

## TWO GREEK MILITARY WRITERS IN AELIANUS TACTICUS: EUPOLEMUS OF HYPATA AND EUANGELUS OF TANAGRA

by

NICHOLAS VICTOR SEKUNDA

**ABSTRACT:** The first chapter of Aelian's *Tactics* contains a list, which seems to be in roughly chronological order, of previous writers on the military art. Following Alexander II of Epirus (272–c. 240 BC) and coming before Polybius (200–118 BC), Aelian lists Clearchus, Pausanias and Euangelus. Later in the same list after Polybius but before Poseidonius the Stoic (135–51 BC) come Eupolemus and Iphicrates. This paper attempts firstly, to identify Euangelus with Euangelus of Tanagra, *archōn* of the Boeotian League c. 240–225 BC. Secondly, it attempts to identify Eupolemus with Eupolemus of Hypata, who held the post of *stratēgos* of the Aetolian League in 176/175 BC, fought at Cynoscephalae in 197 BC and was possibly the eyewitness source of information for Polybius on that battle. Other possible identifications of authors in Aelian's list are then discussed.

### INTRODUCTION

The composition of the work usually termed the *Taktikē theōria*, or more simply *Taktika* (BRODERSEN 2017: 10), written by an otherwise unknown author, one Aelian “The High Priest”, known to us as Aelian “Tacticus” in order to distinguish him from other authors of the same name. Whilst it is certainly dedicated to the Emperor Trajan (AD 98–117), it is dated differently by various authorities; to AD 101 (WHEELER 1978: 354), to between AD 106 or 107 and 113 (DAIN 1946: 19), after AD 106 (BRODERSEN 2017: 11), or to circa AD 110 (STADTER 1980: 40). The first Chapter of this work contains a list of previous writers on the military art (at 1, 2; transl. by DEVINE 1989: 44). It runs as follows:

The theory has been elaborated by Aeneas (who also composed a considerable number of strategic books, of which Cineas the Thessalian made an epitome) in great detail, and by Pyrrhus of Epirus, who composed a treatise on tactics, and by Alexander his son, and by Clearchus, as well as by Pausanias, by Euangelus, and by Polybius of Megalopolis, a man of multi-faceted learning and the companion of Scipio, by Eupolemus and by Iphicrates. The Stoic Poseidonius also wrote a tactical theory, and many others, some in introductions, like Bryon, others in large-scale works. All of these we have consulted and consider too commonplace to be worthy of particular mention.

The *Technē taktikē* of Arrian seems to have been composed somewhat later, in AD 136/137 (WHEELER 1978: 354). The first folio of this work is missing, but the corresponding passage (1, 1) is partially preserved, beginning with Alexander the son of Pyrrhus, and repeats the list of the passage in Aelian, but supplying some further information. Arrian adds that the Clearchus named in the list is not to be identified with the Clearchus who was the leader of the Ten Thousand, but another person of the same name; he confirms that Polybius is the famous historian bearing that name; and finally he states that the Iphicrates named in the list is not the Athenian general of that name, but another person.

Both lists seem to be arranged in approximate chronological order. Arrian does not, like Aelian, mention Bryon in his list. It has been suggested (SEKUNDA 1992: 333) that this individual bearing the name Bryon, which is extremely rare, who was a writer of an introductory work on the military art, is to be identified with an Athenian of the same name (*LGPV* II, p. 91 s.v. 1 = ? = 2) active at the very end of the fourth century BC. It should be noted that Aelian adds Bryon to his list, at the end, almost as an afterthought, as a writer of another type of work, shorter and introductory. Therefore, it could be argued, the chronological order of the list is not broken.

The Aeneas named is Aeneas Tacticus, whose only surviving work *How to Survive under a Siege*, was composed in the latter half of the 350s (WHITEHEAD 1990: 8 f.). Cineas the Thessalian, born around 355 BC, who was engaged at the Epirote court, probably made an epitome of Aeneas' works for the needs of Pyrrhus' sons, around 285 BC. He died soon after 278 BC. Pyrrhus of Epirus died in 272 BC: he probably wrote in the 280s BC. King Alexander II of Epirus was born shortly after 295 BC, when Pyrrhus married Lanassa, the daughter of Agathokles tyrant of Syracuse. He assumed the throne of Epirus in his early twenties in 272 BC when Pyrrhus met his death in battle at Argos. He died around 240 (HAMMOND 1967: 590) in his mid-fifties. Polybius was born "it would appear, about 200 B.C., or a year or two before" and he is reputed to have died from a fall from a horse in 118 BC at the age of 82 (WALBANK 1972: 6 f., 13). Poseidonius the Soic Philosopher was born about 135 BC and died around 51 BC.

Of the writers named in the list, five are otherwise unknown to us, and have not been convincingly identified to date: Clearchus, Pausanias and Euangelus before Polybius; and Eupolemus and Iphicrates after.

If more than two centuries of classical scholarship have been unable to identify these five military writers, then it goes without saying that this article does not seek to do more than propose suitable candidates for identification. If the process was that easy or obvious it would have been done a long time ago.

This article proposed one candidate to be identified with Euangelus, who should be placed after Alexander of Epirus but before Polybius, and a second candidate to be identified with Eupolemus, who should be placed after Polybius

but before Poseidonius. The first identification proposed, of Euangelos, I regard as being “possible”, while the second one, that of Eupolemos, I regard as being “probable”.

#### EUANGELUS OF TANAGRA

A firmer *terminus ante quem* is provided for Euangelos by Plutarch, who writes in his *Life of Philopoemen* (4, 4) that the future general of the Achaean League, among other writings, was most devoted to the *Tactics* of Euangelus (τοῖς Εὐαγγέλου τακτικαῖς). The action is set when Philopoemen was a young man, and probably in this section of his *Life* Plutarch relied heavily on the earlier biography of Philopoemen written by Polybius (PÉDECH 1951; cf. WALBANK 1972: 14). Plutarch begins the next chapter of his *Life* with the words “He was now thirty years of age”. Philopoemen was born in 252 BC (ERRINGTON 1969: 246 f.) and so he would have been aged thirty in 222. It seems to follow, therefore, that Euangelus most probably wrote his work in the third quarter of the third century BC.

