10

The Tyche Sacrifices in John Malalas: Virgin Sacrifice and Fourth-Century Polemical History*

BENJAMIN GARSTAD

Scattered throughout John Malalas' history of the world from Adam to Justinian there are some dozen accounts of virgins being sacrificed at the foundation of various cities.[1] In most cases the sacrifice is overseen by a king or ruler, after the sacrifice an image of the virgin selected is set up which becomes the cult statue of the civic *tyche*, and she gives her name to

* The author wishes to express his gratitude to George Huxley, Wolf Liebeschuetz, Jacob Stern, and Craig Williams who each showed great kindness and patience in reading over drafts of this paper with care and attention, and offering helpful corrections and advice. Where I have not followed the promptings of such wise men, I acknowledge I do so at my peril.

This paper is offered to the author's aunt, Alice Olsenberg, on the occasion of her seventy-fifth birthday. She is a woman in whom a quiet zeal has never compromised plain truth in all things.

[1] By Taurus at Gortyn: Malalas, 2.7, Perseus at Tarsus and possibly Iconium: 2.11, Iphigenia at Nyssa/Scythopolis: 5.35, Alexander the Great at Alexandria: 8.1, Seleucus at Antioch: 8.12, Seleucus at Laodicea: 8.17, Augustus at Ancyra and the province of Galatia: 9.13, Tiberius in building the theatre at Antioch: 10.10, Zarbus at Anazarbus: 10.53, Trajan in rebuilding Antioch: 11.9, Constantine at Constantinople: 13.7. For the text and citations of Malalas, I have employed the text of J. Thurn, *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia* (Berlin 2000). See esp. E. Jeffreys, "Malalas' world view" in *Studies in John Malalas*, ed. E. Jeffreys, et al., (Sydney 1990) 57; but also K. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur* (München 1897) vol. i, 326; W. Robertson Smith, *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites* (New York 1927) 159 n. 1; C. Bosch, *Die kleinasiatischen Münzen der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Stuttgart 1935) Teil ii, Band I, 1 Hälfte, 258 n.194; G. Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest* (Princeton 1961) 74 n. 89; P. Bonnechere, *Le sacrifice humain en Grèce ancienne* (Athens/Liège 1994) 130–31 n. 544; C. Saliou, "Statues d'Antioche de Syrie dans la *Chronographie* de Malalas" in *Recherches sur la Chronique de Jean Malalas*, II, ed. S. Agusta-Boularot, et al., (Paris 2006) 69–95. Work on this topic is also currently being undertaken by Dolly Rosenberg of Tel-Aviv University.

the *tyche* of the city. These *tyche* sacrifices are carried out by the heroes of Greek legend such as Perseus and Iphigenia, by Alexander and Seleucus, by a number of Roman emperors, and finally—in a modified form—by Constantine. Seleucus' foundation of Antioch and initiation of one of the most prominent civic *tyche* cults (made famous through the statue of Eutychides, a model for other figures),[2] according to Malalas' *Chronicle*, offers a good representative example of these narratives:

> ... where the village of Bottia was, across from Iopolis, there he[3] [Seleucus Nicator] staked out the foundations of the wall, and through the agency of Amphion the high priest and officiant of the mysteries he sacrificed a virgin girl by the name of Aimathe in the space between the city and the river on the 22nd of Artemisios, or May, at the first hour of the day, as the sun was rising. He called [the city] after the name of his own son who was called Antiochus Soter. And he straightway established a temple, which he called that of Zeus Bottios. And he swiftly raised the tremendous walls through the agency of Xenarios the architect. He set up a bronze stele in the form of a statue of the maiden who had been offered as a sacrifice as the *tyche* of the city above the river, and at once he made a sacrifice to her as the *tyche*.[4]

Trajan's *tyche* sacrifice, also at Antioch, includes some important details:

> And this most pious Trajan made foundations in Antioch the Great, beginning with his first foundation, the gate called the Middle Gate near the temple of Ares, where the torrent of the Parmenios flows down, close to what is now called the Macellum. He carved above an image of the she-wolf nursing Romus [Romulus] and Remus, by which it would be recognized that this was a Roman foundation. There he sacrificed a comely virgin girl of the city by the name of Calliope for the sake of the redemption and cleansing of the city, and he held a bridal procession for

[2] See T. Dohrn, *Die Tyche von Antiochia* (Berlin 1960).

[3] Here I have followed Jacoby's tentative emendation of διεχάραξαν to διεχάραξεν (*FGrH* 854 F 10; app. crit. 3 C^2 940, 23) noted by Thurn (2000) 151, otherwise there is no main verb for the singular participles.

[4] Malalas, 8.12: ὅπου ἦν ἡ κώμη ἡ καλουμένη Βωττία ἄντικρυς τῆς Ἰωπόλεως, ἐκεῖ διεχάραξαν τὰ θεμέλια τοῦ τείχους, θυσιάσας δι' Ἀμφίονος ἀρχιερέως καὶ τελεστοῦ κόρην παρθένον ὀνόματι Αἱμάθην κατὰ μέσου τῆς πόλεως καὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ μηνὶ Ἀρτεμισίῳ τῷ καὶ μαΐῳ κβ΄, ὥρᾳ ἡμερινῇ α΄, τοῦ ἡλίου ἀνατέλλοντος, καλέσας αὐτὴν Ἀντιόχειαν εἰς ὄνομα τοῦ ἰδίου αὐτοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ λεγομένου Ἀντιόχου Σωτῆρος, κτίσας εὐθέως καὶ ἱερόν, ὃ ἐκάλεσε Βωττίου Διός, ἀνεγείρας καὶ τὰ τείχη σπουδαίως φοβερὰ διὰ Ξεναρίου ἀρχιτέτονος, στήσας ἀνδριάντος στήλην χαλκῆν τῆς σφαγιασθείσης κόρης τύχην τῇ πόλει ὑπεράνω τοῦ ποταμοῦ, εὐθέως ποιήσας αὐτῇ τῇ τύχῃ θυσίαν.

> her. And he immediately repaired the two great porticoes, and established many other public works in the city of Antioch, among them the baths and the aqueduct, diverting the water which flowed from the springs of Daphne to the [ravines] called 'the Wilds' (*Agriai*),[5] and gave his name to the baths and the aqueduct. And he completed the theatre of Antioch, which was unfinished, setting up in it, on top of four small pillars in the middle of the nymphaion of the proscenion, a gilded bronze stele of the maiden sacrificed by him. She was sitting over the river Orontes, depicted as the *tyche* of the city being crowned by the kings Seleucus and Antiochus.[6]

The fuller context of this passage is also significant: it is followed by an account of Trajan's execution of the Christian bishop of Antioch, and of five Christian virgins, statues of whom are also set up by the emperor.[7] Constantine apparently also required a *tyche* for his new capital at Constantinople, but, it is made clear, he inaugurated this *tyche* without resorting to human sacrifice:

> Making a bloodless sacrifice to God, he [Constantine] called the *tyche* of the city renewed by him and reestablished in his own name Anthousa. This city was founded at first by Phidalia, and the *tyche* of the city was then called Ceroe.[8]

[5] For this interpretation of the passage, I depend on G. Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria: from Seleucus to the Arab conquest* (Princeton 1961) 221.

[6] Malalas, 11.9: ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς εὐσεβέστατος Τραϊανὸς ἔκτισεν ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τῇ μεγάλῃ ἀρξάμενος πρῶτον κτίσμα τὴν λεγομένον μέσην πύλην πλησίον τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ Ἄρεως, ὅπου ὁ Παρμένιος χείμαρρος κατέρχεται, ἔγγιστα τοῦ νυνὶ λεγομένου Μακέλλου, γλύψας ἄνω ἄγαλμα λυκαίνης τρεφούσας τὸν Ῥῶμον καὶ τὸν Ῥῆμον, διὰ τὸ γινώσκεσθαι, ὅτι Ῥωμαϊόν ἐστι τὸ κτίσμα, θυσιάσας ἐκεῖ παρθένον κόρην εὐπρεπῆ πολίτιδα ὀνόματι Καλλιόπην ὑπὲρ λύτρου καὶ ἀποκαθαρισμοῦ τῆς πόλεως, νυμφαγωγίαν αὐτῇ ποιήσας. καὶ εὐθέως ἀνήγειρε τοὺς δύο ἐμβόλους τοὺς μεγάλους, καὶ ἄλλα δὲ πολλὰ ἔκτισεν ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ Ἀντιόχου πόλει καὶ δημόσιον καὶ ἀγωγὸν, ἀποστρέψας τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ἀπὸ τῶν πηγῶν Δάφνης ἐκχεόμενον εἰς τὰς λεγομένας Ἀγρίας, ἐπιθήσας καὶ τῷ δημοσίῳ καὶ τῷ ἀγωγῷ εἰς τὸ ἴδιον ὄνομα, καὶ τὸ θέατρον δὲ τῆς αὐτῆς Ἀντιοχείας ἀνεπλήρωσεν ἀτελὲς ὄν, στήσας ἐν αὐτῷ ὑπεράνω τεσσάρων κιόνων ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ νυμφαίου τοῦ προσκηνίου τῆς σφαγιασθείσης ὑπ' αὐτοῦ κόρης στήλην χαλκῆν κεχρυσωμένην, καθημένην ἐπάνω τοῦ Ὀρόντου ποταμοῦ εἰς λόγον τύχης τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως, στεφομένην ὑπὸ Σελεύκου καὶ Ἀντιόχου βασιλέων.

[7] Malalas, 11.10.

[8] Malalas, 13.7: τὴν δὲ τύχην τῆς πόλεως τῆς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἀνανεωθείσης καὶ εἰς ὄνομα αὐτοῦ κτισθείσης ποιήσας τῷ θεῷ θυσίαν ἀναίμακτον ἐκάλεσεν Ἀνθουσαν. ἥτις πόλις ἐκτίσθη ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑπὸ Φιδαλίας· καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τότε τὴν τύχην αὐτῆς Κερόην.

This is the last mention of a civic *tyche* in Malalas' *Chronicle*.

As they are presented by Malalas, these accounts of *tyche* sacrifice have no clear purpose or overall structure. Malalas does not use these narratives as the basis of negative evaluations of those involved in them, nor does he make their significance explicit. In fact, these narratives are usually attached to otherwise praiseworthy, or at least neutral, characters.[9] The accounts of *tyche* sacrifice, however, demonstrate such consistency that they can safely be discussed as the fragments of a distinct work. If we can assign a specific context and compositional model to this work its purpose and structure should become apparent. In this paper we will develop the hypothesis that the *tyche* sacrifice narratives are fictions which belong to a Christian 'polemical history' composed in Antioch in the later fourth century. This history exploited the literary techniques of the novel and the rhetoric of Christian encomium and diatribe to praise Constantine as a unique model of kingship and damn Julian, who was rumoured to have engaged in human sacrifice, and all pagan rulers with him. The figure of the civic *tyche* is central to the author's attack on pagan kings, but his efforts to denigrate traditional *tyche* cults are set precariously beside his efforts to sanctify the *tyche* as it had been absorbed into the ceremonial and iconography of Christian empire.

Authorship and date

It is most unlikely that Malalas himself is the author of the accounts of *tyche* sacrifice. Malalas presents the *tyche* sacrifices blandly and dispassionately, among the other deeds and accomplishments of those who perform them, and balances them with positive appraisals of the rulers in question. If virgin sacrifice were an interest of Malalas himself, moreover, we should expect such famous incidents of virgin sacrifice in Greek myth as the—attempted—sacrifice of Iphigenia to be treated in a manner more consistent with the *tyche* sacrifices, or as the sacrifice of Polyxena to be more than merely alluded to.[10] The assumption that the *tyche* sacrifices belong to one of his sources also explains Malalas' use of '*tyche*' in the abstract, especially in reference to 'the *tyche* of the Christians' or to victory

[9] For instance, the account of the human sacrifices and persecutions of Trajan introduces the emperor as 'the most pious Trajan' (θειοτάτου Τραϊανοῦ; Malalas, 11.8). This may be a formulaic title (it is less likely to be ironic), but it obviously goes unaffected by the acts that are ascribed to the emperor.

[10] See Malalas, 5.6, 10, 13.

through Christ and the *tyche* of a Christian emperor,[11] which would otherwise seem incongruous with the accounts of *tyche* sacrifice. Malalas' use of these accounts at second hand might, furthermore, explain the omissions in those cases in which details we expect to find in the accounts of *tyche* sacrifice are missing.[12] It seems most likely, then, that the narratives of *tyche* sacrifice were composed by one of Malalas' sources, or the source of one of his sources, and that Malalas found these remarkable stories concerning a number of the kings he was chronicling and included them as just a few more events in the lives of his subjects—altogether heedless of any overall pattern or polemical intent to them.

Malalas does not cite any source for the *tyche* sacrifices directly, but two of the accounts are connected with citations of one Bouttios (or Bottios), a historian only known from three references in Malalas.[13] In the first instance, Euripides' mythical account of the conception of Perseus is contrasted with the historicizing or rationalizing version of Bouttios in which Zeus bribes Danae with a sum of gold.[14] Malalas' account of Perseus goes on to relate that the hero performed a virgin sacrifice in founding

[11] Malalas, 16.17: καὶ ἐνίκησεν ὁ σωτὴρ Χριστὸς καὶ ἡ τοῦ βασιλέως τύχη; Malalas, 18.77, app.: Νικᾷ ἡ τύχη τῶν χριστιανῶν. Cf. Malalas, 7.10: ἡ τύχη Ῥωμαίων ἀεὶ νικᾷ τοὺς πολεμίους.

[12] E.g., Perseus founds Iconium on the site of the village of Amandra, and names the *tyche* of the city Persis after himself, but there is no virgin sacrifice to initiate the *tyche* cult (Malalas, 2.11); Perseus sacrifices Parthenope at Tarsus, but there is no mention of a *tyche* (Malalas, 2.11); likewise, Alexander sacrifices a virgin at the foundation of Alexandria and Augustus does the same at the foundation of Ancyra, but no *tyche* is mentioned (Malalas, 8.1, 9.13); when it was first founded by Phidalia, before Constantine's re-foundation, the *tyche* of Byzantium is supposed to have been called Ceroe, but there is no account, as we would expect, of Phidalia's sacrifice of a virgin named Ceroe (Malalas, 13.7).

[13] See E. Jeffreys, "Malalas' sources" in Jeffreys, *Studies in John Malalas*, 174. Three inconsistent versions of this historian's name are found in the text of Malalas: Βούττιος, Βόττιος, Βώττιος. My use of 'Bouttios' throughout is perhaps arbitrary, but this form is the first to appear, and it does seem more consistent with similar names found in other contexts. BOVTIVS appears as the name of a potter in Imperial Gaul; H. Dragendorff, "Terra sigillata. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der griechischen und römischen Keramik" *Bonner Jahrbücher* 96 (1895) 107 (*PW* iii.1, 800). Boutzios /-us was the owner of seal bearing a cruciform monogram in the middle to late sixth century; *PLRE* iii.a, 248 (Zacos 2789). Bottas was a— possibly Persian—*gloriosissimus* in Egypt in 621; *P. Oxy.* 1921 (a. 621); *PLRE*, iii.a, 247.

[14] Malalas, 2.11. In a similar manner Dionysius of Halicarnassus opens his account of Heracles in Italy by contrasting the "more mythical" and "more truthful" versions; *Ant. Rom.* 1.39.1.

Tarsus, and possibly Amandra (as well as ritually killing the virgin Medusa in order to make a talisman out of her head).[15] No other source is mentioned in the chapters on Perseus, and Malalas seems to follow Bouttios (or an intermediary) for the Perseus narrative as a whole. The contrast between Euripides and a 'historical version' is, moreover, consistent with the adaptation of Euripides' drama in Malalas' account of Orestes and Iphigenia, in which there is also a *tyche* sacrifice at the foundation of Nyssa (Scythopolis) in Palestine.[16] In the second instance, Bouttios is the only source cited for Malalas' brief account of the career of Alexander the Great, which includes the sacrifice of a virgin when Alexandria is founded at the site of Rhakoustis.[17] No other authorities are associated with the *tyche* sacrifices in Malalas, and, taking their consistency into account, it seems plausible to credit Bouttios with all of the accounts of *tyche* sacrifice.[18]

The third reference to Bouttios in Malalas cites him as a source on the emperor Domitian's exile of St. John to Patmos and his persecution of the Christians.[19] First, and most importantly, this sympathetic interest in the persecution of the Christians indicates that Bouttios himself was a Christian. Secondly, it suggests that Bouttios might be driving at some kind of connection between his seemingly disparate subjects: famous rulers of the

[15] Malalas, 2.11.

[16] See Appendix I.

[17] Malalas, 8.1. If, as we shall argue, Bouttios treated the kings of legend and history and the persecuting emperors as various examples of a single, rather sinister, type, it is noteworthy that Alexander is here described as setting out 'like a leopard' (καὶ εὐθέως ὡς πάρδαλις ἐκεῖθεν ὁρμήσας ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος), since Ignatius (whose martyrdom is mentioned in connection with Trajan's visit to Antioch, which we have seen includes a *tyche* sacrifice; Malalas, 11.10) refers to the soldiers who take him to the beasts in Rome as 'leopards' (*Ep. ad Rom.*, 5.1: ἐνδεδεμένος δέκα λεοπάρδοις, ὅ ἐστιν στρατιωτικὸν τάγμα); see B. Baldwin, "Leopards, Roman Soldiers, and the Historia Augusta," *ICS* 10 (1985) 281–83. According to Strabo (17.1.19) the *boukoloi* (or 'rangers') were stationed to patrol the harbour of Pharos against strangers, and given Rhakoustis as a dwelling (17.1.6), and according to Cassius Dio (72.4), and the novels of Achilles Tatius, Heliodorus, and probably Lollianus, these same *boukoloi* practised human sacrifice (see J. Winkler, "Lollianos and the Desperadoes" *JHS* 100 [1980] 175–81), so that the inhabitants of the site of Alexandria at its foundation are identified as practitioners of human sacrifice, which might offer some explanation of Bouttios' ascription of human sacrifice to Alexander at this site.

