

Paweł Madejski

(Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin, Poland)
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3585-0801>
 E-mail: pater.deorum@poczta.umcs.lublin.pl

The Death of M. Licinius Crassus: Between *Mors Aurata* and Euripides' *Bacchae*

Śmierć M. Licyniusza Krassusa: pomiędzy mors aurata a Bachantkami Eurypidesa

ABSTRACT

The defeat at Carrhae is usually seen as a turning point of the Roman imperialism. But this is a view of the modern historiography. For the Latin historiography of the period the defeat was primarily a pretext to justify next military or quasi-military actions. This is why Latin-writing authors stressed a motif of revenge. It is especially manifest when descriptions of M. Licinius Crassus' death are concerned. Although the earliest reports on the matter have not survived to our time, thanks to indirect or direct mentions it is possible to reconstruct the narrations about Crassus' death. The Latin versions stressed Parthian brutality and deceit, while paying less attention to the triumvir himself – and it was a justifiable step – and Crassus' lost. This is the main reason to describe him as a careless general. Too accurate depiction was not necessary and undesirable. Crassus died during a retreat, after his soldiers mutinied, cheated by the Parthians, having no time and opportunity to deliver any last words or perform any symbolic gesture. It was not a digni-

PUBLICATION INFO			
			e-ISSN: 2449-8467 ISSN: 2082-6060
THE AUTHOR'S ADDRESS: Paweł Madejski, the Institute of History of the Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin, 4A Maria Curie-Skłodowska Square, Lublin 20-031, Poland			
SOURCE OF FUNDING: Statutory Research of the Institute of History of the Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin			
SUBMITTED: 2020.01.07	ACCEPTED: 2020.05.28	PUBLISHED ONLINE: 2020.12.21	
WEBSITE OF THE JOURNAL: https://journals.umcs.pl/rh		EDITORIAL COMMITTEE E-mail: reshistorica@umcs.pl	

fied death of a Roman politician, leader or a Roman. The Greek view was more different. Some of the authors of course shared the Roman view, but the other developed a story of a post-mortem fate of Crassus. This motive was known to the Latin readers as well and in the 4th century A.D. developed into a moralizing narration about punished greed. What is more surprising, within this trend Crassus had been brought to life: he suffered *mors aurata* alive! The late antique authors just reworked an element of the narration present already in the Livian version.

Key words: Carrhae, M. Licinius Crassus, Parthians, Roman historiography, Greek historiography, death, decapitation

In ancient historiographic literature the subject of the deaths of famous people has a significant position. In biographical works the description of the death takes a prominent place, sometimes it is even separated from the continuous and chronological narrative about the life of a specific person (as in Suetonius' *Lives of the Twelve Caesars*). There were also separate treatises dedicated entirely to the deaths of famous men¹.

The description of the deaths was interesting for a variety of reasons. For some, it contained an ethical or moralizing and didactic message², for others, it was an opportunity to weave macabre, scandalous, or even obscene elements into their own narrative. In both cases, it made the story more attractive. Death, as an individual phenomenon, could sum up the life of a given person. Undoubtedly canons for assessing death as worthy or unworthy were created³. Simultaneously, combining historical events with didactic or simply fictional elements enriches the ancient messages with the features of bio-fiction or thanatography (in the modern understanding of these terms). However, this phenomenon is slightly different from funeral laudations praising the dead, tombstone eulogia or recalling the dead in speeches⁴, but it is closely related to them, especially in literary terms.

¹ Most of these works have not survived to our times. It is known that the death of Caesar was described by Empylos of Rhodes (Plutarchus, *Vitae parallelae*, ed. C. Sinteis, Lipsiae 1864–1884 [hereinafter: Plut.], *Brutus*, 2). Perhaps Messala and Rufus, mentioned by Pliny the Elder (Caecilius Plinius Secundus C., *Naturalis historia*, ed. C. Mayhoff, Lipsiae 1897–1933 [hereinafter: Pl., *NH*], 7.53) – if they are not a single person – were the authors of works about the circumstances of the death of famous figures. However, the lampoon of Lactantius (L. Caecilius Firmianus Lactantius) on the deaths of emperors-persecutors of Christians (*De mortibus persecutorum*) has been preserved.

² This is usually associated with executions, cf. O. Kubińska, *Przybyłem tu by umrzeć: relacje z placów straceń*, Gdańsk 2013.

³ Cf. K. Sauer, *Untersuchungen zur Darstellung des Todes in der griechisch – römischen Geschichtsschreibung*, Frankfurt 1930.

⁴ Cf. D. Pierzak, *Ab inferis ad rostra: przywoływanie zmarłych w retoryce rzymskiej okresu republikańskiego*, Katowice 2019.

The circumstances of the death of Marcus Licinius Crassus, in contrast to the deaths of some of his contemporaries (Caesar or Cicero, but also M. Antony or Brutus), did not receive much attention in later periods. In common perception, Crassus is primarily an opponent of Spartacus. Of course, descriptions of the triumvir's last moments appear in works dedicated to the Battle of Carrhae (Harran) and his biographies⁵, but they were not the subject of a separate study. The most discussed element of this narrative is the use of Crassus' severed head as a prop during the staging of Euripides' *Bacchae*⁶.

The subject of this article is the Greek and Latin tradition about the death of Crassus after the Battle of Carrhae and about the fate of his remains. The extant testimonies describing the death of the Roman leader, the relations between them and the potential sources of the information quoted⁷ as well as the mechanisms shaping the messages and narrative strategies adopted by individual authors were analyzed. It ends with comments on the reception of descriptions of Crassus' death in later periods. Parthian opinions on this subject are, unfortunately, unknown: messages related to the Battle of Carrhae are no longer extant, although they probably existed⁸.

None of the oldest accounts in which the circumstances of Crassus' death were mentioned – or may have been mentioned – have survived to our times. It can be expected that there were reports sent from Syria by officers who had survived the massacre. Among them was C. Cassius, who for the next two years was successfully defending Roman properties against Parthian attacks⁹. Other soldiers returning from the expedition had to bring their reports as well. In the surviving testimonies from the late 50s and the 40s of the 1st century BC the defeat suffered on the Euphrates is

⁵ G. Traina, *La resa di Roma: 9 giugno 53 a.C., battaglia a Carre*, Bari 2010, pp. 83–90; K. Weggen, *Der lange Schatten von Carrhae: Studien zu M. Licinius Crassus*, Hamburg 2011, pp. 82–94; M. Piegdóń, *Krassus: polityk niespełnionych ambicji*, Kraków 2014, pp. 223–230; G.S. Sampson, *The Defeat of Rome: Crassus, Carrhae & the Invasion of the East*, Barnsley 2015, pp. 140–144.

⁶ D. Braund, *Dionysiac Tragedy in Plutarch, Crassus*, 'Classical Quarterly' 1993, 43, pp. 468–474; A.V. Zadorojniy, *Tragedy and Epic in Plutarch's Crassus*, 'Hermes' 1997, 125, pp. 169–182.

⁷ Cf. K. Regling, *De belli Parthici Crassiani fontibus*, Berlin 1899.

⁸ For instance, Appian mentions that this victory made them feel conceited (Annaeus Lucanus M., *Belli civilis libri decem*, ed. A.E. Housman, London 1926 [hereinafter: Lucan., BC], 2.83), cf. Iordanes, *Romana et Getica*, ed. Th. Mommsen, Berolini 1882, 237; K. Weggen, *op. cit.*, pp. 263–277, 302–304. The Sassanids pursued a policy of deliberately destroying the legacy of their predecessors, see: K. Maciuszak, *Średniopierski poemat 'Drzewo asyryjskie' i jego partyjska geneza*, Kraków 2007, p. 7.

