

AELIUS ARISTIDES, ΕΙΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΑ

By C. P. JONES *

A short speech preserved among the writings of Aelius Aristides is addressed to an unnamed emperor.¹ At present, it is generally agreed to be spurious, spoken by an unknown orator before the emperor Philip the Arab. It has been called 'the only preserved specimen of the oratory of the third century',² 'perhaps the only speech preserved in the corpus of Aristides of which the authenticity can be denied with confidence',³ and it has been used as a primary document for the history of Philip's reign.⁴

It was not always so. Up to the end of the nineteenth century, the authenticity of the speech was never questioned, though there was disagreement about the identity of the emperor. The manuscripts express no doubt about Aristides' authorship, and indeed one of the chief ones puts the εἰς βασιλέα at the head of the collection: there are no scholia to indicate who the emperor was thought to be. Willem Canter, in his Latin translation of 1566, briefly identified him as Marcus Aurelius, and the son who is mentioned at the end of the speech as Commodus.⁵ John Masson, who made the first attempt at a chronology of Aristides' life and works for Samuel Jebb's Oxford edition of 1722, saw Pius as the emperor and Marcus himself as the son.⁶ That view did not find many adherents, with the notable exception of W. H. Waddington in his essay on Aristidean chronology.⁷

Then, in his edition of 1898, Bruno Keil briefly athetized the speech. He published his arguments in 1905, undertaking to demonstrate both that it could not be by Aristides for stylistic reasons and that the emperor addressed was Macrinus.⁸ Keil's first proposition has been universally accepted; but the second proved contentious. Mommsen, even before the publication of Keil's paper, thought of Pertinax.⁹ A. von Domaszewski, soon after it, argued for Gallienus.¹⁰ Philip the Arab was proposed in 1918 by E. Groag, who also suggested a name for the author: Nicagoras, the contemporary of the biographer Philostratus.¹¹ Groag's identification of the emperor, though not of the author, is now the received opinion.¹² Not that assent has been universal: Santo Mazzarino not long ago proposed Decius,¹³ and almost simultaneously Sir Ernest Barker saw the speech as a Byzantine product of the ninth century or later.¹⁴

The argument of the present paper is, like Keil's, twofold: first, that the speech is by Aristides and, second, that the emperor is indeed Antoninus Pius. It then remains to see how the speech would fit the chronology of Aristides' career and the history of the time. If these proposals are accepted, new testimony accrues for the life of a leading representative of the Second Sophistic and for a notoriously ill-documented period.

* I am very grateful to T. D. Barnes, C. A. Behr, G. W. Bowersock, R. P. Duncan-Jones and J. F. Gilliam for their helpful criticism. A version of this paper was read at Harvard University on 28 October, 1971, and I have benefited greatly from comments made then.

¹ Or. 35 K. Keil's numbering will be used here for the speeches that he edited (*Aelii Aristidis . . . quae supersunt* II [1898, repr. 1958]), James H. Oliver's for the *Panegyricus* (*The Civilizing Power*, Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, n.s. LVIII, 1 [1968]), and W. Dindorf's edition (3 vols., [1829, repr. 1964]) for the rest.

² K. Münscher, *Jahresb. über die Fortsch. des klass. Altertumswiss.* 149 (1910), 37.

³ A. Boulanger, *Aelius Aristide et la sophistique dans la province d'Asie au II^e siècle de notre ère* (1923), 382.

⁴ As by W. Ensslin, *CAH* XII (1939), 88-9; Fr. Oertel, *ibid.* 264; M. Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*² (1957) I, 438; 451 ff.; 732, n. 15.

⁵ *Aristidis orationum tomii tres nunc primum latine versi* (1566).

⁶ *Collectanea historica ad Aristidis vitam*, accessible in Dindorf's edition, vol. III, pp. lviiii-lxi.

⁷ *Mémoire sur la chronologie de la vie du rhéteur Aelius Aristide*, Mémoires de l'Institut impérial de France, Académie des inscriptions et belles lettres 26 (1867), 255; 259, n. 3 (53; 57, n. 3 of the separate publication).

⁸ *Nachr. Ges. der Wiss. zu Gött., phil.-hist. Kl.*, 1905, 381-428 (henceforth referred to as 'Keil'). I have not seen J. Turzewitsch's Russian study of 1907, in which he argued to the same conclusion as Keil: for a report, P. Wendland, *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 1907, 1449-50.

⁹ Mommsen *apud* Wilamowitz in *Die Kultur der Gegenwart* I, 8 (1905), 161-2 ('eine Entdeckung des Th. Mommsen'). Still there in the second edition (1907), 163-4, it is silently dropped in the third (1912), 237, evidently as a result of Keil's paper.

¹⁰ *Philologus* 65 (1906), 344-56.

¹¹ *Wiener Studien* 40 (1918), 20-45 (henceforth referred to as 'Groag').

¹² Thus Louis J. Swift, *GRBS* 7 (1966), 267-89, especially 272 ('the emperor must be Philip'); C. A. Behr, *Aelius Aristides and the Sacred Tales* (1968), 88, n. 92 (on p. 89).

¹³ *Trattato di Storia romana* II (1956), 406-7.

¹⁴ *Social and Political Thought in Byzantium* (1957), 220-5.

I

Keil argued against Aristides' authorship in two ways: none of the emperors under whom he lived could possibly fit the indications of the speech, and on stylistic grounds it could not be by Aristides. It will be best to begin with the second assertion, leaving the question of the emperor for later.

Keil observed that A (as he may be called for the present) shows the influence of two models in particular, Isocrates' *Evagoras* and Xenophon's *Agésilas*. Thus, for Isocrates, compare 35, 8 οὕτως ἐμέλησεν αὐτοῦ τοῖς θεοῖς ὅπως ὀσίως καὶ εὐσεβῶς ἐπιστήσεται τοῖς πράγμασιν, ὥστε ἃ μὲν τῆς μανίας καὶ ἀπονοίας ἔργα ἦν, ἑτέροις ἀνέθηκαν, ἃ δὲ τῆς δικαιοσύνης καὶ φιλανθρωπίας καὶ τῆς ἄλλης εὐσεβείας, τούτῳ διεφύλαξαν, with Isocrates 9, 25, τοσαύτην ὁ δαίμων ἔσχεν αὐτοῦ πρόνοιαν ὅπως καλῶς λήψεται τὴν βασιλείαν, ὥσθ' ὅσα μὲν ἀναγκαῖον ἦν παρασκευασθῆναι δι' ἀσεβείας, ταῦτα μὲν ἕτερος ἐπραξεν, ἐξ ὧν δ' οἶον τ' ἦν ὀσίως καὶ δικαίως λαβεῖν τὴν ἀρχήν, Εὐαγόρα διεφύλαξεν. It is to be observed that, while adhering closely to Isocrates' syntax and thought, A has nevertheless shifted the idea contained in ὀσίως . . . λαβεῖν τὴν ἀρχήν from the end of Isocrates' sentence to the beginning of his, ὀσίως . . . τοῖς πράγμασιν. For Xenophon, compare 35, 27 καὶ μὴν καὶ ὅσα ἡδοναὶ ἀρχουσὶν ἀνθρώπων οὐδεμιᾶς ἴσμεν ἡττημένον τὸν βασιλέα, τοσοῦτον γὰρ ἀπέσχευ, κτλ. with Xen., *Agés.* 5, 1 ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ ὅσα ἡδοναὶ πολλῶν κρατοῦσιν ἀνθρώπων, ποίας οἶδέ τις Ἀγησίλαον ἡττηθέντα; ὃς μέθης μὲν ἀποσχέσθαι, κτλ. For Keil these borrowings were doubly significant. Aristides was a follower above all of Demosthenes, and to a lesser extent of Plato: yet there is scarcely a trace of these two in the speech,¹⁵ whereas the real Aristides owed 'verhältnissmässig wenig' to Isocrates and Xenophon. Moreover, Aristides did not imitate his models in the slavish manner of A: 'dafür kann er zuviel'.¹⁶

It can be conceded that the speech shows an author strongly under the influence of classical models: that may help later with the question of its date. Keil's arguments, however, do not tell against Aristides' authorship but rather, and not for the last time, in its favour. The same two authors are imitated in Aristides' masterpiece, the *Panathenaicus*. For Isocrates compare *Pan.* 56-7 καὶ πρῶτον μὲν τὴν ἐπικειμένην ἐκάσθηρε θάλατταν . . . τοὺς ἐπὶ τῶν προθύρων ὀχληροὺς ἀναστήσασα, λέγω τὸ ληστικὸν ἅπαν καὶ βαρβαρικόν, καὶ καταναγκάσασα ὡς πορρωτάτῳ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς παραλίας . . . ἀποχωρῆσαι. ἐξ ὧν ὁ τῶν νήσων κύκλος ὤκισθη βεβαίως . . . πρὸς δὲ τούτοις τὰς ἐπικειμένας τῇ Πελοποννήσῳ νήσους ὤκισε, . . . πανταχόθεν τοὺς βαρβάρους ὥσπερ προβόλοις ἀνεירוῦσα . . . καὶ διεβίβαζεν εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν τὰς πολλὰς καὶ μεγάλας ἀποικίας, with Isocr. 12, 43, καὶ πρῶτον μὲν τὰς Κυκλάδας νήσους . . . ὑπὸ Καρῶν κατεχομένης, ἐκβαλόντες ἐκείνους . . . τοὺς μάλιστα βίου τῶν Ἑλλήνων δεομένους κατῴκισαν εἰς αὐτάς· καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα πολλὰς πόλεις ἐφ' ἑκατέρας τῆς ἡπείρου καὶ μεγάλας ἔκτισαν, καὶ τοὺς μὲν βαρβάρους ἀνέστειλαν ἀπὸ τῆς θαλάττης. Aristides has taken over Isocrates' τοὺς βαρβάρους ἀνέστειλαν ἀπὸ τῆς θαλάττης, but applied it to the settlement of the Cyclades, whereas Isocrates, writing before the conquests of Alexander, used it of Asia Minor: a similar change was visible in A's adaptation of Isocrates' *Evagoras*. For Xenophon compare Aristides, *Pan.* 158 τὸ γὰρ ἐν πολέμῳ καὶ φιλονικίᾳ τῶν Ἑλλήνων πρὸς αὐτὴν καθεστηκότων τῆς ὑπὲρ τῶν Ἑλλήνων προνοίας μὴδὲν μᾶλλον ἀφείσθαι, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τῶν κοινῆ συμπερόντων βασιλεῖ πολεμεῖν διὰ γῆς ἀπάσης καὶ θαλάττης, πόση τινὶ χρὴ τῇ μεγαλοψυχίᾳ προσθεῖναι; with Xen., *Agés.* 7, 7 ὃς καὶ πολεμουσῆς τῆς πατρίδος πρὸς Ἑλληνας ὁμῶς τοῦ κοινοῦ ἀγαθοῦ τῇ Ἑλλάδι οὐκ ἡμέλησεν, ἀλλ' ἐξέπλευσεν ὅτι δύναται κακὸν ποιήσων τὸν βάρβαρον. It is noticeable that, just as Aristides has here changed Xenophon's οὐκ ἡμέλησεν into τῆς προνοίας μὴδὲν ἀφείσθαι, so conversely A adapted Isocrates' ἔσχεν πρόνοιαν by ἐμέλησεν. Such borrowings are deliberate, not unconscious: by composing variations on a familiar passage, an author at once paid homage to his predecessor and tried to emulate him.

