

Studies in Cornelius Nepos' *Eumenes*

Stewart Richard Skerten Innes



**Dissertation presented for the degree of
Master of Arts (Classical Studies)
in the School of Languages and Literatures
University of Cape Town
June 2025**

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Texts and Abbreviations	iv
A Note on Early Hellenistic Chronology	vii
Introduction	1
I. From <i>Quellenforschung</i> and History to Composition and a <i>Life</i>	35
II. Nepos' Eumenes – <i>homo novus</i> ?	75
III. Nepos' Account of the Babylonian Settlement (<i>Eum.</i> 2.1-2)	111
Conclusion	137
Appendix α – Eumenes: Chronology and Source Tradition	140
Appendix β – Nepos' <i>Eumenes</i> : Text Breakdown	152
Appendix γ - Alexander's Ring and To Whom He Bequeathed his Empire in the Extant Tradition	154
Bibliography	155

Abstract

This dissertation presents the first examination and analysis of Cornelius Nepos' *Eumenes* on its own terms and in its own right. Although Nepotian studies have experienced a revival, for example, in the form of the two recent monographs by Rex Stem (2012) and John Lobur (2021), as well as Francesco Ginelli's (2022) commentary, Nepos' *Eumenes* has received comparatively little individual attention, besides Stem (2018) and James Bradley (1991), despite being the equally longest biography in Nepos' *Liber De Excellentibus Ducibus Exterarum Gentium* and the author's only biography of a subject from the Argead Macedonian world.

Chapter 1 discusses Nepos' conception of biography, his methods, and his use of source(s) as they concern the *Eumenes*. Nepos is consciously writing *vitae* and not *historia* and prioritises the *virtutes* of his subjects in his construction of biography at the expense of *res gestae*. His aims are explicitly stated (*Epam.* 4.6; *Pelop.* 1.1) and continually inform his writing. Nepos utilised Hieronymus of Cardia as his principal, and probably only source, as Bradley (1991) argues. By comparing Nepos' *Eumenes* with other sources derived principally from Hieronymus (i.e. Diodorus Siculus, Arrian *Successors*, Plutarch's *Eumenes*, Justin's *Epitome* of Pompeius Trogus, and the *Heidelberg Epitome*), I reconstruct a hypothetical schema of information contained in Hieronymus' original work, and thus what was available to Nepos, to show that Nepos selects only such information that illuminates the exemplary *virtutes* of Eumenes.

Chapter 2 begins by showing how Nepos' presentation of Eumenes aligns broadly with the other accounts derived from Hieronymus. Then I argue that Nepos foregrounds the idea of Eumenes as a *homo novus* (a 'new man') to better explain his career for his Roman audience. Nepos' ascription to Eumenes of *virtus*, *industria*, and *ingenium* is unambiguously reminiscent of the language with which prominent *homines novi* (especially Cato Maior, C. Marius, and Cicero) spoke about themselves and are spoken about, and the ideology of *novitas* generally. The discrimination experienced by Eumenes is contrasted with that experienced by *homines novi* in Rome.

Whereas Chapters 1 and 2 deal focus on *Eumenes* as a biography, Chapter 3 takes a more historical and historiographical approach: I focus on Nepos' highly abbreviated account of the Babylonian Settlement (June to July 323 BC) which is markedly different from our other extant sources. With close reading and commentary-style discussion, I show how and why Nepos constructed his account as he does and propose possible solutions to the so called 'errors' attributed to Nepos.

Acknowledgements

Firstly, I wish to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisors, Prof. David Wardle and Dr Jeffrey Murray, for their unremitting support and encouragement throughout the course of this project, and long before; their manifold knowledge and guidance have been *sine quibus non* — always steering me in the right direction and aiding in my development as an academic. Dr Matthew Shelton has time and again proven himself to be indispensable, both in his practical assistance and his moral support. Likewise, Dr Berenice Bentel, who has been ceaseless in her motivation and a greater help than I suspect she realises. Thomas Stranex has been a sympathetic sounding board and a valued postgraduate companion; he has read and commented on many parts of this work, for which I thank him. And Dr Gwyndolen Ortner kindly double-checked German translations. However, all errors, exclusions, and eccentricities that remain in this work are for my account alone.

A vote of thanks must be extended to Rosie Watson, Russel Williams, and the whole Inter Library Loans department at the University of Cape Town, who have tirelessly dealt with my barrage of obscure requests and repeatedly succeeded in sourcing the material. I also acknowledge the support of Dr Franca Landucci, who most kindly provided me with copies of her commentaries on Diodorus Siculus, which I was otherwise unable to consult.

Chapters 2 and 3 of this dissertation were presented in embryonic form at conferences in Cape Town, Stellenbosch, and Omaha, Nebraska. Trying out my ideas on these audiences, and the helpful and insightful comments received, have undoubtedly improved this work. Prof. Stephen Harrison furnished me with particularly helpful feedback and advice on what became Chapter 2, for which I am grateful.

I was privileged to receive a De Villiers-Smuts Scholarship, which provided generous financial support for this project.

Finally, it would be remiss not to thank my family, my parents and brother, for their support over the years—especially my mother, who has always believed in me and has sacrificed much on my behalf.

This dissertation is dedicated not only to a supervisor but also to a friend, on the occasion of his upcoming retirement from teaching.

DW
optimo magistro

SRSI
Cape Town
February 2025

Texts and Abbreviations

The text of Nepos is that of Marshall (1991), replacing consonantal *u* with *v*. For all other sources I have utilised the most recent Loeb Classical Library edition where available, with the following exceptions: the *BNJ* text for Arrian's *Successors* (*BNJ* 156), as well as Dexippus (*BNJ* 100); Wheatley (2013) for the *Heidelberg Epitome*; Thomas (1960) for the *Liber de Morte*; and Adler (1928) for the *Suda* text. Although I have used the Loeb text for Plutarch, numbering has been adjusted to accord with the more common Teubner numeration.

References to ancient authors and texts follow the conventions of the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (4th Edition, 2012), followed by Arabic numerals. Noting, however, the following exceptions, and additions of rarer material:

D.S.	Diodorus Siculus
Arr. <i>Succ.</i>	Arrian, <i>Successors</i> (Vatican Palimpsest = Arr. <i>Succ.</i> 24-25 ¹)
<i>HE</i>	The <i>Heidelberg Epitome</i>
<i>LdM</i>	The <i>Liber de Morte</i>
Dexippus	Dexippus, <i>Successors</i> (as based on Arrian's <i>Successors</i>)
<i>BCHP</i>	Babylonian Chronicles of the Hellenistic Period ²

Abbreviations of Nepos' works are as follows:

<i>Ag.</i>	<i>Agesilaus</i>
<i>Alc.</i>	<i>Alcibiades</i>
<i>Ar.</i>	<i>Aristides</i>
<i>Att.</i>	<i>Atticus</i>
<i>Cat.</i>	<i>Cato Maior</i>
<i>Chab.</i>	<i>Chabrias</i>

¹ *Cod. Rescriptus Vaticanus Graecus* 495 fol. 230 & 235, which provides two fragments from Book 7 of Arrian's original work. I have consulted the *BNJ* text and use that numbering but also provide the equivalent Teubner numbering (as used by Anson [2015]).

² Available at: <https://www.livius.org/sources/content/mesopotamian-chronicles-content/bchp-3-diadochi-chronicle/>.

<i>Cim.</i>	<i>Cimon</i>
<i>Con.</i>	<i>Conon</i>
<i>Dat.</i>	<i>Datames</i>
<i>Dion</i>	<i>Dion</i>
<i>Epam.</i>	<i>Epaminondas</i>
<i>Eum.</i>	<i>Eumenes</i>
<i>Ham.</i>	<i>Hamilcar</i>
<i>Han.</i>	<i>Hannibal</i>
<i>Iph.</i>	<i>Iphicrates</i>
<i>Lys.</i>	<i>Lysander</i>
<i>Milt.</i>	<i>Miltiades</i>
<i>Paus.</i>	<i>Pausanias</i>
<i>Pelop.</i>	<i>Pelopidas</i>
<i>Phoc.</i>	<i>Phocion</i>
<i>Praef.</i>	<i>Praefatio</i>
<i>Reg.</i>	<i>De Regibus</i>
<i>Them.</i>	<i>Themistocles</i>
<i>Thras.</i>	<i>Thrasybulus</i>
<i>Timol.</i>	<i>Timoleon</i>
<i>Timoth.</i>	<i>Timotheus</i>

Citations of modern scholarship follow the Harvard Style. Full bibliographical references may be found in the bibliography. Abbreviations of periodicals are those of *L'Année Philologique*. Noting, however, the following abbreviations:

ANRW	Temporini, H. and Haase, W. (eds.). 1972—. <i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung</i> . Berlin: De Gruyter.
BNJ	Worthington, I. (ed.). 2006—. <i>Brill's New Jacoby</i> . Leiden: Brill.
CAH VI ²	Boardman, J., Hornblower, S., Lewis, D.M., and Ostwald, M. (eds.). 1994. <i>The Cambridge Ancient History</i> . Vol. VI. 2 nd Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- FRHist* Cornell, T. J. (ed.). 2013. *The Fragments of the Roman Historians*. 3 Vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- FGrHist* Jacoby, F. (ed.). 1923—. *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Berlin: Weidmann; Leiden: Brill.
- L&S* Lewis, T.L. and Short, C. (eds.). 1879. *A Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- LSJ* Liddell, H.G., Scott, R., and Jones, H.S. (eds.). 1996. *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Marshall Marshall, P.K. (ed.). 1991. *Cornelii Nepotis Vitae Cum Fragmentis*. Stuttgart: Teubner.
- MRR* Broughton, T.R.S. 1951-2, 1986. *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*. 3 Vols. New York: American Philological Association.
- OLD* Glare, P.G.W. (ed.). 2012. *The Oxford Latin Dictionary*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- ORF*⁴ Malcovati, H. 1976. *Oratorum Romanorum Fragmenta Liberae Rei Publicae*. 4th Edition. Turin: Paravia.
- POxy.* Grenfell, P.B., Hunt, A.S. *et al.* 1898—. *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. London: Egypt Exploration Society.
- SB Shackleton Bailey, D.R. (ed. and trans.). 1991. *Cicero. Epistulae ad Atticum*. Loeb Classical Library. 4 Vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

A Note on Chronology

Any study of the early Hellenistic Period, from the death of Alexander at least down to 310 BC (but 316/315 BC for my purposes here) is fraught with chronological uncertainty.³ Although the present study does not engage in any relative chronology or attempt any dating, an overview of the problem is imperative. Two main schools of thought on the matter developed: the ‘High Chronology’ and the ‘Low Chronology’, but more recently Tom Boiy has taken a middle ground, a hybrid, ‘Between High and Low’.⁴ All these theories stem from readings of the ancient Greek and Latin sources.⁵ However, Babylonian cuneiform tablets have become vital in chronological reconstructions.⁶

Each of the ‘High’ and ‘Low’ chronologies is centred on ‘nodal events’ around which scholars are polarised (for our purposes, down to the death of Eumenes):⁷

First Diadoch War

The deaths of Craterus and Perdiccas and the conference at Triparadeisus (‘High’ = 321 BC; ‘Low’ = 320 BC).

Second Diadoch War

The Battle of Gabiene and death of Eumenes; the siege of Pydna and death of Olympias (‘High’ 317/6 BC; ‘Low’ 316/5 BC).

³ See e.g. Errington (1970: 75) ‘the chronology of the early relationships of the *Diadochoi* has never been satisfactorily elucidated in its entirety’ and Wheatley (2007: 179) ‘few scholars of the *Diadochoi* would disagree that chronology and chronography are the reoccurring nightmares that bedevil effective analysis of this period’. Wheatley (2007) provides the most digestible introduction to what is a complex set of problems.

⁴ Adherents to the ‘High’ Chronology include Bosworth (1992a and 1992b), and formerly by Vezin (1907) and Beloch (1927 IV²: 235–249); those who follow the ‘Low’ Chronology comprise Anson (2015), whom I follow; Errington (1970: 75–7); Billows (1997: 64–80). Cf. Boiy (2007a and 2007b). See also Boiy (2007a: 111–16) for a thorough analysis of High and Low systems, and their advocates, and (2007a: 116–124) for the various eclectic chronologies (e.g. Wheatley: 1998). Likewise, Heckel and Wheatley (2011: 8–9) for the various positions and references.

⁵ On the use of ‘classical sources’, see Wheatley (2007: 183–4), and Boiy (2007a: 15–22).

⁶ On this, see Boiy (2000 and 2007b), Anson (2007) for a lucid introduction, but especially Boiy (2007a: 22–34).

⁷ Following Wheatley and Heckel (2011: 10) and Wheatley (2007: 181), who says, ‘as a result, two perfectly feasible parallel historical reconstructions can be generated which do little to no violence to the source tradition’.

For the purposes of this dissertation, I adhere to Edward Anson's chronology (as reproduced with minor changes in **Appendix α**), a case for the 'Low' Chronology' which he argued for first in 2004 and then again in 2015.⁸

⁸ Wheatley and Heckel (2011: 9) call Anson's 2004 arguments a 'powerful attack' on the 'High Chronology'. Cf. Anson's (2015, which is a 'new edition' of his 2004 monograph on Eumenes) chronological appendices (pp. 128-131 and 206-212).

Introduction

1 – Cornelius Nepos

1.1 – Nepos' Life and Relationships

Although Cornelius Nepos is best known as a biographer, the details of his own life are not fully certain, even though he lived and worked in one of the best attested periods of Roman history.¹ That Nepos was a coeval of Titus Pomponius Atticus is assumed from Cicero, *Att.* 19.1 (= *FRHist* T6), where Nepos speaks as if Atticus and himself were of similar age, and suggests a birth date around 110 BC; modern scholarly consensus favours birth around 100 BC.² Either date places him in the generation of Atticus, Cicero (106-43 BC), and Varro (116-27 BC).³ That he died after 27 BC is clear from Pliny the Elder, who records that Nepos lived to see the principate of Augustus (*Plin. NH* 9.137 = *FRHist* T10: *Divi Augusti principatu obiit*). Nepos, then, lived through the most tumultuous period in Roman history, and was an eyewitness to civil strife and a transitioning political landscape of the Late Republic and Triumviral period that would inform his work.⁴ His *praenomen* has not survived, and his place of birth is debated. Pliny the Elder notes that Nepos was *Padi acola* (*NH* 3.127 = *FRHist* T9), literally 'neighbour to the Po', or as Francesco Ginelli puts it an 'inhabitant of the shores of the River Po'.⁵ Broadly, meaning that he was a Transpadane Gaul. John Briscoe and Andrew Drummond suggest 'perhaps from Ticinum', but Ginelli makes the case for Hostilia (modern Ostiglia).⁶ Pliny the Younger says explicitly that Nepos' family were not of senatorial rank: *non*

¹ Cf. Ginelli (2022: 1). A full bibliography of scholarship on Cornelius Nepos (up to 2015) is collected and collated by Spies (2017).

² For 110 BC see Briscoe and Drummond (2013 I: 395); Geiger (1985a: 67 n. 6); Horsfall (1989: xv); for circa 100 BC, Shackleton Bailey (1999:17) for November, Slingsby (2019: 13), Lobur (2021: 1) and Ginelli (2022: 1-2). Passages marshalled for this assertion: *Att.* 19.1: *nunc, quoniam fortuna nos superstites ei esse voluit.*; cf. *Att.* 21.1: *tali modo cum VII et LXX annos complisset.*; cf. *Att.* 22.3 for Atticus' death on 31 March 32 BC.

³ Lobur (2021: 130).

⁴ As shown by Dionisotti (1988) and Millar (1988) initially, but later Stem (2012), Slingsby (2019), and Lobur (2021).

⁵ Ginelli (2022: 2)

⁶ Briscoe and Drummond (2013 I: 395), cf. Ginelli (2022: 2) argues that two factors support this theory: 1) the proximity to Catullus' hometown Verona; and 2) the number of inscriptions connecting the *gens Cornelia* to this town. However, Ginelli

quidem hi senatores (*Ep.* 5.3.6 = *FRHist* T12). Joseph Geiger plausibly says that Nepos was ‘almost certainly of equestrian status.’⁷ The Transpadanes obtained Latin rights in 89 BC (*Ascon.* 3C), and Nepos may have acquired Roman citizenship through holding a magistracy in his hometown.⁸ Although he did not pursue a political career at Rome, he was in the capital by 65 BC when Cicero defended C. Cornelius (*Hier. c. Ioh.* 12 = *FRHist* T20). There Nepos appears to have begun his literary pursuits, and we find him mingling with and befriending the Roman *literati*, especially those of Atticus’ circle.⁹ He likely remained in Rome, writing, and publishing until his death at the dawn of the Principate.

Nepos’ contemporary relationships are central to understanding his life.¹⁰ It was with Atticus that he fostered his closest friendship.¹¹ Although Atticus is best known today for his friendship with Cicero, it is patent that Nepos and Atticus’ friendship was significant too. Not only was Atticus the dedicatee of Nepos’ *De Excellentibus Ducibus Exterarum Gentium*, but Nepos’ biography of Atticus clearly indicates a close and meaningful friendship (and possible patronage).¹² Nepos eulogises Atticus throughout, and *Att.* 13.6, reveals clearly that Nepos was *au fait* with Atticus’ daily life and his expenses.¹³ The length of the *Atticus*, the only extant biography of a contemporary, can also be marshalled as evidence for this relationship.¹⁴

does present other arguments for places from which Nepos might have originated.

⁷ Geiger (1985a: 102).

⁸ Briscoe and Drummond (2013 I: 395): ‘or he could have owed his enfranchisement to Sulla.’

⁹ Horsfall (1989: xv) says that ‘the ‘circle of the Villa Tamphiliana’ (Atticus’ town house) can be made to sound like a research seminar in history and antiquities for gentleman amateurs’, (*Att.* 13.2). He knew Catullus.

¹⁰ Arguments for Nepos’ knowledge of Varro are inconclusive, and definitely not as important. See Horsfall (1989: xvi) and Titchener (2003: 96) who makes the case for a close friend.

¹¹ See esp. Lindsay (2002); Stem (2012: 55-61); Stem (2019); Lobur (2021: 98-104).

¹² *De Excellentibus Ducibus Exterarum Gentium* is henceforth *On Foreign Generals*. On this relationship, see Stem (2012: 55-61), with Stem (2012: 55 n. 1) for bibliography on the *Atticus*, but especially important are Millar (1988), and Horsfall (1989: 7-28, 58-112), and also Lobur (2012: 98-105, esp. 98-99) for the closeness of the relationship.

¹³ For praise of Atticus, see Millar (1988: *passim*), with *Att.* 2, 6-9, 12, 13, 18, 20. Stadter (2007: 53) calls this biography ‘uniformly laudatory’. Whether we see the *real* Atticus, denied by Millar (1988), is not important for my purposes.

¹⁴ That is, being a close associate of the subject, Nepos did not lack for material, and firsthand information collected over many years. Horsfall (1989: 7); Stem (2012: 15), who also adds that it the *only* extant biographical treatment of an *eques*. Geiger (1985a: 86, 100) suggests a biography of Caesar, possibly in a book on orators.

Nepos was very sympathetic to the character of Atticus and particularly regarding his decision to avoid a political career in such a corrupt and strife-ridden time, from which Rex Stem plausibly hypothesises that Nepos' life 'followed the same model, though likely on a smaller scale.'¹⁵

From *Atticus*, it is obvious that Nepos himself had witnessed the political vicissitudes in the Roman world: the struggle between Cn. Pompeius Magnus and Caesar, and the latter's assassination (*Att.* 7-8.1); Brutus and Cassius, the saviours of the Republic (*Att.* 8), but not for long, as the *Triumviri rei publicae constituendae* forever changed the political landscape at Rome, proscriptions and all (*Att.* 10, 12); and M. Antonius' loss to Octavian (soon to be Augustus), the result of a struggle that Nepos so eloquently says was bound to transpire: *sed obtrectatio tanta intercedebat, quantam fuit [incidere] necesse inter Caesarem atque Antonium, cum se uterque principem non solum urbis Romae, sed orbis terrarum esse cuperet* (*Att.* 20.5). *Atticus* is, in some sense, Nepos' most explicit commentary on this period.¹⁶ Scholars have inferred Nepos' political leanings: Nicholas Horsfall says Nepos 'speaks bravely' of Mark Antony and 'with no warmth of Octavian'.¹⁷ Fergus Millar goes further: 'it is incontestable ... that Nepos himself was at the least reserved and neutral, and very likely hostile, in the face of Octavian's rise to power.'¹⁸ This view is shared by Anna Carlotta Dionisotti, who in her seminal article, articulates 'the consistency and coherence' of Nepos' republican outlook.¹⁹

¹⁵ Stem (2012: 61); Millar (1988: 54): '... neutrality, which Atticus observed, and Nepos praised'; cf. Horsfall (1989: 72): 'Atticus' masterly perception of the ethical bases and political realities of a neutral position dominates these chapters'.

¹⁶ Millar (1988: 40): 'The biography of Atticus by Cornelius Nepos, covering the last eight decades of the Republic and written at the precise moment of the establishment of monarchy by Octavian, ought always to have been treated both as one of the best introductions to the period, and as an exposition, from a unique angle, of some of the values expressed in Roman society', cf. Horsfall (1989: 7). The value of the *Atticus* is often stated: Conte (1994: 223); Stadter (2007: 533): 'The *Atticus*, a portrait of the wealthy banker who managed to keep on good terms with both sides during the civil war, shows Nepos at his best'.

¹⁷ Horsfall (1989: xv), the implication being that Nepos felt little warmth for either triumvir, his view of Antonius can be seen at *Att.* 10.1, 12.2.

¹⁸ Millar (1988: 42).

¹⁹ Quote from Stem (2012: 114-115); Dionisotti (1988), whose arguments are dealt with below.

A long friendship with Atticus would certainly have opened doors for Nepos, providing him with access to many prominent persons, especially writers, but also politicians. None was perhaps so important as Cicero.²⁰ It is ‘plausible but not demonstrable’ that Nepos was introduced to Cicero by Atticus.²¹ Even though there were at least two volumes of published correspondence, suggesting at least a degree of rapport (if not good friendship), there has been relatively robust debate on the nature of Nepos and Cicero’s relationship.²² Although Aulus Gellius writes *Cornelius Nepos . . . et M. Ciceronis ut qui maxime familiaris fuit* (Gell. 15.28.1 = *FRHist* 45 T14), Edna Jenkinson thought the two men were as ‘different as chalk and cheese.’²³ Geiger, however, clearly believes Nepos and Cicero to be friends.²⁴ And Stem takes a middle line: ‘Cicero is not as close or favourable toward Nepos as Atticus is but he does not want to be discourteous to a friend of Atticus who is also, though to a lesser degree, a friend of his own.’²⁵ Perhaps the most telling piece of evidence for Nepos’ acquaintance with Cicero as a person, and his work, is that Nepos wrote a now lost biography of Cicero in at least two books (Gell. 15.28.1-2).²⁶ Although Nepos was close to Cicero, they were not necessarily ‘close friends’ or maybe the warmth of the friendship had diminished by the 40s.²⁷ A thorough analysis of the fragments of their extant correspondence and Cicero’s occasional comments to Atticus is beyond the scope of this introduction, but the two men discussed topics

²⁰ On Nepos’ relationship with Cicero, see esp. Geiger (1985b); Stem (2012: 61-83); Lobur (2021: 89-98).

²¹ Stem (2012: 61-62); Slingsby (2019: 14); Lobur (2021: 89); cf. Horsfall (1989) who says, ‘it is not clear to me whether he met Cicero or Atticus first.’

²² For this correspondence, see Macrob. *Sat.* 2.1.14, on which see Stem (2012: 8 n. 31 and 62 n. 21). However, both Geiger (1985b) and Slingsby (2019: 14-15) are open to the possibility that Nepos and Cicero were not necessarily close friends.

²³ Jenkinson (1973: 703).

²⁴ Geiger (1985b: 270): ‘it should be evident by now that it went far beyond the one-sentence descriptions to be found in the modern literature.’

²⁵ Stem (2012: 70), cf. Lobur (2012) who in surveying this relationship seems reticent to offer a strong opinion either way.

²⁶ See Geiger (1985b: 269-270), who says that ‘written sources must have been important in the composition of the biography’ in addition to autopsy. The assumption must be that these written sources included Cicero’s own works, and probably especially his correspondence with Atticus.

²⁷ Suet. *Iul.* 55; Amm. Marc. 21.16.12-13; Lact. *Div. Inst.* 3.15.10. On which, see Stem (2012: 62-65), cf. Cic. *Att.* 16.5 = SB 411, 16.14 = SB 425.

as diverse as Caesar as an orator, moral philosophy, and the insincerity of philosophers.²⁸ This shows that Cicero and Nepos engaged with one another in a scholarly manner and that their ‘friendship’ extended beyond association only with Atticus. However, the friendship was not without its hiccups. For example, in Cicero’s correspondence to Atticus, at *Att.* 16.5.5 (= SB 411), Cicero says that he is expecting a letter from Nepos (*Nepotis epistulam exspecto*) but believes that Nepos does not think highly of his work (*cupidus ille meorum, qui ea quibus maxime γαυριῶ legenda non putet?*). Stem concludes that ‘we again see that Cicero is not as close or as favourable toward Nepos as Atticus is.’²⁹ This can be seen also at *Att.* 16.14.4 (= SB 425), in which Cicero says: *male narras de Nepotis filio, valde mehercule moveor et moleste fero, nescieram omnino esse istum puerum*. Cicero’s ignorance of Nepos even having a son suggests that in late-44 BC, as Shackleton Bailey dates this epistle, they were not in close contact.³⁰ Thus, as Horsfall yields, ‘I draw no conclusions’ on this matter.³¹ The general scholarly mood is not to make judgement one way or another on this relationship. Perhaps, it is best to conceive of it as professional, maybe collegial, but not close.

1.2 – Nepos’ Works

Before I discuss *On Foreign Generals*, the only book of Nepos’ writing that survives in full from *De viris illustribus*, I outline Nepos’ other literary outputs, in chronological order (as far as is ascertainable). Although precise dating cannot be offered for all Nepos’ outputs, we know he was *scriptor historicus clarus* by 40 BC (Hier. *Chron.* 159^d = *FRHist* T18).

²⁸ Slingsby (2019: 15); cf. Stem (2012: 63-64) who senses that Cicero disagrees with some of Nepos’ views on philosophy (Amm. Marc. 21.16.12-13).

²⁹ Stem (2012: 70).

³⁰ Shackleton Bailey (1999: 363).

³¹ Horsfall (1989: xvi).

α) Love Poetry (*carmina?*)

Pliny the Younger (*Ep.* 5.3.6) places Nepos' poetic oeuvre alongside Virgil, Accius and Ennius (*inter quos vel praecipue numerandus est P. Vergilius, Cornelius Nepos et prius Accius Enniusque*). What exactly this poetry was is a mystery, but, as Horsfall suggests, poetical composition was 'a very common pastime among educated Romans of the age'.³² This is almost certainly to be seen as Nepos' first literary endeavour, of which nothing survives, and his only foray into verse.

β) *Chronica*

iam tum, cum ausus es unus Italarum
omne aevum tribus explicare cartis
doctis, Iuppiter, et laboriosis. (Cat 1.5-7)³³

Much ink has been split upon the vexed question as to whether Catullus is, in his opening *carmen*, heaping sincere praise upon the unnamed literary work of his fellow Transpadane, or, if it is simply neoteric allusivity, and veiled criticism.³⁴ It is these lines by which most are introduced to Nepos, and with which much criticism of Nepos begins.³⁵ Here Catullus introduces us to Nepos' *Chronica*, the scope of which can be gleaned neatly from Cat. 1.6: *omne aevum tribus explicare cartis*, and the novelty (in Roman terms) of the pursuit from the previous line: *cum ausus es unus Italarum*. Thus, the *Chronica* is a 'first of its kind' work by an 'Italian' (i.e. Roman), which ventures to explain, or, more poetically, unravel, all time, all history, in three books. The *Chronica* must have been published sometime before 54 BC, as Catullus makes

³² Horsfall (1989: xvii), cf. Titchener (2003: 85) says 'some kind of poetry'; Stem (2012: 8), 'some poetry'.

³³ On the nature of the dedication and Catullus' relationship with Nepos, see Stem (2012: 1-6), who surveys the scholarship (on both ends of the spectrum). The most important works on this dedication are Elder (1967), Cairns (1969) and Gibson (1995).

³⁴ On this relationship, see esp. Wiseman (1979: 141-182); Stem (2012: 1-11 with collected bibliography); Lobur (2021: 89-98); Ginelli (2022: 1-2). For a positive reading of the dedication, see Cairns (1969), Levine (1969) and Singleton (1972). For a negative reading of the dedication, see Copley (1951), Gibson (1995). Cf. Elder (1967) who took the middle ground.

³⁵ Indeed, for example, Stem (2012) begins his monograph with Catullus 1, finding it an especially good entry point to a discussion of Nepos.

no mention of any event later than that.³⁶

The *Chronica*, as its title suggests, is a work fundamentally concerned with time, with the synchronisation of different worlds, Roman and Greek, and perhaps Eastern.³⁷ The *Chronica* is best seen as a ‘world’ or ‘universal’ history.³⁸ Time and synchronicity, between not only events but also individuals and peoples, are the key words here.³⁹ Gellius provides us with a description of Nepos’ content of this work, from which we might deduce what Nepos’ criteria for inclusion were (17.21.1): *excerpebamus ex libris, qui chronici appellantur, quibus temporibus flourissent Graeci simul atque Romani viri, qui vel ingenio vel imperio nobiles insignesque ... fuissent*. A perusal of the fragments, together with Stem’s erudite summary allow us to see that Nepos indeed encompassed *omne aevum* – from the mythical past (e.g. *FRHist* F1), to the near contemporary (e.g. F11) and everything in between.⁴⁰ While this was undoubtedly an antiquarian work in the vein of Varro⁴¹ or Atticus, it was a scholarly undertaking that required near-encyclopaedic reading. The actual synchronisation normally with *AUC* dates or consulships (and often correctly) cannot be seen as a small undertaking.⁴² In this undertaking, Nepos is emulating Apollodorus of Athens’ *Chronica* for a Roman world and extending its chronological timeframe.⁴³ Apollodorus wrote in verse towards the end of the 2nd c. BC, and covers the time from the fall of Troy (1184/83 BC) to his own day. His work became a

³⁶ Briscoe and Drummond (2013 I: 399), cf. Gieger (1985: 68 n. 11) who suggests 55 BC.

³⁷ Briscoe and Drummond (2013 I: 398-399) say ‘there is no evidence that it included anything beyond the Greco-Roman world’, and likewise Stem (2012) holds the *Chronica* dealt with Roman and Greek events alone. Cf. Ginelli (2022: 3-4), who argues that it may have contained Near Eastern events.

³⁸ Wiseman (1979: 157), but the idea of this as ‘world’ history is found in almost all scholarship that addresses the *Chronica*. Geiger (1985a: 69) notes: ‘one point cannot be too strongly stressed: the *Chronica* was the first work of Roman historiography — or, perhaps, antiquarianism — not concerned with exclusively Roman (or Italian) history’.

³⁹ Wiseman (1979:157); Rauk (1997: 320).

⁴⁰ Stem (2012: 2-11). Briscoe and Drummond (2013 I: 399) note that Nepos reconciled various dating systems, i.e. *AUC*, consular, and Olympiad. Of particular interest to this thesis, is Nepos’ dating of the birth of Alexander the Great to a specific consular year (F 6).

⁴¹ Varro published a similar work: *De gente populi Romani*, on which, see Wiseman,(1979: 158).

⁴² These dating systems are easily extrapolated from the fragments, see: *FRHist* F1-11 (Marshall F 1-9).

⁴³ For an introduction to Apollodorus of Athens, see Fleisher (2020), who also collects the fragments (= *BNJ* 244).

highly influential and exemplary chronographic reference work right from its publication.⁴⁴ Nepos may have envisioned his audience, or at least part thereof, as being unfamiliar with Greek history, a view which might be an embryonic conception of what he was later to attempt in *De viris illustribus* as a whole, although we can infer this only from *On Foreign Generals*.⁴⁵ Despite Catullus' praise, it is uncertain whether Nepos' *Chronica* was widely used, but the quality of the endeavour should not be understated.⁴⁶ Whatever the case, Geiger is right to state that this work was 'truly revolutionary', as Nepos brought together through synchronism 'data from two fields that had been hitherto strictly separated'.⁴⁷

γ) *Exempla*

This work also appears to be innovative in Latin literature, a collection of moral *exempla* in at least five books from which the reader can ascertain the *virtutes* or *vitia* of almost any subject, with the goal of emulation or avoidance.⁴⁸ This genre reached its zenith in Valerius Maximus' *Facta et dicta memorabilia*.⁴⁹ Yet, we know almost nothing about Nepos' work. The work is only mentioned by name twice, the first (Charisius 1 p. 185.24 Barwick = Marshall F 10) only for an obscure use of the ablative. Gellius (6.18.11), however, reports the following about oaths, and how they ought not to be broken:⁵⁰

Cornelius autem Nepos in libro exemplorum quinto id quoque litteris mandavit multis in senatu placuisse, ut hi, qui redire nollent, datis custodibus ad Hannibalem deducerentur, sed eam sententiam numero plurium, quibus id non videretur, superatam; eos tamen, qui ad Hannibalem non redissent, usque adeo intestabiles invisosque fuisse, ut taedium vitae ceperint necemque sibi consciuerint.

⁴⁴ Fleisher (2020: 3).

⁴⁵ *Praef. 2; Pelop. 1.1*, and see Briscoe and Drummond (2013 I: 399).

⁴⁶ The collected fragments show that eminent ancient scholars read and used the *Chronica*.

⁴⁷ Geiger (1985a: 90).

⁴⁸ For novelty, see Geiger (1985a: 73); Stem (2012: 83); Lobur (2021: 27-28). An *exemplum* is for Stem (2012: 84), 'an allusion to or summary of a historical anecdote that illustrates the speaker's persuasive goal'. For at least five books, see Gell. 6.18.11.

⁴⁹ Although Valerius Maximus never cites Nepos, he is generally believed to have inspired and influence Hyginus and Valerius work, see Horsfall (1989: xvii); Conte (1994); Briscoe and Drummond (2013 I: 398); Lobur (2021: 27-28); and Murray (2022a: 10) and Murray (2022b: 244 n. 42).

⁵⁰ For the fragments of the *exempla*, see Marshall (F 10-35).

This, the only certain fragment of substance and definite content gives us nothing more than a vague idea as to how the work may have been laid out, and its overall scheme, and structure.⁵¹ For example, Horsfall includes ‘at least’ the fragments of Nepos on the history of *luxuria* at Rome, as found in Pliny the Elder, but Briscoe and Drummond are not convinced.⁵²

There is, however, another point of contention over a series of fragments (e.g. Marshall F 15-25, 29) related to geography, principally found in Pomponius Mela and Pliny the Elder, that have been attributed to Nepos.⁵³ This content relates to distances between places, latitudes, locations and the like. Horsfall seems to exclude them from the *Exempla*; Briscoe and Drummond say that ‘their attribution to the *Exempla* is entirely arbitrary’.⁵⁴ Geiger posits ‘a geographical work by Nepos’.⁵⁵ On my view, there is little direct evidence that Nepos’ *Exempla* contained a geographical section, and it is best to hold that these fragments belong to a different as yet unattested work. Notwithstanding, it is evident that Nepos’ *Exempla* constituted a novelty at Rome, as he ‘undertook to transfer a form from Greece to Rome’, as he had done with the *Chronica*.⁵⁶ J.C. Rolfe tentatively dates this work after the Battle of Mutina (43 BC) from a reference in Suetonius (*Aug.* 77), on the perhaps shaky assumption that this anecdote derives from Nepos’ *Exempla*, and not some other work.⁵⁷

⁵¹ Briscoe and Drummond (2013 I: 398) argue that it was arranged thematically, not chronologically (just as Valerius Maximus would later do); see Murray (2022b: 244 n. 42).

⁵² Horsfall (1989: xvii-xviii); cf. Briscoe and Drummond (2013 I: 397-398).

⁵³ Most recently by Ginelli (2022: 4).

⁵⁴ Briscoe and Drummond (2013 I: 398).

⁵⁵ Horsfall (1989: xv); Horsfall (1989: xv); Geiger (1985a: 76).

⁵⁶ Geiger (1985a: 73), noting ‘the very slight evidence for the literature of *exempla* in Greek’. See Geiger (1985a: 76 n. 38) for scholarship on Greek *exempla*, also (Stem 2012: 83 n. 72) for Greek precedents and Stem (2012: 84 n. 76) for Roman rhetorical schools and *exempla*.

⁵⁷ Rolfe (1929: viii), citing Suet. *Aug.* 77: *Vini quoque natura parcissimus erat. Non amplius ter bibere eum solitum super cenam in castris apud Mutinam, Cornelius Nepos tradit.*

δ) *De viris illustribus*

With the *De viris illustribus*, we are on firmer ground, as it is Nepos' best-preserved work and the reason why he is known almost exclusively for his *vitae*. Yet, this work is not without its own challenges. A fragment references a sixteenth book (Charisius 1 p. 178.20 Barwick = Marshall F 43).⁵⁸ Thus, it is generally held that the work was at least that long and contained a collection of biographies collected and categorised into several books. There is, however, considerable debate about the nature of the books and their content, not least, their divisions and potential pairing, as noted by Ginelli.⁵⁹ On this topic, Stem warns, 'quickly we turn to speculation.'⁶⁰ Clearly not even the titles of all the books have survived, and only the *Liber de excellentibus ducibus Exterarum Gentium* survives in its entirety with manuscript attestation of its title.⁶¹

Through internal references and surviving fragments, the title of two other books can be recreated with some confidence:⁶²

- I) *Liber de Romanorum imperatoribus*⁶³
- II) *Liber de Latinis historicis*⁶⁴

The former is inferred from Nepos' statement at the end of his *Hannibal*: *Sed nos tempus est huius libri facere finem et Romanorum explicare imperatores, quo facilius collatis utrorumque factis, qui viri praeferendi sint, possit iudicari* (13.4), where Nepos points his readers forward to the next book in

⁵⁸ *Cornelius Nepos illustrium virorum libro XVI 'a fratre patruale' inquit*. Cf. Geiger (1985a: 87) who says 'eighteen seems to be the more correct figure'. For his complex argument, see also Geiger (1985a: 87-88).

⁵⁹ Ginelli (2022: 6-7, 9) for a breakdown of the number of books.

⁶⁰ Stem (2012: 23) for quote; cf. Ginelli (2022: 5); Geiger (1985a: 88).

⁶¹ On the title of this work, and the various books, see Ginelli (2022: 4-9).

⁶² See Ginelli (2021 and 2022: 4-7) for the best introduction to reconstructing the content of *De viris illustribus* through fragments, on which see also Stem (2012: 11-30), for a broader overview and possible reconstructions.

⁶³ Noting that we have no ancient reference to this work by name, but rather that it is inferred from *Han.* 13.4 as a pair of books on *duces*.

⁶⁴ Name from Marshall F 59, with Ginelli (2022: 4-5).

collection: one on Roman *imperatores*.⁶⁵ The title of the *Liber de Latinis historicis* (Marshall F 59) emerges from the letter that was attached to *On Foreign Generals* in one of the principal manuscripts of Nepos (A) which has the heading *Verba ex epistula Corneliae Gracchorum matris ex libro Cornelii Nepotis de Latinis historicis excerpta*.⁶⁶ However, the authenticity of this fragment has been questioned, and likewise its statement in which book the Gracchi were contained.⁶⁷ Just as *On Foreign Generals* presupposes a Roman counterpart, likewise a book on Latin historians suggests a now lost book on Greek historians. Confirmation of which has been sought in *Dion 3.2 (eodemque tempore Philistum historicum Syracusas reduxit, hominem amicum non magis tyranno quam tyrannidi. Sed de hoc in eo libro plura sunt exposita, qui de historicis Graecis conscriptus est)*, but Ginelli rightly notes that the lack of an agent for *sunt exposita* precludes definitively ascribing this passage to the lost book on Greek historians.⁶⁸ The existence of *On Foreign Generals* leads scholars to the belief that there was definitely an *On Roman Generals*, the contents of which can only be surmised in part.⁶⁹ Suetonius' fragmentary *Terence* twice mentions Nepos by name (*Ter.* 1, 3), which suggests biographies of poets.⁷⁰ Beyond these 'vocations' as Stem and Conte label these groups lies 'a good deal of inconclusive speculation.'⁷¹ The 'vocations' offered as suggestions are far-

⁶⁵ The implications of this pairing of books so as to facilitate what Stem (2009-10: 123-128; 2012: 8, 16) calls 'cross-cultural comparison' is drawn out in **Chapter 1**. Likewise cultural relativism, as Nepos introduces in his *praefatio*, is key to this comparison and adjudication across cultures.

⁶⁶ Stem (2012: 22). On the division, see Ginelli (2022: 4-7). Gellius (11.8.5) suggest that *On Latin Historians* was book 13 of Nepos' *De viris illustribus*.

⁶⁷ Especially by Stem (2012: 13) who asks 'How could such a letter have fit into a book titled *On Latin Historians*? Did Nepos claim to quote them from a source? Did that source present itself as a historical collection of Cornelia's letters, and were those the letters of Cornelia that Cicero says he had read? Or was that source an annalist, roughly contemporary to the dramatic date of the letter (ca. 124 BC)? The uncertainty of the answers to these questions impedes interpretation of the letter itself'. Geiger (1979: 662-663; 1985: 88) suggests that this could have been from a book on orators, 'though this is far less certain than seems universally to be believed'.

⁶⁸ Ginelli (2022: 8); cf. Geiger (1979: 662; 1985a: 96). Stem (2012: 22), too, counsels caution.

⁶⁹ Scholars have argued for lives of Scipio Aemilianus (Fronto *ad Verum* 2.1.17, with Stem [2012: 23]), M. Claudius Marcellus, L. Licinius Lucullus and Ti. Sempronius Gracchus (all from Plutarch's references to Nepos in parallel lives: *Marc.* 30.4; *Comp. Pel. et Marc.* 1.5; *Luc.* 43.4; *Ti. Gracch.* 21.2). Geiger (1985a: 86, 100) argues for the possibility of a biography of Caesar (in *On Latin Orators*), and less persuasively for a biography of M. Antonius (Geiger 1985a: 104-105).

⁷⁰ Marshall F 53-54; on a book of poets, see Geiger (1985a: 89); Stem (2012: 23); Ginelli (2022: 8).

⁷¹ Horsfall (1989: 12). For the term 'vocation', see Stem (2009-10, 123, 126); cf. Conte (1994: 222) who calls the groups

ranging: grammarians, kings, philosophers, artists, lawgivers, practitioners of different genres of poetry, and women.⁷²

As already noted, *On Foreign Generals* survives in its entirety, and the biographies therein are explicitly part of that collection.⁷³ However, the *Cato* and *Atticus* stand outside of *On Foreign Generals*, and their rightful place in Nepos' corpus is debated.⁷⁴

Nepos' *Cato*, as it survives in the manuscript tradition is, as we are told by Nepos, abridged and perhaps severely so.⁷⁵ However, Gellius (11.8) provides evidence that the *Cato* was very likely included in the book *On Latin Historians*.⁷⁶

The position of the *Atticus* poses more serious problems. Although Horsfall states that the *Atticus* belongs to *On Latin Historians*, a view which is shared by Geiger and Stem, Mark Toher argued that the *Atticus* was rather a self-contained work.⁷⁷ This argument rejects the manuscript tradition, and is based primarily

'professional categories'.

⁷² Stem (2012: 23 and n. 74) for the scholarship and various speculations. Ginelli (2022: 6-9), who offers a sober analysis of what we can know with any degree of certainty.

⁷³ For the manuscript tradition of Nepos, see Marshall (1977), noting that the *On Foreign Generals* was wrongly attributed to an Aemilius Probus, and 'only the Lives of Atticus and Cato, together with the Cornelia fragments, which are attributed to Nepos in the Manuscripts' (Marshall, 1977: 8). On this 'mistake' and its correction, see Stem (2012: 12); Lobur (2021: 17); Ginelli (2022: 1). Geiger (1982), however, presents a series of arguments in defence of Nepos as author of *De viris illustribus*, wherein all relevant issues and information can be found in the manuscript tradition.

⁷⁴ Esp. Toher (2002). Although Nepos' biography of Cicero is particularly interesting and its importance noted, it was not part of *De viris illustribus*.

⁷⁵ *Cat.* 3.5: *Huius de vita et moribus plura in eo libro persecuti sumus, quem separatim de eo fecimus rogatu T. Pomponii Attici. Quare studiosos Catonis ad illud volumen delegamus.*

⁷⁶ Although Gellius does not explicitly state the name of the book in which the *Cato* was contained, the context makes it clear.

⁷⁷ Toher's (2002) argument can be summed up as such: 'the size and character of the Atticus-life lead to doubt about its suitability within the book of *historici* of *De viris illustribus*, but as a piece on its own, it would have formed a suitable *monumentum* for a friend and patron'. Cf. Geiger (1985a: 43 n. 60); Stem (2012: 8, 12-13); see also Hägg (2021: 188-196) for a recent assessment of the *Atticus*. Earlier Hägg (2012: 189-190) had placed it in *On Latin Historians*.

on the ‘unique’ nature the *Atticus* in Nepos’ extant collection.⁷⁸ Ginelli cautiously does not include the *Atticus* under this heading of *Liber de Latinis Historicis*, but Elisabeth Slingsby presents the most lucid and compelling argument for the inclusion of the *Atticus* in Nepos’ *On Latin Historians*.⁷⁹ On the basis of her argument and the views of eminent scholars, it seems fair to at least be open to the possibility of the *Atticus*’ originating in this work. A common argument against this inclusion focuses on the scale of the *Atticus*.⁸⁰ At twenty-two Teubner chapters, it is almost double the length of the next longest extant biographies in the *De viris illustribus*.⁸¹ Slingsby argues that in *On Foreign Generals* the shortest biographies (*Aristides* and *Iphicrates*) are both only three chapters in length, such that the *Eumenes* and *Hannibal* are over four times their length.⁸² With this perspective, the comparative length of the *Atticus*, compared to the other longer biographies, is perhaps not so drastic. Whether other Roman *Lives* were similarly as long is intractable, but the information available to Nepos for his *Atticus*, through autopsy, would have provided material for a longer biography.

At this point, some broad conclusions about Nepos’ *De viris illustribus* can be presented. Firstly, the (at least) sixteen books were arranged by ‘vocation’.⁸³ This must have required careful thought (and justification) by Nepos, as many of subjects would have certainly found a home in more than one schematic category.⁸⁴ The most notable case in point is Cato Maior, who was placed in *On Latin Historians*, but equally deserved to be in a book on orators.⁸⁵ The grouping of lives by ‘vocation’ is, as Conte notes,

⁷⁸ Marshall F 59: *Ex libro Cornelii Nepotis de latinis historicis Incipit vita attici*.

⁷⁹ Ginelli (2022: 6). Cf. Leo (1901: 195) who places the *Atticus* in *On Latin Historians*, and Slingsby (2019: 20-22), who presents a three-fold argument for including *Atticus* in *On Latin Historians*.

⁸⁰ Toher (2002: 148).

⁸¹ *Eumenes* and *Hannibal* are tied at thirteen Teubner chapters.

⁸² Slingsby (2019: 21)

⁸³ On this arrangement, see Horsfall (1989: 11); Toher (2002: 141); Stem (2012: 8); and Ginelli (2022: 4-5) for a less certain view, calling it ‘an hypothesis’.

⁸⁴ Slingsby (2019: 17).

⁸⁵ For the breadth of Cato’s career, both literary and other, see Astin’s (1978) biography.

‘well attested in Hellenistic biography’, and so Nepos’ contribution was almost certainly to be the first bring this practice to Rome.⁸⁶ Beyond this, however, ‘the significant original contribution of Nepos’ is his explicit request of his readers systematically to compare nationalities, what Stem calls, ‘cross-cultural comparison.’⁸⁷ This was, it seems, entirely novel, and, on the view of Geiger, a material influence, and perhaps inspiration for Plutarch’s *Parallel Lives*.⁸⁸

1.3 – *On Foreign Generals*

As *Eumenes* is contained within *On Foreign Generals*, I intend to focus on this book. Issues include its date and the question of a second edition, as well as the identity of its audience. However, I begin with some basic facts about this book.

On Foreign Generals, one of the longest books ever written in antiquity, contains twenty-two biographies, which span roughly three and half centuries: from Miltiades to Hannibal (i.e. c. 550 to c. 183 BC).⁸⁹ The non-Roman *duces* (or, in most instances: στρατηγοί) include eleven Athenians (Miltiades, Themistocles, Aristides, Cimon, Alcibiades, Thrasybulus, Conon, Iphicrates, Chabrias, Timotheus, and Phocion), three Spartans (Pausanias, Lysander, and Agesilaus), two Thebans (Epaminondas and Pelopidas), two

⁸⁶ Conte (1994: 222); Stem (2012: 96-97).

⁸⁷ Conte (1994: 223) for quote. See also, Stem (2009-10: *passim*) and Stem (2012: 16).

⁸⁸ Geiger (1985a: appendix, 117-120) and Geiger (1988).

⁸⁹ See Geiger (1985a: 85); Horsfall (1982: 292 and 1989: 115); Tuplin (2000: 144); Stem (2012: 17); Lobur (2021: 40 n. 31) states that ‘Nepos’ book (i.e. *De viris illustribus*), as wide ranging as it is, is also the longest single book extant in classical Latin. *De Regibus* is better described as ‘chapter’, a ‘biography’ would be the incorrect term, as it cover numerous individuals. *De Regibus* is positioned between the *Timoleon* and the *Hamilcar* and constitutes a twenty-third section of *On Foreign Generals*. In it, a brief ‘King List’ is presented, and Nepos says: *hi fere fuerunt Graecae gentis duces, qui memoria digni videantur, praeter reges. Namque eos attingere nolimus, quod omnium res gestae separatim sunt relatae* (1.1). Thus, *On Foreign Generals* includes only *duces* who did not hold a kingship. The Spartan kings, however, Agesilaus and Pausanias, who served as regent, are included due certainly to the collegiate nature of Spartan kingship, and thus not true autocrats, and in the Roman mind akin to the consulship. Slingsby’s (2019: 18) ‘roughly two and a half centuries’ for the temporal span on *On Foreign Generals* must be incorrect. Cf. Stem (2012: 17-18).

Carthaginians (Hamilcar and Hannibal), one Sicilian (Dion), one Persian/Carian (Datames), one Cardian (Eumenes), and one Corinthian/Sicilian (Timoleon). Greeks dominate, a probable consequence of Nepos' criterion that his generals did not hold autocratic power, which would exclude many nations. The biographies are ostensibly arranged in a rough chronological order.⁹⁰ *Eumenes* is the only biography directly linked to Argead Macedonia, and thus, it is the only biography in which Nepos engages with the world of Philip II and Alexander the Great, and his successors.⁹¹

Nepos' programmatic statement at *Epam* 4.6 (*quoniam uno hoc volumine uitam excellentium virorum complurium concludere constituimus*) speaks explicitly to his intention to include numerous (*complurium*) lives in one volume and implicitly shows that he is conscious of the need to be brief. Indeed, Nepos' biographies are comparatively short (and thus suffer by comparison with those of Plutarch).⁹² That being said, the biographies in *On Foreign Generals* are of uneven length; on the longer end of the spectrum are *Eumenes and Hannibal* (13 Teubner chapters), and on the other end, *Aristides* and *Iphicrates* (3 Teubner chapters), such that Nepos' longest lives are over four times the length of his shortest. This difference is surely due to 1) the source(s) available for the individual lives (and the breadth of material they provided), and 2) Nepos' interest in each particular subject, and their *virtutes* (and as such the *exempla* he can extract from their lives).

For whom did Nepos write? The usual starting point for this discussion is Nepos' prefatory statement, where he says that at least some of his readers (especially his critics) will be *expertes litterarum*

⁹⁰ The fourth-century subjects are divided by region down to the era of Alexander. The only major divergence or exception from this is the disjointed placement of the two Sicilian lives (i.e. *Dion* and *Timoleon*), who, although practical contemporaries are placed tenth and twentieth in the collection. See esp. Ginelli (2022: 12-17) for the arrangement of *On Foreign Generals*.

⁹¹ At *Reg.* 2.1 Nepos does no more than mention the glorious reigns of Philip and Alexander.

⁹² Stem (2012: 12); Lobur (2021: 40).

Graecarum,⁹³ probably meaning ‘not so learned’ Romans,⁹⁴ those who had little or no knowledge not only of the Greek language, but also of Greek history and culture.⁹⁵ Some have claimed that Nepos’ work was a text in the ancient school curriculum or that Nepos was ‘a populariser ... writing to entertain and give moral upliftment’, presumably not to the elite.⁹⁶ Stem cogently suggests that ‘the brevity and overt moralizing of Nepos’ political biography are ... the very things that make possible its appeal to a wide audience — a more middlebrow audience’, some sort of intermediate “class”.⁹⁷ We must be cautious at overestimating the breadth of the readership, especially given that the cost of at least sixteen books of the *De viris illustribus* was way beyond the means of the true common person.⁹⁸

When did Nepos write *De viris illustribus*, and more pertinently, *On Foreign Generals*? There is only one certain chronological reference in Nepos’ extant work (*Att.* 19.1: *hactenus Attico vivo edita a nobis sunt. Nunc, quoniam fortuna nos superstites ei esse voluit, reliqua persequemur et, quantum potuerimus, rerum exemplis lectores docebimus, sicut supra significavimus, suos cuique mores plerumque conciliare fortunam*). Evidently, Nepos was writing this chapter while Atticus was alive (that is, before 31 March 32 BC). The argument has been made, first by Friedrich Leo, that *De viris illustribus* was published in two different

⁹³ Nepos reiterates this point later at *Pelop.* 1.1: *ne rudibus Graecarum litterarum minus dilucide appareat*.

