

The *Etymologicum Magnum* and the “Fragment of Urbicius”

Philip Rance

BYZANTINE LEXICA AND ETYMOLOGICA have long been recognised as treasuries rich in citations from lost works of antiquity.¹ These great monuments of mediaeval Greek scholarship and encyclopaedism have been subjected to almost two centuries of modern criticism and commentary, of which the highpoint was the enterprise of late nineteenth/early twentieth-century German classical philologists. Many obscurities

¹ I am grateful to Prof. Klaus Alpers (University of Hamburg) for his kind assistance with this subject. The following abbreviations have been used:

Alpers (1990) = K. Alpers, “Griechische Lexicographie in Antike und Mittelalter,” in H.-A. Koch with A. Krup-Eber (eds.), *Welt der Information. Wissen und Wissensvermittlung in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Stuttgart 1990) 14–

38

Cellerini = A. Cellerini, *Introduzione all’ Etymologicum Gudianum* (Rome 1988)

Dain (1946) = A. Dain, *L’Histoire du texte d’Elien le Tacticien* (Paris 1946)

Dain/de Foucault (1967) = A. Dain (texte mis au net et complété par J.-A. de Foucault), “Les stratégistes byzantins,” *TravMém* 2 (1967) 317–392

Dain/de Foucault (1968) = A. Dain (complété par J.-A. de Foucault), “Urbicius ou Mauricius?” *REB* 26 (1968) 123–136

Förster = R. Förster, “Studien zu den griechischen Taktikern,” *Hermes* 12 (1877) 426–471

Greatrex et al. = G. Greatrex, H. Elton, R. Burgess, “Urbicius’ *Epitedeuma*: an Edition, Translation and Commentary,” *Byzantion* 98 (2005) 35–74

Lasserre/Livadaras = F. Lasserre and N. Livadaras, *Etymologicum Magnum Genuinum, Symeonis Etymologicum una cum Magna Grammatica, Etymologicum Magnum Auctum* I α-άμωσγέπως (Rome 1976), II ανά-βώτορες (Athens 1992)

Reitzenstein (1897) = R. Reitzenstein, *Geschichte der griechischen Etymologika* (Leipzig 1897)

Reitzenstein (1907) = “Etymologika,” *RE* 6 (1907) 807–817

Shuvalov I, II = P. B. Shuvalov, “Урбикий и “Стратегикон” Псевдо-Маврикия,” *VizVrem* 61 (2002) 71–87; 64 (2005) 34–60

Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies 47 (2007) 193–224

© 2007 GRBS

persist in this field, however, in part because some of the most important works lack modern and/or complete critical editions or have never been published.² The present study directs a relatively narrow focus upon a single entry in the *Etymologicum Magnum*, the conventional title for an extensive lexical compendium produced by an unknown compiler in the mid-twelfth century.³ The article *στρατός* in the *Etymologicum Magnum* contains what purports to be an extract of an unnamed work by Urbicius, a writer of military treatises in the late fifth/ early sixth century, who in turn drew on a classicizing tradition of tactical writing dating back to the late Hellenistic period. This embedded extraneous item has been variously identified as a heavily modified excerpt from Urbicius' extant *Tacticon* or a fragment of a unidentified lost work by Urbicius, though there is no scholarly consensus on this point and none of the arguments advanced is wholly satisfying. This paper presents a detailed deconstruction of the text of this lexical article, which

² For up-to-date introductions to the tradition of Greek lexicography, citing earlier bibliography, see Alpers (1990) and Alpers, “Lexicographie (B.I–III),” in G. Üding with W. Jens (eds.), *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik* II (Tübingen 2001) 194–210. For Byzantine *etymologica* Reitzenstein (1897) remains fundamental, abridged with emendations in Reitzenstein (1907), and summarised with additional bibliography in H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner* II (Munich 1978) 45–48. For studies of classical authors and genres preserved in Byzantine *etymologica* see e.g. A. Colonna, “Antica esegesi nicandrea negli Etymologica,” *Bollettino del Comitato per la preparazione dell' Edizione Nazionale dei Classici Greci e Latini* N.S. 4 (1956) 17–24; C. Calame, *Etymologicum Genuinum: Les citations des poètes lyriques* (Rome 1970); G. Marcovigi, “Le citazioni dei lirici corali presso l'Etymologicum Genuinum,” *Quaderni Triestini per il lessico della lirica corale greca* 1 (1970) 11–49; F. Kolb, “Ο ΔΗΜΟΣ ΚΑΘΗΜΕΝΟΣ: Zur Notiz des Etymologicum Magnum über die Diobelie,” *Historia* 27 (1978) 219–221; G. Massimilla, “Gli ultimi due libri degli Αἴτια di Callimaco nell' *Etymologicum Genuinum*,” *StIt* 16 (1998) 159–170; F. Schironi, *I frammenti di Aristarco di Samotracia negli etimologici bizantini* (Hypomnemata 152 [Göttingen 2004]).

³ The most recent complete edition is T. Gaisford, *Etymologicum Magnum* (Oxford 1848). Partial edition: specimen glosses in αμ– in Reitzenstein (1897) 223–241. Incomplete critical edition: (as *Etymologicum Magnum Auctum*) in Lasserre/Livadaras. For studies and earlier bibliography see Reitzenstein (1897) 212–253, (1907) 815–816; Lasserre/Livadaras I xvii–xxii; Cellerini 66–67.

will demonstrate that it is a complex amalgam fashioned from several sources that originate in different genres and periods, and locating it within the textual traditions of both Graeco-Roman military literature and Byzantine lexicography. It is hoped in addition that these limited objectives will make a modest but significant contribution to understanding the methodology, source-materials, and originality of the compiler of the *Etymologicum Magnum* and, more broadly, the reception and preservation of classical literature in Byzantine encyclopaedic compilations.

The article *στρατός* in the *Etymologicum Magnum* incorporates a short self-contained section under the heading Ὀρβικίου, τῶν περὶ τὸ στρατεύμα τάξεων, “(from) Orbikios, on the formations of the army.”⁴ This item, hereafter “the fragment,” comprises a brief explanatory outline of the technical and for the most part classicising terminology for the various sub-divisions of an army and the appropriate commanding officers, followed by a list of terms relating to the deployment of troops on the battlefield. The Ὀρβίκιος in question is doubtless Urbicius, a *stratégiste en chambre*, about whom almost nothing is known with certainty other than his authorship of military treatises during the reign of Anastasius I (491–518).⁵ Two (formerly conjoined) works by Urbicius are extant. First, the *Tacticon* is a brief skeletal epitome of the first part (chs. 1–32) of Arrian’s *Ars Tactica*, written in A.D. 136 in celebration of Hadrian’s *vicennalia*. This section of Arrian’s work is a conventional and avowedly antiquarian treatment of the arcane terminology, internal articulation, and tactical evolutions of an idealised infantry phalanx, drawing on an originally late Hellenistic sub-genre of Graeco-Roman military literature.⁶ Second, the Ἐπιτήδευμα or “Invention” was

⁴ *Etym.Magn.* 728.48–729.18.

⁵ For the problematic sources for Urbicius’ life and works see esp. Greatrex et al. 40–49; also Förster 449–466; G./J. Gyomlay, *Böles Leó Taktikája mint magyar történeti kútforrás* (Értekezések a nyelv-és széptud. köréből 18.1 [Budapest 1902]) 35–40; Dain (1946) 37–39, 109; Dain/de Foucault (1967) 341–342, 347 (with errors); Dain/de Foucault (1968) 124–130; *PLRE* II 1190 “Urbicius 2” (with errors); Shuvalov I 83–86, II 35–36 (to be read with caution).

⁶ Urbicius’ *Tacticon* is preserved in a single manuscript prototype, the

originally appended to the *Tacticon* but separated and transmitted as an independent item at some point before the late tenth century.⁷ In this pamphlet Urbicius recommends, with rhetorical embellishment, his own design for a type of portable *chevaux-de-frise* called *kanones* (κανόνες), which he contends would be of great utility in warfare against barbarian horse-archers. This tract falls within the category of amateur compositions addressed to imperial incumbents and predicting victory through technological innovation, which sought as much to publicize the author’s erudition and curry favour at court as to offer practical counsel. It is of no immediate relevance to the present study.⁸ To these two opuscula modern

tenth-century *Ambros.gr.* 139 (119 B sup.) (93^r–95^v). The text is edited only by Förster 467–471, who explains (459–461) that this edition is not based on his autopsy of the original MS., but follows the late Friedrich Haase’s collated transcription of two seventeenth-century apographs. Förster demonstrated (449–455, 459–466) that Arrian’s *Ars Tactica* was the sole source for the *Tacticon*, a view endorsed by all subsequent studies except *PLRE* II 1190, which erroneously claims Aelian as Urbicius’ model. For Arrian’s *Ars Tactica* see *Flavii Arriani quae exstant omnia* II, ed. A. G. Roos, add. et corr. G. Wirth (Leipzig 1968) 129–176; repr. in J. G. DeVoto, *Flavius Arrianus, Tactical Handbook and The Expedition against the Alans* (Chicago 1993), accompanied by a near-impenetrable English translation. For Arrian’s antiquarian intent: *Arr. Tact.* 32.2–3. For the work’s date and context: *Tact.* 44.3 with esp. E. L. Wheeler, “The Occasion of Arrian’s *Ars Tactica*,” *GRBS* 19 (1978) 351–365; accepted by M. Devine, “Arrian’s ‘Tactica’,” *ANRW* II.34.1 (1993) 312–337, at 315–316, and A. B. Bosworth, “Arrian and Rome: The Minor Works,” *ANRW* 226–275, at 255, 259–261.

⁷ *Ambros.gr.* 139, which contains only the *Tacticon*, is convincingly dated to 959 by C. M. Mazzucchi, “Dagli anni di Basilio Parakimomenos (cod. *Ambr.* B 119 sup.),” *Aevum* 52 (1978) 267–316, esp. 267–282, 292–310.

⁸ For text, Eng. transl., and comm. of the *Epitedeuma* see now Greatrex et al. For the characteristics of this class of treatise see also the fourth-century anonymous *De rebus bellicis*, ed. R. I. Ireland (Leipzig 1982); Eng. transl. and comm. E. A. Thompson, *A Roman Reformer and Inventor* (Oxford 1952); It. transl. and comm. A. Giardina, *Anonimo, Le cose della guerra* (Milan 1989); for studies and bibliography: M. W. C. Hassall and R. I. Ireland (eds.), *De rebus bellicis* (BAR Int. ser. 63 [Oxford 1979]); M. A. Tomei, “Le tecnica nel tardo impero romano: le macchine da guerra,” *Dialoghi di Archeologia* N.S. IV 1 (1982) 63–88, at 69–84; T. Weidemann, “Petitioning a Fourth-Century Emperor,” *Florilegium* 1 (1979) 140–150; H. Brandt, *Zeitkritik in der Spätantike. Untersuchungen zu den Reformvorschlägen des Anonymus De rebus bellicis* (Munich

scholarship has conventionally added a third work, the so-called “*Cynegeticus* of Urbicius,” a short tract concerning large-scale hunting as a method of training cavalry, but both the title and ascription are modern fabrications without manuscript authority that resulted from confused and careless scholarship in the 1930s.⁹ The erroneous ascription of Maurice’s *Strategicon* (ca. 590–600) to Urbicius in one tenth-century manuscript (**M**) is demonstrably spurious and the result of the copyist’s intervention.¹⁰

1988); J. H. W. G. Liebeschuetz, “Realism and Fantasy: The Anonymous *De Rebus Bellicis* and its Afterlife,” in E. Dabrowa (ed.), *The Roman and Byzantine Army in the East* (Cracow 1994) 119–139; B. Meißner, *Die technologische Fachliteratur der Antike* (Berlin 1999) 277–283.

