

## LYCOPHRON'S *ALEXANDRA*, THE ROMANS AND ANTIOCHUS III

KENNETH R. JONES  
*Baylor University\**

**Abstract:** Much of the debate over the authorship and composition date of the *Alexandra* has focused on the so-called 'Roman Passages' (lines 1226–82 and 1446–50). Though attributed to Lycophron, a scholar-poet in the court of Ptolemy II, many scholars, ancient and modern, have questioned whether the extravagant terms used to describe Roman power are appropriate for the early third century BC. Scholars have mostly either settled for the traditional date and assign the 'Roman Passages' to the aftermath of the Pyrrhic War or they have dated the passages to the time of the Second Macedonian War. This article offers a new context for the material on Rome, namely the Antiochene War. The new dating is based on the appearance of similar themes in the *Alexandra* and accounts, both historical and propagandistic, of the Antiochene War. These themes, which include Rome's Trojan origins, the conflict of Europe and Asia, and Rome's conquest of the world, are absent from accounts of the Pyrrhic and Second Macedonian Wars. After establishing a date in the aftermath of the Antiochene War, this article identifies the shadowy figures mentioned in the second 'Roman Passage'.

**Keywords:** Lycophron, *Alexandra*, Antiochus III, Antiochene War

Tradition assigns the *Alexandra* to Lycophron of Chalcis, a scholar active in the court of Ptolemy Philadelphus, whose writings included many tragedies and a work on comedy (Περὶ κωμωδίας).<sup>1</sup> Already in antiquity there were some questions raised about the extravagant terms in which Roman power is described in the poem. A scholiast commented that such an appreciation of Roman power would be impossible in the court of Ptolemy Philadelphus and therefore doubted the authorship of Lycophron of Chalcis, suggesting that another Lycophron composed the poem.<sup>2</sup>

The Roman material is confined to two sections (1226–82 and 1446–50), dubbed the 'Roman Passages'. The first one recounts the adventures of Aeneas and the fortunes of his descendants. The second serves as the culmination of Cassandra's prophecy concerning the conflict between Europe and Asia, which takes up the last section (1283–1450) of the *Alexandra*. This second Roman Passage is inseparable from the preceding lines (1435–45) which recount the activities of Alexander and his successors. Together they form a final prophecy to the poem.

The Roman Passages and the final prophecy have been at the centre of scholarly debates over the authorship, composition date and aims of the *Alexandra*. Since the 'Lycophron Question' was renewed in the 18th century, three main positions have emerged.<sup>3</sup> The so-called 'Conservative Unitarians' – to use Stephanie West's designations – accept the traditional dating and read the

\* K\_R\_Jones@baylor.edu. I would like to thank Professors Erich S. Gruen and R. Alden Smith, who read and commented on an earlier version of this article. I would also like to thank the present and previous editors of the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* and the anonymous reviewers for many suggestions that strengthened the case presented here.

<sup>1</sup> Luc. *Lex.* 25; *Suid.* s.v. Λυκόφρων. The 12th-century polymath Johannes Tzetzes also accepts it as Lycophron's work in his commentary on the poem; see E. Scheer, *Lycophronis Alexandra* (2 vols) (Berlin 1881–1908; 2nd edition 1958), with Tzetzes' commentary in the second volume.

<sup>2</sup> Schol. in Lyc. *Alex.* 1226: ἐντεῦθεν περὶ Ῥωμαίων λέγει καὶ Λυκόφρωνος ἑτέρου νομιστέον εἶναι τὸ ποίημα, οὐ τοῦ γράψαντος τὴν τραγωιδίαν. συνήθης γὰρ ὦν τῷ Φιλαδέλφῳ οὐκ ἂν περὶ Ῥωμαίων διελέγετο.

<sup>3</sup> For summary treatments of the main lines of debate and earlier bibliography, see S. West, 'Lycophron italicised', *JHS* 104 (1984) 127–30; S. West, 'Lycophron's *Alexandra*: something old and something new', in J.A. López Férez (ed.), *Mitos en la literatura griega helenística e imperial* (Madrid 2003) 79–84; A. Hurst, *Lycophron, Alexandra* (Paris 2008) xiii–xxv. G. Schade, *Lycophrons 'Odyssee': Alexandra 648–819* (Berlin and New York 1999) 220–28, provides a useful chart of the solutions proposed by scholars from 1788 to 1991.

poet's treatment of Rome in the context of the war with Pyrrhus (280–275 BC) and the diplomatic exchange between Alexandria and Rome in 273. The 'Radical Unitarians' accept the integrity of the poem, but argue for a later date, with the majority placing the Roman material in the context of the Second Macedonian War (200–197). Finally, the 'Analysts' usually accept the traditional date and authorship for the majority of the poem, but credit a later interpolator with items that seem anachronistic for the early third century.<sup>4</sup>

In the present paper I shall offer a fresh solution to the interpretation of the Roman Passages by placing them in the context of Rome's war against Antiochus III (192–188). By necessity this argument will require the rejection of the traditional dating of the poem as a whole to the early third century.<sup>5</sup> I shall refrain, however, from joining either of the remaining camps of 'Radical Unitarians' or 'Analysts'.<sup>6</sup> It is not the purpose of this paper to determine the integrity of the *Alexandra*, but only the historical context of the Roman Passages.<sup>7</sup>

Before proceeding it would be useful to outline the main points in the Roman Passages which require interpretation. As noted above, the first passage deals with Aeneas and his descendants. It begins with a prophecy in which Cassandra foretells the future glory of her descendants (1226–30):

γένους δὲ πάππων τῶν ἐμῶν αὐθις κλέος  
 μέγιστον αὐξήσουσιν ἄμιναμοί ποτε,  
 αἰχμαῖς τὸ πρωτόλειον ἄραντες στέφος,  
 γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης σκῆπτρα καὶ μοναρχίαν  
 λαβόντες.<sup>8</sup>

The second Roman Passage makes up part of Cassandra's concluding prophecy which foretells the end of the conflict between Europe and Asia at the hands first of Alexander and then of the Romans (1435–50):

<sup>4</sup> The analytical position, especially popular during the 19th century, was revived by P.M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (3 vols) (Oxford 1972) 2.1065–67, n.331, though he subsequently rejected it; see P.M. Fraser, 'Lycophron on Cyprus', *Report of the Department of Antiquities, Cyprus* (1979) 341–43. The greatest champion of interpolation in recent years has been S. West, 'Notes on the text of Lycophron', *CQ* 33 (1983) 122–31, where she suggested an interpolator during the reign of Augustus; and S. West (n.3 1984) 127–51. Y. Durbec, 'La prophétie de Cassandre: le kleos dans l'*Alexandra* de Lycophron', *PP* 62 (2007) 430–40 and 'L'*Alexandra* de Lycophron, un drame en cinq actes: questions de structure', *PP* 63 (2009) 429–36, has recently offered strong arguments on literary and structural grounds against interpolation.

<sup>5</sup> As West (n.3 1984) 129 notes, the burden of proof falls on those who reject the traditional dating of the entire poem to the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus. The traditional dating continues to find wide support as can be seen from its acceptance by G. Lambin, *L'Alexandra de Lycophron* (Rennes 2005) 20–30; Hurst (n.3) vi–xxv. As noted by West (n.3 2003) 84, some of the appeal of this solution can be attributed to the vigorous defence of the traditional dating by A. Momigliano, 'Terra Marique',

*JRS* 32 (1942) 53–64. Momigliano's defence is especially seductive as it offers an apparently solid historical foundation for the poet's admiration for Rome. To my knowledge, Momigliano's historical arguments have never been refuted. Since my own proposal dating the Roman Passages to the war against Antiochus III will rely heavily on historical arguments it is appropriate to devote some space in the present paper to a full examination and refutation of Momigliano's arguments.

<sup>6</sup> Interpretations other than the traditional one will not be treated in full, but rather specific points and rival solutions will be dealt with as they are relevant to my own arguments.

<sup>7</sup> In keeping with this approach, I shall avoid the terminology used by West to denote the different schools of thought on the poem's integrity and date. Rather I shall refer to the various proposals by the context in which the Roman Passages are placed, thus: the Pyrrhus Hypothesis, the Philip V Hypothesis, the Augustus Hypothesis and the Antiochus III Hypothesis.