The personal name Euangelos, spelt either Εὐάνγελος or Εὐάγγελος (the second form tends to be used later on) is not uncommon. The name is overwhelmingly popular at Delphi. *LGPN* (III B, p. 146 Εὐάγγελος) lists more than thirty examples, some undoubtedly referring to the same individuals. Only one of these individuals, however, can be dated before the last decade of the third century BC. Some held the post of eponymous archon at Delphi. Delphi, epigraphically well represented, was a small city-state, however, so one did not have to be a particularly important person to hold the office.

A total of 9 entries under Euangelus are listed in PAULY–WISSOWA (*RE*), of which the first three are given to a god, a hero and a figure of myth, the fourth, fifth and sixth are known from inscriptions to have held the post of archon at Delphi. The seventh held the office of *archōn* at Tanagra. The eighth was a writer during the New Comedy attested in Athenaeus (XIV 644 C). The ninth (KIRCHNER 1909b) is our military writer.

As we have seen Euangelus the military writer is to be placed in the third quarter of the third century BC: a period only very scantily covered by our historical sources. Consequently, perforce we have to search for a possible match for Euangelus in the epigraphic record.

Euangelus is only attested as being the Boeotian federal *archon* in the dating formula of one inscription from Oropus (*IG* VII 322, 1). He is not included in the list of people holding that name in PAULY–WISSOWA, because his name was first read as Euarestes. The name was later correctly re-read as Euangelus by PÉTRARCHOS (cf. ROESCH 1965: 92 f.), and appears as such (Ἄρχοντος ἐν τῷ κοινῷ Εὐαγγέλου) in the corpus of Oropian inscriptions published by PÉTRARCHOS (1997: 116, no. 147). The inscription records a decree of the

Oropians, at that time members of the Boeotian League, awarding *proxenia* to the Athenian Menekles son of Pythodoros. The *stratēgeia* of Euangelus was at first dated to 202–199? BC by ROESCH (1965: 90), but ETIENNE & KNOEPFLER (1976: 313 f., no. 3) later suggested an earlier date. His date is recorded to be ?c. 240–230 BC in *LGPN* (III B, p. 146, no. 1).

There are good reasons to think that Euangelus came from Tanagra. One Εὐάγγελος Βοιωτίας ἐκ Τανάγρας is awarded a *proxenia* at Delphi (*FD* III (3) 104) in an inscription which is dated to the archonate of Aristion. The archonate of Aristion was formerly dated to 215/214 (?) BC by FLACELIÈRE (1937: 486, II, 80), but subsequently to 256/255 (?) BC by DAUX (1943: 37, no. G 22), which dating is followed in *LGPN* (III B, p. 146 Εὐάγγελος no. 4). The dating of the archonate of Aristion, however, remains uncertain.

ETIENNE and KNOEPFLER (1976: 314, n. 186) have already drawn attention to the possibility that this individual, Euangelus of Tanagra, is to be identified with the Boeotian federal *archōn* Euangelus. The patronymic of Euangelus is, unfortunately, damaged in the inscription, which complicates the identification of other members of his family. BOURGUET read ΙΙΝΩ and proposed the restoration Πίνω[νος]? The inscription is reported to be now completely illegible (ROESCH 1982: 456 = *SEG* XXXII 1985, 534).

A tombstone from Tanagra which only bears the name Euangelus carved in epichoric letters (VÉNENCIE 1960: 594, no. 10; *SEG* XIX 1963, 349 k) has been dated to the fifth century BC (*LGPN* III B, p. 147 Εὐάγγελος no. 2). The name Euangelus, without further text, is recorded on two further funerary inscriptions from Tanagra, one (*IG* VII 982), written in the form Εὐάνγγελος, has been dated tentatively to the third century BC (*LGPN* III B, p. 147 Εὐάνγγελος no. 3), the other (*IG* VII 981), written in the form Εὐάγγελος, to the second or first centuries BC (*LGPN* III B, p. 146 Εὐάγγελος no. 5). All three individuals could belong to different generation of the same family.

One Euangelus is attested as a local *archōn* (Εὐανγέλω ἄρχοντος) in an inscription (*IG* VII 508, 6) from Tanagra dating to the late third century BC. This Euangelus was one of the individuals bearing this name listed in PAULY–WISSOWA, referred to above (KIRCHNER 1909a). The inscription records the award of *proxenia* to Xanthippos son of Kendebas, a Pisidian (Ξάνθιππον Κενδήρα Πισίδαν).

ETIENNE & KNOEPFLER (1976: 314, n. 186) have connected the two homonymous individuals, and remarked: “On aurait donc le cas vraisemblable d’un archonte local devenant archonte fédéral”. FOSSEY (1984: 124, no. 6) assigned this inscription, on the basis of the letter forms used, to his Group A, which he dated to the period c. 245/240–c. 210 BC, and the archonate of Euangelus to around 240–210 BC. The inscription is dated to c. 240–225 BC in *LGPN* (III B, p. 146 Εὐάγγελος no. 4). In other words this Euangelus meets the dating criteria for the Euangelus mentioned by Aelian in his list of military writers.

This inscription (*IG VII 508*) is carved on the left side of a marble base. On the right side of the same base is carved *IG VII 507*, which also records the award of the *proxenia* of the city of Tanagra, this time to Sosibios son of Dioskourides of Alexandria. The same individual is honoured with an award of *proxenia* in the city of Orchomenus (*IG VII 3166*, 3–4), and is honoured with a statue, along with Agathoboulus son of Neon also an Alexandrian, at Cnidus (*OGIS 79*). Agathoboulus son of Neon an Alexandrine (*PP IV 15784*) is otherwise unknown.