⁹ In its earliest extant form the tract on hunting is appended to the “authentic recension” (MSS. **MA**) of Maurice’s *Strategicon* (12.D), though eccentricities of style and vocabulary betray its earlier independence. Detailed argument will follow elsewhere; it suffices here to observe that there is no manuscript authority for ascribing this item to Urbicius, nor any reason to connect him with it. The “*Cynegeticus* d’Urbicius” first surfaced from a bewildering jumble of errors in A. Dain, *La “Tactique” de Nicéphore Ouranos* (Paris 1937) 58, and via additional misconceptions became an *idée fixe* in Dain/de Foucault (1967) 341–342, 352–353, 372, thence passing into the work of many other scholars, most recently Shuvalov I 77–78, 81–83, II 35 with n.4, 40 fig. 2, 42, 46, 48 (with additional misunderstanding). On this tract in general see P. Rance, “*Simulacra pugnae*: the Literary and Historical Tradition of Mock Battles in the Roman and Early Byzantine Army,” *GRBS* 41 (2000) 223–275, at 254–258; V. V. Kuchma, “Трактат «Об охоте»,” *ADSV* 33 (Ekaterinburg 2002) 48–58.

¹⁰ Förster 455–459; F. Aussenres, “L’auteur du *Strategicon*,” *REA* 8 (1906) 23–40; Dain/de Foucault (1968) 136; G. T. Dennis (ed.), *Das Strategikon des Maurikios*, Germ. transl. E. Gamillscheg (CFHB 17 [Vienna 1981]), 15–18 with stemma codicum at 41. Even Shuvalov I 79–81, 84, who wishes to ascribe the *Strategicon* to Urbicius, has to concede that on codicological grounds the ascription to Urbicius (ΟΥΡΒΙΚΙΟΥ) uniquely found in **M** must have been introduced by the tenth-century copyist and that his exemplar (ε) bore an ascription to Maurice (ΜΑΥΡΙΚΙΟΥ), cf. n.45 below. Shuvalov has attempted to resurrect the long-discredited thesis that Urbicius wrote the *Strategicon*. He presents a highly conjectural case for a two-stage textual evolution of the *Strategicon*, the earliest version of which was written in the late fifth/early sixth century. This putative “*Strategicon* of Urbicius” was, he claims, revised in the late sixth century during the reign of Maurice (582–602), at which point the many internal references that now date the work to that period were added, and presumably all explicit traces

The few scholars who have examined the article στρατός have drawn widely differing conclusions concerning the origin and character of the alleged extract of Urbicius. The text has been available to scholarship since the *editio princeps* by Zacharias Kallierges in 1499, but until the later nineteenth century it was better known via an appendix to Henri Estienne’s *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae* (1572), where it was originally printed as a discrete fragment without explanation or reference to the *Etymologicum Magnum*, though an editorial note was added in the revised edition of 1865.¹¹ Scholarly interest began with Johann Scheffer, the *editor princeps* of Maurice’s *Strategicon* (1664), who conjectured that this “fragmentum Urbicii” had been extracted from a lost work, which, he thought, Maurice had used when compiling his treatise, though Scheffer offered no evidence to substantiate this speculation and his antiquarian guesswork need not detain the modern reader.¹² In the earliest critical

of Urbicius’ authorship erased. The current text of the *Strategicon*, he contends, is thus an “Urbician” treatise overlaid by a “Maurician” textual stratum, and this “Maurician recension” was transmitted in the manuscript tradition under Maurice’s name. See Shuvalov I and II, with a slightly different version of the same arguments in *idem*, “Влияние авар на поздне-римское военное дело,” in V. M. Masson et al. (eds.), *Изучение культурного наследия Востока* (St. Petersburg 1999) 48–51. Shuvalov’s hypothesis, for the most part a modified rehearsal of arguments originally put forward by R. Vári in the 1890s–1900s (in support of his own case for authorship by a putative eighth-century “Urbicius”), will be rebutted in detail in P. Rance, *The Roman Art of War in Late Antiquity: The Strategicon of the Emperor Maurice* (Birmingham Byzantine, Ottoman and Modern Greek Monographs, forthcoming).

¹¹ *Etymologicum Magnum Graecum*, ed. and printed by Z. Kallierges (Venice 1499). H. Stephanus et al., *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae*³ (Paris 1831–65) VIII 344–345.

¹² *Arriani Tactica et Mauricii Artis militaris libri duodecim* (Uppsala 1664) 383–384. Scheffer appears to have been ignorant of the context or character of this “fragmentum,” which he knew only as an unreferenced fragment in the appendix to the *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae* (1572). Scheffer’s seventeenth-century guesswork is based on too many misconceptions and faulty and/or incomplete data to warrant detailed rebuttal. The fragment was also noted without comment by F. Haase, “Über die griechischen und lateinischen Kriegsschriftsteller,” *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik* 5 [14.1] (1835) 88–118, at 108, as “de Ordinibus exercitus.”

assessment of the evidence Richard Förster firmly denied a connection between the “Fragment des Urbicius” and the extant *Tacticon*, observing that their contents exhibit few points of correspondence, though he offered no alternative explanation for the origin of the fragment.¹³ Karl Krumbacher acknowledged the existence of this “lexikalische Artikel” but stopped short of identifying it with Urbicius’ known works, implying that this item is or derives from an additional composition, though the content and context of the fragment make it an unlikely independent work, at least in its current form.¹⁴ In contrast, and with greater confidence, the distinguished French codicologist Alphonse Dain identified the fragment as a modified abridgment of Urbicius’ *Tacticon*, “un développement qui est une adaptation fortement résumée et stylisée du morceau d’Urbicius, et qui porte encore mentionné le souvenir de son origine.”¹⁵ Dain’s status as the most prolific and influential scholar of the Greek tactical tradition writing in the second half of the twentieth century has ensured the endorsement of this view by subsequent scholarship.¹⁶ Most recently Geoffrey Greatrex was inclined to accept the essence of this textual relationship, though he rightly observed partial inconsistency in the content of the fragment and the *Tacticon*.¹⁷ There is there-

¹³ Förster 456 n.2: “Dieses unbedeutende Stück enthält nur die Namen der Theile des Heeres und deren Führer. Ein Bestandtheil des gleich zu nennenden τακτικόν des Urbicius ist es nicht, kann auch kaum in uneigentlichem Sinne auf dasselbe zurückgeführt werden, da es nur in einigen Punkten mit demselben inhaltlich stimmt.”

¹⁴ K. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der Byzantinischen Literatur*² (Munich 1897) 635, 637, “Ausserdem schrieb Orbikios einen Auszug der Taktik des Arrian (τακτικόν) und einen im Etymologicum Magnum erhaltenen Artikel über die Unterabteilungen des Heeres und deren Führer (Ὀρβικίου τῶν περὶ τὸ στρατεῦμα τάξεων).”

¹⁵ Dain (1946) 38–39, reiterated in Dain/de Foucault (1967) 347; (1968) 130, “C’est une adaptation fortement stylisée et un bref résumé du *Tacticon* d’Urbicius, présenté sous le nom même d’Urbicius.”

¹⁶ E.g. *PLRE* II 1190, “The passages (sic) of Urbicius cited in the *EM* s.v. στρατός from a later résumé of the *Tacticon*”; and most recently Shuvalov I 83.

¹⁷ Greatrex et al. 42–43 with n.36: “the last section of the entry, however ... does not appear to be drawn from either Urbicius or Arrian.”

fore scope for further investigation to determine the origin and character of the fragment and its relationship to Urbicius and his works, and to conjecture the possible circumstances or interest that led to its inclusion in the *Etymologicum Magnum*.

The article στρατός reads as follows:

στρατός· τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πολεμούντων· παρὰ τὸ στρέφω, στρέψω, ἔστροφα, ἔστραμμαί, ἔστραπται, στραπτός καί, κατὰ ἀποβολὴν τοῦ π, στρατός, ὁ εὐπερίστρεπτος, ἢ ὁ συνεστραμμένος καὶ συνδεδεμένος ὄχλος· ἀλλὰ μὴν οἱ Αἰολεῖς στρόφω λέγουσι τὸ ῥῆμα καὶ στρότον λέγουσι τὸ συνεστραμμένον πλῆθος· ἢ παρὰ τὸ στερρῶς ἴσασθαι στρατός· ἢ παρὰ τὸ στερρῶς ἄττειν, ἡγουν ἐφάλλεσθαι.

Ὀρβικίου, τῶν περὶ τὸ στράτευμα τάξεων· ἰστέον δέ, ὅτι τῶν περὶ τὸ στράτευμα τάξεων καὶ ἡγεμονιῶν, ὁ μὲν πέντε ἀνδρῶν ἀριθμὸς καλεῖται πεμπάς· ὁ δὲ ἄρχων, πεμπάδαρχος· ὁ δὲ τῶν δέκα, δεκάς, καὶ δεκάδαρχος· ὁ δὲ τῶν πέντε καὶ εἴκοσι, λόχος, καὶ λοχαγός· ὁ τῶν πενήκοντα, πενηκοστής, καὶ πενηκόνταρχος· ὁ τῶν ἑκατόν, τάξις, καὶ ταξίαρχος· ὁ τῶν πενήκοντα καὶ διακοσίων, σύνταγμα, καὶ συνταγματάρχης· ὁ τῶν πεντακοσίων, πεντακοσιοστής, καὶ πεντακοσίαρχος· ὁ τῶν χιλίων, χιλιοστής, καὶ χιλίαρχος· ὁ τῶν δισχιλίων μεραρχία καὶ τέλος, μεράρχης καὶ τελάρχης· ὁ τῶν τετρακισχιλίων, φάλαγξ, καὶ φαλαγγάρχης· ὁ τῶν μυρίων, μυριοστής, καὶ μυρίαρχος· αἱ δύο διφαλαγγαρχαί, τετραφαλαγγαρχία, ἀνδρῶν μυρίων ἑξακισχιλίων· καὶ ὁ ἄρχων, τετραφαλαγγάρχης· τὸ μέντοι πεζικὸν ἅπαν στράτευμα, ὁμωνύμως τοῖς μερικοῖς τάγμασι, λέγεται φάλαγξ· καὶ ὁ ἡγούμενος, στρατηγός· τοῦ δὲ ἵππικου, ἵππαρχος· τὸ δὲ συναμφότερον πεζοί τε καὶ ἵππεις, στρατιά· τῆς δὲ στρατιᾶς τὸ μέτωπον λεγόμενον, ὃ καὶ πρῶτον ζυγὸν καλοῦσι, πρωτοστάται· καὶ ὁ ἡγούμενος, πρωτοστάτης· οἱ δὲ παρ’ ἐκάτερα ταπτόμενοι κέρατα, δεξιὸν τε καὶ εὐώνυμον, οἱ αὐτοὶ καὶ παραστάται· ὁ δὲ ἀρχὸς ὁμωνύμως· οἱ δὲ ὀπισθεν αὐτῶν ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ βάθος ταπτόμενοι, ἐπιστάται· τὸ δὲ ἐπὶ τούτοις πρὸς τὸ βάθος ἔσχατον ζυγὸν, οὐρὰ καὶ οὐραγία, καὶ οὐραγός· ὁ αὐτὸς δὲ ὀπισθοφύλαξ· ἢ συνήθεια πενηκοντοφύλακα αὐτὸν καλεῖ· ὁ δὲ γε τοῦ παντός στρατοῦ ἡγεμονεύων, βασιλεύς.

The article comprises two distinct elements: first, the lemma στρατός followed by an etymological gloss that adduces a sequence of typically fanciful derivations; second, a purported excerpt or abstract of an unidentified work or works by Urbicius, distinguished by a separate but rather uninformative rubric Ὀρβικίου, τῶν περὶ τὸ στράτευμα τάξεων. This second

section has a somewhat anomalous position within the *Etymologicum Magnum* as a whole in that, although an underlying etymological interest is implicit in many of the names of military units and officers listed (e.g. a notional five-man unit is intrinsic to the derivation of πεμπάς and πεμπάδαρχος), this section is nevertheless free of explicit etymologising, even where derivations are ripe for construal or misconstrual. In substance and genre, therefore, this excerpt takes the form of a specialist word-list, onomasticon, or short self-contained military lexicon, rather than, strictly speaking, an *etymologicum*. The differing character of the two elements of this lexical article, the gloss and the fragment, and the expressly extraneous origin of the latter, call for separate investigation with regard to their source material.