⁹⁴ On this, see Rawson (1985: 49) and Ginelli (2012: 12).

⁹⁵ Horsfall (1989 xix) assumes that Nepos’ readers had no knowledge of Greek, a view which had been stated earlier by Rolfe (1929: xx); cf. Tuplin (2002: 136-142) and Stem (2012: 231-232) says that, despite the negative view, ‘Nepos does not consistently assume an audience ignorant of Greek things). Also, see Rawson (1985: 49) and Ginelli (2022: 12).

⁹⁶ A view put forward by Syme (1964: 235) and reiterated by Jenkinson (1973: 717), whose arguments are made on the basis of that Nepos was a school text in the modern world. Quote from Jenkinson (1967: 5).

⁹⁷ Stem (2012: 234). Nepos himself describes his reader as *vulgus* (*Pelop.* 1.1), a term that scholars interpret slightly differently: Conte (1994: 223) speaks of ‘people of an ordinary cultural level’; cf. Ginelli (2022: 12): ‘Nepos, according to most interpreters, is addressing a *middle-of-the-road public* [my emphasis], semi-educated, interested in Greek literature and culture, but not really able to read or understand the Greek language in depth.’ Rawson (1985: 49) talks of ‘a semi-educated public defined as the *vulgus*, prone to *satietas* and suffering from *ignorantia*’. Ginelli (2022: 12) defines this group as ‘a new emerging class, comprising people who were not part of the old traditional Roman senatorial aristocracy, and this necessitated a more accessible and “popularized” literary culture to appeal to the new political and social milieu of Rome’.

⁹⁸ Rawson (1985: 49).

editions, with the work being updated and republished after the death of Atticus.⁹⁹ Nepos' use of the perfect tense at *Han.* 13.1 when referring to Atticus' *Annales: Atticus ... in annali suo scriptum reliquit* is crucial to this argument: the tense suggests a deceased Atticus, where, if he were still alive one would expect a present tense. Ultimately this theory, in the words of Ginelli, 'seems too contrived' and 'creates more problems than it solves.'¹⁰⁰ I would argue that the fact that Atticus is the dedicatee of *On Foreign Generals (praef. 1)* strongly suggests that he was still alive at the time of the book's publication. If there were a second edition of anything, it would be of the *Atticus* alone, as he was the only contemporary subject whose achievements might need reassessment.¹⁰¹

At *Att.* 19.2 Nepos describes Octavian as *imperator divi filius*, a title the young Caesar used from either late-39 or 38 BC until 16 January 27 BC, when he was given the new *cognomen* of Augustus.¹⁰² Thus, from *Atticus* alone, in its final form, we can posit a *terminus post quem* of 31 March 32 BC, and a *terminus ante quem* of 15 January 27 BC. Thus, chapters 1 through 18 should be dated before Atticus' death, and chapters 19 through 22 before our *terminus ante quem*. Revision is clear, irrespective of one's view on a general second edition, as Nepos alerts the reader that chapters 19 to 22 are added: *reliqua persequemur* (19.1).

For *On Foreign Generals*, with Ginelli, I err on the side of caution and will stick to what that text tells us. Firstly, we know from *Dion* (3.2) that *On Greek Historians* preceded *On Foreign Generals*, and as such, *On*

⁹⁹ Leo (1901: 195-198). Later restated by Toher (2002). The argument is centred on the first 18 chapters of *Atticus* being published while the subject was alive, and 19-22 after his death.

¹⁰⁰ Ginelli (2022: 10-11).

¹⁰¹ Stem (2012: 14-15) and Briscoe and Drummond (2013 I: 401) state that the *Atticus* was the first biography to be published (or circulated) while its subject was still alive. If one reads between the lines, then Leo (1901: 195) also makes this claim. Geiger (1985a: 95) also makes the case for a possible *Antonius*, published during his lifetime, on the evidence of Suet. *Aug.* 77, cf. Rolfe (1929: viii) who believes this fragment to be from Nepos *Exempla*.

¹⁰² For 38 BC, see Syme (1939: 112-113) and Levick (2010: 30-31). However, Simpson (1998) pushes this date back to late-39 BC. In regard to dating Nepos' work, see also Geiger (1985a: 85), Millar (1988: 41, 52); Horsfall (1989: 8-9); Stem (2012: 15).

Latin Historians (in which *Cato*, and possibly *Atticus* were contained) must also have preceded *On Foreign Generals*.¹⁰³ Therefore, we can, through analysing the *Atticus*, extract events from which we can date *On Latin Historians*. *Att.* 12.1-2, and the apparent deterioration of the relations between the triumvirs, Octavian and Antonius, in context of a marriage between Atticus' daughter and Agrippa, suggests a date during or after 35 BC.¹⁰⁴ However, this dating, on the 'tone' of passage, despite its prevalence, is arguably shaky, but should not be discredited *prima facie*.¹⁰⁵ This marriage, in fact, took place in 37 BC.¹⁰⁶ And, as such, should be taken as the *terminus post quem* for *On Foreign Generals*.¹⁰⁷ Thus, for the purposes of this dissertation, I date *On Foreign Generals* to between 37 and 31 March 32 BC. I acknowledge that there are scholars wish to push the *terminus ante quem* down to 28/7 BC, however given the definite uncertainties of a second edition of the work, I believe this is speculative, given that the only certain date that can be construed is the death of Atticus, as dedicatee of the *praefatio*.¹⁰⁸

1.4 – Nepos' *Nachleben* — A Literature Review

I now present the main scholarly attitudes towards Nepos and his work, diachronically, with special emphasis on a recent shift in the scholarship that has not only inspired but also facilitated much of the present study.

Nepos (*praef.* 1) anticipated that many (*plerosque*) of his contemporary readers would look upon the genre

¹⁰³ Ginelli (2022: 6-7) for the scenario of book ordering.

¹⁰⁴ Geiger (1985a: 85); Horsfall (1989: 8); Stem (2012: 14-15, 29).

¹⁰⁵ An astute observation by Slingsby (2019: 23), noting that Nepos' apparent coolness towards M. Antonius could be the result of numerous reasons.

¹⁰⁶ Horsfall (1989 *ad loc.* = 84).

¹⁰⁷ Noting that this date concurs vaguely with the rough dating of Amerio (1991-2) and Dionisotti (1988) in their political readings of Nepos (placing the work between 50 and 30 BC, hence vague). Ginelli (2022: 10), however, suggests that 35 BC is the better option.

¹⁰⁸ Following Ginelli (2022: 10-11). Cf. For the most recent argument for a later dating, see Slingsby (2019: 22-24).

he had chosen to write in as trivial (*leve*), and yet it was not this audience alone who took such a view but also much modern scholarship until quite recently. In English-language scholarship widely accessible and influential negative views appear in Rolfe's 1929 introduction to the Loeb Classical Library edition of Nepos and in Jenkinson's 1967 chapter in Thomas Dorey's widely-cited anthology, *Latin Biography*.¹⁰⁹ Jenkinson writes that Nepos presents 'a happy hunting-ground for those in quest of historical errors' and that his only value was in being the first example of Latin biography, and as such, the influence and impact he had on who came after him but 'in every way surpassed him.'¹¹⁰ Jenkinson's opinions are repeated (and expanded) in her *ANRW* chapter: 'Nepos' style is very uneven, and suggests one not in complete control of his medium, the Latin language ... [h]e is at his best when he is not overambitious and expresses himself in the short, simple sentences appropriate to his unpretentious subject-matter.'¹¹¹ Michael Winterbottom's review of Marshall's Teubner edition of Nepos opines scathingly, that 'it is difficult to believe that there is any classical author more tedious than Nepos, less capable of telling a good story well. The manuscripts are more interesting than the author himself.'¹¹² These views undoubtedly had an effect on the next generation of opinion, notably on Horsfall who famously alleged that 'Nepos is an intellectual pygmy whom we find associating uneasily with the literary giants of his generation' and that his sole significance 'lies in the accident of his survival as the earliest Latin biographer.'¹¹³ Horsfall concludes his condemnation by saying that 'Nepos' scheme was ambitious and influential (for Plutarch, evidently), yet the execution

¹⁰⁹ Rolfe's (1929) harshest comments are at xii-xiii, followed by Jenkinson (1967: 10). Stuart (1928) in an early work in English on ancient biography, does not deem it necessary to deal with Nepos in any meaningful way.

¹¹⁰ Jenkinson (1967: 14).

¹¹¹ Jenkinson (1973: 715-716).

¹¹² Winterbottom (1979: 55), and if this denunciation were not enough, Winterbottom goes on to say, 'it is doubtful if Nepos will need (or deserve) to be edited again.'

¹¹³ First quote from Horsfall (1982: 290). These 'giants' were, in Horsfall's mind, Atticus, Cicero, and Varro. Second quote from Horsfall (1982: 290-291), whose criticism of Nepos was all encompassing, e.g. 'Nepos' shallow learning was exercised upon fashionable topics ... Inaccuracies are startling and innumerable ... his periods are not sustained, his excessive alliteration and strivings for antithesis annoy, his archaisms and colloquialisms are used without apparent purpose.'

often fell regrettably short.¹¹⁴ This assessment had a lasting impact through its promulgation in the *Cambridge History of Classical Literature* and the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* and understandably features in later attempts to re-evaluate Nepos.¹¹⁵

It was not until 1985, with the publication of Geiger's pioneering monograph *Cornelius Nepos and Ancient Political Biography*, that Nepotian scholarship received a 'fresh start'.¹¹⁶ Before Geiger, Nepos had not been deemed worthy of study in his own right and on his own terms.¹¹⁷ Geiger argued that Nepos invented ancient 'political biography', which he defined as an account of a life of a man of political importance from birth to death.¹¹⁸ This argument, although important and groundbreaking, had its detractors.¹¹⁹ Criticism took two forms: 1) the fragmentary nature of Hellenistic *bioi* makes it difficult to determine if such a genre existed before; and 2) the difficulty of differentiating 'political biography' from encomium or historical monographs or other forms of biography.¹²⁰ Geiger's strict delineation of this genre had made its existence

¹¹⁴ Horsfall (1982: 292). For Nepos' influence on Plutarch, see Geiger (1988).

¹¹⁵ *OCD*³ has a negative view of Nepos, revised more positively in *OCD*⁴. Horsfall (1989: xvi) barely moderates his evaluation in his commentary on *Atticus* in 1989: 'my description of Nepos as an "intellectual pygmy" attracted a good deal of amused opprobrium: without doubt, though, he was the social and intellectual inferior of Varro, Atticus, and Cicero.' For a lucid outline of the various negative views on Nepos, see esp. Pryzwansky (2009-10: 97-100); Stem (2012: 30-139); and Lobur (2021: 31-69) who addresses a series of different issues leveled against Nepos, and like Stem (2012: 40-54) attempts a 'recuperation' of Nepos. Lobur (2021: 9 n. 1) expresses how 'even defenders find themselves at a loss' and presents evidence to show that even those sympathetic to Nepos struggle at times to be wholly laudatory.

¹¹⁶ Stem's phrase (2012: 96).

¹¹⁷ There are, however, three notable exceptions: Bradley (1967), McCarty (1970), and Marshall (1977). The first of these is of most importance to my present study.

¹¹⁸ Noting, however, that Geiger had first presented this thesis in his 1979 article (1979: 667). Geiger (1985a: 14-15); Stem (2012: 102). Noting that Geiger's argument draws upon Momigliano's definition of biography: 'an account of a life of a man from birth to death', on which see Momigliano (1993: 11). Cf. Stadter's (2007: 579) redefinition, 'a self-sufficient account of the kind of life led by a historical person that also evaluates the subject's character, goals, and achievements', nicely encapsulates the kind of information in which Nepos was interested.

¹¹⁹ Chiefly Moles (1989). Dionisotti (1988: 48) sagely asserted that 'the definition of this genre, like much of the argument, invites all manner of question', whereas Wiseman (1987: 250) calls Geiger's thesis 'wholly convincing.' For an overview of the responses to Geiger's argument, see Pryzwansky (2009-10: 101-102) and Tuplin (2000: 124-125).

¹²⁰ Geiger's (1985a: 44-65) argumentation here shows that he is aware of this possible line of attack. Geiger (1985a: 44) does note that he could be seen as making an *argumentum ex silentio*. The second point is, arguably, the biggest threat to Geiger's thesis, and has been brought to the fore by many scholars. Stadter (2007: 528) alerts us to the fact that 'we can only speak of separate genres of history and biography if we remain aware of the fluidity of the boundary between them, and the difficulty

‘a self-fulfilling prophecy’.¹²¹ Although Geiger’s thesis may not have convinced the entire scholarly community and become accepted as a *communis opinio*, he opened the proverbial door to further study on Nepos, and made a serious attempt to show that ‘Nepos’ corpus consistently demonstrates innovations in form and subject matter.¹²²

Shortly after Geiger’s monograph three separate articles appeared that addressed and reveal the political perspective of Nepos’ work. Millar uses the *Atticus* as a lens through which to analyse Nepos’ views on Triumviral politics, showing that how the values and opinions expressed in this work, especially neutrality, prefigure the values of the Principate.¹²³ Dionisotti’s work was, however, truly groundbreaking: she showed that Nepos ‘[commented] on political behaviour, with a pretty sharp edge to recent events, implying also a specific view, as much political as moral, of what has gone wrong’.¹²⁴ There are three interrelated elements to her argument: firstly, that at the core of Nepos’ work lie three principles to which he ascribed: ‘*libertas*, not tyranny, obedience in public office, not private initiative, the *civitas*, not the individual’, and, that Nepos was ‘no general moraliser’, but through his work makes a concerted ‘effort to understand the problem[s]’ of his world.¹²⁵ Maria Luisa Amerio, in attempting to take Dionisotti’s argument further, sought to show how certain elements and episodes in *On Foreign Generals* mirror those of the Triumviral

of drawing any neat demarcation’. Horsfall (1989: 11) asks ‘so where is the boundary drawn?’; Moles (1989: 230) says, ‘though in general political biography is formally distinct from the other types mentioned, there may nevertheless be far more overlap between them than Geiger allows’. For similar arguments about this issue, see Momigliano (1993: 82- 4); Tuplin (2000: 126-132 esp. for this argument); Stem (2012: 101-105) aptly suggests that ‘to require such texts to fit into only one category—in order to declare that political biography did not exist before Nepos—does more harm than good to our understanding of the history of ancient biography’.

¹²¹ Slingsby’s (2019: 8) phrase.

¹²² Stem (2012: 96), who notes that Geiger’s (1985a) argument for an imaginative and creative Nepos was principally a retort to Leo (1901); on this see Wiseman (1987: 249). For Geiger’s response to the various criticisms of his theory, see Geiger (2008: 41-44).

¹²³ Millar (1988).

¹²⁴ Dionisotti (1988: 39).

¹²⁵ Dionisotti (1988: 45).

period in which Nepos wrote, but some of her assertions are speculative or unlikely.¹²⁶

Not until 2012, with the publication of Stem's monograph, did Nepos receive another book-length study.¹²⁷ This work, in the words of a reviewer, is 'indispensable'.¹²⁸ Stem draws upon both the work of Geiger and Dionisotti, but makes the broad argument that Nepos was writing 'exemplary political biography'.¹²⁹ That is, while he accepts Geiger's thesis of 'political biography', he goes further and suggests that Nepos 'shaped the biographies in *On Foreign Generals* in order to present his subjects as republican *exempla*'.¹³⁰ For this, Stem draws on Dionisotti's view that Nepos holds 'a specific view, as much political as moral, of what has gone wrong', through which Nepos is engaging in historical commentary.¹³¹ Although not as explicit as Livy or Valerius Maximus, Nepos, Stem argues, uses figures from the past as *exempla* to be imitated or avoided. This thesis adds much to the study of Nepos.

In 2021 the next book-length study of Nepos appeared in which John Lobur lamented that his deceased graduate school colleague, Stem, had 'presented numerous insights I had hoped to introduce. The reader will find many references to Stem's work in these pages. Many times have I cursed my timing and many

¹²⁶ Amerio (1991-2: 10-13), for example, argues that Nepos portrays Eumenes' death in jail (at the hands of an agent of Antigonos) so as to recall the death of Sextus Pompeius in 35 BC. The argument on the face of it appears sound. However, it comes with an implication: is Eumenes meant to be read, throughout the text, as Sextus Pompeius? Hardly. There are too many differences (of background, allegiance, action, etc.). Slingsby (2019: 11) is probably correct in stating that Amerio's effort is a less successful endeavour than that of Dionisotti.

¹²⁷ Stem (2012).

¹²⁸ Luke (2015: XCI) offers a brilliant assessment as to the importance of Stem's effort: 'whereas Geiger's work primarily grappled with the difficult and contentious history of the biographical genre to establish Nepos' place in it, Stem offers a lucid introduction to Nepos and a persuasive, historically informed reading of Nepos' extant works.'

¹²⁹ Stem (2012: 128-132, 162-228); Luke (2015: *passim*).

¹³⁰ Stem (2012: 162): 'Nepos' manipulations of his sources, in sum, further document how he has drawn from them in order to support the exemplary framing and republican thinking that are the hallmarks of his creation of serial political biography. Although drawn from narrative accounts of political history, Nepos' *Lives* should be read for what he shaped them to be: exemplary biographical presentations of his own moral and political thought.'

¹³¹ Dionisotti (1988: 39).

more have I praised his judgment.¹³² What this accurately suggests is that Lobur's work can be seen as a continuation of the work done by Stem. But, in many ways Lobur's work is more thorough and in-depth, with a wealth of introductory material, which analyses all facets of Nepos' life, relationships, methods, and works.¹³³ Lobur does not, like Geiger and Stem, offer a new thesis per se, but builds his monograph around the idea that Nepos' work was a product of the Triumviral period, and thus offers modern scholars unique insights 'into the way cultural elites reflected and influenced the social imagination to express new possibilities for a political solution to the disintegration of the old republic.'¹³⁴

Finally, Ginelli's 2022 commentary, which, as the title (*Cornelius Nepos: The Commanders of the Fifth Century BCE*) suggests, covers the biographies *Miltiades*, *Themistocles*, *Aristides*, *Pausanias*, *Cimon*, *Lysander*, *Alcibiades*, and *Thrasybulus*. This work is a significant contribution to Nepotian studies. Nipperdey's commentary through its numerous editions imparted an air of negativity over Nepos' work, which has been long lasting. Ginelli offers a much-needed replacement.¹³⁵ Although principally philological, stylistic, and grammatical, Ginelli nonetheless goes to great lengths to explain historical and biographical details also. Most important, at least for the present project, is Ginelli's magisterial introduction, described (rightly) as 'very good' by a reviewer; the most appreciated aspect of this section of Ginelli's work is that he is 'careful, sober, and observant', generally erring on the side of caution, adhering to what the text tells the reader, and avoidant of rash judgements or speculations.¹³⁶ His

¹³² Lobur (2021: ix).

¹³³ Cf. Westall's (2022: 512) evaluation: Lobur 'offers a compelling rereading of the work of Cornelius Nepos as the product of the Triumviral period and an integral part of the cultural discussion that produced the Principate.'

¹³⁴ Quote from Lobur (2021: 240); cf. Westall (2022: *passim*) who agrees, saying, 'this engaging and densely argued monograph offers a compelling rereading of the work of Cornelius Nepos as the product of the Triumviral period and an integral part of the cultural discussion that produced the Principate.'

¹³⁵ Horsfall's (1989) commentary on *Cato* and *Atticus*, is considered by Moles (1992: 314) as 'extremely useful'. South African contributions to post-Nipperdey commentary work have been commentaries written for Master's degrees by Jackson (1982) and Musnick (2008).

¹³⁶ Lobur (2023: CXXXVIII).

commentary, despite not covering *On Foreign Generals* in its entirety, is an important aid in the analysis and elucidation of the work as a whole, not least through thorough cross references to *On Foreign Generals* as a whole.

So, in the space of fifty years, Nepos has progressed from an irredeemable author to one worthy of independent study. His rehabilitation has shown Nepos to be learned and innovative and his works to exude understanding and examination of the world in which he lived, Triumviral Rome.

2 – Eumenes of Cardia

2.1 – Eumenes’ Life and World

I now present a brief overview and biography of Eumenes of Cardia. This dissertation, over the course of its three chapters, but especially in Chapter 1, deals with Eumenes’ life and career, so an extensive discussion of Eumenes is impractical here; instead, what follows is meant to familiarise the reader with Eumenes’ life, more broadly. **Appendix α**, which presents a full chronology of Eumenes’ life, and which collects and collates all the source material, can be used to aid this overview.

Eumenes of Cardia (361-315 BC) was a Greek from Cardia in the Thracian Chersonnese. Almost nothing is known of his early life, but in 342 BC a bond of guest-friendship between his father Hieronymus and Philip II of Macedon brought Eumenes to the Argead royal court in Pella. There Eumenes served as a royal secretary to Philip and later as the head of the Macedonian Chancellery under Alexander the Great, whom Eumenes accompanied on his Asian campaign, initially against the Achaemenid Empire, but later to the end of the world. Although principally an administrator, Eumenes did engage in military activities, certainly as commander of the ‘Companion Cavalry’ in 324 BC, but probably more widely, given his

extensive military successes after Alexander's death. He was a close associate, even a friend to Alexander and was one of few Greeks to be recognized as an ἑταῖρος (*hetairos*) of the king.¹³⁷

Only after Alexander's death does Eumenes emerge fully into the source tradition and become a key player in the post-Alexander world, to no small degree because his compatriot and relative, Hieronymus of Cardia, focused his history on his character and actions. Although Alexander's death (11 June 323 BC) would have caused something of a crisis for Eumenes, he emerged from Babylon as satrap of Cappadocia and Paphlagonia, and quickly allied himself with Perdiccas, who emerged as regent for Alexander's heirs (Alexander IV and Philip Arrhidaeus) in the power struggle after Alexander's death.¹³⁸

In 320, the contest for power amongst Alexander's 'Successors' began, the so-called 'First Diadoch War'. Eumenes, acting on behalf of Perdiccas and the kings, defeated Neoptolemus and Craterus, the latter a highly respected and decorated commander. Almost immediately after these successes, however, Perdiccas was murdered in Egypt. Under the terms of the so-called 'Treaty of Triparadeisus' Eumenes and

¹³⁷ It is an accepted fact that Philip and Alexander, like Achilles (Hom. *Il.* 1.179-180; Stagakis, 1970), had ἑταῖροι or φίλοι, but, as Carlier (2000: 261) says, 'the meaning of the title *hetairos* in Macedonian society is a very complex problem'. The ἑταιρεία ('companionate') was an ancient institution, the primary role of which was to advise the king and form his immediate retinue (Hammond, 1989: 140-151). The Macedonian king chose his own ἑταῖροι (*BNJ* 115 Theopompus F 225b), so there was no hereditary nobility in Macedonia (Hammond, 1989: 54). The choice of companions would have been both pragmatic and utilitarian: who would serve best as in times of war as military commanders, and, in times of peace, as administrators of the king. Under Alexander, the ἑταῖροι constituted the 'companion cavalry' (ἑταῖροι βασιλικοί), whom the king normally commanded but who were put under Eumenes' command in 326 BC (Nepos *Eum.* 1.6; Plut. *Eum.* 1.5). Arrian (*Anab.* 6.14.4) records that there were 1,700 companions in 326 BC (see Bosworth (1988b: 268-269), whereas 1800 fought at Gaugamela in 331 BC, which was the normal number (Arr. *Anab.* 3.11.8). On Alexander's ἑταῖροι, see Berve (1926: 103-122) on Alexander's companion cavalry, see Brunt (1963), cf. also Tarn (1950: 154-167). On ἑταῖροι and ἑταῖροι-relations generally, see Stagakis (1962 and 1970).

¹³⁸ The word 'satrap', from the Old Persian *xšaçaṣpānā*, is equivalent to a governor of a province, one level below the king. This Achaemenid term was appropriated by the Greeks, and later Macedonians, as σατράπης, where it holds the same meaning. The province was called a satrapy (σατραπεία). On this terminology, see Waters (2014: 100-103).

the other Perdiccans were then outlawed, and Antigonus Monophthalmus was charged with the war against them.

From this moment Eumenes' career consisted of protracted conflict with Antigonus. After being defeated at Orkynia and subsequently besieged at Nora, Eumenes ostensibly allied himself with Antigonus, but soon broke this alliance, because his loyalty drew him back to the Argead house and to an alliance with Polyperchon and his broader coalition.¹³⁹ Eumenes marched east, into the upper satrapies, where he would fight one minor and two major battles with Antigonus. The battle at the Cophrates was minor, but nonetheless a victory for Eumenes. The subsequent battles of Paraetacene and Gabiene were indecisive, but after the latter Eumenes was betrayed by his own troops, especially the Silver Shields. Eumenes was forthwith handed over to Antigonus, imprisoned, and executed in January 315 BC. Eumenes had survived only eight years after Alexander's death, and unlike many other Successors (for example, Antigonus, Ptolemy, Seleucus, Lysimachus) he left behind no dynasty and no long-lasting impact on the Hellenistic world.

Eumenes lived as a Greek in a distinctly Macedonian Empire. His failure to survive the early wars of Alexander's successors is cast in our sources as the result of discrimination, specifically ethnic prejudice. Eumenes' failures, according to the sources, did not result from a lack of ability or character defects, but rather from Macedonian biases against him. In fact, almost as a rule, Eumenes is shown favourably in the source tradition, ultimately the result of Hieronymus' paean. How true this is, is debatable: in reality, Eumenes was probably less altruistic and loyal than the sources may suggest and, like the other Successors,

¹³⁹ After Perdiccas' murder, he was replaced as regent by Antipater, Alexander's commander in Europe while away in Asia, who soon died, and was in turn replaced by Polyperchon.

was ambitious to carve out his share of power. This dissertation will deal with several of the issues raised by Eumenes' career.

2.2 – Scholarship on Eumenes

Because of Hieronymus of Cardia, Eumenes of Cardia looms large in the ancient source tradition, yet he has attracted little focused attention in modern scholarship. This is, ultimately, because Eumenes did not emerge as a lasting force in Hellenistic history (unlike Antigonus, Seleucus, and Ptolemy). By January 315 BC Eumenes was dead, leaving behind no dynasty and having been a critical figure of the early Hellenistic period for only a relatively short moment.

Interest in Eumenes, in his own right, begins with August Vezin in 1907, whose biographical monograph attempted to situate Eumenes within his broader historical period. Although ground-breaking, at least in its novelty of concentration, Vezin's work is generally marginalised today due to its simplistic analysis, panegyric tone, and questionable suppositions. Vezin's conclusion elucidates well his view of Eumenes:

So endete im Januar des Jahres 316, fünfundvierzig Jahre alt, der Kardianer Eumenes sein wechselvolles Leben, nachdem er fast siebenundzwanzig Jahre, seit dem Tage, da Philipp II. ihn an seinen Hof gezogen, in unermüdlicher Arbeit für die Argeaden-dynastie gewirkt, vielleicht das bedeutendste Talent und die interessanteste Erscheinung, jedenfalls aber der lauterste Charakter unter den Feldherrn der Diadochenzeit. Dafs es ihm trotz aller glänzenden Eigenschaften, all seiner Staats- und Feldherrnkunst, Kühnheit, Gewandtheit und Ausdauer, durch die er immer von neuem und immer Überraschender die widrigsten Verhältnisse nach seinem Willen zwang, doch nicht gelingen wollte, sich auf die Dauer durchzusetzen, daran trug einmal der Umstand Schuld, daß er als Hellene, als unberechtigter Fremdling, unter dem neuen Herrenvolke der Makedonen stand ὁ Καρδιανός, der Kardianer, wie ein Schimpf hängte das Wort sich seinem Namen an. Aber er hätte trotzdem ... in einer höchst ehrenvollen und wichtigen Stellung behaupten können - das eigentliche Verhängnis seines Lebens war die funerschotterliche Treue, mit der er fort und fort den Reichsgedanken und das Recht des legitimen Königtums verfocht.¹⁴⁰

¹⁴⁰ Vezin (1907: 125-126). On 316 BC for Eumenes' death, see **A Note on Chronology**, as Vezin subscribed to the 'High' Chronology, placing Eumenes' death a year before the chronology followed by this dissertation, which is based on Anson's

Veizin's presentation of Eumenes is undoubtedly an uncritical reading of the source material. Although the key themes Veizin extracts are not incorrect, he perhaps pushes them too far and focuses on the tragic nature of Eumenes' career and its reversals — Veizin was obviously taken by the potential *pathos* of Eumenes. In summary, Veizin's work is now outdated.¹⁴¹

Edward Anson, who has over the last half-century become the world's 'Eumenes expert', defended a PhD thesis on Eumenes of Cardia in 1975, but this remained unpublished until 2004.¹⁴² Anson's primary idea was that Eumenes was no mere devotee to the Argead house, but rather that he himself was hungry for power like the other Successors, and his loyalty to Alexander's family was predicated on self-interest and hunger for power (thus no different from that of many of Alexander's successors), effectively dismantling the thesis of Veizin.¹⁴³

In the gap between Anson's PhD defence and its publication, Christoph Schäfer presented the first serious modern work on Eumenes which critically assessed the Cardian's place in Hellenistic history and accounted for his successes and failures. Schäfer produced an argument less blinkered than that of Veizin and arrived at a more balanced but also more complex conclusion: that Eumenes was not as hindered by his ethnicity as had been supposed and that his motives were not as altruistic as the sources might make them seem.¹⁴⁴ Thus, Schäfer straddles a middle ground, between the arguments of Veizin and Anson, as he himself indicates:

'Low' Chronology.

¹⁴¹ Schäfer (2002: 15-16) argues that Veizin pushes themes too far. Anson (2015) in a work that has become the gold-standard on Eumenes, makes almost no mention of Veizin (he mentions him nine times, and mainly in footnotes). No assessment of the work is given by Anson (whose silence may need to be taken as criticism).

¹⁴² Anson (1975); Anson (2004).

¹⁴³ Anson (1975: 82-83), cf. Schäfer (2002: 16).

¹⁴⁴ Schäfer (2002).

Beide Werke sind von einer einseitigen Sichtweise geprägt. Irgendwo zwischen Vezins aufopferungsvoll für die Argeadendynastie eintretenden Gefolgsmann Alexanders und Ansons nur an machtpolitischen Erwägungen orientiertem Feldher wird man den historischen Eumenes suchen müssen.¹⁴⁵

Despite Schäfer's contribution, scholarship on Eumenes reached its zenith with Anson's monograph, which is the most important work on Eumenes.¹⁴⁶ Anson provides a thorough biography and historical analysis of Eumenes' life; his subtitle, 'A Greek Amongst Macedonians', highlights a critical issue about Eumenes — that he was a foreigner — and discrimination against Eumenes, often thought to be ethnic, was, as Anson cogently argues, rather an issue of class.¹⁴⁷ It was this, rather than not being Macedonian that hamstrung Eumenes. Anson also fully recognised that Eumenes himself sought power and was not simply a passive participant of the tumultuous events of the eight years after Alexander's death.¹⁴⁸

These three monographs on Eumenes inevitably provide the basis of modern study on Eumenes. However, there are a couple of smaller contributions that need to be mentioned from the very small pool of studies available.¹⁴⁹ Firstly, Henry Westlake (1969), covers much ground in a short space, focusing not only on the source tradition, but also on the key themes of Eumenes' life and career. For Westlake, it is Eumenes' cleverness and loyalty that define him, but he was disadvantaged by his Greek pedigree, which limited his advancement. Unlike Vezin, however, Westlake does not see Macedonian xenophobia as the sole reason

¹⁴⁵ Schäfer (2002: 16). His position is rightly praised by Epplett (2003).

¹⁴⁶ Anson (2004 and 2015). Notwithstanding Bosworth's (2006) lukewarm review of the 2004 edition, Anson has almost entirely superseded Schäfer because the latter's work, although good, lacked a large print run, which probably limited its impact.

¹⁴⁷ Anson (1980 and 2014b), the latter a revision of early arguments and almost identical in content to (2015: 241-261).

¹⁴⁸ Anson (2015: 3) provides an apt précis: 'in the final analysis, Eumenes was one of many contenders for power in the chaos that followed the Conqueror's death, who, while suffering from certain limitations, was more successful than most, but in the final analysis joined the ranks of those contenders who did not survive the first decade of conflict. His importance in this period is more the result of his prominence in the sources, than in his accomplishments. However, given that our sources follow his career so closely, it is through an examination of his career that so much of the nature of the early development of the Hellenistic Age is discovered.'

¹⁴⁹ A search for Eumenes of Cardia on *L'Année Philologique* brings up only 17 titles.

for Eumenes' failures.¹⁵⁰ The importance of this chapter, on my view, is the way it acts as a bridge between Vezin and the later works of Schäfer and Anson.

Secondly, Franca Landucci Gattinoni (1979) examines prejudice faced by Eumenes and Hieronymus of Cardia; the historian was discriminated against, just like his compatriot, which influenced and aided the assimilation of this topic into his historical work. Landucci Gattinoni (unlike Anson) clearly believes that this prejudice was ethnic in origin.¹⁵¹

Pierre Briant (1982), although focusing on the Successors to Alexander more broadly, when concentrating on Eumenes, maps out his military policy.¹⁵² Briant emphasises Eumenes' inclusion of indigenous soldiers into his army (as opposed to Macedonians), as a mechanism by which the loyalty of the soldiers would be to the military commander and not to a higher power (that is, a Macedonian). So, Briant sees Eumenes as a bona fide Diadoch, seeking power, and not just the loyal follower, that Hieronymus of Cardia would have us believe he was. Briant argues that Hieronymus clearly distorts facts and that '*en vérité, ni ses origines grecques, ni sa loyauté envers les rois ne constituent une explication satisfaisante de la carrière du Kardien.*'¹⁵³

Finally, Joseph Roisman, in his 2012 monograph, focuses on Alexander's Macedonian veterans and their

¹⁵⁰ Westlake (1969: 329-330): 'Although Eumenes was probably less indifferent to his own interests than Hieronymus seems to have allowed, he did differ from most of the leading Macedonians in being less easily corrupted and therefore more loyal to the house of Alexander. One reason may have been that, as has already been pointed out, the highest prize of all was not open to him. A stronger reason, however, was that he enjoyed the very great advantage of having been born and brought up in the politically and intellectually more advanced atmosphere of a Greek city-state.'

¹⁵¹ Landucci Gattinoni (1979: 98): '*la vicenda storica di Eumene, infatti, nella versione di Cornelio, Diodoro e Plutarco, implica l'esistenza di un pregiudizio etnico macedone nei confronti dei Greci, altrettanto pesante, forse, di quello che gli scrittori greci dell'età classica mostravano verso i Macedoni?*'

¹⁵² Briant (1982: 13-94).

¹⁵³ Briant (1982: 91).

roles in the early wars of Alexander the Great's Successors (323 – 316/5 BC). Roisman's study is extensive and authoritative on the subject.¹⁵⁴ Like Briant, Roisman's study has a definite focus on Eumenes and dedicates the final three chapters to the Cardian and his dealings with the Macedonian veterans.¹⁵⁵ Especially important, however, are the final two chapters that present a lucid and thorough analysis of Eumenes' troubled relationship with the Silver Shields, who would, after the Battle of Gabiene, betray Eumenes to his foe, Antigonus, and consign him to his death.

This literature review has included only those works which deal specifically with Eumenes of Cardia. Because Eumenes' career is writ large in our extant sources, Eumenes is a subsidiary focus of much scholarship, especially in commentaries on sources in which he is a major figure, but also broader studies of the period in which he lived.¹⁵⁶

2.3 – Nepos' *Eumenes* as a Historical Source

Despite being one of Nepos' fullest and more expansive works, *Eumenes* has not been held in high esteem by scholars of both Eumenes and the early Hellenistic period in general. This is due to the fact that Nepos has, until recently, not been viewed as either a credible or reliable source. His biographies are, for the most part, short and schematic, and ostensibly of little use to the historian, whereas Diodorus Siculus and, to a lesser degree, Justin provide considerably more far-ranging accounts of the period.¹⁵⁷ Even Plutarch's *Eumenes* is deemed to be more useful a source, because of its comparative length.¹⁵⁸ Nepos' idiosyncratic

¹⁵⁴ Roisman (2012: 4): 'The story of Alexander's veterans spans the period from his death in 323 to their last clear attestation in 316'.

¹⁵⁵ Roisman (2012: 142-236).

¹⁵⁶ Commentaries: e.g. Goralski (1989); Heckel and Wheatley (2011); Wheatley (2013); Landucci Gattinoni (2018); Landucci (2021); Meeus (2022). Studies: e.g. Hornblower (1981); Billows (1997); Bosworth (2002); Rathmann (2005); Anson (2014a).

¹⁵⁷ Pryzwansky's (2009-10: 99) view that 'contemporary scholars ... are less likely to judge biographers to be failed historians, or biography and its 'mistakes' to be subpar history for a lower class of reader' is perhaps optimistic.

¹⁵⁸ Anson (2015) relies heavily on Plutarch's *Eumenes* in his biographical and historical analysis.

chronology and gaps, although perfectly suited to his purposes (see **Chapter 1**), are offensive to scholars seeking to reconstruct events. Although Anson mentions or cites Nepos roughly a hundred times in his monograph, the significant majority of these are parallel references (in footnotes or in-text) and only a handful of citations to Nepos alone. What this indicates is that Nepos' *Eumenes* does not provide much unique information; rather, the biography contains (mainly) anecdotes found in other fuller sources. Such unique information as it does provide is of limited importance: dates, as found at 1.6 and 13.1, where we learn that he was nineteen when he arrived at the Macedonian court, that he served Philip II for seven years, Alexander for thirteen and that he died at forty-five.¹⁵⁹ Perhaps this is the most pertinent content of the *Eumenes*, as this material is elsewhere absent.¹⁶⁰

3 – Studies in Cornelius Nepos' *Eumenes*

This dissertation presents the first study focused solely on Nepos' *Eumenes* as a serious literary work. Besides Bradley (1991) and Stem (2018), no more than minor consideration has been paid to this biography, despite it being Nepos' only biography of a subject from the Argead Macedonian world.¹⁶¹ Sources for Eumenes' life and career, both broadly and specifically, have been a focus of scholars over the past century and more, but, none specifically on Nepos, and therefore this dissertation hopes to fill a gap in the scholarship (not only in terms of Nepos but also Eumenes) by presenting a range of studies on this largely under-studied biography.

¹⁵⁹ *Eum.* 1.6: *hunc locum tenuit amicitiae apud Philippum annos septem. Illo interfecto eodem gradu fuit apud Alexandrum annos tredecim...*; 13.1: *Sic Eumenes annorum V et XL, cum ab anno vicesimo, uti supra ostendimus, VII annos Philippo apparuisset, XIII apud Alexandrum eundem locum obtinuisset.*

¹⁶⁰ That is, all reconstructions of Eumenes' age and dates of service to Philip and Alexander are derived from Nepos alone.

¹⁶¹ Bradley (1991: 137-161) analyses Nepos' use of sources in the *Eumenes*, concluding that Nepos utilised Hieronymus of Cardia alone. Stem (2018: 33-44 esp.) present a reading of *select* passages of the *Eumenes* to show the way in which Nepos deals in exemplarity, which ties into Stem's (2012) argument that Nepos was writing 'exemplary political biography.'

3.1 – Dissertation Outline

In Chapter 1 **From *Quellenforschung* and History to Composition and a *Life*** I discuss Nepos' use of sources both broadly, but also specifically for the *Eumenes*. I will argue that Nepos utilised Hieronymus of Cardia as his principal, and most probably, only source, following Bradley's (1991) seminal work on Nepos' use of sources. By comparing Nepos' *Eumenes* with other sources derived from Hieronymus of Cardia (i.e. Diodorus Siculus, Arrian *Successors*, Plutarch *Eumenes*, Justin, and the *Heidelberg Epitome*), I construct a hypothetical schema of information contained in Hieronymus' original work and thus what was available to Nepos. This allows us to see 'where' and 'how' Nepos deviates from his source and, through an analysis of Nepos' programmatic statements (where he delineates his aims and biographical methods, especially that he is writing *vitae* and not *historia*). I show that Nepos prioritises the *virtutes* of his subjects in his construction of biography and subordinates *res gestae*. I argue that the key themes of Nepos' *Eumenes*, that is, the *ingenium* and *fides* of its subject, explain why Nepos deviates from Hieronymus. Moreover, I show the extreme degree of compression and selection that Nepos has exercised, to fit the chosen scale of his *Life* and to focus on the exemplary *virtutes* of Eumenes.

Chapter 2 **Nepos' Eumenes — *homo novus*?** focuses on Nepos' presentation of Eumenes, which broadly aligns with the portrayal of Eumenes in other sources, with themes and traits ultimately drawn from Hieronymus of Cardia. I begin by demonstrating the similarities across our source tradition, but then argue that Nepos pushes beyond the preexisting and predominant characterisation of Eumenes and instead presents Eumenes in the guise of a *homo novus* (a 'new man') for his Roman audience. Through a careful study of his language, I show that Nepos' deliberate emphasis on Eumenes' *virtus*, *industria*, *ingenium*, and on the forces of *fortuna* and *invidia* that operated against him, recalls how prominent *homines novi* spoke about themselves and how others spoke of them (esp. Cato Maior, C. Marius, and Cicero), and how it is identical with the 'language ideology' of *novitas* more generally. Here, the issue of

prejudice or discrimination against Eumenes — a Greek amongst Macedonians, topical in both ancient and modern sources alike — is addressed and shown to be a key component of Nepos' portrayal of Eumenes as *homo novus*.

Whereas Chapters 1 and 2 deal with Nepos as a biographer and with Eumenes as the subject of a biography, Chapter 3, **Nepos' Account of the Babylonian Settlement (*Eum.* 2.1-2)** takes a more historical and historiographical approach, analysing how Nepos deals with post-Alexander Macedonian politics within the confines of a comparatively short biography. I focus on Nepos' highly abbreviated account of the Babylonian Settlement (June-July 323 BC), a sequence of events following the death of Alexander the Great that was 'constitutionally unique and politically complex'.¹⁶² Nepos' account, devoid of conflict and contestation, is markedly different from our other extant sources. By a close reading of the parallel sources and through a commentary-like discussion of one small section of the text, I show how and why Nepos constructed his account as he does and present possible solutions for a couple of often-cited 'errors'. My main conclusion is that Nepos includes only the political details necessary for his readers to understand this biography and shapes the material to help his distinctly Roman audience understand Greek culture, politics, and history.

The dissertation is rounded off with a brief conclusion, in which I summarise my findings, and provide an outlook for future research on Nepos' *Eumenes*.

¹⁶² Bosworth (2002: 32).

Chapter I: From *Quellenforschung* to Composition and from History to a *Life*¹

I.1 – Nepos' Use of Sources

Sie ergänzen sich ... aber bei beiden stimmen der Stoff, die Betrachtungsart, die Auffassung des Mannes so völlig überein, dass an der gemeinsamen Quelle, und zwar einer biographischen, nicht gezweifelt werden kann. Nepos wird diese in einer Abzweigung benutzt haben, der spätere Plutarch wahrscheinlich die maßgebende Biographie selbst.²

They [Nepos' and Plutarch's *Eumenes*] complement each other ... but in both cases the subject matter, the perspective, and the man's views align so completely similar that there can be no doubt about their common source, namely a biographical one. Nepos likely used a branch of this [= derivative secondary source], the later Plutarch probably had access to the authoritative biography itself.³

Karl Nipperdey, who produced the first modern commentary on Nepos, suggests that there were a number of sources potentially available for Nepos to use in the composition of his *Eumenes*.⁴ However, the modern discussion of Nepos' sources (historical or otherwise) began properly with Leo.⁵ He argued that Nepos did not make direct use of Greek historians, but instead consulted Hellenistic biographies.⁶ On this view, all of Nepos' references to Greek historians (at least for the 5th c. BC lives) are not the result of direct consultation, but instead haphazard and uncritical copies from a hypothetical 'griechisches

¹ This chapter is complemented by two appendices: **Appendix α) Eumenes — Chronology and Source Tradition** and **Appendix β) Nepos' *Eumenes* – Text Breakdown**.

² Leo (1901: 201-2).

³ 'Abzweigung': some derivative of the 'authoritative original' biography, which Leo believed Plutarch consulted, whereas Nepos used only something derived or abridged from the original work — a view that denigrates both Nepos' methods and use of sources).

⁴ Nipperdey (1849: 22). There are a number of revisions to this commentary (up to a 13th edition, 1962), that are cited in modern scholarship on Nepos, which I have unfortunately been unable to consult.

⁵ Bradley (1991: 137), and Ginelli (2022: 41) who carefully outlines the history of scholarship on the matter. I note, however, that Leo based his thesis on that of Meyer (1892), as Bradley and Ginelli do, but it is Leo's work that predominantly infiltrated subsequent scholarship.

⁶ Biographies that have left no traces either in Nepos' work or in any other writer's, on which see Ginelli (2022: 41). Leo (1901: 200): 'Ja die Annahme ist kaum zu umgehen, dass Nepos seiner Arbeit wenigstens für die ältere Geschichte ein einziges griechisches Werk zu Grunde gelegt hat'. This 'single Greek work' he also assumes was an epitome: 'es denn es ist wohl nicht anders als aus der Willkür eines Einzelnen zu erklären, dass von Herodot und Xenophons Hellenika im Buche des Nepos nirgend eine Spur erscheint'.

Werk.⁷ Leo's view reflects his overall negative assessment that '*Nepos ist weder Künstler wie Plutarch noch Gelehrter wie Sueton*'.⁸ Concerning Plutarch's *Eumenes*, Brian Bosworth agrees that there is an 'accepted biographical outline' for Eumenes' life, but rejects Leo's view that there was any sort of biographical tradition.⁹ Ginelli argues correctly that Leo's theory — because that is what it is — 'had one palpable weakness': that it was an *argumentum ex silentio*, which presupposed the existence of a broad biographical corpus in the first century BC that was well-known to Nepos and more appropriate for his purposes than 'proper' historical works.¹⁰ As Bradley states, Leo unfortunately makes 'no attempt ... to demonstrate his contention'.¹¹ However, despite the lack of any meaningful evidence for Leo's preexisting biographical works — neither cited nor attested nor their use posited in any other Roman author — this view influenced subsequent scholarship.¹² Since Geiger, however, Leo's theory has been harshly criticised and dismantled: the new orthodoxy is that Nepos 'seems to reveal a methodical preference for major historians from whose accounts a short *Life* of a leading figure could be patched together without undue effort' and that Nepos 'preferred the best ones eligible'.¹³ On this view, any and all references to historians (as well as the single reference to Plato) that we find in Nepos are genuine and indicate that he possessed these texts and consulted them directly.

⁷ Leo (1901: 200). Those sources named by Nepos are: Thucydides: *Them.* 1.4, 9.1, 10.4, *Paus.* 2.2, *Alc.* 11.1; Xenophon: *Ag.* 1.1; Theopompus: *Acl.* 11.1, *Iph.* 3.2; Dinon: *Con.* 5.4; Timaeus: *Alc.* 11.1; Solinus: *Han.* 13.1; Polybius: *Han.* 13.1; Sosylus: *Han.* 13.1.

⁸ Leo (1901: 193). An opinion of Nepos all too typical of scholarship of this era, on this outdated view, see **Introduction**.

⁹ Bosworth (1992: 57 and n. 8).

¹⁰ Ginelli (2022: 41); and implicit in Bradley (1991: 5-6).

¹¹ Bradley (1991: 137).

¹² Ginelli (2022: 41 and n. 147) states that Leo's theory enjoyed partial 'success', as followed by Rolfe (1926: xiii) who says it is 'obvious that [Nepos] rarely, if ever made first-hand use' of the sources he mentions and Horsfall (1989: xvii) suggests that Nepos had a 'feeble appetite' for primary sources.

¹³ Geiger (1985a: 108-110, cf. 56). Geiger's 1985 monograph instigated a change in scholarly mood towards Nepos, and a slow but steady rehabilitation of Nepos and his corpus (not just his use of source, as referenced here), as discussed in **Introduction**. Quote from Geiger (1985a: 108). The key figures after Bradley on Nepos' use of sources are McCarty (1970, 30-34) and (1974, 383, 389); Jenkinson (1973: 713, although maintaining a negative view of Nepos); Geiger (1985a: 108-109); Titchener (2003: 89-90); Stem (2012: 34-54); Lobur (2021: 70-88); Ginelli (2022: 41-44).

Not until Bradley, however, was a thorough analysis of Nepos' use of sources undertaken.¹⁴ Although his study addresses only nine of twenty-two biographies, it has become the standard work, which demonstrates that Nepos did indeed use a wide range of sources (historical and philosophical).¹⁵ Bradley studied the *Themistocles*, *Pausanias*, *Iphicrates*, *Chabrias*, *Timotheus*, *Epaminondas*, *Pelopidas*, *Agesilaus*, and *Eumenes*.¹⁶ From a close reading of these *Lives*, he deduced that Nepos was familiar with and used Thucydides, Ephorus, Timotheus, Callisthenes, Xenophon, Theopompus, and Hieronymus of Cardia.¹⁷ The last of these will be of particular importance for the *Eumenes*.

After Bradley and Geiger, Stem, and Lobur reached the general conclusion that Nepos indeed utilized a broad range of sources.¹⁸ It is, however, Ginelli in his commentary on the first eight biographies, who provides the next wide-ranging discussion of the sources for individual *Lives*.¹⁹ Ginelli concludes that '[Nepos] mixed different sources and followed, in each biography, the best narrative available to him among the Greek authors.'²⁰ However, there is a vital caveat: Nepos shows a propensity towards using a single main source per biography.²¹ This allowed Nepos, as Ginelli notes, 'to give the most complete

¹⁴ Bradley's 1967 PhD, published unrevised in 1991. In his introduction, Bradley addresses Leo's view in detail, and why it prevailed, although it is implausible, see Bradley (1991: 3-6 esp.); cf. Lobur (2021: 35-36).

¹⁵ I exclude *De Regibus* from this count, as it is not strictly a biography. Each of Geiger (1985a), Stem (2012), Lobur (2021), and Ginelli (2022) — the major monographs on Nepos — duly to Bradley's thesis, and its importance in the reevaluation of Nepos, and his sources. Other, shorter, studies that address Nepos' use of sources include McCarty (1970: 30-34); McCarty (1974: 383); Jenkinson (1973: 713); and Titchener (2003: 89-90).

¹⁶ Bradley (1991): *Themistocles* (pp. 9-40), *Pausanias* (pp. 41-57), *Iphicrates* (pp. 59-64), *Chabrias* (pp. 64-70), *Timotheus* (pp. 70-80, but notes on *Iph.*, *Chab.*, and *Timoth.* together on pp. 81-87), *Epaminondas* (pp. 89-108), *Pelopidas* (pp. 109-120), *Agesilaus* (pp. 121-136), and *Eumenes* (pp. 137-161). Bradley (1991: 59-87) treats Nepos' *Iph.*, *Chab.*, and *Timoth.* together in one chapter, saying that they are 'a trio related not only by form but also by the intersecting careers of their subjects.'

¹⁷ See n. 7 above for sources Nepos mentions by name in *Foreign Generals*. Bradley's arrival at names not mentioned by Nepos is obviously his real contribution (i.e. Nepos never mentions Hieronymus by name).

¹⁸ Geiger (1985a: 56) citing Bradley's original PhD thesis, before its formal publication in 1991; Stem (2012: 34-54); Lobur (2021: 70-88, but esp. 75-82).

¹⁹ Ginelli (2022: 37-44).

²⁰ Ginelli (2022: 42).

²¹ Ginelli (2022: 42); (Bradley: *passim*).

portrait of a subject in the smallest space possible ... summarising large textual sections of his models.²² Importantly, it is evident that Nepos does not slavishly copy his Greek models but reshapes them for the purpose of writing biography.²³

Before addressing what material was available for Nepos to use for his *Eumenes* and which source(s) he actually uses, a couple of crucial conclusions ought to be stated about the new *communis opinio*: 1) Nepos did not use (or perhaps even have access to) any preexisting Greek biographical tradition, and 2) he relied generally on a main (i.e. primary) source, and occasionally supplemented it with another source.²⁴ Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon form the backbone of many biographies, and are potentially augmented by another work, cautiously to be identified as Ephorus.²⁵

I.2 Nepos' Source(s) for *Eumenes*

Nepos does not name his source (or sources), nor claims authority for the information and narrative of his *Eumenes*.²⁶ There are, at the outset, two points that must be asserted: firstly, Nepos' *Eumenes* is exceptionally consistent in tone. From beginning to end, the biographer is unerringly positive in his presentation of his subject. One could go so far as to say that Nepos does not have a single noticeably negative thing to say about the Cardian.²⁷ Although he is highly selective in his choice of material for this *Life*, Nepos makes sure to include only the most encomiastic portraits of Eumenes.²⁸ This consistent

²² Ginelli (2022: 42).

²³ Ginelli (2022: 42); cf. Stem (2012: 39).

²⁴ See n. 21 above. This is important to note, because in the majority of both Bradley's and Ginelli's analyses of sources only one can be discerned definitively — secondary sources are speculative. *Alcibiades* is the obvious exception to this, where four sources are mentioned.

²⁵ Bradley (1991: *passim*); Ginelli (2022: 42-44); cf. Parmeggiani (2023: 49) who acknowledges that Nepos used Ephorus as a source (only mentioning *Agesilaus* and *Alcibiades*). Ginelli's (2022: 42-43) use of 'probably' and 'maybe' with regard to Nepos following Ephorus suggests a degree of vigilance.

²⁶ This is not exceptional, as only seven *Lives* include named source(s). Once again, see n. 7 for the list of sources mentioned.

²⁷ The only potential issue is Eumenes' escape from Nora (5.6) under seemingly false pretences, which is dealt with below.