⁹ H. ten Cate Fennema, *Quaestiones Parthicae*, Nijmegen 1882, pp. 78–80.

rarely mentioned. Obviously, this may be the result of the very state of the extant documents. For instance, we do not have the correspondence between Cicero and Atticus from the years 53–52. Cicero himself probably corresponded with Crassus. Possibly, it is where the information about the prophetic *Cauneas!* originated (*de div.* 2.84)¹⁰. What emerges from Cicero's writings¹¹ is only the considerations on the unimaginable defeat (*calamitas maxima*¹²), regarded from the angle of ignored *dirae* and the failure to fulfil the formal requirements for a just war (*bellum iustum*)¹³. It is, therefore, hardly surprising that Cicero himself called the defeat and death of Crassus an infamous and shameful event¹⁴. Current political events, especially the escalating conflict between the two remaining triumvirs, that was soon to trigger the outbreak of the civil war, pushed the topic of the defeat at Carrhae into the background.

Nevertheless, even such sparse information indicates that the narrative of Crassus' Parthian expedition was shaped by the Roman belief that the commander himself was responsible for the defeat (interestingly, Cicero separates the death of both Crassi from the massacre of their army). Crassus thus acquired the features of a scapegoat, which was a common, if not standard, solution used in describing the defeats suffered by the Romans¹⁵. Moreover, opinions about almost proverbial greed of Crassus were added¹⁶. The passages about supernatural signs announcing defeat and

¹⁰ The exclamation of a street fish seller was read as *Cave ne eas!*, cf. K. Weggen, *op. cit.*, pp. 137–138.

¹¹ About Crassus in Cicero's writings, see: K. Nakonieczna-Szcutak, *Triumwirowie i triumwiraty w mowach i pismach Cyconona*, Katowice 2010, pp. 146–153; K. Weggen, *op. cit.*, pp. 121–138.

¹² Tullius Cicero M., *De divinatione, de fato, Timaeus*, ed. R. Giomini, Leipzig 1975 [hereinafter: *Div.*], 1.29; K. Weggen, *op. cit.*, p. 137. It should be remembered, however, that it is a phrase of Appius Claudius Pulcher that was used to insult Gaius Ateius Capito.

¹³ S.P. Mattern-Parkes, *The Defeat of Crassus and the Just War*, 'Classical World' 2003, 96, pp. 387–396.

¹⁴ *Div.*, 2.22: 'sibi interfecto Publio filio exercituque deleto trans Euphratem cum ignominia et dedecore'; K. Weggen, *op. cit.*, p. 137.

¹⁵ Cf. R. Geist, *Der gescheiterte Feldherr (dux ferrox): der besiegte römische Feldherr als literarische Figur bei römischen Niederlagen, dargestellt an ausgewählten schweren Niederlagen von der frühen Republik bis zu Augustus*, Frankfurt 2009, pp. 127–145; G. Traina, *Imperial Views on the Battle of Carrhae*, in: *War in Words: Transformations of War from Antiquity to Clausewitz*, eds. M. Formisano, H. Böhme, Berlin 2010, pp. 209–217; O. Stoll, *Vestigia cladis: Roms Umgang mit militärischen Misserfolg*, Berlin 2019, pp. 51–52.

¹⁶ The accusation of greed presumably developed from the opinion of immense wealth, cf. Tullius Cicero M., *Epistulae ad Atticum*, ed. D.R. Shackleton Bailey, vol. 1–7, Cambridge 1965–1970, 1.4.3, 2.4.2; Tullius Cicero M., *Academica, Tusculanae disputationes*, ed. C.F.W. Müller, Lipsiae 1904, 1.13; idem, *De officiis, de virtutibus*, ed. C. Atzert, Leipzig 1971, 3.75–76; *Div.*, 2.22; Sallustius Crispus C., *Catilina, Iugurtha, ex historiis orationes et*

ignored by Crassus, which should be considered an inseparable element of the story about the leaders who had lost, entered the constructed narrative about the Battle of Carrhae as the result of those versions spreading¹⁷. All these *omina*, however, refer to the defeat, and not to death – none of the surviving accounts mentions a sign announcing Crassus' own death (except perhaps Plut, *Cras.* 17.10). Within the narrative, the same role as the signs from the gods was played by all remarks that the expedition was not a *bellum iustum* – in this case the Romans had to put a lot of effort, because it is hard to suppose that Crassus would act against the senate and the people¹⁸ (opposition to the expedition is a separate issue, which the most ardent exponent was the tribune of the people, G. Ateius Capito¹⁹).

At the same time, however, messages of a different nature began to appear. Most of them have not survived to our times and at best they are known from other texts, the existence of other ones is often a mere hypothesis or even an act of faith of researchers of the subject. One of the first authors would be P. Licinius Apollonius, a freedman of P. Licinius Crassus. In 45 BC, Cicero recommended him to Caesar as a worthy candidate for the author of the Greek description of Caesar's deeds (*fam.* 13.16). About Apollonius it is only known that Cicero met him in Cilicia and that he had already written some historical works (*fam.* 13.16 Shackleton Bailey: '*habet usum, iam pridem in eo genere studi litterarumque versatur*'). Cicero unfortunately did not write anything more specific about the works of Apollonius. Modern scholars attribute to him the authorship of a study about the Crassus' Parthian expedition, positive comments about the role played by Publius Crassus and C. Cassius, as well as the dramatic elements interwoven with the narrative²⁰. The next candidate for the author – an eyewitness of the events – is the King of Armenia, Artavasdes. It is justified by the remark of Plutarch of Chersonesus (*Cras.*

epistulae, ed. A. Eussner, Lipsiae 1917, 48.5; Terentius Varro M., *Saturarum Menippearum fragmenta*, ed. R. Astbury, Leipzig 1985, fr. 36; Pl., *NH*, 33.134; A.V. Zadorojnyi, *op. cit.*, p. 173.

¹⁷ N. Rosenstein, *Imperatores victi: Military Defeat and Aristocratic Competition in the Middle and Late Republic*, Berkeley 1990, pp. 71–72, 89, 162.

¹⁸ Cf. P. Arnaud, *Les guerres parthiques de Gabinius et de Crassus et la politique occidentale des Parthes Arsacides entre 70 et 53 av. J.-C.*, 'Electrum' 1998, 2, pp. 13–34.

¹⁹ Plut., *Crasus*, 16.4–8.

²⁰ On Apollonius, cf. E. Klebs, *Apollonius 60*, in: *Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, vol. 2, Stuttgart 1895, p. 124; A.W. Lintott, *A Historian in Cicero: ad Familiares – P. Licinius (?) Apollonius*, 'Rheinisches Museum für Philologie' 1976, 119, 4, p. 368; E. Rawson, *Crassorum funera*, 'Latomus' 1982, 41, 3, pp. 540–549; C.J. Smith, *P. Licinius Apollonius*, in: *The Fragments of the Roman Historians*, vol. 1, *Introduction*, ed. T.J. Cornell, Oxford 2013, p. 355; G.C. Sampson, *op. cit.*, p. 189.

33.2), that the ruler left behind various literary works, including historical ones²¹. Supposedly, there was also an account of the Parthian expedition and subsequent fights with the forces of Orodes II in Syria, written by C. Cassius or by someone whom the future assassin of Caesar appointed to do it²². According to modern scholars, such a hypothetical account explains the generally favorable portrait of Cassius in the extant descriptions of *expeditio Crassiana*. Considering the fact that Cassius' retreat from the battlefield of Carrhae could be considered an act of cowardice and even desertion, it cannot be ruled out that he himself must have taken care of an appropriate interpretation of events that were not necessarily favorable to his public reputation. There is no evidence of the existence of such a work. Equally hypothetical is the so-called Mesopotamian anonymous text – a Parthian Greek's account of an expedition and the battle that would later be used by others, notably Pompey Troge (Pompeius Trogus) and Plutarch²³.

The Mesopotamian anonymous text is the first of the Greek-language works dedicated to or mentioning Crassus' expedition, among which the most important was the text of Apollodorus of Artemita, the author of the unpreserved *Parthica*. This work was certainly known to Strabo of Amaseia and Pompey Troge, and perhaps also (at least indirectly) to Solinus²⁴. According to the findings of V.P. Nikonorov, Apollodorus described the Battle of Carrhae, whereas Posidonius of Apameia²⁵, deceased around 51 BC author of the treatise on the Parthians, did not. Strabo, mentioning Apollodorus, added a note about the authors of works on Parthian history creating along with him (Strabo 2.5.12: 'τῶν τὰ Παρθικὰ συγγραψάντων τῶν περὶ Ἀπολλόδωρον τὸν Ἀρτεμιτηνόν'). These τὰ Παρθικὰ συγγραψάντοι are usually considered students or associates of Apollodorus himself, but in my opinion this term should be understood as authors writing at the same time as Apollodorus about the history of the Parthians, including Crassus' expedition²⁶. Perhaps this heavy defeat of the Romans caused at least a temporary demand for works about their

²¹ W.W. Tarn, *The Greeks in Bactria and India*, London 1951, p. 52, rejects this possibility; G.C. Sampson, *op. cit.*, p. 190.

