

'NO FREER THAN THE HELOTS'
MESSENIAN REBEL BEHAVIOUR IN
PAUSANIAS' *MESSENIKA* IN
COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

Drs. Lydia L.B.M. Langerwerf

Thesis submitted to the University of Nottingham for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy

FEBRUARY 2010

ABSTRACT

This dissertation explores Pausanias' depiction of the (mythical) Messenian revolt against the Spartans in book 4 of his *Periegesis* in comparative perspective with ancient depictions of slave revolts and Flavius Josephus' *Jewish War*. I concentrate on how Pausanias portrays Aristomenes and the other rebels, as well as the Messenians in general. Although recently the Messenian Wars have been the subject of scholarly interest from literary critics, historians, and archaeologists, who have fruitfully combined their disciplines in their interpretations of the story, Pausanias' aims and agenda in his representation of the Messenians have so far been left unexplored. This dissertation therefore asks: What stance did Pausanias take in the contested history of Messenia?

In my analysis of Pausanias' figuration of Messenian history, in chapters 1 (the introduction) and 2 I concentrate on his frequent use of τόλμη and in particular in its combination with ἀπόνοια ('despair'). Τόλμη, translated as daring, contains both positive and negative connotations. It is a necessary ingredient of courage, but can also lead to recklessness if uncontrolled.

My comparative framework in chapters 3 to 6 puts this reading of Pausanias' book 4 to the test. In chapter 3 I compare Pausanias' depiction of Aristomenes' leadership qualities with Athenaeus' use of the story of Drimakos, the rebel leader of a slave revolt on the island of Chios. In chapters 4 and 5 I pursue the connection between slavery, τόλμη and ἀπόνοια further in a comparison of the Messenian revolt with Diodorus' depiction of the two Sicilian slave wars, along with Plutarch's and Appian's account of Spartacus' revolt. In the sixth chapter I interpret the Messenian revolt as a 'nationalistic' uprising and compare Pausanias' account with Josephus' *Jewish War*.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

During the four years of my doctoral research I have had the good fortune to meet and work with many inspiring people. My primary debt of gratitude goes to my supervisor, Professor Steve Hodkinson, whose ability to offer much food for thought and fresh insights did not in the least suffer from my decision to leave helots as a topic of research alone and concentrate on Pausanias. My work has benefited enormously from his constructive criticism. He was also very helpful in correcting my English.

The other members of the Sparta in Comparative Perspective Project have on numerous occasions given helpful advice. In particular Rosie Harman has enthusiastically listened to all my ideas as well as frustrations. I could not have wished for a better office- and flatmate.

The writing-up year I spent alterably in Mainz at the *Forschungen zur antike Sklaverei* Project and in Groningen where I gained valuable teaching experience. Cressida Ryan put up with me whenever I had to come to Nottingham and has been a very good friend throughout. Wim Jongman, Onno van Nijf, Jan-Willem Drijvers and Ed van der Vliet I owe thanks not just for the half year that they were my colleagues, but also for the five years that I was their student during my undergraduate studies. They encouraged me to try my luck in England and take up an academic career. In Mainz I was made to feel very welcome by Johannes Deißler and Heinz Heinen. They facilitated my stay in every possible way.

I could not have completed the project without the financial help from the School of Humanities, the Fundatie van de Vrijvrouwe van Renswoude te 's Gravenhage, the Graduate School (sponsoring my first stay in Mainz and offering me a Travel Prize to attend a conference in Wroclaw), the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD; sponsoring my second stay in Mainz) and the Thomas Wiedemann Fund.

I thoroughly enjoyed the visits from the ladies of LHB in Nottingham. Katrijn de Ronde en Minte Kamphuis even managed to visit me in the short period I was in Mainz. My parents have supported me both financially and emotionally. I also owe Manfred Tjapkes for his support, in particular when my dissertation took me away from him for 5 years. I am so glad to be back!

CONTENTS

Chapter one: Pausanias in between epic history and irony	1
Chapter two: The Messenians and their foolish courage in Pausanias' <i>Messenika</i>	45
Chapter three: Drimakos of Chios: Rebel leader and civic hero	95
Chapter four: Decadence and despair: Diodorus Siculus' account of the two Sicilian Slave Revolts	120
Chapter five: Despair and death defiance: on ἀπόνοια and φρονήμα in Appian's and Plutarch's Spartacus	156
Chapter six: Stubborn slaves and their daring love of liberty in Flavius' Josephus' <i>Jewish War</i>	179
Chapter seven: Being 'happy in other things' in Antonine Greece	241
Bibliography	257

CHAPTER ONE

PAUSANIAS IN BETWEEN EPIC HISTORY AND IRONY

When they were about to come to close quarters, they threatened one another by brandishing their arms and with fierce looks, and fell to recriminations, these [the Spartans] calling the Messenians already their slaves, no freer than the Helots (οικέτας αὐτῶν ἤδη τοὺς Μεσσηνίους καὶ οὐδὲν ἐλευθερωτέρους ἀποκαλοῦντες τῶν εἰλωντων); the others answering that they were impious in their undertaking, who for the sake of gain attacked their kinsmen and outraged all the ancestral gods of the Dorians, and Heracles above all.¹

In this scene from Pausanias' description of the 'First Messenian War', the Spartans insult the Messenians by comparing them to their helots. This Spartan depiction of their enemy is at first sight in stark opposition to Pausanias' overall account of the revolt, which is from a Messenian perspective. It is the only reference to the Messenians as helots in the whole of his narrative on Messenia in the *Periegesis*. In this dissertation I will evaluate Pausanias' stance in his representation of the Spartan-Messenian conflict and compare his depiction of the Messenians as a people and as rebels with other literary accounts of slave revolts from Diodorus, Appian, Plutarch and Athenaeus as well as Josephus' account of the Jewish War.

The second-century Greek travel writer or historian,² devoted much of his fourth book, on Messene, to the events of a revolt that, according to him, broke out a generation after the Spartans had subjugated Messene. He dates this subjugation to the end of the 'First Messenian War', lasting from 743 B.C. to

¹ Paus. 4.8.2. All translations are based on the translation of W.H.S Jones in the Loeb Classical Library edition (1926), with minor adaptations, in particular with the translation of τόλμη (daring) and ἀπόνοια (despair).

² Both definitions of Pausanias as an author are problematic. I address this in the second half of this introduction. References to his own time in the *Periegesis* refer to a period between AD 120 and AD 180.

724 B.C., and the revolt, also known as the 'Second Messenian War' to 685 B.C.³ According to his account, as part of the original subjugation the Spartans had imposed measures unacceptable, in particular, to the younger Messenians who, with no experience of warfare, thought death and exile preferable to this slavery.⁴ In Pausanias' account, the revolt was led by the 'younger men' from Andania, whose main leader was Aristomenes, the man 'who first made the name of Messene important and respected'⁵.

Pausanias is careful to call the rebels at all times 'Messenians', so that the only reference to them as slaves is, as may be read in the citation above, indirect. Yet, the status of the Messenians was a subject of heated debate from Thucydides onwards. This was first the case during their period of subjection, when the Messenian exiles' involvement in the Peloponnesian War raised questions about the identity of the remaining inhabitants of Messenia as slaves or as Greeks. Thucydides provides detailed information on the damages that the Messenians inflicted on the Spartans, even though Peter Hunt has argued that he deliberately downplayed their role out of a reluctance to acknowledge the fighting skills of former slaves.⁶ After the refoundation of Messene in 370 BC, the identity of the new Messenians as either former helots or former exiles was tied into the legitimisation of Messene as an independent polis. Dinarchus, *Against Demosthenes* praises Thebes' restoration of Messenia, whereas the pro-Spartan Isocrates' *Archidamus* insists that the liberated 'Messenians' are not truly Messenians, but merely ex-helots.⁷ In his recent book on *The Ancient Messenians*, Nino Luraghi argues that Messenian identity continued to be a source of anxiety well into imperial times since the

³ Paus. 4.5.8; 4.6.2-5; 4.13.7; 4.15.3; 4.23.4.

⁴ Paus. 4.14.6.

⁵ Paus. 4.6.3.

⁶ P. Hunt, *Slaves, warfare and ideology in the Greek historians* (Cambridge 1998) 63. In a similar vein he comments (182-3) on Xenophon's avoidance of mentioning the foundation of Messene in his *Hellenica*.

⁷ Dinarchus, *Against Demosthenes* 73; Isocrates, *Archidamus* 28.1 and 88. Cf. Plato, *Laws* 776 C on the controversy concerning the Helots as Greeks. I discuss Athenaeus' use of this passage at Ath. 6.264 d-e in chapter 3, 106-109.

Messenians' ancestry could always be called into question.⁸ I will provide below a more detailed overview of the use of Pausanias' text in the current scholarly debate on Messenian identity.⁹

Pausanias makes it no secret that the Messenians' rebellion originated from harsh treatment, equivalent to slavery, received from the Spartans.¹⁰ His careful avoidance of calling them slaves could at first sight be understood as an indication of sympathy for their revolt. In fact, as we will see, all interpretations of Pausanias' *Messenika* start from the assumption that it provides a pro-Messenian account of the war. In my discussion of recent contributions I will show that the explanation for this is often found in the sources Pausanias used. However, in addition, scholars have long argued that Pausanias' anti-Lakonian attitude, expressed as it is in his explanation of the war as an example of Spartan unjust aggression and greed, implies a pro-Messenian stance.¹¹ The extent to which this supposition is supported by the narrative will be a key subject of my dissertation. In my evaluation of Pausanias' stance in the contested history of this most peculiar of Greek city-states I will therefore concentrate on his authorial agenda and methods.

Such as focus on Pausanias as a versatile author, consciously using his sources to fit in his own narrative of Greek history, is in accordance with the growing interest of literary scholars in his *Periegesis*. As we will see in more detail, J. Elsner's seminal study of Pausanias as a pilgrim in 1992 emphasised the role

⁸ N. Luraghi, *The Ancient Messenians. Constructions of Ethnicity and Memory* (Cambridge 2008) 323-327.

⁹ The recent work of S.E. Alcock, N. Luraghi, J. Auberger, D. Ogden and J. Akujärvi deserve specific mention, see my discussion below, 7-22 and 25-26.

¹⁰ Note also Pausanias' quotation of the punishments mentioned by Tyrtæus, Paus. 4.14.5.

¹¹ See most recently Pausanias, *Description de la Grèce. Tome IV, Livre IV* (translation and commentary Janick Auberger, Paris 2005) 133-36, 160 on Pausanias' emphasis on Spartan greed as a motivation for the war. Compare similar remarks by J. Kroymann, *Pausanias und Rhianos* (Berlin 1943) 41-2 and W. Ameling, 'Pausanias und die Hellenistische Geschichte' in: J. Bingen ed, *Pausanias Historien. Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique* XLI (Geneva 1996) 143. Cf. Janick Auberger, 'Pausanias et les Messéniens: une histoire d'amour!' *Revue des Études Anciennes* 94.1-2 (1992) 187-197; Janick Auberger, 'Pausanias et le Livre 4: une leçon pour l'empire' *Phoenix* 54 (2000) 255-277, esp. 258. A.R. Meadows, 'Pausanias and the historiography of Classical Sparta' *Classical Quarterly* 45.1 (1995) 92-113 is more concerned with source criticism than with the tendency of book 3.

of Pausanias as a narrator in the political and social context of the second century AD.¹² Two edited volumes in 1996 and 2001, as well as the monographs by K.W. Arafat and W.E. Hutton, also expressed an appreciation of Pausanias as an author in his own right and firmly placed his work in his Graeco-Roman world.¹³ Of particular interest is J. Akujärvi's published dissertation on Pausanias as *Researcher, Traveller, Narrator*. Not only does she explicitly use the theory of narratology in her exploration of the *Periegesis*, but she also devotes considerable attention to book 4.¹⁴ Finally, M. Pretzler, *Pausanias. Travel Writing in Ancient Greece* (2007) deserves to be mentioned. She dispels the myth that Pausanias was only interested in the classical past by emphasising his mention of Roman and Hellenistic monuments. Important too is her characterisation of Pausanias as a *pepaideumenos*, whose display of knowledge marks him out as an exponent of the Second Sophistic (in a wider sense).¹⁵ Useful though these articles and books are in their emphasis on Pausanias as author and Pausanias in his own time, they are, Akujärvi excepted, not very informative on the *Messenika*. The appreciation of Pausanias' authorial agenda and methods has therefore yet to be fully developed in relation to studies of Messenian identity.

When approaching Pausanias' representation of the Messenians we should take into account that Pausanias did not write in isolation. Although Pausanias is by far the most extensive source for Aristomenes' heroic exploits, it is clear from other sources that he participates in a literary Aristomenes-

¹² J. Elsner, 'Pausanias: A Greek Pilgrim in the Roman World' *Past and Present* 135 (1992) 3-29.

¹³ J. Bingen ed., *Pausanias Historien. Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique* XLI (Geneva 1996); S.E. Alcock, J.F. Cherry and J. Elsner eds., *Pausanias: Travel and Memory in Roman Greece* (Oxford 2001); K.W. Arafat, *Pausanias' Greece: Ancient Artists and Roman Rulers* (Cambridge 1996); W.E. Hutton, *Describing Greece: Landscape and Literature in the Periegesis of Pausanias* (Cambridge 2005).

¹⁴ Johanna Akujärvi, *Researcher, Traveller, Narrator: studies in Pausanias' Periegesis* (Stockholm 2005).

¹⁵ M. Pretzler, *Pausanias. Travel Writing in Ancient Greece* (London 2007). On *pepaideumenoi*, cf. Tim Whitmarsh, *The Second Sophistic* (Oxford 2005) 13-15 with further bibliography.

tradition,¹⁶ which concentrated on the hero's bravery and courage in his glorious defeat against the Spartans. Pausanias himself confirms this by referring to his sources Myron of Priene and Rhianos of Bene, the latter of whom 'makes him [Aristomenes] appear as glorious as Achilles in Homer's *Iliad*'.¹⁷ The nature of Aristomenes' heroism in this tradition may be gleaned not just from this comparison with Achilles to which Pausanias refers, but also in other, regrettably mostly isolated, references to the Messenian hero. The most important of these are found in the works of Pausanias' near contemporaries Plutarch and Polyaeus, as well as in a passage from Diodorus, each of which discusses Aristomenes' ἀρετή and ἀνδρεία.¹⁸ This thematic similarity invites a source-critical approach to Pausanias' account, since it appears to be derived from the same source as all the other fragments. Daniel Ogden, for example, has connected similarities between Polyaeus' and Pausanias' accounts to the fact that Plutarch is a known source of Polyaeus. J. Kroymann concentrated on the differences in both accounts and connected it to both authors' use of Rhianos. Differences between Pausanias and Diodorus may, as has been argued by Jacoby, have been caused by the latter's use of Myron and Pausanias' preference for Rhianos.¹⁹ The fact that of these other authors we really only possess snippets makes the thematic centrality of Aristomenes' ἀρετή and ἀνδρεία all the more impressive. At the same time, however, any attempt at comparison is seriously thwarted by the paucity of surviving material.

¹⁶ The derivation of this tradition, and whether it is purely literary, or also has historical or folk elements is a contested issue. See D. Ogden, *Aristomenes of Messene. Legends of Sparta's Nemesis* (Swansea 2004) chapter 2 for the argument that the presence of folk elements does not need to imply that the stories dated back to the occupation, and appendix 2 for a summary of all extant references to Aristomenes.

¹⁷ Paus. 4.6.3.

¹⁸ I refer here only to the passages directly relevant to Aristomenes' ἀρετή and ἀνδρεία. For other references to Aristomenes, see Ogden, *Aristomenes* appendix 2.

¹⁹ Ogden, *Aristomenes* 193-195; Kroymann, *Pausanias und Rhianos* 68-70; Jacoby *FGH* 106 F12 = Diodorus 8.12. Diodorus' account of the *aristeia* and Pausanias placing Cleonnis in the 'First Messenian War' appears to indicate a possible use of Myron by Diodorus, such as proposed by Jacoby, *FGH* 106 F12 = Diodorus 8.12, but at 15.66 Diodorus places Aristomenes in the 'Second Messenian War'. See Ogden, *Aristomenes* 191.

The most direct reference to Aristomenes' ἀρετή is found in Diodorus, where we meet Aristomenes competing in an *aristeia* with another Messenian, Cleonnis. This Cleonnis also appears in Pausanias' *Messenika* as a noble contemporary of King Euphaes and, after this king's death, a competitor for his throne against Aristodemos.²⁰ Although Cleonnis kills more Spartans than Aristomenes, the latter wins as he succeeds in carrying home safely his severely wounded rival.²¹ In the fragments of Pausanias' near contemporaries, Polyaeus and Plutarch, ἀρετή is also at the forefront of their depictions of Aristomenes.

Polyaeus emphasises that the Spartans considered Aristomenes a dangerous enemy of considerable ἀρετη. He explains how the Spartans, on capturing Aristomenes along with many fellow rebels, decided to throw them all over a precipice into the Caeadas; but whereas they stripped the other Messenians naked, they left Aristomenes his armour 'because of his reputation for ἀρετη'. As we will see in more detail in chapter 2, this proves to be a mistake as Aristomenes manages to 'parachute' himself to safety with his shield. It comes therefore as no surprise that when after this episode the Spartans were again confronted by Aristomenes, 'again fighting bravely' (πάλιν ἀριστεύοντα), 'they all broke and ran, believing the man to be more than mortal'.²²

Plutarch's *Life of Aristomenes*,²³ finally, has been lost except for a few passages, but the fact that he wrote one is a measure of the importance of this hero for Greek history. The strengths and weaknesses Plutarch may have accorded Aristomenes can only be speculated about, due to the absence of the full text. Nevertheless, from other Plutarchan references to the Messenian hero we at

²⁰ Ogden, *Aristomenes* 105-110 discusses this passage as a doublet to Paus. 4.10.5., which relates the competition between Cleonnis, Damis and Aristodemos for who was to succeed king Euphaes: 'they were believed to excel him generally, but particularly in warfare. The enemy had finished off Antander in battle as he risked himself in defence of Euphaes'. Pausanias gives, however, no other clue that this competition took the form of an *aristeia*.

²¹ Diodor 8.12.

²² Polyaeus, *Strategems* 2.31.

²³ unpaired.

least learn of the awe that he inspired in his enemies. For example, the Spartans' amazement at their formidable opponent is central in the account of their submitting him to an experiment of anatomy and subsequently discovering that he had a hairy heart. The reason for their wonder may also be found in Aristomenes' celebration of the *hekatomphonia*²⁴ three times, referred to by Plutarch in three different places.²⁵

From this perspective it is not so strange that Pausanias wrote at length about Aristomenes' rebellion. It is, however, unusual that he devoted more than a quarter of his book on Messenia to Aristomenes' uprising, following a similar amount already devoted to the First Messenian War. Each book of the *Periegesis* provides an introduction both to the sights worth seeing and to the history of the region in question. The relative size of these two elements varies greatly from book to book, but the large amount of history compared to sights in book 4 deserves some explanation.²⁶ The lengthy descriptions of both the First and the Second Messenian War also vary from the more annalistic style that characterises the *Periegesis* as a whole. There are many other places where Pausanias elaborates on a sight or an event, but nowhere at such length.²⁷

Explanations for Pausanias' interest in the Messenian Wars range from his being influenced by folk traditions, by novelistic sources (predominantly via Rhianos), by Messenian identity-politics in the Hellenistic and imperial period

²⁴ Literally: 'hundred-slaughter'. Whether the word relates to a sacrifice made by Aristomenes after he killed 100 of his enemy or the killing itself is unclear, see Ogden, *Aristomenes* 40-44.

²⁵ Hekatomphonia: *Romulus* 25; *Questions at Dinner (Moralia 660f)*; *Dinner of the Seven Sages (Moralia 159e-f)*. Hairy Heart: Stephanus of Byzantium s.v. Andania (Rhianos *FGH* 265 F46/F53 Powell).

²⁶ Habicht, *Pausanias Guide*, 4n20 calculated the percentages of history to sights. Books 5 and 6 on Elis and 10 on Phocis have large portions of history (respectively 13 % and 8%), but this does not even come close to Messene (80%). On the need for explanation, see Auberger, *Pausanias VIII-XIII* and Akujärvi, *Researcher, Traveller, Narrator* 207-208, with further references.

²⁷ Some interesting examples: the chest of Cypselus, tyrant of Corinth, Paus. 5.17.5-5.19; The treachery of Callicrates and the rise of Rome, Paus. 7.10.7-17.4; the stories of Melannippus and Comaetho, Paus. 7.19.2-6 and Coresus and Callirhoe, Paus. 7.21.1-5 (both novelistic); the defence of Thermopylae against the Gauls, Paus. 10.19.5-23.

and even by a lack of sights worth seeing.²⁸ With the exception of Janick Auberger, who emphasises a Roman imperial interest in values of good leadership, among these ἀρετή and ἀνδρεία,²⁹ Pausanias' own agenda and methods as an author have not been given full attention. Even Auberger's remarks refer more to a general *Zeitgeist* than to a specific authorial agenda; and considering Diodorus's earlier interest in Aristomenes' ἀρετή, her explanation loses its alleged chronological distinctiveness. After all, the values of ἀνδρεία and ἀρετή were important concepts of self-definition throughout classical antiquity.³⁰

In the remainder of this introduction I will first give a summary on the current debate on Pausanias, and especially his book 4, and explain how my approach will differ from the present interpretations of the text. I will then examine the clues that Pausanias himself gives about his methods and purpose in the *Periegesis*. I will propose in this part of this introduction that modern historical theory combining literary criticism with historiography, such as pioneered by Hayden White, may give us an alternative perspective on Pausanias' agenda as both travel writer and historian. White's discussion of the historical *metier* concentrates on the emplotments historians necessarily impose on their narratives. This focus will assist my exploration of Pausanias' attitude as an author towards Messenian history.³¹ I will conclude this chapter by

²⁸ Folk traditions: Ogden, *Aristomenes*; novelistic sources: J. Auberger, 'Pausanias romancier? Le témoignage du livre IV' *Dialogues d'Histoire Ancienne* (1992) 257-280; identity-politics: Luraghi, *The Ancient Messenians*; lack of monuments: Susan E. Alcock, 'The Peculiar Book IV and the Problem of the Messenian Past' in: Susan E. Alcock, John F. Cherry and Jaś Elsner eds., *Pausanias. Travel and Memory in Roman Greece* (Oxford 2001) 142-153; C. Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece* (Berkeley 1985) 137.

²⁹ Auberger, 'une leçon'; Auberger, *Pausanias* 182-183.

³⁰ See in particular the essays collected in R.M. Rosen and I. Sluiter eds., *Andreia. Studies in manliness and courage in classical antiquity* (Leiden 2003) and in addition; T. Schmitz, *Bildung und Macht: Zur sozialen und politischen Funktion der zweiten Sophistik in der griechischen Welt der Kaiserzeit* (Munich 1996). On the importance of the Greek ideals of ἀρετή and ἀνδρεία in the Roman concept of 'virtus' see M.A. McDonnell, *Roman Manliness. Virtus and the Roman Republic* (Cambridge 2006) 40-1, 128-134, 334 and on 'audacia' as a translation of τόλμη 59-71.

³¹ John Marincola, 'Genre, Convention, and Innovation in Greco-Roman historiography' in: Christina Shuttleworth Kraus ed., *The Limits of Historiography. Genre and narrative in ancient historical texts* (Leiden 1999) 281-324, 304-305 also discusses the value of White's theory in interpreting both Greek and Latin historiography.

introducing the comparative perspective that I have used to examine the *Messenika*.

Recent readings of Pausanias' *Messenika*.

The existence of a corpus of texts by different authors referring to Aristomenes makes it clear that Pausanias is not alone in writing about this mythical episode in Messenian history. The origin of the Aristomenes tradition has long been debated and although the debate was by necessity inconclusive, it seems without doubt that the Hellenistic period (i.e. the time of Myron of Priene and Rhianos of Crete, but more importantly the period in which Messene was 'liberated' by the Thebans) saw an increased interest in the mythical Messenian hero.³² The importance of his story for the (re)foundation of Messene and the development of a Messenian identity have been the subject of recent attention. Although it has been recognised that we read the story through the interpretation of a Lydian Greek³³ writing in Roman imperial times, modern scholarship, stimulated especially by the advances made by Jonathan Hall and Irad Malkin among others in the research of ethnicity- and identity-politics in antiquity,³⁴ has focussed on the 4th and 3rd centuries BC as the period in which the drastic changes after the Battle of Leuctra called for a new interpretation (or 'invention'³⁵) of Messenian history. Although the present scholarship is highly critical of the nineteenth- and early twentieth-century source criticism of Pausanias, it is nevertheless a continuation of it in

³² Luraghi, *The Ancient Messenians* 83-94, 247.

³³ At Paus 5.13.7, Pausanias identifies himself with Magnesia on Sipylos. Whereas in other descriptions he often refers to 'they' as in 'they say that', here he writes: 'we have a tradition'. The first to notice this was W. Gurlitt, *Über Pausanias* (Graz 1890) 56-7, 130. His suggestion has been widely accepted. Cf. Pretzler, *Pausanias* 21-23 for further references and a discussion of the region.

³⁴ See J.M. Hall, *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge 1997); J.M. Hall, *Hellenicity. Between ethnicity and culture* (Chicago 2002); I. Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece* (Leiden 1987); I. Malkin, *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean* (Cambridge 1994); I. Malkin, *The Returns of Odysseus: colonization and ethnicity* (Berkeley 1998) and the articles collected in I. Malkin ed., *Ancient Perceptions of Greek ethnicity* (Washington 2001).

³⁵ This trends follows from a functionalist perspective on the development of history that places emphasis on the agenda of the subjects of history, pioneered by E.J.E. Hobsbawm and T.O. Ranger eds., *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge 1992).

that it seeks to interpret this imperial source for Messenian history from the perspective of Pausanias' sources. In addition to Myron of Priene and Rhianos of Bene, it has been suggested that local historians provided impulses to the tradition through their competition for the supremacy of their particular Messenian city, which entailed putting forward various claims to a heroic past.³⁶

Pausanias, in introducing his Hellenistic sources, proves himself to be a sceptic when it comes to the value of Myron, pointing out that his statement that Aristomenes killed the Spartan king Theopompus is in contradiction to evidence from Tyrtaeus that he in fact had ended the war against the Messenians. Consequently, he cannot agree with Myron's dating of Aristomenes to the First Messenian War and chooses to adhere to Rhianos' version which places him in the Second Messenian War. In support of this decision he comments that the differences between both accounts are so wide that he is unable to combine both accounts, but is forced to choose just one. Additionally, he remarks that 'one may realise in other of his works that Myron gives no heed to the question of his statements seeming to lack truth and credibility, and particularly in this Messenian history'.³⁷ Modern scholars have quite naturally concluded from these comments that the subsequent account of Aristomenes may therefore be interpreted as that of Rhianos.³⁸ The fact that Rhianos is also known as an epic poet, who among other works produced a translation of Homer, is thought to explain Aristomenes' Achillean heroism and further corroborates the idea that he was in fact Pausanias' most important source.³⁹

³⁶ In addition to Luraghi, *The Ancient Messenians* 327, discussed below: N. Deshours, 'La légende et la culte de Messène ou comment forger l'identité d'une cité' *Revue des Études grecques* 106 (1993) 39-60. The original hypothesis was first put forward by E. Schwartz, 'Tyrtaeos' *Hermes* 34 (1899) 428-68, 457-8 and taken over by Kroymann, *Pausanias und Rhianos* 55 ff.

³⁷ Paus. 4.6.3-5.

³⁸ This has even gone to the extent of reprinting parts of Pausanias as fragments of Rhianos, and discussions of Rhianos' style. Note Ogden's critical discussion of Couat, Castelli, Kohlmann, Kroymann, Kiechle, Misgeld, Musti and Torelli: Ogden, *Aristomenes* 167-8.

³⁹ Kroymann, *Pausanias und Rhianos* esp. 68, 70, 87, *passim*. He suggests (70) that in addition to Achilles a comparison between Hektor and Aristomenes may be made in their capacity as

This search for the ancient sources behind Pausanias' account was connected to attempts to historicise and contextualise both the wars themselves and the often wondrous episodes told by Pausanias. Pausanias, as we will see in chapter 2, does not accord Aristomenes a hairy heart, nor does he explain his survival from his fall in the Caeadas by having him use his shield as a parachute; but he does depict him as performing equally marvellous deeds, which indeed invite an interpretation of the story as a piece of (epic) literature, or an 'invented history' sprung from the desire to create a heroic past, rather than a later, and hence, presumably, more disinterested, analytical and sober account.

Many scholars, most recently Susan Alcock, Thomas Figueira, and Nino Luraghi, have therefore been tempted to interpret book 4 as emerging from a Messenian desire to (re)claim identity and establish a community feeling. This interpretation has emerged from the original debate regarding whether or not the story of Aristomenes' rebellion could actually be considered history. Whereas L.R. Shero had first put forward a somewhat romantic argument that it was precisely the oppression of the Messenians that had fostered a tendency of holding on to the memory of the revolt, in later years, and especially after Lionel Pearson's 1962 article, book 4 was increasingly interpreted as a 'pseudo-history'.⁴⁰ Following on from this, recent scholarship has tried to establish the connection between this pseudo-history and actual Messenian history.

defeated heroes. The Homeric elements in the story of Aristomenes need not to have been derived from Rhianos. Homer is the single most cited author in the *Periegesis* as a whole. Note in particular Paus 2.21.10 ('for I place more reliance than others on the poetry of Homer'); 9.9.5. ('[the Thebaid] is mentioned by Callinus, who says that the author was Homer, and many good authorities agree with this judgment. With the exception of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* I rate the *Thebaid* more highly than any other poem').

⁴⁰ Lionel Pearson, 'the Pseudo-history of Messenia and its authors' *Historia* 11(1962) 397-426; L.R. Shero, 'Aristomenes the Messenian' *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 69 (1938) 500-531.

In 'The pseudo-history of Messenia unplugged' (1999), Susan Alcock positioned herself between these two schools of thought. Partly from a desire to do justice to the enslaved Messenians, she does not want to disregard their opportunity to remember. But at the same time she also recognises the influences on that memory over time and singles out the fourth-century liberation as a major influence. Steering a middle course, she concludes that Messenian history is rather 'an incessantly dynamic process of remembrance and oblivion, commemoration and rejection'.⁴¹

This process she illuminates in more detail in her *Archaeologies of the Greek Past. Landscape, Monuments and Memories* (2002). Leaving open the question to what extent Messenian tradition was invented, she emphasises the ability of the Messenians to have a strong view on what it means to 'be Messenian', despite many years of subjugation. Although stressing the importance of the archaeological remains, she also uses Pausanias' book 4 to illustrate this. She criticises those who interpret book 4 as the product of the fourth-century liberation for having a 'disdain for invented traditions', an 'over ready assumption of their instrumentalist nature' and, worse of all, a 'conviction that a people without freedom or political organization can have no sense of self, no memories, no "history" – or at least none worth worrying about'. The biggest problem she notes with this interpretation of book 4 is the disregard of the possibility that the stories may have derived from enslaved Messenians in favour of the agency of the Messenians returning in the fourth century. In her view, both memories and invented traditions could have been kept both by

⁴¹ Susan E. Alcock, 'The Pseudo-history of Messenia Unplugged' *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 129 (1999) 333-341.

the exiled and by the enslaved Messenians.⁴² That the text is written by a writer living in the second century AD forms no part of her critique.⁴³

Thomas Figueira in his article on 'The Evolution of Messenian identity'⁴⁴ evaluates the emergence of Messenian identity from the fifth century onwards. Beginning his exploration with Thucydides and investigating signs of Messenian identity in archaeological remains from the fifth century, he analyses Messenian identity from the perspective of the Messenian-Athenian alliance in the Peloponnesian War. At the heart of his discussion is the help the earthquake rebels received when Athens settled them in Naupactus and the part the Naupactian Messenians subsequently took in the Peloponnesian War on Athenian side. This alliance was reflected, in his view, in Messenian identity as we find it in Thucydides, but also in later authors such as Diodorus and Pausanias. He writes about the '*Messenika*, the local histories that are reflected in the account of Pausanias' and reads them as the products of returning Messenians and their descendants, whose vision of their identity is still heavily influenced by their role in the Peloponnesian War.⁴⁵

As I will argue in chapter two, Thucydides' theory of *stasis*, and in particular his thoughts on the confusion of the meaning of courage and cowardice in

⁴² As we will see below, Luraghi's thesis, developed alongside Alcock's, is the most obvious example of this tendency. Although Luraghi in his latest book admits the possibility that the Aristomenes-tradition developed in the early 4th century, following Ogden's proposition that the exiled communities may have been an important influence, his general interpretation of the story as we find it in Pausanias sees in it a Theban-Messenian 'vulgate' disclaiming the presence of ex-helots in Messenia.

⁴³ Alcock, 'The Peculiar Book IV' focuses more on the agenda of Pausanias as an author. She investigates the 'stratigraphy' of book 4 and discovers that 'periods characterised by a lack of autonomy' are met with relative silence. This silence parallels a similar gap in the archaeological record from Messenia. She mentions that the Messenians after the liberation are able to triumph at Olympia (Paus. 6.2.10-11), which suggests an association between their identity and their freedom. The Messenians thereby provide an example of a people who have gone through a similar problem as the Greeks under Roman rule have.

⁴⁴ Thomas J. Figueira, 'The evolution of the Messenian identity' in: S. Hodkinson and A. Powell eds., *Sparta. New Perspectives* (London 1999) 211-244.

⁴⁵ Figueira, 'The evolution of Messenian identity' 220. This implies that the influence of the settlement of Messenians at Naupactus can be detected in book 4: Pearson, 'Pseudo-history' 403-4; N. Robertson, *Festivals and Legends: The formation of the Greek cities in the light of public ritual. Phoenix* supplementary volume 31 (Toronto 1992) 225; Ogden, *Aristomenes* 146-148; Cf. Luraghi, *The Ancient Messenians* 188-210 for the Messenian identity and accompanying identity-politics of the Naupactians.

such a situation of civil unrest, may be reflected in Pausanias' use of τόλμη. I will also discuss in that chapter the possible reflection of local histories in Pausanias' treatment of the Naupactian Messenians. Pausanias' book 4 is used by Figueira, however, solely to detect these *Messenika*, which were written (possibly among others) by Myron of Priene and Rhianus of Bene and whose path 'was blazed by fourth-century historians like Callisthenes'.⁴⁶ Through these authors, the *Messenika* drew 'upon the traditions derived from the experiences of Messenian refugees of the archaic period like those established in Italy'.⁴⁷ By choosing this chronological frame Figueira partly avoids interpreting book 4 as evolving from a fourth-century desire to have a new history as well as a new community, but he still places its production in the context of the fourth-century liberation of Messenia. He recognises and even emphasises the continuity and evolution of Messenian identity from the earthquake revolt onwards, but ignores the context in which Pausanias was reading and using the *Messenika*.

Nino Luraghi uses the same chronological framework in his article 'The imaginary conquest of the helots'.⁴⁸ His aim is to investigate how the origin of helotage as a result of the violent conquest of Messenia was 'imagined' at different points in time. He begins with Tyrtaeus and works his way up to Pausanias, whom he discusses in the context of the second century AD as a period in which Greeks were engaged in a definition of their cultural identity. Luraghi also refers to Pausanias (and to Plutarch) in his analysis of the fourth century BC. In this discussion he juxtaposes the 'Spartan party line' with the 'Theban-Messenian party line'. Isocrates' *Archidamus* is part of the Spartan story and is hostile towards the citizens of the New Messene, who are not 'true Messenians', but 'helots'. The Theban-Messenian version of the story, however, emphasises the role of exiles returning to Messene as true

⁴⁶ Figueira, 'The evolution of Messenian identity' 226.

⁴⁷ Figueira, 'The evolution of Messenian identity' 227.

⁴⁸ Nino Luraghi, 'The imaginary conquest of the Helots' in: Nino Luraghi and Susan E. Alcock ed., *Helots and their Masters in Laconia and Messenia. Histories, Ideologies, Structures* (Washington, Cambridge Ma., London 2003) 109-141.

Messenians.⁴⁹ Both versions agree on the view that no Messenians were living in Messenia at the time of liberation. The sources for the Theban-Messenian party line are, however, difficult to find. Luraghi uses Pausanias and Plutarch and argues that they incorporated the Theban-Messenian 'vulgate' by the use of their sources.

This basic interpretation of the *Messenika* as a source for a semi-official Messenian view of their own history is carried over with added nuances in Luraghi's most recent work, *The Ancient Messenians. Constructions of Ethnicity and Memory*.⁵⁰ Here, he pursues the theme of 'invention of tradition' further and investigates how the Messenians identified themselves and constructed representations of their past. He emphasises that 'invention' should not be understood as a conscious creation of new myth on a blank slate, but is rather a 'creative engagement with the past' that has to follow certain rules of plausibility, thereby moving closer to Alcock's original definition of Messenian history as 'an incessantly dynamic process of remembrance and oblivion, commemoration and rejection'.⁵¹ This results in a tension between plausibility and functionality, which in Greece most often 'took the form of a dialectic between local and panhellenic myths'.⁵²

⁴⁹ See also: David Asheri, 'La diaspora e il ritorno dei Messeni' in E. Gabba ed., *Tria Corda. Scritti in onore di Arnaldo Momigliano* (Como 1983) 27-42.

⁵⁰ As well as in a 2001 article on the earthquake revolt, where he discussed Pausanias as the highpoint of a 'messenisierenden Revision': Nino Luraghi, 'Der Erdbebenaufstand und die Entstehung der messenischen Identität' in: Dietrich Papenfuß and Volker Michael Strocka eds., *Gab es das Griechischen Wunder? Griechenland zwischen dem Ende des 6. und der Mitte des 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (Mainz 2001) 279-301.

⁵¹ Alcock, 'Pseudo-history' 338.

⁵² Luraghi, *The Ancient Messenians* 47-8: 'the former reflected most directly what a community liked to think about its past, giving expression to the functional side, but at the same time they needed to be acceptable on a panhellenic level in order to be plausible, while the panhellenic myths, enshrined in the words of the most illustrious poets and therefore less easy to tamper with and often completely out of date, set the conditions for the acceptability of the local myths.' It is interesting in this respect that Pausanias often comments on the implausibility of local myths when compared with panhellenic myths, especially when these myths are found in the works of Homer, see in particular: Paus. 1.13.8-9; 2.4.2; 2.12.3; 2.14.2; 2.21.10; 3.24.10-11; 4.2.1-3; 4.32.2; 5.2.3-5; 6.12.8-9; 7.2.4; 7.5.1; 9.38.6-8; 10.6.5-7; 10.17.3-4. On some occasions he specifically mentions the functionality that these 'imagined' myths have for their intended public as an additional argument for their falsity: Paus. 2.26.7; 4.33.2; 10.24.2-3.

Working from the assumption of this tension, Luraghi subsequently sets out how the Messenians constructed their past in a functional way, within these limits of acceptability. Central to his discussion of the functionality of Messenian myth is the necessity for the new polis of Messene at Ithome to legitimise its existence, its dominance over other 'Messenian' communities, as well as to answer the Spartan criticism, voiced in Isocrates' *Archidamos*, that the Messenians were no more than former slaves. In this respect, Luraghi comes close to arguing that Pausanias offered a semi-official history of the cities of Messene and Andania.⁵³ We will see in chapter 2 that the attention in book 4 shifts from Andania and Mt. Eira as the centre of Aristomenes' revolt to Mt. Ithome as the place where Aristomenes buries a 'secret thing' and where subsequently Messenia is reborn in the fourth century. This is explained by Luraghi through his suggestion that Myron and Rhianos were both commissioned by Messenian cities, but not by the same one: Myron's narrative of the First Messenian War emphasizes the role of Mt. Ithome, but also mentions other cities in Messenia; Rhianos' account centres on Andania.⁵⁴ The shift in emphasis in Pausanias' text thus results from the differences between these two writers and these differences are caused by local competition in Messenia.

Luraghi does include an analysis of local competition in Graeco-Roman Messenia, and reflects on the possible effects of this on Pausanias' book 4, but

⁵³ Illustrative are the following passages: 'The defeat and enslavement at the hands of the Spartans were a stain on the Messenian past and cried for correction. Narrating the history of the Messenian wars from a resolutely Messenian point of view was an obvious way to try to repair this deficit. Unless Pausanias is seriously misleading, both Myron and Rhianos transformed the wars into a tale of glorious Messenian victories in pitched battles and guerrilla raids. Only treason and trickery brought them down, and no occasion is missed to praise the gallantry in the face of the ruthless Spartans' (88); 'If Myron's transmitted confidence about the strength and cohesion of a unified and somewhat undifferentiated Messenia, Rhianos apparently foregrounded a part of the region that actually coincided with the territory of the polis Messene. In his perspective, this was where the Messenians who had fought for freedom from Sparta came from. Rhianos' perspective could have a twofold implication: on the one hand the memory of the heroic war against the Spartans was de facto claimed exclusively by the polis of Messene, while on the other, the sacrifice of the Messenians from the northern Messenian plain, who had faced war and exile for the freedom of the whole region, could function as a charter-myth for the supremacy of the polis of Messene and for its leading role within Messenia' (286-7).

⁵⁴ Luraghi, *The Ancient Messenians* 286.

his approach here is indicative of his low valuation of Pausanias as an author.⁵⁵ He addresses the *Messenika* particularly in his discussion of the Spartan-Messenian competition over the area of Dentheliatis under the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius. The Messenians lost the area as a punishment of their support for Antony during the Battle of Actium. Shortly after Augustus' death, however, Tacitus reports that the Messenians successfully petitioned the new emperor Tiberius for the return of this area. Both the Messenians and the Spartans made use of the works of poets and historians referring to the period of Messenia's enslavement.⁵⁶ Luraghi mentions in this respect Eduard Schwartz's conjecture that Pausanias may have been using a 1st century AD historian whose work was put forward in this dispute.⁵⁷ Although he admits that this hypothesis cannot be proven, he comments that 'Pausanias' narrative of the Messenian Wars involves extensive tampering with the main sources, the works of Rhianos and Myron, but it seems impossible to exclude with certainty that such a creative engagement with the sources should be credited to Pausanias himself.'⁵⁸ This reads as a very reluctant dismissal of Schwartz's hypothesis,⁵⁹ and in the subsequent discussion of Pausanias' treatment of the Andanian Mysteries and of the incident at the sanctuary of Artemis Limnatis,⁶⁰ Luraghi likewise does not seem to want to let go of this supposed local historian, crediting him even with the Herodotean similarities in Pausanias' narrative, although it is widely admitted that Pausanias used

⁵⁵ Luraghi, *The Ancient Messenians* 323-327 makes clear that local competition about who is truly 'Messenian' and what this means continues in imperial Messene. Although he notes that Pausanias' 'concept of Greece as repository of a unified cultural and religious heritage would have been inconceivable before the Roman conquest', he remains steadfast in the traditional interpretation of the *Messenika* as Hellenistic and concludes that 'for better or for worse, Pausanias' detailed overview of the Messenian past reflects choices made to a large extent by the Messenians themselves, especially in the Hellenistic period, and then reiterated on various occasions'.

⁵⁶ Luraghi, *The Ancient Messenians* 16-23, 294-5, 299-300; Tacitus, *Ann* 4.43.1-3.

⁵⁷ Luraghi, *The Ancient Messenians* 295, referring to Schwartz, 'Tyrtaios' 457-8. Cf. Kroymann, *Pausanias und Rhianos* 55.

⁵⁸ Luraghi, *The Ancient Messenians* 295.

⁵⁹ Compare Luraghi, *The Ancient Messenians* 324-325: 'The fluent narrative produced, integrating and reworking the material offered by Rhianos and Myron, may be Pausanias' own achievement, or he may have derived it more or less closely from an author of the early first century BC, as seems more likely on the whole.'

⁶⁰ See Paus. 4.4.1-4, and below, chapter 2.

Herodotus directly as a model throughout the *Periegesis*.⁶¹ In view of his extensive discussion of changes and continuities in local identity politics, this reluctance is remarkable and even at times contradictory of his insistence that Pausanias' attempts to preserve the memory of monuments and events were influenced by the Antonine context in which he lived.⁶² Referring to Pausanias' interpretation of the Messenian relationship with the Achaean League, Luraghi points out that the contradictions in his account with that of Polybius, Livy and Plutarch, may well have derived from Pausanias' local Messenian informants⁶³ and comments that 'Pausanias was continuously intruding with his own authoritative voice in the politics of memory practiced by the elite families who must have constituted both a part of his intended audience and his acquaintances.'⁶⁴ Luraghi's discussion, however, does not include any analysis of Pausanias' authoritative voice. He mines the source for possible Messenian voices from the Hellenistic 'liberation' of Messene onwards, instead of taking Pausanias' authorial agenda as a starting point. Although understandable, given that his interest lies with Messenian identity and ethnicity, not with Pausanias, the question of how we should interpret the latter's treatment of Messenian history remains open.

⁶¹ Luraghi, *The Ancient Messenians* 294-300. At 299-300: 'Possibly at this point a revised version of the early history of Messenia was also produced, one in which the mysteries featured in an even more prominent and systematic way than before. Pausanias' Messenian version of the Limnai incident probably goes back to this phase, and the hypothetical local historian could be responsible also for the pervasive imitation of Herodotus found in Pausanias' Messeniaka, and possibly even for Herodotean pastiches like the story of the Messenians in Rhegion and Zankle.' Ogden, *Aristomenes* 28-32 discusses Herodotean elements in the Aristomenes story and views it as an indication that they may be traced back to folk traditions. For Herodotus as Pausanias' model: I.O. Pfundtner, *Pausanias Periegeta imitator Herodoti* diss. Königsberg (1866); C. Wernicke, *De Pausaniae Periegetae studiis Herodoteis* (Berlin 1884); G. Pasquali, 'Die schriftstellerische Form des Pausanias' *Hermes* 48 (1913) 161-223; O. Strid, 'Über Sprache und Stil des "Periegetes" Pausanias' *Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Studia Graeca Upsaliensa* 9 (1976); Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide* 3, 97, 133, 154; J. Elsner, 'Structuring "Greece": Pausanias' *Periegesis* as a literary construct' in: S.E. Alcock, J.F. Cherry and J. Elsner eds., *Pausanias. Travel and Memory in Roman Greece* (New York 2001) 3-20, 17-19; Hutton, *Describing Greece* 213; Cf. Meadows, 'Pausanias and the historiography of Classical Sparta' on Pausanias' use of Herodotus in book 3.

⁶² Luraghi, *The Ancient Messenians* 327: 'The past Pausanias dealt with was far from being dead, and its relevance to the world he lived in is a necessary starting point if we want to understand the way he dealt with it'.

⁶³ C.P. Jones, 'Pausanias and his guides' in: S.E. Alcock, J.F. Cherry and J. Elsner eds., *Pausanias. Travel and Memory in Roman Greece* (New York 2001) 33-9; M. Pretzler, 'Pausanias and oral tradition' *Classical Quarterly* 55 (2005) 235-49.

⁶⁴ Luraghi, *The Ancient Messenians* 326.

The importance of Aristomenes' story for later Messenians is also recognised in Daniel Ogden's attempt to place Pausanias' representation of the Messenian rebel leader Aristomenes in a folk tradition through an investigation of the symbolic nature of the different episodes in the story. Its importance, in his view, is that 'the legend reflects, however dimly, the voice, self-identity, memories and aspirations of the Messenian people under — or just after — three centuries of serfdom to Sparta, or Spartan-determined exile from the Peloponnese'.⁶⁵ In Alcock's definition of the two schools of interpretation of the *Messenika*, Ogden therefore falls in the category of those who, following Shero, believe in the ability of an enslaved people to hold on to their own vision of their past.⁶⁶ He nevertheless simultaneously disclaims any suggestion that his recognition of folkloristic and symbolic elements in the story necessarily refers to an earlier history. He concludes, in a reconstruction of the tradition, that the earliest author certain to have written about Aristomenes is Callisthenes of Olynthus, possibly in his *Hellenica* written before he accompanied Alexander the Great's Persian expedition in 336 BC.⁶⁷

Ogden's reconstruction of the tradition corroborates Luraghi's conclusion that there was a strong Hellenistic interest in Aristomenes' myth and is in agreement with his analysis of the functionality of (specific parts of) the myth for returning exiled Messenians and their Theban supporters.⁶⁸ In confirmation of his earlier dating of the tradition to at least Callisthenes, the focus is, however, more on the exiled communities than on the new

⁶⁵ Ogden, *Aristomenes* xiii.

⁶⁶ Ogden, *Aristomenes* 129 concludes that there are strong indications for the hypothesis that the legend of Aristomenes existed prior to Callisthenes and that Pausanias' account of the use of Aristomenes' shield during the battle at Leuctra as well as the Messenians' call for Aristomenes to return to his fatherland after the 'liberation' entail that the idea of Aristomenes was already thriving — amongst Messenians and Spartans alike — in 371, and this in itself throws his development and fame back at least some way into the occupation period'.

⁶⁷ Ogden, *Aristomenes* 181-182.

⁶⁸ Ogden, *Aristomenes* 134-151: 'There was no doubt much to encourage the development of Aristomenes' tradition in the restored Messenia, and numerous focuses of it or vehicles of it can be identified' (137).

Messenian cities of Messene and Andania.⁶⁹ This idea of the functionality of myth also comes across in his analysis of Pausanias' depiction of Aristomenes. Ogden remarks that the Messenian hero shares characteristics with three different hero-types.⁷⁰ The first to be discussed by Ogden, and the most obvious one after reading Pausanias' introduction regarding Rhianos, is Achilles. This type accords well with Aristomenes' martial qualities - referred to by Pausanias through the word τόλμη. As I will suggest in chapter 2, it may also be connected to the downside of his daring, namely his recklessness.⁷¹ The second hero-type present in Pausanias' portrayal is Odysseus. Ogden notes that Aristomenes often behaves as a trickster figure and connects this especially to the second phase of his revolt in which open battles had made way for guerrilla warfare. Thirdly, Aristomenes may also be compared to Aesop, in a number of episodes in which he is captured in unheroic circumstances, but escapes thanks to his resourcefulness. Ogden concludes: 'If the Achillean Aristomenes best suits a Messenia that fights Sparta on equal terms, and the Odyssean Aristomenes best suits a Messenia struggling against a stronger Sparta, the Aesopic Aristomenes best suits a wholly subject Messenia'.⁷²

Ogden's symbolic approach to the Aristomenes story results in many interesting insights in the heroic character of Aristomenes, but it hardly bears on Pausanias' portrayal of the rebel leader and his fellow rebels. Why Pausanias would be interested in the story at all and how he adapted it from earlier sources receives precious little attention. Along with Alcock, Ogden refers to the lack of archaic and classical monuments in Pausanias' text and

⁶⁹ Compare Figueira, 'The evolution of Messenian identity' 220. Figueira concentrates entirely on the Naupactian Messenians, whereas Ogden, *Aristomenes* 144-8 traces the story back to the earlier exiled communities and notes that 'there is no compelling indication of a post-Ithomaeon input into the Aristomenes legend as we have it'.

⁷⁰ Ogden, *Aristomenes* chapter 3.

⁷¹ This has not been noted by Ogden, although he does comment elsewhere (120) on Paus. 4.16.4., where Aristomenes goes 'besirkir'. Taking over the suggestion of B. Sergent, *Homosexuality in Greek Myth* (London 1986) 225, he argues that Aristomenes' frenzy has animalistic features. In chapter 2 I will compare the capacity of Aristomenes to go 'besirkir' with Achilles' anger.

⁷² Ogden, *Aristomenes* 53-54.

adds that his interest in the liberty of Greece, 'may have particularly endeared the feisty and hard-done-by Messenians to him'.⁷³ In addition, although Ogden discusses Pausanias' text in detail, Pausanias' literary style and vocabulary go unmentioned, except for his stylistic similarities with Herodotus. The Herodotean nature of the text can, however, serve as an argument in favour of the unity of the *Periegesis*, as the *Histories* provided the primary model for the *Periegesis*, which Ogden acknowledges.⁷⁴ Nevertheless, for Ogden this is all the more reason to analyse the story as part of popular tradition.⁷⁵

Janick Auberger in her 2005 running commentary on book 4, as well as a selection of articles, attributes the heroic characteristics of Aristomenes and of the Messenians more generally both to a novelistic influence - presumably although not certainly through Rhianos⁷⁶ - and to a Roman imperial interest in ἀνδρεία and *moderatio*. This approach is based on a detailed analysis of Pausanias' language.⁷⁷ She argues that Pausanias in book 4 let go of his usual objectivity and wrote a '*histoire d'amour*' for the Messenians. She starts by asking the rhetorical question whether Pausanias used in this book the 'plat et terre' ('flat and dull') style of which he is normally accused and answers it by placing emphasis on Pausanias' depiction of the courage displayed by the

⁷³ Ogden, *Aristomenes* 2.

⁷⁴ Ogden, *Aristomenes* 28-32.

⁷⁵ Ogden, *Aristomenes* 32: 'Whatever the context in which Plutarch encountered the Herodotean Aristomenes, and whatever the means by which he entered Pausanias' work, it is likely that he owed his origin to the same sort of sources that ultimately generated much of Herodotus' archaic Greek material, namely popular tradition.'

⁷⁶ Auberger, 'Pausanias romancier?' mentions the Greek novels of the Second Sophistic as a possible inspiration for Pausanias. Ogden's criticism, *Aristomenes* 17, that the single most distinguishing feature of the Greek novel, the love-relationship, is absent in the Aristomenes story is valid. Pausanias' interest in the Greek novel can, however, also be detected in his discussions of the stories of Melannipus and Comaetho, Paus. 7.19.2-6 and Coresus and Callirhoe, Paus. 7.21.1-5.

⁷⁷ Including the word τόλμη that she interprets as a wholly positive word: J. Auberger, 'Les Mots du Courage chez Pausanias' *Revue de Philologie, de Littérature et d' Histoire Anciennes* 98 (1996) 7-18. Regrettably she does not comment upon the difference between the predominance of ἀνδρεία and ἀριστος in the other sources of the Aristomenes-tradition versus the dominant τόλμη in Pausanias.

Messenians.⁷⁸ She interprets his frequent use of the word *τόλμη* as indicating a more noble courage than the Spartans possess,⁷⁹ based on self preservation rather than on greed, and concludes that of the two parties 'les Messéniens sont les seuls vrais guerriers' ('the only real warriors'). The Spartans manage to defeat them only through fate and the treachery of the Arcadian king Aristocrates.

Delving deep into the far-from-dull style Pausanias employed in the *Messenika*, Auberger sets out to demonstrate that Pausanias is a writer in his own right, who cannot be simply labelled as a travel-writer or a historian. Book 4 is, according to Auberger, an example of how he went beyond reporting sights and stories by playing with both past and contemporary genres and styles. Within the limits set by his sources, which on the whole he respects,⁸⁰ Pausanias is apt to introduce novelistic elements derived from the genre of the Greek novel, whose heyday coincided with Pausanias' life. Auberger's thesis has been criticised persuasively by Ogden for being too limited in recognising elements as novelistic that in fact have a far more universal value in Greek literature and can be found in Homer and Herodotus, both authors to whom Pausanias refers frequently, as well as in later literature.⁸¹ Nevertheless, her analysis of Pausanias as a playful writer, a man of his own time as much as of the past, and as an innovative historian is an advance on the mining operations that have characterised previous interpretations and deserves to be followed by a textual analysis of his methods in presenting Messenian history.

⁷⁸ Where does this accusation come from? I agree with Auberger in disagreeing with this harsh judgment. Personally I found many far from dull passages in the whole of the *Periegesis*, not just in book 4.

⁷⁹ This is interesting in the light of the recent argument of D. Levystone, 'Le courage et les mots de la peur dans la *Lachès* et le *Protagoras*' *Phoenix* 60 (2006) 346-363 that Plato makes a distinction between Athenian and Spartan courage. The Athenians exemplify a more reasoned and strategic type of courage, whereas the Spartans demonstrate a rather more sublime courage that is characterised by contempt for fear. Pausanias' use of *τόλμη*, as interpreted by Auberger, might appear to have some similarities with Plato's interpretation of Spartan courage.

⁸⁰ Although in Auberger, 'Pausanias et le Livre 4' 257 she holds that he is rather more flexible with them.

⁸¹ Ogden, *Aristomenes* 16-18.

Auberger's approach therefore seems useful, as it develops from the text as we have it and first of all asks how the author Pausanias depicts Messenian history before addressing the question why. Its perspective is first and foremost a literary one, without excluding the potential of the text to bear on historical issues. The latter obviously should include attempts to place him in the context of his own time. Auberger's more recent work on Pausanias includes analyses of Aristomenes' leadership qualities with reference to the imperial canons of the ideal leader, emphasising *moderatio*, *clementia*, εὐνοια, πρόνοια, εὐσέβεια, ἀνδρεία and θυμός.⁸² This approach is open to a similar criticism as her 1992 article, in that none of these qualities are specific to the 2nd century AD. Additionally, I will argue in chapter 2 that Aristomenes is seriously lacking at least in *moderatio* and πρόνοια. The word ἀνδρεία is also conspicuously absent from Pausanias' narrative. I will argue that his frequent reference to Aristomenes' τόλμη implies the opposite of ἀνδρεία.⁸³ The Messenians' τόλμη is commendable, according to Auberger, as it is courage aimed at self-preservation. The Messenian War should accordingly be interpreted as a defensive war against unjust aggressors.⁸⁴ These two assumptions will also be critically reviewed in this dissertation.

Auberger's reappraisal of Pausanias as an author in his own right, whose *Periegesis* is more than an ancient *Baedeker*,⁸⁵ supports a closer reading of Pausanias' own treatment of the history of the places he visits, as well as the

⁸² For the first 5 ideals, see Auberger, 'une leçon'; for the latter two, see: Pausanias, *Description de la Grèce. Tome IV, Livre IV* (translation and commentary by J. Auberger, Paris 2005) 182-183.

⁸³ *Pace* Auberger, 'une leçon?' 275-6: 'Et puis surtout il y a ce mot, τόλμη, qui est toujours chez Pausanias une qualité à admirer, qui qualifie toujours un individu et jamais un groupe de soldats, qui se suffit à lui-même puisqu'on ne trouve jamais d' εὐτολμία par exemple. Et qui est souvent appuyé par d'autres mots qui qualifient l'élite comme φρόνημα, "l'intelligence," "la hauteur d'âme"; ἀρετή (4.7.11, 18.7, 21.6). Et elle est presque toujours couronnée de success, l'εὐτυχία, alors que le success ne vient pas toujours couronner les simples qualités, louables certes, mais limitées que sont d' ἀνδρεία ou la προθυμία'.

⁸⁴ Auberger, 'Les Mots du Courage'.

⁸⁵ Habicht, 'An ancient Baedeker'; Frazer, *Pausanias' Description of Greece* xxiv. Cf. Elsner, 'A Greek Pilgrim in the Roman World' 6 with further references.

sources he uses in the process of writing these histories. She rightly points out that Pausanias' own agenda has been strangely ignored in interpretations of his text. As a result, the easy assumption that he wrote from a pro-Messenian and anti-Lakonian perspective, shared by all commentators including Auburger herself, has not yet been fully researched.

Pausanias as narrator

I have so far argued that the underestimation of Pausanias as an author has led to a neglect of his techniques and methods in writing the *Periegesis*, and that this neglect is undeserved, not only because it is a worthwhile exercise in itself to explore the authorial agenda of ancient writers (even mediocre ones), but also because Pausanias is more interesting than he has been given credit for. The neglect, however, also stems from the problem of identifying Pausanias' primary task as a narrator.⁸⁶ In this section I will review identifications of Pausanias as a travel writer (Habicht), a pilgrim (Elsner), and a historian (Akujärvi) and ask how modern historical theory, concentrating on the historian as narrator, may help us in solving this problem.

I have so far approached Pausanias' narrative as a history.⁸⁷ The main reason for this is that Pausanias is concerned with telling the truth about the Greek past. Various references to false and true beliefs scattered throughout the *Periegesis* testify to his educational intention and his trust in a rational study of the past.⁸⁸ In his book on Phocis, for example, he justifies his digression on Sardinia 'because it is an island about which the Greeks are very ignorant'.⁸⁹ The ignorance of the Greeks about their own past crops up at other places too.

⁸⁶ Marincola, 'Genre, Convention, and Innovation' 300 comments on the importance of being innovative for ancient historians. Especially in the interpretation of Pausanias it is helpful to keep in mind that the boundaries between genres were fluent since the question of what genre he wrote in is still being discussed.

⁸⁷ Pace Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide* 95-6: 'He is not and does not intend to be a historian, and should not be judged by the standards applied to historians'.

⁸⁸ Paus. 1.3.3; 2.2.1; 2.11.5; 2.14.2; 2.16.4; 2.23.6; 3.15.10-11; 3.26.6; 4.4.1-3; 4.33.2; 5.2.3-5; 5.6.2-3; 5.23.7; 6.8.2; 8.2.5-7; 10.17.3-4.

⁸⁹ Paus. 10.17.13.

In the book on Attica, Pausanias remarks that 'there are many false beliefs current among the mass of mankind, since they are ignorant of historical science and consider trustworthy whatever they have heard from childhood in choruses and tragedies',⁹⁰ and in the book on Arcadia he complains that 'all through the ages, many events that have occurred in the past, and even some that occur today, have been generally discredited because of the lies built up on the foundation of fact', adding that 'those who like to listen to the miraculous are themselves apt to add to the marvel, and so they ruin truth by mixing it with falsehood'.⁹¹ This tendency in the reception of the Greek past is one that the *Periegesis* seeks to remedy.

At several points in the *Periegesis*, Pausanias gives further explanations of the structure and purpose of his work, but they are all rather short and scattered at disparate places. The first indication comes half-way through the first book, on Attica. Here Pausanias comments that 'my narrative must not loiter, as my task is a general description of all Greece (πάντα ὁμοίως ἐπεξιόντα τὰ Ἑλληνικά)'.⁹² Only towards the end of the book do we learn what this description of Greece entails, when he concludes that 'such in my opinion are the most famous legends and sights (λόγοις καὶ θεωρήμασιν) among the Athenians, and from the beginning my narrative has picked out of much material the things that deserve to be recorded (τὰ ἐς συγγραφὴν ἀνήκοντα)'.⁹³ He expands on this in book 3, explaining that 'from the beginning the plan of my work has been to discard the many trivial stories (λόγος ... οὐκ ἀξίων) current among the several communities and to pick out the things most worthy of mention (ἀξιολογώτατα)'.⁹⁴ From this we can

⁹⁰ Paus. 1.3.3.

⁹¹ Paus. 8.2.5-7.

⁹² Paus. 1.26.4.

⁹³ Paus 1.39.3.

⁹⁴ Paus. 3. 11.1.

conclude that Pausanias' subject matter is twofold and includes both stories and sights.⁹⁵

Although in many cases Pausanias' depiction of a particular sight gives rise to an accompanying story, usually begun with a reference to an unspecified 'they' as in 'they say that',⁹⁶ this is by no means a universal rule. Generally, Pausanias begins each book with a history of the region in question, containing its genealogy and the wars it has participated in, before moving on to the specific sights. As noted above, the relative space devoted to both parts varies greatly.⁹⁷ Book 4 consists of approximately 80 % history and only 20 % sights.

Johanna Akujärvi argued in her 2005 book of her doctoral thesis *Researcher, Traveller, Narrator. Studies in Pausanias Periegesis* that it is not the sights, but the stories that dominate the structure of Pausanias' narrative. Using the hermeneutics offered by Genette's narratology, she analyses the role of the narrator in the text⁹⁸ and concludes that he uses the sights as triggers, but not the only triggers, for the more important stories. In her introduction she argues against the objection that she is using instruments developed in the interpretation of fiction for the analysis of non-fiction by referring to both theoretical and practical studies that have, in her view, demonstrated that 'narratologically speaking, the difference between fact and fiction is one of degrees rather than essence'. She adds that the successful use of modern narratology to interpret ancient texts should remove any hesitation in

⁹⁵ See in particular S. E. Alcock, 'Landscapes of Memory and the authority of Pausanias' in: J. Bingen ed., *Pausanias Historien. Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique* XLI (Geneva 1996) 241-267, esp. 244-246; Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide* 20-1, 95-6; Arafat, *Pausanias' Greece* 32-3.

⁹⁶ See Akujärvi, *Researcher, Traveller, Narrator* 92 for the interpretation of 'they say' as a means to express uncertainty and scepticism on the narrator's part.

⁹⁷ See above, 7 n.26.

⁹⁸ She insists on calling the first person singular in the text Ego instead of Pausanias, as it is not proven that the author refers to himself whenever he is using this. Strictly speaking she is right that Ego and Pausanias are not the same, but I feel that Pausanias' use of the first person singular to add to his authority as a narrator justifies calling him Pausanias, Akujärvi, *Researcher, Traveller, Narrator* 5-6.

applying the tools of modern hermeneutics to Pausanias.⁹⁹ Her approach is therefore akin to the theory of Hayden White¹⁰⁰ that historical texts should be approached as narratives. His main point was that narratives are imposed on history by historians in their attempts to explain the past. The historian uses narrative techniques such as tropic figuration and emplotment in order to render the unfamiliar familiar. The resulting historical narrative is thereby added by the historian to the history he wishes to tell, rather than somehow found in his source material.¹⁰¹

Likewise, Akujärvi's concentration on the narrator attempts to move beyond earlier 'mining expeditions' in the text. She warns that 'to use the *Periegesis* as a source of information that can be applied to almost any area of interest or any time in the history of Greece before the author's life-time, without considering the temporal and spatial situation of the text in which the different pieces of information occur, is a potential abuse of the text',¹⁰² and she welcomes the recent trend to interpret Pausanias as an author in his own right. Her project, however, goes further than contextualising the *Periegesis* in Pausanias' era, the 160s to 180s AD, than does Aubergier's. It consists, rather, of looking at Pausanias as the creator of the text. It certainly helps in this respect that he is very much present in his own text.

Pausanias, in the tradition of classical Greek ethnography, is mostly present in the text as a witness of what he reports. The act of travelling thereby forms an

⁹⁹ Akujärvi, *Researcher, Traveller, Narrator* 3-5 referring to

¹⁰⁰ Regrettably she does not mention White, or any other major historical theorist.

¹⁰¹ Hayden White first explained his theory in *Metahistory. The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore and London 1973) especially the introduction 1-43. His later articles are conveniently reprinted in *Tropics of Discourse. Essays in cultural criticism* (Baltimore 1978) esp. the introduction, chapters 2 and 3; *The Content of the Form. Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore 1987) esp. chapters 1 and 2; *Figural Realism. Studies in the Mimesis effect* (Baltimore 1999). Kuisma Korhonen, 'General Introduction: The History/Literature Debate' in: Kuisma Korhonen ed., *Tropes for the Past. Hayden White and the History/Literature Debate* (Amsterdam and New York 2006) 9-20 provides a handy overview of Hayden White's theory and the ensuing debate. Other useful introductions: Keith Jenkins, *On "What is History"? From Carr to Elton to Rorty and White* (London and New York 1995); Keith Jenkins, 'On Hayden White' in: *Why History? Ethics and Postmodernity* (London and New York 1999) 115-132.

¹⁰² Akujärvi, *Researcher, Traveller, Narrator* 2.

integral part of his methodology, but not necessarily of the structure of the resulting narrative. The fact that the sights are not the backbone of the *Periegesis* explains why it cannot be used as a travel guidebook, as Wilamowitz long ago discovered.¹⁰³ Pausanias' omission of anything not worth mentioning makes it certain that one will inevitably lose one's way, as there are many extant sights, both classical and Roman, deemed uninteresting. Furthermore, not only does the *Periegesis* contain both stories and sights, with the stories mostly but by no means invariably connected to the sights, the sights in their turn are not always related in topographical order.¹⁰⁴ The topographical markers in the text suggest the narrator's own travels rather than persuade the reader to follow in his footsteps.¹⁰⁵ The suggestion therefore that Pausanias reports on his travels to serve a public unable to visit these places is more apposite than the idea that the *Periegesis* is an ancient *Baedeker*.¹⁰⁶

More important still, I think, is the authority that Pausanias derives from travelling. One method by which Pausanias dismisses false beliefs concerning the legends that make up the Greek past is to witness and experience. An example of this in book 4 concerns Aristomenes' parentage. Pausanias remarks that 'most of the Greeks say that Pyrrhus (i.e. the son of Achilles) was the father of Aristomenes, but I myself know that in their libations the Messenians call him Aristomenes, son of Nicomedes'.¹⁰⁷ Another interesting example of Pausanias deriving authority from witnessing (or, in this case, not witnessing) a certain phenomena concerns the 'dappled' fish in the river

¹⁰³ Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Erinnerungen 1848-1914* (Leipzig 1928) 153ff; cited by Habicht, 'An ancient Baedeker' 222-223.

¹⁰⁴ Note for instance Paus. 5.14.4: 'Now that I have finished my account of the greatest altar, let me proceed to describe all the altars in Olympia. My narrative will follow in dealing with them the order in which the Eleans are wont to sacrifice on the altars'; and Paus. 5.14.10: 'The reader must remember that the altars have not been enumerated in the order in which they stand, but the order followed by the Eleans in their sacrifice'.

¹⁰⁵ Elsner, 'Pausanias. A Greek Pilgrim' 11-17; Elsner, 'Structuring Greece' 4/5.

¹⁰⁶ Anthony Spawforth, 'Shades of Greekness: A Lydian case study' in: I. Malkin ed., *Ancient Perceptions of Greek ethnicity* (Washington 2001) 375-400, esp. 390-391. Pretzler, *Pausanias* chapter 10 provides an interesting overview of how the *Periegesis* has influenced travellers in the 17th and 18th century and argues that its popularity in this time is the chief cause for the similarities with modern travel writing. *Baedeker* is in some ways a modern *Periegesis*, but the *Periegesis* is not an ancient *Baedeker*.

¹⁰⁷ Paus. 4.14.7.

Aroanius discussed in his book on Arcadia: 'These dappled fish, it is said, utter a cry like that of the thrush. I have seen fish that have been caught, but I never heard their cry, though I waited by the river even until sunset, at which time the fish were said to cry the most'.¹⁰⁸ In the book on Boeotia Pausanias also gives a detailed description of the procedures at the sanctuary of Trophonius and finishes it by alleging that 'What I write is not hearsay; I have myself inquired of Trophonius and seen other inquirers. Those who have descended into the shrine of Trophonius are obliged to dedicate a tablet on which is written all that each has heard and seen. The shield of Aristomenes is also still preserved here'.¹⁰⁹ Pausanias has at this point already explained that the inquiry can be a traumatic experience from which the supplicant needs several days to recover.¹¹⁰

The question of whether sights or stories matter more for Pausanias does not concern the author himself, even if he gives an occasional hint that he is mostly guided by the sights encountered on his journey. His main criterion rather seems to be whether they are worth the telling. This, he promises, 'is an excellent rule which I will never violate',¹¹¹ and he reiterates this intention by excusing his omissions on the basis of their unimportance.¹¹² His sole sentence on the Boeotian town of Olmones, for example, is that: 'In Olmones they did not show me anything that was in the least worth seeing'.¹¹³ More informative on his selection procedure is his introduction of the statues at Olympia:

After my description of the votive offerings I must now go on to mention the statues of racehorse and those of men, whether athletes or ordinary folk. Not all the Olympic victors have had their statues erected; some in fact, who have distinguished themselves, either at the games or by other exploits, have had no statue. These I am forced to omit by the nature of my work, which is not a list of

¹⁰⁸ Paus. 8.21.2.

¹⁰⁹ Paus. 9.39.14.

¹¹⁰ Paus. 9.39.5-40.2 for the whole procedure at Trophonius.

¹¹¹ Paus. 3.11.1.

¹¹² Paus. 1.3.3; 1.23.4; 1.29.2; 3.18.9; 3.18.10; 4.24.3; 4.35.11; 5.4.5; 6.1.1-2; 9.24.3.

¹¹³ Paus. 9.24.3.

athletes who have won Olympic victories, but an account of statues and of votive offerings generally. I shall not even record all those whose statues have been set up, as I know how many have before now won the crown of wild olive not by strength but by the chance of lot. Those only will be mentioned who themselves gained some distinction, or whose statues happened to be better made than others.¹¹⁴

This passage is informative on various levels of Pausanias' methodology. First, it explains that he cannot mention Olympic winners without a statue. This is simply because the book on Elis is not the proper place. Pausanias does mention winners without a statue in other places. They are worth noting in respect of their various home *poleis*, but are not relevant for a description of Olympia. Secondly, Pausanias only mentions statues that are either made distinguished by their winners (i.e. winners that have won their victories by merit not by chance) or are distinguished in themselves by being better made than others. Hence, the aesthetic quality of a sight may make it worth mentioning, but also the story to which a sight refers can induce Pausanias to include it.

When it comes to stories worth relating, Pausanias presents us with contradictory statements. On the one hand, things are not worth mentioning if they cannot in all rationality be taken seriously. On Medusa, for example he remarks 'I omit the miraculous (*μύθου*), but give the rational parts of the story about her'.¹¹⁵ Messenia's claim to have been the birthplace of Zeus he discards by referring to 'all peoples who claim that Zeus was born and brought up among them' and concluding with the simple comment, that 'The Messenians too have their share in the story'.¹¹⁶ Pausanias' scepticism is, however, under pressure owing to his respect for the unusual. In book 8 he explains how his travels have made him less sceptical:

¹¹⁴ Paus. 6.1.1-2.

¹¹⁵ Paus. 2.21.5.

¹¹⁶ Paus. 4.33.2.

When I began to write my history I was inclined to count these legends as foolishness, but on getting as far as Arcadia I grew to hold a more thoughtful view of them, which is this. In the days of old those Greeks who were considered wise spoke their sayings not straight out but in riddles, and so the legends about Cronus I conjectured to be one sort of Greek wisdom. In matters of divinity, therefore, I shall adopt the received tradition.¹¹⁷

Although Pausanias has learnt not to be so quick in dismissing the unbelievable, he still holds on to the possibility of a rational explanation. To equate legends with riddles is to say that they can ultimately be solved. This attitude towards stories of the Greek past, it would seem, marks Pausanias out as a historian rather than a pilgrim, but before this can be argued we need to delve into Jaś Elsner's arguments for a reading of the *Periegesis* as a pilgrimage.

There is one major exception to Pausanias' criterion of inclusion and exclusion, which is of particular interest in an interpretation of him as a pilgrim, namely his treatment of the Mysteries of Demeter.¹¹⁸ Coming across the Mysteries of Eleusis, Pausanias relates how he was fully intent on writing about the content of the sanctuary, but a dream had stopped him.¹¹⁹ A similar reluctance crops up at other places too where Demeter is honoured.¹²⁰ His silence at these places is partial. He is happy to relate what everybody is able to know,¹²¹ but keeps silent about information reserved to the initiates, indicating that he himself is an initiate.¹²² This, in addition to his many remarks on other religious sites, indicates that Pausanias' respect

¹¹⁷ Paus. 8.8.2-3.

¹¹⁸ See Elsner, 'Pausanias: A Greek Pilgrim' 22-25 on Pausanias' silence as a ritual act.

¹¹⁹ Paus. 1.14.3.

¹²⁰ Paus. 1.37.4; 2.14.1-4; 4.33.5; 8.37.8-10; 8.38.7; 9.25.5-10.