²⁸ **Appendix a** presents an attempt to visualise Nepos' selectivity in the *Eumenes*.

presentation suggests to me that Nepos employs a single narrative source, and most likely, given the conclusions above and what the hypothetical reconstruction of Hieronymus will show were its contents, an historical work.²⁹ Secondly, Nepos' and Plutarch's *Eumenes* both bear a remarkable resemblance to one another — especially in terms of narrative structure, but also in general tone — Plutarch is, for the most part, similarly positive in his portrayal of Eumenes.³⁰

It is with this overt likeness, and the belief that Nepos and Plutarch used the same source (or sources), that Bradley begins his analysis of Nepos' sources for *Eumenes*.³¹ It is fortuitous that Nepos' *Eumenes* is his longest biography, whereas, in contrast Plutarch's *Eumenes* is his shortest.³² This allows for a more in-depth comparison between the two biographers and their overlapping biographies than would normally be the case, as Plutarch's βίοι are usually more detailed and much longer. Plutarch's *Eumenes*, however, is still more than double the length of Nepos' *Eumenes* in terms of words, leading to a fuller picture overall of Eumenes' career.³³

None of the major historical sources that focus on the early Hellenistic period have, as Alexander Meeus states, 'survived the ravages of time' and indeed, even the extant fragments are meagre.³⁴ I will first list and

²⁹ *Eumenes* is organised chronologically, as are most Nepotian biographies, but especially so the *Eumenes*, which further suggests, one could argue, an annalistic historical source or similar.

³⁰ In contrast to Nepos, Plutarch includes a number of disparaging anecdotes and negative comments, esp. *Eum.* 2.1-10. This unescapable similarity between Nepos' and Plutarch's *Eumenes* (esp. in structure and tone) does present a difficult question: did Plutarch use Nepos as a source? Plutarch was familiar with Nepos' biographies (e.g. *Plut. Marc.* 30. 4; *Comp. Pel. et Marc.* 1. 5; *Luc.* 43. 4; *Ti. Gracch.* 21. 2). However, I must agree with Bosworth (1992: 57) who says 'there can be no question of direct borrowing, for Plutarch would hardly have used a Latin source for a Greek subject', and especially in his most superficial biography, and Plutarch includes much that Nepos does not.

³¹ Bradley (1991: 137).

³² That is, equal longest in *On Foreign Generals*. Nepos' *Atticus* is considerably longer at 22 Teubner chapters, as noted in **Introduction**, where more is said of the length of Nepos' *vitae*.

³³ Nonetheless, Bosworth (1992: 58) calls Plutarch's representation of Eumenes a 'caricature' and bemoans 'the number of glaring omissions in the *Life*'.

³⁴ Meeus (2022: 59); for a similar sentiment, see Billows (1997: 327-329).

describe briefly those authors on whom meaningful comment is possible and whose works could have contained material relevant to Eumenes, and as such, what material Nepos theoretically could have utilised.³⁵

Euphantus of Olynthus (*BNJ* 74), a tutor to Antigonus Gonatas, and as such attached to the Antigonid House (Diog. Laert. 2.10.110), wrote a history of his own times.³⁶ If in Book 4 he dealt with Ptolemy III (Εὐφάντος δ' ἐν τετάρτῃ Ἱστοριῶν Πτολεμαίου φησὶ ..., Athen. 6. 251D), then, the work (we must judge) was clearly not extensive in its coverage, and thus likely not useful to Nepos, who would certainly have consulted one more thorough.³⁷

Diyllus of Athens (*BNJ* 73) appears to have composed a twenty-six book universal history (D.S. 16.14.5), perhaps from around the years 357/6 to 297 BC, the death of Philip IV (D.S. 16.76.6), which was likely a continuation of Ephorus.³⁸ That Diodorus Siculus mentions Diyllus' work three times (16.14.5, 16.76.6, 21.5) and Plutarch once (*Mor.* 826b), suggests that he was a worthy historian, but the extent of his influence on the source tradition is opaque, as we possess only four fragments.

Demochares of Athens (*BNJ* 75) was the nephew of Demosthenes ([Plut.] *Mor.* 847c-d).³⁹ We know from Cicero (*Brut.* 286) that Demochares wrote a history focused on Athens in his own time in an oratorical

³⁵ The best summaries (in English) of the various historical sources for the period, are: Billows (1997: 327-340); Anson (2015: 14-20) for sources of the period other than Hieronymus of Cardia; for Hieronymus, see: Anson: 2015: 9-14) and Meeus (2022: 59-68) for overviews, however noting that Hornblower (1981) is the principal book-length study on Hieronymus of Cardia.

³⁶ On Euphantus, see Anson (2015: 14); Meeus (2022: 58).

³⁷ Anson (2015: 14); Meeus (2022: 58).

³⁸ On Diyllus, see: Billows, (1997: 336-337); Heckel and Wheatley (2011: 3); Anson (2015: 14); Meeus (2022: 66). On Diyllus as a continuator of Ephorus, see Tuplin (2007: 161-164).

³⁹ On Demochares, see Anson (2015: 14-15).

style.⁴⁰ This is all we can say with certainty, noting that both Diyllus and Demochares were principally focused on Athenian history, and thus of little use to a study of Eumenes.

Marsyas of Pella (*BNJ* 135) and Marsyas of Philippi (*BNJ* 136) are, as Meeus says, ‘little more than [names] to us.’⁴¹ The former wrote a history of Macedonia in ten books, according to the *Suda* (s.v. *Marsyas Pella*) from the first Macedonian king to 331 BC, which Anson considers an unlikely source for the material of the early Hellenistic period.⁴² Marsyas of Pella was, not unimportantly, the brother of Antigonus.⁴³ Nothing suggests that Marsyas of Philippi covered the political and military history of the Successors to Alexander.⁴⁴ These two historians are often simply grouped together as *FGrH/BNJ* 135/6, which is testament to the state of our knowledge surrounding them and their works.⁴⁵

Nymphis of Heracleia (*BNJ* 432), whom the *Suda* describes as an historian (s.v. *Heracleia*), produced two works that we know of: a history of his city (Περὶ Ἡρακλείας) and a work on the Successors and *Epigoni* of Alexander in twenty-four books (Περὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ τῶν Διαδόχων καὶ Ἐπιγόνων βιβλία κδ).⁴⁶ The one fragment to survive sheds no light on what he may have said about Eumenes or that Nepos would have used him as a source. Anson, importantly, adds that Nymphis, born c. 310 BC, was not a contemporary of the events he wrote about.⁴⁷ Although, Nymphis was thought to be, as Richard Billows

⁴⁰ *Demochares autem, qui fuit Demostheni sororis filius, et orationes scripsit aliquot et earum rerum historiam quae erant Athenis ipsius aetate gestae non tam historico quam oratorio genere perscripsit.*

⁴¹ Meeus (2022: 58).

⁴² Anson (2015: 17).

⁴³ Billows (1997: 399) and Heckel (2016: 80) suggest they were half-brothers (by the same mother). *Suda* s.v. Μαρσύας Περιάνδρου Πελλαῖος: ἱστορικός (οὗτος δὲ ἦν πρότερον γραμματοδιδάσκαλος) καὶ ἀδελφὸς Ἀντιγόνου τοῦ μετὰ ταῦτα βασιλεύσαντος.; cf. Plutarch *Mor.* 182c.

⁴⁴ Anson (2015: 17).

⁴⁵ Meeus (2022: 58 n. 208), and Vezin (1907: 4) does not even specify which Marsyas he is speaking about.

⁴⁶ On Nymphis, see Billows (1997: 339) and Anson (2015: 17-18).

⁴⁷ Anson (2015: 17-18); Meeus (2022: 58).

says, ‘a fairly good historian’, he has left no discernible mark on the extant sources for this period — despite being a work that would have been of potential interest to these sources, given its content.⁴⁸ None of these historians and their works, therefore, are likely contenders for the ultimate source of the surviving material on Eumenes, nor of Nepos’ study.

Duris of Samos (*BNJ* 76) is, however, well-known, and a most probable contender to be a source for at least some of our surviving material for the early Hellenistic period.⁴⁹ He wrote a history of Macedonia (*Μακεδονικά*) in twenty-three books, from the death of King Amyntas of Macedonia in 370/69 BC and to the death of Lysimachus in 281 BC.⁵⁰ It seems that Duris was much concerned with anecdotal and/or controversial material, such that he was regarded as ‘tragedising’ by Plutarch.⁵¹ Although Cicero calls Duris *diligens*, an attentive historian (*Att.* 6.1.18: *Duris Samius, homo in historia diligens*), there is general agreement that Duris was generally unreliable and not to be considered a serious historian.⁵² This final

⁴⁸ Billows (1997: 339); cf. Billows’ comment on Nymphis’ work: ‘Whether it had any influence, direct or indirect, on the extant sources it is impossible to say; it is unlikely to have had much influence, as it is never cited, though this argument from silence is far from decisive.’

⁴⁹ On Duris of Samos see esp. Kebric (1973) and Pownall (2013); Anson (2015: 18-20), Billows (1997: 333-336); Meeus (2022: 64-66, with n. 236). Kebric (1973: 2-19) presents the best biography of Duris, which informs his life and work. The position of Duris of Samos is aptly stated by Heckel and Wheatley (2011: 3), who say that he is ‘of secondary importance’ in the *Quellenforschung* of the early Hellenistic Period.

⁵⁰ Meeus (2022: 64), cf. αἱ Δουῖρις δὲ φησιν ἐν τῇ κῶ τῶν Ἱστοριῶν ὡς ἦν τὸ παλαιὸν τοῖς δυνάσταις ἐπιθυμία τῆς μέθης (Athen. 12. 546C-D). For name of the work: Δουῖρις δ’ ἐν ζ Μακεδονικῶν περὶ Πασικύπρου λέγων τοῦ ἐν Κύπρῳ βασιλέως ὅτι ἄσωτος ἦν γράφει καὶ τάδε (Athen. 4. 167C-D). See D.S. 15.60.3: Ἀμύντας μὲν ὁ Ἀρριδαίου βασιλεύων τῆς Μακεδονίας ἐτελεύτησεν ἄρξας ἕτη εἴκοσι καὶ τέτταρα and Plin. *NH.* 8.143: *is vero (sc. canis) cui nomen Hyrcani reddit Duris accenso regis Lysimachi rogo iniecit se flammae.*

⁵¹ Plutarch is particularly critical in his assessment of the ‘historian’ (see *Dem.* 19; *Plut. Dem.* 23. 4; *Plut. Eum.* 1. 1–3), cf. *Plut. Per.* 28.1: Δουῖρις δ’ ὁ Σάμιος τούτοις ἐπιτραγοῦσιν πολλὴν ὠμότητα τῶν Ἀθηναίων καὶ τοῦ Περικλέους κατηγορῶν, ἦν οὔτε Θουκυδίδης ἰστόρηκεν. On Duris’ writing of ‘tragic history’ and where he took influence, see Kebric (1973: 15-18), who does appear to agree with Plutarch’s assessment: ‘generally speaking, it has many of the qualities associated with tragedy. Heroes and heroines, reversals of fortune, moral lessons, costumes and scenery are all part of the fabric.’ Most recently, see Pownall (2016) and Hau (2021).

⁵² Meeus (2015: 65) cautions us to remember that in this letter Cicero is attempting to make an excuse for one of his own errors, which evidently recalled one made by Duris. Meeus, saying that ‘[Cicero] will not lightly have chosen this example out of all the available possibilities’. Pownall (2013: 53) calls the fragments ‘somewhat sensationalistic’ in nature, likewise Billows (1997: 333): ‘Some thirty-six fragments of the *Μακεδονικά* survive (*FGIHL* Fs 1–15 and 35–56), most of them concerned with what we would call anecdotal matter: tales of drunkenness and vice, flattery, the unusual and the marvellous, and anything reflecting

point does not preclude Nepos' use of Duris, but, given that none of Nepos' *Eumenes* contains material of this nature (cf. Plut. *Eum.* 2.1-11), it would indicate that Nepos probably did not consult this work.

Hieronymus of Cardia (*BNJ* 154) and Duris of Samos (*BNJ* 76) are generally believed to be the two main sources for the extant works (both historical and biographical) of this period, and likewise that Hieronymus of Cardia is generally held to be viewed positively (and as such the source of the 'reputable' information), whereas Duris is viewed more disparagingly, as anecdotal and scandalous (and thus the origin of such information in our sources).⁵³ Despite Billows' caution, this view stands as representative of the majority position of scholars historically, although the judgement is shifting.⁵⁴

It is, however, very hard to see beyond Hieronymus of Cardia as the supreme source, indeed the *Urquelle*,

discredit on historical personages certainly seem to have attracted Duris' interest'. However, Billows cautions that 'these fragments do not necessarily, however, give us a complete picture of Duris' history'. Although Kebric (1973) endeavours a rehabilitation of Duris, he is cognisant of the fact that 'all that remains from which to estimate the importance of his contribution is a handful of fragments of questionable worth, and, on the basis of such evidence, modern critics have been quick to condemn him'. Pownall (2013), attempts a more balanced view of the elusive Duris of Samos than many other scholars have in the past or more presently. For further evidence for this view, see Pownall (2016: CLXII), where in her review of a French edited volume on Duris, she laments that 'some of its authors are more *au courant* than others with recent trends in the relevant scholarship'; strongly suggestive of a recent, but ongoing, reappraisal. Hau (2021: 61) offers a markedly different assessment to most scholars, saying that Duris was 'committed to 'telling it as it was', or at least how [he] believed it to have been on the basis of [his] sources, including social memory'. Although not entirely rehabilitating Duris, Hau presents a historian who did, in his own way, try to portray the truth, even if from his perspective, however this truth was presented through the 'tragedising' of trauma events (Hau: 2021: 64).

⁵³ This view is, to a greater or lesser degree, repeated by the majority of scholars. Vezin (1907: 4) is particularly caustic: saying that Duris adorned and invented without hesitation. However, it is pertinent to note that a work of 23 Books must have contained much, and almost certainly, a majority of plain or straightforward material. As Pownall (2013: 44) notes, the thirty-six fragments that we possess may not give an entirely accurate view of Duris and his work — this is especially the case given that over half the fragments come from Athenaeus and Plutarch, who mined the work for anecdotal material; skewing our view of Duris.

⁵⁴ Billows (1997: 333) cautions that 'it is particularly regrettable, therefore, that there has arisen among modern scholars something of a tendency to regard Hieronimos as unquestionably authoritative, and hence to refer information that one considers or wishes to be considered truthful to Hieronimos as source, while relegating facts one considers or wishes to be considered dubious to a different source, usually Duris, who is generally regarded as unreliable'. Vezin (1907: 4) says that Duris is in 'every respect opposite' to Hieronimus. See Kebric (1973), Pownall (2013 and 2016), and Hau (2021) for more balanced, and at least sympathetic, assessments.

for this period. Even Billows concedes that:

The one fact that may be said to have been established beyond reasonable doubt by modern *Quellenforschung* on the Diadoch period is that Hieronymos of Kardia is the most important of the primary historians of the period, and that his work is the ultimate source for most of the factual material preserved in the surviving accounts.⁵⁵

Anson, too, rationally suggests that ‘the basic question today is not whether Hieronymus was the major source ... but how much additional material from other sources may have been added.’⁵⁶

Despite this general approbation we know very little about Hieronymus of Cardia’s work: not its title nor the number of books; we do know that nobody could bear to read his work to the end (Dion. Hal. *De Comp. Verb.* 4.30), which suggests a long, and perhaps, tedious work. Testimonia give us the content matter: ὅς τὰ ἐπ’ Ἀλεξάνδρῳι (*Suda. s.v. Hieronymos Kardianos*).⁵⁷ Most likely, Hieronymus’ work ran from Alexander’s death until the death of Pyrrhus (272 BC).⁵⁸ As I will demonstrate in greater detail below, it is now commonly held that all major extant sources for the early Hellenistic Period, to varying degrees, derive from Hieronymus of Cardia, namely Diodorus Siculus, Justin, Arrian *Succ.* (τὰ μετὰ Ἀλέξανδρον), Plutarch *Eumenes*, and the *Heidelberg Epitome*.⁵⁹

⁵⁵ Billows (1997: 329-330).

⁵⁶ Anson (2015: 9).

⁵⁷ Although the *Suda* entry indicates the subject matter, the title of Hieronymus’ work is uncertain: Diodorus (18.42.1) writes of ὁ τὰς τῶν Διαδόχων Ἱστορίας γεγραφώς, Josephus (*Ap.* 1.213) ἡ περὶ τῶν διαδόχων ἱστορία (Josephus.), and Dionysius (*Ant. Rom.* 1.5.4) ἡ περὶ τῶν ἐπιγόνων πραγματεία; see Hornblower (1981: 76-77).

⁵⁸ Paus. 1.13.7, 9: κεράμῳι δὲ βληθέντα ὑπὸ γυναικὸς τεθνάναι φασὶ Πύρρον. Ἀργεῖοι δὲ οὐ γυναικὰ τὴν ἀποκτείνασαν, Δήμητρα δὲ φασιν εἶναι γυναικὶ εἰκασμένην. ... (9) ... διάφορα δὲ ὅμως ἐστὶ καὶ ταῦτα ὧν Ἱερώνυμος ὁ Καρδιανὸς ἔγραψεν.

⁵⁹ For the general assertion, see e.g. Westlake (1969: 313). That Diodorus used Hieronymus as his principal source for this period is stated almost ubiquitously but see esp. Landucci Gattinoni (2018: XII-XXIV), Landucci (2021: XI-XXI), Meeus (2022: 59-63), and Anson (2015: 20). Landucci (2018) addresses at length the sources other Hieronymus that Diodorus might have used. For Justin’s use of Hieronymus primarily, see Heckel and Wheatley (2011: 3-4). For Arrian’s use of Hieronymus in his *Successors*, see Goralski (1989: 82), who is non-committal, but gives preference to Hieronymus. The length of Arrian’s original work (10 books from 323 to 319, [see *Arr. Succ.* 1] means it would have required much source material); cf. Anson (2015: 37) for a view I would agree with: ‘Despite the obvious limitations on arriving at any conclusions regarding Arrian’s sources, there are indications that he was in the main following Hieronymus. In the first place, Arrian in his work on Alexander, the *Anabasis*, lists his major sources and further explains his reasons for their selection. Here he demonstrates a preference for knowledgeable eyewitnesses (*Arr. Anab.* 1. *pref.*). Such a predilection would naturally attract him to Hieronymus. Secondly, Arrian’s surviving

Of his life we are better informed: Hieronymus was a countryman of Eumenes from Cardia in the Thracian Chersonese, as Diodorus Siculus (18.50.4) indicates: Ἱερώνυμον ... φίλον ὄντα καὶ πολίτην Εὐμενοῦς τοῦ Καρδιανοῦ. The actual nature of their relationship can be gleaned from Arrian (*Ind.* 18.7), by whom Eumenes' father is called Hieronymus (Εὐμένης δὲ Ἱερωνύμου ἐκ Καρδίας), and thus it is most likely that Hieronymus was his nephew, as grandsons were often named after grandfathers.⁶⁰ It can be assumed that this bond, definitely ethnic and highly likely familial, may have engendered an explicit (or implicit) bias in Hieronymus and his historical work.⁶¹ Any bond would only have been intensified as a result of Hieronymus serving on the staff of Eumenes. It is this service both along with and to Eumenes that arguably left an inedible mark on Hieronymus' historical work: the closeness to Eumenes and the events which entangled his countryman would naturally become the focus of his work.

When, however, did Hieronymus join the retinue of Eumenes and become an eyewitness of the events he related? Hornblower argues that Hieronymus 'must have been a member of Eumenes' staff by 322', when

fragments and Photius' epitome show a striking resemblance to Diodorus' account of this same period'. For Plutarch's utilisation of Hieronymus in his *Eumenes*, see Bosworth (1992: 57). And for the *Heidelberg Epitome*, see Wheatley (2013: 21-23).

⁶⁰ This Hieronymus, Eumenes' father, was evidently a prominent Cardian, as we are told that Eumenes is *domestico summo genere* (Nepos *Eum.* 1.3) and that Eumenes' advancement was the result of guest friendship with Eumenes' father (Plut. *Eum.* 1.2: διὰ ξενίαν καὶ φιλίαν πατρῶαν). On Eumenes' early life, as far as we can reconstruct it, and the position of his father in Cardia, and his relations with Philip, see Anson (2015: 41-46). On the relationship between Eumenes and Hieronymus the historian, see Hornblower (1981: 5, 8), who says that 'Hieronymus the father of Eumenes may have been the grandfather of Hieronymus the historian' and that 'it is both possible and plausible that he was Eumenes' nephew'. Similarly Billows (1997: 320) says that Hieronymus 'was a close friend and probably nephew of Eumenes of Kardia'. On the naming conventions, see This Hieronymus, Eumenes' father, was evidently a prominent Cardian, as we are told that Eumenes is *domestico summo genere* (Nepos *Eum.* 1.3) and that Eumenes' advancement was the result of guest friendship with Eumenes' father (Plut. *Eum.* 1.2: διὰ ξενίαν καὶ φιλίαν πατρῶαν). On Eumenes' early life, as far as we can reconstruct it, and the position of his father in Cardia, and his relations with Philip, see Anson (2015: 41-46). On the naming conventions within families, see Anson (2015: 11 n. 20).

⁶¹ On bias, both towards Eumenes and to elites more generally, in Hieronymus' work, see Roisman (2010 which was revised in 2012). And, on bias towards to his 'masters', see Hornblower (1981: 153-164 for 'apologia to Eumenes', and 197-211 for Hieronymus and Eumenes; cf. 164-179 and 211-233 for Hieronymus and the Antigonids). Hornblower (1981: 168-169) draws attention to the use of the words ἰδιοπραγέω ('to pursue one's own interests') and ἰδιοπραγία ('the pursuit of private interests') in Diodorus (e.g. 18.7.4, 39.7, 42.2, 18.50., 52.7, 62.3-7), language which she believes is derived from Hieronymus. Throughout Book 18, Diodorus presents most of the Diadochs competing for power in pursuit of their own interests—except Eumenes. This suggests that Hieronymus presented Eumenes as without ambitions. See esp. Roisman (2014: 12-17) for an overview of this. This links with Eumenes' *fides* as outlined in Nepos.

Perdiccas installed Eumenes as satrap of Cappadocia after defeating Ariarathes.⁶² Her evidence for this claim is Plutarch *Eum.* 3.7: καί τὰς μὲν πόλεις τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ φίλοις παρέδωκε, καί φρουράρχους ἐγκατέστησε καί δικαστὰς ἀπέλιπε καί διοικητὰς οὐς ἐβούλετο.⁶³ Hieronymus is plausibly one of the φίλοι, but is not named.⁶⁴ However, Hieronymus emerges ‘at last into the light of history’ during Antigonus’ siege of Eumenes at Nora: Eumenes later sent envoys to Antipater to discuss the terms of surrender ὧν ἦν ἡγούμενος Ἰερώνυμος ὁ τὰς τῶν διαδόχων ἱστορίας γεγραφώς (D.S. 18.42.1).⁶⁵ Of particular importance, especially as regards the nature of Hieronymus’ work and focus, is D.S. 19.44.3: ἀνήχθη δ’ ἐν τοῖς τραυματίαις αἰχμάλωτος καὶ ὁ τὰς ἱστορίας συνταξάμενος Ἰερώνυμος ὁ Καρδιανός, ὃς τὸν μὲν ἔμπροσθεν χρόνον ὑπ’ Εὐμενοῦς τιμώμενος διετέλεσεν, μετὰ δὲ τὸν ἐκείνου θάνατον ὑπ’ Ἀντιγόνου ἐτύγχανε φιλανθρωπίας καὶ πίστεως.⁶⁶ This explains the predominance of the Antigonids in Hieronymus’ work and their place in history.⁶⁷

So, Hieronymus of Cardia was on the staff of Eumenes probably from 322, but certainly from 320. Hieronymus served with Eumenes in, we must assume, all his endeavours from this time until his compatriot’s murder in 315.⁶⁸ The exact position and function of Hieronymus (besides his envoy role at Nora) is somewhat uncertain, whether his services to Eumenes were of a civilian or military nature

⁶² Hornblower (1981: 9), see: **Chapter 3** for discussion of this installation.

⁶³ Anson (2015: 11) marshals App. *Mith.* 8 as further evidence: Περδίκκας ... ἐπέστησε τοῖς ἔθνεσιν Εὐμένη τὸν Καρδιανόν. Εὐμένους δὲ ἀναρεθέντος ὅτε αὐτὸν οἱ Μακεδόνες εἶλοντο εἶναι πολέμιον ... Νικάνορα ἔπεμψε Καππαδοκῶν σατραπεύειν.

⁶⁴ I hold that Hieronymus and Eumenes were together at this time in Cappadocia, until the latter’s death.

⁶⁵ Quote from Hornblower (1981: 10); cf. Nepos *Eum.* 5.1-6 for siege of Nora; no envoys are mentioned. Other references to Hieronymus by name include D.S. 18.50.4; D.S. 19.44.3 Plut. *Eum.* 12.1.

⁶⁶ This is after the Battle of Gabiene (December 316) and the death of Eumenes (January 315).

⁶⁷ Perhaps most importantly seen in Plutarch’s *Demetrius* — that is, Demetrius I Poliorcetes, Antigonus’ son, whom Hieronymus would go on to serve. Hieronymus’ history would then furnish Plutarch with the requisite material to compose a lengthy biography.

⁶⁸ Deduced from the named references to Hieronymus, which show the historian as being present with Eumenes over an extended period of time, e.g. D.S. 18.42.1; D.S. 18.50.4; D.S. 19.44.3 Plut. *Eum.* 12.1. It is highly unlikely that Hieronymus would have had intermittent service with Eumenes.

initially.⁶⁹ Hornblower argues that Hieronymus' main function (at least in the early stages) was that of secretary (*scriba*/γραμματεύς), just as Eumenes had been for Philip/Alexander.⁷⁰ That Hieronymus is described as a φίλος of Eumenes may suggest a military role (advisory or otherwise), as the Greek φίλοι can equate, in the Macedonian context, to ἑταῖροι, who in Macedonian society performed military functions as well as offered advice to the king, or his representative.⁷¹ Being in Eumenes' retinue, Hieronymus would have been an eyewitness to most of his political and military endeavours, which is clearly one reason why Hieronymus' now lost history focused so much on him.⁷² After Eumenes' death, at the hands of Antigonos, Hieronymus entered the service of the Antigonids: Antigonos and later his son Demetrius.⁷³ Anson correctly says that '[Hieronymus]'s contemporary knowledge would have made him ideally suited to write such a history' (that is, of the early Hellenistic period).⁷⁴ This history, it can be surmised, portrayed Eumenes in a favourable light, such that sources based upon it inherit the positive representation of their source.⁷⁵

⁶⁹ D.S. 19.50.4. On this, see Hornblower (1981: 10).

⁷⁰ D.S. 19.23.1-3 and 19.96.1 both speak about letters (the former to Eumenes and the latter to Antigonos) that were written in Syrian characters (Συρίοις γράμμασιν), almost certainly Aramaic, which assumes a learned scribe in the service of both. The suggestion has been made that the scribe was Hieronymus, as he mentions the letter and functions of the chancellery. Hornblower (1981: 10) argues that this would have been the job fulfilled by an educated Greek, such as Hieronymus.

⁷¹ On ἑταῖροι and ἑταῖροι-relations in Macedonia, see **Introduction** n. 137. On Hieronymus' role, see Hornblower (1981: 10). The equivalence as presented above, between φίλοι and ἑταῖροι, is explained by Stagakis (1970: *passim*). However, for the same concept Nepos employs *amici* (e.g. *Eum.* 2.4; *Reg.* 3.1). The use of *amici* for ἑταῖροι is ubiquitous in our Latin sources for this period, especially Curtius Rufus (Stagakis, 1970: 93-96).

⁷² Even so, if one takes a step back, it does seem rather strange that our historical and biographical sources focus so intently on the figure of Eumenes, who was not the most important figure in the early-Hellenistic period. Both Plutarch and Nepos afford Eumenes a biography, yet characters like Seleucus, Ptolemy, Lysimachus left an objectively more lasting impression on the Hellenistic world: by January 315 Eumenes was dead, leaving no dynasty or hyper-influential mark on what was to follow (cf. Seleucids, Antigonids, Ptolemies, Lysimachids).

⁷³ Which might explain why Hieronymus and Nepos refer to Antigonos as *callidus*. For Hieronymus' career under the Antigonids, see Hornblower (1981: 11-15, but also 164-179 and 211-233) and Billows (1997: 390-392); D.S. 19.44.3 quoted above.

⁷⁴ Anson (2015: 13).

⁷⁵ Hornblower's (1981: 154-164) entitles a subchapter 'The Apologia for Eumenes' and notes (1981: 163) how Hieronymus may have written an encomium for Eumenes soon after his death, which was later included in a history of the *Successors* ... Duris [however] had perhaps represented Eumenes as tricky and ambitious, and Hieronymus wrote in reply to this hostile criticism.'

The most important treatment and the only one focused entirely on Nepos' sources, remains that of Bradley.⁷⁶ Bradley's method is important: he compares Nepos with Plutarch's *Eumenes*, with Diodorus Siculus (Books 18-20), who is known to have based his work on Hieronymus, and to a lesser degree with Justin's Epitome of Pompeius Trogus, which probably, if not certainly, bases the parts of the work focused on Eumenes on Hieronymus, but also used other sources, as well as Arrian's *Successors*, and finally, but to a lesser degree, Polyaeus.⁷⁷ Going passage by passage through the text, Bradley demonstrates a meaningful concordance between the various Hieronymean sources and Nepos, leading him to conclude that Nepos used Hieronymus alone.⁷⁸

Anson's monograph on Eumenes, while magisterial, gives only one page to Nepos' *Eumenes* (and the sources for this work), although all other extant sources are treated in considerably more detail.⁷⁹ Anson does not cite Bradley, neither in his thesis or later published monograph, but rejects the once-prevailing view that Nepos and Plutarch relied on 'Alexandrine Biographies'; he argues that 'neither relied on a main

⁷⁶ His doctoral dissertation awarded in 1967, from Harvard, was published unrevised in 1991.

⁷⁷ See Heckel and Wheatley (2011: 2-4) for other sources used by Justin as a complement to Hieronymus. On Bradley's methodology for this study of the Eumenes, see (1991: 157).

⁷⁸ Bradley (1991: 157-158). Hornblower (1981: 67), however, believes that Nepos did not use Hieronymus for *Eum.* 11-12 but a 'more popular' source, because of the inclusion of speeches (*dicta*), which were not a feature of Hieronymus (as Anson [2015: 28-29] notes in relation to Diodorus). This is, I believe, speculative. Firstly, we know Hieronymus was present at Eumenes' capture (D.S. 19.44.3), and is one of the most likely prison-visitors (cf. Nepos *Eum.* 11.2), who could have recorded the testimony of his compatriot. And secondly, this material, as least as it survives in Plutarch (*Eum.* 18-19) and Nepos is less so speeches than short statements. That this 'popular' material does not find its way into the historical accounts is a valid question, but it is certainly material more suited to biographer than historian (that is, such material is included by both Plutarch and Eumenes), and, as noted, the extant historical sources are, to varying degrees, abbreviated. There is no evidence to suggest that Nepos uses a secondary source elsewhere in *Eumenes*, so Hornblower's assumption would have Nepos consulting a second source for only these two chapters (cf. Plutarch, where evidence of his secondary source, Duris, is displayed in multiple places). Furthermore, Hornblower is unwilling (or unable) to posit a name for of the suggested source; cf. Lobur (2021: 81 n. 47) for Nepos' use of Hieronymus alone. On Hieronymus' distaste for speeches, see *POxy.* 4808 col. i 18-29: Ἱερώνυ[μ]ος [ὁ περὶ] διαδόχου] γράψ]ας ... καὶ εἰ μὴ πυκναῖς ῥητορείαις... For commentary, see *POxy.* LXXI: 32-35, and Chrysanthou (2015: 29-31). The use of ῥητορεία ('speech' or 'oratory', *LSJ* A1) does not, I would suggest, necessarily preclude reported statements of the length seen in Plutarch or Nepos, especially as πυκνός (*LSJ* A2-b2, 'frequent' or 'numerous') suggests that there were at least some speeches or *dicta* in Hieronymus' work.

⁷⁹ Anson (2015: 34).

source' and instead 'it is now generally recognized that both relied on numerous primary sources'.⁸⁰ Anson cites only Frances Titchener (2003) for Nepos' use of sources, seemingly having consulted neither Geiger (1985a) nor Stem (2012).⁸¹ Nor has Anson shown conclusively that Nepos' *Eumenes* was based on numerous sources, a view which Bradley has cogently refuted.⁸² Anson argues from the presumed negativity of Eumenes' feigned surrender at Nora (Nepos *Eum.* 5.7), and engagement in shameful trickery, that some non-encomiastic source has been employed rather than the positive view followed by Diodorus (18.50.2).⁸³ However, Anson fails to appreciate that what he considers shameful is in fact the *calliditas* that Nepos singles out for praise in his important introduction of Eumenes' qualities.⁸⁴ It is, moreover, highly unlikely that Nepos would consult a negative source for one comparatively minor event given what has been said about Nepos' predilections in terms of sources.

Robert Hadley (2001) has posited a 'lost source' that Diodorus and Plutarch used to supplement Hieronymus, but Lobur's analysis of Hadley's argument rightly emphasizes that the alleged passages which overlap actually show how little of the hypothetical 'lost source' Nepos might have used for *Eumenes* and in fact strengthens the case that 'in all likelihood [Nepos] follows Hieronymus alone'.⁸⁵

In clear distinction to Nepos' uniformly positive, Hieronymean line, Plutarch mentions Duris of Samos

⁸⁰ Anson (2015: 34).

⁸¹ Titchener (2003) is an important article in rehabilitating Nepos but it does not address Nepos' *Eumenes*. Geiger (1985a: 35) states that for *Eumenes* Nepos 'certainly depended on the *historian* Hieronymus of Cardia' (Geiger's emphasis).

⁸² Despite the general excellence of his monograph Anson's treatment of Nepos' sources is lacking.

⁸³ Anson (2015: 35). This incident is the only event Nepos includes in his biography that *could* be seen as negative.

⁸⁴ *Calliditas ingenii* is a cardinal trait of Eumenes in Nepos (*Eum.* 1.3); see further below.

⁸⁵ Hadley's argument can be summarised in this quote: 'Like Hornblower, I believe that an *apologia/enkomion* for Eumenes is evident in several passages in Diodoros; unlike her, I do not believe that Hieronymos is necessarily the author of these passages or that Diodoros' entire account of Eumenes belongs to a single separate source. What I will argue here is that we have clear evidence in Diodoros' Eumenes narrative of a second source, but one whose structure and purpose differ from those passages which seem likeliest to be drawn from Hieronymos' (Hadley 2001: 5); cf. Lobur (2021: 81 n. 47).

in the opening line of his *Eumenes* for a negative account of Eumenes' upbringing and background which he immediately goes on to reject.⁸⁶ Consequently, we know that Plutarch is using another, unnamed, source for the positive material: certainly, his main source.⁸⁷ Because of the blatant similarity between the positive material in Plutarch and in Nepos and because the negative material in Plutarch clearly derives from Duris it is natural to believe that all positive material derives from Hieronymus and thus that Nepos, who is uniformly positive towards Eumenes, relied solely on Hieronymus.

I.3 – Reconstructing Hieronymus and A Compositional Analysis of Nepos' *Eumenes*

Having determined who Nepos plausibly draws his material from, we now need to ask 'what does Nepos do with this material?' and that requires us first to establish what was in Hieronymus. The principal obstacle to this endeavour is that, despite being hailed as 'the greatest historian of the Successors', Hieronymus' work does not survive.⁸⁸ Therefore, we cannot directly compare Nepos' *Eumenes* and its supposed source. However, since modern scholarship overwhelmingly holds that our extant narrative sources are (to varying degrees) reliant on Hieronymus, we can, through collation, draw up a schema of what may have been contained in Hieronymus' original work, and thus see what might have been available to Nepos when he composed his *Eumenes*. Sound arguments have been made for each of these sources' reliance predominantly on Hieronymus of Cardia as a primary source.⁸⁹ The *Heidelberg Epitome* is probably entirely derived from Hieronymus of Cardia.⁹⁰ There is some debate about the extent to which

⁸⁶ Εὐμενῆ δὲ τὸν Καρδιανὸν ἱστορεῖ Δοῦρις πατρὸς μὲν ἀμαξεύοντος ἐν Χερρονήσῳ διὰ πενίαν γενέσθαι ... δοκοῦσι δὲ εἰκότα λέγειν μᾶλλον οἱ διὰ ξενίαν καὶ φιλίαν πατρῶαν τὸν Εὐμενῆ λέγοντες ὑπὸ τοῦ Φιλίππου προαχθῆναι. Other negative material in Plutarch can similarly be assigned to Duris e.g. the various anecdotes about how Eumenes being in conflict with both Alexander and Hephaestion as well as other Macedonians (*Eum.* 2.1-10); cf. Bosworth (1992 n. 11 and 12).

⁸⁷ See Bosworth (1992 57-58) for Hieronymus as Plutarch's primary source for *Eumenes*.

⁸⁸ Bosworth (1992: 57) for quote, but there are many different statements made by scholars to the same effect. Hornblower (1982: 3): 'in the present state of our knowledge, a handful of citations of Hieronymus twelve testimonia and eighteen fragments are preserved; and these provide valuable information about the historian's life'.

⁸⁹ At least where their narratives focus on Eumenes and/or Antigonos, on which see nn. 60 and 73

⁹⁰ Wheatley (2013: 22-24), noting that only a fraction of the work (3.1-2) addresses Eumenes' career.

Diodorus Siculus relied on Hieronymus in Books 18-19.⁹¹ Justin may also have used other sources such as Duris of Samos, as likewise maybe Arrian's *Successors*.⁹² **Appendix a** intentionally presents a breakdown of all available information pertaining to the whole of Eumenes' career, both his own actions (presented under the **event** column in bold) and the most noteworthy events that directly affected Eumenes to make it obvious that he existed in a broader political environment in which actions 'behind the scenes' and spatially distant had an appreciable effect on Eumenes.⁹³ Column four, **parallel sources**, when taken as a whole, could equate to at least a rough outline of Hieronymus' work (especially given that his history focused on Eumenes) for the period from Alexander the Great's death down to Eumenes' own death. Each of the main parallel sources that are known or believed to have utilised Hieronymus are included. The significance of this document is that it allows us to, 1) see what content was probably available to Nepos when he composed his *Eumenes* and, consequently, 2) understand where Nepos deviates from the Hieronymean tradition by exclusion or addition. This should make it easier for us to answer the question of *why* Nepos adapts Hieronymus as he does.

One thing to be borne in mind during this hypothetical reconstruction of Hieronymus is that all extant sources engaged in severe and uneven abbreviation of their source(s).⁹⁴ That is, they all condensed and compressed Hieronymus' apparently mammoth work, so that even if we look at what these sources include, it will only be a fraction of the original and be reworked through different lenses. This is

⁹¹ Hornblower's (1981) belief that Diodorus Siculus was entirely slavish and just copied Hieronymus is now an outdated view. Although Landucci (2018 and 2021) and Meeus (2022) both believe that Hieronymus was a principal source, they do argue that Diodorus was using other sources, of which Duris of Samos is particularly likely. Landucci Gattinoni (2018: XII-XXIV), Landucci (2021: XI-XXI), Meeus (2022: 59-63).

⁹² For Justin, see Heckel and Wheatley (2011: 3); for Arrian, see Goralski (1989: 82) addresses the various options, but given the state of survival of the *Successors*, all besides Hieronymus are putative.

⁹³ **Appendix a** uses the chronological framework, with minor changes, of Anson, who includes, to a greater or lesser degree, the totality of important events from 323 to 315 (i.e. the death of Eumenes). See **A Note on Chronology**.

⁹⁴ Of our extant historical sources, only Diodorus Siculus is not an epitome or abbreviation, and even his work is not comprehensive.

particularly evident in Nepos because his *Eumenes* is the shortest of the surviving works in its original conception.

Even a cursory look at **Appendix a** reveals that we possess a relative abundance of material for Eumenes' life and career. There is perhaps little surprise that Eumenes' early career under Philip II and Alexander the Great is meaningfully addressed only in our biographical sources (Nepos *Eum.* 1.4-6, cf. 13.1; Plut. *Eum.* 1.1-6), in which only Nepos (13.1) provides us with information on his birth in 361, his arrival at the Macedonian court in 342 BC, and the number of years he served each king.⁹⁵ Certainly, from the death of Alexander to the death of Eumenes we have a fuller account of the Cardian's career. That is to say, our extant sources give us the ability to follow and analyse the *res gestae* of Eumenes in that period with some comprehensiveness.

Nepos is, however, unconcerned with addressing the whole of Eumenes' career.⁹⁶ Various (indeed many) events, and actions of Eumenes that were obviously covered by Hieronymus, and subsequently appear in our extant historical sources, are absent from Nepos' *Eumenes*. I will now list *what* Nepos excludes and *what* he includes, in order to then answer more substantively *why* he makes the choices he does. So firstly, the omissions (limited to those events directly related to Eumenes). It is self-evident that Nepos' omissions are extensive, as the following list of twenty examples indicates:

- i) Eumenes and Leonnatus in Hellespontine Phrygia(?) (September/October 323 BC)
- ii) Eumenes' return to Babylon (Late 323 / Early 322 BC)
- iii) Perdiccas and Eumenes in Cappadocia. Two Battles against Ariarathes (July 322 BC)
- iv) Perdiccas moves to Cicilia; Eumenes organizes Cappadocia (Late Summer/Autumn (322 BC)
- v) Eumenes goes to Armenia (to help Neoptolemus) (Late Autumn/Early Winter 322-321 BC)
- vi) [Compression of events before and after Perdiccas' death (and results etc.)]
- vii) Eumenes winters in Celaenae (Autumn/Winter 319 BC)

⁹⁵ On the dearth of information of subjects' childhoods in ancient biography and why this is the case, see Pelling (1990).

⁹⁶ As I will show below, Nepos is preoccupied with the explication of *virtutes* and not *res gestae*.

- viii) Failed negotiations among the surviving Perdiccan leaders (Autumn/Winter 319 BC)
- ix) Polyperchon new regent, Cassander, Chiliarch (Late Summer 319 BC)
- x) Eumenes released from Nora and allies with Antigonus(?) (Early Spring 318 BC)
- xi) Eumenes allies with Polyperchon (Summer 318 BC)
- xii) Eumenes moves into Cilicia, joined by Argyraspids (the ‘Silver Shields’) (Summer 318 BC)
- xiii) Eumenes moves in Phoenicia (Autumn/Winter 318 BC)
- xiv) Eumenes leaves Phoenicia for the east (September 317 BC)
- xv) Eumenes in Babylonia; revolt of citadel commander in Babylon (Autumn/Winter 317 BC)
- xvi) Eumenes moves into winter quarters in the ‘Carian villages’ (Autumn/Winter 317 BC)
- xvii) Eumenes joins with the forces of the satraps of the upper satrapies (Spring 316 BC)
- xviii) Eumenes arrives in Susa (Late May 316 BC)
- xix) Eumenes and Antigonus battle on Coprates River (July 316 BC)
- xx) Antigonus retreats into Media (August 316 BC)

As **Appendix α** clearly shows, no author endeavours (or, is able) to be comprehensive and include each and every event and every detail. The list of omissions presented is, therefore, not included to criticise Nepos, but rather provides a means with which to visualise the information he excluded. In short, it seems that there are two conspicuous gaps in his narrative: 1) from September/October 323 BC (or winter 323) until spring 320 BC; and 2) from summer 318 BC to late October/November 316 BC.

So now we consider the most important inclusions that Nepos makes from the lengthy Hieronymean narrative available to him which may enable us to see what stages of Eumenes’ career Nepos considers most valuable and what kinds of information on Eumenes he foregrounds. **Appendix β** demonstrates that, apart from Nepos’ general assessments of Eumenes (1.1-3 and 13.1-3) which we will study in detail below, the *Life* is comprised of only a handful of episodes. Nearly forty years of his life are skimmed over in 1.4-6 and Nepos focuses on the period from Alexander’s death (11 June 323 BC) to early-315 BC — nine highly complex years.

Within these nine years Nepos selects seven episodes:

- i) 2.1-5: Death of Alexander and the year(?) afterwards (323-322? BC)⁹⁷
- ii) 3.1-4.4: First Diadoch War begins (including Eumenes against Craterus and Neoptolemus, 320 BC)
- iii) 5.1: Death of Perdiccas, Triparadeisus, Eumenes outlawed (320 BC)
- iv) 5.2-7: Eumenes besieged at Nora (campaign against Antigonus (Spring 319 – Late Winter 318 BC)
- v) 6.1-5: Eumenes and Olympias – an exposition of *fides*
- vi) 7.1-4: Alexander Tent (318? BC)
- vii) 8.1-12.4: Extended campaign against Antigonus (includes death of Eumenes)

If we needed to compress these further, we could see them as two sections: 1) Eumenes under Perdiccas and 2) Eumenes at odds with Antigonus. Thus, the majority of the *Eumenes* is focused on Eumenes as fighter and strategist, thus on his career as general (*dux*) and the actions therein that exemplify his *ingenium* as *dux* (cf. 1.3).⁹⁸

There is also one section of *Eumenes* (2.3-5) that appears to be an addition or creation by Nepos (as it does not appear in the other Hieronymean derivatives) that we should examine before attempting to draw some conclusions from Nepos' many choices on content.

[2.3] Hunc sibi Perdiccas adiunxerat magno studio, quod in homine fidem et industriam magnam videbat, non dubitans, si eum pellexisset, magno usui fore sibi in iis rebus, quas apparabat. Cogitabat enim, quod fere omnes in magnis imperiis concupiscunt, omnium partis corripere atque complecti. [4] Neque vero hoc ille solus fecit, sed ceteri quoque omnes, qui Alexandri fuerant amici. Primus Leonnatus Macedoniam praeoccupare destinavit. Hic multis magnisque pollicitationibus persuadere Eumeni studuit, ut Perdiccam desereret ac secum faceret societatem. [5] Cum perducere eum non posset, interficere conatus est; et fecisset, nisi ille clam noctu ex praesidiis eius effugisset.

Nepos places Eumenes' adhesion to Perdiccas immediately after Alexander's death but Plutarch (*Eum.* 3.3-5) several months later. Leonnatus' promises to Eumenes, as well as Leonnatus' attempt on Eumenes' life are unique to Nepos. In Plutarch, Eumenes escapes during the night (3.5) and only Leonnatus' plans

⁹⁷ The death of Alexander, and, more specifically, the Babylonian Settlement is discussed in **Chapter 3**.

⁹⁸ 10 of 13 chapters predominantly focus on the Battle of the Hellespont in the First/Second Diadoch War and on Eumenes' bitter struggle with Antigonus.

to usurp Macedonia are expressed—no promises are made. Bradley calls this a ‘confused mélange of events’ for the year after Alexander’s death and says that it is ‘probable’ that the attempt on Eumenes’ life, and his subsequent escape is a confused account of Antigonus’ escape when he discovered that Perdiccas wished to ‘get him [Antigonus] out the way’ (D.S. 18.23.3).⁹⁹ Bradley, again, argues that it is ‘more than likely’ that the promises (*multis magnisque pollicitationibus*) that Leonnatus used to detach Eumenes from Perdiccas were in fact based upon overtures by Antipater and Craterus to Eumenes, asking him to join their coalition in 321/0 BC (Plut. *Eum.* 5.6).¹⁰⁰ If this is correct, Nepos has significantly re-shaped the material to highlight a key aspect of Eumenes’ character, his key quality of *fides* (‘loyalty’), and especially *fides* to legitimate authority. In effect, this episode shows how Leonnatus attempts to attack and test Eumenes’ *fides*, but Eumenes remains true to his *virtus*. Historical narrative has been formed into an *exemplum*.¹⁰¹

A consequence of Nepos’ extreme compression and selection of the narrative, he creates a fast-flowing narrative of the years 323 to 315, but at the expense of actual chronology. Although his account is not without chronological markers, they are only relative (apart from the precise noting of Alexander’s death) and vague.¹⁰² He attempts to make the events seem as connected as possible, as having happened in the

⁹⁹Quote from Bradley (1991: 141); cf. D.S. 18.23.3: μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα Ἀντιγόνου τὴν προαίρεσιν αὐτοῦ κατανοήσαντος καὶ φιλίαν ἔχοντος πρὸς Ἀντίπατρον, ἔτι δὲ ὄντος τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τούτου πρακτικωτάτου τῶν ἡγεμόνων ἔκρινεν αὐτὸν ἐκποδῶν ποιήσασθαι.

¹⁰⁰ παρ’ ἐκείνων δὲ ἀπέσταλτο πρεσβεία πρὸς Εὐμενῆ παρακαλοῦσα μεταθέσθαι πρὸς αὐτούς, καρπούμενον μὲν ἄς εἶχε σατραπείας, προσλαβόντα δὲ στρατιὰν καὶ χώραν παρ’ αὐτῶν, Ἀντιπάτρῳ μὲν ἀντ’ ἐχθροῦ φίλον γενόμενον, Κρατερῶ δὲ μὴ γενόμενον ἐκ φίλου πολέμιον.

¹⁰¹ *Exemplum* here meaning ‘a model for action’. On exemplarity in the Roman context, see Roller (2004 and 2009) and Chaplin (2000: 1-32), and especially Langlands (2018). Stem (2012: 128-140 and 2018) argues cogently that Nepos was writing ‘exemplary biography’, an argument which builds upon the work of Geiger (1985a), who argued (as seen in **Introduction**) that Nepos was writing ‘political biography’. Stem correctly identifies that *Eumenes* is more concerned with exemplary virtues: ‘the remainder of the *Life* (i.e. *Eum.* 2.1 onwards) sustains the focus on the exemplary virtues that are identified in the introduction’. On exemplarity in Nepos’ *Eumenes*, see Stem (2018: 33-34), who focuses on the following passages 1.1-3; 1.5; 7.2-3; 13.2-3; and 8.1-3. He has a special interest in presenting exemplary actions with potential Roman significance. For exemplarity in Nepos, see also Skufca (2018).

¹⁰² E.g. 2.1 *Alexandro Babylone mortuo* (= 2.2 *hoc tempore*); 3.1 *interim*; 5.1 *haec dum apud Hellespontem geruntur*; 5.7 *ver*

sequence they are presented in, and without any major gaps. Without an annalistic source at their disposal Nepos' readers would struggle to grasp the temporal complexities of Eumenes' career (and the early Hellenistic period more broadly) from Nepos' account alone.

II. Nepos and Biography

Having, then, argued that Nepos' only source was an extensive, positive, narrative history and demonstrated how he excluded much of its content, we now need to look at *why* he made that decision and see *how* he deployed material to create his *Eumenes*. To get to the *why*, I believe we must begin with what Nepos says about his project in *On Foreign Generals*, so that we can understand his broader aims and methods; then we can look specifically within the *Eumenes* to see how by direct authorial guidance and by structures his readers are led to a certain picture of Eumenes; with this reading of *Eumenes* we can finally examine how and why Nepos has reshaped his Hieronymean material.

To begin, we start from the passages in which Nepos explains his aims and methods, which are commonly referred to a 'programmatically passages':¹⁰³

Praefatio

[1] Non dubito fore plerosque, Attice, qui hoc genus scripturae leve et non satis dignum summorum virorum personis iudicent, cum relatum legent, quis musicam docuerit Epaminondam, aut in eius virtutibus commemorari, saltasse eum commode scienterque tibiis cantasse. [2] Sed ii erunt fere, qui expertes litterarum Graecarum nihil rectum, nisi quod ipsorum moribus conveniat, putabunt. [3] Hi si didicerint non eadem omnibus esse

appropinquabat; 6.1 *cum* [sc. Eumenes] ... *in Asiam*; 7.1 *itaque copias contraxit* (temporally linked to 6.5 in the text); 11.1 *cum eum in custodiam dedisset*.

¹⁰³ On the programmatic passages, see: Jenkinson (1973: 709-11); McCarty (1974: 383-86); Horsfall (1982: 291) and (1989: 29-30, 113-16); Geiger (1985a: 21-26, 37-38, 112-15); Moles (1989: 230-32); Albrecht (1997: 483-84); Tuplin (2000: 132-42); Titchener (2003: 86-88); Beneker, (2009: 109-120); Stem (2012: 100-101); Lobur (2021: 44-46); Ginelli (2022: 27-30).

honesta atque turpia, sed omnia maiorum institutis iudicari, non admirabuntur nos in Graiorum virtutibus exponendis mores eorum secutos.

Nepos essentially explains that he is writing *Lives* that will deal primarily with *mores*.¹⁰⁴ He prudently prepares his envisaged readers (*qui expertes litterarum Graecarum*), who are, within *On Foreign Generals*, going to encounter numerous instances where Greek culture is at odds with their own, Roman, culture. Importantly, for Nepos, *mores* are the setting in which *virtutes* (and logically *vitia*) can be established.

***Pelopidas* 1.1**

Pelopidas Thebanus, magis historicis quam vulgo notus. cuius de virtutibus dubito quem ad modum exponam, quod vereor, si res explicare incipiam, ne non vitam eius enarrare, sed historiam videar scribere: si tantummodo summas attigero, ne rudibus Graecarum litterarum minus dilucide appareat, quantus fuerit ille vir. itaque utrique rei occurram, quantum potuero, et medebor cum satietati tum ignorantiae lectorum.