²² Kurt Regling considered the Cassian account as the basis for later Latin accounts (K. Regling, *De belli*, p. 60), the position was repeated by, among others: F.E. Adcock, *Marcus Crassus, Millionaire*, Cambridge 1966, p. 51; E. Rawson, *op. cit.*, *passim*; G.C. Sampson, *op. cit.*, p. 190.

²³ K. Regling, *De belli*, pp. 3–11; W.W. Tarn, *op. cit.*, pp. 51–52; V.P. Nikonorov, *Apollodorus of Artemita and the Date of his Parthica Revisited*, 'Electrum' 1998, 2, p. 108.

²⁴ V.P. Nikonorov, *op. cit.*, pp. 107, 115; G.C. Sampson, *op. cit.*, p. 197.

²⁵ V.P. Nikonorov, *op. cit.*, pp. 109, 119; G.C. Sampson, *op. cit.*, p. 197.

²⁶ V.P. Nikonorov, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

vanquishers or explaining the success of the Parthians. This would be a phenomenon analogous to that which, more than 200 years later, Lucian of Samosata would ridicule: a deluge of not very sophisticated works devoted to important current events considered decisive, especially wars²⁷. Nothing is known about them, nor is it clear for whom they were intended: for the Greeks in general, for the Parthian Greeks, for the Parthians or perhaps for the Romans²⁸. If a lot of them were indeed created and some of them reached Rome, the hypothesis can be proposed that it was in the circle of such works where the belief that Parthians can be defeated only by the king was developed. Originally, it could come down to the conclusion, one inconvenient for the Roman rulers of the East and favorable to the Parthians, that, since Crassus was defeated by merely a servant of the king, who at that time fought with the opponent worthy of his majesty, king Artavasdes of Armenia, the Romans, not ruled by the king, will never be able to beat the Parthians. In Rome it turned into a rumor, popular around 44 BC, and apparently taken from the Sibylline Books²⁹, that in order to defeat the Parthians Caesar would assume the title of king.

In the meantime, Roman-Parthian relations became more active. Caesar thought about undertaking an expedition to the Parthia, but the attempt on his life prevented him from realizing his plans. The Romans turned their swords against their fellow citizens again. When in 40 BC

²⁷ *Quom. hist. conscr.* 2 Jacobitz: 'ὡς οὖν ἐνι, φασίν, ἐνι παραβαλεῖν, τὸ Ἀβδηρικὸν ἐκείνο πάθος καὶ νῦν τοὺς πολλοὺς τῶν πεπαιδευμένων περιελήλυθεν, οὐχ ὡστε τραγωδεῖν — ἔλαττον γὰρ ἂν τοῦτο παρέπαιον ἀλλοτρίοις ἰαμβεῖοις, οὐ φαύλοισι κατεσχημένοι — ἀλλ' ἀφ' οὗ δὴ τὰ ἐν ποσὶ ταῦτα κекίνηται, ὁ πόλεμος ὁ πρὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους καὶ τὸ ἐν Ἀρμενίᾳ τραῦμα καὶ αἱ συνεχεῖς νίκαι, οὐδεὶς ὅστις οὐχ ἱστορίαν συγγράψει, μᾶλλον δὲ Θεουκιδίδα καὶ Ἡρόδοτο καὶ Ξενοφῶντες ἡμῖν ἅπαντες, καὶ ὡς εἰκοεν, ἀληθὲς ἄρ' ἦν ἐκείνο τὸ πόλεμος ἀπάντων πατῆρ, εἴ γε καὶ συγγραφέας τοσούτους ἀνέφυσεν ὑπὸ μιᾷ τῇ ὀρμῇ'; cf. A.M. Kemzis, *Lucian, Fronto, and the Absence of Contemporary Historiography under the Antonines*, 'American Journal of Philology' 2010, 131, 3, p. 293; Ch. Mallan, *The Parthica of Pseudo-Appian*, 'Historia' 2017, 66, 3, pp. 375–376; P. Madejski, *Exercises in Loss or Absence? Ancient Historiography and the Marcomannic Wars*, in: *Marcomannic Wars and Antonine Plague: selected essays on two disasters that shook the Roman World*, eds. M. Erdrich et al., Brno-Lublin 2020.

²⁸ Although it is believed that it was a philo-Parthian circle – F. Muccioli, *La testa mozza di Crasso (Plut., Cras. 32–33): a proposito di un libro recente sulla battaglia di Carré*, 'Electrum' 2012, 19, p. 168.

²⁹ Such a genesis could also suggest that the Jews who had hostile attitude towards Rome and friendly towards Parthians joined the trend of writing about Crassus' expedition (after Carrhae, another rebellion broke out – Flavius Iosephus, *Antiquitatum Iudaicarum libri*, rec. W. Dindorff, Paris 1845 [hereinafter: Ios., AI], 14.5.6). At the same time, the influence of Jewish pilgrims from the Mesopotamian territories coming to Jerusalem cannot be ruled out, cf. M.J. Olbrycht, *Imperium Parthicum: kryzys i odbudowa państwa Arsakidów w pierwszej połowie pierwszego wieku po Chrystusie*, Kraków 2013, p. 20.

the Parthians invaded Roman Syria, M. Antony's legate, P. Ventidius, successfully confronted them. He defeated them in two great battles and was the first to be privileged to celebrate *de Parthiis* triumph on November 27, 38 BC³⁰. The work of Julius Polyaeus of Sardis, to whom Suda (*Π* 1955 Adler) attributes the authorship of Θριάμβος Παρθυικός in three books, is related to this event. Most researchers assume that it concerned Ventidius' victories³¹, only Ronald Syme proved that the work of Polyaeus was connected with the expedition of G. Caesar in 2 BC to the East³². Not much later the history of M. Antony's expedition against the Parthians was written. This campaign ended with an even heavier defeat than that of the Crassi. Its author was Quintus Dellius, then a supporter of Antony. Dellius left a description in the style of Xenophon, favorable to Antony and possibly to Cassius as well, quoted by Strabo and Plutarch and considered by many researchers to be Plutarch's main source of information about the Crassus' expedition³³.

When the works about the battles with the Parthians in the years 40–38 BC had been written, the narrative about the Crassi expedition was interwoven with the theme of revenge for their failure. This is confirmed in the later repeated reports that the Battle of Mount Gindarus, in which Pacorus was killed, allegedly took place on the same day as the Battle of Carrhae (Cass. Dio 49.21.2–3)³⁴, as well as in the account of how the severed head of the Parthian prince was displayed in Greek cities as a visible sign of taking revenge for the death of Crassus³⁵. Undoubtedly, the theme of revenge had a fundamental influence on the formation of at least one trend in the narrative about the Crassi expedition. The deaths

³⁰ Velleius Paterculus, *Historiarum libri duo*, ed. W.S. Watt, Leipzig 1989 [hereinafter: Vell. Pat.], 2.65.3; Valerius Maximus, *Factorum et dictorum memorabilium libri novem cum Iulii paridis et Ianuarii Nepotiani epitomis*, ed. C. Kempf, Stuttgart 1966 [hereinafter: Val. Max.], 6.9.9; Pl., *NH*, 7.135; Plut., *Antonius*, 34.5; Cornelius Fronto M., *Epistulae*, ed. M.P.J. van den Hout, Leiden 1974, *ad Verrum*, 2.1.7; Gellius Aul., *Noctes Atticae*, ed. C. Hosius, Lipsiae 1903, 15.4.4; Eutropius, *Breviarium ab urbe condita*, rec. C. Santini, Leipzig 1979, 7.5; M. Reinhold, *An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History: Books 49–52 (36–29 B.C.)*, Atlanta 1988, pp. 51–52.

