

## WHO WROTE KROMAYER'S SURVEY OF GREEK WARFARE?<sup>1</sup>

— ROEL KONIJNENDIJK —

### ABSTRACT

*Johannes Kromayer and Georg Veith's handbook on Greek and Roman warfare (1928) has long been regarded as the epitome of older German scholarship on ancient military history. However, Kromayer's contribution on Greek warfare borrows extensively from Adolf Bauer's earlier edition, written for the same series (1893). Modern scholars still cite and praise Kromayer's text, unaware that nearly half of it is not his. This article offers a guide to Kromayer's handbook, showing which parts can be considered contemporary original work, and which reflect scholarship that was already 35 years old at the time.*

### KEYWORDS

*Greek warfare, Johannes Kromayer, Adolf Bauer, handbooks, plagiarism*

On his field expedition to the ancient battlefields of Italy and North Africa in 1907–1908, the Prussian classicist Johannes Kromayer (1859–1934) was accompanied by Georg Veith (1875–1925), an Austrian artillery officer with a keen interest in ancient military history.<sup>2</sup> The pair joined forces and worked together until Veith was murdered on the site of the battle of Zela.<sup>3</sup> With Veith's help, Kromayer completed his monumental topographical and tactical study *Antike Schlachtfelder* (1903–1931) as well as the five volumes of the *Schlachten-Atlas zur antiken Kriegsgeschichte* (1922–1929). These and other works cemented the status of Kromayer and Veith as the leading experts on ancient warfare in the German-speaking world and beyond. Small wonder, then,

<sup>1</sup> This article is part of an ERC Horizon2020-funded MSCA-IF project at Leiden University, titled 'The Prussian Fathers of Greek Military History' (PFoGMH). I am grateful to Herman Paul and the anonymous reviewers of *HCS* for their comments. Any remaining errors are my own.

<sup>2</sup> Kromayer and Veith 1912, vii. For general biographical information about the two authors, see the *Deutsche biographische Enzyklopädie* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 2005–2008), 6.81 (Kromayer) and 10.229 (Veith), as well as Kromayer's entry in the *NDB* (Rieckenberg 1982) and Veith's biography in Happ and Mildner 2003.

<sup>3</sup> Veith's tragic fate was noted by several reviewers of the handbook discussed here: see Grosse 1929, 225; Lammert 1930, 593; Enßlin 1931, 328; Oldfather 1932, 13.

that Walter Otto invited them to contribute a study of military matters to the all-encompassing *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft (HdA)* after he became its editor-in-chief in 1920. The result of their collaborative effort was published in 1928 as *Heerwesen und Kriegführung der Griechen und Römer (HdA IV.3.2)*.

This book was intended as an update to the *HdA*'s existing surveys of Greek and Roman military antiquities by Adolf Bauer and Hermann Schiller, which had been commissioned by Iwan Müller and last revised for respective second editions in 1893.<sup>4</sup> Reviewers welcomed the initiative. They considered the works of Bauer and Schiller too short to cover their subject in full, and found them obsolete after 35 years of intense scholarly activity.<sup>5</sup> With both original authors already deceased, they thought no one more suitable to provide a comprehensive new overview than Kromayer and Veith.<sup>6</sup> They also approved of the decision to treat Greek and Roman warfare together in a single volume.<sup>7</sup>

The new handbook easily met the demand for more detail. At 649 pages, it was nearly three times the size of Bauer and Schiller's surveys put together. Veith's long treatment on the army of the Roman Republic and the chapters of subject experts like E. von Nischer (on the Roman standing army), A. Köster (on naval warfare) and E. Schramm (on siege warfare) went well beyond the material of the handbook's predecessors.

Among these contributions, Kromayer's section on Greek warfare stands out for being shorter than Bauer's second edition.<sup>8</sup> More remarkably, it stands out for reusing large swathes of the earlier handbook with little to no alteration. Kromayer copied so much of Bauer's text — including the introduction, conclusion, bibliographical sections, and practically all of Bauer's treatment of Archaic and Classical Greece — that the resulting survey has limited value as a reflection of the state of the art at the time of its publication. Despite the addition of some new sections based on Kromayer's own research, his edition should not be regarded too easily as an up-to-date study by a leading expert.

<sup>4</sup> Bauer 1887; 1893; Schiller 1887; 1893. Müller was knighted in 1889 and published the second editions as Iwan von Müller.

<sup>5</sup> Couissin 1929, 198; Grosse 1929, 224–225; Syme 1929, 266; Oldfather 1932, 13.

<sup>6</sup> Grosse 1929, 225; Enßlin 1931, 328; Oldfather 1932, 14.

<sup>7</sup> Syme 1929, 266; Enßlin 1931, 328.

<sup>8</sup> Kromayer offers 155 pages (9–162 and 246–247) against Bauer's 200 (269–469). Admittedly, parts of Bauer's remit were taken up by Köster and Schramm. If we add their chapters to Kromayer's, the full survey of Greek and Hellenistic warfare is a modest 38 pages longer than Bauer's handbook — as against a tenfold increase in length for the part on Rome.

The fact that Kromayer reused Bauer's work is neither surprising nor alarming in itself. The *HdA* regularly publishes updated versions of its themed volumes. Under Otto's stewardship, new authors were not asked to rewrite the volumes from scratch; they were sent the manuscripts of older editions with the request to make adjustments in line with the latest scholarship. Kromayer may not have felt that he was under any obligation to write a wholly original survey. He delivered what he had been asked to deliver.