It seems to have been FOU CART (1880: 98) who first identified the individual honoured with the *proxenia* at Tanagra and Orchomenus with Sosibios the minister of Ptolemy IV Philopator (222–205 BC), on whom see WALBANK (1957: 567), and noted that the kings of Egypt raised considerable forces of mercenary troops in Greece for the Fourth Syrian War that started in 219 BC and culminated in the Battle of Raphia in 217 BC. “Ces rapports entre les rois d’Égypte et les Béotiens furent peut-être l’occasion des deux décrets de Tanagre et d’Orchomène” (FOU CART 1880: 98, n. 4). FOU CART also noted that one of the commanders of the troops so raised was Socrates the Boeotian. So the inscription *IG VII 507* probably dates to circa 218 BC.

It follows that the inscription *IG VII 508*, though inscribed on the same block as the inscription which has been dated to 218 BC seems to be somewhat earlier. BARRATT (1932: 111) has demonstrated that “the eponymous magistrates of the Boeotian towns were often men of fifty and more”. Even so the award of a *proxenia* at Delphi in the archonate of Aristion in ?256/255 BC must have come relatively early in the political life of Euangelus. Maybe he was about thirty at the time, in which case *IG VII 508* might have been inscribed about 235 BC, and the federal archonate of Euangelus might have fallen sometime in the 240s.

The Boeotian army was involved in halting the Gallic invasion of Greece in 279 BC. After that military event the infantry of the Boeotian League adopted shields of the *thureos* type from their Gallic opponents. The *thureophoros* was better suited to the tactical needs of many smaller Greek armies than was the less mobile phalangite (MA 2000: 357). Boeotian funerary monuments dating to the second quarter of the third century show *thureoi* and Boeotian helmets (FRASER, RÖNNE 1957: pl. 1.1, pl. 2.4), and Boeotian military catalogues (inscribed on stone stelae) list troops called *θυρεαφόροι*.

At some point towards the middle of the third century BC the Boeotian military catalogues stop listing *θυρεαφόροι*, start listing troops called *πелτοφόροι* instead. This seems to have been noted first by BELOCH (1906: 44), who considered it to be a reaction to the military defeat inflicted on the armed forces of the Boeotian League by the Aetolians at the battle of Chaironeia in 245 BC, which is mentioned by Plutarch (*Vit. Arat.* 16, 1). After studying the catalogues in detail FEYEL (1942: 197) proposed a slightly earlier date: “Donc la réforme de l’armement a dû être décrétée entre 250 et 240. Nous sommes ainsi ramenés à la

date de 245, proposée déjà par Beloch, ou peut-être à une date comprise entre 250 et 245”. ROESCH (1982: 353) suggested that the decision to reform the army was taken in either 252 or 251 BC. On the other hand, following a detailed study of the most recent epigraphical evidence available, KALLIONTZIS suggests that the introduction of *peltophoroi* into the army of the Boeotian league could be as late as the 230s BC (KALLIONTZIS 2020 – *non vidi*; cf. JUHEL 2017: 55).

We do not know what the precise nature of the work written by Euangelus might have been. It is not quite clear from the preface of Aelian whether Euangelus’ work was entitled *Tactica*, as was the work of Pyrrhus mentioned before it in the list, or was a more general work on military theory. On the other hand, Plutarch (*Vit. Philop.* 4, 4) quite clearly calls the works *Tactica*. So, despite the title, the work of Euangelus might have had a broader remit. However, our idea of what a book termed a *Tactica* should contain is based on the works of Asclepiodotus, Aelian and Arrian which are the only works of this genre to have survived before the Byzantine compendia. Perhaps earlier works of this genre were more diverse in their contents. On this point it might be worth quoting the words of WHEELER (1988a: 8, n. 30) “One of the works read by Philopoemen was the *Tactica* of Evangelus [...]. Treatises entitled *Tactica* were not collections of stratagems, but nothing precludes a work of this title from containing a discussion of stratagems or a few examples”. It is tempting to associate Euangelus with the military reforms of the Boeotian League in 245 BC, and to propose that this may have given him the stimulus for writing such a work, but this would be pure speculation.

According to Polybius (V 63, 11–13), Agathokles and Sosibius entrusted the preparation of the Ptolemaic army to Echekrates the Thessalian, Phoxidas of Meliteia, assisted by Eurylochos the Magnesian, Socrates the Boeotian, and Knopias of Allaria, adding the information that these men had served under Demetrius and Antigonos, by which he would mean the Macedonian kings Demetrius II (239–229 BC) and Antigonos III Doson (229–221 BC). Polybius later informs us (V 65, 2) that Socrates the Boeotian was put in command of the 2,000 peltasts. It might have been the case that Agathokles and Sosibios intended to make use of the experience of Socrates gained in training the πελτοφόροι of the Boeotian infantry phalanx, perhaps only a little more than a decade beforehand, and that the presence of Sosibius in Boeotia can be explained by the desire to recruit troops trained in this type of fighting, including Socrates himself and other Boeotians.

This Socrates the Boeotian (Polyb. V 63, 12; 65, 2; SCHOCH 1927) has no obvious connection with the other holders of that name listed in PAULY–WISSOWA. *LGPN* (III B, p. 390) lists 34 individuals holding the same name coming from Boeotia, again with no obvious connection to our individual.

In summary, from the textual evidence in Aelian and Plutarch we can place Euangelus the military writer in the third quarter of the third century BC. As



stated above, due to the lack of historical sources for the period we have to rely on the epigraphic record to provide us with a possible candidate. Around the years *c.* 245/240–*c.* 210 BC Euangelos of Tanagra was appointed *proxenos* at Delphi, held the post of *archōn* of the Boeotian League, and *archōn* in his home city of Tanagra.

