

TRANSACTIONS
OF THE
AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY
HELD AT PHILADELPHIA
FOR PROMOTING USEFUL KNOWLEDGE

NEW SERIES—VOLUME 43, PART 4
1953

THE RULING POWER
A STUDY OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE IN THE SECOND CENTURY AFTER CHRIST
THROUGH THE ROMAN ORATION OF AELIUS ARISTIDES

JAMES H. OLIVER
Professor of Classics, The Johns Hopkins University

THE AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY
INDEPENDENCE SQUARE
PHILADELPHIA 6
1953

III. TRANSLATION OF THE ROMAN ORATION

Numbers in bold-face type refer to sections in the edition of Bruno Keil, who skipped the number 35. A revised Greek text may be found in the Appendix.

A reader unfamiliar with Greek must bear in mind that *basileus* meant in ordinary parlance "king" or "emperor," and in the political theory of Plato and others, "ideal statesman." The word *hêgemôn* has been rendered as "leader" or sometimes as "princeps," the usual Latin word for emperor which disguises the emperor's position as a monarch and suggests a leadership based on universal recognition of worth and ability.

1. It is a time-honored custom of travellers setting forth by land or sea to make a prayer pledging the performance of some vow—whatever they have in mind—on safe arrival at their destination. I recall a poet who playfully parodied the custom by pledging "a grain of incense—with gilded horns!" As for me the vow that I made as I journeyed hither was not of the usual stupid and irrelevant kind, nor one unrelated to the art of my profession: merely that if I came through safely I would salute your city with a public address.

2. But since it was quite impossible to pledge words commensurate with your city, it became evident that I had need of a second prayer. It is perhaps really presumptuous to dare undertake an oration to equal such majesty in a city. However, I have promised to address you, and I can speak only as I can. Yet even so it may not be unacceptable, for I could name others too who hold that if they do the very best they can, it will seem good enough even to the gods.

3. But, sirs, you who are at home in the great city, if you share the hope that I prove not false to my vow, join your prayers to mine for the success of my boldness. Suffer me to say at once, before I come to the praise of your city, that here I found men—in a phrase of Euripides—"able to inspire one, though he were speechless before, to eloquence and skill," to discourse on things quite beyond his natural gifts.

4. Praise of your city all men sing and will continue to sing. Yet their words accomplish less than if they had never been spoken. Their silence would not have magnified or diminished her in the least, nor changed your knowledge of her. But their encomiums accomplish quite the opposite of what they intend, for their words

³³ The source is frequently identified with Timagenes of Alexandria, but see A. Momigliano, Livio, Plutarco e Giustino su Virtù e Fortuna dei Romani, Contributo alla Ricostruzione della Fonte di Trogio Pompeo, *Athenaeum* 12: 45-56, 1934.

do not show precisely what is truly admirable. If an artist should make a botch of it after undertaking to portray in a painting a body of famous beauty, probably everyone would say it would have been better not to paint it at all; to have let them see the body itself, or <at least> not to show them a caricature. 5. And so I think it is with your city. Their speeches take away from her most of her wonders. It is like some effort to describe the marvelous size of an army such as Xerxes'. The man tells of seeing 10,000 infantry here, and 20,000 there, and so and so many cavalry, without reporting in what excites his wonder even a mere fraction of the whole.

6. For it is she who first proved that oratory cannot reach every goal. About her not only is it impossible to speak properly, but it is impossible even to see her properly. In truth it requires some all-seeing Argos—rather, the all-seeing god who dwells in the city. For beholding so many hills occupied by buildings, or on plains so many meadows completely urbanized, or so much land brought under the name of one city, who could survey her accurately? And from what point of observation?

7. Homer says of snow that as it falls, it covers "the crest of the range and the mountain peaks and the flowering fields and the rich acres of men, and," he says, "it is poured out over the white sea, the harbors and the shores." So also of this city. Like the snow, she covers mountain peaks, she covers the land intervening, and she goes down to the sea, where the commerce of all mankind has its common exchange and all the produce of the earth has its common market. Wherever one may go in Rome, there is no vacancy to keep one from being, there also, in mid-city. 8. And indeed she is poured out, not just over the level ground, but in a manner with which the simile cannot begin to keep pace, she rises great distances into the air, so that her height is not to be compared to a covering of snow but rather to the peaks themselves. And as a man who far surpasses others in size and strength likes to show his strength by carrying others on his back, so this city, which is built over so much land, is not satisfied with her extent, but raising upon her shoulders others of equal size, one over the other, she carries them. It is from this that she gets her name, and strength (*rōmē*) is the mark of all that is hers. Therefore, if one chose to unfold, as it were, and lay flat on the ground the cities which now she carries high in air, and place them side by side, all that part of Italy which intervenes would, I think, be filled and become one continuous city stretching to the Strait of Otranto.

9. Though she is so vast as perhaps even now I have not sufficiently shown, but as the eye attests more clearly, it is not possible to say of her as of other cities, "There she stands." Again it has been said of the capital cities of the Athenians and the Lacedaemonians—and may no ill omen attend the comparison—that the

first would in size appear twice as great as in its intrinsic power, the second far inferior in size to its intrinsic power. But of this city, great in every respect, no one could say that she has not created power in keeping with her magnitude. No, if one looks at the whole empire and reflects how small a fraction rules the whole world, he may be amazed at the city, but when he has beheld the city herself and the boundaries of the city, he can no longer be amazed that the entire civilized world is ruled by one so great.

10. Some chronicler, speaking of Asia, asserted that one man ruled as much land as the sun passed, and his statement was not true because he placed all Africa and Europe outside the limits where the sun rises in the East and sets in the West. It has now however turned out to be true. Your possession is equal to what the sun can pass, and the sun passes over your land. Neither the Chelidonean nor the Cyanean promontories limit your empire, nor does the distance from which a horseman can reach the sea in one day, nor do you reign within fixed boundaries, nor does another dictate to what point your control reaches; but the sea like a girdle lies extended, at once in the middle of the civilized world and of your hegemony.

11. Around it lie the great continents greatly sloping, ever offering to you in full measure something of their own. Whatever the seasons make grow and whatever countries and rivers and lakes and arts of Hellenes and non-Hellenes produce are brought from every land and sea, so that if one would look at all these things, he must needs behold them either by visiting the entire civilized world or by coming to this city. For whatever is grown and made among each people cannot fail to be here at all times and in abundance. And here the merchant vessels come carrying these many products from all regions in every season and even at every equinox, so that the city appears a kind of common emporium of the world.

12. Cargoes from India and, if you will, even from Arabia the Blest one can see in such numbers as to surmise that in those lands the trees will have been stripped bare and that the inhabitants of these lands, if they need anything, must come here and beg for a share of their own. Again one can see Babylonian garments and ornaments from the barbarian country beyond arriving in greater quantity and with more ease than if shippers from Naxos or from Cythnos, bearing something from those islands, had but to enter the port of Athens. Your farms are Egypt, Sicily and the civilized part of Africa.

13. Arrivals and departures by sea never cease, so that the wonder is, not that the harbor has insufficient space for merchant vessels, but that even the sea has enough, <if> it really does.

And just as Hesiod said about the ends of the Ocean, that there is a common channel where all waters have one source and destination, so there is a common channel

to Rome and all meet here, trade, shipping, agriculture, metallurgy, all the arts and crafts that are or ever have been, all the things that are engendered or grow from the earth. And whatever one does not see here neither did nor does exist. And so it is not easy to decide which is greater, the superiority of this city in respect to the cities that now are or the superiority of this empire in respect to the empires that ever were.

14. I blush now: after such great and impressive matters have been mentioned, my argument reaches a point where it is without great and impressive material; I shall distinguish myself ingloriously by recalling some barbarian empire or Hellenic power and it will seem that I intend to do the opposite of what the Aeolic poets did. For they, when they wished to disparage any work of their contemporaries, compared it with something great and famous among the ancients, thinking in this way best to expose its deficiency. Yet having no other way to show the degree of your empire's superiority, I shall compare it with petty ancient ones. For you have made all the greatest achievements appear very small by your success in surpassing them. Selecting the most important, I shall discuss them, though you perhaps will laugh at them then.

15. On the one hand, let us look at the Persian Empire, which in its day had indeed reputation among the Hellenes and gave to the king who ruled it the epithet "great"—for I shall omit the preceding empires which were even less ideal—and let us see all in succession, both its size and the things which were done in its time. Therefore we must examine in conjunction how they themselves enjoyed what they had acquired and how they affected their subjects.

16. First then, what the Atlantic now means to you, the Mediterranean was to the "King" in that day. Here his empire stopped, so that the Ionians and Aeolians were at the end of his world. Once when he, "the King of those from the Sunrise to the Sunset," tried to cross into Greece, he evoked wonder less for his own greatness than for the greatness of his defeat, and he exhibited his splendor in the enormity of his losses. He who failed by so much to win control over Hellas, and who held Ionia as his most remote possession, is, I think, left behind by your empire not by a mere discuss throw or an arrow's flight, but by a good half of the civilized world and by the sea in addition.

17. Moreover, even within these boundaries he was not always king with full authority, but as the power of Athens or the fortunes of Lacedaemon varied, now king as far as Ionia, Aeolis and the sea, and then again no longer down to Ionia and the sea, but as far as Lydia without seeing the sea west of the Cyanean Islands, being a king while he stayed upcountry just like a king in a game of children, coming down again with the consent of those who would let him be king. This the army of Agesilaus revealed, and before him that of the

Ten Thousand with Clearchus, the one marching as through its own country, all the way to Phrygia, the other penetrating, as through a solitude, beyond the Euphrates.

18. What enjoyments they derived from their empire are illustrated in the shrewd and neat remark of Oebaras. It is said that he first told Cyrus, who was grieved at his much wandering, that if he wished to be king, he ought—ay, there was necessity—to go marching around to every part of his empire, will he nill he, for he saw what happened to the leather bag: the parts on which he set foot became depressed and touched the ground, while the parts off which he stepped rose up again and were depressed once more only with another trampling. They were a kind of vagrant kings and were superior to the nomadic Scythians only in so far as they went around in carriages instead of carts,—a kind of nomadic kings and wanderers who, on account of their distrust and fear of settling in one place, crushed down their country, really like some leather bag, and, by this, controlling now Babylon, again Susa, then Ecbatana, not understanding how to hold it *<all>* at all times nor tending it as shepherds.

19. In truth such were deeds of men who, as it were, dared not trust that the empire was their own. They did not mind it as their own, nor did they raise either the urban or the rural areas to beauty and full size, but like those who have laid violent hands on property not their own they consumed it without conscience or honor, seeking to keep their subjects as weak as possible, and as if, in the feat of the five exercises, vying with each other in murders, the second ever tried to outdo the man before. It was a contest to slaughter as many people, to expel as many families and villages, and to break as many oaths as possible.

20. Those then are the enjoyments they derived from their famous power. The consequences of these enjoyments were what a law of nature ordained, hatreds and plots from those who were so used, and defections and civil wars and constant strife and ceaseless rivalries.

21. They themselves harvested these rewards, as if ruling as the result of a curse rather than in answer to a prayer, while the subjects received all that those who are ruled by men like that must of necessity receive, and of which some mention has already been made, more or less. A child's beauty was a terror to its parents, a wife's beauty a terror to her husband. Not he who committed the most crimes but he who acquired the most property was doomed to destruction. It could almost be said that more cities then were being destroyed and demolished than are being founded today.

22. It was easier to be preserved when fighting against the Persians than when obeying them. For in battle they were easily defeated, but where they had power their insolence knew no bounds. And those who served them they despised as slaves, while those who

were free they punished as enemies. Consequently they passed their lives in giving and receiving hatred. And so in war, which was their way of settling disputes in the majority of cases, they often feared their subjects more than their enemies.

23. Fundamentally two things were wrong. The Persians did not know how to rule and their subjects did not cooperate, since it is impossible to be good subjects if the rulers are bad rulers. Government and slave-management were not yet differentiated, but king and master were equivalent terms. They certainly did not proceed in a reasonable manner and with great objectives. For the word "master" (*despôtes*) applies properly within the circle of a private household; when it extends to cities and nations, the role is hard to keep up.

24. Again Alexander, who acquired the great empire—so it looked until yours arose—by overrunning the earth, to tell the truth, more closely resembled one who acquired a kingdom than one who showed himself a king. For what happened to him, I think, is as if some ordinary person were to acquire much good land but were to die before receiving the yield of it.

25. He advanced over most of the earth and reduced all who opposed him; and he had absolutely all the hardships. But he could not establish the empire nor place the crown upon the labors he had endured, but died midway in the course of his affairs. So one might say that he won very many battles but, as a king, he did very little, and that he became a great contender for kingship, but never received any enjoyable result worthy of his genius and skill. What happened to him was much as if a man, while contending in an Olympic contest, defeated his opponents, then died immediately after the victory before rightly adjusting the crown upon his head.

26. After all, what laws did he ordain for each of his peoples? Or what contributions in taxes, men or ships did he put on a permanent basis? Or by what routine administration with automatic progress and fixed periods of time did he conduct his affairs? In civil administration what successes did he achieve among the people under his rule? He left only one real memorial of his endowment as a statesman, the city by Egypt which bears his name; he did well in founding this for you, the greatest city after yours, for you to have and to control. Thus he abolished the rule of the Persians, yet he himself all but never ruled.

27. Now, when he died, the empire of the Macedonians immediately broke up into innumerable pieces, and the Macedonians showed by what they did that the rule of an empire was beyond their capabilities. They could not even hold their own country any longer, but came to that point of fortune where they were compelled to abandon their own country in order to rule over alien territory, more like men who had been deported than like men with a capacity for command. And it was

a riddle: Macedonians, each reigning not in Macedon but wherever he could, who garrisoned rather than governed their cities and districts, men driven from home, appointed as kings not by the great king but by themselves, and if the expression be permitted, satraps without king. With which term shall we describe a condition such as theirs, for were they not more like robber chieftains than like kings?

28. Now, however, the present empire has been extended to boundaries of no mean distance, to such, in fact, that one cannot even measure the area within them. On the contrary, for one who begins a journey westward from the point where at that period the empire of the Persian found its limit, the rest is far more than the entirety of his domain, and there are no sections which you have omitted, neither city nor tribe nor harbor nor district, except possibly some that you condemned as worthless. The Red Sea and the Cataracts of the Nile and Lake Maeotis, which formerly were said to lie on the boundaries of the earth, are like the courtyard walls to the house which is this city of yours. On the other hand, you have explored Ocean. Some writers did not believe that Ocean existed at all, or did not believe that it flowed around the earth; they thought that poets had invented the name and had introduced it into literature for the sake of entertainment. But you have explored it so thoroughly that not even the island therein has escaped you.

29. Vast and comprehensive as is the size of it, your empire is much greater for its perfection than for the area which its boundaries encircle. There are no pockets of the empire held by Mysians, Sacae, Pisidians, or others, land which some have occupied by force, others have detached by revolt, who cannot be captured. Nor is it merely called the land of the *King*, while really the land of all who are able to hold it. Nor do satraps fight one another as if they had no king; nor are cities at variance, some fighting against these and some against those, with garrisons being dispatched to some cities and being expelled from others. But for the eternal duration of this empire the whole civilized world prays all together, emitting, like an aulos after a thorough cleaning, one note with more perfect precision than a chorus; so beautifully is it harmonized by the leader in command.

30. The keynote is taken by all, everywhere, in the same way. And those who have settled in the mountains are, in their avoidance of discord, lower in pride than those who dwell in the least elevated plains, while those in the rich plains, both men who have cleruchic holdings and men who have your colonial land, are engaged in agriculture. Conditions no longer differ from island to mainland, but all, as one continuous country and one people, heed quietly.

31. All directions are carried out by the chorus of the civilized world at a word or gesture of guidance more easily than at some plucking of a chord; and if anything

need be done, it suffices to decide and there it is already done.

The governors sent out to the city-states and ethnic groups are each of them rulers of those under them, but in what concerns themselves and their relations to each other they are all equally among the ruled, and in particular they differ from those under their rule in that it is they—one might assert—who first show how to be the right kind of subject. So much respect has been instilled in all men for him who is the great governor, who obtains for them their all.

32. They think that he knows what they are doing better than they do themselves. Accordingly they fear his displeasure and stand in greater awe of him than one would of a despot, a master who was present and watching and uttering commands. No one is so proud that he can fail to be moved upon hearing even the mere mention of the Ruler's name, but, rising, he praises and worships him and breathes two prayers in a single breath, one to the gods on the Ruler's behalf, one for his own affairs to the Ruler himself. And if the governors should have even some slight doubt whether certain claims are valid in connection with either public or private lawsuits and petitions from the governed, they straightway send to him with a request for instructions what to do, and they wait until he renders a reply, like a chorus waiting for its trainer.

33. Therefore, he has no need to wear himself out traveling around the whole empire nor, by appearing personally, now among some, then among others, to make sure of each point when he has the time to tread their soil. It is very easy for him to stay where he is and manage the entire civilized world by letters, which arrive almost as soon as they are written, as if they were carried by winged messengers.

34. But that which deserves as much wonder and admiration as all the rest together, and constant expression of gratitude both in word and action, shall now be mentioned. You who hold so vast an empire and rule it with such a firm hand and with so much unlimited power have very decidedly won a great success, which is completely your own.

36. For of all who have ever gained empire you alone rule over men who are free. Caria has not been given to Tissaphernes, nor Phrygia to Pharnabazus, nor Egypt to someone else; nor is the country said to be enslaved, as household of so-and-so, to whomsoever it has been turned over, a man himself not free. But just as those in states of one city appoint the magistrates to protect and care for the governed, so you, who conduct public business in the whole civilized world exactly as if it were one city state, appoint the governors, as is natural after elections, to protect and care for the governed, not to be slave masters over them. Therefore governor makes way for governor unobtrusively, when his time is up, and far from staying too long and disputing the

land with his successor, he might easily not stay long enough even to meet him.

37. Appeals to a higher court are made with the ease of an appeal from deme to dicastery, with no greater menace for those who make them than for those who have accepted the local verdict. Therefore one might say that the men of today are ruled by the governors who are sent out, only in so far as they are content to be ruled.

38. Are not these advantages beyond the old "Free Republic" of every people? For under Government by the People it is not possible to go outside after the verdict has been given in the city's court nor even to other jurors, but, except in a city so small that it has to have jurors from out of town, one must ever be content with the local verdict . . . <deprived> undeservedly, or, as plaintiff, not getting possession even after a favorable verdict.

But now in the last instance there is another judge, a mighty one, whose comprehension no just claim ever escapes. **39.** There is an abundant and beautiful equality of the humble with the great and of the obscure with the illustrious, and, above all, of the poor man with the rich and of the commoner with the noble, and the word of Hesiod comes to pass, "For he easily exalts, and the exalted he easily checks," namely this judge and princeps as the justice of the claim may lead, like a breeze in the sails of a ship, favoring and accompanying, not the rich man more, the poor man less, but benefiting equally whomsoever it meets.

40. I shall treat also the records of Hellenic states, since I have come to that part of my speech, but I feel shame and fear lest my argument sound too trivial. Nevertheless, treat them I shall, but as I just said, not as comparing equal with equal. In the absence of other parallels, I am compelled to use those at hand, because in such a case it is absurd to keep asserting with enthusiasm that it is impossible to find other achievements even remotely equal to yours but that all are overshadowed by these, yet to keep waiting for a time to make comparisons when we may have equal achievements to recall. It is inappropriate, I think, because even similar achievements, if we had any to report, would not be similarly astonishing.

41. Again I am by no means unaware that these Hellenic records, in proud extent of territory and grand scale of operations, are still poorer than the Persian record which I just now examined. But to surpass the Hellenes in wisdom and restraint, while outdoing the Barbarians in riches and in might, seems to me a great achievement and one fulfilling the ideal and more glorious than every other.

42. My next subject, then, is what kind of international organizations the Hellenic states created and how they fared therewith. If it appear that they were

unable to preserve much smaller organizations, obviously this will decide the issue.

43. The Athenians and the Lacedaemonians did all they could to get control and hegemony, and theirs was the power to sail the sea and to rule over the Cyclades and hold the Thracian regions and Thermopylae and the Hellespont and Coryphasion. That was the extent of their power. Their experience was as if a man who wished to obtain possession of a body received some claws and extremities instead of the whole body and with these in his possession thought that he had just what he wanted. So they too, after striving for hegemony, brought home small islands and headlands and havens and such places, and they wore themselves out around the sea, in pursuit of an hegemony which existed more in their dreams than within their powers of acquisition.

44. Nevertheless, at times as if their turn had come around in the allotment, each city became chairman of the Hellenes without keeping the office even for a single, say, generation. So there was no clear supremacy, but in the struggle for hegemony they inflicted upon each other the so-called Cadmean victory. It was as if each city always demanded that the others be not the only ones to get a chance at being hated, but that they themselves might have a share.

45. For just one Lacedaemonian leader so disposed the Hellenes that they willingly got rid of the Lacedaemonians and <gladly> sought other rulers for themselves. After they had given themselves to the Athenians, in a little while they repented, not liking the disproportion of the tributes imposed nor those who used the tributes as a pretext for graft, and being dragged to Athens every year to render an account concerning their own local affairs, while cleruchs were being dispatched into their country and ships to collect extra funds beyond the tribute, if perhaps another need prevailed.

46. Moreover they were unable to maintain the freedom of their citadels and were in the power of the politicians whom the Athenians installed, both those with good intentions and equally those with bad. They were obliged to undertake unnecessary campaigns, often in holidays and festivals, and in brief, from the Athenian leadership they derived no benefit great enough to make it worth their while to perform these heavy services.

47. As a result of these conditions the majority were disgusted with the Athenians, and turning again from them to the Lacedaemonians, just as formerly from the latter to the Athenians, they were deceived again by the Lacedaemonians. The latter first proclaimed that they would fight the Athenians in behalf of the liberty of the Hellenes, and in this way they attracted many. When they had destroyed the walls of Athens and had secured control of the Greek world and could do anything, they so far outdid the Athenians that they established in all

the Greek cities tyrannies, which they euphemistically called decarchies.

48. And destroying one arbitrary government, that of the Athenians, in its place they introduced many from themselves which incessantly harassed the governed, not from a seat at Athens nor from one at Sparta but from positions permanently located in the very lands of the governed and interwoven, as it were, in the local institutions. So if, as they started the war, they had announced to the Hellenes that they would fight the Athenians in order to do them greater and more frequent injuries than the Athenians did and to make what the Hellenes had from the Athenians look like freedom, there would have been no better way to make good their promise. **49.** And in consequence they soon gave way to one fugitive and were abandoned by the Thebans and were hated by the Corinthians; the sea was made full of their "harmonizers" who were being expelled because they were disharmonious and because, when installed as governors, they held the cities in a way which belied the very name of harmost.

50. From the misdoings of those men and the hatred which the Hellenes for that reason felt for the Lacedaemonians, the Thebans gathered strength and defeated the latter in the Battle of Leuctra; but as soon as the Lacedaemonians were out of the way, then no one could endure the Thebans, who had succeeded in one battle. On the contrary, it became clear that it was yet more to the advantage of the Hellenes that the Cadmeia (i. e. Thebes) be occupied by, than victorious over, the Lacedaemonians. Thus the Thebans now received their hate.

51. These examples I have collected, certainly not to denounce the Hellenes generally like the extraordinary author of the "Three-headed Creature"—may it never be so necessary—but wishing to show thereby that the knowledge how to rule did not yet exist before your time. For if it did exist, it would be among the Hellenes, who distinguished themselves for skill, I venture to say, very greatly, at least in the other arts. But this knowledge is both a discovery of your own and to other men an importation from you. For it might well be true if one were to say about the Hellenes as a whole what has already been said in the case of the Athenians, that they were good at resisting foreign rule and defeating the Persians and at expending their wealth in public service and enduring hardships, but were themselves still untrained to rule, and in the attempt they failed.

52. First they used to send into the cities garrisons which of course were not always less numerous than the able-bodied natives in the countries to which they were being sent. Secondly they aroused suspicion among those who were not yet garrisoned that they were conducting all business by force and violence. So there were two results, an insecure grip on the object of their encroachment, yet a powerful reputation for encroachment: they were failing to hold the cities securely, and

besides they were earning hatred and were reaping the hardships instead of the blessings of empire.

53. Then, what followed? Ever widely dispersed and separated they became too weak at home and were unable to preserve their own land, through seeking to hold that of others. So neither were they able to outnumber, in the troops they sent elsewhere, those whom they strove to rule, nor was it possible to maintain an adequate defence with those they left behind for their own protection. They were too few abroad, too few at home. Without the ultimate means to hold the empire, its expansion posed for them an insoluble problem. Thus the aims which they pursued were in opposition to their needs. The success of their plans became an embarrassment, almost a curse, while the failure was less a burden for them and less terrifying. Instead of rulers they seemed no different from a fallen city's scattered remnants, toiling for the sake of toil. For as the poets say (of Sisyphus), the crowning effort would unaccountably weaken at the moment the end was reached, and back (the stone) would roll to where it had been.

54. It was no longer to their interest that the governed should be either strong or weak: they did not want them strong because of possible treachery, nor weak because of the menace of wars from outside, and in order to have some advantage from the league of allies. Toward them the Athenians had come to feel much like those who, in a game of draughts, advance their pieces to one position and pull them back to another, without knowing what use they will make of them. But wishing, as they did, both to have their allies, and not to have them, the Athenians would take them in hand and move them without being able to say whither they were going in earnest.

55. And the strangest and most absurd thing of all: they would make the rest, who had rebellion in mind themselves, go to war against those who were rebelling. It was much as if in doing so they were asking the very rebels to take the field against their own rebellion. They were unreasonably leading against the rebels men who were on the rebels' side, and to whom it was surely inexpedient to reveal the help that in serious effort could be given to the others against the Athenians. **56.** So in this also they were accomplishing the very opposite of their wish and of their interest, because, in their desire for the recovery of those in revolt, they were causing the revolt even of those allies who were with them. For they showed them that if they remained they would be available to the Athenians for use against each other, but that leagued together in revolt, they would all be securely free, because at the end the Athenians would have none left through whom the rebels might be taken. Therefore, they did themselves more harm than their faithless allies did, in that the latter seceded individually, while they themselves introduced a universal defection as a result of their activity.

57. Thus in that period there was still no orderly system of imperial rule and they did not go after it with knowledge of what an orderly system was. Although their holdings were small and, as it were, marginal lands and military allotments, nevertheless they were unable to retain even these because of their own inexperience and weakness. For they did not lead the cities with kindness nor did they have the power to hold them firmly, being simultaneously oppressive and weak. So at last they were stripped of their plumage like Aesop's jackdaw, and were fighting alone against all.

58. Well, this which, in a word, escaped all previous men was reserved for you alone to discover and perfect. And no wonder! Just as in other spheres the skills come to the fore when the material is there, so when a great empire of surpassing power arose, the skill too accumulated and entered into its composition, and both were mutually reinforced. On account of the size of the empire the experience necessarily accrued, while on account of the knowledge how to rule with justice and with reason the empire flourished and increased.

59. But there is that which very decidedly deserves as much attention and admiration now as all the rest together. I mean your magnificent citizenship with its grand conception, because there is nothing like it in the records of all mankind. Dividing into two groups all those in your empire—and with this word I have indicated the entire civilized world—you have everywhere appointed to your citizenship, or even to kinship with you, the better part of the world's talent, courage, and leadership, while the rest you recognized as a league under your hegemony.

60. Neither sea nor intervening continent are bars to citizenship, nor are Asia and Europe divided in their treatment here. In your empire all paths are open to all. No one worthy of rule or trust remains an alien, but a civil community of the World has been established as a Free Republic under one, the best, ruler and teacher of order; and all come together as into a common civic center, in order to receive each man his due.

61. What another city is to its own boundaries and territory, this city is to the boundaries and territory of the entire civilized world, as if the latter were a country district and she had been appointed common town. It might be said that this one citadel is the refuge and assembly place of all perioeci or of all who dwell in outside demes.

62. She has never failed them, but like the soil of the earth, she supports all men; and as the sea, which receives with its gulfs all the many rivers, hides them and holds them all and still, with what goes in and out, is and seems ever the same, so actually this city receives those who flow in from all the earth and has even sameness in common with the sea. The latter is not made greater by the influx of rivers, for it has been ordained by fate that with the waters flowing in, the sea maintain

its volume; here no change is visible because the city is so great.

63. Let this passing comment, which the subject suggested, suffice. As we were saying, you who are "great greatly" distributed your citizenship. It was not because you stood off and refused to give a share in it to any of the others that you made your citizenship an object of wonder. On the contrary, you sought its expansion as a worthy aim, and you have caused the word Roman to be the label, not of membership in a city, but of some common nationality, and this not just one among all, but one balancing all the rest. For the categories into which you now divide the world are not Hellenes and Barbarians, and it is not absurd, the distinction which you made, because you show them a citizenry more numerous, so to speak, than the entire Hellenic race. The division which you substituted is one into Romans and non-Romans. To such a degree have you expanded the name of your city.

64. Since these are the lines along which the distinction has been made, many in every city are fellow-citizens of yours no less than of their own kinsmen, though some of them have not yet seen this city. There is no need of garrisons to hold their citadels, but the men of greatest standing and influence in every city guard their own fatherlands for you. And you have a double hold upon the cities, both from here and from your fellow citizens in each.

65. No envy sets foot in the empire, for you yourselves were the first to disown envy, when you placed all opportunities in view of all and offered those who were able a chance to be not governed more than they governed in turn. Nor does hatred either steal in from those who are not chosen. For since the constitution is a universal one and, as it were, of one state, naturally your governors rule not as over the property of others but as over their own. Besides, all the masses have as a share in it the permission to *<take refuge with you>* from the power of the local magnates, *<but there is>* the indignation and punishment from you which will come upon them immediately, if they themselves dare to make any unlawful change.

66. Thus the present regime naturally suits and serves both rich and poor. No other way of life is left. There has developed in your constitution a single harmonious, all-embracing union; and what formerly seemed to be impossible has come to pass in your time: *<maintenance>* of control over an empire, over a vast one at that, and at the same time firmness of rule *<without>* unkindness.

67a. Thus the cities can be clear of garrisons. Mere detachments of horse and foot suffice for the protection of whole countries, and even these are not concentrated in the cities with billets *<in>* every household, but are dispersed throughout the rural area within bounds and orbits of *<their own>*. Hence many nations do not

know where at any time their guardians are. But if anywhere a city through excess of growth had passed beyond the ability to maintain order by itself, you did not begrudge to these in their turn the men to stand by and guard them carefully.

68. It is not safe for those to rule who have not power. The second best way to sail, they say, is to be governed by one's betters, but by you now it has been shown to be actually the first best way. Accordingly, all are held fast and would not ask to secede any more than those at sea from the helmsman. As bats in caves cling fast to each other and to the rocks, so all from you depend with much concern not to fall from this cluster of cities, and would sooner conceive fear of being abandoned by you, than abandon you themselves. **67b.** And as a result all send their tribute to you with more pleasure than some would actually receive it from others: they have good reason.

69. They no longer dispute over the right to rule and to have first honors, which caused the outbreak of all the wars of the past. Instead, the rulers of yore do not even recall with certainty what domain they once had, while the others, like water in silent flow, are most delightfully at rest. They have gladly ceased from toil and trouble, for they have come to realize that in the other case they were fighting vainly over shadows. As in the myth of a Pamphylian, or if not so, then Plato's myth, the cities, already being laid, as it were, upon the funeral pyre by their mutual strife and disorder, merely received the right leadership all at once and suddenly revived. How they reached this point they have no explanation and can only wonder at the present. They have come to feel like men aroused from sleep: instead of the dreams they but recently had, they awakened to the sudden vision and presence of these genuine blessings.

70. Wars, even if they once occurred, no longer seem to have been real; on the contrary, stories about them are interpreted more as myths by the many who hear them. If anywhere an actual clash occurs along the border, as is only natural in the immensity of a great empire, because of the madness of Getae or the misfortune of Libyans or the wickedness of those around the Red Sea, who are unable to enjoy the blessings they have, then simply like myths they themselves quickly pass and the stories about them. **71a.** So great is your peace, though war was traditional among you.

72a. In regard to the civil administration of the whole empire it has been stated in what way you thought of it and what kind you established. Now it is time to speak about the army and military affairs, how you contrived in this matter and what organization you gave it. **71b.** Yes, for the shoemakers and masons of yesterday are not the hoplites and cavalry of today. On the stage a farmer appears as a soldier after a quick change of costume, and in poor homes the same person cooks the meal, keeps the house, makes the bed. But you were

not so undiscriminating. You did not expect that those engaged in other occupations would be made into soldiers by the need, nor did you leave it to your enemies to call you together. **72b.** Rather in this too it is amazing how wise you were, and there is no precedent to serve as a parallel all the way.

73. For the Egyptians also progressed to the point of segregating the military, and it was deemed a very clever invention of theirs to have those who defended their country settled in special areas away from the rest. As in so many other respects, when compared to others, they were, it seemed, "clever Egyptians," as the saying goes. But when you visualized the same thing, you did not execute it in the same way. Instead you made a more equitable and more skillful segregation. In the former system it was not possible for each of the two groups to have equality of citizenship; the soldiers, who alone and forever bore the hardships, were in an inferior status to those who did not fight. Therefore the system was neither fair, nor agreeable to them. With you, on the other hand, since all have equality, a separate establishment for the military is successful.

74. Thus a courage like that of Hellenes and Egyptians and any others one might mention is surpassed by yours, and all, far as they are behind you in actual arms, trail still further in the conception. On the one hand you deemed it unworthy of your rule for those from this city to be subject to the levy and to the hardships and to enjoy no advantage from the present felicity; on the other hand you did not put your faith in alien mercenaries. Still you needed soldiers before the hour of crisis. So what did you do? You found an army of your own for which the citizens were undisturbed. This possibility was provided for you by that plan for all the empire, according to which you count no one an alien when you accept him for any employment where he can do well and is then needed.

75. Who then have been assembled and how? Going over the entire league, you looked about carefully for those who would perform this liturgy, and when you found them, you released them from the fatherland and gave them your own city, so that they became reluctant henceforth to call themselves by their original ethnics. Having made them fellow-citizens, you made them also soldiers, so that the men from this city would not be subject to the levy, and those performing military service would none the less be citizens, who together with their enrollment in the army had lost their own cities but from that very day had become your fellow-citizens and defenders.

76. Under your hegemony this is the contribution which all make to the armed forces, and no city is disaffected. You asked from each only as many as would cause no inconvenience to the givers and would not be enough by themselves to provide the individual city with a full quota of an army of its own. Therefore all cities

are well pleased with the dispatch of these men to be their own representatives in the union army, while locally each city has no militia of its own men whatsoever, and *<for military protection>* they look nowhere but to you, because it is for this sole purpose that those who went out from the cities have been marshalled in good order.

77. And again, after you selected from everywhere the most competent men, you had a very profitable idea. It was this. You thought that when even those picked out for their excellent physiques and bodily superiority train for the festivals and the prize contests, then those who would be the contenders in the greatest engagements of real war, and victors in as many victories as one might chance to win in behalf of such an empire, ought not to come together merely in a crisis. You thought that the latter, selected from all as the strongest and, especially, most competent, ought to train for a long while ahead of time so as to be superior the minute they took their stand.

78. So these men, once you eliminated the morally and the socially base, you *<introduced into>* the community of the ruling nation, not without the privileges I mentioned nor in such a way that they would envy those who stay in the city because they themselves were not of equal rights at the start, but in such a way that they would consider their share of citizenship as an honor. Having found and treated them thus, you led them to the boundaries of the empire. There you stationed them at intervals, and you assigned areas to guard, some to some, others to others.

79. They account also for the plan which you devised and evolved in regard to the walls, which is worth comment now. One would call this city neither unwalled in the reckless manner of the Lacedaemonians nor again fortified with the splendor of Babylon or of any other city which before or after may have been walled in a more impressive style. On the contrary, you have made the fortification of Babylon seem frivolity and a woman's work indeed. **80.** To place the walls around the city itself as if you were hiding her or fleeing from your subjects you considered ignoble and inconsistent with the rest of your concept, as if a master were to show fear of his own slaves. Nevertheless, you did not forget walls, but these you placed around the empire, not the city. And you erected walls splendid and worthy of you, as far away as possible, visible to those within the circuit, but, for one starting from the city, an outward journey of months and years if he wished to see them.

81. Beyond the outermost ring of the civilized world, you drew a second line, quite as one does in walling a town, another circle, more widely curved and more easily guarded. Here you built the walls to defend you and then erected towns bordering upon them, some in some parts, others elsewhere, filling them with colonists, giving these the comfort of arts and crafts, and in general establishing beautiful order.

82. An encamped army like a rampart encloses the civilized world in a ring. The perimeter of this enclosure, if a survey were made, would not be ten parasangs, nor twenty, nor a little more, nor a distance that one could say offhand, but as far as from the settled area of Aethiopia to the Phasis and from the Euphrates in the interior to the great outermost island toward the West; all this one can call a ring and circuit of the walls.

83. They have not been built with asphalt and baked brick nor do they stand there gleaming with stucco. Oh, but these ordinary works too exist at their individual places—yes, in very great number, and, as Homer says of the palace wall, “fitted close and accurately with stones, and boundless in size and gleaming more brilliantly than bronze.”

84. But the ring, much greater and more impressive, in every way altogether unbreachable and indestructible, outshines them all, and in all time there has never been a wall so firm. For it is a barrier of men who have not acquired the habit of flight. It is they who defend these ordinary walls. They have perfected in the employment of all the tools of war exercises which bind them to one another in that union of the Myrmidons which Homer in the passage cited compared to the wall: a formation of helmets so close that an arrow cannot pass; a platform of shields raised overhead which would support in mid-air racetracks so much firmer than those constructible in town that even horsemen could race upon them, “a bronze plain,” as one will then truthfully claim to see, for it is this in particular which deserves the phrase of Euripides; a line of breastplates so clinging to one another that if one ordered the man between two others to take his place with only light arms, the shields on either side would come half way and meet to cover him; and a shower of javelins, as it were, falling from heaven in a solid mass. Such are the parallel harmonies or systems of defence which curve around you, that circle of the fortifications at individual points, and that ring of those who keep watch over the whole world.

85. Once long ago Darius, with Artaphernes and Datis, succeeded in destroying one city on one island by dragging a net over its territory to catch the citizens. In a manner of speaking you too used a net; you dragged it over the whole civilized world. But having done so, you now preserve all the cities by means of the very citizens you caught, the strangers whom they share with you. When you selected them, as I said, from all, you led them out, providing the men who showed quality with expectations that they would have no regret. The man who at any time might hold the first rank would not be from the nobility, and the man of second rank would not be from the second class and so on throughout the rest of the order. Each man would hold the post that was his due in the sense that not words but deeds would here distinguish the men of quality. And of these things you gave illustrious examples. Consequently they all consider unemployment a disaster and think that engagements are

occasions for the fulfillment of their prayers, and against the enemy they are of one mind but in relation to each other they are perpetual rivals for preference, and they alone of mankind pray to meet with enemies.

86. Accordingly, upon seeing the training and organization of the military, one will think that the opponents in the words of Homer, “were they ten <or twenty times> as many,” would soon be completely routed and in single combats overcome. And one who looks into the system of recruitment and replacement will express and feel what the king of Egypt meant when Cambyses was plundering the country and pillaging the sanctuaries. Standing upon the walls of Thebes, the Egyptian held out to him a clod of earth and a cup of water from the Nile; therewith he signified that as long as Cambyses was unable to carry away Egypt itself with the river Nile and to drag it off as plunder, he had not yet received the wealth of the Egyptians, but while river and land remained the Egyptians would soon have just as much again and the wealth of Egypt would never run out. So also concerning your military system one is justified in thinking and stating that as long as none can move the land itself from its foundation and leave a vacuum on departure, as long as the civilized world itself must remain in place, there is no way to make the wealth in your multitude of soldiers run out, for you have as many as you want arriving from all the civilized world.

87. In respect to military science, furthermore, you have made all men look like children. For you did not prescribe exercises for soldiers and officers to train for victory over the enemy only, but for victory over themselves first. Therefore, every day the soldier lives in discipline and no one ever leaves the post assigned to him, but as in some permanent chorus he knows and keeps his position and the subordinate does not on that account envy him who has a higher rank, but he himself rules with precision those whose superior he is.

88. It seems a pity that others have already said it first about the Lacedaemonians that, but for a few, their army consisted in commanders of commanders. It was a proper phrase to have been kept for you and to have been applied to your case first, whereas the right occasion had not yet come when the author brought it forth. However, the Lacedaemonian army may well have been so small that there was nothing incredible in even all of them being commanders. But merely to name the branches and nationalities of your armed forces would not be easy. In these many units your soldiers, beginning with one who examines everything and looks after all—nations, cities, armies, are themselves leaders, through all the intermediate grades I could not mention, down to one in command of four or even two men. Like a spinning of thread which is continuously drawn from many filaments into fewer and fewer strands, the many individuals of your forces are always drawn together into fewer and fewer formations; and so they reach their

complete integration through those who are at each point placed in command, one over others, each of these over others still, and so on. Does this not rise above Man's power of organization?

89. An impulse comes over me to change the Homeric line a little at the end and say, "Such within, I ween, is of Olympian Zeus the" empire. For when one ruler rules so many, and when his agents and envoys, much inferior to him but much superior to those over whom they watch, perform all commands quietly without noise and confusion, and envy is absent, and all actions everywhere are full of justice and respect, and the reward of virtue escapes no one, does not this epic tone seem right, this version of the line?

90. It appears to me that in this state you have established a constitution not at all like any of those among the rest of mankind. Formerly there seemed to be three constitutions in human society. Two were tyranny and oligarchy, or kingship and aristocracy, since they were known under two names each according to the view one took in interpreting the character of the men in control. A third category was known as democracy whether the leadership was good or bad. The cities had received one or the other constitution as choice or chance prevailed for each. Your state, on the other hand, is quite dissimilar; it is such a form of government as if it were a mixture of all the constitutions without the bad aspects of any one. That is why precisely this form of constitution has prevailed. So when one looks at the strength of the People and sees how easily they get all that they want and ask, he will deem it a complete democracy except for the faults of democracy. When he looks at the Senate sitting as a council and keeping the magistracies, he will think that there is no aristocracy more perfect than this. When he looks at the Ephor and Prytanis, who presides over all of these, him from whom it is possible for the People to get what they want and for the Few to have the magistracies and power, he will see in this one, the One who holds the most perfect monarchic rule, One without a share in the vices of a tyrant and One elevated above even kingly dignity.

91. It is not strange that you alone made these distinctions and discoveries how to govern both in the world and in the city itself. For you alone are rulers, so to speak, according to nature. Those others who preceded you established an arbitrary, tyrannical rule. They became masters and slaves of each other in turn, and as rulers they were a spurious crew. They succeeded each other as if advancing to the position in a ball game. Macedonians had a period of enslavement to Persians, Persians to Medes, Medes to Assyrians, but as long as men have known you, all have known you as rulers. Since you were free right from the start and had begun the game as it were in the rulers' position, you equipped yourselves with all that was helpful for the position of rulers, and you invented a new constitu-

tion such as no one ever had before, and you prescribed for all things fixed rules and fixed periods.

92. I should not perhaps be bringing it up at the wrong moment if I now expressed a thought which for a long time has occurred to me, and, rising to my very lips, has often forced itself upon me, but so far has always been pushed aside by the argument. How far you surpass all in total extent of your empire and in firmness of grip and plan of civil administration is set forth in what has already been said; but now, it seems to me that one would not miss the mark if he said the following: all those of the past who ruled over a very large part of the earth ruled, as it were, naked bodies by themselves, mere persons composing the ethnic groups or nations. **93.** For when were there so many cities both inland and on the coast, or when have they been so beautifully equipped with everything? Did ever a man of those who lived then travel across country as we do, counting the cities by days and sometimes riding on the same day through two or three cities as if passing through sections of merely one? Hence the inferiority of those who lived in former times appears, because the past is so much surpassed, not only in the element at the head of the empire, but also in cases where identical groups have been ruled by others and by you. Those whom the others ruled did not as individuals have the equality of civil rights and privileges, but against the primitive organization of an ethnic group in that time one can set the municipal organization of the same group's city of today. It might very well be said that while the others have been kings, as it were, of open country and strongholds, you alone are rulers of civilized communities.

94. Now all the Greek cities rise up under your leadership, and the monuments which are dedicated in them and all their embellishments and comforts redound to your honor like beautiful suburbs. The coasts and interiors have been filled with cities, some newly founded, others increased under and by you.

95. Ionia, the much contested, freed of garrisons and of satraps, is visible to all, first in beauty. She has now advanced beyond herself by as much as she formerly seemed to surpass the other lands in elegance and grace. Alexander's great and noble city by Egypt has become a glory of your hegemony, like a necklace or armlet among a wealthy lady's other possessions.

96. Taking good care of the Hellenes as of your foster parents, you constantly hold your hand over them, and when they are prostrate, you raise them up. You release free and autonomous those of them who were the noblest and the leaders of yore, and you guide the others moderately with much consideration and forethought. The barbarians you educate, rather mildly or sternly according to the nature that each has, because it is right that those who are rulers of men be not inferior to those who are trainers of horses, and that they have tested their natures and guide them accordingly.

97. As on holiday the whole civilized world lays down the arms which were its ancient burden and has turned to adornment and all glad thoughts with power to realize them. All the other rivalries have left the <cities>, and this one contention holds them all, how each city may appear most beautiful and attractive. All localities are full of gymnasia, fountains, monumental approaches, temples, workshops, schools, (98) and one can say that the civilized world, which had been sick from the beginning, as it were, has been brought by the right knowledge to a state of health. Gifts never cease from you to the cities, and it is not possible to determine who the major beneficiaries have been, because your kindness is the same to all.

99. Cities gleam with radiance and charm, and the whole earth has been beautified like a garden. Smoke rising from plains and fire signals for friend and foe have disappeared, as if a breath had blown them away, beyond land and sea. Every charming spectacle and an infinite number of festal games have been introduced instead. Thus like an ever-burning sacred fire the celebration never ends, but moves around from time to time and people to people, always somewhere, a demonstration justified by the way all men have fared. Thus it is right to pity only those outside your hegemony, if indeed there are any, because they lose such blessings.

100. It is you again who have best proved the general assertion, that Earth is mother of all and common fatherland. Now indeed it is possible for Hellene or non-Hellene, with or without his property, to travel wherever he will, easily, just as if passing from fatherland to fatherland. Neither Cilician Gates nor narrow sandy approaches to Egypt through Arab country, nor inaccessible mountains, nor immense stretches of river, nor inhospitable tribes of barbarians cause terror, but for security it suffices to be a Roman citizen, or rather to be one of those united under your hegemony.

101. Homer said, "Earth common of all," and you have made it come true. You have measured and recorded the land of the entire civilized world; you have spanned the rivers with all kinds of bridges and hewn highways through the mountains and filled the barren stretches with posting stations; you have accustomed all areas to a settled and orderly way of life. Therefore, I see on reflection that what is held to be the life before Triptolemus is really the life before your time,—a hard and boorish life, not far removed from that of the wild mountains. Though the citizens of Athens began the civilized life of today, this life in its turn has been firmly established by you, who came later but who, men say, are better.

102. There is no need whatsoever now to write a book of travels and to enumerate the laws which each country uses. Rather you yourselves have become universal guides for all; you threw wide all the gates of the civilized world and gave those who so wished the oppor-

tunity to see for themselves; you assigned common laws for all and you put an end to the previous conditions which were amusing to describe but which, if one looked at them from the standpoint of reason, were intolerable; you made it possible to marry anywhere, and you organized all the civilized world, as it were, into one family.

103. Before the rule of Zeus, as the poets say, the universe was full of strife, confusion and disorder, but when Zeus came to the rule he settled everything, and the Titans, forced back by Zeus and the gods who supported him, departed to the lowest caverns of the earth. Thus one who reflects about the world before your time and about the condition of affairs in your period would come to the opinion that before your empire there had been confusion everywhere and things were taking a random course, but when you assumed the presidency, confusion and strife ceased, and universal order entered as a brilliant light over the private and public affairs of man, laws appeared and altars of gods received man's confidence.

104. For formerly they used to lay waste the world as if (like Cronos) they were mutilating their parents, and though they did not swallow their children (like Cronos), they destroyed each other's children and their own in their strife even at sanctuaries. But now a clear and universal freedom from all fear has been granted both to the world and to those who live in it. And it seems to me that they are wholly rid of evil treatment and have accepted the many incentives toward following good leadership, while the gods, beholding, seem to lend a friendly hand to your empire in its achievement and to confirm to you its possession, (105)—Zeus, because you tend for him nobly his noble creation, the civilized world; Hera, who is honored because of marriage rites properly performed; Athena and Hephaestus because of the esteem in which the crafts are held; Dionysus and Demeter, because their crops are not outraged; Poseidon because the sea has been cleansed for him of naval battles and has received merchant vessels instead of triremes. The chorus of Apollo, Artemis and the Muses never ceases to behold its servants in the theatres; for Hermes there are both international games and embassies. And when did Aphrodite ever have a better chance to plant the seed and enhance the beauty of the offspring, or when did the cities ever have a greater share in her blessings? It is now that the gracious favors of Asclepius and the Egyptian gods have been most generously bestowed upon mankind. Ares certainly has never been slighted by you. There is no fear that he will cause a general disturbance as when overlooked at the banquet of the Lapiths. On the contrary, he dances the ceaseless dance along the banks of the outermost rivers and keeps the weapons clean of blood. The all-seeing Helius, moreover, casting his light, saw no violence or injustice in your case and marked the absence of woes such as were frequent in former times. Accordingly, there is good reason why he looks and shines with most delight upon your empire.

106. Just as Homer did not fail to realize that your empire was to be, but foresaw it and made a prophecy of it in his epic, so Hesiod, were he as complete a poet and as prophetic, would not, I think, in listing the Generations of Men have begun with the Golden Race as he actually does. And having once made this beginning, he would not at least, in treating of the last, the Iron Race, have named as the time for its ruin to occur the hour "when those born with hoary temples come into being," but rather when your protectorate and empire come. That is the hour he would have named for the Iron tribe to perish on the earth. To Justice and Respect in that period he would have assigned a return amongst men. And he would have pitied those born before your time.

107. Your ways and institutions, which were really introduced by you, are ever held in honor and have become ever more firmly established. The present great governor like a champion in the games clearly excels to such an extent his own ancestors that it is not easy to declare by how much he excels men of a different stock. One would say that justice and law are in truth whatever he decrees. This too <one can see> clearly before all else, that the partners whom he has to help him rule, men <like> sons of his own, similar unto him, are more than had any of his predecessors.

108. But the trial which we undertook at the beginning of our speech is beyond any man's power, namely to compose the oration which would equal the majesty of your empire, for it would require just about as much time as time allotted to the empire, and that would be all eternity. Therefore it is best to do like those poets who compose dithyrambs and paeans, namely to add a prayer and so close the oration.

109. Let all the gods and the children of the gods be invoked to grant that this empire and this city flourish forever and never cease until stones <float> upon the sea and trees cease to put forth shoots in spring, and that the great governor and his sons be preserved and obtain blessings for all.

My bold attempt is finished. Now is the time to register your decision whether for better or for worse.

IV. TEXTUAL NOTES AND COMMENTARY

GENERAL REMARKS

As Wilamowitz¹ noted about *Oratio XVIII* (Keil) and as Lenz² proved for other orations, there is a single tradition behind the extant manuscripts of the Roman Oration. The tradition presents a pattern of errors with which the student must reckon.

Bruno Keil's edition was a considerable improvement over earlier editions, but his text of the Roman Oration

is far from satisfactory. To the writer it seems that Keil unnecessarily assumed still unfilled lacunae in sections 40, 71, 72, 101, and two each in sections 92 and 107; that he unnecessarily deleted words in sections 2, 8, 13, 18, 29, 39, 41, 45, 50, 59, and 92; that he unnecessarily inserted a word in sections 10 and 105; that he confused the sense by false emendations in sections 33, 51, 59, 85, 106, and 107; and that his notes are sometimes misleading.

Furthermore, Keil justifies some of his deletions as deletions of glosses, but the writer can find not one case of an obvious gloss, and so believes that no deletions should be made on the assumption of a gloss. When serious foreign wars began with the reign of Marcus Aurelius, the Roman Oration became somewhat outdated and probably did not appeal to the schoolmasters who were selecting models from the now famous Aelius Aristides. Hence the text was less liable to such expansion as occurred in those orations of Aelius Aristides which were studied in the schools. Obvious transpositions, on the other hand, do occur, and the extra words which Keil deletes can sometimes be readily explained as false insertions of a marginal correction. Transposition is fairly obvious in the confusion of the traditional text for sections 71-72, in the words ὡς οὐκ for οὐχ ὡς in section 40, and in the words ἔξω τῶν ποταμῶν for τῶν ἔξω ποταμῶν (Keil) in section 105. Other cases previously unnoted occur in sections 36 (*ἐπ' αὐτοῖς*), 62 (a whole clause), 67-68 (a whole sentence), perhaps also in 74 (*οὐκ ἀξιά τῆς ἀρχῆς*), and 76 (*τοὺς ἔξελθόντας*).

However, the most common error, sometimes limited to one or two manuscripts but sometimes extending to all four, is the short omission. In addition, ordinary faults of iotaism are here very common, and there are obvious cases of dittography in sections 36, 51, 82, and 100, while in section 9 there is a case of repetition where the scribe began to skip, then noticed the deletion, but forgot to delete the first word he had already written. Misreadings of isolated letters, on the other hand, are comparatively uncommon, except for secondary changes after an omission.

In general, I have retained the traditional text wherever possible. Where the traditional text seemed indefensible, I have not hesitated to indicate a lacuna or to emend, but the reader will find in the very brief *apparatus criticus* both the reading of the four chief manuscripts and who the author of the alteration was. Where the manuscript readings seem to be untrue, an attempt to heal the corruption should, I think, be made first on the assumption of a short omission; if this fails, one should look for transposition. These are the two most characteristic errors. I agree with Sieveking who says (25) that Keil was right in adopting an eclectic treatment of the four important manuscripts, though the speech is best preserved in U, worst in D, and that while S has no lacunae which are not found elsewhere, T and U have several. Of the eighty-eight changes I have

¹ U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Hermes* 61: 293 f., 1926.

² F. Lenz, *Aristidesstudien*, *Hermes* 66: 49-70, 1931.

made in Keil's text the most serious are in sections 18, 29, 40, 51 (end), 59, 62, 67, 71b, 78, 84, and 107.

On all occasions I have retained the numbering of Keil's sections, even though he skipped a section 35. Where I make a transposition, I still retain his numbering but divide it into parts *a* and *b*.

REMARKS ON INDIVIDUAL PASSAGES

1. The poet who made the witticism is unknown. The usual vow called for sacrifice of an animal, for which incense and the gilding of its horns were the ordinary trimmings.

"Stupid," *ἀμούσον*. The Muses were patrons of literature, not just of poetry, which, moreover, was in this period a mere subdivision of rhetoric. See H. I. Marrou, *Mουσικὸς ἀντίρρητος*, *Étude sur les scènes de la vie intellectuelle figurant sur les monuments funéraires romains*, Thèse, Paris, 1937. For the Muses as patrons of oratory see *Hesperia*, Suppl. 8: 249 f., 1949.

The prooemium of Aristides' prose hymn to Zeus, XLIII Keil, announces that the hymn is being spoken as the result of a vow for safe delivery from a perilous sea voyage. Also another oration of about this period, Aristides' prose hymn to Sarapis, XLV Keil 13, was delivered in gratitude for the orator's preservation. The Roman Oration is offered, however, probably not as the result of a vow made in the crisis of a storm, but on a pretence of a vow made as to a deity in anticipation of the perils of a long voyage by land and sea. Actually, however, Aristides was merely giving an exhibition of his art (*ἐπίδεξις τῆς τέχνης*) like many another traveling rhetor, musician or lecturer, except that the locale and his youth—he was twenty-seven—made the exhibition of unique importance to him.

On the "first fruits" which an artist from out of town might offer, see L. Robert, *Études épigraphiques et philologiques (Bibliothèque de l'École pratique des Hautes-Etudes, Sciences historiques et philologiques* 272) 14-15, 38-45, 1938, and *Hellenica* 2: 35-36, 1946. Aristides might have hoped for a career like that of Isaeus, who was Hadrian's teacher.

2. "It became evident that I had need of a second prayer. It is perhaps really presumptuous to dare undertake the kind of oration which should equal such majesty in a city." The punctuation makes some difference. The Aldine text, Canter, Jebb, Dindorf, and Sieveking (26) punctuated ἀλλ' ὡς ἀληθῶς εὐχῆς αὐτὸν προσεδεῖτο ἐτέρας, οὐσιαὶ μὲν οὐν καὶ μείζονος, δυνηθῆναι τοιοῦτον ἄραι λόγον, οὕτως παρισώσεται τοσῷδε ὅγκῳ πόλεως. Bonini (1517) and Keil, on the other hand, placed a colon after *ἐτέρας*, as do I. Carteromachus, Canter, Sieveking, and Levin take *μείζονος* as referring to a *εὐχή*, but Reiske has rightly protested, "non enim videtur ad *εὐχῆς* referre posse." It seems to me that the interpretation of Carteromachus and Canter ignores the implications of the particles *μὲν οὖν*, which are answered by *γε μήν* in the next clause (for parallels cf. J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, 473

and 348). If, however, *εὐχῆς* is not to be understood with *μείζονος*, what then? Reiske proposed *δυνάμεως* or *οὐσίας*, and he has been followed by Keil ("sc. ρήτορός ἐστιν ἡ ἐμοῦ") and by L. A. Stella. Here I part company. I take *μείζονος* in the unfavorable sense listed in the GEL s. v. *μέγας* II 5, and understand the word as meaning "a rather presumptuous man," or "too big a plan." There should be no comma after *μείζονος*.

Thus certain interpretations of the words *δυνηθῆναι τοιοῦτον ἄραι λόγον* are automatically eliminated, but Sieveking's comment requires notice. Sieveking thought he found an echo of this passage in Libanius, *Epist.* 1243 (ed. Foerster): *εὑξασθαι μὲν γὰρ τάκεινων δυνηθῆναι ράδιον*, *δυνηθῆναι δ' ἀμύχανον*, to which might be added *Or.* LIX (Foerster) 58, *εὑξασθαι μὲν ράδιον, λαβεῖν δὲ οὐ δυνατόν*. Sieveking draws the further, unwarranted inference that Libanius had interpreted Aristides exactly in the way that Canter did. I understand Libanius as saying in the first case, "to dare make the vow is easy, to rise to its fulfillment is impossible." I think this just happens to go better with my interpretation that Aristides found it easy to dare make the *first* vow but feared now (or pretended to fear) that he could never rise to its fulfillment. Canter and Sieveking, on the other hand, were thinking of the *second* vow, an interpretation which Reiske, Keil, L. A. Stella, and I discard as grammatically impossible. The first *εὐχή* is that stated in section 1, a vow to deliver a speech which would do justice to the majesty of Rome; according to my interpretation, the second has not yet been revealed, it comes in section 3 and turns out to be a prayer or petition to the audience to help him with inspiration from which an artist may receive the power to speak even on themes which are greater than his talents. However, Libanius echoes, not the Roman Oration of Aristides, but the Third Olympian Oration of Demosthenes III 18: *εὑξασθαι μὲν . . . ράδιον . . . ἐλέσθαι δ' . . . οὐκέτ' ὀμοίως εὐπόρον*. The double prayer at the beginning of Demosthenes' Crown Oration 1 and 8 and that at the beginning of Lycurgus' oration *Against Leocrates* are not really comparable.

3. "The great city," *τῆς μεγάλης πόλεως*. The epithet is often applied to Alexandria and, by Malalas, to Antioch. The phrase has nothing to do with the division for certain purposes into lesser, greater, and greatest cities (*Dig.* XXVII 1, 6, 2). One might better compare the use of the word *μεγάλη* in inscriptions of Roman Sidē to distinguish the *general gerusia* of the whole city from those of the city regions (*Bulletin épigraphique*, 156, 1952). In the poetic tradition "the great city" was above all Troy.

"Able to inspire one, though he were speechless before, to eloquence and skill." The same quotation from Euripides occurs in the Dionysus Oration, XLI Keil 11. It is fragment 663 Nauck, which more completely reads, "*Eros* teaches a man to be a *poet*, though he were speechless (*ἀμούσος*) before." It was a famous quotation made by Plato, *Symposium* 196e, in the speech of Agathon.

6. "Of the *all-seeing* god (*τοῦ πανόπτου θεοῦ*) who dwells in the city." The poetical adjective is an epithet of Helius, as Levin recognized. Aristides alludes to the emperor, whose power was often compared to the great power of the sun. Caligula appears in *SIG³* 798 as the New Helius, Nero in *IGR* III 345 and *SIG³* 814 (*νέος Ἡλιος ἐπιλάμψας τοῖς Ἐλλησι*). In A. D. 69 the prefect of Egypt, Tib. Julius Alexander, published an edict³ "in order that" people might "with greater confidence expect all things" *παρὰ τοῦ ἐπιλάμψαντος ἡμεῖν ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ τοῦ παντὸς ἀνθρώπων γένους εὐεργέτου Σεβαστοῦ Αὐτοκράτορος Γάλβα*. The Helius motif figures prominently in Dio Chrysostom's Third Discourse on Kingship 73-83 (cf. H. von Arnim, *Leben und Werke des Dio von Prusa*, 422-425, Berlin, 1898). An inscription of Termessus in Pisidia honors Constantine as "Ἡλιος παντόπτης" (*TAM* III 45).⁴ Still the allusion is veiled, so that it might possibly be applied to the Palatine Apollo. The sanctuary with its adjoining portico and libraries and memorials of the Roman orators had been founded by Augustus and was in many ways the most impressive sanctuary of Rome.⁵ The senate occasionally convened here, and much of the business of the city and empire was transacted in and around it. However, Aristides may have been partly influenced by the parallel in his mind between Plato's second-best but more viable state of the *Laws* and the ideal state realized by Rome. Plato's state was built around the sanctuary of Apollo Helius (*Laws* XII 945-947).

7. The almost entirely literal citation from the *Iliad* (XII 281-284, as Canter recognized) is supported by parenthetic insertion of the word *φῆσι* in the Platonic manner (cf. Dorothy Tarrant, "Plato's Use of Quotations and Other Illustrative Material," *Cl. Q.* 44: 61, 1951).

8. The other cities which Rome carries upon her back are the cities which rise into the air, i. e. the *insulae* or apartment houses of which there still are examples at

³ Metropolitan Museum of Art, *Egyptian expeditions* 14, No. 4, 1938.

"The motif continues into Christian times when the ruler, who can no longer be called a New Helius or a New Apollo, is called a New Constantine: see Ernst H. Kantorowicz, The "King's Advent" and the Enigmatic Panels in the Doors of Santa Sabina, *Art Bull.* 26: especially 209, 1944. In general see O. Weinreich, *Meneikrates Zeus und Salmoneus* 12-15 (*Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft* 18) 12-15, 1933, who shows that the Helius motif to describe the universal attention of the chief statesman goes back at least to the fifth century B.C.; F. Cumont, *La théologie solaire du paganisme romain*, *Mémoires présentées par divers savants à l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres* 12 (2): 457 ff., 1909; A. Alföldi, *Insignien und Tracht der römischen Kaiser*, *Röm. Mitt.* 50: 3-171, 1935; H. P. L'Orange, *Apotheosis in ancient portraiture* (Oslo, *Institutet for Sammenlignende Kulturforskning*, Ser. B, *Skrifter* 22) 34-38 and 60-72, 1947.

⁴ Platner-Ashby, *A topographical dictionary of Ancient Rome*, s. v. Apollo Palatinus; G. Lugli, *Roma antica, il centro monumentale*, 434-441 and 468-479, Rome, Bardi, 1946. Compare the reference in the opening words of the *Tabula Hebana*, to which the entire issue of *La Parola del Passato* 14, 1950, is devoted.

Ostia, certainly not real cities, for which Schönbauer, *ZSS*, 51: 324, 1931, mistakes them. Many of those at Ostia date from the time of Hadrian, and in Rome Nero's fire had prepared the way for much building activity. On the *insulae* see Axel Boethius, *Den romerska storstadens hyreshusarkitektur och dess bebyggelsegeografiska Sammanhang* (*Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift* 50 [4]), 1944, which has a summary in English; A. R. A. van Aken, "The Cortile in the Roman Imperial Insula-Architecture," *Opuscula Archaeologica* 6: 112-128, 1950. L. Homo, *Rome impériale et l'urbanisme dans l'antiquité* 552-579, Paris, Michel, 1951.

With the play on the name *Ῥώμη* compare the play on the name of Demosthenes as recommended by Theon (*Rhet. Gr.* II, 109 Spengel). L. A. Stella points out that the derivation of the name of Rome from the Greek word for "strength" appears in the hymn to Rome by Melinno (Diehl, *Anth. Lyr.* IV 315), also in Pseudo-Scymnus, *Description of the Earth*, 232, and in Festus (p. 328 Lindsay).

"The Strait of Otranto," *τὸν Ιόνιον (sc. πόρον)*.

9. "It has been said:" Thucydides I 10.

"The entire civilized world." On the *Oikoumenē* as the Roman world, see F. Gisinger *RE* 17: 2165-2167, 1937, s. v. "Oikumene (Orbis)"; F. W. Walbank, "The Geography of Polybius," *Classica et Mediaevalia* 9: 155-182, 1948.

"Amazed . . . no longer amazed." Compare Xenophon, *Lac.* I 1.

10. The background of this passage is provided, as Canter realized, by a fragment (1 Krauss) of the *Alcibiades* of Aeschines Socratus, a fragment preserved, incidentally by Aelius Aristides XLVI (Dindorf, 292 f.):

"Call to mind whence the sun rises and where it sets."

"But, Socrates," he said, "there is nothing difficult in knowing such things as that."

"Then has it ever yet occurred to you, that though this land is so vast, one man rules as much as the sun traverses, land which is called Asia."

"Yes indeed," he said, "the Great King."

This passage from the *Alcibiades* presupposes an earlier source which would be the *λογοποιός* inferred by Aelius Aristides, who probably used Aeschines Socratus alone in here writing, *ὅπερ γάρ τις ἔφη τῶν λογοποιῶν περὶ τῆς Ἀσίας, λέγων ὅσην ὁ ἥλιος πορεύεται, ταύτης πάσης ἄρχειν ἄνδρα ἔνα*.

A little further on, Aeschines refers to the king of Persia as *τὸν τῶν ἀφ' ἥλιον ἀνίσχοντος μέχρι ἥλιον δυομένου βασιλεύοντα*. This would reflect the official Persian terminology and the Persian feeling of the universality of their empire.

G. Kaibel, *Hermes* 20: 497-500, 1885, drew attention to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who in the *Roman Antiquities* I 3, 6, says that in all the history of the world Rome was the first and the only state which made sunrises and sunsets boundaries of her empire. The idea of

an empire's universality was certainly not new, and it was no great effort for a Greek of the Augustan Period to infer that universality of empire had been achieved not so much by the Persians as by the Romans. Few scholars will unreservedly follow L. A. Stella (pp. 112 f., note 12) who makes no reference to Aeschines Socratus and suggests patriotically that Dionysius "abbia tratto dagli scrittori latini questa imagine che esprime un orgoglio tutto romano (cfr. ad es. Tibullo, II, 5, 57-60)." Horace (*Odes* IV 15, 13-16) and Ovid (*Fasti* IV 832) as well as Tibullus had used the image, but they may have obtained it from someone like Posidonius. In the writer's opinion the assertion of Dionysius does not express a peculiarly Roman pride but merely reflects a rhetorician's desire to give an old phrase a new and striking application. The phrase was one used repeatedly by Sumerian,⁶ Akkadian, Babylonian, Assyrian, and Persian kings.

Furthermore, everyone knew the word *ζόφος* (darkness) which Homer had applied to the West (to the North, according to Crates of Pergamum), and the term continued to interest the *grammatici* who interpreted Homer. The ancient Oriental phrase for universality of empire and the Homeric phrase for the West were two aspects of the same subject (cf. Strabo I 2, 24-28), and Aristides treats them together quite naturally when he insists that the Roman Empire is a more truly universal empire and that its territory, of which so much, including the capital, lies in the West, is not the land of darkness. With the latter he prepares the audience for emphasis on the brilliant light of the Roman Empire (see section 103 and commentary). Contrast Vergil, *Aeneid* VI 795 f.:

iacet extra sidera tellus
extra anni solisque vias.

"Because," εἰ δῆ. Reiske emended to εἰ μή, but this gives the wrong sense. Rather it should be emended to ἐπειδή, but I think that even εἰ δῆ can have had the meaning ἐπειδή and should not be changed.

"Turned out to be true." Pointing to a similar phrase in section 89, Bartoletti calls for the deletion of ἀληθὲς εἶναι as a redundant interpolation. But a little redundancy is not offensive and variation is to be expected.

"For neither the Chelidonean nor the Cyanean promontories limit your empire, nor does the distance from which a horseman can reach the sea in one day." These were terms of the Peace of Callias according to Demosthenes, XIX, 273. The Cyanean Islands, also called the Symplegades, were located at the mouth of the Bosphorus. The Chelidonian Islands were off the Cilician Coast. On the Peace of Callias see H. T. Wade-Gery, "The Peace of Callias," *Harvard Studies in Classical Phil-*

⁶ The phrase, as W. F. Albright has kindly shown me, occurs from the time of the Sumerian king Lugalzaggisi (cf. F. Thureau-Dangin, *Die sumerischen und akkadischen Königsinschriften*, 155, Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1907). H. H. Schaeder, *Das persische Weltreich*, Breslau, 1941, is inaccessible to me.

ology, Suppl. 1: 121-156, 1940 (cf. B. D. Meritt, Wade-Gery and McGregor, *The Athenian Tribute Lists* 3: Ch. VIII, Princeton, Amer. School of Class. Studies at Athens, 1950); M. Cary, "The Peace of Callias," *Cl. Q.* 39: 87-91, 1945.

"The sea like a girdle lies extended at once in the middle of the civilized world and of your hegemony." Aristides echoes Choerilus of Samos. See Probus, *Commentarius in Vergili Georgica* I 233, which I cite from H. J. Mette, *Sphairopoia*, 186 (= fr. 23h of Crates of Pergamum), Munich, Beck, 1936: "nam quidam orbem terrarum descripsérunt in formam litterae θ, et in lineamentis quae per circuitum ambiant litteram formam referunt Oceani, quem recte ξωστήρα τοῦ κόσμου dixerunt <velut> et C<h>oeril{1}us cum ait 'Οκεανός φάσα περίρυτος ἐνδέδεται χθών."

11. "Great continents greatly sloping," μεγάλαι μεγαλωστί, a citation from the *Iliad*, XVI 776, κεῖτο μέγας μεγαλωστί. Compare the way these words are echoed in section 63 with the substitution of the prose form μεγάλως for the poetic μεγαλωστί. Similarly Plato cites this Homeric phrase with an adaptation, *Republic* 566c: δῆλον ὅτι μέγας μεγαλωστὶ οὐ κεῖται.

The *topos* of a mart in the center of the world goes back to Isocrates, *Panegyricus* 42, where the Piraeus is described as the center of Hellas. Strabo XVII 13 refers to Alexandria μέγιστον ἐμπόρου of the civilized world. The word ἐργαστήριον might suggest a shop or the business establishment of a capitalist who finances and controls the production of outworkers and disposes of their products.

12. "Cargoes from India" had been coming for a century and a half. See M. P. Charlesworth, "Roman Trade with India. A Resurvey," *Studies in Roman Economic and Social History in Honor of Allan Chester Johnson*, 131-143, Princeton Univ. Press, 1951.

Isocrates, *Panegyricus* 42, also spoke of the abundance and greater ease with which products could be found at Athens than in their countries of origin. Compare also Thucydides II 38 (the funeral oration of Pericles).

"Your farms (γεωργίαι) are Egypt, Sicily, and the civilized part of Africa." For the three parts of Africa see Herodotus II 32. Compare Cicero's reference (*Against Verres* II 3) to productive provinces as "praedia populi Romani."

13. "So that the wonder is, not that the harbor has insufficient space for merchant vessels, but that even the sea has enough, if it really does." The traditional text reads ὥστε εἶναι μὴ ὅτι περὶ τοῦ λιμένος, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῆς θαλάττης, ὅτι περ ἔξαρκε δλάδου. Keil denounced the last four words as corrupt and suggested their deletion. Sieveking (95) defended the text but admitted that the particle περ betrayed some kind of corruption, perhaps influenced by the περὶ of the preceding line. L. A. Stella's translation "abbastanza posto per tutte le navi" suggests an unconvincing emendation πάσας in place of περ. Rather the vestige περ points to an original εἰπερ.

The citation from Hesiod is, as G. F. Schoemann, *Opuscula Academica* 2: 327 f., Berlin, 1857, recognized, an incorrect citation of *Theogony* 736-741, which despite F. Jacoby (*Hesiodi carmina*, 22-27, Berlin, Weidmann, 1930), may still be by Hesiod (cf. F. Solmsen, *Hesiod and Aeschylus* [*Cornell Studies in Class. Phil.* 30] 60, 1949). Dorothy Tarrant ("Plato's Use of Quotations and other Illustrative Material," *Cl. Q.*, 44: 61, 1951), counts twenty such cases of incorrect citation in Plato, whose manner Aristides affects, and (p. 62) she notes that one is from the *Theogony* and 17 are from Homer. Compare the other case in section 86.

"There is a common channel to Rome and," Levin's excellent translation where Keil perversely deleted four words. With this passage contrast what Tacitus has to say about Rome, "quo cuncta undique atrocia aut pudenda confluunt celebranturque" (*Ann.* XV 44). Reiske², who was troubled by the absence of πάντα and would have inserted it before συντέρηται, might better have gotten his πάντα by merely inverting the two next words καὶ πάντα, but the traditional text seems acceptable as it is.

"All meet here . . . all the arts and crafts that are or ever have been." Compare the catalogue of Herondas I 26-32, beginning

τὰ γὰρ πάντα,
ὅσσ' ἔστι κον καὶ γίνετ', ἔστ' ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ.

Both Herondas and Aristides perhaps reflect a famous encomium of Alexandria. But see the parallels collected by Walter Headlam, *Herondas, the Mimes and the Fragments*, 25-26, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1922.

14. "I blush now: after such great and impressive matters have been mentioned, my argument reaches a point where it is without great and impressive material; I shall distinguish myself ingloriously by recalling some barbarian empire or Hellenic power, and it will seem that I intend to do the opposite of what the Aeolic poets did," Ερυθρῶ δῆτα, εἴ, τοσούτων καὶ τηλικούτων εἰρημένων, εἴτα μὴ ἔχοντος τοῦ λόγου, φανούμαι μεμνημένος ἡ βαρβαρικῆς τινος ἀρχῆς ἡ Ἑλληνικῆς δυνάμεως, καὶ δόξω τοινάντιον ποιήσειν τοῖς Αἰολεῦσι ποιητᾶς. This, modeled on Isocrates XII 74, has been one of the most difficult passages, and several students have proposed emendations: <*προβαλνεῖν*> μὴ ἔχοντος τοῦ λόγου (Reiske), μὲ ἐλόντος (Jacob), εἴτα μ<*ειονεκτοῦ*>ντος (Keil), εἴτα μὴν ὑπεν>ε<*γκ*>όντος τοῦ λόγου (V. Bartoletti, *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica* 12: 209-211, 1935). Sieveking (29) correctly insisted that the text was all right; but he argued that λέγειν τι was the unexpressed object of ἔχοντος, and this understandably did not convince Bartoletti. The unexpressed object is τοσαῦτα καὶ τηλικαῦτα, easily supplied from what precedes. Bartoletti would emend also <*εἰ*> καὶ δόξω, but this too seems unnecessary. There is, of course, a suggestive play on words in ποιήσειν and ποιητᾶς. By "the opposite of what the Aeolic poets did" Aristides means that he fears lest it look as if he intended to disparage

the Greeks of yore, and in section 51 he reiterates that disparagement of the ancient Greeks is not his intention.

"Having no other way to show the degree of your empire's superiority." A similar apology occurs in XIII Dindorf, p. 281.

For the importance of comparisons to orators, historians, etc. see F. Focke, "Synkrisis," *Hermes* 58: 327-368, 1923; or, even better, G. L. Hendrickson, *The Decennial Publications* (of the Univ. of Chicago) 6: 3-33, 1902.

15. "The preceding empires which were even less ideal." The word φαυλότερα implies further removal from an ideal excellence. The noun φαυλότης may mean the absence of *aretē* or the presence of vice. In section 41, however, where the adjective φαυλότερα is applied to the Hellenic hegemonies in comparison with the Persian kingdom as a world empire, it clearly does not mean "more vicious." On the other hand, that could but need not be the meaning here in section 15. For the contrast between ἀρετή and φαυλότης see the commentary on section 41. Herodotus did not count the Assyrian and Median Empires among world-empires (cf. commentary on section 91), but Ctesias did. Aristides does not return to the standpoint of Herodotus, but he follows Polybius I 2 in selecting the Persian and Macedonian Empires as the most famous of those which preceded Rome.

"How they themselves enjoyed (ἀπέλανον) what they had acquired and how they affected their subjects" (τοὺς ἀρχομένους παρεσκεύαζον). See Polybius III 4. The Persian Empire is to be judged according to success or failure from two standpoints, the happiness of the rulers and that of the ruled. L. A. Stella translates, "quale ordinamento abbiano saputo dare ai popoli su cui dominarono," and Levin renders "How they handled their subjects" (cf. Canter's "civibus uti"). Levin fails to distinguish the interest in the happiness of the subjects from the interest in the happiness rather than skill of the rulers, while L. A. Stella expands with a paraphrase (perhaps misleading) that can hardly pretend to be a translation. Plato *Laws* X 896-898, where good or bad primary movements in the soul are said to produce good or bad secondary movements in the body, may be worth citing, because the government is the soul of an empire, and the subjects are the body.⁷

16. "The King of those from the Sunset to the Sunrise." Compare Aeschines, *Against Ctesiphon* 132, and the passage from the *Alcibiades* of Aeschines Socratus cited above in the commentary to section 10.

"Defeat," "losses." The important word in each clause is held in reserve for a paradoxical ending.

17. The presence of erratic change, the absence of permanent boundaries and of proper control are em-

⁷ For the Platonic *kinēseis* compare J. B. Skemp, *The theory of motion in Plato's Later Dialogues*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1942.

phasized in a way to support the analogy which he may seem to suggest in section 18 between conditions in the Persian Empire and the chaos of the reign of Necessity. For the indissoluble Roman frontier see section 84.

"Like a king in a game of children." For the game L. A. Stella points to a reference in Dio Chrysostomus, *Orat.* IV 48.

The reference to the ease with which Greek armies passed through Persian territory is an echo of Isocrates IV 148.

18. The name of Oebaras occurs six times in the eight sections devoted by Photius in his summary of the *Persica* of Ctesias to the books concerning Cyrus. R. Henry, *Ctésias: La Perse, L'Inde, Les sommaires de Photius*, 12, 14, 15, and 16, Brussels, Office de Publicité, 1947, in the summary points out that in one case the Marciannus 450 has the genitive *Oιβάρα*, while the Marciannus 451 has the genitive *Oιβάρον* corrected into *Oιβαρᾶ*. The manuscripts seem to agree on the ending -a in the two other references to the name in the genitive (pp. 14 and 15). In fragment 66 of Nicolaus of Damascus (F. Gr. Hist. 2a), which is held by Jacoby to be a straight excerpt from Ctesias without additions, the name of Oebaras occurs nineteen times, with a nominative in -as and a genitive in alpha. Ctesias, to judge from the summary of Photius and the excerpt by Nicolaus of Damascus, declined the name with the genitive *Oιβάρα* and the nominative *Oιβάρας*, whereas Herodotus, who mentions him in III 85, 87 and 88, uses the genitive *Oιβάρεος* and the nominative *Oιβάρης*. Names ending in -as were in Attic Greek properly declined with a genitive in -ou, those ending in -ρης with a genitive in -ρον (cf. Meisterhans-Schwyzer, *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*, ed. 3, 120 and 134 f., Berlin, Weidmann, 1903. Therefore Aristides like Ctesias called the man *Oιβάρας* but declined the name in the Attic manner.⁸ It is clear that Aristides had the story directly or indirectly from Ctesias, in whose history the sage played a great role, and not, as Keil suggested without evidence, from the *Alcibiades* of Aeschines Socraticus.

For the Oebaras of Ctesias see A. Momigliano, "Tradizione e invenzione in Ctesia," *Atene e Roma*, 12, 1931, especially pp. 26-33.

The words "wandering" (*πλάνη*), "necessity" (*ἀνάγκη*), "to every part" (*πανταχοί*), "nomads" (*νομάδες*) and "wanderers" (*πλάνητες*) may suggest the

⁸ James W. Poultney (*per litteras*) points out that the Old Persian form of the name would have had an a-vowel. Ctesias explained the name as 'Αγαθάγγελος. Poultney comments that the second member of the compound name *Oιβάρας* is a derivative of the Indo-European *bher- "bring," and he adds that Professor Roland Kent would identify the first member as the Old Persian stem *vau*, sometimes transcribed *vah u*, cognate with Sanskrit *vasu*—“good” and appearing as first member of several compound names. Thus with an i-extension on the first member the compound name would be **vah v-i-baras*. The two *v*-semivowels would not be represented at all in Attic-Ionic Greek, which did not have the digamma, and the *h* also would not appear. Only *a i* would be left to appear in Greek as *Oi-*.

erratic, random course of celestial bodies in the time of Necessity. Keil deleted as a gloss the words *νομάδες τινὲς βασιλεῖς καὶ πλάνητες*, but perhaps the sentence expresses in its disharmonious structure a deliberate contrast with the periodic style. The word *periodos* means not only a compact rounded sentence but also the path of a celestial body's orderly rotation. In section 33 it is indicated that the Roman emperor Antoninus Pius does not wander.

"Not . . . as shepherds." Plato, *Politicus* 267e, "those shepherds of human flocks whom we called statesmen," etc., but see also 275b-c.

19. "They did not mind it as their own." For the contrast see section 65.

"Raise . . . to beauty and full size." For the Homeric phrase *κάλλος καὶ μέγεθος* see also Plato, *Charmides* 154c and Xenophon, *Cyrop.* V 2, 7, where it is applied to the human body. It means *χάρις*. Plato, *Laws* X 896e-897a, argues that the soul produces growth or decay, the Good World-Soul growth, the Bad World-Soul decay. It is the Roman government which produces beauty and growth everywhere (58, 94-99).

"As weak as possible." For Rome producing health, strength, and beauty, see section 97.

Plutarch, *De fortuna Romanorum* (edd. Nachstädt, Sieveking et Titchener) 317b-c, on the world before Rome created a peaceful Cosmos: *ἀμήχανος <ἢ> ή φθορὰ καὶ πλάνη καὶ μεταβολὴ πάσα πάντων*.

20. "The consequences (*παρέπεσθαι*) of these enjoyments were what a law of nature ordained, hatreds and plots," etc. Compare the secondary movements (*τούτοις ἐπομένας*) produced by the Good or Bad Soul in Plato, *Laws* X 897a. With the hatreds and plots of this rule compare the security of the rule of Rome in section 100. On the law of nature see Glenn R. Morrow, "Plato and the Law of Nature," *Essays in Political Theory Presented to George H. Sabine*, 17-44, Ithaca, Cornell Univ. Press, 1948; J. P. Maguire, "Plato's Theory of the Law of Nature," *Yale Class. Studies* 10: 151-178, 1947, with criticism by K. von Fritz, *AJP* 71: 428-431, 1950. The phrase *φύσεως νόμος διέταξε*, before which Reiske anachronistically inserted a definite article, undoubtedly means "law of nature ordained," but Aristides probably has in mind the Platonic phrase *τοὺς τῆς φύσεως νόμους*, which, as Taylor and Cornford warn the reader of *Timaeus* 83e, means "the established custom of nature."

21. "Destroyed and demolished." The universal *φθορὰ* of Plutarch, *De fortuna Romanorum* (edd. Nachstädt Sieveking Titchener) 317b.

"More or less," *σχεδόν*. For this use of the adverb to indicate limitation to the essential compare Xenophon *Lac.* V 1 and the commentary in Ollier's *Thèse complémentaire*, p. 36.

The last two sentences are devoted to the *topos* of the "solita regibus" (cf. Tacitus, *Hist.* V 8).

22. "Easier to be preserved when fighting against them." Cf. Isocrates XII 160.

"Giving and receiving hatred." Aristides emphasizes this aspect to bring out the character of Roman rule.

"War which was their way of settling disputes in the majority of cases." Plato's Demiurge did not settle everything by force but resorted to persuasion (*Timaeus* 48a; cf. F. M. Cornford, *Plato's Cosmology*, 361-364). Rome likewise did not settle all disputes by military action.

23. "It is impossible to be good subjects if the rulers are bad rulers." The body of a world cannot be just if the soul is unjust (cf. section 58). Diodotus in Thucydides III 46, 5 refers to the naturalness of revolt in case of bad rule.

"Government and slave management were not yet differentiated, but 'king' and 'master' were equivalent terms." This is directed against Plato, *Politicus* 258e and 259c, where the Stranger insists on the essential identity of the terms *πολιτικός*, *βασιλεύς*, *δεσπότης* and *οἰκονόμος*. The *differentia imperiorum* goes back to Panaetius (cf. W. Capelle, "Griechische Ethik und römischer Imperialismus," *Klio* 25: 86-113, 1932).

"They certainly did not proceed in a reasonable manner or with great objectives," *οὐκονν εἰκότως οὐδὲ ἐπὶ μεγάλᾳ προῆλθον*. On the other hand, Carteromachus translates, "Iure igitur ne magna quidem suspicere incrementa potuere"; Canter, "Quocirca neque magnos fecerunt progressus"; L. A. Stella, "E naturale quindi che falissero a la prova"; Levin, "So the Persians naturally did not get far." But the word *εἰκότως* reverberates significantly, I think, at the end of sections 58 and 67b.

"The word 'master' applies properly within the circle of a private household." Hans Lietzmann, *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament* 3: 53-55, Tübingen, Mohr, 1913, has some remarks, still worth reading, about the word "master" (*δεσπότης*) and "lord" (*κύριος*). The title "master" is given to Oriental kings in Herodotus, Diodorus, and Greek inscriptions. Augustus and Tiberius made it clear that they would not permit such an address except from the slaves of their own households. Suetonius, *Divus Augustus* 53: "Domini appellationem ut maledictum et obprobrium semper exhorruit. cum, spectante eo ludos, pronuntiatum esset in mimo *O domum aequum et bonum* et universi quasi de ipso dictum exultantes comprobassent, et statim manu vultuque indecoras adulaciones repressit et insequentie die gravissimo corripuit edicto; dominumque se posthac appellari ne a liberis quidem aut nepotibus suis vel serio vel ioco passus est." Suetonius, *Tiberius* 27: "Dominus appellatus a quodam, denuntiavit ne se amplius contumeliae causa nominaret." Tacitus, *Ann.* II 87: "acerbeque increpuit eos qui divinas occupationes ipsumque dominum dixerant." Cassius Dio LVII 8, 2: (Tiberius) "often said, 'I am master to my slaves, imperator to the troops, princeps to the rest.'" Claudius advised a

Parthian prince "ut non dominationem et servos sed rectorem et civis cogitaret" (Tacitus, *Ann.* XII 11). Dio of Prusa I 22 says that the good king "dislikes to be called 'master' not only by free men but even by slaves."