Other contributors to the series, however, usually made their debt to their predecessors explicit. For example, Ernst Hohl acknowledged Benedictus Niese's work on the first four editions of the *Grundriss der Römischen Geschichte* in Hohl's preface to the fifth (*HdA* III.5, 1923). Manu Leumann's revised *Lateinische Grammatik* (*HdA* II.2, 1926–1928) is subtitled 'auf der Grundlage des Werkes von Friedrich Stolz und Joseph Hermann Schmalz'. Such attributions were in line with long-established principles of authorship.<sup>9</sup> By contrast, Kromayer and Veith made no mention of Bauer's manuscript anywhere in their preface or introduction, nor did they refer to his edition in their remarks on other scholarship. It takes careful reading to find any acknowledgement of its existence. Bauer 1893 appears only in a few footnotes (sometimes identified as '2. Auflage dieses Werkes'), usually in places where Kromayer disagreed with its claims.<sup>10</sup>

Kromayer's decision not to credit Bauer created a false impression that the whole treatment of Greek warfare in the new edition of the handbook was his original work. Those who realised how much of it was taken from the earlier text were not happy when they learned the truth. In his review for *Gnomon*, Friedrich Lammert spoke for all readers who were disappointed to recognise Bauer's words:

Schon der Titel kündigt eine Abkehr von dem mehr antiquarischen Vorgehen Bauers und Schillers an, was im Vorwort stark unterstrichen

<sup>9</sup> Modern scholars regard the late eighteenth to early nineteenth century as the key period in the establishment of copyright and its associated principles of authorship and intellectual property: see for example Jackson 2003, 127; Maurel-Indart 2007, 19–24; Mazzeo 2007, 10–12; Terry 2010, 25. The notion of plagiarism is more complex, featuring several kinds of demands on authors and changing significantly over time (MacFarlane 2007; Mazzeo 2007, 5–10). That said, Terry (2010, 3, 19–23) dates the emergence of a relevant conception ('a concealment of debt', 8) to the second half of the eighteenth century.

<sup>10</sup> See for example 26 nn. 2 and 3, 36 n. 6, 105 n. 9, 109 n. 6, 142 n. 1. Kromayer's tendency to cite Bauer only polemically was noted by Lammert (1930, 593–594) and Oldfather (1932, 14). The sole exception is 35 n. 2, where Kromayer agreed with Bauer's reading of a passage in Xenophon.

wird. Der kundige Leser, der infolgedessen eine völlig neue Arbeit erwartet, fühlt sich dagegen im ersten Teile bald an bekannte Auffassungen und Wendungen erinnert und muß feststellen, daß der Text auf weite Strecken wörtlich aus der früheren Auflage des Handbuchs wiedergegeben ist.<sup>11</sup>

Similarly, William Oldfather's review for *Classical Weekly* frankly expresses his frustration when he realised what Kromayer had done:

This somewhat oldfashioned appearance of the bibliographical matter was, I confess, a mystery to me until I compared the corresponding sections in Bauer's monograph [...]; then it was immediately clear. Professor Kromayer has followed Bauer at times very closely. [...] A scholar so original and competent as Professor Kromayer has shown himself to be in his many works [...] certainly need not have thus carelessly used older work; he could so easily have done very much better on the basis of his own knowledge and judgment.<sup>12</sup>

These scholars stopped short of accusing Kromayer of plagiarism. They seem to have accepted that authors of new editions in a series like the *HdA* might reuse parts of their predecessors' work. No doubt the matter would have been different if Kromayer had also borrowed from Hans Droysen's contemporaneous handbook or Hans Delbrück's survey of Greek warfare published seven years later.<sup>13</sup> Even so, they clearly felt cheated. Kromayer had not only failed to produce a full survey of the calibre of which they thought him capable, but also tried to make it appear as though he had.

It is fair to say that his attempt was highly successful. Most readers never found out. The short notices in *JHS*<sup>14</sup> and *JRS*<sup>15</sup> make no mention of Bauer, and even the detailed reviews in *Revue de Philologie*, *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* and *Historische Zeitschrift* only acknowledge him as

<sup>11</sup> Lammert 1930, 593.

<sup>12</sup> Oldfather 1932, 13–14.

<sup>13</sup> Droysen 1889; Delbrück 1900.

<sup>14</sup> The author of this review, identified only as 'M.C.', is most likely Max Cary, who is listed as a member of the Acting Editorial Committee in *JHS* 49 (1929), clxiv. I cite the review below as Cary 1929.

<sup>15</sup> The author 'R.S.' can be plausibly identified as Ronald Syme, frequently listed as the author of book notices for *JRS* in this period. The lack of explicit reference to him in this issue may explain the absence of the review from the bibliography of Syme compiled by E. Badian (Syme 1979). I cite it here as Syme 1929.

the author of one of the work's now dated predecessors.<sup>16</sup> Couissin's review for the first of these journals only noted that the figures from the earlier edition had been reprinted.<sup>17</sup> The observations of Lammert and Oldfather seem to have done nothing to diminish the reputation of a celebrated standard work that was already known simply as 'Kromayer–Veith' by the time Oldfather wrote his review.<sup>18</sup> The reviewer for *JHS* declared that 'it should remain standard for many years to come',<sup>19</sup> and so it did: Kromayer and Veith's volume was reprinted for the *HdA* in 1963 and continues to be cited and discussed. Several modern authorities on Greek warfare have singled it out for special praise as a uniquely useful and insightful older survey of the subject.<sup>20</sup> Meanwhile, they have forgotten Adolf Bauer. Even scholars listing early German works on Greek warfare in historiographical surveys do not cite him.<sup>21</sup> To my knowledge, no published scholarly work on Greek warfare has remarked on Bauer's presence in Kromayer's handbook.<sup>22</sup>

It will be worthwhile, therefore, to take stock. How exactly did Kromayer construct his new edition out of Bauer's original text? To what extent (and on which subjects) can we trust the handbook to reflect Kromayer's own insight and the state of contemporary scholarship?

