



---

The Chronology of the Wars in Armenia, A. D. 51-63

Author(s): Bernard W. Henderson

Source: *The Classical Review*, Vol. 15, No. 4 (May, 1901), pp. 204-213

Published by: [Cambridge University Press](#) on behalf of [The Classical Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/694805>

Accessed: 31-08-2015 09:12 UTC

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Cambridge University Press and The Classical Association are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Classical Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

table of the law)? In this case they supply another particular in which the Apostle reproduces Our Lord's answer to the lawyer (St. Mark 12 § 31). Not only, then, does he quote ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς ἐαυτὸν, but refers to it as a second commandment. This view is supported by the circumstance

that St. Paul himself uses τὸν πλησίον in § 10 for 'neighbour'; he does not only quote it: and in § 9 has εἴ τις ἑτέρα ἐντολή, where he is summing up the commandments that come in the Second Table.

T. NICKLIN.

## THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE WARS IN ARMENIA, A.D. 51—63.

### II.—A.D. 54—60.

THE first few years of this period give us very little difficulty: the last are the most perplexing of this whole period A.D. 51—63.

A.D. 54 (Dec.)—57.

*Tacitus' Order of Events:—*

A.D. 54. Dec. Nero has to determine on an Armenian policy.—xiii. 6. (Cf. previous paper).

„ 54. Dec.—55 init. Nero makes preparations for war: viz., orders new enrolments for Eastern legions: mobilisation of troops: construction of bridges over the Euphrates. Corbulo is appointed 'retinendae Armeniae' &c., xiii. 7. 8.

„ 55. (? spring) Corbulo hurries to the East to take over the command in Cappadocia (while Quadratus remains in command in Syria), and meets Quadratus at Aegeae in Cilicia, who hands over to him half his forces as directed by Nero.

Consequent division of forces:

In Syria with Quadratus: 2 legions (viz. X Fretensis and XII Fulminata) and part of auxiliaries.

In Cappadocia with Corbulo: 2 legions (viz. III Gallica and VI Ferrata): part

of auxiliaries, sent him by Quadratus from Syria: and all cohorts and alae then in Cappadocia. The client kings of Lesser Armenia, Commagene, &c., are ordered to assist either Corbulo or Quadratus as seems advisable. Most choose the former. xiii. 7. 8.

Meantime: 'Exortusque in tempore aemulus Vologesi filius Vardanes; et abscessere Armenia Parthi, tamquam differrent bellum.' xiii. 7, 2.

Coins date this revolt of Vardanes as lasting at least from November 55 to June 58. (Gardner 'Parthian Coinage,' pp. 13, 51.) The revolt may easily have begun some months earlier, and the news of it seems to have reached Rome after Corbulo's appointment: whether or no before his departure for the East cannot be told. Hence we may continue:—

A.D. 55 (? summer). Revolt of Vardanes. The Parthians evacuate Armenia.

Corbulo arrives in Cappadocia.

„ 55.

Messages sent to Vologeses by both Corbulo and Quadratus, demanding 'pacem quam bellum mallet datisque obsidibus

solitam prioribus reverentiam in populum Romanum continuaret.' xiii. 9, 1.

Vologeses hands over as hostages 'nobilissimos ex familia Arsacidarum,' either 'quo bellum ex commodo pararet an ut aemulationis suspectos per nomen obsidum amoveret.' xiii. 9, 2.

Corbulo and Quadratus quarrel at length as to which deserves the credit for making Vologeses give hostages. Nero seeks to heal the breach. xiii. 9.

Vologeses evidently did not desire war at once on Corbulo's arrival. When he gave the hostages the revolt of Vardanes probably had already broken out and gave him cause to be suspicious of his nobles (xiii. 9. 2). Otherwise there existed no reason for his desire to postpone the war, a desire distinctly to his foe's advantage. As the envoy from Syria reached him before the envoy from Cappadocia, he was probably in the S. of Armenia, engaged in withdrawing his troops who had accompanied Tiridates on his last seizure of the throne (cf. previous paper).

Tacitus tells us nothing more of Armenian affairs until under the year A.D. 58 he resumes the subject thus:—

'Eius anni principio mollibus adhuc initiis prolatatum inter Parthos Romanosque de obtinenda Armenia bellum acriter resumitur, quia nec Vologeses sinebat fratrem Tiridatem dati a se regni expertem esse aut alienae id potentiae donum habere, et Corbulo dignum magnitudine populi Romani rebatur parta olim a Lucullo Pompeioque recipere.' xiii. 34, 4.

The position of Tiridates in this interval A.D. 55–58 thus becomes of interest. After Corbulo's first campaign he sends to ask indignantly

'Cur datis nuper obsidibus redinte-

grataque amicitia . . . veterem Armeniae possessione depelleretur.' (xiii. 37, 4.)