24. "Again Alexander who acquired the great empire—so it looked until yours arose." Aristides significantly substitutes the phrase *ὁ τὴν μεγάλην ἀρχὴν μέχρι τῆς ὑμετέρας κτηγάμενος* for the expected phrase *ὁ μέγας καλούμενος*. Another interpretation would be that the great empire was Asia plus Europe, and that *only* (so Canter) Alexander had held it before Rome, but the fact remains that the word "only" is not in the text. Reiske commented that the words *μέχρι τῆς ὑμετέρας* meant "which extended to the boundaries of your empire or which coincided with the rise of your empire." G. Kaibel, *Hermes* 20: 448, 1885, emended the word *μεγάλην* to *μεγίστην*, which was accepted by Keil, Sieveking (30), L. A. Stella and Levin over the protest of Wilamowitz. Sieveking rightly denied that either of Reiske's explanations was acceptable, but neither is Kaibel's. It is palaeographically implausible and it destroys the play on the epithet of Alexander the Great. Alexander's achievement no longer seems to be great, because, as he says in section 14, Rome has made all the greatest achievements seem small.

For Plato, *Politicus* 291a-311c, the king was not a man with the title *basileus* but an ideal statesman whether or not he held office. Aristides plays on this theme as he raises the question, so familiar from Dio of Prusa IV, whether or not Alexander displayed the skill of a statesman (*πολιτικός*). Alexander died before he had a chance to show what capacity he had for the art of government, which Plato called the royal art.

25. "He could not establish (*κατεστήσασθαι*) the empire." Alexander did not execute whatever plan he had in mind. Aristides is still thinking of government as the royal art and of Alexander as an artist. In section 72a Aristides says of the Romans, "In regard to the civil administration of the whole empire it has been stated in what way you thought of it and what kind you established" (*κατεστήσασθε*).

26. "Or by what routine administration with automatic progress and fixed periods of time did he conduct his affairs?" *ἢ ποιὰ συνήθει διουκήσει τὰ πράγματα ἡγαγεν αὐτομάτως προϊούση χρόνων τακτάς περιόδους*; Translating the verb, I follow A. D. Nock, who in a letter compares *ἄγειν δι' ἐπιστολῶν* in section 33. The contrast in the fixed terms of Roman governors comes in section 36, and more generally in section 91. The phrase *χρόνου τακτὴ περίοδος* occurs in the Panathenaic Oration of Aristides (p. 240 Dindorf), as Keil notes. These terms can without much strain be interpreted as carrying cosmological overtones: the civilized world was not yet a Cosmos with a self-moving soul, a Cosmos like the Universe where the celestial bodies moved in fixed orbits, etc.

Hunc solem et stellas et decadentia certis
tempora momentis

"In civil administration what successes did he achieve among the people under his rule," *ποῖα πολιτεύματα ἐπολιτεύσατο ἐν τοῖς ἀρχομένοις*; The implied contrast occurs partly in section 36 (*ῶσπερ ἐν μᾶς πόλει πάσῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ πολιτεύομενοι*). Still evaluating Alexander as an artist, Aristides inquires what sort of works he actually produced in the art of government. Canter translates, vaguely, "quam functionem inter suos habuit?" L. A. Stella, "Quale regime politico instaurò fra i popoli sotto il suo governo." Levin, "Did he carry out any policies toward his subjects?" But surely none of these versions can be supported. This and the following sentence are paraphrased by E. Schönbauer, *ZSS* 51: 326, 1931: "Wie viele *πολιτεύματα* hat er denn, wenn man von Alexandrien absieht, begründet?" To the subject of the many *politeumata* which Alexander did indeed found W. W. Tarn provides an introduction in his *Alexander the Great* 1: 132-136 and 2: 232-259, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1948. However, the *πολιτεύματα*, here mentioned, are not communities of *politai* but successes as *πολιτικός* (antithesis of *στρατηγός*). In support of my interpretation I cite a passage from Isocrates not previously adduced. In the *Philippos* (ed. Benseler) 140 Isocrates wrote to the king of Macedon, 'Ἐνθυμοῦ δ' ὅτι μάλιστα τούτους τιμώσιν ἄπαντες καὶ θαυμάζοντο, οἵτινες ἀμφότερα δύνανται, καὶ πολιτεύονται καὶ στρατηγεῦν. ὅταν οὖν ὁρᾶς τὸν ἐν μᾶς πόλει ταῦτην ἔχοντας τὴν φύσιν εὐδοκιμοῦντας, ποίους τινὰς χρὴ προσδοκᾶν τὸν ἐπαίνους ἔσεσθαι τὸν περὶ σοῦ ῥῆθησομένους, ὅταν φαίνη ταῖς μὲν εὐεργεσίαις ἐν ἄπαισι τοῖς "Ἐλλησι πεπολιτευμένοις, ταῖς δὲ στρατηγίαις τὸν βαρβάρους κατεστραμμένους; With these last words compare what Aelius Aristides says of Alexander in section 25, *τὸν ἀντιστάντας ἄπαντας κατέστραπτο*. But with the rhetorical question in section 26, *ποῖα πολιτεύματα ἐπολιτεύσατο ἐν τοῖς ἀρχομένοις*, Aristides means that in the other half of the ideal (cf. Isocrates, *ταῖς μὲν εὐεργεσίαις ἐν ἄπαισι τοῖς "Ἐλλησι πεπολιτευμένοις*) Alexander was found wanting. Again Aristides uses the word *πολιτεύματα* here precisely in the way Plutarch uses it in *Lycurgus* 10, 1, and 11, 1 and 28, 2; *Numa* 17, 1. In general see W. Ruppel, "Politeuma. Bedeutungsgeschichte eines staatsrechtlichen Terminus," *Philologus* 82: 268-312 and 433-454, 1927, especially 290.

Fed by the Peripatetic and Stoic Schools, Greek feeling toward Alexander was on the whole unfavorable until the first century B. C. In the time of Trajan, Alexander was pretty generally rehabilitated, so that Aristides, who of course has a favorable attitude toward Alexander, can treat Alexander as constituting for most contemporary Greeks an ideal *basileus*. For an outline of contrasting views of Alexander as king or tyrant see W. Hoffmann, *Das literarische Porträt Alexanders des Grossen im griechischen und römischen Altertum*, Diss., Leipzig, 1907; J. Stroux, "Die stoische Beurteilung Alexanders des Grossen," *Philologus* 88: 222-240, 1933. W. W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great* 2: 1-134, 1948.

Concerning the phrase "Alexandria by Egypt" see Sir Harold Bell, "Alexandria ad Aegyptum," *JRS*, 36: 130-132, 1946. The mention of Alexandria in this connection is technically motivated by the issue whether or not Alexander, its founder, had the royal art of statesmanship. The foundation of Alexandria was indeed the act of a far-seeing statesman. Really, of course, mention of Alexandria may have been motivated by the recent trip to Egypt and by the special predilection of the orator for that city, which in section 95 he mentions again.

"The greatest city after yours." So also Dio of Prusa XXXII 35. In a Syriac Notitia Urbis Alexandrinae, which goes back to a Greek text composed sometime probably in the first two centuries after Hadrian, it is claimed that Alexandria is the greatest city of the *Oikoumenê* (cf. P. M. Fraser, *Jour. Egyptian Archaeol.* 37: 103-108, 1951).

"To have and to control," *ὅπως ἔχοιτε καὶ . . . κρατοῖτε*. The phrase *ἔχειν καὶ κρατεῖν*, which occurs in *IG II²* 2758 and which was repeated every year in the archon's proclamation (Aristotle, *Ath. Const.* 56, 2), was a technical formula of Attic private law for the idea of possession. Alexandria, which did not have a city council, was governed directly by Roman officials, so that her status was unique among Greek cities.

27. "More like men who had been deported than like men with a capacity for command," *ῶσπερ ἔξεψισμένοι μᾶλλον ἢ κρατεῖν δυνάμενοι*. Keil emends *ἢ* to *ἄν* and translates, "quasi extra patriam (deducti) facilius regnare possent." Sieveking (30) rightly protests with an indication of the contrast in section 33.

"Men driven from home appointed as kings not by the great king but by themselves," *ἀνάστατοί τινες βασιλεῖς οὐχ ὑπὸ τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως ἀλλ᾽ ὑφ' ἑαυτῶν αὐτοῖς γεγενημένοι*. Aristides, as Rostovtzeff shows (*SEHHW* 1346 f., note 24), is not speaking of the later Macedonian kings, but of the Diadochi, whom he considers "self-made kings." Both L. A. Stella, who translates "re in esilio," and Levin, who translates "mere refugee kings," connect the first three words more closely than I do. The contrast comes in section 36.

"Satraps." This term of abuse occurs in Plutarch, *Cleomenes* 31 and 16, in a passage denouncing the *ὑβριν καὶ πλεονεξίαν* of the Macedonians.

"With which term shall we describe a condition such as theirs, for were they not more like robber chieftains than like kings?" *ληστείᾳ μᾶλλον ἢ βασιλείᾳ προσεοικέναι*. In the Acts of Appian⁹ an Alexandrine "martyr," denying that the emperor Commodus is a *basileus*, calls him a robber chieftain (*ληστάρχης*). St. Augustine, *City of God* IV 4, writes: : "Remota itaque iustitia quid sunt regna nisi magna latrocinia? . . . Eleganter enim et veraciter Alexandro illi Magno quidam comprehensus

⁹ U. Wilcken, *Chrestomathie* 20, col. IV. On this literature see H. I. Bell, *The Acts of the Alexandrines*, *Jour. Juristic Papyrology* 4: 19-42, 1950.

pirata respondit. Nam cum idem rex hominem interrogasset, quid ei videretur, ut mare infestaret, ille libera contumacia: Quod tibi, inquit, ut orbem terrarum; sed quia id ego exiguo navigio facio, latro vocor; quia tu magna classe, imperator.”¹⁰ Though there is nothing wicked about the Alexander of Aelius Aristides, the empire acquired by Alexander remained without *iustitia*, so that even Alexander commanded a mere band of robbers. In sections 34-39 and 107 Aristides will show that the Roman Empire does have justice, but here in 27 his summation implies the absence of justice from the Persian Empire and the Macedonian kingdoms. L. A. Stella (note 29) has failed to catch the implication. She finds the rhetorical question inexplicable after the brief reference to the division of Alexander's kingdom by the Diadochs, and she suggests that it be connected with sections 22-23 as the conclusion of the “brigantesco governo” of the Persians. The transposition seems to the writer neither necessary nor even possible. About the Macedonian Successors of Alexander, moreover, Aristides wishes to stress that they knew nothing about civil administration and were mere garrison commanders. For the terrible sufferings and bitter memories which garrisons imposed upon the Greek cities see the commentary on the contrasting passage in section 67. Note the reference to Ionia's relief from garrisons and satraps in section 95.

With the insistence of Aristides that the Diadochs were not kings at all but mere garrison commanders the reader should compare the great tribute which Trogus, following a Greek source, paid to the kingly quality of the Diadochs. It seems to the writer that Aristides reacts against the exaggerated encomium of the Diadochs in the same source, partly because also the latter appears to have detested the Macedonian soldiery as robbers, and because what Trogus said about these Macedonian generals seeming to be men selected (*electos*) from the entire civilized world looks like a phrase used by Aristides (36) about the Roman governors. The passage XIII 1 in Justin's epitome of Trogus reads as follows:

“When indeed they had to believe that he (Alexander) was dead, all the barbarian nations who a little while before had been conquered by him mourned him not as an enemy but as a father. Also the mother of king Darius upon hearing of the death of Alexander committed suicide, not because she preferred her enemy to her son but because she had experienced the piety of a son in him whom she had feared as an enemy. For because of the victor's kindness she had not become disgusted with life on the day when with the loss of her son she had been brought down into captivity from the pinnacle of such great majesty. On the other hand, the

¹⁰ The end of the anecdote appears also in Cicero, *De re pub.* III 24 (p. 91 Ziegler): cf. R. Reitzenstein, *Nachr. Gött. Gesell. Wiss.*, Phil. hist. Kl., 418, 1917, where the parallels in Nonius 125, 318, and 534 and in St. Augustine's *City of God* IV 4 are cited.

Macedonians conversely did not mourn his loss as that of a fellow-citizen and king of such great majesty but rejoiced in the death of an enemy, because they detested both his excessive severity and the unremitting perils of war. Moreover, the chiefs (*principes*) looked to the kingship and the military commands (*regnum et imperia*), the common soldiers to the treasures and their great accumulation of gold as unexpected booty, the former with their thoughts on succession in the kingship, the latter with their thoughts on inheriting the wealth and riches. For there were 50,000 talents in the treasuries, and in annual taxes and tribute 300,000. Nor did the friends¹¹ of Alexander look to the kingship in vain. For they were men of such quality and dignity that you would think each one of them every inch a king (*Nam eius virtutis ac venerationis erant, ut singulos reges putares*). Indeed there was in all of them such beauty of appearance and such development of body and strength and such magnitude of wisdom that one who did not know them would decide that they were not from one race but selected men from the entire civilized world (*ex toto terrarum orbe electos*). For never previously did Macedon or any other nation produce a crop of men so distinguished, whom first Philip, then Alexander, chose with such great care that they seemed selected, not so much for association in the war as for succession in the kingship. With such agents, therefore, who would be surprised at the conquest of the world, since the army of the Macedonians was directed not by so many military commanders but by kings? The latter would never have met their equals if they had not quarreled among themselves, and Macedon would have had many Alexanders in place of one, if fortune had not armed them to their mutual destruction with rivaling ability.”

28. “Now, however, the present empire has been extended to boundaries of no mean distance, to such, in fact, that one cannot even measure the area within them.” This is probably an answer to the measurement of the Persian Empire at the end of the *Persica* by Ctesias (cf. the summary of Photius 45^a = 64 Henry). For use of Ctesias by Aristides see commentary to sections 79 and 86. Compare also Xenophon, *Cyrop.* II 1, 11: *vūv οὐν σώματα . . . οὐ μεμπτά.*

“The Red Sea.” The body of water which writers of the second century called the Red Sea extended from Africa to India and included both the sinus Arabicus and the sinus Persicus. Compare K. Meister, *Eranos* 46: 96-101, 1948; E. Paratore, *Tacito*, 613-625, Milan, Cisalpino, 1951. Here Aristides means the sinus Arabicus first of all.

“Lake Maeotis,” the Sea of Azov.

The ancient authors who did not believe that Ocean flowed around the earth included Herodotus IV 36, as Keil noted, and again as Keil noted on p. 471, the assertion that the poets invented the name and introduced it into their poetry comes from Herodotus II 23. Further-

¹¹ A court title.

more the exploration of the northern and western ocean by Rome is the counterpart to the exploration of the southern ocean and of the Indus in Herodotus IV 42 and 44. But Herodotus does not mention the great island in the Ocean. The immediate inspiration of this passage came from the controversy mentioned by Plutarch, *Life of Caesar* 23: 2-3: "The expedition against the Britons was famous for its audacity. First he entered the western Ocean with a fleet, and transporting an army to war, he sailed through the Atlantic Sea. Second he carried the Roman rule (*ἡγεμονίαν*) beyond the civilized world in attempting to occupy an island incredible in its size and which causes a great controversy among a multitude of writers whether a name and a story have been invented for an island which has never existed and does not exist." See further F. W. Walbank, *Classica et Mediaevalia* 9: 173 f., 1948; H. J. Mette, *Pytheas von Massalia (Kleine Texte* 173) 8, 1952. Tacitus, *Agricola* 10 records the circumnavigation of Britain. Like some other students of Plato Aristides identifies Britain with the Atlantis of the *Timaeus* and the *Critias*. The Island reappears in section 82.

Section 28, though it has not previously been noted, was imitated by Dexippus in a fragment (12 Jacoby) preserved in the *Suda* s. v. 'Ρωμαῖον ἀρχή. "This one surpassed by far that of the Assyrians and Persians and Macedonians, those which preceded it. It has fixed as its boundaries: toward the East the Red Sea of the Indians and the cataracts of the Nile¹² and Lake Maeotis, then the entire West and Ocean itself, which, it has been shown, is no¹³ myth nor is its name sung by the poets merely for entertainment, since even the land of the Britons, which it surrounds and makes an island, is now listed as found at the boundaries of the Roman Empire."

29. The empire is much greater because of its perfection, i. e. precision or exactitude (*ἀκρίβεια*), than because of its extent. Quality is even more impressive than quantity. In the fifth century sculptors, architects, and other artists achieved their success by careful measuring to get the right proportions. Polyclitus and writers of musical theory laid particular stress on this exactitude, and the sophists applied the same terminology and ideas to the art of speaking, as the ridicule from Aristophanes and Plato reveals. Exactitude was the very essence of the periodic style of oratory (*περιόδοις πρὸς κανόνα καὶ διαβήτην ἀπηκριβωμέναις*) with its measured cola balancing each other. Exactitude is the perfection which one achieves in sculpture, architecture, music, oratory, etc., by exact measurement and faithful application of scientific rules. For this see H. Oppel, "Κανών. Zur Bedeutungsgeschichte des Wortes und seiner lateinischen Entsprechungen (regula-norma)," *Philologus, Suppl.* 30, Heft 4, especially chapter II, 1937, "Κανών als

Schlagwort für das Exaktheitsstreben (*ἀκρίβεια*) des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts." Applied to the empire, the term "exactitude" means both perfection in the art of government and the perfection of a work of art created by Rome.

Paradox:—The extent of the empire cannot be measured (28), but the perfection of the empire is as if it were the result of exact measuring. He cannot pretend that the Roman empire in extent incomparably surpasses the extent assigned by Ctesias to the Persian Empire, but he can remind the readers of the chronicle of plots and misgovernment left by Ctesias.

Keil's deletions *ἀκούει μὲν {ἢ} βασιλέως {γῆ}* are mistaken because the next clause proves that *ἀκούει* here means "is called" rather than "obeys." And in line 29 the deletion *τοῦ κορυφαίου {ἡγεμόνος}* is mistaken because the text finds support in Demosthenes XXI 60, *ἡγεμὼν τῆς φυλῆς κορυφαῖος*.¹⁴ The word that Keil would delete is a word often used for "princeps." The deletion, accordingly, would destroy a very typical play on words. The chorus of the civilized world is "harmonized" (*συγκροτεῖται*) by the leader who is of course the emperor. The word *συγκροτεῖ* means primarily "to make them sound in unison," but secondarily "to discipline or train." Both meanings go back to the Attic orators. Demosthenes in a passage which Aristides certainly had in mind (*Against Meidias*, 17) uses the expression *συγκροτεῖν καὶ διδάσκειν τὸν χορόν* of the help he received from the aulete Telephanes.

"Aulos." Reiske saw that there was something wrong with the sentence *ῶσπερ αὐλῆς περίβολος ἐκκεκαθαρμένος οὗτος ἄπασα ἡ οἰκουμένη χοροῦ ἀκριβέστερον ἐν φθέγγεται*, because the image of the well cleaned courtyard did not go well with the conclusion "emits one note with more precision than a chorus." Keil and Bartoletti have assumed an omission, Keil after *ἐκκεκαθαρμένος*, and Bartoletti after *ἄπασα*, where he wished to insert the words *ὑμῖν ἡ γῆ, καὶ ἄπασα*. As even this emendation fails to bridge the gap from courtyard to chorus, I believe that Keil and Bartoletti have not correctly understood the nature of the corruption. The main corruption is that of *αὐλὸς* into *αὐλῆς*. "Like an aulos after a thorough cleaning the whole civilized world sounds one note with greater precision than a chorus." The simile reflects two passages in the Discourses of Dio Chrysostom, namely XLVIII 7 about political harmony, *καλὸν γάρ, ὕσπερ ἐν χορῷ τεταγμένῳ, συνάδειν ἐν καὶ ταῦτὸ μέλος, ἀλλὰ μὴ . . . διαφέρεσθαι διπλοῦς φθόγγους τε καὶ ἥχους ἀποφαίνοντ<α>s . . . τρόπον αὐλὸν κατεαγότος*,¹⁵ and IV 139, *μεταλαβόντες καθαράν τε καὶ κρείττω τῆς πρότερον ἀρμονίας . . . ὑμνῶμεν*. In the latter passage the word *ἀρμονία* has the meaning "stringed instrument"¹⁶ or, at least, could

¹² Many editors delete the word in Demosthenes also, but the two texts support each other.

¹³ Though deleted by Reiske and others, the last three words are in the manuscripts.

¹⁴ For *ἀρμονία* in the meaning "stringed instrument" see Diogenes 268 with the commentary of L. Delatte, *Les traités*

¹² Two cases of hendiadys.

¹³ Bekker's emendation *μῆ* for *δῆ* is vindicated by the text of Aristides. On the other hand, Jacoby's emendation *ἄλλως {ἢ}* *πρὸς ψυγαγγίαν* is disproved. Also there seems to be no lacuna.

have been so understood. The basic idea is the comparison between political reorganization and the renovation or replacement of an old musical instrument. The error in the traditional text of the Roman Oration probably arose out of partial dittography of the words *ώσπερ αὐλὸς*. I suspect that at first *ώσπερ αὐλοῦστος* was written and that this was interpreted *ώσπερ αὐλῆς περίβολος*, partly because of the appearance and partly because upsilon and beta were pronounced alike. For the aulos, which is neither a flute nor a clarinet exactly, see Kathleen Schlesinger, *The Greek Aulos*, London, Methuen, 1939, reviewed by H. I. Marrou, *REG* 53: 87-92, 1940; and N. B. Bodley, "The Auloi of Meroë," *AJA* 50: 217-240, 1946. For Rome cleaning the world see sections 78 and 103.

The subject of section 29, accordingly, is not only the artistic precision of Rome the ideal state, but also its cleanliness. They go together. The two qualities are joined in the criticism which the enemies of democracy make against Themistocles. Compare Plutarch, *Themistocles* 4, 5: *εἰ μὲν δὴ τὴν ἀκρίβειαν καὶ τὸ καθαρὸν τοῦ πολιτεύματος ἔβλαψεν η̄ μὴ ταῦτα πράξας, ἐστω φιλοσοφώτερον ἐπισκοπέν.*

The phrase *χοροῦ ἀκριβέστερον*, followed by a reference to the imperial trainer, will awaken memories of the chorus and *ὁρθὸς νομοθέτης* in Plato's *Laws*, Book II, and of the *ἀκριβεστέρα παιδεία* (*Laws* II 670e). Compare also Xenophon, *Cyrop.* III 70, *πολὺ μᾶλλον χοροῦ ἀκριβῶς*.

30. Keil marked as a crux the phrase *ὑπὸ πάντων δὲ πανταχοῦ ἵστον ἄρχεται* and commented that it was corrupt and not yet healed, furthermore that *πάντων*, as the sequel proved, meant those in the mountains and plains, on the continents and islands. Sieveking substituted *πάντα* for the first two words. Canter rendered "Aequali autem ubique regitur imperio." L. A. Stella rendered "Dappertutto tutti sono governati dalle stesse leggi"; and Levin similarly, "All everywhere are ruled equally," which he marked as a crux. I am by no means convinced that the text is corrupt. None of my predecessors have taken the passage as a continuation of the musical metaphor in the previous sentence, but a continuation of the metaphor is to be expected. Hence it is not far fetched to read into the verb *ἄρχεται* a reference to the keynote (*ἀρχή*). Aristides is subtly exploiting a wide range of meanings in the verb *ἄρχεται* and in the corresponding noun, but the surface meaning is that of the keynote or tone being received. For the Greek name of the keynote (*ἀρχή*) see K. Schlesinger, *The Greek Aulos*, 40 and 182-190, where she discusses the terminology of the musical writers. For the leader of the

chorus giving the keynote, compare Lucian, *Rh. Pr.* 13; Dionysius of Halicarnassus VII 72, Themistius XIII Dindorf 215.¹⁷ The word *ἄρχεται* is substituted for the phrase *ἄρχῃ λαμβάνεται*, and though it is an unusual and rather bold meaning for the verb, phrases like *λαμβάνειν φόβον, αἰδῶ, ὄργήν, etc.*, were interchangeable with the verbs *φοβεῖσθαι, αἰδεῖσθαι, ὀργίζεσθαι, etc.* With the rest of the sentence compare what in XLIII Keil 30 Aristides says of Zeus, *ἵστον πανταχοῦ πάντων κρατῶν*. Contrast Thucydides V 66, 3: *βασιλέως γὰρ ἄγοντος ἵπ' ἐκείνου πάντα ἄρχεται*.

The subject of the whole section, with which A. D. Nock compares *Corpus Hermeticum* XVIII 14, is the evenness of tone throughout the chorus of the civilized world. For a contrast see Plato, *Laws* II 662b. The harmony of the Roman Empire reappears in XXVII Keil 30-31.

"In their avoidance of discord" (*πρός γε τὸ μὴ ἀντιτάτεσθαι*) implies readiness to follow the guidance of the choral leader who is the emperor. For the political connotation of the word compare Thucydides III 83, 1 and particularly St. Paul, *Ep. Rom.* 13, 2: *ὁ ἀντιτασσόμενος τῇ ἔξουσίᾳ*, "he who resists the authority of Rome." The phrase *κοιλοτάτοις πεδίοις* contrasts with the word "mountains" in two ways: first it suggests depth as against altitude, hence "deepest valleys"; but it also suggests the mentality of people who live in plains so that the translation "deepest valleys," since valleys belong to a mountain system, does not cover the same range of meaning as the Greek. Levin's translation "most exposed plains" brings out one meaning with great clarity but it too fails to cover the whole range of meaning. Much the same idea occurs in XXVII Keil 9. Xenophon *Lac.* VIII 2 has a similar play on words.

The sentence *οἱ δὲ τῶν πεδίων τῶν εὐδαιμόνων κληροῦχοι τε καὶ οἰκήτορες ὑμέτεροι γεωργοί* is translated by Stella "gli abitanti e i coloni delle feraci pianure lavorono le terre per voi," and Levin carries this interpretation to its absurd but logical conclusion by putting into the mouth of Aristides the remarkable statement, "The owners and occupants of rich plains are your peasants." Surely that would be no cause for enthusiasm in a landowner like Aelius Aristides. Is he not comparing Hellenistic times when Greeks and Macedonians received cleruchic land on the understanding that they could be called upon for military service? Now even these rich plains are never raided, and the successors of those Greek and Roman veterans who had to police those areas have full opportunity to work and enjoy their estates. The adjective *ὑμέτεροι* goes with *οἰκήτορες* and not as Canter took it with *γεωργοί*. It is the *topos* later mentioned in

de la royauté d'Éphante, *Diotogène et Sthénidas* (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège 97) 270-271, 1942. It has not been noticed that the word *ἀρμονία* has the same meaning in Plutarch, *Cleomenes* 16, 6, where the author, comparing political reorganization with the renovation of a musical instrument, speaks of Cleomenes "tightening up that *harmonia* with the sagging strings, the ancestral constitution."

¹⁷ The last passage, from the *Ἐρωτικός* of Themistius, actually compares the Roman Empire to a chorus taking the keynote from its leader the emperor, and must be quoted in full: "Απασα ἄρχῃ μείων τε καὶ μικρότερα πρὸς τὸ ἀγαθὸν τέταται. ὅρᾳ γὰρ πρὸς τὸν ἥλον τῶν βασιλέων, ὡσπερ ἐν χορῷ πρὸς τὸ ἐνδόσιμον τοῦ κορυφαῖον καὶ δι πρωτοστάτης καὶ δευτεροστάτης καὶ διτα μέτεστιν ἐφεκῆς τῆς τοῦ χοροῦ ἡγεμονίας.

Menander II (Spengel, *Rh. gr.*, 3: 377 = Bursian, 105) : γεωργεῖται μετ' εἰρήνης ἡ γῆ. Still Aristides may have had a definite passage in mind such as that of Posidonius which we have in Strabo III 154, where the peaceful inhabitants of plains are forced to fight by the raiding mountaineers ὁστὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ γεωργεῖν ἐπολέμουν καὶ οὐτοι. It probably goes back, directly or indirectly, to a passage in the lost *Geōrgoi* of Aristophanes. By way of contrast we cite Vergil, *Georgics* I 505-508:

tot bella per orbem,
tam multae scelerum facies, non ullus aratro
dignus honos, squalent abductis arva colonis,
et curvae rigidum falces conflantur inensem.

For Athenian cleruchies of the fifth century b. c. compare H. Nesselhauf, *Klio*, Beiheft 30: 120-140, 1933; A. W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* 1: especially 373-380, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1945; V. Ehrenberg, *Aspects of the Ancient World*, 116-143, N. Y., William Salloch, 1946; B. D. Meritt et al., *The Athenian Tribute Lists* 3:284-297, Princeton, Amer. School of Class. Studies at Athens, 1950. The Ptolemaic cleruchies were "framed to some extent on the model of Greek, especially Athenian, cleruchies" (Rostovtzeff, *SEHHW*, 284, who emphasizes the necessity of absence for military duty). Also Athenian cleruchs were unable to tie themselves down with personal cultivation of their *kleroi*, as we know from Tod, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*, 63. Aristides alludes once again to the cleruchies in section 57.

31. For the *ethnê* or tribes of Asia Minor see A. H. M. Jones, *Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, 92-95, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1937, and T. R. S. Broughton, "Roman Asia Minor," *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome* 4: 646-648, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1938. The word *θνος* does not mean only a group organized as an Asianic *ethnos* but can mean any large group not organized as a polis but forming some kind of a unity. Compare the Thyatirene decree (Hadrianic), *Hesperia*, 20: 32, 1951, which mentions πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς Ἑλλάδος, and *IG IV²* 1 68 (fourth century b. c.), which recognizes that a Greek state may be either a polis or an *ethnos*. See now A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship*, 269-270, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1939, who points out that "the cities and the *ethnê*" is a normal descriptive phrase for the Roman Empire, and that this does not exclude the cities from the *ethnê*, "but recognizes the smaller units alongside of the larger, and as of equal importance."

"Who obtains for them their all," τὰ πάντα πρυτανεύοντος. The idea becomes more distinct with the double prayer in section 32. The same verb recurs in section 109 in the same meaning and enters into the rhetorical tradition: cf. the Berlin Papyrus *Sammelbuch* V 7517 of 211/2 A. D., in the preamble of which the petitioner says to the prefect of Egypt, ἐκάστῳ τὰ ἴδια πρυτανεύεις. Still it could also mean that the emperor is "the all-initiating," and it hints at the emperor's role as prytanis.

32. "No one is so proud that he can fail to be moved upon hearing even the mere mention of the Ruler's name, but, rising, he praises and worships him and breathes two prayers in a single breath, one to the gods on the Ruler's behalf, one for his own affairs to the Ruler himself." The beginning of the sentence contains a verbal echo of Demosthenes XIV 13, οὐδεὶς δήπου τῶν πάντων Ἐλλήνων τηλικοῦτον ἐφ' αὐτῷ φρονεῖ ὅστις ὁρῶν, κτλ., and perhaps Dio of Prusa I 80, but Aristides is really thinking of the proud behavior of the Spartan ephors: Xenophon, *Lac.* XV (XIV) 6, "All rise from their seats upon the appearance of the king, except the ephors from their official chairs. They exchange oaths each month, the ephors in behalf of the city, the king in his own behalf." Also Nicolaus of Damascus, *F. Gr. Hist.* 2A 90, fr. 103z, and "Plutarch," *Apophth. Lac.* 217c, report that the ephors kept their seats upon the appearance of the king. Among references to other cases of respectful rising I choose two for illustration. In the *Iliad* I 534 the other gods rise when Zeus enters the assembly. In the *Cato Maior* 63 Cicero mentions *decedi ad surgī* among the marks of honor which result from *auctoritas*, and then cites a Greek story about those who did and did not rise with the respect due to *auctoritas*. Aristides attributes to the Roman emperor charismatic authority. In general see A. Magdalain, *Auctoritas principis*, Paris, Belles Lettres, 1947, and the review by Hugh Last, *JRS* 40: 119-123, 1950. For the *Kaisermystik* see A. D. Nock, *Harvard Theol. Rev.* 45: 238 f., 1952. The double prayer reads in the Greek, τὴν μὲν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ τοὺς θεοῖς, τὴν δὲ αὐτῷ ἐκείνῳ περὶ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ. Prayers ὑπὲρ . . . are ordinarily prayers for the preservation of living individuals or communities (see for example the prayers mentioned in Athenian prytany decrees). Negotiations or petitions περὶ . . . are ordinarily negotiations or petitions to obtain something: cf. J. H. Oliver, *The Sacred Gerusia (Hesperia Suppl.* 6) No. 23, 1941, πρεσβευτήρι τε πολλάκις περὶ τῶν μεγίστων ἐν οἷς περὶ γεροντίας (which the Athenians obtained apparently from Marcus Aurelius). Hence I prefer to interpret as neuter the word *τῶν* in the phrase περὶ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ, which Nock, however, translates (*op. cit.* 239) "for those who are his own."

"And if the governors should have even some slight doubt whether certain claims are valid (εἴ τινες ἄρα ἀξιοί εἰεν) in connection with either public or private lawsuits (*δίκας*) and petitions (*ἀξιώτες*) from the governed, they straightway send to him with a request for instructions what to do, and they wait until he renders a reply, like a chorus waiting for its trainer." For the Thucydidean construction with a present indicative in the apodosis and with an optative in the protasis see W. W. Goodwin, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*, 2nd ed., 500, Boston, 1890. The division of the law into public and private law is found in Aristotle, *Rhetoric* I 13, 3, and in the *Institutes of Justinian*, I 1, 4, and was a usual division for both Greek and Roman Law. With the codification of the edict in

the reign of Hadrian the magistrate was no longer free to make his own interpretation of the law; instead, when faced with a new or doubtful situation in a case of importance, he now had to turn to the emperor for a ruling. The emperor was, of course, assisted by a standing *consilium*. The emperor's reply to such a consultation by a governor was called a rescript. In note 42 L. A. Stella interpreted the words of Aristides as referring to both *rescripta* and *mandata*.

The crux of this passage lies in the words *εἰ τινες ἄπα ἀξιοί εἰσιν*, which are omitted by Livingstone, *The Mission of Greece*, 259. L. A. Stella, who translates "quando ne vale la pena," assumes that the clause is the protasis of a condition, while Levin, who translates "whether petitions should be granted," assumes more correctly that the clause is an indirect question. For the personal construction see Sandys' note on δίκαιοι in Demosthenes, *Against Leptines* 458, 4.

"Trainer," διδάσκαλον. The ideal *basileus* is compared with a διδάσκαλος by Plutarch, *Cleomenes* 13, 1. For the educational function of the ideal statesman see H. Zeise, *Der Staatsmann, Ein Beitrag zur Interpretation des platonischen Politikos* (*Philologus*, Supplementband 31, Heft 3) 87-95, 1938.

33. "Therefore he has no need to wear himself out traveling around the whole empire," ώστε οὐδὲν δεῖ φθειρεσθαι περιόντα τὴν ἀρχὴν ἄπασαν. Keil curiously and incomprehensibly emended περὶ{ι}όντα. Zucker (*Gnomon* 21: 59, 1949), rightly protested. The contrast is with the constant and unavoidable peregrination of the Persian king in section 18. Keil commented, "fort. Hadriani imperium pervagantis memoriam cavillatur," and Zucker more strongly, "offenbar Kritik von Hadrians Reisen." This interpretation seems to me impossible for the following reasons. (1) The oration contrasts conditions under the Roman Principate with conditions before the rise of Rome, not with conditions in distressing or other periods of Roman rule. (2) Hadrian had *no need* to wear himself out, nor *did* he wear himself out by his traveling. (3) The hostility against Hadrian came from the senatorial order, not from the Greeks, to whom Hadrian was in fact a great culture hero. (4) It is most unlikely that Aristides, whose family had presumably obtained their citizenship from Hadrian and whose native city Hadrianutherae had been founded by Hadrian, would be personally bitter against that very popular emperor, for whom he shows positive affection in L. Keil 106. (5) It is also unlikely that a young Greek hoping to make a career would have thought of ingratiating himself with Antoninus Pius by attacking Hadrian. (6) The artistic crudity of such an irrelevant interpolation is unlike Aristides.

"To make sure of each point when he has the time to tread their soil," βεβαιοῦσθαι δύότε σφίσιν τὴν γῆν παροίη. In agreement with Schmid (*Atticismus* II 49) Boulanger, *Aelius Aristide*, 406, concludes, "Aristide n'emploie qu'à bon escient la voix moyenne." The verb βεβαιοῦσθαι means both "ascertain a fact or situation for

himself" and "secure a locality for himself." The verb παροίη is a play on the verb παροῦντος used in section 18 of the Persian king.

For the imperial bureaus of the *ab epistulis* and the *a libellis* see F. Preisigke, *Die Inschrift von Skaptopara in ihrer Beziehung zur kaiserlichen Kanzlei in Rom* (*Schriften der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft in Strassburg* 30) 1917, with the corrections of U. Wilcken, "Zu den Kaiserreskripten," *Hermes* 55: 1-42, 1920, and of H. Dessau, "Zur Inschrift von Skaptopara," *Hermes* 62: 205-224, 1927. For the imperial post see E. Holmberg, *Zur Geschichte des cursus publicus*, Diss., Uppsala, 1934, and [H. G. Pflaum], "Essai sur le cursus publicus dans le Haut-Empire Romain," *Mémoires présentées par divers savants à l'Académie des Inscriptions et de Belles Lettres de l'Institut de France* 14: 189-391, 1940.

34. "But that which deserves as much wonder and admiration as all the rest together." ὁ δὲ πάντων ἀξιού ἀγασθαί τε καὶ θαυμάζειν. The text is correct as it stands: *Iliad* XV 719, πάντων Ζεὺς ἀξιούς ἡμαρτῶν ζόωκεν. There is no need for the μάλιστα which Reiske² and Keil inserted (cf. commentary on parallel passage in section 59).

"Shall now be mentioned," νῦν εἰρήσεται. This use of the future perfect is a peculiarity of Aristides according to Boulanger, *Aelius Aristide*, 408. But compare Isocrates XII 16 and 225.

"With such a firm hand." For the full significance of the adverb ἐγκρατῶς see the commentary on section 66.

"Unlimited power," ἔξουσία, a Thucydidean word meaning particularly the power to do as one likes that comes from wealth or something else. In Thucydides I 38, 5 the Corinthians say ὑβρεῖ καὶ ἔξουσίᾳ πλούτου . . . ἡμαρτήσαι. In Thucydides III 45, 4 Diodotus says that various causes lead men to enter danger, e. g. poverty with its sense of oppression, and ἔξουσία with its *hybris*. So here Aristides has *hybris* in mind as the usual concomitant of "power." The Romans have much "power" but nevertheless refrain from *hybris*, whereas the Persians (section 22) ἐν ταῖς ἔξουσίαις οὐ μετρίως ὑβριζον. For many classical writers the opposite of *hybris* was *kosmos*, and W. Vollgraff, *L'oraison funèbre de Gorgias*, 44-55, Leyden, Brill, 1952, has subjected this pair of contrasts to a careful study. Carlo Del Grande, *Hybris*, Naples, Ricciardi, 1947, though less useful here, may also be mentioned.

36. "You alone rule over men who are free." They are free because of the absence of *hybris*. For what liberty meant to the ancient Greeks see Père A.-J. Festugière, *Liberté et civilisation chez les Grecs*, Paris, Revue des jeunes, 1947; W. W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great* 2: 199-232, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1948; David Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* 1: 56-58, Princeton Univ. Press, 1950. The best accounts of what the Roman *libertas* meant are those of Fritz Schulz, *Principles of Roman Law*, tr. by M. Wolff, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1936, Ch. VIII, of L. Wickert, "Der Prinzipat und die Freiheit," *Symbola Coloniensis Josepho Kroll*

. . . *oblata*, 111-141, Cologne, Pick, 1949, and of Ch. Wirszubski, *Libertas as a Political Idea at Rome during the Late Republic and Early Principate*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1950, Ch. IV and V with a bibliography on pp. 172-176. The freedom of the whole world had been an article of propaganda in the Hellenistic Period; Livy accepted the freedom of the whole world as part of Rome's mission and utilized it repeatedly in his history.¹⁸ The contrast here is between the art of government such as Plato described in the *Politicus* and elsewhere and Rome has realized, and the despotic rule of the Persians. The state that we want, says Plato, *Laws* VIII 832c-d, is one which "provides the greatest leisure and" in which all citizens "are independent of each other." When Constantius reunited Britain with the empire, the Britons became "tandem liberi tandemque Romani" (*Paneg. Lat.* IV 19, 2).

"Nor is the country said to be enslaved, as household of so-and-so, to whomsoever it has been turned over, to a man himself not free." The phrase "household of so-and-so" is a reference to Oriental terminology for a provincial court and to Seleucid terminology for areas devoid of self-government (cf. Rostovtzeff, *SEHHW*, 503). Didymus *In Demosthenem* col. 7, 21 cites Philochorus on the Athenian reaction to the negotiations of presumably 392 B. C.: "And the King sent down the Peace of Antalcidas which the Athenians did not accept, because it was written therein that the Hellenes who lived in Asia were all included in the *household* of the King." Tacitus, *Hist.* I 16, makes the emperor Galba say: "neque enim hic, ut gentibus quae regnantur, certa dominorum domus et ceteri servi." On the other hand, Tacitus exploits the word "household" to emphasize the unrepresentative character of the imperial policy toward Egypt, when he refers (*Hist.* I 11) to the decision "Aegyptum . . . domi retinere."

"You appoint the governors, as is natural after elections (*οἱον ἐξ ἀρχαιρεσῶν*), to protect and care for the governed." I do not think that *οἱον* means "as if" (so L. A. Stella and Levin). A. D. Nock comments justly that consuls and praetors were still being elected. The *consulares* and *praetorii*, from whom the governors were appointed, were in a sense chosen men. Aristides may have had in mind what Polybius VI 4 has to say about the selective character (*κατ' ἔκλογήν*) which distinguishes aristocracy from oligarchy. Again the Roman governors are contrasted with the Diadochs of section 27, who were rejects at home and usurpers abroad. It is as if Aristides wished both to reverse and to reapply the compliment which the Greek source of Trogus paid those marshalls of Alexander who eventually succeeded him: Justin (XIII 1, 11) renders it that one who did not know them would judge that the Diadochs were, not from one race, but men selected from the entire civilized world (*non ex una gente, sed ex toto terrarum orbe electos*).

¹⁸ Huldrych Hoch, *Die Darstellung der politischen Sendung Roms bei Livius*, 94-106, Frankfurt am Main, Klostermann, 1951.

"Not to be slavemasters over them," *οὐκ ἐπὶ τῷ δεσπότας εἶναι ἐπ' αὐτοῖς*. Keil recognized that the phrase *ἐπ'* *αὐτοῖς* could not be correct after *καθίστατε* where the manuscripts place it, and therefore he deleted the phrase. But the first problem is to explain how the phrase *ἐπ'* *αὐτοῖς* ever got into a place where it obviously does not belong. The words are clearly no gloss. The answer seems to be that the words *ἐπ' αὐτοῖς* represent an omission first corrected with a marginal note and then inserted in the wrong place. They are just right after *δεσπότας εἶναι*.

37. "Appeals to a higher court are made with the ease of an appeal from deme to dicastery, with no greater menace for those who make them than for those who have accepted the local verdict," *ἔκκλητοι δὲ ὕσπερ ἔφεσις* (or *ἔφεσε_ς*) Jebb, Reiske, Sieveking) *ἐκ δημοτῶν εἰς δικαιοτήριον σὺν οὐκ ἐλάττονι τῶν δεξαμένων φόβῳ περὶ τῆς κρίσεως ἢ τῶν ποιουμένων γίγνονται*. The main difficulty lies in the word *δεξαμένων*, which seemed to Reiske to indicate Roman magistrates or their judges. Accordingly L. A. Stella translates, "Nelle sentenze dei tribunali speciali, sono ammessi ricorsi in prima istanza e in appello al tribunale superiore, la cui sentenza è attesa con ansia non minore dalle parti interessate che dal giudice." Similarly Levin translates, "Just as cases are appealed from a district court to a jury, imperial officials have to answer to an appellate tribunal, where they are no safer from an adverse verdict than the appellants." I, on the other hand, believe that the meaning can be recognized from the hypothesis which Libanius composed for Demosthenes LVII, *Appeal against Eubulides* (where, incidentally, the Athenian procedure is praised by the speaker). The easy *ἔφεσις* *ἐκ τῶν δημοτῶν* of the Athens of Demosthenes, i. e. appeal to a dicastery from the unfavorable decision of one's fellow demesmen in a citizenship trial, was notorious in the second century after Christ because of the terrible danger in which the appellant was thought to have stood, though A. W. Gomme, *Essays in Greek History and Literature*, 67-86, Oxford, Blackwell, 1937 argues that Plutarch, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Libanius and the lexicographers had merely misunderstood Aristotle, *Ath. Const.* 42, 1. It was thought, correctly or incorrectly, that if a man abided by the decision of his fellow-demesmen against his citizenship, he became a metic, but that if he appealed to a dicastery and lost his case again, his property was confiscated and he himself was sold into slavery.

"The men of today are ruled . . . only in so far as they are content to be ruled." Compare Herodotus III 83, 3.

38. "Are not these advantages beyond the old 'Free Republic' of every people (*πάσης δημοκρατίας*)? For under Government by the People (*ἐκεῖ*) it is not possible to go outside after the verdict has been given in the city's court," etc. For this use of *ἐκεῖ* to indicate a way of life under a certain constitution compare Xenophon, *Lac.* II 11 and VII 6. The word *dēmokratia* carries the

connotation of freedom; fundamentally it means (1) democracy in a good or bad sense, (2) republic (*cf.* Lycurgus, *Against Leocrates* 3 and 79), (3) Old Republic. When Tacitus *Ann.* I 3, 7 asks about the Romans of A. D. 14, "quotus quisque reliquus, qui *rem publicam* vidisset?" he means the *libera res publica*, the *maiorum libertas*. So a Greek of the same period might speak of the *dēmokratia* of his city and mean, not exactly the democracy, but the old *libera res publica* which existed in the city before the Roman domination, the *πάτριος δημοκρατία* which a bilingual inscription of 167 B. C. renders into Latin as the *maiorum libertas* (ILS 31 = OGI 551). When Plutarch, *Galba* 22, 12 says that the army of Germany abandoned *τοὺς καλὸὺς ἔκεινους καὶ δημοκρατικοὺς εἰς σύγκλητον ὄρκους*, he means "that fine old Republican oath of theirs to a Senate," and certainly is not thinking of democracy, but of the contrast between the present system of government and the Old Republic. Similarly Dio Cassius LIII 17, 3 applies the word *dēmokratia* to the oligarchical government of the Roman Republic in contrast to government under control of an emperor. The Greek word *δημοκρατία* continued to mean "democracy," but as Levin rightly notes, it also meant, in the language of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods, a city's traditional sovereignty and constitution (*cf.* J. A. O. Larsen, *Cl. Phil.*, 40: 88-91, 1945, and David Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* 2: 824-829, Princeton Univ. Press, 1950). Aristides takes advantage of this ambiguity to suggest that the advantages of Roman rule over local sovereignty are the advantages which the constitution of the ideal state had over democracy. For the attitude toward local sovereignty compare Plutarch, *Political Precepts* 824c, who is emphasizing internal order as the real concern of local statesmanship and contrasting it with areas in which the local statesman has at present little or no need to exercise the art of statesmanship: "As for freedom, the ruling power (*οἱ κρατοῦντες*) assigns a portion to the Greek republics (*τοῖς δῆμοις*): this much they have, and perhaps more would be no improvement."

"Except in a city so small that it had to have jurors from out of town." See L. Robert, "Décrets de Smyrne pour les juges étrangers," *Hellenica*, 7: 171-188, 1949; J. A. O. Larsen, "Judges in Cicero *Ad Atticum* vi. 1. 15," *Cl. Phil.*, 43: 187-190, 1948; also the references given by J. and L. Robert, *Bulletin épigraphique*, No. 171 (REG 57: 231), 1944. It was once far more common than Aristides implies, and it continued into the Roman period (see for example R. Meister, *Jahreshefte* 27: Beibl. 233 f., 1932), but there can be no doubt that Rome had now inherited this international role and that Roman governors efficiently provided as an accommodation an impartial court away from the city in which the case arose.

In the final sentence there is a gap followed by the words *παρὰ τὴν δίκην, ἥ καὶ δώκοντα μὴ κρατήσαντα μηδὲ τῷ νευκῆσθαι*. Keil did not bracket these last three words in the text itself, but in his commentary he wrote, "vv.

μηδὲ τῷ νευκῆσθαι addidisse videtur interpolator, cum ad κρατήσαντα oppositum desiderari opinaretur." But there is nothing wrong with the phrase *μηδὲ τῷ νευκῆσθαι*, for Aristides is contrasting with the perfection of imperial justice the unfairness (*παρὰ τὴν ἀξίαν*) and weakness of the courts in a city state of the traditional type. The phrase *τῷ νευκῆσθαι* means "after a decision in court" and does not mean "after having been defeated himself in court." The passive voice is due to the influence of the customary formulae *ἐὰν δίκη νικηθῇ* and *δίκη νικηθεῖς* as opposites of the formula *καθάπερ ἐκ δίκης*.¹⁹ Aristides refers to the difficulty of execution even after a clear verdict in favor of the plaintiff.

39. "And here there is an abundant and beautiful equality of the humble with the great," etc. This is the true *isonomia*, not the false *isonomia* of extreme democracy. Of course, this is not the first time that a constitution was so praised: compare for example Polybius' eulogy of the Achaean League for its *ἰσότης* and *φιλανθρωπία* (II 38). As a matter of fact, the Romans made a distinction between *honestiores* and *humiliores*. The former included all members of the senatorial, equestrian, and curial orders. Ever since the beginning of the Principate it had been customary for Roman magistrates to treat the *honestiores* with greater consideration, but it had been left to the individual magistrate to use his own judgment as to how much consideration he should give to *dignitas*. About this time the Roman imperial government began to put these customs into law, so that in criminal cases certain generally recognized privileges of the *honestiores* became rights. The earliest imperial constitution which recognizes the distinction dates from the reign of Antoninus Pius, and since Aristides talks as if no such distinction yet existed, the recognition may well have begun with Antoninus Pius. See G. Cardascia, "L'apparition dans le droit des classes d'*honestiores* et d'*humiliores*," *Revue historique de droit français et étranger*, 4^e série, 28: 305-337 and 461-485, 1950.

"The word of Hesiod," *Works and Days* 5.

40. "Because in such a case it is absurd." The traditional text, which reads *εἴτα καὶ γελοῖον*, is corrupt or incomplete. Reiske wanted to emend *εἴτα* to *εἴτ' οὐ* and turn the whole thing into a question. Keil postulated a lacuna in the text before *εἴτα*, while in the commentary he suggested an emendation of *εἴτα* into *εἴται* in addition to what he would supply in the alleged lacuna. This is clearly too complicated. Keil recorded but rejected a suggestion from Wilamowitz to emend *εἴτα* into *ἐπεὶ* without lacuna. I assume an easy loss of the participle *δν* after *γελοῖον* and retain unaltered the traditional reading *εἴτα*, which would then connect the participial phrase in the accusative absolute with the preceding participial phrase in the genitive absolute. This use of *εἴτα* when

¹⁹ L. Robert, *Le sanctuaire de Sinuri près de Mylasa*, Première Partie, Les inscriptions grecques (*Mémoires de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie de Stamboul* 7) 66 f., 1945.

one participial phrase follows another occurs frequently in Plutarch, for example *Agis and Cleomenes* (edd. Lindskog et Ziegler) 3, 8; 3, 9; 31 (10), 4; 34 (13), 3; 46 (25), 3; 49 (28), 3. See also Onosander, *De imperatoris officio* 46, 60, 80, and 83. Aristides too uses it in this way in section 14. The adverb *εἴτη* is synonymous with *ἔπειτα*, which Plutarch, though rarely, likewise uses to connect two participial phrases, e. g. *Cleomenes* 26, 3. Some influence may be allowed also to Demosthenes, *On the Crown* 59, *εἴτη καὶ πολλῶν προαιρέσεων οὐσῶν*, and 122. On *εἴτη* in Aristides see Schmid, *Atticismus* 2: 107-108.

"It is inappropriate, I think, because even similar achievements, if we had any to report, would not be similarly astonishing," *οὐκ οἷμαί γε δεῖν, ὅτι γε οὐδὲ θαυμαστὰ ὅμοίως ἀνὴν, εἰ τινα ἔχομεν εἰπεῖν ὅμοια*. Far greater recognition goes properly to the first doer. L. A. Stella and Levin, who make Roman achievements the implied subject of *ἡν*, have a different interpretation. She translates, "Anzi, a me pare che la vostra grandezza non sarebbe così degna di ammirazione se si potesse dire che ve ne è un altro uguale." Levin, "I think we ought not to put it off, for Rome would not be so admirable if we could name anything like it." In my opinion Aristides was not expressing a fear of postponement but the futility of it.

41. "To surpass the Hellenes in wisdom and restraint, while outdoing the barbarians in riches and in might, seems to me a great achievement and one fulfilling the ideal and more glorious than every other." Mesk has already cited Isocrates, *Areopagiticus* 4, *συντέτακται καὶ συνάκολουθεὶ τοῖς μὲν πλούτοις καὶ ταῖς δυναστείαις ἄνοιᾳ καὶ μετὰ ταύτης ἀκολασίᾳ, ταῖς δὲ ἐνδείαις καὶ ταῖς ταπεινότησι σωφρούνη καὶ πολλὴ μετριότης*. The only difficulty in this sentence of the Roman Oration lies in the words *παντελὲς εἰς ἀρετῆς εἶναι λόγον*. Canter rendered unsatisfactorily "cum virtute prorsus coniunctum." Zuretti separated the phrase *εἰς ἀρετῆς λόγον* from the adjective *παντελές* and translated "sembra a me, dove si ragioni di virtù, certame grande e perfetto e splendido più di qualsiasi altro" (italics mine)—likewise L. A. Stella, who translates "sia nel campo dei valori morali." But they can hardly be separated, and the correct interpretation is that given in Levin's version, "Fulfilling the ideal standard." Wisdom and restraint were traditionally the outstanding virtues, the one of Athens, the other of Sparta (cf. E. Kienzle, *Der Lobpreis von Städten und Ländern in der älteren griechischen Dichtung*, 78 f., Diss. Basel, 1936).

42. "Much smaller organizations." Much smaller than the Roman Empire, not the Persian (Levin).

43. "As if a man who wished to obtain possession of a body received some claws and extremities instead of the whole body and with these in his possession thought that he had just what he wanted," *ώσπερ ἀνὴν εἰς τις σώματος ἐπιθυμῶν γενέσθαι κύριος ὄνυχάς τινας καὶ ἄκρα λάβοι ἀντὶ ὅλου τοῦ σώματος καὶ ταῦτα <έχων> ἔχειν οἷοιτο ἄπειρ ἐβούλετο*.

The passage has had various interpretations. Boulanger (352) translates "comme si, pour s'emparer d'un corps tout entier, on le saisirait par les ongles ou les extrémités." L. A. Stella, "Erano press' a poco nelle condizioni di chi, desiderando impadronirsi di una persona, ne prendesse le unghie e le estremità, e che credesse di avere quel che desiderava." Levin, "as if someone that wished to subdue a person were to get hold of nails and fingertips instead of the whole body, and then thought, 'I have just what I wanted.'" I understand a reference to the division of a catch after a hunt, or to some other distribution of meat. Surely no one with the intention of subduing a man or woman would so congratulate himself because he was holding the person's hands. This would not be a credible example of self-deception, but a man with a bag of assorted cuts might easily fail to realize that the best parts were missing or that some inferior pieces had been substituted. The body here is the body of a dead animal, but the English word "carrion," which would make the passage clearer, would overemphasize that aspect and would blur the image elsewhere in the oration. The implication of the whole paragraph is that neither the Athenians nor the Lacedaemonians ever wielded power over a true world-empire which could be compared with the body of the Cosmos. Instead of a World-Body they had merely *disiecta membra* of a world. With the phrase *σώματος . . . κύριος* compare the phrase *κύριοι τῶν πραγμάτων καὶ τοῦ πάντα ποιεῖν* in section 47. With the phrase *ἔχειν . . . ἄπειρ ἐβούλετο* compare the phrase *οὐκ ἔχοντες ὅ τι χρήσονται* in section 54. For the whole idea see the commentary on section 57. For theories about world empires see the commentary on section 91.

In support of my interpretation that Aristides means the *disiecta membra* of a dead animal I adduce the passage which I consider the immediate inspiration, Polybius (ed. Büttner-Wobst) I 4, 7: *καθόλου μὲν γὰρ ἔμοιγε δοκοῦσιν οἱ πεπισμένοι διὰ τῆς κατὰ μέρος ἴστορίας μετρίως συνόψεοθαί τὰ ὅλα παραπλήσιόν τι πάσχειν, ὡς ἀνὴν εἰς τινες ἐμψύχους καὶ καλοὺς σώματος γεγονότος διερριμμένα τὰ μέρη θεώμενοι νομίζουσιν ἵκανως αὐτόπται γίνεσθαι τῆς ἐναργείας αὐτοῦ τοῦ ζῴου καὶ καλλονῆς*. Aristides has kept not only the reference to *disiecta membra* but the construction *παραπλήσιον πάσχειν*, and he has substituted quite apparently the phrase *γενέσθαι κύριος* for the phrase *αὐτόπται γίνεσθαι*. The phrase *γενέσθαι κύριος* occurs in another sentence of the same passage (Polybius I 2, 5), but is of course very common. Compare also Tacitus, *Hist.* I 16, "immensum imperii corpus."

44. "In the famous phrase 'they won the Cadmeian victory over each other' in the struggle for hegemony." On the proverb see the *Suda* s. v. *Καδμεία νίκη*, and Zenobius IV 45 (with the material collected in the *Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum* I p. 97). It meant "a disastrous victory."

Far from lasting like the Cosmos throughout all eternity or throughout a world cycle, the Hellenic empires

hardly lasted any time. The background of the thought is first of all the ancient Athenian institution of the *epistates*, familiar from the orators and from Aristotle, *Constitution of Athens* 44. As the *epistates* held office for one day and night, so the city with hegemony might have held power for one generation, but she never lasted that long. The rotation designed to give everyman a taste of government and to prevent a monopoly of power in the hands of the same people is here adapted to a monopoly of hatred. The phrase *περὶ τῆς ἡγεμονίας* makes it natural to expect the following clause to run *ῶστε οὐκ ἀξιούντες τὸν ἔτερον μόνον ἥγεισθαι δὲ οἱ ἔτεροι*, so that the substitution of *μετέσθαι* instead of *ἥγεισθαι* cannot fail to be noted.

45. "Just one Lacedaemonian leader," Pausanias.

"Disproportion (*ἀμετρίαν*) of the tributes imposed." The word "disproportion" may just possibly reflect what Plato has to say in the *Timaeus* 87c about the prime importance of proportion between soul and body in the microcosm, "The beautiful is never disproportionate" (*ἄμετρον*). There should be a harmony of movement between body and soul. The soul in the case of an empire is the government. The whole paragraph condemns both the Lacedaemonian and the Athenian Empire of disproportion in contrast to the beautiful harmony between body and soul in the Roman Empire (cf. sections 30 and 31).

For the tribute and the accounting at Athens see B. D. Meritt, H. T. Wade-Gery, and M. McGregor, *The Athenian Tribute Lists 1-3*, Princeton, Amer. School of Class. Studies at Athens, 1940-1951, reviewed by G. Klaffenbach, *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 71: 33-37, 1950.

"Those who used the tributes as a pretext for graft," *τὸν ἐπὶ τῇ τούτων προφάσει παρακλέπτοντας αὐτοῖς*. Keil deleted the last word which is transmitted with a smooth breathing. Sieveking (31) rightly supports Reiske, "suum ad commodum suffurantes."

"Cleruchs were being dispatched." The cleruchs were Athenians who obtained lands confiscated from local owners (cf. commentary on section 30). This means encroachment of one part of the body upon another. In *Timaeus* 82a Plato says that one main cause of disease in the body is the encroachment (*πλεονεξία*) of one part on the other. In *Timaeus* 86e-87a Plato says that disorder in the soul may arise from disease in the body. In *Laws* X 906c Plato says that "encroachment" in cities and constitutions is called "injustice" (*ἀδικία*). In this and the next paragraphs Aristides may wish to show that the imperial government of the Athenians, which would correspond to the World-Soul in the Cosmos, was a disordered soul (in section 43 he has pointed out that the Athenians never had a real world-empire to be compared with the body of the Cosmos).

"Ships to collect (*ἀργυρολόγων*) extra funds." Aeschines (III 159) denounces Demosthenes for taking a trireme and squeezing money out of the Hellenic allies (*τὸν Ἑλληνας ἄργυρολόγησε*). A good example of this

kind of behavior is recorded by Xenophon, *Hellenica* I 4, 9, where it is said that Alcibiades squeezed 100 talents from Caria, though the word *ἀργυρολόγεω* is not used; but in I 1, 8 Xenophon mentions that the Athenians were sailing *ἐν ἀργυρολόγιαν*. Then *νῆες ἀργυρολόγου* are mentioned several times by Thucydides and Aristophanes. It was the hegemony of the Lacedaemonians which Polybius VI 48-49 denounced for its *πλεονεξία* and for its resort to *ἀργυρολογεῖν*.

46. "Were in the power of the politicians whom the Athenians installed, both those with good intentions and equally those with bad." This is usually taken as a reference to Athenian demagogues like Cleon, Hyperbolus, etc. In support of this interpretation A. D. Nock in a letter points to the contrast of one and many dynasties in section 48. Despite section 65, which might be taken as a contrast, it apparently does not refer to local politicians supported by the Athenians. For examples of the latter see R. Meiggs, "A Note on Athenian Imperialism," *Cl. Rev.* 63: 9-12, 1949.

"To perform these heavy services," *ταῦτα . . . ὑπομεῖναι*. For the verb *ὑπομεῖναι*, which is applied by Thucydides to the military service of men who sacrificed their lives, and which often means "to perform a very heavy financial liturgy," see J. H. Oliver, "On the Funeral Oration of Pericles," *Rh. Mus.* 94: 327-330, 1951. Compare section 75.

47. The decarchies were well known from Plutarch and Xenophon. See E. Cavaignac, "Les décarchies de Lysandre," *Revue des études historiques* 25: 285-316, 1924.

48. "Arbitrary government," *δυναστείαν*. The Athenian government is ironically called by a word which was a common antithesis of *ἰσονομία*, which to Herodotus and Thucydides meant "democracy."

49. The fugitive, as Reiske noted, was of course the Athenian exile Conon, who defeated the Lacedaemonians off Cnidos in 393 B. C. The subjects eagerly break away unlike those of Rome (section 68).

For the harmosts or "harmonizers" see H. W. Parke, "The Development of the Second Spartan Empire," *JHS* 50: 37-79, 1930. The play on words to emphasize the contrast is in the manner of Plato (cf. D. Tarrant, "Colloquialisms and Semi-Proverbs and Word-Play in Plato," *Cl. Q.* 40: 109-117, especially 116 f., 1946). The harmosts did not create *harmonia*; in section 66, on the other hand, the Romans are said to have created *harmonia*.

"When installed as governors, they held." The particles *τε καὶ* have the value "when . . . then" (see the parallel in section 50 and the references collected by J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, 515).

50. That the Thebans came to their hegemony through Spartan mistakes and Greek resentment (*μῖσος*) is stated by Polybius VI 43, but the same criticism could have been made by Anaximenes of Lampsacus, who de-

nounced Sparta and Thebes in the lost "Three-Headed Creature" (*cf.* section 51).

"As soon as." For *ἄπα τε . . . καὶ cf.* Demosthenes, *Against Aristocrates* 126, etc.

"The Cadmeia be occupied by, than victorious over, the Lacedaemonians." The seizure of the Cadmeia (the acropolis of Thebes) in 383 b. c. by the Lacedaemonians, who thereby violated their oaths, was one of the acts which aroused the greatest indignation against Sparta throughout Greece. It led eventually to a murderous reaction, to the expulsion of the Lacedaemonian garrison, and to the Battle of Leuctra in 371 b. c.

51. "Certainly not to denounce the Hellenes generally like the extraordinary author of the 'Three-headed Creature' . . . but wishing (*βούλομαι*) to show thereby," etc. Compare the apologetic comment in section 14. The "Three-headed Creature" is a lost work by the fourth century historian Anaximenes of Lampsacus (*F. Gr. Hist.* II 72, 20-21). The three heads (of Greece) were Athens, Sparta and Thebes. Anaximenes was still a familiar author (*cf.* Plutarch, *Political Precepts* 803b). Keil emended *βούλομαι* to *βούλόμενος*, but compare Aeschines, *Against Ctesiphon* 26.

"Your discovery" (*εὑρημα*). For Rome as *πρώτος εὑρέτης* of the art of government see section 58 and commentary.

"At resisting foreign rule and defeating the Persians and at expending their wealth in public service and enduring hardships." The traditional text reads *ἐπεὶ τοῖς μὲν ἄρχοντιν ἀντιστῆναι καὶ κρατῆσαι Πέρσας καὶ Λυδὸς καὶ πλοῦτον καὶ πόνους ὑπενεγκεῖν*. In the first phrase the definite article is impossible because one cannot accept as praise of the Athenians that they were good at resisting their own magistrates. Surely the words *ἐπεὶ τοῖς* are a vestige of *ἐπεισάκτοις*, contrasting with the common expressions *ἀιρετοί* and *κληρωτοί*, especially since the short omission is the most common error. In the second place mention of the Lydians, which disturbed Keil, cannot be justified by Herodotus I 15-22. The Lydians were not conspicuous opponents of the Greeks. Nor can *πλοῦτον* be easily taken as a direct object of *κρατῆσαι*. Keil emended *πλοῦτον* to *πλοῦς τε*, but it would be palaeographically and logically preferable to retain *πλοῦτον* and emend *Λυδὸς καὶ* to another infinitive, *ἀναλῶσαι* (*cf.* Demosthenes XX 10). The two nouns *δαπάνη* and *πόνοι* were coupled by Pindar (*Isthm.* 6, 10f. and [*Ol.*] 5, 16f.) in proof of excellence, and the same association of ideas reappears in Thucydides and others (*cf.* H. R. Breitenbach, *Historiographische Anschauungsformen Xenophons*, 47-57, Diss. Basel, 1950, on the theme *δαπανήματα*). With the emendation *ἀναλῶσαι* for *Λυδὸς καὶ* one gets a perfectly balanced "enumeration" consisting of four infinitives as follows: noun-verb, verb-noun, verb-noun, noun-verb. For Athenian willingness to make sacrifices and take risks see Demosthenes, *Against Androtion* 76 and *Against Timocrates* 184. Compare the phrase *πόνοις Ἀρεως* which appears in *IG I²*

530 (important commentary by J. and L. Robert, *Bull. épigraphique*, 43, 1952).

What Aristides has to say here about the Athenians parallels what Polybius VI 44 said about them. Perhaps they had a common source in Anaximenes of Lampsacus.

52. For the contrast see sections 67 and 76.

53. "Too weak," *ἀσθενεστέρους*. Also in section 57 the Athenians are said to have been "weak." For the contrast with Rome (*rōmē* = "strength") see section 8. The health of the Roman Empire is praised in sections 39, 69 and especially 98.

"They seemed no different from a fallen city's scattered remnants," *οὐδὲν γὰρ ἄλλο ἢ διοικομένοις ἔφεσαν*. Compare Thucydides VII 75, 5 on the Athenians after the naval battle at Syracuse: *οὐδὲν γὰρ ἄλλο ἢ πόλει ἐκπεπολιορκημένη ἔφεσαν*.

"The crowning effort would unaccountably weaken," *τὸ κεφάλαιον ἐλάνθανε λνόμενον*. As Canter recognized, Aristides alludes to the punishment of Sisyphus in Hades, but this phrase has continued to trouble translators. L. A. Stella resigned herself to an unacceptably free paraphrase; Levin lost touch with Sisyphus in translating, "the whole structure would collapse before they knew it." Each time that Sisyphus gets within reach of his goal at the top of the hill, no intervention is seen, but the stone becomes too heavy for him (*Odyssey* XI 597), and he has to let go.

54. "Towards them the Athenians had come to feel much like those who, in a game of draughts, advance their pieces to one position and pull them back to another, without knowing what use they will make of them," *ἐπεπόνθεσαν πρὸς αὐτὸν παραπλήσιον ὅπερ οἱ ἐν ταῖς παιδιάσ τῇ μὲν εἰς τοῦμπροσθεν ἄγοντες, τῇ δὲ εἰς τοῦπισθεν ἀνθέλκοντες, οὐκ ἔχοντες ὁ τι χρήσονται*. Levin translates very differently, "Their relations with their subjects were like a game where you keep pulling people forward with one hand and dragging them back with the other. They did not know what to do with them." However, *τῇ μὲν* and *τῇ δὲ* are in this case, I think, more precisely translated "to this place" and "to that place" (*cf. GEL*, s. v. δ, ἥ, τό, VIII, 1 b), while the implied object of the participle *ἄγοντες* is not "people" but "pieces," though this seems to have escaped L. A. Stella as well as Levin. The text continues, *ἀλλ’ οἷον εἶναι τε καὶ μὴ εἶναι αὐτὸν βούλόμενοι, αὐτοὶ μεταχειρίζομενοι τε καὶ ἄγοντες, ἐν οἷς σπεύδουσι, εἴπειν οὖν ἔχοντες*. L. A. Stella makes no real break after *χρήσονται*, and ignoring the signal in the adversative *ἀλλ’*, translates "ora li spingevano avanti, ora li trascinavano indietro, senza saper bene che cosa fare, come volendo ad un tempo che esistessero e non esistessero; nel guidarli e nel dirigerli non sapevano neppur loro dove miravano." Having failed to recognize the game implied in the earlier clause as a game played with pieces on a *tabula lusoria*, L. A. Stella and Levin could not understand the participle *μεταχειρίζομενοι* here. For the sense one might compare Plutarch, *De communibus notitiis* (ed. Bernardakis) 1068: *πεττῶν δίκην*

δεῦρο κάκεῖ τὰς κοινὰς ἐννοίας μετατίθεις. There were many games played with pieces on a board, and it is impossible to prove any identification of the game implied by Aristides, but the context imposes upon me an impression that the game was that described as *πόλεις παιζεῖν* (cf. Lamer, *RE* 13: 1973-1975, 1927, s. v. "Lusoria tabula"). Now then, it seems to me that the comparison of the Athenians with poor *πεττευταί* implies by contrast that Rome was a good *πεττευτής*. The connection is supplied by Plato, *Laws* X 903b-e, where the god, ὁ τοῦ παντὸς ἐπιμελούμενος, is compared with an ἔντεχνος δημιουργός and is called the *πεττευτής*. In other words the good *πεττευτής* with whom the Athenians are contrasted is Rome the Demiurge. For another reflection of *Laws* X 903b-e see the commentary on section 98.

"Without being able to say whither they were going in earnest," ἐν οἷς σπεύδοντιν οὐκ ἔχοντες εἰπεῖν. Reiske wished to emend to ἐφ' οἷς, and Wilamowitz to ὅποι, but for this use of ἐν with verbs of motion see the GEL s. v. ἐν I 8. Since *σπουδή* is the opposite of *παιδιά*, the word *σπεύδοντιν* contrasts with the word *παιδιᾶς* above, but also it reminds the audience ironically of "Simonides" fr. 118 on the fallen Athenians, 'Ελλάδι γὰρ σπεύδοντες ἐλευθερίην περιθεῖναι | κείμεθ' ἀγγράντῳ χρώμενοι εὐλογίῃ, "We to set Freedom's crown on Hellas' brow | Laboured, and here in ageless honour lie" (W. C. Lawton's translation).

55. "The help." The articular infinitive replaces an abstract noun. It was unprofitable for the Athenians to reveal to the remaining allies, who were already not serious about helping Athens, the help that the remaining allies could wholeheartedly, seriously give the rebels.

56. Aristides has in mind the speech of the ambassadors from Lesbos before the Peloponnesians according to Thucydides III, 10, 6: "We no longer had Athenian leaders whom we could trust, in view of the samples of their intention in what had already happened. For when they subjected some of those whom they had made allies at the same time as they made us allies, it was not likely that they would have failed to do the same to all the rest, if they had ever had the power."

"Leagued together in revolt (*κοινῇ δ' ἄπαντες ἀποτάντες*), they would all be securely free." The league of which Athens had the hegemony impeded rather than furthered freedom. For the contrast see sections 36 and 68.

57. "Thus in that period there was still no orderly system of imperial rule, and they did not go after it with knowledge of what an orderly system was," Οὕτω τότε ἀρχῆς οὕπω τάξις ἦν, οὐδὲ εἰδότες αὐτὴν ἐδίωκον. In Plato, *Laws* X 898a-b, *τάξις* and *κόσμος* are associated with the Good World-Soul. Because of a deficiency of knowledge in the soul of the Athenian Empire the living organism became weak and sickly. Because of the presence of knowledge in the soul of the Roman Empire the civilized world is brought to a state of health (cf. section 97, *ἐπιστημόνως*).

"Although what they had were small territories and like marginal lands and military allotments," καίπερ μικρὰ καὶ οἶον ἐσχατὰς καὶ κλήρους ἔχοντες. All they had were the *disiecta membra* of an empire. These are the contemptible "claws and extremities" (ὄννχάς τινας καὶ ἄκρα) of section 43. For Athenian cleruchies see the commentary on section 30. Thucydides III, 50, 2 gives a famous account of the 3,000 *kleroi* created by the Athenians on Lesbos (cf. Tod, *GHI* 63), but the word *kleroi* does not have to refer to a specifically Athenian kind of military allotment. The most familiar *kleroi* were those of the Spartiates, whom P. Roussel, *Sparte*, 72, Paris, 1939, considers "less landowners than soldiers collecting for their support rents of which even the quota is fixed." Plutarch is the main source of our knowledge of the Spartan *kleroi*, about which Roussel, *Sparte*, 71-78 and 162-167 gives a good account (see further C. Roebuck, *Cl. Phil.* 40: 151, 1945). On Hellenistic *kleroi* see Rostovtzeff, *SEHHW* 284-287. On ordinary *eschatiai* see A. Wilhelm, *Neue Beiträge* 3: 12-15 (*SB Wien* 175, 1), 1913, and on the *kleroi* for which Plato calls in the *Laws* see Wilhelm, *ibidem*.

"They were stripped of their plumage like Aesop's jackdaw and were fighting alone against all." The jackdaw was stripped of his plumage in the fable of "The Jackdaw and the Birds," *Aesopica* 101 (ed. B. E. Perry); also in Babrius 72 Crusius, Aphthonius 31 Sbordone,²⁰ and Epistle 34 of Theophylactus.²¹ Babrius of course presented his versified fables as basically Aesopic, and a fable which is cited as Aesopic by Dio Chrysostom but appears first in Babrius now turns up in prose in a papyrus of the first century after Christ, P. Ryl. 493. Aristides alludes to a fable in some "Aesopic" collection like that of P. Ryl. 493. The story concerns a beauty contest of birds. The jackdaw picks up feathers dropped by other birds, and transforms his natural ugliness; but eventually he is recognized behind the beautiful plumage, whereupon the other birds unite to attack him and pull out all his feathers. Whereas in Babrius 72 and Aphthonius 31 it is merely a beauty contest, in the version of *Aesopica* 101 the contest has been called because Zeus wishes to appoint a *basileus* of the birds. Likewise in Theophylactus the purpose was to assign the hegemony of the birds to one. Both the jackdaw and the Athenians, therefore, were candidates for hegemony. "The Jackdaw and the Owl" of Aphthonius was supposed to teach one "to hate encroachment" (*πλεονεξία*). It so happens that the epimythium added to a genuine fable of the Aesopic corpus, "The Jackdaw and the Doves," 129 Perry, states that "encroachment" besides doing no good often entails loss of one's own heritage. The "encroachment" which Aristides has shown to be an outstanding vice of the Athenians quite naturally brings the jackdaw to mind,

²⁰ F. Sbordone, *Ricensioni retoriche delle favole esopiane, Rivista indo-greco-italica* 16: fasc. 3-4, 35-68, 1932.

²¹ R. Hercher, *Epistolographi graeci*, 773 f., Paris, 1873.

but in mentioning some current version of the fable Aristides has a purpose which appears in the contrasting passage in section 107.

58. Rome as the inventor of the science of government, the τέχνη πολιτική (or βασιλική), which in section 51 was called Rome's εὐρημα. The early history of the Greek passion for isolating individual persons or peoples who invented the arts, sciences, crafts, etc., has been treated by A. Kleingünther, "Πρώτος εὑρετής. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte einer Fragestellung," *Philologus*, Suppl. 26, Heft 1, 1933.

"On account of the knowledge how to rule with justice and with reason, the empire flourished and increased." The Good World-Soul produces growth (Plato, *Laws* X 896e-897a). For the contrast see sections 19 and 23.

59. "But there is that which very decidedly deserves as much attention and admiration now as all the rest together. I mean your magnificent citizenship with its grand conception, because there is nothing like it in the records of all mankind," τοῦτο δὲ καὶ πολὺ μάλιστα πάντων ἄξιον ἴδειν καὶ θαυμάσαι τὴν περὶ τὴν πολιτείαν καὶ τὴν τῆς διανοίας μεγαλοπρέπειαν, ὡς οὐδὲν ἑουκὸς αὐτῇ τῶν πάντων. The words καὶ πολὺ μάλιστα go together, likewise the words πάντων ἄξιον. Compare the very same phrases in section 34, ὃ δὲ πάντων ἄξιον ἀγασθαί τε καὶ θαυμάζειν and ἔκεινο καὶ πολὺ μάλιστα νενικήκατε. The phrase τὴν περὶ τὴν πολιτείαν καὶ τὴν τῆς διανοίας μεγαλοπρέπειαν, where Keil's emendations (*tῶν* for the first *τὴν*, and deletion of the connective) are quite unnecessary, means merely τὴν μεγαλοπρεπή πολιτείαν καὶ τὴν μεγαλοπρεπή διάνοιαν. For a somewhat similar transition compare Demosthenes, *Against Timocrates* 88.

"Your empire—with this word I have indicated the entire civilized world." Romans usually would have distinguished between the *orbis terrarum*, which included vassal states and other peoples with whom Rome had influence, and the *imperium Romanum* proper. Tacitus always made this distinction (cf. K. Meister, *Eranos* 46: 102-107, 1948), but Cicero (*Cat.* III 26), Vergil (*Aeneid* I 278), Ovid (*Fasti* II 683), and the heading of the *Res Gestae divi Augusti* did not.

"You have appointed to your citizenship or even to kinship with you," πολιτικὸν ἥ καὶ ὁμόφυλον ἀπεδώκατε. Reiske would delete the whole phrase ἥ καὶ ὁμόφυλον as a gloss on πολιτικόν. Keil rightly retains it. Compare Dio of Prusa XXXII 36. The phrase is a reference to the ease with which "new" Roman citizens could contract safe marriages and make or accept adoptions beyond the limits of their original community. In the Achaean League, for example, citizens from one city did not enjoy these rights in another city except by special grant. Perioeci of Lacedaemon never entered a Spartiate family, though they did have Lacedaemonian second-class citizenship. In section 102 Aristides refers specifically to the removal of restrictions on marriage, and he refers to the joy which Hera has in the Roman Empire

because of improvement in the laws of marriage. See the commentary on section 104 in regard to marriages. As for adoptions, one striking case may serve to show the equality of all Roman citizens before the law. Around A. D. 100 a deceased Athenian hierophant, a Roman citizen of the equestrian order, is honored by the heiress, his adopted daughter, an occidental lady from a consular family domiciled in Gallia Narbonensis. It was undoubtedly a testamentary adoption (cf. *AJA* 55: 347-349, 1951).

Schönbauer (ZSS 51: 312, 1931) interprets the words πολιτικόν and ὁμόφυλον quite differently. He believes that πολιτικόν means "into a class of *politai*," not Roman citizens but citizens of some polis or *civitas*. The word ὁμόφυλον he translates "gleichrangig" and means thereby Roman citizens. The ἀρχόμενοι Schönbauer (312 f.) considers to be *peregrini dediticii*. But section 63 shows clearly that Aristides was not here dividing the world into the categories of those (whether *cives* or *peregrini*) who belonged to a *polis* or *civitas* and those who were *peregrini dediticii*, but into *cives Romani* and *peregrini*. Schönbauer, incidentally, used Dindorf's instead of Keil's text and therefore read πόλιν αἰτίαν instead of πολιτείαν, and he gives no reference to Keil's note.

"The better part of the world's talent, courage, and leadership," τὸ μὲν χαριέστερὸν τε καὶ γενναιότερον καὶ δυνατώτερον. The meaning of the adjective χαριέστερον should be approached partly from Plutarch's use of it, *Agis and Cleomenes* 8 and 32 on filling up the citizen ranks with new material: ἀναπληρωθῆναι δὲ τούτους ἐκ τε περιοίκων καὶ ξένων, ὅσοι τροφῆς μετεσχηκότες ἐλευθερίον καὶ χαρίεντες ἄλλως τοῖς σώμασι καὶ καθ' ἥλικιαν ἀκράζοντες εἶν, and ἀναπληρώσας δὲ τὸ πολίτευμα τοῖς χαριεστάτοις τῶν περιοίκων ὁπλίτας τετρακισχιλίους ἐποίησε. The χαρίεντες or χαριέστεροι are those notable for their *charis*, those who in their spiritual or physical development approach the ideal beauty and freedom of a divine being. The early Christian idea of spiritual "grace" was similarly one of participation in God. Even the term χαρίεντες to mean aristocrats reflected an ancient claim to greater kinship with the gods. Would it be facetious to say that there were two kinds of Romans, *Romani per naturam* (born Romans) and *Romani per gratiam* (created Romans as a favor in recognition of superiority)? For the antithesis *natura-gratia* see E. N. Kantorowicz, *Harvard Theol. Rev.* 45: 253-277, 1952. The adjective χαριέστερον means here primarily those who by divine gifts are "praestantiores animis," and it carries one implication of the Latin word "gratia." The adjective δυνατώτερον means "potentiores," but no longer primarily in the physical sense; rather it carries one connotation of the word "gratia," e. g. in Tacitus, *Ann.* I 81, 3. The adjective γενναιότερον alludes to the chief military virtue. In theory the ideal soldiers are "non tantum corporibus sed etiam animis praestantissimi," as Vegetius I 7 expresses it. The terminology of military fitness, which once formed the legitimate basis of citizenship, is here in a striking

phrase reinterpreted to include the old but to reach a higher conception of citizenship.

On the spread of Roman citizenship see Ernst Dorsch, *De civitate Romanae apud Graecos propagatione*, Diss. Breslau, 1886; A. H. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship*, Part II, Ch. X, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1939; Mason Hammond, "Germana Patria," *Harvard Studies Class. Phil.* 60: 147-174, 1951.

The division into two types, the superior with (Roman) citizenship and the others without it, indicates the justice of Rome the ideal state. Plutarch, *De Alexandri Fortuna* 1, 6: "Alexander said that the good are the real kinsmen and the bad the real strangers, and the good man is the true Greek and the bad man the real barbarian." See also Strabo I 4, 9.

60. "Nor are Asia and Europe divided in their treatment here," a reference to a famous phrase of Isocrates, *Panegyricus* 179, or Herodotus I 4, 4, or to the earliest map (by Anaximander) on which the earth was divided into two parts, Asia and Europe, or to those other passages which are collected by A. Momigliano, "L'Europa come concetto politico presso Isocrate e gli Isocratei," *Rivista di filologia* 61: 477-487, 1933. The antithesis Europe-Asia was abolished by Alexander the Great.

"No one worthy of rule or trust remains an alien," *ἔνος δὲ οὐδεὶς ὅστις ἀρχῆς η̄ πίστεως ἄξιος*. The characterization *ένος* may have been suggested by the passage just cited from Plutarch or by the common source. The words *ἀρχῆς* and *πίστεως* were suggested not by literature but by the obvious fact that many Greeks were now being advanced to prominent posts in the imperial service, though access to a senatorial career was not usually granted to the first generation with citizenship. The word *ἀρχή* means above all the post and imperium of a senatorial magistracy, while *πίστις* is commonly used of a high equestrian office. For example, the *ab epistulis graecis* is called *ὁ τὴν τάξιν τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν ἐπιστολῶν πεπιστευμένος* both by Flavius Josephus and in the list of imperial advisers attached to a newly discovered letter of the emperor Commodus (Raubitschek, *Hesperia Suppl.* 8: 288 f., 1949; cf. *AJP* 71: 178 f., 1950) and in the same list the *a cubiculo* is called, *ὁ ἐπὶ [τὴν τοῦ θαλάμου καὶ το]ῦ σώματος τοῦ ἐμοῦ πίστιν ἐπιτε[ραγμένος]*.

"A civil community of the World . . . as a Free Republic," *κοινὴ τῆς γῆς δημοκρατία*. The World State here receives a name slightly suggestive of names for ideal cities such as the City of the Sun, or City of the Sky, or City of the Stars. The phrase *κοινὴ πολιτεία* would have been ordinary; for example, two lost works of Aristotle are the *κοινὴ Ἀρκάδων πολιτεία* and the *κοινὴ Θετταλῶν πολιτεία*. The extraordinary word *δημοκρατία* is here significantly substituted for the usual *πολιτεία* and emphasizes (1) freedom as the outstanding characteristic of the Roman World (for *δημοκρατία = libertas* see J. A. O. Larsen, *Cl. Phil.*, 40: 88-91, 1945, already cited by Levin), and (2) the *ἰσονομία* of health (cf. section 98). There is a contrast with Persian despotism,

with the *libera res publica* of the Romans²² (see the section on Tacitus and Aristides above in Ch. II), with the old "Free Republic" to which every Greek city looked back (section 38), and with the "universal defection" under the Athenians (section 56). It was not late usage in general, but that of Isocrates and Polybius in particular, which led Aristides to call the Roman Empire a *δημοκρατία*. Polybius VI 57, 9 distinguishes ochlocracy, the worst form of government, from *ἐλευθερία καὶ δημοκρατία*, the fairest of all; and in II 44, 6 he uses the words *ἐκουνώντας τῆς τῶν Ἀχαιῶν δημοκρατίας* to say of some non-Achaean cities that they joined his beloved Achaean League. Isocrates, *Areopagiticus* 61, speaks of the Lacedaemonians as *δημοκρατούμενοι*, because to him *δημοκρατία* in a good sense means merely *ἰσονομία*. Isocrates, *Panegyric* 151 says that the leading Persians have never known the equality of a civil community.

The thought that the entire world now belongs to all and that there are no differences of treatment reappears in XXVII Keil 32.

The "one, the best, ruler and teacher of order" (*ἄρχοντι καὶ κοσμητῷ*) reflects primarily Herodotus III 82, 2, but he is also the statesman inspired by an ideal of justice, the *basileus nomothētēs* of Plato's *Politicus* 294a-295b and 305b, who in 295a assigns to each man his due. The emperor is called an "archon" because that term suggests the activity of an administrator and judge in a civil community. The emperor is called also *kosmêtēs*, a vague term which carries the image of a political Cosmos but which means approximately "establisher of Order." The Homeric *kosmêtōr* (a poetic equivalent) was the marshal of the troops. At Athens the *kosmêtēs* was the man of authority who commanded the ephesbes, who were theoretically young military recruits, but apart from financial support his function was less to exercise command on would-be military expeditions than to restrain disorder and to teach order. Even the legislator whom Plato, *Laws* VIII 843e, calls *τὸν μείζω πόλεως κοσμητήν*, is a restrainer of disorder and teacher of order for the whole polis. Accordingly, the word describes the emperor both as a legislator through *mandata*, rescripts and edicts, and as the supreme commander who keeps the Army of the Rhine and the Army of the Danube and the Army of Syria from losing their discipline and abandoning their respective posts. The word *κόσμος*, from which it is derived, very often meant "discipline" in classical writers, and its opposite was *ὕβρις* (cf. W. Vollgraff, *L'oraison funèbre de Gorgias*, 44-55, Leyden, Brill, 1952).