Even more explicitly here Nepos emphasises that he is writing ‘lives’ (that is, ‘biography’), *vitam ... enarrare*, and underlines a clear distinction between *res* (‘deeds’) and *virtutes* (‘merits’).¹⁰⁵ He states categorically that his aim is to give an account of his subjects’ virtues (*de virtutibus ... exponam*), and in doing so distinguishes his chosen genre from history-writing. The contrast drawn both here and in the *praefatio*, where Nepos confronts the idea that readers may find *hoc genus scripturae* (i.e. the writing of *Lives*) to be *leve* (‘trivial’), does suggest a general presupposition of the supremacy of *historia* as a literary

¹⁰⁴ *Hoc genus scripturae* inescapably marks his work as different from history. He is, from the outset, preparing his readers to expect that he will not be writing *res gestae* but rather trading in *mores* and *virtutes*.

¹⁰⁵ Almost as a rule, scholars regularly draw a parallel between Nepos *Pelop. 1* and Plut. *Alex. 1.1-3*. Adams (2021: 26-27): ‘It is worth emphasizing that, in light of this relationship, it is the writers of biography who felt most compelled to define their task in contrast to history and not vice versa (e.g. Nep. *Pelop. 1.1*; Plut. *Alex. 1.1-3*; *Pomp. 8*). This suggests that ancient biographers viewed history as the dominant or more established literary form and that they were attempting to describe their task in comparison with the other’ ... ‘this ambiguity is not the case in his famous discussion at the opening of his parallel lives of Alexander and Caesar where he claims that he is not writing history, but *Lives* (οὔτε γὰρ ἱστορίας γράφομεν, ἀλλὰ βίους, *Alex. 1.1*). In order to differentiate between the two, Plutarch speaks of his purpose: the revelation of character (virtue or vice) through the recounting of actions and sayings, both great and small. The recounting of deeds and speech was a standard way of portraying a person’s character in many genres, but was particularly strong in biographies. For Plutarch, the actions of his subjects display their virtues and vices in order to elicit positive change within the reader. On this, see also Ginelli (2022: 27-29).

pursuit.¹⁰⁶ One need not, however, see Nepos' statements here as an *apologia* for his literary choice but as an indication to readers who knew him as an author of many genres that here he was adhering to the rules of biography.¹⁰⁷ What is most important for Nepos in this work is the elucidation and explication of *virtutes* — he is interested overarchingly in the character and merit of his subject.

Ginelli puts it well (on *Pelop.* 1.1 and *Plut. Alex.* 1.1):

Historiography and biography have the same working methods. Both select facts and use sources of multiple types, not only literary texts, but also monuments, inscriptions, decrees, and linguistic or topographical documents. The main difference between these literary genres consists in their respective purposes: biography aspires “to grasp” the character of the subject, his/her life and relationship with virtue and vice, and it therefore tends to influence people by providing examples of behaviour; historiography aims to narrate events with a special interest in the context, in political facts, and chronological coherence. Historiography and biography have, however, similar narrative rhythms.¹⁰⁸

***Epaminondas* 1.3-4**

[3] Cum autem exprimere imaginem consuetudinis atque vitae velimus Epaminondae, nihil videmur debere praetermittere, quod pertineat ad eam declarandam. [4] Quare dicemus primum de genere eius, deinde quibus disciplinis et a quibus sit eruditus, tum de moribus ingeniique facultatibus et si qua alia memoria digna erunt, postremo de rebus gestis, quae a plurimis animi anteponuntur virtutibus.

Here Nepos sets out what is required for the effective delineation of a life and the sequence that is appropriate: *consuetudo* and *vita* come first; next comes family (*genus*), what he studied and who his teachers were, character (*mores*) and mental qualities (*ingenium*); and in last place (*postremo*) come *res gestae*, that is, deeds, which can be assumed to encompass historical actions, and probably also assumes a

¹⁰⁶ The novelty of biography ought to be noted: *historia* had a long and prestigious history, biography did not. This is especially the case at Rome, with Nepos as the earliest extant Latin biographer (perhaps the first Latin biographer proper); see Wardle (2014: 6-7) and Wardle (2025).

¹⁰⁷ Cf. Titchener (2003: 87).

¹⁰⁸ Ginelli (2022: 29).

narrative structure.¹⁰⁹ Therefore, it would be uncontroversial to state that Nepos has a ‘hierarchy of interest’: he alerts his readers to the fact that he will often pay less attention to (or neglect) major actions or exploits of his subjects, but instead will choose to focus on matters that may seem trivial.

Further passages which have drawn less attention are also worthy of consideration:

Timotheus 4.5-6

[5] Venio nunc ad fortissimum virum maximique consilii omnium barbarorum, exceptis duobus Karthaginiensibus, Hamilcare et Hannibale. [6] de quo hoc plura referemus, quod et obscuriora sunt eius gesta pleraque et ea, quae prospere ei cesserunt, non magnitudine copiarum, sed consilii, quo tum omnes superabat, acciderunt: quorum nisi ratio explicata fuerit, res apparere non poterunt.

Although this passage is clearly not programmatic in the same way as the preceding ones with regard to the method and structure of Nepotian biography, it makes a clear point about Nepos’ literary aims: it further emphasises that *res* cannot be adequately explained or elucidated without looking at the strategic-intelligence of a subject (here subsumed under the *ratio*) — because Timotheus’ achievements were mostly on the small side (comparatively speaking), his most significant contribution to his successes was his strategic acumen.¹¹⁰ In the climactic words of the *Life* Nepos is unambiguous in this regard: unless (*nisi*) you understand the intellectual contribution of somebody, the true scale of their actions cannot properly be understood. Added weight here comes from the fact these words are the conclusion of the *Timotheus*.

¹⁰⁹ Ginelli (2022: 37): from ‘Nepos’ ... biographical [collection], one may infer that chronological narration and time coherence are not essential elements of biography.’

¹¹⁰ *Ratio* here is that faculty of the mind which forms the basis of act of reckoning, calculation, and hence of mental action in general, i.e. ‘judgment’, ‘understanding’, reason’ (*L&S* s.v. *ratio* 2 and *OLD* 1), with a specific reference to military stratagems. Timotheus’ *consilium* provides a good comparison for Eumenes’ *calliditas* (*Eum.* 1.3).

Epaminondas 4.6

abstinentiae erit hoc satis testimonium. Plurima quidem proferre possumus, sed modus adhibendus est, quoniam uno hoc volumine vitam excellentium virorum complurium concludere constituimus, quorum separatim multis milibus versuum complures scriptores ante nos explicarunt.

I believe that one of the reasons why Nepos has suffered such a poor reputation is the brevity that he has deemed essential to this biographical project, especially when compared to narrative histories.¹¹¹ Here, Nepos himself draws attention to the issue of scale: he cannot be comprehensive in the treatment of his subjects and has no intention of being so. His plan is to include numerous (*complurium*) shorter biographies (*vitam*) of eminent men (*excellentium virorum*) in just a single volume (*uno hoc volumine*), thus explicitly confronting his readers with an implicit scale; he plans to highlight the *virtutes* and *mores* of his subjects since their deeds (*res*; *res gestae*) have been written about in previous writers, above all, historians, ‘in many thousands of lines’ (*quorum separatim multis milibus versuum complures scriptores ante nos explicarunt*).¹¹² And, he feels no obligation to rehash these. Thus, again, *res* are subordinated.

De Regibus 1.1

Hi fere fuerunt Graecae gentis duces, qui memoria digni videantur, praeter reges...

This statement is programmatic, but not in terms of Nepos’ method. It provides his criteria for inclusion in this book: here he deals only with generals (*duces*) who did not hold kingship (i.e. as *rex*).¹¹³ This would explain the absence of objectively superlative generals, such as Philip II and Alexander the Great (cf. *Reg.* 2.1). Nepos’ potential subjunctive ‘*videantur*’ is noteworthy – ‘who *may* seem memorable’ — suggesting

¹¹¹ On Nepos’ reputation, see **Introduction**.

¹¹² Although in the preface Nepos had stated that he was writing for those who were *expertes Graecarum litterarum* (*praef.* 2) and *rudibus Graecarum litterarum* (*Pelop.* 1.1) he seems to think here that his readers, should they wish to consult an account of a subject’s *res gestae*, would be able to read Greek.

¹¹³ The Spartan dual kingship, which in principle resembled the Roman consulate in its collegiality and shared power, is an exception.

that his Roman readers may not (necessarily) view the non-Roman as memorable.¹¹⁴ This sentiment links with Nepos' warning about cultural differences, best expressed at *Epam.* 1.1-2 and in the *praefatio*.

Nepos' use of *memoria dignus* is an interesting appropriation of a notion primarily exploited by historians, for example, Herodotus' programmatic concern with ἔργα μεγάλα (cf. *Chab.* 1.1) and Thucydides (1.1.1-3).¹¹⁵ The idea was important also in Roman historiography, specifically in Nepos' time, as Sallust (*Cat.* 4.2) writes *statui res gestas populi Romani carptim, ut quaeque memoria digna videbantur, perscribere*, also using *videri* probably to highlight the role of an authorial choice rather than to question the standing of the deeds. Nepos too, then, is affirming his selection of subjects and subject matter.¹¹⁶

Hannibal 13.4

Sed nos tempus est huius libri facere finem et Romanorum explicare imperatores, quo facilius collatis utrorumque factis, qui viri praeferendi sint, possit iudicari.

Nepos wrote two books on generals: one of non-Romans, which we possess, and one of Romans, which is lost.¹¹⁷ The readers are made aware, at the very end of the book, that they may compare the deeds of Romans and non-Romans in order to see which should be held in higher esteem. There is, however, an important implication in the opportunity to compare the deeds (*facta*) of many different *duces* — what is being compared and what is being measured? A question here must be whether the *qui* relates to individuals (e.g. Epaminondas and say Scipio Africanus), or to broad groups (i.e. Romans and non-Romans). Plutarch's structure explicitly encourages and offers individual comparison, whereas Nepos'

¹¹⁴ Or, 'who might seem worthy of record'.

¹¹⁵ The biographer's four uses of the expression relate to noteworthy biographical subjects (*Timoth.* 4.4, *Reg.* 1.1) and noteworthy exploits performed by his subjects (*Chab.* 1.1, *Epam.* 1.4).

¹¹⁶ As did Valerius Maximus (*praef.*) under Tiberius, see Wardle (1998: 66-67); cf. Justin *praef.* 4: ... *cognitione quaeque dignissima excerpsti et omissis his, quae nec cognoscendi voluptate iucunda nec exemplo erant necessaria*.

¹¹⁷ On this, see **Introduction**.

(and his words here) suggest that group comparison is foremost in his mind. Indeed, he may be the pioneer in incorporating cultural identity into exemplarity.¹¹⁸ Nepos was combatting crude patriotism in his Roman readers (despite his pleas for the recognition of cultural relativism).

From all these programmatic passages, then, some conclusions can be made about Nepos' biographical method and his conception of biography: 1) he conceives of himself as 'writing lives' — *vitae* not *historia*; and 2) these *vitae* are principally concerned with elucidating and explicating both the *virtutes* and *mores* of his subjects (even cross-culturally); and 3) *res gestae* are subordinated and the deeds are included only if and when they are useful to point 2; 4) the reader or critic of Nepos should not compare his work to narrative history; and finally 5) Nepos' biographies (at least in *On Foreign Generals*) are, for the most part, a selection of *exempla* and *strategemata* woven together into a longer narrative.¹¹⁹ In my analysis of why Nepos' *Eumenes* includes what it does, and the structure Nepos has given his material, these conclusions will be paramount.

Next, we must examine the *Eumenes* itself, not for the kind of programmatic passages we have just examined — because there are none — but in order to understand how Nepos guides his readers by the way he structures his text. This is done in strategic places within the *Life*: at 1.1-3 Nepos draws the readers' attention specifically to qualities in which Eumenes excelled, thus guiding them as they read the material he has included to exemplify these virtues; at 13.1-3 new points are made that retrospectively the readers can appreciate: Eumenes was a great *dux* (deserving of his place in this collection) and he was marked by

¹¹⁸ Stem (2018: 28-29).

¹¹⁹ Although the word *strategemata* does not appear in Nepos' work, most of the *exempla* that Nepos chooses to include in this biography involve military stratagems. The effectiveness of Eumenes' *strategemata* led to their inclusion in both Polyaeus (4.8) and Frontinus (*Strat.* 4.34).

unfailing *fides* to the Argead house. I will argue that, in addition to his military achievements, two specific qualities, *ingenium* and *fides*, define Nepos' Eumenes.¹²⁰

Starting from the words with which Nepos begins the *Eumenes*, to which readers would naturally look for authorial pointers.

[1.1] Eumenes Cardianus. huius si virtuti par data esset fortuna, non ille quidem maior, sed multo illustrior atque etiam honoratior, quod magnos homines virtute metimur, non fortuna. [2] nam cum aetas eius incidisset in ea tempora, quibus Macedones florent, multum ei detraxit inter eos viventi, quod alienae erat civitatis neque aliud huic defuit quam generosa stirps. [3] etsi ille domestico summo genere erat, tamen Macedones eum sibi aliquando anteponi indigne ferebant, neque tamen non patiebantur: vincebat enim omnes cura, vigilantia, patientia, calliditate et celeritate ingenii.

For our purpose two key pointers emerge: 1) great men are measured by their *virtus*, not by their *fortuna*, of which Eumenes enjoyed little; 2) despite the disadvantages of low birth and not being a Macedonian, Eumenes surpassed all (*omnes*) Macedonians in four virtues: *cura*, *vigilantia*, *patientia*, *calliditas et celeritas ingenii*.¹²¹ These abstract nouns do not reoccur in the text, thus requiring the readers themselves to identify concrete *exempla* of these abstract qualities, which in some cases is not entirely straightforward (as the following attempt suggests). Even so, these are the qualities that Nepos intends to emphasise in this *Life* and that will inform his selection of material. The list of Eumenes' *virtutes* (especially those at 1.3) are highly generalized and overlapping.

¹²⁰ Eumenes' wisdom (σοφία), here akin to *ingenium* (esp *OLD* s.v. *ingenium* 4a and 6a), is prominent in other sources too: Suda E3579: ὁ δὲ Εὐμένης οὗτος ὑπὸ Ἀντιγόνου ἀναιρεῖται, ἀνὴρ σοφώτερος ἢ κατὰ τοὺς λοιποὺς τῶν Μακεδόνων δόξας εἶναι καὶ ἀνεπίληπτος ἐν στρατηγίαις, ὡς καὶ τῷ ἔπειτα χρόνῳ παρασχεῖν ὄνομα; *HE* 3: [1] ὅτι ὁ Εὐμένης σοφὸς ὢν ἐκ τῶν στρατηγῶν καὶ διαδόχων Ἀλεξάνδρου ἐτήρησε στοργὴν ἀδολωτάτην πρὸς τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον and Plut. *Eum.* 8.1: καὶ δόξη μὲν ἦρθη μέγας ἀπ' αὐτῆς, ὡς τὰ μὲν σοφία. Stem (2018) shares my view on these qualities. For instances of *ingenium*: 3.3-6, 5.4-7, 7.1-3, 8.4-10.1; for *fides*: 1.4 2.3, 3.1, 4.3-4, 6.1-5, [10.1-2, enemies' lack of *fides*, i.e. *perfidia*], 13.2-3 [to Argeads].

¹²¹ Stem (2018: 37) says that 'the main purpose of Nepos' introduction to this *Life* is to explain why Eumenes was rendered less fortunate in his career than his virtue merits'. For discussion of *fortuna*, see **Chapter 2**. I consider *calliditas et celeritas ingenii* to be one virtue. If anyone were to doubt that the four were virtues, at 1.4, as the biography proper begins, Nepos immediately indicates that Eumenes possessed *indoles virtutis*, i.e. innate virtue displayed from early days. The subsequent addition of *industria* (1.5) I will discuss in **Chapter 2**.

As *exempla* of Eumenes' *cura* ('carefulness', 'diligence', 'attentiveness') the readers could note his skillful choice of battleground and deployment of his forces to protect his weak infantry (3.6) and to avoid being overwhelmed by superior enemy numbers (5.2), his concern to heal the wounded Craterus and treat his remains with dignity (4.4), and his attention to the conditioning of his cavalry when they could not exercise normally (5.4-7).¹²² By contrast, *vigilantia* ('wakefulness', 'vigilance', 'alertness') is hard to distinguish: there are no examples of a typical general's feat of going without sleep.¹²³ In the broader sense of alertness to the fears of his own soldiers, a case that Nepos labels as *prudentissimum* (3.5), Eumenes conceals facts from his troops (3.3-6) and of alertness to the wiles of Antigonos (9.1-6) Eumenes checks his advance.¹²⁴

Patientia ('endurance', 'willingness to endure hardship or suffering') is a hallmark characteristic of Eumenes: he was condemned in his absence as a traitor, felt the blow hard but did not give up (5.1), endured the hardships of being besieged in Nora (5.4-7), suffered betrayal at the hands of the Macedonian forces that had sworn to defend him (10.1), endured imprisonment during which he was subject to humiliations (11-12) and ultimately while being starved to death was strangled by his captors (12.3-4).¹²⁵ In his only description of Eumenes' physical attributes Nepos notes his ability to endure hardship (11.5: *viribus ad laborem ferendum firmis*).

As to the last quality however, *exempla* of Eumenes' *calliditas* and *celeritas ingenii* appear explicitly and are signalled as such. On even a plain reading of the text, Eumenes' *ingenium* is on display throughout

¹²² OLD s.v. *cura* 2.

¹²³ OLD s.v. *vigilantia* 1 for 'wakefulness', cf. OLD s.v. *vigilantia* 2 for 'vigilance' or 'alertness'.

¹²⁴ Specifically, against whom the Macedonians under his command will be fighting: the renowned Craterus. On the position of Craterus and his reputation, see **Chapter 3**.

¹²⁵ OLD s.v. *patientia* 2.

(3.3-6, 5.4-7, 7.1-3, and 8.4-10.1).¹²⁶ This makes up about half of the biography, even more so, if we exclude Nepos' introduction and closing summary at 1.1-3 and 13.1-4. From his reading of his source, Nepos chooses to highlight Eumenes' *ingenium* as his principal quality and constructs his biography around that theme. Particularly notable about Nepos' focus on Eumenes' *ingenium* is that all the examples are linked to his actions as a general. In many of the *Lives* in *On Foreign Generals* Nepos elucidates his subjects' character by supplying a wealth of interesting information, yet, often outside the scope of them being *duces*. Here Eumenes' greatest virtue is precisely that which a *dux* needed to exercise. Indeed, Caesar had been the greatest general of Eumenes' time, renowned for his *celeritas*.¹²⁷ So, Nepos' opening summary provides the readers with a good guide as to what they will find; the emphasis will lie on Eumenes' intellectual excellence, seen particularly in *calliditas et celeritas ingenii*, that brought about his military successes.

What we will consider next is Nepos' closing summary of the *Eumenes* (13.1-4), to see what he chooses to emphasise retrospectively, thus reinforcing to his readers the lessons or *exempla* which he has hoped to impart:

[13.1] Sic Eumenes annorum quinque et quadraginta, cum ab anno vicesimo, uti supra ostendimus, septem annos Philippo apparuisset, tredecim apud Alexandrum eundem locum obtinisset, in his unum equitum alae praefuisset, post autem Alexandri Magni mortem imperator exercitus duxisset summosque duces partim reppulisset, partim interfecisset, captus non Antigoni virtute, sed Macedonum periurio talem habuit exitum vitae. [2] in quo quanta omnium fuerit opinio eorum, qui post Alexandrum Magnum reges sunt appellati, ex hoc facillime potest iudicari, quod, <quorum> nemo Eumene vivo rex appellatus est, sed praefectus, [3] eidem post huius occasum statim regium ornatum nomenque sumpserunt neque, quod initio praedicarant, se Alexandri liberis regnum seruare, praestare voluerunt et uno propugnatore sublato quid sentirent aperuerunt. huius sceleris principes fuerunt Antigonus, Ptolemaeus, Seleucus, Lysimachus, Cassandrus. [4] Antigonus autem Eumenem mortuum propinquis eius sepeliundum

¹²⁶ My references for these examples differ only marginally from Stem (2018).

¹²⁷ E.g. Cic. *Att.* 7.22, 8.9A, 16.10, Vell. Pat. 2.41, 2.51; Luc. 10.505-9; Suet. *Iul.* 57. And thus certainly a topical quality of the Late Republic. On Caesar's *celeritas*, see Danon (2017 and 2018).

tradidit. hi militari honestoque funere, comitante toto exercitu, humauerunt ossaque eius in Cappadociam ad matrem atque uxorem liberosque eius deportanda curarunt.

α) 13.1: *imperator exercitus duxisset summosque duces partim reppulisset, partim interfecisset*: as the senior ranking general (i.e. *imperator*) and not anyone's subordinate, Eumenes led armies and defeated *summi duces*. He was the superior *dux*. This clearly reiterates Eumenes' ability as *dux/imperator*. These victories, one way or another, are a direct result of his *ingenium* (this is clear from a reading of the text, and if one looks at the passages that exhibit *ingenium* they overlap with military or political victories for Eumenes). In this summary Nepos is referring particularly to the defeat of Craterus and Neoptolemus (4.1-4), and to Nepos' defeats of Antigonus (8.1-10.1).

β) When Eumenes finally lost, or rather, was betrayed (13.1: *...captus non Antigoni virtute, sed Macedonum periurio talem habuit exitum vitae*), he was defeated not by superior *virtus* of another general, but by treachery perpetrated by Macedonians, a suggestion that Eumenes was more virtuous than his opponents (and the Macedonian generals that betrayed him).¹²⁸

γ) In a highly complex comment on Eumenes' reputation (13.2-3): *in quo quanta omnium fuerit opinio eorum, qui post Alexandrum Magnum reges sunt appellati, ex hoc facillime potest iudicari, quod, <quorum> nemo Eumene vivo rex appellatus est, sed praefectus, eidem post huius occasum statim regium ornatum nomenque sumpserunt*), Nepos draws another powerful contrast between Eumenes and the other Macedonian generals: he never claimed the title of *rex* whereas they (that is, Antigonus, Ptolemy, Seleucus, Lysimachus, and Cassander) did; and he suggests that Eumenes' virtue restrained the others, as long as he lived, but once he had been eliminated they could then indulge their passion for kingship. Because Nepos

¹²⁸ At 10.1 Nepos describes Antigonus as *callidus* and thereby shows that Eumenes outdid him in this imperial virtue.

knew from reading Hieronymus that Eumenes died nine years before the successors declared themselves kings, his *statim* is not so much an error but a deliberate *auxesis* of Eumenes as champion of *libertas* over tyranny (in this case, a legitimate king versus usurpers).¹²⁹

δ) Nepos continues (13.3) by identifying Eumenes as the sole *propugnator* of Alexander's children, displaying admirable *fides* to the Argead House, whether in the form of its kings or their legitimately appointed regents (principally Perdiccas). Although the noun, *fides*, does not appear here readers can think back to the ways Nepos has outlined this quality throughout the *Life*, for example, from early in his service to the Argeads.¹³⁰ 1.5: *Scribae*, in the Macedonian context *grammateis*, must be faithful; at 2.3 Perdiccas (by this stage regent for the Argeads) courts Eumenes as an ally because he sees Eumenes' *fides*; 3.1: despite Perdiccas' weakness during the First Diadoch War Eumenes' *fides* holds, and he is loyal to Perdiccas until the regent's death.¹³¹ 6.1-5, a clear intrusion into the coherent narrative in which 7.1 picks up 5.7 is included by Nepos to make explicit his loyalty to Philip, Alexander and his children, as well as Olympias. Although, *fides* is not explicitly mentioned frequently or appears throughout the life — it is implicitly essential for this biography.

¹²⁹ These successors claimed kingship in 306/5 BC, see Gruen (2018). Dionisotti (1988: 45) makes the point that the following is fundamental for Nepos: '*libertas* not tyranny, obedience in public office, not private initiative, the *civitas*, not the individual...' — this links with the recurrent theme in the *Eumenes* of obeying and serving legitimate authority. Nepos' *scelus* is striking and perhaps the most overt political commentary in *Eumenes*. The biographer does not look favourably upon this assumption of kingship by Antigonos, Ptolemy, Seleucus, Lysimachus and Cassander. These men had usurped power and influence from its rightful owners/holders, the children of Alexander. Here Nepos implicitly deplores the movement of a society towards tyranny, perhaps acutely aware of events in the 30s, as he was writing.

¹³⁰ Plut. *Eum* 1.3 mentions a tie of guest-friendship between Eumenes' father and Philip and as such a degree of loyalty could have existed even before his arrival at Macedonian court.

¹³¹ Victorious Eumenes' attempts to save the life of the dying Craterus is probably meant to elicit the conception of a Eumenes faithful to his friends, even if they became enemies.

After having analysed the opening and closing summative assessments of *Eumenes*, it can be shown that *calliditas et celeritas ingenii* and *fides* are central qualities of this *summus dux*. Therefore, given that Nepos is concerned to elucidate character (*virtus*) at the expense of actions (*res gestae*), a plausible assumption is that the biographer will focus on material which emphasises these core qualities within the military sphere in which Eumenes excelled.

So with a clearer understanding of what Nepos intended from his *Eumenes* and the qualities he chooses to emphasise, we are better positioned to return to the Hieronymus' hypothetical work and answer the question of why Nepos included and excluded what he did in relation to Eumenes. The following discussion refers to the numbered lists on pages 53 to 54 and divides them into 'military' and 'political' passages. His primary criteria for inclusion were events or anecdotes that showed Eumenes' *fides* and/or *calliditas et celeritas ingenii*. Even a cursory consultation of **Appendix a** clearly shows that many of the events that occurred when Eumenes was active were perhaps not exemplary, but mostly run-of-the-mill *res gestae* or material that did not centre on Eumenes, even if he was involved to some degree, or did not neatly fit the overarching themes of Nepos' work. And, because the majority of events elucidating the *ingenium* and/or *fides* of Eumenes can be found in his conflicts, first with Neoptolemus and Craterus, and later his extended campaign against Antigonus, Nepos focuses his narrative on these.¹³²

i) The extended and significant chronological gap, from late 323 to spring 320 (**items 10 to 32**) in **Appendix a** although striking from the perspective of a historian, is unsurprising. Between these dates Eumenes was for the most part merely restoring order in Armenia (Plut. *Eum.* 4.3), not engaged in significant military campaigns, or at the heart of the political manoeuvrings of other prominent

¹³² Ten of thirteen chapters predominantly focus on these events (to some degree or other).

Macedonians; Eumenes was operating on the outskirts. That is not to say that Eumenes' actions during this period were completely insignificant, however, but simply not useful for Nepos.

ii) Eumenes' return to Babylon (**item 8**) reconnected him with Perdiccas, but is superfluous information if Nepos minimises events before the First Diadoch War.

iii) Perdiccas and Eumenes' campaign against Ariarathes (**item 12**) importantly made the promise of Eumenes' satrapy of Cappadocia a reality but Perdiccas, not Eumenes, was supreme commander and responsible for the victories.¹³³

iv) Once Perdiccas (and Eumenes) had pacified Cappadocia, Eumenes was tasked with 'organising' the satrapy (**item 15**). Plutarch marks an ambitious Eumenes dispensing favours and toadying up to (θεραπέων) Perdiccas, a slant at odds with Nepos.¹³⁴

v) Eumenes' deployment by Perdiccas to Armenia over the winter of 322/1 (**item 19**), to undo the bad management of its former satrap Neoptolemus, shows that Perdiccas, as regent, trusted Eumenes over Neoptolemus.¹³⁵ Nepos will find room for Neoptolemus only in the Battle of the Hellespont (4.1-2) as a commander defeated in hand-to-hand combat by Eumenes. Nepos again ignores Eumenes' Armenian command and campaigns because of its paucity of *exempla*.¹³⁶

¹³³ Plut *Eum* 3.11: ... ὀλίγον δὲ ὕστερον εἰς Καππαδοκίαν κατήχθη μετὰ δυνάμεως, αὐτοῦ Περδίκκου παρόντος καὶ στρατηγοῦντος.

¹³⁴ Plut. *Eum.* 3.12-13.

¹³⁵ Anson (2015: 90-91).

¹³⁶ Anson (2015: 91): 'it seems apparent that Eumenes was intermittently involved in Armenia perhaps until 320, campaigning in 322 and 321.'

From the start of the First Diadoch War (**item 33**) onwards, the frequency and length of Nepos' omissions decrease, as the biographer focuses on the two major episodes:

1) The Battle of the Hellespont – Eumenes vs. Craterus and Neoptolemus (3.3-4.4)

2) Eumenes vs. Antigonus (5.2-12-4)

Nepos chooses to ignore Eumenes' first engagement of the war: his defeat of Neoptolemus in Phrygia (**item 39**) ten days (Plut. *Eum.* 8.1) before his victory at the Battle of the Hellespont against both Craterus and Neoptolemus.¹³⁷ This latter battle provided a wealth of material for Nepos: notably Eumenes' exemplary *calliditas ingenii* (3.3-6), which makes sure none of his Macedonian soldiers face Craterus, but think that they are fighting 'some barbarian tribe' (3.5: *persuaderet se contra quosdam barbaros proficisci*), and Eumenes' single combat against Neoptolemus, whom he defeats (4.2).¹³⁸ Eumenes thus was not only an exceptional *dux*, but also a good *miles*. His battle with Neoptolemus was bland material by comparison — for Nepos' purposes, he only needed one battle, and especially the example of Eumenes' personal bravery expressed in single combat.

vii) Eumenes' wintering in Celaenae (**item 47**), xiii) and xiv), Eumenes' movements relating to Phoenicia and xv) Babylon, his wintering in a Carian village xvi) and arrival in Susa xviii) simply put Eumenes in specific locations at specific times; no exploits of any kind are lost.

¹³⁷ On the uncertain location of this engagement, see Anson (2015: 118 n. 50): 'Nepos (*Eum.* 5. 1) mistakenly places the battle at or near (*apud*) the Hellespont (accepted by Hornblower [1981: 6 n. 11, 30 n. 43]; Billows [1997: 65]). Diodorus (18.37.1) places the battles 'near Cappadocia'. Nepos is most likely reflecting the original location of Eumenes' forces (D.S. 18.29.3), while Diodorus clearly in the midst of abbreviating his source has left the location of the battle ambiguous.'

¹³⁸ Craterus was highly respected by the Macedonian rank and file, as one of Alexander's most influential *hetairoi* and infantry commanders (Heckel: 2016: 123-124); Plut. *Eum.* 7.1-2: ἀντέταξε δὲ Κρατερῶ Μακεδόνων μὲν οὐδένα ... ἐδεδίει γὰρ ἰσχυρῶς τοὺς Μακεδόνας, μὴ γνωρίσαντες τὸν Κρατερὸν οἴχονται μεταβαλόμενοι πρὸς ἐκείνον. The contest between Eumenes and Neoptolemus is certainly pseudo-Homeric in how it is cast, Plut. *Eum.* 7 gives an extended account of this single combat, as does Nepos.

xix) The last exclusion of any consequence, given the focus on the struggle between Eumenes and Antigonos, is a battle between the two at the Coprates River (**item 88**). Antigonos attempted to cross the Coprates, but Eumenes routed Antigonos' men who had managed to make a crossing. Diodorus (19.18.7) speaks about the scale of the rout and Plutarch (*Eum.* 14.8-11) emphasizes the consequence of the victory which brought home to the Macedonians that Eumenes was the best of the commanders present and that the Macedonians thought that he alone was competent to lead them.¹³⁹ For Nepos, this episode would not fit with his *invidia* motif and the military encounter was not a set battle and had no lasting consequence, unlike those at Paraetacene and Gabiene.

Of passages that are more 'political than 'military', that is, embodying different kinds of silences, viii) is an intriguing exclusion by Nepos, the 'failed negotiations of Perdiccan leaders' (**item 48**), but probably he does not want to complicate the narrative with more names and political bargaining.

xi) and xii) After his relief from siege at Nora, Eumenes was made commander of Asia and was joined by the Silver Shields (**item 67**) on the command of the regent Polyperchon (D.S. 18.53.3-4).¹⁴⁰ Plutarch (*Eum.* 13.2-3) mentions that the Silver Shields were envious (*φθόνος*) of Eumenes and held him in disdain. Given that Nepos repeated and explicitly states that Eumenes was the subject of *invidia*, it is interesting that he does not introduce the Silver Shields and their *φθόνος*, especially given that it was the Silver

¹³⁹ Plut *Eum.* 14.4: ἄρχειν δὲ καὶ πολεμεῖν δυνατὸν ἡγούμενοι μόνον ἐκεῖνον.

¹⁴⁰ The Silver Shields (Ἀργυράσπιδες) were an elite unit of 3000 of hypaspists (ὕπασπιστής, literally 'shield-bears') from Alexander's former infantry guard. They were so named because they had embellished their shields with silver while campaigning in India (Arr. 7.11.3; Curt. 9. 3. 21; D.S. 17.95.4). A key feature of this group was their age, of whom the youngest was 60 (Plut. *Eum.* 16.4; D.S. 19.41.2). For their origins, see Lock (1977), and Anson (1981 and 1988), and for an assessment of them and their abilities, see Baynham (2013). For specifically Eumenes and the Silver Shields, see Roisman (2012: 177-236).

Shields who would ultimately betray Eumenes (Plut. *Eum.* 17.12).¹⁴¹ Rather, he speaks generally of *invidia ducum* and *perfidia Macedonum veteranorum* probably because introducing the Silver Shields would interrupt the flow of the narrative in which the clear focus is the campaign against Antigonus.¹⁴² Moreover, given his decision to excise Polyperchon from the narrative (see below), there is no mechanism by which he can introduce the Silver Shields without having to address the fact that Antipater had died and that there was a new regent.¹⁴³

xvii) Nepos omits Eumenes' meeting with the governors of the eastern satrapies at Susa in the spring of 316 BC at which there was contestation over who should be supreme commander and where Eumenes made a diplomatically-wise suggestion. Once again, it would be entirely rational to suppose that Nepos excised this event, despite its consequence, because 1) it would break the narrative focus on the conflict between Eumenes and Antigonus; 2) it does not provide any worthwhile new *exemplum*, being little more than a doublet of the 'Alexander Tent' episode (7.1-3); and 3) because it complicates the political side of the biography. Arguably, Nepos wishes to emphasise the way in which Eumenes is alone in his fight for

¹⁴¹ For φθόνος in Plutarch's *Eumenes*, see also 18.1 and *comp. Sert. et Eum.* 1.8-9. On Eumenes' relationship with the Silver Shields, stage by stage, see Roisman (2012: 177-236), who in two chapters analyses the difficulties Eumenes experienced with them, and especially draws out contest of leadership in the royal army.

¹⁴² The only break in the military narrative is chapter 6, where Olympias asks Eumenes to fight for Alexander's children. However, at 6.1-5, although presented as describing correspondence between Eumenes and Olympias alone, is in fact best seen as a combination of a variety of epistolary exchanges between Eumenes and Olympias, but also Polyperchon (see D.S. 18.57-58). Plutarch (*Eum.* 13.1-2), in addition to outlining Olympias' plea, albeit very briefly, adds a letter from Polyperchon (as regent for Philip Arrhidaeus and Alexander IV): φεύγοντι δὲ Εὐμενεῖ γράμματα κομίζεται παρὰ τῶν ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ τὴν Ἀντιγόνου δεδοικότεων αὔξησιν, Ὀλυμπιάδος μὲν παρακαλοῦσης ἐλθόντα τὸ Ἀλεξάνδρου παιδίον παραλαβεῖν καὶ τρέφειν ὡς ἐπιβουλευόμενον, Πολυσπέρχοντος δὲ καὶ Φιλίππου τοῦ βασιλέως κελευόντων Ἀντιγόνῳ πολεμεῖν τῆς ἐν Καππαδοκίᾳ δυνάμεως ἄρχοντα. This clearly shows Eumenes and Polyperchon as allies, or at least about to become allies (**item 65**) — that is, through their communication. As also seen in Diodorus Siculus (18.58.1), Polyperchon made Eumenes commander of Asia (cf. Antipater making Antigonus commander in Asia): ὡς ἂν ἀποδεδειγμένῳ στρατηγῷ τῆς ὅλης Ἀσίας αὐτοκράτορι. A note on Nepos' use of *veteran*, although he never mentions the Silver Shields by name, the use of this term suggests older soldiers such as the Silver Shields were, and perhaps a deliberate word choice in this context (*OLD* s.v. *veteranus* 1).

¹⁴³ Although Nepos includes Antigonus (Heckel (2016: 308-314), one of the commanders of the Silver Shields, in his narrative (5.1, 7.1), he does not mention his role; he is simply a general.

Alexander's children and the Argead house more broadly — that is, by making Eumenes appear as sole (and final) saviour from the death of Perdiccas onwards (5.1), he produces a more dramatic portrayal and characterization of Eumenes.

ix) and ix) present the most significant political omission, namely the appointment of Polyperchon as regent after the death of Antipater. One explanation may be a concern for simplicity, but another overriding consideration may be a desire to present Eumenes as the sole defender of the Argeads after Perdiccas, as can be suggested also by his version of the 'Treaty' of Triparadeisus (Late August/Early September 320 BC), after the death of Perdiccas by which Antipater became the new regent for the kings, redistributed some of the satrapies, and outlawed the Perdiccans (including Eumenes), and Antigonus was made general of Asia and the war against the Perdiccans. Nepos (5.1) deals succinctly with this episode focusing on Antipater as the new regent, and on Eumenes being outlawed. Whereas historically Antipater had possession of the kings, lawfully in Macedonian eyes, and in fighting against Antigonus (Antipater's appointee) Eumenes was fighting against the kings, by excluding Polyperchon Nepos makes Eumenes appear consistently against those who murdered Perdiccas and never an ally of theirs, and remains uninterruptedly on the side of the kings, a splendid example of *fides*.

The exclusion of Polyperchon contributes to the amplification of Eumenes' *fides* in yet another way. At 6.1-5 Nepos includes correspondence from Olympias with the exiled Eumenes asking him to make war on Antigonus. Diodorus (18.57.18) and Plutarch (*Eum.* 13.1-4) show that Nepos has combined different epistolary exchanges between Eumenes and Olympias, but also with Polyperchon, after Eumenes had allied himself with Polyperchon and consequently was made commander of Asia (D. S. 18.58.1). There was important communication from Olympias (cf. D.S. 18.58.3-4) but the appeal for Eumenes to fight

seems to come from Polyperchon. All that was needed, in Nepos' eyes, was for Eumenes to be seen as faithful to the Argead House and fight for Alexander's children.¹⁴⁴

In this chapter, I have discussed Nepos' sources, first broadly, and then specifically with respect to the *Eumenes*. I argued that Nepos, for this biography, utilised Hieronymus of Cardia as his only source, choosing the preeminent history of the early Hellenistic period. Then, by collecting and collating all the available information for Eumenes' life in other Hieronymus-derived sources, I drew up a schema (**Appendix α**), showing hypothetically what Hieronymus' original work contained and thus what was available to Nepos when he came to write *Eumenes*. Then, to understand how and why Nepos uses Hieronymus as he does, I first showed the extent of the abbreviation he undertakes (and some of the consequences of abbreviation). To the end of answering why he abbreviates Hieronymus, I discussed each of Nepos' programmatic statements in *On Foreign Generals* to show his singular focus on his subject's *virtutes* (at the expense of *res gestae*) and then showed how Nepos constructs this biography as an exposition of Eumenes' exemplary *virtutes*, foremost among which are the *calliditas et celeritas* which distinguish his *ingenium*. Anything that does not serve Nepos' exemplary purposes is relegated or minimised; Nepos includes only the briefest of contextualisation of history or politics for his readers. Finally, through close analysis of the text with source and method in mind, I was able to present some answers to both 'how' and 'why' Nepos makes the selections of material that he does.

¹⁴⁴ D.S. 18.58.4 is here very similar in formulation to Nepos: ὁ δ' Εὐμενῆς ... αὐτὸς δ' αἰεὶ τὴν εὐνοίαν βεβαιοτάτην πρὸς τοὺς βασιλεῖς τετηρηκῶς ἔκρινεν Ἀντιγόνῳ μὲν μὴ προσέχειν ἐξιδιαιζομένῳ τὴν βασιλείαν, τοῦ δὲ Ἀλεξάνδρου παιδὸς προσδεομένου βοηθείας διὰ τε τὴν ὀρφανίαν καὶ διὰ τὴν τῶν ἡγεμόνων πλεονεξίαν διέλαβεν ἀρμόζειν ἑαυτῷ πάντα κίνδυνον ἀναδέχασθαι τῆς τῶν βασιλέων σωτηρίας ἕνεκα.

Chapter II: Nepos' Eumenes' — *homo novus*?

II.1 – Nepos' Presentation of Eumenes

In **Chapter 1** I made the case that Nepos draws solely upon Hieronymus of Cardia, the principal source also for many of the extant accounts of the period. I have also attempted to demonstrate how Nepos abbreviated that work as the requirements of his biographical project demanded. This analysis revealed several of the key areas of focus for Nepos (Eumenes' particular virtues: his *fides*, *cura*, *vigilantia*, *patientia*, and *calliditas et celeritas ingenii*), indicating that he had a particular picture of Eumenes that he wished to present, not simply a slavish reproduction of Hieronymus. In this chapter I will briefly examine how the other extant sources dependent on Hieronymus portray Eumenes, demonstrating a largely shared, and overall positive, presentation, but will also demonstrate how Nepos, with his Roman readers in mind, casts Eumenes in such a way as to present him as an 'outsider', and one whose success depended on his own merits, and not the fortune of birth, that is, as a *novus homo* (a 'new man'). This is undoubtedly Nepos' unique contribution to ancient accounts of Eumenes.

To begin, I must reiterate the most important fact about the state of our extant sources, that:

...despite minor divergences all present substantially the same picture of Eumenes, which must be that of Hieronymus. This unanimity is evidence of the extent to which his account dominated the literary tradition.¹

Anson, likewise, can plausibly state that 'the surviving sources are remarkably consistent in their presentation of Eumenes' career' and that '[t]he picture painted by the sources is, indeed, a most sympathetic one.'² However, this is not to say that each of our sources merely replicates the 'Eumenes' of

¹ Westlake (1969: 317); cf. Billows (1991: 328) for the same sentiment, as quoted in **Chapter 1**.

² Quotes from Anson (2015: 4); so too Hornblower (1981: *passim*) and Billows (1991: 333). A preliminary encomium of Eumenes has been surmised that was later expanded by Hieronymus into part of his extensive history (Hornblower 1981: 162–

Hieronymus; there is, as one would expect, a degree of differentiation amongst them. There are, however, recurrent elements, which, importantly, often align with Nepos.

Although regarded as minor sources, the *Heidelberg Epitome* and the *Suda* both provide succinct summaries of Eumenes and his career.³ Given their abbreviated nature these texts may not be of much use historically, but they present a highly distilled version of Hieronymus' Eumenes and a succinct overview of the most important facets of his character and career:

Suda E3579: ὁ δὲ Εὐμένης οὗτος ὑπὸ Ἀντιγόνου ἀναιρεῖται, ἀνὴρ σοφώτερος ἢ κατὰ τοὺς λοιποὺς τῶν Μακεδόνων δόξας εἶναι καὶ ἀνεπίληπτος ἐν στρατηγίαις, ὡς καὶ τῷ ἔπειτα χρόνῳ παρασχεῖν ὄνομα.

HE 3: [1] ὅτι ὁ Εὐμένης σοφὸς ὢν ἐκ τῶν στρατηγῶν καὶ διαδόχων Ἀλεξάνδρου ἐτήρησε στοργὴν ἀδολωτάτην πρὸς τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον καὶ τεθνεῶτα, καὶ ἐπολέμησεν πολλάκις πρὸς τοὺς ἐπεμβαίνοντας τοῖς βασιλικοῖς πράγμασι, καὶ ἐνίκησε μεγάλους πολέμους καὶ στρατηγούς μεγάλους ἐκ τῶν Μακεδόνων. [2] εἶτα ἐπεὶ ὁ Ἀντίγονος πλεονεκτῶν καὶ αὐξανόμενος ἐβούλετο νοσφίζεσθαι καὶ τὸ τῆς βασιλείας ὄνομα, ἐδεήθησαν οἱ βασιλεῖς τοῦ Εὐμένους εἰς βοήθειαν ἢ τε Ὀλυμπίας καὶ ὁ Ἄρριδαῖος ὁ Φίλιππος καὶ ἡ Ἰωνία διὰ γραμμάτων βασιλικῶν. ὅς καὶ ἐπικαμφθεὶς ταῖς ἐκείνων δεήσεσιν ἀνήλθεν εἰς τὰς ἐπέκεινα τῆς Βαβυλωνίας σατραπείας, καὶ συναγαγὼν μεγάλας ἐκεῖθεν δυνάμεις ἐπολέμησε τῷ Ἀντιγόνῳ. καὶ δις καὶ τρίς καὶ νενίκηκε, τάχα δ' ἂν καὶ ἐς τὸ παντελὲς ἠφάνιζεν, εἰ μὴ τινες τῶν περὶ αὐτὸν φίλων ἐπιβουλεύσαντες συνέλαβον καὶ δεδώκασι τῷ Ἀντιγόνῳ. τούτου δὲ γενομένου ἠῤῥήθη ἐς μέγιστον ὁ Ἀντίγονος καὶ ἦν τοῖς ὅλοις ἀπρόσμαχος.⁴

Both texts, with their laudatory comments about Eumenes, are undoubtedly derived from Hieronymus.⁵

That both sources place the greatest emphasis on Eumenes as σοφός and σοφώτερος is striking and aligns well with Nepos' depiction of Eumenes' *calliditas et celeritas ingenii* which operates within the same

3), but (*pace* Hadley (2001: 3–33), it is impossible to distinguish whether our extant accounts used the encomium in addition to Hieronymus' history, especially in the case of Nepos, cf. Lobur (2012: 81 n. 47).

³ What makes their inclusion worthwhile is to show how these character traits are almost certainly not a creation of the writer in question (e.g. *HE* or *Suda* or even Nepos), but rather extend back to an original authority.

⁴ The *Heidelberg Epitome* (Cod. Pal. Gr. 129) is written in the hand of a Byzantine chronicler but is indisputably a revision and abbreviation of an earlier source, the date of which is debated, see Wheatley (2013: 21–22). Its contents are excellently summarised by Wheatley (2013: 23–25, under 'historical remarks').

⁵ The *Suda* entry on Eumenes of Cardia has been spliced onto the end of the entry on Eumenes of Pergamum, a confusion of the kind perpetrated also by L. Ampelius (including Eumenes of Cardia under the heading XXXIII: *Reges Asiae et Pergami*, and likewise confusing the Cardian Eumenes with the Pergamene).

semantic arena as σοφός.⁶ This emphasis in all three writers suggests not a philosophical or academic wisdom, but a practical wisdom seen in strategic or tactical grasp.

The *Suda* goes on to specify that Eumenes was ἀνεπίληπτος ἐν στρατηγίαις — irreproachable in matters of military strategy, which further clarifies the field of application of his σοφία. The implicit suggestion of the *Suda* is that Eumenes was a masterful general, often victorious — an aspect on which the *Heidelberg Epitome* expands: ἐνίκησε μεγάλους πολέμους καὶ στρατηγούς μεγάλους ἐκ τῶν Μακεδόνων. Eumenes was a great military leader.⁷

As Eumenes' second most distinctive characteristic, the *Heidelberg Epitome* emphasizes his devotion to Alexander and consequently his loyalty to the Argead House. Although terms such as πίστις are not used here, it is clear that the Argead family's entreaty to Eumenes to help (ἐδεήθησαν οἱ βασιλεῖς τοῦ Εὐμένους εἰς βοήθειαν) and Eumenes' resultant war against Antigonos shows that he was loyal to the family of Alexander and a person of integrity.⁸ Yet, despite these plainly positive qualities, Eumenes is ultimately betrayed by some of his friends and handed over to Antigonos (εἰ μὴ τινες τῶν περὶ αὐτὸν φίλων ἐπιβουλεύσαντες συνέλαβον καὶ δεδώκασι τῷ Ἀντιγόνῳ). Although not explicitly stated, these φίλοι were Macedonian, and Eumenes was betrayed as a result of the φθόνος/*invidia* of Macedonians — a vital point, which is drawn out more clearly in the less compressed sources.⁹

⁶ *LSJ* A: skilled in any handicraft or art, clever; or *LSJ* A2: clever in practical matters, wise, prudent. Both operate in the same semantic field as *ingenium* (*OLD* s.v. *ingenium* 4 and 6).

⁷ 3.2 goes on say how Eumenes defeated Antigonos two or three times, further testament to his military prowess: καὶ δις καὶ τρίς καὶ νενίκηκε.

⁸ Westlake's (1969: 323) opinion that the *HE* 3.1-2 indicates 'trustworthiness' more than strict loyalty is hard to square with the implicit implications of *HE* 3.1-2, where the personal pleas of Olympias, Philip, and Roxane suggest loyalty to their cause rather than mere reliability.

⁹ Wheatley (2013: 24) puts Eumenes' end eloquently: 'Finally the ironic and undeserved nature of his downfall — a favourite *topos* in the ancient tradition — completes the cameo.'

Arrian's *Successors*, originally written as an historical account in ten books covering the years 323 to 319 BC, cannot have failed to mention and evaluate Eumenes' dispositions at some point. However, as this work survives only as an epitome by Photius, who presents at most a schematic outline of events, one cannot adequately extract an explicit presentation of Eumenes' character. He features only in §§ 11-12, 22-23, 26-27, 30, 49-43, and with negligible comment on his character or actions. Importantly, *Successors* ended at 319 BC, before Eumenes' major conflict with Antigonus, and therefore, it is possible that there was in fact no summative judgement of the Cardian and his character.

The majority of the remaining sources exhibit all of these traits but differ in the degree of prominence they attribute to each. What I show here is that Nepos and the other sources all present the same qualities and obstacles Eumenes faced, but that Nepos transcends the stereotypical portrait of Eumenes as being clever, loyal, able, and lacking in good fortune, and reshapes it into the '*homo novus* package', easily understood by his Triumviral readers.¹⁰ Three main issues have been especially singled out in the sources, as far as Eumenes is concerned: ability, prejudice/discrimination against him.¹¹

Intellect

As shown in **Chapter 1**, Nepos makes much of Eumenes' *calliditas et celeritas ingenii*, thereby helpfully delimiting for the readers the broad term *ingenium* to indicate specifically what will enable Eumenes to excel as *dux* and *imperator*.¹² This quality, and the prominence of Eumenes' *ingenium*, most certainly does

¹⁰ Eumenes' fortune (hitherto not satisfactorily discussed) as seen in the extant sources will be addressed below.

¹¹ As Westlake (1969: 317) says: 'the surviving authorities for the career of Eumenes are in general agreement in differentiating him from most of his principal contemporaries for three main reasons. The first is that he was outstandingly clever, resourceful and persuasive; the second that he was handicapped by being a Greek and not a Macedonian; the third that single-minded loyalty to the Macedonian royal house governed his actions'. So too Hornblower (1981: 155) and Anson (2015: 1-2, 5-7).

¹² His 'mental ability' or 'talent' and his 'skill' (*OLD* s.v. *ingenium* 4 and 6). Argued in in **Chapter 1**, *ingenium* is used only once by Nepos; the readers are evidently supposed to deduce instances of this virtue on their own. Thus, although Nepos' only usage

not originate in Nepos, but goes back to Hieronymus, as it can unambiguously be seen in all parallel sources. Nepos clearly indicates examples of Eumenes' mind at work at 3.4: *Eumenes intellegebat ...*; at 3.5 *visum est prudentissimum*; and at 10.1, where *callidum imperatorem vicit consilio celeritatemque eius impedivit* reintroduces the terminology of 1.3 explicitly denoting Eumenes' superiority over the *callidus* and *celer* Antigonus in those very attributes. It is, however, the various military stratagems employed by Eumenes (for example, at 3.3-6, 5.4-7, 7.1-3, and 8.4-10.1), which preeminently exemplify his *ingenium*, and in fact amount to over half the biography.

Eumenes' intellect deployed primarily in the military sphere can be exemplified in the following passages (this list is not, however, comprehensive, but rather indicative of the prevalence of these exemplary traits). In Diodorus Siculus, examples of Eumenes' military ability are found at 18.29.2 (στρατηγία), 4-5; 18.30-32: (εὐψυχία); 18.60: ἐμφρόνως). In Plutarch, at 5.4-5 (προνοίας καὶ παρασκευῆς); 7.5-8.1 (ταύτην τὴν μάχην Εὐμενῆς ἡμέραις δέκα σχεδόν τι μετὰ τὴν προτέραν ἐνίκησε: καὶ δόξη μὲν ἦρθη μέγας ἀπ' αὐτῆς, ὡς τὰ μὲν σοφία...; cf. 'wisdom' in *HE* and *Suda*); 9.3-10.2: Eumenes' well-executed retreat after the battle of Orkynia; and Plutarch praises Eumenes' ability in battle again in this conclusion (*Comp. Ser. et Eum.* 1.8-9). Likewise, Justin heaps repeated praise on Eumenes as *dux* (for example, 13. 8. 3-9; 14.1.1-5, 9-12, 14.2.12). So too the *HE*, as noted above, but seen best in the following: ὃς καὶ ἐπικαμφθεὶς ταῖς ἐκείνων δεήσεσιν ἀνῆλθεν εἰς τὰς ἐπέκεινα τῆς Βαβυλωνίας σατραπείας, καὶ συναγαγὼν μεγάλας ἐκεῖθεν δυνάμεις ἐπολέμησε τῷ Ἀντιγόνῳ. καὶ δις καὶ τρίς καὶ νενίκηκε (3.2). Finally, Polyaeus includes five examples of Eumenes' military skills in his work on stratagems (4.8.1-5).¹³ Thus, Eumenes' σοφία/*ingenium*, which enabled him to win victories against superior numbers in many campaigns during

probably has the meaning of *OLD* 4 ('mental powers', 'talent', 'ability') that does not preclude other shades of the term when the readers are assessing where evidence of this quality appears.

¹³ However, 4.8.2 and 4.8.4 are his best known stratagems (and seen in Nepos: *Eum* 7, and 8-9).

the internecine conflicts that followed the death of Alexander is the primary quality identified in the Hieronymean tradition.