1. *The gloss s.v. στρατός*

The compiler of the *Etymologicum Magnum* most frequently cites among his sources two other *etymologica*, which he styles τὸ μέγα Ἑτυμολογικόν and τὸ ἄλλο Ἑτυμολογικόν. The first of these is the *Etymologicum Genuinum*, which was compiled at Constantinople around the mid-ninth century and drew on the writings of numerous earlier lexicographers and scholiasts. This work was discovered during the nineteenth century in two tenth-century manuscripts, *Vat.gr.* 1818 (A) and *Laurent.S.Marci* 304 (B), which do not preserve the earliest recension but two differing abridgements; the difficulties inherent in reconstructing the original text from these manuscripts, and from the comparative testimony of derivative lexica, are largely responsible for the *Etymologicum Genuinum* remaining for the most part unpublished.¹⁸ The second or “other *etymologicum*” is the so-called

¹⁸ The critical edition initiated by Ada Adler continues in preparation under the direction of Klaus Alpers. Another edition projected by N. A. Livadaras, “Ce qu’apportera l’édition de l’*Etymologicum Genuinum*,” *Ἐθνικὸν καὶ Καποδιστριακὸν Πανεπιστήμιον Ἐπιστημονικὴ Ἐπετηρὶς τῆς Φιλοσοφικῆς Σχολῆς* 24 (1973–74) 331–336, is in progress (as *Etymologicum Magnum Genuinum*) in Lasserre/Livadaras (α-βώτορες only). Individual sections: specimen glosses in αμ- in Reitzenstein (1897) 11–44; A. Colonna (ed.), *Etymologicum genuinum, littera A* (Quaderni Athena 4 [Rome 1967]); N. A. Livadaras, “Ἑτυμολογικὸν Genuinum. Μεταγραφή καὶ ἔκδοσις τοῦ ἐξιτῆλου κειμένου τοῦ κώδικος Β,” *Ἀθηνᾶ* 70 (1968) 37–82; K. Alpers, *Bericht*

Etymologicum Gudianum, the archetype for which has been identified in the *Vat.Barberin.gr.* 70. While the southern Italian provenance of this *Urhandschrift* is generally acknowledged, its date remains disputed, with arguments for the late tenth century accepted here.¹⁹ The relationship between the *Etymologicum Genuinum* and the *Etymologicum Gudianum* is complex; the compiler of the *Gudianum* certainly had the *Genuinum* at his disposal as an exemplar, but appears also to have utilised some of the

über Stand und Methode der Ausgabe des Etymologicum Genuinum (mit einer Ausgabe des Buchstaben A) (Copenhagen 1969); G. Berger, *Etymologicum genuinum et Etymologicum Symeonis (B)* (Beitr.klass.Philol. 45 [Meisenheim am Glan 1972]). E. Miller, *Mélanges de littérature grecque* (Paris 1868) 1–318, published from codex **B** the lemmata in *Etymologicum Genuinum* (as “*Etymologicum Florentinum*”), collated with Gaisford’s 1848 edition of the *Etymologicum Magnum*, but his accuracy cannot be relied on. Studies: Reitzenstein (1897) 1–69, and (1907) 812–814; A. Colonna, “Un antico esemplare dell’ *Etymologicum Genuinum*,” *Bollettino del Comitato per la Preparazione dell’ Edizione Nazionale dei Classici Greci e Latini* N.S. 13 (1965) 9–13; R. Pintaudi, “Etymologica,” *RendIstLomb* 107 (1973) 10–24; Lasserre/Livadaras I v–xi; Cellerini 60–62; Alpers, *Bericht* 3–24, and “Eine byzantinische Enzyklopädie des 9. Jahrhunderts. Zu Hintergrund, Entstehung und Geschichte des griechischen Etymologikons in Konstantinopel und im italogriechischen Bereich,” in G. Cavallo et al. (eds.), *Scritture, libri e testi nelle aree provinciali di Bisanzio* (Spoleto 1989) I 235–69; Alpers (1990) 28–31; I. C. Cunningham, *Synagoge. Συναγωγή λέξεων χρησίμων* (SGLG 10 [Berlin/New York 2003]) 13–14, 22, 35–38.

¹⁹ The only complete edition is F. W. Sturz, *Etymologicum Graecae Linguae Gudianum* (Leipzig 1818), using a single corrupt and heavily interpolated (class IV) manuscript (*Guelpherb.Gud.gr.* 29/30), see remarks of Cellerini 12–13; Alpers (1990) 29. Partial editions: specimen glosses in αμ- in Reitzenstein (1897) 109–136; E. L. de Stefani, *Etymologicum Gudianum quod vocatur* (Leipzig 1909–20) fasc. 1 (α-βωμολογία), 2 (βωμολόχοι-ξειαί). For manuscripts see Reitzenstein (1897) 70–109; Cellerini 12–13, 21–29; S. Maleci, *Il Codice Barberiniano Graecus 70 dell’ Etymologicum Gudianum* (BollClassici Suppl. 15 [Rome 1995]). Date: *Barberin.gr.* 70 has been convincingly redated to the late tenth-century by K. Alpers, “Marginalia zur Überlieferung der griechischen Etymologica,” in D. Halfinger and G. Prato, *Paleografia e codicologia greca* I (Alessandria 1991) 523–541, at 531–540. Cellerini in his stemma at 69 appears also to favour the late tenth century, though he does not argue for this in his discussion at 21–24. Maleci (6) dates this MS. to the eleventh century, without argumentation, and Schironi, *I frammenti* 23–24, to the twelfth.

same sources directly.²⁰ Aside from these two earlier *etymologica*, the sources of the *Etymologicum Magnum* include an abridgement of Stephanus of Byzantium, Diogenianus' epitome, Eulogius' *Ἀπορίαι καὶ λύσεις*, the *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν*, George Choeroboscus' *Epimerismi ad Psalmos*, scholia on Pindar, and other grammatical, rhetorical, and lexicographical works.²¹ The compiler of the *Etymologicum Magnum* freely modified the material he drew from his two principal sources—abbreviating and expanding explanations, and/or transposing text; adding glosses and imposing a stricter alphabetical sequence; altering or suppressing citations, rewording lemmata and interpolating new references. In short he was not an unoriginal copyist but sought to craft a novel and individual work according to his own design.²²

Given our knowledge of the sources of the *Etymologicum Magnum* and of the working practices of its compiler, reconstruction of the textual history of the gloss *στρατός* presents relatively few problems. The compiler combined the corresponding articles in the *Etymologicum Genuinum* and *Etymologicum Gudianum*, and by amalgamating and transposing clauses according to a fastidious cut-and-paste methodology, and variously reducing and expanding the text of his two exemplars, he critically refashioned these sources into a new text. The process is tabulated below, with borrowings from the *Genuinum* underlined and those from the *Gudianum* in bold type.

²⁰ Reitzenstein (1897) 98–155, (1907) 814–815; E. L. de Stefani, “Per le fonti dell’ Etimologico Gudiano,” *BZ* 16 (1907) 52–68; Cellerini 30–63.

²¹ O. Carnuth, *De Etymologici Magni fontibus* (Berlin 1873); A. Kopp, “Zur Quellenkunde des Etymologicum Magnum,” *RhM* 40 (1885) 371–376; R. Reitzenstein, “Zu den Quellen des sogenannten Etymologicum magnum,” *Philologus* 48 (1889) 450–455; 49 (1890) 400–420; Reitzenstein (1897) 248–253, 351–352; (1907) 816.

²² Reitzenstein (1897) 241–248 demonstrates the compiler’s methodology using specimen glosses in αμ-.

Ety. Geniuinum

στρατός· τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πολεμούντων, ὁ δὲ τόπος στρατόπεδον· λέγεται γὰρ τοῦ στρατοῦ τὸ πέδον. εἴρηται δὲ παρὰ τὸ στρέφω, ἔνθα ἔστραπται στραπτὸς καὶ στρατός, τὸ συνεστραμμένον πλῆθος. ἀλλὰ μὴν οἱ Αἰολεῖς στρόφω λέγοντες τὸ ὄημα καὶ στρότον λέγουσιν· ἐνήλλακται τὸ εἰς τὸ α, ὡς Ἄρτεμις Ἄρταμις.²³

Ety. Magnum

στρατός· τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πολεμούντων. παρὰ τὸ στρέφω, στρέψω, ἔστραφα, ἔστραμμαι, ἔστραπται, στραπτὸς καί, κατὰ ἀποβολὴν τοῦ π, στρατός, ὁ εὐπερίστρεπτος, ἢ ὁ συνεστραμμένος καὶ συνδεδεμένος ὄχλος. ἀλλὰ μὴν οἱ Αἰολεῖς στρόφω λέγουσι τὸ ὄημα καὶ στρότον λέγουσι τὸ συνεστραμμένον πλῆθος. ἢ παρὰ τὸ στερρῶς ἴστασθαι στρατός· ἢ παρὰ τὸ στερρῶς ἄττειν, ἢ γουν ἐφάλλεσθαι.²⁴

Ety. Gudianum

στρατός· γίνεται παρὰ τὸ στερρῶς ἄττειν, ἢ γουν ἐφάλλεσθαι, ἢ παρὰ τὸ στρέφω, ἔστραμμαι, στραπτός, ὡς γέγραπται γραπτός, καὶ στρατός, ὁ εὐπερίστρεπτος, ἢ παρὰ τὸ στερρῶς ἴστασθαι στρατός· ὁ συνεστραμμένος καὶ συνδεδεμένος ὄχλος.²⁵

Furthermore, the sources for the glosses in the two older *etymologica* can in turn be established. The source for the *Etymologicum Gudianum* is an anonymous alphabetised collection of Homeric epimerisms compiled between the mid-eighth and mid-ninth centuries:

²³ Text: edited from MSS. **A** and **B** by A. R. Dyck, *Epimerismi Homerici* (SGLG 5 [Berlin/New York 1983–95]) II 674. Variants: λέγεται–πέδον **A** : om. **B**; εἴρηται **A** : γίνεται **B**; ἔστραπται **A** : om. **B**; στραπτός **A** : ἐστραπτός **B**; στρότον **A** : στρότον **B**; τὸ εἰς τὸ (**B** : om. **A**) α, ὡς (hab. **B** τὸ) Ἄρτεμις Ἄρταμις.

²⁴ Text: Gaisford 728.40–47 with minor repunctuation and the following emendations: ἄλλα Gaisford : ἀλλὰ; στρόφω Gaisford : στρόφω; στρότον Gaisford : στρότον; ἄττειν Gaisford : ἄττειν. For στρόφω and στρότον see Dyck, *Epim.Hom.* σ 9 and σ 52, app. crit. (II 659, 674), citing R. Meister, *Die griechischen Dialekte I* (Göttingen 1882) 48, 52. It is not possible to determine whether εὐπερίστρεπτος in *Ety.Magn.* is due to an error or editorial choice. Dyck edits *Epim.Hom.* σ 9 (II 659.50) εὐπερίστρεπτος (citing MSS. **G O**), and this reading is corroborated in the derivative *Et.Gud.* Cramer's *editio princeps* of MS. **O** (*Oxon.bibl.Nov.Colleg.* 298) of *Epim.Hom.*, however, reports εὐπερίστρεπτος at 236^r: *Anecdota Graeca I* (Oxford 1839) 389.23–27.

²⁵ Text: Sturz 513.18–22 with minor repunctuation; emend ἄττειν Sturz 513.18 : ἄττειν; ἐφάλλεσθαι Sturz 513.19 : ἐφάλλεσθαι *Ety.Magn.* 728.47, *Epim.Hom.* σ 9 (Dyck II 659.48).

