

provided by the story of the presence and disappearance of Hylas in Mysia near Kios. Strabo also connected the story with Kios,⁸ and he believed the Mysians of northwestern Asia Minor to have been of Thracian origin.⁹ Artemidoros of Ephesos according to Strabo stated that Mysia had been settled by Mysians from beyond the Istros¹⁰—thus Artemidoros linked Mysoi with Moisoι.¹¹ Since the Mysians in the hinterland of Kios were thought to have come from Thrace, they resembled in their European origin their neighbours the Bithynians, who were known to have been Thracian.¹²

When Hylas was seized by one or more nymphs in Mysia, he did not cease to exist. Cult kept him alive and present. The Dryopian youth, though unseen, became a dweller in a land of Thracians, where Mysians together with their neighbours in Kios persisted in searching for him.¹³ Dryopian by birth, Hylas became perforce a Thracian by adoption in Mysia. To compensate for the loss, sons of the Mysians were settled at Trachis by Herakles as hostages, ἀντενέχυρα τοῦ Ὑλά.¹⁴

'Thracian' Hylas is therefore not evidence that the elegist was lacking in geographical knowledge; nor does 'Thracian' come from a hitherto unknown version of the tale. What the epithet shows is that the poet had some knowledge of ethnography.

G. L. HUXLEY

Gennadius Library
American School of Classical Studies
106 76 Athens Greece

⁸ xii 564 Cas.

⁹ vii 295 Cas.

¹⁰ xii 571 Cas.

¹¹ For the equivalence of ἡ κάτω Μυσία with *Moesia inferior* see Christian Habicht, *Die Inschriften Asklepieions. Altertümer von Pergamon* viii 3 (Berlin 1969) No. 125, lines 9–10.

¹² Herodotos i 28.

¹³ Ap. Rhod., *Arg.* i 1353.

¹⁴ Schol. Ap. Rhod. *Arg.* i 1355–7a, p. 122, 7–8 Wendel.

Some suggestions on the proem and 'second preface' of Arrian's *Anabasis*

In *JHS* cv (1985) 162–8, J. L. Moles has given an excellent treatment of the literary influences at work in the 'second preface' of Arrian's *Anabasis* (i 12.1–5).¹ I am in agreement with the main points of his work, and the purpose of the present note is to offer some additional evidence and suggestions.

1. *Literary influences.* Moles sees five major influences at work in the second preface: Homer, Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, and the prose encomium. Of this last he writes (164), 'Arrian's work will be biographical in orientation and fundamentally encomiastic'. There is no doubt, of course, that Arrian's work is encomiastic; Arrian does not hesitate to express admiration for Alexander at the outset of the work or in comments throughout the work or in the ἐπιμετρῶν λόγος at the work's conclusion.² But Arrian's history is not an encomium, though it may incorporate elements

from that genre.³ It is an historical narrative, its subject ἔργα or *res gestae*.⁴ The ἔργα themselves, however, are those of a single man and in this sense it is an individual-centred history.⁵

The precedent for all individual-centred historiography in Greece is Theopompus, and in fact there are two possible echoes of the preface of the *Philippica* in *Anabasis* i 12.4–5. Among other things, Arrian states here: (1) that the uniqueness of Alexander and his deeds was the reason that he set out upon his history;⁶ (2) that he considers himself not unworthy of the first place in Greek letters. Two similar remarks appear in the preface of the *Philippica*. In the first, Theopompus states that Europe had never produced such a man as Philip, and that this is why he set out on his history:

Θεοπόμῳ, ὃς γ' ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς Φιλίππου συντάξεως δι' αὐτό μάλιστα παρορμηθῆναι φήσας πρὸς τὴν ἐπιβολὴν τῆς πραγματείας διὰ τὸ μηδέποτε τὴν Εὐρώπην ἐνηνοχέειν τοιοῦτον ἄνδρα πάραπαν οἷον τὸν Ἀμύντου Φίλιππον, κτλ.⁷

Theopompus also boasted of his literary ability, mentioned his writings, and claimed a pre-eminent place among his contemporaries:

