Palladas and the Foundation of Constantinople*

KEVIN W. WILKINSON

ABSTRACT

The recent adjustment to Palladas' dates necessitates a fresh look at an old question: Should Constantinople be considered the proper setting for some of his epigrams? Allusions in a few poems to statuary and to buildings, and one ekphrasis of a coin, suggest not only that he was in Constantinople at some point during his life (as many others have thought), but also that he was there quite close to the time of the city's foundation. These epigrams yield precious (if also enigmatic) clues to a murky period in the history of the Eastern capital.

Scholarly consensus used to place the epigrammatist Palladas of Alexandria in Constantinople at one or two points during his life.[1] This judgement rested in large part on the authority of two lemmata in our Byzantine manuscripts of the Greek Anthology: AP 11.292 was thought to be a lampoon of Themistius composed during the philosopher's tenure as prefect of Constantinople (A.D. 384), and AP 9.528 was thought to describe bronze statues of the gods that were housed in the Palace of Marina (constructed no earlier than the 420s).[2] In the middle of the twentieth century, however, the lemmata and their implied chronology of Palladas' life (*c.* A.D. 360–450) were thoroughly discredited.[3] This important demolition of Byzantine misinformation allowed for new historical work to be done. In the course of arguing for a revised set of dates (*c.* A.D. 319–400), C. M. Bowra and Alan Cameron dismissed all earlier claims that the poet had any connection with Constantinople. This, I think, is not quite right. The lemmata are indeed dubious, but several of Palladas' epigrams find a natural home in the Eastern capital.

This might be a pointless debate to revive except for the fact that I am convinced that Palladas lived much earlier than anyone has realized. Recently, I have offered a comprehensive argument for situating his birth in the 250s or 260s and his death at some point

* I am grateful to the editor of this journal, the editorial board, the anonymous readers, and Tim Barnes for their helpful comments on earlier drafts of this paper. I am also indebted to Bill Metcalf, Nathan Elkins, and the Yale Art Gallery and its staff for supplying images of three coins that appear below as Figs 1–3. Finally, I acknowledge the support of the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library of Yale University and its director Frank Turner. Unless otherwise noted, all passages from the Greek Anthology reproduce the text of H. Beckby (ed.), *Anthologia Graeca*[2], 4 vols (1965–1968).

[1] e.g. A. Franke, *De Pallada Epigrammatographo* (1899), 43; W. Peek, *RE* 18.3 (1949), 158–68, at 158; T. A. Bonanno, 'Pallada', *Orpheus* 5 (1958), 119–50, at 120–2; J. Irmscher, 'Palladas-Probleme', *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Universität Rostock* 12 (1963), 235–9, at 237.

[2] On the first of these, see now K. W. Wilkinson, 'Palladas and the age of Constantine', *JRS* 99 (2009), 36–60, at 56–60. On the second, see ibid., 38, 54–6, and below, Section I.

[3] See especially C. M. Bowra, 'Palladas and Christianity', *Proc. Brit. Acad.* 45 (1959), 255–67; idem, 'Palladas and the converted Olympians', *Byz. Zeit.* 53 (1960), 1–7; Alan Cameron, 'Palladas and the Nikai', *JHS* 84 (1964), 54–62; idem, 'Palladas and Christian polemic', *JRS* 55 (1965a), 17–30; idem, 'Notes on Palladas', *CQ* n.s. 15 (1965b), 215–29.

JRS 100 (2010), pp. 179–194. © *The Author(s) 2010.*
Published by The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.
doi:10.1017/S0075435810000109

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435810000109 Published online by Cambridge University Press

after A.D. 331 (but presumably not much later than the middle of the fourth century).[4] If this is correct, then the debate over whether any of his epigrams should be situated in Constantinople takes on a new importance, for the early years of Constantine's city are very poorly documented. It is not that there is a dearth of sources; the problem is that most of them are late and unreliable. If we can demonstrate, therefore, that Palladas was present there very early on, there is a chance that he might add something to our meagre knowledge of the city during this period.

First, however, and on a more general note, it is possible that some will wonder whether it is a legitimate exercise to seek to identify historical or topographical referents in Palladas' poetry. Judgement in this matter depends, of course, on what sort of poet one thinks that he is. This would clearly be a fruitless approach to some forms of ancient verse, but in the case of epigram it frequently is not. To take merely one example, it is uncontroversial that Martial alludes to Domitian's renewal of the *lex Julia de adulteriis*, to identifiable military campaigns, to specific topography in Rome, and much more.[5] Though Palladas' commentators have always recognized a similar topicality in many of his epigrams, the misapprehension of his dates has prevented any comparable consensus. Once his oeuvre is read against its proper historical context, however, it is possible to identify with confidence a number of allusions — among these, allusions to Constantine's law restricting unilateral divorce (AP 11.378), to the civil war of A.D. 324 (AP 10.90 and 91), to the introduction of the *solidus* and a new gold standard (AP 10.97), and, I shall argue below, to features of the newly-founded Eastern capital. Palladas is unquestionably a topical poet. This is not to deny that there are risks in attempting to pinpoint some of these allusions; there is inevitably a measure of conjecture involved in this sort of endeavour. The only real test of worth, however, as always, is the coherence and explanatory power of the hypotheses. Each of the first five sections of this paper is an independent unit. If one is adjudged to be less convincing than the others, therefore, the central argument is not overturned. And the totality of the evidence points to the likelihood that Palladas was in Constantinople not long after its foundation.

I

Χριστιανοὶ γεγαῶτες Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες
ἐνθάδε ναιετάουσιν ἀπήμονες· οὐδὲ γὰρ αὐτοὺς
χώνη φόλλιν ἄγουσα φερέσβιον ἐν πυρὶ θήσει. (AP 9.528)

> Having become Christian, the owners of Olympian palaces dwell here unharmed; for the melting-pot that produces the life-giving *follis* will not put them in the fire.

Since I have treated this epigram elsewhere in some detail, I shall here merely restate the salient point.[6] On the revised dates for Palladas, there is now a very attractive historical context for these lines: Constantine's spoliation of the pagan temples (*c.* A.D. 330).[7] The

[4] Wilkinson, op. cit. (n. 2).

[5] J. P. Sullivan, *Martial, the Unexpected Classic: A Literary and Historical Study* (1991), 130–55, and *passim*. It might be objected that Martial is a Latin poet and therefore writing within a very different literary tradition, but the attention to Ptolemaic persons, events, and sites in Hellenistic Greek epigram is well known, and similar sorts of allusions can be discerned in Greek scoptic epigram of the Roman period. On Lucillius and Ammianus, for example, whose influence on Palladas is extensive, see G. Nisbet, *Greek Epigram in the Roman Empire: Martial's Forgotten Rivals* (2003), 113–64. Nisbet hedges a good deal more than earlier commentators but accepts the fundamental topicality of some of these scoptic epigrams.

[6] Wilkinson, op. cit. (n. 2), 54–6.

