

elected praetor for 166 (Livy 45. 44. 2) but never reached the consulship. It is by no means certain that L. Iulius was also the praetor Caesar who died in office at Rome (Pliny *NH* 7. 181),² but this point is not essential to the identification.

In the light of all this, the relevant portion of my stemma of the Iulii had better be emended. Table 1 gives the corrected stemma (females and *adfines* are omitted for the sake of clarity).³

G. V. SUMNER

University of Toronto

2. See Münzer, s.v. "Iulius 127," *RE* 10 (1917): 183; cf. "Iulius 28," *ibid.*, 111. The conjecture that L. Iulius was urban praetor depends on the order of names in Livy 45. 44. 2. Pliny does not give a praenomen in his reference: "nullis evidentibus causis obiere, dum calciantur matutino, duo Caesares, praetor et praetura perfunctus dictatoris Caesaris pater—hic Pisis exanimatus est, ille Romae." It is noticeable that Pliny does not actually identify the former of the two Caesares as a direct ancestor of the dictator; Sex. Iulius Caesar, urban praetor in 123 (Cic. *Dom.* 136), seems a possible alternative candidate (cf. Table 1, n. b).

3. They can be found in Münzer's proposed stemma (s.v. "Iulius 127," *RE* 10 [1917]: 183–84).

THE SETTLEMENT OF ARTAPHRENES

... κατὰ δὴ τούτους μέτρησας φόρους ἔταξε ἐκάστοισι, οἱ κατὰ χώραν διατελέουσι
ἔχοντες ἐκ τούτου τοῦ χρόνου αἰεὶ ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ὡς ἐτάχθησαν ἐξ Ἀρταφρένεος.
ἐτάχθησαν σχεδὸν κατὰ ταῦτὰ τὰ καὶ πρότερον εἶχον [Hdt. 6. 42. 2].

"The statement as to the tribute is defective and difficult," comment How and Wells,¹ and certainly it has aroused as much argument as any remark of Herodotus. Grote's² interpretation was that Artaphrenes' assessment remained valid for the Ionian cities in the sense that the Great King continued to claim tribute from them even after these cities revolted and joined the Delian League; however, he failed to collect it. This view, or variants of it, has always found a degree of scholarly support,³ and there is evidence from both Greek and Persian sources that the Great King did maintain a residual claim to tribute. Thucydides (8. 5. 5) reports that Darius II in 412 B.C. pressed Tissaphernes for payment of tribute which the latter had been unable to produce because he could not collect from the Greek cities; and on the Persian side, we have a foundation tablet from the terrace at Persepolis where Xerxes enumerates among the countries which bore him tribute "the Ionians who live on the salty sea, and those who live beyond the salty sea."⁴ Clearly Xerxes preferred to ignore his defeat. But is it this residual, but unenforced, claim to tribute from the Greek cities to which Herodotus refers in 6. 42. 2?

The majority of scholars have inclined to the view that it is not. Herodotus describes the *phoroi* of Artaphrenes as "valid" or "in force" (κατὰ χώραν),⁵ and this seems to preclude a levy, or even the assessment of a levy, which could not be enforced in Herodotus' own time. But it will not do to suggest that Herodotus

1. W. W. How and J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus* (Oxford, 1912), 2:78. For a general bibliography, see O. Murray, "'Ο ἀρχαῖος δασμὸς," *Historia* 15 (1966): 142–56; R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford, 1972), pp. 53–62.

2. G. Grote, *History of Greece*⁶ (London, 1888), 4:425, note.

3. E. M. Walker, *CAH*, 5:470; J. L. Myres, *Herodotus, Father of History* (Oxford, 1953), p. 200; cf. A. W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1945), pp. 334–35.

4. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament*, edited by J. B. Pritchard (Princeton, 1955), p. 316. The translation is by A. Leo Oppenheim.