"Each man his due." See L. Wenger, "Suum cuique in antiken Urkunden," *Aus der Geisteswelt des Mittelalters. Studien und Texte Martin Grabmann zur Vollendung des 60. Lebensjahres von Freunden und*

²² The word *libera* is not indispensable: compare Tacitus, *Hist.* I 16 (Galba speaking), "dignus eram a quo res publica inciperet." This shows the perfect equivalence of *dēmokratia* and *res publica*. Compare also Tacitus, *Hist.* I 50, "mansuram fuisse sub Pompeio Brutoque rem publicam."

Schülern gewidmet (*Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters*, Supplementband 3), 1415-1425, 1935; and *Actes du V^e Congrès International de Papyrologie*, 533-536, Brussels, Fondation égyptologique Reine Élisabeth, 1938. Plato, *Republic* I 331e and *Laws* VI 757, also Isocrates, *Areopagiticus* 21 f., are classical precedents of a sort, but the importance of the idea in Roman practice was publicized in Asia by a Roman decree of A. D. 44, of which several copies have come to light: see F. K. Dörner, *Der Erlass des Statthalters von Asia Paullus Fabius Persicus*, 37, II, lines 16-17, Diss., Greifswald, 1935.

61. "The civilized world." Above all compare *Berliner Klassikertexte* 7: Berl. Pap. P. 13045, lines 28-31, "The other cities are towns of their adjacent territory, but are villages of Alexandria. For the civilized world has Alexandria as a town."

"Common town." A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship*, 202, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1939, says that the "ἀστυ κοινόν" is simply *communis patria*, a "demonstrably Roman" idea. If I understand him correctly, Sherwin-White implies that the Romans invented the idea and that Aristides got it from the Romans. These would be two undemonstrable conjectures, and in place of them I propose (1) that the phrase *ἀστυ κοινόν* meant "capital city" (e.g. Athens in Attica, Sparta in Lacedaemon), perhaps also was an ancient *topos* of display oratory at Panhellenic and League festivals to compliment the city in which the festival or gathering was held, (2) that the phrase *κοινὴ πατρίς*, which is not quite *ἀστυ κοινόν*, and which Isocrates, *Panegyric* 81, applied to Hellas, was an ancient *topos* to describe a (potential or real) Greek League or its territory and was an imported compliment for the Roman Confederacy. In the prose hymn to Poseidon which Aristides delivered at the Isthmian Games, he calls Corinth *κοινὸν ἀστυ τῶν Ἑλλήνων* (XLVI Keil 23).

"This one citadel" (*ἀκρόπολιν*). Wilamowitz was probably wrong in emending *ἀκρόπολιν* to *μητρόπολιν*. In the parallel passage of XLVI 23 Aristides calls Corinth *κοινὴ πάντων καταφυγή* and compares it with a mother-city, *οἷον μητρόπολίς τις ἀτεχνῶς*. In the Roman Oration the words "into this one citadel" mean "into this *κοινὴ καταφυγή*." Compare St. Augustine, *City of God* XIX 5, "commune perfugium."

With this section contrast Isocrates, *Panegyric* 131 (with play on the word *perioikoi* to mean, not "perioeci," but "subjects" or "serfs") and *Panathenaic* 179. The best known perioeci were those of Lacedaemon, but perioeci were to be found in Argolis, Crete, Elis, Thessaly and other places (see J. A. O. Larsen, *RE* 37: 816-833, 1937, s. v. *Περίοικοι*). They were in general citizens with lesser rights. However, he has only Lacedaemon and Attica in mind. Those provincials with both Roman and municipal citizenship remind Aristides of Athenians who live in demes outside the capital. Those provincials with municipal citizenship but without

Roman citizenship remind Aristides of the Lacedaemonian perioeci.

62. This section is the most disturbed of the whole oration. If my impression is correct, the main difficulty began with omission of the words *ώστερ δὲ ή τοῖς κόλποις δεχομένη τοὺς ποταμὸν θάλαττα πάντας τοσούτους κρύψασα ἔχει ἐξιόντων καὶ εἰσιόντων ἵση οὖσά τε καὶ φαινομένη*, which belong before the words *οὗτα καὶ ἵδε δέχεται* because the verb *δέχεται* echoes the phrase *δεχομένη . . . θάλαττα*. The omission was detected and the missing words were added in the margin; but the provenience was not clearly indicated, and on being recopied some of the words were inserted in one wrong place and others in a second wrong place, one word, *ώστερ*, being inserted twice. Transposition and repetition are well attested as characteristic defects of the tradition. The words *ή τοῖς κόλποις δεχομένη* were no longer clearly intelligible and suffered further alteration made easy by Byzantine iotaism: they became *οἱ . . . δεχόμενοι*, and called forth very unconvincing translations. So, at least, I believe. To understand this passage entirely one must know the contrasting passage in Plato, *Timaeus* 50c, where the all-receiving *physis* is compared with an *ekmēgeion* which really remains the same but which seems different because what goes in and out shows.

"With the waters flowing in." The traditional text reads *οὐν αὐτοῖς εἰς ροῦν*. Schmid, *Atticismus* 2: 224 recognized the word *εἰσρέοντων*. But we do not have to assume so much of a corruption. Aristides would have used the form *εἰσροῦσιν*, so that we need reckon with only one omission, a short one of two consecutive letters. This is the commonest type of error. For the simile compare *Ecclesiastes* I 7.

"Here no change is visible, because the city is so great," *τῆδε ὑπὸ μεγέθους οὐδὲν ἐπίδηλον*. Keil supplied *οὐτε* before *τῆδε* to correspond with the *οὐτε* in the previous clause. One might argue rather that *δὲ* has been lost after *τῆδε*, but the asyndeton is poetical and solemn (cf. J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, 510, sect. iv). Since the asyndeton is by no means impossible, the traditional text had better be preserved.

The sea was Solon's symbol of perfect justice (fr. 11 Diehl: cf. G. Vlastos, "Solonian Justice," *Ci. Phil.* 41: 66, n. 18, 1946).

63. The words *μεγάλοι μεγάλως* hark back, as Keil notes, to the Homeric phrase *μεγάλοι μεγαλωστί* used in section 11. A slight variation in citing the Homeric phrase is intentional and fastidious. Both ways of treating Homer are very much in the Platonic manner (cf. Dorothy Tarrant, "Plato's Use of Quotations and Other Illustrative Material," *Ci. Quart.* 44: 59-67, 1951, especially the remark on p. 61 about adaptations which violate the metre).

"Stood off," *ἀποσεμνυάμενοι*. Compare the genus of the cranes separating themselves from the rest and giving themselves airs, *σεμνήνοντος αὐτὸν ἐαντό* (Plato, *Politician* 263d).

"And you have caused the word 'Roman' to be the label, not of membership in a city, but of some common nationality," καὶ τὸ Ἀριστίδην εἶναι ἐποιήσατε, οὐ πόλεως, ἀλλὰ γένους ὄνομα κοινοῦ τυποῦ. As Mesk realized, Aristides is here twisting the famous words of Isocrates, *Panegyric* 50, "And (Athens) has made the name 'Hellenes' seem no longer that of the race but of the intellect (καὶ τὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὄνομα μηκέτι τοῦ γένους ἀλλὰ τῆς διανοίας δοκεῖν εἶναι), and it is those sharing in our education rather than those sharing in our common nature who are called Hellenes." While the Athenians reduced the whole *genos* to one polis, the Romans have expanded their polis into a whole *genos*. On the old division into Hellenes and Barbarians see T. J. Haarhoff, *The Stranger at the Gate*, 75 ff., Oxford, Blackwell, 1948.

"It is not absurd, the distinction which you made." This reflects Plato, *Politicus* 262d-e, where the Stranger mocks the popular division of humanity into Hellenes and Barbarians, particularly because the Barbarians who differed so much among themselves did not form a single category. The Stranger ironically compared the division with one into an arbitrary ten-thousand and the rest. Aristides emphasizes that this is no arbitrary ten-thousand by concluding with the clause "as you showed them a citizenry more numerous, so to speak, than the entire Hellenic race." The division now is between Romans and non-Romans, but it is not absurd because, even if "Roman" means "Roman citizens," the group is a large group with political unity. Compare the title assumed by Shapur I, King of the kings of the Iranians and the non-Iranians, *shahanshah i Eran u Aneran, βασιλεὺς βασιλέων Ἀριανῶν καὶ Ἀναριανῶν*.

64. It is slightly exaggerated but generally true, as names of local magistrates, gymnasarchs, and agonothes in contemporary inscriptions reveal, that the ruling class everywhere had Roman citizenship. Of course they were devoted to Rome, which protected them against a recrudescence of low class violence and of demands for a cancellation of debts and for a redistribution of property, the slogan of social revolution in the Hellenistic Period. Rome did not send troops to hold the cities as Athens had held them (cf. section 52). For the theme of Rome's generosity in the extension of citizenship see the speech of Claudius according to Tacitus, *Ann.* XI 24.

65. "No envy sets foot in the empire." Polybius VI 7 says that envy arises when the rulers cease to rule for the benefit of the governed and seek special privileges for themselves. In his epilogue Polybius implies that Fortune will eventually envy the Romans. The phrase "no envy" occurs in the *Timaeus* 29e. A. D. Nock comments in a letter that there is no parallel because Rome suffers no envy while the Demiurge of the *Timaeus* feels none. Still there may be a verbal echo, again in XXVII Keil 35. In the *Phaedrus* 247a Plato stresses the absence of envy from the divine choir. Plutarch, *Numa* 20, 7, says that there was no envy in

the Rome of Numa. St. Augustine, XXII 30, mentions the absence of envy in the City of God.

This section is balanced against sections 44-46, in which Athens, Sparta and Thebes were depicted as taking turns in ruling the Greeks and as begrudging each other the first rank in hatred, and in which the exploitation of the subject cities by Athens was mentioned. For the theme that Rome is not exclusive but permits others to share in the rule see the speech of Cerialis in Tacitus, *Hist.* IV 74.

The meaning of the word δυνατοί is the key to an understanding of the last sentence. The phrase ἐκ τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς δυνατῶν has been translated in very different ways: "a potentioribus" (Canter); "from their governors" (Livingstone, *The Mission of Greece* 257); "delle autorità locali" (L. A. Stella); "from the men in power over them" (Levin). It has been paraphrased as "the ruling classes in the cities" by A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship*, 263 (cf. 260), Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1939. There is no doubt in the writer's mind that Canter and Sherwin-White are correct, though Plutarch, *Political Precepts* 19, might be better adduced than the Sibylline Oracles which Sherwin-White reviews. Since Aelius Aristides writes Attic Greek and has been speaking of the Athenian Empire in Thucydidean terms, the meaning of the word δυνατοί must be approximately that which it has in the speech of Diodotus, Thucydides III 47, 3, where, as a synonym for ὀλίγοι, it indicates the wealthy few (oligarchs) as distinct from the majority of the citizens. It has the same meaning frequently in Thucydides, e. g. I 24, 5; II 65, 2; III 27, 3; V 4, 3; VIII 21; VIII 48; VIII 63, 3; VIII 73, 2. However, the δυνατοί were the *potentes* or *potentiores* with whom Canter accurately identified them rather than the *honestiores* with whom Sherwin-White, not incorrectly but less precisely, must have identified them. The *potentes* were a small group within the *honestiores* (cf. G. Cardascia, *Revue historique de droit français et étranger*, 4^e série, 28: 308-310, 1950).

"All the masses have as a share in it the permission to <take refuge with you> from the power of the local magnates, <but there is> the indignation and punishment from you which will come upon them immediately, if they themselves dare to make any unlawful change." Tacitus, *Ann.* XII 48, shows the two sides: "Isdem consulibus (A. D. 58) auditae Puteolanorum legationes quas diversas ordo plebs ad senatum miserant, illi vim multitudinis, hi magistratum et primi cuiusque avaritiam increpantes." The Roman government punished popular ringleaders on this occasion. Similarly Rome punished rioters at Athens late in the reign of Augustus, and at Cyzicus, Tyre, and Sidon in the reign of Tiberius (cf. P. Graindor, *Athènes sous Auguste* [Université Égyptienne, *Recueil de Travaux publiés par la Faculté des Lettres*, 1] 41-45, 1927, and the criticism in *Hesperia* 20: 351, 1951). For ἄδεια in the sense "freedom to do something" see Dio of Prusa XXXII 55.

For a picture of Rome protecting the masses against the magnates see Chapter V. For warnings from the Roman government see Chapter VII, and for the very phrase "dare to make any unlawful change" see Case V therein. As the reader will note in Chapter V, the thought of the missing words can be almost recovered from Plutarch, *Political Precepts* 19, where the phrase is φεύγειν τὴν πόλιν, though Aristides in the lacuna would have indicated whither, not whence. The better word καταφέγειν is suggested by XLVI Keil 23-24, where imitating what Aeschines, *Against Ctesiphon* 134 said about Athens, Aristides calls Corinth κοινὴ πάντων καταφυγή and καταφυγὴ καὶ σωτηρία πᾶσι τοῖς ἐντυχάνοντις. Corinth was the seat of the proconsul of Achaia and the Roman administration of Greece. Isocrates, *Panegyric* 41, praises Athens as an ἀσφαλεστάτη καταφυγή for the other Greeks, and as suiting both rich and poor. Compare also Demosthenes LVII 6 and 56, κατέφυγον εἰς ὑμᾶς.

66. Aristides says that with the Roman state there has been created a single all-embracing *harmonia*.²³ The Greek word *harmonia* may mean musical harmony or harmony of the World Order, or any close union of dissimilar parts in a well-built wall or house.²⁴ It may mean also a framework within which parts are assembled. Thus Aristides suggests (1) that the Roman constitution provides a frame within which all men have their proper place, (2) that because of the Roman constitution the chorus of the civilized world is singing harmoniously, (3) that the Roman state constitutes a parallel to the World Order. The skill with which Aristides lightly brings out again the musical metaphor of sections 29-31 is particularly notable.

"<Maintenance> of control over an empire, over a vast one at that, and at the same time firmness of rule <without> unkindness." The traditional text of this passage is of course corrupt. It reads κράτος ἄρχῆς ἄμα καὶ φιλανθρωπίας καὶ μεγάλης γε καὶ οὐκ ἐνὸν (or οὐ κανὸν) ἄρχειν ἐγκρατεῖς. Sieveking (32) pointed out the comparative material in sections 34 and 57. For οὐκ ἐνὸν where (*pace* Büchner, *Philologus* 49: 182 f., 1890) undoubtedly one of the main difficulties lies, the inferior

²³ Polybius VI, 18, 1 uses the word ἄρμογή, a synonym of ἄρμοντα. The Latin equivalent *compages* is applied to the Roman state by Lucan I, 72-80 and Tacitus, *Hist.* IV, 74. Plutarch, who uses the words ἄρμοσάμενος and συνήρμοσε of the work of Lycurgus at Sparta (*Lycurgus* 7, 5 and 31, 3), compares the state to a ἄρμοντα λύρας in the comparison between Lycurgus and Numa (1, 6) and uses the word *harmonia* in *Lycurgus* 27, 8. An altar (Blinkenberg, *Inscr. Lindos* 456) was dedicated in the Roman Period to the four elements and to Harmonia, Eudaimonia, Phémè and Basileia. On the cult of Harmonia see J. and L. Robert, *Hellenica* 9: 62, 1950. It is slightly different when Plato, *Republic* IV 431-432, likens *sôphrosynê* to a *harmonia* as the virtue of a state, but he speaks of the citizens striking the same note together (ξυνάδοντες).

²⁴ St. Augustine, *City of God* XIX 13: "Pax civitatis (est) ordinata imperandi atque oboediendi concordia civium.... Ordo est parium dispariumque rerum sua cuique loca tribuens dispositio." In general see Harald Fuchs, *Friedensgedanke*.

manuscript Baroc. 136 offers the anonymous emendation οὐ κενὸν, which does not clear up the obscurity. I, on the other hand, emend to οὐκ ἄνευ, which presupposes a very easy misreading, and I assume that the troublesome φιλανθρωπίας originally followed. Whereas Reiske and Sieveking were inclined to emend the latter to the nominative, the genitive is right if the word has been transposed. Accordingly, I assume here an ordinary transposition followed by a secondary change. The phrase μεγάλης γε goes in the first half with the word ἄρχῆς while the phrase οὐκ ἄνευ φιλανθρωπίας goes in the second half with the words ἄρχειν ἐγκρατεῖς. Thus everything is now accounted for except a third καὶ which is a mere duplication or else a corruption of κατέχειν. In fact there is another contrasting passage overlooked by Sieveking, namely in section 18, comparison with which suggests either that κράτος is a corruption of κράτος (νῦντας) or that an infinitive κατέχειν has fallen out. On reflection I choose the later and read κράτος ἄρχῆς ἄμα καὶ μεγάλης γε <κατέχειν> καὶ οὐκ <ἄνευ> φιλανθρωπίας ἄρχειν ἐγκρατεῖς. The particle and the hyperbaton throw the adjective μεγάλης into high relief. With this passage one must compare also the speech of the Athenians in Thucydides I 76. They use the phrase ἄρχειν ἐγκρατῶς, and shortly afterwards they say, ἐπαινέσθαι τε ἀξιοι οἵτινες χρησάμενοι τῷ ἀνθρωπείᾳ φύσει (contrast the φιλανθρωπία of Aristides) ὥστε ἔτερων ἄρχειν δικαιότεροι ἢ κατὰ τὴν ὑπάρχοντα δύναμιν γένονται. In section 37, where he speaks of Rome's virtue despite Rome's immense power, Aristides uses the adverb ἐγκρατῶς with the same verb, but here Aristides says ἄρχειν ἐγκρατεῖς on the analogy of Thucydides' phrase ἄρχειν δικαιότεροι. Aristides probably understands Thucydides as meaning, "They are worthy of praise who notwithstanding human nature become such that they rule others more justly than they need with the power they have."

For the ἐγκράτεια of the Roman government compare sections 29, 34, and 92. For the famous word φιλανθρωπία and its development—incidentally, the word was a favorite of Plutarch's—see R. Hirzel, *Plutarch (Das Erbe der Alten* 4) 25-32, 1912; S. Lorenz, *De progressu notionis φιλανθρωπίας*, Diss., Leipzig, 1914; V. Valdenberg, "La théorie monarchique de Dion Chrysostome," *REG* 40: 142-162, 1927 especially 153; S. Tromp de Ruiter, "De vocis quae est φιλανθρωπία significatio atque usu," *Mnemosyne* 59: 271-306, 1932; H. I. Bell, "Philanthropia in the Papyri of the Roman Period," *Hommages à Joseph Bidez et à Franz Cumont*, 31-37, Brussels, Latomus, 1949; Bruno Snell, *Die Entdeckung des Geistes: Studien zur Entstehung des europäischen Denkens bei den Griechen*, 2nd ed., Hamburg, Classon and Goverts, 1948, Ch. X, "Die Entdeckung der Menschlichkeit und unsere Stellung zu den Griechen." With this word Aristides gives recognition to Roman *humanitas*, for which see I. Heinemann, *RE*, Suppl. 5: 282-310, 1931 s. v. "Humanitas"; F. Schluz, *Principles of Roman Law*, Ch. X, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1936, with bibliography.

67a. “And even these are not concentrated in the cities with billets *<in>* every household but are dispersed throughout the rural area within bounds and orbits of *<their own>*.” The traditional text runs *καὶ οὐδὲ ἀνταὶ* (presumably *ἀνται*) *κατὰ τὰς πόλεις ἐκάστῳ τῶν γενῶν πολλαὶ ἰδρυμέναι, ἀλλ’ ἐν ἀριθμῷ τῶν ἄλλων ἐνεσπαρμέναι ταῖς χώραις*. Carteromachus rendered, “ac ne ipsae quidem frequentes cuiusque nationis urbibus impositae, sed in aliorum numero per provincias sparsae”; Canter, “nec ipsae sunt plures oppidatim dispositae, sed per totam regionem permistae”; Livingstone, “And these troops are not quartered in strength in the towns of each country, but scattered up and down as the population demands”; L. A. Stella, “non concentrate in fortis contingenti entro le città, ma disseminate in numero giusto per le province”; Levin, “not stationed in force in the various cities of each people, but scattered through the countryside among a multitude of civilians.”

In my opinion the word *γενῶν* is not in this passage a synonym for *ἔθνων* as Carteromachus, Livingstone and Levin understood it, of whom the two last were influenced probably by an emendation of Wilamowitz, who proposed *ἐκάστου* for *ἐκάστῳ* but who thought the *γένη* were “genera cohortium et alarum.” Nor does it mean “minores civitates” (so Sieveking 33). Nor can I accept Keil’s suggestion that the phrase *ἐκάστῳ τῶν γενῶν* is an interpolation, though this opinion seems to have been held also by Canter and L. A. Stella, who omit the words in their translations. There are no interpolations, because this oration did not receive glosses; it is even more significant that the clauses are balanced, though as usual with studied variations. Traditionally the first clause reads,

A¹ B¹ C¹
κατὰ τὰς πόλεις | ἐκάστῳ τῶν γενῶν | πολλαὶ ἰδρυμέναι.

Traditionally the second clause reads,

B² C² A²
ἐν ἀριθμῷ τῶν ἄλλων | ἐνεσπαρμέναι | ταῖς χώραις.

Thus the contrasts are town against country, concentration against dispersal, *ἐκάστῳ τῶν γενῶν* against *ἐν ἀριθμῷ τῶν ἄλλων*. Reiske would have emended to *<ἐν>ἰδρυμέναι* on account of the dative *ἐκάστῳ*. In view of the usual construction I prefer to insert the *ἐν* as a preposition before *ἐκάστῳ*. Misreadings such as that assumed by Wilamowitz, probably also by Carteromachus, Livingstone and Levin, are rare, whereas the short omission is a common error in our text.

Since with all due respect to Carteromachus and L. A. Stella there is no justification for equating *χώραις* with provinces, the next question is the meaning of the phrase *ἐν ἀριθμῷ*. Neither Carteromachus nor Canter thought the phrase through. Does it mean “among” (so Reiske), or “in proportion” (so Keil, Livingstone and L. A. Stella), or “in a multitude” (Levin, “among a multitude”), or does it mean something else? In my opinion the phrase means “in units, conditions, orbits (of their own), precisely limited.”

It must first be explained why I render the Greek singular with an English plural; then the meaning(s) can be defended. In English we use a generalizing plural where Aristides uses a collective singular, and in English we use a collective singular where Aristides uses a generalizing plural. Aristides, for instance, says in section 71b, *ἐν οἰκίᾳ πενιχρᾷ οἱ αὐτοὶ ὄψοποι<οῦσιν>, οἰκουροῦσιν, στρωνύουσιν*, which I at least (unlike L. A. Stella and Levin) translate, “In poor homes the same person cooks the meal, keeps the house, makes the bed.” Accordingly, I render *ἀριθμῷ* with an English plural and *χώραις* with a singular.

The meaning can be approached indirectly from the aforesaid contrast between B¹ and B². What made the quartering of troops upon the civil population such a dreadful hardship was the intrusion upon the individual families of the town, because the family on whom a soldier was billeted had to supply the man with living quarters, food and clothing, and they had to submit even to the inconvenience of entertaining friends whom he brought home to dinner. Plutarch, *Sulla* 25, 4 in the same breath mentions the excesses of the soldiery quartered upon the inhabitants of Asia (Aristides’ own home) and the terrible exactation of 20,000 talents. These facts are so familiar from Rostovtzeff, *SEHHW passim* (especially p. 1561) and from M. Launey, *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques* Ch. XII, Paris, de Boccard, 1950, that they do not need to be labored here. In brief, the abuse to which Aristides refers in B¹ is the intrusion upon every family. The contrast implied in B² is the complete segregation of the soldiers so that they do not, with their *hybris* (to use Plutarch’s phrase), disrupt family life among the people they are supposed to defend.

So far, then, we have determined that the contrast is between a situation where the troops are *ἰδρυμέναι <ἐν> ἐκάστῳ τῶν γενῶν* and a situation where the troops have a separate establishment. But the phrase *ἐν ἀριθμῷ τῶν ἄλλων*, as it stands, cannot bear this interpretation. Hence, there is some error. The emendation *λαῶν*, proposed by Wilamowitz in place of *ἄλλων*, though palaeographically and idiomatically easy, gives the wrong sense and has won no support. The commonest error in our text is the short omission. Now when Aristides returns to the subject in section 73, he uses the phrases *χωρὶς ἰδρυσθαι* and *ἴδιᾳ ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἰδρυντο*. Here, I think, we have the word which has fallen out. Our text surely read *ἐν ἀριθμῷ ἀπὸ (or χωρὶς) τῶν ἄλλων*.

An exact parallel for the use of the word *ἀριθμός* in the sense “precise conditions of military service” is of course hard to find. One article in *OGI* 266, the accord between Eumenes I and the revolting mercenaries, reads *ὑπὲρ τῶν τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἀποδιδόντων τὸν κύριον καὶ γενομένων ἀπέργων, ὅπως τὸ ὄψων λαμβάνωσι τοῦ προεργασμένον χρόνον*, which I should translate, “As for those who were trying to render the service specified in the contract binding them and who have run out of work, they should receive the same salary as in the previous period when they did have work.” Though the meaning of the

word is much disputed here too (see Launey, *Recherches* 742 f.), the passage is worth remembering. It may be noted, moreover, that the word *ἀριθμός* belongs also to the language of medicine, astrology, and astronomy. Besides the medical writers cited in the *GEL s. v. ἀριθμός* XIII, the index of Diels' *Vorsokratiker*⁶ should be consulted to compare the way Hippasus, for instance, used the word and to catch the cosmological overtones. "Number" is a tool with which the Demiurge separates and brings order.

"But if anywhere, through excess of growth, a city had passed beyond the ability to maintain order by itself, you did not begrudge to these in their turn the men to stand by and guard them carefully." A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship* 256, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1939, comments that the "obscure reference to cities that cannot help disorderly behavior because of their size . . . looks like a recognition of Alexandrian discontent." It is a reference to Alexandria all right, but it ignores their discontent. For the Roman troops at Alexandria see Strabo XVII 12 and Dio of Prusa XXXII 71-72. L. A. Stella, who speaks of "prefetti e procuratori" in her translation and of *curatores* and *procuratores* in note 72, has missed the point. It would have been better to speak of *curatores* and *correctores* or *legati Augusti pro praetore ad corrigendum statum liberarum civitatum* (for examples see Groag, *Achaia I passim* and Magie, *Roman Rule* 1454 f.), but even these are not meant, or at least not primarily. Aristides is speaking of troops in cities.

67b. The last sentence of 67 has been transposed in our tradition from its place, because in its traditional position it interrupts the thought. The first sentence of 69 suggests that the transposition was from the end of 68.

Unlike the allies of Athens those of Rome pay their tribute gladly because their defense is thus provided more inexpensively and certainly. See Cicero's letter to his brother Quintus I 1, 11, the speech of Cerialis in Tacitus, *Hist.* IV 74 and the speech of Maecenas in Dio LII 29. Aristides implies that Pergamum, Cyrene, and Nicomedia had chosen to pay tribute to Rome rather than receive it from others. He refers to the wills by which the kingdoms of Pergamum, Cyrene, and Bithynia were left to the Romans (for bibliography see Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*, Ch. I notes 90-94 and Ch. XIII note 49, Princeton Univ. Press, 1950).

68. The δεύτερος πλοῦς is Plato's phrase in the *Phaedo* 99d, *Politicus* 300c, *Philebus* 19c. Examples of the phrase in other authors are given by Archer-Hind in his commentary on *Phaedo* 99d. When there is no breeze, you resort to the oars; if one cannot have the Rule of Law, the second best course is to have the enlightened rule of the Philosopher King.

The bats in the cave, as Reiske recognized, is a Homeric simile, *Odyssey* XXIV 6 ff.

"Those at sea from the helmsman." Cf. Xenophon, *Cyrop.* I 6, 21.

69. "First honors," πρωτείων. Compare Demosthenes, XVIII 66, and especially Strabo VIII 5, 5. For a different view of the cause of wars see Tacitus, *Hist.* IV 74.

"Plato's myth," possibly labeled as Plato's to avoid confusion with the myth in Plutarch's *De sera vindicta* 563b + 568a. Throughout this passage Aristides combines elements from two Platonic myths, the allegory of the Cave where the men were watching shadows (*Republic* VII 514-521) and the myth of Er the Pamphylian who revived when he was already on the funeral pyre (*Republic* X 613-621). From the former Aristides has his image of previous illusions, the "shadows," σκιαί (Plato) and ἐσκιαμάχου (Aristides); also the image of their contempt for their former illusions, once they saw reality. The reference to the illusion of dreams does not come from the allegory of the Cave but occurs right after it in 534c. However, the image of a fight over shadows occurs also at the end of Demosthenes V, *On the Peace*.

"Received the right leadership all at once and suddenly revived" (cf. *Republic* X 614b-621b). The adjective in the phrase *ἀθρόαν* ἔδέξαντο τὴν ἡγεμονίαν has been interpreted in several ways. Canter, "subitum acceperunt imperium." Livingstone, *The Mission of Greece* 257, renders "have exchanged mutual quarrels and disorders for a collective supremacy." L. A. Stella, "accolsero incondizionatamente la supremazia di Roma." Levin, "accepted your leadership fully." Livingstone's interpretation seems unconvincing right off, because the cities are not treated as if they shared in a "supremacy," while the "supremacy" is mentioned with the definite article. The adjective *ἀθρόαν* means "as a whole," and it conceivably might contrast with the idea "by degrees" or with the idea "in part." As Er the Pamphylian revived immediately upon receiving the *psychê*, which was the vitalizing element, so the world revived immediately upon receiving the *hégemonia*, which was the vitalizing element. Therefore, the adjective *ἀθρόαν* seems to contrast, not with the idea "in part," but with the idea "by degrees."²⁵ The word *hégemonia* in respect to government means (1) League leadership, (2) Principate. For Greeks the word *hégemonia* meant the kind of leadership that Athens and Sparta were supposed to provide and did not provide. "Tyrant" was the antithesis of *hégemôn*, as "tyranny" of *hégemonia*. Thucydides again and again emphasizes that Athens had acquired a dominant power unjustly and that her role was that of a tyrant city. Sparta was even more tyrannical, as Aristides has reminded the audience in sections 47-48. Rome's leadership had been very oppressive in the time of the Republic, but fortunately the Greek word *hégemôn* was the standard translation for the Latin

²⁵ There is a similar use of the adverb in Themistius VII Dindorf 111.

word *princeps*. Hence Aristides can avoid awkward mention of the detested Roman Republic and say truthfully that the cities revived with the sudden establishment of the true Principate, while seeming to say "with the sudden establishment of Roman leadership," which would be very complimentary but untrue. Note the absence of the word *ἱμετέραν* in the phrase *τὴν ἡγεμονίαν*. Plato calls Zeus *hēgemōn*, and the word *hēgemonia* had connotations of just, firm and kind rule. One parallel will suffice: Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride* 351d interprets Homer, *σεμνοτέραν ἀπέφηνε τὴν τοῦ Διὸς ἡγεμονίαν ἐπιστήμην καὶ σοφίαν πρεσβυτέραν οὐσαν*. With the latter comment it is interesting to compare the implications of Rome's *σοφία* and *ἐπιστήμη* in sections 51 and 97. For the Roman *hēgemonia* in the sense of "Roman government" see Plutarch, *Caesar* XXIII 3.

"How they reached this point (revival, after their fratricidal discords led them to the verge of death) they have no explanation." The period before Roman intervention was admittedly one of internal discords among Greeks, but the manner or spirit of the Roman intervention had been much disputed. Tacitus (*Hist.* IV 73) represents Petilius Cerialis as telling the Treveri, "Terram vestram ceterorumque Gallorum ingressi sunt duces imperatoresque Romani nulla cupidine, sed maioribus vestris invocantibus, quos discordiae usque ad exitium fatigabant." A passage in Cicero's letters (*ad Q. fratrem* I 1, 11) suggests that the Romans had for a long while been saying the same thing to the Greeks, who, on the other hand, were quick to charge the Romans with *cupido*.

"They have come to feel like men aroused from sleep: instead of the dreams they but recently had, they awakened to the sudden vision (<ἢ>*παρ ιδόντες* Reiske for *παριδόντες*) and presence (*καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς γενόμενοι*) of these genuine blessings" (*ταῦτα*). Reiske's convincing emendation, rejected by Keil and L. A. Stella, has been adopted by Turtzovich and Levin. Furthermore, L. A. Stella and Levin substitute the reflexive pronoun so as to read *καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς γενόμενοι*, and they translate "tornato in se" or "take hold of themselves" (cf. the expressions *ἔξω ἔαντων* and *ἐντὸς ἔαντῶν*). Rather the two participles are a variant of the phrase *ὅρῶντες καὶ παρόντες* (cf. Plutarch, *Brutus* 28, 2; Demosthenes XVIII 22). On the antithesis *ὄντες—ἴπαρ* see E. Hermann, *Nachr. Gesell. Wiss. Göttingen*, 284-286, 1918, and H. Frisk, *Eranos* 48: 131-135, 1950. It occurs in the *Odyssey* XIX 547 and XX 90; Aeschylus, *Prometheus* 485 f.; Pindar, *Ol.* 13, 66 f.; Plato, *Republic* II 382e, *Philebus* 36e and 65e, *Phaedrus* 277d, *Theaetetus* 158b-d, *Politicus* 277d-278e, *Epistle* III 319b. Furthermore, it appealed to Aristides, who used it in the Hymns to Athena (XXXVII Keil 1) and to the Asclepiadae (XXXVIII Keil 1).

70. "On the contrary, stories about them are interpreted more as myths by the many who hear them." The traditional text reads *ἄλλ' ἐν ἄλλως* (or *ἄλλων*) *μύθων τάξει τοῖς πολλοῖς ἀκοίονται*, but Bartoletti (*Studi Ital. Fil.*

Class. 12: 211 f., 1935) is perhaps right in insisting that the text is corrupt. He explains *ἄλλως* as a misunderstood marginal correction for the omission of *ώς* after the conjunction. I should prefer to regard *ἄλλως* as a misreading of *μᾶλλον* (cf. Strabo I 2, 35: *ἄλλ' ἐν μίθον μᾶλλον σχήματι*).

"If anywhere an actual clash occurs along the border, as is only natural in the immensity of a great empire," etc. Keil, who cites Demosthenes II 21 *ἐπειδὰν δ' ὅμορος πόλεμος συμπλακῆ*, forestalls criticism of the reading adopted by the editors. Plutarch, *Numa* 20, 1, comments that the Temple of Janus is rarely closed, "the empire being always involved in some war since because of its great size it has pressure to resist from the barbarians who surround it."

"The madness of Getae or the misfortune of Libyans or the *κακοδαιμονίᾳ* ('wickedness' rather than 'wretchedness') of those around the Red Sea." Aristides could have ignored the disturbances, which apart from that in Mauretania were really slight, but the troublemakers were artistically useful to him as satisfactory examples of blind appetitive forces, the errant cause, the refractory residuum in the Cosmos. On barbarians as mad see G. Rudberg, *Coniectanea Neotestamentica* 1: 16, 1936, and H. Riesenfeld, *ibid.* 9: 3, 1944. The Dacians are called "Getae," an inappropriate but elegantly classical term, to avoid a new word.²⁶ The references to these three areas are references to punitive actions in course or barely finished at the time of the Oration's delivery (see W. Hüttl, *Antoninus Pius* 1: 278-295, Prague, Calve, 1933, and L. A. Stella, note 74), in Dacia since 143, on the borders of Egypt between August 142 and May 144.

71-72. There is an undeniable break in the sense after the phrase *κανὸν πάτριον πολεμεῖν*. All students but Levin agree on this. Wilamowitz explained the rest of section 71 as a transposition; Keil assumed another lacuna. Sieveking, Bartoletti and Stella agree with Wilamowitz that the rest of section 71 is out of place, because the subject of the army, which is the subject here, cannot be broached until after the beginning of section 72. Whereas Wilamowitz would shift section 71b to a position after *ἀπέδοτε* in section 72, Sieveking would ignore it entirely as an insertion in another style from another oration, while Bartoletti, who correctly denies a difference in style, would shift it to section 73 after *ἰδρύσθαι*. Stella accepts the transposition proposed by Bartoletti, but I am inclined to agree with Wilamowitz on this, because the objections are not strong, while it is a big advantage to the theory of an insertion from a marginal note if the insertion occurs somewhere near the passage which it is supposed to have accompanied.

71b. "In poor homes the same person cooks the meal, keeps the house, spreads the couch," *ἐν οἰκίᾳ πενιχρῷ*

²⁶ Compare the contemporary Greek inscriptions of Palmyra which apply the name Scythia to the Saka kingdoms of North-western India (H. Seyrig, *JRS* 40: 6, 1950).

οἱ αὐτοὶ ὄψοποιο<ῦσιν>, οἰκουροῦσιν, στρωννύοντιν. The three occupations represent or cover the three main tasks, kitchen work, cleaning, and (in my opinion) dining room service. The traditional text ὄψοποιοὶ would inflict upon us in immediate sequence three occurrences of the diphthong *oi*. Reiske's emendation gives us not only a more convincing asyndeton of three verbs but removes a disturbing hiatus. The emendation is both palaeographically and stylistically satisfying. For the thought Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* VIII 2, 5, ἐν μὲν γὰρ ταῖς μικραῖς πόλεσιν οἱ αὐτοὶ ποιοῦσιν κλίνην, θύραν, ἀροτρον, τράπεζαν, and VIII 2, 6, φὸ μὲν γὰρ ὁ αὐτὸς κλίνην στρώννυσι, τράπεζαν κοσμεῖ, μάρττει, ὅφα ἄλλοτε ἀλλοῖα ποιεῖ, κτλ. The assignment of special functions in a Roman household is mentioned by Tacitus, *Germania* 25: "Ceteris servis non in nostrum morem, descriptis per familiam ministeriis, utuntur."

72a. "In regard to the civil administration of the whole empire it has been stated in what way you thought of it and what kind you established," τὰ περὶ τὴν ὄλην ἀρχὴν τε καὶ τὴν περὶ ταύτην πολιτείαν ἔργηται ὄντων ἔγνωτε τρόπον καὶ ὥπως κατεστήσασθε. Canter translates, "Verum totius imperii administrationem qualem institeritis, hactenus dictum est." L. A. Stella, "Finora abbiamo parlato in generale dell' impero e dell' attuale regime, mettendo in rilievo attraverso quali esperienze e con quali criteri siete arrivati alla sua costituzione." Levin, "I have discussed the nature of your policies and institutions concerned with the empire as a whole and its government." However, what Aristides really discussed was the Roman Empire's civil administration as an artistic masterpiece created by careful calculation and by faithful adherence to certain good principles. The phrase ὄντων ἔγνωτε τρόπον, which carries the image of artistic creation, refers to the concept in the mind of the artist, while the phrase ὥπως κατεστήσασθε, which also carries the image of artistic creation, refers to the execution of the idea. The artist is Rome. See the commentary on section 25, where Alexander is contrasted.

73. Correcting L. A. Stella, who in note 77 erroneously assumed that Aristides was thinking of the Ptolemaic army, Zucker (*Gnomon*, 1949, 60) asserted that Aristides was thinking of Herodotus II 164, where the warrior caste (*τὸ μάχιμον γένος*) is mentioned. A still closer reference to the segregation of the warrior caste (*τὸ μάχιμον γένος*) occurs in Plato, *Timaeus* 24b, and in Plutarch, *Lycurgus* 4, 7, but the lack of equality is intimated neither by Herodotus nor by Plato, nor by Plutarch. A hint comes from Diodorus I 73, 7-9 where he notes as a curiosity that the warrior caste to whom the safety of all was entrusted had no share in the country for which they endured struggles. Since there is no verbal echo of Diodorus in Aristides, it seems clear that Aristides drew his picture of the ancient Egyptian military caste from the same lost source, probably either Ctesias or Hecataeus the Abderite. Both Diodorus and

Aristides, moreover, emphasize the skill and courage of the Egyptians.

74. The distinction which Aristides makes between a courage such as that of the Hellenes or Egyptians and a courage such as that of the Romans is best understood by reading the complementary speeches of Brasidas and Phormio in Thucydides II, 87-89, especially what Phormio has to say about the inferiority of the Peloponnesian *τόλμα* which is really based on the kind of ἐμπειρία that in a naval battle will do them no good. The Athenian *τόλμα* according to Phormio was superior precisely because the Athenians were professional sailors. Aristides, therefore, says that brave Hellenes because they had less training, perhaps even less confidence in themselves, are defeated by brave Romans; he does not imply that the instinctive courage of Hellenes is inferior to that of Romans. On the courage of the Egyptians see Xenophon, *Cyrop.* VII 1, 30-46.

"On the one hand, you deemed it unworthy of your rule for those from this city to be subject to the levy and to the hardships and to have <no> enjoyment of the present felicity," τὸ μὲν γὰρ τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως στρατεύεσθαι καὶ ταλαιπωρεῖν καὶ <τὸ μὴ> τῆς παρούσης εὐδαιμονίας ἀπολαύειν οὐκ ἄξια τῆς ἀρχῆς εἶναι ἐνομίσατε. The traditional text reads τὸ . . . στρατεύεσθαι καὶ ταλαιπωρεῖν οὐκ ἄξια τῆς ἀρχῆς καὶ τῆς παρούσης εὐδαιμονίας ἀπολαύειν εἶναι ἐνομίσατε. Sieveking (36) emended καὶ <τοῦ> τῆς παρούσης εὐδαιμονίας ἀπολαύειν, while Bartoletti (*Studi Ital. Fil. Class.* 12: 213, 1935) emends τοῦ . . . στρατεύεσθαι and deletes εἶναι. I believe that there is a difficulty and that it may be due to transposition, that of the words οὐκ ἄξια τῆς ἀρχῆς, but the transposition alone does not solve the problem. It must be assumed that something has fallen out, especially since the phrase τὸ . . . στρατεύεσθαι καὶ ταλαιπωρεῖν, closely knit together, constitutes a singular object which would hardly justify the plural ἄξια. For the new meaning which I give to στρατεύεσθαι see section 75 and commentary. For a contrast of sentiment see Xenophon, *Cyrop.* VII 5, 74-80.

"Faith in alien mercenaries." There is a play on the word ἔνοι, which means both "mercenaries" and "aliens." The Saite Egyptian, the Persian and the Hellenistic Greek kings and the Carthaginians had relied to a great extent on mercenaries, who were often unreliable. Advantages and dangers in the use of mercenaries were much discussed in the fourth century B. C. (cf. H. W. Parke, *Greek Mercenary Soldiers*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1933, and Armand Delatte, *Essai sur la politique pythagoricienne (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège* 29) 119, 1922. Tacitus, *Ann.* VI 36 (42) expresses a low opinion of the *externi* in the army of Artabanus.

"Before the hour of necessity," πρὸ τῆς ἀνάγκης. Canter translates "mature"; L. A. Stella "prima che venisse la necessità di adoperarlo"; Levin "of necessity." The phrase means "without waiting for a time of great crisis." Compare Plato, *Laws* IX 858a-b. Com-

pare also Plutarch, *Numa* 10, 12, where it means, "before the awful moment of the final, culminating act."

"You count no one an alien when you accept him for any employment where he can do well and is then needed," *rò μηδὲν* (so Keil, *μηδὲν Ο*) *ἐγκρίνειν* *ἔνον εἰς μηδὲν ὅν ἀν δύνηται τε καὶ δέη ποιεῖν*. Three points require notice. (1) Two meanings of the verb *ἐγκρίνειν*, "to count or rule" and "to admit," are here combined. (2) Keil, who was the first to read *μηδὲν* by changing the accent and adding the apostrophe, gives credit to Hepner's translation, "keinen Fremden." (3) The wording is reminiscent of Demosthenes, *First Philippic* 7, but the statement itself reflects what Eratosthenes (Strabo I 4, 9) said about Alexander the Great. This aspect of Alexander's ideology receives particular emphasis from W. Kolbe, *Die Weltreichsidee Alexanders des Grossen*, Freiburg im Br., Hans Speyer, 1936. In Roman policy the generous attitude became much more conspicuous with the government of Nerva, Trajan, and Hadrian.

75. A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship*, 208, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1939, notes that in this period "the term *munus* was confined in meaning to the service of the local *patria*." The same would be true of the term *λειτουργία* among contemporary Greeks, but for the classical Greek authors on whom Aristides modeled his style military service was indeed a *λειτουργία* (cf. *Rh. Mus.* 94: 327-330, 1951).

Hadrian had introduced a system of local recruitment which did not yet really open the Roman legions to the non-Romanized or non-Hellenized peasants. The *ex castris*, children of former soldiers, were one group, but the Greek cities supplied a large number of these recruits. Theoretically a legionary was a Roman citizen, but Hadrian permitted at all times henceforth the recruitment of select peregrine volunteers, who when accepted received potential Roman citizenship. The Army absorbed all the man's time for the twenty-five years of his enlistment; his city of origin could have no liturgy from him, and he lost all opportunity for participation in the life of his native city for those twenty-five years. Aristides does not distinguish between legionaries and auxiliaries, but local recruits went into *auxilia* and *numeri* as well as into legions. In general see Ritterling s. vv. "Exercitus" and "Legio" and Rowell s. v. "Numerus" in the *RE*; also H. M. D. Parker, *The Roman Legions*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1928; G. L. Cheesman, *The Auxilia of the Roman Imperial Army*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1914; also K. Kraft, *Zur Rekrutierung der Alen und Kohorten an Rhein und Donau* (*Dissertationes Bernenses*, Ser. I, Fasc. 3) 1951; B. d'Orgeval, *L'empereur Hadrien: Œuvre législative et administrative*, Book II, Ch. V, "Les Militaires," Paris, Domat Montchrestien, 1950; J. Lesquier, *L'armée romaine d'Egypte d'Auguste à Dioclétien* (*Mémoires publiées par les membres de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire* 41) 1918; and the articles of Eric Birley cited in the commentary to section 85.

"The men from the city would not be subject to the levy" (*μὴ στρατεύεσθαι*). It is, of course, abundantly attested that after Vespasian Italians continued to join the Roman Army, but they did so on a voluntary basis. See for example, Eric Birley, "Noricum, Britain and the Roman Army," *Festschrift für Rudolf Egger (Beiträge zur älteren europäischen Kulturgeschichte* 1) 175-188, Klagenfurt, 1952.

"You released them from the fatherland and gave them your own city," *ὅμοι τῆς τε πατρίδος ἀπηλάξατε καὶ τὴν ὑμετέραν αὐτῶν πόλιν ἀντέδοτε αὐτοῖς*. And he speaks of them as "having lost their own cities" (*τῆς ἀρχαίας ἀπόλιδας γεγενημένους*). By these phrases Aristides suggests for the sake of a striking antithesis that the recruits lost citizenship in their city of origin, whereas we know that citizens of a Greek city retained their local citizenship upon acquiring that of Rome. He is playing with words, using the word *ἀπόλιδας* in the sense of "exile" without giving to it the implication of *ἀπωλία* (cf. Dio of Prusa XLVII 10 for a similar conceit). The antithesis may have rested upon the distinction which Greek Public Law made between potential and active citizenship, so that it was possible to claim that the recruits were henceforth deprived of their active citizenship in the local city. Or veterans as well as soldiers may have received immunity so that they were forever lost to their cities of origin as far as *munera patrimonii et personalia* were concerned. The "liturgy" of service in the Roman Army would then excuse them from all other liturgies to their city of origin.

"They became reluctant henceforth to call themselves by their original ethnics," *εἰπεῖν ὅθεν ἡσαν τὸ ἀρχαῖον*. Aristides is led to make this comment by a desire to show how much the Greek world and the attitude of Greeks in Roman service had changed since the Mithridatic Period, the experiences of which were still remembered by Romans and by Asianic Greeks. The antithesis to the statement of Aristides about these Greeks in the service of Rome is that of Posidonius (cited by Athenaeus V, 213b), who says that in the time of Mithridates the Greeks in Roman service *μεταφιεσάμενοι τετράγωνα ἱάτια τὰς ἐξ ἀρχῆς πατρίδας ὄνομάζοντι*.

76. "You asked from each only as many as would cause no inconvenience to the givers (*ὅσοι μήτε τοῖς διδοῦσιν ἔμελλον ἄχθος ποιήσειν*) and would not be enough by themselves to provide the individual city with a full quota of its own." This is the interpretation of Carteromachus and Canter, whereas Reiske had the anachronistic idea that Aristides was saying "only as many as would be a burden to each city if it were not giving." But compare Isocrates IV 186. It was the levy itself rather than the select recruits which might have been a burden. Tacitus, *Hist.* IV 14 emphasizes that the revolt of Civilis in A. D. 69 had begun with resentment at the levy (*dilectum . . . suapte natura gravem*). The Rome of A. D. 143 was not only more experienced (wiser) but under less pressure. And again Tacitus, *Hist.* IV 74 represents Petilius Cerialis as making the point that the

Gauls needed the protection of the united forces of the Roman World, precisely because they were unable to protect themselves alone.

"Those who went out." In Athenian Law the phrase was used to emphasize the absence of guilt in certain kinds of voluntary exile (*cf.* Demosthenes *Against Aristocrates* 45). The clause *μηδὲ βλέπειν ἄλλοσ τοὺς ἔξελθόντας ή πρὸς ὑμᾶς διὰ τὸ πρὸς τοῦτο μόνον καλῶς συντετάχθαι*, as transmitted, would bring the standpoint of the recruits back again into the discussion. Since, however, the standpoint of the recruits has already been treated and finished, I believe that the system of recruiting is now considered from the standpoint of the cities and that the words *τοὺς ἔξελθόντας* belong after *συντετάχθαι*. Compare Polybius VI 50, 3: *πάντας* (the other states) *δ' εἰς αὐτὸν* (the ruling power) *ἀποβλέπειν*.

77. "And again, after you selected from everywhere the most competent men, you had a very profitable idea. It was this." *καὶ μὴν τούς γε ἐπιτηδειοτάτους ἔκασταχόθεν ἐπιλέξαντες κέρδος οὐ μικρὸν τοῦτο εἴρασθε.* The word *τοῦτο* looks ahead, not backward; it refers to the idea which forms the subject of section 77. But L. A. Stella translates. "Avete poi introdotto una riforma di grande utilità con la scelta degli elementi più idonei di ogni regione," and Levin, "You profit not a little from this innovation of recruiting the best qualified men from all over." These renderings ignore the implication of the progressive *καὶ μήν*. For a selection of the "most competent" soldiers see Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* VII 1, 22.

"The contenders in the greatest engagements of real war," *τοὺς δὲ τῶν μεγίστων καὶ ἀληθινῶν ἔργων ἀγώνιστας.* In Polybius XXI 23, 11 the Rhodian ambassadors say of their countrymen, *καὶ τῶν μεγίστων ἀγώνων καὶ κινδύνων ἀληθινῶν* (rather than *ἀληθινῶς*, the inferior reading preferred by Büttner-Wobst) *ὑμῖν μετεοχκότες.* The comparison of soldiers with athletes *τοῦ μεγίστου ἀγῶνος* was a favorite with Plato, *Republic* 403e, *Laches* 182a, and above all, *Laws* 830a. See P. Louis, *Les métaphores de Platon*, 161, Thèse, Paris, 1945.

"Train for a long while." For the system of training recruits after the reforms of the Hadrianic Period see A. R. Neumann, "Römische Rekrutenausbildung im Lichte der Disziplin," *Cl. Phil.* 43: 157-173, 1948.

78. "So these men, once you eliminated the morally (*καθάραντες*) and the socially base (*φυλοκρινήσαντες*), you [introduced into] the community of the ruling nation." The particles *δὴ ἄπα* indicate that he is summarizing what he has already said, namely in sections 75-77, and drawing the conclusion. Dindorf translates, "diligerent habitu dilectu adscivistis in communionem iurium vestrorum, qui estis rerum domini." But the obscurity of the traditional text is due, I think, to the loss not only of the preposition (so Dindorf, who made the phrase which follows it depend upon the second participle) but also of a main verb *ἐσηγάγετε*. The basic thought is that of the ancient expression *εἰσάγειν εἰς τὴν πολιτείαν*, which was still used (*cf.* Papyrus Cattaoui IV, decision by the

Idiologus in A. D. 142, the soldier's son *εἰσαχθῆναι εἰς τὴν πολιτείαν τὴν Ἀλεξανδρέων οὐ δύναται*). With the two participles compare the pairing of ideas by Dionysius of Halicarnassus IV 24, *τὸ δὲ μιαρὸν καὶ ἀκάθαρτον φῦλον ἐκβαλοῦσιν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως* (the whole passage on the exclusion of undesirables is too long to cite but worth study).²⁷ The Roman military writers taught that the *infames*, those who had been condemned in criminal cases and those who had once exercised a disreputable profession, were quite unsuitable for military service. Compare Vegetius I 7 and C. Th. VII 13, 8. Vegetius writes, "Et hoc est in quo totius reipublicae salus vertitur, ut tirones non tantum corporibus sed etiam animis praestantissimi diligentur." Again it is well known that freedmen were ineligible for service in the legions (Mommsen, *Staatsrecht* 3: 448-451). The participle *φυλοκρινήσαντες*, however, ("eliminating the socially base") refers not only to *libertini* but to all those who did not have something like local citizenship in a municipium or polis, because it must be assumed that Aelius Aristides is using the word in its proper ancient Attic significance. The word means primarily "to separate those who on the basis of their ancestry are not entitled to citizenship in the local polis," and even when used otherwise by Alcibiades (Thucyd. VI 18: "discriminate," i. e. be very particular about whom to accept as an ally), it still implies the intent to eliminate. In Egypt those peregrines who, having passed through the *epikrisis*, belonged to a higher condition and paid the poll-tax at a reduced rate²⁸ were eligible for recruitment in the legions and corresponded to men with the double qualification of free birth and municipal citizenship. The word *καθάραντες* could apply to all recruits; the word *φυλοκρινήσαντες* applies properly to legionary recruits alone. These two words have not previously been understood. Thus L. A. Stella (note 86) misinterprets the second participle as an allusion to the ordering of numeri and auxiliaries into ethnic groups. Levin renders, "They are screened and classified by the board of officials," and he places asterisks around the phrase "by the board of officials," which I translate as "the community of the ruling nation." In Thucydides VII 63, 4 Nicias, addressing those of the Athenian troops who did not have Athenian citizenship, calls them *κοινωνοὶ . . . τῆς ἀρχῆς*, "partners in imperial rule." The situations are somewhat analogous in respect to the status of the troops. The phrase *τὸ κοινὸν τῶν ἀρχόντων* ("community of the ruling nation") was deleted by Keil on the mistaken notion that, as in Egypt of the third century after Christ, it meant the board of magistrates. Keil thought the words were a gloss; but it would be an absurd kind of gloss. Rather Aristides is speaking in the same terms with which he has described the empires of the past: in his account of the Athenian Empire the

²⁷ Cf. also Plato, *Laws* V 736a-c; and *PSI* X 1160.

²⁸ R. Taubenschlag, *The Law of Graeco-Roman Egypt in the light of the Papyri* 2: 45, Warsaw, Polish Philol. Soc., 1948.

Athenians were the would-be ἀρχοντες and the allied Hellenes were the ἀρχόμενοι. Aristides is using the word κουνόν as the ambassadors from Lesbos, who referred to the κουνόν of the Athenians, used it in the speech of Thucydides III 11, 5, an oration reflected by Aristides also in section 56 (see commentary above). For the common expression κουνὸν τῆς πόλεως see the Index Aristotelicus. Aristides really combines two thoughts, both Thucydidean: κουνὸν τῆς ἀρχούσης πόλεως and κουνωνία τῆς ἀρχῆς.

"Equal rights at the start." Cf. Xenophon, *Cyrop.* II 1, 15.

79. "One would call this city neither unwalled in the reckless manner of the Lacedaemonians nor again fortified with the splendor of Babylon or of any other city which before or after may have been walled in a more impressive style. On the contrary, you have made the fortification of Babylon seem frivolity and a woman's work indeed." In note 49 Levin comments that the phrase "woman's work" is an allusion to the legend that the walls "were built by the queens Semiramis and Nitocris (Herodotus I 184-186)." He is quite right in recognizing an allusion to Semiramis, but the story comes from Ctesias and not from Herodotus. We still have the version of Ctesias in Book II of Diodorus, who acknowledges the debt. It is because he follows Ctesias that Aristides throws in the phrase "or of any other city which before or after may have been walled in a more impressive style." Diodorus II 2-3 describes the walls of Nineveh as the most magnificent of all time and as having been built before those of Babylon. The great walls of Babylon are described by Diodorus II 7-10 as the work of Semiramis (Nitocris is not mentioned). She collects architects and engineers and a labor force of 2,000,000 men, and then builds walls extending for 360 stades and containing walls within walls, decorated with colored reliefs. On the story preserved by Diodorus see A. Momigliano, "Tradizione e invenzione in Ctesia," *Atene e Roma* 13, 1931, especially pp. 17-26. Also Dionysius the Periegete (1005 f.) and Strabo XVI 1, 2 attributed the walls of Babylon to Semiramis alone.

80. "Ignoble and inconsistent with the rest of your concept." Compare the letter in Chapter VII, Case I, of A. D. 104 by Afranius Flavianus, who describes a certain man's act of generosity as "belonging and becoming to his life and character."

"Visible (*ὅπαρά*) to those within the circuit." Perhaps this comment has something to do with the very popular argument from design, an argument less cryptically presented in section 88. From the visible world one could infer the invisible cosmic creator and director (cf. H. Almqvist, *Plutarch und das Neue Testament*, § 152: 83-84, Uppsala, Appelberg, 1946). But rather than proof of a design it is a parallel for the σώματα ὅπαρά of Plato (compare the *Timaeus* 46d). The emendations, ἀόπαρα Reiske² and ὥπά<μα>ρα Pohlenz apud Sieveking (36), are unnecessary.

81. "Beyond the outermost ring (*κύκλον*) of the civilized world you drew a second line . . . another circle more widely curved and more easily guarded." Plutarch, *Caesar* (ed. Lindskog et Ziegler) XXIII 3, says of the invasion of Britain, προήγαγεν ἔξω τῆς οἰκουμένης τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίαν, and further on (LVIII 7) he uses the phrase τὸν κύκλον τοῦτον τῆς ἡγεμονίας. Therefore the idea of a ring or circle beyond the outermost ring of the civilized world was already at hand.

"Here you built the walls . . . and then erected towns." For this usage of *τε καὶ* see sections 49 and 50 with commentary. Others build a city and then build walls close to the city; Rome builds a "wall" and then builds cities close to the "wall." The Roman Army, which the "walls" turn out to be, greatly expanded the urban civilization of the Mediterranean, because it provided orderly conditions and protection for rich new areas, where, even as a great consumer, it stimulated economic life.

"Filling them with colonists (*οἰκητόρων*), giving these the comfort of arts and crafts, and in general establishing beautiful order" (*κοσμήσαντες*). Compare the speech which Arrian, *Anabasis* VII 9, 2 puts into the mouth of Alexander, πόλεων τε οἰκήτορας ἀπέφηνε καὶ νόμοις καὶ ἔθνοις χρηστοῖς ἐκόσμησεν (what Philip II did for the Macedonians).

82. "An encamped army like a rampart encloses the civilized world in a ring," ὕπερ τάφρος, κύκλῳ περιείργει στρατόπεδον. I am the first to make στρατόπεδον the subject of περιείργει and to place a comma after the word τάφρος, which (cf. *τάφρωσις* and *ταφρεία*) seems to mean "entrenchment," i. e. "rampart" with the emphasis on the mound rather than on the excavated ditch, as is proved by the Latin gloss "vallatus" cited in the *GEL* s. v. *τάφρωσις*, and as is paralleled by the usage of Cassius Dio XXXVI 54. The object of περιείργει is supplied from the previous paragraph. My predecessors have interpreted the whole sentence to mean, "It is like a ditch which surrounds a camp." I wish to recognize the word-play and to continue the image of a wall. A *murus* and a *vallum* had a similar function, even though there was a big difference between a city wall of stone masonry and the earthen rampart of a camp. The mound called *vallum*, so conspicuous a feature of the Roman *limes* in some areas, would have suggested the comparison between the entire *limes* and a *vallum*. Demosthenes XVIII 299, in a passage which has influenced Aristides, speaks of *τειχισμός* and *ταφρεία* and Cicero calls the Alps the *vallum* of Italy.

"As far as from the settled area of Aethiopia to the Phasis and from the Euphrates in the interior (*ἄνω*) to the great outermost island toward the West." For the *topos* of geographical expressions to indicate North, South, East, and West (the World Circle) compare E. Norden, "Ein Panegyricus auf Augustus in Vergils *Aeneis*," *Rh. Mus.* 54: 469-482, 1899; Werner Hartke, *Römische Kinderkaiser, Eine Strukturanalyse römischen*

Denkens und Daseins, 355-388, Berlin, Akademie-Verlag, 1951. "Vergil und die Prägung des römischen Imperialismus." The Phasis represents the North as in Herodotus IV 45, 1. Britain often represents the West as for Nicolaus of Damascus (*F. Gr. Hist.* II A p. 410). On the word ἄνω see also L. Robert, *Hellenica* 7: 24, 1949.

83. The mound with its ditch along the frontier in various places was not considered a wall comparable to that of a city. Though it concealed troop movements and provided a serious obstacle to raiders who would have to dismount before entering Roman territory and would have to carry booty over the obstacle, it would not help much in case of an invasion. Moreover, many areas had no such protection at all. Ignoring the mound and its ditch, he does allude to the castella (the ordinary walls). See the representations of frontier-towers and blockhouses on Trajan's column, and the discussion by I. A. Richmond, *Papers of the British School at Rome* 13: 34-36, 1935; F. Hettner, O. von Sarwey and E. Fabricius, *Der obergermanisch-rätische Limes des Römerreiches*, 14 v., Heidelberg, Petters, 1894-1938; A. Poidebard, *La trace de Rome dans le désert de Syrie: le limes de Trajan à la conquête arabe: recherches aériennes*, Paris, Geuthner, 1934; R. Mouterde and A. Poidebard, *Le limes de Chalcis: organisation de la steppe en Haute Syrie romaine*, Paris, Geuthner, 1945; J. C. Bruce, *Handbook to the Roman Wall*, tenth edition revised by I. A. Richmond, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Andrew Reid, 1947; Eric Birley, *Housesteads Roman Fort Northumberland*, Official Guide, 2nd ed., London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1952.

"They have not been built with asphalt and baked brick nor do they stand there gleaming with stucco." The asphalt and baked brick of the walls of Babylon were mentioned by Ctesias (cf. Diodorus II 7, 4). Even temporary walls had stucco or plaster to protect them from erosion of the interstices, as one may infer from Thucydides III 20, 3, where reference is made to a section which in the wall of the besiegers of Plataea happened to be unplastered; but Aristides may be thinking of the colored reliefs at Babylon.

"Homer says of the palace wall." *Iliad* XVI 212.

84. "There has never been a wall so firm." Turtzovich, and Sieveking wrongly insert ὡς before οὐδεῖς, while Levin appears to translate it. On the comparison of soldiers to a wall see especially Aeschines, *Against Ctesiphon* 84 and Demosthenes, *On the Crown* 299, and in general the passages cited by E. Kienzle, *Der Lobpreis von Städten und Ländern, in der älteren griechischen Dichtung*, 7-8, Diss., Basel, 1936. For a reflection of this passage contrasting the ordinary walls and the more distant and unbreachable wall compare the opening sentence of the hypothesis which Libanius composed for the Crown Oration of Demosthenes.

"Have not acquired the habit of flight," φυγὴν οὐ νομίσαντες. Keil emended to the present, but for the

aorist see Herodotus II 63, 4; *Vita Aesopi* G 33.²⁹ Aristides has substituted the phrase οὐ νομίσαντες for οὐκ ἔθισθέντες in order to utilize the ancient antithesis νόμος-φύσις: cf. F. Heinemann, *Nomos und Physis: Herrkunft und Bedeutung einer Antithese im griechischen Denken des 5. Jahrhunderts* (*Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft*, Heft 1), 1945. The troops of Rome quite naturally hold their ground. It suffices to cite Herodotus V 118, 2: "This man's plan was for the Carians to cross the Maeander and to engage with the river at their back, so that with no possibility of flight to the rear, the Carians, under compulsion to stand their ground, might become even better than they were naturally" (ἔτι ἀμείμονες τῆς φύσεως). However, on the disciplined solidarity of the Roman Army and its freedom from fear see also Josephus, *Bell. Iud.* III 74 and 104. W. Gernenz, *Laudes Romae* 89, Diss., Rostock, 1918, speaks of a *locus communis* of rhetorical training behind Josephus and Aristides. Rather than a mere *topos*, the phrase used by Aristides is an allusion to the famous criticism which Plato, *Laws* IV 706b-c, made against the Athenians: "Still, it would have been to their advantage to lose many times seven children rather than to have acquired, on frequent raids, after becoming sailors instead of steadfast hoplites, the habit of racing back again into their ships and of thinking that they were doing nothing dishonorable when they did not have the courage to face death by standing their ground before the oncoming enemy, but that they had reasonable and exceedingly ready excuses whenever they threw away their arms and fled, as they claimed, a not dishonorable flight." Compare also Plutarch, *Themistocles* 4, 3, and *Philopoemen* 14, 3. The Romans develop μόνηροι ὄπλιται (statuarii milites), the old-fashioned (or moderate) and Platonic ideal.

"Union of the Myrmidons," *Iliad* XVI 212-217, with reference to arms.

"In mid-air race tracks." A pertinent passage is cited by Keil from Arrian, *Tactica* 11, 6, about the Roman formation of a *testudo* on which javelin-men might dash across. For plastic representation compare C. Cichorius, *Die Reliefs der Trajanssäule*, Tafel LI, Berlin, Reimer, 1900, and E. Petersen, A. Domaszewski, and G. Calderini, *Die Markussäule auf Piazza Colonna in Rom* 71, Bild LIV, Munich, 1897.

Euripides, *Phoenissae* 110, "I see a bronze plain," meaning the army of the Seven against Thebes.

"If one ordered the man between two others to take his place with only light arms," εἰ καὶ γυμὸν τάξαις τὸν μέσον. As Aristides readapts the Homeric passage on the Myrmidons to the military tactics of his own day, he inevitably thinks of the famous poem in which Tyrtaeus readapts the same Homeric passage to the new style of the Spartan hoplite army. Tyrtaeus addresses the heavy-armed hoplites but then continues with an appeal to the

²⁹ B. E. Perry, *Aesopica* 1, 47, Urbana, Univ. of Illinois Press, 1952.

gymnêtai or light-armed troops who as individuals take their place among the hoplites and operate under the protection of adjacent armor (*Tyrtaeus* 8 Diehl, lines 35-38, with commentary by K. M. T. Chrimes, *Ancient Sparta*, 380, Manchester Univ. Press, 1949). Compare also Tacitus, *Hist.* I 79; "inermem Sarmatam (neque enim scuto defendi mos est)."

"The shields on either side," *τὰ ἐκατέρωθεν* (*sc. ὅπλα*). It is a line of hoplites.

"Such are the parallel harmonies or systems of defence which curve around you, that circle of the fortifications at individual points, and that ring of those who keep watch over the whole world," *τοιᾶδε αἱ ἄρμονίαι συγκέκλευται ὁ τε τῶν διεξόδων κύκλος τειχῶν τε καὶ ὁ τῆς πάσης ἔφορος γῆς*. In Plato's latest work (particularly the *Timaeus* and *Critias*), and only there, single *τε* frequently connects single words (*cf.* J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* 498); so the phrase *διεξόδων . . . τειχῶν τε* may be said to have the flavor of Plato's later style. The crux of this passage really lies in the meaning of the word *διεξόδων*, which contrasts with the phrase *πάσης γῆς*. Since the phrase *κατὰ διέξοδον* and the adverb *διεξοδικῶς* mean "in detail," and since the adjective *διεξοδικός* means "detailed" in contrast with "universal" or similar adjectives of style, and since in Mathematics the same adjective suggests a line of loci, the phrase *ὁ τῶν διεξόδων κύκλος* means "the curving line of the loci or individual points." Of course, in the word *διεξόδων* there is a suggestion of gates in an ordinary city wall, in keeping with the overall image. With its word-play and peculiarity reminiscent of Plato's "later" style, the sentence is typical of Aristides, and it is typical of Aristides also to summarize at the end of each subject. This sentence, which Wilamowitz and Sieveking, who did not understand it, would have eliminated as spurious, is the indispensable summarization of sections 79-84. The text seems highly acceptable to me, but Keil emended the main verb to *συγκέλῃται* and the first three words to *τοιᾶδε ἄρ' ἄρμονίᾳ* (suggested perhaps by an irrelevant passage of "Philolaus," B 6 Diels⁵), and Bartoletti, *St. Ital. Fil. Class.* 12: 214, 1935, wishes to emend *τοῖχος* for *τειχῶν* and to eliminate *καὶ ὁ*.

85. The story of Darius sweeping up (*σαγηνεύσας*) one city of one island through the agency of Artaphernes and Datis concerns Eretria as Carter recognized. It comes from Herodotus VI 119 plus Plato, *Laws* 698c-d. Herodotus mentions Datis and Artaphernes together as agents of Darius in collecting and transporting the Eretrians to Asia. The words of Aristides *σαγηνεύσας ἐλεῖν* are suggested by Plato's *σαγηνεύσαντες* and *ἐλεῖν*. The Eretrians were settled as a separate group in the interior of the Persian Empire. The Romans too have swept up (*σαγηνεύσαντες*) and planted Greeks elsewhere in a community by themselves, but what a contrast of purpose and method! There is of course considerable licence in the word *σαγηνεύσαντες* as applied to Roman recruiting methods. The phrase must not be translated "you kept

the whole world in a dragnet" (so Levin, pp. 6 and 26), for there is no implication of compulsion. For the metaphor see P. Louis, *Les métaphores de Platon*, 162, Thèse, Paris, 1945.

"Preserve all the cities of the civilized world by means of the very citizens you caught, the strangers whom it shares with you," *τὴν οἰκουμένην οὔτως σώζετε τοὺς κοινοῖς αὐτῆς πολίταις τε καὶ ἔνοις*. The reading *αὐτῆς* of S is better than the other readings *αὐτὰς*, *αὐτὰ*, *αὐτὴν*. All manuscripts read *κοινοῖς*, which Keil needlessly emends to *κοινῇ*, while he needlessly deletes *αὐτῆς*. With the phrase *κοινοῖς αὐτῆς* compare *κοινοῖς ἑαυτῶν* in section 76 and F. Zucker's comment in *Gnomon* 21: 60, 1949. The play upon their double status may have been a conceit suggested by the Leptinean Oration of Demosthenes XX 30, where Leucon, called "an alien by birth, a citizen by your adoption," is treated as vulnerable on both accounts. Each man belongs both to Rome and to whatever polis of the *Oikoumenê* had him first, so they are very different from those mercenaries whom Tacitus *Ann.* VI 36 (42) called "suis quisque sedibus extorres." But in their own towns the soldiers have ceased to perform the duties of active citizens, hence have become denationalized and, in a sense, alien.

"Each man would hold the post (*τάξιν*) that was his due (*ἥς ἀν ἔκαστος ἀξίας ἦ*) in the sense that deeds and not words would here distinguish the men of quality." Compare the *τυμὴ τῆς ἀξίας* of Plato *Laws* V 738e and 744b-c. For the *topos* concerning the antithesis of word and deed see Felix Heimann, *Nomos und Physis (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft* 1) 45-58, 1945. Here Aristides is thinking primarily of the legionaries whose chances for promotion were greater than those of auxiliaries. See A. von Domaszewski, *Die Rangordnung des römischen Heeres* (*Bonner Jahrbücher* 117) 54, 1908, on the promotion of legionaries to officer status in the auxilia; Eric Birley, "The Origins of Legionary Centurions," *Laureae Aquincenses (Dissertationes Pannonicae, Ser. II, 11)* 47-62, 1941, on the promotion of legionaries to officer status in the legions; H.-G. Pflaum, *Les procurateurs équestres dans le Haut-Empire Romain*, Part II, Ch. III-IV, Paris, Maisonneuve, 1950, on the promotion of legionary officers to procuratorial posts. In general see also Eric Birley's review of Pflaum in *Latomus* 11: 91-99, 1952, and Birley's articles, "Noricum, Britain and the Roman Army," *Festschrift für Rudolf Egger, (Beiträge zur älteren europäischen Kulturgeschichte* 1) 175-188, Klagenfurt, 1952; "The Equestrian Officers of the Roman Army," *Durham Univ. Jour.* 41: 8-19, 1949; "The Origins of Equestrian Officers," *ibid.* 43: 86-95, 1951. In "The Origins of Legionary Centurions" Birley argues convincingly (against Domaszewski) that even from Hadrian to Septimius Severus the bulk of the legionary centurions were always promoted legionaries, also that their origins were much the same as those of soldiers in the same legions; and on p. 60 he makes an interesting inference which I must quote:

As far as the centurionate is concerned, the need for attracting men with adequate qualifications for the higher ranks was met by offering special inducements. The likeliest candidates were commissioned as centurions directly; such were the *centuriones ex equite Romano*, or the men whose prior service as *praefecti fabrum* might easily have been the prelude to an equestrian career; such was the ill-fated Metilius Crispus for whom the good offices of the younger Pliny secured a commission.

"All . . . think that engagements are occasions for the fulfillment of their prayers . . . they alone of mankind pray to meet with enemies." Tacitus, *Hist.* I 5, makes a somewhat similar remark but without the admiration, when he says of the psychology of some troops in the year A. D. 69: "Miles . . . neque magnis meritis ac praemiis eundem in pace quem in bello locum . . . intelligit." A still more interesting comment of Tacitus occurs in *Hist.* II 4: "Tres . . . ipsi Vespasiano legiones erant, exercitae bello; quattuor Mucianus obtinebat in pace, sed aemulatio et proximi exercitus gloria depulerat segnitiam, quantumque illis roboris discrimina et labor, tantum his vigoris addiderat integra quies et inexperti belli labor."³⁰

86. "In the words of Homer, 'were they ten <or twenty times> as many,'" δεκά<κις καὶ εἰκοσάκις> τόσοι. Sieveking is probably right in seeing an incorrect citation of *Iliad* IX 379, οὐδὲ εἴ μοι δεκάκις καὶ εἰκοσάκις τόσα δοίη. Dorothy Tarrant ("Plato's Use of Quotations and other Illustrative Material," *Cl. Q.* 44: 61, 1951) counts twenty such cases in Plato, whose manner Aristides affects. See also J. Labarbe, *L'Homère de Platon*, part II (*Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège* 117) 1949. Compare the other misquotation in section 13.

"They would soon be completely routed and in single combats overcome." The traditional text reads, ταχέως ἀν αὐτῶν περιστραφέντας ἄνδρα παρὰ ἔνα λειφθῆναι (SDT) or ληφθῆναι (U). Canter ignored the participle and translated "omnes ad unum confestim captum iri." Reiske would emend the participle to ἐπιστραφέντας or περιτραπέντας, and read λειφθῆναι, which with the three preceding words he would render "viri unius virtute vinci." This seems to be the model for Levin's translation, "if the enemy outnumbered them ten to one, one man would promptly beat the ten of them and put them to rout." L. A. Stella, preferring the second version of the infinitive, translates "sarebbero vinti e fatti prigionieri subito fino all' ultimo uomo." Canter, Reiske, L. A. Stella, and Levin, accordingly, though they differ, start apparently from the usage of παρά which the latest GEL lists under C III 6. In contrast, I start from the usage which the latest GEL lists under C I 7. Keil was tempted to delete the participle and emend the infinitive to <περι>ληφθῆναι, but the participle cannot be ignored or explained away, for it is clearly no gloss. Emendation is not justified by any argument yet adduced. The verb

στρέφω, of which a compound is here used in a hitherto unattested sense, is a military term thrice used of tactical maneuvres by Xenophon, *Lac.* XI 9-10. The prefix περι-strengthens the simple verb. My interpretation may be summarized as follows. The word περιστραφέντας refers to the deployment of a group. The phrase ἄνδρα παρὰ ἔνα does not mean παρὰ ἔνα ἄνδρα but ἄνδρα ἔνα παρ' ἄνδρα ἔνα, and is to be explained by the idea of comparison inherent in the word λειφθῆναι. The word λειπω, not only in Homeric diction but also in the jargon of the contemporary arena, meant "to overcome in single combat." Athletes and gladiators who had never been defeated were being advertised as ἀλειπτοι: examples have been collected by L. Robert, *Les gladiateurs dans l'orient grec* (*Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Etudes* 278) 22, 1940. Two streams come together in this sentence. First we have a vestige of a *topos* invented for praise of the Lacedaemonian army's training and skill, namely that the number of the opponents was unimportant (cf. Plutarch, *Cleomenes* 4, 10). Secondly we have a reflection of the impression produced by the old Battles of Cynoscephalae and Magnesia, more specifically a reflection of the analysis made of the superiority of the Roman style of fighting to the Macedonian style by Polybius XVIII 31-32, who emphasized especially that the Romans had an enormous advantage in their ability to fight singly (*κατ' ἄνδρα*).

"Will express and feel." On Demosthenes' use of double expression with verbs of thinking and saying, cf. Fr. Blass, *Die Attische Beredsamkeit* 3: 93 f., Leipzig, 1877. Though the Egyptian had not stated it explicitly, a clear understanding of what the Egyptian really meant will come suddenly and will seem true. The words are interpreted otherwise by L. A. Stella, "si potrà pensare a manifestare la stessa opinione di quell' Egiziano," and by Levin, "you will turn your words and thoughts to the Egyptian." Turning to the inexhaustible supply of recruits for the Roman army, Aristides employs a similar expression, "one is justified in thinking and stating" (*νομίσαι τε καὶ εἶπεν ἔξεστιν*), and the reminiscence of the previous words of course is intentional.

The story of the Egyptian and Cambyses is attested nowhere else in our extant sources. Keil pointed out that for what Aristides says about carrying away (*μετενεγκεῖν*) the wealth of Egypt, there is a most significant parallel in Diodorus I 46 in reference to the capture of Thebes by Cambyses, ὅτε δῆ φασι τοὺς Πέρσας μετενεγκόντας τὴν εὐπολίαν ταύτην εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν. The story of the Egyptian clearly goes back to the classical source on which Diodorus drew. Surely the source was Ctesias, and the main reason for which Keil eliminated Ctesias will not win approval, namely that Ctesias never wrote a glorification of the Egyptians. Aristides has a way of taking well known literary passages and giving them an entirely new interpretation. The glorification lies only in the new interpretation given by Aristides. The original story is that of the climactic surrender of Thebes. The Egyptian mounts upon the wall and holds out to Cam-

³⁰ The last word is surely a corruption, as modern editors agree. Andresen's *rubor* seems the best emendation.

byses the usual offering of earth and water in token of submission.

For this type of reinterpretation of an earlier text compare Plato, *Timaeus* 85a-b and *Protagoras* 339-347. Other examples and a good discussion of Plato's use of sophisms may be found in the study by G. J. De Vries, *Spel bij Plato*, 117-152, Amsterdam, Nord-Hollandsche, 1949.

"Leave a vacuum on departure," κενώσαντες οὐχεσθαι. Turtzevich's emendation κένωνται σαντες is unnecessary and palaeographically improbable.

87. Erich Sander, "Die Hauptquellen der Bücher I-III der epitoma rei militaris des Vegetius," *Philologus* 87: 369-375, 1932, concludes that Book II of Vegetius gave the situation before Hadrian and Book III after Hadrian in respect to tactics and to methods of fortifying a camp. On p. 373 he says of the constitutions of Hadrian in this field that "they set the pattern for the development down to the end of the third century," and that "Septimius Severus and Gallienus merely advanced further along the track which Hadrian indicated to them." See also A. Neumann, "Das Augusteisch-Hadrianische Armee-Reglement und Vegetius," *Cl. Phil.* 31: 1-10, 1936. Aelius Aristides reflects the great reforms which had just been carried through.

On Hadrian as the restorer of discipline, etc., see B. d'Orgeval, *L'empereur Hadrien, Œuvre législative et administrative*, 358-362, Paris, Domat Montchrestien, 1950. Compare, however, the similar passages in Josephus, *Bell. Iud.* III 72-73 and the comment of W. Gernentz, *Laudes Romae*, 89, Diss., Rostock, 1918.

"You have made all men look like children." The same phrase occurs in another connection in Oration XXVII Keil 16.

"Victory over themselves first." Cf. Plato, *Laws* 840c.

"The subordinate does not envy him who has a higher rank." St. Augustine, *City of God* XXII 30: "Nulli superiori ullus inferior invidebit." See also section 65 above and commentary.

88. Two famous passages are here reflected. Thucydides V 66, 3-4 describes the chain of command of the Lacedaemonian Army in the field: the basileus is said to have supreme command, intermediate commanders are listed, and then the whole army is said to consist of commanders of commanders. The words ὁνδὲ . . . ἔξευρεν ράδιον are an echo of Isocrates IV 127.

"Looks after all," ἔφορῶντος. Xenophon, *Cyrop.* V 3, 59 and 4, 18 uses the same word to describe the personal attention which Cyrus, the ideal *basileus*, gave to his army.

"Nations, cities, armies." Dio of Prusa I 44: "armies and cities and nations." See also Demosthenes XVIII 159, "men, localities, cities."

"Down to those in command of four or even two men." It would be useless to press this statement for information about the Roman Army. For it reflects

Greek theory that the best organization is into numbers divisible by two all the way down to unity. Compare Asclepiodotus, *Tactics* II 7: "You should rather select numbers which are evenly divisible by two down to unity, and you will find that most tacticians have made the phalanx to consist of 16,384 hoplites, because this number is divisible by two down to unity" (Loeb translation). Eight, however, is the smallest number mentioned by Asclepiodotus.

"Like a spinning of thread (*περιστροφὴν νήματος*) which is continuously drawn (*κατίεναι*) from many filaments into fewer and fewer strands, the many individuals of your armed forces are drawn together into fewer and fewer formations." After reading H. Blümner, *Technologie und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste bei Griechen und Römern* 1: 107-120, Leipzig, 1875, and after discussing the passage with my colleague, John Young, I am convinced that the image is that of filaments being twisted together into strands and of strands being twisted together into larger strands. The thread is clearly being spun, as the word *περιστροφήν* proves (Blümner, 114): it is not "unraveling" (so Levin). The word *κατίεναι* may be interpreted, I think, as the passive of *κατάγειν*, which as a spinning term means "to draw out."

"Pass to their complete integration (*τελευτῆς*) through those who are at each point placed in command." The Roman commanders are at each point where filaments join together as strands and strands join together as larger strands; thus the Roman discipline resembles a twisting together of strands drawn from all the world. The filaments and strands pass through (*διήκειν*) many commands to reach their integration.

"Does this not rise above Man's power of organization?" The Argument from Design! Aristides sees in it evidence of the Divine Mind (of Rome the Demiurge) at work and perhaps he recalls τὰ διὰ Νοῦ δεδημονργημένα of the *Timaeus* 29d-47e.

89. "Such within, I ween, is of Olympian Zeus the empire." *Odyssey* IV 74 with substitution of the last word "empire" (*ἀρχή*) for "court" (*ἀνλή*). The emperor Hadrian, of whom Antoninus Pius was the adopted son and a recent successor at the time of the oration, appeared in the Greek world as Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ Τραjanὸς Ἀδριανὸς Σεβαστὸς Ὄλυμπιος Πανελλήνιος Ζεὺς (cf. *Hesperia* 20: 32, 1951, and the scores of Athenian inscriptions honoring Hadrian as "Olympian"), but there is probably no identification of the emperor with Zeus in the mind or imagery of Aristides.

"Agents and envoys," διάκονοι τε καὶ πρέσβεις. The contemporary expression *πρεσβευτῆς καὶ ἀντιστράτηγος*, which means *legatus pro praetore*, is approached but still avoided. The "agents" may be the equestrian officials, the "envoys" the senatorial. The reference to the emperor and his "agents" suggests also Stoic terminology for the soul which consisted of the *ἡγεμονικόν* and its διάκονοι or "faculties" (cf. Amand Jagu, *Epictète et*

Platon: Essai sur les relations du Stoïcisme et du Platonisme à propos de la Morale des Entretiens, Ch. IV, Paris, Vrin, 1946, "Le spiritualisme d'Epictète": see Epictetus, *Discourses* II 10, 1 and 28, 5-19.

"Justice and respect," δίκης δὲ καὶ αἰδοῦς. The background for this passage lies in the myth of Plato's *Protogoras* 320c-322d. The political art did not yet exist, and Zeus, fearing lest the entire human race be destroyed, sent Hermes to give justice (δίκη) and consideration (αἰδώς) to mankind. Compare J. Mewaldt, "Fundament des Staates," *Genethliakon Wilhelm Schmid* (*Tübinger Beiträge* 5) 69-93, 1929; D. Loenen, *Protogoras and the Greek Community*, 1-49, Amsterdam, Nord-Hollandsche, 1941; Bruno Snell, *Die Entdeckung des Geistes*, 2nd ed., Ch. VII, Hamburg, Classen and Goverts, 1948.

90. "A constitution not at all like any of those among the rest of mankind." Pericles is represented as claiming originality for the Athenian constitution (Thucyd. II 37, 1), Xenophon (*Lac.* I 2) and Plutarch (*Lycurgus* 31, 3) claim it for Sparta.

"Formerly there seemed to be three constitutions in human society. Two were tyranny and oligarchy, or kingship and aristocracy, since they were known under two names each according to the view one took in interpreting the character of the men in control (*παρὰ τοὺς τῶν ἔχοντων τρόπους*). A third category was democracy whether the leadership was good or bad." This is a summary of what the Stranger says in Plato's *Politicus* 291d-292a. For the grouping see also "Archytas," *On Law and Justice* with the commentary of Delatte, *Essai sur la politique pythagoricienne* 96. But verbally Aristides echoes a very different passage, from Aeschines, *Against Ctesiphon* 6: "Three are the constitutions in all human society, tyranny and oligarchy and democracy. Tyrannies and oligarchies are guided by the character of the men in control (*τοῖς τρόποις τῶν ἔφεστηκότων*); cities under a democracy are ruled by law."

In a famous passage Polybius (VI 11, 12) eulogizes the Roman constitution as a mixed constitution: "For if one fixed one's eyes on the power of the consuls, the constitution seemed completely monarchical and royal; if on that of the senate it seemed again to be aristocratic; and when one looked at the power of the masses, it seemed clearly to be a democracy" (Paton's translation in the Loeb Classical Library). Aristides agrees with Polybius that Rome has a mixed constitution, but the mixture is now concentrated in one institution which is monarchical in the best sense but through which both the Many and the Few realize their aims. The emperor is a good monarch, but at the same time something more than a Hellenistic king. He is a champion of the People and a champion of the aristocracy; he represents the democratic institution of the tribunate and the aristocratic institution of Cicero's *tutor et procurator rei publicae*, which Karl Büchner, "Der Tyrann und sein Gegenbild in Ciceros 'Staat,'" *Hermes* 80: 343-371,

1952, has shown to be the patriot who stops a Catiline. Three institutions representing the three basic forms of true government are, though *res olim dissociabiles*, now subtly blended in this new creation. Aristides seems to have accepted the official interpretation of the role of the emperor at its face value, but so did Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius. The emperor is ever on the watch for the interests of the People, but ostensibly like Cicero's conscientious "auctor et princeps" he is also the aristocratic leader of the patriotic opposition to any abuse of power or to any attempt to subvert the traditional order.

