price of two pennies mimics prostitution advertisements found elsewhere in Pompeii and provides exactly the sort of epigraphical context to confirm Festus' report.

How are we to understand the graffiti in this room? It would seem that someone was making fun of Glyco. While scholars accept many of these prostitution inscriptions as legitimate advertisements,[11] cunnilingus almost invariably serves the function of invective in the Pompeian graffiti.[12] Another inscription, a more obviously unreal and humorous bit of invective, adopts a similar approach by suggesting that the object of the attack, Maritimus, 'will perform cunnilingus for 4 pennies. Virgins welcome. Let us proceed to a city gate' (*CIL* 4.8939).[13] The designation *alicaria* was an especially skilful piece of invective in that, it not only identified Glyco as a prostitute, it also characterized him as a woman. This would have been especially fitting from a male, Roman point of view, which looked upon the oral participant in the act of cunnilingus as playing an especially demeaning and passive role. Those who lowered themselves to perform such an act could hardly claim to be male.[14] Finally, the term *alicaria* is appropriate and particularly clever in light of the archaeological context. The room seems to have been a shop where certain food items such as bran and daily rations could be purchased. Varone notes that it also served as an entranceway to a bakery.[15] Thus, Glyco, whose 'advertisement' appears in the shop, is described with exactly the sort of word that would have been applied to a real prostitute who plied her trade in the vicinity of a bakery.

Gustavus Adolphus College, St Peter, Minnesota M. PANCIERA
mpancier@gac.edu
doi:10.1017/S0009838807000333

[11] T. A. J. McGinn, *Prostitution, Sexuality, and the Law in Ancient Rome* (Oxford, 1998), 267, n. 132.

[12] For an extended argument on this point see ch. 3 of M. Panciera, 'Sexual practice and invective in Martial and Pompeian inscriptions' (Diss., University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 2001).

[13] *Maritimus cunnu(m) linget a(ssibus) IIII, virgines ammittit / perga[m]us al(i)qua po(rta?)*. The first line of this graffito is repeated in *CIL* 4.8940. W. Krenkel, 'Review of *Erotica Pompeiana*', *Gnomon* 69.6 (1997), 552–4, at 553, argues that *ammittit* can come from either *abs-mitto* or *ad-mitto* and thus it is also possible to translate this as 'he sends away virgins'.

[14] A point Martial makes in 7.67 about the lesbian Philaenis who wrongly thinks it manly (*virile*) to perform cunnilingus on other women.

[15] A. Varone, *Erotica Pompeiana: iscrizioni d'amore sui muri di Pompei* (Rome, 1994), 138, n. 242.

ELEPHANTS AT RAPHIA: REINTERPRETING POLYBIUS 5.84–5*

5.84.2 ὀλίγα μὲν οὖν τινα τῶν παρὰ Πτολεμαίου συνήρεισε τοῖς ἐναντίοις· ἐφ' ὧν ἐποίουν ἀγῶνα καλὸν οἱ πυργομαχοῦντες, ἐκ χειρὸς ταῖς σαρίσαις διαδορατιζόμενοι καὶ τύπτοντες ἀλλήλους, ἔτι δὲ καλλίω τὰ θηρία, βριαιομαχοῦντα καὶ συμπίπτοντα κατὰ πρόσωπον αὑτοῖς. 3. ἔστι γὰρ ἡ τῶν ζῴων μάχη τοιαύτη τις. συμπλέξαντα καὶ παρεμβαλόντα τοὺς ὀδόντας εἰς ἀλλήλους ὠθεῖ τῇ βίᾳ, διερειδόμενα περὶ τῆς χώρας, ἕως ἂν κατακρατῆσαν τῇ δυνάμει θάτερον παρώσῃ τὴν θατέρου προνομήν· 4. ὅταν δ' ἅπαξ ἐγκλῖναν πλάγιον λάβῃ,

* I should like to thank *CQ*'s anonymous referee for most useful advice.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000341 Published online by Cambridge University Press