[7] Eusebius, *VC* 3.54; idem, *LC* 8.2–4; Jerome, *Chron.* A.D. 330; Julian, *Or.* 7.22 (Bidez); Anonymus, *De rebus bellicis* 2.2; Libanius, *Or.* 30.6, 37; Socrates, *HE* 1.16; Sozomen, *HE* 2.5; Zosimus 5.24.6.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435810000109 Published online by Cambridge University Press

statues confiscated by the government during this period were melted down for coins, except for some bronzes that were preserved and displayed in the newly-founded Constantinople. This accounts much better for the Olympians' dilemma in AP 9.528 than any other known set of circumstances.[8]

That the statues are said to find safety 'here' (ἐνθάδε) suggests that Palladas was in Constantinople when he composed this epigram.[9] Whether ἐνθάδε means simply 'here in the city' or rather 'here in this particular spot' (in accordance with epigraphic usage) is impossible to say. It is noteworthy, however, that he jokingly attributes the gods' survival to the fact that they converted to Christianity. While it is true that the relocation of statuary had no inherent religious valence,[10] this contemporary pagan observer evidently thought that Constantine's *spolia* offered a clear message. Having ceased to be objects of pagan cult, these statues had also been imbued with the religion of the emperor and, it would seem, of the emperor's new city (see below, Section VI).

II

Τύχη καπηλεύουσα πάντα τὸν βίον,
ἀσυγκέραστον τὴν φύσιν κεκτημένη,
καὶ συγκυκῶσα καὶ μεταντλοῦσ' αὖ πάλιν
καὐτὴ κάπηλός ἐστι νῦν τις, οὐ θεά,
τέχνην λαχοῦσα τὴν τρόπων ἐπαξίαν. (AP 9.180)

Fortune, who manages life like a tavern, who possesses a nature like unmixed wine, and who formerly mixed things up and poured them out — even she is now a tavern-keeper rather than a goddess, and she has chanced upon a vocation that suits her manner of life.

Ἀνεστράφησαν, ὡς ὁρῶ, τὰ πράγματα,
καὶ τὴν Τύχην νῦν δυστυχοῦσαν εἴδομεν. (AP 9.181)

Things have been turned upside down, so I see, and we have now seen Fortune suffer misfortune.

Καὶ σύ, Τύχη δέσποινα, τύχην ἀτυχῆ πόθεν ἔσχες;
ἡ παρέχουσα τύχας πῶς ἀτυχὴς γέγονας;
μάνθανε καὶ σὺ φέρειν τὰ σὰ ῥεύματα, καὶ σὺ διδάσκου
τὰς ἀτυχεῖς πτώσεις, ἃς παρέχεις ἑτέροις. (AP 9.182)

And you, Lady Fortune, how is it that you have suffered misfortune? How have you, who furnishes fortunes, become unfortunate? Learn to bear your own twists of fate, and instruct yourself in the unfortunate vicissitudes that you furnish for others.

[8] The φόλλιν of Palladas' epigram has been taken by some to mean 'bellows' rather than coinage. See especially H. White, 'Notes on Palladas', *Myrtia* 13 (1998), 225–30, at 229–30; A. Pontani, 'Ancora su Pallada, AP IX 528, ovvero il bilinguismo alla prova', *Incontri triestini di filologia classica* 6 (2006–2007), 175–210. In a Greek context, I find it quite impossible to escape a monetary interpretation of the word, but I also think it likely that Palladas crafted a line that would allow for the bilingual reader to form multiple associations; see K. W. Wilkinson, 'Some neologisms in the epigrams of Palladas', *GRBS* 50 (2010).

[9] It should be noted that this epigram was traditionally situated in Constantinople during the fifth century. See above, n. 1; also J. Irmscher, 'Das "Haus der Marina"', in L. Varcl and R. F Willetts (eds), ΓΕΡΑΣ: *Studies Presented to George Thomson on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday* (1963), 129–33. Others have argued for a setting in Alexandria at the end of the fourth century: e.g. Bowra, op. cit. (n. 3, 1960), 1–4; Cameron, op. cit. (n. 3, 1965b), 223–5.

[10] J. Curran, 'Moving statues in late antique Rome: problems of perspective', *Art History* 17 (1994), 46–58.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435810000109 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Καὶ σύ, Τύχη, λοιπὸν μεταβαλλομένη καταπαίζου,
μηδὲ τύχης τῆς σῆς ὕστατα φεισαμένη·
ἣ πρὶν νηὸν ἔχουσα καπηλεύεις μετὰ γῆρας,
θερμοδότις μερόπων νῦν ἀναφαινομένη.
νῦν ὁσίως στένε καὶ σὺ τεὸν πάθος, ἄστατε δαῖμον,
τὴν σὴν ὡς μερόπων νῦν μετάγουσα τύχην. (AP 9.183)

So, Fortune, you too are mocked for your changed circumstances; and at the end you have not even been spared your own fortune. You who once had a temple now keep a tavern in your old age, and in plain view you serve warm draughts to mortals. It is fitting that you too should groan at your lot, O volatile goddess, now that you, just like mortals, suffer your own change in fortune.

Tyche, in all of her guises, was one of Palladas' favourite subjects.[11] This particular series of epigrams, however, evidently alludes to a singular event. Tyche, he says, who formerly managed life as if it were a tavern (180.1), is now a κάπηλος instead of a goddess (180.4); this is accordingly a suitable τέχνη (180.5); she works in a tavern though she had once governed a temple (183.3); she is even a humble server there of hot water or hot drinks (183.4).[12] There can be scarcely any doubt that these are allusions to a cult site of Tyche that had been converted into a drinking establishment. For Palladas this was an invitation to apply his wit to the subject of 'Fortune's misfortune'.

The second of these four epigrams contains a clue to the approximate date of composition. Palladas says that things had been turned upside down: ἀνεστράφησαν, ὡς ὁρῶ, τὰ πράγματα (AP 9.181.1). It is the same verdict that he gives in the final line of another well-known poem:

Ὢ τῆς μεγίστης τοῦ φθόνου πονηρίας·
τὸν εὐτυχῆ μισεῖ τις, ὃν θεὸς φιλεῖ.
οὕτως ἀνόητοι τῷ φθόνῳ πλανώμεθα,
οὕτως ἑτοίμως μωρίᾳ δουλεύομεν.
Ἕλληνές ἐσμεν ἄνδρες ἐσποδωμένοι
νεκρῶν ἔχοντες ἐλπίδας τεθαμμένας·
ἀνεστράφη γὰρ πάντα νῦν τὰ πράγματα. (AP 10.90)

O, the great wickedness of envy! A certain person hates the fortunate man whom God loves. Thus we are irrationally deceived by envy, and thus we are readily enslaved to folly. We Hellenes are men reduced to ashes, holding to our buried hopes in the dead; for everything has now been turned on its head.

This epigram has usually been dated to A.D. 391.[13] In fact, however, these lines are full of Constantine's religious and political propaganda after A.D. 324.[14] Palladas writes here

[11] See especially C. M. Bowra, 'Palladas on Tyche', *CQ* n.s. 10 (1960), 118–28.

[12] θερμοδότις in this line is a *hapax legomenon* and its meaning not entirely secure. *LSJ* (s.v.) suggests 'female bath-attendant'; see too Bowra, op. cit. (n. 11), 125. F. Jacobs (*Animadversiones* 2.3 (1801), 238) suggests 'calidam vendens, pro copa; vino enim calidam admiscebant veteres'. And cf. Lampe, *Greek Patristic Lexicon*, s.v. θερμοδότης (the masculine equivalent, also very rare): 'servant who brings hot water or perh. hot drinks'. The similarly rare cognate verb θερμοδοτέω appears in Leontius, *Vita Sym. Sal.* 176 (A. J. Festugière and L. Rydén (eds), *Vie de Syméon le Fou et Vie de Jean de Chypre* (1974), p. 81, 8–9): ποτὲ δὲ θερμοδοτῶν ἐν καπηλείῳ ἐλάμβανεν τὴν τροφὴν αὐτοῦ. This is rendered: 'Une fois, il [*sc.* Simeon] gagnait son pain en apportant de l'eau chaude dans un cabaret' (p. 135; see also the brief comment on p. 193). The passage is discussed by H. J. Magoulias, 'Bathhouse, inn, tavern, prostitution and the stage as seen in the lives of the saints of the sixth and seventh centuries', *Epet. Byz.* 38 (1971), 233–52, at 237. From Leontius it is clear that whatever the precise nature of this menial task it was appropriate to the setting of a tavern.

