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EURYCLES OF SPARTA

By G. W. BOWERSOCK

The most notable personality in the history of Augustan Greece is the Spartan, C. Julius Eurycles. As a partisan of Octavian, he led the Spartan force against Antony at Actium, and his name reveals that his allegiance was rewarded with Roman citizenship. Eurycles enjoyed the friendship of Augustus, and abused it. The history of this man provides valuable evidence for Augustan policy toward cities and dynasts of the East. Yet most of the modern literature dealing with him is inconclusive. It will be impossible to say the final word about Eurycles, but a great deal of confusion can be cleared up. Moreover, a recently published palimpsest requires that a crucial piece of evidence be revised.

A few preliminary matters must be considered first. Strabo the geographer, a contemporary of Eurycles, calls him ο ΚΟΛΕίς των ΑΛΚΕΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΩΝ ήγεμών. Elsewhere Strabo refers to his ἐπιστάσις. Constitutionalists may ask whether Eurycles was ἡγεμών or ἐπιστάτης of Sparta. Strabo is an unreliable guide in such a delicate inquiry: he also applies the term ήγεμών to Sulla, a provincial governor, a prefect of Egypt, a German chieftain and the Emperor Tiberius. The word ἐπιστάσις is uncommon in Strabo, but there is no reason to believe that he is using it any more technically than his somewhat older contemporary, Diodorus the Sicilian, when he says τῆς τῶν ΚΑΡΧΙΝΩΝ ἐπιστάσιος.

But it does not matter much what Eurycles was called; his power was the vital thing. Weil demonstrated long ago from numismatic evidence that Eurycles held a unique, dynastic position in Sparta, which his son held after him. Coins with the legends ΕΥΚΛΕΙΩΝ and ΕΥΚΛΕΙΩΝ form a series, beginning soon after Actium. Although there is an abundance of Spartan coins from the period before Actium, none bears the name of Lachares, Eurycles’ father. It was the Emperor who raised up the Euryclids, and it was the Emperor who could pull them down again.

Inasmuch as the first Eurycles coin belongs to the years 31–27 B.C., it is reasonable to suppose that Eurycles was established as dynast of Sparta through the φίλας of a grateful Octavian not long after the Battle of Actium. Further confirmation of the early installation of Eurycles may perhaps lie in a passage of Strabo in which the Spartans are said to have presided over the newly founded Actia. Octavian chose the Spartans, no doubt, not only because of the refuge accorded to Livia and the support rendered at Actium but also because an amicus, appreciative of the citizenship, was in control at

1 For criticism of various drafts of this paper I am deeply grateful to Professor Sir Ronald Syme, Professor F. W. Walbank, Mr. R. Meiggs and Mr. E. W. Gray. A much abbreviated version of this study was included in a paper read to the Oxford Branch of the Classical Association on 25th May, 1961.

2 Plut., Ant. 67.

3 The following contain the most important studies of Eurycles: R. Weil, Ath. Mitt. 6 (1881), 10 ff.; E. Kjellberg, Klio 17 (1921), 44 ff.; E. Kornemann, Neue Dokumente zum labischen Kaiserkult (Breslau, 1929) 13 ff.; S. Accame, Il Dominio Romano in Grecia dalla Guerra Acaia ad Augusto (Rome, 1946) 124 ff.; K. M. T. Chrimes (Mrs. Atkinson), Ancient Sparta (Manchester, 1949) 160 ff.; J. H. Oliver, The Ruling Power (Philadelphia, 1953) 954 ff. Also notices in P-W: Niese, 6, 1330 f. (inaccurate); Groag, 10, 580; Ehrenberg, 2te. Reihe, 3, 1447. There are valuable remarks on Eurycles in the following reviews: A. Momigliano (Chrimes), Rivista Storica Italiana 62 (1950), 283; A. M. Woodward (Chrimes), Historia 1 (1950), 622, and JHS 73 (1953), 171; E. W. Gray (Oliver), JHS 75 (1955), 196. Each of these books and articles to be cited by its author’s surname only. References will be given by the letter S and the appropriate page number.

