



P. Gr. Vindob. 29788C: Hexameter Encomium on an Un-Named Emperor

Ronald C. McCail

The Journal of Hellenic Studies, Vol. 98. (1978), pp. 38-63.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0075-4269%281978%2998%3C38%3APGV2HE%3E2.0.CO%3B2-U>

The Journal of Hellenic Studies is currently published by The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/hellenic.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

P. GR. VINDOB. 29788C: HEXAMETER ENCOMIUM ON AN UN-NAMED EMPEROR

It is now fifty years since Hans Gerstinger published the *editio princeps* of a Vienna papyrus containing hexameter poems by, as he believed, Pamprepus of Panopolis.¹ Out of seven fragments Gerstinger, working with H. Ibscher, was able to restore one binion of a codex (P. Gr. 29788A–B). A separate leaf (P. Gr. 29788C) was presumed by the restorers to come from the same codex as the binion.² The binion contains (1) a hexameter idyll evoking the successive moods of Nature on a day in spring or autumn, (2) a hexameter encomium on the patrician Theagenes of Athens, (3) letters nos. 80 and 90 by St. Gregory Nazianzen. Lines from another hexameter poem are partly legible on two fragments which together constitute the top of the first page of the binion. The only trace of an author's name in the binion is the genitive-ending οἴου in the title of the encomium on Theagenes. The separate leaf (P. Gr. 29788C) preserves some fifty lines from a second hexameter encomium, but has been torn in such a way that the line-beginnings are missing from the Verso and the line-endings from the Recto; the names of the author and the addressee have not survived. Gerstinger's opinion that the hand is the same throughout and the writing of a style current in the fifth and sixth centuries has not been challenged.³ It has seemed to me unnecessary to reproduce in fuller detail the description of the papyrus given in the *editio princeps*. Should this not be available to the reader, ample information may be found in the reviews by Maas, Körte and Keydell.⁴ Gerstinger's attribution of the poems to Pamprepus was greeted by these and other critics with reactions varying from reserve to trenchant scepticism.⁵ There is reason to connect the encomium on Theagenes with Pamprepus, since the two were in Athens at the same time, Theagenes as archon, Pamprepus as a grammaticus. But even if we accept that Pamprepus wrote the encomium, the idyll is of higher quality, as Keydell and Maas noted, and might well be the work of a different poet. Doubt concerning the attribution has persisted, and Gerstinger's title-page remains virtually the only place where the poems are ascribed without qualification to Pamprepus.

Hitherto, discussion of this papyrus has centred on the contents of the binion, and little attention has been given to the encomium on the separate leaf. This is doubtless because the state of its text in the *editio princeps* was such as to discourage close study. Recently, photographs of the whole papyrus have been published by E. Heitsch,⁶ who has also provided a text incorporating supplements and corrections subsequent to Gerstinger's edition. Opportunity thus arises for a fresh study of the language and content of the encomium preserved on the separate leaf,⁷ and it is with this part of the papyrus that I shall be concerned.

The availability of an improved text has already stimulated T. Viljamaa to examine our poem in his monograph on late Greek encomiastic poetry.⁸ Viljamaa suggests that the addressee of the encomium is the emperor Anastasius. His argument is presented in a somewhat desultory fashion, but may be summarised as follows: Our poem resembles in style and in some of its content the

¹ Hans Gerstinger, *Pamprepus von Panopolis, Eidyllion auf die Tageszeiten und Enkomion auf den Archon Theagenes von Athen nebst Bruchstücken anderer epischer Dichtungen und zwei Briefe des Gregorios von Nazianz im Pap. Gr. Vindob. 29788A-C*, in *SÖAW, Philos.-hist. Kl. ccviii*³ (Wien/Leipzig 1928). Pamprepus (A.D. 440–84) was an Egyptian rhetor and astrologer who, as a senator and *quaestor sacri palatii*, played some part in politics under the eastern emperor Zeno. Cf. the biographical reconstruction by R. Asmus in *Byz. Zeits.* xxii (1913) 320. His horoscope has been identified in *Cat. Cod. Astr.* viii 4.221, ed. Cumont. Cf. A. Delatte and P. Stroobant, 'L'Horoscope de Pamprepus' in *Bull. de la Cl. des lettres de l'Acad. Roy. de Belg.* (1923) 58.

A text of the whole Pamprepus papyrus is being prepared by Prof. E. Livrea, who was kind enough to read

this article and to put his work at my disposal. Our readings and interpretations differ in some points.

² 'Ein von einem dritten Blatte desselben Kodex stammendes Fragment . . . hat sich nachträglich noch zugesellt.' Gerstinger 3.

³ *Ibid.* 5.

⁴ P. Maas in *Gnomon* v (1929) 250; A. Körte in *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* x (1932) 25; R. Keydell in *Byz. Zeits.* xxix (1929–30) 290.

⁵ Most sceptical was P. Graindor in *Byzantion* iv (1929) 469.

⁶ E. Heitsch, *Die griechischen Dichterfragmente der römischen Kaiserzeit*² (Göttingen 1963) i 108.

⁷ Heitsch, pl. E–F.

⁸ T. Viljamaa, *Studies in Greek Encomiastic Poetry of the Early Byzantine Period* (Helsinki 1968) 56–7, 101–4.

encomia on Anastasius by Priscian and Procopius of Gaza, and all three encomia follow the pattern recommended by the rhetorician Menander for those composing a βασιλικὸς λόγος or imperial panegyric. The subjugation of certain rebels related in Verso 1–15 of our text is an allusion to the Isaurian war of Anastasius;⁹ the humbling of Persia referred to in Recto 14 is Anastasius' successful Persian war of 502–6. The harbour-works of Anastasius at Constantinople and Alexandria are referred to in Recto 22 ff.,¹⁰ Anastasius' patronage of poets in Verso 21 ff.,¹¹ the Hippodrome-riot of 498 in Recto 30 f. Viljamaa concludes that our encomium and the other poems in the papyrus are all the work of Christodorus of Coptus, who flourished under Anastasius and wrote a poem, the *Isaurica*, in praise of him.

Viljamaa's view is open to criticism on a number of grounds. I begin with what seem to me its most serious weaknesses. The war between Anastasius and the Isaurian leaders who refused to acknowledge his succession ended in 498. The war against Persia lasted from 502 until 506. If the addressee is Anastasius, is it not odd that the part of the encomium traditionally allotted to the emperor's achievements in war should be devoted here to the earlier war, while the more recent campaign is relegated to the part of the scheme reserved for administrative achievements? (I accept that our poem follows the Menandrian scheme of topics.) Further, some fifteen lines are devoted to the suppression of the Isaurians, but only five (perhaps even fewer) to the Persian war; if the panegyrist were writing after 506, as Viljamaa's argument assumes, he would surely have given most space to the Persian war. It is also noteworthy that there is no mention in the text of Anastasius' main administrative reform, the abolition of the *chrysargyron* tax.¹² This was a popular measure, duly praised by his panegyrists in the part of their work reserved for the emperor's civil achievements.¹³ The tax was abolished in 498; how could a panegyrist writing after 506 have failed to mention it? True, our text lacks its beginning and perhaps also its end, but these are not the places where Priscian and Procopius mention the *chrysargyron* or where Menander recommends that topics of this kind should be mentioned. Besides these major defects, Viljamaa's argument includes a number of smaller errors and misinterpretations which further damage its credibility. His treatment of Recto 22 ff. exhibits a bewildering confusion. On p. 56 he says that these lines tell of 'the dangers of the sea and possibly of its pacification', whereas on p. 104 he says that the same lines relate 'how the Trojan war broke out'. In fact both interpretations are false and consequently the Anastasian harbour-works and the Trojan war are equally irrelevant.¹⁴ He sees nothing incongruous in suggesting in one breath that the phrase δῆμον ξείνον ἄθυρμα (Recto 31) may refer either to the Trojan horse or to Anastasius' Thracian wall. When he repeats Gerstinger's view that all the poems in the papyrus are by the same author he overlooks the fact that the encomium on Theagenes was subsequently judged inferior to the idyll by competent scholars. Finally, although Recto 21–32 clearly allude to an outbreak of civil strife, we have no warrant to connect this with the Hippodrome-riot of 498, as Viljamaa does in his comments on Recto 29–32; for such outbreaks are recorded under many emperors.

There are therefore serious difficulties in Viljamaa's thesis that the encomium is addressed to Anastasius. Even allowing for the fragmentary state of the papyrus, the resemblance between the record presented in our poem and the events of Anastasius' reign is at best superficial, and any attempt to bring the two into harmony does violence to chronology or to the letter of the text. Evidently the emperor here addressed is one for whom the suppression of internal enemies was a recent and major event, and whose success against Persia was of such a character as to claim from his panegyrist a comparatively modest amount of attention. In seeking a candidate who fits this description we may disregard emperors before the middle of the fifth century; for linguistic examination of our text reveals the influence of Nonnus in many lines, and Nonnus probably wrote under Leo or Zeno.¹⁵ That Leo is addressed is very unlikely. His suspension of the annual subsidy to Persia might, indeed, have been represented by his panegyrist as a triumph; but the

⁹ Cf. Priscian *Pan.* 50–139, Proc. *Gaz. Pan.* 8–9. I cite Priscian and Procopius from the volume of the Bonn Corpus containing Dexippus etc., ed. Niebuhr.

¹⁰ Cf. Priscian *Pan.* 184–92, Proc. *Gaz. Pan.* 19–20.

¹¹ Cf. Priscian *Pan.* 248–51.

¹² Gerstinger's reconstruction ἀργυρέη in Recto 4 was over-optimistic, see my linguistic commentary *ad loc.*

¹³ Cf. Priscian *Pan.* 149–66, Proc. *Gaz. Pan.* 13.

¹⁴ The praetorian prefect Constantine who reconstructed the Anthemian wall lived not under Anastasius, as Viljamaa says, but under Theodosius II. Cf. J. B. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire* (London 1923) i 70.

¹⁵ Before 471, Keydell in *Kl. Pauly* (Munich 1972) iv 154; under Zeno, P. Friedländer in *Hermes* xlvii (1912) 58.

other events of his reign find no echo here. Equally, Justin I, Justinian and Justin II are out of the question; and our poem is too literate to have been written later than the middle of the sixth century. We are left with Zeno, who was the candidate suggested by Gerstinger in his *editio princeps*.¹⁶ Our encomium corresponds at many points with the picture of Zeno's reign given by contemporary and later historians, and I think that Gerstinger's identification was correct. Although Zeno was execrated by the Orthodox, his memory was revered in the Monophysite church, so that it would be no surprise if a panegyric on him were to have been re-copied in Egypt.¹⁷ In my submission, our encomium was composed in 489 or 490, one or two years after Zeno had crushed the revolt of Illus and Leontius, and at the time when he was promoting his brother Longinus as heir to the throne. See my historical commentary, especially on Recto 1-15 and 21-32. This would disqualify Pamprepisus from having been its author, since he perished in the revolt. I make no suggestion as to who the author was. Though certainly not inspired, he was at least articulate and correct. He draws on the whole epic tradition from Homer to Nonnus, and at the same time foreshadows the poetry of the sixth century. These sources can help us to restore the text of our poem in some places and to follow the argument in others. The first part of my commentary is a linguistic and textual study, the second part a historical interpretation. My critical apparatus lists only the places where I have adopted a different reading from that printed by Heitsch; full notice of alternative readings and proposed supplements is taken in the commentary, and Heitsch's apparatus may be consulted as an additional guide.

I have been conscious throughout of my debt to all those who have worked on this difficult text, even when my opinion has differed from theirs. Indeed, Viljamaa has pointed the way in two important particulars. He was right in believing that Verso 1-15 refer to an Isaurian war; but it was, in my opinion, the one under Zeno. He was also right in pointing out that our panegyrist follows the precepts of Menander, and we have in this a valuable clue to the development of the argument. I have therefore prefixed portions of Menander's scheme for the βασιλικὸς λόγος to the relevant sections of my linguistic commentary.¹⁸

Fol. 29788C

Verso

]βασι[λ. .]. [.]ας
]ν ἀδερκέος ἐλ[π]ίδι φήμης
]ρτεν, ἔδεκτο δὲ θέσπι ἀνωγῆν
	ἀ]	νιχνεύειν βασιλῆων·
5]ο, λέων δ' ἀλάπαξε καλιάς
]τάτημόνος ἴχνια θήρης
]ων ἐγκύμονας ἄνδρας ἐλάσσας
]σαν ὑπὸ σπήλυγγα μελάθρων
]ς	ἐδιδά[σκ]εν διζύας· [ο]ἱ δὲ πεσόντες
10	πο]	ινῆτει[ρα]ν ἀναστενάχοντες ἀνά[γ]κ[η]ν
	π]	ατρῶ[ω]ν κτεάνων ρίψα[ντες] ἀρ[
]γεγά[ασι]ν ἐλώριον· ἀλλα[. .]θεον[
]τρον ἐ[λ]έγξας
]ρέησιν ἀκουαῖς
15] ἀπελύσας δεσμῶν.
]οῖες ἔργον ἀνάπτων

¹⁶ Though for an unsound reason. In Recto 10 Gerstinger read παλλ]ακίης and took this as a reference to sexual intrigues at the court during the usurpation of Basiliscus, 475-6. Cf. Gerstinger 84. There is evidence for such intrigues, cf. E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire* (Bruges 1959) i 363. But this reading is not likely to be correct, and the text admits of another explanation, see below.

¹⁷ Monophysites of the sixth century did not accept the condemnation of Zeno's memory imposed by Justin I. Cf.

J. Maspero, *Histoire des Patriarches d'Alexandrie* (Paris 1923) 20 n. 1.

¹⁸ Much the same procedure was adopted by C. Kempen, *Procopii Gazaeti in imperatorem Anastasium Panegyricus* (Diss. Bonn. 1918) xix ff.; and more recently by F. Cairns in the study of Theocritus *Id.* xvii included in his book *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry* (Edinburgh 1972) 105 ff.

20 ὑπέ]ρτερα μάλλον αείσω
]ηκαιο πᾶσιν ἀρήγων
]ν ἔσω βασιληίδος αὐλῆς
]σι σὺν ἀνδράσιν Αὐσονιή[ω]ν
 π]ολλοὶ δέ τε παῖδες ἀοιδῶν
]ς ἦπτοντο τραπέζης
 φ]ερέσβιος ἦσθα πορείη
]χης πάντεσσι τιταίνων
 25]υκες εὐχ[ο]ς ἀοιδαῖς
].?ι[.....]λθων
 [ος

Verso 11 π]ατρῶ[ω]ν:]α πατρῶ[ω]ν

12]γεγά[ασι]ν: γ]ὰρ γεγά[ασι]ν

16]οῖες:]οῖ[.].]ες

22]ς:]ῆς

Recto

.]οιο[
 .]όσσα[

 ..].ρε[
 5 σοῖ γὰρ[
 αὐτοκασ[ιγνητ
 διογενή]ς
 ἔς πυμάτην πιπ[.....]....[
 πᾶσι μὲν εὐνομιῆς ἀν[ύ]σας ἔαρ ε[
 10]ιης θρέπτειραν ἀτασθαλο[
 ]θαλάμοιο κατέθλασε[
 ἔνθα μὲν εὐνήσας ὑπερήνορα[
 ἔνθα δὲ χρυσοχίτωνος ὑποπερ[
 αὐχένα γαῦρον ἄρηος Ἄχαιμεν[
 15 Τοῖος ἔών, βασιλεύς τ' ἀγαθὸς κρατε[ρός τ' αἰχμητῆς,
 σ]ῆσι σαοφροσύνησι τετὴν παρακάτθ[εο νύμφην
]εων ἐπιδευέα κηδεμονή[ων
 Τοιγ[.....]ἐπι]δήμιον ἵχνος ἔρ<ε>ίσας
 ημ[.....] ὁ μὴ κάμε δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς
 20 × × × × × ×
 Εἰ καὶ ἐρ...σ.ν.οις[.....].[
 χθιζὸν γὰρ πτολίεθρον ἀμ[
 ἡμερος ὠλεσίπατρις ἐρ..[
 πᾶσα δὲ λωβητῆρι περιζωσ[θείσα
 25 ἔλπωρῇ δεδόνητο γαληναίω [βασιλῆι
 καὶ τις ἀγνηορέων αἰζήμιος ε[
 θαρσε.....εζων, φονίη δ' οἶστρ[
 ἐμφύ[λο]ν στονόεσσαν ἐδύσατο [
 εἰρήνης ἀδίδακτον ὀμήλικα λα.[
 30 Οὐ μὲν λᾶας ἔπαλλεν ἐθήμον[
 δήμου ξεῖνον ἄθυρμα φονοσ[
 μ[.].σ[.].ρα[.].ν ἀμάθουνεν ἄ χεῖρ[
 ]χατ[
 ]σ[

Recto 4 ..].ρε[: ἀρ]γυρέη] 8 Vocabulum]Αἴγν[πτον, quod restituit Gerstinger e particulis litterarum prope
 finem versus servatis, legendum non puto 10]ιης: ...]ακιης 15 κρατε[ρός τ' αἰχμητῆς
 Anim 16 νύμφην supplēvi 18 Τοιγ[: τοῖς 20 Litteras]σας in fine versus Gerstinger sibi visus est
 conspiciere 23 ἐρ.[: ἐρύκ[ακε 24 περιζωσ[θείσα supplēvi 25 βασιλῆι supplēvi 27
 θαρσε.....εζων: θαρσαλε[ως] σώζων 29 λα.[: λαε[32 ἄ χεῖρ[: ἀχειρ

Verso

]ε δίκης κοσμήτορι [
 σ]αόφροσι Κωστα[ντίνω
]τόσσον φίλος ὄσσο[ν
]ὄσσον Διὶ Φοῖβος [Ἐπόλλων
 5]ωσι ταν. .ερο[
]ρε[. .]νω[
 (septem fere versus desunt)

αμ[
 παν[
 εισ[

Translation

Fol. 29788C Verso . . . / . . . by the hope of invisible rumour / . . ., and he received the divine command / to track down . . . of the rulers; / (5) . . ., and like a lion he plundered their lair / . . . alone the footprints of (his) quarry / having driven men swollen with . . . / . . . beneath the cave of (their) dwelling / . . . he taught them woes; and they, having fallen / (10) . . . bewailing avenging necessity / . . . having cast away . . . of ancestral possessions / . . . (they) are become a prey; but . . . / having put to shame (?) . . . / . . . with . . . ears / (15) . . . thou didst release from bonds. / Kindling . . . to (?) the task / . . . I shall rather sing of things more elevated than these / . . . thou didst . . . bringing help to all / . . . inside the royal palace / (20) . . . together with men of the Ausonians / . . . while many sons-of-poets / . . . were touching . . . table / . . . thou wast a life-giving way / proffering to all . . . / (25) . . . glory in songs / . . . / . . .