5. J. E. Powell, *Lexicon to Hdt.*, s.v. *χώρα*; cf. *ATL*, 3:275, n. 6.

refers here only to those cities of the first satrapy which remained tributaries of Persia for some time after Mycale; for his use of *ἐκαστοῖσι* admits no major exceptions, and his indication of date ("down to my time"), vague though it is, must refer to a period not much earlier than the date when he composed his account of the Ionian Revolt.⁶ Thus, whatever it was to which Herodotus referred, it could still be described as "in force" after the middle of the fifth century, for the *communis opinio* is that this passage was composed after 449 B.C.; one scholar has dated it to the immediate aftermath of the Samian Revolt.⁷

Hence we are left with the view that the *phoroi* which are here described as valid were those collected by the Delian League, but this interpretation brings fresh difficulties. If Herodotus meant to imply that the Delian League took over Artaphrenes' assessments, and that *these remained unchanged* down to his own time, he is wrong. It is manifestly untrue that the tribute quotas remained unchanged in the fifth century. A number of years ago, K. M. T. Atkinson⁸ made an ingenious attempt to demonstrate that Aristides' first assessment of 460 talents for the League was, in fact, the same as the Persian assessment of 400 Babylonian talents (= 466 Euboic talents) for the first satrapy, and thus Aristides must have carried over the assessments of Artaphrenes; but there are formidable difficulties in the way of this theory. Hence most scholars have adopted a position close to that of the editors of *The Athenian Tribute Lists*, who translate the passage, "he [Artaphrenes] surveyed the land by parasangs, and on this basis he assessed tributes to each of them; these tributes have continued to hold valid on the same scale from this time right down to my own day, just as they were assessed by Artaphrenes."⁹ The editors of *ATL* do not explain what they mean by "scale," for what Artaphrenes did was not to establish a "scale" of tribute, but rather to make a land survey and an assessment based upon it. Nevertheless, the common view is that Artaphrenes established a basis for tribute which the Athenians adopted and were still using after the middle of the fifth century.

In 1966, Oswyn Murray¹⁰ revived Grote's theory, and argued cogently that what Herodotus means by the *phoroi* which remained on the same level to his own day is the residual claim to tribute by the Great King, which, however, he did not receive. "There seems no reason for attempting to explain away any of the passages which refer to Persian demands for tribute from the cities of Asia Minor; they constitute in themselves consistent and sufficient evidence that the king at all times claimed such tribute. None bears on the question whether he received it or not. . . ."¹¹ Murray argues in addition that, while *phoros* itself is an ambiguous word, when used with the noun *τάξις* or a form of the verb *τάσσειν*, it clearly refers to an assessment of tribute, and not to the amount of tribute which is actually

6. Hdt. 3. 97. 2 presents a parallel use of *ἐτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ*, where the meaning seems to be "down to the time I did my research into the subject."

7. Cf. M. Cary, "The Peace of Callias," *CQ* 39 (1945): 87-91; A. French, "Topical Influences on Herodotus' Narrative," *Mnemosyne* 25 (1972): 13.

8. "Thucydides' Lamp," letter to the *Times Literary Supplement* (London), 30 June 1945, p. 307; cf. A. W. Gomme's reply, *ibid.*, 28 July 1945, p. 355.

9. *ATL*, 3:234.

10. "Ὁ ἀρχαῖος δασυός," pp. 142-56.

11. *Ibid.*, p. 156.

received.¹² The point is valid. Murray then attempts to use this argument to dispose of one objection to Grote's theory: that Herodotus could not refer to *phoroi* as "in force" when they remained unpaid.

I should not care to argue against Murray's point that the Great King declined to recognize his defeat at the hands of the Greeks, but the Persian Empire was not unique in this attitude. In the modern world, the Baltic republics of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, which had belonged to czarist Russia and got their freedom by the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, were reabsorbed by the U.S.S.R. at the first opportunity. Eire maintains a residual (but unofficial) claim to the northern six counties of Ireland, and Japan has a residual claim on her former territories annexed by the U.S.S.R. in World War II. Yet most countries, their residual claims notwithstanding, adjust themselves to the realities of the situation, and I doubt if the history of Greco-Persian relations presents an exception to this rule. When Xerxes described himself on the Persepolis foundation tablet cited above as overlord of the Ionians on both sides of the Aegean, and implied that he had crushed all revolts against him, he was writing for Ahura-Mazda, without fear of contradiction. Herodotus, however, was writing for a Greek audience; and for a Greek, especially an Athenian, the word *phoros* must have been associated indelibly in the third quarter of the fifth century with the tribute brought to Athens each year at the time of the Great Dionysia. An Athenian, hearing the passage in question, must have thought first of the *phoros* of the Athenian Empire, and if, on reflection, he realized that Herodotus referred instead to the Persian *phoros*, the realization must have come with a sense of shock. Aeschylus,¹³ no doubt expressing the common opinion, connected the Persian defeat with loss of tribute. If Herodotus means here what Murray would have him mean by his almost casual reference to *phoros*, he is either being deliberately ambiguous for effect, or some historical event had happened shortly before the time when Herodotus wrote this passage which brought the residual claims of the Persian Empire to mind. Neither hypothesis seems particularly likely.