στρατός· γίνεται παρὰ τὸ στερωῶς ἄπτειν, ἥγουν ἐφάλλεσθαι. ἢ παρὰ τὸ στρέφω ἔστραμμαί στραπτός, ὡς γέγραπται γραπτός, καὶ στρατός, ὁ εὐπερίτρεπτος. ἢ παρὰ τὸ στερωῶς ἴστασθαι στρατός· ὁ συνεστραμμένος καὶ συνδεδεμένος ὄχλος.²⁶

The gloss in the *Etymologicum Genuinum* was drawn from two sources. (a) The majority of the gloss derives from a Homeric epimerism, possibly known in the form of a scholion rather than an alphabetised lexicon. A substantially similar text is preserved in the aforementioned collection of *Epimerismi Homerici*, which must derive from the same tradition but is not the direct source for the gloss in the *Etymologicum Genuinum*:

στρατός· ὄνομα ῥηματικὸν παρὰ τὸ στρέφω, ἔνθεν τὸ ἔστραπται στραπτός καὶ ἐνδεία τοῦ π, ὡς ἐν τῷ θάλπῳ θάλπαμος καὶ θάλαμος, γίνεται στρατός, οἶονεὶ τὸ συνεστραμμένον πλήθος. καὶ τὸ ε τρέπεται εἰς α, ὡς Ἄρτεμις Ἄρταμις· οἱ δὲ Αἰολεῖς στρόφω λέγοντες τὸ ῥῆμα καὶ στρότον λέγουσιν.²⁷

(b) The first line, στρατός· τὸ πλήθος τῶν πολεμούντων, ὁ δὲ τόπος στρατόπεδον· λέγεται γὰρ τοῦ στρατοῦ τὸ πέδον, is derived from the so-called ῥητορικόν, a designation that the compiler of the *Etymologicum Genuinum* elsewhere applies to an earlier lexical compilation, now identified as a late recension of the anonymous *Συναγωγή λέξεων χρησίμων*, an originally later eighth-/early ninth-century alphabetised adaptation of the (fifth-century?) glossarium of rare words falsely ascribed to Cyril of Alexandria. Different versions of the *Synagoge* were independently the sources for the identical glosses s.v. στρατός in both the *Lexicon* of Photius (ca. 840) and the *Suda* (ca. 1000).²⁸

²⁶ *Epim.Hom.* σ 9 (Dyck II 659.48–660.51). For date see Dyck I 6–7, with 9–10, 14–16, 23–27 for *Et.Gud.*'s use of *Epim.Hom.*

²⁷ *Epim.Hom.* σ 52 (Dyck II 674.26–31). Cf. Cramer I 394.9–14 (237^r). For this form used by οἱ Αἰολεῖς cf. Sappho fr.16.1; Alcaeus fr.382.2, and possibly fr.300.1 (ed. E.-M. Voigt, *Sappho et Alcaeus* [Amsterdam 1971]). For general discussion of the ambiguous evidence for *Et.Gen.*'s use of *Epim.Hom.* see Dyck I 36–38.

²⁸ *Συναγωγή λέξεων χρησίμων* σ 250: στρατός· τὸ πλήθος τῶν πολεμούντων, ὁ δὲ τόπος στρατόπεδον· λέγεται γὰρ τοῦ στρατοῦ τὸ πέδον. Cf. identically Photius *Lexicon* (ed. R. Porson [Cambridge 1822] 542.21–22); *Suda* σ 1183 (ed. A. Adler IV 442). For demonstration of the sources of and relationships between these and other lexical works see Cunningham 20–42

This gloss already had a long pedigree: it was earlier partially registered in the fifth-century *Lexicon* of Hesychius, and in extant *lexica* it may be traced back to the surviving abridgement of the *Lexicon Homericum* of Apollonius Sophista (originally ca. A.D. 100), and given the derivative character of the latter work in all likelihood derives from an earlier Homeric glossary or scholion, though which of Apollonius’ many sources supplied this material is not known.²⁹

2. The “Fragment of Urbicius”

Reitzenstein has already observed that the fragment of Urbicius does not occur in either the *Etymologicum Genuinum* or *Etymologicum Gudianum*, nor in any of the other known sources of the *Etymologicum Magnum*.³⁰ The compiler seems therefore to have drawn the fragment from an alternative and unknown source, and it remains to be established whether he knew an original text by Urbicius directly or via another lexical compendium, and to what degree he modified its contents. A translation of the fragment follows:

(From) Orbicius, on the formations of the army. One should know, with regard to the formations and commands of the army, that a force of five men is called a *pempas*, of which the commander is a *pempadarchos*; a force of ten men is a *dekas* under

with summary at 13–14; note that in the stemma at 14 the second Σ should read Σ'. For the thorny question of the identity of the λεξικὸν ῥητορικὸν see K. Alpers, “Das Lexikon des Photius und das Lexicon Rhetoricum des Etymologium Genuinum,” *JÖByz* 38 (1988) 171–191, whose conclusions are corroborated by Cunningham 20–42, but acrimoniously contested by C. Theodoridis, “Das Lexicon des Patriarchen Photius und das Lexicon Rhetorikon des Etymologicum Genuinum,” *JÖByz* 42 (1992) 95–141.

²⁹ Hesychius σ 1972 (ed. P. A. Hansen [Berlin 2005] 355): στρατός· τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πολεμούντων στρατιωτῶν; Apollonius Sophista *Lexicon Homericum* (ed. I. Bekker [Berlin 1833]) 145.17: στρατός· τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πολεμούντων, στρατόπεδον δὲ ὁ τόπος. For Apollonius’ sources see H. Schenck, *Die Quellen des Homerlexikons des Apollonius Sophistes* (Hamburger philol. Stud. 34 [Hamburg 1974]).

³⁰ Reitzenstein (1897) 250: “ebenso aus Orbikios entlehnte längere Stück ... Die Zahl der benutzen Nebenquellen ist bei diesem vielleicht erst durch die allmähliche Arbeit verschiedener Grammatiker entstandenen Werk keinesfalls gering.”

a *dekarchos*; twenty-five men a *lochos* under a *lochagos*; fifty men a *pentékostus* under a *pentékontarchos*; a hundred men a *taxis* under a *taxiarchos*, two hundred and fifty men a *suntagma* under a *suntag-matarchos*; five hundred men a *pentakosiotus* under a *pentakosiarchos*; a thousand men a *chiliostus* under a *chiliarchos*; two thousand men a *merarchia* or *telos* under a *merarchês* or *telarchês*; four thousand men a phalanx under a *phalangarchês*; ten thousand men a *muriostus* under a *muriarchos*. Two *diphalangarchiai* are a *tetraphalangarchia*, of one thousand six hundred men, of which the commander is a *tetraphalangarchês*. An army which is wholly infantry is called a *phalanx*, having the same name as its constituent units, of which the leader is a *stratêgos*, while a *hipparchos* leads the cavalry; but an army that is both infantry and cavalry is a *stratia*. The so-called “front” (*metôpon*) of the army is what they also call the first rank, the *prôtostatai*, of which the leader is a *prôtostatês*. The men deployed on either wing, the right and the left, these are both *parastatai*, and the commander is similarly named. The men deployed in depth behind them are *epistatai*, while their last rank is called the “tail” (*oura*) or *ouragia*, under an *ouragos*; this man is also an *opisthophulax*, who is customarily called the *pentékontophulax*. The man who heads the whole army, however, is the emperor.

The fragment divides broadly into two parts: an initial outline of an organisational structure and hierarchy for an army, followed by an explanation of terminology concerned with tactical deployment and the stationing of personnel. It is first necessary to determine whether and to what extent either part corresponds to the contents of Urbicius’ *Tacticon*.

Urbicius begins his *Tacticon* with a similar summary of the subdivisions of an army, but it is markedly different in content and origin. Here Urbicius reiterates a conventional and largely artificial numerical schema for the organisation of an idealised phalanx, as delineated by his model Arrian (*Tact.* 10) and the other authors who drew on the same late Hellenistic tradition of tactical writing (principally Asclepiodotus and Aelian). The base unit for this system was a squad or file (*lochos*) of 16 men, which is successively doubled via a series of increasingly larger units to arrive ultimately at a hypothetical army of 16,384 heavy infantry, supported by half as many light infantry (8,192) and half that again in cavalry (4,096). Within such abstract discussions of the tactical manoeuvres of an infantry phalanx the value of the magic number 16,384 was its sequential divisibility

by two down to, in theory, a two-man file ($16,384 = 2^{14}$). This numerical sequence, which was probably formulated, or at least canonised, in a lost *tactica* by the Stoic philosopher Poseidonius of Apamea (ca. 135–51 B.C.), is in some measure reflective of Hellenistic philosophical and arithmetical idealism, but it served military theorists as a convenient illustrative model when explaining military formations and tactical evolutions. To the extent that this sub-genre portrays a “real” army, it is most probably the Seleucid army of the late second century B.C.³¹

³¹ For this numerical schema cf. Asclep. 2.7–10, 6.1–3, 7.11 (with comments of L. Poznanski, *Asclépiodote. Traité de tactique* [Paris 1992] 41, 44); Ael. 8.3–9.10, 15.2–16.3, 20.2; Arr. *Tact.* 9–10, 14, 18; Syrianus *De re strat.* 15.62–76 (ed. G. T. Dennis, *Three Byzantine Military Treatises* [CFHB 25 (Washington 1985)] 1–135, as “Sixth-Century Anonymus, *On Strategy*”). The figure 16,384 also recurs in Mamluk military treatises via a late mediaeval Arabic translation of Aelian’s *Tactica*, see G. Tantum, “Muslim Warfare: A Study of a Medieval Muslim Treatise on the Art of War,” in R. Elgood (ed.), *Islamic Arms and Armour* (London 1979) 187–201, at 190, 194–195. For the textual relationship between the *tactica* of Asclepiodotus, Aelian, and Arrian and cognate opuscula see Dain (1946) 26–40; A. B. Bosworth, “Arrian and Rome: The Minor Works,” *ANRW* II.34.1 (1993) 226–275, at 253–255, 258–259, 262–264; M. Devine, “Aelian’s Manual of Hellenistic Military Tactics,” *AncW* 19 (1989) 31–64, at 32–33, and “Arrian’s ‘Tactica,’” *ANRW* II.34.1, 312–337, at 316–330, *contra* Förster 426–449; P. A. Stadter, “The *Ars Tactica* of Arrian: Tradition and Originality,” *CP* 73 (1978) 117–128, at 117–118. The hypothesis that most satisfactorily accounts for the points of similarity and divergence requires that Aelian and Arrian (chs. 1–31) drew independently on a common lost source (Dain’s “*Techne Perdue*”), to which Arrian introduced minor changes, interpolations, and glosses. The so-called *Lexicon Militare*, ed. H. Köchly and W. Rüstow, *Griechische Kriegsschriftsteller* II.2 (Leipzig 1855) 217–233 (hereafter *Lex.Mil.*), also derives independently from this source. The unknown author of this source and Asclepiodotus both had direct access to the lost treatise of Poseidonius of Apamea, of which Asclepiodotus’ work is an abridged summary. It has been suggested that a lost tactical memorandum known to have been written by Polybius underlies this tradition of tactical writing: K. K. Müller, “Asklepiodotos 10,” *RE* 2 (1896) 1637–41, at 1640–41; A. M. Devine, “Polybius’ Lost *Tactica*: The Ultimate Source for the Tactical Manuals of Asclepiodotus, Aelian, and Arrian?” *AHB* 9 (1995) 40–44; partially endorsed by B. Campbell, *OCD*³ s.v. “Asclepiodotus”; F. Walbank, “Polybius as Military Expert,” in P. R. Hill (ed.), *Polybius to Vegetius. Essays on the Roman Army and Hadrian’s Wall presented to Brian Dobson* (Hadrianic Society 2002) 19–31, at 21. However, N. Sekunda, “The *Taktika* of Poseidonius of Apameia,”

Urbicius presents this contrived organisational hierarchy as follows (*Tact. praef.*):

τὸ πλῆθος τοῦ παντὸς πεζικοῦ στρατεύματος ὀφείλει ἔχειν ἄνδρας μυρίους ἑξακισχιλίους τριακοσίους ὀγδοήκοντα τέσσαρας. αἱ δὲ ὀνομασίαι τῶν ἡγεμόνων τοῦ τοιοῦτου στρατεύματος εἰσὶν αὗται· λοχαγὸς ὁ δεκαἕξ ἀνδρῶν ἡγούμενος. διλοχίτης ὁ δύο λόχων ἡγούμενος, ὃ ἔστιν ἀνδρῶν λβ'. τετράρχης ὁ τεσσάρων λόχων ἡγούμενος, ὃ ἔστιν ἀνδρῶν ξδ'. ταξίαρχης ὁ λόχων ὀκτῶ ἄρχων, τουτέστιν ἀνδρῶν ρκη'. ἑκατοντάρχης ὁ ἑκατὸν μόνον ἀνδρῶν ἡγούμενος. συνταγματάρχης ὁ λόχων ις' ἡγούμενος, ὃ ἔστιν ἀνδρῶν σνς'. οὗτος δὲ καὶ ξεναγὸς καλεῖται. δεῖ δὲ τοὺς σνς' ἔχειν ἐπιλέκτους πέντε, σημειοφόρον, οὐραγόν, στρατοκήρυκα, σαλπικτήν καὶ ὑπηρέτην. πεντακοσιάρχης ὁ λόχων λβ' ἡγούμενος, ὃ ἔστιν ἀνδρῶν φιβ'. χιλίαρχης ὁ λόχων ξδ' ἄρχων, τουτέστιν ἀνδρῶν ,ακδ'. μεράρχης ὁ λόχων ρκη' ἡγούμενος, τουτέστιν ἀνδρῶν ,βμη'. οὗτος δὲ καὶ τελάρχης ὀνομάζεται. φαλαγγάρχης ὁ λόχων διακοσίων πεντηκονταἕξ ἄρχων, ἡγουν ἀνδρῶν ,δς'. οὗτος δὲ καὶ στρατηγὸς καλεῖται. διφαλαγγάρχης ὁ λόχων φιβ' ἡγούμενος, τουτέστιν ἀνδρῶν ,ηρξβ'. τὸ δὲ τάγμα τοῦτο καλεῖται κέρας. τετραφαλαγγάρχης ὁ λόχων ,ακδ' ἄρχων, ὃ ἔστιν ἀνδρῶν μυρίων ἑξακισχιλίων τπδ'. τοῦτον γὰρ τὸν ἀριθμὸν κάλλιστον καὶ ἀρμόζοντα τῇ ὀπλιτικῇ τῶν πεζῶν τάξει ἐκρίναμεν.