To which Corbulo answers as follows:—

'Suadet Tiridati precibus Caesarem adgredi: posse illi regnum stabile et res incruentas contingere, si omissa spe longinqua et sera praesentem potior-emque sequeretur.' (xiii. 37, 6.)

From these passages it appears that the giving of hostages in A.D. 55 amounted to a 'redintegrata amicitia': that in A.D. 58 Tiridates can talk of a *vetus possessio* of Armenia: and that Corbulo practically admits his previous 'regnum' in denying its stability under existing conditions.

Tiridates, that is, must have remained in possession of the throne of Armenia in A.D. 55 despite the withdrawal of Vologeses and his Parthian troops. But it seems he never acknowledged the Roman suzerainty. The question now at issue between Rome and Parthia was the right of 'bestowing that throne as a gift,' as Tacitus puts it. Tiridates may be *defacto* recipient of the donum. Who is to be recognised as lawful donor, *i.e.*, as suzerain?

Tiridates, remaining in possession of the Armenian throne, does not, despite Vologeses' giving of hostages, recognise the Roman claim to suzerainty. At a time then when Vologeses has got the better of Vardanes' revolt and has his hands free again, it is important for Corbulo to bestir himself and impress upon Tiridates the uncertainty of his tenure, somewhat to Tiridates' surprise and indignation. To 'recover Armenia' in Roman official language need not mean more than the obtaining of this recognition of Roman suzerainty. And of course if the Vologeses who is King of Parthia after 58 A.D. is not Rome's old opponent but a new king, the need and opportunity for Roman action are alike emphasized. But on the whole the numismatic evidence in favour of this supposition seems to me outweighed by the historic evidence against it. (Cf. Gardner 'Parthian Coinage,' p. 52).

Thus far we therefore obtain these results:—

A.D. 55. Revolt of Vardanes. Vologeses evacuates Armenia. Corbulo arrives in Cappadocia. Agreement between Vologeses and Corbulo.

„ 55–58. Tiridates in possession of Armenia.

„ 58. End of Vardanes' revolt. Be-

ginning of war 'keenly' in Armenia.

At this point the chief chronological difficulty begins.

A.D. 57-60.

*A. Order of Events in Tacitus:—*

- A. 'Eius anni principio (viz: 58 A.D.) mollibus adhuc initiis prolatatum inter Parthos Romanosque de obtinenda Armenia bellum acriter resumitur.' *i.e.* Active hostilities begin.—xiii. 34. 4.
- B. Corbulo's chief difficulty is the lack of discipline &c. in his army, especially in the Syrian legions sent him (in 55 A.D.) by Quadratus. Many unfit are discharged. Hence new levies in Galatia and Cappadocia. A legion summoned from Germany.—35. 1-3.  
[This was probably Leg. IV Scythica: and as in xiii. 40. 3 Corbulo has under his command part at least if not all the Leg. X Fretensis, which in the original division remained in Syria with Quadratus (cf. *supra*), it is possible that the new legion's arrival in Syria caused the transfer of Leg. X to Corbulo].
- C. Winter: Corbulo, despite the fierce cold, keeps his troops under canvas 'donec ver adolesceret.' The auxiliary cohorts are sent on garrison duty to fit spots under supervision of Paccius Orfitus; strict orders are given against engaging the enemy. Orfitus disobeys these and suffers a reverse. 35. 5-36. 5.  
[Corbulo evidently winters in hostile territory, viz. Armenia. The severity of the winter agrees with this].
- D. Spring: Beginning of active hostilities. Tiridates with the aid of troops sent him by Vologeses carries on an active guerilla warfare, always eluding Corbulo's attempts to catch him, his forces being 'equestres copiae' (xiii. 40. 1.). This continues a long while '*diu*.'—37. 1. 2.  
[*i.e.* Corbulo's first plan of campaign consists of a general pursuit of the Armenian De Wet].
- E. Corbulo borrows a leaf from his enemy's book and sends out several detached columns to attack different places at one and the same time. Antiochus of Commagene is ordered to co-operate. Pharasmanes and the Moschi also make incursions into Armenia in the Roman interest. Vologeses cannot come to the aid of Tiridates, because himself detained by the Hyrcanian revolt.—37. 2-4.  
[*i.e.* Corbulo's second plan of campaign consists of pursuit &c. by flying columns. This is so far successful that—]
- F. Tiridates makes overtures to Corbulo and proposes an interview. Corbulo assents, but (cf. Caesar and Ariovistus) takes such precautions that Tiridates' intended treachery fails and the interview is a fiasco.—37. 4-38. 7.
- G. Renewal of hostilities. Tiridates fails in an attempt to intercept Corbulo's convoys coming from Trapezus and thus cut his line of communication.—39. 1. 2.
- H. Corbulo—to put an end to the war—determines to attack Armenian forts [*i.e.* his third plan of campaign], thus abandoning his direct pursuit of Tiridates. Three main divisions of the Roman army are constituted for this purpose, under Corbulo himself, Cornelius Flaccus legate, and Insteius Capito, camp-prefect.—xiii. 39. 2.
- I. Storming of Volandum by Corbulo's division, and taking of smaller forts by the other two. 'Unde orta fiducia caput gentis Artaxata adgrediendi.'—39. 2-7.
- J. March to Artaxata. Tiridates makes a vain demonstration *en route* and then flees away to Media.—39. 7-41. 2.
- K. Surrender (next day) of Artaxata.—41. 3.
- L. Burning of Artaxata to the ground by Corbulo, as he had not enough men both to garrison the city and to prosecute the war, and if evacuated its capture would have been worthless. 'Adicitur miraculum velut numine oblatum: nam cuncta Artaxatis tenus sole inlustrata fuere; quod moenibus cingebatur repente ita atra nube coopertum fulguribusque discretum est ut quasi infensantis deis exitio tradi crederetur.'—41. 4.
- M. News of the fall of Artaxata reaches Rome. Public rejoicings and senatorial debate and decrees.—41. 5.