<sup>8</sup> 'And the fame of the race of my ancestors shall hereafter be exalted to the highest by their descendants, who shall with their spears win the foremost crown of glory, obtaining the sceptre and monarchy of earth and sea' (translation: A.W. Mair, Loeb).

πολλοὶ δ' ἀγῶνες καὶ φόνοι μεταίχμιοι  
 λύσουσιν ἀνδρῶν οἱ μὲν ἐν γαίαι πάλας  
 δειναῖσιν ἀρχαῖς ἀμφιδηριωμένων,  
 οἱ δ' ἐν μεταφρένοισι βουστρόφοις χθονός,  
 ἕως ἂν αἶθων εὐνάσῃ βαρὺν κλόνον,  
 ἀπ' Αἰακοῦ τε κάπῳ Δαρδάνου γεγῶς  
 Θεσπρωτὸς ἄμφω καὶ Χαλαστραῖος λέων,  
 πρηνῆ θ' ὁμαίμων πάντα κυπῶσας δόμον  
 ἀναγκάσῃ πτήξαντας Ἀργείων πρόμους  
 σῆναι Γαλάδρας τὸν στρατηλάτην λύκον  
 καὶ σκῆπτρ' ὀρέξαι τῆς πάλαι μοναρχίας.  
 ὧι δὴ μεθ' ἕκτην γένναν αὐθαίμων ἐμὸς  
 εἷς τις παλαιστής, συμβαλὼν ἀλκὴν δορὸς  
 πόντου τε καὶ γῆς κείς διαλλαγὰς μολῶν,  
 πρέσβιστος ἐν φίλοισιν ὑμνηθήσεται,  
 σκύλων ἀπαρχὰς τὰς δορικτήτους λαβῶν.<sup>9</sup>

There are several interpretive questions that any hypothesis seeking to solve the Roman Question must address. There are two primary questions: what is the significance of the formula γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης σκῆπτρα καὶ μοναρχίαν (1225) and at what point in Rome's history would this be an appropriate description of Roman might? After answering these central questions we can turn to secondary questions which deal with the identification of specific figures in Cassandra's final prophecy: Who are the Argives (1443)? Who is the Wolf-general of Galadra (1444)? With whom (ὧι) does the descendant of Cassandra join battle by sea and land (1446–48)? How is the sixth generation (1446) reckoned? Who is the wrestler (1447)?

Before proceeding it is necessary to describe my approach to the Roman Passages. The case for the Antiochus III Hypothesis will not rest primarily on the identification of the particular figures found in the closing prophecy, as listed in the previous paragraph. Any such identification must remain speculative and ultimately is as good as any other speculative identification. The case for assigning the Roman Passages to the context of the Antiochene War will be made on the basis of the themes found in the Roman Passages and more broadly in the final section of the poem detailing the conflict between Europe and Asia. Once the Antiochene context is established on this thematic basis, the identification of the various figures in the final prophecy will be attempted. These identifications will be offered as a way of checking the solution derived from the thematic material. The question for each identification will be: does this identification fit into the Antiochene context? If it does not, this would be a serious difficulty for the dating hypothesis. As I hope to show, dating the Roman Passages to the aftermath of the war against Antiochus III provides the best context for identifying the figures found in the second Roman Passage, while avoiding the problems raised by other solutions.

<sup>9</sup> 'And many contests and slaughters in between shall solve the struggles of men, contending for dread empire, now on land, now on the plough-turned backs of earth, until a tawny lion – sprung from Aeacus and from Dardanus, Thesprotian at once and Chalastraeon – shall lull to rest the grievous tumult, and, overturning on its face all the house of his kindred, shall compel the chiefs of the Argives to cower and fawn upon the Wolf-

general of Galadra, and to hand over the sceptre of the ancient monarchy. With him, after six generations, my kinsman, a unique wrestler, shall join battle by sea and land and come to terms, and shall be celebrated among his friends as most excellent, when he has received the first fruits of the spear-won spoils' (translation: A.W. Mair, Loeb). The Roman Passage proper consists of lines 1445–50.

### I. The Pyrrhus Hypothesis

Momigliano examines the Roman Passages on historical grounds and argues that they fit the events of the Pyrrhic War and its aftermath. First, Momigliano argues that the attribution of rule over land and sea was a commonplace formula of Hellenistic poetic flattery rather than an accurate assessment of a ruler's power.<sup>10</sup> As such, the formula is deprived of much of its meaning. Secondly, Momigliano adduces certain features of the war against Pyrrhus as evidence that Rome met the minimal requirements for application of this formula. Thirdly, having established to his satisfaction the historical context of the poem in relation to the Pyrrhic War, Momigliano proceeds to identify some of the figures mentioned in the second Roman Passage. His argument and conclusions should be briefly summarized.

To demonstrate the weakness of the land and sea formula, Momigliano appeals to a number of Hellenistic poems that used it. His examples include: a poem of Alcaeus of Messene (*A.P.* 9.518.1–2) claiming that the earth and the sea have been made subject to Philip's sceptre; poems by Callimachus (*Hymn* 4.166–69) and Theocritus (17.91–92) employing the formula to celebrate their royal patron, Ptolemy Philadelphus; and poems by Alpheius of Mitylene (*A.P.* 9.526.3–4) and the poetess Melinno (Diehl *Anth. Lyr. Graec.* 2.315–16) commemorating Roman power in terms of mastery over land and sea. In all of these cases Momigliano admits that the claim largely conforms to reality. Consequently, his argument rests on one final poem (*A.P.* 6.171.7–8), the dedicatory epigram of the Colossus of Rhodes, which applies the formula to the island nation, declaring its lordship over land and sea. Even in the wake of Rhodes' successful resistance to Demetrius Poliorcetes, the poem's implied context, this is an excessive statement of Rhodian power. It is this consideration that led Momigliano to the conclusion that the formula was not meant to be taken literally.<sup>11</sup>

In the second part of his argument, Momigliano sets out to demonstrate that Rome had, as a result of the victory over Pyrrhus, achieved sufficient distinction as a naval power to merit use of this formula. According to Momigliano, Cassandra's prophecy that her descendants would join battle on sea and land (1447–48) is justified by the fact that the Pyrrhic War began with a naval incident, Rome's defeat at Tarentum, and ended with the Roman-Carthaginian naval pact. Momigliano judges that the claim of monarchy over land and sea (1229) is justified by Rome's naval capabilities, demonstrated by: Carthaginian acknowledgment of Rome's maritime power in the naval treaties binding the two states (Polyb. 3.22–26); the Roman office of *duoviri navales* established in 311; the naval agreement between Rome and Tarentum before the war; and the Carthaginian naval victory over Pyrrhus as he crossed to Italy from Sicily.<sup>12</sup> Finally, according to Momigliano, the defeat of a Macedonian king meant that Rome had arrived on the world stage and this victory prompted Ptolemy II to enter into a diplomatic relationship with the western power. It was then, in this flush of victory and world recognition, that Lycophron wished to celebrate his royal patron's new Roman friends.

In this proposed setting Momigliano identifies certain figures in the second Roman Passage. The unique wrestler who is celebrated by his friends (1449) is to be understood in reference to the embassies exchanged between Rome and Alexandria in 273. The implied antecedent of the relative pronoun ὅτι (1446) is apparently Macedon. He dismisses the possibility of any definite interpretation

<sup>10</sup> Momigliano (n.5) 61, offers Tarn's definition of naval power in the Hellenistic world: 'What is called the command of the sea at this time only meant that the Power who claimed it had a good prospect, if challenged, of getting a fleet to sea, which might defeat the challenger' (W.W. Tarn, *Hellenistic Military and Naval Developments* (Cambridge 1930) 142).

<sup>11</sup> Momigliano (n.5) 55.

<sup>12</sup> This last item is not, strictly speaking, a Roman naval accomplishment. Momigliano (n.5) 60, seems to suggest that the Carthaginian victory might have been taken as a Roman victory from the Alexandrian vantage point. P. Corssen, 'Ist die *Alexandra* dem Tragiker Lykophron abzusprechen?' *RhM* n.s. 68 (1913) 125, makes this point explicitly.

of Cassandra's reference to the sixth generation (1446), merely noting that it might refer to the six kings of Macedon who followed Alexander (Philip Arrhidaeus, Cassander, his sons, Demetrius Poliorcetes, Pyrrhus).<sup>13</sup> Now that we have summarized Momigliano's case, we may turn to its refutation.