Loyalty

Second in prominence and ubiquity is Eumenes' loyalty, especially to the Argead House. Beyond the repeated examples presented by Nepos, loyalty is celebrated in important extant parallel sources (but absent from Justin) primarily through πίστις and its cognates in our Greek sources.¹⁴ In Diodorus, Eumenes' πίστις (and cognates) appear across Books 18 to 19. At D.S. 18.29.2: διὰ τὴν τῆς πίστεως βεβαιότητα; at 18.53.7 προστῆναι τῶν βασιλέων (loyalty assumed; at 18.57.3-4 ἀπεφαίνετο μάλιστα πάντων πρέπειν Εὐμενῆ τῆς βασιλικῆς οἰκίας κήδεσθαι καὶ φροντίζειν (loyalty assumed); at 18.58.2-4 πιστότατον ... τῶν φίλων ... αὐτὸς δ' αἰετὴν τὴν εὐνοίαν βεβαιοτάτην πρὸς τοὺς βασιλεῖς τετηρηκῶς ἔκρινεν Ἀντιγόνῳ μὲν μὴ προσέχειν ἐξιδιαιζομένῳ τὴν βασιλείαν; and at 19.42.5 τὴν δεδομένην ὑπὸ τῶν βασιλέων πίστιν. In Plutarch, we find Eumenes' loyalty brought to the fore at 1.4: μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἐκείνου τελευτὴν οὔτε συνέσει τινὸς οὔτε πίστει λείπεσθαι δοκῶν τῶν περὶ Ἀλέξανδρον ἐκαλεῖτο μὲν ἀρχιγραμματεὺς. And, *HE* 3.2 assumes the loyalty of Eumenes to the Argead family: εἶτα ἐπεὶ ὁ Ἀντίγονος πλεονεκτῶν καὶ αὐξανόμενος ἐβούλετο νοσφίζεσθαι καὶ τὸ τῆς βασιλείας ὄνομα, **ἐδέηθησαν** οἱ βασιλεῖς τοῦ Εὐμένους **εἰς βοήθειαν** ἢ τε Ὀλυμπιάς καὶ ὁ Ἀρριδαῖος ὁ Φίλιππος καὶ ἡ Ῥωξάνη διὰ γραμμάτων βασιλικῶν.

¹⁴ Examples from Nepos, summarily from chapter 1: 1.5, 2.3, 3.1 (to Perdiccas, as regent), 6.1-5 (to Olympias and Alexander's children), therefore Argead House, and 13.2-3 as the last champion of the Argead House. Cf. lack of *fides* by his enemies at 4.3 and *perfidia* of his generals at 10.2-3. On the absence of *fides* in Justin, see Heckel and Wheatley (2011: 2-3) who note, and as was addressed in **Chapter 1**, that Pompeius Trogus relied on numerous sources, and not Hieronymus alone, from whom the theme of loyalty surely stems. Therefore this absence of *fides* in Justin's epitome of Trogus may be either the result of severe abbreviation on behalf of Justin and/or compositional choices (sources, narrative focus etc.) on behalf of Trogus himself — both scenarios could lead to the disposal of *fides*. This is to say that although Eumenes' *fides* is not present in Justin, one cannot be certain that it was absent from Pompeius Trogus original work.

Thus, *calliditas et celeritas ingenii* and *fides* are to be seen as the two most significant qualities that aided and abetted Eumenes' rise from the position of *scriba/grammateus* to Philip II and Alexander to become the leader of the royal army after the death of Perdiccas.

Prejudice

A great success in Greece could always expect φθόνος (often from the gods). In the case of Eumenes φθόνος/*invidia* is motivated primarily not by his superiority and success alone but by the fact that he was not Macedonian, and Anson, for example, is able to say that '[w]hile successful in battle, Eumenes' brilliance, however, was doomed to failure before the all-consuming prejudice of his Macedonian officers and soldiers'.¹⁵ Nepos emphasises from his opening remarks in this *Life* the *invidia* of the Macedonians towards Eumenes as a Greek and his superiority over them (1.2-3). The most detailed example of this *invidia*, and Eumenes' explicit cognisance of it occurs at 7.1-3 (the Alexander Tent stratagem): *invidiam verens*. Eumenes wanted to make it seem as if the decisions of the army were being made not by himself but by Alexander (which he felt would elicit less jealousy). Again at 10.1 Nepos writes that it was the *perfidia* of the Macedonians and the *invidia* of the generals that lead to Eumenes' betrayal to Antigonos, and ultimately his death.¹⁶

Hieronymus, as a fellow Cardian, can be expected to have given this full weight in his narrative, as I have suggested in **Chapter 1**, and those who draw on his account in their various ways also record this (save again for Justin).¹⁷ Diodorus at 18.29 speaks of Neoptolemus being jealous of Eumenes (ὁ μὲν Νεοπτόλεμος φθονήσας τῷ Εὐμένει); at 18.60.1 Eumenes anticipates that he will be envied by the

¹⁵ Anson (2015: 1).

¹⁶ All this is drawn out more extensively in **Chapter 1**.

¹⁷ Anson (2015: 6): in 'Diodorus, Plutarch, and Nepos, he is routinely depicted as a foreigner whose achievements are resented by the Macedonians.'

Macedonians under his command (καταφρόνησιν ἅμα καὶ φθόνον); and at 18.61.2 Eumenes attempts to wear down this growing envy (καθ' ἑαυτοῦ φθόνον ἀπετρίψατο). In Plutarch, φθόνος is equally prevalent. At 8.1 Plutarch relates how Eumenes' victory at the battle of the Hellespont only helped swell the Macedonian envy against him (φθόνον δὲ πολὺν ἔσχε); and, at 13.4 the envy of the Silver Shields is made clear (φθόνου δὲ καὶ φιλονεικίας ἐφαίνοντο μεστοί, δευτερεύειν ἀπαξιοῦντες ἐκείνω, τὸν μὲν φθόνον ὁ Εὐμενῆς ἐθεράπευε τῶ τὰ χρήματα μὴ λαβεῖν ὡς οὐδὲν δεόμενος). Finally, in Plutarch's comparison between the lives of *Sertorius* and *Eumenes* (*Comp. Ser. et Eum.* 1.3), he further emphasises the φθόνος that the latter faced as a result of his successes and the dangers it brought upon him (ὁ κίνδυνος ὑπὸ τῶν φθονούντων).

Treachery of Opponents

Anson rightly points out that Eumenes' enemies' are routinely depicted as 'rapacious and faithless', even Perdiccas.¹⁸ Only Antigonus escapes such negative treatment.¹⁹ Although it may be on the surface be surprising that Eumenes' archenemy is to be seen in a positive light, one should recall that, after Eumenes' death, Hieronymus entered the service of Antigonus (D.S. 19.44.3) and later his son Demetrius, and finally, Antigonus Gonatas. Hieronymus' history, which had begun with Eumenes' career, moved on to cover the Antigonids.²⁰ This extended career under the Antigonids retrospectively enabled their reputations to be improved. Hieronymus' own standing and reputation among his Antigonids, and his proximity to them informed the remainder of his history.

¹⁸ See for enemies: D.S. 18.7.4, 41.4–5, 47.3, 50.5, 58.4; 19.19.4, 90.3–4; Plut. *Eum.* 3.5; Just. 13.8.3; 14.3, 11; Nepos *Eum.* 10.1–2; 13. 1–3. For negative opinions on Perdiccas, see D.S. 18.33.3; Arr. *Succ.* 1.20, 28; Nepos *Eum.* 2.3; Justin 13.8.2.

¹⁹ Anson: Indeed, Antigonus is praised as energetic, intelligent, daring, and as a skilful general (D.S. 18.23.3–4, 72.5, 73.1; 19.30.1; Plut. *Ser.* 1. 5; Polyaeus 3.6.1–20; Justin 14.3.2).

²⁰ Hornblower (1981: 211): 'Hieronymus' history of Eumenes was probably the most colourful part of his history, but not the most objective; and it was actually the death of Eumenes which emancipated Hieronymus as a historian: with it we leave the realm of apologia and memoir writing and enter upon the struggle for 'the whole', which centred on the figure of Antigonus Monophthalmus.'

The overwhelmingly positive presentation of Eumenes across all our extant sources stems undoubtedly from Hieronymus, and importantly so too does the characterisation of his enemies and allies.²¹ Hieronymus, I suggest, is extremely sympathetic to Eumenes, but purposely characterises other actors as a foil for Eumenes: where Eumenes is loyal, his enemies are faithless; Eumenes' *fides* is emphasised and exacerbated by the display of opposite qualities in his enemies.²²

This brief survey has demonstrated the overwhelming agreement of the Hieronymean sources on what constituted the ἀρετή/*virtus* of Eumenes in such a way that we can see that Nepos has also read Hieronymus intelligently and identified the key qualities in his subject. Next I will discuss (i) whether or not Nepos' treatment of Eumenes' *fortuna*, which is signalled as prominently as his *virtus* (*Eum.* 1.1), is Hieronymean and (ii) whether or not Nepos has adapted it from its Hellenistic origins to suit the context of Triumviral Rome.

In modern scholarship little attention has been paid to the role of *fortuna* or τύχη ('fortune' or 'chance') in Eumenes' life and career, although it is a key motif in Diodorus Siculus Book 18 and Plutarch's *Eumenes*, and indeed appears in the opening sentence of Nepos' work, powerfully contrasted with Eumenes' unquestionable *virtus*. We can venture explanations of what 'fortune' meant to both Diodorus and Plutarch, because the former speaks almost programmatically about it in connection with Eumenes, and

²¹ see **Chapter 1**.

²² Put simply, Eumenes is made to look as good as possible (see Hornblower quote in n. 20 above). He is a paradigm of loyalty and ability. For the most part his foes are not, and the same for his allies. This can be seen in 2.3-5, where we see explicitly Eumenes as loyal to the Argead state, versus Leonnatus who despite being a satrap yearns for even more power, and decides to usurp Macedonia.

because the latter makes extensive use of the concept across his biographical and philosophical works.²³

However, scholarship on *fortuna* in Nepos is slender.²⁴

Diodorus' account of Eumenes is punctuated by individual instances of τύχη but also features a programmatic evaluation of her role in Eumenes' whole career. At 18.41.6 she appears for the first time: ὁ δὲ εἰδὼς τὴν τύχην ὀξέως μεταβάλλουσαν μείζονα ἤτι φιλανθρωπίας τῆς περὶ αὐτὸν οὔσης περιστάσεως, explicitly recognised by Eumenes himself as 'ever changing', a fluctuating force, that will sometimes favour one, and sometimes do one a disservice. Landucci Gattinoni calls this passage, and the next: 'Paremiographic'.²⁵ At 18.42.1, Diodorus repeats the idea immediately after mentioning Hieronymus (αὐτὸς [Eumenes] δὲ πολλαῖς καὶ ποικίλαις κεχρημένος τοῦ βίου μεταβολαῖς οὐκ ἔταπεινοῦτο τῷ φρονήματι) and again uses the language of fluctuation (μεταβόλαι); πολλαῖς καὶ ποικίλαις emphasises the vicissitudes of τύχη, i.e. not one single change in a lifetime. Eumenes again recognises *Tyche's* role and Diodorus as historian endorses his view. 18.53.1 presents a third instance: οὗτος γὰρ μεγάλαις καὶ παραδόξοις μεταβολαῖς χρώμενος διετέλεσεν αἰεὶ παρ' ἐλπίδας ἀγαθῶν τε καὶ κακῶν μεταλαμβάνων, with the same language of repeated fluctuation but also the idea of unexpectedness. One cannot escape the conclusion that Diodorus insists upon the prevalence and importance of fortune (both positive and negative) in *il 'destino di Eumene'*.²⁶ However, at 18.59.4-7 Diodorus, in the context of the arrival of the Silver Shields on the behest of Polyperchon and Eumenes no longer being an enemy of the state, presents his most important excursus on fortune, which takes the readers back to the same ideas: πάντες δ' ἔθαύμαζον τὸ τῆς τύχης εὐμετάβολον καὶ παράδοξον (18.59.4). Here, Diodorus (or, better, his source)

²³ On τύχη in Diodorus Siculus 18, see esp. Landucci Gattinoni (2018: 195, 227, 244-246) and Sacks (1990: 40-41). On Plutarch and τύχη, see Brenk (1977: 145-183) and Tatum (2010).

²⁴ The only work dedicated to *fortuna* in Nepos is Jefferis (1943).

²⁵ Landucci Gattinoni (2018 *ad loc.*).

²⁶ Landucci Gattinoni (2018 *ad loc.*); this view of τύχη is expanded through the rest of the passage, 18.53.1-4.

interrupts an eventful story to begin a long and detailed reflection on the ‘fickleness of fortune’, which certainly condenses Diodorus’ view of this concept (cf. 18.60.1), and likewise, the importance of this concept to his history as a whole.²⁷ Fittingly, Eumenes is said to have foreseen that fortune would change again (προορώμενος τὴν τῆς τύχης καινοτομίαν, 18.60.1). Sacks comments that because the ‘slant on τύχη’ relating to Eumenes differs slightly from that elsewhere in the work the former is taken from Hieronymus, whereas Hornblower is more inclined to see Diodorus’ philosophical reflections on the τύχη of Eumenes at 18.59 as reflecting his own preoccupations.²⁸ I do not see the two views as mutually exclusive: Diodorus’ slant on τύχη and Eumenes may well be his own invention, but the historical reality of Eumenes’ changing fortunes must have been present in Hieronymus’ original, as it would be exceedingly unlikely that three separate sources would latch onto this feature of his life.²⁹

By contrast to Diodorus, Plutarch uses τύχη only once in reference to Eumenes, saying that he his ‘fortunes were changeable’ (πολυτρόπῳ παρὰ τὰς τύχας, *Eum.* 16.6). But the programmatic statement about τύχη at the beginning of his *Sertorius*: ἐν ἀπειρῷ τῷ χρόνῳ τῆς τύχης ἄλλοτ’ ἄλλως ῥεούσης (*Sert.* 1.1), reveals a similarity in the role of τύχη in both Sertorius’ life and that of Eumenes.³⁰ Indeed, Plutarch’s comments at the beginning of the paired biography of *Sertorius* retrospectively impress on his readers

²⁷ The story of Eumenes’ leaving Cappadocia and being met by the Shiver Shields. Landucci Gattinoni (2018: 224).

²⁸ Hornblower (1981: 60-61).

²⁹ Landucci Gattinoni (2018: 224) is repeatedly reticent to name a source for these episodes, saying ‘*Diodoro (o, meglio, la sua fonte)*’.

³⁰ Bosworth (1992: 61) addresses the similarity, in respect to fortune: ‘A rapid rise to distinction and office is followed by initial military success. Then comes the *first peripeteia*: proscription at the hands of the faction victorious in civil war. Next there is a time of troubles, a wandering from bolt-hole to bolt-hole under constant military harassment. This takes us to the nadir of fortune, Sertorius relegated to petty warfare in Mauretania and Eumenes under siege at Nora. The crucial turn of fortune now comes for both, with unsolicited invitations of employment. Sertorius is transferred to Lusitania, to organize the native resistance there, while Eumenes is appointed royal general in Asia and given command of the Silver Shields. Both men then engage in successful warfare against the leading generals of the day, until they are removed by treachery. The two narratives are clearly not mirror images, but they do display a similar ebb and flow of fortune, with the high and low points occurring at comparable stages.’

that ἄδικος and βίαια τύχη were experienced by both: τύχη δὲ χρησάμενοι βιαίῳ καὶ ἀδίκῳ περὶ τὴν τελευτὴν ἐπιβουλευθέντες γὰρ ἀμφοτέρω, μεθ' ὧν τοὺς πολεμίους ἐνίκων, ὑπὸ τούτων ἀνηρέθησαν (*Sert.* 1.11-12). Diodorus uses μεταβολή twice (18.53.1, 59.4); Plutarch only uses πολύτροπος (*Eum.* 16.6), but it would not be wrong to think in terms of Aristotelian *peripeteia*.³¹ Plutarch, however, when he reflects on the effects of *peripeteia* makes a very different point to Diodorus, he is attempting to avoid a τύχη-driven analysis.

Bosworth's use of the term *peripeteia* is appropriate, as the reversals of fortune experienced by Eumenes are pronounced.³² There is a close parallel to what can be seen in Diodorus, and as such, markedly different to the way *fortuna* is addressed and portrayed in Nepos' biography. This, however, is not the only direct reference to misfortunes undergone by Eumenes. At 9.1-2 Plutarch explains:

τὸ μὲν οὖν εὐτυχεῖν καὶ τοὺς φύσει μικροὺς συνεπικουφίζει τοῖς φρονήμασιν, ὥστε φαίνεσθαι τι μέγεθος περὶ αὐτοὺς καὶ ὄγκον ἐκ πραγμάτων ὑπερεχόντων ἀποβλεπομένους; ὁ δὲ ἀληθῶς μεγαλόφρων καὶ βέβαιος ἐν τοῖς σφάλμασι μᾶλλον καὶ ταῖς δυσημερίαις ἀναφέρων γίνεται κατάδηλος, ὥσπερ Εὐμενῆς.

Here Plutarch speaks rather of δυσημερία for misfortune.³³ The crux of the matter at 9.1 is Plutarch's saying after the philosophical judgement ὥσπερ Εὐμενῆς — directly asserting that Eumenes underwent a series of misfortunes. And in doing so Plutarch again draws attention to the significance of τύχη in his narration of Eumenes' life, in a manner that is distinctly reminiscent of τύχη in Diodorus. In both Diodorus and Plutarch, we can see the concept of a fickle τύχη that is ever changing and most probably found its origin in the work of Hieronymus of Cardia.³⁴

³¹ Bosworth (1992: 61 and n. 40).

³² Bosworth (1992: 61 and n. 40).

³³ *LSJ* s.v. δυσημερία A1.

³⁴ Hence why Sacks (1990: 40-41) can claim that Diodorus' conception of fortune in Book 18 is, bar one example elsewhere, unique to his historical work (because he relied on Hieronymus for this book).

An analysis of Nepos' conception of *fortuna*, will show that he is using this concept in a distinctly different way to Diodorus and Plutarch. Jefferis has demonstrated that Nepos uses *fortuna* with six different meanings, that he categorises as follows:³⁵

- 1) **Something which can be molded by man**, which can scarcely be termed 'blind or wilful dominion of chance': (*Dion* 6.1; *Milt.* 3.3; *Han.* 13.3; *Att.* 11.6, 19.1).
- 2) **Definite personification.** (*Thras.* 1.4).
- 3) **Chance** (*Thras.* 1.1, 1.5; *Dion* 9.2; *Eum.* 6.5; *Timoth.* 3.4); cf. **Capricious power of chance** (*Timoth.* 4.1; *Att.* 10.2).
- 4) **Good fortune** (*Cim.* 2.2; *Alc.* 9. 4; *Dat.* 5.4; *Eum.* 1.1 (twice); *Att.* 3.3, 10.5, 19.3).
- 5) **Bad fortune** (*Cim.* 4.2; *Ag.* 5.2; *Timol.* 2.2; *Att.* 11.2; *Phoc.* 2.1; *Milt.* 2.5; *Con.* 5.1; *Timol.* 1.2; *Ham.* 4.1; and *Att.* 9.5; the last two instance *fortuna* should, for Jefferis, more properly be classed as 'wealth'.
- 6) **Wealth** (*Pelop.* 5.1).

Even if one might disagree with individual categories, it is clear that Nepos' meaning of *fortuna* in any specific case can only be inferred through context.³⁶ What is, however, clear is that Nepos does not, besides at *Thrasylbulus*. 1.4, use *fortuna* 'with a big F' as a theological abstraction. Instead, most of Nepos' usages of *fortuna* denote good or bad luck, and chance. Jefferis' view that Nepos 'had no very clear idea in his own head of exactly what he meant by the word' is harsh, and emblematic of the prevailing opinion of Nepos in the 1940s.³⁷ I would argue that Nepos is cognisant of the many shades of meaning available, and possible uses of *fortuna*. There is clearly a degree of sophistication at work in Nepos' use of the term, as the schema above hopefully exhibits (contra what Jefferis may think). However, the uses of *fortuna* in *Eumenes* must be our focus here.

At *Eum.* 1.1, Nepos juxtaposes two prominent terms central to Roman political and military discourse, *virtus* and *fortuna*.³⁸ In almost all accounts, *virtus* was paramount to the Romans as the traditional quality

³⁵ Jefferis (1943).

³⁶ This is not a comprehensive list of meanings of *fortuna* in Latin; see Kajanto (1981) for an introduction to the issue, but for full coverage of *fortuna*'s meanings in literary sources, see Matthews (2011: 100-140); cf. Miano (2018) who addresses *Fortuna* specifically as a deity and the related shades of meaning.

³⁷ Jefferis (1943: 50).

³⁸ *Eumenes Cardianus. Huius si virtuti par data esset fortuna, non ille quidem maior exstitisset, sed multo illustrior atque etiam honoratior, quod magnos homines virtute metimur, non fortuna.*

that played ‘a central role in politics, war, and religion.’³⁹ With the *virtus-fortuna* apposition Nepos employs and adapts the ἀρετή-τύχη trope which he would have found in his Greek sources and models.⁴⁰ The *virtus-fortuna* pairing conveys a characteristic concern: the relationship between human power and ability, and external forces.⁴¹ In many Greek historical works τύχη was a fickle, malicious, and chaotic power, perhaps best translated as ‘blind chance’ but neither Nepos, nor Romans generally, need have perceived *fortuna* in the same way, while Matthews indeed argues that in coming to Rome τύχη ‘lost the attributes of fickleness.’⁴² Nepos then would be asserting that Eumenes was endowed with innate ability but suffered from a paucity of good luck. In fact, beyond the two authorial assertions of Eumenes’ *virtus* Nepos expressly highlights that the misfortunes suffered by Eumenes were the result of others’ objections to his *virtus* (*tanta fuit nonnullorum virtutis obtrectatio*, 10.2), that is, an utterly human (even rational) response and not the hand of a fickle deity. Despite its prominence at the outset, the term appears elsewhere in the life only once (6.5), when Eumenes is asked by Olympias to fight for Alexander’s family — presenting Eumenes with possible death, and most likely with the meaning of chance.⁴³

It is evident that Nepos in his *Eumenes* is not using ‘fortune’ in the same way as Diodorus and Plutarch; there is no *peripeteia*, no fluctuations, and in fact, no change. Eumenes’ *fortuna* in Nepos is static; he is seen as simply deficient in good luck.⁴⁴ Now, if we assume that the fickle τύχη and/or μεταβολή found in Diodorus and Plutarch springs from Hieronymus, Nepos too might have been expected to follow Hieronymus’ line, but he does not. Τύχη’s loss of fickleness in coming to Rome may be a shorthand

³⁹ McDonnell (2006: 2). The best introduction to *virtus* is Balmaceda (2017: 14-47).

⁴⁰ Eisenhut (1973: 47). On this, see also: McDonnell (2006: 72-83) and Balmaceda (2017: 19-25). On the issues of translating τύχη into Latin, see Miano (2018: 157-177).

⁴¹ McDonnell, 2006: 85).

⁴² Kajanto (1981: *passim*); Matthews (2011: 1).

⁴³ Jefferis (1943: 49). 6.5: *his rebus Eumenes permotus satius duxit, si ita tulisset fortuna, perire bene meritis referentem gratiam quam ingratum vivere.*

⁴⁴ The use of *fortuna* at 6.5 exists outside of Nepos’ original judgement at 1.1 which should be taken as Eumenes’ actual *fortuna*.

explanation for Nepos' deviation from Hieronymus. However, reading the opening of the *Eumenes* more carefully, Nepos explains plausibly why Eumenes suffered a lack of *fortuna*: *nam* (1.2) tells the readers that the principal reason for Eumenes' apparent lack of *fortuna* is because he was a Greek living in a Macedonian world (1.2-3). As such, his was simply a misfortune of birth.

II.2 – Nepos' Eumenes — *homo novus*?

I have demonstrated that there is a consistent and recurrent collection of traits ascribed to Eumenes across our sources: ability/wisdom (*calliditas ingenii* or σοφός); loyalty (*fides* or πίστις); prejudice against Eumenes (*invidia* or φθόνος); and the impact of fortune (*fortuna* or τύχη). In presenting Eumenes as endowed with these attributes, our sources reproduce, to a greater or less degree, the idealised 'Eumenes' of Hieronymus of Cardia.⁴⁵ None of the other 'Hieronymean' sources is confronted with the problem that faced Nepos, of presenting Eumenes to an audience unfamiliar with the Hellenistic world and, probably, with Greek. I will now demonstrate how Nepos casts Eumenes in a different light for his Roman readers.

In this respect, I present a theory, which as far as I know, is entirely novel: that Nepos, while accommodating all the major elements of the Hieronymean tradition, consciously and clearly portrays Eumenes (a Greek among Macedonians) in the form of a *homo novus* ('a new man'). By employing language and tropes that would be familiar to, and easily understood by, his Triumviral readers, he can render Eumenes in a manner that would make sense to his audience, mostly unacquainted with Greek, and more specifically Macedonian, history and culture of the fourth century BC.⁴⁶ Nepos astutely perceived that the characteristics attributed to Eumenes, as found in his source, provided him with the

⁴⁵ We have noted that Nepos' treatment of *fortuna* is different and here will show how that too relates to the Roman context of *novitas*.

⁴⁶ Cf. Nepos' *expertes Graecarum litterarum* (*Praef.* 2) and *rudibus Graecarum litterarum* (*Pelop.* 1.1).

material for an entirely original and still unique ‘version’ of Eumenes. Although he does not ever explicitly state that Eumenes is a *homo novus*, I hope to demonstrate that this is implicitly the case.

The language that Nepos uses to portray the primary virtues of Eumenes is particularly reminiscent of the way Roman *homines novi* are spoken about and, indeed, speak about themselves, in our sources. Through an analysis of the works of Cato Maior, Cicero, and Sallust, three preeminent new men themselves, the language (and ‘ideology’) of *novitas* (that is, ‘newness’) or the quality of being a *homo novus* can be constructed — a nexus of traits and terms centred on *virtus*, *industria*, and *ingenium*.⁴⁷ These three traits will be shown to be those which the aspirant *homo novus* ought to possess. Yet, simultaneously, there are also forces that conspire against him: the *invidia* of the political establishment, and to a limited extent chance.⁴⁸ Importantly, we possess an abbreviated version of Nepos’ *Cato*, in which Nepos himself writes about an authentic *homo novus*.⁴⁹

Language analysis is central to my argument. The first assertion to be made, and the basis of my argument, is that Eumenes’ career (both as described by Nepos, but likewise across the other sources for his life more broadly) as a political and ethnic outsider at the Argead court, who advanced through loyal service to this dynasty, can legitimately be compared to the prejudice and alienation experienced by Romans from outside the *nobilitas* (‘nobility’), as they progressed through the *cursus honorum*. Even if the similarities of language, which are addressed below, were to be disregarded, there is an appreciable equivalence with the material circumstance of Eumenes’ political career and that experienced by Roman *homines novi*. This is to say that Nepos saw in Eumenes a character who, despite being Greek, mirrored eminent Roman ‘new

⁴⁷ Dugan (2005: 13).

⁴⁸ E.g. as seen at *Eum.* 6.5.

⁴⁹ For an introduction to Nepos’ *Cato* and its state of preservation, see Horsfall (1989: 3-4 with commentary); Lobur (2021: 141-143).

men' not only in his lived experience, but also in his character as presented in the source material.

If my argument is convincing, it sheds new light on how Nepos interprets and represents Eumenes for his Triumviral audience, at a time when the *homines novi* were more visible and powerful than ever before. Suetonius (*Aug.* 35.1) speaks of an expansion of the Senate under the Triumvirate, although he avoids mentioning the Triumvirate, and instead speaks of 'after the death of Caesar': *senatorum affluentem numerum deformi et incondita turba—erant enim super mille, et quidam indignissimi et post necem Caesaris per gratiam et praemium adlecti, quos orcovos vulgus vocabat.*⁵⁰ While numbers had risen after the Sullan reforms in 81 BC, which increased the numbers of the Senate from the traditional 300 to 600, and Caesar had recruited many new senators and expanded the number of quaestorships which brought in even more, it was the Triumvirs who deliberately but indiscriminately introduced *homines novi* and raised many of them to *nobilitas* by the sale of high office. Dio (43.47.1-3) relates:⁵¹

ἀριθμὸν δὲ οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι ὅσοιπερ καὶ πρότερον, στρατηγοὶ δὲ τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα ταμίαι τε τεσσαράκοντα ἀπεδείχθησαν. πολλοῖς γὰρ δὴ πολλὰ ὑπεσχημένος οὐκ εἶχεν ὅπως σφᾶς ἄλλως ἀμείψηται, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ταῦτ' ἐποίει. καὶ προσέτι **παμπληθεῖς μὲν ἐς τὴν γερουσίαν, μηδὲν διακρίνων μήτ' εἴ τις στρατιώτης μήτ' εἴ τις ἀπελευθέρου παῖς ἦν, ἐσέγραψεν**, ὥστε καὶ ἐνακοσίους τὸ κεφάλαιον αὐτῶν γενέσθαι, πολλοὺς δὲ καὶ ἐς τοὺς εὐπατρίδας τοὺς τε ὑπατευκότας ἢ καὶ ἄλλην ἀρχὴν τινα ἄρξαντας ἐγκατέλεξεν.⁵²

This expanded Senate and bloating of the magistrates had an appreciable effect on the make-up of that body, as both Suetonius and Dio clearly express, such that the *nova nobilitas* was a blatant reality. Men were admitted not on merit, but on the whims of Caesar, and later of the Triumvirs.⁵³

⁵⁰ See Wardle (2014 *ad loc.*); cf. Dio (52.42.1) for the same information: πολλοὶ μὲν γὰρ ἰππῆς πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ πεζοὶ παρὰ τὴν ἀξίαν ἐκ τῶν ἐμφυλίων πολέμων ἐβούλευον, ὥστε καὶ ἐς χιλίους τὸ πλῆρωμα τῆς γερουσίας αὐξηθῆναι.

⁵¹ See e.g. Suet. *Iul.* 41.1, 80.2.

⁵² cf. Plut. *Ant.* 15.2: πολλοὺς μὲν ἄρχοντας ἀπεδείκνυε, πολλοὺς δὲ βουλευτάς, ἐνίους δὲ καὶ κατήγε πεφυγαδευμένους καὶ καθειργμένους ἔλυνε, ὡς δὴ ταῦτα τῷ Καίσαρι δόξαντα.

⁵³ As a visualization of the increase in magistrates under Caesar, as dictator, see *MRR* (II: 256-315). And, see *MRR* (II: 334-419) for the years of the Triumvirate, which likewise show a vast increase in the number of magistrates elected, or adlected, of whom many were *homines novi*. Cf. Wiseman (1971) for increase in new senators, esp. the prosopographical list (209-283) which is presented in alphabetic order.

Wiseman presents the names of 563 *homines novi* — political newcomers, mostly from the last century of the Republic.⁵⁴ This shows the relevance of new men during this period and suggests that the concept of *novitas* would likely be grasped even by the less politically aware Romans. Nepos, then, purposefully presents Eumenes in a manner that would have been relevant, topical, recognizable, and relatable to his audience.

Before discussing Nepos' presentation of Eumenes as a *homo novus*, we need to understand what is meant by 'homo novus', which requires some survey of the key scholarship on the subject. Henriette van der Blom's recent chapter provides an authoritative introduction to the topic.⁵⁵ There exists no ancient definition for *nobilis* or *homo novus*.⁵⁶ Modern scholars, therefore, posit their own definitions, informed by their readings of the source material and, unsurprisingly, there is much contention and disagreement.⁵⁷ As van der Blom suggests, *nobilitas* and *novitas* ought to be seen as antithetical, best expressed in Joseph Hellegouarc'h's statement that: '*c'est le nouus qui s'oppose au nobilis*.'⁵⁸

I will begin by defining the latter. Mommsen proposed: '*Der Kreis der Nobilität umfasst die drei Kategorien der Patricier, der aus dem Patriciat unter Wahrung des Bürgerrechts ausgeschiedenen und der zu curialischen Ämtern gelangten Plebejer nebst ihrer Descendenz*'.⁵⁹ Crucial here is the *nobiles*' right (*ius*) to display the

⁵⁴ Wiseman's (1971: 209-283) for this number of *homines novi*, noting however, that this list is based on his definition (no senatorial ancestry).

⁵⁵ Van der Blom (2010: 35-59), cf. van der Blom's (2013) comprehensive *Oxford Bibliographies* entry on *homo novus*.

⁵⁶ Gelzer (1969: 28) and Brunt (1982: 1) for *nobilis*; Brunt (1982: 1) and van der Blom (2010: 35) for *homo novus*.

⁵⁷ Van der Blom (2010: 35) says: 'modern scholars have tried to formulate definitions which would cover and explain the various passages referring to *homo novus* and related terms'.

⁵⁸ Hellegouarc'h (1963: 473), but see also: Mommsen (1887 III³: 462-3); assumed throughout by Vogt (1926); assumed by Gelzer (1969: 27-28), who after defining the *nobiles* says, 'on the other hand the *homo novus*, the political self-made man', and defines such a man in term antithetical to the *nobilitas*.

⁵⁹ Mommsen (1887 III³: 463).

imagines, which were wax portraits of their ancestors, in the *atria* of their homes.⁶⁰ On Mommsen's view, this included all patrician families descended from curule office holders.⁶¹ As van der Blom notes, Mommsen's position was unchallenged and adhered to by a majority of scholars into the early twentieth century.⁶² Then, in 1912, Gelzer put forward a new definition: a claim to *nobilitas* 'demanded consular ancestors' — a definition that found much favour.⁶³

These two positions outline and define the concept of *nobilis*, and as a result, also what constituted a *homo novus*. Hence, for Mommsen, a *homo novus* was engaged in politics and attained high office at Rome, was not of patrician stock, or someone without ancestors who had held any curule offices, and, for Gelzer, any *homo novus* was someone who did not have consular ancestry.⁶⁴ In 1971 Wiseman, however, argued the term *homo novus* was 'ambiguous in its usage of the late Republic', and that it could mean men without consular ancestry, or those without senatorial ancestry, depending on context and who was positing their *novitas*.⁶⁵ Wiseman suggests that the 'more normal ... meaning' is a senator without any senatorial

⁶⁰ E.g. The *ius imaginum*. Gelzer (1969: 28) says, 'the nobles were recommended by their forebears and their 'smoke-stained ancestral images'. On this point, see also Flower (1996: 60-63). It is important to note that we should not view the *nobilis* as a group in the legal sense. Van der Blom notes how this (the 'traditional view') has been repeatedly criticized, e.g. Goldmann (2002): 'Vielmehr sei nobilitas als Status zu sehen, den bestimmte Verhältnissformen, ein besonderer Lebensstil, ein auf den Dienst an der res publica ausgerichtetes Ethos charakterisieren', and likewise Levi (1998: 555): 'L'adjectif nobilis et le nom abstrait dérivé nobilitas, loin de désigner une catégorie sociale ou bien un status de droit public, indiquent, à l'origine et en accord avec leur acception étymologique, la notoriété personnelle acquise par le citoyen romain grâce à son prestige ou à ses richesses. Although not legally defined, there is a prevailing view of the *nobilitas* as 'closed off' to outsiders. However, it is important to note that, as Hopkins and Burton argue, that they, the *nobilitas* as a group, were in fact more open than previously thought (1983: 32-78), on which see Burckhardt (1990: 80-84), and van der Blom's (2010: 39) caution about Hopkins and Burton's study.

⁶¹ Mommsen (1887 III³: 463). i.e. dictator, *magister equitum*, censor, consul, praetor, and curule aedile, on which, see Brunt (1982: 1).

⁶² Van der Blom (2010: 35).

⁶³ Gelzer (1969: 32). I have used the 1969 English translation of Gelzer. Van der Blom (2010: 36) rightly says that on Gelzer's view this would include descendants of those magistracies which exercised consular power, e.g. 'dictator and consular tribunes of the middle republic'. For a succinct and lucid overview of Mommsen's and Gelzer's arguments, see Brunt (1982: 1-2). Adherents to Gelzer's definition include: Syme (1939: 11, 94), Earl (1961: 18), Nicolet (1977: 732), Shackleton Bailey (1986: 256-258), and Burckhardt (1990: 81).

⁶⁴ Mommsen (1887 III³: 463-4), cf. Gelzer (1969: 32), this means that even those who have praetors or curule aediles as ancestors could be considered new men until such a time as they were elected to the consulship.

⁶⁵ Wiseman (1971: 1), cf. van der Blom (2010: 37) who suggests that, 'the ambiguity in the sources reflected an ambiguity in

ancestry.⁶⁶ This view, however, has not proven uncontested.⁶⁷

John Dugan, dealing specifically with Cicero and his self-representation as a *homo novus*, avoids advancing a strict definition and instead offers the following: a *homo novus* is ‘a political outsider without the authenticating pedigree of ancestors who had held high elected office’.⁶⁸ This definition does not supersede the other three, but rather constitutes an alternative, one which is perhaps best suited to my study of Nepos’ Eumenes, because the definitions of Mommsen, Gelzer, and Wiseman are strictly defined by Roman cultural and political institutions which do not easily map onto Greek or Macedonian institutions.⁶⁹ What I hope to show is that in Nepos’ mind, Eumenes was indeed a political outsider, who despite a lack of ‘authenticating ancestry’ (specifically Macedonian ancestry) attained very high station in the Macedonian world.

Conceptualising *novitas*

Even if there is no ancient definition or a universally accepted modern definition, we can extract from the Latin texts of the Republican and Triumviral periods the vocabulary used to describe *homines novi* by

the terminology itself as employed by the Romans’. In her *Oxford Bibliography* entry, she later concludes: ‘the ongoing discussions of the terms *nobilitas* and *novitas* indicate the impossibility of providing a clear definition based on the extant ancient sources. *Nobiles* seems not to have been a legal or technical term but rather a political and ideological term used for rhetorical and political purposes’.

⁶⁶ Wiseman (1971: 1).

⁶⁷ E.g. by Nicolet (1977) and Dondin Payre (1981), who both focus on the incomplete nature of the *Fasti Capitolini*, which renders knowing persons’ ancestry uncertain: ‘*mais souvent c’est notre seule ignorance des Fastes complets de la République qui nous incite à considérer tel personnage comme un nouus*’, so Dondin Payre (1981: 27), *contra* Wiseman (1971). However, Dondin Payre’s (1981) most important contribution was to present a challenge to all three definition of *homo novus*, on the grounds that there was no consistency of usage in the ancient sources: ‘*cette incohérence s’explique par les variations d’application de la notion homo nouus qu’aucune définition antique n’éclaircit*’. However, as van der Blom says, Dondin Payre’s study has been ‘dismissed ... off hand’ by a number of scholars (2013).

⁶⁸ Dugan (2005: 1).

⁶⁹ Van der Blom (2010:39) notes that Dugan’s apparent ‘unwillingness to offer a precise definition reflects ... the current trend in modern scholarship as to the term *homo novus*’.

themselves and by others in order to see how it relates to Nepos' description of Eumenes.

Three individuals dominate the discussion of *homines novi*: Cato Maior, Marius, and especially Cicero, each of whom can categorically be said to have enjoyed stellar political careers.⁷⁰ Although much of his work has been lost, Cato's *Origines* as well as his many speeches would have been full of his self-justification, and defence of his *virtutes*, which Cicero in his own works that deal with Cato goes to great lengths to draw out.⁷¹ Marius as a *homo novus* we know mostly through Sallust's *Bellum Jugurthinum*.⁷² And Cicero was never short of words, especially about himself.

Analysis begins with Cato Maior.⁷³ A fragment of his speech *De suis virtutibus contra <L.> Thermum* delivered in 183 BC provides a fundamental piece of information about how Cato presented himself: *ego iam a principio in parsimonia atque in duritia atque industria omnem adulescentiam meam abstinui agro colendo, saxis Sabinis, silicibus repastinandis atque conserendis* (F128 = Fest. p. 350.26-36 L.).⁷⁴ Here we are told that Cato was writing about his own merits (*scripsit de suis virtutibus*), of which he specifically celebrates his poverty and austerity (a renowned feature of the man), but, most importantly he takes pride in his *industria*, which Allen has called 'the trademark of the new man.'⁷⁵ For the Romans of the Late Republic, Cato Maior was the archetypal *homo novus*, and his qualities indicative of what subsequent

⁷⁰ That is, modern scholarship focuses principally on these three individuals when addressing the idea of a *homo novus*. This is surely the result of the 'ideology of *novitas*' being most well developed and defined in their works (i.e. Cicero and Cato), and how they are portrayed (Marius in Sallust's *Bellum Jugurthinum*, and Cato Maior in Cicero and to a lesser degree in Nepos).

⁷¹ The exact number of speeches given by Cato is unknown, but Astin (1978: 19) and Manuwald (2013: xiii) say that 150 speeches were known to Cicero, of which we know the title of nearly eighty.

⁷² Whether his speech (*BJ* 85), which presents a well-defined ideology of *novitas*, reflects Marius' thought (or what he genuinely said) or the views of Sallust, himself also a new man (cf. the contrast between Carney [1959] and Comber and Balmaceda [2009 *ad loc.* 85 = page 249]), is not crucial for our present purposes. What matters is that Sallust's work is in the public domain in the Triumviral period.

⁷³ On Cato's career, see Astin (1978).

⁷⁴ For this date, see *ORF*⁴: 51.

⁷⁵ Allen (1954: 124).

Roman men ought to emulate. Cicero, for example, often uses Cato, specifically identified as a *homo novus*, as an exemplum of *industria* and *virtus*, such as in his *De Republica* 1.1: *M. vero Catoni, homini ignoto et novo, quo omnes, qui isdem rebus studemus, quasi exemplari ad industriam virtutemque ducimur*. Importantly, here Cicero links *industria* and *virtus* with the concept of *novitas* (*homini ignoto et novo*). Similarly, in his *Verrines*, Cato is mentioned, in a passage where Cicero goes to draw attention to the *novorum hominum virtus et industria* (2.5.180).⁷⁶ Cicero took his description directly from Cato's oratorical corpus with which he was familiar.⁷⁷ It is a pity that we cannot draw more on Cato's own words to see how he addressed and perceived his own *novitas*, but he provides a start and left an indelible mark on the works of Cicero and Sallust.

A century later, it is Cicero who provides the best evidence for the concept of *novitas*, and what he considers to be the various hallmarks of *homines novi*: *virtus, industria, and ingenium*.⁷⁸ The most comprehensive and informative list of qualities ascribed to the *homines novi*, and necessary for their political success appears in Cicero's attack on Verres (*Verr.* 2.3.7): *Odistis hominum novorum industriam, despicitis eorum frugalitatem, pudorem contemnit, ingenium vero et virtutem depressam exstinctamque cupitis*. Here Cicero presents the qualities of the new man as something that the *nobiles* hate, as the *novi* seem to have the qualities which the *nobiles* themselves lack.⁷⁹ That is, the *novi* are successful not because of their famous ancestry but as a result of their merits. Cicero repeats this idea several times, primarily in

⁷⁶ Cf. Cic. *Verr.* 2.5.180: *Venit mihi in mentem M. Catonis, hominis sapientissimi et vigilantissimi; qui cum se virtute, non genere, populo Romano commendari putaret, cura ipse sui generis initium ac nominis ab se gigni et propagari vellet, hominum potentissimorum suscepit inimicitias, et maximis laboribus suis usque ad summam senectutem summa cum gloria vixit ... [181] Videmus quanta sit in invidia quantoque in odio apud quosdam nobiles homines novorum hominum virtus et industria.*

⁷⁷ As can be seen at e.g. *Brut.* 65-68; *Off.* 1.89; *Sen.* 14.

⁷⁸ Noting with van der Blom (2010: 51) that Cicero employs synonyms: 'sometimes, the 'virtue and energy' (*virtus et industria*) is replaced by such synonyms as 'hard work and constancy' (*labor et constantia*) or 'zeal and energy' (*studium et industria*), but both pairs seem to be synonymous with *industria*. I have restricted myself to the core terms alone, as they provide ample evidence of the conceptualisation of *homo novus* ideology.

⁷⁹ *Odistis* in the second person plural certainly means the collective *nobiles*.

his speeches, of himself, and of other *homines novi*, so that we can indisputably identify *ingenium*,⁸⁰ *virtus*,⁸¹ and *industria*⁸² as the most significant terms for the ideology of *novitas*.

The fundamental claim was to *virtus*, which in its original sense connoted ‘manliness’ or ‘courage’, being derived from *vir* ‘man’. But here, in the discussion of *novitas*, the term is considerably less restrictive, indicating a semantic change to encompass the meanings of ‘character’, ‘merit’, or ‘excellence’. This semantic change owes much to Greek influence and renders the word ἀρετή (‘excellence’, ‘good’, ‘best-ness’).⁸³ Thus, *virtus* was to be used for both ἀρετή and ἀνδρεία (‘manliness’, ‘courage’), which can cause linguistic ambiguity — but, in the present discussion the shades of meaning are those found in the *OLD* s.v. *virtus* 2 and 3.⁸⁴ Secondly, the *homo novus* emphasised his *industria*: this ‘hard work’ or ‘diligence’, and his *ingenium*: his ‘talent’ or ‘ability’.⁸⁵

Sallust himself was a *homo novus*, whose historical monograph, the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, is the vehicle for a more systematic and extended presentation of *novitas*, focusing on the figure of Marius.⁸⁶ Marius, as

⁸⁰ *Verr.* 2.3.7; *Sest.* 136; *Fam.* 3.11.2. Although *ingenium* is the key quality of the *homo novus*, in addition to *industria* and *virtus*, Cicero makes reference to this less frequently than the other qualities.

⁸¹ *Verr.* 2.3.7; *Pis.* 2; *Rep.* 1.1; *Clu.* 111; *Mur.* 16; *Sull.* 24; *Font.* 42 (*cognita virtus*); *Sest.* 136; *Fam.* 3.11.2; *Verr.* 2.5.180, 181. The importance, even necessity, of *virtus* as means for entry to the *nobilitas* is aptly summed by Cicero in a fragmentary letter to Hirtius (*Ep. Hirt.* fr. 3): *cum enim nobilitas nihil aliud sit quam cognita virtus* (‘for what is nobility other than recognised excellence?’) cf. *cognita virtus* at *Cic. Font.* 42.

⁸² *Verr.* 2.3.7; *Rep.* 1.1; *Rosc. Am.* 10 (with *studium*); *Clu.* 111; *Mur.* 16; *Sull.* 24; *Font.* 42; *Fam.* 3.11.2; *Verr.* 2.5.181.

⁸³ As Cicero himself said: *appellata est enim ex viro virtus* (*Tusc.* 2.43). On this, see McDonnell (2007) for the semantic shift (esp. pp. 1-141, and 320-331 for the *virtus* of the ‘new man’); cf. *LSJ* s.v. ἀρετή A1.

⁸⁴ *LSJ* s.v. ἀνδρεία A1. See Balmaceda (2017: 24). That this broadened meaning is to be understood is clear from a reading of the passages of Cicero and Sallust, and likewise as it will be shown, Nepos. *OLD* s.v. *virtus* 2: Excellence of character or mind, worth, merit, ability, etc., **b** a particular excellence of character, ability, etc., a virtue or merit.; *OLD* s.v. *virtus* 3: Moral excellence, virtue, goodness.

⁸⁵ *OLD* s.v. *industria* 1; *OLD* s.v. *ingenium* 4.

⁸⁶ It is important to caution that Sallust in his *Bellum Jugurthinum* presents multiple ‘definitions’ of what a *homo novus*, see Paul (1984: 7) and Vanderbroeck (1986: 239): ‘the relevant passages are: *Iug.* 23.6 and 63.7 (strict sense, i.e. consul of non-senatorial ancestry); *Iug.* 4.7 and 8.1 (newcomers to the senate); *Iug.* 65.5 (men of senatorial but not consular ancestry). This, however, does not affect my argument in any way.

presented by Sallust, is arguably the finest extant exposition we possess about what a *homo novus* could be said to be and, importantly, how he is presented, outside of the Ciceronian corpus.⁸⁷ The conflict between *nobilitas* and *novitas* is a key theme that runs through the work. Sallust's prooemium (1.1-3) emphasises from the outset that success by means of *virtus* through the presence of *patientia*, *industria*, and *bona artes* is possible for anyone. Several passages expand the idea: for example, Memmius is accorded a speech in which he 'lambasts the nobility' in an attempt to excite the common people against the degenerate *nobilitas*, who have exercised political and social domination to the exclusion of the *vulgus*.⁸⁸ It is, however, the speech of Marius who has secured the consulship against vicious opposition from the nobility (85) that 'crystallizes the issues of *nobilitas* and *novitas* and in particular the ideology of *homines novi*'.⁸⁹ By becoming the champion of the common people and having pried the consulship from the established nobility Marius' aim is to set himself up as the champion of the *nova nobilitas* (the 'new nobility'), as a fine example of a *homo novus*. Marius can in no way rely on illustrious ancestry like the *nobilitas*, but only on his *virtus*, and says *mihi spes omnes in memet sitae, quas necesse est virtute et innocentia tutari. Nam alia infirma sunt* (85.4).⁹⁰ As Balmaceda suggests, Sallust presents '*virtus* as an ideal, and more specifically as an ideal that brought *nobilitas* to the *homo novus*'.⁹¹ For Sallust '*virtus* ... is

⁸⁷ This is my opinion, but the fact that almost all discussions on *novitas* start with Cicero and move to Sallust's *Bellum Jugurthinum* proves the point.

⁸⁸ Earl (1961: 68).

⁸⁹ Van der Blom (2010: 51).

⁹⁰ An idea developed by Earl (1961: 32): 'all Marius' hopes lie in himself alone, in his own toils and dangers, in his own '*hastas, vexillum, phaleras, alia militaria dona, praeterea cicatrices adverso corpore*', in '*illa multo optuma rei publicae*' which he has learnt by personal experience—in short, his own '*bene facta rei publicae*', his own '*bonae artes*', his own *virtus*'. Balmaceda (2017: 49-50) cogently writes: '[Sallust] broadens the concept of *virtus* by moving it away from a particular, closed social group—the *nobilitas*—to a more open one: the *homines novi*; and also how with his new appraisal, the traditional, aristocratic notion of *virtus* becomes a common "ideal" for all Romans. Paradoxically (and impressively), he will reinforce the need for this missing *virtus* by developing a "language of decline and *vitium*'. This statement reinforces the idea that *virtus* is the domain of the *nobilitas*, but those outside of this group who possess it can also succeed — i.e. the *homines novi*. Cf. 85.17: *ex virtute nobilitas coepit*; and Marius' assertion that the *nobilitas* lacked *virtus*: ... *virtutem non reliquere* (85.38).

⁹¹ Balmaceda (2017: 55).

based on *ingenium*.⁹² Thus, one can begin to see essentially the same ideology of *novitas* in Sallust as we saw in Cicero, but with some expansion of terminology, and is best seen in Marius' speech (*BJ* 85).⁹³

For Sallust, the central nexus of terms is: 1) *virtus*,⁹⁴ 2) *industria*,⁹⁵ and 3) *innocentia*⁹⁶ (here meaning 'integrity' or 'honesty'⁹⁷) as the three positive characteristics of the *homo novus*. Conversely, he identifies two negative traits, or themes, as: 1) a lack of *fortuna*,⁹⁸ and 2) *invidia*⁹⁹ from the *nobilitas*. Sallust presents powerfully how the *nobiles* exhibit (or are shown to exhibit¹⁰⁰) *superbia*,¹⁰¹ *ignavia*,¹⁰² and *luxuria*¹⁰³ by contrast with the *virtus*, *industria*, and *ingenium* of the *novi*.

Having, then, established what was meant by *homo novus* and having identified the vocabulary used by (and of) *homines novi*, we can now see how Nepos employs this same language and the idea of *novitas* of Eumenes. Nepos wrote *On Foreign Generals* most likely sometime before 31 March 32 BC, roughly a decade after the death of Cicero, and even less time after the publication of the *Bellum Jugurthinum* in 41-40 BC.¹⁰⁴ It would, therefore, be uncontentious to suppose that Nepos was almost certainly aware of and

⁹² Sallust has a rather more complex view or understanding of *virtus* than Cicero, see Earl (1961: 28-40) and esp. Balmaceda (2017: 48-81).

⁹³ Marius' speech provides the crescendo to Sallust's exposition of the conflict; in the words of Syme (1964: 164), 'with Marius, the attack on the oligarchy moves to a climax, with a harangue which is a social as well as a political indictment. Marius not only arraigns the *nobiles* as a caste, but parades '*novitas mea*' against them'. Quote from van der Blom (2010: 52).

⁹⁴ *BJ* 85.4, 17, 13-2, 20, 38. cf. proemium 1.3.

⁹⁵ *BJ* 85.1. cf. proemium 1.2-3

⁹⁶ *BJ* 85.4, 18.

⁹⁷ *OLD* s.v. *innocentia* 2.

⁹⁸ *BJ* 85.14, cf. proemium 1.3.

⁹⁹ *BJ* 85.18.

¹⁰⁰ Our evidence for this comes primary from Sallust and Cicero, and some bias ought to be expected.

¹⁰¹ *BJ* 85.1, 13, 38.

¹⁰² *BJ* 85.1, 14, 20, 43.

¹⁰³ *BJ* 85.43.

¹⁰⁴ This date is from Comber and Balmaceda (2009: 2), the most recent commentary on the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, whereas Ramsey (2013: 150) suggests that Sallust only began work on the historical monograph ca. 41 BC.

familiar with the literary outputs of Cicero and Sallust, generally, but also the way in which they depicted *homines novi*, which would draw on their own experience as new men, and the relevant language and ideology.

In the case of Cicero, this is easily provable as we know Nepos and he were friends, but not perhaps overly close.¹⁰⁵ Nepos (*Att.* 16.3-4) compliments Cicero's published correspondence to Atticus, which suggests some familiarity with the published output of Cicero and his extensive biography of Cicero must have required knowledge both of his political and literary achievements.¹⁰⁶ Consequently, it would not be rash to assume that, when Nepos came to write *Eumenes*, he knew how Cicero had presented himself as a *homo novus*, and also that *novitas* was highly topical in the Late Republic, and especially the Triumviral period, when so many offices of state were sold and held by *homines novi*.¹⁰⁷

That Nepos was acquainted with Sallust's literary output is not so easily ascertained. Geiger believes that Sallust was 'perhaps' known to and read by Nepos.¹⁰⁸ The most notable, and most disappointing, piece of evidence for a relationship between Nepos and Sallust is ultimately false evidence: a forged letter, from Nepos to Sallust, prefacing a manuscript of Dares the Phrygian on the Trojan War that Nepos had supposedly discovered and translated into Latin as *Historia de excidio Troiae* (*BNJ* 51 T 1).¹⁰⁹ We cannot

¹⁰⁵ On Nepos' relationship with Cicero, see **Introduction**.

¹⁰⁶ Geiger (1985b: 269-270).

¹⁰⁷ See *MRR* (II: 334-419); cf. Wiseman (1971: 4-5) accepts that 'many *novi homines* benefited from [Caesar's] dominance' ... 'The twenty years of the dictatorship and the triumvirate opened the Senate to scores of Italian and provincial *novi*'; e.g. from Ferriès' (2007: 309-315) prosopographical catalogue: Albedius, C. Asinius Pollio, M. Barbatius Pollio, Barbius Philippicus, Q. Caerellius, Caesennius Lento, C. Calvisius Sabinus, P. Canidius Crassus.

¹⁰⁸ Geiger (1985a: 84).

¹⁰⁹ *Cornelius Nepos Sallustio Crispo suo salutem. cum multa ago Athenis curiose, inveni historiam Daretis Phrygii ipsius manu scriptam, ut titulus indicat, quam de Graecis et Troianis memoriae mandavit ... optimum ergo duxi ita ut fuit vere et simpliciter perscripta, sic eam ad verbum in Latinitatem transvertere ut legentes cognoscere possent, quomodo res gestae essent.* On this forged letter, see Lobur (2021: 21, 74, 82-83) and Geiger (1985a: 75), 'though this is a late, and ridiculous, pseudepigraphon, it is just possible that it was based on the fact that the two men were acquainted'.

say that Nepos and Sallust were definitely acquainted, and it is certainly unsubstantiated to assert that Nepos was *definitely* familiar with any of Sallust's works (despite the fact that Nepos' portrayal of Eumenes as *homo novus* is heavily reliant on the concept of *fortuna* and *invidia*, which is arguably better sketched by Sallust than Cicero). What can be stated, however, is that Nepos was certainly part of a Late Republican and Triumviral milieu of writers who were concerned with contemporary issues such as *novitas* and the rise of *homines novi* and wrote 'ideologically loaded material'.¹¹⁰ Therefore, Nepos' utilisation of the language and ideology of *novitas* in his *Eumenes* can hardly be a coincidence — I argue that it is a conscious choice by the author. Ultimately, in his extant biographies of Greeks, we must assume that he is reflecting not the concerns of his (= Greek) sources, but rather those of contemporary Rome.¹¹¹

To posit that Nepos knowingly portrays Eumenes as *homo novus* may, on the face of it, seem somewhat illogical, because how can a Greek be a new man? In strictly historical terms, he cannot; but a Greek can very well be presented as such in literary terms, for example in a biography. It is even more likely if Nepos was operating with a broader definition of the concept, such as the one proposed by Dugan, a 'political outsider without the authenticating pedigree of ancestors who had held high elected office', which strips the concept of *novitas* away from specific Roman political offices (e.g. consulship, senatorial status *et cetera*).

Next, for the purposes of my argument, I will set out Eumenes' career in outline, to show how it has parallels to *homines novi* of the Late Republic. Eumenes, in his Macedonian '*cursus honorum*' rises swiftly—and outshines many a Macedonian, despite being both an ethnic and political outsider.

¹¹⁰ As Lobur (2021: 2) says, 'along with Sallust and Varro, Nepos is one of the few surviving contemporary prose authors of the Triumviral period, a time of great cultural and political transition, and he writes ideologically loaded material.'

¹¹¹ Slingsby (2019: 3) and as Dionisotti (1988: 39, 49).

Becoming an *hetairos* in Macedonian society was a clear equivalent to the Roman *nobilitas*.¹¹²

A synthesis of the existing ancient accounts yields, on my view, seven clear career stages for Eumenes:

- 1) 342 BC: Arrival at Macedonian court as a result of guest-friendship between his father and Philip II (Plut. *Eum.* 1.3: ξενίαν καὶ φιλίαν πατρῶαν).¹¹³ Eumenes holds position of γραμματεὺς or *scriba*.
- 2) 336 BC: Chief secretary (ἀρχιγραμματεὺς) under Alexander.
- 3) 326 BC: Becomes *hetairos* of Alexander.¹¹⁴
- 4) 323 BC: Satrap of Cappadocia, Pamphlagonia, and Euxine Coast (this position equivalent to Roman proconsul).¹¹⁵
- 5) 322 BC: Commander of royal forces (i.e. under the regency of Perdiccas) in Asia Minor.
- 6) 320-318 BC: Leader of the Perdiccan forces (after his death).
- 7) 318-315 BC: Leader of royal forces in Asia (under regency of Polypercon).

From this brief list, Eumenes' meteoric rise under Alexander from comparatively humble beginnings is analogous to any Roman who rose through the ranks of the *cursus honorum*. But, unlike Rome (at least during until the last years of the Republic), Macedonia was not a democracy but rather an autocratic monarchy; there was no set political career path, moving in some determined ascending order; there was no senate; nor any voting assemblies.¹¹⁶ In effect, any step up the proverbial ladder, for Macedonian and Greek alike, was the result of advancement by a Macedonian superior, be that a king or, after the death of Alexander, a regent.

From the very first sentence of Nepos' *Eumenes*, after the formulaic specification of name and toponym,

¹¹² Although there was no formal Macedonian *cursus honorum*, Heckel (1986) feels able to use the phrase in the title of his article; appointments and reappointments could include huge changes in status. However, for the purposes of my argument, it is important to try draw an equivalence between Rome and Macedonia. Eumenes was not the only non-Macedonian to rise in the service of the Argead kings, see Berve (1926: 31) and Anson (2015: 49).

¹¹³ Plutarch (*Eum.* 1.3) uses the verb προάγω, in the passive, 'advanced' when speaking about Eumenes' arrival in Macedonia and him being given the position of secretary by Philip.

¹¹⁴ Eumenes was possibly already *hetairos* of Alexander at this point, but 326 is the *terminus ante quem*.

¹¹⁵ This position would entail Eumenes being able to command troops, i.e. as *dux* or στρατηγός. Satrap is a political and military position, roughly equivalent to that of a praetorian military command, which is further addressed in **Chapter 3**.

¹¹⁶ On the Macedonian 'army assembly' as their *potential* roles in decision-making, see **Chapter 3** n. 9.

Nepos provides the readers with both information and value terms that identify Eumenes in terms that have been shown as fundamental to the conception and perception of *homines novi*.

[1.1] Eumenes Cardianus. huius si **virtuti** par data esset fortuna, non ille quidem maior, sed multo illustrior atque etiam honoratior, **quod magnos homines virtute metimur, non fortuna**. [2] nam cum aetas eius incidisset in ea tempora, quibus Macedones florerent, multum ei detraxit inter eos viventi, quod alienae erat civitatis neque **aliud huic defuit quam generosa stirps**. [3] etsi ille domestico summo genere erat, tamen Macedones eum sibi aliquando anteponi indigne ferebant, neque tamen non patiebantur: **vincebat enim omnes cura, vigilantia, patientia, calliditate et celeritate ingenii**.

Straightaway, Nepos emphasises Eumenes' *virtus* and his lack of equivalent *fortuna*.¹¹⁷ In the second he establishes Eumenes as an 'outsider' and of non-elite birth. Therefore, right from the start, astute readers of the 30s BC would be cued into the fact that Eumenes had the crucial quality expected of the *homines novi*: *virtus*; and, that he was an ethnic, but more importantly, political outsider.

The issue of *fortuna*, or its lack, is juxtaposed with his *virtus*, and the cause of this is indicated in the *nam* clause: he was Greek, not Macedonian (*quod alienae erat civitatis*). Eumenes was Greek, but, as Nepos clearly states, he lived at a time when the Macedonians flourished (*in ea tempora, quibus Macedones florerent*). Nepos goes on to say that Eumenes lacked nothing but a *generosa stirps* [sc. *Macedonicus*] — that is, noble Macedonian lineage.¹¹⁸ Here, Nepos sets up a dichotomy: between Macedonian and non-Macedonian, and *generosa* \approx *nobilis/non generosa* \approx *humilis* which can be seen as a parallel to the *nobilitas/novitas* issue, in Roman terms, outlined above.

Eumenes was, as Nepos says, *domestico summo genere* (1.3), but this counted little when in the service of

¹¹⁷ Cf. Nepos *Thras.* 1.1: *Si per se virtus sine fortuna ponderanda sit, dubito, an hunc primum omnium ponam; illud sine dubio: neminem huic praefero fide, constantia, magnitudine animi, in patriam amore.*

¹¹⁸ *OLD* s.v. *generosus* 1: **1** Of noble birth, high-born, noble. **b** of or connected with high-born persons. From the context of the passage, it is implicit that Nepos could only mean that Eumenes lacked a noble Macedonian ancestry.

a foreign power (albeit an ally), and he faced discrimination on account of his ethnicity, according to Nepos and Plutarch.¹¹⁹ Anson has, however, convincingly shown that any discrimination against Eumenes was not ethnic, but rather an issue of social class, arguing that the rank-and-file soldiers had little grievance with Eumenes as a foreigner, but that it was the Macedonian generals (and officer-class), the *nobilitas*, who exhibited prejudice towards Eumenes, and who ultimately betrayed him into the hands of Antigonos, which led to his death.¹²⁰ When surpassed by an outsider, the Macedonians were disgruntled, much like the Roman *nobiles* as *homines novi* rose to prominence in the Late Republic.

Twice Nepos mentions how Eumenes is the object of *invidia* (7.1-2, 10.1). Although the first example is reported as Eumenes' fear or belief, the second is an historical instance (substantiated by his earlier fear or belief, indicating that Eumenes' fear was not ill-founded). In both cases the *invidia* is specified as that of the Macedonians.

7.1 ... **invidiam** verens (quam tamen effugere non potuit), si potius ipse alienigena summi imperii potiretur quam alii **Macedonum**.

7.2 ... credens minore se **invidia** fore, si specie imperii nominisque simulatione Alexandri bellum videretur administrare. quod effecit.

10.2 nam **invidia** ducum, cum quibus erat, **perfidiaque Macedonum veteranorum**, cum superior proelio discessisset.

¹¹⁹ Anson (2015: 41-57) deals with Eumenes' early career, from Cardia to Babylon. Anson says that 'information concerning Eumenes' background must come from an analysis of the history of his home city, Cardia, in the fourth century.' We have no specific information on Eumenes in Cardia. Plutarch credits a tie of guest-friendship (ξενία και φιλία) between Eumenes' father, Hieronymus, a prominent Cardian, and Philip (Plut. *Eum.* 1. 3; cf. Nepos *Eum.* 1. 4) perhaps established in 352. From 346 Cardia was recognised as an ally of Macedonia, but by 342 it was under the rule of a tyrant and Eumenes had to leave (Dem. 5. 25; 19. 158, 174; [Dem.] 12. 11).

¹²⁰ Anson (2014b), Anson (2015), cf. Anson (1980). Vezin (1907) and Westlake (1969) both saw this prejudice as being 1) primarily ethnic (Anson argues against this); and 2) primary the reason why Eumenes did not ultimately succeed (e.g. Vezin [1907: 125-6]).

The *invidia* that Eumenes had to contend with would, I argue, remind the Roman readers of the *invidia* that *homines novi* suffered from the *nobiles* — a point asserted by both Cicero (*Verr.* 2.5.181) and Sallust (*BJ* 85.18). The Cicero passage shows how he, as *homo novus* is aware (*videmus*) of the *invidia* directed at him by those who hated to see his success through merit and diligence (*virtus et industria*). Likewise Sallust also notes how the *nobilitas* envy (here *invidere*) him, and his success. Cicero says that he was the victim of *invidia* and Sallust has Marius say to it to a popular audience.

Eumenes, as I have noted above, is aware of this *invidia*. The whole of Chapter 7, the ‘Alexander Tent’ incident, is concerned with Eumenes responding to *invidia*. Nepos has Eumenes’ fear lead to an action aimed directly at managing or circumventing *invidia*. Thus, we see the first point of overlap between Eumenes and the way *homines novi* are portrayed in the *invidia* they face from the *nobilitas* — the Macedonians envy the success of Eumenes seemingly at their expense.¹²¹ At 7.1-3, Nepos feels or perceives the possibility that there is *invidia* held against him and it will become a reality at 10.1.

To this point I have attempted to show that Eumenes was a political and ethnic outsider — a Greek amongst Macedonians — and how this led to animosity between him and Macedonian military and political establishment, particularly as Eumenes surpassed the vast majority of them in political and military terms (as Nepos says at 1.3: *vincebat enim omnes cura, vigilantia, patientia, calliditate et celeritate ingenii*).¹²² This establishes a correlation between Eumenes’ political position and that of a *homo novus* at

¹²¹ Following on from *fides*, we saw earlier that Sallust (and to a lesser degree, Cicero) repeatedly highlighted *invidia* as a typical response of the *nobiles* to the pure *virtus* of the *homines novi*. In addition to the prejudice/discrimination described at 1.2, Nepos highlights three explicit cases of *invidia* towards Eumenes (discussed above) and two of *perfidia* (10.1, 11.5), the second of which is very similar to the idea of *invidia* as well as being the opposite of the *fides* that Eumenes himself exemplifies. His ultimate betrayal into the hands of his enemy Antigonus (and his subsequent death) was, as Nepos says, the result of this *invidia* (10.2).

¹²² *Omnes*, here, includes the Macedonian generals and/or *hetairoi* and/or the Silver Shields, but Nepos’ readers will know nothing about the latter. On Eumenes and the Silver Shields, see **Chapter 1** n. 140.

Rome. This is important, because without the fact that the background of Eumenes has a concrete overlap in this respect, similarities in language would be relatively meaningless, as they would not reference a political situation or context that would allow the vocabulary to make sense to his readers.

Now, I turn to the way in which Nepos employs both Ciceronian and Sallustian language of *novitas* in his presentation of Eumenes more broadly. Nepos' opening assessment presents Eumenes in a most glowing light. Crucial here is the importance that Nepos bestows upon *virtus*, especially Eumenes' *virtus: magnos homines virtute metimur, non fortuna* (*Eum.* 1.1) — we, presumably elite Romans, judge greatness by one's *virtus* and not by one's *fortuna*. The *nam* that follows the general assessment suggests that this lack of *fortuna* means that Eumenes was 1) a foreigner, and 2) lived at a time when Macedonians rather than Greeks flourished. Here we have *fortuna* in respect to one's birth, as Sallust (*BJ* 85.14): *contemnunt novitatem meam, ego illorum ignaviam; mihi fortuna, illis probra obiectantur*.

This contrast of *virtus* and *fortuna* finds an important parallel in the prooemium of *Bellum Jugurthinum*: Sallust, like Nepos, suggests that *virtus* is always a greater asset than *fortuna*, and that any and all good is the result of *virtus: neque fortuna eget, quippe probitatem, industriam, aliasque artis bonas neque dare neque eripere cuiquam potest* (*BJ* 1.3). Sallust is making a general statement, which can be applied to Marius. Whether Nepos draws on Sallust here, or just has a similar conceptual understanding of the *virtus-fortuna* dichotomy is beyond proof.¹²³

From the outset, therefore, Nepos brings the *virtus* of Eumenes to the fore.¹²⁴ Besides the two references to *virtus* at 1.1, at 1.4, Nepos speaks of Eumenes' *indoles virtutis*, highlighting that his *virtus* was innate,

¹²³ Neither Paul (1984) nor Comber and Balmaceda (2009 *ad loc.*) posit a parallel.

¹²⁴ *Virtus*, here, in the broader ἀρετή sense, as outlined earlier.

and visible at a young age. By foregrounding *virtus* at the outset (while the biographer provides a holistic assessment of his subject), the readers know that this will be a central facet of the *Life*.

The readers are not left to guess what manifestations of *virtus* Eumenes might display, as Nepos at once specifies *vincebat enim omnes cura, vigilantia, patientia, calliditate et celeritate ingenii* (that is, he surpassed the Macedonians [the *nobiles*] in these *virtutes*). One could argue that this is the ‘*homo novus* package’ — a collection of positive traits that allow Eumenes to attain his exceptional success. Although none of these terms is used again of Eumenes himself, the readers can recognise and categorise examples of each from their reading of the text.¹²⁵

Nepos’ assessment of Eumenes opens with *virtus* and concludes with *ingenium*, such that two of the principal qualities of a Roman *homo novus* bookend the beginning of the biography. Right from the opening of the *Eumenes*, therefore, the language of *novitas* is consciously highlighted.

Although Nepos does not explicitly draw attention to Eumenes’ *industria* in his initial summative judgement, the biography certainly identifies *vigilantia*, *patientia*, and *cura* (as discussed in **Chapter 1**) as related aspects of *industria*. Careful readers would likely be aware of the close relation of these terms.

We have seen that *industria*, ‘activity which establishes a claim to political advantage’,¹²⁶ is one of the (if not the) most important qualities of a *homo novus*. In his extant corpus Nepos uses *industria* only nine

¹²⁵ Examples of these traits in Nepos’ text are identified and analysed in **Chapter 1**. However, *celeritas* alone reappears at 10.1 Cf. **Chapter 1**: Eumenes is easily inferred to be *callidior* than the *callidus* Antigonus; and although Antigonus exhibits *celeritas* (10.1), Eumenes is *celerior*.

¹²⁶ Paul (1984: 11 = *ad loc.* Sall. *BJ.* 1.2).

time, twice each in *Cato*, *Atticus*, and *Eumenes*.¹²⁷ The similarity of language between *Cato* and *Eumenes* is suggestive that Nepos is thinking of these two subjects in the same terms — as *homines novi*.¹²⁸ Similarly, Cato's *diligentia* (3.1) is analogous to Eumenes' *cura*.¹²⁹ It cannot be a mere coincidence that *only* Eumenes and Cato are spoken of as displaying *industria*, *cura/diligentia*, as key elements of their overall *virtus*.¹³⁰ There is an likely overlap and, while Cato's *ingenium* is not explicitly mentioned, the biography as it comes down to us is severely abbreviated and should not be taken as indicative of the content of the original. In all likelihood, the qualities of Cato were probably extolled even more in the original biography, with the inclusion of a summative judgement almost certain (a typical pattern for Nepos in most of his works). As the *Cato* is the only biography of a genuine *homo novus* that we possess in the Nepotian corpus, we can make direct comparison between a Nepotian *homo novus* and his *Eumenes*, where Nepos is clearly presenting him as a *homo novus*.

A final point of similarity, in relation to *industria*, should be drawn, between Cicero's and Sallust/Marius' self-fashioning of their *novitas* and Nepos' Eumenes. As shown in the passages the term *labor* ('labour' or 'toil'¹³¹) is mentioned as a quality of *homines novi* (e.g. Cic. *Verr.* 2.5.180; Sall. *BJ.* 85.18), although not as

¹²⁷ Recalling Allen's assertion that *industria* is 'the trademark of the new man' (1954: 124). See *Eum.* 1.5: *Nemo ad id officium admittitur nisi honesto loco, et fide et industria cognita*; *Eum.* 2.3: *Nunc sibi Perdiccas adiunxerat magno studio, quod in homine fidem et industriam magnam videbat, non dubitans, si eum pellexisset, magno usui fore sibi in iis rebus quas apparabat.*; *Cat.* 3.1: *in omnibus rebus singulari fuit industria: nam et agricola sollers et peritus iuris consultus et magnus imperator et probabilis orator et cupidissimus litterarum fuit*; *Cat.* 3.4: *... in quibus multa industria et diligentia comparet.*; *Att.* 12.3: *...Attici labore atque industria factum est.*; *Att.* 13.4: *... et potius diligentia quam pretio parare non mediocris est industriae.* cf. *Them.* 1.3; *Ages.* 3.2, 3.3 (not of Agesilaus himself).

¹²⁸ Atticus was in social terms a *homo novus*, but as he remained an *eques* he did not follow the *cursus honorum*. His eminence within that *ordo* might justify him as a *princeps*, a standing he achieved through his undoubted *industria*.

¹²⁹ OLD s.v. *diligentia* 1 = OLD s.v. *cura* 2.

¹³⁰ Nepos says of Cato's *virtus* (*Cat.* 2.4): *a multis temptatus non modo nullum detrimentum existimationis fecit, sed, quoad vixit, virtutum laude crevit* (F128). He might be suggesting that Cato Maior was attacked (*temptatus*) as a result of his political success, possibly because he was a new man? Just before this Nepos says *usque ad extremam aetatem ab adolescentia, rei publicae causa suscipere inimicitias non destitit*. *Inimicitias*, which could be the negative opinion of the *nobilitas*.

¹³¹ OLD s.v. *labor*² 1.

commonly seen as the other terms discussed. One must also remember what van der Blom says in regard to Cicero's use of synonyms that, 'sometimes, the 'virtue and energy' (*virtus et industria*) is replaced by 'hard work and constancy' (*labor et constantia*).¹³² Therefore, I would argue that Nepos, when describing Eumenes' physical form directly after a lacuna in the text, says at 11.5, as follows <...> *nam et dignitate fuit honesta et viribus ad **laborem** ferendum firmis neque tam magno corpore quam figura venusta*, Nepos shows Eumenes as being able to bear *labor*, which can be seen a further indication that Nepos is using the language of *novitas* in this biography.

One essential and defining trait of Eumenes is not mentioned, even implicitly, at the start of the *Life*: his *fides* to the Argead monarchy. In the Macedonian context, as opposed to Republican Rome, political advancement was not, as we have seen, the result of elections; rather, it was the result of promotion by the monarch, or his representative. Eumenes' success was the direct result of advancement by Philip, Alexander (Nepos *Eum* 1.4-6), and later Perdiccas as regent (Nepos *Eum.* 3.2). Each of these figures was 'head of state' and it was through loyalty to the state and its head (along with at least a healthy dose of *virtus* and *ingenium*) that men without noble ancestry could progress. To a greater or lesser degree, the relationship between Eumenes and the Macedonian monarchs functioned like a Roman *patronus-clientis* relationship. Eumenes, could not fall back on ancestry; his positions and advancements were the result not only of his hard work (*industria*) but also of loyalty (*fides*). At 2.3 Perdiccas tries to lure Eumenes into an alliance because of his *industria* and *fides* and at 1.5 Philip sees the exact same combination of qualities in Eumenes (note *cognita industria*).¹³³

¹³² Van der Blom (2010: 51).

¹³³ 1.5: *Nemo ad id officium admittitur nisi honesto loco, et **fide** et **industria** cognita ...*; 2.3: *Nunc sibi Perdiccas adiunxerat magno studio, quod in homine **fidem** et **industriam magnam** videbat.*

In summary, from passages in Cato, Cicero, and Sallust that deal with *novitas* and *homines novi*, it is clear that each believed that their accomplishments rested not on the dubious credentials of some ancestor(s), but on their own excellence.¹³⁴ There is an established vocabulary of *novitas*, which political outsiders used to express their conceptions of themselves and political position, as they gained success. Nepos was most likely well-versed in this language and ideology of *novitas*, saw in Eumenes, a Cardian living as a political emigré in the Macedonian world, an appropriate subject for such language, and so drew on and mirrored the self-conceptions evident in Cicero and Sallust. This presentation is an indication of the complexity of thought Nepos brought to bear on his biographical work. Like Cicero, Cato Maior and Marius, Eumenes had the necessary *virtus*, *industria*, and *ingenium* to succeed.

¹³⁴ Almost the formulation of Cicero himself (*Pis.* 2): *homini ille honorem non generi, moribus non maioribus meis, virtuti perspectae non auditae nobilitati deferebat.*

Chapter III: Nepos' Account of the Babylonian Settlement (*Eum.* 2.1-2)

In this dissertation thus far, I have examined the argument that Hieronymus of Cardia was Nepos' source for *Eumenes*, I have attempted to recreate what the Hieronymean account contained and to see what choices Nepos makes in reducing a lengthy narrative history into a slim exemplary biography. I have also looked at the particular representation of Eumenes' overall career that Nepos creates for his Roman readers. In this chapter I attempt a tightly focused study on a small section of the *Eumenes* that deals with key, especially political, events immediately after the death of Alexander the Great, which resulted in what modern historians call the Babylonian 'Settlement'.¹ Analysing Nepos' account word by word, akin to what an historical or historiographical commentary might do, throws further light on Nepos' excerpting: does his method, which involves both omission and extreme compression of his source, his particular characterisation of Eumenes, and the accommodations needed for his Latin-speaking readers compromise the historical accuracy of the picture he draws?

[2.1] Alexandro Babylone mortuo, cum regna singulis familiaribus dispertirentur et summa rerum tradita esset tuenda eidem, cui Alexander moriens anulum suum dederat, Perdiccae [2] (ex quo omnes coniecerant eum regnum ei commisisse, quoad liberi eius in suam tutelam peruenissent: aberat enim Crateros et Antipater, qui antecedere hunc videbantur, mortuus erat Hephaestio, quem unum Alexander, quod facile intellegi posset, plurimi fecerat), hoc tempore data est Eumeni Cappadocia siue potius dicta: nam tum in hostium erat potestate.

The ancient historian is blessed with a relative abundance of sources for the death of Alexander the Great and the period that followed it, some of which go back to the memoirs of protagonists in the events, such as Ptolemy I. However, not all sources are of equal merit. With respect to accounts of the occurrences directly following the death of Alexander, Curtius Rufus and Justin have been held in higher esteem,

¹ However, Bosworth (2002: 33) calls the 'settlement' a 'misnomer', saying it is but the first stage of a 'complex process of political bargaining'. Perhaps 'agreement' or 'accord' is better terminology. 'Settlement' is, however, used across modern scholarship, for example, Errington (1970), Bosworth (2002), Meeus (2008), Atkinson (2009), Heckel and Wheatley (2011), Roisman (2012), and Anson (2015).

primarily because of the detail they provide and the comparative length of their accounts. The most influential modern reconstructions of the events of June-July 323 BC, which resulted in the accord commonly referred to as the Babylonian Settlement, are almost wholly reliant on these two primary accounts.² Other sources include Diodorus Siculus' *Bibliothēke*, Plutarch's *Eumenes*, Arrian's *Successors*, Justin, and the *Heidelberg Epitome*.³ To differing degrees these sources, and their accounts of the Babylonian Settlement, have been studied in their own right. However, Cornelius Nepos' account of this pivotal event in Hellenistic history, has been overlooked as worthy of independent analysis because he adds no new information. Nepos' version has been cited in relation to events in Babylon, but for the most part to pad out footnotes in the form of parallel references.⁴ This is unsurprising, as Nepos' account is highly abbreviated and idiosyncratic, and perhaps more significantly, because Nepos has, until relatively recently, been typically regarded as full of errors, and unworthy of serious scholarly study. It is the case, however, that Nepos' account of the events at Babylon, written sometime before 32 BC, is potentially our

² Practically all reconstructions of events in Babylon rely on these two sources, see esp. Errington (1970), Bosworth (2002), Meeus (2008), and Anson (2015). However, on many aspects, the accounts of Curtius and Justin differ (sometimes substantially) because they used different sources (and because of abbreviation by Justin), such that modern reconstructions are influenced by which of these two sources the scholar deems best. Bosworth (2002: 29) favours Justin, saying that 'Justin's outline [sc. of events], for all its faults, is the more reliable, whereas Anson (2015: 66), although acknowledging Bosworth's view, says that 'Curtius' account ... is more faithful to the specific historical context'. Errington (1970) says that 'Justin's account is confused and abbreviated to the point of practical uselessness' and thus favours Curtius (and provides an appendix which details Curtius' sequence of events [1970: 72-75]). Meeus (2008) attempts to look at events more holistically and addresses all sources available.

³ Plutarch's *Alexander* is also important on some points concerning death of Alexander, with tangential information relevant to events in Babylon, although not crucial to the discussion here. Dexippus (*BNJ* 100) based his work on Arrian's *Successors*. Both are known only through epitomes by Photius (#92 and #82 respectively). As a consequence he has received little scholarly attention, surviving only as an epitome of an already abbreviated text. The sources for the Babylonian Settlement are: Nepos *Eum.* 2.1-2; D.S. 18.2.1-4; Plut. *Eum.* 3.1-4; Arr. *Succ.* 1.1-5; *HE* 1.1-3; Curt. 10.6-10.1; Justin 13.1.10-3.10, 13.1.4-8. Sources for the distribution of the satrapies which followed the Settlement: Curt. 10.10.1-4; Justin 13.4.9-25; Nepos *Eum.* 2.2; D.S. 18.3.1-4; Plut. *Eum.* 3.1-4; Arr. *Succ.* 1.5-7; *HE* 1.3. The *Liber de Morte* is a very late source and loaded with subsequent propaganda, and thus of little use, see Heckel (1988). That Curtius Rufus, alone of our principal sources, did not draw on Hieronymus of Cardia but rather on Cleitarchus, see Atkinson (2000: 322 and 2009a: 20-21).

⁴ Meeus (2008) and Anson (2015) cite Nepos as a parallel reference, but none of Errington (1970), Bosworth (2002), and Roisman (2012) cite Nepos 2.1-2 at all in their reconstructions of the Babylonian Settlement.

oldest extant source for the Babylonian Settlement and definitely our earliest Latin source.⁵ His account of the Babylon Settlement has never been studied in its own right.⁶ For these reasons alone an in-depth study of Nepos' account is justified and perhaps necessary.

Despite success beyond measure and beyond emulation, Alexander the Great died young.⁷ Nepos does not entertain the speculation that Alexander was murdered, but at *Reg.* 2.1 records a natural death: [*Alexander*] *Babylone morbo consumptus est*.⁸ Not only did Alexander die young, but he died without legitimate issue: he had an illegitimate son, Heracles, by his concubine Barsine. However, Rhoxane, his wife, was either six (*Curt.* 10.6.9) or eight (*Justin* 13.2.5) months pregnant — with no certainty of a male child. In Macedonian royal successions where sons were expected to follow fathers, the lack of issue complicated issues and there was no formal process to be followed.⁹ Another compounding problem was

⁵ For the dating of *On Foreign Generals*, see **Introduction**. Diodorus Siculus and Nepos were near contemporaries. How and when Diodorus published his *Bibliothēke* is uncertain. Meeus (2022: 8) writes 'the commonly accepted date of composition of circa 60–30 BCE can thus likewise be only a very rough estimate'. Nepos may have composed *On Foreign Generals* before Diodorus wrote (or published) Book 18.

⁶ Nipperdey's (1849) commentary and Bradley's (1991) overview are the best studies available that look at this passage. Neither makes any attempt to analyse carefully what Nepos is doing with his source material: Nipperdey makes some individual comments and Bradley addresses matters purely in terms of *Quellenforschung*.

⁷ Alexander the Great died 11 June 323 (Depuydt 1997), as established through Babylonian records (Samuel 1962: 46-47). Bosworth, however, held firm to 10 June despite the arrival of important new evidence.

⁸ For Alexander's final illness and death, see *Plut. Alex.* 75-7; *Curt.* 10.5.1-6; *Arr.* 7.28. On possible illnesses that Alexander may have suffered, see Atkinson (2009b) and on possible poisoning, see Bosworth (1971). Bosworth (1988a: 157-184) offers a detailed account of Alexander's last days drawing primarily on Arrian and Plutarch, both supposedly based on the 'Royal Journals' (*Ephemerides*), apparently written by Eumenes. Samuel (1965) and Hammond (1988) rightly ask difficult questions about this 'source' in light of the lack of evidence for a royal journal outside of the last days of Alexander's life, and whether it was later propaganda.

⁹ On Argead Macedonian succession, see Greenwalt (1989), Carney (2000), and esp. Mitchell (2007) who provides a lucid diachronic account of Argead successions. In successions the role of the Macedonian army assembly in appointing kings is disputed, see Errington (1978), Anson (1985), and Anson (1991) which focuses on its evolution from 330 to 315 BC, and esp. Hatzopoulos (1996: 261-279) in his overview of Macedonian institutions; and Anson (2008a) for this institution under Philip II. Errington (1978: 131) says that 'in normal times, as far as the sources allow us to see, Macedonia had no formal or regular assembly of people or army', However, as Anson (1991: 236-38) notes, the extenuating circumstances at Babylon gave the army power and 'the army, as a result of its ability to put Arrhidaeus on the throne, now acquired a sense of its own authority', see also King (2010: 383-384). The result of this was that where an army assembly had not meaningfully existed before this event, it would afterwards become a feature of Hellenistic politics. For the possible judicial role of these assemblies, see Anson (2008b).

the issue of geography: Alexander had died in Babylon, far from the Macedonian homeland, such that (as it turned out) the succession was decided by only those present at Babylon, not by the Macedonians as a whole.¹⁰ The events of June, to perhaps July, 323 BC were unprecedented and unique.

On his deathbed, Alexander was aware of the inevitable complications of his unexpected passing far from home and without an heir. Some of our sources record that Alexander said that he bequeathed his empire to either ‘the strongest’ or to ‘the best.’¹¹ The majority tradition holds that Alexander added the caveat (and, as it turned out, correct prediction) that the ensuing conflict of his *hetairoi* would be his funeral games.¹² Alexander was correct: decades of civil strife would follow. Most importantly, however, for the present discussion, the initial problems related to the succession of the Macedonian throne and the division of Alexander’s hard won empire proved to be a ‘constitutionally unique and politically complex’ set of problems.¹³ The result of this, and the process that ensued (which likely lasted about a month), the Babylonian Settlement, was the first of a number of ‘conferences’ that would over time demarcate the

¹⁰ See Anson (2015: 58) for the potential difficulties to be faced. He asserts that ‘Alexander’s chief companions, his officers, and in this succession, as it turned out his troops, were faced with determining not only the future ruler or even rulers, but, in this particular crisis, even the very nature of the monarchy’, because as Fredricksmeier (2000: 133-166) argues Alexander no longer thought of himself as the king of Macedonia, but as the King of Asia — a major ideological shift. From Strabo we know that Alexander thought of Babylon as his royal capital/residence, οὐδὲ τοῦθ' [sc. τὰ Σοῦσα] ἠγεῖτο τὸ βασίλειον, ἀλλὰ τὴν Βαβυλῶνα (13.5.9).

¹¹ For references to these statements in the extant source tradition, see **Appendix γ**.

¹² D.S. 18.1.4: προορῶμαι γὰρ ἐπιτάφιον μέγαν ἀγῶνα γενησόμενόν μοι τῶν φίλων; Curt. 10.5.5: *ob id certamen magnos funebres ludos parari sibi*; Justin. 12.15.6: *tacentibus cunctis tum ipse, ut hoc nesciat, ita illud scire vaticinarique se ac paene oculis videre dixit, quantum sit in hoc certamine sanguinis fusura Macedonia, quantis caedibus, quo cruore mortuo sibi parentatura*; cf. Arr. *Anab.* 7.26.3, who says neither Ptolemy nor Aristobulus related this prediction: ταῦτά τε ἀπαγγεῖλαι τοὺς ἐταίρους καὶ Ἀλέξανδρον οὐ πολὺ ὕστερον ἀποθανεῖν, ὡς τοῦτο ἄρα ἤδη ὄν τὸ ἄμεινον. οὐ πόρρω δὲ τούτων οὔτε Ἀριστοβούλῳ οὔτε Πτολεμαίῳ ἀναγέγραπται. οἱ δὲ καὶ τάδε ἀνέγραψαν, ἐρέσθαι μὲν τοὺς ἐταίρους αὐτὸν ὅτῳ τὴν βασιλείαν ἀπολείπει, τὸν δὲ ὑποκρίνασθαι ὅτι τῷ κρατίστῳ: οἱ δὲ, προσθεῖναι πρὸς τοῦτῳ τῷ λόγῳ ὅτι μέγαν ἐπιτάφιον ἀγῶνα ὄρᾳ ἐφ' αὐτῷ ἐσόμενον. However, this statement is most likely apocryphal, as Atkinson (2009a: 146) notes, because of the silence of Ptolemy and Aristobulus on it, who were Arrian’s principal sources for the *Anabasis*, see Bosworth (1980: 18-34), for a discussion of Arrian’s use of sources and (1988: 38-60) for the way in which Arrian handles them.

¹³ Bosworth (2002: 32). However, Heckel and Wheatley (2011: 79) caution that one must be weary of thinking of the *ad hoc* arrangements made in Babylon in rigid constitutional terms.

power, influence, and territory of Alexander's most prestigious *hetairoi*.¹⁴

I will attempt to make sense of Nepos' account of the Babylonian Settlement in light of other sources and suggest how and why he differs so much from them, especially those which also draw on Hieronymus. I argue that Nepos' literary (that is his biographical) purpose and method shaped the way he composed and compressed. That is, as I have argued in **Chapter 1**, Nepos was not writing history and is, therefore, not intrinsically interested in explicating the complexities of early Hellenistic geopolitics, but rather aims to provide his readers only with that information necessary to understand the biography of Eumenes. Likewise, I consider whether Nepos' account reveals a sound understanding of the events in Babylon after Alexander the Great's death.

What we know was a period of intense negotiations, conferences, and conflicts, marked by shrewd political manoeuvring and compromises, Nepos reduces to an uncontested, uncomplicated solution in two subordinate clauses, a rambling explanatory parenthesis, and a short main clause that records the assignment of Cappadocia to Eumenes.¹⁵ A potentially complex account of one of the most debated events in Macedonian history becomes a brief, essentially contextualising, note which would make just enough sense to his Roman readers so that they could understand the broader political milieu in the *Eumenes*

¹⁴ There is some debate about the length of time from Alexander's death to the distribution of the satrapies: Meeus (2008: 82) suggests that 'after more than a month of struggle ... the Macedonian empire finally had a government'; Bosworth (2002: 55) says the process last 'a matter of weeks rather than days'. There are no relevant temporal markers in the sources that address the length of this process. Of these other 'conferences', only that at Triparadeisus falls within Eumenes' lifetime.

¹⁵ There were three stages, following Meeus (2008): 1) the first meeting after Alexander's death and the *στάσις* (between the infantry and Alexander's companions); 2) a compromise; and 3) the final settlement (and the distribution of the satrapies). This 'three stage' settlement was first proposed by Errington (1970), and is followed by all subsequent scholarship, esp. Bosworth (2002), whose reconstruction of events is praised by Meeus (2008: 39): 'Bosworth's thorough analysis will definitely set the standard for many years to come'. A thorough outline and analysis of all these stages, and the Babylonian Settlement as a whole, is beyond the scope of the present discussion, but for a breakdown of sources for each of these stages, and an outline of the decisions taken at each stage, see Meeus' table (2008: 82).

without the multi-phased conflict and disagreement.

So what does Nepos present to his readers? *Alexandro Babylone mortuo* (2.1) functions as an orientating temporal marker, alerting them to the jump from 324 BC.¹⁶ Nepos is not interested in Alexander or his death, consigning the event to an ablative absolute.¹⁷ The events directly after Alexander's death are what is important for the *Life*. The key points of Nepos' summary of events are the powers given to Perdiccas and Eumenes' receipt of a satrapy. Taking 2.1-2 as a whole, it is evident that the main clause, and thus the primary concern for Nepos, is *hoc tempore data est Eumeni Cappadocia*. In essence, Nepos is relating to his readers that *after* Alexander's death, Eumenes was awarded the satrapy of Cappadocia.¹⁸ What is presented outside of these phrases are the basic geopolitical factors needed by his readers.

Perdiccas emerged from this first conference at Babylon as regent.¹⁹ It has rightly been argued that the Babylonian Settlement was the story of Perdiccas' success:²⁰ his regency was the fundamental result, and the distribution of the satrapies was a subsidiary outcome. However, these results emerged only after

¹⁶ Nepos jumps directly from Eumenes' command of the companion cavalry and his becoming a proper *hetairoi* at 1.6: *praefuit etiam alterae equitum alae, quae Hetaerice appellabatur*.

¹⁷ Plutarch similarly uses a genitive absolute for Alexander's death ἀποθανόντος δὲ Ἀλεξάνδρου (*Eum.* 3.1).

¹⁸ Nepos simplifies the historical realities: Eumenes also received Paphlagonia and the Euxine Coast, but Cappadocia was the most important satrapy and where Eumenes (together with Perdiccas) later campaigned. *Tum in hostium erat potestate* is, however, important and correct: Alexander had not fully subdued Cappadocia which was under the rule of Ariarathes (cf. Plut. *Eum.* 3.4). These territories were in effect 'promised', as they would first need to be conquered (cf. D.S. 18.16.1). Ariarathes seemed ill-disposed to giving up his territory easily, 'und erwies sich als durchaus ernstzunehmender Gegner' (Schäfer 2002: 60), having become used to the *de facto* peace he enjoyed with neighbouring Antigonos, whom Alexander had left as satrap of Greater Phrygia in early spring 333, see Anson (1988) and (2015: 79); Billows (1997, 41). Anson (1988: 471) lays out the position of Antigonos as follows: 'the ten years from Issus until Alexander's death in Babylon in 323 were, however, not wasted for Antigonos. They were used by him to create a personal empire in Asia Minor; one based on direct control of an extended satrapy, alliances with native rulers, and the recruitment of native forces. As a result, after Alexander's death Antigonos was a major force with which to be reckoned'. Hence Antigonos was unwilling to support Eumenes in subjugating Cappadocia. The manpower of Ariarathes was significant: Diodorus (18.16.2) writes that he could muster 30,000 infantry and 15,000 cavalry.

¹⁹ On Perdiccas' career, see Heckel (2016: 153-188) and Rathmann (2005: 6-9) for a succinct overview.

²⁰ Bosworth (2002: 7) states that Perdiccas had, in effect, 'staged a coup', as important Macedonians such as Antipater and Craterus had no say in any decisions. This is dealt with below.

significant disagreement and conflict amongst different participants in the process who held irreconcilable opinions as to how the problem of succession ought to be addressed and resolved. This conflict is called a *στάσις* (both in our sources and in the scholarly literature), at its least, a clash between the rank-and-file infantry on the one side, and Alexander's bodyguards and companions (*hetairoi*) of Alexander led by Perdikkas (Alexander's Chiliarch, his second in command).²¹ Only in Nepos is this epoch-making event of the regency so easily and effortlessly entrusted to Perdikkas.

The idea of regency in Nepos' account is conveyed by the action of Alexander giving his signet ring to Perdikkas moments before he passed away.²² Nepos attaches great importance and significance to the identity of the recipient: *eidem ... Perdikkae* is emphatic. By placing the relative clause (*cui ... dederat*) in the middle of a clause describing the power granted to Perdikkas, Nepos surely draws a causal link between Perdikkas' being granted *summa rerum ... tuenda*, and his possession of Alexander's ring. This point is further drawn out by the explicit causal link *ex quo omnes coniecerant eum regnum ei commisisse: coniecerant* does not imply 'acceptance' but rather 'conjecture' or 'inference'.²³ This inference is a rational conclusion drawn from what was observed, as Alexander did not say what he was doing by giving the ring. This suggestion, however, does not diminish the emphatic causal link which Nepos draws between

²¹ *Στάσις* and cognate forms are universal in the Greek sources (D.S. 18.2.1: Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ βασιλέως τετελευτηκότος ἄπαιδος ἀναρχία καὶ πολλή *στάσις* ἐγένετο περὶ τῆς ἡγεμονίας; Plut. *Eum.* 3.1: ἀποθανόντος δὲ Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ τῆς φάλαγγος *διεστῶσης* πρὸς τοὺς ἑταίρους; Arr. *Succ.* 1: διαλαμβάνει τὴν τε *στάσιν* τῆς στρατιᾶς καὶ τὴν ἀνάρρησιν Ἀρριδαίου; HE 1.1: *στασιαζόντων* δὲ τῶν περὶ αὐτὸν περὶ τῆς βασιλείας), while the Latin account of Justin offers similar ideas (13.2.3: *inter ipsos vero aequalitas discordiam augebat nemine tantum ceteros excedente, ut ei aliquis se submitteret ...* 13.3.3: *statim et seditio crevit*). On the office of Chiliarch, which came to denote the second in command to the king, see Charles (2015) for its function in Achaemenid administration; for Macedonian inheritance of the Chiliarchy, see Collins (2001) and Hammond (1985). For the position of Chiliarch in the context of the Babylonian Settlement, see Meeus (2009). The word comes from Old Persian **hazarapatis* 'commander of a thousand', into Greek χιλίαρχος. Although Nepos understands the term correctly elsewhere (*Con.* 3.2: *primum ex more Persarum ad chiliarchum, qui secundum gradum imperii tenebat*) he chooses not to complicate the narrative here with such a technical term.

²² Rathmann (2005: 9-26) is the most thorough account of this action, and deals with what power (if any) Alexander's ring gave Perdikkas.

²³ OLD s.v. *conicio* 13.

the ring and the regency.

Arrian and Plutarch do not record that Alexander handed his ring to Perdiccas because they utilised Ptolemy as a source, who later wished to downplay the power and prestige afforded to Perdiccas by Alexander.²⁴ It is Curtius who comes closest to Nepos' formulation which indicates that Alexander had wished to confer supreme power on Perdiccas (... *placere igitur summam imperii ad Perdiccam deferri*, 10.6.16-17). The *Heidelberg Epitome*, however, makes a similar link between Perdiccas receiving Alexander's ring and his becoming regent, to the one in Nepos: ἡμέθη ἐπίτροπος καὶ ἐπιμελητῆς τῶν βασιλικῶν πραγμάτων ὁ Περδίκκας, ᾧ δέδωκεν ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος τελευτῶν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ δακτύλιον ὡς πιστοτέρῳ τῶν ἄλλων (1.2).

Nepos reports only Alexander's action on his deathbed but no final words. We must see this action as a means by which Alexander ensured the continuation of state functioning after his death.²⁵ For Alexander's companions, the precedent of Philip II leaving his ring with his son, Alexander, while on campaign in Byzantium would have guided their understanding of the gesture: Philip was not bestowing kingship on his son, but rather making sure that in his absence the state could function effectively—which required the royal seal (Plut. *Alex.* 9.1). In Argead Macedonia there was a *Staatsiegel* and the king's seal was the

²⁴ See **Appendix γ**. Ptolemy was a companion of Alexander, who after the death of Alexander, as satrap of Egypt soon became enemies with Perdiccas (cf. 3.2: *ipse* [sc. *Perdiccas*] *Aegyptum oppugnatum adversus Ptolemaeum erat profectus*). As Roisman (1984: 374-376, 382) notes, Ptolemy's 'distortions consist of omission of information that could have contributed to Perdiccas' fame', as such Alexander giving his ring to Perdiccas. See Errington (1969) and Bosworth (2002) for bias in Ptolemy's history. For very different views on Alexander's ring, see Badian (1988) and Hammond (1989b) and (1995). Curt. 6.6.6 says that Alexander was in possession of Darius' ring such that he used his Macedonian one for European correspondence, and the Persian one with his Persian subjects, see Atkinson (1994 *ad loc.*). Hammond (1995) argues that Alexander did not have a second ring. Rathmann (2005, 18-22) argues correctly that Perdiccas received the Macedonian ring from Alexander, because if he had received Darius' ring this would have made its way into subsequent propaganda. Whether Nepos knew that Alexander had two rings is simply intractable. However, *suum* suggests that it was his own ring, which would undoubtedly have been thought to be the Macedonian signet ring (cf. ἑαυτοῦ *HE* 1.2).

²⁵ Rathmann (2005: 25-26).

very symbol of authority.²⁶

In effect, Alexander simply made Perdiccas *primus inter pares*. There was nothing untoward or unusual in the choice of Perdiccas, for as Chiliarch he was already second-in-command and, as such, a natural choice to ensure that the Macedonian governance over Asia would continue to run smoothly. In the accounts of Diodorus and Curtius, Alexander gives the ring to Perdiccas first and, then, in response to a question from his friends ‘to whom do you leave the kingdom?’, he replied ‘the best’ or ‘strongest’.²⁷ If he wanted to give his empire and the kingship to Perdiccas, or to his child(ren), Alexander would not have spoken any such words. Schachermeyr argues that Alexander chose Perdiccas because he saw in him ‘a personality that seemed to be the closest to him in temperament, talent, and ambition, as well as stature as general’.²⁸ This may very well be the case, but it is important to remember that Perdiccas was, as the *Heidelberg Epitome* says, Alexander’s ‘most loyal’ general (1.2 πιστοτέρωι τῶν ἄλλων στρατηγῶν) which would be reason enough to want Perdiccas to take charge of the state. Both of these potential options are viable, but both can be further reinforced by a simple fact of hierarchy: Perdiccas was Chiliarch, and technically second in command of the Macedonian state in Asia. Only the *Liber de Morte* (112) explicitly states that Alexander wanted to make Perdiccas his successor; like Cassius Dio, this writer of the imperial period was well familiar with Roman imperial transfers of power and probably retrojected Roman expectations.²⁹

²⁶ On this terminology, see Instinsky (1962: 13-22); cf. Curt. 10.6.5: *et Perdicca: ‘Ego quidem’, inquit, ‘anulum, quo ille regni atque imperii vires obsignare erat solitus, traditum ab ipso mihi, reddo vobis’*. Curtius makes much of the role of the ring at Babylon, and his statement that Perdiccas was willing to return the ring, and therefore power, was meant to recall Augustus’ return of power to the state in January 27 BC (RG 34.1). On the Roman-ness of Curtius’ account and its overlaps with Roman history, see Atkinson (2000, esp. 307, 319-325), and (2009 *ad loc.*).

²⁷ The order is reversed in Justin.

²⁸ Schachermeyr (1970: 16): *‘In Perdikkas hat Alexander eine Persönlichkeit erkannt, die ihm an Temperament, Begabung und Ehrgeiz, wie überhaupt an Format, irgendwie noch am nächsten zu stehen schien’*.

²⁹ *Tunc ipse sibi anulum de digito detraxit et Perdiccae tradidit*. The continuations with dramatic details of Rhoxane’s grief concludes with Alexander physically entrusting her to Perdiccas: *eam complexus osculari coepit dexteramque eius tenens in dexteram Perdiccae indidit nutuque commendationem fecit’*. cf. Alexander’s statement at 110: *‘ego quae post mortem meam fieri*

Were both the act of bestowing the ring and the final words from Alexander present in Hieronymus? Arrian (*Anab.* 7.26.3) says that neither Ptolemy nor Aristobulus related the prediction of strife; Curtius' account of both these incidents (10.5.4-5) is plausibly derived from his main source, Cleitarchus, as is Justin's. Diodorus provides two accounts of Alexander's end — at the end of Book 17, and at the beginning of Book 18.³⁰ Both contain the handing over of the ring, but there are clear lexical differences as to Alexander's words: κράτιστος (17.117.4) and ἄριστος (18.1.4).³¹ It is generally accepted that Diodorus used Cleitarchus as this principal source for Book 17 and then switched to Hieronymus for Book 18, and from the incompatibility of the two adjectives was not concerned by the inconsistency.³² Nepos and the *Heidelberg Epitome*, to the best of our knowledge, both reliant solely on Hieronymus, report only the ring-giving. Although both are severely abbreviated and cannot be assumed to include all material from their source, it is likely that Hieronymus recorded neither Alexander's 'to the best' or 'to the strongest'.³³

What might the passing of a ring by a supremely powerful politician and invincible general have meant to Nepos' Roman readers? The Republican *exempla* preserved by Valerius Maximus belong in the context of private inheritance, and might suggest an answer.³⁴ With an individual in possession of power in the public sphere, however, the boundary between public and private could become blurred. To the Roman readers of the 30s BC, the death of Alexander may well have recalled the death of Julius Caesar roughly a

vellem, testamento scripsi. Nunc interim tu Perdicca et Antipater videte ac negotia procurate. On this peculiar and late source, see Heckel (1988: 26) for this episode.

³⁰ For this passage, see n. 12 above. For Cleitarchus as Curtius' source for this episode, see Atkinson (2009a *ad loc.*). For Justin, see Heckel (1997: 34-38), although making no comment on Justin's use of sources for these episodes.

³¹ Landucci Gattinoni (2008: 6-7) notes the lexical similarity of Diodorus Book 17 account to Arrian *Anab.* 7.26.3: κράτιστος.

³² For Cleitarchus as Diodorus' source for Book 17, see Bosworth (1980: 29). Landucci Gattinoni does not address the lexical incompatibility between Books 17 and 18 in her commentary on 18.2.4 when the difference arises.

³³ Hornblower (1981: 67) bizarrely considers it uncertain whether Hieronymus related the handing over of the ring. Uncertainty pertains only to Alexander's words.

³⁴ Val. Max. 7.8.5, 6, 8, with Simpson (2005: 181-182). It should be emphasised that in these cases the recipients did not inherit because of being given the ring.

decade earlier.³⁵ Although the circumstances of these deaths were markedly dissimilar, especially as Nepos rejects a conspiracy on Alexander's life, in both instances the preeminent figure in their respective worlds had died unexpectedly and bitter conflict followed. Like Perdiccas, Octavian came to possess the ring of his predecessor; the first mention of this is Cassius Dio's narrative of the portents of 42 BC (47.41.2), specifically the epiphany of Divus Iulius to a Thessalian before the defeat of the Republican forces at Philippi:

ἀνὴρ Θεσσαλὸς ἔδοξέν οἱ τὸν Καίσαρα τὸν πρότερον κεκελευκέναι εἰπεῖν τῷ Καίσαρι ὅτι τε ἐς ἔνης ἢ μάχη γενήσοιτο, καὶ ἵνα ἀναλάβῃ τι ὧν δικτατορεύων αὐτὸς ἐφόρει. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὸν δακτύλιον αὐτοῦ τότε τε εὐθὺς περιέθετο καὶ ἔπειτα πολλάκις ἔφερεν.