Whilst it is true that both the post of federal and civic *archōn* were of a civil and not of a military nature, the elite families of the Hellenistic federal states tended to occupy both civil and military posts alternately. During the Hellenistic period the army of the Boeotian League was under the overall command of a college of Boeotarchs. The federal and civic archonate were both eponymous posts, and this is the reason why attestations of Euangelus have survived at all in the epigraphic record at all. It is highly probable that Euangelus also held the military post of Boeotarch repeatedly during the same period, but attestations to Boeotarchs do not survive as readily in the epigraphic record. No more suitable candidate exists, and if the reader only considers it to be “possible” that Euangelus “Tacticus” is to be identified with Euangelus of Tanagra, the aim of the author will have been accomplished.

#### EUPOLEMUS OF HYPATA

Eupolemus the military writer (JACOBY 1907) comes after Polybius in Aelian’s list. We must, therefore, on chronological grounds, resist the temptation to identify this Eupolemus “Tacticus” with, arguably, the most prominent individual who bore this name, which would be Eupolemus the son of Potalos, who was a *stratēgos* of Cassander, active in Caria and Lycia *circa* 315–313 BC (WILLRICH 1907; *LGPN* IV, p. 134, nos. 3 & 4). This Eupolemus is known from passages in Diodorus (XIX 68, 5 f.; 77, 6), a number of inscriptions, and from the coinage he struck. The most complete treatment of his career is that of DESCAT (1998).

Eupolemus the military writer can, however, almost certainly be identified with a later Eupolemus, a military officer of the Aetolian *koinon*, who is attested as being active between 197 and 170 BC (WISSOWA 1909; *LGPN* III B, p. 163, no. 10; GRAINGER 2000: 171 Eupolemus [5]).

According to Polybius (XVIII 19, 9–11), before the battle of Cynoscephalae in 197 BC Flaminius, the Roman commander, sent a force out to reconnoitre the battlefield, including two Aetolian *oulamoi* of cavalry commanded by Eupolemus. The force commanded by Eupolemus “fought with great vigour” and called upon the Italians to take part in the action. Later, in the opening phases of the battle the Macedonians pressed hard on the enemy, however, according to Polybius (XVIII 22, 4 f.; transl. by PATON, WALBANK, HABICHT 2012: 153):

But the chief obstacle to their putting the enemy entirely to rout was the high spirit of the Aetolian cavalry who fought with desperate gallantry. For by as much as the Aetolian infantry is inferior in the equipment and discipline required for a general

engagement, by so much is their cavalry superior to that of other Greeks in detached and single combats. Thus on the present occasion they so far checked the spirit of the enemy's advance.

WALBANK (1967: 575) in commenting on this passage suggests of Eupolemus: "Can he have been one of P.'s verbal sources for this battle, and especially for those parts where the Aetolians appear in a very favourable light?", and (WALBANK 1967: 580): "It is significant for P.'s sources on the battle that he knows the names of the two Aetolians, but not those of the Roman military tribunes [...] Eupolemus, who had been deported to Rome three years before P. [...]". We shall return to this point later.

Eupolemus the Aetolian is next mentioned in our sources in the year 190/189 BC as one of the officers involved in an unsuccessful operation carried out in defence of the city of Ambracia against a Roman army commanded by M. Fulvius. In this account Nicander the Aetolian is termed *praetor* by Livy (XXXVIII 4, 6). This is the standard Latin equivalent for the Greek *stratēgos*, and so it would seem that Nicander held the office of *stratēgos* of the Aetolian League for the year 190/189 BC. (On Nicander son of Bithes of Trichonium see WALBANK 1979: 83). Later in the account of the siege of Ambracia given by Livy (XXXVIII 6, 5) both Eupolemus and Nicodamus (not otherwise known) are given the Latin term *duces*. Perhaps Eupolemus at least, held the office of *hipparchos*.

Three emancipation decrees from Delphi (*SGDI* 1745, 1863, 1864) are all dated to the year when Eupolemus held the office of *stratēgos* of the Aetolians, and the year in which Xenochares (*LGPN* [volume?], p. 319, no. 10) was *archōn* at Delphi, which had once been put in the year 261/260? BC by FLACELIÈRE (1937: 451, II 37), but was plausibly re-dated to 176/175 BC (?) by DAUX (1943: 51, no. L 23).

The missing *stratēgos* name in an inscription recording a manumission from Phycus in East Locris was plausibly restored by MASTROKOSTAS (*Arch. Eph.* 1955, 52; *SEG XVI* 1959, 355) as:

Στ[ρα]ταγέ[ον]τος [τῶν Αἰτωλῶν Εὐπολέμο] | Ὑπαταίου

on the basis of the ethnic which was still preserved in the second line of the inscription. This restoration was subsequently accepted by KLAFFENBACH (*JG IX* 1<sup>2</sup>, 3672, 27) who dated the inscription to 176/175 BC when Eupolemus is known to have held the office of *stratēgos* for sure.

Eupolemus is later attested in a passage which comes in Livy (XLI 25, 4) dealing with events of 174 BC. In that year, the Romans sent a delegation to deal with *stasis* connected with debt that had broken out at some time previously in Aetolia.

When exiles from Hypata, who belonged to the party of Proxenus, had been promised restoration to their city and a public safeguard had been promised them by Eupolemus, the chief of the city, eighty distinguished men, whom Eupolemus with



the rest of the population had even gone out to meet on their return, although they were received with courteous addresses and hand-clasps, as they entered the gate appealing in vain to the assurances of safety given and to the gods, were slain. In consequence of this a more serious war flared up afresh.