As stated, Momigliano's contention that the land and sea formula need not be a reflection of reality is based entirely on his interpretation of the Rhodian epigram. This poem presents itself as the dedicatory inscription of the Colossus built to commemorate Rhodes' successful resistance to the siege and blockade of Demetrius Poliorcetes in 305–304.<sup>14</sup> The Rhodians' hyperbolic claim to rule over land and sea is so far out of keeping with the reality of the situation that it would seem to deprive the formula of any force. This is true, however, only if we accept the implied date of the poem as the authentic dedicatory inscription for the Colossus. There are compelling reasons to reject this assumption, which can only be summarized briefly here.<sup>15</sup>

There is an obvious connection between the Rhodian epigram and the epigram mentioned above on Philip V penned by Alcaeus of Messene, in which the poet attributes rule over land and sea to the Macedonian king.<sup>16</sup> Scholars have tended to suppose that Alcaeus wrote his epigram in response to the Rhodian inscription.<sup>17</sup> This is not necessary and the dependence could be reversed.<sup>18</sup> The Rhodian epigram is anonymous and the phrases shared between the poems sound rather awkward or bland in the Rhodian dedication.

It should be noted that the Rhodian epigram does not actually lay claim directly to rule over land and sea for the islanders, rather it assigns this role to the descendants of Heracles. The Rhodians did not claim descent from Heracles.<sup>19</sup> Also the assertion of rule over land and sea is closely tied in to the act of liberation. Such language is anachronistic in the late fourth century, but fits quite appropriately with the propaganda of the Second Macedonian War, wherein Rhodes and her Roman allies proclaimed and fought for freedom for the Greeks.<sup>20</sup> Furthermore, the war

<sup>13</sup> This is the solution proposed by Corssen (n.12) 325; and W. Rollo, 'Quo tempore Lycophron *Alexandra* composuerit?' *Mnemosyne* n.s. 56 (1928) 101.

<sup>14</sup> *A.P.* 6.171:

Αὐτῶι σοὶ πρὸς Ὀλυμπον ἑμακύναντο κολοσσόν  
 τόνδε ῥόδου ναέται Δωρίδος, Αἴλιε,  
 χάλκεον, ἀνίκα κῦμα κατευνάσαντες Ἐννοῦς  
 ἔστρεψαν πάτραν δυσμενέων ἐνάροις·  
 οὐ γὰρ ὑπὲρ πελάγους μόνον ἄνθεσαν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν γαῖ  
 ἄβρὸν ἀδουλώτου φέγγος ἐλευθερίας,  
 τοῖς γὰρ ἀφ' Ἡρακλῆος ἀεξῆθεισι γενέθλας  
 πάτριος ἐν πόντῳ κῆν χθονὶ κοιρανία.

'To thy very self, O Sun, did the people of Dorian Rhodes raise high to heaven this colossus, then, when having laid to rest the brazen wave of war, they crowned their country with the spoils of their foes. Not only over the sea, but on the land, too, did they establish the lovely light of unfettered freedom. For to those who spring from the race of Heracles dominion is a heritage both on land and sea' (translation: W.R. Paton, Loeb 1).

<sup>15</sup> I have examined the question thoroughly in 'Alcaeus of Messene, Philip V, and the Colossus of Rhodes', *CQ* 64 (2014) 136–51. What follows here is a summary of the argument presented there.

<sup>16</sup> *A.P.* 9.518:

Μακόνου τείχη, Ζεῦ Ὀλύμπιε· πάντα Φιλίπῳ  
 ἀμπατᾶ· χαλκείας κλεῖτε πύλας μακάρων.  
 χθῶν μὲν δὴ καὶ πόντος ὑπὸ σκήπτροισι Φιλίππου  
 δέδμηται, λοιπὰ δ' ἄ πρὸς Ὀλυμπον ὁδός.

'Heighten thy walls, Olympian Zeus; all is accessible to Philip: shut the brazen gates of the gods. Earth and sea lie vanquished under Philip's sceptre: there remains the road to Olympus' (translation: W.R. Paton, Loeb 3). The connection between the two poems depends on the appearance of the rare middle form of the verb μακυνᾶσθαι in the first line of both, the use of the land and sea formula, and the appearance of the phrase πρὸς Ὀλυμπον in both.

<sup>17</sup> C.F. Edson, 'The Antigonids, Heracles, and Beroea', *HSPH* 45 (1934) 221, sees Alcaeus' epigram as a riposte to what he perceived as the taunting tone of the Rhodian dedication aimed at Demetrius Poliorcetes. The two epigrams received a great deal of attention from scholars during the 1930s and 1940s. In addition to Edson and Momigliano, F.W. Walbank, 'Alcaeus of Messene, Philip V, and Rome', *CQ* 36 (1942) 134–45, and S. Accame, 'Alceo di Messene, Filippo V e Roma', *RFIC* n.s. 25 (1947) 94–105, both studied the poems.

<sup>18</sup> As Accame, (n.17) 96–99, realized.

<sup>19</sup> As A.S.F. Gow and D.L. Page (eds), *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams* (2 vols) (Cambridge 1965) 2.589, point out.

<sup>20</sup> See R.M. Berthold, *Rhodes in the Hellenistic Age* (Ithaca 1984) 102–46 for a discussion of Rhodes' place in the politics of the eastern Mediterranean during the first decade of the second century. On Rhodian and Roman demands for Greek freedom, see Polyb. 18.2.3–4, 44.1–7; Liv. 32.33.6–7; cf. App. *Mac.* 8.1.



was most profitable for the island republic. Not only did the Rhodians regain their possessions on the mainland of Asia Minor, they also became the leaders of a resurrected Nesiotic League. In this context, a Rhodian claim to rule over land and sea, albeit one limited to the Aegean, is not as shocking as it would be for the closing years of the fourth century.<sup>21</sup>

Once we set aside Momigliano's contention that the formula need have only a slight connection with reality, it becomes clear that Roman maritime accomplishments before the first war with Carthage fell far short of monarchy over land and sea. A brief review of Momigliano's evidence for Roman naval strength will demonstrate this.<sup>22</sup> The naval engagement off Tarentum in 282 that ultimately led to the intervention of Pyrrhus was a disaster for the Romans, who lost five of the ten ships that sailed into Tarentine waters (App. *Samn.* 7.1). As for the Roman-Carthaginian naval pact of 279, Roman maritime inferiority is again underlined. According to the terms of the treaty (Polyb. 3.25.1–5), in the event that naval action was necessary against Pyrrhus, the Carthaginians alone undertook to provide the ships required for transport and fighting, regardless of which of the signatories was attacked.<sup>23</sup> As it turned out, the only significant naval operation of the war was a Carthaginian victory over Pyrrhus' fleet as he abandoned Sicily and returned to Italy (Plut. *Pyrrh.* 24; Paus. 1.12.5).<sup>24</sup> As for the *duoviri navales*, the few notices that the office merits indicate that it was *ad hoc* rather than annual and relatively unimportant.<sup>25</sup> Finally, it should be noted that the establishment of diplomatic contact between Rome and Alexandria was probably of much greater significance for the former than the latter.<sup>26</sup>

Another argument against the Pyrrhic War context might be added. E. Kosmetatou has argued persuasively against locating the *Alexandra* in the context of the diplomatic exchange of 273, on the following points.<sup>27</sup> First, such flattery of Rome was totally out of place in the court of Philadelphus and would make more sense during the second century. Secondly, we would expect to find references to the Ptolemies, or at least to Egypt, in a poetic product of the Ptolemaic court (*cf.* Call. *Hymn* 4.166–69). Thirdly, if a poet of Philadelphus' court set out to flatter Rome, it would be odd to find him applying a formula his fellow poets, Theocritus and Callimachus, had applied to their shared patron. It is hard to imagine that Ptolemy II would have looked kindly on one of his poets using the formula of rule over land and sea for an upstart power like Rome.

