



<https://publications.dainst.org>

**iDAI.publications**

ELEKTRONISCHE PUBLIKATIONEN DES  
DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

Dies ist ein digitaler Sonderdruck des Beitrags / This is a digital offprint of the article

J. E. Lendon  
**Rhetoric and Nymphaea in the Roman Empire**

aus / from

**Chiron**

Ausgabe / Issue **45 • 2015**

Seiten / Pages **123–149**

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34780/chiron.v45i0.1006> • URN: <https://doi.org/10.34780/chiron.v45i0.1006>

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor

**Redaktion Chiron | Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Amalienstr. 73 b, 80799 München**

Weitere Informationen unter / For further information see <https://publications.dainst.org/journals/index.php/chiron>

ISSN der Online-Ausgabe / ISSN of the online edition **2510-5396**

**©2020 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut**

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Zentrale, Podbielskiallee 69–71, 14195 Berlin, Tel: +49 30 187711-0

Email: [info@dainst.de](mailto:info@dainst.de) / Web: <https://www.dainst.org>

**Nutzungsbedingungen:** Mit dem Herunterladen erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) von iDAI.publications an. Die Nutzung der Inhalte ist ausschließlich privaten Nutzerinnen / Nutzern für den eigenen wissenschaftlichen und sonstigen privaten Gebrauch gestattet. Sämtliche Texte, Bilder und sonstige Inhalte in diesem Dokument unterliegen dem Schutz des Urheberrechts gemäß dem Urheberrechtsgesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Die Inhalte können von Ihnen nur dann genutzt und vervielfältigt werden, wenn Ihnen dies im Einzelfall durch den Rechteinhaber oder die Schrankenregelungen des Urheberrechts gestattet ist. Jede Art der Nutzung zu gewerblichen Zwecken ist untersagt. Zu den Möglichkeiten einer Lizenzierung von Nutzungsrechten wenden Sie sich bitte direkt an die verantwortlichen Herausgeberinnen/Herausgeber der entsprechenden Publikationsorgane oder an die Online-Redaktion des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts ([info@dainst.de](mailto:info@dainst.de)).

**Terms of use:** By downloading you accept the terms of use (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) of iDAI.publications. All materials including texts, articles, images and other content contained in this document are subject to the German copyright. The contents are for personal use only and may only be reproduced or made accessible to third parties if you have gained permission from the copyright owner. Any form of commercial use is expressly prohibited. When seeking the granting of licenses of use or permission to reproduce any kind of material please contact the responsible editors of the publications or contact the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut ([info@dainst.de](mailto:info@dainst.de)).

# CHIRON

MITTEILUNGEN  
DER KOMMISSION FÜR  
ALTE GESCHICHTE UND  
EPIGRAPHIK  
DES DEUTSCHEN  
ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN  
INSTITUTS

*Sonderdruck aus Band 45 · 2015*



DE GRUYTER

## INHALT DES 45. BANDES (2015)

RODNEY AST – ROGER S. BAGNALL, The Receivers of Berenike. New Inscriptions from the 2015 Season

DENIS FEISSEL – MICHAEL WÖRRLE, Eine Ehrung des Älteren Theodosius und ein spätantikes Edikt zur Steuererhebung in Limyra

CHRISTOPHER P. JONES, The Earthquake of 26 BCE in Decrees of Mytilene and Chios

J. E. LENDON, Rhetoric and Nymphaea in the Roman Empire

ANDREW LEPKE – CHRISTOF SCHULER – KLAUS ZIMMERMANN, Neue Inschriften aus Patara III: Elitenrepräsentation und Politik in Hellenismus und Kaiserzeit

PETER LONDEY, Making up Delphic history – the 1st Sacred War revisited

S. J. V. MALLOCH, Frontinus and Domitian: the politics of the Strategemata

FABIENNE MARCHAND, The Associations of Tanagra: Epigraphic Practice and Regional Context

IVANA SAVALLI-LESTRADE, Les adieux à la βασίλισσα. Mise en scène et mise en intrigue de la mort des femmes royales dans le monde hellénistique

PETER THONEMANN, The Martyrdom of Ariadne of Prynnessos and an Inscription from Perge

PETER WEISS, Eine *honesta missio* in Sonderformat. Neuartige Bronzeurkunden für Veteranen der Legionen in Germania superior unter Gordian III.

CHRISTOPHER WHITTON, Pliny's Progress: On a Troublesome Domitianic Career

J. E. LENDON

## Rhetoric and Nymphaea in the Roman Empire

Monumental nymphaea, those titanic, column-crowded, statue-infested, rare-marble-revetted, often multi-storied fountain-houses that became à la mode in the cities of Roman Asia Minor, never cease to fascinate and horrify.<sup>1</sup> Archaeologists and art historians work to establish typologies of architectural design and decoration, and discuss the formal evolution of the building type.<sup>2</sup> They also argue about the relationship between the designs of the great nymphaea of Asia Minor and earlier prototypes: local or Roman? Roman-period, Hellenistic, or older? Perhaps the stage buildings of theaters?<sup>3</sup> Were monumental nymphaea chiefly practical or symbolic in purpose, or,

---

I thank KAI BRODERSEN, BARBARA BURRELL, COULTER GEORGE, and ELIZABETH A. MEYER, fountain experts BETSEY ROBINSON and DYLAN ROGERS, and the anonymous reader and the editors of *Chiron* for their many improvements to this paper, the writing of which was supported by a stipendium from the Gerda Henkel Stiftung, and the revisions by the Willis F. Doney Membership at the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton.

Abbreviations for catalogues of nymphaea often cited below: D-Kl = C. DORL-KLINGENSCHMID, *Prunkbrunnen in kleinasiatischen Städten: Funktion im Kontext* (2001) 168–260; R = J. RICHARD, *Water for the City, Fountains for the People: Monumental Fountains in the Roman East. An Archaeological Study of Water Management* (2012) 259–280.

<sup>1</sup> RICHARD (2012) 1–12 and ARISTODEMOU (2012) 25–27 provide historical summaries of the scholarship. For the ancient terms used to describe large fountains, SETTIS (1973) 683–740; LETZNER (1990) 24–116; RICHARD (2012) 14–27. Νυμφαῖον or *nymphaeum* was never in antiquity a general term for such structures, but its modern ubiquity as the term for large, spectacular, ornamented Roman-period fountains makes its use here inevitable. A definition of a «monumental nymphaeum» would – admitting some exceptions – look to elements such as (a) a frontage of at least 15 meters; (b) a main water-receptacle open to the sky; (c) elaborate decoration, usually in the «tabernacle» or «aedicular» (columns and niches) style, adorned with statues and rare marbles. For an even vaguer definition of «monumental fountain» see RICHARD (2012) 28–31.

<sup>2</sup> E.g., LETZNER (1990); DORL-KLINGENSCHMID (2001); RICHARD – WAELKENS (2013).

<sup>3</sup> For concise histories of ancient fountains, with suggestions as to their evolution and the origins of the various types, MESCHINI (1963); GINOUVÈS (1969); GROS (1996) 418–444; GLASER (2000); ARISTODEMOU (2012) 31–41. On the origins of «aedicular» or «tabernacle» architecture – the class into which most monumental nymphaea in Asia Minor fall – see BERNS (2002). On the relationship between façade nymphaea and theatrical façades, ARISTODEMOU (2011a) 170–172; LAMARE (2011 – a preview of his unpublished dissertation); ARISTODEMOU (2012) 41–47, all with literature.

as seems inevitable, some mix of both?<sup>4</sup> On the symbolic side, it is claimed that monumental water-works were emblems of Rome and its power,<sup>5</sup> and that some nymphaea at least seem to have had sacred associations.<sup>6</sup> On the practical side it is noted that, besides offering clean and plentiful water, nymphaea might also provide cool refuges and lounging places in hot areas of the empire, and so ought to be studied in the wider context of urban design.<sup>7</sup> Recently, scholarship has begun to place monumental fountains within the greater context of cities' other major water-works, their aqueducts and water pipes, sewers and baths.<sup>8</sup>

But the historian still has his questions. Inscriptions suggest that the impetus for such projects in Asia Minor was primarily local (rather than directed by Rome), and that such structures were for the most part paid for by the cities themselves, or by rich donors associated with the cities.<sup>9</sup> But why in a world with so many other opportunities for civic benefaction – many of which seem, to us at least, far more useful or enjoyable to the city's inhabitants – did donors choose to build gigantic fountains?

---

<sup>4</sup> RICHARD (2012) 237–258; a question asked of all major Roman water-works, even the most seemingly practical, such as aqueducts, KEK (1996) 265–316; and indeed of all major Roman building in general, DRERUP (1966).

<sup>5</sup> E.g., WALKER (1979) 276–277; LONGFELLOW (2009) 228; ARISTODEMOU (2011a) 173, 188, 191.

<sup>6</sup> E.g., WALKER (1979) 275, 277–278; LONGFELLOW (2012); ARISTODEMOU (2011a) 192–195; ARISTODEMOU (2012) 47–49; RICHARD (2012) 186. «For no spring exists that is not sacred» (*nullus enim fons non sacer*), as Servius said (ad loc. Aen. 7.84). Sacred associations are an old assumption from the term νυμφαῖον («place of the nymphs»), but the term appears to have become largely denatured of sacred implications, RICHARD (2012) 18–19.

<sup>7</sup> MACDONALD (1986) 99–107; and after him SEGAL (1997) 151–168; DORL-KLINGENSCHMID (2001) 116–119; RICHARD (2008); UĞURLU (2009) 30–37 (who also adduces LYNCH's theory of urban legibility, 38–45); ARISTODEMOU (2012) 56–64.

<sup>8</sup> TUTTAHS (2007); RICHARD (2012).

<sup>9</sup> For lists of imperial-period fountains in Asia Minor and their donors (when they can be deduced from inscriptions), PONT (2010) 169–174; ARISTODEMOU (2012) 68–87. The conventions of inscribing on buildings can mislead: many buildings are dedicated to or mention the names of emperors even if the emperor made no financial contribution, and others bear inscriptions indicating a presiding grandee who may or may not have borne most or all of the cost (e.g., Laecanius Bassus, a proconsul of Asia, who προνοήσαντα δὲ κατασκευασθῆναι – «supervised» and «fully equipped» – a monumental fountain and its water-works, I.Ephesos 695; D-Kl nr. 24 = R nr. 34, AD 79–82?). ARISTODEMOU (2012) 70–72 introduces the evidence of the Justinianic John Malalas for imperial fountain-building, but CARL OTFRIED MÜLLER warned as early as 1839 that notices in Malalas of items «built» (κτί(ω) by emperors could also refer to repair or improvement of a structure, and DOWNEY (1938; citing MÜLLER [non vidi] p. 2 n. 1) adds (pp. 2–10) that Malalas' notices can mean no more than that an item was built, by somebody, during a given emperor's reign, and that Malalas was often in error even about that. Malalas is better used (as below) as an indicator of attitude than a source of reliable facts about imperial construction under the high empire. Arguing that the impetus for building monumental nymphaea in Asia Minor came primarily from Rome, WINTER (1996) 177–184; LONGFELLOW (2011) esp. 2, 28, 208–211; that it was local, RICHARD (2011); CAMPAGNA (2011); RICHARD (2012) 247–252; BURRELL (2012); and the evidence and arguments for local motivation are far stronger.

What prompted the invention of monumental nymphaea in the Flavian period and certified them as a new building type worthy to enter the canon of public buildings that adorned the cities of Asia Minor? Why did the habit of building monumental nymphaea begin when and where it did (in the late first century AD on the west coast of Asia Minor) and flourish when and where it did (through Asia Minor and points east in the second and early third centuries AD)? And why did it continue into Late Antiquity with surprising strength, with old structures being repaired well into the sixth century, and new being built into the fifth, in addition to the adaptation of other buildings into fountain houses (Ephesus' Library of Celsus being the most famous)?<sup>10</sup> Why did the habit of building monumental fountains never extend significantly into the Latin West, with the exception of the city of Rome itself, its immediate region, and some cities in North Africa?<sup>11</sup> And why did the habit extend east of Asia Minor, into Syria and the Levant, but only to a lesser extent to the immediate west, into metropolitan Greece?<sup>12</sup> Finally why, most broadly, did the Romans and Greeks choose to monumentalize the structures they did, and not others?<sup>13</sup>

Some appealing solutions to parts of this puzzle quickly fail. Monumental nymphaea were not an obvious or necessary development simply waiting for the necessary hydraulic technology to make them possible. Large fountains, usually with a large water basin open to the sky – «hypoethral» is the term of art – so that its contents were vulnerable to evaporation, did indeed need a large water supply, and some monumental nymphaea had dedicated Roman-style aqueducts, while others drew on aqueducts indirectly. But Roman aqueducts came to Asia Minor under Augustus, while monumental nymphaea did not appear until the Flavians: Roman water technology may often have enabled, but it did not unleash, monumental nymphaea.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Asia Minor: DORL-KLINGENSCHMID (2001) and RICHARD (2012); summarily, PONT (2010) 169–176. For Late Antiquity, JACOBS – RICHARD (2012); RICHARD (2012) 215–236.