The use of Isocrates and Xenophon is no more surprising in the *Panathenaicus* than in the εἰς βασιλέα. For encomia, especially of a ruler or a city, these two were natural and

¹⁵ Note, however, the allusion to Plato, *Rep.* 374 E at 35, 3 (Keil, 390). Aristides cites the *Republic* more than any other work of Plato except the *Gorgias* (a special case because of the essays *In*

defense of Rhetoric and *In defense of the Four*): Behr, op. cit. II, n. 28.

¹⁶ Keil 390-4.

recommended models.¹⁷ However much Aristides saw himself, and was seen, as the new Demosthenes, that was not the model to which he would turn when composing a panegyric, and the lack of his influence is no argument against Aristides' authorship.¹⁸ Moreover, it may be held that Isocrates has left as strong a mark as Demosthenes on Aristides' public speeches.¹⁹

Keil drew attention to A's observance of hiatus. Though hiatus is generally avoided, Keil found several 'unentschuldbare' transgressions and three 'wirklich schwere' ones, τάξει ἀπολέσαντες (7), εἶα αὖξεσθαι (13), ἀσφαλεστάτω ὄρμει (15); in a fourth, ὄσαι ἡδοναὶ ἄρχουσιν (27), Keil supposed that A was attempting to conceal his debt to Xenophon, *Ages.* 5, ἰ ὄσαι γε ἡδοναὶ . . . κρατοῦσιν by omitting γε, and 'gleiches wird Niemand dem Aristides nachsagen'.²⁰ Aristides, however, allows hiatus with as much licence as A. The Roman Oration has many instances as glaring as those which Keil found unforgivable in the εἰς βασιλέα: thus λόγου οὐκ (2), ἄνω ἤκει (8), μὴ ἐπι (8), and (an example very similar to ὄσαι ἡδοναὶ ἄρχουσιν), τέχναι ὀπόσαι εἰσί (13). Even so careful a speech as the *Panathenaicus* is not particularly rigorous in avoiding hiatus.²¹ Again, Keil's argument against Aristides' authorship tends to prove the opposite.

A's fondness for conjoined synonyms like ἐν ἑορτῇ καὶ ἐν ἱερομηνίᾳ (1) is another striking feature of his style: Keil was able to collect a list of over eighty. In some, he conceded, it might be held that there was a gradation of meaning, the second term being more emphatic than the first, but such distinctions would do A too great an honour: 'ihm kam es nur auf Worte an', whereas Aristides used this device only 'sparsam'.²²

Again, it can perhaps be conceded that this device is more frequent in the εἰς βασιλέα than in so finished and mature a speech as the *Panathenaicus*. But even that has it in abundance. Thus, from the preface alone, ἐν μαθήμασι καὶ λόγοις (2), μηδεμίαν προπέτειαν μηδὲ εὐθήθειαν, ἐργώδης . . . καὶ χαλεπὸς διενεγκεῖν, μεγάλη καὶ λαμπρᾶ τῇ τύχῃ,²³ εἰρηκόσι καὶ προκατειληφόσι τὰς ἀκοάς, κεκοσμηκότων καὶ διεξεληλυθότων (3). The same speech contains some of the pairs incriminated by Keil in the εἰς βασιλέα: thus compare 35, 5 and 14 πρῶτον καὶ μέγιστον with *Pan.* 128 πρῶτην . . . καὶ . . . μεγίστην and 246 μέγιστον . . . ἢ . . . πρῶτον; and 35, 24, μέγας καὶ θαυμαστός with *Pan.* 211 μέγιστον . . . καὶ θαυμαστότατον; 35, 30 ἐκράτησε καὶ κατεστήσατο with *Pan.* 174 κατεστήσαντο μὲν . . . , ἐκράτησαν δέ . . . This use of paired synonyms is a favourite device of Isocrates; here again his influence on Aristides is evident.

One of the arguments of Keil that most impressed others was drawn from A's use of consecutive clauses introduced by ὥστε: no less than seventeen in thirty-nine sections.²⁴ This 'beleidigend' repetition became for Keil 'unerträglich' when two such clauses followed closely on each other, as in 35, 7, 8, 26-7, 28, 29. Here again, though this device is frequent in the εἰς βασιλέα, it is not appreciably more so than in other speeches of Aristides. In a passage of equivalent length to the εἰς βασιλέα, 26, 1-39, ὥστε occurs the same number of times, seventeen.²⁵ In this passage also such clauses occur in as close succession as in the εἰς βασιλέα: thus 26, 11-12, 26-7, 28. Here again Keil's argument tends to support the case for authenticity, and again Aristides is visibly influenced by Isocrates: the preface to the *Panegyricus*, for example, contains on average one ὥστε-clause in every other sentence, a much higher proportion than in the εἰς βασιλέα.

More generally, Keil pointed for evidence of A's stylistic inferiority to two other passages. He found 'elend' the long sentence of 35, 26, where the main verb ἐπέδειξεν is

¹⁷ Isocrates: e.g. Menander, *περὶ ἐπιδεικτ.* III, 372, 6 Sp. Xenophon: e.g. Theon, *Progymnasm.* II, 68, 27 Sp.

¹⁸ Note that Demosthenes is not on Theon's list of models for the encomium, II, 68, 24 ff. Sp. On the dangers of atheizing a work, Tacitus' *Dialogus* for instance, without regard for the genre in which it is written, cf. E. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa*² I (1915), 11-12.

¹⁹ For examples, see pp. 136-7. Note also Philostr., *VS* 584.

²⁰ Keil 395.

²¹ Thus ἡ οἰκεία (13), νικᾷ ἐν (42), μόνου ἤδη (43), τοῦ ἔφου (52).

²² Keil 395-7.

²³ cf. 35, 1, χρηστῇ καὶ φιλανθρώπων τύχῃ.

²⁴ Keil 397, claiming eighteen. Cf. Münscher op. cit. (n. 2), 37; Boulanger op. cit. (n. 3), 384.

²⁵ In ten of these, it is true (8; 11; 13 twice; 25; 26; 32; 33; 36; 37), Keil ends the previous clause with a colon or period, so that they might be argued not to have a subordinating function. But the distinction is merely editorial, since all of them could be punctuated so as to be part of the previous sentence; and in any case they should all be equally 'beleidigend'.

followed by seven participles, two of which in turn introduce consecutive clauses, the latter itself containing another participle and three infinitives. Similarly, the 'Satzungetüm', 35, 14, contains a genitive absolute with four participles; the last of these introduces a relative clause with two finite verbs, the second with four dependent participles; the main sentence consists of four finite verbs, of which the first has its own dependent participle. Yet there are several sentences in the *Panegyricus*, for example, that in length and complexity far exceed those criticized by Keil in the εἰς βασιλέα.²⁶ In picking out such sentences, Keil has once again lighted on a feature characteristic of Aristides' public style, and one which again shows him a pupil of Isocrates.²⁷ Keil in fact overlooked, by an error of punctuation that will be discussed below,²⁸ the long sentence, 35, 35-6. This, after a long causal clause introduced by ὅπου and containing several subordinate clauses, has for its main sentence a direct question, τίνα ταῦτ' οὐχ ὑπερβέβληκεν ἀνδρείαν, ἢ τίς ἀμείνων . . . γένοιτ' ἂν ταύτης κατάστασις; It may be observed that two of the long sentences in the *Panegyricus* are very similarly constructed, with a long articular infinitive clause ending in a rhetorical question, and one of the questions is similar to the one here, ποῖα ταῦτ' ἔνεστι ψυχῆ παραβαλεῖν ἀνθρωπίνῃ, καὶ τίνος οὐκ εὐτυχίας μᾶλλον θαυμάσαι;²⁹

For Keil, the speech also contained a number of 'stilistische Härten' that betrayed a writer inferior to Aristides. For example, he found 'besonders perplex' the sentence, τὸ μὲν γὰρ βιασάμενον καὶ καταναγκάσαντα στέργειν παρασκευάσαι φόβῳ καὶ οὐ γνώμῃς περιουσίᾳ ἐστὶν οὕτως ἔχειν αὐτοὺς πεποιηκέναι, 'to bring people to love you by force and compulsion is to have caused them to be so disposed from fear and not abundance of judgment' (35, 31): the infinitive of the perfect instead of the aorist was also 'für den Verfasser charakteristisch'.³⁰ This is the usual compression that results when an author strives for a γνώμη: a much more complex case is *Pan.* 33 οὐ γὰρ ἠξίωσαν αὐτὸ δὴ τοῦτο γῆ κρύψαντες ἔξαρκεῖν, ἀλλὰ τοσοῦτον ἀπέσχον τοῦ φοβηθῆναι μὴ ἄρα τοὺς ἄλλους ἐξ ἴσου σφισὶ ποιήσωσιν ὥστ' οὐκ εἶναι κάλλιον φήθησαν ὅσῳ τῶν ἄλλων προέχουσιν ἐνδείξασθαι ἢ εἰ πάντας εὖ ποιοῦντες ὀφθήσονται, 'they did not think they ought to be satisfied merely with this, hiding it in the ground, but were so far from fearing they might make others equal to themselves that they thought there was no more virtuous way to show how far they excelled all others than being seen to benefit everyone'. The use of the perfect infinitive in the clausula, so far from showing the work not to be by Aristides, is a trademark of his: thus, merely from the preface of the *Panathenaiscus*, συμβέβηκε (2), παρεικνίας balancing ὑπερεχούσης, προσειρήκασι preceded by three verbs in the present (4), and for the exchange of perfect and aorist compare *Pan.* 54, διαγέγονε . . . ἐνήλλαξεν . . . κατέδειξε . . . πεποιήται . . .