The mass of the whole infantry army ought to comprise 16,384 men. The terms for the commanders of such an army are as follows: a *lochagos* is the commander of 16 men. A *dilochitês* is the commander of two *lochoi*, which is 32 men. A *tetrarchês* is the commander of four *lochoi*, which is 64 men. A *taxiarchês* is the officer of eight *lochoi*, which is 128 men. A *hekatontarchês* is the commander of only a hundred men. A *suntagmatarchês* is the commander of 16 *lochoi*, which is 256 men; this man is also called a *xenagos*. The 256 men should include five select men: a standard-

in Sekunda, *Hellenistic Infantry Reform in the 160's BC* (Łódz 2001) 125–134, at 128–129, argues persuasively that Poseidonius originated the tradition. For what it is worth, the speculative attempt of L. Poznanski to reconstruct what Polybius' lost *tactica* might have looked like envisages a work quite different in content from the Poseidonian tradition: "A propos du 'Traité de Tactique' de Polybe," *Athenaeum* 58 (1980) 340–352, and "Essai de reconstitution du Traité de Polybe d'après le livre III des Histoires," *AntCl* 49 (1980) 161–172.

bearer, a rearguard (*ouragos*), a herald, a bugler, and an adjutant. A *pentakosiarchês* is the commander of 32 *lochoi*, which is 512 men. A *chiliarchês* is the commander of 64 *lochoi*, which is 1,024 men. A *merarchês* is the commander of 128 *lochoi*, which is 2,048 men; this man is also termed a *telarchês*. A *phalangarchês* is the officer of 256 *lochoi*, which is 4,096 men; this man is also called a *stratêgos*. A *diphilangarchês* is the commander of 512 *lochoi*, which is 8,192 men. This unit is called a wing. A *tetraphalangarchês* is the officer of 1,024 *lochoi*, which is 16,384 men. For we have judged this number to be the best and most convenient for a combat formation of infantry.

It is difficult to concur with Dain’s conclusion that this passage was the source for the article in the *Etymologicum Magnum*. The binary sequence of the late Hellenistic tradition differs from the decimal system outlined in the fragment. There are points of conceptual and terminological correspondence: both texts include a *suntagmatarchês* (commanding 250 or 256 men), a *pentakosiarchês* (500 or 512), a *chiliarchês* (1,000 or 1,024), a *merarchês* or *telarchês* (2,000 or 2,048), a *phalangarchês* (4,000 or 4,096), and a *tetraphalangarchês* (16,000 or 16,384). But the author of the fragment has clearly attempted to reconcile two conflicting organisational systems, in that for the most part he presents a decimal sequence (5, 10, 25, 50, 100, 250, 500, 1,000, 10,000) which at first stands in sharp contrast to the unit-strengths Urbicius describes in the *Tacticon* (16, 32, 64, 128). For some of the larger formations the two systems, in rounded figures, coincide (250/256, 500/512, 1,000/1,024), but the author of the fragment struggles to accommodate other elements of the Hellenistic tradition, which more crudely intrude into his preferred decimal model; thus he incongruously includes formations of 2,000 (rounded 2,048) and 4,000 (4,096) men, and having completed his decimal sequence at 10,000 he abruptly adds that a *tetraphalangarchia* comprising 16,000 men is composed of two *diphilangarchiai*, though he does not otherwise mention the latter formation or name its officer. There are also contradictions in the use of terminology: for Urbicius a *lochos* under a *lochagos* is a 16-man unit, but in the fragment contains 25 men; while according to Urbicius the term *stratêgos* is synonymous with *phalangarchês*, the commander of the 4,096-strong sub-unit called a *phalanx*, but in the fragment the *stratêgos* is the

commander of the entire army, which may, apparently, also be called a *phalanx*. Other officer-titles listed by Urbicius are absent from the fragment (διλοχίτης, τετράρχης, ἑκατοντάρχης, ξεναγός).

Furthermore, a large number of organisational and hierarchical terms which appear in the fragment are nowhere used by Urbicius. In the *Tacticon* Urbicius supplies only the titles of officers but not the names of the units they command, as found in the fragment. In some cases it is perfectly conceivable that the author of the fragment could have construed the names of units from their officers' titles (λόχος < λοχαγός, τάξις < ταξιάρχης, σύνταγμα < συνταγματάρχης, μεραρχία < μεράρχης, τέλος < τελάρχης, διφαλαγγαρχία < διφαλαγγάρχης, τετραφαλαγγαρχία < τετραφαλαγγάρχης), but in other instances the terminology of the fragment is wholly without parallel in Urbicius' work (πεμπάς, πεμπάδαρχος, δεκάς, δεκάδαρχος, πεντηκοστύς, πεντηκόνταρχος, χιλιοστύς, πεντακοσιοστύς, μυριοστύς, μυρίαρχος). Above all, none of the information in the second part of the fragment concerning tactical deployment occurs in the eleven chapters of Urbicius' *Tacticon*, and the author could not therefore have drawn on this text for his definitions of the terms—μέτωπον, πρωτοστάται, παραστάται, ἐπιστάται, οὐρά, οὐραγία, οὐραγός, ὀπισθοφύλαξ, πεντηκοντοφύλαξ, or ἵππαρχος.³² The concluding reference to the

³² Urbicius later mentions a ἵππαρχος (*Tact.* 5), but this officer is the commander of a specific 512-strong cavalry unit according to the conventions of the late Hellenistic organisational schema, and thus quite distinct from the ἵππαρχος in the fragment, who commands all the cavalry in the army. Urbicius also mentions an οὐραγός as one of the five select men (ἐπίλεκτοι) of a 256-man *suntagma*, but the completely different context and the additional terminological synonyms in the fragment (οὐρά καὶ οὐραγία, καὶ οὐραγός· ὁ αὐτὸς δὲ ὀπισθοφύλαξ ... πεντηκοντοφύλακα) indicates that Urbicius' *Tacticon* was not the source. In ancient tactical writers the term οὐραγός was used with two distinct meanings. First, the last man in every file, i.e. the final rank of a formation, were collectively the οὐραγοί or "file-closers," whose important role in maintaining cohesion from the rear during combat is frequently acknowledged (Xen. *Mem.* 3.1.8, *Eq.Mag.* 2.3, *Cyr.* 3.3.41–42; Asclep. 2.2, 3.6; Ael. 5.1; Arr. *Tact.* 6.6; Maurice *Strat.* 12.B.16.27–29). Second, in the Hellenistic tradition οὐραγός, as the "rearguard," also designated a single supernumerary officer attached to a larger field unit, whose

emperor’s overall command of the armed forces is also without parallel in the *Tacticon*. To summarise: the fragment contains a different numerical system from that outlined in Urbicius’ *Tacticon*, which for the most part uses different terminology for units and officers, and contains none of the information about deployment found in the fragment. In short, less than a third of the content of the fragment can have originated in the *Tacticon*.

If one insists upon the authenticity of the heading Οὐρβικίου, it might initially be tempting to speculate—as previously did Scheffer and (by implication) Krumbacher and Förster—that the *Etymologicon Magnum* preserves a fragment of a lost work by Urbicius, and it is not impossible that Urbicius wrote other treatises.³³ But this hypothesis would require Urbicius to have

duty was to supervise drills and manoeuvres from the rear (Asclep. 2.9, 3.6, 6.3; Ael. 9.4, 14.8; Arr. *Tact.* 10.4, 12.11). The potential confusion between the two types of οὐραγοί is illustrated at Asclep. 3.6. The latter sense is meant in both the *Etym.Magn.* and Urbicius’ *Tacticon*.

³³ Insofar as the tenth-century topographical compendium known as the *Patria Constantinopoleos* may be trusted, Urbicius was credited with “writing military works” (τοῦ ἱστορήσαντος [τὰ] στρατηγικά) of unspecified number: *Patr.Const.* 3.22 (ed. T. Preger, II 220.6–11). This may refer to the *Tacticon* and *Epitedeuma* only, or to these opuscula and/or additional works, though it is unlikely that the topographer was in possession of detailed information. On the doubtful reliability of this work, and specifically in relation to the “two Urbicii,” see A. Berger, *Untersuchungen zu den Patria Konstantinopoleos* (Poikila Byzantina 8 [Bonn 1988]) 211–212, 223–224, 228–229, 404–406, 586–587, 607; Greatrex et al. 40–41. All previous scholars have read the word στρατηγικά (some MSS. τὰ στρατηγικά) in this passage as generic “military works.” Recently Shuvalov I 83, 86, has attempted to argue that here is a reference to the actual title of a major treatise, i.e. Shuvalov’s putative “*Strategicon* of Urbicius” (cf. n.10 above), but this is no more than his wishful thinking and it is highly implausible that the tenth-century topographer accurately preserved, knew, or meant a specific title. For other examples of this middle-Byzantine usage of (τὰ) στρατηγικά cf. Nicephorus Phocas *De velitatione* 21.1, ed. G. Dagron and H. Mihăescu, *Le Traité sur la guérilla (De velitatione) de l’empereur Nicéphore Phocas* (Paris 1986) 119.11, οἱ τὰ τακτικά καὶ στρατηγικά ἀναγραφάμενοι. See also the extensive source-notice at the beginning of the *Tactica* of Nicephorus Uranus (*Constantinop.gr.* 36) listing the various τακτικά ἤγουν στρατηγικά (sic) he has consulted: F. Blass, “Die griechischen und lateinischen Handschriften im alten Serail zu Konstantinopel,” *Hermes* 23 (1888) 219–233, at 225; Dain, *La “Tactique” de Nicéphore Ouranos* 13, 89–90, 93–95; Dain (1946) 150–151; Dain/de Foucault

written another work, similar to the *Tacticon*, but substantially at odds with its content, which was somehow known uniquely to the twelfth-century compiler of the *Etymologicum Magnum*, but otherwise undocumented in the rich tradition of Greek, Roman, and Byzantine tactical writing. Furthermore, this proposition does not in any case acknowledge and account for the distinctive character of the fragment. We have already noted indications of the author's attempt to amalgamate and reconcile conflicting sources descending from different literary traditions, which marks out the fragment as the construction of a compiler or antiquarian rather than an informed and coherent composition on military matters. The most striking characteristic of the fragment, however, is its lexical interest. The organisational section contains obvious genre terms or “*tactica*-speak” used by the writers of tactical treatises (σύνταγμα, συνταγματάρχης, πεντακοσίαρχος, μεραρχία, τέλος, τελάρχης, μεράρχης, φαλαγγάρχης, διφαλαγγαρχία, τετραφαλαγγαρχία, τετραφαλαγγάρχης, μέτωπον, πρωτοστάτης, ἐπιστάται) or words too commonplace to establish a connection with a particular source or genre (λόχος, λοχαγός, δεκάδαρχος, τάξις, ταξίαρχος, φάλαγξ, χιλίαρχος, στρατηγός, ἵππαρχος, στρατιά, στράτευμα, τάγμα, ζυγόν, κέρατα, βάθος, οὐρά, οὐραγία, οὐραγός, ὀπισθοφύλαξ). But this lexical article is not merely a rehearsal of the standard technical vocabulary of Greek tactical writing; on the contrary, the fragment is conspicuous for its assemblage of rare words seldom attested in antiquity outside specialist lexica and in some cases otherwise unknown. These include poetic or archaïcising forms (ἀρχός); terminology not conventionally found in the late Hellenistic tradition followed by Urbicius (παρασάται, πεντηκοντοφύλαξ);³⁴ and in particular a significant number of Atticising

(1967) 371–372. Cf. also Constantine VII *Præcepta* in J. F. Haldon, *Three Treatises on Imperial Military Expeditions* (CFHB 28 [Vienna 1990]) Text C 106.196–199, βιβλία στρατηγικά; Psellus *Chron.* 7.16 (ed. Renauld II 181.12–13), ἀπὸ τῶν τακτικῶν βιβλίων καὶ στρατηγικῶν καὶ πολιορκητικῶν.