<sup>11</sup> The West: LETZNER (1990); Rome and its environs: NEUERBURG (1965); North Africa: AUPERT (1974).

<sup>12</sup> Greece: WALKER (1979); GLASER (1983) nrs. 54, 60, 74, 75, of which only the Nymphaeum of Herodes Atticus at Olympia (GLASER [1983] nr. 75 = R nr. 51 and BOL [1984]) and those at Nicopolis (WALKER [1979] 138–148 and LONGFELLOW [2011] 131–134) and Gortyn (LONGFELLOW [2011] 136–138, 206–208; R nr. 41) bear real comparison in size to the great nymphaea of Asia Minor. The East: SEGAL (1997) 151–168; KAMASH (2010) 112–117; and RICHARD'S (2012) 259–280 catalogue. I know of no study of nymphaea in the empire's Balkan provinces outside Greece, but nymphaea do appear to be depicted on the coins of cities in that area: Hadrianopolis (Thrace), and possibly Nicopolis ad Istrum (Moesia), LETZNER (1990) 10 and 13.

<sup>13</sup> For the aesthetics of monumentality under the Roman empire, THOMAS (2007a).

<sup>14</sup> On the aqueducts of Asia Minor and their dates, COULTON (1987) esp. 73, arguing that it was not ignorance of the technology, but fear that a city's relying on a militarily vulnerable exterior water supply would be dangerous, that delayed major aqueducts in Asia Minor to as late as the reign of Augustus; WINTER (1996) 180–182; SCHERRER (2006). For relations between aqueducts and nymphaea, RICHARD (2012) 52–92; for dedicated aqueducts feeding nymphaea, pp. 71–74, but noting, pp. 57–58, that it was more common for nymphaea to be integrated into

Nor do the monumental nymphaea of Asia Minor seem obviously to have evolved under the Flavians from earlier local forms of fountain. Older – Hellenistic and Julio-Claudian – fountains in Asia Minor, at least those that were built with an eye to how they looked, were very different: smaller, perhaps consisting of a statue squirting water into a pool, the pool often half-moon-shaped; or sometimes looking like a small stoa, roofed, that is, to limit the evaporation of the water, with the roof supported by a screen of columns in front; or at times like a small circular temple, again with a roof supported by columns – rather than being, like the most common type of later monumental nymphaeum, open to the sky with a screen of columns behind for decoration (the so-called «*façade nymphaeum*»).<sup>15</sup> Nor has a strong case been made that the nymphaea of Asia Minor copied Roman prototypes, because large public fountains in Rome, most famously the Meta Sudans, the conical «*sweating turning-post*» that was sometimes copied in the provinces, appear to have looked very different.<sup>16</sup>

Nor, finally, did monumental nymphaea simply echo the history of the development of other major building-types in Roman Asia Minor, implying that some universal force was propelling the construction of all types of buildings willy-nilly. Certainly the second century AD witnessed a great increase in the construction of public buildings in many of the cities of the region, and monumental nymphaea shared in that rise. But some building-types – such as temples to the gods – seamlessly carried on Greek and Hellenistic traditions into the Roman period; others, like temples of the imperial cult, began under Augustus and developed from his era. Basilicas, that distinctly Roman form, seem to have begun under Augustus as well, while baths seem to have changed slowly from Greek to Roman designs over the years of the Julio-Cla-

---

existing systems of water distribution, although in many cases those existing systems were ultimately fed by Roman-period aqueducts.

<sup>15</sup> For older fountain-forms in Asia Minor, DORL-KLINGENSCHMID (2001) 28–48; WEISS (2011) 75–97; RICHARD (2012) 35–40; ARISTODEMOU (2012) 31–35. WEISS (2011) 78–83, 86 makes a vigorous attempt to trace the origins of the *façade nymphaea* of Asia Minor to earlier structures in Ephesus: *non liquet*, and even if she is right to see formal similarities, the three monuments she adduces date respectively to the late second century BC (probably, but certainly before 80 BC; D-Kl nr. 17 = R nr. 32 with THÜR [1995] 91, 102–103 for the date); to the Augustan period (D-Kl nr. 21 = R nr. 36); and to the early first century AD (D-Kl nr. 23 = R nr. 33): hardly a strong tradition to inspire later men, more like a series of orphaned oddities.

<sup>16</sup> See LONGFELLOW (2011) 13–60 for a concise account of fountains in Republican and early imperial Rome. For the Meta Sudans, LTUR ad loc.; for provincial copies, LONGFELLOW (2011) 25, 33, 46–49. The best candidates to be Roman prototypes for the *façade nymphaea* of Asia Minor (see GINOUVÈS [1969] 144) are the so-called *Bagni di Livia* in Nero's *Domus Transitoria* (NEUERBURG [1965] nr. 174 = LETZNER [1990] nr. 247 = LTUR ad loc. *Domus Transitoria*; MANDERSCHIED [2004]) and the poorly understood Neronian «*Nymphaeum-in-the-substructures-of-the-Temple-of-Divus-Claudius*» (NEUERBURG [1965] nr. 137 = LETZNER [1990] nr. 284; DOMINGO – MAR – PENSABENE [2013] esp. 295, 321–323 for the unsatisfactory state of the question), both of which seem to have been domestic or private fountains inside Nero's palaces (see LONGFELLOW [2011] 29–31 for the latter), and (as BURRELL [2012] notes of the latter), inspired no local imitation.

dian dynasty.<sup>17</sup> The one class of building that appears to have much the same history as the monumental nymphaeum in Asia Minor – a Flavian-period start, and an explosion in the second century AD – is the monumental bath/gymnasium complex.<sup>18</sup> This similarity in timing may be significant, as we will see, but it is not an explanation.

I hope here to argue that monumental nymphaea came to be credentialed as a new building type worthy of great and expanding expenditure by cities and benefactors not chiefly because of any superior practical usefulness or potent symbolic charge, but rather because of the peculiarities of elite education. I maintain that an accident in the history of education in the late first century AD led to a shift in how members of the Greco-Roman ruling class – especially the Greek-speaking ruling class – conceived of their cities and those cities' amenities. This accident led to a subtle adjustment of cities' self-conception, often evident in the public oratory of the period, with the result that their inhabitants were increasingly concerned not merely with their water supply (a perennial civic anxiety in any Mediterranean town), but especially focused on their water-supply as an object of pride, of display, and especially of competition with other cities. This shift then manifested itself in a desire to show off that abundance of water, and from that desire evolved a new sort of building, the monumental nymphaeum. And once the first monumental nymphaea came to be built, the logic of this new civic structure was so obvious to those who shared the same education as the first benefactors that other donors and their cities quickly and naturally adopted nymphaea as suitable objects for civic and individual rivalry.<sup>19</sup>

\* \* \*

By the first century AD, education first in language and then in rhetoric had become the primary – indeed, often the only – education received by the ruling classes of the Roman empire. This fact (long known) is illustrated by the prevalent influence of rhetoric on imperial literature, be it poetry or history-writing, a phenomenon that has been the subject of intensive scholarly study.<sup>20</sup> It was while working through the *pro-*

---

<sup>17</sup> For different building types in Roman Asia Minor and their dates, conveniently PONT (2010) 25–201. For basilicas in Asia Minor, STINSON (2007); for the coming of Roman-style baths to Asia Minor, NIELSEN (1993) 1, 101–103.

<sup>18</sup> For the monumental gymnasium/bath complex, YEGÜL (1992) 250–306; NIELSEN (1993) 1, 103–108; 2, 36–39 and a list at 1, 105 n. 72; mean size 1, 105. The earliest known monumental bath/gymnasium complex is the Domitianic so-called Harbor Baths at Ephesus, with a ca. 11,000 m<sup>2</sup> footprint (NIELSEN [1993] nr. 295).

<sup>19</sup> I respectfully point the reader to the parallel argument of THOMAS (2014) that the development in rhetoric of the aesthetic we know from [Longinus] *On the Sublime* inspired changes in architecture, producing, inter alia, the monumental nymphaea this paper tracks back to rhetoric by another route.

<sup>20</sup> For rhetorical education and its influence on literature, see now the essays in DOMINIĆ – HALL (2007) esp. 69–82, 369–450 collecting a great volume of earlier work.



γυμνάσματα («preliminary exercises»), the intermediate stage of such education that followed the elementary study of «grammar» (γραμματική, *grammatica*) and preceded the final stage of «declamation» (μελέτη, *declamatio*; the giving of practice speeches on contrived topics), that boys first learned the techniques of how to praise or blame a man or city.<sup>21</sup> And while the last years of education were dominated by declamation, training in deliberative and above all forensic oratory (speeches of persuasion to historical figures facing grave decisions, and imaginary court cases), it seems clear that over time, and especially in the Greek-speaking eastern provinces of the Roman empire, epideictic («display») oratory began to make inroads, and began to push its way from the προγυμνάσματα into the more advanced curriculum.<sup>22</sup> In the East this development is presumably related to the fad for listening to display oratory associated with that body of celebrity itinerant orators whose tale is told in Philostratus' Lives of the Sophists. That author calls this cultural movement the Second Sophistic, and points to the Neronian-period Nicetes of Smyrna as the first of the breed.<sup>23</sup>

No matter at what age boys were taught the elements of epideictic oratory, the major real-world subject of such oratory was the praise of individuals, which had frequent practical application: imperial birthdays and civic festivals of every type required speeches in praise of the emperor, while the movement of Roman governors around the provinces, as of other great men, was accompanied by relentless speeches of praise in their honor. Such speeches also adorned the weddings and funerals of prominent personages, and, indeed, nearly any public occasion. It was natural, then, that teachers of rhetoric developed protocols for such speeches. These protocols (the subjects to be treated, and the order of treatment – home city, parents, education, virtues) were taught to boys in school, and available in handbooks (some of which survive to us), if adults needed to be reminded.<sup>24</sup>

Persons were certainly not the only subjects of encomia. The gods demanded their praises too, at their festivals, and great works of man, such as harbors and temples, merited the same. As an educational exercise or a public display of virtuosity paradoxical themes could be pursued in encomiastic form: there were famous sophistic praises of baldness, and of a parrot.<sup>25</sup> But given the overwhelming importance of the praise of persons – and therefore the concentration of training upon it – it was per-

---

<sup>21</sup> On the προγυμνάσματα, WEBB (2001); KRAUS (2005). For English translations of the surviving textbooks, KENNEDY (2003), and for a collection of such exercises performed by a distinguished orator and teacher (Libanius), GIBSON (2008).

<sup>22</sup> I adopt the cautious conclusions of HEATH (2004) esp. 277–279 about the continued dominance of forensic and deliberative declamation, against earlier scholars (including PERNOT [1993] 55–105) who suggested a more thorough-going colonization of imperial education by epideictic.

<sup>23</sup> WHITMARSH (2005) usefully gathers writings on the Second Sophistic.

<sup>24</sup> PERNOT (1993) 134–178 gathers the voluminous testimonia for encomia of individuals.

