

A Memorial in the World

Legendary Patterns in Late Antique Biography

Matthew O'Farrell B.Arts (hons.) ANU, MRes. MQ.

Department of Ancient History, Macquarie University

Vakgroep Geschiedenis, Universiteit Gent

Submitted 15-06-2018

Summary

This study identifies and examines a pair of narrative patterns – *sequences* – associated with royal origins seen in the historical or historicising literatures of a number of west Eurasian societies. Taking a contextual and comparative approach, it will suggest a general theory for the emergence and behavior of both as products of formal, laudatory, and apologetic processes.

Central to this examination are two Medieval biographical traditions addressing Late Antiquity: the *Kārnāmag* of Ardashir I, a Middle Persian tradition that existed in some form by the early 11th century, and the *vitae*, a number of Greek hagiographies of Constantine I dating from the 9th to the 13th centuries. These are composite traditions drawing together heterogeneous material, including an instance of each sequence, into a longer biographical narrative. Both traditions, *particularly* the Byzantine, offer a case study in the action of each sequence in a living historical discourse.

Finally, the presence of the same sequences, similar structure, and a broadly similar reception allow the narratives seen in the texts of the *Kārnāmag* and the *vitae* to be viewed as representative of the same *kind* of work and thereby offers a new interpretation of the rather opaque Iranian tradition.

Statement of Originality

This work has not previously been submitted for a degree or diploma in any university. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made in the thesis itself.

Matthew O'Farrell: 15-06-2018

Acknowledgments

Without the help of the following people, this dissertation would not have been possible.

The taxpayers of the Commonwealth of Australia, *anōšag bawēd*. My supervisors Peter Van Nuffelen, Ghazzal Dabiri, Lieve Van Hoof and especially Andrew Gillett, who have been consistently forgiving of my missteps and enthusiasms over the last three years and have always led me back to the right path. Samuel Lieu, Mark Vermes, and Michael Jackson-Bonner who have very kindly allowed me access to their unpublished translations. Katrien De Graef and Almut Hintze who most generously answered my unsolicited requests for advice. My teachers at the ANU, especially Elizabeth Minchin, Zahra Taheri, Mohammed Seyyed-Torabi, Peter Londey, Paul Burton, Robert Barnes, and Joan Stivala. Sandra Duggan who, I only belatedly realised, was the first person to show me *how* to think. I also wish to thank those such as Alana Nobbs, Anne Moffat, Arjan Zuiderhoek and Koenraad Verboven who though not directly involved in my work have always been most collegial and encouraging towards me.

My colleagues and officemates at the University of Ghent: Jeroen Wijnendaele, Andy Hilkins, Marianna Mazzola, Maria Coterno, Marta Bigus, Kasey Reed, Milan Pajic, Lorenzo Focanti, Panos Manafis, Raf Praet, Kristof Vermote, Amber Brüsewitz, Linsey Vandervoorde, Toon Bongers, Dorien Leder, and, I *deeply* regret to say, the expendable Alexis Daveloose.

All of the friends I have made during the many years of my studies, particularly William Bullock-Jenkins, Asefeh Zeinalabedini, Kalina Allendorf *née* Ślaska-Sapała, Corinna Verity-Box, Hannah Borsody-Casey, Fiona Sweet-Formiatti, and Christian Mark Blauer.

Outside of the academy, my mother and father who have always encouraged me, and my parents-in-law and sister Kelly who took on a very heavy burden during my stays in Ghent. My very oldest friends: Steve Pokorra, Mick White, Richard Ko, Maple Ko, Warwick Smith, Sareh Sangsari, Beck Bidstrup, Fulvia Hughes, Nick Neal, Simon Long, Brad Huvel, and Adam Rumbold.

Finally my wife Kristin, daughter Ivy, and son Edwin, to whom I owe a great debt of time and attention and ought now return.

List of Abbreviations

Acta. SS VIII =	Stiltingus, J. Suyskenus, J. Perierus, J. and Cleus, J. (Eds.) (1762). <i>Acta Sanctorum Septembris</i> , Acta Sanctorum VIII, Antwerp.
ATU =	Uther, H. 2004. <i>Types of International Folktales: A classification and Bibliography</i> . 3 vols, Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia/Academia Scientiarum Fennica.
EDH=	<i>Epigraphic Database Heidelberg</i> . Electronic resource (1986 -. Heidelberg Academy of Sciences and Humanities).
FGrH =	<i>Brill's New Jacoby Online</i> . Electronic Resource. (1926 -. Ed. F. Jacoby, I. Worthington, S. Schorn, H. Joachim-Gehrke and V. Bucciattini).
KNA =	Anonymous. <i>Kâr-nâma-î Artakhsîr-î Pâpakân</i> . (1935. Ed. B.T. Anklesaria). Bombay.
LoT =	Anonymous. <i>The Letter of Tansar</i> . (1954. Ed. And Trans. M. Boyce). Rome: Royal Institute of Translation and Publication of Iran, Instituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, UNESCO.
NPi =	Skjaervø, P.O. (Ed.) (1983). <i>The Sasanian Inscription of Paikuli, Restored text and translation</i> . . Vol. 3.1. Wiesbaden: Dr Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
PG =	<i>Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Graeca</i> . (1857-66. Ed. J.P. Minge)
PLRE =	Martindale, J.R. (1980). <i>The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire: Volume II, 395-527 AD</i> . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
ŠhN =	Ferdowsi. <i>Šāhnāmeḥ</i> . Persian Heritage Foundation, Persian Texts, New Series 1. 8 Vols. (1987-2007. Ed. D. Khaleghi Motlagh and M. Omidasalar). Costa Mesa: Mazda Publishers
ŠKZ =	Huyse, P. (1999). <i>Die dreisprachige Inschrift Šābuhrs I. an der Ka'ba-I Zardušt (ŠKZ)</i> . Corpus Inscriptionem Iranicum pt. III. London: School of Oriental and African Studies.

A Note on Transliteration

This study covers a wide variety of texts from a number of different languages. As a result, a *completely* consistent transliteration is impossible. The following guidelines have been followed:

- Middle Persian follows the transliteration used in D.M. Mackenzie's *A Concise Dictionary of Pahlavi*.
- Modern Persian and Arabic follow the transliteration used by the *Encyclopedia Iranica*, with the exception that the letter Khe is rendered "kh" *not* "k"
- The rare uses of Armenian names follow the usage of the referenced translations.
- Where a translation has been quoted the transliteration of the original has been maintained.
- Where a conventional English spelling for a name exists it will be used. Hence: Ctesias, *not* Ktesias, Sargon, *not* Šarrum-kin, and Ardashir, *not* Ardaxšīr or similar.

Tables

Table 1: Sargon, Sequence One.....	291
Table 2: Sargon, Sequence Two	292
Table 3: Cyrus, Sequence One	293
Table 4: Cyrus, Sequence Two	294
Table 5: Ardashir, Sequence One.....	295
Table 6: Ardashir, Sequence Two	296
Table 7: Shapur, Sequence One	297
Table 8: Ormazd, Sequence One	298
Table 9 (1-4): Constantine, Sequence One	299-302
Table 10 (1-3): Constantine, Sequence Two.....	303-305

Table of Contents

Summary	3
Statement of Originality	5
Acknowledgments	vii
List of Abbreviations	ix
A Note on Transliteration	xi
Tables	xiii
Table of Contents	xv
A Memorial in the World	1
Introduction	1
1 Methods and concepts	11
1.1 Plan of the work	11
1.2 Limits and Caveats	13
1.3 Terms	15
1.4 Methods	17
1.4.1 Myth and its Theorists	18
1.4.2 Folkloristics and Defining Sequences	21
1.4.3 Sequence One	24
1.4.4 Sequence Two	26
1.5 Conclusion	29
2 The Mesopotamian Background	31
2.1 Introduction	31
2.1.1 From Akkad to Achaemenes	33
2.2 Sargon of Akkad	34
2.2.1 The Sumerian King List	35
2.2.2 The Birth Legend: Sequence One?	37
2.2.3 The Sumerian Legend: Sequence Two?	38
2.2.4 Sargon Imaginaire	44
2.3 Cyrus the Great	49

2.3.1	Herodotus	50
2.3.2	Ctesias	54
2.3.3	Xenophon	61
2.4	The Problem of Transmission	65
2.4.1	Achaemenid Self-Presentation	66
2.4.2	The Babylonian Interpretation	68
2.4.3	Cyrus as Sargon	73
2.5	Conclusion	74
3	Ardashir	79
3.1	Introduction.....	79
3.1.1	Competing Traditions.....	81
3.2	Ṭabarī.....	84
3.3	The Chronicle Tradition	89
3.4	The Kārnāmag	98
3.4.1	The Nature of the Kārnāmag	98
3.4.2	Overview and Setting of the Kārnāmag.....	101
3.4.3	Ardashir: Sequence One?	105
3.4.4	Ardashir: Sequence Two.....	110
3.4.5	Shapur: Sequence One	115
3.4.6	Ormazd: Sequence One.....	118
3.4.7	Other Attestations of Kārnāmag Origin Narratives	124
3.5	The Usefulness of Typology.....	131
3.6	The Kārnāmag as Compilation	134
3.7	Conclusion	135
4	Constantine	137
4.1	Core Texts	138
4.2	Constantine's Early Life According to the Vitae	140
4.3	The Vitae	141
4.4	Sequence One: The Inn Narrative	144
4.4.1	The Passio Eusignii.....	146
4.4.2	The Life of Theodore of Sykeon	149
4.4.3	"John of Ephesus"	150
4.4.4	The "Libellus"	152
4.5	Date, Authorship and Intent.....	154
4.5.1	The Status of Helena	157
4.5.2	The Recognition(s) of Constantine	166
4.5.3	Summary of Sequence One	172
4.6	Sequence Two: The Flight From Court.....	173
4.6.1	Lactantius and the Disappearing Campaign of 305.....	175
4.6.2	The Warning, and the Plot.....	180
4.6.3	Contrast through Combat	182
4.6.4	Flight	194
4.6.5	Young Constantine's School Days.....	199
4.6.6	Overlapping Models in the Representation of Constantine	204

4.6.7	Summary of Sequence Two	209
4.7	Constantine and Ardashir: Parallel Lives?	210
5	Synthesis	213
5.1	Overview	213
5.2	Key Assertions.....	214
5.2.1	Themes.....	214
5.2.2	Patterns of Emergence	218
5.2.3	Precedent and Replication.....	223
5.2.4	Effects in Historiography	226
5.3	Religious-Imperial Historiography	227
5.3.1	Imperial Narrative and Communal Narrative	233
5.3.2	Function.....	239
5.3.3	Context and Audience	243
5.4	Conclusion: Parallel Lives?.....	251
Conclusion	255
Bibliography	263
Pre-Modern	263
Modern	267
Tables	289

A Memorial in the World

Introduction

On April 25th 387 CE, Easter Sunday, John Chrysostom addressed the populace of Antioch in what must have been an atmosphere of great relief.¹ Having heard the pleas of Antioch's friends and representatives, the emperor Theodosius I (r.379-395 CE) had graciously declined to have the city's leading citizens rounded up and executed for their failure to prevent a riot in which the emperor's images were torn down and stoned. According to Chrysostom, this was entirely due to the efforts of Flavian, the city's elderly bishop, a version of events that may not have been completely, or at all, true.² A large part of Chrysostom's sermon claims to recount Flavian's representations before the emperor *verbatim*. As Chrysostom tells it, the saintly priest, blaming the disturbances on external, supernatural forces, admitted to the city's ingratitude and begged the disappointed emperor's pardon.³ In representing Flavian's case for clemency as both an imperial and Christian virtue, Chrysostom saw fit to mention a similar act of mercy made by the emperor Constantine who had died five decades before. After describing the dead emperor's mild and philosophical response to the stoning of *his* images, Chrysostom, speaking as Flavian, made a striking statement.

“It is related of the blessed Constantine, that on one occasion, when a statue of himself had been pelted with stones, and many were instigating him to proceed

¹ For the dates of Chrysostom's homilies during the controversy, see Pavard (1991), pp.363-364.

² Responsibility for the pardon may, in fact, lie with the recommendations of Caesarius, Theodosius' *Magister Officorum*, a number of other petitions that were put to Theodosius after the riot, or a combination of some or all of these representations, see *ibid.* pp.135-149. On the extremely rhetorical and thereby tendentious nature of the sources for these events and their resulting problems as historical sources, see French (1998).

³ PG. 49.216 f.

against the perpetrators of the outrage; saying, that they had disfigured his whole face by battering it with stones, he stroked his face with his hand, and smiling gently, said, I am quite unable to perceive any wound inflicted upon my face. The head appears sound, and the face also quite sound. Thus these persons, overwhelmed with shame, desisted from their unrighteous counsel.

This saying, even to the present day, all repeat; and length of time hath neither weakened nor extinguished the memory of such exalted wisdom. How much more illustrious is such an action than any number of warlike trophies! Many cities did he build; and many barbarous tribes did he conquer; not one of which we now remember; but this saying is repeated over and over again to the present day; and those who follow us, as well as those who come after them, all will hear of it.”⁴

Given the context of Chrysostom’s speech, the persuasive intent of the rhetorical mode and the all too neat appropriateness of the analogy for the situation, one may express some skepticism as to the historicity of Chrysostom’s example. Chrysostom was well within his rights to offer plausibility rather than fact; there was no reason after all, why the great Constantine *could not* have behaved in such a way and every reason why he *should* have.⁵ One may also suspect that Chrysostom’s self-contradicting assertion, that Constantine’s vast earthly successes, his campaigns and foundations, had *entirely* faded from public memory a mere half century after his death, to have been another artifact of Chrysostom’s rhetorical pose rather than a firm insight into the sociology of historical knowledge in the later fourth century.

Despite the artificiality of its context and the deeply suspicious use to which it was put, this statement has, on occasion, been used in studies of later literary traditions surrounding that emperor as evidence of the rapid transmutation of Constantine into a figure of legend.⁶ Unfortunately, to link this statement to the development of *literary* legends, even as a brief example in passing, is an awkward elision of two rather different things. “Legend” is part of a knot of terms describing varieties of narrative that are, at

⁴ Ibid. Trans., Schaff and Stephens (1889), pp.485-486.

⁵ Kempshall (2011), p.350 f.

⁶ Linder (1975), pp.45-6, Lieu and Montserrat (1996), p.99.

least in English, often poorly delineated.⁷ Invoking the “sayings” of the late emperor, Chrysostom appears to have been referencing, probably inventing, the rawest level of “oral” history - what has been called a society’s “general historical knowledge” or its “unprocessed historical record”⁸ - that is, informal history, beliefs about the past distributed among the individual members of a society at any given time. Yet there is no obligatory link between this, the gross, the collection of individual constructions of the past borne by ephemeral millions, and the net, the collection of literary remnants passed to posterity. Though it was certainly not the intent of these writers to do so, the quotation of Chrysostom’s rhetoric in these contexts, accidentally links one to the other, inadvertently implying a process proceeding largely from the bottom up. The result is a misleading sense of how “historical legend”, that is, unhistorical narrative of a stereotypical nature in pre-modern texts that claim historicity, comes into being. The dissolution of historical individuals into recognizable bundles of images and associations in the representation of history in text is a process in which the boundless and eternally faceless concepts of the “oral” and the “popular” are not the only, or even the most important, actors.

Of course, the interpretation these authors have drawn from Chrysostom’s statement is, in the broadest sense, quite true. It is almost certain that various demotic, perhaps quite fantastic, stories of Constantine were in circulation in Chrysostom’s lifetime, but these and any “sayings” known to his audience, are almost entirely closed to us. They died with the last person who heard them or gradually affixed themselves to other figures, leaving no discernible trace of their former attachment. What remains for us is another set of materials entirely, that information which those with the skills, the time and the inclination thought important enough to create, record and preserve. Such people are rarely as informative as one would like, particularly in regards to *their* sources. Indeed, there almost invariably comes a point in the consideration of historical material where information peters out, where links stubbornly refuse to be made and historians find themselves staring at a map:

⁷ Thompson (1977), pp.7-14.

⁸ Finnegan (1970), p.198, White (1973), p.5.

“Without the least vestige of land”⁹

At this point, one may either admit that one can proceed no further, or one can, out of a *horror vacui*, start making assumptions about the nature and behavior of processes one cannot observe. A form of the latter approach, the supposition of an underlying oral tradition, is very often applied in cases where historical narrative has become implausible, unrealistic and stereotypical. This approach has the great advantage of being essentially immune to examination, allowing the author to pass quickly on to more fertile pastures. It is very often, however, a deeply unsatisfactory answer to the problem of why, and how, the implausible, the unrealistic and the stereotypical came to reside in representations of the past in the first place. It is to present, in a far less calculated way, an explanation akin to that made in Chrysostom's panegyric of thanks to his emperor and his bishop.

When considering this sort of narrative, what might be called *historical legend*, we should be wary of the assumption, echoing that of the first wave of European folklorists, that there exists in all cultures a living reservoir of narratives into which writers sometimes dipped.¹⁰ This is not to claim that writers are always and everywhere austere above the non-literate traditions current in their time. This is clearly not the case.¹¹ Nor is it to entirely discount an “oral” or “popular” component in the circulation of such stories. Rather it is to recognise that things are far more complicated than an either/or distinction and to take the, by now, not controversial position that the effects of literate transmission impact on literate and non-literate contexts alike.

Composing a textual representation of the past presumes both an opinion on the past and, in most societies, membership of a group whose skills presuppose some awareness of a precedent of previous representations in text. Writers are both bearers of the

⁹ He had bought a large map representing the sea,
Without the least vestige of land:
And the crew were much pleased when they found it to be
A map they could all understand.
Lewis Carroll, *The Hunting of the Snark*.

¹⁰ A summary of early trends in folklore studies and their relationship to Classical scholarship can be found in, Hansen (2002), pp.1-10.

¹¹ Gurevich (1988), pp.4-11.

unwritten traditions of their societies *and* readers. Moreover, because those who portray the past write in the expectation of being read and understood, they compose according to codes they have already internalized. In this way the generation of alternative representations of history is a feedback loop in which the repetition of an image both references and strengthens the symbolic power of that image, diffusing it ever more broadly into the consciousness of the society in which it dwells.

Thus, when a particularly powerful, but implausible, image or narrative can be discerned repeatedly, over a long period of time, in very different examples of historical or *historicising* writing, one has to consider that its ease of recognition may be its point - that it was, and is, intended to be read vertically, as a shorthand for a collection of interpretations drawn from recollections, conscious or not, of its previous applications. It is, in other words, an accepted *literary* image. In these cases the problem of stereotypical historical legend claiming historicity becomes less one of naïve oral transmission into “popular” texts opposed to a supposedly rational historiography, and one of positioning events within a chain of, more-or-less, knowing literary comparison. This understanding simultaneously makes the extremely diffuse presence of a stereotypical narrative more explicable and opens up a number of interpretive approaches.

If ancient oral sources, about which we know, and can know, basically nothing, are made secondary considerations, the continuous reappearance of historical or *historicizing* stereotypes, becomes a literary problem. Having recognized and defined a repetitive narrative, we may search for and collect applications of it across time. We may then extract from this archaeology of application a vertical profile of the narrative that gives us an overview of the historical circumstances with which it tends to be associated. Proceeding from this overview we may examine the development of particularly well documented applications of the narrative horizontally, as a *historiographic* problem. This is itself a twofold process. First an attempt needs to be made to reconstruct the context and form in which narrative first entered into text as well as the motives driving its introduction. Next, the reception of the narrative into the literate matrix of the host society needs to be sketched out in order that we might understand *how* it was viewed, *who* was using it, and *why*, as well as any development it may have shown over time.

The merciful Constantine seen in Chrysostum's speech within a speech was, in all likelihood, a self-contained, *ad hoc* construction referencing only the circumstances of its creation; as such it can hardly be considered a historical legend of the type discussed here. The specific method by which it sought to arouse an effect and its place in the Greek, Christian literary tradition does, however, allow us to demonstrate the concepts outlined above in miniature. Here Chrysostum relies on a vertical effect: albeit one whose referent is explicitly named. In technical terms he presented his hearers with a *comparatio*, and in doing so created an image of history disguised as a folksy commonplace. He did this in order to convey something unstated but meaningful. Striking a direct parallel between the merciful Constantine and the merciful Theodosius, Chrysostum invited his audience to collapse five decades of very significant political and religious change into a single point, suggesting an ideal of the eternally clement Christian ruler who was simultaneously both Constantine and Theodosius. Shifting to horizontal considerations; Chrysostum made this comparison in the context of a formal oration, a persuasive mode of communication that his culture traditionally associated with the extremely erudite. Moreover, the speech was the product of a particularly local, set of circumstances. Though published and circulated, the sermon was very much of its moment. As a symbol the forbearance of Constantine was of very transient appeal, and appears to have had very little impact in the emperor's literary afterlife.

There are however much larger, much older, and much more resilient historical typologies lurking in the world's historical literatures, some of which are so ancient and so prevalent as to almost forbid analysis. This study will hinge on an examination of a closely related pair of such narrative structures and their relation to the core texts of this study, two composite, Late Antique, historical or quasi-historical traditions that incorporate both of these structures. These are the accounts of the birth and youth of Constantine I (c.275-337 CE) used in a set of Greek hagiographies composed between the 9th to 13th centuries, and those used in various Perso-Arabic texts carrying stories related to the so-called *Kārnāmag* tradition of Ardashir I († c.242 CE) the founder of the Sasanian empire. It will propose that these structures represent long established and widely dispersed modes in the representation of history, modes attracted to an infrequently repeated set of historical circumstances, and thence to historical and historicising literature, by reason of their accumulated explanatory and exculpatory power.

Using a methodology adapted from the study of folklore, I will first identify these structures as recognisable, though not strictly delineated, clusters of specific components, here designated as *sequences*. I will then examine a number of *traditions* (understood as a broader discourse that underlies extant texts and is somewhat accessible through them) of historicizing literature in which each of these sequences were (separately) employed. The first constitutes a pair of Mesopotamian legends concerning Sargon the Great (24th-23rd century BCE) and the second a clutch of Greek versions of the life of the founder of the Achaemenid Empire, Cyrus II († c.530 BCE).¹² Developing certain speculations in existing scholarship, it will be argued that Cyrus' legends reflect Sargonic precedent and that this transference can be traced with some certainty to an urban environment that was both literate and heavily antiquarian; a likelihood that emphasizes the significant role historical literature played in maintaining, renewing and retransmitting these narrative habits. This relationship will be used to suggest that the defined sequences have a very long, trans-regional and multilingual precedent as representations of historical events; representations that lean suspiciously towards the apologetic and the laudatory.

On this basis I will turn to separate examinations of two collections of texts: a legendary account of the life of Ardashir represented in a single Middle Persian text and the New Persian epic *Šāhnāme*, and a particular set of Byzantine hagiographies of Constantine that come into view in the 9th century. Both the Iranian and Roman collections represent lengthy, and plainly composite, biographical works whose early sections reproduce features seen in the much older Mesopotamian traditions. Taking into account the broader historiography of each period I will attempt to isolate the sources of these episodes. Where this is unclear or unavailable, I will examine the details contained in the texts themselves for clues as to when, and where possible, how, they entered historical literature.

Proceeding from this examination it will be argued that in both of these traditions the representation of the birth and youth of the subject are not only recognizably unhistorical, but that they were often quite deliberately and knowingly so. In these

¹² The Middle Chronology is used throughout.

cases, old narratives were recycled to create partisan, and sometimes quasi-official, entrants in a competitive historical dialog. Here, it is the Byzantine legends of Constantine, whose antecedents are relatively clear, that give shape to trends that are only suggested in the Perso-Arabic material. It is contended that a general similarity in circumstance, and the later reception of that circumstance into memory, allows us to use the inception and development of these episodes in the hagiographies of Constantine as a possible model for understanding their analogs in the similarly conglomerate, but far less well-understood *Kārnāmag* tradition; particularly as all of these sections may plausibly be argued to share common ancestries through various streams of the ultimately Mesopotamian legends of Cyrus and before him, Sargon.

In conclusion I will suggest an outline of the development and meaning of each sequence as history. Having thus addressed the *origin* of this material I will turn to a comparative overview of its *reception* into the much later Iranian and Roman composite traditions. This will attempt to answer why two very different communities came to incorporate the same ahistorical narratives into relatively long biographical texts in essentially the same way. It will be argued that this was the result of the combination of old mindsets with a novel cultural-political matrix; the actions of both men played a similarly foundational role in the self-understanding of what might be called religious-imperial communities, and were therefore categorized in exactly the same way. These relics of polemic became attractive, as once the argument they addressed had lost its urgency they could *also* be received as images of divinely approved foundation. Thus, the loop closed, as appeals to hallowed images of kingship were themselves hallowed.

Here I wish to emphasise that a simplistic, totalizing equivalence between Ardashir and Constantine, their cultural context or the political orders they founded is not posited in this dissertation. The suggestion is merely that certain details of their lives and the institutional consequences of their actions were similar enough, in *outline*, to steer the propagation of their memories onto the same, well-trodden, literary paths. Both men took controversial political and cultural stances; behind the narratives of glorious restoration and divine favour lurk traces of discontent, memories of grubby politics, dynastic murder, opportunism and irregular, or at least contested, succession. On the other hand, both men came to be seen as religious revolutionaries (or restorers in the case of Ardashir) who married political and religious ideologies within their

kingdoms. Both would, as a result, assume the same stereotypical role in later discourse as their memories were used to justify an ideal social and political status quo. This investigation draws attention to certain shared assumptions that conditioned the representations of this role.

What follows then is a study of a very big picture by reference to a very small mechanism. It is about how the controversial foundation of novel imperial ideologies became nested in much more ancient forms of imagining monarchy as those ideologies calcified around a particular interpretation of the past. As cosmocratic monarchies buttressed by religious claims developed on either side of the Euphrates between the 3rd and 7th centuries, particular streams of literature arose in which the memories of their founders were sacralised. In these, shining facades were erected over chains of complex, difficult, and sometimes scandalous, events - facades whose unrealistic outlines are familiar and seem, on first glance, popular and spontaneous. Yet, the roots of some of these images lie, to a surprising degree, in knowing uses of narrative expectation, in attempts by literate partisans of the founder's political order to hold the commanding heights of historical memory against strands of criticism perceived as especially damaging to their subject. In the cases examined in this dissertation, the presence of legend can be shown to be a historiographic problem. Here the legacy of history was used to rewrite history, to craft machines capable of cutting straight roads through the complicated and contradictory landscape of memory.

1

Methods and concepts

This study touches on a large number of texts composed over a very long period of time in a variety of languages. It deals with material that is usually split over a number of fields and concepts that are often slippery or unclear. It is, as a result, particularly important to present the argument in such a way as it may be easily followed and to define a limited, and comprehensible, vocabulary to be used in its presentation. The following section will outline the structure of this study, state its limits and then define the terms and concepts that it will use. It will next proffer a methodology for the identification of the two narratives that connect the heterogeneous mass of material considered here and briefly discuss the theoretical trends that guide this categorisation. Finally, it will present a schematic of these narratives that will allow us to move on to a consideration of the material itself.

1.1 Plan of the work

Chapter Two will establish the deep history of the narrative assemblies that are the subject of this study. It will do this through the comparison of a collection of Mesopotamian historical-biographical representations with much later works in Greek that make use of very similar motifs. A link between the two sets of texts will be suggested with reference to the historical context of each collection and the existing scholarship on this problem. The intention is twofold: to demonstrate the close

relationship of these literary structures with historical memory and to establish a widespread and ancient precedent for their use, and *reuse*, to structure representations of the acquisition of kingship.

Chapter Three considers the first of two target traditions, a legendary version of the life of Ardashir I known from two extant texts that appear to descend from a very similar source. The source reflected in these texts included a number of origin narratives very similar to those seen in the Mesopotamian and Greek texts considered in Chapter Two. A comparison of these narratives with other strands in the Perso-Arabic historiography of the early Sasanian period can be leveraged into a series of hypotheses regarding the structure, authorship and purpose of the underlying source and thereby the intended functions of the motif assemblies themselves.

These hypotheses can be strengthened by reference to the second target tradition of this survey, a clutch of hagiographic legends of Constantine I dating from the 9th century in which the same pair of origins narratives are again discernible. These are the focus of Chapter Four. These versions of Constantine's life come to us enmeshed in an extensive network of texts, much larger and more detailed than the Perso-Arabic material addressing the ascent of Ardashir. Reaching back into the strata of these works it is possible to offer a fairly comprehensive biography of Constantine's association with these narratives and to place, with some confidence, the points at which it was felt necessary to reshape his life according to received patterns.

Chapter Five will conclude this study with a synthesis of the preceding observations into some general guidelines regarding the emergence and behavior of the origins narratives shared by these quite disparate traditions. I will offer a theory of what these legendary set-pieces were intended to do, how their meaning tends to change over time and why, in the teeth of much evidence to the contrary, they repeatedly made their way into "history". It will then reflect on the implications of the parallel presence of these narratives in the structurally similar composite biographies of Ardashir and Constantine. It will be argued that the presence of these narratives in both traditions points to broadly parallel integrations of polemic into edifying histories and that these integrations were mediated by the commemorative impulses of religious communities who saw their history as connected to the political legacies of the subjects of these

works. In this way I will suggest that the Constantine hagiographies and the *Kārnāmag* may fruitfully be read with reference to the other.

1.2 Limits and Caveats

One generation passes away and another generation arises, but the earth abides forever; so too, in one form or another, does narrative. Not, to be sure, the multitude of day-to-day narratives birthed to describe one of an endless number of concrete and unique situations encountered by the living. With rare exceptions, these die almost at birth. There are, however, a large number of narrative habits and expectations in our cultural inheritance that are functionally immortal. These may be simple or relatively complex and can take the form of just about any possible mode of expression, even a joke.¹ Any such unit of narrative may be extremely ancient, so ancient in fact, as to completely obfuscate its age and origin. It may appear so often, in so many languages over such a vast stretch of time, that the sheer weight of attestation confounds and imposes brutal linguistic demands on any who try to examine it.² As the pair of narratives at the centre of this investigation are structures of this sort, it is necessary to first define certain limits in order to avoid becoming lost in the thousands of connections and possible digressions they present. While there is still considerable complexity to be found at every stage of this investigation, it is to be hoped that these limits will serve to confine it to a usable, comprehensible frame.

This study will consider *only* a pair of recognizable, oft-entangled, narratives to be defined below. First and foremost, this is a study of how these narratives effect the *image of history*. It will focus on particular legendary-biographical texts associated with Ardashir I and Constantine I. On the assumption that the presence of recognisable and counter-factual narratives links these Late Antique and Medieval sources to much older

¹ An example of such a narrative, “Odysseus and the Oar” is given in Hansen (2014).

² A truly comprehensive study of the survival of narrative structures would look something like Watkins (1995).

patterns of royal representation it will do so as part of a broader, diachronic, investigation. To establish the plausibility of such deep connections, and the sort of context with which they were likely to arise, I will first consider the legends attached to two earlier west Eurasian rulers known to have actually existed before the 3rd century CE.

As the overlap of the specific real and the eternal unreal is a key theme of the entire investigation, the exclusion of fictional or uncertain figures may seem like special pleading. There is not, however, space enough to consider figures of a more liminal historicity in any great depth. Nor does the intended methodology, which compares historical legends to coexisting currents in historiography in order to tease out the circumstances of their creation, transmission, and preservation, lend itself to the study of figures that are essentially *all* legend. Having said this, the “lives” of two Biblical figures of dubious historicity, Moses and King David, are relevant and *will* be discussed in relation to some of the biographies presented here. It needs to be emphasized that these are not the focus of the investigation and are brought into the conversation either because they shed light on certain facets of the other traditions considered, or, because they are bound up in certain contextual problems presented by texts used in this study. Nor am I able, being neither a Hebraist nor a Biblical scholar, to do full justice to the considerable scholarship on either.

This investigation considers the movement of a pair of literary representations through a number of cultures over a very long period of time. It is, therefore, often fairly speculative. It is sometimes necessary to speak in generalizations or to leave gaps in the data sketched out only by a theoretical reconstruction. While every effort has been made to be rigorous, it is simply not possible to directly address material that does not survive. In a similar vein, this study takes in a broad swathe of data from a number of distinct fields and has to do so in a relatively condensed form; it is to be hoped that specialists in these fields may forgive any lack of detailed analysis they may occasionally perceive.

Finally, the boundaries of this investigation are constrained to a consideration of two specific narratives and these alone. Moreover, I understand the lifecycle of these narratives to be tightly linked to historical processes and circumstances *sui generis*, and not models for the creation and propagation of myths or legends more generally. While

some *very* abstract conclusions regarding the interaction of legendary patterns and historiography, or even hagiography, may be drawn from this discussion, it is not the intention here to be creating general principles. Nor am I at all concerned with the ultimate origins of these narratives. These are neither relevant to this study, nor, despite the claims of certain, often ingenious, methodologies, safely recoverable.³ Whatever they started as, once introduced into text these structures became explicable literary phenomena. Avoiding origins will also (hopefully) avoid any presupposition of the meaning of these narratives based on preferred axioms rather than the observation of their role in a historical and social context.

1.3 Terms

Narrative is, by nature, a slippery thing and its study is often beset by problems of terms; because recognizable narrative structures do not appear strongly bound by modern notions of genre, networks of shared features can create confusing patterns of overlap, no more so than when the stereotypical enters historiography. Does the presence of recognizable and unrealistic components make a “historical” account a history in the sense that we would understand it, or a something else? More specifically, does the resulting narrative reflect a sincerely held belief about the past, a mere entertainment, or a “possible world” that is near-enough true?⁴ How are such shared components even to be classified and defined? For the following discussion to be comprehensible a number of terms and concepts must first be established.

As noted above, the focus here is the operation of two motif assemblies, as they emerge in certain textual traditions of two roughly contemporary imperial peoples, and,

³ Recently, some truly extraordinary claims about the ability of computer modeling to reconstruct the date of certain motifs back (in one case) into *pre-human* times have been made, see da Silva and Tehrani (2015) and d'Huy (2016). While the methodology suggested in these researches is interesting, and it cannot be doubted that motifs are often extremely ancient, given the nature of the source material, one has to wonder at how confidence we might place in such approaches.

⁴ See Doležel (1998).

by extension their interaction with and place in those societies' "general historical knowledge".⁵ Throughout, the terms, *sequence*, *narrative* and *story* will be used fairly interchangeably to describe both assemblies. The terms *motif* and *component* will be used to describe the individual parts constituting each *sequence* (to be described below). These terms are adapted from similar concepts developed for the study of myth and folklore, as is the general idea that sharing specific, stereotypical features denotes some relationship between disparate narratives.

Though I take some of the methodological approaches of Myth and Folklore Studies as a methodological starting point, these sequences are, properly speaking, neither folklore nor myth and both terms may (in reference to the target narratives of this study) henceforth be disposed of as unhelpful. A more technically correct term for the historically bound narratives seen in the traditions under investigation here is *legend*.⁶ The demarcation of what is a legend and what is not is a topic of some dispute; as with so much of the terminology for various forms of narrative, its meanings tend towards expansion and can be somewhat difficult to pin down.⁷ I have accepted a rather straightforward, and fairly conservative, definition in which a *legend* is a story seen to be historical in a concrete sense.

Despite the liberties taken with plausibility, almost all of the individual texts considered below, are historical, at least *historicising* texts; they recount the life, or part of the life, of a person known, or believed, to have existed and they are located in the actual past rather than the timeless parallel world of myth. They tell stories believed, at least in certain contexts, to be "true". Further, as will become apparent, the authors of these texts were often connected to some kind of formal historical practice; whether stylistically, through a conscious attempt to position their texts as historical narrative, by consultation of historical sources in constructing them, or by the use of their own work as sources for later histories.

Finally, as will become increasingly apparent, the reception of the Late Antique origin legends that comprise the bulk of this study was conditioned by the existence of

⁵ Finnegan (1970), p.195.

⁶ The stress on the historical nature of legend follows Bascom (1965), pp.3-6.

⁷ See a review of the scholarship provided in Tangherlini (1990).

religious groups with a close relationship to imperial ideology. Because of its importance in the following discussion the term “religion” needs some clarification. Religion, as the term is generally used, is a relatively recent concept shaped by the specific experience of Early Modern Europe.⁸ The idea that there was a division between sacred and the secular politics would have made very little sense in most pre-modern communities. Moreover, the related notion that “religion” is a personal opinion, largely separated from communal life and legal or ritual praxis, is a spectacularly inappropriate way to approach the role of belief in ancient societies. In discussing the ideology animating Sasanian imperialism, Adam Becker has suggested the term “political theology” ought to be used to avoid secular and liberal assumptions in discussing the supernatural positions of ancient polities.⁹ This is a laudable goal, but alternative terms are difficult to apply without a great deal of awkward circumlocution and total precision must bend to clarity. When used here, “religion” and “religious” are meant in the redescriptive sense suggested by Brent Nongbri: that is, as modern terms that usefully include and evoke features of ancient practice but are not meant to imply the presence of a modern paradigm.¹⁰

1.4 Methods

The study of repetitive, trans-regional features in ancient literature, historical or otherwise, has usually fallen outside of the purview of ancient historians or classicists.¹¹ Such problems have traditionally been of more interest to folklorists and students of mythology, two fields with considerable overlap. To reiterate, the sequences under

⁸ Nongbri (2013).

⁹ Becker (2014), pp.

¹⁰ Nongbri (2013), pp.157-159

¹¹ At the birth of Folklore studies in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, attempts were made to examine Classical literature in light of evidence that many of its narratives were obviously allied to internationally dispersed story patterns. Such approaches generally failed to establish themselves for reasons that are outlined in Hansen (1997) and again in Hansen (2002), pp.6-12. Hansen’s own work has attempted to pick up where this movement petered out.

discussion here are neither myths nor folktales, but they share with both a certain universality of application and recognition. The tools developed to study more clearly fictive iterations of narrative patterns, are also apt for investigating the appearance of similar patterns in historicizing works. Of course, a variety of interpretations, often strongly opposed, have been proposed in these fields and a short clarification of the theoretical background and which particular tools or approaches may be drawn from it, is required.

1.4.1 Myth and its Theorists

“Myth” in its broadest possible sense is the assumption that a narrative underlies and informs an object, an event or a theoretical structure. As such it is an omnipresent, inescapable, and near undefinable aspect of every human society. Without a foundation of myth we would be unable to imprint any order at all on a cosmos that is neither reducible nor responsive to human needs or concerns. This sort of “mythology” is therefore, the prerequisite for the emergence of all social systems and there is nowhere in the human-made universe that one cannot detect its presence. The production of history, for example, even of the most positivistic kind, can escape neither the assumptions of the sources nor those assumptions reproduced in the writer’s desire to impose an order on them.¹²

Understandably, the academic study of myth has tended towards a much more circumscribed, technical sense of the concept. It has concentrated on what might be described as stories of origins; explanatory, communal narratives that occur somewhat outside of “normal” time and are associated with contexts that are somehow distinguished from the everyday; ritualistic practice or formal story-telling for example.¹³ Even so constrained, the problem remains vast and multi-faceted. Because myths are stories, the attempt to explain their origins and functions has attracted

¹² Joseph Mali argues that a recognition of the centrality of myth, and a proper coming to terms with its significance, is both the marker of the truly modern and something largely lacking in modern historiography, see Mali (2003), p.3 f. esp. 11-13.

¹³ Bascom (1965), p.4.

anthropologists, psychologists and literary theorists, among others, resulting in a large number of theoretical approaches, but nothing like a resolution. Of interest to this study are particular strands in this vast edifice dealing with repetition and historicity or historical context in “mythic” narrative.

In very broad terms, the twin problems of origins and meaning have dominated attempts to understand why certain narratives are so prevalent and so recognisable. From its inception in the late 18th century, right up until the middle of the 20th, influential but extremely reductive strands in the scholarship viewed the meaning of any myth as baked into the circumstances of its origin, generally heavily reconstructed.¹⁴ Myths were all too often assumed to be independent of the social particulars of their context. It is unfortunate for this study that certain features of the narratives examined here seem to link them to a particularly egregious example of this line of reasoning; the archetypal “Heroic Life” of which much was made in the previous century.¹⁵ This saw a common set of features as underlying the narratives of just about every famous hero, king or religious figure, historical or otherwise, in the world’s literatures. While the listed commonalities are indeed notable, the assumption of universal *meaning* that is simultaneously esoteric and universally explicable invited overenthusiasm; something clearly seen in the most popular iteration of the concept, Joseph Campbell’s theory of a heroic mono-myth. Presenting no more evidence than a flat assertion that the claims of Jungian psychology were self-evidently true, Campbell, with some help from George Lucas, managed to entrench an eternal, omni-cultural “heroic journey” in the popular imagination.¹⁶

The work of the Structuralist Claude Levi-Strauss presented a rather more nuanced schema; here the meaning of myth resided in the connections between bundles of constituent elements in *all* versions of the same story.¹⁷ By the 1960s, however, attention was being drawn to the inadequacies of commenting on the meaning of stories without studying their milieu. The “Contextualist” school, a number of mainly French historians

¹⁴ A general overview of schools of mythic interpretation is available in Csapo (2005).

¹⁵ Three influential studies in this vein are collected in Segal (1990).

¹⁶ Outlined in Campbell’s *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*, Campbell (1993).

¹⁷ Levi-Strauss (1955). pp.435-40.

and classicists, used Structuralist methods, yet insisted on grounding the study of every myth in the political and social environment of its likely origin and were skeptical of the ability of *any* outsider to completely understand the stories generated by a society.¹⁸ Importantly, they also drew a sharp distinction between the behavior of myth in literate and oral societies.¹⁹

Having already stated that the target narratives of this study are not myths, it may be asked why the time has been taken to offer such a brief and incomplete summary of two facets, one very old fashioned, of the enormous edifice that is the study of myth. The answer lies in the exemplary power of highlighted theories: one is a useful consideration of how the tools of historical method may be applied to narrative in order to extract something concrete, and the other is a trap, a theory overawed by the size of its subject and achieved through the abstraction of particulars and their subordination to a theoretical whole.

The Contextualist approach is a useful starting point for this study. The presence of essentially the same sequences in what should be very disparate legendary biographies is only truly explicable by an exploration of the specific circumstances in which each set of shared sequences emerged and were collected. Moreover, to a very great extent the textual nature of these legends determines how we should interpret and analyse them. On the other hand, the excesses of those who sought meaning in the recognition of pattern alone serves as a warning. This study is structured with an eye to avoiding any similar temptation towards the grandly theoretical or the quasi-mystical. Each chapter will treat the association of historical individuals with legendary narrative as a literary problem unfolding in a particular historical context. This will eventually produce a sequential set of case studies of narrative development in which certain symmetries may be perceived throughout. I hope in this way to preserve the comparative bent of this study while emphasizing the explicability of these narratives in terms of the political, the ideological and the social. In other words, the Golden Bough is understood here as the yoke of the Iron Plough.

¹⁸ As argued in Vernant (1970), p.274, *f* and Vernant (1980), pp.186-206. For a general overview of this school, its concerns and methods, see Champagne (1992), pp.4-25.

¹⁹ Vernant (1980), pp.238-9.

1.4.2 Folkloristics and Defining Sequences

If the history of the scholarship of myths provides a set of guidelines and thereby a general structure for the study as a whole, that of folktales, clearly fictive narratives of a stereotypical nature, provides it with a set of specific tools. Because widely dispersed folktales often express very strong, very repetitious similarities a certain reductionism has emerged in the scholarship dealing with them.

In the 1920's the folklorist Vladimir Propp's *The Morphology of the Folktale* famously posited an almost mathematical system to describe the content and syntax of Russian folktales. It was, however, the slightly later contributions of Antti Aarne and Stith Thompson that came to hold a central place in the field. In their work a twofold classification of folktale structure was made: *tales* representing independent narratives and *motifs* representing shared components that made them.²⁰ Hence, as in Propp's system, any recognizable story is itself a bundle of smaller story parts, albeit, in a far less rigid way than Propp's functions. This distinction was the basis of the Aarne-Thompson Tale and Thompson Motif indexes, which, despite criticism, remain important works in the field.²¹ This granular approach has great value for clarifying terms in a limited study such as this. The flexibility granted by this split terminology in particular is extremely useful; it will be noted that the terminology of *narrative/story/sequence* and *component/motif* adopted above, is merely *tale* and *motif* slightly rephrased in order to better reflect the mutual attractiveness of these particular motifs to each other and their tendency to fall in a loose order.

However useful their classification schemes, folktales are generally understood to be fictive and as such are not good models for our narratives. These, it will be shown, are much less organic and are usually referenced in the pursuit of some definite purpose. Containing readily recognisable symbolism, the use of these sequences was intended to suggest appropriate linkages and readings. The directness of the reference may vary. It

²⁰ Detailed in Thompson (1977), pp.415-28.

²¹ The Aarne-Thompson Tale Types index has been fairly recently updated as the Aarne-Thompson-Uther (ATU) index, listed in the bibliography as Uther (2004). Thompson's motif indexes remain in use and are listed as Thompson (1955-1958). Some criticisms of the indexes can be found in Dundes (1997), and at Hansen (2002), p.23.

can encompass a bluntly mimetic use in which a *known* precedent is used (even stated) to encode or “frame” an event explicitly in terms of another, and thereby draw a particular interpretation from its readers. Eusebius’ comparison of Constantine to Moses, it will be seen, is both obvious and explicit.²² On the other hand, the reference may be far less direct and without any overtly specific antecedents, though this does not make it entirely unconscious. Here something similar to the concept of the “Floating Motif” used by David Aaron in his study of the literary history of the Ten Commandments, *Etched in Stone: The Emergence of the Decalogue* is suggested. Aaron’s definition of this concept is so pertinent as to be worth repeating at length. A Floating Motif is;

“...a highly adaptable set of themes that frequently travel together as part of a culture’s ideological, linguistic, aesthetic or literary “fabric” amidst what Wolfgang Iser, in *The Act of Reading*, calls the “repertoire”...

“It is extremely difficult to speak about the content of a culture or of a cultural consciousness in terms specific enough to allow us to locate where a motif presides. Obviously, in order to be a motif, a theme (or a cluster of themes) must reside in more than one individual. That is, a motif requires repetition in order to be identifiable as a motif. Normally we recognize that repetition as taking place in multiple literary adaptations, for adaptability is another identifying characteristic of motif, which can readily end up in structures and functions of considerable diversity. In other words, *a motif involves form as much as it does content, where the form is always recognizable even though two literary adaptations may have little in common in terms of content. For the various adaptations to make sense, the ideas themselves must exist independently of any specific adaptation, literary or otherwise.* In that sense, the ideas must be part of the culture, or what Iser calls the “cultural repertoire”.²³

Though Aaron uses slightly different terminology, his proposition that defined bundles of themes (I would say *motifs* or *components*) have an intangible existence in public memory, his recognition that such bundles suggest particular meanings to the

²² On “framing” and “keying” see, Damgaard (2013b), pp.11-12 and the references therein.

²³ Aaron (2006). Emphases are mine.

reader, and most importantly of all, the reflexive, cumulative, nature of that meaning, is very close to what I propose here. As his reference to Wolfgang Iser indicates, Aaron's concept bears a resemblance to Reader-Response theory. This approach sees writing as a sort of system building in which the writer leaves cues and suggestions for the reader to untangle and rearrange.²⁴ According to Iser these cues are part of the *repertoire*, a very complex symbolic system accessed by the writer in order to guide the interpretation of his work.

"The repertoire consists of all the familiar territory within the text. This may be in the form of *references to earlier works, or to social and historical norms*, or the whole culture from which the text has emerged—in brief, to what the Prague Structuralists have called the "extratextual" reality.

...the repertoire presents existing norms in a state of suspended validity—thus turning the literary text itself into a kind of halfway house between past and future."²⁵

Having attempted to define and position what the category "sequence" represents, it becomes necessary at this point to describe the specific objects of the study themselves. Below I will rationalize the two target narratives and their constituent components. Henceforth they will be referred to as *Sequence One* and *Sequence Two*. Though many of their motifs are rather similar, each narrative is actually quite distinct. Both are, however, deeply entangled due to a reliance on a common set of assumptions about royalty, applicability to similar sets of circumstances and the fact that each is set during a different time of the subject's life; something that allows them to occupy sequential positions in the Iranian and Byzantine composite narratives. Each sequence will be given a general description giving first an overview of its form, then a schematic of its constituent motifs.

Neither sequence is intended as a straightjacket; not all components are present in every iteration of either sequence and there is room for considerable flexibility in

²⁴ Iser (1978), p.61 *f.* Emphases are mine. For a specifically Iranian take on this sort of narrative see p.132 below.

²⁵ Ibid. pp.69-70.

arrangement. One version of the birth of Ardashir, for example, manages to split a number of the components of Sequence One over two people, father and son. Additionally, both are adaptable and can absorb appropriate motifs, whether general such as solar imagery, or culturally appropriate, such as a gift of purple clothing, without issue. There is in each, however, an over-arching similarity, displayed throughout a large and diverse corpus of texts, suggesting a limited, but very pervasive, repertoire of narrative possibilities is at work.²⁶

1.4.3 Sequence One

Sequence One is relatively simple, though still capable of considerable complexity; it deals with birth and its expressions bear, at times, a resemblance to a number of ATU types categorised as “Realistic Tales” or “Novellae”; particularly, ATU 920 *The Son of the King (Solomon) and the Smith*, ATU 870A *The Goose-Girl (Neighbour’s Daughter) as Suitor*, ATU884 *The Forsaken Fiancée: Service as a Menial*, ATU930 *The Prophecy* and ATU931 *Oedipus*. The narrative conceived of here admits considerable flexibility; in particular it regards exposure of the child as an optional motif, a more intensive form of distancing the child from its descent, rather than a core component.²⁷ Exposure is notably not present in traditions of Ardashir or Constantine.²⁸ Sequence One may be summarised as follows:

A boy is born to a royal house. The circumstances of his birth are, however, unusual: one of his parents is likely to have (outwardly) low or outsider status and the birth is usually announced by an omen. The import of this omen is either embraced or feared by one or the other parent. Though the reaction to this omen dictates the tone of the story, the result is *generally* the same: the boy is “lost”

²⁶ It need hardly be said that this classification scheme is one designed for the two streams of related legends that are the subject of this investigation *only*. Some of the components listed below may correspond to one or more of Thompson’s motifs. Such correspondences will be given in footnotes.

²⁷ The tendency to exaggerate the importance and symbolism of exposure *per se* can be seen in Klaniczay’s summary of earlier theories addressing the birth of Cyrus, see Klaniczay (2000), pp.24-27.

²⁸ Hansen links ATU920 to the birth of Cyrus, a story that will be examined in greater depth below, see Hansen (2002), pp.408-413.

somehow to the royal part of his ancestry and he is adopted and/or raised by parents of notably low status. The boy comes to light in adolescence. His recognition is performed via a very limited set of means: a display of an activity that is understood as a synecdoche of kingship, a display of tokens proving parentage and/or a physical resemblance to the ruler. The sequence ends with an acknowledgement of the relationship by the sitting ruler. This is usually a happy occasion (the king often has no heir), but is not always.

The components of Sequence One are:

- 1) An omen of the subject's future greatness is made, usually in a dream but a horoscope might also be used.²⁹
- 2) One of the subject's parents has an outwardly humble or otherwise undesirable station in life.³⁰
- 3) Conversely, the subject also has some connection to a royal or otherwise distinguished ancestry.
- 4) If the omen is taken as ill, the subject is exposed or otherwise attacked as an infant.³¹
- 5) The subject is abandoned by, hidden from or lost to the "royal" parent in some way.
- 6) The subject is raised in a decidedly non-regal setting.³²
- 7) The subject is recognized by a) games, b) resemblance, or c) tokens.³³
- 8) The subject is reconciled with his royal "father".

²⁹ B144.1. *King prophesies hero's birth*. M311.1. *Prophecy, king's grandson will dethrone him*. M342.1. *King's downfall prophesied*. M312.0.4. *Mother's symbolic dream (vision) about the greatness of her unborn child*.

³⁰ T281. *Sex hospitality to king* appears in a number of the Greek texts to be considered below, if the terms "king" and "sex" are generously interpreted.

³¹ M371. *Exposure of infant to avoid fulfillment of prophecy*. K1847.1.1. *King deceived about heir's birth*. R131. *Exposed child rescued*.

³² N836.1. *Adoption of Hero by king*. K2015. *Adoption by rich man*. N854.1. *Peasant as foster father*. L111.2. *Foundling hero*. L111.2.1. *Future hero found in boat (basket, bushes)*.

³³ H20. *Recognition by resemblance*. H111.1. *Recognition by royal garment*.

1.4.4 Sequence Two

Sequence Two is considerably more complex than Sequence One; because of this its components are often more comprehensively scrambled. It deals with *youth* and takes place at the court of a king, who is the antagonist of the narrative. In historical applications of this sequence, this king is a historical individual, a representative of the dynasty or order deposed by the actions of the subject.

A young man comes to the court of a king. In instances where this sequence appears alone, he may be of low birth. In instances where it is joined with an iteration of Sequence One he is usually a junior nobleman. Due to his beauty and great skill in courtly activities he comes to occupy a position close to the ruler. At this point a number of components are common but are often tightly interlinked and do not always appear in the same order: 1) The youth will either a) engender a plot against the sitting king, usually at the instigation of a helper and/or some kind of encouraging omen, or b) be plotted against by the king who sees in him a threat to his rule. 2) A *public display*, one that highlights the inadequacy of the sitting king in comparison to the youth, is present in some cases, often involving a confrontation or combat with an animal or animalistic opponent. 3) A *warning* of some kind, again, usually some kind of omen, is almost always given to the king. The youth flees court for his father's homeland or kingdom; his father is often portrayed as dying, ill or dead. He is pursued by the agents of the king and sometimes performs a trick of some kind to delay or shake off his pursuers. He arrives safely, accepts the loyalty of his "countrymen" (often his father's retainers). This is the prelude to a military campaign that will depose the order or dynasty represented by or linked somehow to the youth's erstwhile patron.

The components of Sequence Two are:

- 1) The subject goes to court to serve (presumes a free-standing use of Sequence Two).
- 2) The subject goes to court on account of his father's rank (presumes a preceding Sequence One)
- 3) The subject takes on a role close to the king (in the oldest, Mesopotamian, versions of this story, often as the king's cupbearer).

- 4) The subject shows extraordinary aptitude in all things, but especially hunting and games.³⁴
- 5) The subject is notably beautiful or youthful. He becomes very popular at court.
- 6) [The subject publicly kills or tames an animal or dangerous enemy, *possibly* as part of the plot.³⁵]
- 7) The subject arouses jealousy or fear and becomes the target of the king's plotting.
- 8) Conversely, the subject engenders his own plot against the king
- 9) At some point in either plot the king is warned that the subject presents a threat. This warning may be given by a courtier, by some kind of prophetic technology or by a specialist in the same (an astrologer, for example).³⁶
- 10) The subject escapes the court and flees to his father's homeland.³⁷
- 11) The subject's father is said to be ill or dead
- 12) The subject is pursued by the king and/or the king's men.
- 13) The subject performs a ruse of some kind in order to avoid his pursuers.³⁸
- 14) In his homeland the subject gathers an army, one which he will use to overthrow the king.

Daniel Ogden's recent work on the legends attached to Seleucus has given a considerable amount of attention to a very similar "sequence", one employed in renditions of Seleucus' flight from Babylon to Egypt.³⁹ Ogden makes several useful observations about the behavior of legendary story forms. He notes, for example how they seem to exert "pressure" over historical narrative, are attracted to particular

³⁴ H41.5. *Unknown Prince shows his kingly qualities in dealing with his playmates.* P35. *Unknown Prince chosen chief of children in play.*

³⁵ This motif is bracketed as it is somewhat erratic and may or may not be indigenous to the older forms of the narrative, see the discussion of a possible parallel in the Alexander Romance on p.156 below. H32. *Recognition by extraordinary prowess.*

³⁶ M302.4. *Horoscope taken by means of stars.* M314.4. *Prophecy of future empire for fugitive hero.*

³⁷ The *Kārnāmag* texts, when describing Ardashir's flight, demonstrate N831. *Girl as helper.*

³⁸ At a stretch, this may be said to resemble R231. *Obstacle flight - Atalanta type.*

³⁹ Ogden (2017), p.68, f.

situations and open to augmentation.⁴⁰ *Mutatis mutandis*, Ogden's characterization of his narrative also applies to my interpretation;

“This tale-type is itself merely the strongest node within a broader constellation of tale-types of dynastic establishment...”⁴¹

Ogden's study concentrates on the particulars of the escape and its associated motifs, a golden token indicating kingship, the crossing of a water-boundary and the presence of a Girl As Helper. This leads him to make a slightly different emphasis than is made here.⁴² I wish to stress the *rivalry* between the old and new kings leading up to the escape and its contrastive potential. This theme is extremely prominent in the Late Antique and Medieval texts to be discussed, and, I believe, key to understanding the attachment of this sequence to Ardashir and Constantine.

Probably because of its strongly contrastive nature, a number of iterations of Sequence Two appear to have a suspiciously strong closeness with power, or at least, an inherent usefulness to the powerful. In this regard, Andrew Knapp's recent study of Near Eastern, apologia, something he defines as court-based, inherently propagandistic, and essentially reactive literary *mode*, provides an extremely useful interpretive suggestion.⁴³ Knapp stresses that the similarities seen in apologetic texts are the result of shared circumstance, that apologetic is not constrained by form and that one should avoid making too much of what seems to be a fairly limited registry of motifs to argue for dependence.⁴⁴ Apologists, argues Knapp, created according to need and did not participate in an institutionalized *genre*.⁴⁵ Knapp is right to reject apologetic as a formal category, but some of these points may be slightly too firmly stated. Several of the uses of Sequence Two considered here are very likely to be apologetic in Knapp's terms; additionally the histories described by the Iranian and particularly the Roman iterations of Sequence Two appear to have been *very* deliberately fitted to a predetermined frame.

⁴⁰ Ibid. p.85 and 95.

⁴¹ Ibid. p.71.

⁴² Ibid. p.84, f.

⁴³ Knapp (2012), pp.37-42.

⁴⁴ Ibid. p.57.

⁴⁵ Ibid. pp.31-35.

If there was no specific apologetic *genre* in these societies, there would seem to be at least one narrative *form* that tended to structure apologetic in a way that goes somewhat beyond the “motifs common to all societies of the ancient Near East”.⁴⁶

1.5 Conclusion

Concentrating on the sets of markers established above, the forthcoming is, in essence, a comparative study, one that looks at texts generated by rather different, though neighbouring, cultures. This kind of approach can be problematic in that comparisons of disparate mythic or legendary material can be, and have been, used to draw sweeping conclusions where a more sympathetic treatment would reveal little cause to do so. In this case however, all the texts can be plausibly said to have been operating in the same extended literary ecosystem. It is to demonstrate this that I will now turn to a review of the appearances of each sequence in the historical or historicizing literature of Western Eurasia.

This review will show that the use of both sequences in interpretations of history is demonstrably very old. It will also show that both have been reinterpreted to local context over and over again; accumulating, losing, and reintegrating much material over centuries, giving rise to some severe surface differences between iterations. Taking a number of examples, but concentrating on the well-known legends of Sargon of Akkad and Cyrus the Great, I hope to show that there is enough correspondence in narrative structure between these and others, to argue that very similar legends existed for centuries in the historicizing literature of the Near East. Moreover, it was via their use in Mesopotamia that each was assimilated into Greek historical literature. Collating several disparate suggestions in the scholarship, a number of narrative similarities, as well as geographic and cultural connections can be shown that suggest fairly direct links between the biographies of each figure.

⁴⁶ Ibid. p.49.

These relationships will be used as the spine of a broader supposition: that the historical use of narratives of this kind is self-perpetuating. Once established in an influential literature they can create a powerful frame of reference, a frame capable of reshaping the lives of others long after the initial referent has been forgotten. Sargon left behind him a historical literature that circulated for more than a thousand years; in the scattered traces of this literature we find evidence that both sequences were used to portray his origins. Though it creates a chicken and egg problem in that it is impossible to determine the reason for Sargon's association with either narrative in the first place, beginning with Sargon establishes a foundation for the literary focus of this investigation. Moreover, it is through our knowledge of the curation of the memory of Sargon in Babylon that a "direct" transference of these narratives from Sargon to Cyrus can be argued to have resulted from a set of behavioral and situational triggers. Transmitted by unclear means into Greek, these same stories of Cyrus would be popularized further by their use in the historical, or quasi-historical, texts of another culture entirely.

It follows that the presence of very similar narratives in the literature surrounding Ardashir and Constantine is the product of styles and habits laid down in a long precedent of rearranging a certain kind of event in certain kinds of ways. Conversely a consideration of these relatively well-attested Late Antique traditions offers insight into the circumstances that suggest the use of such rearrangements and the processes by which they were introduced and replicated. At the same time, features shared by the Iranian and Byzantine composite texts make them more similar to each other than to any text that might be accounted amongst their shared "ancestors". It will be argued that this is because the history described in these longer texts was understood to be more than a simple record of an unusual dynastic change. Rather, they were narratives of state foundation created by members of a faith community who had come to see these foundations as pivotal moments in their own constructions of history. Driven by the same needs, remarkably similar editorial methods emerged, resulting in parallel recycling of old solutions, the legitimizing styles of a new, divinely appointed *monarch*, in service of a new problem: the emergence of a new ideology of a divinely ordained *state*.

2

The Mesopotamian Background

2.1 Introduction

For a host of technical and historical reasons, the study of Latin and Greek speaking societies has traditionally been somewhat separate from those of “the East”, be they Semitic, Iranian or otherwise. As has become increasingly clear, this modern distinction does not reflect ancient reality. No ancient culture existed in splendid isolation and the conspicuous outrage of a Judah Macabee or a Juvenal notwithstanding, it would seem that the resulting trade in cultural goods vexed relatively few people.¹ To take just one example, Matthew Canepa’s consideration of the ceremonial and visual cultures of the Later Roman and Sasanian courts shows how ideological and diplomatic competition drove each not to the rejection but to the appropriation of the visual language of the other.²

In a deeper sense, some of the most fundamental symbolic infrastructure of all western Eurasian societies was (and is) held in common. The mythic and literary cultures of the Mediterranean rim cannot be excised from those of the Levant and Fertile Crescent, nor can many of the basic mythic, legendary or narrative

¹ As Thomas Sizgorich has noted in his study of Late Antique religious violence, the surface markers of culture, clothing, music, and literature, are not, generally, exclusive. True communal boundaries are marked instead by a sense of membership in a shared historic narrative. Moreover, even this boundary tends to be lax and must be patrolled by those seen to embody this narrative and deeply invested in maintaining it. See, Sizgorich (2009), pp.8-11.

² Canepa (2009).

commonplaces present in this system be said to “belong” to any one group.³ The origin sequences used in the biographies targeted by this study are stories of this type, part of the common stock of stories known to a very broad range of peoples. They are somewhat unusual, however, in that they have been consistently applied in historiographic, or quasi-historiographic works for millennia. This chapter will examine a number of these earlier appearances in order to propose a “descent” for the historicizing use of these sequences and, thereby, suggest some constants that may be seen to underlie the continued reappearance of these recognizably stereotypical narratives in ostensibly historical material.

From an Occidental perspective the most significant uses of both sequences are ensconced in the memories of Sargon of Akkad and Cyrus the Great, a pair of Near Eastern rulers who lived more than a millennia apart. Biographical traditions of the first of these rulers had an extraordinarily long life and those of the second were probably developed from them. What follows is a brief outline of the remains of both, their likely relationship and the situational factors that may have led to the transference of an ancient biographic style to a new king. While Mesopotamian speculations would seem to have very little connection to the Medieval Greek and Persian texts at the heart of this study, these sources offer a demonstration of narrative inertia, that is the cumulative effect of the repetition of narrative in establishing and replicating typology. The first instance is a case study in how our sequences came to establish themselves as historical discourse in a context of social disruption. The second is an example of how, once assimilated as history, these narratives become sensitive to the perception of repetition in events and thus apt to transference in the right circumstances. Such transmission leads to rebirth; as stock narratives become established in new contexts and new languages, new historicising literatures arise and thus the cycle may begin again. The transmission of the younger tradition into Greek is particularly suggestive in this regard.

³ In particular, it has increasingly been noted that much of the Greek tradition appears to have had roots in the cultures of Anatolia and the Near East, see Mondi (1990), West (1999), esp. p.438 f., López-Ruiz (2014), and Bacharova (2016).

2.1.1 From Akkad to Achaemenes

Both the story of the abandoned or adopted royal child and that of the courtly *wunderkind* are extraordinarily old. Ignoring unanswerable questions of origins or orality and admitting only figures of unchallenged historicity, the legendary traditions of two rulers from the ancient Near East represent in one case the earliest and in the other, the (arguably) best known uses of each sequence as a historicizing literary narrative: Sargon of Akkad (24-23rd C BCE) and Cyrus the Great of Persia († c.530 BCE). These legends take on an additional significance in this study because their apparent similarities have raised suggestions that they are related to each other and (via Cyrus) also to the much later *Kārnāmag* traditions of Ardashir examined in the next chapter.⁴ Thus, very little of what is presented below about either Sargon or Cyrus is particularly radical. It is instead largely a review of these proposed connections in the terms of the narrative schema outlined above. I wish however, to go a step further by looking at the possibility that the creation of a Greek Cyrus (modeled, though unknowingly and at some removes, on an Akkadian and Sumerian Sargon) lies behind certain poses struck in the early rhetoric and historiography used to describe the youth (and somewhat later, the birth) of Constantine. I want to suggest that because they incorporate some of these same elements to describe origins, certain aspects of Constantine's hagiographic tradition may simply be late examples of very old, very pervasive and ultimately Mesopotamian, styles of kingly origins.

Finally, the imposition of patterns drawn from Sargon's biographies over those of Cyrus flags a number of issues that will be seen again in consideration of the origins narratives given in the Late Antique traditions. Cyrus circulated his own account of his origins during his lifetime and several examples of his claims remain extant. These make no pretense to an unusual childhood, or a confrontational and personal usurpation; rather, they stress Cyrus' conventional royal ancestry and paint him as a

⁴ To give only a sample, a connection between the various stories of Sargon and Cyrus has been suggested in Boyce (1968), p.60, Drews (1974), Kuhrt (2003), Frye (1964), p.42, Briant (2002), pp.14-16. A connection between Cyrus and Ardashir is suggested in Harmatta (2002), and Llewellyn-Jones and Robson (2010), p.65.

fairly standard Near Eastern kingly figure fighting with (a) god on his side.⁵ This discrepancy foreshadows certain problems in the far more complex memories of Ardashir and Constantine. The rebuilt, imaginary, Cyrus, that emerged in the two centuries after Cyrus' death, proves how things both can and cannot be: how "realistic" and legitimising recollections of origins, expressed here as conventional dynastic statements, can coexist with a body of complimentary legend that contradicts them.

2.2 Sargon of Akkad

The earliest *known* historical figure to whom either sequence may have been applied in text was Sargon of Akkad. Sargon was the first ruler of an "imperial" state in Mesopotamian, and possibly world, history; his impact on the politics and culture of the region was correspondingly immense. His dynasty ruled over an extensive empire for almost two centuries and in founding it he broke with many of the political and social norms of his time. Almost nothing is known for certain of Sargon's early life but his later actions argue that that he was something of a *novus homo*. Though the legend of his rise is connected to the already ancient city of Kish Sargon did not make his capital there but in the relatively new city of Akkad, well outside of Sumer.⁶ Akkadian rule greatly upset existing political systems; Sargon and his successors are believed to have cemented their grip on power through expropriation and the promotion of new, loyal classes of people to religious and political preeminence.⁷ It is perhaps because of such disruption, and the unease it generated, that Sargon's dynasty was forced to confront a number of rebellions over its lifetime.⁸ The self-deification of Sargon's grandson Naram-Sin after crushing the largest of these revolts was perhaps the most egregious

⁵ Matthews (2008), *passim* but especially p.25 f and 59 f.

⁶ Heinz (2007), p.68.

⁷ Ibid. *passim* and Foster (2016), pp.44-46, 140-142. See also n.58 below.

⁸ An overview of Akkadian rule after Sargon, and the various revolts it faced, culminating in the bloody reign of Naram-Sin, can be found at Foster (2016), p.6 f.

innovation of all and he was remembered bitterly long after the fall of Akkad itself.⁹ Yet, despite such disquiet, Sargon's impact on Mesopotamian cultures was such that he quickly became seen as a model king, with tales of his deeds remaining popular for centuries after his death.¹⁰

Various legends of the life of Sargon are extant in later, sometimes much later, cuneiform texts.¹¹ Here, however, we are interested only in those texts that narrate his rise to kingship, not those dealing with his rule. This corpus within a corpus is very ancient and, often, very imperfectly recorded. Additionally, relevant material cuts across genres and represents a huge range of dates. With these caveats in mind, the picture of origins that emerges from our sources is most interesting; the very earliest "account" of Sargon's origins contains potential references to *both* sequences. Conversely, two later, much longer, documents recount what look like relatively unmixed versions of each. All of these attestations are of course patchy, however, in aggregate they point to the very early establishment within Mesopotamian literature of a relatively stable collection of origin tales structured according to the rules of our sequences and comprised of many of their stock components.

2.2.1 The Sumerian King List

The earliest text considered in this study is Sargon's entry in the so-called *Sumerian King List*, a tradition whose earliest layers may have formed during the Ur III dynasty, very early in the second millennium BCE.¹² A chronicle-like or quasi-annalistic production containing much that is quasi-mythological, the *King List*'s import is still a matter of debate but it is likely to have had a propagandistic purpose. Possibly its ostensibly bland accounting of rulers was intended to imply that there was only ever one "great kingship" at a time thus supporting the predominance of Ur over the rest of Sumer and

⁹ Foster notes that the very popular *Curse of Agade*, a poem that damns Naram-Sin for his impiety, presents an inversion of Naram-Sin's own victory inscriptions, see *ibid.* pp.13-14.

¹⁰ Lewis (1980) p.1 and 102.

¹¹ For a survey of this literature, see, *ibid.* pp.134-139.

¹² The list is not in fact a single document, but known from a variety of non-identical exemplars from different places, the standard edition is still Jacobsen (1939), to which references will be made here.

legitimizing its conquests beyond.¹³ Whatever its authors considered the *King List* to be, its relevance to this study lies in its very brief commentary on Sargon's reign.

“In Agade Sharru(m)-kin-
his was a date-grower-
cupbearer of Urzababa(k),
king of Agade, the one who
built Agade
became king and ruled 56 years;”¹⁴

On account of its brevity Sargon's entry is an impossible text to classify according to the schema outlined above. The biographical details it provides are paltry: their relevance is only clear in the light of their repetition in later, longer works. The important lines to consider here are 32 and 33; *his was a date-grower/cupbearer of Urzababa(k)*. On their own these lines would prove very little; the *List* is often formulaic and repetitive, and also mentions several other kings with unexpected backgrounds.¹⁵ There was besides, something of a long-lived Mesopotamian tradition of appointing a “substitute king” in times of strife, a custom that was believed to have accidentally made a king of a gardener at least once.¹⁶ On the other hand, the particular *combination* of a humble, rustic, background and the office of cupbearer to Urzababa, be it ever so brief, is an unusual amount of detail for the *List* and extremely relevant in the light of the presentation of Sargon's early life and rise made in two later traditions.

These are represented by considerably more elaborate texts in which Sargon's agrarian background and role as cupbearer were (separately) key features. Presuming that they ultimately descend from the same stories drawn on for the *King List*, it may be permitted to read some of the details of these later texts back into the older tradition; it would be, for instance, a fairly safe speculation that the most likely reconstruction of

¹³ For dates, see, *ibid.*, pp.140-1, Cooper (1993), pp.19-20.

¹⁴ Jacobsen (1939), p.111 (Col.VI, lines 31-6).

¹⁵ For example Etana, a shepherd, *ibid.* p.81 (Col II, line 16), Lugal-banda, also a shepherd, p.89 (Col.III, line 12), a king whose name is damaged, a smith, p.93 (Col.III, line 31), Kug-baba, a “barmaid” p.105, (Col.V, lines 36-37).

¹⁶ Bottéro (1992), p.138 *f.* It should also be noted that shepherd was a common metaphor, and even title for royal office in the ancient Near East, see, *ibid.* 149, and Matthews (2008), p.118. See also Dvornik (1966), pp.266-268 and *passim*.

the lacuna in line 32 would be that Sargon's *father* was a date grower.¹⁷ Each of the later texts has suggestive resemblances to one or the other of the target sequences, although both lack any resolution that would confirm their use of either. The probable reuse of Sargonic narratives for Cyrus may permit us to hypothesise the possible nature of some of the missing Sargonic material by selective reference to the various extant biographies of the Persian king. What can be known for certain is that the body of legend attached to Sargon contained both a tradition of lowly origins, *and* a tradition of courtly intrigue bought on by divine interference in earthly politics. These have come to us as separate pieces, but the appearance of possible references to *both* in the much older *King List* may indicate not only the great age of each, but also their very early association. If so, the editorial choices made in the composition of the *King List* were very much a sign of things to come.

2.2.2 The Birth Legend: Sequence One?

Sargon's humble heritage is an integral part of a much later Akkadian pseudo-autobiographical text known from four Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian tablets, henceforth called the *Birth Legend*. Here, "Sargon" who was abandoned in a sealed basket on a river by his mother, an *ēntu* priestess, claims never to have known his father.¹⁸ Given the often regal background and social significance of the *ēntu* priestess this statement is likely to have been a roundabout way of claiming royal blood; a subtle, but important point that bears heavily on the story's own relationships.¹⁹ He is found and adopted by a tenant farmer before becoming king in an unspecified way due to his

¹⁷ See n.20 below.

¹⁸ Oddly enough, the "Sargon" of this text claims to have known his father's *family* and states they inhabited a mountainous region; perhaps implying them to have been rural outsiders, see, Lewis (1980) p.24 (line 2-3). Note also that this statement contradicts one of the *Sumerian Legend* tablets in which Sargon's father is named, cf. Cooper and Heimpel (1983), TRS 73 obv, line 11.

¹⁹ On the issue of Sargon's mother in the *Birth Legend* see Lewis (1980) pp.37-42. On the *ēntu* priestess see note 163 below.

connection to the goddess Innana/Ishtar.²⁰ As an exposure story the *Birth Legend* has an affinity with Sequence One, but is incomplete as the resolution of Sargon's abandonment is brushed off with a reference to the help of the goddess Innana. Despite this, the text and the tradition it represents display a number of the features of Sequence One (see Table 1).

In a comprehensive survey of the surviving texts of this legend, Brian Lewis offered a date range of the 13th to the 8th centuries BCE for its origin, but noted that it was most likely a composite work in which the exposure of the future king was one of the older components of the story; the fact that the boy, as in the *List*, is raised by a *farmer* certainly supports this reading.²¹ On the other hand, the *List's* mention of Urzababa and Sargon's position at his court is conspicuously absent. Like the *List*, the *Birth Legend* gives only a brief and unsatisfying hint of the beliefs held about Sargon in later times. It would *seem* to present a summary of a much longer exposure story featuring a lost "prince" that might have terminated in some form of recognition and adoption; indeed, much has been made of its strong similarities to the abandonment of Moses seen in Exodus.²² We are once again, however, faced with evidence that admits only the possibility of a hypothetical, retrospective, comparison.

2.2.3 The Sumerian Legend: Sequence Two?

Far more encouraging is a probably older tradition that gives some shape to the putative connection between Sargon and king Urzababa mentioned in the *List*. Urzababa was believed to have been a king of Kish but he is unattested outside of mentions in historical and historicizing literature. Sargon's supposed service under this king is expanded in two copies of a Sumerian text probably composed in the Old Babylonian

²⁰ Ibid. p.25 (lines 8-13), Sargon's adoptive father's job is discussed at pp.55-7. The word used probably denotes a tenant farmer who worked a wealthy man's orchard, most likely tending *date palms*. If so this statement may have been built up on the older tradition seen in the *Sumerian King List* above.

²¹ Ibid. pp.93-7.

²² Ibid. p.149.

period (19th – 16th centuries BCE), hereafter referred to as the *Sumerian Legend*.²³ Though also incomplete, the *Sumerian Legend* would seem to contain a suggestive number of the components of Sequence Two. As in the *List*, Sargon is the king's cupbearer. His early life is not described (though his father is named), and the narrative seems to be confined to a court drama. The text is, however, fragmentary and incomplete; in particular it lacks a denouement. What we do have appears to detail the opening stages of Sargon's usurpation of his master. The text has notable affinities to Sequence Two, particularly in its courtly setting, its use of a prophetic dream, the presence of a warning and a conspiracy against the subject (see Table 2).

The extant story opens with an edict from Enlil, the king of the gods, declaring that the reign of Urzababa is to be brought to an end.²⁴ Innana marks Sargon, Urzababa's cupbearer, as a replacement while Urzababa is struck by a feeling of unease.²⁵ While sleeping in the temple of Ezinu, Sargon has a nightmare in which he sees the goddess Innana drown Urzababa in a river of blood.²⁶ Another translation of this section has Sargon seeing *himself* being drowned in the river.²⁷ Sargon's cries attract Urzababa's attention. The king interrogates his servant and learns of his vision.²⁸ Frightened, Urzababa makes his own interpretation of the dream and sends Sargon on a strange, presumably dangerous, errand involving carrying bronze to a smith.²⁹ Innana turns Sargon back from the temple because he is impure due to being covered in blood.³⁰ When Sargon survives this ploy Urzababa dispatches him to Lugalzagesi, the king of Uruk with what looks like a letter either designed to enrage the recipient or containing

²³ Urzababa's entry in the *List* can be found at Jacobsen (1939), pp.107-9 (Col.IV, lines 12-14). The *Sumerian Legend* has been known since a fragment of it was published in Scheil (1916). It has since been extended by reference to another tablet, see Cooper and Heimpel (1983) (references to the text of these tablets refer to the reconstruction given in pp.76-8 of this article and are cited by tablet and line number).

²⁴ Cooper and Heimpel (1983), TRS 73 obv, lines 6-9.

²⁵ Ibid. 3N T296, lines 3-7.

²⁶ Ibid. 3N T296, lines 12-14.

²⁷ Foster (2016), p.349.

²⁸ Cooper and Heimpel (1983), 3N T296, lines 16-24.

²⁹ Ibid. 3N T296, lines 30-45. In this translation it is not entirely certain what Urzababa has in mind. In the translation prepared by Foster the smith was supposed to kill Sargon by throwing him into a mold full of molten metal, see Foster (2016), p.349.

³⁰ Cooper and Heimpel (1983), 3N T296, lines 40-43. This makes more sense if Foster's translation is followed.

orders to kill the bearer.³¹ As the texts emphasize that the letter was not sealed, the final surviving section, giving part of Lugalzagesi's response, would seem to indicate that Sargon became aware of the trick and escaped death via a ruse of his own, though, unhappily, this part is fragmentary and the rest of the story is not preserved.³² Another Akkadian text, the so-called *Weidner Chronicle*, also knew Sargon as a subordinate of Urzababa. This text, however, is so brief and so preoccupied with its writer's idiosyncratic religious concerns that it is of little use to a consideration of the legend other than to underline the pervasiveness of a courtly link between the two men.³³

Unlike the *Birth Legend*, the *Sumerian Legend* grants some texture to the versions of Sargon's early life circulating in Sumerian and Akkadian literature. In doing so it presents an interesting question regarding the relationship of this retelling to the course events it claims to describe. We know essentially nothing about Sargon's actual origins and the plausibility of the *Sumerian Legend* leaves much to be desired. The overtly supernatural drivers of the episode and the suspicious passivity of Sargon, here merely the instrument of fate, do not well accord with historical plausibility or the proclamations of Sargon's own monuments recorded in later copies; these are, more often than not straightforwardly militarist and triumphal, and one comes away with the sense that Sargon rather exerted himself in arranging his ascension.³⁴ How then to approach this narrative?

In attempting to answer this question, we see here one of the most interesting facets of the relationship between this stereotype of historiography and the events it seeks to pattern, one that we will see repeated in much later iterations of Sequence Two. Despite its supernatural cast, the *Sumerian Legend* is not a whole-cloth invention: one of its

³¹ Ibid. 3N T296, lines 25 f, TRS 73 rev. Commentary p.82. It has been suggested that the *Sumerian Legend* doubled as a story about the invention of the clay envelope, see Alster (1987).

³² Or, not fooled by Urzababa's new invention, Sargon opens the envelope and reads the contents of the letter, see Alster (1987), pp.172-3.

³³ The writer of the *Wiedner Chronicle*, presumably a priest or temple functionary, associated kingship entirely with observance of the proper rites at the temple of Marduk at Esagila, in particular, the provision of fish offerings. A piscine theme is thus present throughout. See Grayson (1975), pp.43-5 & 148 (Chron.19, lines, 46-52).

³⁴ To give just one example, an Old Babylonian copy of one of Sargon's inscriptions reads: "Sargon, King of the World, with nine contingents from Agade conquered the city of Uruk, was victorious in battle, captured fifty governors and (Sargon) personally captured the King of Uruk" Frayne (1993), Sargon E2.1.1.3, lines 3-20, p.16.

actors turns up in contemporary epigraphy. While Urzababa is known only from historical literature, Lugalzagesi is independently attested from his own inscriptions as well as some Old Babylonian copies of Sargonic inscriptions glorying in his defeat.³⁵ Thus, while the *Sumerian Legend* is an unrealistic portrayal, it does feature at least two real people: Sargon, of course, but also a king we know to have been Sargon's *enemy*. We also know what the story must have ended with Sargon's ascension, if not precisely how it gets there. If, as seems likely, Urzababa was also a real king of Kish, then Sargon's rise is constructed here as a pair of *personal* confrontations in which a divinely ordained king faces rulers he had in fact (inferring from Sargon's boast that he had conquered Lugalzagesi) destroyed in battle. The narrative would seem to be a sort of historical theatre in which a particularly successful usurper is retrospectively accounted as a man of destiny while his opponents are cast in roles that force them to bear direct witness to this.

It may be suspected that this staging gives a misleading sense of Sargon's position and the tools by which his coup was arranged. It is completely possible that Sargon was some kind of official under a king of Kish named Urzababa and that he came to power by means of purely internal court machinations.³⁶ Two of Sargon's own sons may have been murdered in coups of this kind.³⁷ The little we know of Sargon's ethnic identity and his actions on achieving rule suggest that he either had cultivated, or intended to cultivate some kind of power base outside of the traditional ruling class of Kish, and indeed, Sumer.³⁸ In what was possibly a continuation of this policy, Sargon's immediate

³⁵ For Lugalzagesi's inscriptions see, Cooper (1986), pp.94-7 (Um.7.1-7.3). For the Old Babylonian tablet copies of Sargon's inscriptions mentioning Lugalzagesi, see, Frayne (1993), Sargon E2.1.1.1, lines 22-31, E2.1.1.2, lines 25-34, and E2.1.1.6, Caption 2 and Colophon 2 (the original of this copy seems to have included labeled images of Sargon and Lugalzagesi), pp.9-20.

³⁶ Kuhrt notes that a surprising number of modern scholars have tried to reconstruct Sargon's early life on the assumption that one legend or the other reflects it somewhat accurately, Kuhrt (2003), pp.356-357. To clarify, I do not take such a position. I suggest here only the possibility that Sargon was a subordinate of Urzababa (not necessarily his cupbearer, on which see below). In line with the general approach taken in this thesis, I suggest that many of the specific claims made about Sargon's life before his accession are *post facto* reconstructions of events driven by political or ideological needs.

³⁷ According to later omen texts, both Rimush and Manishtusu were killed by their own officials, see Goetze (1947), p.256-257 (omens 13 and 14).

³⁸ Heinz notes that Sargon's accession led to the emergence of new elites and patterns of patronage in Mesopotamia and that Sargon either founded, or, at least, based himself in, Akkad, distancing himself from the

descendants would seize and redistribute land to their followers.³⁹ If this characterization of the political and social context of Sargon's usurpation is correct, then the *Sumerian Legend* may be read as making a number of political claims. Because he was warned, Urzababa knew that the gods had withdrawn their approval of his kingship, his actions against Sargon were as pointless as they were impious. On the other hand, acting as the proxy of a god renders invalid any criticism of Sargon, his descendants or their supporters as *arrivistes* motivated by little more than the will to power.

The Sumerian Legend contains three features that Knapp associated with the apologetic mode: divine election, the unworthy predecessor and a passive subject.⁴⁰ Casting Sargon as cupbearer may have been a significant detail in this regard. In the Akkadian period itself, the cupbearer was charged with overseeing the supply of the court's food, cutlery and certain ritual observances, thus it was a position of great trust and one that brought with it a certain closeness to the ruler.⁴¹ Claiming this form of intimacy with Urzababa may be seen as a protestation of innocence. Sargon was no natural rebel, but a mere servant of Innana more sinned against than sinning. The personal connection and ultimately fatalist logic of legitimacy undergirding the *Sumerian Legend* is suspiciously useful, so much so that it may be suspected that the oldest layers of the story took shape when the names Urzababa, and Lugalzagesi retained some political significance. This is not, however, an easy proposition to prove.

According to Jacobsen's edition of the *Sumerian King List*, the oldest fragments of this "document" identifying Sargon as cupbearer and son of a date farmer date to early in the Old Babylonian period between the 18th and 15th centuries BCE.⁴² The *List* itself is, however, much older, and the dates of these fragments indicate only the latest possible date for the belief that Sargon was Urzababa's cupbearer. Jerrold Cooper, the co-editor

much older Kish, Heinz (2007), pp.70-82. Sargon was, besides, a Semite (rather than a Sumerian) and something appears to have been made of this identity in the later literature, Lewis (1980), p.110.

³⁹ On expropriation of land by and the new patronage networks formed under Sargon's dynasty, see Foster (2016), pp.1-2, 7-8, 35-36, 39-44.

⁴⁰ Knapp (2012), p.59 and 62-64.

⁴¹ Foster (2016), p.104.

⁴² Both lines are present on the tablets designated WB, and S, line 33 also appears on L₁, see Jacobsen (1939), p.110. For Jacobsen's dating of these tablets, see pp.5 and 9.

of the *Sumerian Legend*, suggests that it was, like the *List*, a product of the Ur III dynasty, a brief Sumerian renaissance that followed the fall of Sargon's dynasty in the 22nd century BCE.⁴³ It should, in his view, be understood as one of a number of "Sumerian 'historical-literary' compositions".⁴⁴ Part of a literature concerned with political legitimacy and the rise and fall of dynasties developed at that time.⁴⁵ In this period Sumerian was losing ground to Akkadian as a spoken language, and the literary efforts of the Ur III kings have been seen as attempts to preserve the unwritten bulk of Sumerian tradition.⁴⁶ There is a possibility then, that while the *Sumerian Legend* does "originate" in the Ur III period, it may have been a recording, an elaboration, or a rationalization, of an even older tradition.

This leaves open the possibility that a story of courtly confrontation driven by omens was known during the Akkadian period. Its affinities with later "apologetic" texts suggest that it may have been propagated intentionally, perhaps by the dynasty's supporters, who had benefited enormously from Akkadian rule and had responded to Sargon and his dynasty with adulation.⁴⁷ Yet there is no proof of this; aside from an obvious devotion to the goddess Innana/Ishtar, the Old-Babylonian copies of Sargon's monuments known to us do not seem to make reference to any of the material contained in either of the *Legends*.⁴⁸ It cannot be stated with any certainty that the tradition reflected in the *Sumerian Legend* was either contemporary or "official", that is, emanating from or encouraged by the palace. If the story were an "unofficial" production its strongly legitimizing nature would still argue for an origin in a group whose interests coincided with those of the dynasty. Perhaps the beneficiaries of Sargon's "reforms" felt the need to rework Sargon's beginnings as a court functionary in Kish into something much grander.

⁴³ Rowton (1960), p.162, Cooper (1993), p.18.

⁴⁴ Cooper (1985), p.37. Foster notes that the author appears to have been familiar with the conventions of Sumerian literature, see Foster (2016), p.266.

⁴⁵ Cooper (1993) pp.13-15.

⁴⁶ West (1999), pp.61-62.

⁴⁷ Westenholz (1979), p.111. Foster notes that members of the new elite went so far as to take theophoric names ascribing godhood to Akkadian kings, see Foster (2016), p.140.

⁴⁸ Sargon's inscriptions, and those of his contemporaries mentioning him are collected, transcribed and translated in Frayne (1993), pp.9-39.

Like the *Birth Legend*, the *Sumerian Legend* says nothing concrete about Sargon's origins. Viewed in a certain light however, it hints at the forces at work in building Sargon's memory. If the story was created by a someone working directly for the dynasty of Akkad or a member of a fellow travelling social group, the tradition and its preservation may imply the existence of a counter-narrative; one in which questionable origins and irregular succession were arrayed against Sargon and his dynasty by those who lost out in the transition to Akkadian rule.⁴⁹ Briefly, the *Sumerian Legend*, and its ancestors, may have been the product of a competition over the meaning of disruptive social innovations driven by dynastic change. This argument finds support in later, far better attested applications of very similar narratives in historicizing writing.

2.2.4 Sargon Imaginaire

Extant material strongly implies that a stable story-form about Sargon rising from farm boy to cupbearer to king established itself in the historical memory of literate Mesopotamian society by the Old Babylonian period, a story exemplified in the *Sumerian Legend*. The relationship of this story to the *Birth Legend* is not entirely clear though it seems very likely that the *Birth Legend* represents a much younger layer of Sargonic legend. Amélie Kuhrt believed that the *Birth Legend* was a later construction stressing the innateness of Sargon's claim by assigning his mother an implicitly royal role rather than his reliance on divine aid. Kuhrt believed that this narrative was likely produced, or at the very least republished, in the service of the much later Assyrian king Sargon II (r. 722-705 BCE).⁵⁰ Kuhrt's study of Sargon's legends makes the import point that though the *Birth* and *Sumerian Legends* may share a common origin, they circulated separately and concurrently.⁵¹

As a rural origin is given in the *List* alongside Sargon's role as cupbearer, Kuhrt saw it as conceivable that the exposure and adoption seen in the *Birth Legend* was a

⁴⁹ The concept of counter-narrative is taken from the theoretical framework used in Yael Zerubavel's consideration of Israeli national myths, see p.239 below.

⁵⁰ Kuhrt (2003), p.352, following on from the hypothesis made in Lewis (1980), pp.103-6.

⁵¹ Kuhrt (2003), pp.351-352.

development of trends long established in the traditions feeding into the *Sumerian Legend* rather than a total innovation.⁵² Yet it should be noted (and will be seen) that the link between the exposure or loss of a child and “royal” blood is a very strong one, and the extant *Sumerian Legend* gives no indication that its Sargon was of royal birth. On the other hand, we do not have anything like the full range of Sargon origin legends that must once have circulated and any proposed genealogy of the stories will always remain speculative.

The precise relationship between the two extant “texts” aside, what is certain is that the establishment of legends of Sargon led to his memory becoming a powerful cultural engine. In Assyria and Babylon, Akkad’s cultural and linguistic successor states, the founder of Akkad was revered and his legends were preserved, replicated and emulated for centuries. With the adoption of Akkadian as a *Lingua Franca*, these traditions had the potential to spread much further into the broader culture of the Near East in the 2nd millennium BCE. Akkadian versions of other Sargonic legends have been found in Hittite and Egyptian archives and Hittite kings appear to have made political use of this corpus, grafting themselves in to the imagined history of Mesopotamia through references to Sargonic legend.⁵³

Two Biblical traditions may also be suspected to be products of this spread. The birth of Moses given in Exodus has, as is well-known, very specific resonances with the *Birth Legend*.⁵⁴ A much more intriguing Biblical parallel may be found in description of the rise of King David in 1 Samuel. The two books of Samuel represent a sometimes confusing weld of historical or quasi-historical traditions among which can be discerned traces of a court story, the so-called *History of David’s Rise*, analogous to the *Sumerian Legend*, and, as will be seen, the Ctesian version of Cyrus.⁵⁵ At the core of this story is the ascent of David from shepherd boy to courtly confidant to Saul, and finally, to the throne itself.

⁵² Kuhrt suggests that the *Birth Legend* may be “...another version, which was perhaps a reworking of the story (ie. the *Sumerian Legend*)” *ibid.* p.354.

⁵³ Bacharova (2016), p.166 f.

⁵⁴ Lewis (1980), p.149 f.

⁵⁵ The precise nature and boundaries of this theoretical tradition are debatable. It has been claimed to underlie variable sections of David’s narrative ranging from 1 Samuel 15– 2 Samuel 7, see Tsumura (2007), pp.15–15, 413–414 and the references contained therein.

God withdraws his blessing from Saul. Vexed and in need of a musician, Saul, on hearing of David's skill in war, rhetoric and music, invites him to court.⁵⁶ Saul is impressed with the good-looking young man and David rapidly becomes his confidant and close servant.⁵⁷ This happy situation comes to an end when David's conspicuous bravery in battle, including his killing of Goliath, makes him a public hero at Saul's expense.⁵⁸ ⁵⁹ The increasingly paranoid Saul marks David for death but David hears of it and runs away.⁶⁰ After a series of adventures Saul dies and David becomes king. Samuel's account of the rise of David also contains two features that, while missing or perhaps (given the fragmentary nature of the text) lost from the extant *Sumerian Legend*, will be seen in other iterations of the narrative defined as Sequence Two: a public display of the inadequacy of the old king staged as the killing of a dangerous animal or an animalistic opponent (Goliath), and the protagonist's escape from court fleeing a plot against him.⁶¹

Given that the entire Biblical tradition long postdates the establishment of Sargon as a literary figure, it is tempting to conjecture that the writers of the apologetic tradition(s) preserved in Samuel worked with historicizing patterns popularized, perhaps entirely unbeknownst to them, by a foreign literature centuries before, and that they did so in order to quell similar problems in their own historical discourse. Akkadian (albeit in a very distinct form) was certainly known to the scribal class of

⁵⁶ 1 Samuel 16:14-20, cf. the withdrawal of divine support from Urzababa and his subsequent troubled mind seen in Cooper and Heimpel (1983), TRS 73 obv. 8-9 and 3N T296

⁵⁷ 1 Samuel 16:21. David becomes Saul's weapon-bearer. The personal qualities of David that so struck Saul are understood to be marks of divine approval, see McCarter (1980) p.281.

⁵⁸ McCarter identifies two distinct sources, poorly harmonized, as constituting of David's confrontation with the Philistine champion. The first (1 Samuel 17:1-11, 33-40, 42-48a-54) is more or less in harmony with David's introduction to Saul seen at 1 Samuel 16, but may be a revised version of an older account in which David's combat with Goliath was introduced. The second (1 Samuel 17:12-31, 41, 48b, 50, 55-58, 18:1-19, 29b-30) has David coming directly from his father's farm carrying food for his brothers who are in Saul's army. He believes this highly contradictory version may have resulted from the popularity of the image of David as a young shepherd when anointed by Samuel. See commentary in *ibid.* pp.295-298 and 307-309. This kind of interpretation is doubted in Tsumura (2007), pp.434-436 and 446.

⁵⁹ 1 Samuel 18:12 and 14-16.

⁶⁰ 1 Samuel 18:25-27 and 19:1-17.

⁶¹ Notice that in 1 Samuel 17:11 Saul balks at fighting the Philistine champion along with the rest of his army, leaving the task to his servant. This theme of the public showing up of royal inadequacy will be seen again in instances of Sequence Two using a combat of some kind.

Canaan during the 2nd millennium BCE.⁶² It is possible that some version of the tradition represented by the *Sumerian Legend* was introduced to the region at this time. Nothing, of course, can be stated for certain, and it is possible that the narrative resemblances are purely coincidental. A number of thematic and, perhaps, situational, parallels between the two are, however, suggestive. In Samuel, the clearly stated role of God in selecting rulers mirrors the deterministic logic of the *Sumerian Legend*. This, alongside David's conscientious obedience and conspicuous non-involvement in Saul's death, has led one commentator on Samuel to characterize certain sections describing the rise of David as drawn from a tradition constituting an "apology" for David's actions, positioning the earliest layers of this narrative in a broader, cross-cultural, and exculpatory mode of royal productions and pushing its date right back to the reign of David himself.^{63 64}

It is interesting to consider this hypothesis in light of the similar narrative seen in the *Sumerian Legend*. The similarity of David and Sargon's legends may suggest the two traditions shared the same subtext, that of a coup staged by an "outsider" subordinate. If this conjecture is indeed true, then we see here two irregular successions that have been reworked in a very similar way; we might understand each as older and younger iterations of a particularly influential *apologetic style* intended to demonstrate divine support for novel, controversial, monarchy.

The cultures of Mesopotamia and those drawn into its cultural orbit, remembered Sargon for the better part of two millennia; more precisely, they remembered a particular *image* of Sargon as a divine instrument and model king. This remembrance was expressed in a number of historical-literary compositions of which the *Birth* and *Sumerian Legends* represent only a fraction. Moreover, the extant shards of this literature

⁶² Canaanite Akkadian was cut off from the Mesopotamian mainstream of the language when the region was subjected to Egypt in the 15th century BCE. The resulting dialect was quite distinct, yet, Canaanite scribes clearly understood the more standard Egyptian Akkadian and probably also identified their written language as a form of Akkadian, see Izre'el (1995). Any Sargonic story had, in any case, at minimum almost five centuries to spread to the region before the Egyptian conquest.

⁶³ McCarter (1980), p.499 f.

⁶⁴ A connection between the story of David and trends in Babylonian royal apologia, particularly in regards to that employed by Nabonidus, is proposed in Dick (2004). Knapp analyses the *History of David's Rise* as a composite of a number of traditions, some of which he believes must have been apologetic, see Knapp (2012), p.133 f.

can only hint at the mass of allied, non-literate traditions that must have arisen from, fed into and run in parallel with them. It is, however, the specific interaction of the written word and political perception that is of interest here. Sargonic legend was both ensconced in a broad literary system *and* an attractive model to those who wielded power.

This meeting of political need and scribal culture provides a certain stability of form, a permanent “spine” along which a single narrative is projected, producing, assimilating, and re-assimilating innovations as it goes. While it is not necessary, or likely, that writing was the *only* medium in which forms of the *Birth* and *Sumerian* legends travelled due to the bilingual tendencies of scribal practice during the 2nd millennium BCE writing was probably a major driver of the spread of this material into the social circles capable of bequeathing us material. When kings wished to be praised, or excused, their followers fell back on received representations, further entrenching them through the repetition. At times this generated texts with the potential to reproduce the subject as a new model. Ironically, constant comparison to Sargon may explain why “his” legends reappear in distant lands long after Sargon was himself forgotten.

Sargon’s origin legends presage a number of extra-narrative features seen in the evolution of the later texts considered in this study. The presence of the same details in “literary” and “historical” works presents us with the first case of what, it will be seen, is a recurring crossover of “genre” in this kind of production. Likewise, some reason beyond the extensive loss of material from this era may be suspected for the total lack of any less supernatural account of Sargon’s origins. It was, perhaps, a combination of literary presentation, a sympathetic readership and a favorable political climate that allowed these images of history to spread, establish and replicate themselves, eventually drowning out the dissenting voices they were intended to quell in the first place. Thus Sargon the man was destroyed by Sargon the paradigm. Evidence of just how completely Sargon’s memory, and thereby the very terms of new, charismatic monarchy, had been captured by Sargon’s legends, comes from Babylon of the 6th century BCE for it was almost certainly there that they became attached to another man whose career can have seemed no less remarkable than that of the now distant founder of Akkad.

2.3 Cyrus the Great

Some seventeen centuries after Sargon's death, a minor king leading a hitherto peripheral people once again conquered all of Mesopotamia. Unsurprisingly, accounts of the early career of Cyrus II (c.600 BCE – c.530 BCE), founder of the Achaemenid Empire or at least, the retellings of it, are in a far more complete condition than those of his Akkadian forerunner, mostly because Cyrus' biography would take an unusual turn in that its preservation would occur in cultures largely external to his empire. In one of history's more convoluted ironies, Cyrus' name came to be forgotten in his native land but was remembered fondly in Jewish, Greek and Roman historical traditions. Discounting a small number of inscriptions, brief entries in late Mesopotamian chronicles and a very few, more or less, contemporary accounts of his actions (of which more will be said later) Cyrus' memory descends to us in two influential streams. In the Biblical tradition he is a literally messianic figure, however this was a marginal interpretation in Hellenistic and Roman traditions where the image of Cyrus was largely established by three influential works of Greek literature: the *Histories* of Herodotus the *Persika* of Ctesias and the *Cyropaedia* of Xenophon.

Each of these authors offers a story that has very little to say about the early life of the real Cyrus, but much about the forms of Near Eastern narratives associated with monarchy current in their time. Clear parallels can be and have been seen between this material and Sargonic legends. Cyrus' biographies represent an important juncture in the history of our narratives. Their attachment to Cyrus in the lands of the Achaemenid Empire, a process glimpsed in these Greek works, renewed Sargon's bibliographic styles while effacing Sargon's name. It is probably on the back of this second wave of biography that the historicizing styles first seen attached to Sargon, filtered down into the literary imagination of Sasanian Iran where they would reemerge as a set of narratives remaking the origins of the imperial family. Moreover, their presence in Greek historiography provides a likely explanation for the shape of the history portrayed in some of Constantine's hagiographies. Cyrus is, therefore, a probable nexus between later Roman and Iranian traditions.

Cyrus' own claims make him an unusual candidate for the kind of remodeling represented by either sequence. Cyrus was born into a royal house and he loudly

declared this ancestry to all who would listen. Though he certainly claimed to work at the behest of a god at least once, this was because as a king he was able to take on the role of a pious military subcontractor. Nonetheless, the unlikely transformations of conquering petty-king into two kinds of shepherd-boy-made-good allows some very useful inferences to be drawn regarding the behavior of these narratives in the representation of history. In particular, it shows how situation suggests typology, how the presence of a body of literate memory can frame new events in their terms even when any political or ideological need for the story seems to be lacking. Finally, Cyrus' "biographies" exist in a relatively expansive form, and might contain material once associated with one or the other of Sargon's legends; at the very least, they show the sort of components that were associated with and could be drawn into the basic sequences of loss and confrontation in the 5th and 4th centuries BCE

2.3.1 Herodotus

The earliest of the extant Greek writers dealing with Cyrus offers the most famous account. Herodotus offers a fairly complete, but strangely negative version of Sequence One (See Table 3). He casts Cyrus as the grandson of Astyages, the Median king he is to depose. Unsettled by a dream Astyages is warned by the Magi that his daughter's child will depose him.⁶⁵ In response, he inexplicably marries her to a foreigner of little social consequence.⁶⁶ Astyages dreams a second dream, merely underscoring the first.⁶⁷ When Astyages' daughter falls pregnant he orders the child killed.⁶⁸ Harpagus, the official charged with this duty, wants no part of it and delegates it to a herdsman.⁶⁹ This man swaps the baby with his own stillborn, and raises it.⁷⁰ Years later, Cyrus's actions in a child's game in which he was elected king, brings him before Astyages where his

⁶⁵ Notably, Astyages' first dream also involves a river, this time of urine, *cf.* Herod, 1.107.1 and Cooper and Heimpel (1983), p.77 (3N T296 lines, 20-24). For an analysis of the baffling logic of Astyages' actions in this report, see Pelling (1996).

⁶⁶ Herod, 1.107.2.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.* 1.108.1-2.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.* 1.108.3-5.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.* 1.109-110.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.* 1.112-113.

manner and resemblance to Astyages reveal his true identity.⁷¹ The rediscovery of Cyrus triggers a series of revenge-fueled court intrigues, most not involving Cyrus directly, that doom Astyages some years later.⁷² Herodotus states that he knew of at least three other versions of Cyrus' origin and that he had selected the one given to him by "certain Persians who do not wish to exalt Cyrus".⁷³

Herodotus' protestation that his Cyrus narrative was drawn from Persian sources cannot be taken at face value. The claim has been picked apart, generating a range of opinions on its validity with some seeing it as no Eastern tale but rather a Hellenised artifact reflecting Greek concerns, part of a tragic story centred on Cyrus' pride.⁷⁴ Herodotus' information about the east more generally has a complicated and murky relationship with Greek expectations and forms.⁷⁵ His sources for Persian history have been variously supposed to be Greek, Greek speaking members of the Persian bureaucracy, and even a Median exile.⁷⁶ Another school of thought is extremely skeptical that Herodotus had any sources at all.⁷⁷ It may be significant in this regard that Herodotus' shadowy predecessor, Charon of Lampsacus, transmitted the same two dreams Herodotus grants to Astyages.⁷⁸ That the symbols of Cyrus' rise are mirrored in his fall, a fall that comes after he begins to see himself as a divine figure, argue strongly that the story told here is largely a Greek one concerned with the tragic fall of a great man through his own arrogance.⁷⁹

Before casting Herodotus' version aside, however, it should be noted that the presence of royal descent, exposure and adoption in his construction of Cyrus' early life

⁷¹ Ibid. 1.114-116.

⁷² Ibid. 1.117.1 f.

⁷³ 'ὥς ὧν Περσέων μετεξέτεροι λέγουσι, οἱ μὴ βουλόμενοι σεμνοῦν τὰ περὶ Κῦρον ἀλλὰ τὸν ἐόντα λέγειν λόγον, κατὰ ταῦτα γράψω...' ibid.1.95.1.

⁷⁴ As part of a series of tragic falls see Immerwahr (1966), pp.167-168. As informed by the conventions of stage tragedy, see Saïd (2002), *passim*. As a story about hubris see Chiasson (2012).

⁷⁵ His portrait of Babylon for example, was probably painted according to a pre-conceived image of that city, see Kuhrt (2002), pp.480-483.

⁷⁶ Lewis (1985), pp.107-108, 116-117, Murray (1987), pp.110-111, Asheri (2007), p.148.

⁷⁷ The argument of Fehling (1989).

⁷⁸ FGrH 262 F14 = Tertullian. De. An. 46.

⁷⁹ It should be mentioned that a parallel rise and fall story might be found in the Iranian religious-mythic complex. Jamshid, a mythical king of Iran, is supposed to have fallen victim to hubris and lost the approval of heaven, and then his life, as a result, see Skjaervø (2012).

admits the possibility of some connection, however tenuous, to something like the *Birth Legend*. Herodotus attributes rumours that Cyrus was suckled by a dog to a misunderstanding of the name of his foster-mother; another variation on the exposure type seen in the *Birth Legend* and elsewhere.⁸⁰ Addressing this story, even in order to refute it, suggests that several versions of the exposure of Cyrus were already widely known to the Greeks of Herodotus' time. It may be possible to view this discarded story in the 1st century CE work of Pompeius Trogus, extant in the later abridgement of Justin. According to Pompeius Trogus, Cyrus was exposed and suckled by a dog before his rescue by the shepherd who became his foster-father.⁸¹ Pompeius Trogus' account otherwise very closely resembles that of Herodotus. Whether Pompeius Trogus was referencing a now lost Greek tradition, elaborating a loose thread in Herodotus' own text to differentiate his own (or using some other author who already had) is impossible to say. It may be fairly assumed, however, that Herodotus did not invent the exposure of Cyrus *ex nihilo*.

Herodotus' exposure narrative gives a complete description of the loss, finding and re-adoption of a lost prince, and is far longer and much, much more detailed than the *Birth Legend*. It also has certain resonances with the birth of Moses (where the status of the exposor and rescuer are curiously reversed) but is more straightforwardly an account of succession. Because the outline of Herodotus' Cyrus narrative, alongside many of the details he employs in its resolution, will resurface in later Iranian biographical legends, it is worthwhile to consider the possibility that the basis of the Herodotus' narrative *may* have been a legend that had originated in the east and had later trickled into the Greek-speaking world. Given the details they hold in common, there is a possibility that we see preserved in Herodotus a more detailed, though second hand, version of an originally Sargonic exposure story akin to the *Birth Legend*.

Herodotus' narrative contains a number of details missing from the extant *Birth Legend* but key to Sequence One in its Late Antique iterations. The boy's birth is associated with dreams and omens, signs interpreted by a dream-interpreter or

⁸⁰ Herod, 1.110.1. Lewis (1980), pp.248-9.

⁸¹ Justin. Epit. 1.4.10-11.

astrologer - in this case, the Magi who advise Astyages so poorly.⁸² Additionally, Herodotus gives two forms of recognition that will feature so prominently in the much later Greek and Iranian texts. Cyrus comes to the attention of Astyages as a result of a game in which the other children, evidently more astute than their parents, have appointed him their king.⁸³ When Cyrus is brought before Astyages the old king cannot help but notice the boy's resemblance to himself. As a result, Cyrus' true identity is brought to light.⁸⁴

By setting exposure in a longer, logical narrative, Herodotus' Cyrus prefigures the pattern of loss and recognition seen in the Medieval Greek and Iranian historicizing traditions that are the targets of this study. Should we posit that this version of Cyrus reflects a genuinely Eastern story with some relationship with the traditions that made the Sargon of the *Birth Legend*, it would open the possibility of reading other elements of Cyrus' story back into the extremely sparse and incomplete framework provided by the few surviving attestations of Sargon's; it would, in other words, allow us to hypothesise that the surviving text of the *Birth Legend* may represent only part of a now lost tradition that was similar to the Herodotean Cyrus.

Unfortunately, as has already been mentioned, Herodotus' ultimate sources for Persian history are unclear and modern investigations have produced rather contradictory opinions as to their nature.⁸⁵ Though a Sargonic link to this Cyrus has been assumed from time to time, there is very little visible connective tissue and as tempting as the association is, it must remain entirely speculative.⁸⁶ What is certain is that something very like the relatively complex narrative of recognition and prophecy used by Herodotus appears in later historicizing works, including Iranian texts that are unlikely to rely on Herodotus himself. It would seem likely then, that Herodotus' Cyrus drew on an originally eastern biographic pattern. Sargon's enduring popularity makes

⁸² Merely "soothsayers", *arioli*, in Justin, see *ibid.* 1.4.3.

⁸³ Herod, 1.114.1.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.* 1.116.1.

⁸⁵ See n.76-77 above. For a general consideration of the relationship between Eastern and Greek material in Herodotus see, West (2003), *passim*.

⁸⁶ Notably, Drews (1974), p.338 and *f*, followed by Kuhrt (2003), pp.354-355 who comes to a rather different conclusion regarding its significance.

him a possible, perhaps even probable, model for this pattern, but more than this we cannot say.

2.3.2 Ctesias

A much more solidly Sargonic version of the life of Cyrus is offered by the 4th century BCE writer Ctesias. Ctesias served the Achaemenid court of Artaxerxes II (r.405/404-359 BCE) in Babylon as a doctor, and, despite having a wide readership in antiquity the fragments of his *Persika* had a cold reception in the twentieth century, one that has scarcely improved over time.⁸⁷ Once merely an incompetent historian, postcolonial trends in scholarship have opened the way for a new and much more sinister characterization of the good doctor; Ctesias, goes one argument, *invented* “The Orient” as a perfumed, iridescent riot of silk-draped Western fantasies and ideological contrast.⁸⁸ In this view, Ctesias was the first of a very long line of Orientalists who saw in the societies of the East, only what they wished to see.

Damned by German philologists on the grounds of accuracy, and decolonising historiographers for questionable anthropology, Ctesias is a difficult author to interpret. Unfortunately for those trying to squeeze the remnants of his writings for useful information about the Achaemenid Empire of the 4th century, Ctesias is unlikely to have either overcome his cultural prejudices or even to have been writing “history” as we understand it.⁸⁹ In his scathing assessment of this author’s work Robert Drews saw Ctesias’ writings as a failure of method, a stage in the regression to an older Greek habit of viewing the East as a succession of disconnected wonders.⁹⁰ This approach was, in Drews’ view, the inevitable outcome of a lack of a single, relatively contemporary event (such as the Persian Wars) to focus the work and allow autopsy, unselective,

⁸⁷ Ctesias does have his defenders, see Stronk (2007), Llewellyn-Jones and Robson (2010).

⁸⁸ A slightly dramatized paraphrase of Sancisi-Weerdenburg (1987), p.43 who does not hold Ctesias *personally* responsible.

⁸⁹ Ibid. pp.37-40. It has been pointed out (about Herodotus, but applicable here also) that even with the best will in the world, the meaning of any cultural practice is vulnerable to misinterpretation in the hands of an outside recorder, see Thomas (2012), *passim*.

⁹⁰ Drews (1973), p.115 f.

sensationalist use of the sources he did have, and, according to Drews' rather blunt assessment, a lack of historical perspective in Eastern literary practice itself.⁹¹ Ctesias, says Drews, took the first step towards the re-enchantment of Eastern history in Greek; after him the East was ceded permanently to the poet and the epitomator.⁹²

Fantasia or not, Ctesias does have the great advantage of having spent some considerable time in close proximity to people who rarely speak for themselves in Greek literature. By abandoning the rigid classification of Ctesias as a historian, some recent arguments have presented his work in a far more sympathetic light. The *Persika*, says this new approach, is a work that wore its fictions on its sleeve.⁹³ The dour metrics of plausibility and scope, in this view, entirely miss the point; the *Persika* was supposed to be enjoyed.⁹⁴ The soap-opera like features that so upset a previous generation of scholarship are, in reality, key elements of the work's intent; harem intrigues make for interesting reading and were hardly insignificant, or invented, features of the contained world of the Achaemenid court with which Ctesias was familiar. Ctesias in this view would be the victim of a too-strict, and entirely modern, genre boundary with "serious" historians on the one side and writers of entertainment on the other.⁹⁵ Additionally, it has been noted that the majority of derogatory comments about Ctesias in Antiquity are not associated with his *Persika*, but rather with his *Indika*, and indeed the fragments of this latter work suggest that it was largely a farrago of nonsense.⁹⁶

If many of the attacks on Ctesias were predicated on what he was *not*, to get anything useful out of his work requires an acceptance of what he was and certain attitude towards what he offers. As a reporter of contemporary events it is undeniable that

⁹¹ Ibid. pp.97-107.

⁹² Ibid. pp.121-122.

⁹³ "'Faction' or a kind of historical novel" Stronk (2007), 43-44.

⁹⁴ The editors of a recent, English, edition of Ctesias' fragments reflected on Stronk's idea, making a comparison between the *Persika* and Giles Foden's 1998 novel *The Last King of Scotland*. In both cases, the author is seen to have drawn on his own experiences in the area, the recollections of members of a ruler's entourage and family as well as primary documentation (this last source unlikely in the case of Ctesias) to create a *version* of history that is an exciting blend of fact and fiction putting the author (a fictional proxy in Foden's case) at the centre of events. See Llewellyn-Jones and Robson (2010), pp.3-7.

⁹⁵ Fehling suggests that Ctesias was not all that different from Herodotus in this regard, Fehling (1989), pp.212-215.

⁹⁶ Llewellyn-Jones and Robson (2010), p.33.

Ctesias had serious limits. Depending on one's interests, however, Ctesias was in a position to have heard some interesting things. Should one go seeking a Polybian style meditation on the impersonal, institutional forces of history Ctesias is worthless. If, on the other hand, one is interested in the ideas about the past current in court circles under Artaxerxes II and their interaction with broader trends in legend, Ctesias is considerably better.⁹⁷ In his *Cyrus*, Ctesias has handed the student of comparative literature and international tales a real gift. Here the maligned author of palace gossip would seem to have surpassed Herodotus as an anthropologist. Presenting a story with clear parallels to Sargonic precedent, one almost certainly drawn from the milieu of Babylon, a centre of Sargonic memory, Ctesias is very likely to have given us no suspiciously Hellenised rise and fall but a "true myth", an *actually Eastern account* drawn, in comparison to the older work, relatively unfiltered, from a Mesopotamian tradition.

The extensive summary of the *Persika* made by Photius in the tenth century fails here. Photius probably did not have the first books of this work at his disposal and begins his summary of Ctesias' narrative just after Cyrus has deposed Astyages. Photius does however indicate that Ctesias' version of events contradicted that of Herodotus at many points and also that Ctesias set his history against that of the older work.⁹⁸ Ctesias' *Cyrus* is carried in a large fragment of the 1st century Syrian author Nicholaus of Damascus excerpted in Constantine Porphyrogenitus' 10th century compilation *De Insidiis*.⁹⁹ Though it has been reworked at least twice, on the basis of recurring themes within the corpus and overlaps in fragments carried by other authors, in particular Diodorus Siculus' account of the overthrow of the Assyrian king Sardanapalus, this text is likely to be reasonably close to Ctesias' original narrative.¹⁰⁰ The story is one of courtly confrontation and is an iteration of Sequence Two (see Table 4).

⁹⁷ "...an unskilled informant who has preserved more of the *literary tradition* than of the factual history of Persia." Sancisi-Weerdenburg (1987), p.43 mentioning the decline theory presented at Drews (1973), p.116. "...an account of Persian court life as *the Persian aristocracy saw it*." Murray (1987), p.113-4. (Emphases added).

⁹⁸ Phot. Cod. Bib. 72.

⁹⁹ Jacoby did not allot Nicholaus' fragments to Ctesias. On the other hand, Lenfant's edition of the fragments of the *Persika* and the *Indika* does. References will henceforth be given to both. The most relevant fragment here is FGrH 90 F66 = Lenfant (2004), F8d*.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. Dio. Sic. 2.23-25 & Lenfant (2004), F1pδ and F1pε*. In a comparison of all the Ctesian fragments of Nicholaus, Lenfant makes the point that a comparison of two fragments ascribed to Nicholaus, the rise of

In this fragment the young Cyrus is the son of a man so poor as to be reduced to banditry.¹⁰¹ He attaches himself to a richer man by means of a Median law allowing self-enslavement.¹⁰² He comes into the service of two palace officials and is finally taken under the wing of Astyages' cupbearer where his grace and skill attract the king's attention.¹⁰³ Becoming cupbearer in turn he is informed that before his birth his mother, while pregnant, dreamt a dream similar to that which Herodotus gives to Astyages. His father calls astrologers for an interpretation. One of them, referred to only as the "Babylonian", foretells Cyrus' rise; Cyrus is enthusiastic.¹⁰⁴ While travelling with the astrologer Cyrus meets a lowly Persian by the name of Oibares whose name, ethnicity and disposition are interpreted as good omens.¹⁰⁵ Convinced of his destiny, Cyrus creates an anti-Median conspiracy among Astyages' subjects then, with Oibares' help engineers his escape from Astyages' court claiming he needs to see his ailing father.¹⁰⁶ His intentions are revealed to Astyages first by the now dead astrologer's brother and next by a singer or concubine who casts the event in an animal metaphor.¹⁰⁷ Cyrus tricks those sent to pursue him before leading a desperate revolt from Persia that ends with the capture and deposition of Astyages.¹⁰⁸

The Sargonic precedent of something like the *Sumerian Legend* is evidenced by a number of parallels. Cyrus is here a complete outsider, of very low stock, as was the

Cyrus and the conspiracy of the Mede Arbakes and the Chaldean Belesys against Sardanalphus contain, aside from a direct reference to the earlier event in the later (cf. FGrH 90 F3 = Lenfant (2004), F1pε* and FGrH 90 F66.12 = Lenfant (2004) F8d*.12), narrative and thematic parallels. The use of omens and the fixer role played by eunuchs for example, suggest both a common origin and shared authorship. She argues also that the substance of Ctesias' narrative has not been radically altered by its redactions, see Lenfant (2000), *passim*.

¹⁰¹ In a start that does not inspire confidence, Ctesias/Nicholaus has mistaken the name of Cyrus' father, here given as, Ἀτραδάτος, FGrH 90 F66.3 = Lenfant (2004), F8d*.3.

¹⁰² FGrH 90 F66.2-3 = Lenfant (2004), F8d*.2-3. König makes the suggestion that the name of Cyrus' tribe, Μάρδος, has here been misunderstood, with *mardos* supposed to represent Old Persian *martiya* which König states (without citation) meant the subordinate in a vassalage-type arrangement, König (1972), p.47. This seems unlikely: *martiya* in Old Persian simply means "mortal" and, as a substantive, "man". It is the ancestor of the Middle and Modern Persian *mard*, also meaning "man", see Kent (1953), p.203.

¹⁰³ FGrH 90 F66.4-5 = Lenfant (2004), F8d*.4-5.

¹⁰⁴ FGrH 90 F66.6-9 = Lenfant (2004), F8d*. 6-9.

¹⁰⁵ FGrH 90 F66. 11-13 = Lenfant (2004), F8d*. 11-13.

¹⁰⁶ FGrH 90 F66.14-23= Lenfant (2000), F8d*.14-23.

¹⁰⁷ FGrH 90 F66.24-26.= Lenfant (2000), F8d*.24-26.

¹⁰⁸ FGrH 90 F66.27 f = Lenfant (2000), F8d*.27 f.

Sargon of the *Sumerian King List*. He too is made the cupbearer to the man he is to depose and the action pivots on a prophetic dream whose reveal to the story's antagonist (Astyages), just as in the *Sumerian Legend* triggers attempts to kill the subject. While this Cyrus is an active conspirator and far less passive than the Sargon of the *Sumerian Legend* (so far as we know), it is still made clear that his actions stem from divine approval; his mother dreams a great future for her son while sleeping in a temple, another parallel to the Sargon of the *Sumerian Legend*.¹⁰⁹ Cyrus will see his own confirmatory omens later in the action.¹¹⁰

Ctesias' account, filtered as it may have been by Nicholas and much later by a number of anonymous Byzantine compilers, is the first text considered here to detail a flight from court to the subject's homeland. There is some very weak evidence in the two *Sargon Legends* that such an escape to a homeland may once have been part of the spectrum of legends once attached to Sargon: his father's people are mentioned in the *Birth Legend* and his father is named in the *Sumerian Legend*.¹¹¹ It would be unsafe, however to put much weight on these given that the end of the older composition is missing and the younger skips over Sargon's rise almost entirely.

One fragment of a rather more obscure Greek author, the 4th century writer Dinon, also reflects Ctesias' Cyrus. Dinon probably based his work largely on Ctesias and, indeed, the larger of his two fragments concerning Cyrus is very similar to the equivalent part of Nicolaus. In both texts Cyrus absents himself from court with Astyages' permission; in Nicolaus, and presumably in Dinon, as part of the plot conceived against his master. Nicolaus has the king told of his foolishness by one of his "dancers and flute players", whereas Dinon makes the announcement via a certain Angares, supposedly a famed singer.¹¹² Both texts deliver the warning using a very similar animal metaphor.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. FGrH.90 F66.9 = Lenfant (2004), F8d*.6, Herod, 1.107.1 (also a river of urine), Cooper and Heimpel (1983), p.77 (3N T296. Line 12) (blood).

¹¹⁰ FGrH.90 F66.41 = Lenfant (2004), F8d*.41.

¹¹¹ Lewis (1980), p.24 (lines 2-3), Cooper and Heimpel (1983), p.76 (TRS 73, Obv, line 11.).

¹¹² Cf. FGrH. 90 F66.26 = Lenfant (2004), F8d*.26 and FGrH 690.9.

The second fragment of Dinon is carried by Cicero's *De Divinatione* and tells of Cyrus' vision of a prophetic solar dream and its interpretation by the Magi.¹¹³ Here Cyrus sees the sun about his body and seeks it three times in vain. In light of other texts the form of the dream is an interesting one. Without its context this fragment is difficult to place in Dinon's narrative. Because it announced a thirty year rule it may imply that Cyrus was king at this point, however, Nicholaus has a theophany given to Cyrus just before he defeats Astyages so it may have fallen there.¹¹⁴ This solar imagery and a threefold repetition are also displayed in the Middle Persian *Kārnāmag* wherein Pabag has a nocturnal vision of Sasan (Ardashir's biological father and supposed scion of the lost Kayanid line deposed by Alexander);

“...as if the sun shone down from the head of Sasan and lit the whole world.”¹¹⁵

It is possible, though not provable, that Dinon has here used another, now lost, Eastern tradition, though whether this was once part of the complex associated with Sargon, merely a very standard form of prophetic dream, or both, is impossible to say.¹¹⁶ Certainly solar imagery has been near universally associated with Eurasian monarchy for a very long time; the coincidence is however, a rather interesting one.¹¹⁷ It may also be relevant that a glowing, post-coital vision is also granted to Constantius in two of the hagiographies considered here and that one of these texts has Constantius attribute this vision to Apollo.¹¹⁸

None of this is to say that the “Babylonian purity” of Nicholaus/Ctesias' account is a straightforward proposition. The very commonalities used by Lenfant to identify the relationship between fragments - a liking for prophecy, eunuchs, and the effeminate, tyrannical, presentation of both Sardanapalus and Astyages for example - might also be used to argue for a considerable overlay of an authorial voice fascinated by dramatic

¹¹³ FGrH. 690.10 = Cic. De Div. 1.46.

¹¹⁴ Ibid. 90 F66.41 = Lenfant (2004), F8d*.41.

¹¹⁵ *did ciyōn ka xwaršēd az sar-ī Sāsān be tāft ud hamāg gehān rōšānih kart*, KNA, 1.9.

¹¹⁶ Repetition, particularly in threes, is an extremely common device in prophetic dreams across the ancient Near East, though one that was supposedly uncommon in the Classical world, see Oppenheim (1956), p.208.

¹¹⁷ On the near ubiquitous use of solar symbolism in relation to kingship, see Dvornik (1966), *passim*.

¹¹⁸ Guidi (1907), p.308, line 29 – 309, line 6. That the *Opitz Vita* once also contained a similar vision can be seen when Constantius remembers it at Halkin (1960), p.12.

stories and dubious stereotypes.¹¹⁹ Additionally, an argument has been made that Ctesias merely refashioned Herodotus' Persian material with a light admixture of Eastern information.¹²⁰ It has also been pointed out that the narrative as presented by Nicolaus is somewhat odd; the helper roles of Cyrus' offside Oibares and that of the Babylonian astrologer seem to overlap and Oibares' trajectory from rags to riches mirrors that of Cyrus to a suspicious degree.¹²¹ Moreover, Oibares' introduction to the narrative is strongly reminiscent of a dream prophecy made in the story, also attributed to Ctesias via Nicolaus, concerning the fall of Sardanalphus.¹²² As a possible result of the narrative containing an "extra" character, Astyages is warned of Cyrus' intentions twice in rapid succession. As Oibares is the name of Darius' helper in Herodotus' account of the accession of that king, the possibility that Oibares exists in Nicolaus only as a riposte or reference to the older work arises.¹²³ On the other hand, the manner of Oibares' introduction to the narrative, and the meaning ascribed to his name may argue a genuinely Eastern origin for the duplication.¹²⁴

Despite such problems, I would argue that the Mesopotamian core of Ctesias' narrative is *relatively* intact. Though the influence of Greek literature has been seen in the staging of other fragments of this writer, Ctesias' Cyrus narrative is likely to be based on much older Mesopotamian traditions.¹²⁵ This rendition of Cyrus may also have introduced a flight from court, though, given the incomplete state of the much earlier *Sumerian Legend*, and the attachment of a flight to David, it is possible that this too was

¹¹⁹ See, again, Sancisi-Weerdenburg (1987), pp.37-40.

¹²⁰ An argument taken up in Cizek (1975) who attempts to explain Ctesias (and all the extant Cyrus narratives) entirely through the filter of trends in Greek literature. This argument is problematic as it both takes Ctesias at his word about the existence of "Persian records" and doesn't account for the parallels with the *Sumerian Legend* noted by later scholarship.

¹²¹ König (1972), p.48.

¹²² Belesys sees talking horses bringing fodder to the sleeping Arbakes, see FGrH 90 F3 = Lenfant (2004), F1pε*.

¹²³ Herod., 3.85-7.

¹²⁴ ὁ γὰρ Οἰβάρης δύναται Ἑλλάδι γλώσση ἁγαθὰ γγεῖλος. (FGrH 90 F66.13 = Lenfant (2004), F8d*.13) Oibares might be reconstructed as *Vahī-bara, "He who brings better things". In addition to the possibility of an Iranian onomastic link, the chance meeting and its prophetic interpretation is in line with Mesopotamian traditions of prophecy, see König (1972), p.47 and Panaino and Basello (2009), p.395-396. As Nicolaus' Oibares is carrying a basket of horse manure when he meets Cyrus, the possibility of a very sophisticated joke on the part of Ctesias might also be considered.

¹²⁵ Holzberg (2003), p.630.

adapted from an earlier set of Sargonic legends.¹²⁶ Because of its resemblance to instances of Sequence Two seen in the target Late Antique texts, and our ability to pin its likely origin to Babylon, of the three Cyrus' considered here, that of the *Persika* is by far the most relevant to this study. As we shall see below, its mere existence argues for both the durability of the tale as a historicizing form and its ability to transfer when the appropriate *circumstances* presented themselves. It need not be stated that the *Persika* itself was not somehow separate to this process. Ctesias' work had a far wider readership, and a far better reception in antiquity than its broken fragments do now.¹²⁷ It is an extremely relevant question as to how much more influential its portrait of Cyrus might have been in the Hellenistic and Roman periods than it has been in more recent times.

2.3.3 Xenophon

Whether Ctesias is considered as a novelist, a novelistic historian, or a "poet" in the most technical sense, he was hardly alone in fictionalizing Persian history for Greeks.¹²⁸ His was not even the most egregiously confected vision of Persian "history" offered to fourth century audiences extant. That honour must go to Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*, written after 362/1 BCE. To characterize fairly, the *Cyropaedia* was never intended, and was probably only rarely, and mistakenly, seen as what we would deem a historical work.¹²⁹ It was part of a rash of Greek political utopias in the fourth century and not even the first to use a fictionalized Cyrus as a protagonist, or at least interlocutor.¹³⁰

¹²⁶ The narratives contained in Samuel may be helpful for understanding the presence of the "helper" Oibares. It may be significant that David is supposed to have escaped Saul's court with the aid of his friend Jonathan, Saul's son, or his wife Michal, Saul's daughter see 1 Samuel 19:9-17 and chapter 20. Note that David's excuse for his absence from court is the attendance of a family sacrificial rite. Cyrus' cover story is that he needs to go home to perform sacrifices on Astyages' behalf and to tend to his father, cf. 1 Samuel 20:6 and FGrH 90 F66.20-23= Lenfart (2000), F8d*.20-23.

¹²⁷ See n.96 above.

¹²⁸ For Ctesias as a "poet" (defined as a writer of things that *might* be true), see Stronk (2007), p.50.

¹²⁹ For the reception of the *Cyropaedia* into the early modern period see, Tatum (1989), p.3 f.

¹³⁰ The Cynic Antisthenes also composed a, now lost, work in which Cyrus was the central character. The very little of it that now remains indicates a moral concern and that at least part of it was a series of questions and answers regarding virtue, see Paquet (1975), p.31, 34 and 37, (Frag. 15, 42 and 54).

Containing chunks of novel like narrative, since Antiquity the *Cyropaedia* has itself been the springboard for other self-consciously fictional works. This has in more recent times seen the *Cyropaedia*, like the *Persika*, classed as a novel-like text if not a novel proper.¹³¹ Unlike the *Persika*'s ambiguous blend of historical narrative and rollicking tales, the fictions of the *Cyropaedia* are more clearly pronounced, as is the overall, didactic, intent.

The *Cyropaedia* makes a conspicuous use of a romantic Eastern flavor to spice what is essentially a political treatise directed at a Greek audience.¹³² As such, the story told here is of very questionable value as a source for anything other than Xenophon's own views of statecraft. This said, the frame narrative used is not entirely without interest. In building up his fictional Cyrus, Xenophon notably contradicts the king's other legendary biographies, restructuring his succession as to violate the very broad bounds of accepted history in the process. Yet even he uses some of the standard motifs of Cyrus' early life, even while twisting them into nearly unrecognizable shapes.

Using the first part of his narrative to frame a series of tedious lectures on logistics, morality and statecraft, Xenophon casts Cyrus as the natural and legitimate grandson of Astyages. Here there are no ominous dreams, no plots and not a hint of infanticide.¹³³ The twelve year-old Cyrus is called to court where, after demonstrating his brilliance and a propensity to lecture, he becomes, briefly, his grandfather's cupbearer.¹³⁴ From this point the narrative diverges completely from precedent. Cyrus and Astyages part on good terms, Cyrus goes on to serve as his grudging uncle Cyaxares' superficially loyal vassal before peacefully succeeding him via marriage.¹³⁵ So artificial is the construct that Xenophon presents a succession that he contradicted in another work; a geographic detail Xenophon offers in his *Anabasis*, a hand account of travel through Persian territory, mentions warfare when the Persians seized the Median kingdom.¹³⁶

Yet contradiction does not entail ignorance. Amongst the seemingly endless dialog that follows Cyrus' departure from Astyages' court one can sometimes spot elements

¹³¹ Fictional biographies are classed as "fringe" novels by Holzberg, see Holzberg (2003), pp.17-19.

¹³² Probably targeted at the ruling classes of contemporary Athens, see Due *ibid.* p.590.

¹³³ Xen. Cyr., 1.2.1.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.* 1.3.1-12.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.* 8.5.19 and 28.

¹³⁶ Xen. An. 3.4.8.

that may reference the older Greek accounts, and, by this route, several familiar motifs emerge of which Cyrus' temporary role as cupbearer is only the most obvious. The same disparaging references to Median decadence, luxury and tyranny, are present, though these claims are suspiciously unverifiable and Greek sounding in all iterations; in any case, they are here left to stand unused as justifications for Cyrus' usurpation.¹³⁷ On his departure to aid the Medes against the Assyrians Cyrus sacrifices to the gods who loudly display their approval. His father Cambyses is pleased not only by the sign of divine favour but by the fact that as Cyrus can read the will of the gods directly, he has no need of soothsayers *who may deceive him*.¹³⁸ Cyrus' deathbed scene also contains a description of sleep that may be inferred as a reference to his direct receipt of messages from the Gods.¹³⁹ Xenophon here appears to be subverting a crucial part of the older Greek narratives by playing up the very ambiguous role of astrologers in other versions of Cyrus' life.

This seeming reference to the liminal nature of the dream interpreter is just one of several correspondences, oppositions really, to the other Greek Cyrus narratives. One line of argument is that, in line with the didactic intent of the *Cyropaedia*, morally dubious events or speech associated with Cyrus can be refigured, or in the case of the Herodotean Astyages' operatic paranoia, completely ignored.¹⁴⁰ Low sentiment might simply be transferred to one of Cyrus' foils; the appeal to materialism displayed in the Assyrian king's speech to his soldiers, for example, is not unlike the choice between ease and toil Cyrus offers his countrymen in Herodotus.¹⁴¹ It would seem that almost everything about Xenophon's Cyrus is a fictional ideal, existing as a response to

¹³⁷ For example, cf. FGrH 90 F66. 14-15 = Lenfant (2004), F8d*, 14-15 & Xen. Cyr., 1.3.2-4. The circularity of relying on an entirely Hellenic set of references to cast the Persian Empire as "decadent" was brilliantly skewered in Sancisi-Weerdenburg (1987), pp.22-28. The same argument holds for these depictions of the Medes.

¹³⁸ Xen. Cyr., 1.6.2.

¹³⁹ Itself preceded by a prophetic dream *ibid.* 8.7.2-3 & 21.

¹⁴⁰ Due (1989), p.118 *f.* & again in Due (2003), p.591-593. Conversely, Tatum argues that the virtue of the Cyrus of the *Cyropaedia* is in fact a cover for a sly manipulator of others, Tatum (1989), p.96 *f.*

¹⁴¹ The Assyrian king offering a rhetoric of cowardly materialism was discussed at Tatum (1989), p.92. With this in mind an interesting contrast can be made between Xen. Cyr., 3.3.45 & Herod., 1.126.

established Greek narratives and answering them rather than drawing anything directly from an Eastern source.

One section of the *Cyropaedia* is, perhaps, more interesting than it appears at first glance. While hunting with his uncle Cyxares, Cyrus' easy command and ready charisma prompt the jealous older man to wryly note that Cyrus is clearly already their king.¹⁴² This section looks to have some relationship with the motif of recognition through games seen in Herodotus.¹⁴³ Insofar as we can still speak of the presence of either sequence in Xenophon's subversion of the other Greek Cyrus narratives, the hostility of Cyxares towards his nephew, and his general lack of royal virtue, aligns him with their depictions of Astyages.¹⁴⁴ As a "public" display, constructed as an aristocratic game and forcing recognition (albeit sardonic) of the subject's innate kingliness, it may be possible to detect here a thematic resonance with public confrontations seen in the Late Antique and Medieval biographies of Ardashir and Constantine. In these cases too, the conspicuous subdual of animals is used to contrast the fitness of the subject and the unfitness of his adversary.

As a self-consciously didactic work of Hellenizing political theory, the *Cyropaedia* holds some interest as evidence of the reach of the standard fictions about Cyrus, the feedback effect generated by their literate transmission and their fluidity within certain limits. Xenophon's Cyrus may reflect even less of the historical figure than the others do, but he is almost certainly compounded, albeit second hand, of some of the same elements. Though he set out to do something completely different with the character - for this Cyrus, unlike the others is explicitly a *character* - Xenophon was bound to participate in the common stock of existing biographical information that surrounded it.

¹⁴² Xen. Cyr., 1.4.9.

¹⁴³ Herod, 1.114.

¹⁴⁴ Cyxares is the "negative pole of the *Cyropaedia*", see, Tatum (1989), p.115.

2.4 The Problem of Transmission

Two of the three major Greek retellings of the origins of Cyrus have a plausible connection with Eastern traditions with the story told by Ctesias being a rather more secure proposition than that recorded by Herodotus. In a situation rather unlike the shadowy antecedents of Sargon, but one that looks forward to some of the problems associated with the Late Antique traditions, a clear disconnect is discernible between the claims made in these legends and the claims made by their subject. The few extant, contemporary “witnesses” to the actual origin of Cyrus contradict *all* of the Greek accounts. Taking his claims at face value, while Cyrus displayed a pragmatic sensitivity to the expectations of his new subjects, his publically proclaimed sources of earthly legitimacy remained based on his family’s long association with kingship. His messaging, and that of his successors, emphasized his connection to this royal line. While Sargon may well have been an outsider at court who directed a coup from within, the historical Cyrus was most certainly not; he was a petty-king on the make, a royal conqueror not at all embarrassed by his descent. Such a man was highly unlikely to want, or need, the kind of obfuscatory apology that puts a baby in a basket or transmutes a farm boy into a king. Nor were his own people likely to have created stories that described the most successful member of their own ruling house as a break in that dynasty.

The legends reflected in the Greek sources can be best explained as mystifications of Cyrus’ origins occurring in circles outside of the core ethnic-political group of his empire. Given the motifs reflected in the Greek accounts, and the location of Ctesias during his service at the Achaemenid court, it is possible to narrow the probable location of this process down to the Mesopotamian regions of his new empire, most likely in Babylon and the literary networks linked to the culture of that city. Specifically how and why this happened are not questions that can be answered with any degree of surety. However, contextual clues have been noted that may allow us to model the process by which a subject group came to foist a particular history of their imperial masters upon the world even while said masters were indebted to an entirely different vision. In Babylon, Cyrus was read not as an individual, but as a locus of types. Trained by the antiquarian bent of their culture to see patterns in history and recently reminded

of the greatness of Sargon, the Babylonians recycled him, pressing his stories, unbidden, over the image of Cyrus.

2.4.1 Achaemenid Self-Presentation

The Cyrus that Cyrus wished the world to see is very clearly described in his own words in his famous account of his conquest of Babylon, the so-called *Cyrus Cylinder* (CB). Though the cylinder itself was intended to be buried under a temple foundation and was therefore addressed to the gods, smaller fragments of this text have been found, implying that it was actually composed with public distribution in mind.¹⁴⁵ As such it offers a fairly reliable report of the sort of messaging the new Persian regime intended for an Akkadian speaking audience. Cyrus' self-description is most telling.

“I am Cyrus, king of the universe, the great king, the powerful king, king of Babylon, king of Sumer and Akkad, king of the four quarters of the world, son of Cambyses, the great king, king of the city of Anshan, grandson of Cyrus, the great king, ki[ng of the ci]ty of Anshan, descendant of Teispes, the great king, king of Anshan, the perpetual seed of kingship, whose reign Bel and Nabu love, and with whose kingship, to their joy, they concern themselves.”¹⁴⁶

As befitted the ruler of Babylon, Cyrus here made use of some very traditional Mesopotamian themes. He references the ancient political concepts of Sumer and Akkad and also cites Babylonian gods as dynastic sponsors. The core of his claim, however, lies in his link to an existing, Persian, dynasty. Old Persian inscriptions confirm that the pose struck for outsiders reflected the internal ideological structure of Persian monarchy. Cyrus' self-identification as a member of a known royal dynasty was the habit of later Persian kings also, even (especially!) the probable usurper Darius I (r. 522-486 BCE) who, sharing a great-great grandfather with Cyrus' son, carried protestations

¹⁴⁵ The recent discovery of two fragments of a Babylonian copy of the *Cyrus Cylinder*, suggests that it, along with its claims of descent from the rulers of Anshan was also likely to have also been widely copied and distributed, see Curtis (2013), p.45. The translation of CB used here is that made by I.L. Finkel in *ibid.*, (2013), p.42-43.

¹⁴⁶ CB 21-22.

of his familial legitimacy to a suspiciously repetitive and fervent degree.¹⁴⁷ This is best seen in his famous trilingual inscription at Behistun (DB).¹⁴⁸

“I am Darius the great king, king of kings, king in Persia, King of peoples/countries, son of Vishtaspa, grandson of Arshama, an Achaemenid.

Darius the king proclaims: My father is Vishtaspa (Gr. Hytaspes); Vishtaspa’s father is Arshama (Gr. Arsames); Arshama’s father is Ariaramna (Gr. Ariaramnes); Ariaramna’s father is Cishpish (Gr. Teispes); Cishpish’s father was Hakhamanish (Gr. Achaemenes).

Darius the king proclaims: For this reason we are called Achaemenids. From long ago we are noble. From long ago we are royal.

Darius the king proclaims: Eight of our family were kings before; I am the ninth; nine kings we are in succession.”¹⁴⁹

Darius’ descendants, would connect themselves to Darius in their own inscriptions, retaining Darius’ stress on Achaemenid origins and thereby his claim to a connection with the family of Cyrus. Because it has already been suggested above that the Sargonic legends, the *Sumerian Legend* in particular, may represent apologia built in response to the succession of an outsider, these are inconvenient data. It is true that Cyrus and Darius posed as tyrannicides in the service of a god; they were however, insiders by birth and had not the slightest whiff of the sheepfold about them.¹⁵⁰

Of course the antagonist of the Greek Cyrus narratives is not Nabonidus, the king of Babylon, but Astyages, the king of the Medes. Herein lies a possible solution to the problem of double origins. Two contemporary accounts give slightly different descriptions of the relationship between Astyages and Cyrus: the first is a clay cylinder found at Sippar commissioned by Nabonidus himself, and the second the so-called

¹⁴⁷ The later Achaemenid inscriptions have been gathered and translated in Lecoq (1997). Darius may have forged two inscriptions of “Cyrus” in the palaces of Pasargadae in order to link him more strongly to Darius’ own branch of the Achaemenid family, see Stronach (1990), pp.198-200, *contra* Lecoq (1997), p.81-82.

¹⁴⁸ The translation of DB used here is that made in Kuhrt (2007), pp. 141-157 (including commentary).

¹⁴⁹ DB I.1-5

¹⁵⁰ Cyrus claimed to have been chosen by Marduk, CB 12, Darius to have been the client of Ahura Mazda, DB I.5. Despite the regal origins of both men, the Greeks appear to have taken strongly to the association of rusticity with the beginnings of Achaemenid kingship. Plutarch, for example, tells of a supposed Persian coronation rite that recalls Cyrus’ origins as a shepherd, Plut. Artaxerxes, 3.1-3.

Nabonidus Chronicle is a later, short account of the reign of that king. Cyrus is named in both as the king of Anshan.¹⁵¹ The text on the cylinder, using a word of obscure meaning, has been interpreted to say that Cyrus was Astyages' subordinate and that he rebelled against his master.¹⁵² The *Chronicle*, on the other hand, would seem to say that Astyages moved against Cyrus for reasons unknown, only to have his army revolt and (perhaps) hand him over to Cyrus.¹⁵³ The claim in both that Astyages was led away into captivity after his defeat is interesting in light of its correspondence with the Greek traditions; it does not however, mean that the lenient treatment he receives in the Greek texts should be regarded with anything other than suspicion.¹⁵⁴ Cyrus, then, may have overthrown his overlord, and may have done so by means of conspiracy. He was thus both king and rebel. The memory of this coup may have lent itself to a particular interpretation when Cyrus came to rule Babylon itself.

2.4.2 The Babylonian Interpretation

The possibility of transference of narratives from Sargon to Cyrus in Babylon has been raised before. Of course, it is now impossible to know either the exact channels by which any such identification was propagated or the precise social demarcation of any component of the legend. Robert Drews argued that it must have been via the popular oral tradition of this city and its cultural hinterland that the story known to Ctesias passed into Greek. This assumption is made on the grounds that written accounts of Sargon's life would have denied Cyrus or his followers the use of Sargon's legend to

¹⁵¹ For the translation of the cylinder copy of this text found at Sippar, see the translation and commentary of P.A. Beaulieu in Hallo (2000), pp.310-313 (2.123A). Reference to the king of Anshan to be found at p.311 (2.123A, i.8-ii.25). According to Beaulieu's own classification of Nabonidus' inscriptions, this is Inscription 15, see Beaulieu (1989), p.34. For the *Nabonidus Chronicle* see Grayson (1975), p.104 f, (Chronicle 7), the reference to Cyrus as king of Anshan is made at p.106, II, line 1.

¹⁵² Hallo (2000), p.311 (2.123A, i.8-ii.25). The word used to describe Cyrus seems to state that Cyrus was once Astyages' subordinate and this was the interpretation preferred by Beaulieu. Others have interpreted this passage as claiming Cyrus as the servant of the gods Sin and Marduk, see *ibid.* n.7.

¹⁵³ This has an interesting resonance with the conspiratorial Cyrus seen in Herodotus and Ctesias. See Grayson (1975), p.106 (Chronicle 7.II, line 2).

¹⁵⁴ On the "sparing" of Creosus in Herodotus, see West (2003), pp.419-20.

those familiar with the Akkadian-Sumerian literary tradition.¹⁵⁵ It is important to note that Drews did not characterize the popular historiography of Achaemenid Babylonia as purely oral or demotic; rather he sees it as codependent with a long literary-historical tradition. The written and unwritten histories of Sargon were, in his view, linked; moreover, they had traded a great deal of material over the centuries.¹⁵⁶ A demonstration of this sort of interdependence might be discerned in the application of Sargon's memory in Babylonian politics on the eve of the Persian conquest.

Extant evidence indicates that Sargon was still known in Achaemenid Babylonia. We may safely assume this to have been true of the literature known to elite and religious circles; the youngest extant fragment of either of the legends is a Neo-Babylonian scribal exercise indicating that the *Birth Legend* was used as a school text in this period.¹⁵⁷ Yet we also have direct attestation of Sargon's use in the explicitly antiquarian propaganda of the unpopular Nabonidus just before Cyrus' conquest of Babylon. Nabonidus appears to have had a fascination with the dynasty of Akkad and expended a great deal of effort in a conspicuous display of his reverence for their relics.¹⁵⁸ He directed a successful excavation at Akkad itself, culminating in the restoration of the temple of Eulmash.¹⁵⁹ In the course of restoring the temple of Shamash at Sippar, he repaired a statue of Sargon and then arranged for offerings to be made to it.¹⁶⁰ The preparation of offerings to a statue of Sargon, from the reign of Nabonidus and into that of Cambyses (r.530-522 BCE), is mentioned in accounts recovered from the archive of the Ebabbarra temple.¹⁶¹ Nabonidus also boasted of his restoration of a foundation inscription of Naram-Sin found during these excavations.¹⁶² Like Sargon, Nabonidus

¹⁵⁵ Drews (1974), p.392.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., pp.392-393. For interactions between oral and written literatures more generally see Finnegan (1970), *passim*. For the serious problems inherent in the idea of a stable cuneiform "canon", see Robson (2011), pp.571-2.

¹⁵⁷ Fragment C of the *Birth Legend*, as described by Lewis (1980), pp.18-21.

¹⁵⁸ Beaulieu (1989), pp.141-143.

¹⁵⁹ Inscription 16 according to Beaulieu's classification, see *ibid.* pp.34-35. An English translation of the relevant part of this text can be found at Foster (2016), pp.271-272.

¹⁶⁰ Nabonidus' restoration of Sargon's statue is recorded in a sympathetic chronicle-like text from his reign, see Lambert (1968/9), p.7 (Ob. III. 20 - Rev. IV. 32.).

¹⁶¹ Kennedy (1969).

¹⁶² Hallo (2000), p.312 (2.123A ii.47-iii.7. and iii.8-10).

installed his daughter as an *ēntu* priestess in Ur.¹⁶³ It would appear that not only was Sargon remembered, but that Nabonidus had revived the memory of the dynasty of Akkad in order to lend legitimacy to his own. Moreover, the public nature of these gestures implies that the imitation of Sargon had purchase outside of a scholarly audience.

Building on such observations, Kuhrt contested the idea of an organic, non-official origin, noting that the cuneiform tradition itself had (at least) two currents, ie, the *Birth* and *Sumerian* legends, and that the *Birth Legend* especially, would have been very useful to the dynasty.¹⁶⁴ Accepting the likelihood that the *Birth Legend* was composed in the service of Sargon II, Kuhrt seems to have come close to theorizing that Cyrus, or his followers, propagated a similarly conscious, top-down imitation of Sargon. The upshot is that Herodotus does actually reflect, at however many removes, a story recycled by Cyrus' house while the much older tradition of courtly confrontation (represented by the *Sumerian Legend*) had become by this time, a "popular, moralising tale".¹⁶⁵ Oral and literate distinctions were, in Kuhrt's view, less important than the functions fulfilled by the different narratives, both of which were in any case composed of flexible "popular" motifs.¹⁶⁶ Unfortunately, both the claims made in Achaemenid epigraphy, and the version of events "known" to Ctesias, present serious problems for this theory.

As we have already seen, aside from Herodotus' account, there is no indication that an exposure narrative was adopted even quasi-officially.¹⁶⁷ If any version of a Sargon legend was officially adopted as an *exemplum*-like device, nothing like it is ever referenced in extant royal inscriptions where legitimacy is strongly predicated on a clear descent from royal ancestors. Thus adoption of any form of the legends known to us would have required two antagonistic streams of legitimization to be officially propagated at the same time. Similarly, if the *Birth Legend* were used in such a way the

¹⁶³ Cf. Lambert (1968/9), Ob. III. 14-16 & Frayne (1993), E2.1.1.16, p.35. On this, by Nabonidus' time, extremely ancient tradition, see Weadock (1975), pp.101-105.

¹⁶⁴ Kuhrt (2003), pp.352-6. Drews' article predates the publication of an accessible version of the *Sumerian Legend* in Cooper and Heimpel (1983).

¹⁶⁵ Kuhrt (2003), p.356.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid.

¹⁶⁷ For what it is worth, Herodotus also claims to have tried to distance himself from the more egregious dynastic stories. See n.73 above.

presence of something much more like the *Sumerian Legend* in Ctesias is difficult to explain. Had any kind of official conflation of the origins of Cyrus with something like the *Birth Legend* occurred we might expect Ctesias to have known of it. As he presents a version of events that excludes the possibility of any kind of exposure, yet one that does appear to have been drawn from Mesopotamian precedent, we can only assume that he had not.

It is possible that Ctesias presented another current narrative simply as a challenge to Herodotus. It is possible that the arrangement of components seen in the *Sumerian Legend*, being (as far as we can tell) much older than those of the *Birth Legend* were more established in Babylonia and had simply overwhelmed the resuscitated younger tradition in the century or so after Cyrus' death.¹⁶⁸ It is also possible that one of the traditional criticisms of Ctesias is actually correct; he really did gather his information from people well outside of the literate class and based some of his work on the informal history current in the period. Another possibility is suggested by Ctesias' similarities to the *Sumerian Legend*: Cyrus was identified with Sargon in Babylon, but was either unable to control or uninterested in controlling the narrative, resulting in the spread of concurrent, contradictory, stories descending from the various streams of Sargonic stock.

Such a position finds support in what we know of Cyrus' propaganda efforts in the city. It seems likely that the transposition of Sargonic motif to Cyrus came about as a result of an *ad hoc* propaganda strategy designed for a particular audience at a specific time. The post conquest phase of Cyrus' rule saw him make, or at least claim to make, a concerted effort to appear a properly *Babylonian* king. Though he damned his predecessor, Cyrus too was at pains to demonstrate his appreciation of the city's past and performed similar acts of conspicuously civic and antiquarian piety.¹⁶⁹ Sargon, whose memory Nabonidus seems to have tried to appropriate, may well have been drawn in to Cyrus' program. It is not even necessary to imagine that any special effort

¹⁶⁸ On the other hand, Foster conjectures that, based on the small number of extant copies, the *Sumerian Legend* may not have been as popular as other literature dealing with Akkad, Foster (2016), p.265.

¹⁶⁹ So it would seem from the document known as the *Verse Account of Nabonidus*, which despite its name is extremely hostile to that king. This text has a rather sinister aspect as the ascendant Cyrus subjects Nabonidus' works to a *damnatio memoriae*. See Pritchard (1969), p.315 (VI).

was expended to do so; Cyrus may have done no more than to pay the ancient king due respect in a public fashion, letting the audience draw whatever conclusions they may.¹⁷⁰ A conflation of the two kings in the public imagination would have been natural and would certainly have drawn no *direct* refutation from the new order. The association was neither insulting nor, necessarily, fatally contradictory.

Thus a variety of public traditions contradicting official legitimizing ideologies could have coexisted with them. If Ctesias drew his report from information he received in Babylon, his informant may have been a local who knew a version of Cyrus' life that was the uncontrolled result of a legitimizing gesture to the Babylonian past performed almost two centuries before. While there is a strong likelihood that the basis for any such identification was not entirely organic, considering the Persian kings' use of multilingual appeals to known bloodlines it is probably wrong to characterize it as formal imperial tradition, even inside Babylonia.¹⁷¹ Cyrus' brilliant career offered to the Akkadian speaking public heroic interpretations that were closed to Nabonidus, whom, perhaps, they knew *too* well. The suggestion in cuneiform sources that Cyrus might have held a subordinate position under Astyages and defeated him through some kind of subterfuge may have offered parallels to the *Sumerian Legend's* description of the relationship between Sargon and Urzababa, strengthening the comparison.¹⁷² With his staggering record of military success, and, one assumes, a charisma distinctly lacking in his predecessor, Cyrus simply made a far better Sargon than Nabonidus ever would.¹⁷³

Ctesias' claim to have seen Persian records can be completely disregarded. Not only is the existence of such records dubious, but the statement that one has extracted one's information from an old book is a pervasive literary strategy that usually signals no

¹⁷⁰ Kuhrt notes that the offerings made to Sargon's statue into the reign of Cambyses would have required royal permission, see Kuhrt (2003), p.356.

¹⁷¹ Darius' multilingual Behistun inscription, in which he very firmly states his royal descent, connecting his patrilineal line back to Teispes, the man Cyrus also claimed as his ancestor, was copied into various languages and circulated across the empire. Cf. translations in Lecoq (1997), p.187 & 212 (DB. 2-3 & 70) and Curtis (2013), p.42 (Line. 21). Babylonian copies of Darius' inscription have been found, see Schmitt (2013) (with references).

¹⁷² See n.158-163 above.

¹⁷³ Kuhrt (2003), pp.355-356.

such thing.¹⁷⁴ It is suggested here that a watered down version of Kuhrt's argument is a very plausible explanation for the shape of the extant evidence. The association of Cyrus with Sargon likely arose as part of an imperial pose; it was the unintentional result of the collision of two sets of performative, antiquarian, rhetoric; the first used by an Akkadian speaking king attempting to shore up his support, the second adopted by a foreign king for the consumption of an audience expecting deference to its customs. It was almost certainly not, however, an "official" production.

2.4.3 Cyrus as Sargon

Persian Babylonia provides the most plausible link between two sets of historicizing legendary narratives that share a suggestive amount of detail. The origins of Cyrus reported by extant Greek authors probably reflect, at varying degrees, long-established narrative patterns lodged for centuries interchangeably in the literatures and oral traditions of Mesopotamia. Of these Ctesias is likely to offer the version most representative of the earlier stream of tradition and the least altered for Greek tastes. The conflation was probably not an intentional one emanating from the palace, but a hypostasis triggered by perceived similarity of circumstance and a recent foregrounding of Sargon's memory in Babylonian politics. The result was a spread of similar traditions, a few of which reach us by way of Greek literature. The features shared by works are the result of deeply ingrained habits of representing novel monarchy whose survival was due, in no small part, to their circulation in text.

In general, the historiography of Mesopotamian societies was not strongly invested in specific chains of causation and result. It leaned instead rather more towards the exemplary. The general character of Achaemenid inscriptions suggests that the Persians inherited a similarly vertical and typological vision of the past.¹⁷⁵ In both cultures, the actions of the powerful tended to be seen not as discrete events in limited contexts but

¹⁷⁴ Claiming a source in ancient books or reliable informants is a strategy seen in Greek novel, see Medieval European history and Modern Persian historical epic alike, see Davis (1996), pp.48-50 and Hansen (2003), *passim*.

¹⁷⁵ Sancisi-Weerdenburg (1999), pp.99-100 & 110. An exception is made for Darius' inscription at Behistun which at times appears to verge into record.

echoes and examples in their turn. This characterization of past events as paradigmatic archetypes resembles the effect seen in non-literate historical traditions wherein only a plastic distant past and the present are real in any meaningful sense.¹⁷⁶ In this context, imagining hard social, or even ethnic, distinctions between written and oral historical modes may not be especially productive. When all of history is understood as instructive, distinctions between instances and individuals begin to blur. It is only with an enormous effort, or a truly remarkable event, that a new lesson may be added to the curriculum.

The subject of an enormously long-lived literature, Sargon's life and deeds remained just such a reference point centuries after the fall of his own state. Such was the power of Sargon as a model king and the cumulative effect of centuries of legend making, that more than a millennium and a half after his death, he was still a viable model for Nabonidus to display for the benefit of a hostile audience.¹⁷⁷ In this atmosphere and in a historical mindset in which the power of example was paramount, Cyrus' post conquest actions and poses collapsed the temporal distance between the two men. Simply by going through the expected motions, Cyrus could easily have triggered an association with Sargon that Nabonidus had inadvertently "prepared" for him, an association with proven legitimizing power and literary potential.

2.5 Conclusion

It was through his actions that Cyrus accidentally unlocked a pair of origins stories lodged deeply in the broader cultural system of the Akkadian and Sumerian languages. In Babylonian eyes Cyrus was an all-conquering foreigner from a small kingdom, whose antecedents were perhaps somewhat obscure; he was, however, known or believed to

¹⁷⁶ Vansina (1985), pp.168-173.