τιτρώσκει τοῖς ὀδοῦσι καθάπερ οἱ ταῦροι τοῖς κέρασιν. 5. τὰ δὲ πλεῖστα τῶν τοῦ Πτολεμαίου θηρίων ἀπεδειλία τὴν μάχην, ὅπερ ἔθος ἐστὶ ποιεῖν τοῖς Λιβυκοῖς ἐλέφασι· 6. τὴν γὰρ ὀσμὴν καὶ φωνὴν οὐ μένουσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ καταπεπληγμένοι τὸ μέγεθος καὶ τὴν δύναμιν, ὥς γ' ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, φεύγουσιν εὐθέως ἐξ ἀποστήματος τοὺς Ἰνδικοὺς ἐλέφαντας· 7. ὃ καὶ τότε συνέβη γενέσθαι. τούτων δὲ διαταραχθέντων καὶ πρὸς τὰς αὑτῶν τάξεις συνωθουμένων τὸ μὲν ἄγημα τὸ τοῦ Πτολεμαίου πιεζόμενον ὑπὸ τῶν θηρίων ἐνέκλινε.

2. A few only of Ptolemy's elephants ventured to close with those of the enemy, and now the men in the towers on the back of these beasts made a gallant fight of it, striking with their pikes at close quarters and wounding each other, while the elephants themselves fought still better, putting forth their whole strength and meeting forehead to forehead. 3. The way in which these animals fight is as follows. With their tusks firmly interlocked they shove with all their might, each trying to force the other to give ground, until the one who proves the strongest pushes aside the other's trunk. 4. And then, when he has made him turn and has him in the flank, he gores him with his tusks as a bull does with its horns. 5. Most of Ptolemy's elephants, however, declined the combat, as is the habit of African elephants. 6. For unable to stand the sight and smell and the trumpeting of the Indian elephants, and terrified, I suppose, also by their great size and strength, they at once turn tail and take to flight before they get near them. 7. This is what happened on the present occasion; and when Ptolemy's elephants were thus thrown into confusion and driven back on their own lines, Ptolemy's guard gave way under the pressure of the animals.[1]

The battle of Raphia,[1] waged near Gaza between the Seleucid king Antiochus III and Ptolemy IV Philopater of Egypt in 217 B.C., represents the first time that the larger Indian elephant (*Elephas maximus*) would meet African elephants in battle.[2] As is generally accepted, the larger African bush elephant (*Loxodonta africana africana*) was unknown to the ancients, which means that Ptolemy's Africans would have been of the smaller forest variety (*Loxodonta africana cyclotis*). The forest elephant, which closely resembles its larger African cousin, is widely regarded as the African type used by both the Carthaginians and the Ptolemaic princes. This particular beast, now confined to the equatorial regions of the continent, was once relatively common in northern Africa until hunted to local extinction.[3] To follow the general interpretation of Polybius,[4] the Seleucid Indian elephants proved too intimidating for Ptolemy's smaller African beasts.[5] Moreover, Antiochus' 102 elephants outnumbered Ptolemy's seventy-three (Polyb. 5.79.2, 5.79.13), which were divided on both sides and placed on the wings.

However, when the battle proper begins, we encounter a problematic passage, which states that some of Ptolemy's elephants were brave enough to fight those belonging to Antiochus. Given that the animals of both sides are here described as

[1] All translations are from the relevant Loeb Classical Library edition.

[2] See Plin. *HN* 8.32, where we are told that the largest elephants come from India; but cf. *HN* 8.35. The views of W. W. Tarn, 'Polybius and a literary commonplace', *CQ* 20 (1926), 98–100, can be disregarded.

[3] See e.g. W. Gowers and H. H. Scullard, 'Hannibal's elephants again', *NC* 10 (1950), 271–83, at 271; F. Shean, 'Hannibal's mules: the logistical limitations of Hannibal's army and the battle of Cannae, 216 B.C.', *Historia* 45 (1996), 159–87, at 174. On elephant types, see J. Shoshani (ed.), *Elephants: Majestic Creatures of the Wild* (Emmaus, PN, 1992), 40–2, with R. Sukumar, *The Living Elephants: Evolutionary Ecology, Behavior and Conservation* (Oxford, 2003), 54.

[4] *3 Maccabees* says nothing about the elephantine aspect of the battle.