Recto Such (?) . . . / so many (?) . . . / . . . / . . . / (5) Since for you . . . / own-brother . . . / Diogenes . . . / . . . to farthest . . . / Having achieved for all a spring-time of good government . . . / (10) the wicked nurturer (obj.) of . . . / . . . he crushed . . . of the bed-chamber. / In one place having stilled the overweening . . . / and in another place with swift wing . . . of the gold-tunicked . . . / . . . the proud neck (obj.) of Persian Ares. / (15) Being such a man, both a good king and a strong spearsman, / to your chastity did you entrust your bride (?) / . . . lacking kinsmen to care for her. / Therefore having planted thy (?) footprint . . . at home / . . . which goodly Odysseus did not accomplish by toil / (20) . . . / Even although . . . / for yesterday the city . . . / lust (subj.) to destroy the fatherland . . . / (24-5) and every hope of the peaceful emperor (?) had been shaken, beset by destructive . . ., / and an arrogant young man . . . / . . . and driven madly on (?) by murderous . . . / entered the lamentable . . . of internecine . . . / . . . (his) equal-in-age (obj.) uninstructed in peace. / (30) But it was not the customary stones that they (?) were hurling, (but?) . . . / a . . . sport strange to the populace . . . / was spoiling . . . which (their?) hand . . . / . . . / . . .

Fol. 29788B Verso . . . orderer (dat.) of justice . . . / . . . to sober Constantine . . . / . . . as dear as . . . / . . . as Phoebus Apollo to Zeus / etc.

LINGUISTIC COMMENTARY

*Fol. 29788C**Verso*

The opening divisions of the βασιλικὸς λόγος are, according to Menander, προοίμιον, πατρίς, γένος, γένεσις, φύσις, ἀνατροφή, ἐπιτηδεύματα.¹⁹ These divisions are missing from our poem.

¹⁹ *Rhetores Graeci*, ed. L. Spengel (Lipsiae 1856) iii 368 ff. Menander's categories differ in some respects from those proposed by Aphthonius, *ibid.* ii 36 ff. For a discus-

sion of the categories cf. L. B. Struthers in *HSCP* xxx (1919) 49. Also Cairns *loc. cit.*

They will have formed between a fifth and a sixth of the whole, if our poet followed the same economy as Procopius and Priscian.²⁰ After this comes the most substantial part of the encomium, the emperor's πράξεις, divided into those in war and those in peace.²¹ When our text begins, the πράξεις κατὰ πόλεμον are in progress, and there can be no doubt that the six or seven lines carried away by a tear at the top of the leaf were devoted to them. The opening divisions must therefore have been written on another leaf.

Menander says that the emperor's πράξεις κατὰ πόλεμον are to be sub-divided into those which proceed from ἀνδρεία (courage), φρόνησις (wisdom), and φιλανθρωπία (mercy). The actual campaigns are to be narrated under the heading of ἀνδρεία, and here belong descriptions of terrain, accounts of the various engagements by land and sea, suitable apostrophes, etc. Under φρόνησις tribute must be paid to the emperor's tactical guidance: αὐτὸς ἦν ὁ διαταττόμενος, αὐτὸς ὁ στρατηγῶν, αὐτὸς ὁ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς συμβολῆς εὐρίσκων, σύμβουλος θαυμαστός, ἀριστεύς, στρατηγός, δημηγόρος. In our text the emperor issues commands and his general carries them out (see 5 n.); the campaign is described, if in an allusive and impressionistic manner. The emperor's φιλανθρωπία is duly mentioned, cf. 13 n., and historical commentary.

1.]βασι[λ...].[.....]ας: Only the bases of some four or five letters remain. The text of Gerstinger and Heitsch, which I reproduce, is very doubtful.
2.]ν ἀδερκέος ἐλ[π]ίδι φήμης: 'by the hope of invisible rumour'. The adjective ἀδερκής is found only here and in *A.P.* xi 372.1 (Ag.) ἀδερκέει σύμπνοον αὔρη. Gerstinger's reading ἐλ[π]ίδι is no doubt correct; for ἐλπίδι as the fifth dactyl cf. Nonn. *D.* ii 602 al. ἐλπίδι νίκης, *id. Par.* iv 229 ἐλπίδι πειθούς, *Mus. H.L.* 312 ἐλπίδι νύμφης.
3.]ρτεν, ἔδεκτο δὲ θέσπιν ἀνωγῆν: 'and he received the divine command'. For the accusative θέσπιν cf. *Od.* i 328 al. θέσπιν ἀοιδῆν; but Nonnus does not use this form. In this context θέσπιν means 'royal' rather than 'divine', cf. θεσπίζειν sancire, θέσπισμα and θεία κέλευσις sanctio, *A.P.* xvi 41.3 (Ag.) θεσπεσίης ἄγχιστα συνωρίδος (σ. = Justinian and Theodora). Possible supplements for]ρτεν are ἧμα]ρτεν, ἄμα]ρτεν, ἀφάμα]ρτεν, of which Nonnus uses only the last, cf. *D.* xxviii 70, *ibid.* xlii 251.
4. ἀ]νιχνεύειν βασιλήων: Cf. *Il.* xxii 192 ἀλλά τ' ἀνιχνεύων θέει ἔμπεδον, ὄφρα κεν εὖρη, Achilles chasing Hector is compared to a hound chasing a fawn. The metaphor inherent in ἀνιχνεύειν becomes explicit in the next line. For ἀνιχνεύειν cf. also Nonn. *D.* xxix 375, *id. Par.* xviii 28. I take βασιλήων as referring to the emperor and Augusta. So οἱ βασιλεῖς denotes Justinian and Theodora in *Romanos Cant.* 54 κβ' 8 (ed. Maas and Trypanis), cf. also *ibid.* 4 *Proem.* iii 5, *ibid.* 35 ια' 4. Similarly ἄνακτες denotes Arcadius and Eudoxia in an inscription on the column of Eudoxia, A.D. 403 (cf. R. Janin, *Constantinople byzantine*² [Paris 1964] 77), and Justinian and Theodora in *A.P.* vii 570.1 (anon.). It seems reasonable to take ἀνιχνεύειν as expressing the substance of the command (ἀνωγῆν), and to punctuate with a semi-colon after βασιλήων, see next note.
5.]ο, λέων δ' ἀλάπαξε καλιάς: 'and like a lion he stormed their lair'. The expression of a comparison without the use of a comparative conjunction is a widespread idiom in Greek verse and prose, and has been fully illustrated by P. Shorey in *CPh* iv (1909) 433, and by W. Headlam on *Herondas* vi 14.²² So, for example, *Theogn.* 347 ἐγὼ δὲ κύων ἐπέρησα χαράδρην, 'I am like the dog in the fable who crossed the torrent'; *A. Ag.* 393 ἐπεὶ διώκει παῖς ποτανὸν ὄρνιν, 'for he is like a boy who chases a winged bird'; [E.] *Rhesus* 56 ὅστις μ' εὐτυχοῦντ' ἐνόσφισας/θοίνης λέοντα, 'who robbed me of my feast when I was triumphing like a lion'. An allied, but not identical, usage occurs in Nonn. *D.* i 19 εἰ δὲ λέων φρίζειεν ἐπαυχενίην τρίχα σείων, 'if in shape of a lion he should shake his bristling mane', of the shape-changing of Proteus. Animals commonly figure in these comparisons, just as a lion figures in ours; and warriors are compared to lions in heroic poetry *passim*. Viljamaa 101 f. explains line 5 inexactly: 'He likens the emperor, as Priscian does Anastasius (*Laudes Anastasii* 67 ff.) to a lion which crushes the men who have disturbed it'. But elsewhere the emperor is addressed in the *second* person, cf. *Verso* 15, 18, 23, *Recto* 5, 16. Accordingly, the grammatical subject of ἀλάπαξε must be his general, see historical commentary.

²⁰ In Procopius these divisions occupy six chapters out of thirty, in Priscian forty-nine lines out of three hundred and twelve.

²¹ *Men.* 372. 25 ff.

²² I owe these references to Prof. A. J. Beattie, who discussed with me many lines of the text, and whose help I gratefully acknowledge.

For *καλιάς* the scribe has written *καλειας*. In the oldest epic *καλιά* denotes a granary or store-room in the interior of a house, cf. Hes. *Op.* 307 σοὶ δ' ἔργα φίλ' ἔστω μέτρια κοσμεῖν, / ὣς κέ τοι ὠραίου βίοντος πλήθωσι καλιαί, *ibid.* 301, 374. This is its sense also in A.R. i 170, iv 1095. The word later came to denote the den or lair of a wild beast, as Opp. *H.* i 718 (a lion's den), etc.; a bird's nest, Theoc. xxix 12, etc.; a humble human dwelling, Call. *fr.* 263.3, Nonn. *D.* xvii 39. Of these meanings, 'lair' and 'nest' occur most frequently in later epic. There seems to be no distinction in meaning between the singular and plural of this word, cf. Hes. *Op.* 307, Call. *Dian.* 96. It is likely that lines 6–9 amplify the phrase *λέων δ' ἀλάπαξε καλιάς*. The poet says, in effect, 'he received the command to track down the emperor's enemies, and this he did; like a lion he plundered their lair, after tracking his quarry and driving them (*ἐλάσσας* 7) to their refuge, where he laid siege to them'. I have therefore not indicated any punctuation between *λέων* 5 and *διζύας* 9. I have punctuated after *βασιλήων* 4 and after *ιο* 5, the latter of which might be the remnant of a pluperfect, e.g. *τετέλεστο*. It might be thought possible to take *λέων δ' ἀλάπαξε καλιάς* as referring to an action separate from that described in 6–9; but I reject this because it is natural to take *ἀμιχνεύειν* 4 and *ἔχνια* 6 as referring to the same action.

6. *ἵατη μόνος ἔχνια θήρης*: It seems better to read the group *ἵατη* as a dative (adscript omitted, as in Recto 27), with Maas (*Gnomon* v [1929] 252), than as a nominative, with Gerstinger, for the line has another nominative in *μόνος*. If governed by *ἔχνια*, *θήρης* is more likely to mean 'prey, quarry' (LSJ s.v. *θήρα* II) than 'hunting'.

7. *ἴων ἐγκύμονας ἄνδρας ἐλάσσας*: Heitsch erroneously prints the first group as *ἵτων*. This was doubtless prompted by Gerstinger's supplement *ἀρετῶν*, which would give the wrong nuance, in my opinion. The pejorative sense of *ἐγκύμων* is more apposite here. Cf. Nonn. *Par.* viii 59 *δυσσεβίης ἐγκύμονες*, *ibid.* 7.29 al. *ἀμπλακίης ἐγκύμονα*.

8. *ἴσαν ὑπὸ σπήλυγγα μελάθρων*: The papyrus has *σπυλιγγα*, corrected to *σπηλιγγα*. In the usage of Nonnus, *ὑπὸ* with accusative may express either rest or motion towards, cf. Nonni *Panopolitani Dionysiaca*, *recogn. Rudolfus Keydell* (Berlin 1959) i 67*. Not enough of the context remains to enable us to say whether we have here 'beneath' or 'to beneath the cave belonging to (their) dwelling'. The letters *ἴσαν* seem to me more likely to be the remnants of an adjective (*ἀχλυόεσσαν*, *εὐρώεσσαν*, *ὀμιχλήεσσαν*) than of a verb (e.g. *ἦσαν*). For these adjectives in Nonn. *D.*, cf. xxv 282 *ἀχλυόεσσαν . . . ὀμίχλην*, xlv 77 *ἀχλυόεντι . . . μελάθρω*, xlv 267 *εὐρώεντι . . . μελάθρω*, xxvi 107 *εὐρώεντι . . . βερέθρω*, xxxv 276 *ὀμιχλήεντι . . . βερέθρω*.

9. *ἴς ἐδίδα[σκ]εν διζύας*: [*ο*]ἴ δὲ πεσόντες: The subject of *ἐδίδα[σκ]εν* is still the emperor's general. For *οἴζυς* denoting the rigours of a siege, cf. Opp. *H.* iv 689 οἱ δ' ἐπὶ πύργοις/λίμω τ' ἀργαλέω και διζυῖ μοχθίζοντες κτλ. This is the reference of *διζύας* here, according to my historical interpretation, see below. The plural of *οἴζυς* is nowhere else found. With the words οἱ δὲ πεσόντες the grammatical subject changes to the besieged, who are also the subject of *ἀναστενάχοντες* 10, *ρίψα[ντες]* 11, and *γεγά[ασιν]* 12.

10. *πο|ινήτει[ρα]ν ἀναστενάχοντες ἀνά[γ]κ[η]ν*: The only supplement of *ἰνήτει[ρα]ν* which suits the context is Gerstinger's *πο|ινήτει[ρα]ν*. Cf. Opp. *H.* ii 421 *ποινήτηρες ἔασιν και ἀλλήλων ὀλετήρες*, and Tzetz. *Posthom.* 35 *εὐχετόωντο . . . / Ἐκτορος ἐσθλοῦ ποινήτειραν τήνδε* (= Penthesileia) *γενέσθαι*, the only other passages in which the word is found. (Nonnus always uses the form *ποινήτωρ*, which he seems to have coined.) The doubtful letters in the extant text of this line are confirmed by Nonn. *D.* xxxvi 142 *ἀλεξήτειραν ἀνάγκην*.

11. *π|ατρῶ[ω]ν κτεάνων ρίψα[ντες] ἀρ|*: Gerstinger reports the beginning of this line as *ἰα πατρῶ[ω]ν* which Heitsch prints. But on Heitsch's photograph the line begins *ἰατρῶ[ω]ν*, and everything to the left of this has been torn off. Heitsch also prints extra letters in the next line, see note. Clearly, however, *π|ατρῶ[ω]ν* is correct (so *πατρῶα χρήματα*, *π. οὐσία*, *π. ὄλβος*, cf. LSJ and Stephanus s.v. *πατρῶος*). I take *ρίψα[ντες]* to mean 'wantonly casting away', a slight extension of the meaning of *ρίπτειν* in phrases like *ἐρρίφθω σοφίας ὁ πολὺς πόνος*, *A.P.* xii 117.5 (Mel.); *ρίπτει γούους* *ibid.* x 78.1 (Pall.), etc. As a supplement for *ἀρ|* I suggest *ἀρ|ωγήν*, which occurs at the end of verses in A.R. iii 524 al., Tryph. 565.

12. *ἰγεγά[ασιν] ἐλώριον ἀλλά[.]θεον|*: Gerstinger and Heitsch print the beginning of this line as *γ|ἀρ γεγά[ασιν]*, but the line begins at *γεγά[ασιν]* on Heitsch's photograph. The singular *ἐλώριον* is found elsewhere only in A.R. ii 264 *δαῖτα . . . / λοίσθιον Ἀρπυίῃσιν ἐλώριον*; *A.P.* ix 154.3 (Ag.) *ἀλλὰ σὺ με* (= Troy) *προλέλοιπας ἐλώριον*.

13.]τρον ἐ[λ]έγξας: A tear has carried away all of this line to the left of]τρον except for the tops of a few letters. Gerstinger read the line as]υδρ.[.....]οσ[...].οι.[..]τρον ἐλέγξας (so Heitsch), but all before]τρον is very doubtful. While it is not possible to say whether ἐλέγξας is an indicative (Gerstinger) or a participle (Heitsch), its subject is presumably the same as that of ἀπελύσαο 15, where the emperor is addressed. The latter half of line 12, and the three lines 13–15, will then be devoted to praise of the emperor's clemency towards vanquished foes, as Menander prescribes, 374. 25 ff.: μετὰ τὸ τέλος τῶν πράξεων ἢ καὶ πρὸς τῷ τέλει τῶν πράξεων ἐρεῖς τι καὶ περὶ τρίτης ἀρετῆς, λέγω δὲ τῆς φιλανθρωπίας. μόριον δὲ τῆς φιλανθρωπίας ἢ δικαιοσύνη, ὅτι νικήσας ὁ βασιλεὺς οὐ τοῖς ὁμοίοις ἡμίνατο τοὺς προάρξαντας ἀδίκων ἀλλ' ἐμέρισε κατὰ τὸ δίκαιον τὰς πράξεις τιμωρία καὶ φιλανθρωπία, κτλ. It is impossible to say in what sense ἐλέγξας is being used in our passage; I translate 'having put to shame', *exempli gratia*.

14.]ρησιν ἀκουαῖς, Heitsch. This combines Gerstinger's unmetrical reading]ρης ἵνα κόραις with Keydell's improvement ἀκουαῖς. For ἀκουαῖς *in eadem sede*, cf. Call. fr. 43.16, Nonn. D. i 413 al., *id. Par.* v 151 al. In Nonn. D. ἀκουαῖ is always 'ears'. Perhaps it should be so translated here, referring to the 'ears' with which the emperor heard his foes' pleas for clemency; see next line and historical commentary.