The distinction between the correct and the corrupt forms of each constitution could have come directly from Plato; it did not come from Polybius. Of course, the praise of a mixed constitution occurs in Plato, *Laws* III 693. The rhetor Menander in his book on Display Oratory says that if one is praising a city with a mixed constitution, one should say that it has taken the best of all types: "This is what Plato has said in the *Laws* about the Spartan constitution, and Aristides in the *Roman Oration*" (*Rh. Gr.*, ed. Spengel, 3: p. 360 = Bursian, p. 60). In fact, the influence of Plato made Aristides seek to prove by way of justification that despite appearances the constitution was essentially the mixed constitution which Plato had stamped with his approval, and he implies that the Roman city state is that ideal state which could not be found anywhere in Plato's day. The ideal of the mixed constitution was handed on, but as conditions changed, the ingredients to be mixed were changing ideals. The Principate represented a compromise between the senatorial aristocracy and other elements, who, as M. A. Levi³¹ reminds us, had placed their interests in the hands of a single leader. Furthermore, Panaetius and Posidonius had adapted the teaching of Plato in arguing that it was natural and right for some to be ruled by others who could get them what they needed, and in this way they had justified the Roman Empire (*cf.* W. Capelle, "Griechische Ethik und römisches Imperialismus," *Klio* 25: 86-113, 1932).

"Ephor and Prytanis." Though ephors did exist outside Sparta, the word "ephor" meant to everyone the famous magistracy of Sparta. Etymologically it emphasized watchfulness as the magistrate's outstanding characteristic. The ephors, though they did later serve the interests of an oligarchy, had at an early time defended the rights of the Demos and were always, even when they wielded an autocratic power, considered a democratic element in the Lacedaemonian constitution, theoretically the champions of the People. When Cleomenes III abolished the board of five ephors in 228 b. c., he had only four of the chairs removed, while he himself occupied the fifth chair as champion of the People, the

³¹ La Tabula Hebana e il suo valore storico, *La Parola del Passato* 14: 158-170, 1950. Some pertinent observations on this subject occur at the end of C. G. Starr's article, The perfect democracy of the Roman Empire, *Amer. Hist. Rev.* 58: 1-16, 1952.

one who could get them what they needed. Cicero describes the Spartan ephors as similar to the Roman *tribuni plebis*. When Aristides calls the Roman emperor the "Ephor," he is thinking of the emperor's tribunician power and visualizing him as the watchful champion of the People. The office of prytanis in a Greek city state was a post which arose in the early struggle of the aristocrats against the decadent monarchy and in many places became an aristocratic chief magistracy. The single prytanis ruled in the interests of the aristocracy as an aristocratic replacement for the king: at Corinth after the abolition of the old kingship "the Heraclid Bacchidae, who were more than 200, held the rule, and all of them together governed the city, and they chose one from themselves every year as prytanis" (Diodorus VII, fr. 9, 6). The word suggested a primacy in *aretē* (excellence of character) and an ability to get things done. When Aristides calls the Roman emperor the "Prytanis," he is thinking of the emperor's *auctoritas*, his influence as Princeps (cf. the word *πρυτανεύοντος* in section 31). It is interesting to note that in the roughly contemporary Hymn to Zeus, XLIII Keil 29, Aristides calls Zeus himself "ephor and prytanis," and thereby contrasts him with a despot. I believe that the idea of the *basileus* as ephor and prytanis would have had to come first and that in the Hymn to Zeus Aristides visualized the god as a kind of emperor.

"One without a share in the vices of a tyrant." For Aristides the principate, though comparable to the ephorate, is not a tyrannical institution *per se*. Plato, *Laws* IV 712d, had criticized the ephorate for its tyrannical character (cf. Aristotle, *Politics* 1270b 20), and in the *Annals* Tacitus had presented a long indictment of the principate itself as tyranny.

91. "Made these distinctions and discoveries," διέλεσθαι καὶ κατδεῖν. The verbs have a strong Platonic color. Aristides, moreover, has Polybius VI 48-50 in mind, who says that the Lacedaemonians had a perfect constitution for Laconia itself but a constitution absolutely worthless for affairs outside Laconia.

"For you alone are rulers, so to speak, according to nature," i. e. according to what is right and valid. "The others . . . established an arbitrary rule (δυναστεύσαντες: on δυναστεία see V. Ehrenberg, *Historia* 1: 536 f., 1950). "As rulers they were a spurious crew" (νόθοι τῆς ἀρχῆς). Compare Plutarch, *Pompey* 39, 2 on the annexation of Syria, because it did not have "kings with genuine capacity" (γνησίους βασιλεῖς), and see G. Downey, *TAPA* 82: 160, 1951. For the antithesis νόθεα-φίστις, which Euripides (fr. 168 Nauck) rejects, see the commentary on the first sentence of section 107. This is also the old antithesis καλεῖσθαι—πεφυκέναι, for which see Plutarch, *Cleomenes* 13, 3 and the passages cited by F. Heinemann, *Nomos und Physis. Herrnkunst und Bedeutung einer Antithese im griechischen Denken des 5. Jahrhunderts* (*Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft* 1) 108 f., 1945.

"As . . . in a ball game," ὥσπερ ἐν σφαίρᾳ. Spartan inscriptions of the second and third centuries after Christ show that ball games were played by *local* teams of σφαιρεῖς, i. e. teams called by local names so that the names "Macedonians," "Persians," "Medes" would sound quite natural. See M. N. Tod, "Teams of Ball-Players at Sparta," *BSA* 10: 63-77, 1903-1904; A. M. Woodward, *BSA* 46: 197-199, 1951. For the list of world empires see C. Triebel, "Die Idee der vier Weltreiche," *Hermes* 27: 321-342, 1882; J. W. Swain, "The Theory of the Four Monarchs: Opposition History under the Roman Empire," *Cl. Phil.* 35: 1-21, 1940; H. L. Ginsberg, *Studies in Daniel*, 5-23, N. Y., Jewish Theol. Sem. of America, 1948. Whereas Herodotus discounted the Assyrians and Medes, Ctesias counted them as world empires. From the second century B. C. the idea was widely disseminated that there would be a fifth world empire to last forever. Compare sections 15 and 109.

"As long as men have known you, all have known you as rulers." True in Rome's case, but compare Aristotle, *Rhetoric* I 5, 5: "Good birth, then, means for a nation or a city . . . that its earliest representatives were conspicuous as leaders."

"You prescribed for all things fixed rules and fixed periods" (θεσμὸς καὶ τάξις ἀφύκτος). The crux of the passage lies in the meaning of the word τάξις. The metaphor of the ball game probably still continues, and the cosmological motif of Rome the Demiurge surely recurs here, so that a wide range of meaning and a still wider range of suggestion enter into consideration. However, Aristides has just criticized earlier empires as arbitrary and is now affirming that Roman rule is not arbitrary but characterized (like the heavenly Cosmos) by fixed rules and τάξις. The latest edition of the GEL, s. v. τάξις viii, gives the meanings "fixed point of time, term," to which we might add "date, inning, period." That this covers the usage in our case appears as soon as we confront the passage with section 26 where Aristides regrets that Alexander did not live long enough to replace the arbitrary rule of the Persians with something better: "By what routine administration with automatic progress and fixed periods of time (χρόνων τακταῖς περιόδοις) did he conduct his affairs?" In Plato's or any cosmology the fixed periods of time in which the heavenly bodies rotated were most important evidence of a universal order.

92. "How far you surpass all in total extent of your empire and in firmness of grip and in plan of civil administration," ὅστον <μὲν> γάρ μεγέθει τῆς ἀπάσης ἀρχῆς <καὶ> ἐγκρατείᾳ καὶ πολιτείᾳ ἐπίνοιᾳ. The word ἐγκρατείᾳ cannot be dismissed as a gloss, as Keil dismissed it. First it is not suitable as a gloss; second it is supported by the triad of extent and ἐγκράτεια in section 34, and of πολιτείᾳ ἐπίνοιᾳ in section 36. To those reasons for not dismissing it, there may be added the consideration that omissions of one word are exceedingly common in the traditional text and that the insertion of a mere καὶ

restores the connection. The virtue of ἐγκράτεια here means firmness of grip even more than self-control. In section 28 Aristides describes the extent. That part of the empire's perfection which Aristides describes in sections 29-33 is doubtless the ἐγκράτεια, and it consists in the absence of areas where Roman rule is merely nominal, in the absence of internal strife, in the willing submissiveness of officials and subjects to the imperial control. The plan of civil administration is also part of the empire's perfection. For the hidden meaning of the reference to the government's ἐγκράτεια see the commentary on section 66.

"Ruled, as it were, naked bodies by themselves, mere persons composing the ethnic groups or nations," ὥσπερ σωμάτων γυμνῶν αὐτῶν τῶν ἐθνῶν ἡρξαν. The word σώματα means not only "bodies" but "persons" as distinct, on the one hand, from wealth and, on the other, from cities (*cf.* Demosthenes XVIII 100, "having got control both of their persons and of their cities"). The verb ἡρξαν governs, not ἐθνῶν as L. A. Stella and Levin interpret it, but σωμάτων, on which ἐθνῶν depends as a partitive genitive. Right after this passage Reiske, Keil, L. A. Stella, and Levin assumed a lacuna, but our text seems to be all right, once the contrast between mere person and wealth is recognized as the subject.

93. "Sometimes riding on the same day through two or three cities as if passing through sections of merely one," ἔστι δὲ ὅτε τῆς αὐτῆς καὶ διὰ δνεῖν καὶ τριῶν ἐξελαύνων ὥσπερ στενωπῶν. The στενωποί could in another context be mountain passes, as L. A. Stella understands the word, but the close association with *poleis* forces upon us the conviction that the στενωποί mentioned here were the *vici*, as Canter translated it and as Carteromachus saw, though he translated too literally *angiportus*; the word meant both the ordinary city streets without arcades and the sections or precincts they traversed: *cf.* Ph. W. Harsh, "'Angiportum,' 'Platea' and 'Vicus,'" *Cl. Phil.* 32: 44-58, 1937. The στενωποί of Antioch are mentioned by Libanius (ed. Foerster), XI 90, 170, 198, 201, and 217. For those of Athens see W. Judeich, *Topographie von Athen*, 180 and 186, 2nd ed., Munich, Beck, 1931.

"Not only in the element at the head of the empire," οὐ μόνον τῷ κεφαλαίῳ τῆς ἀρχῆς. Compare Tertullian, *Apologetic* I 1, "vobis, Romani imperii antistites, . . . in ipso fere vertice civitatis praesidentibus."

"Did not as individuals have the equality of civil rights and privileges" (in a city state), οὐκ ἵσων ἐκάστων οὐδὲ ὄμοιων ἡρξαν. Schönbauer (*ZSS* 51: 326, 1931) correctly interprets the phrase to mean that the predecessors of the Romans did not rule over ἵσαι καὶ ὄμοιοι as the Romans do. Others like L. A. Stella and Levin understand Aristides to say that the people neither equalled nor approximated what they are today. The phrase ἵσαι καὶ ὄμοιοι, however, was an ancient phrase to indicate people who enjoyed *isonomia* or perfect equality among themselves. The main point, it seems to me, is

that a polis was a union of ἵσαι καὶ ὄμοιοι, i. e. a group who should enjoy ἵσαι καὶ ὄμοιοι. Aristides means that those who ruled large areas, i. e. the Assyrians, Medes, Persians, and Macedonians, ruled people without the good life for which men form poleis. Pompey and the Roman emperors, particularly Hadrian, had encouraged the formation of urban centers and the transformation of native communities into cities of the Greek or Roman type. From the Greek and Roman standpoint civilized life meant the city state with at least part of what this implied in freedom, cultural activities, and social life. The Romans had continued to take care of veterans by colonization, but a good deal of the Roman work of urbanization had nothing to do with veterans and was an attempt to raise the standard of living among the natives.

94-95. The χάρις καὶ κόσμος of the civilized world of the present are extolled with a play on various meanings of these words. *Xáris* can be full growth and health as well as grace, *kósmos* can be jewelry as well as order and discipline. The freedom from *hybris* is represented specifically by a freedom from the garrisons and satraps of the Persian and Macedonian periods, because also the Macedonian rulers were mere satraps, who garrisoned rather than governed (section 27).

96. "Taking good care of the Hellenes as of your foster parents." Aristides thereby illustrates the εὐσέβεια or *pietas* of the Romans. Now in section 15 Aelius Aristides has used the adjective φαῦλος to describe all world empires before that of the Romans. There is probably a contrast between φαῦλότης (vice of the soul) and εὐσέβεια (one virtue of the soul) as in the *Alcibiades* of Aeschines,³² which Aristides has already cited in section 10. For the contrast in the *Alcibiades* see the discussion by Edmund G. Berry, "The Oxyrhynchus Fragments of Aeschines of Sphettus," *TAPA* 81: 1-8, 1950. Aeschines uses the word εὐσέβεια to cover filial piety: it was precisely the absence of filial piety that illustrated the early φαῦλότης, the lack of εὐσέβεια in Themistocles. See also E. Kienzle, *Der Lobpreis von Städten und Ländern in der älteren griechischen Dichtung*, 77, Diss. Basel, 1936.

"You release (ἀφίέντες) free and autonomous." The phrase "free and autonomous," in my opinion, expresses an idea both negatively and positively in a manner very common in Greek. It implies that control by a foreign or local master is absent and that the old customs are present. It implies the absence of *hybris* and the presence of the city's own laws functioning without hindrance. But the phrase, so common in the propaganda of the fifth, fourth, and third centuries B. C., has a long

³² It is essential to consider not only the fragments known to H. Krauss, *Aeschini Socratici reliquiae*, Leipzig, Teubner, 1911, but the new fragments in the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 13: 88-94, No. 1608, 1919. A valuable study with a complete translation of the *Alcibiades* by A. E. Taylor, *Philosophical studies*, 1-27, London, Macmillan, 1934, does not help with the term φαῦλότης.

history and constitutes the bone of contention in the famous dispute among Heuss, Bikermann, Hampl, Wüst, Tarn, and others. For our purposes, without prejudice and with the single protest that the Greeks did not think "juridically," it will suffice to refer the reader to W. W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great* 2: 192-232, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1948. The word ἀφίημι, used in this sense by Diodorus XIX 75, 1, Appian *Mithr.* 113, and Arrian, *Anabasis* I 17, 4, is discussed by A. Heuss, *Stadt und Herrscher des Hellenismus in ihren staats- und völkerrechtlichen Beziehungen* (*Klio*, Beiheft 39) 220-237, 1937. *Civitates liberae* were Athens, Sparta, Rhodes, Delphi, Pergamum, Miletus, Byzantium and many others (compare J. A. O. Larsen and T. R. S. Broughton in *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome* 4: 446-449 and 706-707, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1938).

"Consideration" (*φειδώ*) was part of the ideal attitude of a Hellenistic king toward subject cities. Long before Vergil said *parcere subiectis*, Polybius had phrased it *τῶν πόλεων φείδεσθαι* (XVIII, 3, 7, a passage in which even the phrase *τοῖς ὑποταττομένοις* occurs: cf. A. Heuss, *ibid.* 250).

97. The passage concerning the ancient burden of arms reflects the language of Thucydides I 6, as Keil noted.

"This one contention" represents the Good Eris of Hesiod, *Works and Days* 11-26. For an allusion to the Bad Eris see section 69.

98. "One can say that the civilized world, which had been sick from the beginning as it were, has been brought by the right knowledge to a state of health," *ἐπιστημόνως τε ἔξεστιν εἰπεῖν οἷον πεπονηκίαν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀνακεκούμσθαι τὴν οἰκουμένην*. To this rendering one might object that *πονέω* can denote any distress, e. g. in a rough sea or in battle, so that it is not necessary to read the health metaphor into the words of Aristides. Still both verbs lend themselves well to that interpretation. The verb *ἀνακεκούμσθαι* can hardly mean that they have been brought back to harbor, because the metaphor would not apply. Elsewhere Aristides does indeed compare Rome with a skillful pilot, but in doing so he represented the cities as still sailing (section 68). The sense "brought back" will not do, because the cities are in a condition or place where they have never been before. The editors of the GEL s. v. *ἀνακούμξω* have interpreted this passage as a health metaphor, and so have previous translators. To me it seems the only natural interpretation. If so, the knowledge with which Rome has cured the world is that of a physician. The metaphor could well be a recollection of Plato, *Laws* X 903b-e, where it is argued that the god, ὁ τὸν παντὸς ἐπιμελούμενος is concerned with the preservation and goodness of the Whole: *πᾶς γὰρ ιατρὸς καὶ πᾶς ἔντεχνος δημιουργὸς παντὸς μὲν ἐνεκα πάντα ἡργάζεται, κτλ.* The image of the physician emphasizes knowledge, while the image of the craftsman emphasizes skill (for another reflection of this passage see the commentary on

section 54), but both possess a combination of *ἐπιστήμη* and *τέχνη*. Keil wished to connect the adverb *ἐπιστημόνως* with *εἰπεῖν*, "ut verbis (*sc. πονεῖν et ἀνακούμσθαι*) e medicorum scientia petitis utar." He is followed by Livingstone, L. A. Stella, and Levin. But these words are not limited to medical language. On the contrary, I think we ought to connect the adverb *ἐπιστημόνως* with *ἀνακεκούμσθαι* and contrast it with the adverb *ἀνεπιστημόνως* in Plato, *Laws* I 636e where it means "without the right knowledge that a city, man, or animal needs." Compare also the way in which Plato, *Politicus* 300-305, uses the expressions *ἀνεπιστήμων*, *ἐπιστήμων* and *μετ' ἐπιστήμην*.

The *δωρεά*, of course, came from the emperor, not the Roman People. They were in the form both of outright gifts and of endowments, many of which appear particularly in epigraphical sources, to which Broughton, Larsen, etc., give references in the pertinent sections of the *Economic Survey of Ancient Rome* 4, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1938. A Thyatirene decree published in *Hesperia* 10: 363-368, 1941 (cf. 20: 32, 1951) mentions a decision of the Attic Panhellenion "to engrave [at Athens] on the Acropolis all *δωρεά* [as each was given by the] greatest of all the *basileis* who have ever lived, Imperator Caesar Trajanus [Hadrianus Augustus] Olympius Panhellenius Zeus, with the purpose for which he gave it." It is for this reason that the Thyatirenes vote to publish at Athens a record of Hadrian's benefactions to them " [in order that] what great [benefactions the *ethnos* of the Thyatirenes has received ([τ]ετ[ύχηκε]) from the] *basileus* [may make it] clear to all the Hellenes that [privately and] publicly the *basileus* has been a benefactor to the entire Hellenic [nation]." The same ideas are behind the Thyatirene decree and behind this passage of the Roman Oration, but Aelius Aristides does not here take up the *topos* of the *basileus euergetes*. Here the benefactor is the Roman government, which to one reader suggests the Beneficent World-Soul (*εὐεργέτης ψυχή*) of Plato, *Laws* X 896e.

"Major beneficiaries," *τοὺς μειζόνων τετυχηκότας*. When a largess was distributed at a festival, the recipients were divided into major and minor beneficiaries. See for example the catalogue published by the writer, "The Eleusinian Endowment," *Hesperia* 11, fasc. 4, 1952.

99. "Smoke rising from plains and fire signals for friend and foe have disappeared as if a breath had blown them away, beyond land and sea," *καπνοὶ δ' ἐκ πεδίων καὶ φρυκτοὶ φίλιοι καὶ πολέμιοι, οἷον πνεύματος ἐκριπίσαντος, φροῦδοι, γῆς ἐπέκεινα καὶ θαλάττης*. All three are gone, (1) the smoke of campfires which betrays the presence of an army in the plain (cf. Xenophon, *Cyrop.* VI 3, 5), and (2-3) the fire signals indicating approach of friend or foe. It cannot be translated with Livingstone, *The Mission of Greece* 258: "The beacon fires of friendship rise on her plains, and those of war are gone as though a wind had blown them beyond land and sea." The ever-burning and sacred fires of the festivals of today replace

the intermittent and unholy fires of the past (*καπνοί* and *φρυκτοί*). For the thought compare Plutarch, *Political Precepts* 824c: "Every Greek or barbarian war has departed from our midst and disappeared." It was in the plains, also, that the crops grew and the smoke of devastation would rise because the aim of most ancient Greek wars was to carry off or destroy each other's crops (cf. A. W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* 1: 10-19, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1945). The word *πνεῦμα* (=breeze or breath) has rich associations, but the *pneuma* from Rome reflects first of all a passage of Plutarch, *Numa* 20, 4-5: "A beginning of a change took hold of the cities around about as if some aura or salubrious breeze (*πνεῦμα*) from Rome were bringing it, and there entered the hearts of all a yearning for orderly government (*εὐνομίας*) and peace and for raising children in tranquillity and for divine worship. Festivals and good cheer, hospitable receptions and warm welcomes as people visited one another without fear, occupied Italy, because sentiments of nobility and justice flowed into all from the wisdom of Numa, as from a spring, and the calm surrounding him diffused itself." A. D. Nock reminds me of the phrase, "Deus flavit et dissipati sunt."

The reference to the unceasing regularity of religious festivals reflects a policy adopted by the imperial government of the second century, which saw in the ancient festivals a means of keeping alive the spiritual values of Hellenism. For the support given by Roman emperors to Greek festivals see the writer's book, *The Sacred Gerusia, passim*, but especially No. 27 (*Hesperia, Suppl. 6*) 1941, and his article, "Three Attic Inscriptions Concerning the Emperor Commodus," *AJP* 71: 170-179, 1950. In the *Vita* 13, 4 it is said that Antoninus Pius "was justly compared to Numa, whose good fortune and piety and religious rites he ever maintained" (Magie's translation). Here the continuous festivals imply the realization of the ideal state (cf. Plato, *Laws* VIII 832-835). Rather than specific passages I cite for its Platonic background the words of F. Solmsen, *Plato's Theology* (*Cornell Studies in Class. Philol.* 28) 169, 1942 in reference to the *Laws*.

The work is more than a legislative system; it is a reintegration of Greek life, a restoration of its true form, which from Plato's point of view would appear to have been in process of disintegration for at least a century. . . . In the *Laws* the City becomes once more the property of the gods. Each part of the territory will be under their protection. . . . Religious festivals, processions, cult activities will at regular intervals enter the individual's life and make him at every turn feel close to the divine powers. Again and again appeal is made to religion, worship, cult practice, in short to the divine element in every form, to sanction and sanctify through its vitalizing presence the regulations which Plato wishes to see in force.

"A demonstration justified by the way all men have fared" (*πάντες γὰρ ἀξίως τούτου πεπράγαστιν*), cf. XIII (Dindorf) p. 240: *τοὺς θεοὺς μαρτύρεσθαι τῆς παρούσης*

εὐδαιμονίας as an explanation of the statement *πρῶτον μὲν πανγγύρεις καὶ πρόσθιοι τοῖς θεοῖς ἤσαν*.

100. "Earth is mother of all and common fatherland." Plutarch (*De Alex. M. fortuna* I 6, 329a-d) said that it was Alexander who had first given a real foundation to the Stoic doctrine of the brotherhood of man, and that on a famous occasion Alexander had ordered all to consider the *Oikoumenē* as their fatherland.

"With or without his property." Inviolability of the person and inviolability of property used to be given in honorary decrees of classical and Hellenistic cities as separate grants, *ἀσφάλεια καὶ ἀστολία*, to a few individuals.

"From fatherland to fatherland," an adaptation of Pindar's phrase "from home to home" (*Ol. VI 99*) as again "from him to him" in XLV Keil 25, on which Campbell Bonner comments (*Harvard Theol. Rev.* 30: 131, 1937) "from Sarapis to Sarapis . . . a new and curiously modern application of the comfortable old phrase of Pindar." I owe this reference to A. D. Nock. See, however, H. Almqvist, *Plutarch und das Neue Testament* 83, § 151, Uppsala, Appelberg, 1946.

"Neither Cilician Gates nor narrow sandy approaches to Egypt through Arab country,³³ nor inaccessible mountains, nor immense stretches of river, nor inhospitable tribes of barbarians cause terror, but for security it suffices to be a Roman citizen, or rather to be a subject of yours." The contrast to the insecurity and turmoil of life under the Persian Empire (18-22) is basically a contrast between the World in the reign of Necessity (cf. section 18, *καὶ ἀνάγκης εἶναι*) and the World in the reign of Eros. The three best parallels for this passage are:

Tibullus I 2, 27:

quisquis amore tenetur, eat tutusque sacerque
qualibet: insidias non timuisse decet.

Propertius III 16, 11-18:

nec tamen est quisquam, sacros qui laedat amantes:
Scironis media sic licet ire via.
quisquis amator erit, Scythicus licet ambulet oris:
nemo adeo ut noceat barbarus esse volet.
luna ministrat iter, demonstrant astra salebras,
ipse Amor accensas percudit ante faces,
saeva canum rabies morsus avertit hiantis:
huic generi quovis tempore tuta via est.

The most important parallel of all is from the twenty-second ode of the first book of Horace. As the ode was explained by G. L. Hendrickson, "Integer Vitae," *Class. Jour.* 5: 250-258, 1910, the poet can wander anywhere because he is a faithful lover free from unfaithfulness (*scelerisque purus*).

He will always be safe:

sive per Syrtis iter aestuosas
sive facturus per inhospitalem
Caucasum vel quae loca fabulosus
lambit Hydaspes.

³³ Cf. Herodotus III 5.

In other words, Aristides here speaks of the power of Rome in the very terms with which other poets³⁴ were accustomed to describe the power of Eros. It is the cosmogonic Eros³⁵ which Aristides has in mind.

The reader may object that Aristides does not specifically mention Eros. On the other hand, the orator has emphasized "hatred" as the outstanding characteristic of the world in the period before the rise of Rome. The Persians are in section 22 said to have "passed their lives in giving and receiving hatred." Another specific reference to hatred in the Persian world occurs in section 20, and indeed the entire passage on the Persians is an illustration of hatred. Similarly the rotation of Hellenic cities as preponderant power in a league of cities is in section 44 described as a rotation in being the most *hated* city. Another specific reference to hatred in the classical Greek world occurs in section 50, and indeed the entire passage on the Greek leagues of Athens, Sparta, and Thebes illustrates the *hatred* produced by the bungling of a preponderant city. In the prelude (3), furthermore, Aristides has intimated to his audience that Rome the child of Venus Genetrix reminds him of Eros the child of Aphrodite, when he substitutes the audience (whom he equates with "Rome" or "this city") for Eros, as he quotes the famous line of Euripides, "Eros teaches a man to be a poet, though he were unmusical before." To deny significance to this quotation would be to underrate Aristides as an artist.

The contrast of Necessity and Eros, moreover, is actually demonstrable as an idea in the mind of Aristides, because he pairs them explicitly in another oration of just this period in his life, the prose hymn to Zeus the Demiurge, XLIII Keil 16.³⁶

101. "Earth common of all" (*Iliad* XV 189): Homer speaks of Earth and Olympus being left common of all three (Zeus, Poseidon, Hades, who had divided up other areas among them). Aristides, of course, in citing the Homeric passage, gives it deliberately a radically different meaning, as Plato might have done. The passage was familiar to an educated audience not only from Homer directly but also from the use which some writers, including Plutarch, *De defectu oraculorum* 422 f., had made of it in connection with the difficulty of Plato, *Timaeus* 55d. Aristides cites the passage also in the prose hymn to Sarapis XLV Keil 23.

"Hewn highways through the mountains." Turtze-

³⁴ The writer cannot cite any poet earlier than Horace, but he assumes a Greek model whose Eros undergoes a humorous transformation at the hands of Horace, from whom Propertius and Tibullus probably depend.

³⁵ On the cosmogonic Eros see G. F. Schömann, *De Cupidine cosmogonico, Opuscula academica* 2: 60-92, Berlin, 1857; L. Klages, *Vom kosmogonischen Eros*, 2nd ed., Jena, Diederichs, 1926; A. B. Cook, *Zeus* 2 (2): 1019-1054, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1925.

³⁶ See also the commentary by Julius Amann, *Die Zeusrede des Ailius Aristides* (*Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft* 12) 76-82, 1931.

vich wished to emend and read *τὰ ὅρη <ἐκ>κόψαντες <ῶστε> ιππήλατον εἶναι*. Both emendations are unnecessary. For the infinitive without *ῶστε* see Schmid, *Atticismus* 2: 56.

"Triptolemus." See pp. 879 f. *supra*.

"I see on reflection," *ἐπινοῶ*. The prefix is not that of intensity but that of time or sequence, as it is occasionally in the noun *ἐπίνοια*.

Reference to the primitive life in the mountains before the creation of a terrestrial cosmos occurs in the speech which Arrian, *Anabasis* VII 9, 2 puts into the mouth of Alexander.

102. "There is no need whatsoever now to write a book of travels (*περιήγησον γῆς*) and to enumerate the laws which each country uses." Compare Aristotle, *Rhetic* I 4, 13: "Evidently, then, books of travel (*αι τῆς γῆς περίσδοι*) are useful with a view to legislation, since from them one can ascertain the laws of different nations" (Jebb's translation). A survey of the literature occurs in J. Schnyder's *De periegetarum graecorum reliquiis* (*Societas Scientiarum Lodzienensis, Sectio I*, 8) 1950.

"You . . . gave those who so wished opportunity to see for themselves" (*αὐτόττας γίγνεσθαι*). In Aristotle, *Meteorologica* I 13, 13 mention of books of travel is accompanied by a reference to what people cannot see for themselves (*αὐτόττας γενέσθαι*).

"You assigned common laws (*νόμους τε κοινούς*) for all and you put an end to the previous conditions which were amusing to describe but which were intolerable if one looked at them from the standpoint of reason." For the absurdity of the variations in systems of local law and a contrasting natural law see Cicero, *De re pub.* III 11. The reference to *κοινοὶ νόμοι* recalls Aristotle's universal law (*Rhetic* I 10-15). Chapters VI and VII *infra* will illustrate in what way Rome introduced a truly welcome uniformity.

"You made it possible to marry anywhere," *γάμους τε κοινοὺς ποιήσαντες*. Rome made it possible to marry anywhere in the empire without jeopardizing the status and inheritance rights of the children. On the narrowness of the ancient Greek law of marriage see H. J. Wolff, "Die Grundlagen des griechischen Eherechts," *Tijdschrift voor Rechtsgeschiedenis* 20: 1, 1952. To become a citizen in Athens after the middle of the fifth century B. C. one had to prove birth from a citizen mother as well as from a citizen father. By the time of Aelius Aristides most of the more important families of every Greek polis had received Roman citizenship, and at least the Roman citizens of one Greek town could intermarry with the Roman citizens of another Greek town. One of the most striking features of the aristocratic society of the Greek world in the second century after Christ is precisely its interterritorial character. Athenian families, for example, were related to families in other parts of the Greek and Roman world; the wife of Herodes Atticus came from Italy. The interterritorialization began

even in the first century as *SIG³* 796 will attest. Here Rome follows in the path of Alexander, especially in the treatment of soldiers. The permanent unions which the latter formed with any women became legal marriages after the soldier's release from service (*cf.* the diplomata of *CIL 16* with Nesselhauf's comments on pp. 154 f.).

"You organized all the civilized world, as it were, into one family." The Persians (*cf.* section 36) organized their subjects into a household of slaves, but the Romans organize their subjects into a family or household of kinsmen. The Roman government of Hadrian and the Antonines attached supreme importance to the traditional Greco-Roman civilization as a unifying force; they encouraged and even supported traditional festivals and traditional education and made Greek culture or its Latin adaptation a criterion of eligibility for advancement and citizenship. Compare Max Vogelstein, *Kaiseridee-Romidee und das Verhältniss von Staat und Kirche seit Constantin* (*Breslauer Historische Untersuchungen 7*) Part I, Ch. III, especially p. 32, 1930, "The idea of a humanity bound by a uniform civilization within which the individual could come to full development is nothing else than the idea of the *Oikoumenê*."

103. The passage, as L. A. Stella saw, has some similarity with Plutarch, *De fortuna Romanorum*, II 317b, but there is nothing in Plutarch to impose the meaning which L. A. Stella gives to the last words, "gli altari dei Dei hanno ricevuto ancora gli onori del culto." Levin renders, with deliberate ambiguity, "the gods' altars acquired sanctity." Rather than to a restoration of religious ritual, Aristides refers to the binding quality of oaths, particularly in view of the Herodotean phrase "give" or "receive" *πίστιν*. Moreover, in the last, emphatic and characteristically ambiguous word *πίστιν*, Aristides may have intended to present to his readers also the idea of *fides*, a virtue on which the Romans traditionally prided themselves (*cf.* F. Schulz, *Principles of Roman Law*, Ch. XI, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1936). He may well have been inspired immediately by Polybius VI 56 on the importance of religion and honesty at Rome and the absence of *πίστις* among the Greeks. For the theme of Rome's creation of order see, for example, the decree of the Commonalty of the Hellenes in Asia, *OGI 458 = SEG 4: 490*.

The Titans, like the Gigantes with whom they were often confused, represented the brute forces. See M. Mayer, *Die Giganten und Titanen in der antiken Sage und Kunst*, Berlin, 1887; U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, "Kronos und die Titanen," *Sitzungsb. d. Berliner Akademie*, phil.-hist. Kl. (*Kleine Schriften 2 [7]*) 35-53, 1929; K. von Fritz, "Pandora, Prometheus and the Myth of the Ages," *Rev. of Religion*, 227-260, 1947.

"Universal order entered as a brilliant light over the private and public affairs of man." Plutarch, *De fortuna Alexandri* I 330d, says: "He wished to make the world subject to one principle and to one constitution, to make

all men one people If the dispatching deity had not soon recalled the soul of Alexander, one law would look upon all men and would rule in accord with one code of justice as a common light. But now there remained of the earth a sunless part, as much as Alexander never saw." Light means the rule of law instead of arbitrary rule or tyranny in Tacitus, *Agricola* 44: "ei non licuit durare in hanc beatissimi saeculi lucem et principem Traianum videre." Pseudo-Scymnus 233 calls Rome "a common star for the whole civilized world."³⁷ The brilliant light of the Roman Empire eventually became a *topos*. It reappears in the *Panegyrici Latini* V 18, 3 and especially IV 19, 2: after the victory of Constantius over Carausius the people of Britain were "finally free and finally Roman, finally restored to life by the veritable light of the empire" (*vera imperii luce*). On the great importance of the light image in early Greek poetry see Bruno Snell, *Die Entdeckung des Geistes*, 168, Hamburg, Classon and Goverts, 1946.

104. The references are, as Sieveking (37) insisted, to the behavior of Cronos. The phrase "even at sanctuaries" alludes to episodes like that of Cylon (so A. D. Nock in a letter).

105. The basic thought of this passage is that the government should win the favor of the gods (deos conciliandos esse rebus humanis, as St. Augustine XIX 17 expresses the false wisdom of the *terrena civitas*: *cf.* also the famous Constitutio Antoniniana of A. D. 212, i. e. P. Gies. 40). Rome has done just that (see the commentary on section 99).

"His noble creation, the civilized world." Cf. Dio Chrysostom XLVIII 14, "this noble creation, the Cosmos."

"The sea . . . cleaned." The "clean" sea was one of the aims of international cooperation for peace in the fourth century B. C.: *cf. IG IV² 1, 68*, line 38.

In sections 96 (see commentary) and 98 Aristides has indicated the *εὐσέβεια* and *ἐπιστήμη* of the Romans. In the *Alcibiades* of Aeschines, fragment 1 Krauss, Socrates, identifying virtue with knowledge, says that fortune does not come to good and bad alike, *ἀλλὰ τοῖς καλοῖς κάγαθοῖς εὐσεβεστέροις γε οὐσιν ἀμείνω τὰ παρὰ τῶν θεῶν ἵπτάρχειν*. Tacitus, when he was writing the *Histories*, as E. Paratore (*Tacito*, 555-570, Milan, Cisalpino, 1951) brings out, assumed a close connection between the morality of Roman behavior and the wrath or beneficence of the gods. The form in which the delight of the gods is expressed has a very close analogy in Aristides' Prose Hymn to Zeus XLIII Keil 25 and is entirely suitable to an oration in honor of a deity.

"And when did Aphrodite ever have a better chance to plant the seed and enhance the beauty of the offspring." The traditional text reads, 'Ερμῆς δὲ ἀγόνων οὐκ ἀμοίρος οὐδὲ πρεσβειών. Αφροδίτη δὲ σπόρων καὶ χαρίτων

³⁷ Contrast Vergil, *Aeneid* VI 795, "iacet extra sidera tellus."

πότε μᾶλλον καιρὸς ὑπῆρξεν, κτλ. Students have sensed a corruption. Canter 'Αφροδίτη^s δὲ χορῶν. Jebb <ώ>ρων. Reiske² σπο<νδ>ῶν. Dindorf 'Αφροδίτη. Wilamowitz begins a new sentence with καὶ Χαρίτων (thus capitalized). But whereas Wilamowitz is content to leave it 'Αφροδίτη δὲ σπόρων (*sc.* οὐκ ἄμοιρος), Keil assumes a lacuna after σπόρων. It is better to retain the reading σπόρων because of what Euripides, *Hippolytus* 449, says of Aphrodite, ἥδε ἐστὶν ἡ σπείρουσα, and it is better to retain the connection of χαρίτων (uncapitalized) with Aphrodite because of Euripides, *Bacchae* 236, δοσσούς χάριτας 'Αφροδίτης ἔχων, and similar passages. In that case Dindorf's editorial change, which is no emendation at all, gives us an acceptable sense, and emendation is not yet justified or invited by a recognizable lacuna.

"It is now that the gracious favors (*χάριτες*) of Asclepius and the Egyptian gods have been most generously bestowed upon mankind." Apart from the well known special devotion of Aristides to Asclepius, there is another reason for mentioning this deity just here: Asclepius was the great god of Pergamum. The deities previously mentioned in significant groupings were the cults of the ancient Greek cities, or the gods of Athens and Sparta. Now come the gods of Pergamum and Alexandria (Asclepius and the Egyptian gods). The names of the latter are perhaps insufficiently classical for mention in this oration. Asclepius forms a kind of bridge between the religion of the Greek cities before and after the rise of Alexandria. It is characteristic of Aristides that he takes up the word *χάριτες* and reuses it in a different sense.

"As when (Ares was) overlooked at the banquet of the Lapiths." As references to this story W. H. Roscher, *Lexikon der Mythologie*, s. v. "Lapithen," 1863, does not cite Aelius Aristides but does cite Vergil, *Aeneid* VII 304, and Servius to *Aeneid* VII 304, who relates, "Pirithous, Lapitharum rex, cum uxorem duceret, vicinos populos Centauros, etiam sibi cognatos, et deos omnes excepto Marte ad convivium convocavit: unde iratum numen inmisit furorem, quo Centauri et Lapithae in bella venerunt." As far as I can see, Vergil and Servius are the only other extant authors who mention the neglect of Ares. In the *Aeneid* Juno, complaining that other deities have been allowed to avenge themselves, says, "Mars perdere gentem immanem Lapithum valuit."

Ares "dances . . . and keeps the weapons clean of blood" (*αἷματος καθαρά*). Keil's insertion of the word ἐμφυλίον to limit αἷματος is unnecessary, and *Vita Pii* 13, adduced by L. A. Stella in support of Keil, is quite irrelevant. Aristides has in mind the χορεία καὶ ἀγωνία of Plato *Laws* VIII 831b, the military training (830d-831b), perhaps even the phrase καθαρὸν εἶναι χεῖρας (831a). The dancing image to represent training in an art occurs also in the Hymn to Dionysus (XLI Keil 11), and reflects the early importance of the dance in Greek education. See also *Iliad* XVI 617, καὶ ὄρχηστήν

περ ἔοντα, "well trained though you are," with the explanation given by Dio of Prusa II 60, rather than that of modern commentators. In Plato, *Laws* II 654a it is proposed to take the gods as συγχορεύται and learn from them. The gods teach by music and dance (φέδαις τε καὶ ὄρχήσεσιν), and the Athenian Stranger asks, Οὐκοῦν δὲ μὲν ἀπαίδεντος ἀχόρεντος ἡμῖν ἔσται, τὸν δὲ πεπαιδευμένον ἴκανός κεχορεύκτα θετέον;

Helius "looks and shines with most delight upon your empire." This refers by way of contrast to *Odyssey* XI 15 and Hesiod, *Theogony* 760.

106. "Homer did not fail to realize that your empire was to be, but foresaw it and made a prophecy of it in his epic." This is of course, as Canter recognized, a reference to *Iliad* XX 307-308: "Now indeed shall the mighty (*βίην*, but there was a variant *γενεῖ*, "race") of Aeneas reign over the Trojans, and his children's children who shall come after him." The Aeneadae who claimed descent from Aphrodite ruled in the Troad at the time these epic words were composed (cf. F. Jacoby, "Homerisches," *Hermes* 68: 39-45, 1933). In the fifth century Hellanicus of Lesbos launched the version that Aeneas had migrated to Italy, and by the third century b. c. the identification of the Romans with the Aeneadae was familiar to the Greek world. In the second century b. c. Titus Quinctius Flamininus in Greece went to special pains to publicize the Romans as the Aeneadae (cf. Plutarch, *Titus* 12). Thereby the Romans, descendants of Aphrodite, cut a much more respectable figure, and later, thanks to the Homeric "prophecy," Roman rule was a little more acceptable to Greeks. From the vast literature on the subject two studies may be selected for the reader's convenience: J. Perret, *Les origines de la légende troyenne de Rome* (281-31), Thèse, Paris, 1942 (though the author's thesis of a late origin for the legend is usually rejected, the evidence is here exhaustively cited and scrupulously examined), and P. Boyancé, "Les origines de la légende troyenne de Rome," *Revue des études anciennes* 45: 275-290, 1943.

"Hesiod . . . would not, in listing the Generations of Men, have begun with the Golden Race." Hesiod, *Works and Days* 109-201, would have foreseen the Golden Age announced by Hadrian in 121 a. d. and symbolized by the recently finished temple of Venus and Rome on the Velia (cf. the introduction to Chapter II). For Hadrian's announcement of the *saeculum aureum* see Paul L. Strack, *Untersuchungen zur römischen Reichsprägung des zweiten Jahrhunderts* 2: 105-108 and 174-184, Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1933.

"And having once made this beginning, he would not," etc. The transition is mutilated in the manuscripts, οὐδὲ ἀν δὴ SD, ἡνίκα UT. Reiske emended <ἢ> ἡνίκα, Keil οὐδὲ <ει> δὴ. The negative οὐδὲ of SD seems indispensable, but the following ἀν is certainly a corruption. In order to explain the origin of the two versions I assume an original text οὐδὲ ἡνίκα corrupted into ἀν δὴ νίκα, I think that the two necessary corrections were actually

TABLE I

Chart to illustrate the structure of the catalogue in section 105: the arrangement beginning traditionally with Zeus, culminating in anapaestic rhythm with Apollo, Artemis, and the Muses, and ending with Helius in the light of the Roman Empire; the many connecting links of *paronomasia*, final *clausulae*, and associated ideas within the section itself; the studied variety of declension and conjugation. The catalogue also brings to mind what has been said elsewhere: the *oikoumenē* and the empire are identified (section 59) and compared with an aulos thoroughly cleaned (section 29); the grace and beauty of the Roman Empire are treated in section 95; Rome is compared with the sea which receives all the rivers (section 62); the chorus of the Roman World sings in unison (section 30), and the Roman Army itself is a dancing chorus (section 87); every man receives his due (section 60); Roman law has removed restrictions on marriage (section 102), and Roman Peace has allowed cleruchs and colonists to devote themselves to agriculture (section 30). See especially how the beauty and health of the Roman World and the absence of *hybris* are reflected.

1. Zeus	<i>καλοῦ</i>										
2. Hera	<i>καλῶς</i>		<i>τιμωμένη</i>		<i>γάμων</i>						
3. Athena and Hephaestus		<i>τιμωμένων</i>									
4. Dionysus and Demeter		<i>οὐχὶ νέρείσσονται</i>	<i>καρποῖ</i>								
5. Poseidon				<i>καθαρευόντας</i>		<i>θαλάττης</i>					
6. Apollo, Artemis and the Muses	<i>χορος</i>				<i>καθορῶν</i>						
7. Hermes	<i>οὐκ ἄμιορος</i>					<i>καθορῶν</i>					
8. Aphrodite	<i>χαρίτων</i>		<i>μοῖραν</i>	<i>σπόριαν</i>							
9. Asclepius and the Egyptian Gods	<i>χάριτες</i>										
10. Ares	<i>χορεύεις χορείαν</i>		<i>οἰδὲς ἡγιμασται</i>	<i>καθορᾶ</i>	<i>ποταιῶν</i>						
11. Helius			<i>οἴδεν βίταιον</i>		<i>ἔφορον ἔφορῷ</i>		<i>ἀρχῆν</i>				
								<i>οἰκουμένης</i>	<i>- - - - <</i>	<i>1.</i>	
								<i>- - - - -</i>	<i>- - - - -</i>	<i>2.</i>	
								<i>- - - - -</i>	<i>- - - - -</i>	<i>3.</i>	
								<i>- - - - -</i>	<i>- - - - -</i>	<i>4.</i>	
								<i>- - - - -</i>	<i>- - - - -</i>	<i>5.</i>	
								<i>- - - - -</i>	<i>- - - - -</i>		

made but were so misunderstood as to become two versions.

"For its ruin to occur" (*γενέσθαι*): infinitive, not of indirect discourse as if future (so others), but of purpose as after a verb of choosing. The quotation which follows is from the *Works and Days* 181.

"To Justice and Respect . . . a return amongst men." For the *renovatio* of the world see the introduction to Chapter II. Under the influence of Plato, *Protagoras* 320c-322d (cf. section 89 and commentary) Aristides substitutes *Dikē* and *Aidōs* for the *Aidōs* and *Nemesis* of *Works and Days* 200, who forsake mankind. This is no great change because the Nemesis of Hesiod was not Retribution or Righteous Indignation but, like the Nemesis at Rhamnus, the personification of Fairness or Right Division, who gave each man his due (*νέμειν* *έκαστων* *τὴν ἀξίαν*).

"He would have pitied those born before your time." Hesiod, *Works and Days* 174-175 pitied those born in his own, the Iron Age, not those born in earlier ages.

107. "Your ways and institutions, which were really introduced by you, are ever held in honor and have become ever more firmly established," *Αὲλ μὲν οὖν τὰ γε δὴ παρ' ὑμῖν τίμα, εἰσαχθέντα ως ἀληθῶς παρ' ὑμῶν, καὶ ἔξῆς ἀεὶ μᾶλλον βεβαιουμένα* (commas as in early editions). The translations, "Le magistrature instaurate da voi sono durevoli" (L. A. Stella) and "Your magistracies are eternal" (Levin), seem wide of the mark, not only in the handling of the initial adverb (cf. Isocrates, *Panegyric* 85; Xenophon, *Cyrop.* II 2, 1) and of the aorist participle but in the limitation of the phrase *τὰ παρ' ὑμῖν* which in my opinion indicates not only magistracies but all the outward manifestation of Rome's spirit such as administrative techniques, the law of procedure, etc. The phrase *τὰ γε δὴ παρ' ὑμῖν* should be interpreted as signifying both "your institutions" and "your plumage," because these opening words allude to the fable about the birds at the beauty contest. The jackdaw, with whom Aristides compared the Athenians in the contrasting passage in section 57, was stripped of his alien feathers and disgraced. In the commentary to section 57 we pointed out that this "Aesopic" fable has come down in *Aesopica* 101 Perry, Babrius 72, Aphthonius 31 Sbordone, and Epistle 34 of Theophylactus. Babrius 72, which dates probably from the first century after Christ, has the gnomic ending *ῳ πάι, σεαντὸν κόσμον οἰκείον κόσμει*, and at some later time, possibly even in the second or third century after Christ, it received the addition of a prose epimythium which has come down, as Crusius notes, in two versions, "Οὐι οἱ νόθοι καὶ ἐπείσακτον (οἱ ἐπίπλαστον) αὐτοῖς περιθέντες κόσμον ἀλλοτρίῳ τε κάλλει σεμννόμενοι, κτλ. Aphthonius 31, which dates from around A. D. 390, has the epimythium *κόσμος* (οἱ νόμοι) *ἐπείσακτος αἰσχύνῃ τοῖς ἔχουσιν*. Sbordone prefers the reading *νόμοι*, but Halm, who included the fable as No. 200 in his edition of Aesop, and B. E. Perry (in a letter) prefer the reading *κόσμος*, as of course I do.

Epistle 34 of Theophylactus, who wrote in the reign of Heraclius (A. D. 610-641), concerns not an ordinary beauty contest but, like *Aesopica* 101 Perry, a contest to determine which bird has such natural dignity as to be deemed worthy of the hegemony of the birds: the jackdaw *τὴν οἰκείαν δεδώς ἀμορφίαν τὴν τῆς φύσεως δημιουργίαν ἐνόθενσεν* (compare Aristides' criticism of Rome's predecessors in section 91 as *νόθοι τῆς ἀρχῆς*), *ἀλλοτρίῳ κόσμῳ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ καλλωπίζων ἀπρέπειαν· ἀλλ' ηλεγέε τὴν ἀμορφίαν ἡ γλαῦξ καὶ τὸν ἐπίπλαστον κόσμον ἐδείκνυε*. So the owl takes her feather away and the other birds take theirs. Then Theophylactus draws the moral, *sôphrosynê*. It is the soul which is lasting, not the external goods which Man acquires. You can't take them with you: *ζῶντες μὲν πρὸς ὄλιγον ἐπιπλάστη σεμννόμεθα κόσμῳ* (compare the above cited epimythium to Babrius 72), *τεθνηκότες δὲ ἀφγρήμεθα ἀπερ οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμέτερα*. So far we have kept close to three versions of our fable, the main evidence, but the phrase *κόσμος ἐπείσακτος*, of which *κόσμος ἐπίπλαστος* is a mere variant, appears elsewhere too. One finds it in the epimythium of Aphthonius 10, while the words *ἐπείσακτος κόσμος* appear in the Aesopic Corpus, both as a promythium and as an epimythium, to fable 451 Perry from the Byzantine Nicephoras Basilica. These are not accidental coincidences; rather they indicate that the antithesis *κόσμος ἐπείσακτος* and *κόσμος οἰκείος* was traditional in the rhetorical collections of *Aesopica*. In a masterly article ("The Origin of the Epimythium," *TAPA* 71: 391-419, 1940) B. E. Perry shows that the epimythium developed out of the promythium which editors of the Hellenistic and Early Roman Periods placed at the top of a fable for the convenience of those consulting the collection merely for illustrative material. I suggest that the phrase *κόσμος ἐπείσακτος* constituted the promythium for the fable concerning the jackdaw in the beauty contest. Even the late epimythium of 101 Perry could have been an interpretation of such a promythium. Accordingly, the Aesopic fable which Aristides mentioned in section 57 illustrates the shamefulness of alien plumage (*κόσμος ἐπείσακτος*). Now Aristides draws the contrast in Rome's case. Rome, no jackdaw like the Athenian Empire, is never stripped of her plumage, which is a cosmos of a different sort, an order truly introduced by herself (the word *εἰσαχθέντα* being a play³⁸ on the phrase *κόσμος ἐπείσακτος*), and her plumage is no disgrace but an honor ever more indisputably her own. Of course in section 58 Rome was hailed as first inventor of the art of government.

The present "great governor" (*ἄρχων μέγας*) contrasts with the "Great King." Compare Plato, *Phaedrus* 246e ὁ μέγας ἡγεμὼν ἐν οὐρανῷ Ζεύς.

"His own ancestors." The manuscripts read *τοὺς πρὸ αὐτοῦ τὸν πατέρα* (SDT) or *τοῖς παρ' αὐτοῦ τὸν πατέρα* (U).

³⁸ For comparison, *οἱ εἰσαχθέντες* are the old city's own youth who have just been entered upon the citizen roll, whereas *οἱ ἐπείσακτοι* are new citizens from outside the families of the old city.

Dindorf and Keil edit *aντοῦ*, and Keil deletes *τὸν πατέρα* as a gloss. Aldus Manutius had emended *καὶ τὸν πατέρα*. While Aristides like most Greeks may have had the highest opinion of Hadrian, Aristides could not have helped knowing what hatred Hadrian had aroused among Roman senators, and therefore the phrase "even his father" would have been provocative. So I cannot accept the emendation in the Aldine edition. Furthermore, I agree with Keil that the reading *τοῦς παρ' αὐτῷ* was a consequential change which the two following words suggested, but I cannot accept *τὸν πατέρα* as a gloss in the usual sense. In fact I do not see any ordinary glosses in this oration. Two other solutions have occurred to me. The first, which I rejected on reflection, was that the words *τὸν πατέρα* were a substitution by someone who felt the phrase *τοὺς πρὸ αὐτῷ* rather strong; cases of this are found elsewhere in the manuscripts of Aristides (cf. F. Lenz, *Hermes* 66: 64 f., 1931), but not in the Roman Oration. The second solution assumes a common type of error, transposition of the letters *προ*. It is based on the *Vita Antonini Pii* 3, 2: "proconsulatum Asiae sic egit ut solus avum vinceret." Aelius Aristides, who had in mind the reputation which Antoninus and his grandfather had achieved as governors of Asia, said *ὑπεραίρει τοὺς αὐτῷ προπάτορας*. If so, the passage in the *Vita* is not derived from Aristides, but both authors go back ultimately to a single source, which I take to be an impressive testimonial to the retiring governor Antoninus in a decree by the Commonalty of Asia. Another echo of the same decree would be the testimonial at Delphi to Claudius Leonticus, *SIG³* 877A.

"Justice and law are in truth whatever he decrees," *δικαιούσνην καὶ νόμουν εἶναι τοῦτο ὡς ἀληθῶς ὅ τι κρίνειν οὐτος*. With this the assertion of Seleucus I should be compared in Appian, *Syrian Wars*, 61: *ἀεὶ δίκαιον εἶναι τὸ πρὸς βασιλέως ὄριζόμενον*. It is customary to say that Seleucus I was trying to create a universal law over and above the national customs of the various *ethnē*, but Appian may have transferred to Seleucus I what was said about the Roman emperor. See also W. Schubart, "Das Gesetz und der Kaiser in griechischen Urkunden," *Klio* 30: 54-69, 1937. The ideas are already present in Plato, *Politicus* 294-302, but Plato may not have been the immediate source. The *basileus* as *νόμος ἐμψυχος* appears in Archytas, *On Law and Justice* (cf. Armand Delatte, *Essai sur la politique pythagoricienne [Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège* 29] 85, 1922, and Louis Delatte, *Traité*, 245-249, 1942). See also A. Steinwenter, "Νόμος ἐμψυχος: Zur Geschichte einer politischen Theorie," *Anzeiger der Akad. d. Wiss. in Wien*, 250-268, 1946. W. Hüttl, *Antoninus Pius* 1: Chap. IV, Prague, Calve, 1936, in showing how important the reforms introduced into Roman Law under Antoninus Pius were, cites this sentence to infer that the legislation of the period marked a moral advance of which the world was aware. That is to put faith in what at least later was a *topos* (cf. Menander II *apud* Spengel, *Rh. Gr.* 3: 375 f.

= Bursian, 103), but it was probably not yet a *topos*, for Pliny did not say it about Trajan. The period of the great classical jurists, with whose work the emperors would be credited, ran from Hadrian to Severus Alexander. Artistically Aelius Aristides here brings out again the motif of the ideal *basileus*, to which Dio of Prusa, The First Discourse, and W. Schubart, "Das hellenistische Königsideal nach Inschriften und Papyri," *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 12: 1-26, 1936, afford the best introduction, though the main studies are by E. Goodenough, "The Political Philosophy of Hellenistic Kingship," *Yale Class. Stud.* 1: 55-102, 1928, and L. Delatte, *Traité*, 1942.

"This too *<one can see>* clearly before everything else, that," etc. The authoritative manuscripts read *τί δὲ καὶ τοῦτο πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων εἴη σαφῶς, ὅτι, κτλ.* The absence of the particle *αὐ* plus the difficulty of the sense suggests that the optative form *εἴη* is a corruption. Dindorf would have supplied the particle, but Keil thought the corruption was more than the loss of two letters and he tentatively suggested rewriting the clause *<ξσ>τι δὲ καὶ καὶ τούτο<ν> πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων <ἐννο>εἰ<ν> σαφῶς*. Sieveking not only supplies the particle but emends (with Reiske²) *τούτ<ψ>* and makes another emendation (*σαφ<έ>s*) and a transposition of words. This is surely too much. The emendation *τί δ' οὐ* of Baroc. 136, which Dindorf and Sieveking mistook for a genuine reading with tradition behind it,³⁹ is palaeographically unacceptable and does not cure the rest of the corruption. The emendation *<ξσ>τι δὲ*, proposed by Jebb and approved by Reiske², conforms with the usage of Aristides (compare section 54 and 65; also XIII Dindorf 225), and has the advantage of presupposing (like Keil's *<ξσ>τι*) only the most common of all errors. The passage, however, is best emended by starting with a suitable parallel containing the word *σαφῶς*, the phrase *ἔξεστι σαφῶς ιδεῖν ὅτι*, which occurs in XLVI Dindorf 161. A secondary corruption, eta for nu, could easily follow the loss of the first two letters of the word *ιδεῖν*. Finally there is nothing objectionable in the form of the pronoun *τοῦτο*, which serves as an antecedent of a *ὅτι* clause in sections 3, 16, 31, 40, 73, and 86.

"The partners whom he has to help him rule, men like sons of his own, similar unto him, are more than had any of his predecessors," *τοὺς τῆς ἀρχῆς κοινωνούς <οὐ>οὺς οἰκείους ἔχει παῖδας δύοιος ἑαυτῷ πλείους ἢ τῶν πρὸ αὐτῷ τις*. The fifth word appears in the authoritative manuscripts as *οὐ*s. The reading *ώς* of Baroc. 136 has of course no authority, and must be considered merely as an anonymous emendation. Keil emended boldly *οὐ*s *οἰκειοῦ<ται> παῖδ<έιρ> δύοιος*, which Sieveking rightly rejected. I should prefer to assume the loss of two letters before *οὺς* and interpret the words *<οὐ>οὺς οἰκείους παῖδες* as equivalent to *τοιούτους οὐοί εἰσιν οἰκεῖοι παῖδες* (for a parallel see Plato, *Soph.* 237c, *οἴω γε ἐμοί*). It is not

³⁹ This manuscript does not represent an independent tradition (cf. F. Lenz, Aristidesstudien, *Hermes* 66: 49-70, 1931).

possible to assume the absurd meaning that Antoninus Pius has more sons than Vespasian or any other emperor. Aristides means rather that Antoninus Pius surpasses other emperors in the number of his *socii laborum*, the noun *κοινωνούς* being the direct object of the verb. The actual wording remains problematical, but the sentence is best elucidated by reference to Epistle VII 332a, where Plato advises Dionysius the Younger, to surround himself with as many loyal friends as possible so as not to be like his father who had no *κοινωνὸς τῆς ἀρχῆς* whom he could trust. Plato and Dio have urged Dionysius the Younger to acquire other friends of a nobly sympathetic character from among his relatives and contemporaries, *φίλους ἄλλους αὐτῷ τῶν οἰκείων ἄμα καὶ ἡλικιωτῶν καὶ συμφώνους πρὸς ἀρετὴν κτήσασθαι*. The *δομούς* *έαντῷ* of Aristides is perhaps a substitution for Plato's *συμφόνους πρὸς ἀρετὴν*, and if so, one of the most delicate compliments in the whole oration. L. A. Stella, who accepts Keil's drastic emendation, presumes that *οἱ τῆς ἀρχῆς κοινωνοί* were the *amici* who constituted the emperor's *consilium*. Levin speaks of "associates" in the government. I understand a reference, not to the *consilium* alone, but to superior collaborators throughout the entire imperial service with its senatorial and, still more important, equestrian officials. Into the senatorial career, essentially the creation of Augustus, the best introduction is still that of O. Hirschfeld, *Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten bis auf Diokletian*, 2nd ed., Berlin, Weidmann, 1905. For the equestrian career of the time of Aelius Aristides see H. G. Pflaum, *Les procurateurs équestres sous le Haut-Empire Romain*, Paris, Maisonneuve, 1950, and A. Passerini, *Le Coorti Pretorie*, Part III (*Studi Pubblicati dal R. Istituto Italiano per la Storia Antica* 1) 1939. The equestrian career was essentially the creation of Domitian, Trajan, and Hadrian, as Pflaum has shown. From a study of epigraphical and literary sources Pflaum concludes that Hadrian had a service of only 107 equestrian functionaries. The number may be a little too low, but without cavilling at this, we cite Pflaum's informed opinion as expressed by him on pp. 66 f.:

Il est absolument étonnant que 107 fonctionnaires équestres aient pu suffire à une tache qui englobait autre la gestion financière impériale, le cabinet du prince, toutes les flottes, l'administration de l'Egypte et d'une partie non négligeable des provinces régies par le statut équestre. Cette économie magnifique de forces résulte principalement du règne de la "paix romaine" sur un territoire unifié, qui de nos jours souffre d'être divisé en une poussière d'états grands et petits.

Pflaum would raise the figures to 109 under Antoninus Pius, 127 under Marcus Aurelius, 136 under Commodus, and 174 under Septimius Severus. But also the number of those appointed to the imperial cabinet (*consilium*) had increased under Antoninus Pius, so that L. A. Stella's interpretation may be preferable. Yet I fail to find any reference to praise of the *consilium* among the *topoi* listed in Menander II (third century after Christ) for an oration in honor of an emperor, but praise of the governors as just men themselves and

worthy representatives of the emperor's justice is indeed listed (Spengel, *Rh. gr.* 3: 375 = Bursian, 103). Furthermore, in Dio Cassius LII 8 Agrippa makes a speech (fictitious of course) to dissuade Octavian from establishing a monarchical form of government. Among other objections, he says:

If you were able all alone to handle well and seasonably both the civil and the military administration and had no need of a collaborator (*συνεργοῦ*) in any of these matters, it would be a different question. But as it is, there is every necessity to have many helping you in the struggle (*συναγωνιστὰς πολλούς*) as rulers (*ἄρχοντας*) of so great a civilized world, and presumably they ought all to be both courageous and wise.

Incidentally the emperor Tiberius, who must have had the same Platonic (or pseudo-Platonic) passage in mind, used to call the praetorian prefect Sejanus his "*socius laborum*" (Tacitus, *Ann.* IV 2, 4; cf. the phrase *adiutor imperii* in IV 7, 2). Suetonius, *Tiberius* 25, 2 quotes the emperor as saying, "universae sufficere solus nemo (potest), nisi cum altero vel etiam cum pluribus." Tacitus, *Ann.* I 11, 3, makes him say "plures facilius munia rei publicae sociatis laboribus exsecuturos."

The word "sons" implies the maximum similarity, and in a mystical sense the *γνήσιος νιός* is the man who is worthy (cf. Louis Delatte, *Traité*, 205-206).

108. "Beyond any man's power, namely to compose the oration which would equal," etc., *παντὸς μεῖζον παρισώσαι . . . τὸν λόγον*, refers back to section 2.

"Like those poets who compose dithyrambs and paeans . . . add a prayer and so close." For Aristides the dithyrambs and paeans are the great choral odes. The Roman Oration assumes the character of a hymn sung, not by Aristides alone, but by the entire chorus of the civilized world (cf. section 29). The second paean of Pindar and the dithyramb of Bacchylides 17 provide good examples of a prayer at the end.

109. "Float upon the sea," *ἴντερ θαλάττης πλέωσιν*. The verb has come down as *πέσοιεν* which Aldus Manutius (followed by Keil) emended to *πέσωσιν*, and Henricus Stephanus emended to *νέοιεν*. Rather the verb as transmitted reflects a secondary change after the loss of two letters, i. e. an attempt to make sense out of *πέωσιν*. Carteromachus translated "super mare ferantur." For the background see the oath in Herodotus I 165.

V. PLUTARCH'S DENUNCIATION OF THE *PRÔTOI* IN THE POLITICAL PRECEPTS 19

"However," says Plutarch, "while making and presenting the fatherland obedient to the (Roman) rulers, (the local statesman) ought not to lower its dignity besides, nor, when the leg has been bound, to submit also the neck to the halter, as some, who refer even insignificant matters as well as more important questions

to the (Roman) governors, bring the reproach of servility upon it, nay rather destroy completely the city government by demoralizing, discouraging, and rendering it powerless everywhere. For just as those who have grown accustomed neither to eat nor to bathe without permission of a physician do not enjoy even as much health as nature does give them, similarly those who add a decision of the governor to every decree, council minute, grant of privilege, and administrative act, force the governors to be their masters more than (the governors) wish. The cause of this is chiefly the encroachment and ambition of the leading citizens (*πρώτοι*). For either, by the injuries they inflict, they force the less influential to take refuge from the city, or in disputes with each other they deem it undignified to get the worst of it among their fellow citizens, and they bring in the higher powers.¹ As a result Council, Assembly, courts, and every magistracy lose their power. By soothing the *potentes* (*δυνατοί*) with concessions and the others with equality (the local statesman) ought to keep them both within the city's constitution and solve their difficulties by applying some secret medicine of statesmanship."

Furthermore, Plutarch projects into the past his resentment against the *prōtoi* of his own day when in the *Life of Titus* 11 he writes that the freedom of Greece,

¹ Plutarch, *Political Precepts*, (ed. Bernadakis, *Moralia*, V), 19: *αλτία δὲ τούτου μάλιστα πλεονεξία καὶ φιλονεκία τῶν πρώτων*. Η γὰρ ἐν οἷς βλάπτουσι τοὺς ἐλάττονας ἐκβιάζονται φεύγειν τὴν πόλιν η περὶ ὧν διαφέρονται πρὸς ἀλλήλους οὐκ ἀξιούντες ἐν τοῖς πολέμαις ἔχειν ἔλαττον ἐπάγονται τοὺς κρείττονας. Other interpretations of this passage are:—(1) Xylander's translation *apud* Wytenbach, *Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia* 4: 225, Leipzig, 1830: "nam aut in his quae cum damno inferiorum agunt, operam dant ut civium iudicium subterfugiant, aut de quibus inter se altercantur, dum non ferunt se inter cives posteriores ferre, ea ut consequantur, potentiores introducunt." (2) H. N. Fowler in volume X (1927) of the Loeb edition of the *Moralia*, 242: "for either, in cases in which they are injuring their inferiors, they force them *into exile from the State*, or, in matters concerning which they differ among themselves, since they are unwilling to occupy an inferior position among their fellow-citizens, they call in those who are mightier." (3) E. Schönauer, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 13: 190, 1939 paraphrased: "Sie wichen der Bürgergemeinschaft aus und liessen nicht die Differenzen untereinander innerhalb der Bürgerschaft austragen." This, of course, misrepresents Plutarch's own words. For something better see Plutarch, *Von der Ruhe des Gemütes und andere philosophische Schriften übertragen und eingeleitet von Bruno Snell*, 186, Zurich, Artemis-Verlag, 1948: "sie nötigen durch Unterdrückungen die Geringen, ihre Zuflucht zum Statthalter zu nehmen und, da sie in den wechselseitigen Streitigkeiten nicht nachgeben wollen, bei den höheren Unterstützung zu suchen." Times have changed but Plutarch's thought runs in an ancient groove (*cf.* Thucydides V 4, 3: *οἱ δὲ δυνατοὶ αἰσθέμενοι Συρακοστός τε ἐπάγονται καὶ ἐκβάλλονται τὸν δῆμον*). That the *pleonexia* of the *prōtoi* was a common complaint appears also from Tacitus, *Ann. XIII* 48: "primi cuiusque avaritiam." Plutarch's disgust with the *prōtoi* comes to the surface also in his description of the opposition incurred by the reform movement in Sparta of the third century B.C.: "they incurred the enmity of the *dynatoi* who did not wish to cast off their usual *pleonexia*" (*Agis and Cleomenes* 2, 10). For the expression *τοὺς κρείττονας* see Dio of Prusa XXXII 59.

which the Romans restored, seemed to the Hellenes of 196 b. c. to have been first destroyed "by the wickedness and rivalry of her leading men."

Accordingly, the Greek cities were dominated by small groups of privileged families, and the other citizens were often forced by the encroachment of the magnates to appeal to the governor (or a legate of his) for protection against the local tyrants or exploiters. The magnates were often families who had risen to power because of Roman backing. Rome never set up tyrannies, but occasionally some one magnate acquired such local power because of his wealth and connections and behaved in a manner so unsatisfactory or domineering, that his fellow-citizens denounced him quite naturally in the traditional terms as a tyrant. For instance, Philostratus, *Lives of the Sophists*, II 559, p. 67 Kayser, relates that when the two Quintili were holding office in Achaia (probably as corrector and comes), the Athenians begged them to notify the emperor that Herodes Atticus was oppressing them as a tyrant. Somewhat later, during the trial at Sirmium, the three-year-old daughter of Marcus Aurelius is said to have clasped the emperor's knees and pleaded with him to save the Athenians (Philostratus II 560, p. 68 Kayser). Of course the opposition to Herodes Atticus got as far as they did partly because the Claudii of Melite and other leading families of Athens united against him.²

The most powerful Athenian of the Flavian period, Tib. Claudius Hipparchus, suffered confiscation of his estate ἐπὶ τυραννικάς αἵτιας ἀς Ἀθηναῖοι μὲν οὐκ ἐπῆγον, οὐδὲ αὐτοκράτωρ οὐκ ἡγόνοσεν as Philostratus says (II 547, p. 56 Kayser). The Athenians were the persons affected, and therefore these words can only mean that Hipparchus was accused of having established a tyranny at Athens. Philostratus, who was prejudiced in favor of Herodes Atticus and the latter's ancestors, relates that the Athenians did not press charges, but this may not be true or may be only part of the truth. For example, out of fear, they may not have done so officially. To judge from Plutarch's above cited comments on the encroachment of the magnates, it is not at all unlikely that Domitian had considerable grounds for intervention.

Not only the history of Roman Athens but the history of Roman Sparta illustrates what Plutarch has to say about the encroachment and ambition of the *πρώτοι* and about the way they make all take their quarrels to the Roman rulers. There were several prominent families but the family of C. Julius Eurycles, who commanded the Spartan contingent which served on the side of Octavian at Actium, outstripped all others in the revolution which followed the victory. The position subsequently occupied by Eurycles at Sparta was one of

² P. Graïndor, *Un milliardaire antique: Hérode Atticus et sa famille* (Cairo, Université Egyptienne, *Recueil de travaux publiés par la Faculté des Lettres* 5) 111-136, 1930. On the Claudii of Melite see J. H. Oliver, *The Athenian expounders of the sacred and ancestral law* 76-81, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1950.

dominance; in the eyes of the other Spartan aristocrats it was a tyranny. But there is no proof that Augustus, who of course helped him to a position of great influence, intended his follower to "plunder" the Peloponnesian. On the contrary, Augustus was displeased. The exact nature of the position of Eurycles has been much debated, most recently by Mrs. Atkinson,³ who, however, mistranslates one of the fundamental pieces of evidence, Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* I, 26, 4: δις γούν ἐπὶ Καίσαρος κατηγορηθεὶς ἐπὶ τῷ στάσεως ἐμπλῆσαι τὴν Ἀχαίαν καὶ περιβάνειν τὰς πόλεις. She translates the reference to accusation in the imperial court with the words "filling Achaia with revolution and destroying the allegiance of the cities" (p. 175), and then in a footnote comments infelicitously, "There is no authority other than the Roman government which could be deprived of the cities, hence the *στάσεις* in question must be revolt from Rome rather than civil strife in the separate cities concerned." But what Josephus says is that Eurycles was accused of having filled Achaia with dissensions and of stripping or plundering the cities. This encroachment of the magnates and the *stasis* or dissension which they cause have been already emphasized in the quotation from Plutarch, and abundantly illustrated by Philostratus in the life of Herodes Atticus, especially in the anecdote of how Herodes frustrated his father's will so that instead of owing every Athenian a mina, he ended up with the surprised Athenians in debt to him.

There is no reason to believe that Augustus wanted a tyranny in Sparta or would tolerate it in the long run. Strabo's phrase (VIII 5, 1 [363]), δ καθ' ἡμᾶς τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων ἥγεμών, to me, at least, indicates a position of some military or political authority, however transient.⁴

³ K. M. T. Chrimes, *Ancient Sparta*, 169-204, Manchester Univ. Press, 1949.

⁴ Dio of Prusa XXXII 14-19 contrasts philosophers who lecture with ἥγεμόνες who act, and he means men in positions of authority (*potestas*, not *auctoritas*) in a polis or ethnos. In XLVI 14 Dio has to distinguish the Roman authorities as the μελέσους ἥγεμόνες: "Nothing that goes on in the cities escapes the notice of the *hêgemones*—I mean the greater *hêgemones*." On the word *hêgemôn* for a Roman governor or vice governor or lieutenant governor see G. Barbieri, *L'alto senatorio da Settimio Severo a Carino* (*Studi Pubblicati dall'Istituto Italiano per la Storia Antica* 6) 562-585, 1952, and H. G. Pflaum, *Les procurateurs équestres sous le Haut-Empire Romain*, 110-117, Paris, Maisonneuve, 1950. It has not escaped me that ever since the publication of the *Res Gestae divi Augusti* it was customary to translate the Latin word *princeps*, when it meant the emperor, with the Greek word *hêgemôn*; but this was not a literal translation, it was more a translation *per comparationem* with the title of the permanent military commander in what was supposed to be a league of Free Cities such as the League of Corinth. The translation *hêgemôn* aimed at intelligibility to Greeks, while the original Latin *princeps* aimed rather at sparing Roman susceptibilities, which the Greeks did not feel. See, however, E. Kornemann, *Klio* 31: 85-90, 1938. Of course the *hêgemôn* of a Greek league of Free Cities was not supposed to be a "master," though he always was in fact, since the *hêgemôn* had overwhelming prestige because of his military power. On the word *hêgemôn* in the sense of "officer" see M. Holleaux, *Études d'épigraphie et d'histoire grecques* 3: 1-14, Paris, 1942.

The definite article, moreover, suggests that Eurycles became a supreme official of some sort or a military commander. The campaign of Actium seems too far back, and a position as permanent *hêgemôn* of a free league, that of Sparta and the Free Laconians,⁵ on the model of the ancient League of Corinth, also seems unlikely but not impossible. Another phrase, πρὸς τὴν ἐπιστασίαν αὐτῶν (Strabo VIII 5, 5 [366] cited below in full), may mean that Eurycles became *epistatēs*, an office reminiscent of the royal governor in Hellenistic towns,⁶ though it does not have to have this meaning. However, there was some extraordinary office outside the ancestral constitution of the Lacedaemonians, an office with associations of foreign domination and not of private business, that is, not a procuratorship. The domination of Athens by Demetrios of Phalerum comes to mind. For other Lacedaemonian aristocrats an extraordinary office, incompatible with a free oligarchy, would constitute a very serious threat, and of course they did what they could to have it dissolved. Pseudo-Plutarch preserves the following anecdote:⁷

One of the accusers of Eurycles was unsparing and tiresome with his frank utterances, and went so far as to say, "If these things, Caesar, do not seem to you to be of high importance, order him to repeat for me the seventh . . . of . . . ;" and Augustus, much incensed, ordered the man away to prison, but, on learning that he was the sole survivor of Brasidas's descendants, he sent for him, and, after reproving him moderately, ordered that he be released.⁸

Until, then, evidence to the contrary arises, it is best to assume that Eurycles stood out in Strabo's memory as the man who had occupied an extraordinary office. Strabo himself (VIII 5, 5 [366]) indicates that Eurycles got the office by exploiting his friendship with Augustus but that it did not last long.

After abolition of the Macedonian kings they had some few clashes with the generals who were sent out by the Romans. At that time the Lacedaemonians were under tyrants and the state was in a bad way. But when they accepted the Romans, they were treated with extraordinary honor and remained free, contributing nothing but the services imposed by friendship. Recently Eurycles threw them into turmoil. He seemed on one occasion to have exploited the friendship of Caesar beyond measure in order to domi-

⁵ For a connection between Sparta and the Free Laconians see IG V (1) 1208.

⁶ For *epistatai* see M. Holleaux, *Études d'épigraphie et d'histoire grecques* 3: 217-219 and 253-254, Paris, de Boccard, 1942; L. Robert, *Études anatoliennes* (*Études orientales publiées par l'Institut Français d'Archéologie de Stamboul* 5) 227-234, Paris, de Boccard, 1937; H. Bengtson, *Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit* 2 (*Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte* 32) 240-251, 300-307, and especially 325-328 plus 400, 1944.

⁷ Plutarch, *Reg. et imp. apophthegmata* 307 F No. 14 (edd. Nachstedt Sieveking Titchener, *Moralia* II p. 109).

⁸ Babbit's translation in the Loeb Classics (Plutarch's *Moralia* III), except that I have removed the, in my opinion, nonsensical reference to the seventh book of Thucydides. The anecdote is supposed to illustrate the remarkable forbearance of Augustus in the face of a grave insult.

nate them. But the office did not last long. Caesar withdrew far enough so that the influence of Eurycles might be reduced to proportion; and his son Tiberius was quite averse to any friendship of this kind.⁹

An inscription at Gythion, the sacred law *AE* 1929 No. 100, shows that a festival of Eurykleia in honor of the deceased philanthropist Eurycles and of his son Laco was being founded in A. D. 15. These extraordinary honors for the family of Eurycles postdate the action taken, according to Strabo, by Augustus when grave accusations were made against Eurycles. Kornemann¹⁰ believed that the new evidence of *AE* 1929 No. 100 proved Strabo mistaken in attributing any action to Augustus. Kornemann and Accame¹¹ thought that a tyranny still existed in A. D. 15 and was only put aside by Tiberius later. According to my interpretation Strabo does not say that Augustus actually removed Eurycles or destroyed him by renouncing publicly his friendship. Rather Augustus still left him *primus* but *primus inter pares*. Augustus merely checked tyrannical tendencies, which had appeared, or abolished an office which was not subject to any control by Spartans. He did not make it impossible for Eurycles to preserve or recover his popularity by generosity of an approved pattern, that is, by exhibiting a noble ambition within the traditional frame.

There can be no question that Eurycles himself was the man tried because the above cited passage of Pseudo-Plutarch shows that a trial did take place before Augustus and that the accusation was brought by certain persons who included at least one Spartan aristocrat and

⁹ Strabo VIII 5, 5 [366]: Νεωστὶ δ' Εύρυκλῆς αὐτοὺς ἐτάραξε δόξας ἀποχρήσασθαι τῇ Καίσαρος φιλίᾳ πέρα τοῦ μετρίου πρὸς τὴν ἐπιστασίαν αὐτῶν, ἐπαύσατο δ' ἡ ἀρχὴ ταχέως, ἐκείνου μὲν παραχωρήσαντος εἰς τὸ χρέων, τοῦ δ' νιοῦ τὴν φιλίαν ἀπεοτραμμένου τὴν τοιάντην πάσαν. The passage became fully intelligible perhaps only after the publication of epigraphical evidence by S. B. Koureas, *Ἐλληνικά* 1: 7-44 and 152-157, 1928, particularly the sacred law of 15 A. D. (= *AE* 1929 No. 100), by which a festival of Eurykleia in honor of the deceased philanthropist Eurycles and his son Laco was established at Gythion. See, for example, H. Seyrig, *Revue archéologique* 29: 97, 1929. On the other hand, K. M. T. Chimes, *Ancient Sparta*, 171, Manchester Univ. Press, 1949, says, "Strabo must mean that *Eurykles* 'gave into necessity'" (*ἐκείνου μὲν παραχωρήσαντος εἰς τὸ χρέων*), that is to say, realised that he must not try the patience of Augustus too far, while his own son Lakon was 'altogether averse to that kind of friendship,' namely friendship with an emperor." I cannot believe either that Laco, procurator of Claudius (*Corinth* VIII, 2, 67), was in the least bit averse to friendship with an emperor, or that the preposition *eis* will bear the interpretation K. M. T. Chimes (Mrs. Atkinson) puts upon it. She was not really confident because in footnote 2 of p. 171 she hedges: "ἐκείνου μὲν παραχωρήσαντος could also be taken literally, meaning that *Eurykles* went into exile from Sparta." In that case what can she do with *eis τὸ χρέων*?

¹⁰ E. Kornemann, *Neue Dokumente zum lakonischen Kaiser-Kult* (*Abhandlungen der Schlesischen Gesellschaft für vaterländische Cultur* 1) 15, 1929.

¹¹ S. Accame, *Il dominio romano in Grecia dalla Guerra Acaica ad Augusto* (*Studi Pubblicati dal R. Istituto Italiano per la Storia Antica* 4) 125 f., 1946.

were perhaps all of them Spartan aristocrats. Also Flavius Josephus, *Bell. Iud.* I 26, 4 has a tradition of the trial of Eurycles. The statement that Eurycles was banished is found in Josephus,¹² but it may be nothing more than an inference from what Strabo says about the reaction of Augustus to the accusations against Eurycles, or, as I personally believe, it may be confusion between the result of the trial of Eurycles for tyranny and the result of the trial of another member of the family later, not necessarily for tyranny.¹³ Not Strabo (so Kornemann and Accame) but Josephus is in error.

Eurycles, accordingly, threatened to dominate the Lacedaemonians.¹⁴ When fears were allayed, he continued to play a leading role in the country. The new evidence from *AE* 1929 No. 100 permits us to see that Marcus Aurelius, who held a trial and checked certain tendencies of Herodes Atticus but preserved his friendship and effected, obviously, a reconciliation between Herodes Atticus and the Athenians, was following the precedent established by Augustus for handling the "encroachment" of an old friend.¹⁵

The problem which the *prōtoi* posed may be defined as the problem how to protect the Greek city from exploitation by certain local families who had support from Rome or had inherited wealth and influence from persons supported by Rome. In other words this is the old dilemma that the local friends of the dominant city are useful to the dominant city and must be supported, but when they are supported, they become in their encroachment dangerous oppressors of their fellow countrymen.

It is worth while noting that just as the Athenians gave *proxenia* and a privileged position to their friends in the Greek cities,¹⁶ so Rome in the last century of the Republic gave *amicitia* and a privileged position to her friends in the Greek cities. The Roman institution of *amicitia* was an equivalent of the Greek *proxenia*.¹⁷

Under the Third Triumvirate Rome's friends, as is well known, were receiving citizenship and other privi-

¹² *Antiq. Iud.* XVI 10, 1 and *Bell. Iud.* I 26, 4.

¹³ Tacitus, *Ann.* VI 18 about Tiberius: "etiam in Pompeiam Macrinam exilium statuitur, cuius maritum Argolicum, sacerum Laconem (the son of Eurycles) e primoribus Achaeorum Caesar adfixerat."

¹⁴ Epynomates of various types were given in return for financial contributions, and therefore the coins with dating by the name of Eurycles are not proof that Eurycles reigned at Sparta as a prince or dynast. After all, his head never appears on the coins, and neither Strabo, nor Josephus, nor Pausanias ever give him a princely title.

¹⁵ K. M. T. Chimes, *Ancient Sparta*, 180, Manchester Univ. Press, 1949, has already noted a similarity between the trials of Eurycles and Herodes Atticus. For another "Hellenic" policy in which Marcus Aurelius strikingly follows the precedent of Augustus see J. H. Oliver, *The Sacred Gerusia* (*Hesperia*, Suppl. 6) 116-120, 1941.

¹⁶ R. Meiggs, A note on Athenian imperialism, *Cl. Rev.* 13: 9-12, 1949.

¹⁷ For *amicitia* see L. Gallet, *Essai sur le Sénatus-Consulte "de Asclepiade sociisque"* (*Nouvelle revue historique de droit français et étranger*, 4^e sér., 16: 242-293 and 388-425, 1937).

leges, i. e. *civitas* had replaced *amicitia* as an instrument for consolidating support in the Greek cities.¹⁸ Fundamentally it was the same policy, and in the writer's opinion it would have led rapidly to abuses, except that the imperial government intervened. The other privileges were now no longer given with the same rashness, and the emperor formulated policies to protect the cities against injury from these influential friends of Rome. It is true that Roman citizenship in *viritane* grants continued to be extended to Greeks with greater and greater frequency after intervals of conservatism,¹⁹ but the Roman government became more aware of the need and desirability of protecting the cities. The new policy goes back to Augustus himself, for it was he apparently who disciplined C. Julius Eurycles of Sparta, and who as early as 7 or 6 b. c. issued an edict in the province of Crete and Cyrene that the local Greeks who had Roman citizenship were none the less to be subject to liturgies in the polis, except those few who had obtained the old privilege of immunity from himself or from Julius Caesar,²⁰ a privilege probably no longer being given.

As for the famous option received by Roman favorites like the *amicus* Asclepiades or the *civis* Seleucus of Rhosos, it was an option not really of law but of tribunal.²¹ It was designed to protect these friends at a time when they might still need protection, and it undoubtedly gave them a great advantage, though in our opinion they had the option only as defendants. By the time of Plutarch, however, the Roman citizens no longer

¹⁸ P. Roussel, Un Syrien au service de Rome et d'Octave, *Syria* 15: 33-74, 1934. This inscription concerning Seleucus of Rhosos can be well studied in the commented edition of F. De Visscher, Le statut juridique des nouveaux citoyens romains et l'inscription de Rhosos, *L'antiquité classique* 13: 11-35, 1944, and 14: 25-59, 1945. Available also in *Inscr. gr. et lat. de la Syrie* III 718. A good translation by N. Lewis and M. Reinhold, *Roman civilization* 1: 152, N. Y., Columbia Univ. Press, 1951.

¹⁹ Once and for all, the reader is referred to the excellent study by A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman citizenship*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1939.

²⁰ Ad. Wilhelm, *Österr. Ak. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl., Anzeiger* 80: 8, 1943: τούτους λειτουργεῖν οὐδὲν ἔλασσον ἐμ πέρι τῷ τῶν Ἑλλήνων <τῷ ἑαυτῶν> σώματι κελεύω. The inscription is SEG IX 8, best consulted in the commented edition by F. De Visscher, *Les édits d'Auguste découverts à Cyrène*, Louvain, Bibliothèque de l'Université, 1940.

²¹ So, correctly in our opinion, F. De Visscher, *L'antiquité classique* 14: 43, 1945, despite the continued opposition of E. Schönbauer, Die Doppelbürgerschaft im römischen Reiche und ihre Wirkung auf die Rechtsentwicklung, *Österr. Ak. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl., Anzeiger* 86: 343-369, 1949. The Greek text of the SC de Asclepiade is conveniently accessible *apud* Riccobono, *Fontes*, I, No. 35. The Latin text, however, has benefited from the discovery of new fragments by C. Pietrangeli, Frammenti del "Senatus Consultum de Asclepiade" ricuperati sul Campidoglio, *Bulletino della Commissione Archeologica* 69: 109-112, 1941, and by criticism from F. De Visscher, *L'antiquité classique* 13: 26-27, 1944, so that it now reads: "[e]orum potestas et optio sit, seive domi le]gibus suis vel(int) iudicio certare seive apud magistratus [nostros vel Italicis iudicibus seive in civitate libera aliqua earum, quae perpe]tuo in [amicitia p(opuli) R(omani) manse]ru[nt, ubi] velint utei ibi iudicium de eis rebus fiat]."

seem to have enjoyed much of an advantage in this respect, because the Roman governors were opening their courts to practically any Greek *politēs*, who felt that the polis, because of the influence of local magnates or for some other reason, would not give him a fair trial. In most Greek towns there were comparatively few with Roman citizenship, and it is impossible to limit the group who, according to Plutarch, took refuge from the *prōtoi* with the Roman government to a mere handful of Roman citizens. Plutarch says nothing about Roman citizens, and in our opinion citizenship has nothing to do with it. The Hellenes expected the Roman government to protect them from their own magnates, and the Roman government usually gave that protection, though the Greeks found the senatorial proconsuls of the time of Augustus unsatisfactory.²²

Nor is there any evidence in Philostratus to indicate that in the time of Polemon (under Hadrian and Antoninus Pius) the Smyrnians who were taking their litigation outside the city, i. e. to the Roman courts, were people with Roman citizenship. Since the great majority in this period were without Roman citizenship, it is impossible to believe that Polemon meant only the Roman citizens among them. The passage occurs in Philostratus, *Lives of the Sophists* 1: 532, 43 Kayser: (Polemon)

persuaded the Smyrnians not to let the actions which they had against one another go anywhere outside the city but to settle them at home. I mean real actions, because those against adulterers, temple-robbers, and murderers, from the neglect of which pollutions arise, he bade them not only take out but even throw out of Smyrna, for these cases required a judge with the *ius gladii*.²³

Furthermore, the imperial (?) letter published in *IG* V (1) 21, which was erected at Sparta and concerns appeals, makes no reference to Roman citizens, and in its, to be sure, fragmentary condition gives the impression that the appeals are those of *peregrini* as well as of *cives*. The phrase οὗτε τὴν ἐπικλήσεων βοήθειαν τοὺς ἀδικουμένους οἴομαι δῆν ἀφειρῆσθαι can hardly refer primarily or only to Roman citizens, for it seems to imply "justice de grâce." Nor in the reference to appeals in the Hadrianic Oil Law at Athens (*v. infra*) is anything said about the Roman citizenship of the eventual appellants. Of course, there was a minimum below which the Roman court could not be bothered and there were other sensible restrictions, but there is no evidence that, when the conditions were met, the Roman courts of the second century after Christ remained closed to the *peregrini*. The governor was not under legal obligation to open his court, but he was doubtless under instructions to oblige the provincial *peregrini*, at least the *honestiores*.