[5] That the Ptolemaic elephants were all of African origin is assumed by B. Bar-Kochva, *The Seleucid Army: Organization and Tactics in the Great Campaigns* (Cambridge, 1976), 133, 135; P. Ducrey, *Guerre et guerriers dans la Grèce antique* (Paris, 1985), 110; G. Hölbl, *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire*, trans. T. Saavedra (London–New York, 2001), 131; W. Krebs, 'Elefanten in den Heeren der Antike', *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Universität Rostock* 13 (1964), 205–20, at 209.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000341 Published online by Cambridge University Press

turreted, this has significant implications for military historians of antiquity since the *entire* passage has often been used, either openly or tacitly, to support the view that forest elephants—the type predominately employed by Carthage—carried turrets in the Hellenistic period. For example, Warry, though unsure whether Punic forest elephants carried turrets, believes that Ptolemaic forest elephants 'certainly did so',[6] presumably on the basis of Polybius' description of Raphia. Connolly, Goukowsky and Scullard think likewise.[7]

According to de Beer, however, the African forest elephant was 'too small and seems never to have carried a castle'.[8] Indeed, there is no literary evidence to suggest that Carthaginian forest elephants were ever equipped with turrets—historical accounts of the Punic Wars, such as those of Polybius, Livy and Appian, never mention turreted elephants. Moreover, the plastic evidence is far from conclusive. The only significant prose references to what one might assume are turreted forest elephants occur in the *Bellum Africum*, but, given the difficulties inherent in unknown authorship, in addition to the text's somewhat formulaic battle descriptions, it is difficult to use this work with complete confidence.[9] Moreover, that it deals with events some 150 years after Raphia and the Second Punic War also poses problems.

This note argues that the 'brave' turret-carrying Ptolemaic elephants were *not* forest elephants, as is generally maintained, but were Indian beasts like their opponents.[10] The implication of this is that Ptolemy must have possessed at least *some* Indian elephants, animals previously captured by his father, or else born to these beasts in Egypt. That the elephants were born in Egypt is significant, especially given that breeding elephants in captivity, it has been supposed, was rarely successful. Following Gowers's earlier opinion,[11] Scullard briefly mentioned the possibility that the Ptolemaic elephants that fought 'with great bravery' were Indians, although this assertion was made with little confidence.[12] But consideration of the text itself,

[6] J. Warry, *Warfare in the Classical World* (London, 1980), 95. Cf. J. M. C. Toynbee, *Animals in Roman Life and Art* (London, 1973), 34, who contends that Punic elephants did not carry turrets.

[7] P. Connolly, *Greece and Rome at War* (London, 1981), 75; P. Goukowsky, 'Le roi Pôrus, son éléphant et quelques autres', *BCH* 96 (1972), 473–502, at 497; H. H. Scullard, *The Elephant in the Greek and Roman World* (London, 1974), 143. D. Head, *Armies of the Macedonian and Punic Wars, 359 BC to 146 BC* (Goring-by-Sea, Sussex, 1982), 187, believes it 'highly probable that Carthaginian elephants did … use towers', though he provides no evidence. Cf. P. Sabin, 'The mechanics of battle in the Second Punic War', in T. Cornell, B. Rankov and P. Sabin (edd.), *The Second Punic War: A Reappraisal*, BICS suppl. 67 (London, 1996), 59–79, at 70, n. 76.

[8] G. de Beer, *Hannibal: The Struggle for Power in the Mediterranean* (London, 1969), 104. Silius Italicus, though aware of their African origin (witness *Pun.* 3.459), describes turret-equipped Punic elephants (*Pun.* 4.599, 17.621). But Silius, with typical poetic licence, perhaps equipped Hannibal's elephants with turrets on account of his familiarity with Hellenistic literature rather than with historical accounts of the Punic Wars.