15. ἀπελύσαο δεσμῶν: Cf. Nonn. D. xxī 66 οὐδὲ Δρυαντιάδην χλοερῶν ἀπελύσατο δεσμῶν. Similarly *Il.* i 401 τὸν . . . ὑπέλυσαο δεσμῶν, Nonn. D. xxvi 140 γενέτην ἀνελύσατο δεσμῶν, *ibid.* xiii 27 Ἄρεα λύσατο δεσμῶν, all at verse-end. In ἀπέλυσαο the emperor is addressed for the first time in the extant papyrus.

At δεσμῶν ends the praise of the emperor's clemency, and of his achievements in war. Hence I punctuate with a full-stop. Lines 16–17 are a prooemium to the next section of the encomiastic scheme, namely praise of the emperor's peaceful achievements (see historical commentary). Menander recommends that each successive section of the encomium should have its own prooemium, 372.14 ff.: χρῆ δὲ γνώσκειν καὶ φυλάττειν τὸ παράγγελμα, ὅτι, ὅταν μέλλῃς ἀπὸ κεφαλαίου μεταβαίνειν εἰς κεφάλαιον, δεῖ προοιμιάζεσθαι περὶ οὗ μέλλεις ἐγχειρεῖν, ἵνα προσεκτικὸν τὸν ἀκροατὴν ἐργάσῃ καὶ μὴ ἔῃς λανθάνειν μηδὲ κλέπτεσθαι τῶν κεφαλαίων τὴν ζήτησιν: αὐξήσεως γὰρ οἰκείον τὸ προσεκτικὸν ποιεῖν τὸν ἀκροατὴν καὶ ἐπιστρέφειν ὥσπερ μεγίστων ἀκούειν μέλλοντα; and *ibid.* 376.13 ff.

16.]οιες ἔργον ἀνάπτων: Heitsch's spacing]οι[. . .]ες is not confirmed by the photograph. It is impossible to say whether ες is a preposition governing ἔργον, or the end of a word. We can, however, say with confidence that ἀνάπτων depends on αἰείω (17); for this language and structure find a counterpart in *A.P.* v 1.1–2 (the anonymous prooemium of the amatory book of the *Palatine Anthology*) *Νέοις ἀνάπτων καρδίας σοφὴν ζέειν, |ἀρχὴν Ἔρωτα τῶν λόγων ποιήσομαι.*

17.]ρτερα μᾶλλον αἰείω: I shall rather sing of things more . . . The emperor's peaceful achievements should be said to excel those in war, according to Men. 375.10 f.: οὕτως οὐ μόνον ἐν τοῖς κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον ἔργοις ὁ βασιλεὺς ἡμῖν θαυμάσιος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τοῖς κατ' εἰρήνην θαυμασιώτερος. This gives the point of the comparative adjective of which only]ρτερα remains. Gerstinger's ὑπέ]ρτερα could be right ('things better . . .'), since ὑπέρτερα occurs in this position in *A.R.* i 682, Nonn. *Par.* i 208 al., and is juxtaposed with μᾶλλον *ibid.* xiv 52 καὶ τούτων πολὺ μᾶλλον ὑπέρτερα θαύματα ῥέζει (π. μ. with τούτων, 'and better miracles shall he do, far more so than these'). Cf. Verg. *Ecl.* iv 1 paulo maiora canamus. The placing of αἰείω at verse-end is characteristic of prooemia, cf. Call. *Dian.* 186, *id. Del.* 1, Nonn. D. i 29, *ibid.* xxv 6, Cleanthes *Hymn to Zeus* 6.

At line 18 begin the πράξεις κατ' εἰρήνην. Menander says that these are to be sub-divided according to whether they concern σωφροσύνη, δικαιοσύνη or φρόνησις (375.6). First comes δικαιοσύνη. Here the orator will praise the emperor's gentleness towards his subjects and his readiness to show mercy to petitioners (τὸ ἡμερον τὸ πρὸς τοὺς ὑπηκόους ἐπαινήσεις, τῆς δὲ πρὸς τοὺς δεομένους φιλανθρωπίας τὸ εὐπρόσοδον). He will say that, just as the Asclepiadae heal men, or as fugitives find safety in churches or temples (καταφεύγοντας ἐπὶ τὰ ἄστυλα τεμένη τοῦ κρείττονος), so the man who has looked on the emperor's face is released from all danger (*ibid.* 14 ff.).

18.]ηκαο πᾶσιν ἀρήγων: The emperor is addressed, cf. 15 and 23. The line might have begun with ὡς, 'I shall rather sing of things more . . . / how thou didst . . .' Cf. Call. *Dem.* 17 f. μὴ μὴ

ταῦτα λέγωμες ἄ δάκρυον ἤγαγε Διοῦ / κάλλιον, ὡς πολίεσσιν ἑαδότα τέθμια δῶκε, etc. The only aorists in -κα are ἔθηκα, ἔδωκα, ἤκα, ἤνεγκα, and compounds thereof. Cf. Kühner-Blass ii 196. Possibilities here are ἐθ]ήκαο, Theocr. xxix 18; and παρεθ]ήκαο, cf. Eva-Maria Hamm, *Grammatik zu Sappho und Alkaios*² (Berlin 1958) 31, to which Mr J. G. Howie kindly drew my attention. For ἀρήγων at verse-end cf. *Il.* v 507 al., Nonn. *D.* xxxv 390, Tryph. 649.

19.]ν ἔσω βασιληίδος αὐλῆς: The vocabulary and rhythm are close to Nonnus. Cf. ἔσω θεοδέγμονος αὐλῆς Nonn. *D.* ix 162 al., *id. Par.* i 148 al., ἔσω βαθυκύμονος αὐλῆς *id. D.* xxi 171 al., ἔσω Κορυβαντίδος αὐλῆς *ibid.* xiv 247, ἔσω πολυχανδέος αὐλῆς *id. Par.* xviii 77, all at verse-end. For βασιληίδος, cf. βασιληίος (sic) αὐλή Nonn. *D.* xviii 62, at verse-end; βασιληίος . . . αὐλή *ibid.* iii 125.

20.]σι σὺν ἀνδράσιν Αὐσονή[ω]ν: Cf. ἀνέρες Αὐσονήες Nonn. *Par.* xi 196. For σὺν ἀνδράσιν *in hac sede*, cf. *Il.* vi 314. For Αὐσονήων at verse-end, cf. Nonn. *D.* iii 199, Dion. Perieg. 333 and 467, *Encomium Heraclii Ducis* I (Heitsch I xxxiv). This third-declension form also in Dion. Perieg. 78, *A.P.* ii 398 (Christod.).

21. π]ολλοὶ δέ τε παῖδες ἀοιδῶν: For παῖδες ἀοιδῶν=ἀοιδοί, cf. παῖδες ζωγράφων Anon. *Encom. ap.* Heitsch I xxx 20, and *ibid.* xxxi 18; ποιητῶν τε παῖδας καὶ ῥήτορας Proc. *Gaz. Panegyrr. in Anast.* 30; τῶν γενναίων ῥητόρων παῖδες Zach. *Mityl. Mund. Orif.* PG lxxxv 1025, *Χριστιανῶν παῖδες* *ibid.* 1029, τῶν γραμματιστῶν οἱ παῖδες *ibid.* 1064; τῶν ἱατρῶν οἱ παῖδες *Aen. Gaz. Ep.* 20.22, with L. Massa Positano's note; *Τυρσηνῶν . . . παῖδες* Nonn. *D.* xlv 105 al. This locution is common at all periods, see LSJ s.v. παῖς I 3. In the collocation δέ τε, the force of δέ is antithetical, while τε denotes the action as habitual. Cf. J. D. Denniston, *Greek Particles*² (Oxford 1954) 528.

22.]ς ἤπτοντο τραπέζης: Cf. Nonn. *D.* xxvi 373 f. καὶ πάντες ἀμοιβαίων ἐπὶ θώκων/ ξεινοδόκω βασιλῆι μιῆς ἤπτοντο τραπέζης, 'and all touched the same table as their hospitable king in turns on rows of seats' (tr. Rouse). *Ibid.* xl 236 f. ἐπὶ ξυνῶ δὲ κυπέλλω /βάκχοις δαιτυμένοισι μιῆς ἤψαντο τραπέζης, 'they . . . touched one table with banqueting Bacchoi over a common bowl'. It is noteworthy that, in the first of these passages, the subject of ἤπτοντο is located in the middle of the previous line; this renders it likely that, in our poem, παῖδες is the subject of ἤπτοντο. Further, both of the Nonnus passages emphasise the community shared by host and guest (μιῆς), as also Nonn. *D.* xlvi 975 πατρὶ σὺν εὐώδιμι μιῆς ἔψανσε τραπέζης. I therefore favour μιῆ]ς as a supplement ('were touching the same table as you') in preference to τε]ῆς Gerstinger, Heitsch. The η is not legible on the photograph.

23. φ]ερέσβιος ἦσθα πορείη: 'thou wast a life-giving way'. It is reasonable to take φερέσβιος with πορείη, considering the frequency in Nonnus of groups like ἀλίδρομον εἶχε πορείην *D.* xliii 281. πορεία occurs often in Nonnus and other late poetry with the sense of 'way', 'course', 'path' of life. The personification of πορεία, however, seems to be paralleled only in Nonn. *Par.* xiv 20 ζῶη ἀληθείη τε καὶ ὄρθιος εἰμι πορείη, cf. *Ev. Joh.* 14.6 Ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωή. Our line may be intended to echo the Gospel. φερέσβιος is commoner in late poetry than appears from LSJ s.v. The second person form ἦσθα does not occur in Nonnus.

24.]χης πάντεσσι τιταίνων: For τιταίνων meaning 'giving, rendering', cf. Nonn. *Par.* vi 37 Χριστὸς ἀειζώνοντι χάριν γενετῆρι τιταίνων ('giving thanks', of Jesus blessing the loaves before feeding the Five Thousand). Doubtless the subject of τιταίνων is the emperor, cf. ἦσθα 23.

25.]υκες εὐχ[ο]ς ἀοιδαῖς: So Keydell,]σκες Gerstinger. For εὐχος meaning 'glory', cf. Nonn. *D.* xxv 103 al., *id. Par.* 5.70 al.

26–7. Neither the fragments of these lines, nor the detached letters visible on Heitsch's photograph, permit any interpretation to be made.

Recto

1. .]οιο[: Heitsch's Plate F does not show line 1, and I therefore rely on his report, which agrees with Gerstinger's.

2. .]οσσα[: In passing to the second topic under the heading δικαιοσύνη, the poet begins with two lines by way of prologue and transition. This I take to be the function of .]οιο[and .]οσσα[, for the former of which we may compare τοῖος in the transition, line 15 below. As supplements, τ]οῖο[ς and either τ]όσσα or some case of τοσσάτιος suggest themselves. For τοσσάτιος (=τόσος) in various cases at the beginning of a line, cf. *A. R.* iv 962, Nonn. *Par.* ii 101 al., *Procl. H.* vii 35, *Dion. Perieg.* 363. So τόσσα *Call. fr.* 388.7, *id. Cer.* 71, *id. Del.* 246, Nonn. *Par.* xii 149. As a part of

the emperor's *δικαιοσύνη*, says Menander, the orator will say that his governors and officials are just (*καὶ ἔρεις ὅτι δίκαιους ἄρχοντας κατὰ ἔθνη καὶ γένη καὶ πόλεις ἐκπέμπει φύλακας τῶν νόμων καὶ τῆς τοῦ βασιλέως ἀξίους, οὐ συλλογέας πλούτου*, 375.18 ff.). He will also praise the moderation of the emperor's taxes and other exactions, and the justice of his legislation. These are aspects of *δικαιοσύνη* rather than of *φρόνησις* (*ibid.* 28 ff.).

3–4. There follow the mutilated beginnings of two lines. Gerstinger's reading *αρ[γυρη]* in line 4 is not confirmed by the photograph, and is to be rejected. The word is irrecoverable, being mutilated by a hole at the beginning and a tear at the end.

5. *σοὶ γὰρ*: This is a typical line-beginning in dedicatory poetry, e.g. *A.P.* vi 231.3 (Phil. Thess.) and 240 (*id.*), *σοὶ* denoting the deity to whom the offering is made. Our poem, however, is not dedicatory, but encomiastic; and in this part of the encomium some reference to the justice of the emperor's officials is prescribed by Menander, see above. A better comparison is, I think, with *A.P.* iv 3B.101 ff. *δεῦρο, μάκαρ Θεόδωρε . . . / (103) σοὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ τὸν ἄεθλον ἐμόχθεον· εἰς σέ δὲ μύθων / ἐργασίην ἤσκησα, κτλ.* There, *σοὶ* denotes the patron whom Agathias has served by editing an anthology of epigrams. I therefore suggest that, in our poem, the lines following *σοὶ γὰρ* contained a list of the emperor's officials and their services to him. Observe that, in line 11 below, the subject is in the third person.

6. *αὐτοκασιγνητ*: In Homer, *αὐτοκασιγνητος/η* commonly stands at the beginning of the verse, and is usually preceded by a personal name in apposition in the line before. Hence the 'brother' (or 'sister') in question may have been named in line 5. Line 6 need not have contained many words, cf. Colluth. 21 *αὐτοκασιγνήτην λευκώλενον Ἀμφιτρίτης*, = Thetis.

7. *διογενη*[: Frequent in Homer as an epithet. Alternatively, it could be a man's name, cf. *A.P.* vii 64.3, 65.1, where the name Diogenes stands first in the line. The names of emperors, generals and other functionaries often occur in the verse-panegyrics of the fifth and sixth centuries, cf. Heitsch I xxxii 75, *ibid.* xxxiv 37, and the encomia of Dioscuroi *ibid.* xlii ff.

8. *ἐς πυμάτην πιπ[.]*[: The adjective *πύματος* has much the same range of meanings as *ὑστατος* and *ἔσχατος*. It presumably qualified a noun of geographical significance here, cf. Opp. C. ii 377 *πυμάτης ἐν τέρμασι Κρήτης*, 'in the innermost regions of Crete'. Often, however, *πύματος* qualifies nouns like *δρόμος*, *χάρις*, *ὄλεθρος*, *ἄντιξ* etc.

About twelve letters are lost in the gap following *πιπ[. .* Towards the end of the line there are visible the bases of approximately four letters. These were read by Gerstinger as *Αἰγυ*, which he supplemented to read *Αἰγυ[πτον]*. There is, however, insufficient evidence to justify this reconstruction. The marks which Gerstinger read as vestiges of the arc and oblique stroke of an alpha look more like the bases of two separate letters. Further, in the recto and verso elsewhere, the diphthong *αι* is always written in such a way that the oblique stroke of the alpha touches the iota following it, whereas here, were we to accept Gerstinger's alpha, there is a considerable gap between the two. With regard to the alleged upsilon, the perpendicular stroke with a leftward hook at the bottom is also characteristic of the scribe's rho (cf. verso 20, recto 10, etc.) and of his psi (see verso 11). These observations can be confirmed from Heitsch's plate F. I therefore omit Gerstinger's reconstruction as being unjustified and likely to lead to misinterpretation. (I have been fortunate in securing the advice of Dr W. S. M. Nicoll concerning the letter-forms here and in lines 10 and 27 below.)

9. *πάσι μὲν εὐνομίας ἀν[ύ]σας ἔαρ ε*[: 'Having achieved for all a spring-time of good government' (*ἀνύσας* is participial, since its last syllable is long). From the structure of lines 9–11, i.e. participial phrase followed by finite verb, it is likely that the sentence begins at *πάσι* and finds its main verb in *κατέθλασε*. Accordingly, I take *μὲν* 9 as beginning the idea which is resumed in *μὲν* 12, and to which *δὲ* 13 provides the antithesis. This duplication of *μὲν* is a familiar idiom in both poetry and prose, cf. Denniston, *Greek Particles* 384: 'The content of the first of the two contrasted ideas proves too great to admit of compression into a single clause, particularly when the speaker permits himself to wander somewhat from the precise point at issue. Hence a second *μὲν* clause is necessary, before the *δέ* clause can follow. The force of the opening *μὲν* has half evaporated, and must be resuscitated by a fresh *μὲν*'. The action referred to in *ἐνθα μὲν κτλ.* 12 is therefore the same as the action described in 9–11. Metaphorical use of *ἔαρ* is common in encomiastic contexts, cf. *A.P.* vii 601.1 (Jul. Aeg.) *ἀμετρήτων χαρίτων ἔαρ ἡδύ*, *ibid.* 12.1 (anon.), *ibid.* 29.3 (Antip. Sid.), etc. References to *εὐνομία* are familiar in eulogies on emperors, magistrates, etc., e.g. *A.P.* vi 236.5

(Phil. Thess.) *Καίσαρος εὐνομίας χρηστής χάρις*, which is evidence for reading a genitive in the third foot in our passage, cf. also A.R. iii 68. We might expect that *πάσι* accompanied some nominal expression at the end of the line, *exempli gr.* ἔ[θνεσι γαίης].

10. . . .]ιης θρέπτειραν ἀτάσθαλο[: I read the first group as . . .]θειης or . . .]λειης. Gerstinger and Keydell read . . .]ακιης, but the letter read by them as a kappa is too square to be one, and kappa is not so written anywhere else on the recto and verso. The word can scarcely have consisted of more than eight letters, and this is an additional reason for rejecting Gerstinger's supplement *παλλ[ακίης*. I suggest *παιδείης*, cf. Orph. *h. in Musas* 76.4 f. *πάσης παιδείης ἀρέτην γεννώσαι ἄμεμπτον, | θρέπτειραι ψύχης*, where the juxtaposition of *παιδείης* and *θρέπτειραι* might afford a parallel to our passage. The accompanying vocabulary (*ἀτασθαλο[*, *κατέθλασε*) suggests moral condemnation. For *ἀτάσθαλος*, 'wicked, violent', cf. *Od.* xvi 86 *λίην γὰρ ἀτάσθαλον ὕβριν ἔχουσι*, Nonn. *D.* xv 77 *παρθενικὴν ἀδάμαστον ἀτάσθαλον εἰς γάμον ἔλκων*, Hes. *Th.* 996 (cited below, line 12 n.), etc. The case of *ἀτασθαλο[* here could have been genitive or accusative. For *θρέπτειρα* in a pejorative context, cf. Colluth. 321 *τὴν δὲ (sc. πύλην) δολοφροσύνης, κενεῶν θρέπτειραν ὀνειρώων*.