³¹ S.P. Mattern, *Rome and the Enemy: Imperial Strategy in the Principate*, Berkeley 1999, p. 66.

³² *Anatolica: Studies in Strabo*, Oxford 1995, p. 155.

³³ M.S. Popławski, *Polityczna publicystyka w dobie Cezara i Augusta*, Lublin 1935, pp. 189–190; F. Adcock, *op. cit.*, p. 59; S.P. Mattern, *op. cit.*, p. 66; G.C. Sampson, *op. cit.*, p. 189.

³⁴ K. Regling, *Crassus' Partherkrieg*, 'Klio' 1907, 7, pp. 388–389; M. Reinhold, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

³⁵ Cassius Dio Cocceianus, *Historiarum Romanarum quae supersunt*, ed. V.P. Boissevain, Berolini 1895–1931 [hereinafter: Cass. Dio], 49.20.3–4; Iordanes, *Romana*, 237: 'sic Crassianam cladem Ventidius Pacori caput Labiniique morte pensavit, nec sit contentus populus Romanus Crassiano interitu oblivisci nisi adhuc saevit in Parthos'; M. Reinhold, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

of both became an essential component of the narrative, but it also made it shallow. This clearly appeared in Augustan poetry. The active politics of the first princeps brought significant success: the return of the legionary symbols lost by Crassus and M. Antony and the return of prisoners³⁶ captured at Carrhae and later held in Margiana³⁷. Along with these prisoners, potential new sources of information came (cf. Tac., *Ann.* 1.61). The same can be expected from the Parthian refugees, exiles and envoys who visited Rome more and more often: Artaxares of Adiabene, sons of Phraates IV, Tiridates I, expelled with a large group of courtiers³⁸. To this group we should add Roman informants operating at the Parthian court, e.g. in the closest circle of Queen Musa³⁹. Theoretically, then, one would expect a new narrative to emerge. However, this did not happen. Considering the surviving evidence, the theme of defeat and revenge was still dominant for it. As mentioned, the main exponent of this approach is Augustan poetry⁴⁰. It is not entirely clear what influence this had on the great historical undertakings of Augustus' era, above all on Timagenes, C. Asinius Pollio and Livy (T. Livius). The works of Timagenes and Asinius have not survived at all and those of Livy have survived incomplete. It is assumed, however, that Asinius was responsible for marginalizing the role of Crassus in Roman history and subordinating it to the struggles of Caesar and Pompey – in this approach the death of Crassus (along with the death of Julia) was reduced to the cause of the outbreak of the civil war. Timagenes' influence on Plutarch is noticeable⁴¹. Livy probably used the information available to him to create a coherent narrative that would undoubtedly emphasize the issue of the signs of defeat. He is also credited with introducing the theme of subsequent wars with Parthia as a revenge for the deaths of both Crassi. According to Kurt Regling, he was also the one who included the story of pouring liquid gold into Crassus' mouth⁴². Livy's

³⁶ On this subject, see: H.L. Kryśkiewicz, *Signa recepta w starożytnym Rzymie 20 roku przed Chrystusem: kontekst polityczny oraz ideologiczny sukcesu*, Szczecin 2016.

³⁷ Servius Maurus Honoratus, *In Vergilii carmina commentarii*, eds. G. Thilo, H. Hagen, Lipsiae 1881, 3.5.5–12; Pl., *NH*, 6.46–47; Iulius Solinus C., *Collectanea rerum mirabilium*, ed. K. Brodersen, Darmstadt 2014, 48.3.

³⁸ M.J. Olbrycht, *op. cit.*, pp. 17–20, 133–134, 137–138, 140–141 with testimonies.

³⁹ On her role: Ios., *AI*, 18.2.4; W.H. Schoff, *Parthian Stations by Isidore of Charax*, Philadelphia 1914, p. 25.

⁴⁰ M. Wiseman, *Die Parther in der augusteischen Dichtung*, Frankfurt 1982, pp. 102–130; K. Weggen, *op. cit.*, pp. 143–144; R. Ash, *Shadow-Boxing in the East: the Spectacle of Romano-Parthian Conflict in Tacitus*, in: *War as Spectacle: Ancient and Modern Perspectives on the Display of Armed Conflict*, eds. A. Bakogianni, V.M. Hope, London 2015, pp. 139–140; T. Babnis, *Augustan Poets on the Roman-Parthian Treaty of 20 BC*, 'Classica Cracoviensia' 2017, 20, pp. 5–44.

⁴¹ K. Regling, *De belli*, p. 60.

⁴² *Ibidem*, pp. 22–23, 59.

message, drawn directly from his work or through the famous epitome, became the basis for almost all subsequent texts, especially the Latin ones. Only Plutarch's *Crassus* constitutes another equally coherent source. This biography originated somewhere between 114 and 120 AD along with other Roman biographies⁴³. It is the first such consistent message among all those preserved to our times, therefore it is the standard basis for any reconstruction. It is unclear what exactly Plutarch was basing his writing about Crassus on. During the early years of his career, the biographer from Chaeronea referred to Fenestella, but what he used as a basis for his description of the expedition remains a mystery. Potential sources include works by Dellius, Nicolaus of Damascus, Timagenes, Livy (or an epitome of his work), a source shared by him and Cassius Dio, or a Greek work he shared with Appian.

The resumption of intensive actions against the eastern neighbor midway through the 2nd century brought a deluge of historical works mentioned already by Lucian. Apart from the flippant authors ridiculed by Lucian, this topic was also taken up by Arrian of Nicomedia (Flavius Arrianus), who devoted one book of his missing *Parthica* to Crassus. Polyaeus might have known Arrian's *Parthica*; hence, the similarities in the description of the events between him and Cassius Dio⁴⁴. Appian of Alexandria was to write a similar work (at least he had announced it – BC 2:18, 67; 5.65.276; *Syr.* 51.260 – but even if his *Parthica* had been written, they have not survived⁴⁵), and finally – Cassius Dio. In this way the store of knowledge available in our times was developed.

It allows for an attempt to reconstruct the historiographic image of Crassus' last moments and to define the rules governing these sources. The first element of the narrative is the place and time of death. Only three authors – Strabo, Plutarch, and Cassius Dio – provide the exact location, i.e. the hills or hill called Sinnaca (Σίννακα), a name derived from the Aramaic language. Their current location is unknown, but they must be not far from Carrhae, which is today's Altınbaşak in Turkey⁴⁶. Other authors, especially Latin ones, simply indicate Carrhae⁴⁷, or the

⁴³ C. Pelling, *Plutarch and History: Eighteen Studies*, Swansea 2011, pp. 1–44.

⁴⁴ E.L. Wheeler, *Polyainos: scriptor militaris*, in: *Polyainos: neue Studien*, ed. K. Brodersen, Berlin 2010, p. 41.

⁴⁵ Ch. Mallan, *op. cit.*, pp. 362–381.

⁴⁶ H. Cameron, *Making Mesopotamia: Geography and Empire in a Romano-Iranian Borderland*, Leiden 2019, pp. 141–142.