²² Tacitus, *Ann.* I 76: Achiam ac Macedoniam onera deprecantis levari in praesens proconsulari imperio tradique Caesari placuit.

²³ The *ius gladii* of the type described by Dio Cassius LIII 14, 5 (θαυμάστην τοὺς ἀρχομένους), not the type described by Dio Cassius LIII, 13, 6-7 (to put Roman soldiers to death without appeal).

These negative arguments would not have detained us except for unwarranted generalizations from the privileged position of Seleucus of Rhosos at the end of the Civil Wars. Much more significant is the positive evidence, not only from the story about Polemon's influence at Smyrna, but above all from what Aelius Aristides says in the Roman Oration, 65 and 66. Using the same word which Plutarch²⁴ used for "magnates," Aristides says that the poor as well as the rich were pleased with the Roman rule, the poor because of permission *<to take refuge with Rome>* from their local *potentes* (*πᾶσιν ἀδεια τοῖς πλήθεσιν ἐκ τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς δυνατῶν <ώσημάς καταφύγειν>*). This may well have been so if we limit the word *πλήθη* to the citizens of Greek cities. It may well have been so at the time, but the remedy largely depended on the spirit of the Roman senatorial officials. As the Greek magnates themselves entered the senate, intermarried with other senatorial families, and gained the protection of the senatorial *esprit de corps*, the middle class and the poor of the Greek cities could rely far less on senatorial officials no matter what their provenience.

The first magnate of Old Greece to enter the Roman senate was Tib. Claudius Atticus of Marathon, adlected *inter praetorios* in the reign of Nerva or shortly afterwards, but in Plutarch's day the big difference between the *hēgemones* who were the local magnates and the greater *hēgemones*²⁵ colloquially known as the *κρείτ-τορες*²⁶ (higher powers) who were the senatorial officials of the province, was still clearly marked and created confidence. The difference was so apparent that Plutarch, *Political Precepts* 813e, could refer to the higher powers as the "boots," meaning thereby the red boots by which Roman senators at this time were conspicuously differentiated from all other men.²⁷

²⁴ The date of Plutarch's *Political Precepts*, composed after the death of Domitian, can hardly be determined accurately. K. Mittelhaus, *De Plutarchi praeceptis gerendae rei publicae*, Diss. Berlin, 1911, dated it between A. D. 115 and 120. Maria Arullani, *Ricerche all' opuscolo Plutarcho εἰ πρεβεντέρω πολιτευτέον*, 6 f., Rome, Poliglotta, 1928, and Sœur Thérèse Renoirte, *Les "Conseils Politiques" de Plutarque* (Université de Louvain, *Recueil de Travaux d'Histoire et de Philologie*, 3^e série, fasc. 40) 1951, date it early in the reign of Trajan. It is assigned to the last years of Trajan by Hermann Bengtson, *Das politische Leben der Griechen in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, *Die Welt als Geschichte* 10: 93-95, 1950.

²⁵ Dio of Prusa XLVI 14.

²⁶ Plutarch, *Political Precepts* 815a, cited above in note 1.

²⁷ Cf. L. Heuzy, *Dictionnaire des Antiquités* I 816, s. v. "calcei." Bruno Snell, *op. cit.*, 184, correctly translates "Patrizierschuhe." It has not escaped the writer that the "boots" to which Plutarch calls the attention of his young Sardian friend are usually interpreted as "the boots of Roman soldiers," so translated by H. N. Fowler in the Loeb Classical Library and even by A. Momigliano in *JRS* 41: 149, 1951. The *honestiores* of Achaea and Asia, where there were no legions, did not live in a military atmosphere, and it was not the boots anyway which primarily distinguished Roman soldiers from other people. The threat of military action is too crude for the Age of Trajan. Plutarch surely means Roman senators, and the reference itself constitutes a weak indication of date, being more suitable early

An interesting document from A. D. 104, the time of Plutarch, is the letter of a senatorial magistrate, Afranius Flavianus, to the archons, Council and Demos of the Ephesians on the occasion of a reconciliation between the city and its local magnate, the Roman knight Vibius Salutaris, who had probably not oppressed the Ephesians but had offended by insisting on his immunity.²⁸ The reader will meet the letter in Chapter VII, Case I. Flavianus begins with a vague reference to previous tension. It is a great pity that the adjective which Flavianus applies to Salutaris in line 374 has been lost, "very . . . because of his influence." The Roman magistrates have pleased both parties, and the incident might serve as an isolated but good illustration of the claim made by Aelius Aristides that Roman rule satisfies both rich and poor.

VI. COMMON LAWS FOR ALL

PART I: CITY CODES AND ROMAN EMPERORS

In section 102 Aristides congratulates Rome heartily on having established common laws for all, and in Chapter II we pointed out that the word "common" (*κοινός*) suggested to Greek ears some kind of a league. Rome fulfills the ideal form of international cooperation by supplying the hegemony and creating a strong alliance of cities without destroying their freedom. This had always been a Greek ideal, and the Vergilian (or, better, Augustan) interpretation of Rome's imperial mission is basically a late recognition of an age-old opportunity. The Senatus Consultum of 4 B. C. at Cyrene, *SEG* IX 8, gives the (urban?) subjects the programmatic title, "allies."

Of course the phrase *νόμοι κοινοί* would have suggested to every man with a good rhetorical education Aristotle's "universal law" as opposed to "special (= municipal) law" (*Rhetoric* I 10-15, 1368b-1375a), but

in the reign of Trajan than in the reign of Hadrian, by which time wearers of "patrician boots" were often local magnates.

²⁸ Vibius Salutaris seems to have come from a family of local Italians, but magnates both of Italian and of local aristocratic origin were now a single group (cf. J. H. Oliver, *The Athenian expounders*, 97, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1950). Plutarch, *Political Precepts* 822a-c, speaks of the resentment felt against rich men who refused to spend money on the city. Plutarch insists that they should spend money but should not spend it on popular amusements like gladiatorial shows. The way in which Vibius Salutaris was at last spending his money would have delighted Plutarch, who writes that the gifts "should be given on some occasion which offers a good and excellent pretext, one which is connected with the worship of a god and leads the people to piety; for at the same time there springs up in the minds of the masses a strong disposition to believe that the deity is great and majestic, when they see the men whom they themselves honour and regard as great so liberally and zealously vying with each other in honouring the divinity" (Fowler's translation).

the concept of these "common laws" and that of "universal law" would have seemed very close.

The common laws which Rome assigned to all (Greeks) may be divided into three big groups:

1. The *ius civile civium Romanorum*. A large minority, in whose hands most of the real property was concentrated, enjoyed Roman citizenship in the time of Aristides in each Greek city. Laws of marriage, inheritance, and disposal of their property were the same for Roman citizens whether of Athens or of Sparta or of Smyrna.

2. International law. Athens had created an international law which she imposed on the members of her empire at least partly for their own convenience. When the Athenian Empire collapsed, similar services were required and many improved substitutes were sought for the excessively tyrannical power of Athens. In some places a Hellenistic king was able to provide services, in other places a league like the Achaean League, sometimes treaties of international cooperation between independent cities. The Pylaean-Delphic Amphictyony especially developed its jurisdiction in international law.¹ Rome gradually took the place of all these substitutes. In the time of Aristides the day was past when the people of a Greek city would take a case to another Greek city in hope of an impartial trial. Rome provided approximately all the old services. Roman courts were long accustomed to handling cases which had arisen out of Greek law, but they handled them of course according to Roman rules of procedure.

3. Local Greek law. The passage from Plutarch, *Political Precepts* 19, cited at the beginning of Chapter V, shows that Rome exercised a certain supervision over the legislation of Greek cities. This supervision aimed at curbing revolution and bad laws which might injure the city itself or its neighbors, but the hand of Rome rested lightly on the cities. What Plutarch particularly emphasizes is the eagerness of the Greeks to clear everything with the Roman government. It was the Greeks who particularly wanted to close the gap between the laws of Rome and their own. One reason is obvious: if a case arising from the new law ever reached a Roman court, they wanted the sanction of a Roman governor behind the innovation. Secondly like Aelius Aristides they may have admired Roman *σοφία*. Thus Greek cities could not institute certain changes, and they themselves made new laws with an eye on Roman custom, but also they actually appealed to Rome to redraft their old code or to give them a code.

The writer leaves the *ius civile civium Romanorum* respectfully to the jurists. In the next chapter he will trace by way of illustration one example of Roman creation of international law out of local Greek material in the manner of the Amphictyonic Council. In this chap-

ter he will treat direct creation of local Greek law for local conditions by Roman emperors.

Most Greeks were anxious to avoid conflict with the Roman Administrative law as we are reminded by an Amphictyonic decree as early as 130/29 B.C., IG II² 1132, in which the Amphictyonic Council grants *asylia* and *aspaleia* to the Athenian branch of the Dionysiac Artists but concludes cautiously, *εἰναι δὲ τὰντα τοῖς ἐν Αθήναις τεχνίταις, εὰν μή τι Πυραιός ὅπ[ε]ρι αὐτοῖς η[ι]*.

More and more cases concerning Greeks were handled in Roman courts, until the problems of concurrency of law and the dangers of imprecise formulation became familiar to everyone. Although in most cases the Roman magistrate was able and eager to take local customs into account,^{1a} obtuse and uncooperative officials and borderline cases must still have been numerous enough to dispose the Greek cities to forestall unpleasant surprises by more careful wording of their own laws or by other alterations. In view of the brilliant development of Roman law the inadequate technique of the local law may have become glaring, but the cities did not always have personally disinterested and willing, universally trusted and professionally trained jurists who could modernize the code.

It was the emperor Hadrian who came to the rescue of the Greek cities. Before his accession Hadrian had received Athenian citizenship and had entered handsomely into the civic life of Athens, where he served as archon in A.D. 112/3. Hadrian was an enthusiastic admirer of things Greek, and he could be trusted to maintain the traditional law of Athens. When their fellow-citizen became emperor, the Athenians knew that an opportunity awaited them.

And so in an age when every educated man was to some extent a student of Plato, the Athenians asked their fellow citizen to assume the character of the law-giver of the *Laws* and to revitalize the life of Athens by a revision and restoration of her ancient code. Like

^{1a} Rafael Taubenschlag, "Die römischen Behörden und das Volksrecht vor und nach der C. A.", ZSS 69: 102-127, 1952, has examined, as far as the evidence will permit, the extent to which Roman officials in Egypt took local peregrine law into consideration or repudiated it. For the period before A.D. 211 he concludes (117) as follows. "Roman officials applied neither local peregrine law exclusively in rulings concerning the family nor Roman Law exclusively in rulings concerning property or procedure. Exceptions occurred among the former in favor of Roman Law, similarly among the latter in favor of peregrine law. Thus peregrine law is recognized in questions of the *status civitatis*, in manumissions, in the renunciation of the rights of a patron, in the decision upon the marriage without written contract and its legal effects, in the mutual liability of relatives in respect to the law of property, in the legal order of inheritance, in the validation of refusals to accept an inheritance and of other dispositions in respect to the law of inheritance, in the *operis novi nuntiatio*, hypallagma, hypothec, documents of execution upon a debt, in the cancellation of sale because of non-payment of the price, and in judgments concerning evidence. On the other hand, peregrine law is repudiated in the formality whereby an inheritance is acquired, in the *ἀλληλεγγύη*, and perhaps also in respect to bail."

¹ R. J. Bonner and G. Smith, Administration of justice in the Delphic Amphictyony, *Ci. Phil.* 38: 1-12, 1943.

the genuine *basileus* of the *Politicus* Hadrian liked to hold all the strings in his own hand, and he was susceptible to the chance of displaying the royal art in a traditional form, in the organization of a city.

Though the affairs of a city were not the responsibility of an emperor, the Athenians asked him to undertake it for them. That the request came from the Athenians themselves is explicitly stated by the chronographer in all three of our versions,² and I find nothing incredible in the initiative they are said to have taken.³ Perhaps the institution of the *curator civitatis* or *logistēs*, the "trouble-shooter" lent by the emperor on request to modernize a city's finances, prepared the way for a request of this sort, or perhaps they had already perceived in Hadrian the keen interest which he later displayed in the revision or drafting of city codes. The emperor's legal staff may have done the routine work, while the emperor formulated the general principles such as maximum adherence to still usable portions of the code of 410-399 B. C. On the other hand, the emperor may well have played a passive role and merely accommodated local statesmen who wanted something like a moderately democratic program but had an outlook sufficiently oligarchical to be still influenced by the mirage of ancient Sparta. The Lacedaemonian constitution had acquired its permanence and strength largely from a higher authorization according to Xenophon, *Lac.* VIII 5, who wrote as follows:

Lycurgus had many other fine devices to make the citizens willing to obey the laws, and one which seems to me to be among the finest is this: he did not give the laws to the many until with the leading citizens he went to Delphi and asked the god whether it would be better and preferable for Sparta to obey the laws which he himself had made. When the god pronounced that it would be universally better, then Lycurgus gave the laws, having made it not only unlawful but unholy to disobey laws authorized by the Pythian Apollo.

These ideas were part of the psychological equipment of the local statesmen, except that Apollo could no longer serve. For this purpose the emperor may have relied upon a *consilium* of Greeks or Athenians. We know nothing of the extent of his own contribution, but he would have personally examined the result before issuing the new code in A. D. 121/2.

The year 121 was that of the *renovatio* of the world, and it looks as if the *saeculum aureum* were inaugurated symbolically at Rome and at Athens.

As Graindor⁴ points out, one Athenian inscription,

² Syncell. 659, 9: 'Ο αὐτὸς Ἀθηναῖος ἀξιώσασιν ἐκ τῶν Δράκοντος καὶ Σόλωνος νόμους ἐπισυνέταξε.

Vers. Arm., ab Abr. 2137 (= A. D. 121): Adrianus Atheniensibus, qui ipsum precati sunt, leges a Dracone et a Solone aliisque (latas) composuit.

Hieron. ab. Abr. 2138 (= A. D. 122): Hadrianus Atheniensibus leges potentibus ex Draconis et Solonis reliquorumque libris iura composita.

³ This, however, bothered W. Weber, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Hadrianus* 165, Leipzig, Teubner, 1907: "Noch gänzlich unerklärt."

⁴ P. Graindor, *REG* 31: 227-237, 1918 and *Athènes sous Hadrien*, 30 f., Cairo, Imprimerie Nationale, 1934.

badly mutilated and incapable of restoration, seems to mention Hadrian's visit and benefactions and then *τ]οῖς παλαιοῖς τῆς πόλε[ως νόμοις*. But much more important, another Athenian inscription contains a long extract actually labeled as an extract from Hadrian's legislation. Available neither in the source collections of Roman law nor in *SIG³* nor in *OGI* nor in *IGR*, this interesting text is less familiar than it should be. Though it may be found in the Corpus and in the collection of Abbott and Johnson, these texts are now out of date. For the reader's convenience the inscription is here re-edited.

Κε(φάλαια) νο(μο)θε(σίας) Ἀδριανοῦ

Οι τὸν ἔλαιον γεωργοῦντες τὸ τρίτον
καταφερέτωσαν, ἢ τὸ ὄγδοον οἱ τὰ
Ἴππάρχον χωρία τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ φίσκου
πραθέντα κεκτημένοι· μόνα γὰρ ἐ
κείνα τὸ δίκαιον τοῦτο ἔχει· καταφε
ρέτωσαν δὲ ἄμα τῷ ἄρξασθαι συνκο
[μιδῆς κ]ατὰ μέρος, πρὸς λόγον το[ῦ]
[συνκομιδ]ούντων, τοῖς ἐλεώναι[ς]
[διδόντες τοῖς] προνοούσιν τῆ[ς] 5
[δημοσίας χρεία]ς· ἀπογραφέσθω
[σαν δὲ λόγοι τῆς] συνκομιδῆς πρὸ[ς]
[τοὺς ἐλαιώνας κα]ὶ τὸν κήρυκα δύο
[ἀντίγραφα παραδ]ιδόντες καὶ τὸ
[ἔτερον ἀπολαμβά]νοντες ἵπογρα
φέν· ἢ δὲ ἀπ[ογραφ]ὴ ἔστω μετὰ ὅρκου
καὶ πόσον συνεκόμισεν τὸ πᾶν,
καὶ ὅτι διὰ δούλον τοῦτο ἢ ἀπελευ
θέρου τοῦτο, ἐὰν δὲ πωλήσῃ τὸν
καρπὸν ὁ δεσπότης τοῦ χωρίου ἢ ὁ
γεωργὸς ἢ ὁ καρπώνης. ἀπογραφέ
σθω δὲ πρὸς τοὺς αὐτοὺς καὶ ὁ ἐπ' ἔξα
γωγὴν πιπράσκων, πόσον πιπράσκει
καὶ τίνι καὶ ποὺ ὅρμ[ε]ι τὸ [π]λοῖον. ὁ δ[ὲ]
ἀπογραφῆς χωρὶς π[ωλήσα]ς ἐπ' ἔξα
γωγὴν, καὶ ὁ ὥφειλεν ὃ κα[τενηνοχῶς]
τῆ πόλει, στερέσθω τοῦ πραθ[έντος].
ὁ δὲ ψευδεῖς ἀπογραφὰς ποιησά[μενος]
ἢ τὰς περὶ τῆς συνκομιδῆς [ἢ τὰς περὶ]
τῆς ἔξαγωγῆς ἢ ὑπὲρ χωρίου, [εἴ τις πα]
ρὰ φίσκου ἐπρίατο μὴ Ἰππάρχ[ον γενόμε]
νον ὄγδοον κατενεγκών, σ[τερέσθω],
[τὸ δὲ ἡμισυ ὁ μη]νύσας λαμ[β]α[νέτω].
[----- ἔξαγω]γὴν ἀναπογ[ράπτων]
[-----]ειρε, εἰ μ[-----]
[-----]των ἀπ[ο]τερ[---]
[-----]ος αὐτὸς ἢ ὅν[τιν]
[ἀν-----]έτω μὲν ἔξ ἀπ[ο]
[-----τ]ῆς δὲ τειμῆς τὸ [ἢ]
μισυ κατεχέτω, εἰ μήπω δέδωκεν, ἢ λαμ
βανέτω· τὸ δὲ ἡμισυ ἔστω δημόσιον.
γραφέσθω δὲ καὶ ὁ ἐμπορος ὅτι ἔξαγει
καὶ πόσον παρ' ἔκάστου· ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀπο
γραψάμενος φωραθῇ ἐκπλέων, στερέ
σθω· ἐὰν δὲ ἐκπλεύσας φθάσῃ καὶ μην
θῇ, γραφέσθω καὶ τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ τοῦ

δήμου κάμοι. τὰς δὲ περὶ τούτων δίκας
μέχρι μὲν πεντήκοντα ἀμφορέων ἡ βουνό^η
λὴ μόνη κρεινέτω, τὰ δὲ ὑπὲρ τοῦτο μετὰ
τοῦ δήμου. ἐὰν δὲ τῶν ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου τις
μηνίσῃ, ἐπάναγκες ὁ στρατηγὸς τῇ ἔξις
ἡμέρᾳ βουλὴν ἀθροισάτω, εἰ δ' ὑπὲρ τοὺς
πεντήκοντα ἀμφορεῖς εἴη τὸ μεμηνόν
μένον, ἐκκλησίαν· καὶ διδόσθω τῷ ἐλέγχῳ
ἔσαντι τὸ ἥμασυ. ἐὰν δὲ ἐκκαλέσηται τις ἡ
ἐμὲ ἡ τὸν ἀνθύπατον, χειροτονείτω σὺν
δίκους ὁ δήμος. ἵνα δὲ ἀπαραίτητα ἡ τὰ
κατὰ τῶν κακονγρούντων ἐπι[τ]είμι[α], τει
μῆς ἴσ τὸ δημάσιον καταφερέσθω τὸ ἔλαιον
ον ἦτις ἀν ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ ἡ. εἰ δέ ποτε ἐνφορί^η
ας ἔλαιον γενομένης πλέον εἴη τὸ ἐκ τῶν
τρίτων ἡ ὄγδόν τον δημοσίας χρείας, ἔξι
στω τοῖς μηδέτω δοῦσιν τὸ ἔλαιον ἡ πᾶν
ἡ μέρος δεντέραν ἀπογραφὴν ποιησαμέ
νοις καὶ δημόσιον τότε ὄφελόμενον
πόσον ἔστιν [σό]ον οἱ ἔλαιῶναι ἡ ο[ι] ἀργυρο^η
ροταρία[ι] οὐ βούλονται παρ' αὐτῶν λαβεῖν,
ὅ μὲν ὄφ[ε]ιλονσιν [—] ν[—]αγ[—]ηση[—]
φυλασσ[—]ασ[—]δια[—] 70
τετα[—] ἀπογραφ[—]γινω
σκομενα[—]ημω ἴσ τειμῆς [—]οε
σθω[—]δη[—] ἀπογραφα[—]αφε[—]
ρων[—]ν ὁ ὀφείληση[—]σοφ[—]

Traces of ten more lines.

EDITIONS

The first approximately complete copies were made by Spon and Wheler on their journey together: George Wheler, *A Journey into Greece*, 388-391, London, 1682, and Jacob Spon, *Voyage d'Italie, de Dalmatie, de Grece, et du Levant fait aux années 1675-1676* 2: 274-277, Hague, 1721. Corrections by other copyists are indicated in the important subsequent editions: A. Boeckh, *CIG* I 355, 1825; W. Dittenberger, *IG III* 38, 1878; J. Kirchner, *IG II²* 1100, 1916; B. D. Meritt, "The Epigraphic Notes of Francis Vernon," *Hesperia*, Supplement 8 (*Commemorative Studies in Honor of Theodore Leslie Shear*) 221-225, 1949.

Meritt's text brings improvement particularly in lines 10-15, though line 11 was already restored by Boeckh, who suggested also τοὺς ἔλαιώνας for line 13. In line 16 Kirchner's ὑπογραφή was just a typographical error. There are convincing new restorations by Meritt also in lines 25 and 67, and his readings have improved the text in some places and have both vindicated and eliminated some older restorations. The changes in my text from Meritt's consist in changes of punctuation (lines 19, 20, 21, 68), in the elimination of some restorations (lines 34-39), in a different division of letters into words (line 66), and in one important change that can be described either as an emendation or a new reading (line 64). Meritt left line 1 unresolved.

50

55

60

65

70

DISCUSSIONS OF THE CONTENT

Spon and Wheler analyzed it and after them Boeckh more successfully. It is treated also by F. F. Abbott and A. C. Johnson, *Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire*, 411-413, No. 90 and p. 447, Princeton Univ. Press, 1926. The chief discussion, however, is that of P. Graindor, *Athènes sous Hadrien*, 74-79, Cairo, Imprimerie Nationale, 1934. John Day, *An Economic History of Athens under Roman Domination*, 189-192, N. Y., Columbia Univ. Press, 1942, reaffirms the views of Graindor, but whereas Boeckh and Graindor emphasized that the aim was to guarantee enough oil for the needs of the Athenian state, Day points out that a second aim was to limit the profits of middlemen. B. d'Orgeval, *L'empereur Hadrien: Œuvre législative et administrative*, 231 f., Paris, Domat Montchrestien, 1950, connects the law with Hadrian's interest in the gymnasial hierarchy of the ephebic organization and says that the law was bound to fail because it weighed down the state with too many comptrollers who were doubtless unable to stop the fraud anyway.

The orthography is strikingly good. Against ἐλεώναι[ς] in line 9 may be placed ἔλαιῶναι in line 67; the spelling ἔσ occurs in line 59 but that is the only certain case of iotaism.

Line 1: The letters θε are not a suitable abbreviation of θειοτάτων but could belong to the word θε(οῖ). On the other hand, the interpretation Κε(φάλαι) νο(μο)θε(σίας) 'Αδριανοῦ brings the heading even closer to a concise heading of the usual type such as "Ορκος ἐφήβων" or "Απόφασις ἐπάρχον" (see Chapter VII) and puts the law-giver more on a plane with Draco and Solon, whom the Athenians had in mind. It is, however, possible that for some reason the Athenians waited until after Hadrian's death to engrave this section, but in the absence of evidence it is more natural to suppose that the inscription was erected soon after the actual codification. Even the resolution θε(οῦ) would not of course imply necessarily that Hadrian was dead.

Lines 3-6: For the estates of Hipparchus and the privilege they enjoyed see Graindor, *Un milliardaire antique: Hérode Atticus et sa famille*, 13 f., Cairo, Imprimerie Nationale, 1930. The estates had been sold outright, because estates belonging to an imperial domain in Attica would not be subject to Athenian requisitions.

Lines 10-16: The producer makes a declaration (*apographē*) in duplicate and receives one copy back with an official subscription (*hypographē*) acknowledging receipt and so verifying the amount which he submits in his one-sided declaration. One should compare the *apographē* in Egypt (see E. Bickermann, "Beiträge zur antiken Urkundengeschichte," *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und Antike* 9: 25-28, 1930; A. M. Harmon, *Yale Classical Studies* 4: 135, 1934). For the background of the declaration upon oath there is an excellent chapter by Fritz Pringsheim, *The Greek Law of Sale*, 232-244, "Cooperation of the

City and the State," Weimar, Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1950.

Line 17: Between the first two letters of *πόσον* an error has been erased and the space has been left blank.

Line 27: The producer cannot retain the stock after losing the purchase price. For the verb *στρέσθω* in the meaning "suffer confiscation" see Xenophon, *Cyrop.* VI 2, 38.

In line 34 it seems to be a question of the export of unregistered products (*ἐξαγωγὴν ἀναπογὰ [ράπτων]*). Meritt's restoration [*δε δ' ἀν ἐπ' ἐξαγωγὴν ἀναπόγη [ράπτα πρίηται]*] is not in accord with the evidence from lines 22-23 and 25-26 where the phrase reads *ἐπ' ἐξαγωγῇ*. The passage may have begun [*ὅστις δ' ἀν ἐξαγωγὴν ἀναπογὰ [ράπτων]*, but I am not proposing it].

Lines 56-57: The syndics were not to hear appeals before they were sent to the emperor (so Abbott and Johnson, 447), but to represent the Athenians in the proconsul's or emperor's court.

In line 64 the letters *ΜΗΔΕΠΩΛΟΥΣΙΝ* caused the editors Boeckh, Dittenberger and Kirchner to depart radically from the readings of the copyists. Meritt, on the other hand, kept these letters and divided them *μηδὲ πωλοῦσιν* without explanation of the word *μηδὲ* which had once troubled his predecessors and still troubled this reader. In line 67 Meritt convincingly restored the word [*δο*] *ον*. This is a gratifying improvement, and so is the publication of line 69, but I think that something more can be done. In Meritt's text a period separates line 68 from line 69, so that the sentence beginning in line 60 reads as follows: *ἐξέστω τοῖς μηδὲ πωλοῦσιν τὸ ἔλαιον ή πᾶν ή μέρος δευτέραν ἀπογραφὴν ποιησαμένους καὶ δημόσιον τό τε ὄφειλόμενον πόσον ἔστιν [δο] οἱ ἔλαιῶνται ή ο[ι] ἀργυροταρία[ι] οὐ βούλονται παρ' αὐτῶν λαβεῖν*. There are two difficulties in that text: *μηδὲ* (as noted) in line 64, and the absence of an infinitive depending on *ἐξέστω*.

If not actually omitted, the infinitive must have been in the lost portion below, and in my opinion there should be no period after *λαβεῖν* in line 68. The difficulty in line 64 cannot be so easily exorcised. At my request Eugene Vanderpool reexamined the stone to see if he could read *μηδέπω δοῦσιν*, which a parallel in line 40 suggests, instead of the unsatisfactory *μηδὲ πωλοῦσιν*. In a communication dated 9 January 1951 he reports that all trace of the crucial letter has now vanished. Therefore, we are dependent upon the old copyists, who were not good about dotting uncertain letters. I prefer to interpret the traditional Λ as an incompletely visible letter rather than a stonemason's error.

TRANSLATION OF THE ATHENIAN OIL LAW

EXTRACTS FROM THE LAWS OF HADRIAN

§ 1. Oil producers shall deliver one-third or, if owners of the Hipparchus estates sold by the fiscus, one-eighth, for only the latter estates have this advantage. They shall make delivery in installments at the beginning of the harvest, in proportion to the amount being har-

vested, and they shall [give it] to the *elaionai* who look out for the [public requirements]. They shall file with [the *elaionai* and] the herald (of the Council and Demos) [a declaration as to the amount and character] of the harvest and hand over two [copies] and get [one copy back] with an endorsement. The declaration shall be made under oath and shall contain a statement as to how much was harvested altogether and through the slave so-and-so or the freedman so-and-so and whether the owner of the estate or the producer or the oil-jobber is to sell the crop.

§ 2. The exporter shall file with the same officials a declaration stating how much he is offering for sale and to whom and where the ship is anchored. Whoever has [sold] for export without having filed a declaration, even if he has delivered to the city what he owed her, shall suffer confiscation of the stock he has agreed to sell.

§ 3. Whoever has made false declarations either concerning what was harvested or what was being exported or the estate, i. e. if anyone has bought from the fiscus property other than that of Hipparchus and has delivered only one-eighth, he shall suffer confiscation of the stock and the informant shall receive one half.

§ 4. —— export of undeclared —— the — himself or whoever —— shall —— and he shall keep half the purchase money, if he has not yet handed it over, or shall receive half the purchase money; the other half of the purchase money shall be confiscated.

§ 5. Also the shipper shall declare that he is exporting and how much from each source. And if he is caught sailing off without having filed a declaration, he shall suffer confiscation of the oil; and if he has already sailed and is then informed against, a suit shall be filed with his city of origin and with me by the Demos (of the Athenians).

§ 6. The Council alone shall judge the cases concerning these matters up to the amount of fifty amphorae, and above this amount together with the Demos. If the informer is one of the crew, the (hoplite) general must convoke a meeting of the Council on the morrow, or a meeting of the Assembly if the case brought by the informer is for more than fifty amphorae. And half shall be given to the informer if he proves the charge.

§ 7. If anyone demands trial either in my court or in that of the proconsul, the Demos (of the Athenians) shall elect syndics.

§ 8. In order that the penalties against transgressors be strictly imposed, the oil shall be delivered to the public treasury at the local market price. If from an abundance of oil at any time the amounts of one-third and one-eighth being deposited are in excess of the public requirements for the whole year, it shall be permitted as follows to those who have not as yet delivered either all or part of their oil. First they shall make out a second declaration stating, in respect to a public share owed at that time, how much it is that the *elaionai* and

the argyrotamiae do not want to accept from them, which, on the one hand, they owe ---.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

1. The oil law is Athenian law and not Roman law. Hadrian gave the laws as an Athenian *nomothetēs*, not as the representative of the Roman state. The oil law covers a situation peculiar to Attica, and any case arising out of illegal sale or export of Attic oil would have to be tried, it seems to me, by Athenian law, whether in a Roman or in an Athenian court.

2. The emperor could never separate completely his private from his public life and property. In this case he may not even have tried. But even if the Athenian law code had theoretically no binding force on the pro-consul of Achaia, the latter would have been very much influenced by the prestige of the imperial *nomothetēs*. The validity of Athenian law in cases arising out of interpretation of Athenian law was very much strengthened by Hadrian's revision, and that is partly why the Athenians had wished to enlist the aid of Hadrian.

3. The Hadrianic revision of the Athenian and other municipal codes left the codes largely as they were except for clarifications and a few modifications. The modifications, however, were partly perhaps forced upon the city by experience in Roman courts where the deficiencies of the local code had been highlighted by Roman criticism. In order to help the cities in such articles the imperial *nomothetēs* presumably made changes describable as Romanization. F. De Visscher made no mention of these revisions by Hadrian, but in *L'antiquité classique* 14: 58, 1945, he advanced the thesis that in the relationship between Roman law and local peregrine systems of law the real evolution lay, not in a provincialization of Roman law, but in a Romanization or progressive penetration of Roman elements into the local peregrine systems of law. While the Hadrianic code of Athens seemed to Greeks, and really was, genuine Athenian law, it would have seemed a kind of Roman law to Roman officials and might have supported the local peregrine law in cities where a Roman emperor had not revised the code.

But Athens is not the only city where Hadrian established the law code. At Megara each of the tribes honored the emperor as lawgiver.⁵ There can be no question that the Megarians meant their own laws and not the provincial edict, because they called Hadrian τὸν ἑαυτῶν κτίστην καὶ νομοθέτην καὶ τροφέα.

There are indications that Hadrian legislated for other Greek cities. A survey of the evidence may be found in B. d'Orgeval's study, *L'empereur Hadrien: Œuvre législative et administrative*, Book II, Ch. I "Administrative Law," Paris, Domat Montchrestien, 1950. For our subject what d'Orgeval (p. 245) says about the Panhellenion founded by Hadrian is most interesting:

Si nous connaissons mieux l'histoire du droit de chaque cité grecque, nous trouverions, il est possible, dans cette union une tentative d'unification d'un droit, en grande partie déjà commun. Ceux qui estiment que Gaius est un écrivain de l'Orient ont notés certaines influences du droit athénien; il y a peut-être là une extension de ce droit à d'autres villes, surtout après sa réforme par Hadrien lui-même.

VII. COMMON LAWS FOR ALL

PART II: ROMAN DECLARATIONS PROTECTING GREEK ENDOWMENTS

It is the belief of the writer that the history and background of the Roman declarations protecting Greek endowments throw a valuable light on the character of the Roman Administrative Law in that they show Rome providing an international or supranational law of a kind once provided as an accommodation by the Pylaeo-Delphic Amphictyony. In other words they show Rome functioning as a kind of league government. The ancient endowments have, of course, been the subject of a study by B. Laum, *Stiftungen in der griechischen und römischen Antike. Ein Beitrag zur antiken Kulturgeschichte*, 1-2, Leipzig-Berlin, 1914, but neither Laum nor anyone else has traced the diplomatic character of the Roman declaration to its source. Consequently, Laum has not correctly analyzed its purpose. Since, however, the purpose has yet to be proved, we shall first examine each declaration individually.

CASE I: EPHESUS

In its entirety the pertinent inscription may be consulted in the three following editions: R. Heberdey, *Forschungen in Ephesos* 2: 127-147, No. 27 with drawing, and pp. 188-198, 1912; F. H. Marshall, *The Collection of Ancient Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum* 4: 238-250, 1916; J. H. Oliver, *The Sacred Gerusia*, no. 3 (*Hesperia, Suppl.* 6) 1941, where the index of Greek words may be useful. Extracts inadequate for our purpose are given by Laum, No. 74.

The endowment was left to Artemis for the use of the Ephesian corporations by an Ephesian C. Vibius Salutaris who was also a Roman citizen of the equestrian order. Ephesus was a Greek city, without *libertas*, without the *ius Italicum*. The steps are recorded in the inscription lines 73-83 in the motivating section of the decree of the Ephesian Council and Demos:

περὶ [ῶν] ἀπάντων διάταξιν εἰσηγ[ησάμε]
[νος ιδ] [λα] ἥξ[ι] ωσεν ἐπὶ[κν] ρωθῆναι καὶ διὰ ψηφίσμα[τος τῆς]
[πόλεως καὶ δι' ἐπιστολῶν τῶν] τῆς ἐπα[ρχ]είας [ἥγεμο]
[νευόντων] νῦν δὲ δημῶν σωτῆρι καὶ εὐεργέ[τ]ης Ἀκο[ν]ιλλι
[ος Πρόκλος δὲ ἀνθύπατο]ς καὶ Ἀφράνιο[ς] Φλαονι
[νὸς δὲ πρεσβευτής καὶ ἀντ]ιστράτηγο[ς, ἀν]υπερβλήτη
[τὴν φιλανθρωπία καὶ] φιλοστοργία[ς] ἐ[πιγι]όντες τὴν
τοῦ ἀνδρὸ[ς μεγαλοψ]υχίας, ὡς γνή[σιοι] πολεῖται <ἢ>
μῶν αὐτοῖς, κα[θ] δὲ ἀνημεῖ] ψωτὸ αὐτῷ[ι καὶ δι' ἐπιστολῶν

⁵ IG VII 70-72.

[συ]νηδόμενο[ι ἀντέ]γραψαν, ἐ[πεκέλ]ευσαν, ὥστε δι[άταξι]ν εἰσενε[ν κείν π]ερὶ τῶν [καθιερώσε]ων αὐτο[ῦ].¹

Concerning all [these] things having [privately] proposed a permanent settlement (=deed of gift), (Vibius Salutaris) asked that it be ratified also by decree [of the city and by epistles of] the provincial [authorities. Our savior] and benefactor² Aquilius [Proculus the proconsul] and Afranius Flavianus [the legatus] pro praetore have [now] acknowledged with supreme [courtesy and] affection the man's magnanimity; and in the return they made to him and in the letters of congratulation which they sent to us, they themselves, as genuine fellow-citizens of ours,³ encouraged us to propose as a bill a permanent settlement concerning his dedications.

A diataxis⁴ is a perhaps even annual allocation of public funds or a permanent arrangement (by testament or deed of gift) for the use or ownership of what has hitherto been private property.

The course of events appears to have been as follows: Vibius Salutaris conceived the desire to establish an endowment which would increase the splendor and attractiveness of the great festival of Artemis and would forever keep his own memory alive. Many valuable statuettes and large sums were involved. He may have feared trouble also from the Roman law of inheritance and from the uncertain attitude of his heirs who like himself would have been Roman citizens; but obviously the chief danger lay in the light-heartedness with which many a Greek polis shifted the financial burden of city government to the treasury of a sanctuary located within the territory of the polis. In some years it was impossible to find candidates to undertake voluntarily the expensive liturgy of public office; and in the absence of a city treasury there were frequent crises and the local governments frequently diverted funds earmarked for another purpose. Therefore, Vibius Salutaris knew that even the consecration to Artemis would never guarantee the permanency of his arrangements, and he asked that the Council and Demos of the Ephesians insure the inviolability of his endowment by a public decree forbidding with heavy sanctions any diversion or any attempt at diversion on any pretext. Above all, he asked that the provincial authorities guarantee the security of the endowment. It was a favor justified by the size and purpose of the endowment, but a great and unusual favor all the same. Neither the Roman authorities nor the Ephesians, to whom it was of special importance that the endowment be adequately protected, regarded the declarations as a curtailment of Ephesian liberties;

¹ In line 80 the crossbar of the final eta was never cut. In lines 82-83 Heberdey restored δι' | [αὐτῶ]ν. In lines 74-76, Heberdey διὰ ψηφίσμα[τος τῆς | βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου, καὶ νῦ]ν τῆς ἐπαρχ[είας [ἡγεμονεύοντες δὲ κράτιστος ἀν]ήρ, κτλ.

² A. D. Nock, "Soter and Euergetes," *The Joy of Study: Papers on New Testament and Related Subjects Presented to Honor Frederick Clifton Grant*, 127-158, N. Y., Macmillan, 1951.

³ A reference to honorary citizenship.

⁴ For the diataxis in the financial administration of Greek cities see J. and L. Robert, *Hellenica* 9: 14-18, 1950. They have an example of an annual diataxis.

the proconsul and his legate made their acceptance contingent upon approval and acceptance by the Ephesian Council and Demos. The proconsul insisted on precise drafting of the diataxis with careful specifications concerning the endowment, the terms, and the executors or administrators. Vibius Salutaris drew up the precise and detailed diataxis on which the proconsul had insisted, and he presented it to the authorities of Ephesus. The diataxis was introduced as a bill and formally accepted by decree of the Council and Demos.

The inscription, which is in a poor state of preservation, once contained the decree of the Council and Demos, the diataxis itself, and the epistles of both the proconsul and the legate to the magistrates, Council and Demos of the Ephesians. Many fragments of these documents are preserved, and there is so much repetition⁵ that the text can often be reconstructed in areas where only a few letters are still extant. As a parallel to the prefect's *apophasis* at Eleusis the most interesting part of the proconsul's epistle is that where he prohibits alteration of the arrangements:

οὐδέποτε βούλομαι νῦν τρόπῳ οὐδενὶ οὔτε παρενέσει οὐδὲ μεταβολὴν ηπαραλλάξαι τι τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ διατεταγμένων· εἰ δέ τις ἐπί τις χειρίσει ηλύσας ηπαραλλάξαι τι τῶν φύνεμαν διὰ τοῦτον τῷ οὐ ψηφίσματος κυρωθησομένων· εἰσηγηθαί τι τοιοῦτον πειράσει, ὑποκείσθω εἰς προσόν· οὐσμησιν τῆς κυρίας Ἀρτέμιδος δημόσιον δημόσιον μυρίοις εκαὶ εἰς τὸν ιερόν· ὡρατοῖς φίσκον ἀλλοιούς δημόσιον πεντακισχιλίοις καὶ οὐδὲν ἔλαττον έστω ἄκυρον οὐπαν τὸ παρὰ τὴν καθιέρωσιν. 365

These terms are repeated, with a reference to the letters, both in the deed of gift and in the decree. For the tone and prolixity of both epistles the much better preserved epistle of the legate will suffice (lines 372-413):

Afranius Flavianus legatus pro praetore to the archons, [Council, Demos] of the Ephesians. Greetings.

Even if it has escaped the notice of the majority how much [good will] and devotion he has for [us,⁶ it has been demonstrated] in many instances that Vibius Salutaris, [my] very dear friend, in whom we have a very [important] man because of his influence⁷ and a man of excellent character [besides], has shown himself from his attitude toward us a friend to be numbered among our closest and most indispensable. But now he has made clear [to all] the [magnificent] affection which he has had for the city from the beginning, for he considers it a thing belonging and becoming⁸ to his own life and character that he contribute to the beauty and [majesty] of both the religious and the profane functions of [our city], the [greatest] and [most] distinguished, and he now in a noble display of public spirit has presented gifts and dedicated funds in honor of, and devotion to, the most mighty [goddess] Artemis and the

⁵ See J. H. Oliver, *The Sacred Gerusia*, Index of Greek Words.

⁶ The pronoun is that of the first rather than second person. Having once accepted an honorary grant of Ephesian citizenship, the legate addresses the Ephesians as his fellow citizens.

⁷ *Auctoritas* or *gratia* rather than *dignitas* would render this use of the Greek word *ἀξίωμα*. Heberdey's adjective *εὐγενέστατος* seems wrong.

⁸ Compare the contrasting phrase in Roman Oration 80.

imperial family. Therefore, I [congratulate] both you because of the man [and him] equally because of you on testifying in reciprocation and on expressing appreciation and on rewarding him in your own behalf with suitable commendation. These acts, I think, are due from you in order that people with a like zeal may be more numerous, when this man is seen to meet with a fitting return. And it would be especially gratifying and pleasing to me, if I should see that the person whom of all my friends I particularly esteem and love,⁹ was among you deemed worthy of recognition and privilege.

Concerning the bequest of the money and the goddess' typestatues and of the images, how it will be necessary to use them and what man will have to be assigned to each transaction,¹⁰ I think that it is reasonable that the donor himself propose and that you so decree. But when the articles are ratified both by the donor himself and by you, I want them to remain forever in the same terms without any subrogation, and I do not want them to be abrogated or changed through derogation by any one on any pretext. If anyone should attempt to advise such a thing or to make a motion concerning a change or new application of the arrangements ratified by the donor and you, I want him to pay immediately a fine of twenty-five thousand denarii to the sanctuary of the most mighty goddess Artemis, and to the fiscus of our lord Caesar . . . [twenty-five] thousand denarii [more], as [Aquillius Proculus the most illustrious] proconsul [sanctioned and stipulated the fine previously] in the letter [through which he replied to you]. Farewell.

CASE II: GYTHION

The Roman declaration supporting the endowment of Claudius Atticus to the Gytheates appears in an inscription *IG*, V (1), 1147, which Laum overlooked:

[— - - - -] ω I[— - - - -]
[— - - - -] ναι κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν κατ[-]
[— - - - -] Τινήιος Σακέρωτι τῷ κρατίστῳ
[ἀνθυπάτῳ, ἵνα — - - -]αι τὰ περὶ αὐτῶν> μοι δύ⁵
[χθέντα. ἐπρέσβενεν δεῖνα] Ἐνιόχου, φ τὸ ἐφόδιον
[δοθήτω, εἴ γε μὴ προΐκα ὑπέσχ]ετο τὴν πρεσβείαν
[ὑπολαμβάνειν. Εὐτυχεῖτε.]

[— - - - - Τινήιος Σακέρωτος ἀνθύπατος Γυθεατῶν
[τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δῆμῳ χαίρειν]. συνηδόμαι ὑμεῖν
[προθύμως, ὅτι ἡ ἐπιστολὴ τοῦ μεγίστου αὐτοκράτορος Τραϊανοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ Σεβαστοῦ ἐκέλευσεν τὰ
[χρήματα καὶ — — τῆς πόλεως] σύμῶν ἀσφαλίσασθαι
[καὶ τὸ δῶρον, δ Τιβ. Κλαύδιος Ἀ]ττικὸς <δ> λαμπρότατος
[ὑπατικὸς — — — εὐεργέτηκε]ν τὴν πόλιν ὑμῶν.
[Πλέμπω δὲ ὑμῖν μετὰ τοῦ γράμματος διάταγμα καὶ καὶ
[— — — — — , διτὶ τὴν γνώμην ὑμῶν ἀπεδεξάμην
[— — — — — ἐρρώσθαι ὑμᾶς] βούλομαι.

10

15

[— - - - - Τινήιος Σακέρωτος ἀνθύπατος] λέγει· τοῦ θεοτάτου
[ἡμῶν αὐτοκράτορος Τραϊανοῦ] Ἀδριανοῦ Σεβαστοῦ τὰ
[χρήματα ἀσφαλίσεσθαι κελεύοντος καὶ τοῦ δώρο<ν> καὶ
[— — — — — δ Τιβ. Κλαύδιος Ἀ]ττικὸς διάταξιν αὐτοῦ κελεύσαντος
[— — — — — — — διατάξῃ]ν αὐτοῦ διατάγματι δηλώσω
[— — — — — — — δ] πως τοὺς κακουργεῖν αὐτὸν βούλομένους — — — — —]

20

⁹ Cicero, *De re pub.* II 1, 1: "quem ut scitis unice dilexi maximeque sum admiratus."

¹⁰ For the construction in line 397 see Ad. Wilhelm, *Nachrichten Gesell. Wiss. Göttingen*, Phil.-hist. Kl. 3: 136-138, 1938-1939.

Tib. Claudius Atticus, who was a Roman senator and an Athenian, had offered an endowment to the Gytheates, who constituted a city belonging to the Eleutherolacones,¹¹ a free league without the *ius Italicum*. The Gytheates sent an embassy to the emperor himself and requested for the projected endowment the protection of Rome in the form of a special declaration. Why to the emperor? The central government had to struggle with a tendency of the provincials to go over the heads of competent officials, but there is nothing in the inscription to warrant an assumption that the Gytheates had slighted the senatorial proconsul of Achaia. They had addressed themselves to the emperor presumably because of their membership in a free league. The emperor replied favorably, saying among other things that he would communicate with the proconsul.

The implication is that the Gytheates were receiving an extraordinary favor from the emperor in the step Hadrian had just taken in their behalf. The proconsul¹² congratulates the Gytheates and mentions his edict supporting (*ἀπεδεξάμην*) their own decree, in a letter wherein he carefully refers to the emperor's order or request as the motivation for this action on his part. In line 18 the word *λέγει* reveals that the edict (*δάταγμα*) just mentioned constitutes the next document of the engraved dossier. This document, in which the proconsul again refers to the emperor's authorization, once contained presumably a declaration of the proconsul similar to the prefect's apophysis preserved at Eleusis and to the declarations of the proconsul and legate of Asia, that whoever violated the terms of the endowment or tried to do so, would be liable to such and such a penalty.

CASE III: RHODIAPOLIS

[Laum, No. 143]. The complete inscription may be consulted in *IGR* III 739 and in *TAM* II 905. From the latter, much the better text, we cite the section V E:

[Ἐ]πὶ ἀρχιερέο[ς Κλαυδίου Μαρκιανοῦ]
[. Σου]φή[να Οὐ]ηρ[ος 'Α]πο[λλωνίω?] 60
Λυ[κ]ιάρχη χαίρειν. Ὁπραμόαν Ἀπολ[λω]
νίου δις τοῦ Καλλιάδον καὶ αὐτὸς ἀ[πο]δέχομαι ἐπὶ τῇ φιλοτειμίᾳ, ἦν πρὸς τὸ λα[μπρο]τατον ἔθνος ὑμῶν ἐπεδείξατο, δω
ρησάμενος αὐτῷ δηνάρια πεντάκις μύ

¹¹ For the early history and territory of the League see K. M. T. Chrimes, *Ancient Sparta*, 435-441, Manchester Univ. Press, 1949.

¹² W. Kolbe in *IG* V proposed to identify the proconsul with Tib. Claudius Sacerdos Julianus who was consul in A. D. 100 and therefore too early. P. Graudor, *Un milliardaire antique, Hérode Atticus et sa famille* (Cairo, Université Egyptienne, Recueil de travaux publiés par la Faculté des Lettres 5) 35, 1930, proposed the name of A. Tineius Sacerdos Clemens cos. A. D. 158. E. Groag, *Achaia* I 63, 1939 retained the gentilicium *Tineios* as a restoration but placed a question mark after it. If correctly restored, the gentilicium *Tineius* would exclude the proconsuls of the first three years, and probably of three of the last four years, of the reign of Hadrian.

μια πρὸς οὓς πέρυσι ὑπέσχητο εἰς τὴν κα-
ταλλαγὴν τοῦ νομίσματος δημαρίου
πεντάκις χειλίους. Τὴν οὖν προδηλούμε-
νην αὐτοῦ δωρεὰν βεβαιῶ ἐπὶ τε τῷ ἀσάλευ-
τον καὶ ἀμετάθετον εἰς τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον εἴ-
ναι καὶ ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀλλαῖς αἱρέσεσιν, αἷς ἐπην-
γῆ [ε]ἰλατο. Ἐρῶσθαι σε εὑχομαι. Ἐδόθη
πρὸ [. . .] εἰδὼν Ὁκτωνβρίων.

65

70

[Su]fe[na V]er[us to] Lyciarch [A]po[llonius?] greetings.
I too command Opramoas son of Apollonius, grandson of Apollonius, great-grandson of Calliades, for the noble ambition which he displayed toward your glorious ethos in presenting it with a gift of 50,000 denarii in addition to the 5,000 denarii which he last year promised toward the currency exchange. I therefore render inviolable the gift of his which is now being published, that it be forever forbidden to endanger or alter the sum and that the gift be subject to the other rules which he chose and announced in his *pollicitio*. Farewell.

Given on the [—] day before the Ides of October.

The Lycian millionaire Opramoas, who did not possess Roman citizenship, has promised an endowment to the Lycian *koinon*, which through its Lyciarch requested a declaration of special protection for the endowment from an imperial legate who between A. D. 124 and 131 governed Lycia and Pamphylia. Since the legate does not mention the emperor, it is clear that the request had gone directly to the legate, who accorded the protection on his own authority.

CASE IV: TRALLES

L. Robert, *Études anatoliennes (Études orientales publiées par l'Institut Français d'Archéologie de Stam-boul 5)* 423 f., Paris, de Boccard, 1937.

[Ἡ πόλις]
[καὶ τὰ ψηφισθέντα]
καὶ ἐπικυρω[θέντα ν]
πὸ θεοῦ Ἀντω[νίου]
ἐκ τῶν Κλαυδίανον Δα]
μᾶ χρημάτων, κτλ.

5

CASE V: ELEUSIS

A Roman declaration in support of an endowment constitutes lines 33-42 of an inscription recently re-edited by the writer,¹³ who argues that the endowment had been established around A. D. 135-140. The inscription itself was erected later, on an occasion when a surplus had accrued and arrangements had been made for the use of this and any future surplus. The ultimate authority rested with the hierophant and daduchus, to whom the safety and protection of the endowment had been entrusted, ὅπ[ως καὶ ἔ]πεικύρωστον οὐν ἡ ἀπό] φ[α]σις ἔξηγεθη πρὸς τὴν ἀπάντων [ν γνώσιν name]. Then the following declaration is cited to establish the authority of the hierophant and daduchus:

¹³ The Eleusinian endowment, *Hesperia* 21: 381-399, 1952.

Ἐπόφασις ἐπάρχ[ου]
Σεβῆρος (εἶπεν). τὴν μὲν φιλοτεμ[λαν ἀποδέχομαι]
καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν πρὸς τοὺς [σ] θεοὺς ἐ[πεδίζατο]. εἰ δέ τις]
παρακεινήσαται τι τολμ[η]σειεν τ[ῶν καθιερωθ]έντω[ν, ἐκ]
δικηγόρεται τῷ ταμ[ει]ψ διπλῆ [δο]ράν ἡ ἄξια π[αρὰ τοῦ τοῦ]
το τολμήσατος ὡς [ἔφ' ι]ερονυλ[αι ἐπιτεμιον] γιγνομένου.
προνοήσονται δὲ το[ῦ δ]λον μάλισ[τα δε τε λειφ]άντης καὶ δ
δαδοῦχος πρὸς τὸ [μῆ σα]λευθῆ[ραι ποτε τοῦ] το τὸ κεφά
λαιον μήτε τὴν ποστήτη τῶν [καθιερωμένη]ων δημαρίω (ἐνι)
μειωθῆναι, φανεροῦ δ[η]ν τοι, μ[ηδέν αὐτοῖς] εστιν ἀκίν
δυνον ἔαν τι περιίδωσ[τι] τούτων παρακεινο]ύμενον.

35

40

THE PREFECT'S DECLARATION

Severus said: "I too approve the act of generosity which he displayed in respect to the gods. If anyone should dare to misapply any of the consecrated moneys, property of twice the value shall be vindicated to the fiscus from the person who so dared, a penalty being levied as for sacrilegium. It is especially understood that the hierophant and the daduchus shall have complete charge in order that this capital investment be never endangered and in order that the amount of the consecrated interest be never reduced by a single denarius. For it is clear that it is not at all safe for them if they overlook any misapplication of the funds."

Since the Eleusinian endowment is described as *θεοῖς καθιερωμένα* and as a *φιλοτιμία πρὸς τοὺς θεούς*, since surplus revenue is to be expended on incense burners for the sanctuary, and since alienation will be considered *sacrilegium* rather than *peculatus*, the recipient of the endowment, from a Roman standpoint, must have been the Eleusinian sanctuary rather than the city of Athens, to whose territory the sanctuary belonged. The masculine plural in the prefect's description of the benefaction as one *πρὸς τοὺς θεούς* does not exclude this interpretation, for the prefect was generalizing.¹⁴ The new owners of the investment are conceived as Demeter and Kore.¹⁵

By comparison with Case I it is possible to determine the exact meaning of the word "consecrated." It is the donor who consecrates, in the diataxis or deed of gift, and what he consecrates is concrete and not abstract. In this case he consecrates money, and he does so by earmarking for a religious purpose the interest on an investment.

The question must now be asked what sort of a prefect would have given protection to an endowment supporting a cult within the territory of the free city of Athens. Foucart¹⁶ identified the prefect as the Roman governor, but the proconsul of Achaia, presumably the official to whom Foucart referred, is never called an

¹⁴ So often Xenophon who used the expressions δ θεός, οι θεοί, τὸ θεῖον as exactly synonymous (cf. R. Walzer, *Annali Pisa Ser. II, 5: 27*, 1936).

¹⁵ V. Scialoja, *Teoria della proprietà nel diritto romano* 1: 144, Rome, Anonima romana editoriale, 1933, concludes "la pertinenza delle cose sacre non è da riferire ne ad alcun uomo, il che sarebbe assurdo, ne al popolo romano, come complesso di uomini, ma senz' altro alla divinità." P. Foucart, *Les Mystères d'Éleusis*, 222, Paris, Picard, 1914, spoke of an "acte de donation fait au temple d'Éleusis," though he mistakenly believed that the inscription contained the very deed of gift.

¹⁶ P. Foucart, *Les Mystères d'Éleusis*, 222, "la décision du gouverneur romain qui la confermait."

επαρχος, especially not in an official document. Occasionally Achaia was governed by an imperial legate, but again the legate is never called an *επαρχος*. Nor is there any reason to see in the prefect either a delegate of the governor of Achaia or some temporary Roman governor of an area comprising or including the free city of Athens. The cultural and propagandistic importance of the free city of Athens and the absence of need for special military protection exclude the possibility of a temporary and unattested military government of Attica. The affairs of the most important city in Greece would, if they were in his province, be handled by the proconsul himself rather than shovved off on a delegate; but they were not in his province, and even the delegate of the proconsul would be a legate and not a prefect. The emperor was in the habit of delegating much of his business to a pretorian prefect, but the name of Severus sufficiently excludes the pretorian prefects of this period.¹⁷ Of course *praefecti alimentorum* and other prefects occasionally rendered decisions for the emperor, but they were appointed where there was some dispute to be settled. There is no dispute here, and the absence of the customary reference to special delegation by the emperor makes it hard to visualize the prefect as a *iudex vice imperatoris*. Laum proposed to call him a *praefectus aerarii*. Laum's reason, namely because the prefect specified the imperial fiscus as the recipient of the penalty in cash,¹⁸ has no validity whatsoever, but two very slight pieces of evidence do point toward that office. C. Julius Severus, a senator who came from a Greek province, ca. A. D. 137 held the post of *praefectus aerarii* after being proconsul of Achaia and imperial commissioner in Bithynia.¹⁹ The date of the term of C. Julius Severus would satisfy the conditions for the inscription at Eleusis, and ties with an ex-governor of Achaia, considered a Greek himself, might have induced the Athenians to prefer him even to the emperor. Moreover, just for this time there is evidence that the *praefecti aerarii* in connection with public property had far reaching judicial duties.²⁰ But the evidence cannot be used to establish any probability that the protection of Greek endowments devolved upon a *praefectus aerarii* as such.

Perhaps the unexplained influence of a Roman *επαρχος* at another famous sanctuary belonging to a free city should here be mentioned, because there may be some connection which is not yet apparent. The edict of Vespasian published by R. Herzog, "Urkunden zur Hochschulpolitik der römischen Kaiser," *Sitzungsber. d.*

¹⁷ L. Passerini, *Le Coorti Pretorie (Studi Pubblicati dal R. Istituto Italiano per la Storia Antica 1)* 291-310, 1939.

¹⁸ *Stiftungen*, 1: 220.

¹⁹ For the date see W. Hüttl, *Antoninus Pius 2*: 51 and 89, Prague, Calve, 1933; E. Groag, *Die römischen Reichsbeamten von Achaia bis auf Diokletian* (Akad. d. Wiss. in Wien, *Schriften der Balkankommission, Antiquarische Abt.* 9) 67, 1939.

²⁰ Th. Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht*, 2nd ed., 2 (2) : 1023, note 4, 1887; O. Hirschfeld, *Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten bis auf Diokletian*, 2nd ed., 49, Berlin, Weidmann, 1905.

Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl. 971, 1935 (= *AE* 1936, No. 128) mentions penalties for violating privileges granted to teachers at the Asclepieum of Pergamum, *τὸ ἐπιτίμιον δὲ ἀν [τάξηι δέ τε κατασταθεὶς επαρχος.*

The evidence of the preceding and following cases shows that a Roman declaration protecting Greek endowments could emanate from one of three sources, namely (1) the emperor(s), (2) the governor of the province in or near which the state was located, (3) the *logistēs* (= *curator civitatis*) assigned by the emperor as a special commissioner to straighten out the financial affairs of a city. There may have been other, as yet unattested, authorities competent to issue a declaration of this sort, but the writer does not expect that another issuing authority will ever be attested. If, then, we already know the possibilities, Severus would have to be a kind of *logistēs*, because he is neither an emperor nor a governor, nor an emperor's or governor's delegate in the usual sense. Does this prove that we do not yet know all the possibilities, or is it possible that despite the title "prefect" Severus can have been a kind of *logistēs*?

Assuming that we know the declaration to have been issued around A. D. 135 or 140 by someone prominent in the imperial service, the writer will offer the following conjectural reconstruction of the occasion. The theory supposes a connection, which cannot be proved independently, between events which are known.

Sometime between 135 and 140 and probably while Hadrian was still alive, the Athenians suffered a disaster in the death of their generous benefactor, the multimillionaire and Roman senator of consular rank, Tiberius Claudius Atticus of the Marathonian deme. For his son, also a Roman senator of course, refused to carry out his father's wishes. Instead of distributing the unprecedented funds which had been promised to them and upon which they had counted, the son Herodes Atticus took advantage of the loophole provided by Roman Law and converted the Athenians from beneficiaries into debtors.²¹ It is likely—and indeed there is some evidence to support the view²²—that the Athenians, before the death of Claudius Atticus, had been using revenues from a source placed at their disposal by Atticus and now withdrawn by his son Herodes. In addition to the well attested fact that the Athenians were in dire financial straits upon the death of Atticus there is the fact that the system of financing the Athenian government had to be reorganized at this time. The Athenian system of tribal patrons called *eponymoi*, which obtained at least until the reign of Severus Alexander, is first attested in the third prytany of A. D. 138/9.²³ It is the suggestion of the writer that the reorganization of Athenian finances was carried out with help from the Roman government,

²¹ Philostratus, *Lives of the Sophists 2*: 549. See P. Graudor, *Un milliardaire antique: Hérode Atticus et sa famille*, (Cairo, Université Égyptienne, *Recueil de travaux publiés par la Faculté des Lettres 5*) 35-37, 71-79, 1930.

²² *AJP* 70: 299-303, 1949.

²³ *Ibid.*, 303-308.

and that the presence of a Roman commissioner in Attica around A. D. 137 accounts for the declaration by which the Athenians were assured the continued enjoyment of another endowment given to them by a Roman senator.

The Galatian aristocrat C. Julius Severus served as proconsul of Achaia probably in A. D. 133/4 and as corrector and *logistēs* in Bithynia probably from A. D. 134 to 136. These are the dates computed by Hüttl²⁴ to whose opinion Groag²⁵ eventually rallied. He next served as *praefectus aerarii* before becoming, probably in 139, consul. The writer suggests that when the crisis broke at Athens, the financial expert, C. Julius Severus, who had just spent many months and even years reorganizing the finances of Greek cities, had been designated as *praefectus aerarii* but was still in the East. Both as an expert in municipal finances and as a recent governor of Achaia, he was so obviously the right man for the assignment that Hadrian, the writer suggests, asked Severus to break the trip at Athens long enough to perform one more task of a corrector and *logistēs*. The Athenians then quite properly call him by his new title. Of course the importance of Athens required a commissioner of higher rank than the ordinary equestrian *logistēs*, and Athens got the best.

The procedure in the Eleusinian case may be summarized as follows. A Roman senator from Crete appears to have established an endowment sufficient to produce, once every year, 6,000 Attic drachmae (=one talent), for distribution to Athenian councillors (members of the Council of the Five Hundred) at the Mysteries. Some person or persons other than the donor—the writer thinks of the herald or Council of the Areopagus—asked the Roman government to declare the endowment *res divini iuris* in Roman Law and to protect it. The petition was addressed to the *praefectus [aerarii?]*, who making the administrative decision on his own authority without reference to the emperor, issued the desired declaration but added the specification that the hierophant and the daduchus, as the persons chiefly interested in its preservation, were to have the full and sole control of the endowment. As a penalty for an attempt at diversion of the funds the prefect specified the *poena dupli*, all of it to go to the fiscus.

The last two specifications concerning details have their analogies in the inscription recording the endowments of Vibius Salutaris at Ephesus, where the proconsul of Asia specified the *poena dupli*, of which half was to go to the Artemision and half to the fiscus, and where the importance of a clear statement as to the administrators is emphasized. The legate, Afranius Flavianus, while he does not name the officials who shall receive the money from Vibius Salutaris, insists that the donor specify what man shall administer the fund (*εἰς τὴν τίγα οἰκονομίαν ἄνδρα τετάχθαι*).²⁶ A similar passage

now lost doubtless stood in the letter of the proconsul after line 354. Vibius Salutaris thereupon did specify²⁷ the treasurer of the Council, the treasurer of the Gerusia, the secretary of the Demos.

There were two reasons why the prefect would have selected the hierophant and the daduchus. In the first place, the hierophant and the daduchus, who had diaconal and administrative as well as liturgical duties, traditionally represented the interests of the sanctuary. It is sufficient to recall an article in an Athenian decree of about 418 B. C. concerning the offering of first fruits at Eleusis,²⁸ κελεύέσθαι δὲ ὁ ἱεροφάντες καὶ [ό] δαιδόχος μυστερίοις ἀπάρχεσθαι τὸς Ἕλλενας τὸ καρπὸν καὶ τὰ πάτρια καὶ τὴν μαντείαν τὴν ἐγ Δελφῶν. In the second place, unlike other men of their class they would have derived no personal advantage from a diversion of the funds toward the ordinary expenses of city government, because a man who became hierophant or daduchus was not expected to undertake any other liturgy.²⁹ They may have lost or waived their immunity late in the reign of Commodus, but that is beside the point.

CASE VI: ATTALEIA IN LYDIA

IGR IV 1168; Laum, No. 72.

5

Ἄπὸ ὥρας α' ἔως ε'
τεθήσεται τὸ ἔλε
ον ἐκ προσόδ{ο}ων
περιβόλου τοῦ ἀγο
ρασθέντος παρὰ
Εἰβούλου Ἀντιφά
νους εἰς Βάσσον, Εὐαρέ[σ]
τον Φωκᾶ τὸν ὑόν, καθὼς
καὶ ὁ ἀξιολογώτατος
Ἀσιάρχης καὶ λογισ
τῆς τὸ β' Πολύβιος
ἐντευχθεὶς ἀπεφή
νατο, ὡς ἔαν τις με
ταψηφίσηται ἢ πα
ρεάσῃ, εἰσοίσει τῷ ιε
ρωτάτῳ ταμείῳ
10 *

15

 βφ

From the first to the fifth hour the oil shall be provided out of revenues from the enclosure transferred by sale from Eubulus the son of Antiphanes to Bassus the son of Evaristes Phoca. It shall be provided under the following sanction which Polybius, the most worthy^{29a} Asiarch and *curator* for the second time, stipulated in the *apophasis* for

ἥντινα) οἰκονομίαν ἄνδρα, see A. Wilhelm, *Neue Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde* 6 (Sitzungsber. Wien, 183 [3]), 44-45, No. 43, 1921; *Anzeiger Wien*, 1924: 156, and *Nachr. Götts.* 3 (5) : 136-138, 1939.

The interrogative *τίνα* is attracted to the article. The meaning is *τίνα ἄνδρα εἰς τὴν οἰκονομίαν*;

²⁷ *Loc. cit.*, lines 290 ff.

²⁸ *SIG³* 83 = M. N. Tod, *A selection of Greek historical inscriptions*, 74.

²⁹ W. Dittenberger, *Hermes* 20: 1-40, 1885.

^{29a} A predicate of rank.

²⁴ W. Hüttl, *Antoninus Pius* 2: 51, 89 f., Prague, Calve, 1933.

²⁵ E. Groag, *Achaia* I 66-68.

²⁶ Lines 397-398. On the construction *τὴν τίγα* (not {τ}

which he was petitioned: "If anyone is responsible for a change in the city ordinance or is guilty of a failure to observe the terms, he shall pay 2500 denarii into the imperial fiscus."

Apparently an endowment was set up in support of a gymnasium. The city ratified the diataxis or *pollicitatio*, and then a supplementary ratification was given by the imperial commissioner, from whose *apophasis* only one clause, the deterrent, is here cited.

The amount of the endowment left by Evarestus is not stated, but the penalty, 2,500 denarii, if a *poena dupli* as in Cases I and V, indicates a sum of 1,250 denarii.

This is for us a particularly important case because the interested parties received the protection in an *ἀπόφασις* of an imperial commissioner.³⁰

CASE VII: ANTIOCH

A. Schenk von Stauffenberg, *Die römische Kaisergeschichte bei Malalias*, 248 and 284, Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1931; Laum 2: No. 208 and 1: p. 219:

'Ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς αὐτοῦ βασιλείας οἱ Ἀντιοχεῖς κτήτορες καὶ πολῖται μήνυσιν ποιήσαντες ἐδεήθεσαν τοῦ αὐτοῦ βασιλέως Κομμόδου, ἵνα ἀπὸ θείας αὐτοῦ κελεύσεως προσκυρώσῃ τῷ δημοσίᾳ τὰς προσόδους, ἃς ἔλασεν τῇ τῶν Ἀντιοχέων πόλει Σωσίβιος ὁ προερμένος λόγῳ θεωρῶν πολυτρόπων καὶ διαφόρων ἀγώνων ἐπιτελουμένων τῇ αὐτῇ πόλει, καὶ ἵνα μὴ πορίζωνται τὰς προσόδους οἱ πολιτευόμενοι, ἀλλὰ τὸ δημόσιον καὶ αὐτὸν χορηγεῖ λόγῳ τῶν ἐπιτελουμένων πρὸς τέρψιν τῆς πόλεως Ὄλυμπίων καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν θεωριῶν ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ πόλει τῶν Ἀντιοχέων. καὶ εὐθέως ὁ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς Κόμμαδος διὰ θείας αὐτοῦ κελεύσεως προσεκύρωσε τῷ δημοσίᾳ τὰς προσόδους, θεοπίσας τὰ Ὄλυμπια ἐπιτελεῖσθαι καὶ ἀφορίσας ἐκ τοῦ δημοσίου παρέχεσθαι εἰς λόγον ἀναλωμάτων τῶν ὑπουργούντων τῇ τῶν Ὄλυμπίων ἱερᾷ καὶ κοσμικῇ ἑορτῇ φανερὰ χρήματα, νομοθετήσας κατὰ τετραετή χρόνον ἐπιτελεῖσθαι ἀμέμπτως ἐν ταῖς ἑορταῖς τῶν ἀναθημάτων ἥτοι θυσιῶν τῶν ἐξ ἔθους, κτλ.

During the same reign those with property and citizenship at Antioch brought charges and requested of the same emperor Commodus that by a *sacra iussio* of his own he confirm for the city treasury the revenues which the aforementioned Sosibius had granted to the polis of the Antiochenes so that games of various types and occasions might be continuously celebrated for this city. They asked that the incumbents of public office be not the ones to draw the income, but that the city treasury itself handle the finances of the Olympic and certain other festivals which are celebrated in the city of the Antiochenes to delight the polis. Thereupon the same emperor Commodus confirmed the revenues for the city treasury by a *sacra iussio* of his own. He solemnly ordained that the Olympia be continuously celebrated, and he specified that cash for the expenditures in support of the sacred and oecumenical festival of the Olympia be continuously provided out of the public treasury. He laid it down as a law that the celebration be held every four years and be irreproachable in respect to the traditional dedications or sacrifices.

³⁰ The emphasis which E. Ziebarth, *Beiträge zum griechischen Recht*: 1. *Die Stiftung nach griechischem Recht*, *Ztschr. für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft* 16: 307-308, 1903, gave to the commissioner's title of Asiarich, was misplaced. The endowment has nothing to do with the imperial cult.

The request appears to have come from the Council and Demos.

Clearly the administrative decision to give the endowment special protection was taken by the emperor (i. e. his *consilium*), although Commodus after his accession never apparently visited Syria. It is equally clear that unless Malalias misrepresented the situation, the emperor himself, not the legate of Syria, issued an order protecting the endowment. The declaration went to the Antiochenes, according to Malalias, as a rescript from the emperor.³¹

This case concerning the endowment set up by an Antiochene councillor in the reign of Augustus helps us perhaps more than any other to understand the situation which made the intervention of Rome particularly desirable to the citizens of a Greek polis. For many years the Antiochenes had not had the benefit of the endowment which Sosibius had left to them, because the magistrates had diverted the revenues of the endowment into public expenses which patriotic rich men were traditionally expected to defray out of their own private resources. The diversion, perhaps pardonable in an occasional crisis, was becoming customary.

CASES VIII AND IX: OXYRHYNCHUS

B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 4: No. 705, plus corrections by U. Wilcken, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 3: 311 f., 1906 [Wilcken, *Chrestomathie*, 407]. On lines 32-35 see U. Wilcken, "Zum alexandrinischen Antisemitismus," *Abh. d. Sächs. Ges. d. Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl.*, 27: 781-840, 1909, especially 792-799. On lines 69-74 see V. Martin, *La fiscalité romaine en Égypte aux trois premiers siècles de l'Empire*, 25, Geneva, Georg et Cie, 1926.

It would be too costly to reproduce this important text of 79 lines in its entirety. However, the complete text is available in two easily accessible publications. The declarations are contained in two epistles, each issued jointly by Septimius Severus and Caracalla to Aurelius Horion and each of about the same brevity. They are true epistles: the emperors' names in the nominative, that of Aurelius Horion in the dative, then the greeting *χαίρειν*, then the declaration. Not much remains of the first declaration except the words *ἐπέδο[—]* and *τῷ* *Οξυρυγχειῶν*.

The dossier on the two cases is for us unique in that unlike the other dossiers it preserves the petitions (*ἀξώσεις*) of Aurelius Horion for a declaration of special protection for his two endowments, one endowment to the town of Oxyrhynchus to supply prizes for the ephoric contests, the other to the villages of the Oxyrhynchites for the relief of those who undertook liturgies.

³¹ The term *θεία κέλευσις* (= *sacra iussio*) in the Late Roman Empire was used particularly of the special type of judiciary rescript which developed in the third century, essentially a clarification concerning a point of Roman Law, a ruling in a specific case not yet submitted to a judge (see E. Andt, *La procédure par rescript*, 4 et passim) Thèse, Paris, 1920.

It is clear at least that it was unusual to receive this kind of protection, for Aurelius Horion in his second request resorts to persuasion and appeals to the emperors on the grounds that it may be to their advantage too by helping to forestall losses to the fiscus from neglect of cultivation. The reply concerning the second endowment reads as follows :

Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ Λ[ο]ύκιος [Σ]επτίμιος Σ[επτήμιον] ἡρός
Εὐσέβης[η]ς Περτίναξ Σεβαστὸς Ἀραβικοῦ Ἀδιαβηνοῦ 55
Παρθικοῦ Μεγίστον[τον] καὶ Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ
Μάρκο[s] Αὐρήλιος Ἀντωνίνος Εὐσέβης Σεβαστὸς
Αἰρηλίου Πρείωνι χαίρειν.
ἀποδεχόμεθά σε καὶ ταύτης τῆς ἐπιδόσεως ἦν
ἀξιοῖς ἐπιδοῦναι ταῖς κώμαις τῶν Ὁξυρυγχειῶν 60
ἀποδόδοντας ἀμοιβὴν ἐντκήσεως. τ[ὸ] δοῦλοιον δὴ καὶ
ἐ[πὶ] τούτου φυλαχθῆσται καὶ καθότ[ι ἡ] θέλησας ἀμε
τάστρεπτον εἰς ἔτερόν τι δαπανήσ[εσ]θαι τὴν χάριν.

We commend you also for this endowment which you ask to establish by giving the villages of the Oxyrhynchites purchase money³² for an estate. Under similar penalties it shall be guaranteed in this case too that the benefaction defray the expenses which you have wished and that it be not diverted to any other purpose.

The emperors refer elliptically to a request, I think, not for a license to establish the endowment, but for the Roman protection that would make it practical. The desire to obtain for his endowments the maximum protection led also the donor in this case to apply to the emperors. "The writer of both petitions," said Grenfell and Hunt correctly, "is Aurelius Horion, who had held high offices at Alexandria and was a rich landowner in the Oxyrhynchite nome; his object in both cases was to secure the Imperial guarantee that certain benefactions which he proposed to found in that district would be permanently maintained."³³ Other distinguished students of the document have described the applications of Aurelius Horion as requests for permission to set up endowments,³⁴ as if this were required. Surely there

³² U. Wilcken, *Archiv* 3: 312, 1906, translates "du gabst ihnen Entgelt für Erwerb von Grund und Boden," with reference to Horion's words, *εἰς συνωνήν χ[ωρί]ον*, line 78.

³³ B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 4; to No. 705, 1904.

³⁴ U. Wilcken, who in *Archiv* 3: 311 f., 1906, described the applications in terms similar to those of the first editors, spoke in *Archiv* 4: 217 f., 1908, of a request for Imperial permission and protection, when he reported on Ziebarth's "Die Stiftung nach griechischem Recht." P. Meyer, *Klio* 7: 130-135, 1907, avoids this error. L. Mitteis, *Römisches Privatrecht bis auf die Zeit Diokletians* 1: 416, Leipzig, Duncker & Humblot, 1908, speaks of requests for permission from the Senate or emperor in order to give an endowment a special protection; but he avoids suggesting that the endowment could not have been set up without the protection. On the other hand, B. Laum, *Stiftungen* 1: 219, 1914, "Die nachgesuchte Genehmigung." J. Hasebroek, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Septimius Severus*, 121, Heidelberg, Winter, 1921, "zur Erlangung der Konzession für die Stiftung eines Kapitals." M. I. Rostovtzeff, *Social and economic history of the Roman Empire*, 374, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1926, (= Italian ed., 490), says that Aurelius Horion "asked for permission to establish a special foundation." F. F.

can have been no prohibition of bequests for worthy causes, but protection merely by the public law of Oxyrhynchus seemed inadequate. At the end of the first extant δέκιων Aurelius Horion, who up to now has been arguing that Oxyrhynchites have special claims upon the gratitude of the emperor, expresses in one sentence what he asks : καὶ ἀξιῶ κελεύ[σαι] ὑμᾶς καὶ ταῦτα τὰ χρήματα μηδενὶ ἔξειν[α], εἰς ἄλλο[μηδεν] περιπτάν. The sentence reminds one of the terms in which Malalas relates how Commodus extended the protection to the old endowments of Sosibius at Antioch, διὰ θείας αὐτοῦ κελεύσεως προσεκύρωσε.

Ever since P. Meyer's study³⁵ it has been assumed—correctly, I think—that the petitions and epistles recorded in this papyrus date from the year when Septimius Severus was in Egypt. The visit of the emperor has been dated either in A. D. 200 or in 202, but it now appears that the visit took place in A. D. 200.³⁶

OTHER CASES

And there are other cases where the declaration may be inferred with less certainty. For example it would seem to be the legal basis for the decision of the official who wrote to Aphrodisias the letter in an inscription best studied with the commentary of L. Robert, *Études anatoliennes*, 315 ff., Paris, de Boccard, 1937. Also the endowment of Titus Flavius Praxias at Acmonia would seem to have benefited from a Roman declaration in A. D. 85 to judge from the notation below the decree of acceptance and guarantee. The inscription, though published in *IGR* IV 661, is best studied with V. Chapot's drawing in the *Revue des Études Anciennes* 4: 79, 1902. Chapot's comments about the vertical hastae, which are the first visible traces in line 31, suggest that lines 31 and 32 read

[να]cat Ἐπεκ]υρώθη πρὸ τριῶν Νωνῶν Μαρτίων vacat
[Αὐτοκράτορι Δομι]τιανῷ Καίσαρι Σεβαστῷ Γερμανικῷ τῷ αῖ

The date according to the Roman calendar indicates some connection with Roman affairs, such as the restoration Ἐπεκ]υρώθη provides. In the middle of the decree the extraordinary phrase of lines 12-13, τοῦτο δὲ τὸ ψήφισμα νενομοθετήσθαι τῷ αἰῶνι τῆς Ρωμαίων ἡγεμονίας

Abbott and A. C. Johnson, *Municipal administration in the Roman Empire*, 543, Princeton Univ. Press, 1926, "the consent of the emperors was obtained." O. W. Reinmuth, *The Prefect of Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian* (*Klio*, Beiheft 34) 33, 1935, "for permission to set aside 10,000 Attic drachmas." A. C. Johnson, *Roman Egypt (Economic Survey of Ancient Rome)* 2: 695, Johns Hopkins Press, 1936, "For both foundations the consent of the emperor was necessary." A. H. M. Jones, *The cities of the eastern Roman provinces*, 329, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1937, "for both requests the approval of the emperor was required." The false emphasis, however, does not reappear apud H. MacLennan, *Oxyrhynchus. An economic and social study*, 26, Diss., Princeton, 1935.

³⁵ *Klio* 8: 130-135, 1907.

³⁶ W. L. Westermann, *Bulletin de la Société Royale d'Archéologie d'Alexandrie* 38: 10, 1949.

φυλαχθησόμενον, can then be more easily understood as a reflection of the language in which a Roman governor communicated the protection or was asked to do so.

THE CHIEF DANGER TO THE ENDOWMENTS

Cicero, when governor of Cilicia, found that part of the reason for the financial embarrassment of the Greek towns was the astounding peculations of the local Greek magistrates. Cicero called upon magistrates of the last ten years to make restitution *sine ulla ignominia*, and they did so, openly admitting their peculations.³⁷

The governor's account of the incident reveals less than we should like to know, but it shows clearly that deplorable conditions existed in the city governments where the Demos no longer could hold the magistrates to a strict accounting. At Athens, for example, the ordeal of the magistrates at the expiry of their terms of office appears to have been reorganized in an oligarchic sense around 103 b. c.³⁸ The heliastic courts lost their control of the magistrates around 103 b. c. as Ferguson has clearly shown. "A justificatory statement to the Council," says Ferguson,³⁹ "was substituted for the public examination before the jury-court theretofore required by law. Because of the defective character of our sources the alteration of the law is demonstrated only for this one magistrate; but it is clearly inferable for the other magistrates as well." After the democratic uprising in connection with the Mithridatic War Sulla restored the oligarchic constitution at Athens. In the post-Sullan world, if not earlier, the democratic institutions had lost their power, and the people were helpless before the influence of the privileged families who ruled everywhere with the help of Roman patronage. The governor's account reveals, furthermore, that the indifference of a whole series of non-interfering Roman governors of Cilicia had made the shocking abuse possible, and that pressure from the Roman government could be applied to the great advantage of the whole city rather than to the special advantage of the business men who were Rome's friends.

For the importance of the audit in a Greek city state the reader has more than a modern theory to guide him. In the *Laws* Plato points out that one of the great problems facing a Greek city was how to prevent an individual magistrate from acting in bad faith. For Plato the effective application of penalties depended upon the automatic audit by the right persons: "if there is something wrong with the auditing of our magistrates, then the justice which holds all parts of our society together in one will be loosened, every office will be torn from every other, and all will no longer conspire in one

³⁷ *Ep. ad Atticum*, VI 2, 5.

³⁸ W. S. Ferguson, *Athenian tribal cycles*, 147-155, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press, 1932. He compares the audit of the cosmete in 101/0 b. c. (*IG II²* 1028) before the Council of the Six Hundred with the earlier records of his audit in a dicastery.

³⁹ *Op. cit.*, 149 f.

effect;⁴⁰ the State will no longer be one but many, will be filled with conflicting factions and soon destroyed" (*Laws XII* 945d-e).

The proconsul of Asia, Paullus Fabius Persicus, in an edict inspired by the emperor Claudius, indicated that the chief danger to the endowments of Ephesus, including those of the Artemisium, came from the magistrates of the city. He called for the protection of endowments in the following words: 'Ομοίως ὅσα χρήματα ἀπολέλειπται τῇ πόλει η μέρει τινὶ [κ]α[ὶ συστ]ήματι τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ, ταῦτα [δα] νείζεσθαι τούτῳ τῷ νόμῳ φοιτείσθηται ἀρέσκει καὶ μὴ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχόντων εἰς ἄλλας χρείας καὶ δαπάνας μετάγεσθαι.'⁴¹

The local magistrates are expressly mentioned in the deed or diataxis of Vibius Salutaris, who forbids any archon, advocate or private citizen to divert the endowment.⁴² But the most important passage is that cited from Malalas under Case VII. Malalas narrates the history of an endowment dating back to the time of Augustus. After awhile, he says, the city magistrates of Antioch began to divert the income to other uses from which they themselves profited, until the emperor Claudius intervened in some way and stopped them. Later the festival, to the support of which the endowment was now supposed to contribute, had to be curtailed in certain years because of disasters, and starting from these legitimate excuses the magistrates began omitting the games in years when there were no disasters.

The chief menace at Antioch, therefore, came from the archons who were the city magistrates. In other places such as Ephesus the endowments were threatened by the same danger. Occasionally, in cases where the donor had Roman citizenship, the Roman law of inheritance may have allowed the heirs to recover the endowment on the grounds that the sanctuary or municipal corporation could not inherit from a Roman citizen, but in many places the chief danger and in all places one of the chief dangers came from the archons. Why was that?

It was notoriously harder to find willing candidates to undertake the financial burdens of municipal office. The

⁴⁰ A. E. Taylor's interpretation, *The Laws of Plato translated into English*, 339, London, Dent, 1934.

⁴¹ F. K. Dörner, *Der Erlass des Statthalters von Asia Paullus Fabius Persicus*, 39, Diss., Greifswald, 1935.

⁴² Lines 315-324 may be rendered as follows: "Let it not be permitted to anyone, either archon or advocate or private citizen, to try to change or alter anything or to make different arrangements for the administration or to transfer by decree any of the statues or money or its revenue or to divert it to any other source of revenue or to any other expense or to do anything against the terms enumerated and ordained above. And if it so happens, let whatever has occurred contrary to these provisions be null and void. And whoever tries to do anything contrary to the diataxis or, that is, to the articles accepted by decree of the Council and Demos and upheld by the supplementary ratifications concerning said diataxis, let him pay toward the adornment of the most mighty goddess Artemis twenty-five thousand denarii and to the fiscus of the emperor twenty-five thousand denarii more." The supplementary ratifications were the declarations of the proconsul and his legate.

system was breaking down, and as various means of compulsion were applied, public office became in a vicious circle less and less of a distinction and more of a burden. It is well known that men with sufficient property to support the expenses of public office often had to be coerced into assuming public office. Hence it is reasonable to suppose that once they had been badgered or legislated into office the same men would be eager to evade as many as possible of the financial burdens of the office. An endowment or sacred reserves provided some chance of evading the financial burdens without producing a breakdown of city government. The audit, that old deterrent in the democratic constitutions, had, as we have seen, been emasculated or abolished.⁴³

It is well known that the Athenians of the fifth, fourth, and third centuries B. C. would borrow from the treasury of Athena during a war and might even strip the gold from the chryselephantine statue of Athena in the Parthenon.⁴⁴ From time immemorial, when private generosity or vulnerability could no longer produce the needed funds, the Greek cities laid hands upon the treasuries of those sanctuaries within their territory. As the number of citizens who could afford to be generous or were vulnerable declined, it became a common practice to defray the expenses of the chief magistracy, when there were no volunteers, out of the treasury of a deity, who was then cited as the eponymous magistrate of the year.⁴⁵ It was no longer a question of borrowing. At Athens in the Severan Period there were occasions when Athena Polias *shared* with a human "volunteer" the eponymate, not of the year, but of the prytany.⁴⁶

Therefore, the chief danger to endowments grew out of the ancient Hellenic custom of depositing their reserves of precious metal in the form of a dedication to a deity and out of the proprietary attitude of the ancient *politai* toward the treasuries of the sanctuaries within their territories.