11.]θαλάμοιο κατέθλασε[: The simple verb *θλάω* is used in prose and poetry to describe the breaking of bone, crushing of cartilage, and denting of metal. In Nonnus, *θλάω*, *διαθλάω* and *συνθλάω* describe the shattering of skull or chest, e.g. *D.* iv 411 *ἄκρα δρακοντείοιο καρήατος ἔθλασε πέτρῳ*. The evidence for *καταθλάω* is confined to the Septuagint and Christian authors, the word not occurring in poetry elsewhere. Though used to describe the breaking of Jesus' legs on the cross (*Acta Pilati* B xi 2, 311, ed. Tischendorf 1876), it more often means 'crush', 'trample underfoot'. So *LXX Is.* 63.3 *κατέθλασα αὐτούς ὡς γῆν*, cf. *Ps.* 41 (42).11 *ἐν τῷ καταθλάσθαι τὰ ὀστέα μου*; Eriphan. *Haer.* 29.9 (Adv. Nazarenos) *ταύτην (sc. αἵρεσιν) φωράσαντες, ὡς βληχρὸν καὶ ὀδύνης ἐμποιητικὸν διὰ τοῦ ἰοῦ σφήκιον (legendum σφήκειον), καταθλάσαντες τε τοῖς τῆς ἀληθείας λόγοις*, 'having detected this (heresy), like a puny wasp which causes pain by its venom, and having crushed it with the words of truth'; *ibid.* 48.15 (Adv. Montanistas) *τὸν μὲν ἰόν, τὰ ἀγκιστροειδῆ τῶν ὀδόντων αὐτῆς φάρμακα ἐν τῷ τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ σταυροῦ ξύλῳ καταθλάσαντες*, 'having crushed its venom and the barbed poisons of its teeth with the wood of the cross of truth'. Thus the word is very strong, and in the last two passages it refers to the extirpation of something vile. Since *κατέθλασε* in our text is third person, its subject is presumably not the emperor, who is addressed in the second person at line 16 below. Although *θαλάμοιο* is partly obliterated, Gerstinger's reading is probably sound, since this form occurs before feminine middle-caesura twelve times in Nonn. *D.* (cf. Peek, *Lexikon* s.v.), and *passim* in other poetry.

12–13. The antithesis *ἔνθα μὲν . . . ἔνθα δέ*, 'in one place . . . in another place', is common in prose (cf. Xen. *H.G.* iii 3.5, etc.), but also occurs in poetry, cf. Colluth. 237 ff. Here the *μὲν* resumes the preceding *μὲν* in line 9, and the *δέ* phrase provides an antithesis to both, as in the numerous examples cited by Denniston, *loc. cit.* line 9 n., above.

12. The metaphorical use of *εὐνάω* with the sense of 'soothe, pacify' occurs *passim*, and is especially frequent in Nonnus, *D.*, e.g. xxv 3 *οὐ πῶ . . . | φύλοπιν ἑπταέτηρον Ἐῷος εὐνάσεν ἄρης*. The long final syllable shows that *εὐνήσας* is aorist participle. The adjective *ὑπερήνωρ* commonly denotes tyrannous pride or cruelty, cf. Hes. *Th.* 995 *στονόεντας ἀέθλους, | τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐπέτελλε μέγας βασιλεὺς ὑπερήνωρ, | ὕβριστῆς Πελῆης καὶ ἀτάσθαλος ὄβριμοεργός*, where the language is similar to that in our passage; Orph. *Arg.* 671 *ὑπερήνωρι θυμῷ*, of Phineus' cruelty in blinding and exposing his own children.

13. *χρυσοχίτωνος*: Cf. *Pi. fr.* 195 *εὐάρματα χρυσοχίτων, ἱερώτατον ἄγαλμα, Θήβα*, of Thebes (*Σ. id. P.* iv 25 *τὸ μὲν γὰρ εὐάρματα τῆς πόλεως, τὸ δὲ χρυσοχίτων τῆς ἠρωίδος*); Peisander *ap. Joh. Lyd. Mag.* iii 64 *σπουδῆ γέγονε τοῖς πολυχρύσοις τὸ πάλαι Λυδοῖς . . . καὶ χρυσοστήμονας διεργάζεσθαι χιτώνας, καὶ μάρτυς ὁ Πείσανδρος εἰπὼν Ἰυδοὶ χρυσοχίτωνες*; *A.P.* vi 102.6 (Phil. Thess.) *χρυσοχίτων' ἐλάην*, of the golden skin of a fruit, as also Orph. *Lith.* 715 *ἐν δέ σφιν καὶ δριμὺν ἐπήλυδα κόκκον ἄνωγα | μίξαι χρυσοχίτωνα, μελαγχροῖην, ἐρίτιμον* (Herman *cf. ῥυσοχίτωνα*); Paul. Sil. *Descr.* 156 *χρυσοχίτων Ἀνθοῦσα* (the sacral name of Rome, here of Constantinople); *ibid.* 599 *μηνὶ χρυσοχίτωνι* (=January, see historical commentary, below).

ὑποπτερ[: Doubtless nominative *ὑπόπτερ[ος*, agreeing with 'he', the subject of *εὐνήσας*. Not literally 'winged', but 'as if winged', denoting a quick succession of activities in several different regions. This is exactly the nuance of the word in Aristides, ii 183 Dindorf, *τὸν οὕτως ὠκὺν καὶ*

ἄγρυπνον καὶ ἡδιστ' ἂν εἶπον ὑπόπτερον τοῦτον, where Aristides is referring to the operations of Pericles in Samos, Caria, Euboea and Megara. No adverb denoting comparison is necessary, cf. Ion Trag. fr. 14 δόμον . . . κλήσον ὑπόπτερος, 'fly and shut the door', and LSJ s.v. ὑπόπτερος, 2. See historical commentary, below.

14. αὐχένα γαῦρον ἄρῃος Ἀχαιμεν[: The phrase αὐχένα γαῦρον is a frequent line-beginning in Nonn. D. e.g. αὐχένα γαῦρον ἔχοντα κατ' οὐρανὸν Ἄρεα φεύγω, *ibid.* xx 51, 'I avoid Ares, who lifts a proud neck in heaven', which contains an idea similar to that in our line. Cf. also A.P. xvi 203.1 (Jul. Aeg.) Κλίνας αὐχένα γαῦρον ὑφ' ἡμετέροισι πεδίλοις; Proc. Gaz. Pan. 30 αὐχένα τε γαῦρον ἐπαίρω. The origin of the phrase is perhaps to be found in A.R. iv 1606 ὁ δ' ἐπ' αὐχένι γαῦρος ἀερθεῖς / ἔσπεται, which is literal and describes a horse about to be yoked. The genitive ἄρῃος is Homeric, but occurs only once in Nonn. D., where it denotes 'war', as here (*ibid.* xxiv 69). Possible supplements for Ἀχαιμεν[are Ἀχαιμενίου, -ίοιο, -ίδου, -ίδαο (cf. A.P. ii 389 [Christod.] ὃς πρὶν Ἀχαιμενίδαο μένος Κύριοιο λιγαίνων). I take it that the line ended in a finite verb governing αὐχένα and meaning 'he/you humbled'.

15. Following the precept of Menander, 376.2 ff., the poet passes to the second virtue embodied in the emperor, namely his σωφροσύνη. Here the orator must say that it is due to the emperor that marriages are chaste and their offspring legitimate, and that proper solemnity is observed at games and festivals. Praise of the Augusta is to be inserted here, if she deserves it: εἰ δὲ ἐπ' ἀξίας εἴη καὶ τιμῆς μεγίστης ἢ βασιλῆς, ἐρεῖς τι καὶ κατὰ καιρὸν ἐνθάδε· ἦν θαυμάσας ἠγάπησε, ταύτην κοινωνὸν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ βασιλείας πεποιήται, καὶ οὐδ' εἰ ἔστιν ἄλλο οἶδε γυναικεῖον φύλον. In our text, line 15 supplies a transition and prooemium, as Recto line 1 above. I accept von Arnim's supplement κρατεῖρός τ' αἰχμητῆς. The line is adapted from Helen's description of Agamemnon in *Il.* iii 179 ἀμφότερον, βασιλεὺς τ' ἀγαθὸς κρατερός τ' αἰχμητῆς. Late writers often quote this line *ad verbum* in encomiastic contexts, cf. Liban. *Panegyric on Constantius II and Constans* 121 (t. iv 268 Foerster), Diod. Sic. xxiv 5.2 (of Hamilcar, Hannibal's father), Zosimus iii 34.7 (the epitaph of Julian the Apostate near Tarsus: Ἰουλιανὸς μετὰ Τίγριν ἀγάρροον ἐνθάδε κείται, / ἀμφότερον βασιλεὺς τ' ἀγαθὸς κρατερός τ' αἰχμητῆς. A longer version is in Zonar, xiii 13). It was a favourite line of Alexander the Great, cf. Plut. *Mor.* 331. For τοῖος ἐὼν at verse-beginning and without a following co-relative, cf. A.R. ii 470 ὡς καὶ ὄδ' ἀνήρ / τοῖος ἐὼν δεῦρ' ἦλθεν, ἐὼν μόρον ὄφρα δαεῖη. With following co-relative, *Od.* i 257 (265), A.R. ii 919, iv 1603.

16. σ]ῆσι σοοφροσύνησι τεὴν παρακάθθ[εο: Gerstinger's supplement παρακάθθ[εο seems certain after τεὴν and βασιλεὺς, which also lend support to Gerstinger's σ]ῆσι. The plural of σωφροσύνη is rare, but it occurs *in hac sede* in *Od.* xxiii 30 ἀλλὰ σοοφροσύνησι νοήματα πατρὸς ἔκευθεν ('from discretion', causal dat.), and Opp. *H.* iii 359 οὔτι σοοφροσύνησι μεμηλότες ('having no shame', of parasites). I take σοοφροσύνησι here to be indirect object after παρακάθθ[εο, the direct object being a feminine noun with τεὴν. παρακατατίθεμαι is a frequent word in poetry for entrusting a child or minor to nurses or guardians. In A.R. ii 504 χθονίης παρακάθθετο νύμφαις, Apollo entrusts the girl Cyrene to the nymphs as her guardians. So παρακάθθεο *ibid.* iv 1743, -ετο Nonn. D. xiii 141, xxiv 46, xlvi 953 and 958. Metaphorically in Opp. *H.* iii 15 (παρακάθθεο), Nonn. D. xlvi 215, xlvi 649 (-ετο). Much the same nuance is present in Sext. *Emp. M.* vi 26 οἱ ἥρωες τὰς ἑαυτῶν γυναικας ὦδοῖς τισίν, ὡς σώφροσι φύλαξι, παρακατετίθεντο. I suggest that our poet wrote τεὴν παρακάθθεο νύμφην, 'to your chastity did you entrust your bride'. This derives support on the one hand from the presence of παρακατατίθεμαι in verse-endings like χθονίαις παρακάθθετο νύμφαις A.R. ii 504, ἐμαῖς παρακάθθετο νύμφαις Nonn. D. xxiv 46, πάλιν παρακάθθετο νύμφη *ibid.* xlvi 649; and on the other from the frequent use of νύμφη by Nonnus to mean 'wife, bride' (Peek s.v. '[Junge] Frau; Mädchen, Jungfrau, Braut; Gattin'), especially in verse-endings like ἐὼν ἐρρύσατο νύμφην *ibid.* xlvi 515, *et simil.* A very similar expression occurs in Prisc. *Pan.* 304 'permittitque viro mundum seseque tuendam'.

17.]εων ἐπιδενέα κηδεμονή]ων: For ἐπιδενέα *in eadem sede* cf. A.R. ii 315, Nonn. D. xxii 190, *id. Par.* iv 223 al. In epic, κηδεμονεύς and κηδέμων mean 'one who cares for another person' (κήδομαι). Included in its sense are those connected by family or friendship with the person for whom they care, and it is used especially often in contexts deploring the lack of such care. Cf. A.R. i 98 (an old man relinquishes his only surviving son to the Argonautic expedition), *ibid.* 271 (an orphan-girl living with her stepmother), Q.S. iii 477 (the old man Phoenix, after Achilles' death), *ibid.* vii 657 (same), *ibid.* xiii 285 (Andromache after the death of Hector and Astyanax). After

ἐπιδευέα, Keydell's supplement κηδεμονή[ων is practically certain. The letters]εων could belong to an epithet qualifying κηδεμονή[ων, but they could equally well be the reflexive possessive adjective ἐών, 'her(?) own', cf. *Il.* xxiv 211 ἐών ἀπάνευθε τοκῆων.

18. *Τοιγ*[. . . ἐπι]δήμιον ἴχνος ἐρ<ε>ίσας: 'Therefore having planted thy(?) footstep . . . at home'. Instead of τοῖς (Gerstinger), I read *τοιγ*[, which I take to be the remnant of *τοιγ*[άρ, marking the beginning of a new sentence and section; see n. on line 19. For *τοιγ*άρ, 'therefore, accordingly', at beginning of line and sentence, cf. *Il.* i 76 al., *Od.* i 179 al. In the rest of the line, Keydell's supplement ἐπι]δήμιον derives probability from Nonn. *Par.* xii 36 Ἰησοῦς / ἔνθεον ἴχνος ἔχων ἐπιδήμιον ἠθάδι κώμη, and *ibid.* xxi 21 πρῶιον ἴχνος ἄγων ἐπιδήμιον ἠθάδι λίμνη. The last word is badly obliterated, but Maas's ἐρ<ε>ίσας would give as the line-ending ἴχνος ἐρείσας, which is a frequent line-ending in Nonnus, cf. *D.* x 151 al., and *Par.* v 31. The reference of ἐπιδήμιον is not easy to elucidate; perhaps the poet is saying that, because of the Augusta's chastity, the emperor's foot is safe at home, whereby he has been able to accomplish labours surpassing those of Odysseus. See next line.

19. *ημ*[. . .] ὁ μὴ κάμε διος Ὀδυσσεύς: Cf. Nonn. *Par.* ix 65 ἑξαπίνης φάος εἶδον, ὁ μὴ πάρος εἶχον ὀπωπαί, of a blind man miraculously healed. It is likely that our poet implies a comparison, 'greater than the toil of goodly Odysseus', as in Musaeus *H.L.* 268 νύμφιε, πολλὰ μογήσας, ἀ μὴ πάθε νύμφιος ἄλλος, 'whose sufferings are greater than the sufferings of any other bridegroom'. For κάμνω in an encomium, cf. Call. *Del.* 187 βασιλῆος ἀέθλια πολλὰ καμόντος, of Ptolemy II.

I take lines 18–20 as being devoted to the last of the three virtues belonging to the πράξεις κατ' εἰρήνην, namely φρόνησις, cf. Men. *Rhet.* 376.13 ff.: ἤξεις ἐπὶ τὴν φρόνησιν μετὰ ταῦτα . . . ἐρείς τοίνυν ἐπὶ τῇ φρονήσει, ὅτι σύμπαντα ταῦτα οὐκ ἂν ἤρκεσε πράξει βασιλεύς, οὐδ' ἂν τοσοῦτων πραγμάτων ὄγκον διήνεγκεν, εἰ μὴ φρονήσει καὶ συνέσει τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς ὑπερέφερε, δι' ἣν καὶ αἱ νομοθεσίαι καὶ αἱ σωφροσύναι καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ κατορθοῦσθαι πεφύκασιν ἀρεταί, κτλ. In our passage, *τοιγ*[άρ (if my supplement is correct) marks the transition from the preceding virtue, σωφροσύνη, to φρόνησις. Odysseus is mentioned because he is the type of φρόνησις and of patient endurance, and the poet's allusion to him corresponds to the words which I have underlined in Menander's text. In the reference to Odysseus we have the poem's first discernible σύγκρισις, or rhetorical comparison. Cf. Men. *Rhet.* 377.2 ff. οὐκ ἐπιλήση δὲ τοῦ προειρημένου θεωρήματος, ὅτι ἐφ' ἐκάστῳ τῶν κεφαλαίων ποιήσει συγκρίσεις, κτλ.

20. Illegible. Gerstinger read the end of this line as]σας, which Heitsch prints. But inspection of Heitsch's photograph does not encourage me to accept these letters, and I omit them from my text.

21. εἰ καὶ ἐρ . . . σ.γ.οισ[. . .].: Gerstinger's reading is confirmed on the whole by Heitsch's photograph, though the letters οισ are very faint and must be regarded as doubtful. Apparently some proviso or limitation was here introduced, 'Even although . . .', the consequence of which is given in the next line. It would be reasonable to take line 21 as forming the transition to the next topic of the βασιλικὸς λόγος prescribed by Menander, namely the τύχη λαμπρά of the emperor. See historical commentary on lines 21–32. For concessive εἰ καὶ *init. vs.* cf. A.R. i 814, *ibid.* ii 342, Nonn. *Par.* viii 11. For καὶ abbreviated *in hiatus* cf. Nonn. *D.* ed. Keydell, i 41*.

22. *χθιζὸν γὰρ πτολίεθρον ἀμ*[: For *χθιζὸν* *init. vs.* cf. *Il.* xix 195, *Od.* iv 656, Colluth. 372, *ibid.* 383. On the time-reference of *χθιζὸν* here, cf. historical commentary.

23. ἦμερος ὠλεσίπατρις ἐρ.[: Gerstinger and Heitsch read the last group as *ερνκ*[, supplemented by Keydell as ἐρύκ[ακε; but the letters after ε are not sufficiently clear to justify accepting this. For ὠλεσίπατρις (*harax legomenon*) cf. ὠλεσίοικος.

