AINEIAS TAKTIKOS IN HIS INTELLECTUAL CONTEXT¹

D. GRAHAM J. SHIPLEY

He began to replace the papers, one by one, in the elaborate sequence he had ordained for them. I handed him *Puck of Pook's Hill*. He took the book from me, still apparently pondering the fearful possibilities consequent on failure to trace the codeword. Then he suddenly became aware I had been looking at the Kipling stories. He took the little volume from me, and pushed it away under a *Glossary of Military Terms and Organization in the Field*. For a second he seemed a shade embarrassed.

Anthony Powell, *The Valley of Bones* (1964)²

Much effort has been expended in the attempt to identify the author of the late classical treatise known as *Poliorketika*, generally by deduction from the meagre evidence in the text itself. As far as this goes, the likeliest candidate remains the younger Aineias of Stymphalos, militarily active in the 360s.³ This, however, remains unconfirmed, as the range of views in this volume shows. Accordingly, I sometimes refer to our author as 'Aineias' (in inverted commas). Whoever the author was, the work seems likely to belong to the mid- or late 350s.⁴

Aside from questions of name and date, what persona does 'Aineias' convey through his text? What identity, or identities, does he intentionally assert or unintentionally reveal? In the light of this, what can we further ascertain about the cultural and intellectual context within which the work was composed, and about the author's aims? To what extent, indeed, were those aims military, scientific, political—or even rhetorical and literary? As we shall see, recent advances in the understanding of the *polis*,⁵ of Arkadian politics and identities,⁶ and of the nature of oligarchy⁷ allow us to fine-tune our appreciation of his self-presentation.

Ethnic and political identities

At the broadest scale, 'Aineias' writes as a Hellene. The observation may seem trivially true; but it does help define the work, for it is noticeable that he draws only a tiny number of historical illustrations from non-Greek history—the story of Glous (31. 35) seems the only straightforward case—despite being familiar, at some level, with the work of Herodotos.⁸ His focus is thus almost exclusively on the Greek world, and he has little interest in warfare and other violence in other places. I say 'warfare' rather than 'siege warfare', because examples of actual sieges in the text are few: in the final part of the work, specifically devoted to what happens once a siege is under way (chapters 32–40),⁹ he uses only three historical examples as against 61 in the preceding 31 chapters.¹⁰ He scarcely even takes any examples from conflicts involving both Hellenes and non-Hellenes. 'Barbarians' as a general category are once, perhaps, envisaged as possible enemies (24.

¹ I thank Maria Pretzler for inviting me to contribute to the 2010 conference *in absentia* and to this volume, as well as for copies of publications and for editorial guidance; and several other contributors for sight of their drafts. My paper has its genesis in the interchange of ideas about Aineias Taktikos with students at the University of Leicester, especially the members of my department's Greek Club and of successive source study groups. On specific points I thank Philip de Souza and Peter Rhodes for useful advice. Particular thanks for helpful comments are also due to Tony Barratt, Kim Harman, and Sarah Scott. The invaluable assistance of the library staff at the University of Leicester and the Institute of Classical Studies, London, is, as ever, acknowledged. *Special abbreviations*: A. = Aineias Taktikos; Bettalli = Bettalli 1990; Hunter = Hunter 1927; Whitehead = Whitehead 2002.

² From p. 63 of the Fontana edition (1973).

³ Whitehead 10–13.

⁴ Whitehead 8–10.

⁵ See esp. Hansen and Nielsen 2004, and the many preceding volumes from the Copenhagen Polis Centre (main ideas summarized by Shipley 2003; Hansen 2006).

⁶ e.g. Nielsen 1999; Roy 2000; Nielsen 2002; Nielsen 2004a; Pretzler 2009.

⁷ See esp. Ostwald 2000a, also Ostwald 2000b.

⁸ For A.'s use of *Hdt.*, see 31. 9 with Brown 1981 and Whitehead 38 n. 114 (with references), 185–6; see also A. 31. 14 and 25–9, 37. 6–7.

⁹ I follow Whitehead 20, who identifies a tripartite structure in the work.

¹⁰ See 37. 6–7, 40. 2–3 and 4–5. At 39. 6 he refers to a technique that has been used, but seems to have no specific incident in mind. On A.'s illustrative stories, see Pretzler, this volume.

17, on secret signals), while in specific terms we hear only of Abdera's encounter with the Triballians (15. 8–10), a Spartan governor in Thrace (27. 7),¹¹ Timoxenos and Artabazos (31. 25–7), Histiaios's ruse in the Ionian revolt (31. 28), the siege of Barke by Amasis (37. 6–7), and Sinope's conflict with Datames (40. 4–5). Other Greek communities that have barbarians for neighbours are discussed without their enemies being named.¹² While the author's focus is Hellenocentric, however, his reference in the preface (§4) to certain Hellenes who have suffered calamity but have subsequently recovered is a striking and perhaps unique refocalization (to which we shall return presently), a momentary stepping outside the Greek world: perhaps in an attempt to universalize his observations to the whole of that world.¹³

To what extent, if at all, does he write as a Peloponnesian,¹⁴ an Arkadian, or indeed a citizen of any particular *polis*, be it Stymphalos or another? Only once does he hint at local knowledge: when he identifies *paneia* ('panic') as a Peloponnesian and especially Arkadian word (27. 1).¹⁵ This would support the notion that he himself came from the Peloponnese, perhaps from Arkadia; but, if so, he is unlikely to have been writing for a purely Arkadian audience, who would have known that the term *paneia* was characteristically their own. Since Arkadia is landlocked,¹⁶ the point about his wider intended audience is supported by the frequent references to coastal locations (e.g. 16. 13, a coastal road; 16. 21, a fleet; 17. 1, docking of ships; 29. 12, dockyards) and by the fact that the closing lines of the text as we have it lead up to a discussion of naval matters.¹⁷ Likewise, recommendations such as that about removing domestic animals to a neighbouring *chora* (10. 1–2) presume a continuous landscape divided into *poleis*. His theoretical landscape may be a re-imagined Peloponnese, but could equally be in central Greece, western Asia Minor, Sicily, or Magna Graecia, or could be a sort of amalgam of these: for in none of them is the typical *polis* far from its neighbours. (None of this, I think, bears upon the question whether the author is Peloponnesian, Arkadian, or Stymphalian, which must be judged on other grounds.) He frames his prescriptions and observations so as to be valid for the Greek world in its widest sense. Only in respect of islands is his vision somewhat impoverished: he never uses the word 'island', he names few island *poleis*,¹⁸ and when he does he never notes that that is what they are.