[9] According to *B Afr.* 86.1, Juba's (presumably) forest elephants were equipped with turrets (*cum turribus*) at Thapsus (46 B.C.); see also 30.2, 41.2: *elephantisque turritis*. On this, see H. H. Scullard, 'Hannibal's elephants', *NC* 8 (1948), 158–68, at 162, n. 9. One cannot say to what degree the text relies on eyewitness information. See A. Bouvet (trans. and ed.), *Pseudo-César: Guerre d'Afrique*, Collection Budé (Paris, 1997), xxi–xxx; and M. Müller's PhD thesis, entitled *Das Bellum Africum: Ein historisch-philologischer Kommentar der Kapitel 1–47* (Trier, 2001), especially 39–46 (authorship), 230–1 and 287 (turreted elephants).

[10] See Polyb. 5.84.2 and Livy 37.40.4 (Seleucid elephants at Raphia and Magnesia respectively).

[11] W. Gowers, 'African elephants and ancient authors', *African Affairs* 47 (1948), 173–80, at 174: 'It is possible that some of the minority which fought well on Ptolemy's side were Indian elephants', repeated by Gowers and Scullard (n. 3), 276.

[12] Scullard (n. 7), 142–3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000341 Published online by Cambridge University Press

coupled with contextual analysis, reveals that Gowers's and Scullard's intuitive postulate is not just a possibility. Rather, it is the most likely of all possible interpretations, perhaps more so in the light of Polybius' statement that the beasts met each other 'forehead to forehead' (*συμπίπτοντα κατὰ πρόσωπον αὑτοῖς*) and interlocked their tusks in a duel of strength (5.84.2–4)[13]—something which could imply that the combatant animals were of similar stature.

Most of Ptolemy's elephants were clearly of African origin. In his *res gestae*, Ptolemy III Euergetes, father of Ptolemy IV, records that he and his father were the first to employ elephants from the land of the Troglodytes and from Ethiopia for military purposes.[14] Furthermore, Polybius (5.84.5) tells us that the cowardly elephants were African. Indeed, *τὰ … πλεῖστα* demonstrates that the majority of Ptolemy's elephants were forest elephants,[15] beasts apparently unwilling to venture near the Indians on account of their enemy's larger aspect, fearful trumpeting, and unaccustomed odour (Polyb. 5.85.5–6). Of course, one need not give much thought to the veracity, from a natural history perspective, of Polybius' assertion—it is well known that African and Indian elephants cohabit quite amicably in zoos. What *is* important is that it raises questions about Polybius' treatment of the initial elephant tussle, where *some* of Ptolemy's elephants (that is, those equipped with turrets) did not hesitate to fight.

In short, it might be inferred from Polybius that the turreted Ptolemaic beasts were unafraid to commit to battle, while those not specifically described as turreted were not so enthusiastic. This discrepancy would make more sense if the 'brave' elephants were of the Indian species, which was often equipped with a turret, while the bulk were of the forest variety, which was perhaps normally deemed too small to be so equipped. It is worth remembering that Polybius mentions the recalcitrance of the African elephants only *after* the elephant-tussle—with turrets on both sides—had taken place.

Polybius supplies further information concerning the military reticence of the forest elephants at 5.85.1. We read here that Echecrates, commander of Ptolemy's right wing,[16] espied the retreat of the Ptolemaic elephants. Although it is unclear whether Polybius refers to animals specifically under Echecrates' command, or those on the left wing, one might assume that the *locus* represents a general statement about the reluctance of forest elephants to engage Indians, something also borne out in Livy (37.39.13) and Appian (*Syr.* 31).[17]

Scullard was very much in doubt about whether Polybius' reference (5.85.3) to Echecrates' cavalry getting outside 'the onset [*τῆς ἐφόδου*] of the elephants' relates to

[13] Scullard (n. 7), 143, with Ducrey (n. 5), 108: 'Dans la bataille ... les éléphants affrontent leurs propres congénères, comme à Raphia' (cf. 110). F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* (Oxford, 1957), 1.614, imagines that Polybius might have seen elephants fighting thus 'in the arena at Rome'.

[14] See Dittenberger, *OGIS* 54, lines 1–13 (Adulis Inscription), especially line 11: *ἐλεφάντων Τρωγλοδυτικῶν καὶ Αἰθιοπικῶν*. See commentary by A. Chaniotis, *War in the Hellenistic World: A Social and Cultural History* (Malden, MA–Oxford–Carlton, 2005), 62.