4 S 363.

5 S 366.

6 S 595 and 654 (Sulla), 569 (governor), 780 (Aelius Gallus), 291 (Segimundus), 627 (Tiberius).


8 Weil, Chrimes, 196, thought ιν ΕΥΡΟΧΛΕΟΥΣ meant that Eurycles was a high priest of Augustus. This theory is untenable: cf. Woodward’s objections in Historia o.c. (note 3) and Momigliano (‘ipotesi senza base documentaria ’).

9 S 345.

10 Sparta had given refuge to Livia and the young Tiberius after the Perusine War (Dio 54, 7, 2) and was in the clientela of the Claudii (Suet., Tib. 6, 2).
Sparta. Subsequently, Augustus honoured the Spartans further by presenting them with Cythera, Thuria and Cardamyle.11

The actual termination of Eurycles’ rule is the central problem in writing his history. It raises topics of historical gravity: the relations of client kings and dynasts of Rome with one another, imperial intervention in the affairs of a free city and the degree to which the emperor can support a corrupt nominee in the face of strong local opposition. If it was Roman policy to encourage the aristocracies of eastern cities, a nice dilemma arises when one segment of a city aristocracy is violently hostile to another. Historians have a bad habit of thinking of local eastern aristocracies as units to be supported or opposed, and yet preoccupations with aristocratic factions at Rome ought naturally to have led them to investigate the same phenomena in other less important cities. Such factions in eastern cities obviously posed a serious problem in the implementation of Roman policy. It was just such a problem that Augustus faced in the case of C. Julius Eurycles.

Strabo provides the basic text. The following have long been taken to be his words: 

Strabo’s note on Eurycles was accordingly to be regarded as one of the twenty-odd additions he made to the Geography in the reign of Tiberius.19

This view was rendered untenable in 1928 when Kougéas published an inscription from Gytheum in Laconia which revealed that Eurycles himself was dead in A.D. 15 and

11 Dio 54, 7, 2 (Cythera); Paus. 4, 31, 1 (Thuria), and Paus. 3, 26, 7 (Cardamyle). This generosity may be due in part to a desire of the Emperor to compensate the Spartans for his liberation of the Laconian League from their control (Paus. 3, 21, 6). In S 363 Cythera is said to be the personal possession of Eurycles, but there is no difficulty, pace Chrimes, 173, in supposing that Augustus presented the island nominally to the Spartans and in fact to their overlord.

12 S 366.


14 Ehrenberg o.c. (n.3), col. 1447.

15 SIG2 789/788, n. 2.

16 Kjellberg, p. 57, declared confidently, ‘Es ist nicht notwendig und durch nichts bezeugt, dass er schon früher (i.e. than Augustus’ death) in die Verbannung hat gehen müssen.’

17 W. Kolbe apud IG v, 1, xvi.

18 Kornemann, p. 15.

19 The composition of Strabo’s Geography is admirably examined in J. G. C. Anderson’s article in Anat. Studies pres. to Ramsay (Manchester, 1923), 1 F., revising E. Pais, Ancient Italy (Chicago, 1908), 379 F. Cf. also below, footnote 26. The veco-Ti is unhelpful, as Strabo applies it to incidents over a range of six decades: e.g. it is used of Caesar’s refoundation of Corinth in 44 B.C. (S 379) and of Zeno’s accession to the throne of Armenia in A.D. 18 (S 556).
by that date thoroughly rehabilitated. It was most unlikely that Eurycles died some
time between 19th August, A.D. 14, and the composition of the Gytheum text, inasmuch
as the inscription records an already flourishing benefactor cult of Eurycles. Perhaps,
after all, ἀκεῖνος is not Augustus; then ὁ υἱὸς will not be Tiberius either. Indeed,
Strabo never elsewhere refers to Tiberius in that way. The nearest parallel would be
ὁ διαδεξάμονος υἱὸς Τιβέριος, but even there Strabo says explicitly Τιβέριος. Thus,
history has vindicated the natural reading of the Greek. ἀκεῖνος is Eurycles, and ὁ υἱὸς
is his son, C. Julius Laco.