Those possible ethnic identities, therefore, are recessive in the work. 'Aineias' does not even name the exemplary people or peoples who were restored to viability after calamity (above): they could as well be Athenians as Spartans or others.¹⁹ Clearly he wants his work to have general applicability across the Greek world,²⁰ and therefore chooses to veil his allegiances almost completely. But his Greek world is a kind of finite universe with almost nothing outside it. To put it another way, what lies outside is of almost no interest, and his prescriptions (written, of course, in Greek) are framed for use by Greeks alone—not humankind in its entirety, as one could say of Thucydides. This contrasts with, for example, Aristotle in the *Politics*, whose arguments are explicitly Hellenocentric (cf. e.g. *Pol.* 1. 1, women and barbarians as natural slaves; 1. 9, the barter economy of barbarians; and indeed his whole notion of the *polis* as a *telos*, e.g. 1. 2) and in a different sense with Xenophon in his *Hipparchikos* or *Cavalry Commander*, which mentions only Attic places (*Mag. eq.* 1. 26, 3. 1–14 *passim*, 7. 1, 7. 4).

More importantly, 'Aineias' is a man of the *polis*. He mentions a great many Greek city-states,²¹ and seems to assume that warfare will involve a city on one side or both: a city, indeed, organized in

¹¹ Probably an 'area harmost' rather than in a Greek *polis* (Whitehead 176).

¹² Bosporan kingdom, 5. 2; Herakleia, 11. 10a and 12. 5; Apollonia, 20. 4. Kyrene and Barke, 16. 14.

¹³ *Contra* Hunter xxv–xxvi, 104. the work is unlikely to have been intended for a single commissioning patron. See Bettalli vii, 15–16, revising the view he stated at Bettalli 1986 and now concurring with Whitehead 39–40 as to the universalizing character of the work. A. envisages a range of possible circumstances and responses.

¹⁴ On Peloponnesian identity and whether it was a significant concept, see Vlassopoulos n.d. [2008]. Whitehead 39 considers the possibility that, if the author is not Aineias of Stymphalos, he is at least Peloponnesian.

¹⁵ See Whitehead 10–11.

¹⁶ Leaving aside coastal Lepreon in Triphylia, incorporated into Arkadia in the 4th cent.: Ps.-Skylax 44 with Shipley 2011 ad loc.; Nielsen 2004b, 543–4.

¹⁷ See Whitehead 24 and 114 for A.'s assumption that the sea is close by.

¹⁸ Only Chios (11. 3; 17. 5), Kerkyra (11. 13–15), Aigina (20. 5), Naxos (22. 20, if the text is correct: see Whitehead ad loc.), and Mytilene (31. 34).

¹⁹ Hunter 102 (Sparta); Bettalli 212–13 (Athens).

²⁰ At other points (e.g. 23. 3–5 and 7–11) editors have thought that he conceals the name of a Peloponnesian community for reasons of discretion or politics (Hunter xvii, on 29. 3–10); but see Whitehead 180.

²¹ For his importance to the study of the *polis*, see Hansen 2007.

the characteristic manner of a Greek *polis*. Its people is divided into political tribes (*phylai*, e.g. 3. 2). It has an *agora* where they gather (e.g. 1. 9, 3. 5, 10. 15), as well as civic offices (*archeia*, 22. 2 and 4), a *prytaneion* (10. 4), magistrates (e.g. 1. 4, 4. 6), a council (10. 4), a theatre (1. 9, 3. 5, 22. 4), and so on. The population is based in the urban centre, not in the countryside.²² The distinction between principal streets (*diodoi*) and alleys (*rhymai*, 2. 5) is consistent with, though it does not entail, the kind of grid-plan layout typical of Greek towns founded or rebuilt in the archaic and classical periods. Such a layout, indeed, was adopted at Stymphalos itself in the second quarter of the fourth century.²³

Does 'Aineias' prefer, or identify with, a particular kind of *polis*? Previous detailed investigations have suggested that he offers no grounds for inferring that he favours a particular political system such as democracy or oligarchy;²⁴ rather, he is a defender of the *status quo*. In the light of recent studies of the classical *polis*, however, as well as of the nature of Greek oligarchy and the political history of the Peloponnese, we can nuance this view somewhat. It is true that his recommended managerial techniques include several that are nowadays thought to have been characteristic of democracies, such as drawing lots (3. 1 and 6, 18. 1, 20. 2). He also remarks that rich men should be selected for certain roles (5. 1, 22. 15), that the well-off should subsidize the city's military needs (13. 1–4), and that one should make an example of them if they fall short in performing their duty (38. 5). At first sight these provisions have a democratic flavour. The lot was the cornerstone of the Athenian constitution, a way of ensuring that a large sample of citizens exercised civic power in turn. At Athens the same selectivity towards the rich was shown in filling key positions such as that of treasurer (*tamias*, e.g. Arist. *Ath. pol.* 4). A man with a great deal at stake in the economy, one who had more to lose, was thought more reliable than a poor man who might be open to bribery.

But the lot was almost certainly a time-hallowed Greek practice, consistent also with oligarchy, the commonest constitutional form in the Peloponnese²⁵ at least before the 360s. The crucial difference in a democracy was that the lot was used to select from among all eligible citizens, not from a limited number.²⁶ Again, oligarchies, no less than democracies, deployed members of the elite in key positions.²⁷ In fact, 'Aineias' envisages that the financial contributions of the rich will be refunded in the fullness of time (13. 1–4), which was certainly not the case with liturgies at Athens, or citizen benefactions elsewhere. He even alludes to his own discussion, in another book, of how to adjust the terms of debts and interest rates 'equitably and painlessly for the rich' (14. 2). From the last two illustrations we may deduce that 'Aineias', while not actively anti-democratic, is not a radical democrat of Athenian type.²⁸ In this connection it may be recalling that, while the historical Aineias grew up in an oligarchic world under Spartan domination, the Arkadian league after 369 promoted democracy,²⁹ so that his role as a commander was precisely to sustain democracies (see below on his actions at Sikyon).

