

compares his teacher, the Neoplatonist Chrysanthius, with Pythagoras, Archytas of Tarentum, Apollonius, 'and those who revered (*προσκυνήσαντες*) Apollonius', 'all of whom merely seemed to have a body and to be men'.⁴⁵ In the contemporary west, Apollonius became the device of militant paganism. Nicomachus Flavianus, one of Eugenius' most prominent supporters, either adapted or translated Philostratus' work.⁴⁶ The appearance of Apollonius on 'contorniates' probably expresses the same atmosphere.⁴⁷

The activity of Nicomachus is inseparable from another work also probably of the late fourth century, the *Historia Augusta*. The author refers to Apollonius in two passages, both of which are relevant to the question of his cult. The first is notorious. Severus Alexander had in his *lararium* not only the deified emperors but *optimos electos et animas sanctiores*, including Apollonius and, so a contemporary author averred, Christ, Abraham, Orpheus, and others of the like.⁴⁸ The distinction between Apollonius and the other 'souls' may suggest that the author found him in his source and was inspired to add the three others: there is nothing inherently unlikely in Alexander's worshipping a person to whom his divine father had erected a sanctuary.⁴⁹ The other names, however, clearly reflect the pagan polemics of the late fourth century.⁵⁰ The second reference to Apollonius is equally revealing. The emperor Aurelian, marching east against Palmyra, was blocked by the resistance of Tyana and determined to destroy it. However, he had a vision of Apollonius, 'that sage of the most celebrated fame and authority, an ancient philosopher, truly a friend of the gods,⁵¹ himself worthy to be worshipped as a divinity (*numen*)'. Aurelian recognized the 'venerable philosopher' from the portraits which he had seen in many temples⁵² and, dissuaded from his purpose, promised him 'a portrait, statues, and a temple'. The historian proceeds to extol Apollonius as one who 'gave life to the dead, and said and did much that was more than human'; the curious are referred to the books written about him in Greek; in fact the author himself, 'if the favour of the great man permits', will write his own brief account (*HA* Aurel. xxiv 2-9). It is clear from the mention soon after of a translator called Nicomachus (*ibid.* xxvii 6) that he is thinking of the translation of Nicomachus Flavianus; probably the whole incident is drawn from another work of Nicomachus, the *Annales*.⁵³ However, the author has not only read Nicomachus, but imbibed some of his spirit. Apollonius is 'more than human', a saviour, and his 'favour' still operates beneficently in human affairs.

The way in which the *Historia Augusta* talks of Apollonius and his continuing influence on mankind recalls the new epigram, and it is tempting to place it in the context of the struggle waged by paganism and Christianity in the

fourth century.⁵⁴ Yet it has been seen that such language does not go far, if at all, beyond the domestic divinisation exemplified by many funeral epigrams of the high empire, so that a third century date is not to be rejected. But if the date must therefore remain in doubt, there is no doubt of the importance of this new text for the history of Apollonius and his legend.

C. P. JONES

University of Toronto

⁵⁴ Compare the not dissimilar Neoplatonic inscription GVI 1283, with the discussion of P. Boyancé, *Le culte des Muses* (Paris 1937) 284-91 (*Bull.* 1938 574); I plan to argue elsewhere that the inscription published by W. M. Ramsay, *CR* xxxiii (1919) 2, is Neoplatonic and not Christian as usually assumed. Cf. also *MAMA* viii 487, with Robert's discussion, *Hellenica* xiii (1965) 170-1.

Datis the Mede

Professor R. T. Hallock generously allows me to publish here his text and translation of the hitherto unpublished Persepolis Fortification Tablet Q-1809, to which he has referred in *Cahiers de la délégation française en Iran* viii (1978) 115.

¹⁷ mar-ri-iš ²KAŠ.lg m.Da-ti-³ya gal-ma du-iš ⁴hal-mi m.sunki-na ⁵ku-iz h.İš-par-da-mar ⁶pir-ra-da-zi-iš ⁷iz⁷-zi-i[š] h. ⁸Ba-ir-[ša] ⁹m.sunki-¹⁰ik¹⁰-ka pa-raš ^{10d}.ITU.lg ¹¹ša-mi-man-¹²taš¹² ^{12h}.be-ul 27-um-¹³me-na h.Hi-da-li

¹⁻³⁷ *marriš* beer Datiya received as rations. ⁴⁻⁵He carried a sealed document of the king. ⁵⁻⁹He went forth from Sardis (via) express (service), went to the king (at) Persepolis. ¹⁰⁻¹³11th month, year 27. ¹³(At) Hidali.