Two recent scholars have wrestled again with the old problem posed by Josephus’
account of Eurycles’ banishment. One scholar rejected Josephus outright, while both
attempted a new translation of the expression παραχωρήσαντος εἰς τὸ χρέον in yet
another effort to reconcile Strabo and history. Nevertheless, the genitive absolute must
certainly mean ‘having died’; cf. Strabo’s expression for dying on p. 61, ἐπελθεὶν εἰς
tὸ χρέον, and indeed the references in Liddell and Scott, Greek-Eng. Lexicon s.v. χρέον II.

Such was the problem, until the recent publication of the Vatican palimpsest of
Strabo, dating from c. A.D. 500 and by far the oldest extant text of that author. The
latter part of the Eurycles passage appears there in the following form: ἐν ὁποιοντού
τὰ ἐν ταχέως, ἀκεῖνού μὲν παραχωρήσαντος εἰς τὸ χρ[ε]ον, το[ὺ] ἢ υἱὸς εἰς τὴν
φιλοτιμίαν ἀ[πο]τράπα συμμόν τὴν τοιαύτην παῖς[ον]. The text is slightly
muddled (ἐπάσαστο for ἐπάσαστο, ταραχὴν for ταραχή, and the εἰς with χρεῶν iterated
after υἱοῦ), but it is clear enough to confirm the accuracy of two crucial conjectures:
tαραχὴ to replace ἀρχὴ and φιλοτιμίαν to replace φιλία. The second half of Strabo’s
sentence must now be read: ἐπάσαστο ἢ ταραχῆς ταχέως, ἀκεῖνου μὲν παραχωρήσαντος
eἰς τὸ χρέον, τοῦ ἢ υἱοῦ τὴν φιλοτιμίαν ἀπεστραμμένου τὴν τοιαύτην πᾶσαν. The whole
sentence may be translated as follows: ‘Recently Eurycles stirred up trouble among the
Spartans by seeming immoderately to abuse his friendship with the Emperor in the
exercise of his authority over them, but the tumult came to a swift end when Eurycles
died and his son rejected all such ambition.’

The new readings relieve the interpreter of much excess baggage. It was not
Eurycles’ overlordship which ended with his death, but the trouble which he fomented.
There is no longer any difficulty about reconciling Strabo’s words with Josephus’ account
of Eurycles’ banishment: Eurycles continued causing trouble after he was banished.
When he died, the trouble stopped. Strabo makes no mention of the banishment because it
clearly had little effect on the situation in Greece, and it reflected badly on the Emperor.
In the second of the two genitive absolutes explaining the cessation of trouble, Strabo
declares that Eurycles’ son had none of the sort of ambition his father had; in other
words, Laco was in no way inclined to take up where his father had left off and to carry
on the tumult in his father’s name. ‘Thus the tumult was not perpetuated. There is no
longer any need to worry about the coincidence of the end of Eurycles’ ἀρχὴ with his
own death (or Augustus’), nor will scholars now be faced with the absurdity of Laco’s
rejecting the friendship of an emperor. A man in Laco’s position simply would not do
such a thing. The Vatican palimpsest makes a vast difference.

The new readings also make it clear that Strabo wrote his lines about Eurycles before
he gave up working on the Geography in the reign of Augustus. Laco was keeping
discreetly quiet after the death of his turbulent father and perhaps hoped that his good
behaviour would one day have its reward. Coins and an inscription attest Laco’s
subsequent overlordship of Sparta, but Strabo will have written before he moved into
that exalted position. The numismatic evidence reveals what must be expected: a hiatus

---

document but did not see its significance for Eurycles.
21 S 288.
22 Chrimes, 171: ‘gave in to necessity.’ Oliver, 936: ‘Caesar withdrew far enough so that the
influence of Eurycles might be reduced to proportion.’ Oliver rejected Josephus.
23 W. Aly, De Strabonis codice rescripto cuius reliquiae in codicibus Vaticanis Vat. Gr. 2306 et 2061
24 ταραχῆς. φιλοτιμίαν R. Syme (an unpublished emendation proposed in a paper to the
Oxford Philological Society in 1948).
between the dynasties of Eurycles and Laco. Surely Strabo’s remarks about Eurycles are to be dated to that hiatus, for he knows nothing of Eurycles’ posthumous rehabilitation and Laco’s elevation. This inference is useful, since Strabo had ceased to work on his Geography by 2 B.C.; and the Eurycles passage cannot be a part of the revision under Tiberius, inasmuch as Eurycles had already been rehabilitated and Laco established in his place by A.D. 15. Accordingly, Eurycles must have been dead c. 2 B.C. A *terminus ante quem* for the end of his rule has now emerged.