[18] It remains to be determined how Bouttios and the *tyche* sacrifice narratives are related to Pausanias (*FGrH* 854), another one of Malalas' sources, who is cited for the career of Perseus and the foundation of Antioch (Malalas, 2.12, 8.8, 18).

[19] Malalas, 10.48.

past, persecuting emperors, and the perpetrators of virgin sacrifice. Such a unified subject is consistent with Trajan's *tyche* sacrifice at Antioch in its context, where a virgin sacrifice by a pagan emperor is connected with the martyrdom of Christian virgins by the same.[20] We shall further develop this idea when we discuss the import of virgin sacrifice in Christian literature, as well as the political implications of the accounts of *tyche* sacrifice.

In addition to being a Christian, Bouttios, we may say with some confidence, was Antiochene. 'Bottios' (a variant of Bouttios) was an epithet of Zeus at one of his temples at Antioch, and Bottia was the name of the village on whose site Antioch was founded,[21] so the name seems to have had local associations. Apart from the sacrifices at such major centres as Alexandria and Constantinople, most of the *tyche* sacrifices, which we have credited to Bouttios, occur at smaller, specific sites clustered in and around Antioch.[22] Bouttios' work was exploited by the Antiochene chronicler Malalas, who exhibits a special interest in the sources on the history of his home city.[23] Bouttios' work, we shall argue, also reflects Antioch's general animosity toward Julian, which prompted that emperor to write his *Misopogon*.[24] The rumours of Julian's own participation in rites of human sacrifice, which apparently informed the accounts of *tyche* sacrifice (see below), also seem to have circulated predominantly in the east and in the vicinity of Antioch.[25]

It is somewhat more difficult to determine the date at which these *tyche* sacrifice narratives were composed than it has been to suggest a name for their author and establish his religious proclivities. The broad parameters are clear enough: some time between the foundation of Constantinople in

[20] Malalas, 11.9–10.

[21] Libanius, *Or.* 11.76 (Ζεὺς Βοττιαῖος); Malalas, 8.12 (Βωττία, Βωττίος Ζεύς). See Downey, *A History of Antioch*, 54–55, 68.

[22] There are three reports of *tyche* sacrifice situated in Antioch itself, others supposed to occur in Tarsus, Laodicea, Anazarbos, Ancyra and the province of Galatia, and possibly Iconium. Further afield such incidents are reported from Gortyn on Crete, Nyssa or Scythopolis in Palestine, and, of course, Alexandria and Constantinople.

[23] See B. Croke, "Malalas, the man and his work" in Jeffreys, *Studies in John Malalas*, 6–11.

[24] See G. Downey, "Julian the Apostate at Antioch" *ChHist* 8 (1939) 303–15.

[25] These rumours are reported by Gregory of Nazianzus and Theodoret, who, as writers in Greek, are presumably more likely to have access to stories current in the eastern, Greek portion of the Empire. Gregory (*Or.* 4.92) sets one of the reports of Julian's involvement in human sacrifice in the palace at Antioch itself, and Theodoret (*H.E.* 3.21) reports Julian's sacrifice of a woman in nearby Carrhae.

324 (the latest event mentioned in the narratives) and the conclusion of Malalas' *Chronicle* in 565 (or 574), but it should be possible to narrow this interval considerably. The *tyche* sacrifices, as we shall argue, reflect not only on the reign of one of their explicit subjects, Constantine, but also on an unspoken subject, the reign of Julian. This offers a new *terminus post quem*, namely the end of the Apostate's brief reign in 363, but no firm *terminus ante quem*, since interest in Julian's reign and the development of scurrilous legends concerning him continued for centuries after his death. In order to suggest a *terminus ante quem* we will have to engage in further speculation on the influence and content of Bouttios' work.

Some of the passages of Malalas which we have identified as being derived from Bouttios have certain affinities with the *Excerpta Latina Barbari*, a work whose original composition can be dated to shortly after 412.[26] These affinities suggest that the compiler of the *Excerpta*, as well as Malalas, employed Bouttios as a source either directly or at second-hand. In Malalas' account of Perseus, with which Bouttios is associated, Perseus is said to be the son of Picus-Zeus, along with Hermes and Heracles, and to have been taught sorcery by his father.[27] The 'Picus-Zeus narrative' is a novel and elaborate historicizing mythography of the fourth-century, preserved in versions in the *Excerpta* and in Malalas,[28] in the undoubtedly genuine portions of which Picus-Zeus is supposed to be the father of Faunus-Hermes and Heracles, and to have engaged in witchcraft and

[26] For the text of the *Excerpta Latina Barbari*, see C. Frick, *Chronica Minora* (Leipzig 1892) 184–370. The *Excerpta* was originally composed in Greek, but survives only in a sixth- or seventh-century Latin translation prepared in Merovingian Gaul by a translator inexpert in both Greek and Latin. The main chronography ends at A.D. 387, but mentions the death of Theophilus, Archbishop of Alexandria, in 412. A *laterculus* was added which brings the list of emperors down to Anastasius (r. 491–518). See Frick (1892) lxxxiii–ccix; B. Garstad, "The *Excerpta Latina Barbari* and the 'Picus-Zeus Narrative,'" *Jahrbuch für Internationale Germanistik* 34 (2002) 259–313.

[27] Malalas, 2.11.

[28] For the texts, see Frick, 234.22–240.11 = Garstad, "The *Excerpta Latina Barbari*," 270–74; Malalas, 1.8–2.2. On the Picus-Zeus narrative, see E. Jeffreys, "The *Chronicle* of John Malalas: A Commentary" in *The Sixth Century: End or Beginning?*, ed. P. Allen and E. Jeffreys, (Brisbane 1996) 52–74; Garstad, "The *Excerpta Latina Barbari*"; B. Garstad, "The Assyrian Hero's Romantic Interlude in Libya: a topos from Virgil in Pisander of Laranda, the Picus-Zeus Narrative, and Nonnus of Panopolis" *Eranos* 101 (2003) 6–16.

outrages against women which reflect those perpetrated by Perseus.[29] It is quite possible that Bouttios was the author of both the Picus-Zeus narrative and Malalas' story of Perseus, which would explain the links between them, and would be the first instance of material from Bouttios in the *Excerpta*.[30] Secondly, just as Euripides is contrasted with Bouttios as a source for the life of Perseus, and one of his plays is carefully followed in the account of Orestes and Iphigenia which includes a *tyche* sacrifice, Euripides is cited in the *Excerpta* as a source for the adventures of Heracles and specifically his erection of pillars at the western limits of the world.[31] This exploitation of

[29] On magic and seduction in the Picus-Zeus narrative, see Garstad, "The *Excerpta Latina Barbari*," 299–301. The phrase used of Acrisius by Malalas, 2.11, τοῦ Ἀκρισίου τοῦ καταγομένου ἐκ τῆς Ἀργείων χώρας (Acrisius who had come from the land of the Argives), also seems intended to distance the story of Perseus' conception from Greece, and perhaps set it in Italy, where Picus-Zeus is supposed to have ruled and seduced the mothers of his many sons. Moreover, in both the Picus-Zeus narrative and the account of Perseus there are supernatural benefactions received from heaven: the tongs of Hephaestus in the former, and the fire of the Ionitans in the latter.

[30] There are, however, certain chronological discrepancies which would have to be resolved before such an idea could be finally accepted; see Garstad, "The *Excerpta Latina Barbari*," 297–98.

[31] Frick, 238.23–240.2: *Et fugiens Erysthea, regem Thibeorum, cum omnia sua nauigauit et regnauit occidentis partibus: unde immagines auro uestitos sibi conposuit in nouissimis occidentales partibus, qui et usque hodie stant: pro quo et Eurypidus ille poeta memorauit* (Fleeing Eurystheus, the king of Thebes, he sailed away with all his household[?] and reigned in the regions of the west. So he made images of himself clothed in gold in the furthest western regions, which stand even to this day; Euripides the poet recalls these matters). Malalas, 6.16, has a very close description of the Pillars of Hercules: ὅθεν καὶ στήλας αὐτῷ χρυσᾶς καὶ πορφυρᾶς ἀνέστησαν οἱ Ἰταλοὶ καὶ βασιλεῖς, ἤτοι ῥῆγες, ἐκ τοῦ γένους αὐτοῦ βασιλεύσαντες ἐν τοῖς ἐσχάτοις τῆς δύσεως μέρεσιν· αἵτινες στῆλαι ἕως τοῦ παρόντος ἵστανται (whence the Italian kings, or *reges*, of his [Heracles'] family who ruled in the furthest regions of the West set up gold and porphyry steles to him; these steles stand up to the present day). The ascription of the construction to the descendants of Heracles and not the hero himself is probably an adjustment by Malalas. The citation of Euripides has also inexplicably fallen out. Both sentences agree, however, that the monuments in question are golden, located in the furthest region of the west, and remain standing to the present day; the ὅθεν in Malalas also makes sense of the introductory *unde* in the *Excerpta*. See Garstad, "The *Excerpta Latina Barbari*," 308–9. A similar phrase is also used of the stele which Perseus set up in Iconium, which is associated with his sacrifice and the naming of the city's *tyche* after himself, Malalas, 2.11: καὶ ἔστησεν ἑαυτῷ στήλην ἔξω τῶν πυλῶν, βαστάζουσαν τὸ ἀντεικόνισμα τῆς Γοργόνος, καὶ θυσίαν ποιήσας ἐκάλεσεν τὴν

Euripides seems to be taken over from Bouttios in both cases. In the third place, Bouttios is the only source cited in Malalas' account of Alexander, and he is specifically cited in regard to the fact that Alexander conquers not only the Persians, but the Assyrians, Medes, Parthians, and Babylonians as well, and frees the *Romans*, Greeks, and Egyptians from their subjection to these peoples.[32] An almost identical conflation of eastern peoples, along with the indication that Alexander freed the Romans from their power and made them a part of his empire, appears in the *Excerpta*.[33] Two such

τύχην τῆς πόλεως Περσίδα εἰς τὸ ἴδιον αὐτοῦ ὄνομα· ἥτις στήλη ἕως τοῦ παρόντος ἵσταται ἐκεῖ (and he set up for himself outside the gates a stele, bearing an image of the Gorgon, and making a sacrifice he named the *tyche* of the city Persis after his own name; this stele stands there up to the present day). The *Excerpta* mentions the Pillars of Hercules again as the boundaries of the empires of Nebuchadnezzar and Alexander (Frick, 260.7, 270.18–19), and Euripides again in lists of prominent Greek 'philosophers' (Frick, 266.7, 268.5).

[32] Malalas, 8.1: καὶ νικήσας τὸν Δαρεῖον, βασιλέα Περσῶν, τὸν Ἀσσαλάμου, παρέλαβεν αὐτὸν καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν χώραν Ἀσσυρίων καὶ Μήδων καὶ Πάρθων καὶ Βαβυλωνίων καὶ Περσῶν καὶ πάσας τὰς βασιλείας τῆς γῆς, καθὼς Βόττιος ὁ σοφώτατος συνεγράψατο, ἐλευθερώσας ὁ αὐτὸς Ἀλέξανδρος καὶ τὰς πόλεις καὶ τὰς χώρας καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν τῶν Ῥωμαίων καὶ Ἑλλήνων καὶ Αἰγυπτίων ἐκ τῆς Ἀσσυρίων καὶ Περσῶν καὶ Πάρθων καὶ Μήδων ὑποταγῆς καὶ δουλείας, ἀποδοὺς Ῥωμαίοις πάντα ἃ ἀπώλεσαν (Once he had defeated Darius, the king of the Perians, the son of Assalam, he took possession of him and his whole kingdom and the whole territory of the Assyrians and Medes and Parthians and Babylonians and Persians and all the kingdoms of the earth, as the most learned Bouttios has written, and this Alexander freed the cities and the territories and the whole country of the Romans and the Greeks and the Egyptians from subjection and slavery to the Assyrians and Persians and Parthians and Medes, returning to the Romans all that they had lost.). Malalas' eighth book opens with an almost identical list of eastern peoples as the ruling powers of the world and the enemies of Alexander. A similar conflation manifests itself when Malalas refers to Nebuchadnezzar, the Babylonian king, as an 'Assyrian' (6.1, 3), and as a 'Persian' (18.2), and has the Median kings from Darius to Astyages and the Persian kings Cyrus and Cambyses rule 'the Assyrians' (6.4, 13).

[33] Frick, 244.12–23: *Post haec tradidit dominus deus regnum terrae Romanorum in manus Assyriorum, Chaldaeorum, et Persarum, et Midorum. Et tributaria facta est terra illa Assyriis, et mansit Roma sine regnum, usque dum suscitauit deus Alexandrum Macedonem et conditorem. Iste quidem pugnauit contra regem Persarum et superauit eum. Et tradidit dominus in manum eius regnum Assyriorum, et introiuit in potestate regnum eorum, et concussit ciuitates Persarum et Medorum, et liberauit omnem terram Romanorum et Grecorum et Egyptiorum de seruitute Chaldeorum, et leges posuit mundo* (After these things the Lord God delivered the kingdom of the land of the Romans into the hands of the Assyrians,

eccentric narratives of Alexander's career, with their obvious similarities, must have a common source: Bouttios. The *Excerpta* also exhibits Bouttios' concern with the persecution of Christians at the hands of Roman emperors,[34] and, finally, notes the foundation of Constantinople by Constantine.[35]

The identification of Bouttios, the author of the *tyche* sacrifice narratives, as a source for the *Excerpta Latina Barbari* may remain tentative for the present. Nevertheless, I think the preliminary evidence is good enough to provide us with a working *terminus ante quem* of shortly after 412. This supplies us with a plausible—if not definite—date for Bouttios of some time in the latter half of the fourth century or the first decade of the fifth.

The *tyche* sacrifices and the *tyche* cult

The origins of the *tyche* cult are shrouded in mystery, but Bouttios—if we may so name the author of these narratives, for the sake of convenience, if not on account of certainty—does not seem to be engaged in speculative religious history. The suggestion that every instance of a widespread cult originated with an act of human sacrifice must be read as an attack on that

Chaldeans, and Persians, and Medes. And this land was made tributary to the Assyrians, and Rome remained without dominion [*or* a king] until the time when God raised up Alexander of Macedon, the Founder. He fought against the king of the Persians and defeated him. And the Lord delivered into his hand the kingdom of the Assyrians, and he entered into power over their kingdoms, and he overthrew the cities of the Persians and the Medes, and he freed the whole country of the Romans and the Greeks and the Egyptians from slavery to the Chaldeans, and he gave laws to the world). Note the similarity of construction: ἐκ τῆς Ἀσσυρίων ... ὑποταγῆς καὶ δουλείας / *de seruitute Chaldeorum*. Malalas, 8.3, also notes that Alexander gave laws to his newly conquered territories. As in the opening sentence of Malalas, book viii, there is the explicit idea that God ordained Alexander's conquest of the Persian empire and the powers of the east. The conflation of these same eastern peoples occurs at Frick, 260.1–5. Nebuchadnezzar is called 'king of the Assyrians' (Frick, 256.22–23), and his realm is said to stretch to the Pillars of Heracles and include 'all the country of the Romans' (Frick, 260.6–11). Alexander is supposed to give laws to the Romans, among others (Frick, 268.16–18).

[34] The *Excerpta* notes the martyrdom of Peter and Paul (Frick, 348.28–350.3; cf. Malalas, 10.35–37), but not the fate of their fellow Apostle, John, mentioned by Bouttios. There is a lacuna (see Frick, 354) where we would expect to find parallel information, if any, on the reign of Trajan. But the persecutions under Diocletian are mentioned (Frick, 354.23–26).

[35] Frick, 356.24.

cult, denigrating its origins and consequently denying its current validity. We may fairly ask, then, what prompted Bouttios' attack on the *tyche* cult. His Christianity can only be part of the reason. His fuller context and the nature of the *tyche* cult itself must also contribute to an explanation.

The Imperial *tyche*, or personal *tyche* of the ruler—and we may note that each example of *tyche* sacrifice is directed by a ruler—was an old *nemesis* of the Christians.[36] Polycarp was enjoined by the proconsul at Smyrna to swear by the *tyche* of Caesar, and on account of his refusal he was martyred.[37] Clement of Alexandria critically notes that the Romans considered *Tyche* the greatest divinity, and that the pagans deify *tyche* along with a number of abstract concepts and natural substances.[38] Origen confirms that the Christians do not swear by the *tyche* of the emperor, because it is either an expression with no substantial reality or a demon.[39] Eusebius, writing on behalf of Constantine, argued that *tyche* was just a word and that it was unreasonable to assume that *tyche* was the power which governed the world.[40] The Church historians, Socrates Scholasticus, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Evagrius, preferred synonyms to the word *tyche* itself in their explanations of historical causation.[41] It is evident, therefore, that the idea, to say nothing of the cult, of *tyche* was considered antithetical to the Christian understanding of the world and codes of conduct.

Tyche was, however, popular as a concept and as a goddess, throughout antiquity.[42] *Tyche* appears as a divinity in our earliest literary evidence for

[36] The Christian antipathy to the *tyche* may have been inherited from the Jewish scriptures. In the LXX Is. 65.11 the names of the heathen gods to whom the Israelites offer illicit sacrifices, Gad and Meni, are rendered as *daimonion* and *tyche*. On the *tyche* in Christian discourse especially, see A. Anwander, "'Schicksal'-Wörter in Antike und Christentum" *ZRGG* 1 (1948) 316–22.

[37] *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, 9.2, 10.1.

[38] Clem. *Protrep.* 51.1, 102.4. Clement also uses *tyche* in the sense of fortune neutrally, and says that it is assigned by God; *Quis div. salv.* 26.3.

[39] Origen, *Con. Cels.* 8.65.

[40] Eusebius, *Const. ad coet. sanct.* (*Oration of Constantine to the Saints*) 6.