[15] This *locus* prompted W. Gowers, 'The African elephant in warfare', *African Affairs* 46 (1947), 42–9, at 44, to write that 'most of the African elephants were frightened of the Indian elephants of Antiochus'. Yet this is not *exactly* what Polybius tells us.

[16] Echecrates' thirty-three elephants faced Antiochus' forty-two on this wing (Polyb. 5.82.7, 5.82.13).

[17] Both *loci* refer to Magnesia (190 B.C.), where the Romans dared not pit their sixteen forest elephants against the fifty-four Indians of Antiochus III (Livy 37.39.13). Livy surely relies heavily on Polybius' now-lost testimony; see also Plin. *HN* 8.27.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000341 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Antiochus' elephants, or those of Ptolemy.[18] Yet it seems logical to assume that Polybius refers to the ἐφόδος of Antiochus' elephants, something which tallies admirably with the contention that the retreating animals viewed by Echecrates were his own. Moreover, one cannot assume that Echecrates could even see what was happening on the other wing, where *some* of the Ptolemaic elephants were indeed confronting the enemy beasts.

That the 'brave' Ptolemaic elephants were Indians is obviously contingent upon the possibility that Ptolemy IV possessed such animals. A sixth-century A.D. copy of an inscription, originally set up at Adulis by Ptolemy III, records the capture 'of Indian elephants' (ἐλεφάντων Ἰνδικῶν) belonging to Seleucus II (*OGIS* 54, line 16).[19] Now, this refers to a campaign fought in 245 B.C., that is, twenty-eight years before Raphia. Could some of the animals captured at that time have survived to fight another day? Young animals captured in 245 B.C. are a possibility, but this is conjecture. Still, elephant cows have lived up to seventy-nine years in 'semi-natural situations', with sixty years being not especially unusual.[20] Worth considering is that the captured elephants were used to form a small stud. Ptolemy III would have surely recognized the superiority of Indian elephants over his smaller Africans, which he continued to procure from the south. He thus must have realized the value of breeding his own Indian elephants for military purposes—and for his dynasty's prestige.[21]

Despite Bar-Kochva's assertion that 'elephants rarely breed in captivity',[22] domesticated Indian elephants *will* breed, though they are not especially prolific. The naturalist Sukumar asserts that '90% or more' of elephants give birth 'in Asian forest camps', but only '34%' in zoos (25% of zoo-born calves, however, are stillborn).[23] Thus Ptolemaic elephant birth-rates would have been dependent upon the beasts' living conditions. On the other hand, Rance leads us to a Persian source referring to the wonder associated with a 'home-born' Indian elephant among the allegedly 900-strong elephant corps of the Sassanian monarch Khusrau II Parviz (*regnauit* A.D. 591–628).[24] This suggests that the Sassanians, at least, found it difficult to breed Indian elephants, though we do not have sufficient information about their handling to draw any watertight conclusions.

Despite the above, it is not improbable that Ptolemy IV had a very small number of Indian elephants available in 217 B.C., which animals could have supplemented the

[18] Scullard (n. 7), 140–1. Yet J. P. Mahaffy, 'The army of Ptolemy IV at Raphia', *Hermathena* 13 (1898), 140–5, at 143, thinks that the elephants deployed on Echecrates' wing did not move.

[19] M. Launey, *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques* (Paris, 1949), 1.587, with n. 12, uses this *locus* to assert that 'les Iagides … ont utilisé des éléphants indiens sur les champs de bataille', though Raphia is not mentioned.

[20] Sukumar (n. 3), 398.

[21] On prestige, see especially O. D. Hoover, 'Eleazar Auaran and the elephant: killing symbols in Hellenistic Judea', *SCI* 24 (2005), 35–44, with Bar-Kochva (n. 5), 81–2; E. T. Newell, *Coinage of the Western Seleucid Mints from Seleucus I to Antiochus III* (New York, 1941), 165.