A *terminus post quem* is within reach. Josephus makes it plain that the trouble which Eurycles caused in Greece and the two accusations in the presence of Augustus occurred *after* Eurycles’ return from a journey to Herod in Judaea and Archelaus in Cappadocia. The ταραχή to which Strabo alludes will be that specified in Josephus: 

\[\text{τῶν Ἁγίασαι καὶ περιδέους τῶν πόλεως.}\]

When Eurycles went to Judaea, he was already established as overlord of Sparta; the inception of his rule had taken place soon after Actium. Josephus declares that when he reached Herod he was οὐκ ἄστησε τῶν ἔξω. So Eurycles arrived in Judaea as dynast of Sparta and friend of Augustus. The reason for his journey to the East is obscure. Possibly, Herod was furnishing hospitality to Eurycles in return for hospitality received at Sparta during the two journeys of the Jew as king to the city of Rome, and evidently Eurycles endeavoured to turn his visits to eastern kings to his own financial gain. Augustus could not have been pleased with the disastrous chaos which his Spartan friend left in his wake in two client kingdoms. With his eastern money, Eurycles went back to Greece and initiated the discord and civil strife which led to his banishment.

Eurycles’ return from Judaea and Cappadocia can be dated. Josephus relates that while at the court of Herod, Eurycles ingratiated himself with the King’s sons, Antipater, son of the common woman Doris, and Alexander and Aristobulus, sons of the princess Mariamne. Eurycles played false to the sons of Mariamne in favour of Antipater, whose hostility to his half-brothers and rivals was long-standing. As a result of Eurycles’ testimony, the king’s suspicions, which Antipater had previously worked upon, were aroused again, and Herod committed his two sons by Mariamne to prison. Subsequently an embassy was sent to Rome. Augustus reluctantly permitted Herod to put his own offspring to death after a trial at Beirut. Alexander and Aristobulus were strangled at...

---

25 Weil, 17–18: a coin, which belongs clearly to the series of Eurycles and Laco, bears the name Timaristos, called an ephor. The bearded head, characteristic of the Euryclid series, is named Lycurgus on the Timaristos piece. This coin, although belonging to the age of the early Eurycles, thus makes no mention of them but alludes instead to the Spartan constitution by the words ‘ephor’ and ‘Lycurgus’. Most probably, therefore, the coin falls between the régimes of Eurycles and Laco, and not surprisingly the hiatus will have been marked by a conspicuous reversion to constitutionalism.

26 The latest datable occurrence in Strabo, apart from passages evidently added in the later revision, is the inclusion of Amaseia in the Roman provincia (S 561), which happened in 3–2 B.C. With regard to certain other eastern places, Strabo’s account reflects a state of things which ceased to exist in 2 B.C. On all this, see Anderson, o.c. (p. 19) 78–90. On the memory of Eurycles and the position of Laco in A.D. 15: *AE* 1929, 99 (II. 19–22 (Gytheium)). The slight difference in Laco’s titles from his dead father’s on that document may perhaps be attributed to the discretion by virtue of which he advanced so far.

27 Jos., *By* 1, 531: after his sojourns with Herod and Archelaus, δίδος θ’ εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα τοὺς ἰκάκους κτήσεως εἰς δῶρα (i.e. like the trouble Josephus says he caused in the Near East) καταγγέλλει· εἰς γὰρ εἰπὸν Καίσαρος καταγγέλλει ἑπὶ τῶν στάσεως ἐμπλήθη τὴν Ἁγίαν καὶ περιδέους τῶν πόλεων συγκλονείται. *Aj* 16, 310: also after his visits to Herod and Archelaus, Εὐρυκλῆς μὲν εὖ ἦ διὰ τὴν λανθασμένην ποιημάτων ἐν εὔχρησιν ἐπὶ πολλαῖς διεκμένους ἀπετερήθη τὴν πτηρίδα.