¹⁷⁷ In his later reign, Nabonidus appears to have overtly promoted the moon god Sin to the head of the Babylonian pantheon at the expense of Marduk. This probably made him extremely unpopular in Babylon itself, see Beaulieu (1989), pp.62-65.

have deposed his overlord. Thus Cyrus was open to interpretation according to either typology of Sargonic origins and was eventually accorded both. Neither, of course, reflected the position of Cyrus and his house, but if they ever heard the comparison made, it would have cost them nothing to play along, even while loudly proclaiming their descent. The reemergence of each sequence represents a revitalization of latent expectations triggered by a perceived parallel in recent events; the recurrence of ancient plots, maintained and strengthened by historicizing literature, as frames for the description of reality.

The reasoning for this particular transference appears to have been purely situational. Though the sequences themselves are allied with textual traditions of a suspiciously apologetic flavor, and it will be argued, would be used so again, they do not seem to have developed as such here. Rather the transference of Sargonic narratives to Cyrus probably occurred informally, within a subject group of his empire. Be this as it may, the association of each sequence with Cyrus renewed these biographic narratives and generated new literatures in turn. It will be contended below that the effects of this revitalization live on in much later Greek and Iranian historiographies of superficially similar situations ending with the ascent of a novel monarchy. The literary contexts of these traditions are far better understood than those of their Mesopotamian ancestors, and, together, they offer a much more detailed picture of the origins and uses of each sequence as a representation of history.

A relationship, based on narrative similarities, between the legendary biography of the Sasanian king Ardashir I, represented in the texts of the so-called *Kārnāmag* tradition, and the Cyrus legends seen in Greek has been suggested several times before, but the vector for any such transmission remains, in the total absence of written evidence, extremely vague. Moreover the problem touches on a fundamental and, given the seeming disappearance of the Achaemenids from Sasanian record, confounding set of issues in Sasanian studies. Certain episodes in the *Kārnāmag* contain enough parallels to the Greek material to allow the assumption that forms of Cyrus' origin narratives did indeed find their way into Persian-speaking contexts. The precise means by which they did so, however, are never likely to be known. Regardless, some granular sense of the social and political function of each sequence as *history* may be teased out by a

comparison of the *Kārnāmag* traditions to other extant representations of Sasanian origins.

The popularity of the Greek Cyrus may be suspected of having a more direct hand in the appearance of both sequences in representations of Constantine's early life throughout the Greek and Latin historical tradition culminating in the compiled biographies seen in the Byzantine hagiographical tradition from the 9th century. Because a relatively large amount of material about Constantine survives it is possible to trace his association with each sequence with considerably more precision than in the other cases considered here. It will be seen how the emperor's early life was remade typologically in a twofold process. In the first instance, recent history was willfully bent, beginning with certain reinterpretations of events seen in the earliest layers of the rhetoric and historiography surrounding Constantine. Some time later a fantastic version of Constantine's conception was created, one possibly spurred by the existence of a hostile polemic hinging on a half-remembered detail of his mother's occupation. Carried in the Byzantine historical and hagiographic traditions, these sequences would later emerge as the earliest sections of later composite hagiographies. The antecedents of Constantine's origins as reported in these hagiographies, display a marked similarity with what may be inferred about those used in the *Kārnāmag*.

In Iranian and Roman Late Antiquity we can see both Sequence One and Sequence Two return to their ancient apologetic roots. Their availability to the authors of the later composites will be argued to be the result of earlier historicizing counter polemical stances that had worked their way into the historical discourse of each society. This parallel evolution of source material is merely the most obvious of a number of cognates that can be perceived in the Iranian and Byzantine traditions examined here. Both are fundamentally communal texts concerned with proffering an image of history in accordance with a developed political and religious position in some way contingent on proving the acceptability of actions of their subject. Both share a compiled-biographical structure, and both may have been created to serve a similar commemorative function. In a larger sense, the creation of these biographies reveals much about the inherent symbolism of each sequence as historical representation. In particular the processes leading up to the emergence of the composites reveals how the semantic weight of either sequence shifts over time. First employed to deflect or forestall specific and

pressing critique, they were much later recognized as fit material for communal histories of a purely laudatory nature. It was in this way that they came to be fused together, becoming the first stages in lives that had to be made, in the most literal sense of the word, wonderful.

3

Ardashir

3.1 Introduction

Slightly more than seven hundred years after Cyrus' death, Ardashir, the scion of a family of minor nobility from the old Achaemenid homeland of Fars, would recreate Cyrus' achievement in rendering much of Mesopotamia part of a vast empire subject to a Persian-speaking dynasty. Ardashir's ascent (c. 224 CE) was a watershed in the cultural history of the region. Under the rule of Ardashir's descendants, the Sasanian dynasty, a specific religious and ideological posture was developed, codifying a group of cultural assertions that would outlast the state itself. The vision of history confected under the Sasanians came to imagine the dynasty as the latest iteration of an eternal line of world-kings through the appropriation of the heroic figures of the pan-Iranian epic complex, alongside the (often interlinked) religious legends of the Avestic tradition, and the dynastic legends of the Arsakid era aristocracy.¹ Key to this conception was the self-identification, initiated by Ardashir himself, of the Sasanian Empire with the concept of *Ērān*, the setting of much of this imagined history and the homeland of its heroes.²

¹ On the disparate sources of this tradition, see, Nöldeke (1979), pp.9-31 Boyce (1968), pp.57-58, Yarshater (1983), pp.367-370 and Shahbazi (1990), pp.209-213.

² The history propagated by the dynasty incorporated a great deal of preexisting religious and epic material, see Boyce (1954), p.49 f. and Gnoli (1989), p.132 f. The first known use of *Ērān* as a political concept appears on Ardashir's coinage in the early stages of his conquest of the Arsakid state, see Alram (1999), pp.18-19.

It is one of the many ironies of Sasanian studies that the man ultimately responsible for this intense interest in building a past remains something of a cipher. The factors that drove (or allowed) Ardashir to overthrow nearly five hundred years of Arsakid rule, the role of Ardashir's own understanding of religion and history in his decision to do so, even his precise descent, are often unclear. Of course, no historical figure is a real, three-dimensional, person; rather, each is the retrospective representation of a real person, a pastiche of texts and habit. Ardashir is, however, a particularly sketchy representation, an amalgam of contradictory images. By the final centuries of his dynasty, Ardashir had fallen deeply into exalted stereotype: in the *andarz* or wisdom literature of the later empire he had become a somewhat faceless model king expounding an idealized version of "his" empire's ideological conclusions.³ Yet, at the heart of Ardashir's ascent, and thus the empire of his descendants, there lay an inescapable act of usurpation and social climbing, accompanied by a great deal of violence against the established aristocratic order.

Sasanian dynastic ideology came to be organised by a claim of eternal kingship buttressed by reference to Iranian religious epic. This edifice rested on a particular interpretation of the meaning of Ardashir's ascent. This narrative was vulnerable to dispute and was weakest at the point at which the dynasty emerged from obscurity.⁴ In this context it is most revealing that a number of differing accounts of the foundation and early years of Ardashir's empire are extant and that some of them make use of origins narratives very similar to those seen in the Greek "biographies" of Cyrus, even more so as these strongly contradict other accounts arising from the historiography of the Sasanian era.

This chapter will examine the reappearance of Sequence One and Two in the context of this disjuncture. It will first consider two versions of the rise of Ardashir drawn from Perso-Arabic historiography in order to demonstrate that a variety of interpretations of

³ On Middle Persian wisdom literature in general see Boyce (1968), pp.51-55 and 60-61, on the traces of such literature attributed to Ardashir see Tafazoli (2010/2011), pp.215-219. On the potential of Ardashir as a model king in later Sasanian times see Daryaee (2003).

⁴ A possible example of a posthumous attack on Ardashir is the hypothesised reproduction of an originally Christian story that Ardashir had been converted to Christianity via the resurrection of his horse in a later work of anti-Sasanian propaganda. See Payne (2016), p.189, Schiling (2008).

this event circulated in the Sasanian period. It will be argued that these accounts also demonstrate how the dynasty's historical claims changed over time. It is against the background of this shift that we will turn to the target tradition of this chapter, the *Kārnāmag*, a highly artificial and legendary narrative of the foundation of Ardashir's state and the origins of his family.

3.1.1 Competing Traditions

The first account to be considered is that given in the *History of the Prophets and Kings* of Ṭabarī (839-923 CE). The story told by Ṭabarī and later historians presenting a similar account corresponds best to the very limited number of extant contemporary witnesses to Ardashir's early career.⁵ Ṭabarī's account is doubly remarkable as its concessions to Late-Sasanian mythic self-image are minimal and tepid. Ṭabarī's sources for this section are opaque but his account holds out the tantalising possibility of the survival of an extremely early, or even *hostile*, Iranian historiography throughout the Sasanian period.

The second account is a composite drawn from a number of similar Perso-Arabic sources. It is contended that this radically streamlined Ardashir reflects a version of events that was relatively common in the late Sasanian chronicle tradition known as the *xwadāy nāmag*. No example of any such work is extant but attestations and structural commonalities in later Perso-Arabic sources all but confirm that Middle Persian chronicles did exist: their nature and date have, however, been debated for some time. In contrast to older work that tended to view the *xwadāy nāmag* as a unitary, official, tradition, here it is accepted that what is reflected in later works was a range of texts sharing a common descent and a number of basic structural commonalities.⁶ The first exemplars of this kind of chronicle were probably created in the 6th century.⁷ Though

⁵ Later authors offering an account similar to that of Ṭabarī are addressed and considered in Widengren (1971).

⁶ A useful parallel may be found in the recent emphasis on manuscript variation and synthesis in Carolingian chronicles. See, Reimitz (2011), p.21 *f*. The analogy is doubly interesting as an analysis in this vein of the *Annales Regni Francorum* posits that the various "texts" of this work degraded the memory of the fallen Merovingian dynasty, stressed the idea of a Frankish identity and portrayed an "ideology of consensus" between elites within the Carolingian state. Mackitterik (2000).

⁷ Shahbazi (1990), pp.213-215. Huyse (2008), p.151-152.

probably not as carefully curated, or exclusively official, as some have assumed, the majority of these texts would seem to have shared a great deal of material and to have been broadly pro-Sasanian; at the very least they appear to have taken the dynasty's mythic-historical claims as given. Thus, the composite offered here may be taken as indicative of an account of Ardashir that was both acceptable and widely circulated late in the Sasanian era. The gap between this Ardashir and that described by Ṭabarī bears witness to the fraught nature of these events in the historical discourse of the Sasanian state. It also hints at considerable variation in the historical beliefs current in the empire and a change in the "official" line over time.

It is in this growing disjuncture between specific memories of the seizure of power and the development of the legitimizing posture that arose in tandem with this act that we see each sequence reemerge. Legendary stories recounting the origins of Ardashir, his son Shapur I, and grandson Ormazd I, first appear in the 6th century and stretch into the historical literature of the Islamic period. A sequential narrative of the early years of the Sasanian dynasty making use of a number these stories is extant in two texts that share a very similar narrative: the early 11th century New Persian epic *Šāhnāmeḥ* of Ferdowsi and a Middle Persian tract of obscure origin copied in India in the early 14th century, the *Kārnāmag-ī Ardāšir-ī Pābagān* (KNA). The similarities seen in these texts suggest that they descend from a common ancestor, a hypothetical, Middle Persian *Kārnāmag-ī Ardāšir-ī Pābagān*.

This chapter will offer a reconsideration of the narratives seen in the *Šāhnāmeḥ* and KNA as reflections of such a work with an emphasis on their use(s) of Sequence One and Two. It will be argued that one may say some *general* things (suitably qualified) about the shape of this hypothetical text by reference to its surviving descendants and a number of other texts that appear to have made selective or partial use of the story they tell. Due to the general paucity of Middle Persian material, modern scholarship has tended not to speculate on the antecedents of KNA or its internal development in anything but the most general way. This understandable reluctance to extrapolate too much from a single text and a lack of transitional or related texts sometimes leads to an implicit conflation of KNA with the underlying tradition that produced it. This has generated a certain ambiguity in terms and titles that must be resolved before any study

of the background and nature of this material can be attempted. Henceforth, the following terms are used in this manner:

- *Kārnāmag*: a general term for the long narrative of Ardashir and his immediate descendants given in KNA and the relevant section of the *Šāhnāme*h.
- hKNA: the hypothetical source text that is the shared ancestor of KNA and the *Šāhnāme*h's account of the early life of Ardashir.
- KNA: the extant Middle Persian text.

Extending the hypotheses of Chapter Two, I will here approach the accession of Ardashir as an event susceptible to remodeling according to paradigmatic story forms established by an already ancient precedent of historical and quasi-historical literature. Comparative and internal data drawn from KNA and the *Šāhnāme*h suggests that hKNA was a collection of earlier, discrete pieces; a collection composed with intent and containing components with predictable behaviors. It will be argued that the origin sequences seen in the *Kārnāmag* were initially created *ad hoc* to obfuscate or contradict a far less appealing set of memories and may represent the first *clearly* deliberate uses of either sequence as an intentional political statement to be considered in this study. It is my thesis that the emergence of these sequences demonstrates the need for specific kinds of counter-polemic and points to the existence of conflict over the meaning of the empire's foundation; specifically, to attacks on the dynasty's lineage and legitimacy. Over time, ideological and social trends encouraged by Ardashir's dynasty would see these counter-polemics given new readings. By the empire's end, its fusion of imperial politics and a religiously inflected historical imaginary had secured it a providential role in the imagined history of a religious community. At some later point, members of this community produced hKNA; a biographical text that cast imperial foundation as a remarkable episode in communal history. In the creation of this text, the ostentatiously divine themes and regal associations of the old dynastic arguments were extremely useful.

Lacking data, the following reconstruction is sometimes short on specific detail. Though it is possible to theorise about the use of each set of sequences, even to offer a broad chronology of their emergence, very little can be said for certain of the specific means by which they were introduced and circulated. In attempting to address this

problem, the introduction of a heuristic from outside of the Sasanian literary-historical tradition will be suggested. Having positioned the *Kārnāmag* as a tradition built out of disparate, originally counter-polemical material collected to propagate a communal historical narrative of state foundation, it will be posited that a broad, but often very useful, parallel may be found in one specific hagiographic tradition: a group of legendary hagiographies of Constantine the Great emerging in the 9th century. These can be shown to share a number of structural, narrative and contextual parallels with the *Kārnāmag*. These too are composite historicizing texts presenting a foundational political figure making use of the same pair of narrative stereotypes to describe his origins. Moreover, unlike those of the *Kārnāmag*, the origins narratives used in these Byzantine traditions have left us a relatively full archaeology of their origins and descent. A consideration of the development of these narratives, particularly their early and deep entanglement with rhetoric and historiography, offers possibilities for a better understanding of their Persian analogs.

3.2 Ṭabarī

Ṭabarī's *History of the Prophets and Kings* offers what may be the most realistic version of Ardashir's rise extant.⁸ His account of the beginnings of the Sasanian dynasty offers a relatively large amount of very plausible detail and thus tends to play an important role in modern reconstructions of the Sasanian rise to power.⁹ Probably because it is both implicitly negative *and* (as we shall see) supported by contemporary evidence, it is easy to assume Ṭabarī's to be a relatively factual version of events. Yet, this account is not as straightforward as it first appears. Though he is now best known as a historian, Ṭabarī was primarily a jurist and this legal background brought with it a certain approach to sources. As an expert in the interpretation of Islamic law, Ṭabarī was an impressive

⁸ Ṭabarī, pp.2-20. The translation used here is Bosworth (1999).

⁹ For example, Christensen (1971), pp.85-88, Widengren (1971), pp.714-717 Daryaee (2010).

researcher well used to sifting information and judging its relative worth.¹⁰ He also had access to many texts long since lost to us. Unfortunately, in this section Ṭabarī was far less precise than he could have been.

Writing history in a legalist style, Ṭabarī did not attempt a synthesis of his materials. Yet he only rarely and very unsystematically names any sources in his account of early Sasanian history.¹¹ This makes it difficult to determine where specifically Ṭabarī found this information, or indeed, even where the seams in this account *are*. Ṭabarī's report appears to be a composite that mixes some Sasanian claims (such as a Kayanid genealogy and the attribution of a unifying, restorative impulse to Ardashir's actions) with a slab of very ancient, and unusually plausible, data, casting serious doubt on these claims. His depiction of the revolt of the Sasanian clan and their internal bickering in particular, leads one to concur with the opinion of Ehsan Yarshater that Ṭabarī had access to sources at odds with the dynasty's fully developed ideology.¹² Despite nods to the Sasanian self-portrayal as restorers of ancient monarchy, Ṭabarī's is not a flattering portrait; his Ardashir is the ruthlessly amoral scion of a social-climbing family and a probable fratricide to boot. It is the presence of this data that makes Ṭabarī's history a key text in the problem of Sasanian origins.

According to Ṭabarī, Ardashir was the son of Pabag who was the son of Sasan.¹³ Ṭabarī indicates knowledge of several genealogies for Sasan but the key linkage in all of them is to Dara, a member of the mythical Kayanid dynasty destroyed by Alexander. Yet this is rather undercut by a description of Sasan that makes him a member of the petty nobility of Fars.¹⁴ Ṭabarī tells us that Sasan was the "custodian" of the shrine of Anahita

¹⁰ On Ṭabarī's method and influence see, Robinson (2003), pp.35-36.

¹¹ On the importance of the *isnād* or transmission chain in Ṭabarī's style of Islamic historiography, see, *ibid.*, p.84, f.

¹² "Read carefully, it depicts Papag as an ambitious ingrate, and Ardashīr as a usurper in his own house. It stands in sharp contrast to the romanticized and highly favourable account of the *Kārnāmag*." Yarshater (1983), pp.476-477.

¹³ Because of conflicting reports in the sources, it is not at all clear whether Sasan was Ardashir's father, Pabag's father or an ancestor to both, see Frye *ibid.*, pp.116-117, Shaki (1990) and below.

¹⁴ It is worth noting that Bal'amī, who adapted Ṭabarī's work into Persian later in the tenth century, elaborates' on Sasan's rank; *malek nabud valikan ān hameh deyeḥ hā va rustā rā mehtari va savari kardi*. (He was not a king, but the chief and leader over a group of villages). This is stated before Sasan's link with the fire temple at Istakhr, *cf.* Bal'amī, p.875 and Ṭabarī, 814, p.4.

in Istakhr; this and a few passing references in Syriac literature that seem to identify early Sasanian kings as magi allows the possibility that the earliest Sasanians had some kind of quasi-priestly standing but this is quite conjectural.¹⁵ Whatever his family's exact position was, it is made clear that Pabag himself was subservient to Gozchir, the king of Istakhr. In his teens, Ardashir is fostered to one of his father's overlord's "vassals" and assumed his foster-father's position on his death. Receiving visions of a great destiny, Ardashir rebels, inciting his father to overthrow Gozchir.

At this point a suggestive contradiction creeps into the narrative, hinting that it was remembered somewhere that it was actually Pabag, not Ardashir, who initiated the revolt. Pabag writes to Ardawan, presenting the revolt as a *fait accompli*. He seeks both its recognition and the transference of Gozchir's crown to Ardashir. Ardawan ignores the letter and Pabag dies. Ṭabarī states that Shapur, Pabag's *other* son, took his father's place as king of Istakhr.¹⁶ When Ardashir does not recognize his brother's authority Shapur marshals his army. On his way to deal with his recalcitrant brother, Shapur is accidentally, though conveniently, killed by a falling building.¹⁷ Ardashir returns to Istakhr where his other brothers (one imagines them looking up nervously) assemble to proclaim him king. Ardashir's continued killing of local kings finally draws Ardawan's attention. An insulting exchange of letters results in a final confrontation in which Ardawan is killed, and Ardashir assumes his crown.

As stated above, Ṭabarī's sources for these family intrigues are not clear but amongst the vagaries are two points of intense interest. First, Ṭabarī mentions the 9th century writer Hisham al-Kalbi as a source for Gozchir's name.¹⁸ Al-Kalbi was, among other things, a genealogist with an unusual interest in non-Islamic information but a somewhat dubious reputation in Muslim scholarship.¹⁹ He might be suspected as the source for Ṭabarī's earlier claim that Gozchir's family was linked to that of Sasan by

¹⁵ Ṭabarī, p.4. In another deviation from Ṭabarī, Bal'amī states that Pabag inherited the custodianship of the temple after Sasan's death, see Bal'amī, p.876. See also Daryaee (2010), p.244-245 and *passim*.

¹⁶ Bal'amī states that Pabag *preferred* Shapur to Ardashir, Bal'amī, p.877-878.

¹⁷ Ṭabarī, p.8. According to Bal'amī, Shapur was undone by a rebellion among his brothers who preferred Ardashir, see, Bal'amī, p.878. Ṭabarī tells of a plot of Pabag's sons against Ardashir after Shapur had been removed, see Ṭabarī, p.9 and Bal'amī, p.879.

¹⁸ Ṭabarī, p.5.

¹⁹ Khalidi (1994), pp.50-54.

marriage.²⁰ Whoever stands behind these details, they are particularly interesting in light of the fact that in later sources Ardashir's family tends to disappear from "Ardashir's" revolt. This scrap of genealogical data linking Sasan and Gozchir also hints at the survival of independent genealogies throughout the Sasanian period. Such records, fabricated or not, would come to sit uncomfortably in the later state ideology.²¹

Second, as is well known, Ṭabarī's report has tangible supporting evidence in contemporary epigraphy and numismatics. In the opening of his famous trilingual inscription at *Naqš-e Rostām* (ŠKZ), Ardashir's son Shapur I gives his genealogy as follows:

"I, the Mazda worshipping bay [*bay/θεός*] Shapur, King of Kings of *Ērān* and not-*Ērān*, whose *čīhr* is of the gods [*ἐκ γένους θεῶν*], son of the Mazda worshipping bay Ardashir, king of kings of Iran, whose *čīhr* is of the gods, grandson of king Pabag, am the lord of *Ērān*."²²

The progression of titles in the space of two generations from *šāh* to *šāhānšāh* conforms to Ṭabarī's version of events. A more telling detail arrives later in the same

²⁰ If these details were completely fabricated, it was unlikely to be at the hands of al-Kalbī as Ṭabarī mentions "others" who report similar information, see Ṭabarī, p.6.

²¹ At Widengren (1971), p.525, the existence of non-compliant genealogies is implied.

²² ŠKZ §1, this section is largely effaced and reconstructed from the parallel Parthian and Greek. Determining the precise meanings of *bay* and *čīhr* is a problem that a comparison of these terms with their Greek equivalents does very little to solve; the formula does not arise from Greek and the concepts expressed would seem to be only clumsily rendered in that language, see Sundermann (1988). *Bay* derives from Old Persian *baga* meaning "god" and Daryaee has argued that this is to be understood in the Hellenistic sense of a divinized king, see Daryaee (2008), p.62ff. Panaino and Soudavar, reflecting Sundermann's argument that the Middle Persian terms contain culturally specific concepts that were meaningless in a Greek context, have suggested that the king was understood as a *reflection* of the gods. The argument is made from the symmetry of Sasanian investiture reliefs, which, it is argued, show the king "mirrored" in a god and a linguistic argument that the Middle Persian *kē čīhr az yazdān*, (the Greek version of which reads *ἐκ γένους θεῶν*), ought to be understood to mean "whose *image* is of the Gods", "not of the *race* of the Gods", *čīhr* meaning both image and origin, semen or seed in Middle Persian and cognate with Modern Persian *čehreh*, one of several words meaning face or image, see Panaino (2003), pp.278-281 and Soudavar (2003), p.41 ff. These positions recall the argument of L'Orange who, though he addresses much later Sasanian symbolism in art, also saw the king taking on the shape of a god, L'Orange (1953), pp.42-3. If one accepts the meaning "image" for *čīhr*, there is still the problem, as Daryaee points out, of the use of the title *bay*, rendered in the Greek version of ŠKZ as *θεός* (the Parthian logogram reads ALHA) and used in early Sasanian coinage. This seems to indicate that a stronger sense of the king's divinity was indeed intended. Panaino discusses *bay* in detail, admitting that it was likely a Hellenistic import but suggesting that it possessed a two-fold meaning, a divine quality applicable to both gods and kings (in their role as upholders of the proper order), but quite separate from the title *yazd* which certainly indicates a god and was at no point given to a human being, see Panaino (2003), pp.274-278 and 281-3.

inscription when Shapur lists family members and officials, living and dead, for whose souls he has provided offerings. Here a little more genealogical data is given.

...for that of *xwadāy* [κύριος] Sasan, *šāh* [βασιλεύς] Pabag, *šāh* [βασιλεύς] Shapur the son of Pabag, *šāhānšāh* [βασιλεύς βασιλέων] Ardashir...²³

Undefined in the inscription and variable in the historical tradition, it is unclear what Sasan's relationship to Ardashir was. His title, *xwadāy*, that is, lord in a very general sense but not *specifically* king, would appear to fit Ṭabarī's description of a local magnate.²⁴ What is far more interesting is that Ṭabarī's source knew of the existence of Ardashir's brother Shapur, a figure who tends to go missing in other representations of this moment. The patronymic title of the elder Shapur given in ŠKZ is reflected on one of his few extant coins where he styles himself as *šāh* and *pus bay Pābag* – king / son of the bay Pabag.²⁵ Another, possible reference to Shapur son of Pabag might be found in Shapur I's son Narseh's (r.293-302) inscription at Paikuli in which he presented himself as the choice of the community of the realm, though this is far from certain.²⁶

If Ṭabarī's presentation of context is in any way accurate, the ultimate origin of the Sasanian dynasty might be reconstructed as a dispute between two branches of the ruling family of Istakhr capped by an intra-clan squabble in which Ardashir asserted his authority over the rest of his family. It is tempting to consider that Pabag may have intended only a local kingship within the Parthian system, but this can only be conjecture. On the other hand, the elder Shapur's presence in the younger's inscription suggests much about what was permissible in the earliest layer of Sasanian historical memory: clearly the version of events Shapur I was comfortable with included his uncle, and in this sense had more in common with Ṭabarī than some later, and much less ambiguous, accounts of his father's rise to power.

²³ ŠKZ §36.

²⁴ On the evolution of and range of meanings expressed by *xwadāy* see Shayegan (2011).

²⁵ Based on three coins of Shapur son of Pabag held by the British Museum, listed in the catalog as 1845,EIC.35, 1894,0506.112 and 1935,0219.2. The use of the ambiguously divine *bay* was an innovation in the coinage of Fars/Persis, see Alram (1999), p.68 and p.71 pl.8.

²⁶ Due to the fragmentary nature of the text in both languages, is not clear whether the *Šāpur šāh* (not *Šāpur šāhānšāh*) mentioned at Skjaervø (1983), §68 (vol.3.1, p.59) is Shapur son of Pabag or Shapur I. See Skjaervø's speculation on this matter in *ibid.*, vol. 3.2, p.105.

As unsatisfying and as problematic as it is, the account of Ṭabarī, and those who followed him, offers the most detailed and plausible, version of Ardashir's origins and the circumstances of his rise that we have.²⁷ Moreover, regardless of whether or not his account is accurate in every particular, Ṭabarī's knowledge of obscure details missing in other branches of historiography provides evidence of the survival of a detailed, and possibly very early, account of Sasanian origins into the Muslim era. Used carefully, Ṭabarī offers us a baseline against which the presentation of this period in other traditions may be considered. At the very least it offers a version of events that must have existed, possibly circulated, throughout the Sasanian era. The negative slant and very survival of this account raises some puzzling questions given its ambiguous sources and relative rarity in later texts. It would appear that Ṭabarī either stumbled upon a freak survival of a very early layer of Sasanian historiography, or, just perhaps, found one that was intentionally non-compliant, one curated with the intention of defying the crystallising historical myths of the later Sasanian dynasty. As shall be seen, a comparison with material drawn from late Sasanian sources suggests that this version of events would eventually fall from favour.

3.3 The Chronicle Tradition

Much of the Perso-Arabic historiography of the Sasanian era is generally believed to be linked to a Sasanian chronicle tradition that was probably first compiled in the 6th century, the so-called *xwadāy nāmag*, the “Book of Kings”.²⁸ No primary work of this tradition is extant and it has to be reconstructed on the basis of references to it as well as very similar content and structure visible in much later works in New Persian or

²⁷ Translations and considerations of later writers who seem to have followed Ṭabarī can be found in Widengren (1971), pp. 764-72.

²⁸ Useful discussions of this tradition can be found in, Nöldeke (1979), pp.23-26, Boyce (1968), pp.57-59 and Yarshater (1983), pp. 359-363, and Shahbazi (1990). A monograph on this tradition, Jaako Hämeen-Anttila's *Khwādaynāmag, The Middle Persian Book of Kings*, was published in April 2018. I have as yet, had no chance to consult this work.

Arabic. Though it has been claimed that these can give us an “excellent idea of its content”, the precise timing, content and shape of the underlying system of texts will forever elude us.²⁹ Because later works usually present the dynasty’s history as a series of royal biographies integrated into a mass of historicized religious and mythic material, works of this sort *probably* positioned the Sasanians as the representatives of a dynasty ever present in an invented history going into deep antiquity.³⁰ We might agree with Yarshater that some works of this kind were “more or less official” in so far as they presented history in terms set by the dynasty itself.³¹

Yet, some caveats must be made. First it needs to be emphasized that this cannot have been a unitary work; rather it was a tradition, perhaps “genre”, of texts of different dates and authorship.³² We know very little about the broader environment of secular

²⁹ Boyce (1968), p.58.

³⁰ There is some difficulty in determining the correct terminology to describe the nature of this invented historiography. There has been a long-standing habit to refer to the late Sasanian historical complex as “national”, as in Nöldeke (1979) and Yarshater (1983). The term nation, however, implies a great deal and is an awkward description to use in relation to any pre-modern society. The theorist of nationalism Anthony Smith argued that Sasanian aristocratic culture did in fact come to constitute a self-aware cultural identity that was both aggressively propagated and could be considered a “lateral”, that is, class bound “proto-nationalism”, see Smith (1986), pp.76-89, Smith (2004), pp.184-90 and 202-204. Conversely, Daryaee has argued that it the Late Sasanian tradition was in fact driven by the gradual establishment of a codified religious system and was, as a result, less “national” than it was “sacred”, see Daryaee (1995). An interesting perspective on the question can be found in Frank (2013), pp.87-89. Here it is suggested that the establishment of a new, multi-ethnic, political order (the Carolingian kingdom), and the resultant increase in literacy came to label a number of peoples, hitherto thought of as distinct, into an abstract “Germanic” identity. Driven by the elite’s need for political myths and genealogical material, the same forces acted as a sort of filter through which legendary and historical material from *all* of these traditions was selectively welded into a single Pan-Germanic complex. This argument is somewhat similar to that made regarding the integration of Arsakid era material into the Sasanian tradition in Boyce (1954). It follows that, even if the resulting tradition is one of ethnogenesis, dynastic need and the distorting effect of a state that contained multitudes, may have been a stronger impetus than any broad sense of ethnic solidarity in the inception of the Sasanian historical tradition. The term “national” is, in any case, far too loaded with modern baggage to be of much use and will be avoided henceforth.

³¹ Yarshater (1983), p.359.

³² Because so much material has been lost, it is difficult to determine just *how* diffuse Sasanian chronicles may have been; the general supposition appears to have been that the various iterations were linked by a shared foundation. For example, while admitting that there must have been different redactions; Shahbazi, in a similar vein to Nöldeke, argued that “there was only ever one core” Shahbazi (1990), p.208 and pp.215-218, Nöldeke (1979), pp.23-25. In his examination of the statements of Ḥamza al-İşfahānī regarding his now lost sources, Zeev Rubin was more skeptical and argued for a *very* diffuse tradition, the product of multiple

Middle Persian literature and even less about how these chronicles may have interacted with it. Second, the reception of this tradition into the Islamic period is just as opaque as any other aspect of early Muslim historiography, a problem compounded by the likelihood that the vast majority of writers of this period could only have been familiar with works of this kind via translation into Arabic or early New Persian.³³ We know of a number of no-longer extant translations into Arabic, most famously that of Ibn al-Moqaffa (d. c. 757) any of which may have cut or added material.³⁴ Zabihollah Safa's observation that many opportunities existed for all sorts of material to be moved in and out of the frame provided by any actually "official" Sasanian chronicle tradition should be kept in mind at all times.³⁵

We are left with something of a problem. How do we resolve the commonalities of structure and content seen in later texts with the uncertain origins of their material, occasionally very pronounced discrepancies between works, and an almost completely opaque but evidently diffuse transmission during which an unknown amount of material was added and subtracted between redactions? Any attempt to truly grapple with the problems of official influence, orality, memory, adulteration and translation across the entire period believed to have been represented in the chronicle tradition would be an intensive exercise indeed. This study is, however, only concerned with a single episode in early Sasanian history. Moreover, certain similarities in later Perso-Arabic works allow us to tentatively posit a "core" or, at least, very common, version of Ardashir associated with this tradition.

As Roger Scott has shown in his consideration of the nearly thousand-year arc of the "genre" in Byzantium, chronicle can be an *extremely* conservative and self-referential format, one in which expected forms and details can survive largely unchanged for centuries. Those writers wishing to argue a point were often forced to reshape known

redactions of rather disparate sources, yet still noted a unity in the "chronological core", see Rubin (2008), pp.43-51 and 54.

³³ On the general impenetrability of the earliest layers of Islamic historiography, see Robinson (2003), p.18, *f*.

³⁴ On ebn al-Moqaffa' see, Latham (2011). The disparate nature of Sasanian dynastic history, and the inadequacy of attributing all Islamic era references to a chronicle to the translation of ebn al-Moqaffa' alone is rightly emphasized in Bonner (2015), pp.46-50.

³⁵ Safa (2011), pp.85-86.

material rather than innovate.³⁶ Thus even a very diffuse tradition can display very strong commonalities across iterations. If the analogy is admitted, then some strong similarities found across the Perso-Arabic historical tradition regarding the Sasanian dynasty may be explained by a common foundation, an influential and early collection of data that largely stabilized the *form* of successive, often very different, redactions. Phillip Huyse, in consideration of a similar question, has theorized that that the “official” chronicle tradition, which he dates roughly to the reign of Khosrow I (539-579 CE), represented the merging of some kind of bare, archival tradition with a collection of legendary traditions drawn from the oral historical traditions current at the time.³⁷ The resulting account, it follows, would be one in which relatively little, quite often historically unreliable, information was clustered around events seen as extraordinary or especially significant.

It is certainly tempting to see the influence of annalistic tradition in the very conventional structure of many Sasanian reigns seen in the *Šāhnāmeḥ*, in much of Ṭabarī and other early historians of the Muslim era; even more so because the existence of something like this is claimed in a 6th century source, strangely enough, in Greek. In his *Historiae*, Agathias claims to have had second-hand knowledge of the Sasanian royal archives from his friend Sergius, a Syriac Christian who worked as an interpreter.³⁸ Agathias proffers a list of Sasanian kings, alongside some minor details that also turn up in much later Perso-Arabic sources and it seems likely that in this case, unlike Ctesias, reference to “Persian books” was something more than a literary device to disguise the author’s reliance on hearsay.³⁹ Sergius may not have known any elaborate, composite, work of historical research, but he may well have had the chance to view a chronicle in the sense of “the names of the Sasanian kings in the right chronological order, with the dates of their respective reigns and a reference to some key events. Nothing more and nothing less.”⁴⁰

³⁶ Though addressing Byzantine chronicles, Scott’s discussion of the accumulative conservatism of their contents provides a useful way of viewing the rather more hypothetical Sasanian tradition, see Scott (2009).

³⁷ Huyse (2008), pp.151-152.

³⁸ Agathias. Hist, 2.30.2. On Agathias’ use of this material, see Suolahti (1947) and Cameron (1969/1970), p.112 f.

³⁹ Briant (2002), p.6.

⁴⁰ Huyse (2008), pp.149-150.

The problem then, lies in trying to determine the *general* direction taken by the forms of the “chronicle” tradition when describing the foundation of the state; that is, trying to define the sort of Ardashir most commonly recounted in the resultant mixtures of archive and “legend”. The most valuable source in this regard is the 10th century chronographer Ḥamza al-Iṣfahānī who claimed that he had access to seven different works bearing titles that might be interpreted as translations of a Sasanian chronicle, or, in some cases, “biographies” of Persian kings.⁴¹ Further, he recorded the unsuccessful attempts of other scholars to harmonise their own collections of translations.⁴² His report of their mutual despair has left us a snapshot of just how fractured the tradition was, even a thousand years ago. Yet Ḥamza also bequeathed us a valuable, though short, summary of the contents of some of the works he had seen.⁴³ With the caveat that we do not know *how* aggressively Ḥamza summarized his sources, his report suggests a great deal about their structure and probable contents.

Ḥamza organizes his information by reign, but the extent of his information regarding each king is variable; indeed some are so minimal that Ḥamza describes nothing but his portrait.⁴⁴ Both this arrangement, and the length of each ruler’s biography *broadly* lines up with more expansive texts. Since Ḥamza would seem to have more directly consulted the same tradition that ultimately underpins these, we might plausibly apply the bland, stereotypical, reign structure (name, coronation speech, cities built, reigned X years) seen in Ferdowsi’s (and sometimes Ṭabarī’s) rendition of kings like Narseh or Bahram II back into the “gaps” in Ḥamza’s work to get some sense of what he skipped over. Thus, Ḥamza’s summary suggests a great deal about the structure of the texts he saw. Importantly, it also gives an account of Ardashir whose echoes can be seen in other works of the Islamic era. We may thus, tentatively retrieve a version of Ardashir that was (presumably) relatively common across the breadth of the chronicle tradition and considered more or less acceptable during the dynasty’s final centuries.

⁴¹ Ḥamza, pp.1-2. See also, Rubin (2008), pp.35-43.

⁴² Ḥamza, pp.1-18.

⁴³ Rubin believes that Ḥamza made his summary from the works of ebn al-Moqaffa’ and al-Barmakī, Rubin (2008), p.42.

⁴⁴ For better or worse, Ḥamza also made extensive use of a picture book containing the portraits of Sasanian kings and seems to have described this source when the chronicles offered nothing of interest.

Versions of Ardashir very similar to Ḥamza's can be seen in the roughly contemporaneous work of the Alexandrian Ebn Beṭrīq/Eutychius and also, somewhat, in the 12th century history of Fars by the writer known as Ebn al-Balkhī.⁴⁵ Some similarities can be perceived in the *Book of Lengthy Histories* of the historian Dīnavarī (d.896-903), though this is a difficult and highly synthetic source of which more will be said below.⁴⁶ In the broadest outlines, these sources agree with Ṭabarī, yet they offer nothing like as much detail, and present Ardashir's motivations as an unifying impulse with the result that a rather different view of the situation is imparted to the reader. A very rough reconstruction, drawn from all of the above sources, would look something like this.⁴⁷

- Ardashir was the son of Pabag (Dīnavarī, Ḥamza, Ebn Beṭrīq, Ebn al-Balkhī)
- He sought to restore the kingdom destroyed by Alexander. A Kayanid ancestry is occasionally claimed. (Dīnavarī, Ḥamza, Ebn al-Balkhī).
- He arose in Fars, and became king of Istakhr (perhaps Dīnavarī, Ḥamza, Ebn al-Balkhī).
- He was dismayed by the religious and/or political disunity he saw about him, and sought to reclaim the rightful place of Fars. (Dīnavarī, Ḥamza, perhaps Ebn Beṭrīq).

⁴⁵ There is some question as to the nature and length of Ebn Beṭrīq's chronicle, Michael Breydy argued that all save one of the extant manuscripts of this work follow a heavily interpolated Antiochene recension in circulation by the early 11th century, see Breydy (1985), p.v-xiv. Should Breydy be correct, the version of Ardashir's life seen in the majority of manuscripts is not the work of Ebn Beṭrīq himself. References to Ebn Beṭrīq refer to the 1987 Italian translation of B. Pirone. This translation follows the majority of manuscripts. Pirone noted Breydy's reservations but also believed that the "interpolation" was itself a valuable document, see Pirone (1985), p.8-9. Pirone's position is the correct one to take in this case; interpolated or not, the version of Ardashir presented in this longer work certainly reflects an Iranian source and remains a suitable reference point for reconstructing the sort of Ardashir one would be likely to have seen in Sasanian chronicles.

⁴⁶ The only complete translation of Dīnavarī into any modern European language is an unpublished work by M.R. Jackson Bonner who has very kindly allowed me both sight and use of it in for this dissertation. All quotations are taken unaltered from his translation and cited according to his pagination. The corresponding pages in Guirgass's 1888 edition, from which the translation is made, are noted in brackets.

⁴⁷ The relevant references are, Dīnavarī, p.282 (p.44), Ṭabarī, p.17, Ḥamza, p.30-31, Ebn Beṭrīq, 10.1 and 3, Fārsnāmeḥ, pp.19-20 and 60. Ebn al-Balkhī's two entries on Ardashir (particularly the second) seem to mix up a number of different sources and certain claims are unclear. He is included because the general outlines of his account, accord with Ḥamza and Ebn Beṭrīq. He also gives a specific number of regional kings (eighty), killed by Ardashir. Ḥamza says ninety.

- He wrote letters demanding the submission of the regional kings. (perhaps Dīnavarī, Ḥamza, Ebn Beṭrīq, Ṭabarī).
- He killed many of the regional kings, a specific number is sometimes given. (Dīnavarī, Ḥamza, Ebn Beṭrīq, Ebn al-Balkhī).
- Having crushed all opposition he reformed the kingdom. This may have included a reassembly of the religious texts “destroyed” by Alexander. (Ḥamza, Ebn Beṭrīq notes that he was considered very just).⁴⁸
- A list of his cities and foundations.

The *tendenz* of this portrait is wrapped up in the characterisation of Alexander as a destroyer and consequent characterization of the Parthian era as a time without a king, a stance that reflects the fully developed form of Sasanian ideology in which the Arsakid dynasty was largely consigned to oblivion.⁴⁹ It is telling what these sources do *not* include. Invariably they contain no detailed description of local context. There is no trace of Shapur son of Pabag, and sometimes even Ardawan goes unmentioned, rolled up into one of the many, often nameless, regional kings crushed by Ardashir on his way to the throne. While Shapur I offered sacrifices for his eponymous uncle’s soul, his remote descendants seem to have either forgotten their inconvenient relation, or chose to ignore him. Likewise, it is suggestive how small the role of Ardawan appears to have been in this version; particularly as his defeat was immortalized in Ardashir’s own

⁴⁸ Ardashir’s supposed reconstruction of the written religious traditions destroyed by Alexander was known to Maqdisi whose late tenth century account of Ardashir’s rise is otherwise flattering but perfunctory, see Maqdisi, p.160 and was present, despite the author’s presentation of a surprisingly realistic picture of Ardashir as a rebel against Ardawan, in the later history of Gardīzī, Gardīzī, p.21.

⁴⁹ On the Middle Persian Alexander, see Gignoux (2007). The period of Arsakid rule is extremely vague and confused in Perso-Arabic sources, Ferdowsi disposed of the entire Parthian dynasty in fewer than thirty lines, ŠhN 6, pp.138-9, lines 64-86. That this was a result of deep inadequacies in the Persian source material is demonstrated by the attempts of Ḥamza al-Iṣfahānī and Bīrūnī (incorporating Ḥamza’s earlier work) to work out chronologies for the various Persian dynasties. Noting from the outset that Persian history is defective in this regard, Ḥamza presents two differing chronologies of the Arsakid era, see Ḥamza, pp.1, 5-6, and 15-16. Bīrūnī, also expressing exasperation at the variance and imprecision of the Persian sources, came somewhat closer to the mark through the use of *Manichean* texts to fix the interval between Alexander and Ardashir, see Bīrūnī. Chron, pp.118-122. Whether or not this shortening was a deliberate attempt to downgrade the Arsakids, as argued in Shahbazi (1990), pp.218-224, or “innocently arrived at” as suggested in Yarshater (1983), pp.386-387, is very difficult to say.

monuments. A distinct separation is therefore visible between this version of events and the version of dynastic origins acceptable in the early 3rd century, insofar as we can infer from a comparison of this reconstruction with ŠKZ and Ṭabarī.

It has to be asked why, judging from the reconstruction made here, the chronicle tradition known to Ḥamza *et al.* would seem to have offered accounts of the Sasanian dynasty's foundation far less detailed than that which Ṭabarī's research managed to build in the 10th century. It is plausible that the "chronicle" Ardashir was simply the result of the idealization of very minimal data. The emergence of a chronicle tradition was likely to have been a late phenomenon, before which there may have been very little formal Middle Persian historiography. Huyse points to the perfunctory treatment of many early kings, abundant anachronisms and the sudden explosion of detail from the 5th century onwards seen in sources of the Muslim era and notes how the shape of the data is very similar to the patterns displayed in oral-historical cultures where detailed "memory" can be expected to stretch back a mere few generations and only the far distant past and the present are real in any meaningful sense.⁵⁰ Thus, the first generation of chronicles, those that set the tone for the entire "genre", would simply have had no recourse to anything but the barest or most sensational data from earlier times.⁵¹

It ought to be noted, however, that such historical amnesia is sometimes extremely puzzling. We have already seen how Ṭabarī had access to at least one fairly detailed, and quite negative, account of the dynasty's foundation. We shall see how the presence of a number of legendary narratives may testify to an engagement with these details. Further indications of a selective historical sense, one inclined to the suppression of data, can be perceived in works bearing the stamp of the chronicle tradition. Famously, the dynasty's own inscriptions were not used as a source. To take a particularly egregious example, the late 3rd century king Narseh (r. 293-302), the son of Shapur I, left a large bilingual inscription at Paikuli offering his excuses for the deposition of his

⁵⁰ That is, it displays a "floating gap", see Huyse (2008), p.152, and Vansina (1985), pp.23-24. On the retrojection of 6th century norms into the mythic past see Shahbazi (1990), pp.211-213

⁵¹ A similar argument that very little specific data about Ardashir was available in the 6th century is made in Daryaee (2003), p.36.

grandnephew Bahram III.⁵² Additionally Greek and Latin sources inform us that Narseh fought a not very successful war against Rome. Despite this, *literally nothing* other than formulaic boilerplate (coronation, speech, ruled so many years, built these cities) is reported of his reign in most Perso-Arabic sources. A lack of detailed knowledge, (perhaps an attempt to clean up the record?), is most evident, however, in these sources' habit of listing Narseh as Bahram III's uncle or even brother.⁵³ Even allowing for the fact that inscriptions are not circulating texts, the lack of any reference to them, indeed, the generally very poor state of antiquarian knowledge of the 3rd and 4th century in a tradition so organised by royal biography, is very strange indeed.

It is certainly possible, as Mary Boyce believed, that the 6th century chroniclers were singularly limited, possibly inept, researchers.⁵⁴ Yet the survival of early Sasanian monuments, and the traces of a wider historical Middle Persian literature to be found in later Perso-Arabic sources, admit the possibility that some information was purposefully excluded from the earliest stages of the chronicle. The chronicle tradition may have impressed a certain structure on later historiography of the Sasanian state, but it has already been seen that it could hardly have been the only version of the past in circulation. We should perhaps imagine the the chronicle tradition as a statement of position, an outline of the "true" nature of history as it stood in the dynasty's view during its last two centuries.⁵⁵ It coexisted and competed with a number of other productions, some antagonistic, some complimentary, and some outdated. If the reconstruction made above is any indication of the general trend, we might posit that late Sasanian chronicles tended to omit detail in an effort to move away from the relatively unapologetic account of dynastic origins current in the early 3rd century. This may have occurred as the circumstances of Ardawan's deposition, the existence of Shapur son of Pabag and, perhaps, the memory of the bloody swathe that Ardashir and

⁵² This inscription has been edited and translated in Skjaervø (1983).

⁵³ A list of sources (including Jordanes!) claiming an erroneous descent for Narseh can be found at Weber (2012), p.157, n.13. Ebn Beṭrīq should also be added Ebn Beṭrīq, 10.15. Weber believes that the confusion arose from the father to son succession of three Bahrams before Narseh, though, interestingly, a Nestorian source provides the correct descent, Weber (2012), pp.157-158. It is perhaps amusing to note that at Fārsnāmeḥ, p.66 Ebn al-Balkhī states that "no important works of his (Narseh) survive" (*az vāy asar maruf namānd...*).

⁵⁴ Boyce (1968), pp.58-59.

⁵⁵ Yarshater (1971), p.359.

his son had cut through the ruling classes of their time, became more and more of a liability. The sensitivity of such matters, and attempts to blunt their explanatory power may be sensed in the target of this study, a third set of recollections of the earliest Sasanian rulers.

3.4 The Kārnāmag

3.4.1 The Nature of the Kārnāmag

As the official or quasi-official account of Sasanian origins shifted towards a streamlined account in which history was cleaned up through the omission of detail, a number of far more baroque recollections of dynastic beginnings also began to circulate. Stories of lost princes and courtly confrontations attached to Ardashir, his son, and grandson, appear in a motley collection of texts, notably, Agathias' *Histories* (6th century), Moses' Khorenats'i's *History of the Armenians* (probably 8th century), Dīnavarī's, *Book of Lengthy Histories* (9th century), Ṭabarī's *History of the Prophets and Kings* (early 10th century), Tha'alebī's *History of the Kings of the Persians* (11th century) and a Greco-Armenian text composed at some point between the later 5th and 10th centuries. The striking familiarity of these narratives, their untenable historicity, and their evident coexistence with *other* accounts argues that the quasi-historical sequences once associated with Cyrus had somehow become established in the West-Iranian repertoire and had once again been transferred to new individuals in the Sasanian era.

How this may have come to pass is obscure due to the extremely ambiguous nature of the sources bearing on the problem. With the exception of Agathias, all extant attestations of either sequence are Medieval and come to us with hazy antecedents. The Perso-Arabic material in particular is built on an opaque source tradition of which much can be speculated but little can be known for certain. Moreover, the extent to which any specific memory of the Achaemenid period survived in Fars by the 3rd century CE,

particularly whether any such memory was at play in the earliest constructions of Sasanian political ideology, is not clear and has long been a subject of debate.⁵⁶ Leaving the intractable problems of origins and transmission to one side, we are left once again with the presence of ancient, historicising narratives in a historical discourse that often contradicts them. Having already seen that rather different accounts of Sasanian beginnings were in circulation and that the acceptable narrative appears to have moved over time, we know that this discourse was a disputed one. It is against this backdrop of contested memory that the reappearance of these much older narratives ought to be evaluated.

Similarly, it is in the context of the consequences of the development of Sasanian political ideology that we should consider the two texts that appear to connect all of these scattered attestations. The first, Ferdowsi's *Šāhnāmeḥ*, is a New Persian epic completed in 1010 recounting a history of Iran from creation to the Arab conquest. The second, the *Kārnāmag-ī Ardāšīr-ī Pābagān* (*The Book of the Deeds of Ardashir, the Son of Pabag*, hereafter KNA), is a Middle Persian prose text of unclear ancestry recounting the life of the first three Sasanian kings. In these we see the origin legends referenced piecemeal across a number of literatures come together into a longer narrative of the establishment of the dynasty that is both far less ambiguous than that of Ṭabarī and far more detailed than that of the chronicle tradition reconstructed above. While not exactly the same in every particular, both narratives appear reasonably unitary; certainly, the

⁵⁶ To give some idea of how slippery the question of Achaemenid memory is; in Eddy (1961), p.65 f. (and perhaps Boyce and Grenet (1991), p.106 f.), a distinctly religious memory of the fallen empire, of which Ardashir was the heir, was posited. Conversely, in Yarshater (1971), it was argued that the Sasanians had no *specific* memory of the Achaemenids and were, if anything, far more influenced by the ideologies and styles of the late Arsakid period, though, this verdict is complicated by a short lived persistence of Achaemenid era names and titles in Fars, see *ibid.* pp.519-520, Panaino (2003). In an attempt to reconcile the ambiguities, Daryaee argued that the earliest Sasanians did retain some kind of distorted memory of the Achaemenids, (and were certainly in contact with groups with much more specific information), but that the dynasty's historiography came to be dominated by the quasi-religious epic cycles they had associated with their political posture, Daryaee (1995). The question is further complicated by the evident reverence shown to Achaemenid relics in the late Arsakid and Sasanian periods, see Canepa (2010). Finally, Shayegan (2012a), makes a very involved argument for an Arsakid memory of the Achaemenids mediated by the *Babylonian* tradition, albeit one that had largely faded by the 3rd century. The problem is unlikely to be resolved to anyone's complete satisfaction any time soon.

sources used in this part of the *Šāhnāmeḥ* and KNA must have been very close indeed.⁵⁷ Given the geographic and temporal span that separates these texts it would seem almost certain that both are descended from a common ancestor, defined above as hKNA.

The date of hKNA is difficult to determine. Its reflection in the *Šāhnāmeḥ*, a warehouse of Sasanian historical traditions, and the existence of a Middle Persian text point suggestively to the Sasanian period itself; as does the sporadic appearance of its component episodes in historical literature from the 6th century on. The date of KNA is, however, somewhat unclear. All extant manuscripts descend from that contained in the much larger Pahlavi Codex MK, the miscellany of a Parsee family containing a sizable chunk of all extant Middle Persian literature. The relevant section of MK was copied in Gudjerat in 1322, but the text used by the copyist may have been considerably older.⁵⁸ In the introduction to his French translation Franz Grenet has noted, based on the Turkic title, *tegin* given to the king of Kabul in KNA, 14.19, that the *terminus post quem* of this text is 706. Complicating matters further Grenet believes that New Persian grammatical forms can be seen in places, suggesting a date after the 9th century; conversely, he also notes that other parts of the text are considerably more conservative.⁵⁹ KNA and/or its model text would seem to have been a post-Sasanian redaction, possibly a summary, of an older text.⁶⁰ Ferdowsi's *Šāhnāmeḥ* is therefore the only firm point in the chronology of the shared source. Unfortunately, not only is the *Šāhnāmeḥ* also quite late, its own sources remain ambiguous and controversial.⁶¹

⁵⁷ Nöldeke (1979), pp.11-12, Safa (2011), pp.149, *f.* (who considers a fuller version of KNA as a source for the lost prose *Šāhnāmeḥ* of al-Razāq, long suspected to have been an important source for Ferdowsi's poem, see however Davis (1996), p.51 *f.*), Grenet (2003), p.29.

⁵⁸ The Middle Persian text of the KNA used here was Anklesaria's 1935 edition. I would like to thank Prof. Almut Hintze at the SOAS for her kind advice in this regard. Translations into English are mine though, due to the perverse nature of Book Pahlavi script, sometimes made with reference to the transliteration and translation of Grenet (2003).

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p.26.

⁶⁰ The opening lines of KNA read: *pad kār nāmag ī ardašir ī pābagān ēdōn nibešt ēstād ka...* "In the Book of Deeds of Ardashir, son of Pabag, it is written that..." KNA, 1.1.

⁶¹ Ferdowsi was traditionally seen to have been working from written sources, see Nöldeke (1979), pp.62-67. In the 1990's the idea that Ferdowsi was connected to an oral tradition was raised, see Davis (1996) and more pointedly in Olga Davidson's *Poet and Hero in the Persian Book of Kings*. This last book drew an extremely heated refutation in Omidisalar (1998). I have far more sympathy for Omidisalar's position than Davidson's, however, given the lack of material from the Sasanian and early Islamic periods, the nature of any texts that may have

hKNA may not, however, be entirely closed to us. The presence of a number of origins narratives conforming to Sequence One or Two within these texts presents an opportunity to theorise the underlying material by means of analogy. Proceeding from observations made about similar Mesopotamian legends in the previous chapter, I will here use the recurrence of narrative as an interpretive tool. I will suggest that hKNA was not a unitary text. To expand Theodor Nöldeke's suggestion regarding KNA, it was, rather, a *compilation* of shorter narratives drawn together by their relationship to Ardashir and the foundation of the state.⁶² The recognizable origins narratives seen intermittently in a number of texts and presented together as part of a single narrative in KNA and the *Šāhnāmeḥ* were generated separately for immediate political reasons; either as responses to critiques of the background of the Sasanian dynasty, or attempts to circumvent criticism of Ardashir's actions by remodeling them according to a well-known pattern of monarchical representation. hKNA was made at a later date for rather different reasons. Following the suggestion of Mary Boyce I will argue that this text was the product of a religious community deeply shaped by the experience of Sasanian political theology.⁶³ In it a number of older narratives were drawn together to cast imperial foundation as communal, sacred, history.

3.4.2 Overview and Setting of the *Kārnāmag*

In broad terms the *Kārnāmag* is a relatively expansive account of the downfall of Ardawan IV and rise of Ardashir to rule over an *Ērān* left divided by the actions of Alexander.⁶⁴ As in the traditions of Cyrus reviewed above, the *Kārnāmag* imposes a series

informed the *Šāhnāmeḥ* will forever remain somewhat conjectural. Moreover, as Qazvini suggested more than sixty years ago, the success of Ferdowsi's text probably extinguished not only its competitors but also one of its most likely sources, the prose *Šāhnāmeḥ* of al-Razāq, Qazvini (1953), p.21.

⁶² "Das *Kārnāmak* zerfällt in mehrere Abschnitte, die ziemlich lose miteinander verbunden sind, die aber darin ihre Einheit haben, das sie sich alle auf die Durchführung der staatlichen Einigung Irān's beziehen." Nöldeke (1878), p.28.

⁶³ Boyce (1968), p.60. The general thesis, if not the specific conclusions of Daryaee (1995) is also relevant to this hypothesis..

⁶⁴ Iran is characterized as been split between two hundred and forty "dynasts" (*kadag xwadāy*) in KNA, 1.1. In 1.6 the "misrule" (*dušxwadāyīh*) of Alexander is mentioned in relation to the flight of Dara, Ardashir's royal ancestor. It is likely that the composite was in line with a conservative, or priestly view of Iranian history in which Alexander had a very poor reputation, see Gignoux (2007).

of fanciful narratives over a stage populated by historical individuals. Ardashir, and his immediate heirs, are given untenably complicated childhoods while the conflict of Ardashir and Ardawan is cast as a narrative of prophecies and personalized courtly brinksmanship strongly reminiscent of the Ctesian Cyrus. This mixture of the historic and the unlikely has, on occasion, led some influential commentators to describe the narrative seen in KNA and the *Šāhnāmeḥ* as a “romantic” tradition; this has, however, rather unhelpful connotations.⁶⁵ While monographs of the heroic works and deeds of individual Sasanian kings may have constituted a “genre” of Middle Persian literature, this does not argue that hKNA was composed as an entertainment.⁶⁶ The combination of highly sensitive subject matter and the use of stereotyped forms of royal biography seen in its descendants invites us to consider a nakedly ideological reading.⁶⁷ This is all the more so because another “historical monograph” with a political edge has been perceived in our sources: a so-called romance describing the life of the usurper Bahram Chubin, who sought to depose the Sasanians and may have called upon an Arsakid ancestry to do so.⁶⁸

⁶⁵ KNA was explicitly accounted a “romance” or “romantic” in, Nöldeke (1878), p.23 and Boyce (1968), p.60. KNA, and the tradition it represents, was considered somewhat unserious or “popular” in Frye (1964), pp.47-48, and Yarshater (1983), p.365. Such appraisals neglect the extent to which the imitation of legendary or epic patterns could be and was used as a legitimising tactic in the Sasanian and Islamic periods. On this last point I am indebted to my supervisor Ghazzal Dabiri who deals with this issue extensively in her forthcoming book based on her doctoral dissertation, Dabiri (2007), and has allowed me sight of the relevant sections.

⁶⁶ Boyce argued that other Middle Persian works similar to KNA existed, though she remained agnostic on the matter of the priority of these in regards to any chronicle tradition, see Boyce (1968), p.60. This supposition finds some support in the so-called “old” introduction to the *Šāhnāmeḥ*. This document is, in fact, the introduction to the older now lost, prose *Šāhnāmeḥ* of al-Razāq that was attached at some point to an edition of Ferdowsi’s more famous work of verse, see Qazvini (1953), pp.23-27. This introduction makes a rather interesting claim in its statement of method: al-Razāq’s client al-Ma’marī, requests books (in the plural form: *kotob*) from a number of men of the old Persian gentry. The introduction states that these included “books of kings, books of the deeds of kings and the lives of each”, *nāmeḥ-haye šāhān va kārnāmeḥ-haye šāhān va zendegāni har yeki*. See *ibid.*, pp.34-35 and Rubin’s discussion of this passage at Rubin (2008), p.49.

⁶⁷ Such a reading has been suggested in Daryaee (2003), pp.36-38 where it is suggested that KNA was the product of Khosrow I’s use of Ardashir as a model in order to impose a particular view of Sasanian history.

⁶⁸ Bahram Chubin’s linkage to the Arsakid dynasty in the later sources suggests that he appealed to an Arsakid ancestry during his revolt. Czeglédý argued that this linkage was actually a pro-Sasanian slur meant to delegitimize Bahram in the “romantic” tradition attached to him, Czeglédý (1958), pp.25-28. By contrast, Pourshariati, whose general thesis sees the old grandee clans as quasi-independent organs of the state, particularly strong in the east, would seem to incline towards a more straightforward explanation for the presence of this ancestry in our sources, Pourshariati (2008), p.122, *f.* Payne argued that this “text” was in fact

The greater part of the *Kārnāmag* describes the life of Ardashir. Of greatest interest here is the relatively long account of Ardashir's early life. Ardashir's father is Sasan, the scion of the Kayanid line deposed by Alexander, now disguised as a shepherd.⁶⁹ Sasan's identity and Ardashir's birth are signaled to Ardashir's maternal grandfather and adoptive father-to-be, Pabag, the sub-king of Fars, by a prophetic, solar, dream.⁷⁰ Fifteen years later, the young Ardashir's fame reaches Pabag's overlord Ardawan IV, who demands the boy come to his court. Ardashir's skill in hunting and polo impresses all until one of Ardawan's sons attempts to claim credit for a remarkable shot Ardashir makes during a hunt in which he sends an arrow through the body of a fleeing onager.⁷¹ Demoted to stable boy, Ardashir attracts Ardawan's concubine who tells him that Ardawan has been warned by astrologers that anyone who escapes from his court in the next three days would depose him.⁷²

With the concubine's help Ardashir flees to his homeland, outpaces the pursuing Ardawan, collects the *xwarrah* (the avatar of divinely approved kingship, here incarnated as a ram of unusual size) accepts the allegiance of the nobility of Fars, and finally defeats Ardawan.⁷³ A tightly compressed Sequence One may be discerned in the exchange of Sasan and Pabag, but the truly significant episode for this study is Ardashir's time at Ardawan's court where many parallels to the Ctesian Cyrus may be found. The *Kārnāmag* goes on to recount a number of wars fought by Ardashir against minor kings in the region of Fars. Attached to this collection of struggles are two additional cycles describing the complicated childhoods of Ardashir's son Shapur I, and

a stridently anti royalist political document, one that insinuated that the Sasanians had converted to Christianity, see Payne (2016), pp.189-190. The continuing appeal of ancient Arsakid antecedents in the east of the Sasanian state, alongside Bahram's heroic image, may have been part of the reason why he was later claimed as an ancestor by the 9th century Samanid dynasty, see Bīrūnī. Chron, p.48, see also, Bosworth (1973), pp.58-59.

⁶⁹ ŠhN 6, pp.139-140, lines 87-98 = KNA, 1.6-7. Sasan is an itinerant soldier in Agathias, Pabag, significantly given the role of such professionals in Cyrus' legends, an astrologer, Agathias. Hist, 2.27.2-3

⁷⁰ ŠhN 6, pp.140-142, lines 99-135 = KNA, 1.8-20. The titles used for Pabag in these texts *šāh* (king), *šahryār* (king), and *marzbān* (governor or warden, akin to *marquis* in the most literal sense) are, in the light of what Ṭabarī has to say, likely to be gross inflations of Pabag's rank.

⁷¹ ŠhN 6, pp. 143-146, lines 143-195= KNA, 2.4-20.

⁷² ŠhN 6, pp. 148-151, lines 214-265 = KNA, 3.1-12. Three days are not specified by Ferdowsi.

⁷³ ŠhN 6, pp.151-156, lines 266-342= KNA, 3.13-5.13.

grandson, Ormazd I. These are more clearly Lost-Prince stories making use of Sequence One: their use of an aristocratic game (polo) and recognition through resemblance strongly recalls the Herodotean Cyrus. All of these sections will be considered sequentially below.

Bearing strong resemblances to ancient Mesopotamian precedent while offering flagrantly unhistorical accounts of sensitive events, one may suspect that each of these narratives were introduced with a particular intent in mind. It has been suggested, on the strength of its preoccupation with the province of Fars, that KNA's ultimate origins lie in the historical traditions of this province.⁷⁴ Attention has been drawn to the fact that one section of the narrative, Ardashir's battle with the princeling Haftowad and his dragon or worm, has very local focus mentioning a number of fairly obscure and specific place names.⁷⁵ This is an attractive argument. Not only is Fars the likely origin of a large amount of extant Middle Persian literature, it will be argued below that the episode of the birth of Ormazd is unlikely to have originated anywhere other than the Sasanian homeland. An origin in Fars would also place the roots of this material in a region thick with the dynasty's partisans lending strength to the idea that apologetic and/or laudatory concerns drove their construction. Moreover, the relatively early appearance of *hostile* versions of episodes seen in the composite narrative well outside of Fars indicates that these legends were aggressively propagated and that the dynasty's detractors sometimes recognized their underlying intent.

⁷⁴ In the forward to his translation of KNA Grenet emphasizes the local horizons of the text, Grenet (2003), p.32 f. This leans very much on the work of Henning, who develops an earlier argument made by Marquart see below.

⁷⁵ Henning posits that the name of this king, rendered in the Book Pahlavi of KNA as *'pt'wbw't'* and Ferdowsi's Perso-Arabic script as *hftw'd* is connected to an Achaemenid title **haftax"wapātā*, "ruler of a seventh" that he reconstructs from an Aramaic title *hpthpt'* attested in a letter written by an Achaemenid governor of Elephantine written in the 5th century BCE. Developing some geographic observations made by Marquart, Henning suggests that the story of Haftowad and his dragon or worm is actually a distorted memory of Ardashir's destruction of a local dynast, a "*Piratehäuptling*", in the south of Fars who had somehow retained an Achaemenid era title. To explain the dragon, Henning speculated that this individual was associated with an Indian snake-cult. Marquart saw instead a repetition of an ancient Iranian dragon slaying myth see, Marquart (1901), pp.44-45 and Henning (1977).

3.4.3 Ardashir: Sequence One?

hKNA almost certainly opened with a short introduction intended to position the coming narrative in time and signal its ideological flavor. The remnants of this can still be seen in the, possibly summary, redaction seen in KNA and in Ferdowsi's lead up to his description of Ardashir;

“In [*pad*] the Deeds of Ardashir, Son of Pabag, it is written that after the death of Alexander the Roman there were two hundred and forty dynasts in *Erānšahr*.”⁷⁶

Ferdowsi claims to work from knowledgeable informants, as he often does, but the import of his introduction to Ardashir's birth is the same;

“After the time of Alexander, who they say ruled over the world
So say the wise *dehqāns* of Čāč [Tashkent], after him there was no one on the ivory throne
There were great men of the race of Āraš, bold, rebellious, graceless men of low bearing
In every corner of the world all at once, each had his own little kingdom
Thus they sat content on their thrones, so they were called the petty kings
Two hundred years passed in this way, they say that there was no king in this world.”⁷⁷

With the stage set, the *Kārnāmag* moves directly to the narrative of Ardashir's birth and early life. This can be broken down as a fusion of Sequence One, (the prophetic dream of Pabag, the shepherd “disguise” of Sasan, complex parentage involving a lowly parent, and adoption) to Sequence Two, another “adoption” of Ardashir, this time to Ardawan, a courtly contest, revelation, plot, flight and conquest (see Table 6). As a rendition of the origins of the empire's founder, these are strong contenders for the core narratives of the composite. It is unclear, however, whether these two sequences emerged as a single piece or whether they arose separately. It would seem that a number of different Sasans were created during the Sasanian period and the Sasan seen

⁷⁶ KNA, 1.1.

⁷⁷ ŠhN 6, p.138, lines, 66-71.

here may derive from a discrete, experimental, genealogy.⁷⁸ Moreover, as will be seen, the very earliest attestation of a *Kārnāmag*-like narrative seems to be an inversion of Sequence One unattached to any broader context. Leaving this question undecided we will here, briefly, consider each of Ardashir's sequences in turn.

In Ardashir's origin story the expression of Sequence One is a fairly curt affair that moves several of the component motifs around in unusual ways (see Table 5). The hostility and paranoia that marked the Herodotean Cyrus' relationship to his grandfather and triggered the "loss" of the protagonist is present but deflected to Alexander's destruction of the Kayanid line. The role of the lost prince is thus transferred from the boy to his father, the "shepherd" Sasan, who is then entirely supplanted, via adoption, by the boy's grandfather the "king" Pabag. This transfer is a rather odd detail that was evidently both old and seen as important, a hostile version of the same story, including a double paternity, was known to Agathias in the 6th century.⁷⁹ As has already been discussed, thanks to a number of variations and generalities in the source material, Ardashir's exact relationship to his dynasty's eponymous forebear is unknown. Though the weight of epigraphy and the Perso-Arabic historical material would strongly support a reconstruction of Ardashir as Pabag's son and Sasan as either his grandfather or ancestor, there is nothing that specifically forbids the latter as Ardashir's father and an argument has been made for this possibility.⁸⁰

Speculation of this type points to the flexible family law of the Zoroastrian tradition in which a number of fictive bonds were available in order to produce an heir for a man, living or dead, who lacked one. While one suspects that Pabag's adoption of his grandson did indeed have a cultural resonance obscure to the modern reader, this is not a particularly convincing explanation for the emergence of the story. Sasan was not universally known as Ardashir's biological father; moreover, the outward rusticity of

⁷⁸ "...stories about Ardaxšīr's origins are so varied that they suggest a search for legitimacy via every tradition that had been passed down by the Persians, some constructed and perhaps those unknown." Daryaei (2010), p.241.

⁷⁹ See p.124 below.

⁸⁰ In Macuch (2014) all extant variations of Ardashir's paternity are examined in the light of the convolutions made possible by the acceptance of fictive bonds and levirate marriages in Medieval Zoroastrian family law. See also Frye (1983), p.117.

the *Kārnāmag*'s Sasan, marks him as a wishful construct. Here, the imposition of a particular narrative logic, one with little time for either fact or legal niceties, seems a much more tenable proposition.⁸¹ It remains most interesting, however, that different men, possibly from two generations of the same family, came to be seen as somehow sharing in Ardashir's paternity. The *Kārnāmag*'s unorthodox use of Sequence One suggests that the solution lies in the interaction of the goals of the historicizing narrative frame with certain sticking points in historical memory.

In order to highlight some of the political assertions woven through the *Kārnāmag*'s version of Ardashir's ancestry, it is necessary to refer again to the account of Sasanian origins given by Ṭabarī. Some minor differences in the two accounts become significant when the *Kārnāmag* narrative is viewed as a historicizing tradition rather than a romantic one. Ṭabarī offers a very condensed version of Kayanid descent similar in outline, if not detail, to that provided by the *Kārnāmag* and indeed, most of the Perso-Arabic historiographic tradition, yet Ṭabarī's sources knew Pabag as the son of Sasan.⁸² Conversely, the *Kārnāmag* texts separate the two men and in doing so cut Pabag out of the Kayanid succession entirely.⁸³ Further, the *Kārnāmag* opens by assuming Pabag to have been Ardawan's appointee in Istakhr.⁸⁴ This, again, contradicts Ṭabarī who states that Pabag was *not* king in Istakhr until he had deposed his overlord Gozchir, a deed for which he most certainly did not have Ardawan's permission.⁸⁵ Thus the *Kārnāmag* presents both a stable political stage in Fars and, in contrast to Ṭabarī, *extremely* clear lines of succession. Compare these statements of Ṭabarī addressing the political fallout of Pabag's death:

Bābak died around that time, and Sābūr, **son of Bābak**, was invested with the crown and ruled in his father's place as king...

⁸¹ Though he argues that KNA was a work derived from popular legend, Shaki made a similar point, Shaki (1990), p.80.

⁸² Ṭabarī, pp.2-3. The most important extant variants of Ardashir's paternity, and Sasan's place in it have been tabulated at Macuch (2014), p.84.

⁸³ KNA, 1.6-7 and 1.20 = ŠhN 6, pp.139-140, lines 87-98 and p.142, line 135. According to Agathias, Pabag wasn't even a maternal ancestor, Agathias. Hist. 2.27.3.

⁸⁴ See n.71 above.

⁸⁵ Ṭabarī, pp.7-8.

He [Ardashir] found there [Istakhr] **a number of his brothers**, some of them older than himself...⁸⁶

with the bald announcement made in the opening passages of KNA that:

“Pabag had **no son** to bear his name.”⁸⁷

On this basis we may suggest that hKNA contained no mention of squabble within the house of Sasan following Pabag’s death, of Shapur son of Pabag, or indeed, of any hint of the contested succession described by Ṭabarī and others. Because Ṭabarī’s 10th century account of Sasanian origins accords reasonably well with contemporary data, the genealogy presented in this section of the *Kārnāmag* would seem interested in creating a version of the history of Fars in the early 3rd century that offers an alternative to rather more challenging recollections that must also have been current in the later Sasanian period. It does so while retaining enough of the original context to ring true-ish as a historical account.

More subtly, the *Kārnāmag*’s Pabag is distanced from Ardashir’s bloodline, albeit in a way that is careful to insist on his historically implausible status as the legitimate ruler of Istakhr.⁸⁸ He becomes a maternal, and thereby peripheral, ancestor to Ardashir’s dynasty. In this way, far more dynastic, if not narrative, weight can be placed on the shoulders of the shadowy figure of Sasan. This stress may have been possible, and, from some perspectives preferable, because the actual Sasan, the *xwadāy* of ŠKZ, was in all likelihood a blank canvas, unlikely to have been well known outside of Fars and possibly only dimly recalled even there. It may be inferred from Ṭabarī’s account that Pabag carried a lot more baggage. If the information carried by Ṭabarī’s sources had any circulation at all, he would have been known as an upstart local king who seized his

⁸⁶ Ibid. 816, p.8.

⁸⁷ *Pābak rāy hēc frazand ī nām burdār nē bud*, KNA, 1.5. On the possible technical, legal, meaning of *nām burdār* (something like name-bearer), see Macuch (2014), p.86.

⁸⁸ Ferdowsi has Pabag as the king of Istakhr by the grace of Ardawan, ŠhN 6, p.139, line 81, *beh estaxr bod bābak az dast-ī uye* (ie. Ardawan). The Middle Persian version gives Pabag the considerably grander title of “governor and king of Fars”, though still as Ardawan’s appointee, KNA, 1.3, *Pābak marzbān šāhryār-ī Pārs bud ud az gumārdag-ī Ārdawan bud*.

crown through an illegitimate act of violence, an action made hardly better by his son's greater act of usurpation.⁸⁹

Dubious genealogies are hardly unusual in any culture, but the early and awkward transference of paternity and stellar lineage away from Pabag was constructed in a very specific way; Pabag is shifted from progenitor to literary archetype. Faced with the immovable facts of Ardashir's close association with Pabag, and Pabag's reputation as a rebel and social climber, somebody employed Sequence One to square the circle. Pabag's illegitimacy is very tacitly addressed by his severance from the Kayanid line, yet, with his sins unmentioned, he remains king enough to be able to perform the role of the royal father. It is to Pabag that the dream-omens of Ardashir's birth are given and Pabag who performs the act of recognition by adopting the Kayanid Ardashir to a royal house whose claims are considerably more *de facto* than *de jure*. Meanwhile, Sasan becomes a strange version of the lost prince as sperm donor, completely disappearing from the narrative after fathering Ardashir.⁹⁰

Because Ardashir's son Shapur mentioned his eponymous uncle in his inscription at Naqš-e Rostam, it would follow that the emergence of this truncated Sequence One can be dated to sometime between the later 3rd and 6th century when Agathias recorded his version of it. As Shapur does not seem to have been embarrassed by his relation, it is possible that this narrative coalesced as the relationship between Sasanian claims and their subjects' acceptance of them changed: possibly in the face of resistance or indifference to the increasingly mythic nature of Sasanian claims among the surviving great families of the old Parthian state.⁹¹ Any such resistance may well have preserved memories of the "true" situation in Fars in Ardashir's time as a means of demonstrating

⁸⁹ Note Agathias' explicit reference to Ardashir's *usurpation* of Ardawan and how it was a proof of a low and wicked character. Agathias. Hist, 4.23.8.

⁹⁰ According to Agathias, Sasan disputed Ardashir's paternity after Ardashir took the throne, *ibid.* 2.27.4. This generates the faintly ridiculous image of a wandering soldier and a leather-worker *cum* hedge wizard arguing over the paternity of a great king and strengthens Cameron's case that the story Agathias heard from Sergius (which, Agathias is particularly insistent to claim, was present in the royal archives, see *ibid.* 2.27.5), represents a hostile reworking of some part of what would become the *Kārnāmag* tradition.

⁹¹ Choksy, for example, saw the nobility's acceptance of Sasanian claims as increasingly pragmatic from the later 4th century, Choksy (1989), pp.49-50. Certainly, it would seem that the greater nobility quickly resumed its accustomed role in the making and breaking of kings after the Sasanian revolt, see Pourshariati (2008), p.56-59 and *passim*.

the unworthy origins of his dynasty. This reconstruction would suggest that disputes over lineage and legitimacy were central to the appeal of Sequence One as a historicizing frame. As we shall see, the *Kārnāmag*'s repeated, use of this sequence to link other early Sasanian kings to aristocratic houses, and the pattern of the development of a similar origin story for Constantine, lend support to this supposition.

3.4.4 Ardashir: Sequence Two

After Ardashir's adoption to Pabag, the *Kārnāmag* immediately moves forward some years, transferring the juvenile Ardashir to the court of Ardawan. The narrative then proceeds to a rendition of Sequence Two that is much longer than the origin narrative that preceded it (see Table 6). Ardashir's court sequence is strongly reminiscent of the Ctesian Cyrus, though, as it has been integrated with a use of Sequence One, he arrives at the palace not via the servant's entrance, but via "adoption" into the inner circle of the royal house after Ardawan hears glowing reports of his skill and demeanor. He then, like Cyrus, proceeds to move in the highest circles, excelling in all things until the outcome of an altercation with Ardawan's son removes his ability to signal his effortlessly royal nature. A clear analog of this hunting scene is not detectable in any of the extant Cyrus traditions reviewed above. On the other hand, a Biblical parallel in David's slaying of Goliath before Saul, has already been mentioned and a remarkable parallel in very early descriptions of the attempt of Diocletian or Galerius to kill the young Constantine by means of an animal combat will be examined later in this study. In addition, the power of this set piece may have received a relatively recent boost in the form of a widespread legend of Alexander's taming of Bucephalus current in Late Antiquity.⁹²

The details of Ardashir's escape from court display a marked resemblance to the Cyrus known to Ctesias and also, probably, Dinon. A series of oddly specific parallels can be discerned: Ardawan is warned by a group of astrologers of his deposition at the hands of a man who will leave soon his court, and is later given an exposition of the symbolism

⁹² See p.182 below.

of the *xwarrah* by his minister. Astyages, it will be recalled, is warned twice, once by an astrologer and again by a singer or court harpist. Ardashir escapes with a helper, here Ardawan's concubine, who, like Oibares, plays a pivotal, practical, role in the young Ardashir's efforts to grasp his destiny. Ardashir's escape comes (at least in the version offered by Ferdowsi) after Pabag has died and Ardawan has disinherited Ardashir.⁹³ Cyrus offers his father's (faked) illness as an excuse to leave Astyages' court. Ardashir, like Cyrus, flees towards his homeland. Like Astyages, Ardawan is pulled from his leisure to an abrupt realization of what is happening and orders a pursuit of the boy.⁹⁴

Though Ardashir does not trick his pursuers as the Ctesian Cyrus does, the chase is staged, with Ardawan stopping to ask for directions only to be informed that Ardashir's destiny, in the form of the *xwarrah*, is literally catching up with him.⁹⁵ The result, combined with the hunt sequence, is a heavy-handed signalling of the underlying meaning of the chase. Having symbolically, and publically, refused Ardashir's claims during the incident at the hunt, Ardawan now has his loss of divine right made visible. As if to emphasise the point, the fact is repeatedly recounted to him by passers by and finally has to be explained by his minister.⁹⁶

Ardashir, of course, reaches the sea and the safety of his homeland.⁹⁷ Having arrived, the province of Fars rallies to him, allowing him to depose Ardawan and claim his crown. Again, as in the application of Sequence One, a comparison of this section of the *Kārnāmag* with the account of Ṭabarī reveals the *tendenz* of the narrative. In Ṭabarī's

⁹³ In ŠhN 6, p.149, lines 231-234.

