



<https://publications.dainst.org>

iDAI.publications

ELEKTRONISCHE PUBLIKATIONEN DES
DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

Dies ist ein digitaler Sonderdruck des Beitrags / This is a digital offprint of the article

Everett L. Wheeler The Hoplomachoi and Vegetius' Spartan Drillmasters

aus / from

Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **13 • 1983**

Seite / Page **1–20**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/1289/5638> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-1983-13-p1-20-v5638.6

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor

Redaktion Chiron | Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Amalienstr. 73 b, 80799 München

Weitere Informationen unter / For further information see <https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron>

ISSN der Online-Ausgabe / ISSN of the online edition **2510-5396**

Verlag / Publisher **Verlag C. H. Beck, München**

©2017 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Zentrale, Podbielskiallee 69–71, 14195 Berlin, Tel: +49 30 187711-0

Email: info@dainst.de / Web: dainst.org

Nutzungsbedingungen: Mit dem Herunterladen erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) von iDAI.publications an. Die Nutzung der Inhalte ist ausschließlich privaten Nutzerinnen / Nutzern für den eigenen wissenschaftlichen und sonstigen privaten Gebrauch gestattet. Sämtliche Texte, Bilder und sonstige Inhalte in diesem Dokument unterliegen dem Schutz des Urheberrechts gemäß dem Urheberrechtsgesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Die Inhalte können von Ihnen nur dann genutzt und vervielfältigt werden, wenn Ihnen dies im Einzelfall durch den Rechteinhaber oder die Schrankenregelungen des Urheberrechts gestattet ist. Jede Art der Nutzung zu gewerblichen Zwecken ist untersagt. Zu den Möglichkeiten einer Lizenzierung von Nutzungsrechten wenden Sie sich bitte direkt an die verantwortlichen Herausgeberinnen/Herausgeber der entsprechenden Publikationsorgane oder an die Online-Redaktion des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (info@dainst.de).

Terms of use: By downloading you accept the terms of use (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) of iDAI.publications. All materials including texts, articles, images and other content contained in this document are subject to the German copyright. The contents are for personal use only and may only be reproduced or made accessible to third parties if you have gained permission from the copyright owner. Any form of commercial use is expressly prohibited. When seeking the granting of licenses of use or permission to reproduce any kind of material please contact the responsible editors of the publications or contact the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut (info@dainst.de).

EVERETT L. WHEELER

The *Hoplomachoi* and Vegetius' Spartan Drillmasters

Vegetius gives an account of the origins of military theory, in which he states that the Spartans were the first to write on this topic and that they had certain instructors of the military art, *magistri armorum* called *tactici*, for their youth.

*Lacedaemoniis autem praecipua fuit cura bellorum. Primi denique experimenta pugnarum de eventibus colligentes artem proeliorum scripsisse firmantur usque eo, ut rem militarem, quae virtute sola vel certe felicitate creditur contineri, ad disciplinam peritiaeque studia revocarent ac magistros armorum, quos tacticos appellaverunt, inventutem suam usum varietatemque pugnandi praeciperent edocere.*¹

A few lines later Vegetius continues his Spartan theme with two examples: first, the Spartan Xanthippus' training of the Carthaginians which resulted in the defeat of Atilius Regulus in 255 B. C.; and second, Hannibal's employment of a Spartan *doctor armorum*, whose advice enabled Hannibal to defeat the Romans repeatedly. Vegetius (3.17) once again couples the Spartans and the Carthaginians in discussing tactical reserves. It was a Spartan invention, imitated by the Carthaginians and subsequently by the Romans.²

Vegetius' account is riddled with errors. No ancient military treatise (extant or otherwise) is known to have been written by a Spartan. What he says about Xanthippus is correct, only if we give Vegetius the benefit of the doubt and interpret his *triumphans bellum omne confecit* to mean Regulus' African campaign rather than the First Punic War as a whole. Hannibal's alleged Spartan *doctor armorum* probably refers to the Spartan Sosylus, who accompanied Hannibal on his cam-

The following abbreviations are used in the footnotes: ANDERSON = J. K. ANDERSON, *Military Theory and Practice in the Age of Xenophon*, Berkeley 1970; KROMAYER/VEITH = J. KROMAYER/G. VEITH, *Heerwesen und Kriegführung der Griechen und Römer*, Munich 1928; LAUNEY = M. LAUNEY, *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques*, BEFAR 169, Paris 1949; PRITCHETT = W. K. PRITCHETT, *The Greek State at War*, II, Berkeley 1974; VERNANT = J.-P. VERNANT, *Problèmes de la guerre en Grèce ancienne*, *Civilisations et Société* 11, Paris 1968.

¹ Veg. 3 praef. cf. 1.8: *Lacedaemonii quidem et Athenienses aliique Graecorum in libris retulere complura quae tactica vocant.*

² Veg. 3.17: *Hoc primi Lacones invenerunt, imitati sunt Karthaginienses, Romani postea ubique servarunt.* Cf. 3.10: *Hanc [scil. artem bellicam] quondam relictis doctrinis omnibus Lacedaemonii et postea coluere Romani.*

paigns, later wrote a history of Hannibal in seven books, and was said to have taught Hannibal Greek.³ There is no evidence to support Vegetius' view of Sosylus as a military adviser. Similarly, the concept of a tactical reserve was not exclusively a Spartan idea, but rather evolved from the time of the Peloponnesian War on.⁴

Nevertheless, we cannot say that the legends of the Spartan origins of military theory and the Spartan drillmasters are a figment of Vegetius' imagination. The use of *firmantur* and the references to epitomizing demonstrate that Vegetius has taken this information from another source,⁵ which apparently stressed a tradition that both the Carthaginians and the Romans shared the original Spartan military doctrine. Spartan *magistri armorum* or *tactici* were its propagators, and Xanthippus and allegedly Sosylus provided the Spartan-Carthaginian link.

The real origins of Western military theory are connected with itinerant Greek drillmasters of the fifth and fourth centuries B. C. – the *hoplomachoi*.⁶ Thus the task of this investigation will be to account for the legend of Spartan drillmasters in Vegetius through an examination of the history of the *hoplomachoi*.

I

Plato and Xenophon's Socratic dialogues provide the most evidence about the *hoplomachoi*.⁷ The picture derived from these sources is consistent: the *hoplomachoi* are frauds and charlatans. They take fees for promising to instruct young men in the art of generalship, but actually teach only tactics. These accounts of the *hoplomachoi* are of course contrived so that Socrates can demonstrate his own brilliance, in this case, that the art of generalship consists of much more than tactics.⁸

³ Diod. 26.4; Nep., Hann. 13.3; FGrrHist 176.

⁴ See ANDERSON 180; KROMAYER/VEITH 86, 119, 296. KROMAYER/VEITH's contention that the Romans invented the tactical reserve ignores much Hellenistic evidence. See B. BAR-KOCHVA, *The Seleucid Army*, Cambridge 1976, 116, 122–23, 168.

⁵ Veg. 3 praef.: *Quae per diversos auctores librosque dispersa, imperator invicte, mediocritatem meam abbreviare iussisti, ne vel fastidium nasceretur ex plurimis vel plenitudo fidei deesset in parvis.*

⁶ See my *The Origins of Military Theory in Ancient Greece and China*, International Commission of Military History, Acta 5, Bucarest 1980, Bucharest 1981, 74–79. Cf. A. BAUER, *Die Anfänge der Kriegswissenschaft*, *Zeitschrift für allgemeine Geschichte* 3, 1886, 1–12 and *Die griechischen Altertümer: die Kriegsaltertümer*, Munich 1893, 273–78. I am preparing a more detailed discussion of this topic.

⁷ Plat., Lach. 179e–84c, Euth. 271b–73c; Xen., Mem. 3.1 cf. Cyr. 1.6.12–14.

⁸ Cf. W. STEIDLE, *Der Dialog Laches und Platon's Verhältnis zu Athen in den Frühdialogen*, MH 7; 1950, 129–46, who emphasizes the apologetic tone of this dialogue and the attempt to portray Socrates as the good teacher rather than the alleged corruptor of youth. For additional bibliography on the Laches see V. ILARI, *Guerra e diritto nel mondo antico*, I, Università di Roma, Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto di Diritto Romano et dei Diritti dell'Oriente Mediterraneo 56, Milan 1980, 139 n. 47.

In reality the *hoplomachoi* were not the fools seen in these dialogues, but rather professional teachers of military skills who filled a gap in Greek military training, particularly at Athens, where public military training cannot be proven before the establishment of the *ephebia* c. 335 B.C.⁹ Moreover, other statements of Plato and Xenophon about the *hoplomachoi* are inconsistent with the view given in these dialogues. Plato provides for teaching *hoplomachia* in the gymnasia of his ideal state and desires *hoplomachoi* to establish the rules for contests in *hoplomachia*. Xenophon also revises his view, for he praises the Spartan army for executing with ease those maneuvers judged most difficult by the *hoplomachoi*.¹⁰

Plato says many *hoplomachoi* traveled around Greece and collected fees for their instruction.¹¹ So far as the dramatic dates of these dialogues can be determined, the *hoplomachoi* were active between 424 and 404 B.C., but *hoplomachoi* in the fourth century B.C. also frequently appear.¹² *Hoplomachia* was regularly taught in the Athenian palaestrae of the fourth century B.C. and Anaxandrides entitled a comedy 'Ο 'Οπλόμαχος.¹³

Only five *hoplomachoi* are known by name. Stesileos, ridiculed by the Athenian strategos Laches in the dialogue of the same name (183 c–84 a), is otherwise unknown. Plato (Euth. 271 b–72 a) gives a full account of the brothers Euthydemus and Dionysodorus. Originally from Chios, they went to Thurii as colonists only to be exiled later. They subsequently spent their time in Athens or parts of the Athenian Empire.¹⁴ Under the title *pankratiastai* they lived by teaching the *hoplomachia*, rhetoric, or writing speeches for litigants. Xenophon mentions a Phalinus of Zacynthus serving Tissaphernes at the battle of Cunaxa in 401 B.C. As a military adviser to Tissaphernes, Phalinus taught tactics and *hoplomachia*.¹⁵ Finally, Diomilus, an exile from Andros, who commanded an elite hoplite unit at Syracuse in 414 B.C. and soon died fighting the Athenians on the Epipolae, may have been an

⁹ Bibliography and a discussion of the value of pyrrhic dancing for military training in my *Hoplomachia* and Greek Dances in Arms, GRBS 23, 1982, 223–233.

¹⁰ Plat., Leg. 7.813 d–e, 8.833 e; Xen., Res. Lac. 11.8.

¹¹ Plat., Lach. 183 a–c, Euth. 272 a cf. Xen., Mem. 3.1.11; Plat., Leg. 7.804 c–d.

¹² Plat., Gorg. 456 d–e, Leg. 7.804 c–d; Isoc. 15.252; Theophr., Char. 21.16; W. K. C. GUTHRIE, *A History of Greek Philosophy*, IV, Cambridge 1975, 125–26, 267. ILARI ([supra n. 8] 140 n. 49) believes the dramatic date of the *Laches*, 424–418 B.C. coincides with the passion for military studies aroused by Alcibiades' plans for the Sicilian expedition: Plut., Nic. 12.1. Certainly the *hoplomachoi* would have profited from such popular interests, but ILARI may be stretching the chronology too far.

¹³ Anaxdr. fr. 35 EDMONDS; E. SAGLIO, *Hoplomachia*, DarSag 3, 1899, 248. John Chrysostom, In Acta Apost., Homil. 29.3, PG 60, 217–18, preserves the tradition that a soldier learned tactics in the gymnasium.

¹⁴ Cf. GUTHRIE (supra n. 12) 268 with n. 3.

¹⁵ Xen., Anab. 2.1.7 cf. Diod. 14.25.1; Plut., Artax. 13.3–4. The Greek who helps Croesus draw up his battleline at the fictitious battle of Thymbrara in Xen., Cyr. 6.3.1 is meant to be seen as an *hoplomachos*, i.e., the equivalent of Phalinus. See ANDERSON 173.

hoplomachos.¹⁶ Let us note that none of these *hoplomachoi* are Spartans or in Spartan service. Diomilus commanded for the Syracusians before the arrival of Gylippus and the Spartan reinforcements.

We should indeed take the *hoplomachoi* seriously as professional instructors of the military art, and it probably does not go too far to call them military sophists. They satisfy GUTHRIE's definition of what a sophist is: they are not of Athenian origin, offer instruction in a *techne*, take fees for their teaching, and travel to various cities.¹⁷ Theophrastus (Char. 21.16) directly connects them with philosophers, sophists, and music teachers. Although we cannot be certain about his brother Dionysodorus, Euthydemus at least was a sophist to be reckoned with: both Plato and Aristotle were compelled to deal with his arguments.¹⁸ Probably not every *hoplomachos* shared Euthydemus' intellectual talents, but this does not eliminate classifying them as professional itinerant teachers of a practical skill, just as many of the rhetoricians were. Many military engineers (*mechanopoioi*) in the fourth century B. C. were likewise itinerant.¹⁹

The military instruction of an *hoplomachos* consisted of *hoplomachia*, tactics, and possibly *strategika*. *Hoplomachia* has nothing to do with *monomachia* or dancing in arms, but denotes rather the skills of individual attack and defense and practice in the use of arms.²⁰ The strategos Nicias (Plat., Lach. 181 e–82 b) observes that *hoplomachia* increases a soldier's strength, gives him training in the use of his weapons, and will aid him in pursuit or retreat after the ranks of the phalanx have been broken. These skills, however obvious and important to every hoplite, were something either which the Athenians in particular tended to assume every citizen already knew, or which had to be learned through private instruction.²¹

The *hoplomachoi* staged public displays of *hoplomachia* to promote business, just as other sophists presented exhibitions of their crafts. These public shows, as in the Laches, should probably be distinguished from teaching sessions with pupils noted in Xenophon (Mem. 3.1). We cannot say whether the contests in Plato (Leg. 8.833 e) present an accurate account of a public *hoplomachia*. It would appear from Laches' criticism of Stesileos (Plat., Lach. 182 d–84 c) that in their public exhibitions (or even in actual military service in Stesileos' case, if the story is not a lit-

¹⁶ Thuc. 6.96.3, 97.4; ANDERSON 96. Diomilus' 600 may be the elite hoplite corps of Syracuse already organized in 461 B. C.: Diod. 11.76.2 cf. PRITCHETT 221.

¹⁷ W. K. C. GUTHRIE, *The Sophists*, Cambridge 1971, 30–41.

¹⁸ Plat., Cra. 386 d; Arist., Soph. El. 177 b 12–13, Rh. 1401 a 23–30.

¹⁹ E. W. MARSDEN, *Macedonian Military Machinery and its Designers under Philip and Alexander*, in: *Ancient Macedonia, II, Thessaloniki 1977*, 211–23, esp. 215.

²⁰ See my forthcoming article n. 9 *supra*.

²¹ R. LONIS, *Guerre et religion en Grèce à l'époque classique*, *Annales Littéraires de l'Université de Besançon* 238, *Centre de Recherches d'Histoire Ancienne* 33, Paris 1979, 35; ANDERSON 84–93. Much of ANDERSON's evidence for weapons training either concerns the *hoplomachoi* or comes from the fourth century B. C., especially from Xenophon.

erary embellishment of Plato) the *hoplomachoi* might emphasize tricks and fancy maneuvers far surpassing normal military practice. These would naturally increase the entertainment value of their show. Criticism of the *hoplomachoi* for such expertise seems unjustified, since modern elite military drill teams likewise display a quality of training and precision beyond the needs of actual practicality.²²

Hoplomachoi, however, also offered training in τὰ τακτικά.²³ This term refers not to grand Napoleonic maneuvers on the battlefield, which in the nineteenth century were called grand tactics, but to petit tactics, i. e., organization of tactical units and unit drill.²⁴ Xenophon (Res. Lac. 11.8–10) specifically mentions that the *hoplomachoi* considered movement of the phalanx from column to line the most difficult tactical maneuver.

Plato claims Dionysodorus and Euthydemus offered instruction in the leadership of armies (τὰς ἡγεμονίας τῶν στρατοπέδων), i. e., *strategika*, although Xenophon in reference to Dionysodorus alone says only τὰ τακτικά were taught.²⁵ If Plato is correct and the *hoplomachoi* did attempt to treat the higher questions of generalship, then the diatribe of Xenophon's Socrates in Mem.3.1.6 ff. (cf. Cyr. 1.6.9 ff.) becomes even more a literary contrivance. If, however, Plato has exaggerated and Xenophon is the more accurate, the *hoplomachoi* still cannot be greatly faulted for seeing tactics as the chief component of generalship. The battles of Greek phalanges in the fifth century B. C. remained circumscribed by numerous unwritten rules and conventions, war as *agon*, and only in the Peloponnesian War did the rules begin «to crack.»²⁶ The *hoplomachoi* taught what was significant from the traditional point of view. Xenophon's digressions on the multiple aspects of generalship reflect the new disposition of the art of war at the end of the Peloponnesian War. The realization had come that war was much more complex than traditionally thought, and that its conduct demanded study, preparation, and analysis – hence the beginning of Western military theory.²⁷

In this regard the *hoplomachoi* also have significance. They are the first known professional instructors of military arts in the Western world, in one sense reflecting the trend toward professionalization of Greek military service, which began in the fifth century B. C. and intensified in the fourth. Quite obviously the Peloponnesian War increased the market for the services of *hoplomachoi*. In another sense they symbolize the rationalization or laitization of war, which like rhetoric or music has become a *techne*, something teachable and no longer merely a matter

²² One can also make a comparison with the *armatura* of the Roman army. See my *The Occasion of Arrian's Tactica*, GRBS 19, 1978, 357–58.

²³ Xen., Mem. 3.1.5, Anab. 2.1.7; Plat., Euth. 273 c.

²⁴ See the definitions of Aeneas Tacticus and Polybius quoted in Ael. Tact. 3.4.

²⁵ Plat., Euth. 273 c cf. Xen., Cyr. 1.6.14; Xen., Mem. 3.1.5.

²⁶ PRITCHETT 173–76, 187; J. DE ROMILLY, *Guerre et paix entre cités*, in: VERNANT, 207–20.

²⁷ Cf. n. 6 supra.

of divine dispensation. As Plato says (Leg. 11.921 d), generals and experts in military affairs (*technikoi*) are as much craftsmen as ordinary workmen (*demiourgoi*).

We cannot say whether any *hoplomachos* made the leap from theory on the drill ground to theory in written form. Ancient military literature is but a part of the genre of technical handbooks which sophists of the fifth century B.C. began to write. Apart from the aphorisms on the conduct of war with which Thucydides abounds, we must wait until the fourth century B.C. for any extant remains.²⁸ Diogenes Laertius asserts that Democritus wrote a *Tactica* and an *Hoplomachicon*. No fragments of these alleged treatises survive and the titles themselves are suspicious.²⁹ The earliest military treatises are not entitled *Tactica*: none of Xenophon's military works bear this title and Demetrius of Phalerum (Diog. Laert. 5.80) called his work «*Strategika*». Similarly the military encyclopedia of Aeneas Tacticus may have been a «*Strategika*».³⁰ Treatises called «*Tactica*» belong to the Hellenistic and Roman periods: the first known is by Pyrrhus.³¹ The title *Hoplomachicon* is unique to Diogenes. Considering the prominence of *hoplomachia* in the Hellenistic period, one would expect to find other treatises with this title, if Democritus had indeed written one.

II

We have now examined what is known about the *hoplomachoi*, their profession, and their significance in the late fifth and early fourth centuries B.C. The profession seems to have embraced both rhetoricians (Euthydemus and Dionysodorus) and mercenaries (Phalinos and Diomilus). A glance at the origins of this profession will demonstrate to which group (rhetoricians or mercenaries) the *hoplomachoi* might have belonged in the beginning.

Ephorus attests that instruction in *hoplomachia* was first devised by Demonax at Mantinea in the mid-sixth century B.C. There is little reason to reject Ephorus'

²⁸ Cf. F.M. CORNFORD, *Thucydides Mythistoricus*, 1907, vii. Even if the *equus* Simon of Aristophanes, Eq. 242–43 is the author of the handbook on horsemanship in Xenophon, *De eq.* 1.1,3, nothing in the extant fragments indicates discussion of military topics. A list of Simon's fragments in LONIS (supra n. 21) 22 n. 14.

²⁹ Diog. Laert. 9.48 = DIELS/KRANZ, *FVS*⁶ 68 B 28b–c. The treatises are accepted as genuine by F. HEINIMANN, *Eine vorplatonische Theorie der τέχνη*, *MH* 18, 1961 109 n. 19 and L. EDMUNDS, *Chance and Intelligence in Thucydides*, Cambridge/Mass. 1975, 154.

³⁰ Polyb. 10.44.1; *Ael.Tact.* 1.2.

³¹ *Ael.Tact.* 1.2; *Arr.*, *Tact.* 1.1 cf. *Front.*, *Strat.* 2.6.10, 4.1.14; *Liv.* 35.14.8; *Ath.Mech.* 6.1, 31.6–10; *Cic.*, *Ad fam.* 9.25.1. The attribution of the two treatises to Democritus is also rejected by M. WELLMAN, *Zu Demokrit*, *Hermes* 61, 1926, 474–75, followed by DIELS/KRANZ, II⁶, 150, who prefers to name as author the obscure Damocritus Historicus of the *Suda* (= *FGrHist* 730). Damocritus wrote a *Tactica* in two books and a *De Iudaeis*. JACOBY dates him without certainty to the first century B.C. or A.D. Since the *Suda*'s entry does not mention the *Hoplomachicon*, I am not convinced by WELLMAN's solution.

Arcadian origin for *hoplomachia*, especially since the only rival tradition is a late Athenian myth in Zenodotus Theophilus.³² Demonax's alleged invention of instruction in *hoplomachia* is a different matter. Ephorus' interest in *heuretes* is attested by his *Περὶ εὐρημάτων* and in his Histories he may have erroneously associated *hoplomachia* with the judicial *monomachia*, which the Mantinean lawgiver Demonax established.³³ The Arcadian *hoplomachoi* should be placed in their proper context.

Although in the Iliad (2.611) the Arcadians are praised for military skill, Arcadian military prominence actually comes much later in the period from the early fifth to the fourth century B. C., when Arcadia is the chief source of mercenary hoplites for service not only in mainland Greece, but also in Sicily and the Persian Empire.³⁴ More than half of Cyrus the Younger's ill-fated army of 10,000 consisted of Arcadians and Achaeans.³⁵ Arcadian mercenaries were preferred to all others and the Mantineans were said to be the bravest of the brave.³⁶ Even the Spartans resorted to the use of Arcadians – their elite cavalry unit the Sciritae as well as Arcadian hoplites for distant campaigns.³⁷ While a comic poet of the fifth century B. C. could joke of mercenaries as the chief Arcadian export, the same repute permitted Dionysius of Miletus in the Hadrianic period to bemoan that the misfortunes of Greece nourished Arcadia.³⁸ Is it not probable that the Greek people who domi-

³² Ephorus, FGrHist 70 fr. 54 = Ath. 4.154 d; Zenodotus Theophilus, FHG IV, p. 516 fr. 5.

³³ Fragments of Ephorus' treatise in FGrHist 70 fr. 104–106. On the genre see M. KREMER, *De catalogis heurematum*, Diss. Leipzig 1890; A. KLEINGÜNTHER, *Protos Heureses*, *Philologus*, Suppl. 26.1, Leipzig 1933; K. THRAEDE, *Das Lob des Erfinders: Bemerkungen zur Analyse der Heuremata-Kataloge*, *RhM* 105, 1962, 158–86 and *Erfinder*, *RAC* 5, 1962, 1191–1278; B. P. COPENHAVEN, *The Historiography of Discovery in the Renaissance: the Sources and Composition of Polydore Vergil's De inventoribus rerum*, *JWI* 41, 1978, 192–214. It is possible that Ephorus' source was Hellenicus, who had written a *Περὶ Ἀρκάδας*: FGrHist 4 fr. 37. On Ephorus' use of Hellenicus for early Greek history see G. L. BARBER, *The Historian Ephorus*, Cambridge 1935, 113–17. For Demonax see my forthcoming article (*supra* n.9), where it is also argued that the *hoplomachoi* and *hoplomachia* have no connection with the Mantinean armed dance or the cult of Zeus Hoplosmios.

³⁴ See L. W. HUNTER/S. A. HANDFORD, *Aeneas, On Siegecraft*, Oxford 1927, xxxii–xxxiii; H. W. PARKE, *Greek Mercenary Soldiers*, Oxford 1933, 11, 14. Cf. J. ROY, *Arcadian Nationality as Seen in Xenophon's Anabasis*, *Mnemosyne* 25, 1972, 129–36. For a survey of Arcadia from Mycenaean to Classical times see P. BORGEAUD, *Recherches sur le dieu Pan*, *Bibliotheca Helvetica Romana* 17, Rome 1979, 15–40.

³⁵ Xen., *Anab.* 6.2.10; PARKE (*supra* n. 34) 23.

³⁶ Xen., *Hell.* 7.1.23; Diod. 15.12.1.

³⁷ Sciritae: PRITCHETT 224; A. W. GOMME/A. ANDREWES/K. J. DOVER, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, IV, Oxford 1970, 103–104 cf. ANDERSON 249–51. Xenophon, *Mag. eq.* 9.4, says the fame of the Spartan cavalry began when they brought in foreign cavalry. He could mean the Sciritae. Arcadian hoplites: PARKE (*supra* n. 34) 15–17; HUNTER/HANDFORD (*supra* n. 34) xxxiii n. 1.

³⁸ Hermippus fr. 63 Edmonds; Philostr. *VS* 1.22, 572. Cf. Ephorus, FGrHist 70 fr. 113 =

nated the market for hoplite mercenaries would also be the first to become professional instructors of hoplite techniques?

The objection can be raised that none of the known *hoplomachoi* were Arcadians. We have seen that the *hoplomachoi* came from Chios, Zacynthus, and Andros, but only five *hoplomachoi* are known by name and the origins of only four of these are stated in the sources. Plato (Lach. 183 c) indicates that *many hoplomachoi* were active. It is probably only a manifestation of the poverty of our sources that we find no Arcadians mentioned, especially since the earliest tradition about the origins of this profession, Ephorus, asserts its Arcadian roots.³⁹

Other Arcadian connections with military theory should be noted. Aeneas Tacticus has often been identified with the Arcadian general Aeneas of Stymphalus.⁴⁰ The extant fragment on the defense of cities from his military encyclopedia appears certainly to have been written by a Peloponnesian, and perhaps by an Arcadian. Aeneas (27.1) is the only source to specify that *paneia* is a Peloponnesian and especially an Arcadian word.

Pan was a particularly Arcadian god and an Hellenistic tradition named Mantinea his birthplace.⁴¹ Association of Pan with the panics of armies was a phenomenon of the fourth century B. C., which to no surprise coincides with the high tide of Arcadian mercenaries.⁴² Polyaeus (1.2) records a much later tradition that Pan, as a general of Dionysus, was the inventor of military organization (*taxis*), named the phalanx, and devised the use of stratagem to create panic in armies. An Arcadian god who allegedly gave the phalanx its name belongs to the wealth of Arcadian military lore of which the *hoplomachoi* also form a part.

As for Aeneas of Stymphalus, nothing except possession of the same name and a common interest in military affairs links him to the fragment. The identification,

Strabo 5.2.4; Suda s.v. 'Αρκάδας μιμούμενοι; Hesychius s.v. 'Αρκάδας μιμούμενος; Marcarius 2.41.

³⁹ Athens during the Peloponnesian War was, to some extent, cut off from Arcadia and its mercenaries: PARKE (supra n. 34) 15. This may be one explanation for the absence of Arcadian *hoplomachoi* at Athens in Plato and Xenophon's accounts of Socrates.

⁴⁰ The identification goes back to the first edition of Aeneas by I. CASAUBON, Paris 1609. Also see A. HUG, Aeneas von Stymphalos, Zurich 1877; HUNTER/HANDFORD (supra n. 34) i-xxvii; W. A. OLDFATHER, in: The Illinois Greek Club, Aeneas Tacticus, Asclepiodotus, Onasander, LCL, London 1923, 7; A. DAIN/A.-M. BON, Enée le Tacticien, Poliorcétique, Paris 1967, x-xii; A. W. LAWRENCE, Greek Aims in Fortification, Oxford 1979, 57. Contra, T. HUDSON WILLIAMS, The Authorship of the Greek Military Manual Attributed to Aeneas Tacticus, *AJP* 25, 1904, 402-403; H. BENGTSON, Die griechische Polis bei Aeneas Tacticus, *Historia* 11, 1962, 461. Cf. S. CELATO, Enea Tattico: il problema dell' autore e il valore dell' opera dal punto di vista militare, *Memorie Padua* 80, 1967/68, 58, 59 n.32 and *La Grecia del IV secolo a. C. nell' opera di Enea Tattico*, *ibid.*, 219-20.

⁴¹ F. BROMMER, Pan, *RE*, Suppl. 8, 1956, 996.

⁴² See W. K. PRITCHETT, *The Greek State at War, III: Religion*, Berkeley 1979, 45. Cf. J. E. HARRISON, Pan, Paneion, Panikon, *CR* 40, 1926, 6-8; BORGEAUD (supra n. 34) 138-41.

although conceivable, cannot be proven. Certainly Arcadian authorship would fit neatly with the plethora of Arcadian mercenaries and an Arcadian origin for the *hoplomachoi*'s profession. Nonetheless, the questionable association of Aeneas of Stymphalus with the fragment need not deprive us of an Arcadian military intellectual: Xenophon's colleague, Sophanetus of Stymphalus, wrote his own *Anabasis*, which may have been a source for Diodorus Siculus.⁴³

To summarize briefly, formal instruction in *hoplomachia* began in Arcadia. Although Ephorus credited the Mantinean lawgiver Demonax with its institution in the mid-sixth century B. C., we should place the *hoplomachoi* in the context of the widespread employment of Arcadian hoplite mercenaries from the early fifth to the fourth century B. C., reflecting another aspect of the professionalization of Arcadian military service. Apparently Arcadian success in this profession and/or the demand for the skills they taught (no doubt increased by the various wars of the fifth century B. C.) encouraged others to take up this profession. By the time of the Peloponnesian War the *hoplomachoi* had become another example of the itinerant professional teachers, commonly called sophists. The mercenaries Phalinus and Diomilus no doubt resemble more closely the original Arcadian *hoplomachoi* than the rhetorician Euthydemus.

III

The history of the *hoplomachoi* from approximately the later fourth century B. C. to the Roman Imperial period can be briefly stated. The Hellenistic period saw the *hoplomachoi* converted from private military sophists into publicly paid instructors in the *gymnasia* of Greek *poleis*. Plato foreshadows this development, when he replaces some athletic exercises in his ideal city with instruction in *hoplomachia* and other military arts.⁴⁴ In practice the first reference to the institutionalization of the *hoplomachoi* comes from Aristotle (Ath. Pol. 42.3): *hoplomachia* with archery, javelin-hurling, and use of catapults became part of the Athenian *ephebia*.

Hoplomachia later was a regular course of instruction in Hellenistic *gymnasia* throughout the Greek world. LAUNEY has stressed the continued military emphasis of the Hellenistic *gymnasia*, which Strabo's description of Seleucid Apameia (16.2.10) seems to confirm.⁴⁵ *Hoplomachoi* and other instructors of military arts were to be found there. Perhaps more importantly, Strabo sees Apameia as a Syrian Pella, and the passage implies that the Macedonians of Philip and Alexander might also have hired *hoplomachoi*.

Several sources attest the prominence of Hellenistic *hoplomachoi*. Ps.-Plato (Ax. 366 a) lists *tactici*, i. e., *hoplomachoi*, along with *paedagoges*, *grammatistae*, and

⁴³ FGrHist 109; Bux, Sophanetos, RE, 3 A 1, 1927, 1008–13.

⁴⁴ Plat., Leg. 7.813 d–e, 8.833 e.

⁴⁵ LAUNEY 816–17.

geometrae as the standard instructors of a young man's education.⁴⁶ Philopoemen learned the *hoplomachia*, as might be expected of an Arcadian, but it was also a subject Cato the Elder taught his son.⁴⁷ We can trace continuation of this instruction in literary sources well into the second century.⁴⁸ Others have collected the epigraphical evidence, which need not be repeated here.⁴⁹

After its institutionalization the *hoplomachia* probably began to lose its original practical value and became increasingly a sport.⁵⁰ The instruction was extended to age classes below that of ephebe and training in *thyreamachia* (oval shield and short sword) was added.⁵¹ Several inscriptions refer to contests in *hoplomachia* at games and festivals, and it is in this regard that the first evidence for *hoplomachoi* at Sparta is found.⁵² Gythium honored the Spartan *hoplomachos* Laidas for his excellent instruction of its citizens, perhaps in the first century B. C.⁵³ Spartan contests involving *hoplomachoi* continued in the second or third century.⁵⁴

What for Hellenistic ephebes was a sport became for the Romans a form of gladiatorial combat. The Romans made no distinction between *hoplomachia* and *monomachia* and used the terms interchangeably. The *hoplomachi* or *oplomachi*, similar in equipment to the *secutores*, first appear in the second half of the first century B. C. and probably replaced eventually the *Samnites*, who disappear in the Augustan period.⁵⁵ *Hoplomachi* apparently remained active in the fourth century: Firmicus Maternus records the horoscopes for the birthdates of *oplomachi*.⁵⁶

In their gladiatorial form the *hoplomachoi* also returned to the sphere of practical military utility. The surgeon Antyllus claims the Romans invented the *hoplomachia* for preparation in war and later used it for the exercise of soldiers. They wore

⁴⁶ Cf. Teles in Stob., Anth. 4.34.72 HENSE. On the date of the Axiochus see GUTHRIE (supra n. 12) V, 395.

⁴⁷ Plut., Phil 3.2, Cato 20.4.

⁴⁸ Xen.Eph. 1.1.2; Galen, De sanitate tuenda 2.11–12, VI, pp. 146–58 K cf. Pollux 7.155.

⁴⁹ O. W. REINMUTH, The Ephebic Inscriptions of the Fourth Century B. C., Mnemosyne, Suppl. 14, Leiden 1971, 23, 132; Ch. PÉLÉKIDIS, Histoire de l'éphébie attique, Paris 1962, 108, 109, 114, 170, 179–80, 207, 230, 269–70; LAUNEY 818–23.

⁵⁰ Cf. Galen in n. 48 supra. J. DELAMORE, Gymnasion, Paris 1960, 469–74, offers strong objections to LAUNEY's views that gymnastic training was meant to produce recruits for Hellenistic armies.

⁵¹ LAUNEY 818, 820 cf. Ps.-Plato, Ax. 366 a.

⁵² PÉLÉKIDIS (supra n. 49) 230; LAUNEY 817, 820.

⁵³ IG V 1, 1523 cf. A. S. BREADFORD, A Prosopography of Lacedaemonians from the Death of Alexander the Great, 323 B. C. to the Sack of Sparta by Alaric, A. D. 396, Vestigia 27, Munich 1977, 255.

⁵⁴ IG V 1, 542 cf. BRADFORD (supra n. 53) 356–57: Pratoalos no. 4; Lucian, Salt. 10. SAGLIO's references, (supra n. 13) 249, to *hoplomachoi* at Sparta are erroneous.

⁵⁵ Evidence on the *hoplomachi* collected by G. LAFLAYE, Gladiator, DarSag 2.2, 1896, 1563–65 cf. G. VILLE, La gladiature en Occident des origines à mort de Domitien, BEFAR 245, Paris 1981, 38, 305 n. 187, 307, 376, 397 n. 108, 405, 419 n. 139, 444.

⁵⁶ Firm.Mat. 7.26.2–3, 8.21.5, 27.3.

the equipment of *monomachoi* and fought an opponent or a post.⁵⁷ Vegetius describes the use of a post for training in swordsmanship and notes its association with gladiators.⁵⁸

Gladiatorial influence on Roman military training goes back to P. Rutilius Rufus, who as consul in 105 B. C. called upon the *doctores gladiatorum* of C. Aurelius Scaurus' school to teach the legions the basic means of individual attack and defense.⁵⁹ Hadrian also concerned himself with the application of gladiatorial techniques, but perhaps more interesting is Pliny's reference that Trajan brought in a *Graeculus magister* to train Roman troops.⁶⁰ Specific identification of this *Graeculus magister* can only be conjecture. But if Antyllus is correct in connecting the post exercise and *hoplomachia*, then we should probably seek this *Graeculus magister* among the *doctores hoplomachorum*, who could by name at least be Greek.⁶¹

The *hoplomachia* might also have had some influence on the Roman *armatura* or *ludi castrenses*, sportive exercises practiced in all units of the Roman army, but publicly exhibited mostly by special units called *armaturae*. Arrian gives a detailed description of an *armatura equestris*, but except for Livy 44.9.5–7 we have no details about the *armatura pedestris*, which was still practiced in the fourth century.⁶² Pliny (Pan. 13.1) mentions the *Graeculus magister* in reference to a *meditatio campestris*, which could indicate the *armatura*. In any event, Roman use of *hoplomachia* in gladiatorial shows or for military sport parallels the contests of ephebes in the Hellenistic gymnasia.

IV

We have surveyed the history of the *hoplomachoi* from their Arcadian origins to gladiatorial use in the Roman Empire. Whether *hoplomachia* as an art continued to be perfected or declined cannot be said, although the Romans replaced the Greek spear with a sword. The following problems now demand solutions: first, Vegetius' omission of the terms *hoplomachos* or *hoplomachus*; second, possible Spartan connections with *hoplomachoi* in the fifth and fourth centuries B. C.; and third, the origins of the legends of Spartan drillmasters and of the Spartan invention of military theory.

⁵⁷ Antyllus, De remediis, in: Oribasius 6.36.2–4. His discussion of the medical advantages of this practice (heavy breathing and intense exertion) can be compared to Nicias' remarks (Plat., Lach. 181 e).

⁵⁸ Veg. 1.11 cf. 2.23. R. W. DAVIES has collected other references to this practice: Fronto, Hadrian and the Roman Army, Latomus 27, 1968, 84 nn. 6–7.

⁵⁹ Val. Max. 2.3.2 cf. Front., Strat. 4.2.2.

⁶⁰ H. A., Had. 14.10; Plin., Pan. 13.5.

⁶¹ ILS 5099, 9341 (C. Furius Hyacinthus).

⁶² Arr., Tact. 33–44; Amm. 21.16.7. Also see my Flavius Arrianus: a Political and Military Biography, Diss. Duke University 1977, 353–62 and (supra n. 22) 357–61.

The *hoplomachoi* of the fifth and fourth centuries B. C. were itinerant privately paid instructors of hoplite techniques, i. e., drill instructors, and we have seen the profession embraced two branches: teachers in the palaestrae (Euthydemus and Dionysodorus) and mercenary military advisers (Phalinus and Diomilus). Vegetius, in the belief that only the Spartans had such professional drill instructors, is also aware of these two types: the *magistri armorum* or *tactici* teach the Spartan youth, and others, such as Xanthippus and Hannibal's *doctor armorum*, act as military advisers in foreign service.

Vegetius' terminology for drill instructors reveals that he has attempted to approximate *termini technici* from the Roman army. Roman drill instructors among the *principales* include *campidoctores*, *doctores*, and *magistri campi*, many of which trained units of *armaturae*, and the subordinate rank of *exercitatores* also occurs.⁶³ In Vegetius *campidoctores* teach the *armatura*; *doctores artifices* instruct in archery; and *doctores armorum* teach spear throwing.⁶⁴ Vegetius (3 praef. cf. 3.1) reserves the title *magister armorum* or *tacticus* for the instructors of the Spartan youth and for military theorists. His apparent inconsistency in calling Hannibal's Spartan adviser a *doctor armorum* can be explained by stylistic *variatio*. *Hoplomachus* did not exist as a rank in the Roman army, and in Roman usage, attested in the fourth century by Firmicus Maternus, this term denoted a gladiator. If Vegetius did know the terms *hoplomachos* or *hoplomachus* to mean drill instructor, he chose not to use them, probably in an attempt to adapt his language to Roman military usage. It is more likely, however, that *hoplomachus* to Vegetius denoted only a gladiator and that his source employed *tactici* to designate *hoplomachoi*.⁶⁵

If we have now clarified why Vegetius did not use the term *hoplomachus*, it remains to account for any possible connections between the Spartans and the itinerant *hoplomachoi* of Plato and Xenophon. The military prestige of Sparta seen in Herodotus and Thucydides requires little comment: they were the ideal hoplites.⁶⁶ Spartan military repute led to their designation as *technitai* and *sophistai* of war, and from this view it is hardly a quantum leap, especially for a later author, to an association with the *hoplomachoi*, military sophists of the fifth and fourth centuries B. C.⁶⁷ But the question should be posed whether such an association is real or completely fictitious.

Plato claims the *hoplomachoi* never set foot in Sparta, and as we have seen, the only evidence for Spartan *hoplomachoi* comes from the Roman period.⁶⁸ One could argue that Lucian's reference to Spartan *hoplomachia* (Salt. 10) applies to an

⁶³ A. VON DOMASZEWSKI, Die Rangordnung des römischen Heeres², Cologne 1967, 26, 45, 47, 48, 59, 77, 98, 101, 102, 104, 106, 107.

⁶⁴ Veg. 1.13, 2.23; 1.15; 1.13, 14.

⁶⁵ Veg. 3 praef.: *magistros armorum, quos tacticos appellaverunt*.

⁶⁶ E.g., Hdt. 7.102-104, 209, 234; Thuc. 1.18.2, 4.40.1. Cf. KROMAYER/VEITH 29.

⁶⁷ Xen., Res. Lac. 13.5; Plut., Pel. 23.3.

⁶⁸ Plat., Lach. 183 a-b cf. Plut., Lyc. 9.3; nn. 53-54 supra.

earlier period than the second century, but Lucian is a dubious source for such things. In addition Plato's statement fits the well-known Spartan policies of secrecy and xenophobia. Why would allegedly the best hoplites in Greece need *hoplomachoi* anyway? Spartan military training was thorough and even mock battles of Spartan youths are attested.⁶⁹

Nevertheless, Xenophon (Res. Lac. 11.8) directly connects the *hoplomachoi* with Spartan drill, although he does not explicitly state that *hoplomachoi* were in Sparta. Since the Spartans employed Arcadian cavalry and Arcadian mercenaries, is it not possible that Arcadian *hoplomachoi* could have had some part in training the Spartan army? Plato's claim that *hoplomachoi* never came to Sparta is echoed by Plutarch's similar assertion (Lyc. 9.3) about sophists teaching rhetoric. Yet we know Hippias of Elis visited Sparta and possibly Critias as well. Plato ridicules such sophistic visits, just as he mocks the *hoplomachoi*.⁷⁰ The Spartans were not immune to sophistic thought, as a recent study of Lysander has shown, and Plutarch's assertion of the Spartan exclusion of foreign teachers and literature should not be taken seriously.⁷¹ The question of Spartan employment of *hoplomachoi* from Arcadia or elsewhere must be left open, but this does not preclude the Spartans themselves from serving as *hoplomachoi*.

Of the two types of *hoplomachoi* active in the late fifth century B. C. the private teachers in the palaestrae became institutionalized as instructors in Hellenistic gymnasia. *Hoplomachoi* of this type, also attested for Sparta and the equivalent of Vegetius' *magistri armorum* for the Spartan youth, have their place in Vegetius' conception of the *hoplomachoi*, although he seems to believe they existed in Classical rather than late Hellenistic/Roman Sparta. The second type of *hoplomachoi*, the military advisers in foreign service, present more interesting results in accounting for the identification of the Spartans with the *hoplomachoi*.

Plutarch (Lyc. 30.5) states that other peoples did not ask Sparta for ships, money, or hoplites, but for a single Spartan leader. His list cites Gylippus sent to the Sicilians, Brasidas to the Chalcidians, and Lysander, Callicratidas, and Agesilaus to the Asian Greeks. We can add Dexippus, a Laconian mercenary captain active in Sicily in 406 B. C. and later, who Timaeus claims enjoyed prestige because of his country; Gastron, a Spartan mercenary in Egypt; Archidamus III, who died in 338 B. C. fighting the Lucanians or Messapians for Tarentum; Cleonymus, the Spartan

⁶⁹ Plut., Lyc. 16.5, 17.2; Paus. 3.14.10 cf. Xen., Cyr. 2.3.17–20.

⁷⁰ Plat., Hip.Ma. 281 a–86 b; Philostr., VS 1.11, 495–96; F. OLLIER, *Le mirage spartiate*, I Paris 1933, 207–209; E. N. TIGERSTEDT, *The Legend of Sparta in Classical Antiquity*, I Stockholm 1965, 238–40; T. A. BORING, *Literacy in Ancient Sparta*, *Mnemosyne*, Suppl. 54, Leiden 1979, 65. OLLIER and TIGERSTEDT accept Plato's account without question. The sophist Hecataeus of Abdera or Teos visited Archidamus IV at Sparta in the early third century B. C., but this occurs too late to support the argument. Plut., Lyc. 20.3; R. FLACELIÈRE et al., *Plutarque, Vies*, I, Paris 1957, 237.

⁷¹ J.-F. BOMMELAER, *Lysandre de Sparte: histoire et traditions*, BEFAR 224, Paris 1981, 208–209; BORING (*supra* n. 70) 41–42.

prince who also aided Tarentum against the same foes in the late fourth century B. C.; Acrotatus, Cleonymus' older brother, who commanded for Acragas against Agathocles c. 314 B. C.; and Cleandrides, a military adviser to King Pleistoanax in 446 B. C., who was later exiled and became a general for Thurii.⁷² The Spartan export of generals continued in the Hellenistic period, in which the few Spartan mercenaries known served as generals. LAUNEY has assembled a list of these commanders, among which the most famous is the Xanthippus cited by Vegetius.⁷³

The best account of Xanthippus is of course in Polybius (1.32–36.4), who probably derived it from Philinus.⁷⁴ He states (1.32.1) a Carthaginian mercenary recruiter brought Xanthippus from Sparta, where he had been educated in the Spartan *agoge* and had suitable experience in military affairs. Xanthippus alleged that the Carthaginian strategic predicament resulted from the inexperience of their generals, drew up the Carthaginian army outside the city, and trained it to move in tactical formations and to obey definite commands (1.32.2,7). In other words Xanthippus performed one of the functions of a *hoplomachos*. We cannot be certain that all Spartan generals in foreign service acted as drill instructors, but this does not affect the argument.⁷⁵ The tradition in Vegetius is based at least in part on Xanthippus.

When the story of Xanthippus is coupled with Plutarch's account of Sparta's export of generals, we gain a composite picture of the Spartans essentially identical to that of fifth century B. C. *hoplomachoi*: foreign drillmasters training other peoples' armies. The accounts of Xanthippus in other sources coincide with the tradition in Plutarch. Although Xanthippus was not a general until the Carthaginians gave him command, the sources make him a general or a king.⁷⁶ Indeed Polybius'

⁷² Dexippus: Diod. 13.85.3 = FGtHist 566 fr. 27; PARKE (supra n. 34) 64–65; Gastron: Front., Strat. 2.3.13; Polyaeus 2.16; KIRCHNER, Gastron, RE 7, 1910, 854; Archidamus III: KIRCHNER, Archidamos 4, RE 2, 1895, 467–69; Cleonymus: BRADFORD (supra n. 54) 246–47; Kleonymos 1; Acrotatus: BRADFORD, 22; Akrotatos I; E. DAVID, Sparta between Empire and Revolution, New York 1981, 117–119; Cleandrides: Front., Strat. 2.3.12; LENSCHAU, Kleandrides 2, RE 11, 1921, 556–57.

⁷³ LAUNEY 117–18. No evidence supports CHRIMES' contention that the unit called *xenagía* in Arr., Tact. 10.3 derives its name from its use by Spartan mercenaries. See K. M. T. CHRIMES, Ancient Sparta: a Re-examination of the Evidence, Manchester 1949, 357.

⁷⁴ Other references in BRADFORD (supra n. 54) 314, who omits Oros. 4.9.2. Philinus as source: E. W. Marsden, Polybius as a Military Historian, in: Polybe, Entretien sur l'antiquité classique 20, Geneva 1973, 229.

⁷⁵ Cf. Agesilaus at Ephesus: Xen., Hell. 3.4.16–17, Ages. 1.25. Xanthippus left Carthage soon after his victory over Regulus (Polyb. 1.36.2), and there can be no basis for TAEGER's claim, now shared by BRIZZI, that Xanthippus was the instructor of generalship for the Barca clan. See F. TAEGER, Völker- und Rassenkämpfe im westlichen Mittelmeer, in: J. VOGT, ed., Rom und Karthago, Leipzig 1943, 59; G. BRIZZI, I sistemi informativi dei Romani, Historia Einzelschr. 39, Wiesbaden 1982, 38 n. 2.

⁷⁶ Diodorus (23.15.7) calls him a *strategos misthophoros*; Appian (Lyb. 3) and Eutropius (2.21.4) imply he was a general; Florus (1.8.23) says *dux* and *vir militaris peritissimus*; and Orosius (4.9.2) makes him a Spartan king.

account is clear that Xanthippus was only one of many mercenaries hired in Greece, and that he was not brought to Carthage as an *hoplomachos*.

Furthermore, a precedent for Xanthippus' activity existed at Carthage. Polyaeus (6.41.1) mentions a Greek (not a Spartan) *tacticus* serving Hamilcar in his operations against Agathocles at Syracuse. We should also consider Dorylaeus Tacticus of Amisos, Strabo's great-great-grandfather and a *xenologus* in Crete for Mithridates Euergetes, who became a general for Cnossos in a war against Gortyn, and Theodotas of Rhodes, an ἀνὴρ γενναῖος καὶ τακτικῶν ἐμπειρὸς, who provided Antiochus I with the decisive stratagem for his victory against the Gauls c. 270 B.C.⁷⁷

Certainly our second type of *hoplomachos*, the mercenary military adviser, did not disappear, but at some point in the Hellenistic period the *hoplomachoi* of this type came to be known as *tactici*. The change in terminology is reflected in the Hellenistic Ps.-Plato (Ax. 366 a), who erroneously (cf. Teles in n. 46) calls military instructors in the gymnasia *tactici*. There is no epigraphical evidence that ephobic instructors of *hoplomachia* or other military arts are called *tactici*, although precision in military terminology from a philosophical text is probably not to be expected. Indeed, as we have suggested, Vegetius knew the *hoplomachoi* only as *tactici*.

The cause of this change in terminology is not readily apparent. The *hoplomachoi* of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. had taught *hoplomachia*, *tactica*, and possibly *strategika*. After the *hoplomachoi* of the palaestrae were institutionalized and *hoplomachia* became an ephobic sport, there is no evidence that Hellenistic *hoplomachoi* continued to teach *tactica* or *strategika*. Conversely, the careers of Xanthippus, Dorylaeus, and Theodotas show no concern for *hoplomachia*, but only for *tactica* and *strategika*. If this view is correct, then the change in terminology reflects directly an Hellenistic specialization in function of the two types of *hoplomachoi*.

Vegetius' view of Spartan *tactici* thus mirrors in part the tradition of Spartan generals and mercenary commanders in foreign service, conflated with the Hellenistic innovation of the functional specialization of the two types of *hoplomachoi*. Not all Hellenistic *tactici* were Spartans, nor can it be proven that all Spartan commanders in foreign service acted as *tactici*. For Vegetius, however, the Spartans originated written military theory and the Spartan *tactici* disseminated this doctrine both to their youth and to foreign armies.

The legendary aspect of Vegetius' Spartan drillmasters is best illustrated by Hannibal's *doctor armorum*, whom we have already identified as the historian

⁷⁷ Dorylaeus: Strabo 10.4.10, 12.3.33; H. WILLRICH, *Dorylaeus* 2, RE 5, 1905, 1578; Theodotas: Lucian, *Zeux*. 9–10; R. LAQUEUR, *Theodotas*, RE, 5A, 1934, 1951–52; FGrHist 230; LAUNY 241–42. Despite the views of DAIN it is not certain that either Dorylaeus or Theodotas of Rhodes wrote tactical treatises. The Hypomnemata of Theodorus in Suda s.v. πανικῶ δειμάτι may belong to the *Tactica* of Theodorus of Syracuse (Diog. Laert. 2.104). See A. DAIN, *Les stratégistes byzantins*, Centre de Recherche d'Histoire et Civilisation Byzantine, Travaux et mémoires II, Paris 1967, 322 and JACOB, comm. ad FGrHist 230.

Sosylus. We know essentially nothing about Sosylus, except that he was with Hannibal in Italy for some time, wrote a history of Hannibal, and taught him Greek. It is not certain that Sosylus was a propagandist for Hannibal.⁷⁸ No doubt Sosylus' capacity as a Greek teacher was corrupted into Vegetius' *doctor armorum*, but we should note that this corruption is definite testimony to the legend of Spartan drillmasters.⁷⁹ A Spartan *doctor* automatically led to the addition of *armorum*.

Vegetius' belief in the Spartan origins of military theory and his account of the Spartan drillmasters form a late addition to Sparta's military *Nachruhm* – a topic still awaiting definitive discussion despite the plethora of handbooks on Sparta. If Vegetius' Spartan *tactici* were the disseminators of the original Spartan military theory, we should now seek the creator of this Spartan doctrine most probably in Lycurgus.

Lycurgus' fame as the founder of Spartan institutions includes military practices as well as the political, social, and economic ones. Vegetius may have seen *tactici* (*boplomachoi*) as an integral part of the *agoge*, but the Lycurgus we seek created specific tactical formations and tactical rules rather than an educational system however military. A Lycurgus of this sort already flourished in the fifth and fourth century B.C. accounts of Herodotus, Hippias of Elis, and especially Xenophon.⁸⁰ A reaction to the military view of Lycurgus, however, began in the late fourth century B.C. Aristotle believed Lycurgus helped to establish the Olympic truce and Demetrius of Phalerum denied any bellicose undertakings of the lawgiver.⁸¹ Plutarch's *Vita Lycurgi*, the most detailed and the last known «*Respublica Lacedaemoniorum*» of Antiquity, reflected this trend.⁸²

Nevertheless, the legend of a military Lycurgus persisted, although its growth cannot be traced in detail. Philostephanus (Plut., Lyc. 23.1) quite improbably credited Lycurgus with the invention of the *oulamos*, a square formation of fifty horsemen.⁸³ Even Plutarch, despite his preference for a peace-loving Lycurgus, pre-

⁷⁸ See n.3 supra; JACOBY comm. ad FGrHist 175–76; E. GROAG, Hannibal als Politiker, Vienna 1929, 11–14.

⁷⁹ E. RAWSON, *The Spartan Tradition in European Thought*, Oxford 1969, 101 n.1. It is surprising that some have accepted Vegetius' account of Sosylus at face value and turned Sosylus into a technical military expert and Hannibal's preceptor of military history. The best source for Sosylus' relationship to Hannibal, Nep., Hann. 13.3, can by no means be stretched so far. See P. LÉVÊQUE, *La guerre à l'époque hellénistique*, in: VERNANT 275; BRIZZI (supra n.75) 38 with n.2; and for a more correct view of Sosylus: J. CARCOPINO, *Profils de conquérants*, Paris 1961, 149–50.

⁸⁰ Hdt. 1.65.5; Hippias, FGrHist 6 fr.7 = Plut., Lyc. 23.1; Xen., Res.Lac. 11–13.

⁸¹ Plut., Lyc. 1.1, 23.1 = FGrHist 228 fr.21. Aristotle's claim, fr. 532 Rose, that the Theban Timomachus founded Spartan military institutions is no doubt another aspect of this reaction.

⁸² Plut., Lyc. 23.2; OLLIER (supra n.70) II, 198. On the military vs. the pacifistic Lycurgus also see ILARI (supra n.8) 85–87 with n.116.

⁸³ Philostephanus wrote a *Περὶ εὐρημάτων*: Clem.Al., Strom.1.16, 77.1; F. GISINGER, *Philostephanos* 7, RE 20, 1941, 111–113. *Oulamoi* appear in Il.4.250,469 as infantry units,

served many fragments of the rival tradition. It is significant and certain attestation to the further growth of Lycurgus' military legacy that these fragments no longer stress creation of formations, but are aphorisms of tactical conduct.⁸⁴ Finally, the otherwise unknown Hermolytus Tacticus contributes that Lycurgus established the Spartan use of *synaspismos*, which Lysander taught as did Epaminondas. The Arcadians and Macedonians subsequently learned it from Charidemus, presumably the mercenary general of the fourth century B.C.⁸⁵

Vegetius' legends of the Spartan origin of military theory and of the Spartan drillmasters thus stem from two sources: the Spartan export of commanders for foreign service, exemplified by Xanthippus, and the military aspect of the Lycurgus legend. Certainly by the time of Plutarch Lycurgus had become a military theorist, the creator of tactical formations and the advocate of specific tactical doctrines. If the Spartans were thought the first to write military theory, then Lycurgus, the supposed founder of Spartan military institutions, must have been seen at some point in the growth of the legend as either the initiator of this literary genre or the guiding light from which alleged later Spartan military writers borrowed.⁸⁶ Vegetius' Spartan *tactici*, such as Xanthippus and Sosylus, became the expounders of the doctrine. Indeed the same picture is derived from Hermolytus Tacticus: Lysander, in the role of an *hoplomachos*, is the teacher of Lycurgus' tactics.⁸⁷ Unfortu-

which later commentators (possibly Aristotle) believed numbered forty men (Eust. ad Il. 4.250, 429). Thereafter the *oulamos* is unattested until the Hellenistic period, when it reappears as a subdivision of the *ile*. See LAMMERT, *Ilai* 2, RE 9, 1914, 997–98; BAR-KOCHVA (supra n. 4) 75. KROMAYER believes a *mora* of Spartan cavalry consisted of two *oulamoi* in the fifth century B.C., but his only evidence is this fragment of Philostephanus in Plutarch. A *mora* of Spartan cavalry was first organized in 424 B.C. and *oulamoi* are not mentioned. KROMAYER/VEITH 39; A. TOYNBEE, *Some Problems of Greek History*, London 1969, 374; P. CARTLEDGE, *Sparta and Lakonia: a Regional History 1300–362 B.C.*, London 1979, 275.

⁸⁴ Avoid waging war too often against the same enemy, lest he be taught how to fight: Plut., *Lyc.* 13.5–6, *Ages.* 26.2–3, *Pel.* 15.4, *Mor.* 189F, 213F, 227C; Polyaeus 1.16.2 cf. *Diod.* 15.33–34 and ANDERSON 161, 165, 224; limited pursuit of a defeated foe: Plut., *Lyc.* 22.5, *Mor.* 228F; Polyaeus 1.16.3; other aphorisms: Plut., *Mor.* 228D–229A, 238B.

⁸⁵ Eust. ad Il. 13.130–35, 924; Schol. Town. ad loc.cit. On the significance of *synaspismos* see my *The Legion as Phalanx*, *Chiron* 9, 1979, 303–18. The career of Charidemus: PRITCHETT 85–89. Diodorus, 16.3.2, credits Philip II with the creation of Macedonian *synaspismos* but imitating a Homeric model. Homer was often thought the creator of military theory: *Ael. Tact.* 1.1–2. Diodorus' source may be Ephorus: N. G. L. HAMMOND, *Sources of Diodorus Siculus XVI*, CQ 31, 1937, 77–91 cf. M. M. MARKLE, *Use of the Sarissa by Philip and Alexander of Macedon*, *AJA* 82, 1978, 484, who argues against Diodorus' evidence.

⁸⁶ Plutarch's claim (*Lyc.* 13.1–3, *Mor.* 227B) that Lycurgus prohibited written laws does not necessarily contradict Lycurgus' role as the creator of written military theory. This assertion involves many inconsistencies in Plutarch's own account and is historically incorrect. See BORING's overly cautious discussion (supra n.70) 22, 24–33. In comparing one legend with another consistency is not to be expected.

⁸⁷ If Lycurgus was thought the father of military theory, could this tradition not also include the belief of Callisthenes, Strabo, Philochorus, and others that Tyrtaeus was a general

nately, we cannot trace the development of this legend and perhaps the details were already lost by the time of Vegetius.⁸⁸

V

It is time to wrestle with the problem of Vegetius' source, for which a conclusive solution cannot be found. LAMMERT demonstrated long ago that Vegetius has connections with works other than the five sources explicitly named (Cato Maior, Celsus, Frontinus, Paternus, and Varro), and we should be wary of any «cut and paste» approach to an analysis of his sources.⁸⁹ Vegetius (3 praef.), in fact, seems to indicate that his «Spartan» source is the *prisci annales* rather than a military writer. This discussion will be limited to a few observations.

Except for Vegetius' reference to the Greek *Tactica* (1.8), which he implies were not used, all references to the Spartans appear in book three (praef., 10, 17) and share the theme of the Spartan origin of military theory. This indicates a common source. In addition Carthaginians are three times linked to the Spartans (3 praef. bis, 3.17) and the formula common to the literature of *heuremata* appears twice.⁹⁰ Thus Vegetius' source emphasized Spartan-Roman and/or Spartan-Carthaginian-Roman connections (cf. Veg. 3 praef. and n. 2 supra) and probably *heuremata*.

Other attempts to analyze Vegetius' sources for 3 praef. and 3.17 have ignored these factors and assigned 3 praef. to Paternus or Frontinus and 3.17 to Cato through Frontinus. None of them can be correct.⁹¹ CHRIMES seeks a different solu-

in the Messenian wars? Strabo 8.4.10 = FGrHist 124 fr.24; Ath.14.630f = FGrHist 328 fr. 216; Diod.8.27; Polyaeus 1.17; JACOBY, comm. ad 328 fr. 216. The claim of an Athenian origin for Tyrtaeus dates to Athenian sources of the fourth century B. C., but this does not preclude further perversion of the truth in much later writers such as Polyaeus.

⁸⁸ Despite his concern for *heures*, Ephorus probably cannot be the creator of the legend of the Spartan origin of military theory. See n. 85 supra. Nor can this tradition be blamed on the Christians, who believed Moses set the military example for the Greeks. See Clem.AL., Strom. 1.24, 158–64.

⁸⁹ Veg. 1.8, 4.41 cf. 2.3; F. LAMMERT, *Gnomon* 10, 1934, 271–74, *Die antike Poliorketik und ihr Weiterwirken*, *Klio* 31, 1938, 400–401, and *Die älteste erhaltene Schrift über Seetaktik und ihre Beziehung zum Anonymus Byzantinus des 6. Jahrhunderts, zu Vegetius und zu Aineias' Strategika*, *Klio* 33, 1941, 285–87. Little new on the problem of Vegetius' sources is found in A. E. NEUMANN, *Vegetius*, RE, Suppl. 10, 1965, 992–1020 or V. GIUFFRÈ, *La letteratura «de re militari»*, Naples 1974.

⁹⁰ 3 praef.: *Primi Lacedaemonii ... artem proeliorum scripsisse ...*; 3.17: *Hoc primi Lacones invenerunt ...* Vegetius (4.21) gives another *heurema*, the tactic of assaulting cities with scaling ladders devised by Capaneus, one of the seven against Thebes in mythology, but we cannot with certainty tie this to our «Spartan» source.

⁹¹ SANDER attributed Vegetius 3 praef. to Paternus' *De re militari*, for which he claimed an Hellenizing *Tendenz* derived from Hadrian's military reforms. SCHENK rightfully rejected this view, while attributing the preface to Vegetius' own creativity and the Spartan exempla to Frontinus (cf. *Strat.* 2.2.11, 3.10). SCHENK's view also will not work, since he ignores Vegetius' explicit references to other sources for the Spartan legends. The two strata-

tion: Vegetius' Spartan *Tactica* existed and a reorganization of the Spartan phalanx after Leuctra became the direct model for the Hellenistic phalanx in Arrian's *Tactica*. The Spartan *Tactica*, however, are as mythical as her views of Spartan military organization.⁹²

Nevertheless, CHRIMES indirectly raises an interesting question. The *Tactica* of Asclepiodotus, Aelian, and Arrian clearly follow a Macedonian model and explicitly refer to only one Spartan tactical tradition – the Laconian countermarch.⁹³ We must distinguish, however, what these manuals label as Spartan from the Spartan material they contain. Xenophon composed the earliest preserved theoretical discussions of tactical organization, which either described the Spartan army or were based on a Spartan model, and he must have had some influence on later tactical writers.⁹⁴ The Spartans had the first Greek phalanx with numerous subdivisions and subordinate tactical commanders – a fact emphasized in the anonymous «*De re strategica*» of the Justinianic period. His statement shows that a Spartan tradition remained alive in the Late Roman Empire, but it cannot be connected with the extant Greek *Tactica*.⁹⁵ One cannot deny that the numerous subdivisions of the Hellenistic phalanx follow a Spartan precedent despite differences in the names and sizes of units. Aelian *Tacticus* (34.3) notes that Philip and Alexander preferred the Laconian countermarch to the Macedonian, and Asclepiodotus (2.2) discusses the change from Spartan to Hellenistic terminology for the subdivisions of the phalangical file. Certainly a Spartan tradition remained in practice and in theory, although no Spartan wrote a military treatise and Spartans were not emphasized in the extant Hellenistic *Tactica*, which therefore cannot be Vegetius' «Spartan» source.

gems from Frontinus both concern Xanthippus. The attribution of 3.17 to Cato through Frontinus ignores the probability of a common source for Vegetius' Spartan material and SCHENK's citations of *Front. Strat.* 2.3.17, 21–22 are not convincing. Other parts of 3.17 may have connections with Cato, but this will not prove only one source was used. Only a weak case for Cato as the «Spartan» source is possible. See n. 97 *infra*. Moreover, Frontinus would not have credited the Spartans with the origins of military theory, since he followed a Greek tradition which saw Homer as the founder of military theory and wrote an Homeric *Tactica* now lost. See *Ael. Tact.* 1.1–2; WHEELER (*supra* n. 62) 371 with n. 126; E. SANDER, *Die historischen Beispiele in der Epitoma des Vegetius*, BPW 50, 1930, 955–58, review of SCHENK, BPW 51, 1931, 875, *Die Hauptquellen der Bücher I–III der Epitoma rei militaris des Vegetius*, *Philologus* 87, 1932, 369–75; D. SCHENK, *Flavius Vegetius Renatus: die Quellen der Epitoma Rei Militaris*, *Klio, Beiheft* 22, Leipzig 1930, 42 n. 3, 54–55.

⁹² CHRIMES (*supra* n. 73) 346–59; TOYNBEE (*supra* n. 83) 365–404.

⁹³ *Asclep.* 10.13–15; *Ael. Tact.* 27.1–3, 28.2, 34.3–5; *Arr., Tact.* 23.1, 3, 24.2, 31.4, 32.1. These manuals also refer to the Spartan unit *enomotia* without specifying it as Spartan: *Asclep.* 2.2; *Ael. Tact.* 5.2; *Arr., Tact.* 6.2–3.

⁹⁴ *Xen., Res. Lac.* 11.3–10, *Cyr.* 2.3.21–22, 4.2–3; ANDERSON 96–98.

⁹⁵ *Anon. Byz., De re strat.* 15.15, in: H. KÖCHLY/W. RÜSTOW, *Griechische Kriegsschriftsteller*, II, 2, Leipzig 1853–55. This statement is not found in Asclepiodotus, Aelian, or Arrian. Although the Anonymous follows these Stoic tacticians in some respects, his phalanx is ten rather than sixteen deep and the scope of his work is broader.

We have noted that Vegetius' Spartan drillmasters form a late addition to the Lacedaemonian military *Nachruhm*, but Vegetius' attempt to see the Romans as the direct heirs of the original Spartan military theory also belongs to another historiographical trend. In the second century B. C. and again in the Late Republican-Augustan period the Romans attempted to refute the Greek view of Romans as barbarians and to stress the continuity of Greek culture with that of the Romans by associating the Roman constitution and Roman customs with those of the Spartans. Two of Vegetius' sources, Cato and Varro, belong to this trend. Cato claimed the Sabines were Spartan descendants, from whom the Romans learned Spartan customs, just as Varro later thought the Romans adopted Spartan practices.⁹⁶

Beyond this point there can be no certainty in determining Vegetius' «Spartan» source. Cato? Varro? A common «Spartan» source for Vegetius and the anonymous *De re strategica*? The meagre evidence forbids a convincing argument.⁹⁷ In any event, Vegetius' Spartan drillmasters present a loud but distinct echo of the real *hoplomachoi* ridiculed by Plato.⁹⁸

⁹⁶ Cato, Orig. fr. 50–51, HRR² I, 68–70 cf. Cic., Rep. 2.2, 3, 15, 18, 42, 43, 50, 58: references to Lycurgus allegedly from the Origines; Varro, fr. 21, HRR² II, 23 cf. Plut., Rom. 16.1, Num. 1.2–3; Strabo 5.4.12; Ath. 6.273 d–e; F. OLLIER, Pythagoras de Sparte, REG 49–50, 1946–47, 139–49; E. J. BICKERMAN, Origines Gentium, CP 47, 1952, 65–81. The Spartan and Carthaginian constitutions were also subjects of comparison to which Polybius added the Romans. Isoc. 3.24; Arist., Pol. 2.8.1–9; Polyb. 6.43.1, 47.9; OLLIER (supra n. 70) II, 149, 163. SANDER's argument for Paternus as the source of Veg. 3 praef. (BPW 51, 1931, 875) is based on a supposed reappearance of this Spartan theme under Hadrian. If Hadrian the *Graeculus* had stressed Roman-Spartan military connections, we would expect to find this idea emphasized in Arrian's *Tactica*, written to celebrate Hadrian's vicennalia. We have seen that Arrian practically ignores the Spartans in this treatise.

⁹⁷ Several factors could point to Cato as the «Spartan» source. SANDER and SCHENK (supra n. 91) assigned Veg. 3.17 to Cato but for inadequate reasons. We have noted Cato's interests in the association of Roman and Spartan customs, and Vegetius' Spartan-Carthaginian connections would also seem to fit Cato. The falsification of Sosylus' role could be special pleading for Roman defeats. In addition, Cato (Orig. fr. 83) employs the infrequent *Laco* for Spartan, which is also found in Veg. 3.17. As the author of an Origines Cato would certainly have some concern for *heuremata*, and the early Roman annalists, Cato's contemporaries, probably invented a number of military *heuremata*. Cf. C. Acilius in Liv. 35.14.5–9. Nevertheless, the case for Cato is still too slight to withstand close scrutiny.

⁹⁸ I wish to acknowledge that my research has been aided by a grant from the Research Council of the Graduate School of the University of Missouri/Columbia and by a fellowship from the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation. My thanks to D. HENNIG and M. WÖRRLÉ for beneficial criticisms.