24. *πάσα δὲ λωβητῆρι περιζωσ*[: I take *λωβητῆρι* to be adjectival, as Nonn. *Par.* viii 44 καὶ θρασὺς Ἑβραίων κυμαίνεται λαὸς ἀκούων, / ἄφρονα λωβητῆρι χέων ῥόον ἀνθερεῶνι (ἀ. = 'mouth'), *ibid.* 142 καὶ θρασὺς Ἑβραίων ἐπεπάφλασε λαὸς ἀκούων / ἄφρονα λωβητῆρι χέων ἔπος ἀνθερεῶνι; Tryph. 21 Τρώσι δὲ λωβητῆρσιν ἐφ' Ἐκτορος ἔλκυσθμοῖσι / μυρομένοις οὐ μόνον ἔην ἐπιδήμιον ἄλγος; Nic. *Th.* 796 σκορπίοι . . . λωβητῆρες. In this context, the meaning of *λωβητῆρι* is more likely to be 'destructive, injurious' than 'insulting', cf. Tryph. *loc. cit.*, Nic. *loc. cit.*, Hsch. *λωβητῆρα*: βλαπτικόν, ὕβριστικόν. A likely supplement for *περιζωσ* is *περιζωσ*[θείσα, 'surrounded, beset', agreeing with *ἐλπωρῆ* in line 25. Cf. Nonn. *D.* xli 268 στέμματι τειχιόεντι *περιζωσθείσα Μυκῆνη*.

25. ἔλπωρῃ δεδόνητο γαληναίω[: I suggest γαληναίω [βασιλῆι, cf. Nonn. *D.* xx 280 καὶ στρατὸς ἡρεμέων μενέτω παρὰ δάσκιον ὕλην / μὴ μόθον ἐντύνειε γαληναίω βασιλῆι (Lycurgus). The person and power of the emperor are often associated with the words γαλήνη, γαληναῖος, and γαληνότης. So Paul.Sil. *Descr.* (*Ambon*) 299 ἀστυόχοιο ἔης . . . γαλήνης, of Justinian's rule, cf. *id. Descr.* 944, 951; *A.P.* iv 3B. 98 (Ag.) τοῦνεκεν, ὁπότε πάντα φίλης πέπληθε γαλήνης, of the peace imposed by the emperor as opposed to the tumult of rebels. So also in titles of address, τὴν αὐτοῦ γαληνότητα, 'his Serenity', of the emperor Theodosius II, *Thdt. Ep.* 79, 186 Azéma; ἡ ὑμετέρα γαληνότης, of the Augusta Pulcheria, *id. Ep.* 43, 114. See P.G.L. s.vv., and Carla Spadavecchia, *Studies in the Letters of St. Basil of Caesarea and of Theodoret of Cyrus* Ph.D. Thesis, Edinburgh 1975 (unpubl.) 295. For δονέομαι met. 'be in commotion', cf. *App. B.C.* iv 52 γιγνομένων δὲ τούτων ἐν 'Ρώμῃ, τὰ ὑπερόρια πάντα πολέμοις διὰ τήνδε τὴν στάσιν ἐδόνετο; Nonn. *D.* xxv 275 νεοφθιμένων δ' ἐπὶ πότμῳ / πᾶσα πόλις δεδόνητο. Nonnus uses δεδόνητο at this point in the line fifteen times in the *Dionysiaca*.

I reconstruct lines 24–5 thus:

πᾶσα δὲ λωβητῆρι περιζωσ[θείσα κυδοιμῶ (exempli gr.)
 ἔλπωρῃ δεδόνητο γαληναίω [βασιλῆι,

'and the peaceful emperor's every hope had been shaken, beset by destructive war' (βασιλῆι dative of interest).

26–31. καί τις κτλ.: In the remaining extant lines of the Recto, the narrative of civil strife is developed. The expression καί τις (with or without a noun) is often used by Nonnus to illustrate and amplify a narrative, the general theme of which has been announced, e.g. *D.* xv 44, 58, 72, 100, 114, 137, 151. Cf. Peek 767, s.v. καί, but this list is incomplete. It is therefore reasonable to take lines 26–31 in our text as illustrating and amplifying the theme of treason and rebellion announced in 21–5. Of the twenty-six instances of καί τις known to me in the *Dionysiaca*, twenty-three refer to a specific individual, and only three have generalising sense ('and many a . . .'). Accordingly it is much more likely that καί τις ἀγνηρόων ἀιζήσιος in our text refers to an individual rebel, than to the rebels in general.

26. τις ἀγνηρόων ἀιζήσιος εἰ: Cf. Nonn. *D.* xxi 163 ἴνα μή τις ἀγνηρόων βρότος ἀνὴρ / ἄλλος ἔχων μίμημα δορθρασέος Λυκοόργου / μῶμον ἀναστήσειεν ἀμωμήτῳ Διονύσω, where ἀγνηρόων describes a blasphemer comparable to Lycurgus. ἀγνηρόω is pejorative also *ibid.* xxxvii 338, and *id. Par.* iii 170. Elsewhere in Nonn. *D.* ἀγνηρόω is neutral or complimentary, cf. xii 206, xxxvii 484 and 698. This verb is not found before Nonnus, and its occurrence here is a strong indication of post-Nonnian date. For ἀιζήσιος = young but full-grown man, see epic poets *passim*.

27. θαρσε εζων, φονίη δ' οἰστρ[: Gestinger's reading θαρσαλέ[ως] σώζων is palaeographically unjustifiable and linguistically unconvincing. The letters θα εζων are visible, but the intervening letters have been almost entirely obliterated. It seems to me that θαρσε εζων might be read (ῥέζων M. L. West, *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 215 [1962] 171). But .αζων is also possible, and I suggest *exempli gratia* θάρσε [κωμ]άζων, 'waxed insolent, triumphing', cf. Nonn. *D.* xxxviii 74 ὡς ἐνὶ μέσσω / κωμάζων Μαραθῶνι μετ' ἄρεα Δηριαδῆος. In the second half of the line, Gerstinger was doubtless right to take the scribe's φονίη as a dative. In epic of all periods this adjective means 'murderous, deadly' and is properly applied to unpleasant and frightening things; it is not used of praiseworthy courage. Gerstinger's supplement οἰστρ[ήλατος ὄρμη] could be right (for οἰστρήλατος cf. *A. Pr.* 580, *P. Oxy.* 2078 fr. 1.15 [lyric]).

28. ἐμφύ[λο]ν στονόεσαν ἐδύσατο [: For ἔμφυλος in expressions denoting civil war, cf. Nonn. *D.* xxxvi 133 θεῶν ἔμφυλον Ἐννώ; *Orac.* anon. *ap.* Dio Cass. lvii 18.5 Ῥωμαίους ἔμφυλος ὀλεῖ στάσις; *Orac.* anon. *ap.* Steph. Byz. s.v. Σύβαρις, τῆνίκα σοι πόλεμος τε καὶ ἔμφυλος στάσις ἦξει. The prose-form ἐμφύλιος, with πόλεμος and παράχη, is used to describe the rebellion of Marcianus (A.D. 479) in Candidus fr. 1 (*F.H.G.* iv 137) and Joh. Ant. fr. 211.3 and 4 (*F.H.G.* iv 619). See historical commentary. For στονόεσαν cf. *Od.* xi 383 and *A.R.* iv 1005 στονόεσαν ἀντήν, whence Gerstinger supplemented here [λύσαν ἀντῆς. For ἐδύσατο applied to a warrior entering battle, cf. *Il.* xx 379 ἐ. οὐλαμόν ἀνδρῶν, Nonn. *D.* xiii 91 and 549 ἐ. φύλοπιν Ἰνδῶν, *ibid.* xxviii 303 ἐ. κῶμον Ἐννοῦς. Cf. also *Il.* xix 313 πολέμου στόμα δύμεναι αἱματόεντος.

29. εἰρήνης ἀδίδακτον ὀμήλικα λα .[: For εἰρήνης ἀδίδακτον cf. Nonn. *D.* xiii 3 δίκης ἀδίδακτον ὑπερφίαλων γένος Ἰνδῶν, *ibid.* 20 εὐσεβείης ἀδίδακτον αἰστώσαι γένος Ἰνδῶν, Coll. 185 καὶ φεύγεις φιλότητα καὶ Ἄρεος ἔργα διώκεις, / ἁρμονίης ἀδίδακτος, ὁμοφροσύνης ἀδαήμων. (The use of ἀδίδακτος with objective genitive, ‘unschooled in’, is much commoner in late poetry than appears from LSJ.) Gerstinger read the last group as λαε[, which Heitsch prints; but the letter read by him as epsilon could equally well be an omicron. I suggest λαὸ[ν ἀγείρας, cf. λαὸν ἀγείρας *fin. vs.* in *Il.* ii 664, A.R. ii 521, *ibid.* iv. 548. Similarly λαὸν ἀγείρων *Il.* iv 377, λ. ἄγειρεν *Il.* xi 715, λ. ἀγείρω *Il.* xvi 129, λ. ἀγείραις A.R. i 893, λ. ἄγειρεν Nonn. *D.* xiii 449, all *fin. vs.* The word-pattern in the line εἰρήνης ἀδίδακτον ὀμήλικα λαὸ[ν ἀγείρας, with two adjectives qualifying λαὸν, would be close to that in Nonn. *Par.* i 112 βαπτίζων ἀδίδακτον ἀπευθέα λαὸν ἀλήτην. The supplement λαὸ[ν ἀγείρας is confirmed, rather than discredited, by the appearance of λάας, ‘stones’, in the next line; for Nonnus has exactly the same paronomasia in *Par.* viii 188 αἰνομανῆς δὲ / λάας ἔχων δασπλήτας ἐπέρρει λαὸς ἀγήνωρ.

30. Οὐ μὲν λάας ἔπαλλεν ἐθήμων[: The subject of ἔπαλλεν is not, I think, αἰζήμιος 26, but the person or persons denoted by ὀμήλικα 29. Gerstinger supplemented ἐθήμων[ας ἀλλά, ‘It was not the customary stones that he brandished, but . . .’ Certainly an adversative word seems necessary in the lost ending of the line, since otherwise λάας and ἄθυρμα would be in apposition to one another, and the stones would be called ‘wonted’ in this line and ‘unwonted’ (ξείνον) in the next. For emphatic οὐ μὲν followed by an adversative word, cf. *Il.* xiv 472, Nonn. *D.* iv 98, *id. Par.* i 20, etc., and Denniston, *Greek Particles* 362. In such expressions the μὲν may itself be adversative, as Nonn. *D.* xxv 6 οὐ μὲν αἰείσω / πρώτους ἔξ λυκάβαντας, . . . / . . . τελέσας δὲ τύπον μιμητὸν Ὀμήρου / ὕστατον ὑμνήσω πολέμων ἔτος, ‘But I shall not sing of the first six years, but . . . only of the last year’. So here. The accus. pl. form λάας is found in later poetry, cf. Nonn. *Par.* viii 188 (cited in preceding note), *ibid.* x 109; Opp. *H.* iii 417 and 422; Manetho vi 417. The adjective ἐθήμων, ‘wonted, customary’, is found first in Nonnus, who uses it frequently, and its appearance here is doubtless a sign of post-Nonnian date (cf. also Mus. *H.L.* 312). For πάλλω, ‘brandish, hurl’, of missiles, cf. Nonn. *D. passim.*

31. δήμου ξείνον ἄθυρμα φονοσ[: Though not fully legible here, δήμου is found *passim* at line-beginnings, e.g. *Il.* xvii 577, *Od.* xiii 186, *ibid.* xxii 36, *H. Cer.* 151, A.R. i 800, *Orph. H.* xviii 15. For ξένος = ‘strange, unwonted’, cf. LSJ s.v. B III, Nonn. *D.* xiv 419 al.; with genitive in the sense ‘strange to’, *ibid.* xix 185 Ἠλιάδων δὲ / ξείνος. I take ἄθυρμα in the sense ‘sport, game’ (*Bacchyl.* xviii 57, Nonn. *D.* xxv 226), and as subject of ἀμάθουνεν. But ἄθυρμα could have its more usual sense of ‘toy, plaything’. The remnant φονοσ[may well have introduced an epithet qualifying ἄθυρμα and conveying the sense of ‘murderous’.

32. μ[. .]σ[. .]ρα[. .]ν ἀμάθουνεν ἄ χειρ[: The root-meaning of ἀμαθύνειν is ‘reduce to dust’ (ἄμαθος = sand, grit), and it is most often used to describe the action of fire, e.g. *Il.* ix 589 ἄνδρας μὲν κτείνουσι, πόλιν δέ τε πύρ ἀμαθύνει. So Nonn. *D.* often. The word is also used, however, of agents other than fire, and with the general sense of ‘spoil, devastate’: of water, *Lyc.* 79, *A.P.* v 281.3 (Paul.Sil.); of Typhon’s storm-wind, Nonn. *D.* ii 79; of a stone damaging the device on a shield, Nonn. *D.* xxxiv 289; of trampling something beneath the feet, Opp. *H.* iii 491; etc. The application of ἀμάθουνεν here can be ascertained, in my opinion, by reference to John of Antioch’s account of the rebellion of Marcianus, quoted in my historical commentary. The last group in the line is read by Gerstinger and Heitsch as ἀχειρ. I interpret this as ἄ χειρ (or χειρὶ, etc.). This would have relevance to John of Antioch’s description: the citizens were destroying (ἀμάθουνεν) the houses which their own hands (ἄ χειρ) had built.

33–34. For the remnants of the two last lines of the Recto, I reproduce Gerstinger’s readings, Heitsch’s photograph being insufficiently legible.

Fol. 29788B

Verso

There follows the fragment numbered by Heitsch as xxxv 2, and by Gerstinger as *fr.* 1. Both consider the fragment to have come from a separate poem, and I am inclined to share their view. See historical commentary, where the fragment’s location in the papyrus is discussed. If, on the

other hand, the fragment belongs to our poem, it might preserve a part of the *τελειοτάτη σύγκρισις*, or 'general comparison', which stands next in the scheme prescribed by Menander, 376.31: ἤξεις δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν τελειοτάτην σύγκρισιν, ἀντεξετάζων τὴν αὐτοῦ βασιλείαν πρὸς τὰς πρὸ αὐτοῦ βασιλείας, οὐ καθαιρῶν ἐκείνας, ἄτεχνον γάρ, ἀλλὰ θαυμάζων μὲν ἐκείνας, τὸ δὲ τέλειον ἀποδιδούς τῇ παρουσίᾳ. οὐκ ἐπιλήσῃ δὲ τοῦ προειρημένου θεωρήματος, ὅτι ἐφ' ἐκάστῳ τῶν κεφαλαίων ποιήσει συγκρίσεις, ἀλλ' ἐκείναι μὲν ἔσσονται μερικάι, οἷον παιδείας πρὸς παιδείαν ἢ σωφροσύνης πρὸς σωφροσύνην, αὐταὶ δὲ περὶ ὅλης ἔσσονται τῆς ὑποθέσεως, ὡσανεὶ βασιλείαν ὅλην ἀθρόως καὶ ἐν κεφαλαίῳ πρὸς βασιλείαν συγκρίνομεν, οἷον τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου πρὸς τὴν παρούσαν.

1.]ε δίκης κοσμήτορι[: For κοσμήτωρ, 'marshaller, orderer', cf. *Il.* i 16 al. κοσμήτορε λαῶν (Agamemnon and Menelaus), *Od.* xviii 152 κοσμήτορι λαῶν. So in later encomiastic poetry, *A.P.* ix 656.3 (anon., on the Chalke of the royal palace, built by Anastasius) κοσμήτορες ἔργων, = the architects; Paul.Sil. *Descr.* (*Ambon*) 301 κοσμήτορι κόσμου, | Χριστῷ παμβασιλῆι. Sometimes, κ. means 'adornner', cf. Nonn. *D.* xxvii 279 τεῆς κοσμήτορι πάτρης; *A.P.* i 10.43 (anon., see next n.) Κωνσταντῖνον, ἐῆς κοσμήτορα Ῥώμης; cf. LSJ s.v. 2. On the question of whether δίκης κοσμήτορι has a Christian application here, see note on line 4, below.

2.]αόφρονη Κωστα[ντίνω: For Keydell's supplement Κωστα[ντίνω (*Gnomon* v [1929] 252), cf. the similar verse-ending in *A.P.* i 10.71 ὑπὲρ ἄντυγος αὐλῆς | ἔστιν ἰδεῖν μέγα θαῦμα, πολύφρονα Κωσταντῖνον, | πῶς προφυγῶν εἰδῶλα θεημάχον ἔσβεσε λύσσαν | καὶ Τριάδος φάος εὗρεν ἐν ὕδασι γυῖα καθήρας. (This epigram consists of two long encomiastic inscriptions copied from the church of St Polyeuct in Constantinople, built A.D. 524–7; cf. C. Mango in *Dumb Oaks P* xx [1966] 222.)

3.]τόσσον φίλος ὄσσο[ν: Expressions like τόσσον . . . ὄσσον are found in the συγκρίσεις of other verse-encomia. Cf. Theocr. xvii 66 ὄλβιε κούρε γένοιο, τίοις δέ με τόσσον ὄσον περ | Δῆλον ἐτίμησεν κυανάμπυκα Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων; *ibid.* 38; Paul.Sil. *Descr.* 152 ff. εἴξατε μοι, Ῥώμης Καπετωλίδες, εἴξατε, φῆμαι | τόσσον ἐμὸς βασιλεὺς ὑπερήλατο θάμβος ἐκείνο, | ὅπποσον εἰδώλοιο θεὸς μέγας ἐστὶν ἀρείων.