The Proxenus referred to in the text is probably Πρόξενος Τριχονεύς, who held the office of *stratēgos* in the year 183/182 BC (MELONI 1953: 142). The Latin formula *princeps civitatis*, which is used to describe the office which Eupolemus was holding at the time, is equivocal. The translators of the Loeb Classical Library text (SAGE, SCHLESINGER 1957: 271–273) have chosen to translate it as “the chief of the city”, even though they note (p. 271, n. 1) that “Eupolemus was *strategus* in 176–175 B.C., and the trouble may have occurred then, not in 174 B.C., when Livy reports it”. BRISCOE (2012: 132) comments in the following way on the passage:

He was the Aetolian *strategos* in 176/5, but the events here described clearly belong to 175/4 and W–M [WEISSENBORN–MÜLLER], therefore, are wrong to say that the meaning is not “a leading man in the state”. He was evidently himself from Hypata.

So in 175/174 BC Eupolemus was chief magistrate, probably holding the office of *archōn* (MELONI 1953: 142 f.), in his native city of Hypata, and this is what the formula *princeps civitatis* refers to. The personal name Eupolemus is otherwise not attested in Hypata, and so we have no information on his family background.

GILLISCHEWSKI (1896: 55 ff., *non vidi*) suggested that Eupolemus of Hypata had held the office of *stratēgos* of the Aetolians once previously in the year 189/188 BC. KLAFFENBACH in *IG IX (1)<sup>2</sup> (1)*, p. LI, places a prior *stratēgia* of Eupolemus of Hypata in the year 189/188 B.C., whereas he places the *stratēgia* of Δικαίαρχος Ἀλεξάνδρου Τριχονεύς (which is likewise uncertain) in 187/186 BC. The probability of Eupolemos holding the office of *stratēgos* in the year 189/188 BC has been contemplated by WISSOWA (1909; “wahrscheinlich”) and BRISCOE (2008: 38; “probably”), but MELONI (1953: 143) dates the earlier *stratēgia* of Eupolemos a year later in 187/186 BC, following LEVI (1921–1922: 184), who under the year 187–186 notes: “Solo per ipotesi si può riferire a quest’anno la prima strategia del Eupolemo”. Without seeing the arguments of GILLISCHEWSKI it is hard to form an opinion on this matter, but it would appear that there is no real need to suggest that Eupolemus held the office of *stratēgos* more than once. Only the term of office held by Eupolemus in 176/175 BC is certain (thus MELONI 1953: 143, n. 1).

The fact that, indeed, Eupolemus was from Hypata is confirmed by a fifth inscription from Thermus (*IG IX 1<sup>2</sup> 1 4 b, 3–5*) where his ethnic is preserved. This inscription records the award of the *proxenia* of the Aetolians to the Athenian Lysikles, son of Phaidros when Eupolemus of Hypata was *stratēgos*. In a note to this inscription (on p. 6) KLAFFENBACH discusses the reasons why it should

be dated to the putative first period when Eupolemus held the post. I hold that it could as easily be dated to 176/175 BC. Fortunately this question is of but marginal relevance to the identification of Eupolemus proposed in this article.

The political career of Eupolemus came to an end in 171 BC. In a passage covering the events of the year 170/169 BC (WALBANK 1979: 329), Polybius (XXVIII 4, 6) reports that Eupolemus and Nicander had already been deported to Rome. This seems to have taken place in 171 BC (Polyb. XXVII 15, 14; WALBANK 1979: 315 f.), when, following the Macedonian victory at the Battle of Kallinikos, it was alleged that the panic and defeat sustained on the Roman side was due to the Aetolians (Livy XLII 60, 8 f.; transl. SAGE, SCHLESINGER 1957: 479):

And in the conference before the consul each in his own defence assigned the blame to the Aetolians; the beginning, they said, of the flight and panic had been made by them; the other allies from the peoples of Greece had also followed the rout of the Aetolians. Five chiefs of the Aetolians, who were the first said to have been seen turning their backs, were sent to Rome.

The handful of Aetolians exiled in 171 BC probably remained in detention in Rome. Eupolemus must have been well advanced in his middle age at the time of his exile in 171 BC. He may well have been in overall command of the Aetolian cavalry at Cynoscephalae in 197 BC, but is only attested as being in independent command of the two Aetolian *oulamoi* sent out to reconnoitre by Flamininus. It would be reasonable to suppose that he was at least in his early thirties at the time. He certainly held senior military command in operations in Ambracia in 190/189 BC. If he was aged 40 in 190 BC, and in his early thirties in 197 BC, he would have been born about 230 BC.

Polybius, on the other hand, was born in about 200 BC “or a year or two before” (WALBANK 1972: 6 f.). He began his period of exile in Rome together with a thousand other Achaean deportees in 167 BC. According to WALBANK (1972: 8), “His fellows were banished to the country towns of Italy for safe keeping; but [...] Polybius was allowed to remain at Rome”. The Achaeans who were deported numbered two thousand, but only five Aetolians were deported three years before, and there is no need to think that they were transported “to the country towns of Italy for safe keeping”. The two men surely met in Rome. It is hard to think otherwise if the suggestion of WALBANK (1967: 575) that Eupolemus was a verbal source for Polybius’ description of the battle of Cynoscephalae has any merit at all.

Polybius would have been in his early to mid-thirties, Eupolemus in his mid-sixties. As well as the respect bred by the difference in age, Polybius may have had further reasons to treat Eupolemus with respect. Both were writers of works dealing with the military art. Polybius mentions in IX 20, 4 of his *Histories* that he has written a work entitled τὰ περὶ τὰς τάξεις ὑπομνήματα, *An Enquiry into Tactics*. As WALBANK (1972: 33, n. 3) writes, “It is generally regarded that Polybius’s *Tactica* was an early work, written before his exile”, indeed it is “more probable that he

wrote the *Tactics* in the 170's before he was hipparch" (WALBANK 1967: 148). Both men had held commands in the cavalry. Polybius "displays a special interest in cavalry [...]. In his account of Philopoemen's reform of the Achaean cavalry he goes into considerable detail" (WALBANK 2002: 27).