<sup>21</sup> This view finds striking numismatic confirmation in the Rhodian issue of Alexander-type tetradrachmas in the first decade of the second century. D.V. Sippel, *Rhodes and the Nesiotic League* (Ph.D. Diss., University of Cincinnati 1966) 105–19 and 'The purpose of the Rhodian Alexander-type tetradrachms', *AncW* 12 (1985) 61–68, suggests that the issue was meant to advertise Rhodian power and self-confidence in the wake of the island's successful resistance to Philip's Aegean campaign of 202–200 and her victory in alliance with Rome. See also F.S. Kleiner, 'The Alexander tetradrachms of Pergamum and Rhodes', *Museum Notes. American Numismatic Society* 17 (1971) 95–125.

<sup>22</sup> Two works fundamental to the study of the origins of the Roman navy appeared after Momigliano's discussion: J.H. Thiel, *A History of Roman Sea-Power before the Second Punic War* (Amsterdam 1954) esp. 3–59; C. Steinby, *The Roman Republican Navy from the Sixth Century to 167 BC* (Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 123) (Helsinki 2007) esp. 29–86. Of the two, Steinby tends to overemphasize Roman maritime strength, focusing on Rome's naval aspirations rather than capabilities; for this tendency, see the review of the book by C.J. Dart, *BMCRev* (2009). Neither scholar,

however, paints a picture worthy of the *Alexandra*'s description.

<sup>23</sup> Thiel (n.22) 6, 12–20, consistently interprets the treaties as expressions of Carthaginian maritime superiority over Rome.

<sup>24</sup> The peculiar notion of Momigliano (n.5) 60 that the court in Alexandria may have perceived this as a demonstration of Roman naval might has little to recommend it.

<sup>25</sup> Liv. 9.30.4 announces the establishment of the office *classis ornandae reficiendaeque causa*. The first operation which is clearly under *duumviral* command is the one which ended in defeat by Tarentum (Liv. *per.* 12). The next mention of the office comes from the years 181–178 when its duties consisted mostly of coastal defence (Liv. 40.42.8–10, 41.1.3). The great naval commands of the third and second centuries were in the hands of *legati* rather than the *duoviri*.

<sup>26</sup> See E.S. Gruen, *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome* (2 vols) (Berkeley 1984) 1.62–63.

<sup>27</sup> E. Kosmetatou, 'Lycophron's "Alexandra" reconsidered: the Attalid connection', *Hermes* 128 (2000) 32–53, esp. 34.

In conclusion, Momigliano's historical arguments for placing the Roman Passages in the context of the Pyrrhic War are not very compelling. While it might be possible that the rest of the poem comes from the pen of a poet in the court of Philadelphus, it is unlikely that the Roman Passages do. Either they are interpolations or the entire poem is to be dated to a later time.

## II. The Antiochus Hypothesis

We shall argue in this section that the Antiochene War provides the most fitting context for the ideas expressed in the Roman Passages. The argument will proceed along two main lines. First, it will be shown that themes central to the Roman Passages resonate with ideas and concepts present in the historiographical traditions of the war with Antiochus. These themes include the conflict of East and West, Rome's Trojan origins, and Roman domination of land and sea. Secondly, certain of the figures in the second Roman Passage will be identified with some of the key players in Rome's Syrian War. Where relevant, other theories regarding the dating of the passages and the identification of the figures will be examined and shown to be inadequate.

One of the central themes of the *Alexandra* is the conflict of Europe and Asia. The final section of the poem consists of an expansion of Herodotus' (1.1-5; *cf.* 7.20) tit-for-tat catalogue of the conflict's events. In addition to the Herodotean material, the poem adds the expedition of the Cretans Teucer and Scamandrus to the land that would become Troy (1302-08); the theft of Hippolyta's belt and the rape of Antiope by Theseus and Heracles (1322-31); the Amazonian invasion of Attica (1332-40); Ilus' raid into Thrace and Macedon (1341-45); Heracles' sack of Troy (1346-50); the Tyrrhenian invasion of Etruria (1351-61); Orestes' occupation of Aeolis (1374-77); the destruction of the Carians connected with the founding of Miletus by Neleus son of Codrus, last king of Athens (1378-87); the Dorian settlement of Asia (1388-96); and Midas' expedition into Thrace and Macedon (1397-408). After an interlude, the poet introduces Xerxes (1412-34). Another brief interlude precedes the introduction of Alexander and, finally, the Romans as the culmination of the struggle between Europe and Asia (1439-50). Thus the second Roman Passage comes as the final volley in the centuries-long battle between East and West.

The same theme features prominently in historiographical and literary traditions of the Antiochene War, going back to the diplomatic exchanges which preceded the war itself. The application of the Europe and Asia theme to the Antiochene War arose naturally from the main point of contention between Rome and Antiochus, namely the division of spheres of influence deemed proper by the Romans for each. As the diplomatic exchanges both before and during the war demonstrate, it was Antiochus' refusal to honour the boundary set by the Romans between the two continents that provoked war.<sup>28</sup> It seems most natural, in the Greek mindset, that the real issues of the war would lead some to think of it in terms of the long conflict between Europe and Asia. There is some evidence that Antiochus himself made use of this theme in his wartime propaganda.<sup>29</sup>

The historiographical use of the theme of Europe and Asia is paralleled by Antisthenes' account (*apud* Phlegon of Tralles *Mirabilia* 3) of some prophecies delivered in the setting of the wars

<sup>28</sup> Polyb. 18.47.1-3; Liv. 33.34.1-4 (Flamininus cautions Antiochus against crossing into Europe); Polyb. 18.50; Liv. 33.39 (Romans view Antiochus' crossing as tantamount to a declaration of war); Liv. 34.58.1-3; Diod. 28.15 (Flamininus offers Antiochus a free hand in Asia, if he stays out of Europe); Polyb. 21.14.4-6; Liv. 37.35.5-7 (after Thermopylae Antiochus asks that the Romans content themselves with Europe while leaving Asia to him). Though Flamininus' offer is missing in Polybius' account, the parallels between Livy and Diodorus suggest

a Polybian original; thus J. Briscoe, *A Commentary on Livy Books XXXI-XXXIII* (Oxford 1973) 137.

<sup>29</sup> Antiochus' ambassadors to the Achaean League described Antiochus and his army in terms reminiscent of Herodotus' Xerxes and the catalogue of his forces (Liv. 35.48.3-9). Plutarch's report (*Tit.* 17.7; *cf. Mor.* 197C) of Flamininus' riposte to Antiochus' rather surprising self-characterization suggests a Polybian original; thus J. Briscoe, *A Commentary on Livy Books XXXIV-XXXVII* (Oxford 1981) 231.

against Antiochus and the Galatians.<sup>30</sup> There is some dispute as to the identity of the author and the composition date of the text, with the majority of scholars placing it in the context of the wars to which it refers, making it roughly contemporary with Polybius.<sup>31</sup>

The theme of conflict between Asia and Europe (or Italy) runs throughout the prophecies. In one (*FGrHist* 257 F36 III.7), the Roman army is told that a king of Asia will cross the Hellespont and invade Italy with an army drawn from every part of Asia and Europe. In another (*FGrHist* 257 F36 III.8) the Romans are promised that just as they defeated the Galatians and led their women, children and goods into Europe, so too would they one day see their wealth, children and wives led into Asia. A concluding prophecy (*FGrHist* 257 F36 III.9) foretells that an army will cross over from Asia to make war on Europe. It is especially interesting to see in Antisthenes the combination of the Europe and Asia theme with prophecy.