The ring that Octavian inherited from his father conferred no power; rather, this ring was Julius Caesar's personal seal. Simpson rightly argues that Dio's use of *πολλάκις* (rather than say, *ἀεί*) 'indicates, without any doubt, that the ring was not an officially necessary item of personal adornment, a seal of state.'³⁶ That is to say that possession of Julius Caesar's ring did not confer any constitutional powers upon Octavian but appropriately belonged to his son and heir, and it was simply an identifier of Caesar.³⁷ While true as to the strictly constitutional, Simpson's argument may understate the power of image and perception. In the Triumviral context of acute contestation of the heritage of Caesar between Octavian and M. Antonius, including challenges to Octavian's heirship and the allegation by M. Antonius that Caesar's bastard son Caesarion was of Caesar's blood (Suet. *Iul.* 52.2), Nepos' readers may have been particularly sensitive to possible parallels. To Caesarians Octavian may have seemed the true heir because, amongst other things,

³⁵ On the issue of dating, see **Introduction**.

³⁶ Simpson (2005: 183).

³⁷ There was as yet no 'imperial seal', but by the Flavian period the 'imperial seal' existed and from his perspective of the early third century AD Cassius Dio (53.30.2) interprets Augustus' handing of his ring to Agrippa in 23 BC as political, an indication that Agrippa was to be his successor; Rich (1990: *ad loc.*) even argues that Augustus deliberately emulated the dying Alexander. On Augustus' three seals, see Suet. *Aug.* 50 and Wardle (2014: 363), who says that 'during the earlier principate the emperor's signet ring was no more than a personal identifier', and thus so too in the 30s BC. Augustus' use of a seal with Alexander the Great's image is interesting though of little practical use to the present discussion, see Plin. *HN* 37.10.

he possessed Caesar's ring.³⁸

As *enim* signals, Nepos to his credit, is aware that Perdikkas was only in such a preeminent position by some degree of chance: Craterus and Antipater were absent (in Cilicia and Macedonia respectively), and Alexander's favourite was dead.³⁹ Antipater was Alexander's proxy in Macedonia, left in that position when Alexander had departed for Asia.⁴⁰ It was Antipater who held the most important position in the Macedonian world after Alexander. Craterus, was on his way back to Macedonia, escorting discharged veterans, when Alexander died.⁴¹ His renown with Alexander was massive: Plutarch says that Alexander showed the most esteem for Craterus (*Alex.* 47.10) and Arrian says that Craterus was Alexander's most loyal companion (*Anab.* 7.12.3).⁴² The death of Hephaestion, in October 324 BC at Ecbatana, obviously rendered him absent from Babylon, but Nepos' *unum ... plurimi fecerat* suggests that Hephaestion was Alexander's favourite and that, had he been present at Babylon, things may have turned out different.⁴³ Nepos' formulation is deliberately vague as to the nature of the relationship between Alexander and Hephaestion.⁴⁴ Nepos is neutral, even functional, whereas we know that he could have been negative:

³⁸ In Curtius' version (10.6.4-5) Perdikkas placed the ring upon Alexander's throne as he made a claim for power through asserting his connection with the dead king. A very similar manoeuvre was repeated by Octavian in 44 BC where he paraded Caesar's crown in the *pompa circensis* on his golden *sella* in the battle for public opinion in the months after Caesar's assassination. He lacked the *imperium* of M. Antonius but demonstrated his *pietas* to Caesar by display of Caesar's attributes.

³⁹ Craterus had been commissioned by Alexander to repatriate 10,000 Macedonian veterans (D.S. 18.4.1); Antipater had been left behind in Macedonia by Alexander, as general of Europe (D.S. 18.12.1: στρατηγός τῆς Εὐρώπης).

⁴⁰ On Antipater's career, see Heckel (2016: 33-43).

⁴¹ On Craterus' career, see Anson (2012); Ashton (2015); Heckel (2016: 122-152).

⁴² Heckel (1992: 107) suggests that Craterus was 'arguably the best' of all Alexander's companions.

⁴³ Principal sources for the death of Hephaestion are: Arr. *Anab.* 7.14.1-10 (Alexander's reaction clearly shows the importance and singular nature of this relationship); Plut. *Alex.* 72.2; D.S. 17.110.7-8; Plut. *Eum.* 2. 9-10; cf. Curt. 10.5.20 who briefly mentions the death.

⁴⁴ Curtius' *amicorum carissimus* (3.12.6) reflects the lifelong friendship of Hephaestion with Alexander; he was said to be Alexander's 'second self' (Arr. *Anab.* 2.12.7; Plut. *Alex.* 47.1). *Unum* clearly indicates that they had a special relationship, perhaps as friends, but he does not mention the possibility of them as lovers. The nature of Alexander and Hephaestion's relationship has generated much scholarship, e.g. Africa (1982: 410-414), Baynham (1988), Reames-Zimmerman (1999), Reames (2010), and Ogden (2011: 155-167) cf. Tarn (1950: 318-326) for a now much outdated view on the relationship. For Hephaestion's career, see Heckel (2016: 75-100, but esp. 85-92) for positions held under Alexander.

Plutarch includes anecdotes that indicate Eumenes and Hephaestion did not have the best rapport (*Eum.* 2.1-2, 8).⁴⁵ Thus Nepos shows that three individuals could have won out over Perdiccas, had they been in Babylon.⁴⁶

We have seen that Hieronymus was the primary source for most extant accounts of the period and from their combined account we can have some idea of what Hieronymus' detailed narrative contained.⁴⁷ Common to these sources (except Nepos) is the universal theme of a στάσις in Babylon, conflict about how the succession ought to proceed. The principal problems tabled were: who ought to be 1) king (i.e. Arrhidaeus, or Alexander's unborn child, or even Alexander's illegitimate son Herakles); and 2) who would be regent, as one would be necessary for all options, because both of Alexander's children were not of age and Alexander's half-brother Arrhidaeus was in some way mentally handicapped.⁴⁸ The options for regent included Perdiccas, Antipater, Leonnatus, and Craterus.⁴⁹

The fact that στάσις followed the death of Alexander is crucial: there was obviously, amongst those in Babylon, no clear-cut solution to the problems at hand. This was not the first succession crisis to face Macedonia, but it was without doubt entirely unique.⁵⁰ Historically, successions had been played out in Macedonia, in front of the whole citizenry and army. This was not the case in Babylon. As mentioned

⁴⁵ These scandalous anecdotes almost certainly derive from Duris of Samos and not Hieronymus, hence Nepos will not have included them. However, aspects of Eumenes and Hephaestion's relations could very well have been present in Hieronymus, but not as negative towards Eumenes as those we see in Plutarch. Despite an obviously strained relationship, Arrian (*Anab.* 7.13.1) says that Eumenes and Hephaestion were reconciled before the latter's death.

⁴⁶ Perdiccas inherited the office of Chiliarch from Hephaestion. Antipater and Craterus both emerged from the settlement with powers, sharing the command of Macedonian affairs in Europe (D.S. 18.3.2).

⁴⁷ See **Chapter 1** and **Appendix α**.

⁴⁸ It is clear that he had some serious psychiatric problem, and it is futile to try elucidate this further, as an actual diagnosis is intractable. On Arrhidaeus, and his condition as well as the sources for it, see Carney (2001).

⁴⁹ On these individuals as options, see Errington (1970: 53).

⁵⁰ Mitchell (2007: 63-64).

above, influential and powerful figures were absent, and the succession played out far away from the traditional capital of Pella. Only a small subset of Macedonians was present in Babylon, and those there would be the decision-makers.

From the Hieronymean sources, we can construct a broad (although perhaps schematic) picture of an original account, which appears to have included three clear stages: first an account of Alexander's death and the ensuing conflict between factions; a compromise; then a resolution to the στάσις resulting in the regency and the distribution of the satrapies. Nepos' very brief account, which focuses almost entirely on results (rather than process), is very different from what may have been found in Hieronymus' original work. Although this conflict in Babylon could (and should from a strictly historical perspective) be seen as the most important aspect of the process (as it was through this conflict that the results of the conference were ultimately mediated), the intricacies are absent from Nepos, because he focuses entirely on the final stage, the result of Perdiccas' appointment as regent and Eumenes' as satrap. I will now discuss the main features of what Nepos does include and how they accord or disagree with the other sources.

There is scholarly debate about the exact nature of Perdiccas' 'regency', what it entailed, and especially the language used to describe it. Latin lacks a word for such a position and thus Nepos (along with Curtius and Justin) are at somewhat of a linguistic disadvantage. Meeus has helpfully collated the various terminologies and phrases used to describe Perdiccas' position post-settlement.⁵¹ Even in the Greek versions there is considerable variation: Diodorus has ἐπιμελητὴν δὲ τῆς βασιλείας (18.2.4); Dexippus ἐπετρόπευον αὐτοῖς τὴν ἀρχὴν (1); the *Heidelberg Epitome* has ἐπίτροπος καὶ ἐπιμελητῆς τῶν βασιλικῶν

⁵¹ Meeus (2008: 54-55) presents a table laying out the powers and/or positions of not only Perdiccas, but all key actors. Meeus (2008: 82) offers an appendix which neatly outlines each of the three stages of events at Babylon and the key events and decisions taken, with reference to the source material.

πραγμάτων (1.2).⁵² The terms ἐπίτροπος and ἐπιμελητής suggest the idea of guardianship was to the fore. Due to the absence of a word for ‘regent’ in Latin, the concept has to be expressed differently. Justin’s epitome of Trogus does not record the exact position of Perdiccas in the final settlement.⁵³ Curtius Rufus, although not using Hieronymus as a source, has *cum rege esse copiisque praeesse* (‘to accompany the king and command his forces’ (10.10.4). While bringing out well the military responsibilities of Perdiccas, this reveals nothing of the role of care or guardianship but does exclude powerfully any notion that Perdiccas was king.⁵⁴ This peculiar formulation could be a result of Curtius struggling to spell out a concept unfamiliar to Romans, but because his source was Cleitarchus rather than Hieronymus, we cannot be sure what he was working with and thus know whether his phrase translates an earlier Greek formulation.⁵⁵ Nepos’ *summa rerum tradita esset tuenda eidem ... Perdiccae* offers a distinctly Roman way of describing a regency and especially one entailing a form of guardianship (for example, of a very young king, such as was the case in 323). Nepos captures well the meaning of ἐπίτροπος and/or ἐπιμελητής.⁵⁶ Given the use of *tueor* in the sense of ‘care’ or ‘guardianship’, it appears that here Nepos is most likely translating Hieronymus.⁵⁷

⁵² Photius’ epitomes of Arrian’s *Successors* and Dexippus have no clear term for ‘regent’, but the original versions would certainly have had to include such a word or formulation. Photius’ ἐπετρόπευον αὐτοῖς τὴν ἀρχήν (Dexippus 1) is vague, and does not necessarily convey regency, and should be translated as ‘[they] made themselves guardians of the empire’. The extended Greek text makes the situation even more obscure: ἀρχεται δὲ ἐν τοῖς μετὰ Ἀλεξάνδρον ἀπ’ αὐτῆς τῆς τοῦ βασιλέως τελευτῆς, καὶ διέξεισιν ὅπως εἰς τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἀλεξάνδρου τὸν Ἀρριδαῖον, ὃς ἦν ἐκ Φιλίνης τῆς Λαρισσαίας τῷ Φιλίππῳ γεγενημένος, ἢ τῶν Μακεδόνων ἀρχὴ περιέστη, εἰς αὐτόν τε καὶ εἰς τὸν μέλλοντα Ἀλεξάνδρου παῖδα τίκτεσθαι ἐκ Ῥωξάνης (ἐν γαστρὶ γὰρ ἔχουσα καταλέλειπτο) καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀμφὶ Περδίκκων, οἱ κρίσει τῶν Μακεδόνων ἐπετρόπευον αὐτοῖς τὴν ἀρχήν, which suggested the power was held by many, and not just Perdiccas.

⁵³ See table in Meeus (2008: 54) for all the various formulations.

⁵⁴ Atkinson (2009a *ad loc.*) shows that this phrase ought to be taken as equivalent to ‘regent’ but does not describe the obtuseness of the formulation.

⁵⁵ Atkinson (2009a: 20-21) for Curtius’ source for the events in Babylon: Cleitarchus.

⁵⁶ There is much said in the now older scholarly literature that Nepos was bad at Greek (all about an *apparent* mistranslation of Thucydides: Nepos *Them.* 9.4 translated from Thuc. 1.137). Both Stem (2012) and Lobur (2021) have grappled with the particular passage and show that Nepos’ Greek was sound.

⁵⁷ *OLD* s.v. *tueor* 2 and 4 and the cognate nouns *tutela* and *tutor*. Which of the two words (or both) were contained in Hieronymus’ original is hard to determine. ἐπιμελητής is, I believe, closer in meaning to Nepos’ *tueor*, and ἐπιμελητής is present in Diodorus Siculus, who is, arguably, most likely to have reproduced what Hieronymus wrote (as opposed to the more

If it was not already obvious from the use of *tueor* that Nepos is trying to express a ‘regency’, this is made abundantly clear from the addition of *regnum ei commisisse, quoad liberi eius suam tutelam pervenissent* — the readers are clearly shown that Perdikkas is to act as a guardian (= regent) of Alexander’s children (or Arrhidaeus) — here *committo* is almost ἐπιτρέπειν.⁵⁸

Nepos’ *liberi eius* is not straightforward: the plural requires a minimum of two children sired by Alexander himself. Alexander died with one illegitimate son, and another child on the way, so on one level the plural is easily intelligible. However, the historical realities of the settlement are problematic for such an easy interpretation. The notion of an illegitimate (Persian) son was quickly eliminated as an option at Babylon, so we can disregard Herakles as a future king whom Perdikkas was to protect; if Rhoxane’s pregnancy resulted in a male child, there would be a need for guardian or regent. Nepos’ plural is not a manuscript issue, nor is it a matter that could be easily confused — decisions at Babylon only ever entertained the thought of Rhoxane’s child and Alexander’s half-brother Arrhidaeus (i.e. there was only one *liber Alexandri*).⁵⁹ Arrhidaeus, although, as has already been mentioned, afflicted by some mental disability, was an important factor in the discussions and conflict in Babylon, albeit not by his own agency, but rather promoted through the designs of others. He was, as it turned out, the only Argead present in Babylon, which put him in a privileged position: the infantry led by Meleager wanted Arrhidaeus to be king, and proclaimed him as such.⁶⁰ Alexander’s bodyguards and *hetairoi*, however, were not in support of this. In

abbreviated sources). However, the argument for ἐπιμελητής is definitely strengthened through its use in the *HE*.

⁵⁸ *OLD* s.v. *committo* 12; cf. *LSJ* s.v. ἐπιτρέπω A3.

⁵⁹ The manuscript tradition for *liberi* is secure. Neither Winstedt’s OCT (1902) nor Marshall’s Teubner (1991) record any variant readings. The correct relationship between Alexander and Arrhidaeus — that he was a half-brother is recorded by Diodorus Siculus (18.2.1: Ἀρριδαῖον τὸν Φιλίππου μὲν υἱόν); likewise, *HE* (1.1: ἀδελφὸς Ἀλεξάνδρου ὁ Ἀρριδαῖος, ὁ καὶ Φίλιππος ὕστερον ὀνομασθεῖς, and *Arr. Succ.* (1: Ἀρριδαίου, ὃς ἐκ Φιλίνης τῆς Θεσσαλῆς Φιλίππῳ τῷ Ἀλεξάνδρου πατρὶ ἐγεγέννητο).

⁶⁰ For Meleager’s role in the conflict, see Bosworth (2002: 35, 38-39, 45-51). Bosworth (2002: 7) says that Meleager as the leader of the Macedonian rank-and-file, ‘saw himself as the king-maker’. Meleager was not a renowned figure, but a phalanx-commander in Babylon; on his career see also Heckel (2016: 101-107). On Macedonian army assemblies, see n. 9 above.

the final settlement in which the infantry and the *hetairoi* were reconciled, it was agreed that Arrhidaeus would be king with a regent and, if Rhoxane bore a son (as it would turn out), there would be a dual kingship (again under a regency).⁶¹

The question here is: does Nepos mistakenly identify Arrhidaeus as a child of Alexander or has his desire to abbreviate and to simplify led to an error both here and at 13.3 (... *se Alexandri liberis regnum servare*)? Traditionally, Nepos was seen as careless with historical fact and, at least since Nipperdey, error-collecting has been a pastime of some scholars.⁶² Yet, while only Nepos seemingly omits Arrhidaeus, it is certain the biographer knew of him, for it would be a major oversight to miss one of the kings (especially as he was present in all Hieronymus-derived sources). Rather, Arrhidaeus is simply unimportant to Nepos; his biographical focus and method does not necessitate exacting detail. Because his account of Eumenes' life will not feature Arrhidaeus again, there is no need to include him as King Philip Arrhidaeus.⁶³ However, even if we follow this line of argument, why does Nepos use the plural? It may be simply that Nepos knew that Perdiccas' regency was for two individuals, and so Nepos needs a plural, but does not want to have to explain further intricacies, or, more likely, Nepos could simply be confused as he does refer in passing to Alexander's children later in the *Eumenes*.⁶⁴ In short, Nepos is averse to including information that does not directly aid the narrative and theme of the *Life* in question, especially given that he is writing *short* biographies. This should perhaps be seen as an idiosyncrasy of Nepos' text precluding a definite answer.

⁶¹ A detailed account of events at Babylon is beyond the scope of this chapter. There are numerous scholarly works that analyse and reconstruct events, and the relevant passages: especially important are Bosworth (2002, 29-63) and Meeus (2008) for a more technical examination. Anson (2015: 58-77) addresses the Babylonian Settlement with a focus on Eumenes. And Roisman (2012: 61-86) looks at this conflict from the perspective of the army.

⁶² For a list of the most notable historical errors, although not comprehensive, see Lobur (2012: 69 n. 154).

⁶³ Beyond the passages under discussion, Arrhidaeus is not mentioned again in the Nepotian corpus.

⁶⁴ The *liberi* are after all both unnamed and not mentioned again in any meaningful way; in the summary of Eumenes' life at 13.3, however, Nepos does describe Eumenes' concern to preserve the *regnum* for Alexander's *liberis*, and Olympias draws attention to the children (*liberis Alexandri*) of Alexander at 6.3.

To reiterate an earlier statement, the Babylonian Settlement was the ‘the story of Perdiccas’ success’.⁶⁵ Without question Perdiccas, through receipt of the regency, was the prime beneficiary and became the most powerful figure in the Macedonian world. Thus Nepos identifies the key outcome, which is especially pertinent, as Eumenes was to side with Perdiccas until the regent’s death in 320.⁶⁶ Yet, if we examine the structure of 2.1-2, the most important part for Nepos is the main clause (*hoc tempore data est Eumeni Cappadocia...*), where he reverts to Eumenes, the subject of the biography from where he has left off at 1.6; all the other material provides necessary contextual information, orientating the readers to understand better how Eumenes came to be allocated a satrapy. Nepos is not writing history proper or even attempting to present a majority of facts at his disposal from his source. Rather, he is focused primarily on constructing his biographies to show the *virtutes* and *mores* of his subjects. He provides historical detail and information that aids that purpose.

Although we have not been able to excuse Nepos from probable error on Alexander’s *liberi*, other alleged errors may be nothing of the sort and may actually spring from casual or pedantic readings of Nepos (ones that are entirely unsympathetic to what Nepos is actually doing).⁶⁷ First, one might, on a casual reading of the text of 2.1, suggest that Nepos has inverted the historical sequence of events in Babylon and placed the division of the satrapies before Perdiccas’ accession to the regency. *Cum regna singulis familiaribus dispartirentur et summa rerum tradita esset tuenda eidem ... Perdiccae* may seem somewhat confused because the distribution of the satrapies was administered by Perdiccas in the name of king

⁶⁵ Bosworth (2002: 34).

⁶⁶ There is a question concerning when Eumenes and Perdiccas became allies. Anson (2015: 68) makes the argument that in reality, Eumenes and Perdiccas were allies already in Babylon after Alexander’s death, although their *amicitia* may perhaps have existed earlier (for which we have no evidence). Plutarch, however, seems to suggest that it was only upon Eumenes’ return to Babylon in the winter of 323/322 that they became allies. In Nepos (2.4: *persuadere Eumeni studuit, ut Perdiccam desereret*) there is an alliance in existence after Alexander’s death and when the First Diadoch War broke out, Perdiccas is Eumenes’ *amicus* (3.1).

⁶⁷ E.g. Nipperdey (1849 *ad loc.*).

Philip Arrhidaeus, as the other sources show.⁶⁸ Although it may seem that Nepos presents these events as contemporaneous, in that they are contained within the same *cum* clause, or in non-chronological order, this is not in fact the case: the imperfect tense *dispertirentur* suggests an incomplete or ongoing process, which most definitely extends beyond the pluperfect tense of *tradita esset* which follows: Nepos is saying that, *after* Perdikkas had been appointed regent and *in the course of* the distribution-process, Eumenes was granted Cappadocia. Thus, it appears he is aware of the correct sequence of events. Furthermore, as already mentioned, Nepos is primarily concerned with Eumenes: by placing the distribution of the satrapies first in the sequence, Nepos prioritises that which actually concerns Eumenes directly (this *cum* clause links with *hoc tempore ...*), such that the first thing mentioned after the death of Alexander is a process in which Eumenes is involved.

Each of the other Hieronymean sources parallel to Nepos uses *σατραπεία*, which is probably (if not almost certainly) the term that Hieronymus used for the territorial units of Alexander's empire. However, Nepos calls them *regna*. Nipperdey's short note has '*regna* better *provinciae*'.⁶⁹ He is not wrong: *regna* ('kingdoms') is certainly not correct — an anachronism that is hard to explain. Alexander had no administrative 'model for action' when he set out for Asia: 'there were no precedents for the administration of the territory he annexed, no system inherited from his father'.⁷⁰ As his conquests and as dominion grew, he took over Achaemenid bureaucratic structures.⁷¹ That is, he inherited Persian satrapies

⁶⁸ For this order of events, and authority, see D.S. 18.2.4: εὐθὺ δὲ βασιλέα κατέστησαν τὸν Φιλίππου υἱὸν Ἀρριδαῖον καὶ μετωνόμασαν Φίλιππον, ἐπιμελητὴν δὲ τῆς βασιλείας Περδίκκαν, ὃ καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τὸν δακτύλιον τελευτῶν δεδώκει, τοὺς δὲ ἀξιολογώτατους τῶν φίλων καὶ σωματοφυλάκων παραλαβεῖν τὰς σατραπείας καὶ ὑπακούειν τῷ τε βασιλεῖ καὶ τῷ Περδίκκᾳ.

⁶⁹ Nipperdey (1849 *ad loc.*). Lobur (2021: 69 n. 154) too acknowledges that Nepos' use of *regna* is likely an error.

⁷⁰ Bosworth (1988b: 229) for whom Alexander saw himself as the successor/heir of the Achaemenids and willingly inherited their governmental system.

⁷¹ On the administration of Alexander's Asian Empire, Bosworth (1988b: 229-240) is an essential introduction (a revised version of his chapter in *CAH VI*²: 846-875); see also: Griffith (1964) and Badian (1965).

and the satrapal form of government.⁷² From the Roman perspective satrapies can be considered a neat equivalent for provinces, and satraps for provincial governors. In the Persian system satraps were one level below the king. What satrapies were not, were independent kingdoms (i.e. *regna*) as Nepos appears to have understood the term here. Not until the coronation of the Diadochs in 306/5 could certain satrapies (or, broader regions) be considered kingdoms. Here Nepos could be confused, as later he makes correct statements about the assumption of the title of king by various Diadochs in 305 (13.2-3 and *Reg.* 3.1-2). Outside the *Eumenes* Nepos uses the Greek-derived term for satrap, *satrapes*, five times (*Paus.* 1.2, *Alc.* 10.3 *Con.* 2.1, *Lys.* 4.1, *Dam.* 3.1), in each instance of Achaemenid governors, not Greeks or Macedonians. However, he never uses the transliterated *satrapia* (σατραπεία), which would be the correct term in this particular instance.⁷³ Both of these transliterated terms are used by Curtius, but he does use *provincia* when describing the division for the empire (10.10.3).⁷⁴ Justin uses *provincia* exclusively, and most importantly at 13.2.13 where he relates the distribution. Nepos, however, does not use *provincia* in his *Eumenes*, and only uses the term four times outside of the Roman *Lives* (*Alc.* 4.3; *Dat.* 1.1, 1.2, 10.2). We can disregard the first usage, as it has nothing to do with Persian or Macedonian satrapies (or provinces). However, each of the uses of *provincia* in the *Datames* refers to Achaemenid satrapies and so the serial reader of Nepos, would be familiar with the term's usage in this context. Why, then would Nepos change the term three *Lives* later to *regna* for Macedonian rule? There are two possible solutions: 1) Nepos is temporally and politically confused, making a minor error, and anticipating historical change by seven years; or 2) he uses terminology that would make sense to his Roman readers of the 30s BC, at which time

⁷² For a brief introduction to Persian satrapal government, see Waters (2014: 100-103).

⁷³ Cf. Plin. *HN* 6.78; and esp. Gell. 10.18.3: *Mausolus autem fuit, ut M. Tullius ait, rex terrae Cariae, ut quidam Graecarum historiarum scriptores, provinciae praefectus σατράπην Graeci vocant.* Nepos uses *praefectus* to mean both 'captain' and 'officer' (*Milt.* 4.2; *Lys.* 4.1; *Eum.* 5.7, 11.1; *Dat.* 6.3; *Phoc.* 2.4, *Ham.* 3.2; *Att.* 6.4), but also unambiguously to mean 'satrap' (*Alc.* 5.3; *Con.* 2.4; possibly *Chab.* 3.1; *Dat.* 2.5; *Ag.* 2.3; *Eum.* 2.4, and 13.3). Alexander's successors called themselves *praefecti* before attaining kingship (*Eum.* 13.3).

⁷⁴ *Satrapes*, e.g. Curt. 3.33.1; 9.8.9; *satrapia*, e.g. Curt. 5.1.44.

many of the satrapal regions in question (for example, Parthia, Pontus, Armenia and Judaea) were all kingdoms (*regna*). Alexander is said to have had a *regnum* at 13.3 and there are two mentions of a Macedonian *regnum* (6.1-2), but neither he, nor any Macedonian before him, ever held multiple *regna*. No solution here is perfect, especially when one considers the fact that Nepos was both aware of and used the correct political terminology elsewhere.

Severe abbreviation produces interesting or incorrect results. On an admittedly critical reading of Nepos' account of the distribution of the satrapies, one could hold the biographer's use of the word *singuli* to indicate that that satrapal appointments were conferred upon and distributed to *each and every one* of Alexander's *familiares*.⁷⁵ This was not the case: there was no universal distribution. Analysis of the uses of *singuli* in Nepos reveals that the meaning of 'each' is apparent and common.⁷⁶ If one looks at the satrapal lists, those who received satrapies were, as Diodorus says, Alexander's most important friends and bodyguards: τοὺς δὲ ἀξιολογωτάτους τῶν φίλων καὶ σωματοφυλάκων παραλαβεῖν τὰς σατραπείας (18.2.4).⁷⁷ Diodorus' φίλοι is synonymous with ἑταῖροι, whereas Justin (13.4.9) refers to provinces being distributed among *principes*.⁷⁸ There were simply not enough satrapies to go around.⁷⁹ Notably, Seleucus

⁷⁵ For Nepos' potential anticipation of a future event, there is the implicit assumption that in his research for the *Eumenes*, Nepos read further than the death of his subject and/or had a broader knowledge of this period. *OLD* s.v. *singuli* 1. It is reasonable to assume that *familiares* is used synonymously with *amici* (see 1.6 and 2.4), which in turn is the common Latin translation of the Greek ἑταῖροι. On *amici* as the typical Latin translation of ἑταῖροι, see Stagakis (1970: 95).

⁷⁶ Cf. *Milt.* 3.2: *quibus singulis illarum urbium perpetua dederat imperia*; *Them.* 4.4: *cum singulos consecrari cogeretur*; *Iph.* 2.2: *ut singuli a peritissimo imperatore dispositi viderentur*. On my reading of all these usages mean 'each' or 'every'.

⁷⁷ For complete satrapal lists, see Goralski (1989: 104-105) and Klinkott (2000: 40-48), who addresses Perdikkas' distribution comprehensively and studies satrapies diachronically, from the Achaemenid Period and across the early Hellenistic period.

⁷⁸ *Plut. Eum.* 3.3 is vague about exactly who received commands, but one must assume the στρατηγοὶ themselves (οἱ στρατηγοὶ καὶ καταστάντες ἐκ τῶν πρώτων παραχῶν διενέμοντο σατραπείας καὶ στρατηγίας).

⁷⁹ Goralski (1989: 104-105) presents a table with the 49 satrapies that were distributed at Babylon. See also Klinkott (2000: 94, 100) for these satrapies. Berve (1926: 31) presents a list of 61 *hetairoi* known by name. Anson (2015: 49) says there are 84 identifiable *hetairoi* (citing the unpublished PhD thesis of Stagakis (1962), which unfortunately I have been unable to view *in toto*). These are only those we know by name. The actual number of *hetairoi* was obviously much greater. Arrian (*Anab.* 6.14.4) states that Alexander had 1,700 companions in 326 BC, on which see Bosworth (1988b: 268-269). On the number of ἑταῖροι

and Aristonous (both bodyguards of Alexander) did not receive appointments.⁸⁰ Similar language, however, is found in the *Heidelberg Epitome* (1.3): ἐκάστῳ — ‘every’ or ‘each’, but the source refers not to ἑταῖροι but rather δέδωκεν ἐκάστῳ **στρατηγῶι** σατραπείαν.⁸¹ The *Epitome* like Nepos was engaged in severe abbreviation, and perhaps both were imprecise in their statements about who received satrapies, preferring a blanket statement, thereby not necessarily erring, as each of those that did receive a satrapy were technically *familiares*. It is interesting to see how accounts that engage in such abbreviating can tend towards statements that can on the surface appear somewhat incorrect, but this is simply a mechanism by which they explain something without having to go into further unnecessary detail.⁸² For example, Nepos simply does not have the space to give a full satrapal list; unlike many of the other sources, he can simply say *singuli* and be specific about Eumenes’ appointment.

As I discussed in **Chapter 2**, one of the most distinguishing features of Eumenes for Nepos is his loyalty to the Macedonian State (specifically, the Argead monarchy). What is certainly intriguing in respect of Nepos’ account of the events in Babylon is how Eumenes’ role in the στάσις and its eventual resolution is entirely excised. Ancient biographers would play up the role of their subjects, yet Nepos does not do this for Eumenes in one of, if not *the*, most important political events of his time.⁸³ Indeed, he even excludes

over time, see Hammond (1989a: 143-147). 1,800 companion cavalry fought at Gaugamela in 331 BC, the normal number (Arr. *Anab.* 3.11.8).

⁸⁰ The former, however, replaced Perdiccas as Chiliarch when he became regent, so Seleucus’ not receiving a satrapy was unsurprising given this promotion.

⁸¹ Here στρατηγός is an even broader (and thus less precise) term than ἑταῖροι. *LSJ* s.v. ἕκαστος A1 = *singuli*.

⁸² The other, fuller sources (Diodorus, Curtius, and Justin) by contrast provide lists of satrapal appointments, which would be necessary for their historical purposes; even Justin’s epitome of Pompeius Trogus retains a near-comprehensive list (14.4.9-25). History writing required a degree of thoroughness for clarification of the broader politics and the audience’s understanding of what follows. For a recent study of some of the issues posed by epitome history, see Love (2019: 1-9).

⁸³ That is, αὔξησις τῶν πράξεων of the subject, which Steidle (1951: 72), says ‘*die dieser ganzen Literaturgattung eigen ist*’, much akin to Polybius (10.21.8: ὑπάρχων ἐγκωμισατικός, ἀπῆτει τὸν κεφαλαιώδη καὶ μετ’ **αὐξήσεως τῶν πράξεων** ἀπολογισμόν, οὕτως ὁ τῆς ἱστορίας, κοινὸς ὦν ἐπαίνου καὶ ψόγου, ζητεῖ τὸν ἀληθῆ καὶ τὸν μετ’ ἀποδείξεως καὶ τῶν ἐκάστοις παρεπομένων συλλογισμῶν).

Eumenes' position as 'mediator', making the disaffected infantry more amenable to the plans of the *hetairoi* during the conflict over the succession, which we learn from Plutarch (*Eum.* 3.1-4), even though the foreignness of Eumenes, which Plutarch claims was crucial to his role, would fit perfectly with Nepos' introductory assessment of him (1.1-3).⁸⁴ Nepos, we may suggest, is compelled to omit Eumenes' role as arbitrator, as it is intrinsically linked to the στάσις and conflict over succession, which would clash with one of Nepos' central themes, namely Eumenes' loyalty to the Argead monarchy. Alexander's death caused a crisis not only for Macedon and Macedonians, but also for Eumenes — his benefactor (that is, Alexander) was no more.⁸⁵ The ensuing conflict, discontent, and dissension between the infantry and *hetairoi* of Alexander somewhat delegitimises the process and result in Babylon. Any settlement obtained by force and death loses some, if not all, legitimacy.⁸⁶ This is something that Nepos wants to avoid in his biography. Regarding his portrait of Eumenes, there is no doubt that Perdiccas did receive authority (through the regency). Therefore, Nepos does not err in saying that 'the supreme power had been committed to the care of Perdiccas.' Yet the biographer presents this in a particularly opaque way by means of the passive *tradita esset*: the process by which this authority was acquired, and the identity of those who

⁸⁴ In fact, the almost singular focus of Plutarch's account of events in Babylon is Eumenes' role: ἀποθανόντος δὲ Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ τῆς φάλαγγος διεστώσης πρὸς τοὺς ἑταίρους, τῇ μὲν γνώμῃ τούτοις προσένειμεν ἑαυτὸν ὁ Εὐμενής, τῷ δὲ λόγῳ κοινός τις ἦν πρὸς ἀμφοτέρους καὶ ἰδιώτης, ὡς οὐδὲν αὐτῷ προσήκον ξένῳ ὄντι πολυπραγμονεῖν ἐν ταῖς Μακεδόνων διαφοραῖς. καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἑταίρων ἐκ Βαβυλῶνος ἀνασκευασμένων αὐτὸς ὑπολειφθεὶς ἐν τῇ πόλει κατεπράυνε πολλοὺς τῶν πεζῶν καὶ πρὸς τὰς διαλύσεις ἡδίους ἐποίησεν. Plutarch best describes Eumenes' position as foreigner at 8.2: ὡς ἔπηλυς ἀνὴρ καὶ ξένος (in reference to what the Macedonians thought of him). Landucci Gattinoni (1979) draws particular attention to this phrase, and its importance in the presentation of Eumenes as foreigner, and the discrimination Eumenes purportedly faced.

⁸⁵ So Anson (2015: 57). Eumenes would face a second, and more serious, crisis with the death of Perdiccas.

⁸⁶ Before the final settlement (stage 3 on Meeus' schema, on which, see n. 15 above), but after the compromise (stage 2 on Meeus' schema), Perdiccas had the 'mutineers' executed, trampled by elephants — those who had instigated the conflict over the succession (the infantry that followed Meleager). Curtius (10.9.18) indicates there were about thirty victims. On the death of Meleager, which was not part of the first batch of executions, see Curt. 10.9.21, D.S. 18.4.7, Justin 13.4.8, Arr. *Succ.* 1.4. The fact of the matter is that before a final settlement was reached, Perdiccas engaged in the killing of fellow Macedonians en route to becoming sole regent. Diodorus (18.33.3) calls Perdiccas murderous and power hungry (καὶ γὰρ φονικὸς ἦν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἡγεμόνων περιαιρούμενος τὰς ἐξουσίας καὶ καθόλου πάντων βουλόμενος ἄρχειν βιαίως). It is natural that Nepos, given the subsequent *amicitia* between his subject and Perdiccas, leaves such actions out of a work that is centred on *fides* to legitimate authority.

conferred the authority are not revealed, and, in doing so, Nepos ‘whitewashes’ not only Eumenes, but also Perdiccas. He, however, is not entirely blind to Perdiccan faults: he is, for example, openly negative about his lust for power (2.3).⁸⁷ However, first and foremost he needs to present Perdiccas in a good light with regards to legitimate power, in order to portray Eumenes, who sides with Perdiccas, as virtuous and faithful to legitimate authority.⁸⁸ Vital here is the fact that Perdiccas, despite himself not being an Argead, became the *de facto* head of the Argead royal administration as regent.⁸⁹ Although one can view the entirety of events after the death of Alexander (that is, Nepos, *Eum* 2.1-13.5, although especially 3.1-13.5) as civil war, Nepos is clearly trying to present his Eumenes as being on the ‘right side’ of Perdiccas and the kings.⁹⁰ After the death of Perdiccas and the Treaty of Triparadeisus, Eumenes is outlawed, along with other Perdiccans. From 5.1 onwards, Nepos presents civil war, primarily the conflict between Eumenes and Antigonus. However, by this point, his readers know that Eumenes is on the right side; Perdiccas was the legitimate regent, with whom Eumenes was allied, probably primarily due to his regency being linked to the Argead house, where Eumenes’ principal loyalty lay. Those who killed Perdiccas upset the nature of properly constituted authority. If he wished to present a decent account of Eumenes’ life, Nepos could not totally avoid civil war; such a thing was all-pervasive in the early Hellenistic Period. What he could do, however, was pick which conflict to present and how to portray it. In this respect he pragmatically avoids the civil strife at Babylon, to present Eumenes and Perdiccas as legitimate down to Triparadeisus

⁸⁷ Nepos is quick to criticise or critique Perdiccas and his lust for power. See 2.3: *cogitabat enim, quod fere omnes in magnis imperiis concupiscunt, omnium partis corripere atque complecti* an idea very similar to that found in Diodorus 18.33.3; he is not the only source, as Rathmann (2005: 7) says, ‘So zeichnen die fragmentarisch überlieferte Diadochengeschichte Arrians, die letzten Kapitel im Werk des Curtius Rufus, die entsprechenden Passagen im dreizehnten Buch des Justin sowie Buch 18 des Diodor für den Untersuchungszeitraum ein überwiegend negatives Bild dieser Person. Die zentralen Vorwürfe sind sein angeblich selbstherrliches Verhalten in Kombination mit Herrschsucht gegenüber den anderen Diadochen’.

⁸⁸ Adherence to legitimate authority is a key theme for Nepos, on which, see Dionisotti (1988: 41), who says, the ‘submission to the law and to properly constituted authority’.

⁸⁹ Perdiccas was *stirpe regia genitos* (Curt. 10.7.8). A member of the royal house of Orestis (Arr. *Anab.* 6.28.4), a canton of Upper Macedonia. On this, see Heckel (2016: 154 and 154 n. 3).

⁹⁰ Nepos *Eum* 3.1 opens with *interim conflata sunt illa bella, quae ad interuicium post Alexandri mortem gesta sunt*. The kings here are Philip Arrhidaeus, and Alexander IV, as Rhoxane’s son was called.

but is happy to deal with the conflict between Eumenes and other Macedonians (that is, Craterus, Neoptolemus, Antigonus), as, in Nepos' mind, they subverted legitimate authority—Eumenes has the proverbial moral high ground.

Ultimately, Nepos' account of the Babylonian Settlement must be seen as but one component of a larger biographical work focused on Eumenes of Cardia. To this end, Nepos' biographical methods are important; he makes absolutely no claim to be compiling an historically-thorough account of the lives of his subjects. Instead, his aim is to 'relate the virtues of the Greeks' (*Graecorum virtutibus exponendis, praef. 3*). As we saw in **Chapter 1**, Nepos is writing *vitae* not *historia* and therefore *res gestae* are subordinated to the elucidation of character. One should not expect Nepos' account to be the same as that of the historians, either in scope or scale. This is not to say that Nepos is unconcerned with 'truth', nor that he wishes to diverge from it in a relative sense. But rather, that he is concerned with events which allow him to emphasise the true character of his subject, as he sees it, and as he is able to achieve in short-format biographies. Although he may be seen to err, and although he has been harshly judged on that count, in antiquity Nepos' was considered by Aulus Gellius as *rerum memoriae non indiligens* (15.28.1), that is, careful in compiling historical events.⁹¹ When he was writing history (for example, his *Chronica*) he was applauded; but his *On Foreign Generals* is not history and ought not to be held to the same standards of the genre.⁹² Despite the highly idiosyncratic nature of Nepos' account of the Babylonian Settlement, much of it can be explained or be shown to make sense, if only within the scope of his method. This is especially true given Nepos' emphasis on result over process in Babylon, as he is trying to avoid the political and moral complexities of such a significant event. Some of the idiosyncrasies, such as the vexed issue of *regna*

⁹¹ This quote about Nepos may have been made in reference to the *Chronica*, and not his biographical corpus.

⁹² As Bosworth (1992: 56) said, 'In these enlightened days few would claim that Plutarch was in any sense writing history', the same could and *should* be said of Nepos.

are perhaps intractable. But, Nepos' account is, when closely examined, not intrinsically wrong and most interpretive problems fall away. He presents a unique, but not factually incorrect, account, one shaped by his biographical aims and methods, with the express purpose of 'translating' the characteristics and exemplarity of foreign generals to a Roman audience. To this end, Nepos has simplified nuanced and complex geopolitics down to the the key issues at stake (especially the positions of Eumenes and Perdiccas and their power) to provide his audience with what they need to understand the political setting of the rest of the biography.

Conclusion

This dissertation has presented the first discrete examination of Cornelius Nepos' *Eumenes*, on its own terms and in its own right. Through a series of studies, each covering a different aspect the author, his text, and his subject, as well as engaging in diverse types of analysis — I hope to have made a meaningful contribution to scholarship on a now rehabilitated Nepos.

In Chapter 1 **From *Quellenforschung* and History to Composition and a *Life***, I asked the questions, 'how does Nepos construct his *Eumenes* as he did?' and 'why does he construct his *Eumenes* as he did?'. To this end, I analysed Nepos' use of sources; first broadly, and then specifically. It became evident that Nepos utilised Hieronymus of Cardia as his only source for this biography (indeed, the minor arguments against this view were addressed). I was then able to construct a schema (**Appendix α**) of the totality of information pertaining to Eumenes through collation of parallel sources also derived from Hieronymus of Cardia. This information allowed us to see 'how' and 'where' Nepos differs from his source. To answer why Nepos chose to include and exclude what he did, I scrutinized all of Nepos' programmatic statements, and was able to map out his biographical aims and methods, and note his conscious differentiation between the 'genres' of *vitae* and *historia* — that is, Nepos is focused on *virtutes*, not *res gestae*. I showed that for Nepos, the critical *virtutes* of Eumenes were his *ingenium* and his *fides*, and that Nepos constructs his comparatively short biography in such a way as to highlight *these* exemplary virtues in his chosen subject. Nepos' divergences from his source and omissions are a result of this singular focus, and his exposition of the character of his subject.

Chapter 2 **Nepos' Eumenes – *homo novus*?** draws upon some of the conclusions of Chapter 1, especially the characteristics of Eumenes that Nepos chose to highlight. This chapter began by looking at representations or portrayals of Eumenes across our extant sources. What emerges is that Nepos' 'Eumenes', and the focus on the themes of *ingenium*, *fides*, *fortuna*, and the *invidia* he experienced — clearly aligned with how Eumenes was presented in other sources, especially Diodorus Siculus and Plutarch. This commonality of characterisation must ultimately derive from Hieronymus of Cardia. However, the main part of this chapter showed how Nepos adapted the Hieronymean Eumenes. I argued that Nepos took the various traits and themes of Eumenes' life and career and amalgamated them into an entirely novel depiction of his Cardian subject. Nepos presents Eumenes in the guise of a *homo novus*, that is, in a manner in which a Roman audience of the Triumviral period would readily understand.

Nepos' emphasis on Eumenes' *virtus*, *ingenium*, and *industria* (and to a lesser degree his *fortuna* and the *invidia* he experienced) was shown, through a careful linguistic analysis to be reminiscent of how Roman *homines novi* spoke about themselves, and, also, how they were spoken about in our extant sources. This study focused on three of most celebrated new men (those most elaborated described in our sources): Cato Maior, Marius, and Cicero. Through a study of their self-conceptions of *novitas*, I was able to establish a 'language ideology' of *novitas*, which unequivocally overlaps with language by which Nepos describes Eumenes: Nepos' Eumenes is meant to be read as a new man. This study went beyond mere language analysis, however, showing also that Eumenes' career bears remarkable resemblance to the meteoric political rises of prominent *homines novi*. Through which I discussed the prominence of *homines novi* in Triumviral Rome, which may explain *why* Nepos chooses to evoke such a striking paradigm for his *Eumenes*. Nepos obviously saw in Eumenes both the traits and trajectory of new men in the Triumviral period at Rome. Therefore, Nepos can be argued to be both innovative and sensitive to the needs of his audience in dealing with unfamiliar figures and contexts, such as Eumenes and the Macedonian world.

Chapter 3 **Nepos' Account of the Babylonian Settlement (*Eum.* 2.1-2)** took a different approach to Nepos and his work. Where the first two chapters were singularly focused on Nepos as biographer, and how he crafts his *Eumenes*, Chapter 3 purposefully employed a different methodology. In this Chapter, I looked at Nepos' *Eumenes* from an historical and historiographical perspective, with the purpose of analysing the ways in which Nepos addresses and deals with the complexities of post-Alexander politics within the confines of a biography. If chapters 2 and 3 had a broad focus, this chapter had a narrow focus, centred on a close, commentary-like, reading of Nepos' version of a 'constitutionally unique and politically complex' episode, to see how he differs from our other sources.¹ It was shown that Nepos' account is decidedly different. I presented possible solutions to some of the 'errors' ascribed to Nepos, and argued that in conclusion, he only includes that political information which he deems necessary for his readers to understand the biography. Yet, Nepos also shapes his narrative in such a way as to fashion an account that can be appropriately understood by his Roman audience. Finally, Nepos was shown to exclude information that could be construed as counteractive to his desired portrait of his subject, and in this regard, especially Nepos' key theme of adherence to legitimate authority.

¹ Bosworth (2002: 32).

This series of studies led me in many directions, some of which unfortunately have not made it into the final dissertation. My extended study of Nepos has made me aware of a few desiderata for future scholarship on these and related topics.

First, and foremost, a full-scale commentary on Nepos' *Eumenes* is essential. As, I have shown, this is a rich and complex *vita*, and one that has numerous parallel sources, which merits expanded analysis and comment *in toto*. Francesco Ginelli has indicated his intention to produce a commentary on the rest of Nepos' *On Foreign Generals*.² Secondly, discussion of *Fortuna/fortuna* in Nepos is lacking an up-to-date work as Jefferis' (1943) article is now dated. With the wealth of scholarship on the topic now available, a study of it specifically in Nepos would bear much fruit. Of particular importance would be the ways in which Nepos addresses, translates, and grapples with the *τύχη* of his Greek sources, and reconciles it with the Roman *fortuna* of the first century BC. A start, in this regard, was made in this dissertation, but much more remains to be said. Thirdly, there was discussion, in Chapter 3, of Nepos' political language — that is, for example, the vocabulary he uses for magistrates or provinces. Nepos is not consistent and evidently translates his Greek sources differently across the *vitae*.³ A thorough study on this issue would be an important contribution, not only for the study of Nepos, but also in terms of Latin translations for Greek political institutions.

* * *

² Ginelli (2022) provided commentary on the following biographies of Nepos' *On Foreign Generals*: *Miltiades*, *Themistocles*, *Aristides*, *Pausanius*, *Cimon*, *Lysander*, *Alcibiades*, and *Thrasybulus*. Ginelli (2022: vii) states that at a future date he wishes to produce a commentary on the remaining biographies, including *Eumenes*.

³ Noting that Bell's (1989) study on Latin terminology for non-Roman institutions includes many references to Nepos.

Appendix α) Eumenes: Chronology and Source Tradition⁴

#	Date	Event	Nepos <i>Eum.</i>	Parallel Sources
1.	361 BC	Birth of Eumenes	13.1	Nepos alone presents information that allows us to extrapolate this date; likewise for dates of service under Philip II and Alexander.
2.	342-323 BC	Eumenes joins the Macedonian court and Career under Philip II (342-336) and Alexander the Great (336 – 11 June 323)	1.4-6; 13.1 1.4-5: Philip 1.6: Alexander	Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 1.1-3 for the two traditions concerning Eumenes joining Macedonian court (and career under Philip II); Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 1.4-2.10 for career under Alexander. ⁵ Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 1.5 = Nepos <i>Eum.</i> 1.6 Eumenes' career under Alexander: Curt. 9.1.19 and Arr. <i>Anab.</i> 5.24.6 (Eumenes commands forces in India after siege of Sangala in 326 [possibly little more than a diplomatic mission])
	323 BC			
3.	11 June	Death of Alexander the Great and Babylonian Settlement	2.1-2	See Chapter 3
4.	Summer	Philip III and Alexander IV proclaimed kings		Arr. <i>Succ.</i> 9
5.		Revolt of the Greeks in the upper satrapies		D.S. 18.7.1-9 Arr. <i>Succ.</i> 9 (στάσεων δὲ μετὰ τὸν Ἀλεξάνδρου

⁴ This chronology is Anson's (2015: xiv-xvi), with slight adaptations. On the issues of early Hellenistic chronology, see **A Note on Chronology**. Parallel sources included here are only those derived from Hieronymus, when taken as a whole, could equate to at least a rough outline of Hieronymus' original work. Thus, Plutarch's *Eumenes*, Diodorus Siculus, Arrian's *Successors*, *The Vatican Palimpsest*, Polyaeus, Justin, and Dexippus' *Successors* (which is only useful for **Chapter 3**). Source(s) other than these are only used to fill gaps, and are signposted. The citations in **parallel sources** list here are from my own reading of the sources, and in some instances differ slightly from those found throughout Anson (2015). Events directly involving Eumenes are shown in bold.

⁵ The majority of this section of Plutarch, *Eum.* 2.1-10, consists of negative anecdotes about Eumenes — almost certainly derived from Duris of Samos (on which, see **Chapter 1**).

				θάνατον πάντα ἐπληροῦτο)
6.	September/October	Eumenes and Leonnatus in Hellespontine Phrygia	Possibly alluded to at 2.4-5 ⁶ (Eumenes and Leonnatus together; Leonnatus plans to usurp Macedonia, Leonnatus <i>Macedoniam praeoccupare destinavit</i>)	Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 3.5-9: Leonnatus' plans to 'claim' Macedonia, πιστεύσας ὁ Λεόννατος οὐδὲν ὧν ἐφρόνει πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀπεκρύψατο. λόγος μὲν γὰρ ἦν ἡ βοήθεια καὶ πρόφασις, ἐγνώκει δὲ διαβάς εὐθὺς ἀντιποιεῖσθαι Μακεδονίας)
7.	Autumn	Start of the Lamian War		Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 3.6 (alludes to Lamian War, but in progress) D.S. 18.8.1 (whole war: 18.8-18, 24-25) Justin 13.5.1 (13.5.1-17 for whole war) Arr. <i>Succ.</i> 9
	323/322 BC			
8.	Winter	Eumenes returns to Babylon	? 2.5 (Leonnatus tries to kill Eumenes, but he escapes, probably to Babylon)	Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 3.12 (Eumenes 'at once enjoyed great influence' ⁷ on return to Babylon; Plutarch does not include any attempt on Eumenes' life, rather Eumenes decides to leave of his own accord)
	322 BC			
9.	March/April	Crossing of Leonnatus to Europe	2.4? Leonnatus' plan to usurp (i.e. go to) Macedonia	Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 3.5-9: Leonnatus' plans to 'claim' Macedonia; 'designs of Leonnatus') D.S. 18.14.4-5 Justin 13.5.14 (possible reference)
10.		Death of Leonnatus		D.S. 18.15.4 Justin 13.5.14-15 Arr. <i>Succ.</i> 9

⁶ Nepos *Eum.* 2.3-5 has no obvious parallel — seems to be a bit of mishmash of the year after Alexander's death, with certain correspondence or time and space. A 'confused mélange of events' (Bradley, 1991: 141), of which I attempt to make sense in **Chapter 1**.

⁷ Cf. Nepos *Eum.* 2.3, where there is no mention of Eumenes' return to Babylon, and thus uncertainty as to when Eumenes and Perdikkas became allies in Nepos' mind. Cf. Plut. *Eum.* 3.12: οὕτως πρὸς Περδίκκαν καὶ τὰ Λεοννάτου βουλευματα κατειπὼν εὐθὺς μὲν ἴσχυε μέγα παρ' αὐτῷ καὶ τοῦ συνεδρίου μετείχεν.