We return to Polybius' account of the Battle of Cynoscephalae, in which Eupolemus fought (XVIII 22, 4 f.; transl. PATON, WALBANK, HABICHT 2012: 153):

But the chief obstacle to their putting the enemy entirely to rout was the high spirit of the Aetolian cavalry who fought with desperate gallantry. For by as much as the Aetolian infantry is inferior in the equipment and discipline required for a general engagement, by so much is their cavalry superior to that of other Greeks in detached and single combats. Thus on the present occasion they so far checked the spirit of the enemy's advance.

Similar sentiments are expressed in the account of the same battle in Livy (XXXIII 7, 13; transl. SAGE 1961: 295), which was based on that of Polybius.

The Aetolian cavalry was the greatest safeguard to prevent their utter rout. At that time their cavalry was by far the best in Greece; in infantry they were inferior to their neighbours.

WALBANK has already suggested that Eupolemus was the eyewitness source on which Polybius based his account. I would further suggest that it was probably under the influence of Eupolemus that Polybius gives such a complimentary account of the Aetolian cavalry. At IV 8, 10 we hear more from Polybius on the subject (PATON, WALBANK, HABICHT 2010: 349):

For example the Thessalian cavalry are irresistible when in squadrons and brigades, but slow and awkward when dispersed and engaging the enemy single-handed as they chance to encounter them. The Aetolian horse are just the reverse.

The context is important. Polybius expresses this opinion shortly before his account of the defeat inflicted on the Achaean forces by the Aetolians at the Battle of Caphyae in 219 BC, in which the Achaean forces were badly handled by their commanders. Polybius had a generally low opinion of the Aetolians (SACKS 1975: 92, n. 1 for earlier bibliography; MENDELS 1984–1986; ECKSTEIN 1995: 212 f.), so one wonders if the conversations held with Eupolemus in Rome might have had some influence on the opinion Polybius expressed on the prowess of the Aetolian cavalry, at least. To some extent Polybius might have been expressing what he took to be a generally known fact (cf. MENDELS 1984–1986: 65). So perhaps we should not exaggerate the influence which I have suggested Eupolemus might have had on Polybius. I believe that the identification of Eupolemus 'Tacticus' with Eupolemus of Hypata to be "probable".

It is only fair to point out that everything points to Eupolemus of Hypata, if indeed he is to be identified with the Eupolemus in Aelian's list, having written

his *œuvre* before, not after Polybius. Polybius seems to have written his *Tactica* in the 170s BC. Aelian may have known that Polybius and Eupolemus were contemporaries, and may have known that the *Tactica* of Polybius was an early work of his. He may have assumed that Polybius wrote before Eupolemus. It is even possible that he did not know who Eupolemus was, although this is difficult to believe.

#### OTHER IDENTIFICATIONS IN AELIAN'S LIST

The aim of this article has been to give plausible identifications to two of the five unidentified military writers in the list given in the preface the Aelian's *Tactica*: three remain; Clearchus not the leader of the Ten Thousand, Pausanias, and Iphicrates not the Athenian general of that name.

It would be tempting at first glance to identify Clearchus 'Tacticus' with Clearchus I the tyrant of Heraclea on Pontus (LENSCHAU 1921). Born 391/390 BC, Clearchus was a pupil of Isocrates and Plato, and therefore highly literate. After being exiled from his home city, he served as a mercenary in Persian service, where he acquired military experience. However, he seized power in Heraclea in 364/363 BC and died in 353/352 BC. Therefore any such identification has to be rejected on chronological grounds, because Clearchus 'Tacticus' comes immediately after Pyrrhus of Epirus and Alexander his son in Aelian's list.

Clearchus 'Tacticus' does not have a separate entry in the *Real-Encyclopädie* of PAULY-WISSOWA. Rather the reference in Aelian's *Tactics* is listed under the entry for the Peripatetic philosopher Clearchus of Soloi, a pupil of Aristotle, by KROLL (1921: 583, ll. 15–18), only to be rejected by the latter, on the grounds that a work of that title is not sufficiently appropriate to be attributed to a philosopher. But other philosophers are known to have written on the military art, and not just Poseidonius; moreover an attribution to Clearchus of Soloi (c. 340–c. 250 BC) would also fit chronologically, just. WHEELER (1988b: 161–165) supports the identification of Clearchus 'Tacticus' with Clearchus of Soloi, pointing out that the latter is known to have written a work entitled Περὶ τοῦ πανικοῦ, of which only a fragment has survived, but which presumably was also of a military nature.

Pausanias comes immediately after Clearchus in Aelian's list, followed by Euangelus and then by Polybius. LORETTO (1995: 569) has tentatively identified the Pausanias 'Tacticus' (LAMBERTZ 1949) with one Pausanias who is mentioned by Livy XXXII 10, 2 as holding the office of *stratēgos* (*praetor*) of the Epirote League for 198 BC (LENSCHAU 1949). This suggestion deserves consideration. Nevertheless, even though the chronology of the list cannot be relied on completely, we would expect Pausanias to have been active sometime in the middle of third century BC, and not during the early second century.

As far as Iphicrates is concerned, we have nothing more for the late second or early first century BC than sporadic occurrences of the name in the epigraphic

record, none of them with any literary, philosophical or military associations. JACOBY (1916) attributes to this Iphicrates ‘Tacticus’ an excerpt from Plutarch’s *Life of Pelopidas* 2, 1 (transl. PERRIN 1917: 343):

For if, as Iphicrates analyzed the matter, the light-armed troops are like the hands, the cavalry like the feet, the line of men-at-arms itself like chest and breastplate, and the general like the head, then he, in taking undue risks and being over bold, would seem to neglect not himself, but all, inasmuch as their safety depends on him, and their destruction too.