⁹⁴ This sudden pulling of the antagonist from rest or leisure involving the pleasures of court (alcohol, concubines or singers) to action is a minor motif of Sequence Two, one that appears to be part of the contrastive slant of the episode, cf. FGrH 90 F66, 26 = Lenfant (2004), F8d*, 26, FGrH 690.9 (Dinon), ŠhN 6, p.153, line 280 f., KNA, 3.14 and 4.1, and Lact. De Mort., 24.7.

⁹⁵ On the *xwarrah*, see Gnoli (1999).

⁹⁶ The fatalistic assesment of Ardawan's chances after the *xwarrah* has caught up with Ardashir is made by Ardawan's minister at KNA, 4.24 = ŠhN 6, p.155-156, lines, 325-329.

⁹⁷ Ogden considered the flight made by the Ctesian Cyrus and the Ardashir of KNA as part of a complex of legends, one iteration of which was attached to Seleucus. He theorises that a key motif of these stories is the crossing of a water boundary, in this case, reaching the sea, see the summary and tables provided at Ogden (2017), pp.71-75, and the consideration of Ardashir in particular at pp.82-84. It will be argued below that in the "historical" cases considered in this study, the flight of the subject from court follows a contrastive episode and leads on to an account of the acquisition, or inheritance, of military means, that is, it serves to connect a symbolic confrontation with a considerably more realistic one. It may be of interest in this regard that the fleeing Constantine had to cross the English Channel in order to reach his father.

telling, the Sasanian clan's political horizons were very constrained; Ardashir was indeed fostered out, but only to a subordinate of Ardawan's underling, the regional king of Fars, certainly not to the court of the Great King himself. Likewise, the revolt of Pabag's family would seem to have been a purely local affair that it took Ardawan some time to notice or respond to.⁹⁸ It is most likely that Ardashir and Ardawan never actually met before the climactic battle in which Ardawan was killed. Why then is Ardashir given such an immediate association with his victim in the image of history proffered by the *Kārnāmag*? The question is doubly puzzling as giving Ardawan a starring role would seem to run counter to the general tendency in later Sasanian historiography to ignore and degrade Ardawan and his dynasty as much as possible.⁹⁹

Placing Ardashir in Ardawan's court may resurrect Ardawan's memory in a way that is hard to reconcile with the preferred positions of late Sasanian historiography, but, in conforming to Sequence Two, it also provides a recognizable staging in which Arsakid, or pro-Arsakid, claims may be negated: first by the juxtaposition of a prodigious youth of high descent with a jealous tyrant whose rule is based on force alone; and secondly by a clear indication, via the omen, that the youth's ascent is divinely ordained. This is seen most clearly in the Middle Persian version where a great deal of emphasis is placed on the divine will. When Ardashir hears the concubine's report of the horoscope cast for Ardawan he replies:

“If the gods have entrusted to us the *xwarrah* of *Ērān* we will well acquit ourselves and come to a good end.”¹⁰⁰

⁹⁸ According to Ṭabarī, it was the illegal construction of the city of Ardašir Xwarrah/Gur that drew a response from Ardawan, see Ṭabarī, p.11. The construction of this city and the hilltop fortress of Qaleh Doxtar (a cliff top fortress whose construction must have presented quite a technical challenge) *before* Ardawan's defeat suggest that Ardashir had a considerable amount of time to prepare. Ardawan was evidently distracted. Whether he had underestimated the threat, needed time to marshal sufficient forces to counter it, or had more pressing concerns is impossible to say, see Huff (2008), p.35 f. and Daryaei (2010), p.249.

⁹⁹ The adjective often used by later Perso-Arabic sources to describe the rulers of the Arsakid period is *ṭawāʿif*. This is an Arabic term that is usually translated as “tribal”, “regional” or “petty”, ie. kings. Given its concordance with the picture of Iran after Alexander as a kingless kingdom, it seems likely to derive from an influential Arabic translation, *perhaps* that of Ebn al-Moqaffa’.

¹⁰⁰ KNA, 3.11. Ferdowsi, possibly due to a reluctance to make explicit references to the old gods, puts a much more neutral response in Ardashir's mouth, see ŠhN 6, p. 151, lines 259-60.

It is also telling that despite his already demonstrated superiority to his Arsakid hosts, and Pabag's reference to the "miraculous power" he holds, Ardashir remains dormant until this sanction is given. In fact, there is a hint that the court episodes seen in KNA and the *Šāhnāme* that hKNA may have been at pains to minimize any unseemly dissent that might be discerned in its narrative. Pabag's loyalty, or rather his inability and unwillingness to defy Ardawan, is emphasized in each; first in his quick obedience to Ardawan's summons and then in his letter warning Ardashir not to take any rash actions after being punished for presumption.¹⁰¹

Thus the *Kārnāmag*'s use of Sequence Two developed the claims of Ardashir's bloodline set up by the use of Sequence One; it provided the young Ardashir a stage on which his actions, and the heavens themselves, validate his fitness to rule in full view of the "illegitimate" house of Arsakes. Bringing victor and vanquished together in this way ensures that the personalized, *contrastive* theme of Sequence Two is dominant: the exchange of words at the hunt serves to crystallise the meaning of the entire episode. It is a highly artificial edifice in which very little - aside from some geographic detail, the names of the players and the establishment of Sasanian rule - can be viewed as even remotely plausible. In this it typifies the odd mixture of the real and the stereotypically unreal that makes hKNA and its descendants difficult to categorise and has led to a number of appraisals suggesting a romantic intent and/or a popular origin.¹⁰²

¹⁰¹ ŠhN 6, pp.143-144, lines 151-162 and and p.147 lines 199-208 = KNA, 2.8-9 and 2.24-30. Note, Knapp (2012), p.64.

¹⁰² "Das Buch von den Thaten des Artachšîr... kann nicht als ein geschichtliches Werk gelten", Nöldeke (1878), p.22, "The *Kārnāmag* was written at a time when information regarding the particulars of Ardashir and his successors was available. (emphasis mine) Thus, we see that the *Kārnāmag* was, like epic narratives, a collection (az...ānbāšteh ast) of customary wonders and imaginings, of "national" beliefs and legends. It follows that the *Kārnāmag* was not written with the intent of giving an account of the historical circumstances of the founder of the Sasanian dynasty, nor was the goal of the author to coin a fresh or creative story for Ardashir. Rather, with the passage of time, stories and particular narratives of the founder of the Sasanian empire had come into being among Iranians; stories that were naturally mixed up with epical concepts (*afkār*). We see similar concepts in the life of Cyrus, the founder of the Achaemenid empire, the history of whose life and deeds also mixed up with legends and stereotypical marvels." Safa (2011), p.148. "The native, popular story" Frye (1964), p.47, "evidently the work of priests... generally romantic character..." Boyce (1968), p.60, "the compilers of the *Kārnāmag* followed popular beliefs that were bound neither to historical truth, nor to the legal strictures of the Sasanian (period). The *Kārnāmag* was, without doubt, the product of a region of partisans and well-wishers of the dynasty, men learned in Pahlavi literature", Shaki (1990), p.80. Note however, "Most probably it was

Here Sequence Two was employed to construct a past in which the Arsakids were deposed by something much higher than mere force of arms. The association of this sequence with Ardashir ought to be viewed as argumentative, as advancing certain positions for the consumption of a live historiography. It was a presentation of alternative facts in which some of the harder edges of Ardashir's story were made to disappear. Like the fanciful paternity with which it was fused, this tale of courtly confrontation and escape speaks to a tension between the grand restorative claims of the Sasanian state and the dynasty's obscure and middling origins. That this lack of pedigree was keenly felt can be seen elsewhere in the *Kārnāmag*.

hKNA appears to have closed with the origin stories of Ardashir's son Shapur I, and his grandson Ormazd I. These were extremely similar narratives in which Sequence One was used to give each of the Sasanian princes a maternal link to a fallen aristocratic house. Though both made a case for Sasanian legitimacy they did so in an extremely ambivalent way, grafting the earliest Sasanian kings to noble families that Ardashir has pledged to destroy. In both, the legitimacy of the pre-Sasanian ruling classes is simultaneously rejected and claimed in terms so purely typological as to forbid any connection with historical reality. These stories can, however, tell us a great deal about the *conditions* of historical memory in the Sasanian period as well as the structure and sources of hKNA. The presence of not one, but *two* such narratives in KNA and the *Šāhnāmeḥ* is yet more evidence that Sasanian antecedents presented serious problems and that a number of genealogical claims were circulated to address this issue. The use of essentially the same story for father and son suggests that the stereotypical nature of the narrative itself was seen to hold explanatory power. Finally, the repetitive nature of these stories, alongside certain features of the birth of Ormazd, suggests that the two stories were conceived independently and were poorly harmonised at a later date.

created with the purpose of providing the rising Sasanian dynasty with a past equal to its ambitions" Cereti (2011).

3.4.5 Shapur: Sequence One

Ardashir's son Shapur I ruled from c.240-270. His precise date of birth is unknown but he must have participated in his father's campaigns against the Arsakids and was probably crowned as co-ruler in his father's lifetime.¹⁰³ Shapur was, by pre-modern standards, an excellent king. His reign, according to the bulk of the Perso-Arabic sources, was marked by a successfully aggressive policy against Rome, extensive building projects, and a resultant economic and technical expansion.¹⁰⁴ In Greek and Latin historiography he is famous as the sacker of Antioch and the captor of Valerian, an event that Islamic era texts linked to the construction of the famous barrage and citadel at Shustar in Khuzestan, though one that they sometimes confused with the confrontation of Shapur II (r. 309-79) and the Roman emperor Julian a century later.¹⁰⁵ Gorged on this surfeit of royal glory, most of the chronicle tradition would seem to have had very little use for the circumstances of Shapur's birth and youth.

Someone, however, did. A tradition forging a blood link between Shapur and the Arsakids by way of his mother was known to several writers of the Islamic era. Dīnavarī believing Ardawan to have lived some time before Ardashir's emergence, imagined Shapur's mother as the last of Ardawan's descendants.¹⁰⁶ Most of the extant material knows her as Ardawan's daughter. Ṭabarī included a version of this story very close to that provided in KNA and the *Šāhnāmeh*, fatally contradicting his just completed narrative of the battle of Hormazdagan by pivoting from the young Shapur's bravery before Ardawan to describe his conception *after* the death of Ardawan. The story itself is a relatively clean version of Sequence One (see Table 7).

Minor differences exist between the various versions of this episode, but it is possible a composite summary is possible. Shapur is made the son of an Arsakid princess who is sentenced to death by Ardashir for her bloodline (Dīnavarī, Ṭabarī) or an attempt to

¹⁰³ Ṭabarī, 826, p.27, Bal'amī, p.884, Mas'udi. Muruj, p.160.

¹⁰⁴ See, for example ŠhN, 6, pp.245-249, lines 61-103, Mas'udi. Muruj, pp.163-164, Ḥamza, pp.33-34, and, mixed up with other material detailing Shapur's sieges of Nisibis and Antioch, a statement that Shapur was most just and saw to the improvement of the provinces, Ebn Beṭrīq, 10.5.

¹⁰⁵ See n.160 below.

¹⁰⁶ Dīnavarī, p.280 and p.282 (p.42 and 45).

revenge her father by poisoning Ardashir (*Šāhnāme*h, KNA).¹⁰⁷ Ardashir's minister is given the task of carrying out this sentence when the condemned woman states that she is carrying Ardashir's child.¹⁰⁸ In the version reported by Ferdowsi and KNA, Ardashir is informed but angrily insists on the penalty.¹⁰⁹ Wanting to hedge his bets, the minister hides her in his own household, castrates himself, seals his severed genitals in a box and asks Ardashir to put said box in his treasury.¹¹⁰ Years later, when Ardashir laments his lack of an heir, his minister asks the king to open the box and secures an amnesty. The minister tells Ardashir that an heir exists. Ardashir summons the boy along with a crowd of other aristocratic youths to the palace, where he immediately recognizes his son.¹¹¹ Confirmation comes however during the polo match when Shapur is the only boy bold enough to enter the royal pavilion in search of a lost ball.¹¹²

The story, with its emphasis on recognition by resemblance and the use of a game, is strongly reminiscent of the finding of the Herodotean Cyrus, though, as the revolution has already occurred, the reunion between generations here represents the joyous replication of a dynasty rather than its tragic fall. Ardashir's lack of an heir is very similar to the predicament (one assumes) of the Herodotean Astyages, and to that of his own "father" Pabag as described in KNA.¹¹³ One might also note that Ardashir's minister's understandable reluctance to be held responsible for the death of a possible heir is somewhat like that shown by Harpagus in the much older story.¹¹⁴ The claims made in this story contradict almost all the other evidence that can be drawn from the period. Shapur's mother is listed in ŠKZ as a certain Lady (*bānūg/κυρία*) Myrōd.¹¹⁵ Since none of our sources mention the Arsakid princess' name, there is no way of disproving

¹⁰⁷ Ṭabarī, pp.23-24, ŠhN 6, pp.194-196, lines 15-47, KNA, 10.1-11.

¹⁰⁸ Dīnavarī, pp.282-283 (p.45), Ṭabarī, 824, p.24, ŠhN 6, pp.96-197, lines 49-53, KNA, 10.13.

¹⁰⁹ ŠhN 6, p.197, lines 54-55, KNA, 10.14-15.

¹¹⁰ Dīnavarī, p.283 (p.45), Ṭabarī, pp.24-25, ŠhN 6, pp.197-198, lines 56-72, castration is not present in KNA, 10.16. On the self castration of a trusted advisor as a motif, see Ogden (2017), p.174 f.

¹¹¹ Dīnavarī, p.284 (p.46), Ṭabarī, pp.25-27, ŠhN 6, pp.197-202, lines 78-123, this sequence is largely followed in KNA, 11, but, possibly due to the summary nature of this redaction, there is no polo game.

¹¹² Dīnavarī, p.284 (p.46), Ṭabarī, 825, pp.26-27, ŠhN 6, pp.202-203, lines 124-139.

¹¹³ KNA, 1.5 and 11.4.

¹¹⁴ Cf. Herod, 1.109-110, KNA, 10.16, and ŠhN 6, p.197, lines 56-62.

¹¹⁵ ŠKZ §37.

that Myrod was an Arsakid. Shapur was, however, very much alive when the Arsacids fell from power.

As the contradictory narratives presented by Ṭabarī, and the depiction of a young Shapur in action in his father's victory relief at Firuzabad argue, Shapur was probably already his father's anointed successor in the early 220s. Assuming that the battle of Hormazdagan occurred sometime around 224, the latest possible date for Shapur's birth would fall sometime in the first decade of the 3rd century, at a time when Shapur's father, grandfather and uncle were petty nobility in open defiance of their overlord. It is unlikely that any member of such a family would have been considered an appropriate match for the Great King's daughter.¹¹⁶ Additionally, the prodigious 10th century *literatus* Mas'udi, quoting some *andarz* (wisdom) literature credited to Ardashir, mentions that Ardashir selected Shapur as he was the best of his children; it cannot, therefore, have been exclusively held, even by those sympathetic to the dynasty, that Shapur was an only child.¹¹⁷

Again, the existence of the story becomes far more explicable if it is understood as an argument about history rather than a history in the modern sense. Like the narratives that would become attached to Ardashir, the reworked birth of Shapur staked a political claim in the record, one with a recognized subtext that may have eased its assimilation into the wider network of historical "knowledge". Sequence One is used here to create a link between the family of a usurper and that of the usurped. Though the Arsakid bloodline is abjured and attacked either as responsible for an ancient crime or a cowardly attempted murderer, it is simultaneously claimed in the person of Shapur.¹¹⁸ Thus, in the hidden birth of Shapur, the house of Sasan is able to claim an Arsakid descent, a rather more concrete, and, evidently, enduring, alternative to the later myths of state. Simultaneously, as in Ardashir's own adoption to Pabag, an extremely simplified succession is presented.

¹¹⁶ Wiese Höfer places the overthrow of Gozchir in 205-6, see Wiese Höfer (2011).

¹¹⁷ Mas'udi. *Muruj*, p.160. Mas'udi also mentions an autobiography *cum* mirror for princes (entitled a *Karnāmaj*!) and an admonitory letter supposedly sent to his officials at *ibid.* pp.162-163.

¹¹⁸ See n.108-109 above.

3.4.6 Ormazd: Sequence One

It would appear that hKNA followed Shapur's recovery with the secret birth and discovery of Shapur's own son Ormazd I. Ormazd's origin story is another iteration of Sequence One (see Table 8) and very strongly resembles that of his father. Though seemingly perfunctory, this story is far more interesting than it appears. Its portrayal of an irascible Ardashir forced to deal with powerful rivals in a fractious realm, its specific and limited geographic staging and subtext of considerable violence, make the argument of this story rather transparent. While this episode's backhanded anxiety over hereditary is of a piece with the birth of Shapur, a number of features suggest that it was not only intensely local, but also quite early. Its seeming repetition of the themes and motifs associated with the preceding episode suggests very strongly that in both cases a recognisable narrative form was employed in order to prove a point. Moreover, the awkward doublet formed by these sequential episodes argues against them having been composed at the same time. Rather, the interchangeable nature of father and son is evidence of the composite structure of hKNA.

Worn down by years of fighting, Ardashir asks an astrologer what it would take to settle the realm. The astrologer replies that Ardashir must mix his line with that of his enemy Mihrag.¹¹⁹ Ardashir takes exception to this prophecy and has Mihrag's family killed, but one of Mihrag's daughters escapes.¹²⁰ Years later Shapur meets her in a village after a polo game; Ṭabarī's version suggests that Shapur attempted to rape her, but the version known to Ferdowsi and the writer of KNA certainly did not see things this way.¹²¹ Knowing that his father would be angry, Shapur keeps his relationship and the resulting son a secret, until one day Ardashir sees the boy playing polo. Impressed by the boy's bearing and noting the resemblance to himself, he demands to know the boy's paternity.¹²² The boy claims to be the son of Shapur, who is forced to admit the truth.

¹¹⁹ The getting of this prophecy is described at Ṭabarī, pp.40-41, ŠhN 6, pp.204-205, lines 164-182, KNA, 12.1-6.

¹²⁰ Ṭabarī, pp.40-41, ŠhN 6, pp.205-206, lines 187-200, KNA, 12.7-8.

¹²¹ Ṭabarī, p.41, ŠhN 6, pp.205-210, lines 205-249, KNA, 13.

¹²² The context of the game differs. Ṭabarī has Ardashir see the boy play with a polo stick while he is travelling, but Ferdowsi and the Middle Persian *Kārnāmag* stage the recognition in almost exactly the same terms as Shapur's. Ṭabarī, pp.41-42, ŠhN 6, pp. 210-211 lines 250-261, KNA, 14.1-9.

Ardashir, thinking the result of the prophecy to be not so bad after all, forgives his son and accepts his grandson.¹²³

Mihrag is an obscure figure with an ambiguous position in the chronology of a number of texts using *Kārnāmag*-like narratives. If he existed at all he can only have been one of the petty kings of Fars killed by Ardashir in his takeover of the province.¹²⁴ In KNA and the *Šāhnāme* he is described as a magnate “also from Fars” who waged war on Ardashir after the death of Ardawan.¹²⁵ Further, they claim that Mihrag attacked Ardashir taking advantage of the fact that Ardashir was engaged with Haftowad, perhaps another petty king of Fars, who is depicted as a sort of dragon-cult leader ruling from a coastal fortress.¹²⁶ Interestingly, KNA describes Mihrag’s attack as *mihrōdrujīh*, that is, oath breaking, leaving open the possibility that Mihrag was remembered in the composite as a traitorous ally of Ardashir.¹²⁷ Ṭabarī tells a slightly different story; he describes Mihrag as a local king, and tells us that he refused Ardashir’s call to obedience in the events following the death of Shapur son of Pabag. Ṭabarī states that Ardashir, killed Mihrag just after he had finished with Haftowad and just before he founded the city of Ardašīr-Xwarrah.¹²⁸

Mihrag’s kingdom, we are told by Ṭabarī, lay in the vicinity of this city: an assertion that complicates the chronology of the account seen in KNA and the *Šāhnāme*. Ardašīr-Xwarrah, also known as Gūr or Fīrūzābād, was founded by Ardashir and probably intended to solidify his power in Fars through the granting of land to his followers.¹²⁹ Ṭabarī’s source(s) supposed the act of its foundation to have been the trigger for Ardawan’s belated attack on the upstart dynasty.¹³⁰ Significantly, the *Kārnāmag* places

¹²³ Ṭabarī, p.42, ŠhN 6, pp.211-214 lines 262-295, KNA, 14.10-19.

¹²⁴ At Widengren (1971), p.715, he is called a figure of “royal legend”.

¹²⁵ *Mihrag ī Anōšagzādān az ham Pārs*. KNA, 8.1, at ŠhN 6, p.177, line 622 we are told that he is from “Jahram” (jhrm). Bosworth renders Mihrag’s kingdom as “Abarsās” in his translation of Ṭabarī, though see p.10, n.32.

¹²⁶ Mihrag’s refusal of Ardashir’s summons is given in, Ṭabarī, pp.10-11. In the *Kārnāmag* tradition Mihrag takes advantage of Ardashir’s war with Haftowad to strike at Sasanian territory, see ŠhN 6, pp.177-178, lines, 622-626, KNA, 7, and 8.1.

¹²⁷ KNA, 8.1.

¹²⁸ On the letters sent by Ardashir, see n.48 above.

¹²⁹ Such is the argument of Huff (2008), pp.37-39.

¹³⁰ Bosworth (1986). Ṭabarī reports Mihrag killed, Ardašīr-Xwarrah founded and Ardawan’s angry response, at Ṭabarī, pp.10-11. The actual foundation date of the city is somewhat vague, though Ardashir’s nearby palace-

the attack of Haftowad, the fall of Mihrag and the extermination of his house as occurring *after* the fall of Ardawan. It follows that hKNA would also have placed the foundation of the city after Ardawan's defeat and before Mihrag's death.¹³¹ If Mihrag is in fact a memory of a real person, the little evidence we have argues that the chronology presented by Ṭabarī is more plausible and that Mihrag died before Ardašīr-Xwarrah was founded.¹³² If the Sasanians rose to power by deposing their overlord, as insinuated by Ṭabarī, it would seem unlikely that any local ruler close to Ardashir's projects at Ardašīr-Xwarrah would have viewed their construction with aplomb. Moreover, as we shall see, Ardashir and the younger Shapur had few qualms and a rather forceful way of dealing with those who refused or hindered them. Finally, taking up arms against Ardashir on the ascent, after he had developed the area, secured a local powerbase and possibly after he had appropriated Arsakid resources, does not seem a particularly sensible course of action.

The stories of Mihrag's fall and Ormazd's link to his family may thus be suspected to refer to, if anything, the Sasanian conquest of Fars, that is, to the dynasty's *pre-imperial* stage. Additional support for the thesis that Ormazd's origin narrative was a story with early, extremely local, origins and constrained political applications can be found in the unlikely nature of its subject. Ormazd I ruled for only a single year and he almost certainly had no time to perform any noteworthy deeds. Indeed, later writers, and thereby, presumably, the chronicle tradition, gave Ormazd short shrift. They relate only a few general details, not entirely to his credit: he was brave, he was physically massive and might have piously persecuted Manicheans; he was not, however, up to his father's

fortress of Qal'aye-Dokhtar certainly predates his defeat of Ardawan, see Huff (2008), p.44. On a possibly relevant, though entirely anecdotal, note regarding the association of famous battles and cities: in 2012, while being driven from Shiraz to the ruins of Bīšāpūr, I was told by my driver that Shapur I had captured a Roman emperor in the narrows of the mountains through which we were travelling. I replied that the incident in question had actually occurred at Edessa in modern Turkey. Though this information was politely acknowledged, I doubt that it had any lasting impact on my driver's rather more attractive version of local history.

¹³¹ Ardašīr-Xwarrah is founded immediately after Ardawan's death at KNA, 5.13, and ŠhN 6, p.165, lines 657-658.

¹³² On the date, as well as the political and ideological significance of Ardašīr-Xwarrah, see Huff (2008), p.42 f. Daryaee, accepting that it was Pabag and the elder Shapur who took the lead in the revolt against the king of Fars posited that Ardashir moved to Ardašīr-Xwarrah *during* Pabag's revolt, see Daryaee (2010), p.248.

standard.¹³³ In his summary Ḥamza noted that the identity of Ormazd's mother, who he names as Gardzād, was the subject of a "well-known story", but this might be editorial comment and may not reflect the contents of the chronicles he was summarising.¹³⁴

Describing a series of events with little relevance outside of Fars, very likely occurring *before* the ascent of the dynasty to the imperial throne, resulting in the birth of a short-lived king with few memorable qualities to the daughter of a magnate with even less claim on the record, the presence of the birth of Ormazd in the *Kārnāmag* is a most informative inclusion. It is actually possible that Ormazd's story is one of the oldest parts of hKNA; that the story of the imperial, Arsakid origins of Shapur I was prefigured by the earlier use of a very similar story to attach his son to a family of local dynasts in a discourse aimed specifically at the local politics of Fars. The positioning of Ormazd's story so late in the narrative of KNA and the *Šāhnāmeḥ* may be a result of the need to reconcile two originally independent narratives.

Given the likely perfunctory nature of any records at this time and the maddening imprecision of extant royal epigraphy (for what little it is worth, there is no trace of a Gardzād in the list of personages made in ŠKZ), there is no reason to believe that exact genealogies of the first generations of the ruling family would have been recalled precisely or even widely known going into the 4th century. It would have been eminently possible for a blood connection between Mihrag and Ormazd to be drawn in Fars where memories of both men would have been strongest and the link would have been politically useful. Because it is doubtful whether Mihrag would have continued to have been considered a useful ancestor during the later stages of the empire, even inside Fars, an early date for the formation of this legend, maybe only one or two generations after Ormazd's death in c.273, seems fairly plausible.¹³⁵

That Shapur's maternity was remodeled in unreal and stereotypical terms is unsurprising; new imperial houses are obligated to explain themselves, especially those that have ascended through force of arms. That Ormazd became attached to a much less

¹³³ Ṭabarī, p.40, Ḥamza, p.34, Tha'alebī gives a very positive report, Tha'alebī, pp.498-499. Ebn al-Balkhī says that he was like his grandfather and that he persecuted Manichees, *Fārsnāmeḥ*, p.63.

¹³⁴ Ḥamza, p.34.

¹³⁵ De Jong uses a similar line of reasoning to date the origin of KNA close to the rule of Ormazd, De Jong (2013), p.38.

important family via the same story form indicates that the genealogical objections to the Sasanian dynastic project were serious indeed. Both narratives would seem to be connected to lingering memories of Ardashir's assault on the aristocratic establishment of his time. The wars cementing Sasanian rule over the old Arsakid state took some time to complete and *probably* began with a movement by Pabag (*not* Ardashir) against his direct overlord in Istakhr.¹³⁶ What is more, these wars left a clear impression in the wider culture. Indeed, even the most sympathetic renderings cannot avoid mention of the considerable violence enacted by Ardashir during this period.

Ṭabarī and Bal'ami recite a litany of kings felled before Ardashir's armies, giving some texture to the round number of dead dynasts given by Ḥamza and Ebn al-Balkhī, but the period attracted a number of more "romantic" treatments as well.¹³⁷ A considerably more violent version of the Princess and the Pea, for example, attached itself to Ardashir's, or Shapur's, conquest of a citadel in Iraq, became proverbial and *probably* crept into some redaction of the chronicle tradition where it was freely attributed to various kings.¹³⁸ Ṭabarī mentions a Bahraini king named Sanatruq who leapt to his death from his city's walls as Ardashir besieged them.¹³⁹ Likewise, Ḥamza tells a rather chilling story of Ardashir's treatment of the population of a Bahraini city that rebelled against him.¹⁴⁰

This version of Ormazd's origin shares with the Arsakid origin of Shapur not only a narrative frame, but the air of an excuse; they are "apologies" that do not so much deny

¹³⁶ Widengren (1971), p.734, Daryaee (2010), pp.244-246.

¹³⁷ Ṭabarī, pp.9-20, Bal'amī, p.879 f.

¹³⁸ This being the story of Dayzan's daughter; Dayzan is the lord of an impenetrable fortress, located by Ṭabarī at Hatra, besieged variously, by Ardashir (Ebn Beṭrīq, 10.1), Shapur I (Ṭabarī, pp.31-37), or (probably a case of elision with Shapur I) Shapur II (Dīnavarī, p.289). Falling in love with the besieging king, Dayzan's daughter betrays her father and opens the fortress with the promise that the king will marry her. In Ṭabarī's telling, the girl's inability to sleep on the mattress provided for her (she is bruised by a leaf that has fallen between the layers of silk) causes her to reveal to the king the extraordinary luxury in which her father had kept her. Shocked at her ingratitude and convinced that she will betray him in turn, the king has her torn apart between two horses or tied by her hair to a single horse and dragged to death. Ṭabarī cites a number of poets who used the incident and Bosworth has theorized that the incident entered Arabic language folklore via ebn Moqaffa' or Hisham al-Kalbī, see *ibid.*, p.31-32, n.97.

¹³⁹ Ṭabarī, p.15, Bal'amī, p.883.

¹⁴⁰ Ardashir supposedly rebuilt the walls of the city over the top of the corpses of the city's inhabitants. Ḥamza, p.33.

the destruction of noble houses as obviate the implications of their destruction by the construction of assimilative genealogies. Of course, none of this *precludes* the idea that Shapur actually did marry, or at least father a child with, the daughter of one of his father's fallen enemies; unlike the supposed Arsakid origin of Shapur himself, this is actually a rather likely scenario. What is odd is that any such arrangement would have become *phrased* in such a predictable, repetitive way. Ormazd's birth is, if anything, an even stronger expression of the motifs of Sequence One than Shapur's; prophecy has returned in the shape of an Indian magician, as has the attribution (via adoption) of a "rustic" origin for one or the other parent.¹⁴¹

The question and answer that opens the story of Ormazd's birth demonstrates the connection between these stories and the social upheaval associated with the early dynasty. Mixing the blood of Ardashir and Mihrag, Ormazd will settle the realm simply by existing.¹⁴² Ormazd's fanciful birth was an argument for Sasanian legitimacy, as in the case of his father, achieved by the total appropriation of a more prestigious bloodline. Sequence One, with all its associations with kingly origins, was used as a suitable form for answering critiques of *lineage*; it was, at least in these cases, a counter-polemical historical posture.

The presence of two very similar stories, the chronological ambiguities presented by each, and the dubious historicity of both demonstrates the composite nature of the *Kārnāmag* tradition, as well as its underlying structure of constructed, episodic, and historicising "biographical" narratives sharing a legitimist concern. It also indicates the existence of a specific set of commonplaces seen as apt for constructing this legitimacy. Ormazd's story is likely to have been an early expression of this revisionist literature. Far more constrained than the claim to imperial blood built for his father, the possibility that it belongs to an early, and local, layer of historical commentary makes it, in some

¹⁴¹ In the version of the story given by Ṭabarī, Mihrag's daughter was raised by shepherds, Ṭabarī, p.41. Her guardian is a farmer (*warzīgar*) according to KNA, 12.8. He is given a promotion by Ferdowsi where he is introduced as a *mehtar* (a word used by Ferdowsi in the general sense of an aristocrat, in this context, a local chief or headman), ŠhN 6, p.206, line 196. In all cases, the boy is, like Shapur before him, removed from the royal context and bought up by social inferiors.

¹⁴² ŠhN 6, p.204, lines 161-162, p.205, line 181-182 and KNA, 12.1-4.

ways, more interesting; particularly as a contrast to the constructed origin narratives of his grandfather Ardashir, which appear to have spread very far very quickly.

3.4.7 Other Attestations of Kārnāmag Origin Narratives

Some very early attestations of the origins sequences contained in the *Kārnāmag* are not Iranian. The earliest is the extremely hostile account of Ardashir's paternity presented in Agathias' 6th century *Histories*.¹⁴³ Agathias' report is almost a mirror image of Sequence One, a story in which all the contradictions of a prince with "humble" antecedents are played straight in order to tarnish its subject. Agathias' Pabag is a leather worker *cum* astrologer. Sasan is a wandering soldier who lodges with him. Somehow divining a great future for his guest's progeny, Pabag sends his own wife to Sasan's bed. Agathias links this information to the Persian records supposedly underlying his later summary of the chronicle tradition, but the story is far too derogatory to be in anyway official. Averil Cameron explained it as "Syrian bias" drawn from a "popular tradition" suggesting Agathias' informant Sergius as its likely source.¹⁴⁴ The supposition of a hostile remodeling is very probable, though it cannot be proved to have been Syriac and assumptions that the story was drawn from a "popular tradition", are complicated by the perverse relationship of Agathias' narrative to that seen in KNA and the *Šāhnāmeh*; most notably, the rather incongruous pairing of an artisan's and astrologer's trade and an unclear paternity resolved by a compromise between Sasan and Pabag.¹⁴⁵

Two later Armenian sources offer evidence that some kind of *Kārnāmag*-like text or texts circulated in Armenia in the early Middle Ages. In the 8th century the Armenian historian Moses Khorenats'i dismissed the signs and wonders he read of in a Persian life of Ardashir translated into Greek by a Persian convert to Christianity.¹⁴⁶ Though

¹⁴³ Agathias, *Hist.*, 2.27.2-3, Khorenats'i, p.217.

¹⁴⁴ Cameron (1969/1970), p.109.

¹⁴⁵ Agathias, *Hist.*, 2.27.4-5.

¹⁴⁶ Khorenats'i says that his account of Ardashir is based on a book, "The History of the First (Kings)" composed by a "Barsuma" known as "Rastsohun" (MP. *rāst saxwan* = "true speech") a Persian taken captive under Julian the Apostate, and translated by another captive, Eleazar *neé* "Khorohbut" into Greek. He briefly

Khorenats'i offers very little detail, his scathing appraisal of the supernaturalisms of this work mentions Pabag's dream and a horoscope leading to Ardashir's flight. Khorenats'i's curt dismissal of this source makes it impossible to know its precise contents, but we can say that it seems to have portrayed Ardashir's birth and time at court as a continuous narrative.¹⁴⁷

A more cryptic indication that some kind of biography of Ardashir was circulating in Armenia is BHG 714. This is an interpolation in a single, 12th century manuscript of a Greek translation of the late 5th century Armenian historian Agathangelos. This interpolation is not present in Armenian manuscripts of Agathangelos but does, on orthographic grounds, appear to have been a translation from an Armenian original.¹⁴⁸ Because the version of Agathangelos used by Simon Metaphrastes included this interpolation, the translation must have entered one stream of the Greek tradition between the 5th and the 10th century.¹⁴⁹

The interpolation describes a prophecy seen by Ardawan who is depicted here as adept in astrology, the treachery of his maidservant and the defection of the nobility to Ardashir in terms that argue strongly for a link to the same tradition that underlies the court sequence seen in KNA and the *Šāhnāmeḥ*. If so, this version appears to have been subject to some very specific editing. The interpolation is part of a history focused on the downfall of the Arsakids and the conversion of Armenia to Christianity. It takes place at Ardawan's court and seems to portray Ardashir as an established nobleman

dismisses the fabulous elements of this work, mentioning, among other things, Pabag's dream, an association of Sasan with a fiery vision, a prophecy of the "Chaldeans" and a plot of Ardashir, he promises to relate from it only information that is both plausible and true, Khorenats'i, pp.213-214. *nb.* Khorenats'i.

¹⁴⁷ Cf. Ibid., ŠhN 6, p.140 f. and p.152 f., KNA, 1.8-20 and 4.11 f.

¹⁴⁸ Plut. VII.cod. Gr. 25. Held in the Laurentian Library. The Armenian origin of this interpolation and its relationship to the life of Gregory the Illuminator used by Metaphrastes was noted as early as 1762 when the MS was published in the *Acta Sanctorum*, see *Acta*. SS. VII, p.315 and p.324, n.l (text published pp.320-323). The connection between these texts, KNA and Ferdowsi was first noted in Nöldeke's German translation of KNA but seems to have received very little attention in more recent times, see Nöldeke (1878), p.324. The interpolation itself is certainly a later addition and not connected to the original text, see Thomson (2011). An English translation joining the two has been made recently in Muradyan and Topchyan (2008) and has been adapted for use here, though its very brief commentary sheds very little additional light on the problem.

¹⁴⁹ The final paragraph of the interpolation is unreadable in the MS but can be reconstructed by reference to PG. 115.948.B-C.

rather than a young ward.¹⁵⁰ Additionally, his confrontation with Ardawan during the hunt and his flight from court, are missing. Parallels can be seen, however, in the *Kārnāmag* texts' renditions of the hunting scene and the interpolation's construction of the fall of Ardawan. Consider first the interpolation's staging of the Persian nobles' ultimatum and Ardawan's death at the hands of Ardashir:

"King Artabanes [*Ardawan*], hanging his head for many hours and looking at the floor, foresaw the future fall of his kingship and looking at the envoys said: "**I am the cause of this insolence**, for I have honored some [of you] with offices and magistracy or have allowed others to become rich by royal gifts making many people owners of estates and possessions."¹⁵¹

The climax, which is illegible in the interpolated manuscript and therefore taken from Metaphrastes, also suggests a familiarity with the "Persian" rendition:

"The latter [*Ardashir*] (*for he had good hands in shooting with a bow* and was always very zealously successful in this) pretended a flight but being persecuted cast an arrow to the breast of the persecutor, which became irresistible thanks to the shooter's strength, and piercing Artabanes' armour, **passed through the breast and issued from the back** and at once showed Artabanes dead."¹⁵²

Compare the above with the version of the hunt given by Ferdowsi:

"Ardashir raced ahead of Ardawan as he drew near he put an arrow in his bow
He struck the backside of a jack, **arrow and feathers passed right through the onager**

Ardawan arrived at this time he saw the young man's deed

"Who shot this onager? He said "may his hand be blessed"

...

Ardawan grew very angry at this, he shouted at the young man [*Ardashir*]

¹⁵⁰ The interpolation describes Ardashir as ἡν τινί τῶν μεγιστάνων, Acta. SS. VII, p.321. (section 4 in text)

¹⁵¹ Ibid. p.322 (section 7 in text). This and the following translation are based on that made by Muradyan and Topchyan.

¹⁵² PG. 115,948.B-C.

He spoke harshly “**this is my fault**, whose upbringing was mine
Why should I take you hunting and and feasting with my retainers
So that you outdo my son, and make a display of your nobility and boldness?”¹⁵³

Finally, the version of this incident given in KNA:

“One day, Ardawan, with his entourage and Ardashir had gone hunting. An onager suddenly passed by on the plain, Ardashir and Ardawan’s older son rushed after it. Ardashir reached it, and **shot an arrow such that the feathers went through its gut and out the other side.**”¹⁵⁴

In the Armenian interpolation, the story has been cut down in such a way as to subvert the Persian narrative and deny Ardashir the clearly expressed approval of heaven. In the first instance, Ardashir is introduced as a man of high rank, already a member of Ardawan’s entourage. No precocious youth, he is given no aristocratic activities by which he might signal his innate right. Ardawan’s fall is thus the result of bad luck, misplaced trust and opportunism, capped by the Persians’ loyalty to their clan over their king. Yet Metaphrastes’ statement that Ardashir’s used a trick shot to kill Ardawan suggests that the author of this version is likely to have known the *entire* story. It is also telling that even here, the horoscope, the signal of divine interest and predestination, may be minimized or sidelined but just as in Agathias, cannot be erased.

Any reconstruction of the relationship between the extant Perso-Arabic texts and the source of this Armenian version, whatever it was, can only be conjectural. Indeed very little at all can be said for certain about it. The authors of a recent consideration of this interpolation believed that the writer’s sympathies lay with Ardawan, and certainly he is here a rather tragic figure.¹⁵⁵ Assuming that the interpolation’s Armenian source was an adaptation of a Persian tradition, some Hellenisation may be just discernable; its author may have had Herodotus’ calculating Cyrus in mind when describing Ardashir’s

¹⁵³ ŠhN 6, p.145, lines, 181-184, p.145, lines, 189-192.

¹⁵⁴ KNA, 2.13-14.

¹⁵⁵ Muradyan and Topchyan (2008), p.1-2.

appeal to a council of Persian and “Assyrian” noblemen.¹⁵⁶ The most significant feature of this narrative is, however, the way in which certain features of the Perso-Arabic texts are either not present, or have been altered in order to change their meaning. As in Agathias’ recasting of Sequence One, we see here the survival of the components of Sequence Two in a narrative hostile to the subject. Ardashir’s revolt is thus given a fated, but ultimately negative, spin which stands in high contrast to the overtly approving tone of the “mainstream” of the tradition. The interpolation should remind us that the descriptions of events contained in the *Kārnāmag* are politically charged claims about the proper shape of history, claims that evidently did not pass uncontested into posterity.

It should be noted that in addition to his reuse of a divinizing court story, the writer behind the interpolation was either not interested in or did not know of the salacious stories of low birth and possible fratricide also attached to the birth of the dynasty. Since, from the perspective of Armenian Christian writers, the advent of Ardashir was the origin story of a family of aggressively meddlesome pagans who had victimized a dynasty of converts and vigorously supported the partisans of the old religion in Armenia, the first option does not seem likely.¹⁵⁷ One would expect them to have eagerly employed the most derogatory material possible to describe such people. It follows that the darker versions of Sasanian origins were often simply not known or accessible. Here one of the origin sequences used in hKNA would seem to have crowded out competing narratives, forcing a hostile group to rework rather than oppose it. In this odd addition to an Armenian hagiographic history we perceive how useful the employment of recognizable motif is when presenting an argumentative history.

¹⁵⁶ cf. Acta. SS. VII, pp.321-322 (5-6 in text) and Herod, 1.125-6 and FGrH 90 F66. 16-19= Lenfant (2004), F8d* 16-19).

¹⁵⁷ The work of Łazar P’arpec’i and Elishē, two historians who probably worked during the sixth century, give some indication of the hostility of Armenian Christians towards the powerful and decidedly non-Christian house of Sasan. In recounting the war of Yazdegird II (r.439-57), against Armenian rebels who had rejected his demand that they abandon Christianity, both writers cast their Iranian antagonists as royal persecutors of the most traditional type. See, for example, the characterization made of the king in Elishē, p.68, f. and P’arpec’i, p.75 f. Parallels to the Syriac tradition of martyr *acta*, and indeed even to Manichean traditions of the death of Mani, can be seen in the portrayal of magi and officials surrounding the throne pouring poison into the king’s ear.

The use of heroic and stereotypical modes of representation generated a virtuous circle of reproduction, a sort of historiographic version of Gresham's Law. Overtly their subtext was widely understood and covertly, their propositions, even denied, were difficult to dislodge. As the curious case of the "Syriac" and Armenian inversions demonstrates, the origin narratives seen in the *Kārnāmag* spread very far, very fast and well outside of the social group that could be expected to find them edifying visions. Indeed these narratives were even capable of colonizing negative appraisals of their subject. It is not possible to prove, but it may be suspected that origin narratives, something like the Persian text mentioned by Khorenats'i, circulated widely in some written form and may even have been translated into the empire's other languages. Having rendered more complicated accounts of Sasanian origins uncommon, it "leaked" thence into historical writing in much the same way that a tendentiously Christian, Syriac "novel" of Julian came to reshape later Greek and Arabic accounts of that emperor's death.¹⁵⁸

Khorenats'i's skepticism aside, we may be reasonably sure that by the early Middle Ages the birth and court narratives associated with the *Kārnāmag* had expanded to fill much of the available historiographic space surrounding the foundation of the Sasanian dynasty. Whether widely believed or not they continued to be considered more or less suitable material for historical writing into the Islamic period, even when it is clear that they were not the only source available to the writer. Ṭabarī's patchy use of this sort of material has already been referenced throughout this discussion. Another striking example of the acceptance of these narratives as somehow historical can be found in one of the earliest known attempts to craft a universal history in Arabic, Dīnavarī's *Book of Lengthy Histories*.

¹⁵⁸ A "novel" that manages the seemingly impossible task of becoming a work of praise directed towards the deeply uninspiring Jovian, see the translation of Gollancz (1928), see also Drijvers (2011). Large parts of its account of Julian's unsuccessful expedition worked its way into Arabic historiography, though, in telling of a captive emperor punished by Shapur II, somehow mixed up with a Persian account of the captivity of Valerian under Shapur I, see Ṭabarī, pp.58-65 n.b. p.58 n.165 (and also p.59 n.4 in Nöldeke's translation and commentary), ŠhN, 6, pp.325-33, lines 443-566. Each part is presented separately in Mas'udi. Muruj, pp.181-186 and 323-324. Jovian's refusal to lead a non-Christian people was also picked up in Greek church histories, see, Socrates, HE, 3.22, Sozomen, HE, 6.3 and Theodoret, HE, 4.1.4.

Dīnavarī's work is an early example of a literary and synthetic approach to historical narrative, something that makes his account of the life of Ardashir difficult to deconstruct. In this section he would seem to have consulted more than one source, one of which must have carried a *Kārnāmag*-like narrative of the birth of Shapur, albeit one different to that seen in KNA and the *Šāhnāme*.¹⁵⁹ Dīnavarī first grants paternity to Pabag in a genealogy very similar to that offered by Ṭabarī;

“...there arose Ardašīr son of Bābakān, and he was Ardašīr **son of Bābak son of Sāsān** the younger son of Fāfak son of Mahrīs son of Sāsān the elder son of Bahman the king son of Isfandyād son of Buštāsif...”¹⁶⁰

He follows with a brief, chronicle-like, appraisal of Ardashir's politics and motivations similar to that seen in Ḥamza *et al.*

“He arose in the city of Iṣṭahr and he gained the ascendancy in the restoration of the kingdom of Fārs to its rightful place.”¹⁶¹

Dīnavarī immediately pivots to a much longer narrative describing the birth of Shapur I, a narrative that is clearly derived from some version of the origin of Shapur seen in the *Kārnāmag*.¹⁶² Shapur's own following section, with its focus on successful war with Rome and constructions at Shushtar, is similar to that made by Ferdowsi and might ultimately derive from some version of a chronicle. The birth of Ormazd, in an extremely confused entry, is given no special significance.¹⁶³ It is important to note two things. First, like the Armenians, Dīnavarī saw components of the *Kārnāmag* as suitable material for history. Yet he would seem to have used them to supplement material drawn from a more straight-laced (though sometimes wildly inaccurate) set of sources

¹⁵⁹ Bonner (2015), p.41 *f.*, especially pp.50-53.

¹⁶⁰ Dīnavarī, p.282 (p.44).

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁶² *Ibid.* pp.282-284. (p.44-46).

¹⁶³ *Ibid.* p.288 (p.49). Ormazd reigned for one year but Dīnavarī gives him thirty, also crediting him with the execution of Mani and the destruction of his followers. Mani was actually executed by Ormazd's brother and successor Bahram I. In fairness, the identity of Mani's killer was a point of confusion in later sources with various writers crediting different Bahrams or even Shapur II. There is an intriguing echo of Dīnavarī's claim that Ormazd I was a persecutor of Manichees at Maqdisi, p.162 (where Ormazd is given the credit for Mani's execution) and the much later work of Ebn al-Balkhī, see, *Fārsnāme*, p.20 and p.34.

probably reliant on some form of the chronicle. Second, like Ṭabarī who followed his detailed account of Ardashir's origins with a contradictory account of the birth of Shapur drawn from a *Kārnāmag* like source, he either did not have, or did not decide to use, the entirety of the *Kārnāmag*.¹⁶⁴

3.5 The Usefulness of Typology

Between the straightforward, if unflattering, account of a dynastic coup known to Ṭabarī and the streamlined accounts seen in the chronicles known to Ḥamza, the various origin narratives built up of Sequence One and Two presented a sort of third option. They resolved some of the spikier details of dynastic foundation, dubious origins, usurpation and violence, not by ignoring them, but by presenting them according to received typologies. These typologies worked in concert with and expanded claims to divine right made from the very beginning of the dynasty, yet do not seem to have been integrated into the chronicle tradition in any consistent way. Moreover, the texture of these narratives is uneven in extant material. For these reasons the string of ostentatiously legendary stories of Sasanian origins seen in KNA and the *Šāhnāmeḥ* probably began life as disconnected, *ad hoc* responses to the political ruptures accompanying the establishment of the dynasty. Much more can be made of this happy convergence of legendary forms with dynastic need. The reappearance of Sequence One and Two in accounts of the early Sasanian dynasty should be considered as deliberate. There is a strong possibility that each narrative was purposefully extracted by and then preserved in a series of relatively early legitimizing rhetorics, some of which may have been composed in circles close to the royal house itself.

The decidedly non-Iranian literary precedent of Sasanian birth and court narratives examined above has not passed unnoticed. Indeed, their similarities to legends of Cyrus the Great known from the Greek literary tradition have been recognized for at least a

¹⁶⁴ On the difficulties involved in unraveling Dīnavarī's sources for Ardashir's reign, see Bonner (2015), pp.50-53.

century and a half.¹⁶⁵ As has been argued above, this linkage would connect components of the *Kārnāmag* with two forms of biographical representation whose oldest attestations are Mesopotamian and may date from the second millennium BCE. The problem with postulating such a linkage lies in demonstrating it in anything but the most general way. The temporal and linguistic gap between the Mesopotamian sources of the Akkadian *cum* Greek Cyrus and the Middle Persian Ardashir, even more so than the corresponding gap in our understanding of Hellenistic Fars, simply cannot be bridged by the paltry sources to hand.

Due to the state of the sources and the legendary cast of the material itself, reconstruction of the roots of the Sasanian historical tradition requires the creation, *ex nihilo*, of strings of invisible transmitters.¹⁶⁶ In this kind of inquiry there is something of a habit of relying heavily on the supposition of an oral tradition; in particular, the *Gōsān* or minstrel described by Boyce.¹⁶⁷ In the specific cases reviewed above, where relationships with non-Iranian, literary stereotypes of historicizing royal biography are strongly indicated, a much more interesting heuristic exists, one that better addresses the nature of the narratives in question and does so in a specifically Iranian context. With reference to the apologetic precedent of the narratives themselves, this approach argues that received narrative typologies were used in a deliberate and considered manner at the highest levels of society.

More than thirty years ago, in a short, comparative study of the titlature used in Achaemenid and Sasanian inscriptions, Oskar Skjraevø demonstrated extraordinarily close correspondences in the epigraphy of the two dynasties that lacked any specific connection.¹⁶⁸ Skjraevø's suggestion, that the reason for these similarities might lie in

¹⁶⁵ Links to Cyrus in general and to Ctesias' Cyrus in particular were postulated as far back as Bauer (1882), pp.68-69 and have been widely accepted ever since, see, Nöldeke (1979), pp.5-8 and 11-12, Pagliaro (1927), pp.xix-xx, Boyce (1968), p.60, Grenet (2003), p.31, Llewellyn-Jones and Robson (2010), Grenet (2003), p.65. Harmatta linked KNA to Herodotus' alleged use of Old Persian "*novelle*" (defined *extremely* broadly), see Harmatta (2002), p.197 f.

¹⁶⁶ It should be noted that an *extremely* detailed, though perhaps over-complicated and too specific, argument for the absorption of a memory of Cyrus' life and legend into the later Iranian legendary complex presented in the *Šāhnāme* is made in Dulęba (1995).

¹⁶⁷ Boyce (1957).

¹⁶⁸ Skjaervø (1985).

generations of self-reinforcing scribal *habit*, was expanded in Rahim Shayegan's *Aspects of History and Epic in Ancient Iran, from Gaumāta to Wāhnam*. Here Shayegan demonstrated a set of parallels in the images used to describe rebellion and its punishment in the Behistun inscription of Darius I, the Paikuli inscription of Narseh, and the mythical rebellion of the sorcerous tyrant Zahak in Ferdowsi's *Šāhnāme*.¹⁶⁹ Shayegan's texts span fifteen hundred years and cut across orality, literature, and epigraphy, suggesting that a stable collection of commonplaces had long been associated with the concept of revolt against rightful authority.¹⁷⁰ Moreover, though they appear in poetic or epic contexts, the images considered in Shayegan's study are more than purely artistic conventions. Their sometime application to historical events, in the case of the Paikuli inscription *contemporary* events recorded in monumental form, indicates that they were understood to impart a particular meaning and employed to generate a specific response.

The origins seen in the *Kārnāmag* were not as directly official as the Paikuli inscription. Despite this, Shayegan's omnipresent and immortal imagery of quashed rebellion is a very good model for understanding how Sequence One and Two work, why they work and how they become blended with historiography. It has been argued above that the centuries-deep memory of Sargon probably exerted enough pressure on the memory of Cyrus to reshape it before it was received into Greek. It has been suggested that this occurred because surface similarities in circumstances suggested the comparison to an audience primed to recognize it. Though the Sasanian origins used in the various texts considered above were more deliberate and directed constructions than the Babylonian reception of Cyrus appears to have been, their power lay in their reference to the same combination of circumstance and precedent.

The Sasanian origin legends reviewed above highlight how the needs of monarchies play a central role in the replication of each sequence. Pressed to defend himself, and

¹⁶⁹ Shayegan (2012b), p.109 f.

¹⁷⁰ Some traditions attached to the (rather confused) Perso-Arabic accounts of the capture and mutilation of Valerian by Shapur I (sometimes mistakenly attributed to Shapur II) may also have belonged to the set of images hypothesized by Shayegan. There is certainly an asinine overtone in the version of Valerian's punishment reported by Ferdowsi, see *ŠhN* 6, p.324, lines 434-7, more straightforward mutilations (of the feet and heels) are reported in Ṭabarī, 845, p.65 (the emperor is, however, sent back to Rome on an ass) and Mas'udi. Muruj, pp.184-185. See Shayegan (2012b), pp.153-155.

able to reward those who came to his defense, the person of a monarch was a likely focal point for the reintegration and re-propagation of long-entrenched, apologetically inclined narratives recognizable at all levels of society. Likewise, those sympathetic to a monarch's legacy were inclined to continue to confront criticism with elevated stereotype long after the subject's death. It may have been the need to defend Ardashir and his family that triggered the reappearance of Sequence One and Sequence Two in the historicising literature of the Sasanian period. We might usefully see the origins of these components of the *Kārnāmag* in attempts by the dynasty's partisans to recast its controversial antecedents in accordance with old legitimising patterns. An almost total lack of context for the Sasanian era makes claims of purposeful, partisan, and often literate transmission highly speculative. Yet, it will be seen in the next chapter that this is how Sequence One and Two made their way into the historiography of the later Roman Empire.

3.6 The *Kārnāmag* as Compilation

If discrete political and dynastic problems encouraged the association of Ardashir and his descendants with old stereotypes of royal childhood how are we to understand their coming together, that is, how may we position hKNA in the milieu of Sasanian or post-Sasanian letters? It has been argued that KNA was the product of the priestly class, sympathetic to the dynasty and conversant with Iranian legend.¹⁷¹ A slightly altered version of this hypothesis is quite likely; hKNA is indeed likely to have been priestly production. Whatever its *actual* religious positions the Sasanian state became strongly associated with a hieratic form of Zoroastrian practice. Priests or scribes subscribing to such beliefs, most likely based in Fars, would seem to have been the group most interested in portraying the foundation of the state as divinely approved and the most able to collate and publish the biographical text we can perceive under our much later

¹⁷¹ See n.104 above.

sources. Their motives for doing so were almost certainly less archival or antiquarian than they were identitarian; they sought to provide accounts of institutional origins that, while historically specious, were typologically and ideologically correct.

If the birth and court sequences seen in the *Kārnāmag* do not appear to have been part of the later dynasty's official or semi-official historical stance, this does not discount the probability that hKNA was created to argue a particular worldview. Here the issues of dynastic legitimacy responsible for the replication of ancient narratives used as sources were not the primary concern. Rather the overtly supernatural cast of these narratives, and their adherence to regal type, were adapted to argue a parallel cause. The hKNA was a sectarian text in which the foundation of the Sasanian Empire was turned into an incident in confessional history.

3.7 Conclusion

Enough circumstantial evidence can be extracted from the various texts referencing narratives of the *Kārnāmag* tradition to suspect that the narrative forms identified as Sequence One and Two were not only present in the historiography of the Sasanian period but were purposefully employed in a contested historical discourse. Some time later a number of these *ad hoc* solutions were compiled into a longer biographical history of the foundation of the state focused on the person of Ardashir. Due to the nature of the evidence it is very difficult to arrive at any more granular sense of the *Kārnāmag*; much can be suspected, but very little can be said with certainty about when each episode may have emerged, still less about the forms in which they may have been propagated. In order to proceed, some form of comparison is required, one in which similar material, under broadly analogous social and ideological pressures, was forced into a like shape.

In its use of ancient counter-polemical narrative sequences to impose meaning on dynastic origins, its eclectic structure, its likely collation then publication at the hands of adherents of a religious-imperial identity, and suspiciously apologetic position in the wider historiography, the hKNA and its descendants bear a remarkable resemblance to a

set of hagiographic legends of Constantine that come into view from the 9th century. These too are heterogeneous collections of historicized legend and historical data produced for communitarian consumption within a discourse in which contradictory information was, at least theoretically, available. The proposed connection is yet more intriguing as these texts also make use of Sequence One and Two to describe their subject's early life. The key difference between the Iranian tradition and the Greek hagiographies is that the antecedents of the latter are far better preserved; as a result, Constantine's origin legends are possible to deconstruct in ways that those of Ardashir and his successors are not.

Both sets of texts are, of course, the products of a very distinct cultural environments; yet this notwithstanding, the parallels between the two invite investigation. By examining the strata of Constantine's later legends we can see clearly how, and when, a version of Sequence Two was adopted and how it was initially used, very deliberately, as part of an early polemical discourse directed against the memory of rulers who had denied Constantine's claims. Constantine's association with Sequence One is less clear, however, suggestive mentions of his mother's occupation bespeaks the same kind of anxiety about lineage that is to be suspected in the *Kārnāmag*'s contortions of the infancy of the earliest Sasanian kings. In short, Constantine offers not only a possible chronology of the emergence of each sequence but a closer look at the particular problems that suggest them and the rhetorical screens that select, recycle and propagate them anew.

4

Constantine

In the Sasanian era the origins and early life of Ardashir, and his descendants, were several times reimagined as kingly fables. These were stories in which a gap in the record, or a selective use of historical memory, provided a structure for arguments asserting the legitimacy of the course of events; arguments expressed as variations on a pair of themes deeply embedded in the literatures of the region. Thus abstracted, untidy, even uncomfortable aspects of the rise of the early Sasanian dynasty were spun into the glittering threads that priestly hands wove back into the tableau of dynastic origins displayed in the *Kārnāmag* tradition. So much can be strongly inferred from the little information available. What is missing is any but the broadest sense of the means by which these narratives were reproduced, the motives for doing so or the audience intended to consume them.

Ardashir was not, however, the only Late Antique ruler whose life and actions came to occupy a pivotal place in the historical schema of a religious-imperial worldview. The favour shown to Christianity by the emperor Constantine I secured him a similar role in the Christian literatures of Eurasia. Because of the retrospective perception of his significance in the Christian era, versions of Constantine's deeds and victories multiplied as the cultural power of Christianity waxed, eventually to be recounted from Britain to Syria. The result is that renditions of Constantine's life, sometimes augmented to be of greater local significance, are abundant. Of this great mass of material, what interests us here are a small number of texts belonging a single "family" of Greek hagiography. At the core of these are three long, composite biographical works framed as historical narratives and largely drawing material from the Byzantine historical

tradition. Enmeshed in these texts are representatives of the same birth and youth narratives, Sequence One and Sequence Two, employed across texts connected to the *Kārnāmag* tradition. Unlike the extant iterations of the *Kārnāmag*, it is possible to break these longer texts down and trace the ancestry of their components with some precision.

This chapter will list the relevant texts, demonstrate the presence of each sequence in them, and then, as in the case of Ardashir above, compare these presentations to other currents in the historiography of Constantine. When this method is applied, useful details emerge regarding the timing, origins, and behavior of both narratives over time, details that may be usefully put to work in a consideration of the Persian tradition: most notably, the distinctly different and clearly separate origins of each, and the deep entanglement of both with an argumentative historiography, again, hinging on problems of *legitimacy* and *lineage*. This is not to argue that the careers or characters of these men were exactly parallel: Ardashir was an outsider, Constantine was not; nor was Constantine's time at court a fiction. Moreover, accession by purely military means was hardly unprecedented, or even illegitimate, in a 4th century Roman context. What links the two is the terms and processes of their later reception: each man presented roughly comparable problems of interpretation while "founding" roughly comparable memorializing systems; each attracted, as a result, the same patterns of interpretation. In the *Kārnāmag* tradition and the 9th century hagiographies, Ardashir and Constantine became the same *kind* of king: a divine appointee charged with ending the old world that the new may be born.

4.1 Core Texts

At the core of this study are three Greek texts that Alexander Kazhdan deemed especially significant in his argument that the eighth and ninth centuries saw the peak of literary interest in the emperor's life. Named for their editors, they are the *Guidi*, *Opitz*

and *Halkin Vitae* (hereafter they shall be referred to collectively as the *vitae*).¹ These categories are based on the schema of Freidhelm Winkelmann, who sorted the MS tradition into six main streams. His system was adopted by both Kazhdan and Samuel Lieu in their considerations of the Byzantine legends of Constantine and is used here.² Representing a range of dates between the ninth and the thirteenth centuries, these texts are conglomerations of components, drawn from a complicated and obscure network of texts that, in turn, rests on a largely invisible mass of even earlier traditions.

The earliest *vita* of Constantine considered by Winkelmann is somewhat extraneous to this study. This work, henceforth the *Winkelmann Vita*, was reconstructed on the basis of three hagiographies derived from the same tradition (BHG 365z, 336 & 366a).³ On the basis of an 8th century MS fragment and the presence of a reference to the (Western) Sylvester Legend, Winkelmann dated this tradition to the 6th century, though he left open the possibility of an earlier date, suggesting either the reigns of Theodosius II or Justinian I as possible times of compilation.⁴ The source texts of this *vita* may represent summaries of a shared prototype, though Winkelmann thought this unlikely.⁵ This tradition seems to have had very little interest in Constantine's youth. Conversely, much effort is expended on Constantine's reverential treatment of church officials, his foundation of Constantinople, and funeral. Though neither sequence is present in this *vita*, it has some minor relevance to our study insofar as it indicates the optional nature of these narratives and appears, like the *vitae*, to have been an attempt to build a relatively lengthy, historically plausible, and laudatory narrative out of heterogeneous material.

In this regard, the introduction of this text is of particular interest. Opening with the (likely) murder of Carinus, an immediate attempt, with a subtext of tyranny, is made to position events within a political context in which a chronology is implied, as in the *Kārnāmag* texts.⁶ Both the *Guidi* and *Halkin vitae* open with similar attempts at place-

¹ Kazhdan (1987), p.200 & 211.

² Winkelmann (1973), Lieu (1998), pp.152-5.

³ Text and commentary given in Winkelmann (1987).

⁴ Ibid. p.631.

⁵ Ibid. p. 625.

⁶ Ibid. pp.632-633.

setting, implying that a similar thought process underlies their construction. As inaccurate as some of their statements are, all of these texts are attempts to compound groups of disparate material into a plausible past. While tendentious, the *Winkelman Vita* contains little that could be considered legendary. The later *vitae*, however, give a detailed, and very familiar, account of Constantine's early life.

4.2 Constantine's Early Life According to the *Vitae*

Each *vita* gives a very similar version of Constantine's birth and youth. The story is made up of two parts, unfolding according to Sequence One and Sequence Two respectively. In outline the story proceeds as follows.

1) Constantius, while travelling on official business, stops at an inn. He has sex with Helena, who is working there in some capacity.⁷ Constantius experiences a post-coital dream-vision from which he senses that the encounter may be of some significance. He gives Helena gifts, including a purple cloak, and leaves.⁸ Constantine is born nine months later. Years pass and Constantius sends his companions out on a mission of some kind: in the older version of the story, they are looking for a suitable boy for Constantius to adopt in place of his imbecilic legitimate son. They stop at the inn where they are served by Helena and her son. When Constantine makes a move towards their horses, Constantius' agents discipline him causing him to get upset. Helena tells the men that they should not act in this way towards the king's son. The men demand proof of this assertion, and Helena displays her gifts. On returning to Constantius, the men tell the emperor of the young Constantine, stressing the boy's kingly bearing and resemblance to his father. Constantius arranges Helena and Constantine to be brought to him, and joyfully "adopts" Constantine.

⁷ In the *Guidi Vita*, Constantius is making an embassy to the Persians and Helena is the daughter of his "guide" (ξενάγωγός), Guidi (1907), p.308, lines 2-20.

⁸ Devos (1982), p.219, sec. 7, Guidi (1907), p.309, lines 22-24, Halkin (1959b), p.74 sec. 2, line 8, Dräger (2010), p.14 (3.3). Absent but implied in Halkin (1960), p.11, sec. 1.

2) Constantine is moved to the court of Diocletian or Galerius, for his own safety (to hide him from the designs of Constantius' legitimate wife), as a royal hostage, or in order to continue his education. Constantine excels, but in doing so arouses jealousy and fear in the heart of the host tetrarch: in some versions, an omen announces his destruction of the old religion. The tetrarch is moved to plot against Constantine's life. In two of the *vitae* this plot takes the form of a combat against animals in the arena. Constantine is, however, protected by God, and thus escapes, fleeing to his dying father in Britain. In some versions he expects to be pursued and takes measures against this possibility. Constantine arrives just in time to receive the dying Constantius' blessing. Though the core of the narrative presented in these three texts is extremely similar, there are significant differences in detail, differences that point to the use of different sources and, just as importantly, the endurance of particular *themes* in each sequence.

4.3 The Vitae

BHG 364 - the *Guidi Vita*. This was a very popular *vita* of probable mid- to-late 9th century date.⁹ Although like the *Winkelman Vita* it too begins with the murder of Carinus and a summary of the political situation at the beginning of Diocletian's rule, this text displays a keen interest in Constantine's origin. Indeed, almost all of the motifs used here are also present in the other two *vitae* to be considered, making the *Guidi Vita* either very influential in or very representative of Byzantine beliefs about this subject in this period. It contains a full and elaborate rendition of Sequence One, in which Constantine is said to have been the product of a one-off liaison in an inn, and then to have worked there with his mother before being recognized by his father's agents and "adopted" back into the imperial household. It also alludes to components of Sequence Two in briefly describing his escape from the murderous designs of Diocletian and Galerius. Though the *Guidi Vita* may be viewed as indicative of trends in the reconstruction of the

⁹ The Greek text was edited and published in Guidi (1907) For a translation of which see Lieu and Montserrat (1996), p.97, f.

emperor as a type during the Middle Ages, its portrayal of origins does not make extensive use of Sequence Two. In contrast to the rich presentation of Sequence One, the iteration of Sequence Two presented here is vague and anaemic, lacking details seen in texts more than four hundred years older. In this matter, the *Guidi Vita* appears to follow Eusebius whose presentation, as will be shown, omitted certain “heroic” details that had previously been attached to this moment.¹⁰ The ur-compiler of the *Guidi Vita* either did not know or chose not to incorporate these details. They would reappear, however, in the work of other hagiographers addressing the life of Constantine.

BHG 365 - the *Opitz Vita*, dated to sometime between the end of the 9th and the end of the 11th centuries.¹¹ A mixture of earlier material including Eusebius, Theodore Lector and Socrates: both Opitz and Bidez saw the work of the Anomoean historian Philostorgios as underpinning some of this *vita*, though possibly mediated by recom compilations in some obscure fashion.¹² Kazhdan and Lieu also noted its use of unorthodox, even non-Christian, texts.¹³ These exotic sources may explain why we can see here some very old elements of Constantine’s biography resurfacing in the narrative. The beginning of this *vita* is fragmentary, with most of Constantine’s youth in the inn (Sequence One) missing. The real interest of the *Opitz Vita* lies in its greatly expanded presentation of Sequence Two. Here the plot made by the antagonist Tetrarch (in this case Galerius) against the young Constantine is fleshed out, with aristocratic hunting games becoming the means by which he seeks to kill the young prince. This version of events sees the young Constantine, aided by God, ward off a lion, a bear, and a leopard.¹⁴ Likewise, this *vita* states that Constantine lamed post-horses behind him in order to avoid pursuit.¹⁵ Neither of these elements occur in Eusebius but can be traced

¹⁰ Eusebius. VC. 19-21.

¹¹ The text of this *vita* was published in Opitz (1934). Parts of its lost beginning have been published in Bidez (1935) and Halkin (1960).

¹² Bidez (1935), p.404, a list of parallels to be found in this section of the *vita* is made at Opitz (1934), pp.591-593. See also, Bidez (1935), p.404 and p.182 below.

¹³ Kazhdan (1987), p.202, Lieu (1998), pp.153-4.

¹⁴ Amidon (2007), p.241, n.8 notes that a similar turn of phrase can be found here between Bidez (1935), p.422 Lact. De Mort., 24.

¹⁵ Bidez (1935), p.422.

right back to the early 4th century, within Constantine's own lifetime: similar claims appear in the works of Lactantius and the shadowy Praxagoras of Athens.¹⁶

The *Opitz Vita* provides considerably more detail than either of these works, and may, particularly in the animal combat, offer a window into a much older layer of the representation of the plot against Constantine. This representation, it will be seen below, was probably a deliberate, tendentious and dramatic remodeling of a rather anodyne reality. By repeating this ancient staging in a hagiographic biography, the *Opitz Vita* signals a certain continuity in the *meaning* of this representation. Constantine's public defeat of beasts was a stage on which a contrast between legitimate and illegitimate monarchy could be made. Moreover, it was one in which a usefully ambiguous divine power might very easily be conscripted. It was therefore just as useful in the 4th century as it was in the 9th or 10th. A comparison with the final *vita* considered here is most telling in this regard: in this text some of these themes are even more developed and even more explicitly referenced.

BHG 365n - the *Halkin* or *Patmos Vita*, dating to the 12th to 13th century.¹⁷ In addition to its probable cannibalism of earlier *Guidi*-like *vitae*, this *vita* makes use of Alexander the Monk's *De Inventio Crucis*.¹⁸ A thoroughly garbled presentation of historical detail drawing heavily from the *Passio Eusignii*, the *Halkin Vita*'s reworkings of the narrative familiar from the *Guidi* and *Opitz vitae* grant it much literary and ideological interest, if not historical significance. In staging Constantine's youth, it shares the general outline of the two previous *vitae*, though it has altered a number of details. This is most significant in its rendition of the beast combat in the arena. In the *Halkin Vita* this has been greatly expanded with Constantine taking Galerius' place in a ritualized combat involving a public acclamation of the king's virtue.¹⁹ Thus the *Halkin Vita* explicitly, and rather heavy handedly, acknowledges this as a *contrastive* episode in which the hand of the divine was at work.

¹⁶ See p.175 below.

¹⁷ Edited and printed in Halkin (1959b), and Halkin (1959a).

¹⁸ Halkin (1959b), pp.70-71. Alexander the Monk wrote at some point between the 6th and 9th centuries but is extremely difficult to date with any certainty; Kazhdan (1987), pp.199-200.

¹⁹ Halkin (1959b), p.77, sec. 3, lines 21-31.

The *Halkin Vita*'s rather obvious staging offers support for what has been argued above in relation to Ardashir: Sequence Two is an argument of a very specific type. It exists to strike a comparison between the illegitimacy of the man "deposed" and the legitimacy of the man who deposed him alongside a clear statement of the latter's divine election. A victorious, public combat is merely an unsubtle extension of the claims of beauty, skill in war, and courtly manners generally asserted in this kind of story though it is not required, and the extant legends of Sargon and Cryus do not appear to use one. The parallel use of such a set piece in the court narratives of Ardashir and Constantine is rather interesting: we see here the attraction of a single motif to a specific story form in very disparate cultural contexts. The implications, meaning, and possible antecedents of this component will receive more attention later in this chapter.

As composite "biographical" texts claiming historicity but using typologically stereotypical narrative forms to portray birth and youth, the *vitae* are comparable to the texts of the *Kārnāmag* tradition. This chapter aims to extract these components and deconstruct their development before their incorporation into the longer, composite narratives represented by the *vitae*. It will do so with reference to a number of texts from the Greek and Latin historical and hagiographic tradition dating from the 4th century through to the Middle Ages. The resulting "stratigraphy" shows each component to have been the product of an entirely separate development. Moreover, it suggests that the roots of each may be found, definitively in one case, in political or ideological claims, or difficulties, current in Constantine's own lifetime.

4.4 Sequence One: The Inn Narrative

The outlines of Constantine's conception and boyhood in an inn, the tokens left to his mother, and his recognition then "adoption" by Constantius narrated in all of the *vitae* are so similar that a tight relationship between all three may be supposed. A seventh century model text for the *Guidi Vita* has been postulated that, if it did indeed exist, might explain the commonalities, though in the absence of anything concrete, this must

remain disputed.²⁰ To complicate things further, crossover certainly occurred with later authors reusing and augmenting the *Guidi* and *Guidi*-like *vitae*.

The *vitae* themselves are, however, composites and as such somewhat secondary to the question of the *ultimate* source of the inn episode. Nearly fifty years ago Winkelmann proposed that a legendary “*Frühgeschichte*” of Constantine underpinned the appearance of this episode in a number of *vitae* and similar conclusions had been drawn some time before.²¹ This idea is revisited here in light of the threefold appearance of Sequence One in the unevenly harmonized Iranian tradition considered above. It will be argued that a case for the relatively early emergence of such a “document” of Constantine’s early life, and for its independent nature, can be made with reference to its narrative type, and this narrative’s possible usefulness as a counter to a polemic hostile to Constantine and centered on his mother.

The appearance of components associated with Sequence One across Constantine’s historiography is mapped out in Table 8 below. The story appears to arrive very suddenly, very late, and “complete” with very little precedent in the historical literature. This may however, be deceptive: a number of brief, sometimes very early, references to Constantine’s maternal ancestry are of significance to understanding the probable antecedents as well as the *why* of this legend. Thus, a number of extremely brief references to Helena’s low status, unattached to any other motif of Sequence One, have been included in this schema.

Fixing a date for the emergence of a text that might qualify as Winkelmann’s *Frühgeschichte* is rather difficult. Some kind of tradition linking Helena to prostitution, or, at the very least, an extramarital relationship, must have been available by the 9th century: Theophanes Confessor appears to (angrily) reference something very like it and, of course, the author of the *Guidi Vita* staged Constantine’s conception in bluntly

²⁰ An earlier *vita* is “unquestionable” according to Linder (1975), p.51. On the possibility of a model text for the *Guidi Vita*, see Kazhdan (1987), p.201.

²¹ “Das Kernstück der *Passio*, ein gutes Drittel des Textes, enthält nämlich **eine legendäre Kindheits- und Frühgeschichte Konstantins I.**, die auch in den vielen, weitverbreiteten hagiographischen Konstantiniden in irgendeiner Form zu finden ist.” Winkelmann (1970), p.286. A 7th or 8th century origin for the romantic version of Constantine’s conception and birth (based on the likely date of the *Passio Eusignii*) seems to have been proposed by Heydenreich (1893), p.14, Coleman (1914), pp.121-122, and (regarding its “*Vorlage*”) Winkelmann (1970), p.288.

transactional terms shortly afterwards.²² While any such reconstruction can only be hypothetical, a knot of details in a number of fairly obscure, and extremely disparate, texts would seem to argue for a relatively early date for the earliest stages of this tradition, *perhaps* as early as the 6th century.

4.4.1 The *Passio Eusignii*

By far the most significant source for the development of Sequence One is BHG 369 - the *Passio Eusignii*, a work postulated to have descended from a 7th century archetype.²³ Supposedly an account of the “interrogation” of the soldier-saint Eusignius by the emperor Julian, the *Passio Eusignii* spends a surprising amount of time talking about the life and deeds of Constantine.²⁴ Often speaking in the first person, the text’s subject “Eusignius” claims to have been a companion of Constantius and then of Constantine himself. He is portrayed as a witness to a number of important events in the younger emperor’s life, including his conception and his foundation of Constantinople. The *Passio Eusignii*’s rendition of Constantine’s conception and later recognition is clearly closely related to the version of Sequence One given in all three *vitae*. Indeed, this version of the incident was believed by Kazhdan to have been much closer to the “original” story of Constantine’s birth than that given in the *Guidi Vita*.²⁵

Although its construction of the conception and birth of Constantine does indeed demonstrate a strong link to the *vitae*, particularly the *Halkin Vita*, the *Passio Eusignii* contains a major structural difference in that Constantine’s rediscovery does not lead to him serving at the court of Galerius and thence to the plots and escapes the *vitae* describe. The *Passio Eusignii* represents a different arrangement of sources, one in which

²² Indeed, the contrast between the denunciations of Theo. Chron. AM.5814 (pp.31-32) and the matter-of-fact statement at Guidi (1907), p.310, lines, 17-20 is quite disconcerting.

²³ Kazhdan found this text difficult to date, though posited a *terminus ante quem* for its Greek version of the very late 10th century Kazhdan (1987), pp.203-204. Winkelmann had already suggested that its “*Vorlage*” went back to the 7th century, see Winkelmann (1970), pp.287-288. This theory would seem to be correct as the story appears in Armenian versions of the Life of Sylvester by the end of the 7th century, see n.58 below.

²⁴ The edited text is printed in Devos (1982).

²⁵ Kazhdan’s brief discussion of this story and his cursory stemma of its likely development is largely followed here, see Kazhdan (1987), p.214.

Sequence Two was not employed. Because the chronological and historical accuracy of the *Passio Eusignii* is rather poor, it can be postulated that its source for Constantine's origin contained very little information connecting it to a broader historical context. Moreover, because this tradition moves directly from Constantine's readoption to a recounting of some of the campaigns he shared with his father whereas the *vitae* move directly to the court of Diocletian or Galerius, it would seem plausible that the narrative of any *Frühgeschichte* ended at Constantius' acknowledgement of his son. As in the births of Shapur and Ormazd, we may see here evidence of a discrete narrative entirely concerned with the birth, loss and recovery of an important individual.

While the *Passio Eusignii* does considerable violence to the reader's sense of plausibility in the advanced age of its protagonist and his lengthy, public, dressing down of a reigning emperor, it contains several curious details that may offer some support for a relatively early date for the core of this narrative.²⁶ First, the author portrayed the saint as a member of the group of men who first accompany Constantius to Helena's inn and then, years later, recognize the boy while seeking a replacement for Constantius' feeble-minded son.²⁷ It is tempting to see this as an inter-textual reference with the author expecting his audience to be already familiar with the story the saint was now telling in the first person. While such a trick would push the date of the narrative back, it is essentially impossible to prove.²⁸ Second, the *Passio Eusignii* sets Constantine's conception in the context of a campaign of Constantius against the Sarmatians: a realistic enemy for a Roman emperor of the third or fourth centuries. Constantine himself fought them, as did his son Constantius II.²⁹ Third, Constantius' active and

²⁶ An interesting detail is the interjection of the army in Eusignius' favor (urging him to keep speaking), Devos (1982), p.222, sec.11. Compare this with the army's assurance to Jovian that it rejected Julian's paganism in the Syriac tradition reported by Socrates, cf. Socrates. HE. 3.22, and Gollancz (1928), pp.211-212.