⁴⁷ Cf. Pl., *NH*, 5.86: 'Carrhas, Crassi clade nobili'; Ammianus Marcellinus, *Rerum gestarum libri qui supersunt*, ed. W. Seyfarth, Leipzig 1978, 23.3.1: 'Crassorum et Romani exercitus aerumnis insigne'; C. *Sollius Apollinaris Sidonius*, ed. P. Mohr, Lipsiae 1895, 2.455: 'ad Carrhas'; cf. *Ibidem*, 9.251; Orosius, *Historia adversus paganos*

deserts on the Euphrates⁴⁸ as the place of Crassus' death, or they entirely fail to mention it⁴⁹. Interestingly, also Isidore of Charax did not consider it appropriate to include any mention in the description of the vicinity of Carrhae⁵⁰. In the course of subsequent wars, Roman legions avoided this region⁵¹, although in April 217 emperor Caracalla was murdered nearby⁵². There are also no traces of searching for the remains of the fallen in order to arrange their proper burial, as was the case after the battle in the Teutoburg Forest (Tac., *Ann.* 1.61–62). The omission of the exact location of elder Crassus' death could have resulted from two reasons. The first was the influence of a narrative displaying an element of revenge, which, as mentioned, simplified the message and made it necessary to trigger emotions with a slogan – only the name of the city, Carrhae, could serve as one. The second is a deliberate bypassing the Sinacca issue – had it been included in the story, it could have been interpreted as a statement that the Roman commander was fleeing from the battlefield instead of a falling with dignity (younger Crassus meets the condition of a soldier's dignified death⁵³) – Valerius Maximus even draws an image of the general's body lying on a pile of soldiers' corpses (1.6.11 Briscoe: '*corpus imperatoris inter promiscuas cadaverum strues*'; the adjective *promiscuus* suggests that it is about the fallen of both fighting sides). The commanders who suffered military defeats were criticized primarily for all kinds of negligence and this is also the case of Crassus (cf. Val. Max. 1.6.11), with the standard addition about his blind thirst for gold. However, they were not accused of cowardice. In such narrative,

libri VII, ed. C. Zangemeister, Lipsiae 1889, 6.13.4: 'prope Carras'; cf. *Ibidem*, 6.12.8: 'apud Parthos'; see: T.M. Green, *The City of the Moon God: Religious Traditions of Harran*, Leiden 1992, p. 47.

⁴⁸ Propertius Sex., *Elegiarum libri IV*, ed. P. Fedeli, Bonn 2006, 4.6.83–84: 'gaude, Crasse, nigras si quid sapis inter harenas / ire per Euphraten ad tua busta licet'; Ovidius Naso P., *Fastorum libri VI*, eds. E.H. Alton et al., Leipzig 2005, 6.465; Val. Max., 6.9.9: 'in hostili solo'; Annaeus Seneca, *Oratorum et rhetorum, sententiae, divisiones, colores*, ed. A.G. Kiessling, Lipsiae 1872, *Controversiae*, 2.1.7: 'apud Parthos'; Lucan., *BC*, 8.433–439.

⁴⁹ Servius Maurus Honoratus, *In Vergilii carmina commentarii*, eds. G. Thilo, H. Hagen, Lipsiae 1881 [hereinafter: Serv.], *ad Aeneam*, 7.606; Annaeus Florus L., *Epitome rerum Romanarum/Epitome of Roman history*, ed. E. Seymour Forster, London 1929 [hereinafter: Florus], 1.46.

⁵⁰ W.H. Schoff, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

⁵¹ K. Maksymiuk, *Geography of Roman-Iranian Wars: Military Operations of Rome and Sasanian Iran*, Siedlce 2015, pp. 29, 32, 44, 46, 55, 79. About the fate of the city under Roman rule, see: T.M. Green, *op. cit.*, pp. 48–51.

⁵² O. Hekster, T. Kaizer, *An Accidental Tourist? Caracalla's Trip to the Temple of the Moon at Carrhae/Harran*, 'Ancient Society' 2012, 42, pp. 89–107; T.M. Green, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

⁵³ M. Piegdorń, *op. cit.*, pp. 223–224.

Crassus constituted both the scapegoat for defeat, but also the pretext for revenge, i.e. a renewed expedition against the Parthians, this time without committing his mistakes.

The same remarks can be applied to the accuracy of determining the time of death. It is not absolute chronology that is important here, but relative chronology. Mentions in most Latin sources show that Crassus died during the Battle of Carrhae, only the better-informed Plutarch and Cassius Dio say that it happened later, on 15 June⁵⁴ (no day date is given). June as the month of the battle is also known to Ovid (*Fasti* 6. 465–468). As in the case of localization, it was also about *decorum* – the death of a Roman commander during a battle looks better than his death during a retreat.

As for the circumstances of death, there is a greater unanimity in the testimonies. There is no doubt that the commander of the army of the Parthian king Surena sought to capture Crassus alive (cf. Oros. 6.13.4). He probably wanted to send him to his overlord, as he previously did with Mithridates (Justin. 42.4.4). Some authors attribute far-reaching plans to Surena, recognising that he was seeking to prevent the conflict from escalating (Plut., *Cras.* 30; Cass. Dio 40.26.1–2; Polyæn. 7.41). There was also a well-founded fear that the Romans, relatively safe in the hilly terrain, would manage to break through to Syria (considering the presence of royal forces in Armenia and Abgar's betrayal, they could hardly think of a retreat to Artavasdes or nearby Edessa)⁵⁵. Either way, Surena offered to sign the alliance on *status quo ante* terms with the Roman commander. His offer was accepted by Crassus with mistrust, but he was forced to engage in talks by the mutiny of his own subordinates (Plut., *Cras.* 30 4–5). Crassus with several companions, among them his legate Octavius, tribune Petronius and two Roscii brothers, descended to the foot of the hill, where he met two half-Greeks from Carrhae sent by Surena. Roscii brothers went to Surena but were stopped by the Parthians and did not return to Crassus. It is not known whether Crassus himself managed to notice this, because at that time he received a horse from Surena with a rich trapping and recommendation that he mount it and ride with his Sakian counterpart to the Euphrates. Two Parthian servants tried to put Crassus on a horse, or to direct him, already mounted, to the positions of their troops. In Crassus' surroundings, this was considered an attempted kidnapping. Octavius killed one of the servants and was soon killed himself. A fight ensued or, as some researchers say, there was a commotion in which Crassus was killed. Only Festus mentions that he made an escape

⁵⁴ K. Regling, *Crassus'*, p. 390; G. Traina, *La resa*, p. 83.

⁵⁵ K. Regling, *De belli*, p. 21; idem, *Crassus' Partherkrieg*, p. 391.

attempt (*Brev.* 17.2). None of the authors mentions what wounds he died from. When he was lying on the ground, already dead or still alive, one of the Parthians, a certain Pomaxathres/Exatres, cut off his head and right hand⁵⁶. Only Cassius Dio states that it is not known exactly who killed him and that it could have been a Roman who wanted to prevent his leader from being taken prisoner (40.27.1–2).

The description of the circumstances of Crassus' death at first glance clearly indicates that the Roman commander did not die in a dignified manner, in a battle on the battlefield, nor did he at least commit suicide. The latter version is allowed mercifully, and only as one of the possibilities, by Cassius Dio. However, for Latin authors it was necessary to present the meeting with Surena, because in this way they showed Parthian perfidy and treachery. Cutting off the head and the right hand was not condemned, because it was a common practice, often used by the Romans themselves⁵⁷.

The death of Crassus, however, brings another three problems, perhaps the most interesting ones.

Crassus' head and his right hand were sent back to Orodes II – nothing surprising about that. In the earlier Persian tradition such trophies were normal, it was the case of the body of Cyrus the Younger⁵⁸. In Parthian culture, it was a common wish to see the enemy's head eaten by vermins⁵⁹. The interesting thing, however, is what was done to Crassus' head. According to ancient accounts, the Parthian governor of Mesopotamia, Silakes, brought the trophies to Orodes at a time when he and Artavasdes were celebrating the wedding of the Armenian ruler's sister to Pacorus. They were graced by the staging of Euripides' *Bacchae*⁶⁰. Almost as *deus ex machina*, the head was brought in when the actor, Jason of Tralles, was delivering the part of Agave with Pentheus' head in her hands. He then handed over the mask of Pentheus he was holding and took Crassus' head in its place⁶¹. This information, most fully described by Plutarch, caused a lively discussion among scientists about the credibility of this description. Some researchers consider the description as true as possible, while others consider it Plutarch's invention. Technical issues (the sympotic habit of singing fragments of the tragedy) related to Jason's performance are,

⁵⁶ Plut., *Crassus*, 31.5–6; Polyaeus, *Stratagematon libri octo*, ed. J. Melber, Leipzig 1887 [hereinafter: Polyaeus.], 7.41.

⁵⁷ G. Traina, *Note in margine alla battaglia di Carre*, 'Electrum' 2009, 15, p. 242.