συνακάσαι δὲ λέγει αὐτὸς (sc. Θεοπόμπος) ἑαυτὸν Ἴσοκράτει τε τῷ Ἀθηναίῳ καὶ Θεοδέκτῃ τῷ Φασηλίτῃ καὶ Ναυκράτει τῷ Ἐρυθραίῳ, καὶ τούτους ἅμα αὐτῷ τὰ πρωτεῖα τῆς ἐν λόγοις παιδείας ἔχειν ἐν τοῖς Ἑλλησιν. (. . .) καὶ ὡς οὐκ ἂν εἴη αὐτῷ παράλογον ἀντιπιοιμένῳ τῶν πρωτείων, οὐκ ἔλαττόνων μὲν ἢ δισμυρίων ἐπῶν τοὺς ἐπιδεικτικούς τῶν λόγων συγγραψαμένῳ κτλ.⁸

Now Theopompus was not (like Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon) in the first rank of the Greek historians. Such critics as Hermogenes and Philostratus have little to say of him that is good.⁹ On the other hand, Dionysius of Halicarnassus gave full (and perhaps fulsome) praise,¹⁰ Theon cites him frequently, and (on a more modest scale) Dio of Prusa recommends that a young man read Theopompus, whom he judges to be the best of the second rank of historians.¹¹ In some

³ The procedure in encomium is given in F. Leo, *Die griechisch-römische Biographie nach ihrer literarischen Form* (Leipzig 1901) 207 with n. 1.

⁴ i 12.4: οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις ἄλλος εἰς ἀνὴρ τοσαῦτα ἢ τηλικαῦτα ἔργα . . . ἀπεδείξατο. Cf. i 12.5: οὐκ ἀπαξιώσας ἑμαυτὸν φανερά καταστήσειν ἐς ἀνθρώπους τὰ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἔργα. Cf. Bosworth (n. 2) 15: 'It is basically a narrative of achievement, with a favourable verdict built into the narrative' (my emphasis).

⁵ P. Stadter, *Arrian of Nicomedia* (Chapel Hill 1980) 63 (though his remarks on Herodotus and Thucydides must be modified in light of Moles' analysis). Notice the twin elements of the actor and his deeds in the phrase Ἀλέξανδρός τε καὶ τὰ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἔργα (i 12.3).

⁶ i 12.4: ἔθενε καὶ αὐτὸς ὀρμηθῆναι φημι ἐς τήνδε τὴν συγγραφὴν, κτλ.

⁷ Polybius viii 11.1 = *FGrH* 115 F 27. It would be tempting to connect the ὀρμηθῆναι of Arrian with the παρορμηθῆναι of Theopompus, but apart from the possibility that Polybius is here paraphrasing or quoting from memory, ὀρμῶω can be found elsewhere in the sense of beginning an historical endeavour: D. Hal., *AR* i 1.2, Diod. i 4.2 (ἀφορμῇ).

⁸ *FGrH* 115 F 25.

⁹ Hermogenes, *Id.* ii 12, para. 412, 1; Philostratus, *VS* i 17.

¹⁰ D. Hal., *ad Pomp.* 6.

¹¹ Theon, *prog.* 154, 159, 163, 164, 185, et al.; Dio, *Or.* xviii 10: τῶν δὲ ἀκρῶν Θεουκιδίδης ἔμοι δοκεῖ καὶ τῶν δευτέρων Θεοπόμπος. Dio goes on to say that Xenophon is the best of all (14 ff.).

¹ 'The Interpretation of the "Second Preface" in Arrian's *Anabasis*', cited throughout by author's name and page number.

² i 12.2–4; vii 28–30. See A. B. Bosworth, *A historical commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander* (Oxford 1980) 15–6 for the numerous exonerations of Alexander's conduct.

measure, therefore, Theopompus was popular, even if he could not be considered among the very best.¹²

There is, as well, the problem of Theopompus' portrait of Philip. Unlike Arrian's Alexander, Theopompus' Philip was anything but encomiastically treated, and was instead criticized and censured (along with almost everyone else) by the historian.¹³ Yet allusion can function just as well by contrast as by similarity. In this case the contrast may be more effective since Arrian's subject is the son of Theopompus' subject. The reader should conclude that unlike the father, the son truly displayed great character and achievements, and is wholly worthy of encomiastic treatment.