28 Oliver, 1955, is surely right in correcting Miss Chrimes’ mistranslation of these charges (Chrimes, 175). Josephus says that Eurycles was charged with fomenting civil discord throughout Achaea and stripping the cities (whatever exactly that may mean). Moreover, the following yap would lack point after Eurycles’ ill-omened arrival in the kingdom of Herod (βασιλεία), not to a desire of Eurycles ‘to enrich himself in order to make himself king’ (Chrimes, 174). (I accept the difficilior lectio προσφορῆι which Miss Chrimes prints but does not correctly translate.) Moreover, the following yap would lack point after Miss Chrimes’ translation. See also Walbank, *CR* 65 (1961), 150.

29 His two journeys as king: W. Otto, *P-W Suppl.* 2, table facing p. 160. On Herod’s relations with Sparta, observe Jos., *By* 1, 425. During one trip to Rome, Herod paused to be agonothete at the Olympic Games: *By* 1, 427. On earlier relations between Jews and Spartans, including an alleged common ancestry: Jos., *Aj* 13, 164, with which cf. 1 *Macabees* 2, 6–18.

30 Jos., *By* 1, 531, quoted in footnote 27, says explicitly that Eurycles used the riches he had acquired in the Near East to foment discord in Achaea.

31 Jos., *By* 1, 536–7.
Sebaste, near Caesarea, c. 7 B.C.33 Meantime, after seeing Herod (presumably in the preceding year), Euryycles had gone on to visit Alexander’s father-in-law, the King of Cappadocia. The Spartan spent long enough with Archelaus to assure him that he had reconciled Herod with his sons and to receive money from him. Euryycles returned to Greece from Cappadocia. The date of his return will, therefore, be approximately 7 B.C.

Accordingly, the tumult in Greece, the trials before Augustus and the death of Euryycles are to be dated between c. 7 and 2 B.C. The apparent failure of Dio Cassius to deal with these events will not be surprising. They happened precisely within that part of the Augustan Age for which the text of Dio is seriously defective.

Josephus reveals that Euryycles stirred up στάσις in Achaea; with the persuasion of his eastern money Euryycles carried what had been local Spartan strife probably throughout the cities of the Free Laconian League. A precious anecdote in Plutarch discloses the identity of one of Eurycles’ accusers in the court of Augustus as a descendant of Brasidas.34 During the Augustan principate, the old and distinguished family of Brasidas still lacked the Roman citizenship,35 while an upstart who had fought on the right side at Actium not only dominated them but rejoiced in the name, C. Julius Euryycles. The old Spartan aristocracy bared its teeth to the new; after all, Euryycles’ father had been a pirate.36 The island of Cythera, which Augustus so generously presented to Sparta, had become, in fact, the personal property of its dynast; his father had perhaps been based there.37 In the Achaean cities to which Josephus refers Euryycles must have tried to bribe the leading lights to support him. He may have aimed at extending his domination over the entire League of Free Laconians, which had been subjected to Sparta since the time of Nabis and had only just received its freedom from Augustus.38 Inscriptions show Eurycles’ influence in at least two league cities, Asopus and Gytheum, of which the latter established a cult in his honour for what must have been a particularly liberal benefaction.39 Gytheum hailed Euryycles, after his rehabilitation, as ευεργήτης τοῦ ἔθους καὶ τῆς πόλεως: the πόλις is surely Gytheum itself, the ἔθνος the League of Free Laconians.40 If Euryycles had tried to re-establish Spartan control over the Laconian cities after Augustus had liberated them, that would have been an abuse of the imperial friendship indeed.