²⁷ ἡμεῖς ἐκ τοῦ πολέμου τῶν Σαρματῶν ἐπανήλθομεν, καὶ κατελύσαμεν & etc. Devos (1982), p.220, sec.1 and f. The other *vitae*, even the *Halkin Vita* which is often very close to the *Passio Eusignii* portrayed both episodes in the third person.

²⁸ "Die eigentliche *Passio* des Eusignios macht nur den Eindruck einer blutleeren konstruierten, breiten Rahmenerzählung", Winkelmann (1970), p.286.

²⁹ In the *Guidi Vita* both the battle against the Sarmatians and the *protectores'* quest for a new heir has been changed to an eastern embassy. The second to a Οὐαραχθης the "king of the Parthians" Lieu suggests that this might refer to one of a series of three Bahrams who ruled the Sasanian empire from 271 to 294, Lieu and Montserrat (1996), p.142. Kazhdan believed that the *Guidi Vita*, though based on the same tradition as that of

soldierly retainers are *protectores*, a late Roman, originally Latin, military title that had probably become largely courtly or ceremonial by the time of Justinian I.³⁰ It should be noted that this title has disappeared in the *Guidi Vita*.³¹ On a related note, Kazhdan remarked that some Latinisms in the text *might* be interpreted as evidence of an early composition: these may, however, simply reflect a conscious effort on the part of the author of the *Passio Eusignii* to use anachronisms in order to grant his production an air of unearned antiquity.³² Finally, with its frank depiction of a Christian hero born from an act of prostitution, the source of the *Passio Eusignii* would appear to be linked to a hagiographic style current in the 6th and 7th centuries in which inns and disreputable people figured heavily in the lives of the holy.³³

Alongside the *Passio Eusignii*, three quite disparate texts offer some very suggestive data concerning the date of Constantine's birth legend and the limits of its original form. The first is the *Life of Theodore of Sykeon*, another hagiography whose staging of the birth of its subject is extremely similar to that made in the *vitae* and the *Passio Eusignii* and is occasionally mentioned in discussions of this group. The second is a fragment of a 6th century Syriac history in which a similar story is granted to the emperor Anastasius. The last is a much later, Medieval Latin adaptation of this episode. Additionally, in the latter two texts, certain details suggest that the same underlying logic, guided by a limited number of narrative possibilities, is common to the use of this narrative in the Iranian and Roman traditions.

the *Passio Eusignii*, was edited by someone with a better grasp of chronology and historical literature, Kazhdan (1987), p.214, cf. Lieu and Montserrat (1996), p.143.

³⁰ *προτίκτορ* in Devos (1982), p.219, sec.7, and Halkin (1959b), p.75, sec.2, line 14 f. The *protectores* are first attested in the third century as trustworthy veterans forming an inner circle around the emperor and fulfilling the roles of military staff, bodyguards and imperial agents, very much, in fact, as they are presented in the *vitae*. In time they became a sort of staff-college. Whether or not they had been "rendered ornamental" by the time of Justinian, as argued by Frank is unclear, though he presents good evidence that it is unlikely that they had any military role of the sort described by "Eusignius" by this time. On the title and its evolution see Frank (1969), pp.34 - 43, 84 f. and especially 213 - 217. See also Kazhdan (1991b), p.1753.

³¹ Here the *protectores* have become "ambassadors" (*πρέσβεις*) drawn from Constantius' court, Guidi (1907), p.310, line 1.

³² Kazhdan considered both possibilities, Kazhdan (1987), pp.203-204.

³³ Magoulas (1971).

4.4.2 The Life of Theodore of Sykeon

Attention has been drawn to the fact that a very similar origin is given to Theodore of Sykeon in BHG 1748 - a hagiography that may date to the 7th century.³⁴ Here the saint's father is called Kosmas and is a *magistranos* travelling on official business: like Constantius he stops at an inn and spends the night with a prostitute. In a post-coital dream the prostitute sees a star fall into her womb, from which Kosmas predicts great things.³⁵ Nine months later a child, Theodore, is born to her. He has a number of remarkable, suspiciously kingly, qualities: he is, for example, unbeatable in games.³⁶ The parallels to the story told across the *vitae* are strong and the possibility exists that Constantine's birth and early life in an inn was modeled on this tradition of *vita*. Yet the haziness surrounding the origin of this version of Constantine's boyhood, and the ancient linkage of Helena to the extremely disreputable occupation of hospitality makes the priority of these traditions uncertain.³⁷ It is possible, as suggested by Kazhdan, that the similarity is a mere coincidence.³⁸ It is also possible that the influence ran the other way: several points argue that this may be so.

Theodore and Constantine's stories take place in adjacent provinces; Theodore is born in Galatia, Constantine in Bithynia. Helena's name, and possibly the woman herself, had some kind of association with Drepanum in Bithynia in the 4th century, though the precise nature of this association is unclear; regardless, it later came to be believed that she originated from there.³⁹ Additionally Helena was already associated with hospitality by the end of this century.⁴⁰ There are besides, in Theodore's *vita* hints, not just of the

³⁴ A connection was considered at Kazhdan (1987), p.215. The same author would again mention both stories in the same breath at Kazhdan (1990), p.136.

³⁵ Festugière (1970), pp.3-4, sec.3 lines 23-24 and sec.4, lines 6-8. Translation in Dawes and Baynes (1977), pp.88-89.

³⁶ Festugière (1970), p.5, sec.5, lines 21-25. Translation in Dawes and Baynes (1977), p.89.

³⁷ On the grounds that the inn story was not known to chroniclers by 600, Kazhdan would seem to have argued for a much later date *and* to have assumed that the Life of Theodore of Sykeon preceded it, see Kazhdan (1987), pp.214-215 and Kazhdan (1990), p.136.

³⁸ Kazhdan (1987), p.215.

³⁹ Cf. Drijvers (1992), pp.9-12, & Barnes (2011), pp.37-38. Barnes theorises that Constantinus and Helena may *actually* have met in an inn while Constantius was travelling on official business.

⁴⁰ See the discussion of Ambrose's panegyric to Theodosius below.

adaption of a more worldly style of biography, but an awareness of the adoption. Visions of this sort, says a holy man, presage the advent of kings, yet this symbolism is here averted twice, the second time very specifically. The boy will instead be a bishop or a great saint.⁴¹ The next source considered here, set once again in the general vicinity of Anatolia, may add some additional weight to this possibility.

4.4.3 “John of Ephesus”

Appended to a 14th century manuscript of Bar Hebraeus is an interpolation claiming to have been taken from the (lost) 5th book of the 6th century historian John of Ephesus. This addition describes the birth of the emperor Anastasius in the context of his foundation of the fortress city of Dara, in terms very similar to those used by the *Passio Eusignii* and the *vitae*.⁴² In this fragment, a travelling merchant lodges with a childless couple living in the countryside near the future site of Dara.⁴³ Experiencing a prophetic dream in which a wonderful tree emerges from the farmer’s courtyard, the merchant strikes a deal with the couple in which he promises to pay for any son that God may see fit to bring them.⁴⁴ Some time after the merchant has left, the couple produces a “beautiful” son whom they raise until he is seven, when the merchant returns and

⁴¹ A prediction is made by the boy’s father that the son will become a bishop ...καρπὸν δωῆ σοι τοῦ τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἀξιωθησόμενον κλήρου... More interesting is the prediction made by a local holy man that while the interpreters of such things hold that a star is the sign of a king, it is not to be read as such in this case. Ἀστὴρ μὲν γὰρ λαμπρὸς βασιλικὴν δόξαν νροσημαίνων διακρίνεται παρὰ τοῖς τὸ κρίνειν εἰδόσιν ὀράματα σοφοῖς· ἀλλ’οὐχ οὕτως ἐπὶ σοὶ τοῦτο λεκτέον. Festugière (1970), p.4, sec.3 lines 23-24 and sec.4, lines 6-8. Translation in Dawes and Baynes (1977), pp.88-89.

⁴² Oxford, Bodleian Library, Huntingdon. 52 (f. 189r-v). This fragment was brought to my attention by Marianna Mazzola, my colleague at the University of Ghent. She has allowed me sight and use of her translation pending its publication. I owe her an enormous debt for bringing this to my attention and for her generosity in sharing her work.

⁴³ Anastasius was actually born in Dyrrachium in Illyria, quite some way from Dara, see the references in PLRE 2, p.78. Van Ginkel suggests that only the last part of this fragment was drawn from John and that the legend forming its bulk may have grown up from a scribal error that transmuted Dyrrachium into Dara and that a confused version of this legend underlies Ebn Beṭrīq’s claim that Anastasius fortified his hometown, Ginkel (1995), p.57, n73 and 74.

⁴⁴ Cf. Herod, 1.108.1. On the significance of tree imagery in eastern traditions, particularly vines as an Achaemenid symbol, see the discussion and references in Eddy (1961), pp.20, 26-30, Cizek (1975), p.540 and Pelling (1996), p.69 (and n.8).

claims the boy, “recognizing” him. The boy is given a royal education by his guardian and is eventually raised to the throne as a result of a dream seen by the “high priest” of the imperial capital. *If* this fragment were indeed taken from John, it would demonstrate that a childhood very similar to that used in our later texts was applied to another Roman emperor as early as the 6th century: an emperor only decades dead at the time of writing.

Unfortunately, certain stylistic and structural discrepancies have been raised against the attribution to John.⁴⁵ Yet, although the fragment does not involve sexual contact, with its returning traveller, prophecies, prodigious child, and oddly staggered paternity it bears a striking resemblance not only to the hypothetical *Frühgeschichte* of Constantine, but also to the 6th century account of Ardashir’s paternity given by Agathias. “John’s” returning merchant is, in fact, far more similar to Agathias’ Sasan, the “travelling soldier”, than it is to Sasan the shepherd in disguise portrayed in the *Kārnāmag* texts. If Averil Cameron’s theory, that Agathias’ take on Ardashir’s conception was a hostile, Syriac, rendition of a Sasanian dynastic story fed to him by his informant Sergius, is correct, the possibility must be admitted that a “positive” version of Sergius’ story may have circulated in Syriac speaking circles during this time.⁴⁶ There is, in any case, nothing that unambiguously disproves the claimed authorship or shows the story to be a later production: it would seem unlikely that any legend about Dara would have originated after the city’s capture by the Rashidun Caliphate in the 7th century. The probable 7th century date for the archetype of the *Passio Eusignii* raises the possibility that it used even older material and, perhaps, thereby, that a similar version of Constantine’s birth was already in circulation during the 6th century and that “John”, whoever that was, may have adapted it in defence of a controversial emperor

⁴⁵ Ginkel (1995), pp.56-57.

⁴⁶ In defence of his community’s claim to represent orthodoxy, the actual John of Ephesus took up a tradition of using hagiographic tropes as sticks to beat “persecuting” emperors, and other Chalcedonians, see Wood (2010), pp.176-178, and 186-191. Moreover, given the liminal creedal and geographic position of Miaphysite groups within the Roman Empire, John and other Miaphysite writers could attach themselves to, or remove themselves from, Roman authority depending on the attitudes of individual rulers, see *ibid.* pp.210-215. In such a context, a Miaphysite writer’s attachment of a positive kingly, *topos* to the “friendly” Anastasius would make a great deal of sense.

sympathetic to a Miaphysite position.⁴⁷ In any case the convergence between the Syriac/Iranian and Syriac/Roman forms is rather interesting: there was, it would seem, a very specific, albeit cross-cultural, way to phrase divine interest in a royal childhood.

4.4.4 The “Libellus”

A much later Medieval Latin text, the *De Constantino Magno eiusque Matre Helena Libellus* (henceforth the *Libellus*), demonstrates the surprising tight limitations of this phrasing. The tradition of this text is hazy: it may date (in some form) to some time before the late 13th century.⁴⁸ A rather obscure, and very late text, the *Libellus* tends to receive only cursory attention in considerations of the *vitae* tradition despite its clear links to it.⁴⁹ This is something of a mistake. Despite its Latinity, and a large-scale adulteration of the narrative with an extraneous romantic element, the self-contained plot of the *Libellus*, terminating at a happy reunion of father and son, may be the most “pure” extant representation of the underlying *Frühgeschichte* used by the *vitae* and the *Passio Eusignii*.

In the *Libellus* Helena is a young Christian noblewoman of Trier. Constantius rapes her in a hotel while she is making a pilgrimage to Rome, leaving tokens with her afterwards out of (it would seem) guilt. Helena lives in obscurity with her young son, the product of her assault, until, at the age of ten, he gets involved in a plot by a pair of merchants to defraud the “Emperor of the Greeks” of his daughter’s dowry by

⁴⁷ Anastasius was a *silentarius* in the imperial court and came to the throne via the machinations of Zeno’s widow Adriane. His accession “disinherited” Zeno’s brother Longinus and triggered a revolt in Zeno’s homeland of Isauria. Moreover, Anastasius had leanings towards Monophysitism and this made him unpopular in the capital. See, Tinnefeld, Savvidis and Degani (2006).

⁴⁸ A romance of Constantine’s childhood appearing in Italian and Latin and sharing many of the features of the Byzantine inn-story, was noted by Wesselofsky (1877), pp.173-176. The Latin version, reproduced by Wesselofsky is taken from the *Chronicon Imaginis Mundi* of Jacques D’Acqui († c.1334), yet this claims to have been taken from a *chronica Treverensi*, which, again, seems to link the story to Trier. Another candidate for the earliest attestation of this legend in a Western language may be in the *Historia Imperialis* of Giovanni Mansionario († c.1337), who cited an unknown “*Historia Britonum*” as the source for this episode, see Coen (1881), pp.30-33. The *Historia Imperialis* is still unedited and difficult to access. I have had no opportunity to examine its text.

⁴⁹ Lieu granted this work about a page in his overview of the subject, acknowledging the link to the Greek tradition via the recognition theme, but not going into much further detail, see Lieu (2005), pp.398-399.

presenting Constantine as the “Western” emperor’s son.⁵⁰ The plot succeeds and Constantine is married under false pretenses to the daughter of the eastern emperor. A “shipwreck” episode follows in which the merchants abandon the couple to die on a deserted island. The merchant’s plot and the resulting shipwreck is an episode alien to the Greek tradition. Constantine returns to Rome alongside his wife and is reunited with his mother.⁵¹ Buying a guest-house, Helena becomes, as she was in the rhetoric of Ambrose a millennia before, a *stabularia*.⁵² In the meantime, the nobility of his blood draws Constantine to military exercises.⁵³ His success in such games before Constantius, now the emperor of the Romans, attracts the emperor’s attention.⁵⁴ An interrogation follows culminating in Helena’s display of Constantius’ gifts.⁵⁵ An “adoption” of Constantine as Constantius’ son, the just punishment of the merchants, and Constantine’s unchallenged inheritance of both halves of the empire follows.⁵⁶

⁵⁰ Dräger (2010) pp.16-18 sec.4-6.

⁵¹ Ibid. pp.34-38 sec.14. Constantine is about twenty at the time his father recognizes him and Helena states that he was away from her for five years, see p.46 (cf. 19.14 & 20.3).

⁵² cf. Amb. De. Ob. Theo.42 & Dräger (2010), pp.38, sec.15.9.

⁵³ Dräger (2010) pp.38-40, sec.15-16, *stabularia* 15.9, *Constantinus... instinctu... quem sibi natura ex nobili sanguine procreate ingeniavit* 16.1.

⁵⁴ Ibid. pp.40-42, sec.16-17.

⁵⁵ Ibid. pp.40-48 sec.17-20, the gifts, are an ornament, likely a clasp or brooch (also the conclusion made by Dräger, see ibid. pp.107-108), worn, according to the text, exclusively by emperors, *ornamentum...quo illo tempore soli imperatores in humeris ornari et insignari consueverunt*, and a ring from Constantius’ finger, p.14 (3.3). In two of the *vitae* the gift is a purple cloak, a garment whose association with the imperial office was well known cf. *πορφυρόβαφον ἔμπλουμνον ἐπενδύτην* Guidi (1907), p.308, lines, 23-24 and *χιτῶνα πορφυροῦν καὶ μανιάκην χρυσοῦν* Halkin (1959b), p.74, sec.2, line 8. The *Opitz Vita*’s use of a very similar story can be safely assumed, as it was at Halkin (1960), p.11, n.4 and (following him) Amidon (2007), p.240, n.2. An ornate fibula, worn on the shoulder, was part of court regalia in Late Antiquity and specific forms of it were reserved for the emperor and empress, see Stout (1994), p.83 f. A passage cited by Stout, Procopius. De Aedif. 3.1.18-23, detailing Justinian’s granting of symbols of office to five Armenian “*σατράπαι*” mentions both a cloak, *χλαμὺς* (though seemingly cloth-of-gold rather than purple) and a brooch *περόνη*. Procopius’ description of these brooches matches those seen in depictions of emperors from the third to sixth century, most famously, that worn by Justinian himself in the apse mosaic of San Vitale in Ravenna. The statement in such a late text that jewelry worn on the shoulder marked imperial rank is, in light of the clear imperial associations of the purple cloak given in the Byzantine *vitae*, intriguing. It is possible that some version of the story had simply swapped one unmistakable imperial badge for another (which a later redactor felt the need to explain). In any case, the presence of what was probably fairly obscure symbolism for a Medieval reader in the West strengthens the case for an ultimately Greek origin for this tradition, with this small detail indicating that the ancestral prototype of the *Libellus* differed slightly from those of the *vitae*. On the possible significance and remarkable prevalence of rings in royal legends see Ogden (2017), p.24 and f.

⁵⁶ Dräger (2010), pp.50-54 (21-22).

The *Libellus* makes a very significant choice of staging in its restructure of the recognition sequence: forced by the addition of the extraneous “shipwreck” plot line, it moves the recognition of the boy by Constantius’ agents in an inn to a display of military games in before Constantius himself. As a result, the work has a strong, specific, parallel with resolution of the origin narratives of Shapur and Ormazd used in the *Kārnāmag* tradition. The *Libellus*’ comparative potential in this regard is so far largely untapped and more will be made of it later.

4.5 Date, Authorship and Intent

While all of the evidence adduced above is quite circumstantial, it does admit the possibility that the story of Constantine’s birth in an inn, and by extension, any written *Frühgeschichte*, may be very old indeed: possibly reaching back as far as the 6th century and perhaps even further. A relatively early origin in writing would certainly help to explain the story’s impressive geographic and linguistic span. Two references to it, seemingly as an independent narrative, in literatures at the fringes of the Byzantine world, bespeak a very wide circulation. A brief reference to Helena as a prostitute in the history of Moses Khorenats’i shows that something like it was known in Armenia by (according to the most skeptical date for this author) the eighth century. Thompson believed Khorenats’i’s source to have been an Armenian version of the *Acta Silvestri*, a tradition that probably originated in Rome in the 5th or 6th centuries.⁵⁷ Two versions of an Armenian translation of Sylvester’s *vita* made at the end of the 7th century are extant and both briefly mention a version of Constantine’s conception involving prostitution and later recognition.⁵⁸ The most accessible Latin edition of the life of Sylvester does not characterize Helena in this way and it follows that Khorenats’i’s source incorporated

⁵⁷ Khorenats’i, p.230 & n.602.

⁵⁸ Thomson (2005), pp.59-65.

this “fact” somewhere in its transmission.⁵⁹ In considering this edition, Thompson suspected that the Armenian versions incorporated some early iteration of the *Passio Eusignii*.⁶⁰ Ebn Beṭrīq, writing in Arabic in Fatamid-ruled Egypt in the early 10th century, gives what looks like a cleaned up version of this story in his chronicle.⁶¹

On the other hand, the story told in the *Passio Eusignii* was certainly not an official production and could have played no role in dynastic propaganda: its possible readings, as demonstrated by the remarkably blunt language used by “Eusignius” and Moses Khorenats’i’s explicit statement that Helena actually was a prostitute, are antithetical to the reverent image of Helena propagated either in the dynasty’s own self-presentation or the productions of those seeking their favour.⁶² For this reason, it also seems extremely unlikely that this was the way that the lost, 4th century biographies of Praxagoras and Bemarchios portrayed Constantine’s boyhood. We might hazard a guess that it arose after the extinction of Constantine’s dynasty perhaps some time before the later 6th century.

The story of Constantine’s birth and early life in an inn has been described as a reflection of the themes of Greek or Roman comedy and far more recently as a “folk-tale and (...) romance of the Hellenistic recognition type”.⁶³ It is certainly true that the recognition of a lost child was an extremely widespread trope in Mediterranean literature, however the recognition scene used here is of a rather specific type; it is neither tragic (as it is in the story of Oedipus), nor the opportunity for humour (as for example, in *Poenulus* where the saucy possibility of accidental incest hangs over the

⁵⁹ The *Acta Silvestri* was very popular and presents, as a result, a monstrously complicated philological problem. A critical edition of its Latin versions has gone unpublished for decades, and I have here relied on an early 20th century edition of the *Sanctuarium seu Vitae sanctorum*, a collection of Latin hagiographies produced by Mombritius in the 15th century, Mombritius (1910), pp.508-531. This is a less than adequate version for scholarly purposes, see Lieu (1998), p.170, n.12. For a recent overview of the tradition of the *Acta Silvestri* as a whole and its relationship to Constantine, see Sessa (2016).

⁶⁰ Translations of the relevant section of both Armenian versions are made at, Thomson (2005), pp.80-83 for the link to the *Passio Eusignii*, see p.80, n.80.

⁶¹ Ebn Beṭrīq, 11.2.

⁶² A review of contemporary evidence for this view is given at Drijvers (1992), p. 39 f. More recent work drawing attention to Helena’s elevated position in Constantine’s dynastic propaganda can be found in Dam (2007), p.302 f, and (in contrast to the lack of female family members in the self-presentation of the other Tetrarchs) Hekster (2015), pp.313-314.

⁶³ Heydenreich (1893), p.14, Linder (1975), p.51.

happy reunion). Moreover, though tokens (specifically a purple cloak) are very prominent in this tradition, it also uses the same forms of identification seen in the Herodotean Cyrus and the *Kārnāmag*'s account of Shapur and Ormazd; the boy looks like his father and (it will be argued) performs a game-like action symbolic of kingship. This version of Constantine's boyhood is, therefore, a member of a group of narratives that presage the glory of a historically significant individual.

As in the Iranian examples, it may be suspected that pressing political and ideological concerns suggest the use of this narrative to sympathetic authors: that the granting of this kind of origin was a tool by which a retrospective shine could be put on the antecedents of a controversial ruler. The appearance of a similar plot (without sex, or tokens, but including a spontaneous recognition) by "John" in a (presumably) partisan description of the solid, but rather unremarkable, Anastasius, an emperor who faced serious objections to his legitimacy, is a case in point. While "John's" attempt to elevate Anastasius in this way failed, the immeasurably greater cultural impact of Constantine's reign and actions provided much more fertile soil for the entrenchment of this pattern.

A childhood containing the motifs classed as Sequence One, is in both the Byzantine and Iranian cases, a script generated under the right conditions. It is a later attempt to plaster over events with the potential to be seen as a rupture in the harmonious operation of societies in which kingship is a quasi-divine office and rapid change is viewed with deep suspicion. In Constantine's case, as it seems to have been in Ardashir's, it was the result of a sharply polarized debate about the political or cultural ramifications of an individual's life in which the *descent* of that individual had become a point of contention. Proceeding from such "sticky" points of historical memory and used to create a past, the narrative form cannot be seen as completely external to historiography. Despite its incredible narrative, its ability to slide into self-consciously historical works should come as no surprise.

4.5.1 The Status of Helena

Constantine's mother Helena has an impressive legendary edifice of her own, largely due to her later association with tales of the discovery of the true cross.⁶⁴ As colourful, and intrinsically interesting, as this edifice is, it would be unwise to be unduly distracted by it here. Helena's story can never be wholly separated from that of her son, however. As he passed into the realm of holy legend so did she; moreover the image of the mother would, at times, exert an enormous influence over that of the son. Perhaps nowhere is this more evident than in the version of Constantine's birth reflected in the *vita*. As has been shown, this account betrays a number of similarities to other stories of royal origins and as such bears the hallmarks of a retrospective construction. Yet, at the same time the setting of this narrative would seem to be strongly, and very specifically, connected to information about Helena emerging very early in the historiography of her son.

Though contemporary sources addressing the subject are hardly detailed, it is certain that Constantine's mother Helena and his father Constantius were not social equals and that this fact was widely known very early on: a *déclassé* Helena was in circulation in the 4th century.⁶⁵ If an oblique reference to Constantine's unworthiness in Libanius' funeral oration for Julian (†.363) does, as it appears to, cast aspersions on Constantine's descent, Julian and his supporters may be conjectured to have harbored some bitterness on this point.⁶⁶ Indeed, it was probably the succession issues raised by Constantius' second marriage, and their brutal conclusion, that ensured the survival and propagation of Helena's status in the record. Constantine was, according to Eutropius (writing around 370), the product of a *déclassé* marriage.⁶⁷ The writer of the *Origo Constantini*,

⁶⁴ On the means by which Helena became associated with the *Inventio Crucis*, a story with which she originally had no connection, see Drijvers (1992), p. 81 f. In the west, imaginings of Helena's status tended to make her an aristocrat, one such story focused on Trier, possibly through confusion with Helena, the wife of Crispus see *ibid.* p.21 f. (this is the line taken in the *Libellus*, see Dräger (2010), p.12 (2.1-2)) Others on Britain, probably through intense romanticisation of Constantine's brief though eventful association with that province, see (for example) Matthews (1983) and Harbus (2002).

⁶⁵ For more detailed discussions of this problem and a list of the relevant sources, see Drijvers (1992), p.15-19 and Barnes (2011), pp.30-35.

⁶⁶ Libanius. Orat. 18.8.

⁶⁷ Eutropius. Breviarium, 10.2.

despite his clear sympathy with Constantine, and a parroting of his propaganda, was even less polite: Helena, here named, was *vilissima*.⁶⁸ The history of the decidedly non-Christian Eunapius, a rough contemporary of the former writers, probably stands behind the later account of Zosimus, who calls her a γυναίη οὐ σεμνός and claims that she was never Constantius' wife.⁶⁹ It appears to have been in response to a very similar position that Theophanes Confessor, writing in the very early 9th century, was moved to comment:

“Other Arians and pagans accuse Constantine the Great of being illegitimate, but they too are lying. For his imperial line goes back even earlier than Diocletian. Indeed his father Constantius was a grandson of the emperor Claudius and he fathered Constantine the Great by his first wife Helena.”⁷⁰

Slightly later George the Monk stated that the “liars and fools” who had spread rumours to the effect that Constantine was the son of a prostitute had been repeatedly refuted.⁷¹

In the 4th and 5th century, however, Christian authors do not seem to have denied the charge. Jerome, writing around 380, calls her a *concubina*, as does Orosius some thirty-five years later, though both may have been borrowing from Eutropius.⁷² A section of the *Passio Artemii*, an eighth century hagiographic text, associated with the fragments of the Anomoean Christian historian Philostorgius (late 4th century), has Julian describe Helen as a low woman, no better than a prostitute and Constantine as an illegitimate usurper.⁷³ It would seem that Philostorgius was sensitive to the genealogical problem presented by “Julian”: he cast Constantius II's massacre of his uncles and cousins as a posthumous order from Constantine, whom they had poisoned: shifting blame in order

⁶⁸ Anon. Val. Origo Const.. 2.

⁶⁹ Zosimus. 2.8.2. On Zosimus and Eunapius see Treadgold (2010), p.110. Paschoud saw the connection between Helena and hospitality as a “*tradition païenne*” Paschoud (2000), p.206.

⁷⁰ Theoph. Chron. AM.5814.

⁷¹ George the Monk. Chron. p.485-486.

⁷² Jerome. Chron. p.228, Orosius.7.25.16, Drijvers (1992), pp.17-18.

⁷³ Ὁ δὲ Κωνσταντῖνος ἐξ Ἑλένης αὐτῷ γέγονε φαύλης τινὸς γυναικὸς καὶ τῶν χαμαιτύπων οὐδὲν διαφερούσης... Philostorgius. 2.16a.

to obviate questions of succession posed by Julian's ascension.⁷⁴ Ambrose, on the other hand, reframed the terms of the argument, *stressing* Helena's humble origins, using them as evidence of Christian piety in his oration on the death of Theodosius I (d.395). This text is also notable for being the earliest *specific* linkage of Helena with hospitality and the first indication that this was a widely known "fact".⁷⁵ ⁷⁶ Helena is here first introduced among other pious imperial figures as company for the late emperor in heaven.⁷⁷

"This woman, so they say [*adserunt*], was an inn-girl [*stabularia*] at first, and thus she was known to Constantius the elder, who afterwards came to rule. A good inn-girl, who so diligently sought the stable of the lord; a good inn-girl who was not unknowing of that innkeeper who cared for the wounds of the man hurt by thieves; a good inn-girl who preferred to be thought of as dung that she might attain Christ. Christ raised her therefore, from the dung-heap, to rule. Just as is written: he raises up the helpless from the earth, and elevates the poor man from the dung."

The *Paschal Chronicle* (c.630) describes Constantine in glowing terms, yet calls him the illegitimate son of Helena in a sentence very similar to the words of Julian in *Passio Artemii* attributed to Philostorgius.⁷⁸ Theophanes' angry denial of similar assertions has already been given. The issue was still in play a century or more later when the

⁷⁴ Philostorgius. 2.4, 2.16. see also Bleckmann and Stein (2015), pp.106-107.

⁷⁵ 42. In a discussion of the term *stabularia*, and Ambrose's use of it Barnes argues that Helena's status was not as low as either Eunapius' polemic or Ambrose's carefully Christianising oratory would have us believe, Barnes (2011), pp.30-33.

⁷⁶ That the author of the Suda also saw this potential (though in an unrelated context) is shown in his entry on the sainted empress herself; here he writes, at some length, on the humble tasks she performed, in later life, in service to monks and holy virgins. These tasks refer not to any memory of Helena's early life but to the legend that grew up around her visit to the Holy Land during which, it later came to be supposed, she put herself at the service of religious communities there, on the lateness of this legend, see Drijvers (1992), p.139. An early version of this story is present in Rufinus. HE. 10.8, (cf. 3.42-44). The story was used in the ecclesiastical histories of Socrates. 1.17, Sozomen. 2.2 and Theodoret. 1.17 and seems to have reached a very wide acceptance. The version, used in Suda ε789, is taken from pp. 501-502.

⁷⁷ Ambrose, *De Obitu Theodosii*, 40-42. A hint of counter-polemic might be discerned in *stabulariam hanc primo fuisse adserunt sic cognitam Constantio seniori*.

⁷⁸ ὁ παῖς αὐτοῦ Κωνσταντίνος ὁ νόθος ἐξ Ἑλένης αὐτῷ γενόμενος, Pasch. Chron. p.517, cf. Philostorgius, 2.16a.

anonymous encyclopaedist responsible for the massive literary compilation known as the *Suda* began his entry on the emperor Constantine with the following observation:

“He was born of *obscure lineage* to Constantius the emperor...”⁷⁹

While the source for this entry was probably the ferociously orthodox George the Monk, his second entry on Constantine indicates that he also knew the decidedly less sympathetic Eunapius. This writer’s low opinion of the great man, very likely coupled with an extremely unflattering description of his mother, scandalized the encyclopaedist’s religious and patriotic sensibilities so much that he, alas, refused to record anything Eunapius had to say on the matter.⁸⁰

Theophanes’ attribution of Constantine’s illegitimacy to “pagans and *Arians*” is interesting but may simply be a spleen vented against the stock enemies of Orthodoxy: as Constantine was “the emperor” so Arius remained “the heretic”.⁸¹ It is, in any case, unclear what interest an “Arian” author would have in asserting Helena’s illegitimacy. Kazhdan theorized that the prostituted Helena was a weapon of Iconoclast writers in their propaganda battle with the Iconodules.⁸² The extraordinarily blunt language of the *Passio Eusignii*, which calls Constantine “the son of a whore” and the “son of sin”, combined with its emphasis on the power of the cross, the Iconoclast symbol *par excellence*, is interesting to consider in this light.⁸³ Yet, while Kazhdan was correct to see political and ideological concerns in the *vitae*, his linkage of this particular section to the Iconoclast dispute is far too narrow a lens through which to view it. As has been argued above, the ingredients for Helena the “prostitute” were much older than Iconoclasm.

Rather, the scraps of data we have suggest that a complex of related anti-Constantine polemics, focusing on the emperor’s descent, character and his often brutal intra-dynastic politics, quickly wrapped themselves around the emperor’s memory as the cultural consequences of his reign became more and more apparent. Sozomen, for

⁷⁹ οὗτος ἐξ ἀφανῶν τίκεται τῷ βασιλεῖ Κωνσταντίῳ... *Suda* κ2284.

⁸⁰ *Suda* κ2285. Something very like Eunapius’ view is probably extant in Zosimus, 2.8.2. On Zosimus’ use of Eunapius, see Treadgold (2010), pp.109-114.

⁸¹ Kazhdan (1987), 196 and pp.243-244.

⁸² *Ibid.*, pp.248-249.

⁸³ πόρνης υἱός... πορνογέ(ν)νητον Devos (1982), p.218, sec.6.

example, writing between 439 and 450, fervently denies the charge that the emperor had converted to Christianity on account of his execution of his son Crispus and wife Fausta on, possibly false, charges of adultery.⁸⁴ Helena's background could easily have become the focus of another critique, one that gained strength with the extinction of her line and the ascension of Julian, who was a product of Constantius I's far more prestigious marriage, had no reason to love his great-uncle and every reason to cast doubt on the credentials of his cousins. Though Julian's reign was brief, the damage would have been done: a classist critique of Helena would have firmly implanted itself in the mainstream of Byzantine, indeed Christian, historiography.

Whether or not Constantine actually was illegitimate is a question that is of no relevance here. What is certain is that some strands of historiography presented him as so via his mother. Humble birth, at least as far as it implied rusticity or lack of education, seems to have been a fairly standard part of a polemic in Constantine's own time and Constantine's partisans were not above making attacks on lineage either. Lactantius, an author whose Roman patriotism was genuine, if conflicted at times, mutters darkly of the barbaric origin of both Galerius and Maximinus Daia then goes on to make much of the pastoral origin of the latter.⁸⁵ The author of the *Origo* found several of the actors in the death of the Tetrarchy to be disappointingly common.⁸⁶ In light of this, and the fact that her position was still being defended five hundred years *after* she had died, Drijvers' suggestion that Constantine's mother was a potential source of embarrassment to him looks well founded.⁸⁷ Yet, perversely, Constantine and his sons had *drawn attention* to Helena, to the possible detriment of a far more traditional appeal to genealogy.

Of the *vitae*, only the *Guidi Vita* mentions the claim that Constantius was the descendant of Claudius II Gothicus.⁸⁸ Even here this is something of a throwaway line of which little is made in contrast to the lengthy description of Helena's visit to

⁸⁴ Sozomen, 1.5.

⁸⁵ Lact. De Mort., 9.2, 18.13 & 19.6.

⁸⁶ Anon. Val. Origo Const., 2 (Constantine), 4 (Severus), 5 (Licinius).

⁸⁷ Drijvers (1992), p.15.

⁸⁸ Guidi (1907), p.307, line, 30.

Jerusalem.⁸⁹ Claudius was almost certainly not present in the basal layers of the inn story: he was included as a learned pendant by whoever was responsible for cleaning up the *Guidi Vita*. A footnote in the *Guidi Vita*, this relationship is actually one of the oldest known components of Constantine's representation, making its (extant) debut in a Latin panegyric delivered around 310 where it has been interpreted as Constantine's assertion of a hereditary claim in preference to the institutions of the Tetrarchy.⁹⁰ In the panegyric the exact nature of this relationship is left ambiguous, as it is in the poems Optatianus presented to the emperor himself, it would seem that the exact relationship was purposefully left vague.⁹¹ Two later 4th century sources look to have improvised: in the *Origo Constantius* descends via Claudius' brother, in Eutropius' *Breviarium* via his daughter.⁹² In the *Historia Augusta*, Constantine's "genealogy", like so much else in this work, may have been the subject of a joke. Claudius must be described carefully, says the author, *intuitu Constanti Caesaris*.⁹³ A letter from "Decius", in the *Historia Augusta*, a compulsively sardonic recommender of future emperors, describes him as *constantissimus civis*.⁹⁴

Though Julian accepted and mentioned this genealogy in his own writings, early references to it in Greek appear to be relatively uncommon.⁹⁵ This "fact" evidently made it into the Greek historical tradition somewhere, perhaps through a Greek translation of Eutropius, as it is also mentioned by Theophanes.⁹⁶ The vagueness of the claim indicates that it was never particularly central to dynastic propaganda moreover, Roman succession was not absolutely predicated on hereditary right, certainly never to the extent that it was in Parthian or Sasanian Iran.⁹⁷ In Byzantine eyes the relationship to

⁸⁹ Ibid., pp. 642-649.

⁹⁰ Lat. Pan. VI(7),2. Rogers (1989), pp.235-240.

⁹¹ Optatianus. Carmina. 8.27, 10.29.

⁹² Anon. Val. Origo Const., 1, Eutropius, 9.22.1.

⁹³ Hist. Aug. Claudius. 1.1.

⁹⁴ Hist. Aug. Claudius. 16.1. Decius' voice was also used to "recommend" Valerian, see ibid. Valeriani Duo. 6.1-3.

⁹⁵ Julian, Caesares, 313 D, and 336 B, and Julian. Panegyric to Constantius, 6 D.

⁹⁶ As in Eutropius, Constantius is Claudius' grandson, Theoph. Chron. AM5796.

⁹⁷ This is not to claim that descent was considered unimportant, see, Hekster (2015), pp. 2-12 and *passim*, and Börm (2015). Iranian dynastic longevity was probably the result of a Parthian political form, largely maintained under the Sasanians, that distributed and decentralized power into the hands of the great nobility

Claudius, surely a very obscure figure by the 9th century, could be decorative, but was hardly critical. Conversely, in the *Kārnāmag* texts ancestry is everything; while Sasan himself is something of a bit player, his bloodline is pivotal to Ardashir's legitimacy and maternal descent from various great houses was usefully attributed to his son and grandson.

Though they make use of a very similar narrative, the *vitae* pay very little attention to Constantine's paternal descent in this section, a feature that Claudius' usual absence from the narrative merely highlights. Constantius was not Sasan, he was a known quantity, undoubtedly a "king" and neither he nor his position seems to have been the point in question. Rather the story's setting in an inn suggests that it was bent around certain lurid "facts" known about Helena, almost certainly with the intention of offering an explanation of what, to later eyes, seemed an unlikely, or unseemly, pairing. Should we see Sequence One to have been, as in the Iranian examples, a form of argument about *lineage*, it ought not be surprising that the legend shaped itself around the mother rather than the father in this case. Helena, unusually prominent for female member of an imperial house in her time, was a very probable locus of intra-dynastic resentment.⁹⁸ To further aggravate matters, she rapidly became a Christian heroine. All of this made her an extremely attractive target for those inclined to dislike her son and/or his legacy.

The idea that Constantine was conceived in an inn seems to have been a relatively early attempt to blunt the kind of genealogical criticism outlined above by reference to a narrative type easily adapted to the situation. As implausible as the construction of Constantine's birth made in the *vitae* is, its portrait of Helena probably rests on two questionable "facts" imprinted into historical memory, and, indeed, historiography at a very early point: she had low origins and a connection to an inn. The meaning of these facts was a point of ideological contention, and both positive and negative inferences were drawn from them. These "facts" and the argument over their significance are likely to have been the kernel around which the other stereotypical aspects of

with the understanding that "high-kingship" was the property of the dynasty, see Pourshariati (2008), pp.53-56.

⁹⁸ Van Dam (2007), pp.302-306, Hekster (2015), p.231.

Constantine's birth accreted into a lost-prince story unfolding according to Sequence One. As it did so, the bitter pill of Helena's ambiguous status was dissolved in the syrup of a readily digestible, and clearly understood, narrative stereotype.

The question has to be asked why *this* narrative was chosen for inclusion in the strand of hagiography represented by the much later *vitae*; why was the “founder” of the Christian empire given such a grubby start in life in a late, and extremely favourable, strand of “biography”. The dynastic and religious disputes that had ensured the survival of a lowly Helena were not exactly live issues in the 9th and 10th centuries. To greatly oversimplify, Constantine's dynasty was gone, but his “heirs” had won, Julian's partisans were long dead, and there was no question of returning to the old ways, nor were the intricacies of Constantius' marriages of any pressing political importance. And yet, all three of the *vitae* continued to present Constantine the result of a one-off act of prostitution, whether implied or explicitly stated.⁹⁹ We know from Theophanes and Suidas that less than flattering versions of Constantine's family life were in circulation, even that Eunapius was still being read at around the time that the *Guidi Vita* was composed; but while this shows that the insinuations made by such writers were remarkably persistent, it does not follow that they would have been so widespread as to trigger the recycling of this story in response.

Rather, it was the continuing validity of the typology employed by the counter polemic that ensured its reuse after the polemic itself had become sterile. The birth of Constantine as given in the *vitae* made the “facts” of Helena's situation fit a much older set of images conditioned by the category of person Constantine was seen to have been: a king whose ascent was due to the providence of a god, in this case the Christian god.¹⁰⁰ Ironically, it defended the validity of Constantine's birth by the assimilation of some aggressively negative interpretations of his mother's background. Its Helena is a

⁹⁹ The *Opitz Vita* is missing its opening, however, given its similarities to the others this can be the only possible course of events in the missing section.

¹⁰⁰ This idea is near universal in stories of this type, to look only at Constantine, we see his conception described as, ἐκ προνοίας Θεοῦ, Devos (1982), p.219, sec.7, and a τέρας, Guidi (1907), p.309, lines 12-13, he is summoned to his father's kingdom τῇ θεϊκῇ ἐκ προνοίας Halkin (1959b), p.75, sec.2, line,25, at Dräger (2010), p.48, sec.20.11, Constantius pronounces his belief that, *nec sine deorum sublimium dispositione talis concubitus accidere potuit de quo talis proles nasceretur...*

pornographic slur turned literary archetype. Helena's prominence turned her into a target while her background helped draw this pattern to her son, allowing an exalted complication of Constantine's parentage that would have been much harder if she had been known as Constantius' social equal. It also made it possible for the young Constantine to be brought up away from his father and without his father's knowledge, providing not only the complicated childhood, but also the later recognition and "adoption" also associated with this sort of tale.¹⁰¹ Into such a frame, dream omens and other indications of divine interest could be, and were, easily worked.

It might be objected that the tradition may equally have been an expression of Christian ideals of poverty and humility, an attempt to turn the tables on Helena's detractors through an application of the new ethics, just as Ambrose sought to do in his oration. While the story was doubtless generated and circulated by someone sympathetic to Constantine's legacy, the story's *pattern* has very little to do with Christianity *per se*. Note that this Helena was no Magdalen. Nowhere, save the *Libellus* in which she is raped, does her brief relationship with Constantius cause her any qualms or difficulties.¹⁰² Compare this to the rapid repentance of Theodore of Sykeon's mother and aunts.¹⁰³ Though appealing to hagiographers, the story itself is in essence a *royal* tradition that had been adapted to Christian use, one entirely indifferent to sticky questions of possibly illicit sex. In fact, as a set of providential coincidences, culminating

¹⁰¹ To review; In the *Birth Legend*, Sargon is adopted and raised by a farmer of some kind, see Lewis (1980), p.25 (lines 8-12), the much older tradition represented by the *Sumerian King List* would seem to have held that his father grew dates (though the line in question falls partially in a lacuna), Jacobsen (1939), p.111 (Col.IV, line 32). David was the son of a shepherd, just before being anointed by Samuel he was out herding sheep, 1 Samuel. 16.11. The "Ctesian" Cyrus was the son of a bandit, FGrH 90 F66.3 = Lenfant (2004), F8d*.3. The "Herodotean" Cyrus, on the other hand, is adopted by shepherds, 1.101-103, Justin. Epit. 1.4.8-13. Sasan, Ardashir's supposed natural father and link to the Kayanid dynasty, posed as a shepherd before his identity was revealed to Pabag, ŠhN 6, p.140, line 97, KNA, 1.6. Perhaps also present in an insult ("son of a Kurd") sent by Ardawan to Ardashir in a letter reported by a probably unrelated tradition included by, see Ṭabarī, p.11. The version of Ardashir's conception given by Agathias stresses Pabak and Sasan's low status (the first is a leather worker the second a travelling soldier) and involves an act of sex-hospitality verging on prostitution, see Agathias. Hist. 2.27.1-3.

¹⁰² Repentance or consequences for fornicators were common in Byzantine hagiography, see Kazhdan (1990), p.136-137.

¹⁰³ Festugière (1970), p.5, sec.6, lines 2-4, translation at Dawes and Baynes (1977), p.90.

in the acknowledgement of a supernaturally gifted royal child, it dispenses with earthly customs entirely.

4.5.2 The Recognition(s) of Constantine

In two of the *vitae* a clearly supernatural indication of the future greatness of Constantine is given at his conception: the *Guidi* and *Opitz vitae* have Constantius experience a vision (in the *Guidi Vita*, one with clearly solar overtones).¹⁰⁴ It is however, the use of tokens, almost always including a transparently symbolic purple cloak, which provides the most obvious proof of the young Constantine's paternity. As has already been mentioned, this has led commentators to link this episode to the widespread literary motif of recognition. Somewhat overlooked is that the use of tokens is triggered by another type of "recognition" and then confirmed by a third. The forms of these recognitions are rather limited and a distinct similarity can be discerned throughout all of the Mesopotamian, Iranian and Roman traditions considered here. The significance of these similarities is worthy of some consideration.

It will be recalled that Herodotus' Cyrus comes to the attention of Astyages as a result of what, on its surface, appears to have been a childish game:

"Now when the boy was ten years old, the truth about him was revealed in this wise. He was playing in the village where these herdsmen's quarters were: there he was playing in the road with others of his age. The boys in their play chose to be their king that one who passed for the son of the cowherd."¹⁰⁵

There would, on first glance, appear to be very little correspondence with the event that brought Constantine to the attention of his father's agents in the *vitae*. In the *Guidi Vita* the men simply start to tease the boy and cause him to run to his mother.¹⁰⁶ The *Passio Eusignii* however, contains a very significant difference:

¹⁰⁴ Guidi (1907), p.308, line 29 – p.309, line 5.

¹⁰⁵ Herod., 1.114.1.

¹⁰⁶ Guidi (1907), p.310, lines 3-6.

“With the *Protectores* entertained, the boy was gladdened and, **as if called by fate to his royal patrimony**, he went out to the horses. One of the *Protectores* went out to take care of the animals and saw Constantine sitting on one of the horses. Irritated, he struck the boy and said to him, “Don’t be bold little boy, **you’re too young to be a soldier.**”¹⁰⁷

This detail resurfaces in the *Halkin Vita*:

“With the pleasure of a little boy, or perhaps rather **summoned by divine providence to his imperial inheritance**, he was enticed by the horses. One of the bodyguards came out and saw him sitting on a horse, and crossly gave him a slap, saying: “Don’t be naughty. You’re too young to go riding.”¹⁰⁸

In this movement towards the horses, Constantine makes a gesture of military, and thereby princely inclinations. Though the effect is somewhat undercut by the boy’s subsequent tearful appeal to his mother, both of these texts link this action to divine providence and both view an inclination to military things as an intrinsic quality of those born to rule: as in the case of Cyrus’ play acting, a child’s diversion signals something more. The innateness signaled by the “game” is confirmed by a physical inspection of the child. Cyrus is called to account for ordering the punishment of the son of an aristocrat in his capacity as “king”. Standing before Astyages he makes a frank admission of his actions. Astyages is, however, troubled:

“While he spoke, it seemed to Astyages that he recognized Cyrus; the fashion of the boy’s countenance was like (he thought) to his own, and his manner of answering was freer than customary: and the time of the exposure seemed to agree with Cyrus’ age.”¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁷ Devos (1982), p.220, sec.8.

¹⁰⁸ Halkin (1959b), p.75, sec.2, lines, 24-28. I am grateful to Prof. Samuel Lieu and Mark Vermes for their permission to use their unpublished translation of the *Halkin Vita*. The final sentence of each is almost the same and the verb used admonish the boy in both texts is the explicitly militaristic *στρατεύω*. I have offered a slightly different translation.

¹⁰⁹ Herod., 1.116.1.

Likewise, after the display of tokens triggered by the disciplining of Constantine, the men return to Constantius and report their find. In the words of the *Guidi Vita* (an extremely similar account of this interview is given in the *Opitz Vita*):¹¹⁰

“After he had welcomed them gladly he asked them what strange and foreign things they had seen in the East; and they all described different things, but the most eminent of them explained to the emperor about Helena and the boy, and said the distinguishing mark of royalty was on the face of the boy who had been born to her and was being bought up in Drepanum: ‘Truly, he is the image of you my lord,’ he said.”¹¹¹

A very similar double recognition, by prowess and resemblance, can be discerned in the Iranian traditions attached to Shapur and Ormazd, most clearly in Ferdowsi’s rendition. Here, informed of the existence of his son, Ardashir orders a hundred aristocratic boys to be dressed in the same clothes and to play polo before him.

“Ardashir came to the square in early in the morning and examined the features
of some of the boys
When he saw the children, he was overcome by emotion
He pointed with his finger and said to his minister, “There is an Ardashir!”
The minister replied, “Oh king, your heart has revealed your son to you!” Ardashir
spoke to a servant, “Go, strike their ball with your mallet
He is among the fair children, hammer the ball before me
So that a bold one comes out from the children, among the lion-hearted riders
The ball will draw him to my sight, in a group one cannot be told from another
He will be without doubt my son, of my race, my line, my true relation!
The servant performed the king’s order, he struck the ball before the riders
The children ran after it like an arrow, so they drew near Ardashir
They grew restless, as brave Shapur came before (Ardashir)

¹¹⁰ Halkin (1960), p.12, lines 2-10.

¹¹¹ Guidi (1907), p.311, lines 2-8.

Before his father he picked up the ball and carried it out
So he left the other children behind.”¹¹²

Ferdowsi’s version of Ormazd’s recognition is extremely similar to his account of the recognition of Shapur while playing polo, though Ardashir does not, in this instance, know that his grandson is hidden among the players. In both of these texts it is the boy’s skill in a game, followed by his boldness before royalty that marks him as something more: as in Herodotus, “his manner of answering was freer than customary”:

“Not a man of them went after the ball, they were restless
Ormazd ran out from among them, in front of the king like a swift wind!
Quickly he returned the ball in front of his grandfather, and the army began to
talk of him.”¹¹³

KNA is similarly curt.

“Ardashir said nothing, the children were silent, [*out of fear of*]Ardashir’s majesty,
none dared approach. Ormazd came boldly, he confidently took up the ball, and
struck it with a shout.”¹¹⁴

Far more interesting, in this context, is the version of this story given by Ṭabarī:

“When Hurmuz was several years old, Ardashīr rode out one day and turned aside to Shābūr’s dwelling because he wanted to tell Shābūr something. He went into the house unexpectedly. When Ardashīr had stretched himself out comfortably, Hurmuz came forth, having by this time grown into a sturdy youth. He had in his hand a polo stick that he was playing with, and was crying out in pursuit of the ball. When Ardashīr’s eye fell on him, this perturbed him, and he became aware of the resemblance in the youth to his own family, because the qualities of Persian kingship characteristic of Ardashīr’s house could not be concealed and could not be disregarded by anyone, because of certain specific traits visible in members of

¹¹² ŠhN 6, p.202, lines 120-132.

¹¹³ Ibid. p.211, lines 257-259.

¹¹⁴ KNA, 14.7-8

that house: a handsome face, a stout physique, and other bodily features by which Ardashir's house was distinguished."¹¹⁵

Characterising Constantine's attempt to play with some horses as "prowess" may seem something of a stretch. Through a comparison with the Latin *Libellus* it can, however, be shown that this action is of a piece with the princely games seen in the Iranian iterations of Sequence One. This text, it will be recalled, turned Helena into a Christian noblewoman and grafted a "romantic" plot, containing a kidnap and shipwreck into a frame provided by some version of the Greek story related in the *vitae*. The integration of this romance, and the casting of Helena as a Christian noblewoman, have altered the plot of the *Libellus* making it impossible for Constantine to be recognized by his father's agents in an inn. In consequence the recognition had to be remodeled for an older Constantine. How this was done is most telling in light of the Iranian *comparanda* given above:

"Constantine however, in accordance with his noble origin, of which he was completely unaware, devoted himself to knightly games."¹¹⁶

It should surprise no one that Constantine is *very* good at such games:

"He took to exercise himself in military games [*hastiludiis*], tournaments [*torneamentis*] and other knightly¹¹⁷ activities. So much that in time, among all the knights and nobles who were in Rome at that time, and everyday from every part of the world, an uncountable host flowed together in that place, accustomed to exert themselves unceasingly in such diversions, he collected such fame that it was believed that there was no man to be found in the city of Rome who was better than Constantine in such things."¹¹⁸

He is so good in fact, that he draws the attention of the emperor, his father:

¹¹⁵ Tabarī, pp.41-42.

¹¹⁶ Dräger (2010), p.40, sec.16.1.

¹¹⁷ The translation of *miles* and its derivatives as "knight" and "knightly" has been suggested not only by the semantic drift of this term towards a higher class of fighter in the Medieval period, but the text's own association of this term with the sort of ritualized combat games popular amongst the upper classes during this time.

¹¹⁸ Dräger (2010), p.40, sec.16.2.

“Those military games and tournaments went on for days and with Constantine overcoming more and more opponents, the emperor undertook to ask who he might be.”¹¹⁹

Constantius is told, first by Constantine, and then by Helena, that Constantine’s mother is a poor woman and that his father is nobody in particular, but he is dissatisfied. Perhaps because he senses something more in the young man:

“The emperor, no more contented with the woman’s answer than he was before, had his doubts. He commanded that she, and her son, come and eat at his own table among the noble ladies...”¹²⁰

It is among these noble ladies, rather than in the company of the gruff and soldierly company of the *protectores* that the fateful display of tokens is made. A formal dinner being, explicitly, a test of character, though the author’s insistence that manners trump hereditary appears rather weak in light of the story’s previous insistence on the innateness of royal talent:

“It was the habit in antiquity to observe great discipline at banquets, consequently, men, and most especially women, were accustomed to do so. They were esteemed noble or ignoble according to the greater or lesser discipline they showed: more so they displayed themselves greater or lesser in habit and virtue. For it was not descent at that time, but the nobility of habit and virtue in men that was assessed: the emperor, silently considering the matter, called Helena to him after the feast, saying “It is not at all as you say regarding your son and his wife, and unless you tell us the truth in this affair, you should understand that you have greatly offended the imperial majesty, and you will know that you cannot escape the recompense owed.”¹²¹

Thus Constantine’s attraction to the horses was eventually transmuted into a public display of military talent, one that is of a type with Cyrus’ play-acting as king and *remarkably* similar to Shapur and Ormazd’s display of skill in polo. In all cases this

¹¹⁹ Ibid. p.40, sec. 16.7.

¹²⁰ Ibid. p.42, sec.18.1.

¹²¹ Ibid. pp.42-44, sec. 18.4-6.

“motion” is an outward display of innate nature expressed as natural ability in a “game” reflecting the habits of the ruling class.¹²² This signaling of innateness is an inescapable aspect of many of the “biographical” texts associated with Sequence One. In these cases, the predictably limited means of staging this display supports the proposition that they are typologically, and thereby thematically, linked. To reiterate, this is not to claim that all historicized instances of the recognition of a lost royal child are directly dependent, rather it is to suggest that there were, by Late Antiquity, fairly tight constraints when constructing a historicizing narrative of this type. There was, as it were, a narrow matrix of narrative possibilities dictated by the argument inherent to the story form itself.

4.5.3 Summary of Sequence One

The evidence reviewed above offers very little *concrete* information that would allow us to pinpoint the origin, or basal form(s) of the story of Constantine’s conception in an inn. It gives us, however, some context in which to frame the story’s emergence and in doing so suggests something about what its purpose may have been. Helena’s status seems to have been, essentially, the *only* thing remembered about Constantine’s early childhood. The brief indications in Libanius and Philostorgius that Julian and/or his cultural partisans employed this “fact” give a possible reason as to why this was so. Whether veracious or not, the image of Helena as a menial, shading into a depiction as a prostitute, seems to have been propagated, apparently quite successfully, not very long after the extinction of Constantine’s dynasty. Ambrose’s panegyric certainly has the feel of an attempt to break an unpleasantly ubiquitous “fact” (*adserunt!*) to harness, to twist a slur into evidence of sanctity. Ambrose could not, however, have been the only person moved to the defence of the dead emperor’s legitimacy, nor, perhaps, was his invocation of Christian humility the most effective solution to the problem of Helena.

¹²² Note the following Stith-Thompson motifs; H32 Recognition by extraordinary prowess, H31.8 Recognition by unique ability to shoot, swim and drink, H41.5 Unknown prince shows his qualities in dealings with his playmates.

Somebody else chose a far less radical, if indifferently Christian, means of reconciling the great man with his disreputable mother: Helena took, in this telling, the traditional role of the “adoptive” lower-class parent. In doing so her profession became the point of admission for the signs and portents long associated with royal birth and was thus obviated, even, ironically, exalted. That such a construction was considered useful to the partisans of a historical argument can be seen in the attachment of a similar story to Anastasius, possibly as early as the 6th century. Indeed, in light of Helena’s extremely early connection with hospitality, there exists the tantalizing possibility that “John’s” Anastasius was a variation on a theme more commonly attached to Constantine by the 6th or 7th century. Regardless of the truth or otherwise of this particular supposition, the aggregate of the circumstantial evidence clinging to this narrative supports both an early date for its emergence and the memory of Helena as the catalyst for its formation. Like the Iranian material considered above, the story engaged with problems of lineage; though here, driven by rather different circumstances, the intent was defensive: the story sought not to shore up an existing dynasty by claiming a useful bloodline, but to defend the reputation of a royal hero of an ascendant, imperial, religion by explaining away a useless one.

4.6 Sequence Two: The Flight From Court

If the unlikely story of Constantine as a lost prince presents us with a great deal that is suggestive, but very little that can be fixed, the antecedents of the next episode used in the *vitae* are far clearer. The evolution of the story of Constantine’s time at the courts of Diocletian and Galerius, his escape and inheritance of his father’s legions is relatively common and can be mapped in a number of texts, and even traced back to a strand of rhetoric current in Constantine’s own lifetime, well before, in fact his final victory over Licinius in 324. Indeed, the rapidity of the story’s bend towards the type represented as Sequence Two, and the egregiously selective rearrangement of very recent events performed in order to make this happen is, as will be shown, quite visible (see Table 10).

In outline, the story proceeds as follows: Constantine is transferred to the court of Diocletian, or Galerius, either as hostage, for his own safety (in some cases where this story is fused to Sequence One, to hide him from Constantius' wife) or to complete his education. Here he performs exceptionally well, but arouses jealousy and fear on the part of his host. This leads to a plot being made against him; the instigator of this plot is variable as the two tetrarchs often become confused or elided, particularly in later works.¹²³ In the very earliest forms of the story, however, the culprit is clearly, and "correctly", Galerius. The plot generally takes the form of arranging some kind of "accident". In some sources this is said to occur during a dangerous game, usually a combat against dangerous animals. Constantine, often with the aid of God, is warned of the plan, or overcomes the attempt on his life. He escapes court and flees to his father in Britain, here he receives the dying Constantius' blessing and inherits his "kingdom".

The story is, as far as we can tell, a tendentious reworking of actual events. According to Barnes' reconstruction, Constantine served Diocletian and Galerius between the years 293 and 305.¹²⁴ Constantine, recently cut from the succession, was probably released from court at this time. Though Galerius must have viewed Constantine as a threat, he had no excuse with which he might detain him and probably couldn't have refused a request from his colleague Constantius.¹²⁵ Constantine really did join his father for a campaign against the Picts in the north of Britain in 305, a campaign that is confirmed by an inscription found in Italy dating to January 306 and mentioned in a panegyric delivered to Constantine in the latter half of the first decade of the 4th century. Yet this campaign would largely disappear from extant sources, completely effaced by the thrilling tale of Constantine's race to his father's deathbed. Likewise, Constantine's taking of leave would take on an entirely sinister resonance. The result is a transparently contrastive, easily divinized episode in which Constantine becomes a

¹²³ The identity of the plotter was Galerius according to Lactantius and (possibly) the *Origo*, never specified by Eusebius, "Maximianus" according to Praxagoras and the *Vita Metrophanis et Alexandrii* (thereby, possibly Gelasius), but Diocletian according to Philostorgius, Galerius according to Alexander the Monk, sequentially Diocletian and Galerius according to Theophanes and the *Guidi Vita*, Diocletian in the *Opitz Vita* and Galerius again in the *Halkin Vita*.

¹²⁴ Barnes (1982), p.42.

¹²⁵ So argued at Barnes (2011), pp.61-63, largely followed by Bardill (2012), p.82.

paragon of princely virtue and his “guardian” is shown to be unworthy of rule. In this it recalls, sometimes very directly, the entirely artificial contrast made between Ardashir and Ardawan; here however the transformation of a relatively anodyne series of events into a narrative stereotype can be (imperfectly) observed in some of the earliest extant rhetoric and historiography surrounding Constantine.

4.6.1 Lactantius and the Disappearing Campaign of 305

The earliest document of relevance to the development of this story is Panygericus Latinus VI(7), which may have been delivered in Constantine’s presence in Trier sometime between 307 and 311.¹²⁶ Amid the rhetor’s fulsome praise of his subject is a very ambiguous reference to Constantine’s exit from the court of Galerius in 305, his meeting with his father and their joint campaign against the Picts in modern Scotland. The rhetor pivots from a ringing description of Constantius’ military accomplishments, itself part of an endorsement of Constantine’s hereditary, to a “description” of the meeting of father and son just before Constantius sailed for Britain.¹²⁷

“For you were summoned even then to the rescue of the State by the votes of the immortals at the very time when your father was crossing the sea to Britain, and your sudden arrival illuminated the fleet which was already making sail, so that you seemed not to have been conveyed by the public post, but to have flown in some divine chariot.

For no Persian or Cydonian weapons ever hit their targets with such sure blows as you, when you reached your father’s side as he was about to depart this earth, a most timely companion, and assuaged by the security of your presence all those cares that preoccupied his silent foreboding mind. Good Gods, what felicity you bestowed upon Constantius Pius even on his deathbed! The Emperor, about to make his journey to heaven, gazed upon him whom he was leaving as his heir. For no sooner had he been snatched from earth than the whole army agreed upon you, and the minds and eyes of all marked you out, and although you referred to

¹²⁶ A case for August 310 is made at Nixon and Rodgers, (1994), pp.213-214.

¹²⁷ On the hereditary claims made in this speech, see Börm (2015), pp.246-251.

the senior rulers the question of what they thought should be done in the interests of the State, the soldiers anticipated in their eagerness what those leaders soon approved by their decision.”¹²⁸

This account of Constantius’ death is something of a montage and its chronology would seem to be very condensed. The orator had, however, already mentioned that Constantius’ final campaign took place in Britain and clearly places Constantine’s acclamation there.¹²⁹ It would follow that the seemingly rapid death of Constantius painted here should be, and was, understood as dramatic license and not an assertion that Constantius was actually *on* his deathbed when Constantine arrived. Further, there is no *unambiguous* indication in this speech that Constantine’s life was in danger. Constantine’s arrival is said to have been extraordinarily rapid, but this may simply be part of the flowery, quasi-divine imagery the orator was employing. Indeed, the senior emperors are, at least superficially, deferred to in the matter of succession. An inscription dating to early January 306 proves that Constantius had campaigned in Britain during 305 and that the operation was claimed as a success.¹³⁰ A short, probably late 4th century text, the *Origo Constantini* offers the further detail that Constantine met Constantius in Bolougne and that Constantius died in York *after* he had subdued the Picts.¹³¹

The version of events given in Pan Lat. VI(7) is therefore plausible, if ornate. The orator certainly spared no effort in elevating Constantine’s descent, but appeals to heredity were not exactly unusual among the younger players in the tetrarchy at this time.¹³² We have already seen that Constantine’s link to Claudius II, of which much is made here, was somewhat vague: indeed it may have been a reactive claim trundled out whenever Constantine’s more contemporary connections had embarrassed him.¹³³ Such matters aside, there is very little in the chain of events presented in this oratory that

¹²⁸ Lat. Pan. VI(7), 7.5-8.2 (trans. Nixon and Rodgers (1994), pp.228-229).

¹²⁹ Lat. Pan. VI(7), 7.1 and 9.1.

¹³⁰ The relevant inscription, EDH.HD032314, was found in Toscana and is dated to the 7th of January 306. In it Constantius and Galerius claim the title *Br(itannici) m(aximi)*.

¹³¹ *ad patrem Constantium venit apud Bononiam*, Anon. Val. Origo Const., 2.

¹³² Warmington (1974), pp.375-377. Rogers (1989), pp.237-238. See now also Börm (2015).

¹³³ Humphries (2008), *passim*.

would count as an *outright* invention. In this, Panegyric VI makes quite the contrast to *De Mortibus Persecutorum*, Lactantius' biting polemic against the persecuting tetrarchs written circa 314/315.

"...he [Constantius] sent letters that he might recall his son, whom he had sought before, but in vain, in order to see him. He [Galerius] truly wished nothing less, for he had often made attempts to ensnare the youth [Constantine] in traps, for he dared do nothing openly, lest he incite the civilians, and what he feared most, the hatred of the soldiery, against himself. So, under cover of games and exercises he threw him [Constantine] to the beasts, but to no avail, for the hand of God, who, in the moment of crisis delivered him from his [Galerius'] hands, protected the man. Having been often asked, he [Galerius] was no longer able to deny [Constantius], he gave to Constantine his leave [*sigillum*] one evening and commanded him to set out the next morning carrying imperial commands, he meant to find some other opportunity to hold Constantine back or to send ahead letters so that Constantine would be arrested by Severus. When Constantine discerned these intentions, he rushed to leave while the emperor was sleeping after dinner. He hastened through many way stations, making away with all the post horses as he went. The next day the emperor, who had purposefully remained in bed until noon, commanded him to be called. He was told that Constantine had set out immediately after dinner. He began to rage and roar. He sought the post horses, that he might draw Constantine back, and when it was announced to him that they had been taken away, he could barely hold back the tears.

Constantine, with incredible speed, reached his father as he lay dying. He commended him to the soldiers and passed on his imperium into his son's hands. And thus, on his bed, he met his death, just as he had wished. Having assumed imperial authority, Constantine Augustus had no higher priority than to return Christians to the faith and to their God: this law was the first of his regarding the restoration of the holy church."¹³⁴

Lactantius completely altered the staging of Constantine's exit, and in doing so, thoroughly reworked recent history. Unlike the orator behind Lat. Pan. VI(7), Lactantius

¹³⁴ Lact. De Mort., 24.3-9, my translation.

has no interest in the campaign of 305, preferring to conflate the death of Constantius with the arrival of Constantine. In doing so Lactantius gives a fairly complete version of Sequence Two, complete with some surprisingly *specific* parallels to Ctesian and Iranian *comparanda*: the depiction of a dying father and an escape while the king is asleep or relaxing.¹³⁵ As will be seen below, it is in outline *this* version of events that would dominate the later historiography of this moment; it is certainly this tradition of interpretation that stands behind the *vitae*.

The fact that Lactantius is the first extant source reporting this version of Constantine's inheritance raises the possibility that the story was one circulating in Constantine's court, and met with the emperor's approval, at least tacitly. Constantine may have met Lactantius while serving under Diocletian in Nicomedia where Lactantius taught rhetoric. In later life, Lactantius became the tutor of Constantine's son Crispus and must certainly have been associated with Constantine's entourage in the 310s. Some commentators have seen Lactantius as an influential voice during this time. It remains, however, difficult to say with any certainty just how close Lactantius' relationship with the emperor was.¹³⁶ It does seem unlikely, however, that the emperor whose actual religious beliefs are *still* a matter of debate, was, or could be, as extravagantly forthright as his learned courtier. *De Mortibus Persecutorum*, once described as a "horrible pamphlet" and "the shrill voice of implacable hatred" is an unashamedly partisan and particularly vicious polemic, one that makes a rather wishful interpretation of the forces that guided the emperor's actions: its claim that Constantine leapt from his

¹³⁵ Ibid. 24.7.

¹³⁶ It is possible that Constantine met Lactantius during his stay in Nicomedia during 293-305. In any case, it seems that the emperor must have thought very highly of the orator as Lactantius became Constantine's son Crispus' tutor in "*extrema senectute*", Jerome. *De Viris Ill.*, 80. *De Mortibus Persecutorum* was written between 313 and 316. Older theories (such as that outlined in Stevenson (1957), pp.675-676) date the text to after 317 based on problems with the chronology of the *terminus post quem*, but this view is no longer held, see Barnes (1973), pp.32-35. Lactantius' movements are not precisely known, but he is generally assumed to have been in Gaul with Constantine in the first half of the second decade of the fourth century; Odahl put Lactantius at Constantine's court in Trier in 313, Barnes in 311 or 312, De Palma Digeser as early as 310, Odahl (1995), p.336-337, Barnes (2011), p.61, Digeser (2000), p.32. A close personal and ideological relationship between the two men has been posited in Odahl (1995), pp.336-342, and Digeser (2000) *passim*.

father's deathbed consumed by a need to defend the church, for example, is not at all convincing.¹³⁷

It is, therefore, uncertain whether the version of Constantine's escape from Galerius' court that Lactantius presents in *De Mortibus* was his own invention, or a Christian adaptation of an already existing *fabula* coined to reinterpret Constantine's role in events of 305. What Lactantius *does* demonstrate is that the origin of the version of events carried in the *vitae* is a very old rhetorical device. That it was known to one of Constantine's courtiers might suggest that forms of it had a broader circulation among those charged with presenting the emperor to the world. Finally, the date ranges for Panegyric VI(7) and *De Mortibus* allow us to date the emergence of the story to between 307 and 316.

That Lactantius was not the author or only source of this staging is suggested by the number of appearances, and variations, of the story of Constantine's escape in 4th and 5th century texts, not all of them Christian. Aurelius Victor's *De Caesaribus* and the *Epitome* of Pseudo-Aurelius Victor both carry a version of it: likewise, the *Origo Constantini* combined a report of the campaign of 305 with certain references to something like the story of flight offered by Lactantius.¹³⁸ Published after Constantine's death in 337, Eusebius' *Vita Constantini* offered a retelling for a specifically Christian audience in which the emperor was framed as Moses.¹³⁹ The fragmentary Christian historians Gelasius and Philostorgius probably also used it, at least in part.¹⁴⁰ On the other hand, another iteration of this story appeared in the *bios* of the emperor written sometime after 324 by Praxagoras of Athens who was certainly not a Christian. We cannot say whether Bemarchios' lost biography of Constantine also had Constantine escape from court.¹⁴¹ We can, however, infer that this version of events was spread rather efficiently:

¹³⁷ 24.9. Momigliano (1963), p.107.

¹³⁸ Victor. *De Caesaribus*, 40.2-3, Psuedo Victor. *Epitome*, 41.2, 2.

¹³⁹ A comparison spelt out at Eusebius, VC., 1.12.

¹⁴⁰ This section of the *Opitz Vita* is counted as Philostorgius, 1.5a.7-8. The supposition that Gelasius may have used this story is based on its appearance in BHG 1279, the *vita* of Metrophanes and Alexander. See, Winkelmann (1982), pp.150-151, sec.2.

¹⁴¹ Phot. Bib. Cod. 62. In the fourth century a sophist named Bemarchios wrote an "Acts of the Emperor Constantine" in ten books, see Suda. β259. Most of what we know about this writer comes as a result of his feud with Libanius in the 340s. The information conveyed by Libanius, though tendentious, suggests that

as in the case of the Armenian interpretation of Ardashir's usurpation of Ardawan, the implausible narrative seems to have crowded out other interpretations. Zosimus' *Historia Nova* written circa 500 makes a hostile interpretation of Constantine's escape that reads like a rephrased version of the flight offered by Lactantius.¹⁴² It would follow that *his* likely source, Eunapius - as we have seen, no friend of Constantine's legacy - had no source to hand offering an alternative report to that of Constantine's propagandists.

This staging of Constantine's time at court was a clearly deliberate remodeling of recent history in which the chance to advertise a successful generalship, traditionally a (perhaps *the*) key aspect of the imperial persona, was put aside in favour of an oddly interpersonal vignette.¹⁴³ The result was a collection of narratives with affinities to the collection of motifs identified as Sequence Two and particularly strong parallels to Ctesias' Cyrus. The argument inherent in this reconstruction is explicable from this resemblance: the plot against Constantine and his subsequent taking of leave is a stereotypical presentation of contrast in which a divine presence can be enlisted to signal a preferred candidate. The assimilation of varieties of this form into historiography established this legendary narrative, to a great extent, as *the* story and in doing so, laid down a certain method in the interpretation of this episode. By constructing this time as one of personal, courtly confrontation, certain comparisons and motifs, both biblical and secular, were enabled.

4.6.2 The Warning, and the Plot

The instances of Sequence Two examined above have tended to deal with the accession of an "outsider". This is, however, a singularly inappropriate descriptor to apply to Constantine. In 305 Constantine was in his thirties, a seasoned soldier and the son of a

Bemarchios was very successful and that he crafted several works in honour of Constantius II, see Janiszewski (2006), pp.371-380.

¹⁴² Zosimus, 2.8.2-3.

¹⁴³ This is doubly strange as Constantine noticeably lacked military prestige at this point in his career, see Börm (2015), pp.247-248.

ruling Augustus.¹⁴⁴ Indeed, Lactantius' very compact description gives Constantine's service under Diocletian and Galerius a decidedly military and traditionalist slant. His is a picture of an idealized Roman barracks princeling, one that emphasises Constantine's excellent military service and the love shown to him by the armies and the people. It is true that Constantine is distinguished *decoro habitu corporis*, but this is not given undue weight.¹⁴⁵ The author of the *Origo* would offer a similarly martial picture sometime later.¹⁴⁶ The specific reasons for Constantine's presence would change and the emperor would become far younger than he actually was, but it is never argued that he was anything other than an eligible claimant.¹⁴⁷ This carries a certain accidental realism into even the most extravagant re-imaginings of this episode. In most applications of Sequence Two an explicit warning has to be made to draw the old king's attention to his subordinate and this is usually supernatural; even the most mundane of those considered above, that of the singer before Astyages, has a metaphorical quality that aligns it to the dreams or prophecies seen elsewhere.

Conversely, from Lactantius on, the danger that Constantine presents to his host is usually purely mundane: he is a very competent, charismatic prince with powerful connections and the tetrarch needs no visions to discern this. Throughout the tradition, the reasons writers give for the jealousy directed at Constantine remain stable; as the boy grows up his virtue and physical perfection become so manifest as to be frightening.¹⁴⁸ Three sources buck this trend, moving the episode more strongly towards type by associating the tetrarch's unease with an omen. Alexander the Monk's *De Inventio Crucis*, a text of uncertain date, the *Guidi Vita*, and the *Halkin Vita* each have the tetrarch receive a warning via augury or haruspicy.¹⁴⁹ In the words of the *Guidi Vita*:

¹⁴⁴ Barnes has argued that Constantine was in fact slated to succeed his father before being shunted aside by Galerius in a "dynastic coup" in 305. It follows that the story that he was a hostage postdates this, see Barnes (2011), pp.54-60.

¹⁴⁵ Lact. De Mort., 18.10.

¹⁴⁶ Anon. Val. Origo Const., 2.

¹⁴⁷ See below p.199.

¹⁴⁸ Lactantius, De Mort., 18.10-11, Eusebius, VC., 1.20.1, Theoph. Chron. AM.5788 & 5793, Bidez (1935), p.421, sec.2, lines 20-24, Halkin (1959b), p.77, sec.3, lines 17-20, 87/3, 4052.B.

¹⁴⁹ Guidi (1907), p.312, line 20 - p.313, line 5. Halkin (1959b), p.77, sec.3, lines 17-20, PG. 87/3, 4052.B.

“For the retinue of Diocletian and Heraclius, who passed their lives in superstition and foretelling the future by the observation of birds and the inspection of livers, suddenly realized that he was destined to attain supreme power, and moreover that he would be a God-fearing emperor who would destroy and abolish the superstition of the Greeks and would be a very great proponent of the kingdom of Christ, and for this reason they began to prepare manifold traps of all kinds to do away with him; they resorted to this in their guiltiness and wickedness.”¹⁵⁰

At first glance it would appear that this is Christian boilerplate, very reminiscent of the way Eusebius described the trigger for Valerian or Diocletian’s persecutions in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*.¹⁵¹ In the context of the above texts, however, these serve as the catalyst for the subject’s flight and therefore operate more like the astrology that warns Astyages and Ardawan of their coming depositions or Sargon’s dream of the goddess Innana. The addition of these omens highlights how in Christian iterations of this narrative, the threat - the “outsider-ness” for lack of a better word - has become purely ideological: heaven is not primarily concerned with Constantine throwing down a “dynasty” or an individual king, be he ever so unworthy. Rather his reign is to destroy an unworthy belief system. This epochal, institutional, reading is, however, an adaptation of a form that is predicated on a very immediate and personal comparison, and nowhere is this clearer than in the actual mechanics of the plot.

4.6.3 Contrast through Combat

Lactantius claims that Constantine was to be killed by wild animals *sub obtentu exercitii ac lusus*, that is, before an audience in the performance of an aristocratic diversion.¹⁵²

¹⁵⁰ Guidi (1907), p.312, line 21-313, line, 5. The translation used here is that made in Lieu and Montserrat (1996), p.111.

¹⁵¹ According to Lactantius, Diocletian blamed the presence of Christian officials for the failure of omens, 10.1-3. Likewise, Eusebius believed that Valerian’s persecution was ultimately triggered by Christian “interference” in the performance of magic or divination, Eusebius, HE, 7.10.4. The same author made accusations of sorcery, heavily slanted towards divination, against Maxentius and Maximinus, *ibid.* 8.14.5, 8 & 9.9.3. In the case of Maxentius, it has been theorized that he may have been reacting to a contemporary, anti-Christian source accusing that emperor of *Christian* sympathy and thereby immorality, see Van Dam (2011), pp.89-93.

¹⁵² Lact. De Mort., 24.4.

However, in extant material this detail is relatively difficult to find in the period between the 4th century and the *Opitz Vita*. The lost *bios* of Praxagoras certainly included it, according to Photius:

“His father sent Constantine to Diocletian in Nicomedia in order that he be educated. He then says that Maximinos, then ruling Asia, sought to ensnare the youth in tricks. He set Constantine to fight an enraged lion, but Constantine prevailed and slew the beast. Having become aware of the trap, he fled to his father.”¹⁵³

The author of the *Origo* presented something that might be read as an alternative version of the same story, possibly an older one though it is difficult to tell given the brief nature of the text. Here, the “public” context is in battle and the enemy is an animalized barbarian; in consequence, the episode has an, in all probability coincidental, resemblance to David’s killing of Goliath before Saul.¹⁵⁴

“After the resignation of the empire by Diocletian and Heraclius, Constantius sought him from Galerius; but Galerius set him before many dangers. First, while fighting as a young cavalryman against the Sarmatians, he caught a ferocious barbarian by his hair and threw him before the feet of the emperor Galerius. Next, sent by Galerius into a swamp, he went in on his own horse and made another route to the Sarmatians, and having killed many of them, he reported a victory to Galerius.”