[13] e.g. C. Lacombrade, 'Palladas d'Alexandrie ou les vicissitudes d'un professeur-poète à la fin du IVième siècle', *Pallas* 1 (1953), 17–26; R. Keydell, 'Palladas und das Christentum', *Byz. Zeit.* 50 (1957), 1–3; Bowra, op. cit. (n. 11), 122–6; Cameron, op. cit. (n. 3, 1964), 57.

[14] Wilkinson, op. cit. (n. 2), 43–8.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435810000109 Published online by Cambridge University Press

about Licinius' foolish opposition to Constantine (ὃν θεὸς φιλεῖ) and about the reversal of fortunes suffered by Hellenes in the East in the wake of the civil war. Everything, he says, has been turned upside down (line 7). As C. M. Bowra saw half a century ago, Palladas' repetition of this trimeter in AP 9.181.1 and 10.90.7 (with slight alterations) is surely significant and suggests a temporal connection.[15] The date, however, is not A.D. 391, as Bowra thought, but at some point not too long after Constantine's seizure of the Eastern provinces in A.D. 324. The four epigrams on the converted temple of Tyche, therefore, are a further meditation on the upheaval experienced by the pagan cults under the new Christian regime.

But what of the location? There is more than one reason (apart from chronology) for thinking that Alexandria in A.D. 391 is not the correct setting.[16] We possess a relatively full record for the events of this period and not a single source mentions the conversion of the Alexandrian Tychaion into a tavern. We hear of three temples seized by Theophilus: a mithraeum, a temple of Dionysus, and the Serapeum.[17] Of these three, the latter two at least became the sites of Christian churches. The silence of our sources on the conversion of the Tychaion in Alexandria (had such a thing occurred) would be especially surprising in light of the temple's prominence. This was a grand and famous structure, known for its many spectacular statues and its bronze pillars inscribed with the city's laws.[18] In fact, if it had been seized at the end of the fourth century, how is it that such an impressive complex would have been turned over to a common tavern-keeper for commercial purposes? Surely it would have been converted into a church or put to some other monumental use. One late source indicates that this is indeed what eventually happened to Tyche's temple. At the end of the fifth century, the Alexandrian patriarch Peter Mongus reportedly interrogated a pagan priest there in front of imperial officials and the city council.[19] Apparently, it was serving as a kind of town hall. Another late reference to this site appears in the *Ecumenical History* of the Egyptian Theophylactus Simocatta. He relates the story of a man who came upon τὸ λεγόμενον τῆς πόλεως Τυχαιῶν one night in A.D. 602.[20] To this man's amazement, the statues that were apparently still assembled there jumped off their pedestals and loudly announced the death of the emperor Maurice.[21] What function was the building serving at this late date? Was it still a town hall? Simocatta does not tell us, but he gives no indication that it was at any point a tavern. All in all, it seems unlikely that this group of Palladan epigrams should be set in Alexandria.

There is also a compelling piece of positive evidence. We *do* hear of a cult site of Tyche that was converted into a tavern — not in Alexandria but in Constantinople. While describing a statue and inscription left by Pompey the Great in Byzantium in honour of

[15] Bowra, op. cit. (n. 11), 122–3.

[16] C. A. Gibson ('The Alexandrian Tychaion and the date of Ps.-Nicolaus *Progymnasmata*', *CQ* n.s. 59 (2009), 608–23) has recently used this setting and date for AP 9.180–183 to locate Ps.-Nicolaus in the late fourth or early fifth century. This needs to be reconsidered in light of the revised dates for Palladas and the following case for the Constantinopolitan provenance of these four epigrams, but the rest of Gibson's argument for dating Ps.-Nicolaus much earlier than is conventional (at least before A.D. 488) is unaffected.

[17] Rufinus, *HE* 11.22; Eunapius, *VS* 472; Socrates, *HE* 5.16–17; Sozomen, *HE* 7.15.

[18] [Libanius], *Progymn.* 12.25 (Förster). On this *ekphrasis*, attributed by modern scholars to an anonymous author conventionally known as Pseudo-Nicolaus, see recently C. A. Gibson, 'Alexander in the Tychaion: Ps.-Libanius on the statues', *GRBS* 47 (2007), 431–54; idem, op. cit. (n. 16).

[19] Zacharias Scholasticus, *Vita Severi*, 33–5. See discussion in F. R. Trombley, *Hellenic Religion and Christianization c. 370–529*, vol. 2 (1994), 13–15; Gibson, op. cit. (n. 16), 615–17.

[20] Theophylactus Simocatta, *Hist.* 8.13.

[21] Gibson, op. cit. (n. 16), 612–15, notes that these were not the Tychaion's divine images, described by Ps.-Nicolaus, which had probably long since been destroyed. Simocatta calls them ἀνδριάντες ('human statues') rather than ἀγάλματα ('divine statues'). They were perhaps the depictions of Alexander and the Ptolemies that are also described by Ps.-Nicolaus.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435810000109 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Tyche, John Lydus remarks in passing: ὁ δὲ τόπος ὕστερον καπηλεῖον ἐγένετο.[22] Those who want to situate Palladas' four epigrams in Alexandria rather than Constantinople have dismissed this inconvenient testimony without much comment.[23] But the only conceivable objection is that Lydus is vague about the nature of this cult site prior to its conversion; he does not say explicitly that it had been a temple.[24] One might counter that Palladas' πρὶν νηόν (AP 9.183.3) is hardly a full description of what he thought might have preceded the tavern. But more importantly, it is quite possible that neither man had any notion of what the site looked like while it was still devoted to pagan cult. I would say that this is probable in the case of Lydus, who was simply familiar with a tavern in Constantinople that contained an ancient monument to Tyche, still prominently displayed there in the sixth century when he translated Pompey's inscription into Greek. One thing, however, remains certain: both Palladas and Lydus knew of a tavern that had formerly been home to some manifestation of the cult of Tyche. And since these are the only two ancient references to such a conversion, surely we are justified in thinking Constantinople far the more likely setting for Palladas' four epigrams.

The conversion of this cult site probably occurred during the construction of Constantine's city. Contemporary evidence for this project is sadly lacking in detail and later sources are not always reliable. Nevertheless, as discussed above, Palladas' reiteration of the judgement that things had been turned upside down (AP 9.181.1) places these epigrams in the late 320s or in the 330s — precisely the period of the creation of Constantinople.