<sup>25</sup> Baldness: the Encomium calvitii of Synesius of Cyrene survives, LAMOUREUX – AUJOLET (2004) 48–90; parrot: Philostr. VS 487.

haps hardly surprising that when, at some point in the second half of the first century AD, the professors set down rules about how to praise the second most common subject of panegyric, the city, it was decided that cities were to be praised according to the same formulae as individuals, adapted as necessary. Quintilian (ca. AD 95) gives a brief account of the method, brief enough, perhaps, as to imply that it was all rather new to him (Inst. 3. 7. 26–27):

Cities and men are praised similarly. For the founder takes the place of the parent, and age adds greatly to authority, as in the case of those who are said to be sprung from the soil. The virtues and vices revealed by their histories are the same as in private individuals; but the excellences related to position and fortification are proper only to cities. Citizens are an honor to cities just as children are to individuals. Public works too can be praised, in which context distinction, usefulness, beauty, and the building's creator are looked to. Temples, for example, are to be praised for their distinction, walls for their usefulness, and both for their beauty and creator.<sup>26</sup>

The order of topics to be addressed was still somewhat unsettled in Quintilian's day. But rhetoricians held as to a plank in a storm to the formula *laudantur urbes similiter atque homines*, and over time refined and adjusted their rules for this practice.<sup>27</sup> And so it was that the teachers of rhetoric came to specify that a speech praising a city should be structured as follows (e.g., Men. Rhet. I 346–351, 353–365):

- Physical Position (θέσις, which took the place of «home city» for an individual)
- Origins (γένος, founding and founders = ancestors of an individual)
- Upbringing or way of life (τροφή, ἐπιτηδεύματα, moral history, just like that of a person; a city's constitution works well here)
- Actions (ἔργα, πράξεις, just like a person) under the four canonical virtues
  - justice (δικαιοσύνη)
  - self-control (σωφροσύνη)
  - wisdom (φρόνησις)
  - courage (ἀνδρεία)

---

<sup>26</sup> *laudantur autem urbes similiter atque homines. nam pro parente est conditor, et multum auctoritatis adfert vetustas, ut is, qui terra dicuntur orti, et virtutes ac vitia circa res gestas eadem quae in singulis: illa propria, quae ex loci positione ac munitione sunt. cives illis ut hominibus liberi sunt decori. est laus et operum: in quibus honor, utilitas, pulchritudo, auctor spectari solet. honor ut in templis, utilitas ut in muris, pulchritudo vel auctor utrubiue.*

<sup>27</sup> In addition to the brief notice in Quintilian (who provides the terminus ante quem for the existence of such rules), accident of survival has left us instructions for praising cities thought to be from the third century AD or after (although there were certainly earlier works upon which the later authors drew): two treatises attributed to Menander Rhetor (I 346–367; II 369–371, 379, 382–388, 391–392, 394, 417, 424, 426–433; text and translation RUSSELL – WILSON [1981]); [Dion. Hal.] Rhet. 257, 275–276 (USENER – RADERMACHER; English translation in RUSSELL – WILSON [1981] 362–381); [Hermogenes] Prog. 7. 15 (PATILLON) = Priscian, Prae. 24 (HALM); Anon. Excerpta Rhetorica in HALM (1863) 587. For the conventions of encomia upon cities, PERNOT (1993) 178–216; for the history of the genre, CLASSEN (1986).

We see these protocols clearly in use in the surviving Greek speeches of Dio Chrysostom, in the same generation as the Latin Quintilian. Elements of this system go back a very long way, to the fifth and fourth centuries BC: so we are hardly surprised to see earlier geographers and historians evaluating cities according to the four canonical virtues (Str. 5. 2. 3; Diod. 5. 14. 1), and showing interest in the θέσις (position) of the city in its χώρα, hinterland (Str. 5. 1. 11, 5. 3. 13). But the French historian of epideictic oratory Pernot is probably right to conclude, on the basis of the broadly different manner – different themes, different arguments, different organization – in which cities and landscapes are praised in earlier literature (see below), that what was to become the standard formula of *laudantur urbes similiter atque homines* does not pre-date by too long Quintilian's description of it in the AD 90s.<sup>28</sup>

It should be emphasized that, however intellectually elegant and teachable the formulation of the professors of rhetoric was that cities should be praised like persons, this instruction was not without its difficulties for practitioners, who were expected to find considerable matter to include about the city under each of the required rubrics. Courage was not hard: one could list the city's victories in war before the Romans put a stop to that sort of thing (Men. Rhet. I 365). But what about «justice,» say, itself divided into justice towards men, justice towards gods, and justice towards the dead? An orator might find himself lauding the Athenians for their scrupulous habit of laying out dead bodies before sunrise (I 363), or, under the topic of «self-control,» mentioning that women in the city were not allowed to own shops, evidently a lewd practice (I 364), or, under «wisdom,» praising the local laws of inheritance (I 364).

Worse, in a speech given according to this formula there was no adequate place for the discussion of grandiose public buildings, because although this was a subject that everybody knew deserved much attention (e.g., Aristides, 17. 10–12 [ΒΕΗΡ]; Philostr. VS 532), the parallel topic in the praise of individuals – personal appearance – was not considered of equal importance and was usually passed over quite quickly.<sup>29</sup> Much of Quintilian's early description of how to give encomia on cities (above) is spent worrying about this problem. And over time different professors urged different solutions: a city's buildings might be stuck on the front as a sort of preface, or added on the end of the speech as an epilogue.<sup>30</sup>

The topic of the θέσις (physical position) of a city appears to have posed a particular problem to practitioners, because it was canonically the first topic to be addressed, and so hardly to be skimmed upon, but was not one obviously rich with possibilities. Naturally the teachers of rhetoric stepped in with helpful suggestions:

<sup>28</sup> PERNOT (1993) 79–82, 178–188.

<sup>29</sup> Praise of individual appearance, PERNOT (1993) 159–161.

<sup>30</sup> Men. Rhet. II 382–383, 386; PERNOT (1993) 215–216. Nor (Men. Rhet. I 365; Lib. Or. 11. 130; [Dion. Hal.] Rhet. 276), causing yet more puzzlement to practitioners, was there a natural place in this structure to bring up the honors and titles the city had received from kings and emperors, a subject of great competition in Greek cities under the Roman Empire, ROBERT (1977 [1989]); HELLER (2006) 163–359; KUHN (2013).

Next in order of the components of «position» is disposition in relation to the territory round about and to neighboring territories. What must be looked to regarding territory round about is whether the city lies at its beginning, or in the middle, or at its end. If it lies at the beginning, it should be likened to a face, in that it protects the territory within, like the gate of an individual house. If it lies in the middle, it is like a royal residence or seat of government, or a shield-boss – as Aristides said – or like the mark indicating the center of a circle. If it is at the end, «it flees those approaching as if it were a girl fleeing the lustful.»<sup>31</sup>

Is it cold or hot? Misty or clear? What produce does the land yield? Close to the sea and its cargos? Far from the sea and its marauders? On a plain or a hill or a mountain? Near famous cities that add to its luster? Or, if a city has no advantages of place at all, the speaker may praise the folk for being such profound philosophers as to live in so forlorn a spot (Men. Rhet. I 346–351).

Nevertheless, it appears that the particular crutch upon which teachers and practitioners came to lean to fill up the required topic of a city's θέσις was water: the excellence of a city's position was illustrated by how well-watered it was. In the handbooks, water supply, and evidence for it, assume in teachers' prescriptions for encomia on cities a role disproportionate to the other themes they discussed.<sup>32</sup>

Next we have to look to the waters of the territory. Sources of water should be divided into three categories: either springs, or rivers, or lakes. These must be judged (like everything else) on grounds of pleasure and usefulness; a yet further division may be made in relation to their number and whether they are natural [or man-made]. In some places, moreover, hot springs are found.<sup>33</sup>

And in actual surviving speeches water-supply plays the same exaggerated role that it does in teachers' prescriptions for them.<sup>34</sup> Discussion of water allowed a speaker to catalogue the rivers and springs that fed the city, and tell of their shape, their modest

<sup>31</sup> Men. Rhet. I 349: ἐξῆς ἦν στοιχεῖα θέσεως, ὅπως ἔχει πρὸς τὴν περιοικίδα χώραν, καὶ ὅπως πρὸς τὰς ἀστυγεῖτονας χώρας. πρὸς μὲν τοῖνυν τὴν περιοικίδα χώραν θεωρητέον, εἰ ἐπ' ἀρχῆς κείται, ἢ ἐν μέσῳ, ἢ πρὸς τῷ τέλει. καὶ εἰ μὲν ἐπ' ἀρχῆς κείται, ὥσπερ προσώπῳ ἀπεικαστέον, καὶ ὅτι ἐντὸς τὴν αὐτῆς χώραν φυλάττει, ὥσπερ μιᾶς οἰκίας προπύλαια. ἐὰν δὲ ἐν μέσῳ, ὅτι ὥσπερ βασιλεία ἢ ἀρχεῖα ἢ ὀμφαλὸς ἀσπίδος, ὥσπερ Ἀριστείδης εἶπε, ἢ ὥσπερ ἐν κύκλῳ μέσον σημεῖον. ἐὰν δὲ ἐπὶ τέλει, ὅτι ὥσπερ ἐραστὰς ἀποφυγοῦσα τοὺς προσιόντας.

<sup>32</sup> Men. Rhet. I 345, 347; II 383–384, 386–387, 392, 427, 433; [Dion. Hal.] Rhet. 257; Anon. Excerpta Rhetorica p. 587 l. 24 (HALM); cf. Men. Rhet. I 352, II 423.

<sup>33</sup> Men. Rhet. I 349: ἔτι δὲ πρὸς τὰ ὕδατα τὰ ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ θεατέον. ὑδάτων δὲ φύσεις τριχῆ δεῖ διαρεῖν, ἢ ὡς πηγῶν, ἢ ὡς ποταμῶν, ἢ ὡς λιμνῶν. κριτέον δ' αὐτὰ ὥσπερ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα, πρὸς ἡδονὴν καὶ ὠφέλειαν, καὶ ἔτι πρὸς ταύτη τῇ διαίρεσει πρὸς πλῆθος καὶ αὐτοφυῖαν· ἐνιαχοῦ γὰρ καὶ θερμαὶ πηγαὶ εὕρισκοντα.

<sup>34</sup> D. Chr. 33. 2, 17, 23–25; 35. 13, 18–20; Aristides 17. 11, 14–15; 18. 6, 9; 21. 14–15; 26. 97 [BEHR]; there subsists also a fragmentary panegyric by Aelius Aristides, which, judging by its title, was wholly devoted to praise of the water of Pergamon (53 [BEHR]), on which JONES (1991); cf. Philostr. VS 491, 525, 557, 613. On praise of rivers, springs, and water-works in general, ΜΑΥΡΑΙ (2003) 33–40, 133–140.

habits (no nasty flooding), their beauty, and their history – and to go on as long as he liked about their myths, their nymphs and their goddesses (e.g., Aristides, 17. 14, 21. 14 [BEHR]). It offered excellent filler for a hard-to-fill-up rubric. And so it is hardly surprising that Dio Chrysostom could mock what a hackneyed topic civic water supply had already become in the encomia of his day (32. 37–38).

So useful, indeed, did the rhetorical use of water become, that it burst the banks of orations in praise of cities and territories and found its way into speeches of other sorts (e.g., Men. Rhet. II 392). So the wedding guest, listening to a local orator deliver a wedding oration, a genre in which there was considerable danger of being «tediously long-winded» (Men. Rhet. II 403, τὴν τοῦ μήκους ἀηδίαν), might nevertheless hear much of springs and rivers and their loves and myths (Men. Rhet. II 401–402). But wedding guests were tolerant: after the wedding speech there was still the orator's *wedding chamber* speech to endure, in which he exhorted the young couple to their amorous duty, resorting to a (rather alarming to us) set of examples taken from war and racing (Men. Rhet. II 405–412), but not excluding a hymn to the rains of autumn, should the wedding take place in that season (Men. Rhet. II 408). An important man leaving a city and delivering a «leave taking» (συντακτικός) oration, naturally praised the city he was departing – and its «harbors, rivers, and springs» (Men. Rhet. II 433, λιμένων καὶ ποταμῶν καὶ πηγῶν). An orator delivering an oration in praise of Apollo (Σμινθιακός) praised the region, the city, the festival, the temple, the statue of the god, and finally «the grove, the nearby rivers, and the springs» (Men. Rhet. II 440, 444–445, quoting 445, τὸ ἄλλος ἐκφράσεις καὶ ποταμοὺς τοὺς ἐγγύς καὶ τὰς πηγάς).

In addition, water might seep into a speech indirectly, when the formula for encomia on cities was adapted to form a part of encomia on other subjects. When delivering an encomium upon a festival, for example, or inviting a governor to one, the *θέσις* of the host city was an expected topic, and naturally a helpful professor of rhetoric drew the speaker's eye to the promising topic of the host city's rivers ([Dion. Hal.] Rhet. 257; cf. Men. Rhet. II 423, 427, 429). The most common type of encomium of all, that of individuals, also required a passage upon the individual's city of origin (and, in the case of a governor's visit, not only praise of the governor's home city, but also of the city being visited). This was a shortened version of the encomium upon a city, and governed by that encomium's rules.<sup>35</sup> Thus the water-sodden formula of encomia on cities, based on that of encomia upon individuals, might find itself swallowed up and regurgitated in the formula that gave it its origins.