The appearance of this theme in works written in the decades immediately following the Antiochene War makes it quite possible that the Roman Passages of the *Alexandra* come from the same period. Furthermore, the use of this theme in the poem makes it unlikely that it was composed in reference to the Second Macedonian War, as many scholars have suggested.<sup>32</sup> The literary and historiographical traditions relating to the war against Philip V have nothing to suggest that this theme played any part in either the propaganda or later understanding of the war.<sup>33</sup>

A second theme found in both the Roman Passages and the literary traditions of the Antiochene War is the kinship connection between Troy and Rome. This connection appears three times (1226, 1232 and 1446) in the Roman Passages. The same theme played a role in Roman propaganda during the war with Antiochus, especially once Roman forces had crossed over into Asia Minor. When they first arrived in Asia the Romans visited Ilium where L. Scipio offered a sacrifice at the Temple of Athena Ilias. Livy (37.37.2–3) records that the people of Ilium showed the Romans great honour and proclaimed them as their descendants (*cf.* Just. *Epit.* 31.8.1–4). The Treaty of Apamea (Liv. 38.39.10) contained provisions beneficial to the people of Ilium, who were given the towns of Rhoeteum and Gergithus. Dardanus was also liberated in recognition of its kinship connection with Rome. Though there is no further mention of this theme in the historical accounts, it seems that Roman posturing made a strong impression on the author of the Roman Passages.

The final theme shared by the Roman Passages and the literary traditions of the Antiochene War is that of rule over land and sea. It is helpful to pay close attention to the exact wording of the poet's use of the formula. In the first Roman Passage, Cassandra prophesies that the Romans will

<sup>30</sup> The text can be found at *FGrHist* 257 F36 III. For discussion and bibliography, see J.-D. Gauger, 'Phlegon von Tralleis, mirab. III.', *Chiron* 10 (1980) 225–61.

<sup>31</sup> For arguments favouring a composition in the aftermath of the Antiochene and Galatian wars, see *FGrHist* IID, 4.844–46; E. Schwartz, 'Antisthenes (9)', *RE* 1.2537–38; M. Holleaux, 'Sur un passage de Phlégon de Tralles', *RPh* 56 (1930) 305–09; J.-L. Ferrary, *Philhellénisme et impérialisme: aspects idéologiques de la conquête romaine du monde hellénistique* (Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 271) (Rome 1988) 238–64. A significant minority opinion prefers a Mithridatic context; first proposed by E. Zeller, 'Über Antisthenes aus Rhodos', *Sitzungsberichte der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Klasse für Sprache, Literatur und Kunst* (1883) 1071–73 and recently revived by Gauger (n.30) 241–44; J.-D. Gauger, 'Orakel und Brief: Zu zwei hellenistischen Formen geistiger Auseinandersetzung mit Rom', in C. Schubert, K. Brodersen and U. Huttner (eds), *Rom und der griechische Osten* (Stuttgart 1995) 57. Against the

Mithridates Hypothesis, see Ferrary (n.31) 254–47. The main difficulty for this theory is the identification of the 'Epirot ruler' (κοίρανον Ἠπειρωτῆτην) with whom the king of Asia will ally against Italy (*FGrHist* 257 F36 III.7). Whether taken literally or figuratively, it is difficult to identify what possible candidate an author writing in the 80s might have had in mind.

<sup>32</sup> B.G. Niebuhr, 'Ueber das Zeitalter Lykophrons des Dunkeln', *RhM* 1 (1827) 108–17 = *Kleine Historische und Philologische Schriften* (2 vols) (Bonn 1828–1843) 1.438–50; K. Ziegler, 'Lykophron', *RE* 13.2.2354–81; S. Josifovic, 'Lykophron', *RE Supplement* 11.925–30; K.J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte* (4 vols; 2nd edition) (Strassburg 1912–1927) 4.2.568–74.

<sup>33</sup> In *A.Pl.* 5 Alcaeus of Messene contrasts the intentions of Xerxes and Flamininus in leading their respective armies into Greece; the former came to enslave Europe, the latter to liberate Greece. There is nothing, however, to suggest the Europe versus Asia theme, especially in the case of Flamininus.



win the crown of glory with their spears and acquire the sceptre and monarchy of land and sea (1229: γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης σκῆπτρα καὶ μοναρχίαν). Though the land and sea formula appears a number of times in Hellenistic poetry, as we have seen, its pairing with monarchy is found only here. This seems to indicate something grander than the usual control of land and sea. Rather the poet appears to suggest that Rome will be the sole mistress of land and sea, in other words, of the entire world. In the second passage, Cassandra predicts that the Romans will cross spears with the successor of the Wolf-general of Galadra by land and sea and reach an agreement (1447–48: συμβαλὼν ἀλικὴν δορὸς πόντου τε καὶ γῆς). This must be a reference to the events of the actual conflict between Rome and the Wolf-general's successor. It appears that the war will be notable both for its land battles and its naval engagements.

We shall examine the second point first. In keeping with the phrasing of the formula in the second Roman Passage (1447–48), the Antiochene War did have an important naval element. The war was resolved in two naval engagements, Cissus and Myonessus, and two major battles on land, Thermopylae and Magnesia. The Roman fleet was under the command of the praetors C. Livius Salinator (191) and L. Aemilius Regillus (190). The latter's victory at Myonessus was so conspicuous that he celebrated a naval triumph upon his return to Rome in 189.<sup>34</sup> Given the necessity of bringing the Roman army across the Hellespont into Asia, naval superiority in this war was paramount.<sup>35</sup>

Cassandra's emphasis on both the maritime and land components of the war weakens the Philip V Hypothesis, for the Second Macedonian War had no memorable naval battles to complement Flamininus' victory at Cynoscephalae. Indeed, any possible war at sea was precluded by the fact that the Macedonian fleet spent the entire war docked at Demetrias. The wartime exploits of the Roman navy are hardly worth noting: Carystus ravaged, Eretria compelled to surrender and the Achaeans pressured into joining the Romans by a fleet anchored off Cenchreae.<sup>36</sup>

Now we turn to the interpretation of Cassandra's prophecy that Rome will enjoy monarchy over land and sea. The necessary implication is that Rome and Rome alone will be mistress of the land and sea. In other words, Rome's dominion will encompass the entire world, with no possible rivals. This theme appears in the historiographical tradition of the war against Antiochus.

In his account of M'. Acilius Glabrio's harangue to his soldiers before the Battle of Thermopylae, Livy (36.17.15) reports that the general declared that victory would extend Rome's empire from Gades to the Red Sea making the ocean its only boundary.<sup>37</sup> According to Livy, Hannibal warned Antiochus that the Romans would follow him to Asia, fighting him on land and sea for the supreme prize, namely dominion over the whole world.<sup>38</sup> In Polybius' account (21.16.8; cf. Liv. 37.45.7–9) of the embassy which approached L. Scipio after Magnesia, the ambassadors called upon the Romans to be magnanimous now that they were masters of the world (τὴν τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀρχὴν καὶ δυναστείαν). After the war was over Rhodian ambassadors to the senate declared, again according to Polybius (21.23.4; cf. Liv. 37.54.15–16), that the gods had subjected the whole world to Rome's dominion (ὑπὸ τὴν ὑμετέραν ἐξουσίαν). According to Livy (38.48.3–4), Cn. Manlius Vulso defended his war against the Galatians by claiming that the extension of Rome's empire to

<sup>34</sup> Liv. 37.58.3–4; see also Broughton *MRR* 1.362.

<sup>35</sup> According to Livy, the Senate had been concerned with naval preparedness against a feared Seleucid invasion of Sicily and Italy already in 192, when the praetor M. Fulvius Centumalus and the previous year's aedile L. Oppius Salinator were ordered to raise a fleet for the defence of Sicily; for sources, see Broughton *MRR* 1.350–51.

<sup>36</sup> For L. Quinctius Flamininus' naval command, see Broughton *MRR* 1.332, 1.334, 1.342, 1.345; for his major campaign, see Liv. 32.16–17, 32.19–23.

<sup>37</sup> Briscoe (n.29) 245 expresses doubts that Livy derived this speech from Polybius based on its absence from Appian's account.