[41] See G. Chesnut, *The First Christian Histories: Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Evagrius* (Paris 1977) 67–70, 180–84, 191, 198, 204–6, 208–14, 219–22, 245–46; G. Chesnut, "Eusebius, Augustine, Orosius, and the Later Patristic and Medieval Christian Historians" in *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism*, ed. H. Attridge and G. Hata (Leiden 1992) 706.

[42] See Dohrn, *Die Tyche von Antiochia*; J. Ferguson, *The Religions of the Roman Empire* (Ithaca 1970) 77–87; Chesnut (1977) 37–39, 41–50; K. Shelton, "Imperial Tyches" *Gesta* 18 (1979) 27–38; J. Ferguson, *Among the Gods: An Archaeological Exploration of Ancient Greek Religion* (London 1989) 166–68;

Greek religion, and as an influential power in the classics of the fifth century B.C. But it was in the time of the Diadochi, when the world must have seemed uncertain and self-determination impossible, that the *tyche* cult came into its own. Practically every city had an image and public worship of its personified civic identity, good fortune, and protective deity. Each civic *tyche* was also identified with a universal goddess, *Tyche* (the Roman *Fortuna*), 'Chance' or 'Luck,' who oversaw the seemingly random happenstances which determined the success or failure of the lives of great and small alike. This *Tyche* might often be viewed as a capricious and malevolent force, opposed or indifferent to goodness, justice, and individual happiness. She is regularly presented in this way in the novels and on epitaphs.[43] (It is perhaps appropriate that Bouttios, who as we shall see was influenced by the novels, also took a dim view of *tyche*.) *Tyche*, nevertheless, continued to be popular and persistent in late antiquity, as a willful and personified explanation of causation in life and literature, as an embodiment of civic pride, and as an object of cultic devotion. The temples of other gods might be torn down, but the *tychaion* often managed to remain standing. As such, the *tyche* cult was a significant competitor with Christianity.

In late antiquity the gods of the Olympian and Capitoline pantheon were worshipped largely as a matter of form, and it is doubtful whether they retained the devotion, enthusiasm, and belief of those who offered them public sacrifice. So when the Christian apologists rail against the gods of Homer and Hesiod, they have, in some measure, set up straw men against which to duel. *Tyche*, by contrast, was the object of sincere belief and earnest imprecations on the part of throngs of devotees. She was real and important to the audience of the apologists in a way that the traditional gods were not.[44] The usual apologetic attacks against paganism, moreover, which

R. Turcan, *The Cults of the Roman Empire*, trans. A. Nevill (Oxford 1996) 25, 295; F. Becchi, "TYXH: Storia di un Nome" in *ΠΟΙΚΙΛΜΑ: Studi in onore di Michele R. Cataudella in occasione del 60° compleanno*, ed S. Bianchetti, et al. (La Spezia 2001) vol. 1, 111–27.

[43] Ferguson, *The Religions of the Roman Empire*, 80–82; T. Hägg, *The Novel in Antiquity* (Berkeley 1983) 11, 12, 13, 26, 49, 74, 86, 87, 89, 114, 119, 131, 174, 228. Interestingly, C. Bowra, "Palladas on Tyche" *CQ* n.s. 10 (1960) 118–28, discerns this to be the attitude of a jaded fourth-century poet as well.

[44] Certainly, for one individual in the fourth century Bowra, "Palladas on Tyche," 125, can say, "It is clear that she is much more real to him than are the Olympian gods, whose misfortunes in the riots of 391 raise no fundamental questions or regrets for him ..., and evoke no more than a smile.... She is a real figure in his depleted cosmology because she symbolizes the irrational and unjust

tended to concentrate on the 'scandal of myth' were not effective against the figure of the *tyche*. As a cult without a mythology to speak of, the *tyche* cult was impervious to attacks based on the immorality or imperfection of the god in question, or on the possibility that he might really be a man or a demon, from both the disgusted piety of philosophically-minded polytheist theologians and the tested Christian polemical arsenal. Bouttios overcame this particular obstacle by turning to the methods of fiction and his own fertile imagination, and creating an embarrassing mythology for the *tyche* cult where none had existed before, which traced the *tyche* back to all that his society considered barbaric and tyrannical.

But Bouttios had to be cautious in attacking the *tyche* cult, since the figure of the *tyche* had been absorbed into the rhetoric and iconography of Christian Roman Imperial propaganda. Despite the fact that Constantinople

scheme of thing in which men live." Nevertheless, I understand that mine is a more controversial contention that it might have been in the past. Nearly fifty years ago J. Toynbee, "Roma and Constantinopolis in Late Antique Art from 312 to 365" *JRS* 37 (1947) 135–36, already maintained that the situation was the reverse, that the reality of the traditional gods made their demise necessary, while the abstraction of personifications such as *tyche* made them innocuous: "The pantheon had to go because its denizens had possessed, for the great majority of pagans a real, objective, and independent existence," whereas the personifications of places, powers, or ideas received worship only derivatively as manifestations of abstract and immaterial entities, which might still be venerated as deriving their significance from God. W. Liebeschuetz, in a personal communication, set out his view of the matter: "The view that the worship of the Olympian gods had early in Roman history ceased to be real religion was once widely held (also by me) but is held no longer by scholars of Roman religion; see M. Beard, et al., *Religions of Rome* (Cambridge 1998). Even in Julian's revival actual worship and cult still centered on the Olympians, and it was worship of the Olympians that Augustine tried to demolish in his City of God. I also do not think that the relatively frequent mention of *Tyche/Fortuna* in Late Antiquity is evidence that Fortune was a widely worshipped divinity. It is rather due to the fact that Fortune could be looked at in two ways: either as a divinity or as impersonal luck. Seen simply as a personification of chance lady luck could be invoked by Christians (at least by most Christians). Fortunes of something or other, e.g., the emperor, or of Antioch, were similarly open to a double interpretation, that of patron spirit of an individual or city or what have you, or as an aspect of the thing itself. So even Christians might light candles in front of an image of the *Tyche* of Constantinople or Antioch without feeling that they committed idolatry." These are the opinions of scholars I respect, and I believe they deserve a hearing in any discussion of the *tyche* in late antiquity, even if I am not persuaded by them, and my impression of the situation remains different.

was deliberately founded as a Christian city,[45] Constantine did in fact raise an image of the civic *tyche* in his new capital,[46] and celebrated the city's dedication with an issue of coins and medallions representing Constantinople in the guise of her *tyche*, a winged woman, wearing a turreted crown, bearing a cornucopia, and resting her foot on a ship.[47] (It is, however, unclear what form the worship, if any, of this *tyche* took.) Indeed, *tyche* figures became more common in official Roman iconography in the fourth century than they had been in the past, and they remained on the Christian coinage of the time.[48] By the reign of Justinian (527–565) a law stipulated that the *tyche* of the emperor is exempt from the laws, since God subjected the laws to her, and sent her down to men as a living law.[49] And in the reign of Mauricius (582–602) the 'godly and heavenly *tyche*' of the emperor was part of the oath formula which made contracts binding[50]—such was the change in Christian usage since Polycarp's martyrdom in Smyrna some five centuries before! So Bouttios had to pursue the precarious goal of at one and the same time denigrating the traditional *tyche* cults and sanctifying the *tyche* as it had been adopted by the system of Christian Empire. This involved presenting Constantine's inauguration of the *tyche* of Constantinople as a unique departure from the virgin sacrifices which had marked the founding of previous *tyche*s.

[45] See Eusebius, *VC* 3.48.2; A. Alföldi, *The Conversion of Constantine and Pagan Rome*, trans. H. Mattingly (Oxford 1948) 110.

[46] *Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronikai* 34; *Patria Constantinopolis* 29 (*Scriptores originum Constantinopolitarum*, ed. T. Preger [Leipzig 1901] vol. 2, 166); see Alföldi, *The Conversion of Constantine*, 111; G. Dagron, *Naissance d'une capitale: Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451* (Paris 1974) esp. 43–45, 37, 40, 42, 307, 373–74 (cf. 26, 32 n. 252 n. 7, 315, 368); A. Cameron & J. Herrin, et al., *Constantinople in the Early Eighth Century: the* Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronikai (Leiden 1984) 208.

[47] A. Alföldi, "On the Foundation of Constantinople: A Few Notes" *JRS* 37 (1947) 16; Alföldi, *The Conversion of Constantine*, 111–12.

[48] Toynbee "Roma and Constantinopolis," 135–44; Shelton, "Imperial Tyches," 29, 32.

[49] Justinian, *Corpus Juris Civilis*, *Nov.* 105.2.4.

[50] R. Bagnall & K. Worp, *Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt*, 2nd ed. (Leiden 2004) 52, 54.

Composition

The *tyche* sacrifices are patently fictitious.[51] There is no reason to believe—indeed, there are very good reasons to disbelieve—that Alexander, Seleucus, Augustus, Tiberius, or Trajan conducted human sacrifices. The accounts of virgin sacrifice reflect reality only inasmuch as each of the cities supposed to have been founded with a *tyche* sacrifice can be shown to have had a civic *tyche* cult.[52] But as fictions they are consistent with the popular literature and historiography of the fourth century: Dictys of Crete, Dares the Phrygian, the *Alexander Romance*, and the *Historia Augusta*. Momigliano's description of the last of these as "sensational and unscrupulous" and full of forged documents[53] might equally well be applied to the lot. And to insist that these works are really novels or romances is to miss the point that they represent the form in which many readers of late antiquity found it most congenial to receive information about the past.

Moreover, in the combination of verifiable fact (the cities in question did have *tyche* cults and statues) and preposterous explanation (the *tychai* originate with virgin sacrifice) the *tyche* sacrifice narratives have definite affinities with the perennially popular genre of 'conspiracy theory' literature, which is hard to classify as fiction or non-fiction. They air the suspicion that something sinister is afoot in the halls of power, about which the general populace is being kept in the dark, and offer startling revelations of the truth. Once again, Bouttios is not unique in this. Roman imperial historiography did not limit itself to the reporting of the public and official acts of the emperor, but also involved a certain amount of unsubstantiated rumour, retailing of court gossip, and tabloid speculation. Procopius' *Secret History* is only the most egregious example of a method to be found in Tacitus, Suetonius, Cassius Dio, and others.

As a writer of fictional history, Bouttios may have little to tell us about his subjects, but he has a great deal to tell us about the attitudes and ideas of

[51] The notable exception to the general consensus that the *tyche* sacrifice narratives are fiction is Bosch, *Die kleinasiatischen Münzen*, Teil ii, Band I, 1 Hälfte, 258 n. 194, who suggests that these accounts occur so regularly in accounts of city foundation that they must be based on actual practice continued until the time of Seleucus I. But the regular occurrence of these human sacrifices is found in only one, late text, and is there supposed to continue after Seleucus.

[52] See A. Moffatt, "A record of public buildings and monuments" in Jeffreys, *Studies in John Malalas*, 105–7.

[53] A. Momigliano, "Pagan and Christian Historiography in the Fourth Century A.D." in *The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*, ed. A. Momigliano (Oxford 1963) 96.

his own day. As he is writing fiction the careful construction of his *tyche* sacrifice narratives, both singly and as a whole, is all the more important in directing feeling and achieving persuasion. We shall now turn to the question of composition in detail.

Human sacrifice

Human sacrifice is perhaps a particularly appropriate subject for a 'fictional history'. The Greeks and Romans were simultaneously fascinated and horrified by the concept of human sacrifice, and they gave it generous treatment in their literature, but there is no unambiguous evidence that they ever actually practised human sacrifice.[54] As Albert Henrichs put it, "Stories of human sacrifice never tell us what the Greeks actually did; their relevance lies in telling us what the Greeks thought. Throughout antiquity, the reality of human sacrifice and its powerful hold on the imagination did not lie in its actual occurrence, but in the pretence—or even possibility—that it once occurred. ... Like few other acts of violence, human sacrifice blurs the boundaries between imagination and reality, between myth and history. Liminal by definition, human sacrifice provokes extreme and anxious reactions in most people. Outwardly disparaged, it is secretly relished and vicariously performed."[55] So, what do the *tyche* sacrifice stories tell us about the thought of one Greek (we presume), an Antiochene, a Christian, a subject of Rome in the last century of her secure hegemony over the Mediterranean, and how he expected his readers to think?

Bouttios' human sacrifices seem primarily intended to elicit the requisite sense of horror. We shall shortly indicate some passages from

[54] As my colleague Craig Williams pointed out, there is no unambiguous evidence that the Greeks *never* practised human sacrifice either, and since human sacrifice is manifestly 'part of the range of human cultural experience' the burden of proof must rest on those who would argue that human sacrifice never occurred in a given culture.

[55] A. Henrichs, "Demythologizing the Past, Mythicizing the Present: Myth, History, and the Supernatural at the Dawn of the Hellenistic Period" in *From Myth to Reason? Studies in the Development of Greek Thought*, ed. R. Buxton (Oxford 1999) 228. Two recent scholarly works on the subject are D. Hughes, *Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece* (London 1991), and Bonnechere, *Le sacrifice humain*. More popular treatments include N. Davies, *Human Sacrifice in History and Today* (New York 1991) and P. Tierney, *The Highest Altar: Unveiling the Mystery of Human Sacrifice* (New York 1989); the latter is often sensational and its treatment of wider issues somewhat shallow, but it does demonstrate that human sacrifice is still practiced in forms very similar to those found in antiquity.

ancient novels which demonstrate a similar effort to provoke horror in the reader, but some suggestion of why human sacrifice is so terrifying, especially compared to other forms of violent death, is perhaps appropriate here. Whereas murder, for instance, which can be frightening enough, is a socially illicit act intended to serve some other motive (greed, vengeance, or lust, for example), human sacrifice is, to some party, at least, socially acceptable, and in the context of human sacrifice the accomplishment of death is something of an end in itself. In a case of murder some motive overcomes basic human decency; human sacrifice denies and overturns human decency. The fatal movements of the ritual are inexorable, and death cannot be averted by appeals to reason, compassion, or even the threat of punishment. The rules of society are not frightfully broken or interrupted, they are horrifically reinvented.[56]

But these are fairly general observations. The horror evoked by the *tyche* sacrifices must have a direction and a target. The reader's visceral response is meant to persuade him to accept an argument which might otherwise meet with some doubt and hesitation. Because human sacrifice was horrific, it belonged to the 'other' and the outsider. As generally understood by the Greeks and Romans, human sacrifice was practiced by barbarians on the remote periphery of the world,[57] and by their own ancestors in a barbarous, or semi-barbarous period of the remote past.[58] But

[56] It is in precisely this element, I suspect, that the real terror of the cult classic, *The Wicker Man* (British Lion Films, 1973), lies.

[57] See J. Balsdon, *Romans and Aliens* (Chapel Hill 1979) 245–48. See also Origen, *De princip.*, 2.9.5, *Con. Cels.* 5.27. As the Greeks and Romans became increasingly familiar with the lands of the Mediterranean, the people to whom they imputed human sacrifice became increasingly farther removed from the centre of Graeco-Roman civilization. For instance, the practice was associated with Ethiopia in late antiquity; see Heliodorus, *Aeth.*, 9.1, 10.7; Procopius, *Bell.*, 1.19.36; as well as an anonymous sixth-century sermon: C. Datema, "New Evidence for the Encounter between Constantinople and 'India'" in *After Chalcedon: Studies in Theology and Church History*, ed. C. Laga, et al. (Leuven 1985) 56–65.

[58] The numerous Greek examples are as old as Homer, who has Achilles kill twelve Trojan princes on the pyre of Patroclus (*Il.* 18.333–37, 21.26–33, 23.19–23, 175–76, 240–42), and also include Iphigenia at Aulis (see Euripides, *Iphigenia in Aulis*), Polyxena at the tomb of Achilles (see Euripides, *Troades*, *Hecuba*), Macaria before the battle against Eurystheus (see Euripides, *Heraclidae*), Athamas' planned sacrifice of Phrixos (who is replaced by the golden ram), and the daughter of Erechtheus and Praxithea (see W. Burkert, *Homo Necans: The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth*, trans. P. Bing [Berkeley 1983] 114 and n. 27, 148 and n. 58; Hughes, *Human Sacrifice*, 73–74). When the Greeks of the literate period heard the exceptional reports of their contemporary compatriots

it remained repugnant, even in these liminal settings, and so human sacrifice was the one item of the otherwise venerated *mos maiorum* which was extirpated by Roman law and Roman legions wherever it was encountered,[59] and some mythographers insisted that the gods of a civilized people would at no time accept a human sacrificial victim.[60] Within the civilized world human sacrifice was supposed to be performed by a different kind of outsider, enemies of the order of the state (especially the Roman state), conspirators such as Tarquin the Proud and Catiline,[61] those enemies of the order of nature and the gods, the magicians,[62] and the most egregiously tyrannical of emperors.[63] To ascribe, therefore, the practice of human sacrifice to the leaders of Greek and Roman polities, the men at the very centre of the civilized world, and especially in the recent past, is to suggest a radical inversion of the prejudices concerning civilization and barbarity, insider and outsider. It is to suggest that there is something

performing human sacrifice, they considered such incidents egregious aberrations, as in the stories of the priest Zoilus at Orchomenos and of the three Persian princes before the battle of Salamis; Plutarch, *Quaest. Graec.* 38 (299E–F), *Themistocles*, 13.2–3; see Burkert, *Homo Necans*, 175; Henrichs, "Demythologizing the Past," 229–35. The Romans believed that their custom of casting effigies into the Tiber on the Ides of May replaced an ancient rite, abolished by Hercules, in which actual men were thrown into the river: Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. Rom.* 1.38.2–3; Ovid, *Fasti* 6.621–34; Varro, *Ling. Lat.*, 7.44; Plutarch, *Quaest. Rom.*, 32 (272B–C). See also Porphyry, *De abstin.* 2.54–57; G. Huxley, "Fulgentius on the Cretan Hecatomphonia" *CPh* 68 (1973) 124–27.