It is time to look at the passage again. Herodotus is dealing with the end of the Ionian Revolt, a venture which did not have his approval. In 6. 42. 2 he describes how the satrap of Sardis summoned deputies from the Ionian cities, and forced them to make agreements to settle their disputes by legal means, and not to make war on each other. This was reminiscent of Athens' own policy later, when she was mistress of the same area. Then he measured the land, and on the basis of this, assessed tribute, which Herodotus deliberately connects with the *phoros* of his own day. Scholars have inferred from this passage that Artaphrenes' assessment was based solely on land;¹⁴ but it should be remembered that assessments carried out under Darius' orders elsewhere in the Persian Empire took into consideration not merely the amount of land but its productivity,¹⁵ that is to say, the revenues

12. Ibid., p. 145. The same point has been made independently for Thucydides' use of *φóρος τὰ χωρία* (1. 96) by M. F. McGregor, *Athenian Policy: At Home and Abroad*, Lectures in Memory of Louise Taft Semple, second series (Cincinnati, 1967), p. 21.

13. *Pers.* 586.

14. Cf. Meiggs, *Athenian Empire*, p. 59.

15. R. N. Frye, *The Heritage of Persia* (London, 1962), p. 113. This is to assume that Artaphrenes' procedures did not differ substantially from those employed under Darius I in Babylonia, where the land was surveyed and measured along with a record of past yields. It can be argued plausibly that Darius took this opportunity to institute in Ionia the assessment reforms that he had already established in Babylonia.

it could produce, and there is no reason to think that Ionia was an exception. Finally, Herodotus adds that the new assessment of Artaphrenes resulted in a tax very little different from the tax paid before the Ionian Revolt.

In other words, Herodotus seems to stress the continuity of Ionia's position as the subject of imperialism, before and after the Ionian Revolt (which therefore was a singularly profitless exploit) and on down to his own day, when Ionia had changed mistresses, but not position. In the following chapter, he goes on to claim that Mardonius established democracies in the Ionian cities, an act which appears to foreshadow later Athenian policy. In this context, it is likely that Herodotus is attempting to make a connection as well between the *phoros* of Artaphrenes and the *phoros* collected by Athens later. The question is, What is the nature of that connection?

The interpretation of the passage in question has been bedeviled by its difficult grammar. As far as I can discover, scholars are at one in taking as the antecedent of the relative pronoun *οἱ* not *ἐκάστοισι*, which immediately precedes it, but *φόρους*.¹⁶ The participle *ἐχόντες* is taken as intransitive, and *ὡς ἐτάχθησαν ἐξ Ἀρταφρένεος* is interpreted either as "to the amount that [i.e., *ὡς* = *δσον*] they were assessed by Artaphrenes" or "in the way that [i.e., on the basis that] they were assessed by Artaphrenes." The latter use of *ὡς* is more common in Herodotus.¹⁷

What would be involved if we were to make the antecedent of the relative *οἱ* the pronoun which immediately precedes it, *ἐκάστοισι*? We would then have to understand an object for *ἐχόντες*, and one is available. It is *φόρους*, which means here not "tribute paid," but "tribute assessed," as Murray has pointed out. We would then arrive at a translation very like the following: "... on the basis of his [Artaphrenes'] measurements by parasangs, he assessed tributes for each of the cities, which continue to have in force right up to my own time *tributes assessed* in the way that they [the tributes] were assessed by Artaphrenes." Thus we arrive at an interpretation very close to that of the editors of *ATL*, who argued that the "scale" established by Artaphrenes was still being used. What Herodotus probably means, simply, is that the Athenians still employed Artaphrenes' land survey in making their assessments in Ionia. Like the Persian arrangements to eliminate internecine strife, and the establishment of democracies in the cities, Artaphrenes' survey looked forward to later Athenian policy in the same area.