Other evidence of the writer's political leanings might be sought among the seemingly illiberal steps that he sometimes recommends, especially in chapter 10. Here and elsewhere he advises the commander to issue proclamations on many matters, imposing tight controls upon citizens and foreigners (including impoverished ones, *talaipeirioi*, 10. 10),³⁰ limitations on free speech, and restrictions on the use of public spaces; there are even 'street commanders' (*rhymarchai*, 3. 4–5). Cattle are to be removed to the next *polis*, if necessary (10. 1). We may wonder what kind of military officer or civic official could, in reality, legally close inns (10. 10), set a premium on imports (10. 12), announce rewards to be paid presumably by the *polis* (10. 16), control the movements of hostages' relatives (10. 23), abolish interest rates and loans (14. 1), and compel the mouths of domestic animals to be cauterized so as to silence them (23. 2). These measures have been seen as totalitarian

²² Bettalli 17.

²³ Shipley 2005b, 361.

²⁴ See esp. Bettalli 19–20; Whitehead 29–32; id., this volume, 000.

²⁵ Gehrke 1986, *passim*; cf. Shipley 2005a, 325–6.

²⁶ Headlam-Morley 1933, 78–87, esp. 80 & n. 1, citing Schömann 1861, 154, who in turn cites Anaximenes, *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* (4th c. BC), 2. 14; but the key passage is 2. 18. 1424a40–b2, where it is explicitly said that in *oligarchies* most magistrates should be appointed by lot.

²⁷ Bettalli 19–20.

²⁸ Whitehead 31 rightly castigates Hunter 233 for protesting that A. would victimize the well-off.

²⁹ Roy 2000; Nielsen 2002, 485–90.

³⁰ Unless the word simply means 'without lodgings': Whitehead 122.

and troublingly anti-democratic.³¹ They may also be purely fanciful.

In some of these cases, however, 'Aineias' may be tacitly assuming that normal decision-making processes will be followed: the commander persuading the council and people to adopt the measures (such as selecting as ambassador a man he wants out of the way, 10. 20).³² In at least one instance he refers to what must surely be a longer-term strategy on the part of the *polis*, not to hire too many mercenaries (12. 4). He gives no hint of whether such decision-making processes are democratic or oligarchic; either would involve council and assembly.³³ On the other hand, in some cases it seems clear that he assumes that the military commander will have executive authority even over non-soldiers.

Even tyranny, though our author's focalizing language generally distances us from it, is not depicted pejoratively. Tyrants, like other governments, may adopt clever ruses (5. 2), though they can also make mistakes (31. 33). Some military techniques are recommended specifically where one is defending 'a tyrant's citadel' (22. 19).³⁴ Tyranny is simply another kind of regime (10. 11), albeit one that may be brought about by the failure on the part of a *polis* to take the right steps to protect itself (12. 5). Is our author's formal neutrality towards tyranny evidence of a preference on his part for autocratic over populist politics, or only of a desire to universalize his recommendations about the conduct of war? The latter seems likely, in view of what we have already seen; so it may be only through incompleteness of coverage that tyranny is the only form of government that he presents as 'other' (apart from, perhaps, Persian kingship).

If the author is Aineias of Stymphalos, the notice he takes of tyrannies may relate to his own military intervention at Sikyon against the tyrant Euphron (Xen. *Hell.* 7. 3. 1),³⁵ when he enlisted the support of the 'leading men' (called *kratistoi* and *beltistoi* by Xenophon, thus not necessarily hereditary aristocrats) who had been expelled without a *dogma*, that is, a decree of the people. The mobilization of influential men does not necessarily mean Aineias was not acting to support democracy. Indeed, the situation at Sikyon was unusually complicated, involving a *demos* seemingly devoted to a leader who had become tyrannical, but also rich exiles who were pro-Spartan rather than pro-Arkadian.³⁶ In any case, the episode tells us nothing directly of Aineias's personal preferences: he was a general of the Arkadian league with a job to do. We must simply assume he would not have been elected *strategos* if there had been any doubt about his commitment to democracy, Arkadian style.

Thus far we have seen that, although it is possible to detect slight differences between the author's vision of a well-run *polis* and the fullest form of democracy and some hints of antipathy towards tyranny, he scrupulously veils his own political preferences for the most part. Although he cannot be said to be either a democrat or an oligarch in a simple sense, in his writing he is an instinctive defender of Hellenism and an active defender of the constitutional *polis*. We may take this neutral pose as reflecting his generalizing impulses, his efforts to map out his subject.

There remains the question whether the author's more dictatorial recommendations could be applied in reality. Is he writing theoretically, even impractically, advocating measures that citizens of no real *polis* would contemplate even in a crisis? Were such steps seen as incompatible with the values of a citizen-state? Or were they actually taken, or at least contemplated, in the classical period? And, if so, were they taken by generals without reference to other authorities?

Sources for classical history offer little support for a positive answer to the last two questions. Athenian generals could call an assembly at Athens (e.g. Thuc. 2. 22. 1; 2. 59. 3), but we have no evidence that they had authority to micro-manage the city.³⁷ When Spartan generals, for example, summon assemblies (Brasidas at Torone and Skione, Thuc. 4. 114 and 120; Gylippos at Syracuse, Thuc. 7. 21), it is quite possible that they have gone through the usual channels, asking the magistrates to convene a meeting. In such cases—and indeed in the circumstances set forth by 'Aineias'—we may be dealing with informal, *de facto* authority rather than the exercise of defined powers. Brasidas probably behaved autocratically in various ways when defending Sparta's allies in

³¹ See Jenkins 2006, 51–9; also Whitehead 40–1.

³² On this passage, see Whitehead 27 & n. 81.

³³ Ostwald 2000a, *passim*.

³⁴ See Whitehead 157 on this passage, with his p. 32 & n. 92.

³⁵ Here I take a slightly different line from Whitehead 157 (on 22. 19).

³⁶ See Roy 2000, 323–4, for the convoluted nature of Sikyonian politics.