⁵⁸ Plut., *Artaxerxes*, 13.2; B. Proc, *Plutarch z Cheronai: żywot Artakserksesa: wstęp, tekst grecki, przekład, komentarz*, Lublin 2019, pp. 334–335.

⁵⁹ K. Maciuszak, *op. cit.*, pp. 131, 144.

⁶⁰ According to other interpretations, Jason of Tralles only quoted a fragment of the play.

⁶¹ Plut., *Crassus*, 33.2–4; Polyaeus., 7.41; K. Regling, *Crassus'*, p. 393.

however, highly credible⁶². The interpretations about the deeper layer hidden in Crassus' biography – the deliberate disguise of the Roman as a godless Pentheus – gained particular popularity⁶³. However, this interpretation should be considered too loose. Undoubtedly, Plutarch's description contains a clear moralizing message, but if the biographer himself had wanted to refer to the fate of Pentheus, he would have clearly indicated it to help the reader in the proper reception of his work.

A piece of gold was put in the severed head's mouth⁶⁴, which soon turned into information about pouring liquid gold and finally resulted in the myth of *mors aurata*: pouring liquid gold into Crassus' mouth⁶⁵. So he would have met the fate of Manius Aquilius, who in 88 AD by the order of King Mithridates VI was executed in front of the crowd gathered in the theater in Pergamon by pouring liquid gold into his mouth⁶⁶. In Persia and the East, there was a punishment, whereby molten metal⁶⁷, probably lead (melts at 327.5 degrees Celsius; gold – in 1064 degrees), was poured down the condemned man's throat. In this case, however, the punishment was not the case – Crassus was not Orodes' subject⁶⁸. The message of pouring gold made purely moralizing sense – it was a punishment for excessive greed. And to reinforce this message, a version was introduced that this was how Crassus was treated still during his lifetime. It gained popularity in later periods, perhaps in the 4th century. In any case, in Jerome's *Chronicon*, both Crassi are captured

⁶² L. Prauscello, *Singing Alexandria: Music Between Practice and Textual Transmission*, Leiden 2006, p. 108, annotation 349.

⁶³ D. Braund, *op. cit.*, p. 468 and passim; L. Prauscello, *op. cit.*, pp. 108–109.

⁶⁴ Cass. Dio., 40.27.2.

⁶⁵ Florus, 1.46; *The Breviarium of Festus*, ed. J.W. Eadie, London 1967, 17.3; Serv., *ad Aeneam*, 7.606; Fulgentius mythographus, *De aetatibus mundi et hominis*, in: Fulgentii Planciadis Opera, ed. R. Helm, Leipzig 1898, 11.43, Helm with the term *mors aurata*.

⁶⁶ Appiani, *Historia Romana*, vol. 1, ed. P. Viereck, Lipsiae 1939, *Mithr.*, 21; Diodorus, *Bibliotheca historica*, rec. C.T. Fisher, Lipsiae 1859, 37.26–27; Vell. Pat., 2.18; Pl., *NH*, 33.14.48–49; Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae*, ed. G. Keibel, Leipzig 1887–1890, 5.50; A. Mayor, *The Poison King: the Life and Legend of Mithridates, Rome's Deadliest Enemy*, Princeton 2010, p. 169.

⁶⁷ L. Ballesteros Pastor, *Troy Between Mithridates and Rome*, in: *Mithridates VI and the Pontic kingdom*, ed. J. Munk Højte, Aarhus 2009, p. 11; B. Proc, *op. cit.*, pp. 354–355. On the technical issues, see: M.H. Harris, *Hebraic Literature: Translations from the Talmud, Midrashim and Kabbala*, London 1901, p. 170; F.R.W. van de Groot, R.L. ten Berge, R. Vos, *Molten Gold Was Poured Down His Throat until His Bowels Burst*, 'Journal of Clinical Pathology' 2003, 56, p. 157.

⁶⁸ As a parallel, the treatment of the head of Cyrus by Queen Tomyris is recalled – the severed head of the Persian king was thrown into a sack of blood to finally satisfy his thirst for blood (Herodotus, *Historiae*, rec. K. Hude, Oxonii 1912, 1.213). According to Kurt Sauer, it was a kind of 'refined barbaric revenge', which 'cannot be denied courtly elegance: Crassus's head becomes a work of art', K. Sauer, *op. cit.*, p. 59, but he did not develop these observations.

alive⁶⁹. The scene of pouring liquid gold into living Crassus' mouth as a punishment for greed has been taken up in European literature and art, although not particularly frequently⁷⁰.

It cannot be ruled out, however, that the description of Crassus' death influenced the descriptions of the death of King Władysław of Varna – the circumstances (broken treaty) and certain details are similar (the king is lying on the ground at the feet of a Turkish commander, and janissary Chyzyr cuts his head off)⁷¹.

Now, in Mesopotamia, Surena made a victorious entry to Seleucia, graced by the so-called triumph of Crassus. A prisoner, one most similar to Crassus, was selected, dressed in women's robes and placed at the head of the procession of musicians, actors, prostitutes and lictors, who carried fasces decorated with purses and the severed heads of fallen Romans⁷². Of course, it was not a triumph (how would the Parthians know the details of this ceremony), but a parody of the Roman governor's entry into the city and province. Once again, the theme of Roman greed, widespread throughout Asia, was used⁷³.

In the testimonies, there is no more data about Crassus' remains. His corpse, as well as those of his soldiers, was never buried. Among the researchers only Giusto Traina concluded that the Parthians, leaving Crassus' body to be eaten by dogs and birds, followed their proper ritual of display⁷⁴. However, the display itself was only a part of the funeral rituals and there is no word about their completion. Even in Parthian customs the corpses of fallen Romans were treated as carcass. Sometimes Roman poetry mentions the tombs of Crassi⁷⁵, but this is only a literary device. Poets wrote rather about the unworthy treatment of the corpses⁷⁶.

⁶⁹ Hieronymus, *Chronicon Eusebii*, ed. R. Helm, Berlin 1913, p. 237: 'Crassus consul cum filio suo apud Carras captus'.

⁷⁰ Cf. Dante Alighieri, *La Divina comedia*, Roma 2017, 20.116–117 about the ideas in art: J. Miziołek, *The Punishment of Licinius Crassus and Other Exempla Iustitiae at the Artus Court in Gdańsk in the Context of the Netherlandish, German, and Italian Art*, 'Quaestiones Mediae Aevii Novae' 2005, 10, pp. 345–374.

⁷¹ About the descriptions, see: E. Potkowski, *Warna 1444*, Warszawa 1990, p. 198; J.A. Chrościcki, *Najstarsze przedstawienie 'Śmierci króla Władysława III po Warną' – na rysunku Jacopo Belliniego*, in: *Aetas media, aetas moderna: studia ofiarowane profesorowi Henrykowi Samsonowiczowi w siedemdziesiątą rocznicę urodzin*, eds. A. Bartoszewicz et al., Warszawa 2000, pp. 541–552.

⁷² Plut., *Crassus*, 32.2–3.

⁷³ E. Sanford, *Roman Avarice in Asia*, 'Journal of Near Eastern Studies' 1950, 9, 1, pp. 28–36.

⁷⁴ G. Traina, *La resa*, pp. 85–87.

⁷⁵ Prop. 4.6.83–84.

⁷⁶ Val. Max., 6.9.9: 'in hostili solo miserabiliter iacentibus'; Lucan., *BC*, 8.433–439.

Concluding, Crassus' death should be considered unworthy of a Roman⁷⁷, and it is interpreted as such⁷⁸. Even in historiographic terms, Crassus is not the master of his last moments – he does not utter any last words, nor does he make any gesture to save his dignity, such as Caesar stabbed with daggers. After all, these inconveniences were turned in favor of the Roman ideology: Parthians were presented as an opponent devoid of all culture, a people treacherous and barbaric. With time, however, the moralizing message of Crassus' fate came also to be emphasized. In the historiosophical sense, it was most fully expressed by Plutarch – all those who in one way or another participated in the murder of the Roman leader, suffered punishment at the hands of the historical nemesis. Later that same year, Orodes II ordered to kill Surena (*Cras.* 33.5), the traitor Andromachos was burned alive by the people of Carrhae (Athen. 6.61.252D). Plutarch even added Pacorus, who did not take part in the battle of Carrhae (*Cras.* 33.5).