These questions are partly answered by a closer look at the handbook's structure. Kromayer's elaborated table of contents obscures his dependence on Bauer: new section headings give the impression that the subject has been fundamentally rethought and rearranged. A comparison of the organisation of Bauer's text with the page numbers of corresponding sections in Kromayer's handbook gives a better sense of the structural similarity between the two works (table 1). Aside from a few inserted sections and chapters, there is no room for deviation from Bauer's template. The related sections form a nearly continuous sequence.

<sup>16</sup> Couissin 1929; Grosse 1929; Enßlin 1931.

<sup>17</sup> Couissin 1929, 201 — although, as Lammert pointed out (1930, 595), some new ones were added. Oldfather (1932, 13) noted their low quality.

<sup>18</sup> Oldfather 1932, 13.

<sup>19</sup> Cary 1929, 108; see also Couissin 1929, 203; Enßlin 1931, 332.

<sup>20</sup> Garlan 1975, 189; Hanson 1989, 22.

<sup>21</sup> Hanson 1989, 22–23; 2007, 7–8; Wheeler 2007, xxvi–xxvii; Kagan and Viggiano 2013, 23. Hanson once included Bauer's name in such a list, but without a reference to his work (1999, 379). In my own earlier research into the scholarly tradition, I only belatedly learned of Bauer's handbook and was not able to give it due attention (Konijnendijk 2018, 7 n. 3 and 5).

<sup>22</sup> I am indebted to the anonymous reviewer for the observation that at least two doctoral dissertations have done or will do so (Wheeler 1977; Schellenberg, forthcoming).

<b>Subject order (Bauer)</b>	<b>Pages (Bauer)</b>	<b>Pages (Kromayer)</b>	<b>Additional subjects (Kromayer)</b>
Sources and scholarship	272–290	9–17	
Early Greek warfare	290–301	18–27	
Sparta and the Peloponnese	301–340	28–44, 63	
Athens and its allies	340–405	44–62	
Thebes and the Boiotian League	405–412	63–67	
Sicily	412–421	67–74	
		74–76	Mercenaries
		76–78	Supply and pay
		79–95	Tactics
Macedon	423–431	95–120	
Alexander the Great	431–441		
Hellenistic period	441–468	120–146	
		147–162	Strategy

Table 1. Structural overlap

The main difference lies in the treatment of tactics and strategy. Kromayer signalled in the preface that these subjects would be his primary focus.<sup>23</sup> Bauer included comments on tactics and strategy under several regional or chronological headings, but Kromayer concentrated their discussion in dedicated chapters. He did this to some extent simply by moving sections of Bauer's text: as Lammert slyly remarked in his summary of the chapter on tactics, 'die große Wandlung in der griechischen Schlachtentaktik, die sich an den Namen des Epameinondas knüpft, wird zumeist mit Bauer's Worten knapp und treffend skizziert'.<sup>24</sup> The brief new section on mercenaries also includes parts of Bauer lifted from their original context. But Kromayer added the rest of these new thematic treatments in his own words, often discarding large amounts of relevant material from Bauer.<sup>25</sup> The chapters on tactics and strategy contain the most significant stretches of new work.

<sup>23</sup> Kromayer and Veith 1928, vi.

<sup>24</sup> Lammert 1930, 595; indeed, Kromayer 93–95 reproduces Bauer 408–411 nearly verbatim.

<sup>25</sup> For instance, Bauer's extensive descriptions of hoplite warfare (320–333), Athenian tactical reforms (396–401) and Hellenistic battle tactics (453–455) have left no trace in the new edition. Similarly, even though Bauer already framed some discussion of Greek and Hellenistic strategy in terms of Hans Delbrück's controversial new concept of 'Niederwerfungsstrategie' (411–412, 421–423), Kromayer replaced these remarks with a detailed discussion of Delbrück's terminology applied to the ancient world (147–162).

Naturally, the decision to consolidate thematic material also applied to the subjects of naval and siege warfare. Since Kromayer knew that his colleagues Köster and Schramm would expand on these subjects in separate chapters, he excised most (but not all) of Bauer's discussion from each chronological section. Schramm used the discarded material to compile the historical introduction to his contribution on siege warfare, which, like Kromayer's text, contains whole pages of Bauer.<sup>26</sup>

The remainder of the handbook follows Bauer's structure. This does not mean, however, that the text was simply reproduced. While Kromayer reused many sections in their entirety, he replaced many others with discussions of his own. The resulting patchwork is outlined below (table 2). In this table, it should be assumed that any section with a direct parallel in Bauer 1893 contains little to no original input from Kromayer. The page numbers listed under '= Bauer' refer to the sections of Bauer's handbook that Kromayer copied, apparently regarding them as an adequate treatment of their subject. Some of these sections were abridged or rearranged, but the majority were reprinted without notable changes.