This ‘aphorism’, or ‘parable’ as PARKE (1933: 74, n. 2, cf. 113) would have it, is repeated in a slightly different form in Polyaeus, *Strategemata* III 9, 22 (transl. KRENZ, WHEELER 1994: 247):

Iphicrates likened the formation of armies to the body. He called the phalanx a trunk, the light-armed the hands, the cavalry the feet, and the general the head. “Whenever the other parts are missing, the army is lame and disabled. But when the general is killed, the entire army is useless”.

In the *Strategemata* of Polyaeus Iphicrates is credited with 63 stratagems, more than any other general. By way of comparison, Agesilaos is credited with 33, Alexander with 32, and Philip with 22. Furthermore, many of these 63 stratagems are of a very general nature. Perhaps more than the one mentioned above are taken from the manual written by Iphicrates ‘Tacticus’ and do not belong to the Athenian general Iphicrates at all.

*University of Gdańsk*  
*sekunda@ug.edu.pl*

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BARRATT 1932: C. BARRATT, *Chronology of the Eponymous Archons of Boeotia*, JHS LII 1932, pp. 72–155.
- BELOCH 1906: J. BELOCH, *Griechische Aufgebote II. 3. Beotien, 4. Der Peloponnes*, Klio VI 1906, pp. 34–78.
- BRISCOE 2008: J. BRISCOE, *A Commentary on Livy Books 38–40*, Oxford 2008.
- 2012: J. BRISCOE, *A Commentary on Livy Books 41–45*, Oxford 2012.
- BRODERSEN 2017: K. BRODERSEN, *Aelianos: Antike Taktiken, Taktika. Zweisprachige Ausgabe*, Wiesbaden 2017.
- DAIN 1946: A. DAIN, *Histoire du texte d’Élien le Tacticien des origines à la fin du Moyen Âge*, Paris 1946.
- DAUX 1943: G. DAUX, *Fouilles de Delphes, III: Épigraphie, Supplément: Chronologie delphique*, Paris 1943.
- DESCAT 1998: R. DESCAT, *La carrière d’Eupolemus, stratège macédonien en Asie Mineure. Appendice: Note sur une inscription caro-grecque de Caunos*, REA C 1998, pp. 167–190.
- DEVINE 1989: A.M. DEVINE, *Aelian’s Manual of Hellenistic Military Tactics. A New Translation from the Greek with an Introduction*, AncW XIX 1989, pp. 31–64.

- ECKSTEIN 1995: A.M. ECKSTEIN, *Moral Vision in the Histories of Polybius*, Berkeley 1995.
- ERRINGTON 1969: R.M. ERRINGTON, *Philopoemen*, Oxford 1968.
- ÉTIENNE, KNOEPFLER 1976: R. ÉTIENNE, D. KNOEPFLER, *Hyettos de Béotie et la chronologie des archontes fédéraux entre 250 et 171 avant J.-C.*, Athènes–Paris 1976 (Bulletin de Correspondance Héliénique, Suppl. 3).
- FEYEL 1942: M. FEYEL, *Polybe et l'histoire de Béotie au III<sup>e</sup> siècle avant notre ère*, Paris 1942.
- FLACELIÈRE 1937: R. FLACELIÈRE, *Les Aitoliens à Delphes: contribution à l'histoire de la Grèce centrale au III<sup>e</sup> siècle av. J.-C.*, Paris 1937.
- FOSSEY 1984: J.M. FOSSEY, *The Proxenia Decrees of Tanagra*, *Horos* II 1984, pp. 119–135.
- FOUCART 1880: P. FOUCART, *Inscriptions d'Orchomène (1)*, *BCH* IV 1880, pp. 77–99.
- FRASER, RÖNNE 1957: P.M. FRASER, T. RÖNNE, *Boeotian and West Greek Tombstones*, Lund 1957 (*Acta Instituti Atheniensis Regni Sueciae* 6).
- GILLISCHEWSKI 1896: H. GILLISCHEWSKI, *De Aetolorum praetoribus intra annos 221 et 168 a. Chr. n. munere functis*, diss. Erlangen, Berlin 1896.
- GRAINGER 2000: J.D. GRAINGER, *Aitolian Prosopographical Studies*, Leiden 2000.
- HAMMOND 1967: N.G.L. HAMMOND, *Epirus. The Geography, the Ancient Remains, the History and the Topography of Epirus and Adjacent Areas*, Oxford 1967.
- JACOBY 1907: F. JACOBY, *Eupolemus (12)*, *RE* VI 1, 1907, col. 1229.
- 1916: F. JACOBY, *Iphikrates (4)*, *RE* IX 2, 1916, col. 2022.
- JUHEL 2017: P.O. JUHEL, *Autour de l'infanterie d'élite macédonienne à l'époque du royaume antigonide. Cinq études militaires entre histoire, philologie et archéologie*, Oxford 2017.
- KALLIONTZIS 2020: Y. KALLIONTZIS, *Contribution à l'épigraphie et l'histoire de la Béotie hellénistique, de la destruction de Thèbes à la bataille de Pydna*, Paris 2020 (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome).
- KIRCHNER 1907a: J. KIRCHNER, *Euangelus (7)*, *RE* VI 1, 1907, col. 844.
- 1907b: J. KIRCHNER, *Euangelus (9)*, *RE* VI 1, 1907, col. 844.
- KRENZ, WHEELER 1994: P. KRENZ, E.L. WHEELER (ed., transl.), *Polyaenus: Stratagems of War*, vol. I: *Books I–V*, Chicago 1994.
- KROLL 1921: W. KROLL, *Klearchos (11)*, *RE* XI 1, 1921, cols. 580–583.
- LAMBERTZ 1949: M. LAMBERTZ, *Pausanias (20)*, *RE* XVIII 2, 1949, col. 2405.
- LENSCHAU 1921: T. LENSCHAU, *Klearchos I (4)*, *RE* XI 1, 1921, cols. 577–579.
- 1949: T. LENSCHAU, *Pausanias (10)*, *RE* XVIII 2, 1949, col. 2401.
- LEVI 1921–1922: M. LEVI, *La cronologia degli strateghi etolici negli anni 221–168 a. C.*, *Atti Accad. Torino* LVII 1921–1922, pp. 179–185.
- LORETTO 1995: L. LORETTO, *Il generale e la biblioteca. La trattatistica militare greca da Democrito di Abdera ad Alessio I Comneno*, in: G. CAMIANO, L. CANFORA, D. LANZA (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica*, vol. II: *La ricezione e l'attualizzazione del testo*, Roma 1995, pp. 563–589.
- MA 2000: J. MA, *Fighting Poleis of the Hellenistic World*, in: H. VAN WEES (ed.), *War and Violence in Ancient Greece*, Swansea 2000, pp. 337–376.
- MELONI 1953: P. MELONI, *Perseo e la fine della monarchia macedone*, Roma 1953 (*Annali delle Facoltà di Lettere, Filosofia e Magistero della Università di Cagliari*, vol. 20).
- MENDELS 1984–1986: D. MENDELS, *Did Polybius Have 'Another' View of the Aetolian League? A Note*, *AncSoc* XV–XVII 1984–1986, pp. 63–72.
- PARKE 1933: H.W. PARKE, *Greek Mercenary Soldiers*, Oxford 1933.
- PATON, WALBANK, HABICHT 2010: Polybius: *The Histories*, vol. II: *Books 3–4*, transl. by W.R. PATON, rev. by F.W. WALBANK, C. HABICHT, Cambridge, MA–London 2010 (Loeb Classical Library 137).
- 2012: Polybius: *The Histories*, vol. V: *Books 16–27*, transl. by W.R. PATON, rev. by F.W. WALBANK, C. HABICHT, Cambridge, MA–London 2012 (Loeb Classical Library 160).
- PÉDECH 1951: P. PÉDECH, *Polybe et l'Éloge de Philopoemen*, *REG* LXIV 1951, pp. 82–103.
- PERRIN 1917: B. PERRIN (transl.), *Plutarch: Lives*. With an English translation, vol. V: *Agesilaus and*