Similarly, Keil pillories A's tendency to repeat or play on words: thus ἔπαυσε τῆς ἐκεῖσε ὀρμῆς, ἔπειτα κατέστησεν εἰς ὄρμον ἄγων· καὶ νῦν ἡ μὲν ἐν ἀσφαλεστάτῳ ὀρμῆι (14-15), κατέχων . . . κατέχων (13), ἡμελημένης . . . οὐκ ἡμέλησεν (20).³¹ But this is another device favoured by Aristides:³² compare *Pan.* 2 ἡ γὰρ ὑπὲρ λόγων λόγῳ γιγνομένη χάρις . . . τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ λόγου πρῶτον ἐπωνυμίαν βεβαιοῖ, μόνη γὰρ ἐστὶν ἀκριβῶς εὐλογος, *Pan.* 96 ἐστῶσι τοῖς ὠσίν and, a few lines below, Ἀτλαντικοῦ πελάγους κληρουχίας ἀτίμους ἠπείλει . . ., ἦν ἀναγκάσειν ἠκρωτηριασμένους προχοῦν εἰς τὸ πέλαγος, ὕδωρ μὲν ἀντλοῦντας, πέτρας δὲ ὀρύττοντας, where Ἀτλαντικοῦ is echoed in ἀντλοῦντας, and ἠκρωτηριασμένους, 'mutilated', contains a punning reference to the ἀκρωτήρια to which the Athenians were to be banished.

A's vocabulary similarly drew Keil's criticism.³³ Thus κατήκοος in the sense of 'spy' (35, 21) is not Attic but Ionic.³⁴ Yet, as has been observed of other speeches that Keil athetized for similar reasons, one or two linguistic peculiarities are likely to be found in any speech of Aristides:³⁵ and in the absence of a lexicon, arguments from unique instances are

²⁶ Keil 397-8. cf. *Pan.* 108 τὸ γὰρ . . . ἐξετάζοντι; 172, τὸ δὲ . . . θαυμάσαι; 211, ἢ πάντα . . . νομίσαντες (where the period usually placed after προσθήσεσθαι obscures the construction).

²⁷ cf. Isocr. *Paneg.* 4, 93-5; 104-5; 107-9.

²⁸ Below, pp. 148-9.

²⁹ *Pan.* 172, cf. 108.

³⁰ Keil 398.

³¹ Keil 398.

³² For examples from Aristides, Boulanger 420-1.

³³ Keil 399-400.

³⁴ Keil himself correctly explained its use here: it echoes the preceding ὑπήκοον. For Keil this was 'geschmackloses Wortspiel': it is precisely the kind of pun illustrated above from the *Panegyricus*.

³⁵ Fr. Egle, *Untersuchungen über die Echtheit der Rede 'Ἀπέλλα γενεθλιακός*, (diss. Tübingen, 1906), 16-17.

highly fallible.³⁶ One of Keil's objections, however, is damaging: the heteroclitite form of νοῦς in the phrase τῷ αὐτῷ νοῖ καὶ τρόπῳ (35, 26) is characteristic of the κοινή, not of a purist like Aristides. There is a ready explanation. Some scribe had in mind a phrase from the opening of Paul's *Second Letter to the Corinthians*, ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ νοὶ καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ γνώμῃ (II Cor. 1, 10). As often, a Christian reminiscence has corrupted a pagan text.³⁷

Finally, Keil criticized the structure of the speech. After the conventional preface, it falls roughly into two parts. The first recounts the emperor's career from just before his accession through the first years of his reign (5-15); the speech then proceeds by a catalogue of his virtues, 'monetary justice' (16), justice (17-19), philhellenism (20), humanity (21-6), superiority to vice (27-9), military virtues, with praise of the present peace (30-37); there is a brief concluding prayer (38) and an address to the emperor's son (39). Keil sees in this scheme A's attempt to free himself from the rules of the handbooks: his inferiority is shown by his lapses, for instance the inclusion of φρόνησις under the rubric of ἀνδρεία.³⁸ Until it is known which emperor A is praising, however, it is vain to criticize him for his chosen scheme: thus it may have been discreet, if the emperor were not military, to count his diplomatic successes among his acts of war. Moreover, it is important not to overrate the influence of the handbooks, especially the late specimens that have survived. If a speaker was unusually skilful in his handling of a topic, that might pass into the tradition and thus practice would influence theory: hence Aristides' *Panathenaicus* supplied Menander with material for his discussion of the βασιλικὸς λόγος.³⁹ Because A does not obey all Menander's rules, it does not follow that he is not Aristides. The source of his scheme is in any case clear: the *Agesilaus* of Xenophon, where again the chronological narrative of the king's life is followed by the catalogue of his virtues.

If the εἰς βασιλέα were by Aristides, it would be expected to resemble other of his works in vocabulary and idiom. The following is a list, collected more or less at random, of such resemblances.

1-4 The preface that combines self-deprecation with criticism of other speakers is of course traditional.⁴⁰ Several elements of this one, however, recur in prefaces of Aristides. Thus compare 35, 1 (unworthiness of the speaker) with 26, 2; 35, 2 (other speakers have unwittingly belittled the topic) with 26, 4-5, *Pan.* 4; 35, 4 (the speaker's efforts at least show his gratitude) with 26, 2, *Pan.* 1-2.

2 τᾶλλα πάντα ἀφείς. cf. *Pan.* 211, πάντα τᾶλλα ἀφείς.

2 προσδεηθείς. A favorite compound of Aristides; cf. 26, 2; 38; 30, 10.

2 τρόπον τινά. This qualifying use, 'in a sense', 'as it were', is characteristic of Aristides; cf. 30, 10; *Pan.* 99, 217, 233, 250; περὶ ῥητ. 2, 4, 22, 14, 24 D.

5 ἐν μὲν οὖν τοῦτο πρῶτον καὶ μέγιστον. *Pan.* 55 ἐν μὲν οὖν τοῦτο τοιοῦτον καὶ τοσοῦτον.

11 εἰκότως, τὸν γὰρ μαθόντα . . . For this ellipse picking up the previous sentence, 'rightly so, since . . .', compare 26, 67-8; *Pan.* 28, 49.

11 ἔξω ἁμαρτίας. ἔξω in the sense of 'without', though not peculiar to Aristides, is characteristic of him; cf. *Pan.* 2, 4, 224.

17 ἔξω τοῦ δικαίου. The same Aristidean use of ἔξω is employed here to produce a mere pleonasm for ἀδίκως; cf. *Pan.* 68, ἔξω τοῦ καλοῦ=αἰσχροῦς.

17-18 τὸ δίκαιον ἀκριβῶς οἶδεν . . . ὥστε μὴ τι τῶν γεγραμμένων διαφεύγειν αὐτόν. Compare 26, 38, of the emperors generally, but spoken under Pius: δικαστῆς . . . μέγας, ὃν οὐποτε οὐδὲν ἐκφεύγει τῶν δικαίων.

19 οὐδεὶς γοῦν ἔστιν ὅστις οὐ τῶν δικαίων ἀπῆλθεν τυχών, οὐδ' ἐμέμψατο τῶν κριθέντων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, οὔτε διώκων ἠττηθεὶς οὔτε φεύγων ἀλόους, ἀλλὰ στέργοντες ἀμφότεροι καὶ προσκυνοῦντες ἀπέρχονται, καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ψῆφον περὶ τῶν ἐγνωσμένων ὃ τε ἠττηθεὶς καὶ ὁ νικήσας φέρει. Compare the mutilated sentence in 26, 38, where Keil uses the present

³⁶ Thus Keil incriminates δλόκληρος in the phrase ἐντελή καὶ δλόκληρον 35, 21. But this collocation is a natural one: compare, in the preface of the τέχναι ῥητορικαὶ attributed to Aristides (II, 459. 8 Sp.; I, 8 Schmid), δλόκληρος καὶ τελείως ἔχων. Similarly, Keil holds that ὡς ἂν (35, 14) is used 'als einfache Vergleichspartikel': this happens to be an idiom of the Attic orators (Kühner-Gerth, I, 243-4), and its

absence from other works of Aristides, even if proved, would be no argument against authenticity.

³⁷ F. W. Hall, *A Companion to Classical Texts* (1913), 182-3; 188-9. One of Aristides' manuscripts in fact reads νῶ.

³⁸ Keil 400-5.

³⁹ III, 372, 10 Sp.

⁴⁰ cf. Isocr. 4, 13-4.

passage to support the restoration <μηδέν' ανάγκη στέργειν ἢ ἀλόντα ἐπὶ τῶν ἐκάστοτε δικαστηρίων> παρὰ τὴν ἀξίαν, ἢ καὶ διώκοντα μὴ κρατήσαντα [μηδὲ τῷ νενικήσθαι]. Similarly, on the judgments of the Areopagus, *Pan.* 43 οἱ μὲν ἡττημένοι στέργουσιν ὁμοίως τοῖς κεκρατηκόσιν.

21 κατεπτηχὸς ἅπαν τὸ ὑπήκοον καὶ ὑπὸ φόβου δεδουλωμένον. Aristides is fond of the accusative absolute, and extends it far beyond the usual range of participles like δεῖσαν, ἐξόν: compare *Pan.* 6, εἰρημένον ὑπὸ πολλῶν . . .

22 ὃ τοίνυν μέγιστον τῆς τοῦ βασιλέως φιλανθρωπίας καὶ κρεῖττον ἅπαντος παραδείγματος, ὦν γὰρ τηλικούτος, κτλ. This idiomatic use of a relative clause containing a superlative and followed by γάρ (cf. Denniston, *Greek Particles*² 60) is a favourite of Aristides: *Pan.* 212 is especially close, ὃ δὲ δὴ μάλιστα ἄξιον τῆς ἐκείνων φύσεως ἀγασθῆναι καὶ κρεῖττον ἢ κατ' ἀνθρώπων ἡγήσασθαι, ἐξόν γάρ, κτλ. but compare also *Pan.* 189, 221, 233.

23 εἴσω περιραντηρίων παριέναι. The identical phrase in 29, 14, as Keil notes. This sense of περιραντήρια, 'lustral area', is extremely rare, *LSJ*⁹ s.v.

23 πῶς οὐ πάσης ἐπέκεινα πραότητος καὶ φιλανθρωπίας; cf. 26, 38 πῶς οὖν ταῦτα οὐκ ἐν τοῖς ἐπέκεινα πάσης δημοκρατίας; This use of ἐπέκεινα in the sense of 'superior to' seems peculiar to Aristides.

24 οἴομενος δεῖν τὸν ὡς ἀληθῶς βασιλέα τῷ τῶν ὄλων ἀπεικᾶσθαι βασιλεῖ. The idea is commonplace, but Keil notes the parallel with 23, 79 βασιλεῖς ἄριστ' ἂν ἄγοιεν τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων πράγματα τοῖς τῶν ὄλων κυρίως ὁμοιοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς τοῖς θεοῖς, compare also 27, 35. Aristides regularly uses τὰ ὅλα of 'the world', 21, 8; 27, 32.