³⁷ On the limited implication of their power to call assemblies, see Hamel 1998, 6–12.

northern Greece against the Athenians; but if one examines his individual decisions one sees that they were taken either in pursuit of military objectives and/or with the implied consent of the community, such as when he evacuated citizens' wives and children to safety (Thuc. 4. 123).

Nor do Greek *strategoi* of the fifth and fourth centuries, when they are present in an allied *polis* to provide military leadership, seem to have thrown their weight around in the way that Aineias envisages. Neither is it clear that when a man was appointed *strategos autokrator*, 'self-empowering general', he had authority to govern by decree. We possess only vague indications of the powers of such men.³⁸ There is no sign, for example, that Dionysios of Syracuse (appointed στρατηγὸς αὐτοκράτωρ at Diod. 13. 95. 1) exercised the kind of authority over civilians that Aineias describes.

Some of the treatise's thoroughgoing prescriptions recall indirectly the improvisations of classical commanders in the field rather than inside a *polis*. For example, stratagems attributed by Polyainos (writing in the second century AD) to the fourth-century Athenian commander Timotheos include melting down coins in order to strike new ones (3. 10. 14), normally the prerogative of a *polis* or ruler. But nothing in Polyainos's copious stories of Iphikrates, Timotheos, and Chabrias (3. 9–11) matches our author's prescriptions for the internal management of a *polis*. Rather, it seems correct to say that he is 'studiously vague' about the formal position of his imagined commander.³⁹ It begins to look as if, even if his recommendations may be both practical in principle and grounded in experience, they do not conform to what we know of last classical warfare, and might have required a new kind of military organization. To that extent, his work can be called theoretical as well as practical.

Literary and intellectual context

Our author, whether Arkadian or not, is writing in a very specific historical and political-military context: one that influences his selection and presentation. Can we go further, and identify the 'research context' in which he is working? Is he simply generating his ideas from his own and from what he has personally read or heard, and then elaborating them? Or does he mean us (as I shall argue) to see his work as situated in a wider tradition of reflection and theorization?

On one level his response to his predecessors is to use them as sources of information. It has long been known, for example, that he retails material from Herodotos⁴⁰ and less often Thucydides,⁴¹ though he does not name them and often adds important details to their accounts.⁴² Awareness of Homer, Xenophon, and other writers is confirmed by examination of his vocabulary,⁴³ though it is less certain that he uses Xenophon's *Anabasis*⁴⁴ or Ephoros.⁴⁵

On a deeper level, it is also uncertain whether he follows earlier writers as models for organizing his work. We are told that the sophists had written 'many' books (Xen. *Cyn.* 13. 1–8 *passim*): among them Simon of Athens, whose work on horsemanship survives in part and who is cited by Xenophon in *Hippike* or *Horsemanship* (*Eq.* 1. 1; 3. 9. 6).⁴⁶ As a general model for a mid-fourth-century man embarking on the writing of a treatise, one could also invoke Plato's earlier dialogues, including *Laches*, an inconclusive discussion of whether young men can be taught courage. Indeed, it would be unwise to underestimate the impact of the sophists, and of Plato's Academy, upon

³⁸ For the term and its limited implications, see Hamel 1998, 201–4.

³⁹ Whitehead 40–1.

⁴⁰ Cases listed at Whitehead 38 n. 114.

⁴¹ Thuc. known to A.: Hornblower 1995, 53. A. uses Thuc. at 2. 3–6 for Plataea (cf. T. 2. 2–6) and at 38. 2 for Brasidas (T. 5. 9. 8, also the view of Hornblower 1996, 444; Whitehead 201 *ad loc.*; cf. Bettalli 330 for 38. 1 τὸ γὰρ ἐπιόν as a possible verbal echo of T.). Referring to the book as a whole, Hunter lxxxi convicts A. of having 'few of the virtues and many of the vices of a conscious literary style', both the virtues and the vices reflecting admiration of Thuc.; while certain phrases (e.g. at 10. 21, 16. 4) 'have an unmistakably Thucydidean ring' (lxxxi n. 1). Yet he resists the notion that A. consciously imitates Thuc. (lxxi).—For 4th-cent. knowledge of T., see generally Hornblower 1995. Cf. also Marchant and Bowersock 1968, 469, for T.'s influence on the 'Old Oligarch'; while Bowersock dates O.O. to the mid-5th cent., Marr and Rhodes 2008, 3–6 with 31–2, date him 431–424; Hornblower 2000 to the 4th cent.

⁴² Brown 1981, 366, 388; Burliga 2009, 101.

⁴³ Hunter lii–lxiv; cf. Bettalli 10 n. 25.

⁴⁴ Bettalli l.c. and 295 on 27. 11, leaving open the possibility that A. is citing Xen. inaccurately from memory. Cf. however the use of μόσυνες at 33. 3, a word specific to the Mossynoikoi of the E. Black Sea (cf. Ps.-Skylax 85–6) previously used only by Xen. *Anab.* 5. 4. 26 (with σσ).

⁴⁵ Bettalli 10 n. 25, *contra* Bengtson 1962, 460.

⁴⁶ Text in Widdra 1964, 41–4.

political elites across Greece. A literate man in a fairly important *polis* outside Athens, no doubt from a prosperous family, would surely have known about the philosophical innovations occurring at Athens, and could even have spent time at Athens—or at least read Plato.⁴⁷ Indeed, we know that a man of Stymphalos, one Sophainetos (*FGrHist* 109), wrote about the expedition of Cyrus;⁴⁸ like Xenophon, he must have known the elder Aineias of Stymphalos, who died on that march (Xen. *Anab.* 4. 7. 13) and whose son or nephew may be our author. What we do not have is any evidence that any writer before ‘Aineias’ composed a technical treatise on warfare; and previous studies have pointed to him as the originator of the model,⁴⁹ a ‘pioneer’.⁵⁰

There can be little doubt that ‘Aineias’, writing in the mid- or later 350s,⁵¹ responds in certain respects to the work of his contemporary Xenophon.⁵² The latter’s *Hipparchikos* (above) is earlier than the *Hippike*, which cites it (*Eq.* 12. 14); both are earlier than the *Poliorketika*.⁵³ Xenophon’s *Kyнетикος* or *On Hunting* (*Cyn.*) is earlier still.⁵⁴ The relationship of our text to Xenophon’s *Poroi* or *Resources* (355 BC or shortly after) is less clear, since they were written around the same date. Be that as it may, the two writers could easily have corresponded or met each other, even if our author is not the historical Aineias of Stymphalos. If he was Aineias, of course, it is even likelier that they knew each other, because Xenophon knew the elder Aineias (above) and because, between about the late 390s and the early 360s, Xenophon lived at Skillous near Olympia—perhaps a long day’s ride, no more than two, from Stymphalos.⁵⁵ Nor is the window for the direct exchange of ideas limited to the years of his residency there. Either before or after he left, they—that is, Xenophon and our author, whether or not he is Aineias of Stymphalos—could have corresponded by letter or met face to face, perhaps even in Athens after Xenophon’s recall from exile.