\* \* \*

A late-first-century AD accident in the realm of education, then, had the result of bringing civic water-supply increasingly before the minds of the decision-making

---

<sup>35</sup> PERNOT (1993) 80–81.

classes of the Roman empire, both during their education and subsequently, during the surprisingly large amounts of time they appear to have spent giving and listening to panegyrics upon their cities, and to speeches of other types into which water themes had flowed directly or indirectly.

The wider effect of this new education can be observed and fixed approximately in time by reading works in other genres, for we witness a transition from a literary world where water, in all its forms, appears in authors when it is somehow significant, to one where water shows up, significant or not, because mention of it has become a required genre element of descriptions of lands and cities. Exceptional supplies or odd forms of water, or its lack, had always drawn the eye of ancient observers – in Homer, Argos already had the epithet «very thirsty» (Il. 4. 171, πολυδίψιος) – as had water when the context demanded it: rivers tend to appear in Thucydides when they provide a useful geographical marker, or prove an obstacle to marching armies, but not where they are unnecessary for the action of the story (e.g., Thuc. 1. 46. 4, 4. 103. 5, 7. 84. 3). There is mention of water and its availability (and grumpy complaint about deficiencies thereof) in the fragmentary Hellenistic travel-account ascribed to Heracleides Criticus, as of the safety of roads and places to spend the night, because he is writing not least to advise those travelling the same routes as he did, and Athens, he felt and reported, was badly supplied with water for travellers.<sup>36</sup> But (for example) in Cicero's encomium upon Sicily in his second Verrine oration (2. 2. 2–8), despite his harping on the province's fertility of grain, he mentions no sources of fresh water, no river, no spring, no fountain: such mention, evidently, was not yet expected by Cicero's time. Nor was it by the early empire. The respectively Tiberian and Claudian geographical authors Strabo and Pomponius Mela mention water mostly when there is something remarkable about it: if it is very cold, or curative, or plunges down a waterfall (Str. 3. 3. 11), or if it proves Homer wrong when he called Argos «thirsty» (Str. 8. 6. 7), or is famous of old, like Corinth's Peirene fountain (Str. 8. 6. 21), or if although inland it appears to rise and fall with the tides (Str. 3. 5. 7),<sup>37</sup> or if it is claimed as the birthplace of Minerva (Mela 1. 36), or rejoices in a floating island (Mela 1. 55), or inhabits the depths of a fathomless cave (Mela 1. 74).

But by the Flavian period – alas, the reign of Nero is a gap in our evidence – there has been a mighty flux of interest in water, and a change in how it was thought about. In the geographical sections of the Vespasianic Natural History of Pliny the Elder, remarkable water is still mentioned, but so is unremarkable water, because water is now more closely associated with cities, and so appears as a normal part of Pliny's mentions of them. Nor was Pliny an eccentric: civic water supply continued to be a subject of surprising concern to the second-century traveler Pausanias (somewhat

---

<sup>36</sup> Heracleides Criticus: ARENZ (2006) fr. I 1, 13, 26, 27 with HEINLE (2009) 47, 50; cf. for remarkable water in Hellenistic writings, e.g., Polyb. 9. 27; SEG XLVIII 1330 ll. 15–22; Letter of Aristeus 89–91.

<sup>37</sup> For water in Strabo, PÉDECH (1971) 246.

unexpectedly, because his interests were primarily in other realms), and springs and rivers become a positive fixation in the – probably – third-century AD geographer and teller of wonders Solinus.<sup>38</sup> This last devotes no more than two hundred and twenty-five words to the district of Boeotia in Greece (7. 21–29), but he nevertheless manages to mention the springs Arethusa, Oedipodia, Psamathe, Dirce, Aganippe, and Hippocrene (and that poets alleged that Aganippe gave poetical inspiration to those who drank from it, and that Hippocrene was created by the stamp of Pegasus' hoof), the rivers Ismenus and Cephisus, and two other rivers, unnamed but reported by Varro, one of which turned the sheep that drank from it dark, and the other white. A well in the same district (confused and vexed, we may guess, by the ever-changing sheep) simply killed any who drank from it. Solinus is mostly rubbish of course, and, worse, derivative rubbish: but that rubbish does seem to be floating in a considerable lake of literary water.

The same shift in attitude was also going on at the same time, at a lower intellectual level, in everyday city-management. Civic leaders and benefactors began to think about their cities differently: water-supply (always, of course, a practical necessity in any ancient city, like the supply of food or oil or any number of other requirements) became a larger and larger part of the identity of the city and its citizens. The timing of this intellectual shift can be traced through the civic coinage of the Greek cities of the empire. During the reign of Nero, a lonely Smyrna began putting a personification of a local river god on its coins; but Egyptian Alexandria minted coins with the Nile on them under Titus, and Ephesus put the Marnas (a river we will meet with again shortly) on its coins under Domitian. This practice of putting local rivers on coins then broke its banks under the Antonines.<sup>39</sup> In such a way did cities advertise to the world (and boast to their rivals) how well-watered they were, just as the first great nymphaea were beginning to rise on the west coast of Asia Minor.

The sculptures that adorned those nymphaea made the same link to the abundance of local water, sometimes by including sculpted swarms of water creatures and spirits, and sometimes, it seems, even by featuring the same river gods as appeared on the city's coins.<sup>40</sup> One of the very first façade-nymphaea of all, Ephesus' *Hydrekdocheion* of

---

<sup>38</sup> Remarkable, e.g., NH 5. 110, 5. 115, 36. 121–125; unremarkable, e.g., 5. 74, 5. 105, 5. 111, 5. 118, 5. 126, 6. 8. For Pliny the Elder as a geographer, EVANS (2005). Pausanias on badly and well-watered cities, e.g., 2. 3. 5, 7. 5. 10–12, 7. 27. 11, 10. 4. 1, 10. 33. 4–7, 10. 35. 6. On rivers in the Roman geographical authors, CAMPBELL (2012) 46–82.

<sup>39</sup> Coins: IMHOOF-BLUMER (1924): Smyrna (285–287); Alexandria (376); Ephesus (279–280 with KARWIESE [2006]); also KLEMENTA (1993) 189 n. 498, 198; DORL-KLINGENSCHMID (2001) 100 n. 501; MAUPAI (2003) 36–39; and CAMPBELL (2012) 449–450 nn. 268–272 brings the scholarship unsystematically up to date.

<sup>40</sup> For the statues on nymphaea, KAPOSSY (1969) 63–65; DORL-KLINGENSCHMID (2001) 86–101; RICHARD (2011); and esp. ARISTODEMOU (2012), with a catalogue. Nymphaea as a class had relatively more «watery» programs of reliefs, with nymphs and tritons and dolphins and the like, than other «aedicular» or «tabernacle» buildings – theaters, gates, libraries, and the

C. Laecanius Bassus (AD 79–82?), was adorned with two statues of river-gods.<sup>41</sup> A Domitianic nymphaeum in Ephesus also had (along with a Zeus) two personifications of river-gods, interpreted as the Marnas and the Klaesas, the sources of the aqueduct that fed the fountain (and one of Ephesus' aqueducts was called the «New Marnas»<sup>42</sup>). At Perge a statue interpreted as the local river-god Kestros reclined on the very lintel of the water-spout of the Hadrianic «Nymphaeum F3,» the famous fountain whose water then formed an artificial bubbling brook down the middle of the main street of the city.<sup>43</sup>

The extent of this growing fixation upon local water-supply can best be illustrated by its end, of which two striking fourth-century AD examples present themselves. One is the famous inscription recording the restoration by Constantine of city status to the small Phrygian town of Orcistus, including a paraphrase of the petition of the Orcistans (MAMA VII 305). Their plea for municipal status consisted of the claims that:

1. They had possessed such status in the past.
2. Their town sits at a cross-roads, convenient for the entertainment of public officials, and has an official lodging-place for them.
3. There is abundant water.
4. There are baths both public and private.
5. There is a forum with statues of former emperors.
6. There is population enough.
7. There are many water-mills powered by the surrounding streams.

---

«marble halls» of bath/gymnasia complexes: DORL-KLINGENSCHMID (2001) 80–82, 96–101; MÄGELE – RICHARD – WAELKENS (2007) 495 n. 67; ARISTODEMOU (2011b); ARISTODEMOU (2012) 100–112, 115–119; and compare Corinth, ROBINSON (2013) 373–380. See BURRELL (2006) for «aedicular» or «tabernacle» buildings considered as a group. For nymphaea other than those discussed below with prominent watery motifs, e.g., D-Kl nrs. 34, 64, 86, 98, 106.

<sup>41</sup> On the Laecanius Bassus fountain (D-Kl nr. 24 = R nr. 34), recently JUNG (2006) and RATHMAYR (2011), with 135–136, 138 for the statues of the river-gods. «One of the first»: the Laecanius Bassus fountain was previously thought to be the first monumental nymphaeum, dating to AD 78–82; but it has recently been argued that the nymphaeum at Miletus (D-Kl nr. 64 = R nr. 50) dates to the reign of Titus, AD 79–81 (for the date TUTTAHS [2007] 168 with n. 412), leaving us without a clear winner.

<sup>42</sup> On the nymphaeum (D-Kl nr. 27 = R nr. 30), recently PLATNER – SCHMIDT-COLINET (2005) 246–249. «New Marnas,» καινού Μάρναντος, I.Ephesos 1530 with SCHERRER (2006) 48–53.

<sup>43</sup> For nymphaeum F3 (D-Kl nr. 85 = R nr. 59), see recently LONGFELLOW (2011) 156–161. Pisidian Antioch had a similar channel down a major colonnaded street: OWENS – TAŞLIALAN (2009) 314–317; and so may Amastris, if that is the nature of the stinking stream Pliny proposed to cover over (Ep. 10. 98). For other apparent river-god statues and fragments, DORL-KLINGENSCHMID (2001) 100 n. 499; ARISTODEMOU (2012) 102–105; and esp. for those in museum collections that cannot be associated with specific monuments, KAPOSSY (1969) 23–26.



Three out of their seven claims, in other words, touch upon their water-supply. That is what they thought the emperor wanted to hear about when considering whether they ought to be made a municipality, and is especially striking if they were also trying to show that their town met a set of official criteria for that status.<sup>44</sup>

But an even more dramatic, one might even say obsessive, instance of the intellectual pressure of water is the orator Libanius' speech in praise of his home city, Antioch (Or. 11).<sup>45</sup> After his proemium, Libanius announces his intention to discuss first the city's glorious past, and then its glorious present (11). But even before that, the city's *θέσις* must be dealt with, and Libanius proclaims that his discussion of that will include the fertility of the land and the water supply (12). Nevertheless, even before the water supply is directly addressed, the streams of the territory flow into the discussion of the quality of the land (19). Finally, the water supply itself (27–28): «Who could number the rivers that course the land? The greater, the lesser, the perennials, and the children of winter? They are all equally useful: those that have their sources in the mountains, and those that spring from the plains; those that empty themselves into others, those that run to the lake, and those that march towards the sea. Our springs, indeed, and their bounty, are our very emblem, and none is so bold nor so proud of the nymphs of his own city, as to boast equality with us in this realm.»<sup>46</sup>

So water has performed for Libanius the gracious duty assigned it by the teachers of rhetoric: to help fill up the deep urn of *θέσις*. It might be thought that water might now be set aside. Not so. The speech moves from *θέσις* to the mythic history of Antioch (44): to Inachus, and Io, and the long-wandering sons of Heracles. And then comes Alexander the Great, who stopped long enough in his pursuit of the fleeing Darius to drink the delicious water of a local spring. It reminded him of the milk of his mother's breast, he said to his companions, and so he named the spring Olympias after that formidable lady and made of it a fountain in the precincts of a shrine to Zeus

---

<sup>44</sup> CHASTAGNOL (1981); JACQUES (1992), noticing the similarity of the Orcistans' claims to the *topoi* of panegyric on cities; KOLB (1993) 325–341, arguing that the Orcistans were trying to show that they fit an official list of criteria for city status; for further literature, RODA (1995) 83–90; WINTER (1996) 177 n. 1608. For an English translation and discussion, VAN DAM (2007) 368–372. For honors in (mostly late-antique) inscriptions to those who built or repaired civic water infrastructure, especially baths, MAREK (2000) 373–375.