29 τεῖχη μὲν γὰρ ἀνάλωτα πολλάκις εἶναι δοκοῦντα καὶ φαῦλοι ὄντες εἶλον ἤδη τινές, ὑπὸ δὲ τῶν ἡδονῶν πολλοὺς καὶ τῶν πάντων ἀγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν κρατουμένους ὄρω. For a similar contrast of those who capture χαρᾶκώματα καὶ τεῖχη with those who give ἀρετῆς παραδείγματα, compare 27, 36; but the idea is trite, Keil, 399.

36 Ἕλληνες καὶ βάρβαροι ταῦτόν ἤδη φθέγγονται. Compare 26, 29, ἅπασα ἡ οἰκουμένη . . . ἐν φθέγγεται.

36-7 This whole panegyric of the *pax Romana* recalls 26, 99-100; compare especially 35, 37 οὐ πάσα μὲν ἄδεια πᾶσιν <βαδίζειν> ὅποι βούλεται τις . . .; with 26, 100 ἐξεστι καὶ Ἕλληνι καὶ βαρβάρῳ . . . βαδίζειν ὅποι βούλεται ῥαδίως. Keil indeed held in his edition that this passage of the εἰς βασιλέα was modelled on that in the εἰς Ῥώμην: in his article, he decided that the similarity was due merely to identity of subject, though it could have been the cause for the εἰς βασιλέα to be ascribed to Aristides.⁴¹

38 ὦ φῶς τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης εὐδαιμονίας . . . The emotional style of this paragraph, marked by apostrophe and asyndeton, is characteristic of Aristides' conclusions: note 18, 6-10; 22, 11-13; 31, 19; and especially 45, 33, ὦ κοινὸν ἅπασιν ἀνθρώποις φῶς . . .

It might be maintained that these parallels are merely such as could result from a close study of Aristides' works. What needs to be shown now, however, is not merely that the author could be someone else, but that he could not be Aristides. Vague impressions are not enough.⁴²

II

So far it has been argued from internal evidence that the εἰς βασιλέα is by Aristides. If it is, however, the emperor must be one of those under whom he flourished, Antoninus Pius, M. Aurelius, or Commodus.⁴³ Commodus is made immediately ineligible by the address to the emperor's son, since he had no issue. Keil was easily able to eliminate Marcus: the speaker could hardly congratulate the emperor on having received the succession unexpectedly (13) and not 'like an heirloom' (5), or on his preference for diplomacy over war in dealing with his enemies (32-5).⁴⁴ It must, therefore, be Pius; and this conclusion, necessitated by the internal evidence, is confirmed by the speech itself. It will be best to proceed by

⁴¹ Keil 425-6.

⁴² I have not used statistical tests based on speech-rhythm, sentence-length, particles, etc. Though the speech appears to accord with Aristides' practice, it is probably too short for such tests to be conclusive.

It may be noted in passing that Aristides' admirer Libanius perhaps shows knowledge of the εἰς βασιλέα:

cf. his *Laudatio Constantii et Constantis* 121-2 (vol. IV, p. 268, 11-269, 5 F.) with Aristid. 35, 27-9; 23-4.

⁴³ Hadrian can safely be excluded. The πᾶσις of 35, 39 would have to be Aelius Caesar in his mid-thirties, and Aristides could not be older than 19 or 20.

⁴⁴ Keil 382-90.

a running commentary on the text, discussing both the positive indications and those which have been used to disqualify Pius or favour some other emperor.⁴⁵ It does not seem necessary, however, to attempt an elaborate refutation of all the arguments advanced in favour of various third-century rulers. Since the work is preserved under Aristides' name, the burden of proof will be satisfied if the style can be shown to be his and the references to suit an emperor under whom he lived.

5 καὶ πρότερον ἢ καταστῆναι εἰς τὴν ἀρχὴν ἄξιος τῆς βασιλείας ἦν. οἱ μὲν γὰρ δι' ἐτέρων κτώμενοι τὴν ἀρχὴν ἢ παρὰ τῶν πρὸ αὐτῶν παραλαβόντες οἱ μὲν ἰσχὺν ἀντὶ τοῦ δικαίου προθέμενοι, οἱ δ' ὡσπερ τινὸς γένους ἀκολουθίαν καὶ διαδοχὴν σώζοντες οὕτως τὴν βασιλείαν ἐκτήσαντο. ὅστις δὲ αὐτὸς μὲν οὔτε παραγγείλας οὔτε δεηθεῖς, δεηθέντων δὲ ἀπάντων αὐτοῦ γενέσθαι, ἔδωκεν τοῖς δεηθεῖσιν ἑαυτὸν καὶ παρακαλέσασιν, πάλαι τούτῳ καὶ δι' ἀρετὴν τοῦτο τὸ γέρας ὠφείλετο. (' Even before entering on power he was worthy of the throne. Some, by obtaining power through others or inheriting it from their predecessors, obtained the throne either by putting force before right or keeping the throne like an heirloom that passes down in some family. But one who himself did not canvass or request it, but when everyone asked him to become emperor, yielded to those who requested and urged him, such a man was long since owed this honour because of his virtue'.) Keil inferred that the emperor had had no prior claim to the throne, or been Caesar.⁴⁶ Aristides certainly implies that he was not born in the purple or adopted long before his accession. But his language is not inconsistent with a late or unexpected designation. Pius was adopted only when Hadrian's first choice, Aelius Caesar, had died on 1 January, 138; he is said to have pondered Hadrian's offer for a month before the adoption on 25 February; and even after Hadrian's death he used the threat of abdication in order to influence the senate.⁴⁷ Dio makes Hadrian conclude his speech of designation with the hope that his candidate 'will take power even against his will', and Pius himself, in a letter to Fronto, refers to his accession as 'that day, when it was resolved that I should assume this position'.⁴⁸

6 καὶ γὰρ τοὶ ἐκείνοις μὲν περὶ τῆς βασιλείας ἀμφισβητοῦσι πολλοί, τούτῳ δὲ οὐδεὶς. (' For those people have many who dispute the power, but he has none'.) Further on, however, Aristides hints at the struggle for the succession among Hadrian's kin (8), and reveals that there had been conspirators against the emperor (9).

7 ἐκείνοι μὲν γὰρ μετὰ πολέμων καὶ φόνων πολλῶν εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὰ πράγματα, πολλοὺς τῶν ἐν τάξει ἀπολέσαντες . . . ὥστε πολλὰς μὲν ἐρημωθῆναι πόλεις ὑπηκόους, κτλ. (' For they (the emperor's predecessors) came to power amid many wars and murders, destroying many of those in high position . . . so that many subject cities were wasted', etc.) Aristides will have been thinking principally of the year 69. But the reference to 'those in high position' would also have recalled Hadrian, whose reign began with the execution of four consulars on a charge of conspiracy.⁴⁹ Pius conspicuously forbore to begin his reign in the same way.⁵⁰

8 ὁ δὲ οὕτως ὁσίως καὶ καλῶς ἐπέστη τοῖς πράγμασιν ὥστε οὔτε καθιστάμενος οὔτε ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς βασιλείας οὐδενὸς φόνου προσεδέθη . . . ἀλλ' οὕτως ἐμέλησεν αὐτοῦ τοῖς θεοῖς ὅπως ὁσίως καὶ εὐσεβῶς ἐπιστήσεται τοῖς πράγμασιν, ὥστε ἅ μὲν τῆς μανίας καὶ ἀπονοίας ἔργα ἦν, ἐτέροις ἀνέθηκαν, ἅ δὲ τῆς δικαιοσύνης καὶ φιλανθρωπίας καὶ τῆς ἄλλης εὐσεβείας, τούτῳ διεφύλαξαν. (' But he came to power so purely and virtuously that neither while becoming emperor nor at the beginning of his reign did he require any murder . . . but the gods took such care that he should come to power purely and piously that they left to others acts of madness and insanity, but reserved for him acts of justice, humanity, and general piety'.) Here again Aristides' words require cautious scrutiny. Keil, followed by Groag, took him to state that the emperor's predecessor or rivals had been dispatched violently, without (at least) his open complicity.⁵¹ A panegyrist, however, is not likely to have ascribed to 'insanity' even a part of the events that led to the emperor's accession.

⁴⁵ The translations are mine. I have rendered βασιλεὺς by 'emperor' throughout, though Aristides uses it indifferently of Greek and Roman monarchs (e.g. in 35, 24).

⁴⁶ Keil 405.

⁴⁷ For the details, *PIR*² A 1513; cf. A. R. Birley, *Marcus Aurelius* (1966), 54-5.

⁴⁸ Cass. Dio LXIX, 20, 5; Pius *apud* Fronto, p. 160,

lines 4-5 van den Hout, 'diem, quo me suscipere hanc stationem placuit'.

⁴⁹ Cass. Dio, LXIX, 2, 5; *HA Hadr.* 7, 1-4; cf. A. von Premerstein, *Das Attentat der Konsulare auf Hadrian im Jahre 118 n. Chr.*, *Klio Beih.* 8 (1908).

⁵⁰ Cass. Dio, LXX, 2.

⁵¹ Keil 383-4; Groag 27.

In the first instance he means, and this is all that the Greek says, that others have committed acts of madness to gain their thrones while the present emperor has gained his virtuously. But there may be an undertone. No 'act of madness' made Pius emperor: but Hadrian had eliminated, not long before his death, two who might later have stood in Pius' way, Julius Servianus and his grandson Pedanius Fuscus.⁵²

The statement that the emperor showed clemency both 'when becoming emperor and at the beginning of the reign', which seemed to Keil a mere pleonasm,⁵³ accords with the tradition of Pius' succession: while Caesar, he preserved those whose deaths were ordered by the dying Hadrian, and in the first days of his reign he prevented the prosecution of those who had prospered under the late emperor.⁵⁴ According to one version, it was the last action that caused the new emperor to be designated 'Pius',⁵⁵ and Aristides' insistence on the emperor's 'piety' in the same context is a clear reference to the title.