<b>Pages</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>= Bauer</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
9–17	Sources and scholarship	272–290	Severely abridged. Brief discussion of major new works added
18–27	Mycenaean/Homeric warfare		Original work (some sentences from Bauer)
28–30	Sparta: introduction	301–304	
30–40	Sparta: kingship, army organisation		Original work
41–44	Sparta: navy, allies	319–320, 335–339	
44–62	Athens	340–387, 391–396	Severely abridged
63	Argos	339	
63–67	Thebes	405–408	
67–74	Sicily	412–421	
74–75	Mercenaries: Sparta	333–334	
75–76	Mercenaries: other Greeks		Original work
76–78	Supply and pay		Original work
79–93	Archaic and Classical tactics		Original work
93–95	Tactics: Epameinondas	408–411	

<sup>26</sup> Specifically, Schramm 213–220 contains elements of Bauer 332–333, 387–391, 428–431 and 455–458.

95–98	Philip and Alexander	421–428	Significant chunks moved or deleted
98–120	Macedonian army and tactics		Original work (paragraphs from Bauer on fleet, infantry and cavalry equipment)
121–122	Successors: introduction	441–443	
122–130	Successors: army numbers, organisation, muster		Original work
130–132	Greek states in the Hellenistic period	466–468	
132–135	Macedonian phalanx	443–448	Abridged, rearranged, some new paragraphs
135–136	Phalangite tactics		Original work
137–141	Light troops, cavalry, chariots, elephants	448–453	
141–146	Hellenistic tactics		Original work
147–162	Strategy		Original work
246–247	Concluding remarks	468–469	

Table 2. Origin of Kromayer's text

Table 2 suggests that even the reviewers who spotted Kromayer's debt to Bauer were not fully aware of its scale. Oldfather admits no more than that Kromayer 'frequently takes over from him entire sentences, or even paragraphs'.<sup>27</sup> In Lammert's analysis, Kromayer largely worked independently after the first few chapters, only gradually coming to lean more heavily on Bauer as he reached the Hellenistic period.<sup>28</sup> In fact, nearly half of the work consists of reprinted material. The introduction is an abridged copy; the chapters on Archaic and Classical Greece contain almost nothing new. Reused material is found throughout, even within (or bracketing) new sections written by Kromayer. The two-page summary that Kromayer placed after the chapters by Köster and Schramm is a reproduction of Bauer's final pages with minor alterations.

Unsurprisingly, the bulk of Kromayer's original material addresses his own research interests. His analyses of tactics have their origin in the detailed studies of battles he wrote for the *Antike Schlachtfelder* and the *Schlachten-Atlas*; he also cites the preliminary study he delivered on the subject before his first field expedition.<sup>29</sup> His discussion of Spartan army

<sup>27</sup> Oldfather 1932, 14.

<sup>28</sup> Lammert 1930, 594–595. My reading suggests the opposite: there is much more of Kromayer in the sections on Alexander and Hellenistic warfare.

<sup>29</sup> Kromayer 1900.



organisation draws on his contribution to the debate on the mustering strength of Greek states.<sup>30</sup> His chapter on strategy rests on his polemic with Hans Delbrück just a few years earlier.<sup>31</sup> The exception is the section on Mycenaean and Homeric warfare, for which Kromayer reused only a few sentences from Bauer,<sup>32</sup> even though he had not published on the topic before. He may have found Bauer's largely descriptive account too antiquarian; his own section relies more on grand developmental models in the mould of Meyer's *Geschichte des Altertums*. In any case, for each of these topics Kromayer was happy to throw out Bauer's work and replace it with his own. His tendency to focus his creative efforts on more familiar subjects lends a sad irony to Couissin's remark that his writing was livelier and more engaging when he discussed strategy than when he described arms and armour.<sup>33</sup> The sections Couissin characterised as 'si froid, parfois si ennuyeux' were written by Bauer.

When we turn to the parts where Kromayer did use Bauer's text, such stylistic differences can be a useful guide. They allow us to recognise where Kromayer replaced some of the pre-existing material or added words of his own. Where he did the latter, it is usually in the form of a few short paragraphs, sometimes no more than a sentence long, touching on topics not covered by Bauer or referring to major works of scholarship that had appeared since the second edition was published.<sup>34</sup> One of the most remarkable of these interjections occurs in the introduction, where Kromayer replaced two paragraphs on late and indirect literary evidence with a single sentence stating that papyri are a useful source.<sup>35</sup> Meanwhile, the longer the paragraph, the greater the odds that Bauer wrote it.

A few further hallmarks of Kromayer's editing hand should be mentioned. The first is his tendency to remove the names of other scholars from the main text.<sup>36</sup> While he did not mind reusing some of Bauer's

<sup>30</sup> Kromayer 1903, specifically the second part (173–212) on Lakonia. Surprisingly, the sections of this article on Athens and Boiotia did not stop him from copying Bauer on those states. He does appear to have kept up with the debate for some years afterwards; his bibliography for this section mentions Beloch 1905; 1906; Niese 1907.

<sup>31</sup> Kromayer 147 n. 1 refers the reader to Kromayer '1924' (= Kromayer 1925); see also Delbrück 1925 (with a reply by Kromayer).

<sup>32</sup> For example, parts of Bauer's description of the chariot (298–299) appear in separate places in Kromayer (19–20, 26). Lammert (1930, 594) noted some of these instances.

<sup>33</sup> Couissin 1929, 202.

<sup>34</sup> For example, Kromayer 16–17, 30, 247.

<sup>35</sup> Compare Bauer 280–281; Kromayer 14.

