fact received little support in subsequent literature on Justin, which has tended to accept the earlier dating (late second/early third centuries).² An exception is T. D. Barnes, who has

¹ Sir Ronald Syme, 'The date of Justin and the discovery of Trogus', *Historia* 37 (1988), 358–71. Restated by Syme in 'Trogus and the HA, some consequences', in Christol, Demougin, et al. (edd.), *Institutions, société et vie politique dans l'empire romain au IV^e siècle ap. J-C* (Rome, 1992), 11–20.

² For the dating suggested by scholars before Syme's article, see Syme (n. 1, 1988), 359–62. Since Syme: G. B. Conte, *Latin Literature: A History*, trans. J. B. Solodow (Baltimore/London, 1994), 551–2; R. Develin in J. C. Yardley and R. Develin, *Justin: Epitome of the Philippic History*

voiced support for a later dating based on a linguistic parallel to Justin in the *Historia Augusta*.³

Barnes observes that Oscar Hey, author of the article *ducatus* in *TLL* (5.2129.30–2131.42), drew attention to the similarity between Justin 30.2.5 *Agathocles regis lateri iunctus civitatem regebat, tribunatus et praefecturas et ducatus mulieres ordinabant* and *HA Heliog. 6.2 militaribus . . . praeposituris et legationibus et ducatus venditis*.⁴ Hey, he notes, refers at the head of that particular section of the article (Section 2 [2130.5–63]) to Seeck's article on *dux*.⁵ Seeck had demonstrated—and this is now taken for granted by scholars—that from the time of Diocletian *dux* is used technically as a formal title, and, in drawing attention to the parallel between *HA Heliog. 6.2* and Justin, Hey must have been intimating that Justin is, like the author of *Heliog. 6.2*, using *ducatus* as a (post-Diocletianic) formal title. He then seems to suggest that Hey was right and Justin is to be dated to at least some time after 260.

Two points need to be made:

1. Hey's Section 2 (*TLL* 5.2130.5–6) begins with the words 'de imperio militari (inde ab aetate Diocletiani de administratione militari provinciae, cf. Seeck P.W. V 1870,7 sqq.)' and the three passages that Hey cites as parallel (*HA Heliog. 6.2*, *Aurel. 10.2*, and Justin 30.2.5) are included here among a large number of clearly non-technical uses of *ducatus*. The word is 'late' (and therefore a 'Justinism' rather than a Trojan usage), occurring first in Suetonius (*Tib. 19, Nero 35.5*), then in Apuleius (*Met. 7.9, 10.1*), Florus (2.9.2), and Livy *Perioch. 96.6*—all, of course, 'non-technical' usages of the word. Even among the ten uses of the word in the *Historia Augusta*, written at the end of the fourth century, it is clear that some, at least, are 'non-technical': cf. *Pert. 6.1*, *Pesc. Nig. 1.5*, *Tyr. Trig. 13.3*, *Probus 7.4*. In fact, it is by no means clear that Hey was suggesting that Justin is using the word in the technical way; he was simply pointing to the collocation of the words *ducatus* and *tribunatus* in the three passages. Indeed, Hey says as much: 'item appos. tribunatus: Vopisc. Aurelian 10.2. cf. etiam infra 1.27 (= Justin 30.2.5)'. It should also be noted that the other two instances of *ducatus* in Justin (2.15.14, 9.6.8) are 'non-technical'.

2. Even if there is (which is by no means certain) some significance to this collocation of the words *ducatus* and *tribunatus* in Justin and the *HA*, it is surely only that the author of the *Historia Augusta* was influenced by Justin in the form of his wording. It does not mean that the words necessarily bear the same meaning. I am reminded of Livy 39.9.1 *huius mali labes*, which is clearly influenced by Verg. *Aen. 2.97 hinc mihi prima mali labes* but where, as Austin notes, the meaning of *labes* is simply not the same ('a step towards' in Vergil, 'taint' in Livy).

What Justin is saying is not, as Barnes believes, that Agathocles became Home Secretary while Agathoclia and Oenanthe formed a kind of feminist Foreign Office, but that Agathocles became Ptolemy's right-hand man and that, through him, the women were able to control all official appointments (*tribunatus et praefecturas et*

of Pompeius Trogus (Atlanta, 1994), 4; P. J. Rhodes, <http://www.dur.ac.uk/Classics/Histos/1998/rhodesrev.html>, 15/10/99; J. M. Alonso-Núñez, *Latomus* 54 (1995), 356 and *CR* 48 (1998), 504.