(translated by LINGUA LAB)

REFERENCES

Printed sources

- Alighieri Dante, *La Divina comedia*, Roma 2017.
 Ammianus Marcellinus, *Rerum gestarum libri qui supersunt*, ed. W. Seyfarth, Leipzig 1978.
 Annaeus Florus L., *Epitome rerum Romanarum/Epitome of Roman history*, ed. E. Seymour Forster, London 1929.
 Annaeus Lucanus M., *Belli civilis libri decem*, ed. A.E. Housman, London 1926.
 Annaeus Seneca, *Oratorum et rhetorum, sententiae, divisiones, colores*, ed. A.G. Kiessling, Lipsiae 1872.
 Appiani, *Historia Romana*, vol. 1, ed. P. Viereck, Lipsiae 1939.
 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae*, ed. G. Keibel, Leipzig 1887–1890.
 C. Sollius Apollinaris Sidonius, ed. P. Mohr, Lipsiae 1895.
 Caecilius Plinius Secundus C., *Naturalis historia*, ed. C. Mayhoff, Lipsiae 1897–1933.
 Cassius Dio Cocceianus, *Historiarum Romanarum quae supersunt*, ed. V.P. Boissevain, Bero-
 lini 1895–1931.
 Cornelius Fronto M., *Epistulae*, ed. M.P.J. van den Hout, Leiden 1974.
 Cornelius Tacitus, *Annales*, ed. H. Heubner, Leipzig 1994.
 Diodorus, *Bibliotheca historica*, rec. C.T. Fisher, Lipsiae 1859.
 Eutropius, *Breviarium ab urbe condita*, rec. C. Santini, Leipzig 1979.
 Flavius Iosephus, *Antiquitatum Iudaicarum libri*, rec. W. Dindorff, Paris 1845.

⁷⁷ On Carrhae prisoners' conduct unworthy of the Romans, cf. Horatius Flaccus Q., *Opera*, ed. F. Klinger, Leipzig 1982, C., 3.5.5–12.

⁷⁸ K. Sauer, *op. cit.*, pp. 58–59; but cf. A.J.L. van Hooff, *From Autothanasia to Suicide: Self-Killing in Classical Antiquity*, London 1990, p. 88.

- Fulgentius mythographus, *De aetatibus mundi et hominis*, in: Fulgentii Planciadis *Opera*, ed. R. Helm, Leipzig 1898.
- Gellius Aul., *Noctes Atticae*, ed. C. Hosius, Lipsiae 1903.
- Herodotus, *Historiae*, rec. K. Hude, Oxonii 1912.
- Hieronymus, *Chronicon Eusebii*, ed. R. Helm, Berlin 1913.
- Horatius Flaccus Q., *Opera*, ed. F. Klinger, Leipzig 1982.
- Iordanes, *Romana et Getica*, ed. Th. Mommsen, Berolini 1882 (*Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Auctores Antiquissimi* 5,1).
- Iulius Solinus C., *Collectanea rerum mirabilium*, ed. K. Brodersen, Darmstadt 2014.
- Iustinus Iunianus M., *Epitoma historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi*, ed. O. Seel, Leipzig 1985.
- Luciani Samosatensis *Opera*, vol. 1–3, ed. K. Jacobitz, Leipzig 1896–1913.
- Orosius, *Historia adversus paganos libri VII*, ed. C. Zangemeister, Lipsiae 1889.
- Ovidius Naso P., *Fastorum libri VI*, eds. E.H. Alton et al., Leipzig 2005.
- Plutarchus, *Vitae parallelae*, ed. C. Sinteis, Lipsiae 1864–1884.
- Polyaenus, *Stratagematon libri octo*, ed. J. Melber, Leipzig 1887.
- Propertius Sex., *Elegiarum libri IV*, ed. P. Fedeli, Bonn 2006.
- Sallustius Crispus C., *Catilina, Iugurtha, ex historiis orationes et epistulae*, ed. A. Eussner, Lipsiae 1917.
- Servius Maurus Honoratus, *In Vergilii carmina commentarii*, eds. G. Thilo, H. Hagen, Lipsiae 1881.
- Strabo, *Geographica*, ed. A. Meinecke, Lipsiae 1904–1909.
- Terentius Varro M., *Saturarum Menippearum fragmenta*, ed. R. Astbury, Leipzig 1985.
- The Breviarium of Festus*, ed. J.W. Eadie, London 1967.
- The Fragments of the Roman Historians*, vol. 1–3, ed. T. J. Cornell, Oxford 2013.
- Tullius Cicero M., *Academica, Tusculanae disputationes*, ed. C.F.W. Müller, Lipsiae 1904.
- Tullius Cicero M., *De divinatione, de fato, Timaeus*, ed. R. Giomini, Leipzig 1975.
- Tullius Cicero M., *De officiis, de virtutibus*, ed. C. Atzert, Leipzig 1971.
- Tullius Cicero M., *Epistulae ad Atticum*, ed. D.R. Shackleton Bailey, vol. 1–7, Cambridge 1965–1970.
- Tullius Cicero M., *Epistulae ad familiares*, vol. 1–2, ed. D.R. Shackleton Bailey, Oxford 1977.
- Valerius Maximus, *Factorum et dictorum memorabilium libri novem cum Iulii/paridis et Ianuarii Nepotiani epitomis*, ed. C. Kempf, Stuttgart 1966.
- Velleius Paterculus, *Historiarum libri duo*, ed. W.S. Watt, Leipzig 1989.

Studies

- Adcock F.E., *Marcus Crassus, Millionaire*, Cambridge 1966.
- Arnaud P., *Les guerres parthiques de Gabinius et de Crassus et la politique occidental des Parthes Arsacides entre 70 et 53 av. J.-C.*, 'Electrum' 1998, 2.
- Ash R., *Shadow-Boxing in the East: the Spectacle of Romano-Parthian Conflict in Tacitus*, in: *War as Spectacle: Ancient and Modern Perspectives on the Display of Armed Conflict*, eds. A. Bakogianni, V.M. Hope, London 2015.
- Babnis T., *Augustan Poets on the Roman-Parthian Treaty of 20 BC*, 'Classica Cracoviensia' 2017, 20.
- Ballesteros Pastor L., *Troy Between Mithridates and Rome*, in: *Mithridates VI and the Pontic kingdom*, ed. J. Munk Højte, Aarhus 2009.
- Braund D., *Dionysiac Tragedy in Plutarch, Crassus*, 'Classical Quarterly' 1993, 43.
- Cameron H., *Making Mesopotamia: Geography and Empire in a Romano-Iranian Borderland*, Leiden 2019.
- Chrościcki J.A., *Najstarsze przedstawienie 'Śmierci króla Władysława III po Warną' – na rysunku Jacopo Belliniego*, in: *Aetas media, aetas moderna: studia ofiarowane profesorowi Henrykowi Samsonowiczowi w siedemdziesiątą rocznicę urodzin*, eds. A. Bartoszewicz et al., Warszawa 2000.