The descendants of Brasidas can hardly have been willing to gaze quietly at the enlargement of Eurycles’ dominion. Achaea was engulfed in local στάσις probably, as at Sparta, between opposing factions of city aristocracies. The banishment of Eurycles did little good to relieve the crisis. But when he died, Laco made no attempt to perpetuate his father’s struggle, and peace came swiftly. The Spartans breathed a sigh of relief, looked back to Lycurgus and embraced the ancient constitution under which the great general Brasidas once had lived.41

The discreet Laco knew the folly of his father’s ambition. In the years that followed Eurycles’ death he must have come to terms with the family of Brasidas. He caused no trouble and endured constitutional government for a while. Rome could only have been pleased with him. Laco’s son married into a Mytilenean family highly favoured by the Emperor.42 By the end of his principate, the ugly events of Augustan Sparta were covered

---

33 The chronology is discussed by W. Otto, P-W Suppl. 2 s.v. Herodes.
34 Plut., Reg. et Imp. Apophtheg. 207 F. The reference in that anecdote to the seventh book of Thucydidès is obscure but fortunately irrelevant to this discussion. Miss Chrimes, 179, rightly noted the nature of the opposition to Euryycles.
35 Cf. H. Box, JRS xxi (1931), 202.
36 Plut., Ant. 67. Euryycles’ son and grandson were to be ranked by Tacitus among the primores Achaeaorum (Ann. 6, 18).
37 Cythera as a pirate base: Polyb. 4, 6; cf. above, footnote 11.
38 S 366; Paus. 3, 21, 6. The most natural time for Augustus’ liberation of the Laconian cities was soon after Actium. The attempt of A. Gitti to interpret τερματικό δήμος τῆς Σπάτας in S 366 as a reference to Euryycles, instead of Nabis, is not convincing: ‘La Condizione delle Città della Laconia e l’Opera di Augusto,’ Atti del V Congresso Nazionale di Studi Romani 2 (1940), 359 ff.
39 Asopus (IG v, 1, 970); Gytheum (AE 1929, 99, 19–20, alluding to cult). For these cities as league members: Paus. 3, 21, 7. S 343 and 363 call Gytheum τὰ τῆς Σπάτας ἔθνα.39
41 See above, footnote 25.
42 C. Julius Argolicus, son of Laco, was the husband of Pompeia Macrina (Tac., Ann. 6, 18). Macrina’s father was an illustriis eques (ibid.), identified in PIR, P 473 as the younger Pompeius Maces (cf. Anth. Pal. 7, 219, and 9, 28). Her brother was Q. Pompeius Maces, praetor in A.D. 15 (Tac., Ann. 1, 72; 6, 18; ILS 9349).

According to

---
over by the rehabilitation of Augustus’ good friend, Laco’s father. Without the testimony of a learned Jew no one would ever have known that the Emperor had been compelled once to send his friend and nominee into banishment.

FAMILY

Eurycles’ descendants were persons of prestige in the early empire; a fresh account of his distinguished family is required in the light of the foregoing results. The Euryclid coinage series revealed that a Laco held a position in Sparta similar to that which Eurycles himself had held. Inasmuch as certain of the Laco coins are dated to the reign of Claudius, it had once been tempting to assume that Laco had been set up as dynast through the favour of that Emperor. But there are also Laco coins which have not the slightest indication of Claudian date, so that, with the emergence of the Gytheum document and the new palimpsest readings, it becomes clear that Laco was probably already installed in Eurycles’ position early under Tiberius. He will have been expelled by the same Emperor in the early thirties, perhaps due to circumstances ironically reminiscent of those which led to Eurycles’ own expulsion. Gaius or more probably Claudius can be assumed to have reinstated Laco; the hostile members of the Brasidas family were pacified by a grant of the citizenship. It has generally been inferred with good reason that the Laco of the coins was Eurycles’ son, and if the Laco of the Gytheum inscription is the man of the same name on the non-Claudian coins, then this inference is strengthened.

An inscription from Corinth, published in 1926, records a C. Julius Laco who was a procurator of imperial estates under Claudius. This knight was immediately identified with the dynast, Eurycles’ son, and attempts were made to reconcile the evidence for his rule at Sparta and a procuratorship at Corinth. But it would be well to observe that the procurator’s filiation is given as C. f.; nowhere is the filiation of a son of the great Eurycles given in any other form than ‘son of Eurycles’:

SIG3 788 (Athens) [Γάιο]ν Ἰ[ο]ύλιον Δεξίμαχον Εὐρυκλέος υἱόν. (? son by adoption.)
SIG3 789 (Olympia) Γ. Ἰουλίου Εὐρυκλέους υἱόν Ἀδριανοῦ.
IG v, 1, 1243 (Taenarum) Γάιον Ἰουλίου Λάκκωνο Εὐρυκλέος υἱόν. Honoured by the League of Free Laconians.