On its left edge it bears Seal 201, which should belong to the supplier at Hidali. It appears in the same position there two months earlier on PF 1404. Earlier seals for suppliers at Hidali are Seals 84 (this and not Seal 201 is on PF 1408) and 138. The seal on the reverse is a small stamp, with figure at left facing an altar with an animal on it, with a moon above.

A beer or wine ration of 70 quarts marks its recipient as a very high personage. The figure recurs on PF 1558 as the ration of Abbatema the Indian, who travels in considerable style (see Lewis, *Sparta and Persia* [Leiden 1977] 5 with n. 14; his rations vary considerably, and he only gets 30 quarts in PF 1556), and has been suggested as a likely ration for apparent sisters of the king (Hallock, *loc. cit.*). To our knowledge it is only exceeded by Parnaka, uncle of the king and chief economic official of Persia, who is on 90 quarts (PF 664-5), and Gobryas, father of Mardonios, one of the greatest men of the kingdom, who is on 100 quarts (PF 688). It is therefore very tempting indeed to identify Datiya with Datis the Mede, commander, along with the king's nephew, of the Persian expedition to Marathon in 490 (Hdt. vi 94.2). The only objection seems to be the unassuming seal, but this may belong to a guide acting for him.

That a high official on a journey should be qualified with *pirradaziš* confirms Hallock's view (*Persepolis Fortification Tablets* 42) that the word is not a title in the strict sense, but may rather qualify the nature of the journey and the facilities to be extended to it. Since horses are also so qualified (PF 1672.5, 1700.3, 2061.4, 2062.5, 2065.4), it may be that the special facilities involve special horses (cf.

⁴⁵ *V S* 23.1.8 (Loeb p. 542).

⁴⁶ *Sid. ep.* viii 3.1. On the problems of this passage, J. Schwartz, *Bonn. Hist.-Aug. Coll.* 1975/76 (Bonn 1978) 191-3.

⁴⁷ A. Alföldi, *Die Kontorniaten* (Budapest 1943) 74-6; cf. now A. and E. Alföldi, *Die Kontorniat-Medaillons I* (Berlin 1976) 32.

⁴⁸ *HA* Alex. 29.2. On this passage see now Schwartz (n. 46) 187-190.

⁴⁹ For an imitation of Caracalla by Alexander in Tarsus, R. Ziegler, *JfNG* xxvii (1977) 40-2.

⁵⁰ R. Syme, *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta* (Oxford 1968) 138.

⁵¹ Cf. Hierocles quoted by Eusebius, *θεοῖς κεχαρισμένον ἄνδρα* (above, n. 41).

⁵² Compare the portraits of the aged Apollonius in the sanctuary at Tyana, Philostr. *VA* viii 29.

⁵³ W. Hartke, *Klio* Beih. xlv (1940) 18-19, 33-4, 37; cf. Syme (n. 50) 111.

Lewis *op. cit.* 57 n. 51). It has already been observed (*Persepolis Fortification Tablets* 42) that such journeys are either under royal authorisation (PF 1285, 1320, 1321, 1329, 1335) or going to the king (PF 1315, 1319, 2052); even in the apparent exception (PF 1334) the messengers may be going to the king.

Though Datiya is going to the king, it is the king's authorisation he is carrying. Journeys are generally authorised from their point of origin (for apparent exceptions, see Lewis, *op. cit.* 5 n. 14, 8 n. 31, and add the unpublished Q-901, 23rd year, 10th month, where Bakabana, based in Susa, authorises travellers from Sardis to Parnaka, probably only for the last section of their journey), and it may be that in normal circumstances only the king authorises return journeys (*cf.* perhaps PF 1318, 1474, PFa 31.13-15). It is at any rate clear on this occasion that Datiya has been on a round trip to Sardis and is now at Hidali, only three stages from the king in Persepolis, on his return journey. Hallock estimates this as at least four days' journey on foot, but he will have travelled faster.

The Persepolis tablets have rarely shed direct light on the highest politics, but this seems to be an exception. The date lies between January 17th and February 15th, 494, in the winter before the closing campaign of the Ionian revolt. It was always likely that Datis had had some experience in the Ionian revolt before his command against Eretria and Athens in 490, but clear evidence has been lacking. It now appears that he may have been sent by the king in person on a tour of inspection and co-ordination before the final campaign. Tithraustes' corresponding mission to Asia Minor in 396/5, with letters giving him the right to give orders to all satraps and the task of disposing of Tissaphernes, perhaps offers the closest parallel. No light is thrown on the question of how a Mede rose so high.

There is the unsolved question about the Lindian Temple Chronicle, which describes an undated attack by Datis on Rhodes (*FGrH* 532 D). This is hard to fit into Herodotus' description of his movements in 490, and there is some temptation to use it as evidence that he was fleet-commander in 494 (see e.g. Burn, *Persia and the Greeks* [London 1962] 210, 218). All that can be said on the harder evidence of our tablet is that, if he reported to the king very quickly, he could have been back in the summer to command the fleet in the Aegean. Datis rapidly passed into Greek popular myth (see Raubitschek, in K. Schauenburg, ed., *Charites* [Bonn 1957] 234-42), and it is the more gratifying to have him for once pinned down on a real occasion.

D. M. LEWIS

Christ Church, Oxford

The Trireme Controversy

The order in which the following contributions appear does not reflect any editorial view on the respective merits of the cases argued.

M. Basch on triremes: some observations

Herodotus informs us at ii 159 that Pharaoh Necho II (610-595 B.C.) built and employed triremes on the Mediterranean and Red Seas. In a recent study I put the case for the traditional view that these triremes were Greek rather

than Phoenician in origin.¹ That case may be summarized as follows:

(1) Thucydides believed (i 13) that the trireme had been invented in Corinth during the Cypselid tyranny (*c.* 657-583 B.C.) and that it was almost immediately taken over by the Samians.²

(2) The standard refutations of Thucydides' statement are invalid.³

(3) The Corinthians and Samians were excellently placed in Egypt to hand on the invention.⁴

(4) An Egyptian stele, probably dating to the Saïte-Early Persian Period, bears a Carian inscription in association with two crude graffiti representing ramming warships which are certainly of a Greek type. This fits perfectly with the fact that Carian and Ionian mercenaries are known to have occupied naval bases in Egypt from *c.* 664 to *c.* 570 B.C.⁵

(5) The early history of the trireme in Phoenicia is shrouded in obscurity. The textual evidence for its invention at Sidon before 676 is worthless and in general our data on the history of the type are compatible with the view that it arrived in Phoenicia from the Aegean as part of a general movement which also brought it to Egypt.⁶

(6) The suspicion that there is a tradition of Egyptian reliance on the Levant in ship-design and ship-construction is unfounded. Available evidence proves no more than a dependence on the area for high-quality timber.⁷

In a critique published in a previous volume of this journal M. Lucien Basch attempts to counter most of these arguments and raises a number of additional points.⁸ In the present study attention will be concentrated on those issues which particularly require comment.

(i) The question of reconciling the internal chronological contradictions of Thuc. i 13.1-4 is taken no further by M. Basch. Therefore, my reasons for arguing that Thucydides believed in a Cypselid date for the invention of the trireme at Corinth remain unimpaired by his study. It is a fundamental principle of all historical research that, if there is no good reason to doubt the validity of a piece of evidence, we must proceed as though it were correct. It may not be but the historian's profession becomes impossible if such a principle does not apply. The issue, therefore, becomes one of determining whether there is good reason for doubting what Thucydides clearly believed the truth to be—and that brings us to the next point.

(ii) In attacking the hoary argument that sophisticated weaponry will immediately achieve general acceptance, I pointed to two instances where this clearly did not happen: the breech-loading rifle, first used in the British Army in 1776 but not generally issued until 1865, and the quadrireme, invented at the very beginning of the fourth century B.C. but absent from the Athenian fleet until *c.* 330. The slow adoption of both inventions I attributed to 'conservatism and sheer economics'.⁹ The first example

¹ 'Were Necho's Triremes Phoenician?' *JHS* xciv (1975) 45 ff., hereafter Lloyd (1975), developing an earlier study, 'Triremes and the Saïte Navy', *JEA* lviii (1972) 268 ff., hereafter Lloyd (1972). The conclusions of both are summarized in my *Herodotus Book II. Introduction* (Leiden 1975) 32 ff.

² Lloyd (1972) 276 ff.; (1975) 52 ff.

³ *Id.* (1975) 53 ff.

⁴ (1975) 55 ff.

⁵ (1975) 59 ff.

⁶ (1975) 49 ff.

⁷ (1975) 51 ff.

⁸ 'Trières grecques, phéniciennes et égyptiennes', *JHS* xcvi (1977) 1 ff.

⁹ Lloyd (1975) 54.