[*After which*—‘*Deinde*’—Suillius is condemned at Rome and Tacitus relates various other events of the year A.D. 58. He then narrates events of the years 59 and 60 A.D. resuming his narrative of Eastern warfare in his annals of this year 60 A.D. with the words:]

- N. ‘At Corbulo post deleta Artaxata utendum recenti terrore ratus ad occupanda Tigranocerta...illuc pergit.’—xiv. 23. 1.

March from Artaxata to Tigranocerta in ‘*glowing summer time*,’ the army harassed by the Mardi *en route* and very greatly suffering for lack of water and grain until its arrival in ‘*loci culti*.’ Two forts are taken, one by storm, one by blockade. Continued march through ‘*regio Tauranitium*’ to Tigranocerta.—23. 1–24. 5.

- O. Surrender of Tigranocerta without resistance.—24. 6. 7.

- P. Defence of and storming of the fort Legerda.—25. 1.

[NOTE.—Vologeses is still detained by the Hyrcanian revolt. Envoys from the Hyrcanians to Nero had before these last events been sent to Rome and now on their return are by Corbulo sent round by a long and circuitous route to reach their own land, lest the Parthians should capture them.—xiv. 25. 2. 3].

- Q. Tiridates invades Armenia again from Media.—xiv. 26. 1.

- R. Corbulo despatches Verulanus, legate, with advanced guard, and follows himself with the legions by forced marches.—26. 1.

- S. Tiridates is thus forced to flee far away and give up all hopes of war.—26. 1.

- T. Corbulo ravages and burns the unfriendly districts of Armenia. He is making effective his occupation of Armenia when—26. 1.

- U. Tigranes, sent by Nero to take over the kingdom, arrives at this juncture.—26. 1.

- V. Tigranes is accepted as king by the majority of Armenians.—26. 2.

- W. Corbulo makes arrangements for his security. He leaves a garrison for him in Armenia and makes various frontier readjustments in order to enlist the neighbouring client-kings in his support.—26. 3.

- X. Corbulo retires into Syria, then left vacant by the recent death of Quadratus and therefore assigned to him.—26. 4.

[This is definitely assigned by the ‘*eodem anno*’ following to the year A.D. 60].

*A'. Points of Time etc. here to be observed :*

Certain preliminary points in the Tacitus narrative suggesting definite times, seasons, and dates, must here be noted :—

1. Corbulo winters in Armenia (C).
2. Active hostilities begin in Spring (D)—viz. : acc. to xiii. 34, 1 that of 58 A.D. (A).
3. Corbulo's first plan of campaign is tried ‘a long time’ (D).
4. Corbulo marches on Artaxata immediately it seems after the capture of Volandum and the other forts. (I, J).
5. News of the fall of Artaxata reaches Rome, according to the ‘*Deinde*’ of xiii. 42, 1 in 58 A.D. (M).
6. The burning of Artaxata is spoken of by Tacitus in one and the same breath as its surrender. The language entirely fails to suggest that any interval of time separated the] capture of the city, the destruction of the city, and the resumed march to Tigranocerta. (K, L, N). Entirely consistent with this is Tacitus' statement that
7. While terror at the news of Artaxata's destruction is still ‘fresh’ Corbulo marches for Tigranocerta (N).
8. The march to Tigranocerta must have taken place in hot summer—the arrival there in late autumn. Thus the crops are ripe in ‘*loci culti*’ near Tauranitis, and it is no uncommon thing for the corn to be still unripe in Southern Armenia even in the beginning of August (cf. Egli, p. 288). The march, too, must have taken some time. The distance—some 500 kil. as the crow flies—through rough country with fighting on the way, the taking of one fort by storm, another by blockade, etc., all this necessitates the conclusion that Tigranocerta cannot have surrendered before September (N, O).
9. Tigranocerta surrenders at once : but Legerda has to be taken by storm (P).
10. The campaigning season in Armenia ends in October at latest.
11. Corbulo finally retires into Syria in A.D. 60 (X).