Xenophon’s *Hippike* provided our author with a model for a theoretical preface, if he needed one; but he chose to write a very different opening from Xenophon’s pious disquisition on the role of the gods and heroes in the origins of hunting.⁵⁶ Closer in time to our work, though possibly written just after it, the *Poroi* offers a closer parallel for an abstract preface outlining the ‘research question’:⁵⁷

For my part I have always held that the constitution of a state reflects the character of the leading politicians. But some of the leading men at Athens have stated that they recognize justice as clearly as other men; ‘but’, they have said, ‘owing to the poverty of the masses, we are forced to be somewhat unjust in our treatment of the cities’. This set me thinking whether by any means the citizens might obtain food entirely from their own soil, which would certainly be the fairest way. I felt that, were this so, they would be relieved of their poverty, and also of the suspicion with which they are regarded by the Greek world.

(1. 1, trans. Marchant)

In other respects, however, the treatises of Xenophon are very different in content from that of ‘Aineias’. This is partly because of their different intended readerships: *Hipparchikos* is aimed at Athenian commanders, *Hippike* at unnamed novices in horsemanship, and neither cites any historical exempla to support its recommendations. Whitehead points out, however, that what

⁴⁷ Cf. the outline suggestion of Slater 2010 that A. may have been connected with current philosophical currents.

⁴⁸ Whitehead 37 n. 111.

⁴⁹ For earlier Sophistic discussions of the soldier’s art as practical and orally based rather than theorized in writing, see Bettalli 14–15. A. himself sometimes hints at earlier areas of (oral?) debate (2.7; 22. 13; 24. 16; 26. 6 and 12; 27. 1); see Whitehead 36–7.

⁵⁰ Bettalli 13–15, against the idea that A. is following a predecessor who wrote *about this topic*; similarly Whitehead 34–5 and n. 101.

⁵¹ Whitehead 8–10.

⁵² Whitehead 36 suggests they exchanged ideas.

⁵³ Marchant and Bowersock 1968, xxviii, says *Mag.* is 365; p. xxxii, *Eq.* soon after. Anderson 1974, 184, dates *Eq.* to Xen.’s old age, and *Mag. eq.* (which *Eq.* cites at 12. 14) ‘some years’ earlier. Bettalli 15: they are closely contemporaneous. Bettalli 14 n. 48 cites Delebecque 1973 (*non vidi*) as revising his earlier view, set out in Delebecque 1957, 430 and 444 (*non vidi*), that Aineias’s work was earlier than *Mag. eq.*.

⁵⁴ Marchant (in Marchant and Bowersock 1968, xl) dates it early in Xen.’s *oeuvre*; Anderson 1985, 161–2 n. 4, suggests a date after Xen. moved to Skillous, perhaps post-387.

⁵⁵ Arrival at Skillous: by c.393, Anderson 1974, 165; 392/1 or later, Tuplin 2004, 252. Departure: Xen. recalled from exile c.369, Anderson 1974, 184 (despite Paus. 5. 6. 4–7, on which see Tuplin 2004, 270–2).

⁵⁶ Gray 1985 shows that the preface and technical section of *Cyn.*, like the rest of the treatise, are original.

⁵⁷ On ancient historiographical prefaces see cf. Earl 1972, with Bettalli 211 ad loc.

unites ‘Aineias’ and Xenophon is a belief in the value of practical experience as opposed to the sophists’ over-theorization.⁵⁸ Their treatises also reflect the evolution of military thinking in the new geopolitical circumstances of the first half of the fourth century.⁵⁹

Other studies, then, have shown that our author responds to a tradition of reflection upon military practice that was, by the mid-fourth century, being translated out of an oral tradition into a written one; and that in the matter of military writing he is probably a pioneer. In the remainder of this paper I aim to go further: arguing, on the basis of one passage in particular, that he consciously attaches himself to a literary heritage and its rhetorical forms as a way of claiming expert authority and thus promoting the adoption of his ideas.⁶⁰ That he does so only briefly is less significant than that he does so at all.

A passage in which our author seems acutely conscious of his place in a literary culture is the preface, which has not received the attention it deserves. It may be a ‘bolt-on’, added as a justification of the work after its completion. The first two subsections, in particular, seem to disclose the author’s literary awareness, particularly when compared with a speech of Perikles as recalled and re-narrated by Thucydides. I append my own, deliberately near-literal, translation of each passage to convey the verbal patterning.

‘AINEIAS’, PREFACE

(1) Ὅσοις τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐκ τῆς αὐτῶν ὀρμωμένοις χώρας ὑπερόριοί τε ἀγῶνες καὶ κίνδυνοι συμβαίνουσιν, ἂν τι σφάλμα γένηται κατὰ γῆν ἢ κατὰ θάλασσαν, ὑπολείπεται τοῖς περιγιννομένοις αὐτῶν οἰκεία τε χώρα καὶ πόλις καὶ πατρίς, ὥστε οὐκ ἂν ἄρδην πάντες ἀναιρεθείησαν. (2) Τοῖς δὲ ὑπὲρ τῶν μεγίστων μέλλουσι κινδυνεύειν, ἱερῶν καὶ πατρίδος καὶ γονέων καὶ τέκνων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων, οὐκ ἴσος οὐδὲ ὁμοῖος ἀγὼν ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ σωθεῖσι μὲν καὶ καλῶς ἀμυναμένοις τοὺς πολεμίους φοβεροὺς τοῖς ἐναντίοις καὶ δυσεπιθέτους εἰς τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον εἶναι, κακῶς δὲ προσεγενθεῖσι πρὸς τοὺς κινδύνους οὐδεμία ἐλπίς σωτηρίας ὑπάρξει.