³ T. D. Barnes, 'Two passages of Justin', *CQ* 48 (1998), 589–93 at 590–1.

⁴ In fact, Barnes incorrectly cites these words as *HA Aurel. 10.2*. The error is easily explainable. Hey does also cite *Aurel. 10.2* because the words *tribunatus* and *ducatus* occur together there, as well (*habuit ergo multos ducatus, plurimos tribunatus*) (*TLL* 5.2130.22).

⁵ O. Seeck, *RE* 5 (1905), 1869.11–1875.10.

ducatus). Indeed, this is made quite clear by the parallel source, Plut. *Cleom.* 33.2, where Plutarch explicitly states that the two women handled 'the most important matters of the realm' (τὰ . . . μέγιστα τῆς ἀρχῆς πράγματα).

Ducatus has no significance for the dating of Justin.

In the second of his notes, Barnes turns to the piece of evidence invariably adduced for the dating of the Epitome, Justin 41.5.9: *Tertius Parthis rex Priaputius fuit, sed et ipse Arsaces dictus. Nam sicut supra dictum est omnes reges suos hoc nomine, sicuti Romani Caesares Augustosque, cognominavere*. The reference here seems to be to the use of Caesar and Augustus as formal titles, and as these could not be said to be in common use until the Antonine period or later, the remark is usually ascribed to the epitomator rather than the Trogan original.⁶

Barnes now offers the novel suggestion that *Caesares Augustosque* is in fact a hybrid: it was Trogus who wrote *Caesares*, and Justin, seeing this standing alone in his text of the Narbonnese historian, added *Augustosque*, because in his day Caesar was the official title of the junior emperor and Augustus the title of the emperor. And if it was Trogus who wrote *Caesares* he—writing shortly after 10 B.C.—will have been referring not only to Julius Caesar and his adopted nephew, but also to Gaius and Lucius Caesar, and this is a compliment paid to Augustus by Trogus. What is the evidence that the expression is a hybrid, and not simply one added by Justin to his original? The titles do not conform to the rule that the more important of the two offices (Augustus) should be cited first. Had the epitomator been responsible for the entire expression, he would certainly have written *Augustos Caesaresque*.

Now apart from the evidence that has been adduced by, for example, Alonso-Núñez for dating Trogus' *Philippic History* to a point after the deaths of Gaius and Lucius,⁷ two considerations make such a hypothesis highly improbable. In the first place, if the order of titles—Augustus first, Caesar second—is so rigid, why did Justin not simply add *Augustos before Caesares*? For Barnes's thesis to be correct, we must assume that Justin slavishly copied his original one word at a time (and did not correct what he had himself written)—and given the large admixture of Justin's own language in the Epitome that is, to say the least, unlikely. But, more important, the argument is badly damaged if we find even a single instance elsewhere of such 'reverse usage'. Such an instance is *HA Ael.* 7.5 *vel Caesares vel Augusti vel principes appellati sunt*. It is clear that both the *Caesares* and the *Augusti* belong to Justin.⁸

University of Ottawa

J. C. YARDLEY
jcyard@uottawa.ca

⁶ For example, F. Ruhl, *Die Verbreitung des Iustinus im Mittelalter* (Leipzig, 1871), 36; R. B. Steele, 'Pompeius Trogus and Justinus', *AJP* 38 (1917), 19–41 at 24–6; Heinz Dietmar Richter, *Untersuchungen zur hellenistischen Historiographie: Die Vorlagen des Pompeius Trogus für die Darstellung der nachalexandrischen hellenistischen Geschichte (Just. 13–40)* (Frankfurt, 1987), 13, n. 2; J. M. Alonso-Núñez, *La Historia Universal de Pompeyo Trogo* (Madrid, 1992), 13.

⁷ J. M. Alonso-Núñez, 'An Augustan world history: the *Historiae Philippicae* of Pompeius Trogus', *G&R* 34 (1987), 56–72 at 60.

⁸ My thanks to my friend and collaborator Waldemar Heckel for reading this note and endorsing its conclusions.