On the matter of literary standing, Theopompus gave an exact and extended reckoning of his previous writings. Arrian lacks the excessive detail and instead claims that his pre-eminence arises from his devotion to οἷδε οἱ λόγοι, either the *Anabasis* itself, or his entire corpus of writings.¹⁴ Yet each writer wishes to depict a parallel between author and subject, and to suggest that he is a worthy and suitable chronicler of his subject. The parallels are not exact and without the complete text of the preface of the *Philippica* we cannot be certain of the manner and context. Nevertheless, the influence of (and allusion to) Theopompus remains possible. Admission of this would not radically alter Moles' interpretation (163–4). It would mean adding only that Arrian, like Theopompus, is centring his work around an extraordinary individual, the dominant figure of his age; like that earlier author, Arrian too can claim first rank among his contemporaries in literary ability, but unlike that earlier historian's subject, Arrian's is truly a man without equal, and one deserving of the fullest praise.

2. *The Proem and the Second Preface*. This is a much-discussed subject and the relation of the proem, intervening narrative, and 'second preface' has been explained in various ways. The view that Arrian's arrangement is modelled on Herodotus' and Thucydides'¹⁵ overlooks important differences as Moles (167) has noted. And the uniqueness of Arrian's procedure should not be minimized. There is no doubt that what he says in the proem and second preface (and at the work's conclusion for that matter) are related and if one combines them, they do not differ perhaps all that much from traditional *topoi*. But such an amalgamation ignores the manner in which Arrian has deployed his comments. Unlike Diodorus, Dionysius, Josephus, and Appian, for example, Arrian does not have a preface in a contained and closed passage, set off from the beginning of the historical narration.¹⁶ The proem, which lacks the traditional αὐξησις of the subject, is dominated by

source-criticism that suggests Arrian's superiority,¹⁷ and in the last sentence of the proem, the question that Arrian thinks may enter the reader's mind is not 'Why Alexander?' but 'Why another writer?'.¹⁸ Here, no doubt, Alexander's popularity in many genres of literature in the Second Sophistic allowed the author to postpone the usual αὐξησις.¹⁹ Instead, the author could distinguish himself in *tanta scriptorum turba* by emphasizing his superior accuracy, which Arrian does by the unusual device of naming his sources.²⁰ And so the author leaves hints and challenges to the reader which are picked up in the second preface.

It is the second preface of the *Anabasis* that exhibits the elements traditionally assigned to the proem: worthiness of the subject, the claims of the author, and the identity (or here anonymity) of the author.²¹ It appears here because the dramatic setting at Troy 'is ideally suited to exposition of all the different historical and literary traditions with which Arrian wishes to align the *Anabasis*',²² the traditions of Homer and the great historians. Xenophon and his *Anabasis* receive extended treatment not only because of Xenophon's importance to Arrian, but also to point out that as Xenophon had narrated the retreat of the Greeks from Asia, so Arrian will narrate the successful conquest of Asia by Greeks. Such a subject appealed to the patriotic and archaizing style of the times, and in this context one might suggest an additional reason for the placement of the second preface. In a movement that wished to recall (and in some sense idealize) the Greek past, Alexander's conquests in mainland Greece and his destruction of Greek cities were a far less congenial subject than his command of a 'united' Greece against the Persian empire.²³ The second preface, with its evocation of Homer and Achilles, is a romanticization of that campaign. Arrian, of course, in choosing individual-centred history was obligated to treat Alexander from his accession to power.²⁴ But the second preface is so placed and reads so much like a proem that it is hard to escape the feeling that Alexander's wars in Greece which preceded are to be less contemplated by the reader than the campaigns to follow. The glorification here and the suggestion that this is where the *Iliad* of Alexander begins diminish the problematic actions that were just narrated. Alexander's

¹⁷ *proem*. 1–2. Stadter (n. 5) 61.

¹⁸ *proem*. 3. Notice the emphasis on the new addition (καὶ ἐμοί) to the ranks of Alexander historians.

¹⁹ E. L. Bowie, in *Studies in ancient society*, ed. M. I. Finley (London 1974) 170–1, 187–8.

²⁰ It is not unusual for the writer of a non-contemporary history to state in the preface that he will use reliable sources in his history: see Diod. i 4.6. Dionysius (*AR* i 7.3; cf. Polybius i 14) gives by name the writers whom the Romans themselves consider most reliable and whom he will use. Nevertheless, the naming of sources is not common, and in Arrian it is in stark contrast with the author's conscious anonymity. In fact, the closest parallels are found not in other historians but in other works of Arrian where his own contribution is placed in terms of previous (and now to be bettered) authors: see *Cyn.* i.1, *Tact.* i.1, where despite the lacuna one can see the same procedure.