12. Thus there are three campaigns among which all the events must be in some manner or other distributed, viz: those of the three years 58, 59, 60 A.D.

*A". The 'Miraculum' at Artaxata:—*

One other preliminary question must be considered at somewhat greater length.

Egli (p. 285) identifies the 'miraculum' which preceded the destruction of Artaxata (L) with an eclipse of the sun which occurred on April 30th, A.D. 59. According to Pliny (N. H. ii. 70. 72, 180), Corbulo in Armenia saw this eclipse 'inter horam diei decimam et undecimam.'

The identification of this eclipse of the sun with the Artaxata miraculum leads Egli to give to the capture of the city the very precise date mentioned, viz: April 30th A.D. 59.

Certainly could this be accepted it would form an excellent starting point for chronological considerations both backwards and forwards. But it is entirely impossible to accept this identification. Tacitus, who himself knows of this eclipse (xiv. 12, 3) entirely fails to identify his 'miraculum' with it, and his description of the latter is decisive:

'While the whole space outside the town up to its buildings was bright with sunlight, the enclosure within the walls was suddenly shrouded in a black cloud, seamed with lightning flashes.' (Church and Brodribb)

This description of a cloud-sunlight effect, however curiously regarded as a 'miracle,' must necessarily, *if we hold to the description*, be regarded as inconsistent with any possible effect of an eclipse of the sun, however partial. To follow Egli (p. 334, 340 etc.) and proceed to reproach the unlucky Corbulo for being 'strangely ignorant, and not knowing an eclipse of the sun when he saw it' seems to me an indulgence in a perversely topsy-turvy argument. Corbulo may have been 'child of his age' (the age be it noted of Pliny), but if he saw no eclipse of the sun at Artaxata, the probability is that there was no eclipse of the sun to see. If he saw a novel effect of cloud, sunshine and storm, he described it, clearly and well.<sup>1</sup>

We must, however reluctantly, abandon the precise date for the capture of Artaxata, April 30th, A.D. 59.

*B. The Schemes proposed:—*

I. EGLI. (P. 282-290). [Adopted by Schiller without criticism or discussion]	II. MOMMSEN (E.T. II. P. 53, 54).	III. FURNEAUX (II. P. 111-115 ETC.) [Following Nipperdey, who however does not divide up A.D. 59, 60 so precisely].	IV. 'COMPROMISE.'
<p>i. Q-X are all closely connected and thus must be in same year—viz.: A.D. 60.</p> <p>ii. P and Q must belong to different years, as P is late in the year [A' 8]. And insisting on A' 6, L and O-P must be in the same year. Thus the break in Tac. narrative between M-N does not imply a break in time.</p>	<p>i. The account in Tac. Bk. XIV. 'evidently describes merely one single campaign.' <i>i.e.</i> N-X = A.D. 60.</p> <p>ii. As Corbulo sees the eclipse of 59 A.D. on Armenian soil the account in Tac. Bk. XIII. embraces 2 campaigns separated by the winter C. Thus A-C = 58 A.D. D-K = 59 A.D.</p>	<p>i. Insisting on A' 8, there must be a break between P-Q. <i>i.e.</i> Q-X = A.D. 60.</p> <p>ii. The break in Tac. narrative between M-N implies a break in time. <i>i.e.</i> P = A.D. 59.</p> <p>iii. Insisting on A' 5, K must have occurred in A.D. 58. And besides to couple D-P together is too much for one year.</p>	<p>i. Insisting on A' 5, viz.: L = 58 A.D. A' 2, viz.: D = 58 A.D. A' 6, viz.: L, N, O, P, all are in same year, we get necessarily D-P = 58 A.D.</p> <p>ii. Thus leaving Q-X for 2 years A.D. 59-60. Of this 2 arrangements are possible. (1) A.D. 59. no events. A.D. 60. Q-X.</p>

<sup>1</sup> If Pliny's words 'circuitu globi alia aliis detegente et occultante' are to be taken to refer to the same phenomenon as that which Tacitus thus describes, we must credit Pliny with the mistake of identifying Corbulo's miraculum with the eclipse, supposing it probable that Tacitus reproduces Corbulo's own accurate description. For the shadow

of an eclipse could hardly be confined within the small circuit of a city wall. But as Corbulo certainly was in Armenia when the eclipse occurred, and Pliny, however distant, would scarcely have made the error, it is better to dissociate the Pliny and Tacitus passages entirely.