4.]ὄσσον Διὶ Φοῖβος [Ἀπόλλων: Gerstinger's supplement is probably correct, since it gives a line-ending found in Homer and the Homeric hymns *passim*, and in Theocr. xvii 67 (see n. on previous line), Nonn. *D.* xlvi 708, Tryph. 509. The relationship between Zeus and Apollo is stated in Call. *Ap.* 29 δύναται γάρ (*sc.* Ἀπόλλων), ἐπεὶ Διὶ δεξιὸς ἦσται, 'since he sits on Zeus's right hand'. This circumstance suggests that the poet was honouring the emperor by saying that his position in relation to Constantine was like that of Apollo in relation to Zeus: 'You are as beloved by Constantine, the orderer of righteousness, as was . . . , and as was Apollo by Zeus', the first expression of comparison (lines 3–4) being lost. In the same way Theocr. xvii 13 ff. honours Ptolemy Philadelphus by saying that Zeus has made him equal with the gods and has given him a throne beside Alexander and Heracles. (I owe this parallel to Prof. Cairns.) If this view is correct, the phrase δίκης κοσμήτορι describes Constantine, and has a specifically Christian connotation, just as ἔργον εὐδικίας is used by Apolinarius in his Metaphrasis of the Psalms to describe the establishment of Christianity, cf. *Apolinarii Metaphrasis Psalmorum*, ed. Ludwich, *Protheoria* 23 ff. ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ἔργον | εὐδικίας ἐκάλυψεν ὅλην χθόνα, οὐδέ τι νεῖκος | οὐδ' ἔρις ἐν λαοῖσιν, ἀναιμάκτοις τε θυηλαῖς | πανσυδίῃ βασιλῆα θεὸν καλέουσι πόλῆς. It should be noted that in *A.P.* i 10.71 ff. (quoted above, line 2 n.) mention of Constantine was accompanied by an allusion to his recognition of Christianity.

5–6. I print the text of Gerstinger and Heitsch, the photograph being indistinct.

The gap between the foregoing fragment and the lower part of the page leaves room for some six or seven lines ('septem fere versus desunt', Heitsch). Then come fragments of the beginnings of three more lines:

αμ[
παγ[
εἰσ[

followed by a horizontal stroke marking the close of the poem. The iambic prologue of the Idyll follows in the next line. The extant letter-groups in our text might have belonged to words which are elsewhere found in the epilogoi of encomia or related literature (the epilogoi should include prayers for prosperity and the continuance of the reign, Men. *Rhet.* 377.28 ff.). Cf. *A.P.* i 10.40 f. μίμνοι δ' ἄσπετον εὐχος ἀριστοπόνοιο γενέθλης, | εἰσόκεν ἠέλιος πυριλαμπέα δίφρον ἐλαύνει, cf.

also Nonn. *Par.* viii 156 εἰσόκε μίμνει / αἰὼν πουλυέλικτος, *ibid.* x 101 εἰσόκε μίμνει / αὐτομάταις ἀψίσιον ἔλιξ κυκλούμενος αἰὼν; Romanos 54 κέ 1 ff. (ed. Maas-Trypanis) Σῶτερ ἀθάνατε, υἱὲ πατρὸς προαιωνίου, πᾶσαν σῶσον τὴν πόλιν, / σῶσον τὰς ἐκκλησίας, σῶσον δὲ καὶ τοὺς βασιλεῖς . . . πᾶσαν τὴν πολιτείαν περίσσωσον, πάνσοφε δυνάστα.

HISTORICAL COMMENTARY

Fol. 29788C

Verso

1–15. I begin by summarising the events on which, as I shall argue, this part of our narrative is based.

Being himself an indifferent soldier, Zeno had for years relied on the military talent of his fellow-Isaurian Illus, who held the post of *magister officiorum*. He had cause to distrust Illus, however, since the latter had opposed him at the outset of Basiliscus' usurpation in 475. Further, Illus held imprisoned in Isauria both Zeno's brother Longinus (from 475) and his mother-in-law, the dowager-empress Verina (from 477). In winter 481–2, following Illus' refusal to release Verina, an attempt was made on his life at the instigation of Ariadne, the empress. After this Illus asked for and received permission to retire to Antioch, and was created *magister militum per Orientem* instead of *magister officiorum*. The hostility between Zeno and Illus now approximated to open war; and in July 484 Illus induced Verina (still his captive) to proclaim as rival emperor at Tarsus the patrician Leontius. Zeno sent against the rebels an army with two commanders, namely John of Scythia, who had in the meantime succeeded Illus as *magister militum per Orientem*, and Theoderic, who was already *consul ordinarius* in the east. A battle was fought, perhaps near the Isaurian Seleucia, and the imperial troops were victorious.²³ Illus and two thousand of his troops fled to the stronghold called variously 'Cherris' and 'the castle of Papirius', where Leontius and Verina joined him. The imperial forces pursued them and invested the place.²⁴ This castle was a place of some notoriety. 'Leo's son-in-law Zeno', says John of Antioch, 'when consul, sent a force to dislodge Indacus from the so-called hill of Papirius. The first to turn this hill into his lair had been Neon (τοῦτον γὰρ πρῶτος Νέων ἐφώλευε), and after him Papirius, and Papirius' son Indacus, who ravaged their neighbours and slew travellers'.²⁵ Zeno had sojourned there during his exile in 475–6, and had later used it as a treasure-house.²⁶ The natural strength of the castle is emphasised by Joshua the Stylite, and in particular he says that only one path led up to it.²⁷ This is one of the features which enabled J. Gottwald to identify the ancient castle of Papirius with the fortified hill-top at Çandır-Kalesi, 24 miles north-west of Tarsus, called Baberon in a twelfth-century Armenian source.²⁸ For the hill-top at Çandır-Kalesi is today approached by a flight of some 150 steps cut into the hill-side, doubtless corresponding to the narrow path mentioned by Joshua. From the head of the staircase, at 3575 feet, the citadel rises sheer for another 325 feet.²⁹ Near the foot of the staircase Gottwald observed a grotto: 'Vor dem Treppenaufgang zweigen nach links 28–30 zum Teil zerstörte Stufen in der Richtung einer sich in das Innere des Felsens erstreckende

²³ Cf. E. W. Brooks, 'The Emperor Zeno and the Isaurians' in *English Hist. Review* viii (1893) 222 ff.; and Stein B-E ii 28 ff.

²⁴ *The Chronicle of Joshua the Stylite, composed in Syria A.D. 507*, tr. W. Wright (Cambridge 1882) c. 16.

²⁵ *Joh. Ant. fr.* 206–2, *FHG.* iv 617.

²⁶ *Jos. Styl.* c. 13, *Jordan. Rom.* 352, cf. Brooks 228 n. 131.

²⁷ c. 17: 'Now because of the difficulty of the natural position of the fortress, it was also rendered wonderfully impregnable by the work of men's hands, and there was no path leading up to it save one, by which, because of its narrowness, not even two persons could ascend at once'.

²⁸ *Byz. Zeits.* xxxvi (1936) 88 ff. Gottwald's identification is detailed and convincing. Cf. P. Lemerle in *Syria* xl

(1963) 320 n. 5.

²⁹ Gottwald 92. Damascius, describing the aspect of the citadel, says: 'On top the rock is flat and wide, underneath it tapers slightly, but still manages to support aloft in the air the broad mass above. In many places it overhangs the mountain which forms its base. Its appearance resembles that of an enormous neck supporting a gigantic and picturesque head'. When Pamprepius was executed inside the citadel, the executioner flung his head down the precipice and into the imperial camp below. Cf. *Damascii Vitae Isidori Reliquiae*, ed. C. Zintzen (Hildesheim 1967) 174 and 245. On the staircase, cf. also M. Ancketill's description in E. J. Davis, *Life in Asiatic Turkey* (London 1879) 44.

Grotte ab, in der Wasser steht'. His sketch shows the grotto as a sizeable landmark, and he emphasises that it was not a cistern.³⁰ In this fastness, fitting subject for the brush of a Salvator Rosa or the pen of a Tolkien, Illus and his partisans were besieged for four years. Treachery from within at last allowed John of Scythia to storm the castle. Illus and Leontius fled to a chapel within the fortification, but were dragged out and executed. Their fate was shared by the betrayers.³¹ Some of those taken with Illus were executed, others had their property confiscated.³² But Illus' wife Asteria and her surviving daughter Thecla were allowed to withdraw to Tarsus, and to take with them the body of his other daughter Anthusa, who had died during the siege.³³ I return to our text.

The campaign described is punitive (10). The enemy have to be tracked down (4–6). Their pursuer is not the emperor in person, but someone acting under his orders (3–4). This pursuer, acting alone (6), drives the enemy to a stronghold with which is associated a cave (7–8). He inflicts suffering on them (9). He captures the stronghold (5, 9). The beaten enemy are punished (10), and lose their ancestral possessions (11). But the emperor also exercises clemency (15). Each of these details has its counterpart in the historians' accounts of Zeno's campaign against Illus after the initial battle near Seleucia. In the words ἀνιχνεύειν 4, ἔχνια θήρης 6, ἐλάσσας 7, we may recognise references to the imperial army's pursuit of Illus. The subject of the verbs ἔδεκτο 3, ἀλάπαξε 5, ἐδίδασκεν 9, is the emperor's general (see n. on Verso 5), in this case John of Scythia. We know from the historical sources that Theoderic fell under suspicion of collusion with Illus and was recalled by Zeno; this is probably why our poet says that John conducted the pursuit 'alone', μόνος (6).³⁴ When the poet characterises the rebels' refuge by the word καλιάς (5), he employs the same metaphor as does John of Antioch when describing the castle of Papirius, τοῦτον γὰρ πρῶτος Νέων ἐφώλενε (see above), both καλιά and φωλεός denoting the lair of wild beasts. Even if our poet intended καλιάς to mean *storehouse* rather than *lair*, it would still be a good description of Zeno's treasure-house. The grotto noted by Gottwald beneath the castle of Papirius is surely to be identified with σπήλυγα μελάθρων 8. Mention of caves occurs in the account of John of Antioch, who says that Illus allowed only the most faithful of his troops to remain in the citadel, and sent the rest to take refuge in caves: τοὺς λοιποὺς ἐν τοῖς ἄντροις ἀπεχώρησαν, ἃ πολλαχοῦ τῆ φύσει τῶν τόπων εἶργαστο.³⁵ As well as the grotto at Çandır-Kalesi there are large caverns an hour's leisurely ride away.³⁶ The four years' siege is referred to in the poet's words ἐδίδασκεν διζύας (9). It is not remarkable that he passes over this period in so few words, since the historical sources are not much more explicit. Zeno was distracted by the revolt of Theoderic in Thrace (486), and by his plans to divert Theoderic against Odoacer. The besieged certainly underwent 'woes', since some of the foremost among them died, and Illus gave himself up to despair.³⁷ When the castle was at last stormed, Illus and Leontius did not die quietly, but πολλὰ πρὸς τὸ θεῖον σὺν δάκρυσιν ἀπειπόντας καὶ τὰς χεῖρας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνατείναντας.³⁸ Hence in our text, ποινήτειραν ἀνασπενάχοντες ἀνάγκην (10). In our poem, the defeated suffer *publicatio bonorum*, πατρώων κτεάνων ῥύψαντες ἀρ[(11), just as did some of those captured with Illus, see above. According to Menander, the πράξεις κατὰ πόλεμον should end with a reference to the emperor's clemency towards the vanquished, cf. linguistic commentary on Verso 13. Lines 12–15 were taken up with this, to judge by the phrases γεγάασιν ἐλώριον (12), ἀπελύσασα δεσμῶν (15), and perhaps ἴρησιν ἀκουαῖς (14). As we have seen, Zeno did in fact exercise mercy in the case of Illus' wife and surviving daughter. He also allowed Verina's corpse to be re-buried at Constantinople with royal honours, and granted her the posthumous title of Augusta.³⁹

³⁰ *Ibid.* Skizze 2, and n. 1. The grotto was described as 'très grande' by L. M. Ali Shan in his topographical work *Sissouan ou l'Arméno-Cilicie* (Venice 1899) 72.

³¹ Joh. Ant. fr. 214.10, *FHG.* v 28.

³² *Ibid.* 12.

³³ *Ibid.* 11.

³⁴ Joh. Ant. fr. 214.4, *FHG.* iv 620, says that Theoderic was recalled when at Nicomedia; but *ibid.* 6 he also says that Gothic troops were in the field after the battle. Theophanes A.M. 5977 says that Theoderic was not recalled until after the siege of Illus' castle had begun. Faced with this conflicting testimony Brooks 228 con-

cluded that Theoderic missed the battle, but was still in the field afterwards. Perhaps he ignored the order to return until quite certain that desertion to Illus was unprofitable.

³⁵ Perhaps we should read ἀπεχώρισαν, cf. Lysias xvi 16.

³⁶ Cf. Ancketill quoted by Davis 46.

³⁷ The deaths of Verina, Marsus, and Illus' daughter Anthusa are recorded, and Pamprepus was executed. Cf. Brooks 229 f.

³⁸ Joh. Ant. fr. 214.10, *FHG.* v 28.

³⁹ *Ibid.* 12.

In this section, therefore, our poem reflects the war against Illus in outline and in some of its details. The version of the historical record which it presents is, to be sure, much abbreviated, the more so because the text is fragmentary. But some of the gloomy repulsion which the castle of Papius and the ordeal of its defenders evoked in the minds of Zeno's contemporaries may be perceived even in these mutilated verses. We should not overlook this when attempting to assign the poem to its historical context.

17–26. Following the prescription of Menander, the panegyrist speaks next of the emperor's achievements in peace, saying that they transcend his deeds in war (see Verso 17 n.). According to Menander, the orator will here begin by praising the emperor's gentleness to his subjects, and his championship of refugees and petitioners. While it is not possible to reconstruct with exactness the contents of 18–20, it is clear that they are on this theme. The emperor is addressed in the second person, and is said to bring help to all (18). In line 19 the phrase 'within the royal palace' may be a reference to the hearing of petitions by the emperor.⁴⁰ Among the recipients of the emperor's generosity are 'men of the Ausonians' (20). Zeno occupied the throne in the East in 476, when the last emperor of the West was deposed by Odoacer, and in the same year he received in Constantinople embassies from both Odoacer and Julius Nepos, each of whom sought legitimisation of his claim to the Western empire.⁴¹ Refugees must have come to Byzantium from the West at this time. We know that in 475 Zeno ransomed captives taken in Africa by Genseric, the Vandal King of Carthage,⁴² and in 483 intervened in the Arian Hunerich's persecution of African Catholics.⁴³ Some of Hunerich's victims found asylum in Constantinople, where they displayed the marks of their tortures.⁴⁴ Towards the illustrious fugitive Placidia, widow of the former Western emperor Olybrius, Zeno continued the hospitality first accorded her by his predecessor Leo. Among the recipients of the emperor's generosity, says our text, are poets (21, 22). That is to say, poets might be rewarded privately by the emperor, or out of the public treasury, so that mention of them is apposite when speaking of the emperor's *φιλανθρωπία*. Thus Pamprepius held a professorial chair, awarded on the strength of his public recitation of one of his poems.⁴⁵ Pelagius, an epic poet, was a close confidant of Zeno until executed in 490.⁴⁶ Another two poets of Zeno's reign, Panolbius and Aetherius, have been described as 'poet-journalists' and 'spokesmen for the opposing parties at Constantinople'.⁴⁷ Because of the proximity of the words *σὺν ἀνδράσιν Αὐσονίων* it might be thought that Italian poets are intended here; especially as Priscian praises Anastasius' hospitality to Latin poets and scholars in a passage similar to ours (*Pan.* 239–253). But we should be careful not to interpret the text in this way. Our poet is enumerating three classes of people who shared the emperor's generosity, namely the lost group preceding *σὺν*, the Italians, and poets. The particles *δέ τε* (21) differentiate between the Italians and the poets. The text continues with two lines telling us that the emperor was 'a life-giving way' (23) and that he 'gave . . . to all' (24). A third line ending *εὐχος ἀοιδαῖς* (25) presumably states the consequence of this: the poets praise him in their verses. So Theocritus, in his encomium on Ptolemy II, says that poets sing of Ptolemy because of his generosity to them, *Μουσάων δ' ὑποφῆται αἰίδοντι Πτολεμαῖον | ἀντ' εὐεργεσίας* (*Theoc.* xvii 115). The section, and also the Verso of the leaf, ends with two lines of which only a few letters are preserved (26–7).

Recto

1–14. The top of the Recto is affected by the tear which has mutilated the Verso. The first two lines were a prooemium, and so indicate change of topic, see linguistic commentary. Of lines 3–4

⁴⁰ Written petitions were conveyed to and from the palace by the *referendarii*, *Proc. An.* xiv 11–12, cf. A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire 284–602* (Oxford 1964) iii 166, n. 24.

⁴¹ Malchus *fr.* 10, *FHG.* iv 119. Cf. W. E. Kaegi, *Byzantium and the Decline of Rome* (Princeton 1968) 49.

⁴² Malchus *fr.* 3, *FHG.* iv 114.

⁴³ Cf. Stein *B-E* ii 60.

⁴⁴ Marcellinus *Com. an.* 484.

⁴⁵ Malchus *fr.* 20, *FHG.* iv 132. Cf. Asmus 328.

⁴⁶ Malchus *fr.* 19, *FHG.* iv 130; Theoph. A.M. 5983. Stein *B-E* ii 75 n. 3 wishes to date Pelagius' execution in 486. But besides the testimony of Marcellinus *Com. an.* 490, Theoph. *ibid.* relates the murders of Cottaiis and Pelagius as the last events of Zeno's reign.

⁴⁷ A. Cameron in *Hist.* xiv (1965) 505–7. I accept Cameron's suggestion that the epic-poet Aetherius mentioned in the *Suda* s.v., and the Aetherius to whom Panolbius dedicated a poem, are identical.

we can read nothing, of 5–8 only the seven or eight initial letters of each line. Of 9 ff., however, more remains, and these lines, together with the scheme of Menander, allow us to catch the drift of the poet's argument in this section. The aspects of the emperor's *δικαιοσύνη* to be mentioned here are, according to Menander, the justice of his officials, taxes and legislation (see linguistic commentary, Recto 2 n.). Now, line 9 contains a clear allusion to these topics (*εὐνομίης ἀνύσας ἕαρ*); and since the next prooemium does not follow until line 15, it is reasonable to take the whole of Recto 3–14 as dealing with aspects of civil administration. I begin by considering lines 5–8.

σοὶ γὰρ [
 αὐτοκασ[ιγνητ
 διογενή[σ
 ἐς πυμάτην πιπ[.....]....]

Following Menander, we look first for an allusion to officials. I suggest that the words *σοὶ γὰρ* (5) began such an allusion (see linguistic commentary), and that 'own brother' (6) is Zeno's brother Longinus. After his release in 485 from the captivity in which Illus had held him,⁴⁸ Longinus was created *magister militum praesentalis* and was consul in 486 and 490.⁴⁹ The years 487, 488 and 491 were designated *post consulatum Longini*. I also suggest that *διογενή[* is not an epithet, but a proper name, that of the Diogenes who as a *comes scholarum* commanded an army in Anastasius' Isaurian campaign of 493–4.⁵⁰ On that occasion he had among his colleagues John of Scythia, whom we have already met, see above on Verso 1–15. If I am right, line 8 tells us that their activity took Longinus and Diogenes 'to the uttermost' part of some region or of the empire. A new sentence (9 ff.) says that through this a spring-time of good government was achieved for all:

πάσι μὲν εὐνομίης ἀν[ύ]σας ἕαρ ε[
 10]ιης θρέπτειραν ἀτάσθαλο[
] θαλάμοιο κατέθλασε[

In lines 9–11 the grammatical subject is third person (*κατέθλασε* 11), and is most probably Longinus, according to my understanding of the preceding lines. What is the activity referred to in lines 10–11? To begin with, we must reject Heitsch's version of the first word of 10, see linguistic commentary. Whatever the word was, it looks likely to have been an objective genitive governed by *θρέπτειραν*. This 'nurturer', then, 'he (i.e. Longinus) crushed'. The verb *καταθλᾶν* is very strong, and tends to be used of crushing poisonous and abominable things. Thus Epiphanius uses it of crushing 'the wasp' and 'the venom' of heresy; see linguistic commentary. The presence of *ἀτάσθαλο[* reinforces the impression that the crushing of some evil is being described. But I do not think that heresy is in question here. The sole action recorded concerning Longinus in his capacity of *magister militum praesentalis* is his campaign in the country of the Tzani, during which, according to Procopius, he established a camp at a place thereafter called *Longini Fossatum*.⁵¹ Stein dates this campaign in 488;⁵² but I prefer 489, when Longinus's name is absent from the consular Fasti. At its eastern extremity, in which the camp of Longinus was probably located, the territory of the Tzani borders on that of the Lazi.⁵³ It was from this region that eunuchs were imported into the Roman empire, a fact attested by Procopius in his description of the Abasgi, one of the subject-races of the Lazi.⁵⁴ Here, then, we have an indication of the subject-matter of lines 10–11:

⁴⁸ Marcellinus Com. an. 485.

⁴⁹ Cf. Stein *B-E* ii 30–1.

⁵⁰ Theoph. A.M. 5985, 5986. Cf. Stein *B-E* ii 84. It is possible that Diogenes was a relative of the empress Ariadne, cf. Mal. 493B, and *Excerpt. Insid.* 167.28, where the name Diogenianus looks like an error for Diogenes.

⁵¹ Proc. *Aed.* iii 6.23: *ἐνθεν δὲ ἰόντι ἐν ἀριστερᾷ πρὸς βορρᾶν ἀνεμον χωρὸς τίς ἐστίν, ὄνπερ καλοῦσιν οἱ ἐπιχώριοι Λογγίνου φοσσᾶτον, ἐπεὶ Λογγίνος ἐν τοῖς ἀνω χρόνοις Ῥωμαίων στρατηγός, Ἰσαυρος γένος, στρατεύσας ἐπὶ Τζάνους ποτε τῆδε πεποιήται τὸ στρατόπεδον.*

⁵² *B-E* ii 64.

⁵³ On the location of *Longini Fossatum*, see N. Adontz, *Armenia in the period of Justinian* (Eng. tr. by N. G. Garsoian, Lisbon 1970) 53.

⁵⁴ *B.G.* iv 3.15–17. I quote from Downey's translation: 'but they [*sc.* the Abasgi] have suffered most cruelly at the hands of their rulers owing to the excessive avarice displayed by them. For both their kings used to take such boys of their nation as they noted having comely features and fine bodies, and dragging them away from their parents without the least hesitation they would make them eunuchs and then sell them at high prices to any persons in Roman territory who wished to buy them. They also killed the fathers of these boys immediately, in order to prevent any of them from attempting at some time to take vengeance from the king for the wrong done their boys, and also that there might be in the country no subjects suspected by the kings. And thus the physical beauty of their sons was resulting in their destruction; for

Longinus ‘crushed’ the ‘wicked nurturer’ (or the ‘nurturer of wicked . . .’), i.e. the supplier of eunuchs for guarding the ‘bed-chamber’ (θαλάμιοιο 11). My supplement παιδε[ίης] (10) stands well in this context, and Gerstinger’s less-likely supplement παλλακ[ίης] would also fit. Thus the panegyrist is representing the military operation as an act of enlightenment, and as part of the emperor’s εὐνομία (9). Credit will have gone equally to Zeno and to Longinus, whom Zeno wanted to succeed him as emperor.⁵⁵ Our poet’s method of treating this theme finds a parallel in the continuation of Procopius’ account of the Abasgi. Procopius relates how Justinian encouraged their conversion to Christianity and forbade them to castrate children. He portrays Justinian’s action as a work of civilization—that is, of εὐνομία.⁵⁶

12 Ἐνθα μὲν εὐνήσας ὑπερήνορα[
ἔνθα δὲ χρυσοχίτωνος ὑπόπετρ[
αὐχένα γαῦρον ἄρηος Ἀχαιμεν[

The grammatical subject is still masculine singular (εὐνήσας 12), but we cannot tell whether this subject continues to be Longinus (if my argument above is accepted) or reverts to the emperor. Whoever he may be, his activity takes place in two regions or spheres (ἔνθα μὲν . . . ἔνθα δὲ) and results in the abasement (it must be) of ‘Persian Ares’ or ‘Persian war’. Line 12 ἔνθα μὲν κτλ. resumes the contents of 9–11 (see linguistic commentary), and therefore concerns the suppression of the Tzani’s trade in children, according to my argument. The adjective ὑπερήνορα suits this interpretation, since it is especially evocative of tyrannous cruelty; see linguistic commentary. Here, it probably qualified a personal noun. In the second ἔνθα phrase, the rare adjective χρυσοχίτωνος is noteworthy. What kind of garment was denoted by this word we can gather from three passages. John of Lydia tells us that the ancient Lydians wore tunics of which the warp was of gold thread, and quotes in evidence a phrase of Peisander, Λυδοὶ χρυσοχίτωνες.⁵⁷ Paul the Silentiary uses the word twice in his *Description of St Sophia*. In line 599 it occurs in an allusion to the miraculously pure water alleged to run from a fountain in St Sophia on the day of the Epiphany, each January: ὁππότε λαὸς / μὲν χρυσοχίτωνι, θεοῦ κατὰ μύστιν ἑορτήν, / ἔννυχίοις ἄχραντον ἀφύσσειται ἄγγεσιν ὕδωρ. Friedländer, following Du Cange, explains μὲν χρυσοχίτωνι as a reference to the robes worn by the consul at his procession on the Kalends of January.⁵⁸ This is no doubt correct;⁵⁹ the consular robes of the later empire included a tunic corresponding to the old *toga picta*, made of purple silk and embroidered with gold thread in patterns which can be clearly seen on the consular diptychs.⁶⁰ Paul’s second use of the word, *ibid.* 156 χρυσοχίτων Ἀνθοῦσα, is also doubtless a reference to the consular robes (see linguistic commentary). In our text, χρυσοχίτωνος is unlikely to refer to Rome or the consulship, for how could someone’s holding of the consulship be said to have caused the abasement of Persia? Nor can I find any reason to see in χρυσοχίτωνος a reference to Persia or the Persian king. There was, however, a gold-tunicked enemy with whom Zeno had to deal, and whose suppression was, as our text says, a blow to Persia. According to Procopius,⁶¹ certain of the Armenian satraps had sided with Illus and Leontius in 484–8. After the fall of Illus and Leontius, Zeno took action against the Armenians, allowing only the smallest of the five satrapies, Balabitene, to remain hereditary; henceforth appointments to the other four were made at the pleasure of the Roman emperor. Justinian in his turn replaced the satraps by two Roman dukes. In his record of this latter event, Procopius makes a special point of mentioning the regalia of the satraps, which he thinks worthy of commemoration. ‘However, they [i.e. the satraps] received the symbols of office only from the Roman Emperor. It is worthwhile to describe these insignia, for they will never again be seen by man. There is a cloak made of wool, not such as is produced by sheep, but gathered from the sea.

the poor wretches were being destroyed through the misfortune of fatal comeliness in their children. And it was in consequence of this that the most of the eunuchs among the Romans, and particularly at the emperor’s court, happened to be Abasgi by birth’.

⁵⁵ Concerning Longinus’s two consulships, Stein points out that hitherto only emperors had held the consulship more than once, *B-E* ii 31, cf. *ibid.* 75, and my n. on Recto 22 ff.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.* 18–21.

⁵⁷ *De Mag.* iii 64.

⁵⁸ P. Friedländer, *Johannes von Gaza und Paulus Silentiarius* (Leipzig 1912) 284.

⁵⁹ So C. Mango, *The Art of the Byzantine Empire 312–1453* (New Jersey 1972) 85.

⁶⁰ See the very comprehensive article by G. Bloch in C. Daremberg and E. Saglio, *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines* (Paris 1877–1919) I, ii 1479–81.

⁶¹ *Aed.* iii 1.26. Cf. Stein *B-E* ii 31.

Pinnos the creature is called on which this wool grows. And the part where the purple should have been, that is, where the insertion of purple cloth is usually made, is overlaid with gold [i.e. the cloak had a golden hem, cf. n. 63 below]. The cloak was fastened by a golden brooch in the middle of which was a precious stone from which hung three sapphires by loose golden chains. There was a tunic of silk adorned in every part with decorations of gold which they are wont to call *plumia*. The boots were of red colour and reached to the knee, of the sort which only the Roman Emperor and the Persian king are permitted to wear' (Proc. *Aed.* iii 1.18–23, tr. Downey). For our present enquiry, the most important item is the silk tunic: *χίτων ἐκ μετάξης ἐγκαλλωπίσμασι χρυσοῖς πανταχόθεν ὠραισμένος ἃ δὴ νενομίκασι πλούμια καλεῖν*. The noun *πλούμια*, *embroidery* (Latin *pluma*), and its derivatives occur frequently in Byzantine Greek.⁶² In the case of the Armenian regalia it is likely to have denoted embroidered representations of the Roman emperor, executed in gold thread. For Malalas tells us that the regalia of the neighbouring Lazican kings after their alliance with Rome in 523 included a white silk tunic embroidered with golden *πλούμια* in the likeness of the Roman emperor.⁶³ Agathias calls this garment merely *χιτώνιον ποδήρες ὑπόχρυσον*, *Hist.* iii 15.2, disdaining to use the Latin loan-word *πλούμια*. The satraps of Armenia, therefore, at the time when Zeno subdued them, could fairly have been termed *χρυσοχίτωνες*; also their regalia was picturesque to the Roman eye, and deserving mention, as we see from Procopius (and analogously from Malalas on the Lazi). The subjugation of Armenia must have been carried out in 488 or 489, at about the same time as Longinus' operation in the country of the Tzani. Since the fact that it happened at all was a direct consequence of the Armenian involvement in Illus' revolt, mention of it in a panegyric commemorating Illus' defeat was amply justified. The territory of the Tzani lay immediately to the north of Upper Armenia, and this is why Longinus (or the emperor) is said by the poet to have acted 'as if winged' (*ὑπόπτερος* 13), 'on this side . . . and on that'.⁶⁴

In a general way, too, the claim that Zeno had '[abased] the proud neck of Persian Ares' was reasonable. Throughout his reign, Persian fortunes were at a low ebb, and their king, Peroz, was occupied in warfare against the Hephthalite Huns. Zeno at first contributed to the garrisoning of the Caucasian fortresses against the Huns, and even ransomed Peroz when the Huns captured him. But in c. 483 he discontinued the payments, and also refused subsidies to Peroz's successor, Balash, in the next year.⁶⁵ We also hear of a re-drawing of the frontier between Rome and Persia;⁶⁶ given Persia's weakness at the time, this is likely to have been to Rome's advantage.

15–17. After a transitional line (15) the poet devotes two lines to the emperor's *σωφροσύνη*; see linguistic commentary. Of the topics suggested by Menander, only praise of the Augusta makes an appearance here. This is pretty certainly the subject of lines 16–17. 'To your chastity', says the poet, 'did you entrust your bride(?)', who was 'lacking kinsmen to care for her'. Ariadne, Zeno's wife, did indeed lack such persons. Her mother Verina spent seven years in custody far from Constantinople, emerging in 484 only to die miserably in the castle of Papirius. Her father Leo had died in 474. Accordingly, the words 'lacking kinsmen to care for her' accurately describe Ariadne's situation in 489/90, the date which I have proposed for our poem. The allusion to her is noticeably brief and trite (Priscian is more generous to Ariadne in *Pan.* 301–8). Verina's long imprisonment, her involvement with Illus, and her death while under siege by imperial troops can have done no good to Zeno's relationship with Ariadne. Symptoms of stress between the

⁶² The word is variously spelt and accented. Du Cange glosses it under the heading *πλουμί, πλουμμίον, πλούμμιν, πλουμίδι*.

⁶³ 413B: καὶ φορέσας . . . χλαμύδα ἄσπρον ὀλοσθήρικον, ἔχον ἀντὶ πορφύρου ταβλίου χρυσοῦν βασιλικὸν τάβλιον, ἐν ᾧ ὑπῆρχεν ἐν μέσῳ στηθάριον ἀληθινόν, ἔχοντα τὸν χαρακτήρα τοῦ αὐτοῦ βασιλέως Ἰουστίνου, καὶ στιχάριον [=tunic] δὲ ἄσπρον παραγούδιον, καὶ αὐτὸ ἔχον χρυσᾶ πλούμια βασιλικά, ὡσαύτως ἔχοντα τὸν χαρακτήρα τοῦ αὐτοῦ βασιλέως, κτλ. So Theoph. A.M. 6015. The *τάβλιον* was a stripe sewn along the hem of the cloak, cf. Sophocles' Lexicon s.v. Malalas' words *ἔχον . . . τάβλιον*

are an excellent gloss on Procopius' sentence *χρυσῶ δὲ ἡ τῆς πορφύρας κατηλήλειπτο μοῖρα κτλ.*, 'And the part where the purple should have been etc.', above. Both mean that the king's chlamys had a golden stripe along the hem instead of a purple one.

⁶⁴ On *ὑπόπτερος* cf. linguistic commentary. There is a similar idea in *A.P.* xvi 39, on the far-flung activities of a later Longinus, who was a *magister militum* in 551.

⁶⁵ Jos. Styl. c. 7–10, 18. Cf. Stein *B-E* ii 64 n. 4.

⁶⁶ J. B. Chabot, *Synodicon Orientale ou Recueil des Synodes Nestoriens* (Paris 1902) 532 f., 536 f. (=Not. et extr. des mss. de la Bibl. Nat. xxxvii 1902). Cf. Stein *ibid.*

couple are, in fact, reported by the historians. 'Is Illus to be in the palace or I?' was Ariadne's ultimatum to Zeno when demanding the release of Verina in winter 481–2.⁶⁷ Cedrenus, indeed, says that Ariadne had taken Anastasius as her lover before she made him her husband.⁶⁸ But this testimony is late, and our confidence in it is reduced by Cedrenus' further assertion that Ariadne had Zeno buried alive when he was in a state of unconsciousness. A contemporary and far more trustworthy witness, Zacharias Scholasticus, says simply that Anastasius enjoyed *παρρησία* with Ariadne during Zeno's lifetime.⁶⁹ The brevity and stilted phraseology of our panegyrist may well reflect his awareness of Zeno's alienation from his wife. He satisfies the formal prescription, but without enthusiasm.

18–20. On the emperor's *φρόνησις*, cf. linguistic commentary. These lines contain no historical allusion that I can discern.

21–32. After a transitional line (21), there follow eleven lines recounting some civil commotion. If the poet is still adhering to the Menandrian scheme, these lines belong to the section in praise of the emperor's good fortune, cf. Men. 376.24 ff.: ἐπὶ τούτοις μὲν καταπαύσεις τὸν λόγον τὸν περὶ τούτων, μνημονεύσεις δὲ μετὰ τοῦτο τῆς τύχης, λέγων ὅτι συμπαρομαρτεῖν δὲ ἔοικεν ἐφ' ἅπασιν καὶ πράξεις καὶ λόγοις τῷ βασιλεῖ τῷ μεγάλῳ τύχῃ λαμπρᾷ, κατορθοὶ γὰρ ἕκαστον κρεῖττον εὐχῆς, καὶ ὅτι παίδων γένεσις αὐτῷ δεδώρηται, ἂν οὕτω τύχῃ, καὶ φίλοι πάντες εὐνοὶ καὶ δορυφόροι κινδυνεύειν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ πρόθυμοι. To begin with, it will be observed that our poem makes no mention of the emperor's progeny. This is understandable, if the subject of the panegyric is Zeno. For Zeno's son by Ariadne, Leo II, died in 474; while the offspring of his previous marriage to Arcadia, a son also called Zeno, died of debauchery at an unknown date, while still a youth. We know from Malchus that Zeno had intended this latter son to succeed him, and there is no reason to dissent from Bury's view that it was his death that led to the advancement of Longinus as heir-apparent.⁷⁰ My dating of the Panegyric to 489 or 490 is consonant with this; Longinus' advancement is in progress, and mention of the younger Zeno's death is not to be looked for in a section devoted to the emperor's good fortune. But what of the other motifs prescribed by Menander, namely that *τύχῃ λαμπρᾷ* attends the emperor's every word and deed, and that all his friends love him and his bodyguard are eager to suffer peril on his behalf? These topics are, in fact, the basis of lines 21–32; but the poem's connection with the Menandrian scheme is obscured at this point by the panegyrist's need to exercise discretion in the selection and treatment of his material. For the *τύχῃ λαμπρᾷ* of Zeno did not present an easy subject. Both the senatorial aristocracy and the populace of Constantinople regarded Zeno with distaste, and his reign was repeatedly marred by civil war. In the revolt of Basiliscus and Verina, Zeno was deprived of his throne for a year and a half (9 Jan. 475–August 476). In the rebellion of Marcianus (479) he narrowly escaped capture. The revolt of Illus and Leontius (484–8) occasioned the major military operations described above. Indeed, Zeno's vicissitudes of fortune became a *locus communis* for historians.⁷¹ Accordingly, it was scarcely possible to praise Zeno's *τύχῃ λαμπρᾷ* in conventional terms. For this reason our poet has taken his cue in this section from the final element in Menander's prescription, καὶ φίλοι πάντες εὐνοὶ καὶ δορυφόροι κινδυνεύειν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ πρόθυμοι. In the emperor's safe deliverance from civil strife he finds a means whereby he can with honesty praise his fortune. On such a theme, the very narrowness of his escape can be made a virtue, and this is no doubt the reason why the emperor's desperate position is emphasised in Recto 24–5 *πάσα δὲ λωβητῆρι περιζωσ[θείσα] . . . / ἔλπωρῃ δεδόνητο γαληναίῳ [βασιλῆι]*; see linguistic commentary. An excellent parallel exists in the encomiastic prologue to Paul the Silentiary's *Description of St Sophia*, lines 18–53. There, no doubt prompted by the precept of Menander, Paul depicts God as the *δορυφόρος* who saved Justinian from the conspiracy of Marcellus and Sergius in December 562. He emphasises the immediacy of Justinian's peril: . . . οὐ δόρασιν, οὐκ ἀσπίσιν, / αὐτῇ δὲ χειρὶ τοῦ θεοῦ φρουρούμενος (20 f.) . . . καὶ τῶν βασιλείων ἐντὸς οἱ ξυνωμόται / ἤδη παρήλθον, τῆς πύλης

⁶⁷ Mal. 387B, Theoph. A.M. 5972. Cf. Brooks 221.

⁶⁸ *Hist. Compend.* i 662B. Cf. C. Capizzi, *L'Imperatore Anastasio I* (Rome 1969) 64.

⁶⁹ *Hist. Eccl.* vii 1, tr. F. H. Hamilton and E. W. Brooks (London 1899) 149. Cf. Capizzi 74, n. 16.

⁷⁰ HLRE i 401. Cf. Malchus fr. 9, FHG. iv 118; Stein, B-E ii 75. On Leo, cf. *ibid.* i 362 f.

⁷¹ Agathias *Hist.* iv 29.2, cf. A.P. ix 482 (*id.*). Malchus fr. 9, FHG. iv 117 f.

τε τῆς ἔσω, / μεθ' ἣν ἔμελλον προσβαλεῖν τοῖς σοῖς θρόνοις, / ἤπτοντο. ταῦτα γνοὺς δὲ καὶ μαθῶν
 πάλαι / ἔκαρτερήσας καὶ πεπίστευκας μόνω / τῷ σου προασπίζοντι, τὸν θεὸν λέγω, / ᾧ
 πάντα νικᾷς· τοῦ σκοποῦ δ' οὐκ ἐσφάλης (26–32).⁷² To what outbreak does our poet refer? Not,
 presumably, the rebellion of Illus in 484–8, to which a section has already been devoted, and
 which did not include a commotion in the capital city, so far as we can gather from the extant
 sources. Nor is it likely to be the abortive conspiracy of Epinicus, Dionysius and Thraustila in 480,
 which was suppressed before it could spread beyond the palace.⁷³ The successful revolt of
 Basiliscus (475–6) was distant in time, and it is also unlikely that Zeno would have relished the
 reminder that he had once been banished from his throne. There remains the sedition of
 Marcianus in 479. This corresponds both to the general terms of Menander's scheme and the
 specific details given in our text. For Zeno was in fact saved on that occasion by his 'faithful
 friends' and 'bodyguard eager to endure peril on his behalf', to quote the Menandrian formula.
 Verina's confinement by Illus, which began in 477, has already been mentioned. After two years,
 Marcianus made of her imprisonment an excuse to challenge Zeno's authority to rule. The events
 of his rebellion have been summarised by Brooks with admirable brevity, and I quote his account:

'Marcian, son of the western Emperor Anthemius, grandson of the Emperor Marcian, and
 like Zenon son-in-law of Leo, with the cry of vengeance for Verina raised a rebellion in
 Constantinople and claimed the empire for himself on the curious ground that his wife
 Leontia was born in the purple, while at the time of the birth of Ariadne Leo was but a simple
 tribune of the soldiers. Surrounded by a force of barbarians and assisted by the citizens, who
 hurled down missiles from the roofs of the houses upon the emperor's troops, he easily made
 himself master of the city, but postponed the attack upon the palace till the next day. This
 gave time to Illus to bring over a force of Isaurians from Kalchedon during the night, and on
 the following day, partly by bribes, partly by force, he succeeded in putting down the
 insurrection, though his own house was burnt by the mob during the fighting. Marcian was
 forced to become a presbyter and sent to Kaisareia in Cappadocia, while his brother Procopius
 and another leader in the revolt named Bousalbos escaped to the camp of Theoderic'.⁷⁴

Here are the points of comparison between our poem and the historical accounts of Marcianus' rebellion:

(i) Marcianus was born *c.* 455.⁷⁵ He was therefore not more than *c.* 24 in 479. This harmonises with our poet's description of the foremost among the rebels as *τις ἀγνωροῦν ἀζήσιος*, Recto 26.

(ii) Marcianus was accompanied by his younger brothers Procopius and Romulus, whose ages cannot have been more than *c.* 21 and 20 respectively. Procopius commanded one of the two forces constituting the rebel army, Joh. Ant. fr. 211.3. The youth of the leading conspirators was thus a distinguishing feature of the rebellion, and this is no doubt why our poet says *εἰρήνης ἀδίδακτον ὁμήλικα*. If my supplement *ὁμήλικα λαῶν* is correct, the poet is seeking to discredit the whole army by saying that it was nothing but young men, like its leaders.

(iii) Zeno was surrounded in the palace and all but captured, Joh. Ant. *ibid.*: *καὶ συμπεσόντες τοῖς φρουροῖς, πολλοὺς διεχειρίσαντο τῶν ἔνδον, καὶ αὐτοῦ δὲ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐκράτησαν ἄν, εἰ μὴ μικρὸν ἀποδρὰς διεσώθη*. Our panegyrist says that, in consequence of *ἡμερος ὠλεσίπατρις*, 'the peaceful emperor's (?) every hope had been shaken, beset (?) by destructive . . .', Recto 23–5. To contemporaries, the rebels' failure to complete their capture of the palace on the first day must have seemed remarkable; they turned instead 'to feasting and sleep' (Theoph.), and were seized next day in the baths of Zeuxippus (Theod. Lect.). Evagrius, perhaps quoting Eustathius of Epiphaneia, includes in his account of this incident a notable dissertation on the fickleness of *καιρός*.⁷⁶ Here again the *τύχη* of Zeno has provided a theme for moral reflections.

(iv) The populace of Constantinople gave active support to Marcianus: *καὶ ὁ τῆς πόλεως*

⁷² Callimachus makes the successful crushing of a revolt one of the topics in his encomium on Ptolemy II, *Del.* 185–7.

⁷³ Cf. Stein *B-E* ii 17.

⁷⁴ Brooks 219 f. Cf. Candidus fr. 1, *FHG.* iv 137; Malchus fr. 20, *FHG.* iv 132; Joh. Ant. fr. 211, 3–4, *FHG.*

iv 619; Theod. Lect. i 37; Evagr. iii 26; Theoph. A.M. 5971. Also Stein *B-E* ii 15 f., and Bury *HLRE* i 395.

⁷⁵ 'Vor 455', *RE* 14.2.1529 (Ensslin); 457, without qualification, *Kl. Pauly* 3.996 (Lasserre).

⁷⁶ *H.E.* iii 26, cf. *A.P.* 16.275 (Posidippus), with Gow and Page's n. *ad loc.*

ὄμιλος ἐκ τῶν δωμάτων διὰ πάσης ὕλης ἐχώρει κατὰ τῶν ὑπὲρ τοῦ βασιλέως ἀγωνιζομένων (Joh. Ant. *ibid.*). That is, they threw missiles down from their houses onto the heads of Zeno's troops, so Brooks and Bury. In our poem we read (Recto 30–1): 'It was not the customary stones that they (?) were hurling, (but?) . . . / a . . . sport strange to the populace . . . / was spoiling . . . which (their?) hand . . .' As may be seen from my linguistic commentary, it is likely that an adversative word stood in the latter part of 30. These words of the panegyrist allude to the circumstance described by Joh. Ant. in the words ἐκ τῶν δωμάτων διὰ πάσης ὕλης ἐχώρει; the demos hurled down impromptu missiles torn from the fabric of its own houses (tiles, chimney-pots, etc.), instead of 'the usual stones' (Recto 30). This would give point to the panegyrist's further words in 32 ἀμάθουνεν ἃ χεῖρ (or χεῖρ[ι], 'was spoiling that which its own hand' had built, or something close to that. I take the grammatical subject of ἔπαλλον to be the persons collectively denoted by ὀμήλικα λαῶν, and the subject of ἀμάθουνεν to be ἄθυρμα or (less probably) those denoted by ὀμήλικα λαῶν.

(v) Our poet says that the sedition happened 'yesterday', χθιζόν, whereas the rebellion of Marcianus took place some ten years before the date which I have suggested for the poem. There is much less difficulty in this than at first appears. For χθές and its derivatives are often used to denote the more distant, rather than the recent, past. Sometimes these expressions are depreciatory in intention, as Demosth. *De Cor.* 130 χθές μὲν οὖν καὶ πρώην ἄμ' Ἀθηναῖος καὶ ῥήτωρ γέγονεν, of Aeschines; Dion. Hal. *Orat. Vet. prooem.* 1 ἐκ τινων βαράθρων τῆς Ἀσίας ἐχθές καὶ πρώην ἀφικομένη, of the Asianist style of rhetoric. Sometimes they are accompanied by a qualifying expression, as when Herodotus says that the Greeks knew nothing about the gods until four hundred years before his own day, ὅθεν δὲ ἐγένοντο ἕκαστος τῶν θεῶν κτλ . . . οὐκ ἠπιστέατο μέχρι οὐ πρώην τε καὶ χθές ὡς εἰπεῖν λόγῳ, ii 53.1; so A.R. ii 1397 ἔξον δ' ἱερὸν πέδον, ᾧ ἐνὶ Λάδων / εἰσέτι που χθιζόν παγχρύσεια ῥύετο μῆλα. The most familiar and celebrated example of this usage is *Il.* ii 303, where Odysseus reminds the Achaean assembly of the portent seen by them at Aulis, nine years before:

χθιζὰ τε καὶ πρωῖζ' ὄτ' ἐς Αὐλῖδα νῆες Ἀχαιῶν
ἠγέρεθοντο κακὰ Πριάμῳ καὶ Τρωσὶ φέρουσαι . . .
ἐνθ' ἐφάνη μέγα σῆμα, κτλ.

According to the scholiast, Odysseus says 'yesterday or the day before' because he wishes to minimise the space of nine years which the Achaeans have spent before Troy.⁷⁷ The Homeric words were proverbial.⁷⁸ It is not surprising, therefore, to find an analogous usage in our poem; the panegyrist says χθιζόν because he wishes to make the events of ten years earlier seem more vivid and recent. So Nonn. *D.* i 123 ὡς καὶ χθιζὰ τέλεσσαν, 'just as he did the other day', where χθιζὰ is not intended literally. One reason why the poet chose to illustrate Zeno's τύχη by a comparatively remote event may be, as I have already suggested, that there was something miraculous in Marcianus' failure to press home his advantage, in consequence of which Zeno escaped; the panegyrist was therefore able to dwell on the gravity of the emperor's plight in order to make his salvation seem more providential. This is exactly what Paul the Silentary does in *Descr.* 18–53. Further, Zeno's clemency to Marcianus (who was exiled; his brothers evaded capture) had been remarkable and praiseworthy. It may well have won him Marcianus' neutrality in 484, when he took no part in Illus' revolt although invited to do so.⁷⁹ Because of these circumstances the events of 479 may have seemed a creditable episode, and a fitting manifestation of Zeno's τύχη λαμπρά.

33–34. The two illegible lines which follow before the lower margin of the leaf will have continued the narrative of civil strife. The question of whether they *concluded* it belongs to the final part of our enquiry.

⁷⁷ κατεσμίκρυνε δὲ τὸν ἐναετὴ χρόνον, ἵνα μὴ διὰ τῆς ἀναμνήσεως πλέον ποιήσῃ ἀγωνιάσαι τοὺς Ἕλληνας.

⁷⁸ Cf. Pl. *Alc.* 2, 141d οἶμαι δέ σε οὐκ ἀνῆκοον εἶναι ἐνία γε χθιζὰ τε καὶ πρωῖζὰ γεγεννημένα, ὅτε Ἀρχέλαον τὸν Μακεδόνων τύραννον τὰ παιδικὰ . . . ἀπέκτεινε, describing an event of 399 B.C., several decades before the imagined

date of this spurious dialogue; Hierocl. *ap. Stob.* 39.36 τὰ τε χθιζὰ ταῦτα καὶ πρωῖζὰ.

⁷⁹ Joh. Ant. *fr.* 214.2 Ἰλλοῦς . . . Μαρκιανὸν ἀναζώννουσι. Nothing is heard of Marcianus thereafter, and Brooks 224 is doubtless right in concluding that he did not respond to Illus' overtures.

Fol. 29788B

Verso

After praising the emperor's *τύχη*, the panegyrist should (according to Menander) go on to compare his reign in general terms with the reigns of his most illustrious predecessors, 'not depreciating them, but rather admiring them, while awarding the palm to the present reign'; cf. linguistic commentary. This is the 'general comparison', which formed the penultimate part of the Menandrian scheme. Procopius of Gaza adheres to these instructions; he compares Anastasius to Cyrus, Agesilaus and Alexander, these comparisons occupying three chapters (25–7) and forming the penultimate section of his encomium. Priscian compares Anastasius to the Antonine emperors, but devotes only four lines to this topic, and inserts it at an earlier stage of his poem (lines 46–9). After the 'general comparison', the encomium should end with the *ἐπίλογοι*, consisting of concluding prayers, etc.; cf. linguistic commentary. So Proc. *Pan.* 28–30, Prisc. *Pan.* 309–12. In our papyrus, topics akin to these appear to be the subject of the hexameter lines written on the detached top of Fol. 29788B Verso, the first page of the binion. This fragment is made up of two pieces of papyrus which certainly belong together. On its Recto side are lines 28–33 of the autumn-evocation.⁸⁰ The ends of four lines can be read, and in these lines someone, presumably an emperor, is said to be as much beloved by sober Constantine as was Apollo by Zeus. Between the bottom of this fragment and the main part of the leaf is a lacuna with space for about seven lines. Then follow the initial letter-groups of three lines which appear to come from an epilogue, and which end the poem; cf. linguistic commentary. The fragment therefore presents us with a comparison followed by an epilogue. These are exactly the topics which ought to stand next in our poem, according to the Menandrian scheme. The comparison might seem to be in our poet's style, since, like the comparison with Odysseus in Recto 19, it is oblique and not laboured (so far as we can tell from the extant text). If, like Gerstinger and Körte, we accept this fragment as the conclusion of our poem, we must suppose that the section on civil strife was completed in the two lines 33–4.⁸¹ This seems to me intrinsically unlikely; after spending twelve lines recounting the emperor's peril, the poet can scarcely have disposed of his preservation in two. I am inclined, therefore, to follow Heitsch, who prints this fragment separately from the panegyric, and numbers it as *Pamprepius* (?) 2. If not the conclusion of some other poem, it might be an independent hexameter-epigram. In any case these lines contain nothing that affects the question of whether our panegyric is about Zeno or another emperor. I have given a full account of them in my linguistic commentary, and little more need be said about them here. Keydell's supplement *Κωστα[πρίνῳ]* is rendered almost certainly correct by the parallel expression in *A.P.* i 10.71. But Heitsch's suggestion that the Constantine referred to was the consul of 457 is misguided. He is, surely, Constantine the Great, who is often alluded to in panegyric contexts elsewhere.⁸² Juxtaposition of the Christian emperor with Zeus and Apollo is not remarkable; a more flagrant juxtaposition is made by John of Gaza in his description of a celebrated picture of the Cosmos (c. 536), where the poet invokes both Apollo and the Christian God, and then proceeds to describe the Cross and the symbol of the Trinity.⁸³

RONALD C. MCCAIL

University of Edinburgh

⁸⁰ Cf. Heitsch 112, and *ibid.* pls. G and H.⁸¹ Gerstinger 83, Körte 26.⁸² cf. *A.P.* i 10.72; *Romanos Cant.* 23 *ση'* 3, *ibid.* 54 *κβ'* 3; Georg. *Pisid.* In *Restitutionem Sancti Crucis* 47 ff. (p. 227 Pertusi).⁸³ *Joh. Gaz. Descr. Tabulae Mundi* 5, 19 ff., 29 ff., 41 ff. (P. Friedländer, *Johannes von Gaza u. Paulus Silentarius* 136–8).