<sup>36</sup> One case of this was identified by Lammert (1930, 593–594).

criticism of Rüstow and Köchly's standard work,<sup>37</sup> he suppressed their names elsewhere. He anonymised or deleted Bauer's repeated engagement with the work of Edmund Lammert and excised praise for Delbrück and Droysen.<sup>38</sup> In a paragraph on the length of the Macedonian *sarisa*, he replaced the names of Johann Gustav Droysen and A. Krause with the anodyne 'ältere Forscher'.<sup>39</sup> He also subtly altered some instances where Bauer himself intruded on the text. One particular interpretation of Polybios, Bauer asserted, 'halte ich nicht für zutreffend'; in Kromayer's version the same interpretation 'ist nicht mit Sicherheit zu erweisen'.<sup>40</sup> The passive voice obscures whose opinion this was.

Perhaps such changes were only a matter of style — a decision to give the main text an air of confident authority and contain controversy in the footnotes. But the convenient result is a work that cannot be as easily dated by the scholarship discussed in the main text. Removing most of the names allowed Kromayer to leave such discussion largely intact without revealing his reliance on a much older work. Readers of his handbook are unlikely to realise that when it deems earlier standard works insufficient 'da das archäologische Material noch lange nicht so reich war wie heute', the 'heute' originally referred to the early 1890s.<sup>41</sup>

Kromayer's second, more objectionable tendency was to abbreviate the bibliographical sections that Bauer included for each chapter. Re-using some of these sections at all was a bold move; as noted above, it was the outdated bibliographical material that brought Oldfather to the realisation that Kromayer had borrowed from Bauer. Several reviewers remarked on the absence of key recent works.<sup>42</sup> But Bauer had been thorough in his compilation of these sections, and it seems Kromayer was not prepared to set aside as much space for them as his predecessor had. For example, the general bibliography that follows Bauer's introductory chapter takes up four packed pages in small print; Kromayer condensed

<sup>37</sup> Bauer 284, 409; Kromayer 16, 94. In the first of these passages, Kromayer helpfully corrected Bauer's idiosyncratic use of commas. The reference is to Rüstow and Köchly 1852.

<sup>38</sup> Compare Bauer 280, 282–283, 285–286, 442–443, 447; Kromayer 14, 16–17, 121–122, 134–135. The last two authors produced monographs on Greek warfare in the period between Bauer's first and second edition (Droysen 1889; Delbrück 1887, 1890), all of which Bauer held in extremely high regard. Bauer also heavily cited Droysen's earlier monograph on the warfare of Alexander (1885).

<sup>39</sup> Compare Bauer 446; Kromayer 134.

<sup>40</sup> Bauer 280; Kromayer 14.

<sup>41</sup> Bauer 284; Kromayer 16.

<sup>42</sup> Couissin 1929, 200; Grosse 1929, 228; Syme 1929, 267; Lammert 1930, 594, 596.

this to less than a page.<sup>43</sup> He added just two entries that post-dated 1893: the first volume of Delbrück's *Geschichte der Kriegskunst*<sup>44</sup> and his own *Antike Schlachtfelder*. Another four pages of scholarship on Athens were deleted altogether, as were several shorter subject bibliographies.<sup>45</sup> Predictably, the brief bibliographies for the chapters Kromayer wrote or revised are much more up to date, citing works as recent as 1926.<sup>46</sup>

These literature sections are just one prominent sign of the strange dual nature of the handbook. In Kromayer's chapters, we find clearly written original research, engagement with contemporary scholarship, and even an unusually conciliatory and constructive attitude to Kromayer's academic nemesis Delbrück. These are exemplary chapters for an introductory work of this kind. Where Kromayer reused the older text, on the other hand, his edition is actually *worse* than Bauer's — offering what amounts to an abridged version of a dated manuscript with a much less comprehensive overview of relevant nineteenth-century scholarship. Some of his attempts to streamline the received text actively diminish its usefulness: in the introduction, Kromayer trimmed down or removed numerous paragraphs on scope, approach and methodology, leaving him without even Bauer's account of what the handbook was trying to achieve.<sup>47</sup>

Modern readers should therefore consult Kromayer's handbook with caution, keeping a close eye on the origin of each section. I hope that this survey and table 2 may serve as a guide. If Kromayer deliberately obscured his dependence on Bauer, it would have reflected badly on him, as two of his contemporary reviewers pointed out; but even if he believed that he was acting in accordance with the terms of his assignment, it remains important for us to acknowledge Bauer's scholarship, as well as his share in the genesis of one of the most widely read handbooks on Greek warfare.

Roel Konijnendijk

*Universiteit Leiden*

r.b.konijnendijk@hum.leidenuniv.nl

<sup>43</sup> Bauer 287–290; Kromayer 17.

<sup>44</sup> He was already able to refer to its third edition (Delbrück 1920).

<sup>45</sup> Bauer 339–340, 401–405, 441, 466.

<sup>46</sup> Kromayer 18, 28, 79, 95. The author retired from his chair in Leipzig in 1927.

<sup>47</sup> Bauer 272–273, 284–287.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bauer, A. 1887. 'Die Kriegsaltertümer', in Busolt, G., Bauer, A. and Müller, I. (eds.), *Die griechischen Staats-, Kriegs- und Privataltertümer (Handbuch der Klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft IV.1)*. Nördlingen. 223–332
- Bauer, A. 1893. 'Die griechischen Kriegsaltertümer', in von Müller, I. and Bauer, A. (eds.), *Die griechischen Privat- und Kriegsaltertümer (Handbuch der Klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft IV.1.2<sup>2</sup>)*. Munich. 269–469
- Beloch, J. 1905. 'Griechische Aufgebote I', *Klio* 5, 341–374
- Beloch, J. 1906. 'Griechische Aufgebote II', *Klio* 6, 34–78
- Cary, M. (?) 1929. Review of Kromayer and Veith, *Heerwesen und Kriegführung der Griechen und Römer*. *JHS* 49.1, 107–108
- Couissin, P. 1929. Review of Kromayer and Veith, *Heerwesen und Kriegführung der Griechen und Römer*. *Revue de Philologie, de Littérature et d'Histoire Anciennes*, 3<sup>rd</sup> series n. 3, 198–203
- Delbrück, H. 1887. *Die Perserkriege und die Burgunderkriege: zwei kombinierte kriegsgeschichtliche Studien*. Berlin.
- Delbrück, H. 1890. *Die Strategie des Perikles erläutert durch die Strategie Friedrichs des Grossen*. Berlin.
- Delbrück, H. 1900. *Geschichte der Kriegskunst im Rahmen der politischen Geschichte I: Das Altertum*. Berlin.
- Delbrück, H. 1920<sup>3</sup>. *Geschichte der Kriegskunst im Rahmen der politischen Geschichte I: Das Altertum*. Berlin.
- Delbrück, H. 1925. 'Zu Kromayers neuer Theorie der Strategie', *Historische Zeitschrift* 132.3, 447–450
- Droysen, H. 1885. *Untersuchungen über Alexander des Grossen Heerwesen und Kriegführung*. Freiburg.
- Droysen, H. 1889. *Heerwesen und Kriegführung der Griechen (K.F. Hermann's Lehrbuch der griechischen Antiquitäten II.2)*. Freiburg.
- Enßlin, W. 1931. Review of Kromayer and Veith, *Heerwesen und Kriegführung der Griechen und Römer*. *Historische Zeitschrift* 143.2, 328–332
- Garlan, Y. 1975. *War in the Ancient World: A Social History*. London.
- Grosse, R. 1929. Review of Kromayer and Veith, *Heerwesen und Kriegführung der Griechen und Römer*. *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 50.1, 224–233
- Hanson, V.D. 1989. *The Western Way of War: Infantry Battle in Classical Greece*. New York.
- Hanson, V.D. 1999. 'The status of ancient military history: traditional work, recent research, and on-going controversies', *Journal of Military History* 63.2, 379–413
- Hanson, V.D. 2007. 'The modern historiography of ancient warfare', in Sabin, P., Whitby, M. and Van Wees, H. (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Warfare I*. Cambridge. 3–21
- Happ, H. and Mildner, P. 2003. 'Georg Veith — Herpetologe, Altertumsforscher und Soldat', *Rudolfinum: Jahrbuch des Landesmuseums Kärnten*, 435–443

- Jackson, M.W. 2003. 'Can artisans be scientific authors? The unique case of Fraunhofer's artisanal optics and the German Republic of Letters', in Biagioli, M. and Galison, P. (eds.) *Scientific Authorship: Credit and Intellectual Property in Science*. New York. 113–131
- Kagan, D. and Viggiano, G.F. 2013. 'The hoplite debate', in Kagan, D. and Viggiano, G.F. (eds.) *Men of Bronze: Hoplite Warfare in Ancient Greece*. Princeton, NJ. 1–56
- Konijnendijk, R. 2018. *Classical Greek Tactics: A Cultural History*. Leiden and Boston.
- Kromayer, J. 1900. 'Vergleichende Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen und römischen Heerwesens', *Hermes* 35, 216–253
- Kromayer, J. 1903. 'Studien über die Wehrkraft und Wehrverfassung der griechischen Staaten, vornehmlich im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.', *Klio* 3, 47–67 and 173–212
- Kromayer, J. 1925. 'Waren Hannibal und Friedrich der Grosse wirklich Ermüdungsstrategie?', *Historische Zeitschrift* 131.3, 393–408
- Kromayer, J. and Veith, G. 1912. *Antike Schlachtfelder: Bausteine zu einer antiken Kriegsgeschichte* III.1. Berlin.
- Kromayer, J. and Veith, G. 1928. *Heerwesen und Kriegführung der Griechen und Römer (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft IV.3.2)*. Munich.
- Lammert, F. 1930. Review of Kromayer and Veith, *Heerwesen und Kriegführung der Griechen und Römer*. *Gnomon* 6.11, 592–599
- MacFarlane, R. 2007. *Original Copy: Plagiarism and Originality in Nineteenth-Century Literature*. Oxford.
- Maurel-Indart, H. 2007. *Plagiats, les Coulisses de l'Écriture*. Paris.
- Mazzeo, T.J. 2007. *Plagiarism and Literary Property in the Romantic Period*. Philadelphia.
- Niese, B. 1907. 'Wehrverfassung, Dienstpflicht und Heerwesen Griechenlands', *Historische Zeitschrift* 98.2, 263–301
- Oldfather, W.A. 1932. Review of Kromayer and Veith, *Heerwesen und Kriegführung der Griechen und Römer*. *The Classical Weekly* 26.2, 13–14
- Rieckenberg, H.J. 1982. 'Kromayer, Johannes', *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 13, 75.
- Rüstow, W. and Köchly, H. 1852. *Geschichte des griechischen Kriegswesens von der ältesten Zeit bis auf Pyrrhos*. Aarau.
- Schellenberg, H.M. forthcoming. *Ancient Military Writers*. Diss. Düsseldorf.
- Schiller, H. 1887. 'Die Kriegsaltertümer', in Schiller, H. and Voigt, M. (eds.), *Die römischen Staats-, Kriegs- und Privataltertümer (Handbuch der Klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft IV.2)*. Nördlingen. 705–741
- Schiller, H. 1893. 'Die Kriegsaltertümer', in Schiller, H. and Voigt, M. (eds.), *Die römischen Staats-, Kriegs- und Privataltertümer (Handbuch der Klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft IV.2<sup>2</sup>)*. Munich. 227–268
- Syme, R. (?) 1929. Review of Kromayer and Veith, *Heerwesen und Kriegführung der Griechen und Römer*. *JRS* 19, 266–267
- Syme, R. 1979. *Roman Papers I–II* (ed. E. Badian). Oxford.