- Pompey, Pelopidas and Marcellus*, London–New York 1917 (Loeb Classical Library 87).
- PÉTRARCHOS 1997: C.B. PÉTRARCHOS, *Hoi epigraphes tou Ōrōpou*, Athinaí 1997.
- ROESCH 1965: P. ROESCH, *Thespies et la confédération béotienne*, Paris 1965.
- 1982: P. ROESCH, *Études béotiennes*, Paris 1982.
- SACKS 1975: K.S. SACKS, *Polybius' Other View of Aetolia*, JHS XCV 1975, pp. 92–106.
- SAGE 1961: E.T. SAGE (transl.), *Livy*. With an English Translation, vol. IX: *Books XXXI–XXXIV*, Cambridge, MA–London 1961 (Loeb Classical Library 313).
- SAGE, SCHLESINGER 1957: E.T. SAGE, A.C. SCHLESINGER (transl.), *Livy*. With an English Translation, vol. XII: *Books XL–XLII*, Cambridge, MA–London 1957 (Loeb Classical Library 332).
- SCHOCH 1927: SCHOCH, *Sokrates (I)*, RE III 1, 1927, col. 804.
- SEKUNDA 1992: N.V. SEKUNDA, *Athenian Demography and Military Strength 338–322 B.C.*, Annual of the British School at Athens LXXXVII 1992, pp. 311–355.
- STADTER 1980: P.A. STADTER, *Arrian of Nicomedia*, Chapel Hill 1980.
- VÉNENCIE 1960: J. VÉNENCIE, *Inscriptions de Tanagra en alphabet épichorique*, BCH LXXXIV 1960, pp. 589–616.
- WALBANK 1957: F.W. WALBANK, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, vol. I: *Commentary on Books I–VI*, Oxford 1967.
- 1967: F.W. WALBANK, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, vol. II: *Commentary on Books VII–XVIII*, Oxford 1967.
- 1972: F.W. WALBANK, *Polybius*, Berkeley 1972.
- 1979: F.W. WALBANK, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, vol. II: *Commentary on Books XIX–XL*, Oxford 1979.
- 2002: F. WALBANK, *Polybius as a Military Expert*, in: P.R. HILL (ed.), *Polybius to Vegetius. Essays on the Roman Army and Hadrian's Wall Presented to Brian Dobson to Mark His 70<sup>th</sup> Birthday*, [Durham] 2002, pp. 19–30.
- WHEELER 1978: E.L. WHEELER, *The Occasion of Arrian's *Tactica**, GRBS XIX 1978, pp. 351–365.
- 1988a: E.L. WHEELER, *Stratagem and the Vocabulary of Military Trickery*, Leiden 1988 (Mnemosyne, Suppl. 108).
- 1988b: E.L. WHEELER, *Polla kena tou polemou: The History of a Greek Proverb*, GRBS XXIX 1988, pp. 153–184.
- WHITEHEAD 1990: D. WHITEHEAD, *Aineias the Tactician: How to Survive Under Siege*. Translated with Introduction and Commentary, Oxford 1990.
- WILLRICH 1907: H. WILLRICH, *Eupolemus (8)*, RE VI 1, 1907, col. 1227.
- WISSOWA 1909: G. WISSOWA, *Eupolemus (8a)*, RE VI 2, 1909, col. 2878 (Nachträge).