²¹ A. B. Breebaart, *Enige historiografische aspecten van Arrianus' Anabasis Alexandri* (Leiden 1960) 25–6.

²² Moles 167.

²³ Arrian places the focus on the campaign against Persia almost immediately (i 1.2). Though the destruction of Thebes is treated in full rhetorical dress, i 9.6–8 mitigates Alexander's responsibility by dwelling on Thebes' previous misdeeds.

²⁴ Not from birth, which would have been the duty of biography.

¹² See in general W. R. Roberts, *CR* 22 (1908) 119–22.

¹³ W. R. Connor, *GRBS* viii (1967) 133–54.

¹⁴ Moles (167) refers οἷδε οἱ λόγοι to the *Anabasis* alone; A. B. Bosworth, *From Arrian to Alexander* (Oxford 1988) 34 n. 88 believes it refers to the *Anabasis* 'as one work in a general corpus—"these λόγοι of mine"'.
¹⁵ P. A. Stadter, *Ill. Class. St.* vi 1 (1981) 157–71. I agree with Stadter that the organization is modelled on Herodotus and Thucydides, but I see the intervening material (*Anab.* i 1.1–11.8) as rejected in the same way that Herodotus rejects (i 4.2) the narrative of mutual abductions that opens his history, and Thucydides rejects the history of the past by elucidating the greater ἀκρίβεια possible with contemporary history (i 22).

¹⁶ Diod. i 1.1–5.3; D. Hal., *AR* i 1.1–8.4; Jos., *BJ* i 1–30, *AJ* i 1–26; Appian, *proem.* 1–15.

actions in Greece were by no means negligible but Arrian gives them brief treatment, seeing in the campaign against Asia the true starting point of his work.²⁵ And at the true starting point he gives a 'true' poem.

3. *The profession of anonymity.* Moles has pointed out that Arrian's *recusatio* of name, country, and offices in the second preface is deliberately and ostentatiously done, and is unlike the absence of such remarks in Homer or Xenophon. And he has further made a strong case, reinforced by verbal parallels (though he himself withholds certainty), that Arrian's preface has a direct relationship with Appian's preface.²⁶ Yet some other passages, in which Homer appears as a foil to historians, suggest that the limits of the examination ought not to be Arrian and Appian alone. The first is from Dio of Prusa, a generation or two before Arrian. In this passage Dio compares the ostentation of the historians who proudly parade their names in their works with the reticence of Homer who has submerged his persona in his work.²⁷

ἔτι δὲ τὸ μηδαμοῦ γεγραφέναι τὸ αὐτοῦ ὄνομα, ἀλλὰ μηδὲ ἐν τῇ ποιήσει αὐτοῦ μνησθῆναι, καίτοι τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων, ὅποσοι τινὰ ἔδοξαν ἔχειν δύναμιν ἢ περὶ ποιήσιν ἢ καταλογάδην συγγράφοντες, καὶ πρῶτον καὶ τελευταῖον τὸ ἑαυτῶν ὄνομα γραφόντων, πολλῶν δὲ καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῖς λόγοις τε καὶ ποιήμασιν, ὡς περ Ἑκαταῖός τε καὶ Ἡρόδοτος καὶ Θουκυδίδης, (10) οὗτος μὲν οὖν οὐχ ἅπαξ μόνον ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς ἱστορίας, ἀλλὰ πολλάκις διαμαρτυρούμενος καθ' ἕκαστον χειμῶνα καὶ θέρος ὅτι ταῦτα ξυνέγραψε Θουκυδίδης.

Two other passages from historians are worth mentioning. The first is from Kephalion, an orator and historian of the era of Hadrian²⁸ who openly drew parallels between himself and Homer, as Photius records:²⁹

οὗτος τὸ μὲν γένος αὐτοῦ καὶ πατρίδα, ὡς αὐτὸς ἐκείνός φησιν, ὡς περ Ὀμηρος ἀποσιωπᾷ. Ὅτι δὲ διατρίβων ἐν Σικελίᾳ φυγῆς ἕνεκα τὴν ἱστορίαν συνέταξεν, ἀποφαίνεται, τὸ μὲν ἀναγκαῖον, πατρίδα εἰπεῖν καὶ γένος παρεῖς, τὸ δὲ καὶ μικροψυχίαν ἐμφαίνον ἐν μνήμῃ πεποικηκός.

And finally there is an anonymous historian ridiculed by Lucian; this historian too compared his own professions with Homer's silence.³⁰

ἤδη δὲ κατιῶν ἐπήνηι καὶ τὴν πατρίδα τὴν Μίλητον, προστιθείς ὡς ἄμεινον ποιῶ τούτο τοῦ Ὀμήρου μηδὲν μνησθέντος τῆς πατρίδος.

Taken together, these passages (though they come from different time periods) indicate that the comparison with Homer among historians was not uncommon.

²⁵ Moles 167: 'Important as the preceding narrative is, Alexander at Troy is appropriately the real beginning of the work.'

²⁶ Moles 164 n. 13, 168. Bosworth (n. 14) has reiterated his belief that Arrian is prior to Appian, and he sees Appian's similarity as 'an echo of Arrian, the sincere, if clumsy, flattery of imitation' (33 n. 86).

²⁷ Or. liii 9–10.

²⁸ On Kephalion see Jacoby, *RE* xi (1922) 191–2. He is usually assigned to the reign of Hadrian but this is not certain.

²⁹ Photius, *Bibl.* 68.4 = *FGrH* 93 T 2. Breebaart (n. 21) 25 had seen in this passage evidence for Arrian's setting himself in a line with Homer.

³⁰ Lucian, *hist. conscr.* 14 (= *FGrH* 205 F 1).

The discussion of Homer's origins seems to have been a common subject in antiquity,³¹ and his unrivalled position as the greatest of poets and narrators seems to have led some historians to compare their anonymity with Homer's own. What we can see, thanks to Moles' analysis, is that Arrian's evocation of Homer is subtle and sophisticated. Therefore, his *recusatio* and his profession of devotion to οἶδε οἱ λόγοι may be seen as an attempt to—like Homer—submerge himself completely into the deeds he narrates, and to take his fame and glory from them.³²

There is another possible reason why Arrian thought it unnecessary to give the information of country, family, and offices. Moles dismisses the belief of previous scholars that Arrian made this renunciation because he realized the irrelevance of such remarks in a history of the past. He cites Arrian's procedure in the *Bithyniaca* where biographical details are given for a non-contemporary history.³³ Yet it may be illegitimate to adduce the Bithynian history, for that work was a local history and in the poem Arrian speaks as a native son addressing his countrymen. The autobiographical remarks are suitable for a local history and show little similarity with the autobiographical remarks found in Great History. Arrian indeed stated his γένος, but also that he had been born and raised and educated in Bithynia, that he was a priest of Demeter and Kore, the city's protecting deities, that he wished to write his country's history since he first learned to write,³⁴ that he was dedicating this work to his countrymen, and that he was sorry for the length of time it took him to complete the work.³⁵ Now it is not unusual for an historian to mention his γένος to establish his identity before a pan-Hellenic audience³⁶ or to indicate a belief that his nationality afforded him a particular benefit for the writing of history,³⁷ but Arrian adds that he was raised and educated in Bithynia, the sorts of details not found in Great History. Mention that he was a ἱερεὺς of Demeter and Kore is relevant when we consider the strong interest that local history exhibits with matters of religion, myth, and cult.³⁸ And dedications and apologies are not usually elements of Great History.³⁹ In sum, then, Arrian's procedure in the *Bithyniaca* may be part of a different set of conventions.⁴⁰

³¹ H. Homeyer, *Lukian: wie man Geschichte schreiben soll* (Munich 1965) 205.

³² Moles 166.

³³ Moles 164 n. 13.

³⁴ On this particular claim (echoed in Arrian's other works) see Moles 167.

³⁵ Photius, *Bibl.* 93 = F 1 Roos = *FGrH* 156 F 14, T 4a.

³⁶ Hecataeus, *FGrH* 1 F 1; Herodotus, *praef.* 1; Thuc. i 1.1; Appian, *BC* 15.62.

³⁷ Diod. i 4.4 on the benefits of being Sicilian.

³⁸ F. Jacoby, *Atthis* (Oxford 1949) 55, 141; *Kleine Pauly*, s.v. 'Lokalchronik'. Of all the other historians, the only comparison I can find is Josephus who claims he was a ἱερεὺς (*BJ* i 1), perhaps because as he states in his autobiography, it is a mark of nobility (τεκμηρίον γένους λαμπρότητος, *Vita* 1). A. Claudius Charax (*FGrH* 103) stated that he was a priest, but this occurred in an introductory epigram and it is uncertain that he mentioned this in the history itself (see T 1, with Jacoby's commentary ad loc.).

³⁹ It is perhaps not coincidental that another work by a Greek historian that contains a dedication is Dionysius' *Antiquitates Romanae*, an antiquarian and locally-limited history. His reasons for doing so are similar to Arrian's: *AR* i 6.5. Cf. Jos., *AJ* i 8.

⁴⁰ Space precludes a detailed discussion here; for the evidence for what is said here and in the following paragraph, see my 'The

In fact, the thought that Arrian's renunciation here displays his belief in the irrelevance of *πατρὶς, γένος, and ἀρχαί* for the writing of non-contemporary history (as Breebaart and Schepens⁴¹ had suggested) is not only consistent with Moles' appreciation of the Greek aspects of the second preface⁴² but is also borne out by a consideration of the tradition of autobiographical remarks in Greek historiography. The different conventions for those who write contemporary and non-contemporary history may be summarized as follows. Beginning with Thucydides, writers of contemporary history aver their contemporaneity with the events they narrate. This is their guarantee of accuracy. Those who write non-contemporary history state that they have used excellent sources or a fine style or both. Those who write large-scale histories that cover contemporary and non-contemporary events blend the two, claiming superiority of treatment for the earlier part and contemporaneity for the later parts.⁴³ The adoption by Greek historians in the imperial period of referring to offices and honours given them is a direct influence from Roman historiography, where career and offices were discussed and given as affirmation of the author's social standing and (simultaneously) as voucher for his trustworthiness. The convention was an accepted part of Roman historiography; it was more problematic among the Greeks. Arrian's refusal to indulge in it in the *Anabasis*, whatever else it may accomplish, re-asserts the primacy of the subject matter;⁴⁴ it rejects something that was part of a Roman tradition, and that properly had no part in a work about the greatest Greek meant for Greeks. What replaces this, of course, are the *λόγοι*, and the devotion that Arrian has given them from his youth.⁴⁵

J. M. MARINCOLA

Union College
Schenectady, N.Y. 12308

Historian's Persona: Autobiographical Conventions in the Greek and Roman Historians' (forthcoming).

⁴¹ Breebaart (n. 21) 17; G. Schepens, *Ancient Society* ii (1971) 265–6.

⁴² Moles 165–6.

⁴³ *Contemporary*: Thuc. i 1.1, v 26.5; Herodian i 2.5; Jos., *Bf* i 3; cf. Theopompus, *FGrH* 115 F 342. *Non-contemporary*: Diod. i 4.2–4; D. Hal., *AR* i 7.2–4. *Mixed*: Polybius i 14–15, iii 4.13, iv 2.1; Dio i 1.2, liii 19.6, lxxii 18.3–4. Other common prooemial themes are expense (Theopompus, Timaeus), hardship (Timaeus, Polybius, Diodorus), or danger (Polybius, Diodorus), but these are limited to large-scale histories and do not pertain to Arrian.

⁴⁴ Schepens (n. 41) 262–6.

⁴⁵ I am grateful to two readers of the *Journal* for their helpful comments and criticisms.

Eastern *Alimenta* and an Inscription of Attaleia

A characteristic phenomenon of the High Empire, though it is found both earlier and later, is the alimentary scheme, whereby foundations established by emperors or private persons provide a kind of family allowance for the children of free-born but not wealthy parents.¹ Though such schemes may well have had

I am grateful to Glen Bowersock and to an anonymous referee for *JHS* for their comments.

¹ I use the following special abbreviations: Balland=A. Balland,

Hellenistic antecedents, the earliest known example is from Julio-Claudian Italy, where T. Helvius Basila, a senator from Atina, leaves 400,000 sesterces to his fellow-citizens 'ut liberis eorum ex redivo, dum in aetatem pervenirent, frumentum et postea sestertia singula milia darentur'.²

In the second century, probably beginning with Nerva, alimentary schemes become part of the system of imperial benefactions, and their workings are attested for many cities of Italy by inscriptions and by letters of the younger Pliny.³ On the present evidence, the first emperor to extend the imperial *alimenta* to the Greek East is Hadrian. At Antinoopolis, a papyrus dated to 151 mentions as one of the emperor's benefactions that 'he wished the children of the Antinoopolites to be nourished when registered by the parents within thirty days of their birth' (ἐβουλήθη τρέφεισθαι τὰ τῶν Ἀντινοείων [τέκνα τὰ] ἀπογραφόμενα ὑφ' ἡμῶν τῶν γονέων ἐντὸς ἡμερῶν τριάκοντα ἀφ' ἧς ἐὰν γένηται).⁴ An Athenian inscription dated to Hadrian's reign (or perhaps to the beginning of Pius) involves what may be an *obligatio praediorum* similar to those found in the imperial *alimenta* of Italy.⁵ Cassius Dio reports that Hadrian 'granted yearly grain' (σίτον ἐτήσιον ἐχαρίσαστο) to Athens, but this sounds more like a gift in kind than an alimentary scheme, though he could have assisted the city's food supply in more ways than one.⁶ When the same emperor is honored by the assembly of the united Greeks as their 'saviour who has rescued and nourished his own Hellas' (σωτήρι, ῥυσαμένῳ καὶ θρέψαντι τὴν ἑαυτοῦ Ἑλλάδα), that also seems to refer to an outright gift of grain, and the same is true when the cities of Megara and Cyrene honor him as their *κτίστες, nomothetes, and tropheus*.⁷

Several inscriptions, all from Lycia or Pamphylia, and all of them either certainly or possibly of the first half of the second century, refer to alimentary schemes instituted by wealthy *privati*. At Sillyon in Pamphylia a certain Menodora sets up a foundation in the name of her son Megacles εἰς παίδων τροφᾶς.⁸ At Oenoanda in north-western Lycia, Licinnius Longus establishes a foundation for 250 παῖδες καὶ παρθένοι of the city.

Fouilles de Xanthos vii: *Inscriptions d'époque impériale du Létion* (Paris 1981); *Bull.* = J. and L. Robert, *Bulletin épigraphique*, appearing almost every year between 1938 and 1984 in *REG*; Duncan-Jones = R. P. Duncan-Jones, *The economy of the Roman Empire*² (Cambridge 1982); Garnsey = P. Garnsey, *Famine and food supply in the Graeco-Roman world* (Cambridge 1988). On the *alimenta* generally, Duncan-Jones, Chapter 7 and Appendixes 3–6; for the Greek evidence, Balland, 195–8.

² *CIL* x 5056 (*ILS* 977); on the date of Helvius Basila, *PIR*² H 67; S. Mitchell, *Chiron* xvi (1986) 19–20, 22–5.

³ Pliny, *Epp.* i 8.10, vii 18.

⁴ H. I. Bell, *Aegyptus* xiii (1933) 518 lines 4–5; *SB* 7602; further bibliography in Balland, 196.

⁵ Athens: *IG* ii² 2776, re-edited and restudied by S. J. Miller, *Hesperia* xli (1972) 50–95, especially 87–91 on the purpose; cf. Balland, 196.

⁶ Cass. Dio lxix 16.2, cf. M. Wörle, *Chiron* i (1971) 335 n. 44, A. J. Spawforth and S. Walker, *JRS* lxxv (1985) 90. For the various ways in which emperors assisted the food supply of cities other than Rome, Wörle, *art. cit.* 324–40 (*Bull.* 1972, 392), Garnsey, 251–7.

⁷ Greeks: *SIG*³ 835 A; *F. Delphes* iii 4 (4), p. 152 n. 6. Megara: *IG* vii 70–2. Cyrene: J. M. Reynolds, *PBSR* xxvi (1958) 164, with the restorations and discussion of J. and L. Robert, *Bull.* 1960, 438. For Hadrian's gifts of grain to cities of the empire, Cass. Dio lxix 5.3.

⁸ *IGRom* iii 800–1; Bean, *Side Kitabeleri* (Ankara 1965) no. 191, shown to be from Sillyon by J. and L. Robert, *Bull.* 1967, 606.