On the other hand, the version of events recounted in Eusebius’ *Vita Constantini*, published shortly after Constantine’s death, is in outline similar to Lactantius in its damning portrait of Diocletian and Galerius and its assertion that Constantine fled a (undescribed) plot against his life to meet his dying father in Britain.¹⁵⁵ Eusebius would follow Lactantius in depicting the arousal of jealousy and fear in the emperor’s erstwhile guardians. He was, however, far less clear about the actual mechanics of the plot than

¹⁵³ “Μαξιμῖνος...καὶ πρὸς μάχην λέοντι ἀγρίῳ καθίστησι τὸν νεανίαν” Photius, Bib. Cod., 62.

¹⁵⁴ “...sed hunc Galerius obiecit ante pluribus periculis...” Anon. Val. *Origo Const.*, 2. Or perhaps his murder-by-proxy of Uriah the Hittite, see 2 Samuel, 11.15.

¹⁵⁵ Eusebius. VC. 1.20.2-21.1.

he was about the providential action of God in its prevention.¹⁵⁶ While Eusebius echoes Lactantius' insistence that a subterfuge was afoot, he does not specifically mention a beast combat. Nor, indeed, do most surviving Byzantine sources reporting the conspiracy against Constantine's life.

In the *Opitz* and *Halkin vitae*, we see a much fuller iteration of the beast combat than would be expected given the general rarity of this set-piece up until this point. The association of the historian Philostorgius (4th – 5th century) with the *Opitz Vita*, including a mention by name in the text, would strongly suggest that this writer stood behind its portrayal of the attempt on Constantine's life. While this is very likely, there are some complications with the attribution that should be considered. From Photius we might surmise that Philostorgius' quarrel with orthodoxy was far more forcefully stated and much more objectionable than that of Eusebius.¹⁵⁷ If Photius' reaction is anything to go by, the undiluted version of his history must have been a truly frightful book in the eyes of the later Byzantine reader.¹⁵⁸ The author of the *Opitz Vita* was himself very doubtful as to this historian's veracity in regards to the emperor.¹⁵⁹ When Bidez associated the fragment of the *Opitz Vita* containing the combat he suggested that its author did not

¹⁵⁶ God's role in the tradition of the plot is prominent but inconsistent. Lactantius has an interventionist deity delivering the young Constantine from Galerius' plot so directly that the reader can almost smell burning fur. Strangely, the deity does not see fit to warn Constantine of anything, perhaps assuming that the young man has worked it out himself. Lact. De Mort., 24.5. The non-Christian Praxagoras seems to have assumed this to be the case in his account, Photius, Bib. Cod., 62. On the other hand, Eusebius credited God with granting Constantine knowledge of the efforts being made against him, Eusebius. VC. 1.20.2. The *Vita Metrophanis et Alexandri*, also has God grant knowledge of the plot to the young Constantine. The relevant section of the *Guidi Vita* is almost identical, but is emphasized by talk of "divine providence" in Constantine's recitation of his adventures to a dying Constantius where a "narrow escape" is also mentioned, cf. Winkelmann (1982), p.150, sec. 1, line 30-sec. 2, line 3 & Guidi (1907), p.313, lines 6-10, and p.313, lines 1-9. In the *Opitz* and *Halkin Vitae* no divine assistance is offered to perceive the scheme in advance but Lactantius' activist God returns to stiffen Constantine's arm in the earlier text, cf. Bidez (1935), p.422, sec.2, lines 1-7, 11-12 & Halkin (1959b), sec. 3, lines 37-42 and 44-45, (p.77).

¹⁵⁷ Photius opens his review of Philostorgius's history with a description of the work as anti-Orthodox polemic and its author as a liar. He is less scathing in his surviving reviews of Eusebius, cf. Philostorgius, *testimonia*, 4.3 (pg. 126 in edition), and Photius, Bib. Cod. 13. On the argumentative and partisan nature of Philostorgius and ecclesiastical history in general, see Bleckmann and Stein (2015), pp.88-90.

¹⁵⁸ Philostorgius probably presented Constantine as an "Arian" who was the target of a determined Nicean conspiracy to corrupt the church, see Ferguson (2005), pp.139-152.

¹⁵⁹ "Οὐκ οἶδα δὲ εἰ ἀληθῆ ταῦτα εἶρηκεν Φιλοστόργιος ὁ φιλοψευδέστατος κατὰ Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ καλλινίκου καὶ εὐσεβοῦς..." Opitz (1934), p.566, lines 36.18-20.

have access to a “pure” version of Philostorgius but a redaction at some removes from the original.¹⁶⁰ Conversely, in their recent edition of Philostorgius, Bruno Bleckmann and Markus Stein suggest that orthodox writers found Philostorgius’ polemics against non-Christians useful and sometimes recycled them without thinking too much about the theology of their source.¹⁶¹

Bidez demonstrated a clear parallel between Photius’ description of Constantine’s return to his father in Britain (fragment 1.5.9) and the same scene in the *Opitz Vita*. Yet Photius’ summary only suggests the presence of the animal combat and does not *confirm* any details that would differentiate Philostorgius’ account of the attempted murder from the vague account given by Eusebius in his *Vita Constantini*.¹⁶² Attribution of the preceding animal combats to Philostorgius merely because they appear in the *Opitz Vita*, which we know used Philostorgius, would be dangerously circular. As Philostorgius’ fragments stand at the time of writing, it cannot be *conclusively* proved that he presented the attempt to kill the young Constantine as an animal combat, though he does seem by far the most likely candidate. The existence of an anonymous, but oddly influential, “Arian” historian in the latter fourth century has been posited to explain certain parallels in Philostorgius, the *Paschal Chronicle* and Theophanes among others.¹⁶³ If this work existed it might be proffered as Philostorgius’ source for this episode. The exact nature, even the existence of such an author is however, unclear. Additionally, as I have shown, there is every reason to assume that variants of Constantine’s escape had become widespread and abundant by the time Philostorgius was writing.¹⁶⁴

The lost *bios* of Praxagoras of Athens is an intriguing “text” in the consideration of this problem in that it admits the possibility of a non-Christian line of transmission into

¹⁶⁰ Bidez (1935). p.404.

¹⁶¹ Bleckmann and Stein (2015), pp.100-101.

¹⁶² Philostorgius 1.5 and 1.5a.9. The parallel was made at Bidez (1935) p.422 who focused on the fact that in both texts Britain was described as “called Albion”. There is the slightest hint that an animal combat set-piece of the type described in the *Opitz Vita* was present in the text seen by Photius in the patriarch’s use of *παράδοξως* to describe Constantine’s escape from Diocletian’s plot. The *Guidi Vita* also describes Constantine’s escape as an “unexpected salvation”, *ἀπροσδόκητον σωτηριαν*, but does not specify why. The reference might be to the supernatural warning Constantine is supposed to have received, see Guidi (1907), p.314, line 10.

¹⁶³ On the hypothesized, anonymous Arian historian of the later fourth century, see, Mango, Scott and Greatrex (1997), pp.lxxx-lxxxi. The “Arianism” of this writer is disputed at Ferguson (2005), pp.71-76.

¹⁶⁴ Van Nuffelen (Forthcoming).

the 9th century. Photius' summary states that according to Praxagoras a lion was used in the plot and a lion is indeed the first animal set on Constantine in the *Opitz Vita*, the second in the *Halkin Vita*.¹⁶⁵ Likewise Constantine would seem to have become aware of the plot without divine guidance in both of the later texts.¹⁶⁶ The fact that these *Christian* authors of *hagiography* have missed the chance to compare the young Constantine to David is an interesting one, particularly as some other texts recycling this episode made just this comparison in the absence of an animal combat.¹⁶⁷ Praxagoras is, however, an extremely unlikely source. There is a discrepancy in detail: Praxagoras gave the name of the responsible tetrach as Maximinus (Galerius is probably meant) whereas the *Opitz Vita* blamed Diocletian.¹⁶⁸ In a wider sense, we have almost no information regarding this work beyond Photius' summary, and there is no reason to suspect that it was ever widely read or particularly influential.¹⁶⁹ The safest assumption remains that the (more or less direct) source for this detail was Philostorgius, and that the reappearance of animal combats in the *Opitz Vita* results from a "rediscovery" of his work, or an extract of it.

If the episode of the animal combat portrayed in the *vitae* does, as seems likely, descend from a rather fuller version of the same story seen in *De Mortibus* recorded by Philostorgius, it would suggest that some relatively basal version of the plot to kill Constantine was far more detailed than extant works of the 4th century would lead one to believe. Whatever the precise transmission, the resurrection of Constantine's

¹⁶⁵ Bidez (1935), p.422, line 5. Halkin (1959b), p.77, lines 25 (defanged) & 39 (unharmd). Janiszewski argued Constantine's duel with a lion may reflect a real combat that occurred at Nicomedia, see Janiszewski (2006), pp.365-366.

¹⁶⁶ cf. ...τῆς δὲ ἐπιβουλῆς αἰσθόμενος... Photius, Bib. Cod., 62, ὁ δὲ Κωνσταντῖνος βεβαίωτάτην συναίσθησιν τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν ἐπιβουλῆς εἰληφώς...Bidez (1935), p.422, sec. 2, lines 11-12, Ὁ τοίνυν εὐσεβῆς Κωνσταντῖνος τὸ δράμα μαθὼν πρὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ πατέρα Κώνσταντα ἀπέδρασε. Halkin (1959b), p.77, sec.3, lines 44-45.

¹⁶⁷ Before David fights Goliath he mentions that he had previously killed lions while guarding his father's sheep, 1 Samuel 17:35-37. Alexander the Monk and Theophanes explicitly compare David's flight from the court of Saul to Constantine's from that of the Tetrarch, yet no mention is made by either writer of a victory over fearful odds, only that a plot was underway. 87/3.4052, & Theophanes. Chron. AM 5793. Incidentally, a comparison of *Constantius* to David is made when he publically anoints Constantine his heir in BHG 1279, Winkelmann (1982), p.145, lines 16-19.

¹⁶⁸ Bidez (1935), p. 422, sec.2, line 9 f. Oddly, in the *Halkin Vita* the responsible tetrarch is given as Galerius.

¹⁶⁹ Lieu and Montserrat argued that these works would have been largely limited to the literati, Lieu and Montserrat (1996), p.100.

struggle with dangerous animals in the *Opitz* and particularly the *Halkin vitae* makes for interesting comparative reading. We see how later hagiographers would read, and indeed augment, this narrative according to its “correct” typology: as a public contrast between a corrupt king and a brilliant, divinely elected, prince. Moreover, as in the contortions of the *Libellus* outlined above, we can see a strong thematic and narrative convergence with Iranian tradition describing the life of Ardashir.

The *Opitz Vita* claims that the plot was to take place during “certain festivals” at which the custom was for the emperor and his *domestici* to fight declawed and defanged animals.¹⁷⁰ Terrified by what he sees in Constantine, Diocletian instructs the animal handlers to substitute intact specimens during Constantine’s bout. Constantine, however, defeats the beasts with the aid of a sudden flash of divine insight. Diocletian pretends to be angry with the handlers, but Constantine sees through him and escapes to his father.¹⁷¹ In short, a cowardly, tyrannical, and illegitimate king unsuccessfully attempts to murder the Lord’s Anointed. The plan backfires, however, becoming a *public* affirmation of the suitability of the intended victim that reflects very poorly on the instigator. The writer of the *Halkin Vita* largely followed the same story, but made some rather unsubtle additions in order to ensure that the import of the scene could not be missed. In this telling, Galerius pretends to be ill and Constantine takes his place in a mock animal combat that is explicitly described as intended to be a ritualistic confirmation of the emperor’s virility performed before a crowd.¹⁷² The crowd, we are told, was expected to shout its approval of the mock combat, crying:

“Wonderful is the courage [τὰ ἀνδρείας] that fate [ἡ τύχη] has granted the emperor. Hooray for the fortune of the Romans!”¹⁷³

Though it is not stated in the text, one presumes that the reader is supposed to imagine Constantine receiving this acclamation after seeing off Galerius’ killers. In the *Halkin Vita*, Galerius miscalculates so badly that the staged display of kingly prowess

¹⁷⁰ Bidez (1935), p.421, sec.2, line 19 – p.422, line 1.

¹⁷¹ Ibid. p.422, sec. lines 1-39.

¹⁷² Halkin (1959b), p.77, sec.3, line 33-35.

¹⁷³ Ibid. p.77, sec.3, lines 30-31.

becomes *real*; Galerius has play-acted his own metaphorical “deposition”, the means of Constantine’s murder have become a symbol of his inherent right to rule and one begins to suspect that they were intended as such all along. By augmenting the story in this way the *Halkin* author merely strengthened a reading pre-existing in his source.

Though the direction of the plot is reversed, a comparison of the confrontation described in the *Opitz* and *Halkin vitae* to the hunt incident described in the *Kārnāmag* tradition may be a fruitful one. In both cases the heroic killing of an animal is performed in a public, courtly context overseen by the subject’s future “enemy”. When the *Kārnāmag* texts do this for Ardashir, the incident is implicitly, but strongly, framed as proof of Ardashir’s claim and a condemnation of its usurpation by Ardawan’s dynasty: an usurpation represented by Ardawan’s siding with his own son in the argument over credit for the shot. An explanation is required, however, for why both Late Antique traditions contain an animal combat while, on the basis of its reconstruction above, the most influential Near Eastern presentations of Sequence Two, Sargon and Cyrus, probably did not.

There was, of course, a very widespread, very old, idea that a king was a guardian of human order, and thereby a master over nature.¹⁷⁴ The expression of this idea in the image of the king hunting, or killing, wild animals was popular in the Near East (almost to the point of mania in Sasanian Iran), but considerably less so in Rome where aristocratic hunting, though certainly an aristocratic activity, was much less explicitly connected to royal ideology.¹⁷⁵ On the other hand, blood sports were extremely popular in the empire, and participation in *exercitii ac lusus* cannot have been out of the question for Roman aristocrats in the early 4th century, Lactantius’ construction of the plot would be a rank nonsense if it were. Yet the hunt and the arena were still somewhat unusual

¹⁷⁴ On the widespread interpretation of hunting imagery as a signal of the divine potency of a king, see the arguments made in Allsen (2006), p.149, *f.* and *passim*. On the *Alexander Legend*, see below.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, pp.15-16, Canepa (2009), pp.157-1. Though the source is too old to be directly relevant, Tacitus’ disdain (or, perhaps, grudging admiration?) for the Parthian expectation that their ruler would get around on horseback, participate in hunts and host banquets is perhaps emblematic of this general cultural divide, see Tac. Ann., 2.2. Particularly when read alongside Bal’amī’s summation of Shapur I’s education: *čun qolām dah sāl šod, ū rā hameh adabhā bayāmukht, savāri va harčeh andar bāyist malakzādegān bāšad*. “When the boy was ten, he taught him all the polite arts, that he would be a horseman, and everything necessary for a prince of that time.” Bal’amī, p.888.

places for a simulacrum of an emperor to find himself in. To complicate matters further, there existed a singularly *unappealing* precedent for the participation of an emperor in games.¹⁷⁶ It is possible that the parallel staging of Ardashir and Constantine's confrontations over, as it were, the carcass of an animal, is a coincidence. It would seem significant, however, that two of these courtly animal combats have a strong, and specific, parallel in the *Alexander Legend*.

In the the A recension of the *Alexander Romance* of Pseudo-Callisthenes, the oldest of many, Phillip is given Bucephalus, a man-eating horse that no one can tame. Phillip has previously consulted soothsayers who inform him that the man who tames the horse, will be his successor.¹⁷⁷ The A recension was compiled around the 3rd century CE but, since Plutarch knew a version of the taming of Bucephalus, the episode itself is likely to have been older.¹⁷⁸ In any case, the *Romance* itself is likely to have already interpreted the details of Alexander's life through the lens of widely known commonplaces.¹⁷⁹ What is of interest here is the meaning attached to the performance. Consider the following passage from the Greek version:

“Alexander reached the age of fifteen. One day he happened to be passing the place where the horse Bucephalus was locked up and he heard his terrifying whinny. He turned to his attendants and asked where the neighing came from.

‘My lord,’ replied Ptolemy the general, ‘this is the horse Bucephalus, whom your father had caged up because he is a man-eater.’

When the horse heard Alexander's voice he whinnied again, but not in the terrifying tones he usually used, but gently and tamely, as if a god were directing him. When Alexander approached the cage, the horse immediately stretched out both his forefeet towards the prince, and licked him with his tongue, acknowledging him as his own master.

¹⁷⁶ Commodus is said to have been obsessed with games, including the killing of animals, and is famous for having taken part in them. These actions were most certainly not to his credit, see Dio Cassius, 73.17-21. Such predilections were part of the *Historia Augusta's* very negative appraisal of Commodus, made possibly *well* after Constantine's death, see HA, Commodus, 12.12, 14.3.

¹⁷⁷ Ps. Callisthenes, 15.

¹⁷⁸ Plut. Alex. 6 is rather similar to the version given in the *Romance* (though considerably more restrained). On the likely date of the *Romance's* compilation, see Hägg (1983), p.125 f. Stoneman (2008), p.19.

¹⁷⁹ Cizek (1978), p.596 f.

When Alexander saw how remarkable the horse was, and saw also the pieces of dismembered human corpses lying around him, he elbowed the horse's guards aside and opened the cage. Then he grabbed the horse by his mane and leapt on him, bridleless as he was, and rode him through the middle of Pella. One of the grooms ran to Phillip, who was outside of the city at that time. The king at once remembered the oracle, and he went to Alexander and embraced him with the words 'Hail Alexander, ruler of the world!' From that day on Phillip was full of joy over his son's future."¹⁸⁰

It should be remarked that Phillip's relationship to Alexander in this tradition is a complicated one. In the *Romance*, Phillip is *not* Alexander's father; Alexander's paternity has been mixed up in what might be an Egyptian "king in the mountain" style tradition concerning Nectenabo II, the Egyptian pharaoh who disappeared after his defeat at the hands of the Persians.¹⁸¹ Despite Phillip's acceptance of the omen, his feelings towards the boy, it is clearly stated, are mixed. Even more telling is that the taming of Bucephalus represents the striking of a contrast to Phillip's detriment.¹⁸² Phillip cannot control the horse and will be replaced by the man who can. Further the horse responds to the divine potential he recognizes in the boy. Two further points are of interest: first Pseudo-Callisthenes appears to have replaced what was initially a mundane trick with inherent numinous power; second, Alexander is said to have been in his early teens when he brought the monster to heel.¹⁸³

In this light, consider the challenge made by a similarly young Ardashir when, while hunting wild asses (*qōr*), Ardawan's son steals the credit for his shot. Keep in mind that the legitimacy of Ardashir's family, as opposed to Ardawan's, has already been stressed in the lead-up to this event. Ferdowsi tells it in a rather condensed form:

¹⁸⁰ Ps. Callisthenes, 17 translation is that of R. Stoneman.

¹⁸¹ Stoneman (2008), pp.15-16. Another interpretation of Pseudo-Callisthenes, though couched in a rather dated general thesis, makes an interesting case that an Egyptian legend concerning Nectenabo II (here described as something like an Egyptian "national hero") was a large component of Alexander's youth in this tradition, see Braun (1938), pp.19-23.

¹⁸² Phillip doubts that Alexander is his son, as well he may, Ps. Callisthenes, 14.

¹⁸³ In a very similar scene, Plutarch has Alexander tame the horse by clever observation of its behavior, see Plut. Alexander, 6.5-7.

“Ardashir said to the prince the field abounds in asses and arrows
You try and make that shot again, lying is a sin of the disobedient (*sarkešān*)”¹⁸⁴

Unusually, the Middle Persian version is longer, and much more interesting:

“Ardashir grew angry at this, and said to Ardawan’s son **“You cannot take on skill and manliness by means of force, assertiveness, lies and injustice.** This is good ground and there are plenty of onagers on it. Let us try this again you and I, right here, **and we will make a showing [*pad dīdar āwarēm*] of our virtue, bravery and agility.** Ardawan took this badly and afterwards barred Ardashir from sitting on a horse.”¹⁸⁵

As in the *Alexander Romance*, the *Kārnāmag* texts give a contrastive slant to the episode. Here too public display of inborn ability/right, manifested as mastery over an animal, is contrasted with ineffectual inability and unworthiness in a courtly, public setting. Ardashir’s proof is a far more physical proposition than that made by the quasi-divine Alexander of the *Romance*, but Ardashir too, we are reminded, has a “miraculous power” inside of him.¹⁸⁶ Likewise, Constantine is shielded by the hand of God, or granted divine insight at the crucial moment. It is in this light that we should consider the response of the crowd in the ritualized combat described in the *Halkin Vita*.¹⁸⁷

While the *Halkin Vita* is distant in time from its ultimate sources, its rather obvious over-emphasis draws attention to the particular response cued by the framing of what, it must be remembered, was always a highly artificial scene. Thus even this late text almost certainly reflects the subtext of its most basal source material: that is, the beast-combat emerging from the cloud of polemic surrounding the living Constantine was meant to be read in exactly the same way as it was by the writer of the *Halkin Vita*. It is not unlikely that the horse taming carried by more sensationalist versions of Alexander’s biography had prepared this reception for a Roman audience. The 3rd and 4th centuries saw a renewed focus on the threat from “Persia”, and Alexander, at least,

¹⁸⁴ ŠhN 6, p.146, lines 187-188.

¹⁸⁵ KNA, 2.18.

¹⁸⁶ Pabag begs his “son” not to throw away his warz, defined at Mackenzie (1986), p.87 as “miraculous power” (*xwēštan warz ō wany butih ma ābespār*), KNA, 2.30.

¹⁸⁷ See pg.187 above.

seems to have been a popular analogy during the period of the Tetrarchy and beyond. Galerius' capture of Narses' harem during his eastern campaign of 298 looks suspiciously like an incident from Alexander tradition. Alexander is referenced three times in the *Panegyrici Latini* dating from this period. Additionally, some of Constantine's own coinage was probably using Alexandrine imagery.¹⁸⁸

That an *imitatio Alexandri*, conscious or otherwise contributed to the *Kārnāmag* tradition is, admittedly, a harder proposition to support. It was once widely, though not universally, suspected that an early Middle Persian translation of Pseudo-Callisthenes circulated in Sasanian times, underpinning much of the positive strand in the historical tradition that emerged from this period.¹⁸⁹ More recently, this idea has been seriously challenged.¹⁹⁰ In the absence of such a text, characterising Alexander's Iranian reception is complicated by the omnipresence of hunting imagery in the Sasanian/Persian tradition, an absence of contemporary evidence and the presence of polarized views in the later strands of the tradition.¹⁹¹ On the one hand, Alexander was supposed to have been an enemy of religion and a quasi-demonic wrecker of the divinely ordained Kayanid kingdom, and this seems to have been the interpretation intended by the *Kārnāmag*.¹⁹² On the other, it is not at all clear whether the views expressed in these works represent a widespread historical opinion or the particular views of the Persian-speaking, Mazdean priestly and scribal classes: after all, *elsewhere* Alexander was "adopted" as a Kayanid.¹⁹³ In any case, fanciful stories of Alexander were certainly circulating in the empire's Syriac literature. As the empire's linguistic and religious

¹⁸⁸ Cf. Rufus. 3.13.10-11, Plut. Alex., 20.11-13, 21.1, Ps. Callisthenes, 41.12 and Eutropius, Brevarium, 9.25. Comparisons are made between Alexander and Maximian, X(2).10.3, and Constantine VI(7), 17.1 (according to Nixon and Rodgers), XII(9), 5.1. On Constantine's *imitatio Alexandri* see Bardill (2012), pp.11-19.

¹⁸⁹ For example, Nöldeke (1979), p.29-30. Yarshater (1983), p.377.

¹⁹⁰ Recent work has put the existence of a Middle Persian translation into serious doubt. A very convincing case has been made that the extant Syriac translation was made directly from Greek around the 7th century, see Ciancaglini (2001), the references within and also the history of doubt on this point referenced at Gignoux (2007), p.89.

¹⁹¹ On the overwhelmingly hostile view of Alexander espoused by Middle Persian sources, see the collection and translation made in Gignoux (2007).

¹⁹² Alexander is accused of misrule (*dušxwādāyih*) in KNA, 1.6. A particularly dismal assessment of Alexander is made by Ḥamza al-Isfahani whose work is probably representative of the later chronicle tradition, Ḥamza, pp.26-28.

¹⁹³ The tradition represented by Ferdowsi made Alexander a Kayanid.

minorities were in general not subject to strict segregation and bilingualism must have been common, it is not impossible to imagine that chunks of the *Alexander Romance* may have been assimilated into the Middle Persian consciousness via the empire's influential Syriac-speaking minority.¹⁹⁴ Finally, Shayegan has recently suggested that a more positive Alexander was assimilated into the legendary complex known to Iranian aristocrats of the Parthian-era, well before the Sasanian revolt.¹⁹⁵ As the religiously inclined ideology of the later Sasanian state probably took some time to crystalise, such a proposition is not at all out of the question.¹⁹⁶

The idea of a contrastive set-piece “combat” expressing themes of inadequacy is, in all likelihood, much older than Alexander, as is its association with a symbolic animal in an expression of Sequence Two: David kills Goliath, an inhuman, bestial enemy, before Saul, and Nicholas turned one of his two prophecies of Astyages' deposition into a struggle *between* powerful animals:

“And one of them [Astyages' concubines] sang the following words in her song:
‘Although the lion had the wild boar in his power, he let him go into his lair; he has become mightier there and will give the lion much grief and despite being weaker will end up subduing one stronger.’ Astyages took her words as referring to him.”¹⁹⁷

Yet, insofar as the popularity of the legend of the taming of Bucephalus may have revitalized this set of images and their attendant readings, there is a distinct possibility that the memory of Alexander of Macedon had a hand in the parallel presence of an animal in the confrontations of Ardashir and Constantine with their “guardians”.

¹⁹⁴ Ciancaglini (2001), pp.135-138. Persian influence in Syriac literature and the broader cultural interactions between the empire's constituent groups are extensively discussed in the essays appended to J.T. Walker's translation of the Syriac *Legend of Mar Qardagh*, see Walker (2006), p.121 f.

¹⁹⁵ Shayegan (2012a), pp.297-307.

¹⁹⁶ See for example, Gnoli (1989), p.138, fn.13 and Shaked (1994), p.112 f. A very strong version of this thesis was made in Gignoux (1984). It is applied to the dynasty's historiography in Daryaei (1995).

¹⁹⁷ 90 F66, 26 = Lenfant (2004), F8d* 26.

4.6.4 Flight

However it is described, the consequence of the unsuccessful plot against Constantine is the final act of the episode: Constantine's "escape" from his would be murderer and arrival at his father's deathbed. When discussing the *Kārnāmag*, it was noted that several parallels can be made between that version of Ardashir and the escape of Cyrus as described by Ctesias. Here a number of the same correspondences can be seen, suggesting that this piece of ancient pro-Constantine rhetoric is also somehow "linked" to an even older Near Eastern habits of royal biography detailed above. We have already seen how the similarities between the Ctesian Cyrus and the *Kārnāmag* have long been noted in scholarship, yet to my knowledge, Constantine's escape to Britain has, to date, not attracted the same kind of comparative treatment.

Just like the plot and the animal combat it was joined to, Constantine's flight was almost certainly a tendentious reinvention of circumstance, part of a package of possible truths developed for political effect in the second decade of the 4th century. Springing from an argumentative construct, the iterations of Constantine's escape are the products of a narrative crafted with some deliberation. That the results of this selective presentation often harmonise with details seen in the even more fictitious flight of Ardashir and the utterly implausible Ctesian Cyrus suggests that the same themes and issues were being addressed according to the same model. Unlike animal combat, this part of the narrative is fairly consistently reported throughout the reception of this tradition. With the exception of the *Opitz Vita*, which alone displays a Lactantian feature, the *vitae* tend not to give a very granular picture of this "escape". They are, however, very clearly based on the same tradition and should therefore, be assumed to have been operating within the range of interpretative possibilities set by the narrative form used by their "ancestors".

It is notable how, at its climax, Sequence Two entwines itself with plausible historical data and redirects it. In very broad terms, the "biographies" of all of these men present a flight towards the subject's father's powerbase; Cyrus' father is the satrap of "Persia" according to Ctesias, whereas Pabag is (supposedly) the king of Fars. Constantius is usually connected to the west of the empire in general and Britain in particular. This is followed by an uncomplicated inheritance of the father's power confirmed either by the

father's followers or the father himself; that is, the military resource used by the subject to elevate himself to rule. For all the transcendent imagery they employ, an ironic *realpolitik* permeates all three traditions. In what is possibly the only *accurate* part of Ctesias' narrative, Cyrus' plot hinges as much on his father's control of Fars as it does on the approval of heaven. Similarly, Constantine's crown is the gift of his father's soldiers, while Ardashir leverages local loyalty to his family into a rebellion against his suzerain. Thus the flight surreptitiously blends a reasonably accurate portrait of their subjects as military leaders into the mystical signs of innate regality shown before the old king in a highly staged circumstance preceding it. All three traditions honestly describe the means by which each man acquired power while greatly simplifying the political context in which they were employed. They are, bluntly, concessions to cynicism generated where the imposition of a legendary frame met inescapably worldly politics.

Because of this parasitic relationship with political and historical realities, it is not so much the outlines of the flight from court as common details that suggest a relationship between these very disparate texts. The subject's father is stated to be ill, dying or dead; having escaped while his antagonist relaxes, the subject is pursued by the antagonist's agents, or the antagonist himself; finally he performs a "trick" of some kind in order to shake his pursuers.

Cyrus uses his father's (feigned) illness as an excuse to return to Fars where his agent has prepared the province to fight Astyages.¹⁹⁸ Likewise, the death of Pabag is explicit in *Šāhnāme* and Tha'ālebī's 11th century history and implicit in the Middle Persian *Kārnāmag* where Pabag disappears from the story after sending Ardashir an admonishing letter.¹⁹⁹ In this last source, the "missing" death is underlined by the construction of Ardashir's arrival in Fars: the young prince is greeted by a group of local noblemen in rebellion against Ardawan, pledging themselves and their resources to Ardashir's cause.²⁰⁰ In the *Šāhnāme* this scene is portrayed as an assembly of nobility

¹⁹⁸ FrGH 90 F66, 20 = Lenfant (2004), F8d* 20.

¹⁹⁹ KNA, 2.30.

²⁰⁰ Ibid., 5.4.

related to Pabag, Sasan and Dara.²⁰¹ Though there is no formal bequest made in this tradition, in both cases the “province” itself is made to confirm Ardashir’s succession to Pabak’s throne. In Ferdowsi the scene feels almost like an idealised late Roman acclamation committed to verse:

“Every man gathered there, the swordsmen, the electors
Rose to their feet on hearing these words, repeating the secret desire of their
hearts
“All of us of Pabag’s line, rejoice in your appearance
And those too who are Sasanians, who have bound this belt about us
Body and soul we are behind you, in you we rejoice, our sorrows flee.”²⁰²

Constantine’s situation was an especially serendipitous one for the application of this form as his biography required little invention: Constantine really did come from Galerius’ court to that of his father, and he really was at his father’s deathbed in York to accept the acclamation of his father’s soldiers sometime in 305. Similarly, Lactantius’ claim that Constantius petitioned Galerius for the return of his son is likely to have been based on accurate information.²⁰³ What is demonstrably *unlikely* is that the elder emperor made this request because he knew himself to be dying.²⁰⁴ As has been discussed above, the escape, with its dramatic deathbed scene, involved a chronological reshuffle, one in which a successful border campaign was discarded. This elision of Constantius’ death into Constantine’s arrival was intended to heighten the drama of Constantius’ anointing of Constantine as his son and heir; something that the author of Pan. Lat. VI(7), was already making a great deal of.²⁰⁵ Although his description is brief, Lactantius too is careful to have Constantius recommend Constantine to the soldiers while Eusebius makes him hand over his share of the empire via “natural succession” in

²⁰¹ ŠhN 6, pp.157-158, lines 343-364. A powerful defector from the Arsacid cause named Banāg/Bawāg, is named in both traditions, *ibid.* pp.159-160, lines 376-397 = KNA, 5.5-8.

²⁰² ŠhN 6, p.158, lines 357-361.

²⁰³ Lact. De Mort., 24.3. A request is perhaps implied by the use of *patri remisit* at Anon. Val. Origo Const., 2. See Barnes (2011), pp.61-2.

²⁰⁴ Something claimed at Lact. De Mort., 24.2-3 and again at Eusebius. VC. 1.21.1. Börm suggests that Constantine may have been sent to his father by Galerius in order to get more experience in the field and that Constantius’ death might have been unexpected, see Börm (2015), p.246, n.38.

²⁰⁵ Lat. Pan. VI(7). 8.2-3.

the company of his other children.²⁰⁶ An extraordinarily fawning description of the handover expressed in a Biblical analogy made its way into BHG 1279 and the *Guidi Vita*, perhaps by way of Gelasius.²⁰⁷ The writers of the other *vitae* were less expansive, but were also careful to emphasize a handover of responsibility.²⁰⁸

Constantius' ill health was probably exaggerated, and his death hastened in order to address immediate questions of dynastic precedence: although the eldest of Constantius' sons, Constantine was not the product of his father's most prestigious marriage. Constantine's younger half-brothers represented a threat, one that Constantine's own sons would resolve in a more permanent fashion immediately after their father's death. These half-brothers occasionally resurface in Byzantine historiography and they are still, just, visible in some of the *vitae*.²⁰⁹ In the 310s however, Constantine's precedence was a rather more pressing issue. Moreover his selection by the army, though thoroughly traditional, was "irregular" insofar as it was unapproved by and forced upon the ruling Augustus. It is probably no coincidence that a stress on hereditary succession, and primogeniture, has been detected in Constantine's self-presentation in the years immediately following his father's death.²¹⁰ Constantius' deathbed scene, as imagined by Constantine's literary "friends", engages with these problems: kingship is simplified as an inheritable office and Constantius was made to, unambiguously, anoint his eldest son as his heir. Constantius' other children, like Ardashir's brothers, were edged out of the record, and eventually disappear almost completely.

²⁰⁶ Lact. De Mort., 24.8, Eusebius. VC. 1.21.2. Eusebius has already shown his hand at 1.18.2 where he gives God the credit for arranging Constantine's presence at the transmission of his inheritance.

²⁰⁷ Comparing father and son to first Jacob and Joseph and then David and Solomon, it is evident that the author of BHG 1279 shared Eusebius' insistence on a "proper" inheritance and a liking for Biblical analogies, see Winkelmann (1982), p.151, sec.2, lines 27-29, 3, lines, 15-18, (p.152).

²⁰⁸ Bidez (1935), p.423, sec.2, lines 5-10, The *Halkin Vita* simply gives a notice, alongside a date that Constantine succeeded his father, Halkin (1959b), pp.77-78, sec.3, lines, 45-47.

²⁰⁹ Eusebius invoked primogeniture, Eusebius. VC.1.21.2, the *Paschal Chronicle* implied that the other children were too young to inherit, Pas. Chron. p.517. Zosimus presents Constantius' Praetorian guardsmen as choosing Constantine hoping for a reward and thinking very little of the alternatives, , 2.9.1. We have already seen that some versions of the inn story gave Constantine a legitimate son with a mental disability, and that Theodora's jealousy was invoked to explain the movement of the young Constantine to the court of Diocletian in the *Guidi* and *Opitz vitae*.

²¹⁰ Warmington (1974), p.374 f. Rogers (1989), pp.237-238.

The desire to clean up succession is a fairly common one in monarchies the world over and a sick or dying father inevitably entails a handover of power; therefore, the parallel presence of such a figure in all of these texts may be considered coincidental. Yet, two minor details of Lactantius' version argue for the use of the same specific model employed in Ardashir's court episode in the most basal layers of this episode. First, according to Lactantius, Constantine fled after dinner when Galerius had retired for the night. Galerius then stayed in his tent until midday the next day when he called for Constantine, hoping to delay his departure.²¹¹ Because the *Origo* claims that Galerius was an inveterate drunk, this detail may have been a reference to another aspect of pro-Constantine polemic current at the time.²¹² On the other hand, it is interesting how Galerius' "laxity" resembles that of Astyages and Ardawan and how all of these men contrast with the active nature of their "wards". This particular detail does not seem to have been transmitted very successfully and does not appear in any of the *vitae*: its presence in Lactantius is, however, a suggestive indication of the sort of associations that the creators of this narrative wished to arouse by its propagation.

Second, Lactantius tells us that in order to avoid pursuit, Constantine made away with the post-horses as he fled to Britain.²¹³ This detail occurs in the *Origo* as well as the epitomes of Aurelius Victor and Pseudo-Victor, though in these texts Constantine is supposed to have lamed or killed the horses as he went.²¹⁴ Eunapius' work probably also included it, as a similar detail is reported by Zosimus, after whom the story seems to disappear for some time.²¹⁵ Like the animal combats, Constantine's laming of horses suddenly reappears in the *Opitz Vita*.²¹⁶ Again the influence of Philostorgius may be suspected, but cannot be proved. This detail, a trick in flight, offers another parallel to eastern material in the earliest layer of Constantine's propaganda. Recall how Nicholas tells us that the departure of Cyrus from the court of Astyages was followed by the

²¹¹ Lact. De Mort., 24.7.

²¹² In Anon. Val. Origo Const., 4, it is claimed that Galerius was so often drunk that, at the urging of his praetorian prefect, he commanded that no order of his issued after lunch should be obeyed. Contrast this to the praise of Galerius made at Eutropius, Brevarium, 10.2.

²¹³ Lact. De Mort., 24.6.

²¹⁴ Anon. Val. Origo Const., 2, Victor, De Caesaribus, 40.2 Ps. Victor, Epitome, 41.2.

²¹⁵ Zosimus, 2.8.3.

²¹⁶ Bidez (1935), p.422, lines 18-21.

king's dispatch of a party to recover him; Cyrus eludes them by preparing a banquet, leaving the sleeping pursuers early in the morning.²¹⁷ Similarly, in the *Kārnāmag* texts Ardashir is pursued by Ardawan himself, and though this flight is missing a stratagem, it is staggered by its portrayal as a race in which Ardawan must move faster than the *xwarrah* but is forced to stop several times to ask for information, receiving instead news of his inevitable failure.

Thus, specific parallels in the staging of Constantine's flight, alongside a heavy emphasis on the deathbed scene in the traditions that fed the *vitae*, offers a further indication that the entire story was conceived of as a defensive, legitimizing strategy designed not for the consumption of posterity, but to play an immediate role in the internecine struggles of the death throes of the Tetrarchy. By discarding the campaign of 305, and compressing the supposed plot against Constantine into an "escape" to Britain culminating in the immediate death of Constantius, Constantine's partisans could reframe recent history in such a way as to glorify their subject while accessing a set of associations long attached to Cyrus. The end result of this restructure was another historical "argument" addressing problems of legitimacy through reference to a well-known narrative form. As in the case of the *Kārnāmag*'s Ardashir, Constantine's time at court is presented as a confrontation between innately legitimate *de iure*, and usurping, "illegitimate", *de facto* kingship, leading to an escape and thence a completely legal assumption of worldly power. As in the Iranian tradition, this construction dovetails nicely (in fact, rather better) with the constraints of historical memory, erasing just enough detail to paper over irregularities, be they temporal, familial or legal, while remaining plausible in essence.

4.6.5 Young Constantine's School Days

An unusual feature of the tradition of Constantine's time at court, and another indication that a narrative archetype is in play in its representations, is the tendency to portray the emperor as a very young man indeed. Constantine's age has always been a

²¹⁷ FGrH F66.26-29 = Lenfant (2004), F8d* 26-29.

very plastic fact; much of the modern dispute over the date of his birth is the result of the emperor's self-presentation as a much younger man.²¹⁸ As Barnes has shown Constantine was probably born in the 270's, and by 305 he was well on his way to middle age.²¹⁹ Constantine almost certainly joined the entourages of Diocletian and Galerius as an imperial "hostage", or at least, as a member of the extended tetrarchic "family", as reported in some of the earlier sources, and indeed the *Guidi Vita*.²²⁰ During this time he served as an officer in the armies of the senior emperors: this martial image is rather clear in *De Mortibus* and must have been preserved somewhere in Greek as well.²²¹ Yet something rather odd happens very early in the tradition: in a number of sources, some quite influential, the realities of the politics of the later third century recede somewhat while the suggestion arises that Constantine moved to court in order to receive an education.²²² ²²³ Given that there is reason to suspect that the most widespread take on this period used a particular typology, and the extreme youth of other kings associated with this typology, the linkage of this period with "courtly education" is worthy of a closer look.²²⁴

The most famous reference to Constantine's education can be found in Eusebius' *Vita Constantini*. Though his "education" during this period is strongly implied rather than directly stated: Eusebius states that Constantine grew to manhood, like Moses, at the

²¹⁸ Barnes (1982), pp.39-41, reiterated at Barnes (2011), pp.2-3 & 55-56.

²¹⁹ Ibid.

²²⁰ Guidi (1907), p.312, lines 12-17.

²²¹ See n.234 below.

²²² Forms of *παιδεύω* abound across the tradition. Aside from its use by Eusebius (see note X below), it is used by "Praxagoras", Photius, Bib. Cod. 62, and Alexander the Monk, PG, 87.4049, and as a passive infinitive at Halkin (1959b), p.76, sec.2, lines, 48-49, and Guidi (1907), p.312, line 20. These last three contain a reference to Constantine learning "Greek wisdom" (and war in the case of the *Halkin Vita*) during this time, suggesting a connection. In the *Guidi* and *Opitz vitae*, Constantine's movement to another court is explained by Constantius' need to remove the boy from the grasp of his jealous wife Theodora.

²²³ Interestingly, in the *Vita Metrophanis et Alexandrii*, a text sometimes linked to the lost historian Gelasius, the young Constantine learns "*ἱερα γραμματα*" from Constantius before his success as a general provokes Galerius to plot, Winkelman (1982), p.150, sec.1, lines 8 and 25 f. This may simply be a development of the glowing portrait of Constantius painted by Eusebius in Eusebius. VC. 1.13-18.

²²⁴ Moses enters Pharaoh's court as a baby. Nicholas describes Cyrus as a *μειρακίσκος* when he first attaches himself to Astyages' court, FGrH 90 F66, 3 = Lenfant (2004), F8d* 3, (on the grounds of the likely Mesopotamian origin of this story, it is tempting to speculate that a very young Sargon also existed, though we are never likely to know). In KNA Ardashir is fifteen when summoned by Ardawan, KNA, 2.5. Pseudo-Callisthenes also gives Alexander's age at the taming of Bucephalus as fifteen, see, Ps. Callisthenes, 17.

court of a tyrant and then goes on to mention the excellence of his rhetorical education.²²⁵ Unlike Lactantius, Eusebius wrote at some distance from his subject and the scenes he described.²²⁶ Writing just after the emperor's death and certain of the epochal significance of his reign, Eusebius, frankly, gushes. Lactantius' model soldier-prince is to be considered in the same light as a Biblical hero; he now possesses a humane education and an exaggerated physical perfection.²²⁷ While this Constantine remains a soldier and man of action, he is more forcefully a supremely polished, almost superhuman, specimen of divinely ordained kingship.²²⁸ Eusebius' motives in building such a portrayal were bound up in his attempt to create an analogy to the extra-Biblical portraits of Moses known to him through Philo and Josephus.²²⁹

Eusebius' penchant for Moses is well known, but somewhat distracting in this case. A longer consideration of Eusebius' Moses and its significance to his Constantine will be made below. For the moment it should be recalled how Ardashir's (almost certainly entirely confected) sojourn at the court of Ardawan contains a similar approach to the court as both pedagogy and display, and a similar focus on physical, cultural and sporting refinements.²³⁰ It follows that the features used by Eusebius to describe Constantine by way of Moses were neither unique nor limited to one cultural or religious mode. Excepting its overt religiosity, Eusebius' Constantine may not have been particularly original either. There is a possibility that the "official", or, at least, preferred, version of events had moved in this direction during Constantine's lifetime, and that it had done so independently of the bishop of Caesarea.²³¹

Photius' choice of language in his very short summary of Praxagoras of Athens', apparently, very sympathetic *Bios* of Constantine leaves open the possibility that an early, non-Christian biographer made a portrayal of this period that explicitly stressed education and youth:

²²⁵ "παίδευσει λόγων" Eusebius. VC.1.19.

²²⁶ Barnes (1981), pp.265-267.

²²⁷ Eusebius. VC. 1.12.2, 19.1-2.

²²⁸ Cf. Ibid. 1.19.2 & Philo. Moses. 1.5.

²²⁹ Rapp (1998), p.287, *f.* A more expansive discussion of this analogy will be made below.

²³⁰ To take just the most concise statement, see KNA, 2.11-12.

²³¹ For all the focus on education in these texts, the *Origo* suggests that some contemporaries must have viewed Constantine as rather poorly schooled, *litteris minus instructus*, Anon. Val. Origo Const., 2.

“His father sent Constantine to Diocletian in Nicomedia in order that he be educated [παιδευθησόμενον].”²³²

Praxagoras wrote after 324 and his *bios* likely predated Constantine’s death; indeed, it may have been intended as a gift to the man himself, perhaps in the 330s.²³³ If this dating is correct and if Photius’ use of *παιδεύω* is an accurate reflection of the source text, then Praxagoras is the first “extant” author to make explicit reference to an education at the court of Diocletian, something only (strongly) implied by Eusebius. Praxagoras would then, indicate that the idea of an “education” at court, possibly alongside a radical revision of the emperor’s age, was both in very early circulation and agreeable to Constantine himself. This is a lot to extract from a single verb in a second-hand description of another author’s (lost) book. If, however, Praxagoras really did complete his work in the final decade of Constantine’s life, the possibility remains that Eusebius simply baptized the beautiful, suspiciously young and unnaturally brilliant student he discovered dwelling in a common version of the recent past.

The disposition of the *vitae* shows how both versions of the “young” Constantine were passed into Byzantine record. The more contextual, older, reading is still present in the *Guidi Vita*, where Constantine’s military accomplishments are foregrounded in Constantine’s own, reported, voice.²³⁴ In the two other *vitae* considered here, however, the Eusebian strand of interpretation has become greatly exaggerated. This is likely a side effect of the weld of sources underlying these texts: the narratives of the *vitae* transition immediately from the rediscovery of the Constantine to Diocletian’s court. Indeed, the transition between the two episodes is most abrupt; in the *Guidi* and *Opitz vitae* Constantine is moved away from his father’s court for his own safety; Constantius’ legitimate wife being extremely upset at the dynastic implications of her husband’s bastard.²³⁵ In the *Halkin Vita* he is simply sent straight away “to be educated” with very

²³² Photius Bib. Cod. 62.

²³³ A summary of the debate on the date of this work can be found in Smith (2007), pp.359-361. Smith believed that the work predates Constantine’s death. Janiszewski argues that it was published between 324 and 325, see Janiszewski (2006), pp.361-362. Photius’ summary of Praxagoras mentioned the foundation of Constantinople in 324, providing the *terminus post quem* for his source, see Photius, Bib. Cod.62.

²³⁴ cf. Guidi (1907), pp.313 line, 23 - 314, line, 1.

²³⁵ Cf. Guidi (1907), p.312, lines 17-19 & Halkin (1960), p.12, Bidez (1935), p.421, lines 4-7.

little explanation.²³⁶ The result is that Constantine is implied to be very young indeed, perhaps in his early teens.²³⁷ Thus, though it is usually specified that Constantine was appointed to the emperor's staff or bodyguard, the court of the Tetrarch as portrayed in the *vitae* reads, at times, as a sort of aristocratic boarding school rather than the armed camp portrayed by Lactantius.²³⁸

Barnes has argued that Constantine encouraged a youthful depiction of himself in order to explain his inaction during the persecutions of Diocletian and Galerius, and this may well be so.²³⁹ Yet, considering how artificial and stereotypical the entire court sequence is, it is notable how a younger Constantine also cuts with the grain of the contrastive logic of the episode. As a much younger man and “student”, opportunities arise for Constantine to demonstrate superiority in a broader range of aristocratic pursuits than war. Yet another contrast may be made between intrinsic right and mere worldly power by way of preternatural ability in regal activities. In a Sasanian context this meant hunting, literacy, polo and chess; in Late Roman or Byzantine eyes, this meant “Greek Wisdom” and a “Rhetorical Education”.²⁴⁰ So it was that the court of Galerius played host, simultaneously, to an elder Constantine known as a successful general and a very young Constantine constructed as a model of princely learning.

²³⁶ Halkin (1959b), p.76, lines 47-49.

²³⁷ In the *Halkin Vita* Constantine is just ten when he is found! Halkin (1959b), p.75, sec.2, line 25. Here the argument that Constantine was born in the early 270's is accepted as by far the most likely, Barnes (1982), pp.39-41 a position restated with vim at Barnes (2011), pp.2-6. Barnes' argues that Constantine's own messaging stressed his “youth”, at least in part, to dissociate himself from the works of the other Tetrarchs, particularly to explain his silence during the persecutions. This is certainly the case at Eusebius. VC. 2.51. Yet, the audience for such misdirection was not exclusively Christian: the emperor's supposed youth during this time is referenced in a context indifferent to Christianity, see Lat. Pan VI(7). 8.5 and 21.6. In this oration Apollo, is invoked, but not Christ.

²³⁸ In two of the three *vitae*, Constantine either becomes a *δομέστικός*, Bidez (1935), p.421, sec.2, lines 13-15, or is enrolled *ἐν τὴν δομεστίκων σχολῇ* Guidi (1907), p.312, line 15. This title had a very wide application in Byzantine times; these texts would seem to mean that the author imagined that Constantine was admitted into the Tetrarch's household guard as an officer. See Kazhdan (1991a) & Kazhdan (1991c). In an interesting parallel, Lactantius records Constantine's rank during this time as *Tribunus ordinis primi*, 18.10. The later texts perhaps represent a similar scene setting reimagined in contemporary terms.

²³⁹ Barnes (2011), p.55.

²⁴⁰ Eusebius. VC. 19.2.

4.6.6 Overlapping Models in the Representation of Constantine

As with so much else pertaining to Constantine, understanding the formation of his legend is complicated by an all pervading, retrospective sense of the importance of his legacy in the Christian era. As hagiographic texts, the *vitae* commemorated Constantine's life as that of a great hero of the Christian faith and the "founder" of an empire that, ideally or theoretically at least, served as the temporal shell for its expression. Yet the idea that Constantine's reign represented a significant event in Christian history goes much further back than the 9th century when the tradition represented by the *vitae* emerged. Even before Constantine died in 337, Eusebius was convinced of the emperor's epochal importance. Firmly convinced of God's providential role in history, Eusebius saw his movement as a distinct *ethnos*, the true heirs of God's chosen people.²⁴¹ Constantine, first savior, then patron of this *ethnos*, warranted comparisons to the heroes of its Biblical past.²⁴² Thus, first in the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, then again in the *Vita Constantini*, the Roman emperor became the reflection, and possibly the proof, of the deeds of the Biblical patriarch Moses.²⁴³

A considerable amount of scholarship has examined the meaning and implications of this comparison. It has been argued that Moses was chosen because he was both a statesman and a prophet, a characterization that became rather too exalted in Byzantine times when the model for Christian kingship shifted to the much more flawed figure of David.²⁴⁴ This position is broadly accepted here: certainly the Moses comparison does not seem to resurface in the mainstream of extant Byzantine historiography. In the context of the argument outlined above, however, it is more important to briefly look into the background of the analogy. Eusebius' Moses was neither created entirely *ex scriptura* nor was it completely opposed to the non-Christian *zeitgeist*. Further, it is to be suspected that the prominence of the *Vita Constantini* in

²⁴¹ Convincingly argued in Johnson's study of the *Preparatio Evangelia*, see Johnson (2006), especially p.94 f.

²⁴² On the meaning of *ethnos*, see *ibid.*, 33-51.

²⁴³ Hollerich (1989a) *passim*.

²⁴⁴ Rapp (1998), 290, echoing sentiments expressed at Hollerich (1989b), p.426.

modern scholarship has masked the extent to which Eusebius was *refining* an older rhetoric into a Christian product.

It is significant that while the narrative arc of Exodus provided Eusebius' grand soteriological thrust, it is not so much the Biblical Moses as the extra-Biblical Moses of Jewish legend that is relevant in consideration of his construction of Constantine's early life. Eusebius first compared Constantine to Moses in his description of the end of the battle of the Milvian bridge, an account written from documentary sources between 313-316.²⁴⁵ Yet it was not until the opening of the *Vita Constantini* that the parallel became all encompassing, moving from the description of a specific event to Constantine's entire career.²⁴⁶ While the Moses of the scriptures does have traditional Near Eastern kingly attributes, the period of his youth at Pharaoh's court is not given an expansive treatment in Exodus.²⁴⁷ It follows that to create the parallel childhood seen in the first book of the *Vita Constantini*, Eusebius must have leaned heavily on extra-canonical biographies of Moses that *did* expand on this period.²⁴⁸ The works of this type most accessible to him would have been those of Philo, Josephus and Clement, but Moses was also the subject of a number of non-Biblical Jewish and quasi-Jewish traditions; some of which we might reasonably expect Philo and Josephus to have known and used.²⁴⁹ Unfortunately for seekers after clarity, from this point it becomes very difficult to unpick any specific thread from the much larger patterns of stereotypical representation.

Take for example the first book of Philo's biography of Moses in which the subject is explicitly portrayed as a king.²⁵⁰ On a second reading, many features, including some of the topoi of Hellenistic kingship theory that Philo made use of, are very similar to, or

²⁴⁵ Dam (2011), pp.84-92.

²⁴⁶ Eusebius, HE, 9.9.5-8, Eusebius. VC. 1.12, 19-21, 38.2.

²⁴⁷ Moses' entire early life is left unspoken in the transition from Exodus 2.10 to 11. The case for the presence of Near Eastern royal motifs in the scriptural Moses is made in Matthews (2008) particularly relevant is p.60 f.

²⁴⁸ Through Alexander Polyhistor Eusebius knew a lost history of the Jewish people by a man named Artapanus who probably lived in Egypt during the 2nd century BCE. Also known in some form to Josephus, this work certainly contained an expanded account of Moses at court that included a plot and an escape, see Holladay (1983), pp.189-193 and 209 f. (fragment 3).

²⁴⁹ Obbink (1966), Meeks (1968), Matthews (2008), pp.25-36.

²⁵⁰ Philo, Moses, 1.148, 334. Dvornik (1966), pp.280-281 and *passim*, Goodenough (1969), pp.181-189.

framed in, the same terms used in the expressions of Sequence Two seen in the historicising works surveyed in this thesis; the court setting, the effortless mastery of all things, the extraordinary beauty and complex parentage.²⁵¹ In any case, the scriptural model on which all is predicated is itself almost certainly linked to older habits of royal representation: most obviously to the *Birth Legend* of Sargon.²⁵² The mere fact that Philo reproduces the courtly prodigy in the gap provided by scripture speaks volumes: Moses was a heroic, kingly, founder, raised at the court of an unworthy king, his image developed in a very predictable way.²⁵³ The sources of Eusebius' sources were themselves participating, at various removes, in the same pool of motifs discussed here.

It has recently been suggested that Constantine himself consciously used Moses as a model. If true this would place the construction of the court sequence entirely within a Christian context and obviate much that has been suggested here.²⁵⁴ This does not seem particularly likely: while it is entirely possible that the not especially modest emperor would project himself in Biblical terms in later life, whether he would have done so in the early 310s is another matter entirely.²⁵⁵ Moses had some purchase in the mindset of Greco-Roman society but probably would not have been an obvious rhetorical model for a Roman emperor in the early 4th century.²⁵⁶ It would seem significant in this regard that Lactantius, possibly the most belligerently Christian author of his time, sticks to a relatively traditional characterisation of Constantine and draws no Biblical parallel in doing so. Moreover, one would not expect an explicitly Biblical parallel to have appealed to the non-Christian Praxagoras. Conversely, Photius records Praxagoras' other works as a history of Alexander and a history of the kings of Athens.²⁵⁷ It is an appealing speculation that this author had a liking for, or at least an exposure to the established

²⁵¹ Philo, Moses, 1.18-25. On the use of similar elements by Josephus, and an argument that these were directed at a non-Jewish audience, see Feldman (1992).

²⁵² Lewis (1980), p.149. A more complicated relationship between the two was argued in Childs (1965).

²⁵³ Notice how, according to Josephus, Moses' success as a general triggered a plot against him, resulting in his flight from the Egyptian court, Josephus. *Ant.*, 2.11.1.

²⁵⁴ Recently in Damgaard (2013a) & Damgaard (2013b).

²⁵⁵ Williams (2011), pp.51-56.

²⁵⁶ For the status of Moses in non-Jewish, non-Christian thought in antiquity, see Gager (1972).

²⁵⁷ Photius, *Bib. Cod.* 62.

forms of royal biography, and would easily have recognized the cues provided for him in the sort of rhetoric reflected in Lactantius.

Eusebius *does* record an unambiguous reference to Moses made by the emperor in an address to a Christian audience, the so-called *Oratio ad Sanctorum Coetum*.²⁵⁸ The suggestion that Moses was being consciously invoked as a model cited above would date this speech to 313.²⁵⁹ Such an early date is a minority position, however, with the bulk of commentators leaning towards a date in the early 320s.²⁶⁰ Seeing the court sequence as a Moses reference from its inception would require us to accept not only an early date for the *Oratio*, but also a view of Constantine as some kind of crypto-Christian as early as the first two decades of the 4th century and the proposition that Moses would have been a useful model in the first place. Unfortunately, for most of his political life Constantine's messaging was religiously ambiguous and very much in line with 3rd century precedent. Moreover, a very wide range of religious positions was possible in this era and Constantine himself is likely to have believed different things at different times.²⁶¹ Eusebius' Moses is, in all likelihood, a secondary layer, an imposition of a "Biblical" precedent over a generically supernatural, legendary historical *topos* that shares the same ancestry.

The possibility should be considered that a much more traditional, and religiously flexible model, consciously or not, was the original referent of this episode. Perhaps tellingly, Eusebius begins the *Vita Constantini* with a traditional rhetorical tool, the claim that his subject was superior to admired historical figures. Constantine was greater than Cyrus, claims Eusebius, because Cyrus died a shameful death at the hands of a woman. He was, Eusebius continues, better by far than the bloodied and irresponsible Alexander because he ruled mercifully and left behind him an orderly inheritance.²⁶² Cyrus and

²⁵⁸ Eusebius. *Oratio Ad Sanctorum Coetum*. 17.

²⁵⁹ An early date is accepted as key to the argument in Damgaard (2013a) and Damgaard (2013b).

²⁶⁰ An outline of the problems in dating this speech, and the scholarly positions, is given in Bardill (2012), pp.299-302. Though Barnes is sympathetic to the idea that Constantine was a Christian sympathizer from a relatively early age (and marshals the content of the *Oratio ad Sanctorum Coetum* in his support) he summarily dismisses the early date, assigning it a date of April 16th or 17th 325, Barnes (2011), p.52 and pp.115-117. A cautious reconsideration is given at Bardill (2012), pp.300-301,

²⁶¹ The thesis advanced in Bardill (2012) (esp. p.218 f.) is largely accepted here.

²⁶² Eusebius. *VC*. 1.7.

Alexander were very conventional model kings in Greco-Roman rhetoric and this is an oddly negative appraisal. Given Eusebius' somewhat adversarial attitude towards the Greek tradition, these denunciations might be understood as a *rejection* of traditional posture; a turning of rhetoric against itself in order to more closely bind Constantine to the Christian tradition.²⁶³ On the other hand, Cyrus, or at least the Greco-Roman image of Cyrus, possessed stolid and adaptable virtues; the Christian writer Phillip of Side, for example, may have made of him a model of chastity in the early 5th century.²⁶⁴ Conversely, a manual of rhetoric, possibly dating to the reign of Diocletian, recommended Cyrus as a model for orators creating divine origins for the disbelieving, but captive, audiences of imperial orations.²⁶⁵ Cyrus had besides, very good press in the Biblical version of history that Eusebius was so attached to. Eusebius himself had earlier described him in terms that should sound familiar.²⁶⁶ In other words, in the early 4th century, Cyrus was a figure both well established and acceptable to almost everyone.

As has been noted above, Ctesias' Persian "history" was likely to have been far more popular than its extant state would lead one to believe. By the 310s this work, and its account of Cyrus at the court of Astyages, had been in circulation in Greek for more than twice as long as the Moses of Philo or Josephus. That an escape forming part of an aggressive rewrite of Constantine's movements in the period 305-306 resembles, in outline and specific points of detail, the escape made by Ctesias' Cyrus, argues that some kind of equivalence was being proffered. This is not to suggest that Constantine's propagandists spent long nights highlighting choice passages from the *Persika*. Seven hundred years is a more than adequate span for stories to detach from a specific author and there is no need for the transmission to have been so direct. The originator of the

²⁶³ These two may have been chosen to avoid comparison to other Roman emperors, see Williams (2011), p.50. A far more systematic deconstruction of the past through the reinterpretation of traditional *exempla* is attributed to Orosius in Van Nuffelen (2012), p.63 f.

²⁶⁴ De Gestis in Perside.19, lines 1-10. In a disputation on religion before a Sasanian monarch, Cyrus is used as a virtuous pagan, a model of chastity who surrounded himself with attractive women in order to test his dedication to heavenly virtue. An examination of this section (p.19 line 25-21 line 10) as a possible fragment of Phillip of Side can be found in Heyden (2006), p.223. On the "romantic" Cyrus, see Davis (2002).

²⁶⁵ These pragmatic instructions are given in Menander Rhetor, 371.

²⁶⁶ Eusebius, Commentary on Isaiah, 7.20, 10.20-21, 14.1-3, 44.24, 44.27-28, 45.1-7, and 45.13.

episode may indeed have “used” Ctesias, but he may equally well have simply drawn a Ctesian artifact from the general stock of stories attached to Cyrus.

4.6.7 Summary of Sequence Two

As can be seen by a survey of its origins, the thrust of the court episode used in the *vitae* was nakedly apologetic: thanks to Lactantius, it can be shown that all of its variations stemmed from a habit of tendentious representation developed in the second decade of the 4th century. Whether consciously or not, this frame relied on a series of images with a very long precedent in historicizing West Eurasian literatures of royal origins: in a Roman context the most accessible of these were connected to Cyrus. We have touched on how themes of beauty, skill and youth were progressively emphasized in the tradition of Constantine’s time at court. Yet the development of this image is merely the *entrée* to the point. The story was, from its inception, intended to recast the rather anodyne return of Constantine’s to his father as a most dramatic, *contrastive*, event and to argue Constantine to be a worthy ruler, far more deserving than his erstwhile “guardians” and their *protégés*. Like the counter-polemic marshaled in defence of Helena, the story of Constantine’s escape and flight long outlived its intended context because its themes are inextricably linked to notions of divine selection.

As such, it remained useful well after there was any need to defend Constantine or his dynasty. As Christianity became the dominant cultural force in “Constantine’s” empire, the interpersonal, dynastic polemic born of civil strife, began to be read instead as a heroic moment of communal foundation, one in which the contrast of holy emperor and unholy persecutor was primary. An old form of divinized personal contrast became instead the conduit through which the hand of God, to echo Lactantius, intervened in history to establish the predominance of a religious *community*; it was due to this latter reading that the court sequence and escape were much later deemed suitable for incorporation into hagiography.

4.7 Constantine and Ardashir: Parallel Lives?

As Hippolyte Delehayé noted in his foundational study of the “genre”, hagiography was nothing if not unselectively omnivorous and entire lives could be, and were, spun out of just about anything.²⁶⁷ As “biographies” of a ruler whose existence was indisputable and whose works would still have been visible, the *vitae* are actually fairly concrete examples of this species of literature. Drawing not only from historical memory, but also the historiographic tradition, the “corrections” seen in the *Guidi Vita*, and the use of the unorthodox Philostorgius in the *Halkin Vita* show that their writers even made the occasional effort to research or engage critically with their sources. And yet, the birth and youth sketched in these texts reflect very little of the “real” Constantine. Rather, in drawing these periods the *vitae* recycle two confected images, images propagated and in some cases published, by those with an interest in defending Constantine or his legacy. Each narrative developed separately and drew, perhaps largely unconsciously, on motif clusters associated with royal biography. Finally each narrative was polemical, or counter polemical, designed to advance or defend a position within a broader argument about the meaning of Constantine’s accession.

An argument generated by Helena’s social standing, or lack thereof, generated an interest in Constantine’s infancy, but also seems to have drawn all discussion of the topic into itself. Constantine’s “lowly” birth, Winkelmann’s hypothetical *Frühgeschichte*, is only sketchily attested before its incorporation into the *vitae*; further, all of the evidence presented above relies on links to be inferred between very disparate, though remarkably similar, material. In aggregate, however, this evidence allows the hypotheses that this narrative emerged relatively early, *and* that it was a more or less conscious attempt to link Constantine’s birth to traditional patterns indicating a divine manifestation. This latter possibility is highlighted by Anastasius’ attachment to a functionally identical story. “John’s” Anastasian fragment also flags narrative and thematic similarities to the various stories of Sasan connected to the content of the *Kārnāmag* tradition, which, as argued above, probably used this pattern to assimilate

²⁶⁷ Delehayé (1961), p.40, f.

prestigious bloodlines into the Sasanian clan. Thus, read in their likely political contexts, the resulting web of texts, as tenuous as it is, would seem to share a common anxiety about issues of lineage. Finally, the slim evidence we have for dating these productions suggests a trend for this narrative to emerge after, but not very long after, the deaths of their subjects and to do so outside of what might be deemed “official” channels.

Decades earlier, a concerted effort by Constantine’s partisans to simultaneously damn the reputation of Galerius and argue for the precedence of Constantine within his own family, quickly swept all before it, dominating the historiography of Constantine’s ascension into the Byzantine era: even Eunapius, and then Zosimus, who loathed Constantine, would be reduced to rephrasing his partisans.²⁶⁸ As outlined above, Lactantius’ handling of this episode makes it likely that the courtly confrontation running through the Byzantine historical tradition and thence into the *vitae*, has its roots in a rhetorical construct propagated in Constantine’s lifetime, one that may have emanated from his court. It has been suggested that a reference to the Ctesian form of the solidly respectable Cyrus was, consciously or not, intended when this episode was constructed. The early date, confected nature, and propagandistic tone of this construct has significance for how we read other “royal biographies” displaying a similar narrative, particularly the very similar, though *much* more artificial, court sequence built for Ardashir and visible in the *Kārnāmag* tradition.

Using the development of Constantine’s confrontation with Galerius as a guide to the “parallel” Sasanian episode, we might suspect that this part of the *Kārnāmag* also descends from a rhetoric that sprung up very soon after Ardashir’s coup, maybe from within his court, but certainly encouraged or admitted by it. Sequence Two is a natural fit for the needs of, for lack of a better word, an “usurper”. It contrasts a “new” king with his predecessor directly and in doing so claims a divine sanction, or at least a supernatural inevitability, for his succession. Being built up on centuries of literary and sub-literary precedent, it activates a number of historical, or quasi-historical,

²⁶⁸ Zosimus, 2.8.3. Janiszewski hypothesised that Eunapius’ source for the life of Constantine was Bemarchios’ (flattering) biography. If so, that work is very likely to have contained some version of the flight, see Janiszewski (2006), p.373.

associations that reinforce this message and encourage its spread. In this way the near total dominance of the tendentious, chronologically mangled, version of Constantine's "escape" and the odd treatment of the *Kārnāmag* tradition affixed to the interpolated history of Agathangelos may be the result of a parallel process.

Thus, certain elements of the *vitae* seem to be mirrored in the *Kārnāmag* and the development of these similar elements may be suspected as having been driven by the same concerns: inconvenient lineage and a pressing need to aggressively assert legitimacy. So far largely unexamined is how and why the much later composite traditions represented in the *vitae* and the *Kārnāmag* selected, collected, and arranged these stereotypical narratives in essentially the same way, and what this says about the intertwined nature of religious, political and communal history in these Late Antique societies. It will be argued that the legacy of both men came to be seen as central to what might be dubbed an imperial-religious community and that this created roughly parallel memorializing systems. Being, simultaneously, very traditional figures of earthly power and heroes of an "imperial" faith, Ardashir and Constantine occupied a special category of biography. Though the religious ideas that would come to animate "their" states were novel, their outsized role in founding them maintained, even encouraged, their association with royal poses of an extremely ancient type.

5

Synthesis

5.1 Overview

The preceding pages have presented a rather complicated argument that proceeds from the very general to the specific. Having first outlined two collections of motifs, defined here as *sequences*, it has attempted to demonstrate a history of the use of like narratives in a number of very disparate examples of historicizing royal biography over a very great span of time. This argument attempts to join up and expand a number of links already suggested in the various scholarships addressing this material. Consequently, a number of commonalities in the themes of these texts, their meanings and the circumstances that brought them into being have been suggested. A considerable space has been dedicated to an examination of the content and context of two traditions of composite royal biography using these stereotypical narratives: the *Kārnāmag*, an episodic, legendary version of the life of Ardashir, that came into being at some point between the 6th and 11th centuries, and the *vitae* of Constantine, a set of very similar hagiographies that emerge in the 9th century. With reference to the context of the emergence of these components, and their development within the Perso-Arabic and Byzantine historical-literary tradition. I have attempted to produce a diachronic reading of the narrative forms that underlie them. In this way, the oddly parallel, and demonstrably implausible, depictions of the subject's birth and youth seen in these later texts may be explored and explained.

This chapter will first condense and restate the key assertions derived from the above study. Having positioned the birth and youth components of the biographies presented by the *Kārnāmag* and the *vitae* within the same long arcs of representation, I

will here consider the meaning of their parallel presence in unrelated Iranian and Byzantine traditions. With reference to all of the case studies considered above, I will first present a theory of the symbolism encoded in Sequence One and Sequence Two, the technologies by which each was replicated and their interaction with broader trends in historiography. From here I will move to a specific examination of the *Kārnāmag* and the *vitae*. An argument will be made that the cultural forces driving the compilation of the longer narratives seen in the *Kārnāmag* and the *vitae* texts were, in *certain* regards, rather similar and somewhat novel. The actions of Ardashir and Constantine came to be seen as foundational to social-religious groups that were both identified with an imperial state and invested in the memory of its founder. The parallel fusion of two unrealistic, but very ancient, and immediately recognisable representations of divinely approved kingship argues that the stories told in the *Kārnāmag* and the *vitae* are neither historical romance nor (strictly) hagiography. Rather, they are both historicizing communal narratives, created to assert the ideal past of a religious-imperial identity tracing its “descent” to the subject.

5.2 Key Assertions

5.2.1 Themes

In the consideration of the *Kārnāmag* and the *vitae* made above, it was noted how the stereotypical stories of birth and youth seen in both seemed to conveniently address problems of lineage and legitimacy hinted at in other surviving literature about Ardashir and Constantine. After an examination of the political and historiographic context of their emergence it was suggested that the most basal layer of these components were “apologetic” in the sense argued by Knapp: that they arose as counter-polemic to attacks on character.¹ Further, it was implied that each was generated either officially, within the rhetoric of the subject or his house, or

¹ Knapp (2012), p.18 f.

unofficially, within groups sympathetic to the subject's legacy. Finally, it was briefly noted that due to their shared reliance on displays of supernatural approval, and intrinsic, aristocratic disposition, they each have a tendency of long outliving the controversies that gave rise to them.

On the basis of those traditions whose context remains somewhat explicable, when used in an apologetic manner each sequence tends to be generated separately in response to different accusations. Because they describe sequential periods in the subject's life, the composite biographical traditions represented by our core texts were able to join them together via some kind of bridging mechanism; a letter from an overlord, a request for the education of the newly discovered prince or the suspicion of a jilted wife. Placed thus side by side, one is struck by how the originally separate narratives both centre on very similar displays of virtue and/or supernatural approval and how both "confirm" these by acts of "recognition". The underlying, legitimizing, message of these displays is the key theme of both sequences and in great part explains their appeal as apologetic strategies. Further, as the signs themselves are either supernatural or superhuman, they tap into concepts that remain attractive to the laudatory historiography of a much later period.

The supernatural signs employed across these traditions express the explicit, and often extremely unsubtle, approval of heaven. It is the function of the various omens or dreams seen throughout the texts considered above to state that the ascent of their subject is preordained and inevitable: indeed, an unambiguous interpretation of these signs stating exactly this is often provided. The need to produce and explain such statements, ostensibly to another character in the narrative, but actually to the "reader", probably explains the presence of so many prophetic professionals, be they astrologers, augurs or dream interpreters, across these texts. In those instances of Sequence One where an omen is employed, it is usually a dream announcing the subject's birth and foretelling their glorious career. The flavour of the omen depends on whether the nascent child is viewed as continuator or usurper: Astyages and Constantius both abandon their descendant after a dream, but the historical context

being re-made is rather different and the story is massaged to accommodate this.² The omen is fulfilled, for good or ill, in the “father’s” recognition of the lost child.

The omens associated with Sequence Two, on the other hand, present a rather more straightforward proposition. As the examples discussed above would seem to show, the thrust of *this* narrative is always aggressive. In narratives of this type, the intent is to describe a personal contrast between a supposedly ineffectual, corrupt or impious ruler and the man who will “replace” or topple him. The “recognition” of the subject is performed by the sitting ruler and is never positive. From Urzababa’s reaction to Sargon’s dream to the omen revealed to Galerius in the *Guidi Vita*, the antagonist of Sequence Two is made to see his own “deposition”, or, in the case of Galerius/Diocletian, the fall of his “order”, at the hands of the subject. Wrapping up such numinous signs in what is essentially a narrative of confrontation offers a clue as to their purpose. The implication is that by acting against the subject, the antagonist of the narrative is knowingly defying a divine decree.

In both sequences, these supernatural signs are enhanced by an array of mundane, but extraordinary traits. Of course, implying a clear distinction between the divine and the physically perfect is far too firm a separation as the body itself functions as a token of divine approval: Pabag’s reaction on seeing the physical perfection of his grandson *cum* son is explicitly a recognition of the fulfillment of his prophetic dream.³ In line with very basal conceptions of the office, kingship is understood to be an innate quality, signaled by displays of excellent manners, aptitude in the activities associated with the ruling class and, to cover all possible angles, family resemblance. Thus, all the external badges that signal the royal estate, what Clifford Geertz called the “symbolics” of power, are described as baked in to the subject himself.⁴ The use, across both sequences, of “games” as a means of inducing this recognition functions as a kind of dress rehearsal for the actual exercise of power.

² One study has argued that the Herodotean Cyrus, and possibly Sargon, is representative of a tradition containing a “murderous grandparent” Schellekens (2006). This assumption of hostility towards the lost child is, in my opinion, far too restrictive.

³ KNA, 2.2 = ŠhN 6, pp.142-143, lines 136-138.

⁴ Geertz (1993), pp.122-125.

Between them, the components of each sequence collect a number of very basic, often overlapping, expectations of the royal office in societies where the ideology of rule was far more overtly transcendental than it is now.⁵ It should be noted however, that both Sequences express such expectations in an oddly contradictory way and this betrays their ultimately argumentative nature. The kingship of the subject is, simultaneously, intrinsically legitimate, expressed in every aspect of his physical being, *and* completely contingent, dependent on the will of a god. Given their attachment to moments of dynastic or social change, we may strongly suspect that the latter element was almost always read as primary in the traditions considered above. What we do *not* see here is a “sacral king” who makes the rains fall and the crops grow.⁶ Nor, though one would intuitively expect Constantine to have been a model for the type, do any of the traditions considered above much resemble any of the categories applied to the “saint kings” of the European Middle Ages.⁷ Rather, the expectations embedded in these stories return to their Mesopotamian roots: they align with a theoretical framework in which a king is understood as the *appointee* of a god, whose approval may be withdrawn at any moment for any reason.⁸

The Iranian conceptual framework of Ardashir’s flight makes this quite clear: the untranslatable *xwarrah* functions as a near physical mark of the right to rule. It is gained and lost by means of a message written in the stars. On the other hand, the fundamental, though unstated, assumption that kingship is a transferrable gift and that heaven is, underneath it all, somewhat fickle, makes the traditions underpinning the early sections of the *vitae*, or at least their reception into Christianising versions of history, a little ironic. Regardless, in both cases this emphasis on divine approval, be it

⁵ A central contention of Dvornik (1966) is a work that is, despite its title, fundamentally a study of the history of *monarchy*. The commonality of the themes and badges of the royal office across western Eurasia is usefully discussed at al-Azmeh (2001), 11 f. Numinous monarchy was defined as the “political commonsense of humankind” at Oakley (2006), pp.1-9.

⁶ At Fowden (1993), p.88, it is argued that Constantine saw himself as such a figure.

⁷ For a review of the trends in the study of this figure, see Klaniczay (2000), pp.2-16. See also Góski (1968).

⁸ This seems to have been the operating assumption in Babylon and Mesopotamia more generally. The Babylonian New Year festival offers a striking example of this line of thought. Here the king was stripped of his regalia and forced to offer his assurances to Marduk that he had faithfully discharged his duties, see Kuhrt (1987). Similarly, the Iranian tradition also saw the relationship between the ruler and heaven as contractual, see Dabiri (2010), p.18 f.

displayed in the progression of the subject from rags to riches or in literal prophecy, obviates awkward problems of lineage and smooths over the unromantic, but effective power politics on which the thrones of both men actually rested.

5.2.2 Patterns of Emergence

If we accept that the themes expressed in each sequence are useful for reconstructing a particular kind of “event” that is seen to be recurrent, and thereby attractive to the apologetic mode, it follows that both tend towards reactive and counter-polemical uses. As such they should be considered as more deliberate creations than they would appear to be at first glance. The above examination of the development of the traditions that fed the relevant sections of the biographies presented in the *Kārnāmag* and *vitae*, attempted to position the separate emergence of various iterations of these narratives within live arguments over the meaning of history, or rather, over the meaning of a particular point in history. While the quality and quantity of evidence for each narrative considered varies wildly, a number of broad conclusions may be tentatively proffered in regards to the timing of their creation and the authorship that brought them into being.

Of the two narratives, Sequence One is the hardest to analyse. The few clues that may allow us to date its expressions are largely speculations based on context. Little in the suggested precedent would offer a guide: Sargonic evidence is so minimal as to be useless, and the Herodotean Cyrus was, in any case, the product of a process that took place outside of the core group of his empire and as such, probably not created with apologetic intent. The repetitious instances of Sequence One seen in the *Kārnāmag*, and the various pieces of Perso-Arabic historiography that used hKNA, its components or descendants, offer a considerably better base for analysis. Ardashir’s own birth, as depicted in these texts, is not only an extremely novel arrangement of the components of this sequence, but also bound up in the much larger problem of the extremely confused status and murky origins of Sasan. As such, it offers few clues that would allow us to place it; our only real clue is Agathias, whose work indicates some version of this story must have been in circulation by the later 6th century. It is in the somewhat overlooked, extremely repetitious, accounts of the birth of his son and grandson that we find some interesting suggestions. With the caveat that firm evidence is both lacking

and vague, these appear to have formed some time after the lives of their subjects though how long after is not easy to say. Given Ormazd's relative obscurity, and the local horizons of his legend, it is to be suspected that his birth is the older of the two and may have postdated his death by mere decades. We might tentatively place Ormazd's birth to the early 5th century,

The origin of the story of Constantine's birth in an inn is likewise obscure, though it certainly cannot have been official. On the assumption that the formation of the *Passio Eusignii* dates to some point in the 7th century, this may serve as the *terminus ante quem*. Two pieces of non-Constantinian material, the life of Theodore of Sykeon, and the legend of Anastasius' miraculous birth near Dara suggest both the popularity of this kind of narrative and the possibility of an even earlier date. So too, do certain internal clues; the presence of an archaic, or at least, old-fashioned, military office, and the very long association of Helena with hospitality and Drepanum.