[59] See Pomponius Mela, 3.18; Pliny, *Nat. hist.* 30.(4).13; Suet., *Div. Claud.* 25.5; Plutarch, *Quaest. Rom.* 83 (283F-284C); Tertullian, *Apol.* 9.2–6; cf. Julius Caesar, *Bell. Gall.* 6.16; Tac., *Hist.* 4.54; Aug., *Civ. Dei* 7.26.

[60] The substitution of an animal for a human victim appears as early as the *Cypria* (Proclus, *Chr.* 104 [Allen]; see M. Davies, *The Greek Epic Cycle* [London 1989] 44), but most famously, Euripides in his *Iphigenia in Tauris* and perhaps *Iphigenia in Aulis* (though the latter may be the work of an interpolator) adapted the myth of Iphigenia at Aulis so that the girl was snatched away at the last minute to be the consecrated servant, rather than the sacrificial victim, of Artemis, and replaced by a deer. Plato, *Rep.*, 3.391B, insists that Homer's report of Achilles offering live captives on the pyre of Patroclus must be considered a lie.

[61] Sallust, *Cat.*, 22; Plutarch, *Publicola*, 4.1, *Cicero*, 10.3; Dio Cassius, 37.30.3.

[62] Cicero, *In Vatinium*, (6)14; Pliny, *Nat. hist.*, 30.19–20; Justin Martyr, *Apol.*, 1.18; Cassius Dio, 69.11.2–3; Philostratus, *V.A.*, 8.5, 7.10, 12–15; Porphyry, *De abstin.*, 2.51; Eusebius, *H.E.*, 7.10.4; Paulus, *Sententiae*, 5.23.16; Libanius, *Decl.*, 41; *Clem. Rec.*, 2.13; *Clem. Hom.*, 2.26, 29, 30. See R. MacMullen, *Enemies of the Roman Order* (Oxford 1966) 95–127.

[63] Dio Cassius, 74.16.5 on Didius Julianus; *Hist. Aug., Elagabalus* 8.1–2.

barbarous and flawed about the revered pagan kings and emperors, and that the societies over which they presided were somehow outside of the civilization they were traditionally supposed to define. It is no doubt significant in this regard that the two emperors against whom the Roman Senate of the fourth century gauged their successors in its customary commendations, Augustus and Trajan,[64] appear in Bouttios as perpetrators of virgin sacrifice. This suggestion is an apt rejoinder to Porphyry's charge that Christianity itself represented "barbarian daring" (τὸ βάρβαρον τόλμημα).[65] If the great rulers indulged in human sacrifice, then the monarchy, and potentially the whole *oikoumene*, are erring and barbarous until they are redeemed by Constantine, who establishes a *tyche* without recourse to human sacrifice. Such ideas, we shall see, are consistent with the rhetoric of Constantine's reign.

There is a further indictment of the sacrificing rulers in a notable difference between the *tyche* sacrifices and many of the accounts of human sacrifice famous in antiquity. In some of the most memorable instances of human sacrifice in Greek myth (especially Iphigenia at Aulis), as well as in the Old Testament (Abraham offering Isaac, Jephthah's daughter, the king of Moab's son), the victim is a close relation of the ruler who performs the sacrifice.[66] The narration of these sacrifices consequently expresses the emotional conflict, the anguished resignation, and the immense grief of the sacrificer, to say nothing of his unquestionable commitment to the cause which calls for such a sacrifice.[67] These narratives also emphasize some external compulsion or necessity (the becalmed fleet, the demands of the divine, a thoughtless vow, an ominous siege) which makes the sacrifice all but unavoidable. In contrast, the victims of the *tyche* sacrifices are not royal princesses (Cepara, sacrificed by Zarbos at Anazarbos is described as a

[64] Eutropius, 8.5.3.

[65] Eusebius, *H.E.*, 6.19.7.

[66] See N. Loraux, *Tragic Ways of Killing a Woman*, trans. A. Forster (Cambridge, MA 1987) 37 and n. 18. The Biblical examples are taken from Gen. 22.1–19, Judg. 11.30–40, II Ki. 3.26–27. See W. Sypherd, *Jephthah and his Daughter: A Study in Comparative Literature* (Newark 1948) for a survey of the literary, musical, and other artistic treatments of at least one of these stories from the middle ages to the twentieth century.

[67] The recognition of the grief of Agamemnon, for one, is strikingly seen in Pliny's description, *Nat. hist.* 35.36 (73), of a painting of the sacrifice of Iphigenia by Timanthes, in which the artist, having exhausted every evocation of grief, depicted Agamemnon veiled; see S. Woodford, *The Trojan War in Ancient Art* (Ithaca 1993) 37.

'country girl,' and Calliope, sacrificed by Trajan, is a girl from Antioch[68]), and there is no suggestion of any emotional involvement whatsoever on the part of the sacrificers. The *tyche* sacrifices, moreover, seem to be more profitable than necessary. These cool, detached killings of hapless subjects, compared with the stories of a sorrowful king slaying his nearest and dearest, would inevitably stress the tyranny and abuse of power on the part of the practitioners of human sacrifice.

The charge of human sacrifice is of particular interest coming from the pen of a Christian author. The simultaneous fascination and revulsion which human sacrifice elicited were, if anything, more powerful in the imagination of the Christian than of his polytheist neighbour. While the practice of human sacrifice was anathema to the Hebrew scriptures and the Christians who inherited them, the idea of human sacrifice was central to the Christian doctrine of redemption and salvation, as well as to the rhetoric of the Christian life.[69] Human sacrifice may have, for this reason, been an attractive topic for a Christian author, but the Christian attitude to human sacrifice was unambiguous. Eusebius and Athanasius, among others, characterized the practice as one of the gross errors of profane religion which led to the proliferation of bloodshed.[70]

The Christians, moreover, were not unfamiliar with the accusation of human sacrifice. They had been the victims of such slander, especially in the second century, when they had been accused of infant sacrifice, ritual murder, cannibalism, and other outrageous crimes.[71] The slander was not so objectionable to them that they hesitated to turn it against their accusers. Human sacrifice, suggested the Christian apologists, was an inevitable and widespread trait of paganism, and they could trot out a number of examples from Graeco-Roman literary culture to prove the point.[72] The charge of human sacrifice was also specifically directed against the persecuting

[68] Malalas, 10.53, 11.9.

[69] See, for example, Rom. 12.1, 1 Cor. 5.7, Eph. 5.2, Heb. 10.10; *Martyrdom of Polycarp* 14.2.

[70] Eusebius, *L.C.* 13.6–8; Athanasius, *Adversus Gentes* 1.25 (*Contra Gentes* 25).

[71] See A. Henrichs, "Pagan Ritual and the Alleged Crimes of the Early Christians: A Reconsideration" in *Kyriakon: Festschrift Johannes Quasten*, ed. P. Granfield & J. Jungmann (Münster 1970) vol. 1, 18–35; F. Dölger, "'*Sacramentum infanticidii*': Die Schlachtung eines Kindes und der Genuss seines Fleisches und Blutes als vermeintlicher Einweihungsakt im ältesten Christentum" *Antike und Christentum* 4 (1934) 188–228.

[72] See Clement Alex., *Protrep.* 3.42; Eusebius, *L.C.* 13.6–8; Greg. Naz., *Or.* 4.70; Davies, *Human Sacrifice*, 115–30.

emperors. Dionysius, the bishop of Alexandria (bishop 248–c.264), according to Eusebius, reports that under the influence of Egyptian magicians the emperor Valerian turned against the Christians and indulged in gruesome child sacrifice in order to win divine favour.[73] Maxentius, the rival of Constantine, was supposed to have sacrificed pregnant women and babies for magical purposes.[74] Bouttios' sweeping accusation of human sacrifice against famous and revered pagan rulers is consistent with this polemic. Nor was this the last time when Christians would tar others with the same brush that had been used against them. Much later, in the Middle Ages, arose the rumour that the Jews required the blood of a Christian victim for their rituals, and this slander has not yet been completely quelled.[75]

Human sacrifice in the *tyche* narratives, then, is a device used to evoke a horror which can be molded into indignation and outrage against Bouttios' chosen subjects, or targets: pagan rulers, ancient and modern. When accused of human sacrifice these kings and emperors are no longer seen as the protectors and arbiters of civilization, but as barbarous powers who stand at the heart of society and cast doubt on its claims to civilization.[76] The chosen victims of these rulers show them to be tyrants, since, unlike the heroes of Greek myth and the Old Testament, they are not killing their own daughters at grave personal expense, but the daughters of strangers. And in accusing the emperors of human sacrifice, the Christians were turning a calumny which had been fixed on themselves against their persecutors.

[73] Eusebius, *H.E.* 7.10.4.

[74] Eusebius, *H.E.* 8.14.5, *L.C.* 1.36.1.

[75] The slanderous accusation that the Jews practised human sacrifice did appear in antiquity (see Josephus, *Contra Apion*, 2.8 [91–96]), but it came to fruition in the Middle Ages beginning in the twelfth century; see H. Strack, *The Jew and Human Sacrifice*, trans. Henry Blanchamp (New York 1909); J. Trachtenberg, *The Devil and the Jews: The Medieval Conception of the Jew and its Relation to Modern Anti-Semitism* (New Haven 1943; repr. Philadelphia 1993) 124–39. On the persistence and spread of this libel, see C. Roth, *The Ritual Murder Libel and the Jew: The Report by Cardinal Lorenzo Ganganelli (Pope Clement XIV)* (London 1935); R. Po-Chia Hsia, *The Myth of Ritual Murder: Jews and Magic in Reformation Germany* (New Haven 1988); R. Po-Chia Hsia, *Trent 1475: Stories of a Ritual Murder Trial* (New Haven 1992); J. Fraenkel, *The Damascus Affair: "Ritual Murder," Politics, and the Jews in 1840* (Cambridge 1997); S. Friedman, *The Incident at Massena: The Blood Libel in America* (New York 1978).

[76] Many modern horror stories, particularly some of the works of M.R. James and H. P. Lovecraft, depend for the intensity of their feeling on a similar irruption of a terrible practice or power into an otherwise familiar or domestic setting.

Virgin sacrifice

The victims of the *tyche* sacrifices are maidens not merely because *tyche* is a feminine word grammatically and the concept is personified as a woman iconographically. *Virgo* was one of the titles of the goddess *Fortuna*, the Roman equivalent of *Tyche*.[77] Popular wisdom, exemplified in the novels, held that the proper victim of human sacrifice is a virgin (just as the correct animal should be 'undefiled' and never have been 'brought under the yoke'). In Achilles Tatius' novel Leucippe is selected as a sacrificial victim because of her virginity, and Heliodorus describes the elaborate test of virginity to which the Ethiopians subject their sacrificial victims.[78] Moreover, the subject of virgin sacrifice is, like human sacrifice, a means of manipulating the sentiments of the reader, and of indicating the tyranny of the sacrificer.

It is perhaps worth noting that in the Greek and Roman imagination the victims of human sacrifice were not exclusively female. From the earliest literary instances in the *Iliad* to charges against magicians under the Empire there were numerous examples of males as the victims of ritual killing, quite possibly equalling female victims in distribution.[79] Of course, the victims of the *tyche* sacrifices are all female because they are supposed to be depicted in the statues of various civic *tychai*, which are consistently female. But there is also a certain romantic — potentially pornographic — appeal in a female sacrificial victim, or a woman in danger, at any rate.[80]

[77] Plutarch, *Quaest. Rom.* 74 (281D), *Fort. Rom.* 10 (322F–323A) reports *Fortuna Virgo* as παρθένος Τύχη, and παρθένος is used of a number of the victims of *tyche* sacrifice. On *Fortuna Virgo*, see J. Champeaux, *Fortuna: recherches sur le culte de la Fortune à Rome et dans le monde romain des origines à la mort de César* (Roma 1982–87) vol. 1, 268–74. On the distinction between the Roman *Fortuna* and the Greek *Tyche*, see K. Latte, *Römische Religionsgeschichte* (München 1960) 176–83.

[78] Achilles Tatius, 3.12; Heliodorus, *Aeth.*, 9.1.25, 10.7–9.

[79] Examples of male sacrificial victims, or prospective victims, include Heracles at the altar of Busiris, Orestes and Pylades in *Iphigenia in Tauris*, the twelve Trojan youths in the *Iliad*, the Lydian youths in the story of Croesus (Herodotus, 1.86.2), the three Persian princes in Plutarch's account of Themistocles, and Theagenes in the final book of Heliodorus's *Aethiopica*. There are also examples from other cultures of which the Greeks and Romans would have been aware: Isaac, the king of Moab's son, and the infant sons of the Carthaginian nobility. Boys or youthful males seem to predominate as the victims of sacrifices for magical purposes.

[80] The appeal of a 'damsel in distress' in some horrific situation hardly requires explanation, it remains constant to the present day. As R. Florescu, *In Search of*

Kilmer's analysis of the Kleophrades Painter's depiction of the rape of Cassandra, in which the victim is likewise a virgin, the sexual aspect of the situation is obvious, her vulnerability is accentuated, and her role as a prophetess and the setting at the cult statue of Athena (a virgin goddess) imply a perversion of religious ritual — despite the gulf of time — suggests that even if the *tyche* sacrifices are supposed to be sexually exciting, in the context of Graeco-Roman society, they are intended to elicit not sadistic lust, but eroticized sympathy for the victim as a beautiful woman.[81] Evidence for the preponderance of the appeal of virgin sacrificial victims

Frankenstein (Boston 1975) 195, comments on the Hammer horror films: "almost all of the horror films turned out by Hammer Films tended to exploit the physical attributes of their leading ladies. Somehow it seemed a more henious crime if the victims of the monster turned out to have amply proportioned and generously exposed bosoms. It was gratuitous, to be sure, but it added enormously to the popularity of the films." Scantily clad heroines facing hair-raising dangers were ubiquitous on the covers and in the pages of the immensely popular pulp magazines; see P. Haining, *The Classic Era of American Pulp Magazines* (Chicago 2000). It is also possible that the sacrifice of Polyxena is eroticized by the exposure of her breasts (Euripides, *Hecuba* 557–65), but it might also suggest her *andreia*, as she exposes the region in which a mortal blow would be dealt to a warrior; see Loraux, *Tragic Ways*, 57–61. The male victims of human sacrifice might have held the same appeal to the more catholic sexual appetites of certain circles in the Graeco-Roman world. In one of the fragments of Iamblichus' *Babyloniaca* (Extract 2) a character opines that fear and bonds make a prisoner, a male slave, more attractive, and C. Williams, *Roman Homosexuality: Ideologies of Masculinity in Classical Antiquity* (Oxford 1999) 104–7, notes that little distinction was made between women and freeborn young men as victims of rape in wartime.

[81] 'Rape of Cassandra' by the Kleophrades Painter = Kilmer, R321; Naples 2422. See M. Kilmer, "Sexual Violence: Archaic Athens and the Recent Past" in *'Owls to Athens': Essays on Classical Subjects Presented to Sir Kenneth Dover*, ed. E. Craik (Oxford 1990) 273–75; M. Kilmer, *Greek Erotica on Red-Figure Vases* (London: Duckworth, 1993) 157–59. Closer to the fourth century spells of erotic magic prescribe that a model of the object of the magician's amorous attentions should be made as a bound figurine in clay, menaced with a sword by a figurine of Ares, and pierced with a number of bronze needles, but the manipulation of circumstances depicted as restraint and violence in these apparently sadistic ritual images is supposed to be realized as acquiescence, not force or compulsion; see F. Graf, *Magic in the Ancient World*, trans. F. Philip (Cambridge, MA 1997) 136–44. By analogy with modern slasher films, it is possible that the endangered female might elicit more than sympathy; C. Clover, *Men, Women, and Chain Saws: Gender in the Modern Horror Film* (Princeton 1992) explores "the possibility that male viewers are quite prepared to identify not just with screen females, but with screen females in the horror-film world, screen females in fear and pain" (5).

might also be found in the insistence of the modern Western imagination on conceiving of the victim of human sacrifice in tropical climes as a female virgin, whereas in actual practice Polynesian taboo demanded that the victim of human sacrifice be exclusively male, and considered his virginity indifferent.[82] We shall explore the significance and function of this romantic element at greater length below.

The immense dramatic potential of virgin sacrifice was by no means lost on the tragedians of Athens.[83] The sacrifice of Iphigenia was the most prominent, but not the only virgin sacrifice dealt with on the tragic stage. A distinction may be made in these treatments. As described by Aeschylus, the death of Iphigenia under compulsion and constraint (she is 'seized, hoisted, and gagged' over the altar) is like a murder, which ought to bring shame on those responsible for it, namely her father and the other kings. Euripides' sacrificial heroines, in contrast, go willingly to their deaths, with an acquiescence appropriate to a sacrificial victim, and consequently achieve a noble death and win 'glory'. The glory of the female victim easily supersedes that of her noble, male sacrificers.[84] In the tragic virgin

[82] For popular and influential examples of the western conception, see such films as 'King Kong' (RKO, 1933; remake Paramount, 1976), 'She Gods of Shark Reef' (American International, 1958). The seldom observed fact that women are not offered in sacrifice by the Polynesians is noted by R. Daggett in his introduction to H.M. King Kalakaua, *The Legends and Myths of Hawaii: The Fables and Folk-Lore of a Strange People* (New York 1888; repr. Honolulu 1990) 46, and by N. Emerson in the notes to his translation of D. Malo, *Hawaiian Antiquities (Moolelo Hawaii)* (Honolulu 1951; 1st pub. 1903) 183 n.34. The western public imposed ideas of their own on a culture which practised human sacrifice, and was not misinformed by their earliest observers of Polynesia. In their numerous mentions of human sacrifice as it was practiced in Tahiti and Hawaii, Cook's journals never refer to a female victim, in fact, they note in one instance that women were excluded from the ceremony of human sacrifice altogether; see *The Journals of Captain James Cook on his Voyages of Discovery*, ed. J.C. Beaglehole (Cambridge 1955–74) vol. 3 (*The Voyage of the* Resolution *and* Discovery *1776–1780*, 1967) 200, cf. 198–206, 978–84. On Hawaiian sacrifice generally, see V. Valeri, *Kingship and Sacrifice: Ritual and Society in Ancient Hawaii*, trans. Paula Wissing (Chicago 1985). The popular 'appeal' to the western imagination of the device of virgin sacrifice, to the moon, no less, and described in nuptial terms (see below), is also evident in the fact that it recurs in the popular stories of Robert E. Howard; see *The Savage Tales of Solomon Kane*, ed. R. Burke (New York 1998) 'The Moon of Skulls' (originally published in *Weird Tales*, June and July 1930) 129–30, 151–52, 'The Hawk of Basti' 261.

[83] See Loraux, *Tragic Ways*, 31–48.

[84] See Loraux, *Tragic Ways*, 42–48.

sacrifices of both Aeschylus and Euripides, however, our sympathies are supposed to rest with the victim, and her sacrificer is supposed to be vilified. Just so, in the *tyche* sacrifices our sympathies belong with the virgin girls, and our feelings are directed against the rulers who sacrifice them.

The ritual killing of virgins by vicious rulers was not, however, relegated to the mythical past. Domitian buried alive a reputedly defiled Vestal Virgin (possibly in AD 92).[85] Pliny protests her innocence, but even if there was some truth to the case, her guilt must have paled beside Domitian's own vices. In 213 Caracalla himself corrupted one of the Vestal Virgins, and then proceeded to bury her alive, along with two of her colleagues.[86] These monstrous acts were committed by notoriously despotic emperors, but by Roman emperors of the none too distant past, nevertheless. They must have both inspired and lent weight to the charges Bouttios apparently leveled against all pagan rulers, irrespective of their reputation for good or bad. These stories should also remind us of the deep sense of outrage with which Graeco-Roman society reacted to the violation of respectable women, particularly of virgins, and especially by abusive rulers.[87] Rape or murder made heroines of the victims, and tyrants of the perpetrators, from the son of Tarquin and Appius Claudius to the rivals of Constantine.[88]

Virginity was an important subject of Christian discourse when Bouttios wrote, and this can hardly have failed to have some impact on how the virgin victims of the *tyche* sacrifices were viewed. As Averil Cameron has said, the general theme of virginity "as a subject of treatises and exhortations achieved its greatest success precisely in the fourth century, especially in the second half, when scarcely any major Christian figure

[85] Pliny, *Epist.*, 4.11; Suet., *Domit.* 8.3–4; Cassius Dio, 60.3.4(3[2]). On the execution of Vestal Virgins see J. Balsdon, *Roman Women: Their History and Habits* (New York 1962) 238–42.

[86] Cassius Dio, 78.16.1–3.

[87] An exclusive reading in the myths of Ovid and Nonnus, in which rape is often as playful as it is frequent, might anaesthetize us to the regularly disturbed reaction of the ancients to rape.

[88] On the rape of Lucretia by Sextus Tarquinius, see Livy, 1.57–60; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 4.64–85. On the attempted rape of Verginia by Appius Claudius, see Livy, 3.44–658; Diodorus Siculus, 12.24; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 12.28–49. On the seductions and adulteries of Maxentius, see Eusebius, *H.E.* 8.14.2, 17, *V.C.* 1.33–34, and of Maximin, see *H.E.* 8.14.14–16; cf. *L.C.* 7.7.

neglected to write about it."[89] In addition to the "treatises and exhortations," as Cameron herself makes clear, virginity was also a central topic in many of the apocryphal *Acts* of the Apostles, composed in the second and third centuries. In the apocryphal *Acts* we often find that a new female convert must maintain her continence in opposition to powerful members of the Roman government and the civic elite.[90] In the *Acts of Andrew*, after her healing and conversion Maximilla denies intercourse to her husband, Aegeastes, the proconsul at Patras.[91] Even more strikingly, Thecla, according to the *Acts of Paul and Thecla*, perseveres in her virginity, despite proposals from eligible men prominent in the city and the importuning and threats of Roman governors in favour of a marriage. As a result of her refusal Thecla is sentenced—not once, but twice—to death, and is only saved by miraculous means.[92] (Thecla, it is noteworthy, was also mentioned in Gregory of Nazianzus' sermons against Julian, further suggesting some affinity with the *tyche* sacrifices, which were, we shall suggest, also directed against Julian.[93])

On Kate Cooper's reading, these confrontations serve to dramatize an ethical conflict between the celebration of sexuality which ensured the continuity of the city in its families and institutions on the one hand, and the renunciation of sexuality as part of a challenge to the established social order on the other. A more superficial, but no less compelling, reading suggests that the *Acts* pursue the same topic as the *tyche* sacrifice narratives: an opposition between rulers and virgins, in which the virgins are the imperiled heroines. The close connection between Christian virgin martyrs and the *tyche* sacrifices seems almost explicit in that Trajan's *tyche* sacrifice at Antioch is followed almost immediately by an account of the execution

[89] A. Cameron, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse* (Berkeley 1991) 171. For discussions of the early Christian discourse on virginity, see A. Cameron, "Virginity as Metaphor: women and the rhetoric of early Christianity" in *History as Text: The Writing of Ancient History*, ed. A. Cameron (Chapel Hill 1989) 181–205; Cameron, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire*, 171–88; K. Cooper, *The Virgin and the Bride: Idealized Womanhood in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, MA 1996).

[90] See Cooper, *The Virgin and the Bride*, 45–67. Cf. M. Aubin, "Reversing Romance? The Acts of Thecla and the Ancient Novel" in *Ancient Fiction and Early Christian Narrative*, ed. R. Hock, et al. (Atlanta 1998) 257–72.

[91] *Passion of Andrew* 14, 16, 17, 23, 36–37, 46; see D. MacDonald, *The Acts of Andrew and the Acts of Andrew and Matthias in the City of the Cannibals* (Atlanta 1990).

[92] *Acts of Paul and Thecla* 20–21, 27.

[93] Greg. Naz., *Or.* 4.69.

of five Christian women for their faith, and the mention of the martyrdom of St. Drosine and other virgins.[94] We do not need to suggest that Bouttios is participating in a subversive or anti-authoritarian discourse (the praise of virginity had, after all, become the authoritative social norm by his time), only that he referred to the popular *Acts* in characterizing pagan rulers as the villains of his piece.

The imagination of antiquity expected the victims of human sacrifice to be virgins, but Bouttios uses this expectation, as well as the necessity that they should be female, to expand the referential field of his *tyche* sacrifice narratives. The virgin victims allude to the sacrificial heroines of tragedy, the Vestal victims of the despotism of Domitian and Caracalla, and the virgin martyrs of the apocryphal *Acts*, as well as exploiting the appealing image of a female sacrificial victim. All of this makes the victim the object of our sympathies, and makes the ruler who sacrifices her out to be not a legitimate ruler at all, but a tyrant.

Foundation sacrifices

Associated as they are with new cities and new buildings, the *tyche* sacrifices also serve as foundation sacrifices. There is widespread anthropological evidence for sacrifices, even of humans and virgins in particular, being offered in conjunction with laying a foundation stone or inaugurating a new construction,[95] but no indisputable evidence for human foundation sacrifices in Greece itself. The young woman found buried, along with a man and four horses, in the tenth-century 'Heroon' at Lefkandi on Euboia might be construed as a foundation sacrifice (the pit in which she was interred is close to a central supporting post), but it is equally possible that she was offered as a burial sacrifice for her male companion or that she

[94] Malalas, 11.10.

[95] See P. Sartori, "Über das Bauopfer" *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 30 (1898) 1–54; Davies (1981) 21–22, 43, 277–78; Burkert, *Homo Necans* 39 and n.17; Tierney, *The Highest Altar* 21 and n. 18, 201, 372. I was surprised to find that when I related the topic of my research to a neighbour from Guinea-Bissau, he was able to tell me about an event that occurred during a war between the Fulani and the Mandinka in his country. The Fulani king set about building a fortress at Kansala, and sacrificed and buried four virgins (in a standing position) in the four corners of the fortification. These foundation sacrifices were performed about 1900, or near the beginning of the Colonial period, and the report of these events was offered to my neighbour by the grandson of the Fulani king.

was buried separately after a natural death.[96] Human foundation sacrifice was practised at a very early period in the Near East, but was largely replaced by the offering of substitute figures.[97] The Greeks did adopt, at a much later time, the Near Eastern custom of depositing valuables as a foundation sacrifice.[98] The Greeks also made animal sacrifices at the founding of buildings, especially temples, well into the historical period.[99] Animal sacrifices are also associated with the inauguration of new cities in legend and history.[100]

The possibility of a memory of practice in the remote past or extrapolation from the well-attested practice of animal sacrifice is hardly necessary to explain the idea of human foundation sacrifice in the *tyche* narratives. The folk belief that it was necessary to somehow secure a human life within a new construction in order to ensure its durability persisted in Greece and the Balkans at least until the end of the nineteenth century. In addition to applying the blood of a sacrificed animal to the corner stone, in nineteenth-century Greece builders would try to set the foundation stone over a man's shadow, or measure a man's shadow or his person and bury the measure under the foundation stone. In Bulgaria and Romania builders measured a man's shadow with a string and built the string into the wall of a new edifice. Certain people made a profession of supplying builders with such strings. Wherever these practices were known, the person whose shadow was thus manipulated was expected to die within a set period of time. His shadow represented his soul, and his life and vigour were transferred to the new building.[101] The same idea is found in the folklore motif of "the walled-up wife," pervasive throughout Greece and the

[96] See M. Popham, et al. "The Hero of Lefkandi" *Antiquity* 56 (1982) 169–74; Hughes, *Human Sacrifice* 46–47; Henrichs, "Demythologizing the Past" 228.

[97] H. Müller-Karpe, *Handbuch der Vorgeschichte* (München 1968) vol. 2 (Jungsteinzeit) 336, 351, 361.

[98] W. Burkert, *The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age*, trans. M. Pinder & W. Burkert (Cambridge, MA 1992) 53–55.

[99] M. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* (München 1955) vol. 1, 404 and n. 10; Burkert, *The Orientalizing Revolution* 54–55.

[100] Aeneas was supposed to have sacrificed a sow and her litter to Juno at the future site of Alba Longa (Verg. *Aen.* 8.42–85), and Cadmus sacrificed a cow at the site of Thebes (Nonn. *Dion.* 4.305–6, 311–55, 5.1–34). Arrian indicates that Alexander made sacrifices at the foundations of Alexandria ad Aegyptum and Alexandria Eschate; *Anab.* 3.1.5, 4.4.1.

[101] J. Frazer, *The Golden Bough* (London: MacMillan, 1911; 3rd edition) vol. 3, 89–91.

Balkans.[102] In the folk tales which contain this motif a master builder must wall up hi wife in the bridge, monastery, or fortress is is building in order to secure its stability. This folk belief seems to contain the best explanation of why Bouttios should suggest, and perhaps expect his readers to believe, that the initiation of a *tyche* image and cult, which was supposed to personify the city and ensure its prosperity and perpetuation (as the man whose shadow had been stolen or the immured wife was to do for the new construction), in almost every case necessitated a human sacrifice. I assume here that this folk practice preserves ritual and belief from a period when foundation sacrifices were actually performed by the Greeks (although with an animal substituted for a human victim). But it is also possible, of course, that this folk practice arose from fictions of human sacrifice such as those of Bouttios.

The *tyche* sacrifices as foundation sacrifices may also have been a means of denigrating the building projects of pagan emperors. Some treatment of the subject's building activity is a standard part of the *basilikos logos*, the formal, rhetorical encomium of a ruler.[103] The building projects of Constantine, almost entirely churches, are lavishly praised by Eusebius in this style.[104] Julian's Christian detractors were quick to point out that on this same count his efforts were a dismal failure. An earthquake wrecked the martyrium he tried to build.[105] Bouttios, as we shall see, makes much of the contrast between Constantine and Julian. But the building program of Constantine, particularly as it was praised by Eusebius, might itself be open to criticism since the churches he built accommodated only a special group of citizens, and not the general public.[106] Bouttios nullifies the achievement of pagan emperors by suggesting that their building projects, no matter how broad their appeal, are contaminated by human sacrifice. It is not irrelevant in this regard that Tiberius sacrificed a girl in connection with his construction of a theatre in Antioch, which was completed by Trajan, who also carried out a *tyche* sacrifice in Antioch.[107] The theatre, a frequent target

[102] See A. Dundes, ed., *The Walled-Up Wife: a Casebook* (Madison 1996).

[103] See A. Cameron and S. Hall, *Eusebius,* Life of Constantine*: translation, introduction, and commentary* (Oxford 1999) 31–32.

[104] Euseb., *L.C.* 9.14–17, *V.C.* 2.45.2–46, 3.1.4, 25–43.4, 47.4–53.4, 4.58–60.

[105] Greg. Naz., *Or.* 4.24–26.

[106] Jul. *Misop.* 346C, professed to feel the pressure to celebrate those festivals which might be enjoyed by all citizens, not only particularly religious polytheists.

[107] Malalas, 10.10, 11.9.

of the criticism of churchmen,[108] was doubly damnable as an imperial building project if it was also founded on human blood.

Modern fiction also indicates that the idea of human foundation sacrifice would have contributed to the underlying sense of horror which Bouttios sought to achieve.[109]

Human sacrifice and the *tyche* cult

It remains to be seen why sacrifices of the type we have described should be connected with the *tyche* cult. Our answers at present are only speculative, but they might help us toward an explanation of Bouttios' narratives. In the first place, it is possible that the fourth-century imagination associated the *tyche* with the moon, and moon worship, in turn, with virgin sacrifice. Sallustius, a member of Julian's circle and writing in his reign, says that the power of fortune (*tyche*) resides in the moon, or, perhaps, extends as far as the moon.[110] Macrobius straightforwardly equates *Tyche* (he uses the Greek term, rather than the Latin *Fortuna*) with the moon.[111] In Heliodorus' novel, the Ethiopians intend to sacrifice the virgin Charicleia to the moon.[112] According to the rumour reported by Theodoret, Julian sacrificed a woman in a temple at Carrhae,[113] and Carrhae was famous for its temple of the Moon.[114] This association of the *tyche* cult with the moon, and of moon

[108] See Tertullian, *De Spectaculis*; Novatian, *De Spectaculis*; John Chrysostom, *Contra ludos et theatra* (*PG* 56, 263–70); H. Jürgens, *Pompa diaboli: Die lateinischen Kirchenväter und das antike Theater* (Stuttgart 1972); C. Schnusenberg, *The Relationship between the Church and the Theatre: Exemplified by Selected Writings of the Church Fathers and by Liturgical Texts until Amalarius of Metz, 75–852 A.D.* (Lanham 1988) 1–53. Bloodshed and death were not, in actuality, altogether foreign to the theatre; Martial, *Spect.* 9 (7), remarks on an actual execution which took place in the context of a mime.

[109] The basic premise of Peter Ackroyd's novel, *Hawksmoor* (London 1985), is that each of the Restoration architect's London churches was founded with a human sacrifice.

[110] Sallustius, 9: ἐν σελήνῃ δὲ τὴν δύναμιν ἔχει, ἐπειδὴ ὑπὲρ σελήνην οὐδὲ ἓν ἐκ τύχης ἂν γένοιτο; see A. Nock, *Sallustius, Concerning the Gods and the Universe* (London 1926) lxxv, 20–21.

[111] Macrobius, *Sat.* 1.19.17: Δαίμονα Τύχην Ἔρωτα Ἀνάγκην, *et duo priores solem ac lunam intellegi volunt, ... luna* Τύχη, *quia corporum praesul est quae fortuitorum varietate iactantur.*

[112] Heliodorus, *Aeth.* 10.4, cf. 6.

[113] Theodoret, *H.E.* 3.21.

[114] Herodian, 4.13.3, says that the temple of the Moon goddess at Carrhae was the principal cult centre of that region, and the fame of the temple can only have

worship with virgin sacrifice can only have been an initial inspiration for the *tyche* sacrifice narratives, because, of course, Bouttios' virgins are not sacrificed *to* the *tyche*, rather by being sacrificed they become *tychai*.

In the Andes, from Incan until modern times, human sacrifices have been made in order procure luck or good fortune (what the Greeks might have called *tyche*) for the person who performs or patronizes the sacrifice.[115] The sacrificial victim becomes a divinity in this process, and himself bestows the luck on his sacrificers and other devotees in perpetuity.[116] In certain instances there is an insistence that the victim must be a young woman, since she is supposed to be married to the god or spirit to whom she is offered.[117] Grisly reports of a similar nature from India indicate that such beliefs and practices are not necessarily isolated to South America.[118]

It is a long way from the Andes to Antioch, but the parallels we find are instructive, and many of the details of South American ritual would hardly have been foreign to the ancient Mediterranean. It is clear that Bouttios envisages the *tyche* sacrifices as situations remarkably similar to the Andean sacrifices: the virgin is sacrificed in order to produce good luck, indeed, *the* good luck of the city personified, and the victim is deified, with the full apparatus of cult including a cult statue and sacrifices. Bouttios also presents the *tyche* sacrifice as, in a way, a marriage. Trajan celebrates a bridal procession for Calliope as part of her *tyche* sacrifice.[119] The understanding of virgin sacrifice as a kind of 'marriage to death' or defloration (we have already noted the affinities between rape and the *tyche*

increased when Caracalla was assassinated on his way to sacrifice there (Herodian, 4.13.3–8). *Hist. Aug., Carac.* 6.6, 7.1, notes that Caracalla was assassinated on his way from Edessa to Carrhae to worship the moon god, and includes some arcana on the moon cult. Cf. Libanius, *Or.* 30.7, 8. See T. Green, *The City of the Moon God: Religious traditions of Harran* (Leiden 1992) 27.

[115] Tierney, *The Highest Altar* 333, 336, 361–63.

[116] Tierney, *The Highest Altar* 33–41, 320.

[117] Tierney, *The Highest Altar* 346–51, 358.

[118] A. Atapur, "Killing for 'Mother' Kali" *Time Asia*, Jul. 22, 2002.

[119] Malalas, 11.9. Calliope's bridal procession may have been supposed to be somewhat analogous to the Boeotian Daedala ceremony in which the Daedala, a wooden image dressed as a bride, was led in a ceremony imitating the marriage rites to an altar, sacrifices were performed, and then everything, image, altar, and sacrificial animals, were destroyed by fire; see W. Burkert, *Greek Religion*, trans. J. Raffan (Oxford 1985) 135.

sacrifices) was by no means uncommon in antiquity.[120] The *tyche* sacrifice as marriage, moreover, might be intended to explain a potential iconographic anomaly: the girls are sacrificed as virgins to become *tychai*, but, as Bouttios and his readers would have been very well aware, the civic *tyche* was depicted as a matron, rather than as a maiden. This makes perfect sense, however, if the sacrifice is also something of a marriage ceremony, and the virgin becomes a matron (a possessor and dispenser of goods, the lady of a — civic — household) and as such fulfills her role as *tyche*.

No exact parallel to the *tyche* sacrifices and their rationale is obvious in the Graeco-Roman world, but the case of Antinous is close. According to Cassius Dio, the truth concerning the death of Hadrian's 'beloved' in 130 was that the youth had been offered as a sacrifice to satisfy Hadrian's appetite for magic spells and divination. As a result, Hadrian built a city named after him at the place where he died and established a cult in his honour, with his sacred images gracing nearly the whole world.[121] The points of comparison are evident: a youth is sacrificed by a ruler; the victim becomes divine, or at least an object of worship, after death; if not married in death, he does become conjoined with Hadrian's godhead through his sacrifice; and his sacrifice is associated with a city foundation (like many of the cities founded with *tyche* sacrifices, Antinoopoolis was established on the site of a previous village). There was also some association of the *tyche* and Antinous inasmuch as a *tyche* figure was represented on the reverse of some coins depicting Antinous on the obverse.[122] The example of Antinous would have suited the polemic of Bouttios, since Christian authors especially considered Hadrian's relationship with the youth and his public

[120] See Loraux, *Tragic Ways* 37–42; D. Fowler, "Virgil on Killing Virgins" in *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble*, ed. M. Whitby, et al. (Bristol 1987) 185–98; R. Rehm, *Marriage to Death: The Conflation of Wedding and Funeral Rituals in Greek Tragedy* (Princeton 1994).

[121] Cassius Dio, 69.11.2–4; cf. *Hist. Aug., Hadrian* 14.5–6. On the death and deification of Antinous, see R. Lambert, *Beloved and God: The Story of Hadrian and Antinous* (New York 1984) esp. 128–54, 177–97; M. Boatwright, *Hadrian and the City of Rome* (Princeton 1987) 239–60. On the foundation of Antinoopolis, see H. Bell, "Antinoopolis: A Hadrianic Foundation in Egypt" *JRS* 30 (1940) 133–47; Lambert, *Beloved and God* 198–208; M. Boatwright, *Hadrian and the Cities of the Roman Empire* (Princeton 2000) 190–96.

[122] Specifically the coins of Philadelphia in Mysia; see G. Blum, "Numismatique d'Antinoos" *Journal international d'archéologie numismatique* 16 (1914) 49, planche 3, 14.

and unmeasured grief for him one of the most disreputable deeds of any emperor.[123]

Overall composition

We have suggested above that Bouttios' making villains of the perpetrators of human sacrifice and direction of the readers' sympathies toward the victim lend a romantic aspect to the accounts of *tyche* sacrifice. Virgin sacrifice, however, properly belongs to romance inasmuch as, at the climax of the narrative, the actual sacrifice of the heroine is averted in the nick of time by the arrival of the hero. But in each instance of the *tyche* sacrifice there is no rescue, and the emphasis seems to be on the grisly rite and not the maiden's vulnerability. This might seem to suggest that the *tyche* sacrifices are intended merely as an attack on the origins of the *tyche* cult, appealing to the ancient appreciation for the macabre,[124] and that they cannot properly be described as 'romantic'. Unless, that is, Constantine's 'bloodless sacrifice' and the new *tyche* of Constantinople are seen to constitute the climax of Bouttios' history of *tyche* sacrifices. The previous *tyche* sacrifices allow the audience to realize the peril facing the heroine at the climax because they have already seen a number of maidens fall victim to the same danger under similar circumstances, with no hero to rescue them. Constantine's act of romantic heroism lies in that, shunning human sacrifice, or pagan blood sacrifice of any kind, he rescues Anthousa (if Constantinople's *tyche*, like the previous ones, was supposed to be named after an actual girl[125]) or any prospective victim, and, by introducing a new way to establish *tychai*, all future victims. And so the *tyche* sacrifices, despite their obvious affinities with the 'penny dreadfuls,' are more than a simple catalogue of terrors; they are a preparation of the audience for the climactic heroism of Constantine.

[123] See A. Hermann, "Antinous infelix: Zur Typologie des Heiligen-Unheiligen in der Spätantike" in *Mullus: Festschrift Theodor Klauser*, ed. A. Stuiber & A. Hermann (Münster 1964) 155–67; P. Guyot, "Antinous als Eunuch: Zur christlichen Polemik gegen das Heidentum" *Historia* 30 (1981) 250–54.

[124] Strabo, 7.3.9, quoting Ephorus (*FGrH* 70 F 42), notes in regard to accounts of Scythian cannibalism that terrible and strange phenomena produce a vivid effect.

[125] No girl named Anthousa is mentioned in Malalas. 'Anthousa' is the Greek equivalent of *Flora*, the 'sacred name' of Rome; see Alföldi (1948) 114; Dagron (1974) 44, 45. It is possible that no actual girl was described as being present at the inauguration of Constantinople's *tyche*, but this does not seem altogether consistent with the literal-mindedness displayed in the rest of the *tyche* sacrifice narratives.

There are a number of incidents in the ancient novels which follow a similar pattern. The heroine is about to be sacrificed or ritually killed, the audience is made to realize the danger she is in, and the hero arrives to rescue her in the nick of time.[126] In the novels there is also a pronounced erotic aspect to these incidents. In the *Ephesiaca* of Xenophon of Ephesus, Anthia, the virginal heroine, is captured by bandits and about to be sacrificed to Ares, her peril is realized through a detailed description of the sacrificial rite, at the last minute she is rescued by Perilaus, and this rescue leads to repeated proposals of marriage (which constitute the erotic aspect).[127] There is a similar narrative in both ps.-Lucian's *Onos* and the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius.[128] A maiden (Charite in Apuleius) is captured by bandits, and after an escape attempt they plan to sew her up in the belly of the ass (not a sacrifice, but a death deliberated to the point of ritual). The danger she faces is brought home to the reader through the suicide of the old crone who was guarding her, the bandits' callous treatment of her corpse, and the sadistic debate over the most appropriate method of death. But she is rescued by her fiancé, and a wedding follows. In Achilles Tatius' novel Leucippe is snatched away to serve as a virgin sacrifice, her peril is realized not only in the detailed description of the exotic sacrificial rite with its libations and Egyptian chanting, but also in the apparent performance of the sacrifice itself, leaping entrails and all (although the hero and the reader later discover that this was a sham).[129] The erotic aspect of this situation is only articulated later when Cleitophon refers to the dangers they have overcome, including human sacrifice and ritual murder, as an inducement to premature sexual union, which Leucippe demurely refuses.[130]

The pattern can be found not only in the narrative of the novels, but in the description of visual effects as well. Achilles Tatius describes two

[126] These incidents in the novels probably have their antecedents in the myths of Theseus and the Minotaur, and Perseus and Andromeda, but the monsters of the myths add another element to the basic narrative.

[127] Xenophon of Ephesus, 2.13.

[128] Ps.-Lucian, *Onos* 22–26; Apuleius, *Met.* 4.23–27, 6.25–7.13. Apuleius makes it clear that his bandits, like those in Xenophon, are devotees of Ares; see *Met.* 4.22, 7.5, 11. Lucius, the sometime ass, moreover, shows that virginity is important to the erotic aspect of the narrative, by demonstrating a great concern for the maiden's chastity when he suspects her of being a slattern when he sees her recognize her fiancé; *Met.* 7.11.

[129] Achilles Tatius, 3.12, 15.

[130] Achilles Tatius, 4.1.

pictures by the same artist, one of Andromeda and one of Prometheus.[131] These two pictures are united by the similar peril of their subjects: bound to rocks, menaced by beasts, and saved by Argive heroes. They are both depicted at the timely moment of salvation by Perseus and Heracles respectively. There is an erotic element in the depiction of Andromeda only. 'Lovely fear' accentuates her beauty (Prometheus' expression, by contrast, conveys only pain), and she is dressed in a wedding garment to be married to Hades. The erotic undertones of Andromeda's situation, moreover, might have been generally understood. The *Imagines* of Philostratus include Eros as the divine helper of Perseus, and say that the beauty of Andromeda was perfected by her mixed emotions of fear and joy at the moment of her rescue.[132] Heliodorus mentions a painting of Andromeda, depicted nude and only just rescued by Perseus, in the bedroom of the Ethiopian king and queen (while other scenes decorate less intimate parts of the palace), which catches the eye of the queen during sexual congress, and so might be intended as erotic art.[133]

The most effective means of having the audience realize the danger facing the heroine is for numerous doomed victims, like the *tyche* sacrifices, to suffer the very fate threatening her before her final salvation. This is a well-worn device in the repertoire of horror movies and thrillers.[134] There are no examples of such previous victims in the ancient novel, but this device is present in the very bedrock of Graeco-Roman literature. In the *Odyssey*, the audience knows what terrors await the hero in the cave of the

[131] Achilles Tatius, 3.6–8. See E. Harlan, *The Description of Paintings as a Literary Device and its Application in Achilles Tatius* (Columbia University: Ph.D. diss., 1965) 107–22; S. Bartsch, *Decoding the Ancient Novel: The Reader and the Role of Description in Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius* (Princeton 1989) 46, 49, 54–62.

[132] Philostratus, *Imag.* 1.29. See Bartsch (1989) 54, 71.

[133] Heliodorus, *Aeth.* 4.8. See Bartsch (1989) 48.

[134] Two pertinent examples might be offered, one from a classic of horror literature, and one from the popular cinema. In Bram Stoker's *Dracula*, Lucy Westenra succumbs to the ghastly fate from which the heroes of the piece are only just able to save Mina Harker. On account of the first victim the audience fully appreciates the peril of the one who is saved and the urgency of the efforts to save her. In one scene from 'Indiana Jones and the Temple of Doom' (Paramount Pictures 1984), a film in which human sacrifice plays a significant part, the hero and the heroine, as well as the audience, witness a human sacrifice successfully carried out with great solemnity, so that all parties are fully aware of the danger facing the heroine when, in a later scene, she is about to be sacrificed in the same manner, and the rite is interrupted in the nick of time by the hero.

Cyclops because they first witness the death of Odysseus' companions at the hands of Polyphemus, before Odysseus, who is explicitly reserved for the last, manages to save himself.[135] An even more apposite example is found in Pausanias' story of the ghost at Temesa.[136] According to Pausanias, one of the crew of Odysseus raped a girl at Temesa and was consequently stoned to death by the locals. His ghost (*daimon* is the word used in Greek) began indiscriminately killing the people of Temesa, until they built a temple to him and began to offer him the most beautiful virgin as a wife every year. This continues until the boxer Euthymus, some time in the fifth century B.C., arrived, fought the ghost and drove him into the sea, and married the virgin intended for the ghost. Pausanias also describes a picture of the ghost: black in colour, frightful in appearance, and garbed in a wolf-skin. As in the *tyche* sacrifices, this story contains the killing in a formal religious context of virgin victims who are supposed to be married through the ritual, numerous previous victims since the legendary past, and an ultimate salvation by a hero. These examples from Homer and Pausanias show that Greek and Roman writers were aware of a device commonly used to evoke horror, and one apparently used by Bouttios. By evoking a story like that found in Pausanias, moreover, Bouttios implies that the *tyche*, rather than a benevolent or even capricious power, is a dark and malicious spirit, like the ghost, and seems to echo Eusebius' assertion that demons are the real instigators and recipients of blood sacrifice, including human sacrifice.[137]

When the *tyche* sacrifice narratives are read altogether, Constantine's initiation of Constantinople's *tyche* without a virgin sacrifice becomes not merely one more incident, but the heroic climax, on the model of the rescues in the novel, of a grisly history of foundations accompanied by human sacrifice.[138] Such a climactic abolition of human sacrifice has further

[135] *Od.*, 9.216–479.

[136] Pausanias, 6.6.7–11. The story is also found in Strabo, 6.1.5 and Aelian, *VH* 8.18, although without the element of virgin sacrifice (the Temesans are said, rather, to pay a tribute to the ghost). See J. Frazer, *Pausanias' Description of Greece* (London 1913) vol. 4, 23–24; D. Felton, *Haunted Greece and Rome* (Austin 1999) 26–27.

[137] Eusebius, *LC* 2.5, 7.6.

[138] It is tempting to look for parallels in the story of St. George as another example of the Christian appropriation of the 'romantic rescue' from Greek myth and fiction in late antiquity, but this is not a contemporary phenomenon. The legend of St. George begins to exhibit these traits at a much later date than the *tyche* sacrifice narratives. As E. Budge, *George of Lydda, the Patron Saint of England: A Study in the Cultus of St. Geoge in Ethiopia* (London 1930) 40, indicates "[t]he

affinities with the novel inasmuch as at the climax of Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* the Ethiopian priest, Sisimithres, sees the events of the romance as conspiring to convince the Ethiopians to give up their ancestral practice of human sacrifice.[139] The *tyche* sacrifices which precede the foundation of Constantinople are not only examples of the pagan wickedness abolished by Constantine, they also give a vivid impression of the dangers from which Constantine has rescued an imperiled heroine, be it a girl by the name of Anthousa or innocent maidenhood generally. Bouttios does not, however, fully exploit the erotic aspect of the rescue from virgin sacrifice found in the novels. The sympathies of Bouttios' readers are directed toward a lovely victim, but, as is appropriate for an emperor, the benefits of Constantine's heroism are not enjoyed by himself alone, but by his people as a whole.

Constantine and the *tyche* sacrifices

The presentation of Constantine as a hero at the climax of the accounts of *tyche* sacrifice is perfectly consistent with the polemical tone and intent which characterized much of the historiography of the fourth and fifth centuries. This polemic was, of course, an expression of the contention between traditional Graeco-Roman polytheism and Christianity, and much of its rhetoric polarized around the political champions of the two parties.[140] On the one hand, there was Eusebius' insistence that the Roman Empire, Christianized by Constantine, marked the culmination of world history, and Orosius' refutation of the pagan charge that the neglect of the traditional cults had brought about the troubles which beset the empire in his day by showing that wars and disasters were at least as frequent in the past.[141] On the other hand, Eunapius — and to a lesser extent his follower Zosimus — vented his hatred of Christianity as a destructive innovation, vilified

version of the legend of George which makes him fight a dragon is older by centuries than that which makes him rescue a princess from a dragon. General currency was given to the latter form by Jacobus de Voragine," the thirteenth-century author of the *Legenda Aurea*.

[139] *Aeth.* 10.39; see R. Hunter, "The *Aithiopika* of Heliodorus: beyond interpretation?" in *Studies in Heliodorus*, ed. R. Hunter (Cambridge 1998) 58–59; J. Winkler, "The Mendacity of Kalasiris and the Narrative Strategy of Heliodoros' *Aithiopika*" in *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel*, ed. S. Swain (Oxford 1999) 344–48.

[140] Cameron and Hall, *Eusebius* 30–31, note that the use of *Lives* as vehicles for ideological messages was popular in the fourth century.

[141] See Chesnut, "Eusebius, Augustine, Orosius," 687–713.

Constantine as a tyrant, and portrayed Julian as a model of every virtue.[142] The depiction of Constantine as a singular hero who revolted against the depredations of his pagan predecessors which we have perceived in the fragments of Bouttios easily finds a place amidst the rhetorical battles which accompanied the waning of polytheism and the consolidation of Christian power around the turn of the fifth century. Bouttios' portrait of Constantine, moreover, agrees with the praise bestowed on that emperor, especially by Eusebius, not merely in broad outline, but in detail as well.[143]

The rhetoric of 'bloodless sacrifice' which might be considered one of the few identifying features of Bouttios' depiction of Constantine, also figures in Eusebius' laudatory treatments of the career of Constantine. In the *Life of Constantine* the emperor's prayers and thanksgiving to God, his banquet with the bishops, and the prayers of the bishops are all described as acceptable sacrifices, either 'sacrifices without fire or smoke' or 'bloodless sacrfices'.[144] In a letter to the Persian king, quoted by Eusebius, Constantine contrasts his prayers to God with the blood and foul odours of sacrifice.[145] The 'bloodless sacrifices' in the *Praise of Constantine* have an even closer bearing on the 'sacrifice' which inaugurates the *tyche* of Constantinople. In this work, Eusebius describes Constantine as rejecting ancient usage and celebrating his Tricennalia not with bloody sacrifices to ghouls, demons, and false gods, but with the devotion of his 'kingly soul' and his mind to the Supreme God as a sacrifice 'without fire and the shedding of blood'. And God is supposed to accept this sacrifice and extend the reign of Constantine.[146] Christ alone, says Eusebius, teaches his followers to offer 'bloodless and rational sacrifices' (ἀναίμους δὲ καὶ λογικὰς θυσίας) through their prayers and the silent contemplation of God. These 'bloodless sacrifices,' offered on altars in churches throughout the world, have displaced gory animal sacrifice, as well as the cruel, mad practice of human sacrifice.[147]

[142] See R. Blockley, *The Fragmentary Classicizing Historians of the Later Roman Empire: Eunapius, Olympiodorus, Priscus and Malchus* (Liverpool 1981) vol. i, 2, 3, 7, 19–23, 88–89.

[143] A. Cameron, "Form and Meaning: the *Vita Constantini* and the *Vita Antonii*" in *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity*, ed. T. Hägg and P. Rousseau (Berkeley 2000) 72–88, reviews previous work on the subject, and brings out the selective focus of the *Life of Constantine* as a hybrid of panegyric and historical documentation.

[144] Euseb., *VC* 1.53.1–2, 3.15.1, 4.45.2.

[145] Euseb., *VC* 4.10.1.

[146] Euseb., *LC* 2.5, 3.1.

[147] Euseb., *LC* 16.9–10.

Human sacrifice recurs in the *Praise of Constantine* as a feature of pagan wickedness which has been dispelled by the Christianity which Constantine promotes. Ancient pagan rulers, deceived by demons, those 'spiritual barbarians,' offered their own people as sacrifices to the gods and made war against the champions of truth.[148] A catalogue of human sacrifice is recited as a contribution to the evils and miseries of the world which prompted the merciful Incarnation of the *Logos*.[149] And the Crucifixion and the Resurrection of the Saviour serve as an apotropaic aversion of the human sacrifices which used to be performed.[150] Here, as in Bouttios, we have human sacrifice habitually performed by pagan rulers, and its cessation noted as a singular event, the consequence of Christianity.

The Christian concern with virginity, which plays a part in the *tyche* sacrifice narratives, also manifests itself in Eusebius' accounts of Constantine. Maxentius, the rival of Constantine, is said to wantonly violate the most respectable women, and resistance is only offered to him by those Christian women who would rather commit suicide than forfeit their chastity.[151] Constantine's victory, of course, saves Rome from such outrages. But Maxentius' crimes were not considered unique, rather they were part of the regular state of the fallen world.[152] Constantine also modified the law so as to improve the legal position of those who had chosen a life of virginity, whom he held in particularly high regard.[153] Maxentius, like Trajan and other virgin-sacrificers in Bouttios, is emblematic of the attacks on virginity by pagan rulers which are finally defeated by Constantine.

We have seen that in the overall composition of the accounts of *tyche* sacrifice Constantine holds a unique place as a hero in the romantic mold who overturns the wicked rites of his predecessors. The biography of Constantine likewise presents him as unique, the superior of his forebears, and an innovator who undoes the evils of his rivals.[154] The literary genre demanded that the subject of an encomium should be favourably contrasted with his predecessors,[155] but the *Life of Constantine* sees Constantine as

[148] Euseb., *LC* 7.5–6.

[149] Euseb., *LC* 13.6b–8; cf. 13.15–16. See H. Drake, *In Praise of Constantine: A Historical Study and New Translation of Eusebius' Tricennial Orations* (Berkeley 1976) 176–77.

[150] Euseb., *LC* 15.11–13. See Drake (1976) 178–79.

[151] Euseb., *VC* 1.33–34; cf. *HE* 8.14.2.

[152] Euseb., *LC* 7.7.

[153] Euseb., *VC* 4.26.3, 28. See Cameron & Hall, *Eusebius,* 321–23.

[154] See Cameron "Form and Meaning," 83.

[155] See Cameron & Hall, *Eusebius* 33 and n. 114.

unique. He is the only emperor to whom God revealed the true religion and whom God made his herald, alone among emperors he received baptism, and alone among mortals he reigned after his death.[156] Constantine is singularly superior, moreover, not only to previous Roman emperors, but also to kings throughout history, such as Alexander[157] — who appears in Bouttios as the perpetrator of a *tyche* sacrifice.

Constantine is presented as superior not only to his predecessors, but also to his rivals. These rivals, whom Constantine must defeat in order to achieve sole rule, are depicted in turn not merely as political enemies, but as tyrants and persecutors of the Church who make war on God.[158] Maxentius in particular is shown as a tyrant of the deepest dye. In addition to his rape of chaste women, noted above, he engages in sorcery to preserve his throne, and even rips open pregnant women and investigates the entrails of newborn babies.[159] The rulers who engage in *tyche* sacrifice, with their violation of chaste women, concomitant persecution of Christians (as by Trajan), and ritual killing of innocent victims, reflect the rivals of Constantine as they are presented by Eusebius.

In his insistence that Constantine holds a unique place among emperors and in the annals of history, Eusebius goes further than simply claiming that Constantine is superior to his predecessors and his rivals. Only a friend of God, says Eusebius, one who imitates the kingly principles of the Heavenly Kingdom, may truly be called a king. Another, deceived, sinful, and enslaved to evil, might seem to rule by 'tyrannical force' (νομίζεται ποτε τυραννικῇ βίᾳ κρατεῖν).[160] This is a revolutionary thesis, which has received very little scholarly attention. In effect, it invalidates the rule of

[156] Euseb., *VC* 1.4, 4.62.4, 67.3.

[157] Euseb., *VC* 1.7.1–2, 8.1, 4.74–75.

[158] Euseb., *VC* 1.5.1, 12.2, 2.1.2, 18, 3.1–3, 12.2; cf. *LC* 7.12. See Cameron & Hall, *Eusebius,* 37–38, 42.

[159] Euseb., *VC* 1.27.1, 36.1, 37.2, *HE* 8.14.5. On the depiction of Maxentius as a tyrant, and Constantine as a legitimate ruler in panegyrists other than Eusebius, see B. Warmington, "Aspects of Constantinian Propaganda in the Panegyrici Latini" *TAPA* 104 (1974) 379, 381.

[160] Euseb., *LC* 5.2–3. See K. Setton, *Christian Attitude towards the Emperor in the Fourth Century, Especially as Shown in Addresses to the Emperor* (New York 1941) 50; Drake, *In Praise of Constantine* 161–62. The panegyrist Nazarius, *Panegyricus* 1, 1 (*Panegyrici Veteres*, ed. C. Schwarz [London 1828] X, vol. 3, 1439) does say that Constantine towers above his predecessors as they towered above private citizens (see Setton, *Christian Attitude* 42), but Eusebius, and Bouttios, exceed this laudatory rhetoric by suggesting that Constantine's rule is legitimate, and that of his predecessors was not.

pagan emperors by claiming that only the king who rules in accord with God is in truth a king. So pagan rulers, those guilty of human sacrifice and harrying the champions of truth, only seem to rule (κρατεῖν νομιζόμενοι) in the same way that a false god only seems to be a god (ἐνομίσθη θεός).[161] Constantine is the first true ruler of the Roman empire, of any gentile kingdom, the first who does not rule as a tyrant. Bouttios tries to make Eusebius' theory manifest in the violent, sacrilegious crimes and tyrannical abuses he imputes to pagan rulers, and in Constantine's repudiation and redemption of the precedent they set.

In Eusebius' works of biography and panegyric Constantine is extolled as a singular hero who instituted 'bloodless sacrifice' in the place of gory animal and especially human sacrifice, the promotion of virginity in the place of the violation of women, and truly valid monarchial government in the place of the exercise of tyrannical violence. Bouttios presents Constantine in the same light at the climax of his accounts of *tyche* sacrifice. There is, however, a significant difference in the methods of the two authors.[162] While Eusebius is selective in the details he includes and tendentious in the slant he gives them, what he offers is an interpretation, through the lens of Christian ideology, of historical facts which might be agreed upon by most parties. Bouttios, by contrast, is writing a fiction which takes the form of history or might pass for history,[163] and in this fiction historical 'fact' can be manufactured to give pagan rulers of every age the semblance of the propagandist image of Constantine's rivals, and to substantiate Eusebius' claim that only the godly (i.e., Christian) ruler is in truth a king, not a tyrant.

Julian and the *tyche* sacrifices

If Bouttios was a proponent of Eusebius' theory of the exclusive validity of Christian monarchy, he would have been opposed on principle to the reign of Julian the Apostate. And indeed it seems very likely that Julian is the unnamed *bête noire* and target of Bouttios. Constantine is clearly his hero,

[161] Euseb., *LC* 7.3, 6.

[162] Hägg & Rousseau, *Greek Biography and Panegyric,* 4–5, note that while panegyricists might "sin by omission," their immediate audiences prevent them from outright lies, but there is no check on the additions and inventions of biographers whose works are read at a greater remove from their subjects.

[163] Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom.* 1.41.1), Strabo (11.6.3), and Plutarch (*Theseus* 1.3) write of giving the form or appearance of history to historicized myth or outright fictions of the unknown past; see M. Fox, *Roman Historical Myths: The Regal Period in Augustan Literature* (Oxford 1996) 79.

and Constantine and Julian were often contrasted by their respective supporters — most vociferously by Eunapius who, writing in the final decades of the fourth century, appears to have been a contemporary of Bouttios.[164] In at least one legend this antagonism of the imperial champions of Christianity and of paganism is centered on the *Tyche* of Constantinople. According to the *Souda*, Constantine erected a prominent statue of the *tyche* of the city in his new capital, but engraved a cross on her head; because of this Christianizing mark, Julian buried the statue in a ditch.[165] The figure of the *tyche* as the focus of this story opposing Julian to Constantine strongly suggests that Bouttios' history of *tyche* sacrifices is intended not only as praise of Constantine, but also as a condemnation of Julian. The fragments of Bouttios are, moreover, consistent on many points with the Christian diatribe against Julian, and may be seen to respond to the policy and the writings of the Apostate.

Tyche, as a goddess, and as an idea, appears significantly time and again in the reign of Julian, and in responses to it. According to Ammianus, Julian commended the outcome of his bid for the throne to *Fortuna*.[166] The words of the historian seem to reflect the sentiments of Julian. Julian wrote his uncle and namesake that if it had come to battle with Constantius he had intended to entrust everything to Tyche and the gods and await their decision.[167] In his *Letter to Themistius* Julian acknowledges *Tyche* as the capricious force which rules the lives of men, especially statesmen, testing and undoing both those to whom she is hostile and those whom she favours.[168] Julian demonstrates this principle in the *Caesars*, where *Tyche* abandons Pompey and favours Octavian.[169] *Tyche* also appears in Sallustius' Neoplatonist primer, *On the Gods and the Universe* — a work

[164] See Blockley (1981) 3, 7, 19–23.

[165] *Souda* apud Μῶμον (M 1064); Adler, *Suidae Lexicon* vol. 3, 395.24–29; cf. *Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronikai* 38; see Dagron, *Naissance d'une capitale* 41, 309 n.1; Cameron & Herrin, *Constantinople* 217–18.

[166] Amm. Marc., 21.5.13; see P. Athanassiadi-Fowden, *Julian and Hellenism: An Intellectual Biography* (Oxford 1981) 77.

[167] Julian, *Epist.* 28 (*Letter to his Uncle*).

[168] Julian, *Epist.* 6 (*Letter to Themistius*), 256C–257D; see Athanassiadi-Fowden, *Julian and Hellenism* 90–91, 95. Among Julian's sympathizers *Tyche* also played an important role in Libanius' autobiographical *Oration* 1 (esp. c. 266); see W. Liebeschuetz, "Libanius and Late Antique Autobiography," forthcoming in a *Festschrift* for Frank Norman.

[169] Julian, *Caes.* 323B, 330A; see Athanassiadi-Fowden, *Julian and Hellenism,* 200.

probably endorsed by Julian[170] — as the power of the gods to order various unforeseen events for the good in the sublunar world.[171] But Julian did not merely give intellectual assent to *tyche* as a concept, he publicly worshipped her as a goddess. Julian himself mentions his visit to the Tyche shrine in Antioch.[172] It was on such a visit, says Theodoret, that the future emperor Valentinian accompanied Julian and proved his faith. At the gates of the temple of Tyche he was sprinkled with water, and struck the temple servant responsible for this, saying he was defiled, not cleansed. As a consequence, Theodoret continues, he was exiled, but gained two kingdoms: the Roman Empire and the Kingdom of Heaven.[173] As in the story from the *Souda*, the figure of the Tyche is once again the focus of a contest between Christianity and paganism, specifically the paganism espoused by Julian. Julian's devotion to the Tyche cult also offended the Christians when he publicly sacrificed to a *tyche* image in the basilica of Constantinople.[174] *Tyche* also has a place in the rhetoric of Christian opposition to Julian. Despite the fact that Julian seized power, says Gregory of Nazianzus, the empire is not the 'spoils of fortune' (ἅρπαγμα τύχης) but the grant of proper succession, and he who possesses the kingdom does not necessarily hold the full measure of the honour of the office[175] (which idea returns to Eusebius' theme of the invalidity of certain rulers). Gregory also bemoans the fact that Julian's career, and God's patience with him, gave people cause to doubt the

[170] See Nock (1926) xcvi–civ; G. Bowersock, *Julian the Apostate* (Cambridge, Mass. 1976) 86, 125; Athanassiadi-Fowden, *Julian and Hellenism,* 154, 159.

[171] Sallustius, 9; see Nock, *Sallustius* lxxv, 20–21; Athanassiadi-Fowden, *Julian and Hellenism,* 157–58. The panegyrist Claudius Mamertinus, 23.6 (*Panegyrici Veteres*, ed. Schwarz, XI, vol. 3, 1530), praises Julian by saying that before his ascension fortune and fear, rather than the principles of astronomy, governed the lives of men (*Prorsus terra marique non ratione coelesti, sed casu ac temere vivebatur*). Mamertinus seems to present *casus*, if not *fortuna*, as a malevolent, or at best ambiguous force which is not the best possible ruling principle for the world. We do not know, however, to what extent Mamertinus was familiar with Julian's public or private philosophy, particularly in regard to *Tyche*.

[172] Julian, *Misop.* 346B (cf. Amm Marc. 23.1.6); see Athanassiadi-Fowden, *Julian and Hellenism,* 200.

[173] Theodoret, *HE* 3.12.

[174] Socrates Schol., *HE* 3.11.4. Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or.* 4.92, also notes that the ire of Julian was turned against Caesarea in Cappadocia, apparently because of the citizens' mistreatment of the *Tyche* statue or shrine in that city.

[175] Greg. Naz., *Or.* 4.46; see Setton, *Christian Attitude,* 107. Setton, *Christian Attitude,* 212–13, also notes that the Christian response to Julian was based on the "Socratic distinction between true kingship and tyranny."

government of some cosmic rulership (κυβέρνησις) or the principle of requital (ἀνταπόδοσις), and to suspect that 'Chance' (τὸ αὐτόματον) ruled the world.[176]

The idea of 'bloodless sacrifice,' which recurs in the praise of Constantine, also appears in Christian criticism of Julian, and in terms verbally closer to Bouttios' account of the inauguration of Constantinople's *tyche*. Gregory characterizes his *Oration against Julian* itself as a 'sacrifice of praise' (θυσίαν αἰνέσεως) and a 'bloodless offering of words' (τὴν ἀναίμακτον τῶν λόγων τιμὴν).[177] He says that Julian's secret sacrifices undid the Christian rites and 'cleansed' the emperor from the 'bloodless sacrifice' (τῆς ἀναιμάκτου θυσίας) of the Christians.[178] The blood sacrifices of the pagans, according to Gregory, polluted the Christian altars of 'bloodless sacrifice' (ἀναιμάκτου θυσίας).[179] Gregory's wording is remarkably similar to Bouttios' expression for the praiseworthy sacrifice which instituted the *tyche* of the new capital: θυσίαν ἀναίμακτον. It is possible that a fairly wide audience, even if they were unfamiliar with the writings of Gregory, would take this phrase to refer somehow to Julian. Julian's policy of reinvigorating the rites of blood sacrifice scandalized not only the Christians, but also some of his pagan supporters, who objected to animal sacrifice on philosophical grounds and preferred some form of 'bloodless sacrifice'.[180] Julian's sacrifice must have struck a great many people with no vested ideological interests as remarkable, since disuse had made animal sacrifice largely unfamiliar.

Human sacrifice also pervades the rhetoric and the rumours instigated by Julian's reign. Gregory assumes that Julian would admire literary examples of human sacrifice.[181] A number of the outrages committed by the pagans are implicitly or explicitly presented by the Christians as human sacrifice. Socrates, the ecclesiastical historian, claims that under Julian certain 'philosophers' ritually killed infants for the purpose of divination and cannibalism.[182] Gregory says that in a church in Alexandria the blood of sacrificial animals mingled with the blood of murdered Christians.[183] Gregory also relates one highly relevant incident in lurid detail. In Arethusa

[176] Greg. Naz., *Or.* 5.24.

[177] Greg. Naz., *Or.* 4.4. The first phrase is borrowed from Ps. 50 (LXX 49).23.

[178] Greg. Naz., *Or.* 4.52.

[179] Greg. Naz., *Or.* 5.29.

[180] S. Bradbury, "Julian's Pagan Revival and the Decline of Blood Sacrifice," *Phoenix* 49 (1995) 332–47.

[181] Greg. Naz., *Or.* 4.70.

[182] Socrates Schol., *HE* 3.13.11.

[183] Greg. Naz., *Or.* 4.86, cf. 5.26, 39.

the mob is said to have seized consecrated virgins, publicly stripped them, ripped them open and eviscerated them, before cannibalizing them and feeding them to pigs.[184] The deaths of these virgins are recounted in terms similar to the human sacrifice in the fragments of Lollianus.[185] So here we have, as in Trajan's *tyche* sacrifice, human sacrifice, the violation and killing of virgins, and the martyrdom of Christians combined. Gregory is, however, not able to fix the blame for these atrocities directly upon Julian, albeit he does consider him their instigator and satisfied observer.[186] Even when Gregory reports bodies hidden in the Orontes or in the cisterns of the palace at Antioch, the bodies of youths and maidens (παρθένοι) killed for purposes of necromancy or divination or sacrifice, and the bodies of martyrs, he goes no further than to say that Julian ordered the concealment of the crimes of others, not the killings themselves.[187] It is Theodoret, writing some time later but undoubtedly preserving earlier material, who makes Julian himself a ritual murderer in a macabre story. On his march against Persia Julian is said to have visited the temple at Carrhae, and when he left had the doors sealed and guarded until his return. When news of his death reached the city the temple was opened, and inside was discovered the body of a woman hung up by the hair, her arms stretched out, and her belly ripped open, supposedly in order to divine the outcome of the Persian campaign.[188] Here is the clear echo of the *tyche* sacrifice: a pitiable woman

[184] Greg. Naz., *Or.* 4.87, cf. 5.29.

[185] Lollianus, B1 recto; see Winkler, "Lollianos," 166–75.

[186] Greg. Naz., *Or.* 4.90, cf. 93, 94.

[187] Greg. Naz., *Or.* 4.92, cf. 2.9, 13, 23, 25, 26. John Chrysostom, *De Sancto Babyla et Contra Julianum et Gentiles* 14 (79), holds Julian responsible for reintroducing necromancy and infant sacrifice, suppressed since the advent of Christ.

[188] Theodoret, *HE* 3.21; see Green, *The City of the Moon God* 50–51, cf. 115, on Julian at Carrhae. The charge does not seem to have been altogether uncommon in the fourth century. We have already seen that Eusebius (*HE* 8.14.5, *VC* 1.36.1) accused Maxentius of ripping open pregnant women. Ammianus Marcellinus (29.17) criticizes Valens for pardoning the tribune Numerius after he was convicted on his own confession of cutting open the womb of a woman and removing her fetus for purposes of necromancy.

The sacrifice at Carrhae is popularly assumed to have been nothing more than a Christian slander against the Apostate; see C. Head, *The Emperor Julian* (Boston 1976) 153; G. Fowden, *Empire to Commonwealth: Consequences of monotheism in late antiquity* (Princeton 1993) 62. R. Browning, *The Emperor Julian* (Berkeley 1976) 195–96, and Bowersock, *Julian the Apostate,* 109–10, mention Julian's stop at Carrhae and his sacrifices there, but say nothing of the rumours of ritual murder. Such a deed, however, should hardly be considered impossible for a man in whom

done to death by a pagan ruler — a tyrant to his enemies — in a self-serving sacrificial ritual.

Bouttios' accounts of *tyche* sacrifice are perhaps more than another example of the Christian attack on Julian. They can also be read as a response to some of the literary tastes and productions of Julian. The work of Bouttios is most obviously a counterpart to Julian's *Caesars*. Julian introduces this work as a 'myth,' but one that conveys a worthwhile message.[189] Bouttios' history with its palpable fiction of human sacrifices performed by famous kings might also seem to be a purposeful myth. As an examination of the virtues and vices of rulers the *tyche* narratives are comparable to the *Caesars*. Julian casts his net widely so as to include Alexander of Macedon in the company of the Caesars,[190] just as Bouttios treats not only Alexander, but Seleucus and certain mythical kings along with the Roman emperors. The opposition of Constantine and Julian is implicit in the *Caesars* as in Bouttios. Julian condemns the folly of Constantine and had him consigned to punishment, while he awards the prize to Marcus Aurelius, after whom he had modeled himself.[191] In another regard, Bouttios seems to be intentionally unlike Julian. The emperor considered erotic fiction inappropriate reading for himself and his priests,[192] and so Bouttios may have considered it particularly piquant to borrow from a genre Julian despised in order to compose an attack on him. Finally, it appears that in his response to the Cynic Heraclius Julian attempted to rehabilitate Euripides as a pious mythographer,[193] and it may be more jousting on the part of Bouttios that he cites Euripides in his own anti-pagan mythography.

Thus it may be seen that there are very strong indications that Bouttios' accounts of *tyche* sacrifices were composed as an attack on Julian — quite as much as in order to present Constantine as a hero. In Christian history and legend the opposition of Constantine and Julian, as well as of Christianity and paganism, often came to a significant head in incidents involving the figure and cult of the *tyche*. The *tyche* was also recognized as important to Julian, personally, philosophically, and in his religious policy.

were coupled a grotesque superstition, remarkable even in the generally superstitious climate of late antiquity, and the supreme power.

[189] Julian, *Caes.* 306A–C.

[190] Julian, *Caes.* 316A–D.

[191] Julian, *Caes.* 335–36.

[192] Julian, *Epist.* 89b (*Fragment of a Letter to a Priest*) 301B–C.

[193] Julian, *Epist.* 7 (*Letter to the Cynic Heracleius*) 214–21; see Athanassiadi-Fowden, *Julian and Hellenism,* 135.

The rumours surrounding Julian, concerning the outrages of pagans during his reign, and especially concerning his own indulgence in human sacrifice at Carrhae, might very well have suggested the form of the accusation Bouttios leveled wholesale against pagan rulers in his polemical history. Likewise, the rhetoric of 'bloodless sacrifice' in the criticism of Julian contributes to the terms which prove Constantine's heroism. If some of the emperor's critics echoed Gregory's reserve and hesitated to fix the blame for atrocities committed during his reign directly upon Julian, Bouttios suggests that not only Julian, but, since time out of mind, all pagan kings were guilty of tyranny, abuse and the most appalling crimes. Bouttios' wide scope accommodates Eusebius' theory on the invalid monarchy of non-Christian rulers, as well as responding to the breadth of Julian's own critique of past rulers in the *Caesars*. Thus Bouttios appears to address not only the reign, but also the writings of Julian.

Tyche is not mentioned at all in Malalas' account of Julian the Apostate,[194] and there is nothing to indicate that Bouttios explicitly connected Julian with his history. So it might fairly be asked why this is the case, if we are correct in assuming that the *tyche* sacrifice narratives are intended as an attack on Julian. The answer probably lies in a combination of hatred and fear. In the *Life of Constantine* Eusebius follows a policy of *damnatio memoriae* in regard to the enemies of Constantine and the Church. He characterizes the biographers of other emperors as wasting their time on "works suited to the silence of oblivion and darkness."[195] He notes the official *damnatio memoriae* of Maximian (without mentioning him by name) in the aftermath of his conspiracy.[196] He refers to Galerius as "the foremost in evils, whoever that might have been" (τὸν πρωτοστάτην τῶν κακῶν, ὅστις ποτ' ἦν ἐκεῖνος).[197] And he quotes one of Constantine's letters in which Diocletian and the other tetrarchs are criticized for their persecutions, but not named.[198] Whether it was composed in the late fourth century or the early fifth century, the *Carmen contra paganos* is closely contemporary Bouttios' history.[199] The victim of this Christian attack on an

[194] Malalas, 13.18–25.
[195] Eusebius, *VC* 1.10.3.
[196] Eusebius, *VC* 1.47.1.
[197] Eusebius, *VC* 1.56.2.
[198] Eusebius, *VC* 2.49–51.
[199] See T. Mommsen, "Carmen codicis Parisini 8084," *Hermes* 4 (1870) 350–63; G. Manganaro, "La reazione pagan a Roma nel 408–9 d.c. e il poemetto anonimo 'Contra Paganos,'" *GIF* 13 (1960) 210–24; idem, "Il poemetto anonimo contra paganos: testo tradizione e commento," *Nuovo Didaskalion* 11 (1961) 23–45; J. Matthews, "The Historical Setting of the 'Carmen contra paganos' (cod. Par. Lat.

important Roman official and his indulgence in pagan rites is likewise unnamed, and his identity is still debated. Bouttios might have wished likewise to condemn Julian to *damnatio memoriae*. This is not to say that he did not want Julian to be recognized as the target of his attack. As Hedrick puts it, "The damnatio memoriae did not negate historical traces, but created gestures that served to dishonor the record of the person and so, in an oblique way, to confirm memory."[200]

Bouttios may also have feared retribution from the supporters of Julian. Despite what the Christian reaction might suggest, Julian's death did not elicit immediate and ecstatic celebration throughout the empire.[201] Julian still had supporters even in Antioch, where he himself was struck by his own unpopularity. The death of an emperor did not initiate wholesale 'régime change,' and officers appointed during Julian's lengthy stay in Antioch would have retained their positions. We know that in Antioch Libanius, the intransigent pagan rhetorician, did not balk at publicly maintaining his respect for Julian after his death.[202] Even the Arians of Antioch in a petition to Jovian refer to Julian as 'most beloved of God' after his death.[203] Bouttios might have considered it impolitic to be too obvious in making Julian the target of his polemic.[204] It is even possible that the *tyche* sacrifice narratives were composed while Julian himself was living in Antioch, as part of the raillery that his residence aroused in the city.

8084)," *Historia* 19 (1970) 464–79; L. Cracco Ruggini, *Il paganesimo romano tra religione e politica (384–394 d.C.): per una reinterpretazione del* Carmen contra paganos (*Atti della Accademia nazionale dei Lincei: Memorie, Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*: ser. 8, vol. 23, fasc. 1 / Roma 1979) 3–143; B. Croke & J. Harries, *Religious Conflict in Fourth-century Rome: A Documentary Study* (Sydney 1982) 80–83; T. Grünewald, "Der letzte Kampf des Heidentums in Rom? Zur postumen Rehabilitation des Virius Nicomachus Flavianus," *Historia* 41 (1992) 474–81; C. Hedrick, *History and Silence: Purge and Rehabilitation of Memory in Late Antiquity* (Austin 2000) 60–63, 270 n. 89.

[200] Hedrick, *History and Silence,* 93.

[201] Gregory of Nazianzus writes his *Orations against Julian* in a tone of jubilation, and Theodoret (*HE* 3.22) says that there was rejoicing in Antioch at the news of Julian's death.

[202] See esp. Libanius, *Orat.* 17, 18, 24.

[203] *Petitiones ad Iovianum Imperatorem* (*PG* 26, 820C); see Setton, *Christian Attitude,* 83–84.

[204] It is interesting to note that Julian himself became a cover for the actual targets in the oblique dialectic of a later period; see, for example, E. Wind, "Julian the Apostate at Hampton Court" in *England and the Mediterranean Tradition: Studies in Art, History, and Literature*, ed. Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, University of London (London 1945) 131–38.

Conclusion

As Arnaldo Momigliano presents the situation, the Christian historians of the fourth century excelled in chronography, ecclesiastical history, and hagiography.[205] Bouttios' fictionalizing and tendentious accounts of rulers from the recent and distant past fits into none of these categories (although the scope of the *tyche* sacrifice narratives might reflect the breadth of Eusebius' *Chronicle*). Even as a polemical historian, Bouttios stands at some remove from the more or less respectable erudition of Orosius. His fragments are an example of the appropriation of the formulae of fiction — as well as the dubious 'conspiracy theory' element in secular historiography — by Christian political history. The stories of *tyche* sacrifice, exploiting as they do the motifs of romanticized virgin sacrifice and heroic rescue, indicate that the Christian taste for fiction had more numerous and varied results than the *Apocryphal Acts* and the Clementine literature. They suggest, moreover, that where we have in the past identified error and misunderstanding in the historiography of the fourth century, we should be more ready to see pure invention, and enquire after its purpose.

The accounts of *tyche* sacrifice are certainly an attack on the *tyche* cult, an important religious and ideological competitor with Christianity in the fourth century. Fiction was practically a necessity in this attack, since, because of the *tyche*'s lack of a mythology, many of the usual avenues of apologetic assault were not open to Christian controversialists. Bouttios damned the *tyche* cult by making up stories which set its origins in barbaric rites of virgin sacrifice, which smacked of black magic and the abuses of tyranny. The plausibility of these stories might have been suggested by the image of the *tyche* figure central to the cult — and the denial of the principles of abstraction and personification which brought it into being. Bouttios also reflects the ambivalence of the place of the *tyche* in the fourth century. *Tyche* was rejected by the Church, but accepted by the Christian emperors. Certain concessions to the figure of the *tyche* were part of the price the Church paid for her new ascendancy. And so Bouttios denigrates the *tychai* established by pagan emperors, but is careful to depict the *tyche* of Constantinople, instituted by Constantine, as a novel event and a redemption of the *tyche* figure.

Constantine's inauguration of his new capital's *tyche* is not only an abrogation of the gruesome rites of the pagan past, it is also the climactic rescue of any potential future victims. Bouttios portrays Constantine as a

[205] See Momigliano "Pagan and Christian Historiography."

hero in the novelistic mold, saving a damsel in distress. But Constantine's unique heroism is also in accord with Eusebius and the Christian political theory of the fourth century. Constantine was supposed to have stood alone at a pivotal point in time, abolishing the errors of the past and ushering in a new era of Christian Empire, which is the culmination of the progress of world history. As a friend and emulator of God, Constantine is a true example of the monarchial principle, and so the first true king. Bouttios' fictions of the past give vivid expression to this theory. Constantine's predecessors are not simply shown to fall short of ideal monarchy. It is evidently permissible to impute any kind of monstrosity to a pagan ruler — perhaps to demonstrate the invariable character of the godless monarch, perhaps so that such calumnies should be believed and the tyrants' memory damned to opprobrium.

It was probably one such pagan ruler in particular who prompted Bouttios' composition in the first place. The reputation of Julian the Apostate was dogged by rumours and accusations of ritual murder and human sacrifice, possibly during his reign and certainly after his death. It must have seemed particularly appropriate to level this same charge against all pagan rulers, and combine it with an attack on *Tyche*, a favourite goddess of Julian's, and with the praise of Constantine, whom Julian despised. So Julian is made a party with the other pagan kings and godless emperors: tyrants, practitioners of barbaric rituals, murderers, and persecutors of the Church. This wholesale condemnation of princes is a far cry from the respectful tone of the second-century Christian apologists who addressed their works to emperors, and made the mob, not the magistrates, responsible for the persecutions which beset them. But in the course of the fourth century the Church had come into its own as the arbiter of imperial legitimacy.[206] Emperors were declared true and valid inasmuch as they were good Christians. Julian's reign was punctuated by incidents of defiance on the part of the Church and her members, not marked by their former general obedience. Bouttios' denigration of pagan rulers is, nevertheless, reactionary, not revolutionary, upholding the established Constantinian order against the short-lived, repristinating innovations of Julian.[207]

Grant MacEwan College, Edmonton Alberta

[206] See Cameron, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire,* 120–54.

[207] Dean Inge raises the question of revolution or reaction in regard to Julian himself; W. Inge "Julian—Apostate or Diehard?" in *Our Present Discontents* (New York 1939) 268–73.

Appendix

The close verbal parallels between Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris* and the account of Orestes and Iphigenia in Malalas indicate that the author of the latter, if not Malalas himself was familiar with Euripides' play, and reduced some of its passages to more prosaic dialogue (dialogue of any kind being quite rare in Malalas' chronicle):

Malalas, v.32: λέγει Πυλάδῃ· 'δοκεῖ σοι θεᾶς εἶναι τάδε μέλαθρα, ἔνθα σύν νηυσὶν ἥκαμεν; ὁρῶ δὲ καὶ των θανόντων ξενων τὰ ὀστέα.'	*I.T.* **Πυ.** 68 ὁρῶ, ... / **Ορ.** 69 Πυλάδη, δοκεῖ σοι μέλαθρα ταῦτ' εἶναι θεᾶς / 70 ἔνθ' Ἀργόθεν ναῦν ποντίαν ἐστείλαμεν 75 τῶν καταθανόντων γ' ἀκροθίνια ξένων

I.T. 625-6 strongly suggest that the burning of the victim to ashes is the norm, which would preclude any bones, but Bates, with comparison to *Bac.* 1212 ff., suggests that in l. 74 the σκῦλα ('booty') under the wall are humans skulls.[208]

Malalas, v.32: λέγει τῷ Ὀρέστῃ· 'φύγωμεν, ἐὰν σωθησόμεθα.' ὁ δὲ Ὀρέστης ἔφη· 'οὐ φεύγομεν· οὔτε γὰρ φεύγειν εἰώθαμεν οὐ δὲ τὸν χρησμὸν τοῦ θεοῦ κακιστεύσομεν.'	*I.T.* 102 ἀλλὰ πρὶν θανεῖν, νεὼς ἔπι / φεύγωμεν, ἥπερ δεῦρ' ἐναυστολήσαμεν. / **Πυ.** φεύγειν μὲν οὐκ ἀνεκτον οὐδ εἰώθαμεν· / τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τε χρησμὸν οὐ κακιστέον
Malalas, v.33: 'Ἀγαμέμνονος καὶ Κλυταιμνήστρης κόρη, ἥκασι δύο νεανίσκοι παρὰ τὴν κυανέαν.'	*I.T.* 238 Ἀγαμέμνονός τε καὶ Κλυταιμνήστρας τεκνον 241 ἥκουσιν ἐς γῆν, κυανέαν Συμπληγάδα / πλάτῃ φυγόντες, δίπτυχοι νεανίαι
Malalas, v.33: 'ποταποί; τίνος γῆς; τί τοὔνομα ἔχουσιν οἱ ξένοι;'	*I.T.* 246 ποδαποί; τίνος γῆς σχῆμ' ἔχουσιν οἱ ξένοι; [Iphigenia's next question (l. 248) concerns the names of the strangers.]

[208] W. N. Bates, *Euripides: Iphigenia in Tauris* (New York 1904) 43.

At this point in Malalas Iphigenia asks a number of questions about the Trojan War: cf. *I.T.* 517-550.

Malalas, v.33: 'ἕτερος πρὸς τὸν ἕτερον ἔφη, Πυλάδη· τοῦ δὲ συζύγου τὸ ὄνομα οὐκ ἴσμεν· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔφη.'	*I.T.* 249 Πυλάδης ἐκλήζεθ' ἄτερος πρὸς θατέρου. / τοῦ ξυζύγου δὲ τοῦ ξένου τί τοὔνομ' ἦν; / οὐδεὶς τόδ' οἶδεν· οὐ γὰρ εἰσηκούσαμεν.
Malalas, v.33: 'τί γὰρ κοινὸν βουκόλος ἐν θαλάττῃ;'	*I.T.* 254 καὶ τίς θαλάσσης βουκόλοις κοινωνία;
Malalas, v.33: 'βοῦς ἤκαμεν νίψαι ἐν ἁλίᾳ δρόσῳ.'	*I.T.* 255 βοῦς ἥλθομεν νίψοντες ἐναλίᾳ δρόσῳ.
Malalas, v.34: 'χώρας μὲν Ἑλλάδος, πόλεως δὲ Μυκήνης ὁ δυστυχὴς πάρειμι.'	*I.T.* 495: Ἕλληνος 500: δυστυχεῖς 510: Μυκηνῶν