<sup>38</sup> Liv. 36.41.5: *In Asia et de ipsa Asia brevi terra marique dimicandum ei cum Romanis esse, et aut imperium adimendum orbem terrarum adfectantibus, aut ipsi regnum amittendum*. The absence of this speech too from Appian makes it unclear whether a Polybian original stands behind Livy. Appian's inclusion of Hannibalic material elsewhere (*Syr.* 14; cf. Liv. 36.7) suggests that Hannibal played some part in Polybius' account of the war.

the Taurus mountains brought with it the responsibility to ensure that cities and kingdoms have peace on land and sea (*ut pacem terra marique habeant*). Finally, in a speech (Liv. 38.60.5) defending L. Scipio from the Petillii, Ti. Sempronius Gracchus noted the injustice of imprisoning the man who had extended the empire of the Roman people to the most distant limits of the earth.<sup>39</sup>

The Mediterranean-wide significance of Rome's victory over Antiochus must be emphasized.<sup>40</sup> The death of Ptolemy IV in 204 threw the three-party balance of the Hellenistic world into disorder. The two remaining powers, Macedon and Syria, both tried to expand into the vacuum. Philip launched a campaign to restore Macedonian naval supremacy in the Aegean. Antiochus III nursed even greater ambitions, when, after his *anabasis*, he embarked on a campaign to recover Seleucid possessions in Palestine and Asia Minor. After Rome's defeat of Philip at Cynoscephalae, Antiochus accepted the Aetolian invitation to intervene in Greek affairs where he came up against the Romans, fresh from their victories over Hannibal and Philip.

The war between these two belligerents would be no minor affair. It was a clash of the two remaining Mediterranean superpowers. Rome won and extended her hegemony over the entire Mediterranean world. It was with full justice that the poet of the first Roman Passage awarded to Rome not only the sceptre, but monarchy, sole rule, over land and sea.

Neither the Pyrrhic War nor the Second Macedonian War rivalled the war against Antiochus in world significance. Indeed, despite its great importance for Rome and Italy, the Pyrrhic War was a marginal affair in Mediterranean terms. The Second Macedonian War was a much greater event, but the defeat of Philip won the Romans mastery of Europe only, not of the entire world.

The case for locating the Roman Passages in the context of the Antiochene War has been made on the basis of themes found in these sections of the *Alexandra* and in the historiographical and literary record of the war. We may now turn to the task of identifying the figures found in the second Roman Passage and the final prophecy more broadly. It should be remembered that the case for the Antiochus III Hypothesis does not rest on the following identifications. Rather they serve to corroborate the dating proposed on the previous evidence. To review, the figures that need identification include: the Wolf-general of Galadra (1444), the one with whom the Romans join battle after the sixth generation (1446) and the kinsman of Cassandra described as a wrestler (1447).

First, we must identify the figures in the final prophecy who lead up to the second Roman Passage. These include the lion, the Argives and the Wolf-general of Galadra. Most commentators have understood the lion to represent Alexander.<sup>41</sup> The poet describes the lion in two ways. On the one hand, he is descended from Aeacus and Dardanus; on the other, he is Thesprotian and Chalastraean. Alexander's genealogical links to Aeacus and Dardanus come through his mother, Olympias, according to a scholiast (to line 1439). Citing Theopompus and the otherwise unknown Pyrandrus, the scholiast tells us that Alexander was descended from Aeacus through Neoptolemus, son of Achilles, and from Dardanus through Helenus, son of Priam. The other words used to describe the lion are geographical. Thesprotian refers to Alexander's Epirot lineage from his mother; Chalastraean, to his Macedonian lineage from Philip II.

<sup>39</sup> J. Briscoe, *A Commentary on Livy Books 38–40* (Oxford 2008) 176–77, proposes the post-Sullan historian Valerius Antias as Livy's source for the speech.

<sup>40</sup> For an appreciation of the significance of the Antiochene War, see J.D. Grainger, *The Roman War of Antiochos the Great* (Mnemosyne Supplements: History and Archaeology of Classical Antiquity 239) (Leiden 2002) esp. 350–57; A.M. Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East: From Anarchy to Hierarchy in the Hellenistic Mediterranean, 230–170 BC* (Malden and Oxford 2008) 306–41: 'The war that began in 192 with the Seleucid

invasion of European Greece was the crucial system-wide war that established Rome as the sole remaining superpower in the Hellenistic Mediterranean' (307).

<sup>41</sup> A few have identified the lion with Pyrrhus; see the chart in Schade (n.3) 220–28. This would be impossible if the arguments given against the Pyrrhus Hypothesis above are accepted. It should be restated that the solution to the dating question ought to rely as much as possible on evidence from the poem rather than speculative identifications of the various figures.

Regarding Alexander, the poet says that the lion will put an end to the conflict of Europe and Asia. He will overturn the house of his kindred, forcing the leaders of the Argives to fawn on the Wolf-general of Galadra, and transfer the sceptre of the ancient monarchy.<sup>42</sup> Coming as it does as the culmination of the conflict of Europe and Asia, this must be a reference to Alexander's conquest of the Persian empire. Readers of Herodotus (7.61.2–3, 7.150.1–2; cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 80, 176–99) will recall that the Persians are Argives through their descent from Persês, son of Argive Perseus.<sup>43</sup> They are thus kindred to the Macedonian Argead dynasty which traced its ancestry back to a son of Temenus, a descendant of Perseus through Heracles, as Herodotus (8.137–9) records.

What, then, are we to make of Cassandra's prophecy that Alexander will compel the Persians to fawn on the Wolf-general of Galadra? The Wolf-general serves as a bridge between Cassandra's prophecy regarding Alexander and the future of her Roman kinsmen. There is also a connection established between the Persians and this individual. The Persians will be made to cower before the Wolf-general and to fawn on him. Furthermore, they will hand over the sceptre of their ancient monarchy to him. This would make the most sense as a reference to the transference of the Persian empire, from the Achaemenids, through Alexander, to the Wolf-general. The Wolf-general, or his successor, will fight against the Romans. The Seleucid dynasty fits both these criteria. If the Wolf-general is to be identified with a particular individual, the most suitable candidate would be Seleucus I.<sup>44</sup>

An immediate objection presents itself in the fact that Alexander did not name a specific successor, nor was Seleucus one of the key players in the early struggles for power in the immediate years after the king's death in Babylon. There is, however, some strong evidence, both Greek and Jewish, that in retrospect Seleucus and his dynasty were seen as Alexander's principal heirs in Asia.

On the Greek side, Arrian (*Anab.* 7.22.2–5) and Appian (*Syr.* 56) preserve, as a portent of Alexander's approaching death, an incident when his diadem was blown off his head while he was sailing. In one version of the story, it was Seleucus who swam out to retrieve it from some reeds; to keep it dry he tied it around his head as he swam back to the boat. It was at one and the same time a portent of Alexander's death and Seleucus' succession.

On the Jewish side, the books of Daniel and I Maccabees confirm this view. In a dream, Daniel (7; esp. 7.7–11, 7.19–27) sees four beasts come up from the sea. The first is a lion with the wings of an eagle; the second, a bear with three tusks; the third, a leopard with wings and four heads; the fourth was more terrifying than the previous three, and, with teeth of iron and claws of bronze, it devoured and destroyed all that came in its path. This beast also has ten horns, from which another small horn grows speaking arrogantly and making war upon the holy ones. God issues a judgement

<sup>42</sup> There is a textual problem in the passage; for discussion, see West (n.4) 124–25; West (n.3 1984) 137. Whereas the manuscripts read Ἀργείων (1443), a scholiast on the line has Ἀκταίων, i.e. men of Attica. He goes on to identify them as the Persians, appealing to Herodotus' (7.62.1) account of the Medes' descent from Medus, son of Medea and Athenian Aegeus. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos* (2 vols) (Berlin 1924) 2.145, accepts the manuscript reading Ἀργείων. West seems to favour Scheer's emendation Ἀρταίων, based on Herodotus' (7.61.2) claim that the Persians used the term to describe themselves. Since there is no problem with the manuscript reading, despite West's objection in the next note, I prefer to keep Ἀργείων. It should be noted, however, that none of the three readings invalidates the present argument that the poet is recounting Alexander's conquest of the Persians and their subjection to Seleucus.

<sup>43</sup> West, (n.4) 124–25 and (n.3 1984) 137, objects on the grounds that the poet has not prepared the reader to make the jump from Argives to Persians. In fact, the poet has done so when he refers (1413–14) to Xerxes as a giant from the seed of Perseus (Περσέως ἕνα σποράς στελεῖ γίγαντα). West admits this, but finds the case less compelling than another odd equation made by the poet between Agamemnon and Zeus on the grounds that the poet makes the Agamemnon-Zeus equation three times (335, 1124 and 1370), while the Persian/Xerxes-Argive/Perseid equation is made only twice (1413 and 1443). This is not a very persuasive argument.