I. EGLI. (P. 282-290). [Adopted by Schiller without criticism or discussion].		II. MOMMSEN (E.T. II. p. 53, 54).	III. FURNEAUX (II. p. 111-115 etc.) [Following Nipperdey, who however does not divide up A.D. 59, 60 so precisely].	IV. 'COMPROMISE.'	
iii. But D to P is too much for one year and D is 58 A.D. And the winter being a natural time for the negotiations of F—hence divide D-F. 58 A.D. G-P. 59 A.D. iv. K-L = April 30. 59 A.D.		iii. Corbulo then must have wintered in Artaxata, marching for Tigranocerta in the spring of A.D. 60.	Thus L and N-P = A.D. 59. and D-K + M = A.D. 58. iv. The winter C is thus that of A.D. 57-58, as suits A' 2. v. Corbulo then must have wintered in Artaxata.	or (2) A.D. 59. Q-U. A.D. 60. V-X. iii. The winter C is that of A.D. 57-58, as suits A' 2.	
I. SUMMARY.		II. SUMMARY.	III. SUMMARY.	IV. SUMMARY.	
A.D. 57	A-B		A-B	A-B	
Winter 57-58	C		C	C	
58	D-E	A-B	D-K + M	D-P	
Winter 58-59	F	C			
59	G-P	D-K	L + N-P	(1) —	(2) Q-U
60	Q-X	L + N-X	Q-X	Q-X	V-X
OBJECTIONS.		OBJECTIONS.	OBJECTIONS.	OBJECTIONS.	
<b>Main :—</b> Entire neglect of A' 5. <b>Minor :—</b> 1. ? Neglect of the Break in Tac. narrative between L-N. But Tac. himself in N closely connects the two (A' 6). 2. The miraculum-eclipse identification (cf. <i>supra</i> ). But the rejection of this leaves the general scheme untouched, if depriving it of a positive argument in its favour. 3. See III.		<b>Main :—</b> 1. Entire neglect of A' 2. 2. Ditto of A' 5. 3. Ditto of A' 6. 4. Ditto of A' 8. 5. Ditto of A' 10. <b>For</b> 1. B can hardly satisfy the <i>acriter</i> bellum resumitur. 2. For ex hyp. Artaxata falls in A.D. 59. 3. For ex hyp. Corbulo winters in Artaxata. 4. To allow time for all events Q-X in same year Tigranocerta must surrender at least in early summer.	<b>Main :—</b> Entire neglect of A' 6. <b>Minor :—</b> 1. ? Too few events are ascribed to 59 A.D. 2. 'Tacitus where he condenses as a rule anticipates' (Momm- sen.) But ex hyp. N-P belong to 59 A.D. <i>i.e.</i> the year before that under which Tac. in xiv. 23 seems to place them. Applies also to I.	<b>Main :—</b> Entire neglect of A' 10. For ex hyp. there is far too much for A.D. 58. <b>Minor :—</b> To (1) : The break in events does not correspond with any break in the narrative. To (2) : A forced solution of which there is no hint in Tac. And the 'Anticipation Rule' throughout is hopelessly broken.	

### C. Consideration of the Rival Views :—

#### I. Egli's View :

In itself this scheme is very attractive. The events are well and probably distributed among the years. Active hostilities begin, as Tacitus says, in A.D. 58. That year is filled up with Corbulo's first plan of campaign, which we are expressly told was tried for 'a long time,' and his

buted among the years. Active hostilities begin, as Tacitus says, in A.D. 58. That year is filled up with Corbulo's first plan of campaign, which we are expressly told was tried for 'a long time,' and his

second plan which involved certainly great preparations and organisation, &c., *i.e.*, much time. And we must always remember that the Armenian campaigning season hardly exceeds four (acc. to Mommsen), or at the most five months. Then comes the 'unmentioned winter.' One such winter at least has on every scheme to be inserted into the Tacitus narrative. Negotiations between Tiridates and Corbulo very conveniently occupy it, on the temporary cessation of warfare enforced by it.

These failing, the year 59 opens with Corbulo's third plan of campaign. The capture of Volandum encourages him to proceed at once to Artaxata. Capturing the city he at once destroys it, as Tacitus' narrative irresistibly implies, because he cannot hold it, and marches for Tigranocerta. Naturally therefore he arrives here only in autumn, as Tacitus obviously implies. And the capture of Legerda closes the campaigning year—59—a full year, but not too full if we begin it with the third plan of campaign.

Then Tiridates' last attempt, Tigranes' arrival, and Corbulo's withdrawal to Syria, fall naturally into the year A.D. 60: events implying much duration of time, however compressed the account of them in Tacitus.