- Terry, R. 2010. *The Plagiarism Allegation in English Literature from Butler to Sterne*. Basingstoke and New York.
- Wheeler, E.L. 1977. *Flavius Arrianus: A Political and Military Biography*. Diss. Duke University.
- Wheeler, E.L. 2007. *The Armies of Classical Greece*. Aldershot.

**APPENDIX**

A comparison of Bauer (1893, 319) and Kromayer (1928, 41) on the Spartan navy shows how the latter copied the former's text verbatim, intervening only to replace the occasional double s with β. I am grateful to Sue Willetts of the Institute of Classical Studies Library, University of London, for her help in scanning these pages.

## 2. Sparta und der Peloponnes. (§ 26.)

319

und nachts wurde auch in der Nähe, von den Skiriten, zu Xenophons Zeit von Söldnern eine Eskorte beigegeben. Im Lager mussten alle mit dem Speer bewaffnet umhergehen, bei den körperlichen Übungen, die veranstaltet wurden, durfte niemand den seiner Mora zugewiesenen Raum verlassen, um von seinen Waffen nicht zu weit entfernt zu sein. Das Lager war also von den Soldaten in der Weise belegt, dass die zusammengehörigen Truppenabteilungen auch zusammen blieben (vgl. Polyän. II 3, 11).

**26. Seemacht.** Die Spartaner sind mit einer überaus geringen Seemacht, fast ganz auf ihre Bundesgenossen angewiesen, in den peloponnesischen Krieg gegangen (Th. I 74, 4; 121, 2); sie selbst waren im Seewesen wenig erfahren, flüchtige Samier fanden als Steuerleute gerne bei ihnen Aufnahme (Th. IV 75, 2). In den spartanischen Flotten erscheinen daher Korinth, Megara, Sikyon, Pellene, Elis, die Amprakioten und Leukadier (Th. II 9, 2) am stärksten vertreten. Diese Bundesgenossen hatten, je nach der Grösse ihrer Seemacht, eine bestimmte Zahl von Schiffen zu stellen.<sup>1)</sup> Noch im Jahre 413 besaßen die Spartaner nur fünfundzwanzig eigene Schiffe (Th. VIII 3, 3), erst die Flotte vor Pylos bestand aus drei- und vierzig Schiffen (Th. IV 11, 1 vgl. II 80, 2). Sparta hatte ferner nur einen Kriegshafen,<sup>2)</sup> in Gytheion.

Für den Oberbefehl der bundesgenössischen Flotte, die gegen Athen aufgestellt werden musste, war in der Nauarchie ein besonderes Amt geschaffen (Th. II 66; 80, 2), das auch Periöken bekleiden konnten (Th. VIII 22, 2). Es bestand das Gesetz, dass derselbe Mann nicht zweimal Nauarch sein dürfe (Xen. Hell. II 1, 7). Wie eine verhältnismässig geringe Zahl eigentlicher Spartiaten im Aufgebot der Hopliten, eine noch kleinere in den Heeren des Bundesaufgebotes hinreichte, um ein Kriegsunternehmen als spartanisches erscheinen zu lassen, so genügten für die grossen überseeischen Unternehmen sogar der Nauarch und Epistoleus<sup>3)</sup> mit seinem Stabe,<sup>4)</sup> um denselben Zweck zu erreichen. Der weitreichende Einfluss des Adels erstreckte sich auch auf den nichtköniglichen Flottenbefehlshaber, denn die Mitglieder seines Stabes, die euphemistisch „Ratgeber“ genannt wurden, konnten, wenn es ihnen nötig schien, selbst das Kommando übernehmen. Hatte ein Nauarch sich etwas zu Schulden kommen lassen, so wurde eine Kommission zur Untersuchung abgeschickt (Th. VIII 39, 2).

Die einzelnen Schiffe wurden von Trierarchen befehligt.<sup>5)</sup> Die Ruderemannschaft bestand aus Heloten und Söldnern.<sup>6)</sup> Die Epibaten, die Marine-Infanterie, waren vermutlich teils Periöken, teils Söldner,<sup>7)</sup> sie waren wahrscheinlich zahlreicher als auf den Kriegsschiffen Athens, denn es wird von den Peloponnesiern noch während des peloponnesischen Krieges berichtet, dass sie durch Entern und den Kampf der Besatzung an Bord den Seekrieg wie zu Lande geführt hätten (Th. I 49, 1 II 84, 1). Wollte man in der

<sup>1)</sup> Th. II 7, 2 vgl. III 16, 3.

<sup>2)</sup> Th. I 108, 3 Xen. Hell. VI 5, 32.