- Geist R., *Der gescheiterte Feldherr (dux ferox): der besiegte römische Feldherr als literarische Figur bei römischen Niederlagen, dargestellt an ausgewählten schweren Niederlagen von der frühen Republik bis zu Augustus*, Frankfurt 2009.
- Green T.M., *The City of the Moon God: Religious Traditions of Harran*, Leiden 1992.
- Harris M.H., *Hebraic Literature: Translations from the Talmud, Midrashim and Kabbala*, London 1901.
- Hekster O., Kaizer T., *An Accidental Tourist? Caracalla's Trip to the Temple of the Moon at Carrahae/Harran*, 'Ancient Society' 2012, 42.
- Kemzis A.M., *Lucian, Fronto, and the Absence of Contemporary Historiography under the Antonines*, 'American Journal of Philology' 2010, 131, 3.
- Klebs E., *Apollonius 60*, in: *Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, vol. 2, Stuttgart 1895.
- Kryśkiewicz H.L., *Signa recepta w starożytnym Rzymie 20 roku przed Chrystusem: kontekst polityczny oraz ideologiczny sukcesu*, Szczecin 2016.
- Kubińska O., *Przybyłem tu by umrzeć: relacje z placów straceń*, Gdańsk 2013.
- Lintott A.W., *A Historian in Cicero: ad Familiares – P. Licinius (?) Apollonius*, 'Rheinisches Museum für Philologie' 1976, 119, 4.
- Maciuszak K., *Średniopierski poemat 'Drzewo asyryjskie' i jego partyjska geneza*, Kraków 2007.
- Madejski P., *Exercises in Loss or Absence? Ancient Historiography and the Marcomannic Wars*, in: *Marcomannic Wars and Antonine Plague: selected essays on two disasters that shook the Roman World*, eds. M. Erdrich et al., Brno–Lublin 2020.
- Maksymiuk K., *Geography of Roman-Iranian Wars: Military Operations of Rome and Sasanian Iran*, Siedlce 2015.
- Mallan Ch., *The Parthica of Pseudo-Appian*, 'Historia' 2017, 66, 3.
- Mattern S.P., *Rome and the Enemy: Imperial Strategy in the Principate*, Berkeley 1999.
- Mattern-Parkes S.P., *The Defeat of Crassus and the Just War*, 'Classical World' 2003, 96.
- Mayor A., *The Poison King: the Life and Legend of Mithridates, Rome's Deadliest Enemy*, Princeton 2010.
- Miziołek J., *The Punishment of Licinius Crassus and Other Exempla Iustitiae at the Artus Court in Gdańsk in the Context of the Netherlandish, German, and Italian Art*, 'Quaestiones Mediae Aevii Novae' 2005, 10.
- Muccioli F., *La testa mozza di Crasso (Plut., Cras. 32–33): a proposito di un libro recente sulla battaglia di Carre*, 'Electrum' 2012, 19.
- Nakonieczna-Szkatka K., *Triumwirowie i triumwiraty w mowach i pismach Cycerona*, Katowice 2010.
- Nikonorov V.P., *Apollodorus of Artemita and the Date of his Parthica Revisited*, 'Electrum' 1998, 2.
- Olbrycht M.J., *Imperium Parthicum: kryzys i odbudowa państwa Arsakidów w pierwszej połowie pierwszego wieku po Chrystusie*, Kraków 2013.
- Pelling C., *Plutarch and History: Eighteen Studies*, Swansea 2011.
- Piegoń M., *Krassus: polityk niespełnionych ambicji*, Kraków 2014.
- Pierzak D., *Ab inferis ad rostra: przywoływanie zmarłych w retoryce rzymskiej okresu republikańskiego*, Katowice 2019.
- Popławski M.S., *Polityczna publicystyka w dobie Cezara i Augusta*, Lublin 1935.
- Potkowski E., *Warna 1444*, Warszawa 1990.
- Prauscello L., *Singing Alexandria: Music Between Practice and Textual Transmission*, Leiden 2006.
- Proc B., *Plutarch z Cheronei: żywot Artakserksesa: wstęp, tekst grecki, przekład, komentarz*, Lublin 2019.
- Rawson E., *Crassorum funera*, 'Latomus' 1982, 41, 3.
- Regling K., *Crassus' Partherkrieg*, 'Klio' 1907, 7.
- Regling K., *De belli Parthici Crassiani fontibus*, Berlin 1899.

- Reinhold M., *An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History: Books 49–52 (36–29 B.C.)*, Atlanta 1988.
- Rosenstein N., *Imperatores victi: Military Defeat and Aristocratic Competition in the Middle and Late Republic*, Berkeley 1990.
- Sampson G.S., *The Defeat of Rome: Crassus, Carrhae & the Invasion of the East*, Barnsley 2015.
- Sanford E., *Roman Avarice in Asia*, 'Journal of Near Eastern Studies' 1950, 9, 1.
- Sauer K., *Untersuchungen zur Darstellung des Todes in der griechisch – römischen Geschichtsschreibung*, Frankfurt 1930.
- Schoff W.H., *Parthian Stations by Isidore of Charax*, Philadelphia 1914.
- Smith C.J., *P. Licinius Apollonius*, in: *The Fragments of the Roman Historians*, vol. 1, *Introduction*, ed. T.J. Cornell, Oxford 2013.
- Stoll O., *Vestigia cladis: Roms Umgang mit militärischen Misserfolg*, Berlin 2019.
- Syme R., *Anatolica: Studies in Strabo*, Oxford 1995.
- Tarn W.W., *The Greeks in Bactria and India*, London 1951.
- ten Cate Fennema H., *Quaestiones Parthicae*, Nijmegen 1882.
- Traina G., *Imperial Views on the Battle of Carrhae*, in: *War in Words: Transformations of War from Antiquity to Clausewitz*, eds. M. Formisano, H. Böhme, Berlin 2010.
- Traina G., *La resa di Roma: 9 giugno 53 a.C., battaglia a Carre*, Bari 2010.
- Traina G., *Note in margine alla battaglia di Carre*, 'Electrum' 2009, 15.
- van de Groot F.R.W., ten Berge R.L., Vos R., *Molten Gold Was Poured Down His Throat until His Bowels Burst*, 'Journal of Clinical Pathology' 2003, 56.
- van Hooff A.J.L., *From Autothanasia to Suicide: Self-Killing in Classical Antiquity*, London 1990.
- Weggen K., *Der lange Schatten von Carrhae: Studien zu M. Licinius Crassus*, Hamburg 2011.
- Wheeler E.L., *Polyainos: scriptor militaris*, in: *Polyainos: neue Studien*, ed. K. Brodersen, Berlin 2010.
- Wisseman M., *Die Parther in der augusteischen Dichtung*, Frankfurt 1982.
- Zadorojnyj A.V., *Tragedy and Epic in Plutarch's Crassus*, 'Hermes' 1997, 125.

STRESZCZENIE

Pogrom rzymskich legii w bitwie pod Karrami (Carrhae) jest zazwyczaj postrzegany jako punkt zwrotny rzymskiego imperializmu. Jest to jednak pogląd nowożytny. Z punktu widzenia historiografii łacińskiej narracja o porażce służyła przede wszystkim uzasadnieniu kolejnych antypartyjskich posunięć militarnych lub dyplomatycznych. Z tego powodu łaciniści autorzy na plan pierwszy wysunęli temat zemsty. Co prawda najstarsze przekazy o bitwie i śmierci M. Licyniusza Krassusa (M. Licinius Crassus) nie zachowały się, ale na podstawie późniejszych informacji można zrekonstruować kierunki rozwoju narracji o zgonie triumwira i podstawowych czynnikach kształtujących ją. Wersje łacińskie podkreślały partyjską brutalność i podstępność mniej koncentrując się na osobie triumwira i porażce. Zbyt dokładna relacja nie była wskazana. Kładziono nacisk na wszelkie potknięcia Krassusa jako wodza, czyniąc go w ten sposób odpowiedzialnym za klęskę. Był to standardowy wybieg w przypadku narracji o militarnych niepowodzeniach. Krassus zmarł w sposób mało godny, nie pozostawiając po sobie żadnych ostatnich słów, nie zdobywając się na żaden symboliczny gest. Co gorsza, zginął podczas odwrotu. Greckie przekazy były nieco inne. Część podzielała wersje rzymskie i rzymski punkt widzenia. Podkreślano natomiast losy szczątków zabitego Rzymianina – zwłaszcza jego odciętej głowy. Najprawdopodobniej już Liwiusz znał opowieść o wkładaniu w usta odciętej głowy złota, ale moralizatorskie przesłanie tej sceny zostało rozwinięte nieco później przez autorów łacińskich i greckich i przyniosło około IV w. informację o Krassusie wziętym do niewoli żywcem, któremu dopiero później wiano do ust stopione złoto.

Słowa kluczowe: Carrhae, Karry, M. Licinius Crassus, Krassus, Partowies, historiografia rzymska, historiografia grecka, śmierć, dekapitacja

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Paweł Madejski – PhD with ‘habilitation’, works at the Department of Ancient and Medieval History at the Institute of History of the Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin.