

Unfortunately, Pissouthnes' revolt is undatable. Westlake says that it 'is widely believed to have occurred not long after the death of Artaxerxes in 424', whilst Cook thinks that c. 416 is a likely date.⁴¹ Andrewes suggests that Th. viii 108 implies that Tissaphernes first arrived in the west with the command to deal with Pissouthnes before the Delians were returned to Delos in 421. His inference, however, assumes that the Persian Arsakes was in 421 the hyparch of Tissaphernes, as he is known to have been in 411; as Lewis notes, this is not a safe assumption.⁴² It is not even clear whether Amorges was continuing the revolt of his father or had started his own revolt some time after Pissouthnes had been crushed,⁴³ although the former seems slightly more likely. In any case, if Athens' support for either him or Pissouthnes predated the launching of the Sicilian expedition in 415, as is possible, then the argument that the Athenians were overcommitting themselves could no longer stand.

It may well be that the Athenians, defeated in two attempts to control south-west Asia Minor by force, saw in Pissouthnes and Amorges an opportunity to achieve their aims without a large military commitment. As for offending the Persian King, the campaigns of Melesandros and Lysikles had both been conducted against subject states of Persia and hence were technically acts of war, yet Persia had done nothing; so the Athenians no doubt expected nothing to be done on this occasion. The fact that Persia did intervene was due to the Athenian defeat in Sicily and the belief that Athens was now beatable and could be forced out of Ionia. Athens' support for Amorges was no doubt held up as a pretext for Persia's break with Athens, but it was only a pretext. This is why Thucydides makes no mention of it; he is only interested in the real reason for Persia's involvement, which he expects his readers to deduce from his text.

With Persia's intervention Karia and Lykia became extremely important, since if Sparta could get a fleet from Persia they had a much better chance of bringing the war to a swift conclusion. Therefore it was in Athens' interests to try to prevent such a link. In addition, control of western Karia could assist in controlling Ionia. Furthermore, Thucydides at this point (viii 35.2) once again mentions Athenian merchantmen from the eastern Mediterranean, which the Spartans intended to capture if possible.⁴⁴ Amorges, however, was taken at Iasos, in what appears to have been a combined assault from a Spartan fleet by sea, as described by Thucydides, and Tissaphernes and his mercenaries (which seem to

have included a substantial Lykian contingent) by land.⁴⁵ This was a serious blow to Athenian strategy in the area, demonstrated by the fact that the oligarch Peisandros was able to have Phrynichos removed from his command because of his failure to save Iasos (Th. viii 54.3).

Further attempts at military intervention were made. One is indicated only by a small piece of information from Xenophon (*HG* i 1.10). When, in 410, Alkibiades was imprisoned by Tissaphernes, he escaped with a man called Mantitheos, who had been captured in Karia. Mantitheos was later a member of the Athenian embassy to Pharnabazos in 409 (*X. HG* i 3.13) and subsequently held a command in the Hellespont (D.S. xiii 68.2). He was probably a general in 410, but it is impossible to say what exactly his operations in Karia were.⁴⁶ Later, in 408, Alkibiades sailed through Karia collecting money for the Athenian forces (*X. HG* i 4.8-9). Presumably he brought many former allies back under Athenian leadership; Iasos at least was an Athenian ally again when the Spartan commander Lysandros campaigned in Karia in 405 (D.S. xiii 104.7).⁴⁷

Karia and Lykia, then, were strategically very important areas for Athens, and many operations were undertaken to ensure that they remained friendly. These operations were, however, largely characterized by failure. This might be seen as contributing to Athens' ultimate defeat in 404. For the failure to control the sea-route from the Mediterranean meant that the Persians felt that recovery of the Asia Minor seaboard was a possibility; for this reason Dareios intervened on Sparta's side.

ANTONY G. KEEN

University of Manchester

⁴⁵ The involvement of a land assault can perhaps be deduced from *TAM* i 44.a.52-5, where Iasos and Amorges are mentioned.

⁴⁶ Westlake (n. 23) 162 suggests he was engaged on diplomatic activity.

⁴⁷ See Westlake (n. 23) 126-7.

The auditor Thaumasius in the *Vita Plotini*

In his *Vita Plotini*, Porphyry recounts a colourful episode which, for a brief moment, brings to life the dynamics within the lecture room of Plotinus in Rome. The author explains how he was in the habit of posing questions to Plotinus frequently and persistently while his teacher was conducting his philosophical discourse before a mixed body of listeners. On one occasion, such an exchange between the two over the issue of the connexion between the soul and the body continued intermittently over a period of some three days, with the following outcome (Porph. *V. Plot.* xiii 12-15):

ὥστε καὶ Θαυμασίου τινὸς τοῦνομα ἐπεισελθόντος τοὺς καθόλου λόγους πρᾶπτοντος καὶ εἰς βιβλία ἀκούσαι αὐτοῦ λέγοντος θέλειν, Πορφυρίου δὲ ἀποκρινομένου καὶ ἐρωτῶντος μὴ ἀνασχέσθαι, ὁ δὲ ἔφη...

The first part of this passage has from quite early on presented editors and commentators of the text with a great amount of difficulty. Creuzer emended the text in the 1835 edition to τοὺς καθόλου λόγους εἰς-

⁴¹ Westlake (n. 23) 105; J.M. Cook, *The Persian Empire* (London 1983) 130.

⁴² Andrewes (n. 35) 5 n. 11; questioned by D.M. Lewis, *Sparta and Persia* (Leiden 1977) 80 n. 198.

⁴³ Lewis (n. 42) 86; Westlake (n. 23) 105.

⁴⁴ The importance of the area for the traffic of merchantmen is emphasized by W.A.P. Childs, *AS* xxxi (1981) 67; see also Hermipp. *fr.* 63.12-13, 22-3. For Spartan interest in Lykia, note the appearance of the name Lysandros on fourth-century inscriptions (*TAM* i 90.3; 103.2; 104.a.2-3), possibly all referring to the same man; see Bryce (n. 11) 162-3.

πράττοντος εἰς βιβλία καὶ ἀκοῦσαι αὐτοῦ, thereby rendering the text as ‘quum Thaumasius universales disputationes sibi aliisque exigeret in scripta transferendas et se eum audire velle diceret’.¹ Wyttenbach, in his notes to the same edition (Creuzer *et al.* pp. cix-cx), suggested reading instead τοὺς καθόλου λόγους τάττειν εἰς βιβλία καὶ ἀκοῦσαι αὐτοῦ λέγοντος θέλειν and translated the passage as qui argumenta universalia disputationum *scripto consignare* et se eum audire velle diceret’. These readings require us to suppose that Thaumasius himself wished to write down Plotinus’ lecture εἰς βιβλία, as books. The collective sense of these readings was embraced by M.-N. Bouillet who translated this passage into French as:²

[Thaumasius] disait qu’il voulait consigner par écrit les arguments généraux développés dans la discussion et entendre parler Plotin lui-même.

Yet the above proposed textual emendations which help make some sense of εἰς βιβλία fail to resolve all the difficulties in establishing the meaning of this passage as a whole, especially with regard to the significance of the phrase τοὺς καθόλου λόγους. The generally-held view maintains that Thaumasius dropped in one day to visit Plotinus, hoping to hear a general, continuous, lecture, which he would then wish to write down. For this reason, he was predictably displeased by Porphyry’s constant interruptions. Such an understanding lies behind the modern translations of the passage. Stephen MacKenna’s translation, first published in 1917, stands as a prime specimen. He freely renders the passage as follows:³

A man called Thaumasius (*sic*) entered in the midst of our discussions; the visitor was more interested in the general drift of the system than in particular points, and said he wished to hear Plotinus expounding some theory as he would in a set treatise.

In the Budé edition of Émile Bréhier, the emphasis is placed on the continuous nature of the discourse rather than on its specific character, with the result that τοὺς καθόλου λόγους is translated ‘une conférence suivie’:⁴

Un certain Thaumasius, entré dans la salle, dit qu’il voulait l’entendre faire une conférence suivie et propre à être écrite ...

Yet Bréhier’s accompanying note explains that such a reading is far from certain: ‘mais d’après ce qui suit, il [le texte] décrit le procédé d’enseignement opposé à la dialectique, c’est-à-dire le discours suivi procédant par thèmes généraux’. (Bréhier 15 n. 1) Later, Richard

¹ F. Creuzer, F. Marsilius, G.H. Moser and D. Wyttenbach, ed., Πλωτίνου ἔργα. Plotini opera omnia i (Oxford 1835).

² *Les Ennéades de Plotin* i (Paris 1857; reprinted Frankfurt 1968) 14.

³ *Plotinus: the ethical treatises, being the treatises of the first Ennead with Porphyry’s Life of Plotinus* (London 1917; reprinted London/Boston 1926) 13.

⁴ *Plotin. Ennéades* i (Paris 1924) 15.

Harder’s opaque translation adheres broadly to the *consensus communis*:⁵

Und als ein Mann namens Thaumasius eintrat und eine Vorlesung über allgemeine Fragen forderte, er wolle etwas hören zum Nachschreiben.

Finally, elements of much of the above commentaries and translations are echoed in A. H. Armstrong’s translation for the Loeb Classical Library:⁶

A man called Thaumasius came in who was interested in general statements and said that he wanted to hear Plotinus speaking in the manner of a set treatise.

Armstrong’s translation of οἱ καθόλου λόγοι as ‘general statements’, while technically impeccable, may easily impart to casual readers the mistaken impression that Thaumasius was interested in broad philosophical generalisations, thus reinforcing the erroneous sense conveyed by MacKenna’s loose translation (see above). Such a misunderstanding had earlier been avoided by the use of more precise, and less ambiguous, renditions such as *universales disputationes* (Creuzer *et al.*), *argumenta universalia disputationum* (Wyttenbach in Creuzer *et al.*), and even *allgemeine Fragen* (Harder). This is not a trivial issue, for much, in fact, depends on the proper understanding of this passage. For example, if one thinks that Thaumasius was interested in ‘general statements’ in the generic sense, he would then appear as someone who was only concerned with philosophical generalisations. From that reading one can then posit the existence of a class of auditors or ἀκροαταί who attended Plotinus’ lectures for his dogmatic exposition, but who had no particular interest in the precise development of philosophical arguments. Such a reconstruction would harmonise well with the theme of growing traditionalism among the late antique philosophical circles discussed by Armstrong himself in ‘Pagan and Christian traditionalism in the first three centuries AD’.⁷ Yet since Plotinus was not known to have delivered set lectures of a general nature before any audience, Thaumasius had neither right nor reason to express the demand which some modern commentators have attributed to him. The philosopher, unlike later Neoplatonists such as Proclus, made no distinction between lectures for an esoteric audience and lectures for a broader public; all his discourses were pitched, so to speak, at a ‘postgraduate’ level where give-and-take discussions with prize disciples should indeed seem quite appropriate.

Given the abundant difficulties in the interpretation of this passage, it is not surprising that the editors of the first volume of the *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* have advanced an entirely different reading. I wish, however, to first take issue with this change in direction, and then to suggest that the discussion ought to resume along the lines previously established.

⁵ *Plotins Schriften V. Porphyrios: Über Plotins Leben und über die Ordnung seiner Schriften* (Leipzig 1937; reprinted Hamburg 1958) 31.

⁶ *Plotinus* i (Cambridge, Mass. 1966) 39.

⁷ In *Studia Patristica* xv (1984) 414-431.

In *PLRE* i 889, our Thamasius received a brief mention under the heading of

THAVMASIUS a rationibus (at Rome) 263/268

The reason for such an entry is that the phrase τὸς καθόλου λόγους πράττοντος can be taken as the Greek way of referring to the Roman official who supervised the *rationes summae* or οἱ καθόλου λόγοι. In this view, Thamasius was therefore a *procurator a rationibus* (cf. Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. 'a rationibus'), a post normally reserved for an *eques*. Unfortunately this radical reinterpretation is merely stated rather than argued in the *PLRE*. Yet it has now been tentatively accepted by Luc Brisson, one of the editors of a comprehensive reference work on the *V. Plot.*, who most helpfully adds the necessary documentation for this conclusion.⁸ With such an authoritative endorsement, it is highly likely that this interpretation would take hold in subsequent scholarly discussions.

Against such a reading it should first of all be noted that Thamasius is nowhere else attested as a chief imperial finance minister. Further, there is no reason for Porphyry to cite specifically Thamasius' official post in this brief mention rather than just to name his status as he does with reference to certain senators (cf. *V. Plot.* vii 29-32). When he informs his readers that the senator Rogatianus once served as a praetor, he does so in order to tell a story for which that particular detail is indeed crucial; yet such is not the case with respect to the episode we are currently discussing.

Quite apart from these considerations, the wording of the phrase τὸς καθόλου λόγους πράττοντος does not in fact conform to the pattern of the attested ways of referring to an *a rationibus* in Greek. The post entailed a supervisory function over all imperial accounts. To designate a person who oversaw οἱ καθόλου λόγοι, the Greeks almost invariably employed ἐπί and/or a noun or verb compounded with this prefix. See, e.g., the reconstructed text of a papyrus fragment from Cyprus.⁹ In order to illustrate this kind of usage, I list a number of Greek references to the *a rationibus*:¹⁰

- (i) [ἐπὶ τῆν τῶν καθόλου λόγων] προστασίαν ἐπίτροπος ἐπιτετραμμένος (*L'année épigraphique* 1952, 165 n. 6);
- (ii) τὸς καθόλου λόγους ἐπιτροπέυσας (*IG* xiv 1480);
- (iii) τὸς γὰρ δὴ καθόλου λόγους ἐπιτετραμμένος (Dio Cassius lxxix 21.1);
- (iv) ἐπὶ τῶν καθόλου λόγων λεγόμενος εἶναι (Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* vii 10.5);
- (iv) τῶν καθόλου λόγων ἑπαρχος (Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* ix 11.1).

In what follows, I wish to return to and expand on the more traditional interpretations of the phrase under con-

⁸ L. Brisson, M.-O. Goulet-Cazé, R. Goulet and D. O'Brien, ed., *Porphyre: la vie de Plotin* i (Paris 1982) 85-86, 268 and n. 1.

⁹ Cf. S. Demougouin, 'Un nouveau procurator summarum rationum', *ZPE* xxi (1976) 135-145.

¹⁰ These examples are drawn from H.J. Mason, *Greek terms for Roman institutions, a lexicon and analysis* (Toronto 1974) 58, s.v. 'οἱ καθόλου λόγοι'.

sideration. Apart from being a reference to financial accounts, τὸς καθόλου λόγους can refer just as easily to universal (as opposed to particular or κατὰ μέρος) propositions which are treated, e.g., in Aristotle's *Analytica Priora* 24a 17 (cf. *LSJ* s.v. 'καθόλου'). *Περὶ τῶν καθόλου λόγων* is also the name of a Pythagorean treatise by Ps.-Archytas.¹¹ That οἱ καθόλου λόγοι constituted a current concern in third-century Neoplatonist circles is shown by the fact that Porphyry's pupil and contemporary Iamblichus of Chalcis relied on *Περὶ τῶν καθόλου λόγων* when imposing an *interpretatio pythagorica* on the Aristotelian categories.¹² Iamblichus himself mentions Archytas' concern with οἱ καθόλου λόγοι in his *De vita pythagorica* (xxix 160). The association of the two figures was enshrined in tradition by a number of ancient authors, including Boethius, who writes: 'Archites etiam duos composuit libros quos καθόλου λόγους inscripsit ... in qua sententia Iamblicus philosophus est non ignobilis'.¹³ We note that Iamblichus' erstwhile teacher Porphyry himself was intimately familiar with and interested in the Aristotelian categories and, in addition to his famous *Eisagogé*, composed two commentaries on Aristotle's *Categoriae*.

Given this rather precise philosophical meaning of τὸς καθόλου λόγους (not just 'general statements' in the generic sense), the verb πράττειν can and should be given the meaning of 'to study', especially in association with the commentaries of texts (cf. *LSJ* s.v. 'πράσσω' IV.2). While it may be far too speculative to suggest that Porphyry is referring to Thamasius as someone specifically engaged in the study of Ps.-Archytas' *Περὶ τῶν καθόλου λόγων*, we may safely suppose that the phrase πράττειν τὸς καθόλου λόγους is much more likely to be used by Porphyry, especially in a text firmly rooted in a philosophical framework, to refer to the study of universal propositions rather than to a governmental post.

Such a reading would alter the meaning of εἰς βιβλία in the passage considerably. Construing the phrase to mean something like 'in the manner of a set treatise' has the virtue of making sense of Thamasius' objection to Porphyry's questions and answers. On the one hand, we can more simply see Porphyry's constant interruptions as inherently irksome to others.¹⁴ Further, such a rendition requires us to translate βιβλία in such an idiosyncratic sense and precise way that it is perhaps unjustified. Clearly not all βιβλία in antiquity were 'set treatises'. Furthermore, the presence of large numbers of 'question-and-answer' dialogues in antiquity featuring discussions between masters and disciples hardly supports the implicit idea that the exchange between Porphyry and Plotinus *ipso facto* could not be

¹¹ Cf. Elias, *In Aristotelis categorias commentarium*. A. Busse, ed., *Comm. in Arist. Graeca* xviii (Berlin 1900) 132, 26-27.

¹² Cf. T. Szlezák, *Pseudo-Archytas über die Kategorien* (Berlin 1972) esp. 29-32; and B.B. Larsen, *Jamblique de Chalcis, exégète et philosophe* i (Aarhus 1972) 233-301.

¹³ Boethius, *In categorias Aristotelis* 1, in Migne, *PL* lxiv 162A.

¹⁴ Cf. Plut. *De recte ratione audiendi* 10, where the author discusses the undesirability of making frequent interjections at philosophical lectures.

turned into a respectable series of books. Thus I suggest that we take εἰς βιβλία rather as 'with reference to written [philosophical] texts'; that is, Thaumasius would rather have Plotinus continue with his *explication de textes* (perhaps even on Ps.-Archytas' Περὶ τῶν καθόλου λόγων) than to preoccupy himself with Porphyry's repeated interjections. Upon hearing this request, Plotinus responded by saying that if he did not solve Porphyry's questions, then they would be utterly incapable of having a worthwhile discussion with reference to the specific book under consideration (εἰπεῖν τι καθάπαξ εἰς τὸ βιβλίον οὐ δυνήσμεθα). We learn from Porphyry himself immediately following (*V. Plot.* xiv 10-16) that it was Plotinus' normal practice first to have commentaries read aloud during the συνουσία and then afterwards he would build his own discourse upon them. Much later, Marinus found it important to note that in the evenings Proclus held philosophical meetings which were *not* based on discussions of a given text, as was his custom during the day (*Vita Procli* 22).

If my proposed interpretation is correct, then Thaumasius, instead of representing an uninspiring layman, whether also a fiscal functionary or not, who boorishly insisted on only hearing broad philosophical generalisations, appears to be an interested student of philosophical propositions who appreciated close textual exegesis. In conclusion, I would translate the passage cited at the outset as follows:

so that after a certain person named Thaumasius (who was studying universal propositions) had come into the lecture-room and said that he wished to hear Plotinus lecture with reference to written [philosophical] texts, but that he could not stand Porphyry's answers and questions, Plotinus said...¹⁵

RICHARD LIM

*Department of History
Smith College, Northampton, Mass*

¹⁵ I wish to thank Mark Edwards, Robert Lamberton, Alan Sommerstein and an anonymous reader for the journal for their detailed and helpful comments.