Furthermore, the influence of Rome had had a decisive effect in the ancient internal struggle between oligarchs and democrats in every polis. Rome never imposed a Western constitution, but Roman support or sympathy led to an oligarchic victory, after which power was more concentrated in the hands of the privileged families and democratic institutions declined. At Athens where the constitutional history is better known, the most striking change in the Roman Period is the dominating position of the Areopagus⁴⁷ and the insignifi-

⁴³ The disastrous effect of the emasculation of the audit upon the municipalities was appreciated by F. F. Abbott and A. C. Johnson, *Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire*, 187, Princeton Univ. Press, 1926.

⁴⁴ W. S. Ferguson, *The treasurers of Athena*, Ch. IX, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press, 1932, "The Conversion into Money of Attic Temple Properties."

⁴⁵ L. Robert, *Divinités éponymes*, *Hellenica* 2: 51-64, 1946.

⁴⁶ J. H. Oliver, Patrons providing financial aid for the tribes of Roman Athens, *AJP*, 70: 299-308 and 403, 1949.

⁴⁷ B. Keil, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Areopags* (*Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissen-*

cance of the Ecclesia. The Areopagus has obtained far-reaching supervisory powers and has absorbed the most important judicial powers of the heliastic courts, which no longer appear in the second century after Christ. As Keil⁴⁸ pointed out, the Areopagus was now a small body, for which not all ex-archons were eligible but only those who had served as chief archon or as basileus (or, he should have added, as polemarch). The magistrates of Roman Athens were recruited from a comparatively small group of wealthy families⁴⁹ who intermarried. Under these conditions one could not count on the willingness of the Areopagus, which was the court of public law, to condemn a magistrate who perhaps indirectly diverted the revenue of an endowment into channels which would relieve the financial burdens of that small group of wealthy, or comparatively wealthy, families.

The writer, therefore, suggests that the chief danger to endowments in most Greek cities was the unwillingness or the inability of the local courts to render justice, often because the courts, unlike the dicasteries of the ancient democratic constitutions, were empaneled from a small group of families who had to support the financial liturgies.

THE NATURE AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE ROMAN REMEDY

Under the Republic the provincials suffered much from the Roman governor's unscrupulous exercise of his almost unlimited power, and in the time of Augustus the problem of reforming provincial government was largely a problem of checking the governor's rapacity or that of his staff by speedier procedure in extortion cases and by the influence which the princeps, the universal patron, could exert in defense of the provincials. The governors became much more circumspect in the exercise of their *imperium*, and it is possible that at the end of some reigns the problem was rather how to encourage honest men to exert more fearlessly the *imperium* which they possessed. Thus under the principate the quality of provincial government came to depend largely on the princeps, whether he was more guided by ideals of good government or by favoritism and personal reactions in extending or withholding his support.

Settlements made by a Roman magistrate with the approval of the Roman senate gave a later Roman magistrate, if he wished to use the vague discretionary powers of his *coercitio*, a moral right to prevent by interfering and to punish violations or evasions of such settlements within the territory subject to his *imperium* or within the free territory over which he had a general supervision. Octavian restored to Artemis of the Eph-

schaften zu Leipzig, Phil.-hist. Kl., 71, Heft 8) 1919; J. Delz, *Lukians Kenntnis der athenischen Antiquitäten*, Ch. IX, "Areopag und Rechtswesen," Diss., Basel, 1950.

⁴⁸ B. Keil, *op. cit.*, 81-89.

⁴⁹ P. Graudor, *Chronologie des archontes athéniens sous l'Empire* (*Mémoires de l'Académie de Belgique* 4°) 1921.

sians the property which produced the necessary revenue for the support of the cult, but the daily supervision over the management of the temple rested with the Ephesians who might misuse their position for personal advantage. If such mischief came to the attention of the proconsul of Asia, the latter would have to take into consideration the effect upon his own career if the frustrated malefactors were influential enough to deprive him of merited testimonials or to bring accusations in Rome or even to reach the emperor, and he might usually be reluctant to initiate within his own short term the kind of action which was likely to provoke unpleasant repercussions. It became a question how much eventual support an energetic and conscientious governor could expect from the princeps, and under the very personal régime of emperors like Caligula courage and morale declined.

In the now famous letter which soon after his accession Claudius wrote to the Alexandrines, the emperor warned the Alexandrines against a recrudescence of riots.⁵⁰ Without specifying precisely what he would do, he said that if it happened again they would find out what a benevolent princeps (*ηγεμών*) could become when moved to anger. The threat implies that the Alexandrines would have no support or protection from the emperor and that the prefect of Egypt would be expected to take vigorous action against them. Similarly in the edict of the proconsul of Asia, Paullus Fabius Persicus, the Ephesians are warned that the emperor Claudius earnestly desired the protection of endowments left to municipal corporations or sanctuaries and the honest fulfillment of the terms of an endowment.⁵¹ Thus the proconsul implies that malefactors could look for no protection from the emperor and that the proconsul would be expected to take vigorous action against them. This is an exercise of the emperor's *auctoritas* in the Augustan tradition. In the writer's opinion the emperor had not exercised *maiis imperium* but given the proconsul the moral backing necessary for better supervision over local affairs if he wished to exercise his *imperium*.

And yet sixty years later, early in the reign of the *optimus princeps*, an Ephesian with great experience in public affairs felt that the endowment which he intended to set up needed a different kind of protection. Vibius Salutaris exploited his friendship with the proconsul and legate to obtain a special kind of protection which was regarded as a great favor, by no means automatic. Since Trajan would have been just as unsympathetic as Claudius to the rascalities of malefactors, what makes the protection of the endowment of Vibius Salutaris so special? In the writer's opinion the Trajanic proconsul

went beyond the Claudian proconsul in that for this particular endowment he set up a specific formula for legal action against a real or would-be evader⁵² or embezzler or rival claimant in the courts of the proconsul and legate and above all insured that the powerful machinery of the fiscus would operate against the malefactor or claimant. Moreover, the Trajanic proconsul and legate committed themselves to grant the action, and they committed even their successors, for the latter could scarcely repudiate the administrative decision of the Trajanic proconsul and legate, when the decision so obviously conformed to the aims of the good emperors. The endowment is protected against local malefactors even under another Nero.

In the case concerning the endowment of Vibius Salutaris to Artemis of the Ephesians the donor himself appealed to the provincial authorities, on the basis of *amicitia*, to place the protection of the proconsul's court, also the court of the *legatus pro praetore*, behind the endowment, and they acceded to the request. In the case concerning the endowment at Gythion the Gytheates, i. e., the practical and probably legal recipients, who perhaps were more afraid of the donor's heirs than of local evaders, have appealed to the emperor for special protection. The emperor does not himself set up the formula but uses his *auctoritas* to make the proconsul of Achaia set up the formula which will place the protection of the proconsul's court behind this particular endowment. Gythion, belonging to a free league, was not part of the province of Achaia. In the writer's opinion Hadrian was not exercising an *imperium maius* but was committing himself as a patron, in that he asked the proconsul to set up for a group of (other) clients of the emperor a socially justifiable *actio utilis* with the understanding that he, the emperor, would always support the proconsul in the consequences. The proconsul regards it as a very unusual favor from the emperor, and in both his letter to the Gytheates and the special edict publishing the decision he is careful to refer to the emperor's recommendation. Not enough of the edict is preserved to prove that here also the fiscus received an interest in the prosecution of anyone who might try to set aside the fixed terms of the endowment, but the author infers from the sanctions of other declarations that the fiscus did obtain an interest here.

In the case of the endowment set up by Opramoas for the Lycian League it was the recipient who requested the protection. The governor formulated an action available for use in his court and thus protected the endowment, but there is a notable difference between this declaration and the declarations in the cases at Ephesus and Gythion. The governor in this case regards the proceedings as mere routine and he expresses himself with plainness and economy. Whereas the authorities

⁵⁰ H. I. Bell, *Jews and Christians in Egypt*, 1-37, London, Oxford Univ. Press, 1924.

⁵¹ F. K. Dörner, *Der Erlass des Statthalters von Asia Paullus Fabius Persicus*, Dissertation, Greifswald, 1935, with contributions by G. Klaffenbach, *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 3te Folge, 6: 413-416, 1935, and by A. Wilhelm, *Glotta* 25: 269-273, 1936.

⁵² By "evader" the writer means a man who avoids carrying out the *munus patrimonii* to which he is liable, particularly by diverting to the public expenses which he should defray the revenue of an endowment established for another purpose.

of Asia wrote to the Ephesians in the highly rhetorical style preferred in epistles with literary pretensions, the legate of Lycia-Pamphylia uses the juristic style⁵³ and a formula which we meet again in the prefect's declaration at Eleusis and in the epistle of Septimius Severus and Caracalla. The date is sometime between A. D. 124 and 131, but the procedure, which, as we saw at Gythion, was still in a formative stage early in the reign of Hadrian, is already standardized.

Although the formula may have received its ultimate shape from some jurist in Hadrian's *consilium*, it was not the jurists who worked out the procedure but enlightened or Hellenophile statesmen in the reigns of Domitian, Nerva, Trajan, and Hadrian. Aquillius Proculus and Afranius Flavianus, who in A. D. 104 issued declarations protecting the endowment of Vibius Salutaris at Ephesus, wrote like men according a rare but not unprecedented favor. Nor can we safely infer that the policy began with the establishment of Nerva's administration, because the most straightforward interpretation of an obscure passage in an Acmonian decree of A. D. 85 would force one to conclude that here a lost declaration by a Roman governor provided the background.⁵⁴

If we are right then for the year A. D. 85, the creator of the new policy was the emperor Domitian, even though the decision as in the next three reigns may have been left to the local Roman magistrate. This would be a determination of some importance, but this change or progress in Roman provincial administration under Domitian would not stand alone. It is well known that the institution of the *curator civitatis*,⁵⁵ by which the municipalities were relieved from their more desperate financial embarrassments, developed mightily under Trajan and Hadrian, but the institution began before Trajan's reign, even before Nerva's. The first datable case of a *curator civitatis* is the senatorial *curat(or) coloni<a>r(um) et municipior(um)* Sospes of ILS 1017 = JRS 14: 191, No. 12, 1924. The date of this career can be disputed, but Sospes was curator of colonies and municipia shortly before a war which the writer with Mommsen, Ritterling, Syme, and Magie⁵⁶ would identify as the Suevic War of A. D. 92. In other words the real creator of this at first helpful institution was Domitian.

Nothing, however, brings out the importance of the

⁵³ For the juristic style see F. Schulz, *Roman legal science*, 259 f., Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1946.

⁵⁴ See the previous section, "Other Cases."

⁵⁵ W. Liebenam, *Curator rei publicae*, *Philologus* 56: 290-325, 1897; G. Mancini apud E. de Ruggiero, *Dizionario Epigrafico di Antichità Romane* 2: 1345-1386, s. v. "Curator Reipublicae o Civitatis"; Hugh Last, *C. A. H.* 11: 467-470, 1936; C. Lucas, *The Curatores Rei Publicae of Roman Africa*, *JRS* 30: 56-74, 1940.

⁵⁶ David Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*, note 13 on pp. 1454-1456, Princeton Univ. Press, 1950. For *curatores* perhaps from the reign of Nerva, cf. Philostratus, *Vitae soph.* I 19 and *Dig.* 43, 24, 3, 4 (Ulpian).

reign of Domitian for the student of Roman provincial administration as clearly as the history of the equestrian procuratorships.⁵⁷ It was Domitian who made the real beginning of the great development of the equestrian service which culminated in the reign of Hadrian after rapid growth under Trajan. Pflaum⁵⁸ sums it up impressively with the observation that the reign of Domitian is "d'une importance primordiale" for his investigation. Trajan, Hadrian, and even Septimius Severus operated along lines first opened for them by Domitian.

Without the epigraphical evidence we should have no idea of the true importance of his reign, but even the epigraphical evidence has been much reduced by the condemnation of Domitian's memory.

The Roman declarations protecting Greek endowments according to a procedure which appears as early as A. D. 104 in a fully developed form have the character of administrative decisions placing under the protection of the *Lex Iulia peculatus et de sacrilegiis et de residuis*⁵⁹ a specific large endowment which served a purpose important to the religious or political life of the Hellenic or Hellenized population and which ordinarily would have had quite inadequate protection under the law of peregrine communities. *Peculatus* originally meant theft from the *Populus Romanus*. *Sacrilegium* of course meant theft from a god, not just any god but the god of a sanctuary which had received the right of ownership in Roman law by *senatus consultum* or, later, by imperial constitution.⁶⁰ It is not necessary to assume that in setting up a formula for an indictment as of *sacrilegium* the magistrate arrogated to himself a power belonging traditionally to the senate; he did not change the status of the sanctuary but confined his order to the one endowment that he wished to preserve by special means in the public interest. Whether the Greek endowment served a secular or religious purpose, the declarations were in much the same form because *peculatus* and

⁵⁷ See H. G. Pflaum, *Les procurateurs équestres sous le Haut-Empire Romain*, 50-54, 60, 97 f., Paris, Maisonneuve, 1950.

⁵⁸ *Op. cit.*, 50.

⁵⁹ *Digest*, 48, 13. In *Digest*, 48, 13, 4, where Solazzio, *Archivio Giuridico* 94: 68, note 2, 1925, has denounced the phrase *Deo immortalis* and restored what must have been the phrase originally used by Marcianus, there is a very pertinent passage: *Marcianus libro XIV Institutionum. Lege Iulia peculatus tenetur, qui pecuniam sacram, religiosam abstulerit, intercepserit. § 1 Sed et si donatum de<is> immortalibus abstulerit, peculatus poena tenetur.* Further on Trajan and Hadrian, the emperors from whose reigns our earliest declarations date, are specifically mentioned as extending the coverage of the *Lex Iulia*: § 7 *Sed et si de re civitatis aliquid surripiat, constitutionibus principum divisorum Traiani et Hadriani cavetur, peculatus crimen committi, et hoc iure utimur.*

⁶⁰ *Epitome Ulpiani* (ed. F. Schulz), 22, 6: *Deos heredes instituere non possumus praeter eos quos senatus consulto constitutionibus<ve> principum instituere concessum est, sicut Iovem T<a>rpeium, Apoll<i>nem Didym<a>eum Mi<le>tii, Martem in Gallia, Minervam <I>liensem, Herculem Gaditanum, Dianam Ephesiam, Matrem Deorum Sipylen<en>, Neme>sim quae Smyrnae colitur, et Caelestem Salinensem Carthagin<i>.*

sacrilegium were subsumed under the same rule in Roman Public Law.

It is a further step in the development of the procedure when the declaration begins to emanate from an expert representative of the central government rather than from the magistrate who temporarily presides over the Roman court which will forever protect the endowment. The first datable case is that of the declaration by a prefect in favor of the endowment at Eleusis. The date would seem to fall around A.D. 137. Whatever functions this particular prefect may have had, his was not a permanent office in the province or free cities of Achaia. From the Hadrianic oil law,⁶¹ for example, we know that there were two Roman courts accessible to the Atherians: they could appeal to the emperor, and they could appeal to the proconsul of Achaia, a province to which the Athenians, a *civitas libera*, did not properly belong. Whereas the magistrates who issued declarations protecting the endowments of Vibius Salutaris, Claudio Atticus, and Opramoas had committed only themselves and their own successors, the prefect of the Eleusinian inscription committed practically neither himself nor his own successors but the contemporary and future governors of Achaia.

The declaration protecting an endowment in support of a gymnasium at Attaleia in Lydia is undated except that the predicate of rank accompanying the title of Asiarch suggests that the declaration was no earlier than that of the prefect in the Eleusinian inscription. The declaration at Attaleia was issued by a wealthy and prominent native of Asia who was serving a second time at Attaleia as *curator rei publicae*, i.e., a financial expert appointed by the Roman government upon the request of the city government to help the city in its financial difficulties. The *curator rei publicae* Polybius issued the declaration upon request as did also the prefect of the Eleusinian inscription.

These two declarations differ from all the others in the way they were communicated. Each of these two was announced as an *apophasis*, while each of the others was communicated in an epistle. The difference may be explained by the fact that neither the prefect nor the *curator rei publicae* held an office to which competence in *re* had been permanently assigned or permanently delegated.⁶² They were performing purely temporary functions as special judges in administrative cases. In practice their decisions were final, but the form remained that of an agent's decision which to be valid still had to be accompanied by authorization of senate or magistrate. In Roman Public Law the grant of protection was not conceived as emanating from these special judges but

from the authority that had in each case appointed the judge.

The substitution of special judges for the provincial governor in a case of this sort highlights the movement away from the Republican tradition. It reveals the increased use of experts, such as trained jurists and men specializing in financial questions, where the Romans of the Republic and early Principate trusted administrators who were expected to have a mere smattering of these subjects and to depend on unofficial or merely clerical advice.

The final step is taken when decisions whether to grant special protection to a Greek endowment cease to be made by a Roman judge (magistrate or special agent) in the province and are made by the emperor, i.e. by the experts in the emperor's *consilium*. Since it is unknown whether the declaration made for an endowment at Tralles by Antoninus Pius was issued while Antoninus was emperor or while proconsul of Asia under Hadrian, the first unmistakable evidence for this repudiation of Hadrian's policy and for this concentration in the hands of the emperor, i.e. of his advisers, dates from the reign of Commodus. It was Commodus who at the request of the Antiochenes, namely the recipients of an endowment established under Augustus, issued a declaration which protected the endowment from the inroads of the Antiochene magistrates and councillors who for generations had been evading their own *munera patrimonii* by illegally diverting the revenues of the endowment. Then we have two more declarations, which were issued upon request as brief epistles by Septimius Severus and Caracalla, probably in A.D. 200. The petitions were submitted by the donor, and even at this late date the donor, who is at pains to set forth the worthy purpose of the endowment and how the endowment will contribute indirectly to the fiscus, regards the grant of special protection as a favor. In the author's opinion these imperial declarations placed the court of the provincial governor behind the endowment. Commodus committed the legate of Syria to grant, if it happened again, a specific action against the local evaders who had successfully diverted the funds of an endowment which was quite inadequately protected by the law of Antioch, probably because these evaders from the propertied class controlled the local courts. Septimius Severus and Caracalla committed the prefect of Egypt to grant an action in his court against any evader or embezzler or rival claimant who might ever be charged with diverting or trying to divert the revenues of the endowments which Aurelius Horion was establishing for the ephesians of Oxyrhynchus.

It happens that our earliest declarations emanate from the local Roman magistrates, our later declarations from special experts assigned—probably by the emperor—locally, and our last declarations from the emperor himself. The evidence undoubtedly reflects the actual development, but the procedure at any one time may not have been quite as uniform as our few examples suggest.

⁶¹ See lines 55-58 of the text in Chapter VI.

⁶² On the difference between powers permanently delegated and powers temporarily delegated, note the comments of F. M. De Robertis, *Sulla Origine della giurisdizione criminale esercitata dal praefectus urbi*, (*Quaderni de "La Corte d'Assise"* 22) Foggia, 1935.

The transition from magistrate to special judge to emperor may have been sudden or slow, but the tendency toward the procedure by imperial rescript⁶³ composed in the unadorned juristic style increases by recognizable stages.

To what sort of endowments did the Roman government accord this special protection and encouragement? That of Vibius Salutaris at Ephesus, that of Xenion at Athens, that of Opramoas to the Lycian *koinon*, and the old one at Antioch, contributed to the greater splendor and attractiveness of religious festivals. At Oxyrhynchus the first endowment supported ephebic contests and the second alleviated the burdens of those who undertook liturgies. The endowment of Eavarestus at Attaleia in Lydia provided oil for the gymnasium. Nothing is known about the endowment of Claudius Atticus at Gytheion, but in all cases where something is known, even in that at Oxyrhynchus from the reign of Septimius Severus and Caracalla, the Roman government fosters endowments which keep alive the spiritual values of Hellenism.

In the *apophasis* at Eleusis it is stated that from one who has violated the terms of the endowment (property of) twice (the value) shall be vindicated to the fiscus as for *sacrilegium*. The writer interprets this to mean that all of a sum equal to twice the value of the endowment is a fine. At Ephesus where Vibius Salutaris was setting up a fund of 20,000 denarii and dedicating valuable statuettes besides, the governor specified a penalty⁶⁴ of 25,000 denarii to be paid to Artemis and 25,000 denarii to be paid to the fiscus. He obviously estimated the value of the statuettes at about 5,000 denarii, and like the prefect of the Eleusinian inscription the proconsul of Asia called for a fine of double the amount. It may be inferred that it was customary or common to stipulate a fine of twice the entire endowment in cases of Roman protection for Greek endowments.⁶⁵ At Ephesus half the fine went to Artemis and

⁶³ In the commentary to Case VII (Antioch) it was pointed out that the judicial rescript of the Late Roman Empire was called a *θεῖα κέλευσις*. It is interesting to note not only the use of this term for the rescript of Commodus in Case VII but also the use of the word *κελεύω* in reference to the indirect rescript of Hadrian to the proconsul of Achaia in Case II and in reference to the expected direct rescript of Septimius Severus and Caracalla in Case VIII. The rescripts of Cases VII, VIII and IX differ from the Late Roman judiciary rescript in being a favor rather than a right and in creating rather than clarifying Roman Law.

⁶⁴ In line 408 the legate refers to the 25,000 denarii for Artemis as a *πρόστεμνον*. It was, therefore, not restitution. Its supplementary character is emphasized in lines 111 and 363 by the prefix in the expression *εἰς προσκόσμησιν τῆς κυρίας Ἀρτέμιδος*.

⁶⁵ R. Düll, Zum vielfachen Wertersatz im antiken Recht, *Scritti in Onore di Contardo Ferrini pubblicati in occasione della sua beatificazione 3* (*Pubblicazioni dell' Università del S. Cuore*, N. S., 23) 211-230, 1948, has collected references from the Solonian Code, from the Laws of Gortyn, from Plato's *Laws*, from a decree of the Pylaeo-Delphic Amphictyony, and he has shown that the *poena dupli* was the most common exaction in cases of embezzlement not only in Roman but also in Greek

half to the fiscus; at Eleusis where the sanctuary had nothing like the depository banking and investment office of the Artemision, no business and legal organization existed to facilitate collection. The purpose of the fine was not to provide income for an agency which collected fines but to prevent the diversion of consecrated money to other uses.

Finally, a brief statement as to the terminology. The declaration itself would be described of course by the form in which it was communicated, as epistle, as edict, as an *apophasis* copied from some official's *commentarii*; after the development of the rescript procedure a declaration communicated in an epistulary rescript might be called a rescript rather than an epistle. The action of the Roman government might be described from the standpoint of the public law of the polis as a supporting or supplementary ratification of the diataxis in addition to the local decree of acceptance; the verb used is *ἐπικυρώ*, three times about the authorities of Asia in Case I,⁶⁶ once about the legate of Lycia-Pamphylia in Case III,⁶⁷ once about Antoninus in Case IV. The late historian Malalas, in Case VII, about Commodus, but only Malalas uses the word *προσκυρώ* in this sense. Or the action of the Roman government might be described from the standpoint of its effect upon the endowment as rendering secure (*ἀσφαλίσασθαι* in Case II) or inviolable (*βεβαῶ* in Case III).⁶⁸ This is the Roman standpoint. The form of the declaration and its phraseology are more easily treated together with the Hellenic precedents in the next section.

When a declaration was issued, it was issued on request. In fact the declaration must be accompanied by the request to be entirely comprehensible, because it assumes knowledge of the request. Of Vibius Salutaris (*eques Romanus*) the Ephesians⁶⁹ say, *διάραξιν . . . ηξί[ι]ωσεν ἐπὶ[κυ]ρωθῆναι*. Hence he made an *ἀξίωσις*, and this is the term used to describe each of the two petitions of Aurelius Horion (*eques Romanus*) in Cases VIII and IX. At Attaleia in Lydia, on the other hand, the *curator rei publicae* issued the declaration in compliance with an *enteuxis*, *ἐντευχθεὶς ἀπεφήνατο*. However, in view of the looseness of ancient terminology we are yet in no position to attribute this difference in the designation of the petition to the status of the petitioner or to the form of the request.

THE HELLENIC ANTECEDENTS OF THE ROMAN DECLARATION AND ITS PHRASEOLOGY

In the preceding section it was pointed out that the Roman declaration protecting a Greek endowment ap-

peared to be a copy of the Greek *synkrateithetai* in the form of a rescript. In evaluating this information one must bear in mind the high interest rates the embezzler would have had to pay if he had borrowed the same amount elsewhere.

⁶⁶ Lines 74, 322-323 and 330.

⁶⁷ *TAM*, II, 905, V. E.

⁶⁸ Similar but not quite the same is the verb *συγκατίθημι* discussed by L. Robert, *Hellenica* 1: 47-49, 1940.

⁶⁹ Line 74, in the decree of acceptance.

peared to all parties as a favor. It was not a meddlesome intervention into local affairs. Rather it constituted a strengthening of the recipient's and donor's purpose, so that in Case III the act of the Roman governor could be described by the Lycians with the words,⁷⁰ καὶ ὁ κράτιστος ἡγεμὼν Σουφῆνα Οὐῆρος ἐπεκύρωσε τὴν τοῦ ἔθνους πρόερεσιν (read προαιρέσιν), while in Case IX the emperors granted the donor's request with the words, καθότ[ι] οὐέλησε. It was a positive favor accorded by a friendly power, a favor that would bring the endowment under the protection of law where the law of the polis could not protect. It was not a license, not a negative favor like an exemption from the oppression of an overlord. The declaration meant that the law of the polis or of the local league was in this special case accepted as a kind of international law, so that violators could be punished and recovery made, no matter who the violators were or where they went. Roman Law appears here not as the law of the Roman citizens but as the international law of the Mediterranean world.

A law consisting of occasional announcements by Roman agencies of government became the effective international law of the free world of Old Greece in the time of Sulla.

After the Battle of Cannae Rome had developed close relations with Delphi, and Rome came into the Greek world partly as the champion of the Pythian Apollo, of whom both Flamininus and Mummius posed as loyal devotees. During the second half of the second century B.C. Delphic policy was dominated by a desire to please Rome, and Roman policy was expressed in Amphicytonic decrees⁷¹ such as that making the Athenian coinage the standard for at least Central Greece.⁷² This was no attempt by Amphicytions to develop a federal constitution, but an attempt (by Rome or by Rome's friends) to create an international law above that of the city states for everyone's advantage. The Delphic sanctuary enjoyed prestige, and the Amphicytonic Council had pretensions to Panhellenic authority. The sanctuary lived on its prestige until Sulla jeered at the god and his supporters. Then the Amphicytions were through. Sulla seized the treasures of sanctuaries which under Amphicytonic Law enjoyed *asylia*, and he seized even those of the Delphic sanctuary itself.⁷³ From then on, the new international law of Greece no longer emanated from the Amphicytonic Council.

In the Hellenistic Period the Pylaean-Delphic Amphicytions issued upon request grants of *ἀσυλία* καὶ *ἀσφάλεια*⁷⁴ to the Dionysiac Artists, as to a corporation

in the religious service, or grants of *ἀσυλία*, defined as ἐκεχειρία καὶ *ἀσφάλεια*,⁷⁵ to a sanctuary during the period of a certain festival receiving formal recognition and approval from the Amphictyony. Such grants placed the Dionysiac Artists or the festival under the protection of Amphictyonic Law, that is to say under the protection of an "international" public law theoretically at least higher than and distinct from the public law of any one state.

The Roman grant of *ἀσφάλεια* or of *σωτηρία* καὶ *ἀσφάλεια*⁷⁶ to endowments in support of religious festivals and other public services was then essentially a further development of a function once performed by the Pylaean-Delphic Amphictyony; except that the threat to the security now usually came from inside rather than outside the city in whose interest the protection had been requested. Just as the violation of the protection granted by the Amphictyonic Council was *ἱεροσυλία* or *ἱεροσυνία* καὶ *ἀσέβεια*, so the violation of protection granted to sacred endowments by the Roman government was regarded as *ἱεροσυλία* or *ἱεροσυνία* καὶ *ἀσέβεια*.⁷⁷ Just as the Amphictyonic Council arranged for a trial of transgressors in an Amphictyonic court⁷⁸ and specified the penalty and the recipient of the penalty,⁷⁹ so the Roman declaration arranged for a trial in a Roman court and specified the penalty and the recipient of the penalty. Just as the Amphictyonic decree concerning the Ptoia stated that the *prophêtēs*, the priest of Apollo Ptoios, the polis and the Boeotian League should continue to be in control of the administration, so the Roman declaration from Eleusis specified that the hierophant and daduchus should have the sole administration, while other Roman declarations imply a specification as to the administration by referring to the diataxis or to the request.

A realization of the historical importance of Amphictyonic Law may help to explain a phenomenon which needs explanation, namely the paucity or total absence of parallel declarations protecting endowments in the Latin West. All the declarations which form the object

⁷⁰ *TAM*, II, 905, V E.
⁷¹ G. Daux, *Delpes au II^e et au I^{er} siècle*, 387-391 and 610-612, Paris, de Boccard, 1936.
⁷² *Fouilles de Delpes* III, 2, 139. Cf. John Day, *An economic history of Athens under Roman domination*, 91, N. Y., Columbia Univ. Press, 1942.

⁷³ On Sulla's treatment of the sanctuaries see Daux, *op. cit.*, 398-407.

⁷⁴ For the phrase compare the Amphictyonic decree *SIG⁸* 692A, line 42.

⁷⁵ *IG VII* 4135: ἐὰν δέ τι γίνηται ἀδικημα παρὰ τὸ δύγμα τῶν Ἀμφικτυόνων, ἀποτεσάτω ὁ ἀδικῶν δισχιλίους στατήρας καὶ ὁ ἀν καταβλάψῃ, τὰ δὲ καταδικασθέντα χρήματα ιερὰ ἔστω τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Πτωτοῦ.

of this study occur in Hellenic or Hellenized areas, while similar declarations from Thracian, Gallic, Spanish, African areas or from non-Hellenized areas of the East are unknown, at least to the writer. This seems to be due neither to accident nor entirely to the special favor in which the Hellenes were held by educated Romans of the second century after Christ, but to the fact that the protection was essentially a development of a peculiarly Hellenic type of *asylia*—not the right of asylum but the inviolability of both person and property.⁸⁰

While the Amphictyonic grant of *asylia* was the real forerunner of the Roman declaration protecting a Greek endowment, the entire literature of speeches, city state decrees and royal letters concerning grants of *asylia* developed and enriched the terminology. Not just from Amphictyonic decrees but from all this come the words and phrases. Furthermore, the Hellenistic chanceries created a style more suitable for a declaration which emanated, not from a council, but from an individual.

In the Hellenistic Period a decree of the Pylaean-Delphic Amphictyony was most important but by itself not enough. Some good evidence for the international negotiations which in the Hellenistic Period preceded recognition of a festival's *asylia* may be found in the cases of the Mouseia of Thespiae⁸¹ around 210 B. C. and of the Ptoia of Acraephiae in the late second century B. C.⁸² Requests are made to cities and leagues and to the Dionysiac Artists for support and are generally mentioned with the verb *ἀξιώ* or *παρακαλέω*. Recognition or acceptance means to *ἀποδέξασθαι* (*καὶ συνανέξειν*). A truly magnificent series of documents⁸³ from Magnesia on the Maeander concerns the reorganization of the festival of Artemis Leucophryene at the end of the third century B. C. The language is much the same. Magnesian ambassadors carrying copies of a decree and asking recognition and support (*παρακαλοῦντες* or *ἀξιοῦντες ἀποδέξασθαι στεφανίτην ισοπύθιον τὸν ἄγωνα*), had been sent out to numerous cities, leagues, and kings.

Another magnificent series of documents is that of 246-242 B. C. concerning the Asclepieia of Cos.⁸⁴ The verb *ἀξιώ* indicates the request in No. 2 and in the decrees of Aegira, Cassandrea, Amphipolis, Philippi, Neapolis, Camarina, Iasos, *αἰτέω* in the decrees of Sparta and Aenos, *παρακαλέω* in the decrees of Messene and Thelphusa. Acceptance in the royal letter of No. 2 occurs with the word [*δε*] *χόμεθα*, in that of No. 3 with

⁸⁰ See above all E. Schlesinger, *Die griechische Asylie*, Diss., Giessen, 1933. See also E. Bikermann, *Institutions des Séleucides* 148-156, Paris, Geuthner, 1938, and H. Seyrig, *Les rois séleucides et l'asylie*, *Syria* 20: 35-39, 1939.

⁸¹ M. Feyel, *Contributions à l'épigraphie bétienne (Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg)* 95: 88-117, 1942.

⁸² *IG VII* 4135-4144. For the date see M. Feyel, *BCH* 60: 25-27, 1936.

⁸³ O. Kern, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander*, Nos. 16-87, Berlin, 1900.

⁸⁴ R. Herzog and G. Klaffenbach, *Asyliekunden aus Kos, Abh. Ak. Berlin*, 1952: 1-30.

the phrase *τὴν εὐνοιαν ἀπ[ο]δέγμεθα*. The Lacedaemonians say *δεξάμεσα*, and the other cities vote to *δέχεσθαι* or *ἀποδέχεσθαι* or *προσδέξασθαι*.

The foregoing examples and others *apud* E. Schlesinger, *Die griechische Asylie*, Diss. Giessen, 1933, suffice to show that by the third century B. C. the procedure of requesting and granting recognition, protection and support for a festival or sanctuary under another public law⁸⁵ than that of the polis to whose territory the sanctuary immediately belonged had already crystallized and in terminology it had already developed a set of formulas. The latter determination gives a value greater than that of an ordinary linguistic parallel to a phrase in one Hellenistic decree⁸⁶ of acceptance, where the motivation reads, *ὅπως ἂν οὖν φαίνηται ἡ πόλις τῶν Ὀρωπίων, καθάπερ αὐτεῖ προσήκει, εὐσεβῶς καὶ ἐνδόξως τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς συντελοῦσα καὶ εὐχαριστοῦσα τεῖ πόλει τῶν Ἀκραιφιείων*. Although there was only one god concerned, Apollo Ptoios, the phrase *πρὸς τοὺς θεούς* generalized exactly as in the prefect's declaration at Eleusis.

Furthermore, just as Greek international law gave protection to sanctuaries or festivals, it was familiar with grants of *ἀσυλία-ἀσφάλεια* made in much the same terms to cities. Decrees of the Aetolian League provide examples.⁸⁷ Although the conduct of the Aetolian League itself provided no respectable precedent in Greek international law, this extension of a device invented for the benefit of religion reflects a more general development which prepared the way for the Roman grants of special protection to an endowment which was not the property of a sanctuary but the property of a city or village.

The writer can find no evidence that the ordinances of Hellenistic kings ever had the character of a decree of the Amphictyonic League raising an article of local law to the status of international law. The epistles of Hellenistic kings, promising *asylia* to all those traveling to and from a festival and any other support to the festival of a favored city or to an international organization of Dionysiac Artists, more closely resemble in character the help given by a polis. The kings, of course, had much more power than any one polis, and the power to

⁸⁵ The Greek conception of a state was a group of *μετέχοντες* rather than a territory, as Ernst Meyer, *Vom griechischen und römischen Staatsgedanken, Eumenia, Festgabe für Ernst Howald* . . . , 30-53, Zurich, Eugen Rentsch, 1947, has recently emphasized. Hence it was not unnatural for Greek cities to treat the international organization of the Dionysiac Artists as a state. The Roman government in the Greek East followed the custom, and the Roman emperors answered requests from the Dionysiac Artists significantly with epistles.

⁸⁶ B. Leonardos, *'Αρχ. ΕΦ.*, 1892, 40-44, No. 70.

⁸⁷ See *IG IX* 1² fasc. 1, and G. Klaffenbach, *Asylievertrag zwischen Ätolien und Milet, Sitzungsber. Berlin* 1937: 155-159.

⁸⁸ In any discussion of international order the services rendered and attempts made by the Amphictyony should be among the first to receive attention as they do from J. A. O. Larsen, *Federation for Peace in Ancient Greece, Cl. Phil.* 39: 145-162, 1944.

bring pressure on others,⁸⁹ but the royal epistle, though it might mean more, never juristically⁹⁰ replaced the Amphictyonic decree as the Roman *senatus consultum*, and later the decision of a Roman magistrate, eventually replaced the Amphictyonic decree. In other words, here again Rome at first played the part of a Hellenistic major power, and it arrogated to itself an Amphictyonic or truly international role in the time of Sulla.

Since Rome began as a Hellenistic major power and since in general the Roman governor was the functional descendant of the Hellenistic king, it is easily understood that the Romans might prefer the epistulary form of communication or announcement, especially when the *senatus consultum* was no longer decisive. Therefore, the writer would suggest that Septimius Severus and Caracalla in Cases VIII and IX replied to the petition of Aurelius Horion by an epistulary rescript rather than by a *subscriptio* because grants of *asylia* (not *asylum*) were traditionally extended by the Hellenistic kings in epistles. Not the presence of the emperors in Egypt nor yet the form of the petition but the subject of the petition determined the epistulatory form of the rescript.⁹¹

In view of the history of the procedure, in view of the custom of Hellenistic chanceries, it is only natural that the rescript should always be worded as an epistle, never as a *subscriptio*, not even when the postulant was a private citizen. After all the private citizen, when he submitted a written petition of this sort, functioned like an ambassador speaking in behalf of a public corporation. This kind of request is fundamentally different from a private *libellus*. The rescripts of Cases VIII and IX, as P. Meyer⁹² argued, were probably written when Septimius Severus was in or near Egypt, but it is incorrect to attribute the epistulatory form of the rescript to the conditions under which the emperor traveled, for he was presumably accompanied by all the chief secretaries including the *a libellis*.⁹³

The growth of the type of document represented by the Roman declaration protecting Greek endowments

⁸⁹ Note that Antiochus III (Welles, *Royal Correspondence* 31) does not accept for the poleis but agrees to get the poleis to accept. There is no replacement here of a national court by the higher international instance. The writer, having no desire to participate in the controversy concerning the relation of the kings to the poleis, will refer the reader to David Magie, *Roman rule in Asia Minor*, pp. 56 f. and 825-828, Princeton Univ. Press, 1950.

⁹⁰ Some might prefer the less specific adverb "morally."

⁹¹ As is well known, U. Wilcken, *Zu den Kaiserreskripten*, *Hermes* 55: 1-42, 1920, concluded that the answer to an epistle was an epistle and that the answer to a *libellus* was a *subscriptio*; that a city or a Roman magistrate always sent an epistle, a private citizen always a *libellus*. This is too rigid; if the *libellus* concerned the affairs of a city, the reply might come as an epistle, especially if the petitioner were a personage of some importance.

⁹² *Klio* 8: 130-135, 1907.

⁹³ The presence of the chief secretaries at Antioch is mentioned in the minutes of a trial before Caracalla on an inscription published by P. Roussel and F. De Visscher, *Syria* 23: 176-194, 1942-1943.

may be studied in another way by comparing in outline the construction of several instruments schematically as follows:

Content of the Epistle (Welles 31) with which Antiochus III extended protection to the Lycophryena

Reference to the embassy and the request
Expression of his good will
Formula of approval (=acceptance), *ἀποδέχθμεθα*
Intention of helping, *πρόκειται τε ἡμῖν συναύξειν*.

Content of the epistle (Welles 32) with which the son and coregent of Antiochus III extended protection to the Lycophryena

Reference to the embassy and the request
Reference to his father's grant
Formula of approval, *ἀποδέχομαι*
Intention of helping, *πειράσομαι . . . συναύξειν*.

Content of the Amphictyonic decree *IG VII 4135* granting protection to the Ptoia of Acræphæia

[The beginning with the formula of approval and acceptance has been lost.]

The administrative decision to place during the festival period travelers and the sanctuary under the protection of the Amphictyonic Law, and the juristic decision as to what will constitute a violation. They are expressed in prohibitions against seizure of travelers and their goods and against violation of the sanctuary and an order for a trial of violators by the Amphictyons.

An order concerning the administration of the festival.

An order concerning the publication of the Amphictyonic decree.

A fine is specified against anyone who in a trial by the Amphictyons will be found to have violated the grant.

Content of the instrument in which protection was granted by the legate of Asia

Recognition of the noble motive behind the donation (lines 374-387). The key words are [*φιλοτεία*] *ειμουμένου*.

Expression of approval and satisfaction at the honor given to the donor (lines 387-395).

Advice (or an order expressed as advice, *νομίζω εὐλογον εἰναι*, etc.) concerning details of the draughting and administration (lines 395-399).

The administrative decision to place the endowment under the protection of Roman Public Law and to give it special protection against threats to its security. It is expressed in a prohibition against change of any sort (lines 399-403), *βούλομαι ταῦτα εἰσαῖ μένειν ἐπὶ τῶν αὐτῶν*, etc.

A fine is specified against anyone who (in the legate's court) will be found guilty of having violated the diataxis.

Reference to the proconsul's grant of protection.

Content of the rescript in which protection was granted by the governor of Lycia-Pamphylia

Formula of approval, *ἀποδέχομαι*.

Recognition of noble motive behind the donation, *φιλοτεία*.

The administrative decision to place the endowment under the protection of Roman Public Law (*βεβαιῶ*⁹⁴ *ἐπὶ τῷ ἀστάλευτῳ καὶ ἀμετάθετῳ εἰς τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον εἰναι*, etc.)

⁹⁴ This word is used by Plutarch, *Romulus*, 9, 3, *βεβαιοῦν τὴν ἀστάλιαν*, a context suggesting that it too belonged to the legal terminology in which Hellenistic grants of protection to sanctuaries were couched. Hence it is not surprising to find it employed also by a Hellenistic king, probably Attalus III, *Ἄστλιαν τῆς παρ' ὑμεῖν Περσικῆ[ς θεᾶς] ἐπὶ τούτῳ βεβαιῶ ὑμεῖν{ν}*

Content of the instrument at Eleusis in which protection was granted by the prefect.

Recognition of the noble motive, *φιλοτειμ[ιαν]*.
Formula of approval [*ἀποέχουσι*] *καὶ αὐτός*.

The administrative decision to place the endowment under the protection of Roman Public Law and to give it special protection against threats to its security. This was partly expressed in the formula of approval=acceptance; it is expressed further in an indirect prohibition against change of any sort, *πρὸς τὸ [μὴ σα]λευθῆν[α] ποτε τοῦ] τὸ κεφάλαιον μήτε τὴν ποσότητα τῶν [καθιερωμέν]ῶν δημαρχῶ (ἐν) μειωθῆναι.*

A fine is specified against anyone who *<in a Roman court>* will be found to have violated the diatasis.

An order concerning the administration.

A justification of the order concerning the administration.

Content of the second rescript at Oxyrhynchus

Formula of approval, *ἀποδεχόμεθα*
Reference to the request, *ἀξιοῖς*.
The administrative decision to place the endowment

ἔφ' ϕ μ[ηδὲν] | ἐν τῇ δωρεᾷ ταύτῃ ἀπαλλαγῆνα[ι τὴν] | συνήθειαν ἦν ἔχετε (Welles, *Royal Correspondence* 68), in a passage resembling the guarantee from the governor of Lycia-Pamphylia even in the use of the word *δωρεά* and in the prepositional phrase forbidding alteration of terms.

under the protection of Roman Public Law and to give it special protection against threats to its security. The decision is expressed by a statement that change will be forbidden, *φυλαχθήσεται . . . ἀμετάστρεψτον εἰς ἔτερόν τι δαπανήσ[εσ]θαι.*

In conclusion we may say that here again Rome has taken the place of the Amphictyonic Council as a source of international law, and we remind the reader that in general the development of Amphictyonic Law was a reflection of the classical development of Athenian Law as the international law of the Athenian Empire.⁹⁵ It came into being because the cities, no longer united by Athens, felt that they had to have it. One who studies the Roman declarations within the framework of an ancient striving for international order will realize that the Greek cities have influenced Rome to undertake, as *hēgemōn* of the league, primarily for them, not for herself, something they have always wanted, and perhaps he too, like Aelius Aristides, will recognize the movement of a humane and helpful spirit, the beneficent World-Soul within the Roman Cosmos.

⁹⁵ R. J. Bonner and Gertrude Smith, Administration of justice in the Delphic Amphictyony, *Ci. Phil.* 38: 1-12, 1943.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. EDITIONS OF THE ROMAN ORATION

- First Aldine edition. 1513. Isocratis opera. Venice, Manuzio. The Panathenaic and Roman Orations of Aelius Aristides were included.
- BONINI, EUFROSINO. 1517. Orationes Aristides, 79-84. Florence, Philippus Iunta.
- Second Aldine edition. 1534. Isocrates nuper accurate recognitus, 106-111. Venice, Manuzio.
- STEPHANUS, HENRICUS. 1593. Isocratis orationes et epistolae . . . Gorgiae et Aristidis quaedam, eiusdem cum Isocraticis argumenti, 98-126. Paris.
- STEPHANUS, PAULUS. 1604. Aelii Aristidis Adrianensis oratoris clarissimi, tomus tres 1: 344-399. [Geneva], Oliva Pauli Stephani.
- WEBB, SAMUEL. 1722. Aelii Aristidis Adrianensis opera omnia graece et latine 1: 197-228. Oxford, e Theatro Sheldoniano.
- DINDORF, WILHELM. 1829. Aristides 1: 321-370, Oratio XIV. Leipzig, Weidmann.
- KEIL, BRUNO. 1898. Aelii Aristidis Smyrnae quae supersunt omnia 2: 91-124, Oratio XXVI. Berlin, Weidmann.

II. TRANSLATIONS OF THE ROMAN ORATION

- CANTER, WILLEM. 1566. Aristidis orationum tomus tres nunc primum latine versi. Basle. This translation has been reprinted in the editions of Henricus Stephanus (1593), which I used, Paulus Stephanus (1604), and Samuel Jebb (1722).
- CARTEROMACHUS (FORTEGUERRI), SCIPIO. January 1519. Ad Galeotum Ruverem . . . Cardinalem . . . Scipionis Carteromachi in Aristidis orationem de urbe Roma . . . e Graeco in Latinum conversam, epistola. The epistle and translation are published in the *Historiae augustae scriptores*, 281-302. Florence, per heredes Philippi Iuntae.
- August 1519. They are published also in the other edition of the *Historiae augustae scriptores*, 397-419. Venice, in aedibus Aldi, et Andreae socii.
- HEPNER, ERNST. 1824. Aristides Lobrede auf Rom. Breslau. Non vidi.
- LEVIN, SAUL. 1950. *Els Πάνην*, To Rome by Aelius Aristides translated with notes and introduction. 31 pages. Glencoe, Illinois, The Free Press.
- LIVINGSTONE, R. W. 1928. The mission of Greece, some Greek views of life in the Roman world, 255-259, has incomplete translation of sections 58-60, 63, 65-67, 69-70, 84, 97-101, 31-33, 38-39. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- STELLA, LUIGLIA ACHILLEA. 1940. In gloria di Roma, orazione di Elio Aristide: introduzione, traduzione e commento. 138 pages. Rome, Edizioni Roma. Reviewed by F. Zucker, *Gnomon* 21: 57-60, 1949.
- TOYNBEE, ARNOLD J. 1939. A study of history 5: 343 f.; 6: 371, has incomplete translation of sections 102-103, 29, 36, 65-66, 60-62, 38-39. Oxford Univ. Press.
- TURTZEVICH, IVAN. 1907. The panegyric of Rome by Aelius Aristides (in Russian). Nyezhin in the Ukraine. Non vidi.
- ZURETTI, CARLO ORESTE. 1923. L'encomio di Roma di Elio Aristide. Milan. Of this translation, which I have not seen, many passages are reprinted by Aurelio Peretti, *Luciano, un intelletuale greco contro Roma*, Florence, Nuova Italia, 1946.

III. OTHER STUDIES OF THE ROMAN ORATION

- BARTOLETTI, VITTORIO. 1935. Per l'encomio di Roma di Elio Aristide, *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 12: 209-214.
- BOULANGER, ANDRÉ. 1923. Aelius Aristide et la sophistique dans la province d'Asie au II^e siècle de notre ère (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 126), 348-357. Paris, de Boccard.

BÜCHNER, WILHELM. 1890. Zu Aelius Aristides, *Philologus* 49: 182 f.

HEITLAND, WILLIAM EMERTON. 1928. Last words on the Roman municipalities, 64-80, Discussion of certain ancient panegyrics on the Roman Empire. Cambridge Univ. Press.

HUG, A. 1912. Leben und Werke des Rhetors Aristides, 30-33. Diss., Freiburg in Switzerland.

GERNENTZ, WILHELM. 1918. Laudes Romae. Diss., Rostock.

LACOUR-GAYET, GEORGES. 1883. Antonin le Pieux et son temps, 100 f. Paris.

MESK, JOSEPH. 1909. Der Aufbau der XXVI. Rede des Aelius Aristides. Vienna, Progr. Franz-Joseph Realgymn.

MOMMSEN, THEODOR. 1884. Die Conscriptionsordnung der römischen Kaiserzeit, *Hermes* 19: 63-64. Reprinted in Mommesen's *Gesammelte Schriften* 6: 78-80. Berlin, Weidmann, 1908.

PASCAL, CARLO. 1905. Graecia capta, 163-177, Una fonte probabile di Rutilio. Florence, Le Monnier.

REISKE, JO. JACOB. 1761. Animadversionum ad Graecos autores volumen tertium, 269-311. Leipzig.

ROSTOVTEFF, MICHAEL. 1926. Social and economic history of the Roman Empire, 125-129. Oxford, Clarendon Press.

SCHÖNBAUER, ERNST. 1931. Reichsrecht gegen Volksrecht? *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte*, Roman. Abt. 51: 321-331.

SHERWIN-WHITE, A. N. 1939. The Roman Citizenship, 202, 208, 256-263, 275 f. Oxford, Clarendon Press.

STARR, CHESTER G., JR. October 1952. The perfect democracy of the Roman Empire, *Amer. Hist. Rev.* 58: 1-17.

IV. SOME GENERAL STUDIES OF THE STYLE OF AELIUS ARISTIDES

BAUMGART, HERMANN. 1874. Aelius Aristides als Repräsentant der sophistischen Rhetorik des zweiten Jahrhunderts der Kaiserzeit. Leipzig.

BOULANGER, ANDRÉ. 1923. Aelius Aristide et la sophistique dans la province d'Asie au II^e siècle de notre ère (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 126). Paris, de Boccard. Reviewed by W. Schmid, *Philologische Wochenschrift*, 1-14, 1924, and by Wilamowitz, *Litteris* 2: 125-130, 1925.

GEFFCKEN, JOHANNES. 1929. Antiplatonica, *Hermes* 64: 87-109.

HUBBELL, HARRY M. 1913. The influence of Isocrates upon Cicero, Dionysius and Aristides. Diss., Yale Univ.

KEIL, BRUNO. 1905. Eine Kaiserrede, *Nachrichten der K. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, Phil.-hist. Kl., 381-428, 1905.

NORDEN, EDUARD. 1898. Die antike Kunstprosa, 401 f. Leipzig.

WILAMOWITZ-MÖELLENDORFF, ULRICH VON. 1925. Der Rhetor Aristides, *Sitzungsber. der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Phil.-hist. Kl., 333-353, 1925.

V. MANUSCRIPTS OF AELIUS ARISTIDES

KEIL, BRUNO. 1898. Aelii Aristidis Smyrnae quae supersunt omnia 2: i-xxxii.

LENZ, FRIEDRICH. 1931. Aristidesstudien, *Hermes* 66: 49-70.

VI. BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REPORTS ON MODERN LITERATURE CONCERNING ARISTIDES

MÜNSCHER, KARL. 1910. *Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 149: 28-57 for 1905-1909.

— 1917. *Ibid.* 170: 58-64 for 1910-1915.

RICHTSTEIG, EBERHARD. 1927. *Ibid.* 211: 48-58 for 1915-1925.

— 1933. *Ibid.* 238: 15-22 for 1926-1930.

GERTH, KARL. 1941. *Ibid.* 272: 94-124 for 1931-1938.

A P P E N D I X

I

GREEK TEXT OF THE ROMAN ORATION OF AELIUS ARISTIDES

ΕΙΣ ΡΩΜΗΝ

- 1 Ἐθος τοῖς πλέονσι καὶ ὁδοιποροῦσιν εὐχὰς ποιεῖσθαι καθ'
ῶν ἀν ἔκαστος ἐπινοῇ· ποιητὴς μὲν οὖν ἥδη τις ἐπε σκώφας
εὔξασθαι· κατὰ χρυσόκερω λιβανωτοῦ·, ἡμεῖς δέ, ὡ ἄνδρες,
παρὰ τὴν ὅδον τὴν ἐνταῦθα καὶ τὸν πλοῦν εὐχὴν ταύτην ἐποιη-
σάμεθα, οὐκ ἀμουσοῦν οὐδὲ ἐκμελῆ οὐδὲ ἀπὸ τῆς τέχνης, εἰ σωθείη-
2 μεν, προσερεῖν ἐν τῷ μέσῳ τὴν πόλιν. κατὰ ἴσομετρήτου μὲν οὖν
εὔξασθαι τῇ πόλει λόγου οὐκ ἐνήν, ἀλλ’ ὡς ἀληθῶς εὐχῆς αὐ
προσεδεῖτο ἐτέρας· ἵσως μὲν οὖν καὶ μείζονος δυνηθῆναι τοιοῦτον
ἄραι λόγον, ὅστις παρισώσεται τοσῷδε ὅγκῳ πόλεως· προσερεῖν
γε μὴν ὑπεσχόμεθα, ὅπως ἀν δυνώμεθα, ἐπειδή γε καὶ ἄλλοι τὰ
ἴσομετρητα σφίσιν αὐτοῖς ἴσομετρητα ποιοῦσιν αὐ καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς.
3 ἀλλ’, ὡ ἄνδρες, οἱ τῆς μεγάλης ἔνοικοι πόλεως, εἴ τι μέτεστιν
ἡμῖν προνοίας μὴ ἐμὲ φεύσασθαι τὴν εὐχήν, συνάρασθε τῷ τολμή-
ματι ἵνα τῶν ἐγκωμίων πρῶτον ἀρχόμενοι καὶ τοῦτο ἔχωμεν
λέγειν, ὅτι εὐθὺς μὲν τοιούτοις ἀνδράσιν ἐντυχεῖν ἥν, ὑφ’ ὧν τις,
‘καν ἀμουσος ἥ τὸ πρὶν’ κατ’ Εὐριπίδην, ἐμμελής τε καὶ δεξιὸς
εὐθὺς γίγνεται καὶ δύναται λέγειν καὶ περὶ τῶν μειζόνων ἥ κατ’
4 αὐτόν· τὴν δὲ πόλιν ἄδοντι μὲν πάντες καὶ ἄσονται, τοσούτῳ δὲ
ἐλάττῳ ποιοῦσιν ἥ σωπῶντες, ὅσῳ παρὰ μὲν τὴν σωπὴν οὐτε
μείζονα οὔτ’ ἐλάττονα ἔστι ποιῆσαι τῆς οὔστης, ἀλλ’ ἀκέραιος τῇ
γνώσει μένει, οἱ δὲ λόγοι τούναντίον οὐ βούλονται ποιοῦσιν·
ἐπαινοῦντες γάρ οὐ δεικνύουσιν ἀκριβῶς ὃ θαυμάζουσιν, ἀλλ’
ῶσπερ ἀν εἴ τις ζωγράφος σῶμα καλὸν καὶ περιβλεπτον ἐπιχει-
ρῶν δεῖξαι διὰ τέχνης, εἴτα ἀπολείποιτο, πᾶς τις ἀν δή που φάι
λυσιτελεῖν μὴ γράφειν, ἀλλ’ ἥ αὐτὸς ἰδεῖν ἔαν, ἥ μὴ δεικνύειν
〈γε〉 αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ τὸ χείρον μιμούμενον, ὡς δὲ καὶ περὶ ταύτης μοι
5 δοκεῖ τῆς πόλεως ἔχειν· ἀφαιροῦσιν οἱ λόγοι τὰ πολλὰ τῶν
θαυμάτων καὶ ποιεῖν δοκοῦσί μοι παραπλήσιον ὕσπερ ἀν εἴ τις
στρατιᾶς πλῆθος ἔξαγγελαι βουλόμενος, οἷον τῆς Ξέρξου, καὶ
πάντα δὴ θαυμάζων, εἴτα λέγοι μυρίους ἥ δισμυρίους στρατιώτας
ἰδεῖν, ἵππον δὲ τόσην καὶ τόσην, οὐδὲ πολλοστὸν μέρος τοῦ
παντὸς λέγων ἐν οἷς θαυμάζει.
6 Ἡ γὰρ δὴ πρώτη λόγου δύναμιν ἔξελέγεξασα οὐκ ἐπὶ πᾶν ἐφικ-
νούμενην ἥδε ἔστι· περὶ ἥς μὴ ὅτι εἰπεῖν κατὰ τὴν ὁξίαν ἔστιν,
ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ ἰδεῖν ἀξίως αὐτήν, ἀλλ’ ὡς ἀληθῶς “Ἀργου τιὼς πανόπ-
του, μᾶλλον δὲ τοῦ κατέχοντος αὐτὴν πανόπτου θεοῦ δεῖ. τίς γὰρ
ἀν τοσάσθ δρῶν κορυφᾶς κατειλημμένας ἥ πεδίων νομοὶν ἐκτε-
πολισμένους ἥ γῆν τοσήνδε εἰς μᾶς πόλεως ὄνομα συνηγμένην,
7 εἴτα ἀκριβῶς καταθεάσαιτο; ἀπὸ ποίας τοιαύτης σκοπιάς; ὅπερ
1. οὖν om. DT.
2. οὖν om. D. αὐ εὐχῆσ D.
3. πρῶτον hic om., post τοῦτο add. U. ἀρχόμενοι DU: ἀρχώ-
μεθα ST. κατ’ εὐριπίδην τὸ πρὶν U.
4. τοσούτῳ U. ἐλάττῳ DU: ἔλαττον T. οὐ βούλονται DSU:
ἥ βούλονται T. ἀν φαίη δήπον D. δεικνύειν 〈γε〉 Wil. αὐτοῖς
Wil Keil: αὐτοῖς O.
5. στρατείασ S¹T. θαυμάζων T: θαυμάζειν SDU. λέγει U.
ἥ δισμυρίους om. D.
6. 〈τὴν τοῦ〉 λόγου Rsk². ἐφικνούμενην S²U²: ἀφικνούμενην
DU¹T. δρῶν Keil: δρῶν O. καταθεάσαιτο US²: καταθεάσατο
S¹DT.
8. οὐδὲ SUT: οὐκ D. τῆσδε Keil: τῆδε O. διαλεῖπόν Rsk:
διάλοιπον O.
9. ἐνδειξάμην Rsk: ἐνδειξάμην O. εἰπεῖν 〈ἔστιν〉 Wil.
{μηκέτι} seclusit Keil.
10. εἰ δὴ O: an 〈έπειδη? ante κτῆσιν add. Canter καὶ
(prob. Rsk² Keil). προσαγορεύει μέχρις D.

- κέκλινται, πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἀεί τι <τὸν> ἐνθένδε πληροῦσαι. ἄγεται δὲ ἐκ πάσης γῆς καὶ θαλάττης ὅσα ὥραι φύουσι καὶ χώραι ἔκασται φέρουσιν καὶ ποταμοὶ καὶ λίμναι καὶ τέχναι Ἑλλήνων καὶ βαρβάρων· ὡστε εἴ τις ταῦτα πάντα ἐπιδεῖν βούλοιτο, δεῖ αὐτὸν ἡ πάσαν ἐπελθόντα τὴν οἰκουμένην οὕτω θεάσασθαι ἡ ἐν τῇδε τῇ πόλει γενόμενον. ὅσα γὰρ παρ' ἔκάστοις φύεται καὶ κατασκευάζεται, οὐκ ἔστιν ὡς οὐκ ἐνταῦθα ἀεὶ καὶ περιττεύει. τοσαῦται δὲ ἀφικνοῦνται δεῦρο κομίζουσαι <πάντα> παρὰ πάντων ὀλκάδες ἀνὰ πάσαν μὲν ὥραν, πάσαν δὲ φθινοπώρου περιτροπήν,
- 12 ὡστ' ἐουκέντα τὴν πόλιν κοινῷ τινι τῆς γῆς ἐργαστηρίῳ. φόρτους μὲν ἀπ' Ἰνδῶν, εἰ βούλει δὲ καὶ τὸν εὐδαιμόνων Ἀράβων, τοσούτους ὁρᾶν ἔξεστιν ὡστε εἰκάζειν γυμνὰ τὸ λουπὸν τοῖς ἐκεῖ λελεῖθαι τὰ δένδρα καὶ δένρο δεῖν ἐκείνους ἐλθεῖν, ἕάν του δένωται, τῶν σφετέρων μεταιτήσοντας· ἐσθῆτας δὲ αὖτις Βαβυλωνίους καὶ τοὺς ἐκ τῆς ἐπέκεινα βαρβάρους κόσμους πολὺ πλείους τε καὶ ῥῶν εἰσαφικνούμενους ἡ εἰ ἐκ Νάξου ἡ Κύθνου Ἀθήνας¹ ἔδει κατάραι τῶν ἐκεῖ τι φέροντας· γεωργίαι δὲ ὑμῶν Αἴγυπτος,
- 13 Σικελία, Λιβύης ὅσον ἡμερον. κατάπλοι δὲ καὶ ἀπόπλοι οὐποτε λείπουσιν· ὡστε εἶναι θαυμάσαι μὴ ὅτι περὶ τοῦ λιμένος, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῆς θαλάττης ὅτι, <εἴ>περ, ἔξαρκεῖ ὀλκάσιν. ἀτεχνῶς δὲ ὅπερ Ἡσίοδος ἔφη περὶ τῶν τοῦ Ὄκεανοῦ περάτων, εἶναι τόπον οὐ συντετρήσθαι πάντα εἰς μίαν ἀρχήν τε καὶ τελευτήν, εἰς αὐτὴν συντέτρηται, καὶ πάντα ἐνταῦθα συμπίπτει, ἐμπορίαι, ναυτιλίαι, γεωργίαι, μετάλλων καθάρσεις, τέχναι διόπτραι εἰσὶ τε καὶ γεγένηται, πάντα ὅσα γεννάται καὶ φύεται. ὅ τι δ' ἀν μὴ ἐνταῦθα ἴδῃ τις, οὐκ ἔστι τῶν γενομένων ἡ γιγνομένων· ὡστε μὴ εἶναι ῥάδιον διακρῖναι πότερα ἡ πόλις ὑπερέχει πλεῖον εἰς τὰς πόλεις τὰς οὖσας ἡ ἀρχὴ τὰς ἀρχὰς τὰς πάποτε γενομένας.
- 14 Ἐρυθρῷ δῆτα, εἰ τοσούτων καὶ τηλικούτων εἱρημένων, εἴτα μὴ ἔχοντος τοῦ λόγου, φανοῦμαι μεμνημένος ἡ βαρβαρικῆς τινος ἀρχῆς ἡ Ἑλληνικῆς δυνάμεως, καὶ δόξω τούναντίον ποιήσειν τοῖς Αἰολεῦσι ποιηταῖς. ἐκεῖνοι μὲν γὰρ ἐπειδάν τι βούλωνται τῶν καθ' αὐτὸν φαυλίσαι, μεγάλῳ αὐτῷ παρέβαλον καὶ παρ' ἀρχαῖοις περιφανεῖ, ἡγούμενοι μάλιστα ἀν οὗτως ἔξελέγχειν· ἐγὼ δὲ τὰ ὑμέτερα οὐκ ἔχων ἐπιδεκνύειν ἀλλως ὅσῳ ὑπερέχει, παραβαλῶ μικροῖς ἀρχαῖοις· πάντα γὰρ ὑμεῖς καὶ τὰ μέγιστα μικρότατα ἀπεφήνατε τὰς ὑπερβολαῖς. ἐπεὶ ἐγὼ μὲν τὰ μέγιστα ἐκλέξας ἐρῶ, ὑμεῖς δ' ἵσως γελάσεσθε ἐπ' αὐτοῖς.
- 15 Τοῦτο μὲν δὴ τὴν Περσῶν ἀρχὴν σκεψώμεθα, ἡ πάντι ποτὲ ἐν τοῖς Ἑλλησιν ἐβεβόητο καὶ μέγαν παρέσχε τὸ ἐπώνυμον καλεῖσθαι τὸν ἔχοντα αὐτὴν βασιλέα — τὰς γὰρ πρὸ αὐτῆς φαυλοτέρας οὖσας ἔστω —· καὶ πάντα ἴδωμεν ἔξῆς, τὸ τε μέγεθος καὶ τὰ γιγνόμενα ἐπ' αὐτῆς. δεῖ γὰρ οὖν καὶ τοῦτο συνεξετάξειν, ὅπως αὐτοὶ τε ἀπέλανον ὧν ἐκέκτηρον καὶ τοὺς ἀρχομένους παρεσκεύ-
-
11. <τὸν> Keil. ἔκασται STU: ἔκαστα D. φέρουσι STU: φέρουσαι D. πάντα S: om. DUT. τοσαῦτα US¹ p. corr. et Sieveking (28): τοσαῦται S¹ a. corr. DT et Keil, qui <πάντα> addidit.
12. 'Αράβων SU: ἀρράβων D, ἀραβίων T. εἰ om. D. Κύθνος Canter, Κύδον O.
13. <εἴ>περ scripsi: περ O. εἰς ταῦτην Rsk² Wil: εἰς αὐτὴν O. ἐμπορίαι om. U. καθάρσεις Rsk: καθάρσις O. ἴδοι DST: ἴδοι U. γενομένων STU: γεννωμένων D. πότερα DSU: πότερον T. {els} secl. Keil.
14. δόξω Rsk: δοκῶ O. παρ' ἀρχαῖοis Keil: παρ' ἀρχαῖo O. ἔξελέγχαι Bergk Keil: ἔξελέγχειν O.
15. τὸ τε μέγεθος S: τε om. DTU. ἀπέλανον STU: ἀπέλαθον D.
16. ὑμῖν UT: ἡμῖν SD. <ἢ> add. Rsk. ἐσχατιαῖς Rsk: ἐσχάτασι O. <γ> add. Ald. αὐτῷ Wil: αὐτῇ O.
17. ἔχοιεν: desunt nunc in S duobus foliis excisis (17-28). μένων DU: μὲν T.
18. μέλλοι TU: μέλλει D. βαίνοι TU: βαίνει D. διαφέροντες Rsk dubitanter, Keil: διέφερον DTU. ἐν ταῦτῳ TU: ἐνταῦθα D. <ἢπ<α>σαν> scripsi: ὅπως ἀν DTU; δπως <πᾶσ>αν Bartoletti. κατέχειν T: κατέχοιεν DU.
19. ηὗξον U: ηὔξον DT. εἰς μὴ εἰσ D. προσήκοντα edd.: προσήκοντας DTU. <ὡς> Keil. ἀρξοντι edd.: ἀρξωσι DTU.
20. φιλονεικίας DTU.

- 21 συνεχεῖς ἔριδας καὶ ἀπαύστους φιλονικίας. αὐτοὶ μὲν δὴ ταῦτα ἀπέλαυνον, ὥσπερ ἐκ κατάρας μᾶλλον ἄρχοντες ἢ κατ' εὐχήν, οἱ δὲ ἄρχομενοι πάντα ἡ τοὺς ὑπὸ τοιούτων ἄρχομένους ἀνάγκη, σχεδὸν δέ τι καὶ προείρηται. φοβερὸν μὲν γὰρ ἦν γονεῦσι παιδὸς εὐμορφία, φοβερὸν δὲ γυναικὸς ἀνδρί· ἔδει δὲ ἀπολωλέναι οὐ τὸν πλεῖστα ἀδικήσαντα, ἀλλὰ τὸν πλεῖστα κεκτημένον. πόλεων δὲ ἀναιρέσεις καὶ κατασκαφὰ τότε πλείους ἢ νῦν ὀλίγουν
 22 δέω λέγειν εἰσὶν οἰκισμοὶ. ᾧδον δὲ ἦν πολεμοῦντα ἢ ὑπακούοντα σωθῆναι· ἐν μὲν γὰρ ταῖς μάχαις ῥᾳδίως ἡττώντο, ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἔξουσίαις οὐ μετρίως ὑβριζον· καὶ τοὺς μὲν θεραπεύοντας ὡς δούλους ὑπερέωρων, τοὺς δὲ ἐλευθέρους ὡς ἔχθροὺς ἐκόλαζον, ἔξ
 23 ὧν μισοῦντές τε καὶ μισούμενοι διῆγον· καὶ γὰρ οὖν πολλάκις τοὺς ὑπηρόδους μᾶλλον τῶν πολεμίων ἐδεδοίκεσαν, τὰ πλείω διαλλακτῇ τῷ πολέμῳ χρώμενοι. αἴτιον δ' ἦν, οὕτε ἔκεινοι ἄρχειν ἡπίσταντο οὔπει οἱ ἄρχομενοι τὸ ἀκόλουθον ἀπεπλήρουν. οὐ γὰρ ἔνεστιν ἄρχεσθαι καλῶς, ὅταν κακὸς οἱ ἄρχοντες ἄρχωσιν. οὕτω γὰρ ἡ τε ἄρχῃ καὶ τὸ δεσπόζειν δῆρητο, ἀλλ' ἣν ἵστην βασιλεὺς καὶ δεσπότης. οὐκον εἰκότως οὐδὲ ἐπὶ μεγάλα προῆθον· οὐ γὰρ πρόεισιν οἴκου περαιτέρω τοῦτο τούνομα, ὅταν δὲ εἰς πόλεις τε καὶ ἔθνη ἀφίκηται, ῥᾳδίως παύεται.
 24 'Αλέξανδρος δ' αὐτὸς τὴν μεγάλην ἄρχην μέχρι τῆς ὑμετέρας κτησάμενος καὶ καταδραμὰν τὴν γῆν ὡς ἀληθῶς δὴ τοῦτο κτησάμενῳ βασιλείαν μᾶλλον ἔσκειν ἢ βασιλεύσαντι. ὥσπερ γὰρ ἀντὶ τις ἰδιώτης συγκτήσατο μὲν γῆν πολλὴν καὶ ἀγαθήν, πρὶν δὲ λαβεῖν ἀπ' αὐτῆς τοὺς καρποὺς τελευτήσειν, ὡς δὴ κάκεινῳ
 25 μοι δοκεῖ συμβῆναι. προῆλθε μὲν γὰρ ἐπὶ πλεῖστον τῆς γῆς καὶ τοὺς ἀντιστάντας ἄπαντας κατέστραπτο καὶ τῶν χαλεπῶν ἀπάντων ἀκριβῶς ἀπέλαυσεν· καταστήσασθαι δ' οὐδὲ ἡδυνήθη τὴν ἄρχην οὐδὲ ἐπιθέναι πέρας τοῖς πεπονημένοις, ἀλλ' ἀπέθανεν ἐν μέσῃ τῇ τῶν πραγμάτων πορείᾳ. ὥστε ἔκεινον μὲν μάχας ἄν τις φαίη πλείστας κατορθῶσαι, βασιλεῦσαι δὲ ἐλάχιστα, καὶ γενέσθαι μὲν ἀγωνιστὴν μέγαν περὶ βασιλείας, ἀπολαῦσαι δὲ οὐδὲν ἄξιον τῆς διανοίας καὶ τῆς τέχνης, ἀλλὰ παθεῖν παραπλήσιον ὥσπερ ἀντὶ τις τὸν Ὀλυμπικὸν ἀγῶνα ἀγωνιζόμενος καὶ κρατήσας τοὺς ἀντιπάλους, ἔιτα ἐπαποθάνοι τῇ νίκῃ, πρὶν εὖ καὶ καλῶς
 26 τῇ κεφαλῇ τὸν στέφανον ἀρμόσαται. ποίους γὰρ νόμους ἔκάστοις διέθηκεν; ἡ ποίας συντάξεις διηγεῖται χρημάτων ἢ στρατιωτῶν ἢ νεῶν ἐποιήσατο; ἡ ποία συνήθει διοικήσει τὰ πράγματα ἤγαγεν αὐτομάτως προϊούση χρόνων τακτάς περιόδοις; ποία πολιτεύματα ἐποιτεύσατο ἐν τοῖς ἄρχομένοις; δὲ καὶ μόνον ἄξιον τῆς ἕαυτοῦ φύσεως ἔργον καὶ μνημένον κατέλυπεν, πρὸς Αἰγύπτων τὴν ἐπώνυμον πόλιν, ταῦτην εὖ ποιῶν ὑμῖν ὄψισεν, ὅπως ἔχοιτε καὶ τῆς μεγίστης μετὰ τὴν ὑμετέραν κρατοίσητε. ὥστε Πέρσας μὲν κατέλυσεν ἄρχοντας, αὐτὸς δὲ ἐγγύτατα οὐκ ἦρξεν. 'Επει γέ μην ἔκεινος ἐτελεύτησεν, εὐθὺς μὲν ἐσχίσθησαν εἰς μυρία οἱ Μακεδόνες, ἔργῳ δεῖξαντες ὑπὲρ αὐτοὺς ἔναι τὴν ἄρχην, κατέχειν δὲ οὐδὲ τὴν αὐτὸν ἔτι ἐδύναντο, ἀλλ' εἰς τοῦτο τύχης ἀφίκοντο ὥστε ἡναγκάσθησαν τὴν σφετέραν αὐτῶν ἐκλιπεῖν, ἵνα τῆς ἀλλοτρίας ἄρχωσιν, ὥσπερ ἐξωκισμένοι μᾶλλον ἢ κρατεῖν δυνάμενοι, καὶ ἦν ὥσπερ αἴνιγμα, Μακεδόνες οὐκ ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ, ἀλλ' οὐ δύναιτο
- βασιλεύοντες ἔκαστοι, ὥσπερ φρουροὶ μᾶλλον τῶν πόλεων καὶ τῶν χωρίων ὃντες ἢ ἄρχοντες, ἀνάστατοι τινες, βασιλεῖς οὐχ ὑπὸ τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως ἀλλ' ὑφ' ἕαυτῶν αὐτοὶ γεγενημένοι, εἰ δὲ οἶν τε εἰπεῖν, σατράπαι ἔρημοι βασιλέως. καίτοι τὴν τοιαύτην κατάστασιν πότερον ληστείᾳ μᾶλλον ἢ βασιλείᾳ προσεοικέναι φήσομεν;
- Νῦν δὲ ὅροι μὲν δήπουνθεν οὐ μεμπτοὶ τῆς ἄρχης ἐκτέτανται, 28 οὐδὲ ὥστε εἴναι μέτρῳ λαβεῖν τὸ ἐντὸς αὐτῶν, ἀλλ' οὐ μὲν τότε ὥριζετο τοῦ Πέρου η ἄρχη, ἐντεῦθεν ἀρξαμένῳ βαδίζειν πρὸς ἐσπέραν πολὺ πλείους ἐστὶν ἡ λοιπὴ τῆς ἐκείνου πάσης. ἐκφεύγει δὲ ὑμᾶς οὐδέν, οὐ πόλις, οὐκ ἔθνος, οὐ λιμήν, οὐ χωρίον, πλὴν εἴ τινων ἄρα ἀχρηστίαν κατέγνωτε. Ἐρυθρά τε θάλαττα καὶ Νείλον καταρράκται καὶ λίμνη Μαιῶτις, ἡ τοῖς πρότερον ἐν πέρασι γῆς ἡκούετο, ἵσα καὶ αὐλῆς ἔρκια τῇδε τῇ πόλει. ὅν γε μὴν ἡπίστουν τινὲς τῶν λογοποιῶν μηδὲ εἴναι τὸ παράπαν Ὦκεανόν, μηδὲ περιρρεῖν τὴν γῆν, ποιητὰς δὲ εὑρόντας τούνομα ψυχαγωγίας ἔνεκα εἰς ποίησιν θέναι, τούτον οὗτως καλῶς ἀνεύρετε ὥστε οὐδὲ η ἐνταῦθα νῆσος ὑμᾶς διέφυγε. τοσαύτη δὲ 29 οὖσα καὶ τηλικαύτη τὸ μέγεθος ἡ ἄρχῃ πολὺ μείζων ἐστὶ τῇ ἀκριβείᾳ ἡ τῷ κύκλῳ τῆς χώρας. οὐ γὰρ Μυσοὶ τὴν βασιλέως ἔχουσιν οὐδὲ Σάκαι οὐδὲ Πισίδαι οὐδὲ ἄλλοι μέσοι, οἱ μὲν βίᾳ εἰσψικισμένοι, οἱ δὲ ἀποστάντες, ληφθῆναι δ' οὐ δυνάμενοι, οὐδὲ ἀκούει μὲν ἡ βασιλέως γῆ, ἔστι δὲ πάντων τῶν ἔχειν αὐτὴν δυναμένων, οὐδὲ σατράπαι μάχονται πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὥσπερ οὐκ οὗτος αὐτοῖς βασιλέως οὐδὲ πόλεις αἱ μὲν πρὸς τούτους, αἱ δὲ πρὸς ἐκείνους δύστανται, καὶ εἰς μὲν τὰς ἐκπέμπονται φρουροί, ἐκ δὲ τῶν ἐκπίπουσιν, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ αὐλὸς ἐκκεκαθαρμένος, οὗτως ἄπασα ἡ οἰκουμένη χοροῦ ἀκριβέστερον ἐν φθέγγεται, συνευχομένη μένειν τὸν ἄπαντα αἰώνα τήνδε τὴν ἄρχην· οὗτως καλῶς 30 ὑπὸ τοῦδε τοῦ κορυφαίου ἡγεμόνος συγκροτεῖται. ὑπὸ πάντων δὲ πανταχοῦ ἵσον ἄρχεται, καὶ οἱ μὲν ἐν τοῖς ὅρεσι κατωκισμένοι ταπεινότεροι τῶν ἐν τοῖς κοιλοτάτοις πεδίοις πρός γε τὸ μῆτατιτάτεσθαι, οἱ δὲ τῶν πεδίων τῶν εὐδαιμόνων κληροῦχοι τε καὶ οἰκήτορες ὑμέτεροι γεωργοί· ἡπειρος δὲ καὶ νῆσος οὐδὲν ἔτι διακέριται, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ μία χώρα συνεχής καὶ ἐν φύλον ἄπαντα ὑπακούει σωπῆ. πάντα δὲ ἐξ ἐπιτάγματος καὶ νεύματος τελεῖται ᾧδον ἡ τις ἀντὶ χορδὴν ψήλειν, καν τι γενέσθαι δέῃ, ἀπόχρη δόξαι, καὶ πέπρακται. οἱ δὲ ἄρχοντες οἱ πεμπόμενοι ἐπὶ τὰς πόλεις τε καὶ τὰ ἔθνη τῶν μὲν ὑφ' ἕαυτῶν ἔκαστοι ἄρχοντες εἰσι, τὰ δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς τε καὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὅμοιως ἄπαντες ἄρχομενοι, καὶ δὴ καὶ τούτῳ φαίη τις ἀντὶ τῶν ἄρχομένων διαφέρειν, ὅτι πρῶτοι δεικνύονται καὶ ἐφεστήκοτα καὶ κελεύοντα. οὐδεῖς δὲ ἐφ' ἕαυτῷ τηλικούτον φρονεῖ, ὅτις τούνομα ἀκούσας μόνον οἴλος τ' ἐστὶν ἀτρεμεῖν, ἀλλ' ἀναστὰς ὑμνεῖ καὶ σέβει καὶ συνεύχεται διπλῆν εὐχήν, τὴν μὲν ὑπὲρ
21. ἀπέλαυνον ΤΥ: ἀπέλαβον Δ.
22. ὑπηρόδους οἰκ. Δ. ἐδεδοίκεσαν ΔΤ.
24. ὥσπερ γὰρ Τ: γὰρ οἰκ. ΔU.
25. ἀντιστάτας Δ. καταστήσασθαι Marc. 428 (Aldus): καταστῆσαι ΔΤU.
26. ἔχοιτε edd.: ἔχητε ΔΤU. αὐτὸς Rsk: αὐτὸν ΔΤU.
27. δὲ ΔU: τε Τ. σατράπαι ἔρημοι ΔU: ἐοικότεσσατράπαιοις Τ.
28. αὐλῆς Canter: αὐτῆς STD, αὐτῇ U. δν STD: δ U. οὗτως STD: οὗτως U.
29. βασιλεύοντος SDU: βασιλείαν T. αὐλὸς scripsi: αὐλῆς περιβολος O. οὗτως STD: οὗτως U. ἡγεμόνος συγκροτεῖται STD: συγκροτεῖται ἡγεμόνος U.
30. ἔτι διακέριται Rsk: ἐπιδιακέριται O.
31. τούτως SD: τούτῳ ΤU.
32. περὶ STD: ὑπὲρ U. ἐνδοι<άζοι>εν Rsk: ἐνδοίεν O. εἰσπέμποντος Kaiibel: ἐκπέμποντος O.

αὐτοῦ τοῖς θεοῖς, τὴν δὲ αὐτῷ ἐκείνῳ περὶ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ. εἰ δέ τι καὶ μικρὸν ἐνδοι<άζοι>εν περὶ δίκας τε καὶ ἀξιώσεις ἡ κοινὰς ἡ ἴδιας τῶν ἀρχομένων, εἴ τινες ὅρα ἀξιοι εἶνεν, ὡς ἐκείνον ε<ἰσ>πέμπουσιν εὐθὺς ἐρωτώντες τί δεῖ ποιεῖν, καὶ μένουσιν ἔστ’ ἄν ἀποσημήνη, οὐχ ἥπτον ἡ διδάσκαλον χορός. ὥστε οὐδὲν δεῖ φθείρεσθαι περιουόντα τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπασαν, οὐδὲ ἄλλοτε ἐν ἄλλοις γιγνόμενον τὸ καθ’ ἐκαστον βεβαιοῦσθαι, δόποτε σφίσι τὴν γῆν πατοΐ· ἀλλ’ εὐμάρεια πολλὴ καθημένῳ πᾶσαν ἄγειν τὴν οἰκουμένην δι’ ἐπιστολῶν. αἱ δὲ μικρὸν φθάνουσι γραφεῖσαι καὶ 33 πάρεισν ὕσπερ ὑπὸ πτηγῶν φερόμεναι. ὁ δὲ πάντων ἀξιον ἀγασθαί τε καὶ θαυμάζειν καὶ χάριν ἐκτίνειν καὶ λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ, τοῦτο νῦν εἰρήσεται. τοσαύτην μὲν γὰρ ἔχοντες τὴν ἀρχήν, οὕτω δὲ ἐγκρατῶς καὶ κατὰ πολλὴν ἔξουσίαν ἀρχοντες, ἐκείνο καὶ πολὺ μάλιστα νενικήκατε, ὃ παντελῶς ὑμῶν ἐστιν ἴδιον.

34 μόνοι γὰρ τῶν πώποτε ἐλευθέρων ἀρχεῖ, καὶ οὐ Καρία δέδοται Τισαφέρειν οὐδὲ Φρυγία Φαρναβάζῳ οὐδὲ Αἴγυπτος ἑτέρῳ, οὐδὲ ὕσπερ οἶκος τοῦ δένειν ἀκούει τὸ ἔθνος, ὅτῳ παρεδόθη δουλεύειν οὐδὲ αὐτῷ ὅντι ἐλευθέρῳ, ἀλλ’ ὕσπερ οἱ ἐν ταῖς κατὰ μίαν πόλεσιν, οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς ὕσπερ ἐν μιᾷ πόλει πάσῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ πολιτεύμενοι τοὺς ἀρχοντας καθίστατε οἵον ἐξ ἀρχαιρεσῶν, ἐπὶ προστασίᾳ καὶ προνοίᾳ τῶν ἀρχομένων, οὐκ ἐπὶ τῷ δεσπότας εἶναι ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς· ὥστε ὑποχωρεῖ μὲν ἀρχῶν ἀρχοντι, ὅταν αὐτοῦ ὁ χρόνος ἐξήκη, καὶ οὐδὲ ἄν ἀπαντήσει ῥάδιως· τοσοῦτον ἀπέχει τοῦ διενεχθῆναι ἄγαν ὡς αὐτοῦ τῆς χώρας οὐσησ. ἐκκλητοι δὲ ὕσπερ ἔφεσι ἐκ δημοτῶν εἰς δικαστήριον σὺν οὐκ ἐλάττονι τῶν δεξαμένων φόβῳ περὶ τῆς κρίσεως ἡ τῶν ποιουμένων γίγνονται· ὥστε φαίη τις ἀν τοσάντα ἀρχεσθαι τοὺς νῦν ὑπὸ τῶν πεμπομένων, ὅπόσα ἀν αὐτοῖς ἀρέσκῃ. πῶς οὖν ταῦτα οὐκ ἐν τοῖς ἐπέκεινα πάσης δημοκρατίας; οὔκουν ἐκεὶ ἔξεστι μετὰ τὴν ἐν τῇ πόλει ψῆφον ἐνεχθείσαν ἐλθεῖν ἀλλοσ οὐδὲ ἐπ’ ἄλλους δικαστάς, ἀλλὰ στέργειν ἀνάγκη τοῖς ἐγνωμένοις, εἰ μή τις ἐστι μικρὰ πόλις, ὥστε προσδεῖσθαι δικαστῶν ὑπεροίρων παρὰ τὴν ἀξίαν, ἡ καὶ δώκοντα μὴ κρατήσαντα μηδὲ τῷ νεκυκῆσθαι· ἀλλὰ μένει δικαστῆς ἔτερος μέγας, ὃν οὐποτε οὐδὲν ἐκφεύγει τῶν δικαίων. κάντανθα δὴ πολλὴ καὶ εὐσχήμων ἵστορες μικροῦ πρὸς μέγαν καὶ ἀδόξου πρὸς ἔνδοξον καὶ πένητος δὴ πρὸς πλούσιον καὶ γενναιον ἀγεννοῦς, καὶ τὸ τοῦ Ἡσιόδου συμβαίνει·

35 37 38 39 40

ῥέα μὲν γὰρ βριάει, ρέα δὲ βριάοντα χαλέπτει

οὗτος ὁ δικαστής τε καὶ ἡγεμών, ὥστε ἄν τὸ δίκαιον ἄγη, ὕσπερ πνεῦμα ἐν νηί, οὐ δή πον πλουσίω μὲν μᾶλλον, πένητι δὲ ἥπτον χαριζόμενόν τε καὶ παραπέμπον, ἀλλ’ ὅτῳ γένοιτο ἀεί, τοῦτον δικοίως ἀφελοῦν.