Thus the scheme as a whole is feasible and attractive. We are bound to reject Egli's 'miraculum-eclipse' identification, it is true. But in reality this is to the advantage of the scheme. For the capture of Artaxata on April 30—the result of the identification—certainly would make the campaign of A.D. 59 in the north of Armenia begin much too early. But rejecting the identification and thus the precise date, we can place the fall of Artaxata, *e.g.*, two months later, and thus be rid entirely of this objection which Furneaux brings against the scheme.

The objection against the scheme which remains and cannot be denied is that it places Artaxata's capture in 59 A.D. while Tacitus by his 'deinde' of xiii. 42, 1, clearly implies that the news of this reached Rome in the preceding year.

## II. Mommsen's View :

This scheme is hopeless: there is practically nothing to be said for it. It combines all the main objections which can be urged against any scheme, and departs altogether from Tacitus. Tacitus says the war begins actively in 58 A.D. The scheme sets the first operations to which this description could possibly be applied in 59 A.D. Tacitus implies that the news of Artaxata's fall

reached Rome in 58 A.D. The scheme puts the fall of the city in 59 A.D. There is neither word nor hint in Tacitus to imply that an interval of six months at least intervened between the capture and the burning of Artaxata, during which interval Corbulo wintered in the captured town. All this is supposed by the scheme. On the contrary Tacitus speaks of the capture and the burning in one and the same sentence, they making part of one and the same impression on the mind of the reader. And if any one certain fact is suggested by Tacitus' narrative, it is that Tigranocerta fell in the autumn. Yet the scheme is bound to set this in the spring, as so many events remain yet to be inserted into this same year.

The scheme indeed seems to be based on two generally enunciated Tacitean principles, *viz.*

- (1) That a break in the Tacitus narrative implies a break in time; but where there is no break in the narrative the events belong to one and the same year unless the change of year is directly stated or obviously implied.
- (2) That where Tacitus combines in one narrative-section events of two years he prefers to anticipate the coming, rather than hark back to the past, year.

Such general principles, however, are scarcely safe guides if they lead, as in this case, to the rejection of well-nigh every particular piece of evidence. This should rather lead us to modify our general conclusions, however painful the sacrifice. It cannot *e.g.* be seriously doubted that in this case the events from the return of Tiridates from Media to Corbulo's withdrawal into Syria cannot belong to the same year as that in the autumn of which Legerda fell.

The Mommsen scheme is distinctly inferior to Egli's when we consider the evidence.

## III. Furneaux's View :

This view is also attractive and possible in itself. 58 A.D. is its full year, while perhaps there is not quite enough left for 59 A.D. which the march from Artaxata to Tigranocerta and the capture of Legerda are supposed entirely to occupy. In its account of A.D. 57–58 (spring) and A.D. 60 it is identical with Egli's scheme. True it supposes that Tacitus, writing annals of A.D. 60,

harks back to include those of A.D. 59. But if this be a blemish, it is common also to Egli's scheme as well.

Looking at the matter from the standpoint of the distribution of events among the years it is slightly inferior to the first scheme. From the more important standpoint of the evidence it is precisely on a level with this in so far as it satisfies all the ten criteria save one only. The great difficulty in this scheme is that it makes Corbulo winter at Artaxata, a fact of which, as has already been pointed out, Tacitus seems entirely ignorant. The 'utendum recenti terrore' passage will, it is true, square with this view as well as with Egli's, inasmuch as the terror is caused by the 'destruction' of Artaxata, which *ex hyp.* takes place in the spring of the year 59 just before Corbulo's march to Tigranocerta. And as a whole year is devoted to this march, Corbulo can be made to arrive at the latter city in the autumn, as required. But the one difficulty remains—that to separate the capture from the burning of Artaxata by six months runs counter to the general impression produced by the narrative.

#### IV. 'Compromise':

As then the first view is opposed to one, and the third view to another, of the main Tacitean criteria, I devise this fourth scheme as an example of an attempt to reconcile these criteria, viz: to allow the news of Artaxata's fall to reach Rome in 58 and set the march to Tigranocerta in this same year.

The result, it must be admitted, is not very happy. By it we get a really impossibly full year of events for 58 A.D., considering the brief campaigning season in Armenia, and then are left with two years on our hands with not enough events for them both: with the result that we must either make one completely blank year, which is historically impossible, or spread the butter very thinly over the two years' slice, making an arbitrary division somewhere or other. It seems hardly possible that this can have been Tacitus' own idea of the division of the years, viz: that xiii. 37-41 + xiv. 23-25 belong all to one year while two years' events are compressed into xiv. 26, 1-4: and thus the sole justification for some such compromise-view, viz: fidelity to Tacitus, vanishes away, leaving us with an impossibly full year to face.