The Hunting Frieze from Vergina*

The tombs at Vergina in Macedonia continue to produce more questions than answers. At the 1990 Annual Meeting of the Archaeological Institute in San Francisco a colloquium entitled 'The royal tombs at Vergina: continuing issues' was presented on these tombs, their dating, and their possible inhabitants. The participants in this colloquium were not in agreement about the identity of those laid to rest in the tombs, or when these burials took place, or the nature of the grave goods which accompanied the funerary rituals. We must continue to anticipate and hope for progress in the debate over these crucial questions.

Somewhat separate from, but nevertheless closely linked with the foregoing questions is the decoration of

In memory of Rumpus, 8/26/84-4/26/91. Much loved. Much missed. Gone so soon.

Tomb II, believed by the excavator, and some commentators, to be the tomb of Philip II of Macedonia, the father of Alexander the Great. This rich tomb carries an important frieze on its facade.¹ There are serious problems with the present condition, rapidly deteriorating, of the frieze. Because of this deterioration, reliance must be placed on the photographs, and most particularly on the excellent line drawing in Andronikos' publication of the tomb.² In the San Francisco colloquium, Jonathan H. Musgrave of the University of Bristol described the frieze as depicting 'tough characters about their business in the hunting field'. The portrayal of these tough characters, and their hunt, on the frieze raises a number of tantalizing and thought-provoking questions. Where was the hunt taking place? Is it a real or hypothetical landscape, with real or hypothetical animals? Where in 4th century BC Macedonia, or elsewhere, would hunters have tracked a boar, a bear, and a lion as well as two deer? Who are the participants in the hunt? Who decided what the subject of the frieze on this tomb should be? Why is it a hunting scene? Why is it *this* particular hunting scene? These questions seem unanswerable with the present state of the evidence, and they go far beyond the question of the original tenancy of the tomb, and its precise date. The portrayal of the animals in the frieze, however, has something new to offer us in and of itself.

When the details of the hunting frieze are examined in the photographs and in the line drawing,³ human hunters are shown both on foot and on horseback, accompanied by nine hunting dogs.⁴ There are thousands of dogs portrayed in Greek art in various mediums, sealstones, frescoes, sculpture, vase painting and coins. Some of these dogs are space fillers, some are integral parts of the representation, still others constitute a focal point of a scene. Here on 'Philip's Tomb' the portrayal of the canine assistants at once appears to present a new dimension to the hunt, and upon close scrutiny it is clear there are two distinct types of dogs represented. The dogs numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, and 8 in my illustration (FIG.1) are fine boned, and well muscled, with long narrow muzzles. We see this dog frequently in Greek art of all periods, a tracking dog of great olfactory abilities,

¹ For the publication and illustration of the tomb, see M. Andronikos, *Vergina: the royal tombs and the ancient city* (Athens 1984) particularly 102-119.

² For bibliography on the finds at Vergina, see Andronikos, 238-239 and E.N. Borza, *In the shadow of Olympus: the emergence of Macedon* (Princeton 1990) 257 n.8.

³ See the accompanying illustration adapted from Andronikos, pp.102-103. In July 1987, when I was able to see the frieze in question, it was extremely difficult to make out the details of the scene. The dogs numbered #6, #7, and #8 in my illustration were at that time the best preserved canine examples.

⁴ In English there is a casual and at times undifferentiated use of the terms 'hound' and 'dog'. Used properly, a 'dog' is a male canine, and a 'bitch' a female one. The term 'dog' is commonly used to refer to animals of both sexes. While 'hound' is used at times in a colloquial or a mildly affectionate manner to refer to almost any dog, a hound is correctly a hunting dog. All of the canines in the Vergina frieze are generically dogs, and specifically hounds.