Δίειμι δὴ καὶ τὰ ‘Ελληνικά, ἐπειδήπερ ἐνταῦθα ἐγενόμην τοῦ λόγου, αἰσχυνόμενος μὲν καὶ δεδιώς μηδόξω μικρολογεύεσθαι· οὐ μὴν ἀλλ’, ὅπερ καὶ ἀρτίως εἰπον, οὐχ ὡς ἵσα ἵσοις παραβάλλων δίειμι, ἀλλ’ οὐκ ὄντων ἐτέρων παραδειγμάτων ἀναγκάζομαι τοῖς οὖσι χρῆσθαι, εἴτα καὶ γελοίον <δν> τοῦτο μὲν αὐτὸ θαυμάζειν καὶ δεικνύειν, ὅτι οὖν ἔστιν εὑρεῖν ἵσα τοῖς οὐδετέροις ἔτερα οὐδὲ ἐγγύς, ἀλλὰ πάντα ὑπὸ τούτων ἀποκρύπτεται, περιμένειν δὲ τηνικάντα παρεξετάσαι, δημητρίκα ἵσων ἔχοιμεν μνημονεύσαι· οὐκ

οἷμαί γε δεῖν, ὅτι γε οὐδὲ θαυμαστὰ δικοίως ἄν ἦν, εἴ τινα εἴχομεν εἰπεῖν ὅμοια. καὶ μὴν οὐδὲ ἐκεῖνό γε ἀγνοῦ, ὅτι ταῦτ’ ἔτι 41 φαυλότερα ὧν ἀρτίως ἐξήτασα περιβολῇ τε ἀρχῆς καὶ ὅγκω πραγμάτων φανεῖται τὰ ‘Ελληνικά τῶν Περσικῶν· ἀλλὰ τὸ τοὺς μὲν βαρβάρους τάις περιουσίαις καὶ ταῖς δυνάμεσιν ὑπερβαλέσθαι, τοὺς δὲ “Ἐλληνας σοφίᾳ καὶ σωφροσύνῃ παρελθεῖν, μέγα μοι δοκεῖ καὶ παντελές εἰς ἀρετῆς εἶναι λόγον καὶ παντὸς ἀγώνισμα λαμπρότερον. τοῦτ’ οὖν ἐρῶν ἔρχομαι, ὥστα ἐκεῖνοι 42 καὶ πηλίκους οὖσι τοῖς ἑαυτῶν ἐχρήσαντο πράγμασι· κανὸν φανῶσι πολὺ μικρότερα διασώσασθαι μὴ δυνηθέντες, δῆλον τὸ συνθησόμενον εἰς τὴν ψῆφον. *Ἐπραξαν μὲν γὰρ πᾶν ὑπὲρ ἀρχῆς 43 καὶ ἡγεμονίας Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, καὶ ἦν αὐτῶν ἡ δύναμις πλεῖν τὴν θάλατταν καὶ τῶν Κυκλαδῶν ἀρχεῖν καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ Θράκης ἔχειν καὶ Πύλας καὶ ‘Ελλήσποντον καὶ Κορυφάσιον· καὶ ταῦτ’ ἦν ἡ δύναμις. καὶ ἐπαθον δὴ παραπλήσιον ὕσπερ ἀν εἰς σώματος ἐπιθυμῶν γενεύσθαι κύριος δυνχάς τινας καὶ ἄκρα λάβοι ἀντὶ ὅλου τοῦ σώματος καὶ ταῦτα <ἔχων> ἔχειν οἰοιτο ἀπερ ἐβούλετο· ὡς δὲ κάκείνοις ἡγεμονίας ἐπιθυμήσαντες νησίδια καὶ ἄκρας ἐπὶ θαλάττη καὶ λιμένας καὶ τουαῦτα ἐξεκαρπώσαντο καὶ κατερίφθησαν περὶ τὴν θάλατταν, ὀνειροπολήσαντες ἡγεμονίαν μᾶλλον ἡ κτήσασθαι δυνηθέντες. γενόμενοι δὲ ὅμως ἐπὶ 44 καιρῶν, ὕσπερ ἐν κλήρου περιόδῳ, ἐπιστάται τῶν ‘Ελλήνων ἐκάτεροι οὐδὲ εἰς μίαν, ὡς εἰπεῖν, γενεὰν διεσώσαντο τὴν τάξιν· οὔκουν ἀμέμπτως γε, ἀλλὰ τοῦτο δὴ τὸ λεγόμενον τὴν Καδμείαν νίκην ἐνίκων ἀλλήλους περὶ τῆς ἡγεμονίας, ὕσπερ οὐκ ἀξιοῦντες τοὺς ἑτέρους μόνους μισεύσθαι ἀεὶ οἱ ἔτεροι, ἀλλ’ αὐτοὶ τοῦ μέρους μεταλαμψάνειν. τοῦτο μὲν γὰρ Λακεδαιμονίων εἰς 45 ἡγεμὸν οὐτω διέθηκε τοὺς ‘Ελληνας ὥστ’ ἀπαλλαγέντας ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ἐκόντας <ἀσ>μένους ἑαυτοῖς ἐτέρους ἀρχοντας ζητῆσαι. δόντες δὲ ἑαυτοὺς Ἀθηναῖοι, ὡς χρόνος οὐ πολὺς δῆλθε, μετέγνωσαν, οὕτε τῶν φόρων φέροντες τὴν ἀμετρίαν οὕτε τοὺς ἐπὶ τῇ τούτων προφάσει παρακλέπτοντας αὐτοῖς, ἀνάσπαστοι τε γιγνόμενοι καθ’ ἐκαστον ἐνιαυτόν, Ἀθήνησι περὶ τῶν παρ’ 46 ἑαυτοῖς ὑφέξοντες λόγον, κληρούχων τε σφίσιν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν πεμπομένων καὶ παρὰ τοὺς φόρους ἀργυρολόγων, εἴ που χρεία κατάσχοι ἐτέρα· προσέτι τάς τε ἀκροπόλεις ἐλευθέρας ἔχειν οὐ δυνάμενοι καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς δημαγωγοῖς ὄντες τοῖς ἐκείνων, εὐ καὶ χείρον φρονοῦσιν ὅμοιας, στρατεύσασθαι τε ἀναγκαζόμενοι στρατείας οὐκ ἀναγκαίας ἐν ἱερομητίαις καὶ ἐορταῖς πολλάκις, ὡς δὲ εἰπεῖν ἀπλῶς, οὐδὲν τηλικούτον τῆς προστασίας ἀπολαύοντες ἀνθ’ ὅτου ταῦτα ἄξιον ἦν ὑπομεῖναι. δυσχεραίνοντες 47 δὲ ἐκ τούτων τοὺς Ἀθηναῖους οἱ πολλοὶ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους πάλιν μεταστάντες τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ὄντες πρότερον ἀπ’ ἐκείνων πρὸς τοὺς Ἀθηναῖους, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ὑπ’ ἐκείνων πάλιν ἐξηπατήθησαν. προειπόντες γὰρ ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν ‘Ελλήνων ἐλευθερίας πολεμήσειν Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ τούτῳ προσαγόμενοι τοὺς πολλούς, ἐπειδὴ καθεέλον ἐκείνων τὰ τείχη καὶ κύριοι τῶν πραγμάτων καὶ τὸ πάντα ποιεῖν ἐγένοντο, τοσοῦτον ὑπερεβάλλοντο ὥστε τυραννίδας ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ‘Ελληνίσι πόλεσι κατέστησαν, ἂς προσέπιον εὐφήμιας δεκαρχίας· καὶ μίαν καθελόντες τὴν Ἀθηναίων δυναστείαν πολλὰς τὰς παρ’ αὐτῶν

33. δι’ ἐπιστολῶν Aldus: δι’ ἐπιστολῆσ O.

34. καὶ ἔργω καὶ λόγῳ D. γὰρ om. D.

35. ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς post καθίστατε O, transposui. ἐξήκη STU: ἔξικοι D. τοσοῦτ’ SUT: τοσοῦτον D. αὐτοῦ T: ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ DS¹, ὑπ’ αὐτῷ US².

39. ρέα Keil ex Hesiodi optimis: ρέια O. πον US²: πω S¹DT. 40. οὐχ ὡς Keil: ως οὐκ O. <δν> addidi.

41. σωφροσύνη SDU, φρονήσει D.

43. <ἔχων> add. Rsk. κατερίφθησαν UT: κατερρίφησαν DS.

45. <ἀσ>μένους Keil: μόνους O. αὐτοῖς Rsk Sieveking (31): αὐτοῖς ST¹, αὐτοὺς DUS². τε S, γε γινόμενοι DUT.

47. ὑπ’ αὐτῷ Rsk: ἀπ’ UT (qui hic = O). ἐκείνων U²: ἐκείνοις O, ἐκείνοις Rsk. πάντα Keil: ταῦτα O, ταῦτα S². ὑπερεβάλοντο S.

- ἀντεισῆγον, αὐτὸν Ἀθήνησιν οὐδέ τὴν Σπάρτη διατελοῦσαι κακῶς ἐποίουν τοὺς ἀρχομένους, ἀλλ᾽ ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῖς σφετέροις ἔκασται χωρίους συνεχῶς ἰδρυμέναι καὶ οἷον συμπεπλεγμέναι. ὥστ᾽ εἰ ἀρχόμενοι τοῦ πολέμου προεῖπον τοῖς "Ἐλλησιν ὅτι ὑπὲρ τούτου πολεμήσουσιν Ἀθηναίοις, ὅπως μείζω καὶ πλείω σφᾶς ἐκείνων κακὰ ἐργάσαιντο καὶ δεῖξαιεν ἐλευθερίαν αὐτοῖς ὄντα τὰ ἀπ᾽ ἐκείνων, μὴ ἀν αὐτοὺς ἀμεινον βεβαιώσαι τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν. καὶ γὰρ οὖν ἡ ττῶντο μὲν εὐθέως ἐνὸς φυγάδος, κατελείποντο δὲ ὑπὸ Θηβαίων, ἐμιστόντο δὲ ὑπὸ Κορινθίων, ἐπίμπλατο δὲ ἡ θάλαττα τῶν ἀρμοστῶν ἐκπιπτόντων, ἀτέ ἀναρμόστων καὶ οὐ κατὰ τοῦ νομα ἐγκατασταθέντων τε καὶ ἐχόντων τὰς πόλεις. ἐπειδὴ τε τοῖς ἐκείνων ἀδικήμασι καὶ τῷ μίσει τῷ διὰ ταῦτα εἰς αὐτοὺς παρὰ τῶν Ἐλλήνων αὐξηθέντες Θηβαῖοι ἐκράτησαν αὐτοὺς τὴν ἐν Λευκτροῖς μάχην, ὅμοι τε Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἐκποδὼν ἤσαν καὶ Θηβαίους οὐδεὶς αὖ φέρειν ἐδύνατο μίαν μάχην εὐνυχήσαντας, ἀλλ᾽ ἀπεφάνθη λυσιτελοῦν ἔτι τὴν Καδμείαν {ἄν} ἔχεσθαι μᾶλλον ἡ 49 κεκρατήκειν Λακεδαιμονίων· οὗτος ἐμισθῆσαν. Καὶ ταῦτα οὐ δή που κατηγορίας ἔνεκα κοινῆς τῶν Ἐλλήνων συνεσκευασάμην, ὥσπερ ὁ θαυμαστὸς ἐκείνος ὁ τὸν Τρικάρανον ποιήσας — μήποτε ἀνάγκη τοσαύτη γένοιτο —, ἀλλ᾽ ἐκείνο ἐπιδεικνύαι βούλομαι, ὅτι οὕτω πρὸ ὑμῶν ἦν τὸ ἄρχειν εἰδέναι· εἰ γὰρ ἦν, ἐν τοῖς "Ἐλλησιν ἦν ἄν, οὐ πλείστον δή που τὸν γε ἄλλων σοφίᾳ δήνεγκαν· ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦτο ὑμέτερόν ἐστιν εὑρῆμα καὶ ὅμοι τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐπεισελθόν. ἐπεὶ τό γε λεχθὲν ἐπ' Ἀθηναίων κινδυνεύει καὶ περὶ πάντων, εἴ τις ἔπιτοι, τῶν Ἐλλήνων ἀληθὲς εἶναι, ἐπεισάκτοις μὲν ἄρχουσιν ἀντιστῆναι καὶ κρατῆσαι Πέρσας καὶ ἀναλόσ>αι πλοῦτον καὶ πόνους ὑπενεγκεῖν ἀγαθοὶ παντὸς μᾶλλον ἤσαν, ἄρχειν δὲ αὐτοὶ ἔτι ἀπαίδευτοι ἤσαν, πειρώμενοι τε 50 51 52 53 54 ἐσφάλλοντο. καὶ πρῶτον μὲν φρουροὺς εἰσέπεμπον εἰς τὰς πόλεις, οἱ τῶν μὲν ἐπιχωρίων ἑάστων καὶ εἰς οὓς ἐπέμποντο οὐκ ἐλάττους ἀεὶ δήπουθεν ἤσαν· ὑπόνοιαν δὲ ἐποίουν καὶ τοὺς μήπω φρουρούμενοις ὡς πάντα πρὸς ἴσχυν καὶ βίᾳ ἀγοντες. ἀμφότερα οὖν συνέβαινε, μήτε τὰς πόλεις ἀσφαλῶς ἔχειν καὶ προσέπτι μισεῖσθαι καὶ τὰ κακὰ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἀντὶ τῶν τῆς ἀρχῆς ἀγαθῶν καρποῦσθαι, τὴν μὲν πλεονεξίαν οὐ βέβαιον, τὴν δὲ τῆς πλεονεξίας δόξαν ἰσχυρῶν ἔχοντας. ἐπειτα τί πρὸς τούτους συνέβαινε; διασπωμένους ἀεὶ καὶ διαιρουμένους ἀσθενεστέρους τὰ οἴκοι γίγνεσθαι καὶ μὴ ἱκανοὺς τὴν ἑαυτῶν σύζειν, διὰ τὸ ζητεῖν τὴν ἔτερων ἔχειν. οὐτὸν ὁν ἀρχεῖν ἐφίνετο ὑπερβαλέσθαι τότε ἐδύναντο πλήθει τούτων ὧν ἐπεμπον, οὐθὲν ἑαυτοῖς τὸ μένειν ἵστος κατέλιπον, ἀλλ᾽ ἤσαν ἐλάττους μὲν ἔξω, ἐλάττους δὲ οἴκοι, καὶ τὸ προϊέναι τὴν ἀρχὴν αὐτοῖς εἰς ἄπορον καθίστατο, οὐκ ἔχουσι τὰ τελευταῖα δι᾽ ὅτων αὐτὴν καθέξουσιν· ὕστε τοῦμπαλιν ἐσπευδον ὧν ἐδέοντο. καὶ ἦν τὸ μὲν προχωρεῖν αὐτοῖς ἡ ἐβούλοντο ἀμῆχανον καὶ κατάρας ἐγγύς, τὸ δὲ μὴ προχωρεῖν κουφότερον τε καὶ ἥττους ἔχον τὸν φόβους· οὐδένει γὰρ ἄλλο ἡ διοικιζομένοις ἐψκεσαν ἀντὶ ἀρχόντων καὶ πονοῦσιν ὑπὲρ τοῦ πονεῖν. ἄμα γὰρ τῷ τέλει τὸ κεφάλαιον εὐθὺς ἐλάνθανε λυόμενον, καὶ πάλιν εἰς ταῦτα κατὰ τοὺς ποιητὰς κατήγει. ἔτι δὲ οὐτὸν ἰσχύειν αὐτοῖς

48. διατελοῦσαι Keil, διὰ τέλους Ο. ἔκασται Rsk: ἔκαστοις SD, ἔκαστου UT. δεῖξαιεν UT: δεῖξαι SD.

50. ἐκράτησαν αὐτοὺς SD Keil: αὐτῶν UT Sieveking (23). ἀλλ᾽ ἀπεφάνθη λυσιτελοῦν ἔτι Wil: ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐφάνθη λυσιτελοῦν; ἔτι Ο. ἔχεσθαι Rsk: ἀνέχεσθαι Ο.

51. βούλομαι Ο: βούλόμενος Keil. ἐπεισάκτοις scripsi: ἐπεισάκτοις Ο. *<ἀναλόσ>*αι scripsi: Λυδούσον καὶ Ο.

53. ἔξω U: ἔξω SDT. ἐώκεσαν DU: ἐώκεσαν ST.

συνέφερε τοὺς ἀρχομένους διὰ τὰς ἐπιβουλὰς οὗτούς ἀσθενεῖς εἶναι διὰ τοὺς παρὰ τῶν ἔξωθεν αὐτὸλέμους καὶ ὅπως ἡ τι πλέον τῆς συμμαχίας, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπεπόνθεσαν πρὸς αὐτοὺς παραπλήσιον ὅπερ οἱ ἐν ταῖς παιδιάς τῇ μὲν εἰς τοῦμπροσθεν ἄγοντες, τῇ δὲ εἰς τοῦπισθεν ἀνθέλκοντες, οὐκ ἔχοντες ὅτι χρήσονται, ἀλλ᾽ οἷον εἶναι τε καὶ μὴ εἶναι αὐτοὺς βούλόμενοι, αὐτοὶ μεταχειρίζομενοί τε καὶ ἄγοντες, ἐν οἷς σπειδούσιν, εἰπεῖν οὐκ ἔχοντες. τὸ δὲ πάντων γελοιότατόν τε καὶ ἀποπώτατον· ἐπὶ γὰρ τοὺς ἀφισταμένους αὐτῶν τοὺς λοιποὺς ἐν νῷ τὸ αὐτὸ ποιεῖν ἔχοντας ἡνάγκαζον ἔναι, παραπλήσιον ποιοῦντες ὥσπερ ἀν εἰ αὐτοὺς τοὺς ἀφεστηκότας ἐφ' ἑαυτοὺς ἐπειθον ἔναι, καὶ οὐκ ἐλογίζοντο τοὺς τῆς ἐκείνων ὄντας μερίδος τούτους ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἄγοντες, οἱς οὐκ ἐλυτέλει δή που καθ' αὐτῶν καταδεικνύαι τὸ τοῖς ἄλλοις σπουδῇ βοηθεῖν. ὕστε κανταῦθα τούναντίον ἡ ἐβούλοντό τε καὶ συνέφερε διεπράττοντο· βούλόμενοι γὰρ τοὺς ἀφισταμένους προσάγεσθαι καὶ τοὺς παραμένοντας ἀν εποίουν ἀφιστασθαι. ἐδίκυνσαν γὰρ αὐτοὺς ὅτι μένοντες μὲν ἐπ' ἀλλήλους ὑπάρξουσιν αὐτοῖς, κοινῇ δὲ ἀπαντεῖς ἀποστάντες ἐλευθεροὶ βεβαίως ἔσονται· οὐ γὰρ καταλείψουσι τελευτῶντες δι' ὃν ληφθήσονται. ὕστε τοσούτῳ περὶ αὐτοὺς ἤσαν φανύστεροι τῶν ἀπίστων συμμάχων, ὥσπερ οἱ μὲν καθ' ἑαυτοὺς ἔκαστοι ἀπεχώρουν, οἱ δὲ κοινὴν ἀπόστασιν ἔξω ἐπραττον εἰστργοῦντο. Οὕτα τότε ἀρχῆς οὕτω πάτεις καὶ κλήρους ἔχοντες οὐν ἡδυγήθησαν οὐδὲ αὐτὰ ταῦτα διασώσασθαι διὰ τὴν τοῦ ἄρχειν ἀπειρίαν τε καὶ ἀδυναμίαν, οὔτε φιλανθρώπως ἄγοντες τὰς πόλεις οὗτος ἐγκρατῶς ἔχειν δυνάμενοι, βαρέες ἄμα καὶ ἀσθενεῖς ὄντες. τελευταῖον δὲ οὐν γυμνωθέντες κατὰ τὸν Αἰσώπου κολοιὸν μόνοι πρὸς ἀπαντας ἐμάχοντο. 55 56 57 58 59 60

Τοῦτο μέντοι τὸ τοὺς πρόσθεν ἀπαντας, ως εἰπεῖν, ἀνθρώπους διαφυγὸν ὑμῖν ἐτηρήθη μόνοις εὑρεῖν τε καὶ τελεώσασθαι· καὶ θαυμαστὸν οὐδέν. ὕσπερ γὰρ τῶν ἄλλων πραγμάτων ἐπὶ ταῖς ὑλαις ἀπαντῶσιν αἱ τέχναι, οὗτος ὅτε ἄρχῃ μεγίστη καὶ δύναμις διαφέρουσα συνέστη, τότε ἐπ' αὐτῇ καὶ ἡ τέχνη συνετέθη τε καὶ συνεισῆλθεν, καὶ ἄμφω δὴ δι' ἀλλήλων ἐκρατύθη· διὰ μὲν τὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς μέγεθος καὶ ἡ ἐμπειρία ἀναγκαῖς περιεγένετο, διὰ δὲ αὐτὸν ἄρχειν εἰδέναι δικαῖως ἄμα καὶ εἰκότως ηγέησεν ἡ ἀρχή· τοῦτο δὲ καὶ πολὺ μάλιστα πάντων ἄξιον ἔδειν καὶ θαυμάσαι τὴν περὶ τὴν πολιτείαν καὶ τὴν τῆς διανοίας μεγαλοπρέπειαν, ως οὐδέν οὐκός αὐτῇ τῷ πάντων. διελόντες γὰρ δύο μέρη πάντας τοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς — τοῦτο δὲ εἰπὼν ἀπασαν εἰρηκα τὴν οἰκουμένην —, τὸ μὲν χαριέστερόν τε καὶ γενναιότερον καὶ δυνατώτερον πανταχοῦ πολιτικὸν ἡ καὶ δύσφυλον πᾶν ἀπεδώκατε, τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν ὑπήκοον τε καὶ ἀρχόμενον. καὶ οὔτε θάλαττα διείργει τὸ μὴ εἶναι πολίτην οὔτε πλήθος τῆς ἐν μέσῳ χώρας, οὐδὲ Ἀσία καὶ Εὐρώπη διγύρηται ἐνταῦθα· πρόκειται δὲ ἐν μέσῳ πᾶσι πάντα· ξένος δὲ οὐδεὶς ὅτις ἄρχης ἡ πίστεως ἄξιος, ἀλλὰ καθέστηκε κοινὴ τῆς γῆς δημοκρατία οὐφ' ἐν τῷ ἀρίστῳ ἄρχοντι καὶ κοσμητῇ, καὶ πάντες ὕσπερ εἰς κοινὴν ἀγορὰν συνίασι τενέζομενοι τῆς ἄξεως

54. τοὺς ἀρχομένους Aldus: συναρχομένους S¹D, συναρξομένους UT (συνερχομένους S²). αὐτοὶ αὐτειστέροις ponit iubet Rsk.

55. τοῖς ἄλλοις τὸ traici vult Wil.

56. καίπερ S²U², καὶ περὶ O.

57. συνεισῆλθε UT, συνῆλθεν SD. ἄμα Rsk, διλλὰ O.

58. δη T. πόλιν αἰτιαν καὶ τὴν O; "ad πόλιν emendata lectio ΛΙΤΕΙΑΝ adscripta," Keil. τε SD: γε UT. καὶ δυνατώτερον καὶ γενναιότερον U.

59. δη D.

- 61 ἔκαστοι. ὅπερ δὲ πόλις τοῖς αὐτῆς ὄρίοις καὶ χώραις ἐστίν, τοῦθ' ἥδε ἡ πόλις τῆς πάσης οἰκουμένης, ὥσπερ αὐτῆς χώρας ἀστυ κοινὸν ἀποδειγμένη· φαίης ἀν περιοίκους ἀπαντας ἡ κατὰ δῆμον οἰκούντας ἄλλον χώρων εἰς μίαν ταύτην ἀκρόπολιν συνέρχεσθαι. ἡ δὲ οὐδεπώποτε ἀπείπεν, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ τὸ τῆς γῆς ἔδαφος, φέρει πάντας· ὥσπερ δὲ ἡ τοῖς κόλποις δεχομένη τοὺς ποταμοὺς θάλαττα πάντας τοστούτους κρύψασα ἔχει, ἔξιντων καὶ εἰσιόντων ἵστησα τε καὶ φαινομένη, οὕτω καὶ ἥδε δέχεται μὲν τοὺς ἔξι ἀπάσης γῆς, κοινὸν δ' αὐτῇ καὶ τοῦτο πρὸς τὴν θάλαττάν ἐστιν· οὔτε γάρ ἐκείνη μείζων ὑπὸ τῆς ἐμβολῆς τῶν ποταμῶν γίγνεται, ὡς συνειμαρμένουν τούτουν σὺν αὐτοῖς εἰσροῦσιν αὐτὴν ἔχειν τὸ μέγεθος, τῷδε ὑπὸ μεγέθους οὐδὲν ἐπίδηλον. καὶ τοῦτο μὲν δὴ τοῦ λόγου ὑπενεγκόντος οὗτον παρεφθέγχω. ὅπερ δὲ ἐλέγομεν, μεγάλοι μεγάλως ἐμετρήσατε τὴν πόλιν, καὶ οὐκ ἀποσεμινάμενοι τούτῳ θαυμαστὴν ἐποήσατε, τῷ μηδενὶ τῶν ἄλλων αὐτῆς μεταδιδόναι, ἀλλὰ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῆς ἀξιον ἔξητησατε, καὶ τὸ Ῥωμαῖον εἶναι ἐποήσατε οὐ πόλεως, ἀλλὰ γένους ὄνομα κοινὸν τινος, καὶ τούτου οὐχ ἔνδος τῶν πάντων, ἀλλ' ἀντιρρόπουν πᾶσι τοῖς λοιποῖς. οὐ γάρ εἰς "Ἐλληνας καὶ βαρβάρους διαιρέτε νῦν τὰ γένη, οὐδὲ γελοίαν τὴν διαιρεσιν ἀπεφήνατε αὐτοῖς πολυανθρωποτέραν τὴν πόλιν παρεχόμενοι ἡ κατὰ πᾶν, ὡς εἰπεῖν, τὸ Ἐλληνικὸν φύλον, ἀλλ' εἰς Ῥωμαῖον τε καὶ οὐ Ῥωμαῖον ἀντιδιείλετε· ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἔξηγάγετε τὸ τῆς πόλεως ὄνομα. τούτων δὲ οὕτω διγρημένων πολοὶ μὲν ἐν ἑκάστῃ πόλει πολίται οὐχ ἡττον ἡ τῶν ὁμοφύλων, οὐδὲ ἰδόντες πώ τινες αὐτῶν τὴν πόλιν, φρουρῶν δὲ οὐδὲν δεῖ τὰς ἀκροπόλεις ἔχοντων, ἀλλ' οἱ ἔκασταχάθεν μέγιστοι καὶ δυνατώτατοι τὰς ἑαυτῶν πατρίδας οὐδὲν φυλάττουσιν· καὶ διπλῇ τὰς πόλεις ἔχετε, ἐνθένδε τε καὶ παρ' αὐτῶν ἔκαστας. φθόνος δὲ οὐδὲν ἐπιβαίνει τῆς ἀρχῆς· αὐτοὶ γάρ ὑπῆρχατε τοῦ μὴ φθονεῖν, ἀπαντα εἰς τὸ μέσον καταθέντες καὶ παρασχόντες τοὺς δυναμένους μὴ ἄρχεσθαι μᾶλλον ἡ ἄρχειν ἐν τῷ μέρει. οὐ τοίνυν οὐδὲ μίσος ἐκ τῶν ἀπολειπομένων ὕπεισι· διὰ γάρ τὸ κοινὴν εἴναι τὴν πολιτείαν καὶ οἰνον πόλεως μιᾶς, εἰκότως οὐχ ὡς ἀλλοτρίων, ἀλλ' ὡς οἰκείων <οἵ> ἄρχοντες ἄρχουσιν· ἐπὶ δὲ καὶ μέτεστιν <ἐν>
- 64 αὐτῇ πᾶσιν ἄδεια τοῖς πλήθεσιν ἐκ τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς δυνατῶν <ἐπὶ τῷ εἰς οὐδὲν καταφεύγειν, ἀλλ' ἐστιν> ἡ παρ' οὐδὲν ἐπ' αὐτούς, ἔαν τι τολμῶσι παρακινεῖν, εὐθὺς ἤξουσα ὄργη τε καὶ
- 65 τιμωρία. οὐτω καὶ πένησι καὶ πλουσίοις εἰκότως τὰ παρόντα καὶ ἀρέσκει καὶ συμφέρει, καὶ ἄλλως οὐ λέλευπται ζῆν· καὶ γέγονε μία ἀρμονία πολιτείας ἀπαντας συγκεκληκύνα, καὶ τὸ πρόσθεν δοκοῦν οὐ δυνατὸν εἴναι συμβῆναι συνῆλθεν ἐφ' οὐδῷ, κράτος ἀρχῆς ἄμα καὶ μεγάλης γε <κατέχειν> καὶ οὐκ <ἄνευ> φιλανθρωπίας ἄρχειν ἐγκρατεῖς. οὐτω δὴ καθαραὶ μὲν φρουρῶν
66. δρίοισι καὶ χωρίοισι D. ἀπάσης T. αὐτῆς χώρας Canter: αὐτῆς χώρας O, {αὐτῆς} χώρας Rsk², αὐτῆς {χώρας} Keil.
67. ὥσπερ δὲ ἡ τοῖς κόλποις . . . ἐπίδηλον scripsi: οὕτω καὶ ἥδε δέχεται μὲν τοὺς ἔξι ἀπάσης γῆς, ὥσπερ τοὺς ποταμοὺς θάλαττα (θάλασσα D). κοινὸν δ' αὐτῇ (αὐτῆς SD) . . . γίνεται, ὡς συνειμαρμένουν τούτουν σὺν αὐτοῖς εἰς φούν (εἰσρέοντι Schmid) . . . ἐπίδηλον· ὥσπερ δὲ οἱ τοῖς κόλποις δεχόμενοι, πάντα οὕτως κρύψασα ἔχει . . . φαινομένη O.
68. <οἷ> add. Rsk². <ἐν> add. Canter. <ἐπὶ τῷ εἰς οὐδὲν καταφεύγειν ἀλλ' ἐστιν> supplevi: lacunam indicavit Keil. ἤξουσα DU: ἤξουσα ST.
69. ἀπαντας SD: ἀπαντα UT. ἄμα—φιλανθρωπίας scripsi: ἄμα καὶ φιλανθρωπίας καὶ μεγάλης γε καὶ οὐκ ἐνὸν ST (οὐ κανὸν DU). ἐγκρατεῖς UT: ἐγκρατής S, ἐγκρατής D.

πόλεις, μόραι δὲ καὶ ίλαι ἀποχρῶσιν ἐθνῶν δλων εἶναι φυλακή, καὶ οὐδὲν αὖται κατὰ τὰς πόλεις <ἐν> ἔκάστω τῶν γενῶν πολλὰ ἴδρυμέναι, ἀλλ' ἐν ἀριθμῷ <ἀπὸ> τῶν ἄλλων ἐνεσταρμέναι ταῖς χώραις, ὥστε πολλὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἀγνοεῖν ὅπου ποτ' ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς ἡ φρουρά. εἰ δέ που πόλις δι' ὑπερβολὴν μεγέθους ὑπερῆρκε τὸ δύνασθαι σωφρονεῖν καθ' αὐτήν, οὐδὲ τούτοις ἐφθονήσατε τῶν ἐπιστησιμένων τε καὶ διαφυλαξόντων. ἄρχειν μὲν γὰρ οἰς μὴ δύναμις οὐ σωτήριον, ἄρχεσθαι δ' ὑπὸ τῶν κρειττόνων ὁ δεύτερος, φασί, πλούς, ὑπὸ δὲ οὐδὲν νῦν καὶ πρώτος ἀπεφάνθη, πάντες οὖν ἀπρὶς ἔχονται καὶ οὐ πρότερον ἀξιώσαιεν ἀν ἀποστῆναι ἡ οἰ πλέοντες τοῦ κυβερνήτου· ἀλλ' οἶνον αἱ νυκτερίδες ἐν τοῖς ἄντροις ἀλλήλων τε καὶ λίθων ἔχονται προσπεφυκύαι, οὕτως οὐδῶν ἄπαντες ἔξηρτηται σὺν πολλῷ φόβῳ καὶ προνοίᾳ μὴ τις ἀποπέσῃ τούτου τοῦ ὄρμαθον, καὶ πρότερον ἀν δείσαιεν μὴ οὐδὲν οὐδῶν καταλειφθώσιν ἡ οὐδᾶς ἀν αὐτοὶ καταλίποιεν. καὶ γάρ τοι ηδίον μὲν οὐδὲν ἄπαντες ἀποπέμπουσι τοὺς φόρους ἡ παρ' ἀλλῶν ἄν τινες αὐτοὶ λαμβάνοιεν· εἰκότως. ἀντὶ δὲ ἀμφισβητήσεως ἄρχῆς τε καὶ πρωτείων, οὐδὲν ἄπαντες οἱ πρότερον συνερρήγνυντο πόλεμοι, οἱ μὲν ὥσπερ οὐδῷρος ἀψοφητὶ ρέον ηδιστα ησυχάζουσιν, ἀσμενοι πόνων παυσάμενοι καὶ κακῶν, μετεγγωκότες ὡς ἄρα ἄλλως ἐσκιαμάχουν, οἱ δὲ οὐδὲν ἦσασιν οὐδὲν ἀναμιμήσκονται, ἀλλ' ἀτεχνῶς κατὰ τὸν Παμφύλον μῆθον, εἰ δὲ μή, Πλάτωνος, οἶνον ἐπὶ τῇ πυρᾷ ηδη κείμεναι αἱ πόλεις οὐτὸν τῆς πρὸς ἀλλήλας ἔριδος καὶ ταραχῆς ἀθρόαν ἐδέξαντο τὴν ἡγεμονίαν καὶ ἔξαιφνης ἀνεβίωσαν. ὅπως δὲ εἰς τοῦτο ἀφίκοντο οὐκ ἔχουσιν εἰπεῖν, οὐδὲν ἵσασιν οὐδὲν πλὴν τὰ παρόντα θαυμάζειν, ἀλλὰ πεπόνθασιν οἰνοι οἱ ἀφυπνισθέντες καὶ ἀντὶ τῶν οὐνειράτων ὡν ἀρτίων ἔωρων ἔσαφιντας ταῦτα <ὑ>παρ ιδόντες καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς γενόμενοι. πόλεμοι δὲ οὐδὲν εἰ πώποτε ἐγένοντο ἔτι πιστεύονται, ἀλλ' ἐν ἄλλως μῆθων τάξει τοῖς πολλοῖς ἀκούονται, εἰ δέ που καὶ συμπλακέντες ἐπ' ἐσχατιαῖς, οἱα εἰκός ἐν ἀρχῇ μεγάλῃ καὶ ἀμετρήτῳ παρανοίᾳ Γετῶν ἡ δυστοχίᾳ Διβύνων ἡ κακοδαιμονίᾳ τῶν περὶ τὴν Ἔρυθρὰν θάλατταν, ἀγαθοῖς παροῦσι χρήσασθαι μὴ δυναμένων, ἀτεχνῶς ὥσπερ μῆθοι ταχέως αὐτοὶ τε παρῆλθον καὶ οἱ περὶ αὐτῶν λόγοι· τοσάντη ἄρρ οὐδὲν εἰρήνη, καὶ πάτριον πολεμεῖν.

Tὰ περὶ τὴν οὐδην ἀρχῆν τε καὶ τὴν περὶ ταύτην πολιτείαν 72a εἴρηται ὄντιν' ἔγνωτε τρόπον καὶ ὅπως κατεστήσασθε· περὶ δὲ τοῦ μαχίμου καὶ τῶν κατὰ στρατείας νῦν καιρὸς εἰπεῖν, ὅπως αὖται τοῦτο ἐπενόησατε καὶ ἥτινα τάξειν αὐτῷ ἀπέδοτε. οὐ γάρ τοι 71b οἱ οὐθὲς σκυτοτόμοι καὶ τέκτονες τήμερον ὀπλίται καὶ ἵππεις, οὐδὲν ὥσπερ ἐπὶ σκηνῆς στρατιώτης μετεσκεύασται ὃς ἀρτίως ἡ γεωργός, οὐδὲν οὖν ἐν οἰκίᾳ πενιχρῷ οἱ αὐτοὶ ὀψοποιοι<οὐσι>, οἰκουροῦσιν, στρωννόυσιν, οὐδὲν εἰκός ἀνεμίξατε· οὐδὲ τοὺς εἰπεῖν ἀλλων ὄντας στρατιώτας οὐτὸν τῆς χρείας γενήσεσθαι

67a. μόραι T: μόρα S¹, μοίρα DS². ίλαι T: ίλαι S, ίλη D. αὗται Kaibel: αὐται O. <ἐν> addidi. <ἀπὸ> addidi. ὑπερῆρκε D. τῷ Aldus: τῷ O. ηδίον T.

68. μὴ DU²: om. SU¹T. ἀν post ἀξιώσαιεν Junt: post πλέοντες O. ἀποπέσοντες DUT. οὐδὲν DUT: άφ' DUT: άφ' S.

69. transposui. αὗτοι Wil: αὗτὸν SDT, αὐτοὶς U.

70. πρότερον DS²U²: πρότεροι S¹U¹T. ἀλλήλους D. οὐδὲν . . . πεπόνθασιν om. D. οἱ om. D. Παμφύλον Canter: παμφίλον O. οὐ παρ ιδόντες Rsk, παριδόντες O.

71a. ποσάντη ἄρρ οὐδὲν εἰρήνη ST (απ μᾶλλον?). συμπλακέντες S: συμπλέοντες U (sup. ἐ add. α U²), συμπλέοντες DT. θάλασσαν O.

71b. οὐ γάρ . . . οὐδὲν ἀλλὰ transposuit Wil: post πολεμεῖν O.

ἀνεμείνατε, οὐδὲ ἐπετρέψατε τοῖς πολεμίοις συγκαλεῖν ὑμᾶς,
 72b ἀλλὰ θαυμαστὴ ἄρ' ἦν καὶ ἡ περὶ τοῦτο σοφία, καὶ παράδειγμα
 73 εἰς τὸ παντελὲς οὐκ ἔχει. μέχρι μὲν γὰρ τοῦ τὸ μάχιμον
 ἀποκρῖναι καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι προῆλθον καὶ ἐδόκουν τοῦτο σοφώτατον
 εὑρεῖν, ὅτι αὐτοῖς ἴδια ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἰδρυντο οἱ προτολεμοῦντες
 τῆς χώρας, ὡσπερ καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ παρὰ τοὺς ἄλλους ἐδόκουν
 εἶναι, γὰ φασιν, Αἰγύπτιοι σοφοί. τοῦτο δὲ ὑμεῖς κατὰ ταῦτα
 γνόντες οὐ ταῦτὸν ἐποιήσατε, ἀλλὰ τοσοῦτῷ κάλλιον καὶ σοφώ-
 τερον αὐτοὶ διείλεσθε, ὥστε ἐν ἑκείνῳ μὲν τῷ συντάγματι οὐκ
 74 ἦν ἵστην τῆς πολιτείας ἀλλήλοις, ἀλλ᾽ ἤστην ἐν τῷ χείρονι οἱ
 στρατεύμενοι τῶν ἡσυχαζόντων μόνοι πονοῦντες δι᾽ αἰώνος —
 οὐκούντινος ἵστην οὐδὲ ἡδέως εἶχεν αὐτοῖς —, παρ᾽ ὑμῖν δὲ ἀπάντων
 ἔχόντων τὸ ἵστην, τὸ μάχιμον δυνατὸν χωρὶς ἰδρῦσθαι. οὗτοι καὶ
 Ἑλλήνων τόλμα καὶ Αἰγυπτίων καὶ ὅτων εἴποι τις ἀν τῆς ὑμετέ-
 75 ρας ἥττάται. καὶ τοσοῦτον ὑμῶν λειπόμενοι πάντες τοὺς ὅπλους,
 ἕπι τῇ γνώμῃ πλέον εἰσὶν ὅπίσω· τὸ μὲν γὰρ τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς
 πόλεως στρατεύσθαι καὶ ταλαιπωρεῖν καὶ <τὸ μῆτ> τῆς πα-
 ρούσης εὐδαιμονίας ἀπολαύειν οὐκ ἄξια τῆς ἀρχῆς εἶναι ἐνομίσατε,
 76 ξένοις δὲ οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε· ἔδει δὲ στρατιωτῶν πρὸ τῆς ἀνάγκης.
 πῶς οὖν ἐποιήσατε; εὑρετε οἰκείουν στράτευμα, τῶν πολιτῶν οὐκ
 ἐνοχλουμένων. τοῦτο δὲ ὑμῖν ἐπόριστεν ἡ περὶ πάσης τῆς ἀρχῆς
 βούλη καὶ τὸ μηδέν ἐγκρίνειν ἔνοντας μηδὲν ὧν ἀν δύνηται τε
 77 καὶ δέη ποιεῖν. τίς οὖν ἡ συλλογὴ καὶ τίς ὁ τρόπος; ἐλθόντες
 ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν ὑπῆκοον ἐντεύθεν ἐσκέψασθε τοὺς λειτουργή-
 σοντας τήνδε τὴν λειτουργίαν, καὶ ὡς εὑρετε, ὅμοι τῆς τε πατρί-
 δος ἀπηλλάξατε καὶ τὴν ὑμετέραν αὐτῶν πόλιν ἀντέδοτε αὐτοῖς·
 ὥστε καὶ αἰσχυνθῆναι τὸ λοιπὸν αὐτοὺς ἐκείνους γ' ἀνειπεῖν, ὅθεν
 78 ἤστην τὸ ἀρχαῖον. ποιησάμενοι δὲ πολίτας, οὗτοι καὶ στρατιώ-
 τας ἐποιήσατε ὥστε τοὺς τε ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως μὴ στρατεύσθαι
 καὶ τοὺς στρατευομένους μηδὲ ὅτιοῦν ἥττον εἶναι πολίτας, τῆς
 μὲν ἀρχαίας ἀπόλιδας γεγενημένους ἄμα τῇ στρατείᾳ, τῆς δὲ
 ὑμετέρας πολίτας τε καὶ φρουροὺς ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς ἡμέρας. καὶ
 πάντες τε οὕτως ἐπονται καὶ πόλις οὐδεμίᾳ δυσμεναίνει, ἀλλὰ
 τοσούτους γε ἀφ' ἐκάστων ἥττάσατε, ὅσοι μήτε τοῖς διδοῦσιν
 ἐμελλον ἄχθος ποιήσειν μήτε αὐτάρκεις ἐσεσθαι πλήρωμα ἐνὸς
 οἰκείου στρατεύματος παραχέσθαι· ὥστε εὔνοιαν μὲν ἀπάσας
 79 ἔχειν τὰς πόλεις τοῖς ἐκπεμφθεῖσιν, ὡς κοινοῖς ἑαυτῶν, ἴδια δὲ
 ἐκάστη μηδὲ ἥττινον εἶναι δύναμιν ἀπὸ τῶν αὐτῆς μηδὲ βλέπειν
 ἄλλοσε ἢ πρὸς ὑμᾶς, διὰ τὸ πρὸς τοῦτο μόνον καλῶς συντε-
 τάχθαι τοὺς ἔξελθόντας. καὶ μὴν τούς γε ἐπιτηδειοτάτους
 ἐκασταχόθεν ἐπιλέξαντες κέρδος οὐ μικρὸν τοῦτο εὑρασθε· οὐ
 72b. ἔστι τὸ D.
 73. μὲν οι. DU. ἡ φασιν U¹T: πολλὰ δὴ φασιν SDU².
 εἰχεν Wil: εἰχον O. τὸ μάχιμον DUS²: τὸ οι. S¹T. τόλμα
 UT: οι. SD.
 74. <τὸ μῆτ> addidi. οὐκ ἄξια τῆς ἀρχῆς transposui: post
 ταλαιπωρεῖν O. δὲ οι. U¹ post ἔδει. ἀν οι. D.
 75. τοὺς ἔξελθόντας transposui: post ἄλλοσε O.
 76. γε Junt: τε O. ὅπόσας Ald: ὅπόσοις SUT, ὅπόσον D.
 τύχοι D. μὴ οι. S¹.

ἐπιλεχθέντας ἀσκεῖσθαι, ὅπως εἰδὺς ἐστῶτες ὑπερέχοιεν. τού- 78
 τους δὴ ἄρα καθάραντες καὶ φυλοκρυνήσαντες <εἰσηγάγετ' εἰς>
 τὸ κοινὸν τῶν ἀρχόντων, οὐ χωρὶς ὧν εἰπον οὐδὲ ὥστε φθόνον
 ἔξειν μᾶλλον τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς ἐπὶ τῆς πόλεως μένουσιν, ἀτε οὐκ
 δοντας ὁμοτίμους τὸ ἀρχαῖον, ἀλλ' ἐν τιμῆς αὐτοὺς μέρει λή-
 φεσθαι τὴν μετουσίαν τῆς πολιτείας. οὕτως εὑρόντες τε καὶ
 διαβέντες αὐτοὺς ἥγαγετε ἐπὶ τὰ πέρατα τῆς ἀρχῆς, κάνταῦθα
 διαστήσαντες ἄλλοις ἄλλα φυλάττειν ἀπενείματε. Τοιγαροῦν 79
 καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν τειχῶν ἐβουλεύσασθε τε καὶ ἐπενοήσατε· νῦν γὰρ
 ἄξιον εἰπεῖν. οὕτε γὰρ κατὰ τὴν Λακεδαιμονίων αὐθάδειαν ἀτεί-
 χιστον ἀν προσείποις τήρει τὴν πόλιν οὐτ' αὐτοῖς τειχήρη κατὰ τὴν
 Βαβυλώνος λαμπρότητα, ἡ εἰ τις ἄλλη σεμνότερον ἐτειχίσθη
 πρότερον ἡ ὑστερον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τούτον τὸν τειχισμὸν παιδίαν καὶ
 γυναικὸς ὡς ἀληθῶς ἔργον ἀπεφήνατε. αὐτῆς μὲν γὰρ τῇ πόλει 80
 περιβαλεῖν τὰ τειχή, οἷον ἀποκρύπτοντες αὐτὴν ἡ φεύγοντες τοὺς
 ὑπῆκους, ἀγεννές τε εἶναι καὶ οὐ πρὸς τῆς ἄλλης διανοίας
 ἐνομίσατε, οἷον εἰ τις δεσπότης δεικνύοιτο τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ δούλους
 φοβούμενος. τειχῶν γε μὴν οὐκ ἡμελήσατε, ταῦτα δὲ τῇ ἀρχῇ
 περιεβάλετε, οὐ τῇ πόλει· καὶ ἐστήσατε ὡς πορρωτάτω λαμπρά
 τε καὶ ὑμῶν ἄξια, ὅρατα τοῖς εἰσω τοῦ κύκλου, ἡ δὲ πορεία ἐπ'
 αὐτά, εἰ τις βούλοιτο ἰδεῖν, μηρῶν τε καὶ ἑναυτῶν ἀρέαμένῳ
 βαδίζειν ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως. ὑπὲρ γὰρ τὸν ἔξωτάτω κύκλον τῆς 81
 οἰκουμένης ἀτεχνῶς οἷον ἐν τειχισμῷ πόλεως δεύτερον ἀγαγόντες
 ἔτερον εὐκαμπτέστερον τε καὶ εὐφυλακτότερον, ἐνταῦθα τειχή τε
 προβάλλεσθε καὶ πόλεις ἐφορίας ἐδείμασθε, ἀλλας ἐν ἄλλοις
 μέρεσι, πληρωσαντες οἰκητόρων, τέχνας τε ὑπουργοὺς δόντες
 αὐτοῖς καὶ τάλλα κοσμήσαντες. ὕσπερ δὲ τάφρος, κύκλω 82
 περιεργει στρατόπεδον, ὥστε οὐ {δὲ} δέκα παρασάγγαι λογι-
 ζομένῳ τοῦ περιβόλου τούτου τὸ περίμετρον, οὐδὲ εἴκοσιν, οὐδὲ
 ὀλίγῳ πλείους, οὐδὲ εἴποις ἀν εἰδὺς ὅπόσον, ἀλλ' οσον Αἰθιοπίας
 τὸ ἐποικούμενον καὶ Φάσις ἐνθένδε καὶ Εὐφράτης ἄνω καὶ πρὸς
 ἐσπέραν ἡ μεγάλη καὶ τελευταία ηῆσος ἐντὸς ἀποκλείσουσιν, τούτο
 πᾶν ἔξεστι κύκλον καὶ περίβολον τῶν τειχῶν εἰπεῖν. τὰ δὲ οὐκ 83
 ἀσφάλτῳ οὐδὲ πλίνιῳ ὅπῃ δέδμηται οὐδὲ κόνει στιλπνὰ ἐστη-
 κεν, ἀλλ' ἔστι μὲν καὶ ταῦτα <τὰ> νομίζομενα ἐφ' ἐκάστων τῶν
 τόπων καὶ μάλα πολλά, καὶ τοῖς λίθοις, ὕσπερ "Ομηρος ἔφη
 (Π 212) τὸν κατ' οἰκίαν τούχον, <πυκνῶς> ἄμα καὶ ἀκριβῶς
 ἡρμοσμένα ἀπειρά τε μεγέθει καὶ λάμποντα χαλκοῦ στιλπνό-
 τερον. ὁ δὲ δὴ πολὺ μείζων καὶ σεμνότερος κύκλος πάντη 84
 παντάπασιν ἀρραγής καὶ ἀλυτος πολὺ πάντας ὑπεράλμπων καὶ
 οὐδεὶς τῶν πότοτε οὕτω παγεῖς, τούτων τῶν τειχῶν προασπί-
 ζουσιν ἄνδρες φυγὴν οὐ νομίσαντες, ἡρμοσμένοι πρὸς ἀλλήλους
 ἐκείνη τῇ ἀρμονίᾳ, ἡ τοὺς Μυρμιδόνας "Ομηρός φησι (Π 215),
 πρὸς ὃν εἴπον τούχον τότε εἰκάζων, πᾶσι τοῖς ὄργανοις τοῦ
 πολέμου· συνεχῇ μὲν οὕτως ἄλλήλοις τὰ κράνη ὡς μὴ εἶναι
 μέσον διεξελθεῖν, ἀσπίδες δὲ ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς ἔξαρθεῖσαι
 μετέωρους ἀν δέχοντο δρόμους, τοσούτῳ στερροτέρους τῶν κατ'

78. <εἰσηγάγετ' εἰς> addidi. οὐδὲ ὥστε UT: οὐδὲ SD. ἔξειν
 Keil: ἔξειναι O. δοντας ὁμοτίμους Keil: δοντες ὁμότιμοι SD, οὐδειν
 δομοτίμου UT. τὸ ἀρχαῖον οι. U¹. αὐτοὺς UT: αὐτοὶ SD.

79. τὴν τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων U.

81. ἐφορίας Keil: ἐφορείας O, ἐφορίους Rsk.

82. τ. οὐδὲ U. οὐ {δὲ} Rsk² Keil. λογιζομένων U¹S²: λογι-
 ζομένου S¹DTU². μεγάλη καὶ τελευταία DUS²: καὶ οι. S¹T.
 ἀποκλήσουσιν Keil: ἀποκλείσουσιν O.

83. <τὰ> Keil. καὶ τοῖς UT: τὸ καὶ τοῖς SD. τὸν SUT: τὴν
 D. <πυκνῶς> Keil. ἄμα καὶ SDT: καὶ οι. U. μεγέθει S:
 μεγέθη DUT.

84. πάντας TU: πάντα DS. τοῦ πολέμου UT: τοῦ οι. SD.

ᾶστυ ποιητῶν ὥστε καὶ ἵππεῦσιν ἔξεστιν ἐπιθεῖν, καὶ τοῦτο δὴ τὸ Εὐριπίδου, ‘κατάχαλκον ὁρᾶν πεδίον’, τότε φήσεις ἀλλήθως· θύρακες δὲ οὔτως ἀλλήλων ἔχονται ὥστε, εἰ καὶ γυμνὸν τάξαις τὸν μέσον, ἀρκεῖν αὐτῷ τὰ ἑκατέρῳθεν ἀπαντῆσαι μέχρι τοῦ μέσου· οἱ δὲ ἄκοντες οἶνον ἐπὶ Διὸς περιπίπτοντες ἀλλήλους ἔγκαταλαμβάνουσιν. τοιαίδε αἱ ἀρμονίαι συγκέκλευνται ὅ τε τῶν διεξόδων κύκλος τειχῶν τε καὶ ὁ τῆς πάσης ἔφορος γῆς. πάλαι μὲν οὖν Δαρεῖος μετ’ Ἀρταφέροντα καὶ Δάτιδος νήσουν μᾶς μίαν πόλιν ἡδυνῆθη σαγηνεύσας ἐλεῖν, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἄπασαι, εἰ οἴοντες εἰπεῖν, σαγηνεύσαντες τὴν οἰκουμένην οὔτως σφέσετε τοῖς κοινοῖς αὐτῆς πολίταις τε καὶ ἔνοισι, οὖς, ὥσπερ ἔφην, ἔξι ἀπάντων προκρίναντες ἔξηγάγετε, ἐλπίδας τε παραστήσαντες τοὺς γυγνούμενοις ἀγαθοῖς ἀνδράσι μὴ μεταμελήσειν—οὐ γάρ ἔξι εὐπατριδῶν ἔσεσθαι τὸν ἀεὶ πρώτον δυνάμενον καὶ δευτέρων τὸν δεύτερον καὶ τὴν ἄλλην τάξιν ὧσαντως, *⟨ἄλλ⟩* ἡς ἀν ἔκαστος ἀξίας ἦ, ταύτην σχήσειν, ἄτε οὐ λόγων, ἄλλ’ ἔργων ἐνταῦθα κρινόντων τοὺς ἀγαθούς —, παραδείγματά τε ἐμφανῆ πᾶσι τούτων ποιήσαντες, ὥστε ἄπαντας *⟨τὴν⟩* μὲν ἀργίαν συμφορὰν ἡγεῖσθαι, τὰς δὲ πράξεις ἀφορμὰς ὡν εἴχονται νομίζειν, καὶ κατὰ μὲν τῶν πολεμίων ὁμοφρονεῖν, πρὸς δὲ ἀλλήλους ὑπὲρ τοῦ πρόσθεν ἀγωνίζεσθαι διὰ βίου, μόνους δὲ ἀνθρώπων ἔχεσθαι εὑρεῖν πολεμίους. ὥστε ὅταν μὲν τις εἰς τὴν ἄσκησιν τε καὶ σύνταξιν ἴδη τοῦ στρατιωτικοῦ, τοῦτο δὴ νομεῖ τὸ Ὁμηρικόν, εἰ καὶ δεκά_κις καὶ εἰκοσάκις τόσοι εἰεν οἱ ἀντίπαλοι, ταχέως ἀν αὐτοὺς περιστραφέντας ἄνδρα παρὰ ἔνα λειφθῆναι, ὅταν δὲ εἰς τὴν πλήρωσίν τε καὶ συλλογὴν αὐτοῦ βλέψῃ, τὸ τοῦ Αἰγυπτίου φήσει τε καὶ οἰήσεται, ὃς τῷ Καμβύσῃ διαρράξοντι τὰ ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ καὶ τὰ ἕρα πορθοῦντι στὰς ἐπὶ τῶν τειχῶν τῶν Θηβαϊκῶν ἀνέτεινε γῆς τε βῶλον καὶ κύλικα ὕδατος ἀπὸ τοῦ Νείλου, σύμβολον ποιύμενος ὅτι, ἔως ἀν Αἰγυπτον αὐτὴν καὶ τὸν ποταμὸν Νείλον μετενεγκεῖν μὴ δύνηται μηδὲ ἀγαγεῖν ἀνάρπαστον, οὐπω τὸν Αἰγυπτίων πλοῦτον εἰληφεν, ἀλλὰ ταχέως αὐτοῖς ἄλλα τοσαῦτα γενήσεται τούτων μενόντων καὶ οὕποτε ἐπιλεύψει πλούτος Αἰγυπτον, τοῦτο δὲ καὶ περὶ τοῦ ὑμετέρου στρατιωτικοῦ νομίσαι τε καὶ εἰπεῖν ἔξεστιν, ὅτι, ἔως ἀν τὴν χώραν αὐτὴν μὴ δύνωνται τινες ἔξι ἔδρας ἀναστῆσαι μηδὲ κενώσαντες οὐχεσθαι, ἄλλ’ ἀνάγκη ἦ μένειν αὐτὴν ἐφ’ ἔαυτῆς τὴν οἰκουμένην, ἀμήχανον ἐπιλεύπειν ὑμᾶς πλήθη στρατιωτικά, ἀλλὰ τοσαῦτα δόποσα βούλεσθε ὑπάρχειν ἀπὸ πάσης τῆς οὐσῆς ἀφικνούμενα. καὶ μήν εἰς γε τακτικῶν λόγον παῖδας ἄπαντας ἀνθρώπους ἀπεφήνατε. οὐ γάρ πρὸς τοὺς πολεμίους ἀσκεῖν μόνον προύθεσθε αὐτὰ τοῖς στρατιώταις τε καὶ ἡγεμόσιν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς αὐτοὺς πρώτον· ὥστε καθ’ ἡμέραν ἐκάστην ἐν τάξει ζῆν καὶ μήποτε λιπεῖν μηδένα τὴν προστεταγμένην αὐτῷ, ἄλλ’ οἶον ἐν χορῷ τινι αἰώνιῳ ἔκαστον τὴν ἐαυτοῦ χώραν εἰδέναι τε καὶ σώζειν, καὶ τῷ μὲν ἐντιμοτέρῳ τὸν ἥττω μὴ διὰ τοῦτο φθονεῖν, ὡν δὲ αὐτὸς μείζων ἐστὶν ἀκρι-

δέχοντο U: δέχονται DS², δέχονται S¹, δέχωνται T. δρόμους DUT: δρόμων S. καὶ γυμνὸν DUT: καὶ om. S.

85. ὑμεῖς δὲ SDT: ὑμεῖς τ’ U. οὕτως ST: οὕτω DU. ἀπάντων STU: ἄπαντος D. δευτέρων Rsk²: δεύτερον O. ἀλλ’ add. Rsk. κρινόντων ἐπάνθιτα U. τὴν add. Rsk.

86. νομεῖν Ald: νομεῖν O. δεκά_κις καὶ εἰκοσάκις> scripsi: δέκα DTU, lacuna S. λειφθῆναι SDT: ληφθῆναι U. οἰήσεται δος UTS²: οἰστος S¹D. γῆς Keil: τὴν O. τῶν Αἰγυπτίων S¹D. ὑμετέρου DU: ὑστέρου T. ἡμετέρου S. νομίσαι τε STU: νομίσητε D. ἐπιλεύπειν Rsk: ἐπιλεύπειν O.

87. εἴσι γε DS²: εἴσι τε UT. τακτικὸν D. ἀπεφήνατε ἀνθρώπους D. ἔκαστον D.

βῶς κρατεῖν. ὅχθομαι δὲ ἔγωγε ἑτέρους φθάσαντας εὐπεῖν ἐπὶ 88 Λακεδαιμονίων, ὅτι ἄρα πλὴν ὀλίγων τὸ στρατόπεδον αὐτοῖς ἀρχοντες ἀρχόντων εἰσίν. ὑμῖν γὰρ ἥρμοττε τετηρήσθαι καὶ ἐφ’ ὑμῶν πρώτον ἐρήσθαι, δὲ πρότερον τοῦ δέοντος προεξήνεγκεν αὐτό. ἀλλ’ οὖν τὸ γε Λακεδαιμονίων στρατόπεδον κινδυνεύει τοσούτων εἶναι, ὅσους οὐδὲν ἀπεικὸς καὶ πάντας ἀρχοντας εἶναι· τὸ δὲ ἐν τοσούτοις ἀριθμοῖς καταλόγων τε καὶ γενῶν, ὡν οὐδὲ τὰ ὄντα εἴσενειν ἔχεντας ἥρδιον, ἀρέμαντος ἀπὸ ἐνὸς τοῦ διὰ πάντων διεξόντων τε καὶ πάντα ἐφορῶντος, ἔθνη, πόλεις, στρατόπεδα, ἡγεμόνας αὐτούς, τελευτᾶν εἰς ἓν τεττάρων καὶ δυεῖν ἀρχοντα ἀνδρῶν — τὸ δὲ ἐν μέσῳ πᾶν ἔξελίπομεν —, καὶ ὥσπερ νήματος περιστροφήν, ἐκ τῶν πλειόνων εἰς τοὺς ἐλάττους ἀεὶ κατιέναι, καὶ οὕτω διήκεν ἄλλους ἐπ’ ἄλλους ἀεὶ ταπτομένους μέχρι τῆς τελευτῆς, πῶς οὐχ ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν ἀνθρωπίνην τάξιν ἐστίν; ἐπέρχεται 89 δέ μοι τὸ Ὁμηρικὸν εἰπεῖν, μικρὸν ἐπὶ τῆς τελευτῆς ὑπαλλάξαντι,

Ζηνός που τοιήδε γε Ὁλυμπίου ἐνδοθεν ἀρχή·

ὅταν γὰρ ἀρχῇ μὲν εἰς τοσούτων, οἱ δὲ ἐπ’ αὐτῷ διάκονοι τε καὶ πρέσβεις αὐτοῦ μὲν πολὺ χείρους, ὡν δὲ ἐπιμέλονται πολὺ βελτίους, πάντα δὲ ἄνευ θορύβου καὶ ταραχῆς σιωπῇ περαίνωσιν, φθόνος δὲ ἐκποδῶν ἦ, δίκης δὲ καὶ αἰδούς πάντα πανταχοῦ μεστά, καρπὸς δὲ ἀρέτης μηδένα ἐκφεύγη, πῶς οὐχὶ νικᾷ τόδε τὸ ἔπος;

Δοκεῖ_{τε} δὲ ἔμοιγε οὐδὲν ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ πόλει πολιτείαν παραπλησίως τισὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων καταστήσασθαι. πρότερον μὲν γὰρ ἐδόκουν τρεῖς εἶναι κατ’ ἀνθρώπους πολιτεῖαι, δύο μὲν ἐν δυεῖν ὄντας, ἐκατέρα παρὰ τοὺς τῶν ἔχόντων τρόπους θεωρουμένη, τυραννὶς καὶ ὀλιγαρχία, βασιλεία καὶ ἀριστοκρατία, τρίτον δὲ ὄνομα δημοκρατία, εὖ τε καὶ χείρον ἀγομένη· διειλήφεσαν οὖν αἱ πόλεις ὡς ἔκαστοις αἱρεσίς ἡ τύχη νικῆσειν. τὸ δὲ ὑμέτερον οὐδὲν ὅμοιάς ἔχει, ἄλλ’ οἰονεὶ κράσις ἀπασῶν τῶν πολιτεών, ἄνευ γε τῆς ἐφ’ ἐκάστη γειρόνος· οὕτω καὶ *⟨τὸ⟩* τοιούτοις εἶδος πολιτείας νενίκηκεν. ὥστε ὅταν μὲν εἰς τὴν τοῦ δήμου τις ισχὺν βλέψῃ, καὶ ὡς ἀπάντων ὡν ἀν βουληθῆ τε καὶ αὐτήσῃ ἥρδιος τυγχάνει, δημοκρατίαν νομεῖ καὶ οὐδὲν ἐδέεν πλὴν ὡν ἔξαμαρτάνει δῆμος· ὅταν δὲ εἰς τὴν γερουσίαν ἴδη τὴν βουλευομένην τε καὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς ἔχουσαν, ἀριστοκρατίαν οὐκ εἶναι ταύτης ἀκριβεστέραν νομεῖ· εἰς δὲ τὸν πάντων τούτων ἐφορόν τε καὶ πρύτανιν βλέψας, παρ’ οὐ τῷ τε δήμῳ τὸ τυγχάνειν ὡν βούλεται καὶ τοὺς ὀλίγοις τὸ ἄρχειν καὶ δύνασθαι, τοῦτον ἐκεῖνον ὁρᾶ, τὸν τὴν τελεωτάτην ἔχοντα μοναρχίαν, τυράννον τε καὶ τακτικῶν λόγον παῖδας ἄπαντας αὐτοῖς αἴρεσθαι. καὶ ταῦτ’ οὐδὲν ἀπεικός οὕτω διελέσθαι καὶ κατιδεῖν μόνους ὑμᾶς καὶ περὶ τῶν ἔξω καὶ περὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ πόλει· μόνοι γάρ ἐστε ὑμεῖς ἀρχοντες ὡς εἰπεῖν κατὰ φύσιν. οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἄλλοι οἱ πρὸ ὑμῶν δυναστεύσαντες δεσπόται καὶ δούλοις ἀλλήλων ἐν τῷ μέρει γιγνόμενοι καὶ νόθοι τῆς ἀρχῆς ὄντες οὕτω διεέλθον, ὥσπερ ἐν σφύρᾳ τὴν τάξιν μεταλαμβάνοντες, καὶ ἐδούλευσαν Μακεδόνες Πέρσαις, Πέρσαι Μήδοις, Μῆδοι Σύροις· ὑμᾶς δὲ ἐκ τοσούτου πάντες ἵσασιν, ἐξ ὅτου περ ἵσασιν, ἀρχοντας. ἄτ’ οὖν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὄντες ἐλεύθεροι καὶ οἶον ἐπὶ τὸ ἄρχειν εὐθὺς γενόμενοι, πάντα τὰ

88. τοσούτων T: τοσούτουσ SDU. στρατόπεδα UT: στρατεύματα SD. δυεῖν Keil (δυοῖν Baroc. 136): δεινῶν O. καὶ ὥσπερ DU: καὶ om. ST.

89. τοιήδε γε S: τοίη δὲ ἐγ' D, ηδε γε UT. δίκησ δὲ SDU (τε T). οὐχὶ SDU: οὐ T.

90. Δοκεῖ_{τε} Rsk²: δοκεῖ O. δυεῖν SD: δυοῖν UT. ἐκάστοις DS: ἐκάστης UT. *⟨το⟩* add. Wil.

91. ἐηγρήσασθε SD.

πρὸς τοῦτο φέροντα καλῶς ἔξηρτύσασθε, καὶ πολιτείαν γε εὑρετε ἦν οὐπω πρόσθεν οὐδεὶς καὶ θεσμοὺς καὶ τάξεις ἀφύκτους ἄπασιν ἐπεστήσατε.

92 Ὁ δὲ ἐκ πολλοῦ μὲν ὑπεισί με καὶ πολλάκις ὥχληκε πρὸς αὐτοῖς τοῖς χείλεσι γυγνόμενον, παρενήνεκται δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου δεῦρο ἀεί, τοῦτο νῦν εἰπὼν οὐκ ἀν ἵσως ἀπὸ καιροῦ πέσοιμι. ὅσον *〈μὲν〉* γὰρ μεγέθει τῆς ἀπάστης ἀρχῆς *〈καὶ〉* ἐγκρατεῖ καὶ πολιτείας ἐπινοίᾳ πάντας ὑπερβάλλεσθε, ἔστιν ἐν τοῖς εἰρημένοις· νῦν δέ μοι δοκεῖ κάκενό τις εἰπὼν οὐκ ἀν ἀμαρτεῖν, ὅτι οἱ μὲν ἄνω πάντες καὶ οἱ ἐπὶ πλεῖστον γῆς ἄρξαντες ὕσπερ σωμάτων γυμνῶν αὐτῶν τῶν ἔθνων ἡρέαν. πότε γὰρ πόλεις τοσαῦται κατ' ἥπειρον καὶ κατὰ θάλατταν, ἢ πότε οὕτω διὰ πάντων ἐκοσμήθησαν; ἡ τίς πω οὕτω τῶν τότε διεξήλασεν, ἐπαριθμῶν ταῖς ἡμέραις τὰς πόλεις, ἔστι δὲ ὅτε τῆς αὐτῆς καὶ διὰ διεῦν καὶ τριῶν ἔξελανύνων ὕσπερ στενωπῶν; ὕστ' οὐ μόνον τῷ κεφαλαίῳ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἡττώνται τοσοῦτον οἱ πρότεροι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὃν τῶν αὐτῶν ἡρέαν ὑμίν, οὐκ ἵσων ἐκάστων οὐδὲ ὁμοίων ἡρέαν, ἀλλ' ἔνεστι τῷ τότε ἔθνει πόλιν ἀντιστῆσαι τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ νῦν. καὶ δὴ καὶ φαίη τις ἀν ἐκείνους μὲν οίνον ἐρημίας καὶ φρουρίων βασιλεῖς γεγονέναι, ὑμᾶς δὲ πόλεων ἄρχοντας μόνους. νῦν ἄπασαι μὲν αἱ Ἐλληνικαὶ πόλεις ἐφ' ὑμῶν ἀνέχουσι καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐταῖς ἀναθήματα καὶ τέχναι καὶ κόσμοι πάντες ὑμῶν ἔχουσι φιλοτιμίαν, ὕσπερ ἐν προαστίῳ κόσμος· ἐκπεπλήρωνται δὲ ἀκταί τε παράλιοι καὶ μεσόγεια πόλεσι, ταῖς μὲν οἰκισθείσαις, ταῖς δὲ αὐξηθείσαις ἐφ' ὑμῶν τε καὶ ὑφ' ὑμῶν. Ἰωνία δὲ ἡ περιμάχητος ἐλευθερωθεῖσα φρουρῶν καὶ στρατηπῶν πρόκειται πᾶσι κάλλους ἡγεμών, ὅσον πρόσθεν ἐδόκει τῶν ἄλλων ὑπεραίρειν γεινόν χάριτα καὶ κόσμῳ, τοσοῦτον νῦν ἐπδεδωκυτά αὐτὴν παρ' αὐτὴν. ἡ δὲ σεμνὴ καὶ μεγάλη κατ' Ἀλγυπτὸν Ἀλεξάνδρου πόλις ἐγκαλλώπισμα τῆς ὑμετέρας γέγονεν ἡγεμονίας, ὕσπερ γυναικὸς πλουσίας ὅρμος ἡ ψέλιον ἐν πολλοῖς τοῖς ἄλλοις κτήμασι. διατελεῖτε δὲ τῶν μὲν Ἐλλήνων ὕσπερ τροφέων ἐπιμελόμενοι, χείρα τε ὑπερέχοντες καὶ οίνον κειμένους ἀνιστάντες, τοὺς μὲν ἀρίστους καὶ πάλαι ἡγεμόνας ἐλευθέρους καὶ αὐτονόμους ἀφίεντες αὐτῶν, τῶν δ' ἄλλων μετρίων καὶ κατὰ πολλὴν φειδῶ τε καὶ πρόνοιαν ἔξηγούμενοι, τοὺς δὲ βαρβάρους πρὸς τὴν ἐκάστοις αὐτῶν οὖσαν φύσιν παιδεύοντες πραότερον τε καὶ σφοδρότερον, ὕσπερ εἰκός ἵππων ἐπιστατῶν μὴ εἶναι χείρους, ἀνδρῶν ὄντας ἄρχοντας, ἀλλ' ἔξητακέναι τὰς φύσεις καὶ πρὸς ταύτας ἄγειν. καὶ γὰρ ὕσπερ πανηγυρίζουσα πᾶσα ἡ οἰκουμένη τὸ μὲν παλαιὸν φόρημα, τὸν σίδηρον, κατέθετο, εἰς δὲ κόσμον καὶ πάσας εὐφροσύνας τέτραπται σὺν ἔξουσίᾳ. καὶ αἱ μὲν ἄλλαι πᾶσαι φιλονικίαι τὰς πόλεις ἐπιλελοίπασιν, μία δὲ αὐτὴ κατέχει πάσας ἔρις, ὅπως ὅτι καλλίστῃ καὶ ἡδίστη αὐτὴ ἐκάστη φανέσται. πάντα δὲ μεστὰ γυμνασίων, κρηνῶν, προπολαίων, νεῶν, δημιουργῶν, διδασκαλείων, ἐπιστημόνων τε ἔχεστιν εἰπεῖν οίνον πεπονηκυάναν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀνακεκομίσθαι τὴν οἰκουμένην· δωρεαὶ δ' οὐποτε λείπουσιν εἰς ταύτας παρ' ὑμῶν ιοῦσαι, οὐδὲ ἔστιν εὑρεῖν τοὺς μειζόνων τετυχηκότας διὰ

92. ὑπεισί με UTS²: μοι S¹D. *〈μὲν〉* add. Rsk². ὑπερβάλλεσθε Rsk: ὑπερβαλέσθαι S¹DT, ὑπερεβάλεσθε US².

93. ἡμέραι STU: ἡμετέραιος D.

94. προαστείω O. μεσόγειαι Keil: μεσόγειοι O.

95. τοσοῦτον UT: τοσοῦτο S, τοσοῦτω D. ψέλιον Ddf: ψέλιον O.

96. ἀφιέντες SD: ἀφεικότες UT.

97. φόρημα SDT: φόρημα U. φιλονεικίαι O. πλέον Keil: πράξεις O. διτι Junt: ἔπι O.

98. διδασκάλων Keil: διδασκαλείων O.

τὴν ὁμοίαν εἰς ἄπαντας ὑμῶν φιλανθρωπίαν. πόλεις τε οὖν δὴ που λάμπουσιν αἴγγλη καὶ χάριτι καὶ ἡ γῆ πάσα οἷον παράδεισος *〈συγκεκόσμηται*. καπνοὶ δὲ ἐκ πεδίων καὶ φρυκτοὶ φίλοι καὶ πολέμιοι, οἷον πνεύματος ἐκριπτίσαντός, φροῦδοι, γῆς ἐπέκεινα καὶ θαλάττης. ἀντεισῆκται δὲ θέας πάσα χάρις καὶ ἀγώνων ἀπειρος ὀριθμός. ὕστε οἷον πῦρ οἴρον καὶ ὁσβεστον οὐ διαλείπει τὸ πανηγυρίζειν, ἀλλὰ περίεισιν ἄλλοτε εἰς ἄλλους, ἀεὶ δὲ ἐστι πού· πάντες γὰρ ἀξίως τούτου πεπράγασιν. ὕστε μόνους ἀξίου εἶναι κατοικέταιροι τοὺς ἔχο τῆς ὑμετέρας, εἴ τινές πού εἰσιν ἄρα, ἡγεμονίας, οἵων ἀγαθῶν στέρονται. καὶ μὴν τό γε ὑπὸ πάντων λεγόμενον, ὅτι γῆ πάντων μήτηρ καὶ πατρὸς κοινὴ πάντων, ἀριστα οὐμεῖς ἀπεδείξατε. νῦν γοῦν ἔξεστι καὶ Ἐλληνι καὶ βαρβάρωφ καὶ τὰ αὐτὸν κομίζοντι καὶ χωρὶς τῶν αὐτοῦ {αὐτοῦ} βαδίζειν ὅποι βούλεται ράδιον, ἀτεχνῶς ὡς ἐκ πατρίδος εἰς πατρίδα ιόντι· καὶ οὔτε Πύλαι Κιλίκιοι φόβον παρέχουσιν οὔτε στενά καὶ φαμάδεις δι' Ἀράβων ἐπ' Αἴγυπτον πάροδοι, οὐκ ὅρη δυσβατα, οὐ ποταμῶν ἀπειρα μεγέθη, οὐ γένη βαρβάρων ἀμικτα, ἀλλ' εἰς ἀσφάλειαν ἔξαρκεν Ρωμαίον εἶναι, μᾶλλον δὲ ἔνα τῶν ὑφ' ὑμῶν. καὶ τὸ Ομήρω φεγέθεν ‘γαῖα δέ τοι ξυνὴ πάντων’ οὐμεῖς ἔργω ἐποιήσατε, καταμετρήσαντες μὲν πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην, ζεύξαντες δὲ παντοδαπάνης γεφύραις ποταμούς, καὶ ὅρη κόψαντες ἵππηλατον γῆν εἶναι, σταθμοῖς τε τὰ ἔρημα ἀναπλήσαντες καὶ διαίτη καὶ τάξει πάντα ἡμερώσαντες. ὕστ' ἔγωγε τὸν νομίζομενον πρὸ Τριπτολέμου βίον τούτον εἶναι τὸν πρὸ ὑμῶν ἐπινοῶ, σκληρόν τινα καὶ ἄγριοκον καὶ ὄρείου διαίτης ὀλίγον ἀποκεχωρηκότα, ἀλλ' ἡρέα μὲν τοῦ ὑμέρου τε καὶ τοῦ νῦν τὴν Αθηναίων πόλιν, βεβαιωθῆναι δὲ καὶ τούτο οὐφ' ὑμῶν δευτέρων, φασίν, ἀμεινόνων. οὐδέ γε δεῖ νῦν περιήγησιν γῆς γράφειν οὐδὲ οἱ ἔκαστοι χρώνται νόμοις ἀπαριθμεῖν, ἀλλ' οὐμεῖς ἄπασιν περιηγηταὶ κοινοὶ γεγόνατε, ἀναπετάσαντες ἀπάσας τῆς οἰκουμένης τὰς πύλας καὶ παρασχόντες ἔξουσίαν αὐτόπτας πάντων τοὺς θέλοντας γίγνεσθαι, νόμους τε κοινοὺς ἄπασι τάξαντες καὶ τὰ πρόσθεν λόγου μὲν διηγήσει τέρποντα, λογισμῷ δὲ εἰ λαμβάνοι τις, ἀφόρητα παύσαντες, γάμους τε κοινοὺς ποιήσαντες καὶ συντάξαντες ὕσπερ ἔνα οίκον ἄπασαν τὴν οἰκουμένην. ἀτεχνῶς δέ, ὕσπερ οἱ ποιηταὶ λέγουσιν, πρὸ τῆς Διὸς ἀρχῆς ἄπαντα στάσεως καὶ θορύβου καὶ ἀταξίας εἶναι μεστά, ἐλθόντος δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν Διὸς πάντα δὴ καταστῆναι, καὶ τοὺς Τιτάνας εἰς τοὺς κατωτάτους μυχοὺς τῆς γῆς ἀπελθεῖν, συνωσθέντας οὐφ' αὐτοῦ τε καὶ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ θέων, οὗτως ἄν τις καὶ περὶ τῶν πρὸ ὑμῶν τε καὶ ἐφ' ὑμῶν πραγμάτων λογιζόμενος ὑπολάβοι, ώς πρὸ μὲν τῆς ὑμετέρας ἀρχῆς ἄνω καὶ κάτω συνετετάρακτο καὶ εἰκῇ ἐφέρετο, ἐπιστάντων δὲ ὑμῶν ταραχὴ καὶ στάσεις ἐληξαν, τάξις δὲ πάντων καὶ φῶς λαμπρὸν εἰσῆλθε βίον καὶ πολιτείας, νόμοι τε ἔξεφάνησαν καὶ θεῶν βωμοὶ πίστιν ἔλαβον. πρότερον γὰρ ὕσπερ τοὺς γονέας ἐκτέμνοντες καὶ τὴν γῆν ἔτεμνον, παίδας τε οὐ κατέπιεν οὐνού, ἀλλ' ἀπώλλυσαν τοὺς ἀλλήλων τε καὶ τοὺς έαυτῶν ἐν ταῖς στάσεσι καὶ πρὸς ιεροῦς. νῦν δὲ κοινὴ καὶ σαφῆς

99. *〈συγκεκόσμηται* Wil: ἐγκεκόσμηται O. καὶ πολέμοις οτι. D. οἷον πῦρ Rsk: δόλον πῦρ ST, πῦρ δόλον U, δυν πῦρ D.

100. {αὐτοῦ} seclusit Keil. δοπι SU: δηπη T, δηπον D. Ἀράβων STU: ἀρράβων D.

101. δέ τοι U: δέ τι T, δέ ἔτι SD. ξυνὴ STU: ξωὴ D. πρὸ ὑμῶν STD: πρὸ δόλων U. ἐπινοῶ STU: ἐπὶ νοῦ D. οὐφ' TU: ἀδέ SD.

102. δεῖ νῦν STU: νῦν δεῖ D. οἰς Rsk: ώσ O. κοινοὶ UT: κοινὴ SD.

103. ἐφ' U: ἀφ' D, οὐφ' ST. τάξεις T.

104. ἔτεμνον UTS²: ἔτεμνον DS¹. κατέπιεν οὐνού Wil: κατέ-

πᾶσι πάντων ἄδεια δέδοται αὐτῇ τε τῇ γῇ καὶ τοῖς ἐν αὐτῇ κατοικοῦσιν· καὶ τοῦ μὲν κακῶς πάσχειν ἀπαντα ἀφείσθαι, τοῦ δὲ καλῶς ἄγεσθαι πολλὰς τὰς ἀφορμὰς εἰληφέναι μοι δοκοῦσι, καὶ οἱ θεοὶ καθορῶντες συγκατορθῶν ὑμῖν ἐμενῶς τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ διδόναι βέβαιον τὴν κτῆσιν αὐτῆς, Ζεὺς μέν, ὅτι αὐτῷ τῆς οἰκουμένης καλοῦν, φασίν, ἔργον καλῶς ἐπιμέλεσθε, "Ἡρα δὲ γάμων νόμῳ γιγνομένων τιμωμένη, Ἀθηνᾶ δὲ καὶ Ἡφαιστος τεχνῶν τιμωμένων, Διόνυσος δὲ καὶ Δημήτηρ, ὅτι αὐτοῖς οἱ καρποὶ οὐδὲ ὑβρίζονται, Ποσειδών δὲ ναυμαχῶν μὲν καθαρευούστης τῆς θαλάττης αὐτῷ, τὰς δὲ ὀλκάδας ἀντὶ τῶν τριήρων μετειληφύιας· ὅ γε μὴν Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ Ἀρτέμιδος καὶ Μουσῶν χορὸς οὗποτ' ἐκκλείπει τὸν ὑπηρέτας ἐν τοῖς θεάτροις καθορῶν· Ἐρμῆς δὲ ἀγάνων οὐκ ἀμοιρός οὐδὲ πρεσβειῶν· Ἀφροδίτη δὲ σπόρων καὶ χαρίτων πότε μᾶλλον καυρὸς ὑπῆρξεν ἢ πότε πλείονα μοῖραν ἔσχον αἱ πόλεις; αἱ δὲ Ἀσκληπιοῦ χάριτες καὶ τῶν κατ' Αἴγυπτον θεῶν νῦν πλεῖστον εἰς ἀνθρώπους ἐπιδεδώκασιν. οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ Ἀρης γε ὑμῖν ἡτίμασται, οὐδὲ δέος μὴ συνταράξῃ τὰ πάντα, ὥσπερ ἐν Λαπιθῶν δείπνῳ παροφθείσι, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ ταῖς ὁχθαῖς τῶν ἔξω ποταμῶν χορεύει τὴν ἀπαυστον χορεύαν, αἷματος καθαρὰ σφέζων τὰ ὅπλα. ὅ γε μὴν πάντ' ἐφορῶν Ἡλιος οὐδὲν εἶδεν ἐφ' ὑμῶν βίαιον οὐδὲ ἄδικον οὐδὲ οὐδὲ πολλὰ ἐν τοῖς πρόσθεν χρόνοις· ὥστ' εἰκότως ἥδιστα ἐφορᾷ τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀρχὴν. δοκεῖ δέ μοι καὶ Ἡσίοδος, εἰ δομοίς Ὄμηρος τέλειος ἦν τὰ ποιητικὰ καὶ μαντικός, ὥσπερ ἔκεινος οὐκ ἡγινόησεν τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀρχὴν ἐσομένην, ἀλλὰ προεῖδεν καὶ ἀνεφθέγξατο ἐν τοῖς ἔπεισιν, οὕτως καὶ αὐτὸς οὐκ ἀν ὥσπερ νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ χρυσοῦ γένους ἄρξασθαι γενεαλογῶν, οὐδὲ ἡνίκα ταύτην ἀρχὴν ἐνεστή-

105

τεινον STD, *κατέκτεινον* U. *ἀπαντα* STU: *πάντα* D. *αὐτῆσ* DUT: *αὐτήν* S.

105. *νόμῳ γάμων* D. *αὐτοῖς* SUD: *αὐτῆσ* T. *οὗποτ'* ἐκκλείπει Keil: *οὗποτε λείπει* O. *τῶν ἔξω ποταμῶν* Keil: *ἔξω τῶν ποταμῶν* O.

106. *οὕτω* DU. *τοῦ χρυσοῦ γένουσ* DS²: om. *τοῦ* S¹UT. *ἄρξασθαι γενεαλογῶν* Keil: *ἄρξασθαι γενεαλογεῖν* SD, *ἄρξαμενος γενεαλογεῖν* UT. *οὐδὲ ἡνίκα* scripsi: *οὐδὲ ἀν δὴ* SD, *ἡνίκα* UT. *ἐνεστήσατο* SUT: *ἀνεστήσατο* D. *φάναι* SDU: *φάσθαι* T. καὶ *δίκη δὲ* US²: *καὶ δὴ* S¹, *καὶ δίκη δὴ* T, *καὶ δίκην δὲ* D. *αἰδοῖ* UT: *αἰδοῖ* S¹, *αἰδῶ* DS².

σατο, περὶ γε τοῦ τελευταίου καὶ σιδηροῦ γένους διαλεγόμενος τοῦτον ἀν αὐτοῦ φάναι γενέσθαι τὸν ὅλεθρον,

εὐτ' ἀν γενόμενοι πολιοκρόταφοι τελέθωσιν,

ἀλλ’ ἡνίκα ἀν ἡ ὑμετέρα προστασία τε καὶ ἀρχὴ καταστῇ, τότε ἀν φάναι φθαρῆναι τὸ σιδηροῦ φῦλον ἐν τῇ γῇ, καὶ Δίκη δὲ καὶ Αἰδοῖ τότε ἀν ἀποδοῦναι κάθοδον εἰς ἀνθρώπους, καὶ οἰκτέραι τοὺς πρὸ ὑμῶν γενομένους. Ἀεὶ μὲν οὖν τά γε δὴ παρ' ὑμῖν 107 τίμια, εἰσαχθέντα ὡς ἀληθῶς ὑφ' ὑμῶν, καὶ ἔξῆς ἀεὶ μᾶλλον βεβαιούμενα. ὅ γε μὴν νῦν ἄρχων μέγας οἶνον ἀγωνιστής καθαρῶς τοσούτον ὑπεραίρει τοὺς αὐτοῦ προπάτροις, ὅσον οὐδὲ εἰπεῖν ῥάδιον ἐτέρους αὐτὸς ὑπεραίρει, καὶ δὴ φαίνη τις ἀν δικαιοσύνην καὶ νόμουν είναι τοῦτο ὡς ἀληθῶς ὅ τι κρίνειν οὐτος. *〈εἴσος〉*τι δὲ καὶ τοῦτο πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων *〈ιδ〉εί〈ν〉* σαφῶς, ὅτι τοὺς τῆς ἀρχῆς κοινωνοὺς *〈οἶ〉*ους οἰκείους ἔχει παῖδας ὄμοίους εαυτῷ πλείους ἢ τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ τις.

Ἄλλὰ τὸ ἔξ ἀρχῆς ἀγώνισμα παντὸς μεῖζον, παριστῶσαι τῷ 108 τῆς ἀρχῆς μεγέθει τὸν λόγον, καὶ σχεδὸν τοῦ ἵσου χρόνου δεόμενον ὕσσοσπερ ὁ τῆς ἀρχῆς· εἴη δὲ ἀν οὗτος ὁ πᾶς αἰών. κράτιστον οὖν, ὥσπερ οἱ τῶν διθυράμβων τε καὶ παιάνων ποιηταί, εὐχήν τινα προσθέντα οὕτω κατακλεῖσται τὸν λόγον. καὶ δὴ κεκλήσθων θεοὶ πάντες καὶ θέων παῖδες καὶ διδόντων τὴν ἀρχὴν τήνδε καὶ πόλιν τήνδε θάλλειν δι' αἰώνος καὶ μὴ παύεσθαι πρὶν ἀν μύδροι τε ὑπὲρ θαλάττης πλέωσιν καὶ δένδρα ἥρι θάλλοντα παύσηται· ἄρχοντά τε τὸν μέγαν καὶ παῖδας τούτου *〈σ〉*ῶς τε είναι καὶ πρυτανεύειν πᾶσι τὰ ἀγαθά. ἐκτετέλεσται μοι τὸ τόλμημα· εἴτε δὲ χέρον εἴτε βέλτιον ἔξεστιν ἥδη φέρειν τὴν ψῆφον.