As it happens, we are able to piece together some of the changes to the cult of Tyche in this city under Constantine. Reportedly, he commissioned two new 'temples' (ναοί), one housing a statue of Rhea, who was the Byzantine Tyche, and the other a statue of Roman Fortuna that the emperor had exported from the old capital.[25] Zosimus is the only source to report that there were two such structures; in truth there may have been only one.[26] But in any event he says that the statues were situated in 'a large forum with porticoes', at the summit of a long flight of steps. There can be little doubt that this large forum is the place known as *Basilikê* — a public square with porticoes on all sides lying just north of the Baths of Zeuxippus and the hippodrome (on the other side of the *Mesê*).[27] The fact that the 'temples' were situated at the top of a long staircase led Cyril Mango to speculate that they were in the north-eastern portico, since the ground to this side of the site still drops off quite steeply.[28] This same Constantinian monument is presumably what Hesychius had

[22] John Lydus, *Mens*. 4.132. The connection between this passage and Palladas' four epigrams has long been recognized by commentators: e.g. F. Jacobs (ed.), *Anthologia Graeca*, vol. 3 (1817), 491; F. Dübner (ed.), *Epigrammatum Anthologia Palatina cum Planudeis*, vol. 2 (1872), 183; H. Stadtmüller (ed.), *Anthologia Graeca*, vol. 3 (1906), 142.

[23] W. Zerwes, *Palladas von Alexandrien: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der griechischen Epigrammdichtung* (1956), 269–70; Bowra, op. cit. (n. 11), 123; Cameron, op. cit. (n. 3, 1964), 57.

[24] As noted by Gibson, op. cit. (n. 16), 619, n. 49.

[25] Zosimus 2.31.2.

[26] A. Berger, *Untersuchungen zu den Patria Konstantinupoleos*, ΠΟΙΚΙΛΑ BYZANTINA 8 (1988), 272; P. Speck, 'Wie dumm darf Zosimos sein? Vorschläge zu seiner Neubewertung', *Byzantinoslavica* 52 (1991), 1–14, at 10. On the site of this structure, however, see below.

[27] C. Mango, *The Brazen House: A Study of the Vestibule of the Imperial Palace of Constantinople* (1959), 43–5; R. Janin, *Constantinople byzantine: développement urbain et répertoire topographique*[2] (1964), 14; S. Bassett, *The Urban Image of Late Antique Constantinople* (2004), 155, 156. G. Dagron (*Naissance d'une capitale: Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451* (1974), 373) thinks that the reference is to the *Tetrastoön* (renamed *Augoustaion*). But see Mango, op. cit.

[28] Mango, op. cit. (n. 27), 44. P. Speck (*Die Kaiserliche Universität von Konstantinopel*, Byzantinisches Archiv 14 (1974), 92–107) argued that the site was in fact outside of the *Basilikê*. Berger (op. cit. (n. 26), 272–3) identified it with the *Milion*; followed by Speck, op. cit. (n. 26), 10. But see Alan Cameron, 'Theodorus τρισέπαρχος', *GRBS* 17 (1976), 269–86, especially 269–73.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435810000109 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in mind when he recorded that a temple of Rhea in the *Basilikê* was the city's Tychaion.[29] He says that it was built by the legendary founder Byzas — a worthless claim that does not vitiate Zosimus' clear and reliable attribution of its foundation to Constantine. This was also presumably the site where the emperor Julian offered public sacrifices to Tyche, for Socrates Scholasticus reports that this event took place in the *Basilikê*.[30]

It is not clear what sort of structure or structures Constantine commissioned in this square. Gilbert Dagron has argued that they were not temples, properly speaking, but rather modest architectural accommodations made for the two prominent statues depicting Tyche in her Roman and Constantinopolitan guises.[31] Whatever one makes of his analysis, it is certainly true that these would not have been fully functioning cult sites with blood sacrifices and professional priesthoods.[32] The innovation seems rather to have been an instance of Constantine's tendency to take up some of the least offensive elements of pagan religion and transform them into expressions of imperial ideology.[33] In this case, the new Tychaion was obviously an expression of the emperor's audacious claim for his new capital, viz. that it was a second Rome.[34]

All of this raises a very relevant question. What, if anything, happened at this point to the locus of Tyche-veneration where Pompey had erected a statue and inscription in the goddess's honour? John Lydus says that the place was converted into a tavern at some unspecified point between the first century B.C. and his own day (the sixth century).[35] Even if Constantine did not simply decommission some or all of the old cult centres of Byzantium, does it not seem likely that his installation of a new Tychaion in the *Basilikê* would have rendered the old monument or temple superfluous? And does this not seem the most probable period for the site's re-use? Palladas' series of epigrams suggests that it was just so. Presumably, after her image had become synonymous with the power of imperial Rome expressed anew in Constantinople, the emperor (or his urban planners) saw no need for the outdated religious and political associations that attached to the ancient site. Tyche's former abode was free to be used for some other purpose. John Lydus and Palladas both attest that it was transformed into a tavern. And Palladas' testimony allows us to date this transformation with high probability to the reign of Constantine I.

III

Νῖκαι πάρεσμεν, αἱ γελῶσαι παρθένοι,
νίκας φέρουσαι τῇ φιλοχρίστῳ πόλει.
ἔγραψαν ἡμᾶς οἱ φιλοῦντες τὴν πόλιν
πρέποντα νίκαις ἐντυποῦντες σχήματα.[36] (APl 282)

[29] Hesychius, *Patr. Const.* 15: Ῥέας μὲν κατὰ τὸν τῆς Βασιλικῆς λεγόμενον τόπον νεών τε καὶ ἄγαλμα καθιδρύσατο, ὅπερ καὶ Τυχαῖον τοῖς πολίταις τετίμηται. See Janin, op. cit. (n. 27), 157.

[30] Socrates, *HE* 3.11.

[31] Dagron, op. cit. (n. 27), 373–4.

[32] Malalas, *Chron.* 13.7 (Thurn, 246; Dindorf, 320) emphasizes the role of Fortuna's statue in the city's dedication ceremony (though the value of his report is uncertain). He says that it was processed to the hippodrome and that Constantine made a bloodless offering (θυσίαν ἀναίμακτον), calling the statue Ἄνθουσα (*sc.* Flora, the sacred name of Rome); C. Ando, *The Matter of the Gods: Religion and the Roman Empire* (2008), 189–91.

[33] As Dagron (op. cit. (n. 27), 373–4) notes, this does not mean that Tyche was stripped of all religious significance; rather she was modified (indeed sanitized) and redirected along imperial lines.

[34] Ando, op. cit. (n. 32), 189–95. Representations of Rome and Constantinople are prominent also in the coinage of this period; e.g. *RIC* VII, pp. 336–46 (Rome), nos 331–4, 338–9, 342–3, 349, 354–8, 361–2, 370–1, 386–7, 390, 396–8, 406–8.

[35] John Lydus, *Mens.* 4.132.

[36] Beckby and the other standard critical editions print the unwarranted emendation φιλόχρηστος for the manuscript's φιλόχριστος in line 2. For discussion, see J. Irmscher, Ἡ φιλόχριστος πόλις (zu Anthologia

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435810000109 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> Here we are, the Victories, the laughing maidens, bearing victories to the Christ-loving city. Those who love the city fashioned us, stamping figures appropriate to the victories.