(1) To any people who, starting out from their own land, are met by struggles and dangers beyond the border, if some calamity comes about by land or by sea there remains,⁶¹ to the survivors among them, their own land and city and fatherland: so that potentially they may not all be totally destroyed. (2) To those, however, who are about to face danger over the greatest things—sanctuaries, fatherland, parents, children, and the other things—it is not an equivalent struggle, nor a similar one. Rather, on the one hand, once saved and having defended themselves well against the enemy, it is a case of being terrifying to their opponents and hard to attack in the time to come. If, on the other hand, they confront the dangers badly, no hope of safety will exist at all.

THUCYDIDES, BOOK 2

43. (3) ἀνδρῶν γὰρ ἐπιφανῶν πᾶσα γῆ τάφος, καὶ οὐ στηλῶν μόνον ἐν τῇ οἰκείᾳ σημαίνει ἐπιγραφή, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῇ μὴ προσηκούσῃ ἄγραφος μνήμη παρ’ ἐκάστῳ τῆς γνώμης μᾶλλον ἢ τοῦ ἔργου ἐνδαιτᾶται. (4) οὓς νῦν ὑμεῖς ζηλώσαντες καὶ τὸ εὐδαιμον τὸ ἐλεύθερον, τὸ δ’ ἐλεύθερον τὸ εὐψυχον κρίναντες μὴ περιορᾶσθε τοὺς πολεμικοὺς κινδύνους. (5) οὐ γὰρ οἱ κακοπραγοῦντες δικαιότερον ἀφειδοῖεν ἂν τοῦ βίου, οἷς ἐλπίς οὐκ ἔστιν ἀγαθοῦ, ἀλλ’ οἷς ἡ ἐναντία μεταβολὴ ἐν τῷ ζῆν ἔτι κινδυνεύεται καὶ ἐν οἷς μάλιστα μεγάλα τὰ διαφέροντα, ἣν τι παίσωσιν. (6) ἀλγεινότερα γὰρ ἀνδρὶ γε φρόνημα ἔχοντι ἢ μετὰ τοῦ μαλακισθῆναι κάκωσις ἢ ὁ μετὰ ῥώμης καὶ κοινῆς ἐλπίδος ἅμα γιγνόμενος ἀναίσθητος θάνατος.

(3) For famous men have the whole earth as their tomb. Moreover, not only the inscribing of standing stones in their own land marks them: but also, in the land that does not belong to them, there dwells in each person an unwritten memory of their reputation rather than their deed. (4)

⁵⁸ Whitehead 34–6, 37, citing Xen. *Mem.* 3. 1. 1 ff., Pl. *Euthd.* 273c, and Pl. *La.* for criticisms of sophists.

⁵⁹ Bettalli 15.

⁶⁰ This relates to the practicability issue discussed above; cf. the portrayal of A. as an essentially practical thinker by Whitehead 35–7.

⁶¹ Singular in the Greek.

Now you, emulating them, and judging happiness to consist in freedom and freedom in courage, must not scorn warlike dangers. (5) For it is not those who are badly off that would more rightly be profligate with their life—for whom there is no hope of the good—but those to whom the opposite alteration in their living is still a danger, and in whom the differences would be especially great if they should trip up in some way. (6) For more painful, at least to a man possessing intelligence, is reversal accompanied by being a weakling than is the death unforeseen that, even as it happens, is accompanied by vigour and common hope.⁶²

In these passages, both of which exhort the citizens to show resolve and point out the calamities consequent upon failure, ‘Aineias’ and Thucydides use some of the same terms,⁶³ employ similarly evaluative language,⁶⁴ and choose words connoting calamity.⁶⁵ This is not surprising, since both are discussing the psychology of warfare,⁶⁶ but the resonances go deeper. Both authors attempt to maintain a philosophically or rhetorically persuasive tone by the repeated use of simple contraries⁶⁷ and more complex oppositions,⁶⁸ some approaching paradox.⁶⁹ On a word-by-word level, the effect seems reinforced by the syntax (e.g. dative of relative pronoun plus verb;⁷⁰ conditional statements;⁷¹ clauses begun with relative pronouns)⁷² and by generally complex periods, especially in ‘Aineias’ (his sentences have 40–51 words, those of Thucydides only 20–34). Even the authors’ grammatical choices add rhetorical and philosophical colour: compound optatives,⁷³ present participles of compound, middle, or deponent verbs,⁷⁴ aorist participles in the middle or passive voice, and so on.⁷⁵

It has scarcely been noticed in modern commentaries that ‘Aineias’ may here be imitating the style of Thucydides.⁷⁶ The whole preface (including §§3–4) stands in stark contrast with most of the rest of the work. What is ‘Aineias’ doing? Is he simply originating a rhetoric *ex nihilo*—not very skilfully but in awareness that complexity of expression may create distance and authority?

The clear resonances of Thucydides in the preface, far more than the factual recollections in other parts of the *Poliorketika*, point to a conscious attempt—albeit in a ‘bolted-on’ passage—to claim a place in an intellectual tradition dominated by Athenian writers. In order to persuade us that his practical expertise is theoretically grounded, he adopts a rhetorical style that evokes philosophical, even ‘scientific’ writing. To this extent the aim of his treatise, for all its grounding in experience and its technical detail, is more than merely practical.

There are, in fact, features of the rest of the work that suggest that ‘Aineias’ is trying to do more than simply record and communicate technical and psychological devices for maximizing the survivability of war. Recent work has highlighted his narrative subtlety.⁷⁷ One may also highlight small-scale rhetorical devices in the text that are designed to enhance his claim to expertise: for example, the withholding of further expert knowledge at 19 (‘I could mention . . .’), or the seven or

⁶² Or ‘death striking him down unnoticed when he is at the height of his powers’ (translating as far as θάνατος), Hornblower 1996, 312.

⁶³ γῆ; ἐλπίς; and words related to ἐνάντιος, κίνδυνος, and πόλεμος.

⁶⁴ A. κακῶς, T. κακοπραγούντες, κάκωσις.