³⁴ πεντηκοντοφύλαξ is otherwise unattested. παρασάται has a rather tenuous place in the technical vocabulary of the late Hellenistic tradition from which Urbicius' *Tacticon* descends. Of the three chief representatives of this sub-genre, only Asclep. 2.4 defines παρασάται, i.e. comrades deployed in

usages (πεμπάς, πεμπάδαρχος, δεκάς, πεντηκοστής, πεντακοσιοστής, πεντηκόνταρχος, χιλιοστής, μυριοστής, μυρίαρχος). This terminological eccentricity both underlines the lexical (rather than military) purpose of the author and points to a source within the genre of *lexica* or *etymologica* rather than *tactica*.

The only previous lexical compilation to contain these words is the *Onomasticon* of Julius Pollux. This work, produced in the later second century, is topical rather than alphabetic in arrangement, and covers a wider range of subjects, including warfare. It functions primarily as a thesaurus rather than a lexicon or *etymologicum*, compiling synonyms and specialist vocabularies, and serving principally as a handbook for Atticising rhetorical composition. It has not survived in its original form; all manuscripts derive from four incomplete and interpolated copies that in turn descend from a common hyparchetype, an epitome possessed and interpolated by Arethas of Caesarea (ca. 900–932). Examination of the *vocabula militaria* of the *Onomasticon* reveals the same body of vocabulary as found in the fragment (1.127–128):

καὶ ὁ μὲν ἐκ δεξιᾶς τοῦ πρώτου ζυγοῦ πρωτοστάτης, καὶ πᾶν τὸ μέτρον, πρωτοστάται. ὁ δὲ παρ’ ἑκαστον ταπτόμενος, παραστάτης, ὁ δὲ ὑπ’ αὐτὸν³⁵ ἐξόπισθεν, ἐπιστάτης. τὸ δὲ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἐν τῷ βάθει ζυγόν, οὐρὰ καὶ οὐραγοί· καλοῖτο δ’ ἂν ὁμωνύμως καὶ

the same rank: ὅταν δὲ λόγῳ λόχος παρατεθῆ, ὥστε λοχαγὸν λοχαγῷ καὶ οὐραγὸν οὐραγῷ καὶ τοὺς μεταξὺ τοῖς ὁμοζύγοις παρίστασθαι, συλλοχισμὸς ἔσται τὸ τοιοῦτον, οἱ δὲ ὁμόζυγοι τῶν λόχων πρωτοστάται ἢ ἐπιστάται διὰ τὸ παρ’ ἀλλήλοις ἴστασθαι παραστάται κεκλήσονται. Ael. 29.3 uses the word once but does not supply a definition (παραγγελοῦμεν ἐξελίσειν τοὺς μεταταγμένους παραστάτας εἰς οὓς προεῖχον τόπους); while it does not occur at all in Arrian’s *Tactica*. The fourth witness to the tradition, the *Lexicon Militare*, corroborates the definition given by Asclepiodotus but is clearly not derived from it, and this coincidence renders more likely the presence of παραστάται in the *Urtext* of this tradition (*Lex.Mil.* 8): παραστάται· οἱ ὁμόζυγοι τῶν λόχων πρωτοστάται καὶ ἐπιστάται διὰ τὸ παρ’ ἀλλήλους ἴστασθαι (= *Suda* π 444). For πεντηκοντοφύλαξ and παραστάτης see nn.36 and 38 below.

³⁵ E. Bethe, *Pollucis Onomasticon* (Leipzig 1900–37) 41.16, prints παρ’ αὐτὸν but the reading ὑπ’ αὐτὸν in MSS. **AV** is undoubtedly correct—an ἐπιστάτης stands *behind* (ἐξόπισθεν) a πρωτοστάτης, while it is παραστάται who stand *alongside* him (παρ’ ἑκατον).

ὁ ἄρχων αὐτῶν οὐραγός, καλοῦνται δὲ καὶ ὀπισθοφύλακες, καὶ τὸ ἔργον οὐραγεῖν, καὶ ὀπισθοφυλακεῖν. τὸ δὲ σύμπαν στρατιά, στρατός, στρατεύμα, στρατιωτικόν, φάλαγξ, τάγμα, σύνταγμα. μέρος δ' αὐτοῦ μυριστός, χιλιοστός, πεντηκοστός, λόχος, δεκάς, πεμπάς. καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες οἱ μὲν τοῦ παντός στρατηγοὶ καὶ συστράτηγοι καὶ ὑποστράτηγοι, ὡσπερ οἱ ἀποχειροτονηθέντες ἀποστράτηγοι καὶ ταξίαρχοι καὶ οὐραγοὶ καὶ μυρίαρχοι καὶ χιλίαρχοι καὶ λοχαγοὶ καὶ ἐκατατόνταρχοι καὶ δεκάδαρχοι καὶ πεμπάδαρχοι, καὶ τῶν ἰπέων ἵππαρχοι καὶ φύλαρχοι. Θηβαίων δὲ ἴδιον Βοιωτάρχης, καὶ Λακεδαιμονίων βασιλεύς.

Juxtaposition of the texts of the fragment and the *Onomasticon* confirms that Pollux was the source for much of the vocabulary concerning deployment:

Poll. *Onom.* 1.127 (Bethe 41.14–19)

καὶ ὁ μὲν ἐκ δεξιᾶς τοῦ πρώτου ζυγοῦ πρωτοστάτης, καὶ πᾶν τὸ μέτωπον, πρωτοστάται. ὁ δὲ παρ' ἑκάστον ταπτόμενος, παραστάτης. ὁ δὲ ὑπ' αὐτὸν ἐξόπισθεν, ἐπιστάτης. τὸ δὲ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἐν τῷ βάθει ζυγόν. οὐρά καὶ οὐραγοί. καλοῖται δ' ἂν ὁμωνύμως καὶ ὁ ἄρχων αὐτῶν οὐραγός, καὶ τὸ ἔργον οὐραγεῖν, καὶ ὀπισθοφυλακεῖν.

Elym. Magn. (Gaisford 729.9–17)

τῆς δὲ στρατιάς τὸ μέτωπον λεγόμενον, ὃ καὶ πρῶτον ζυγόν καλοῦσι, πρωτοστάται. καὶ ὁ ἡγούμενος, πρωτοστάτης. οἱ δὲ παρ' ἑκάτερα ταπτόμενοι κέρατα, δεξιόν τε καὶ εὐώνυμον, οἱ αὐτοὶ καὶ παραστάται. ὁ δὲ ἀρχὸς ὁμωνύμως. οἱ δὲ ὀπισθεν αὐτῶν ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ βάθος ταπτόμενοι, ἐπιστάται. τὸ δὲ ἐπὶ τούτοις πρὸς τὸ βάθος ἔσχατον ζυγόν. οὐρά καὶ οὐραγία καὶ οὐραγός. ὁ αὐτὸς δὲ ὀπισθοφύλαξ. ἡ συνήθεια πεντηκοντοφύλακα αὐτὸν καλεῖ.

The author of the fragment slightly modified the wording of his exemplar and introduced three minor expansions, presumably with the aim of clarification, though certainly in two instances, and possibly all three, these interventions led him to err: he misunderstands the definition of παραστάτης³⁶ and perhaps

³⁶ As noted above, παραστάται denotes the comrades stationed either side of a man in his rank, so e.g. Hdt. 6.117.3; Xen. *Cyr.* 3.3.59, 8.1.10, *Hell.* 6.5.43; Polyæn. 2.10.4; Asclep. 2.4; *Lex.Mil.* 8 (= *Suda* π 444). The author of the fragment appears to have misunderstood the definition in Pollux 1.127 ὁ δὲ παρ' ἑκάστον ταπτόμενος, παραστάτης, “the men deployed to each side,” and conceived instead οἱ δὲ παρ' ἑκάτερα ταπτόμενοι κέρατα, δεξιόν τε καὶ εὐώνυμον, οἱ αὐτοὶ καὶ παραστάται, i.e. apparently the men deployed on each flank of the formation.

also ἐπιστάτης,³⁷ while the *hapax* πεντηκοντοφύλαξ adduced as a synonym for ὀπισθοφύλαξ appears to be the author’s own formulation, the sense of which, both etymological and military, defies explanation.³⁸

With regard to the Atticising terminology for the units and unit-commanders of a decimal-based army outlined in the fragment, it is necessary to emphasise how rare these words are. Although a small number are individually registered in other lexica, Pollux’s *Onomasticon* and the *Etymologicum Magnum* are the only works in which all these terms are assembled, other than Pollux’s own source for this recherché vocabulary, Xenophon, chiefly the *Cyropaedia*.³⁹ In particular, in the *Cyropaedia* Xen-

³⁷ It is not clear whether he has fully understood the meaning of ἐπιστάτης. Tactical manoeuvres that sought to increase or reduce the depth of a formation relied on a fundamental organisational arrangement in which each man in a file was alternately designated πρωτοστάτης or ἐπιστάτης; thus in an eight-man file positions 1, 3, 5, 7 were πρωτοστάται, while 2, 4, 6, 8 were ἐπιστάται: e.g. Asclep. 2.3, 5.2; Onas. 20; Ael. 5.1–4; Arr. *Ect.* 5, *Tact.* 6.4–6, 12.4–10; Syrianus *De re strat.* 15.56–61. Thus correctly Pollux 1.127: ὁ δὲ ὑπ’ αὐτὸν (πρωτοστάτην) ἐξόπισθεν, ἐπιστάτης. The author of the fragment, however, writes οἱ δὲ ὀπισθεν αὐτῶν (πρωτοστάτων) ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ βάθος ταττόμενοι, ἐπιστάται, importing the phrase ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ βάθος from Pollux’s subsequent definition of οὐραγοί, and wrongly implying that behind the front rank of πρωτοστάται all the men “deployed in the depth of the formation” (i.e. “through the ranks”) are classed as ἐπιστάται.

³⁸ I can offer no explanation for πεντηκοντοφύλαξ other than the observation that this word is attested only in the fragment and appears to be without historical foundations. As a synonym for ὀπισθοφύλαξ a “fifty-guard” makes no intrinsic or etymological sense, and why a rearguard might be so styled remains elusive. The author’s claim that “custom (ἡ συνήθεια) calls him (the rearguard) a *pentēkontophulax*” implies access to an alternative tradition, but this word is possibly his own fabrication, perhaps inspired by a corrupt text of his model: cf. Poll. 1.127: οὐραγός. καλοῦνται δὲ καὶ ὀπισθοφύλακες, καὶ τὸ ἔργον οὐραγεῖν, καὶ ὀπισθοφυλακεῖν; *Etyim. Magn.* 729.16–17: οὐραγός. ὁ αὐτὸς δὲ ὀπισθοφύλαξ. ἡ συνήθεια πεντηκοντοφύλακα αὐτὸν καλεῖ.