Commentators have traditionally identified this epigram's 'Christ-loving city' as Constantinople.[37] This is probably correct. It does, at least, seem a natural destination for victories in the fourth century, and it is perhaps (along with Jerusalem) the leading candidate to earn the epithet φιλόχριστος. Several decades ago, however, Palladas' native Alexandria was proposed as an alternative.[38] The plausibility of this dissenting opinion rests on the claim that the Eastern capital is never (or not until very late) called φιλόχριστος, whereas Alexandria is designated as such several times during the Byzantine period.[39] The fact that none of the examples adduced is earlier than the seventh century may give one pause;[40] but if it is true that Constantinople was never known as 'Christ-loving', then the argument is not to be taken lightly. Since the adjective is more commonly applied to persons than to cities, its use as a civic epithet is going to be in any case quite rare. Nevertheless, it is a signal fact that Gregory Nazianzen, upon taking his leave of Constantinople in A.D. 381, called the city μεγαλόπολις καὶ φιλόχριστος.[41] And a few decades later the author of the *Vita Melaniae* applied the same epithet to the Eastern capital.[42] Both of these, while later than Palladas, are considerably earlier than the first attested application of the adjective to Alexandria. The one argument in favour of the latter is therefore vitiated. In fact, the evidence tends to support Friedrich Jacobs's claim that Constantinople was 'prae ceteris ἡ φιλόχριστος πόλις'.[43] Constantinople appears to be the more probable referent, but a closer inspection of the poem may help to decide the matter.

This epigram has typically been interpreted as an *ekphrasis* of paintings or sculptures of Victory, but this is not perhaps the most obvious reading of Palladas' language. He says that 'those who love the city' ἔγραψαν (line 3) and were ἐντυποῦντες (line 4). Γράφω is a very general word, which could indicate painting or sculpting but could equally refer to drawing, representing, inscribing, and so on; 'to fashion' is suitably vague. Ἐντυπόω, on the other hand, like the uncompounded form of the verb, is in the first instance 'to stamp' and is used of minting coins or marking wax seals. It is also used metaphorically, usually 'to stamp on the mind or the soul'. Indeed, this seems to be the most common use of the word, though it is clearly not applicable here. It appears more rarely in an extended sense (that is, by analogy) of sculpting reliefs, and the only example provided by *LSJ* of its use for painting is this very epigram — an interpretation that appears to be unlikely at best. On the most natural reading, 'those who love the city *fashioned* us, *stamping* figures appropriate to the victories'. Does Palladas not seem to be writing here of struck coins?[44]

Graeca XVI 282)', in *Studien zum Neuen Testament und zur Patristik Erich Klostermann zum 90. Geburtstag dargebracht* = *TU* 77 (1961), 323–30; Cameron, op. cit. (n. 3, 1964), 54–6; Wilkinson, op. cit. (n. 8).

[37] J. Reiske (ed.), *Anthologiae Graecae a Constantino Cephala conditae libri tres, duo nunc primum, tertius post Iensium iterum editi, cum latina interpretatione, commentariis et notitia poetarum* (1754), 254; Jacobs, op. cit. (n. 12), 244–5; Bonanno, op. cit. (n. 1), 122; P. Waltz, 'Sur quelques épigrammes "protreptiques" de l'Anthologie (livre X): notes critiques et exégétiques', *REG* 59–60 (1946–47), 176–209, at 203; Irmscher, op. cit. (n. 36), 330.

[38] Zerwes, op. cit. (n. 23), 325; Cameron, op. cit. (n. 3, 1964), 56–9; R. Aubreton (ed.), *Anthologie Grecque*, vol. 13 (1980), ad loc. Irmscher also came to adopt this thesis in a later article ('Alexandria: die christusliebende Stadt', *Bulletin de la Société d'Archéologie Copte* 19 (1967–1968), 115–22). The possibility had been raised in passing by Franke, op. cit. (n. 1), 16–17.

[39] Cameron, op. cit. (n. 3, 1964), 56; Irmscher, op. cit. (n. 38), 117–20. It is only fair to note that Cameron says explicitly that he was relying on Irmscher's brief survey in the first of his two articles on this subject. The electronic TLG has rendered this sort of work much simpler and more comprehensive.

[40] But see now *P.Oxy* 63.4394.11 (A.D. 494); *P.Paramone* 15.4 (*c.* A.D. 592).

[41] Gregory Nazianzen, *Or.* 42.27.

[42] Gerontius, *Vita Melaniae* 53. This occurrence is noted by Dagron, op. cit. (n. 27), 387, with other references to Constantinople as 'Christ-loving'.

[43] Jacobs, op. cit. (n. 12), 245.

[44] For other examples of ecphrastic poems with coins as their objects, cf. Posidippus, *Epigr.* 31 (Austin and Bastianini); Ovid, *Pont.* 2.8. On the first of these, see S. Stephens, 'For you Arsinoe…', in B. Acosta-Hughes,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435810000109 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The frequent appearance of Victory on Roman currency commends this interpretation, but it is also an obstacle to speculating about what sort of coin may be in view or which emperor. Nevertheless, it is an intriguing coincidence that it was Constantine who introduced the VICTORIAE LAETAE legend on his *vota* coins. The reverse depicts two smiling Victories inscribing a shield that sits atop an altar (Fig. 1). Might this coin-type be the inspiration for Palladas' Νῖκαι γελῶσαι? Perhaps, though the timing does not seem to be quite right. This legend first appeared on coins issued after Constantine's victory over Maxentius and continued to be struck at intervals until the early 320s. This obviously predates the founding of Constantinople, and it is difficult to imagine that any city would have been called 'Christ-loving' at this early date. If the reader is to seize rather on the detail that Victories are *bearing victories* (line 2), one might think of the Victoria who is seated and holding a globe upon which a smaller Victory is perched (Fig. 2). This is a gold *solidus* that commemorates Constantine's triumph over Licinius in A.D. 324. Neither of these two coin-types, however, captures what seems to be of central importance in Palladas' epigram, namely the city.

A much more plausible source of inspiration is one (or more) of the issues depicting a personification of Constantinople paired with an exultant Victoria. Constantine founded the city to commemorate his victories over Licinius in the civil war.[45] And the dedication of the Eastern capital in A.D. 330 was advertised on his coinage in subsequent years with complementary representations of Constantinople and Victoria. I have reproduced an image of one of these, a bronze coin minted at Antioch, which depicts a helmeted personification of the Eastern capital bearing the legend CONSTANTINOPOLIS; on the reverse stands Nikê in military attire with spear and shield (Fig. 3).[46] She is here quite literally bringing her victories to the city. In another contemporary issue, the two are depicted together on the reverse, Victory crowning Constantinople with a wreath.[47]

If Palladas had one or more of these coins in view, this might also explain why he declares that the minted figures were *appropriate* to the victories (line 4). This has generally been taken to mean that the figures were somehow appropriate to the goddess. But why, after speaking in the first person throughout the poem, would the Nikai suddenly refer to themselves in the third person? Ought they not to say in this case πρέποντα ἡμῖν or simply πρέποντα? It seems to me that the figures were rather appropriate to the military victories that had been won. This might easily be a reference to the fact that the Constantinople-Victoria issues depict Nikê with military accoutrements (for which σχήματα is just the right word). But there is one other notable fact: she is also, on all of these coins, standing on the prow of a galley. This was a reference to the decisive naval conquest over Licinius' fleet during the civil war.[48] Perhaps, then, it was the image of Victory both arrayed in military attire and also guiding a warship that elicited the comment of πρέποντα νίκαις.

I consider one of these commemorative coins to be a very plausible object of Palladas' *ekphrasis*. If this is convincing, the epigram can be dated quite securely to the 330s. Given our poet's penchant for highly topical references, one would expect a date closer to — rather than further from — the foundation of the city and the first appearance of these images (*sc.* under Constantine). At the very least, however, I take it to be highly probable that (i) the city in question is Constantinople and (ii) the epigram describes coins rather than paintings or sculptures.

E. Kosmetatou, and M. Baumbach (eds), *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus, P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309* (2004), 161–76, at 165–6.