9 καὶ μὴν οὐδὲ ὡς ἔσχεν τὴν ἀρχήν, οὐδὲν ἔπραξεν σκυθρωπὸν . . . οὐδὲ ὥσπερ ἄλλοι τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ βασιλέων τῶν ἐν τέλει τινὰς φοβηθέντες ἐπιβουλεύειν αὐτοῖς αἰτιασάμενοι τοὺς μὲν φυγαῖς, τοὺς δὲ θανάτοις ἐξημίωσαν, οὐδὲν τούτων ἐποίησεν, οὐδὲ τὸν τρόπον μετέθετο, ἀλλ' οὕτως ἐστὶ πάντων πόρρω τῶν τοιούτων . . . ὥστε καὶ τῶν ἐπιβουλεύοντων τινὰς καὶ τῶν φανερώς ἐξελεγχόμενων, καὶ τούτους περιεῖναι καὶ ζῆν τῇ τούτου φιλάνθρωπία. ('Indeed, even when he was established in office, he did nothing grim . . . Other emperors before him, fearing certain of those in office, accused them of plotting against them and punished them with exile or death; but he did none of these things, nor did he alter in character. So far is he from all such acts . . . that even some of those who were plotting against him and were clearly incriminated survive and live thanks to his humanity'.) The implication is that the emperor had requested or allowed the death of at least one conspirator while pardoning others. The *Historia Augusta* names two who died on charges of conspiracy, but asserts that Pius forbade investigation of their accomplices.⁵⁶ The 'other emperors' who had acted differently were several, but Aristides' audience would presumably have heard yet another reference to the reign of Hadrian.⁵⁷

10 ταῦτ' . . . ἐστὶν ἐπίδειγμα . . . τοῦ μὴ καταπεπληῆχθαι ὑπὸ φόβων τὴν ἀρχήν, μηδὲ ταραχωδῶς ἔχειν πρὸς τὰ συμβαίνοντα, μηδὲ δεξύροπον εἶναι πρὸς τε ὄργην καὶ θυμόν, ἀλλὰ βεβαία καὶ ἀκινήτῳ τῇ διανοίᾳ χρῆσθαι πρὸς ἅπαντας. ('This is proof . . . that the throne is not terrorized by fears, or alarmed at events, and is not quick to wrath and anger, but regards all with a steady and unwavering disposition'.) The tributes to Pius' even temper are many,⁵⁸ but Marcus' is the most similar: 'not easily moved or shifting (μὴ εὐμετακίνητον καὶ ῥιπταστικόν) but persistent in the same places and affairs'.⁵⁹ Just as it may be surmised that criticism of Hadrian underlies this description,⁶⁰ so also Aristides may again be praising Pius by oblique contrast with his predecessor.

11 τὸν γὰρ μαθόντα ἅ χρῆ καὶ παιδευθέντα καὶ μηδενὸς τῶν καλῶν ἀμελήσαντα μηδὲ ἀμαθῆ γενόμενον . . . ('(He has) learned and been educated as he should be, and not neglected or remained ignorant of anything virtuous'.) For Keil 'this amounts to an admission of the emperor's lack of education'.⁶¹ The tribute is conventional, but not embarrassed: it would suit any Roman senator who had passed through the usual studies without pursuing them to excess.⁶² So also Hadrian is made by Dio to say of Pius merely that 'he has been educated according to the laws'.⁶³

13 ὁ δὲ οὕτω καθωσίωτο τῇ βασιλείᾳ ὥστε τὴν πρώτην τεταγμένος ὅπως ἔτυχε ταχθεῖς, ἀδήλου ὄντος τοῦ μέλλοντος, ὁρῶν πολλὰ τῆς βασιλείας οὐ καλῶς οὐδὲ ὀσιῶς

⁵² Cass. Dio, LXIX, 17, 1; *HA Hadr.* 15, 8; 23, 2-3; 23, 8 (*PIR*² I 631). The *HA* asserts that Hadrian killed 'many others' on the same occasion, *Hadr.* 23, 8, but cf. R. Syme, *Historia* 17 (1968), 97. Similarly, in the passage of Isocrates which Aristides is imitating, *Evag.* 9, 25-6, the reference is to the usurper Abdemon who assassinated the Phoenician 'tyrant' of Salamis and so prepared the way for his own overthrow by Evagoras.

⁵³ Keil 396.

⁵⁴ Cass. Dio, LXIX, 23, 3; LXX, 2; *HA Hadr.* 25, 8; *Pius* 2, 4; 6, 3.

⁵⁵ Cass. Dio, LXX, 2. Cf. C. H. Dodd, *Num. Chron.*, 4th ser., 11 (1911), 6-41; P. L. Strack, *Unters. zur röm. Reichspr. des zweiten Jahrh.* II (1933), 191-2.

⁵⁶ *HA Pius* 7, 3-4. The second of these, Cornelius Priscianus, was condemned in 145, so probably after the delivery of the speech, cf. H.-G. Pflaum, *Historia-Augusta Colloquium* 1964/1965 (1966), 145. On the date of the speech, see below, p. 150.

⁵⁷ cf. above, on section 7.

⁵⁸ Thus Cass. Dio, LXIX 20, 4; Philostr., *VS* 534-5; *HA Pius* 11, 8.

⁵⁹ M. Aurelius, *Med.* I, 16, 7.

⁶⁰ Syme, *Tacitus* (1958), 251, n. 5.

⁶¹ Keil 385.

⁶² As Agricola was restrained by his mother from excessive study of philosophy, Tac., *Agr.* 4, 4.

⁶³ Cass. Dio, LXIX, 20, 4.

διοικούμενα, ἀλλὰ πολλὴν αὐθάδειαν καὶ ὕβριν καὶ ἀκολασίαν ἐγγενομένην, οὐκ εἶα αὐξέσθαι οὐδὲ περαιτέρω χωρεῖν, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ μεγάλου σώματος καὶ οὐχ ὑγιαίνοντος ἰώμενος τὰ ὑπουλα καὶ νενοσηκότα αὐτοῦ, ἢ καθάπερ ἵππου χαλεποῦ καὶ βιαίου κατέχων τὸ ἄγριον καὶ ἀπειθές, ἐκφερόμενος μὲν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, πολλὰκις δὲ κατέχων καὶ ἀνακόπτων τὰς συνεχεῖς καὶ ἀλόγους καὶ βιαίους ὁρμάς, ἐπραττεν αὐτῷ καὶ προεώρα τὰ συμφέροντα. ('He was so initiated into rule that, for a while, in the position he happened to hold, while the future was as yet unknown, seeing many things in the realm that were not conducted virtuously or righteously, but much harshness, violence, and lawlessness occurring, he tried not to let them go further, but as if it were a great, unhealthy body he cured (or: tried to cure) what was festering and sick in it, or as if it were a head-strong and violent horse he checked (or: tried to check) its wildness and disobedience, carried along by it, but yet often holding in and restraining its continuous, irrational and violent lunges, and so performed and foresaw what was expedient for it'.) The emperor had clearly been in a position of influence during the previous reign: hence this passage has been applied to Philip's position as *praefectus praetorio* under Gordian III.⁶⁴ Pius had held three positions before his elevation to which these words might apply: as one of the four consulars appointed by Hadrian to administer justice in Italy, as proconsul of Asia, and as a member of the emperor's *consilium*.⁶⁵ An orator from the province of Asia would be thinking above all of the proconsulate, in which Pius was remembered, at least after his accession, for his moderation and diligence.⁶⁶ The phrase 'violent lunges', if it has a more precise application, may allude to the erratic behaviour of Hadrian in his last years: Aristides has already been seen hinting at the tradition that Pius preserved those whom Hadrian had marked out for destruction.⁶⁷

14 ἐπεὶ δὲ ἡ . . . πρόνοια . . . καὶ τοῦτον ἐκάθισεν εἰς τὸν βασιλείον θρόνον, . . . ἀπάντων μὲν κεκινημένων καὶ μεθισταμένων ὡς ἔπος εἶπεῖν εἰς ἑτέραν γῆν, σαλευούσης δὲ τῆς ἀρχῆς ὥσπερ ἐν μεγάλῳ χειμῶνι ἢ σεισμῷ, κἀτα ὡσπερ νεῶς καταδύεσθαι μελλούσης ἀποφερομένης πρὸς ἔσχατα γῆς, οὐ καὶ πρότερον ἀπεπλανήθησάν τινες τῶν ἐν ἀρχαῖς καὶ βασιλείαις γενομένων, κάπειτα ὡσπερ ἐν λαβυρίνθῳ πολλὰς καὶ χαλεπαῖς ἀπορίας ἐντυχόντες τελευτώντες αὐτοὺς ἀπέπειπον, ἀποκλεισθέντες τῆς ὀπίσω ὁδοῦ ἐπανελθεῖν μὴ δυναθέντες, ταῦτα ὁρῶν οὐχ ὡς ἀπειρος κυβερνήτης εἶασεν ὅπως ἔτυχε φέρεσθαι οὐδὲ κινδυνεύειν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἂν ἐμπειρότατος βασιλέων καὶ γνώμη προέχων πρῶτον μὲν ἐπέσχε καὶ ἔπαυσεν τῆς ἐκεῖσε ὁρμῆς, ἔπειτα κατέστησεν εἰς ὄρμον ἄγων. καὶ νῦν ἡ μὲν ἐν ἀσφαλεστάτῳ ὁρμῇ, ὡσπερ ναῦς ἐκ πολλοῦ καταστᾶσα χειμῶνος. ('When providence . . . had set him on the imperial throne . . ., when all was disturbed and so to speak moving to another land, and the empire was tossing as in a great storm or earthquake, then like a ship about to sink was being carried off to the ends of the earth, where indeed some of those in power and on the throne had wandered off previously, and then as if in a labyrinth finding themselves in many intractable difficulties finally despaired of themselves, cut off from the way back and unable to return, seeing this he did not act like an inexperienced pilot, letting it be carried at random and run into danger, but like the most experienced of emperors and the most outstanding in wisdom he first restrained and checked it from its course in that direction, and then settled it in port. And now it is settled in the safest of places, like a ship moored after a heavy storm'.) The reign had clearly begun with a series of troubles on its frontiers, especially in the East:⁶⁸ by resolving them, the emperor had inaugurated a period of peace. Pius on his accession was immediately embroiled with the threat of an eastern war. Vologaeses II of Parthia, after a period of friendly relations with Rome, appears to have taken advantage of the change of emperors to invade Armenia: the dispute was settled, with Vologaeses withdrawing after 'a mere letter' from Pius and Rome 'giving' Armenia a king, at some time between 140 and 144.⁶⁹ The evidence indicates a diplomatic settlement like that concluded by Nero,

⁶⁴ Groag 22, silently correcting Keil's notion that the emperor had held only a minor position before his elevation (385).

⁶⁵ For the evidence, *PIR*² A 1513.

⁶⁶ Note especially *OGIS* 493; *Dig.* 48, 3, 6; Philostr., *VS* 534-5; 554-5; *HA Pius* 3, 2-5.

⁶⁷ Above, on section 8. Cf. below, p. 145.

⁶⁸ So Keil 385, Groag 21, correctly.