Such an interpretation may go part way toward solving another problem, which concerns the first assessment of Aristides. Plutarch¹⁸ indicates that Aristides was assigned the duty *χώραν τε καὶ προσόδους ἐπισκεψάμενον ὁρίσαι τὸ κατ' ἅξιν ἐκάστῃ καὶ δυνάμει*. Meiggs¹⁹ takes this as conflicting with the evidence of the Aristotelian *Constitution of Athens*,²⁰ from which we infer that Aristides completed his assessment within the archon year of Timosthenes (478–477), which Meiggs believes was too short a time for one man to survey land and revenues of each League member. However, if the Athenians in Herodotus' day still made use of Artaphrenes' land survey, we can assume that Aristides also used it to facilitate his task wherever it was relevant.

16. Cf. *ATL*, 3:275, n. 6.

17. Powell, *Lexicon*, s.v. *ὡς*, notes that *ὡς* means "in the way that" 34 times.

18. *Aristides* 24. 1.

19. Meiggs, *Athenian Empire*, p. 59.

20. *AthPol.* 23. 5. This paper has profited greatly from criticism it received from M. F. McGregor and R. Sealey. The errors I claim for myself.

Hence some of the basis for his work was already done. We should remember that in the early fifth century the basis of the economy of most *poleis* was agricultural, and the relationship between the amount of arable land possessed by a city (and its fertility) and the city's revenues was intimate. The exceptions to this rule must have been few. Artaphrenes' survey, if it was similar to other assessments made by Darius' officials, took into consideration both the amount of land and its fertility, and as such would serve Aristides as a basis for measuring not merely the territory a city possessed, but also its revenues. Thus it is not necessary to think that Aristides could not have completed his assignment within one archon year, even if he carried it out as thoroughly as Plutarch implies.

J. A. S. EVANS

University of British Columbia

O REM RIDICULAM!

Housman, and Kroll before him, may have been mistaken in their interpretation of *trusantem* in Catullus 56, for which Kroll adduced Martial 11. 46. 3 "truditur et digitis pannucea mentula lassis"; but their error, if it was one, will hardly have been due to innocence. Has Mr. Rockwell (*CP* 70 [1975]: 214) bethought himself of Baehrens' note? "Vocem alibi non lectam 'trusare' uolunt esse aut 'fortiter trudere' aut 'trudere conari,' obscene accipientes instar graeci *ωστίζεσθαι* . . . sed neque hoc intrudendi uerbum omnino extitit in sermone latino neque uero 'trudere' umquam sensum habet obscenum (quae res summi est momenti) neque denique qua ratione hoc uerbum possit regere datium ullo modo apparet." The last objection might be met by reading *puellam*. But there is much to be said for the old conjecture *crissantem*, improved by Baehrens to *crusantem*. Only his exposition of the word and the situation is not entirely satisfactory. Logic rather suggests that the object of Catullus' intervention (if *crusantem* is right) should be, not the boy, but his playmate. Thus:

deprendi modo pupulum puellae
crusantem; hanc ego, si placet Dionae,
protelo rigida mea cecidi.

Dionae (= *Veneri*) fits the context well enough, but *Dianae* (Westphal) would fit considerably better, both as patroness of virginity, with her *puellae et pueri integri*, and as the subject of Valerius Cato's well-known poem. As Mr. Rockwell says, *protelo* is certainly one word. Housman was not the first to see that, though he probably was the first to explain it on the right lines.¹

D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY
Harvard University

1. The matter has also been the subject of some recent discussion by D. Fehling, "Gegen die neueste Äusserung zu Cat. 56," *Hermes* 102 (1974): 376.