⁶⁵ A. ἀναιρεθείησαν, T. θάνατος.

⁶⁶ Cf. A. ἀγῶνες—ἀγών, φοβερούς, perhaps δυσεπιθέτους (a *hara*, Hunter 102); T. μνήμη, κρίναντες, μὴ περιορᾶσθε, ἀλγεινότερα, φρόνημα ἔχοντι, ῥώμης, ἀναίσθητος; plus ἐλπίς, above.

⁶⁷ A. ἐκ τῆς αὐτῶν χώρας . . . οἰκία χώρα, T. ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ . . . ἐν τῇ μὴ προσηκούσῃ; also A. κατὰ γῆν ἢ κατὰ θάλασσαν.

⁶⁸ A. καλῶς ἀμυναμένοις . . . κακῶς προσενεχθεῖσι; T. οὐ στηλῶν μόνον ἐπιγραφὴ . . . ἄγραφος μνήμη, τῆς γνώμης . . . τοῦ ἔργου; see also A.’s §1. 1 versus §1. 2; and T.’s §43. 3, 5, and 6, each expounding a contrast.

⁶⁹ A. οὐκ ἴσος οὐδὲ ὁμοῖος ὁ ἀγὼν ἔστιν, T. οὐ γάρ οἱ . . . ἀλλ’ οἷς. The striking, chiasmic abstraction of T.’s τὸ εὐδαιμον τὸ ἐλεύθερον, τὸ δ’ ἐλεύθερον τὸ εὐψυχον, is not, however, matched—at least in this passage—by A.’s bland ὑπὲρ τῶν μεγίστων.

⁷⁰ A. τοῖς δέ . . . οὐδεμία ἐλπίς ὑπάρξει, T. οἷς . . . ἐλπίς οὐκ ἔστιν.

⁷¹ A. ἄν τι σφάλμα γένηται, T. ἥν τι παίσωσιν.

⁷² A. ὅσοις, T. οὓς.

⁷³ A. ἀναιρεθείησαν, T. ἀφειδοῖεν.

⁷⁴ A. ὀρμωμένοις, περιγιγνομένοις, T. προσηκούσῃ, κακοπραγούντες, γιγνώμενος.

⁷⁵ A. σωθεῖσι, ἀμυναμένοις, προσενεχθεῖσι; T. ζηλώσαντες, κρίναντες.

⁷⁶ Hunter notes the careful and rhythmical periods of the preface (102, ad loc.), and sees A. as ‘grappl[ing]’ with abstract ideas (lxxx). Whitehead 38 merely mentions ‘a brief but noticeable attempt at a polished preface’. Bettalli (13 and 211) notes its careful composition and use of rhetorical devices; he comments that the treatment of general themes lent itself to such a format, and that A. had many models to follow for a preface. Both he and Whitehead 98 compare Thuc. 4. 92. 4 and cite Lammert 1938, 397, for comparison with e.g. Vitruvius 10. 10. 1; Vegetius 4. 31.

⁷⁷ Burliga 2009.

eight references he makes to his other writings.⁷⁸ The very fact that he supports his recommendations with named, specific examples from the experiences of other Greek observers, not merely his own experiences or *a priori* theorization, puts him in the same ambit of ‘scientific’ writing as Aristotle’s *Politics*. In this respect he departs from the Xenophontic model that was surely present to his mind, for exempla drawn from outside Athens are rare in Xenophon’s treatises on horses and hunting and, when they do occur, are largely non-Greek.⁷⁹

Comparison with the *Periplus* of Pseudo-Skylax (c.337–335 BC) is perhaps relevant. The author of that technical treatise, working either within, or in the ambit of, the post-Platonic Academy or the early Peripatos,⁸⁰ adopts only rudimentary narrative techniques and rhetorical devices to enliven a text that remains, for the most part, a rather dry enumeration of coasts and peoples. Yet a generation earlier ‘Aineias’, perhaps without the advantage of having worked in Athens, makes greater efforts to establish his credentials, though almost exclusively in a preface that may well be an afterthought.

Conclusion

This paper has contended that ‘Aineias’ presents his recommendations as universally applicable, but implicitly only within the world of the *polis*; and that since he is pioneering, mapping out a new field of written discourse, he responds (at least in one passage) to the Greek literary tradition—more directly than scholars have realized—in order to enhance his credibility and promote the adoption of his views, which are in a sense both theoretical and practical. The realization that he engages, to some degree, with the literary tradition enriches our understanding of the scientific context within which he is working, and thus of his aims in writing.

Works cited

- Anderson, J.K.
 1974 *Xenophon*. (Classical Life and Letters.) London.
 ———
 1985 *Hunting in the Ancient World*. Berkeley–Los Angeles.
 Bengtson, H.
 1962 ‘Die griechische Polis bei Aeneas Tacticus’, *Historia*, 11.4, 458–68.
 Bettalli, M.
 1986 ‘Enea Tattico e l’insegnamento dell’arte militare’, *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell’Università di Siena*, 7, 73–89.
 ———
 1990 *Enea Tattico, La difesa di una città assediata (Poliorketika)*. (Studi e testi di storia antica, 2.) Pisa.
 Brown, T.S.
 1981 ‘Aeneas Tacticus, Herodotus and the Ionian revolt’, *Historia*, 30.4, 385–93.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/4435775>
 Burliga, B.
 2009 ‘Aeneas Tacticus between history and sophistry: the emergence of the military handbook’, in J. Pigoń (ed.) *The Children of Herodotus: Greek and Roman Historiography and Related Genres*, Newcastle upon Tyne, 92–101.
 Delebecque, É.
 1957 *Essai sur la vie de Xénophon*. Paris.
 — (ed.)
 1973 *Xénophon, Le Commandant de la cavalerie*. Paris.
 Earl, D.C.

⁷⁸ See discussion at Whitehead 13–16.

⁷⁹ Xen. *Eq.* 8. 6, Persians and Odrysians riding downhill safely; more allusively, the Boiotian style of helmet, 12. 3; the Persian sabre, 12. 12; mounting ‘in the Persian fashion’, *Mag. eq.* 1. 17 and *Eq.* 6. 12. In *Cyn.* direct references are more numerous: Phasian or Carthaginian flax, 1. 4; Indian hounds, 9. 1; other hounds, 10. 1 and 4; hunting in foreign lands, 11. 1–4.