<sup>44</sup> Seleucus was born in either Europos (Steph. Byz. s.n. Ὠρωπός) or Pella (App. *Syr.* 56 with Paus. 1.16.1), rather than Galadra, which seems from *Alex.* 1341–42 to serve as a synecdoche for Macedon. Through its association with Apollo, patron deity of the Seleucid house, the wolf would be a fitting symbol for Seleucus. Justin *Epit.* 15.4.2–9 preserves a story that Apollo was the father of Seleucus.

against the beast and it is destroyed. Commentators have long identified the fourth beast with the Seleucid empire, with the small horn representing Antiochus IV in his conflict with the Jews.<sup>45</sup> The vision as a whole represents the succession of world empires and presents the Seleucid empire as the immediate successor to the empire that came before, which must be the Persian empire.

The evidence of I Maccabees is more straightforward. The text (1.1–10) opens with an account of Alexander's conquest of the Persians and Medes. As Alexander dies he divides his empire among his officers, who put on crowns and hand their realms down to their descendants. From them a sinful root comes forth, namely Antiochus IV. Like the author of Daniel, the author of I Maccabees presents the Seleucid dynasty as direct successors of Alexander.

The identification of the Wolf-general with Seleucus explains Cassandra's prophecy that Alexander will force the Persians to flatter him and hand over their ancient sceptre. It does not, of course, allow for a Roman connection. We must now turn to the question of the conflict after the sixth generation.

It is here that a difficult problem rears its head, namely the antecedant of the relative pronoun in line 1446. Cassandra says that Alexander will cause the Persians to fawn on the Wolf-general of Galadra (Seleucus), with whom, after the sixth generation, Rome will join battle by land and sea. Rome did not enter into hostilities with Seleucus nor did Seleucus live for six generations. The usual solution is to see the relative pronoun in reference to one of the successors of Alexander and the Wolf-general; though not entirely satisfactory, there is little else that can be done.<sup>46</sup>

There are two ways to calculate generations. One would be to use an average length in number of years. This is the practice of Herodotus, who uses two different lengths: generations of between 22 and 23 years (1.7) and generations of 33 years (2.142). If we take the lower reckoning and calculate six generations from Alexander's death in 323 – if this is the proper starting place – we end up with a date between 191 and 185, which coincides well with the dates of the Antiochene War (192–188).<sup>47</sup>

The other method of reckoning generations finds its most common use in king-lists, though mythological figures can also be used. One can simply count up the number of rulers and use it for generational reckoning.<sup>48</sup> This method was first applied to the *Alexandra* by Niebuhr, though he referred the poet's six generations to the royal successors of Alexander in Macedon.<sup>49</sup> If we apply the method to the Seleucids we arrive at Antiochus III.<sup>50</sup>

<sup>45</sup> For discussion of the vision and its interpretation, see J.J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Minneapolis 1993) 274–324, esp. 319–23.

<sup>46</sup> West (n.4) 125, has objected to this solution as 'impossibly strained', but there is very little else that can be done and the six generations require that the figure represented by the pronoun be much later than Alexander and the Wolf-general.

<sup>47</sup> If the composer of the second Roman Passage did have Herodotus' reckoning in mind, he might have been influenced by the proximity of Herodotus' use of the shorter generational count, which comes immediately after the historian's recapitulation of the conflict between Europe and Asia. Herodotus (1.7) uses this generation length to calculate the duration of the dynasty of the Heraclidae in Lydia.

<sup>48</sup> For this method, see D.W. Prakken, *Studies in Greek Genealogical Chronology* (Lancaster PA 1943) 5–17, 73–101.

<sup>49</sup> Niebuhr, (n.32) 113–14, reckons the generations thus: Philip Arrhidaeus (1), Cassander (2), Demetrius Poliorcetes (3), Antigonus Gonatas (4), Demetrius II (5), Antigonus Doson (6) and Philip V (7). Though he notes

that his reckoning skips Cassander's sons, Pyrrhus, Lysimachus, Seleucus Nicator and Ptolemy Ceraunus, he does not justify this omission. He does not even mention the surprising exclusion of Alexander IV, the only actual heir of Alexander the Great.

<sup>50</sup> The succession runs thus: Alexander (1), Seleucus I (2), Antiochus I (3), Antiochus II (4), Seleucus II (5), Seleucus III (6), Antiochus III (7). There are, of course, various ways to interpret the phrase μεθ' ἑκτην γένναν and compute the years. It is unclear from the poem whether the poet intends to start with Alexander or Seleucus. I have chosen to reckon from Alexander based on an analogous case from ancient literature. Tatian (*Coh. ad Graecos* 36.2) states that Berossus completed his history of the Chaldaeans for Antiochus I, the third successor after Alexander (Ἀντιόχοι τῶι μετ' αὐτὸν τρίτῳ), reckoning inclusively from Alexander. If we continued with the count, Antiochus III would stand in seventh place. The analogy from Tatian is not decisive, but it does not need to be. It is only necessary to show that on some reckoning the poet's phrase can be understood as a reference to Antiochus III, thereby confirming the identification reached by other arguments.



We turn to the last point, namely the identity of the wrestler (1447). One of the strongest points favouring the Philip V Hypothesis is the identification of this figure with T. Quinctius Flaminius, the victor of Cynoscephalae. On the face of it, the description of Cassandra's kinsman is quite fitting for the general and statesman (1449–50).<sup>51</sup> Flaminius' great popularity with the Greeks after proclaiming liberty is well known.<sup>52</sup> As for Cassandra's prophecy (1449) that he would be hymned by his friends, Plutarch (*Tit.* 16) reports that there was a hero-cult in Chalcis that honoured Flaminius down to his own day. The reference (1448) to reconciliation in the poem might recall the lenient terms offered to Philip; whereas the spear-won spoils (1450) well describe Flaminius' magnificent triumph (Plut. *Tit.* 14). The Philip V Hypothesis, however, falters on other grounds, as has been shown above. And, as stated above, the context must be supported by more than the conjectural identification of some of the figures found in the second Roman Passage. The most important thing in identifying the figures is whether or not a suitable identification can be found within a given context. For the Antiochus III Hypothesis there is, indeed, a suitable candidate for Cassandra's kinsman wrestler, namely P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus.

One of the foremost men of his day, by the Augustan age the 'Scipionic Legend' had reached its fullest form with tales of Africanus' divine birth and daily visits to the Temple of Jupiter on the Capitoline to commune with the god.<sup>53</sup> Already by Polybius' time certain elements had begun to take shape, some dating perhaps from the general's own lifetime.<sup>54</sup> Polybius (10.2.2) himself describes Scipio as nearly the most famous man who had ever lived up until that time.

This reputation was turned to good purpose during the campaign against Antiochus. Though Africanus accompanied his brother as legate, the accounts of Polybius and Livy make it clear that Africanus was perceived as the effective leader of the Roman expedition. This is demonstrated by the regularity with which embassies approached him rather than his consular brother.<sup>55</sup> A recurring theme is the trust that Rome's enemies placed in Africanus' reputation for magnanimity in Spain and Africa. Africanus' reputation and diplomatic skills earned him honours and powerful friendships in the East.<sup>56</sup>

The evidence demonstrates that Scipio Africanus was highly regarded among the Greeks. Whether his fame equalled that of Flaminius is beside the point.<sup>57</sup> It is not necessary to show that

<sup>51</sup> Momigliano, (n.5) 59, admits the appropriateness of the lines as a description of Flaminius.

<sup>52</sup> For the points recalled here, see Ziegler (n.32) 2361–63. On Flaminius' popularity, Plut. *Tit.* 10–12; Polyb. 18.46.

<sup>53</sup> R.M. Haywood, *Studies on Scipio Africanus* (The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science 51.1) (Baltimore 1933) 9–29; F.W. Walbank, 'The Scipionic legend', *PCPhS* 193 (1967) 54–69; E. Gabba, 'P. Cornelio Scipione Africano e la leggenda', *Athenaeum* 53 n.s. (1975) 3–17. For the notion that Scipio was semi-divine, born of a god who lay in the form of a serpent with his mother, see App. *Hisp.* 23; Gell. 6.1.6; rejected by Liv. 26.19.7. For visits with Jupiter, see Liv. 26.19.3–6; Gell. 6.1–5.