The thread running through all of these narratives is problematic lineage. Ardashir's clan was, at best, the cadet branch of a dynasty of local sub-kings and their eponymous ancestor Sasan remains something of a cipher. Given the hints that the bloodletting accompanying Ardashir's rise was accompanied by a symbolic violence directed against the dynastic-religious infrastructure of aristocratic families it is interesting that the *Kārnāmag* presents Ardashir as the representative of a mythic dynasty but casts Ardashir's immediate descendants as continuations of specific aristocratic families.⁹ The fact that a number of the most powerful aristocratic families of the Arsakid period survived the Sassanian accession and retained powerful roles in Ardashir's state would seem particularly significant in any reading of these stories.¹⁰ Linking Sasanian princes to known bloodlines reflects a need to ground the grand claims of Kayanid descent in more concrete markers of rule. Marriage stresses continuity by producing children that bridge old and new orders; the much later claim that Hussein, the son of Ali and the

⁹ Boyce positioned dynastic fires as an extension of ancient Indo-Iranian worship at hearth fires, and saw the early Sasanians as deliberately targeting these, see Boyce (1975). This argument was developed in De Jong (2006).

¹⁰ Such is the general thesis of Pourshariati (2008).

grandson of Mohammad, married a Sasanian princess probably reflects a similar need to harmonise old and new.¹¹

It may be possible to discern a similar controversy driving the placement of Constantine's birth in an inn; though here the terms of the argument were weighted more towards the cultural than the dynastic. Helena's background was well known in the 4th century. It was, moreover, a likely target of those hostile to the perceived consequences of Constantine's reign. It is possible that the reign of Julian emboldened or focused such voices at a time when this sort of attack would still have been politically relevant. We might see in Ambrose's slightly later oration both an acknowledgment of such a controversy and an attempt to turn it into something more palatable. From this reasoning it is possible to suggest that variants of Sequence One were most likely to have arisen sometime after the death of their subject and that the sequence was attractive in cases where a controversy had arisen over *lineage*. Because the stories proffered in the *Kārnāmag* and the *vitae* appear to contradict early Sasanian and Constantinian dynastic postures, we might also suggest that though Sequence One tended to be replicated defensively by writers and orators sympathetic to the subject, it was unlikely to be adopted in any strictly official version of dynastic origins.

Sequence Two is somewhat easier to pin down. Its demonstration of divine election and its inherently contrastive message attacks and defames a specific figure: as such, its political applications are more focused and more immediately useful than those of Sequence One. Moreover, thanks to the relative density of sources surrounding Constantine, an example of its use as "apologetic" rhetoric is clearly illustrated. To return to a very early point in the study, when discussing the *Sumerian Legend* it was suggested that the reader was nudged towards viewing Urzababa's actions towards Sargon as futile and impious, and this inclination would seem to hold true in the later traditions considered here. Further, it was suggested that painting Urzababa in this way might have been a propagandistic claim made not very long after Urzababa's fall. That a similar confrontation emerges from the rhetoric of Constantine's rise in the second decade of the 4th century should sharpen this suspicion. One suspects that the entirely

¹¹ Savant (2015), pp.102-108.

confected confrontation of Ardawan with a young Ardashir in KNA and the *Šāhnāme* may represent a late, and baroque, development of a similarly early attempt to set the record straight.

Should we take the development of Constantine's flight from contemporary rhetoric, to historical fact, to hagiographic component as broadly parallel to the processes that built up Ardashir's escape from Ardawan, we arrive at some interesting possibilities. Later Roman panegyric was a culturally specific institution that probably had no *exact* analog in the Iranian tradition: though it should perhaps be noted that Arsakid kings had been described as (and mocked for) presiding over Hellenised courts and Greek style oratory may not have been completely alien to a 3rd century Iranian context.¹² Of course, it does not follow that an early Sasanian court would know *no* laudatory oratory. While Boyce's theorized minstrel tradition might be a somewhat overused heuristic, very elaborate poetic panegyric was a well-established feature of later Persian-speaking courts, and the practice may have arisen from Sasanian antecedents.¹³ If Ardashir's dispute with and flight from Ardawan is, as Lactantius' report of the plot against Constantine seems to have been, a story taken up in the rhetoric of the subject's court, it would locate the origins of both historical narratives in a particular kind of elite *performance*.¹⁴

Late Roman orators and Iranian court entertainers were, it needs to be said, not the same thing; both were, however, essentially spinners of images, ultimately reliant on patronage. When representing the recent past, the focus of each kind of performance was the figure of the ruler, whose approval brought reward and whose preferred outlook set the limits and the tone of the act itself. Into this frame could be worked the stock tales of the speaker's culture.¹⁵ The result here was an invitation to the audience to a vision of the past that was both laudatory and exculpatory, one in which the ruler's

¹² Plut. Crassus, 32-33. Some Greeks may have returned their admiration, see, Livy 9.18.6.

¹³ The *locus classicus* for the transmission of Iranian traditions is Boyce (1957). On the legacy of Iranian court poetry, see Meisami (1987), pp.1-14, and Mottahedeh (2015).

¹⁴ On this point too I am indebted to Ghazzal Dabiri's forthcoming book.

¹⁵ "For the epideictic oratory of the empire, especially the panegyric literature of which there was so much, relied heavily for its effectiveness on a repertoire of symbolic evocation. The repeated allusions to stock examples (historical figures "good" and "bad" emperors, kingly figures like Cyrus and Alexander), stock virtues, and stock themes form the technical armory of evocation." Cameron (1991), p.84.

fallen foes are damned and current conditions are made both inevitable and divinely sanctioned. Should this version have met with approval it would be taken up more generally as other professionals followed suit. The result would be a number of related, ultimately ephemeral, compositions asserting a similarly argumentative, “demonstrative”, claim about what just happened and why it happened.¹⁶ A particularly successful claim of this sort may coalesce into *the* preferred position, with those making representations to the ruler expected to be willing to repeat it. Such claims were not exactly the one and only official position. Rather, they were features expected of formal, laudatory works performed in the presence of the ruler or intended for his eyes; as such, they could and did exist in parallel with more prosaic accounts of the recent past.

In the Roman context, we know that panegyrics were sometimes published and circulated.¹⁷ We can also be fairly sure that Lactantius’ version of Constantine’s flight can’t have been the only attack on Galerius’ memory in “print”; the existence of a number of similar constructions can be seen in what is perhaps another version of the plot offered by the *Origo* and the fact that Lactantius’ polemic is a very unlikely source for Greek texts making use of similar details.¹⁸ It would seem that various texts of this type were in circulation and that these served as the interface between the representations of Constantine’s courtiers and historical literature. It is much harder, given the lack of evidence and scholarship’s tendency to locate Sasanian material in more demotic oral traditions, to work out how a Sasanian court narrative might be transmitted into writing.

While the close association with literacy and civic context of Greek and Latin panegyric would seem to render it quite distinct from the courtly context and oral-poetic form we tend to assume for Iranian praise poetry, the two forms may have had more in common than is generally assumed. Certainly “Roman” panegyric had the potential to adopt a more courtly “Iranian” style. From the late 4th century until the middle of the 5th, epic panegyric in Latin was devised as a means to broadcast the ruler’s

¹⁶ On demonstrative rhetoric as a category, its convergence with panegyric, influence over Medieval Latin historiography and ethical emphasis, particularly its relationship with *exempla*, see Kempshall (2011), pp.138-171. On the mechanics of Roman imperial panegyric in Late Antiquity, see Rees (2002), pp.6-19, esp. p.12.

¹⁷ Potter (1999), pp.27-28.

¹⁸ Such as, for example, Praxagoras, see Janiszewski (2006), pp.365-366.

political messages to the senatorial aristocracy. In this form the speaker became the client of his subject while the audience, in this mode entirely cut out of the transaction, was merely expected to heed well what was being said.¹⁹ Conversely, it is not necessary to assume that Iranian performance was purely oral or completely spontaneous.²⁰ Had the kernel of the court narrative seen in the *Kārnāmag*, Ardashir's confrontation with Ardawan, his acquisition of the *xwarrah* and his flight, become an "approved" historical claim in an early, courtly, context, it is not unlikely to have attracted a considered, written, composition at some point. Any such work could serve as the base for not only the entry of the narrative into historiography, but also its elaboration and further romanticisation over time.

5.2.3 Precedent and Replication

The utility of both sequences as argument is based on the easy recognition of their symbolism, that is, on a wide understanding of what they mean. This recognition rests not only upon the explicit symbolism of the themes described above, but also the association of both sequences with previous historicizing uses. This precedent is conveyed in a system of non-direct transmission whereby the very system of attachment, modification and *ad hoc* reattachment continually renewed these narratives by the creation of new exempla. This process strengthened their explanatory and (in the literal sense of the word) propagandistic power by spreading them ever further and freighting them with ever more useful associations.

The apologetic use of these forms is, therefore, circular and self-referential, hallowed images of kingship employed to deflect critique are, on account of their generic appeal to divinity, assimilated to laudatory literature, whence they propagate themselves further as suitable models for the deflection of critique. A notable exception to this directly apologetic tendency is Cyrus whose life seems to have accidentally acquired Sargonic forms in Babylon. Even here however, it may be suspected that Cyrus' later

¹⁹ Gillett (2016).

²⁰ Shayegan (1999), pp.5-13.

biographies accidentally inherited established apologetic forms by way of the antiquarian preoccupations of the legitimizing rhetoric of Nabonidus.

This would seem to be a rather facile argument, essentially positing that success breeds success, and as such it would be an unsatisfyingly circular explanation. A better analogy would, however, be a Newton's Cradle; a particularly forceful use of these narratives, captured in influential literary traditions, creates literary assertions that begin to shape literate, non-literate, or para-literate expectations alike. As stated earlier in this study, it is to be suspected that the long association of Sargon, a figure of near mythic status in Mesopotamian society, with a complex parentage and a courtly confrontation, entrenched these forms in a number of influential cultural repertoires and firmly associated them with the ideal of kingship. As literate and non-literate versions of his early life were transmitted and retransmitted, they continuously reformed and re-patterned each other.²¹

Thus it was the inertia granted them by centuries of repetition that made these particular motif assemblages, what one theorist of modern, national, mythmaking would describe as *intuitive* images: forms deeply, and unconsciously, associated with a concept, in this case, divinely appointed, but in some sense “new”, monarchy.²² Cyrus, despite not employing these narratives to assert his own legitimacy, could become a springboard for later apologia, simply because he came to be seen as exemplary and a model for emulation. The *ultimate* basis of these narratives, the cultural matrix that made them effective in the first place, lurks somewhere behind the smiths and shepherds of the *Sumerian King List*. It is entirely possible that one or both sequences were well established in the unwritten culture of pre-Sargonic times. Any such supposition, however, would be almost completely speculative and lie in any case, well outside the scope of this inquiry. It is the extremely long-lived historical-literary tradition surrounding Sargon that was, literally, fundamental to the processes of reception that link the *Kārnamag* to the *vitae*.

²¹ A similar idea is expressed at Drews (1974), p.393.

²² Zerubavel (1995), pp.110-113.

Continuous dispersal by and reintegration into literature provided these particular arrangements of motifs with more and more points of possible crossover into other cultural contexts; one may suspect, for example, that the centuries long use of Akkadian in parallel with other languages throughout the Near East during the 2nd millennium BCE may have played some role in shaping certain traditions describing the relationship between David and Saul, or “folkloric” accounts of the birth of the “kingly” prophet Moses. Cyrus, whose life we know to have attracted extensive treatments in Greek, serves as a more concrete example of this kind of crossover. At any point in this long trajectory, other suitable motifs, or culturally specific modifications, from other constructions of the ideal royal life could easily be worked into the frame provided by either narrative. The beast combat seen in Ardashir and Constantine’s court narratives, for example, may not have been native to the Sargonic pattern of interpersonal confrontation. Yet the former is certainly a suitably heroic image, one in harmony with the contrastive theme of the latter and, therefore, easily drawn into its iterations.

Extant literature therefore allows a plausible relationship to be traced between disparate, historicizing iterations of both sequences and suggests likely points of crossover between language groups. Text in a variety of forms would seem to have played an important role in transmitting each narrative into and across repertoires. Moreover, the continuing presence of either narrative in text provided points of reference for its imitation and further dispersal. Having argued that this study’s target traditions are the deliberate products of considered engagements with troublesome historical problems it would seem significant that any such texts would have been most accessible to those most likely to recycle them in the service, or defence, of “new” rulers: orators, poets, historians and the like. This is *not* to claim an absolutely direct dependence on a model text in every case. Nor is it to cast the replication of these sequences in history as a purely literary exercise; as has been argued, these narratives were selected precisely because they had a much broader presence in their cultural setting. Rather, it is to acknowledge that the literate are the hinge between old *topoi* and new “history”. Consequently, whether intending a specific comparison or merely relaying set-pieces absorbed in the course of their lessons, their *reapplications* of either sequence may have involved somewhat more textual guidance than is usually considered.

5.2.4 Effects in Historiography

Finally, a noticable, though probably unintentional side effect of the use of these narratives to recast history is their tendency to push competing narratives out of the broader historiography over time. With the caveat that we have lost an enormous amount of material, we have seen how nothing *except* historicized legend remains of the early life of Sargon. In the cases of Cyrus, Ardashir and Constantine, questionable narratives built up on these sequences appear to have marginalised, sometimes almost obliterated, any other account, even officially propagated accounts, of their subjects' early lives. Some instances of the adaptation of these implicitly adulatory narratives by writers hostile to the legacy of the subject firmly underscore this point.

Several factors would seem to have driven this tendency. In the first case very few *concrete* details of the early lives of any of these men would have been *easily* available in later times, leaving the exaggerated relicts of exhausted polemics and counter polemics as the most accessible sources for later writers. More abstractly, a retrospective sense of the social and cultural importance of the dynasties and/or systems that later writers believed to have been "founded" by these men assigned them to an established category of representation. In this way arguments about history adapted, at least indirectly, from historical literature *became* historical literature.

Introduced to argue a point by reference to precedent, both sequences took on a very different meaning when their subject became viewed as an exemplary and significant figure, particularly one associated with some kind of momentous social or political break. When this occurred the subject was shunted into the very category of extraordinary kingship that his defenders had drawn on as a rhetorical device; a proposition that could be supported by a circular reference to the alignment of the subject's early life with that of other exemplary and significant figures. This tight association of both sequences with the idea of signal royal greatness and the all-permeating mass of convention underlying the messaging of each created a certain idealism of form. Uses of either sequence tended towards the possibilities predefined by their older incarnations, leading to a remarkable consistency in very different cultures and circumstances. We see this most vividly in the small details; in the highly constrained form of recognitions made in Sequence One; the way that the antagonist of

Sequence Two is made to relax as the subject escapes; or the way that the *Halkin Vita* added “missing” elements to and exaggerated or underlined particular themes in its source material for the emperor’s youth.

It is this categorizing process of *reception* that allows a pivot from a general demonstration of a loose narrative and circumstantial relationship between all of the historicizing narratives considered above to a specific examination of the meaning of the structural and narrative similarities seen in the opening sections of the *Kārnāmag* texts and the *vitae*. It will be contended that the eventual (albeit heavily idealized) identification of rule with a specific religious community within the Roman and Sasanian empires, took these very old claims of numinous kingship, generated in the heat of ideological or political dispute, in a somewhat novel, and unusually parallel, direction. Without positing equivalence, we may discern beneath these composite traditions the emergence, preservation, and eventual fusion, of both sequences through a broadly similar, religious-communal, processes of commemoration.

5.3 Religious-Imperial Historiography

That various Late Antique Roman and Iranian writers came to attach roughly the same narratives of royal birth and youth to a divisive king is perhaps not particularly surprising. Novel, “usurping” monarchies face similar problems and, as I hope to have shown, the “correct” depiction of royal origins in each society had been conditioned by what was, ultimately, a single system of precedent. What sets apart the story told in the *Kārnāmag* and the *vitae* is their selection and arrangement of these narratives into composite biographies through which a politically significant religious community connected its own history to that of the subject, and the transmission of these composites through the literate commemorative systems of that same community. In this way the partisan polemics and counter polemics of an earlier stage of historiography were transformed into retrospective proof of the action of the divine will in history and the resulting composites became more than the sum of their parts.

From the 3rd century until the fall of the Sasanian dynasty in the 7th, both Rome and Iran had seen their imperial ideologies become closely associated with a single religious community. The theological and historical claims of these communities lent a certain style to each empire's claim to universal rule and their identity would come to be closely entwined with that of their host polity. These merged identities, be they expressed in artistic, literary or ceremonial forms, were based on an imagined ideal; reality was far less clean. The vision of a Christian, Orthodox and universal empire projected from Constantinople was, perversely, extremely prone to fracture. On the one hand, the creation of a canon allowed interpretations at odds with those sanctioned by the imperial centre. On the other, the nature of ecclesiastical organization itself had the potential to make any such dissent dangerously regional.²³ In *Ērānšahr* the emphasis of the “dominant” religious system, as well as the institutional balance between throne and altar, was rather differently weighted and Sasanian rulers generally had a freer hand in religious matters; their religious policies could, therefore, be far more flexible and much better suited to managing a very diverse confessional landscape.²⁴ Moreover, participation in government or possession of elite status was never closed to non-Zoroastrians.²⁵ These are, however, general statements that require some clarification.

In broad terms, the Kings of Kings came to fashion the various non-Zoroastrian communities of their empire into useful tools of imperial control; rewards and punishments would be used in order to keep hierarchs and their followers working with imperial officials. In turn, the king, as an outsider, could be invoked as an arbiter in

²³ Hence Fowden's concept of *commonwealth* as a broken universalism, Fowden (1993), pp.6-8. The trials of keeping an universal, imperial faith together are illustrated in detail in Allen (2001).

²⁴ Shaked argued that Sasanian Zoroastrianism was an extremely diverse set of beliefs whose priestly and demotic registers in particular, differed sharply. More controversially, he cast Sasanian kings as essentially managerial in their approach to *all* religions, Shaked (1994), p.71 f. and pp. 109-115. These statements drew an article length response from Boyce arguing that some kind of orthodoxy did in fact exist during this time and that the house of Sasan was dedicated to it, see Boyce (1996). Though Shaked's theories may have been slightly overstated, it should be noted that, in deep contrast to the later “Iranian” tradition (see for example, ŠhN 6, p.336, line. 594.) Manichean portrayals of the magi's role in the death of their prophet stress that the magi damned him by persuading the king, who was angered by Mani's failures as a doctor, and did not rely on the citation of dogma, see Allberry (1981), 241: 43, 15-25, Henning (1942), pp.949 and 950-951.

²⁵ On the regional and historical means of constructing elite status outside of Iranian, Zoroastrian circles, see Payne (2012).

internal disputes.²⁶ Yet managerial absolutism had its limits; holding close political relationships with Christian and Jewish leaders does not signal that the king was free to dabble with any system that took his fancy. The ideology of Sasanian rule, the very term *Ērān* itself, was bound up in the legendary of a particular stream of a broader religious complex whose adherents were largely, but not exclusively, speakers of Iranian languages.²⁷ While it is not probable that the particular variant of this religion dominant in Istakhr was a widespread, centralised, or even particularly consistent, set of beliefs at the time of the dynasty's climb to power, it does seem likely that a rather *more* centralised and *more* organized institution, one increasingly textual and sometimes entwined with the organs of state, had emerged by its final century; possibly with the encouragement of the state itself.²⁸

Late Middle Persian religious works, and thence a number of Perso-Arabic texts, would claim that the Sasanian state had made “twins” of religion and kingship; though one needs to be *extremely* careful in appraising this claim in regards to the power of priests at court, there is a very small, very hard, kernel of truth in it.²⁹ The edifice of legend that built up around the king's office was not an afterthought. Shapur I mentioned his foundation of ritual fires and sacrifices in ŠKZ, indicating his allegiance to very traditional Indo-Iranian rites, but over the empire's life this would grow into an appeal to a much more specific narrative embedded in this tradition.³⁰ Through the foundation of large fire temples, the very geography of the empire came to be remade in

²⁶ Payne has argued that the Syriac speaking churches of Sasanian Iran were managed in a deliberate and relatively careful manner, and, that as a result, these communities eventually became worked into the political and symbolic fabric of the state. This culminated in the use of Christian symbolism and a knowing engagement with Christian factions during the Sasanian occupation of the Roman territory during the reign of Khosrow II (r.590-628), see Payne (2016) p.164 f.

²⁷ The diversity of this system has caused a great many problems due to the lateness of most Zoroastrian literature and a general assumption that as a religiously inflected polity the Sasanian empire must necessarily always have strongly desired and actively sought religious uniformity; an assumption drawn from an intrinsically Abrahamic framework, see Rezakhani (2015), p.62. A very useful comparison has been suggested to Hinduism (a concept that is itself something of a modern construct, see *ibid.* pp.62-63, Nongbri (2013), pp.110-112), Kryenbroek (2008), p.13 and Becker (2014), p.9.

²⁸ See p.234 below.

²⁹ An argument that this position was a wishful post-production is made in Gignoux (1984).

³⁰ ŠKZ §32-40 and f.

the image of the old religious-epic cycles.³¹ Kings sponsored and worshipped at these temples, and one should note that in the 7th century the Romans under Heraclius destroyed a temple particularly beloved of the dynasty.³² The king was, certainly by the 6th and 7th centuries, very clearly identified as an adherent of Zoroastrian beliefs and outsiders perceived this stance as central to his empire.³³

The king was not alone. The unreasonably vicious kings and magi of the Syriac *acta* are exaggerated caricatures but the characterization of many of the subjects of these documents tell us something important about the empire's ideological structure. The targets of persecution were very often converted Iranian aristocrats.³⁴ Moreover, if the Syriac material can be taken as representative, apostasy from Zoroastrianism was policed by the magi. It would follow that the *Iranian* aristocracy of the Sasanian empire were also expected to conform to some variety of traditional practice and that their priests were responsible for enforcing communal boundaries.³⁵ In this way, the jealous magi of the multi-confessional empire of the *šāhānšāh* somewhat recall the priests, monks and ascetics of the various Christian groups inside and outside of the Roman Empire.³⁶ In both cases groups of religious professionals sought to keep their charges inside a communal boundary, in both cases this boundary was in no small part, drawn by the positioning of the community within a particular historical narrative.³⁷

³¹ Canepa (2013). Later poetic references to royal visits to the great fire of Ādur Gušnasp (cf. KNA, 1.10) in the modern Iranian province of West Azerbaijan are listed in Boyce (2011). Bahram V's (r.420-428) supposed dedication of booty, a Turkish king's crown, to this temple was also recalled by Ṭabarī, 865, pp.96-97. Ardashir is said to have prayed at Ādur Farnbāg in Fars before his battle with Ardawan at KNA, 5.10.

³² Ādur Gušnasp was sacked by Heraclius in 623, see Sebeos, 38 [124] (p.81).

³³ Agathias. Hist, 2.26.5.

³⁴ Payne (2016), pp.48-56.

³⁵ Joel Walker's study of the Syriac *acta* of Mar Qadagh provides a very useful illustration of this careful communal demarcation within the shared culture of the Sasanian Empire. The hero of this text is an aristocratic Iranian convert whose conversion is prosecuted by Zoroastrian priests. Interestingly the writer of this text was clearly familiar with the conventions of *Iranian* heroism and used them unsparingly, see Walker (2006), esp. pp.53-54 and 121 f.

³⁶ On the religious classes as patrollers of boundaries, see Sizgorich (2009), pp.108-143.

³⁷ Sizgorich saw a distinct inclination to "primordialism" in Christian communal historical discourse, with groups leaning on myths of communal origins, particularly stories of martyrs, to orientate themselves with regard to others, *ibid.* p.46-79. Two recent works on Christians in the Sasanian empire show this technique used to work Christianity into the landscape while stressing the distinct origins of Christian communities, see Payne (2016), pp.59-78, Smith (2016), pp.129-153.

Of course, the evolution and internal conflicts of Roman Christianity are relatively well recorded and we have nothing like as much detail for developments in Iran. We do, however, have some evidence of the existence of disagreement and the potential for rupture along regional or doctrinal lines in the Sasanian period. The famously ecumenical bigotry of the high priest Kartir (mid-late 3rd century) may or may not have been empty posturing, but, commissioned by a man so sure of his position as to carve his inscriptions into those of the imperial house, these words testify to the will, if not an ability, to aggressively enforce *some* kind of religious position from the very centre of the state at a fairly early point in its existence.³⁸ Kartir used the word *zandik*, which probably derives from a term meaning “interpretation”, to describe an unspecified religious group, perhaps variants of his own tradition of which he disapproved.³⁹ Priestly education and transmission of scripture remained primarily oral far into the Sasanian period and it is likely that a wide variety of interpretations had emerged as a result.⁴⁰ Later sources would, for example, cast the still very poorly understood Mazdakite movement as a religious innovation within the body of Sasanian “Zoroastrianism”.⁴¹

A corollary to this doctrinal variance, particularly the “revolt” of the Mazdakites, may perhaps be found in the fact that Zoroastrian, and Islamic tradition would assign the compilation of written scriptures and commentaries, something that seems to have occurred in the late Sasanian period, to imperial command.⁴² If this claim is true, it

³⁸ Kartir’s four inscriptions were collected, transliterated and translated in Gignoux (1991). The word *zandik* (represented here as *zyndyk*) was used in the three copies of his resume engraved at Naqš-e Rostam (KNRm), Naqš-e Rajab (KNRb), and on the Ka’baye Zardošt (KKZ) the word is however only preserved in KKZ. Gignoux translates it as “Manicheans”.

³⁹ An etymology cited at Mas’udi. Muruj, pp.167-168, where *zandik* is held to mean Manichean. See also Tafazoli (2010/2011), p.117.

⁴⁰ On the long ascendance of orality in Iran, particularly in regards to scripture, see Huyse (2008), and Tafazoli (2010/2011), pp.67-69.

⁴¹ Crone (1991), pp.26-30.

⁴² Though modern scholarship has found it very difficult to determine what Madakism was, it has traditionally been posited as the cause of deep structural changes in the Sasanian polity, Christensen (1971), p.364 *f.*, Shayegan (2003), pp.376-378 see however, Pourshariati (2008), pp.83-94. It has been argued that the perception that these disturbances were religious in nature was the trigger for the deliberate creation of a more structured and centralised creed, a system that is reflected in today’s Zoroastrianism, Jong (2015), pp.98-100. Khodadad Rezakhani, who also saw Mazdakism as aiding the creation of a canonical Zoroastrianism, would

shows an imperial interest in controlling and tightening the religious canon and engagement with the priestly class. Even if it is exaggerated, it shows that Sasanian kings came to be viewed as legitimizing sources of religious authority whose weight could be used to define a particular vision of orthodoxy. In either case, it shows how a particular religious identity became more and more fused with the mythic ideological claims of the imperial centre; a fusion that appears to have survived, and may perhaps have been intensified by, the fall of the empire itself. Conversely, a trace of opposition to Sasanian primacy within this mythology may be seen in the extremely obscure, and very difficult to date, *Letter of Tansar*; here a regional king seems to complain (obliquely) about Sasanian usurpation of the Iranian legendary complex.⁴³ This trace of aristocratic opposition to Sasanian innovation is particularly relevant in light of a recent argument that some of the old Arsakid era families held onto local interpretations of Iranian religion during Sasanian rule.⁴⁴

One should not overstate the parallels in what were very different arrangements with starkly different antecedents and attitudes. We may say, however that both Roman and Sasanian imperialisms produced, or at least, *claimed* to have produced, a core confessional group, a religious-imperial community whose identity was nested in historical beliefs that were linked somehow to the mythology of state. The terms of the religious imaginary proffered in Constantinople was more canonically defined, more uniform and almost certainly far more centralized than that on offer in Ctesiphon and Fars for most of the Sasanian period, but in the broadest terms each community, at least the *ideal* of each community, came to play a similar role in the mindset of their host polities. It is this similar alignment of interests and the shared need to produce communal histories that included empire that pushed the opening sections of the *vitae* and the *Kārnāmag* on to a similar path.

seem to place the construction of “orthodoxy” *after* the Arab conquest, see Rezakhani (2015). As noted above, later sources sometimes claimed that it was *Ardashir* who ordered the rationalization of the faith; this was probably an attempt to attribute reform to a long-dead model king, see Daryaee (2003).

⁴³ LoT. pp.36-37, 43-44 and 66.

⁴⁴ Pourshariati (2008). p.360 f.

5.3.1 Imperial Narrative and Communal Narrative

It has been argued above that the birth and youth components of the composite traditions labeled as the *Kārnāmag* and the *vitae* are likely to have originated separately in times when and contexts where the meaning of history was both disputed and of political concern. They were both laudatory and apologetic, accessing particularly traditional streams of royal representation made effective by a complex network of texts and expectations. Though connected to this mass of precedent, the *Kārnāmag* and the *vitae* share two features that separate them from their predecessors and make them particularly relevant to each other. On the one hand, both possess a parallel structure; each tradition has reintegrated both narratives in essentially the same way, presenting them as parts of a longer narrative that is both “biography” and an account of imperial foundation. On the other, the construction of longer narratives was, in both cases, mediated by the presence and needs of an imperial-religious community. The question becomes one of interpretation and transformation. How and why do relics of polemic and counter polemic survive to get taken up into much later historiographies of glorious discontinuity?

Several general explanations have already been advanced for this durability: stereotypical narratives travel far and fast and have on this account a ready availability; the divine symbolism used in both narratives is applicable across a wide range of the theories of numinous kingship common to pre-modern societies; and finally, that a retrospective appraisal of a figure as exemplary aligns him with previous exemplars lodged in the repertoire. The Iranian and Byzantine composite traditions considered here present a shared additional factor in that stereotypical descriptions of events were received and filtered through the institutional *results* of the events described. The most useful analysis of the production, audience and intent of these composites would, therefore, proceed from an investigation of them as the products of similar social processes. This institutional slant is evident in the case of *vitae* which fall, more or less neatly, into the (admittedly extremely broad) Christian “genre” of hagiography, but is not as obvious in the case of the *Kārnāmag* which is, for various reasons, something of an isolate. The functional and structural equivalence seen in each tradition directs us to a

number of considerations of group identity and intergroup relations in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages.

In Rome the imperial creed was a streamlined construct built over a considerably less unitary religious landscape. What would become Orthodox Christianity, as is well known, developed slowly and unevenly through a highly literary process in which a stock of stories was created and then shared throughout various, relatively decentralized, communities.⁴⁵ A sudden and unexpected association with temporal power made necessary a slew of new negotiations and aggravated what had been purely internal problems of theology and precedence into problems of state. The situation in Ardashir's putative *Ērānšahr* was quite different. Various forms of the beliefs that are now usually described as "Zoroastrian" were already extremely traditional and aristocratic. The Arsakid dynasty and its *Pahlav* or Parthian aristocracy appear to have appealed to the same gods, known versions of the same legends and to have used rites very similar to those so prominent in Sasanian productions. Unlike the Sasanians however, Arsakid rulers made no, or very little, public or political use of their religious beliefs.⁴⁶ There is a brief indication in a later Middle Persian religious text that one Arsakid king may have sponsored a codification of religious "texts", but if this happened it would seem to have had very little effect on what was by Sasanian times an ancient and very eclectic religious tradition that was transmitted orally and was by nature "more inclined to collect and conflate than exclude".⁴⁷

Thus a subtle but important difference; in its Christian phase, Roman imperialism allied itself to the representatives of one of a number of competing truths extracted from a heavily textual system predicated on access to absolute truth. Sasanian imperialism, on the other hand, would favor a particular facet of a scruffy and diffuse set of unwritten religious traditions sharing a common ancestry. In doing so, it has been argued, the dynasty eventually oversaw the transmutation of an extremely varied, inherently accumulative and informally polytheistic tradition into a rationalized system of a considerably more henotheist or monotheist bent; a system that is largely reflected

⁴⁵ Cameron (1991), p.89 f., and *passim*.

⁴⁶ Jong (2015), pp.94-96.

⁴⁷ Boyce 1979, p.135, Shaked (1994), pp.115-119.

in the Zoroastrianism that survives to the present day.⁴⁸ Though the timing and conditions differed, the end results were, in abstract, rather similar: a particular community, defined in idealized terms, became seen as the vessel of the “soul” of the state.⁴⁹ As these identifications were neither organic nor uncontested a secondary result of this process was the need to locate this relationship in a recognizable historical narrative; to harmonise the history of the community with that of “their” polity in a way that presented the union as natural and preordained.⁵⁰ It is, more than anything else, this grafting of two separate storylines that guided the creation of our target texts and governed their constructions of the early lives of the “founders”.

Occurring as they do at the juncture of literature, the propagation of an imperial ideology and religious identity, the question of just how to describe the place of the *vitae* and the *Kārnāmag* presents modern interpretive frames with a very slippery problem indeed. Though I have, up until this point, avoided the term as inherently misleading, this particular set of connections suggests that these texts *could* be approached through particular interpretations of the phenomenon of national identity. This was the approach taken by Phillip Wood in his recent study of the emergence of a Christian Syriac identity from the 5th century.⁵¹ “National” and “nationalism”, it must be repeated, are enormously loaded concepts that bring with them very serious problems. In a narrow sense, they have a precedent of being too easily applied in Sasanian studies. More generally, a powerful set of arguments maintains that they are completely inapplicable to a pre-modern context.⁵² Wood, however, used the concept of *ethnie*, defined by Anthony Smith as pre-modern group consciousness based on a sense of shared identity, as a way into the problem.⁵³ This allowed him to borrow from theorists

⁴⁸ De Jong (2013), pp.45-59, De Jong (2015), pp.98-100.

⁴⁹ Fowden (1993), pp.31-36.

⁵⁰ “What was being fought over by pagans and Christians in the fourth century, therefore, was the right to interpret the past.” Cameron (1991), p.138.

⁵¹ Wood (2010).

⁵² Notably, the work of Ernst Gellner and Benedict Anderson, see Gellner (2006), Anderson (2006).

⁵³ Smith (2004), pp.184-90 & 202-4.

of national identity without going so far as to suggest direct equivalence between the nation state and the political-religious formations of the Roman east.⁵⁴

Wood uses these approaches to describe the creation of a distinct, at times somewhat anti-imperial, Christian consciousness within the Roman state. In one part of his argument he pays particular attention to the role that the creation of legendary histories played in crafting notions of Syriac, in particular Edessene, identity. A key element of this process was a legend, already known to Eusebius, that Jesus had replied to a letter from Abgar V (r. 4 BCE-50 CE) the king of Edessa. The legend goes on to state that after Jesus' ascension, the apostle Thomas had sent a representative, Addai, in order to expound the faith to Abgar.⁵⁵ An elaborate 5th century reworking of this legend, the *Doctrina Addai*, describes how Addai converted Edessa's elite and established a church there. In Wood's analysis, the *Doctrina Addai* was a top-down, *composite* work aimed at creating a Christian past for the city, casting its church as an ancient foundation in which its nobility were enthusiastically involved.⁵⁶ Moreover, containing a number of "Addai's" sermons, the document was also a presentation of what Edessene Christianity was, and was *not*, according to the words of its "founder".⁵⁷

Though intended to advance the claims of Edessa, the Abgar legend was attractive to the adherents of other Syriac-speaking Christian factions who linked to it to build the histories of *their* communities. The next work discussed by Wood, the *Acts of Mar Mari*, tells the story of the mission of Mari, a disciple of Addai. This text has also, according to Wood, baptised a number of *Manichean* conversion narratives to create what is possibly a Diophysite *subversion* of the claims made in the *Doctrina Addai*.⁵⁸ Finally, the *Cave of Treasures*, a rendition of Biblical history with a particular focus on the north of Mesopotamia, also utilized the legend of Agbar's letter to strengthen its assertion that Syriac speakers held a superior place in Christian history.⁵⁹

⁵⁴ Sizgorich also adapted the work of theorists of modern identity in his work on Late Antique religious violence, see Sizgorich (2009), pp.49-51.

⁵⁵ Eusebius, HE, 1.13.

⁵⁶ Wood (2010) pp.83-88, and 93-95.

⁵⁷ Ibid. pp.91-92.

⁵⁸ Ibid. pp.112-117.

⁵⁹ Ibid. pp.121-124.

In these texts Wood demonstrates how a discrete historical legend was worked into a number of longer, legendary histories of origins, which were then used to shape civic and religious identities within a distinct ethnic, or linguistic frame. Particularly in the case of the unusual sourcing of the *Acts of Mar Mari*, his study reveals how connected claim and counterclaim often are; how the mere assertion of the historicity of an event redraws the terrain over which new, even very hostile, historical assertions must be made. The target composite traditions of this study, and the forces that coalesced them, would appear to present many similarities in their technique and intent. Yet, in one important respect, they are quite different. The Syriac legendary traditions cited by Wood represent the productions of a fractious set of communities located within, but not of, a theoretically universal imperial orthodoxy. They are, to a greater or lesser extent, declarations of separateness from the mainstream of their host polity. The Constantine of the *vitae*, and the Ardashir of the *Kārnāmag* represent the antithesis of this. These are foundation histories of imperial orthodoxy itself; they collapse what was in actuality the contest of a number of related identities and practices into a single vision of a monolithic, imperially backed, mainstream creed.

This claim rests on more than the incorporation of the heavily divinized symbolics of Sequence One and Sequence Two. Both composites display a preoccupation with the construction of the physical and institutional infrastructure of the imperial creed. The *vitae* are careful to mention Constantine's construction of Constantinople as a Christian capital, the pious foundations he, or his servants, built and his summoning of the council of Nicea. The *Kārnāmag* is accessible in full in only two texts, one of which (KNA) is rather curt and the other (the *Šāhnāmeḥ*) seemingly shorn of overt references to the old religion. Yet in KNA it is still possible to perceive a similar emphasis. Ardashir's progress is marked by the appearance of fire temples; the empire's great fires appear allegorized in the dream foretelling his birth, and both his escape from and victory over Ardawan are the occasion for the foundation of fires in thanksgiving.⁶⁰ Other incidental features, Ardashir's performance of the *wāḥ* prayer and the probably anachronistic

⁶⁰ KNA, 2.10, 5.10, 5.13.

presence of a chief priest at his court betray late, and priestly, religious assumptions.⁶¹ Moreover, an interpolation appearing just after the death of Ardawan (between sections 5 and 6) in two of the later manuscripts descended from MK, one from the late 19th century and the other of uncertain date, leaves very little doubt as to the significance of this moment in the eyes of the Parsee community who preserved this text:

“And so he [Ardashir] sat on the throne of Ardawan, he summoned the great and the humble of the army and the Archimagus [*mowbed-ī mowbedān*] before him and declared “Now that I possess this great kingship which the gods have given to me, I will do good. I will work justice and adorn [*ārāst*] the holy Good Creed [*dēn-ī weh*, ie, Zoroastrianism] and tend the inhabitants of the earth as my children.”⁶²

Henrik Nyberg, rejecting an earlier claim that this interpolation was present in a manuscript of KNA predating MK, posited that it had been extracted from another, now untraceable, manuscript.⁶³ The passage, whose syntax seems to reflect New Persian norms, would appear to be late; it also has a suspiciously strong air of familiarity to anyone who has read through any of the innumerable speeches from the throne composed by Ferdowsi. Yet the lateness of this addition to the composite does not render it valueless as an interpretive tool. Indeed, the presence of this neat set-piece merely confirms how the moment of the proclamation of a long dead empire remained relevant to a relatively small, rather inward looking, and decidedly *un-imperial* community. The tone and date of the interpolation is somewhat suggestive; in the 19th century the Parsee community was confronted by both Protestant missionary efforts and forms of exegesis imported from Europe, assaults which the Parsee community of this time found itself poorly equipped to face. The need to confront these challenges would eventually lead to significant changes in how Parsees approached their texts and interpreted their tradition.⁶⁴ It would be interesting if it were in this context of the reorganization of communal identity that a copyist felt the need to augment a text that

⁶¹ Ibid. 8.11, 10.9.

⁶² This interpolation is listed as Appendix A in Anklesaria's edition, and is transcribed and translated at Grenet (2003), pp.76-79. I have translated only the first, most relevant, part; the remainder continues in this vein.

⁶³ Nyberg (1964), pp.xi-xii.

⁶⁴ Maneck (1994), p.313 f.

already presupposes a tight link between the foundation of the Sasanian state and the Parsees' religion.

As in the hagiographic traditions represented by the *vitae*, the *Kārnāmag* tradition intertwines the triumph of a single figure with that of an institution while retrojecting some of the assumptions of that institution back to a point at which they had certainly not yet developed. The late interpolation of KNA highlights an ongoing engagement with KNA as a narrative of origins; long, after the empire had ceased to exist, this account of its foundation could still be referenced to provide, if not a group history, a group *with* a history. Like the *vitae*, the *Kārnāmag* reaches back to a moment of triumph, in both cases, described as a time in which a perfect harmony existed between throne and altar. Thus political and communal histories are fused in the person of the subject and an idealised model of the (later) religious state is offered through an account of its beginnings.

5.3.2 Function

This is of course a very convenient view of the past, one that glosses over or minimizes controversies and assumes that the received forms of religious life were established in an instant, under the tutelage of a king sponsored by god, and not through a slow and tortuous process of internal conflict. The *vitae*, for example, do address the “defeat” of Arianism at Nicea, and sometimes pour scorn on “Arian” claims, but Arianism was merely an early and prominent example of the numerous, increasingly arcane, doctrinal disputes within Roman or Byzantine Christianity. On the other hand, for most of its existence the Sasanian dynasty would appear to have been comfortable with a wide variety of religious practice. Certainly demotic forms of the “Zoroastrian” religion in this period appear to have been a great deal more varied and syncretic than one would expect from the later Pahlavi books.⁶⁵ Both stories told by the *Kārnāmag* and the *vitae* are then history as it *should* have happened, a presentation of the past desired by the future, created by partisans of a particular cause and designed for internal consumption.

⁶⁵ De Jong (2006), pp.223-233.

As such, each of these traditions might be seen as very self conscious examples of what Margaret Somers has called *public narrative*, that is, the narrative of an institution providing an overarching frame that organizes its members' sense of self.⁶⁶ They might equally be defined as attempts to build what Yael Zerubabbel has called a *master narrative*, that is, the line considered mainstream within a collective's historical memory.⁶⁷ Zerubabbel's terms are especially attractive as her examination of the development of Israeli national identity sees master narrative as built up of system of lurid and inherently polarizing points; of claims and the subversion of claims; that is, *counter narrative*. The exemplary death of a handicapped Zionist hero, for example, becomes the subject of grim jokes in anti-war literature within a few generations.⁶⁸ In a similar vein, one consideration of the construction of identity in the successor states of the Soviet Union shows how the creation of a communal past in Armenia seized on apposite moments in what was imagined to be communal history, and encoded them heroically, demonstrating an absolute impatience with complexity or qualification.⁶⁹ It will be recalled that the creation and propagation of the stereotypical origins sequences considered above also seem to have hinged on points of polemic or counter polemic. The sectarian slant of the composite traditions, combined with their granular and episodic form, into which only the most retrospectively affirming versions of events were admitted, demonstrates a considered and deliberate attempt to construct a formal master narrative out of disparate materials bequeathed by posterity. The result in both cases was a string of claims, a particular arrangement of switches, arranged into "the" history, and proffered as a presentation of self to self.

A similarly identitarian imperative can be discerned in the imperial imaginaries that began to emerge in Roman and Iranian Late Antiquity. Though his political significance and closeness to Constantine have sometimes been exaggerated, it is worth looking at Eusebius' anthropological thought as an early example of the sort of thinking that would later inform the identity of the Christian empire. Eusebius identified Christianity

⁶⁶ Somers (1994), p.619.

⁶⁷ Zerubavel (1995), p.214 f.

⁶⁸ Ibid. p.39 f.

⁶⁹ Suny (2001), p.884 f.

with the “Hebrews” (whom he was *very* careful to distinguish from the Jews) of the Old Testament. As carriers of the unbroken chain of true revelation, to Eusebius Christians, though ethnically diverse, were a distinct people united by a creed that stretched back into deep antiquity.⁷⁰ In this conception, the overt parallel Eusebius drew between Constantine, Roman emperor, and Moses, savior and lawgiver to the “Hebrews” is rather telling.⁷¹ Should we follow Eusebius’ analogy to its logical conclusion, Constantine, a Moses clad in purple, would lead to the establishment of a state with a strongly confessional character. In his various elisions of ethnicity with creed and sacred history with contemporary affairs, Eusebius was participating in a stream of Christian thought that had begun to see the Roman Empire as playing a providential role in the divine plan.⁷²

With the correct claims properly emphasised, the reign of Constantine was for Eusebius and those who came to share in his interpretation, a point from which an uncomplicated and harmonious vision of the unfolding of a specifically *Christian* polity might be sketched. The *vitae*, compiled much later in an avowedly Christian empire containing a number of distinct ethnic and linguistic identities, continued this line of interpretation. Through Constantine it was possible to conflate a Christian identity with an imperial style of political order. The stereotypical and heroic accounts of Constantine’s early life became, in other words, part of a suggested master narrative, stories produced by certain Christians for other Christians, either in the expectation (or hope) that the state would take on a unitary, confessional, identity, or, later, the belief that it already had.

It will be recalled that Kazhdan proposed that the earliest layers of the “Constantine Legend” seen across the *vitae* texts may have emerged in Iconoclastic propaganda at some point around the year 800, and that Iconophiles responded by reworking such material to be more to their tastes. If true, this factional origin would seem to

⁷⁰ Johnson (2006), p.94 f.

⁷¹ On the parallels Eusebius sought to draw from Biblical history, see Williams (2011), pp.18-57.

⁷² On the increasing equation of Christianity with Hellenistic kingship theory and Roman imperialism, see Dvornik (1966), p.611 f., Fowden (1993), pp.89-99, and Oakley (2006), p.73, on the use of this equivalence as a rhetoric of progress, infiltrating the older idea of *Romanitas*, see Wood (2010), pp.23-37. On Eusebius’ Roman focus, and seeming lack of interest in non-Roman Christians, see Smith (2016), pp.25-27 and 60-61.

complicate the idea that the story told in the *vitae* was a demonstration of imperial and religious unity; in fact it merely illustrates the point.⁷³ Iconoclasts and Iconophiles alike agreed that a single, imperially backed religious identity ought to exist, they merely disagreed (vehemently!) over the style of that identity. If Kazhdan was correct, then we need only imagine that returning to Constantine was a way of asserting the claims of one or the other faction as foundational. This would have drawn counter reactions, but given both parties shared some very basic historical assumptions, this would probably not have required drastic rewriting.

If Roman Christian theorists from the 4th century looked to Biblical precedent to determine what, exactly, a Christian empire ought to mean, appeals to *Ērān* offered the Sasanian dynasty a more natural, and considerably more concrete, conceptual basis. *Ērān* as stated above, was a concept drawn from a widespread complex of religiously tinted legends. The notion itself would seem to have already had a recognizable geographic, quasi-ethnic, component as early as the 3rd century, though if this were so, the exact boundaries of either are now somewhat hazy.⁷⁴ In any case, from the beginning of the Sasanian period, *Ērān* was linked to assertions of the legitimacy of the imperial house; as such, a particular interpretation of its meaning had to be constructed and imposed. The early, top-down identification of *Ērān* with the new empire masked the very heterogeneous nature of the belief system from which the idea was drawn. As the later dynasty began to align itself more and more with a particular, priestly, perspective, the actually diffuse nature of the underlying religious system must have become increasingly problematic.⁷⁵

We may see in this disjuncture, as in the Christian empire, the attraction of foundation narratives that simplified “Iranian” religious identity as imperial, eternal,

⁷³ Kazhdan (1987), pp.246-249.

⁷⁴ On the development and origins of the concept of *Ērān*, see Gnoli (1989). On its possible geographic conception in the 3rd and 4th centuries, see Gignoux (1971). On the difficult ethnic, religious and political meanings of this term, see Shaked (2008), Daryaee (2010).

⁷⁵ De Jong has argued that the Sasanians oversaw an “intense restructuring, or veritable recreation, of Zoroastrianism”, which culminated in the “closing” of the canon after the Mazdakite revolt, De Jong (2015), pp.96-100. Crone argued that heterodox “Zoroastrianisms”, many of which she viewed as Mazdakite leaning, were central to several quasi-Islamic rural uprisings in the Abbasid period, see Crone (2012).

and unitary.⁷⁶ It is likely that hKNA, the root of the *Kārnāmag* narratives known to us today, was conceived of as a collection of narratives amenable to this centripetal interpretation; a collection edited, and then published, in order to confirm a past for those already invested in a particular historical outlook. Of course, circumstances make the emphasis of each composite tradition slightly different. The Sasanian dynasty survived and would come to pose as *renewers*, merely the latest members of a dynasty coeternal with the “*Ērān*” of legend. As these legends overlapped with aspects of traditional religion, the dynasty’s later doctrinal inclinations could be, and were, portrayed as a natural occurrence, merely a seamless continuation of the claims made at Ardashir’s rightful seizure of the crown. In the Roman context, the discontinuity between the old and new was far more evident and as a result, an influential strand of Christian historical thought came to see Constantine as a *founder*, a man who had swept away the old beliefs and begun the era of Christian rule. In this conception, any dynastic concerns were entirely secondary to the cosmic significance of the outcome. Despite this, their commonalities – the association of a religious institution, often in an anachronistic form, with a moment of state foundation, and the sublimation of religious difference into a highly idealized imperial creed – suggest that both traditions were compiled to serve a very similar communal-identitarian function.

5.3.3 Context and Audience

This communal imperative is fairly evident in the general situation of the *vitae* texts. Coming into view in the 9th century, the tradition carried by the *vitae* was the product of a period in which classicizing modes of historiography were largely in abeyance, and the “private” ostentatiously literary audiences for which such works were crafted long gone.⁷⁷ Though much of the material of the *vitae* has been culled from more traditionally historical material, their sequential, declarative, narratives and narrow, sacred, subject matter reflect a rather different expectation of historical narrative and thereby, the desires of a rather different audience. The disposition of surviving manuscripts appears

⁷⁶ A rather stronger version of this argument is proposed in Daryaei (1995).

⁷⁷ Croke (2010), pp.28-42.

to reflect this change in consumption. This, alongside the likely context in which these texts emerge, allows a number of conclusions to be drawn regarding their origins and uses.

The *Halkin Vita* was composed by a monk near Thessaloniki. It was found in a codex that seems to be a miscellany of hagiographies, and other religious writings.⁷⁸ Because over a quarter of this codex is given over to St Christodule, the 11th century founder of the Monastery of St John on Patmos, it was probably compiled in that institution.⁷⁹ The *Opitz Vita* is fragmentary and incomplete, with parts redacted from various manuscripts. Texts of the *Guidi Vita*, however, are relatively abundant and often found in menologies, that is, chronological texts containing the lives of saints arranged by their feast days.⁸⁰ The creation of this sort of compilation can be attested from the early 9th century though less formal collections of lives certainly predate this.⁸¹ The production of hagiography, - stories of the saints, their lives and actions - was tied to a larger, public, mechanism of religious commemoration.⁸² Additionally, the preparation of menologies seems to have involved the collection and editing of material and language in order that the lives of the saints might reach a broader audience.⁸³ As noted by Kazhdan, the “author” of the *Guidi Vita* seems to have done some work in squaring up his source text(s); there is a possibility that this *vita* was originally prepared for inclusion in some such collection.⁸⁴ Finally, it was almost certainly created in a monastery where the motive to produce edifying devotional works, the means to transcribe them and a library of research materials were most likely to come together. Though it may not have been the first composite produced according to this pattern, the semi-liturgical and commemorative setting of the *Guidi Vita* might plausibly be taken as representative of the tradition of the *vitae* more broadly.

⁷⁸ The coda of the *Halkin Vita* contains the author’s greetings to his brothers (presumably on Patmos) sent from a town near Thessaloniki. (Halkin (1959a), p.372, sec.24.

⁷⁹ Halkin (1959b), pp.64-67.

⁸⁰ Winkelmann (1973), p.268.

⁸¹ Rapp (1995), pp.33-34.

⁸² The broad audience and public uses of hagiographic texts in the early to middle Byzantine period are touched on in Efthymiadis (1996), pp.64-5, and more generally in E.C. Bourbouhakis (2010).

⁸³ Rapp (1995), p.34 f.

⁸⁴ Kazhdan (1987), pp.213-214.

The origin of hKNA and the audience for the story reflected in the extant *Kārnāmag* texts are more difficult to interpret. As indicated above, on the basis of some geographic details seen in parts of KNA, and its account of the descent of the short-lived Ormazd I from a seemingly insignificant local king, hKNA was probably compiled in Fars; *when* this happened is a much harder question to answer. It *may* have been at some point in the later Sasanian era; certainly, there are hints that other royal biographies did exist, and the strongly legitimist and “orthodox” message of the *Kārnāmag* would suit this time and place.

There is also, however, an intriguing possibility that it was put together sometime *after* the Sasanians’ fall from power. The cities of Fars had resisted the first wave of conquest and the province was, for some centuries afterwards, a stronghold of the old religion; presumably, being the heartland of the old empire, largely in its most hieratic and “canonical” form.⁸⁵ Up until about the 9th century Zoroastrians still had, in places, relatively large urban populations and access to the financial and political support these provided.⁸⁶ Moreover, the conquest itself had deep psychosocial consequences; the loss of the empire had made Iranian identity, once the ideological centre of the polity, just one more component of a heterogeneous, Arab dominated, Islamic empire. This loss of status was particularly keenly felt by those who stuck to the old religion.

Coming to terms with this shift produced a climate of retrospection. Those who had converted faced the problem of reconciling the prestigious identities formed in the old order with the claims of the new. They dealt with this by grafting their cultural and imperial legacy on to the story of Islam: identifying the figures of Iranian myths with Abrahamic analogs, or merging the old royal family with that of the prophet, for example.⁸⁷ This option was obviously not open to Zoroastrians who could only view the new religion as alien and its triumph as a cosmic disaster. The first few centuries of the post conquest period saw the emergence of Zoroastrian literature that attempted to come to terms with this situation. Polemical, admonitory and legal texts urged the community to remain separate and hold on as their social position became less and less

⁸⁵ Choksy (1997) pp.20-22 and 87-88.

⁸⁶ Ibid. pp.96-98.

⁸⁷ On the negotiation of an Islamic Iranian identity through fusion see Dabiri (2013) and Savant (2015).

attractive.⁸⁸ Alongside this, a cyclical apocalyptic tradition was adapted to both explain Islam, and predict an eventual return to power.⁸⁹ In this context, an account of Ardashir's rise, an event that the later Sasanian tradition had already interpreted as both religious and restorative, may have been extremely attractive.

Whether post-Sasanian or not, any Middle Persian form of the composite would for most of its existence, have been received and interpreted against this backdrop of loss and promise. The memory of the empire as a previous incarnation of an idealised Zoroastrian order appears to have continued in Zoroastrian political cosmology for a very long time. During his stay in Isfahan in the 1670s the Huguenot traveller Jean Chardin reports as having in his possession for over three months a book in which he believed much of the old Persian religion to have been recorded. Because Chardin became dissatisfied with his interpreter, his account of this (seemingly quite miscellaneous) volume is rather short, but bears witness to how the merger of communal and sacred history begun in the Sasanian era was still playing out amongst the Zoroastrian minority in Safavid Iran.

“The book was made in the time of Yazdegird the fourth [!] the last of the idol worshipping [!!] kings of Persia. Alongside commentaries that were added eight hundred years ago when the public practice of their [ie. the Zoroastrians'] religion was abolished. It speaks a great deal of the reign of this last king and of many other matters other than those of religion.”⁹⁰

Chardin follows with a description of his understanding of Zoroastrian religious doctrine, historical understanding and institutional practice in which he makes certain claims, such as their detestation of Alexander and Mohammed, that indicate fairly good sources.⁹¹ In the midst of this Chardin made a very short, but, in light of the earlier quote, extremely interesting, observation.

⁸⁸ Boyce (1984), Choksy (1997), pp.99-100 and 110-137.

⁸⁹ Choksy (1997), pp.54-56.

⁹⁰ Chardin (1735), 2. p.181.

⁹¹ Ibid. 2. pp.185-186

“It is one of their most constant traditions that their religion shall again come to power, and will become dominant in Persia, *and that the empire shall return to them (que l’Empire leur sera rendu)*. They and their children maintain this hope.”⁹²

Consisting of only a few manuscripts and their archetype (contained in Codex MK), evidence for a Middle Persian *Kārnāmag* as a tradition external to its adaptations in Perso-Arabic texts is extremely limited. The little we do have places the text in a tightly constrained, and priestly context. The surviving manuscripts of KNA do not come from Iran, but from the Parsee community of northwest India. Presumably an ancestral *Kārnāmag* text made its way there from Iran sometime before the relevant section of MK was copied in 1322, either in one of the very poorly recorded waves of migration, or in one of the sporadic exchanges of texts and priests that occurred over the centuries.⁹³ Very little, however, is known for certain about the history of the community before the early modern period. The Zoroastrian community in India had, over time, been reshaped by its circumstances; it spoke Gujarati and had adopted a number of distinctly Indian mores under the guise of ancestral practice.⁹⁴ Despite this, the Parsees remained a distinct, endogamous, minority whose social position fell usefully outside of the social classifications of their neighbours.⁹⁵ Their Indian context and an uneven collection of sacred texts led to some divergence in custom and practice from their Iranian brethren.⁹⁶ The most marked contrast between the two groups was, however, the social acceptance and economic success enjoyed by the Indian community and the rather more precarious existence of their coreligionists in Iran.

Yet, the Parsees never forgot that their community had its roots in Iran; indeed the Iranian community was appealed to in several cases of religious dispute.⁹⁷ While, unlike Iranian Zoroastrians, they had few pressing reasons to dream of its restoration, the

⁹² Ibid. 2. p.184

⁹³ Boyce (1984), pp.166-176.

⁹⁴ Maneck (1994), pp.54-58.

⁹⁵ Axelrod (1980), pp.153-155.

⁹⁶ Boyce argued that both communities remained “orthodox” in doctrine with only minor changes in practice Boyce (1984), pp.173-175. In contrast, Maneck argued that Parsee beliefs were, in general, secondary to the maintenance of communal praxis and thereby identity. In consequence, *beliefs* were far more susceptible to change than rituals, see Maneck (1994), pp.29-37, 73-80.

⁹⁷ Maneck (1994), pp.73-80 and 214 f.

memory of empire continued to play a role in the Parsee conception of communal and thereby *sacred* history. Around 1600, Bahman Kay Qobād Sanjāna, a Parsee from a priestly family, composed a “history” of the founding of his community in Modern Persian verse, the so-called *Qesseh-ye Sanjān*, or the *Story of Sanjan*. Like all accounts of ethnogenesis the *Qesseh* contains much more of the writer’s own beliefs and concerns than of historically accurate detail. In this telling, the foundation of the community was a singular event in which the ancestors of the Parsees, driven from Iran by Muslim oppression, came to India as refugees; almost certainly, a dramatic simplification of a much slower, far more complex process of migration that may have begun with trading settlements in the Sasanian era itself.⁹⁸ Its depiction of the settlement as a contract between Iranian migrants and an Indian prince explains certain oddities of Parsee practice as the conditions of their acceptance and asserts a cooperative, yet firmly marked, communal boundary which the Parsee community displays itself as promising to enrich Indian society while remaining separate from it.⁹⁹

What is notable for this study is the vision of religious history from which the migration and settlement recounted in the *Qesseh* proceed. After a fairly long introduction, the author gives a brief history of the course of the Zoroastrian faith reflecting a rise and fall tradition of staggered apocalyptic into which the Sasanian empire, its representation of Alexander as a destroyer, a restorative Ardashir and the fall of the Sasanians are folded.¹⁰⁰

“In King Vishtāspa’s days, religion’s path
 was brought to light by Holy Zoroaster.
 He’d told of things to come in the Avesta
 ‘Oppressive kings will show themselves to you,
 Three times the Good Religion will be broken
 each time the faithful will be crushed and wounded.
 The name of those same “kings” will be “Oppressor”,
 and hence the noble faith become despairing.’

⁹⁸ Cereti (1991), pp.13-15, Maneck (1994), pp.39-41.

⁹⁹ Axelrod (1980), pp.152-153.

¹⁰⁰ Boyce and Poonawala (1986).

I speak now of Religion's work, so listen,
 how once again the noble faith was weakened.
 At length King Alexander came upon them,
 he burnt religion's holy books in public.
 Three hundred years this faith was brought down low,
 and tyranny oppressed its faithful people.
 Then after, for a while, the faith found refuge
 when Ardashir took sovereignty of it.
 And once again the noble faith could flourish,
 it came to be illustrious in the world.
 ...
 When Zoroaster's thousandth year had come
 the limit of the Noble Faith came too.
 When kingship went from Yazdegird the king
 the infidels arrived and took his throne.
 From that time forth Irān was smashed to pieces!
 Alas! That land of the Faith now gone to ruin!"¹⁰¹

Unlike KNA, the *Qesseh* was composed in a living language. Persian being the Mughal language of administration the poem would have been readily understandable, at least to the better-educated members of the community, without priestly training. The poem also has a distinctly local angle; the *Qesseh* would seem to have been asserting the prominence of the community at Sanjan within the broader Parsee community. These factors indicate, perhaps, that a wider audience was intended.¹⁰² Yet, it is notable how the *Qesseh* assumes the claims of later Sasanian historiography; it has adopted the restorative Ardashir of the later Sasanian era and interpreted "his" empire as both the ancestral homeland and a vehicle for the exercise of religious virtue. Indeed, this work proceeds from same fundamental political and religious assumptions made in the *Kārnāmag*, albeit from a later stage of eschatology. If the later interpolation of KNA speaks to a continuing priestly, literary, engagement with this interpretation, the *Qesseh*

¹⁰¹ This translation is that made in Williams (2009), p.71, lines 82-86 and p.73, lines 95-100.

¹⁰² The author claimed that a *dastur*, a priest of some standing was his source, see *ibid.*, p.67, lines 69-70.

may indicate that the themes of this “historiography” circulated more broadly within the community. The *Qesseh* itself would be used as a source for another Persian history of communal origins.¹⁰³ KNA’s survival in the miscellany of a Parsee family may have been the result of this sense of social and theological continuity with the empire. The text both reflected events seen as critical in the formation of Parsee self-image and, composed in a language strongly associated with those times, may have appeared to have been an especially authoritative account of them.

The *vitae* were produced, and largely received, within a reduced, but still viable Christian Roman Empire. They appear to have been linked to a style of formally commemorative literature that was largely produced in explicitly religious communities for a *somewhat* general consumption. hKNA and its Middle Persian descendants shared with the *vitae* a very probable authorship by religious specialists, yet the dating of these texts, their uses and intended audience, are much less clear. Though it would seem that translations into New Persian or Arabic were available at a relatively early point, Muslim writers appear to have largely viewed their contents as mere source material for Sasanian history. The survival of a Middle Persian version in a Parsee codex hints that the memory of empire continued to play a foundational role in Zoroastrian consciousness and suggests that within this community the story told in the *Kārnāmag* had a far deeper meaning. Unlike the Greek *vitae* the increasing obscurity of the Middle Persian script and language would have limited the direct audience for Middle Persian renditions of the *Kārnāmag* to relatively small, overwhelmingly priestly, circles. Yet, as demonstrated by the much later *Qesseh* the most important of the *Kārnāmag*’s historical postulates came to be assumed more broadly within the community. Thus, though their readership was probably narrower than that of the *vitae*, hKNA and its descendants appear to have addressed a similar need. Should we take the development of the story told in the *vitae* as a model, we may suggest that the *Kārnāmag* was a historical representation produced by members of a religious institution; an institution whose relationship, or former relationship, with power gave the memory of empire an unusually central position in a community’s identity and historical consciousness. Both

¹⁰³ This later work is treated in Cereti (1991).

traditions aimed to provide and preserve a harmonious account of the formation of a pious state for those whose identity depended on the idea that such a thing existed, or had existed.

5.4 Conclusion: Parallel Lives?

The social, structural and ideological convergences that can be discerned in the *Kārnāmag* and the *vitae* should alter our understanding of them; the form and role of the story told in the *Kārnāmag* in particular makes a great deal more sense when compared to that seen in the *vitae*, its Byzantine “analog”. Indeed, hKNA and KNA might even be helpfully classified as the same kind of work. Some years ago a long debate between Averil Cameron and Timothy Barnes over the nature and genre of the *Vita Constantini* highlighted the strangeness of Eusebius’ text and in doing so made an interesting, and here, very relevant, point. Both Cameron and Barnes, though disagreeing on most issues, referred to the *Vita* as hagiography.¹⁰⁴ In Barnes’ view it was a particularly awkward species of hagiography and certainly not a “*life in the ancient sense*”.¹⁰⁵ Cameron countered some time later that this was a meaningless distinction, “*what is hagiography if not the writing of lives?*”¹⁰⁶ Cameron meant to link Eusebius’ biography to a number of non-Christian, Late Antique, lives of “holy men”. Yet, it is her implication that “hagiography” was a continuation of older trends that is of interest here. In this sense, both composite traditions may be thought of as functionally “hagiographical” insofar as they are biographical, religious and communally commemorative. In their parallel incorporation of hoary forms of royal apologetic and their portrayal of state foundation

¹⁰⁴ In short, Cameron believed the *Vita Constantini* to have been a basically unitary work and that it sits within the genre of Late Antique *Lives* of holy men (described in Cox (1983)) An argument made at Cameron (2000), p.82. *Contra* Barnes believed it to have been published posthumously and as a compilation of two works, a formal panegyric and “something like a biography” Barnes (1981), p.265, *f*.

¹⁰⁵ Barnes (1989), p.110.

¹⁰⁶ Cameron (1997), p.148

as the alliance of a religious institution with temporal power, they are, however, “hagiographies” of an unusual and very specific type.

The conditions under which Ardashir and then Constantine came to power gave rise to very standard controversies associated with “usurping” or contested succession. In turn, these controversies aroused very standard responses that were simultaneously apologetic and panegyric. These included historical assertions that made use of traditional origins narratives long associated with great men. It has been argued from historical context and an examination of the origins of Constantine’s legend that here the origins narratives used in the *Kārnāmag* and the *vitae* were likely to have arisen as deliberate rhetorical or literary efforts made either by courtiers with an interest in defending the subject directly, or, by later writers operating independently but somehow invested in defending the legacy of their subject in a contested historiography. Because the ideology of rule in both Rome and the Sasanian empire came, by degrees, to be identified with a religious community, these argumentative positions would long outlive their subjects, outlast the target controversies and eventually transform into something else entirely.

Later members of these communities came to judge each man, rightly or wrongly, as a foundational figure; a king whose rise, insofar as it brought about their alliance with temporal power, was divinely ordained. As a numinous figure in communal history, each man attracted a biographic treatment that doubled as a just-so story of origins in which the cult of state and its boundaries were firmly and clearly established at the inception of the state itself. The relics of old *personal* controversies became proofs of a divinely favoured, *communal* monarchy. Both recognizably kingly and ostentatiously divine, they were seen to “invoke the appropriate attitude of admiration towards their subject.”¹⁰⁷ The result was two traditions in which relatively new styles of empire were (partially) expressed in what should have been incongruous terms. On the one hand, the use of a pair of enormously ancient and extremely traditional origins narratives portraying the king as the personal client of a god displays an approach to monarchy, and the supernatural supports of monarchy, that would not be out of place in the cities

¹⁰⁷ Zerubavel (1995), p.85.

of ancient Mesopotamia. On the other, the prominent insertion of a religious institution into each composite tradition moderates this personal relationship, granting it a providential status in which the king becomes a heroic conduit for social and political processes much larger than himself.

So far as we can tell, in a dry, factual sense, the accessions of Ardashir and Constantine were similar only in outline. Ardashir was a *parvenu* who had deposed a centuries old dynasty and cowed or co-opted the grandees of their realm with a program of terrifying violence that probably continued into the reign of his son. Constantine was an insider who had eliminated a series of other insiders in what was, for the time, a fairly unexceptional, if extremely thorough, manner: *his* sons fought amongst themselves and his dynasty was extinguished with the death of a man who cursed his memory. Yet, directed by broadly similar religious and social forces, the interpretations of both lives would eventually come to align and this alignment produced the stories told by the *Kārnāmag* and the *vitae*. Created within and preserved by explicitly religious communities, both testify to a similar merging of political and spiritual history in the person of a king imagined as a champion of the community. They are parallel “rhetorics of insularity”, statements crafted to give an authoritative beginning and an antique solidity to religious and political axioms that developed later.¹⁰⁸ Nowhere is this clearer than in their conspicuous application of stereotypical narratives to describe the early life of the subject.

¹⁰⁸ Jong (2000), p.58.

Conclusion

From deep antiquity onwards two definable motif complexes, *sequences*, may be discerned in the historical literatures of a number of very different cultures over a great span of time. The continuous use of these sequences to pattern royal biography has made accounts of the early lives of a number of men remarkably similar, both in outline and, surprisingly often, specific detail. The examination offered here has used the presence of these sequences to link the legendary-biographical traditions of four kings into a comparative study with the aim of better understanding the meaning, the role and the movement of each sequence through and across cultures. Commencing with an examination of the Mesopotamian background of each sequence this dissertation has focused on the *Kārnāmag*, a legendary biographical tradition of Ardashir I, and a number of hagiographical *vitae* of Constantine. Both of these traditions are part of *relatively* well preserved historiographies, and both may be examined in the light of other versions of the events they recount.

An analysis of the various components of these composite biographies strongly suggests that in both cases each sequence was introduced deliberately in order to make an *argument about history*. This observation has been expanded into a set of more general guidelines about the attraction of both sequences to controversial monarchy, and the role played by literary and/or rhetorical practices in their replication. Being in many cases crafted references to a known precedent, the power of both sequences was inherently circular, the product of centuries of apologetic and explanatory use, and far less organic than is sometimes assumed. Lastly, the fact that the narratives of the *Kārnāmag* and the *vitae* integrated both sequences in what appears to be a parallel way, argues that both composite traditions were the products of roughly similar processes. Eager to present the reigns of Ardashir and Constantine as foundational moments in *confessional* history, literate partisans of two imperial-religious communities selected

those versions of events they saw as most in tune with the accepted signs of divinely favoured rule. Repurposing old rhetoric and remaking, yet again, the stock tales of Eurasian kingship, the creators of both traditions displayed a pleasingly symmetrical unity of habit, one that makes it possible to end this dissertation with the “same” quote with which it began.

If the manuscripts have recorded the date correctly, on the 8th of March 1010, or, according to the Persian calendar, the 25th of Esfand in the 378th year of Yazdegird III, Ferdowsi completed his *Šāhnāme*.¹ Now the sole surviving work of its kind, this immense epic would ensure the poet a revered place in Persian literature. Ferdowsi’s life’s work would also make the poet a looming though frustratingly cryptic presence in any discussion of the mythologies and historiographies emerging from the Sasanian period. This is in no small part due to his poem’s role in driving competing *Šāhnāme*s, including many of his own sources, into extinction.²

An 11th century Persian-speaking Muslim from Tus, located in what is now the North-Eastern extremity of modern Iran, Ferdowsi is unlikely to have ever heard of John Chrysostom, and he would certainly never have read the homily on Theodosius’ forgiveness of the Antiochenes quoted at the very beginning of this dissertation. It is probable, however, that he would not have been surprised to have been told that in the course of composing his enormous poem he had reproduced (with considerable concision) the long-dead bishop’s sentiments by presenting an argument for the impermanence of material fame contrasted with the invincibility of the pertinent example and the cutting aphorism.

“Where are Ferīdūn, Zāhhak and Jam?
The lords of the Arabs, the kings of ‘Ajam?
Where are the great of the line of Sasan?
The family of Bahram, to the house of Saman?
Zāhhak was a wicked king
He was unjust and heedless

¹ Khaleghi-Motlagh (1999).

² Qazvini (1953), pp.20-21.

The blessed Ferīdūn was praised
He died but his name is immortal
Words remain, a memorial in the world
Words are better than kingly jewels.”³

A later writer tells us that the *Šāhnāme* was initially poorly received by its dedicatee Mahmud Ghazna and that the eunuch bearing Ferdowsi’s promised payment arrived just in time to meet the poet’s funeral cortege at the gate of Tabrān.⁴ John Chrysostum, whose position in the church allowed him to be far less subtle in his irritations of the powerful than any sane court poet would ever dare, had died in exile.⁵ Poet and bishop, however, have had the last laugh; though a significant figure in the history of India and central Asia, Mahmud Ghazna himself is not only dead but famed for shortchanging Ferdowsi, and who now even remembers the emperor Arcadius? Speaking through their productions these writers have now a far more substantial existence than the kings under whom they served and the states in which they lived. This is hardly uncommon; with relatively few exceptions, yesterday’s powerful speak in “words” (*sokhan*) or “sayings” (*ṛṇṡa*) that were not of their choosing. Their lives and deeds are not so much recorded as they are staged, portrayed retrospectively in terms defined by personal need, the goals of faction, and the power of habit.

Chrysostum and Ferdowsi would have agreed on very little, yet in a sense they were members of the same club. It was, and is, the habit of writers, orators and poets everywhere to esteem other practitioners of their craft as bearers of eternal profundity, to preserve, reference, quote and imitate each other as part of a learned meta-language. This mutual esteem is key in understanding the interaction of such men with the production of history in relation to power. As Ferdowsi implied in the passage translated above, this ability to set the terms of remembrance is a power, possibly the *only* power, that writers hold over rulers. It is perhaps too perfect that Neẓāmī ‘Arūẓī, the writer who recorded the story of the churlish Mahmud’s change of heart and the

³ ŠhN 6, p.137, lines 52-56.

⁴ Neẓāmī ‘Arūẓī (1910), pp.81.

⁵ Socrates HE, 6.21

late arrival of Ferdowsi's payment, claimed to have heard it from a poet.⁶ Ferdowsi's echo of Chrysostom's rhetoric might be read as a self-interested plea for the importance of his craft, but in a broader view the parallel reflects something much deeper. The bishop of Constantinople and the *dehqān* of Tus both saw posterity as theirs to shape, a right held by virtue of their membership in a group with access to the tools of communication, mastery of a cultural inheritance transmitted through these tools and the ability to sculpt this inheritance anew.

If writers, rhetors, and poets shaped this inheritance, the targets of their appraisal were shaped by it. In its day-to-day practice, pre-modern monarchy was a territorial and solitary business. The 13th century Shirazi poet Sa'di put it best when he stated that ten dervishes might happily sleep on a carpet but the same clime would not hold two kings.⁷ Yet kings, like the literary men who served or reflected on them, were bound to each other by a web of symbols and expectation that knew few borders and all languages. Legitimate rule was a living, indiscriminately accumulative institution, one that was seen to have a certain continuity through vast stretches of time. An Armenian historian of the 10th century offers a vivid demonstration of this mindset in his depiction of Constantine's Christian rule:

"Now, it was said [in the past] that at the time when Joab removed the kingdom from the sons of Amon, he took the crown from the treasury of their house and sent it to be placed on King David's head, and from him to Solomon, and from Solomon to Rehoboam and then to Abia, Asaph, and Jehosaphat. Following these, likewise, all the kings of Judah [wore it], and finally Zedekiah and Jehoiachin [were crowned by it]. Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, captured [the crown] and was coronated by it in Babylon; not only did he wear the crown but so did his successors also, until King Cyrus of Persia, after whom [the crown] reached King Darius of Persia, whom Alexander of Macedonia slew. This crown, now captured by [Alexander] remained in the empire until Antiochus. Arshak the Brave of Bahl chased the [Macedonians] and took the crown. It remained with [the Parthians] until Shapur who was called king of kings, who also submitted himself willingly to

⁶ Nezāmī 'Arūzī (1910), p.80.

⁷ Sa'di. *Golistan*, 1.3.

Constantine the Great.⁸ Therefore, Constantine wanted that his God-pleasing kingdom be the owner of the original and prophetic crown.”⁹

As a metonymy for legitimate kingship, the *idea* that a specific object was transmitted through a line of kings as a token of heavenly favour before making its way to a figure of whom the author greatly approved is meaningful. What is most telling is the uncomplicated conception of divine right on display in this Christian text: through possession of the crown Jewish, Babylonian, Macedonian, Greek, Parthian, Sasanian and finally Roman kingship all fall into the same category. Though bookended by Abrahamic states, one cannot help but suspect that the intervening chain of “pagan” possessors cited here lends David’s crown, as it were, extra weight.¹⁰ A king was a king, and kingship was the gift of heaven, something most apparent when heaven changed its mind.

The long persistence of the lost prince and the courtly superstar in historicising texts across the west of Eurasia was largely the product of those moments when “David’s crown” changed hands. They emerge from a meeting of narrative habits internalised by men like Chrysostom and Ferdowsi and the sort of partisan work they were sometimes expected, or moved, to produce. Much of what the members of this extended clique “knew” about the past had been created or passed on by other men just like them. By Late Antiquity continual reuse of both sequences considered in this study had made each a commonplace in this system. Thanks to their age and their extremely early association with royalty, they were bound to no particular place, time, or language. Both sequences had, however, a useful omnipresence and an aptness for the explanation of a situation that was not only recurrent but often greatly in need of explanation.

In drawing attention to the literary nature of historical writing, Hayden White argued that the subtext of any historical representation was to be found in the thematic slant of the connections used by the writer to draw raw material into a comprehensible

⁸ On the strange claim that Shapur II had submitted himself to Constantine, see Smith (2016), pp.156-176.

⁹ This quote was taken from the 10th century history of Ukhantes of Sebastia who claims to have taken it from the 9th century history of Pseudo-Shapuh Bagratuni, Arzoumanian (1988), p.92.

¹⁰ In this vein, one might also point to the entirely fanciful genealogy constructed for Basil II in which the emperor was connected to Constantine, Alexander and *Arsakes*. Ševčenko (2011), pp.12-19.

whole.¹¹ Should we stretch White's point into a grammatical simile, the two sequences seen in all the texts considered above behaved like *hazvāreš* or Aramaic heterograms in Pahlavi orthography. As Iranian languages supplanted Imperial Aramaic during the Hellenistic, scribal habit preserved Aramaic forms as an option for common words.¹² Where this occurred, what was originally an Aramaic word was read and pronounced as what was understood to be its Iranian equivalent. The quite spectacular corruption of letterforms that accompanied the movement from Aramaic often rendered what was once a word with explicable parts an image whose meaning was inseparable from, in fact, generated by, its history of use. In a similar fashion, specific narratives of royal origins entrenched by the needs of a particularly early imperial state crystalised into heterograms in the broader cultural repertoire of western Eurasia.

Those who introduced each sequence into the various legends of Constantine and Ardashir referenced this set of heterograms and are likely to have done so in rhetorical or compositional contexts that were argumentative and formal. Neither sequence could have been *solely* transmitted in text, but succession that was unusual or in some way irregular provided a nexus of circumstance, need, and professionalism likely to trap both sequences in text and thence, to provide a model for later imitation. The parallel legends of the origin and youth of the early Sasanians and of Constantine were products of this confluence of power, circumstance, and craft, one in which the mechanics of praise and excuse were tightly linked. The long texts in which we now see such legends integrated - the *vitae*, the *Šāhnāmeḥ* and KNA - are products of a secondary stage, one in which heterograms were placed next to each other in order to produce a more complex "sentence". This complexity was demanded by new developments in monarchy, developments that brought with them new visions of the role of the state in history and new relationships between organized confessional groups and power.

In their reliance on the same motif complexes, their compound structure, and parallel social role, the long biographies seen in the composite Iranian and Roman texts are alike in ways that are useful for the analysis of both. On the one hand, the narratives

¹¹ White (1973), pp.30-31.

¹² Tafazoli (2010/2011), p.24.

used to build the legend depicted in the *vitae* show that decidedly archaic and ultimately non-Roman expressions of monarchical style were effective in the 4th century and that they survived well into the Christian empire. On the other, thematic and structural parallels with a Byzantine biographical tradition allow us to assess the *Kārnāmag* as something *like* a hagiography, at least as something *like* one particular stream in the hagiography of Constantine. It is my hope that the suggestions drawn from the comparative and historical approach taken in this study offer new ways of looking at the composite biographies and the texts connected to them. In particular I hope to have offered a useful heuristic for the understanding of the *Kārnāmag* tradition that links KNA and the *Šāhnāmeḥ*, a tradition whose interpretation has suffered from a lack of context, an almost complete dearth of comparable material and a tendency towards a vague, and to my mind erroneous, categorization as “romantic” or “popular”. If we instead view large parts of the *Kārnāmag* as evidence of the use of specific argumentative strategies in the Sasanian period and the “text” itself as a kind of social and institutional history forged by certain trends in Late Antique imperialism, a more nuanced and more interesting view of this odd biography becomes possible.

Finally, I hope to have presented a case for a situational and diachronic approach to recurring narrative in portrayals of history. Where it can be shown that a particular unreality has a history of its own, it is worthwhile to take this history into account. Where a narrative parallel overlaps with correspondences in circumstance, technology, and need, otherwise unrelated texts or traditions become relevant to each other. The product of layer after layer of the appropriation, propagation and recycling of claims and images, monarchy was a particularly powerful driver of this sort of confluence. Continuous appeal to proven symbolism generated a net of very widely shared expectations and a number of shortcuts and shorthands for suggesting them. These cues are extremely complex but they are not *always* completely inexplicable; it is sometimes possible to trace the genealogy of a strand of representation back to the point at which it became fixed in the wider consciousness. When one does so, one may find that very different fruit grows on the branches of the same tree.

Monarchs everywhere claimed to represent an eternal, stable, and legitimate order. Were this actually true, neither sequence would ever have emerged as a way of explaining the past. The presence of one, the other or both sequences in a historical or

historicizing account is a sign of disjuncture, an indication that attempts were made to present sudden shifts in power as a correction, a return to the proper order of things. Emerging in a particularly successful set of historical-literary assertions of divine election made at the very dawn of empire itself, both sequences were adapted, translated and rewritten over and over again with a distinct tendency to cluster around moments of controversial or extraordinary succession. As they spread out from the cultures of the ancient Near East both narratives remained attractive to the laudatory and apologetic practices likely to record them; thus they were pushed ever deeper into the symbolic vocabulary of monarchy. So it came to pass that the lives of a very few people were composed well before they were born.

Bibliography

Pre-Modern

- Agathias. *Historiae*. Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae IIA. (1975. Ed. And Trans. J. Frendo). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Ambrose. *Explanatio symboli, De sacramentis, De mysteriis, De patientia, De excessu fratris, De obitu Valentiniani, De obitu Theodosii*. Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinii 73 (1955. Ed. O. Faller). Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Anonymous. *Chronographiae quae Theophanis Continuati nomine fertur Liber quo Vita Basilii Imperatoris amplectitur*. Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae Vol. XLII. (2011. Ed. And Trans. I. Ševčenko). Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Anonymous. *Chronicon Paschale*. Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae, 2 Vols. (1832. Ed. L. Dindorf) Bonn: Academiae Litterarum Regiae Borussicae.
- Anonymous. *De Gestis in Perside. Das Sogenannte Religionsgespräch Am Hof Der Sasaniden* (1899. Ed. E. Bratke). Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
- Anonymous. *Historie über Herkunft und Jugend Constantins des Grossen und seine Mutter Helena von einem unbekannten Verfasser*. (2010. Ed. P. Dräger). Trier: Kliomedia.
- Anonymous. *Incerti Auctoris de Constantino Magno eiusque Matre Helena Libellus*. (1879. Ed. Heydenreich, E.). Leipzig: Teubner.
- Anonymous. *Kâr-nâma-î Artakhsîr-î Pâpakân*. (1935. Ed. B.T. Anklesaria). Bombay.
- Anonymous. *The Letter of Tansar*. (1954. Ed. And Trans. M. Boyce). Rome: Royal Institute of Translation and Publication of Iran, Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, UNESCO.
- Anonymous. *Origio Constantini: Anonymous Valesianus*. (1987. Ed. I. König). Trier: Trier Historische Forshungen.
- Bal'amī. *Tārikh-e Bal'amī*. (1974/1975. Ed. M.P. Gonabadi). Tehran: Kitābforushi Zavār.

- Ebn al-Balkhī. *Fārsnāmeḥ*. (1921. Ed. G. Le Strange & R. Nicholson). London: University of Cambridge Press.
- Ebn Beṭrīq. *Gli Annali*. (1987. Ed. And Trans. B. Pirone). Cairo: Franciscan Centre of Oriental Studies.
- Bīrūnī. *The Chronology of Ancient Nations*. (1879. Ed. And Trans. E. Sachau). London: Oriental Translation Fund of Great Britain and Ireland.
- Brill's New Jacoby Online. Electronic Resource. (1926 -. Ed. F. Jacoby, I. Worthington, S. Schorn, H. Joachim-Gehrke and V. Bucciandini).
- Ctesias. *Ctésias de Cnide, la Perse, la Inde, autres Fragments*. (2004. D.Lenfant). Collection des Universités de France. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Diodorus Siculus. *Library of History, Vol.I*. Loeb Classical Library 279. (Ed. and Trans. C.H. Oldfather). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Dīnavarī. *The Book of Lengthy Histories*. (2013. Ed. and Trans. M.R. Jackson Bonner). Translation provided in private correspondence.
- Dio Cassius. *Roman History IX. Books 71-80*. Loeb Classical Library 177. (1959. Ed. and Trans. E. Cary). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Eḷishē. *History of Vardan and the Armenian War*. (1982. Ed. and Trans. R.W. Thompson). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Epigraphic Database Heidelberg. Electronic resource (1986 -. Heidelberg Academy of Sciences and Humanities).
- Eusebius. *Church History, Life of Constantine, Oration in Praise of Constantine*. A Select Library of the Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church Vol.I. (1890, Ed. and Trans. A.C. McGiffert). Oxford: Parker and Company.
- Eusebius. *Ecclesiastical History and Martyrs of Palestine*. 2 Vols. (1927-1928. Ed. and Trans. H.J. Lawlor and J.E.L. Oulton). London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge.
- Eusebius. *Life of Constantine*. Clarendon Ancient History. (Ed. and Trans. A. Cameron and S.G. Hall). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Eusebius. *Über das Leben des Kaisers Konstantin*, Eusebius Werke Band 1, Teil 1. (2011. Ed. F. Winkelmann). Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Eusebius. *Commentary on Isaiah*. Ancient Christian Texts, (2013. Ed. J.C. Elowsky, Trans. J.J. Armstrong). Grove: InterVarsity Press.
- Ferdowsi. *Šāhnāmeḥ*. Persian Heritage Foundation, Persian Texts, New Series 1. 8 Vols. (1987-2007. Ed. D. Khaleghi Motlagh and M. Omidasalar). Costa Mesa: Mazda Publishers
- Gardīzī. *Zayn al-Akḥbār*. (1968. Ed. A.H. Habibi). Tehran: Entešārat-e Bonyād-e Farang-e Ērān.
- George the Monk. *Georgii Monarchi Chronicon*, (1904. Ed. and Trans. C. De Boor). Leipzig: Teubner.

- Ḥamza al-İşfahānī, *The Annals of Ḥamzah al-İşfahānī*. (1932. Ed. And Trans. U. Daudpota). Bombay: The K.R. Cama Oriental Institute.
- Herodotus. *The Persian Wars: Books 1-2*. Loeb Classical Library 117. (1920. Ed. and Trans. A.D. Godley). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Jerome. *Eusebius Werke siebenter Band; die Chronik des Hieronymus*. (1956. Ed. R. Helm). Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- John Chrysostom. *Saint Chrysostom*. A Select Library of the Nicean and Post-Nicean Fathers of the Christian Church Vol. 9. (1889 Ed. and Trans. Schaff, P., and W.R.W. Stephens). New York: The Christian Literature Company.
- Josephus. *Jewish Antiquities Books 1-3*. Loeb Classical Library 242. (1929. Ed. and Trans. H. Thackeray). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Julian. 1913. *Orations 1-5*. Loeb Classical Library 13. (Ed. and Trans. W.C. Wright). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Julian. *Orations 6-8. Letters to Themistius, To the Senate and People of Athens, To a Priest. The Caesars. Misopogon*. Loeb Classical Library 29. (1913. Ed. and Trans. W.C. Wright). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Maqdisi. *Le Livre de la Création et de l'histoire d'Abou-Zéïd Ahmed Ben Sahl el-Balkhî*. (1903. Ed. and Trans. M.C. Huart). Paris: L'École des Langues Orientales Vivantes.
- Mas'udi. *Les Prairies d'Or*. (1863. Ed. and Trans. B. De Meynard and P. De Courteille). Paris: Société Asiatique.
- Menander Rhetor. *Menander Rhetor*, (1981. Ed. and Trans. D.A. Russell and N.G. Wilson. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Mombritius. *Sanctuarium seu Vitae Sanctorum*. Tom. 2. 1910. Paris: Fontemoing et Socios.
- Moses Khorenats'i. *History of the Armenians: Translation and Commentary on the Literary Sources*. (2006. Ed. and Trans. R.W. Thomson), Ann Arbor: Caravan Books.
- Neẓāmī 'Arūẓī . 1910. *Čahār Māqaleh*. (1910. Ed. M. Qazvini and M. Mo'in). Leiden: Brill.
- Lactantius. *De Mortibus Persecutorum: Die Todesarten der Verfolger*. Fontes Christiani 43. (2003. Ed. A. Städele). Turnhout: Brepols.
- Libanius. *Orations, Volume I: Julianic Orations*. Loeb Classical Library 451. (1969. Ed. A. Norman). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Library of Latin Texts Series A and B*. Electronic resource. (2011. Brepols).
- Optatianus. *Carmina*. (1877. Ed. L. Müller). Leipzig: Teubner.
- P'arpec'i, Łazar. *The History of Łazar P'arpec'i*. (1991. Ed. and Trans. R.W. Thompson). Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Graeca*. (1857-66. Ed. J.P. Minge)

- Philo. *On Abraham. On Joseph. On Moses*. Loeb Classical Library 289. (1935. Ed. and Trans. F. Colson). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Philostorgius. *Church History*. (2007. Ed. and Trans. P. Amidon). Writings from the Greco-Roman World Vol. 23. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Philostorgius. *Kirchengeschichte*. Kleine und fragmentarische Historiker der Spätantike (KFHist) E7. 2 Vols. (2015. Eds. Bleckmann, B. and M. Stein). Paderborn: Schöningh.
- Photius. *Bibliothèque*. (1959. Ed. and Trans. René Henry). Paris: Société D'Édition "Les Belles Lettres".
- Plutarch. *Lives, Volume VII: Demosthenes and Cicero. Alexander and Caesar*. Loeb Classical Library 99. (1919. Ed. and Trans. B. Perrin). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Plutarch. *Lives, Volume XI: Aratus, Artaxerxes, Galba, Otho, General Index*. Loeb Classical Library 103. (1926. Ed. and Trans. B. Perrin). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Procopius. *On Buildings*. Loeb Classical Library 343. (1940. Ed. and Trans. H.B. Dewing and G. Downey). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Pseudo-Callisthenes. *Historia Alexandri Magni*. (1926. Ed. W. Kroll). Berlin: Weidmann.
- Pseudo-Callisthenes. *The Greek Alexander Romance*. Penguin Classics. (1991. Ed. and Trans. R. Stoneman).
- Rufinus. *Die Kirchengeschichte*. In *Die Lateinische Übersetzung des Rufinus*. Eusebius Werke, zweiter Band. (1909. Ed. T. Mommsen). Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
- Sa'di. *Matn-e Kāmel-e Divān-e Šeikh Ajal Sa'di*. (1961. M. Ed. Mosafa). Tehran: Ma'refat.
- Sebeos. *The Armenian History attributed to Sebeos*, (1999. Ed. and Trans. R.W. Thompson, J. Howard-Johnston and T. Greenwood). Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- Socrates and Sozomen. *Church Histories*. A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church 2. (1891. Ed. A.C. Zenos and C.D. Hartranft). Oxford: Parker and Company.
- Suda. *Suda Online*. (Ed. and Trans. D. Whitehead et al.). <http://www.stoa.org/sol/>. Accessed 3/04/18.
- Ṭabarī. *The History of al-Ṭabarī Volume V: The Sāsānids, the Byzantines, the Lakhmids and Yemen*. (1999. Ed. and Trans. C.E. Bosworth). New York: State University of New York Press.
- Ṭabarī. *Geschichte der Perser und Araber zur Zeit der Sasaniden*. (1973. Ed. and Trans.. T. Nöldeke). Akademische Druck-u. Graz: Verlagsanstalt.
- al-Tha'alebī. *Historie des Rois des Perses*. (1900. Ed. and Trans. H. Zotenberg). Imprimerie Nationale.
- Theophanes. *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor*. (1997. Ed. and Trans. Mango, C., R. Scott, and C. Greatrex). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Ukhtanēs of Sebastia *History of Armenia. Vol. I. History of the Patriarchs and Kings of Armenia*. (1988. Ed. and Trans. Z. Arzoumanian). Fort Lauderdale.
- Xenophon. *Anabasis*. Loeb Classical Library 90. (1998. Ed. and Trans. C.L. Brownson). Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1998.
- Xenophon. *Cyropaedia, Volume I: Books 1-4*. Loeb Classical Library 51. (1914. Ed. and Trans. W. Miller). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Xenophon. *Cyropaedia, Volume II: Books 4-8*. Loeb Classical Library 52. (1914. Ed. and Trans. W. Miller). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Zosimus. *New History*. (1982. Ed. and Trans. R. Ridley). Sydney: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies.
- Zosimus. *Historie Nouvelle Tom. I, Livres I-II*. (2000. Ed. F. Paschoud). Collection des Universités de France. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Modern

- Aaron, D.H. (2006). *Etched in Stone: The Emergence of the Decalogue*. New York: T&T Clark.
- Alimoradi, P. (2014). Baresi Sarčešmehhāye Bumiye Rāstkišiye Zardošti, Ayāt-e Fārs va Neveštehhāye Meyār-e Fārsiye Miāneh. *Irān Nāmeḥ* 29 (2 (Summer 2014)), pp.64-82.
- Allberry, C.R.C. (1981). *A Manichean Psalm-Book. Vol. 2, Manichean Manuscripts in the Chester Beatty Collection*. Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer.
- Allen, P. (2001). The Definition and Enforcement of Orthodoxy. In A. Cameron, B. Ward-Perkins and M. Whitby (Eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History*, pp.811-834. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Allsen, T. (2006). *The Royal Hunt in Eurasian History*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Aram, M. (1999). The Beginning of Sasanian Coinage. *Bulletin of the Asia Institute, New Series* 13, pp.67-76.
- Alster, B. (1987). A Note on the Uriah Letter in the Sumerian Sargon Legend. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* Band 77, pp.169-173.
- Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined communities : reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.

- Asheri, D. (2007). Book I. In O. Murray. and A. Moreno (Eds.), *A Commentary on Herodotus: Books I-IV*, pp.57-218. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Axelrod, P. (1980). Myth and Identity in the Indian Zoroastrian Community. *Journal of Mithraic Studies* 3, pp.150-165.
- al-Azmeh, A. (2001). *Muslim Kingship: Power and the Sacred in Muslim, Christian and Pagan Politics*. London: IB. Tauris.
- Bacharova, M.R. (2016). *From Hittite to Homer: The Anatolian Background of Ancient Greek Epic*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press.
- Bardill, J. (2012). *Constantine, Divine Emperor of the Christian Golden Age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barnes, T.D. (1973). Lactantius and Constantine. *The Journal of Roman Studies* 63, pp.29-46.
- Barnes, T. (1981). *Constantine and Eusebius*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Barnes, T. (1982). *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Barnes, T. (1989). Jerome and the "Origo Constantini Imperatoris". *Phoenix* 43 (2), pp.158-161.
- Barnes, T. 2011. *Constantine: Dynasty, Religion and Power in the Later Roman Empire*. Blackwell Ancient Lives. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Bascom, W. (1965). The Forms of Folklore: Prose Narratives. *The Journal of American Folklore* 78 (307), pp.3-20.
- Bauer, A. (1882). *Die Kyros-Sage und Verwandtes*. Wien: Büchhändler der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Beaulieu, P.A. (1989). *The Reign of Nabonidus King of Babylon 556-539 B.C.* New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Becker, A.H. (2014). Political Theology and Religious Diversity in the Sasanian Empire. In G. Herman (Ed.), *Jews, Christians and Zoroastrians: Religious Dynamics in a Sasanian Context*, pp.7-25. Piscataway: Gorgias Press.
- Bidez, J. (1935). Fragments nouveaux de Philostorge sur la Vie de Constantin. *Byzantion* 10, pp.403-437.
- Bonner, M.R. Jackson. (2015). *Al-Dīnawarī's Kitāb al-Aḥbār al-Ṭiwāl: An Historiographical Study of Sasanian Iran*. Vol. XXIII, Res Orientales, Bures-sur-Yvette: Groupe pour l'Étude de la Civillisation du Moyen-Orient.
- Börm, H. (2015). Born to be Emperor: The Principle of Succession and the Roman Monarchy. In J. Wienand (Ed.), *Contested Monarchy: Integrating the Roman Empire in the Fourth Century AD*, pp.239-264. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Bosworth, C.E. (1973). The Heritage of Rulership in Early Islamic Iran and the Search for Dynastic Connections with the Past. *Iran* 11, pp.51-62.
- Bosworth, C. E. (1986). ARDAŠĪR-KORRA. *Encyclopedia Iranica* Vol. II (Fasc. 4): pp. 384-385. Digital version: <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/ardasir-korra>. Published online: 11-08-2011. Last accessed: 29-05-2018.
- Bottéro, J. (1992). *Mesopotamia: Writing, Reasoning, and the Gods*. Trans. Z. Bahrani and M. van de Mieroop. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bourbouhakis, E.C. Nilsson, I. (2010). Byzantine Narrative: the Form of Storytelling in Byzantium. Blackwell Reference Online. Digital version: http://www.blackwellreference.com/subscriber/tocnode.html?id=g9781405126540_chunk_g978140512654025. Last accessed 06-08-2015.
- Boyce, M. (1954). Some Remarks on the Transmission of the Kayanian Heroic Cycle. In F. Steiner (Ed.), *Serta Cantabrigiensia*, Wiesbaden: Aquis Mattiacis.
- Boyce, M. (1957). The Parthian "Gōsān" and Iranian Minstrel Tradition. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, 1/2, pp.10-45.
- Boyce, M. (1968). Middle Persian Literature. In *Handbuch der Orientalistik, erste Abteilung*, VIII. Band, 1. Abschnitt, lieferung 2, pp.31-66. Leiden: Brill.
- Boyce, M. and F. Grenet. (1991). *A History of Zoroastrianism, Vol.III, Zoroastrianism under Macedonian and Roman Rule*. Leiden: Brill.
- Boyce, M. (1975). On the Zoroastrian Temple Cult of Fire. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 95 (3), pp.454-465.
- Boyce, M. (1984). *Zoroastrians: Their Religious Beliefs and Practices*. London: Routledge and Keegan Paul.
- Boyce, M. (1996). On the Orthodoxy of Sasanian Zoroastrianism. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 59 (1), pp.11-28.
- Boyce, M. (2011). ĀDUR GUŠNASP. *Encyclopedia Iranica*, Vol. I (Fasc. 5), pp.475-476. Digital version: <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/adur-gusnasp-an-atas-bahram-see-atas-that-is-a-zoroastrian-sacred-fire-of-the-highest-grade-held-to-be-one-of->. Last accessed: 26-03-18.
- Boyce, M. and Poonawala, I.K. APOCALYPTIC. *Encyclopedia Iranica*, Vol.II (Fasc. 2), pp.154-160. Digital Version: <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/apocalyptic-that-which-has-been-rcvealed>. Last accessed: 08-06-2018.
- Braun, M. (1938). *History and romance in Graeco-Oriental literature*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Breydy, M. (1985). *Das Annalwerk des Eutychios von Alexandrien*, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalum Scriptores Arabici Tomus 44. Leuven: E. Peeters.

- Briant, P. (2002). *From Cyrus to Alexander: a History of the Persian Empire*. Trans. P.T. Daniels. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Cameron, A. (1969/1970). Agathias on the Sasanians. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 23/24, pp.67-183.
- Cameron, A. (1991). *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cameron, A. (1997). Eusebius' Vita Constantini and the Construction of Constantine. In M. Edwards & S. Swain, (Eds.), *Portraits: Biographical Representation in the Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire*, pp.145-174. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Cameron, A. 2000. Form and Meaning: The Vita Constantini and the Vita Antonii. In T. Hägg and P. Rousseau (Eds.), *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity*, pp.72-88. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Campbell, J. (1993). *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*. Hammersmith: Fontana Press.
- Canepa, M. (2009). *The Two Eyes of the Earth*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Canepa, M. (2010). Technologies of Memory in Early Sasanian Iran: Achaemenid Sites and Sasanian Identity *American Journal of Archaeology* 114 (4), pp.563-596.
- Canepa, M. (2013). Building a New Vision of the Past in the Sasanian Empire: the Sanctuaries of Kayānsīh and the Great Fires of Iran. *The Journal of Persianate Studies* 6, pp.64-90.
- Cereti, C.G. (1991). *An 18th Century Account of Parsi History: The Qesse-ye Zartoštīān-e Hendustān: Text, Translation and Commentary*, Naples: Istituto Universitario Orientale Dipartimento di Studi Asiatici.
- Cereti, C. (2011). KĀR-NĀMAG Ī ARDAŠĪR Ī PĀBAGĀN. *Encyclopedia Iranica*, Vol.XV (Fasc. 6), pp.585-588 Digital version: <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/karnamag-i-ardasir>. Last accessed: 30-05-2018.
- Champagne, R. (1992). *The Structuralists on Myth: An Introduction*. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Chardin, J. (1735). *Voyages du chevalier Chardin en Perse et autres lieux de l'Orient*. Amsterdam: Detens de la compagnie.
- Chiasson, C. (2012). Myth and Truth in Herodotus' Cyrus Logos. In E. Baragwanath & M. De Bakker (Eds.) *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Childs, B. (1965). The Birth of Moses. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 84 (2), pp.109-122.
- Choksy, J.K. (1989). Sacral Kingship in Sasanian Iran. *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 2, pp.35-52.
- Choksy, J.K. (1997). *Conflict and Cooperation: Zoroastrian Subalterns and Muslim Elites in Medieval Iranian Society*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Christensen, A. (1971). *L'Iran sous les Sassanides*. Osnabrück: Otto Zeller. Original edition, 1944. Reprint, 2.

- Ciancaglini, C.A. (2001). The Syriac Version of the Alexander Romance. *Le Muséon: Revue D'Études Orientales* Tome 114 (Fasc. 1-2), pp.121-140.
- Cizek, A. (1975). From the Historical Truth to the Literary Convention: The Life of Cyrus the Great viewed by Herodotus, Ctesias and Xenophon. *L'antiquité classique*, Tome 44 (fasc 2), pp.531-552.
- Cizek, A. (1978). Historical Distortions and Saga Patterns in the Pseudo-Callisthenes Romance. *Hermes* 106 Bd. (H. 4), pp.593-607.
- Coen, A. (1881). *Di una leggenda relativa alla nascita e alla gioventù*. Archivio della Società Romana di Storia Patria IV, pp.1-55.
- Coleman, C.B. (1914). *Constantine the Great and Christianity. Three Phases: the Historical, the Legendary and the Spurious*. New York.
- Cooper, J.S. (1985). Sargon and Joseph: Dreams Come True. In A. Kort and S. Morschauser (Eds.) *Biblical and Related Studies Presented to Samuel Iwry*, pp.33-39. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Cooper, J.S. (1986). *Sumerian and Akkadian Royal Inscriptions, Volume I: Presargonic Inscriptions*. New Haven: The American Oriental Society.
- Cooper, J.S. (1993). *Paradigm and Propaganda. The Dynasty of Akkade in the 21st Century*. In M. Liverani (Ed.) *Akkad the First World Empire; Structure, Ideology, Traditions*, pp.11-23. Padova: Sargon srl.
- Cooper, J.S. and W. Heimpel. (1983). The Sumerian Sargon Legend. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 103 (1), pp.67-82.
- Cox, P. (1983). *Biography in Late Antiquity: A Search for the Holy Man*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Croke, B. (2010). Uncovering Byzantium's historiographical audience. In R. Macrides (Ed.), *History as Literature in Byzantium: Papers from the Fortieth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Birmingham*, April 2007, pp.25-54. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Crone, P. (1991). Kavād's Heresy and Mazdak's Revolt. *Iran* 29, pp.21-42.
- Crone, P. (2012). *The Nativist Prophets of Early Islamic Iran: Rural Revolt and Local Zoroastrianism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Csapo, E. (2005). *Theories of Mythology*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Curtis, J. (2013). *The Cyrus Cylinder and Ancient Persia: A New Beginning for the Middle East*. London: The British Museum Press.
- Czeglédy, K. (1958). Bahrām Čōbīn and the Persian Apocalyptic Literature. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 8 (1), pp.21-43.
- Dabiri, G. (2007). *Origins and Development of Persian Epics*. PhD Diss. University of California, Los Angeles.

- Dabiri, G. (2010). The Shanama: Between the Samanids and the Ghaznavids. *Iranian Studies*. 43:1, pp.13-28.
- Dabiri, G. (2013). Historiography and the Sho'ubiya Movement. *Journal of Persianate Studies* 6, pp.216-234.
- Damgaard, F. (2013a). Propaganda Against Propaganda: Revisiting Eusebius' Use of the Figure of Moses in the Life of Constantine. In A. Johnson and J. Schott (Eds.), *Eusebius of Caesarea: Traditions and Innovations*, pp.113-132. Washington D.C.: Centre for Hellenic Studies, Trustees for Harvard University Press.
- Damgaard, F. (2013b). *Recasting Moses: The Memory of Moses*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Daryaee, T. (1995). National History or Keyanid History? The Nature of Sasanid Zoroastrian Historiography. *Iranian Studies* 28 (3/4 Summer-Autumn), pp.129-141.
- Daryaee, T. 2003. The Ideal King in the Sasanian World, Ardaxšīr ī Pābagān or Xusrō Anōšagruwān? *Nāme-ye Irān-e Bāstān* 3 (1), pp.33-45.
- Daryaee, T. (2008). Kingship in Early Sasanian Iran. In V. Sarkhosh-Curtis & S. Stewart (Eds.) *The Sasanian Era*, pp.60-70. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Daryaee, T. (2010). The Idea of Ērānšāhr: Jewish, Christian and Manichean Views in Late Antiquity. In C.G. Cereti (Eds.) *Iranian Identity in the Course of History: Proceedings of the Conference Held in Rome, 21-24 September 2005*, pp.91-108. Rome: Istituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente.
- Daryaee, T. (2010). Ardaxšīr and the Sasanians' Rise to Power. *Anabasis, Studia Classica et Orientalia* (1), pp.236-255.
- Davis, D. (1996). The Problem of Ferdowsī's Sources. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, pp.116 (1), pp.48-57.
- Davis, D. (2002). *Panthea's Children: Hellenistic Novels and Medieval Persian Romances*. New York: Bibliotheca Persica Press.
- Dawes, E., and Baynes, N.H. (Eds.) (1977). *Three Byzantine Saints*. London: Mowbrays.
- Delehay, P.H. (1961). *The Legends of the Saints: An Introduction to Hagiography*. Trans. V.M. Crawford. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- DePalma Digeser, E. (2000). *The Making of A Christian Empire: Lactantius and Rome*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Devos, P. (1982). Une Recension Nouvelle de la Passion Grecque BHG 639 de Saint Eusignios. *Analecta Bollandiana* 100, pp.209-228.
- Dick, M.B. (2004). The "History of David's Rise to Power" and the Babylonian Succession Apologies. In B.F. Batto and K.L. Roberts (Eds.), *David and Zion: Biblical Studies in Honor of J.J.M. Roberts*, pp. 3-19. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

- Doležel, L. (1998). Possible Worlds of Fiction and History. *New Literary History* Fall: 29 (4), pp.785-809.
- Drews, R. (1973). *The Greek Accounts of Eastern History*. Washington: The Centre for Hellenic Studies.
- Drews, R. (1974). Sargon, Cyrus and Mesopotamian Folk History. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 33 (4), pp.387-393.
- Drijvers, J.W. (1992). *Helena Augusta: The Mother of Constantine the Great and the Legend of her Finding the True Cross*. Leiden: Brill.
- Drijvers, J.W. (2011). Ammianus, Jovian, and the Syriac Julian Romance. *Journal of Late Antiquity* 4.2 ((Fall)), pp.280-297.
- Due, B. (1989). *The Cyropaedia: Xenophon's Aims and Methods*. Copenhagen: Aarhus University Press.
- Due, B. (2003). Xenophon of Athens: The Cyropaedia. In G. Schmeling (Ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*, pp.581-599. Leiden: Brill.
- Dulęba, W. (1995). *The Cyrus Legend in the Šāhnāme*. Cracow: The Enigma Press.
- Dundes, A. (1997). The Motif-Index and the Tale Type Index: A Critique. *Journal of Folklore Research* 34 (3), pp.195-202.
- Dvornik, F. (1966). *Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy*. 2 vols. Washington D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies.
- Eddy, S.K. (1961). *The King is Dead: Studies in the Near Eastern Resistance to Hellenism 334-31*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Efthymiadis, S. (1996). The Byzantine hagiographer and his audience in the ninth and tenth centuries." In C. Høgel (Ed.) *Metaphrasis: Redactions and Audiences in Middle Byzantine Hagiography*, pp.59-80, Oslo: The Research Council of Norway.
- Fehling, D. (1989). *Herodotus and his "Sources"*. Trans. J.G. Howie, Arca: Francis Cairns.
- Feldman, L. (1992). Josephus' Portrait of Moses. *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 82 (3/4), pp.285-328.
- Ferguson, T. C. (2005). *The Past is Prologue: The Revolution of Nicene Historiography*. Leiden: Brill.
- Festugière, A.J. (Ed.) (1970). *Vie de Théodore de Sykéon. Vol. 1. Texte Grec*, Subsidia Hagiographica. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes.
- Finnegan, R. (1970). A Note on Oral Tradition and Historical Evidence. *History and Theory* 9 (2), pp.195-201.
- Foster, B.R. (2016). *The Age of Agade: Inventing Empire in Ancient Mesopotamia*. London: Routledge.
- Fowden, G. (1993). *Empire to Commonwealth: Consequences of Monotheism in Late Antiquity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Frayne, D. (1993). *Sargonic and Gutian Periods (2334-2113 BC)*. The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia Vol. 2. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Frank, R. I. (1969). *Scholae Palatinae*. Rome: The American Academy in Rome.
- Frank, R. (2013). Germanic Legend in Old English Literature. In M. Godden and M. Lapidge (Eds.) *The Cambridge Companion to Old English Literature*, pp.82-100. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- French, D.R. (1998). Rhetoric and the Rebellion of A.D. 387 in Antioch. *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* Bd. 47 (H 4 (4th Qtr)), pp.468-484.
- Frye, R. (1964). The Charisma of Kingship in Ancient Iran. *Iranica Antiqua* 4, pp.36-54.
- Frye, R. (1983). The Political History of Iran under the Sasanians. In E. Yashater (Ed.) *The Cambridge History of Iran*, pp.116-180. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Frye, R. (1964). The Charisma of Kingship in Ancient Iran. *Iranica Antiqua* 4, pp.36-54.
- Gager, J.G. (1972). *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Geertz, C. (1993). *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology*. London: Fontana Press.
- Gellner, E. (2006). *Nations and Nationalism*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Gignoux, P. (1971). La Liste des Provinces de l'Ērān dans les Inscriptions de Šābhur et de Kirdīr. *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 19, pp.83-94.
- Gignoux, P. (1984). Church-State Relations in the Sasanian Period." In T. Mikasa (Ed.) *Monarchies and Socio-Religious Traditions in the Ancient Near East (Papers read at the 31st International Congress of Human Sciences in Asia and North America)*, pp.72-80. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Gignoux, P. (1991). *Les quatre inscriptions du mage Kirdīr : textes et concordances*. *Studia iranica*, 9. Paris: Union Académique Internationale.
- Gignoux, P. (2007). La démonisation d'Alexandre le Grand d'après la littérature pehlevie. In M. Machuch, M. Maggi and W. Sundermann (Eds.), *Iranian Languages and Texts from Iran and Turan: Ronald E. Emmerick Memorial Volume*, pp.87-97. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Gillett, A. (2016). Epic Panegyric and Political Communication in the Fifth-Century West. In L. Grig and G. Kelly (Eds.), *Two Romes: Rome and Constantinople in Late Antiquity*, pp.256-290. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gnoli, G. (1989). *The Idea of Iran: an Essay on its Origins*. Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.
- Gnoli, G. (1999). FARR(AH). *Encyclopedia Iranica*. Digital version: <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/farraah>. Last accessed 30-05-2018.

- Goetze, A. (1947). Historical Allusions in Old Babylonian Omen Texts. *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*, 1 (3), pp.253-265.
- Gollancz, H. (Ed.) (1928). *Julian the Apostate, Now Translated for the First Time From the Syriac Original*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Goodenough, E.R. (1969). *By Light, Light: The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism*. Amsterdam: Philo Press.
- Góski, K. (1968). La naissance des états et le "roi saint" problème de l'idéologie féodale. In . Manteuffel and A. Gieysztor (Eds.), *L'Europe aux IX - XI. siècles aux origines des états nationaux*, pp.425-432. T. Varsovie Panstwowe Wydawn Naukowe.
- Grayson, A.K. (1975). *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles, Texts from Cuneiform Sources*. Locust Valley, New York: J.J. Austin.
- Grenet, F. (Ed.) (2003). *La Geste D'Ardashir Fils de Pâbag*. Die: éditions A Die.
- Guidi, I. (1907). Un BIOΣ di Constantino. *Rendiconti della Reale accademia dei Lincei, Classe di Scienze Morali, Storiche e Filologiche* 5th ser. (16), pp.304-40 and 637-60.
- Gurevich, A. (1988). *Medieval Popular Culture: Problems of Belief and Perception*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hägg, T. (1983). *The Novel in Antiquity*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Halkin, F. (1959a). Les deux derniers chapitres de la nouvelle vie de Constantin. *Analecta Bollandiana* 77, pp.370-372.
- Halkin, F. (1959b). Une nouvelle vie de Constantin dans un légendier de Patmos. *Analecta Bollandiana* 77, pp.63-207.
- Halkin, F. (1960). Les autres passages inédits de la vie acéphale de Constantin. *Analecta Bollandiana* 78, pp.11-15.
- Hallo, W. (Ed.) (2000). *The Context of Scripture Vol. II: Canonical Compositions, Monumental Inscriptions and Archival Documents from the Biblical World*. Leiden: Brill.
- Hansen, W. (1997). Mythology and Folktale Typology: Chronicle of a Failed Scholarly Revolution. *Journal of Folklore Research* 34 (3), pp.275-280.
- Hansen, W. (2002). *Ariadne's Thread: A Guide to International Tales in Classical Literature*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Hansen, W. (2003). Strategies of Authentication in Ancient Popular Literature. In S. Panayotakis, M. Zimmerman and W. Keulen (Eds.), *The Ancient Novel and Beyond*, pp.301-314. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Hansen, W. (2014). Odysseus and the Oar. In L. Edmunds (Ed), *Approaches to Greek Myth: Second Edition*, pp.245-279. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Harbus, A. (2002). *Helena of Britain in Medieval Legend*. Rochester: D.S. Brewer.

- Harmatta, J. (2002). Herodot und die Altpersische Novelle. In L. Havas and I. Tegyey (Eds.), *Selected Writings: West and East and the Unity of the Ancient World*, pp.192-206. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetem.
- Heinz, M. (2007). Sargon of Akkad: Rebel and Usurper in Kish. In M. Feldman and M. Heinz (Eds.), *Representations of Political Power: Case Histories from Times of Change and Dissolving Order in the Ancient Near East*, pp.67-86. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Hekster, O. (2015). *Emperors and Ancestors: Roman Rulers and the Constraints of Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Henning, W.B. (1942). Mani's Last Journey. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 10 (4), pp.941-952.
- Henning, W.B. (1977). Ein persischer Titel im Altaramäischen. In W.B. Henning (Ed.), *W.B. Henning Selected Papers*, pp. 659-666. Leiden: Brill.
- Heyden, K. (2006). Die Christliche Geschichte des Philippos von Side, mit einem kommentierten Katalog der Fragmente. In M. Wallraff (Ed.), *Julius Africanus und die Christliche Weltchronistik*, pp.209-243. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Heydenreich, E. (1893). Constantin der Grosse in den Sagen des Mittelalters. *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 9 (1), pp.1-27.
- Holladay, C.R. (1983). *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors. Volume I: Historians*. Chico: Scholars Press.
- Hollerich, M.J. (1989a). The Comparison of Moses and Constantine in Eusebius of Caesarea's Life of Constantine. In E.A. Livingstone (Ed.) *Studia Patristica* 19, pp.80-85. Leuven: Peeters Press.
- Hollerich, M.J. (1989b). Myth and History in Eusebius's "De vita Constantini": "Vit. Const. 1.12" in Its Contemporary Setting. *The Harvard Theological Review*, 82 (4), pp.421-445.
- Holzberg, N. (2003). The Genre: Novels Proper and the Fringe. In G. Schmeling (Ed.) *The Novel in the Ancient World*, pp.11-28. Leiden: Brill.
- Holzberg, N. (2003). Novel-like Works of Extended Prose Fiction II. In G. Schmeling (Ed.) *The Novel in the Ancient World*, pp.619-653. Leiden: Brill.
- Huff, D. (2008). Formation and Ideology of the Sasanian State in the Context of Archaeological Evidence. In V. Sarkhosh Curtis and S. Stewart (Eds.), *The Sasanian Era*, edited. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Humphries, M. (2008). From Usurper to Emperor: The Politics of Legitimation in the Age of Constantine. *Journal of Late Antiquity* 1 (1), pp.82-100.
- d'Huy, J. (2016). The Evolution of Myths. *Scientific American* 315 (6), pp.62-69.

- Huyse, P. (1999). *Die dreisprachige Inschrift Šābuhrs I. an der Ka'ba-I Zardušt (ŠKZ)*. Corpus Inscriptionem Iranicum pt. III. London: School of Oriental and African Studies.
- Huyse, P. (2008). Late Sasanian Society Between Orality and Literacy. In V. Sarkosh-Curtis and S. Stewart (Eds.) *The Sasanian Era*, pp. 140-155. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Immerwahr, H. (1966). *Form and Thought in Herodotus*. Cleveland: The American Philological Association.
- Iser, W. (1978). *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Izre'el, S. (1995). The Armana Glosses: Who Wrote What for Whom? Some Sociolinguistic Considerations. In S. Izre'el and R. Drory (Eds.), *Language and Culture in the Near East*, pp.101-122. Leiden: Brill.
- Jacobsen, T. (Ed.). (1939). *The Sumerian King List*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Janiszewski, P. (2006). *The Missing Link: Greek Pagan Historiography in the Second Half of the Third Century and in the Fourth Century AD*. Trans. D. Dzierzbicka. Warsaw: Faculty of Law and Administration Warsaw University.
- Johnson, A.P. (2006). *Ethnicity and Argument in Eusebius' Praeparatio Evangelica*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- De Jong, A.F. (2000). Zoroastrian Religious Polemics and Their Contexts. In T.L. Hetteema and A. van der Kooij (Eds) *Religious Polemics in Context: Papers presented to the Second International Conference of the Leiden Institute of the Study of Religions (LISOR), held at Leiden, 27-28 April 2000*, pp.48-63. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum.
- De Jong, A.F. (2006). "One Nation under God? The Early Sasanians as Guardians and Destroyers of Holy Sites." In R.G. Kratz and H. Spieckermann (Eds.) *Götterbilder - Gottesbilder - Weltbilder. Band I: Ägypten, Mesopotamien, Persien, Kleinasien, Syrien, Palästina*, pp. 223-238. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- De Jong, A.F. (2013). Religion in Iran: the Parthian and Sasanian Periods. In M. Salzman (Ed.) *The Cambridge History of Religions in the Ancient World*, pp.23-53. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- De Jong, A.F. (2015). Religion and Politics in Pre-Islamic Iran. In M. Stausberg, Y. Sohrab-Dinshaw Vevaina and A. Tessman (Eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Zoroastrianism*, pp.85-101. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kazhdan, A. (1990). Byzantine Hagiography and Sex in the Fifth to Twelfth Centuries. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 44, pp.131-143.
- Kazhdan, A. P. (1987). 'Constantine Imaginaire'; Byzantine Legends of the Ninth Century About Constantine the Great. *Byzantion* 57, pp.196-250.

- Kazhdan, A. (1991a). Domestikos. In A. Kazhdan, A.M. Talbot, T. E. Gregory and N. P. Ševčenko (Eds.), *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, p.646. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kazhdan, A. P. (1991b). Protiktores. In A. Kazhdan, A.M. Talbot, T. E. Gregory and N. P. Ševčenko (Eds.), *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, p.1743. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kazhdan, A.P. (1991c). Scholae Palatinae. In A. Kazhdan, A.M. Talbot, T. E. Gregory and N. P. Ševčenko (Eds.), *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, p.1851. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kempshall, M. (2011). *Rhetoric and the Writing of History*: Manchester University Press.
- Kennedy, D. (1969). *Realia*. *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 63 (1), pp.79-82.
- Kent, R. (1953). *Old Persian, Grammar, Texts, Lexicon*. 2nd ed. New Haven: The American Oriental Society.
- Khaleghi-Motlagh, D. (1999). FERDOWSI, ABU'L-QĀSEM i. Life. *Encyclopedia Iranica* Vol. IX (Fasc. 5), pp.514-523. Digital version: <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/ferdowsi-i>. Last accessed: 04-06-2018.
- Khalidi, T. (1994). *Arabic Historical Thought in the Classical Period*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Klaniczay, G. (2000). *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses: Dynastic Cults in Medieval Central Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Knapp, A. (2012). Royal Apologetic in the Ancient Near East. PhD Diss. John Hopkins University.
- König, F. (1972). *Die Persika des Ktesias von Knidos*. Vol. 18, Graz: Im Selbstverlage des Herausgebers.
- Kryenbroek, K.G. (2008). How Pious was Shapur I? In V. Sarkosh-Curtis and S. Stewart (Eds.) *The Sasanian Era*, pp.7-15. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Kuhrt, A. (1987). Usurpation, conquest and ceremonial: from Babylon to Persia. In D. Cannadine and S. Price (Eds.), *Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies*, pp.20-55. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kuhrt, A. (2002). Babylon. In I. de Jong E. Bakker, H. van Wees (Eds.), *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, edited by, pp.475-496. Leiden: Brill.
- Kuhrt, A. (2003). Making History: Sargon of Agade and Cyrus the Great of Persia. In W. Henkelman and A. Kuhrt (Eds.), *Achaemenid History XIII: A Persian Perspective, Essays in Memory of Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg*. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.
- Kuhrt, A. (2007). *The Persian Empire: A Corpus of Sources from the Achaemenid Period*. 2 vols. Vol. 1. London: Routledge.

- Lambert, W. (1968/9). A New Source for the Reign of Nabonidus. *Archiv für Orientforschung* Band 22, pp.1-8.
- Latham, J.D. (2011). EBN AL-MOQAFFA', ABŪ MOḤAMMAD 'ABD-ALLĀH RŌZBEH. *Encyclopedia Iranica* Vol.VIII (Fasc. 1), pp.39-43. Digital version: <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/ebn-al-moqaffa>. Last accessed: 11/4/2017.
- Lecoq, P. (1997). *Les Inscriptions de la Perse achéménide*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Lenfant, D. (2000). Nicolas de Damas et le corpus des Fragments de Ctésias. *Ancient Society* 3, pp.293-318.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. (1955). The Structural Study of Myth. *The Journal of American Folklore* 68 (270), pp.428-444.
- Lewis, B. (1980). *The Sargon Legend: A Study of the Akkadian Text and the Tale of the Hero who was Exposed at Birth*. Cambridge: American Schools of Oriental Research.
- Lewis, D.M. (1985). Persians in Herodotus. In M. Jameson (Ed), *The Greek Historians: Literature and History: Papers Presented to A.E. Raubitschek*, pp.101-117. Saratoga: Anma Libri.
- Lieu, S. (1998). From History to Legend and Legend to History: The medieval and Byzantine transformation of Constantine's Vita. In D. Montserrat and S. Lieu (Eds.), *Constantine: History, Historiography and Legend*, London & New York: Routledge.
- Lieu, S. N. (2005). Constantine in Legendary Literature. In N. Lenski (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine*, pp.298-322. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lieu, N. and D. Montserrat, (Eds.) (1996). *From Constantine to Julian: Pagan and Byzantine Views, A Source History*. London: Routledge.
- Linder, A. 1975. The Myth of Constantine the Great in the West: Sources and Hagiographic Commemoration. *Studi Medievali* 3rd series 16 (Fasc. 1), pp.43-95. Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi Sull'alto Medioevo.
- Llewellyn-Jones, L. and J. Robson. (Eds.) (2010). *Ctesias' History of Persia: Tales of the Orient*, Routledge Classical Translations. London: Routledge.
- López-Ruiz, C. (2014). Greek and Near Eastern Mythologies: A Story of Mediterranean Encounters. In L. Edmunds (Ed), *Approaches to Greek Myth: Second Edition*, pp.152-199. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Mackenzie, D.N. (1986). *A Concise Pahlavi Dictionary*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Macuch, M. (2014). Ardashir's Genealogy Revisited. *Irān Nāmeḥ* 29 (2, pp.80-94.
- Maneck, S.S. (1994). *The death of Ahriman: Culture, identity and theological change among the Parsis of India*. PhD Diss. The University of Arizona.

- Magoulas, H. (1971). Bathhouse, Inn, Tavern, Prostitution and the Stage as Seen in the Lives of the Saints in the 6th and 7th Centuries. *Ἐπετηρὶς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν* 38, pp.233-252.
- Mali, J. (2003). *Mythistory: The Making of a Modern Historiography*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Marquart, J. (1901). *Ērānšāhr nach der Geographie des Ps. Moses Xorenac'i*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
- Martindale, J.R. (1980). *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire: Volume II, 395-527 AD*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matthews, J.F. (1983). Mascen, Maximus and Constantine. *Cylchgrawn Hanes Cymru / Welsh History Review* 11 (4), pp.431-448.
- Matthews, R.D. (2008). *Major Motifs in the Pentateuchal Portrayal of Moses as a Proto-Monarch*. PhD Diss. Union Theological Seminary and Presbyterian School of Christian Education.
- McCarter, P.K. (1980). The Apology of David. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 99 (4), pp.489-504.
- McCarter, P.K. (1980). *I Samuel*. The Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday & Company.
- McKitterick, R. Political ideology in Carolingian Historiography. In, Y. Hen and M. Innes (Eds). *The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages*, pp.162-174. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Meeks, W.A. (1968). Moses as God and King. In J. Neusner (Ed.), *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough*, pp.354-371. Leiden: Brill.
- Meisami, J.S. (1987). *Medieval Persian Court Poetry*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Minge, J.P. (1857-66). *Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Graeca*.
- Momigliano, A. 1963. Pagan and Christian Historiography in the Fourth Century A.D. In A. Momigliano (Ed.), *The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*, pp.79-99. London: Oxford University Press.
- Mondi, R. (1990). Greek Mythic Thought in the Light of the Near East. In L. Edmunds (Ed.) *Approaches to Greek Myth*, pp.141-198. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Mottahedeh, R.P. (2015). Finding Iran in the Panegyrics of the Ghaznavid Court. In A.C.S. Peacock and D.G. Tor (Ed.), *Medieval Central Asia and the Persianate World*, edited by, pp.129-142. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Muradyan, G., and A. Topchyan. (2008). The Romance of Artaban and Artasir in Agathangelos' History. *e-Sasanika* Vol.2.
- Murray, O. (1987). Herodotus and Oral History. In A. Kuhrt H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg (Eds.) *Achaemenid History II: The Greek Sources, Proceedings of the Groningen 1984 Achaemenid History Workshop*, pp.93-115. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.

- Nixon, C., and B. Saylor Rodgers. (Eds.) (1994). *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors, The Pangyrici Latini: Introduction, Translation and Historical Commentary*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Nongbri, B. (2013). *Before Religion: A History of a Modern Concept*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Nöldeke, T. (1878). Geschichte des Artachšir i Pâbakân, aus dem Pehlewi übersetzt, mit Erläuterungen und einer Einleitung versehen. *Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen*, Vierter Band, pp.22-69.
- Nöldeke, T. (1979). *The Iranian National Epic or Shahnamah*. Trans. L.T. Bogdanov. Philadelphia: Porcupine Press.
- Nyberg, H. (1964). *A Manual of Pahlavi, Part I: Texts*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Oakley, F. (2006). *Kingship: The Politics of Enchantment*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Obbink, H.W. (1966). On the Legends of Moses in the Haggadah. In W.C. van Unnik and A.S. van der Woude (Eds.), *Studia Biblica et Semitica Theodoro Christiano Vriezen*, pp.252-264. Wageningen: H. Vleenman & Zonen.
- Odahl, C. (1995). Divine Sanction for Imperial Rule in the First Christian Emperor's Early Letters and Art. *The Catholic Historical Review*, 81 (3), pp.327-352.
- Ogden, D. (2017). *The Legend of Seleucus: Kingship, Narrative and Mythmaking in the Ancient World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Omidasalar, M. (1996). Unburdening Ferdowsi. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*. Vol.116 No.2 (April – June), pp.235-242.
- Opitz, H. (1934). Die Vita Constantini des codex Angelicus 22. *Byzantion* 9, pp.540-90.
- Oppenheim, A. (1956). *The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East: With a Translation of an Assyrian Dream-Book*, Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society.
- L'Orange, H.P. (1953). *Studies on the Iconography of Cosmic Kingship in the Ancient World*, Oslo: H. Aschehoug & Co. (W.Nygaard).
- Pagliaro, A. (1927). *Epica e Romanzo nel Medioevo Persiano*. Florence: G. C. Sansoni.
- Panaino, A. (2003). The bayan of the Fratarakas: gods or divine kings? .In C.G. Cereti et. al. (Eds.), *Religious Themes and Texts of Pre-Islamic Iran and Central Asia. Studies in Honour of Professor Gherado Gnoli on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday 6th December 2002*, Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichart Verlag.
- Panaino, A., and G. Basello. (2009). A Mesopotamian Omen in the Cycle of Cyrus the Great, with an Appendix on Cuneiform Sources. In M. Luukko, S. Svärd and R. Mattila (Eds.), *Of God(s), Trees, Kings, and Scholars; Neo-Assyrian and Related Studies in Honour of Simo Parpola*, Helsinki: The Finnish Oriental Society.

- Paquet, L. (1975). *Les Cyniques Grecs*. Ottawa: Éditions de L'Université D'Ottawa.
- van de Paverd, F. (1991). *St. John Chrysostom, the Homilies on the Statues: An Introduction*, Orentalia Christiana Analecta. Rome: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalium.
- Payne, R. 2012. Avoiding Ethnicity: Uses of the Ancient Past in Late Sasanian Northern Mesopotamia. In W. Pohl, C. Gantner and R. Payne (Eds.) *Visions of Community in the Post-Roman World: The West, Byzantium and the Islamic World, 300-110*, pp.205-221. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Payne, R.E. (2016). *A State of Mixture: Christians, Zoroastrians, and Iranian Political Culture in Late Antiquity*, Oakland: University of California Press.
- Pelling, C. (1996). The Urine and the Vine: Astyages' Dreams at Herodotus 1.107-8. *The Classical Quarterly* 46 (1), pp.68-77.
- Pourshariati, P. (2008). *Decline and Fall of the Sasanian Empire, The Sasanian-Parthian Confederacy and the Arab Conquest of Iran*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Potter, D.S. (1999). *Literary Texts and the Roman Historian*. London: Routledge.
- Pritchard, J. (Ed.) (1969). *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Third Edition with Supplement ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Qazvini, M.B. (1953). *Bist Maqāleh*. Tehran.
- Rapp, C. (1995). Byzantine Hagiographers as Antiquarians, Seventh to Tenth Centuries. In S. Efthymiadis, C. Rapp and D. Tsougarakis (Eds.), *Bosphorus: Essays in Honour of Cyril Mango*, pp.31-44, Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert.
- Rapp, C. (1998). Comparison, Paradigm and the Case of Moses in Panegyric and Hagiography. In M. Whitby (Ed.) *The Propaganda of Power: The Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity*, pp.277-298. Leiden: Brill.
- Rees, R. (2002). *Layers of Loyalty in Latin Panegyric: AD 289-307*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Reimitz, H. (2011). The social logic of historiographical compendia in the Carolingian period. *The 12th International Conference Series in the Hermeneutic Study of Textual Configuration*, pp.17-28. Nagoya University, Global COE Program. Digital version: https://www.gcoe.lit.nagoya-u.ac.jp/eng/result/pdf/157-170_REIMITZ.pdf.
- Rezakhani, K. (2015). Mazdakism, Manichaeism and Zoroastrianism: In Search of Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy in Late Antique Iran. *Iranian Studies* 48 (1):55-70.
- Robson, E. (2011). The Production and Dissemination of Scholarly Knowledge. In K. Radner and E. Robson (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Cuneiform Culture*, pp.557-576. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Robinson, C. (2003). *Islamic Historiography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rogers, B. (1989). *The Metamorphosis of Constantine*. *The Classical Quarterly* 39 (1), pp.233-246.

- Rowton, M.B. (1960). The Date of the Sumerian King List. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, Vol. 19 (2), pp.16-162.
- Rubin, Z. (2008). Ḥamza al-Iṣfahānī's Sources for Sasanian History. *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 35, pp.27-58.
- Safa, Z. (2011). *Hāmaseh Sarāīyi dar Irān*. Tehran: Enteshārāt-e Ferdous.
- Saïd, S. (2002). Herodotus and Tragedy. In I. de Jong E. Bakker, H. van Wees (Eds.), *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, pp.117-147. Leiden: Brill.
- Sancisi-Weerdenburg, H. (1987). Decadence in the Empire or Decadence in the Sources? From Source to Synthesis: Ctesias. In H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg (Ed.) *Achaemenid History I: Sources, Structures and Synthesis. Proceedings of the Groningen 1983 Achaemenid History Workshop*, pp. 33-45. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.
- Sancisi-Weerdenburg, H. (1987). The Fifth Oriental Monarchy and Hellenocentrism: Cyropaedia VIII and its Influence. In H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg and A. Kuhrt (Ed.) *Achaemenid History II: The Greek Sources*, pp.117-131. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.
- Sancisi-Weerdenburg, H. (1999). The Persian Kings and History. In C. Shuttleworth Kraus (Ed.) *The Limits of Historiography: Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts*, pp.91-112. Leiden: Brill.
- Savant, S. Bowen. (2015). *The New Muslims of Post-Conquest Iran: Tradition, Memory, and Conversion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Scheil, V. (1916). Nouveaux Renseignements sur Šarrukin: d'après un Texte Sumérien. *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale*, 13 (4), pp.175-179.
- Schellekens, J.J. (2006). The murderous grandparent motif: Myth as political discourse. *Semiotica* 162 (1/4), pp.245-261.
- Schmitt, R. (2013). BISOTUN iii. Darius's Inscriptions. *Encyclopedia Iranica*. Vol. IV (Fasc. 3), pp.299-305. Digital version: <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/bisotun-iii>. Last accessed: 31-05-2018.
- Schiling, A.M. (2008). L'apôtre du Christ, la conversion du roi Ardašīr et celle de son vizir. In C. Jullien (Ed.), *Controverses des Chrétiens dans l'Iran sassanide*, pp. 89-112. Paris: Association pour l'Avancement des Études Iraniennes.
- Scott, R. (2009). Byzantine Chronicles. In E. Kooper (Ed.) *The Medieval Chronicle* 6, pp.31-57, Brill Leiden.
- Segal, R. (Ed.) (1990). *In Quest of the Hero, Mythos*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Sessa, K. (2016). Constantine and Silvester in the Actus Silvestri. In M.S. Bjornlie (Ed.), *The Life and Legacy of Constantine: Traditions through the Ages*, pp.77-91. London: Routledge.

- Shahbazi, S. (1990). On the Xuadāy-nāmāg. In A. Kasheff and S. Shahbazi (Ed.), *Iranica Varia, Papers in Honour of Professor Ehsan Yarshater*, pp.208-29. Leiden: Brill.
- Shaked, S. (1994). *Dualism in Transformation, Varieties of Religion in Sasanian Iran*. London: School of Oriental and African Studies.
- Shaked, S. (2008). *Religion in the Late Sasanian Period: Eran, Aneran and other Religious Designations*. In V. Sarkosh-Curtis and S. Stewart (Eds.), *The Sasanian Era*, pp.103-117. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Shaki, S. (1990). Sāsān ki bud? *Iranshenāsi* 2 (1), pp.78-88.
- Shayegan, R.M. (1998). The Evolution of the Concept of Xwadāy"God". *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, Vol.52 (1-2), pp.31-54.
- Shayegan, R.M. (1999). *Aspects of Early Sasanian History and Historiography*. PhD Diss. Harvard.
- Shayegan, R.M. (2003). Approaches to the Study of Sasanian History. In S. Adhami (Ed.), *Paitmāna: Essays in Iranian, Indo-European, and Indian Studies in Honor of Hanns-Peter Schmidt*. Costa Mesa: Mazda Publishers.
- Shayegan, R.M. (2012a). *Arsacids and Sasanians: Political Ideology in Post-Hellenistic and Late Antique Persia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shayegan, R.M. (2012b). *Aspects of History and Epic in Ancient Iran, from Gaumāta to Wāhnam*. Washington: Harvard University Press.
- Sizgorich, T. (2009). *Violence and Belief in Late Antiquity: Militant Devotion in Christianity and Islam*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- da Silva, S. G., and J.J. Tehrani. (2015). Comparative phylogenetic analyses uncover the ancient roots of Indo-European folktales. *Royal Society Open Science* 3 (150645), pp.1-11.
- Sizgorich, T. (2009). *Violence and Belief in Late Antiquity: Militant Devotion in Christianity and Islam*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Skjaervø, P.O. (Ed.) (1983). *The Sasanian Inscription of Paikuli, Restored text and translation*. . Vol. 3.1. Wiesbaden: Dr Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Skjaervø, P.O. (1985). Thematic and Linguistic Parallels in the Achaemenian and Sassanian Inscriptions. *Acta Iranica* 25, pp.593-603.
- Skjaervø, O. (2012). JAMŠID i. Myth of Jamšid. *Encyclopedia Iranica* XIV (Fasc.5): 501-522. Digital version: <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/jamsid-i>. Last accessed: 01-06-2018.
- Smith, A.D. (1986). *The Ethnic Origin of Nations*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Smith, A.D. (2004). *The Antiquity of Nations*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Smith, K. (2016). *Constantine and the Captive Christians of Persia: Martyrdom and Religious Identity in Late Antiquity*. Oakland: University of California Press.

- Smith, R. (2007). A Lost Historian of Alexander 'Descended from Alexander', and Read by Julian? Praxagoras of Athens Reviewed in the Light of Attic Epigraphy. *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Bd. 56 (H. 3), pp.356-380.
- Stevenson, J. (1957). The Life and Literary Activity of Lactantius. *Studia Patristica* 1, pp.661-77.
- Stoneman, R. (2008). *Alexander the Great: A Life in Legend*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Somers, M.R. (1994). The Narrative Constitution of Identity: A Relational and Network Approach. *Theory and Society* 23 (5), pp.605-649.
- Soudavar, A. (2003). *The Aura of Kings, Legitimacy and Divine Sanction in Iranian Kingship*. Costa Mesa: Mazda Publishers.
- Stiltingus, J. Suyskenus, J. Perierus, J. and Cleus, J. (Eds.) (1762). *Acta Sanctorum Septembris*, Acta Sanctorum VIII, Antwerp.
- Stronach, D. (1990). On the Genesis of Old Persian Cuneiform Script. In F. Vallat (Ed.), *Contibution à L'Histoire de L'Iran; Mélanges Offerts à Jean Perrot*, pp.195-203. Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations.
- Stronk, J. (2007). Ctesias of Cnidus, a Reappraisal. *Mnemosyne* 60 (Fasc. 1), pp.25-58.
- Stout, A.M. (1994). Jewelry as a Symbol of Status in the Roman Empire. In J.L. Sebastia and L. Bonfante (Eds.), *The World of Roman Costume*, pp. 77-100. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Sundermann, W. (1988). Kē čīhr az yazdān. Zur Titulatur der Sasanidenkönige. *Archív Orientální* 56, pp.338-340.
- Suny, R.G. (2001). Constructing Primordialism: Old Histories for New Nations. *The Journal of Modern History* 73 (4 (December 2001)), pp.862-896.
- Suolahti, J. (1947). On the Persian Sources Used by the Byzantine Historian Agathias. *Studia Orientalia* 13 (9), pp.3-13.
- Tafazoli, A. (2010/2011). *Tāriḫ-e adabiyāt-e Irān piš az Islām*. Tehran: Enteshārāt-e Sokhān.
- Tangherlini, T. (1990). "It Happened Not Too Far from Here..." A Survey of Legend Theory and Characterization. *Western Folklore* 49 (4 (Oct. 1990)), pp.371-390.
- Tatum, J. (1989). *Xenophon's Imperial Fiction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Thomas, R. (2012). Herodotus and Eastern Myths and Logoi. In E. Baragwanath and M. De Bakker (Eds.), *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thomson, R.W. (2005). The Armenian Versions of the Life of Sylvester. *Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies* (14), pp.55-139.
- Thomson, R.W. (2011). Agathangelos. *Encyclopedia Iranica* Vol.1 (Fasc.6), pp. 607-608. Digital version: <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/agathangelos>. Last accessed, 30-05-2018.

- Thompson, S. (1955-1958). *Motif-Index of Folk-Literature: A Classification of Narrative Elements in Folktales, Ballads, Myths, Fables, Mediaeval Romances, Exempla, Fabliaux, Jest-Books and Local Legends*. 6 vols. Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger.
- Thompson, S. (1977). *The Folktale*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Tinnefeld, F., K. Savvidis, and E. Degani. (2006). "Anastasius". *Brill's New Pauly*. Digital version: http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/brill-s-new-pauly/anastasius-e120080?s.num=0&s.f.s2_parent=s.f.book.brill-s-new-pauly&s.q=anastasius. Last accessed: 02-08-17.
- Treadgold, W. (2010). *The Early Byzantine Historians*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tsumura, D.T. (2007). *The First Book of Samuel*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Uther, H. 2004. *Types of International Folktales: A classification and Bibliography*. 3 vols, Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia/Academia Scientiarum Fennica.
- Van Dam, R. (2007). *The Roman Revolution of Constantine*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Dam, R. (2011). *Remembering Constantine at Milvian Bridge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Ginkel, J.J. (1995). *John of Ephesus: A Monophysite Historian in Sixth-Century Byzantium*, PhD diss. University of Groningen.
- Van Nuffelen, P. (2012). *Orosius and the Rhetoric of History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Van Nuffelen, P. Forthcoming. "Considérations sur l'Anonyme homéen." In E. Amato (Ed) *Les historiens fragmentaires de l'Antiquité tardive*.
- Vansina, J. (1985). *Oral Tradition as History*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Vernant, J.P. (1970). Greek Tragedy: Problems of Interpretation. In E. Donato and R. Macksey (Eds.), *The Languages of Criticism and the Sciences of Man: The Structuralist Controversy*, pp.273-295. Baltimore.
- Vernant, J.P. (1980). *Myth and Society in Ancient Greece*. Tran. J. Lloyd. New Jersey: Harvester Press.
- Walker, J.T. (2006). *The Legend of Mar Qardagh: Narrative and Christian Heroism in Late Antique Iraq*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Warmington, B.H. (1974). Aspects of Constantinian Propaganda in the Panegyrici Latini. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 104, pp.371-384.
- Watkin, C. (1995). *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Weadock, P. (1975). The Giparu at Ur. *Iraq* 37 (2), pp.101-128.
- Weber, U. (2012). Narseh, König der Könige von Ērān und Anērān. *Iranica Antiqua* 47, pp.153-302.
- Wesselofsky, A. (1877). Dit L'empereur Coustant. *Romania* 6, pp.161-198.

- West, M.L. (1999). *The East Face Of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- West, S. (2003). Croesus' Second Reprieve and Other Tales of the Persian Court. *The Classical Quarterly* 53 (2), pp.416-437.
- Westenholz, A. (1979). The Old Akkadian Empire in Contemporary Opinion. In M. Larsen (Ed.), *Power and Propaganda; a Symposium on Ancient Empires*. Copenhagen: Akademisk Vorlag.
- White, H.V. (1973). *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Baltimore & London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Widengren, G. (1971). The Establishment of the Sasanian Dynasty in Light of New Evidence. In E. Ceruilli et al. (Eds.), *La Persia nel Medioevo*, pp.711-182. Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei.
- Wiesehöfer, J. (2011). ARDAŠĪR I i. History. *Encyclopedia Iranica*, Vol.II (Fasc. 4), pp.371-376. Digital version: <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/ardasir-i>. Last accessed: 30-05-2018.
- Williams, A. (2009). *The Zoroastrian Myth of Migration from Iran and Settlement in the Indian Diaspora: Text, Translation and Analysis of the 16th Century Qeṣṣeh-ye Sanjān 'The Story of Sanjan'*. Leiden: Brill.
- Williams, M. (2011). *Authorised Lives in Early Christian Biography: Between Eusebius and Augustine*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Winkelman, F. (1970). Die Überlieferung der Passio Eusignii. *Philologus: Zeitschrift für der klassische Alterum* 114, pp.277-288.
- Winkelman, F. (1973). Ein Ordnungsversuch der griechischen hagiographischen Konstantiniden und ihrer Überlieferung. In J. Irmscher and P. Nagel (Eds.) *Studia Byzantina*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Winkelman, F. (1982). *Vita Metrophanis et Alexandri*, BHG 1279. *Analecta Bollandiana* 100, pp.147-183.
- Winkelman, F. (1987). Die älteste erhaltene griechische hagiographische Vita Konstantins und Helena. In J. Dümmer et al. (Eds.), *Texte und Textkritik eine Aufsatzsammlung*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Wood, P. (2010). *'We have no king but Christ': Christian Political Thought in Greater Syria on the Eve of the Arab Conquest (c.400-585)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yarshater, E. (1971). Were the Sasanians Heirs to the Achaemenids? In E. Ceruilli, et al. (Eds.), *La Persia nel Medioevo*, pp.517-533. Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei.
- Yarshater, E. (1983). Iranian National History. In E. Yarshater (Ed.) *The Cambridge History of Iran* Vol.3 (1), pp. 359-478. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zerubavel, Y. (1995). *Recovered Roots: Collective Memory and the Making of Israeli National Tradition*.
Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Tables

Table 1: Sargon : Sequence One

	Sumerian King List 20th c. BCE?	Birth Legend 13th - 8th c. BCE?
Birth Announced by Omen		
“Humble” Parent	X	X
Royal Parent		X
Exposed/Attacked as Infant		X
“Lost” to Regal Origins		?
Non-Regal Setting	?	?
Child Recognised - Games		
Child Recognised - Resemblance		
Child Recognised - Tokens		
Child Adopted		

Table 2: Sargon, Sequence Two

	Sumerian King List 20th c. BCE?	The Sumerian Legend 19th c. BCE?	The Weidner Chronicle After 18th c. BCE?
At Court to Serve	X	X	?
At Court as Aristocrat			
Has Role Close to King	X	X	X
Shows Extraordinary Aptitude			
Beautiful/Youthful/Popular			
“Animal” Combat			
Arouses Jealousy			
Plot is Made		Against Sargon	
Antagonist is Warned		X	
Escape to “Homeland”			
Father is Ill or Dead			
Pursued			
Trick Performed in Flight			
Leads Army	? (p.110, lines 28-30)		

Table 3: Cyrus, Sequence One

	Herodotus, Histories 444-424 BCE	Justin, Epitome of Pompeius Trogus 4th c. CE (Original 1st c. CE)
Birth Announced by Omen	X	
“Humble” Parent	X	X
Royal Parent	X	X
Exposed/Attacked as Infant	X	X
“Lost” to Regal Origins	X	X
Non-Regal Setting	X	X
Child Recognised - Games	X	X
Child Recognised - Resemblance	X	X
Child Recognised - Tokens		
Child Adopted	?	

Table 4: Cyrus, Sequence Two

	Herodotus, Histories 444-424 BCE	Nicholaus (Ctesias) Early 1st c. CE (c.394 BCE)	Dion After 343/2 BCE	Xenophon, Cyropaedia After 362/1 BCE	Justin, Epitome of Pompeius Trogus 4th c. CE (Original 1st c. CE)
At Court to Serve		X			
At Court as Aristocrat				X	
Has Role Close to King		X		X	
Shows Extraordinary Aptitude				X	
Beautiful/Youthful/Popular		X		X	
“Animal” Combat		Used as metaphor	Used as metaphor		
Arouses Jealousy				X	
Plot is Made	Against Astyages	Against Astyages	?		Against Astyages
Antagonist is Warned		Twice	X		
Escape to “Homeland”	Cyrus is already in Persia	X			Cyrus is already in Persia
Father is Ill or Dead		Father is claimed to be ill, dies later			
Pursued		X			
Trick Performed in Flight		X			
Leads Army	X	X			X

Table 5: Ardashir, Sequence One

	Agathias, Histories c.559 CE	Moses Khorenats'i, History of the Armenians 8 th century	Ferdowsi, Šāhnāmah 1010 CE	al-Tha'lebī, 11 th century CE	KNA Copied 1322
Birth Announced by Omen	X	Mentions dream of Pabag	X	X	X
“Humble” Parent	Both Sasan and Pabag		X	X	X
Royal Parent			Sasan and Pabag's daughter	Sasan and Pabag's daughter	Sasan and Pabag's daughter
Exposed/Attacked as Infant					
“Lost” to Regal Origins	Child raised by Pabag		Sasan, <i>not</i> Ardashir	Sasan, <i>not</i> Ardashir	Sasan, <i>not</i> Ardashir
Non-Regal Setting	X		Sasan works as a shepherd	Sasan works as a soldier	Sasan works as a shepherd
Child Recognised - Games					
Child Recognised - Resemblance					
Child Recognised - Tokens					
Child Adopted	Dispute over Paternity		By Pabag	By Pabag after Sasan's death	By Pabag

Table 6: Ardashir, Sequence Two

	Moses Khorenats'i History of the Armenians 8 th century	BHG 714 5 th - 10 th century	Ferdowsi, Šāhnāmah 1010 CE	KNA Copied 1322
At Court to Serve				
At Court as Aristocrat	?	X	X	X
Has Role Close to King	?	X	X	X
Shows Extraordinary Aptitude	?		X	X
Beautiful/Youthful/Popular	?		X	X
“Animal” Combat	?	Transferred to killing of Ardawan	X	X
Arouses Jealousy	?		X	X
Plot is Made		Against Ardawan		
Antagonist is Warned	X	X	X	X
Escape to “Homeland”	Arashir said to flee		X	X
Father is Ill or Dead	?		X	?
Pursued	?		X	X
Trick Performed in Flight			Staged pursuit	Staged pursuit
Leads Army	?		X	X

Table 7: Shapur, Sequence One

	Dīnawarī, Book of Lengthy Histories late 9 th century CE	Ṭabarī, History of the Prophets and Kings late 9 th -10 th century CE	Ferdowsi, Šāhnāmah 1010 CE	KNA Copied 1322
Birth Announced by Omen				
“Humble” Parent				
Royal Parent	Ardawan’s descendant	Ardawan’s daughter	Ardawan’s daughter	Ardawan’s daughter
Exposed/Attacked as Infant				
“Lost” to Regal Origins	Raised by Ardashir’s minister	Raised by Ardashir’s minister	Raised by Ardashir’s minister	Raised by Ardashir’s minister
Non-Regal Setting	X	X	X	X
Child Recognised - Games	X	X	X	X
Child Recognised - Resemblance	X	X	X	X
Child Recognised - Tokens				
Child Adopted	X	X	X	X

Table 8: Ormazd, Sequence One

	Tabarī, History of the Prophets and Kings late 9 th -10 th century CE	Ḥamza al-Iṣfahānī, Annals 10 th century CE	Ferdowsi, Šāhnāmah 1010 CE	KNA Copied 1322
Birth Announced by Omen	X		X	X
“Humble” Parent	X	Ormazd’s mother the subject of a “well known story”	X	X
Royal Parent	Shapur		Shapur	Shapur
Exposed/Attacked as Infant				
“Lost” to Regal Origins	Hidden from Ardashir		Hidden from Ardashir	Hidden from Ardashir
Non-Regal Setting	X		X	X
Child Recognised - Games	Ormazd holds a polo stick		X	X
Child Recognised - Resemblance	X		X	
Child Recognised - Tokens				
Child Adopted	X		X	X

Table 9 (1): Constantine, Sequence One

	Lat. Pan. VI(7) c.310 CE	Origo Constantini late 4th century CE	Eutropius, Breviarium after 364 CE	Ambrose, De Obitu Theodosii c.395 CE	Philostorgius, Church History late 4 th century CE
Birth Announced by Omen					
“Humble” Parent		X	X	Helena’s humility emphasised	Helena’s low birth referenced in Passio Artemii
Royal Parent	Link to Claudius Gothicus		Link to Claudius Gothicus		
Exposed/Attacked as Infant					
“Lost” to Regal Origins					
Non-Regal Setting					
Child Recognised - Games					
Child Recognised - Resemblance					
Child Recognised - Tokens					
Child Adopted					

Table 9 (2): Constantine, Sequence One

	Zosimus, Historia Nova c.500 CE	Chronicon Paschale 631-641 CE	Armenian Life of Sylvester 7 th century CE	Passio Eusignii 7 th century CE	Moses Khorenats'i History of the Armenians 8 th century
Birth Announced by Omen					
“Humble” Parent	Helena of low birth	Constantine illegitimate	Helena is a prostitute	Helena is a prostitute	Helena is a prostitute
Royal Parent			X	X	X
Exposed/Attacked as Infant					
“Lost” to Regal Origins			X	X	
Non-Regal Setting			X	X	
Child Recognised - Games					
Child Recognised - Resemblance					
Child Recognised - Tokens			X	X	
Child Adopted			X	X	

Table 9 (3): Constantine, Sequence One

	Theophanes Confessor, Chronicle late 8 th -9 th century CE	George the Monk late 9 th century CE	Suda later 10 th century CE	Guidi Vita 9 th century CE	Opitz Vita late 9 th to 11 th century CE
Birth Announced by Omen				Post-coital dream	Dream recalled by Constantius
“Humble” Parent	Denied, Helena was Constantius’ wife	Denied, Helena was smeared	Constantine of low birth, knew Eunapius	X	X
Royal Parent	Link to Claudius Gothicus	X	X	X	X
Exposed/Attacked as Infant					
“Lost” to Regal Origins				X	?
Non-Regal Setting				X	?
Child Recognised - Games				Horses as symbol for military inclinations	?
Child Recognised - Resemblance				In report to Constantius	In report to Constantius
Child Recognised - Tokens				X	?
Child Adopted				X	X

Table 9 (4): Constantine, Sequence One

	Halkin Vita 12 th - 13 th century CE	Libellus 14 th century CE
Birth Announced by Omen		
“Humble” Parent	X	
Royal Parent	X	Helena is also noble
Exposed/Attacked as Infant		
“Lost” to Regal Origins	X	X
Non-Regal Setting	X	X
Child Recognised - Games	Horses as symbol for military inclinations	X
Child Recognised - Resemblance		
Child Recognised - Tokens	X	X
Child Adopted	X	X

Table 10 (1): Constantine, Sequence Two

	Lat. Pan. VI(7) c.310 CE	Lactantius, De Mortibus Persecutorum c.314-315 CE	Eusebius, Vita Constantini after 337 CE	Origo Constantini late 4th century CE	Praxagoras of Athens early 4th C? (Photius 10th century)	Aurelius Victor, Liber de Caesaribus c.360 CE
At Court to Serve						
At Court as Aristocrat		X	Educated at the court of the tyrant	X	For education	As hostage
Has Role Close to King		X	X	X		
Shows Extraordinary Aptitude		X	X			
Beautiful/Youthful/Popular		X	X			
“Animal” Combat		X		Barbarised enemy	X	
Arouses Jealousy		X	X			
Plot is Made		X	X	Implied	Against Constantine	Against Galerius
Antagonist is Warned						
Escape to “Homeland”		X	X		X	X
Father is Ill or Dead	Liminal	X	Arrives at Constantius’ deathbed			X
Pursued	Not pursued but travels by imperial post	X		Implied		Fears pursuit
Trick Performed in Flight		X		X		X
Leads Army	Campaigns in Britain	Inherits legions	Inherits legions	Campaigns in Britain	Inherits legions	Inherits legions

Table 10 (2): Constantine, Sequence Two

	Pseudo Aurelius Victor, Epitome (very late 4th-very early 5th century CE)	BHG 1279 (Gelasius?) if Gelasius, before 400 CE	Zosimus, Historia Nova c.500 CE	Alexander the Monk 6 th - 9 th centuries CE	Theophanes Confessor, Chronicle late 8 th -9 th century CE	Guidi Vita 9 th century CE
At Court to Serve						
At Court as Aristocrat	X	X	X	Educated at the court of the tyrant	X	Constantine moved for his safety
Has Role Close to King		X				X
Shows Extraordinary Aptitude		X		X	X	
Beautiful/Youthful/Popular				X	X	
“Animal” Combat						
Arouses Jealousy			Averted: Constantine driven by will to power	X		
Plot is Made		Against Constantine	Against Galerius	Against Constantine	Both Diocletian and Galerius against Constantine	Against Constantine
Antagonist is Warned				By an omen	By divination	X
Escape to “Homeland”	X	X	X	Flees “like David”	Flees “like David”	X
Father is Ill or Dead	X	X		Constantine is not on deathbed	Constantine is not on deathbed	X
Pursued	X		Implied			
Trick Performed in Flight	X		X			
Leads Army	Inherits legions	Inherits legions	Inherits legions			Inherits legions

Table 10 (3): Constantine, Sequence Two

	Opitz Vita late 9 th to 11 th century CE	Halkin Vita 12 th - 13 th century CE
At Court to Serve		
At Court as Aristocrat	Constantine moved for his safety	For education
Has Role Close to King	X	
Shows Extraordinary Aptitude	X	X
Beautiful/Youthful/Popular		
“Animal” Combat	X	X
Arouses Jealousy	X	
Plot is Made	Against Constantine	Against Constantine
Antagonist is Warned		By omen
Escape to “Homeland”	X	X
Father is Ill or Dead	X	Not specified
Pursued	Fears pursuit	
Trick Performed in Flight	X	
Leads Army	Inherits Constantinus’ office	Inherits, but not immediately