⁶⁹ *HA Pius* 9, 6, 'Parthorum regem ab Armeniorum expugnatione solis litteris reppulit. Abgarum regem

ex orientis partibus sola auctoritate deduxit'; coins of 140/144 showing REX ARMENIIS DATVS, Strack, *Unters. zur röm. Reichspr. des zw. Jahrh.* 111 (1937), 66; 262 no. 851. Cf. W. Hüttl, *Antoninus Pius I* (1936), 232-7; D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (1950), 1, 659-60; K.-H. Ziegler, *Die Beziehungen zwischen Rom und dem Partherreich* (1964), 110-12; K. F. Stroheker, *Bonner Historia-Augusta Colloquium 1964/1965* (1966), 243-6.

though, as then, a show of force on the Parthian front may have been necessary to influence negotiations.⁷⁰ The Parthian question seems to have been linked with other eastern disturbances. Invasions of the Alani, a continuation of those resisted by Arrian as governor of Cappadocia in the mid-130's, were apparently repelled by Pius more than once.⁷¹ Trouble from the Alani meant weakness or perfidy in the client-kingdom of the Iberi, through which the invaders had to come: it is likely that the visit of the Iberian king Pharasmenes to Rome, apparently early in the reign, signalled the resumption of friendly relations after a period of strain.⁷² Other interventions in eastern client-kingdoms, in Colchis and Osroene, may belong to the same period and be linked to the settlement with Parthia.⁷³

About 144, therefore, Pius could be represented as having averted or won a *bellum Parthicum* and imposed a Roman vassal on the throne of Armenia. This achievement is what Aristides is mainly referring to when he praises the emperor for having rescued the empire from 'the ends of the earth'. Correspondingly, by those who 'wandered off . . . and incurred many intractable difficulties there', he is hinting not only at figures of the distant past,⁷⁴ but at an event within living memory: Trajan's protracted and inconclusive Parthian war, from which he never returned.⁷⁵

Though the east is foremost in Aristides' mind, the 'storms' beneath which the empire had been 'about to sink' also have a wider reference. The early years of Pius saw several foreign crises besides the Parthian. In Britain, marauders from the north had to be repelled by the legate Lollius Urbicus, who built a new defensive wall against them between the Clyde and the Forth: this war appears to have been over by 142, when Pius took his second, and last, acclamation as *imperator*.⁷⁶ There was also a German war, probably a continuation of the one attested in Pannonia in the last years of Hadrian: this too seems to have been settled at some time before 144, and as in the east the settlement may have been as much diplomatic as military.⁷⁷ Other wars known from the literary sources, in Dacia and Mauretania, and the rebellions in Judaea, Egypt and Achaëa, appear to have erupted later in the reign, though the preliminaries may have occurred before 144.⁷⁸ Despite these warning signs, the regime now broadcast an era of victorious peace.⁷⁹

The historical background, then, amply justifies Aristides' comparison of the empire to 'a ship moored after a heavy storm'. Although the image is frequent, it may not be by coincidence that it appears also in the contemporary works of Fronto. Writing to his pupil Marcus in late 139, Fronto compares 'the difficulties and troubles' surrounding Pius to the waves and storms beating upon an island:⁸⁰ and similarly in his speech of thanks to the

⁷⁰ *ILS* 1076, showing legionary detachments sent to Syria under Pius for a *bellum Parthicum*. This was dated to the beginning of the reign by Fr. Schehl, *Hermes* 65 (1930), 177-93, cf. Groag, *RE* xvi (1935), 2551-2. On Nero's settlement, Ziegler, *op. cit.* 67-78.

⁷¹ *HA Pius* 5, 5, 'Alanos molientis saepe refrenavit'; cf. *BGU* vii, 1564, requisitions for troops in Cappadocia in September 138. This might refer either to the Alani or to the Parthians, cf. Schehl, *art. cit.* 192; Strack, *op. cit.*, iii (1937), 50; H. Nesselhauf, *Athenaeum*, n.s., 36 (1958), 224-6.

⁷² *HA Pius* 9, 6, cf. Cass. Dio, lxi, 15, 3. See now Nesselhauf, *art. cit.*, 219-28 = *AE* 1959, 38.

⁷³ *Lazi*: *HA Pius* 9, 6, cf. Hüttl, *op. cit.*, i (1936), 320-1. Osroene: *HA Pius* 9, 6. If 'Abgarum' here is an error, however, as Ziegler suggests (*op. cit.* 112, n. 111) the *rex* might be the same as the one 'given' to Armenia, which is mentioned in the previous sentence.

⁷⁴ Keil 385-6 thought of Crassus and the Seleucids: there is also C. Caesar, on whose Armenian campaign see now James E. G. Zetzel, *GRBS* xi (1970), 259-66. Aristides' phrase 'despaired of themselves' (αὐτοῦς ἀπείπουν) fits well the accounts of Gaius' end (*Vell. Pat.* ii, 102, 2-3, Cass. Dio, lv, 10, 8).

⁷⁵ Perhaps there is also a glance at Hadrian's Jewish War, personally conducted by the emperor from 134 to 135.

⁷⁶ *HA Pius* 5, 4; Paus. viii, 43, 4. Cf. Hüttl

op. cit., i (1936), 254-63; E. Birley, *Roman Britain and the Roman Army* (1953), 31-47; S. Frere, *Britannia* (1967), 141-50; *PIR*² L 327.

⁷⁷ *HA Pius* 5, 4, cf. *Hadrian*, 23, 13; *Ael.* 3, 2; *ILS* 1058; coins dated 140/144 showing REX QVADIS DATVS, Strack, *op. cit.*, iii (1937), 262, no. 852. Cf. Hüttl, *op. cit.*, i (1936), 271-3; *PIR*² H 30; Mócsy, *RE* Suppl. ix (1962), 554-5; A. Dobó, *Die Verwaltung der römischen Provinz Pannonien von Augustus bis Diocletianus* (1968), 107-8.

⁷⁸ *HA Pius* 5, 4-5. Cf. Hüttl, *op. cit.*, i (1936), 277-87 (Dacia: but the tripartition of Dacia is now known to have occurred under Hadrian, C. Daicovicu and D. Protase, *JRS* LI, 1961, 67-9); 290-5 (Egypt: on the date, see below); 301-15 (Mauretania); 315-20 (Judaea); 320 (Achaëa). For early trouble in Dacia and Mauretania, Aristides, 26, 70. Aristides' reference there to war 'on the Red Sea' is generally taken to refer to the rebellion in Egypt (on the chronological difficulties, O. W. Reinmuth, *BASP* 4, 1967, 97); it might, however, refer to the province of Arabia.

⁷⁹ Strack, *op. cit.*, iii (1937), 53-9.

⁸⁰ Fronto, p. 40, lines 25 ff. van den Hout; on the date, Mommsen, *Ges. Schr.* iv (1906), 481. Compare the picture of the empire as a walled enclosure that begins to appear in writers of this period, Aristides 26, 82-4; Appian, *praef.* 28.

emperor in 143 Fronto compared Pius' conduct of the British campaign to that of a pilot guiding a ship, a metaphor identical to one used by Aristides.⁸¹

15 ὁ δὲ οὕτως ἐξηγείται καὶ διέπει τὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς ὄνπερ χρῆ τὸν εὐσεβίαν . . . καὶ δικαιοσύνην . . . κοσμοῦντα. ἤρξατο μὲν γὰρ, ὡσπερ προσήκει, ἀπὸ εὐσεβείας . . . ('He guides and administers affairs of state as a man who lends lustre to piety and justice . . . for he began, as is fitting, with piety'.) As before, Aristides plays on the emperor's title of 'Pius' (Εὐσεβής). This was accorded to him within months of his accession, so that he indeed 'began with' it.⁸²

16 τῆς γὰρ συντάξεως ὑπερβαλλούσης τῆς εἰς τὴν διοίκησιν συντεταγμένης, καὶ φόρων ἐπιταχθέντων πλείονων καὶ οὐδὲ τούτων ἀρκούντων, ἀλλὰ κεκενωμένων μὲν τῶν πανταχοῦ ταμείων, αἱ δὲ μείζονος ὄντος τοῦ περὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος φόβου, οὐ τοῦ πλείονος ἐδεήθη . . . ἀλλ' ἀνῆκε καὶ ἐπεκούφισεν. ('The tribute levied for the administration had been increasing, more taxes had been imposed, and even these were not enough, but the treasuries everywhere were emptied, and fear for the future was greater all the time: but he did not require an increase . . . but remitted and lightened (the taxes)'). The prudence of Pius' financial policy is well attested.⁸³ Aristides seems to be thinking in particular of the remission of half the *aurum coronarium* to the provinces, which is celebrated on the so-called Province Series of coins in 139.⁸⁴ While Hadrian's administration may well have strained the treasury,⁸⁵ Aristides has probably exaggerated the plight of the provinces under him in order to throw Pius' regime into greater relief. This time-honoured device, so long as it was artfully applied, allowed the speaker wide liberties with past history: thus in the Roman Oration Aristides exalts Pius' legal expertise above that of all other emperors, despite the achievements of Hadrian.⁸⁶ On the other hand, to praise a ruling emperor for virtues that he too conspicuously lacked could appear an insult. That might have been the effect of such a compliment addressed to Philip the Arab, whose financial policies laid heavy burdens on the provinces.⁸⁷

17-19 τὴν δὲ πρὸς τὰς δίκας δικαιοσύνην καὶ φιλανθρωπίαν τίς ἂν ἀξίως ἐπαινέσειεν; . . . τούτου δὲ αἴτιον ὅτι οὐκ εἰς ἑτέρους ὁρῶν ἐρμηγέας οὕτω λαμβάνει τὸ δίκαιον, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ἔχων ἐκ παιδείας τῶν ὡς ἀληθῶς καλῶν καὶ [τῶν] ἀγαθῶν ἐπιστήμην τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν νόμων ἐμπειρίαν προσειληφώς, ὥστε μὴ τι τῶν γεγραμμένων διαφεύγειν αὐτόν . . . οὐδεὶς γοῦν ἔστιν ὅστις . . . ἐμέμψατο τῶν κριθέντων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, οὔτε διώκων ἠττηθεὶς οὔτε φεύγων ἀλοῦς, ἀλλὰ στέργοντες ἀμφοτέροι καὶ προσκυνοῦντες ἀπέρχονται. ('Who could properly praise the justice and humanity of his verdicts? . . . The reason is that he does not look to other interpreters to find what is just, but having from his training experience of what is truly virtuous and good he has also experience in the laws, so that not a single item of what has been written escapes him . . . No one . . . finds fault with his decisions, neither the plaintiff who loses his case nor the defendant who is found guilty, but both parties depart satisfied and with obeisance'.) Pius' career before his elevation, in particular his selection as one of the four consulars to administer justice in Italy, and his considerable legal activity as emperor are the background for this tribute of Aristides.⁸⁸ Pius' legal expertise is also singled out from among his other qualities for praise in the Roman Oration.⁸⁹ The reference to προσκύνησις has been taken to indicate a post-Antonine date.⁹⁰ This word may denote formal adoration, as it does elsewhere in the speech;⁹¹ Lucian shows that in Rome of the mid-second century even eminent *privati* commonly received a form of προσκύνησις.⁹² It

⁸¹ Paneg. Lat. 8 (4), 14, 2. This fragment (not in van den Hout) is probably from the *gratiarum actio* of 143, cf. v. Rohden, *RE* II (1896), 2502.