³⁹ πεμπάς: Xen. *Cyr.* 2.1.22, 24, 26, 30, 3.22; 4.5.5; *Hell.* 7.2.6. πεμπάδαρχος: Xen. *Cyr.* 2.1.22, 23, 26, 30, 3.21; *Eq. Mag.* 4.9–10; cf. Hesych. δ 2703 πεμπαδάρχης. δεκάς: Xen. *Cyr.* 2.1.22, 24, 26, 30, 3.22; 4.2.27, 5.5; cf. Hesych. δ 2703. πεντηκοστής: Thuc. 5.68.3; Xen. *An.* 3.4.22; cf. Harp. I 208.3 Dind., 177 Keaney (= Phot. *Lex.* μ 653; *Suda* λ 65, μ 1259). In support of πεντηκοστής Harpocration cites Xenophon on the Spartans, although

ophon has Cyrus the Great create and train an idealised Persian army organised along decimal lines according to the following sequence:

<i>Constituent units</i>	<i>Unit-title</i>	<i>Officer-title</i>	<i>Total</i>
	πεμπάς	πεμπάδαρχος	5
2 πεμπάδες	δεκάς	δεκάδαρχος	10
5 δεκάδες	λόχος	λοχαγός	50
2 λόχοι	τάξις	ταξίαρχος	100
10 τάξεις	χιλιοστός	χιλίαρχος	1,000
10 χιλιοστές	μυριοστός	μυρίαρχος	10,000

In the context of sixth-century Persian history the detailed structure and terminology of this army is pseudo-historical, though it may partly reflect Xenophon's knowledge of authentic Achaemenid military organisation of his own day, perhaps modified by contemporary Greek practices.⁴⁰

In this organisational section of the fragment there is again evidence that the author has attempted to elaborate and amplify his source material without access to additional or alternative information. Two examples suffice. First, the only "non-Urbician" officer-title in the fragment which cannot be accounted for as a borrowing from Pollux's *Onomasticon* is πεντηκόνταρχος, and in this instance it is telling that the author

Xenophon never uses this word of a Spartan unit but does refer to Spartan officers styled πεντηκοντήρες (codd. πεντηκοστήρες), *Lac.Pol.* 11.4, 13.4; *Hell.* 3.5.22, 4.5.7. Harpocration must have assumed, probably correctly, a Spartan institution of πεντηκοστός on the grounds that at *An.* 3.4.21–2 (cf. *Thuc.* 5.66), in a non-Spartan context, Xenophon refers to πεντηκοντήρες commanding πεντηκοστές. The notoriously conflicting evidence for Spartan military organisation, including πεντηκοστός and πεντηκοντήρες, is surveyed by J. K. Anderson, *Military Theory and Practice in the Age of Xenophon* (Berkeley/Los Angeles 1970) 225–236, and more successfully by J. F. Lazenby, *The Spartan Army* (Warminster 1985) 5–10, 52–53. χιλιοστός: *Xen. Cyr.* 2.4.3; 6.3.13, 31, 32; 7.1.22, 5.17; cf. differently Hesych. ε 1285, *Suda* κ 274, χ 306. μυριοστός: *Xen. Cyr.* 6.3.20. μυρίαρχος: *Xen. Cyr.* 3.3.11; 6.3.20, 21, 22; 8.1.14, 15, 4.29; *Polyaen.* 1 praef. 2; cf. μυρίαρχος in *Hdt.* 7.81 (twice).

⁴⁰ On the decimal system of the Achaemenid army see P. J. Junge, "Hazarapatis," *Klio* 33 (1940) 13–39; G. Widengren, "Recherches sur le féodalisme iranien," *Orientalia Suecana* 5 (1956) 79–182, at 160–166; E. Benveniste, *Titres et noms propres en Iranien ancien* (Paris 1966) 67–70.

has strayed from the tradition: Pollux did not provide him with a classicizing term for a commander of a 50-strong πεντηκόνταρχος and so the compiler imported or guessed at a πεντηκόνταρχος. While this formulation for a “commander of fifty” makes intrinsic sense and is consistent with patristic and Byzantine usage, it does not in fact occur in the Greco-Roman tactical genre; indeed in classical literature πεντηκόνταρχος is restricted to a small number of Attic authors, for whom it meant exclusively a petty officer on a trireme, a historical context that baffled later lexicographers.⁴¹ Second, and similarly,

⁴¹ Administrative assistant of a τριήραρχος: Dem. 50.18, 19, 24, 25; Xen. *Ath. Resp.* 1.2; Pl. *Leg.* 707A, with J. S. Morrison and J. F. Coats, *The Athenian Trireme* (Cambridge 1986) 111. Atticist lexicographers in the Roman Empire knew that πεντηκόνταρχος correctly applied to a naval officer, but it is doubtful whether any understood the historical context of the classical Athenian trireme, and certainly some rationalised this grade as an un-historical “commander of a *penteconter*”: Poll. 1.96 τριήραρχος, πεντηκόνταρχος, ναύαρχος; 1.119 πλοία, οἱ δὲ ἄρχοντες τριήραρχοι καὶ πεντηκόνταρχοι καὶ ναύαρχοι; Harp. I 245.1–3 Dind. (210–211 Keaney) πεντηκόνταρχος ὁ τῆς πεντηκοντόρου ἄρχων, ὡς δηλοῖ Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ περὶ τοῦ ἐπιτριηραρχήματος. ὅτι δὲ πεντηκόντορος ἐκαλεῖτο ἢ ναὺς ὑπὸ ν' ἐρεσσομένη πρόδηλον (= partially Phot. *Lex.* 411.7–9; *Suda* σ 981). πεντηκόνταρχος is first used as a generic “leader of fifty” in LXX Ex. 18:21, 25, Deut. 1:15, 4 Reg. 1:9–11, 13–14, Is. 3:3, 1 Macc. 3:55, and this usage thence passed into biblical commentaries, patristic writings, and derivative chronicles. In the tactical genre πεντηκόνταρχος is unattested, though a πεντηκονταρχία is documented both as a 64-man unit of light infantry in the artificial organisational schema of the late Hellenistic tactical tradition (Asclep. 6.3; Ael. 16.1; Arr. *Tact.* 14.3; *Lex.Mil.* 30 [= *Suda* τ 96]) or a generic “50-man” unit (Onas. 34.2). Only in middle Byzantine sources does πεντηκόνταρχος, -ης occur as a specific officer-grade: Niceph. Phocas *Praec.Milit.*, ed. E. McGeer, *Sowing the Dragon's Teeth: Byzantine Warfare in the Tenth Century* (Washington 1995) 1.1 (p.12.8–10), 1.4 (14.39), 10 (18.109–110); Anon. *De re militari* 1.175, ed. Dennis, *Three Byzantine Military Treatises* 246–326, at 254; *Sylloge Tacticorum*, ed. A. Dain (Paris 1938) 1.26, 20.2, 20.4, 35.6, 45.12, 46.5; Niceph. Uranus *Tactica* 56.1 (ed. McGeer 88.8–13), 64.4 (148.43); cf. Const. Porph. *De thematibus* 1.28, ed. A. Pertusi (Rome 1952). πεντηκόνταρχος also occurs in chronicle sources, though it is unclear whether this is a generic usage or corresponds to an actual rank or title: *V.Pachomii* 75.9 (*BHG* 1396a), ed. F. Halkin, *Le Corpus athénien de Saint Pachome* (Geneva 1982) 11–72, at 38, δέκαρχοι, πεντηκόνταρχοι, ἑκατόνταρχοι, χιλίαρχοι; *Mirac. S. Demetrii*, ed. P. Lemerle, *Les plus anciens recueils des miracles de Saint Démétrius I* (Paris 1979) 230.20. Later Byzantine lexicographers register both the spurious “com-

the fragment lists a 500-strong unit called a πεντακοσιοστὺς commanded by a πεντακοσίαρχος, both terms absent from Pollux's *Onomasticon*. In the idealised army of the Hellenistic tactical tradition a πεντακοσίαρχης commands a body of 512 men, but this corps is correctly termed a πεντακοσιαρχία.⁴² Urbicius' *Tacticon* rehearses this organisational schema, but supplies only the officer-titles and not the names of the units they command. Faced with this terminological gap, and with no additional corroborative sources at his disposal, the author of the fragment construed the term for the 500-man command of a πεντακοσίαρχος as a πεντακοσιοστὺς, a unique usage he appears to have coined himself in accordance with the Atticising conventions for unit-names set out in Pollux's word-list (e.g. πεντηκοστὺς, χιλιοστὺς, μυριοστὺς).⁴³

Conclusions

The following conclusions may be drawn from the foregoing analysis. The article στρατός in the *Etymologicum Magnum* does not contain a “fragment” (in the conventional sense) of the *Tacticon* of Urbicius, still less of a putative lost work by that author. Rather, this short self-contained military glossary labelled Ὀρβικίου, τῶν περὶ τὸ στράτευμα τάξεων is a com-

mander of a *pentecoster*” and the biblical/patristic “commander of fifty,” e.g. Phot. *Lex.* 411.4–5 πεντηκόνταρχος· ὁ τῆς πεντηκοστῆς τοῦ τέλους ἄρχων; 7–9 πεντηκόνταρχος· ὁ τῆς πεντηκοντόρου ἄρχων· ἐκαλεῖται δὲ πεντηκόντορος ἢ ὑπὸ πενήκοντα ἐρεσσομένη ναῦς (= *Suda* σ 981); *Lex.Seg.*, ed. I. Bekker, *Anecdota Graeca* I (Berlin 1814) 195–318, at 297.11–12, πεντηκόνταρχος· ὁ ἄρχων τῆς πεντηκοστῆς τοῦ τέλους καὶ τῶν πεντηκοστῶν.

⁴² Asclep. 2.10, 3.3; Ael. 9.6. 10; Arr. *Tact.* 10.9; *Lex.Mil.* 13; Syrianus *De re strat.* 15.68–69.

⁴³ πεντακοσιοστὺς occurs otherwise only in the sixth-century anonymous *De scientia politica dialogus* 4.15, ed. C. M. Mazzucchi, *Menae patricii cum Thoma referendario, de Scientia politica dialogus* (Milan 1982) p.3.15, though here the author does not in any case mean the title of a unit, but merely the elaborately Atticising numeral 500: ἀνὰ πεντακοσιοστὺν ἀνδρῶν ἰπέων, “up to five hundred mounted men.” It is highly improbable that the author of the fragment knew this work, and πεντακοσιοστὺς is most likely to be his own formulation. The only other occurrence of πεντακοσιοστὺς is in Eustathius *Ad Il.* Π 173 (1052.46: III 827.27 van der Valk), but since *Elym. Magn.* was one of Eustathius' principle lexical sources, a direct transmission can be assumed.

posite of two sources descending from two different literary traditions: *A*, a representative of the late Hellenistic tradition of tactical writing initiated by Poseidonius of Apamea, which concerned the internal structure, deployment, and manoeuvres of an idealised and hypothetical phalanx of 16,384 men; *B*, a witness to an older tradition of Atticising vocabulary for a pseudo-historical army organised along decimal lines, originating in Xenophon’s *Cyropaedia*, but in this instance mediated via Pollux’s *Onomasticon*. In terms of substance, nothing precludes identifying source *A* as any of the direct or indirect descendants of Poseidonius’ lost work (Asclepiodotus, Aelian, Arrian, Urbicius, Syrianus Magister), such is the uniformity of content among these treatises, but given the citation of Ὀρβικίος in the heading it is reasonable to accept that source *A* was Urbicius’ *Tacticon*, which provided the author of the article with an initial structural framework. The author probably had recourse to Urbicius’ spare and jejeune opusculum, rather than the more expansive representatives of this Hellenistic sub-genre, precisely because it offered a succinct and convenient resumé of terminology; indeed the principal reason for the preservation of the *Tacticon*, especially in such a high-quality production as *Ambros. gr.* 139 (B 119 sup.), was its utility as a glossary of the arcane military vocabulary of the ancients rather than its relevance to contemporary practice, and one might conjecture that its later, and perhaps even original, function was as a guide to reading classical military literature.⁴⁴