11.	Late Spring	Craterus crosses to Europe		D.S. 18.16.4
12.	July	Perdiccas and Eumenes arrive in Cappadocia and defeat Ariarathes in two battles		Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 3.12-13 (cf. 3.4) D.S. 18.16.1-3 Justin 13.6.1-3 Arr. <i>Succ.</i> 11-12 App. <i>Mith.</i> 8
13.	Late July/August	Battle of Crannon		Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 5.1 (Craterus and Antipater 'overpowered' the Greeks (sc. at Crannon) D.S. 18.17.1-5
14.		Antipater arranges affairs in Peloponnese and Athens		D.S. 18.17.7-8, 18.18.1-6
15.	Late Summer/Autumn	Eumenes organises Cappadocia		Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 3.13-14 (καί τὰς μὲν πόλεις τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ φίλοις παρέδωκε, καὶ φρουράρχους ἐγκατέστησε καὶ δικαστὰς ἀπέλιπε καὶ διοικητὰς οὓς ἐβούλετο, τοῦ Περδίκκου μηδὲν ἐν τούτοις πολυπραγμονούντος, αὐτὸς δὲ συνανέζευξεν ἐκείνόν τε θεραπεύων καὶ τῶν βασιλέων ἀπολείπεσθαι μὴ βουλόμενος) D.S. 18.16.3, 22.1 (both relate Eumenes' being installed as satrap of Cappadocia, but no organisation spoken about)
16.		Perdiccas moves to Cilicia ⁸		Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 4.1 D.S. 18.22.1
17.		Neoptolemus moves to Armenia		Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 4.1 (Neoptolemus in Armenia)
18.		Annexation of Cyrene by Ptolemy		Arr. <i>Succ.</i> 19 Justin 13.6.18-20
	322/321 BC			

⁸ Cf. Anson (2015: 91 n. 7) on the uncertainty of location: 'no source gives any indication of the ending of 322; there is no reference to seasonal changes, nor to the army retiring into camp ... These passages suggest that Perdiccas either continued on to Pisidia and entered winter quarters there, or wintered in Cilicia. The latter appears to be the most likely. Perdiccas clearly had entered Cilicia and with this area only having been recently abandoned by Craterus it was certainly in Perdiccas' interest to ensure the loyalty of the forces left there. Spending the winter would have given him the opportunity to accomplish this goal.'

19.	Late Autumn/Winter	Eumenes sent to Armenia		Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 4.2-5.1
20.		Perdiccas winters in Cicilia		D.S. 18.22.1 Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 4.1
		Return of Antipater and Craterus to Macedonia		D.S. 18.18.7 (Antipater and Craterus) 18.16.3 (Craterus from Cicilia)
	321 BC			
21.	Spring	Perdiccas campaigns in Pisidia		D.S. 18.22.1-8
22.		Perdiccas calls for Antigonos to answer charges		D.S. 18.23.4 assesses these as such: ἐπιβαλὼν οὖν αὐτῷ <u>διαβολὰς</u> ψευδεῖς καὶ κατηγορίας <u>ἀδίκους</u> φανερός ἦν ἀναιρήσων αὐτόν Arr. <i>Succ.</i> 20
23.		Arrival of Nicaea and Cleopatra with marriage proposals		D.S. 18.23.1-3 Justin 13.6.4-7 (allusion to both potential marriages) Arr. <i>Succ.</i> 21 (Nicaea and Cleopatra) Justin 13.6.7
24.		Marriage of Perdiccas and Nicaea		Arr. <i>Succ.</i> 21
25.		Marriage of Ptolemy and Eurydice		Arr. <i>Succ.</i> 23
26.		Invasion of Aetolia by Antipater and Craterus		D.S. 18.24.1-25.5 (whole campaign)
27.	Summer	Cynnane arrives in Asia and is murdered		D.S. 19.52.2 Arr. <i>Succ.</i> 22-23 Polyaenus 8.60
28.		Marriage of Adea (Eurydice) and Philip III		Arr. <i>Succ.</i> 23
29.		Perdiccas determines to seize the monarchy	2.3? Does Nepos include this earlier in his narrative?: <i>Cogitabat enim, quod fere omnes in magnis imperiis concupiscunt, omnium partis corripere atque complecti</i>	D.S. 18.23.1-4 (but placed at arrival of Nicaea and Cleopatra? As marriage to Alexander's sister, Cleopatra, would be ideologically important in any push for kingship [i.e. link with Argeads]) Justin 13.6.1-8 Arr. <i>Succ.</i> 20-24, 26
30.		Alexander the Great's body begins its journey west		D.S. 18.26.2-28.2 (excursus on Alexander's funeral carriage), 18.28.2 funeral

				carriage moves from Babylon to Egypt) Arr. <i>Succ.</i> 25 (both setting out and diversion)
	321/320 BC			
31.	Late Autumn/Winter	Antigonus flees to Macedonia		D.S. 18.25.3 Arr. <i>Succ.</i> 24
32.		Diversion of Alexander's body to Egypt		D.S. 18.28.2-3 (Ptolemy diverts body from Syria to, perhaps, Memphis) Arr. <i>Succ.</i> 25 Paus. 1.6.3 Curt. 10.5.4 for Alexander's wish to be buried at Ammon (cf. Aegae where Arrhidaeus had been instructed to take the body)
	320 BC			
33.	Spring	First Diadoch War begins	3.1 <i>Interim conflata sunt illa bella, quae ad internecionem post Alexandri mortem gesta sunt</i>	Arr. <i>Succ.</i> 26 (suggests the beginning of hostilities) Justin 13.6.8, 13.6.17
34.		Perdiccas marches to Egypt	3.2	D.S. 18.29.1 (also, 18.33-36 for whole failed campaign) Justin 13.6.16
35.		Eumenes to the Hellespont	3.3-6? (3.5-6 for the stratagem Eumenes employs to make sure no Macedonian troops face Craterus)	D.S. 18.25.6 (and again 18.29.1) Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 6.1-12 (for Eumenes' stratagem — the same, although longer, account)
36.		Desertion of Cleitus and the fleet to Antipater		Not directly mentioned in sources, but inferred from later events. See Anson (2015: 112 n. 49)
37.		Crossing of Antipater and Craterus to Asia		Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 5.1-2 D.S. 18.29.4 Arr. <i>Succ.</i> 26
38.		Antigonus attempts to intercept Eumenes, then to Cyprus		Arr. <i>Succ.</i> 25.2 ⁹ = Vatican Palimpsest fol. 235: 8. Arr. <i>Succ.</i> 30 Antigonus departing from Cyprus

⁹ The Vatican Palimpsest = Arr. *Succ.* 24–25. On this, see Anson (2015: 4 n. 1).

39.	May/June	Eumenes defeats Neoptolemus in Phrygia		Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 5.4-5, 6.1 D.S. 18.29.4-5 Justin 13.8.4-5 Arr. <i>Succ.</i> 27
40.		Eumenes later defeats Neoptolemus and Craterus	4.1-4	Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 7.1-8.1; D.S. 18.30.1-32.2 (our most detailed account for the Battle of the Hellespont, 18.32.2-4 for aftermath) Justin 13.8.6-7 Arr. <i>Succ.</i> 27
41.		Deaths of Neoptolemus and Craterus	4.2 and 4.3-4 respectively	Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 7.7-12 (Neoptolemus and Eumenes in single combat — death of Neoptolemus assumed), 7.6 (Craterus) D.S. 18.31.5 (Neoptolemus), 18.30.5 (Craterus) Justin 13.8.8 (Neoptolemus) Justin 13.8.7 (Polyperchon? = mistake for Craterus) Arr. <i>Succ.</i> 27
42.		Death of Perdiccas	5.1	Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 8.3; D.S. 18.36.5, 18.37.1 (18.33-36 for whole failed campaign Egyptian campaign) Justin 13.8.10, 14.1.1 <i>HE</i> 1.3, 4.1 Arr. <i>Succ.</i> 28
43.		Condemnation of Perdiccas by royal army	5.1	Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 8.3-4 (only Eumenes mentioned: 'condemned Eumenes to death'); D.S. 18.37.2 (only Eumenes mentioned) Justin 13.8.10 (14.1.1)
44.		Pithon and Arrhidaeus new regents for Philip III and Alexander IV		D.S. 18.39.1 Arr. <i>Succ.</i> 30
45.	Late August/Early September	'Treaty' of Triparadeisus	5.1	D.S. 18.39.1-7 (thorough breakdown of distribution of powers at Triparadeisus) Justin 13.8.10 (14.1.1)

				HE 1.4 Arr. Succ. 32-39
46.		Antipater new regent	5.1	D.S. 18.39.3 HE 1.4 Arr. Succ. 32, 33
47.		Eumenes winters in Celaenae		Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 8.7
48.		Failed negotiations among the surviving Perdiccan leaders		Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 8.8
	319 BC			
49.	Winter	Antipater crosses back to Europe with the kings		Arr. Succ. 45
50.	Spring	Eumenes defeated by Antigonus at Battle of Orkynia	5.3 (not named)	Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 9.1-5 D.S. 18.40.5-8 Justin 14.2.1-2 Polyaenus 4.6.12
51.		Eumenes enters Nora	5.3; (5.4-6 horse-training <i>exempla</i>)	Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 10.2 (10.3-11.1: Eumenes' conference with Antigonus; horse training <i>exempla</i> : 11.4-9) D.S. 18.41.1 (18.41.1-42.5 details about Nora) Justin 14.2.2 (14.2.2-3 for Nora)
52.	July	Antigonus defeats Alcetas		D.S. 18.44.1-47.5 (who campaign against Alcetas and other Perdiccans)
53.		Death of Alcetas		D.S. 18.46.7
54.	Late Summer	Death of Antipater		Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 12.1 D.S. 18.47.4 HE 1.5
55.		Polyperchon new regent, Cassander, Chiliarch		Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 12.1 (only 'dissension' between Polyperchon and Cassander mentioned); D.S. 18.47.4 (only Polyperchon mentioned), 18;48.4 (Polyperchon = regent, Cassander = Chiliarch) HE 1.4 (Cassander as Chiliarch after Triparadeisus), 1.5 (Polyperchon regent after Antipater's death).

				Arr. <i>Succ</i> 38 (Cassander as Chiliarch after Triparadeisus)
	319/318 BC			
56.	Winter	Flight of Cassander to Antigonos		D.S. 18.54.1-4
57.		Polyperchon's "Freedom of the Greeks" decree		D.S. 18.55.1-57.1
	318 BC			
58.		Eumenes released from Nora and allies with Antigonos	5.7 ¹⁰	Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 12.4 (12.2-3 peace agreement between Eumenes and Antigonos); D.S. 18.52.4 Justin 14.2.4-5
59.	Early Spring	Antigonos takes Ephesus and Cleitus flees		D.S. 18.52.7-8 Arr. <i>Succ.</i> 25.2-6 ¹¹ = Vatican Palimpsest fol. 235; 7-10.
60.		Ptolemy occupies Phoenicia and Syria		D.S. 18.43.1-2
61.		Alexander, the son of Polyperchon, arrives in Athens, followed later by Polyperchon		Justin 14.5.1 presence of Alexander and Polyperchon in Greek assumed D.S. 18.68.3
62.	May	Death of Phocion	Nepos <i>Phoc.</i> 4.3-4	
63.		Cassander arrives in Piraeus		D.S. 18.68.1
64.	Summer	Antigonos captures all of Lydia		D.S. 18.52.6-8
65.		Eumenes allies with Polyperchon		Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 13.2 (Eumenes seems to be taking orders from Polyperchon) D.S. 18.58.1-3 (correspondence between Eumenes and Polyperchon, also 18.57.3) Eumenes made commander of all Asia (18.58.1 ὡς ἄν ἀποδεδειγμένῳ στρατηγῷ τῆς ὅλης Ἀσίας αὐτοκράτορι)

¹⁰ Nepos does not mention explicitly that Eumenes allied himself with Antigonos. Uniquely, Nepos says that Eumenes escaped by feigning surrender (5.7): *simulata deditioe, dum de condicionibus tractat, praefectis Antigoni imposuit seque ac suos omnes extraxit incolumis*.

¹¹ The Vatican Palimpsest = Arr. *Succ.* 24–25. On this, see Anson (2015: 4 n. 1).

66.		Polyperchon invades Peloponnesus, besieges Megalopolis		18.70.1-73.3 (discussed at length in these passages).
67.		Eumenes moves into Cilicia, joined by Argyraspids		Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 13.2-3 (Antigenes and Teutamus mentioned, as commanders of 'Silver Shields' D.S. 18.58.3-4 (18.58-63) Justin 14.2.6-12 (for whole episode)
68.		Eumenes creates 'Alexander Tent'	7.1-3	Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 13.4-8 D.S. 18.60.1-61.3 Polyaenus 4.8.2
69.	Autumn	Polyperchon returns to Macedonia, orders Cleitus to the Hellespont		Justin 14.5.1
70.	Autumn/Winter	Eumenes moves into Phoenicia		D.S. 18.63.6
	317 BC			
71.	Summer	Sea battles in the Hellespont		D.S. 18.72.4
72.		Defeat of Cleitus		D.S. 18.72.5-8, 9 = death of Cleitus Polyaen. 4.6.8
73.	July	Demetrius of Phalerum in charge of Athens		D.S. 18.73.4
74.		Cassander's first invasion of Macedonia		D.S. 19.35.7 cf. 18.75.7
75.	September	Eumenes leaves Phoenicia for the east		Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 13.9 D.S. 18.72.2
76.	Autumn	Eurydice claims regency		D.S. 19.11.1
77.		Olympias returns to Macedonia	6.1-5 – Eumenes' correspondence with Olympias about her return to Macedonia, and requesting Eumenes to fight on behalf of Alexander's children. (6.3: <i>ferretque opem liberis Alexandri</i>).	Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 13.1 (Letters from those who feared the 'increasing power of Antigonos: i.e. Olympias, as well as Polyperchon, see D.S. 18.57.3, 58.1-4) D.S. 19.11.3 Justin 14.5.9-10 Polyaenus 4.8.3 (fake letter from Olympias about return to Macedonia)
78.	Autumn/Winter	Philip III Arrhidaeus and Eurydice murdered	6.3 mentions Olympias' bad behaviour (i.e. possible allusion to	D.S. 19.11.4-7 Justin 14.5.10 <i>HE</i> 1.5, 2.2

			her being behind Eurydice's murder – <i>crudelissime se gessit.</i>	
79.		Eumenes in Babylonia		D.S. 19.12.1
80.		Revolt of citadel commander in Babylon ¹²		<i>BCHP</i> 3, Obv. 33–4 ¹³
81.		Eumenes moves into winter quarters in the Carian villages		D.S. 19.12.1-2
82.		Antigonos winters in Mesopotamia		D.S. 19.15.6
	316 BC			
83.	Spring	Eumenes joins with the forces of the upper satrapies		Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 13.9; D.S. 19.13.7 (Eumenes asks all satraps to assemble at Susa), 19.15.1 (join together in Susiane) <i>HE</i> 3.2
84.	Late May	Eumenes arrives in Susa		D.S. 19.15.5 <i>HE</i> 3.2 ('Eumenes marched inland to the satrapies that they beyond Babylonia')?
85.	Late Spring/Summer	Cassander successfully invades Macedonia		D.S. 19.35-36 Justin 14.5.8, 6.2
86.		Siege of Pydna begins		D.S. 19.36.1 Justin 14.6.1-10 (death of Olympias 14.6.11-12)
87.		Deposition and exile of Aeacides		D.S. 19.36.4

¹² This is the only significant event directly associated with Eumenes that cannot be found in at least a single source derived from Hieronymus, which is testament to the fact that one is able to construct the vast majority of Eumenes' career from sources reliant on Hieronymus of Cardia.

¹³ The Babylonian Chronicles of the Hellenistic Period (or, *The Chronicle of the Diadochoi*).

Available at: <https://www.livius.org/sources/content/mesopotamian-chronicles-content/bchp-3-diadochi-chronicle/>

[Obv.i.33.(14')] Year 7 of Philip (317/6), month VII (3 – 31 Oct. 317). The troops of the king, which in order to make a str[ong guard entered the palace, but the satrap of Akkad by doing]

[Obv.i.34.(15')] [bat]tle captured the palace of Babylon from them and the [x]-person(s) [.]

Anson (2015: 187 and n. 19) cites this Babylonian astronomical tablet, which is a clear statement that a royal army was near Babylon in 317 BC, and captured the palace—or at least part of it. Eumenes' army was the only army with official royal status operating in this locale. On this, see Anson (2015: 208) for the difficulties reconciling this cuneiform source with other ancient accounts of this episode (esp. Diodorus 19.12.3, who, in direct opposition to *BCHP*, says Eumenes never entered Babylon). As noted in **A Note on Early Hellenistic Chronology**, Cuneiform evidence is vital in the chronological reconstructions off the early Hellenistic period. For an introduction to this source material and its importance, see Boiy (2000, 2007a, and 2007b) and Anson (2007), but especially Boiy (2007a: 22-34). Anson (2015: 130, 187) deals specifically with the *BCHP*.

88.	July	Eumenes and Antigonos battle at the Coprates		Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 14.2-11 D.S. 19.18.3-7
89.	August	Antigonos retreats into Media		D.S. 19.19.2-8
90.	Late October/Early November	Battle of Paraetacene	8.1 (<i>hic in Paraetacis cum Antigonos confluxit</i>) 8.1 Antigonos winters in Media; Eumenes at Persis 8.2-3 excursus on license of Macedonian Phalanx 8.4-9.6 Eumenes' stratagem to prevent advance/surprise attack of Antigonos	Plut. <i>Eum.</i> does not record battle, but include Eumenes' stratagem (15.5-13); D.S. 19.27.1-31.9 (prelude, 19.25-26, aftermath 19.33) <i>HE.</i> 3.2 (Eumenes defeated Antigonos 'two or three times')? Polyaenus 4.8.4 (stratagem to check advance of Antigonos, also 4.6.11)
91.	December	Battle of Gabiene	10.1 10.2 (betrayal by generals and troops after victory at Gabiene – 10.3-4 Antigonos' debates what to do with Eumenes?)	Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 16.1-17.1 for battle, Gabiene mentioned at 15.4. D.S. 19.40.1-43.9 Justin. 14.3.1-2 (14.3.3-12; Eumenes' speech to troops after betrayal, 14.1-14) <i>HE.</i> 3.2 (Eumenes defeated Antigonos 'two or three times')? Polyaenus 4.6.13 (4.6.15 for Silver Shield's betrayal of Eumenes after battle)
	315 BC			
92.	January	Eumenes' Imprisonment ¹⁴	11.1-5 (lacuna at 11.4?; 10.1-4: Eumenes betrayed by troops; and Antigonos' confusion about what to do with Eumenes.	Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 18.4-9 (Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 17.5-11: Eumenes' speech to his troops after being handed over to Antigonos)
93.		Death of Eumenes	12.1-4	Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 19.1 (18.6 for deliberations) D.S. 19.44.2 <i>HE.</i> 3.2 (allusion to death at hands of Antigonos)
94.		Eumenes' ashes sent to Cappadocia by Antigonos	13.4	Plut. <i>Eum.</i> 19

¹⁴ Probably very late December 2016, straight after Battle of Gabiene, to very early January 2015 (his death).

				D.S. 19.44.2 (also mentions Antigonus' confusion, and that he sent ashes to Eumenes' family, Nepos <i>Eum.</i> 13.4)
--	--	--	--	--

Undatable Elements:

‡	N/A	Summative Assessments of Eumenes	1.1-3 13.1-3	Plutarch <i>comp. Sert. et Eum.</i> 1.1-2.8 ¹⁵ <i>Suda</i> E3579 <i>HE</i> 3.1-2
---	-----	----------------------------------	-----------------	---

¹⁵ Noting that some sections address both Eumenes and his parallel subject Sertorius.

Appendix β) Nepos' *Eumenes*: Text Breakdown

1.1-3 Opening Assessment

1.4 Eumenes Arrives at Macedonian court (342 BC)

1.5-6 Eumenes and Alexander the Great (336 – 323 BC, but specifically 324 as *hetairos*)

2.1-2 Death of Alexander; Babylonian Settlement (11 June to mid-July[?] 323 BC)

2.3-5 Perdiccas and Leonnatus court Eumenes (Late-323/Early-322? BC)

3.1 First Diadoch War begins (Spring 320 BC)

3.2 Perdiccas to Egypt; Eumenes given territory by Perdiccas; Eumenes to fight European enemies (Spring 320 BC)

3.3 Craterus and Antipater cross the Hellespont (Spring 320 BC)

3.4-6 Eumenes' stratagem to ensure his Macedonians do not face Craterus; Roman soldiers as best in world (Spring 320)

4.1-4 Battle of Hellespont; deaths of Neoptolemus and Craterus (May/June 320 BC)

5.1 Death of Perdiccas; Treaty of Triparadeisus; Eumenes outlawed (Late Augustus/Early September 320 BC)

5.2/3-7 Eumenes besieged at Nora in Phrygia (Spring 319 – Late Winter 318 BC)

5.4-6 Excursus on Eumenes training horses

6.1-5 Eumenes' correspondence with Olympias

6.5 Eumenes' *fides* compels him to help her

7.1-3 'Alexander Tent' (~Summer 318 BC)

8.1 Battle of Paraetacene (Late October – Early November 316 BC)

8.2-3 excursus on the license and lawlessness of the Macedonian phalanx (cf. Roman soldiers of Late Republic are the same for Nepos)

8.4-7 Antigonus' plan to surprise Eumenes (i.e. route taken)

9.1-6 Eumenes' stratagem to counter Antigonus' plan (Eumenes successful, 10.1)

10.1 Battle of Gabiene (December 316 BC)

10.2 Betrayal of Eumenes by generals and troops

10.3-4 Antigonus uncertain about what to do with Eumenes

11.1-5 Eumenes in prison (Late December? – Early January? 316-5 BC)

11.3-5 Eumenes' conversation with jailor, Onomarchus

12.1-4 Death of Eumenes (January 315 BC)

13.1-4 Final assessment of Eumenes

Appendix γ) Alexander's Ring and To Whom He Bequeathed Empire in the Extant Tradition

Source	Alexander's Ring to Perdiccas	Alexander's kingdom: 'to the best' or 'strongest'
Cornelius Nepos	<i>cui Alexander moriens anulum suum dederat, Perdiccae (Eum. 2.1)</i>	
Diodorus Siculus	τὸν δακτύλιον ἔδωκε Περδίκκα (17.117.3) ὁ βασιλεὺς τὸν δακτύλιον τελευτῶν δεδώκει (18.2.4)	εἶπεν τῷ κρατίστῳ (17.117.4) εἶπεν τῷ ἀρίστῳ (18.1.4)
Curtius Rufus	<i>detractum anulum digito Perdiccae tradidit (10.5.4)</i> <i>anulum sibi pridie traditum a rege in eadem sede posuit (10.6.4)</i>	<i>ei, qui esset optimus (10.5.5)</i>
Arrian <i>Anab.</i> and <i>Succ.</i>		τὸν δὲ ὑποκρίνασθαι ὅτι τῷ κρατίστῳ (<i>Anab.</i> 7.26.3)
Dexippus <i>Succ.</i>		
Plutarch <i>Alex.</i> and <i>Eum.</i>		
Justin	<i>exemptum digito anulum Perdiccae tradidit (12.15.11)</i>	<i>respondit 'dignissimum' (12.15.8)</i>
<i>Liber de Morte</i>	<i>Tunc ipse sibi anulum de digito detraxit et Perdiccae tradidit (112)</i>	
<i>Heidelberg Epitome</i>	ὁ Περδίκκας, ὃν δέδωκεν ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος τελευτῶν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ δακτύλιον (1.2)	

Bibliography

- Adams, S.A. 2001. 'What are *Bioi/Vitae*? Generic Self-Consciousness in Ancient Biography', in *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Biography*, Temmerman, K. (ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 19-32.
- Adler, A. 1928. *Suidae Lexicon*. Pars I: A – Γ. Munich: K.G. Saur.
- Africa, T. 1982. 'Homosexuals in Greek History', *The Journal of Psychohistory*, 401-420.
- Albrecht, M. von. 1997. *A History of Roman Literature: From Livius Andronicus to Boethius: With Special Regard to its Influence on World Literature*. Leiden: Brill.
- Allen, W. Jr. 1954. 'Cicero's Conceit', *TAPhA* 85, 121-144.
- Amerio, M.L. 1991-2. 'I *Duces* de Cornelio Nepote, la Propaganda Politica di Ottaviano ed Antonio e Le Proscrizioni Trimvirali', *Invigilata Lucernis* 13-14, 5-46.
- Anson, E.M. 1975. *Eumenes of Cardia*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. University of Virginia.
- Anson, E.M. 1981. 'Alexander's Hypaspists and the Argyraspids', *Historia* 30, 117-20
- Anson, E.M. 1985. 'Macedonia's Alleged Constitutionalism', *CJ* 80, 303-316.
- Anson, E.M. 1988a. 'Hypaspists and Argyraspids after 323', *AHB* 2, 131-131.
- Anson, E.M. 1988b. 'Antigonus, the Satrap of Phrygia', *Historia* 37, 471-477.
- Anson, E.M. 1991. 'The Evolution of the Macedonian Army Assembly (330-315 B.C.)', *Historia* 40, 230-247.
- Anson, E.M. 2004. *Eumenes of Cardia: A Greek among the Macedonians*. Leiden: Brill.
- Anson, E.M. 2007. 'Early Hellenistic Chronology: The Cuneiform Evidence', in *Alexander's Empire: Formulation to Decay*, Heckel, W., Tritle, L., and Wheatley, P. (eds.). Claremont: Regina Books, 193-198.
- Anson, E.M. 2008a. 'Philip II and the Transformation of Macedonia: A Reappraisal', in *Macedonian Legacies: Studies in Ancient Macedonian History and Culture in Honor of Eugene N. Borza*, Howe, T. & Reames, J. (eds.). Claremont, CA: Regina Books, 17-30.
- Anson, E.M. 2008b. 'Macedonian Judicial Assemblies', *CPh* 103, 135-149.
- Anson, E.M. 2012. 'The Macedonian Patriot: The Diadoch Craterus', *AHB* 26, 49-58.

- Anson, E.M. 2014a. *Alexander's Heirs: The Age of the Successors*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell
- Anson, E.M. 2014b. 'Discrimination and Eumenes of Cardia Revisited', in *The Age of the Successors and the Creation of the Hellenistic Kingdoms (323–276 BC)*. *Studia Hellenistica* 53. Hauben, H., & Meeus, A. (eds.). Peeters: Leiden, 539–558.
- Anson, E.M. 2015. *Eumenes of Cardia: A Greek among Macedonians*. [New Edition]. Leiden: Brill.
- Ashton, N. 2015. 'Craterus Revisited', in *East and West in the World Empire of Alexander*, Wheatley, P. & Baynham E.J. (eds.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 107-116.
- Atkinson, J.E. 1994. *A Commentary on Q. Curtius Rufus' Historiae Alexandri Magni, Books 5–7.2*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.
- Atkinson, J.E. 2000. 'Originality and its Limits in the Alexander Sources of the Early Empire', in *Alexander the Great in Fact and Fiction*, Bosworth, A.B. & Baynham, E.J. (eds.): Oxford: Oxford University Press, 307-325.
- Atkinson, J.E. 2009a. *Curtius Rufus: Histories of Alexander the Great Book 10 — Introduction and Commentary* (Yardley, J.C. trans). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Atkinson, J.E. 2009b. 'Alexander's Last Days: Malaria and Mind Games?', *AClass* 52, 23-46.
- Badian, E. 1965. 'The Administration of the Empire', *G&R* 12, 166-182.
- Badian, E. 1988. 'The Ring and the Book', in *Zu Alexander d. Gr.: Festschrift G. Wirth zum 60. Geburtstag am 9.12.86*, Will, W. (ed.). Amsterdam: Hakkert, 605–625.
- Balmaceda, C. 2017. *Virtus Romana: Politics and Morality in the Roman Historians*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of South Carolina Press.
- Baynham, E.J. 1998. 'Why didn't Alexander Marry before Leaving Macedonia? Observations on Factional Politics at Alexander's Court in 336-334 B.C.', *RhM* 141, 141-152.
- Baynham, E.J. 2013. 'Alexander's Argyraspids: Tough Old Fighters or Antigonid Myth?', in *After Alexander: The Time of the Diadochi 323-281 BC*, Anson, E.M. & Alonso Troncoso, V. (eds.): Oxford: Oxbow Books, 110-120.
- Bell, B.M. 1989. *Terminology for non-Roman Institutions in Latin Authors of the Republic and early-Principate*. Unpublished MPhil Thesis. University College London.

- Beloch, K.J. 1927. *Griechische Geschichte*. Vol. IV, 2nd Edition. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Beneker, J. 2009. 'Nepos' Biographical Method in the *Lives of Foreign Generals*', *CJ* 105, 109-121.
- Berve, H. 1926. *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage*. Munich: C.H. Beck.
- Billows, R.A. 1997. *Antigonus the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Boiy, T. 2000. 'Dating Methods during the Early Hellenistic Period', *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 52, 115–121.
- Boiy, T. 2007a. *Between High and Low: A Chronology of the Early Hellenistic Period*. Berlin: Verlag Antike.
- Boiy, T. 2007b. 'Cuneiform Tablets and Aramaic Ostraca between the Low and High Chronology for the Early Diadoch Period', in *Alexander's Empire: Formulation to Decay*, Heckel, W., Tritle, L., and Wheatley, P. (eds.). Claremont: Regina Books, 199-207.
- Bosworth, A.B. 1971. 'The Death of Alexander the Great: Rumour and Propaganda', *CQ* 21, 112-136.
- Bosworth, A.B. 1988a. *From Arrian to Alexander: Studies in Historical Interpretation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bosworth, A.B. 1992a. 'History and Artifice in Plutarch's *Eumenes*', in *Plutarch and the Historical Tradition*, Stadter, P.A. (ed.). Routledge: London, 56–89.
- Bosworth, A.B. 1992b. 'Philip III Arrhidaeus and the Chronology of the Successors', *Chiron* 22, 55–81.
- Bosworth, A.B. 2000. 'Ptolemy and the Will of Alexander', in *Alexander the Great in Fact and Fiction*, Bosworth, A.B. & Baynham, E.J. (eds.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 207-241.
- Bosworth, A.B. 2002. *The Legacy of Alexander: Politics, Warfare, and Propaganda under the Successors*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bosworth, A.B. 2006. 'Review of E.M. Anson, *Eumenes of Cardia: A Greek among Macedonians*', *CR* 56, 419-421.
- Bradley, J.R. 1991. *The Sources of Cornelius Nepos: Selected Lives*. New York, NY: Garland.
- Brenk, F.E. 1977. *In Mist Apparelled: Religious Themes in Plutarch's Moralia and Lives*. Leiden: Brill.
- Briant, P. 1982. *Rois, Tributs et Paysans*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

- Briscoe, J. & Drummond, A. 2013. 'Cornelius Nepos (45)', in *The Fragments of the Roman Historians*, Cornell, T.J. (ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brunt, P.A. 1963. 'Alexander's Macedonian Cavalry', *JHS* 83, 27-46.
- Brunt, P.A. 1982. 'Nobilitas and Novitas', *JRS* 72, 1-17.
- Burckhardt, L.A. 1990. 'The Political Elite of the Roman Republic: Comments on Recent Discussions on the Concepts of *Nobilitas* and *Homo Novus*', *Historia* 39, 77-99.
- Cairns, F. 1969. 'Catullus I', *Mnemosyne* 22, 153-158.
- Carlier, P. 2000. 'Homeric and Macedonian', in *Alternatives to Athens: Varieties of Political Organisation and Community in Ancient Greece*, Brock, R. & Hopkinson S. (eds.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 259-268.
- Carney, E. 2000. *Women and Monarchy in Macedonia*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Carney, E. 2001. 'The Trouble with Philip Arrhidaeus', *AHB* 15, 63-89.
- Carney, T.F. 1959. 'Once again Marius' Speech after Election in 108 BC', *SO* 35, 63-70.
- Chaplin, J.D. 2000. *Livy's Exemplary History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Charles, M. 2015. 'The Chiliarchs of Achaemenid Persia: Towards a Revised Understanding of the Office', *Phoenix* 69, 279-303.
- Chrysanthou, C.S. 2015. 'P. Oxy. LXXI 4808: *Bios*, Character, and Literary Criticism', *ZPE* 193, 25-38.
- Collins, A.W. 2001. 'The Office of Chiliarch under Alexander and the Successors', *Phoenix* 55, 259-283.
- Comber, M. & Balmaceda, C. 2009. *Sallust: The War Against Jugurtha*. Oxford: Aris and Philips.
- Conte, G.B. 1994. *Latin Literature: A History*. Solodow, J.B. (trans.). Revised by Fowler, D. and Most, G.B. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Copley, F.O. 1951. 'Catullus c. 1', *TAPhA* 82, 200-206.
- Danon, B. 2017. *Celeritas Caesariana: Reputation, Representation and Reality*. Unpublished MA Dissertation. Stellenbosch University.
- Danon, B. 2018. 'A Quantitative Analysis of Caesar's Representation of *Celeritas*', *AClass* 61, 16-35.
- Depuydt, L. 1997. 'The Time of Death of Alexander the Great: 11 June 323 B.C. (-322), ca. 4:00-5:00 PM', *WO* 28, 117-135.

- Dionisotti, A.C. 1988. 'Nepos and the Generals', *JRS* 78, 35-49.
- Dondin-Payre, M. 1981. 'Homo novus: Un slogan de Caton à César', *Historia* 30, 22-81.
- Dorey, T.A. (ed.). 1967. *Latin Biography*. London: Routledge.
- Dugan, J. 2005. *Making a New Man: Ciceronian Self-Fashioning in the Rhetorical Works*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Earl, D.C. 1966. *The Political Thought of Sallust*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eisenhut, W. 1973. *Virtus Romana: Ihre Stellung im römischen Wertesystem*. Munich: Wilhem Fink.
- Elder, J.P. 1967. 'Catullus I, His Poetic Creed, and Nepos', *HSPH* 71, 143-149.
- Epplert, C. 2003. 'Review of C. Schäfer, *Eumenes von Kardia und der Kampf um die Macht im Alexanderreich*', *BMCRev* 2003.06.30.
- Errington, R.M. 1969. 'Bias in Ptolemy's History of Alexander', *CQ* 19, 233-242.
- Errington, R.M. 1970. 'From Babylon to Triparadeisos: 323-320 BC', *JHS* 90, 49-77.
- Errington, R.M. 1978. 'The Nature of the Macedonian State under the Monarchy', *Chiron* 8, 77-134.
- Ferrière, M.-C. 2007: *Les partisans d' Antoine (des orphelins de César aux complices de Cléopâtre)*. Bordeaux: de Boccard
- Fleisher, K. 2020. *The Original Verses of Apollodorus' Chronica*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Flower, H.I. 1996. *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Geiger, J. 1979. 'Cornelius Nepos, *de Regibus Exterarum Gentium*', *Latomus* 38: 662-669.
- Geiger, J. 1982. 'Cornelius Nepos and the Authorship on the Book of Foreign Generals', *LCM* 7, 134-136.
- Geiger, J. 1985a. *Cornelius Nepos and Ancient Political Biography*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Geiger, J. 1985b. 'Cicero and Nepos', *Latomus* 44, 261-270.
- Geiger, J. 1988. 'Nepos and Plutarch: From Latin to Greek Political Biography', *ICS* 13, 245-256.
- Geiger, J. 2008. *The First Hall of Fame: A Study of the Statues in the Forum Augustum*. Leiden: Brill.
- Gelzer, M. 1969. *The Roman Nobility* [trans. R. Seager]. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Gibson, B.J. 1995. 'Catullus 1.5-7', *CQ* 45, 569-573.

- Ginelli, F. 2021. 'The New Nepos: Prolegomena Toward a Renumbering of Cornelius Nepos' Fragments', in *The Continuity of Classical Literature Through Fragmentary Traditions*, Ginelli, F. & Lupi, F. (eds). Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 103-120.
- Ginelli, F. 2022. *Cornelius Nepos, The Commanders of the Fifth Century BCE: Introduction, Text, and Commentary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goldmann, F. 2002. 'Nobilitas als Status und Gruppe—Überlegungen zum Nobilitätsbegriff der römischen Republik', in *Res publica reperta. Zur Verfassung und Gesellschaft der römischen Republik und des frühen Prinzipats* (Festschrift Jochen Bleicken), J. Spielvogel (ed.). Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag, 45–66.
- Goralski, W.J. 1989. 'Arrian's Events after Alexander: Summary of Photius and Selected Fragments', *AncW* 19, 81-100.
- Greenwalt, W. 1989. 'Polygamy and Succession in Argead Macedonia', *Arethusa* 22, 19-45.
- Gruen, E.S. 2018. 'The Coronation of the Diadochi', *Karanos* 1, 109-119.
- Griffith, G.T. 1964. 'Alexander the Great and an Experiment in Government', *PCPhS* 10, 23-39.
- Hadley, R. 2001. 'A Possible Lost Source for the Career of Eumenes of Cardia', *Historia* 50, 3–33.
- Hägg, T. 2012. *The Art of Biography in Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hammond, N.G.L. 1985. 'Some Macedonian Offices c. 336-309 BC', *JHS* 105, 156-160.
- Hammond, N.G.L. 1988. 'The Royal Journal of Alexander', *Historia* 37, 129-150.
- Hammond, N.G.L. 1989a. *The Macedonian State. Origins, Institutions, and History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hammond, N.G.L. 1989b. 'Aspects of Alexander's Journal and Ring in His Last Days', *AJPhil* 110, 155-160.
- Hammond, N.G.L. 1995. 'Did Alexander Use One or Two Seals?', *Chiron* 25, 199-204.
- Hammond, N.G.L. & Griffith, G.T. 1979. *A History of Macedonia*. Vol. 2. Clarendon Press. Oxford.
- Hatzopoulos, M.B. 1996. *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings*. Paris: de Boccard.
- Hau, L.I. 2021. 'Tragedies of War in Duris and Phylarchus: Social Memory and Experiential History', in *After the Crisis: Remembrance, Re-anchoring and Recovery in Ancient Greece and Rome*, Klooster, J. and Kuin, I.N.I. (eds.). London: Bloomsbury, 49-64.

- Heckel, W. 1986. 'Somatophylakia: A Macedonian *Cursus Honorum*', *Phoenix*, 40, 279-294.
- Heckel, W. 1988. *The Last Days and Testament of Alexander the Great: A Prosopographic Study*. Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag.
- Heckel, W. 1992. *The Marshals of Alexander's Empire*. New York: Routledge.
- Heckel, W. 1997. *Justin: Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus. Volume I. Books 11-12: Alexander the Great* (Yardley, J.C. trans). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Heckel, W. 2016. *Alexander's Marshals*. 2nd Edition. New York: Routledge.
- Heckel, W. & Wheatley, P. 2011. *Justin: Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus. Volume II. Books 13-15: The Successors to Alexander* (Yardley, J.C. trans). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hellegouarc'h, J. 1963. *Le Vocabulaire Latin des Relations et des Partis Politiques sous la République*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Hopkins, K. 1983, *Death and Renewal*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hornblower, J. 1981. *Hieronymus of Cardia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Horsfall, N. 1982. 'Prose and Mime', in *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, Vol. 2: *Latin Literature*, Kenney, E.J. and Clausen, V.W. (eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 286–294.
- Horsfall, N. 1989. *Cornelius Nepos: A Selection, including the Lives of Cato and Atticus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Instinsky, H.U. 1962. *Die Siegel des Kaisers Augustus ein Kapitel zur Geschichte und Symbolik des antiken Herrschersiegels*. Baden-Baden: Bruno Grimm.
- Jackson, J.L. 1982. *A Commentary on Nepos' Life of Alcibiades*. Unpublished MA dissertation. Rhodes University.
- Jefferis, J.D. 1943. 'The Concept of *Fortuna* in Cornelius Nepos', *CPh* 38, 48-50.
- Jenkinson, E. 1967. 'Nepos—An Introduction to Latin Biography', in *Latin Biography*, Dorey, T.A. (ed.). New York, NY: Basic Books, 1-15.
- Jenkinson, E. 1973. '*Genus scripturae leve*: Cornelius Nepos and the Early History of Biography at Rome', *ANRW* I.3, 703-719.

- Kajanto, I. 1981. 'Fortuna', *ANRW* II.17, 502-558.
- Kebric, R.B. 1977. *In the Shadow of Macedon: Duris of Samos*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- King, C.J. 2010. 'Macedonian Kingship and other Political Institutions', in *A Companion to Ancient Macedonia*, Roisman, J. & Worthington, I. (eds). Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 373-391.
- Klinkott, H. 2000. *Die Satrapienregister der Alexander- und Diadochenzeit*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Landucci, Gattinoni, F. 1979. 'Eumene: ἔπηλυσ ἀνὴρ καὶ ξένος', in *Conoscenze etniche e rapporti di convivenza nell'antichità*, M. Sordi (ed.). Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 98-107.
- Landucci Gattinoni, F. 2008. *Diodoro Siculo: Biblioteca storica, Libro XVIII: Commento Storico*. Milan: Vita e Pensiero.
- Landucci, F. 2021. *Diodoro Siculo: Biblioteca storica, Libri XIX-XX. La Grecia e l'Oriente. Commento storico*. Milan: Vita e Pensiero.
- Langlands, R. 2018. *Exemplary Ethics in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levick, B. 2010. *Augustus: Image and Substance*. London: Longman.
- Levi, M.-A. 2008. 'Nobilis e Nobilitas', *REA* 100, 555-559.
- Levine, P. 1969. 'Catullus c. 1: A Prayful Dedication', *CSCA* 2, 209-216.
- Leo, F. 1901. *Die griechisch-römische Biographie nach ihrer litterarischen Form*. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.
- Lindsay, H. 1998. 'The Biography of Atticus: Cornelius Nepos on the Philosophical and Ethical Background of Pomponius Atticus', *Latomus* 57, 324-336.
- Lobur, J.A. 2021. *Cornelius Nepos: A Study in Evidence and Influence*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Lobur, J.A. 2023. 'Review-Discussion: A New Commentary on Nepos', *Histos* 17, CXXX-CXLII.
- Lock, R.A. 1977. 'The Origins of the Argyraspids', *Historia* 26, 373-378.
- Love, R.L. 2019. *Writing After Livy: Historical Epitomes in the Livian Tradition*. PhD Thesis. Yale University.
- Luke, T. 2015. 'Review-Discussion: Nepos as a Political Biographer', *Histos* 9, XCI-C.

- Miano, D. 2018. *Fortuna: Deity and Concept in Archaic and Republican Italy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Manuwald, G. 2023. (ed. and trans.). *Cato. Testimonia, Origines*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Marshall, P.K. 1977. *The Manuscript Tradition of Cornelius Nepos*. BICS Supplement 37. London: Institute of Classical Studies.
- Marshall, P.K. (ed). 1991. *Cornelii Nepotis Vitae Cum Fragmentis*. Stuttgart: Teubner.
- Matthews, L. 2011. *Roman Constructions of Fortuna*. Unpublished DPhil Thesis. Oxford University.
- McCarty, T.G. 1970. *Cornelius Nepos: Studies in Technique of Biography*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation University of Michigan.
- McCarty, T.G. 1974. 'The Content of Cornelius Nepos' *De viris illustribus*', *CW* 67, 383-391.
- McDonnell, M. 2006. *Roman Manliness: Virtus and the Roman Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Meeus, A. 2008. 'The Power Struggle of the *Diadochoi* in Babylon, 323 BC', *AncSoc* 38, 39-82.
- Meeus, A. 2009. 'Some Institutional Problems concerning the Succession to Alexander the Great: 'Prostasia' and 'Chiliarchy'', *Historia* 58, 287-310.
- Meeus, A. 2022. *The History of the Diadochoi in Book XIX of Diodoros' Bibliothek*. A Historical and Historiographical Commentary. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Meyer, E. 1902. *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte*. I. Halle an der Salle: Max Niemeyer.
- Millar, F. 1988. 'Cornelius Nepos, *Atticus* and the Roman Revolution', *G&R* 35, 40-55.
- Mitchell, L. 2007. 'Born to Rule? Succession in the Argead Royal House' in *Alexander's Empire: Formulation to Decay*, Heckel, W., Tritle, P, & Wheatley, P. (eds.): Claremont, CA: Regina Books, 61-74.
- Moles, J.L. 1989. 'Review of J. Geiger, *Cornelius Nepos and Ancient Political Biography*', *CR* 39, 229-233.
- Moles, J.L. 1992. 'Review of N. Horsfall, *Cornelius Nepos: A Selection, Including the Lives of Cato and Atticus*', *CR* 42, 314-316.
- Momigliano, A. 1993. *The Development of Greek Biography*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Mommsen, T. 1887. *Römisches Staatsrecht*. 3rd Edition. Leipzig: S. Hirzel.
- Murray, J. 2022a. 'Introduction', in *Reading by Example: Valerius Maximus and the Historiography of Exempla*, Murray, J. & Wardle, D. (eds.). Leiden: Brill, 1-14.
- Murray J. 2022b. 'Valerius on Vice', in *Reading by Example: Valerius Maximus and the Historiography of Exempla*, Murray, J. & Wardle, D. (eds.). Leiden: Brill, 233-260.
- Musnick, L.J. 2008. *A Historical Commentary on Cornelius Nepos' Life of Themistocles*. Unpublished MA Dissertation. University of Cape Town.
- Nicolet, C. 1977. 'Les classes dirigeantes romaines sous la République. Ordre sénatorial et ordre équestre', *Annales (Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations)* 32, 726–55.
- Nipperdey, K. 1849. *Cornelius Nepos*. Leipzig: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
- Ogden, D. 2011. *Alexander the Great: Myth, Genesis and Sexuality*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- Paul, G.M. 1984. *A Historical Commentary on Sallust's Bellum Iugurthinum*. Liverpool: Francis Cairns.
- Parmeggiani, G. 2023. *Ephorus of Cyme and Greek Historiography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pelling, C.B.R. 1990. 'Childhood and Personality in Greek Biography', in *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*, Pelling, C.B.R. (ed.). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 213-244.
- Pownall, F. 2013. 'Duris of Samos and the Diadochi', in *After Alexander: The Time of the Diadochi 323-281 BC*, Anson, E.M. & Alonso Troncoso, V. (eds). Oxford: Oxbow Books, 43-56.
- Pownall, F. 2016. 'Debating Tragic History: A New Collection on Duris: Review Article', *Histos* 10, CLV-CLXII.
- Pryzwansky, M.M. 2010. 'Cornelius Nepos: Key Issues and Critical Approaches', *CJ* 105, 97-108.
- Ramsey, J.T. (ed.), Rolfe, J.C. (trans.). 2013. *Sallust. The War with Catiline. The War with Jugurtha*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rathmann, M. 2005. *Perdikkas zwischen 323 und 320*. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Rauk, J. 1997. 'Time and History in Catullus 1', *CW* 90, 319-332.
- Rawson, E. 1985. *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic*. London: Duckworth.

- Reames, J. 2010. 'The Cult of Hephaestion', in *Responses to Oliver Stone's Alexander: Film, History, and Cultural Studies*, Cartledge, P., & Greenland, F.R. (eds.). Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 183-216.
- Reames-Zimmerman, J. 1999. 'An Atypical Affair? Alexander the Great, Hephaistion Amyntoros and the Nature of Their Relationship', *AHB* 13, 81-96.
- Rich, J.W. 1990. *Cassius Dio. The Augustan Settlement (Roman History 53-55.9)*. Oxford: Aris and Phillips.
- Roisman, J. 1984. 'Ptolemy and his Rivals in his History of Alexander', *CQ* 34, 373-385.
- Roisman, J. 2010. 'Hieronymus of Cardia: Causation and Bias from Alexander to his Successors', in *Philip II and Alexander the Great: Father and Son, Lives and Afterlives*, Carney, E. & Ogden, D (eds): Oxford: Oxford University Press, 135-148.
- Roisman, J. 2012. *Alexander's Veterans and the Early Wars of the Successors*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Rolfe, J.C. 1929. *Cornelius Nepos*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Roller, M.B. 2004. 'Exemplarity in Roman Culture: The Cases of Horatius Cocles and Cloelia', *CPh* 99, 1-56.
- Roller, M.B. 2009. 'The Exemplary Past in Roman Historiography and Culture', in *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians*, Feldherr, A. (ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 214-230.
- Sacks, K.S. 1990. *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Samuel, A.E. 1962. *Ptolemaic Chronology*. Munich: Beck.
- Samuel, A.E. 1965. 'Alexander's "Royal Journals"', *Historia* 14, 1-12.
- Schepens, G. 1989. 'Review of J. Geiger, *Cornelius Nepos and Ancient Political Biography*', *Mnemosyne* 41, 214-217.
- Shackleton Bailey, D.R. 1986. 'Nobiles and Novi Reconsidered', *AJPhil* 107, 255-260.
- Shackleton Bailey, D.R. [trans.]. 1999. *Cicero: Letters to Atticus*. Vol. 1. Cambridge, MA & London: Harvard University Press.

- Schachermeyr, F. 1970. *Alexander in Babylon und die Reichsordnung nach seinem Tode*. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Schäfer, C. 2002. *Eumenes von Kardia und der Kampf um die Macht im Alexanderreich*. Frankfurt: Buchverlag Marthe Clauss.
- Simpson, C.J. 1998. 'Imp. Caesar Divi Filius. His Second Imperial Acclamation and the Evolution of an Allegedly "Exorbitant" Name, *Athenaeum* 86, 419-437.
- Simpson, C.J. 2005. 'Rome's "Official Imperial Seal"? The Rings of Augustus and His First Century Successors', *Historia* 54, 180-188.
- Singleton, D. 1972. 'A Note on Catullus' First Poem', *CPh* 63, 192-196.
- Slingsby, E. 2019. *Tyranny Under the Triumvirs: Statesmen and Sole Rulers in Cornelius Nepos' De Excellentibus Ducibus Exterarum Gentium*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis. University of Sydney.
- Skufca, A. 2018. 'Tyrant and Anti-tyrant: Archetypes and Exemplarity in Cornelius Nepos' Sicilian Lives', *Papers of the Langford Latin Seminar* 17, 89-106.
- Spies, Y. 2017. *Kornelbibliographie: Die gesamte Literatur von und über Cornelius Nepos bis zum Ende des Jahres 2015*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Stadter, P. 2007. 'Biography and History', in *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, Marincola, J. (ed.). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 503-514.
- Stagakis, G.S. 1962. *Institutional Aspects of the Hetairoi Relation*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. University of Wisconsin.
- Stagakis, G.S. 1970. 'Observations on the *hetairoi* of Alexander the Great', *Archaiia Makedonia* 1, 86-102.
- Steidle, W. 1951. *Sueton und die antike Biographie*. Munich: Beck.
- Stem, R. 2009-10. 'Shared Virtues and the Limits of Relativism in Nepos' *Epaminondas* and *Atticus*', *CJ* 105, 123-136.
- Stem, R. 2012. *The Political Biographies of Cornelius Nepos*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Stem, R. 2018. 'Exemplarity and Identity in Cornelius Nepos' *On Foreign Generals*', *Papers of the Langford Latin Seminar* 17, 25-52.

- Stem, R. 2019. 'Idealizing a Life of Friendship: Cicero's *De Amicitia* in Nepos' *Life of Atticus*', *TAPhA* 149, 27-45.
- Stuart, D.R. 1928. *Epochs in Greek and Roman Biography*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Syme, R. 1939. *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Syme, R. 1964. *Sallust*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Tarn, W.W. 1950. *Alexander the Great. II: Sources and Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thomas, P.H. 1960. *Incerti Auctoris Epitoma Rerum Gestarum Alexandri Magni cum Libro de Morte Testamentoque Alexandri*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Titchener, F. 2003. 'Nepos and the Biographical Tradition', *G&R* 50, 85-99.
- Toher, M. 2002. 'Nepos' Second Edition', *Philologus* 146, 139-149.
- Tuplin, C. 2000. 'Nepos and the Origin of Political Biography', in *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History X*, C., Deroux, (ed.). Brussels: Latomus, 124-61.
- Tuplin, C. 2007. 'Continuous Histories (Hellenica)' in *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, Marincola, J. (ed.). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 143-153.
- Vein, A. 1907. *Eumenes von Kardia: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Diadochenzeit*. Munich: Druck und Verlag der Aschendorffschen Buchhandlung.
- Vogt, J. 1926. *Homo Novus, ein Typus der römischen Republik*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer.
- van der Blom, H. 2010. *Cicero's Role Models: The Political Strategy of a Newcomer*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- van der Blom, H. 2023. 'Homo Novus/New Man', *Oxford Bibliographies, Classics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vanderbroeck, P.J.J. 1986. 'Homo novus Again', *Chiron* 16, 239-242.
- Wardle, D. 1998. *Valerius Maximus' Memorable Deeds and Sayings*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Wardle, D. 2014. *Suetonius: Life of Augustus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Wardle, D. 2025. *Suetonius: Life of Julius Caesar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Waters, M. 2014. *Ancient Persia: A Concise History of the Achaemenid Empire, 550-330 BCE*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Westall, R. 2022. 'Cornelius Nepos as a Writer. Review of J.A. Lobur, *Cornelius Nepos. A Study in the Evidence and Influence*', *CR* 72, 512-514.
- Westlake, H.D. 1969. 'Eumenes of Cardia', in *Essays on Greek Historians and Greek History*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 313-329.
- Wheatley, P. 2007. 'An Introduction to the Chronological Problems in Early Diadoch Sources and Scholarship', in *Alexander's Empire: Formulation to Decay*, Heckel, W., Tritle, L., and Wheatley, P. (eds.). Claremont: Regina Books, 179-192.
- Wheatley, P. 2013. 'The *Heidelberg Epitome*: A Neglected Diadoch Source', in *After Alexander: The Time of the Diadochi 323-281 BC*, Anson, E.M. & Alonso Troncoso, V. (eds.). Oxford: Oxbow Books, 17-29.
- Winstedt, E.O. 1904. *Corneli Nepotis Vitae*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Winterbottom, M. 1979. 'Review of P.K. Marshall, *The Manuscript Tradition of Cornelius Nepos*', *CR* 29, 55-56.
- Wiseman, T.P. 1971. *New Men in the Roman Senate: 139 B.C.—A.D. 14*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wiseman, T.P. 1979. *Clio's Cosmetics: Three Studies in Greco-Roman Literature*. Leicester: Leicester University Press.
- Wiseman, T.P. 1987. 'Review of J. Geiger, *Cornelius Nepos and Ancient Political Biography*', *JRS* 77, 250.