⁸² *PIR*² A 1513, p. 311 ('inde ab initio fere imperii'), Strack, op. cit. II (1933), 190-2, III (1937), 2-3, 25, n. 44.

⁸³ References in Hüttl, op. cit., I (1936), 340; cf. Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*² (1957) I, 371.

⁸⁴ *HA Pius* 4, 10; cf. Strack, op. cit. III (1937), 39-43.

⁸⁵ On Hadrian's finances, cf. Cass. Dio, LXIX, 5, 1; *HA Hadr.* 6, 5; Rostovtzeff, op. cit. I, 362-71; and below, p. 152.

⁸⁶ 26, 107. On Hadrian and the law, B. d'Orgeval, *L'Empereur Hadrien: œuvre législative et administra-*

tive (1950); A. d'Ors, in *Les empereurs romains d'Espagne* (1965), 147-58. Cf. also below, pp. 146.

⁸⁷ Th. Pekáry, *Syria* 38 (1961), 275-83; P. J. Parsons, *JRS* 57 (1967), 134-41.

⁸⁸ *HA Pius* 12, 1, 'multa de iure sanxit'. The references in the *Digest* and elsewhere are collected by D. G. Hänel, *Corpus Legum* (1851), 101-14; G. Gualandi, *Legislazione imperiale e Giurisprudenza* I (1963), 58-102. Cf. Hüttl, *Antoninus Pius* I (1936), 70-129.

⁸⁹ 26, 38; 107 (where Keil adduces this passage).

⁹⁰ Louis J. Swift, *GRBS* 7 (1966), 286.

⁹¹ 35, 35.

⁹² Luc., *Nigr.* 21.

may, however, mean merely 'pay respect', a sense attested in contemporary papyri.⁹³ In either case it is no evidence for a date later than the reign of Pius.

20 εἰ δ' αὖ τὸ φιλέλληνα εἶναι καλὸν καὶ πρέπον βασιλεῖ, τούτῳ προσήκων ὁ ἔπαινος· οὕτω γὰρ σφόδρα φιλέλλην ἔστιν ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ τοσοῦτον αὐτῷ περίεστιν τούτου τοῦ καλοῦ ὥστε ἡμελημένης τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων παιδείας καὶ καταπεφρονημένης, ἀνηρημένων δὲ τῶν ἐπ' αὐτῇ τιμῶν, παρεωσμένου δὲ καὶ ἐν οὐδενὸς ὄντος μέρι παντὸς τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ, οὐκ ἡμέλησεν ὁ βασιλεὺς, ἀλλὰ πρὸς ταῖς ὑπαρχούσαις τιμαῖς καὶ ἄλλας προσέθηκεν. ('If to be a philhellene is virtuous and fitting for an emperor, this praise belongs to the present one: for so very great a philhellene is the emperor, and such an abundance of this virtue does he have, that when Greek education was neglected and despised, its honours removed, and all that is Greek was thrust aside and of no account, the emperor did not neglect it, but added new honours to those already existing'.) This passage is the cardinal objection to identifying the emperor as Pius, since his predecessor Hadrian had been one of the most conspicuous philhellenes on the Roman throne.⁹⁴ It should be noted, however, that Aristides refers particularly to Greek παιδεία and the honours paid to it. Proud and jealous of his own erudition, Hadrian showed the same unpredictability in his relations with Greek *litterati* as with his other associates.⁹⁵ Early in the reign, the Syrian philosopher Euphrates, once admired by the younger Pliny, was ordered to commit suicide.⁹⁶ Near the end of it, the architect Apollodorus was exiled and put to death.⁹⁷ The sophist Favorinus, who for a long time skilfully weathered the emperor's caprices, was finally relegated to an island.⁹⁸ Along with Favorinus, Hadrian is said to have 'tried to destroy' another sophist, Dionysius of Miletus.⁹⁹ The learned Valerius Eudaemon, after a long and varied career in the emperor's service, suddenly found himself without employment.¹⁰⁰ The same fate overtook the Syrian philosopher Avidius Heliodorus, previously in charge of the emperor's Greek correspondence.¹⁰¹ Hadrian himself, or a group influential with the declining emperor, restored Heliodorus to influence as prefect of Egypt at the very end of the reign,¹⁰² and Pius appointed Eudaemon to succeed him a few years later.¹⁰³ Favorinus is found flourishing in Rome early in the new reign.¹⁰⁴ It is likely that, in this as in other respects, Pius consciously attempted to efface the bitter memories of Hadrian's last years, and that such a policy lies behind the present passage of Aristides. The orator's interest was not merely casual. Heliodorus was his friend and patron, and two of his teachers, Alexander of Cotiaeum and Herodes Atticus, were appointed by Pius as tutors to the princes Marcus and Lucius.¹⁰⁵ The influence of such friends at court may be closely connected with the circumstances in which the εἰς βασιλεία was delivered.¹⁰⁶

As for Pius' own philhellenism, naturally inscriptions from the Greek East acclaim him

⁹³ Preisigke, *Wörterbuch* s.v.

⁹⁴ Thus Keil 382: 'das (the identification with Pius) widerlegt einfache Lektüre. So würde Hadrian als Vorgänger des Pius zu einem der Herrscher, welche griechische Bildung verachtet und unterdrückt haben'.

⁹⁵ Note Marcus' tribute to Pius, *Med.* 1, 16, 5: 'his tendency to honour true lovers of wisdom, but not to reproach the other kind nor yet to be easily led by them'.

⁹⁶ Cass. Dio, LXIX, 8, 3, ὁ Εὐφράτης ὁ φιλόσοφος ἀπέθανεν ἐθελόντης, ἐπιτρέψαντος αὐτῷ καὶ τοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ κώνειον καὶ διὰ τὸ γῆρας καὶ διὰ τὴν νόσον πιεῖν. It is generally assumed (though not by A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny* [1966], 108) that Euphrates' suicide was voluntary, but Dio's language makes clear that he was merely allowed the *arbitrium mortis*: cf., of another of Hadrian's victims, *HA Hadr.* 15, 4, 'ad voluntarium mortem coegit'. On Euphrates, see Pliny, *Epp.* 1, 10 with Sherwin-White's commentary; *PIR*² E 121. Some connection with the supposed conspirators of 118 may be suspected, perhaps with the philosophic Avidius Nigrinus (*PIR*² A 1408; C. P. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome* [1971], 53-4).

⁹⁷ Cass. Dio, LXIX, 4, 1 (*PIR*² A 922).

⁹⁸ Cass. Dio, LXIX, 3, 4; 6; *HA Hadr.* 15, 12-13; 16, 10 (*PIR*² F 123; G. W. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* [1969], 51-2).

⁹⁹ Cass. Dio, LXIX, 3, 4, καταλείβει ἐπεχείρει (*PIR*² D 105; Bowersock, op. cit. 52; for a new inscription, *Anz. Akad. Wien* 106 [1969], 136-7).

¹⁰⁰ *HA Hadr.* 15, 3, 'Eudaemonem prius conscium imperii ad egestatem perduxit'; *ILS* 1449. Pflaum, *Les Carrières procuratoriennes équestres* 1 (1960), 264-71, no. 110; Bowersock, op. cit. 50-3.

¹⁰¹ Cass. Dio, LXIX, 3, 5; *HA Hadr.* 15, 5; 16, 10. *PIR*² A 1405; Pflaum, op. cit., 1 (1960), 251-3, no. 106; Bowersock, op. cit. 50-3. Pflaum, 253, distinguished the *ab epistulis* from the discarded friend, but see Bowersock 51.

¹⁰² Reinmuth, *BASP* 4 (1967), 95; R. Coles, *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Congress of Papyrology* (1970), 85-7, a new edict of Heliodorus, perhaps showing that he became prefect between 28 August and 7 September, 137.

¹⁰³ Reinmuth, op. cit. 96.

¹⁰⁴ A. Gellius, II, 26. However, the date of 143 assumed for this anecdote in *PIR*² F 123, e.g., is not assured.

¹⁰⁵ Heliodorus: Behr, *Aelius Aristides and the Sacred Tales* (1968), 16; 82. Alexander as imperial tutor: Aristides, 32, 14; *HA Marcus* 2, 3 (*PIR*² A 502). Herodes: *HA Marcus* 2, 4; *Verus* 2, 5 (*PIR*² C 802).

¹⁰⁶ See below, p. 151.

as a saviour and benefactor.¹⁰⁷ Pausanias in a long digression praises him for his generosity to the Greeks, and according to the *Historia Augusta* he gave 'honours and salaries to rhetors and philosophers throughout the empire'.¹⁰⁸ It is true that he kept a strict eye on the claims of such practitioners to immunity from local burdens, but that shows concern for the financial health of the subject cities, not hostility to Greek culture.¹⁰⁹ The later Greek tradition closely resembles the Latin in praising Pius and criticizing Hadrian for his jealousy and capriciousness.¹¹⁰ As elsewhere in the speech, Aristides has enhanced the effect of Pius' benevolence by exaggerating the contrast with his predecessors.

It might be held that the passage causes greater difficulty applied to Philip the Arab than to Pius. Philip's predecessor, the boy Gordian, appears to have been of Greek-speaking origin himself, and was probably related to Herodes Atticus: his philhellenism and popularity in the Greek East are abundantly attested.¹¹¹ It has accordingly been suggested that the orator is thinking of Maximinus: but nothing known about Maximinus suggests an enemy of Greek culture.¹¹²

21 κατεπτηχῶς ἅπαν τὸ ὑπήκοον καὶ ὑπὸ φόβου δεδουλωμένον, πολλῶν τῶν κατηκῶν περιόντων καὶ ὠτακουστῶντων κατὰ πάσας τὰς πόλεις εἴ τις φθέγγαιτό τι, . . . ἀπήλλαξε τοῦ φόβου τούτου καὶ ἠλευθέρωσε τὰς ἀπάντων ψυχάς, ἐντελῆ καὶ ὀλόκληρον ἀποδιδούς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν αὐτοῖς. ('Every subject had been cowed and enslaved by fear, since many spies went around eavesdropping in every city for anything a person might utter . . . ; but he rid (his subjects) of this fear and freed everyone's spirit, giving them back their freedom whole and entire'.) Here again Aristides seems to have exaggerated a well-known feature of Hadrian's rule, his use of *frumentarii* as secret agents,¹¹³ in order to set off the more relaxed policy of his successor. According to his biographer, Pius abolished public informers, *quadruplatores*; ¹¹⁴ his elaborate display of *civilitas* makes it plausible that the *frumentarii* were similarly curbed.