It also appears that in the minds of some Byzantine scholars of the tenth to thirteenth centuries the historically-distant Urbicius had acquired a wholly unmerited reputation as a great general and influential military theorist, whose name might thus serve as a mark of authenticity and antique authority in

⁴⁴ The character of Urbicius’ *Tacticon* is aptly summarised by Mazzucchi, *Aevum* 52 (1978) 282, “si riduce a un dizionario della falange.” Note that this codex (349^r–352^v) also contains the archetype of *Ad Basilium patricium Naumachica*, a broadly analogous dictionary of nautical technicalia compiled by an unknown contemporary from classical sources, including Homer and Pollux’s *Onomasticon*. This work was presumably produced to assist Byzantine readers in their comprehension of the so-called *Corpus Nauticum*. See A. Dain, *Naumachica* (Paris 1943) 57–68; Dain/de Foucault (1967) 363.

discussions of military matters. The citation of Urbicius in the twelfth-century *Etymologicum Magnum*, in an article that derives only to a small degree from his writings, may therefore reflect a similar misconception of his significance.⁴⁵ In reality, in the

⁴⁵ Urbicius' modest extant oeuvre of two short and formerly conjoined opuscula, the *Tacticon* and *Epitedeuma*, appears to have had no impact upon contemporaries nor any discernible *Nachleben*. He and his work pass unnoticed in late fifth-/sixth-century sources and he is never referred to, cited, nor quoted in the rich corpus of Byzantine military literature, which terminates ca. 1010. This 500-year obscurity stands in contrast to the re-emergence of Urbicius in the second half of the tenth century, though in sources and contexts of dubious historical credibility. The scribe of *Mediceo-Laurent.gr.* 55.4, the important collection of Greek, Roman, and Byzantine *tactica* compiled ca. 940–950, uniquely ascribed Maurice's *Strategicon* to Urbicius, an historical impossibility according to internal indications of date, and demonstrably not the ascription the scribe found in his exemplar ε. This error appears in essence to be the product of a misreading of ΜΑΥΡΙΚΙΟΥ as ΟΥΡΒΙΚΙΟΥ, and certainly the copyist was capable of blunders of this magnitude (e.g. at fol. 159^v he wrongly assigns the poliorcetic treatise of Aeneas to Aelian via a similarly careless reading of the superscription ΑΙΝΕΙΟΥ as ΑΙΛΙΑΝΟΥ), but his ascription of the *Strategicon* to Urbicius implies that the tenth-century scribe had at least heard of an Urbicius and knew him to be an author of military treatises. Cf. bibliography n.10 above. Slightly later, as previously noted (n.33), the frequently-inventive topographer who compiled the *Patria Constantinopoleos* reports (3.22) that an Urbicius who lived during the reign of Anastasius was known for "writing military works," and describes him as *patricius* and *magister militum per Orientem*, founder of an important church of the Theotokos, and eponym of a district of Constantinople, all details unreported in any other source. On this basis *PLRE* II 1291 locates "Urbicius 2 Barbatus" (the epithet is modern and erroneous) in the *fasti* of *magistri militum per Orientem* within the lacuna of 506–516/8, though this apparently prominent dignitary does not exist outside the *Patria*, and Greatrex et al. 41 have recently expressed doubts concerning his historical reality, tentatively identifying a muddled doublet of the renowned *praepositus sacri cubiculi* of the same name (*PLRE* II 1188–90, Urbicius 1), who was an influential courtier and pious benefactor in the reign of Anastasius, but who in the *Patria* (1.58, 70; 3.6) is transformed into a semi-legendary figure misdated to the reign of Constantine. By the mid-thirteenth century the reputation of Urbicius the tactician had become embellished to such a degree that his name could be listed in a peculiar catalogue of the most illustrious generals of all time: Theodorus II Ducas Lascaris *In laudem Iohannis Ducae Imperatoris* 14, ed. L. Tartaglia, *Teodoro II Duca Lascari, Encomio dell' Imperatore Giovanni Duca* (Naples 1990) 73.711–715, δεῦρο δὴ πᾶς βασιλέων ἀρίστων ἄλλος κατάλογος τῶν στρα-

lexical notice that bears his name, Urbicius’ *Tacticon* has been

τηγία μὲν ἐκλαμπάντων, ἀρετῇ δὲ καὶ φρονήσει βιωσάντων βασιλικῶς, ἦτοι Βρούτοι καὶ Κάτωνες, Ἀντώνιοι τε καὶ Ἀννίβαι, Ἀδριανοὶ καὶ Τραϊανοί, Πομπηῖοι τε καὶ Οὐρβίκιοι καὶ πᾶς ἄλλος βασιλικὸς χορὸς ἀνδραγαθία καὶ χάριτι κλειζόμενος (“Here indeed is another full list of the best emperors who were distinguished for their generalship, or those who with virtue and prudence have lived in the manner of emperors, all the Brutuses and Catos, Antonys and Hannibals, Hadrians and Trajans, Pompeys and Urbiciuses, and the all the rest of the imperial chorus celebrated for their courage and generosity”). The imperial or quasi-imperial status accorded to Urbicius here presumably reflects the now-complete fusion of Urbicius the *stratégiste en chambre* and Mauricius the emperor. It is not clear what precisely inspired this tenth-century re-invention of Urbicius, though one likely source of confusion was the existence of a panegyric epigram which extols the merits of a military work written by an Urbicius during the reign of Anastasius. In these twelve lines of verse, without doubt composed by Urbicius himself or a close associate, the treatise in question introduces itself to the reader as a revival or reworking of an ancient text “which once the Emperor Hadrian had beside him in his wars, / which for ages lay disused and nearly forgotten, / but in the reign of the firm-handed Emperor Anastasius / I was released into the light again” (ἦν πάρος Ἀδριανὸς μὲν ἀναξ ἔχεν ἐν πολέμοισι, / κρύψε δ’ ἀεργίῃ χρόνον ἄσπετον ἐγγύθι λήθης, / ἀλλ’ ὑπὸ καρτερόχειρος Ἀναστασίου βασιλῆος / ἦλυθον ἐς φάος αὐθις). The object of praise is unquestionably Urbicius’ *Tacticon*, an epitome of Arrian’s *Ars Tactica*, the latter written expressly to celebrate Hadrian’s *vicennalia* and fashioned with elements of panegyric to gain imperial interest and endorsement (cf. bibliography n.6 above). Furthermore, this epigram immediately precedes Urbicius’ *Tacticon* in *Ambros.gr.* 139 (92^v), the unique manuscript prototype, where it serves as a verse preface. It also found its way into the *Palatine Anthology* 9.210, in which the lemma similarly links it to “a tactical book of Urbicius” (εἰς βιβλίον τακτικῶν Οὐρβικίου). No other Greek, Roman, or Byzantine military treatise is the subject of panegyric, and this unusual literary adjunct to what was, in Byzantium, a traditionally low-brow technical genre, certainly attracted scholarly interest and even prompted the composition of supplementary hexametric verses during the reign of Leo VI (886–912). See Förster 462–463; Dain/de Foucault (1968) 124–127; A. Cameron, *The Greek Anthology: from Meleager to Planudes* (Oxford 1993) 149–150, 333, 336; Greatrex et al. 40; *contra* Shuvalov I 83–85, II 41 with 40 fig. 2 (with errors and to be read with great caution). I plan to treat this complex topic in a separate study, but it suffices here to suggest that the rhetorical hyperbole of these antique laudatory verses may have led unwary scholars of the tenth-century Macedonian Renaissance to invest Urbicius with an undeserved fame quite disproportionate to his minor historical and literary significance.

so radically modified and augmented that the contribution of his work is all but obliterated and reduced to a deeply-buried and barely-discernible textual substratum, in effect an endo-skeleton fleshed out using material drawn from Pollux's *Onomasticon*. The relative debt owed by the “fragment” to these two sources is illustrated below, with borrowings from Pollux signified in bold and those from Urbicius underlined:

Elym. Magn. 728.48–729.18

Ὀρβικίου, τῶν περὶ τὸ στράτευμα τάξεων. Ἰστέον δὲ, ὅτι τῶν περὶ τὸ στράτευμα τάξεων καὶ ἡγεμονιῶν, ὁ μὲν πέντε ἀνδρῶν ἀριθμὸς καλεῖται **πενπάζ**· ὁ δὲ ἄρχων, **πενπάδαρχος**· ὁ δὲ τῶν δέκα, **δεκάς**, καὶ **δεκάδαρχος**· ὁ δὲ τῶν πέντε καὶ εἴκοσι, **λόχος**, καὶ **λοχαγός**· ὁ τῶν πενήκοντα, **πεντηκοστὺς**, καὶ **πεντηκόνταρχος**· ὁ τῶν ἑκατόν, τάξις, καὶ **ταξίαρχος**· ὁ τῶν πενήκοντα καὶ διακοσίων, **σύνταγμα**, καὶ **συνταγματάρχος**· ὁ τῶν πεντακοσίων, **πεντακοσιοστὺς**, καὶ **πεντακοσίαρχος**· ὁ τῶν χιλίων, **χιλιοστὺς**, καὶ **χιλίαρχος**· ὁ τῶν δισχιλίων **μεραρχία** καὶ τέλος, **μεράρχος** καὶ **τελάρχος**· ὁ τῶν τετρακισχιλίων, **φάλαγξ**, καὶ **φαλαγγάρχος**· ὁ τῶν μυρίων, **μυριοστὺς**, καὶ **μυρίαρχος**. αἱ δύο διφαλαγγαρχίαι, τετραφαλαγγαρχία, ἀνδρῶν **μυρίων ἑξακισχιλίων**· καὶ ὁ ἄρχων **τετραφαλαγγάρχος**. τὸ μέντοι πεζικὸν **ἅπαν στράτευμα**, ὁμωνύμως **τοῖς μερικοῖς τάγμασι**, λέγεται **φάλαγξ**· καὶ ὁ ἡγούμενος, **στρατηγός**· **τοῦ δὲ ἵππικου, ἵππαρχος**. τὸ δὲ συναμφότερον πεζοῖ τε καὶ ἵππεις, **στρατιά**. τῆς δὲ στρατιάς **τὸ μέτωπον** λεγόμενον, **ὁ καὶ πρόωτος καλοῦσι, προωτοστάται**· καὶ ὁ ἡγούμενος, **προωτοστάτης**· οἱ δὲ **παρ' ἑκάτερα ταπτόμενοι κέρατα**, δεξιὸν τε καὶ εὐώνυμον, οἱ αὐτοὶ καὶ **παραστάται**· ὁ δὲ **ἀρχὸς ὁμωνύμως**· οἱ δὲ **ὀπισθεν αὐτῶν** ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ βάθος ταπτόμενοι, **ἐπιστάται**· **τὸ δὲ ἐπὶ τούτοις πρὸς τὸ βάθος ἔσχατον ζυγόν, οὐρά** καὶ οὐραγία, καὶ **οὐραγός**· ὁ αὐτὸς δὲ **ὀπισθοφύλαξ**· ἡ συνήθεια **πεντηκοντοφύλακα** αὐτὸν καλεῖ. ὁ δὲ **γε τοῦ παντός στρατοῦ** ἡγεμονεύων, **βασιλεύς**.

In this process of amalgamation the author of the article not only struggled to reconcile the two conflicting traditions, but also sought to amplify his source material on the basis of his own often-misconceived deductions, which suggest that he was both devoid of expertise in the practice and literature of warfare and writing at a significant chronological remove from his sources. While it is not possible to divine when and by whom this mélange was executed, the multi-source, “cut-and-paste” method of its author resembles that of the compiler of the

Etymologicum Magnum as a whole, as previously exemplified by his blending of the glosses s.v. στρατός from the *Etymologicum Genuinum* and *Etymologicum Gudianum*. Given this similarity of technique, combined with the primarily lexical interest of the item, it is legitimate to speculate that the “fragment” was not a pre-existing article, but that its author and the compiler of the *Etymologicum Magnum* were one and the same.

October, 2006

Seminar für Alte Geschichte
und Epigraphik
University of Heidelberg
Marstallhof 4
69117 Heidelberg, Germany
prr@fastnet.co.uk