[45] Anonymous, *Orig. Const.* 30.

[46] Similar coins were produced at the Constantinopolitan mint, recently founded by Constantine; see *RIC* VII, pp. 579, 582 (Constantinople), nos 63, 79, 86.

[47] *RIC* VII, p. 337 (Rome), no. 343.

[48] On the significance of this battle, see Anonymous, *Orig. Const.* 26; Zosimus 2.23–4. For its representation on coinage, see A. Alföldi, 'On the foundation of Constantinople: a few notes', *JRS* 37 (1947), 10–16, at 11.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435810000109 Published online by Cambridge University Press



FIG. 1. *RIC* VII (Siscia), no. 59 (A.D. 319). Obv.: IMP CONSTANTINVS P F AVG; bust of Constantine laureate, helmeted and cuirassed r. Rev.: VICTORIAE LAETAE PRINC PERP; two Victories standing facing one another holding shield inscribed VOT / P R over altar. Marks: ASIS*. Scale 2:1. (© *Yale University Art Gallery, Gift of Brian Weinstein, BA 1959: 2002.121.24*)



FIG. 2. *RIC* VII (Thessalonica), no. 131 (A.D. 324). Obv.: anepigraphic; head with plain diadem r., looking upwards. Rev.: CONSTANTINVS AVG; Victory seated l. on throne, holding Victory on globe and cornucopiae; behind, shield. Marks: SMTS[Δ]. Scale 2:1. (©*Yale University Art Gallery: 2001.87.8735*)



FIG. 3. *RIC* VII (Antioch), no. 92 (A.D. 335). Obv.: CONSTANTINOPOLIS; helmeted bust l., spear over shoulder. Rev.: anepigraphic; Victory standing on prow. Marks: SMANI. Scale 2:1. (© *Yale University Art Gallery: 2001.87.17066*)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435810000109 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Finally, there is the question of tone. Some have suggested that the epigram is ironic. Johannes Irmscher, for example, thought that Palladas' Victories were laughing scornfully at the Christ-loving city — a place whose religious character the poet himself despised.[49] But laughter had always been one of the primary characteristics of the Nikai.[50] If Palladas wanted his readers to imagine that they were sneering rather than joyful, he surely would have provided some indication. Alan Cameron, despite rejecting Irmscher's logic, has also detected irony. He places the poem in the context of Theophilus' anti-pagan activities of A.D. 391.[51] 'Those who love the city', on his reading, are Alexandrians of earlier days who fashioned proper Victories for Alexander and the Ptolemies; it is these very statues that have now been captured, mutilated, and forced to bring victories to those who love Christ rather than the city. I have already made my case for dislodging Palladas' poetry from the late fourth century, and for situating this epigram in Constantinople. But there is also nothing obviously disdainful or sarcastic about these four lines (even if we believe that the poet must have been winking when he wrote them). I see no reason to think that the poem was designed to be read as anything other than a serious commemoration of the new capital city and the victorious emperor. Of course, this does not mean either that Palladas was himself a Christ-lover, or even that he took any personal joy in the emperor's victories and the foundation of the city.[52] This epigram, like those on Licinius' foolish opposition to God's favourite (AP 10.90 and 91),[53] may simply be a concession to Constantine's propaganda.

IV

ὅρκοις λοιπὸν ἄγει τε πεποίθαμεν· ἀλλὰ μεθ' ὅρκον
ζητεῖν ἔστι θεοὺς δώδεκα καινοτέρους. (AP 10.56.17–18)

> We are left to trust in her oaths and in her religious scruples; but after her oath she can seek out twelve newer gods.

This is the final couplet of Palladas' longest extant epigram — an eighteen-line attack on the infidelity of women. Nothing, he says — neither youth nor age, neither beauty nor deformity, neither gaiety nor severity — is a reliable indicator of a woman's chastity. Men are left to trust that their lovers remain true to their oaths; but even then, if a woman is unfaithful, she can seek out twelve newer gods. The end of the pentameter is emended (quite plausibly) from the manuscript's nonsensical and unpunctuated καινερεου.[54] The idea seems to be that after she has sworn an oath of fidelity by the twelve pagan deities, the unchaste woman can simply acquire forgiveness by means of twelve newer ones (*sc.* the Apostles). The Christian emphasis on forgiveness of sins was thought by some pagans to be a very reckless approach to ethics. It comes in for sharp criticism, for example, in Julian's send-up of Constantine in the *Caesares*.[55] Julian may also be the source of the rumour, found in later sources, that his uncle did not fully commit himself to the new religion until after the untimely deaths of Crispus and Fausta, when an opportunistic

[49] Irmscher, op. cit (n. 36), 329–30.
[50] As noted by Zerwes, op. cit. (n. 23), 325; Cameron, op. cit. (n. 3, 1964), 56.
[51] Cameron, op. cit. (n. 3, 1964), 56, 59–62. And see Irmscher, op. cit. (n. 38), 121–2.
[52] Waltz (op. cit. (n. 37), 200–3) thought that these lines proved Palladas to be a Christian. See also Keydell, op. cit. (n. 13), 3.
[53] Wilkinson, op. cit. (n. 2), 43–8.
[54] W. R. Paton (ed.), *The Greek Anthology*, vol. 4 (1918), 32–3; Zerwes, op. cit. (n. 23), 54, and discussion at 57–8. This is also the reading adopted by Beckby. Does the nonsense written by the Palatine scribe (or someone before him) represent a failure of nerve upon realizing that the punchline was anti-Christian?
[55] Julian, *Caes.* 38 (Lacombrade).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435810000109 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Christian priest was the only one who dared to absolve Constantine of his supposed guilt in the affair.[56] This slander probably has nothing to do with the couplet quoted above, but the verse may contain a Constantinian connection of a different sort.

As one would expect of Palladas, the sarcastic reference to Christian absolution at the end of this epigram is made in a riddling form. But why especially the Apostles? And why does he call them gods? The one thing that must have been obvious to even the least well informed was that Christians acknowledged only one deity (or, at any rate, no more than two or three). Perhaps it is possible that Palladas was willing to sacrifice a degree of intelligibility for the sake of gaining a vague parallelism between the pagan and Christian Dodecades. This is not altogether satisfying, however, nor does it explain why he would introduce this comparison in the first place. And we are still left with the puzzle of why a loose woman would turn to the Apostles (rather than to Christ) for forgiveness. It is a very odd way indeed of saying that her final option was conversion to Christianity.

If we believe that Palladas habitually chose his words with great care — and all of the evidence suggests that he did — then there must be an allusion in this couplet that would have made it sensible to his contemporary readers. This is not to say that we will be able to identify it. There are plenty of cryptic passages in his epigrams that are likely to remain obscure because we are lacking the information required to solve them. Perhaps the 'twelve newer gods' fall into this class. There is a potential context, however, from the period and place under consideration in this paper, that may go some way to explaining Palladas' odd expression: the construction of the Holy Apostles in Constantinople.