Indeed, Eurycles’ grandson, C. Julius Spartiaticus, is called Euryclis n. Such a famous ancestor was not to be obscured by the mere praenomen. Hence, the Corinthian procurator must be a different man from the Spartan dynast, presumably his son; the dynast was growing old by the time of Claudius.

A revised stemma of the Euryclids may now be useful. Eurycles’ great-grandfather is named below as Heraclanus. A certain Heraclanus is attested as the father of a Lachares on two first-century B.C. inscriptions, but he cannot be Eurycles’ paternal grandfather,

Tacitus, her great-grandfather was Theophaenes of Myrtene (Tac., Ann. 6, 18). ‘Theophaenes’ son, therefore Macrina’s alleged grandfather, will have had the same name and the same equestrian rank as her father (S 618, reading Μάκρον for Μάριον, as is customary): he served under Augustus as librarian (Suet., Jul. 56, 7) and procurator of Asia (S 618). But Professor Syne, in his Tacitus (Oxford, 1938) 748–9, argues that Tacitus has erred in the number of generations between Theophaenes and the praetor of A.D. 15; Strabo (618) says that Theophaenes left a son [sic], whom Augustus at one time made procurator of Asia and who is now (sic vide) one of the chief friends of Tiberius. Accordingly, this passage will be one of those added by Strabo in his later revision, and ‘Theophaenes’ son will be the praetor’s father.

Weil 14, no. 7. And coins in an unpublished hoard mentioned by Miss Chrimes, 184–5, footnote 4.

Weil 14, nos. 5 and 6.

43 Weil 14, no. 7. And coins in an unpublished hoard mentioned by Miss Chrimes, 184–5, footnote 4.

44 Weil 14, nos. 5 and 6.

45 Tac., Ann. 6, 18.

46 JRS xxi (1931), 205, on Ti. Claudius Brasidas.

47 AJA 30 (1926), 396 = Corinth viii, 2, no. 67.

48 AE 1929, 99, l. 21 (Gytheum), gives no filiation for Laco, presumably because his father’s name appears in l. 19 in a parallel context. ‘Two of Laco’s sons, Cratinus (IG v, 2, 541) and Spartiaticus (AJA 30 [1926], 393 = Corinth viii, 2, no. 68), are each called ‘son of Laco’, and his daughter, Julia Pantimia (IG v, 2, 542), is called ‘daughter of Laco’. But a son who was himself called Laco after his father would only need the simple C. f.

49 AJA 30 (1926), 393 = Corinth viii, 2, no. 68.

50 IG v, 1, 94, l. 11; v, 1, 265. The name Heraclanus does not imply Roman citizenship, as Miss Chrimes thought (461, n. 3): cf. Kolbe ad IG v, 1, 94. On provincials adopting Roman names without the franchise, see Dittenberger apud Box, JRS xxi (1931), 200, and Badian, Foreign Clientelae (Oxford, 1958), 250–7.
whose name happened also to be Eurycles. Therefore, probably his great-grandfather. Agesinicus and Leonidas, both called sons of a Lachares on first-century B.C. documents, have been somewhat arbitrarily made brothers and the offspring of Heraclanus’ son. The Lachares mentioned in an inscription of 71–70 B.C., in honour of the Cloatii brothers at Gytheum, is taken to be identical with the father of Agesinicus and Leonidas; he could not easily be the father of Julius Eurycles. The Augustan Lachares, son of Lachares, is most plausibly a brother of the Ἑρύκλεος. A Λαχάρης Ἐπηράτου Λακηδαιμόνιος, attested on an inscription from the second century B.C., does not appear on the stemma below.

Of the imperial Euryclids, the children of Laco the dynast are, apart from the procurator, non-controversial. The patronomos of c. A.D. 75, also named C. Julius Laco, is taken to be the procurator’s son, who, in turn, had a son of the same name substituting for him. A brother of the substitute patronomos will be the son of a C. Julius Laco, namely the senator C. Julius Eurycles Heraclanus, who died sometime after A.D. 130.

The family of Theophanes in the early empire is presented in accordance with the latest study of Theophanes’ posterity.