¹²¹ For instance Paus. 4.33.5: 'But my dream did not prevent me from making known to all that the brazen urn, discovered by the Argive general, and the bones of Eurytus the son of Melaneus were kept there'; Paus. 9.25.5: 'But there is nothing to prevent my declaring to all what the Thebans say was the origin of the ritual'.

¹²² Paus. 1.37.4: 'Whoever has been initiated at Eleusis or has read what are called the *Orphica* knows what I mean'.

for the sacred pervades the *Periegesis* and was a strong motive for his choice of themes.

Elsner, in his seminal article in 1992,¹²³ ties Pausanias' interest in the sacred resolutely to his contemporary Antonine context. Proceeding from the assumption that Pausanias' authorial content reflects concerns in the Greek past stemming from the practice of living in the Graeco-Roman present of the 2nd century AD, Pausanias' book 4 is interesting not only for what it tells us about Messenian history. It also illuminates how Pausanias coped with living and writing in a Graeco-Roman imperial context. The book on Messenia is a history of a Greek people losing and reclaiming autonomy. More than any of the other books in the *Periegesis*, it is a valuable source for his experience of being a subject. Accordingly, Pausanias has often been placed in the intellectual context of the Second Sophistic and his writings viewed as forms either of resistance or of escapism.

Elsner argues that we should see Pausanias as a Greek pilgrim in the Roman world 'using myths of the ancient Greek past and the sacred associations of pilgrimage to shield himself from the full implications of being a subject'.¹²⁴ He explores 'all things Greek' and when visiting memorable places and monuments on his travels to Greece he records not just the histories these places and monuments refer to, but also the state of those places and monuments as he finds them.¹²⁵ The history of those sites, whether real or mythical, explains the attachment of a people to its land.¹²⁶ Admittedly, he almost completely neglects any monument after 150 BC, and focuses mostly

¹²³ Elsner, 'Pausanias: A Greek pilgrim'.

¹²⁴ Elsner, 'Pausanias: A Greek pilgrim'. E.L. Bowie already argued in 1974 that the interests of Greeks in the period of the 2nd Sophistic in their past was connected to their dissatisfaction with the political situation of the present. E.L. Bowie, 'Greeks and their past in the Second Sophistic' in: M.I. Finley ed., *Studies in Ancient Society* 166-209. See also Joyce Heer, *La personnalité de Pausanias* (Paris 1979) 7-9, 66-68.

¹²⁵ Arafat, *Pausanias' Greece* 27.

¹²⁶ Francois Chamoux, 'La méthode historique de Pausanias d'après le livre I de la Periégèse?' in: Jean Bingen ed., *Pausanias historien* (Geneva 1996) 45-69; 63.

on Archaic and Classical Greece.¹²⁷ The pilgrim in Pausanias, however, is visiting these sites not just for their importance in the past, but also for the meaning they could have in the present. Arguing along the same lines, François Hartog interprets the *Periegesis* as providing a utopian vision of classical Greece. Pausanias describes the remains of things that are no longer visible and thereby manages to stretch the limits of visibility, depicting the invisible and hence creating an ideal vision.¹²⁸ The *Periegesis* is therefore much more than an archaic collection of antiquities. It is a search into and a proclamation of Greek identity as it was in the past before Macedonian and Roman domination, but also as it is for Pausanias. As Elsner puts it, 'pilgrimage is a journey into one's identity in its topographic, cultural and spiritual resonances'.¹²⁹ J. I. Porter in a more recent article emphasizes this aspect of resistance even more strongly and claims that Pausanias with his *Periegesis* 'combats the loss of memory', thereby 'preserving the possibility of freedom itself'.¹³⁰ As long as the Greeks can still imagine their freedom, it is not yet lost.

Arguing against this line of thought that considers Pausanias and other Second Sophistic writers as the intellectual resistance against Roman domination, Anthony Spawforth has pointed to the interest in Greek antiquity by the Roman elite. In his view, Pausanias' 'whole fascination with old Greece reflects a Hadrianic and Antonine fashion led not by subject Greeks but by Rome'.¹³¹ David Braund points to Pausanias' discussion of Sulla's sack of Athens as an example of 'the willingness even of champions of Hellenic culture to accommodate the most appalling Roman imperialist outrages' and

¹²⁷ Bowie, 'Greeks and their past' 188-189.

¹²⁸ François Hartog, *Memories of Odysseus. Frontier tales from ancient Greece* (translation Janet Lloyd; Edinburgh 2001).

¹²⁹ Elsner, 'Pausanias' 10; See also: Patrick H. Hutton, *History as an art of memory* (Hannover and London 1993) 84-87 on pilgrimage and Hutton, *Describing Greece* 7.

¹³⁰ James I. Porter, 'Ideal and ruins. Pausanias, Longinus, and the Second Sophistics' in: Susan E. Alcock, John F. Cherry and Jaś Elsner, *Pausanias. Travel and memory in Roman Greece* (Oxford 2001) 63-92, esp. 75.

¹³¹ Spawforth, 'Shades of Greekness' 390-391; see also: Graham Anderson, *The Second Sophistic. A cultural phenomenon in the Roman Empire* (London and New York 1993) Chapter 4.

concludes that Pausanias affirms Roman virtue.¹³² Christian Habicht interprets Pausanias' work as a guidebook for tourists and a collection of short stories for readers sitting at home, which also implies that he sees him as working for an elite public that may comprise both Greeks and Romans.¹³³

A final view is that Pausanias' text was open to a variety of contemporary interpretations, with the possibility that his public could react to the text in different ways. As Tim Whitmarsh has said on the tendency of the Second Sophistic to look at a far away (both temporally and spatially) Greece: 'My point is not that historical declamations worked consistently, or even regularly, as anti-Roman allegories, but that while the reader enjoys glorious narratives of the Greece's military past, the gates to the realm of fantasy are open wide.'¹³⁴ Pausanias has thus been interpreted as both participating in a Roman fashion and resisting Roman domination.¹³⁵ As this multiplicity of readings suggests, the two do not necessarily exclude each other, though they do not go easily together either.

A second aspect of the *Periegesis* that Elsner draws attention to is Pausanias' interest in Greece as a whole. This connects well with Alcock's observation that Roman domination made clear the vulnerability of boundaries, setting 'the scene for a different conception of Greece'.¹³⁶ This vulnerability is a recurring theme in the *Periegesis*. The interest in Greece as a whole goes hand in hand with a criticism of Greeks fighting each other.¹³⁷ This interest comes out clearly when Pausanias claims that the great heroes of the Greek past, one of whom is Aristomenes, 'will be seen to have helped each his own country

¹³² David Braund, 'Cohors: the governor and his entourage in the self-image of the Roman Republic' in: Ray Laurence and Joanne Berry ed., *Cultural Identity in the Roman Empire* (London and New York 1998) 10-24, esp. 22/23.

¹³³ Habicht, 'An ancient Baedeker'; Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide* 95-6.

¹³⁴ Whitmarsh, *The Second Sophistic* 70.

¹³⁵ Hutton, *Describing Greece* 47-53 discusses both positions.

¹³⁶ Susan Alcock, *Graecia Capta. The landscape of Roman Greece* (Cambridge 1993) chapter 3: 93-128.

¹³⁷ Elsner, 'Pausanias: A Greek pilgrim'. Cf. Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide* 106.

and not Greece as a whole¹³⁸. Elsner comments regarding this criticism of interstate hostilities that 'the way Pausanias structured his subject matter reveals an attempt to transcend the historical realities of conflict and division among the Greeks in search of a myth-history which might evoke the image of a free, unified Greece.'¹³⁹ According to him, Pausanias' parallel travelling and writing as a pilgrim serve to undermine the diversity apparent in the countless local histories Pausanias relates and the conflicts of Greece become a unifying force, providing the *poleis* with a shared explanation of their various pasts.¹⁴⁰

The interpretation of the *Periegesis* as an account of a pilgrimage is interesting, as it results from a focus on the narrator as the primary agent of the narrative. It inquires into the political and moral agenda of Pausanias as an author and takes into account his choices of subject matter as well his approach towards it. In other words, this approach takes issue with the overall structure that Pausanias imposes on his data, as well as with the ideological implication of that choice. This is again interesting in respect of Hayden White's historical theory. White's interest in ideology results from the assumption that the writing of history through the historian's imposition of emplotment and figuration is necessarily a political act.¹⁴¹ Influenced by existentialist philosophy,¹⁴² he believes the historian to be bound to his freedom to tell the story one way or another.

¹³⁸ Paus. 8.52.1.

¹³⁹ Elsner, 'Pausanias: a Greek pilgrim' 5. Cf. Porter, 'Ideal and ruins' emphasising the mythical character of this history.

¹⁴⁰ Elsner, 'Pausanias: a Greek pilgrim' 14. See also: J. Elsner, 'Structuring "Greece"' 3-20.

¹⁴¹ Hayden White, 'The politics of historical interpretation: Discipline and de-sublimation' in: *The Content of the Form* 58-82, originally published *Critical Inquiry* 9.1 (1982). Cf. White, *Metahistory* 22-29; White, 'The value of narrativity in the representation of reality' in: *The Content of the Form* 1-25, esp. 14, originally published *Critical Inquiry* 7.1. (1980); White, 'Interpretation in history' in: *Tropics of Discourse*, 51-80, esp. 67-75, originally published *New Literary History* 4 (1972-3).

¹⁴² Hans Kellner, 'A bedrock of order. Hayden White's linguistic humanism' in: *Language and historical representation. Getting the story crooked* (Madison, London 1989) 193-227; Peter Novick, *That noble dream. The 'objectivity question' and the American historical profession* (Cambridge 1988) 601; Herman Paul, 'An ironic battle against irony. Epistemological and ideological irony in Hayden White's philosophy of history' in: Korhonen ed., *Tropes for the Past* 35-44.

This aspect of White's theory is possibly the one most heavily criticised.¹⁴³ White's insistence on the historian's freedom has often been mistaken for a licence to tell the story any way imaginable. White has been thought to say that historians cannot be judged on the way they treat their source material and that therefore historians who diligently work through all the available data before constructing their narrative are on a par with the authors of pure fiction. Hence, there would be no way to say, for example, that Paul Cartledge's *Sparta and Lakonia* is better history than Steven Pressfield's *Gates of Fire*, as White appears to judge a historical monograph on equal terms with a novel. It all seems to be a matter of taste. This perceived danger of relativism has been strongly condemned by Lionel Gossman: 'I am now concerned that the current tendency to conflate "historical" and fictional" narrative and the new emphasis on the "poetics" of history ... may be promoting a facile and irresponsible relativism which will leave many who espouse it defenceless before the most dangerous myths and ideologies, incapable of justifying any stand.'¹⁴⁴ The implication is that a Nazi interpretation of the Holocaust is equally justified as a liberal one, as long as it is well written.¹⁴⁵

¹⁴³ The list is endless, see for an overview: Richard T. Vann, 'The reception of Hayden White' *History and Theory* 37.2. (1998) 143-161. Some good examples: G.R. Elton, *Return to essentials* (Cambridge 1991); R. Evans, *In defence of history* (London 1997); Eugene O. Golob, 'The Irony of Nihilism' *History and Theory* 19.4. (1980) 55-65; Maurice Mandelstein, 'The Presuppositions of Metahistory' *History and Theory* 19.4. (1980) 39-54; Wulf Kansteiner, 'Hayden White's Critique of the Writing of History' *History and Theory* 32.3 (1993) 273-295; Lionel Gossman, *Between History and Literature* (Cambridge Ma. 1990); Arnaldo Momigliano, 'The Rhetoric of History and the History of Rhetoric: On Hayden White's Tropes' *Comparative Criticism* 3 (1981) 259-268. F.R. Ankersmit, *Narrative Logic. A Semantic Analysis of the Historian's Language* (Den Haag 1983) 220-248 accepts White's emphasis on narrativity, but complains on White's refusal to explain why one historical study can be considered more persuasive than others, cf. Frank Ankersmit, 'Introductie' in *De Navel van de Geschiedenis. Over interpretatie, representatie en historische realiteit* (Groningen 1990) 21-22, 26; Fiona McIntosh-Varjabédian, 'Probability and Persuasion in 18th-Century and 19th-Century Historical Writing' in: Korhonen ed., *Tropes for the Past* 109-117.

¹⁴⁴ Gossman, *Between History and Literature* 303.

¹⁴⁵ White addresses this issue in 'The Politics of Historical Interpretation' 76, where he states that the denial of the Holocaust is 'as morally offensive as it is intellectually bewildering'; and in 'Historical emplotment and the problem of the truth' in: Saul Friedländer ed., *Probing the Limits of Representation. Nazism and the 'final solution'* (Cambridge Ma. 1992) 37-53, where he appeals to 'the facts' to argue that a revisionist history of the Holocaust simply cannot compete with other histories. Kansteiner, 'Hayden White's Critique' 290-3 complains that the lack of clarity over what White means by 'the facts' leaves the reader in methodological uncertainty.

This is an unfair treatment of White's theory. White's interest in the historian's act of narrating his story and the necessary figuration during writing, as well as the pre-figuration during research, has led him to emphasise these aspects of the historical metier. Nowhere has he denied that it is perfectly possible to take issue with the thoroughness that a historian has displayed in researching the available material.¹⁴⁶

Furthermore, his concentration on the historian's selection of this material and on his essential freedom to use available and recognisable narrative devices in rendering the unfamiliar familiar emphasises the historian's responsibility as much as his freedom. It is in this respect that White's criticism of philosophers such as Ricoeur and Foucault should be seen.¹⁴⁷ In his preface to *Metahistory*, White admitted that his work was written in the ironic mode, but he adds that

¹⁴⁶ As Mandelbaum, 'Presuppositions' 44 appears to argue. I do not think that White would argue against the existence of connections between data prior to the historian's collection of them. The knowledge ability of these connections to the historian is another matter. Mandelbaum 50-51 suggests that a comparison of works on the same historical subject would demonstrate a limit to the number of possible stories that can seriously be told about these 'given' data. White's rebuttal (n 131) of Holocaust denials appears to be in agreement that there are stories one cannot tell about a given historical subject. His remarks to the limitlessness of history can therefore be better understood as referring to the boundlessness of human imagination which will always come up with alternative histories. Note, for example, White, 'Interpretation in History' 60: 'But surely the historian does not bring with him a notion of the "story" that lies embedded within the "facts" given by the record. For in fact there are an infinite number of such stories contained therein, all different in their details, each unlike every other. (...) The historian must draw upon a fund of culturally provided *mythoi* in order to constitute the facts as figuring a story of a particular kind, just as he must appeal to that same fund of *mythoi* in the minds of his readers to endow his account of the past with the odor of meaning or significance'. Compare also White, 'Historical Text as artifact' 84-5 and 98: 'The older distinction between fiction and history, in which fiction is conceived as the representation of the imaginable and history as the representation of the actual, must give place to the recognition that we can only know the *actual* by contrasting it with or likening it to the *imaginable*'.

¹⁴⁷ White, 'Foucault Decoded: Notes from Underground' in: *Tropics of Discourse* 230-260, originally published in: *History and Theory* 12.1 (1973); White, 'Foucault's Discourse: The Historiography of Anti-Humanism' in: *The Content of the Form* 104-141, revised after its original publication in: John Sturrock ed., *Structuralism and Since: From Lévi-Strauss to Derrida* (Oxford 1979); White, 'The Metaphysics of Narrativity: Time and Symbol in Ricoeur's Philosophy of History' in: *the Content of the Form* 169-184, revised after its original publication as 'The Rule of Narrativity: Symbolic Discourse and the Experiences of Time in Ricoeur's Thought' in: Théodore F. Geraets ed., *A la recherche du sens / In search of Meaning* (Ottawa 1985). Cf. On the similarities of the theories of White and Ricoeur: Nancy Partner, 'Hayden White: The Form of the Content' *History and Theory* 37.2 (1998) 162-172, esp. 168-9.

his irony is an irony against irony.¹⁴⁸ With this struggle against irony, White fights the relativism of postmodernity. The key question therefore is how he understands irony.

White distinguishes four tropes of figuration, four modes of emplotment, four types of explanation and four ideological implications.¹⁴⁹ He starts from the *tropes*, or figures of speech, as he believes that they not only structure the narrator's narration of the text, but also inform our perception of reality.¹⁵⁰ He distinguishes metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche and irony, and associates these four tropes with a process from a naïve (metaphorical) apprehension of reality to a self-reflective (ironic) consciousness.¹⁵¹ These tropes fit, but do not necessarily coincide, with types of explanations historians prefer to use and plots they impose on their narrative. There is the idiographic (or formacist), the organicist, mechanistic and contextualist explanation, correlating with the plots of romance, comedy, tragedy and satire. These then correlate with four modes of ideological implication: anarchist, conservative, radical and liberal. White does not insist on the necessity of these correlations and even argues that great masterpieces of history derive from the tensions built into the model when authors try to escape from these correlations.¹⁵² He does, however, identify his own era with the fourth set of correlations in which the ironic trope is dominant:¹⁵³

What is involved here is a kind of attitude towards knowledge itself which is implicitly critical of all forms of metaphorical identification, reduction, or

¹⁴⁸ White, *Metahistory* xii.

¹⁴⁹ I will concentrate only on the fourth set of correlations. See for White's explanations of the four tropes: White, *Metahistory*, Introduction; White, 'Introduction' *Tropics of Discourse* 1-25 and White, 'Interpretation in History' *Tropics of Discourse* 51-80.

¹⁵⁰ White, 'Introduction' *Tropics of Discourse* 7-23. Note Kellner, 'A bedrock of order' 8-14 on White's conflation of tropes as figures of thought, rather than just figures of speech.

¹⁵¹ White, 'Introduction' 19.

¹⁵² White, 'Interpretation in History' 70.

¹⁵³ See for a criticism of the apparent contradiction between the developmental cycle of tropes and the historian's freedom to use all tropes and plots: John S. Nelson, 'Tropal history and the Social Sciences: Reflection on Struvever's Remarks' *History and Theory* 19.4 (1980) 80-101, esp. 92-4; Philip Pomper, 'Typologies and Cycles in Intellectual History' *History and Theory* 19.4 (1980) 30-38.

integration of phenomena. In short, irony is the linguistic strategy underlying and sanctioning scepticism as an explanatory tactic, satire as a mode of emplotment and either agnosticism or cynicism as a moral posture.¹⁵⁴

Trying to understand White's quest of using irony against itself, Herman Paul has argued that a distinction needs to be made between epistemological and ideological irony. White employs the first against the latter. He does not have a problem with the negating and self-reflexive function of epistemological irony, but he dislikes the sceptical, agnostic and cynical tendencies of postmodernism.¹⁵⁵ Far from giving the historians of his age a licence to continue in their cynicism, he wanted to break away from it. Ewa Domanska also draws attention to the cyclical pattern of White's philosophy by pointing out that he connects the rise of an ironic apprehension of the world to 'an atmosphere of social breakdown or cultural decline'.¹⁵⁶ It is unclear what the next stage should be, but reading White one suspects that he is a romantic at heart.¹⁵⁷

What has this to do with Pausanias, a pilgrim, or an historian, in the Second Sophistic? We have seen above that the Second Sophistic is often deemed a period of political decline.¹⁵⁸ Pausanias' narrative has consequently been interpreted as either combating or escaping from this decline. His report of the Greek past is judged to be an attempt to fight against the loss of Greek memory in a period of Roman supremacy. His agenda in travelling and reporting is thought to be to achieve a Greek unity over and against the visible signs of conflict and diversity. Pausanias' pilgrimage hence is inherently self-

¹⁵⁴ White, 'Interpretation in History' 73-4.

¹⁵⁵ Paul, 'An Ironic Battle against Irony'.

¹⁵⁶ Ewa Domanska, 'Hayden White: Beyond Irony' *History and Theory* 37.2 (1998) 173-181.

¹⁵⁷ Note Pomper, 'Typologies and Cycles' 36: 'White wants to move on from our ironic phase to a rejuvenating metaphoric phase'.

¹⁵⁸ One could go even further and argue, along with Whitmarsh, *The Second Sophistic* 9 that the period of the Second Sophistic is similar to Postmodernism in producing a class of allusive, self-conscious, playful and theatrical 'arch hyperintellectuals'.

reflective, concerned with Greek identity in the past as well as in the present.¹⁵⁹

I will argue that the figuration of Pausanias' *Periegesis*, in particular book 4 is both epistemologically and ideologically ironic. I will also argue that Pausanias' irony, like that of White, is an unhappy irony. Pausanias' complaints about the false beliefs that the masses hold and the trouble he takes in verifying stories may strike the reader as being sceptical of the marvellous. This attitude is especially clear when Pausanias explains how the populations of different localities may hold different beliefs according to their own needs.¹⁶⁰ In that respect Luraghi's detection of competing versions of Messenian history in the *Periegesis* may be explained in part by Pausanias' own interest in the tension between plausibility and functionality. Pausanias' brief disavowal of the Messenians' belief that Zeus was born and raised in their country fits into this category, as does his comment, 'that Corinthus was a son of Zeus I have never known anybody say seriously except the majority of the Corinthians',¹⁶¹ or his remarks on the Athenian version of their defeat at Aegospotami. Having explained how the Athenians believe that their generals had been bribed by Lysander, he concludes with a curt: 'so much for this belief'.¹⁶² His attitude, similar to that of Herodotus, is summed up neatly in book 6: 'Now I am obliged to report the statements made by the Greeks, though I am not obliged to believe them all'.¹⁶³

We have, however, also seen that the *Periegesis* demonstrates a contradictory attitude towards respect for the marvellous. Pausanias' refusal to write about ordinary things results from the far more romantic assumption that 'many are

¹⁵⁹ On the self-reflexivity in his epistemological irony, see: C. Jacob, 'The Greek Traveller's Areas of Knowledge: Myths and other discourses in Pausanias' *Description of Greece*' *Yale French Studies* 49 (1980) 55-85, esp. 79-82.

¹⁶⁰ Paus. 2.2.1; 2.16.4; 2.26.7; 3.26.2-3; 3.26.6; 4.4.1-3; 4.33.2; 5.23.7; 6.8.2; 6.26.1-2; 10.9.11-12

¹⁶¹ Paus. 2.2.1.

¹⁶² Paus. 10.9.11-12.

¹⁶³ Paus. 6.3.8. Compare Herodotus, *Histories* 7.152: 'And I am obliged to say what is said, but I am not at all obliged to believe it, and let this saying hold good for my entire account'.

the sights to be seen in Greece, and many are the wonders to be heard'.¹⁶⁴ There is also no sign of an overly sceptical attitude when he remarks that 'so everyone should be neither over-hasty in one's judgments, nor incredulous when considering rarities' and comments that 'though I have never seen winged snakes, I believe that they exist, as I believe that a Phrygian brought to Ionia a scorpion with wings exactly like that of locusts'.¹⁶⁵

The tension between Pausanias' interest in the extraordinary and his scepticism towards 'false beliefs' corresponds to a lacuna in White's theory remarked upon by Frank Ankersmit. He notes that it is the primary task of a historian to give his readers a representation of the past, and that this consists first and foremost of sketching a hierarchy of the important and the unimportant. The historian needs to provide a plausible account of what is essential to the past – which, being its distinguishing feature, is always unique. The problem is of course that the unique, the extraordinary, resists explanation. In other words, marvels stop being marvellous when they are familiarised.¹⁶⁶ Pausanias shows himself keenly aware of this problem when he remarks that, 'I know that the height and breadth of the Olympian Zeus have been measured and recorded; but I shall not praise those who made the measurements, for even their records fall far short of the impression made by a sight of the image'.¹⁶⁷ There is a limit to what his narrative may achieve, and the ultimate irony of it is that the closer he gets to representing the past, the more he is confronted with his inability to write it down.

¹⁶⁴ Paus. 5.10.1.

¹⁶⁵ Paus. 9.21.6.

¹⁶⁶ F.R. Ankersmit, *Historical Representation* (Stanford 2001) 16-17, 67-68, 73, 246; F.R. Ankersmit, 'Twee vormen van narrativisme' in: *De Navel van de Geschiedenis* 44-77, esp. 44, originally published in *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis* 50.1 (1988) 40-81; History's inherent interest in the remarkable is his main reason for preferring 'representation' to 'interpretation'. He argues that history, like art, presents the remarkable, whereas science attempts to subsume the remarkable to the general. See: F.R. Ankersmit, 'Historical Representation' *History and Theory* 27 (1988) 205-229.

¹⁶⁷ Paus. 5.11.9.

A similar tension between Pausanias' sceptical outlook and his romantic interest in the exceptional characterises his depiction of the Messenians in book 4. My comparative framework will demonstrate that this conflict between irony and epic can also be found elsewhere in ancient historiography. In view of this tension we need to allow for the possibility that historians may combine different modes and different emplotments.¹⁶⁸ In Pausanias' Messenian history, as I will argue in chapter 2, the ironic mode is dominant. But, as elsewhere in the *Periegesis*, a romantic attitude appears to be suppressed by this ironic mode.

In my analysis of Pausanias' figuration of Messenian history I will concentrate on his frequent use of τόλμη and in particular in its combination with ἀπόνοια. As I will explain in more detail in chapter 2, τόλμη, translated as 'daring', contains both positive and negative connotations. It is a necessary ingredient of courage, but can also lead to recklessness if uncontrolled. The senselessness and despair implied by ἀπόνοια suggests that the Messenians lack this kind of self-control. Consequently, the positive features of τόλμη are negated by the ἀπόνοια which accompanies the Messenian daring. Being an ambivalent word, τόλμη already carries in itself the possibility of an ironic use; the prevalent ἀπόνοια in Pausanias' depiction of the Messenians brings this possibility even more to the fore. This results in a rather more negative reading of the story than has hitherto been accepted.

My comparative framework in chapters 3 to 6 will put this ironic reading of Pausanias' book 4 to the test. Without such a comparative approach, the concentration on Pausanias as narrator would lead to an overly de-contextualised discussion of his text. Researching the similarities and dissimilarities of various texts on courage and rebellion will help to place Pausanias as a historian in his own historical context.

¹⁶⁸ Nelson, 'Tropal History' 90-1.

In chapter 3 I will compare Pausanias' depiction of Aristomenes' leadership qualities with Athenaeus' use of the story of Drimakos, the rebel leader of a slave revolt on the island of Chios. Although Athenaeus uses as his source Nymphodorus of Syracuse, my main interest in this chapter will be the function of Athenaeus' citation from Nymphodorus in the debate on slavery that occupies a large part of the sixth book of the *Deipnosophistae*. I will investigate the contrast between Drimakos' ἀνδρεία and Aristomenes' τόλμη and connect it to the identity of the rebels in both revolts as slaves.

In chapter 4 I will pursue the connection between slavery and τόλμη and ἀπόνοια further in a comparison of the Messenian revolt with Diodorus' depiction of the two Sicilian slave wars. Diodorus' account is highly critical of the slave owners who by treating their slaves harshly render them desperate. I will compare Diodorus' use of ἀπόνοια with Pausanias' use of the word in reference to the Messenians. In both accounts the ability of slaves to display courage – that is courage including the self-control needed to use τόλμη positively – is problematised.

In chapter 5 I will contrast Appian's and Plutarch's representation of Spartacus and his followers to Pausanias' depiction of Aristomenes. Spartacus and his followers are in both accounts depicted as possessing φρονήμα, a word which, like τόλμη, may be interpreted positively as referring to 'a certain nobility of mind' (Jones' translation of the Messenians' φρόνημα), but also negatively as signifying over ambition and arrogance. The diverse usages of this word by Appian and Plutarch point to the multiple possibilities in which this word can be interpreted in Pausanias.

The status of the Messenians in book 4 is still under discussion. We have already noted that Pausanias emphasises the harsh treatment meted out to them by the Spartans as their main motivation to rebel. He makes it clear that this treatment results in the enslavement of the Messenians. At the same time,

however, he is careful to not refer to the rebels as helots. The consequent identification of the rebels as Messenians is one of the main arguments for Luraghi's thesis that Pausanias has written down the official Theban-Messenian version of the story. In this version the failure of Aristomenes' rebellion is followed by an exile of all Messenians capable of travelling. These are the Messenians who will later return to build up the new Messene. According to this story therefore the new Messenians are former exiles and not ex-helots.

In the sixth chapter I will therefore interpret the Messenian revolt as a 'nationalistic' uprising and compare Pausanias' account with Josephus' *Jewish War*. Josephus regularly uses a combination of *τόλμη* and *ἀπόνοια*, but in a much more explicitly rhetorical fashion. I will argue that Josephus and Pausanias share a certain ambivalent attitude towards the rebellions they depict. In both cases their usage of the two words is ironic, yet at the same time not devoid of admiration.

Pausanias' admiration for the Messenians has been seen as the key feature of his account of their revolt. In view of his choice of words, as well as the emplotment of the story, this all-too-easy conclusion is, as I will argue in chapter 2, mistaken. However, the mistake is easily made and ultimately depends on one's own perception of the author in the Second Sophistic. In the final chapter, I will present my conclusions from all the comparative chapters and discuss how the comparative perspective has helped in my re-evaluation of Pausanias' narrative of Messenian history.

CHAPTER TWO

THE MESSENIANS AND THEIR FOOLISH COURAGE IN PAUSANIAS' *MESSENIAKA*

He was in the prime of his life and daring (ήλικία και τόλμη) and he and others enticed them to revolt (ἀπόστασιν).¹

With these words, Pausanias introduces Aristomenes' central role in the instigation of the revolt of the Messenians, often known as the Second Messenian War. The quotation emphasises the elements of age and daring (ήλικία και τόλμη) in Aristomenes' leadership. In this chapter, I will investigate Pausanias' choice of words in his depiction of the Messenian rebels and Aristomenes in particular. Brief, yet tantalising fragments on the Messenian hero, in other writers such as Diodorus, Plutarch and Polyaeus, suggest a literary tradition that emphasises Aristomenes' ἀρετή and ἀνδρεία. What is Pausanias' attitude towards this discourse of Aristomenean courage?

I concluded my introduction to Pausanias with the suggestion that although his authorial presence in the *Periegesis* is chiefly sceptic, the ironic style with which he has furnished his depiction of Greek sights and (his)stories, sometimes betrays a more romantic inclination. My brief introductory reading of Pausanias' attitude towards the stories received from both his literary and his human guides proposed that his narrative displayed a tension between a sceptical analysis of stories and an admiration for the unique and the wonderful.

As book 4 of the *Periegesis* treats the Messenian struggle for freedom and against Spartan domination, the subsequent exile of the Messenians and the long-awaited return of the Messenians to the Peloponnesus, it provides ample

¹ Paus. 4.14.6-8.

scope for a romantic view of Greek history. Accordingly, scholars have interpreted the book as part of the Messenian quest for their own heroic past in post-liberation developments of Messenian identity. Others, who concentrate more on Pausanias as an author of the so-called Second Sophistic,² writing as he was under the reigns of Antoninus Pius, Lucius Verus and Marcus Aurelius, read the book in a context of intellectual resistance: the remarkable continuity of Messenian identity during their 300 years of exile could serve as a reassuring example of Greek endurance in difficult circumstances, while the story of Greeks fighting Greeks was no direct affront to the Romans.³

The central figure of Aristomenes would appear to give the *Messeniaka* an appropriately epic allure:⁴ his heroic presence in a literary tradition emphasising his ἀρετή and ἀνδρεία is strengthened by Rhianos' comparison of him, repeated by Pausanias, with Achilles.⁵ Describing him as the most important rebel-leader, Pausanias depicts him as the centre of Messenian resistance. To Pausanias he is the one who gave Messene an independent history even if he failed in achieving political autonomy.⁶ Regardless of whether Aristomenes is a historical figure, the type of hero that Pausanias made him tells us much about how he envisaged Messenian independence and identity.⁷ This is especially the case when characteristics of Aristomenes

² I use this term in its broader meaning of referring to Roman Greek literature generally and not to a specific literary genre or even a specific way of dealing with past and power. T.J. Whitmarsh, *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire. The politics of imitation* (Oxford 2002) 43-45 warns against the implication in the use of the term 'Second Sophistic' that there was a 'single, uncontested way of constructing the relationship between past and present'. I hope my research will demonstrate my agreement with this.

³ See esp. Elsner, 'Pausanias: A Greek pilgrim'; J. Auberger, 'La revanche des exclus: l'histoire messénienne revisitée' in: C. Wolff ed., *Les Exclus dans l'antiquité. Actes du colloque organisé à Lyon les 23-24 septembre 2004* (Lyon 2007) 27-35, esp. 29.

⁴ K. Stratiki, 'Les héros Grecs comme personification de la liberté dans la Periégèse de Pausanias' *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé* (2002) 92-112, esp. 107-108 discusses Aristomenes as a personification of local ἐλευθερία.

⁵ Paus. 4.6.3.

⁶ Paus. 4.6.3.

⁷ Aristomenes' role as the personification of Messenian identity and independence is also clear from his name, which literally means 'best in might/passion/disposition', but which could also be understood as 'best of the Messenians'. At Paus. 4.24.1-3, Damagetus of Rhodes is given the advice by the Pythia to marry the daughter of 'the best of the Greeks', and concludes that

pertain not only to him personally, but to the other rebels and the Messenians in general.

This chapter therefore concentrates on Pausanias' repetitive use of τόλμη (daring) and ἀπόνοια (despair) in reference to both Aristomenes and other Messenians. It starts with an exploration of positive and negative connotations of τόλμη in classical Greek historiography and philosophy. While the development of the concepts of daring and courage is addressed in more detail in the comparative chapters of this dissertation, I also note in this section that the valuation of τόλμη is subject to military and political changes through time. The chapter continues with a focus on Aristomenes as the most important hero of Messenian history and addresses Pausanias' depiction of Aristomenes as a daring warrior and leader of the Messenian revolt.

In the second half of this chapter I investigate whether daring and despair are characteristic only of the Aristomenes revolt or are central to Pausanias' depiction of Messenians generally through a discussion of other central periods and events in Messenian history. In the final part of this chapter I will argue that the characteristics of τόλμη (daring) and ἀπόνοια (implying desperation and loss of sense) are ascribed both to other Greeks and to non-Greeks. The frequent combination of the two words in book 4, however, marks it out as a specific Messenian trope.

Τόλμη and ἀνδρεία

Aristomenes is repeatedly referred to as having τόλμη;⁸ this 'daring' makes him an excellent warrior who is able to do 'more than what is usual for an individual'.⁹ But the word has negative connotations as well, which I would

this implies Aristomenes. Aristomenes thereby becomes the founder of the famous Diagorad family (Paus. 6.7.3.). Cf. Ogden, *Aristomenes* 55, 149.

⁸ This is also observed by Pearson, 'the Pseudo-History' 414.

⁹ Pausanias 4.15.4.

like to introduce by looking at the concept of ἀνδρεία (manly courage). As shown in the introduction, Aristomenes is the subject of a discourse on courage, but in Pausanias' narrative the word ἀνδρεία is conspicuously absent. Interesting in this respect is Aristomenes' appearance in Diodorus' account of the *aristeia* between him and Cleonnis, both contenders for the throne after king Aristodemus had died.¹⁰ We have seen that Aristomenes wins this contest not because of his ability to kill Spartans –as Cleonnis had slain more- but because he brought back safe both himself and his competitor. Diodorus commends him for his regard for safety in the heat of his display of courage and moralises: 'For the man who, while fighting desperately, meets the threatening danger with calm mind, has a double claim to bravery, that of body and that of soul'.¹¹

The combination of bravery and prudence that Aristomenes displays in the *aristeia* is commonplace in classical conceptions of courage. Plato has Socrates say in *Laches* that ἀνδρεία in every circumstance, not only in battle, cannot go together with the absence of knowledge (ἐπιστήμη), since courage without understanding is only ἡ ἄφρων τόλμη: 'foolish daring'. Τόλμη is necessary for ἀνδρεία, but τόλμη on its own is not just foolish, but even potentially harmful. In order to be truly courageous one must not only be willing to put oneself at risk, but must do so rationally and responsibly.¹²

Plato's analysis of foolish daring was also shared by classical historiography, in particular Thucydides, whose use of 'τόλμη ἀλόγιστος' is part of his denunciation of the topsy-turvy world created by internal strife. He complains that the situation in Corcyra in 427 BC had become so deplorable that:

¹⁰ Ogden, *Aristomenes* 107 suggests that this story is a variety of the Theban story recorded in Plutarch, *Life of Pelopidas* 4, on the differences in Pelopidas' and Epaminondas' courage against the Arcadians at Mantinea.

¹¹ Diodorus 8.12. Aristomenes is described as 'ἀνδρεῖος καὶ συνετός'.

¹² Plato, *Laches* esp. 191d-192d; Walter T. Schmid, *On manly courage: a study of Plato's Laches* (Carbondale and Edwardsville 1992).

Words had to change their ordinary meaning and to take that which was now given them. Reckless audacity came to be considered the courage of a loyal ally (τόλμα μὲν γὰρ ἀλόγιστος ἀνδρεία φιλέταιρος ἐνομίσθη); prudent hesitation, specious cowardice (μέλλησις δὲ προμηθῆς δειλία εὐπρεπής); moderation was held to be a cloak for unmanliness (τὸ δὲ σῶφρον τοῦ ἀνάνδρου πρόσχημα); ability to see all sides of a question inaptness to act on any. Frantic violence, became the attribute of manliness; cautious plotting, a justifiable means of self-defence.¹³

Thucydides explains in this passage how proposals for prudence were mistaken for cowardice and reckless ventures seen as examples of bravery. His complaint relates to the ease with which the populace in times of crisis may be persuaded to stop listening to rational arguments. Recklessness and prudence are perceived by the irrational as courage and cowardice.¹⁴ Similarly, true courage and detestable cowardice could also be misrepresented by the clever. While Plato notes the danger of foolish daring, Thucydides is aware of the possibility of presenting foolish daring as something else.¹⁵ In both cases, it is not τόλμη itself which is harmful; it is rather the misuse and abuse that should be recognised.

¹³ Thucydides 3.82.4; discussed by Helen North, *Sophrosyne. Self-Knowledge and Self-Restraint in Greek Literature* (Ithaca and New York 1966) 101-115, esp. 108: 'the noble daring of Periclean Athens (equivalent to *andreia*, because governed by reason) becomes something quite different in Cleon and Alcibiades, something closer to *thrasos* (in Platonic terms) and it becomes wilder and more immoderate, it becomes more and more contemptuous of *sophrosyne*. Cf. Karen Bassi, 'The semantics of manliness in ancient Greece' in: Ralph M. Rosen and Ineke Sluiter ed., *Andreia. Studies in manliness and courage in classical antiquity* (Leiden 2003) 25-58, 51-54, who compares the passage to Aristotle *EN* 2.8.11108b19-20: 'a courageous man seems rash in comparison to a coward and cowardly in comparison to the rash'; Ryan K. Balot, *Greek Political Thought* (Malden, Oxford and Victoria 2006) 71 for a general introduction of these issues.

¹⁴ J.J. Price, *Thucydides and Internal War* (Cambridge and New York 2001) 24-30. Cf. J. Roisman, *The Rhetoric of Manhood. Masculinity in the Attic Orators* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 2005) 66-70, discussing Demosthenes 60, argues how an inherent conflict in Athenian society between the values of honour and of moderation and self control make this unavoidable.

¹⁵ Angela Hobbs, *Plato and the Hero. Courage, Manliness and the Impersonal Good* (Cambridge 2000) *passim*, esp. 65-67 and chapters 6 and 7 argues that Plato was interested in this danger of misrepresentation as well, especially in relation to the use of Achilles as role model.

The danger of mistaking prudence for cowardice is clear in Aristotle's definition of ἀνδρεία in his *Eudemian Ethics*: 'the attribute of a man whose actions demonstrate a reasoned, and moderate negotiation between 'boldness' (θράσος) and 'fear' (φόβος).¹⁶ ἀνδρεία means that the human instinct of fear must be overcome and mastered.¹⁷ Courage is thereby the opposite of giving in to fear, of cowardice. But it is also inherently different from the daring which results from blindness to danger. The courageous man assesses the risks of going to battle realistically and goes nonetheless in the confident knowledge that they are worth whatever goal he fights for.¹⁸

At the centre of these definitions is the control of one's self.¹⁹ This emphasis on control is not surprising, as the courage most needed in the defence of Greek city-states is the courage that helps hoplites to stay in line. Battles fought in phalanx-formation are decided when the line of either one of the parties breaks. Or, as Laches says: 'If someone is willing to remain in the ranks and ward off the enemies and not run, you know he is courageous.'²⁰

The classical concepts of τόλμη and ἀνδρεία will be of key importance in my interpretation of Pausanias' representation of Messenian courage. It therefore has to be taken into account that what is needed to be successful in warfare and what may be considered courageous, changes through time. Pausanias'

¹⁶ Aristotle, *Eudemian Ethics* 1228a26-30a37. Cf. Bassi, The semantics of manliness'.

¹⁷ Joseph Roisman, 'The Rhetoric of courage in the Athenian orators' in: Ralph M. Rosen and Ineke Sluiter eds., *Andreia. Studies in manliness and courage in classical antiquity* (Leiden 2003) 127-144.

¹⁸ David Pears, 'Courage as a mean' in: A.O. Rorty ed., *Essays on Aristotle's Ethics* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 1980) 171-187, esp. 183-187; Compare also Pericles' Funeral Oration at Thuc. 2.40: 'the man who can most truly be accounted brave is he who knows the meaning of what is sweet in life and of what is terrible, and then goes out undeterred to meet what is to come' with the discussions in: R. K. Balot, 'Pericles' Anatomy of Democratic Courage' *The American Journal of Philology* 122.4 (2001) 505-525, esp. 508-9 and 512: 'the Athenians are unusual in combining daring with rationality. Their passionate love for the polis inspires this daring, but is based on a long-term calculation of their individual good'; and A.B. Bosworth, 'The historical context of Thucydides' Funeral Oration' *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 120 (2000) 1-16, esp. 6: 'voluntary death in battle is proof that the individual has seen the worth of community and constitutes the highest form of arete'.

¹⁹ Charles Taylor, 'Plato's self-mastery' in: Idem, *Sources of the Self. The Making of the Modern Identity* (Cambridge 1989) 115-126. Cf. Hobbs, *Plato and the Hero* 87-88 on Republic 442b: 'courage seems here to merge with self-control.'

²⁰ Plato, Laches 190e 4-6. Discussion by: Schmid, *On manly courage* 100-101.

word usage reminds us of Herodotus and Thucydides, and is intended to do so, but he wrote in an era where victories on the battlefield were no longer won through the collective power of the phalanx.²¹ The looser formation of the Roman legions and the larger, more complex manoeuvres in which they were deployed arguably demanded more individual bravery in man-to-man combat.²² The importance of individual military skills must, however, not be underestimated in classical Greek times or overestimated in Roman imperial times. Classical Greek historiography emphasised pitched battles, but also acknowledges the importance of smaller skirmishes where the men did not fight in phalanx-formation.²³ In Roman warfare, maintaining a close formation both in retreat and pursuit was imperative in minimising loss of life.²⁴ In both types of warfare equilibrium had to be found between daring boldness and security.

The ideology of courage is not only subject to changes in warfare, but also to political developments. In a recent book on *Roman Manliness: Virtus and the Roman Republic* Myles McDonnell has argued that the display of *virtus*, particularly in single combat, became increasingly instrumental in the acquisition of political power. Hence, in the critical final years of the Republic the rise of strong men was accompanied by an increased awareness of the dangers that such a display could pose for the Republic. The constraint and discipline imposed on (especially young) men was therefore as important as their aggressive *virtus*.²⁵ In line with Rome's expansion to the East, the meaning of *virtus* was more and more influenced by the Greek concept of

²¹ There is some debate, but no positive evidence on whether Roman legions occasionally fought in phalanx-formation. Cf. Catherine M. Gulliver, 'Battle' in: Philip Sabin, Hans van Wees and Michael Whitby eds., *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Warfare* Volume 2 (Cambridge 2007) 122-157, 133.

²² Philip Sabin, 'Land Battles' in Philip Sabin, Hans van Wees and Michael Whitby eds., *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Warfare* Volume 1 (Cambridge 2007) 399-433, esp. 402. Cf. Thomas Wiedemann, *Emperors and Gladiators* (London and New York 1992) 36-39.

²³ Simon Hornblower, 'Warfare in ancient Literature. The paradox of war' in: Philip Sabin, Hans van Wees and Michael Whitby eds., *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Warfare* Volume 1 (Cambridge 2007) 22-53.

²⁴ C.M. Gilliver, *The Roman Art of War* (Stroud and Charleston 1999) 117-120.

²⁵ Myles McDonnell, *Roman manliness. Virtus and the Roman Republic* (Cambridge 2006) in particular 7, 195-205 and 399-412. See also Oakley, 'Single Combat' 405-407.

ἀρετή.²⁶ During the empire, however, daring was still a much admired component of *virtus*, and as the emperor should be the most virtuous of all men, the quality of daring was part of his (self-) representation. I will discuss this in more detail in Josephus' depiction of Titus' daring in chapter six. In comparison, the combination of daring and insubordination had a more ambiguous meaning.²⁷

The dynamic meaning and valuation of τόλμη and ἀνδρεία is a significant indication of the continued importance of these concepts. It has been a central concept in self-definition throughout classical antiquity,²⁸ but in the second century AD, when Pausanias was writing, identity and its relation to power and status in the context of the Roman Empire was not just a matter of discussion but also of anxiety.²⁹ This may well have been one reason for the popularity of Aristomenes' story. The important role of τόλμη in classical conceptions of ἀνδρεία, as well as the suggestion from other sources that Aristomenes was a hero with a special connection to bravery and courage, indicates at the very least that Pausanias' persistent use of τόλμη cannot have been accidental.³⁰ In the next section we will therefore concentrate on Aristomenes' daring heroism.

²⁶ McDonnell, *Roman manliness* Chapter 3. Stefan Müller, ' "Schauspiele voller Kraft und Charakter" Die Gladiatorenkämpfe als Drama fürs Volks' *Gymnasium* 109 (2002) 21-47, 41.

²⁷ See also Tim Duff, *Plutarch's Lives. Exploring Virtue and Vice* (Oxford 1999) 293 for the significance of this to Plutarch, both in the *Parallel Lives* and in *Political Precepts*. On the importance and difficulty of controlling bellicosity: Christopher Pelling, 'Plutarch: Roman Heroes and Greek Culture' in: Miriam Griffin and Jonathan Barnes ed., *Philosophica Togata. Essays on Philosophy and Roman Society* (Oxford 1989) 199-232, esp. 206.

²⁸ Cf. Rosen and Sluiter eds., *Andreia*; Gleason, *Making men for the Second Sophistic*; W.V. Harris, *War and Imperialism in Republican Rome 327-70* (Oxford 1979; paperback 1985) ch. 1, esp. 20-29 on the ideology of *laus* and *gloria* in Roman Republican context.

²⁹ Jeremy McInery, 'Plutarch's Manly Women' in: Ralph M. Rosen and Ineke Sluiter eds., *Andreia. Studies in manliness and courage in classical antiquity* (Leiden 2003) 319-344.

³⁰ This has been recognised by Auberger 'Les mots du courage chez Pausanias', who notes that τόλμη is a dominant word in his portrayal of military leaders fighting against the odds. In her view the association with φρόνημα ('spirit' or 'intelligence') and ἡλικία ('being in the prime of one's life') means that Pausanias' use of τόλμη is not pejorative. It emphasises the aspect of bravery in courage and is a positive feature in a warrior like Aristomenes, especially as he uses it to encourage his fellow rebels.

Aristomenes and his men: *'In the prime of their life and daring'*

It is his role as a military leader that is most characteristic of Aristomenes. In his first appearance in book 4, Pausanias states that Rhianos' account of him makes him 'as glorious as Achilles'.³¹ Aristomenes is first and foremost a good warrior, and it is in this capacity that he 'made the name of Messene important and respected'.³² A second important aspect of his heroism is his people's subjected status. The Messenians fight against the odds against strong Spartan domination. Their desperate situation is confirmed by the passage in which Pausanias relates his place of origin. He describes how a group of young men out of desperation at their present situation decided to rebel.³³ This situation arises out of the measures that the Spartans take towards the Messenians after the First Messenian War, mentioned just before this passage, with references to the poetry of Tyrtaeus.³⁴ The two passages quoted by Pausanias read as follows:

Like asses worn by heavy burdens;
Bringing to their masters under grim compulsion
Half of the fruits the soil bears.

ὥσπερ ὄνοι μεγάλοις ἄχθεσι τειρόμενοι,
δεσποσύνοισι φέροντες ἀναγκαίης ὑπὸ λυγρῆς
ἤμισυ πᾶν θ' ὅσων καρπὸν ἄρουρα φέρει.

Wailing for their masters, they as well as their wives,
Whenever one met the wretched fate of death

δεσπόταχ οἰμώζοντες, ὁμῶς ἄλοχοί τε καὶ αὐτοί,
εὐτέ τιν' οὐλομένη μοῖρα κίχοι θανάτου.

³¹ Paus. 4.6.3.6-8.

³² Paus 4.6.3.

³³ Paus. 4.14.6-8.

³⁴ Paus. 4.14. 4-6.

Pausanias understands these passages from Tyrtaeus as referring to the Messenians³⁵ and explains that they comprise the punishments inflicted on them after the First Messenian War. Whereas the first passage refers to the economic exploitation that the Messenians were subjected to, the second illustrates the degradation that went with it, forcing the Messenians to mourn their masters.³⁶ That Pausanias represents the Messenians as slaves³⁷ is clear in the next passage as well.

Finding themselves in these unhappy straits, the younger men (νεώτεροι), plan to revolt. They:

had no experience of war (πολέμου μὲν ἔτι ἀπειρώως ἔχοντες) and a certain nobility of mind (λαμπροὶ δὲ ὄντες τὰ φρονήματα), and preferred to die free in their own country rather than to be slaves and be happy in other things (εἰ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα εὐδαιμόνως δουλεύειν παρείη).³⁸

The best of these young men came from Andania and one of them was Aristomenes, who 'was in the prime of his life and daring (ἡλικία καὶ τόλμη) and he and others enticed them to revolt'.³⁹ At this stage Aristomenes is still one of many. The three characteristics mentioned here ('age', 'inexperience' and 'nobility of mind') are common to all the rebels. Φρόνημα was understood by Auberger as 'intelligence',⁴⁰ but here it refers to the refusal of

³⁵ Pavel Oliva, *Sparta and her Social Problems* (Prague 1971) 109; Jean Ducat, *Les Hilotes* (Athens 1990) 59-60.

³⁶ It is not quite clear what the correct wording of ἡμισυ πᾶν ὄσων καρπὸν ἄρουρα, is, as there is a textual problem with πᾶν θ', but the ἀναγκαίης ὑπὸ λυγρῆς is unambiguous. The use of δεσπότης in reference to the Spartans corroborates the interpretation of the Messenians' situation as one of subjection. Cf. Stephen Hodkinson, *Property and Wealth in Classical Sparta* (Swansea 2000).

³⁷ Pausanias' use of δεσπότης and δουλεύειν does not, however, automatically imply slavery as in chattel slavery. Note, for example, Hermann Hitzig and Hugo Blümmer, *Pausaniae Graeciae Descriptio* (Leipzig 1901) volume 2, 131, who comment that the passage implies the Messenians were subjected as perioikoi and this suggestion has recently been taken over by Luraghi, *The Ancient Messenians* 74, 104-5.

³⁸ Pearson, 'Pseudo-history' notes Thucydidean reminiscences in this passage: Thuc. 11.8.1, 42.4, 63.3.

³⁹ Paus. 4.14.6-8.

⁴⁰ Auberger, 'Les Mots du Courage' 14-16.

the Messenians to accept being treated like slaves. 'Age' and 'inexperience' refer to the rashness with which the men decided to enter into battle. Although being in the prime of one's life is in itself positive, Pausanias' identification of the rebels as νεώτεροι also emphasises their willingness to revolt.⁴¹ Both the experience of slavery and the identification of the rebels as νεώτεροι⁴² are factors to take into account when considering the meaning of φρονήματα. Φρονέω and φρόνις are words that could at first sight signify wisdom and prudence, but are used not infrequently to imply high mindedness and even presumption. The *Iliad* features the word in relation to wild animals and Sophocles also uses it in a negative sense with reference to women.⁴³ The occurrence of the word in relation to the rebels can therefore be understood as suggesting presumption.

The combination of age and daring in Aristomenes equips him together with the other leaders to persuade the Messenians to join in the revolt. Τόλμη is therefore used here as a positive characteristic, but is also connected to the inspiration of a revolutionary spirit in young and inexperienced men. So how should we understand Aristomenes' leadership? Before going into the more questionable aspects of Aristomenes' heroism in the next section, it is important to realise that Aristomenes' τόλμη makes him a powerful warrior.

Aristomenes was always, out of necessity, on enemy territory. Already in the passage introducing Aristomenes, Pausanias emphasises that he and the other leaders stimulated the revolt 'not in an immediate, public way'. Secret messengers were sent to Argos and Arcadia to enquire for help.⁴⁴ The rebellion starts off therefore as a conspiracy, which hardly provides the best

⁴¹ Νεωτερίζειν ('to revolt') is used by Thuc. 4.41.3; 4.80.2-3; 5.14.3 in relation to Messenian helots who revolt or are suspected to revolt. Cf. Ducat, *Les Hilotes* 139.

⁴² W. Hoben, *Terminologische Studien zu den Sklavenerhebungen der römischen Republik* (Wiesbaden 1978) 36.

⁴³ *Iliad* 11.296; 13.156; 16.758; 11.325; Compare Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* 7.5.62; Sophocles, *Oedipus Tyrannus* 1078.

⁴⁴ Paus. 4.14.6; Secrecy is a major theme of book 4. The Spartans are blamed for not renouncing their friendship when they first started the war and the Argives come to aid the Messenians in secret, see below, 77.

opportunity for a display of daring. In 18.1-3 we read that Aristomenes and his men 'robbed from Lakonia and their own countryside, which by now they thought of as enemy territory'.⁴⁵ Activity at night⁴⁶ also points to the rebels having to resort to guerrilla-warfare.

The guerrilla type of fighting is accompanied, however, by open battle. In the first years of the revolt, three open battles are fought, before the Messenians are forced to retire to the mountain of Eira and give up their cities (including Andania).⁴⁷ It has been argued that Pausanias includes these battles partly because of his sympathy with the Messenian cause, which made him want to write both a eulogy of Aristomenes and a description of a legitimate war. Since the aspect of having to hide does not accord well with that aim, guerrilla warfare must be presented as a chosen tactic by Aristomenes: a proof that he is bold enough to go into the lion's den and show the Spartans that he can attack them at the very heart of their power.⁴⁸ In this narrative framework, Aristomenes' success in hiding is a sign that he is as clever as Odysseus.⁴⁹

Not only does Aristomenes take the forefront concerning bold acts, but he is also able to inspire the same 'daring' (τόλμη) in his men. Time and again Pausanias mentions that Aristomenes could rely on everyone to follow him everywhere.⁵⁰ The behaviour of his men in battle is governed by the same principles of τόλμη and ἀπόνοια as that of Aristomenes. In the description of the battle of Derai, for example, it is clear that Aristomenes takes the lead and that his behaviour in battle is meant to inspire the same daring in other men.

⁴⁵ Paus. 4.18.1-3.

⁴⁶ The attack on Pharai in Paus 4.16.8), a plan for an attack on Sparta in Paus 4.14.9; an attack on Amyklai in Paus 4.18.3; an attack on the Corinthian allies of the Spartans in Paus. 4.9.2; a plan for an attack on Sparta in Paus.4.12.3-4.

⁴⁷ The Battle at Derai (Paus. 4.15.4); the Battle at Kaprou (Paus. 4.15.7-4.16.1-6); the Battle at the Great Trench (Paus.4.17)

⁴⁸ Keith Hopwood, ' "All that may become a man": the bandit in the ancient novel' in: Lin Foxhall and John Salmon ed., *When men were men. Masculinity, power and identity in classical antiquity* (London and New York 1998) 195-204 discusses the uses of banditry in the ancient novel as an explicit negation of the correct way of waging war.

⁴⁹ Ogden, *Aristomenes* 44-46.

⁵⁰ Paus. 4.15.5; 4.16.2-3; 4.18.1-3.

They would only be ready to suffer if he was.⁵¹ At the Boar's Grave (Κάπρου in Stenycleros), a year later, both the Messenians and the Spartans had allies with them and all present were as eager (πρόθυμος) as was befitting for their age and strength. The Spartans were urged on by Tyrtaeus, whereas the Messenians were inspired by the priests of the Eleusinian mysteries. Aristomenes and his elite troops, who were of the same age as him, fought, however, with the most desperate courage and successfully repelled Anaxander and his Spartan guard:

Neglecting the wounds they received and advancing in every kind of desperation they repelled those around Anaxander in time and with daring.

Λαμβάνοντες δὲ τραύματα ἀφειδῶς καὶ ἐς πᾶν προΐόντες ἀπονοίας τῷ τε χρόνῳ καὶ τοῖς τολμήμασιν ἐτρέψαντο τοὺς περὶ Ἀνάξανδρον.⁵²

Although all men on the battlefield are courageous, the Messenians finally get the better of the Spartans and their allies through this combination of ἀπόνοια and τόλμημα. The πρόθυμία that is displayed by everyone refers to a characteristic that should be shared by all men of the same age and strength. The ἀπόνοια and τόλμη of the Messenians, on the other hand, are more extraordinary aspects and unique to those around Aristomenes. They appear at first sight as positive features. It is only through ἀπόνοια and τόλμη that the Messenians are such resilient fighters and able to beat the Spartans.⁵³ In the next section we will see, however, that the combination of daring and ἀπόνοια can also have negative consequences.

⁵¹ Paus. 4.15.5.

⁵² Paus. 4.16.3.

⁵³ See: Auberger, 'Une histoire d'amour!' who argues that Pausanias describes the Messenians as 'les seuls vrais guerriers', but ignores the ἀπόνοια of the Messenians' τόλμη.

The effects of daring

The centrality of τόλμη and ἀπόνοια in Pausanias' depiction of Aristomenes serves to mark him out as a dangerous enemy for the Spartans. This is especially the case when these characteristics pertain not only to him, but to the other Messenian rebels. The downside of the combination of τόλμη and ἀπόνοια, however, is made clear by what happens to the Messenians in the aftermath of the battle at the Boar's Grave, when it appears that the Messenians are unable to reap the fruits of their victory. After the Messenians had succeeded in breaking the Spartan line, Aristomenes went after the fleeing Spartans:

They were now running without shame and without waiting for one another while he assailed them with a terror that seemed more than one man's fury could inspire (φοβερώτερος ἢ κατὰ ἀνδρὸς ἑνὸς εἶναι μανία). There was a wild pear-tree growing in the plain, beyond which Theoclus the seer forbade him to pass, for he said that the Dioscuri were seated on the tree. Aristomenes, in the heat of passion (δὲ εἰκὼν τῷ θυμῷ) did not hear all that the seer said, and when he reached the tree, lost his shield, and his mistake gave to the Lacedaemonians an opportunity for some to escape from the rout. For he lost time trying to recover his shield.⁵⁴

Although questions may be asked about the importance of Aristomenes' shield and the need to recover it,⁵⁵ Pausanias devotes more attention to the

⁵⁴ Paus. 4.16.4-5.

⁵⁵ Paus. 4.16.4-5 informs us that Aristomenes went to Delphi to ask the Pythia how to recover the shield and was sent to the sanctuary of Trophonius at Lebadeia, where indeed he found it and dedicated it to the sanctuary. Ogden *Aristomenes* 59-74 has recently posed the questions of how Aristomenes could lose his shield on an open plain and why it was so important to him to recover it. On the second issue he notes Polyaeus' version of Aristomenes' survival from his fall in the Caeadas and remarks that in both sources Aristomenes' shield has an important function as a protective talisman. In Polyaeus 2.31.2, Aristomenes saves himself by using his shield as a parachute. In comparison, the protective function of the shield as talisman is less clear in Paus. 4.18.4-9, in which Aristomenes is carried down by an eagle. Ogden also combines the story of Aristomenes' loss of shield with an episode mentioned by Paus. 4.13.1 in his account of the reign of King Aristodemus, the last king before Sparta's conquest of

question of how the mistake was made. He explains it by showing that Aristomenes pursued the Spartans with a fury greater than that of any one man (φοβερώτερος ἢ κατὰ ἀνδρὸς ἑνὸς εἶναι μανίαν) and was unable to hear the advice of his seer due to his passion (δὲ εἰκὼν τῷ θυμῷ). Tentatively, Ogden proposes that we may think of the Dioscuri as maddening effigies.⁵⁶ He points to the Spartans' practice recorded in Herodotus of carrying statues of the Dioscuri with them in battle and adds that there are other ancient sources in which statues inspire madness.⁵⁷ This suggestion is, however, unnecessary if we are to understand that Aristomenes' τόλμη and ἀπόνοια inherently imply madness in battle.⁵⁸ As Ogden correctly observed, Aristomenes' madness precedes his confrontation with the Dioscuri and his error in ignoring them.⁵⁹ In light of this, and remembering that ἀπόνοια inherently implies loss of mind in desperation, the proposition that Aristomenes displays an example of Platonic ἡ ἄφρων τόλμα or Thucydidean τόλμα ἀλόγιστος seems to me a simpler explanation.

The Messenian victories at Derai and the Boar's Grave and Aristomenes' subsequent mistaken pursuit of the Spartans thereby show us both the strength and the weakness of his daring. He gains the victory in battle by τόλμη and ἀπόνοια, but is shown to lose the fruits of his victory by his μανία

Messenia in the 'First Messenian War', in which the occurrence that the armed statue of Artemis let fall its shield is taken as a portent for Messenia's destruction. The protection that a shield may offer therefore only becomes clear by the loss of both shield and protection.

⁵⁶ Criticised by Mc Cauley, *BMCR*.

⁵⁷ Herodotus 5.75.

⁵⁸ Compare, however, K. Bassi, *Acting like Men: Gender, drama and nostalgia in ancient Greece* (Ann Arbor 1998) 194, 208-210, 225 and R. Padel, *In and Out of the Mind: Greek images of the tragic self* (Princeton 1992) 27-30, 97 on μανία as a Dionysiac experience both resulting from worship and as a punishment for failing to worship. The connection of θυμός to μανία is addressed by Padel.

⁵⁹ B. Sergent, *Homosexuality in Greek Myth* (London 1986; translated from *L'homosexualité dans la mythologie grecque*, Paris 1984) compares Aristomenes' μανία to the frenzy of the 'bersirkir' warrior. Note, however, Van Wees' discussion of the frenzies of Homeric heroes: 'Homer's beserkers remain quite sane by modern military standards let alone by standards of other heroic traditions: their behaviour is mad only by comparison with the rather low levels of courage and stamina expected in Homeric combat': H. van Wees, *Status Warriors: war, violence and society in Homer and History* (Amsterdam 1992) 164-5. The applicability of the full 'bersirkir-rage' to even an Achillean Aristomenes may thus be questioned. Ogden, *Aristomenes* 120 takes over Sergent's suggestion and develops it in a discussion of animalistic features in Aristomenes.

and θυμός. That τόλμη is an irrational and irresponsible sort of bravery is suggested by Pausanias through the recurrent combination of the word with ἀπόνοια, but is even more striking in this passage where it is paired with μανία⁶⁰ and θυμός. In the heat of the battle and in his hate for the Spartans, Aristomenes had lost control of his mind and had no other aim than to kill Spartans, however unwise that might be. His anger is therefore closely connected to his despair.

There are other passages in which hatred for the Spartans seems to cloud Aristomenes' judgement. One relevant passage is Pausanias' account of the final battle of the Messenian War at Eira. It is preceded by his mention of two oracles. The oracle of Delphi had prophesied that Eira was destined to fall in the eleventh year of the siege. Pausanias makes it a point that Aristomenes knew about the oracle and was convinced by it.⁶¹ Aristomenes' leadership qualities also consist in knowing about a second oracle that when 'a certain thing' (ἀπορρήτος) should get lost, the Messenians would forever disappear. This thing, it turns out later (when Pausanias recounts Messenia's liberation by the Thebans under Epaminondas),⁶² are the conventions of the cult of the Goddesses at Andania. Aristomenes takes it to Ithome and buries it, so as not to lose the one hope of return to Messenia.⁶³ Not all is lost for the Messenians therefore. But certainly for Aristomenes and his men there is nothing anymore to hope for. Aristomenes knows it and acts accordingly.

Nevertheless, Aristomenes and his seer Theokles spur the Messenians on to more daring, and remind them of the behaviour, again described by the term τόλμη, of the people of Smyrna who, when Gyges and the Lydians occupied their city, threw them out by sheer courage and eagerness. Pausanias uses the words ἀρετή ('excellence', 'bravery') and προθυμία ('readiness', 'eagerness')

⁶⁰ Note also Ameling, 'Pausanias und die hellenistische Geschichte' on μανία as a reason for Greece's downfall.

⁶¹ Paus. 4.20.1-4 and 4.21.3

⁶² Paus. 4.26.8.

⁶³ Paus. 4.20.4; see below, 84-85 on the significance of the *Andanian Mysteries* for Pausanias.

with reference to the people of Smyrna, whereas the effect of those words on the Messenians is referred to by ἀπόνουα, implying a loss of sense and desperation.⁶⁴ The fact that the Smyrnians were also extremely 'daring', does not have the exact same connotation of rashness as the τόλμη of the Messenians in my other examples. Τόλμη is a necessary ingredient of courage, and the Smyrnians possess it alongside ἀρετή and προθυμία. The Messenians in contrast combine their τόλμη only with ἀπόνουα, and that as we have seen, amounts to ἡ ἄφρων τόλμη (α): 'foolish daring'. Another difference between Smyrna and Eira that merely adds to this foolishness is that Eira was lost, and Aristomenes knew it.

After the loss, the survivors find refuge in Arkadia, and Aristomenes' sorrow (οἶκτος) over the sack of Eira and his hatred (μῖσος) for the Lakonians make him decide to pick 500 men for an attempt to occupy Sparta. It is certain that this will not succeed, and Aristomenes knows full well that it is impossible to save Messene. The men are therefore picked because of their willingness to die with Aristomenes and take revenge (τιμωρέο) on the Spartans. Aristomenes says:

"If we can take and occupy Sparta we can give the Lakonians back what they own in exchange for what we own. If we fail we shall still die having done something worth remembering in future."⁶⁵

The idea of leaving something worth remembering is interesting, as in retrospect this is all that Aristomenes and his men have done. As it happens, the Arcadian king prevents Aristomenes from taking this particular

⁶⁴ Paus. 4.21.5-6; My interpretation is thus diametrically opposite to Hitzig and Blümmer, *Pausaniae* 145, who argue that Pausanias tries to make clear that the Messenians are braver than the Smyrnians. It is in this respect interesting that Pausanias by all likelihood came from Magnesia on Sipylos, not far from Smyrna. As he identifies himself as a Greek, he may have had a special interest in the Smyrnians' resistance against Gyges. Cf. Pretzler, *Pausanias* 21-23.

⁶⁵ Paus. 4.22.4-5; reminiscent of *Iliad* 22.305, in which Hector, expecting to die at Achilles' hands, he still hopes to wound or kill him and thereby 'do some great thing, so that men to come will learn about it'. Cf. Kroyman, *Pausanias und Rhianos* 71, who suggests that Hector was, in addition to Achilles, a model for Aristomenes.

opportunity to live on in death by betraying the plan to the Spartans.⁶⁶ It is the last moment of resistance that Pausanias reports. He ends Aristomenes' story by relating how the Messenians on the coast fled to a city on the coast of Elis and sent a message from there to ask Aristomenes to lead them in search of a new land. This Aristomenes refuses, stating that he will fight the Spartans as long as he lives. In Pausanias' further account of Aristomenes' life, however, he then proceeds to marry off the female half of his family and ends his life quite peacefully in his son-in-law's home in Rhodes. Pausanias says that Aristomenes was planning to travel from there to Sardis, but that he was prevented to do so by illness and death, 'for no further misfortune was to befall the Lacedaemonians at the hands of Aristomenes'.⁶⁷

Achillean Aristomenes: his leadership and his daring

Aristomenes' τόλμη and ἀπόνοια may make him quite an impressive warrior. But is he also a good leader? One thing Aristomenes appears to be very good at is inspiring the same daring in equally desperate fellow Messenians.⁶⁸ After the first pitched battle of his war, he is made στρατηγός ἀτοκράτωρ and it is said that his men thought it a tremendous honour to fight for him.⁶⁹ Nevertheless, Aristomenes' power to control his men is more problematic. This is most clear in the passage concerning the kidnap of some Spartan virgins. Aristomenes had decided to kidnap the daughters of rich and influential Spartans so that he could ransom them. However, the moment that he leaves some of the rebels to guard them, they start to rape the girls. He orders the men to stop; but he is ignored until he kills some of them:

...but by day he ambushed the maidens in Caryae who were dancing for Artemis and seized all those who were outstanding either in their wealth or in

⁶⁶ Paus. 4.22.3-7.

⁶⁷ Paus. 4.24.1-3.

⁶⁸ For Auberger, 'Les Mots du Courage' 15 this is the main reason to interpret Aristomenes' τόλμη positively.

⁶⁹ Paus. 4.15.4.

the rank of their fathers. He took them to a village in Messenia and rested for the night, after entrusting the guarding of the girls to men from his band. Then the youths, for reasons, I suppose, of drunkenness and general lack of good sense, attempted to force the maidens. Aristomenes tried to deter them from this behaviour contrary to Greek custom, but they paid him no heed, so that he was compelled to kill the most drunken of them. He ransomed the captive girls for a great deal of money, virgins, just as he had taken them.⁷⁰

The effects of drunkenness held special fascination for the educated elite in the Roman world and is a theme specifically relevant for the representation of Messenians in the light of Plutarch's reference to the Spartan custom of intoxicating helots as counter-examples for their youths.⁷¹ We have already seen that the rebels' identity as young men suggests an incompleteness of mind corroborated by the repeated mention of *τόλμη* and *ἀπόνοια*. Now they also prove unable to hold their drink.⁷² Admittedly, Aristomenes does put a stop to their violation of Greek custom, and it is implied in this passage that he does it partly for that reason rather than just to protect the value of ransom for the girls. However, he is forced to use violence against his own men as they refused to listen to him. The relationship between him and his men is positive in battle, when Aristomenes by the display of his daring encourages the Messenians to do the same. But that power over his men is lacking when he gives a simple order to guard a number of girls he is meaning to ransom.

Although the preparedness to use violence against one's own men may not in itself appear as bad leadership in ancient literature, there are other cases where Aristomenes has difficulties controlling his men. A similar neglect to

⁷⁰ Paus. 4.16.9-10.

⁷¹ Plutarch, *Lycurgus* 28.4; *Demetrius* 1.5; cf. Ducat, *Les Hilotes* 107-109, 115-116. On drunkenness and bandits: Hopwood ' "All that may become a man" ' 197. On drunkenness in general: J. D'Arms, 'Heavy drinking and drunkenness in the Roman World. Four questions for historians' in: O. Murray and M. Teğusan eds., *In Vino Veritas* (London 1995) 304-317.

⁷² At 9.30.5, Pausanias also connects drunkenness to *τόλμη* in his account of the Thracian women murdering Orpheus. Wine helps them coming over their fear for their husbands. Pausanias comments that 'thereafter the custom of their men has been to march to battle drunk'.

follow his orders may be recognised in the events leading up to the fall of the Eira. Pausanias explains the Spartans' detection of the Messenian hiding place by reference to a love romance.⁷³ One of the slaves of a notable Spartan, Emperamus, had fallen in love with the wife of a Messenian and had for this reason deserted. Whenever the Messenian was on duty to guard, the slave would visit his wife. This went on for some time, until one day it rained and Aristomenes because he was wounded could not do his usual rounds to check up on the guards. 'This', Pausanias says, 'was the main reason that the acropolis was deserted'.⁷⁴ All guards had gone home, including the cuckold who unaware of his wife's lover hiding in the back, told her all about the rain and how everybody had decided to go home, *en passant* giving away the details of the exact location.

These two episodes are surely more than amusing stories. It is ironic that a hero who is so good at inspiring his men into battle frenzy, cannot trust any of them to do a simple guarding job. The rebels risk their life in a desperate fight, but they cannot stand a drop of rain.⁷⁵ Elsewhere too, Pausanias comments on their inability to endure hardship, in his account of the Arcadian king Aristocrates' betrayal of the Messenians.⁷⁶ He concentrates in the episode on the fact that Aristocrates had taken bribes from the Spartans to desert the battlefield in the midst of fighting, and for that reason it has been interpreted as an example of the pro-Messenian/anti-Lakonian tendency of book 4.⁷⁷ It is, however, also interesting that the Messenians' behaviour is far from courageous. At the sight of the fleeing Arcadians, the Messenians:

⁷³ Paus. 4.20.5-21.1; Auberger, 'Pausanias romancier' 275 sees this as a story inside a story, sprung from Pausanias' interest in the romance. As I have suggested in the Introduction, I agree that this may indeed have influenced Pausanias, although I also think that the story has a wider relevance for the complete narrative of book 4.

⁷⁴ Paus. 4.20.7.

⁷⁵ Indeed, the whole revolt could be understood as the result of the Messenians' inability to endure hardships as Pausanias' comment (4.14.6-8) that the rebels 'could have been happy in all other respects' implies.

⁷⁶ Paus. 4.17.2-9.

⁷⁷ Kroymann, *Pausanias und Rhianos* 81: 'Rhianos konnte Aristomenes und die Messenier nicht durch überlegene kriegerische Tüchtigkeit des Spartaner zugrunde gehen lassen'.

were amazed at the unexpected state of affairs, and moreover were thrown into confusion by the passage of the Arcadians through their ranks, so that they almost forgot what lay before them; for instead of the advance of the Lacedaemonians they watched the Arcadian retreat, some begging them to stand by them, others cursing them for traitors and scoundrels.⁷⁸

The Messenians' bafflement may be understandable, but it is not the heroic behaviour of warriors fighting with a willingness to die rather than to be enslaved. Another comment not only illustrates that the Messenians were less than ready to face the music, but also explains why by reference of the Messenians' ambition at the start of the battle:

So great were the numbers of the people of the Messenians slain that in lieu of their former thoughts of becoming the masters instead of the slaves (δεσπότας ἀντὶ δούλων) of the Lacedaemonians they now had no hope of safety itself (τότε μηδὲ ἐς τὴν σωτηρίαν αὐτὴν ἔτι ἔχειν ἐλπίδα).⁷⁹

Whereas in introducing the Messenian revolt, Pausanias had referred to the φρονήμα of the young men as an indication of their refusal to be slaves, here this aspect of the Messenian rebels comes to the fore again in a statement indicating that they were not only blind in their despair but also in their ambition. As both Aristocrates' treachery and the role of Emperamus' slave remind the reader of the betrayal that caused Leonidas' heroic defeat at Thermopylae,⁸⁰ the quintessential desperate battle,⁸¹ one would expect in a

⁷⁸ Paus. 4.17.8.

⁷⁹ Paus. 4.17.19.

⁸⁰ Herodotus 7.213; Although Herodotus is an important model for Pausanias' *Periegesis* the battle at Thermopylae is only briefly mentioned by Pausanias 3.4.7-8. Kroymann, *Pausanias und Rhianos* 92-93 compares the fall of Eira to the fall of Troy. See also: Auberger, 'Une histoire d'amour' 194-5.

⁸¹ Pears, 'Courage as a Mean' 183, 186 discusses the desperation of the Spartans at Thermopylae. Their courage is desperate as they are aware of their imminent deaths, but they made their offer on the basis of a realistic assessment of their risks and a valuation that the goal they are fighting for is achievable and worth it. A similar analysis may be found in LévyStone, 'Le courage' who compares the Athenian calculated courage with Spartan sublime courage. The difference between the two types of courage corresponds to the difference between φόβος and δέος as well as to the difference between σοφία and ἐπιστήμη.

pro-Messenian story a little less presumption and bafflement, and considerably more gallant fighting.

Aristomenes' exceptional daring is reminiscent of Achilles' heroism.⁸² The comparison with Achilles, taken over by Pausanias from Rhianos,⁸³ thereby emphasises his abilities as a warrior. In light of Aristomenes' problems to control both himself and his men, however, I think that the comparison is made to show not just how heroic Aristomenes is, but also the nature of his heroism. At moments of anger, first directed at Agamemnon, then at Hector, Achilles' power is strongest, but at the same time overtakes him.⁸⁴ His power is deeply ambivalent: it is directed by an anger that works to the advantage of the Achaeans when he returns to the battlefield, but at the same time overtakes Achilles in important moments: he does not master it. Rather it masters him, and it makes him at the same time 'beast-like' and 'god-like'.⁸⁵ This divine beastliness of Achilles is connected to a refusal of being slave-like. His anger against Agamemnon and his decision to separate himself from the other Achaeans arise out of not accepting Agamemnon's authority and refusing to submit to the king's wishes. However, the refusal to be subjected to Agamemnon equates in Achilles' case to a refusal to belong to the community of Achaeans. In not belonging, Achilles is already in some respect socially dead.⁸⁶

⁸² Ogden, *Aristomenes* 37-39 also makes this comparison, but for different reasons. He writes that 'The Achillean Aristomenes best suits a Messenia that fights Sparta on equal terms.' I disagree with this. I think it is rather the inequality of the fight, the fact that the Messenians are already doomed, that makes him like Achilles. Cf. below on the connection between Aristomenes' Achillean anger and his 'slavish' despair.

⁸³ Paus. 4.6.3.

⁸⁴ The use of the word βίη for Achilles' power expresses this ambivalence. Gregory Nagy, *The best of the Achaeans. Concepts of the hero in archaic Greek poetry* (Baltimore and London 1979).

⁸⁵ Katherine Callen King, *Achilles. Paradigms of the war hero from Homer to the Middle Ages* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 1987) esp. 17-28. See also: Donna F. Wilson, *Ransom, Revenge and Heroic Identity in the Iliad* (Cambridge 2002) 33 and Jean-Pierre Vernant, 'Between the Beasts and the Gods' in: Idem, *Myth and Society in Ancient Greece* (translation: Janet Lloyd; Sussex and London 1980) 130-167; Douglas L. Cairns, *The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in ancient Greek Literature* (Oxford 1993) 131-2 on Achilles' lack of αἰδώς.

⁸⁶ Cf. Hans van Wees, 'A brief history of tears: gender differentiation in archaic Greece' in: Lin Foxhall and John Salmon eds., *When men were men. Masculinity, power and identity in*

In the *Odyssey* the connection between Achilles' divine beastliness and his refusal to be slave-like is made explicit. When Odysseus visits Achilles in the underworld, he praises him and remarks how he was honoured as a god in life but also has great power among the dead. Achilles however replies:

“And do not you make light of death, illustrious Odysseus. I would rather be bound down working as a θής for another, by the side of a landless man, whose livelihood is not great, than be ruler over all the dead who have perished.”⁸⁷

Now that Achilles has been taken to Hades he regrets his former pride and prefers the lowest possible status, that of a θής, to death. The use of θής reinforces the connection between Achilles' beastliness and slavishness. The status of θής is not one of slavery, but fits very well with Orlando Patterson's definition of slavery as a situation defined by social death.⁸⁸ In the Homeric epics the difference between a position as slave and a position as θής is that a slave belongs to a household, whereas the θής does not belong at all. Neither one was truly free.⁸⁹

Similarly, Aristomenes with his τόλμη is able to inflict great harm on the Spartans, but his lack of control also works against him. This is clear in cases where his daring clouds his judgement such in the mistaken pursuit of the Spartans beyond the border set by the Dioscuri, in his desire to leave 'something worth remembering', which inspires him in a Don Quixote type of attack against Sparta itself, and in his failure to lead his men. The anger and despair of both Aristomenes and Achilles develop in situations in which their

classical antiquity (London and New York 1998) 10-53 for etymology of the word hero and a claim that it originally meant 'a slave whose purpose was to serve and to protect'.

⁸⁷ Homer, *The Odyssey* 11.488-491 (translation: Moses I Finley, *The World of Odysseus* (2nd edition Harmondsworth 1979) 58-9.)

⁸⁸ Orlando Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death* (Cambridge Ma. 1982).

⁸⁹ Moses I. Finley, 'Wealth and Labour' in: Idem, *The World of Odysseus* (2nd edition Harmondsworth 1979) 51-73, esp 57-59 and 70-71. See also: Kurt Raaflaub, *The Discovery of Freedom in ancient Greece* (translation: Renate Franciscono; London and Chicago 2004) 31-32.

lives no longer belong to them. Aristomenes' life is forfeited as surely as Achilles' is foredoomed and both men realize that they are heading towards their deaths.⁹⁰ Some readers have interpreted Aristomenes' story as one of the invincible loser. When Pausanias heroicised Aristomenes, he somehow had to take into account the fact that he had lost. This has been seen as a matter of fate.⁹¹ But I think it is better to interpret both his successes and his final downfall within the same context of despair and recklessness.⁹²

The anger of the Messenians

The story that Pausanias writes contains in its imagery elements that are significant in an interpretation of Aristomenes as a rebel leader. The daring and despair in which he excels, however, also pertain to his followers. One important question therefore is to what extent τόλμη and ἀπόνοια are characteristic of the Messenians generally. In this section I will look at the beginning of Messenian-Spartan hostilities and the first Messenian War.

Pausanias tells us that the first dispute between the Messenians and the Spartans arose during the reign of Phintas. The sanctuary of Artemis Limnatis on the border between Messenia and Lakonia was shared by both the Messenians and the Spartans. After one of the festivals, the Lacedaemonians claimed that the Messenians had raped their virgins and killed their king when he tried to prevent them.⁹³ The Messenians replied that the Lacedaemonian virgins were not virgins at all but young men in disguise intending to kill some influential Messenians.⁹⁴ Pausanias with characteristic

⁹⁰ Michael Grant, *Myths of the Greeks and Romans* (London 1963) Chapter 1 on Achilles' doom.

⁹¹ Auberger, 'une histoire d'amour'; Figueira, 'The evolution Messenian identity' 226-227.

⁹² Compare: Keith Hopwood, ' "All that may become a man" '.

⁹³ Compare Strabo 6.257 and 362, B. Berg, 'Wronged Maidens in Myron's Messenian history and the ancient Novel' *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 39.1 (1998) 39-62; Auberger, *Pausanias* 133 notes that the Spartan version corresponds to a familiar *topos* and is in particular reminded of the Spartan violation of girls at Schédasos nearby Leuktra (Plutarch, *Life of Pelopidas* 20.5); Luraghi, *The Ancient Messenians* 81 remarks on the correspondence with the massacre of the Persian embassy by Alexander of Macedon, Herodotus 5.20.

⁹⁴ Paus. 4.4.1-3.

scepticism concludes that one may believe the story of whichever side one supports.⁹⁵

That he himself supports the Messenians becomes clear when he explains how a generation afterwards the Spartans sought and found a pretext to attack the Messenians. A Messenian with no land, Polychares, had given his cattle to a Spartan, Euaephnus, to let them graze on his land and have a share of the produce. Euaephnus however, first tried to deceive Polychares into believing he had been robbed of the cattle, and next, after Polychares had forgiven him, murdered his son. When Polychares obtained no satisfaction, he:

went out of his mind; he gave way to his anger (ἐκ τοῦ νοῦ καὶ τῷ θυμῷ χρώμενος), and, regardless of himself, he dared (ἐτόλμα) to murder every Lakonian he could catch.

This was then taken by the Lakonians as a legitimate reason to go to war.⁹⁶ Pausanias remarks that the Lacedaemonians had obtained:

a pretext which was not only sufficient for them, eager for a quarrel as they were and resolved on war at all costs, but also plausible to the highest degree, although with a more peaceful disposition (εἰρηνικωτέρως γνώμης) it could have been settled by the decision in the court.

From the outset therefore, Pausanias presents the Spartans as the aggressors, wanting to find a legitimate reason to attack Messenia.⁹⁷ Polychares is finally provoked into giving them one, although the whole matter could have been easily solved had the Spartans been more peacefully inclined (εἰρηνικωτέρως

⁹⁵ Paus. 4.4.3: 'These are the accounts given by the two sides; one may believe them according to one's feelings towards either side'.

⁹⁶ Paus. 4.4.4-8 and 4.5

⁹⁷ This is also clear from his repetition (4.5.2-5) of allegations that the Spartans were first to submit to Croesus, participated in the plundering of the temple at Delphi and allied themselves with Apollodorus, the tyrant of Cassandreia. Pausanias is careful to add that this is what 'they [the Messenians] say'.

γνώμης).⁹⁸ The Messenian, Polychares, on the other hand contributes to this outcome because he is governed by a senseless daring. The τόλμη used in this context is unambiguously negative in tone. As with Aristomenes pursuing the Spartans after his victory at the Boar's Grave it is paired with θυμός, clouding the protagonist's judgment. Although Pausanias blames the Spartans for abusing Polychares' rage for their own greed, there is no doubt that in his view Polychares over-reacted. It is a Spartan that does wrong to a Messenian, but it is the Messenian that loses his mind and gives the Spartans a reason to invade by giving way to his anger. Pausanias remarks that Polychares acts 'regardless of himself'. The episode sums up neatly the Messenian and Spartan disposition in the subsequent war: Spartans are governed by greed; Messenians by anger. Neither one deserves Pausanias' praise, although admittedly the Messenians receive his pity.⁹⁹

The Spartans proceed by sacking the city of Ampheia. Pausanias depicts this as an act of unjust aggression by explaining that the Spartans had made all the preparations for this in secret, and had not sent a herald declaring war or even renounced their friendship with the Messenians beforehand.¹⁰⁰ In his depiction of an assembly held by king Euphaes at Stenycleros, the Messenians seem aware that defeat in war would equal slavery. Nevertheless, Euphaes tells his subjects not to be too struck with terror.

On the one hand the Spartans had practice with warfare for a longer time, on the other the Messenians had a stronger necessity to show themselves brave men and the gods would be better to them because they were defending their country and not beginning the injustice.

⁹⁸ Paus. 4.4.4.

⁹⁹ Compare Akujärvi, *Researcher, Traveller, Narrator* 215-6: 'the narrator's account shows that the Messenians themselves made some wrong decisions'.

¹⁰⁰ Paus. 4.5.8. Compare, however, Paus. 4.10.1.: 'The Argives intended to come without the knowledge of the Lacedaemonians, and by private enterprise rather than by public declaration'; 4.10.7.: 'The Argives did not think fit to declare their hatred for the Lacedaemonians beforehand, but prepared to take part in the contest when it came'. There is no indication here that their secretive behaviour is unjust. Note also Aristomenes' guerrilla fighting, discussed above, 55-56.

Μελέτην μὲν γὰρ ἐκείνοις¹⁰¹ τῶν πολεμικῶν ἐκ χρόνου πλείονος, σφίσι δὲ εἶναι τήν τε ἀναγκὴν ἰσχυροτέραν ἀνδράσιν ἀγαθοῖς γίνεσθαι καὶ τὸ εὐμενέστερον ἔσεσθαι παρὰ τῶν θεῶν ἀμύνουσι τῇ οἰκείᾳ καὶ οὐκ ἀδικίας ἄρχουσιν.¹⁰²

Four years of reciprocal skirmishes pass, before the two forces meet for battle. Theopompus, the Spartan king, encourages his troops by saying that they would outdo their forefathers in subduing their neighbours and conquering valuable land.¹⁰³ Euphaes holds before the Messenians' eyes what would happen to them if they lost and concludes that it is better to die a noble death than to suffer those evils:

It was far easier for them, while still undefeated and equally matched in eagerness (προθυμία) to outdo their enemy by their daring (τὰς τόλμας), than it would be to repair their losses if they lost their present state of mind (τὸ φρόνημα).¹⁰⁴

Again, it is the dominance of τόλμη in the Messenian mind that separates them from their adversaries and will help them to beat them. But it is also emphasised how close the Messenians already are to either death or slavery. Whereas the Spartans are fighting for land and glory, the Messenians fight to preserve themselves. Euphaes' reference to τὸ φρόνημα as a characteristic of free men, lost in the eventuality of military defeat, is also noteworthy in this respect. The juxtaposition of Spartans and Messenians is also clear in the imagery of their behaviour in battle.

¹⁰¹ Translations differ in making this refer to Messenians or Spartans. With ἐκείνοις meaning 'the latter', Messenians would be more correct. However the μὲν – δὲ construction of this text makes a translation to Spartans more plausible, in which Euphaeus would be saying that on the one hand the Spartans have had more experience in warfare, on the other, the Messenians have better reasons to fight. This translation is also preferable because it is in line with the rest of the story in book 4 in which it is repeatedly stressed that the Spartans are better trained.

¹⁰² Paus. 4.6.6.

¹⁰³ Paus. 4.7.9.

¹⁰⁴ Paus. 4.7.10-11.

The Messenians charged the Lacedaemonians recklessly like men eager for death in their anger (ἀτε ἄνθρωποι θανατῶντες ὑπὸ τοῦ θυμοῦ), each one of them eager to be the first to join battle. The Lacedaemonians also advanced to meet them eagerly, but were careful not to break their ranks.¹⁰⁵

This opposition between the reckless Messenians and an eager and disciplined Lacedaemonian force¹⁰⁶ is emphasised throughout the description of the battle.¹⁰⁷ The Messenians are in that way already presented as a desperate people, aware of having no choice but to die or be enslaved.¹⁰⁸ This is emphasised even more by the claim that the Spartans were ‘calling the Messenians already their slaves (οἰκέτας), no freer than the Helots’ (οὐδὲν ἐλευθερωτέρους τῶν εἰλώτων).¹⁰⁹ The despair and daring of the Messenians gives them victory in this battle, but afterwards things go wrong. Scarcity of resources, deserting slaves and disease cause them to give up all their inland towns and settle on Mt. Ithome.¹¹⁰ Pausanias implies that fate has already decided that Messenia will be conquered. Even if the Messenians are

¹⁰⁵ Paus. 4.8.1.

¹⁰⁶ Spartan control and discipline is not a key theme as such in Pausanias, but he uses it to emphasise the uncontrolled Messenian behaviour. Cf. Noreen Humble, ‘Sōphrosynē revisited: was it ever a Spartan Virtue’ in: A. Powell and S. Hodkinson eds., *Sparta: beyond the mirage* (London 2002) 85-109, discussing the virtue of moderation as a specific Spartan virtue in various authors.

¹⁰⁷ Paus 4.8. See especially: 8.4: ‘The Messenians were inspired alike by desperation (ἀπόνοια) and readiness to face death (τὸν θάνατον εὐθυμον)’; 8.6. The Lacedaemonians refrained from exhorting one another, and were less inclined than the Messenians to engage in striking deeds of daring (τῶν τολμημάτων) ’ 8.9: Finally Euphaes and his men in a frenzy of despair that was near to madness (τῆς τε ἀπονοίας μανίας ὄντες ἐγγύτατα) (for picked Messenian troops formed the whole of the king’s bodyguard), overpowering the enemy by their bravery (ἀνδραγαθίας), drove back Theopompus himself and routed the Lacedaemonian troops opposed to them.

¹⁰⁸ Gabriele Bockisch, ‘Die Helotisierung der Messenier. Ein interpretationsversuch zu Pausanias iv 14,4f’ in: Heinz Kreißig and Friedmar Kühner eds., *Antike Abhängigkeitsformen in den griechischen Gebieten ohne Polisstruktur und der römischen Provinzen. Actes du colloque sur l’esclavage, Iéna, 29 septembre-2 octobre 1981* (Berlin 1985) 29-48, esp. 36-37 reads the passage in similar vein, but remarks on this juxtaposition as an indication for the historicity of Pausanias’ account: ‘gerade die Gegensatz zwischen geübter spartanische Hopliten und messenischen Einzelkämpfer, die die Sache den Letzteren von vornherein aussichtslos erscheinen, läßt, spricht für eine annähernd realistischen Schilderung und auch in diesem Falle für die Glaubwürdigkeit des Pausanias’. Pausanias’ depiction of Spartan and Messenian behaviour in his account of this mythical revolt may be very vivid, but it does not make his account more historically reliable.

¹⁰⁹ Paus 4.8.2. This passage cannot be used as proof that the Messenians were in fact helotised: Auberger, *Pausanias* 160.

¹¹⁰ Paus. 4.9.1.

successful in their battles, they will have to give up their country. Although it is clear therefore that Pausanias depicts the First Messenian War as a defensive war against unjust aggression, Euphaes' confidence that the gods would fight on the Messenian side appears with hindsight to be ironic. The stronger necessity of the Messenians to demonstrate their braveness will not suffice to maintain their independence.

Fate plays a special role in the downfall of the Messenians. This has commonly been interpreted as part and parcel of Pausanias' anti-Lakonian agenda: by presenting the Messenian defeat as fated, he diverts attention from the Spartan accomplishment in subduing their neighbours.¹¹¹ The central role of fate came out clearly in the story of Aristomenes' knowledge of the two oracles at Delphi and his subsequent decision to bury the ἀπορορήτος on the Mt Ithome in order to safeguard the Messenians' chances to one day return to their homeland. In the earlier history of Messenia, fate likewise contributes significantly to the Messenians' downfall. An important example is the story of Aristomenes' predecessor Aristodemus who, like Aristomenes, is shown to be overtaken by a lethal combination of fate and anger.

The oracle at Delphi had called for the sacrifice of a royal maiden and Aristodemus willingly offered his own daughter, but was thwarted by her lover who claimed she was pregnant. As a consequence, he 'drove Aristodemus to such a fury of passion (ὕπὸ τοῦ θυμοῦ) that he killed his daughter: then cutting her open he showed that she was not pregnant'. Now dead, the girl could no longer be sacrificed.¹¹² In order to save the peace, Euphaes persuades the Messenians that through killing his daughter Aristodemus had fulfilled the oracle,¹¹³ but throughout the reigns of Euphaes and Aristodemus, the Messenians are unable to turn the tide. At the end of his

¹¹¹ See in particular Figueira, 'The evolution of the Messenian identity' 27 and Ogden, *Aristomenes* 46 on the Messenians as 'invincible losers'.

¹¹² Paus. 4.9.3-10.

¹¹³ Paus. 4.9.9.

six years' reign, Aristodemus realises the truth and connects Messenia's downfall with his own crime against his daughter, before committing suicide on his daughter's grave. Pausanias concludes that 'he had done all that human calculation could do to save the Messenians, but fortune brought to naught both his achievements and his plans'.¹¹⁴

Aristodemus is by and large depicted as a good king, treating both his allies and the other Messenian nobles with consideration;¹¹⁵ a careful strategist, making the most of the available men and weapons;¹¹⁶ and a clever hero, seeing through Spartan tricks.¹¹⁷ Nevertheless, however well he rules and commands the Messenians, there is no possibility to undo the damage already done. Pausanias' analysis of Messenia's downfall may be that it was fated, but he also makes clear how both Aristodemus and Aristomenes, like Polychares before them, sealed this fate by their anger.¹¹⁸

In Pausanias' account of the beginning of Spartan-Messenian hostilities and the First Messenian War, aspects of the Messenian revolt under Aristomenes are foreshadowed. The dominant characteristics of τόλμη and ἀπόνοια are repeated in his depiction of the battles fought by Euphaes and his men. The juxtaposition with the disciplined Spartan troops emphasises the lack of control inherent to the combination of despair and daring. Uncontrolled behaviour is also connected to the emotion of anger in Pausanias' depiction of Polychares and Aristodemus. In some respects, Pausanias treats Messenian history with sympathy through blaming their subjection to Sparta on a combination of fate and unjust Spartan aggression. However, although he describes a situation where the Messenians have good reasons to be angry and

¹¹⁴ Paus. 4.13.4.

¹¹⁵ Paus. 4.10.6.

¹¹⁶ Paus. 4.11.2-4.

¹¹⁷ Paus. 4.12.2

¹¹⁸ Auberger, *Pausanias* remarks on the tragic nature of Aristodemus' story through comparing him with Oedipus. She emphasises Aristodemus' piety more than his anger; Maria Marinescu-Himu, 'Les sources d'inspiration de Pausanias dans le livre IV de la Periegesis' in: *Actes de la xiiie Conférence Internationale d'études classiques "Eirene"* (Bucharest and Amsterdam 1975) 251-257, 254 compares the episode to Agamemnon's sacrifice of his daughter Iphigenia.

desperate, the Messenians' uncontrolled emotions are instrumental in bringing about their fated defeat.

The curious case of the Naupaktian Messenians

We have seen that the daring, anger and despair in which Aristomenes' excelled are not typical of him alone. Throughout the first and second Messenian War, Messenian leaders and their followers exhibit these passions both to their advantage as well as their disadvantage. In light of Euphaes' warning that the Messenians' state of mind would suffer under Spartan domination, it is interesting to see how the Messenians fared after their final defeat and exile. The years after Aristomenes' death are, however, not treated in any great detail by Pausanias. One explanation for this is that his method of arranging his material is geographical. He therefore has no clear structure that would allow for an extensive treatment of the history of the Messenians in exile. Another explanation has, as we have seen in chapter 1, been offered by Nino Luraghi, who reads the account in Pausanias as Theban-Messenian propaganda. In this version of the liberation of Messenia, former helots and perioikoi were given no place.¹¹⁹

We know, however, from Thucydides that the Messenians revolted after the earthquake 464 BC and continued to damage the Spartans as Athenian allies after they were settled by them on Naupaktos. Luraghi, and before him Figueira, have argued that the Naupaktians' self-representation as Messenians informed the sense of identity of the Messenians after their 'liberation'.¹²⁰ Pausanias' depiction of them should therefore tell us much about the supposed pro-Messenian/anti-Lakonian tendency of Book 4.¹²¹

¹¹⁹ Luraghi, *The Ancient Messenians* 197, 220, 222-3. In line with this, Pausanias generally refers to an exile of near to 300 years, glossing over the fact that the Naupaktians had been absent only for about a century.

¹²⁰ N. Luraghi, 'Der Erdbebenaufstand'; Figueira, 'The Evolution of Messenian Identity'

¹²¹ Paus. 4.14.5-7 and 4.26.1-2.

A first question to be asked is who the rebels of 464 BC were.¹²² Pausanias, possibly in line with the Theban-Messenian ‘vulgate’ of the Messenians’ return, appears to imply that at the end of the Second Messenian War all Messenians had gone into exile, but it is important to note that Pausanias refers at this point only to the Messenians who are still with Aristomenes, and have found asylum in Arcadia.¹²³ The exiles are a limited group of rebels, and not the entire Messenian population.¹²⁴ Pausanias does not give an indication of how large a group fled the Peloponnesus and how many stayed behind. He depends on the reader’s awareness of Messenian history and the context in which he uses ‘Messenians’, to make clear which specific group he refers to. This is presented as self-evident. The question of Messenian identity therefore plays a comparatively small role in Pausanias’ narrative.

Pausanias does, however, place a particular emphasis on the Naupaktian Messenians in the passages leading up to the battle at Leuctra and the foretold deliverance of Messenia. In 24.5-8, Pausanias relates how the Messenians reduced to the position of helots were enticed to revolt after the earthquake of 464 and were settled by the Athenians in Naupactos.¹²⁵ The whole of chapter 25 is devoted to the war that they brought upon the Acarnanians of Oeniadae in order to take possession of their land.¹²⁶ The rebels held out for 8 years until 456 B.C. and brought severe losses to the Spartans, ultimately forcing them to allow their resettlement, but despite these considerable successes, Pausanias

¹²² Ducat, *Les Hilotes* 134-144 for a general discussion.

¹²³ The key passage follows from Aristomenes’ refusal to lead the people of Pylos and Mothone to Cyllene in search of a new home and his subsequent failed attempt on Sparta. Paus. 4.23.3 explains that he ‘ordered all the Messenians who wished to take part in the colony to join the leaders at Cyllene. And all took part except those debarred by age or lack of funds from journeying abroad. These remained here with the Arcadians’.

¹²⁴ Cf. Paus. 4.23.1: ‘all the Messenians who were captured about Eira or anywhere else in Messenia were reduced by the Lacedaemonians to helotage’.

¹²⁵ Paus. 4.24.5-8.

¹²⁶ Akujärvi, *Researcher, Traveller, Narrator* 209-210 notes that the history of the Naupaktians is presented as being continually dominated by war against other Greeks; Kroymann, *Pausanias und Rhianos* 37 considers it ‘nichts anderes als ein einzige Lobeshymne auf Messenische Tapferkeit, Zähigkeit und Klugheit’. Although I disagree with his reading of Messenian courage, I agree with him that the representation of the Naupaktians is consistent with the representation of Messenians in the entire book 4.

depicts this war in a context of the Messenians' desire to show themselves capable of fending for themselves:

When they occupied Naupaktus it was not enough for them to have received a city and country at the hands of the Athenians, but they were filled with a strong desire to show that they had won something notable with their own hands (ταῖς αὐτῶν φανῆναι λόγου τι κεκτημένους ἄξιον).¹²⁷

Initially, the Messenians are successful. Pausanias explains that through their superior ἀρετή, and through all kinds of technological innovations, they quickly forced the Acarnanians to withdraw under terms.¹²⁸ This is the first mention of ἀρετή with reference to the Messenians in book 4, and also in succeeding events they show a lot of courage. A year later, the Acarnanians make the mistake of believing the Messenians unprepared to sustain a desperate fight against a large majority.¹²⁹ The Messenians, however, being Messenians, demonstrate that ἀπόνοια was their most important trademark:

But they were determined before the siege was formed to fight a battle in the open, and being Messenians, who had not been surpassed in valour even by Lacedaemonians (οἱ μὴδὲ Λακεδαιμονίων ἀνδρία), but in fortune only, were determined not to be dismayed at the horde (ὄχλον) which had come from Acarnania.¹³⁰

Again, an unambiguously positive word for courage is used, and even coupled with despair. The result is, however, rather different from the effects of τόλμη and ἀπόνοια in Aristomenes' war. Although we have seen that the combination of daring and despair foreshadowed the final outcome of the

¹²⁷ Paus. 4.25.1.

¹²⁸ Paus. 4.25.1-2.

¹²⁹ Paus. 4.25.4: 'So they changed their plans and at once turned on the Messenians in Oeniadae and prepared to besiege them, for they never supposed that men so few in number would show such desperate courage as to fight against the full levy of the Acarnanians (οὐ γὰρ ποτε ὑπελάμβανον ἄνδρας οὕτως ὀλίγους ἐς τοσοῦτον ἀπονοίας ἦξειν ὡς μαχέσασθαι πρὸς τὴν Ἀκαρνάνων ἀπάντων στρατιάν)'.
¹³⁰ Paus. 4.25.5.

revolt, it was nonetheless a lethal weapon against the Spartans. The outcome of the battle against the Acarnanians on the other hand is in favour of the Acarnanians who succeed in establishing their siege. Pausanias comments that, despite mockery on the part of the Messenians, who claimed they could hold out at least for ten years, the supplies of the Messenians were in fact exhausted after a mere eight months. An attempted escape was noticed by the Acarnanians and the Messenians were forced (ἀναγκασθέντες) to fight.¹³¹

This sorry outcome of the Messenian aggression against the Acarnanians strikes me as ironic. Pausanias again emphasises the high-mindedness of the Messenians: they wanted to show themselves capable of fighting their own fights instead of merely accepting the Athenian gift of Naupaktus. Pausanias' use of ἀρετή in this context is a marked difference from his previous uses of τόλμη. Simultaneously, however, the depiction of the Acarnanians as a horde (ὄχλον) strikes home the fact that they form a much easier opponent than the Spartans. Pausanias' account of the end of the Acarnanian-Messenian hostilities, which depicts the Acarnanians having to force the fleeing Messenians to a battle, contrasts to such an extent with the earlier Messenian determination to meet the Acarnanians in open battle, that the reader is invited to have second thoughts about the Messenians' reputation of 'being Messenians, who had not been surpassed in valour even by Lacedaemonians (οἱ μὴδὲ Λακεδαιμονίων ἀνδρεία), but in fortune only'.

In line with this ironic depiction of the Naupaktian Messenians' ability to fend for themselves, their accomplishments during the Peloponnesian War are not emphasised. Pausanias mentions that they offered Naupaktus as a base and that they had helped capture the Spartans at Sphacteria, but limits his comments to the familiar refrain that 'they were stirred by their hatred against the Lacedaemonians'. In the single paragraph he devotes to the role of the Naupaktians, more attention is given to the fact that the Spartans drove them

¹³¹ Paus. 4.25.9-10.

away from Naupaktus than to the damages that the Naupaktians had caused the Spartans.¹³²

The earthquake revolt at Mt. Ithome is nevertheless important in the story of the return of the Messenians. The importance of Mt. Ithome is first made clear in the story of Aristomenes' burying the 'secret thing'. We have seen that Aristomenes, having heard of the oracle that announced the fall of Messene, takes a secret thing (ἀπορρήτος) that the Messenians possess and buries it somewhere on the Mt. Ithome. According to the oracles of Lycus, the Messenians would be able to recover their country after a certain period as long as the thing was kept safe.¹³³

Centuries later, the Theban leader Epaminondas and his seer Epiteles are able to find it through a nightly appearance of a priest of Demeter and it turns out to contain the Mysteries of the Great Goddesses.¹³⁴ Pausanias picks up the story again in 372 BC, when, he tells us, a δαίμων predicts the return of the Messenians to the Peloponnese. The δαίμων appears before a priest of Heracles in 'Messene on the Straits', the Messenian exiled community in Sicily. In addition Comon of the Euesperitae in Cyrenaica, a Greek community that exiled Messenians had joined, dreamt that he had sex with his dead mother, who then came to life again.¹³⁵ This also is a sign of the recovery of Messenia in the near future. Comon as the leader of the Messenians fighting at Sphacteria can be thought of as the leader of the Messenians in exile in general. By being the recipient of this dream, he becomes in a way also the leader of the return. Messene on the Straits is an older community in exile, but had also taken up the Naupaktians.

¹³² This discrepancy was already noted by Alcock, 'The Peculiar book 4' 144-5.

¹³³ Paus. 4.20.4.

¹³⁴ Paus. 4.26.6-8.

¹³⁵ Paus. 4.26.3.

More important, however, is Epaminondas' decision regarding building a new Messene. Not long after the signs of impending recovery, the Thebans won their tremendous victory over the Spartans at Leuctra and sent messengers to all the Messenians in exile to summon them back to the Peloponnese.¹³⁶ Having achieved the return of the exiles, Pausanias remarks that Epaminondas found it difficult to find a city that was strong enough to resist the Spartans or to find a place to build one. Also, the Messenians refused to settle in Andania and Oechala, 'because their disasters had befallen them while they dwelt there.' It is in the context of this particular difficulty, finding a place for the Messenians to live in, that Epaminondas is visited by the priest of Demeter who gives him the opportunity to find the 'secret thing' and does so by ordering Epaminondas to 'restore to the Messenians their fatherland and cities, for now the wrath (μῆνιμα) of the Dioscuri against them has ceased.'¹³⁷

The importance of Mt. Ithome as the keeper of Messenian existence and the birthplace of a new Messenia is significant as Epameinondas chose to build the new city of Messene here partly because of its symbolic power in the Messenian resistance. However, even though Mt. Ithome was the stronghold of the earthquake-rebels, the Naupactians only play a minor role in Pausanias' account of Epaminondas' decision. The Theban leader only finds the 'secret thing' after the Messenians had refused to settle at Andania and Oechala.¹³⁸ Given Aristomenes' role in burying the ἀπορρήτος, at the centre of the story is therefore the events happening before the fall of Eira.

The role that Mt. Ithome played for many of the later exiles and also for many of the helots that stayed behind is therefore given only limited recognition. After the revolt of 465 B.C, the rebelling helots had taken refuge at Mt. Ithome and from there they were eventually settled at Naupaktos by the Athenians. It is a significant discrepancy of the refoundation myth of Messene that Mt.

¹³⁶ Paus. 4.26.4-5

¹³⁷ Paus. 4.26.5-8.

¹³⁸ Paus 4.26.5-6.

Ithome plays a significant part in it whilst the struggle of 465 B.C. receives only limited attention. Susan Alcock has argued that the fact that the Ithome is not honoured for this role is the result of 'a deliberate, willed forgetfulness'.¹³⁹ Nevertheless, the very choice of Ithome as the birthplace of the new Messene points in another direction. At the loss of Andania and Oechalia, Aristomenes and his rebels retired not to the Ithome, but to Mt. Eira. Eira is the centre of their resistance and the place of their final struggle. The only thing that connects Ithome with Aristomenes' revolt is that at the end of it he chooses to bury the 'secret thing' there. Looking at matters from the story of the seventh-century mythical rebellion, there is no apparent reason for this. However, taking into account the whole history of Messenian resistance against Spartan domination, it may suggest that the later importance of the Ithome as the centre of the fifth-century rebellion has been recognised in this story by its acknowledgment of its importance for Messenian identity. The fifth-century rebels would in that fashion be connected to Aristomenes and his men.

The fifth-century struggle therefore does play a part in the refoundation of Messene through the symbolic choice of Ithome as its main capital. Nevertheless, the story that Epaminondas chose this spot after having found the conventions of the Eleusinian Mysteries there connects the new Messene to Aristomenes and his men, rather than to the Naupaktian Messenians. This is reinforced by a passage in which Pausanias relates the foundation rituals of Messene. Pausanias tells us that Messenians

summoned their heroes to return and dwell with them, first Messene the daughter of Triopas, after her Eurytus, Aphareus and his children, and of the sons of Heracles Cresphontes and Aepytus. But the loudest summons from all alike was to Aristomenes.¹⁴⁰

¹³⁹ Alcock, 'The pseudo-history'.

¹⁴⁰ Paus. 4.27.5-6.

Messene, Eurytus, Aphareus, Cresphontes and Aepytus are all heroes from Messenia's foundation myth.¹⁴¹ Aristomenes is mentioned therefore in a context of the heroes of the mythical foundation of Messene.¹⁴² The foundation ceremony refers back to this mythical past and places Aristomenes and his rebellion at the heart of it, without referring to any later, historical revolts. It is in that respect significant that there is no named leader of the 464 revolt, even though this revolt could easily have been written as a success story.¹⁴³

In conclusion, the foundation of Messene on Mt. Ithome seems to have taken place not just for strategic but also for symbolic reasons and as such it is undeniable that the Naupaktians played an important role in the formation of Messenian identity. This is acknowledged by Pausanias only to a certain extent. He places more emphasis on the original exile of Aristomenes and his men than on the later, historical exile of the rebels of the fifth century. In his depiction of the Naupaktians they nevertheless share important characteristics

¹⁴¹ See Paus. 4.1-3

¹⁴² Aristomenes' story is also connected with the mythological beginnings of Messene through his knowledge of the Mysteries. The legend, retold in Paus. 4.1.5-9, has it that the state of Messene was named after the wife of Polycaon, the founder of the state, who was the first recipient of the Mysteries of Eleusis and was initiated in these mysteries by Caucon in Andania. The emphasis on the continuity of the Mysteries symbolizes therefore a return to Messene's origins. Interpreting the ἀπορρήτος as a safeguard of Messenian freedom and identity, a story is told in which the Messenians were never truly absent. Spartan domination can then be understood as just a physical enslavement while the Messenian identity was safeguarded. The 'return' of the Messenians consequently becomes nothing but that: a return to Messenia as it was and always has been. Note in addition the use of κάθοδος in Pausanias, and a similar discourse of return and refoundation in Diodorus (book 15) and Cornelius Nepos (Epan.8.5; Pelop 4.3.) An inscription giving instruction for the celebration of the mysteries testifies to the existence of the cult before Pausanias, and presumably at least from the existence of the independent state onwards. Nevertheless, the important role of the mysteries in Pausanias' book 4 may also be influenced to a great part by Pausanias' own interest in the mysteries. We have seen in chapter 1 that he was an initiate of the Eleusinian Mysteries on which the Andanian Mysteries were modeled. For the inscription: SIG3 2.401-11; An English translation is available in: Marvin W. Meyer ed., 'The Andanian Mysteries of Messenia' in: Marvin W. Meyer ed., *The ancient mysteries. A sourcebook* (New York 1987) 49-59. Cf. Deshours, 'la légende et le culte'; Figueira, 'The evolution of the Messenian identity'; Heer, *Personnalité de Pausanias* 127-89; Elsner, 'Pausanias' 20-25; Ogden, *Aristomenes* 96.

¹⁴³ Ogden, *Aristomenes* 148, however, interestingly points to Herodotus 9.64: 'Mardonius was killed by Arimnestos, a distinguished man in Sparta. Some time after the Persian invasion, marshalling 300 men, he joined battle with all the Messenians on Stenyclerus, there being a war. He and his three hundred all perished.' The only possible historical context would be the 464 revolt, but the name of the Spartan commander, according to Ogden, 'shares considerable assonance with Aristomenes', while the 300 Spartans killed might refer to Aristomenes' three *hekatomphia*.

with the Messenians of the First and Second Messenian Wars. In particular their high-mindedness and their hatred for the Spartans are emphasised. Pausanias also stresses the desperate nature of the Messenians' behaviour in battle, but simultaneously ironically questions this by pointing out their lack of endurance. His attitude towards their presumption in attempting to overthrow the Acarnanians is therefore highly sceptical. From Thucydides, as well as from the Messenian dedications celebrating their victory in particular the famous Nike of Paionios, we know that Pausanias, had he wanted to emphasise the heroic struggles of the Messenians against the Spartans, could easily have made more of the Messenian role in the Peloponnesian War.¹⁴⁴ It is therefore illustrative of his sceptical analysis of Messenian courage that he spends so much energy on the lost war against the Acarnanians while he all but glosses over their considerable successes against the Spartans.

Messenians after the Liberation

Anger, despair and high-mindedness have so far appeared to be the hallmarks of Messenian identity. It may also be argued that there appears to be a connection between these characteristics and the Messenians' subjection to Sparta. Pausanias consistently portrays the Messenians as weak while their land is occupied. For example, only when they regain independence do any Messenians do anything of note in the Olympics. The Olympic Games are not only an important symbol of Greek identity, but also closely connected to Aristomenes' heroism as he was the founder of the Diagorad family in Rhodes. The Diagorads were famous for their outstanding successes at various Olympiads.¹⁴⁵ Does their return also form a break in their ability to display courage? In the remainder of this chapter I will argue that in contrast

¹⁴⁴ For the monuments, cf. Alcock, *Archaeologies of the Greek Past* 160-1 and, more sceptically, Luraghi, *The Ancient Messenians* 174-177. Pausanias' admiration in Paus. 1.8.2-3; 2.33.3-5. of Demosthenes even invites a more detailed account of his Messenian auxiliaries.

¹⁴⁵ Cf. L.R. Shero, 'Aristomenes the Messenian' 518-520; Pearson, 'The Pseudo-History' 423; G.L.Huxley, *Early Sparta* (London 1962) 92-3; H.T. Wade-Gerry, 'The "Rhianos-hypothesis"' in: E. Badian ed., *Ancient Society and Institutions. Studies presented to V. Ehrenberg on his 75th Birthday* (Oxford 1966) 289-302, esp. 292-5.

to the earlier Messenians, the Messenians of the fourth and third centuries B.C. are portrayed as having a remarkable amount of self-control. On two occasions the Messenians again have to fight with great daring, but in neither case is there any sign of ἀπόνοια. It appears that their changed situation from subjugation to freedom has also changed their behaviour in battle.¹⁴⁶

The first occasion takes place in the context of the rise of Macedonia under Philip and Alexander. Pausanias tells us that while the Thebans were present in the Peloponnese, the Spartans were too scared of them to do anything about the foundation of Messene. But after the Thebans had to withdraw, in the Sacred War, hostilities between the Spartans and the Messenians begin again. The Messenians allied themselves to Philip.¹⁴⁷ The Messenians are therefore still governed by their hatred for the Spartans.

One situation in which they came to Philip's assistance was at Elis, where they combined τόλμη with σοφία.¹⁴⁸ It may at first reading appear from the use of σοφία that the missing ingredient of courage has thus been added to the Messenian daring. According to Pausanias, the leading citizens of Elis were divided about which side to take, and came to blows. As the Spartans were preparing to help those opposing Philip, the Messenians arrived first and pretended to be Lakonians by painting over their shields and were led into town. This trick, so Pausanias says, was imitated from the episode in the *Iliad* in which Patroclus pretended to be Achilles, and it is the employment of that strategy that he refers to as σοφία.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁶ Alcock, 'The Peculiar Book IV' notes that Pausanias by representing the Messenians as 'frozen' in time during Spartan rule, makes a connection between a people's identity and their freedom: 'only when the Messenians are liberated and restored to their land can they triumph at Olympia. She does not, however, interpret Aristomenes' rebellion as one governed by 'slavish' behaviour through the predominance of τόλμη and ἀπόνοια in the Messenians' behaviour.

¹⁴⁷ Paus. 4.28.1-3

¹⁴⁸ Paus. 4.28.4-8.

¹⁴⁹ Paus 4.28.4-8; See also LévyStone, 'Le courage et les mots de la peur' 349.

Σοφία as trickery may then be interpreted as a positive aspect of Messenian courage. It does not however imply 'understanding', as in Plato's definition of courage in *Laches*, or Aristotle's in his *Eudemian Ethics*.¹⁵⁰ The word used by Plato is ἐπιστήμη. Aristotle uses αἰδώς. Both words imply that in order to be courageous, one must know the danger that one is exposing oneself to. Σοφία on the other hand evokes different qualities, especially in the context of the Messenians' invasion of Elis. It suggests cleverness, skill, practical wisdom and cunning, as well as learning and wisdom.

In the second instance referred to above, the Messenians had to defend Messene against Macedonian troops who had suddenly arrived at dawn at Mt. Ithome.¹⁵¹ We are not told by Pausanias why the alliance between the Messenians and the Macedonians was broken,¹⁵² but he does give us an idea of the surprise of Ithome's inhabitants:

When day dawned, and the inhabitants had realised the danger that beset them, they were at first under the impression that the Lacedaemonians had forced an entry into the town, and rushed against them more unsparingly owing to their ancient hatred (ἐπ'αὐτοὺς ἀφειδέστερον διὰ τὸ μῖσος τὸ ἐξ ἀρχῆς). But when they discovered from their equipment and speech that it was the Macedonians and Demetrius the son of Philip, they were filled with great fear (δειμα ἰσχυρόν), when they considered the Macedonian training in warfare and the good fortune which they say that they enjoyed in all their ventures.¹⁵³

¹⁵⁰ Indeed, trickery is not something new to the Messenians. Aristomenes is in many ways a trickster-hero. Note his Odyssean ability to enter Spartan centres of power and leave proof of his existence, with the aim of inspiring fear. The frequency of night raids also points to his elusive character. One of the main reasons for the Spartans to be afraid of Aristomenes was that he was a hero who is very hard to catch. However, possibly the most important aspect of Aristomenes' trickery is that when they finally succeed in catching him, he always manages to escape. We have seen how Aristomenes survived a fall in the Caedas, but on two other occasions too he escapes, and in these instances he uses trickery and charms to get away, Cf. Paus. 4.17.1 and 4.19.4-6.

¹⁵¹ Paus. 4.29.1-2

¹⁵² Polybius 7.2.10 denounces Philip's interference in Messenia.

¹⁵³ Paus. 4.29.3

The situation is described as being a serious one indeed. Thinking that the invaders were Spartans, the Messenians were by no means plunged into despair, but rushed at the opportunity to meet them in battle. Their hatred of old is a reason to go against them ἀφειδέστερον (more unsparingly, without mercy). At discovery of the Macedonians, however, they experience 'great fear' (δειμα ἰσχυρόν).

The experience of δειμα, even if it is ἰσχυρόν, is a significant change from the depictions of Messenians before their liberation. Unlike the implication of senselessness that is part of ἀπόνοια, this fear relates to the Messenians' understanding of the seriousness of their situation. On discovering the Macedonians, they consider (λογίζομαι), the latter's training in warfare and their good fortune and understand that they are therefore in great danger. This great danger is however no cause for despair:

Nevertheless the magnitude of the present evil caused them to display a courage beyond their strength (ἀνδρίαν τινὰ καὶ πέρα τοῦ δυνατοῦ), also they were inspired with hope for the best, since it seemed not without divine help that they had accomplished their return to Peloponnese after so long an absence.¹⁵⁴

There is no mention of the word τόλμη, but the magnitude of events causes them to display 'courage beyond their strength' (ἀνδρίαν τινὰ καὶ πέρα τοῦ δυνατοῦ). Their return to the Peloponnese after such a long time helps them to trust in the gods and offer a strong resistance against the Macedonians in the hope that they were to succeed. The δειμα ἰσχυρόν is therefore fundamentally different from the ἀπόνοια of the subjected Messenians. Not only is it based on understanding, but in addition now that the Messenians are free they are capable of a display of courage, which is more than just daring and desperation.

¹⁵⁴ Paus. 4.29.4.

Daring Greeks and Desperate Barbarians

I have so far argued that Pausanias' valuation of Messenian courage is ironic through his frequent use of the word τόλμη as opposed to other unambiguous words for courage, such as ἀρετή and ἀνδρεία. The frequent combination of this word with words such as ἀπόνοια, θρασός, θυμός, νεώτεροι and φρόνημα is sufficient reason to read the word in its classical, ambiguous reading. In the concluding chapter I will discuss in more detail how the Messenians fit into the grander picture of Greek history, but before that I would like briefly to discuss a few other Greeks who are depicted as having τόλμη. Pausanias uses the word most frequently with respect to the Messenians, but as Auberger has already remarked, he also uses the term in relation to Pyrrhus, Callistrates, Cleomenes and Philopoemen.¹⁵⁵

Pyrrhus¹⁵⁶ is especially interesting in comparison with Aristomenes because he claimed ancestry from Achilles. Pausanias' treatment of him¹⁵⁷ is also of interest for his view on Roman-Greek relations as Pyrrhus was the first to attack the Romans.¹⁵⁸ Introducing him, Pausanias remarked that he ' marvelled greatly both at the daring (θαυμάσαι Πύρρου τόλμα τε) of Pyrrhus in battle, and also at the forethought (πρόνοιαν) he displayed whenever a contest was imminent.¹⁵⁹ This appears at first sight to be a positive statement and Pausanias' wonderment marks Pyrrhus out as exceptional. A few lines further on however, he remarks on Pyrrhus' decision to enter into battle with the Carthaginians:

In his self-conceit (φρονήσας δὲ ἐφ' αὐτῷ), although the Carthaginians, being Phoenicians of Tyre by ancient descent, were more experienced seamen than any other non-Greek people of that day, Pyrrhus was nevertheless encouraged

¹⁵⁵ Auberger, 'Les Mots du Courage' does not in fact mention Philopoemen.

¹⁵⁶ Cf. Discussion in Hutton, *Describing Greece* 281-289.

¹⁵⁷ Paus. 1.11-13.

¹⁵⁸ Hutton, *Describing Greece* 283 notes that this use of 'the first we know' is reminiscent of similar expressions of priority in Herodotus.

¹⁵⁹ Paus. 1.12-1.2.

to meet them in a naval battle, employing the Epeirots, the majority of whom, even after the capture of Troy, knew nothing of the sea nor even as yet how to use salt.¹⁶⁰

Admittedly, Pausanias does not explicitly connect Pyrrhus' τόλμη with his presumption, but in comparison with the Messenians it is interesting that Pyrrhus combines the same two characteristics, leading to an unnecessary defeat.¹⁶¹ The connection is more clearly made in connection with Cleomenes III. The Spartan king is one of Pausanias' most favourite subjects in a negative sense¹⁶² and he introduces him accordingly:

Cleomenes, the son of Leonidas, the son of Cleonymus, having succeeded to the kingship at Sparta, resembled Pausanias in being dissatisfied with the established constitution and in aiming at a tyranny. A more fiery man than Pausanias, and no coward, he quickly succeeded by spirit and daring in accomplishing all his ambition (ἄτε δὲ ὄντι αὐτῷ Πανσανίου θερματέρῳ καὶ οὐ φιλοψύχῳ ταχὺ τὰ πάντα ὑπὸ φρονήματος καὶ τόλμης κατείργαστο).¹⁶³

Cleomenes' τόλμη is unquestionably used negatively in the depiction of him 'daring' (τολμήσαντα) to bribe the Pythian priestess.¹⁶⁴ Pausanias' low opinion of his courage is further demonstrated by his account of Cleomenes' attack on Argos, where the Spartan was defeated by the Argive women. Pausanias remarks that the Spartans gave way because a victory against women would be an invidious success, whereas defeat would mean a shameful disaster.¹⁶⁵

¹⁶⁰ Paus. 1.12-5.

¹⁶¹ Compare Hutton, *Describing Greece* 288: 'Pausanias casts Pyrrhos as a myth-historic hero, a prodigiously talented and genetically well-endowed ruler with a tragic lack of moderation and patience'.

¹⁶² For instance: Paus. 2.9.1-3; 2.20.8-10; 3.4.3-6; 3.6.9; 7.7.4.

¹⁶³ Paus. 2.9.1.

¹⁶⁴ Paus. 3.4.3-6.

¹⁶⁵ Paus. 2.20.8-10.

Pausanias depicts Cleomenes in all sorts of sly manoeuvres, using treachery and bribery to achieve his aims. The same is true for the third and fourth Greeks who possesses τόλμη: Callistrates and Menalcidas.¹⁶⁶ Under the temptation of bribes they sold out the Achaean League to the Romans. At various places Pausanias emphasises the outrageousness of their crimes by noting that they *dared* to break truces, accept bribes, refuse payments etcetera. Τόλμη is, however, in the historical excursus in Book 7 not an aspect unique to these traitors, but is shared by the Lacedaemonians who heroically resist the Achaean League. The episode is particularly interesting as Pausanias comments on their resistance in terms similar to his depiction of the Messenian revolt:

The Lacedaemonians, with a spirit greater than their strength (δὲ ὑπὸ φρονήματος μᾶλλον ἢ ἰσχύος), took up arms, and sallied forth to defend their country. But they were soon crushed; a thousand of their bravest youths (οἱ ἡλικία μάλιστα αὐτῶν καὶ τόλμαις) fell in the battle, and the rest of the soldiery fled towards the city with all the haste they could.¹⁶⁷

As with the Messenian νεώτεροι, the Spartan τόλμη is connected to youth and φρόνημα. Also, like the Messenians, the young Spartans' bravery is to no avail as their strength in battle fails to match their spirited ambition to defend their country. As we will also see in the concluding chapter, the juxtaposition here of Callistrates' and Menalcidas' daring with the desperate daring of the young Spartans, illustrates both Pausanias' sympathy for defensive daring as opposed to unjust greed and his sceptical analysis of whatever good such daring may bring.

Finally, I would like to briefly discuss the daring of Philopoemen.¹⁶⁸ Pausanias' account of him is positive overall, but he does comment in a

¹⁶⁶ Paus. 7.10.7-12; 7.12.1-2; 7.13.7.

¹⁶⁷ Paus. 7.13.3.

¹⁶⁸ Paus. 8.49-51.

negative sense on his τόλμη, connecting this aspect of his courage to the faults of anger and over-enthusiasm:

He wished to model his whole life on Epaminondas, his wisdom and his achievements, but could not rise to his height in every respect. For the temper of Epaminondas was calm and, in particular, free from anger, but the Arcadian was somewhat passionate (θυμός).¹⁶⁹

This passion is combined with a positive τόλμη in the following passage, which describes Philopoemen's behaviour during the battle at Sellasia. Pausanias explains that he was serving with the cavalry until he saw that the outcome of the battle depended on the infantry, at which point he voluntarily stepped down from his horse. As a result he was wounded in both thighs, but nevertheless continued to fight. Pausanias comments that Antigonos was so impressed by his daring (τολμήματα), that he wanted to take Philopoemen with him to Macedon, which, however, Philopoemen refused.¹⁷⁰ The passage implies that Pausanias is equally impressed, although he also notes the downside of daring.

This repeated combination of θυμός and τόλμη confirms it as a common trope throughout the *Periegesis*. In his account of Philopoemen's involvement in the Roman actions against the Spartan tyrant Nabis, Pausanias also complains of his προθυμία: Philopoemen was too enthusiastic to keep out of the quarrel.¹⁷¹

These five individual examples of τόλμη demonstrate that Pausanias' use of the word is consistent and sceptical. He may occasionally betray some sympathy for the display of daring in self-defence, but his treatment of these episodes first and foremost demonstrates a negative assessment of its value. In

¹⁶⁹ Paus. 8.49.3.

¹⁷⁰ Paus. 8.49.5-6.

¹⁷¹ Paus. 8.50.7.

particular, he emphasises the irrationality of unmitigated *τόλμη* through his usage of the word in situations where the protagonist(s) in question misjudge(s) a situation because of the passions of anger, enthusiasm or high-mindedness.

The predominant passion in the history of the Messenians, namely despair, is one that Pausanias treats with considerable interest and understanding. This is also clear in his account of 'Phocian despair', where the combination of despair and daring leads to a favourable result.¹⁷² In their war against the Thessalians, the Phocians were driven to take desperate measures:

Their disaster created such panic among the Phocians in the camp that they actually gathered together in one spot their women, children, movable property, and also their clothes, gold, silver and images of the gods, and making a vast pyre they left in charge a force of thirty men. These were under orders that, should the Phocians chance to be worsted in battle, they were first to put to death the women and children, then to lay them like victims with the valuables on the pyre and finally set it alight and perish themselves, either by each other's hands or by charging the cavalry of the Thessalians. Hence all forlorn hopes are called by the Greeks 'Phocian Despair'.¹⁷³

As a consequence, Pausanias explains, the Phocians, in the knowledge of what would happen in the case of defeat, dared the most desperate deeds and beat the Thessalians.¹⁷⁴ The passage reminds somewhat of Euphaes' exhortations to make his troops more desperate in the knowledge of the slavery that awaited them if they lost.¹⁷⁵ It should, however, be noted that the 'Phocian despair' is a self-chosen despair. It is ironic that the Thessalians by themselves cannot entice the Phocians to courage in battle; the Phocians only really commit to the

¹⁷² Paus. 1.3-10. Phocian despair is also mentioned, in lesser detail, by Polybius 16.32.

¹⁷³ Paus. 10.1.5-7.

¹⁷⁴ Paus. 10.1.9.

¹⁷⁵ Paus. 4.7.10-11.

fight after they have made the resolution to kill their wives and children and burn their valuables.¹⁷⁶

The combination of despair and daring also features in Pausanias' account of the Greek defence against the Gallic invasion at Thermopylae.¹⁷⁷ Pausanias treats it as 'the greatest of the Greek exploits against the barbarians'¹⁷⁸ and remarks that although 'the spirit (φρονήματα) of the Greeks was utterly broken, the extremity of their terror forced them to defend Greece'.¹⁷⁹ This battle at Thermopylae should be distinguished from the Greek defence against the Persians, as previous invasions of the Gauls had proven that submission would not lead to safety. As a result 'every man, as well as every state, was convinced that they must either conquer or perish'.¹⁸⁰

Notwithstanding these desperate circumstances, Pausanias continues his story by demonstrating that ἀπόνοια and θυμός characterised the Gauls in this battle, whereas the Greeks, especially the Athenians, displayed ἀρετή. On the Gauls, he writes:

The Gauls were worse armed than the Greeks, having no other defensive armour than their national shields, while they were still more inferior in war experience. On they marched against their enemies with the unreasoning fury and passion of brutes (οἱ δὲ ἐν ὀργῇ τε ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐναντίους καὶ θυμῷ μετὰ οὐδενὸς λογισμοῦ καθάπερ τὰ θηρία ἐχώρουν). Slashed with axe or sword they kept their desperation (ἀπόνοια) while they still breathed; pierced by arrow or javelin, they did not abate of their passion (τοῦ θυμοῦ) so long as life remained.¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁶ Compare Polybius 16.32, who contrasts the Phocians and the Acarnians with the Abydenians. Polybius complains that the Abydenians had far better reason to adopt this policy, and also comments (16.30) on their bravery before they started to despair of their situation.

¹⁷⁷ Paus. 10.19.5 - 10.23.

¹⁷⁸ Paus. 10.19.5.

¹⁷⁹ Paus. 10.19.12.

¹⁸⁰ Paus. 10.19.12.

¹⁸¹ Paus. 10.21.2-3.

Θυμός and ἀπόνοια serve to explain the danger posed by the Gauls despite their inferior weapons and training, but they are ultimately no match against Greek ἀρετή.¹⁸² Pausanias' juxtaposition here of these barbarian and Greek behaviours in battle, suggests that ἀπόνοια is dangerous in the enemy, but not something to be proud of.

Conclusion

Aristomenes is depicted by Pausanias as a hero who is somewhat like Achilles. He has great daring, τόλμη, which he uses to do great harm to the Spartans. It is also an infectious daring, shared by all his fellow rebels. However, neither Aristomenes nor any of the Messenians are able to control their daring. It is often mentioned in connection with ἀπόνοια, which implies that it is daring resulting from desperation. This combination with ἀπόνοια, makes clear that although τόλμη can be positive, in the Messenian case it is not. Their τόλμη is a daring without reason which makes for foolish daring: ἡ ἄφρων τόλμη.

In the episodes taking place before and after the liberation it appears that the Messenians' daring is connected to their subjected and defeated status. Whereas Aristomenes' successes and his doom must be interpreted in the same context of despair and recklessness, the Messenians after the liberation are able to display a courage which they did not possess before. In essence therefore, Pausanias portrays Aristomenes' resistance as futile. Although Pausanias considers the Spartan aggression to be unjust and solely motivated by greed, he does not portray the Messenian fight for freedom in an altogether positive light: he rather criticises the Messenians by his repeated mention of their hatred for the Spartans and by his emphasis on the extent to which the Messenians are governed by unrealistic φρόνημα and irrational anger.

¹⁸² Paus. 10.21.5.

Pausanias' usage of the word τόλμη is consistent throughout the *Periegesis*. The skeptical Pausanias has more eye for the connotation of recklessness than he has for the potential of true valour. He is, however, also often filled with wonderment at his subject's daring. Although Pausanias ascribes τόλμη and ἀπρόνοια to other protagonists, the combination of the two words is so persistent in relation to the Messenians that we should consider it a specific Messenian trope. It is a trope that implies some sympathy for the severity of the Messenians' fate, but that is most of all an ironic comment on the ineffectuality of their revolt. Anger is a typical Messenian weakness. In almost all cases it is clear that their anger is provoked by injustice, but it is nevertheless discussed as a loss of control, harming rather than helping the Messenians. Connected to this is Pausanias' emphasis on the inability of the Messenians to endure hardships.

By emphasising the senselessness of the Messenian revolt, Pausanias appears to provide a far bleaker depiction of Greek history, than he has been accounted for. This is the case in his opinion of the two Greek peoples he treats in this book, and especially in his opinion on resistance. Even though Pausanias is explicitly anti-Spartan, his depiction of the way in which the Messenians partly bring on their own doom relies on the stereotypes which implicitly depict the Messenians as 'slave like' even before their defeat. By depicting the Messenian rebels in this way, Pausanias makes clear that he concurs with the Spartans when they insult the Messenians as 'already their slaves, no freer than the helots'.

CHAPTER THREE

DRIMAKOS OF CHIOS: REBEL LEADER AND CIVIC HERO

I have argued so far that Pausanias' depiction of the Messenian revolt is ironic. His consistent use of *τόλμη* and *ἀπόνοια* with reference to the Messenians emphasises the irrationality of their resistance. This is especially the case in his representation of Aristomenes, who as literally 'the best of the Messenians', excels in daring but also exemplifies the irrationality of daring through his hate and anger for the Spartans. Aristomenes' anger causes him to lose sight of the best interests of his people.

An interpretation of Aristomenes' revolt as a rebellion of slaves could explain some of the negative aspects of Pausanias' representation, as the Messenians' lack of self-control might be interpreted as a 'slavish' characteristic.¹ Pausanias' book 4 does not explicitly treat a slave revolt. He makes it clear at the very beginning that the Messenians are degraded to the status of slaves by the Spartans, but he never refers to them as slaves or helots. The only exception is when he records the Spartans insulting the Messenians as 'already their slaves, no freer than the helots.' The extent to which Pausanias' representation of their rebellion may be considered a slave revolt is therefore unclear, yet of relevance to the question of his attitude towards Messenian history.

¹ Lack of self-control as a 'slavish' characteristic will be discussed in relation to Plato, Aristotle and Poseidonius in this and the next two chapters. Interesting in this respect is also the stereotype of the slave as glutton. The most famous example of this is Petronius, *Satyricon*. At 6.262b-d, Athenaeus plays with this stereotype, quoting from various comedies. On self-indulgence as 'slavish, see also the discussion of Juvenal, Cicero, Seneca and others in: Catherine Edwards, *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome* (Cambridge 1993; paperback edition 2002) 190-198.

We have seen in chapter one that the Hellenistic refoundation of Messene provoked a debate on the status of the Messenians.² The story of Aristomenes' heroic resistance and the subsequent exile of the Messenians might, as Luraghi has argued, have been used to argue the case that the Messenians were not, as the Spartans claimed, former slaves, but rather a free Greek people returning to reclaim their ancient birth ground. Although most fragments pertaining to Aristomenes are of much later date, thereby testifying to the continued interest in the Messenian past well into Roman imperial times, there is no doubt that there existed a longer tradition on Aristomenes, probably from before the 'liberation' of Messene.³ It is also clear from our later sources that a central aspect of Aristomenes' heroism was his ἀνδρεία.

In chapter two I have argued that Pausanias' emphasis on the Messenians' daring, desperation, anger and high-mindedness reads like an ironic commentary on this tradition. The combination of τόλμη with ἀπόνοια, in addition to Pausanias' treatment of the Messenians' θυμός and φρονήμα, is such a persistent trope in his depiction of the Messenians that we must conclude that his use of these terms is deliberate. A comparison with literary accounts of (slave) rebellions, with a focus on the rebels' behaviour in battle, will provide both parallels and contrasts to Pausanias' portrayal of the Messenians. It will clarify to what extent Pausanias' ambivalence is tied to an identification of the Messenians as rebels and slaves.

In this chapter I will start with a discussion of the story of the slave rebels on the island of Chios and their leader Drimakos as it appears in book 6 of the *Deipnosophistae* by Athenaeus of Naucratis. Although it is not clear when exactly he wrote this work, it now appears likely that he was a near

² See in particular P. Vidal-Naquet, 'Reflections on Greek historical writing about slavery' in: P. Vidal Naquet, *The Black Hunter: Forms of thought and forms of society in the Greek world* (translated by A. Szegedy-Maszak, Paris 1986) 168-188, 183.

³ Ogden, *Aristomenes* 129-133.

contemporary of Pausanias.⁴ Athenaeus' work professes to be an account of a banquet held by his Roman patron, Larensis, and the conversations it records include numerous citations and paraphrases from earlier writers. The story of Drimakos is one of these citations which originally came from a work by Nymphodorus of Syracuse (*A Journey along the Coast of Asia*), written in the third century BC and which is put by Athenaeus into the speech of one of the diners Democritus as part of a discussion on the subject of slavery.⁵

A comparison between Pausanias' *Periegesis* and Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae* is of particular interest for a number of reasons. Athenaeus has in the past been called 'a culinary Pausanias'.⁶ This description is apt in so far as both authors are *pepaideumenoi*⁷ and rival each other in the sheer wealth of information they

⁴ S.D. Olson, *Athenaeus of Naucratis, The Learned Banqueters* Vol 1 (Cambridge Ma. 2006) xi-xii and B. Baldwin, 'Athenaeus and his work' *Acta Classica* 19 (1976) 21-42, esp. 34, have argued against the early third century, as the latest reference to an external event or person is the emperor Commodus, who reigned 180-192 AD. It seems that he is dead by the time of writing, which would place Athenaeus at the most two decades after Pausanias. The character Ulpian is not to be identified with the jurist Ulpian, who died in AD 228, as was thought by Georg Kaibel in his Teubner edition of Athenaeus (vol. 1, Leipzig 1887, v-vii), but with his father who was, like the character, a grammarian and who died, like the character, a peaceful death.

⁵ The whole discussion of slavery: Ath. 6.26b-6.27b; Democritus' speech: Ath. 6.262b-6.270a; Drimakos: 6.265d-6.266e = Jacoby *FGrH* 572 F 4-8. Nymphodorus also wrote a Περί τῶν Σικελίαι Θαυμαζομένων, mentioned by Athenaeus in 13.588f and by two scholiasts. See Jacoby *FGrH* 572 F 1-3. Nymphodorus is further mentioned by name only at various places. See Jacoby *FGrH* 572 T 3 and *FGrH*.572 F 9-15. With such poor survival, it is impossible to see how accurate Athenaeus has recorded the original. Olson, *Athenaeus* xv argues that it is unlikely Athenaeus would have had access to all the works he refers to. This problem is especially pressing as Athenaeus himself remarks that 'in many copies, as I have found, the man is not mentioned by name' (ἐν πολλοῖς δὲ ἀντιγράφοις ἔξ ὀνόματος αὐτὸν καλούμενον οὐχ εὔρον). Does 'αὐτὸν' refer to Nymphodorus or Drimakos? See Linckenheld, 'Nymphodorus' *RE* 17.3 (1937)1623-1627, 1627. D.U. Hansen, 'Leser und Benutzer. Überlegungen zu Athenaios' *Classica et Mediaevalia* 51(2000) 223-236 argues that Athenaeus uses (and occasionally adapts accordingly) his sources for his own purpose. See also below 116-120 for Athenaeus' adaptation of Plato, *Laws* 776c-778a.

⁶ G. Anderson, 'Athenaeus: the Sophistic Environment' in: W. Haase ed., *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.34.2 (1998) 2173-2185, 2178-9. C. Jacob, 'Athenaeus the Librarian' in: D. Braund and J. Wilkins eds., *Athenaeus and his World. Reading Greek culture in the Roman empire* (Exeter 2000) 85-110, 104 names Athenaeus a 'periegetes' and the *Deipnosophistae* 'a library tour'. K. Arafat, 'The recalcitrant Mass. Athenaeus and Pausanias' in Braund and Wilkins, *Athenaeus and his World* 191-202 provides a more substantial comparison, in which he concludes that although both authors may be considered *pepaideumenoi*, Athenaeus' work is primarily a display of learning whereas Pausanias (202) 'is not attempting to impress the audience with his learning, but to combine his reading with his own observation, preferring autopsy and personal opinion, where possible, to a derivative account'.

⁷ On the importance of παιδεία to Athenaeus, see his introduction at 1.1a.

offer their readers. But they differ in their method of presentation. The *Deipnosophistae* has, like Pausanias' book 4, mainly been researched for the information it gives on earlier writers. Athenaeus' practice of letting the diners cite from Larensis' extensive library admittedly provides more scope for the use of his work as a finding ground for interesting fragments. Nevertheless, the *Deipnosophistae* also deserves a treatment as a literary construct in its own right.⁸ A second reason for comparing Pausanias and Athenaeus is that questions have been asked about the historical reality which may lie behind the stories of Aristomenes and Drimakos, but in both cases sceptics of this kind of research have pointed to elements that appear to be derived from the genre of the Hellenistic novel.⁹ Thirdly, however, both accounts are of interest beyond the Archaic, Classical and Hellenistic history and literary tradition to which they might refer, as they are ultimately the products of Greeks from the eastern part of the Roman Empire.¹⁰ I will argue that an interpretation from a literary perspective, contrasting Athenaeus' and Pausanias' depictions of their protagonists' leadership, has important consequences for the historical value of these texts.

Democritus' speech is dominated by the activities of the rebel leader Drimakos, who, after leading his followers in successful rebellion, came to an

⁸ This has in recent years been recognised. See in particular: Braund and Wilkins, *Athenaeus and his World*; C. Jacob, "“La table et le cercle”: sociabilités savantes sous l'Empire romain" *Annales HSS* 3 (2005) 507-530.

⁹ Especially concerning Drimakos' death, see below 112-113. Ath. 266b-d says that the polis proclaimed that it would give an award to whoever captured him alive or dead. On growing old, Drimakos ordered his favourite boy to cut off his head and claim the reward. The apparent paradox between the blessings that Drimakos' treaty brought Chios and the polis' ungrateful response of issuing the reward has made Linckeheld, *RE* 17.2. 1626 think that the story found in Athenaeus is the result of an amalgamation of the two stories. See also: J. Vogt, 'Zum Experiment des Drimakos: Sklavenhaltung und Räuberstand' *Saeculum* 24 (1973) 213-219; G. Bonelli, 'La saga di Drimaco nel sesto libro di Ateneo: ipotesi interpretativa' *Quaderni Urbinate di Cultura Classica* (1994) 135-42; A. Fuks, 'Slave war and slave troubles in Chios in the third century B.C.' in: A. Fuks, *Social Conflict in Ancient Greece* (Jerusalem and Leiden 1984) 260-269. Y. Garlan, *Slavery in Ancient Greece* (translated by J. Lloyd, Ithaca and London 1998) 181-3 criticises this reading. Cf. T. Urbainczyk, *Slave Revolts in Antiquity* (Stocksfield 2008) 29-38 and 53-4.

¹⁰ Arafat, 'The Recalcitrant Mass' compares how both authors use their references to Classical and Hellenistic sources as a display of their learning.

agreement with the former slave masters and founded a maroon community.¹¹ In my comparison I will therefore begin by concentrating on the contrasts in the leadership qualities of Drimakos and Aristomenes. In the second part of this chapter I will discuss the Drimakos-episode in the context of the whole discussion on slavery in book 6. We will see that the literary sources on slavery often deal with decadence and luxury as regrettable by-products of the process of civilisation that necessitates the existence of slavery. I will therefore end the chapter with the question of how Athenaeus' treatment of this problem compares with Pausanias' criticism of the Spartan greed that provoked their unjust conquest and enslavement of the Messenians.

The leadership of Aristomenes and Drimakos

In chapter two I argued against Janick Auberger's thesis that Aristomenes' τόλμη, in its combination with φρονήμα, should be interpreted positively. In her commentary on the episode regarding Damagetus' marriage to Aristomenes' daughter, she argues in addition that the defensive character of Aristomenes' war against Spartan aggression makes Aristomenes into a hero who is brave but also partakes in the Roman ideal of *moderatio*.¹² The story of Drimakos in Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae* differs in many respects from Aristomenes' story. One obvious difference is that the revolt in Chios was successful. But the literary character of Drimakos is also markedly different, and not in the least in relation to his *moderatio* and ἀνδρεία.

⁹ Maroon societies: communities of fugitive slaves who have succeeded in maintaining a semi-independent settlement. On occasion such communities have made agreements with the master class to stop hostilities in return for provisions. The best introduction for modern world *marronage* is R. Price, 'Maroons and their communities' in: R. Price ed., *Maroon Societies: Rebel slave communities in the Americas* (New York 1973) 1-30. Garland, *Slavery in Ancient Greece* 181-3 has proposed that Drimakos' foundation of a maroon-community is comparable to the existence of modern maroon-communities in the Americas. See also P.A. Cartledge, 'Rebels and Sambos in classical Greece: a comparative view' in P.A. Cartledge and F.D. Harvey eds., *CruX: Essays presented to G.E.M. de Ste. Croix on his 75th birthday* (Exeter 1985) 16-46, esp. 38-40. This comparison is worked out in more detail by Urbainczyk, *Slave Revolts in Antiquity* 29-38. Their approaches investigate the historical possibility of maroon communities in classical Greece and Rome.

¹² Paus. 4.24.2; Auberger, *Pausanias* 181-3.

Democritus begins his citation of the work of Nymphodorus by sketching the situation of the slaves on Chios in that period.¹³ We learn that large numbers ran away into the mountains and forests of the island, from which they proceeded to do damage to the property of the Chians. At one point one of the slaves took on a leading role. Democritus cites Nymphodorus as saying that Drimakos, 'was a brave man (ἀνδρεῖον δέ τινα ὄντα) and directed the runaways' military operations successfully, as if he were the commander of an army'.¹⁴ The use of the term ἀνδρεῖος to describe Drimakos is noteworthy in comparison with Aristomenes: it was Drimakos' courage that formed the basis of his position as the leader of the slaves.

The citation of Nymphodorus continues by saying that the Chians' expeditions against him failed and that Drimakos proposed a treaty and offered his terms. Drimakos warns the Chians that the slave troubles would not stop as they had happened in accordance with an oracle, but promises them that if they made a treaty with him, he would be 'the founder of many good things' (πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀρχηγός). Democritus continues his citation from Nymphodorus by summing up the terms of the treaty:

The Chians accordingly concluded a truce with him and ceased hostilities for a while; afterwards, he made himself measures, weights, and a personal seal (μέτρα καὶ σταθμὰ καὶ σφραγίδα), showed these to the Chians, and said: 'Whatever I take from any of you, I will take it using these measures and weights; after I take what I need, I will seal up the storerooms with this seal and otherwise leave them as they are. When your slaves run away, I will ask them

¹³ Fuks, 'Slave war and slave troubles' has attempted to date the rebellion to the Peloponnesian War with the help of Thucydides 8.4.20. This suggestion is taken over, with reservations, by Cartledge, 'Rebels and Sambos' 35-36; A.W. Gomme, A. Andrewes and K.J. Dover, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, Volume 5, Book VIII (Oxford 1981) 86-7; Hunt, *Slaves, Warfare, and Ideology* 85-7, 102-8 and now Urbainczyk, *Slave Revolts in Antiquity* 29. The historicity of the revolt is not important for my literary comparison of Drimakos and Aristomenes. We will, however, see below that this search for historical actuality has led to interpretations of Drimakos' character that go beyond the information given to us by this fragment. Bonelli, 'La saga di Drimaco' warns against such oversimplification as our lack of knowledge on Nymphodorus and the uniqueness of the story do not warrant easy historicising.

¹⁴ Ath. 6.265d.

why. If I think they ran away because they received unforgivable treatment, I will keep them with me; but if they do not convince me that they are in the right, I will send them back to their masters'.¹⁵

The treaty consists of two parts. It ensures the future survival of Drimakos' community of runaway slaves, giving the slaves the right to take a limited amount of produce from the Chians' storerooms; but it also states that Drimakos will not in future take any runaways, unless they had a just cause for running away. It will be up to the discretion of Drimakos to decide when runaways have suffered something irreparable. Drimakos also devises a system of weights and measures that settles what the former masters should give up to his community. His creation of weights and measures, along with his use of a seal, might suggest a comparison with archaic lawgivers, as has been argued by J. Vogt.¹⁶ The fact that he refers to himself as an 'ἀρχηγός of many good things' also points in this direction. The story characterises him as someone who has brought order to a situation of chaos. His discretionary powers concerning future runaways and the limits he sets on what the rebels can take from the Chians for their livelihood combine to produce a new status quo for the island in which the system of slavery is mitigated, but at the same time legitimated.¹⁷

¹⁵ Ath. 6.265e-266a.

¹⁶ Vogt, 'Zum Experiment des Drimakos'. It should be noted, however, that Vogt uses the story as a historical source for actual developments in archaic Chios. This has been rightly criticized by Bonelli, 'La saga di Drimaco'.

¹⁷ See M. Schofield, *Saving the City: Philosopher-kings and other classical paradigms* (London 1999) 1 on political theory as a search for a remedy for *stasis*, and A Szegedy-Maszak, 'Legends of the Greek Lawgivers' *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 19 (1978) 199-209, who notes that the resolution of crises is a repeated theme in the legends of Greek lawgivers. A more historical approach that equates lawgivers with 'judges' is K.-J. Hölkeskamp, *Schiedsrichter, Gesetzgeber und Gesetzgebung im archaischen Griechenland* (Stuttgart 1999). See for weighing and lawgivers H.S. Kim, 'Archaic coinage as evidence for the use of money' in: A. Meadows and K. Shipton eds., *Money and its Uses in the Ancient World* (Oxford 2001) 7-21, esp. 18 with references. On seals as marks of ownership and tokens of value in civic exchange: S. von Reden, *Exchange in Ancient Greece* (London 1995) 171-194; R. Seaford, *Money and the early Greek Mind: Homer, philosophy, tragedy* (Cambridge 2004) 115-124. D. Steiner, *The Tyrant's Writ: Myths and images of writing in ancient Greece* (Princeton 1994) 159-65 warns that changes in systems of weights and measures could be understood as tyrannical.

Drimakos' decision to negotiate with the Chians and come to an agreement with them concerning future fugitives as well as the future of his existing band of fugitives is a far cry from Aristomenes' hatred for the Spartans and his desire to damage them whenever possible. Drimakos sets himself up as a supreme judge in all matters concerning slavery, with the power to decide what are just reasons for running away, and thereby positions himself in between the slaves and the masters. Aristomenes would never have been satisfied with the peace and quiet that Drimakos barter for, as his motivation was anger at the Spartans. We have seen in the discussion of the Battle of Boar's Grave in chapter two that Aristomenes would have done much better by controlling his anger and not offending the Dioscuri, and it has been tentatively suggested by Ogden that Aristomenes here neglected to reap the benefits of his victory.¹⁸

Democritus recounts through Nymphodorus that Drimakos' terms work out well for the slave owners: the slaves, for fear of a trial before Drimakos, are less inclined to run away and Drimakos' existing followers 'being far more frightened of him than they were of their own masters, did everything he demanded and obeyed him as they would a general' (πειθαρχοῦντες ὡς ἄν στρατηγῶ).¹⁹ The importance of the treaty for maintaining a system of slavery is clarified too by Nymphodorus' statement that the Chians were again confronted by troubles with their slaves after Drimakos' death. The problems stopped when they built a shrine to Drimakos, worshipping him as a benevolent hero (ἥρωος εὐμενοῦς).²⁰ This worship reinstated Drimakos as the supreme judge in matters concerning slavery.

Drimakos' death has been the subject of debate in historical approaches to his story. According to Ath. 266b-d he dies in old age, making use of a proclamation issued by the polis that they would reward whoever captured

¹⁸ Cf. 61-64.

¹⁹ Ath. 6.266a.

²⁰ Ath. 6.266d-e.

him alive or dead. He persuades his favourite boy to cut off his head and claim his bounty, which includes his freedom. Various scholars have been puzzled by the apparent paradox between the blessings Drimakos brought the state and the state's ungrateful response.²¹ Although lately it has been suggested that there is no inconsistency in the co-existence of treaties with a persisting interest to capture maroon leaders, the story has reminded some of Hellenistic love stories.²² Vogt interprets Drimakos' sacrifice as an admirable example of death defiance, while his boy appears as the paradigm of a loyal slave.²³ This interpretation would also suit second century AD interests in loyalty and in the ability to face one's death courageously, as we will see in chapter 5. There is no reason, however, to suspect that Democritus' quotation is the amalgamation of two separate stories.

The existence of a hero-cult for Drimakos is an aspect that he has in common with Aristomenes.²⁴ Pausanias mentions the latter cult several times, adding that the Messenian hero was worshipped in his own day and age and explaining in what way the Messenians sacrificed to him.²⁵ Both rebel-leaders therefore in their afterlife became civic heroes. However, whereas Aristomenes was worshipped with a cult only after the refoundation of Messene as an independent state, Drimakos was appropriated by the Chian master classes in order to maintain the system of slavery.

²¹ Linckeheld, *RE* 17.2.1626; Vogt, 'Zum experiment des Drimakos'; Bonelli, 'La saga di Drimaco'; Fuks, 'slave war and slave troubles' 268, n. 19.

²² Garland, *Slavery in Ancient Greece* 181-3; Urbainczyk, *Slave Revolts in Antiquity* 29-38 and 53-4.

²³ Vogt, 'Zum experiment des Drimakos' 218-9.

²⁴ Both cults have also been historically attested by archaeological remains. For Aristomenes: SEG xxiii 207 = xxxv 343 = L. Migeotte, 'Réparation de monuments publics à Messène au temps d' Auguste', *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 109 (1985) 597-607, lines 13-17 and possibly IG xii.1 no.8, both discussed by Ogden, *Aristomenes* 33-37. P.G. Themelis, 'Ἀνασκαφή Μεσσήνης' *Praktika* 153 (1998) 89-126, esp. 113-15 and *Ἡρώες καὶ Ἡρώα στὴ Μεσσήνη: βιβλιοθήκη τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἐταιρείας* (Athens 2000) 34-40 thinks he may have found the *heroon*, but his suggestion is dismissed by D. Boehringer, *Heroenkulte in Griechenland von der geometrischen bis zur klassischen Zeit: Attika, Argolis, Messenien* (Berlin 2001) 274-7, 282 and 352. For Drimakos: W. Lambrinudakis, 'Antike Niederlassungen auf dem Berge Aipos von Chios' in D. Papenfuß and V.M. Strocka eds., *Palast und Hütte: Beiträge zum Bauen und Wohnen im Altertum von Archäologen, Vor- und Frühgeschichtlern: Tagungsbeiträge eines Symposiums der Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung, Bonn-Bad Godesberg, veranstaltet vom 25.-30. November 1979* (Mainz 1982) 375-81.

²⁵ Paus. 414.7;4.32.3

Drimakos' shrine is visited both by fugitives and by the Chians, to whom he appears warning them of plots. Drimakos is presented thereby as the safe keeper of a fragile co-existence of chattel slaves and masters. This contrasts sharply with Pausanias' depiction of Aristomenes as a rebel leader whose sole purpose is to overthrow his Spartan masters. Aristomenes deliberately refuses the position of quasi-civic leadership adopted by Drimakos. His early refusal to be king may be understood as a refusal to carry civic responsibility; a refusal finally confirmed when he declines to lead the Messenians and proceeds as an individual exile to Rhodes in pursuit of his solitary mission to do harm to the Spartans until his death.²⁶ In addition, his position as a *stratēgos autokratōr* marks him out solely as a military commander, which enables him to vent his rage on the Spartans without having to take responsibility for the Messenian common good. Unsurprisingly, this purely military role results in a different style of leadership. In contrast to Drimakos, whose military leadership is explicitly likened to that of a king, Aristomenes knows how to incite his followers, who think it a great honour to fight with him, but is not able to calm them down. This was clear in the episode concerning the Spartan virgins, where Aristomenes had to kill some of the guards in order to stop them raping their captives.²⁷

In contrast, in Democritus' citation of Nymphodorus, the fugitive slaves appear only as testimony to Drimakos' power to control them. We read that,

Drimakos used to punish those who failed to follow his orders, and did not allow anyone to plunder a field or commit any other crime without his approval.²⁸

²⁶ Cf. 62.

²⁷ Cf. 62-63.

²⁸ Ath. 6.266a.

Before and after Drimakos there is chaos: the slaves are damaging the Chians' lands and obey no law. But during his period of eminence, they fear him and are controlled by military discipline. Consequently, it can be argued that although this source is very positive regarding Drimakos, it is rather negative towards the other fugitive slaves. They appear as running loose and disregarding the law until someone rises up who is masterly enough to discipline them. To the Chians' slaves he is not unlike their former masters, except concerning his possession of the power that they lack. Those that are with him fear him more than their masters and those that would in other circumstances have run away prefer not to when by doing so they risk his judgment. Drimakos is a benevolent hero, but he seems to be benevolent especially towards the Chian slave-owners.

Drimakos as problem solver

The context in which Democritus tells Drimakos' story clarifies further how his role as a civic hero marks him out as a problem solver. Democritus cites Theopompus' *Histories* to explain that the Chians were the first Greeks to purchase barbarians as chattel-slaves and comments that:

I believe that this was why the *daimon* felt resentment against the Chians, for in later times they were drawn into a war on account of their slaves.²⁹

He reiterates his opinion at the end of his quotation from Nymphodorus. He mentions three authors (Herodotus, Nicolas the Peripatetic and Poseidonius the Stoic) who all comment on the punishments meted out to the Chians because of their introduction of chattel slavery. Democritus adds:

²⁶Ath. 6.265c. P. Garnsey, *Ideas of Slavery from Aristotle to Augustine* (Cambridge 1996) 62 argues pace Vidal-Naquet, 'Reflections on Greek historical writing' 41 n. 16, that Democritus makes explicit that this is his own opinion. Vidal-Naquet considers the citation from Theopompus to be at the heart of the discussion on slavery in book 6.

There can thus be little doubt that the *daimōn* was angry at them for being the first people to rely on purchased slaves, although many of them did their own work unassisted. This is perhaps the origin of the proverb 'A Chian purchased his master,' used by Eupolis in *Friends*.³⁰

The function of Drimakos' story in this context is therefore to emphasise the Chians' own responsibility for their slave troubles. The problems are caused by divine anger at their innovation of chattel slavery, which, as Democritus explains through his use of Theopompus, is a marked change from the practices of the Spartans and the Thessalians, who were the first to use slaves, but who enslaved fellow Greeks as helots and penestae respectively. It was this introduction of a new type of slavery that provoked the *daimōn's* anger. The solution that Drimakos offers the Chians is a regulation of this new system. By his mention of the oracle he reminds the Chians that their problems have a divine background, and he devises a method by which the masters can keep their slaves if they treat them properly.

The importance of correct treatment of slaves to prevent slave revolt is, however, not unique to the system of chattel slavery.³¹ Some passages surrounding the citation from Nymphodorus make this clear. Democritus' discussion of the revolt on Chios comes after a long quotation from Plato, *Laws*.³² The text of this citation is somewhat different from Plato's original text in *Laws* 776C-778A, as it omits some of the details and digressions he offers;

³⁰ Ath. 6.266f.

³¹ See A. Paradiso, *Forme di dipendenza nel mondo Greco. Ricerche sul VI libro di Ateneo* (Bari 1991) esp. chapter 1, in addition to Vidal-Naquet, 'Reflections on Greek historical writing', on Athenaeus' book 6 as a discussion of different types of slavery. I agree with Paradiso that this seems a unifying theme for the discussion of slavery in the second half of book 6. My focus is nevertheless on treatment of slaves and prevention of slave revolt. Athenaeus mentions the types of slavery in connection with the problem of slave management, but does not arrive at any consistent conclusions regarding this. The risk of revolt is a universal problem both in the maintenance of helotage and of chattel slavery. The structure (or lack thereof) of the *Deipnosophistae* makes the idea of a unifying theme questionable, although it can be upheld concerning the debate on slavery. See E. Gowers, *The Loaded Table: Representations of food in Roman literature* (Oxford 1993) 9,21, 29, 45, 162 ; Anderson, 'Athenaeus'; Hansen, 'Leser und Benutzer'; Olson, 'introduction' and several articles in Braund and Wilkins, *Athenaeus and his World*.

³² Ath. 6264d-264f = Plato, *Laws* 776c-778a.

but the argument and the words used to express the argument are the same.³³ Plato was concerned with the problem of property (slavery being a particularly difficult type of property), and he builds up a legal system to regulate Greek practices such as the practice of keeping slaves.³⁴ Athenaeus does not have such a practical purpose, but quotes the passage in a theoretical discussion on slavery in its own right.

Plato mentions three examples of slavery – the helots, the Mariandynoi and the penestae - and comments that the helot system of Sparta is the subject of controversy. Without explaining that the disputes concern the fact that these slave populations were Greek,³⁵ he approaches the question from a pragmatic point of view, emphasising the difficulty in managing slaves who speak the same language as each other and as their masters. The Messenian revolts exemplify this problem.³⁶ In explaining the risk of revolt, Plato comments, with reference to Homer, on the effects of slavery on a man's mind³⁷ and remarks that 'there is nothing sound in a slave's soul and no one with any sense should trust them at all'.

The suggestion that slaves have lesser mental powers than free men is a common *topos* in ancient literature and is emphasised in Athenaeus' account by citations from other authors too. One example is the quotation from Poseidonius, cited a few sentences before this passage, who, writing about the Mariandynoi, remarks that:

³³ S.D. Olson, *Athenaeus of Naucratis, The Learned Banqueters* Volume 3 (Cambridge Ma. 2008) 217 n. 342 comments that Athenaeus' modification consists in particular of the removal of some remarks sympathetic to slaves.

³⁴ G.R. Morrow, 'Plato and Greek slavery' *Mind* 48 (1939) 186-201; more generally: R.F. Stalley, *An Introduction to Plato's Laws* (Oxford 1983) 7.

³⁵ Garnsey, *Ideas of Slavery* 56. Garnsey adds, however, that Plato's advice concerning proper treatment is not developed specifically in connection with helotage. Urbainczyk, *Slave Revolts in Antiquity* 95-7 comments that helotage was more controversial than the enslavement of the Mariandynoi and the Penestae as, unlike these two populations the helots were not thought to have been enslaved voluntarily. This problem has no consequences for the difficulty of preventing revolt among slaves speaking the same language.

³⁶ Hunt, *Slaves, warfare and ideology* 64-5.

³⁷ 'For wide-voiced Zeus takes away half the intelligence (*vóov*) of men whom the day of enslavement lays hold of'. The original text in Homer uses *aretē* instead of *nous*. The change was already made by Plato.

Many people who are unable to care for themselves because of their intellectual deficiencies surrender themselves into the service of more intelligent individuals, so that they can get the necessities of life from their masters and can in turn repay them with whatever services they are capable of rendering.³⁸

Poseidonius and Plato disagree on the causes of an incomplete mind among slaves,³⁹ but they both argue that slaves do not have the mental powers that free men have. In Plato an express connection is made between this lack of soundness of mind and revolt.⁴⁰ We will see in chapter four that Diodorus' account of the Sicilian slave revolts, for which he had been using Poseidonius,⁴¹ also expresses an interest in slaves who are prone to revolt both due to their weakness of mind and the ill-treatment they are given. This compares well to the combination of *tolmē* and *aponoiā* in Pausanias' depiction of the Messenians.

As we have seen in chapter two, there is a strong anti-Spartan tendency in Pausanias' account of their conquest of Messenia. He blames the Spartans' greed for causing the Messenians' *ἀπόνοια*. Similarly, as we will see in more detail in chapter four, slave rebellions are often caused by unjust treatment of the slaves. In her appraisal of Aristomenes' *moderatio*, Auberger has specifically pointed to what she considers the defensive nature of the

³⁸ Ath. 6.263c-6.263d. Garnsey, *Ideas of Slavery* 148-9 argues that Poseidonius suggests the Mariandynoi struck this contract as a means of prevention of being uprooted. See also Vidal-Naquet, 'Reflections on Greek historical writing'; A. Paradiso, 'Sur la servitude volontaire des Mariandyniens d'Héraclée du Pont' in A. Serghidou ed., *Fear of Slaves-Fear of Enslavement in the Ancient Mediterranean/Peur de l'esclave-Peur de l'esclavage en Méditerranée Ancienne (discourse, representations, pratiques)* (Paris 2007) 23-33.

³⁹ According to this quotation from Poseidonius, slaves –ideally- become slaves because of their lack of intellect, whereas in Plato's quotation from Homer it is suggested that slaves have an incomplete mind because of the fact that they are slaves. Diodorus' account of the Sicilian Slave Revolts stresses the effects of slavery on the slaves' mind. We do not have enough fragments left over from Poseidonius to come to a definite conclusion on his theory of slavery.

⁴⁰ It may be of significance that Aristotle is not mentioned in Athenaeus' book 6. Millett 2007 esp. 194-200 argues that the identification of slaves with βαρβάροι was a prerequisite for Aristotle's theory of natural slavery. The problems with helotage are problematic for his theory. See i.e. Aristotle, *NE* 1269a34-b13 and *Pol* 1330a25-8.

⁴¹ The extent to which Diodorus gives an accurate description of Poseidonius' work is, however, a matter of debate, in which I take the position that we should be careful to attribute anything solely found in Diodorus to Poseidonius, see chapter 4 pp.

Messenian War.⁴² This is *prima facie* incorrect as the Messenians are not fighting to preserve something they possess. As said, they rebel from a position of subjugation in order to regain their freedom. Nevertheless, even if we were to interpret their revolt as a defensive war, it is not clear that the resulting ἀπόνουια and τόλμη imply *moderatio*. Pausanias, as well as Plato, rather suggests the opposite. The quotation from Plato continues with a suggestion as to how one should treat slaves in order to prevent revolt.

Two courses of action remain: not to allow those who are going to be slaves to come from the same country or share a language, to the extent this is possible, and to take proper care of them, not just for their sake, but more out of concern for ourselves, and so never do violence to them (ὕβριζεν τε ἥκιστα εἰς αὐτούς). We ought to punish our slaves as they deserve, and not ruin them by merely admonishing them, as if they were free people. Almost everything said to a slave should be a command, and there should be no joking whatsoever with slaves, whether female or male. Many people thoughtlessly corrupt their slaves by behaving this way, and tend to make life more difficult both for their slaves as subjects and for themselves as masters.⁴³

The key to prevent slave revolt is therefore to treat slaves as slaves. At the end of this passage it is emphasised that improper treatment — that is, treatment that one would give free men — makes it difficult for both slaves and masters respectively to serve and rule.⁴⁴ Plato's use of the verb ὕβριζω to express the situation in which a master uses too much violence towards a slave indicates that he is not just thinking about the treatment of slaves in practical terms, in terms of minimizing the risk of revolt, but also in terms of what is just.⁴⁵ This is also shown by his explicit statement that slaves should be properly treated

⁴² Auberger, *Pausanias* 182-3.

⁴³ Ath. 6.265a-6.265b.

⁴⁴ P. Millett, 'Aristotle and slavery in Athens' *Greece and Rome* 2 (2007) 178-209, esp. 198; Morrow, 'Plato and Greek slavery'; G.R. Morrow, *Plato's Cretan City: a historical interpretation of the Laws* (Princeton 1960) 148-52; G. Vlastos, 'Does slavery exist in Plato's Republic' *Classical Philology* 63 (1968) 291-295.

⁴⁵ Morrow, 'Plato and Greek slavery'; Cf. N.R.E. Fisher, *Hybris. A study in the values of honour and shame in ancient Greece* (Warminster 1992) 499-500 on the concept of *hybris* in Plato's thought.

'not just for their own sake'. Nevertheless, the statement labels it as a secondary purpose; the emphasis in this passage is therefore on the practical consequences of unjust behaviour. This aspect receives even greater attention in Athenaeus' use of the citation.

It is at this point that Democritus starts the long quotation from Nymphodorus of Syracuse regarding Drimakos. Its starting point therefore is the problem of slave revolt, which is a consequence of the different nature of slaves, namely their lesser mental powers. At the end of his discussion of the troubles on Chios he sums up examples of measures passed by the Athenians 'to protect the condition of their slaves' and 'legalise suits for outrage even on behalf of slaves'.⁴⁶ These measures also express some secondary concern for the welfare of the slaves themselves, even though their immediate purpose is to prevent slave troubles.

This framework within which Drimakos' story is presented indicates that Athenaeus is concerned with slave revolt as a universal risk in both systems of helotage and chattel slavery. These two types of slavery both carry specific problems. Whereas the Chians are punished for introducing chattel slavery, the enslavement of Greeks is also problematic since their common language involves management problems. Nevertheless, both Plato and Nymphodorus point to similar solutions. Given the existence of difficulties with both helotage and chattel slavery, the emphasis must be on the treatment of slaves. Plato advises a treatment based on fair punishment and commandments. Similarly, the 'many good things' with which Drimakos blesses the Chians, also consist in his ability to command and punish.

The emphasis on fair punishment and commandments reinforces the importance of *moderatio* in dealing with slaves. It is common place in ancient literature, especially in Stoic writings, that the ability to control one's slaves

⁴⁶ Ath. 6.266f-6.267b.

easily was a test of the slave owner's *moderatio*. Precisely because slave owners had ultimate power over their human possessions, it was important that they should not be seen to abuse their power, as it implied that they gave way to their anger: to control one's slaves is to control oneself.⁴⁷ The same goes for indulging one's slaves. We will see in chapter four an example of a Sicilian slave owner who let himself and his dinner guests be amused by his slave's predictions that the slave would one day be king. Here, the slave owner's desire to be amused made him neglect the danger of joking with his slave.

The underlying assumption of this rhetoric, and indeed the assumption used to legitimate slavery in almost all slave societies, ancient and modern, is that slaves lack self-control.⁴⁸ Slaves will let anger and despair as well as desire and laziness, the hallmarks of the clichés of Nat Turner and Sambo respectively, get the better of them; hence, the need for self-controlled and 'fair' masters. In this context, the Messenians' anger, especially as exemplified by Aristomenes, which makes them daring but not courageous, can be interpreted as a 'slavish' characteristic. It is ironic that Aristomenes is thus carried away by his anger in an attempt to preserve his freedom. The contrast between Drimakos' position as a civic hero and Aristomenes' refusal to take on civic responsibilities underlines this reading. We have seen that Pausanias complains that the Messenians 'could have been happy in other things'. Drimakos, although he becomes a civic hero for the Chians, also has a role in protecting the slaves against outrages. In a sense, his mitigation of the system of slavery points to a way in which the Messenians might have been happier in other respects. We will see in chapter six that the alleviation of one's sufferings through submission is also a theme in Josephus' account of the Jewish revolt.

⁴⁷ William Fitzgerald, *Slavery and the Roman Imagination* (Cambridge 2000) chapter 2, esp. 35-36; K. Hopkins, 'Novel Evidence for Roman Slavery' *Past and Present* 138 (1993) 3-27, esp. 7-10.

⁴⁸ Note in this context Plato, as cited by Ath. 6.264e 'because a slave's soul is entirely unsound, and no one with any sense should trust them at all'.

The effects of ill-treatment on the willingness of slaves to rebel will be discussed in more detail in chapter four; suffice it to say for now that self-control was an important theme in literature dealing with slavery throughout antiquity. Athenaeus' treatment of the Chians shows that it is of relevance to the question of how to treat slaves. Additionally, it could be argued that the question of self-control is important in the coming into existence of slavery. Democritus' insistence on the Chians' own responsibility for their problems suggests that the acquisition of slaves might have been affected by the slave owners' greed. This would be in line with Pausanias' criticism of the Spartans, whose greed he blames for the troubles that they had with the Messenians. In the next section I will therefore address the need for slavery and its connection with love of luxury.

Civilisation and Greed

Towards the end of book 6, after Democritus has ended his long speech, the Roman host Larensis enters the debate and makes mention of the large number of slaves among the Romans.⁴⁹ He then focuses on the problem of slave revolts in Italy. He mentions both the second Sicilian slave revolt and the Spartacus revolt, and connects these to the large numbers of slaves and a deterioration of Roman virtues.⁵⁰ He remarks that the Romans of old, in contrast, were moderate (σώφρονες) and very virtuous (πάντα ἄριστοι) and mentions in this context among others Scipio Africanus and Julius Caesar, emphasising that although they owned slaves, they lived restrained lives.

What then, did Scipio and Caesar not have slaves? They had them; but they preserved their ancestral customs and lived a disciplined life, respecting their state's norms. Because it is a mark of intelligent men to maintain the ancient

⁴⁹ Larensis' speech: 6.272d-6.275b; this part 6.272d—6.272f. P. Livius Larensis is a historical figure, a Roman consular from the late second century: CIL VI 2126; see also E.L. Bowie, 'Athenaeus' in: P.E. Easterling and B.M.W. Knox eds., *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature* (Cambridge 1982-1985) 682-683.

⁵⁰ Ath. 6.272f-6.273a.

practices that allowed them to overcome other nations in war, while simultaneously adopting anything good or useful that their defeated enemies had worth imitating.⁵¹

Larensis follows with a long exposition of things borrowed from others, but with special emphasis on the Roman characteristic of austerity, and the valuation of tradition, especially the tradition of living a restrained life.⁵² The combination of these two elements is interesting as the elements of preserving tradition and innovation appear at first sight contradictory. The Roman attitude towards Greek civilisation in particular was problematic and provoked heated debate on the value of civilisation and the danger of decadence. It is therefore not surprising in itself that Larensis expresses an interest in this.⁵³ However, the *Deipnosophistae*, written by a Greek-speaking author from Naucratis and celebrating mainly Greek literature,⁵⁴ appears at first sight to be an odd place to present this concern for Roman austerity in. I will argue below that the critical treatment of luxury is largely self-reflexive. This aspect of Athenaeus' criticism of luxury demonstrates that his critical attitude towards slave-owners ought not to be reduced to a black-and-white question.

At 274 e, Larensis continues his speech with the introduction of luxury (τρυφή) to the Romans, with reference to several authors. This introduction of this topic towards the end of book 6 is indicative of the relationship, also found in Diodorus (see chapter four), of luxury and slavery. Having slaves to do all necessary work is of course a luxury in itself, as may be surmised in some fragments of Old Comedy that Democritus mentions at the end of his speech. All these fragments depict ideal dream worlds in which produce

⁵¹ Ath. 6.273d-6.273e

⁵² Ath. 6.273e-6.274e.

⁵³ Compare a similar remark made by Larensis at Ath. 2.50f-51b, discussed by John Wilkins, 'Dialogue and Comedy. The Structure of the *Deipnosophistae*' in: Braund and Wilkins, *Athenaeus and his World* 23-47.

⁵⁴ Cf. Anderson, 'Athenaeus' 2180, who notes that although Roman literature is not excluded from the *Deipnosophistae* altogether, it is hardly frequent.

simply grows abundantly without the need for any work. As a result, slaves are superfluous.⁵⁵

The fact that these ideal dream worlds refer to places literally beyond the scope of civilisation may be seen to underline the basic existence of slavery as an unavoidable part of it.⁵⁶ One possible solution of the problem of slave revolts is therefore at least not an option: slavery cannot be abolished. Ian Ruffell in an article discussing these fragments makes a distinction between two types of utopia, namely automatist utopia and nostalgic utopia. Following the theories of Ricoeur and Mannheim, he argues that the fragments cited here by Athenaeus fall in the first category, and were first used to criticise the dominant ideology. He illustrates this in a detailed discussion of Cratinos' *Ploutoi*, in which the accumulation of wealth, and consequently the accumulation of slaves, in Athens are questioned.⁵⁷ Although Ruffell is more interested in the function of the original comedies that the fragments are taken from, his conclusion may be of interest to Athenaeus' work as well. Emily Gowers, in her study of the representation of meals in Roman literature, has argued that 'convivial or festive works', such as the *Deipnosophistae*, had a marginal literary status, but are interesting for precisely that reason: their marginality provides scope for experiment and criticism.⁵⁸ Cratinus' play, as well as the other utopian visions mentioned by Athenaeus, expressed this criticism by demonstrating the ridiculousness of a world without the need for work.

⁵⁵ Ath. 6.267e-6.270a. The fragments in themselves do not explicitly refer to an absence of slavery. However, Athenaeus does remark that he uses them for that purpose. Cf. Ian Ruffell, 'The world turned upside down: utopia and utopianism in the fragments of Old Comedy' in: David Harvey and John Wilkins eds., *The Rivals of Aristophanes. Studies in Athenian Old Comedy* (London and Swansea 2000) 473-506 and compare John Wilkins, *The Boastful Chef. The Discourse of Food in Ancient Greek Comedy* (Oxford 2000) 110-123 who gives more attention to the nostalgic elements of these fragments.

⁵⁶ Garlan, *Slavery in Ancient Greece* 136 notes that 'far from abolishing the logic of slavery the myth of automation instead reinforces it, integrating it fully into the natural order of things'. Cf. Vidal-Naquet, 'Greek historical writing' 173-4.; Wilkins, *The Boastful Chef* 110-115.

⁵⁷ Ruffell, 'The world turned upside down'.

⁵⁸ Gowers, *The Loaded Table* 29-32.

As Athenaeus' work is in many ways a representation of the wealth of Larensis' library as well as Athenaeus' παιδεία, we should not delve too deeply in an attempt to discover some sort of direct relationship between his use of the comedy-fragments and Larensis' mention of the slave revolts and luxury.⁵⁹ Nevertheless, book 6, like other books in the *Deipnosophistae* is a thematic unity in as far that slavery and luxury, and the combination of these two, run through it.⁶⁰ Luxury is the central theme of book 12, but it also receives a lot of attention throughout the whole work.⁶¹ Its appearance in book 6 is therefore not unusual. It is, however, representative of the concern shared by many ancient authors that the influx of large numbers of slaves was not only a physical danger but also a moral one to Roman society.⁶²

The end of Larensis' speech makes clear that his complaints about greed and extravagancy are to some extent self-reflexive. He concludes with a reference to Theopompus, which is also a disguised reference to the setting of the speech:

But nowadays, according to Theopompus in book I of his *History of Philip*, there is no one even among the only moderately well-to-do who does not set an expensive table, owns cooks and many other servants, and spend more money every day than people spent in the past at their festivals and sacrificial rites.⁶³

⁵⁹ See n. 21, above.

⁶⁰ See in particular Jacob, 'Athenaeus the Librarian' 104: 'Athenaeus' library is the result of the collection of quotations, of words and of textual fragments, but these fragments do not follow the continuity of the texts they were extracted from. It is arranged according to the thematic principles and the rules of analogy, of complementarity, of digression, of metonymy that made possible mobility within and between the topics. The collection (συναγωγή) whether a library, whether a treatise, or a symposium, ties on an order, a "syntax", a sequence that produces at the same time continuity and variety: the banquet, like the talks, has to keep going'.

⁶¹ See Wilkins, *The Boastful Chef* 259-272.

⁶² The fragments demonstrate that this concern was older than the 2nd century AD, but the expansion of the Roman Empire into the Mediterranean during this century made the influx of slaves and other luxuries a growing and actual concern. Cf. Nicholas Purcell, 'The way we used to eat: diet, community and history at Rome' *American Journal of Philology* 124 (2003) 329-358.

⁶³ Ath. 6.275b.

Larensis' quotation of Theopompus is self-reflexive, as setting an extravagant table and lavishing his guests, who in turn lavish each other with words, is exactly what Larensis is doing. This poses questions about the seriousness of his call for moderation and austerity. To begin with, it suggests that the austerity of the past is an ideal that Larensis (and other Romans) may aspire to, but will not achieve. The slaves needed to cater for this decadence are unavoidable, as even those Romans famous for their moderation owned many slaves.

But, secondly, it does not just suggest the inability of Larensis to be austere, it also emphasises it. The presence of this passage at the very end of book six gives an ironic view on the setting of the *Deipnosophistae*. The work is modelled on the classical example of the *Symposium* but, unlike the sophists in Plato's masterpiece, the debaters in the *Deipnosophistae* actually eat and they do not just eat lightly either.⁶⁴ The same may be said of their speeches, which may be read as a catalogue of Larensis' library. The richness of detail in the *Deipnosophistae* is rather hard to swallow for the modern reader.⁶⁵ Both dinner and talk demonstrate the wealth of Larensis. Athenaeus puts words into Larensis' mouth that show the downside of it, namely the decadence which is a contributing factor in stimulating the slave revolts.⁶⁶

⁶⁴ Although Athenaeus makes extensive use of Plato's *Symposium* as well as the *Phaedo*, his use is somewhat paradoxical as he emphasises not just the sympotic elements of learning and conversation, but also provides a literary representation of the meal itself, in which the discussions may be interpreted as a sublimation of the dishes served. Baldwin, 'Athenaeus and his work' 22 for that reason compares the *Deipnosophistae* with Lucian's *Convivium* and Anderson, *The Second Sophistic* 176-9 calls Athenaeus the greatest 'antisymposiasmos'. Cf. Michael Trapp, 'Plato in the *Deipnosophistae*' in Braund and Wilkins, *Athenaeus and his World* 353-363; Alessandra Lukinovich, 'The play of reflections between literary form and the sympotic theme in the *Deipnosophistae* of Athenaeus' in Oswyn Murray ed., *Sympotica. A Symposium on the Symposium* (Oxford 1990); Gowers, *The Loaded Table* 29; Wilkins, *The Boastful Chef* 51.

⁶⁵ Hansen, 'Leser und Benutzer' 229 is revealingly hesitant in admitting 'und so scheint es mir notwendig das Werk zunächst als einen Vertreter der fiktionalen Literatur zu betrachten und damit anzunehmen daß der Hauptzweck des Buches darin besteht gelesen zu werden', although he concludes on a more positive note, uttering the hope that Athenaeus might even be enjoyed!

⁶⁶ David Braund, 'Learning, luxury and Empire. Athenaeus' Roman patron' in: Braund and Wilkins, *Athenaeus and his World* 3-22 notes the positive aspects of Athenaeus' display of Larensis wealth; Jacob, 'Athenaeus the Librarian' reads the *Deipnosophistae* as the literary and artistic embodiment of Larensis' library. Analogue to this is Luciana Romeri's interpretation of 'the talk at table as a mimema (imitation) of the meal of Larensis which runs parallel with

In addition to posing questions about Larensis' argument for moderation, Athenaeus also poses a question about himself. The attention to austerity and the light irony with which Athenaeus plays, in combination with the lack of austerity in the *Deipnosophistae*, makes one wonder what Athenaeus' own position is. He seems to attack the very thing he is part of. It is clear in the setting of the *Deipnosophistae* that Larensis' role is not just that of a host, but more specifically of a patron. His guests have to 'earn' their dinner by demonstrating their knowledge and are not allowed to eat before they speak.⁶⁷ Athenaeus therefore appears as a self-professed parasite.⁶⁸ He shows us the positions that Greek sophists could achieve in the elite of the Roman Empire, but at the same time demonstrates, in a light and playful manner, the ambiguity of that position. The playfulness with which he addresses the question of luxury and slavery is in line with this light irony.⁶⁹ His, and his patron's, awareness of the problems and difficulties inherent in the system of slavery, are not less real, even though he is not down-cast by it. The fragments in book 6 may point to the danger of luxury, through their emphasis on the danger of slave revolts which results from the influx of large numbers of slaves; but through Athenaeus' presentation of them, the quotations are at the same time a demonstration of luxury and a result from the courtship with that luxury.

Athenaeus' book as a mimema (imitation) of the talk at table': Luciana Romeri, 'The logodeipnon. Athenaeus between banquet and anti-banquet' in: Braund and Wilkins, *Athenaeus and his World* 256-271.

⁶⁷ Wilkins, 'Dialogue and Comedy' 369; See also, N.R.E. Fisher, 'Symposiasts, Fish-Eaters and Flatterers: Social Mobility and Moral Concerns in Old Comedy' in: David Harvey and John Wilkins eds., *The Rivals of Aristophanes. Studies in Athenian Old Comedy* (London and Swansea 2000) 355-396, 373 and 387, nt 79 on parasites in Old Comedy.

⁶⁸ Tim Whitmarsh, 'The Politics and poetics of parasitism. Athenaeus on Parasites and Flatterers' in: Braund and Wilkins, *Athenaeus and his World* 304-315.

⁶⁹ On Athenaeus' playfulness: Christopher Pelling, 'Fun with Fragments. Athenaeus and the historians' in: Braund and Wilkins, *Athenaeus and his World* 171-190

Conclusion

The comparison between Pausanias' book 4 and the debate on slavery in book 6 has resulted in more contrasts than similarities. This is caused in part by the fact already mentioned that Pausanias does not explicitly depict the Messenian revolt as a slave revolt. To this it should be added that Pausanias is concerned with the Messenian revolt as a part of Messenian history. That is to say, the exploration of their behaviour in the revolt is his key interest in book 4. Nymphodorus and Athenaeus, however, are concerned with the problems that slave owners face, how they are caused and how they could be solved. As a result of this difference, Pausanias' treatment of Spartan greed is also rather different from Athenaeus' references to slave owners' love for luxury. Spartan greed to Pausanias is an explanation of the deplorable circumstances that the Messenians find themselves in, but not a subject for discussion in itself. In Athenaeus' treatment of luxury-loving, this also appears as an explanation of slave rebellions, but a harsh condemnation of slave owners is missing. In neither of the two cases does their criticism clearly translate into sympathy for the slaves.

These contrasts, however, also help to bring out some of the more important characteristics of Aristomenes as a leader. Comparing him with Drimakos, the negative qualities of his leadership, especially his uncontrolled anger and his refusal to accept any civic responsibility, come out much more clearly than the justification for his revolt. Pausanias makes it clear that Aristomenes had good reason to be angry, but this passion does not help him much. Perhaps we may look at Drimakos' treaty with the Chians as a possibility of how the Messenians might have been 'happy in other respects'.

Athenaeus' subtle play with the two themes of slavery and luxury also suggest another important insight with respect to our interpretation of Pausanias. As is demonstrated by the wealth of material in book 6, and as we

will also see in the following chapters, the interplay between luxury, greed and slave revolts is not an uncommon trope. This does not mean that greed on the part of the slave owners is a justification for rebellion. As we have seen, the Drimakos-episode provides both the slave owners and the slaves with other solutions, namely for the slave owners to command and give out fair punishment, and for the slaves to be loyal, submit and co-operate.

CHAPTER FOUR

DECADENCE AND DESPAIR: DIODORUS SICULUS' ACCOUNT OF THE TWO SICILIAN SLAVE REVOLTS

In the previous chapter I have discussed Nymphodorus' account of Drimakos' revolt on Chios within the context of a wider debate on slavery in Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae*. The host of the banquet that Athenaeus uses as a setting, the Roman patron Larensis, contributes to the discussion by mentioning the Sicilian slave revolts and the Italian slave revolt led by Spartacus. The danger of slave revolts, it has by then become clear in Democritus' speech, is a problem that may have started in Chios but is inherent to slavery everywhere and in every period. In addition I have argued that both the substance of the debate as well as the setting in which it is held - an extravagant banquet - connect the need for slaves with a desire for luxury, which has grown alongside the Romans' expansion of territory and influence. Hence, the danger of slave revolts is caused in part by the problem of extravagance, and through the process of imperialism.

As we shall see, Diodorus Siculus' account of the two Sicilian Slave Revolts explains the uprisings partly by pointing out the arrival of large numbers of new slaves to the island as a result of Rome's conquests and partly by emphasising the irresponsible behaviour of the slave owners towards them. Although the extent to which Diodorus used Poseidonius' *History*, which covered the period from 146 BC to 88 BC, for his accounts remains unclear, I will interpret them in the context of some major themes pervading the whole of Diodorus' *Bibliothēke*. His attitude towards Roman rule is interesting in comparison with Pausanias' *Periegesis*. We have seen in chapter two that Pausanias' anti-Lakonian tendency in Book 4 has often been mistakenly translated into sympathy for the Messenian rebels. Similarly, we must ask whether Diodorus' criticisms of Roman and Sicilian slave owners and of

Roman rule (or lack thereof), means that he had sympathy for the slaves, as has recently been claimed by Theresa Urbainczyk.¹ Diodorus makes much of the desperation that motivated them into action. How does this compare with the Messenians' despair?

Little definitive can be said about Diodorus' use of Poseidonius. It is nevertheless interesting from the comparative perspective of this dissertation that Athenaeus quotes him regularly. Diodorus' text contains passages on the nature of slaves and slavery that illuminate Poseidonius' position in a late Hellenistic debate on slavery and may also connect it to the role of Nymphodorus' treatment of Drimakos in Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae*. These passages will also help solve the question of the extent to which the slaves' revolt may be legitimately compared with the Messenians' resistance against the Spartans.

I have argued in chapter three that Aristomenes and Drimakos were different kinds of leaders, as the latter positioned himself in between the slaves and their masters, thereby legitimating the system of slavery, whereas Aristomenes was motivated solely by his hatred for the Spartans. Drimakos' followers hardly featured in Nymphodorus' account. Diodorus, however, informs us about both the rebel leaders' strategic and ruling abilities, and the rebel masses' motivation for joining the revolt. This will enable me to compare their behaviour with that of Aristomenes' followers.

Before I begin my comparison, it will be necessary to deal briefly with the problematic survival of Diodorus' account in two Byzantine manuscripts, as well as the ultimately unsolvable question of to what extent he depended on Poseidonius. I will continue by discussing the different versions of the two

¹ Theresa Urbainczyk, *Slave Revolts in Antiquity* (Stocksfield 2008) chapter 6: 'Sympathy for the Slaves: Diodorus Siculus'; See also: Gerhard Wirth, *Katastrophe und Zukunftshoffnung. Mutmaßungen zur zweiten Hälfte von Diodors Bibliothek un ihren verlorenen Büchern* (Vienna 2007) 122-129.

revolts, with a focus on the causes of the revolt and the implied criticisms of the slave masters and the Roman authorities. How does this compare to Pausanias' criticisms of the Spartan conquest of Messenia? In the second half of this chapter I will discuss Diodorus' representation of the nature of the slaves and their behaviour during the revolts, concentrating on the relationship between the rebels and their leaders.

Manuscript and Sources

Like Pausanias, Diodorus Siculus has suffered more criticism than admiration. Until Kenneth Sacks' 1990 defence of Diodorus,² scholars have concentrated on the reliability of his *Bibliothēke* as a historical source and in this respect wondered to what extent his representation of earlier historians such as Ephorus and Poseidonius was accurate. The more positive readers complimented him on preserving so much material of value that would otherwise have been lost; the negatively inclined deplored his 'simplification' of more sophisticated originals.³ Only in the last two decades, after Sacks'

² Kenneth S. Sacks, *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century* (Princeton 1990). The book was critically reviewed: John Carter, *The Classical Review* 42 (1992) 34-36; C.W. Fornara, *Classical Philology* 87 (1992) 383-88; F.W. Walbank, *Journal of Roman Studies* 82 (1992) 250-1.

³ Positive: J.M. Bigwood, 'Diodorus and Ctesias' *Phoenix* 34 (1980) 195- 207, although see his remark on 202: 'In Diodorus' hands Ctesias' highly colourful narrative has clearly become something rather dull and conventional'; Jane Hornblower, *Hieronymus of Cardia* (Oxford 1981); Françoise Bizière, 'Comment travaillait Diodore de Sicile' *Revue des Études Grecques* 87 (1974) 369-374; Jonas Palm, *Über Sprache und Stil des Diodorus von Sizilien. Ein Beitrag zur Beleuchtung der hellenistischen Prosa* (Lund 1955), esp. 195-8; Negative: E. Schwartz, 'Diodorus' *RE* 5 (1905) 663-704; L. Canfora, 'Le but de l'historiographie selon Diodore' in: H. Verdin, G. Schepens and E. de Keyser eds., *Purposes of History. Studies in Greek historiography from the 4th to the 2nd centuries BC* (Leuven 1990) 313-322; Peter Garnsey, 'The Middle Stoics and Slavery' in: Paul Cartledge, Peter Garnsey, and Erich Gruen eds., *Hellenistic Constructs: Essays in culture, history and historiography* (Berkeley and London 1997) 159-174, esp. 162-165: 'What is left is even-handed judgment on the causes of the revolt (the cruelty of masters), the nature of the slave system in Sicily, and the attitude of the slave rebels (who are exonerated from blame for the war and pictured as capable of repaying good treatment with mercy) – but without any philosophical underpinning'; Robert Drews, 'Diodorus and his sources' *The American Journal of Philology* 83.4 (1962) 383-392 on Diodorus 'unfortunate historiographical objectives'

pioneering study has more attention been given to Diodorus' own agenda as a historian.⁴

Although initially heavily criticised by some and only hesitantly accepted by others,⁵ Sacks has argued convincingly that the *Bibliothèque* forms a narratological unity containing a historical philosophy that is Diodorus' own. One of his arguments is that many episodes in the *Bibliothèque* share similar emplotments that emphasise this philosophy. In particular the two terms of ἐπιείκεια ('fairness', 'moderation') and φιλανθρωπία ('humanity', 'benevolence') occur frequently throughout the *Bibliothèque* and at places where Diodorus was supposedly copying from different sources. The terminology fits an analysis of the rise and fall of empires, where domination is won through moderation and benevolence and lost through harsh (βιαιώς) treatment. Sacks argues that this concentration on the relationship between ruler and subjects is quite different from the emphasis on luxury and decadence used to explain the fall of empire –especially the fall of the Roman Republic- in many of Diodorus' Hellenistic sources as well as by authors of the late Republic and early Empire.⁶

I will argue below that Diodorus' explanation of the two Sicilian Slave Revolts exemplifies his interest in the dynamics of ruler and ruled, but it should be admitted that any argument for the unity of the *Bibliothèque* suffers from the incompleteness of the manuscript. Diodorus promises in his introduction to

⁴ Catherine Rubincam, 'Did Diodorus Siculus take over cross-references from his sources?' *The American Journal of Philology* 119.1 (1998) 67-87 has at least put to rest the notion that Diodorus was a 'slavish copyist' by proving that he only rarely took over a cross-reference when it made no sense in his own narrative; François Chamoux, 'Un historien mal-aimé' *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé* (1990) 243-252 writes positively about Diodorus as 'un véritable historien' and commends his morality and erudite style. Cf. recently Wirth, *Katastrophe und Zukunftshoffnung*, esp. 16-17; Federico Santagenelo, 'Prediction and Divination in Diodorus' *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* (2007) 115-125.

⁵ Even though Sacks was preceded by P.A. Brunt, 'On historical fragments and epitomes' *The Classical Quarterly* 30.2. (1980) 477-494, esp. 478.

⁶ Sacks, *Diodorus Siculus*, chapter 2: 'Themes in historical Causality' and his depiction of the first slave revolt: 142-154. Cf. Kenneth S. Sacks, 'Diodorus and his Sources: Conformity and Creativity' in: S. Hornblower ed., *Greek historiography* (Oxford 1994) 213-232. A similar approach is taken by Wirth, *Katastrophe und Zukunftshoffnung* esp. 37-46, 63-73, 122-129 but he emphasises the theme of luxury and decadence as Diodorus' own.

present the reader with forty books, starting before the Trojan War and finishing in his own lifetime.⁷ Of these only books 1-5 and 11-20 have survived; the other books are either completely lost or have survived only in fragments in Byzantine compilations. Diodorus' treatment of the two Sicilian Slave Revolts, occupying large parts of books 34-36, has come down to us through the *Bibliothèque* of the Byzantine patriarch Photius, working in the second half of the ninth century AD, and the encyclopaedia ordered by the emperor Constantine XII Porphyrogenetos in the middle of the tenth century.

Photius' *Bibliothèque* is, much more so than Diodorus' work, a *Bibliothèque* in the literal sense of the word.⁸ Photius provided summaries of what he had read, of which the longer ones, including Diodorus' account of the slave revolts, tend to be more or less verbatim. Comparisons with surviving originals show that Photius' summaries are not reliable representations of the structure of the narratives, as his selection often left out important aspects of the original work.⁹ The quotes that Photius did select, however, are by and large trustworthy copies of the original, although he occasionally simplified language, which may have had the effect of sobering Diodorus' own wording.¹⁰ Constantine's *Excerpts* are certainly more colourful than Photius' version. This can, however, hardly be a good indication since different parts of Diodorus' account were selected and the excerpters were also more interested in the morality of his narrative. Constantine's interest in how one

⁷ D.S. 1.4.6-5.1.

⁸ On the title of Diodorus' work, see Wirth, *Katastrophe und Zukunftshoffnung* 12-13.

⁹ On Photius' selection: D. Mendels, 'Greek and Roman history in the *Bibliotheca* of Photius – a note' *Byzantion* 61 (1986) 196-206, 204 suggests that Photius was specifically interested in the two Sicilian slave revolts as they may have reminded him of similar events during his lifetime; Thomas Hägg, *Photios als Vermittler antiker Literatur. Untersuchungen zur Technik des Referierens und Exzerpierens in der Bibliothèque* (Uppsala 1975) 141 comments on his comparison between Plutarch's *Life of Pompey* and Photius' epitome: 'Wer Plutarchs Biographie nur durch Photius kannte, musste unbedingt an eine moralisierende, anekdotische, auf Kuriosa ausgerichtete Art der Biographie denken'.

¹⁰ Palm, *Über Sprache und Stil* 16-26 Hägg, *Photios als Vermittler* esp. 66-70, 97, 100 and Klaus Bringmann, 'Weltherrschaft und innere Krise Roms im Spiegel der Geschichtsschreibung des zweiten und ersten Jahrhunderts v. Chr.' *Antike und Abendland* 12.1 (1977) 28-49, 38-39, who considers that Photius simplified Poseidonius, and passes Diodorus by.

should rule an empire such as his could have meant that his compilers chose to emphasise this aspect of Diodorus' work.¹¹ Christian Mileta has proposed that references to the slaves' ἀπόνοια may also have been added by the excerpters.¹²

In the discussion of the slaves' motivation below we should therefore take into account that differences in the representation of the slaves' despair may originate either from Photius' sober reworking of the account, the compilers having left out such a colourful word, or from Constantine's specific interest in the ruler-ruled dynamic, the compilers adding general statements on the slaves' despair as an illustration. I will proceed from the assumption that both compilers worked with Diodorus' text¹³ and by contextualising the fragments in relation to the overarching themes of the whole *Bibliothēke*.

Diodorus and Poseidonius

Photius' and Constantine's preservation of Diodorus' account demonstrate at the very least that compiling is more than copying. This realisation is also relevant for assessing the use Diodorus made of his sources. Diodorus has been read as a copyist and large parts of his books 34-36 have appeared in collections of fragments of Poseidonius' work.¹⁴ That Diodorus used Poseidonius as his principal source in these books is without doubt. As we shall see, Athenaeus quotes Poseidonius in the *Deipnosophistae*, Book 12 regarding the Sicilian slave owner Damophilus in a fragment that fits very

¹¹ Urbainczyk, *Slave Revolts* 83-4.

¹² Christian Mileta, 'Verschwörung oder Eruption? Diodor und die byzantinischen Exzerptoren über den Ersten Sizilischen Sklavenkrieg' in: Christian-Friedrich Collatz ed., *Dissertationunculae criticae: Festschrift für Günther Christian Hansen* (Würzburg 1998) 133-154, esp. 139-142.

¹³ I do not agree with Mileta, 'Verschwörung oder Eruption?' that Constantine's excerpters worked from Photius' text. They give too much information that is not to be found in Photius' *Bibliothēke*.

¹⁴ Originally Jacoby, *FGrH* 87, but J. Malitz, *Die Historien des Poseidonius* (Munich 1983) is his most recent follower. Malitz incorporates fragments Jacoby did not; I.G. Kidd, *Posidonius II. The Commentary* (Cambridge 1988) 294-295 forms an exception. He comments on Athenaeus 12.542b, that 'this sentence forms the only secure link between Diodorus book 34 and Posidonius'.

well with Diodorus' depiction of the man in Constantine's *Excerpts*.¹⁵ The extent to which he depended on Poseidonius' *History* and the manner in which he used his work is, however, far from clear.

Diodorus himself says regarding his methodology that he has worked on his history for 30 years, spending this time travelling throughout Europe and Asia to see the major sites, and studying all the available literature in Rome.¹⁶ Diodorus therefore spent a considerable amount of time compiling a bibliography and can at least in that respect be considered a compiler.¹⁷ Indeed, Diodorus states it as one of the aims of the *Bibliothēke* to serve those students of history who are unable to collect and read all the available literature.¹⁸

The study of history, according to Diodorus, provides the reader with experience and knowledge into what is just and what is evil. By presenting him with past examples of successes and mistakes to emulate or avoid, history has the capacity to make the student more experienced than he really is.¹⁹ In other words, his *Bibliothēke* has a strong didactic element in that it should teach the reader how to live well. An example of this may be found in his account of the First Sicilian Slave War, in the version preserved in Constantine's *Excerpts*, where Diodorus generalises that 'not only in the public realm of power should those in authority treat those who are humble and lowly with consideration, but similarly in their private lives, if they are sensible (τοὺς εὖ φρονοῦντας), people should treat their slaves gently'.²⁰

¹⁵ Ath. 12.542b.

¹⁶ D.S. 1.4.1-5.

¹⁷ Note Fornara's critical remark (*Classical Philology* 384) on Sack's thesis: 'Diodorus did not pretend that he was not a compiler'. Of course that does not mean he was only a compiler.

¹⁸ D.S. 1.3.8.

¹⁹ D.S. 1.1.4-5.

²⁰ D.S. 34/35.2.33. Translators disagree on whether τοὺς εὖ φρονοῦντας refers to a new subject or not. A translation with two subjects is coherent with other uses of the phrase in the *Bibliothēke*. See D.S. 1.2.4; 26.1.1-3; 27.16.2. I thank Piotr Wozniczka at the University of Trier for bringing this to my attention.

It has already been noted that the relationship between ruler and ruled is a key theme in Diodorus' *Bibliothēke*. It is, however, also a special interest of Constantine.²¹ This kind of non-specific material is precisely the type of material that could have been added by his compilers, although the phrase τὸς εὖ φρονοῦντας reappears elsewhere in the *Bibliothēke*.²² If it was an addition, the compilers can at least be said to have much in common with Diodorus, who comes to similar conclusions in his investigation of other empires, such as Athens or Sparta. Could it, however, also have been derived from Poseidonius? The task that Diodorus set himself is not that different from the job that the Byzantine excerpters fulfilled. Diodorus notes that the present difficulty of learning from the past is that:

since both the dates of the events and the events themselves lie scattered about in numerous treatises and in diverse authors, the knowledge of them becomes difficult for the mind to encompass and for the memory to retain.²³

The didactic function of history as a store of experience is accomplished only if the student acquires an overall view of past events and developments, and it is for this reason that Diodorus has brought together all the available material in one narrative.²⁴ Part of his justification is that not only are there practical difficulties in acquiring all the existing histories, but also that these histories vary. As his universal history should be relevant for every possible use, it follows that Diodorus is interested in presenting a detailed yet easy to follow account of all important events.²⁵ Like any handbook, it should provide the reader with the state of the art rather than be a vehicle of one specific

²¹ Urbainczyk, *Slave Revolts* 84.

²² See D.S. 1.2.4; 26.1.1-3; 27.16.2.

²³ D.S. 1.3.4.

²⁴ D.S. 1.3.2: 'For although the profit which history affords its readers lies in its embracing a vast number and variety of circumstances, yet most writers have recorded no more than isolated wars waged by a single nation or a single state, and but few have undertaken, beginning with the earliest times and coming down to their own day, to record the events connected with all peoples (...)'.

²⁵ D.S. 1.3.8: 'For from such a treatise every man will be able readily to take what is of use for his special purpose, drawing as it were from a great fountain'; Cf. the discussion of Diodorus' aims by Drews, 'Diodorus and his sources' 383-5.

interpretation. But like any handbook writer, Diodorus also takes the trouble to demonstrate the common ground of all these various past events and their histories. In fact, the basic aim that one should be able to learn from the past assumes that such a common ground exists.

As argued by Sacks, the ruler-ruled dynamic is one such common ground and it is here that Diodorus' philosophy appears to differ significantly from that of Poseidonius.²⁶ It is not at all easy to decide what Poseidonius' philosophy exactly was, as his *History* survives only in the uses that later writers²⁷ put it to, but these fragments found in different places can give us some impression. We have encountered Poseidonius' ideas on slavery in chapter three, where I have discussed Athenaeus' quotation of his account of the submission of the Mariandynoi to the Heracleots.²⁸ Their voluntary enslavement should not be seen in terms of the theory of natural slavery as proposed by Aristotle, but rather as a 'social contract' in which the weaker party exchanged its labour for the protection of its stronger opponents.²⁹ The Heracleots for their part agreed to refrain from selling the Mariandynoi abroad, out of their own country. The weakness of the Mariandynoi should be seen in the light of a Stoic philosophy that emphasises intellectual inferiority and lack of self-control as moral slavery.³⁰ The theme of moral slavery also runs through Diodorus' account of the Sicilian slave revolt, but is more at the foreground in the one secure

²⁶ Pace Gerald G. Verbrugge, 'Narrative Pattern in Posidonius' "History"' *Historia* 24.2 (1975) 189-204, who discusses the two Sicilian slave revolts alongside Appian's and Plutarch's account of the Spartacus revolt and, following Strasburger, passages treating the rise and suppression of piracy in Appian's *Mithridatica*, Plutarch's *Pompey* and Strabo. Cf. Hermann Strasburger, 'Poseidonius on Problems of the Roman Empire' *The Journal of Roman Studies* 55 (1965) 40-53. The causes and phases of the revolts, as well as the 'episodic' nature of the accounts, are in his view very similar. Although I take his point that certain aspects of these revolts are stressed in all these accounts, especially the responsibility of the slave owners and the Roman rulers, this is not sufficient proof that all these accounts are derived from Poseidonius. The haphazard rise of the revolts can also be connected to the historical circumstances in which the uprisings came to fruition and not just to the narrative emplotment chosen by the author. The theme of greedy slave holders is furthermore not unique to Poseidonius. See also chapter five below, for the differences between Appian's and Plutarch's account of Spartacus' rebellion.

²⁷ Apart from Diodorus, Strabo and Athenaeus are the most important sources.

²⁸ Ath. 6.263.c-d.

²⁹ Garnsey, 'The Middle Stoics and Slavery' 171.

³⁰ Cf. 117-118.

fragment from Poseidonius' account. This fragment is to be found in Book 12 of Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae*, where he quotes Poseidonius on the role of the slave owner Damophilus in the First Slave War:

He was therefore a slave to luxury and vice, driving around the countryside in four-wheeled carts, with horses and handsome grooms and a retinue of parasites and lads dressed as soldiers swarming beside him. But later he, with his whole household, ended his life in a disgraceful fashion having been treated with the most extreme violence and insult by his slaves.³¹

As we shall see below, Damophilus' moral enslavement is a theme in Diodorus' account of the first slave revolt, and his addiction to luxury is symptomatic for the behaviour of the other slave masters on the island as well. This similarity might suggest the influence of Poseidonius, although the single fragment in Athenaeus, in a book on the theme of luxury, does not in itself suffice to prove that the *topos* of luxury and decadence formed Poseidonius' explanation for the outbreak of the slave revolt. Nevertheless, the prominence of the theme in other fragments found in Strabo and Athenaeus makes it likely.³²

More important for our estimation of the extent to which Poseidonius' philosophy influenced Diodorus, is the realisation that decadence as the cause for the fall of empires is a popular theme in much literature of the late Republic and early Empire.³³ Diodorus might have been influenced by Poseidonius, but he would not have needed him to alert him to that theme. Although it will be made clear below that luxury was indeed a theme of his narrative, it is not at the foreground of his narrative. Given the difficulty of

³¹ Ath. 12.542b.

³² Note also Sacks, *Diodorus Siculus* 145. 'Diodorus was following Poseidonius in tracing the cause of the revolt to social decay'; In his 'Diodorus and his Sources' 218-20 he claims that Diodorus minimises the theme of luxury in Poseidonius' original account in favour of his own model of the rise and fall of empires.

³³ Bringmann, 'Weltherrschaft und innere Krise Roms'; Wirth, *Katastrophe und Zukunftshoffnung* 42-43.

sketching Poseidonius' philosophy at all on the basis of indirect sources, Diodorus' engagement with a generally popular *topos* hardly provides sufficient reason to accuse him of mindlessly copying Poseidonius.

We should therefore, in relation to my interpretation of Pausanias' *Messenika*, look at how the theme of luxury fits with Diodorus' own analysis of the ruler-ruled dynamic. For Diodorus, the arrival of so many new slaves and the depravity of luxury-addicted landowners on Sicily is only part of the cause of the slave revolt. Diodorus' didactic aim is to show how slave owners, given this problem, should act towards their slaves. We have already seen that this is made explicit in the generalisation that 'not only in the public real of power should those in authority treat those who are humble and lowly with consideration, but similarly in their private lives, if they are sensible, people should treat their slaves gently'. This perspective compares well to Athenaeus' interests in book 6 of the *Deipnosophistae*. We have seen that the presence of new slaves, especially if they shared the same language, was considered an inevitable problem. The Chians were not only punished for introducing chattel slavery, but also had to be taught by Drimakos how to cope with this irreversible situation. His answer was to treat slaves like slaves.

The relationship between the moral slaves ruling Sicily and their legal slaves who refused to accept their domination sheds light on the question what a negative portrayal of the master class implies for the depiction of the rebellious slaves. In the next section I will investigate Diodorus' explanation for the causation of the revolts.

Decadence and Despair: Causes for the revolt

The First Slave Revolt: Photius' *Bibliothēke*

The first slave revolt, dating from 135 to 132 BC is connected by Diodorus, in both versions of his account, to the acquisition of large groups of new slaves. This is especially clear in Photius' version where it is stressed that the difficulties with the slaves began as a result of a period of prosperity in Sicily. He relates that in the 60 years after the destruction of Carthage,³⁴ the Sicilians had been happy in all aspects, and started using their recently acquired great wealth to buy large numbers of slaves, which however they neglected to treat well.³⁵ Diodorus draws attention to the fact that the slaves came directly from the slave markets and were immediately branded and sent to their respective jobs.³⁶ He adds that as they were given only the bare minimum for food and clothing, the slaves resorted to brigandage.

The slave masters were not deterred from ill-treating their slaves by either Roman attempts to suppress the bandits or by the danger of brigandage getting out of hand.³⁷ Nothing was done about the wrong-doing of the slaves or its cause, their ill-treatment. Diodorus complains that the Roman magistrates were powerless against the slave owners, as most of them were Roman *equites*, who, through their place in the juries had the power to find the governors guilty of any charges that were brought.³⁸ In this situation,

³⁴ Both in the First (264-241 B.C.) and the Second Punic War (218-201 B.C.), Sicily had been the stage of most of the fighting and had suffered accordingly. Diodorus refers to the end of the Second Punic War, even though Carthage was definitely destroyed only in 146 B.C.

³⁵ D.S. 34/35.2.1-2. See also M.I. Finley, *Ancient Sicily* (rev. ed. London 1979) 137-148 and K. Hopkins, 'Conquerors and Slaves. The impact of conquering an empire on the political economy of Italy' in: idem, *Conquerors and Slaves* (Cambridge 1978) 1-98 on the large influx of slaves and the effects on the political economy. Compare Joseph Vogt, *Ancient Slavery and the Ideal of Man* (translation by Thomas Wiedemann, Oxford 1974) 42-50.

³⁶ D.S. 34/35.2.1.; Wirth, *Katastrophe und Zukunftshoffnung* 124

³⁷ D.S. 34/35.2.3. See Hoben, *Terminologische Studien* 17-21 on the use of words connoting 'brigandage' in the literary accounts as an indication that the slave wars lacked certain attributes of regular war, such as, for example, a declaration of war. See also Thomas Grünewald, *Bandits in the Roman Empire. Myth and Reality* (translation by John Drinkwater, London and New York 2004) 58-9.

³⁸ It is remarkable that Diodorus mentions *equites* owning land in Sicily and influencing governors to leave the brigands alone. K. S. Sacks has pointed out in his discussion of the First

according to Photius' version, the slaves started to discuss revolt when they could no longer tolerate the ὕβρις of their masters.³⁹

Having stated the reasons for the large scale revolt, Diodorus follows by illustrating the arrogance and cruelty of the slave owners through the introduction of the key players in the revolt. He begins by introducing the rebel leader Eunus:

There was a certain Syrian slave, belonging to Antigenes of Enna; he was from Apamea by birth⁴⁰ and was a magician and a wonder-worker (ἄνθρωπος μάγος καὶ τερατουργὸς τὸν τρόπον). He claimed that he was able to predict future events from messages sent to him by the gods while he was asleep and because of his talent along these lines deceived many. Going on from there, he not only gave oracles by means of dreams, but also claimed that he was able to see the gods themselves and to learn from them about events that were to take place in the future.⁴¹ Of the many things that he reputedly saw in his visions, some actually, by chance (ἀπὸ τύχης), turned out to be true.⁴²

Diodorus makes it clear that he regards Eunus as a charlatan.⁴³ The successful predictions are attributed to luck (ἀπὸ τύχης) and the focus in this passage is

Slave War that Diodorus may have made them the main culprits of the story, yet says nothing concrete about them. At this point in history, however, the *equites* did not make up a significant part of the juries in Rome and it may also be doubted that they actually owned the majority of land in Sicily. To Sacks this is a sign that Diodorus had possibly introduced the Romans and the Italians as an addition to Poseidonius' original account. The negative account of Roman influence in Sicily is a constant theme in the *Histories*, especially when it concerns a lack of moderation in Rome's treatment of its subjects. Sacks, *Diodorus* 142-154, see also 42-54 and 120-121 and Gerald P. Verbrugghe, 'Sicily 210-70 BC: Livy, Cicero and Diodorus' *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 103 (1972) 535-559. Compare Keith R. Bradley, *Slavery and Rebellion in the Roman world, 140 B.C. – 70 B.C.* (Bloomington, Indianapolis and London 1989) 50 who argues that Diodorus exaggerates the poor servile conditions in view of the 'morality tale' he wanted to tell.

³⁹ D.S. 34/35.2.4.

⁴⁰ Malitz, *Poseidonios* 34-42 argues that Diodorus is copying Poseidonius. Although I argue that this cannot be proven, I do accept that Diodorus may have been reliant on Poseidonius for much of the information. In that respect it is interesting that Eunus is from Apamea, as this was also the birth town of Poseidonius.

⁴¹ Florus mentions the goddess Atargatis.

⁴² D.S. 34/35.2.5-6.

⁴³ Santangelo, 'Prediction and Divination' 123; W. Burkert, 'Signs, commands, and knowledge: ancient divination between enigma and epiphany' in: S.I. Johnston and P.T. Struck eds., *Mantikê. Studies in Ancient Divination* (Leiden and Boston 2005) 29-49, 47; Pace Jean-

on how Eunus managed to deceive people. Diodorus continues by pointing out that Eunus' fame grew because the predictions that did not occur were forgotten, whereas the things that did happen became famous. He then expands on the technique used by Eunus to pretend that he could spit fire.⁴⁴

Diodorus then discusses how Eunus' master Antigenes used his predictions as dinner table-amusements, and remarks that 'the whole thing was treated as a big joke'⁴⁵ The emphasis in this passage is on the improper treatment of Eunus by his master, who transgressed the proper rules of hierarchy by inviting Eunus to his table and treated as a joke a prophecy that actually turned out to be true. The criticism of Antigenes of course does not mean that Diodorus thought he should have taken the prediction serious. Rather, he blames him for not having taken the danger of such predictions seriously.⁴⁶ This danger becomes apparent when Diodorus points out Eunus' influence on the slaves of

Christian Dumont, *Servus. Rome et l'esclavage sous la République* (Paris 1987) 202, who argues that Photius decided to emphasise this factor. According to him, in Diodorus' original account the theme, though present, was compensated by the positive features of Eunus' character. Dumont's suggestion is taken over by Wirth, *Katastrophe und Zukunftshoffnung* 126.

⁴⁴ The fire-spitting has reminded some of the Jewish Messianic tradition. See in particular Peter Green, 'The First Sicilian Slave War' *Past & Present* 20 (Nov. 1961) 10-29 but note the reaction of W.G.G. Forrest and T.C.W. Stinton, 'The First Sicilian Slave War' *Past & Present* 22 (July 1962) 87-93. See also Vogt, *Ancient Slavery and the Ideal of Man* 67.

⁴⁵ Green, 'The First Sicilian Slave War' sees a parallel with Luke 23,42 and refers to R. Eisler, *Jesus Basileus II* (1930) 724.

⁴⁶ Franz Bömer, *Untersuchungen über die Religion der Sklaven in Griechenland und Rom III* (Stuttgart 1990) 96-102, esp. 99-100, notes that Syrian religion was not the cause of the revolt but a means by which it was fought; compare 165 on Aristonikus' war. See, however, P. Oliva, 'Die Charakterischen Züge der grossen Sklavenaufstände zur Zeit der Römischen Republik' (Darmstadt 1976) 237-253, first published in E.C. Welskopf ed., *Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte der Alten Welt II. Römisches Reich* (Berlin 1965) 75-88, 249 who makes clear that such an interpretation is also informed by modern day scepticism (especially in Marxist thought) concerning the supernatural. On the perceived danger of magic and the association of magic and revolution in ancient thought, see Richard Gordon, 'Imagining Greek and Roman Magic' in: Bengt Ankarloo and Stuart Clark eds., *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe. Ancient Greece and Rome* (Philadelphia 1999) 161-275. Derek Collins, 'Nature, Cause and Agency in Greek Magic' *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 133 (2003) 17-49 points out that the lingering acceptance of the possibility of divine intervention made it impossible to deny the possibility of magic. This leads to the conclusion that what is really problematic to magic, as opposed to divine intervention, is the practice of magic outside a civic context. On the importance of a civic context for religion: Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood, 'What is Polis Religion' and 'Further Aspects of Polis Religion' both reprinted in: R. Buxton, *Oxford Readings in Greek Religion* (Oxford 2000) 13-37 and 38-55 and Louise Bruit Zaidman and Pauline Schmitt Pantel, *Religion in the ancient Greek City* (translated by P. Cartledge, Cambridge 1992).

the farmer Damophilus.⁴⁷ Their motivation to rebel arises from the despair caused by Damophilus' bad treatment of them, but they execute the revolt only after Eunus had confirmed that the gods were favourable to their plans.⁴⁸

Damophilus appears as a depraved man in a similar fashion to Poseidonius' representation of him in Athenaeus' book 12,⁴⁹ but Diodorus' emphasis is less on Damophilus' decadence and more on his inhumane treatment of his slaves. Diodorus introduces him as:

A man of great wealth but insolent in manner (ὕπερήφανος δὲ τὸν τρόπον); he had abused his slaves to excess, and his wife Megallis even vied with her husband in punishing the slaves and in her general inhumanity (ἀπανθρωπίαν) towards them.⁵⁰

Damophilus' arrogance towards his slaves and his wife's inhumanity are aspects not found in Athenaeus' quotation of Poseidonius, whereas Damophilus' luxury does not form part of Diodorus' representation. He is far more interested in the effect that Damophilus' treatment of his slaves has on them, and explains that:

⁴⁷ Compare Vogt, *Slavery and the Ideal of Man* 63-64 on despair and (unrealistic) hope as universal themes: 'We know from the experiences of many people in our own times what the spiritual conditions of a prison camp are like, how willing people are to believe any tokens of hope for the future, and how ready they are to clutch at the slightest prospect of freedom'.

⁴⁸ This turned the revolt into a religious war, and makes a comparison with the Jewish Wars possible, on which I will expand in chapter 6. See: Vogt, *Ancient Slavery and the Ideal of Man* 65-69. See also: Green, 'The First Sicilian Slave War' and Forrest and Stinton, 'The First Sicilian Slave War'. Georg Luck, 'Witches and Sorcerers in Classical Literature' in: Bengt Ankarloo and Stuart Clark eds., *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe. Ancient Greece and Rome* (Philadelphia 1999) 93-158, esp. 104-106, on the attraction of magic and religion: 'the sorcerer can be a priestlike figure, a theurgist in the Neoplatonist style, or, more likely, a charlatan. But he deals with a clientele whose predominant emotions are hope and fear'. On the distinction between magic and religion see H.S. Versnel, 'Some reflections on the relationship magic-religion' *Numen* 38.2 (1991) 177-197. He proposes to define magic not by opposing it to religion, but by opposing it to non-magic.

⁴⁹ Ath. 12.542b: 'He was therefore a slave to luxury and vice, driving around the countryside in four-wheeled carts, with horses and handsome grooms and a retinue of parasites and lads dressed as soldiers swarming beside him. But later he, with his whole household, ended his life in a disgraceful fashion having been treated with the most extreme violence and insult by his slaves.'

⁵⁰ D.S. 34/35.2.10.

The slaves, reduced by this degrading treatment to the level of beasts (ἀποθηριωθέντες), conspired to revolt and murder their masters.⁵¹

This resolve they put into action after Eunus had confirmed that the gods were in favour of their plans.⁵² The factors leading to the revolt, as far as we can tell from Photius' version of Diodorus, are the arrival of many new slaves (who, as is clear from them having to be branded, had previously been free men) and their masters' bad treatment of them. Both their masters' cruelty and the necessity to resort to brigandage to provide for their livelihood soon made Sicily into an explosive situation.⁵³ Eunus was able to work his magic on the desperate slaves as his master further encouraged him in his trickery. The focus in these fragments is therefore on the relationship between masters and slaves, where the masters are shown to be too arrogant to realise the dangers of ill-treatment.

The First Slave Revolt: Constantine's *Excerpts*

How do the fragments preserved in Constantine *Excerpts* compare to this? As in Photius' *Bibliothēke*, the uprisings are connected to Sicily's prosperity in the sixty years preceding the revolt. Diodorus remarks that:

Because of the superabundant prosperity of those who exploited the products of this mighty island, nearly all who had risen in wealth adopted first a luxurious mode of living (τρυφήν), then arrogance and insolence (ὑπερηφάνιαν καὶ ὕβριν).⁵⁴

We have already come across *arrogance* and *hybris* as *topoi* in Photius' version of Diodorus, but the theme of luxury was not prominent there. Throughout the fragments preserved in Constantine's *Excerpts* the depravity of the slave

⁵¹ D.S. 34/35.2.10.

⁵² Hoben, *Terminologische Studien*, 32, 41-42 argues that Diodorus follows a model common to most rebellions.

⁵³ Hoben, *Terminologische Studien* 54: 'Der erste Sklavenkrieg erscheint als die über das Ziel hinauschießende Fortsetzung einer von den Sklavenhaltern geförderten Entwicklung'.

⁵⁴ D.S. 34/35.2.26.

owners receives attention. Diodorus explains that the Sicilians had acquired much wealth and were now 'rivalling the Italians in their arrogance, greed and villainy (ὑπερηφάνιας τε καὶ πλεονεξίας καὶ κακουργίας)'.⁵⁵ Damophilus is depicted as a prime example of these vices. Diodorus is here evidently writing with Poseidonius in hand as he repeats almost verbatim Poseidonius' depiction of him as a slave to luxury.⁵⁶ But he continues by describing Damophilus' lavish dinners, comparing his love of luxury with that of the Persians.⁵⁷ Here too, luxury (τρυφή) goes hand in hand with arrogance (ὑπερηφάνια) and the relationship of these is explained in relation to Damophilus' character:

His uneducated and boorish nature, in fact, being set in possession of irresponsible power and in control of a vast fortune, first of all engendered satiety (κόρον), then overweening pride (ὑβρίν), and, at last, destruction for him and great calamities for his country.⁵⁸

That Damophilus merely exemplifies the bad treatment meted out by most slave owners on the island becomes clear as Diodorus explains that Damophilus acquired many slaves who had formerly been free and had them branded, and that he sent them out as herdsman without their basic needs for food and clothing.⁵⁹ This specific complaint against Damophilus is very similar to the general comments made in Photius' version. Diodorus continues with an illustration of Damophilus and his wife's cruelty towards their slaves, in similar manner to the version found in Photius *Bibliothēke*,⁶⁰ and also arrives at a similar conclusion:

And because of the spiteful punishments received from them both, the slaves were filled with rage against their masters, and conceiving that they could

⁵⁵ D.S. 34/35.2.27.

⁵⁶ D.S. 34/35.2.34.

⁵⁷ D.S. 34/35.2.34-37.

⁵⁸ D.S. 34/35.2.35.

⁵⁹ D.S. 34/35.2.36.

⁶⁰ D.S. 34/35.2.10.

encounter nothing worse than their present misfortunes began to form conspiracies to revolt and to murder their masters.⁶¹

Although in this version of Diodorus the role of luxury and decadence is stressed in a more colourful depiction of Damophilus' depravity, the analysis that bad treatment of the slaves made them desperate and willing to risk revolt is the same in both versions. The lesson that slave-owners have to learn from this is made explicit in this version in *Constantine's Excerpts* as it is stressed that

not only in the public realm of power should those in authority treat those who are humble and lowly with consideration (ἐπιεικῶς). But similarly in their private lives, if they are sensible (εὖ φρονούντας), people should treat their slaves gently.⁶²

As said,⁶³ the general nature of this passage in *Constantine's Excerpts* makes it possible that it was added by the excerpters. Nevertheless, we have also seen that the theme of ruler-ruled dynamic pervades the whole *Bibliothèque*. The paragraph continues with this theme by specifying that arrogance (ὑπερηφάνια) and harshness (βαρύτης) in the households leads to slaves' plots against their masters, which on the level of the state quickly leads to *stasis*. ὑπερηφάνια as the guiding force of the slave masters and the cause of the slaves' despair runs through all fragments, both in Photius *Bibliothèque* and in *Constantine's Excerpts*. In addition, the vocabulary here has much in common with Diodorus' analysis of Athens' loss of power to Sparta,⁶⁴ and should therefore be considered Diodorus' own, even though we can understand how the passage was of interest to *Constantine's* compilers.

⁶¹ D.S. 34/35.2.37.

⁶² D.S. 34/35.2.33. See also: Bradley, *Slavery and Rebellion* 133-134.

⁶³ 126-7.

⁶⁴ Sacks, *Diodorus Siculus* 101-105; Drews, 'Diodorus and his sources' 386.

The Second Slave Revolt: Photius' *Bibliothēke*

A similar analysis runs through Diodorus' account of the Second Sicilian Slave Revolt (104-100 BC). Both versions show that peace had never properly returned to Sicily and the fragments indicate that Diodorus treated the resultant disturbances in some detail as precursors to the second slave war. The version preserved in Photios' *Bibliothēke* begins its account of the revolt by explaining that the governor of Sicily, Licinius Nerva, had started freeing hundreds of slaves after a decree had passed the Senate that decried the illegal enslavement of subjects of allied states, thereby inspiring hope for freedom in many others. After a few days however, Nerva stopped this policy, being urged to do this by the rich and powerful in Sicily.⁶⁵ As a consequence, the slaves who had gathered to apply for freedom began to revolt.⁶⁶ This opening to the account implies that some of the slaves had indeed been enslaved illegally, and were therefore fighting for a just cause, and in addition refers to the same problem that had inspired the first revolt, the problem of wealthy landowners being the only ones to reap the benefit from the newly acquired wealth and causing troubles for everyone else. In contrast to Diodorus' account of the First Sicilian Revolt, no mention is made of harsh treatment and undue cruelty that inspired the slaves to revolt. Instead, it is Nerva's reversal of the promise of freedom that stimulates them into action. Unlike the First Sicilian Slave War, this uprising is not fuelled by despair caused by ill-treatment. The slaves are not made to fight, they choose to.⁶⁷

⁶⁵ D.S. 36.3.3. See also Vogt, *Ancient Slavery and the Ideal of Man* who notes the government's weakness in the face of the illegal practices of slave-traders and owners. This focus on bad slave masters in Diodorus has led to an interpretation of slave revolts as isolated responses in places where slaves, especially those new to slavery, were densely concentrated and their living conditions aggravated by difficult local circumstances. Note the recent criticism of this approach (mainly found in Vogt and Bradley), which takes Diodorus' critical account at face value and displays an unwillingness to see larger motives, by Urbainczyk, *Slave Revolts in Antiquity* chapter 3.

⁶⁶ D.S. 36.3.3-4. Bradley, *Slavery and Rebellion* 68 interprets this as the main cause of the revolt: 'But when hopes of freedom were raised only to be dashed, the psychological impact on the victims of official inconsistency was disastrous. Licinius had clearly miscalculated his capacity to control the rising expectations of that element of the slave population that had only recently been subjected to slavery'.

⁶⁷ Compare Bradley, *Slavery and Rebellion* 81 who still argues that desperation must have been an important factor, as cruelty is an intrinsic part of Roman slavery. He may be right, but

Diodorus' criticism of Nerva is, however, similar to his criticism of the Roman governors during the First Sicilian Slave War. He makes it clear that Nerva was weak-hearted not only in accepting the bribes from the landowners, but also in the manner in which he conducted the campaigns against the slaves. His first action on discovering the strength of the slave rebels' stronghold was to bribe one Gaius Titinius Gadaeus, a bandit, to betray the slaves.⁶⁸ In comparison with Diodorus' account of the First Slave War, therefore, the slave owners' treatment of the slaves receives little attention and more is made of the Romans' inability to control the situation on Sicily.

This is made clear in the rest of the account as well. After the first uprising was quelled by means of Gadaeus' betrayal of the slaves, Nerva is blamed for not taking decisive enough action and thereby allowing the remaining rebels to grow in force.⁶⁹ Diodorus mentions that the rebels persuaded other slaves to revolt by calling Nerva a coward and although this remark may refer to the (over) confidence of the rebels, the successes Diodorus accounts to such propaganda also reflect badly on Nerva.⁷⁰ Further successes against one of his commanders make the rebels even bolder (θρασύτερον), and their boldness is contrasted by Diodorus to Roman cowardice. He relates how after the rebels chose one Salvius as their king and had made Morgantina into their stronghold, he managed to defeat the Romans simply by offering safety to whoever would throw down their weapons. The majority turned tail as typical cowards.⁷¹ Interestingly, the Romans use similar tactics when they promise their slaves freedom if they help in the defence against the rebels, but Diodorus adds that many of the slaves who had chosen to stay with their masters later revolted when they did not stay true to their promise.⁷²

Diodorus does not mention it in this instance. Diodorus is therefore much more positive on the slaves' agency than Bradley.

⁶⁸ D.S. 36.3.5.

⁶⁹ D.S. 36.4.1-2.

⁷⁰ D.S. 36.4.3.

⁷¹ D.S. 36.4.7.

⁷² D.S. 36.4.8.

In comparison with the two versions of the First Slave War, Photius' version of the Second Slave War therefore concentrates on the malfunctioning of Roman tactics rather than on the ill-treatment of slaves and their resultant despair. In the remainder of the account, as we shall see further below, interesting details are given about the two leaders of the revolt, Salvius and Athenion, and their relationship with their followers. The slaves' motivation and the causes of the revolt receive less attention.

Second Slave Revolt: Constantine's *Excerpts*

The version preserved in *Constantine's Excerpts*, however, differs to a great extent from the text preserved by Photius. These differences include the outline of the whole story and the inclusion of new material, as well as the image given of the rebels and their antagonists. In general, the situation Diodorus depicts in this version is one of general turmoil in which both slaves and the poorer free citizens resort to violence.

This situation exists 'both because there was no Roman rule to dispense justice to anyone and because many people simply usurped power, for which they were not answerable to anyone'.⁷³ With respect to the slaves, Diodorus says that

The rebels (ἀποστάται) had power over the open countryside and made the rural lands impassable, since they harboured deep and long-remembered hatreds for their masters (μνησικακοῦντες τοῖς δεσπότηαις) and were never satisfied with unexpected good fortune (δὲ τῶν ἀνελπίστων εὐτυχημάτων). What is more, the minds of the slaves who were still in the cities were becoming infected with the disease of rebellion (νοσοῦντες ταῖς ψυχαῖς καὶ μετεωριζόμενοι πρὸς ἀπόστασιν) and as they moved ever closer to open revolt, they became objects of great fear to their masters.⁷⁴

⁷³ D.S. 36.11.1-3.

⁷⁴ D.S. 36.11.3.

Nothing whatsoever is said about Nerva's freeing the slaves and then stopping, and no alternative reason for the revolt is given, other than the slaves' hatred for their masters and their susceptibility to becoming 'infected' (νοσοῦντες). Whereas in Photius' version the wealthy are held accountable for the uprisings in so far as they bribed Nerva to stop his policy and thereby caused widespread frustration among the slaves, here they are simply portrayed as the victims of violence both by the slaves and by the poor.⁷⁵

The theme of despair is therefore much more at the foreground of Diodorus' account of the First Slave Revolt than it is in both versions of the Second Slave Revolt. The same can be said about Diodorus' interest in the relationship between master and slave. In his account of the Second Slave Revolt, Diodorus seems to have been more interested in the Roman inability to end the chaos.

The fragmentary nature of the extant accounts means of course that we can never know whether Diodorus had addressed the ill-treatment of slaves by their masters and the slaves' despair. He may well have done so, since his mention of the slaves' hatred towards their masters certainly ties in with their need for revenge in the first revolt. The metaphor of disease suggests, however, some distancing from the idea that the slaves were solely motivated by the *hybris* they had endured from their masters. This would suggest that, although Diodorus offers some sort of understanding of the slaves' actions, he stops short of being sympathetic towards them. In the second half of this chapter, I will explore his view on the character of the slaves in comparison with Pausanias' depiction of the Messenians.

⁷⁵ D.S. 36. 3.3. Compare D.S. 36.11.2-3: 'Men who aforesaid had stood first in their cities in reputation and wealth, now through this unexpected turn of fortune were not only losing their property by violence at the hands of the fugitives, but were forced to put up with insolent treatment even from the free born'.

From despair to revolt: the Messenians and the Sicilian slaves

We have so far been able to conclude that Diodorus is highly critical towards the slave owners, like Pausanias towards the Spartans. Pausanias depicted the Spartan aggressors as being motivated by greed and as winning their victories by betrayal. Similarly, in Diodorus' account the Sicilian slave owners greedily acquire masses of new slaves without thinking of the justness of their actions and of the dangers they might bring. Diodorus emphasises that the slaves are new and suggests, at least in Photius' account of the Second Slave War, that their enslavement was unjust. We have also demonstrated that in his account of the First Slave War, *ἀπόνοια* is an important motivation for the slaves to rebel. Even though the emphasis on despair could have been due to the manner in which the accounts have been preserved, I have argued for its presence as a key *topos*, since it results from Diodorus' interest in the relationship between ruler and ruled. So far I have concentrated on his depiction of the rulers' part in causing the crisis, their harsh treatment in provoking the slaves' despair, but Diodorus also has a lot to say about the role of the slaves.

I have argued in chapter one that the combination of *τόλμη* and *ἀπόνοια* corresponds to loss of mind. I will not repeat my arguments there, but it may be useful to return briefly to the passage in which Pausanias introduces Aristomenes' revolt. We have seen that the Messenian rebellion starts when the young men (*νεώτεροι*) find it impossible to live under the rules that the Spartans had laid down for them.⁷⁶ Their identity as young men and their lack of experience with warfare suggests that their *τόλμη*, which is an incomplete sort of courage, corresponds to an incompleteness of mind.

The context of slavery in the two Sicilian Slave revolts complicates our comparison of Messenian despair with the despair of the slave rebels, since

⁷⁶ Paus. 4.14.6.

one aspect of ancient ideas of slavery was the insistence on slaves' insufficient λόγος. In chapter three I discussed Athenaeus' use of Plato's quotation from Homer that 'Far-seeing Zeus takes away half the understanding of men whom the day of slavery deposes' (ἡμῖσιν γὰρ τε νόου ἀπαμείρεται εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς ἀνδρῶν οὓς ἂν δὴ κατὰ δούλιον ἡμᾶρ ἔλησι) and compared it with Poseidonius' statement on the Mariandynoi that 'many persons who are unable to manage themselves, on account of the weakness of their intellect, give themselves voluntarily to the service of more intelligent men'.⁷⁷ In contrast to Poseidonius' assertion of the Mariandynoi's willing servitude, both in Plato's original text and in Athenaeus' use of it an express connection is made between the incomplete mind of slaves and the danger of their rebelling.

Diodorus, whose accounts of the two Sicilian Slave Revolts are influenced to some extent by Poseidonius, emphasises the degrading effects of the inhumane treatment of slaves.⁷⁸ We have seen that in Photius' version of the First Slave War the slaves started to discuss revolt when they could no longer bear the *hybris* of their masters and that, as a result of their treatment, Damophilus' slaves were ὦν ἀποθηριωθέντες (nearly made into beasts). Diodorus continues by describing how they acted as such in their attack on Enna:

When they found their way into the houses they shed much blood, sparing not even suckling babes. Rather they tore them from the breast and dashed them to the ground, while as for the women - and under their husbands' very eyes - but words cannot tell the extent of their outrages and acts of lewdness (ἐνύβριζόν τε καὶ ἐνησέλγαινον)!⁷⁹

⁷⁷ Ath. 6.263b. Cf. 107-108.

⁷⁸ See on this Malitz, *Poseidonios* 138-144 and 409-428.

⁷⁹ D.S. 34/35.2.10

The *hybris* of their masters has caused them to return that *hybris* in kind against them and their families.⁸⁰ Diodorus continues, however, by stating that the slaves spared Damophilus' daughter as she had always been kind to them. The slaves' consideration for Damophilus' kind daughter is used by Diodorus as evidence that savagery is not innate to slavery but caused by their hardships:

Thereby it was demonstrated that the others were treated as they were, not because of some natural savagery of slaves (οὐχὶ ὠμότης εἶναι φύσεως), but rather in revenge for wrongs previously received.⁸¹

His explicit denial that slaves are naturally savage suggests an active engagement with a debate on the nature of slaves, in which Diodorus takes the position that slaves may be rendered ὠμότης by their condition, if they are ill-treated. They are not enslaved because of their inferiority and slavery per se does not make them savage either.⁸²

Similar sentiments are found in Constantine's *Excerpts*. As we have seen, there is a greater emphasis on the slave owners' depravity than on their relationship with their slaves, but it is clear that the slaves are made desperate by their maltreatment. Diodorus' advice to slave owners to treat their slaves gently, since arrogance leads to *stasis* both in the household and in the state, is followed by another general statement, in which he explains the effects of their arrogance on the slaves:

⁸⁰ Karl Reinhardt, *Poseidonios I* (Hildesheim and New York 1976, reprint of Munich 1921) 31 discusses the slave leader Eunus as the embodiment of the degeneration of the slaves. He juxtaposes him to Damophilus as the symbol for greed and cruelty of the master class.

⁸¹ D.S. 34/35.2.13

⁸² On the effects of the slave uprisings on ideas on slavery, see Karl-Wilhelm Welwei, 'Das Sklavenproblem als politischer Faktor in der Krise der römischen Republik' in: Hans Mommsen and Winfried Schulze eds., *Vom Elend der Handarbeit. Probleme Historischer Unterschichtenforschung* (Stuttgart 1981) 50-69, esp. 52.

To the degree that power is perverted by cruelty and lawlessness (ὠμότητα καὶ παρανομίαν), to that same degree the characters of subject persons are made savage to the point of despair (πρὸς ἀπόνοιαν ἀποθηριούται).⁸³

The ἀπόνοια in this passage results from being treated harshly. If only masters would treat their slaves better, they would have less cause of despair. Even though it is possible that the compilers of this version of Diodorus' account placed specific emphasis on despair, the analysis is very similar to the version found in Photius' *Bibliothēke*. The same goes for the slaves' treatment of Damophilus' daughter. In Constantine's *Excerpts* somewhat more detail is given and the conclusion is reached that

Although the rebellious slaves were enraged against the whole household of their masters and resorted to unrelenting abuse and vengeance (ὕβριν καὶ τιμωρίαν), there were yet some indications that it was not from innate savagery (ὠμότητα φύσεως), but rather because of the arrogant treatment they had themselves received that they now ran amuck when they turned to avenge (προαδικησάντων) themselves on their persecutors. Even among slaves, human nature is capable of being its own teacher (αὐτοδίδακτός ἐστιν ἡ φύσις) in regard to a just repayment (δικαίαν ἀπόδοσιν), whether of gratitude or of revenge.⁸⁴

Again, the general nature of this moralising makes it a possible candidate for a Byzantine addition, but it is clear that the underlying sentiments in both accounts are that the slave masters were merely reaping what they had sown and that the slaves were not naturally wild but were made that way through the desperate circumstances in which they had to live.⁸⁵

⁸³ D.S. 34/35.2.33. See also: Bradley, *Slavery and Rebellion* 133-134.

⁸⁴ D.S. 34/35.2.40. See also the discussion by Sacks, *Diodorus Siculus* 36-41.

⁸⁵ Compare Hoben, *Terminologische Studien* 35. He notes that although Diodorus calls the slaves' activities κακόν at several places, the use of that word serves to separate their activities from the 'Terror' of the free. This is not quite convincing as Diodorus also says that the slaves commit *hybris*.

In both Photius' and Constantine's version of Diodorus the slaves' savagery is also tied to their existence as bandits. We have seen that Diodorus emphasises that they had to provide for their livelihood this way as their masters did not give them a minimum allowance of food and clothing. In Constantine's *Excerpts* we find a passage that goes beyond the explanation that their hardships led them to despair, and also illustrates how their existence of bandits/herdsmen taught the slaves to be daring:⁸⁶

Since the slave herdsmen were raised in the countryside and were armed like soldiers, naturally they were filled with high spirits and recklessness (φρονήματος καὶ θράσους). They brandished clubs, spears, and imposing herdsmen's staffs, and their bodies were covered in the hides of wolves and wild boars, so that they had a frightening appearance that was not far from the works of war itself.⁸⁷

The φρονήμα and θράσος of the slaves are aspects that they have acquired by being forced to become bandits in order to provide for their livelihood.⁸⁸ So not only have the slave masters brought their problems on themselves by causing the slaves to despair, but they have also positively encouraged them to use violence to provide for their livelihood. In Constantine's *Excerpts* we find Diodorus giving an example of this when he depicts Damophilus scolding a slave who requested clothes: 'What! Do those who travel through the country go naked? Do they not offer a ready source of supply for anyone

⁸⁶ Vogt, *Ancient Slavery and the Ideal of Man* 45 appears to take over Diodorus' sentiment: 'But robbery gave them a taste of freedom'.

⁸⁷ D.S. 34/35.2.29.

⁸⁸ Vogt, *Ancient Slavery and the Ideal of Man* 46-47 criticises Diodorus' moralistic approach in emphasizing the owners' bad treatment of their slaves as neglecting political elements and giving a slanted view of the island's economy. He points out that as the cultivation of cereals, vines and olives were the main sources of wealth, most slaves would have been working on the *latifundia* rather than using them as herdsmen. See also Oliva, 'Sklavenaufstände'. V.M. Scramuzza, 'Roman Sicily' in Tenney Frank ed., *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome* 3 (Baltimore 1937) 318 tries to join together Diodorus and Cicero by arguing that not all rebels were herders. On problems with Scramuzza's approach, see Verbrugge, 'Sicily 210-70 BC'. For my purpose it is more important to point out what Diodorus did comment upon than to remark on what he neglected to mention. In that respect the fact that Diodorus describes them as 'herdsmen' is interesting from a literary perspective as this aspect is important in the Roman conception of banditry. See Grünewald, *Bandits* 62.

who needs garments?'.⁸⁹ The combination of φρονήμα and θράσος in 34/35.2.29 and ἀπόνοια in 34/35.2.33 reminds us of Pausanias, *Messenikiaka*, in which he connects the Messenians' τόλμη and ἀπόνοια to their state of subjection. There is one important difference, however. We have seen that after their liberation the Messenians suffer moments of δειμα ἰσχυρὸν, but they have lost their desperation. The connection between slavery and ἀπόνοια/τόλμη is, however, not so straightforward before their enslavement. As discussed in more detail in chapter two, the Messenians were already governed by despair and daring before their subjection by the Spartans. The connection with slavery is present in that situation solely in the knowledge that the so-called First Messenian War will lead to enslavement. As we have seen, the Messenians' slavery is caused by fate, which is expressed by their behaviour before, during and after Spartan domination. In Diodorus' analysis of the first Sicilian Slave War, however, bad treatment in slavery causes θράσος and ἀπόνοια. This is in line with Diodorus' didactic aim and reminds us of Plato's use of Homer's argument that 'Far-seeing Zeus takes away half the understanding of men whom the day of slavery deposes', which we have discussed in chapter 3.⁹⁰

Diodorus' philosophy, which holds that slaves have no different φύσις and stresses the importance of external factors, partly solves the problem of comparing his depiction of the rebels with Pausanias' depiction of the Messenians. His insistence in his account of the First Sicilian War on the slaves' despair as resulting from the depravity of their owners (their moral slavery in Stoic terms) contrasts with the ἀπόνοια of the Messenians. Unlike Diodorus, Pausanias offers no justification for the Messenians' anger. Although he gives a bleak picture of the Spartans' greed leading to an unjust war, he also makes clear that the Messenians' anger predated the war and suggests that the young Messenians' enthusiasm in the war resulted from a lack of experience and realism. Although I would therefore not go so far as to

⁸⁹ DS 34/34.2.38.

⁹⁰ Ath. 6.264d-6.264f = Plato, *Laws* 776C-778A.

say that Diodorus has sympathy for the rebels, in comparison with his understanding for their position, at least in the First Sicilian War, the irony of Pausanias' depiction of the Messenians is drawn out even more clearly.

The picture is different with respect to Diodorus' depiction of the Second Slave War. Diodorus' depiction of the slaves' minds as being infected differs from his depiction of the slaves' *θρόσος* and *ἀπόνοια* in his account of the First Sicilian Slave Revolt in Diodorus 34/35.2.29.⁹¹ Whereas in the latter account it was clear that the slaves were not innately bound to rebel, in the former account rebellion is described as a growing infectious disease which affected an increasing number of slaves.⁹² Less sympathy is awarded to the slaves' reasons for hating their masters. Although in his account of the First Sicilian Slave Revolt, Diodorus had made it clear that the slaves were so badly treated that they had no alternative to revolt, in his account of the Second Revolt he blames the slaves for not being satisfied with whatever good fortune came their way. It is reminiscent of Pausanias' depiction of the young men from Andania who 'without experience of war but with a certain nobility of mind preferred to die free in their own country rather than to be slaves and be happy in other things'.⁹³ The emphasis in both narratives is on the mental weakness of the rebels.

Using that perspective, Diodorus' insistence on the lessons slave masters have to learn and the prominence of external influences on the slaves' characters in his narrative do not absolve the rebels of responsibility for their wrongdoing. Slave masters may be to blame for taking the slaves' obedience for granted, but the slaves are accountable for their lack of self control in such hardship.⁹⁴ In Pausanias' *Messenika* the rebels' weakness of mind was reflected in their

⁹¹ Bradley, *Slavery and Rebellion* 81.

⁹² Malitz, *Poseidonios* 140-1 notes that the theme of retribution in Diodorus' account stands in opposition to the description of the rebellion as a disease. Compare also Diodorus 34.2.19; 34.2.26; 34.2.43; 34.9; 36.5.1.

⁹³ Paus. 4.14.6-8.

⁹⁴ Malitz, *Poseidonios* 143 uses Diodorus' account solely as a source for Poseidonios, but he comes to similar conclusions concerning the didactic aims of the text.

leader Aristomenes who was able to entice many Messenians to share in his anger and hatred towards the Spartans, but who was unable to control his followers. In the final part of this chapter I will therefore focus on the slave leaders in Diodorus' account. How heroic are they and what effect did they have on their followers?

Leaders and Followers

We have already noted that Diodorus, in Photius' version, considered the slave leader of the First Slave War, Eunus, a charlatan. He remarks on his tricks and notes that his fame as a magician grew because only the predictions that came true were remembered, whereas the ones that did not were forgotten. Diodorus blames his master for not taking the dangers of such predictions seriously. But what does it say about the slaves that they believed in Eunus' power to foretell the future?

I will suggest in this section that the slaves' despair can also be recognized in their sensitivity to magic.⁹⁵ We have seen in chapter two that Pausanias places emphasis on the fact that the Messenians were fated to lose their fight and that Aristomenes was fully aware of this. They fight without a realistic hope for victory. Before king Aristocrates' betrayal of them, the Messenians' φρονήμα (high mindedness) makes them, unrealistically, believe that the tables might be turned, but they lost this hope as soon as the Arcadians left the battlefield.⁹⁶ The Messenians' presumption in fighting their destiny is a key motif that Pausanias repeats time and again in his narrative. Similarly, Diodorus' negative portrayal of the use of magic by the slave leaders underlines the slaves' willingness to believe in unrealistic promises. Diodorus' remarks on the rebel leaders' predictions suggest at several places in his account a negative valuation of their followers' lack of insight.

⁹⁵ See above, n. 46 on the association of magic and slavery.

⁹⁶ Paus. 4.17.8-9.

This is especially clear in the slaves' adherence to the leadership of Eunus. Diodorus makes it clear that Eunus was chosen as king not for his ἀνδρεία, but for his predictions, his role in instigating the revolt, and his name, which suggests εὐνοία (good will) towards his subjects.⁹⁷ He also died in a particularly unmanly (and unkingly) fashion, caught after a flight from the battlefield in the company of his cook, baker, bath masseur and entertainments master. Diodorus adds that 'his body was destroyed by a mass of lice as befits a man of his wickedness'.⁹⁸

Diodorus' emphasis on the presence of Eunus' cook, baker, bath masseur and entertainments master are symptomatic of his analysis of his character.⁹⁹ It is clear in the whole passage that he disapproves of Eunus' deceitful methods, and is stressed that Eunus was not chosen because of his ἀνδρεία or qualities as a military leader. In addition to that, the presence of these four servants, denote Eunus as decadent and luxury-loving. This emphasis on luxury is interesting, as the story of the First Slave War started out with an emphasis on Sicilian luxury as the cause of the revolt.¹⁰⁰ It is this luxury that resulted in the arrival of too many slaves who were not treated well.

The other slave leaders are depicted much more favourably. In the First Slave War, Eunus is joined by the bandit Cleon, who contrary to Eunus rushes out with a small group to meet his enemy and his death heroically.¹⁰¹ In Constantine's *Excerpts*, however, Cleon is also depicted as a Cilician, 'who was accustomed from childhood to a life of brigandage and had become in Sicily a

⁹⁷ D.S. 34/35.2.14.

⁹⁸ D.S. 34/35.2.22; Anton J.L. van Hooff, *From Autothanasia to Suicide: Self-killing in classical antiquity* (London and New York 1990) 85 comments: 'Rebels in particular deserve to expiate their infidelity by self-destruction'.

⁹⁹ Compare with Grünewald, *Bandits* 61, who argues that Eunus escaped being brandished a bandit, because 'he was simply transferred to another category, that of the degenerate Hellenistic monarch, which in Roman eyes was just as despicable as that of 'bandit'. Wirth, *Katastrophe und Zukunftshoffnung* 126 finds it difficult to come to grips with Diodorus' negative portrayal of Eunus in view of his (assumed) sympathy for the revolt and suggests that this might be an addition by Photius.

¹⁰⁰ Reinhardt, *Poseidonius* 31

¹⁰¹ D.S. 34/35.2.21; On the contrast: Urbainczyk, *Slave Revolts* 56.

herder of horses, constantly waylaid travellers and perpetrated murders of all kind'.¹⁰²

The similarity of Eunus and Cleon to the two leaders of the Second Slave War is in many respects striking, but Diodorus' valuation of their leadership skills and heroism differs significantly.¹⁰³ The Cilician Athenion, subordinated himself and his troops to the mantic flute player Salvius,¹⁰⁴ who, affecting the name Tryphon¹⁰⁵ had started to build up a Hellenistic monarchy. Brief remarks in both Photius' and Constantine's version of the First Slave War suggest that Eunus had done likewise, since we learn in Photius' account that Eunus 'called himself Antiochus and his horde of rebels Syrians' and in *Constantine's Excerpts* that he named one Achaeus as his royal counsellor.¹⁰⁶ Diodorus makes it clear that both Athenion and Salvius combined their skills in foretelling the future with sound strategy. Of Athenion, we are told that:

When he was chosen by these people to be king and had placed a diadem on his head, he conducted his rule in a manner that was the opposite of all the other rebels. He did not accept all slaves who went into revolt, but making the best of them into soldiers, he forced the others to remain at their former tasks and had each of them take care of their own household managerial tasks and work assignments; thus, Athenion was able to provide an abundance of supplies for his soldiers. He predicted that the gods had foretold to him, by means of the stars, that he would become king of all Sicily. It was therefore necessary for him

¹⁰² D.S. 34/35.2.43.

¹⁰³ Verbrugghe, 'Narrative Pattern in Posidonius' *History*' The similarities between these leaders and Eunus can be understood as literary motives that recur, but they can also be interpreted as actual similarities in the leadership-styles of these rebels. Salvius and Athenion may have had Eunus' uprising in mind when they were leading their revolts: Dumont, *Servus* 220. On the differences between the two wars, note also Hoben, *Terminologische Studien* 77-8 on Diodorus' use of ληστήριον. The term is used only once, in reference to the end of the first slave revolt and describes the revolt as an example of brigandage. Hoben analyses the isolated use of the term as a sign that Diodorus considered that the slave revolt, was at first respectable but had sunk to this level.

¹⁰⁴ D.S. 36.4.4.

¹⁰⁵ Vogt, *Ancient Slavery and the Ideal of Man* 42 suggests that Tryphon was named after the uprising of Diodorus Tryphon against Demetrius II in 145 BC. See Strabo 14.5.2.

¹⁰⁶ D.S. 34/35.2.24; D.S. 34/35.2.42.

to conserve the land and all the plants and animals on it, since they now belonged to him.¹⁰⁷

Athenion is described as a good strategist. He does not just entice other slaves to join in the revolt, but selects those that would be good soldiers, and assigns to the others tasks for which they are more suited. In this way he is depicted not just as a strategist, but also as a good king. Athenion already starts preparing for the period after the revolt in which he would be king of the island. Even though ultimately he was defeated by the Romans, for the time that his reign lasted his predictions resulted in good leadership.

Salvius¹⁰⁸ likewise may share in some characteristics that are typical for slave-leaders, especially his power to foretell the future, but more importantly he acts as a good commander in building a proper army with soldiers who are skilled in warfare and on whom he imposes suitable discipline. Diodorus explains how Salvius avoided cities as the sources of idleness (ἀργία) and insolence (τρυφή), divided his troops into three groups with three appointed commanders and sent them away into the country to supply themselves and come back fully prepared.¹⁰⁹ In his defeat of the Romans at Morgantina, Salvius makes the humane as well as strategically sound decision to offer the Romans safety in return for surrender, whereas the Roman soldiers are depicted as typical cowards seizing the opportunity to stay alive.¹¹⁰

Of the two leaders, Salvius/Tryphon does deserve some criticism. Diodorus notes that Athenion was obedient to Tryphon as a general is obedient to his king, but later on Tryphon suspected that he would turn against him and had him locked up, until the Romans sent in a large force to crush the rebels. Only then did Tryphon release him and was persuaded by him to fight the Romans

¹⁰⁷ D.S. 36.5.2-3.

¹⁰⁸ Note the similarity of his name to that of Eunus. Both refer to benevolence as the attribute of a king. See Grünwald, *Bandits* 61-3. and Dumont, *Servus* 220-221 on the stories of Eunus and Salvius as doublets.

¹⁰⁹ D.S. 36.4.4-5.

¹¹⁰ D.S. 36.4.7; Urbainczyk, *Slave Revolts* 44-5.

in an open battle.¹¹¹ The difference in the two leaders' behaviour in battle is reminiscent of the differences between Eunus and Cleon. Diodorus says that Athenion on his terrain was very successful and stopped fighting only when he was wounded in both knees and had received a third blow on top of that. Tryphon, however, lost against the Romans, turned and fled. He was saved only because the *praetor* neglected to pursue him.¹¹²

Athenion's heroic behaviour is emphasised by his heroic death two years later in a single combat against the Roman consul Aquillius, wounding him in the head before he was killed.¹¹³ Diodorus' depiction serves to glorify Aquillius' ἀνδρεία, but it is clear that he admires the consul's opponent.¹¹⁴ He ends his depiction of the Second Slave War by noting that 1000 slaves who were left had been brought to the arena to meet their punishment, but heroically refused to fight the beasts and killed each other before the last survivor killed himself.¹¹⁵

Diodorus' treatment of the rebel leaders is therefore ambiguous: he betrays some sympathy and admiration, but he is not altogether positive either. In relation to their predictions, he may accept that they lead to good government, but remains sceptical about the slaves' willingness to believe in them. Nowhere, except in the case of Eunus, does Diodorus explicitly remark that these predictions were only part of the respective leader's tactics, but his emphasis on their effects on the slave rebels does imply that conclusion. On Athenion, the leader he admired most, Diodorus comments that he decided to withdraw from Lilybaeum, stating that he had seen in the stars impending

¹¹¹ D.S. 36.8.1-2.

¹¹² D.S. 36.8.3-4.

¹¹³ D.S. 36.10.1. This was not a formal duel in S.P. Oakley's definition of single combat. He discusses the fight in 'Single Combat in the Roman Republic' *The Classical Quarterly* 35.2 (1985) 392-410, 397.

¹¹⁴ Urbainczyk, *Slave Revolts* 59.

¹¹⁵ D.S. 36.10.3. Urbainczyk, *Slave Revolts* 59-60 comments that Diodorus' depiction of their end as 'tragic', suggests his sympathy.

disaster should they continue their siege. When his troops were indeed attacked by Mauritian auxiliaries,

As a result the rebels marvelled (ἐθαύμαζον) at his prediction of the event by reading the stars.¹¹⁶

The episode continues from a section in which Diodorus had made clear how Athenion had come to power, stating that he had won the slaves over through 'having great skill in astrology' (τῆς ἀστρομαντικῆς πολλὴν ἔχων ἐμπειρίαν) and had implemented his rule by pretending (the verb used is προσποιέω) that the stars had foretold he would be king of Sicily. Diodorus' negative valuation of the ease with which Athenion deceives the rebels is admittedly less explicit than in the case of Eunos, but the combination of προσποιέω and θαύμαζω¹¹⁷ denotes not just Diodorus' own skeptical outlook with respect to the rebel leader's predictions, but also a low estimation of the slaves' trust in Athenion.¹¹⁸

Conclusion

Diodorus skepticism is similar to that of Pausanias. In both their narratives the use of ἀπρόνοια connotes senselessness, and this connotation is further strengthened by an emphasis on the rebels' willingness to believe in unrealistic hopes. The fragmentary nature of Photius' *Bibliothēke* and Constantine's *Excerpts* makes it difficult to decide just how prominent the theme of ἀπρόνοια was in Diodorus' original account, but its connection to Diodorus' interest in the relationship between ruler and ruled suggest that the analysis we find in the two Byzantine compilations is Diodorus' own. As the

¹¹⁶ D.S. 36.5.4.

¹¹⁷ Note also Collins, 'Nature, Cause, and Agency' 28 on the relation between θαύματα and magic and R. Gordon, 'Imagining Greek and Roman Magic' 168-172, who connects 'the marvellous' to power claims: 'the marvellous is the strange appropriated into a network of claims to power'.

¹¹⁸ Santangelo, 'Prediction and Divination' 123, n. 19 also notes that Diodorus' depiction of Athenion's astrological claims demonstrates a similar attitude to his more explicit criticism of Eunos.

analysis is compatible with Poseidonius' philosophy, but goes beyond it in its concentration of the treatment of slaves, it proves in my view that Diodorus had his own distinctive approach to master-slave relations and the causes of slave revolts.

It is therefore not surprising that Diodorus' treatment of the slaves' despair diverges from Pausanias' account of the Messenian revolt. Scholars have concluded regarding both writers that their critical attitude towards the rulers implied admiration and understanding for the ruled. Regarding neither of the two authors, however, is this conclusion correct. Diodorus shows understanding of the slaves' despair: he explains how bad treatment may lead to revolt and advises slave holders to treat their slaves well. This understanding is not always at the foreground of his narrative, since on a number of occasions he appears more interested in the savagery of the slaves than in the cruelty of the masters, and in his account of the second slave revolt he talks about the rebels as being 'infected with the disease of rebellion'. It is, however, a recurring motif that in his view slaves are made inferior by ill-treatment. This analysis stops short of being sympathetic. The slaves' despair is understandable; it is not heroic.

Nevertheless, for all its ambiguity in relation to the slaves' savagery and their willingness to believe in unrealistic predictions, Diodorus' account is still more positive regarding the slaves, than is Pausanias' account of the Messenians. Both accounts share a similar criticism of the ruled, but in Pausanias' case the Spartans' treatment of the Messenians does not explain the Messenians' anger and despair. The comparison of both accounts therefore strengthens my argument that Pausanias' depiction of the Messenian revolt is ironic.

CHAPTER FIVE
DESPAIR AND DEATH DEFIANCE: ON ἈΠΟΝΟΙΑ AND
ΦΡΟΝΗΜΑ IN APPIAN'S AND PLUTARCH'S
SPARTACUS

We have seen in the previous chapter that Diodorus' use of ἀπόνοια and his criticism of the slave owners are in many ways similar to Pausanias' depiction of the Messenians' despair and his critical attitude towards the Spartans. In both cases I have argued that their critical stance towards one party does not easily translate into sympathy for their opponents.

Both authors have only recently been recognised as having an agenda and style of their own beyond their role in selecting and using material from other authors. My conclusions are based on an attempt to remedy this situation by researching the plot and choice of words of their accounts and how these fit in with the narratological framework of their work as a whole. To evaluate Pausanias' work as a historian it is, however, also necessary to place his representation of the Messenians in the context of ideas on courage, rebellion, resistance and slavery current in his own time. I noted in chapter two that although Pausanias' vocabulary is reminiscent of Herodotus and Thucydides, courage is a dynamic concept. Different types of warfare demand different types of courage. A balance still had to be found between daring and security, but it could be argued that the looser structure of the Roman legion as opposed to the phalanx stimulated a more individual and daring courage. The extent to which this may have influenced Pausanias' valuation of daring is the subject of the next two chapters.

The changed nature of warfare is apparent in Plutarch's and Appian's account of Spartacus' rebellion, which both emphasise the strategic manoeuvring and leadership of Spartacus and his various Roman opponents, specifically

Crassus. They both also pay attention to Spartacus' final battle, in which he died heroically in an attempt to personally engage Crassus. Chapter six, on Josephus' *Jewish War*, will demonstrate a similar interest in strategy as well as single combat and heroic death. In both this and the next chapter I will suggest that since warfare in these authors' era required a more daring kind of courage, τόλμη still remained an ambiguous word but could also be used in a positive sense.

Appian and Plutarch share with Pausanias the circumstances of being Greek-speaking authors in the Roman Empire in the second century AD. The already noted fact that Plutarch wrote a *Life of Aristomenes* indicates that he also shared with Pausanias certain specific interests in the Greek past. On Plutarch's attitude towards Greek history and Roman domination much has already been written and the comparison with Pausanias has received attention as well.¹ It will therefore be useful to contrast his glowing depiction of Spartacus with Pausanias' more critical account of Aristomenes. The importance of looking at the authorial agenda need not be argued in Plutarch's case. It has often enough been recognised that his digression on Spartacus in the *Lives of Nicias and Crassus* should be interpreted in the context of his representation of Crassus,² and I believe that Crassus' juxtaposition to Nicias is also important.

In Appian's case, the context of his account of the revolt consists of his account of Rome's Civil Wars and follows his account of Pompey's exploits against Sertorius and Perpenna. Like Plutarch, Appian ends his account of Spartacus' rebellion with remarks on the rivalry between Pompey and Crassus. Throughout his corpus, Appian emphasises the virtues and weaknesses that brought Rome their victories as well as their defeats. Although this serves on the whole to illustrate Rome's superiority, Appian also recognises the virtues

¹ Jeremy McInerney, '“Do you see what I see?” Plutarch and Pausanias at Delphi' in: Lukas de Blois, Jeroen Bons, Ton Kessels and Dirk M. Schenkeveld eds., *The Statesman in Plutarch's Work. Proceedings of the International Conference of the International Plutarch Society, Nijmegen/ Castle Hernen, May 1-5, 2002* (Leiden and Boston 2004) 43-55.

² See most recently Urbainczyk, *Slave Revolts in Antiquity* 67-71 with further references.

and weaknesses of the peoples subdued by the Roman forces.³ This is interesting in comparison with Pausanias as Appian uses the words *τόλμη* and *ἀπόνουα* both in positive and negative terms with reference to both Romans and their enemies.⁴ His nuanced use of these terms throws light on the various connotations attached to these terms.

Spartacus' *virtus* and gladiatorial despair

The threat Spartacus posed to the Republic was viewed with a mixture of admiration and disgust. The current opinion, based on Stampacchia's groundbreaking work, has it that there are two traditions on Spartacus: a favourable one deriving from Sallust, whose fragmentary remains of his account suggest an extensive and positive depiction of him, and a hostile tradition derived from the similarly no longer extant account of Livy.⁵ Livy's attitude may possibly be recognised in Florus: to him the difficult suppression of the rebellion was such a disgrace that he expressed shame in having to name the rebellious gladiators 'enemies' and their revolt a proper 'war'.⁶

In a recent book on slave revolts, Theresa Urbainczyk suggests that the danger posed by the rebels is central to the representation of their leader. The very

³ Martin Hose, *Die Historiker im Imperium Romanum von Florus bis Cassius Dio* (Stuttgart, Leipzig 1994) 250-253; T. Hidber, 'Appian' in: Irene de Jong, Rene Nünlist and Angus Bowie eds., *Narrators, Narratees and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative* Vol. 1 (Leiden and Boston 2004) 175-185, 181.

⁴ Bernhard Goldmann, *Einheitlichkeit und Eigenständigkeit der Historia Romana des Appian* (Hildesheim 1988) 8, 15 and 52 on *τόλμη* as a characteristic of Caesar and Scipio the Younger and 56-60 on *ἀπόνουα*. Cf. Barbara Kuhn-Chen, *Geschichtskonzeptionen griechischer Historiker im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert n. Chr. Untersuchungen zu den Werken von Appian, Cassius Dio und Herodian* (Frankfurt am Main 2002) 56-58.

⁵ G. Stampacchia, *La Tradizione della guerra di Spartaco da Sallustio a Orosio* (Pisa 1976). See, however, the criticism on this thesis by Klaus Meister, 'Der Sklavenaufstand des Spartakus: kritische Anmerkungen zu einer neuen Deutung' in: Hans Jörg Kalcyk, Brigitte Gallath and Andreas Graeber eds., *Studien zur alten Geschichte. Siegfried Lauffer zum 70. Geburtstag am 4. August 1981 dargebracht von Freunden, Kollegen und Schülern* Vol 2. (Rome 1986) 633-656.

⁶ Florus 2.8.20.12: 'our enemies, I am ashamed to give them this title' (-pudet dicere-hostes). Normally, slave rebels would be considered as *latroni*: Hoben, *Terminologische Studien* 18; H.T. Wallinga, 'Bellum Spartacium. Florus' text and Spartacus' objective' *Athenaeum* (1992) 25-43, esp 1 and 35, notes, however, that Florus also emphasises the 'Roman' organisation of Spartacus' army and suggests that his account may indicate actual, historical behaviour of Spartacus' troops.

idea that slaves were able to pose such a threat was, in view of the large number of slaves present in society, unacceptable.⁷ As Appian and Plutarch both at least imply through the contexts in which they placed their account, slaves could play a significant part in the outcomes of the various struggles and competitions taking place towards the end of the Republic. Urbainczyk suggests that the emphasis on Spartacus' leadership in both accounts is meant to distract from this danger. The danger was neutralised as the success of the revolt was blamed on one exceptional individual.⁸

Urbainczyk's theory is based on an evaluation of the two accounts as historical sources not only of the events of the early 1st century BC, but also of the contemporary attitude towards the rebels. This is not without good reason, as the differences in the accounts of Appian and Plutarch have often been explained by reference to the sources these authors presumably used.⁹ For that reason, and also because they happen to be the two largest extant depictions of the revolts, they have been considered representative of the positive Sallustian and negative Livian tradition on Spartacus. Although it is true that Appian's account shares similarities with Florus' that strengthens the assumption that both are to some extent derived from Livy,¹⁰ Appian's and Plutarch's depiction of Spartacus' heroism is at least equally dependent on their early imperial perception of courage and despair as on the late Republican fear for slave uprisings. It is in that respect relevant that both authors emphasise the fact that Spartacus' revolt was from the beginning a gladiatorial rebellion.

⁷ Urbainczyk, *Slave Revolts* 52, 74; Wiedemann, *Emperors and Gladiators* 27. See also on the role of slaves in the civil wars: Heinz Kühne, 'Zur Teilnahme von Sklaven und Freigelassenen and den Bürgerkriegen der Freien im 1. Jahrhundert v.u.z. im Rom' *Studii Clasice* 4 (1962) 189-209; Karl-Wilhelm Welwei, 'Das Sklavenproblem'.

⁸ The opposite argumentation is, however, also possible, as Spartacus symbolised this danger. Cf. Keith Bradley, *Slavery and Rebellion* 131.

⁹ The most extreme is perhaps Christo M. Danov, 'Einige beachtenswerte Wesenszüge des Spartakusaufstandes' *Antiquitas Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis* 598 (1983) 9-14, 10 who argues that Plutarch gives a shortened version of Sallust. Cf. Dumont, *Servus* 286-9. Gerald P. Verbrugge, 'Narrative Pattern' 201-203 names Posidonius as a source of both Plutarch and Appian.

¹⁰ H.T. Wallinga, "'Der famoseste Kerl'" Over Spartacus en zijn opstand' (Utrecht 1990).

Gladiators, both demonised and heroised, won glory through a display of violence: the more desperate their situation and the more daring their fighting, the more fame their performance gave them. A gladiator should be able to demonstrate that he despised pain and death.¹¹ The fact that Spartacus was a gladiator is therefore important in considering his courage and despair. This connection is made explicit by Florus, when he reports that the rebels fought *sine missione* in their final battle, 'as became those who were commanded by a gladiator'.¹² It is significant that he explains that the gladiators were fighting to their death, using terminology reminiscent of gladiatorial bouts in which the producer commands that none of the fighters may leave the arena alive.¹³

The ambivalent status of the gladiator, who was simultaneously supposed to be an infamous criminal as well as the subject of much admiration if he fought well and faced death courageously, is expressed in the gladiatorial oath, binding the gladiator 'to be burned, to be bound, to be slain by the sword'.¹⁴ Carlin Barton has remarked that it served to transform 'what had originally been an involuntary act to a voluntary one, and so at the very moment that he becomes a slave condemned to death, he becomes a free agent and a man with honour to uphold'.¹⁵ Paradoxically, the preparedness of the gladiator to

¹¹ Wiedemann, *Emperors and Gladiators* 34-35: 'instead of seeing a gladiatorial combat as a public display of killing, it might be useful to see it as a demonstration of the power to overcome death'. Wiedemann builds on J. Vogt, 'Der sterbende Sklave. Vorbild menschlicher Vollendung' *Sklaverei und Humanität. Ergänzungsheft* (Wiesbaden 1983) 6-16; Carlin A. Barton, *The Sorrows of the Ancient Romans. The Gladiator and the Monster* (Princeton 1993) 31 appears to confuse death defiance for despair: 'The gladiator's struggle was required to be a desperate one in order to gain him honor. Desperation was the condition of his glory. But in that struggle, provided he fought *gladiatorio animo* with contempt of life and hope, of status and future, he could gain glory'.

¹² Florus. 2.8.20.14.

¹³ Barton, *The Sorrows of the Ancient Romans* 16-17 on the term *sine missione*.

¹⁴ Seneca, *Epistulae* 37.1-2; discussed by Wiedemann, *Emperors and Gladiators* 107-108; Barton, *The Sorrow of the Ancient Romans* 16-17.

¹⁵ Barton, *The Sorrows of the Ancient Romans* 14-15. Barton's book has been very critically reviewed by James Davidson, *Journal of Roman Studies* 84 (1994) 188-9 and Philip De Souza, *Classical Review* 44 (1994) 117-118, and I agree with them that its psychological approach is overly suggestive. However, her emphasis on the importance of voluntarism and preparedness in the gladiatorial fight is helpful in understanding the Stoics' admiration for the gladiators' defiance of death and bringing out the difference between death defiance and despair. She herself seems at times to confuse the two attitudes, see nt. 10.

endure pain and ultimately death symbolised the *virtus* that Roman soldiers should exhibit in battle.¹⁶ This exemplary function of the gladiatorial fights is referred to by Pliny, commending the shows that Trajan had organised in his *Panegyric* to him: ‘nothing spineless or flabby, nothing that would soften or break the manly spirit of the audience to noble wounds and to despise death, since even in the bodies of slaves and criminals the love of praise and desire for victory could be seen’.¹⁷ In Cicero’s *Tusculan Disputations* as well as in various places in Seneca’s corpus defiance of death and pain is stressed as a component of *fortitudo* and *virtus*.¹⁸ There is no better place to demonstrate these characteristics than in the arena. Precisely because the gladiators find themselves in such an extreme, denigrating situation, they regain the highest honour, when in the eyes of the audience they show exceptional bravery.¹⁹

The extremeness of the gladiator’s situation causes him to operate on the threshold of despair and defiance of death. As a consequence, Spartacus’ motivation is also intrinsically connected to his position as a gladiator. We have seen that Diodorus argued that the slaves were motivated by the despair caused by ill treatment. Their inability to endure the *hybris* of their masters any longer inspired them to take their radical step. In contrast, Appian and Plutarch emphasise that it was the shame of having to fight as gladiators which inspired Spartacus and his men.²⁰ Appian’s passing comment, that

¹⁶ Valerie Hope, ‘Fighting for identity: the funerary commemoration of Italian gladiators’ in: Alison E. Cooley ed., *The Epigraphic Landscape of Roman Italy* (London 2000) 93-113, 110 states it very explicitly: ‘A gladiator was a soldier. It was the gladiator’s military ability and his courage that made him a symbol of the Roman ideal of *virtus*’; Cf. Magnus Wistrand, *Entertainment and Violence in Ancient Rome. The Attitudes of Roman writers of the first century AD* (Göteborg 1992) 15; Donald G. Kyle, *Spectacles of Death in Ancient Rome* (London 1998) 80-7, esp. 81 where he compares the gladiatorial fight with the practice of *devotio*; Müller, ‘“Schauspiele 28.

¹⁷ Pliny, *Pan.* 33.1., cited and translated in Barton, *The Sorrows of the Ancient Romans*. [pgrref](#)

¹⁸ On Seneca in comparison with Cicero, see: Thomas Kroppen, *Mortis dolorisque contemptio. Athleten und Gladiatoren in Senecas philosophischem Konzept* (Hildesheim 2008) esp. chapter 6. Cf. P. Cagniard, ‘The philosopher and the gladiator’ *Classical World* 93.6 (2000) 607-618, esp. 614-7; Wistrand, *Entertainment and Violence* 18-19; Magnus Wistrand, ‘Violence and Entertainment in Seneca the Younger’ *Eranos* (1990) 31-46.

¹⁹ Kroppen, *Mortis dolorisque contemptio* 110.

²⁰ Wistrand, ‘Violence and Entertainment’ 33-34 comments on Seneca, *benef.* 34.3 that he implies ‘that the gladiator really is a *vir fortis* in opposition to a worthless slave that despises death out of rashness’.

Spartacus 'persuaded about seventy of his comrades to strike for their own freedom rather than for the amusement of spectators'²¹ suggests that the nature of their work was instrumental in their decision to revolt. This is further corroborated by Plutarch, who describes how the Gauls and Thracians owned by the gladiator school of Lentulus Batiatus were forced to fight as gladiators 'not for any crimes they had committed but because of the unjust behaviour of their owners'.²²

Plutarch, more so than Appian, combines his attribution of unfairness as a motive to revolt with a portrayal of both the slave leader Spartacus and his followers as undeserving of such fate. On Spartacus he writes:

The first of these was Spartacus, a Thracian from a nomadic birth, possessing not only great spirit (φρόνημα μέγα) and bodily strength (ῥώμην), but also in intelligence (συνέσει) and gentleness (πραότητι) superior to his fortune and he was more Greek than his background might indicate.²³

By attributing Greekness to this man whom he believes comes from Thrace, Plutarch is giving Spartacus a great compliment.²⁴ He makes clear that in his view none of the gladiators had deserved their fate, but least of all Spartacus, who does not deserve to be a slave at all. This positive judgment on the rebels is emphasised in Plutarch's depiction of their behaviour in the first phase of the revolt as well. He explains how the gladiators took weapons from their enemies and exchanged these for their gladiatorial equipment and comments that 'they happily made the exchange, throwing away their gladiatorial armaments, which they viewed as dishonourable and barbaric'.²⁵

²¹ Appian, *The Civil Wars* 1.116.

²² Plutarch, *Life of Crassus* 8.1-2.

²³ Plutarch, *Life of Crassus* 8.2-3.

²⁴ Bradley, *Slavery and Rebellion* 92-93.

²⁵ Plutarch, *Life of Crassus* 9.1.

Spartacus' possession of φρόνημα is interesting in comparison with the young Messenians' high-mindedness discussed in chapter two. I have argued, *pace* Auberger that Pausanias uses the word in its ambivalent sense as an indication not so much of the nobility of the Messenian rebels but more of their presumption. But we have also seen that the quality of φρόνημα is not in itself purely negative. Like τόλμη, it is a multi-faceted word. Through the use of φρόνημα, Pausanias suggests that the Messenians have the right instinct to refuse to submit to the Spartans, but lack discipline and realism. In comparison with his insistence on the unjustness of the enslavement, it is interesting that Plutarch also complains that the slaves' owners had sold them to the gladiatorial school for no good reason. Spartacus' refusal to fight as a gladiator should therefore be seen in relation to his φρόνημα.

Spartacus' φρόνημα is offset in the passage above by his σύνεσις (sagacity) and πραότης (mildness, gentleness). The latter characteristic in particular is an important virtue in Plutarch's corpus.²⁶ In the case of the Messenians, however, τόλμη and φρόνημα featured so often in combination with ἀπόνεια that the irrationality of their revolt was brought to the fore. Plutarch's introduction of Spartacus contrasts sharply with this as he attributes characteristics to Spartacus which illustrate the nobility of his resolve, while emphasising that he possesses none of the arrogance and presumption that could also result from φρόνημα. This will become clear in a more detailed analysis of Plutarch's account and its similarities and differences with Appian's.

²⁶ Brad L. Cook, 'Plutarch's "many other" imitable events: Mor. 814B and the statesman's duty' in: Lukas de Blois, Jeroen Bons, Ton Kessels and Dirk M. Schenkeveld eds., *The Statesman in Plutarch's Work. Proceedings of the International Conference of the International Plutarch Society, Nijmegen/ Castle Hernen, May 1-5, 2002* (Leiden and Boston 2004) 200-210, 200, 205 and 210 nt 23 for further references. Cf. Duff, *Plutarch's Lives* 213, discussion of Plutarch, *On Lack of Anger*, on the relation of πραότης to ἀνδρεία; Manuel Tröster, *Themes, Character, and Politics in Plutarch's Life of Lucullus. The Construction of a Roman Aristocrat* (Stuttgart 2008) 34, 38-9 and 40-44 on πραότης as a marker of Greekness and H.M. Martin, 'The concept of prâotês in Plutarch's Lives' *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 3 (1996) 65-73.

Spartacus' strategy in Appian and Plutarch

Apart from the common theme of the slaves' desire to escape the shame of the arena, the accounts of Appian and Plutarch differ considerably. In this section I will briefly introduce some of the basic, factual differences before explaining how they result in different analyses of Spartacus' courage as a rebel leader.

It has been rightly remarked by Urbainczyk that Appian accords a larger part to Spartacus as a leader of the men in the beginning of the revolt. He explains that it was Spartacus who persuaded about 70 other gladiators to escape with him and furthermore names two commanders who are subordinated to him: Crixus and Oenomaus.²⁷ In contrast, Plutarch mentions the betrayal of an already existing plan, after which the slaves rush out. In his account, leaders were chosen only after the fugitives had found a stronghold.²⁸ On the next phase of the revolt, Plutarch gives more information. We learn from him that Spartacus' troops first repulsed the soldiers from Capua and then managed to invade the camp of the praetor Clodius by descending down an impossible precipice with the help of self-manufactured ladders. Spartacus then engages the army of the next praetor to come up against him, Publius Varinus, before defeating a third praetor, Cossinius, from whom he also took his lictors and his horse.²⁹ Appian only mentions briefly two praetors and emphasises that these came with 'forces picked up in haste and at random, for the Romans did not consider this a war as yet, but a raid, something like an outbreak of robbery'.³⁰ Hence, although he is keen to remark that the Romans underestimated the enemy, in comparison with Plutarch he appears unwilling to give Spartacus due recognition for his victories.

²⁷ Appian, *The Civil Wars* 1.116.

²⁸ Plutarch, *Life of Crassus* 8.2.

²⁹ Plutarch, *Life of Crassus* 9.5.

³⁰ Appian, *The Civil Wars* 1.116. Like Florus, nt 9 above, Appian refers to the usual procedure, where a slave revolt would be treated as a *latrocinium*. Hoben, *Terminologische Studien* 84-85 suggests that the depiction of Spartacus' revolt as a *bellum*, may have been caused by Crassus' propagandistic use of his victory. Even so, Crassus was not publicly congratulated for it with a triumph.

A second phase begins when the Senate decides that the danger posed by Spartacus deserved to be met by two consuls.³¹ This is mentioned in both accounts, but Spartacus' reaction to this news differs. In Plutarch we read that, although Spartacus had become 'great and formidable' (μέγας καὶ φοβερός),

he took a proper view of the situation (ἐφρόνει δὲ τὰ εἰκότα), and since he could not expect to overcome the Roman power, began to lead his army towards the Alps, thinking it necessary for them to cross the mountains and to go to their respective homes, some to Thrace, and some to Gaul.³²

This proper insight into his army's capabilities contrasts with his men's φρονήμα, who prevent him from executing this plan:

But his men were now strong in numbers and full of confidence (μέγα φρονοῦντες), and would not listen to him, but went ravaging over Italy.³³

Plutarch continues by saying that a German contingent 'was so insolent and bold' (ὑβρεὶ καὶ φρονήματι) that it had separated itself from Spartacus and was defeated by the consul Gellius.³⁴ Spartacus, after defeating the consul Lentulus, moved on towards the Alps, met and defeated the governor Cassius, but there is no further attempt to cross the Alps.³⁵

In Appian's account the defeat of the Germans takes place before Spartacus' attempt to escape over the Alps. The attempt is checked by one of the consuls, who is nevertheless defeated by Spartacus.³⁶ Appian continues by saying that

³¹ Appian and Plutarch suggest that the Senate's underestimation of their enemy caused them to act so slowly, but they were also constrained by the employment of troops in the third Mithridatic War. Cf. Welwei, 'Das Sklavenproblem' 56-57.

³² Plutarch, *Life of Crassus* 9.5.

³³ Plutarch, *Life of Crassus* 9.6.

³⁴ Plutarch, *Life of Crassus* 9.7.

³⁵ Plutarch, *Life of Crassus* 9.7.

³⁶ Appian, *The Civil Wars* 1.117.

Spartacus, having got rid of all excess baggage, marched to Rome.³⁷ Plutarch never mentions this plan, only commenting in a later phase of the war that Crassus feared it.³⁸ In a remark similar to Plutarch's comment that 'Spartacus took a proper view of the situation', Appian notes that Spartacus changed his opinion about attacking Rome when he judged that his army was not ready. He then retires to Thurii and starts preparing his army.³⁹

A third phase starts when Crassus is appointed to the command. Both accounts give the same information about how he stationed himself at Picenum and sent his legate Mummius to surround Spartacus. Against Crassus' commands, Mummius decides to engage Spartacus' troops and is defeated.⁴⁰ Both accounts also agree on how Crassus punished Mummius' army with decimation, although Plutarch says that 500 men who had run from the battle scene were decimated, while Appian is uncertain about whether the two legions of Mummius or the whole of Crassus' army met this punishment.⁴¹ Appian is also more informative on the effects of the decimation on Crassus' troops. In his account, Crassus marches against Spartacus and beats him brilliantly, after which he also manages to overtake the remainder of Spartacus' forces in their attempted flight to Sicily and walls them in.⁴² This differs considerably from Plutarch's account, which sees Spartacus initially succeeding in avoiding battle with Crassus on his way to Sicily. On arriving at the coast, however, Spartacus is betrayed by the Cilician pirates whom he had bribed to transport his troops over to the island. Spartacus takes position at Rhegium, where he is walled in by Crassus, but nevertheless manages to escape with about a third of his troops.⁴³

³⁷ Appian, *The Civil Wars* 1.117.

³⁸ Plutarch, *Life of Crassus* 11.1.

³⁹ Appian, *The Civil Wars* 1.117.

⁴⁰ Plutarch, *Life of Crassus* 10.1; Appian, *The Civil Wars* 1.118.

⁴¹ Plutarch, *Life of Crassus* 10.2-3; Appian, *The Civil Wars* 1.118.

⁴² Appian *The Civil Wars* 1.118.

⁴³ Plutarch, *Life of Crassus* 10.4-6.

In the final scenes of the war, both Appian and Plutarch emphasise Crassus' haste in securing his victory before the arrival of Pompey and Lucullus. Plutarch tells us that he had reason to be more confident after the slaughter of a group of defected rebels. Plutarch puts the initiative with him in sending out a detachment of 6000 to occupy a stronghold. On their discovery, Crassus had to come to their aid and fought a battle in which he killed 12,300 of Spartacus' troops. Plutarch comments that of those killed only two had wounds in their back.⁴⁴ In Appian's account Crassus reacts to an attempted break out and kills 12,000. Rather than emphasising the heroism of the defeated, he mentions that only three Romans were killed and seven wounded and connects this to the decimation that had improved the morale of Crassus' troops.⁴⁵ Appian continues with the suggestion that in view of Crassus' haste to end the revolt before the arrival of Pompey, Spartacus tried to come to terms with him.⁴⁶ When Crassus rejected this, Spartacus decided to risk a battle in order to break through Crassus' troops and escape to Brundisium. When this proved impossible as a result of Lucullus' arrival there, Spartacus 'despaired of everything (πάντων ἀπογνους) and brought his forces (...) to close quarters with Crassus'.⁴⁷ In a long and bloody battle he was killed, but not before he was severely wounded and no longer able to stand. In Plutarch, there is no mention of an attempt to come to terms. Spartacus is thwarted in his attempts to avoid battle by his own troops, who had become over confident after a minor victory. Plutarch has it that on seeing that his enemy received ever more reinforcements, Spartacus 'saw the necessity that was upon him (ὄρων τὴν ἀνάγκην) and drew up his whole army in order of battle'. Spartacus finds his death after a failed attempt to push towards Crassus himself and the defection of most of his companions.⁴⁸

⁴⁴ Plutarch, *Life of Crassus* 11.3.

⁴⁵ Appian, *The Civil Wars* 1.119: 'Spartacus tried to break through and make an incursion into the Samnite country, but Crassus slew about 6000 of his men in the morning and as many more towards the evening. Only three of the Roman army were killed and seven wounded, so great was the improvement in their moral inspired by the recent punishment'.

⁴⁶ Appian, *The Civil Wars* 1.120; Wallinga, '“Der famoseste Kerl” 13-18, refuting Vogt, *Ancient Slavery and the Ideal of Man* 81.

⁴⁷ Appian, *The Civil Wars* 1.120.

⁴⁸ Plutarch, *Life of Crassus* 11.4-5.

In comparison with the Messenians, it is interesting that Appian mentions Spartacus' ἀπόγνοια (despair)⁴⁹ in the final battle, whereas despair is absent in Plutarch's account of Spartacus' death. I will come back to this in the final part of this chapter. First, however, I will return to the theme of φρόνημα. It has become clear in this summary of Plutarch's account that it was a quality possessed not only by Spartacus but by his followers too. Plutarch's use of φρόνημα with reference to Spartacus' troops is, however, very different from his depiction of Spartacus and actually brings the leader in conflict with his men.

Leadership and φρόνημα

Before I consider the details of Appian's and Plutarch's representation of Spartacus, his followers and his enemies, it should be noted first that some of the differences between the two accounts mentioned above are caused by the fact that Plutarch's account is simply longer. Another reason is that both wrote in different genres and with different aims.⁵⁰ This is especially clear in their depiction of Spartacus' leadership skills. Plutarch is naturally more interested than Appian in the character of Spartacus and inclined to write positively about it, as he juxtaposes it to the character of Crassus.

⁴⁹ Not to mistaken for ἀπόνοια, Cf. below 175-6.

⁵⁰ On biography as a genre, see: Arnaldo Momigliano, *The development of Greek biography* (expanded edition, Cambridge Ma. and London 1993); Mark J. Edwards and Simon Swain eds., *Portraits. Biographical Representation in the Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire* (Oxford 1997). It is nevertheless important to recognise that biography was concerned with the individual in his social, political and religious context: Simon Swain, 'Biography and biographic in the Literature of the Roman Empire' in: Edwards and Swain eds., *Portraits* 1-37, 1. Similarly, historiography contains many 'biographic elements': Mark Edwards, 'Epilogue. Biography and the Biographic' in Edwards and Swain eds., *Portraits* 227-234, esp. 233 and Christopher Pelling, 'Biographical History: Cassius Dio on the early Principate' in Edwards and Swain eds., *Portraits* 117-144, esp. 138-9. Cf. specifically on Plutarch, D.A. Russell, 'On reading Plutarch's "Lives"' *Greece and Rome* 13.2 (1966) 139-154; and on the *Life of Crassus*: Christopher Pelling, 'Plutarch and Roman Politics' in: Barbara Scardigli eds., *Essays on Plutarch's Lives* (Oxford 1995) 319-356, esp. 322-3.

In my summary of both accounts I have noted that Appian appears to accord Spartacus a more important role than Plutarch in the beginning of the revolt. In his account Spartacus acts a leader before the gladiators escape, as he entices the others to join him in the revolt; whereas in Plutarch's version of the story the escape is more of a collective enterprise and Spartacus is chosen as a leader only later. During the revolt, Plutarch is more interested in Spartacus' leadership than is Appian, but he also notes the problems that Spartacus has in controlling his men. This is especially clear in the passage below that discusses the slaves' arrogance after their small victory against part of Crassus' army. We read that:

'This success was the ruin of Spartacus, for it filled his slaves (δραπέταις) with over-confidence (φρονήματος). They would no longer consent to avoid battle, and would not even obey their leaders, but surrounded them as soon as they began to march, with arms in their hands, and forced them to lead back through Lucania against the Romans, the very thing which Crassus also most desired'.⁵¹

This φρονήματος, translated here as over-confidence, of the slaves is Spartacus' major problem throughout the war. The use of the word δραπέταις for slaves is also significant, since it is a negative word for fugitive slaves. The word is never used in relation to Spartacus and underscores his superiority over his followers.⁵² There is a strong suggestion that Spartacus might have succeeded in bringing to slaves to safety and freedom, were it not for the high mindedness of his followers.⁵³ The Germans who had separated themselves from Spartacus' army and were defeated are depicted as ὕβρει καὶ φρονήματι.⁵⁴ The combination of these two words makes it explicit that their φρόνημα should be interpreted negatively.

⁵¹ Plutarch, *Life of Crassus* 11.4-5.

⁵² Hoben, *Terminologische Studien* 135.

⁵³ Karl Christ, *Krise und Untergang der römischen Republik* (Darmstadt 1987) 244.

⁵⁴ Plutarch, *Life of Crassus* 9.7.: 'Gellius, one of the consuls, fell suddenly upon the Germans, who were so insolent and bold (ὕβρει καὶ φρονήματι) as to separate themselves from the main body of Spartacus, and cut them to pieces.'

Avoiding battle, as we have seen, appears as Spartacus' key strategy in Plutarch's account.⁵⁵ Despite his successes, he maintained 'a proper view of the situation' (ἐφρόνει δὲ τὰ εἰκότα).⁵⁶ Unlike his followers, whose confidence results from their strong numbers, he does not become elated. And he maintains this 'proper view' after the final confrontation with Crassus had become inevitable. According to Plutarch, 'he saw the necessity that was upon him, and drew up his whole army in order of battle'.⁵⁷ Spartacus then dies in a particularly heroic fashion, demonstrating great courage, awareness of his imminent death, yet no despair:

In the first place, when his horse was brought to him, he drew his sword and, saying that if he won the day he would have many fine horses of the enemy's, but if he lost it he did not want any, he slew his horse. Then pushing his way towards Crassus himself through many flying weapons and wounded men, he did not indeed reach him, but slew two centurions who fell upon him together. Finally, after his companions had taken to flight, he stood alone, surrounded by a multitude of foes, and was still defending himself when he was cut down.⁵⁸

Spartacus' realism is therefore a key factor, making him appear as far superior to his followers.⁵⁹ In comparison with Diodorus' depiction of the slave leaders of the first and second Sicilian slave war it is perhaps significant that Plutarch mentions that Spartacus' wife was a *mantic*.⁶⁰ However, Spartacus' ability as a strategic commander is disconnected from his wife's prediction that he would have a great future. Whereas Athenion was making strategically sound decisions on the basis of the prophecy that he would be king, Spartacus made his on the basis of a realistic judgment that he will not be able to overpower the Romans. Another difference is that he is the only one of the four slave leaders who has a negative view on the future. The prophecy that he would

⁵⁵ Grünewald, *Bandits* 63-69.

⁵⁶ Plutarch, *Life of Crassus* 9.5.

⁵⁷ Plutarch, *Life of Crassus* 11.6.

⁵⁸ Plutarch, *Life of Crassus* 11.6.

⁵⁹ Grünewald, *Bandits* 64-69, although he also recognises Spartacus' realism in Appian's account. See also Oliva, 'Sklavenaufstände' 247.

⁶⁰ Plutarch, *Life of Crassus* 8.3.

become great and powerful and would have a good future does not cloud his judgment in military strategy.⁶¹ When he finally loses, this is blamed in part on the other rebels who did not share this realism, and in part on the fact that the Romans were, as Spartacus had acknowledged, simply stronger.

Note also how in the passage above he has been deserted by his men, who, only a few sentences before are depicted as so arrogant that they sabotage Spartacus' attempts to escape. This is similar to the Messenians' presumption in going into battle but not seeing all the necessary hardships through, as when they were betrayed by the Arcadians or when they had to guard the stronghold on Mt Eira in the rain. The difference between Spartacus and his followers, as well as between him and the Messenians, is therefore not a lack of φρονήμα, but the fact that his high mindedness does not cloud his judgment.

Aristomenes fights against the Spartans out of a desire to take revenge on them, and continues to do so even after the other Messenians realised that exile was the only way open for them and asked him to lead them there. Aristomenes, who knows full well that Messene cannot be saved, refuses this responsibility out of hate for the Spartans. This hatred is more important to him than his love for his people. Plutarch's Spartacus on the other hand is consistently occupied by finding a road to safety as he realises that he cannot hope to beat the Romans. It is clear that this is no sign of cowardice as he is fully prepared to face his death heroically.

This contrasts with Appian's Spartacus, who is much less concerned with his escape and more active in engaging in battle with the enemy. Even though he later thought better of this plan, Spartacus is shown to be a bold commander

⁶¹ This makes him different not only from the slave leaders in Diodorus' account, but also from Nicias, the subject of the parallel *Life* to Crassus', see below 173-5.

when he decides to march on Rome.⁶² His later idea to come to terms with Crassus bespeaks a more conservative approach, but even here Appian comments that Crassus' scornful rejection of this offer made Spartacus decide desperately to try to escape with his whole army through the Roman forces.⁶³ Appian depicts Spartacus as a dangerous enemy, a good strategist and a daring warrior. In these respects, he depicts Spartacus in similar terms to Crassus. Crassus too is quick and bold in his moves against the rebels. The effect of this juxtaposition of the Roman commander and the rebel leader is to illustrate the magnitude of Crassus' victory: through his recognition of Spartacus' as well as Crassus' qualities, Appian explains both why the war lasted so long and how it was won. This is in line with the whole of his corpus which explains the rise of the Roman Empire through the juxtaposition of Roman virtues with the virtues of the peoples they subjected.⁶⁴

Crassus and Spartacus are also alike in the way they command their troops. We have seen that according to Appian the morale of the Roman troops was improved as a consequence of their punishment. Using decimation, Crassus had terrorised his troops into action. Although we hear little about Spartacus' relation with his troops, Appian does suggest that Crassus and Spartacus share the same ruthlessness. Spartacus' execution of 300 Roman prisoners to honour Crixus' death may be seen in this light, but more interesting is his later crucifixion of a Roman prisoner in between the two camps. Appian specifies that this was done 'to show his own men what fate awaited them if they did not conquer'.⁶⁵ Spartacus is thus shown to deliberately make his troops more

⁶² Grünewald, *Bandits* 66 notes that while Florus blames Spartacus for the presumptuous plan and Plutarch does not mention the plan at all, Appian takes a position in the middle by referring to the plan, yet depicting Spartacus as cautious enough to recognise that the slaves did not have the means to go through with it.

⁶³ Appian, *The Civil Wars* 120: 'When his proposals were rejected with scorn he resolved to risk a battle (διακινδυνεύειν), and as his cavalry had arrived he made a dash with his whole army through the lines of the besieging force and pushed on to Brundisium with Crassus in pursuit'.

⁶⁴ Hose, *Die Historiker* 250-3, 342; Kuhn-Chen, *Geschichtskonzeptionen* 51-55, 125.

⁶⁵ Appian, *The Civil Wars* 1.117: 'Spartacus sacrificed 300 Roman prisoners to the shade of Crixus, and marched on Rome with 120,000 foot, having burned all his useless material, killed all his prisoners and butchered his pack-animals in order to expedite his movement'; 1.119: 'he

desperate and less willing to give in. There are more passages in Appian's *History* where enemies of Rome are dangerous because they are desperate and on the whole it seems to be his advice to Rome's leaders never to engage an already defeated but desperate army.⁶⁶

Plutarch's aim in his depiction of Spartacus is to strengthen his account of Crassus' *Life*. We have already seen that the Spartacus episode reflects the rivalry between Crassus and Pompey and Crassus' desire to win a military victory. This is also apparent in the closure of the episode where Plutarch remarks that 'although Crassus had been fortunate, had shown most excellent generalship, and had exposed his person to danger, nevertheless, his success did not fail to enhance the reputation of Pompey'. Pompey had arrived just after Crassus had defeated Spartacus in open battle and was just at the right place to mop up the remainder of Spartacus' army, allowing him to claim that he had ended the war. Plutarch ends this chapter in Crassus' *Life* by commenting that whereas Pompey celebrated his victory in Spain with a triumph, Crassus was only given an ovation as he had only defeated slaves.⁶⁷ Seen from this perspective, Plutarch's heroisation of Spartacus emphasises the greatness of Crassus' exploits and the unfairness of his not receiving due recognition. It serves to make Crassus' frustration understandable and explains why Crassus was so keen to drag Rome into his disastrous Parthian campaign, literally the finale of his *Life*.⁶⁸

also crucified a Roman prisoner in the space between the two armies to show his own men what fate awaited them if they did not conquer'.

⁶⁶ Goldmann, *Einheitlichkeit und Eigenständigkeit* 56-60 draws attention to the fact that ἀπό(γ)νοια can result in great power, but the underlying message of the passages he refers to in Appian is that a fight against desperate people should be avoided, and does not imply a positive judgment of the despair itself.

⁶⁷ Plutarch, *Life of Crassus* 11.7-8.

⁶⁸ See in particular Plutarch, *Life of Crassus* 14.4: 'Now Pompey did all this from an unbounded love of power; but to that ancient infirmity of Crassus, his avarice, there was now added a fresh and ardent passion, in view of the glorious exploits of Caesar, for trophies and triumphs. In these alone he thought himself inferior to Caesar, but superior in everything else. And his passion gave him no rest nor peace until it ended in an inglorious death and public calamities'; and 27.7: 'But he was lying on the ground by himself, enveloped in darkness, to the multitude an illustration of the ways of fortune, but to the wise an example of foolish ambition (ἀβουλίας καὶ φιλοτιμίας), which would not let him rest satisfied to be first and

But Plutarch's emphasis on Spartacus' qualities also serves another purpose. Plutarch's introduction of Spartacus attributes to the rebel leader not only the qualities that neutralise the negative aspects of φρονήμα, but also more importantly precisely the qualities that the two main protagonists of the book lack.⁶⁹ The *Lives of Nicias and Crassus* centralise the weaknesses of superstition (in Nicias' case) and ambition (Crassus).⁷⁰ In the campaign against Spartacus, Crassus sacrificed safety and security in order to have the sole honour of defeating Spartacus and not having to share it with Pompey.⁷¹ He got away with that risk, beating Spartacus in a closely contested battle, but failed because of the same eagerness in his campaign in Parthia.⁷² Nicias on the other hand is shown to be too hesitant and too willing to yield to bad portents. Plutarch concludes in his comparison of the two *Lives*,

Since one of them was wholly given to divination, and the other wholly neglected it, and both alike perished, it is hard to draw a safe conclusion from the premises; but failure from caution, going hand in hand with ancient and prevalent opinion, is more reasonable than lawlessness and obstinacy.⁷³

greatest among many myriads of men, but made him think, because he was judged inferior to two men only, that he lacked everything'.

⁶⁹ Pace Urbainczyk, *Slave Revolts in Antiquity* 69-70: 'In portraying Spartacus this way, Plutarch is continuing the negative portrayal of the Roman, since even a slave has more nobility of character than this Roman. There is no such negative contrast in the *Life of Nicias*'.

⁷⁰ See F.E. Brenck, *In Mist Apparelled. Religious themes in Plutarch's Moralia and Lives* (Leiden 1977) 41-45 on Nicias' superstition as a tragic flaw and Bradley, *Slavery and Rebellion* 136-137 on the Spartacus' episode as foreshadowing Crassus' defeat in the Parthian campaign due to his ambition.

⁷¹ See Plutarch's comment, *Synkrisis of the Lives of Nicias and Crassus* 3.2: 'I do not, indeed, commend Crassus, in the war with Spartacus for pressing forward into action with greater speed than safety, although it was natural for a man of his ambition to fear that Pompey would come and rob him of his glory, just as Mummius had robbed Metellus of Corinth'.

⁷² Both David Braund, 'Dionysiac Tragedy in Plutarch, Crassus' *The Classical Quarterly* 43.2 (1993) 468-474, esp 474 nt. 24 and A.V. Zadorojnyi, 'Tragedy and Epic in Plutarch's "Crassus"' *Hermes* 125.2 (1997) 169-182, esp 176 nt. 35 argue that Plutarch's emplotment of the *Life of Crassus* is along the lines of Euripides, *Bacchae*. In this context the Spartacus-episode functions also as a prelude to the Parthian disaster. Crassus, like Pentheus was the subject of Dionysus' wrath as Spartacus wife was a follower of his. Crassus faults are also Pentheus' faults.

⁷³ Plutarch, *Synkrisis of the Lives of Nicias and Crassus* 5.2

Nicias' susceptibility to divination and Crassus' lack of caution provide a context in which Spartacus' strategic wisdom as well as his spirit and strength appear all the more admirable. The combination of φρονήμα with σύνεσις (sagacity) and πραότης (mildness, gentleness), in addition to his ῥώμη (bodily strength), make him appear as a man who possesses a completeness of character that both Nicias and Crassus miss. As the word for strength is also a pun referring to Rome, Plutarch indicates that this Thracian slave combines both Roman and Greek qualities in a way that the key protagonists of this book cannot.⁷⁴

Death and Despair

One quality that Spartacus possesses in both accounts is his heroism in the face of death in the final confrontation with Crassus. Both Appian and Plutarch show him trying to circumvent this battle; in Plutarch's account through escaping, in Appian's through coming to terms with Crassus. But once the battle had become inevitable, both accounts show Spartacus defending himself to the very end in a courageous manner. In Appian's version, however, despair is at the forefront:

When Spartacus learned that Lucullus had just arrived in Brundisium from his victory over Mithridates he despaired of everything (πάντων ἀπογνους) and brought his forces, which were even then very numerous, to close quarters with Crassus. The battle was long and bloody, as might have been expected with so many thousands of desperate men (ἀπογνώσει τοσῶνδε μυριάδων).

In comparison to the Messenians' ἀπόνοια, it is interesting that Appian depicts the final battle as a desperate one through his use of the noun ἀπόγνοια, meaning despair, and the adjective απογνώσιμος, translated as desperate.⁷⁵ ἀπόγνοια is derived from the verb ἀπογιγνώσκω which conveys

⁷⁴ Urbainczyk, *Slave Revolts in Antiquity* 70 and nt 93 on 144-145. See also Grünewald, *Bandits* 65 and Pelling, 'Plutarch: Roman Heroes and Greek Culture' 200, 206 on the representation of Rome as a particularly bellicose city in the *Lives of Coriolanus and Marius*.

⁷⁵ See also Goldmann, *Einheitlichkeit und Eigenständigkeit* 56.

not only 'to despair' but also to 'give up a design (in despair)'.⁷⁶ Appian's use of the term corresponds to Plutarch's statement that Spartacus 'saw the necessity' (ὄρων τὴν ἀνάγκην) to make a stand,⁷⁷ as in both cases Spartacus clearly has no alternative but to draw up his forces and acts accordingly. Ἀπόγνοια has a somewhat different focus than ἀπόνοια, as the latter word has as its primary meaning 'loss of sense', and can be used not just in the expression of 'desperation' but also of 'madness' in a more general sense. Nevertheless, the combination of ἀπό and γιγνώσκω in ἀπόγνοια also implies a failure to observe and know a situation correctly. In that respect Appian's use of ἀπόγνοια contrasts sharply with Plutarch's use of ὄραω and φρονέω.⁷⁸

As Appian is also in other respects less positive on Spartacus' heroism than Plutarch, it is perhaps not so surprising that in his death too Plutarch's Spartacus' is more heroic than Appian's. Nevertheless, even in Appian's ambiguous account, Spartacus' despair leads to much more heroic behaviour than the despair of the Messenians in Pausanias' *Messenika*. It is significant in this respect that both authors made it clear that Spartacus had no other choice but to fight to the death. This naturally contrasts with the Messenians who, according to Pausanias, 'could have been happy in other things', if they accepted Spartan domination.

The extremity of the gladiator's situation causes him to operate on the threshold of despair and defiance of death. Plutarch's account of Spartacus' death, which emphasizes Spartacus' proper understanding of his situation,

⁷⁶ LSJ⁹, s.v.

⁷⁷ Plutarch, *Life of Crassus* 11.6.

⁷⁸ Van Hooff, *From Authonasia to suicide* 131: 'Despair is mainly ascribed to a defeated enemy and as such is noted with satisfaction by the observer, who can dwell at some length on horrible scenes of destruction'. According to Marlein van Raalte, 'More Philosophico: Political virtue and philosophy in Plutarch's *Lives*' in: Lukas de Blois, Jeroen Bons, Ton Kessels and Dirk M. Schenkeveld eds., *The Statesman in Plutarch's Work. Proceedings of the International Conference of the International Plutarch Society, Nijmegen/ Castle Hernen, May 1-5, 2002* Vol. 2 (Leiden and Boston 2005) 75-112, 87, Plutarch objects to the more fanatic Stoic examples of death defiance. Πραότης is the characteristic that can moderate this.

also demonstrates his contempt for death when Spartacus kills his horse and quips that he will not need one if he loses. Appian's Spartacus has crossed the threshold to despair, but still he dies fighting.

Conclusion

What implications does our study of the revolt of Spartacus have for our interpretation of Pausanias' book 4? Although there are occasions, especially at the beginning of the revolt where the Messenians' despair in combination with their daring brings them victories over the Spartan army, all in all their despair is connected more to their inability to face further hardships than to their willingness to die free in their own country. Their φρονήμα, although it refers to a certain noble instinct to refuse to be treated like slaves, also carries the connotation of arrogance and blindness.

This overconfidence of the Messenians corresponds to that of Spartacus' followers in Plutarch's account of his rebellion. Plutarch's use of the term in reference to both the rebels and their leader demonstrates the possibilities of employing it with both negative and positive connotations, and thereby serves as a warning not to interpret the same term too single-mindedly in Pausanias' account. Pausanias' depiction of the Messenians' daring and high-mindedness is neither straightforwardly positive nor negative. It is clear in Plutarch's introduction of Spartacus that his φρονήμα should be interpreted positively as the more ambiguous facets of the term are neutralised by other characteristics. This reinforces the importance of looking at τόλμη in Pausanias in the context of its frequent combination with ἀπόνοια as well as φρονήμα. Although τόλμη and φρονήμα are not inherently negative, together and especially when accompanied with ἀπόνοια, they emphasise the dangers of recklessness, overconfidence and despair.

In Appian's account of Spartacus' rebellion, in accordance with his analysis throughout his work, it is clear that the combination of these dangers can be lethal for the opponent. Spartacus' final battle is a desperate one, and although it is depicted in less positive terms than Plutarch's account of the same event, Appian emphasises that it is precisely this despair that makes the suppression of the slaves so difficult for the Romans. In Diodorus too we have seen that the growth of despair among a slave population is to be avoided if slave owners wish to value their safety. Such an analysis should not be considered a compliment to desperate rebels, even though it explains why some revolts are difficult to put down. This will be illustrated once more in the final comparative chapter, on Josephus' *Jewish Wars*.

CHAPTER SIX

STUBBORN SLAVES AND THEIR DARING LOVE OF LIBERTY IN FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS' *JEWISH WAR*

I have argued so far that Pausanias' use of *τόλμη* and *ἀπόνοια* with reference to the Messenians marks them out as rebels and implies a negative valuation of their struggle against Spartan domination. The lack of control inherent in the Messenians' display of desperate daring has been put into comparative perspective in chapters 3 to 5, treating various representations of slave revolts. The contrast drawn in chapter 3 between Aristomenes and Drimakos in Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae* focussed on the negative consequences for the Messenians of their anger towards the Spartans. The discussion in chapter 4 of Diodorus' account of the two Sicilian slave revolts demonstrated that sharp criticism of the master class does not automatically excuse their slaves' rebellion. In chapter 5 the similarities and differences between Appian's and Plutarch's depiction of Spartacus brought the multivariied meaning of the word *φρονήμα* to the fore. Plutarch's Spartacus distinguished himself from his followers, and from Appian's Spartacus, by having a clear view of his own situation and recognising the necessity of what had to be done.

These comparisons are interesting in view of the severity of the Spartans' treatment of the Messenians, emphasised by Pausanias at the outset of his account of the Messenian revolt. But although Pausanias made it clear that the Messenian youths were motivated by their subjugation to the position of slaves, the only other reference to the Messenians as slaves is an indirect statement that depicts the Spartans insulting the Messenians during the battle by calling them 'no freer than the helots'.¹ Throughout his account, Pausanias is careful to refer to the Messenians as Messenians. Pausanias' ambivalent depiction of the Messenians remains therefore a depiction of a Greek people.

¹ Paus. 4.8.2.

It will therefore be useful to use the comparative lens on the 'national' and 'civil' aspects of Aristomenes' war. Flavius Josephus' *The Jewish War* provides a good example of an account of national unrest for a number of reasons. He wrote as a Jew in imperial Rome about his own involvement with the war, and thus shared with Pausanias a common subjection to Rome. His closeness to the events he relates is an important difference from Pausanias, which will help to put Pausanias' attitude to Greek history into perspective.² One of the most interesting aspects of the comparison is, however, the similarities in vocabulary between the *Periegesis* and *The Jewish War*, in particular Josephus' regular use of *τόλμη* and *ἀπόνοια*. We will see that his use of these terms is much more explicitly rhetorical.³ For that reason, the negative connotation of the words is at the forefront, but the range of meanings attached to *τόλμη* and *ἀπόνοια* is also made clearer. In comparison with my discussion of Pausanias, I will concentrate on the combination of these two words with words relating to anger and presumption.

Josephus' involvement in the events he describes has resulted in an interpretation of his work as Flavian propaganda.⁴ In the *Jewish War* in particular he excuses the Jewish people by blaming the revolt, and especially its long duration, on the fanaticism of the zealots and the *sicarii*.⁵ He admits

² I join James S. McLaren, *Turbulent Times? Josephus and Scholarship on Judaea in the First Century CE* (Sheffield 1998) 189 and Mary Beard, 'The Triumph of Flavius Josephus' in: A.J. Boyle and W.J. Dominik, *Flavian Rome. Culture, Image, Text* (Leiden and Boston 2003) 543-558 in considering Josephus' closeness to be an asset to his importance as an historical source.

³ The rhetorical purpose of *The Jewish War* has long been recognised. See recently Steve Mason, 'Introduction' in: *Flavius Josephus, Life of Josephus* (translation and commentary by Steve Mason, Boston and Leiden 2003) xxvi-xli; Steve Mason, 'Figured speech and Irony in T. Flavius Josephus' in: Jonathan Edmonds, Steve Mason, James Rives ed., *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome* (Oxford 2005) 243-288.

⁴ The classic account is H. St John Thackeray, *Josephus. The Man and the Historian* (New York 1929). A recent reading of *The Jewish War* as propaganda: Beard, 'The triumph of Flavius Josephus', see esp. 556 and further references in n. 9. A critical overview of this scholarship is provided by McLaren, *Turbulent Times?* esp. chapter 5.

⁵ A very explicit expression of this theme is found in BJ 4.386-388: 'Every human ordinance was trampled under foot, every dictate of religion ridiculed by these men, who scoffed at the oracles of the prophets as impostor's fables. Yet those predictions of theirs contained much concerning virtue and vice, by the transgression of which the Zealots brought upon their country the fulfillment of the prophecies directed against it. For there was an ancient saying of

that more Jews, especially young men, were involved at the beginning of the revolt and his depiction of the Roman procurator Florus, who among other things misused the Temple's Treasury, shows that their grievances were to some extent legitimate even though their reaction was exaggerated. The emphasis in this part is, however, on the rebels' underestimation of Roman strength. In the revolt's second phase Josephus and other members of the Jewish nobility become involved. Josephus presents himself as a reluctant general, having serious misgivings about the Jewish chances against Roman superiority, but nonetheless forced by his loyalty towards his people to put up a strong defence. A turning point is Josephus' realisation that the Romans were not only stronger, but also had God's favour. After his surrender to Vespasian, the revolt had lost all its legitimacy and is carried out only by those fanatics who would not accept God's will and terrorise the innocent population into supporting them.⁶

The emphases on Roman strength and the irrationality of the rebels, as well as the bleak picture of the tyrant-rebels in the third phase of the revolt justify partly the reading of *The Jewish War* as resulting from the Flavian patronage Josephus enjoyed. The extent of the Flavians' involvement in the production of the book is, however, by necessity the subject of speculation only. From Josephus' mention of his correspondence with the Judaeian king Marcus Julius Agrippa II, it appears that his patronage was possibly more important.⁷

inspired men that the city would be taken and the sanctuary burnt to the ground by the right of war, whensoever it should be visited by sedition and native hands should be the first to defile God's sacred precincts. This saying the Zealots did not disbelieve; yet they lent themselves as instruments of its accomplishment'.

⁶ For the three phases, see: Shaye J.D. Cohen, *Josephus in Galilee and Rome: his Vita and Development as a Historian* (Leiden 1979) 98-100 and McLaren, *Turbulent Times?* 98-107.

⁷ On Josephus' social environment: Hannah M. Cotton and Werner Eck, 'Josephus' Roman audience. Josephus and the Roman elites' in: Jonathan Edmonson, Steve Mason, James Rives eds., *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome* (Oxford 2005) 37-52 who emphasise the lack of our knowledge on this topic. As we are so dependent on Josephus' own boasts on his relation with the Flavians and with Agrippa, it is not clear at all that he did not exaggerate these. On the patronage of Agrippa see T. Rajak, 'Friends, Romans, Subjects: Agrippa II's speech in Josephus' *Jewish War*' in: Idem, *The Jewish Dialogue with Greece and Rome. Studies in cultural and social interaction* (Boston and Leiden 2002) 147-159. Cf. Steve Mason, 'Flavius Josephus in Flavian Rome: Reading on and between the lines' in: A.J. Boyle and W.J. Dominik, *Flavian Rome. Culture, Image, Text* (Leiden and Boston 2003) 559-589; Steve

Whatever Josephus' precise social circumstances after being freed by Vespasian and taking on the name Flavius Titus Josephus, his portraits of Vespasian and Titus are, at least at face value, extremely positive.

In the last two decades this traditional interpretation of *The Jewish War* has received criticism from scholars interested in Josephus' own authorial agenda. It has been acknowledged that although this may have coincided largely with the Flavian propaganda on the events in Judaea it may also have diverged from this public image at critical points.⁸ James McLaren, for example has argued that Josephus' account of Titus' bravery and clemency may strike the modern reader as complimentary, but could also be read, especially in comparison with other contemporary accounts of Titus, as an ironic comment on his public image.⁹ I will discuss this in greater detail in the final part of this chapter. Throughout the chapter, I will follow McLaren's suggestion that although Josephus was not in the position to openly criticise his saviours and patrons, this does not mean that the author had no opportunity at all to voice his criticisms. In his two books on the literary climate under Nero, Rudich has argued that authors could circumvent the censure through their use of a 'strategic irony', with which they were able to depict their criticisms as compliments.¹⁰

Mason, 'Of audience and meaning: Reading Josephus' *Bellum Judaicum* in the context of a Flavian audience' in: Joseph Sievers and Gaia Lembi eds., *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond* (Leiden and Boston 2005) 71-100.

⁸ In particular: Mason, 'Figured Speech'; Honora Howell Chapman, 'Spectacle in Josephus' *Jewish War*' in: Jonathan Edmonds, Steve Mason, James Rives ed., *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome* (Oxford 2005) 289-313; Gottfried Mader, *Josephus and the Politics of historiography. Apologetic and Impression Management in the Bellum Judaicum* (Leiden 2000); Fausto Parente, 'The impotence of Titus, or Flavius Josephus's *Bellum Judaicum* as an example of "pathetic" historiography' in: Joseph Sievers and Gaia Lembi, *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond* (Leiden and Boston 2005) 45-69; T.D. Barnes, 'The sack of the Temple in Josephus and Tacitus' in: Jonathan Edmonson, Steve Mason, James Rives eds., *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome* (Oxford 2005) 37-52.

⁹ James McLaren, 'Josephus on Titus: the vanquished writing about the victor' in: Joseph Sievers and Gaia Lembi, *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond* (Leiden and Boston 2005). McLaren's article is a reaction to B.Jones, 'The reckless Titus' in: C. Deroux ed., *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History VI* (Brussel 1992) 408-20.

¹⁰ Vasily Rudich, *Dissidence and Literature under Nero. The Price of Rhetoricization* (London 1997) esp. 12 for the term 'strategic irony'; Idem, *Political Dissidence under Nero: The Price of Dissimulation* (London and New York 1993).

The idea that Josephus commented on an existing public image of the Flavians' rise to power is of interest in my comparison with Pausanias as well. We have seen in chapters 1 and 2 that although the fragments by Diodorus, Plutarch and Polyaeus on Aristomenes leave much room for doubt about the nature of Aristomenes' heroism, it does seem likely that the tradition connected him with the ideal of ἀνδρεία. Pausanias' persistent use of the ambiguous word τόλμη instead of ἀνδρεία makes sense as an ironic comment on this tradition. It is therefore interesting that Josephus uses this word frequently and in an explicit rhetorical fashion.

Josephus' use of τόλμη is grounded in his use of Thucydides and Polybius as examples. It lies beyond the scope of this dissertation to draw out all the aspects in which his account of the war follows Thucydides' model of στάσις. Much work has been done on this already.¹¹ The prominence of recklessness and youth as themes derived from both authors is nevertheless of key interest to my comparison with Pausanias.

In order to draw out the rhetorical features of Josephus' choice of words, I will begin this chapter by analysing some of the speeches he puts in the mouths of Agrippa II, Josephus himself, Titus, Vespasian and Eleazar.¹² Agrippa and

¹¹ On Thucydides: H.J. Attridge, *The interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus* (Missoula 1976) 44-45; Mader, *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography* 55-103; T. Rajak, *Josephus. The historian and his society* (London 1993) *passim*, esp. 91-4 and 136-7; J.J. Price, 'The Provincial historian in Rome' in: Joseph Sievers and Gaia Lembi eds., *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and beyond* (Leiden 2005) 101-118, esp. 110-111; L.H. Feldman, *Josephus' Interpretation of the Bible* (Berkeley 1998) 140-148; Per Bilde, *Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome. His Life, his works and their importance* (Sheffield 1988) 91-101. On Polybius: Shaye J.D. Cohen, 'Josephus, Jeremiah and Polybius' *History and Theory* 21 (1982) 366-81 and A.M. Eckstein, 'Josephus and Polybius: A reconsideration' *Classical Antiquity* 9.2. (1990) 175-208. See also Gabba on Polybian elements in the speech of Agrippa II and Rajak, *Josephus passim*, esp. 91-4 and 136-7; Emilio Gabba, 'The Roman Empire in the Speech of Agrippa II (Ioseph., B.I., II, 345-401)' 2, translated by Tommaso Leoni and edited by Steve Mason as part of the Project of Ancient Cultural Engagement (P.A.C.E.; Toronto 2007): <http://pace.cns.yorku.ca:8080/medio/pdf/studies/Gabba-AgrippaII.pdf>; accessed 24/06/2008; originally published in *Rivista Storica dell' Antichità* 6-7 (1976-1977) 189-194.

¹² *The Jewish War* abounds in speeches, which cannot all be analysed: BJ 1.201-203 (Antipater); BJ 1.373-379 (Herod); BJ 1.458-466 (Herod); BJ 1.500-503 (Archelaus); BJ 1.622-628 (Herod); BJ 1.629-635 (Antipater); BJ 2.26-32 (Antipater, the son of Salome); BJ 2.84-92 (Archelaus); BJ 2.345-404 (Agrippa); BJ 2. 605-608 (Josephus); BJ 3.197-201

Josephus are both members of the Jewish upper class who opposed the rebellion. The two Roman emperors discuss the Roman strengths in opposition to typical Jewish weaknesses. Eleazar, finally, as leader of the *sicarii* persuades the rebels at Masada to commit suicide. I will then continue by comparing Pausanias' representation of the Messenians in battle with the battle scenes recorded by Josephus.

The speech of Agrippa II

King Agrippa's speech at *BJ* 2.345-404 is made at the moment when he is pressed by 'the people' to send an embassy to Nero to denounce the Roman governor Florus, who had just harshly put down the resistance against his taxation of the temple.¹³ Agrippa, who as great-grandson of Herod followed his family's tradition in basing his power on his good relations with Rome, knew, according to Josephus,¹⁴ such an embassy to be ineffectual. Placing his sister Berenice and himself on the roof of the Hasmonean palace, he attempted to dissuade the populace from further violence. Agrippa's opposition to the revolt was in all probability representative of the stance of many members of the Jewish elite, among them Josephus, who owed their prominence to Roman support and their wealth to stability.¹⁵ He begins by alluding to the motives for revolt:

(Josephus); *BJ* 3.209-211 (Vespasian); *BJ* 3.260-1 (Josephus); *BJ* 3.356-360 (Josephus' companions in the cave at Jotapata); *BJ* 3.362-382 & 388 (Josephus); *BJ* 3.400-403 (Josephus); *BJ* 3.472-484 (Titus); *BJ* 3.494-6 (Titus); *BJ* 4.39-48 (Vespasian); *BJ* 4.93-96 (Titus); *BJ* 4.163-192 (Ananus); *BJ* 4.238-269 (Jesus); *BJ* 4.272-282 (Simon); *BJ* 4.368-376 (Vespasian); *BJ* 5.121-125 (Titus); *BJ* 5.362-419 (Josephus); *BJ* 6.34-53 (Titus); *BJ* 6.97-110 (Josephus); *BJ* 6.124-128 (Titus); *BJ* 6.328-350 (Titus); *BJ* 6.411 (Titus); *BJ* 7.6-12 (Titus); *BJ* 7.323-336 (Eleazar); *BJ* 7.342-388 (Eleazar).

¹³ *BJ* 2-293-344.

¹⁴ Josephus, *Life* 364-367 notes that Agrippa read and approved of Josephus' account of the War. Presumably he also read and agreed with (or at least had no problem with) Josephus' rendering of the speech. Gabba, 'The Roman Empire in the Speech of Agrippa II'. It is nonetheless obvious from the repetition of many Josephan themes, that the speech expresses, to a considerable extent, Josephus' own analysis. See Rajak, 'Friends, Romans, Subjects' 148-9.

¹⁵ Rajak, *Josephus* 158. Peter A. Brunt, 'Josephus on Social Conflicts in Roman Judaea' *Klio* 59.1. (1977) 149-153 notes that Josephus' account gives some reason to interpret the revolt as a social conflict: the nobility enjoyed the stability that the Romans brought, but the masses were unable to reap any benefits of empire.

Seeing that the stimulus to war is for some of you mere youthfulness (ἡλικία) which lacks experience of its horrors (τῶν ἐν πολέμῳ κακῶν ἀπειράτος), for others an unreflecting hope of regaining independence (ἐλπίς ἀλόγιστος ἐλευθερίας), for yet others perhaps avarice and the prospect of enriching themselves at the expense of the weak in the event of a general upheaval, in order to bring these misguided persons to reason and a better frame of mind, so that the virtuous would not reap the consequences of the foolishness of a few, I have thought it necessary to call you all together and to tell you what I conceive to be to your interest.¹⁶

From the start the focus in the speech is not on what is right or wrong, but on what is sensible.¹⁷ Apart from those that hope to profit from a tumultuous situation, those that are willing to fight are either at an age that they are still inexperienced in the ills of war (ἡλικία τῶν ἐν πολέμῳ κακῶν ἀπειράτος), or have an unreasonable hope for freedom (ἐλπίς ἀλόγιστος ἐλευθερίας).¹⁸ As in Pausanias' book 4, in which the revolt is led by 'the young men, who were still without experience of war' (οἱ νεώτεροι, πολέμου μὲν ἔτι ἀπειρώς ἔχοντες) and in which it is emphasised that Aristomenes 'was in the prime of his life and daring' (οὗτος μὲν οὖν ἀκμάζων ἡλικία καὶ τόλμη), it is suggested that it is not so much the hope of freedom as the inexperience of warfare that is the main stimulant.¹⁹ This is reinforced by Agrippa, when he says that hope of freedom is ἀλόγιστος.²⁰ In view of Josephus' depiction of the revolt as a kind of στάσις, it is not accidental that ἐλπίς ἀλόγιστος is reminiscent of Thucydides' use of τόλμη ἀλόγιστος in his description of the situation in Corcyra. Josephus, through Agrippa, presents Roman domination as inevitable and any resistance against it futile.

¹⁶ BJ 3.346.

¹⁷ Rajak, 'Friends, Romans, Subjects' esp. 154 notes that the speech is concerned with the question of whether the revolt could have succeeded, which, to her, is also the main theme of *The Jewish War* as a whole. Since the answer to this question is negative, she interprets Agrippa's speech as representing the 'realist voice'.

¹⁸ Mader, *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography* 23-24 suggests that Josephus follows Thucydides in giving a negative connotation to hope, akin to 'delusion'.

¹⁹ Paus. 4.14.6-8.

²⁰ Compare also Agrippa's reference to τὰ τῆς ἐλευθερίας ἐγκώμια τραγωδοῦσιν at BJ 2.348.

This inevitability of Roman rule is emphasised throughout *The Jewish War* and is explained by Josephus as in accordance with the will of God.²¹ This is especially clear in his own speech at Jotapata (see below), but the detailed exposition there is presaged in Agrippa's speech when he remarks that the rebels will have no help from God.²² Firstly, the Romans would never have been able to build a large empire were it not for divine assistance, and secondly, the Jews would be disadvantaged by the necessity – not shared by the Romans – to honour the Sabbath. The Jews then are faced with a choice between evils. They could preserve their customs, which would result in defeat. Or they could ignore the Sabbath, but alienate God from them by doing so, and hence also be defeated.²³ Agrippa concludes:

All who embark on war do so in reliance on the support either of God or man; but when, in all probability, no assistance from either quarter is forthcoming, then the aggressor goes with his eyes open to certain ruin. What is there, then, to prevent you from dispatching with your own hands your children and wives and from consigning this surpassingly beautiful home of yours (τὴν

²¹ A few of the more explicit examples: BJ 2.360; BJ 2.390; BJ 3.136-7; BJ 3.293; BJ 3.494; BJ 4.76; BJ 4.104-5; BJ 4.320; BJ 4.370; BJ 5.1; BJ 5.39; BJ 5.60-1; BJ 5.343; BJ 5.559; BJ 5.562-6; BJ 5.572; BJ 6.285-315. Josephus often explains the defeat as the result of divine punishment, for example: BJ 2.393-4; BJ 2.455-6; BJ 2.469-476; BJ 2.582; BJ 4.318-325; BJ 4.386-388; BJ 5.24-26; BJ 5.256-7. Gabba, 'The Roman Empire in the speech of Agrippa II' 2-3 remarks that this thesis shares aspects with Jewish-apocalyptic theory as well as Hellenistic historiography; see also Rebecca Gray, *Prophetic Figures in the Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine. The evidence from Josephus* (Oxford 1993) 38-40: 'Josephus uses the Polybian language of τύχη to express a distinctly Jewish understanding of history and the rise and fall of empires'. For the paradox in Josephus' explanation of the defeat as on the one hand fated and on the other a deserved punishment: McLaren, *Turbulent Times?* 78-107.

²² BJ 2.390-394. The central role that the idea that God had abandoned the Jews plays in *The Jewish War* indicates that we should think of Josephus' use of Ἰουδαῖοι as referring to the group of people who share their belief in the Jewish God and not just to the inhabitants of Judaea. Hence, I take the example of Schwartz in translating the term to 'Jews'. Daniel R. Schwartz, 'Herodians and Ioudaioi in Flavian Rome' in: Jonathan Edmonds, Steve Mason, James Rives ed., *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome* (Oxford 2005) 63-78; Daniel R. Schwartz, *Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity* (Tübingen 1992) 29-43.

²³ Mader, *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography* 130 considers this a prelude to the alienation that the Zealots will suffer as a result from their crimes against God, the Temple and the religious community.

περικαλλεστάτην πατρίδα) to the flames? By such an act of madness (μανέντες) you would at least spare yourselves the ignominy of defeat.²⁴

The use of μανέντες gives an ironic slant to the option of suicide for the purpose of preventing the humiliation of defeat.²⁵ Τὴν περικαλλεστάτην πατρίδα similarly refers to the positive features of life that are still to be enjoyed even in a Judaea occupied by Romans, but would be lost in a futile resistance. This again reminds us of the Messenians who 'preferred to die free in their own country, rather than to be slaves and be happy in other things.'²⁶ The Messenians, like the Jews, do not only give up their lives, they give up the possibility of being happy as well. Earlier on in the speech, Agrippa had warned of the consequences of revolt. He remarks that it is not good to talk about liberty if the purpose is to denounce unjust masters, nor should one complain about harsh treatment if it is the fact of slavery itself that one resists. Rather, one should pacify the people in authority by serving (θεραπεύειν), and not provoking (ἐρεθίσειν) them:

When you indulge in exaggerated reproaches for minor errors, you only injure yourselves by your denunciation of those whom you incriminate; instead of maltreating you, as before, in secret and with a sense of shame, they will now despoil you openly. There is nothing to check blows like submission, and the resignation of the wronged victim puts the wrongdoer to confusion (διατροπή).²⁷

Διατροπή ('confusion') can also mean 'pity', which is interesting as Agrippa remarks later on in the speech, after he has ironically said that 'acts of madness might spare the Jews the ignominy of defeat'²⁸, that unlike victims of unforeseen disaster, who deserve pity, 'he who rushes to manifest destruction

²⁴ *BJ* 2.394-395.

²⁵ Μανία is used elsewhere as a rebellious characteristic that provokes στάσις: *BJ* 5.396; 5.407; 6.328; 7.267.

²⁶ Paus. 4.14.6-8.

²⁷ *BJ* 2.351.

²⁸ *BJ* 2.394-395.

incurs reproach' (ὁ δ' εἰς πρόδηλον ἀπώλειαν ὀρμήσας καὶ προσονειδίξεται).²⁹ Just as Pausanias' critical account of the Messenian War did not imply a positive depiction of the Spartans, so does Agrippa not suggest that the Romans have a moral right to subdue the Jews; his advice to his people to confuse their new masters by their obedience rather implies the opposite.³⁰

In comparison with Pausanias it is also significant that the speech takes place at the beginning of the revolt. Several actors in the third phase of the revolt use the harsh treatment they will likely receive from the Romans as an argument to continue their resistance.³¹ As we saw in chapter 2, Pausanias comments on the treatment meted out to the Messenians as a motive for revolt. Likewise, my comparison in chapter 4 with the slaves on Sicily highlighted their despair as a result of bad treatment. In this early phase of *the Jewish War*, however, Agrippa suggests that things are not so bad (yet) for the Jews, but could get much worse if they continued in their stubbornness.³² In that respect, his position may be compared to that of Drimakos in chapter 3, who had based his own freedom on cooperation with the Chians. Similarly, Agrippa suggests that accepting Roman supremacy may render the Jews

²⁹ *BJ* 2.396-397.

³⁰ Compare Rajak, 'Friends, Romans, Subjects' 156: 'Significance lies, rather, in the voice represented in this speech, the voice of the realists, who knew exactly what living under an empire was about, but also that at most times it was necessary to knuckle under, to dig in and wait. Such realists well understood why their fellow countrymen hated Rome, however intensely they deplored their actions; and glimmerings of this understanding, too, come out in Agrippa's speech, even if it is not the author's overt purpose to convey them'.

³¹ See in particular below my discussion of Josephus' hesitation before surrendering and Eleazar's speech in favour of suicide. Note also below Josephus' exhortation to his men to fight as avengers of the violence that will be used on the Jews by the Romans after their defeat. Compare in addition *BJ* 4.193: Ananus realizes the difficulty of defeating the Zealots as 'in despair of obtaining pardon for all they had done, they would never give in to the end'; *BJ* 4.221/222: John of Gischala arguing against Ananus' proposal to send an embassy to Vespasian: 'Any who cherish hopes of being pardoned in the event of defeat must either have forgotten their own daring deeds, or suppose that the penitence of the perpetrators should be followed by the instant reconciliation of the victims'; *BJ* 5.353-355: 'I cannot but think that the rebels would have been converted by that vision, had not the enormity of their crimes against the people made them despair of obtaining pardon from the Romans. But, death being the punishment in store for them if they desisted, they thought it far better to die in battle'.

³² Note in this respect that there is no reference whatsoever to Roman benevolence or clemency in the entire speech: Menahem Stern, 'Josephus and the Roman Empire as reflected in *The Jewish War*' in: Louis H. Feldman and Gohei Hata eds., *Josephus, Judaism and Christianity* (Detroit 1987) 71-80, esp. 76; Price, 'The provincial historian in Rome' 115.

happy in other respects. The Jews (and the Messenians) will lose this possibility if they refuse to submit.

Referring to the second motive for revolt, the love of liberty, Agrippa now returns to his point that there is no hope for freedom. He argues that there was a proper time and place for resistance against the loss of liberty, namely when the Romans first invaded Judaea, but that since the Jews were unable to keep their independence then and submitted to the Roman army, those who were born in that state of subjection ought to follow their lead.³³ The main body of the speech, from *BJ* 358 to *BJ* 390, contains a list of peoples who had already submitted to the Romans. This serves to set out the magnitude of the Roman Empire³⁴ and the lack of possible allies for the Jews, but more specifically to take away some of the shame of submitting.³⁵ If the Athenians, the Spartans, the Macedonians, Germans, Thracians, Egyptians and others are content to accept Roman domination, then who are the Jews to resist it?³⁶ In resistance, however, they would give way to their passion, and thereby remove the possibility of a peaceful life. Agrippa puts it clearly:

For servitude is a painful experience and a struggle to avoid it once and for all is just; but the man who having once accepted the yoke then tries to cast it off is a stubborn slave, not a lover of liberty (αὐθάδης δοῦλός ἐστιν, οὐ φιλελεύθερος).³⁷

³³ *BJ* 2.356-357.

³⁴ Helgo Lindner, *Die Geschichtsauffassung des Flavius Josephus im Bellum Judaicum. Gleichzeitig ein Beitrag zur Quellenfrage* (Leiden 1972) 21-25. But it also contains criticism as he emphasises Rome's exploitation of these peoples; see Rajak, 'Friends, Romans, Subjects' 155-6. The speech also contains statements about the peaceful surrender of the Gauls, Germans and Adiabeniens that the reader knows to be incorrect. Mason, 'Figured Speech and Irony' 271.

³⁵ Gabba, 'The Roman Empire in the Speech of Agrippa II' 6-9.

³⁶ *BJ* 2.357; *BJ* 2.361.

³⁷ *BJ* 2.356. Compare Livy 21.41.10-13, cited by Mader, *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography* 30.

I argued in chapter 2 that Auberger's analysis of the Messenian revolt as a defensive war is incorrect. The Messenians had been enslaved for more than a generation, as Pausanias emphasised at the start of his account of the Second Messenian War. They do not possess independence and hence they cannot defend it. Agrippa here says something similar about the Jews. He notes that the time of resistance is past. Like the Messenians after the First Messenian War, the Jews submitting to Sulla had been forced to acknowledge the superiority of the invading forces. Agrippa's *Realpolitik*³⁸ as represented by Josephus consists of the conviction that the best interest of his people lies in making the most of this given situation, rather than dying for a noble fiction. The same sentiment underlies Pausanias' comment that the young Messenians 'could have been happy in other respects'.

Another question is how Agrippa's advice to 'confuse' the Roman masters fits in with an interpretation of *The Jewish War* as Flavian propaganda. The grievances that the Jews harbour at this point in the narrative have nothing to do with the Flavians as they result from the wrongdoings of the governor Florus and Agrippa's realistic fear that Nero would not listen to his petition. Josephus furthermore has much to say about the Flavians' benevolence towards the Jews once they had taken over power.³⁹ Nevertheless, the juxtaposition of stubborn slaves with lovers of liberty also functions in bringing to the fore the freedom the Jews might still have in their subjected status. What the stubborn slaves, unlike Drimakos in chapter 3, fail to recognise is how they might still use their situation to their own advantage. Read in this fashion, Agrippa's speech has a subtly subversive undertone.

³⁸ For the use of this term: Price, 'the provincial historian' 114.

³⁹ But see Susan P. Mattern, *Rome and the Enemy. Imperial strategy in the Principate* esp. 193-4 for the idea that Roman benevolence is only part of Rome's public image. She argues that Rome based its empire above all on its superiority in sheer power. Agrippa's speech certainly fits well in a more negative propaganda on what Rome was capable of doing to unruly subjects.

The Speech of Josephus at Jotapata

The speech of Josephus at Jotapata, at *BJ* 3.362-382, given just before his men committed suicide and Josephus gave himself up to the Romans, is a pivotal moment in *The Jewish War*.⁴⁰ Josephus appears on the scene only at the end of the second book (*BJ* 2.568) as a reluctant defender of Judaea against the Romans when he is chosen as a general of the two Galilees and Gamala. The next paragraphs until *BJ* 2.589 show him recruiting and training his army, but, unlike his self-representation in *The Life of Flavius Josephus*, do not give much detail on his motivation for accepting the role. The scene at Jotapata, however, explains both his involvement in the revolt and his reason for writing its history and forms the centre-piece of Josephus' image of himself in *The Jewish War*.

The speech takes place after the fall of Jotapata, when Josephus and 40 men of distinction (τῶν ἐπισημῶν ἄνδρας), 'assisted by a certain divine providence' (δαίμονίῳ τινὶ συνεργίᾳ χρησάμενος), have found refuge in a cave.⁴¹ Josephus gives an extensive account of how Vespasian sent men down to persuade him to surrender. He relates how he was first reluctant, as he considered that his actions against the Romans must lead to some form of punishment, but that having listened to the proposals expressed by his friend Nicanor, a tribune, he remembered the dreams he had, foretelling the fate of the Jews and the Romans, and was minded to interpret them.⁴² Josephus explains that he was competent at interpreting dreams and divining the

⁴⁰ Cohen, 'Josephus, Jeremiah and Polybius' 374-77; Cohen, *Josephus in Galilee and Rome* 98-100.

⁴¹ *BJ* 3.342.

⁴² *BJ* 3.344-3.354. Cohen, *Josephus in Galilee and Rome* 109 notes that 'this theme is a standard element in Roman autobiographies which are always filled with dreams, portents, omens, and other signs of divine concern for the subject'. Robert Karl Gnuse, *Dreams and dream reports in the writings of Josephus. A traditio-historical Analysis* (Leiden, New York and Cologne 1996) 9 and 20 remarks that Josephus appears more as a Jewish prophet and priest than a Hellenistic intellectual. I agree that it is important not to forget this aspect of his self-presentation, but in comparison with Pausanias and Plutarch especially I would conclude that Josephus' piety fits in quite well with his identity as a Hellenistic intellectual.

ambiguous meanings of what God said, and as a priest knew about the prophecies in the Bible, and cites from his prayer:

Since it pleases you, who created the Jewish nation, to break your work, since fortune (τύχη) has completely passed over to the Romans, and since you have chosen my spirit (ἐμὴν ψυχὴν) to announce the things that are to come, I willingly surrender to the Romans and consent to live; but I take you to witness (μαρτύρομαι⁴³) that I go, not as a traitor, but as your minister (δὲ ὡς οὐ προδότης, ἀλλὰ σὸς ἄπειμι διάκονος).⁴⁴

Josephus' decision to surrender is protested against by the other 40 men in the cave, who accuse him of betrayal and threaten to kill him if he would not kill himself.⁴⁵ Referring to the shame that Josephus in their view brings to their ancient laws and to God, 'who gave the Jews souls that scorn death' (ὁ κτίσας ψυχὰς θανάτου καταφρονούσας), they rhetorically ask Josephus if he loves life so much that he can endure to see the light in slavery (φιλοζωεῖς Ἰώσηπε, καὶ φῶς ὑπομένεις ὄραν δοῦλος;). And reminding him of the many men he had exhorted to die for liberty, they conclude: 'False, then, was that reputation for bravery (ἀνδρείας), false that fame for sagacity (συνέσεως), if you can hope for pardon from those whom you have fought so bitterly, or supposing that they grant it, can deign to accept your life at their hands'. Lamenting Josephus' forgetfulness, they take responsibility for their country's κλέους ('glory', 'fame'), and hand him the sword, warning him that they would consider him a traitor (προδότης), if he were to refuse to use it on himself.⁴⁶ Josephus explains that he gives his speech as 'he considered it would be a betrayal

⁴³ The use of this word is significant and should be read in parallel with Josephus' use of the same verb when he accounts of Eleazar' motive for collective suicide. See below, 214-217.

⁴⁴ *BJ* 3.354.

⁴⁵ As these companions did not live to tell anyone of Josephus' treachery, it is remarkable that Josephus gives quite so much attention to their indictments. It may be possible that their accusations of Josephus' cowardly and treacherous behaviour are based on actual charges against Josephus during the war or at the time of writing. Gray, *Prophetic Figures* 41-44, referring to *BJ* 3.432-42 (the reactions of the inhabitants of Jerusalem to the fall of Jotapata); *BJ* 3.403 and *BJ* 4.625 (Vespasian suspects that Josephus surrendered in order to save himself).

⁴⁶ *BJ* 3.356-360.

(προδοσίαν) of God's commands, should he die before delivering his message'.⁴⁷

The main theme of this prologue to the speech is the question of what a traitor is. Josephus defends himself against the accusation of betrayal, by emphasising that God gave him a special responsibility for which it was necessary to live.⁴⁸ An interesting aspect of that defence is that it assumes that, theoretically, had Josephus not been chosen as God's servant (διάκονος), it would have indeed been better to die.⁴⁹ Josephus does not refute his companions' argument that he betrays his country and his people by not dying along with the men he encouraged to fight to the death. Neither does Josephus, at this point, express agreement with King Agrippa that it is better to accept domination than it is to die. We will see that he does remark on this in his speech,⁵⁰ but it is important to note at the outset that Josephus makes it clear that his purpose is to persuade the men who want to kill him, by saying that 'he proceeded, in this emergency, to reason philosophically (φιλοσοφεῖν) with them'.⁵¹ Unlike the recipients of the speech, the reader is aware of what

⁴⁷ *BJ* 3.361.

⁴⁸ I agree with Gregory E. Sterling, *Historiography and self-definition. Josephus, Luke-Acts and apologetic historiography* (Leiden, New York and Cologne 1992) 235- 238 that this was also Josephus' reason for discussing this episode in such detail. In addition to Sterling's bibliography in 237 nt 54: Gray, *Prophetic Figures*, esp. 44-52.

⁴⁹ Earlier in his account of the siege of Jotapata, Josephus' remarks that Vespasian might pardon him, but that it would be a disgrace to abandon command and surrender to the Romans: *BJ* 3.137. Note also that Josephus' initial reluctance to surrender is based on fear of the punishment he expected to receive from the Romans: *BJ* 3.346. His fear of punishment is paralleled by that of his men: 'The situation even drove many of Josephus' picked men to suicide; seeing themselves powerless to kill a single Roman, they could at least forestall death at Roman hands, and retiring in a body to the outskirts of the town, they there put an end to themselves', *BJ* 3.331. In his private audience with Vespasian, Josephus argues that God's purpose with him is the sole reason for his surrender: 'Had I not been sent on this errand by God, I knew the law of the Jews and how it becomes a general to die', *BJ* 3.400-401. Of relevance too, may be his admiration for the endurance with which the Essenian martyrs resisted Roman domination, and which contrasts sharply with Agrippa's arguments and Josephus' arguments in his speech at *BJ* 2.151-153. A similar contrast may be found in the speeches by Ananias and Jesus in book 4, see in particular *BJ* 4.163; *BJ* 4.175-9; *BJ* 4.252. See in addition, below, the discussion of the suicide of the *sicarii* at Masada, with Josephus' positive account of the suicide of Simon at *BJ* 2.469-476.

⁵⁰ *BJ* 3.380.

⁵¹ *BJ* 3.361-362. Gray, *Prophetic Figures* 48, notes that Josephus makes clear in this sentence that this speech is 'a somewhat desperate ("in this emergency") attempt to save himself'. I would add that the use of φιλοσοφεῖν strengthens her reading of this statement as ironic. See also Gnuse, *Dreams and dream reports* 136: 'the arguments he presents against suicide to his

Josephus asserts as his real reason for staying alive, namely to act as a messenger for God. The ‘voice of realism’⁵² expressed by King Agrippa, which takes pride of place in the following speech as well as throughout *The Jewish War*, is emphatically not the voice of Josephus as he is clearly not inspired by reason alone.⁵³

Josephus’ speech first tackles the arguments that it is good to die in war and for liberty, before moving on to his main point (for which, see below) that it is impious to lay down one’s life.⁵⁴ This beginning is a direct response to his accusers. He remarks that although it may be good to die in battle, at the hands of one’s enemies, killing oneself would just be foolish (ἡλίθιος), as it would mean inflicting on oneself the treatment that one wishes to avoid from the enemy. He concludes:

It is equally cowardly (δειλός) not to wish to die when one ought to do so, and to wish to die when one ought not. What is it we fear that prevents us from surrendering to the Romans? Is it not death? And shall we then inflict upon ourselves certain death, avoid an uncertain death, which we fear, at the hands of our foes? ‘No it is slavery (δουλείαν) we fear,’ I shall be told. Much freedom (ἐλεύθεροι) we enjoy at present! ‘It is noble to destroy oneself,’ another will say. Not so, I retort, but most ignoble; in my opinion there could be no more arrant coward than the pilot who, for fear of a tempest, deliberately sinks his ship before the storm.⁵⁵

comrades were probably peripheral in the mind of Josephus in terms of his own self-justification’.

⁵² Rajak, ‘Friends, Romans, Subjects’ 154-158.

⁵³ Gray, *Prophetic Figures* 47-48 suggests that speech is ‘in some sense not really intended to be persuasive’.

⁵⁴ It is good to die in war: *BJ* 3.362-368. Suicide is impious: *BJ* 3.369-378. This dissection of the speech in two parts is derived from Rajak, who argues that Josephus offers three explanations for his surrender, all three of which supposed to be persuasive: a ‘practical’ explanation expressed in the first part of the speech, a ‘moral’ argumentation that takes up the second half. A ‘supernatural’ explanation is offered only to the reader, in Josephus’ interpretation of his dream. Along with Gray, *Prophetic Figures* 44-52 I disagree with her argument that all three arguments are representative of Josephus’ motivation.

⁵⁵ *BJ* 3.365-368.

The discussion of what is cowardly and what courageous in the speech is reminiscent in some aspects of Thucydides' account of the situation on Corcyra, where caution was mistaken for cowardice and daring recklessness for courage.⁵⁶ Throughout the speech Josephus refers to the accusations he receives from the men in the cave that he was a coward. His present speech is a reaction to the men's exclamations that his reputation of courage will turn out to be false if he fails to die with them. Towards the end of the speech he will also return to the men's accusation and make it explicit that it was uttered in a moment of great passion and devotion to death, thus illustrating the extreme situation in which the meaning of such words can easily become lost.⁵⁷

Keeping this in mind, Josephus' present defence would not strike any reader as strong argumentation. We have seen at the beginning of this section that Josephus was at first reluctant to surrender, precisely because he feared the treatment that he would surely receive as one of the Romans' most eminent enemies. The sharp distinction between δουλείαν and ἐλεύθεροι furthermore refers to Agrippa's use of the juxtaposition of stubborn slaves and lovers of liberty, since Josephus' argumentation is consistent with the idea that the struggle for liberty was long lost. In Josephus' case, the fear of slavery is subordinate to the fear of death and worse. He notes that before Nicanor approached him he mistrusted the Roman ambassadors who entreated him to surrender:

His suspicions were based not on the human character of the envoys, but on the consciousness of all he had done and the feeling that he must suffer proportionately.⁵⁸

⁵⁶ Thuc. 3.82.4.

⁵⁷ On the confusion of words and their meanings, see J.J. Price, *Thucydides and Internal War* (Cambridge and New York 2001) 24-30 with a comparison made to Josephus' account of the situation in Jerusalem BJ 5.429-30 and, with reference to τόλμη ἀλόγιστος, 24-30.

⁵⁸ BJ 3.346.

In addition, after relating in detail Nicanor's assurances that Vespasian would not send a friend if his purpose was to deceive him, Josephus remarks that he was still hesitant up to the point when he was reminded of his dreams.⁵⁹ This extensive account of Josephus' fears problematises his argument that it is foolish to commit suicide out of fear for what would happen after surrender. It also takes away some of the praise that Vespasian deserved for his clemency. Both he and his captive are ruled by the will of God. Josephus may have realised the invincibility of Rome long before his surrender, but his dream explains that this is caused by a changed fortune, willed by God, and not so much by Roman virtues.⁶⁰ His decision is therefore based not on the *Realpolitik* that Agrippa followed, but on his pious conviction.

Josephus' second argument concerning fear for enslavement is equally weak, and for the same reason. His ironic exclamation 'how much liberty we enjoy at present!' is offset by the fact that Josephus had until very recently been explicitly frightened of his future captivity. If he stands by the statement that 'it is cowardly not to wish to die when one ought to do so, and to wish to die when one ought not', then why does he devote so much space to his own hesitation, which, following this argumentation, is precisely the kind of cowardice that Josephus is talking about?

Josephus continues his speech by arguing that suicide is impious.⁶¹ He reasons that life is a gift of God and that it therefore should be God's decision to take it away ('for it is from him that we have received our being, and it is to him that we should leave the decision to take it away').⁶² If someone dies according to the law of 'nature' (which, it is clear from Josephus' words, equals the law of God), then they obtain eternal fame (κλέος μὲν αἰώνιον), safety for house and family, and a most holy place in heaven (χωρον οὐράνιον τὸν ἀγιώτατον).

⁵⁹ *BJ* 3.3.346-354.

⁶⁰ See in particular Cohen, *Josephus in Galilee and Rome* 204; Cohen, 'Josephus, Jeremiah and Polybius'.

⁶¹ *BJ* 3.369-378.

⁶² *BJ* 3.371.

But for those that have taken their own life, their souls will be sent to Hades, and their family will receive God's revenge for the *hubris* of their parents.⁶³

This argumentation is decisively stronger in relation to Josephus' conviction that he is a messenger from God. Nevertheless, he ends his speech on a more ambiguous note:

But for my part, I shall never pass over to the enemy's ranks, to prove a traitor (προδοτικός) to myself; I should indeed then be far more senseless than deserters who go over to the enemy for safety, whereas I should be going to destruction – my own destruction. I pray, however, that the Romans may prove faithless; if, after pledging their word, they put me to death, I shall die content, for I shall carry with me the consolation, better than a victory, that their triumph has been sullied by perjury.⁶⁴

The reader knows that this prayer is totally meaningless. Josephus was afraid of Roman perjury: his own account claims it as the chief reason for his hesitation. Hence, if it had been Josephus' purpose to persuade the reader in the same way as he tried to persuade the 40 men in the cave, he would not have admitted to it. Josephus' reasoning therefore makes it clear that his rhetoric is not an expression of his true motivation, but of his attempts to persuade the men. Both the start and the end of the speech bear out this aim as well. We have seen that he explained at the outset that 'he proceeded, in this emergency, to reason philosophically with them'. In a similar vein, Josephus continues his narrative after the speech by saying that 'by these and many similar arguments Josephus sought to deter his companions from suicide'.⁶⁵

It may be argued that Josephus by his account tries to depict himself as a general skilled in oratory. This would be in accordance with the image he

⁶³ *BJ* 3.374-378.

⁶⁴ *BJ* 3.381-382.

⁶⁵ *BJ* 3.383. 'Many similar arguments' suggests that Josephus only recorded a sample of the arguments he used: Gray, *Prophetic Figures* 50.

draws of himself elsewhere in *The Jewish War*, as well as in the *Life*, as there are a number of occasions in which Josephus demonstrates his skills in persuasion and trickery.⁶⁶ In this case, however, Josephus has no success and is forced to tap into another valuable skill that he as a good general possesses:⁶⁷

But desperation (ἀπογνώσει) stopped their ears, for they had long since devoted themselves to death (καθοσιώσαντες ἑαυτοὺς τῷ θανάτῳ); they were, therefore, infuriated at him and ran at him from this side, and that, sword in hand, upbraiding him as a coward (ἐκάκιζόν τε εἰς ἀνανδρίαν), each one seeming on the point of striking him. But he, addressing one by name (ὁ δὲ τὸν μὲν ὀνομαστὶ καλῶν), looking another in the face in a general's way (τῷ δὲ στρατηγικώτερον ἐμβλέπων), clasping the hand of a third (τοῦ δὲ δρασσόμενος τῆς δεξιᾶς), shaming a fourth by entreaty (ὄν δὲ δεήσει δυσωπῶν), and torn by all manner of emotions (ποικίλοις διαιρούμενος πάθεσιν) at this critical moment, succeeded in warding off from his throat the blades of all, turning like a wild beast surrounded by the hunters (ὥσπερ τὰ κυκλωθέντα τῶν θηρίων) to face his successive assailants. Even in his extremity, they still held their general in reverence; their hands were powerless (αἰδουμένων παρελύοντο μὲν αἱ δεξιαί), their swords glanced aside (περιωλίσθανεν δὲ τὰ ξιφη), and many, in the act of thrusting at him, spontaneously dropped their weapons (καὶ πολλοὶ τὰς ὀμοφαίας ἐπιφέροντες αὐτομάτως παρεῖσαν⁶⁸).⁶⁹

The first thing to note about this passage in comparison with Pausanias' depiction of the Messenians, is Josephus' use of ἀπογνώσις and the connection he makes between the men's despair and them 'devoting themselves to their death' (καθοσιώσαντες ἑαυτοὺς τῷ θανάτῳ). In Pausanias' account of the Phocians' despair and in his depiction of the Gauls

⁶⁶ *BJ* 2.600-607; *BJ* 2.611-613; *BJ* 2.618-9; *BJ* 2.630-1; *BJ* 2.635-646; *BJ* 3.187-189; *BJ* 3.260-1.

⁶⁷ Josephus self-representation as an ideal general in Greco-Roman context is, in addition to the passages mentioned in n. 238 below, especially apparent in *BJ* 2.569-584; *BJ* 3.187-189.

⁶⁸ The codices Marcianus, Vaticanus, Palatinus and Urbinas give παρεῖθησαν: 'were paralysed'.

⁶⁹ *BJ* 3.384-386.

at Thermopylae it is this devotion to death that makes despair such a dangerous emotion. The same warning is given to slaveowners by Diodorus, as we have seen in chapter 4.

Here the rebels' devotion to death contrasts with Josephus' devotion to life, which is solely inspired by God, since we have seen that regardless of the fact that Josephus gives rational arguments in his speech, these arguments do not constitute his actual motivation for staying alive. Just as rationality failed to reach men already devoted to death, Josephus also has abilities that are less or more –depending on one's perspective- than human. He controls his assailants by naming, viewing, taking and shaming them. This process is depicted as a way of taking possession: the result is that his attackers become powerless. The images of their hands becoming powerless and their swords glancing sideways suggest that they do not back off as conscious agents, but that Josephus' control of them happens to them unawares. In addition, in the last part of the sentence, the men are mentioned as the main subject (πολλοὶ), but their agency is affected by the use of αὐτομάτως.

Nevertheless, Josephus, the controlling agent, also appears not as the self-possessed general in control of himself as well as of his men, but as 'a wild beast' (θηρίον), 'torn by all manner of emotions' (ποικίλοις διαιρούμενος πάθεισιν). Josephus is holding on to dear life in the same passionate way as his attackers are rushing to their deaths. And he turns the tables by responding in kind to the treatment that they give him. They call him a coward; Josephus calls them by name, and shames them by entreaty. They encircle him; Josephus takes their hands and fixes his eyes on them.

Josephus finally tricks his men into a suicide pact.⁷⁰ Trusting in God,⁷¹ he proposes to draw lots to decide in which order they should kill each other,

⁷⁰ Gray, *Prophetic Figures* 45 comments that this episode is particularly problematic for Josephus' positive self-image, and to such an extent that it has to be deliberate.

⁷¹ *BJ* 3.387; Gray, *Prophetic Figures* 51.

and when he was left alone with one man, persuaded him to stay alive, after which he surrendered to Vespasian.⁷² Josephus gets the chance to execute God's plans with him during Titus' siege of Jerusalem. Titus sends him out to talk reason into the Jewish rebels and implore them to surrender.⁷³ The speech contains many similarities with Agrippa's. Similar to Agrippa at *BJ* 2.356 he tells them that the time of resistance is past:

Be it granted that it was noble to fight for freedom (ἐλευθερία), they should have done so at first; but after having once succumbed and submitted for so long, to seek then to shake off the yoke was the part of men madly courting death, not of lovers of liberty (τὸν ζυγὸν δυσθανατούντων, οὐ φιλελευθέρων εἶναι).⁷⁴

Like Agrippa he remarks that a life in submission to the Romans is better than death by violence or famine in the beleaguered city and assures them of the Romans' leniency were they to surrender. However, if they continued their resistance, the Romans would not spare anyone.⁷⁵ This invokes Agrippa's argument that it is better to pacify than to provoke one's master.⁷⁶

Agrippa had substantiated his arguments by giving a list of examples of other nations who have surrendered to the Romans.⁷⁷ Josephus does the same by giving examples from Jewish history where the Jews, rather than taking up arms, submitted to the will of God. By paying attention to the role of God in these instances, he implies that the Jews have brought their defeat on themselves through their internal problems and thereby disowns to some extent the Roman accomplishment in subduing them.⁷⁸ This difference from

⁷² *BJ* 3.387-391.

⁷³ Josephus' commission: *BJ* 5.360-361; Josephus' speech *BJ* 5.362-419. This invites a comparison of Josephus with the prophet Jeremiah. W.C. van Unnik, *Flavius Josephus als historischer Schriftsteller* (Heidelberg 1978) chapter 3.

⁷⁴ *BJ* 5.365.

⁷⁵ *BJ* 5.363-374: 'whereas, if he took the city by storm, he would not spare a man of them, especially after the rejection of offers made to them when in extremities'.

⁷⁶ *BJ* 2.350-351.

⁷⁷ *BJ* 2.358-387.

⁷⁸ *BJ* 5.379-398.

Agrippa is tied to his identity as a prophet. Agrippa is portrayed as a sensible king, who understands that the Jews are unable to win against a stronger enemy. Josephus on the other hand, has a direct knowledge of why the enemy is stronger and connects it to a transfer of fortune.

Comparing Josephus' behaviour at Jotapata with Agrippa's speech, we have to note some additional important differences. Agrippa appeals to rationality, and argues that since hope of freedom is unrealistic, it is better to submit and try to find happiness in that situation. Roman domination is inevitable and to fight against the inevitable marks the rebel out as a stubborn slave, not a lover of liberty. As in Pausanias' representation of the Messenian War, the decision to rebel is described as the decision of men who are too young, too foolish or too greedy to know any better. Josephus' account of his surrender at Jotapata repeats the belief that God had predestined Roman victory, but interestingly Josephus remembers this fact only when entreated to surrender for the third time. He realizes that he must surrender, since he believes that God gave him the assignment to be his messenger. Josephus then tries to reason with his companions, along similar lines as Agrippa reasoned with his people, but it is clear that Josephus does not surrender based on these rather weak arguments. I would argue that the ambivalent self-representation of Josephus suggests that, were it not for God's plans with Josephus, his companions' criticism of Josephus would be justified.⁷⁹ In particular in the act of tricking them in his proposal for a suicide pact, Josephus may even appear disloyal to his compatriots. This suggested disloyalty, however, reinforces the evocation of an overriding loyalty to God.

The speeches of Titus and Vespasian

Titus' first speech at *BJ* 3.472-484 intends to encourage his men at Tarichaeae, who, finding themselves opposed by a majority of Jews, started to betray

⁷⁹ Note *BJ* 3.400 in which Josephus admits to Vespasian that he would have had to commit suicide, were it not for God's assignment to him. Gray, *Prophetic Figures* 50-51.

some signs of dismay. In his attempt to demonstrate that greater numbers does not always equal greater power, Titus emphasises the disadvantages of Jewish desperation against the benefits of Roman discipline and training. Addressing the more doubtful of his men, he exhorts:

Let such a person consider who he is and against whom he is going into battle, and let him remember that the Jews, however daring (τόλμηται) and disdainful of death (θανάτου καταφρονοῦντες) they may be, are yet undisciplined (ἀσύντακτος) and inexperienced (ἄπειρος) in war and deserve to be called a mere rabble (ὄχλος), rather than an army.⁸⁰

The description of the Jews as having τόλμη and despising (καταφρονοῦντες) death is taken as a possible reason for fear, but feature alongside clearly negative aspects of the character of the Jewish 'mob' (ὄχλος). Titus connects them to being undisciplined (ἀσυντακτος) and inexperienced (ἄπειρος). It is the same connection we have found in Pausanias' *Messenika*, but made explicit by Titus rhetorical use of τόλμη. The argument is further developed directly after the remark that wars are won by courage (ἀνδρεία) rather than numbers:⁸¹

The Jews are led on by daring (τόλμα), rashness (θράσος) and despair (ἀπόνοια), emotions which are bracing in the flush of success, but are damped by the slightest check; we, by excellence (ἀρετή), ready obedience (εὐπειθία), and a nobility (γενναῖον) which, though doubtless seen to perfection when favoured by fortune, in adversity also holds on to the last.⁸²

By this juxtaposition of three Jewish attributes and three Roman characteristics, Titus explicates what is meant by ἀνδρεία, and argues that Jewish behaviour is governed by its opposite. The Jews will be defeated as their τόλμη ('daring') is brought against Roman ἀρετή ('excellence'), their

⁸⁰ *BJ* 3.475.

⁸¹ *BJ* 3.478.

⁸² *BJ* 3.479.

θράσος ('rashness') will meet Roman εὐπειθία ('ready obedience') and, finally, their ἀπόνοια (despair)⁸³ will be no match for Roman γενναιότης ('nobility'). The deciding factor that makes τόλμη, θράσος and ἀπόνοια⁸⁴ so different from ἀρετή, εὐπειθία and γενναιότης is the consistent stability of the latter characteristics in both fortunate and unfortunate circumstances.⁸⁵ Titus emphasises the importance of this stability when he continues his speech by juxtaposing the motivations of the two opponents. Whereas the Jews are fighting for liberty (ἐλευθερία) and country (πατριδων), the Romans fight for glory (εὐδοξία) and for the reputation that no people have been a match for them.⁸⁶ Although he describes the Roman cause as a higher one, the implication of the Jewish motivation is that it renders them more desperate.

The combination of ἀπόνοια with τόλμη and θράσος is a familiar trope in Pausanias' depiction of the Messenians and Diodorus' account of the two Sicilian Slave Revolts. In these narratives, however, despair made the slaves and the Messenians into very dangerous enemies. Titus' use of the trope to encourage his soldiers may also be read as a warning not to underestimate the enemy. I will come back to the effects of Titus's speech on his men in more detail below, where I will discuss Roman and Jewish behaviour in battle.

The use of καταφρονοῦντες in Titus' depiction of the Jews is also similar to the combination of φρονήμα and τόλμη in Pausanias' narrative. This is reinforced by the second quotation from Titus' speech where he indicates that daring, rashness and despair are unstable emotions that only work to the

⁸³ Mason, *Life of Josephus* 29, nt 132 notes that this word is a favored term of Josephus' for the rebel mentality in the War'. Cf. M. Hadas-Lebel, 'Ἄνοια et ἀπόνοια des ennemis de Rome selon Flavius Josèphe' *Associazione italiana per lo studio del Giudaismo* 4 (1987) 197-212.

⁸⁴ On the combination of these three terms as a recurring theme that has parallels in the writings of Livy (esp. 28.19.10) and other Roman writers: Mader, *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography* 33-35.

⁸⁵ This is a recurring theme in *The Jewish War*, see below and additionally BJ 1.335 (the supporters of Herod are governed by a love of change); BJ 3.15 (a juxtaposition of Roman order and policy versus Jewish inexperience and passion). Similar juxtapositions are discussed below. The changeability of τόλμη, θράσος and ἀπόνοια is, and especially their tendency to inspire over-confidence after successes according to Mader, *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography* 37 a 'Thucydidean-Polybian pattern of error analysis'.

⁸⁶ BJ 3.480-481.

advantage of the enemy in the case of success. We have seen that the Messenians' φρονήμα often deceives them in overestimating their chances and that in the case of adversity their daring gives way to despair. The Roman soldiers that Titus attempts to encourage have, however, yet to be convinced of the instability of daring and despair. I will return to this below.

A speech from Vespasian, at *BJ* 4.39-48, during the siege of Gamala, runs along similar lines. Josephus explains how Vespasian thought it necessary to console his troops, as they were disheartened (ἀθυμοῦσαν) due to some unexpected losses and had not yet had the experience of such disasters.⁸⁷ It is interesting that he describes the troops as lacking in θυμός, because it confirms that passion is a necessary part of courage, as long as one is not governed solely by it.⁸⁸ Vespasian's short speech, even though it is meant to remedy his men's lack of θυμός, emphasises the same aspects of discipline, training and steadfastness in times of crisis that Titus spoke of. On the importance of staying strong in situations of misfortune, he says:

As it is a mark of vulgarity (ἀπειροκάλων) to be over-elated by successes, so it is unmanly to be downcast in adversity; for the transition from one to the other is rapid, and the best man (ἀριστος) is he who meets good fortune soberly, to the end that he may still remain of good spirits (εὐθυμίας) when contending with reverses.⁸⁹

Ἀπειρόκαλος literally implies that its subject is ignorant of what is good, and so is usually translated as 'vulgar', but it could also mean that the subject is 'foolish'. Both meanings fit this passage, as being over-elated by success can indeed be considered both a matter of bad taste and of foolishness in the context of the rapid changes in fortune. The double meaning of ἀπειροκάλος

⁸⁷ *BJ* 4.39.

⁸⁸ On θυμός in a negative sense in both Greek and Jewish texts: Tessa Rajak, 'The Angry Tyrant' in: Tessa Rajak, Sarah Pearce, James Aitken and Jennifer Dines eds., *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London 2008) 110-127.

⁸⁹ *BJ* 4.42.

accompanies a similar problem in translating νήφωv, which literally means 'sober', but also carries the connotation of wariness. Hence, the way to remain in possession of good θυμός, is to be aware of the changing nature of fortune. The importance of this awareness for the Messenians in Pausanias' book 4 has been emphasised in chapter 5 by contrast to Spartacus' proper insight in his own situation in Plutarch's *Life of Crassus*. In this speech a clear connection exists between such awareness and experiences of both good and misfortune. Whereas we have seen that the Jews, like the young Messenians, were disadvantaged because they had no experience of the hardships of war, which resulted in their willingness to fight for a lost cause, in this case the Romans are also hampered by their inexperience of defeat.

In a passage reminiscent of Aristomenes pursuing the fleeing Spartans beyond the range permitted by the Dioscuri, Vespasian continues his speech by explaining that the Roman losses have nothing to do with either their μαλακία or any Jewish ἀρετή, but were caused by the Romans' lack of restraint in pursuing the Jews when they fled for safety to higher grounds.

Now, because you were so absolutely eager for victory, you neglected your own safety. But thoughtlessness in war (ἀπερίσκεπτον ἐν πολέμῳ) and mad impetuosity (ὄρμηξ μανιώδεις) are alien to us Romans, who owe all our success to experience and order (ἐμπειρία καὶ τάξις): they are a barbarian fault and one to which the Jews mainly owe their defeats. It is necessary therefore, to fall back upon our own excellence (ἀρετήν) and to be angry rather than disheartened (θυμοῦσθαι μᾶλλον ἢ προσαθυμεῖν) by this unworthy reverse.⁹⁰

Vespasian juxtaposes Jewish and Roman characteristics in a similar way to Titus. Whereas Titus emphasised the values of ἀρετή, εὐπείθεια and γενναιότης in relation to the weakness of τόλμη, θράσος and ἀπόνοια, Vespasian here warns his men not to be carried away by typically barbarian passions as thoughtlessness and mad eagerness for victory. The emphasis on

⁹⁰ BJ 4.44-46.

the absence of rationality that can be detected in this phrase reinforces the argument that the passion of θυμός is not in itself problematic, as it is lack of θυμός that Vespasian wishes to remedy.⁹¹ The juxtaposition of θυμοῦσθαι to ὄρμηξ μαγιῶδες furthermore explains that Roman θυμός is very different from the crazy impetuosity of the Jews. θυμός is, however, dangerous if not governed well, which is the classic barbarian mistake,⁹² but a mistake too that the Romans made due to their inexperience.

This recurring theme of the importance of experience⁹³ is also interesting in comparison with Pausanias' representation of the Messenians. The Messenians, we have seen, are led to fight a useless war not only because of their inexperience with the horrors of war, but also because they lack both understanding and discipline. In Josephus' depiction of the Romans we notice that these two aspects result from experience and training, which, of course, is in itself a type of experience. The prominence attached by Vespasian and Titus to training and discipline suggests that these are instrumental in curbing the passions when understanding belongs only to the generals. The two future emperors are naturally perfect examples of such understanding, as is their captive Josephus, whose intelligence was already demonstrated in his speech at Jotapata but will be seen more clearly in his role as a general in the battle scenes (see below).⁹⁴

In chapter 2 I demonstrated that Aristomenes is in a perfect position to show the same leadership skills as he has knowledge no-one else has. His knowledge of the oracles foretelling Messenia's doom is similar to Josephus'

⁹¹ This is also illustrated by the daring behaviour in battle that Vespasian and even more so Titus display. See below.

⁹² Y.A. Daube, *Le Barbare. Recherches sur la conception de la barbarie et de la civilisation* (Brussel 1981).

⁹³ See for instance: *BJ* 1.305-6; *BJ* 3.6; *BJ* 3.24; *BJ* 3.308; *BJ* 4.39; *BJ* 4.197; *BJ* 5.177-185; *BJ* 6.190.

⁹⁴ On Josephus' leadershipskills: Cohen, *Josephus in Galilee and Rome* 90-97. Useful is also L.H. Feldman, 'Josephus' Portrait of Moses' *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 82.3/4 (1992) 285-328, esp. 313-22, comparing Josephus' depiction of Moses' leadershipskills in *The Jewish Antiquities* with Thucydides' portrait of Pericles.

knowledge as a prophet that God has taken the side of the Romans.⁹⁵ I suggested in the comparative chapters that, unlike Drimakos and Spartacus, Aristomenes may have special knowledge, but is lacking in understanding and in self-discipline; and I argued that Pausanias' choice of words like τόλμη and ἀπόνοια confirmed this negative interpretation. Aristomenes gives way to his anger and neglects the welfare of the Messenians, even after they expressly requested his leadership in their exile. The combination of daring and anger is a persistent trope in Pausanias' depiction of the Messenians.

Josephus, who as a general found himself in a not dissimilar situation to that of Aristomenes, defends a completely different way of dealing with it. Josephus' narrative of the scene at Jotapata admittedly leaves scope for criticism of his leadership, since he fails to persuade his fellow companions and is forced to trick them. Nevertheless, I believe that this episode is purposefully ambiguous about Josephus' role as a general, as the ambivalence highlights his overriding loyalty as a prophet to God. We will see below more positive depictions of Josephus' leadership qualities. In Agrippa's speech, as well as in those of Titus and Vespasian, we can read a less ambiguous account of what Josephus considered appropriate behaviour in the face of Roman domination, namely submission. The fact that Josephus makes Vespasian and Titus use words as τόλμη, ἀπόνοια, θράσος and θυμός in their explications of the Jewish weaknesses indicate that these words can indeed have the negative connotations, which in my view they also have in Pausanias' *Messenika*.

⁹⁵ Note also Josephus' mention of portents referring to the end of Jerusalem and his mention throughout *The Jewish War* of 'false prophets'. Rajak, *Josephus* 91-91 remarks on Josephus' seemingly contradictory treatment of applauding portents which foretell Roman victory whereas he criticises 'false prophets' for their political use of portents in order to persuade an easily swayed public. Nevertheless, Josephus' criticism of 'false prophets' serves to identify himself as a 'true' prophet.

The speech of Eleazar

The suicide of Eleazar and his fellow *sicarii* at Masada, described at *BJ* 7.389-401, forms the finale of Josephus' account of *the Jewish War*.⁹⁶ Josephus' account of Eleazar's speech and its effects on his followers forms a counterpart to his own decision to surrender at Jotapata; but, unlike what we would expect from the rest of his narrative in *The Jewish War*, it is not devoid of admiration.⁹⁷ After explaining that the Romans won control over the fortress through a sudden change of wind, 'as if by divine providence' (καθάπερ ἐκ δαιμονίου προνοίας),⁹⁸ Josephus comments that Eleazar did not consider flight or allow anyone else to do so. However, seeing (ὄρῶν) that the protective wall was being consumed by fire, Eleazar 'was unable to think of any further means of deliverance or bold deeds' (ἄλλον δ'οὐδένα σωτηρίας τρόπον οὐδ'ἀλκῆς ἐπινοῶν). Josephus continues by saying that Eleazar, imagining what the Romans would do to them as well as to their wives and children, considered (ἐβουλεύσατο) that the death of all was the best option in the present situation.⁹⁹ From the outset therefore, Eleazar's proposal for suicide is described as the result of a careful deliberation, based on a not unrealistic fear of the punishment that the Romans would be likely to meet out to the rebels.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁶ The Roman attack on Masada begins at *BJ* 7.252 ff. Eleazar's speeches are quoted at *BJ* 7.323-336 and *BJ* 7.341-388.

⁹⁷ Rajak, *Josephus* 81-91, esp. 89; T. Rajak, 'Dying for the Law: the martyr's portrait in Jewish-Greek Literature' in: Idem, *The Jewish Dialogue with Greece and Rome. Studies in Cultural and social interaction* (Boston, Leiden 2002) 99-133, esp.124-125; Solomon Zeitlin, 'Masada and the Sicarii' *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 55.4 (april 1965) 299-317, esp. 305; Raymond R. Newell, 'The Forms and Historical Value of Josephus' Suicide Accounts' in: Louis H. Feldman and Gohei Hata eds., *Josephus, Judaism and Christianity* (Detroit 1987) 278-294; David J. Ladouceur, 'Masada. A consideration of the literary evidence' *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 1980) 245-60 argues that Josephus did not intend to depict the *sicarii* as heroes. He reiterates his opinion in 'Josephus and Masada' in: Louis H. Feldman and Gohei Hata eds., *Josephus, Judaism and Christianity* (Detroit 1987) 95-113, arguing that Eleazar as a philosopher figure is made to resemble the Cynic-Stoic opposition to the Flavians.

⁹⁸ *BJ* 7.318.

⁹⁹ *BJ* 7.321-322.

¹⁰⁰ Compare Josephus' initial fear of what would happen to him if he surrendered at *BJ* 3.346.

This depiction of the leader of the *sicarii* marks a sharp contrast with Josephus' representation of the *sicarii* throughout *The Jewish War*, which focused on the wrongdoings of these knife-men, their betrayal of fellow Jews and their mad resistance against the Romans.¹⁰¹ In accordance with this contrast, Eleazar's speech makes it clear that he has finally recognized God's purpose and converted from his rebellious convictions. Eleazar begins by reminding his followers of their determination not to serve anyone except God. This determination which led them into battle should not leave them in defeat, as they would certainly be punished harshly by the Romans for their persistent rebellion.¹⁰² Eleazar opines that 'it is God who has granted us this favour, that we have it in our power to die nobly and in freedom – a privilege denied to others who have met with unexpected defeat'.¹⁰³ God is also central to Eleazar's explanation of the defeat:

Maybe, indeed, we ought from the very first –when, having chosen to assert our liberty, we invariably experienced such hard treatment from one another, and still harder from our foes –we ought, I say, to have read God's purpose and to have recognized that the Jewish race, once beloved of Him, had been condemned.¹⁰⁴

In keeping with Josephus' general explanation of the Roman victory,¹⁰⁵ Eleazar argues that God's purpose was manifest in the specific circumstances that allowed the Romans to take control over Masada, namely the destruction of its wall by fire:

¹⁰¹ See especially *BJ* 2.254-7; *BJ* 2.274-276; *BJ* 2.425; *BJ* 4.398-409; *BJ* 5.2-5; *BJ* 5.5-20; *BJ* 5.27-38; *BJ* 5.100-105; *BJ* 5.528. His representation of the *sicarii* compares to that of the zealots, esp. in *BJ* 4.138ff. The crimes of the *sicarii* as well as of the zealots and the Idumaeans are summed up at *BJ* 7.254-274. Rajak, *Josephus* 81 comments: 'Nowhere is Josephus more emotive, or more repetitive than in what he writes about the rebels'.

¹⁰² *BJ* 7.323-325.

¹⁰³ *BJ* 7.325-326.

¹⁰⁴ *BJ* 7.327-328.

¹⁰⁵ Rajak, *Josephus* 80-81 also argues that Eleazar's speech functions as a mouthpiece for Josephus' own opinions. Recently: Mader, *Josephus and the politics of historiography* 26-27.

For it was not of their own accord that those flames which were driving against the enemy turned back upon the wall constructed by us; no, all this betokens wrath at the many wrongs (πολλῶν ἀδικημάτων) which we madly dared (ἄμανέντες ... ἐτολήσαμεν) to inflict upon our countrymen.¹⁰⁶

As in the speeches by Agrippa, Josephus, Vespasian and Titus, Eleazar refers to the rebels' past behaviour as examples of μανία and τόλμη (through use of the verb τολμάω). Unlike the use of these words by Agrippa and Vespasian and Titus, however, μανία and τόλμη do not imply in this context that it was per se madness to fight against Roman domination. Eleazar's wording rather suggests that the doom God has inflicted on the Jews originates from a later stage in the rebellion, and results from the crimes committed by the *sicarii* on their compatriots. It is in that respect significant that Josephus in no instance depicts the Masada-rebels as fighting against Romans. They are pre-occupied slaughtering their own people.¹⁰⁷

Eleazar's call for a collective suicide also stems from this analysis, as he proposes to pay the penalty not to the Romans, but to God.¹⁰⁸ Eleazar's repentance is therefore only partial. He regrets having offended God by not having recognized earlier that submission of the Jews by the Romans was fated, but he maintains his intention to avoid that submission at all costs.¹⁰⁹ The final words of his speech bear this out:

Our provisions let us spare; for they will testify (μαρτυρήσουσιν), when we are dead, that it was not want which subdued us, but that, in keeping with our initial resolve, we preferred death to slavery (θάνατον ἐλόμενοι πρὸ δουλείας).¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁶ *BJ* 7.332.

¹⁰⁷ Ladouceur, 'Josephus and Masada' 105.

¹⁰⁸ *BJ* 7.333; Lindner, *Geschichtsauffassung* 34.

¹⁰⁹ I therefore agree with Rajak, *Josephus* 80-81 that Eleazar articulates some of Josephus' opinions. It is possible, as she argues, that Josephus was influenced by the literary tradition 'of putting stirring and even anti-Roman words into the mouths of defeated enemies'.

¹¹⁰ *BJ* 7.336.

Not burning the provisions, Eleazar argues, is a show of the strength of the rebels in the face of their enemies. It demonstrates that they had not killed themselves out of want, but in order to maintain until the very end their intention of not submitting to slavery.¹¹¹ The use of the verb μαρτυρέω (to bear witness) foreshadows the effects that the sight not just of the remaining provisions but, more strikingly, of the rebels' bodies will have on the conquerors.¹¹² We will see below that Josephus' description of that dreadful sight offers plentiful opportunity to interpret the rebels' action as the actions of martyrs. This possibility has been fruitfully exploited by modern day admirers of the *sicarii*,¹¹³ but is in stark opposition not only to Josephus' description of them throughout *The Jewish War* as bandits,¹¹⁴ but also to Eleazar's own admission of their crimes.

Josephus continues by commenting that Eleazar, on seeing that his speech had not persuaded all the rebels, embarked on a brighter (λαμπροτέρους) address on the immortality of the soul.¹¹⁵ In this monologue he addresses in more detail the questions of what behaviour constitutes courage and daring. Τόλμη

¹¹¹ Thomas Grünewald, *Bandits in the Roman Empire. Myth and Reality* (translated by John Drinkwater, London and New York 2004) 107-108 comments that the rebels thereby robbed the Romans of their victory.

¹¹² *BJ* 7.402-406.

¹¹³ On the changing role of the Masada-episode in the development of Israelian identity: Barry Schwartz, Yeal Zerubavel and Bernice M. Barnett, 'The recovery of Masada: a study in collective memory' *The Sociological Quarterly* 27.2 (Summer 1986) 147-164; Yael Zerubavel, 'The Death of Memory and the Memory of Death: Masada and the Holocaust as Historical Metaphors' *Representations* 45 (Winter 1994) 72-100; Yael Zerubavel, *Recovered Roots: Collective Memory and the Making of Israeli National Tradition* (Chicago 1994); Nachman Ben-Yehuda, *The Masada Myth: Collective Memory and Mythmaking in Israel* (Madison 1995) with further bibliography.

¹¹⁴ See note 101. Mason, *The Life of Josephus* 31-32 nt 143 remarks that Josephus uses, both in *The Life* and in *The War*, terms like ληστής, ληστεία, ληστρικόν as well as στασιασταί, στασιῶδες to refer to the rebels and that by his use of the ληστ-*group* he 'places them rhetorically beyond the threshold of civilized society, evoking the threat to public safety of a criminal "counterstate"'. The word 'sicarii' belongs to this category as well. Cohen, *Josephus in Galilee and Rome* 211-214 concludes, on the contrary, that the ληστ-*group* 'usually refers to men who were primarily brigands, only secondarily, and not always, revolutionaries. More generally on banditry in Josephus: Grünewald, *Bandits* chapter 5; B.D. Shaw, 'Tyrants, Bandits and Kings: Personal power in Josephus' *Journal of Jewish Studies* 44 (1993) 176-204; B.D. Shaw, 'Bandits in the Roman Empire' *Past and Present* 105 (1984) 3-52; R.A. Horsley and J.S. Hanson, *Bandits, Prophets and Messiahs: Popular Movements in the Time of Jesus* (Minneapolis 1985).

¹¹⁵ *BJ* 7.341-388.

is used in a positive way side by side with ἀνδρεία, ἀρετή, and ἀγαθός. But it is a classified τόλμη, a defiance of death based on a consideration both of what it means to live under Roman domination and of what it means to die.¹¹⁶ In this sense Eleazar's τόλμη is comparable to Spartacus' φρονήμα as described by Plutarch. They both meet their death in full awareness of the limited options available to them. For Eleazar and his men the choice between death and domination is helped by the conviction that death is not the end. At the start of his speech he says:

Deeply, indeed, was I deceived in thinking that I should have brought together brave men in our struggles for freedom (ἀνδράσιν ἀγαθοῖς τῶν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐλευθερίας ἀγώνων) – men determined to live well or die (ζῆν καλῶς ἢ τεθνάναι). But you, it seems, are no different than the common herd in excellence or in daring (ἀρετὴν οὐδ'εὐτολμίαν), you who are terrified even of that death that will deliver you from the direst ills, when in such a cause you ought neither to hesitate an instant nor wait for a counsellor. For from of old, since the first dawn of intelligence, we have been continually taught by those precepts, ancestral and divine – confirmed by the deeds and noble spirit (ἔργους τε καὶ φρονήμασι) of our forefathers - that life, not death is man's misfortune.¹¹⁷

Τόλμη and ἀρετή are considered on the same footing as the marks of noble men (ἀνδράσιν ἀγαθοῖς), who have no fear of death, and prefer to die if they cannot live a good life. The use of εὐτολμία¹¹⁸ to indicate the impulsiveness inherent in daring is deliberate, as Eleazar points out that in their situation there is no room for hesitation or deliberation. A similar tendency to act on intuition is accorded to the forefathers by reference to their spirit (φρονήμα). The two words which, as we have seen both in *The Jewish War* and in the other

¹¹⁶ Indeed for Ladouceur, 'Josephus and Masada' the use of words derivative from τόλμη implies that the whole speech should be read ironically. In his opinion, Josephus through this undercuts the positive meanings of ἀνδρεία, ἀρετή, and ἀγαθός. My reading of τόλμη, however, suggests that τόλμη is not purely negative. Titus' τόλμη, see below, bears this out.

¹¹⁷ *BJ* 7.341-343.

¹¹⁸ The prefix removes any doubt that this word may not be considered in a positive light.

texts discussed in this dissertation, normally indicate character traits that harbour dangers if not accompanied by reason, are used here in an unambiguously positive way by Eleazar. The reason for this is that Eleazar aims to clarify that they are based on the traditional and divine principles that death is better than life.¹¹⁹

Although Eleazar's speech leaves no doubt as to the correct interpretation of *τόλμη* and *φρονήμα*, the fact that the person uttering these words is a leader of bandits invites a reading of his speech that problematises his defiance of death. This is especially the case since the first part of the speech, which addresses the superiority of death over life,¹²⁰ is in direct contrast with Josephus' philosophical reasoning at Jotapata on the crime of suicide.¹²¹ The ambiguity, however, cuts both ways. We have already noted that Josephus' introduction to his speech made it clear that the sole purpose of his rhetoric was to persuade his companions and that his arguments should not be interpreted as representing his own opinion.¹²² The reader knows at this point that Josephus has another overriding motivation for staying alive. The direct contrast with Eleazar's reasoning on suicide does not therefore necessarily imply that Josephus considers Eleazar to be wrong. Rather, he shows two ways of thinking about suicide, both of which are problematic.

¹¹⁹ Solomon Zeitlin, 'The Sicarii and Masada' *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 57.4 (April 1967) 251-270 points out that the suicide goes against Jewish theological arguments that one who commits suicide will be excluded from paradise. This is, however, not remarked upon by Josephus.

¹²⁰ *BJ* 7.341-357.

¹²¹ *BJ* 3.362-382. Rajak, *Josephus* 89 also interprets the two speeches as a set, in the tradition of paired speeches found in Greek and Roman historians, most notably Dionysius of Halicarnassus. I disagree with her argument that the pairing of the speeches functions 'to show that Josephus' own behaviour had been at least as respectable and justifiable as that of the heroes', as in my interpretation of Josephus' speech, Josephus deliberately constructs a dubious argument. Mason, 'Figured Speech and Irony' 271 suggests that Josephus' admiring account of Eleazar's speech is ironic, but does not discuss it in detail. Mader, *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography* connects the two speeches on suicide with Josephus' account of the heroic suicide of Longus (*BJ* 6.186-190), which 'is reported as a *letum nobile* in the best Roman tradition' although it is in direct opposition to Josephus' speech on suicide. Mader concludes that 'the two examples show how easily Josephus moves between the two cultures, adjusting discourse and perspective as the narrative requires', but it also demonstrates the dubious nature of Josephus' speech.

¹²² *BJ* 3.362.

In the second half of his speech Eleazar returns to the argument that it is God's will that the Jews will be defeated.¹²³ He reiterates that the defeat is not due to Roman strength or Jewish weakness and continues by arguing that those who died defending liberty are happier than those captured by the Romans. The danger of torture and the evils of slavery are brought vividly before his auditors' eyes¹²⁴:

For we were born for death, we and those whom we have begotten; and this even the fortunate cannot escape. But outrage and servitude (ὕβρις δὲ καὶ δουλεία) and the sight of our wives being led to shame with their children – these are no necessary evils imposed by nature on mankind, but befall through their own cowardice (δειλίαν) those who, having the chance of forestalling them by death, refuse to take it. But we, priding ourselves on our courage (ἡμεῖς δ' ἐπ' ἀνδρεία μέγα φρονοῦντες), revolted from the Romans, and now at the last, when they offered us our lives, we refused the offer. Who then can fail to foresee their wrath (θυμὸς) if they take us alive?¹²⁵

The argument that Roman anger (θυμὸς) would fall more heavily on those who rebelled with more passion is a familiar one. We have seen that Agrippa had warned the Jews not to rebel as this would provoke maltreatment, whereas by submitting obligingly they would not only avoid harsh punishment, but might even confuse the rulers.¹²⁶ Josephus' hesitation to surrender before he remembered his dream was also informed by the knowledge that he had been one of the worst enemies of the Romans. I argued that his prayer to God to take him to witness (μαρτύρομαι) that he surrendered as his minister and not as a traitor (προδότης) implicitly confirmed a reading of his actions as treacherous, were it not for the special

¹²³ *BJ* 7.358-388.

¹²⁴ And also to the readers' eyes. See Chapman, 'Spectacle in Josephus' on Josephus' description of the Masada episode as a 'spectacle of violence'.

¹²⁵ *BJ* 7.381-384.

¹²⁶ Remember also that Agrippa even ironically remarked that the rebels might just as well commit suicide in order to spare themselves the ignominy of defeat. *BJ* 2.395.

situation that Josephus had been selected as God's messenger.¹²⁷ The following unconvincing rhetoric on the evils of suicide emphasised the strength of his loyalty to God by affirming the questionability of his actions vis-à-vis the other rebels in the cave. Eleazar's argument, that it is cowardly to choose to live and accept slavery and *hubris* from the Romans, is in direct opposition to Josephus' argument at Jotapata that those who commit suicide for fear of punishment are comparable to the captain who sinks his ship for fear of the storm. This, however, does not invalidate Eleazar's point.¹²⁸ It rather corroborates the impression that, although Josephus was opposed to the stubbornness and methods of the revolt of the *sicarii*, an analysis which comes out clear throughout his description of them in *The Jewish War* and is even shared by Eleazar in this speech, he was in agreement with Eleazar's chosen exit strategy.¹²⁹

The positive reading of the *sicarii's* suicide is further strengthened by Josephus' description of the Romans' reaction on seeing the bodies. Eleazar had finished his speech expressing his hope that the collective suicide would fill the Romans with amazement and wonder:

Let us hasten then to leave them, instead of their hoped-for enjoyment at capturing us, amazement at our death and wonder at our daring.¹³⁰

Σπεύσωμεν οὖν ἀντὶ τῆς ἐλπίζομένης αὐτοῖς καθ' ἡμῶν ἀπολαύσεως
ἔκπληξιν τοῦ θανάτου καὶ θαῦμα τῆς τόλμης καταλιπεῖν.

¹²⁷ Josephus' hesitation: *BJ* 3.346; Josephus' prayer: *BJ* 3.354.

¹²⁸ From a Thucydidean perspective, however, one might argue that Eleazar's identity as a leader in the Jewish στάσις implies he is confusing the meaning of words relating to courage and cowardice. I do think that Josephus is playing with that common place both here and in his own Jotapata-speech; nevertheless, the questionability of his own argument suggests that his play is more subtle than has been accounted for.

¹²⁹ Compare Josephus' discussion of Spartan and Jewish death defiance in *Against Apion* 2.226-2.235. He admiringly states that the Jews surpass the Spartans in their obedience to their laws and their readiness to suffer and die for them. Jan Willem van Henten, *The Maccabean martyrs as saviours of the Jewish people. A study of 2 and 4 Maccabees* (Leiden 1997) 224-225.

¹³⁰ *BJ* 7.388.

Eleazar's hope is fulfilled exactly, as Josephus' describes the wonder of the Romans on discovering their enemies:

Here encountering the mass of slain, instead of exulting as over enemies, they wondered at (ἐθαύμασαν) the nobility (γενναιότητα) of their resolve (τοῦ βουλευματος) and the contempt of death (τοῦ θανάτου καταφρόνησιν) displayed by so many in carrying it, unwavering, into execution.¹³¹

The Romans' wonder at the Jews' daring and their contempt for death (τοῦ θανάτου καταφρόνησις) should be considered in the context of Titus' and Vespasian's characterisation of these passions (alongside with ἀπόνοια and θράσος) as barbarian.¹³² They argued that since these passions would weaken in bad circumstances, they would be no match for Roman training, experience and ἀρετή that are steadfast in times of crisis as well as of success. Now the same death defiant τόλμη is not just a cause for wonderment but is also considered a mark of nobility, as the Romans are amazed by the steadfastness with which the rebels had carried out their collective suicide. Note also that in the worst possible circumstances, the act of suicide is still depicted as the result of a deliberated decision (βουλευματος).

The combination of steadfastness, rationality and amazed spectators invites a reading of the *sicarii's* death as an example of martyrdom, although it is different from martyrdom in being self-inflicted.¹³³ In addition to Eleazar's explicit statement at the end of the speech that Roman amazement and

¹³¹ *BJ* 7.406. Ladouceur, 'Josephus and Masada' 105 proposes in place of Thackeray's translation ('they admired the nobility of their resolve'): 'they were astonished at the high spirit of their resolve'. I kept 'nobility' and used 'wondered' as a translation for ἐθαύμασαν. Ladouceur argues that Thackeray's translation is too positive, but he neglects that even in his own more neutral translation, Josephus' account of the Romans' reaction is remarkably positive.

¹³² See above, 201-206.

¹³³ Rajak, 'Dying for the Law' 124-126. She reacts against Hengel's suggestion that the depiction of the suicide as martyrdom only appeared in *The Jewish War* since Josephus' source material already contained this image. Note, however, Van Henten, *The Maccabean martyrs* 6-8, who differentiates between heroic suicide and martyrdom. Van Henten (58-9) also interestingly discusses the possibility that Josephus authored *4 Maccabees* on the basis of the interplay between passion and reason.

wonder is a goal of the collective suicide, he has also described it earlier in the speech as ‘an example for others of readiness to die’.¹³⁴ Eleazar’s expression of the belief that God had given the *sicarii* this opportunity to choose their own death¹³⁵ further corroborates the impression that this is a religiously motivated act.¹³⁶ In that respect too, Eleazar’s speech is a counterpiece to Josephus’ speech at Jotapata. Unlike Eleazar, Josephus can only ask God to witness his resolve to live, since all other witnesses mistake his behaviour for treachery. Eleazar’s and Josephus’ motivation and the resultant combination of passion and rationality, are, however, similar.

In his dramatic depiction of the act itself,¹³⁷ Josephus draws a vivid picture of the passions running through the *sicarii*’s hearts, but at the same time emphasises their unwavering belief in their decision, based on the considerations that Eleazar had put forward in his speech.¹³⁸ Josephus describes how Eleazar’s hearers ‘were in a haste to do the deed, filled by some uncontrollable impulse’ (πρὸς τὴν προᾶξιν ἠπείγοντο, ἀνεπισχέτου τινὸς ὁρμῆς πεπληρωμένοι), and went about it like men possessed (δαμονῶντες).¹³⁹ At the same time, he relates how the men:

inflexibly held to the resolution, which they had formed while listening to the address, and though personal emotion and affection (οἰκείου καὶ φιλοστόργου

¹³⁴ *BJ* 7.351.

¹³⁵ *BJ* 7.325.

¹³⁶ Rajak, ‘Dying for the Law’ 124-126 points out that Josephus’ *Against Apion* emphasises the importance of total obedience to God. See in particular CA 232, where Josephus compares this obedience with Spartan obedience to the law. See also: Erich S. Gruen, ‘Jewish perspectives on Greek culture and ethnicity’ in: John J. Collins and Gregory E. Sterling ed., *Hellenism in the Land of Israel* (Notre Dame, Indiana 2001) 62-93, esp. 68-70.

¹³⁷ The vividness of Josephus’ depiction invites the reader to be as amazed as the Romans at the sight of the *sicarii*’s bodies. On Josephus’ account of their suicide as a ‘spectacle of violence’, see Chapman, ‘Spectacle in Josephus’ *Jewish War*’ 307-9. This further strengthens the interpretation of their suicide as an example of martyrdom, as martyrdom requires spectators, both direct and indirect.

¹³⁸ *BJ* 7.389-401.

¹³⁹ *BJ* 7.389.

πάθους) were alive in all, reason (λογισμοῦ), which (δὲ ὥς)¹⁴⁰ they knew had consulted best for their loved ones, was paramount.¹⁴¹

The rebels display in Josephus' description a combination of eagerness and daring on the one hand, and steadfastness and reason on the other. Despite his negative valuation of the *sicarii's* resistance to Roman domination up to this point, now that the rebels have understood the defeat to be inevitable Josephus presents their story with admiration and pity. To Josephus they have now become 'victims of necessity' (ἄθλιοι τῆς ἀνάγκης),¹⁴² and their suicide is an admirable tragedy (πάθος).¹⁴³ The contrast of the mass suicide with Josephus' decision to surrender and the defence of his behaviour at Jotapata, which emphasised Josephus' unique role in the history of the Jewish revolt as a messenger from God, demonstrates a range of possible interpretations, both positive and negative, of the passionate and daring behaviour of the rebels. The simple dichotomy between good reason and bad passion, which can be seen in the speeches of Titus, Vespasian and Agrippa, is proven to be more complex in the representations of Josephus' surrender and Eleazar's suicide. This complexity reappears in the battle scenes in *The Jewish War*.

The Jewish-Roman dichotomy of ἀπόνοια and ἀρετή in the battle scenes

The juxtaposition of despairing Jews and disciplined Romans expressed by Titus and Vespasian recurs in Josephus' account of the battles between the rebels and the conquerors.¹⁴⁴ In this section I will first analyse the behaviour of groups of Jews and Romans in battle, before discussing the heroic deaths of some individual Romans and Jews. In the final part of this chapter I will then

¹⁴⁰ Ladouceur, 'Josephus and Masada' 102-3 makes much of this expression of doubt, suggesting that it betrays Josephus' real opinion that the suicide was not reasonable. I stick to the interpretation that it simply suggests doubt, nothing more and nothing less.

¹⁴¹ *BJ* 7.390.

¹⁴² *BJ* 7.393.

¹⁴³ *BJ* 7.401.

¹⁴⁴ See in addition to the passages analysed below *BJ* 3.15; *BJ* 3.152-3; *BJ* 3.267-9; *BJ* 3.276; *BJ* 5.121-125; *BJ* 5.305-311; *BJ* 5.338-339; *BJ* 5.486-490; *BJ* 6.12-21; *BJ* 6.136-148; *BJ* 6.159-160; *BJ* 6.393-4; *BJ* 7.7.

argue that this juxtaposition of Jewish daring and Roman courage is not as clear cut as may first appear.

In the proemium of the first book Josephus admits that in his own view the Jews brought their troubles on themselves because of their civil unrest (στάσις).¹⁴⁵ Accordingly, in the first book he mainly treats the struggles between Antiochus Epiphanes and the Hasmoneans, who involved Pompey in the war, emphasising the irrationality of Jewish τόλμη without paying much attention to the Romans' behaviour in battle. Only halfway through the book does he relate how the Roman governor of Syria, Sossius (ordered by Antony to support Herod against Antiochus), besieges Jerusalem with a large army.¹⁴⁶ Josephus describes three types of reaction among the besieged. The weaker (ἀσθενέστερον), 'indulged in frenzy and invented numerous oracular utterances to fit the crisis' (ἔδαιμονία καὶ πολλὰ θειωδέστερον πρὸς τοὺς καιροὺς ἐλογοποιεῖ); the more daring (τολμηροτέρων) went on marauding expeditions to seize provisions; among the military men, finally, the more disciplined (εὐτακτότερον) had to repel the besiegers.¹⁴⁷ Josephus' use of εὐτακτότερον could be considered problematic in view of his Roman-Jewish dichotomy, but he proceeds to emphasise the difference between Jewish and Roman discipline by describing Herod's tactics against Antiochus' defence.¹⁴⁸ The comparative εὐτακτότερον is meaningful only with reference to the populace of Jerusalem. The Jews hold out against the Romans not because of their discipline but because of their τόλμη:

As for the combatants, the military experience (ἐμπειρία) of the Romans gave him [Sossius] the advantage over them [the rebels], although their daring (τόλμη) knew no bounds. If they did not openly fling themselves against the Roman lines, to face certain death, they would through their underground

¹⁴⁵ *BJ* 1.10-12 and *BJ* 1.27-29. στάσις is a leading theme throughout books 1 and 4 as well as the beginning of book 5. See in addition *BJ* 2.523-527; *BJ* 2.638; *BJ* 3.492-496; *BJ* 5.255-257; *BJ* 5.424ff; *BJ* 5.512-518. See in book 4 especially *BJ* 4.368-376 and *BJ* 4.386-388.

¹⁴⁶ *BJ* 1.345-1.353.

¹⁴⁷ *BJ* 1.347-348.

¹⁴⁸ *BJ* 1.349.

passages appear suddenly in the enemy's midst; and before one portion of the wall was overthrown they were erecting another in its stead. In a word, neither in action nor intention did they ever flag, fully resolving to hold out to the last.¹⁴⁹

The defendants' daring is depicted as a dangerous weapon against the Romans that, combined with the endurance with which they continued their resistance, prolongs the siege to five months. But ultimately it is no match for Roman ἐμπειρία. The strength of Antiochus' defence only serves to magnify the Roman feat of defeating such enthusiastic enemies.¹⁵⁰ In Josephus' account of the aftermath of the battle, the daring of Antiochus' men works to their disadvantage as he describes how the Roman troops' anger at the length of the siege, despite Herod's entreaties, results in a massacre.¹⁵¹ Agrippa's warning at *BJ* 2.351 that a rebellious attitude would only entice the Romans to treat their subjects harshly, whereas submission might result in better treatment, therefore reflects the experience of his great grandfather Herod who pleaded in vain. It is noteworthy in this respect that Josephus emphasises the presence of the Roman army to the extent of ignoring Herod's own troops and Syrian auxiliaries. He mentions them before the battle scene as part of the whole army, and at the beginning of his account of the massacre,¹⁵² but, apart from sporadic mention of Herod's elite forces, not in his depiction of the battle itself.

In accordance with Titus' and Vespasian's explanation of Jewish behaviour in battle, in his account of the unsuccessful attack on Ascalon Josephus connects the juxtaposition of daring and passion versus experience and rationality to the danger of over-elatedness. He explains how the Jews were unable to restrain themselves after their defeat of the legate Cestius at Beth Horon¹⁵³ and

¹⁴⁹ *BJ* 1.349-350.

¹⁵⁰ Compare Newell, 'Josephus' Suicide Accounts' 287.

¹⁵¹ *BJ* 1.351-353.

¹⁵² *BJ* 1.345 and *BJ* 1.1.351.

¹⁵³ *BJ* 2.517ff.

rushed into battle at Ascalon.¹⁵⁴ Their confidence is the beginning of their downfall as they enter into an unequal fight:

It was a case of novices against veterans (πρὸς ἐμπείρους πολέμων ἄπειροις), infantry against cavalry (πεζοὶς πρὸς ἵππεις), ragged order against serried ranks (ἄσυντάκτοις τε πρὸς ἠνωμένους), men casually armed against fully equipped regulars (πρὸς ὀπλίτας ἐξηρτυμένους εἰκαιότερον ὀπλισμένοις), on the one side men whose actions were directed by passion rather than policy, on the other disciplined troops acting upon the least signal from their commander (θυμῶ τε πλέον ἢ βουλή στρατηγούμενοις πρὸς εὐπειθεῖς).¹⁵⁵

The dominance of θυμός over βουλή resulting from the Jews' confidence inspired by their defeat of Cestius offers an explanation for their behaviour analogous to Agrippa's characterisation of the rebels as motivated by an unrealistic hope for freedom (ἐλπὶς ἀλόγιστος ἐλευθερίας)¹⁵⁶ and Titus' emphasis on the instability of τόλμη, θράσος and ἀπόνοια.¹⁵⁷

A similar pattern can be found in Josephus' account of the fighting between Titus and the Idumaeans in book 5.¹⁵⁸ He begins by outlining the civil conflicts between the Idumaeans and the Zealots and concludes that 'it was the civil strife which subdued the city and the Romans that subdued the strife' (γὰρ ὡς τὴν μὲν πόλιν ἢ στάσις, Ῥωμαῖοι δ'εἶλον τὴν στάσιν).¹⁵⁹ In the ensuing battle scenes the discord is temporarily set aside. At first, Jewish daring appears to get the better of Roman discipline. They combine forces against the Roman battering engines, and nearly manage to set them on fire.¹⁶⁰ However, as the battle continues, Josephus juxtaposes the motives of both parties, and notes that,

¹⁵⁴ *BJ* 3.9-14.

¹⁵⁵ *BJ* 3.15.

¹⁵⁶ *BJ* 3.346.

¹⁵⁷ *BJ* 3.479. See also Mader *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography* 41, who compares the passage to Polybius 3.81 and 9.12.

¹⁵⁸ *BJ* 5.248 ff.

¹⁵⁹ *BJ* 5.257.

¹⁶⁰ *BJ* 5.277-308, esp. 285-288.

For the Romans, the incentives for manliness (ἀνδρεία) were their habit of victory and inexperience of defeat, their continuous campaigns and perpetual training, the magnitude of their empire, and above all Titus, ever and everywhere present beside all.¹⁶¹

We have seen in Vespasian's speech that Romans' inexperience of defeat was a problem as it inspired overconfidence. Here it appears in a more positive sense and is followed by a reference to the experience of war that the troops did possess. Nevertheless, Josephus does comment on the danger of overconfidence when he continues from this general statement by remarking that for many of the troops the desire to be considered courageous (γενναῖος) by the emperor inspired them to 'display greater eagerness than their strength warranted'. He gives the behaviour of one of them, Longinus, as an example:¹⁶² he relates how Longinus jumped out of the Roman lines into the Jewish ranks, breaking their lines and killing two of the bravest (γενναϊοτάτους), before returning safely to his own side.¹⁶³ Although he makes clear that Longinus' feat was an example of ἀρετή and ἀνδρεία,¹⁶⁴ he also comments that:

Titus, on the other hand (δὲ), cared as much for his soldiers' safety as for success; and (μὲν), pronouncing inconsiderate impulsiveness to be mere desperation (ἀπερίσκεπτον ὀρμήν ἀπόνοιαν λέγων), and ἀρετή only deserving of the name when combined with forethought (προνοίας) and a regard for the actor's security, he ordered his troops to prove their manhood without running personal risks.¹⁶⁵

¹⁶¹ *BJ* 5.310.

¹⁶² *BJ* 5.311-314.

¹⁶³ Mader, *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography* notes that the precision with which Longinus carried out his attack may also be interpreted as a sign of strategic calculation.

¹⁶⁴ *BJ* 5.314: 'His valour gained him distinction, and led many to emulate his manliness' (ὁ μὲν οὖν δι' ἀρετὴν ἐπίσημος ἦν, ζηλωταὶ δὲ τῆς ἀνδρείας – L edition:

ἀνδραγαθίας- ἐγίνοντο πολλοί).

¹⁶⁵ *BJ* 5.316.

The μὲν clause relating to the δὲ in the sentence does not relate directly to Longinus, but to the Jewish contempt for death. In his account of Longinus' feat, Josephus emphasises that Longinus returned uninjured.¹⁶⁶ Sandwiched between this example of ἀρετή and the comments on Titus' concern for safety, Josephus remarks that:

The Jews, for their part, regardless of suffering, thought only of the injury which they could inflict and death seemed to them a trivial matter if it involved the fall of one of the enemy.¹⁶⁷

The importance of forethought and safety for ἀρετή and manliness expressed by Titus suggests that the crucial difference between Jewish daring and Longinus' bravery is the fact that while Longinus' προθυμία exceeds his strengths, it does not spring from despair, as is the case for the Jews, but from the anticipation of Titus' approval.¹⁶⁸ Hence, Longinus' display does not contain the disregard for suffering and death, which marks the Jewish behaviour. As in Vespasian's speech, we see that passionate enthusiasm can be a commendable characteristic for a soldier, and it is a mark of Titus' leadership that he is able to inspire it.

The difference is further exemplified by the case of Castor.¹⁶⁹ Along with five others, Castor pretended to surrender to the Romans, and was offered security by Titus. While Titus was waiting for them to come down, a (fake) discussion followed, culminating in violence, as five others exclaimed that they would never be slaves of the Romans. Josephus comments that Castor did not stop

¹⁶⁶ *BJ* 5.313: 'He then escaped unscathed to his own lines from the midst of the enemy'.

¹⁶⁷ *BJ*. 5.315.

¹⁶⁸ This is comparable to the death of Sabinus the Syrian, who sacrificed himself after Titus had tried to motivate his men to more θυμός: *BJ* 6.54-67, discussed by Mader, *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography* 108-110. In the heroic death of Julianus the Bithynian (*BJ* 6.81-91) the presence of Titus is also of importance. Julianus takes the initiative in sacrificing himself in order to turn the situation to the advantage of the Romans, but, according to Mader 110-112, 'Titus' reactions to the exploit –first amazement (83), then grief at the hero's death (89) –endorse the centurion's action and in effect stamp it as an implementation of his own will.

¹⁶⁹ *BJ* 5.317-330.

his trickery even when struck by an arrow, and explains that he was the only one to see through this.¹⁷⁰ Titus understood ‘that in warfare compassion was mischievous, as severe measures afford less scope for artifice’, only after Castor killed a Jewish deserter, who came up to gain the money that Castor claimed to bring with him.¹⁷¹ At this point Castor and his companions escaped through the flames into a vault, impressing the Romans, who imagined they had jumped into the fire, with their courage (ἀνδρεία).¹⁷²

The episode is important not so much for Josephus’ opinion of trickery, which on the whole is positive.¹⁷³ This is especially the case when it is Josephus the general who uses it, and it is in that respect significant that he is the only one who recognizes Castor’s trick.¹⁷⁴ More relevant is the fact that the courage which astonished the Romans is a pretended courage. Josephus’ use of the two *exempla* in the context of an analysis of Roman and Jewish fighting styles aims to show that ἀνδρεία and ἀρετή belong to the Roman side and are applicable to Longinus’ feat, but not to Castor’s. His juxtaposition of Jewish death defiance and Roman concern for safety indicates that, while ἀνδρεία involves the taking of risks, it must go together with an awareness of these risks. At the same time, Castor’s trickery, which deliberately uses the Romans’ conceptions of courage in order to deceive them, demonstrates that the risk taking is an inherent part of ἀνδρεία.

The question of how ἀρετή and ἀνδρεία should be defined also runs through Josephus’ account of the single combat between Jonathan and Priscus in book

¹⁷⁰ *BJ* 5.321-326.

¹⁷¹ *BJ* 5.326-329. Mason, ‘Figured Speech and Irony’ 262-7 argues that this and other episodes are veiled criticisms of Titus’ clemency. In a world based on power politics, such softness accompanied by an inability to see through Castor’s trick is not a positive character trait.

¹⁷² *BJ* 5.330.

¹⁷³ *BJ* 2.600-607; *BJ* 2.611-613; *BJ* 2.618-9; *BJ* 2.630-1; *BJ* 2.635-646; *BJ* 3.187-189; *BJ* 3.260-261.

¹⁷⁴ In his selfportrayal in *The Life*, Josephus is even more of a trickster. See especially *Life* 262-265 and 377.

6.¹⁷⁵ Josephus remarks that Jonathan challenged the Romans to single combat and comments that:

Of those in the opposite ranks at this point, the majority regarded him with contempt, some probably with apprehension, while others were influenced by the not unreasonable reflection that it was wise to avoid a conflict with one who courted death; being aware that men who despaired of their safety (ἀπεγνωκότας τὴν σωτηρίαν) had not only ungovernable passions (ὄρμας ἀταμιεύτους) but also the ready compassion of God, and that to risk life in an encounter with persons whom to defeat were no great exploit, while to be beaten would involve ignominy as well as danger, would be an act not of bravery, but of recklessness (οὐκ ἀνδρείας ἀλλὰ θρασύτητος).¹⁷⁶

It is remarkable that Josephus implies that those who court death gain compassion from God, as throughout *The Jewish War* he makes clear that the favour of God has left the Jews. Nevertheless, the passage also suggests that it is better not to presume God's favour, and the story of Jonathan bears this out. Jonathan is depicted as conceited and contemptuous of the Romans (ἀλαζῶν γάρ τις ἦν αὐτῷ σφόδρα καὶ τῶν Ῥωμαίων ὑπερήφανος).¹⁷⁷ His challenge is therefore based on an unreasonable estimation of his enemy. The argument that to risk life in a battle with an enemy whom to defeat would not result in great honour is comparable to Plutarch's treatment of Crassus' recklessness. We have seen in chapter 5 that Crassus sacrificed safety so that he would have the sole honour of defeating Spartacus and his men. Since he defeated only slaves, he was not rewarded with a triumph.

The section above also concentrates on the differences between reason and uncontrollable passions and ἀνδρεία and θράσος. Josephus emphasises that when one of the troops was enticed to enter into combat with Jonathan, this

¹⁷⁵ *BJ* 6.169-176.

¹⁷⁶ *BJ* 6.170-171.

¹⁷⁷ *BJ* 6.169 and 172. In the interpretation of Mader, *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography* 113: 'The dissonance between posture and appearance is consciously exploited to discredit Jonathan as a mean Thersites'.

was done thoughtlessly. The man does not get a chance to begin fighting Jonathan as by chance he fell and was instantly killed by him.¹⁷⁸ Another Roman, the *centurion* Priscus, acts more sensibly and makes an end to Jonathan's empty boasting by shooting him.¹⁷⁹ His unheroic death, according to Josephus, 'illustrates how quick in war is the nemesis that overtakes irrational success' (ἀποφήνας ἐν πολέμῳ τὴν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀλόγως εὐτυχοῦσι νέμεσιν).¹⁸⁰ Both Jonathan and Castor therefore appear to be lacking in the courage that inspired Longinus. Castor because he pretends to run risks which he does not, Jonathan because he does not understand the risks he is taking.

The story of Castor also draws attention to Titus' leniency as an emperor. Titus is depicted as being forced to take harsh measures by the stubbornness of rebels like Castor who abuse his humanity. This plays into Josephus' agenda of placing the responsibility for the revolt with the rebels. This theme is also at the forefront when Josephus reveals how Titus, on capturing the second wall of the city, offered a free exit to the rebelling factions and restoration of the population's houses, and forbade his troops to sack the city.¹⁸¹ However, the rebels 'mistook his humanity for weakness' and managed to expel the Romans.¹⁸² Josephus concludes that 'God was blinding their minds because of their transgressions'¹⁸³ and comments that the vision of Titus' splendid troops should have been enough to change their minds, 'had not the enormity of their crimes against the people made them despair of obtaining pardon from the Romans'.¹⁸⁴

Another aspect of Josephus' depiction of the rebels that is similar to Pausanias' depiction of the Messenians is the emphasis on youth. Josephus tells us that a

¹⁷⁸ *BJ* 6.172-174: 'perhaps also thoughtlessly presuming on his puny stature' (εἰκὸς δὲ καὶ πρὸς τὴν βραχύτητα τοῦ σώματος αὐτὸν ἀσκέπτως ἐπαρθῆναι)

¹⁷⁹ *BJ* 6.175.

¹⁸⁰ *BJ* 6.176.

¹⁸¹ *BJ* 5.334.

¹⁸² *BJ* 5.336-341.

¹⁸³ *BJ* 5.343

¹⁸⁴ *BJ* 5.354.

minor Roman provocation resulted in wholesale massacre when the masses called on the Roman procurator Cumanus to punish the offending soldier and ‘some of the more hot-headed young men and seditious persons in the crowd (οἱ δὲ ἤττον νήφοντες τῶν νέων καὶ τὸ φύσει στασιῶδες), started a fight, and picking up stones, hurled them at the troops’.¹⁸⁵ The connection between youth and an inclination to rebel was also a theme in Agrippa’s speech and recurs frequently in *The Jewish War*.¹⁸⁶ Josephus’ repeated combination of these two features confirms that Pausanias’ use of this commonplace with regard to the Messenians should be interpreted as a negative trait.¹⁸⁷ By emphasising the actions of these young and rebellious men, Josephus excuses the actions of Cumanus’ troops in repressing the crowd.¹⁸⁸ He similarly makes sure to mention that other calamities following the massacre were started by those ‘inclined to rob’ (ληστικὸς), and continues by relating how the murder of a Galilean by a Samaritan caused even greater unrest when the news reached Jerusalem.¹⁸⁹ Josephus remarks how the masses, ‘without generals and without listening to any of the magistrates who sought to hold them back’, left for Samaria to massacre the inhabitants.¹⁹⁰ And he reinforces the image of these enraged avengers by noting that they disregarded the magistrates who went after them from Jerusalem to implore them to stop their actions:

¹⁸⁵ *BJ* 2.223-227. Their emphasis on Josephus’ contempt for the masses runs against Shaye D. Cohen, ‘Hellenism in unexpected places’ in: John J. Collins and Gregory E. Sterling ed., *Hellenism in the Land of Israel* (Notre Dame, Indiana 2001) 216-243, 223: ‘His goal is to restrict guilt: only a small number of Jews rebelled, and they represent neither the Jews nor Judaism’.

¹⁸⁶ *BJ* 1.503; *BJ* 1.535; *BJ* 2.267; *BJ* 2.286; *BJ* 2.290; *BJ* 2.303; *BJ* 2.346; *BJ* 2.409; *BJ* 2.476; *BJ* 3.595; *BJ* 4.128; *BJ* 4.153; *BJ* 7.196-209. See in addition Rajak, *Josephus* 91-95, esp. 93 on the concept of stasis and the young-old distinction, which is derived from Thucydides 2.8.20.2; 2.8.21.2; 5.43.2; 6.17 and 18.6. Eckstein, ‘Josephus and Polybius’ argues that Josephus’ use of this distinction is more Polybian than Thucydidean. On this discussion: Mader, *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography* 70-72. He argues that Josephus is heavily influenced by Thucydides.

¹⁸⁷ Mason, however, notes that in *The Life*, Josephus appears to have understanding for youthfulness. This is not per se an indication for a positive interpretation of daring: what is understandable for the young, becomes inexcusable for adult men. Mason, *The Life of Josephus* 80 nt 609 and 91 nt 761.

¹⁸⁸ This impression is reinforced too by his mention of the panic (φόβος) that seized the Jews: *BJ* 2.226.

¹⁸⁹ *BJ* 2.232-246.

¹⁹⁰ *BJ* 2.234.

As for the rest of the party who had rushed to war with the Samaritans, the magistrates of Jerusalem hastened after them, clad in sackcloth and with ashes strewn upon their heads, and implored them to return home and not, by their desire for reprisals on the Samaritans, to bring down the wrath of the Romans on Jerusalem, but to take pity on their country and sanctuary, on their own wives and children; all these were threatened with destruction merely for the object of avenging the blood of a single Galilean.¹⁹¹

As in the speeches by Agrippa, Josephus and Eleazar the emphasis is not on what is right or wrong, but on preventing Roman punishment. Josephus remarks that some indeed were persuaded by the magistrates, but that others were enticed by the more reckless (*θρασύτερων*) to continue their banditry.¹⁹² Josephus' attitude to Cumanus is not uncritical, as he notes that Cumanus let the murder go unpunished and has the magistrates complain likewise to the Syrian governor Quadratus, resulting ultimately in Claudius' punishment of the Samaritans and Cumanus' banishment,¹⁹³ but his emphasis is on the exaggerated and insensible response of the Jewish crowds.

Josephus' analysis of the Roman victory as willed by God tends to deny the Romans' responsibility for their behaviour.¹⁹⁴ Not only does he point out the crimes that sections of the Jewish population have committed, for which the Jews as a people are punished; by emphasising their recklessness, he can also point the reader to the self-destructive aspects of *τόλμη*, indicating that the Jews even more than the Romans were instruments in bringing about their own punishment. A striking example of this is Placidus' defeat of a group of fugitives:

¹⁹¹ *BJ* 2.237.

¹⁹² *BJ* 2.238.

¹⁹³ *BJ* 2.239-246.

¹⁹⁴ Rajak, 'Dying for the Law' 157: 'The implication of the Josephan doctrine that God is siding with the Romans must surely be that the day will come when the tables will be turned, when he will change side once more'; Mason, 'Figured Speech and Irony' 267: 'While sitting in Rome and addressing Roman audiences, surrounded by the evidence of Roman victory and in the face of all resentment and reprisal that such victories inevitably bring, Josephus has the clarity of vision to write a subversive history that displaces the Romans as victors in any meaningful sense'; Lindner 1972: 25,33, 43-4, 61-8, 82-4.

The Jews, in fact, were destroyed after a display of mere daring (τόλμης); for, flinging themselves upon the serried Roman ranks, walled in, as it were, by their armour, they found no loophole for their missiles and were powerless to break the line, whilst their own men were transfixed by their enemies' javelins and rushed, like the most savage of beasts (τοῖς ἀγριωτάτοις ... θηρίοις), upon the blade. So they perished, some struck down by the sword facing the foe, others in scattered flight before the cavalry.¹⁹⁵

The Jews' display of daring makes the Roman troops appear to be almost superfluous, as Josephus makes no mention of the people holding the swords, and focuses entirely on the ones who find their deaths on them. The account is strikingly similar to Pausanias' depiction of the Gauls at Thermopylae. As we have seen in chapter 2 he emphasised the beastly aspects of the Gauls' passion by remarking that their ἀπόνοια and θύμος remained strong even after they were slashed by sword or axe or pierced by arrow or javelin.¹⁹⁶

The Cumanus episode forms a prologue to Josephus' introduction of the *sicarii*,¹⁹⁷ as 'a new species of bandits' (ἕτερον εἶδος λῆστών), who committed murders in broad daylight with their *sica*, and of 'another evil crowd' (στίφος ἕτερον πονηρῶν) of 'deceivers and impostors' (πλάνοι γὰρ ἄνθρωποι καὶ ἀπατεῶνες), who 'persuaded the multitude to act like madmen (δαμονᾶν), and led them out into the desert under the belief that God would there give them tokens of deliverance (ἐλευθερίας)'.¹⁹⁸ Josephus compares the effects of this persuasion to the spreading of disease, rather like Diodorus described the growth of the Second Sicilian Slave War:

¹⁹⁵ *BJ* 4.419-425; this citation: 424-425.

¹⁹⁶ Paus. 10.21.2-3.

¹⁹⁷ The zealots reappear later in the story as the main instigators of civil strife in Jerusalem; *BJ* 4.121-161, esp. 161.

¹⁹⁸ *BJ* 2.254-260. On the role of the false prophets: Mader, *Josephus and the Politics of historiography* 21-24.

No sooner were these disorders reduced than the inflammation, as in a sick man's body (ὡσπερ ἐν νοσοῦντι σώματι), broke out again in another quarter. The impostors and brigands, banding together, incited numbers to revolt, exhorting them to assert their independence, and threatening to kill any who submitted to Roman domination and forcibly to suppress those who voluntarily accepted servitude. Distributing themselves in companies throughout the country, they looted the houses of the wealthy, murdered their owners, and set the villages on fire. The effects of their frenzy (τῆς ἀπονοίας) were thus felt throughout all Judaea, and every day saw this war being fanned into fiercer flame.¹⁹⁹

As we have seen in chapter 2 and 4, the metaphor of disease to illustrate revolt is a commonplace of Greek literature that has its roots with Thucydides' theory of *stasis*.²⁰⁰ In Diodorus' account of the second Sicilian Slave War, νοσοῦντες was paired with the excessively harsh treatment of the slave owners in order to explain the susceptibility of desperate slaves to rebel. Similarly, Josephus mentions ἀπόνοια as an enticement to revolt, but adds that the bandits threatened those who submitted to the Romans. Again, his apologetic aim, which involves excuses for both the Romans and the Jewish population, causes him to lay the blame on the bandits, although there are hints of Roman excesses as well.

Despair as a weapon

The possibility of despair becoming a dangerous weapon is at the forefront of Josephus' account of the fighting at Jotapata. The Jewish troops have to be represented relatively positively as they are led by Josephus himself.²⁰¹ As part of his self-presentation, Josephus pictures himself as a good general.²⁰² Having explained how the revolt developed into a full-blown war and how he was

¹⁹⁹ *BJ* 2.264-265.

²⁰⁰ E. Keitel, 'Principate and Civil War in the Annals of Tacitus' *American Journal of Philology* 105 (1981) 300-325. See also Mason, 'Reading Josephus' *Bellum Judaicum* 97.

²⁰¹ Mader, *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography* 114 n. 22.

²⁰² Cohen, *Josephus in Galilee and Rome* 91-100.

chosen as the general responsible for the two Galilees and Gamala,²⁰³ Josephus relates in detail how he had trained his army along Roman lines, understanding that 'the Romans owed their invincible strength above all to discipline and military training'.²⁰⁴ He accordingly introduced a Roman military hierarchy, alongside Roman tactics and signals, but 'above all he trained them for war by continually dwelling upon the good order (εὐταξίαν) maintained by the Romans and telling them that they would have to fight against men who by their bodily strength and intrepidity (δ'ἀλκὴν σώματος καὶ ψυχῆς) had become masters of almost the whole world'.²⁰⁵ His extensive account of the siege of Jotapata²⁰⁶ provides him with further opportunity to comment on his skills as a general, but as we shall see there are some interesting variations.²⁰⁷

To begin with, notwithstanding Josephus' emphasis on Roman εὐταξία, the behaviour of his troops at Jotapata is governed by despair and lacks discipline. At the start of the siege, the Jews manage to push the Romans back, displaying many braver feats and daring (χειρῶν ἔργα καὶ τόλμης), but suffering as many losses as the Romans.²⁰⁸ Josephus explains this situation by juxtaposing the Jewish desperate and Roman disciplined fighting styles:

For as much as the Jews were strengthened by despair for their deliverance (τῆς σωτηρίας ἀπόγνωσις), to that extent the Romans were strengthened by shame (αἰδώς); on the one side were skilled experience and strength (ἐμπειρία μετ'ἀλκῆς), the other had recklessness for its armour, and passion for its leader (τοὺς δὲ θράσος ὥπλιζε τῷ θυμῷ στρατηγουμένου).²⁰⁹

²⁰³ *BJ* 2.562-568.

²⁰⁴ Josephus' preparations: *BJ* 2.569-584; citation: *BJ* 2.577.

²⁰⁵ *BJ* 2.580.

²⁰⁶ *BJ* 3.141ff.

²⁰⁷ Cohen, *Josephus in Galilee and Rome* 8, 69-70 comments on the difference in Josephus' self-portrayal as a general in *The Jewish War* and *The Life of Josephus*. Whereas *The War* depicts Josephus preparing a war against the Romans, *The Life* claims that the Jewish aristocracy sent Josephus as a peacekeeper.

²⁰⁸ *BJ* 3.152.

²⁰⁹ *BJ* 3.153.

The dichotomy of ἀπόγνοια versus αἰδώς translates in practice into the juxtaposition between ἐμπειρία and ἀλκή on the one hand, and θράσος and θυμός on the other. For the moment they hold each other in check, but the juxtaposition already foreshadows the inevitable Jewish defeat. A few lines earlier Josephus had related how the Romans, by blocking all possible means of escape, had made the Jews more desperate, resulting in greater daring:

This manoeuvre, making them despair of deliverance, stimulated the Jews to daring; for nothing in war makes one more warlike as necessity.²¹⁰

Τοῦτ' ἐν ἀπογνώσει σωτηρίας παρώξυνε τοὺς Ἰουδαίους πρὸς τόλμαν.
Οὐδεν γὰρ ἀνάγκης ἐν πολέμῳ μαχιμώτερον.

The strategy is reminiscent of Pausanias' account of Phocian despair, mentioned in lesser detail by Polybius as well, but for the fact that in this case the enemy has occasioned the despair.²¹¹ Josephus' emphasis on τόλμη and ἀπόνοια is in accord with his representation of the masses who are persuaded by the zealots and the *sicarii* to take up arms, and his philosophy that Roman dominance was inevitable. Nevertheless, he also makes clear that these characteristics make the Jews dangerous enemies. In combination with Josephus' generalship they are the source of much Roman amazement and frustration; and the Romans are in the end able to take the city only through the treachery of a deserter who advised Vespasian when the guards would be the least vigilant.²¹²

Josephus' role as a general during the battle consists of two elements. He invents stratagems to outwit the Romans and he encourages his men to show more daring. The latter is remarkable in view of Josephus' negative interpretation of τόλμη and ἀπόνοια as barbarian character traits, as well as

²¹⁰ *BJ* 3.149.

²¹¹ Paus. 10.1.5-7; Polybius 16.32.

²¹² A classical theme: in addition to Herodotus on the fall of Thermopylae, compare the story of the adulterous cowherd in Paus. 4.20.5-10. Cf. above, 67-68.

his original intention to build his army along Roman lines. The present behaviour of his army corresponds to Josephus' scepticism about the possibility of providing sufficient instruction in Roman discipline,²¹³ but it can also be read as a demonstration of Josephus' limited success as a general.

Josephus' attempts to encourage the Jews to show more daring may be compared to Aristomenes' leadership at the siege of Eira. We have seen that Aristomenes, despite his knowledge that the Eira is fated to fall, exhorts his men to more τόλμη and ἀπόνοια; and that after this has happened he organises a raid to Sparta with the sole aim of leaving behind something worth remembering.²¹⁴ Josephus on realizing that Jotapata would no longer hold out encourages his men in a similar fashion:

'Now is the time', he said, 'to begin the combat when there is no more hope for deliverance (ὅτ' ἐλπίς οὐκ ἔστι σωτηρίας). Fine (καλὸν) it is to exchange one's life for renown (εὐκλειαν) and by some glorious exploit (δράσαντά τι γενναῖον) to ensure in falling the memory of posterity (εἰς μνήμην ὀψιγενῶν πεσεῖν)'.²¹⁵

The idea of fighting for a memory, similar to Aristomenes' encouragement to his selected troops for the raid on Sparta ('if we die, at least we leave something worth remembering'),²¹⁶ is expressed in an even stronger fashion a few paragraphs further on, when Josephus reports himself as exhorting his men to fight as avengers of what will happen when Jotapata falls to the Romans.

Let each man fight not as the saviour of his native place, but as its avenger (οὐχ ὡς ὑπὲρ σωθησομένης, ἀλλ' ὡς ὑπὲρ ἀπωλωλυίας), as though it were lost

²¹³ *BJ* 2.577: 'if he despaired of providing similar instruction to be acquired only by long use, he observed that their discipline was due to the number of their officers, and he therefore divided his army on Roman lines and increased the number of his company commanders'.

²¹⁴ Paus. 4.21.5-6 and 4.22.4-5.

²¹⁵ *BJ* 3.204.

²¹⁶ Paus. 4.22.4-5.

already. Let him picture to himself the butchery of the old men, the fate of the children and women at the hands of the foe, momentarily impending. Let the anticipation of these threatened calamities arouse his concentrated fury (θυμὸν), and let him vent it upon the would-be perpetrators.²¹⁷

Although Josephus remarks that he put his words into actions by leading his most warlike (μαχιμωτάτων) men in sudden attacks into the Roman camps,²¹⁸ the crucial difference from Aristomenes in this episode is that Josephus is not prepared to die himself. This is further clarified in his later speech at Jotapata, where, as we have seen above, Josephus is unable to refute his companions' accusations that his surrender is inconsistent with his persuasion of his men to die for liberty.²¹⁹ It is also made clear by the context in which Josephus repeats his encouragement. He explains that he had considered flight, and asked advice from the leading citizens, but was discovered by the people who begged him to stay.²²⁰

Josephus suspected that this insistence would not go beyond supplication if he yielded, but meant that watch would be kept upon him if he opposed their wishes. Moreover, his determination to leave them was greatly shaken by compassion for their distress. He therefore decided to remain, and make the universal despair of the city into a weapon for himself (καὶ τὴν κοινὴν τῆς πόλεως ἀπόγνωσιν ὀπλισάμενος) (...).²²¹

Later, when Josephus plans to surrender, his men's daring will nearly cost him his life, as his companions remember how Josephus encouraged his men to die for freedom and call on him to die with them.²²² However, for the moment ἀπόγνοια is a weapon instrumental in prolonging the siege and thereby Josephus' life. He reports that Vespasian urged his troops not to be

²¹⁷ *BJ* 3.260-261.

²¹⁸ *BJ* 3.205.

²¹⁹ *BJ* 3.362-382.

²²⁰ *BJ* 3.193-205.

²²¹ *BJ* 3.203-204.

²²² *BJ* 3.356-360.

provoked into battle with 'men bent on death' (θανατῶσιν ἄνθρωποις) and said that 'nothing is stronger than despair (ἀπογνώσεως), and their eagerness, deprived of an objective, will be extinguished, like fire for lack of fuel'.²²³ He repeats here the commonplace we have seen in his own and his son's speeches that τόλμη and ἀπό(γ)νοια, unlike Roman ἀρετή, lack constancy. The relation between behaviour in battle and motivation for battle receives further attention when he reminds his audience of the different reasons that the Romans and Jews have for fighting: 'Besides, it becomes even Romans to think of safety as well as victory, since they make war not from necessity, but to increase their empire'.²²⁴ Josephus follows this with a remark that henceforth Vespasian used his auxiliaries to defend against the Jewish attacks.²²⁵ The short-term dangers of τόλμη and the importance of safety are familiar, as is the idea that τόλμη is fickle.

However, this commonplace used by both Vespasian and Titus at various places in *The Jewish War* is proven wrong by the stubbornness with which large sections of the Jewish population continued their resistance. We have seen for example that the steadfastness of the rebels at Masada, culminating in their suicide, was as much cause for surprise as it was cause for admiration.²²⁶ The Roman troops had good reason to be so surprised as they had been told time and again that daring would give way in more desperate circumstances.²²⁷ Although Josephus places the Roman-Jewish dichotomy at the heart of his narrative and generally gives a positive reading of Roman discipline and order and a negative interpretation of Jewish daring and despair, he simultaneously problematises this juxtaposition by showing how the Romans' prejudice concerning the relation between τόλμη and ἀπόνοια does not always come true. This combination is a dangerous weapon, and one

²²³ *BJ* 3.207-210.

²²⁴ *BJ* 3.210.

²²⁵ *BJ* 3.211.

²²⁶ Compare *BJ* 6.13-14: 'Worst of all was the discovery that the Jews possessed a fortitude of soul that could surmount faction, famine, war and such a host of calamities'.

²²⁷ See above the speeches of Vespasian and Titus and especially *BJ* 3.15; *BJ* 3.209-211.

that, as it turns out, is somewhat underestimated. At the forefront of his negative interpretation of τόλμη and ἀπόνοια is the disorder that often results. However, we also see that Josephus at Jotapata is able to use these aspects while realising his clever stratagems, and elsewhere too we see it combined with effective planning and execution of battle tactics.²²⁸ It is of course a matter of discussion whether his mixing of the two literary *topoi*, relating to his self-casting as the ideal general²²⁹ and to his description of the Jewish daring, is convincing; but that is not the point. More important is the realisation that, although the Roman-Jewish dichotomy runs through *The Jewish War*, the value of the Jewish characteristics is by no means clear-cut. Τόλμη does have some positive connotations, just like discipline and order do have some negative.

In addition, in Josephus' representation of the two emperors the line between Roman and Jewish behaviour in battle is occasionally crossed. There are, for instance, some passages in *The Jewish War* that show Vespasian and Titus diverging from the tactics of caution and encouraging their men to be more daring, passages that provide interesting parallels to Josephus' enticement of his troops.²³⁰ We have already seen how the use of θύμος in Vespasian's speech contains both negative and positive elements, as Vespasian attempts to

²²⁸ See above the discussion of the siege at Jotapata and compare in addition: *BJ* 3.271: 'In this critical situation, Josephus, taking counsel from necessity (σύμβουλον λαβὼν τὴν ἀνάγκην), -ready as she is in invention when stimulated by despair (ἀπόγνωσις), -ordered boiling oil to be poured upon this roof of close-locked shields'; *BJ* 5.121 (Titus comments): 'These Jews, with desperation for their only leader (οἷς ἀπόνοια μόνη στρατηγεῖ), do everything with forethought and circumspection (προνοίας καὶ σκέψεως): their stratagems and ambushes are carefully planned, and their schemes are further favored by fortune because of their obedience and their mutual loyalty and confidence'; *BJ* 6.17-18 (commenting on an unsuccessful attack on earthworks): 'For, to begin with, there seemed to be no unanimity in their design: they dashed out in small parties, at intervals, hesitatingly and in alarm, in short not like Jews: the characteristics of the nation -daring, impetuosity, the simultaneous charge, the refusal to retreat even when worsted (ἡ τόλμα καὶ ὄρμη καὶ δρόμος ὁμοῦ πάντων καὶ τὸ μηδὲ πταίοντας) - were all lacking'.

²²⁹ For Josephus' self-portrayal as an ideal general: *BJ* 2.569-584; 2.620-631, esp. 623; *BJ* 2.635-646, esp. 642-646; *BJ* 3.171-175; *BJ* 3.183-5; *BJ* 3.195-189; *BJ* 222-225; *BJ* 3.258-261. Josephus' use of trickery: *BJ* 2.600-607; *BJ* 2.611-613; *BJ* 2.618-9; *BJ* 2.630-1; *BJ* 2.635-646; *BJ* 3.187-189; *BJ* 3.260-1.

²³⁰ Death-defiance on the part of Vespasian and Titus: *BJ* 3.239; *BJ* 3.324; *BJ* 3.490 (referring to 483-4); *BJ* 3.497-8; *BJ* 4.31-35; *BJ* 5.62; *BJ* 5.85-97; *BJ* 5.288; *BJ* 5.341; *BJ* 5.486-490; *BJ* 6.132-135.

inspire his men to overcome their lack of it. The speech occurs after Josephus has portrayed Vespasian fighting shield to shield with his men and standing his ground in a controlled retreat.²³¹ He connects Vespasian's ἀρετή with a quality that goes beyond rationality and discipline by saying that he fought 'like a man inspired' (ὡσπερ ἔνθους γενόμενος) and that his opponents were 'impressed by his daemonic bravery' (δαμόνιον τὸ παράστημα τῆς ψυχῆς συννοήσαντες).²³² Titus's first speech, although it defines τόλμη, θράσος and ἀπόνεια as distinctive barbarian characteristics, has the effect of filling his men with a daemonic eagerness (προθυμία δαμόνιος).²³³ This eagerness pertains not only to his men, but also to Titus himself:

As he spoke, he leapt on his horse, led his troops to the lake, rode through the water and was the first to enter the town, followed by his men. Terror-struck at his daring (τόλμαν), none of the defenders on the ramparts ventured to fight or to resist him (...).²³⁴

Titus wins the day by surprising the enemy with his daring, taking great risks for his own life as he does so. The element of surprise is important, as Josephus emphasises in his account of the siege of Jotapata, as well as elsewhere, the suddenness of the Jewish attacks on Roman lines.²³⁵ In his representation of the emperor's courage the importance of courageous instinct, in addition to reason, corresponds with the necessity in battle to act quickly, and thus to some extent impulsively. There is more than a hint in Josephus' account that too much order and discipline may not always be the best weapon against a desperate and daring enemy.²³⁶ Accordingly, death-

²³¹ *BJ* 4.31-38.

²³² *BJ* 4.33-34.

²³³ *BJ* 3.485.

²³⁴ *BJ* 3.497-498.

²³⁵ *BJ* 2.506; *BJ* 2.517-522; *BJ* 2.543; *BJ* 3.169; *BJ* 3.177.

²³⁶ Note for instance *BJ* 5.79: Moreover, men habituated to discipline and proficient in fighting in ordered ranks and by word of command, when suddenly confronted with disorderly warfare, are peculiarly liable to be thrown into confusion (μάλιστα δὲ τοὺς ἐν ἔθει συντάξεως ὄντας καὶ μετὰ κόσμου καὶ παραγγελμάτων πολεμεῖν εἰδότες ἀταξία φθάσασα θορυβεῖ). Mason, 'Figured speech and irony' 263.

defiance is a strong element of Josephus' image of Vespasian and, even more so, of Titus.²³⁷

Conclusion

In his depiction of the fall of Jotapata Josephus had to unite some conflicting strands in his work and succeeded only partly. The motif that the revolt resulted from internal Jewish conflicts, and was instigated by bandits does not accord well with the picture of Josephus as the ideal general. To these themes, Josephus also added complimentary images of his imperial protectors Vespasian and Titus, as well as the theory that God had willed Roman domination, at least for this time. His emphasis on the dangers posed by the defenders of Jotapata to the Romans aims at magnifying the Roman victory, just as Plutarch's positive image of Spartacus was used to demonstrate the magnitude of Crassus' feat in putting down the slave revolt. It also provides him with the opportunity of relating the stratagems he had used in Jotapata's defence. These two story patterns, however, come into conflict with the Roman-Jewish dichotomy that runs through *The Jewish War* and that emphasises Roman strengths and Jewish weaknesses.

In comparison with Pausanias' book 4, this dichotomy brings out the negative meaning of ἀπόνοια and τόλμη, and would appear to strengthen an interpretation of Pausanias' representation of the Messenians as negative. There are, however, difficulties in interpreting the combination of these terms in such a straightforward manner.

This difficulty of maintaining a sharp dichotomy between Roman strengths and Jewish weaknesses comes out sharply too when we look at Josephus' own part in the revolt. Josephus uses the Jotapata scene to explain why he went over to the Roman side, but his self-presentation both in the battle scene and

²³⁷ *BJ* 5.87-89: Titus ignores his friends' advise not to risk his life by going against an enemy who is eager to die.

the ensuing speech on suicide is highly ambivalent and contradictory. Although he employs the Graeco-Roman dichotomy of Roman reason versus barbarian passions, and blames the fanatical leaders of the beginning and end of the revolt for exacerbating the Jewish problems by enticing the people to resistance governed by *τόλμη* and *ἀπόνοια*, he also depicts himself as using despair as a weapon. In this respect it is noteworthy that Josephus presented his speech on suicide as a sophistry, implying that, were it not for God's plans with him, his companions' critique on his inconsistency would not have been without justification. Similarly, commenting on the sack of Jotapata by the Roman troops, who, 'remembering what they had borne during the siege, showed no quarter or pity for any', Josephus reports that many of his elite troops were driven to commit suicide.²³⁸ His explanation that they were powerless against the Romans and could at least in this way prevent death by the enemy's hands implies some understanding for their decision.

This understanding may be compared with Diodorus' and Pausanias' understanding for despair. Their understanding does not extend to sympathy as in both cases it is accompanied with strong criticism of giving in to this weakness. Like *τόλμη*, *ἀπόνοια* is not a straightforwardly negative word, but has both positive and negative connotations. The comparative perspective in chapters 4 to 6 therefore warns against an all too easy interpretation of Pausanias' *Messenika* as either negative or positive. As I will reiterate in the conclusion, it is for this reason that irony is a useful trope to think with.

Josephus clearly attempts to set himself apart as an ideal general in Graeco-Roman fashion, but he is unable to tell his story without pointing out some aspects in which he appears to have failed.²³⁹ Josephus has failed to build an army along Roman lines as his troops are now clearly fighting in Jewish fashion, no matter how brave they are and no matter how clever Josephus' stratagems. Josephus is also seen as governed as much by his people as they

²³⁸ *BJ* 3.329-331.

²³⁹ Cohen, *Josephus in Galilee and Rome* 97.

are by him, as they force him to stay. Like Aristomenes, Josephus is more able at enthusing them than at controlling them. But unlike Aristomenes he does not share in their resolve to die rather than be enslaved.

CHAPTER SEVEN

BEING 'HAPPY IN OTHER THINGS' IN ANTONINE GREECE

In these straits the Messenians, foreseeing no kindness from the Lacedaemonians, and thinking death in battle or a complete migration from Peloponnese preferable to their present lot, resolved at all costs to revolt. They were incited to this mainly by the younger men, who had no experience of war and had a certain nobility of mind (οἱ νεώτεροι, πολέμου μὲν ἔτι ἀπείρως ἔχοντες, λαμπροὶ δὲ ὄντες τὰ φρονήματα), and preferred to die free in their own country, rather than to be slaves and be happy in other things (εἰ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα εὐδαιμόνως δουλεύειν παρείη).¹

Throughout this dissertation I have repeatedly come back to this passage, commenting on Pausanias' use of νεώτεροι, their lack of experience, and their φρονήματα. But most important for my reading of Pausanias' *Messenika* is its ending: the Messenians could have been slaves and have lived happily in other matters. Although my main question was what stance Pausanias took towards Messenian history, we may now also tentatively ask what the implications of Pausanias' complaint about the Messenians' dissatisfaction are for Pausanias' own experience of living as a subject.

I engaged both with the current literary 'Pausanias-boom' of which Maria Pretzler's recent book is an example, and with the more historical approach spearheaded by Nino Luraghi to interpret Pausanias' treatment of Messenian history as a finding ground for Messenian self-assertion in Hellenistic and Roman times. But contrary to previous interpretations of book 4 I argue that Pausanias' valuation of Messenian courage is ironic rather than positive through his frequent use of the word τόλμη as opposed to other unambiguous words for courage, such as ἀρετή and ἀνδρεία. The frequent combination of

¹ Paus. 4.14.6-8.

this word with words such as ἀπόνοια, θρασός, θυμός, νεώτεροι and φρόνημα provides further reason to read the word in its classical, ambiguous meaning, such as can be found for example in Thucydides' theory of *stasis*.

I deliberately chose to concentrate on this largest historical excursus in the *Periegesis*, so that I could combine a close reading of the text with a comparative perspective bringing out the historical and literary implications of my interpretation of Pausanias' narrative. Notwithstanding the ironic nature of Pausanias' narrative, I have to admit that Luraghi's argument, which follows earlier research by Alcock and Figueira, is to some extent persuasive. The idea that the popularity of the Aristomenes-stories mirrors the intense need of the Messenians to 'invent' their own heroic past in order to strengthen their identity as a Greek people provides an opening to develop a better understanding of why in the 2nd century AD, stories of the Messenian Wars were still being told.² However, the recent work on Messenian identity has not shed light on how Pausanias as an author dealt with Messenian history.³ Those scholars who along with Luraghi have mined book 4 for information on Messenian identity have forgotten to ask how Pausanias himself reacted to his sources.⁴

As Pausanias is our single most important source for Messenian history, it is vital that his methods and agenda as an author should be taken into account. Following the example of Akujärvi and Auberger, I looked at Pausanias' account as a narrative and argued that his use of words such as τόλμη,

² Alcock, 'Landscapes of Memory'; Idem, 'The Pseudo-history'; Idem, 'The peculiar book IV'; Figueira, 'The evolution of Messenian identity'; Luraghi, 'Der Erdbebenaufstand'; Idem, 'The imaginary conquest'; Idem, *The Ancient Messenians*.

³ Pretzler, *Pausanias* 11 emphasises the importance of Pausanias' agenda in her suggestion that travel is a form of communication: 'the *Periegesis* also records the interdependence and conflict between a visitor's perspective and the self-preservation and self-image of his local informants, reminding us that travel is a form of communication, a discourse between insiders and an outsider observer'.

⁴ The element of his communication with sources is important in interpreting Pausanias' narrative as ironic in the period of the Second Sophistic. Cf. Fowler, 'Postmodernism, Romantic Irony and Classical Closure' *passim*, esp. 248 on the awareness 'that all saying is saying again' as a crucial element of (Romantic) irony. See also David Carr, *Time, Narrative and History* (Bloomington, Indianapolis 1986) 58 on the narrative voice as ironic.

ἀπόνοια, θύμος and φρόνημα is deliberate and consistent throughout the *Periegesis*.⁵ In addition, using Hayden White's tropology as a starting point, I argued that Pausanias' choice of vocabulary suggests an ironic valuation of Messenian history. This comes out especially in comparison with the dominance of ἀνδρεία and ἀρετή in other texts dealing with Aristomenes.⁶

The comparative framework of this dissertation has demonstrated the multivariate meanings attached to these four words. In particular τόλμη and φρόνημα can be used both in positive and in negative senses. Hence, Pausanias' *Messenika* can also be read as a mixture of admiration, sympathy, criticism and scorn. In my reading it is neither straightforwardly positive, nor straightforwardly negative. Since it has so far always been read as a simple elegy of the Messenians' brave fight for freedom, however, the more negative facets of Pausanias' representation needed to be brought to the foreground.

The comparisons were chosen because they shared a certain thematic similarity. All treat revolts and concentrate to a large extent on the rebels' motivation and their behaviour in battle. I also limited myself to texts written in Greek, so that I could more effectively compare their representations of rebels with Pausanias' depiction of the Messenians.⁷ Nevertheless, within these limitations, they vary widely. Although the comparison with Athenaeus, Plutarch and Appian was interesting in the light of their chronological closeness to Pausanias, and thereby exemplified an interest in courage and rebellion in the second century AD, my discussion of Josephus (although he is sometimes also considered a forerunner of the Second Sophistic) and

⁵ Akujärvi, *Researcher, Traveller, Narrator*; Auberger, 'Pausanias et les Messéniens'; 'Pausanias romancier?'; 'Les mots du courage'; 'Pausanias et le livre 4'; 'La revanche des exclus'.

⁶ Diodorus 8.12; Polyaeus, *Strategems* 2.31; Plutarch, *Romulus* 25; Idem, *Questions at Dinner (Moralia 660 f)*; Idem, *Dinner of the Seven Sages (Moralia 159 e-f)*.

⁷ A comparison with changing concepts of *virtus* and *audacia*, including both Latin and Greek historiography of the first two centuries AD would be interesting, but is beyond the scope of this dissertation.

especially of Diodorus has demonstrated the longer-term importance of these themes in Greek history and culture.⁸

It has also been evident that the diverse genres in which these accounts feature and the agenda their respective authors brought to their narratives had a strong impact on their representation of rebels. Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae* is like the *Periegesis* a display of knowledge, but it is clear that his use of quotations from sources differs fundamentally from the other authors. I have also pointed out that Plutarch's primary interest in the weaknesses and strengths of Crassus impacted on his account of Spartacus' revolt. Appian and Josephus are both similar in juxtaposing the daring characteristics of Rome's enemies with the order and discipline of the Roman soldiers. Josephus' personal involvement in *The Jewish War*, however, is not repeated in any of the other accounts. Diodorus' didactic aims, finally, resulted in a narrative that concentrated on ways of preventing revolt.

Unsurprisingly, these differences in agenda and method coincide with differences in focalisation. Pausanias presented his account of the Messenian War in book 4 from a Messenian perspective. The contrast of his ambiguous depiction of Aristomenes' leadership skills with Nymphodorus' positive appraisal of that of Drimakos is reflected also in the Chian setting of the latter's story. Drimakos becomes a civic, Chian hero; a hero of the master class. The perspective of Diodorus' account is also firmly with the owners of the rebellious slaves, who, as we have seen, are even expressly addressed in the account.⁹ Finally, an interpretation of Josephus' account as Flavian propaganda is too simple, since we have seen that although his overall

⁸ The comparative perspective, ranging over a longer period than Pausanias' own time, was therefore an improvement on Auberger's thesis that Pausanias' interest in τόλμη and ἀνδρεία belonged to the 2nd century AD. The comparative perspective enabled a discussion of these as dynamic concepts. Much wider reaching research would be valuable. Cf. Ogden, *Aristomenes* 16-18 for a critique on Auberger.

⁹ In particular Diodorus 34/35.2.33.

representation of the rebels is clearly negative, it is not totally devoid of admiration.

Notwithstanding these differences, contrasting and likening diverse accounts of revolt has not only clarified the multifaceted meanings of words such as *τόλμη*, *φρονήμα*, *ἀπόνοια* and *θῦμος*, but also given clues about how these words can be interpreted in Pausanias' narrative.

Chapter 3 on the revolt of Drimakos on Chios in Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae* started with the question to what an extent Pausanias' ambivalence could be tied into an identification of the Messenians as rebels and slaves. Concentrating on the leadership skills of Drimakos and Aristomenes, I argued that Drimakos' treaty with the Chians may be understood as a regulation of the system of slavery. This regulation, bringing advantages to both slaves and their masters, was in sharp contrast with Aristomenes' hatred for the Spartans, which made him neglect the Messenian common good. The literary setting of the fragment by Nymphodorus of Syracuse in a debate on slavery strengthened the interpretation of the narrative as a lesson to slave owners in how to treat slaves. The story of Drimakos warns slave masters about the desperation, hatred and daring their behaviour may inspire in their slaves and supplies them with useful advice on how to treat their slaves properly.

The *Deipnosophistae's* other fragments on slavery in book 6 demonstrate that such an interest in how to treat slaves properly is a recurrent theme in Greek literature throughout antiquity. The lessons slave masters need to learn in order to prevent slave revolts are also the key theme of Diodorus' account of the Sicilian slave revolts. Diodorus, like Athenaeus and Pausanias, utters sharp criticism of some slave owners' cruel treatment of their slaves, and his discussion of the slaves' *ἀπόνοια* is comparable to Pausanias' depiction of the Messenians' despair. Although Diodorus expresses sympathy for the slaves' plight, he nonetheless portrays them as beastly and unable to control their

passion in their revolt. Whereas chapter 3 therefore concentrated on the combination of daring and hatred, chapter 4 addressed Pausanias' use of *ἀπόνοια* as a quality which may have rendered the Messenians dangerous enemies to the Spartans, but which simultaneously referred to their lack of control and the hopelessness of their cause. Diodorus' lesson to the masters is much more explicit and his narrative lacks the sort of light irony that characterises Athenaeus. I argued that his account of the slave revolts should be seen in the context of Diodorus' interest in the dynamic between rulers and ruled throughout his *Bibliothēke*: Diodorus offers an explanation of the slaves' despair, but stops short of offering sympathy.

Both Diodorus and Athenaeus are therefore each in their different styles primarily interested in how masters should treat their slaves in order to prevent slave revolt. In Athenaeus' use of Nymphodorus, Drimakos' followers feature solely as an illustration of Drimakos' heroism, which consists of controlling them and stopping them from doing further damage to the slave owners' properties; in Diodorus' account both rebel leaders and their followers are mentioned more often, but chiefly in order to teach slave owners what might happen if they mistreat their slaves. This concentration on slave owners meant that the comparison with Pausanias was limited to the conclusion that a critical attitude towards one party does not necessarily translate into sympathy for their opponents. In contrast, in the case of Drimakos I was able to note that Aristomenes, through his hatred, lacks the self-control that enabled Drimakos to impose a treaty on the Chians. Also, in comparison with the Sicilian slaves, I was able to conclude that *ἀπόνοια* as the result of ill-treatment, although understandable, is a far from laudable reaction since it inspires an irrational rashness.

Chapters five and six proceeded from this conclusion with an investigation of *τόλμη* in combination with *φρονήμα* as an element of courage with both positive and negative connotations. Appian's and Plutarch's account of

Spartacus' revolt emphasised the positive role of Spartacus as a leader who, even though he was unable to curb the unrealistic aspirations of his followers, demonstrated in his death a reasoned awareness of his desperate situation and a preparedness to find a heroic death on the battlefield rather than fall into the hands of Crassus. Such heroism may be admired, as we have also seen in Josephus' account of the suicide of the Masada rebels, as the only escape from a hopeless situation. Josephus advocated acceptance of Roman rule as the will of God, but he could still admire Eleazar's resolve in refusing to be treated like slaves.

As we will see below, Pausanias too admires heroic death on the battlefield. On the Athenian Callistratus, for example, who died defending the Athenian camp at Syracuse during the Sicilian debacle, he concludes that 'he won glory for the Athenians and for himself, by saving the men under his command and seeking his own death'.¹⁰ A crucial aspect of such a sacrifice is that it should serve a goal different from death itself. It is ironic that Aristomenes in the end never makes such a sacrifice. He dies instead of disease and old age.¹¹

Both chapters also acknowledged courage as a dynamic concept, dependent on the changing nature of warfare. I noted in chapter five that daring defiance of death could be appreciated both in the arena and on the battlefield as a praiseworthy quality to be emulated. In chapter six, τόλμη is a positive characteristic of the emperors Titus and Vespasian, and although Josephus juxtaposes Jewish daring in combination with their ἀπόνοια and θράσος to Roman discipline and experience, it is clear from his depiction of the collective suicide at Masada and the Roman amazement at such defiance of death, that the juxtaposition between Roman courage and Jewish daring is not as clear-cut as it might at first appear.

¹⁰ Paus. 7.16.6.

¹¹ Paus. 4.24.1-3.

This admiration for and amazement at death-defying daring in both chapters also opens up the possibility of reading Pausanias' *Messenika* in a more positive way. Although the combination of τόλμη with ἀπόνοια and φρονήμα emphasises the more negative connotations of τόλμη in its meaning of rashness, it has to be admitted that Pausanias also at times expresses admiration for Aristomenes' feats. We have seen in chapter two that his miraculous survival from the Caedas is taken as proof that the gods favoured Aristomenes. Since Pausanias was himself an initiate in the Eleusinian Mysteries, it is also not insignificant that Aristomenes is shown to fulfil a special role in the continuation of the Andanian Mysteries. Furthermore, Aristomenes may not have been very successful in controlling his men, but he did the right and honourable thing in not allowing them to rape the Spartan girls. His predecessor Aristodemos also features as a pious ruler, notwithstanding the fact that he killed his daughter in a fit of anger. In addition, as we have seen, despite the Messenians' ultimate defeat, it cannot be denied that their daring contributed to a few major victories over the Spartans.

In view of the multiplicity of possible readings of the *Messenika*, it has been helpful to concentrate on the recurrent tropes in Pausanias' representation of the Messenians rather than on the meaning of specific words. Thus, the Messenians are not so much marked by his depiction of them as daring, which could be interpreted negatively or positively depending on the reader's own valuation of this characteristic; but rather they are seen to be especially daring in moments of anger and despair, both unquestionably negative situations. The similarities of Pausanias' use of these typically Messenian tropes to Diodorus' concentration on despair and Josephus' use of the same tropes with reference to the Jewish rebels brought this out clearly thanks to Diodorus' and Josephus' much more explicitly rhetorical styles. The contrast between Aristomenes' leadership and that of Drimakos and Spartacus strengthened this impression. Nevertheless, we have also seen in each chapter that these

tropes are not purely negative, since the combination of these characteristics always causes danger to enemies and often inspires awe.

My argument that Pausanias' account of the Messenian revolt is ironic, in Hayden White's sense, thus leaves room for both positive and negative elements in his representation of the Messenians, although admittedly the negative analysis dominates the admiration which is also there. It is important in this respect to be clear about the ambiguity of words such as τόλμη, ἀπόνοια and φρονήμα. As much as I have resisted the current positive interpretation of these words in studies of Pausanias' *Messenika*, we should also realise that they are not inherently negative. It is precisely this ambiguity that makes irony a useful trope to think with.¹² I have commented in the introduction on Pausanias' development from a sceptical approach to history towards a more romantic respect for the miraculous. This development mirrors a tension felt throughout *Periegesis* between his exclusion of stories that in his view cannot be taken seriously and his inclusion only of stories that are important and special enough to be worth telling. Pausanias clearly has an interest in the unique and the inexplicable running counter to his (initial) unwillingness to believe in wonders.¹³ This hypothesis has two implications for our interpretation of book 4. The first is that it is not necessary to decide whether the account is positive or negative, as such a reading would be a simplification of Pausanias' more subtle attitude towards both Spartan and Messenian history. Secondly, it is not necessary to conclude that book 4 is atypical of the *Periegesis* as a whole. Its structure may be quite different from the other books, but its representation of the Messenians is a combination of

¹² On (romantic) irony as a useful trope in the interpretation of classical literature, see Don Fowler, 'Postmodernism, Romantic Irony and Classical Closure' in: Irene J.F. de Jong and J.P. Sullivan eds., *Modern Critical Theory and Classical Literature* (Leiden 1994) 231-256. Irony may also help overcome a tendency to view history as propaganda. In addition to Luraghi, Figueira and Alcock on the 'invention' of history, Paradiso has proposed a reading of Nymphodorus' fragment in Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae* as 'propaganda of the master class'.

¹³ On this tension in the *Periegesis* as well as in Greek ethnography and historiography in general, cf. Christian Jacob, 'The Greek Traveler's Areas of Knowledge: Myths and Other Discourses in Pausanias' *Description of Greece*' in: *Yale French Studies* (1980) 65-85.

reporting the unique daring of the Messenians in resisting the Spartans and a sceptical attitude towards the valuation of this daring.

The comparative perspective with other accounts of rebellion in Greek literature could succeed because of the unusual large part that the account of the Messenian Wars have in book 4. This made it possible to note the repetitive nature of Pausanias' use of τόλμη in its combinations with φρονήμα and ἀπόνοια. In order to enable a concentrated and in-depth research of book 4 in a comparative perspective, I have limited myself to the question of what stance Pausanias took in the Messenian-Spartan conflicts. I could therefore only refer briefly to other, more sporadic usages of τόλμη and ἀπόνοια by Pausanias. Both the internal and external comparative perspectives, however, lead to the question of how Pausanias' attitude to Greek history should be understood in the context of his own time.¹⁴ This question needs to be developed further in future research, on the basis of a more detailed research on the *Periegesis* as a whole, but a few conclusions may tentatively be drawn.

To begin with, it has become obvious that Pausanias was critical both towards the Spartan greed that inspired them in an unjust war and towards the Messenian anger and daring that allowed the Spartans to find a pretext. Criticism of Greeks fighting Greeks is a common theme of the *Periegesis* as a whole, and has been much remarked on by Pausanias' modern readers.¹⁵

Secondly, Pausanias' insistence on the negative aspects of daring and (over-)ambition in resistance appears to indicate that he advocates a realist approach towards independence and subjugation.¹⁶ His remark that the Messenians

¹⁴ Carr, *Time, Narrative and History passim* in reaction to Hayden White and Louis O. Mink on narrative as form imposed on history, argues that narrative is a structure inherent in human experience. This realisation helps in moving from Pausanias' narrative to Pausanias' life.

¹⁵ See in particular Akujärvi, *Researcher, Traveller, Narrator* 12-20 and 206-231 with further references.

¹⁶ I therefore come to a similar conclusion as Jaap-Jan Flinterman, *Power, Paideia & Pythagoreanism. Greek identity, conceptions of the relationship between philosophers and*

‘could have been happy in other things’,¹⁷ had they not followed their φρονήμα so daringly, may therefore refer to how he as a Greek lived happily and satisfied, but perhaps not without some melancholy under Roman rule.¹⁸ In the final part of this conclusion I will therefore briefly look at his account of Greek resistance against Roman domination in the second century BC.

I have already commented on Callicrates’ and Menalcidas’ daring at the end of chapter two. Their crimes are reported in the second largest historical narrative of the *Periegesis*, in book 7 on Achaia, and form the basic explanation for the downfall of the Achaean League. In addition to Callicrates and Menalcidas, Pausanias also mentions the Megalopolitan Diaeus as the three scoundrels¹⁹ who destroyed Greek unity.²⁰ It is distinctive of his approach that Pausanias refers to these three individuals in much more detail than does Polybius, even though the latter personally suffered from their crimes.²¹

monarchs and political ideas in Philostratus’ Life of Apollonius (Amsterdam 1995) 122, 125-6, who identifies such a ‘middle of the road policy’ as a typical feature of many Greek writers of the imperial age, and mentions Pausanias as an example.

¹⁷ Paus. 4.14.6-8.

¹⁸ Compare Hutton, *Describing Greece* 47-51 on Pausanias as a conformist, who considers the Roman conquest of Greece a misfortune, but shows ‘no enduring bitterness in references to the current Roman rulers, or to the contemporary Roman system of imperial control’.

¹⁹ As we have seen, the second century AD was also a period in which the biographical element in history became stronger. Plutarch obviously comes to mind, but we have noticed an interest in individuals in Josephus and Appian as well. Latin literature of this period demonstrates a similar tendency, as has been argued by Anne Malling Eriksen, ‘Redefining Virtus. The Settings of Virtue in the Works of Velleius Paterculus and Lucan’ in Erik Ostenfeld ed., *Greek Romans and Roman Greeks* (Aarhus 2002) 111-122. Comparing changing concepts of *virtus* and ἀνδρεία, in relation to the representation of prominent individuals in Greek and Latin historiography would be a welcome addition to my analysis of Pausanias in a Greek literary context.

²⁰ The whole narrative: 7.10.1-7.16.10, see on Callicrates and Menalcidas esp. 7.12.1-2, 7.13.7. Pretzler, *Pausanias* 88-89 refers to the passage as an example of how Pausanias prefers to give explanations on the basis of individual exploits and failings, rather than on long-term political developments. She deplores the fact that he does not comment on the connections between events. His recurrent use of τόλμη could, however, connect these events even when Pausanias does not comment on it explicitly.

²¹ See in particular Polybius on Callicrates: 24.10-12 and 30.23. Polybius does not name him, although Pausanias does, in his account of the list of ‘traitors’ drawn up to be exiled to Rome, which is interesting as he himself was one of the ‘traitors’. Erich. S. Gruen, ‘The Origins of the Achaean War’ *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 96 (1976) 46-69, 50 suggests that Pausanias’ accounts derives from Polybius’, but his own discussion shows that Pausanias is more tendentious than Polybius.

Menalcidas and Diaeus were, according to Pausanias, personally to blame for an escalation of the Spartan-Achaean animosity resulting from the questions whether Sparta should be part of the Achaean League or not and how much influence the League should have on domestic matters.²² War ensued, in which the brave young Spartans, as we have seen in chapter two, fought with φρονήμα and τόλμη against the much stronger Achaean League when the former had not yet received Roman support.²³ It is clear from the rest of the narrative too that, although he provides a bleak portrait of Menalcidas, Pausanias supports the Spartans.²⁴ Subsequent events are told in a remarkably pro-Roman tone. Pausanias admits that the Romans wished to separate as many states as possible from the League,²⁵ but also comments that the Roman general Metellus wanted to bring the war to an end before the arrival of Mummius and offered positive terms to the Achaeans.²⁶ The rejection of these terms by the Achaean general Critolaus, who ‘was seized with a keen but utterly unthinking passion (οὐδενὶ λογισμῶ ... ἔρωσ) to make war against the Romans’,²⁷ is depicted as a mistake, when Pausanias comments that on arrival of Metellus’ army Critolaus cowered away from putting up a worthy defence:

Then, when Critolaus was informed by his scouts that the Romans under Metellus had crossed the Spercheius, he fled to Scarpheia in Locris, without daring (ἐτόλμησεν) even to draw up the Achaeans in the pass between Heracleia and Thermopylae, and to await Metellus there. To such a depth of terror did he sink that brighter hopes were not suggested even by the spot itself,

²² Paus. 7.12.9. ‘Diaeus misled the Achaeans into the belief that the Roman senate had decreed the complete subjection to them of the Lacedaemonians; Menalcidas deceived the Lacedaemonians into thinking that the Romans had entirely freed them from the Achaean League.

²³ Paus. 7.13.3.

²⁴ See in particular Paus. 7.12.1.

²⁵ Paus. 7.14.1. Gruen, ‘Origins’ doubts that this was the Roman policy and accuses Pausanias of getting his ‘facts’ muddled.

²⁶ Paus. 7.15.2. ‘So he dispatched envoys to the Achaeans, bidding them to release from the League the Lacedaemonians and the other states mentioned in the order of the Romans, promising that the Romans would entirely forgive them for their disobedience on the previous occasion.

²⁷ Paus. 7.14.4.

the site of the Lacedaemonian effort to save Greece, and of the no less daring exploit (τολμήματα) of the Athenians against the Gauls.²⁸

In the two heroic battles at Thermopylae, daring in situations of extremity was admired by Pausanias, as we have seen in chapter two. Leonidas' exploits are interestingly not mentioned in great detail by Pausanias,²⁹ but the Athenian ἀρετή is contrasted extensively with the Gauls' θυμός and ἀπόνοια.³⁰ In this instance, Critolaus' lack of daring is mocked, since it does not live up to his scornful rejection of the Roman peace offering; but Pausanias' depiction of the offer, which would leave the Achaeans their freedom, even if it cost them their dominance in Greece, suggests that even better than a daring resistance would be an early acceptance of Roman domination.³¹ His depiction of Critolaus' cowardly response to the advance of Metellus' army reminds us of his ironic depiction of the Messenians' unwillingness to fight once the Arcadians had betrayed them or the Naupactian Messenians' later reluctance to meet the Acarnanians in open battle.³² Critolaus, according to Pausanias, was overtaken by the Romans on his flight from Thermopylae, but was never found: on the basis of which he suggests that the general may have attempted to escape over the marsh but drowned.³³ This shameful death contrasts sharply with his earlier boastful rejection of a reasonable peace.

²⁸ Paus. 7.15.3.

²⁹ Although his very brief mention is undoubtedly positive, Paus. 3.4.7-8: 'Now although the Greeks have waged many wars, and so have foreigners among themselves, yet there are but few that have been made more illustrious by the exceptional valour (ἀρετή) of one man, in the way that Achilles shed lustre on the Trojan War and Miltiades on the engagement at Marathon. But in truth the success of Leonidas surpassed, in my opinion, all later as well as all previous engagements'.

³⁰ Paus. 10.19.5-10.23.

³¹ See in particular Paus. 7.14.6. 'For a king or state to undertake a war and be unlucky is due to the jealousy of some divinity rather than to the fault of the combatants; but audacity (θρασύτης) combined with weakness should be called madness (μάνια) rather than ill-luck'. Pausanias significantly does not describe Mummius' subsequent sack of Corinth, but it was an infamous example of harsh behaviour by a Roman ruler. Cf. Pretzler, *Pausanias* 86; Arafat, *Pausanias' Greece* 90-7.

³² Paus. 4.17.2-9 and 4.25.

³³ Paus. 7.15.4; Compare Polybius 38.16 which reports the same incident without naming Critolaus. Cf. Gruen, 'Origins' 65 for the identification.

The continued Achaean resistance after Critolaus' death is depicted as a case of foolish stubbornness, while Metellus' humanity towards his captives and his repeated offers of terms of peace are applauded by Pausanias.³⁴ A criticism of over-elatedness similar to Josephus' depiction of the Jewish φρονήμα may be recognised in Pausanias' account of the Achaean reaction to a small success. Pausanias explains that Roman carelessness had allowed the Achaeans to sack part of Mummius' army:

Puffed up with this success (ἀπὸ τούτου δὲ τοῦ ἔργου καὶ ἐπήρθησαν), the Achaeans marched out to battle before the Romans began their attack. But when Mummius advanced to meet them, the Achaean horse at once took to flight, without waiting for even the first charge of the Roman cavalry. The infantry were depressed (ἀθύμωσ) at the rout of their horse, but nevertheless received the onslaught of the Roman men-at-arms; overwhelmed by numbers and faint with their wounds they offered a spirited (ὑπὸ τοῦ θυμοῦ) resistance, until a thousand picked Romans fell upon their flank and utterly routed them.³⁵

Pausanias remarks that the acting general Diaeus could have pushed towards Corinth with a more daring attitude ('if after the battle Diaeus had daringly thrown -ἐτόλμησεν ἐσδραμεῖν- himself into Corinth...) and that way could have forced Mummius to negotiations, but he abandoned his troops and fled straight to Megalopolis. His suicide there is depicted as a cowardly death, contrasted with the heroic behaviour of the Athenian Callicrates, who not only brought most of his men to safety by pushing straight through the enemy, but then returned to the Athenian camp that was being routed and met his death there.³⁶ Pausanias' sympathetic depiction of the Athenian may be exemplary for his general sympathy for Athens throughout the *Periegesis*, but it also says something about his valuation of daring and rashness. Pausanias by no means opposes the pursuit of a heroic death in battle when this serves a higher cause, i.e. the common good, but he is a harsh critic of rash behaviour that disguises

³⁴ Paus. 7.15.10-11.

³⁵ Paus. 7.16.2-3.

³⁶ Paus. 7.16.5.

itself as heroic resistance, while it really destroys the opportunity for one's community to hold on to those freedoms they may still possess. In that sense he is a realist very much like Agrippa II in Josephus' *Jewish War*, and, along with Josephus, his negative evaluation of the chief protagonists' daring is in line with Thucydides' theory of the confusion of values in *stasis*. The Achaean leaders base their internal power on their seemingly courageous defiance of Roman peace offers, but their courage should really be understood as rashness. The relevance of this lesson for his own time is made explicit at the end of his narrative, when he refers to the fact that Roman governors are still sent to Greece.³⁷

I argued in the Introduction that Hayden White was unfairly criticised for his relativism. In part this criticism is caused by an interpretation of his theory as post-modern rather than existentialist. Especially in his later writings on Holocaust denial, White has argued against the lack of any foundations.³⁸ His ironic battle against ideological irony is therefore explicitly political. It has, however, also been argued that irony, because it always invites a multiplicity of readings, makes it difficult to act politically.³⁹ This difficulty may perhaps be recognised in Pausanias' ambiguous response to the Messenians' struggle. With hindsight, he can see that it was pointless, but he cannot deny that they were motivated by a much more noble instinct than the greedy Spartans. Similarly, his discussion of the resistance to the rise of Rome, blamed on a few treacherous individuals, on the one hand criticises them for their defiance of Roman offers and on the other hand ridicules them for not living up to their stubborn resistance on the battlefield itself. We have seen the same

³⁷ Paus. 7.16.10 certainly reads like a melancholic statement. Pausanias is, however, very positive about the emperors of his own time and recognises the advantages that they have brought. C.f. A. Jacquemin, 'Pausanias et les empereurs romains' *Ktema* 21 (1996) 29-42.

³⁸

³⁹ Efficiently, that is, for in an existentialist philosophy one is bound to act politically. J.E. Seery, *Political Returns, Irony in Politics and Theory from Plato to the Antinuclear Movement* (1990) esp. 343, discussed by Fowler, 'Postmodernism, Romantic Irony and Classical Closure' 253-254.

combination in Pausanias' representation of the Messenians, but it does leave the reader to wonder whether he advocates a more or less daring resistance.

For the present therefore, the question of what this implies for Pausanias' experience as a subject remains unresolved. Personally, I imagine him to have been 'happy in other things'. A more complete examination of this question, however, must be left for another study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Akujärvi, Johanna

Researcher, Traveller, Narrator: studies in Pausanias' Periegesis (Stockholm 2005).

Alcock, S.E., J.F. Cherry and J. Elsner eds.,

Pausanias: Travel and Memory in Roman Greece (Oxford 2001).

Alcock, Susan E.

Graecia Capta. The landscape of Roman Greece (Cambridge 1993).

'Landscapes of Memory and the authority of Pausanias' in: J. Bingen ed., *Pausanias Historien. Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique* XLI (Geneva 1996) 241-267.

'The Pseudo-history of Messenia Unplugged' *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 129 (1999) 333-341.

'The Peculiar Book IV and the Problem of the Messenian Past' in: Susan E. Alcock, John F. Cherry and Jaś Elsner eds., *Pausanias. Travel and Memory in Roman Greece* (Oxford 2001) 142-153.

Ameling, W.

'Pausanias und die Hellenistische Geschichte' in: J. Bingen ed, *Pausanias Historien. Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique* XLI (Geneva 1996).

Anderson, Graham

The Second Sophistic. A cultural phenomenon in the Roman Empire (London and New York 1993).

Anderson, G.

'Athenaeus: the Sophistic Environment' in: W. Haase ed., *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.34.2 (1998) 2173-2185.

Ankersmit, F.R.

Narrative Logic. A Semantic Analysis of the Historian's Language (Den Haag 1983) 220-248.

'Historical Representation' *History and Theory* 27 (1988) 205-229.

De Navel van de Geschiedenis. Over interpretatie, representatie en historische realiteit (Groningen 1990).

'Twee vormen van narrativisme' in: *De Navel van de Geschiedenis* 44-77, originally published in *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis* 50.1 (1988) 40-81.

Historical Representation (Stanford 2001).

Arafat, K.W.

Pausanias' Greece: Ancient Artists and Roman Rulers (Cambridge 1996).

'The recalcitrant Mass. Athenaeus and Pausanias' in Braund and Wilkins, *Athenaeus and his World* 191-202.

Asheri, David

'La diaspora e il ritorno dei Messeni' in E. Gabba ed., *Tria Corda. Scritti in onore di Arnaldo Momigliano* (Como 1983) 27-42.

Attridge, H.J.

The interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus (Missoula 1976).

Auberger, Janick

'Pausanias et les Messéniens: une histoire d'amour!' *Revue des Études Anciennes* 94.1-2 (1992) 187-197.

'Pausanias romancier? Le témoignage du livre IV' *Dialogues d'Histoire Ancienne* (1992) 257-280.

'Les Mots du Courage chez Pausanias' *Revue de Philologie, de Littérature et d'Histoire Anciennes* 98 (1996) 7-18.

'Pausanias et le Livre 4: une leçon pour l'empire' *Phoenix* 54 (2000) 255-277.

Pausanias, *Description de la Grèce. Tome IV, Livre IV* (translation and commentary Janick Auberger, Paris 2005).

'La revanche des exclus: l'histoire messénienne revisitée' in: C. Wolff ed., *Les Exclus dans l'antiquité. Actes du colloque organisé à Lyon les 23-24 septembre 2004* (Lyon 2007) 27-35.

Baldwin, B.

'Athenaeus and his work' *Acta Classica* 19 (1976) 21-42.

Balot, Ryan K.

'Pericles' Anatomy of Democratic Courage' *The American Journal of Philology* 122.4 (2001) 505-525.

Greek Political Thought (Malden, Oxford and Victoria 2006).

Barnes, T.D.

'The sack of the Temple in Josephus and Tacitus' in: Jonathan Edmonson, Steve Mason, James Rives eds., *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome* (Oxford 2005) 37-52.

Barton, Carlin A.

The Sorrows of the Ancient Romans. The Gladiator and the Monster (Princeton 1993).

Bassi, Karen

Acting like Men: Gender, drama and nostalgia in ancient Greece (Ann Arbor 1998).

'The semantics of manliness in ancient Greece' in: Ralph M. Rosen and Ineke Sluiter ed., *Andria. Studies in manliness and courage in classical antiquity* (Leiden 2003) 25-58.

Beard, Mary

'The Triumph of Flavius Josephus' in: A.J. Boyle and W.J. Dominik, *Flavian Rome. Culture, Image, Text* (Leiden and Boston 2003).

Ben-Yehuda, Nachman

The Masada Myth: Collective Memory and Mythmaking in Israel (Madison 1995).

Berg, B.

'Wronged Maidens in Myron's Messenian history and the ancient Novel' *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 39.1 (1998) 39-62.

Bigwood, J.M.

'Diodorus and Ctesias' *Phoenix* 34 (1980) 195- 207.

Bilde, Per

Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome. His Life, his works and their importance (Sheffield 1988).

Bingen, J. ed.

Pausanias Historien. Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique XLI (Geneva 1996).

Bizière, Françoise

'Comment travaillait Diodore de Sicile' *Revue des Études Grecques* 87 (1974) 369-374.

Bockisch, Gabriele

'Die Helotisierung der Messenier. Ein interpretationsversuch zu Pausanias iv 14,4f' in: Heinz Kreißig and Friedmar Kühner eds., *Antike Abhängigkeitsformen in den griechischen Gebieten ohne Polisstruktur und der römischen Provinzen. Actes du colloque sur l'esclavage, Iéna, 29 septembre-2 octobre 1981* (Berlin 1985) 29-48.

Boehring, D.

Heroenkulte in Griechenland von der geometrischen bis zur klassischen Zeit: Attika, Argolis, Messenien (Berlin 2001).

Bömer, Franz

Untersuchungen über die Religion der Sklaven in Griechenland und Rom III (Stuttgart 1990) 96-102.

Bonelli, G.

'La saga di Drimaco nel sesto libro di Ateneo: ipotesi interpretativa' *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* (1994) 135-42.

Bosworth, A.B.

'The historical context of Thucydides' Funeral Oration' *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 120 (2000) 1-16.

Bowie, E.L.

'Greeks and their past in the Second Sophistic' in: M.I. Finley ed., *Studies in Ancient Society* (London 1974) 166-209.

'Athenaeus' in: P.E. Easterling and B.M.W. Knox eds., *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature* (Cambridge 1982-1985) 682-683.

Bradley, Keith R.

Slavery and Rebellion in the Roman world, 140 B.C. – 70 B.C. (Bloomington, Indianapolis and London 1989).

Braund, David

'Dionysiac Tragedy in Plutarch, Crassus' *The Classical Quarterly* 43.2 (1993) 468-474.

'Cohors: the governor and his entourage in the self-image of the Roman Republic' in: Ray Laurence and Joanne Berry ed., *Cultural Identity in the Roman Empire* (London and New York 1998) 10-24.

'Learning, luxury and Empire. Athenaeus' Roman patron' in: Braund and Wilkins, *Athenaeus and his World* 3-22.

Braund, D. and J. Wilkins eds.,

Athenaeus and his World. Reading Greek culture in the Roman empire (Exeter 2000).

Brenck, F.E.

In Mist Apparelled. Religious themes in Plutarch's Moralia and Lives (Leiden 1977).

Bringmann, Klaus

'Weltherrschaft und innere Krise Roms im Spiegel der Geschichtsschreibung des zweiten und ersten Jahrhunderts v. Chr.' *Antike und Abendland* 12.1 (1977) 28-49.

Bruit Zaidman, Louise and Pauline Schmitt Pantel,

Religion in the ancient Greek City (translated by P. Cartledge, Cambridge 1992).

Brunt, Peter A.

'Josephus on Social Conflicts in Roman Judaea' *Klio* 59.1. (1977) 149-153.

'On historical fragments and epitomes' *The Classical Quarterly* 30.2. (1980) 477-494.

Burkert, W.

'Signs, commands, and knowledge: ancient divination between enigma and epiphany' in: S.I. Johnston and P.T. Struck eds., *Mantikê. Studies in Ancient Divination* (Leiden and Boston 2005) 29-49.

Cagniard, P.

'The philosopher and the gladiator' *Classical World* 93.6 (2000) 607-618.

Cairns, Douglas L.

The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in ancient Greek Literature (Oxford 1993).

Callen King, Katherine

Achilles. Paradigms of the war hero from Homer to the Middle Ages (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 1987).

Canfora, L.

'Le but de l'historiographie selon Diodore' in: H. Verdin, G. Schepens and E. de Keyser eds., *Purposes of History. Studies in Greek historiography from the 4th to the 2nd centuries BC* (Leuven 1990) 313-322.

Carter, John

Review of Sacks, *Diodorus*, *The Classical Review* 42 (1992) 34-36.

Cartledge, P.A.

'Rebels and Sambos in classical Greece: a comparative view' in P.A. Cartledge and F.D. Harvey eds., *Crux: Essays presented to G.E.M. de Ste. Croix on his 75th birthday* (Exeter 1985) 16-46.

Chamoux, Francois

'Un historien mal-aimé' *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé* (1990) 243-252.

'La méthode historique de Pausanias d'après le livre I de la Periégèse?' in: Jean Bingen ed., *Pausanias historien* (Geneva 1996) 45-69.

Chapman, Honora Howell

'Spectacle in Josephus' *Jewish War*' in: Jonathan Edmonds, Steve Mason, James Rives ed., *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome* (Oxford 2005) 289-313.

Christ, Karl

Krise und Untergang der römischen Republik (Darmstadt 1987).

Cohen, Shaye J.D.

Josephus in Galilee and Rome: his Vita and Development as a Historian (Leiden 1979).

'Josephus, Jeremiah and Polybius' *History and Theory* 21 (1982) 366-81.

Collins, Derek

'Nature, Cause and Agency in Greek Magic' *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 133 (2003) 17-49.

Cook, Brad L.

'Plutarch's "many other" imitable events: Mor. 814B and the statesman's duty' in: Lukas de Blois, Jeroen Bons, Ton Kessels and Dirk M. Schenkeveld eds., *The Statesman in Plutarch's Work. Proceedings of the International Conference of the International Plutarch Society, Nijmegen/ Castle Hernen, May 1-5, 2002* (Leiden and Boston 2004) 200-210.

Cotton, Hannah M. and Werner Eck

'Josephus' Roman audience. Josephus and the Roman elites' in: Jonathan Edmonson, Steve Mason, James Rives eds., *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome* (Oxford 2005) 37-52.

Danov, Christo M.

'Einige beachtenswerte Wesenszüge des Spartakusaufstandes' *Antiquitas Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis* 598 (1983) 9-14.

D'Arms, J.

'Heavy drinking and drunkenness in the Roman World. Four questions for historians' in: O. Murray and M. Teçusan eds., *In Vino Veritas* (London 1995) 304-317.

Davidson, James

'Review of Barton, *Sorrows*' *Journal of Roman Studies* 84 (1994) 188-9.

Daube, Y.A.

Le Barbare. Recherches sur la conception de la barbarie et de la civilisation (Brussel 1981).

Deshours, N.

'La légende et la culte de Messènè ou comment forger l'identité d'une cité' *Revue des Études grecques* 106 (1993) 39-60.

De Souza, Philip

'Review of Barton, *Sorrows*' *Classical Review* 44 (1994) 117-118.

Domanska, Ewa

'Hayden White: Beyond Irony' *History and Theory* 37.2 (1998) 173-181.

Drews, Robert

'Diodorus and his sources' *The American Journal of Philology* 83.4 (1962) 383-392.

Ducat, Jean

'Isocrate et les Hilotes' *Annales: Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations* 50 (1985) 95-101.

Les Hilotes (Athens 1990).

Duff, Tim

- Plutarch's Lives. Exploring Virtue and Vice* (Oxford 1999).
- Dumont, Jean Christian
Servus. Rome et l'esclavage sous la République (Rome 1987).
- Eckstein, A.M.
'Josephus and Polybius: A reconsideration' *Classical Antiquity* 9.2. (1990) 175-208.
- Edwards, Catherine
The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome (Cambridge 1993; paperback edition 2002).
- Edwards, Mark
'Epilogue. Biography and the Biographic' in Edwards and Swain eds., *Portraits* 227-234.
- Edwards, Mark J. and Simon Swain
Portraits. Biographical Representation in the Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire (Oxford 1997).
- Elsner, J.
'Pausanias: A Greek Pilgrim in the Roman World' *Past and Present* 135 (1992) 3-29.
'Structuring "Greece": Pausanias' Periegesis as a literary construct' in: S.E. Alcock, J.F. Cherry and J. Elsner eds., *Pausanias. Travel and Memory in Roman Greece* (New York 2001).
- Elton, G.R.
Return to essentials (Cambridge 1991).
- Evans, R.
In defence of history (London 1997).
- Feldman, L.H.
'Josephus' Portrait of Moses' *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 82.3/4 (1992) 285-328.
Josephus' Interpretation of the Bible (Berkeley 1998) 140-148.
- Figueira, Thomas J.
'The evolution of the Messenian identity' in: S. Hodkinson and A. Powell eds., *Sparta. New Perspectives* (London 1999) 211-244.

Finley, Moses I

Ancient Sicily (rev. ed. London 1979).

The World of Odysseus (rev. ed. Harmondsworth 1979).

Fisher, N.R.E.

Hybris. A study in the values of honour and shame in ancient Greece (Warminster 1992).

Fitzgerald, William

Slavery and the Roman Imagination (Cambridge 2000).

Fornara, C.W.

Review of Sacks, *Diodorus. Classical Philology* 87 (1992) 383-88.

Forrest, W.G.G. and T.C.W. Stinton,

'The First Sicilian Slave War' *Past & Present* 22 (July 1962) 87-93.

Frazer, J.G.

Pausanias' Description of Greece (London 1913) vol. 1.

Fuks, A.

'Slave war and slave troubles in Chios in the third century B.C.' in: A. Fuks, *Social Conflict in Ancient Greece* (Jerusalem and Leiden 1984) 260-269.

Gabba, Emilio

'The Roman Empire in the Speech of Agrippa II (Ioseph., B.I., II, 345-401)' 2, translated by Tommaso Leoni and edited by Steve Mason as part of the Project of Ancient Cultural Engagement (P.A.C.E.; Toronto 2007): <http://pace.cns.yorku.ca:8080/medio/pdf/studies/Gabba-AgrippaII.pdf>;

accessed 24/06/2008; originally published in *Rivista Storica dell' Antichità* 6-7 (1976-1977) 189-194.

Garlan, Y.

Slavery in Ancient Greece (translated by J. Lloyd, Ithaca and London 1998).

Garnsey, P.

Ideas of Slavery from Aristotle to Augustine (Cambridge 1996).

'The Middle Stoics and Slavery' in: Paul Cartledge, Peter Garnsey, and Erich Gruen eds., *Hellenistic Constructs: Essays in culture, history and historiography* (Berkeley and London 1997) 159-174.

Gilliver, Catherine M.

The Roman Art of War (Stroud and Charleston 1999) 117-120.

'Battle' in: Philip Sabin, Hans van Wees and Michael Whitby eds., *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Warfare* Volume 2 (Cambridge 2007) 122-157.

Gleason, M.W.

Making men: sophists and self-presentation in ancient Rome (Princeton 1995).

Gnuse, Robert Karl

Dreams and dream reports in the writings of Josephus. A traditio-historical Analysis (Leiden, New York and Cologne 1996).

Goldmann, Bernhard

Einheitlichkeit und Eigenständigkeit der Historia Romana des Appian (Hildesheim 1988).

Golob, Eugene O.

'The Irony of Nihilism' *History and Theory* 19.4. (1980) 55-65.

Gomme, A.W., A. Andrewes and K.J. Dover,

A Historical Commentary on Thucydides, Volume 5, Book VIII (Oxford 1981).

Gordon, Richard

'Imagining Greek and Roman Magic' in: Bengt Ankarloo and Stuart Clark eds., *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe. Ancient Greece and Rome* (Philadelphia 1999) 161-275.

Gossman, Lionel

Between History and Literature (Cambridge Ma. 1990).

Grant, Michael

Myths of the Greeks and Romans (London 1963).

Gray, Rebecca

Prophetic Figures in the Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine. The evidence from Josephus (Oxford 1993).

Green, Peter

'The First Sicilian Slave War' *Past & Present* 20 (Nov. 1961) 10-29.

Gruen, Erich S.

'Jewish perspectives on Greek culture and ethnicity' in: John J. Collins and Gregory E. Sterling ed., *Hellenism in the Land of Israel* (Notre Dame, Indiana 2001) 62-93.

Grünewald, Thomas

Bandits in the Roman Empire. Myth and Reality (translated by John Drinkwater, London and New York 2004).

Gurlitt, W.

Über Pausanias (Graz 1890).

Habicht, C.

Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece (Berkeley 1985).

'An ancient Baedeker and his critics: Pausanias' "Guide to Greece"' *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 129.2 (1985) 220-224.

Hadas-Lebel, M.

'Ἄνοια et ἀπόννοια des ennemis de Rome selon Flavius Josèphe' *Associazione italiana per lo studio del Giudaismo* 4 (1987) 197-212.

Hägg, Thomas

Photios als Vermittler antiker Literatur. Untersuchungen zur Technik des Referierens und Exzerpierens in der Bibliothek (Uppsala 1975).

Hall, J.M.

Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity (Cambridge 1997).

Hellenicity. Between ethnicity and culture (Chicago 2002).

Hansen, D.U.

'Leser und Benutzer. Überlegungen zu Athenaios' *Classica et Mediaevalia* 51(2000) 223-236.

Harris, W.V.

War and Imperialism in Republican Rome 327-70 (Oxford 1979; paperback 1985).

Hartog, François

Memories of Odysseus. Frontier tales from ancient Greece (translation Janet Lloyd; Edinburgh 2001).

Heer, Joyce

La personnalité de Pausanias (Paris 1979).

Henten, Jan Willem van

The Maccabean martyrs as saviours of the Jewish people. A study of 2 and 4 Maccabees (Leiden 1997).

Hidber, T.

'Appian' in: Irene de Jong, Rene Nünlist and Angus Bowie eds., *Narrators, Narratees and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative* Vol. 1 (Leiden and Boston 2004) 175-185.

Hitzig, Hermann and Hugo Blümmer

Pausaniae Graecia Descriptio (Leipzig 1901) volume 2.

Hobbs, Angela

Plato and the Hero. Courage, Manliness and the Impersonal Good (Cambridge 2000).

Hoben, W.

Terminologische Studien zu den Sklavenerhebungen der römischen Republik (Wiesbaden 1978).

Hobsbawm, E.J.E. and T.O. Ranger

The Invention of Tradition (Cambridge 1992).

Hodkinson, Stephen

Property and Wealth in Classical Sparta (Swansea 2000).

Hölkeskamp, K.-J.

Schiedsrichter, Gesetzgeber und Gesetzgebung im archaischen Griechenland (Stuttgart 1999).

Hooff, Anton J.L. van

From Authothanasia to Suicide: Self-killing in classical antiquity (London and New York 1990).

Hope, Valerie

'Fighting for identity: the funerary commemoration of Italian gladiators' in: Alison E. Cooley ed., *The Epigraphic Landscape of Roman Italy* (London 2000) 93-113.

Hopkins, K.

'Conquerors and Slaves. The impact of conquering an empire on the political economy of Italy' in: idem, *Conquerors and Slaves* (Cambridge 1978) 1-98.

'Novel Evidence for Roman Slavery' *Past and Present* 138 (1993) 3-27.

Hopwood, Keith

' "All that may become a man": the bandit in the ancient novel' in: Lin Foxhall and John Salmon ed., *When men were men. Masculinity, power and identity in classical antiquity* (London and New York 1998) 195-204.

Hornblower, Jane

Hieronymus of Cardia (Oxford 1981).

Hornblower, Simon

'Warfare in ancient Literature. The paradox of war' in: Philip Sabin, Hans van Wees and Michael Whitby eds., *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Warfare* Volume 1 (Cambridge 2007) 22-53.

Horsley, R.A. and J.S. Hanson

Bandits, Prophets and Messiahs: Popular Movements in the Time of Jesus (Minneapolis 1985).

Hose, Martin

Die Historiker im Imperium Romanum von Florus bis Cassius Dio (Stuttgart, Leipzig 1994).

Humble, Noreen

'Sōphrosynē revisited: was it ever a Spartan Virtue' in: A. Powell and S. Hodkinson eds., *Sparta: beyond the mirage* (London 2002).

Hunt, P.

Slaves, warfare and ideology in the Greek historians (Cambridge 1998).

Hutton, Patrick H.

History as an art of memory (Hannover and London 1993) 84-87.

Hutton, W.E.,

Describing Greece: Landscape and Literature in the Periegesis of Pausanias (Cambridge 2005).

Huxley, G.L.

Early Sparta (London 1962).

Jacob, C.

'The Greek Traveller's Areas of Knowledge: Myths and other discourses in Pausanias' Description of Greece' *Yale French Studies* 49 (1980) 55-85.

'Athenaeus the Librarian' in: Braund and Wilkins eds., *Athenaeus and his World* 85-110.

'"La table et le cercle": sociabilités savantes sous l'Empire romain' *Annales HSS* 3 (2005) 507-530.

Jacoby, F.

Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker. Kommentar zu Nr. 106-261 (Berlin 1930).

Jenkins, Keith

On "What is History"? From Carr to Elton to Rorty and White (London and New York 1995).

'On Hayden White' in: *Why History? Ethics and Postmodernity* (London and New York 1999) 115-132.

Jones, B.

'The reckless Titus' in: C. Deroux ed., *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History VI* (Brussel 1992) 408-20.

Jones, C.P.

'Pausanias and his guides' in: S.E. Alcock, J.F. Cherry and J. Elsner eds., *Pausanias. Travel and Memory in Roman Greece* (New York 2001) 33-9.

Kansteiner, Wulf

'Hayden White's Critique of the Writing of History' *History and Theory* 32.3 (1993) 273-295.

Keitel, E.

'Principate and Civil War in the Annals of Tacitus' *American Journal of Philology* 105 (1981) 300-325.

Kellner, Hans

'A bedrock of order. Hayden White's linguistic humanism' in: *Language and historical representation. Getting the story crooked* (Madison, London 1989) 193-227.

Kidd, I.G.

Posidonius II. The Commentary (Cambridge 1988).

Kim, H.S.

'Archaic coinage as evidence for the use of money' in: A. Meadows and K. Shipton eds., *Money and its Uses in the Ancient World* (Oxford 2001) 7-21.

Korhonen, Kuisma

'General Introduction: The History/Literature Debate' in: Kuisma Korhonen ed., *Tropes for the Past. Hayden White and the History/Literature Debate* (Amsterdam and New York 2006) 9-20.

Kozak, Lynn

' "Hope is not a strategy": Homer's Hector and Thucydides' Nicias' in: Jakub Pigoń ed., *The Children of Herodotus. Greek and Roman historiography and related genres* (Cambridge 2008) 58-68.

Kroppen, Thomas

Mortis dolorisque contemptio. Athleten und Gladiatoren in Senecas philosophischem Konzept (Hildesheim 2008).

Kroymann, J.

Pausanias und Rhianos (Berlin 1943).

Kühne, Heinz

'Zur Teilnahme von Sklaven und Freigelassenen and den Bürgerkriegen der Freien im 1. Jahrhundert v.u.z. im Rom' *Studii Clasice* 4 (1962) 189-209.

Kuhn-Chen, Barbara

Geschichtskonzeptionen griechischer Historiker im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert n. Chr. Untersuchungen zu den Werken von Appian, Cassius Dio un Herodian (Frankfurt am Main 2002).

Kyle, Donald G.

Spectacles of Death in Ancient Rome (London 1998).

Ladouceur, David J.

'Masada. A consideration of the literary evidence' *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 1980) 245-60.

'Josephus and Masada' in: Louis H. Feldman and Gohei Hata eds., *Josephus, Judaism and Christianity* (Detroit 1987) 95-113.

Lambrinudakis, W.

'Antike Niederlassungen auf dem Berge Aipos von Chios' in D. Papenfuß and V.M. Strocka eds., *Palast und Hütte: Beiträge zum Bauen und Wohnen im Altertum von Archäologen, Vor- und Frühgeschichtlern: Tagungsbeiträge eines Symposiums der Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung, Bonn-Bad Godesberg, veranstaltet vom 25.-30. November 1979* (Mainz 1982) 375-81.

Levystone, D.

'Le courage et les mots de la peur dans la *Lachès* et le *Protagoras*' *Phoenix* 60 (2006) 346-363.

Linckenheld, E.

'Nymphodorus' *RE* 17.3 (1937)1623-1627

Lindner, Helgo

Die Geschichtsauffassung des Flavius Josephus im Bellum Judaicum. Gleichzeitig ein Beitrag zur Quellenfrage (Leiden 1972).

Luck, Georg

'Witches and Sorcerers in Classical Literature' in: Bengt Ankarloo and Stuart Clark eds., *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe. Ancient Greece and Rome* (Philadelphia 1999) 93-158.

Lukinovich, Alessandra

'The play of reflections between literary form and the sympotic theme in the Deipnosophistae of Athenaeus' in Oswyn Murray ed., *Symptica. A Symposium on the Symposion* (Oxford 1990).

Luraghi, N.

'Der Erdbebenaufstand und die Entstehung der messenischen Identität' in: Dietrich Papenfuß and Volker Michael Strocka eds., *Gab es das Griechischen Wunder? Griechenland zwischen dem Ende des 6. und der Mitte des 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (Mainz 2001) 279-301.

'The imaginary conquest of the Helots' in: Nino Luraghi and Susan E. Alcock ed., *Helots and their Masters in Laconia and Messenia. Histories, Ideologies, Structures* (Washington, Cambridge Ma., London 2003) 109-141.

The Ancient Messenians. Constructions of Ethnicity and Memory (Cambridge 2008).

Mader, Gottfried

Josephus and the Politics of historiography. Apologetic and Impression Management in the Bellum Judaicum (Leiden 2000).

Malitz, J.

Die Historien des Poseidonius (Munich 1983).

Malkin, I.

Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece (Leiden 1987).

Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean (Cambridge 1994).

The Returns of Odysseus: colonization and ethnicity (Berkeley 1998).

Ancient Perceptions of Greek ethnicity (Washington 2001).

Mandelstein, Maurice

'The Presuppositions of Metahistory' *History and Theory* 19.4. (1980) 39-54.

Marincola, John

'Genre, Convention, and Innovation in Greco-Roman historiography' in: Christina Shuttleworth Kraus ed., *The Limits of Historiography. Genre and narrative in ancient historical texts* (Leiden 1999) 281-324.

Marinescu-Himu, Maria

'Les sources d'inspiration de Pausanias dans le livre IV de la Periegesis' in: *Actes de la xiiie Conférence Internationale d'études classiques "Eirene"* (Bucharest and Amsterdam 1975) 251-257.

Martin, H.M.

'The concept of *prâotês* in Plutarch's *Lives*' *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 3 (1996) 65-73.

Mason, Steve

'Introduction' in: *Flavius Josephus, Life of Josephus* (translation and commentary by Steve Mason, Boston and Leiden 2003).

'Flavius Josephus in Flavian Rome: Reading on and between the lines' in: A.J. Boyle and W.J. Dominik, *Flavian Rome. Culture, Image, Text* (Leiden and Boston 2003) 559-589.

'Figured speech and Irony in T. Flavius Josephus' in: Jonathan Edmonds, Steve Mason, James Rives ed., *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome* (Oxford 2005) 243-288.

'Of audience and meaning: Reading Josephus' *Bellum Judaicum* in the context of a Flavian audience' in: Joseph Sievers and Gaia Lembi eds., *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond* (Leiden and Boston 2005) 71-100.

Mattern, Susan P.

Rome and the Enemy. Imperial strategy in the Principate (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London 1999).

McCauley, B.

Bryn Mawr Classical Review 2005.07.45 of Ogden, *Aristomenes*.

McDonnell, M.A.

Roman Manliness. Virtus and the Roman Republic (Cambridge 2006).

McInery, Jeremy

'Plutarch's Manly Women' in: Rosen and Sluiter eds., *Andria* 319-344.

' "Do you see what I see?" Plutarch and Pausanias at Delphi' in: Lukas de Blois, Jeroen Bons, Ton Kessels and Dirk M. Schenkeveld eds., *The Statesman in Plutarch's Work. Proceedings of the International Conference of the International Plutarch Society, Nijmegen/ Castle Hernen, May 1-5, 2002* (Leiden and Boston 2004) 43-55.

McIntosh-Varjabédian, Fiona

'Probability and Persuasion in 18th-Century and 19th-Century Historical Writing' in: Korhonen ed., *Tropes for the Past* 109-117.

McLaren, James S.

Turbulent Times? Josephus and Scholarship on Judaea in the First Century CE (Sheffield 1998).

'Josephus on Titus: the vanquished writing about the victor' in: in: Joseph Sievers and Gaia Lembi, *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond* (Leiden and Boston 2005) 279-295.

Meadows, A.R.

'Pausanias and the historiography of Classical Sparta' *Classical Quarterly* 45.1 (1995) 92-113.

Meister, Klaus

'Der Sklavenaufstand des Spartakus: kritische Anmerkungen zu einer neuen Deutung' in: Hans Jörg Kalcyk, Brigitte Gallath and Andreas Graeber eds., *Studien zur alten Geschichte. Siegfried Lauffer zum 70. Geburtstag am 4. August 1981 dargebracht von Freunden, Kollegen und Schülern* Vol 2. (Rome 1986) 633-656.

Mendels, D.

'Greek and Roman history in the *Bibliotheca* of Photius – a note' *Byzantion* 61 (1986) 196-206.

Meyer, Marvin W.

'The Andanian Mysteries of Messenia' in: Marvin W. Meyer ed., *The ancient mysteries. A sourcebook* (New York 1987) 49-59.

Migeotte, L.

'Réparation de monuments publics à Messène au temps d' Auguste', *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 109 (1985) 597-607.

Mileta, Christian

'Verschwörung oder Eruption? Diodor und die byzantinischen Exzerptoren über den Ersten Sizilischen Sklavenkrieg' in: Christian-Friedrich Collatz ed., *Dissertatiunculae criticae: Festschrift für Günther Christian Hansen* (Würzburg 1998) 133-154.

Millett, P.

'Aristotle and slavery in Athens' *Greece and Rome* 2 (2007) 178-209.

Momigliano, Arnaldo

'The Rhetoric of History and the History of Rhetoric: On Hayden White's Tropes' *Comparative Criticism* 3 (1981) 259-268.

The development of Greek biography (expanded edition, Cambridge Ma. and London 1993).

Morrow, G.R.

'Plato and Greek slavery' *Mind* 48 (1939) 186-201.

Plato's Cretan City: a historical interpretation of the Laws (Princeton 1960) 148-52.

Müller, Stefan

' "Schauspiele voller Kraft und Charakter" Die Gladiatorenkämpfe als Drama fürs Volks' *Gymnasium* 109 (2002) 21-47.

Nagy, Gregory

The best of the Achaeans. Concepts of the hero in archaic Greek poetry (Baltimore and London 1979).

Nelson, John S.

'Tropical history and the Social Sciences: Reflection on Struever's Remarks' *History and Theory* 19.4 (1980) 80-101.

Newell, Raymond R.

'The Forms and Historical Value of Josephus' Suicide Accounts' in: Louis H. Feldman and Gohei Hata eds., *Josephus, Judaism and Christianity* (Detroit 1987) 278-294.

North, Helen

Sophrosyne. Self-Knowledge and Self-Restraint in Greek Literature (Ithaca and New York 1966).

Novick, Peter

That noble dream. The 'objectivity question' and the American historical profession (Cambridge 1988).

Nussbaum, Martha C.

The Therapy of Desire. Theory and Practice in Hellenistic Ethics (Princeton 1994).

Oakley, S.P.

'Single Combat in the Roman Republic' *The Classical Quarterly* 35.2 (1985) 392-410.

Ogden, D.

Aristomenes of Messene. Legends of Sparta's Nemesis (Swansea 2004).

Oliva, Pavel

Sparta and her Social Problems (Prague 1971).

'Die Charakterischen Züge der grossen Sklavenaufstände zur Zeit der Römischen Republik' (Darmstadt 1976) 237-253, first published in E.C. Welskopf ed., *Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte der Alten Welt II. Römisches Reich* (Berlin 1965) 75-88.

Olson, S.D.

Athenaeus of Naucratis, The Learned Banqueters Volume 1 (Cambridge Ma. 2006).

Athenaeus of Naucratis, The Learned Banqueters Volume 3 (Cambridge Ma. 2008).

Padel, R.

In and Out of the Mind: Greek images of the tragic self (Princeton 1992).

Palm, Jonas

Über Sprache und Stil des Diodorus von Sizilien. Ein Beitrag zur Beleuchtung der hellenistischen Prosa (Lund 1955).

Paradiso, A.

Forme di dipendenza nel mondo Greco. Ricerche sul VI libro di Ateneo (Bari 1991).

Parente, Fausto

'The impotence of Titus, or Flavius Josephus's *Bellum Judaicum* as an example of "pathetic" historiography' in: Joseph Sievers and Gaia Lembi, *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond* (Leiden and Boston 2005) 45-69.

Partner, Nancy

'Hayden White: The Form of the Content' *History and Theory* 37.2 (1998) 162-172.

Pasquali, G.

'Die schriftstellerische Form des Pausanias' *Hermes* 48 (1913) 161-223.

Patterson, Orlando

Slavery and Social Death (Cambridge Ma. 1982).

Paul, Herman

'An ironic battle against irony. Epistemological and ideological irony in Hayden White's philosophy of history' in: Korhonen ed., *Tropes for the Past* 35-44.

Pears, David

'Courage as a mean' in: A.O. Rorty ed., *Essays on Aristotle's Ethics* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 1980) 171-187.

Pearson, Lionel

'the Pseudo-history of Messenia and its authors' *Historia* 11(1962) 397- 426.

Pelling, Christopher

'Plutarch: Roman Heroes and Greek Culture' in: Miriam Griffin and Jonathan Barnes ed., *Philosophica Togata. Essays on Philosophy and Roman Society* (Oxford 1989) 199-232.

'Plutarch and Roman Politics' in: Barbara Scardigli eds., *Essays on Plutarch's Lives* (Oxford 1995) 319-356.

'Biographical History: Cassius Dio on the early Principate' in Edwards and Swain eds., *Portraits* 117-144.

Pfundtner, I.O.

Pausanias Periegeta imitator Herodoti diss. Königsberg (1866).

Pomper, Philip

'Typologies and Cycles in Intellectual History' *History and Theory* 19.4 (1980) 30-38.

Porter, James I.

'Ideal and ruins. Pausanias, Longinus, and the Second Sophistics' in: Susan E. Alcock, John F. Cherry and Jaś Elsner, *Pausanias. Travel and memory in Roman Greece* (Oxford 2001) 63-92.

Pretzler, M.

'Pausanias and oral tradition' *Classical Quarterly* 55 (2005) 235-49.

Pausanias. Travel Writing in Ancient Greece (London 2007).

Price, J.J.

Thucydides and Internal War (Cambridge and New York 2001).

'The Provincial historian in Rome' in: Joseph Sievers and Gaia Lembi eds., *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and beyond* (Leiden 2005) 101-118.

Price, R.

'Maroons and their communities' in: R. Price ed., *Maroon Societies: Rebel slave communities in the Americas* (New York 1973) 1-30.

Purcell, Nicholas

'The way we used to eat: diet, community and history at Rome' *American Journal of Philology* 124 (2003) 329-358.

Raaflaub, Kurt

The Discovery of Freedom in ancient Greece (translation: Renate Franciscano; London and Chicago 2004).

Raalte, Marlein van

'*More Philosophico*: Political virtue and philosophy in Plutarch's *Lives*' in: Lukas de Blois, Jeroen Bons, Ton Kessels and Dirk M. Schenkeveld eds., *The Statesman in Plutarch's Work. Proceedings of the International Conference of the International Plutarch Society, Nijmegen/ Castle Hernen, May 1-5, 2002* Vol. 2 (Leiden and Boston 2005) 75-112.

Rajak, T.

Josephus. The historian and his society (London 1993).

'Friends, Romans, Subjects: Agrippa II's speech in Josephus' *Jewish War*' in: Idem, *The Jewish Dialogue with Greece and Rome. Studies in cultural and social interaction* (Boston and Leiden 2002) 147-159.

'Dying for the Law: the martyr's portrait in Jewish-Greek Literature' in: Idem, *The Jewish Dialogue with Greece and Rome. Studies in Cultural and social interaction* (Boston, Leiden 2002) 99-133.

'The Angry Tyrant' in: Tessa Rajak, Sarah Pearce, James Aitken and Jennifer Dines eds., *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London 2008) 110-127.

Reden, S. von

Exchange in Ancient Greece (London 1995) 171-194.

Reinhardt, Karl

Poseidonios I (Hildesheim and New York 1976, reprint of Munich 1921).

Robertson, N.

Festivals and Legends: The formation of the Greek cities in the light of public ritual.
Phoenix supplementary volume 31 (Toronto 1992).

Roebuck, Carl Angus

A history of Messenia from 369 to 146 BC (Chicago 1941).

Roisman, J.

'The Rhetoric of courage in the Athenian orators' in: Ralph M. Rosen and Ineke Sluiter eds., *Andria. Studies in manliness and courage in classical antiquity* (Leiden 2003) 127-144.

The Rhetoric of Manhood. Masculinity in the Attic Orators (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 2005).

Romeri, Luciana

'The logodeipnon. Athenaeus between banquet and anti-banquet' in: Braund and Wilkins, *Athenaeus and his World* 256-271.

Rosen, R.M. and I. Sluiter eds.,

Andria. Studies in manliness and courage in classical antiquity, (Leiden 2003).

Rubincam, Catherine

'Did Diodorus Siculus take over cross-references from his sources?' *The American Journal of Philology* 119.1 (1998) 67-87.

Rudich, Vasily

Political Dissidence under Nero: The Price of Dissimulation (London and New York 1993).

Dissidence and Literature under Nero. The Price of Rhetoricization (London 1997).

Ruffell, Ian

'The world turned upside down: utopia and utopianism in the fragments of Old Comedy' in: David Harvey and John Wilkins eds., *The Rivals of Aristophanes. Studies in Athenian Old Comedy* (London and Swansea 2000) 473-506.

Russell, D.A.

'On reading Plutarch's "Lives"' *Greece and Rome* 13.2 (1966) 139-154.

Rutherford, Ian

'Tourism and the Sacred. Pausanias and the traditions of Greek pilgrimage' in: S.E. Alcock, J.F. Cherry and J. Elsner eds., *Pausanias. Travel and Memory in Roman Greece* (Oxford 2001).

Sabin, Philip

'Land Battles' in Philip Sabin, Hans van Wees and Michael Whitby eds., *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Warfare Volume 1* (Cambridge 2007) 399-433.

Sacks, Kenneth S.

Diodorus Siculus and the First Century (Princeton 1990).

'Diodorus and his Sources: Conformity and Creativity' in: S. Hornblower ed., *Greek historiography* (Oxford 1994) 213-232.

Santangelo, Federico

'Prediction and Divination in Diodorus' *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* (2007) 115-125.

Schmid, Walter T.

On manly courage: a study of Plato's Laches (Carbondale and Edwardsville 1992).

Schmitz, T.

Bildung und Macht: Zur sozialen und politischen Funktion der zweiten Sophistik in der griechischen Welt der Kaiserzeit, (Munich 1996).

Schofield, M.

Saving the City: Philosopher-kings and other classical paradigms (London 1999).

Schwartz, Barry, Yeal Zerubavel and Bernice M. Barnett

'The recovery of Masada: a study in collective memory' *The Sociological Quarterly* 27.2 (Summer 1986) 147-164.

Schwartz, Daniel R.

Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity (Tübingen 1992) 29-43.

'Herodians and Ioudaioi in Flavian Rome' in: Jonathan Edmonds, Steve Mason, James Rives ed., *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome* (Oxford 2005) 63-78

Schwartz, E.

'Tyrtaeos' *Hermes* 34 (1899) 428-68.

'Diodorus' *RE* 5 (1905) 663-704.

Scramuzza, V.M.

'Roman Sicily' in Tenney Frank ed., *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome* 3 (Baltimore 1937).

Seaford, R.

Money and the early Greek Mind: Homer, philosophy, tragedy (Cambridge 2004) 115-124.

Sergent, B.

Homosexuality in Greek Myth (London 1986; translated from *L'homosexualité dans la mythologie grecque*, Paris 1984).

Shaw, B.D.

'Bandits in the Roman Empire' *Past and Present* 105 (1984) 3-52.

'Tyrants, Bandits and Kings: Personal power in Josephus' *Journal of Jewish Studies* 44 (1993) 176-204.

Shero, L.R.

'Aristomenes the Messenian' *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 69 (1938) 500-531.

Sourvinou-Inwood, Christiane

'What is Polis Religion' in: R. Buxton, *Oxford Readings in Greek Religion* (Oxford 2000) 13-37.

'Further Aspects of Polis Religion' in: R. Buxton, *Oxford Readings in Greek Religion* (Oxford 2000) 38-55.

Spawforth, Anthony

'Shades of Greekness: A Lydian case study' in: I. Malkin ed., *Ancient Perceptions of Greek ethnicity* (Washington 2001) 375-400.

Stalley, R.F.

An Introduction to Plato's Laws (Oxford 1983).

Stampacchia, G.

La Tradizione della guerra di Spartaco da Sallustio a Orosio (Pisa 1976).

Steiner, D.

The Tyrant's Writ: Myths and images of writing in ancient Greece (Princeton 1994) 159-65.

Sterling, Gregory E.

Historiography and self-definition. Josephus, Luke-Acts and apologetic historiography (Leiden, New York and Cologne 1992).

Stern, Menahem

'Josephus and the Roman Empire as reflected in The Jewish War' in: Louis H. Feldman and Gohei Hata eds., *Josephus, Judaism and Christianity* (Detroit 1987) 71-80.

Strasburger, Hermann

'Poseidonius on Problems of the Roman Empire' *The Journal of Roman Studies* 55 (1965) 40-53.

Stratiki, K.

'Les héros Grecs comme personification de la liberté dans la Periégèse de Pausanias' *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé* (2002) 92-112.

Strid, O.

'Über Sprache und Stil des "Periegetes" Pausanias' *Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Studia Graeca Upsaliensa* 9 (1976).

Swain, Simon

'Biography and biographic in the Literature of the Roman Empire' in: Edwards and Swain eds., *Portraits* 1-37.

Szegedy-Maszak, A

'Legends of the Greek Lawgivers' *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 19 (1978) 199-209.

Taylor, Charles

'Plato's self-mastery' in: Idem, *Sources of the Self. The Making of the Modern Identity* (Cambridge 1989) 115-126.

Thackeray, H. StJohn

Josephus. The Man and the Historian (New York 1929).

Themelis, P.G.

'Ανασκαφή Μεσσήνης' *Praktika* 153 (1998) 89-126.

Ἡρώες καὶ Ἡρώα στὴ Μεσσήνη: βιβλιοθήκη τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἐταιρείας (Athens 2000).

- Trapp, Michael
 'Plato in the Deipnosophistae' in Braund and Wilkins, *Athenaeus and his World* 353-363.
- Treves, P.
 'The problem of a history of Messenia' *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* (1944) 102-106.
- Tröster, Manuel
Themes, Character, and Politics in Plutarch's Life of Lucullus. The Construction of a Roman Aristocrat (Stuttgart 2008).
- Unnik, W.C. van
Flavius Josephus als historischer Schriftsteller (Heidelberg 1978).
- Urbainczyk, T.
Slave Revolts in Antiquity (Stocksfield 2008).
- Vann, Richard T.
 'The reception of Hayden White' *History and Theory* 37.2. (1998) 143-161.
- Verbrugge, Gerald G.
 'Sicily 210-70 BC: Livy, Cicero and Diodorus' *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 103 (1972) 535-559.
- 'Narrative Pattern in Posidonius' "History"' *Historia* 24.2 (1975) 189-204
- Vernant, Jean-Pierre
 'Between the Beasts and the Gods' in: Idem, *Myth and Society in Ancient Greece* (translation: Janet Lloyd; Sussex and London 1980) 130-167.
- Versnel, H.S.
 'Some reflections on the relationship magic-religion' *Numen* 38.2 (1991) 177-197.
- Vidal-Naquet, P.
 'Reflections on Greek historical writing about slavery' in: P. Vidal Naquet, *The Black Hunter: Forms of thought and forms of society in the Greek world* (translated by A. Szegedy-Maszak, Paris 1986) 168-188.
- Vlastos, G.
 'Does slavery exist in Plato's Republic' *Classical Philology* 63 (1968) 291-295.

- Vogt, J.
'Zum Experiment des Drimakos: Sklavenhaltung und Räuberstand' *Saeculum* 24 (1973) 213-219.
Ancient Slavery and the Ideal of Man (translation by Thomas Wiedemann, Oxford 1974).
- 'Der sterbende Sklave. Vorbild menschlicher Vollendung' *Sklaverei und Humanität. Ergänzungsheft* (Wiesbaden 1983) 6-16.
- Wade-Gerry, H.T.
'The "Rhianos-hypothesis"' in: E. Badian ed., *Ancient Society and Institutions. Studies presented to V. Ehrenberg on his 75th Birthday* (Oxford 1966) 289-302.
- Walbank, F.W.
Review of Sacks, *Diodorus*. *Journal of Roman Studies* 82 (1992) 250-1.
- Wallinga, H.T.
H.T. Wallinga, "'Der famoseste Kerl" Over Spartacus en zijn opstand' (Utrecht 1990).
'Bellum Spartacium. Florus' text and Spartacus' objective' *Athenaeum* (1992) 25-43.
- Wees, Hans van
Status Warriors: war, violence and society in Homer and History (Amsterdam 1992).
'A brief history of tears: gender differentiation in archaic Greece' in: Lin Foxhall and John Salmon eds., *When men were men. Masculinity, power and identity in classical antiquity* (London and New York 1998) 10-53.
- Welwei, Karl-Wilhelm
'Das Sklavenproblem als politischer Faktor in der Krise der römischen Republik' in: Hans Mommsen and Winfried Schulze eds., *Vom Elend der Handarbeit. Probleme Historischer Unterschichtenforschung* (Stuttgart 1981) 50-69.
- Wernicke, C.
De Pausaniae Periegetae studiis Herodoteis (Berlin 1884).
- White, Hayden

Metahistory. The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe (Baltimore and London 1973).

Tropics of Discourse. Essays in cultural criticism (Baltimore 1978).

'Interpretation in history' in: *Tropics of Discourse*, 51-80, esp. 67-75, originally published *New Literary History* 4 (1972-3).

'Foucault Decoded: Notes from Underground' in: *Tropics of Discourse* 230-260, originally published in: *History and Theory* 12.1 (1973).

The Content of the Form. Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation (Baltimore 1987).

'Foucault's Discourse: The Historiography of Anti-Humanism' in: *The Content of the Form* 104-141, revised after its original publication in: John Sturrock ed., *Structuralism and Since: From Lévi-Strauss to Derrida* (Oxford 1979).

'The value of narrativity in the representation of reality' in: *The Content of the Form* 1-25, esp. 14, originally published *Critical Inquiry* 7.1. (1980).

'The politics of historical interpretation: Discipline and de-sublimation' in: *The Content of the Form* 58-82, originally published *Critical Inquiry* 9.1 (1982).

'Historical emplotment and the problem of the truth' in: Saul Friedländer ed., *Probing the Limits of Representation. Nazism and the 'final solution'* (Cambridge Ma. 1992) 37-53.

Figural Realism. Studies in the Mimesis effect (Baltimore 1999).

Whitmarsh, Tim

Greek Literature and the Roman Empire. The politics of imitation (Oxford 2002).

The Second Sophistic (Oxford 2005).

Wiedemann, Thomas

Emperors and Gladiators (London and New York 1992).

Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, Ulrich von

Erinnerungen 1848-1914 (Leipzig 1928).

Wilkins, John

'Dialogue and Comedy. The Structure of the *Deipnosophistae*' in: Braund and Wilkins, *Athenaeus and his World* 23-47.

The Boastful Chef. The Discourse of Food in Ancient Greek Comedy (Oxford 2000).

Wilson, Donna F.

Ransom, Revenge and Heroic Identity in the Iliad (Cambridge 2002).

Wirth, Gerhard

Katastrophe und Zukunftshoffnung. Mutmaßungen zur zweiten Hälfte von Diodors Bibliothek un ihren verlorenen Büchern (Vienna 2007).

Wistrand, Magnus

'Violence and Entertainment in Seneca the Younger' *Eranos* (1990) 31-46.

Entertainment and Violence in Ancient Rome. The Attitudes of Roman writers of the first century AD (Göteborg 1992).

Zadorojniy, A.V.

'Tragedy and Epic in Plutarch's "Crassus"' *Hermes* 125.2 (1997) 169-182.

Zeitlin, Solomon

'Masada and the Sicarii' *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 55.4 (April 1965) 299-317.

'The Sicarii and Masada' *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 57.4 (April 1967) 251-270.

Zerubavel, Yael

'The Death of Memory and the Memory of Death: Masada and the Holocaust as Historical Metaphors' *Representations* 45 (Winter 1994) 72-100.