107. καὶ ἔξησ ἀεὶ μᾶλλον βεβαιούμενα U: ἔξησ om. S¹, add. ἔξησ δεὶ S² mg; καὶ ἀεὶ μᾶλλον βεβαιούμενα ἔξησ ἀεὶ T, καὶ ἔξησ ἀεὶ καὶ ἀεὶ μᾶλλον βεβαιούμενα D. τοὺς αὐτοῦ προπάτορας scripsi: τοὺς πρὸ αὐτοῦ τὸν πατέρα SDT, τοῖσ παρ' αὐτοῦ τὸν πατέρα U. αὐτὸς STU, αὐτὸν δ. *〈εἴσος〉*τι scripsi: τί O. *〈ιδ〉εί〈ν〉* scripsi: εἴη O. *〈οἶ〉*ous scripsi: οὖσ O. δομοίστι STU: δομοίστι D.

108. μεῖζον UTS²: μεῖζω DS¹.

109. παύεσθαι Keil: *παύσεσθαι* STD, *παύσασθαι* U. θαλάσσησ O. *πλέωσιν* scripsi: *πέσοιεν* O. μέγαν STU: μέγα D. *πλέωσις* τε Rsk: ὡς τε O.

INDICES

GREEK INDEX TO THE ROMAN ORATION OF AELIUS ARISTIDES

(REFERENCES ARE TO SECTIONS)

- ἀγαθός 24, 51, 52, 70, 85 twice, 99, 109.
 ἄγαμαι 34.
 ἄγαν 36.
 ἄγαπάω 8 twice.
 ἄγεννής 39, 80.
 Ἀγησίλαος 17.
 ἄγνοῶ 41, 67, 106.
 ἄγορά 60.
 ἄγροικος 101.
 ἄγω 11, 26, 33, 39, 52, 54 twice, 55, 57,
 78, 81, 86, 90, 96, 104.
 ἄγών 25, 77, 99, 105.
 ἄγωνίζομαι 25, 85.
 ἄγωνισμα 19, 41, 108.
 ἄγωνιστής 25, 77, 107.
 ἄδεια 65, 104.
 ἄδικέω 21.
 ἄδικημα 50.
 ἄδικος 105.
 ἄδοξος 39.
 ἄδυναμιτα 57.
 ἀεὶ 11 twice, 17, 18, 19, 39, 44, 52, 53, 85,
 88 twice, 92, 99, 107 twice.
 ἄδω 4 twice.
 ἄήρ 8.
 Ἀθηνᾶ 105.
 Ἀθήναξε 12.
 Ἀθηναῖος 9, 17, 43, 45, 47 thrice, 48 twice,
 51, 101.
 Ἀθήνησι 45, 48.
 ἀδρόος 69.
 αἴγλη 99.
 Αἰγύπτιοι 73 thrice, 86.
 Αἰγύπτιος: τοῦ Αἰγυπτίου the Egyptian
 king 86.
 Αἰγύπτος 12, 26, 36, 86 twice, 95, 100, 105.
 αἰδέομαι 32.
 αἰδὼς 89.
 Αἴδως 106.
 Αἴθουσια 82.
 αἴμα 105.
 αἴνιγμα 27.
 Αἴολεις 14, 16, 17.
 αἴρεσι 90.
 αἴρεω 85.
 αἴρω 2, 8 twice.
 αἰσχρῶς 19.
 αἰσχύνω 40, 75.
 Αἴσωτος 57.
 αἰτέω 76, 90.
 αἴτιος 23.
 αἰών 29, 73, 108, 109.
 αἰώνιος 87.
 ἀκέραιος 4.
 ἀκόλουθος 9, 23.
 ἀκούω 28, 29, 32, 36, 70.
 ἀκρίβεια 29.
 ἀκριβέστερος 29, 90.
 ἀκριβῶς 4, 6, 25, 83, 87.
- ἀκρόπολις 46, 61, 64.
 ἄκρος 7 twice, 43 twice.
 ἀκτή 7, 94.
 ἄκων (= ἀέκων) 18.
 ἄκων "javelin" 84.
 Ἄλεξανδρος 24, 95.
 ἀληθής 10 twice, 51.
 ἀληθινός 77.
 ἀληθῶς 84; ὡς ἀληθῶς 2, 6, 18, 19, 24, 79,
 107 twice.
 ἀλλά 2, 3, 4 thrice, 6 thrice, 8 thrice, 9,
 10, 13, 16, 17 twice, 18, 19, 21, 23, 25
 twice, 27 thrice, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 36,
 38 twice, 39, 40 twice, 41, 44 twice, 48,
 50, 51 twice, 53, 54 twice, 57, 60, 62, 63
 four times, 64, 65, 67, 68, 69 twice, 70,
 71b, 73 twice, 76, 78, 79, 82, 83, <85>,
 85, 86 thrice, 87 twice, 90, 93 twice, 96,
 99, 100, 101, 102, 104, 105, 106 twice,
 108: ἀλλ' οὐ 8; ἀλλ' οὐν . . . γε 88; οὐ
 μὴν ἀλλά 40.
 ἀλλήλων 19, 20, 29, 31, 44, 56, 58, 68, 69,
 73, 84 four times, 85, 91 104.
 ἀλλος *passim*: πρὸ τῶν ἀλλων 107.
 ἀλλοσε 38, 76.
 ἀλλοτε 33, 99.
 ἀλλότριος 27, 65.
 ἀλλως 14, 66, 69, 70?
 ἀλς 7.
 ἀλυτος 84.
 ἀμα 53, 57, 58, 66, 75, 83.
 ἀμαξα 18.
 ἀμαρτάνω 92.
 ἀμείνων 9, 48, 101.
 ἀμελέω 80.
 ἀμέμπτως 44.
 ἀμέτρητος 70.
 ἀμετρία 45.
 ἀμήχανος 53, 86.
 ἀμικτος 100.
 ἀμιλλάομαι 19.
 ἀμοιρος 90, 105.
 ἀμοντος 1, 3.
 ἀμφισβήτησις 69.
 ἀμφότερος 52.
 ἀμφω 58.
 ἀν 1, 2, 4 twice, 5, 6, 8, 9 twice, 13, 14,
 24, 25 twice, 31 twice, 32 twice, 36, 37
 twice, 39, 40, 43, 48, 51, 55, 56, 61, 67b,
 68 thrice, 73, 74, 77, 79, 82, 84, 85, 86
 thrice, 90, 92 twice, 93, 103, 106 six
 times, 107, 108, 109: see also κάν.
 ἀνά 11.
 ἀναβίω 69.
 ἀναγκάζω 27, 40, 46, 55.
 ἀναγκαῖος 46.
 ἀναγκαῖς 58.
 ἀνάγκη 18, 21, 38, 51, 74, 86.
 ἀνάθημα 94.
- ἀναίρεσις 21.
 ἀνακομίζω 98.
 ἀναλίσκω 19.
 ἀναμένω 71b.
 ἀναμιγνύω 71b.
 ἀναμιμνήσκω 69.
 ἀναπετάννυμι 102.
 ἀναπίπλημι 101.
 ἀναπλήρω 8.
 ἀναπτύττω 8.
 ἀνάρμοστος 49.
 ἀνάρπαστος 86.
 ἀνάσπαστος 45.
 ἀνάστατος 19, 27.
 ἀνατείνω 86.
 ἀνατολή 10.
 ἀναφθέγγομαι 106.
 ἀνεῖπον 75.
 ἀνεύ <66>, 89, 90.
 ἀνευρίσκω 28.
 ἀνέχω 94; falsa lectio 50.
 ἀνήρ 1, 3 twice, 7, 8, 10, 21, 84, 85, 86,
 88, 96.
 ἀνθέλκω 54.
 ἀνθίστημι 25, 51, 93.
 ἀνθρώπινος 88.
 ἀνθρωπός 7, 58, 85, 87, 90 twice, 105, 106.
 ἀνίστημι 18, 32, 86, 96.
 ἀνίσχω 16.
 ἀντεισάγω 48, 99.
 ἀντί 43, 46, 52, 53, 69 twice, 105.
 ἀντιδιαιρέω 63.
 ἀντιδίδωμι 75.
 ἀντίπαλος 25, 86.
 ἀντίρροτος 63.
 ἀντιτάττω 30.
 ἀντρον 68.
 ἀνω 8, 17, 82, 92, 103.
 ἀξία 6, 38, 60, 85.
 ἀξιος 25, 26, 32, 34, 46, 59, 60, 63, 74, 79,
 80, 99.
 ἀξιώ 44, 68.
 ἀξιως 6, 99.
 ἀξιωσις 32.
 ἀπαιδευτοι 51.
 ἀπαλλάττω 18, 45, 75.
 ἀπαντάω 36, 58, 84.
 ἀπαριθμέω 102.
 ἀπας 9, <18>, 25 twice, 29 twice, 30, 31
 twice, 33, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 65, 66,
 67b, 68, 69, 73, 76, 85 twice, 87, 90
 twice, 91, 92, 94, 98, 102 four times, 103,
 104: ἐξ ἀπάντων 77, 85.
 ἀπαντος 20, 105.
 ἀπειμι 9.
 ἀπείπον 62.
 ἀπειρία 57.
 ἀπειρος 83, 99, 100.
 ἀπέσικα: σύδεν ἀπεικός 88, 91.

- ἀπέρχομαι 103.
 ἀπέχω 16, 36.
 ἀπιστέω 19, 28.
 ἀπιστία 18.
 ἀπιστος 56.
 ἀπλῶς 16, 46.
 ἀπό 1, 6, 12, 16, 18, 24, 45, 47, 48, 73, 74,
 75 twice, 76 twice, 80, 86 twice, 88, 92,
 106.
 ἀποδίδωμι 59, 72, 106.
 ἀποδεικνύω 61, 100.
 ἀποθήσκω 25.
 ἀποκλείω 82.
 ἀποκρίνω 73.
 ἀποκρύπτω 40, 80.
 ἀπολαύω 15, 18, 20, 21, 25 twice, 46, 74.
 ἀπολείπω 4, 65.
 ἀπολις 75.
 ἀπόλλυμι 21, 104.
 Ἀπόλλων 105.
 ἀπονέμω 78.
 ἀποπέμπω 67b.
 ἀποπίπτω 68.
 ἀποπληρώω 23.
 ἀπόπλους 13.
 ἀπορον 53.
 ἀποσεμνύω 63.
 ἀποσημαίνω 32.
 ἀπόστασις 20, 56.
 ἀποσφάττω 19.
 ἀποφάνω: ἀπεφάνθη 50, 68; ἀπεφήνατε 14,
 63, 79, 87.
 ἀποχράν 31, 67.
 ἀποχωρέω 56, 101.
 ἀπρίξ 68.
 ἄρα 7, 8, 9, 28, 32, 69, 71, 72, 78, 88, 99.
 Ἄραβες 12, 100.
 ἄργιλα 85.
 Ἅργος 6.
 ἄργυρολόγος 45.
 ἄρεσκω 37, 66.
 ἄρετή 41, 89.
 Ἅρης 105.
 ἄριθμός 67, 88, 99.
 ἄριστοκρατία 90 twice.
 ἄριστος 60, 77, 96, 100.
 ἄρκεω 84.
 ἄρκοντως 9.
 ἄρμαμάξα 18.
 ἄρμονία 66, 84 twice.
 ἄρμοστής 49.
 ἄρμόττω 25, 83, 84, 88.
 ἄρραγής 84.
 Ἅρταφέρνης 85.
 Ἅρτεμις 105.
 ἄρτιως 40, 41, 69, 71b.
 ἄρχαιος 14 twice, 75: τὸ ἄρχαιον 75, 78.
 ἄρχαιρεστα 36.
 ἄρχή “beginning” 13, 91, 108; “office”
 60, 90; “rule” or “empire” 9, 10, 13
 twice, 14, 15, 16 twice, 18 twice, 19, 24,
 25, 28 twice, 29 twice, 33, 34, 41, 43,
 52 twice, 53, 57, 58 thrice, 59, 65, 66,
 69, 70, 72, 74 twice, 77, 78, 80, 89, 92,
 93, 103 thrice, 104, 105, 106 thrice, 107,
 108, 109; “rulership” 23, 27, 91.
 ἄρχω 9, 10, 19, 21, 23 thrice, 26 twice, 27
 twice, 31, 34, 36, 43, 45, 51 twice, 53
 twice, 57, 58, 65 twice, 66, 68 69, 78,
- 88 four times, 89, 90, 91 thrice, 92 twice,
 93 thrice, 96, 101; middle 3, 28, 48, 80,
 88, 106; passive 9, 15, 21 twice, 23
 twice, 26, 30, 31 thrice, 32, 36, 37, 48,
 54, 59, 65, 68.
 ἄρχων 31 twice, 36 thrice, 51, 60, 65, 107,
 109.
 ἄσβεστος 99.
 ἄσθενέστατος 19.
 ἄσθενέστερος 53.
 ἄσθενής 54, 57.
 Ἀστα 10, 60.
 ἄσκεω 77 twice, 87.
 ἄσκησις 86.
 Ἀσκληπίος 105.
 ἄσμενος <45>, 69.
 ἄσπις 84.
 ἄστυ 61, 84.
 ἄσφάλεια 100.
 ἄσφαλτος 83.
 ἄσφαλτος 52.
 ἄσταξ 103.
 ἄτε 49, 78, 85, 91.
 ἄτελχιστος 79.
 ἄτεχνως 8, 13, 17, 69, 70, 81, 100, 103.
 ἄτιμάω 105.
 Ἀτλαντικὸν πέλαγος 16.
 ἄτοπώτατος 55.
 ἄτρεμέω 32.
 ἄτυχέω 16.
 αῦ 2 twice, 12, 20, 24, 50, 54, 58, 72, 79.
 αὐθάδεια 79.
 αὐθίς 18.
 αὐλ<λ>ή 28.
 αὐλ<ό>s 29.
 αὔξω 19, 50, 58, 94.
 αὐταρκής 76.
 αὐτομάτως 26.
 αὐτόνομος: ἐλευθέρους καὶ αὐτονόμους 96.
 αὐτόπτης 102.
 αὐτὸς passim; ταύτη 53, 73; ταύτων 73.
 αὐτοῦ 4, 8 twice, 14, 16, 19, 27 twice, 31,
 32, 37, 45, 48, 55 twice, 56 twice, 61, 67,
 75, 76, 95, 100 twice, 107.
 ἀφαιρέω 5.
 ἀφίημι 96, 104.
 ἀφικένομαι 11, 17, 23, 27, 69, 86.
 ἀφίστημι 29, 55 twice, 56 thrice, 68.
 ἀφόρητος 102.
 ἀφορμή 85, 104.
 Ἀφροδίτη 105.
 ἀφυκτός 91.
 ἀφυπνίξω 69.
 ἀχθομαι 88.
 ἀχθος 76.
 ἀχροστία 28.
 ἀχρι 17.
 ἀψοφητή 69.
- Βαβυλών 18, 79.
 Βαβυλώνιοι 12.
 βαδίζω 28, 80, 100.
 βαίνω 18.
 βαρβαρικός 14.
 βάρβαρος 11, 12, 41, 63, 96, 100 twice.
 βαρύς 57.
 βασιλεία 24, 25, 27, 90.
 βασιλεύς 15, 16 twice, 17 thrice, 18 twice,
 23, 27 thrice, 29 thrice, 90, 93.
- βασιλεύω 10, 17, 18, 24, 25, 27.
 βέβαιος 52, 104.
 βεβαίω 33, 48, 101, 107.
 βεβαίως 56.
 βελτίων 89, 109.
 βία 29, 52.
 βίαιος 105.
 βίος 85, 101, 103.
 βλάσφημον 9.
 βλέπω 9, 76, 86, 90 twice.
 βοάω: ἐβεβόητο 15.
 βοηθέω 55.
 βουλεύω 79, 90.
 βουλή “plan” 74.
 βούλομαι 4, 5, 11, 12, 14, 43, 51, 53, 54,
 56 twice, 80, 86, 90 twice, 100.
 βριάω 39 twice.
 βύρσα 18 twice.
 βῶλος 86.
 βωμός 103.
- γαῖα 101.
 γάμος 102, 105.
 γάρ 4, 6, 7, 10 twice, 11, 14 twice, 15, 19,
 21, 22, 23 thrice, 24, 25, 26, 29, 34, 36,
 39, 43, 45, 47, 51, 53 twice, 55, 56 thrice,
 58, 59, 62, 63, 65 twice, 68, 71b, 73, 74,
 77, 79 twice, 80, 81, 85, 87, 88, 89, 90,
 91 twice, 92, 93, 99, 104; καὶ γάρ 19, 97;
 καὶ γάρ οὖν 49; καὶ γάρ τοι 67b.
 γάρ δή 6.
 γάρ οὖν 15, 22.
 γε 2, <4>, 8, 16, 17, 30, 40 twice, 41, 44,
 51, 66, 75, 76, 77, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 100,
 102, 105, 106; see also ἔγωγε.
 γε δή 107.
 γελάω: γελάσεσθε 14.
 γελοίος 40, 63.
 γελοιότατος 55.
 γε μήν 2, 18, 27, 28, 80, 105 twice, 107.
 γενεά 44.
 γενεαλογέω 106.
 γενναῖος 39.
 γενναιότερος 59.
 γεννάω 13.
 γένος 63 twice, 67, 88, 95, 100, 106 twice.
 γεροντία 90.
 Γέται 70.
 γέφυρα 101.
 γεωργία 12, 13.
 γεωργός 30, 71b.
 γῆ 6, 7 twice, 8 twice, 9, 11 twice, 16, 18,
 24 twice, 25, 28 twice, 29, 33, 45, 60, 62
 twice, 84, 86, 92, 99 twice, 100, 101, 102,
 103, 104 twice, 106.
 γίγνομαι 3, 7, 8, 11, 13 four times, 15, 18,
 25, 27, 31, 33, 37, 39, 40, 43, 44, 45, 47,
 51, 53, 62, 66, 69, 70, 71b, 75, 85, 86, 91
 twice, 92, 93, 95, 102 twice, 105, 106
 thrice.
 γεγνώσκω 38, 72, 73.
 γνώμη 74.
 γνώσις 4.
 γονεύς 21, 104.
 γονύν 100.
 γράφω “paint” 4; “write” 33; “com-
 pose” 102.
 γυμνάστων 97.

- γυμνός "stripped" 4; "light-armed" or "unarmed" 84; "mere" 92.
 γυμνώ 57.
 γυνή 21, 79, 95.
- δαπανά *<51>*.
 Δαρείος 85.
 Δάτις 85.
 δέ with precedent μέν 4 twice, 7 twice, 8, 9 thrice, 11, 12 twice, 13, 14 twice, 16, 17, 18 twice, 21 twice, 22 twice, 24, 25 thrice, 26, 27, 29 thrice, 30, 31, 32 twice, 34, 39 twice, 40, 41, 45, 49 twice, 51, 52 twice, 53 twice, 54, 56 twice, 58, 59, 62, 63, 64, 67 twice, 68 twice, 69, 73 twice, 74 twice, 75, 76, 77, 80, 84 four times, 85 thrice, 86, 87, 89 six times, 90 four times, 91, 92 twice, 93 twice, 94 twice, 96 twice, 97 twice, 101 twice, 102, 103 twice, 104, 105 eight times; without precedent μέν 1, 4 twice, 5, 6, 7, 9 twice, 11 thrice, 12, 13 twice, 16, 17 twice, 21 thrice, 22, 23 twice, 24, 26, 27, 28 thrice, 29 thrice, 30 twice, 31 twice, 32 twice, 33, 34, 37, 43, 44, 46, 47, 49, 54, 55, 57, 59, 60 twice, 61, 62 twice, 64, 65 twice, 69 thrice, 70 twice, 72, 74, 75, 77, 82, 83, 85, 86, 88 four times, 89, 90, 92, 95 twice, 96, 97, 98, 99 thrice, 100, 101, 103 twice, 104, 106 twice, 107, 108, 109.
- δεῖ 6, 10, 11, 12 twice, 15, 18, 21, 31, 32, 33, 40, 64, 74, 77, 88, 102.
- δεῖδω 22, 32, 40, 68.
- δεικνύω 4 thrice, 27, 31, 40, 48, 56, 80.
- δεῖνα 36.
- δεῖπνον 105.
- δέκα 82.
- δεκά_{κις} 86.
- δεκαρχία 47.
- δέμω 81, 83.
- δένδρον 12, 108.
- δεξιός 3.
- δέομαι 12, 17, 53, 108.
- δέος 105.
- δεσπόζω 23.
- δεσπότης 23, 32, 36, 80, 91.
- δεῦρο 11, 12, 92.
- δεύτερος 19, 68, 81, 85 twice, 101.
- δέχομαι 37, 62 twice, 69, 84.
- δέω 21, 74 twice.
- δή 5, 6, 8, 10, 16, 20, 24 twice, 31, 39 twice, 40, 43, 44, 58, 67, 84 twice, 86, 103. See also γε δή, καλ δή, μὲν δή.
- δή ἄρα 78.
- δῆλος 42.
- δηλών 17.
- δημαγωγός 46.
- Δημήτηρ 105.
- δημιουργία 97.
- δημοκρατία "Old Free Republic" 38; "free republic" 60; "democracy" 90 twice.
- δῆμος 19, 61, 90 thrice.
- δημότης 37.
- δή που 4, 39, 51 twice, 55, 99.
- δήπουθεν 28, 52.
- δήτα 14.
- διά with genitive 4, 10, 17 twice, 33, 53,
- 56, 58, 73, 85, 88, 93 twice, 100, 109; with accusative 18, 50, 53, 54 twice, 57, 58 twice, 65, 67, 76, 87, 98.
- διαβαίνω 16.
- διάγω 22.
- διαίρεις 63.
- διαιρέω 23, 53, 59, 60, 63, 64, 73, 91.
- διαιτά 101 twice.
- διάκονος 89.
- διακρίνω 13, 30.
- διαλαμβάνω 90.
- διαλέγω 106.
- διαλείπω 8, 99.
- διαλλακτής 22.
- διάνοια 25, 59, 80.
- διαπράττω 56.
- διαρπάζω 86.
- διασπάω 53.
- διασώζω 42, 44, 57.
- διατάττω 20.
- διατελέω *<48>*, 96.
- διατίθημι 20, 26, 45, 78.
- διαφέρω 18, 31, 36, 51, 58.
- διαφεύγω 28, 58.
- διαφυλάττω 67.
- διδασκάλ_{ει}ον 97.
- διδάσκαλος 32.
- διδωμι 36, 45, 76, 81, 104 twice, 109.
- διειμι 40 twice.
- διείρω 60.
- διέξειμι 88.
- διεξελάνω 93.
- διεξέρχομαι 84, 91.
- διέξοδος 84.
- διέρχομαι 17, 45.
- διήγησις 102.
- δίήκω 88.
- διηνεκής 26.
- διθύραμβος 108.
- διίστημι 29, 78.
- δίκαιος 38, 39.
- δικαιοσύνη 107.
- δίκαιως 58.
- δικαστήριον 37.
- δικαστής 38 thrice, 39.
- δίκη 32, 89.
- Δίκη 106.
- διοικησις 7, 26.
- διουκέω 53.
- Διόνυσος 105.
- διπλάσιος 9.
- διπλοῦς 32, 64.
- δίσκος 16.
- δισμύριοι 5.
- διώκω 38, 57.
- δοκέω 4, 5, 8, 14, 24, 31, 40, 41, 66, 73 twice, 90 twice, 92, 95, 104, 106.
- δόξα 52.
- δουλεύω 36, 91.
- δοῦλος 22, 80, 91.
- δρόμος 10, 84.
- δύναμαι 2 twice, 3, 16, 27 thrice, 29 twice, 42, 43, 46, 50, 53, 57, 65, 67, 70, 74, 85, 86 twice, 90; δύνηθη 25, 85; δύνηθησαν 57.
- δύναμις 6, 9 thrice, 14, 17 twice, 20, 41, 43 twice, 58, 68, 76.
- δυναστεία 48.
- δυναστεύω 91.
- δυνατός 65, 66, 73.
- δυνατώτατος 64.
- δυνατώτερος 59.
- δύνο 59, 88, 90 twice, 93.
- δύσβατος 100.
- δυσμεναῖνω 76.
- δυσμή 10.
- δυστυχία 70.
- δυσχεραίνω 18, 47.
- δύω 16.
- δωρεά 98.
- έάν 12, 65.
- έαντοῦ 18, 26, 27, 31, 32 twice, 42, 45 thrice, 53 twice, 55, 56, 64, 76, 80, 86, 87, 104, 107.
- έάω 4, 15.
- έγγύς 40, 53.
- έγγυτατος 26.
- έγκαθίστημι 49.
- έγκαλλώπισμα 95.
- έγκαταλαμβάνω 84.
- έγκράτεια 92.
- έγκρατής 66.
- έγκρατώς 34, 57.
- έγκρινω 74, 77.
- έγκωμιον 3.
- έγώ 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 14 twice, 24, 41, 89, 92 twice, 104, 106, 109; έγωγε 88, 90, 101.
- έδαφος 62.
- έδρα 86.
- έθέλω 8.
- έθνος 23, 28, 31, 36, 67 twice, 88, 92, 93.
- έθος 1.
- εἰ 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12 twice, 14, 18, 24, 25, 27, 28, 32 twice, 38, 40, 43, 45, 48, 51 twice, 55, 67, 70 twice, 79, 80 twice, 84, 85, 86, 99, 102, 106; εἰ δὲ μή 69.
- εἴδον 4, 5, 6, 9, 13, 15, 18, 59, 64, 80, 86, 87, 90, 105, <107>.
- εἴδος 90.
- εἰκάζω 12, 84.
- εἰκῇ 103.
- εἰκός 70, 96.
- εἴκοσι 82.
- εἰκότως 23, 58, 65, 66, 67b, 105.
- εἴμι 55 twice, 98, 100.
- εἴμι "really is" 4, 99; "exist" 13 twice, 28, 40 twice, 51 thrice, 54 twice, 86, 90, 106; "there is" 13, 18, 19, 54, 57, 83, 86, 90; "is possible" with infinitive 3, 4, 6, 8, 9 twice, 13, 28, 40, 73, 84, 98; copula 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 twice, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21 twice, 22, 23 twice, 27, 28, 29 twice, 31, 32 twice, 34, 36 twice, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 46, 48, 50, 51 four times, 52, 53 twice, 54, 56 twice, 57, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 67 twice, 71b, 72b, 74 twice, 75 twice, 76, 77, 78, 80, 86, 87, 88 twice, 89, 91 twice, 96 twice, 99, 100, 101 twice, 103, 106, 107, 108, 109; with genitive 13, 19, 29, 36, 43, 55, 85, 88; with dative 29, 62, 76, 96; with prepositional phrase 7, 16, 27, 46, 71b, 73 twice, 85, 88, 92; έστι . . . δέ 93; έστι που 99; ήν ώσπερ 27; οὐδέ έστιν ὡς 11.
- εἴπερ 13.
- εἴπον 1, 6, 9 twice, 18, 27, 40 twice, 44, 46, 51, 54, 58, 59, 63, 69, 72, 73, 78, 79, 82

- twice, 84, 85, 86, 88, 89, 91, 92 twice, 98, 107.
εἰρήνη 71.
εἰς 6, 9 twice, 13 thrice, 16 twice, 18, 19 twice, 23, 27 twice, 28, 29, 37, 41, 42, 44, 50, 52 twice, 53, 54 twice, 60, 61, 63 twice, 65, 69, 72, 74, <78>, 86 twice, 87, 88, 90 thrice, 97, 98 twice, 99, 100 twice, 103, 105, 106.
εἰς 6, 8, 10, 13, 29, 30 twice, 36 twice, 44, 45, 48, 49, 50, 60, 61, 63, 65, 66, 76, 85 twice, 86, 88 twice, 89, 97, 100, 102.
εἰσάγω <78>, 107.
εἰσαφικέομαι 12.
εἰσεμι 62.
εἰσέρχομαι 103.
εἰσηγόμαι 56.
εἰσοικίζω 29.
εἰσπέμπω <32>, 52.
εἰσρέω <62>.
εἴσω 80.
εἴτα always in neighborhood of participle: connecting nouns 18; participle and finite verb 4, 5, 6, 25; connecting two participles 14, 40.
εἴτε 109 twice.
ἐκ 11, 12 twice, 17, 20, 21, 22, 29, 31, 36, 37, 47, 56, 62, 65 twice, 77, 84, 85 twice, 86, 88, 91 thrice, 92, 98, 99, 100, 108.
ἐκασταχόθεν 64, 77.
ἐκαστος 1, 11 twice, 26, 27, 31, 33, 45, 48, 52, 56, 60, 64 twice, 67, 76 twice, 83, 85, 87 twice, 90 twice, 93, 96, 97, 102.
ἐκάτερος 44, 90.
ἐκατέρωθεν 84.
Ἐκβάτανα 18.
ἐκεῖ 12 twice, 38.
ἐκείνος 12, 14, 16, 17 twice, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 32 thrice, 42, 43, 46, 47 twice, 48 twice, 50, 51, 55, 62, 73, 75, 84, 90, 93, 106; *ἐκείνο* . . . δ 34; *ἐκείνο* . . . ὅτι 41, 51, 92.
ἐκκαθαίρω 29.
ἐκκαρπόμαι 43.
ἐκκλητος 37.
ἐκλέγω 14.
ἐκλείπω 27, 88, <105>.
ἐκμελής 1.
ἐκνικάω 10.
ἐκπέμπω 29, 76; f. 1. 32.
ἐκπίπτω 29, 49.
ἐκπληρώω 94.
ἐκποδῶν 50, 89.
ἐκπολίξω: *ἐκπεπολισμένους* 6.
ἐκριπίζω 99.
ἐκτένω 28.
ἐκτελέω 109.
ἐκτέμνω 104.
ἐκτίνω 34.
ἐκφαίνω 103.
ἐκφεύγω 28, 38, 89.
ἐκών 18, 45.
ἐλάττων 4 twice, 9, 37, 52, 53 twice, 88.
ἐλάχιστος 25.
ἐλευθερία 47, 48.
ἐλευθερος 22, 36 twice, 46, 56, 91, 96.
ἐλευθερών 95.
Ἐλλάς 16 twice.
"Ελλην" 11, 15, 41, 44, 45, 47, 48, 50, 51 thrice, 63, 73, 96, 100.
Ἐλληνικός 14, 40, 41, 63, 94.
Ἐλληνίς 47.
Ἐλλήσποντος 43.
Ἐλπίς 85.
ἐμβολή 62.
ἐμμελής 3.
ἐμπαλιν 53.
ἐμπειρία 58.
ἐμπίπτω 19.
ἐμπόριον 7, 13.
ἐμπροσθεν 54.
ἐμφανής 85.
ἐν 1, 5, 7 thrice, 10, 11, 15, 16 twice, 17, 18, 20, 22 twice, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30 twice, 33, 36 twice, 38 twice, 39, 44, 46, 47, 48 twice, 50, 51, 54 twice, 55, 60 twice, 64, 65, 67, 68, 69, 70 twice, 71b, 73 twice, 78, 81 twice, 86, 87 twice, 88 twice, 90 twice, 91 thrice, 92, 93, 94 twice, 95, 104 twice, 105 thrice, 106 twice.
ἐναντίος: *τούναντίον* 4, 14, 56.
ἐνδείκνυμι 9.
ἐνδέω 90.
ἐνδοιάζω: *ἐνδοι<άξοι>εν* 32.
ἐνδοξος 39.
ἐνδοθεν 89.
ἐνειμι 2, 23, 93.
ἐνεκα 28, 51.
ἐνθένδε 11, 64, 82.
ἐνιαυτός 45, 80.
ἐνίστημι 106.
ἐνοικος 3.
ἐνοχλέω 74.
ἐνσπείρω 67.
ἐνστάξω 31.
ἐνταῦθα 1, 9, 11, 13 twice, 16, 28, 39, 40, 56, 60, 78, 81, 85: see *κάνταῦθα*.
ἐντεῦθεν 28, 75.
ἐντιμότερος 87.
ἐντός 28, 82.
ἐντυγχάνω 3.
ἐξαγγέλλω 5.
ἐξάγω 63, 85.
ἐξαίρετος 10.
ἐξαίρω 84.
ἐξαίφνης 69 twice.
ἐξαμαρτάνω 90.
ἐξαπατάω 47.
ἐξαρκεῖ 13, 100.
ἐξαρτάω 68.
ἐξαρτώ 91.
ἐξειμι "go out" 62.
ἐξαλαύνω 93.
ἐξελέγχω 6, 14.
ἐξέρχομαι 76.
ἐξεστι 12, 38, 82, 84, 86, 98, 100, <107>, 109.
ἐξετάζω 41, 96.
ἐξευρίσκω 88.
ἐξηγέομαι 96.
ἐξήκω 36.
ἐξῆς 15, 107.
ἐξικνέομαι 16.
ἐξοικίζω 27.
ἐξουσία 22, 34, 97, 102.
ἐξω 53, 91, 99, 105.
ἐξωθεν 54.
ἐξωτάτω 81.
ἐσικα 11, 24, 53, 59: see *εἰκός*.
ἐσορτή 46.
ἐπαγγελία 48.
ἐπαινέω 4.
ἐπαποθητίσκω 25.
ἐπαριθμέω 93.
ἐπει 14, 27, 51.
ἐπειδάν 14.
ἐπειδή 2, 47, 50: see *ει δή* 10.
ἐπειδήπερ 40.
ἐπειδίον 11.
ἐπεικάσιος 51.
ἐπεισέρχομαι 51.
ἐπειτα 53.
ἐπέκεινα 12, 38, 99.
ἐπέρχομαι 11, 89.
ἐπί with genitive 7 twice, 8 twice, 9, 15, 18 twice, 43, 44, 51, 59, 66, 71b twice, 77, 78, 83, 86 twice, 88 twice, 89, 94 twice, 103, 105; with dative 8, 14, 32, 36 thrice, 43, 45, 46, 58 twice, 69, 70, 88, 89, 90, 105; with accusative 4, 6, 8 twice, 10, 18, 23, 25, 31, 38, 45, 55 thrice, 56, 63, 65, 75, 77, 78, 80, 91, 92, 100, 103.
ἐπιβαίνω 65.
ἐπιβούλη 20, 54.
ἐπιδειγμα 16.
ἐπιδεικνύω 14, 51.
ἐπιδηλός 62.
ἐπιδίωμα 95, 105.
ἐπιθένε 84.
ἐπιθυμέω 43 twice.
ἐπιλέγω 77 twice.
ἐπιλείπω 86 twice, 97.
ἐπικέλομαι 89, 96, 105.
ἐπινοέω "have in mind" 1; "contrive" 72, 79; "see on reflection" 101.
ἐπίνοια 92.
ἐπιπολής 8.
ἐπισταμαι 23.
ἐπιστάτης 44, 96.
ἐπιστημόνως 98.
ἐπιστολή 33.
ἐπίταγμα 31.
ἐπιτηδειότατος 77 twice.
ἐπιτίθημι 25.
ἐπιτρέπω 71b.
ἐπιχειρέω 4, 16.
ἐπιχώριος 52.
ἐποικέω 82.
ἐπομαι 76.
ἐπος 89, 106.
ἐπύνυμος 8, 15, 26.
ἐργάζομαι 48.
ἐργαστήριον 11.
ἐργον 7, 26, 27, 34, 77, 79, 85, 101, 105.
ἐρείδω 8.
ἐρημία 17, 93.
ἐρημος 27, 101.
ἐρις 20, 69, 97.
ἐρκίον 28.
Ἐρμῆς 105.
Ἐρυθρὰ θάλαττα 28, 70.
ἐρυθριάω 14.
ἐρχομαι 12, 38, 42, 75, 103.
ἐρῶ 14; *ἐράν* 42; *ερῆσεται* 34; *ερηκα* 59;

- εἰρηται* 72; *ειρήσθαι* 88; *ειρημένων* 14; *ειρημένοις* 92.
έρωτάω 32.
έσθής 12.
έσπέρα 17, 28, 82.
έστε 32.
έσχατιά 16, 57, 70.
έτερος 2, 8, 10, 36, 38, 40 twice, 44 twice, 45 twice, 53, 81, 88, 107.
έτι 27, 30, 41, 50, 51, 54, 65, 70, 74.
έν 25, 26, 46, 90.
ένδαιμοντα 74.
ένδαιμων 12, 30.
ένθέως 49.
ένθυς 3 twice, 27, 32, 53, 65, 77, 82, 91.
ένκαμπέστερος 81.
ένμάρεια 33.
ένμενώς 104.
ένμορφία 21.
έννοια 76.
ένπατρίδης 85.
ένρημα 51.
Εύριπίδης 3, 84.
ένρισκω 28, 40, 58, 73, 74, 75, 77, 78, 85, 91, 98.
Εύρώπη 10, 60.
ένσχήμων 39.
έντε 106.
έντυχέω 50.
ένφήμως 47.
Εύφρατης 17, 82.
ένφροσύνη 97.
ένψυλακτότερος 81.
ένχή 1 twice, 2, 3, 21, 32, 108.
ένχομαι 1, 2, 85 twice.
έφεσις 37.
έφίημι 53.
έφικνέμαι 6.
έφιστημι 32, 67, 91, 103.
έφοράω 88, 105 twice.
έφόριος 81.
έφορος 84, 90.
έχθρός 22.
έχω 3, 4, 14 twice, 15, 16 twice, 17, 26, 29 twice, 34, 40 twice, 43 twice, 46, 49, <50>, 52 twice, 53 thrice, 54 twice, 55, 57 twice, 62 twice, 64 twice, 68 twice, 69, 72, 73 thrice, 76, 78, 84, 85, 90 four times, 94, 105, 107.
έως 17 thrice, 86 twice.
ζεύγνυμι 101.
Ζεύς 84, 89, 103 twice, 105.
ζητέω 19, 45, 53, 63.
ξῶ 66, 87.
ξωγράφος 4.
ξώντη 10.

ἢ disjunctive "or" 4 twice, 5, 6 twice, 11 twice, 12, 13 twice, 14 twice, 16, 17 twice, 26 four times, 32 twice, 38, 59, 60, 61, 70 twice, 79 twice, 80, 90, 93 twice, 95, 105; comparative "than" 3, 4, 8, 9, 12, 21 twice, 22, 24, 27 thrice, 29, 31, 32 thrice, 37, 43, 50, 53, 56, 63, 64, 65, 67b, 68 twice, 76, 107.
ἢ 73.
ἡγεμονία 10, 43 thrice, 44, 69, 95, 99.
ἡγεμών 29, 39, 45, 87, 88, 95, 96.
ἥγέομαι 14, 85.
ἥδεως 73.
ἥδη 1, 69, 109.
ἥδιστος 69, 97, 105.
ἥδιων 67b.
ἥκω 8, 65.
ἥλιος 10 four times, 16.
"Ἥλιος 105.
ἥμεις 1.
ἥμέρα 75, 87, 93.
ἥμερήσιος 10.
ἥμερος 12, 101.
ἥμερώ 101.
ἥμισυς 16.
ἥντια 106 twice.
ἥπειρος 11, 30, 93.
ἥ που 16.
ἥρ 109.
**Ἕρα* 105.
Ἡσιόδος 13, 39, 106.
ἥσυχάξω 69, 73.
ἥττάομαι 22, 49, 73, 93.
ἥττων 32, 39, 53, 64, 75, 87.
"Ἥφαιστος 105.

θάλαττα 7, 10 twice, 11, 13, 16 twice, 17 thrice, 28, 43 thrice, 49, 60, 62 twice, 70, 93, 99, 105, 109.
θαλάττιος 10.
θάλλω 109 twice.
θαῦμα 5.
θαυμάζω 4, 5 twice, 9 twice, 13, 16, 34, 40, 59, 69.
θαυμαστός 40, 51, 58, 63, 72b.
θέα 99.
θεάομαι 11.
θέατρον 105.
θέλω 102.
θεός 2, 6, 32, 103 twice, 104, 105, 109 twice.
θεραπεύω 22.
θερμός 91.
θεωρέω 90.
θηβαικός 86.
Θηβαῖοι 49, 50 twice.
θόρυβος 89, 103.
Θράκη 43.
θώραξ 84.

ἴδια 73, 76.
ἴδιος 32, 34.
ἴδιωτης 24.
ἴδρυν 48, 67, 73 twice.
ἱερομηνία 46.
ἱερόν 86, 104.
ἱερός 99.
ἱκανός 53.
ἱλη 67.
ἱνα 3, 27.
ἱνδοί 12.
'Ιόνιος (πόρος) 8.
ἱππεύς 71b, 84.
ἱππήλατος 101.
ἱππος ἢ "cavalry" 5.
ἱππος δ 10, 96.
ἱσομέτρητος 2 thrice, 8.
ἱσος 10, 23, 28, 30, 40 four times, 53, 62, 73 twice, 93, 108.
ἱσότης 39.

ἱστημι: *ἐστήσατε* 80; *στάς* 86; *ἐστᾶτε* 77;
ἐστηκεν 9, 83.
ἱσχυρός 52.
ἱσχύς 52, 90.
ἱσχύω 54.
ἱσως 2, 9, 14, 73, 92.
"Ἴταλα 8.
"Ιωνες 16, 17 twice.
"Ιωνία 16, 95.

Καδμεία 50.
Καδμεῖος 44.
καθαιρέω 47, 48.
καθαίρω: *καθάραντες* 78.
καθαρέω 105.
καθαρός 67, 105.
κάθαρσις 13.
καθαρῶς 8, 107.
καθέδρα 18.
κάθημαι 33.
καθίστημι 25, 36, 47, 53, 60, 72, 90, 103, 106.
κάθοδος 106.
καθοράω 104, 105.
καὶ passim; "in its turn" 101.
καὶ γάρ 19, 97.
καὶ γὰρ οὖν 49.
καὶ γάρ τοι 67b.
καὶ . . . δέ (ορ δή) 106.
καὶ δή 107, 109.
καὶ δή καὶ 31, 93.
καὶ μὲν δή 8.
καὶ μήν 41, 77, 87, 100.
καίπερ 57.
καιρός 44, 72, 77, 92, 105.
καίτοι 27.
κακοδαιμονία 70.
κακός 48, 52, 69, 90.
κακώς 19, 23, 48, 104.
καλέω 15, 109.
κάλλιστος 97.
καλλίων 73.
κάλλος 19, 95.
καλός 4, 105.
καλύπτω 7 thrice.
καλῶς 23, 25, 28, 29, 76, 91, 104, 105.
Καμβίστης 86.
κἄν 3, 31, 42, 71.
κάνταῦθα 39, 56, 78.
καπνός 99.
Καρία 36.
καρπός 24, 89, 105.
καρπώ 52.
κατά with genitive 1 twice, 2, 55, 85; with accusative 3 twice, 6, 9, 14, 18, 19, 21, 33, 34, 36, 45, 49, 53, 56, 57, 61, 63, 67 twice, 69, 72, 73, 79 twice, 83, 84, 87, 90, 91, 93 twice, 95, 96, 105.
καταβαίνω 7.
καταγιγνώσκω 28.
καταδείκνυμι 55.
καταθεάμαι 6.
καταίρω 12.
κατακλείω 108.
καταλαμβάνω 6, 8.
καταλεπτω 26, 49, 53, 56, 68 twice.
κατάλογος 88.
καταλύω 26.

- καταμετρέω 101.
 καταπίνω 104.
 κατάπλους 13.
 κατάρα 21, 53.
 καταρράκτης: Νεῖλον καταρράκται 28.
 κατασκαφή 21.
 κατασκευάζω 9, 11.
 κατάστασις 27.
 καταστρέψω 25.
 κατατίθημι 65, 97.
 κατατρέχω 24.
 κατατρίβω 43.
 κατάχαλκος 84.
 κατεῖδον 91.
 κάτειμι 17, 53, 88.
 κατέχω 6, 18, 27, 45, 53, <66>, 97.
 κατηγορία 51.
 κατοικέω 104.
 κατοικίζω 30.
 κατοικτείρω: κατοικτείραι 99.
 κατορθώ 25.
 κάτω 103.
 κατώτατος 103.
 κείμαι 69, 96.
 κελεύω 32.
 κενόω 86.
 κέρδος 77.
 κεφάλαιος 53, 93.
 κεφαλή 25, 84.
 Κιλίκιος 100.
 κινδυνεύω 51, 88.
 Κλέαρχος 17.
 κλῆρος 44, 57.
 κληρούχος 30, 45.
 κλίνω 11.
 κοιλότατος 30.
 κοινή 56.
 κοινός 7 twice, 11, 32, 51, 56, 60 twice, 61, 62, 63, 65, 76, 78, 85, 100, 102 twice, 104.
 κοινωνός 107.
 κολάξω 22.
 κολοιός 57.
 κόλπος 62.
 κομίζω 11, 100.
 κόνις 83.
 κόπτω 101.
 Κορίνθιοι 49.
 κορυφαῖος 29.
 Κορυφάσιον 43.
 κορυφή 6, 7.
 κοσμέω 81, 93.
 κοσμητής 60.
 κόσμος 12, 94 twice, 95, 97.
 κουφότερος 53.
 κράνος 84.
 κράσις 90.
 κρατέω 10, 16, 18, 25, 26, 27, 38, 50 twice, 51, 87.
 κράτιστος 108.
 κράτος 66.
 κρατύνω 58.
 κρείττων 68.
 κρήνη 97.
 κρίνω 85, 107.
 κρίσις 37.
 κρύπτω 62.
 κτάσιμα 15, 21, 24 twice, 43.
 κτήμα 95.
 κτήσις 10, 104.
- Κυάνεαι 10, 17.
 κύβερνήτης 68.
 Κύθνος 12.
 Κυκλάδες 43.
 κύκλος 29, 80, 81, 82 twice, 84 twice.
 κύλιξ 86.
 κύριος 43, 47.
 κυρίως 17.
 Κύρος 18.
 κωλύω 7.
 Δακεδαιμόνιοι 9, 17, 43, 45, 47, 50 twice, 79, 88 twice.
 λαμπάνω 24, 28, 29, 43, 56, 67b, 78, 86, 102, 103, 104.
 λαμπρός 80, 103.
 λαμπρότερος 41.
 λαμπρότητης 16, 79.
 λάμπω 83, 99.
 λαυθάρια 53.
 Λάπιθαι 105.
 λέγω 3 twice, 5 twice, 9, 10 twice, 18, 21, 44, 51, 63, 100, 101, 103: see εἰπον and ἔρω.
 λείπω 12, 13, 16, 66, 74, 86, 87, 98.
 λειτουργέω 75.
 λειτουργία 75.
 Λεύκτρα 50.
 λήγω 103.
 ληστεῖα 27.
 λιθανωτός 1.
 Λιθύες 70.
 Λιθύη 10, 12.
 λίθος 68, 83.
 λιμήν 7, 13, 28, 43.
 λίμνη 11, 28.
 λογίζομαι 55, 82, 103.
 λογισμός 102.
 λογοποίος 10, 28.
 λόγιος 2 twice, 4, 5, 6, 14, 34, 40, 41, 45, 63, 70, 85, 87, 92, 102, 108 twice.
 λοιπός 28, 55, 59, 63: τὸ λοιπόν 12, 75.
 Λυδοί 17: f. 1. 51.
 λυσιτελέω 4, 50, 55.
 λύω 53.
 λωτέω 7.
 Μαιῶτις 28.
 Μακεδόνες 27 twice, 91.
 Μακεδονία 27.
 μάλα 83.
 μάλιστα 14, 34, 59, 77.
 μᾶλλον 6, 8, 21, 22, 24, 27 thrice, 32 twice, 39, 43, 50, 51, 65, 78, 100, 105, 107.
 μαντικός 106.
 μαρτυρέω 9.
 μάχη 20, 22, 25, 50 twice.
 μάχιμος 72, 73 twice.
 μάχομαι 29, 57.
 μεγαλοπρέπεια 59.
 μεγάλως 16, 63.
 μεγαλωστή 11.
 μέγας 3, 9, 11, 14, 15, 16, 23, 24, 25, 27, 31, 38, 39, 41, 63, 66, 70, 82, 95, 107, 109.
 μέγεθος 8, 9 thrice, 15, 19, 29, 58, 62 twice, 67, 83, 92, 100, 108.
 μέγιστος 14 twice, 26, 58, 64, 77 twice.
 μεθίστημι 47.
- μεῖων 2, 3, 4, 29, 48, 62, 84, 87, 90, 98, 108.
 μεῖς 80.
 μέλλω 18, 76.
 μεμπτός 28.
 μέν 3, 4 twice, 7, 9 thrice, 10, 11, 12, 14 twice, 16, 17 twice, 18, 21, 22 twice, 24, 25 thrice, 26, 27, 28 twice, 29 four times, 30, 32 twice, 34, 36, 39 twice, 40 twice, 41, 43, 45, 49, 51, 52 thrice, 53 twice, 54, 56 twice, 58, 59, 62, 64, 67, 67b, 68, 69, 73 twice, 74, 75, 76, 77, 80, 83, 84, 85 twice, 86, 87, 89 twice, 90 thrice, 91, 92 thrice, 93, 94 twice, 96 twice, 97 twice, 101 twice, 102, 103, 104, 105 twice.
 μέν δή 8, 15, 21, 63.
 μέν οὖν 1, 2 twice, 85, 107.
 μέντοι 58.
 μένων 4, 17, 29, 32, 38, 53, 56, 78, 86 twice.
 μερὶς 55.
 μέρος 5, 9, 44, 59, 65, 78, 81, 91.
 μεσόγεος 94.
 μέσος 25, 29, 84 thrice; εἰς τὸ μέσον 65; ἐν μέσῳ 7 twice, 10, 60 twice, 88; ἐν τῷ μέσῳ 1.
 μεστός 89, 97, 103.
 μετά with genitive 85; with accusative 26, 38.
 μεταγυγνάσκω 45, 69.
 μεταδίδωμι 63.
 μεταιτέω 12.
 μεταλαμβάνω 44, 91, 105.
 μεταλλον 13.
 μεταμέλει: μεταμελήσειν 85.
 μετανάστης 18.
 μετασκευάζω 71b.
 μεταφέρω 86.
 μεταχειρίζομαι 54.
 μέτειμι 3, 65.
 μετέωρος 8, 84.
 μετουσία 78.
 μετρέω 63.
 μετρίως 22, 96.
 μέτρον 28.
 μέχρι 7, 10, 16, 17, 24, 73, 84, 88.
 μή 3, 4 twice, 6, 8 twice, 13 thrice, 14, 19 twice, 30, 38 twice, 40, 42, 48, 53 twice, 54, 60, 65 twice, 68 thrice, 69, 70, <74>, 75, 77, 84, 85, 86 twice, 87, 96, 105, 109.
 μηδὲ 28 twice, 38, 75, 76 twice, 86 twice.
 μηδεὶς 63, 74 twice, 87, 89.
 Μῆδοι 91 twice.
 μηκέτι 9.
 μήν: see γε μήν, καὶ μήν, οὐ μήν ἀλλά, οὐ μήν οὐδέ.
 μήποτε 51, 87.
 μήπω 52.
 μήτε 52, 76 twice.
 μήτηρ 100.
 μαιφονία 19.
 μικρολογέουμα 40.
 μικρός 14, 32, 33, 38, 39, 57, 77, 89.
 μικρότατος 14.
 μικρότερος 42.
 μιμέω 4.
 μιμήσκω: μεμνημένος 14.
 μισέω 22 twice, 44, 49, 50, 52.
 μίσος 20, 50, 65.

μνημείον 26.
μνημονεύω 40.
μοίρα 105.
μοναρχία 90.
μόνος 26, 32, 36, 44, 57, 58, 73, 76, 85, 87,
91 twice, 93 twice, 99.
μόρα 67.
Μοῦσαι 105.
μύδρος 109.
μύθος 69, 70 twice.
μύριοι 5, 17.
μυρίος 27.
Μυρμιδόνες 84.
Μυστοί 29.
μυχός 103.

Νάξος 12.
νᾶν: νεῶν 26; νη̄ 39.
ναυμαχία 105.
ναυτίλια 13.
Νεῖλος 28, 86 twice.
νεῦμα 31.
νεώς: νεῶν 97.
νῆμα 88.
νησίδιον 43.
νήσος 28, 30, 82, 85.
νικάω 8, 34, 38, 44, 77, 89, 90 twice.
νικη 25, 44.
νικηφόρος 77.
νόθος: νόθοι τῆς ἀρχῆς 91.
νομάς 18 twice.
νομένις 18.
νομίζω 32, 85: νομίζουμενος 83, 101; νομεῖ
86, 90 twice; ἐνομίσατε 74, 80; νομίσαι
86; νομίσας 9, 84.
νόμιμος 107.
νόμος 20, 26, 102 twice, 103, 105.
νομός 6.
νοῦς 55.
νυκτερίς 68.
νῦν 8 twice, 9, 10, 16, 17, 18, 21, 28, 34,
37, 63, 68, 72, 79, 92 twice, 93, 94, 95,
100, 101, 102, 104, 105, 106, 107.

ξένος 60, 74 twice, 85.
Ξέρειν 5.
ξυνός 101.

δύκος 2, 41.
δόε 6, 7, 8 twice, 9, 11, 28, 29 twice, 61,
62 twice, 75, 79, 89, 109 twice.
δδοιπορέω 1.
δδός 1.
δθεν 75.
Οιβάρας: Οιβάρον 18.
οίδα 32, 51, 57, 58, 69 twice, 91 twice.
οἰκεῖος 17, 19, 65, 74, 76, 107.
οἰκέω 61.
οἰκήτωρ 30, 81.
οἰκία 71b, 83.
οἰκίω 8, 26, 94.
οἰκισμός 21.
οῖκοι 53 twice.
οἶκος 19, 23, 36, 102.
οἰκουμένη 9, 10, 11, 16, 29, 33, 36, 59, 61,
81, 85, 86, 97, 98, 101, 102 twice, 105.
οἰκουρέω 71b.
οἰκτίρω 106.

οἴομαι 40, 43, 77, 86.
οἰονεῖ 90.
οῖος 70, 99, 105, <107>; as adverb οῖον 5,
36, 48, 54, 57, 65, 68, 69 twice, 71b, 80
twice, 81, 84, 87, 91, 93, 96, 98, 99 thrice,
107.
οῖος τε 27, 32, 85.
διστός 84.
οῖχομαι 86.
δλεθρος 106.
δλιγαρχία 90.
δλιγος 82, 88, 101: οι δλιγοι 90; δλιγον
δέω λέγειν 21.
δλκάς 11, 13, 105.
δλος 9, 43, 67, 72.
ο'λυμπικός 25.
ο'λυμπιος 89.
ο'μηρικός 86, 89.
ο'μηρος 7, 83, 84, 101, 106.
δμοιος 40, 93, 98, 107.
δμοιως 7, 10, 31, 39, 40, 46, 90, 106.
δμότιμος 78.
δμού 50, 51, 75.
δμοφρονέω 85.
δμοφυλος 59, 64.
δμως 44.
δνειρον: δνειράτων 69.
δνειροπολέω 43.
δνομα 6, 8, 23, 28, 32, 48, 63 twice, 88, 90
twice.
δνυξ 43.
δπηνίκα 40.
δπισθεν 54.
δπισω 74.
δπιτης 71b.
δπλον 74, 105.
δποι 100.
δπόδος 13, 37, 77, 82, 86.
δπότε 33.
δπον 7, 67.
δπτός 83.
δπως 2, 15, 17, 19, 26, 31, 39, 42, 48, 54,
69, 72 twice, 77, 97.
δρατός 80.
δράω 6, 12, 17, 18, 69, 84, 90.
δργανον 84.
δργή 65.
δρеios 101.
δριζω 10, 16, 28.
δρион 61.
δρκос 19.
δρμαθός 68.
δρμос 95.
δρоs 7, 30, 100, 101.
δρоs 9, 10, 17, 28.
δs 18, 71b, 86; η̄ 15; δ̄ 4, 9, 26, 34; ο̄ 4.
90; η̄s 6, 85; η̄ 84; δ̄ 28, 38, 84; η̄ 69,
91; ο̄l 51, 52; ᾱl 48; ᾱ 18 twice, 20, 21,
28, 32, 53; ω̄ 1, 3, 15, 18, 22, 41, 53
thrice, 56 twice, 69 twice, 74, 78, 85, 87,
89, 90 thrice, 93; ο̄is 5, 54, 55, 68, 102;
ο̄is 52, 85; ᾱs 47.
δтos 4, 8, 9, 10, 11 twice, 12, 13, 14, 16
twice, 18, 56, 76, 82, 88, 92, 95, 107.
δπер: δπер 7, 10, 13, 16, 40, 54, 61, 63;
δпper 47; δπер 43.
δтos 108.
δтis 2, 32, 36, 39, 46, 53, 60, 72 twice, 73,
91.

δστισοῦν 75, 76.
δтav 23 twice, 36, 86 twice, 89, 90 twice.
δтe 58, 93.
δтi 3, 13, 16, 31, 40 twice, 41, 48, 51, 56,
73, 86 twice, 88, 92, 100, 105 twice, 107:
with superlative 97; μὴ δтi 6, 13.
δ тi 13, 54, 107.
ο'ν passim: ούχι 89; ο'ν 'Ρωμαίους 63.
ο'ν 7, 10, 13, 27, 28.
ο'нде 1 twice, 5, 6, 8, 9 twice, 10 four times,
17 twice, 18, 19, 23, 25, 27, 28 twice,
29 six times, 33, 36 five times, 38, 40
twice, 41, 44, 48, 57 twice, 60, 63, 64,
65, 67 twice, 69 thrice, 70, 71b four
times, 73, 78, 82 four times, 83 twice,
88, 90, 93, 98, 102 twice, 105 four times,
106, 107: ο'ν μὴν ο'нде 105.
ο'ндеis 7, 8, 25, 28, 30, 32, 33, 38, 46, 50,
53, 58, 59, 60, 62, 64, 65, 69, 76, 84, 88,
90 twice, 91 twice, 105.
ο'ндеπ'ωπоте 62.
ο'нкéти 17.
ο'нкоуи 23, 38, 44, 73.
ο'н μὴν δλλά 40.
ο'н μὴν ο'нде 105.
ο'н 38, 42, 52, 53, 57, 68, 74, 75, 88, 90,
91, 99, 108: see also γὰρ ο'н, καὶ γὰρ ο'н
and μὲν ο'н.
ο'нπоре 13, 38, 86, 98, 105.
ο'нпω 23, 51, 57, 86, 91.
ο'нте 4 twice, 19 twice, 23 twice, 45 twice,
53 twice, 54 twice, 57 twice, 60 twice,
62, 79 twice, 100 twice.
ο'нтос 39, 107, 108; τούтou 62, 63, 68, 82,
99, 109; τούтou . . . ο'пωs 48; τούтou 18,
47, 63; τούтou . . . δтi 31; τούтou 28,
39, 79, 90, 101, 106; τούтou 17, 40, 45,
47, 53, 64, 84, 85, 86, 90; τούтou 20, 53,
67; τούтou 29, 55, 77, 78; α'нтη 97;
τа'нтηs 4, 10, 90; τа'нтη 1, 26, 61, 72,
85, 106; α'нтai 67; τа'нтas 96, 98; τо'нто
8, 23, 24, 34, 44, 51, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63,
69, 72, 72b, 73, 74, 76, 82, 87, 91, 92,
101, 107; τо'нто of what is to follow 77,
84, 86; τо'нто as antecedent of δπер 7,
10, 16; τо'нто . . . δтi 3, 16, 40, 73, 86,
107; τо'нто . . . δs 9, 59; τо'нто . . .
δпωs 15, 19, 42; ε'л τо'нто τ'нхηs . . .
штpe 27; τо'нто м'в 15, 45; τа'нтa 11, 20,
21, 38, 41, 43 twice, 46, 50, 51, 57, 69,
80, 83, 91.
ο'нтws 11, 14, 20, 28, 29 twice, 34, 36, 45,
50, 57, 58, 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 68, 71b,
73, 75, 78, 84 thrice, 85, 88, 90, 91 twice,
93 twice, 103, 106, 108.
δфθамлs 9.
δхтη 105.
δхлew 92.
δψопоiш 71b.

παιά 108.
παιδεύω 96.
παιδιά 17, 54, 79.
πа'нt 17, 21, 87, 104, 107, 109 twice.
πа'наi 85, 96.
πа'наis 97.
πа'нt 17 twice, 18 twice, 47 twice, 53.
πа'мфулoс 69.
πа'нtγyрiзω 97, 99.

- πανήγυρις** 77.
πανόπτης 6 twice.
παντάπαιον 84.
πανταχοῦ 18.
πανταχοῦ 30, 59, 89.
παντελῆς 41, 72b.
παντελῶς 34.
πάντη 84.
παντοδαπός 101.
πάνν 5, 15.
παρά with genitive 11, 48, 50, 54, 64, 65, 67b, 90, 98; with dative 11, 14, 45, 65, 73, 107; with accusative 1, 4, 8, 38, 45, 73, 86, 90, 95.
παραβάλλω 14 twice, 40.
παράδειγμα 8, 9, 40, 72, 85.
παράδεισος 99.
παραδίδωμι 36.
παρακινέω 65.
παρακλέπτω 45.
παράλιος 94.
παραμένω 56.
παρανολα 70.
παράπαν 28.
παραπέμπω 39.
παραπλήσιος 5, 25, 43, 54, 55.
παραπλησίος 90.
παρασάγγης 82.
παρασκευάζω 15.
παραφέρω 92.
παραφθέγγω 63.
πάρειμι 32, 33, 66, 69, 70, 74.
παρεξετάζω 40.
παρέπομαι 20.
παρέχομαι 41, 70.
παρέχω 15, 63, 65, 76, 100, 102.
παρίστημι: παρασήσαντες 85.
παρισώ 2, 108.
παροράω 105.
πάροδος 100.
πᾶς 4 twice, 5, 6, 8, 9 twice, 10 twice, 11 six times, 13 thrice, 14, 15, 16, 21, 28, 29, 30, 31 twice, 33, 34, 36, 38, 40, 41, 43, 47 twice, 51 twice, 52, 55, 59 four times, 60 thrice, 61, 62 twice, 63 thrice, 65, 68, 74 twice, 75, 76, 82, 84 thrice, 85, 86, 88 five times, 89 twice, 90, 91 twice, 92 twice, 93, 94, 95, 97 five times, 99 thrice, 100 thrice, 101 thrice, 102, 103 twice, 104 twice, 105 twice, 108 twice, 109 twice.
πάσχω 25, 43, 54, 69, 104.
πατέω 18, 33.
πάτριος 71.
πατρίς 64, 75, 100 thrice.
παύω 23, 69, 102, 109 twice.
πεδίον 6, 7, 30 twice, 84, 99.
πείθω 55.
πειράματι 19, 51.
πέλαγος 16.
πέμπω 31, 37, 45, 52, 53.
πένης 39 twice, 66.
πενιχρός 71b.
πένταθλος 19.
περ 13?, 91.
περαινω 89.
περαιτέρω 23.
πέρας 13, 16, 25, 28, 78.
πέρι with genitive 3, 4, 6, 9 twice, 10, 13
thrice, 25, 32, 37, 44, 45, 51, 70, 72, 74, 86, 91 twice, 103, 106; with accusative 11, 32, 43, 56, 59, 70, 72 twice, 72b.
περιβάλλω 80 twice.
περιβλεπτος 4, 20.
περιβολή 41.
περιβόλος 82 twice; f. 1. in 29.
περιγλύνομαι 58.
περίειμι (-ibo) 18, 33, 99.
περιεργω 82.
περιήγησις 102.
περιηγήτης 102.
περιμάχητος 95.
περιμένω 40.
περίμετρον 82.
περίοδος 26, 44.
περίοικος 61.
περιουσία 41.
περιπίπτω 84.
περιρρέω 28.
περιστρεφω 86.
περιστροφή 88.
περιτροπή 11.
περιττεύω 11.
περιφανής 14.
περιφοιτάω 18.
Πέρσαι 15, 26, 51, 91 twice: collective singular 28.
Περσικός 41.
πήγνυμι 84.
πηλίκος 42.
πιέζω 18.
πιμπλημη 49.
πίπτω 92.
Πισίδαι 29.
πιστεύω 70, 74.
πιστις 60, 103.
πίων 7.
πλάνη 18.
πλάνης 18.
Πιλάτων 69.
πλείστος 8, 19 thrice, 21 twice, 25 twice, 51, 92, 105.
πλείων 12, 13, 21, 22, 28, 48, 54, 74, 82, 88, 105, 107.
πλεονεκτία 52 twice.
πλέω 1, 43, 68, <109>.
πλῆθος 5, 53, 60, 65, 86.
πλήν 28, 69, 88, 90.
πληρώω 11, 81.
πλήρωμα 63, 76.
πλήρωματι 86.
πλινθός 83.
πλοῦν 1, 68.
πλούσιος 39 twice, 66, 95.
πλοῦτος 51, 86 twice.
πνεύμα 39, 99.
ποιέω 1 twice, 2, 4 thrice, 5, 10, 14, 16, 19, 26 twice, 32, 37, 47, 48, 51, 52, 55 twice, 56, 63 twice, 73, 74 twice, 75 twice, 76, 85, 86, 101, 102.
ποίησις 28.
ποιητής 1, 14, 28, 53, 103, 108.
ποιητικός 106.
ποιητός 84.
ποῖος 6, 26 four times.
πολεμέω 22, 47, 48, 71.
πολέμιος 22, 71b, 85 twice, 87, 99.
πόλεμος 22, 48, 54, 69, 70, 84.
- πολιοκρόταφος** 106.
πολιός 7.
πόλις 1, 2 twice, 3, 4 twice, 6, 7, 8 twice, 9 four times, 11 twice, 13 twice, 19, 21, 23, 26, 27, 28 twice, 29, 31, 36 twice, 38 twice, 47, 49, 52 twice, 57, 61 twice, 63 four times, 64 thrice, 65, 67 thrice, 69, 74, 75 twice, 76 twice, 78, 79, 80 thrice, 81 twice, 85, 88, 90 twice, 91, 93 four times, 94 twice, 95, 97, 99, 101, 105, 109.
πολιτεία 59, 65, 66, 72, 73, 78, 90 four times, 91, 92, 103.
πολίτευμα 26.
πολιτεύομαι 26, 36.
πολίτης 60, 64, 74, 75 thrice, 85.
πολιτικός 59.
πολλάκις 22, 46, 92.
πολλοστός 5, 9.
πολυανθρωπότερος 63.
πολύς 16, 18, 24, 33, 34, 39, 45, 48, 64, 67 twice, 68, 73, 83, 92, 95, 96, 104, 105: masculine plural with article "the many" 47 twice, 70; **πολύ** as adverb 5, 8 twice, 9, 12, 28, 29, 34, 42, 59, 84 twice, 89 twice.
πονέω 25, 53 twice, 73, 98.
πόνος 51, 69.
πορεία 10, 25, 80.
πορεύω: πορεύεται 10; **πορεύεσθαι** 10.
πορθέω 86.
πορίζω 74.
πορρωτάτω 80.
πόρρωθεν 77.
Ποσειδών 105.
πότε 93 twice, 105 twice.
ποταμός 11, 62 twice, 86, 100, 101, 105.
ποτε 15, 16, 67, 69.
πότερος: πότερα 13; **πότερον** 27.
πον 45, 67, 70, 89, 99: **ἔστι πον** 99; **ἢ πον** 16: see **ἢ πον**.
πράγμα 25, 26, 41, 42, 47, 58, 103.
πρᾶξις 85.
πράστερος 96.
πράττω 31, 32, 43, 56, 99.
πρεσβεία 105.
πρέσβυς: πρέσβεις 89.
πρὶν 3, 24, 25, 109.
πρᾶ 15, 17, 51, 74, 91, 101 twice, 103 thrice, 106, 107 twice.
προαγορεύω 10.
προασπίζω 84.
προάστιον 94.
προβάλλω 81.
προεῖδον 106.
πρόειμι 23, 26, 53.
προείπον 47, 48.
προεκφέρω 88.
προερέω: προειρηται 21.
προέρχομαι 23, 25, 73.
πρόκειμα 60, 95.
προκρίνω 85.
πρόνοια 3, 36, 68, 96.
προπάτωρ <107>.
προπολεμέω 73.
προπύλαια 97.
πρός with genitive 80; with dative 16, 26, 53, 92, 104; with accusative 11, 17, 19, 28, 29 thrice, 30, 31 twice, 39 thrice, 47

- twice, 52, 54, 57, 62, 69, 76 twice, 82, 84 twice, 85, 87 twice, 91, 96 twice.
προσαγορεύω: *προσερεῖν* 1, 2.
προσάγω 47, 56.
προσδέομαι 2, 38.
προσεικάξω 8.
προσείπον 47, 79.
προσέοικα 27.
προσέτι 46, 52.
προσήκω 19, 31.
πρόσθεν 58, 66, 85, 91, 95, 102, 105.
προστασία 36, 46, 106.
προστάτη 87.
προστίθημι 108.
προσφίω 68.
πρότερος 93: as adverb *πρότερον* 19, 28, 47, 68 twice, 69, 79, 88, 90, 104.
προτίθημι 87.
προῦχω 77.
πρόφασις 45.
προχωρέω 53 twice.
πρυτανεύω 31, 109.
πρύτανις 90.
πρώωνες 7 twice, 8.
πρωτεῖον 69.
πρώτως 3, 6, 16, 18, 31, 52, 68, 85, 87, 88.
πτηνός 33.
πυκνός <83>.
Πύλαι 43.
Πύλαι Κιλικίου 100.
πύλη 102.
πύρ 99.
πυρά 69.
πω 64, 93.
πώποτε 13, 36, 70, 84.
πῶς 38, 74, 88, 89.
ράδιον 13, 88, 107.
ράδιως 22, 23, 36, 90, 100.
ράφων: *ῥάφων* 12, 22, 31.
ῥέα 39 twice.
ῥέω 69.
Ῥωμαῖος 63 thrice, 100.
ῥώμη 8 twice.
σαγηνεύω 85 twice.
Σάκαι 29.
σατράπης 27, 29, 95.
σαφῆς 104.
σαφῶς 107.
σέβω 32.
σεμνός 95.
σεμνότερος 79, 84.
σεμνότης 90.
σιδηρος 97.
σιδηροῦς 106 twice.
Σικελία 12.
σιωπέω 4.
σιωπή 4, 30, 89.
σικέπτω 15, 75.
σκήνη 71b.
σκιαμαχέω 69.
σκληρός 101.
σκόπελος 10.
σκοπιά 6.
Σκύθαι 18.
σκυτοτόμος 71b.
σκώπτω 1.
Σοῦσα 18.
- σοφία 18, 41, 51, 72b.
σοφός 73.
σοφώτατος 73.
σοφώτερος 73.
Σπάρτη 48.
σπεύδω 53, 54.
σπόρος 105.
σπουδή 55.
σταθμός 101.
στάσις 103 twice, 104.
στενός 100.
στενωπός 93.
στέργω 38.
στερέω 16.
στέρομαι 99.
στερρότερος 84.
στέφανίτης ἀγών 77.
στέφανος 25.
στιλπνός 83.
στιλπνότερος 83.
στρατεία 46, 72, 75.
στράτευμα 74, 76.
στρατεύομαι 46, 73, 74, 75 twice.
στρατιά 5.
στρατιώτης 5, 26, 71b twice, 74, 75, 87.
στρατιωτικός 86 thrice.
στρατόπεδον 82, 88 thrice.
στρωνύω 71b.
συγκαλέω 71b.
συγκατορθόω 104.
συγκλείω 66.
συγκλίω 84.
συγκοσμέω 99.
συγκροτέω 29.
συγκτάομαι 24.
συγχωρέω 17.
συλλογή 75, 86.
συμβαίνω 24, 39, 52, 53, 66.
σύμβολον 86.
συμμαχία 54.
συμμαχος 56.
συμπίπτω 13.
συμπλέκω 48, 70.
συμφέρω 54, 56, 66.
συμφορά 85.
σύν 17 twice, 37, 62, 68, 97, 103.
συνάγω 6.
συναίρω 3.
συνείμαρται 62.
σύνειμι 60.
συνεισέρχομαι 58.
συνεξετάξω 15.
συνέρχομαι 61, 66, 77.
συνεύχομαι 29, 32.
συνεχής 8, 20, 30, 84.
συνεχῶς 48.
συνήθης 26.
συνιστημι: συνέστη 58.
σύνταγμα 73.
σύνταξις 26, 86.
συνταράττω 103, 105.
συντάττω 76, 102.
συντετραίνω 13 twice.
συντίθημι 42, 58.
συνωθέω 103.
Σύροι 91.
συρρήγγυμι 69.
συσκευάζω 51.
- σφαῖρα 91.
σφάλλω 51.
σφεῖς: *σφίσιν* 2, 33, 45; *σφᾶς* 32, 48.
σφέτερος 12, 27, 48.
σφοδρότερος 96.
σχεδόν 21, 108.
σχίζω 27.
σφύω 1, 22, 53, 85, 87, 105.
σῶμα 4, 43 twice, 77, 92.
⟨σ⟩ῶς 109.
σωτήριος 68.
σωφρονέω 67.
σωφροσύνη 41.
- τακτικός 87.
τακτός 10, 26.
ταλαιπωρέω 74.
τάξις 44, 57, 70, 72, 85, 87, 88, 91 twice, 101, 103.
ταπεινός 18.
ταπεινότερος 30.
ταπεινόω 18.
ταραχή 69, 89, 103.
τάττω 84, 88, 102.
τάφρος 82.
ταχέως 70, 86 twice.
τε alone 51, 84, 98, 104; τε . . . τε 85; οὐτε . . . οὐτε . . . τε 45; τε καὶ οὐ τε . . . καὶ “when . . . then” 49, 50, 81; τε καὶ 3, 7, 10, 12, 13 twice, 18, 22, 23, 30, 31 twice, 32, 39 twice, 49, 53, 54 twice, 55, 56, 57, 58 twice; 59, 62, 63, 64, 65, 67, 68, 69, 72, 74, 75, 77, 78, 79, 80 twice, 81, 85, 86 four times, 87 twice, 88 twice, 89, 90 four times, 96 twice, 101, 103 twice, 104, 106, 108; τε . . . καὶ 10, 15 twice, 20, 23, 41, 45, 46, 50 twice, 70, 75 twice, 76, 81 twice, 83, 84, 86, 90 twice, 94, 96, 101, 102 twice, 103, 104, 109 thrice; τε . . . καὶ . . . καὶ 28, 34, 59: see also οἴστε τείνω 8, 10.
τειχήρης 79.
τειχίζω 79.
τειχισμός 79, 81.
τείχος 47, 79, 80 twice, 81, 82, 84 twice, 86.
τελέθω 106.
τέλειος 106.
τέκτων 71b.
τελέω 58.
τελευταῖς 53, 57, 82, 106.
τελευτάω 24, 27, 56, 88.
τελευτή 13, 88, 89.
τελέω 31.
τελεύτατος 90.
τέλος 53.
τέμνω 104.
τέρπω 102.
τέτταρες 88.
τέχνη 1, 4, 11, 13, 25, 58 twice, 81, 94, 105.
τηλικοῦτος 14, 29, 32, 46.
τημέλεω 18.
τήμερον 71b.
τηνικαῦτα 40.
τηρέω 58, 88.
τιθημι 8, 28.
τιμάω 105 twice.

- τιμή 78.
 τίμος 107.
 τιμωρία 65.
 τίς 75 twice: τι 32, 53.
 τις *passim*.
 Τισταφέρνης 36.
 Τιτάνες 103.
 τοι: καὶ γάρ τοι 67b.
 τοιγαροῦν 79.
 τοινυν 16, 17, 65.
 τοισθε 84, 89.
 τοιοῦτος 2, 3, 6, 19, 21, 27, 43, 77, 90.
 τοῖχος 83, 84.
 τόλμη 73.
 τολμά 65.
 τόλμημα 3, 109.
 τόξευμα 16.
 τόπος 13, 83.
 τόσος 86: τόσην καὶ τόσην 5.
 τοσθέδε 2, 6 twice.
 τοσοῦτος 4, 8, 9 thrice, 11, 12, 14, 16 twice,
 18, 29, 31, 34, 36, 37, 47, 51, 56, <62>,
 63, 71, 73, 74, 76, 84, 86 twice, 88 twice,
 89, 91, 93 twice, 95, 107.
 τότε 16, 21, 28, 53, 57, 58, 84 twice, 93
 twice, 106 twice.
 τρέις 90, 93.
 τρέπται 97.
 τριήρης 105.
 Τρικάρανος 51.
 Τριπτόλευος 101.
 τρίτος 90.
 τρόπος 47 twice, 72, 75, 90.
 τροφεύς 96.
 τυγχάνω 60, 77, 90 twice, 98.
 τύραννις 47, 90.
 τύραννος 90.
 τύχη 17, 27, 90.
 ὑβρίζω 22, 105.
 ὕδωρ 69, 86.
 ὕλη 58.
 ὕμεις 3, 11, 12, 14 twice, 16, 26, 28 twice,
 34, 36, 51, 58, 64, 65, 66, 67b, 68 four
 times, 71, 71b twice, 73 twice, 74 twice,
 76, 80, 85, 86, 88 twice, 91 four times,
 93 twice, 94 four times, 98 twice, 100
 twice, 101 thrice, 102, 103 thrice, 104,
 105, 106, 107 twice.
 ὕμετερος 10 four times, 14, 16, 24, 26, 30,
 40, 51, 64, 73, 75 twice, 86, 90, 95, 99,
 103, 105, 106 twice.
 ὕμένω 32.
 ὕπακούν 22, 30.
 ὕπαλλάττω 89.
 ὕπαρ <69>.
 ὕπάρχω 56, 65, 86, 105.
 ὕπειμι 65, 92.
 ὕπέρ with genitive 19, 32, 43, 47, 48, 53,
 77, 79, 84, 85, 109; with accusative 8
 thrice, 17, 27, 81, 88.
 ὕπεραίρω 67, 95, 107 twice.
 ὕπερβάλλω 19, 41, 47, 53, 92.
 ὕπερβολή 14, 67.
 ὕπερέχω 13, 14, 77, 96.
 ὕπερλάμπω 84.
- ὑπεροράδα 22.
 ὑπερόριος 38.
 ὑπέχω 45.
 ὑπήκοος 22, 59, 75, 80.
 ὑπηρέτης 105.
 ὑπισχνέομαι: ὑπεσχόμεθα 2.
 ὑπό with genitive 3, 9, 21, 27 twice, 29,
 30, 33, 37, 40, 47, 49, 62 twice, 68 thrice,
 69 twice, 71b, 92, 94, 100, 101, 103, 107;
 with dative 31, 60, 100.
 ὑπολαμβάνω 103.
 ὑπομένω 46.
 ὑπόνοια 52.
 ὑπουργός 81.
 ὑποφέρω 51, 63.
 ὑποχωρέω 36.
 ὑστερός: as adverb ὑστερον 79.
 ὑψηλός 7.
 ὕψος 8.
 φαίνω 9, 14, 41, 42, 62, 97.
 Φαρνάβαζος 36.
 Φάσις 82.
 φαυλίζω 14.
 φαυλότερος 15, 41, 56.
 φειδώ 96.
 φέρω 8 twice, 11, 12, 33, 38, 45, 50, 62, 91,
 103, 109.
 φεύγω 80.
 φημι 4, 7, 9, 10, 13, 25, 27, 31, 37, 61, 68,
 73, 83, 84 twice, 85, 86, 93, 101, 105,
 106 twice, 107.
 φθάνω 33, 88.
 φθέγγω 29.
 φθείρω 33, 106.
 φθινόπωρον 11.
 φθονέω 65, 67, 87.
 φθόνος 65, 78, 89.
 φιλανθρωπία 66, 98.
 φιλανθρώπως 57.
 φίλιος 99.
 φιλονικία 20, 97.
 φιλοτιμία 94.
 φοβερός 21 twice.
 φοβέω: φοβούμενος 80.
 φόβος 18, 31, 37, 53, 68, 100.
 φορά 16.
 φόρημα 97.
 φόρος 45 twice, 67b.
 φόρτος 12.
 φρονέα 32, 46.
 φροντίζω 19.
 φροῦδος 99.
 φρουρά 67.
 φρουρέω 52.
 φρούριον 93.
 φρουρός 27, 29, 52, 64, 67, 75, 95.
 Φρυγία 17, 36.
 φρυκτός 99.
 φυγάς 49.
 φυγή 84.
 φυλακή 67.
 φυλάττω 64, 78.
 φυλοκρινέω 78.
 φύλον 30, 63, 106.
- φῦσις 26, 96 twice: δρχούτες κατὰ φῦσιν
 91; φύσεως νόμος 20.
 φύω 7, 11 twice, 13, 77.
 φῶς 103.
- χαλεπός 25.
 χαλέπτω 39.
 χαλκός 83.
 χαρίζω: χαριζόμενον 39.
 χαριστέρος 59.
 χάρις 34, 95, 99 twice, 105 twice.
 χεῖλος 92.
 χείρ 96.
 χείρω 4, 46, 73, 89, 90 twice, 96, 109.
 Χειδίδονει 10.
 χέω 7 twice, 8.
 χθές 71b.
 χιών 7, 8.
 χορδή 31.
 χορεία 105.
 χορεύω 105.
 χορός 29, 32, 87, 105.
 χρέα 45, 71b.
 χρῆμα 26.
 χρόνος 26, 36, 45, 105, 108.
 χρυσόκερως 1.
 χρυσοῦς 106.
 χρώμαι 22, 40, 42, 54, 70, 102.
 χώρα 11, 18, 19, 29, 30, 36, 60, 61 twice,
 67, 73, 86 twice, 87.
 χωρίον 27, 28, 48.
 χωρίς 73, 78, 100.
 χώρος 61.
- ψάλλω 31.
 ψαμμάθης 100.
 ψαύω 18.
 ψέλιον 95.
 ψεύδω 3, 19.
 ψῆφος 38, 42, 109.
 ψυχαγωγία 28.
- ὦ 1.
 Ὁκεανός 13, 28.
 ὥρα 11 twice.
 ὥς 4, 8 twice, 24, 43.
 ὥς 8, 9 twice, 11, 17 twice, 18, 19 four
 times, 22 twice, 32, 36, 40, 45, 52, 59,
 65 twice, 69, 75, 76, 80, 84, 90 twice,
 100, 103: ὥς ἀληθῶς 2, 6, 18, 19, 24, 79,
 107 twice; ὥς εἰπεῖν 44, 46, 58, 63, 91,
 105, 106 twice, 108: ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ 4, 5, 24,
 25, 43, 55.
 ὥστε 8, 11 twice, 12, 13 twice, 16, 25, 26,
 27, 28 twice, 32, 33, 36, 37, 38, 45, 47,
 48, 53, 56 twice, 67, 73, 75 twice, 76, 78,
 82, 84 twice, 85, 86, 87, 90, 93, 99 twice,
 101, 105.
 ὥφελέω 39.

INDEX OF PASSAGES INTERPRETED

Literature

- Aelius Aristides, The Roman Oration, 873-953
 Aesopica 101 Perry, 951
 Anonymous Encomium of Alexandria, 882
 Aphthonius, Fable 31 Sbordone, 951
 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* VI 201d-e, 881
 Babrius 72, 951
 Callixeinus of Rhodes on the procession at Alexandria, 881
 Demosthenes XXI 60, 916
 Dexippus fr. 12 Jacoby, 916
 Dio of Prusa IV 139, 916
 XLVIII 7, 916
 Josephus, Antiq. Iud. XVI 10, 1, 956
 Bell. Iud. I 26, 4, 955 f.
 Lucian, A Professor of Public Speaking, 11, 888
 Malalas 284 Schenk von Stauffenberg, 969, 976
 Philostratus, Vitae soph. II 547, p. 56
 Kayser, 954

Plutarch, Agis 2, 10, 954

- Cleomenes 16, 6, 916 f.
 Titus 11, 954
 Political Precepts 19, 953-959
 Strabo VIII 5, 1-5 [363-366], 955 f.
 Theophylactus, Epistle 34, 951
 Thucydides I 76, 930

Inscriptions

- Année épigraphique 1929, No. 100, sacred law at Gythion, 954
 Edict of Paullus Fabius Persicus (ed. Dörner), 971, 973-976
 Forschungen in Ephesus 2: No. 27 (Vibius Salutaris), 958, 963-965, 968, 973-977
 Hesperia 21: 381-399, 1952, 966-968, 975 f., 978, 980
 Suppl. 6: No. 3 (Vibius Salutaris), 958, 963-965, 968, 973-977
 Suppl. 8: 221-225, 1949, 960-963
 IG II^a 1092, 966-968, 975 f., 978, 980
 IG II^a 1100, 960-963

IG V (1) 21, 957

- IG V (1) 1147, 965, 973-976
 IGR III 739 (TAM II 905), 965 f., 973, 975-977, 979
 IV 661, 970 f., 974
 IV 1168, 968 f., 975 f.
 JHS 40: 77-87, 1950 (Cyrene and the Panhellenion), 891
 OGI 266 (Eumenes II and the Mercenaries), 931
 TAM II 905. See IGR III 739.

Papyri

- Berliner Klassikertexte aus den staatlichen Museen zu Berlin 7: Berl. Pap. P. 13045, 882
 Oxyrhynchus Papyri 4: No. 705, 969 f., 975-977, 980

ADDENDA

Page 889, column 2, paragraph 2:—It did not escape Hermann Bengtson, *Griechische Geschichte*, 511, Munich, Beck, 1950, that Aristides thought of the empire as a league of cities.

Page 913, at end of commentary to section 23, add new paragraph:—Aristides means that the Persian Empire was both tyrannical and primitive. He reflects Thucydides who in I 17 says that the tyrants did not accomplish anything great and who in I 13, 1 speaks of the primitive *πατρικὰ βασιλεῖαι*, which resembling as they did the *dominium* of a *pater familias*, once met the needs of clans but never of larger and more complicated groups. Aristides will contrast the civic constitution established by Rome with the pre-civic *οἰκονομικὴ μονάρχια* (Aristotle, *Politics* 1255 b) of the Persians, also the statesmanship of Rome with the tyranny of the Persians. In this important passage we meet for the first time one of the main ideas of Aristides, namely that the Roman Empire is something new in the world because of its civic character (the antithesis of the *πολιτικὴ* versus the *οἰκονομικὴ ἀρχὴ*).

Page 919, at beginning of commentary to section 36 the first sentence should read:—They are free because of the absence of *hybris* and the absence of a master, even a good master: freedom, as Cicero says, consists, not in having a good master, but in having no master at all.

Page 920, commentary on section 37, first paragraph, add:—Ugo Enrico Paoli, “*La ἔφεσις εἰς τὸ δικαιοτήριον*,”

Mélanges Fernand De Visscher 4 (Revue internationale des droits de l'antiquité 5): 325-337, 1950, points out that *ephesis* to a dicastery is the exercise of a citizen's right, when defendant, to refuse any settlement by a board, magistrate or deme and to demand a trial before a dicastery. It is not quite what we ordinarily mean by “appeal”; the local verdict must be *accepted* to become valid. The emphasis which Paoli places upon *έμμενεν* as an act of acceptance by the defendant greatly strengthens my interpretation of the key word *δεξαμένων* in the Roman Oration 37.

Page 926, third paragraph of commentary to section 59, add a reference to F. De Visscher, “*‘Conubium’ et ‘civitas’*,” *Iura 2*: 140-144, 1951, who points out that *civitas* did not originally include the aristocratic privilege of *conubium*.

Page 927, at end of commentary to section 59, add new paragraph:—“The rest you recognized as a league under your hegemony,” *τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν* (sc. *ἀπεδώκατε*) *ὑπήκοον τε καὶ ἀρχόμενον*. “The rest” are, all of them, I think, *recepti in fidem*. There were three possibilities: (1) to make them actually citizens of Rome, (2) to admit them on various terms into an alliance as free allies, (3) to make them *dediticii*. Rome has not made permanent *dediticii* of any who belong to the civilized world. For free allies as *ὑπήκοοι* see André Piganiol, “*Venire in fidem*,” *Mélanges Fernand De Visscher 4 (Revue internationale des droits de l'antiquité 5)*: 347, 1950, and Ugo Coli, “*Regnum*,” *Studia et documenta historiae et iuris 17*: 147-153, 1951.