⁸⁰ Shipley under review; Shipley 2011, 15–18.

- 1972 'Prologue-form in ancient historiography', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, 1.2, 842–56.
- Gehrke, H.-J.
1986 *Jenseits von Athen und Sparta: das dritte Griechenland und seine Staatenwelt*. München.
- Gray, V.J.
1985 'Xenophon's Cynegeticus', *Hermes*, 133.2, 156–72.
- Hamel, D.
1998 *Athenian Generals: Military Authority in the Classical Period*. (Mnemosyne Supplements, 182.) Leiden.
- Hansen, M.H.
2006 *Polis: An Introduction to the Ancient Greek City-state*. Oxford.
- 2007 'Aineias the Tactician', in M.H. Hansen (ed.) *The Return of the Polis: The Use and Meanings of the Word Polis in Archaic and Classical Sources*, Historia Einzelschriften, 198; Papers from the Copenhagen Polis Centre, 8, Stuttgart, 243–5.
- Hansen, M.H., and Nielsen, T.H.
2004 *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*. Oxford.
- Headlam-Morley, J.W., Sir, with D.C. Macgregor
1933 *Election by Lot at Athens*. 2nd edn. Cambridge.
- Hornblower, S.
1995 'The fourth-century and hellenistic reception of Thucydides', *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 115, 47–68. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/631643>
- 1996 *A Commentary on Thucydides*. ii. Oxford.
- 2000 'The Old Oligarch (Pseudo-Xenophon's Athenaiion politeia) and Thucydides: a fourth-century date for the Old Oligarch?', in P. Flensted-Jensen, T.H. Nielsen, and L. Rubinstein (eds), *Polis and Politics: Studies in Ancient Greek History presented to Mogens Herman Hansen*, Copenhagen, 363–84.
- Hunter, L.W., with S.A. Handford
1927 *Aeneas on Siegetcraft: A Critical Edition*. Oxford.
- Jenkins, T.E.
2006 *Intercepted Letters: Epistolary and Narrative in Greek and Roman Literature*. (Roman Studies: Interdisciplinary Approaches.) Lanham, Md.
- Lammert, F.
1938 'Die antike Poliorketik und ihr Weiterwirken', *Klio*, 31 (n.s. 13), 389–411.
- Marchant, E.C., and Bowersock, G.W. (eds)
1968 *Xenophon, Scripta Minora; Pseudo-Xenophon, Constitution of the Athenians*. 2nd edn. (Loeb Classical Library, 183 (Xenophon, 7).) Cambridge, Mass./London.
- Marr, J.L., and Rhodes, P.J. (eds)
2008 *The 'Old Oligarch': The Constitution of the Athenians attributed to Xenophon*. (Aris & Phillips Classical Texts.) Oxford.
- Nielsen, T.H.
1999 'The concept of Arkadia: the people, their land, and their organisation', in T.H. Nielsen and J. Roy (eds), *Defining Ancient Arkadia*, Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre, 6; Historisk-filosofiske meddelelser, 78, Copenhagen, 16–79.
- 2002 *Arkadia and its Poleis in the Archaic and Classical Periods*. (Hypomnemata, 140.) Göttingen.
- 2004a 'Arkadia', in M.H. Hansen and T.H. Nielsen (eds), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, Oxford, 505–39.
- 2004b 'Triphylia', in M.H. Hansen and T.H. Nielsen (eds), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, Oxford, 540–6.
- Ostwald, M.

- 2000a *Oligarchia: The Development of a Constitutional Form in Ancient Greece*. (Historia Einzelschriften, 144.) Stuttgart.
- 2000b 'Oligarchy and oligarchs in ancient Greece', in P. Flensted-Jensen, T.H. Nielsen, and L. Rubinstein (eds), *Polis and Politics: Studies in Ancient Greek History presented to Mogens Herman Hansen*, Copenhagen, 385–96.
- Pretzler, M.
2009 'Arcadia: ethnicity and politics in the fifth and fourth centuries BCE', in P. Funke and N. Luraghi (eds), *The Politics of Ethnicity and the Crisis of the Peloponnesian League*, Hellenic Studies, 32, Washington, DC/Cambridge, Mass./London, 86–109.
- Roy, J.
2000 'Problems of democracy in the Arcadian confederacy 370–362 BC', in R. Brock and S. Hodkinson (eds), *Alternatives to Athens: Varieties of Political Organization and Community in Ancient Greece*, Oxford, 308–26.
- Schömann, G.F.
1861 *Griechische Staatsalterthümer*. i. 2nd edn. Berlin.
- Shipley, D.G.J. 2003. Review of M.H. Hansen and others, *Acts and Papers of the Copenhagen Polis Centre: A Comparative Study of Thirty City-state Cultures*. In *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, **123**: 234–7.
- 2005a 'Between Macedonia and Rome: political landscapes and social change in southern Greece in the early hellenistic period', *Annual of the British School at Athens*, 100, 315–30. <https://lra.le.ac.uk/handle/2381/2850> [no file]
- 2005b 'Little boxes on the hillside: Greek town planning, Hippodamos, and polis ideology', in M.H. Hansen (ed.) *The Imaginary Polis*, Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre, 7; Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser, 91, Copenhagen, 335–403. <http://hdl.handle.net/2381/3769> [no file]
- 2011 *Pseudo-Skylax's Periplous: The Circumnavigation of the Inhabited World*. Exeter.
- under review 'Pseudo-Skylax the Peripatetic',
- Slater, N.W. 2010. A horse is a horse?: Pursuing Plato in Aeneas Tacticus 31.15. CAMWS 106th Annual Meeting (Oklahoma City, 24–7 Mar. 2010). www.camws.org/meeting/2010/program/abstracts/03E1.Slater.pdf
- Tuplin, C.J.
2004 'Xenophon, Artemis and Scyllus', in T.J. Figueira (ed.) *Spartan Society*, Swansea, 251–81.
- Whitehead, D.M.
2002 *Aeneas the Tactician, How to Survive under Siege*. 2nd edn. (Classical Studies Series.) London.
- Widdra, K. (ed.)
1964 *Xenophontis de re equestri*. Leipzig.