<sup>3)</sup> Xen. Hell. I 1, 23 II 1, 7. Er heisst auch Epistoliaphoros (Hell. VI 2, 25), gemeint ist derselbe bei Thuk. VIII 61, 2, wo statt *ἐπιβάτης* wohl *ἐπιστολεύς* zu lesen ist.

<sup>4)</sup> *σύμβουλοι* Th. II 85, 1; 86, 4 vgl. III 79, 2.

<sup>5)</sup> Th. IV 11, 3 Xen. Hell. II 1, 12.

<sup>6)</sup> Th. VI 91 VIII 45, 2. Xen. Hell. II 1, 12 V 1, 13 ff. VII 1, 12.

<sup>7)</sup> Xen. Hell. V 1, 11 VII 1, 12.



## II. Organisation und Taktik. Die griechischen Freistaaten

41

## 3. Die Seemacht

Die Spartaner sind mit einer überaus geringen Seemacht, fast ganz auf ihre Bundesgenossen angewiesen, in den Peloponnesischen Krieg gegangen (Thuk. I 74, 4; 121, 2); sie selbst waren im Seewesen wenig erfahren, flüchtige Samier fanden als Steuerleute gerne bei ihnen Aufnahme (Thuk. IV 75, 2). In den spartanischen Flotten erscheinen daher Korinth, Megara, Sikyon, Pellene, Elis, die Amprakioten und Leukadier (Thuk. II 9, 2) am stärksten vertreten. Diese Bundesgenossen hatten, je nach der Größe ihrer Seemacht, eine bestimmte Zahl von Schiffen zu stellen.<sup>1</sup> Noch im Jahre 413 besaßen die Spartaner nur fünfundzwanzig eigene Schiffe (Thuk. VIII 3, 3), erst die Flotte vor Pylos bestand aus dreiundvierzig Schiffen (Thuk. IV 11, 1; vgl. II 80, 2). Sparta hatte ferner nur einen Kriegshafen,<sup>2</sup> in Gytheion.

Für den Oberbefehl der bundesgenössischen Flotte, die gegen Athen aufgestellt werden mußte, war in der Nauarchie ein besonderes Amt geschaffen (Thuk. II 66; 80, 2), das auch Periöken bekleiden konnten (Thuk. VIII 22, 2). Es bestand das Gesetz, daß derselbe Mann nicht zweimal Nauarch sein dürfe (Xen. Hell. II 1, 7). Wie eine verhältnismäßig geringe Zahl eigentlicher Spartiaten im Aufgebot der Hopliten, eine noch kleinere in den Heeren des Bundesaufgebotes hinreichte, um ein Kriegsunternehmen als spartanisches erscheinen zu lassen, so genügten für die großen überseeischen Unternehmen sogar der Nauarch und Epistoleus<sup>3</sup> mit seinem Stabe,<sup>4</sup> um denselben Zweck zu erreichen. Der weitreichende Einfluß des Adels erstreckte sich auch auf den nichtköniglichen Flottenbefehlshaber, denn die Mitglieder seines Stabes, die euphemistisch „Ratgeber“ genannt wurden, konnten, wenn es ihnen nötig schien, selbst das Kommando übernehmen. Hatte ein Nauarch sich etwas zu Schulden kommen lassen, so wurde eine Kommission zur Untersuchung abgeschickt (Thuk. VIII 39, 2).

Die einzelnen Schiffe wurden von Trierarchen befehligt.<sup>5</sup> Die Ruderemannschaft bestand aus Heloten und Söldnern.<sup>6</sup> Die Epibaten, die Marineinfanterie, waren vermutlich teils Periöken, teils Söldner,<sup>7</sup> sie waren wahrscheinlich zahlreicher als auf den Kriegsschiffen Athens, denn es wird von den Peloponnesiern noch während des Peloponnesischen Krieges berichtet, daß sie durch Entern und den Kampf der Besatzung an Bord den Seekrieg wie zu Lande geführt hätten (Thuk. I 49, 1; II 84, 1). Wollte man in der Fremde Krieg führen, so wurden die Hopliten auf der Flotte dahin transportiert (Thuk. II 80, 1). Wie die Schiffe ausgerüstet waren, wissen wir nicht.

Die direkte Teilnahme des spartanischen Staates am Kriege zur See war somit auf die Kommandoführung durch den jährlich wechselnden Nauarchen und dessen Stellvertreter, den Epistoleus, beschränkt, Spartiaten sind außer in deren Stab auf der Flotte kaum vertreten. Haben die Spartaner selbst nur ganz wenige Schiffe besessen, so sind auch die Flotten ihrer Bundesgenossen, die unter verschiedenen Nauarchen an dem Peloponnesischen

<sup>1</sup> Thuk. II 7, 2; vgl. III 16, 3.

<sup>2</sup> Thuk. I 108, 3; Xen. Hell. VI 5, 32.

<sup>3</sup> Xen. Hell. I 1, 23; II 1, 7. Er heißt auch Epistoliaphoros (Hell. VI 2, 25), gemeint ist derselbe bei Thuk. VIII 61, 2, wo statt ἐπιβάτης wohl ἐπιστολεύς zu lesen ist.

<sup>4</sup> σύμβουλοι Thuk. II 85, 1. 86, 4; vgl. III 79, 2.

<sup>5</sup> Thuk. IV 11, 3; Xen. Hell. II 1, 12.

<sup>6</sup> Thuk. VI 91; VIII 45, 2; Xen. Hell. II 1, 12; V 1, 13 ff.; VII 1, 12.

<sup>7</sup> Xen. Hell. V 1, 11; VII 1, 12.