<sup>45</sup> For English translations and commentary, DOWNEY (1959) and NORMAN (2000); for a fuller treatment, FRANCESCO (2004). SALIOU (2006a) offers an excellent introduction to the speech, listing translations into other modern languages at p. 274 n. 5, and discusses the theme of water in it (2006b). For what archaeology has uncovered of the reality – Antioch does seem to have had a remarkable number of baths – YEGÜL (2000).

<sup>46</sup> ποταμούς τοίνυν ὅποσοι διαρρέουσι τὴν γῆν, τίς ἂν ἐξαριθμήσειε τοὺς μὲν μείζους, τοὺς δὲ ἐλάττους, καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἀνάους, τοὺς δὲ τοῦ χειμῶνος ἐκγόνους, πάντας δὲ ὁμοίως χρησίμους, τοὺς μὲν ἐκ τῶν ὄρων ὀρμωμένους, τοὺς δὲ ἐκ τῶν πεδίων ἀνίσχοντας, τοὺς μὲν εἰς ἀλλήλους ἐμβάλλοντας, τοὺς δὲ εἰς λίμνην ἰόντας, τοὺς δὲ εἰς θάλατταν στείχοντας; αἶ γε μὴν πηγαὶ καὶ τὸ τούτων ἄφθονον ἡμέτερον ἀκριβῶς γνῶρισμα, καὶ οὐδεὶς οὕτω θρασὺς οὐδὲ ἐπὶ Νύμφαις μεγαλοφρονῶν, ὅστις ἂν ὡς ἴσον ἐνταῦθα ἔχων παρρησιάσαιτο.

Bottiaeus. An earlier Darius, Libanius stops to remind his hearers, campaigning in Thrace, had deemed the river Tearos the fairest of all, and had put up a notice to that effect. Alexander was *not*, Libanius insists, entering Antioch's spring into this competition of watercourses (72–74), although he thereby reminds us that waters might always be regarded as in contention one with another.

Alexander's successor Seleucus, to the modern historian the real founder of Antioch, almost failed in that duty, or so Libanius reports. Seleucus was sacrificing at Antigonina, a few miles away. But Zeus sent a gigantic bird to whisk away the burning thighs of his sacrifice and drop them on the altar of Zeus Bottiaeus, right beside (as Libanius reminds us) Alexander's beloved spring (85–88). And Seleucus took the hint, and built the city of Antioch on the indicated spot, setting his elephants about the perimeter to help him imagine where the towers should be (90).

Upon the death of Seleucus that king was succeeded by a train of worthy monarchs, who adorned the city with temples, theater, council house, and, naturally, water conduits. Libanius carefully specifies that some kings brought into the city water from the suburbs, while others moved water from parts of the city with springs to parts less well supplied (125). Eventually the city fell peacefully under Roman rule. When a great Roman army was gathered there, the water sources of Antioch (Libanius is at pains to point out) did *not* run dry, unlike the rivers of Thrace when Xerxes marched upon Greece of old (178).

Libanius then turns from history to a physical description of the city itself (196). And here, like a stream growing into a river, the splashing of water gets louder and louder. First we hear of the springs on the mountain that overhangs Antioch (200), and the river Orontes is mentioned (202). A vast façade nymphaeum (as yet unlocated by modern archaeologists)<sup>47</sup> stands in the center of the metropolis (202). The Orontes appears again, making an island of the so-called «new city» (203), and the emperor can gaze down upon the river from his palace (206). Baths are spread through the city (212), some suited for winter use, and some for summer (220); there are springs in the suburbs (234); and especially glorious are the springs of Daphne, veritable «palaces of the nymphs» (Νυμφῶν . . . βασιλεια) bringing forth the purest and clearest of waters (240), water wonderful to look at, touch, bathe in, and drink (242). If nymphs sometimes inhabit other springs, they do so only as tourists, before they return to their home in the springs of Daphne (241). And the waters of Daphne flow into the city in conduits (243). There are friendly rivalries between the neighborhoods of the city: the eastern quarter prides itself on Alexander's Olympias fountain (250), mentioned yet again.

«And this is the respect in which we triumph over all: that is, that our city is absolutely flowing with water. And even if someone should be impudent about our city in other respects, all must give way to us at the mention of our water. We defeat those

---

<sup>47</sup> R nr. 2.

who have beautiful water by the plenitude of ours, and those who have a plenitude by the beauty of ours, or, rather, we defeat their abundance with our plenitude, and their waters of pleasing appearance with the beauty of ours» (244).<sup>48</sup> The water in public baths flows richly, that in private baths hardly less so; the civic tribes compete in the adornment of their neighborhood baths (245). Practically every house has its private fountain, so public fountains serve mostly for display (247). Not for us, says Libanius, the shabby scrums that develop around fountains in other cities, with each inhabitant trying to draw water first, producing curses, broken jars, and broken heads (247). And the water in our fountains is so clear that it is nearly invisible (248). Even now, as his speech enters the last of its many minutes, Libanius is not finished with water. The sea produces its bounty (Antioch has a splendid artificial harbor [263]), the lake its, and the Orontes its own, while carrying the good things of the world to Antioch (258–260, 265). Alas the folk of Egypt, whose navigation of the Nile is often interrupted by rocks! Alas the folk of Thesprotia, whose river runs the wrong way (261–262)!

Finally the peroration. «What city is worthy to be set beside this one?» But here Libanius' enthusiasm has run away with him. For there were at least two cities that all knew to be greater: Rome and Constantinople. How to escape? How can the much-patched Hellenistic walls of Antioch compete, for example, with the magnificent fortifications of Constantinople? «If we are worsted by any city in respect of our walls, we are greater than that city because of – the abundance of our water!» (270).<sup>49</sup>

If the overt mention of water in Libanius' speech were not enough, it also dominates the speech's figures and metaphors. It was not altogether natural, in his discussion of the enormous population of Antioch, for the orator to compare the crowd in the market to a river flowing over rocks (172), the motions of crowds of shoppers and roaring rivers (when one thinks about it) being rather different; nor was it essential (nor any less contrived) for him to compare the colonnaded streets of Antioch to rivers and its side-streets to torrents flowing from them, nor that a cross-street connecting the side-streets in turn should be compared to a canal (201), nor that the arrival of soldiers who came to Antioch to fight the Persian war beginning in AD 337 should be compared to rivers flowing to the sea (178).<sup>50</sup> Nor again was it strictly compulsory that the kindly wind Zephyrus should cool Antioch by «flowing» rather than «blowing» through the city (225).<sup>51</sup> But the orator reaches most easily for the most familiar metaphors.

<sup>48</sup> καὶ νῦν ᾧ μάλιστα νικῶμεν, τοῦτό ἐστιν, ὅτι κατάρρυστος ἡμῖν ἡ πόλις. καὶ πρὸς μὲν τᾶλλα κἂν ἀναισχυντήσῃ τις, ἐν δὲ ὑδάτων μνήμῃ πάντες εἴκουσι. τὰ μὲν καλὰ πλήθει νικῶμεν, τὰ δὲ πολλὰ κάλλει, μᾶλλον δὲ τὰ μὲν ἄφθονα τῷ πλήθει, τὰ δὲ χαρίεντα τῷ κάλλει.

<sup>49</sup> τίνα δὴ ταύτη πόλιν παραβάλλειν ἄξιον; . . . καὶ μὴν ἤς μὲν ἡττάται κατὰ τοὺς τοίχους, ταύτης κρείττων γίνεται τῷ τε ἐνύδρῳ.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. HUSKINSON (2005) 249–250 n. 9.

<sup>51</sup> ὁ δὲ διαρρεῖ τε ἅπασαν καὶ περιρρεῖ καὶ οὐδὲν ἄμοιρον τῆς ἐπικουρίας ἀφίησιν.

Was Libanius simply mad? If so, he shared his madness not only with his own townsmen but also with many or most other educated inhabitants of the Roman empire of his day. Watery themes were common on mosaics in private houses all over the Roman world, even if they seem to have been especially common at Antioch.<sup>52</sup> And two centuries later John Malalas, also from Antioch, wrote a history of everything from Adam to his own day, with a good deal of emphasis on Antioch and its buildings, and especially its baths. But he also illustrates the wider late-antique interest in water, laboriously listing imperial donations of fountains and baths and water-works in other eastern cities as well.<sup>53</sup> And water, both natural in springs and streams and rivers or presented in man-made fountains and baths, simply appears to occupy a larger place in the literature of Late Antiquity than in that of earlier times.<sup>54</sup>

\* \* \*

In the late first century AD, a novel formula for delivering encomia upon cities entered practice and education, and exaggerated the interest of the Greco-Roman ruling class in civic water-supply as an element of civic identity. And it was perfectly natural that the resulting passion for displaying civic water that inspired the depiction of local rivers on coins in the late first and second centuries AD and culminated in the Orcistus inscription and Libanius' oration in praise of Antioch played a role in the building of monumental nymphaea, first in western Asia Minor, then in Asia Minor in general, Syria, and the Levant. These displayed a city's excellent water-supply, frequently at the expense of convenient distribution of the actual water, which would have been better accomplished through smaller neighborhood fountains (as, e.g., at Pompeii).<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> KONDOLEON (2000) 71–74; HUSKINSON (2005).

<sup>53</sup> Building involving water (usually baths) at Antioch, Malalas, Chron. 9. 5 (216–217), 9. 14 (222), 10. 10 (234), 10. 18 (243), 10. 19 (244), 10. 50 (263), 11. 9 (276), 11. 14 (278), 11. 30 (282), 12. 2 (283), 12. 22 (294), 12. 33 (302), 12. 38 (307), 13. 30 (339), 13. 40 (346), 17. 17 (422), 17. 19 (423); in other cities, Malalas, Chron. 8. 1 (192), 10. 10 (235), 11. 22 (280), 11. 25 (281), 12. 20 (292), 12. 21 (293–294), 13. 8 (321), 14. 12 (359–360), 14. 20 (363), 14. 29 (367), 16. 10 (399), 16. 21 (409), 18. 17 (435–436), 18. 33 (445), 18. 91 (482). For Malalas' accounts of imperial building, DOWNEY (1938); JEFFREYS (2000). In the same century, in the West, Cassiodorus, Var. 8. 31 lists baths as part of an implicit definition of a city.

<sup>54</sup> For late-antique interest in water cf. (among many) Ausonius, *Ordo urbium nobilium* (and of course we have from Ausonius a whole panegyric on a river, his *Mosella*); Rutilius Namatianus; Libanius, Or. 61. 7–8, 17–18; Himerius, Or. 41. 4–7, 10, 14; and MAREK (2000) 377 n. 37 for Greek epigrams. For water, fountains, and baths in late-antique Greek and subsequent Byzantine panegyrics, FENSTER (1968) 29, 34, 59, 187; and BOUFFARTIGUE (1996) 54–55, noting in n. 71 (p. 55) that «[l]es descripteurs ou laudateurs des villes byzantines omettent rarement de mentionner les bains.»

<sup>55</sup> For the convenient neighborhood fountains of Pompeii: SCHMÖLDER-VEIT (2009) 115–137. The fundamental impracticality of concentrating so much water in large fountains is emphasized by the late-antique habit of carving holes in large older nymphaea and running pipes from them into houses and businesses: JACOBS – RICHARD (2012).

In its early days, the building of nymphaea maps well onto the geography of the Second Sophistic narrowly understood, that is the normal cities of residence and performance of the orators described in Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophists*, and the cities that honored sophists and rhetors in inscriptions.<sup>56</sup> This is hardly surprising, because the sort of oratory that drove nymphaeum-building would be most frequently taught and learned, heard and valued, in those cities. And the greatest of the sophists, Herodes Atticus, himself built two major nymphaea in the mid-second century.<sup>57</sup> But nymphaea were probably not a function of, or caused by, the Second Sophistic: they resulted from changes in elite education that inspired both the Sophistic and giant fountains alike, albeit in different ways.

Once rhetoric canonized monumental nymphaea as legitimate public buildings, the building of such structures was snatched up like a feather and whirled into the vortex of one of the most powerful historical forces in the Roman empire: the competition for status between the cities of Asia Minor.<sup>58</sup> Thinking of fountains as ranked against one another was old: a Ptolemaic papyrus preserves a list of the «most beautiful fountains» (κρήναι κάλλι[σται]).<sup>59</sup> And in Roman times building fountains came to be the subject of competition between the cities of Asia. As Aelius Aristides said, «all other competitions have been abandoned, but one competition holds all the cities: that each may appear the most beautiful and charming. And everything is crammed with gymnasiums and fountains and gates and temples» (26. 97 [BEHR]).<sup>60</sup> The nymphaeum of one city inspired the prompt building of one in the next, which might echo or strive to over-top the first in size or design or decoration, this achievement sometimes inspiring the first in turn to build another fountain to regain its lead over its rival. Indeed, cities built nymphaea near the gates or on the very roads leading to other cities that had previously erected competing nymphaea.<sup>61</sup> And it was in city-pairs where such rivalry was strongest that nymphaea might both multiply and wax largest: in its competition with nearby Laodicea, Phrygian Hierapolis built the largest foun-

<sup>56</sup> PUECH (2002), esp. 17–23.

<sup>57</sup> The Nymphaeum of Herodes Atticus at Olympia (GLASER [1983] nr. 75 = R nr. 51 and BOL [1984]) and the Nymphaeum of Herodes Atticus at Alexandria Troas (D-KI nr. 2 = R nr. 1). Herodes built other water-works too, Philostr. VS 548, 551.

<sup>58</sup> On competition between Greek cities under the empire, ROBERT (1977[1989]); LENDON (1997) 74–77; HELLER (2006); and KUHN (2013). For competition especially in building, MAURAI (2003) 5–7, 307–327; PONT (2010) 269–296.

<sup>59</sup> DIELS (1904) 13–14, and see Hor. Carm. 3. 13. Cf. for the ranking of rivers, CAMPBELL (2012) 67, 71, 76, 81, 118–128.

<sup>60</sup> καὶ αἱ μὲν ἄλλαι πᾶσαι φιλονεικίαι τὰς πράξεις ἐπιλελοίπασι, μία δὲ αὐτὴ κατέχει πάσας ἔρις, ὅπως ὅτι καλλίστη καὶ ἡδίστη αὐτὴ ἐκάστη φανείται. πάντα δὲ μεστὰ γυμνασίων, κρηνῶν, προπυλαίων, νεῶν.

<sup>61</sup> DORL-KLINGENSCHMID (2001) 150–158; DORL-KLINGENSCHMID (2006), who identifies some agonistic fountain-building in Hellenistic times as well, 383; LONGFELLOW (2011) 188. For the locations of nymphaea in their cities, often near or even outside gates, UĞURLU (2009) esp. 136–137.

tain in Asia Minor, the Nymphaeum of the Tritons, with a façade sixty-five meters long.<sup>62</sup> With such a structure as this functioning as Hierapolis' *second* major nymphaeum – quite aside from the city's famous hot springs, which tourists still visit today – the epigram in the city's theater that urged «Hierapolis, may you of all cities rejoice in the most outstanding land in wide Asia. O thou city of gold, mistress of the nymphs, adorned with splendid springs,» was wholly justified.<sup>63</sup> Cities, mostly in the early third century, proudly depicted their new nymphaea on their coins so that all might know and envy.<sup>64</sup> And in some cities with multiple nymphaea – and especially Ephesus – it appears that the erection of such buildings also became a form of internal rivalry, not merely a contest between cities, but a contest between the great men of a single city.<sup>65</sup>

This building frenzy mates well with scholars' sense that competition between and within cities for status by construction was a habit considerably more violent in Asia Minor than in other parts of the Roman empire. So the powerful culture of φιλοτιμία characteristic of the region can perhaps explain why the phenomenon of monumental nymphaea grew to its greatest proportions in Asia Minor, Syria, and the Levant, which appear to have shared that culture. In metropolitan Greece, on the other hand, competition between cities tended to emphasize their ancient monuments. So often rather than building new fountains, famous old ones could be renovated and bedizened: the most striking instance is Corinth's venerable and oft-reconstructed Peirene.<sup>66</sup> And a late teaching text tells us that the ancient fountains of Greece were still thought to hold their own against much later, grander structures (Aphthonius, Prog. 12. 10 [PATION]). Whence, perhaps, in addition to the greater poverty of the region, an explanation of the lesser extent of the monumental-nymphaea-building habit in Greece.<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>62</sup> Recently on the Nymphaeum of the Tritons (D-Kl nr. 35 = R nr. 43), CAMPAGNA (2007); D'ANDRIA (2011) 150–160. For the competition between Hierapolis and Laodicea, DORL-KLINGSMID (2006).

<sup>63</sup> CIG 3909 = MERKELBACH – STAUBER (1998–2004) 02/12/05:

Ἀσίδος εὐρείης προφερέστατον οὐδας ἀπάντων,  
χαίροις, χρυσόπολι Ἱερῇ πόλι, πότνια Νυμφῶν  
νάμασιν, ἀγλαίησι κεκασμένη – – – –

«City of gold» is a pun on the name of a local river, so another claim to excellence by water.

<sup>64</sup> LEZTNER (1990) 13–19.

<sup>65</sup> For this internal competition, sometimes going on for generations, PONT (2010) 387–405; WEISS (2011) 72, 84–114.

<sup>66</sup> Lack of new fountains in Greece before the Flavians, AGUSTA-BOULAROT (2001); cf. WALKER (1979) 290–302, noting early imperial Greece's poverty, and later a skein of restraining classicism. Hadrian's fountains and their legacy in Greece, LONGFELLOW (2009). Peirene: ROBINSON (2005), (2011).

<sup>67</sup> ROBINSON (2013) 365 gives a good sense of the lesser ambitions of even a rich city like Corinth, with the wise observation, «[w]e may wonder if the stature of the city's great old fountains actually discouraged local and regional leaders – the primary benefactors of the city – from trying to compete with new designs.»

In the western provinces, the building of monumental nymphaea, so far as we know, was confined to the region of Rome and to North Africa. The most obvious explanation for this is climatic. Competition in the display of water only made sense in an arid climate. In northwest Europe, where most Roman cities were situated on rivers and where the engineering genius of the Romans was devoted to preventing flooding and draining wetlands, there was something slightly absurd about making a spectacle of the abundance of a city's cold water.<sup>68</sup> This more pragmatic attitude towards an abundant resource perhaps produced a comparable outcome in the building of Roman baths, of which modest versions existed in great number in the northern provinces, but where gigantic monumental baths – for baths too showed off a city's abundant water-supply, as is clear from the Orcistus inscription and the speech of Libanius above – were rare. The folk of the northern provinces liked bathing as much as any other inhabitants of the empire, but had less time for gargantuan baths that displayed (among other things) their water, because they saw less need to show it off. Perhaps it was therefore also to be expected that the cities of Asia Minor, outside Rome, built the most monumental baths, often combining them with gymnasia into tremendous structures.<sup>69</sup>

But a second reason for the lack of monumental nymphaea in the Roman West was a lack of first- and second-century models, either in Rome itself (traditionally a source of imitation) or elsewhere in the West.<sup>70</sup> The two areas of the West that did eventually come to participate in the competition of nymphaeum-building did so only belatedly. First came Rome itself, which stormed into the contest under Septimius Severus with the immense three-storied Septizodium, the biggest nymphaeum in the Roman world, with a façade at least some 95, and perhaps 150, meters long.<sup>71</sup> Ammianus Marcellinus knew what to make of it (even if he thought Marcus Aurelius had built it):

<sup>68</sup> On the cities and rivers of the Three Gauls, BEDON (2008); Britain, ROGERS (2013).

<sup>69</sup> Baths in the North and West, NIELSEN (1993) 1, 64–84; 2, 11–26. As LAURENCE – ESMONDE CLEARY – SEARS (2011) 228 observe, «[t]he vast amounts of water that were consumed by the baths . . . would . . . have been more impressive in the heat of a North African summer than in the midst of a winter on the Rhine where the provision of water could be assumed.» FAGAN (1999) 166 collects literary passages and inscriptions illustrating how baths contributed to the competitive standing of a city. Exceptions to the comparative modesty of the size of baths in North and West are Trier's second-century «Barbara» baths (20,640 m<sup>2</sup> of interior space; NIELSEN [1993] nr. 79), the same city's Constantinian (and perhaps unfinished) «Imperial baths» (15,270 m<sup>2</sup> interior space; NIELSEN [1993] nr. 81), and the Hadrianic «Large Baths» of Italica in Spain (ca. 16,800 m<sup>2</sup> interior space; GÓMEZ ARAUJO [2010] 72–76).

<sup>70</sup> Copying Rome: as the domestic fountains of Gaul did the domestic fountains of Rome and Italy, DESSALES (2004). Outside third-century Rome and North Africa (see below), almost all of the great number of fountains in the West catalogued by NEUERBURG (1965) and LETZNER (1990) are small.

<sup>71</sup> On the Septizodium and the controversies over its size and reconstruction, LTUR ad loc. *Septizonium*, *Septizodium*, *Septisolium* (2); LUSNIA (2004); THOMAS (2007b); and GLIWITZKY (2010) 95 n. 50 for literature.

he called it an *operis ambitiosi nymphaeum*, a «nymphaeum of rivalrous work» (15. 7. 3). This structure was patently built in imitation of, in competition to, and in triumphant victory over, the great nymphaea of Asia Minor. The Latin West, where without an earlier example from Rome the challenge to competition in building nymphaea was neither thrown down nor picked up among the provincial cities, may now have been doubly reluctant to enter into competition with Rome's monster. But North Africa was the exception. For here Septimius Severus built a large nymphaeum in his home city of Lepcis Magna – large, but hardly as unsurpassable as the Septizodium in Rome was. And so the competition in nymphaeum-building that began in Asia Minor in Flavian times, and that tempted Severan Rome to compete and triumph, spawned a second-order competition in North Africa in the early third century AD, and rival fountains subsequently arose in far-flung North-African cities such as Timgad, Lambaesis, Volubilis, Cuicul, and Simithus.<sup>72</sup> In what is perhaps a parallel development, from the reign of Hadrian, but especially during the Severan period, and also perhaps in part to show off their abundant water, the cities of North Africa began to build large representational baths.<sup>73</sup>

Nor was all the world intimidated by the Septizodium: it seems to have recharged the competitive engines of Asia Minor, where Side soon began a three-storied nymphaeum looking eerily like the Roman giant, and under Gordian III (AD 241–244) a third story was added to the now-venerable nymphaeum in Miletus.<sup>74</sup>

\* \* \*

The argument that has been made here is straightforward: that formal education can have real-world consequences, and that the often artificial way knowledge is structured in order to teach it can have unintended consequences of its own. There was nothing inherent in the practice of delivering encomia upon cities – or teaching boys how to deliver encomia on cities – that required civic water-supply to achieve an unnatural prominence in the minds of those who received that education. It was the result of an idiosyncratic decision made and popularized by late-first-century AD teachers of rhetoric whose names and works are lost to us, a decision that cities were to

---

<sup>72</sup> Lepcis nymphaeum: JONES – LING (1993); LONGFELLOW (2011) 183–185; and for evolution of nymphaea in North Africa, SCHMÖLDER-VEIT (2009) 43–46 and esp. 45. For other major water-works in Severan North Africa, known only epigraphically, some of which may have been monumental nymphaea, JOUFFROY (1986) 241–249.

<sup>73</sup> YEGÜL (1992) 186–234; NIELSEN (1993) 1, 84–95; 2, 26–32.

<sup>74</sup> For the influence of the Septizodium in Asia Minor, GROS (1996) 433; LONGFELLOW (2011) 180–181. On the Fountain at the City Gate at Side (D-Kl nr. 106 = R nr. 70, ca. AD 210–240s) see now GLIWITZKY (2010) 87–122 with p. 109 for the date and pp. 94–95 for its connection to the Septizodium. On the Miletus nymphaeum (D-Kl nr. 64 = R nr. 50), recently KÖSTER (2004) 65–77 and TUTTAHS (2007) 168–173. Cf. the three-level Nymphaeum of the Tritons at Hierapolis (D-Kl nr. 35 = R nr. 43; AD 222–235?).



be praised according to the same formula, adapted as little as possible, that was used to laud prominent men. But once that rule of rhetoric was laid down and accepted, the construction of monumental nymphaea followed by a process that, although hardly ineluctable, certainly involved less whimsical logic. For the new teaching adjusted the way the rhetorically educated ruling class of the empire – at least in its drier sections – looked at their cities, and at the amenities their cities ought to possess. Water, they thought, should not merely exist, or merely be used for drinking and bathing: it should be shown off, as ostentatiously as possible. Teaching boys to mention fountains in speeches encouraged those boys to build fountains when they became men.

Monumental nymphaea, then, are a story of education and its unexpected consequences. And it is pleasant in closing to contemplate an effect that nymphaea, in their turn, had upon education. Deep within the Greek Anthology there lurk a series of epigrams that present mathematical puzzles (14. 1–4, 6–7, 11–13, 48–51, 116–147). Most (14. 116–146) are assigned to one Metrodorus, and he may be responsible for all.<sup>75</sup> The date of this perverse pedagogue we do not know (although he is usually considered a figure of the fourth-to-sixth century AD), and it would do little good if we did, because he may have gathered his brain-teasers from many centuries. But one sub-set of his epigrams (14. 7, 130–133, 135) offers a strong terminus post quem, because they are story-problems about fountains with so many spouting statues that they surely must be monumental nymphaea:

Oh, with what a fair stream do these swift ones glut the basin:  
 These two rivers, and Bacchus in his elegance.  
 But their flow is not equal! Nay!  
 Nile alone will fill it up in a day,  
 So much water streams from *his* breasts. The thyrsus  
 Of Bacchus, pouring forth wine, will fill it in three.  
 And your horn, Achelous, will fill it in two. Now, run them  
 All at once, and you'll fill it up in a few hours! (14. 133)<sup>76</sup>

The puzzle is to figure out how long it will take to fill the basin of the fountain if all three statues spout at once: the kindly commentator tells us that the answer is six elevenths of a day. And it is nice to think of students scratching their heads over these

---

<sup>75</sup> On some of the mysteries of authorship this collection of mathematical puzzles presents, GRANDOLINI (2006).

<sup>76</sup>

ὡς ἀγαθὸν κρητῆρι θεοὶ κερόωσι ῥέεθρον  
 οἶδε δὺ ποταμοὶ καὶ Βρομίω χάρις.  
 ἴσος δ' οὐ πάντεσσι ῥόου δρόμος· ἀλλὰ μιν οἶος  
 Νεῖλος μὲν προρέων ἡμάτιος κορέσει,  
 τόσσον ὕδωρ μαζῶν ἀπερεύγεται· ἐκ δ' ἄρα Βάκχου  
 θύρσος ἐνὶ τρισσοῖς ἡμασιν οἶνον ἰεῖς·  
 σὸν δὲ κέρασ, Ἀχελῶε, δὺ ἡμασι. νῦν δ' ἅμα πάντες  
 ῥεῖτε καὶ εἰν ὥραις πλήσετέ μιν ὀλίγαις.

mathematical epigrams, which take the form they do because other students, perhaps centuries before, scratched their heads over how to praise a city as if it were a man.

*Corcoran Department of History*  
*University of Virginia*  
*Charlottesville, VA 22904*  
 U. S. A.  
*lendon@virginia.edu*

### *Bibliography*

- AGUSTA-BOULAROT, S. (2001) Fontaines et fontaines monumentales en Grèce de la conquête romaine à l'époque flavienne: permanence ou renouveau architectural? in: J.-Y. MARC – J.-C. MORETTI (eds.), *Constructions publiques et programmes éditaires en Grèce entre le II<sup>e</sup> siècle av. J.-C. et le I<sup>er</sup> siècle ap. J.-C.*, 167–236.
- ARENZ, A. (2006) Herakleides Kritikos «Über die Städte in Hellas». Eine Periegesis Griechenlands am Vorabend des Chremonideischen Krieges.
- ARISTODEMOU, G. A. (2011a) Theatre Façades and Façade Nymphaea. The Link Between, *BCH* 135, 163–197.
- ARISTODEMOU, G. A. (2011b) Sculptured Decoration of Monumental Nymphaea at [sic] the Eastern Provinces of the Roman Empire, in: T. NOGALES – I. RODÀ (eds.), *Roma y las Provincias: Modelo y Difusión*, 1, 149–160.
- ARISTODEMOU, G. A. (2012) Ο Γλυπτός Διάκοσμος Νυμφαίων και Κρηνών, στο *Ανατολικό Τμήμα της Ρωμαϊκής Αυτοκρατορίας*.
- AUPERT, P. (1974) Le nymphée de Tipasa et les nymphées et «septizonia» Nord-Africaines.
- BEDON, R. (2008) Les villes des Trois Gaules et leur recherche d'une proximité de l'eau: gestion des atouts et des difficultés créés par la présence de rivières et de marécages, in: E. HERMON (ed.), *Vers une gestion intégrée de l'eau dans l'empire romain*, 99–106.
- BERNS, C. (2002) Frühkaiserzeitliche Tabernakelfassaden. Zum Beginn eines Leitmotivs urbaner Architektur in Kleinasien, in: C. BERNS – H. VON HESBERG – L. VANDEPUT – M. WAELKENS (eds.), *Patris und Imperium. Kulturelle und politische Identität in den Städten der römischen Provinzen Kleasiens in der frühen Kaiserzeit*, 159–174.
- BOL, R. (1984) Das Statuenprogramm des Herodes-Atticus-Nymphäums.
- BOUFFARTIGUE, J. (1996) La tradition de l'éloge de la cité dans le monde grec, in: C. LEPELLEY (ed.), *La fin de la cité antique et le début de la cité médiévale de la fin du III<sup>e</sup> siècle à l'avènement de Charlemagne*, 43–58.
- BURRELL, B. (2006) False Fronts: Separating the Aedicular Facade from the Imperial Cult in Roman Asia Minor, *AJA* 110, 437–469.
- BURRELL, B. (2012) Review of LONGFELLOW (2011) in *AJA* 116. 2 (online: <http://www.ajaonline.org/online-review-book/1107>).
- CAMPBELL, B. (2012) Rivers and the Power of Ancient Rome.
- CAMPAGNA, L. (2007) Le recenti indagini al Ninfeo dei Tritoni (Regio II): nuovi dati per lo studio del monument, in: F. D'ANDRIA – M. P. CAGGIA (eds.), *Hierapolis di Frigia I. Le attività delle campagne di scavo e restauro 2000–2003*, 311–332.
- CAMPAGNA, L. (2011) Le fontane nelle città dell'impero romano: «a monument indelibly associated with the emperor»? [Review of LONGFELLOW (2011)], *JRA* 24, 648–656.
- CHASTAGNOL, A. (1981) L'inscription constantinienne de Orcistus, *MEFRA* 93, 381–416.

- CLASSEN, C. J. (1986) Die Stadt im Spiegel der *Descriptiones* und *Laudes urbium* in der antiken und mittelalterlichen Literatur bis zum Ende des zwölften Jahrhunderts.
- COULTON, J. J. (1987) Roman Aqueducts in Asia Minor, in: S. MACREADY – F. H. THOMPSON (eds.), *Roman Architecture in the Greek World*, 72–84.
- D'ANDRIA, F. (2011) Gods and Amazons in the Nymphaea of Hierapolis, in: F. D'ANDRIA – I. ROMEO (eds.), *Roman Sculpture in Asia Minor*, 150–172.
- DESSALES, H. (2004) Les fontaines privées de la Gaule romaine: l'adoption de modèles venus de Rome? *Dossiers d'archéologie* 295, 20–29.
- DIELS, H. (1904) *Laterculi Alexandrini* aus einem Papyrus ptolemäischer Zeit. *Abhandlungen der königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Klasse* 2, 1–16.
- DOMINGO, J. Á – R. MAR – P. PENSABENE (2013) El Complejo Arquitectónico del Templo del Divo Claudio en le Monte Celio de Roma, *ArchClass* 64, 295–347.
- DOMINIK, W. – J. HALL (eds.) (2007) *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric*.
- DORL-KLINGENSCHMID, C. (2001) Prunkbrunnen in kleinasiatischen Städten: Funktion im Kontext.
- DORL-KLINGENSCHMID, C. (2006) Brunnenbauten als Medium des interkommunalen Wettbewerbs, in: G. WIPLINGER (ed.), *Cura Aquarum in Ephesus*, 2, 381–386.
- DOWNEY, G. (1938) Imperial Building Records in Malalas, *ByzZ* 38, 1–15, 299–311.
- DOWNEY, G. (1959) Libanius' Oration in Praise of Antioch (Oration XI), *PAPhS* 103, 652–686.
- DRERUP, H. (1966) Architektur als Symbol. Zur zeitgenössischen Bewertung der römischen Architektur, *Gymnasium* 73, 181–196.
- EVANS, R. (2005) Geography without People: Mapping in Pliny, *Historia Naturalis Books 3–6*, *Ramus* 34, 47–74.
- FAGAN, G. G. (1999) Bathing in Public in the Roman World.
- FENSTER, E. (1968) *Laudes Constantinopolitanae*.
- FRANCESIO, M. (2004) L'idea di città in Libanio.
- GIBSON, C. A. (2008) Libanius's *Progymnasmata*: Model Exercises in Greek Prose Composition and Rhetoric.
- GINOUVÈS, R. (1969) IV. Le nymphée de Laodicée et les nymphées romains, in: J. DES GAGNIERS – P. DEVAMBEZ – L. KAHIL – R. GINOUVÈS (eds.), *Laodicée du Lycos. Le nymphée. Campagnes 1961–1963*, 136–167.
- GLASER, F. (1983) Antike Brunnenbauten (KPHNAI) in Griechenland.
- GLASER, F. (2000) Fountains and Nymphaea, in: O. WIKANDER (ed.), *Handbook of Ancient Water Technology*, 413–451. Largely a translation of F. GLASER, *Brunnen und Nymphäen*, in: G. GARBRECHT – W. ECK – F. GLASER (eds.), *Pergamon. Recht/Verwaltung, Brunnen/Nymphäen, Bauelemente. Die Wasserversorgung antiker Städte* 2 (1987), 103–132.
- GLIWITZKY, C. (2010) Späte Blüte in Side und Perge. Die pamphyliche Bauornamentik des 3. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.
- GÓMEZ ARAUJO, L. (2010) El Agua y las Termas en la Ciudad Romana: El Caso de Itálica (Santiponce, Sevilla), in: J. SOBRINO SIMAL – L. CERVERA POZO (eds.), *Actas del II Coloquio Internacional Irrigación, Energía y Abastecimiento de Agua: La Cultura del Agua en el Arco Mediterráneo*, 65–86.
- GRANDOLINI, S. (2006) Sugli epigrammi aritmetici nell'Anthologia Palatina: riflessi letterari ed aspetti di vita quotidiana nell'insegnamento dell'aritmetica, *GIF* 58, 341–353.
- GROS, P. (1996) *L'Architecture romaine de début du III<sup>e</sup> siècle av. J.-C. à la fin du Haut-Empire I. Les monuments publics*.
- HALM, C. (1863) *Rhetores Latini Minores*.
- HEATH, M. (2004) *Menander: A Rhetor in Context*.

- HELLER, A. (2006) Les Bêtises des Grecs. Conflits et rivalités entre cités d'Asie et de Bithynie à l'époque romaine (129 a. C. – 235 p. C.).
- HEINLE, M. (2009) Stadtbilder im Hellenismus – Wahrnehmung urbaner Strukturen in hellenistischer Zeit, in: A. MATTHAEI – M. ZIMMERMANN (eds.), Stadtbilder im Hellenismus, 41–69.
- HUSKINSON, J. (2005) Rivers of Roman Antioch, in: E. STAFFORD – J. HERRIN (eds.), Personification in the Greek World: From Antiquity to Byzantium, 247–264.
- IMHOOF-BLUMER, F. (1924) Fluss- und Meergötter auf griechischen und römischen Münzen (= SNR 23, 1923, 173–421).
- JACOBS, I. – J. RICHARD (2012) «We Surpass the Beautiful Waters of Other Cities by the Abundance of Ours»: Reconciling Function and Decoration in Late Antique Fountains, *Journal of Late Antiquity* 5, 3–71.
- JACQUES, F. (1992) Les moulins d'Orcistus. Rhétorique et géographie au IV<sup>e</sup> s., in: M. CHRISTOL – S. DEMOUGIN – Y. DUVAL – C. LEPELLEY – L. PIETRI (eds.), Institutions, société et vie politique dans l'empire romain au IV<sup>e</sup> siècle ap. J.-C., 431–446.
- JEFFREYS, E. (2000) Malalas, Procopius and Justinian's Buildings, *AntTard* 8, 73–79.
- JONES, B. – R. LING (1993) 6. The Great Nymphaeum, in: J. B. WARD-PERKINS (ed.), *The Several Buildings of Lepcis Magna: An Architectural Survey*, 79–87.
- JONES, C. P. (1991) Aelius Aristides, «On the Water in Pergamon», *AA*, 111–117.
- JOUFFROY, H. (1986) La construction publique en Italie et dans l'Afrique romaine.
- JUNG, K. (2006) Das Hydrekdocheion des Gaius Laecanius Bassus in Ephesos, in: G. WIPLINGER (ed.), *Cura Aquarum in Ephesus*, 1, 79–86.
- KAMASH, Z. (2010) Archaeologies of Water in the Roman Near East, 63 BC – AD 636.
- KAPOSSY, B. (1969) Brunnenfiguren des hellenistischen und römischen Zeit.
- KARWIESE, S. (2006) Polis Potamön – Stadt der Flüsse. Die Gewässer auf den ephesischen Münzen, in: G. WIPLINGER (ed.), *Cura Aquarum in Ephesus*, 1, 17–22.
- KEK, D. (1996) Der römische Aquädukt als Bautypus und Repräsentationsarchitektur.
- KENNEDY, G. A. (2003) *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*.
- KLEMENTA, S. (1993) Gelagerte Flußgötter des Späthellenismus und der römischen Kaiserzeit.
- KOLB, F. (1993) Bemerkung zur urbanen Ausstattung von Städten im Westen und im Osten des Römischen Reiches anhand von Tacitus, *Agricola* 21 und der Konstantinischen Inschrift von Orkistos, *Klio* 75, 321–341.
- KONDOLEON, C. (2000) Mosaics of Antioch, in: id. (ed.), *Antioch: The Lost Ancient City*, 63–77.
- KÖSTER, R. (2004) Die Bauornamentik von Milet 1. Die Bauornamentik der frühen und mittleren Kaiserzeit.
- KRAUS, M. (2005) *Progymnasmata, Gymnasmata*, in: G. UEDING (ed.), *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik* 7, 159–191.
- KUHN, C. T. (2013) Der Rangstreit der Städte im römischen Kleinasien: Anmerkungen zu Kontext und Datierung von I.Laodikeia 10, *ZPE* 186, 195–204.
- LAMARE, N. (2011) L'influence de l'architecture théâtrale sur le décor des fontaines monumentales, in: N. LAMARE – Z. LECAT – E. ROCCA – M. UBERTI (eds.), *Le passé et son héritage. Modalités et enjeux dans les sociétés du monde romain et de l'Antiquité tardive*, 28–45.
- LAMOUREUX, J. – N. AUJOLET (2004) *Synésios de Cyrène, Tome 4: Opuscles 1*.
- LAURENCE, R. – S. ESMONDE CLEARY – G. SEARS (2011) *The City in the Roman West, c. 250 BC – c. AD 250*.
- LENDON, J. E. (1997) *Empire of Honour: The Art of Government in the Roman World*.
- LETZNER, W. (1990) Römische Brunnen und Nymphaea in der westlichen Reichshälfte.
- LONGFELLOW, B. (2009) *The Legacy of Hadrian: Roman Monumental Civic Fountains in*

- Greece, in: C. KOSKO – A. SCOTT (eds.), *The Nature and Function of Water, Baths, Bathing, and Hygiene from Antiquity through the Renaissance*, 211–232.
- LONGFELLOW, B. (2011) Roman Imperialism and Civic Patronage: Form, Meaning, and Ideology in Monumental Fountain Complexes.
- LONGFELLOW, B. (2012) Roman Fountains in Greek Sanctuaries, *AJA* 116, 133–155.
- LUSNIA, S. S. (2004) Urban Planning and Sculptural Display in Severan Rome: Reconstructing the Septizodium and its Role in Dynastic Politics, *AJA* 108, 517–544.
- MACDONALD, W. L. (1986) *The Architecture of the Roman Empire II. An Urban Appraisal*.
- MÄGELE, S. – J. RICHARD – M. WÄELKENS (2007) A Late-Hadrianic Nymphaeum at Sagalassos (Pisidia, Turkey): A Preliminary Report, *MDAI(I)* 57, 469–504.
- MANDERSCHIED, H. (2004) Was nach den «ruchlosen Räubereien» übrigblieb – zu Gestalt und Funktion der sogenannten Bagni di Livia in der Domus Transitoria, in: A. HOFFMANN – U. WULF (eds.), *Die Kaiserpaläste auf dem Palatin in Rom*, 75–85.
- MAREK, C. (2000) Der Dank der Stadt an einen comes in Amisos unter Theodosius II., *Chiron* 30, 367–387.
- MAUPAI, I. (2003) Die Macht der Schönheit. Untersuchungen zu einem Aspekt des Selbstverständnisses und der Selbstdarstellung griechischer Städte in der römischen Kaiserzeit.
- MERKELBACH, R. – J. STAUBER (1998–2004) *Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten*.
- MESCHINI, S. (1963) Ninfei e Fontane, *Enciclopedia dell'arte antica classica e orientale* 5, 505–512.
- NEUERBURG, N. (1965) *L'architettura delle fontane e dei ninfei nell'Italia antica*.
- NIELSEN, I. (1993) *Thermae et Balnea. The Architecture and Cultural History of Roman Public Baths*.
- NORMAN, A. F. (2000) Antioch as a Centre of Hellenic Culture as Observed by Libanius.
- OWENS, E. J. – M. TAŞLIALAN (2009) «Beautiful and Useful»: The Water Supply of Pisidian Antioch and the Development of the Roman Colony, in: C. KOSKO – A. SCOTT (eds.), *The Nature and Function of Water, Baths, Bathing, and Hygiene from Antiquity through the Renaissance*, 301–317.
- PÉDECH, P. (1971) La géographie urbaine chez Strabon, *AncSoc* 2, 234–253.
- PERNOT, L. (1993) La rhétorique de l'éloge dans le monde gréco-romain.
- PUECH, B. (2002) Orateurs et sophistes grecs dans les inscriptions d'époque impériale.
- PLATTNER, G. A. – A. SCHMIDT-COLINET (2005) Beobachtungen zu drei kaiserzeitlichen Bauten in Ephesos, in: B. BRANDT – V. GASSNER – S. LADSTÄTTER (eds.), *Synergia. Festschrift für Friedrich Krinzing*, 1, 243–255.
- PONT, A.-V. (2010) Orner la cité. Enjeux culturels et politiques du paysage urbain dans l'Asie gréco-romain.
- RATHMAYR, E. (2011) Die Skulpturenausstattung der C. Laecanius Bassus Nymphaeum in Ephesos, in: F. D'ANDRIA – I. ROMEO (eds.), *Roman Sculpture in Asia Minor*, 130–149.
- RICHARD, J. (2008) Roman Monumental Fountains in the Levant: Water Supply vs. Urban Aesthetics? In: C. OHLIG (ed.), *Cura Aquarum in Jordanien*, 263–284.
- RICHARD, J. (2011) In the Élités' Toolkit. Decoding the Initiative and Reference System behind the Investment in the Architecture and Decoration of Roman Nymphaea, *Facta* 5, 65–100.
- RICHARD, J. (2012) *Water for the City, Fountains for the People: Monumental Fountains in the Roman East. An Archaeological Study of Water Management*.
- RICHARD, J. – M. WÄELKENS (2013) A Newly Discovered Nymphaeum near the Stadium of Sagalassos (SW Turkey), in: G. WIPLINGER (ed.), *Historische Wasserleitungen. Gestern – Heute – Morgen*, 85–91.
- ROBERT, L. (1977[1989]) La titulature de Nicée et de Nicomédie: la gloire et la haine, *HSPH* 81, 1–39. Reprinted in: id., *Opera Minora Selecta* 6 (1989), 211–249.
- ROBINSON, B. A. (2005) Fountains and the Formation of Cultural Identity at Roman Corinth,

- in: D. N. SCHOWALTER – S. J. FRIESEN (eds.), *Urban Religion in Roman Corinth: Interdisciplinary Approaches*, 111–140.
- ROBINSON, B. A. (2011) *Histories of Peirene: A Corinthian Fountain in Three Millennia*.
- ROBINSON, B. A. (2013) *Playing in the Sun: Hydraulic Architecture and Water Displays in Imperial Corinth*, *Hesperia* 82, 341–384.
- RODA, S. (1995) *La polis ellenistica e la civitas romana: gli spazi della civiltà*, in: E. FALQUE – F. GASCÓ (eds.), *Graecia Capta. De la conquista de Grecia a la helenización de Roma*, 83–103.
- ROGERS, A. (2013) *Water and Roman Urbanism: Towns, Waterscapes, Land Transformation and Experience in Roman Britain*.
- RUSSELL, D. A. – N. G. WILSON (1981) *Menander Rhetor*.
- SALIOU, C. (2006a) *Antioche décrite par Libanios. La rhétorique de l'espace urbain et ses enjeux au milieu du quatrième siècle*, in: E. AMATO – A. RODUIT – M. STEINRÜCK (eds.), *Approches de la troisième sophistique*, 273–285.
- SALIOU, C. (2006b) *Rhétorique et réalités: l'eau dans l'Éloge d'Antioche (Libanios, Or. XI)*, *Chronos* 13, 7–27.
- SCHERRER, P. (2006) *Die Fernwasserversorgung von Ephesus in der römischen Kaiserzeit: Synopse der epigraphischen Quellen*, in: G. WIPLINGER (ed.), *Cura Aquarum in Ephesus*, 1, 45–58.
- SCHMÖLDER-VEIT, A. (2009) *Brunnen in den Städten des westlichen Römischen Reiches*.
- SEGAL, A. (1997) *From Function to Monument. Urban Landscapes of Roman Palestine, Syria, and Provincia Arabia*.
- SETTIS, S. (1973) «Esedra» e «ninfeo» nella terminologia architettonica del mondo romano. *Dall'età repubblicana alla tarda antichità*, *ANRW* 1. 4, 661–745.
- STINSON, P. (2007) *Imitation and Adaptation in Architectural Design: Two Roman Basilicas at Ephesus and Aphrodisias*, in: M. MEYER (ed.), *Neue Zeiten – Neue Sitten. Zu Rezeption und Integration römischen und italischen Kulturguts in Kleinasien*, 91–100.
- THOMAS, E. (2007a) *Monumentality and the Roman Empire: Architecture in the Antonine Age*.
- THOMAS, E. (2007b) *Metaphor and Identity in Severan Architecture: The Septizodium at Rome between «Reality» and «Fantasy»*, in: S. SWAIN – S. HARRISON – J. ELSNER (eds.), *Severan Culture*, 327–367.
- THOMAS, E. (2014) *On the Sublime in Architecture*, in: J. ELSNER – M. MEYER (eds.), *Art and Rhetoric in Roman Culture*, 37–88.
- THÜR, H. (1995) *Der ephesische Ktistes Androklos und (s)ein Heroon am Embolos*, *JÖAI* 64, 63–103.
- TUTTAHS, G. 2007. *Milet und das Wasser – ein Leben in Wohlstand und Not in Antike, Mittelalter und Gegenwart*.
- UĞURLU, N. B. (2009) *The Roman Nymphaea in the Cities of Asia Minor: Function in Context*.
- VAN DAM, R. (2007) *The Roman Revolution of Constantine*.
- WALKER, S. E. C. (1979) *The Architectural Development of Roman Nymphaea in Greece*. Unpublished dissertation, University of London.
- WEBB, R. (2001) *The Progymnasmata as Practice*, in: Y. L. TOO (ed.), *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*, 289–316.
- WEISS, C. F. (2011) *Living Fluidly: Uses and Meanings of Water in Asia Minor (Second Century BCE – Second Century CE)*. Unpublished dissertation, Brown University.
- WHITMARSH, T. (2005) *The Second Sophistic*.
- WINTER, E. (1996) *Staatliche Baupolitik und Baufürsorge in den römischen Provinzen des kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien*.
- YEGÜL, F. (1992) *Baths and Bathing in Classical Antiquity*.
- YEGÜL, F. (2000) *Baths and Bathing in Roman Antioch*, in: C. KONDOLEON (ed.), *Antioch: The Lost Ancient City*, 146–151.

Der CHIRON wird jahrgangweise und in Leinen gebunden ausgeliefert.  
Bestellungen nehmen alle Buchhandlungen entgegen.

*Verlag: Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston*

*Druck und buchbinderische Verarbeitung: Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen*

*Anschrift der Redaktion: Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des  
Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Amalienstr. 73b, 80799 MÜNCHEN, DEUTSCHLAND  
redaktion.chiron@dainst.de*