#### D. Conclusion:

Other rearrangements besides this suggested 'Compromise' can be made. But no one that I have devised but presents one or other of the difficulties named and added evils besides.

We may therefore confine our attention to the four schemes set forth above. And now we may reject the second and fourth views as distinctly inferior to the first and third.

Therefore we are compelled to make our choice between the first and third, viz: Egli's and Furneaux's. Each is attended by one great difficulty, involving a contradiction of one point of time suggested by Tacitus. That is, it is impossible to devise a scheme satisfying all ten Tacitean criteria. At least some one of these must be rejected.

Either Tacitus is mistaken when he declares that the news of the fall of Artaxata reached Rome in 58 A.D., or when he implies that Corbulo burnt Artaxata immediately after its capture and marched forthwith for Tigranocerta.

Thus (1) following Egli, we must believe that Tacitus ascribes to A.D. 58 proceedings in the Senate really belonging to A.D. 59.

or (2) following Furneaux, we must believe that Tacitus is ignorant of the fact that Corbulo winters in Artaxata after capturing that city in A.D. 58.

Which of these is more probable?

Considering Tacitus' probable sources, (1) for the proceedings in the Senate (2) for Corbulo's campaigns, I accept with small hesitation the first alternative.

For Senatorial proceedings Tacitus doubtless used the records of the Senate. And in view of the whole tenor of the narrative a mistakenly implied date is here not very unlikely. Having inserted in his *Annals* in its right place, under the year 58 A.D., the beginning of active hostilities and Corbulo's pursuit after Tiridates, Tacitus both harks back a little to explain Corbulo's previous preparations, and then carries the narrative forward to the next year to embrace Corbulo's first great and notable success, viz. the Artaxata capture, without a break. Naturally there follows on this an account of the reception of the news in Rome, wherein he 'anticipates' (cf. Mommsen's 'general rule') events of A.D. 59. The 'Deinde' with which afterwards he resumes the tale of events in Rome of 58 A.D. may

be regarded as a mere literary connecting particle, or a pure slip of the pen.

This supposition presents no very great inherent improbability. But such an improbability *does* seem involved in the only alternative to it, viz. Furneaux's view that Tacitus is ignorant that Corbulo wintered in Artaxata.

For his account of Corbulo's campaigns it seems clear that Tacitus consulted Corbulo's own despatches from the seat of war. Such a sentence as 'Corbulo post deleta Artaxata utendum recenti terrore ratus ad occupanda Tigranocerta' goes straight back to those despatches and reveals the general's hopes and strategy. Now had Corbulo wintered in Artaxata after taking the town and not burnt it until his evacuation (ex hyp.) in the following spring, it is hardly possible that this fact would not have appeared with some prominence in his despatches. It is impossible surely that Tacitus should have summarised them in so misleading or ignorant a manner, omitting entirely to notice the use to which Corbulo put the captured city. Strategically again, in view of the general's hopes and intentions, it was not only better for Corbulo to winter near his base of operations, the Cappadocian frontier, at Tigranocerta than far away in the inclement North at Artaxata, but also it is far less probable that his march from the Armenian Bloemfontein to the Armenian Pretoria was resumed only after a six months' interval of inactivity than that he destroyed the former at once for very excellent strategic considerations. These considerations duly make their appearance in Tacitus' narrative, albeit Tacitus is far removed as the poles asunder from being in any sense a strategist or military historian. Nor could any delay be caused to Corbulo's intentions to finish the war by a rapid advance by commissariat troubles or the thought of his lines of communication. For his army, as we are expressly told, lived on the country as it marched through it, however scanty the provender in consequence, and Corbulo in his dash from Artaxata sundered his force from his line of communications to open a new line in the south by his occupation of Tigranocerta.

This rapid and immediate advance from the one city to the other is as irresistibly implied throughout Tacitus' narrative as it is strategically far more probable than the opponent view. It is implied alike by the details he gives of Artaxata's treatment as by the obvious fact (though so curiously neglected by Mommsen) that he reached

Tigranocerta only late in the year's campaign. It is Corbulo's own account which penetrates to the surface through and despite of Tacitus' unmilitary narrative, and herein lies its value and its strength as evidence.

Somewhere or another Tacitus omits to mention the passing of a winter. It is far more probable to suppose with Egli that this was a winter occupied by negotiations than with Furneaux that this was a winter during which Corbulo's army rusted inactively at distant Artaxata, if we consider the sources of Tacitus' account.