As is the case with most of the fourth-century buildings in the capital, there are conflicting reports about who was responsible for the construction of this church and when it was begun. Eusebius' seemingly unimpeachable testimony that it was Constantine who built it late in his reign has been suspected of interpolation.[57] Some have thought that the church was begun by Constantine and completed by his son Constantius; others still that it was conceived by Constantius alone. The best theory is probably that proposed by Cyril Mango, who suggests that Constantine commissioned only a circular mausoleum for himself and dedicated it to the Apostles.[58] According to Mango, this is what Eusebius describes with intentional vagueness about the building's scope so as to allow for the more flattering interpretation that this structure was actually a Christian basilica. It was only later, however, under Constantius II, that the church proper was built in the neighbourhood of the mausoleum. If this is correct, then Constantine's rotunda was constructed in the 330s, as Eusebius' narrative suggests, and the bishop's testimony remains extremely valuable. He says that it was a tall building with a copper roof and gold-plated ceiling, and he reports that it was surrounded by a large courtyard with porticoes containing residences and shops. Eusebius further says that it possessed a central altar and that Constantine made provision for Christian services to be held there. Finally, he reveals that it contained twelve coffins, one for each of the Apostles, which were distributed evenly on either side of a thirteenth intended for Constantine himself. If his renovation of the city's cult of Tyche shows Constantine adapting pagan elements for the purpose of imperial propaganda, then this peculiar monument shows him putting Christian elements to a similar use.[59] In any

[56] Zosimus 2.29 (drawing on Eunapius).

[57] Eusebius, *VC* 4.58–60. For the 'interpolation' argument, see G. Downey, 'The builder of the original Church of the Apostles at Constantinople: a contribution to the criticism of the "Vita Constantini" attributed to Eusebius', *DOP* 6 (1951), 51–80. Many, however, have taken Eusebius' testimony to indicate beyond a reasonable doubt that Constantine was responsible for the church in its initial phase, though with varying theories of what form the building took. See *inter alia* R. Janin, *Les églises et les monastères* (1953), 46–55; R. Krautheimer, 'Zu Konstantins Apostelkirche in Konstantinopel', in A. Stuiber and A. Hermann (eds), *Mullus: Festschrift Theodor Klauser* (1964), 224–9; Dagron, op. cit. (n. 27), 401–8.

[58] C. Mango, 'Constantine's mausoleum and the translation of relics', *Byz. Zeit.* 83 (1990), 51–62.

[59] On the assimilation of Constantine to the original 'Thirteenth Apostle', see R. Staats, 'Kaiser Konstantin der Grosse und der Apostel Paulus', *Vig. Chr.* 62 (2008), 334–70.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435810000109 Published online by Cambridge University Press

event, after his death in A.D. 337, the emperor was buried in this mausoleum. If Palladas happened to be in Constantinople at the time of its construction, we might expect the novelty to have caught his attention. And it seems to me that the couplet quoted above is more intelligible — and perhaps also the joke funnier — if he is alluding to this new Christian 'temple' and its twelve tutelary 'deities'.

This is a rather subjective argument, to be sure. And if it explains anything at all, it only explains why Palladas might call the Apostles θεοί. The very purpose of an allusion to the 'twelve newer gods' and their 'temple' — when what the couplet requires is merely a reference to religious conversion — is still obscure. There is, however, a historical notice that may offer a solution. In his late ecclesiastical history, Nicephorus Callistus declares that Constantine's mausoleum, dedicated to the Twelve Apostles, was in fact built on a site that had formerly housed an altar of the twelve pagan deities: ἐκήδευσε (*sc.* Constantius II) τὸν πατέρα ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἣ τῶν Ἀποστόλων ἐστὶν ἐπώνυμος· ἔνθα ἔτι τῷ ζῇν περιὼν Κωνσταντῖνος, ἠρίον ἑαυτῷ κατεσκεύασεν, ὃ βωμὸς Ἑλλήνων πρότερον ἦν, δωδεκάθεον ὄνομα.[60] This is one of those late reports that are difficult to evaluate. It is plausible enough — Christian cult sites of the fourth century were frequently constructed over earlier pagan ones — but Nicephorus is far from the best authority. If, however, he is credible on this point, we might finally possess a full and satisfying explanation of Palladas' couplet. After breaking the oath that she had made at the shrine of the pagan Δυωδεκάς, the unchaste woman could take refuge in the twelve newer 'gods' that had replaced them — and without even leaving the altar (as it were). What he means, of course, is simply that she could convert to Christianity and be absolved of her sins. But this simple thought is encoded in a typically Palladan allusion — this time to the recent conversion of a pagan cult site into a Christian imperial monument.[61]

This is perhaps more conjectural than the arguments set out in Sections I–III. Its virtue, however, is that it is capable of answering the questions that impede our comprehension of Palladas' couplet: What is the point of a comparison between the pagan and Christian Dodecades? What do the Apostles have to do with conversion in the first place? And why are they newer *gods*?

V

Frendentem Scyllam metus est prope litoris oram
sic sisti, Caesar: vincula necte prius.
nam potis est virtus spirantis fallere aeni,
ut prius astringat, navita quam caveat. (*Ep. Bob.* 51)

> There is fear that the gnashing Scylla has been set up in this manner near the coast, O Caesar; fashion restraints before (she strikes). For the excellence of the breathing bronze has the power to deceive, that she might draw in [or seize?] the sailor before he is on his guard.[62]

These two verses are found in the so-called *Epigrammata Bobiensia*, a collection compiled *c.* A.D. 400. According to the title that appears in the manuscript — *in Scyllam Constantinopolitanam in circo* — the epigram deals with a Constantinopolitan statue of Scylla that

[60] Nicephorus Callistus, *HE* 8.55 (PG 146, 220c).

[61] This technique can be seen in varying degrees in the epigrams discussed above. Cf. also AP 10.97, in which λίτραν ἐτῶν ζήσας (alluding to the newly introduced *solidus* and its weight in gold) means simply 'at the age of seventy-two'.

[62] The Latin text is that of W. Speyer (ed.), *Epigrammata Bobiensia* (1963). Speyer records H. Fuchs's suggestion of *arripiat* for *astringat* in line 4, hence the alternate translation in brackets. I am grateful to Philip Hardie for his assistance with the interpretation of this epigram.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435810000109 Published online by Cambridge University Press

was erected in the hippodrome. This site was close enough to the sea to provide a plausible fit for the poem's 'prope litoris oram', and we know from later *testimonia* that there was indeed a large bronze Scylla on the *spina* of the city's hippodrome.[63] As others have noted, these lines are almost certainly based on a lost Greek original.[64] The lost model, therefore, was included in the fourth-century Greek anthology that Alan Cameron has posited as the sole source for the Latin imitations produced by Ausonius and the Bobbio poets.[65] Furthermore, the Greek original of this epigram was itself quite clearly a product of the fourth century. This is proved by the apostrophe of an emperor (line 2), who seems to be responsible for the placement of the statue. All of this has been noted by Cameron, who quite naturally thought of 'Constantine and his immediate successors who adorned [the hippodrome] with the stolen statuary of the entire Graeco-Roman world'.[66] But there is only one epigrammatist contained in the fourth-century anthology who was late enough to have written the model — Palladas. The others are Hellenistic or early Roman; all were long dead by the founding of Constantinople.[67] Moreover, as several other Palladan epigrams are most plausibly situated in the Eastern capital during its early years, and as he wrote elsewhere about the statuary that was being imported into the city, it appears quite likely that he was responsible for the lost original of this epigram too. The only alternative — always an unsatisfying one — is to posit an anonymous and otherwise unattested poet.[68] This seems an unnecessary hypothesis when the timing, the locale, and the subject matter are all appropriate to Palladas, who was also demonstrably included in the anthology used by the Bobbio poets.

Since a number of Palladas' epigrams reflect conditions during the sole reign of Constantine I (at which time the poet himself was apparently advanced in years), it is perhaps likeliest that this is the apostrophized emperor of line 2. The Scylla, therefore, was probably erected in the hippodrome very near the foundation of the city.[69] The law of percentages might also be invoked in support of this judgement, for it was undoubtedly Constantine who imported the majority of the city's antique statuary.[70] It is possible, however, even if there is no proof, that Palladas survived into the reign of Constantius II, in which case the statue could have been imported in the late 330s or in the 340s. The Greek original of this epigram almost certainly does not postdate the midway point of the century.[71]

[63] cf. AP 11.270, 271, and presumably also 9.755, which provides no indication of date and is also anonymous. On the statuary of the hippodrome, see S. Bassett, 'The antiquities in the hippodrome of Constantinople', *DOP* 45 (1991), 87–96 (90 and 91 for the Scylla); idem, op. cit. (n. 27), 227–30.

[64] See Munari's note in his edition of the *Epigrammata Bobiensia*, ad loc.: 'Suspicor nostro epigrammati Graecum exemplar subesse.' See also Alan Cameron, *The Greek Anthology: From Meleager to Planudes* (1993), 94. A large block of Greek ecphrastic epigrams is missing from the Palatine Anthology between Books 9 and 10; only some of these were preserved by Planudes. See A. S. F. Gow, *The Greek Anthology: Sources and Ascriptions*, The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies, Supplementary Paper no. 9 (1958), 51–2.

[65] Cameron, op. cit. (n. 64), 78–96.

[66] ibid., 95.

[67] Some have thought that Rufinus, one of the poets represented in the lost anthology, may have been as late as the fourth century; see especially D. L. Page, *The Epigrams of Rufinus* (1978), 3–49. Alan Cameron ('Strato and Rufinus', *CQ* n.s. 32 (1982), 162–73), however, has proved that he was writing three centuries earlier than this. And in any event all of his known epigrams are amatory.

[68] As suggested by Alan Cameron, op. cit. (n. 64), 95.

[69] Bassett (op. cit. (n. 27), 85, 230) has suggested that it might have been erected under Theodosius I or Arcadius. This judgement is based, however, solely on the hippodrome scenes from the Column of Arcadius (where Scylla is depicted). This evidence is capable of providing only a *terminus ante quem*.

[70] Eusebius, at least, could say in the 330s that Constantinople was already filled with bronze statues that had been imported from all over the Empire (*VC* 3.54.3).

[71] Not only because of the dates for Palladas' life proposed in Wilkinson, op. cit. (n. 2), but also because of indications that the fourth-century anthology used by the Bobbio poets was already in existence by the early stages of Ausonius' career; see ibid., 41–2.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435810000109 Published online by Cambridge University Press

VI

Taken as a whole, the evidence for placing Palladas in Constantinople is quite strong. Six of his epigrams (on the converted Olympian bronzes, on Victories and the Christ-loving city, and the four on Tyche's tavern) very likely pertain to the Eastern capital; he may have made one passing allusion to the imperial mausoleum; and he is the likeliest source of an epigram (which now survives only in Latin translation) about a bronze Scylla in the Constantinopolitan hippodrome. What is more, everything points to his presence there during the 330s, when (on the corrected dates) he would have probably been in his seventies.

Given the generally sorry state of our information on Constantinople at the time of its foundation, the evidence supplied by Palladas is a welcome boon. He was an eyewitness to the extensive importation of pagan statuary that is elsewhere attested for the reign of Constantine. In particular, it appears likely on the evidence of *Ep. Bob.* 51 that the large bronze Scylla in the hippodrome was erected very early in the city's history. Palladas also encountered a cult site of the goddess Tyche that had been transformed into a tavern. John Lydus' brief report to this effect has largely been ignored, presumably on account of its temporal vagueness. Palladas, however, allows us to date the site's conversion to Constantine's initial foundation (or very shortly thereafter). Finally on topographical aspects of the city, Palladas may lend some credibility to Nicephorus' late claim that the imperial mausoleum, which was dedicated to the Twelve Apostles, had been built over an earlier altar of the pagan Twelve. Palladas should now assume his rightful place alongside Eusebius of Caesarea as an early (if also enigmatic) witness to the very early years of Constantine's city.

More important perhaps than the topographical hints to be gleaned from Palladas' epigrams is his perspective on the religious character of Constantinople in the 330s. The conversion of Tyche's temple was one more example for him of the manner in which the traditional cults had suddenly been undermined (ἀνεστράφησαν, ὡς ὁρῶ, τὰ πράγματα). And statues of the gods that adorned the city's public spaces had, he says, converted to Christianity (Χριστιανοὶ γεγαῶτες). Not only had they ceased to be objects of pagan cult, they had taken on the religious character of the emperor and of the emperor's new capital. Most strikingly of all, Palladas calls Constantinople 'the Christ-loving city' (τῇ φιλοχρίστῳ πόλει).

None of this should be surprising. At about the same time, Eusebius of Caesarea was confidently declaring the birth of a new Christian capital, dedicated to the God of the martyrs and purged of all idol-worship.[72] In modern scholarship, however, not everyone has found this claim to be wholly credible. Some have detected incongruous elements in the public religion of the capital: from quasi-pagan monuments like the new Tychaion, to the appearance of Victories and other conventional figures, to the Helios imagery of Constantine's statue in the Forum.[73] The presence of these and similar features cannot be denied and may seem to contradict Eusebius' claim. Indeed, if 'pagan' and 'Christian' are to be treated as pure categories, then there can be no doubt that Constantinople contained

[72] Eusebius, *VC* 3.48.2. See A. Alföldi, *The Conversion of Constantine and Pagan Rome*, trans. H. Mattingly (1948), 110–23; A. H. M. Jones, *Constantine and the Conversion of Europe*[2] (1962), 191–2; idem, *The Later Roman Empire 284–602*, vol. 1 (1964), 83; T. D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (1981), 222–3; idem, 'Constantine after seventeen hundred years: the Cambridge Companion, the York exhibition and a recent biography', *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 14 (2007), 185–220, at 209.

[73] e.g. C. Mango, *Le développement urbain de Constantinople, Ive–VIIe siècles* (1985), 34–6; N. Lenski, 'The reign of Constantine', in N. Lenski (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine* (2006), 59–90, at 77–8; and in the same volume J. Elsner, 'Perspectives in art', 255–77, at 266–8; Z. Kuban, 'Konstantins neue Polis: Konstantinopel', in A. Demandt and J. Engemann (eds), *Konstantin der Grosse: Geschichte, Archäologie, Rezeption: Internationales Kolloquium vom 10.–15. Oktober 2005 an der Universität Trier zur Landesausstellung Rheinland-Pfalz 2007 'Konstantin der Grosse'* (2006), 221–33.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435810000109 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a 'mixed' or even 'contradictory' religious environment. But on this score others have already pointed the way forward.[74] Because Constantine himself was avowedly Christian, whatever he endorsed in the realm of public religion in his city was also perforce Christian — however much discomfort some elements might have caused a visiting bishop from Caesarea. Palladas is now our second extant witness from the 330s, and he seems to corroborate Eusebius' testimony on this point. Whatever continuities with the pagan past that we might now detect, Constantinople was perceived by Constantine's subjects to be a Christian city from its inception.

Yale University
kevin.wilkinson@yale.edu

[74] e.g. R. Krautheimer, *Three Christian Capitals: Topography and Politics* (1983), 60–7.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435810000109 Published online by Cambridge University Press