[22] Bar-Kochva (n. 5), 79. He also asserts that 'the Indian kings are likely to have tried to preserve their monopoly over the supply of elephants by only offering bulls' (79). Yet Pyrrhus apparently had at least one Indian cow with him in Italy (Dion. Hal. 20.12.3; Flor. 1.13.12; Zon. 8.6). A plate from Capena, Italy, depicting a female elephant and her calf, is generally associated with the Pyrrhic wars; see Goukowsky (n. 7), 491, fig. 8; Scullard (n. 7), pl. 7a. Furthermore, with incessant warfare, demand was always going to outstrip the Hellenistic world's ability to breed elephants in sufficient numbers.

[23] See Sukumar (n. 20), 398–9, especially 399.

[24] P. Rance, 'Elephants in warfare in late antiquity', *AAntHung* 43 (2003), 355–84, at 384, n. 141.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000341 Published online by Cambridge University Press

larger number of forest elephants. Ptolemy's Indians would have been trained from a very early age (regardless of their provenance) and thus would have been more disciplined than their native counterparts, which were generally captured as young animals.[25] Such an interpretation is corroborated by Polybius' account, for the 'brave' elephants mentioned at 5.84.2 exhibited a high degree of discipline and martial resolve, whereas the other Ptolemaic beasts described at 5.84.5 did not.

If our reinterpretation of the Polybian *locus* holds, we are left to reflect on why the battle was represented thus. It seems that Polybius—like his antecedents and rivals—was not above including overly economical versions of military events.[26] One might adduce the pro-Egyptian Zeno of Rhodes, who comes under vigorous attack by Polybius (16.18.2–20.1) for presenting a woefully inaccurate account of Panion (200 B.C.). Two possibilities emerge. Either certain elements of Raphia, which *may* have informed us of the different elephant-types possibly used by Ptolemy, were compressed or elided in order to suit the author's literary purpose; or else Polybius' source material was marred by 'telescoping' and structural rearrangement on the part of an earlier writer—perhaps even Zeno, as Momigliano proposes.[27]

To conclude, the discussion shows that the *locus* cannot be used with security to support the view that African forest elephants of the Hellenistic period carried turrets into battle. The present reinterpretation would mean that Gowers's and Scullard's hesitant postulate about elephant-type has a relatively solid foundation. Of broader significance is that this reinterpretation indicates—given that there is no evidence whatsoever for the independent acquisition of Indian elephants by Ptolemaic Egypt—that captive Indian elephants in antiquity were potentially long lived, or, alternatively, that breeding these beasts was not as problematic as some have suggested.[28] Finally, it reaffirms the contention that ancient historians, even the more accurate ones, sometimes left out military information of great interest to their modern counterparts, but deemed of little moment to ancient audiences.

Queensland University of Technology, Australia MICHAEL CHARLES
m.charles.@qut.edu.au
doi:10.1017/S0009838807000341

[25] On capturing elephants, see Plin. *HN* 8.24.

[26] W. Pereman's assertion ('Notes sur la bataille de Raphia', *Aegyptus* 36 [1951], 214–22, at 222) that Polybius presents 'une version claire et logique' is optimistic; cf. Mahaffy (n. 18), 152. Polybius does entertain the possibility of error at 16.20.9, his view being that the composition of universal history means that (small) errors are inevitable.

[27] A. Momigliano, 'Un decreto trilingue in onore di Tolomeo Filopatore e la quarta guerra di Celesiria', *Aegyptus* 10 (1929), 180–9, at 189. F. W. Walbank, *Polybius* (Berkeley–Los Angeles–London, 1972), 54, does not discount this possibility. Others have argued that Polybius' sources for Book 5 were pro-Seleucid, e.g. W. Otto, *Beiträge zur Seleukidengeschichte des 3. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, ABAW 34.1 (Munich, 1928), 83. T. S. Brown, 'Apollophanes and Polybius, Book V', *Phoenix* 15 (1961), 187–95, at 193, thinks it possible that Polybius used 'more than one source', although he still leans toward a single pro-Syrian one.

[28] Cf. Juv. 12.102–10, who says that elephants do not breed in Italy. Yet Claudius Aelianus (*NA* 2.11) seems to believe that elephants (he does not indicate which type) could breed in captivity, or at least in naturalistic settings.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000341 Published online by Cambridge University Press