Hence I reject the third view and choose the first. Rejecting of course the positive date, April 30th, it champions, as based on Egli's untenable identification of the Artaxata miraculum with the eclipse, and thus securing, as I have suggested above, an additional advantage for the very scheme itself, I propose, following Egli otherwise, this scheme for the most probable chronology of the years A.D. 57-60:—

- |       |               |  |
|-------|---------------|--|
| A, B. | A.D. 57.      | Corbulo's preparations for war.  |
| C.    | winter 57-58. | Corbulo winters under canvas in Armenia.   |
| D-E.  | 58.           | The first year's campaign, in which Corbulo tries two plans of action, neither with great success, save that Tiridates enters into negotiations.   |
| F.    | winter 58-59. | The negotiations — with no result.   |
| G-P.  | 59.           | Hostilities resumed. Corbulo's new plan of campaign. Capture of Vollandum and the forts. Surrender and destruction of Artaxata. Corbulo's rapid march to Tigranocerta. Surrender of the city in autumn. Storming of Legerda. |
|       | winter 59-60. | Corbulo winters in Tigranocerta.   |
| Q-X.  | 60.           | Invasion of Tiridates from Media. Corbulo's march to meet him and his enforced retreat.  |

Q-X.

60. Corbulo over-runs  
Armenia. Arrival  
of Tigranes. Settle-  
ment of the country.  
Corbulo withdraws  
to Syria.

winter 60-61. Corbulo in Syria.  
Tigranes in Ar-  
menia. Tiridates in  
Parthia.

BERNARD W. HENDERSON.

*Merton College, Oxford.**(To be concluded.)*

## SOME SUGGESTIONS ON CALPURNIUS SICULUS.

## I. 73-76.

Exsultet quaecumque Notum gens ima  
iacentem  
erectumue colit Boream, quaecumque uel  
ortu  
uel patet occasu medioe sub aethere feruit.

These lines mean that every inhabitant of the world's five zones must rejoice in the new accession and the era of peace and prosperity which it is to usher in. The turn of the first of the clauses introduced by *quaecumque* is obviously antithetical, 'iacentem erectumue' (so Baehrens, the MSS -que). But there is no antithesis in the second. For *patet* we must read *tepet* which is properly opposed to *feruit*. So at v. 41 for '*patenti*', preserved in one family of the inferior MSS (*w*), the other family (*v*) writes *tepent*.

It is possible that the same change should be made at Tibullus 2. 5, 59 in the very difficult, and perhaps unexampled 'patent ortus.'

## II. 51 sqq.

O si quis Crocalen deus afferat! hunc ego  
terris,  
hunc ego sideribus solus regnare fatebor  
secernamque nemus dicamque 'sub arbore  
numen  
hac erit; ite procul (sacer est locus) ite  
profani.'

For *erit* Maehly proposed *est*, but a more pertinent and an easier correction would be *erat*. The sense is that 'the place is sacred because once a deity was there.' Confusion of the terminations *-it*, *-at*, and the like, is common enough; e.g. at v. 31, the MSS vary between 'crescit' and 'crescat.'

Among the marvellous beasts, snow-white hares, boars with horns and so forth, exhibited in the games given by the young emperor of Eclogue VII. the rustic Corydon tells us he saw the elk:

uidi genus omne ferarum,  
hic niueos lepores et non sine cornibus  
apros,  
hic raram siluis etiam quibus editur alcen.  
(vii. 57-59).

The description of this animal 'as rare even in its native forests' might be thought insufficiently distinctive. But in itself that would be no reason for doubting the *Hic raram* of the vulgate in view of the passage of Pausanias ix. 21. 3, which I transcribe in Dr. Frazer's translation.

'There is a beast called the elk, in appearance between a stag and a camel; it is a native of the land of the Celts. It is the only beast we know of that cannot be tracked or seen afar off by man; but sometimes when men have gone out to hunt other game, chance throws an elk in their way. It smells man, they say, while it is still a great way off, and plunges into gullies and the deepest caverns. So the hunters surround the plain or mountain in a circle of at least a thousand furlongs, and taking care not to break the circle, they gradually close in, and so catch the animals inside the circle, the elks among the rest. But if the elk happens not to have its lair there, there is no other way of catching it.'

More ground for suspicion is, however, to be found in the strange variants of some of the MSS. The lost *Codex Ugoleti* (Schenkl's A) had side by side with *Hic raram* the name of the fabulous wild animal *Mantichoram* (μαντιχώρας or μαντιχώρας) while *Nicticanam* or *Nocticanam* is in the inferior MSS (Schenkl's V). The divergent *nicticanam*, *mantic(h)oram*, *hicraram* may well have come from *adclinem*; which was first written *inclinem* by a common confusion of prepositions (as at line 26 of this poem 'in sedes' the Gudianus, 'ad sedes' the rest) and was then further corrupted through such letter changes as are observable at v. 15 'montibus' the Gudianus for 'mollibus,' vi. 29 'insta nunc'