<sup>54</sup> Polyb. 10.2–20 relates two stories in which Scipio claimed divine guidance from his dreams. The earliest evidence seems to be some disputed lines of Ennius (*apud* Lactant. *Div. Inst.* 1.18.3; *cf.* Cic. *Rep.* fr. 3; Sen. *Ep.* 108.32; Cic. *Leg.* 2.57; Cic. *Tusc. Disp.* 5.49) that may have represented an attempt on the part of the poet to present Africanus as a Hero; for discussion, see Haywood (n.53) 18–22; Walbank (n.53) 57–59. Africanus' reputation for mysticism also seems to have made an impression on Antisthenes *apud* Phlegon

*Mirabilia* 3 (*FGrHist* 257 F36 III), who portrays him issuing prophecies foretelling Rome's doom as divine vengeance for the war in Greece and Asia; see Holleaux (n.31) 306; Gabba (n.53) 7; Ferrary (n.31) 245–50.

<sup>55</sup> Liv. 37.6.4–7; *cf.* Polyb. 21.4 (Athenian embassy); Liv. 37.7.7; *cf.* Polyb. 21.5.12 (Africanus negotiates Aetolian armistice); Liv. 37.25.8–10 (a letter from Africanus and his reputation confirm the allegiance of Prusias of Bithynia); Liv. 37.34.4; *cf.* Polyb. 21.13.9–10 (Antiochus' ambassador meets with Scipio because of his reputation as a commander in Spain); Liv. 37.36.1–2; *cf.* Polyb. 21.15.1–4 (Antiochus' ambassador tries to bribe Africanus); Liv. 37.37.8 (Antiochus attempts to win over Africanus by restoring his captured son); Liv. 37.45.4, 37.45.6 (after Magnesia Antiochus' ambassadors meet with Africanus before the consul); Liv. 37.45.11 (Africanus delivers the terms of peace).

<sup>56</sup> The people of Delos granted him proxeny and a laurel crown (*IG* 11.4.712). Polybius (10.9.3) quotes from Scipio's correspondence with Philip V.

<sup>57</sup> Livy (35.10.5–9) directly addresses the relative reputations of Scipio and Flaminius during the consular elections for 192. His assessment is that Scipio's glory was greater, but men had tired of it, whereas Flaminius' was more recent.



Africanus was perceived as the greater man in the East, only that a Greek poet could refer to him in the terms found in the *Alexandra*. The lines are fairly devoid of individual detail. They speak of a war on land and sea, which works better for the Antiochene War; the fame he enjoyed among his friends, which is equally applicable to either; the settlement that ended the war, which could easily refer to the Peace of Apamea; and the magnificence of the booty won. All of these details rest as easily on Africanus' shoulders as on Flamininus'. There is nothing in the poem that compels us to prefer Flamininus to Scipio Africanus as Cassandra's famous kinsman and there is one point that tells against it, namely the reference to the spoils of war that will be won by the wrestler. It would be rather tacky to draw attention to the plunder carried off by the great defender of Greek liberty.<sup>58</sup>

Two other identifications of the wrestler must be addressed. One scholar has recently offered the same solution to the wrestler's identity as proposed in the present paper, though shifting the context to the Second Punic War.<sup>59</sup> In this solution, Rome's victory over Tyrian Carthage would bring the conflict of East and West full circle with Rome avenging the rape of Argive Io by Phoenician sailors. The suggestion raises certain difficulties. First, Rome champions Troy in the poem, so why would the Trojan settlement be concerned with avenging Argos? Secondly, the theory fails to account for any connection between Carthage and Alexander (the Thesprotian and Chalastraeon Lion of 1441). Finally, if we accept that the Argives (1443) are a mask for the Persians, how does Carthage fit into this? There is no evidence in the historical record that the wars between Rome and Carthage were seen through the lens of the Europe/Asia conflict. Nor could Rome assert a claim to monarchy over land and sea as the result of her victory over Hannibal, when the eastern Mediterranean had yet to interest Rome. It is hard to see how a Greek poet living in an eastern Mediterranean still under the dominance of Macedon and Syria would describe Rome in such grand terms.

Lastly, we must examine the solution put forth by Stephanie West that the Roman Passages are to be assigned to the Augustan Age, with the *princeps* himself hiding behind the wrestler's mask.<sup>60</sup> She notes that the phrase εἰς τις παλαιστής accords well with the unique and hard-won position of Augustus as ruler of the world. Furthermore, the description of the wrestler as πρέσβιστος recalls to mind the connotations of *Augustus* and *princeps*, and fits in with Augustus' preference for vague titles. Additionally, the slogan of 'Peace by land and sea' was a commonplace of the Augustan Age.<sup>61</sup> Finally, West notices the surge in interest enjoyed by the *Alexandra* during the late first century BC. Thus far the hypothesis accords fairly well with the evidence of the poem.

It is when West turns to the identification of other figures in the second Roman Passage that difficulties arise, as she herself acknowledges. The greatest difficulty comes from the reference to the sixth generation. West appeals to a statement in Dionysius of Halicarnassus' *Roman History* (1.3.5) where the historian reckons seven generations of Roman world-domination from the time Rome defeated Carthage and Macedon down to his own day. The lines are redolent with the imagery employed by the poet of the second Roman Passage. The problem, of course, is that there is no reference to Rome's war with Macedon – and it is not clear whether Dionysius has in mind the war against Philip V or Perseus or both – in the second Roman Passage. To overcome this difficulty, West suggests that one or more lines may have been lost after 1441. These lost lines would also explain the identification of the Wolf-general of Galadra, who would be a Roman commander sent out to battle the Macedonians. Finally, they would have provided an antecedent

<sup>58</sup> West (n.4) 127, draws attention to the inappropriateness of this remark.

<sup>59</sup> V. Gigante Lanzara, 'Il tempo dell'*Alessandra* e i modelli ellenistici di Licofrone', *PP* 53 (1998) 410–11; V. Gigante Lanzara, *Licofrone, Alessandra* (Milan 2000) 17–21

<sup>60</sup> West (n.4) 127–29; West (n.3 1984) 146, n.93.

<sup>61</sup> For which West cites Liv. 1.19.3; Aug. *RG* 13; Suet. *Aug.* 22 and the sources gathered by Momigliano (n.5) 62–64.

to the relative pronoun in line 1446, which would be interpreted as a reference to Cleopatra's forces at Actium on the basis that some general indication of Macedonian power is missing. On this reconstruction, the Argives/Actaeans of line 1443 would not be Persians, but the Greeks who came under Roman protection from Philip V.

It is a bold and ingenious solution, but raises the same problem that bedevils the Philip V Hypothesis, namely the connection of the Europe/Asia theme with the Second Macedonian War. As stated above, there is no evidence that the war was seen in terms of the Herodotean theme of conflict between Europe and Asia. Nor is it clear how the proposed subject of the lost line would overthrow the house of his Argive/Actean kindred (1442). West herself backed away from her speculation concerning missing lines, instead suggesting that an interpolator had been rather clumsy in trying to graft the Roman Passage onto the description of Alexander's exploits.<sup>62</sup> Acknowledging the continued difficulty of the sixth generation, West resolves it by suggesting that seven was a symbolic number allowing the interpolator some licence in thus calculating the time which elapsed between Alexander and Augustus.

The Antiochus III Hypothesis does not raise as many difficulties. It allows for a natural identification of the various figures found in the second Roman Passage. The reference to the sixth generation will always be problematic, but the solution I have proposed seems less problematic than others. The particular strength of this hypothesis is its basis in the themes found in the latter part of the *Alexandra* as a whole and the Roman Passages in particular rather than the speculative identification of the figures. That the figures can be identified within the context suggested by the themes, namely the Antiochene War, strengthens the hypothesis. Whether the Roman Passages are the work of the original poet of the *Alexandra*, a conclusion that would require that the entire poem is a product of the second century, or the work of an interpolator, is a question that must be answered by examining the poem in the light of the proposed date of the Roman Passages offered here.

<sup>62</sup> West (1984) (n.3) 146 n. 93.