22 ἡμερότητι καὶ ἐπιεικείᾳ διενήνοχεν ἀπάντων βασιλέων, ὥστε μικρὸν μὲν οἶα "πατήρ", μικρὸν δὲ οἶα "ποιμὴν τῶν λαῶν" εἰπεῖν εἶναι καὶ πάντα ὅσα ποιητὰι δυνάστας ὑμνοῦντες ἐφθέγγαντο. ('He exceeds all emperors in gentleness and goodness, so that tributes like 'father' and 'shepherd of his people' and all that poets have uttered in praise of rulers, are too little'.) Pausanias similarly closes his panegyric of Pius, 'This emperor the Romans called Pious . . . but in my opinion he should be awarded the title of the elder Cyrus and be called 'Father of Men''.¹¹⁵

23-4 μηδὲν δεῖν ἕνεκα τῆς προσόδου πραγματεῦσθαι . . . οὐ γὰρ τῷ σπάνιον καὶ δυσπρόσοδον παρέχειν ἑαυτὸν ἡγεῖται τὴν τοῦ μέγας καὶ θαυμαστὸς . . . δόξαν ἀποίσεσθαι βασιλεύς. ('There is no need to go to trouble to approach him . . . for he does not make himself scarce and inaccessible in the expectation of winning himself a reputation as a great and marvellous emperor'.) Pius' biographer also praises him for his accessibility and avoidance of ceremony.¹¹⁶

24-6 . . . οἰόμενος δεῖν . . . μὴ πρὸ μὲν τῆς βασιλείας χρηστὸν τι καὶ μέτριον ἦθος ἐμφαίνειν ἑαυτοῦ, βασιλέα δὲ ἀποδειχθέντα χαλεπὸν καὶ βίαιον εἶναι περὶ τοὺς ἀρχομένους . . . (26) ὁ δ' ἐπέδειξεν ὅτι καὶ ἰδιώτην ὄντα καὶ βασιλέα οἶόν τε ἐστὶ τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι διὰ τέλους. ('He does not think that before becoming emperor one should show a kind and moderate nature, then when appointed emperor be harsh and cruel with one's subjects . . . (26). He

¹⁰⁷ D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (1950), 1, 630-3. The 'Italian' aspects of Pius' rule do not show that he 'did not share the philhellenic and cosmopolitan tastes of his predecessor Hadrian' (J. M. C. Toynbee, *CR* 39 [1925], 170). Cf. J. Beaujeu, *La religion romaine à l'apogée de l'empire* 1 (1955), 298-311: 'Antonin philhellène'.

¹⁰⁸ Paus. VIII, 43, 4-6; *HA Pius* II, 3. Cf. Philostr., *VS* 534, and also *CIG* 2811 b, lines 8-11 = Lebas-Waddington, 1620 a, lines 7-9.

¹⁰⁹ *Dig.* 27, 1, 6, 2; 7, cf. *HA Pius* 7, 7-8. See G. W. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (1969), 33-4; 40. Similarly Groag 36, n. 3, correctly argued that Philip's denial of immunity to poets, *Cod. Just.* 10, 53, 3, does not disqualify him as the emperor here.

¹¹⁰ Thus cf. Julian, *Caes.* 311 D-312 A; Suda, A 527; 2762, with *Aur. Vict.* 14-15; *Eutr.* 8.

6-8; *Epit. de Caes.* 14-15. Cf. now K. F. Stroheker, *Bonner Historia-Augusta Colloquium* 1964/1965 (1966), 247-53.

¹¹¹ On his origin see (most recently) Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (1969), 7-8; V. Nutton, *Latomus* 29 (1970), 719-28; Syme, *Emperors and Biography* (1971), 167-8; on his philhellenism, L. Robert, *CRAI* 1970, 14-6.

¹¹² For this suggestion, Groag 35-6. Maximinus apparently gave *ornamenta consularia* to Apsines of Gadara (Suda, A 4735; on the reading, *PIR*² A 978). See now R. Syme, *op. cit.* 179-93.

¹¹³ Cass. Dio, LXIX, 5, 1; *HA Hadr.* II, 4-6, cf. *Syll.*³ 830.

¹¹⁴ *HA Pius* 7, 2.

¹¹⁵ Paus. VIII, 43, 5-6.

¹¹⁶ *HA Pius* 6, 4; 6, 12; 7, 6; 7, 10; II, 1. Cf. M. Aurelius, *Med.* I, 16 *passim*; VI, 30, 2-4.

has shown that it is possible to be unchangingly the same, both as a private person and as emperor'.) The tribute is conventional,¹¹⁷ but exactly fits what is recorded of Pius: 'he treated his friends as ruler just as he had when private.'¹¹⁸

26-7 παράδειγμα δὲ σωφροσύνης ἑαυτὸν παρασχών . . . καὶ μὴν καὶ ὅσαι ἡδοναὶ ἄρχουσιν ἀνθρώπων οὐδεμιᾶς ἴσμεν ἡττημένον τὸν βασιλέα . . . τίς μὲν γὰρ οὕτω γαστροὺς ἐγκρατῆς, τίς δὲ ἀφροδισίων, τίς δὲ τῶν ἄλλων ἡδονῶν; . . . οὐδὲ ὡσπερ ἄλλοι τινὲς βασιλεῖς πρὸς τε ἀνδρείαν καὶ φιλανθρωπίαν ἐπιεικῶς ἔχειν δόξαντες ἀκολαστότατοι περὶ τὰς ἡδονὰς καὶ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας ὄντες ἐφάνησαν. ('He shows himself a model of restraint. . . . Of all the pleasures that rule men there is none to which we know the emperor to be subject. . . . Who is so above gluttony, sex, and other pleasures? . . . Not like certain other emperors who seemed to be fairly endowed with manliness and humanity, but proved most licentious in their pleasures and desires'.) Again, the praise is conventional, but deserves comparison with the tribute of Pius' heir: 'What is recorded of Socrates would fit him, that he could both resist and enjoy the things which most people are weak in resisting and abandoned in enjoying'.¹¹⁹ Aristides illustrates his reference to certain other 'kings' who combined apparent manliness with licentiousness by the examples of Agamemnon and Achilles: but there may be a covert allusion to Pius' immediate predecessors, Trajan and Hadrian, both soldier emperors and both notorious for soldierly vices.¹²⁰

30 τὰ μὲν πρὸς πολεμίους ἀνδρείοις πολλοῖς ὑπῆρξε γενέσθαι, ὑπὸ δὲ τῶν σφετέρων στρατιωτῶν αὐτοὺς ἄρχεσθαι· ὁ δὲ οὕτως ῥαδίως ἐκράτησε καὶ κατεστήσατο ὥστε πολλῶν μὲν καὶ ἀπειρῶν ὄντων τῶν διδομένων αὐτοῖς, χαλεπῶν δὲ καὶ φοβερῶν, εἰ μὴ τοσαῦτα λαμβάνοιεν καὶ ἔτι πλείω τῶν διδομένων αὐτοῖς, οὐχ ὅπως ἐπηύξησεν τὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν, ἀλλ' ὀρίσας τὸ δέον τοὺς μὲν στρατιώτας πρὸς τοὺς πόνους καὶ τὴν ἄσκησιν τῶν σωμάτων ἀμείνους ἐποίησεν . . . τοῦτο ποιήσας ἐπήμυνε μὲν ταῖς τῶν ἀρχομένων ἐνδείαις, ἐπεμελήθη δὲ τῆς εὐταξίας τῶν στρατιωτῶν, τῶν δὲ χρημάτων βεβαιότεραν ἐποίησεν τὴν πρόσοδον. ('Many have proved to be brave against their enemies, but to be ruled by their soldiers; but he so easily checked and settled them that, although the gifts given to them had been many and enormous, and they were unruly and menacing unless they received the same amount or even more than what had been given to them, so far from increasing their desires, he drew the limit at what was necessary and made the soldiers better in regard to labour and the exercise of their bodies. . . . By doing this he met the needs of his subjects, saw to the discipline of the soldiers, and made more secure the income from revenues'.) This passage has proved misleading. It can be excluded *a priori* that the present emperor had been the donor of the 'many limitless gifts': that would be an insult, and the Greek need only mean that such gifts had been given previously.¹²¹ Nor is it true that the passage describes a prolonged period of military anarchy such as could not have occurred between Nerva and Commodus.¹²² This picture, like that of the neglect of Greek culture and the terrors caused by secret agents, is likely to be overdrawn as a contrast to the present situation. Hadrian had granted the soldiers a double donative at his accession, and his familiarity with them was a byword.¹²³ While it is not known how large Pius' donative was, fear of the soldiers played an important part in the first weeks of the reign.¹²⁴ Aristides, making the best of the facts, praises the emperor for 'drawing the limit at what was necessary' (ὀρίσας τὸ δέον); and it is no coincidence that Marcus likewise praises Pius for 'considering what had to be done (τὸ δέον προαχθῆναι) and not glory for what he did' in making public largesses.¹²⁵ Similarly, the 'labours' and the 'discipline' to which Pius subjected his armies were in part the involuntary response to a series of frontier wars.¹²⁶

¹¹⁷ Menander III, 375. 8-18 Sp.

¹¹⁸ *HA Pius* 11, 1.

¹¹⁹ M. Aurelius, *Med.* 1, 16, 9.

¹²⁰ Cass. Dio, LXVIII, 7, 4; Julian, *Caes.* 311 C; 318 C-D; 327 B-C; 333 A; *HA Hadr.* 2, 7; 3, 3; 4, 5; 14, 5-7; 23, 10. Similarly, in the Roman Oration the mockery of the Persian King always travelling around his empire may glance at Hadrian, 26, 18.

¹²¹ That is, διδομένων stands for the finite ἐδίδοτο; cf. ὄντος, 20; περιόντων καὶ ὠτακουσούντων, 21 (Kühner-Gerth, 1, 200, Anm. 9). Louis J. Swift, *GRBS* 7 (1966), 279, translates, 'even when he

provided them with a great many—or rather, limitless—donatives', and adduces coins of Philip with the legend LIBERALITAS.

¹²² As Groag 22.

¹²³ *HA Hadr.* 5, 7 (donative); Fronto, p. 195 lines 8-12 van den Hout (familiarity).

¹²⁴ *HA Pius* 8, 1 (donative); Cass. Dio, LXX, 1, 3 (fear). On Pius' *liberalitates*, G. Barbieri in De Ruggiero, *Dizionario epigrafico* 4 (1957), 845-50.

¹²⁵ M. Aurelius, *Med.* 1, 16, 7.

¹²⁶ Note the coins of 140/144 proclaiming DISCIPLINA: Strack, *Unters. zur röm. Reichspr. des zw. Jahrh.* III (1937), 56; 260, no. 828.

32-4 φρονήσεως δὲ πολλὰ μὲν καὶ ἄλλα ἔργα ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ παρέσχηται, κάλλιστον δὲ καὶ πλείστου ἄξιον ἢ πρὸς τοὺς πολέμους εὐβουλία τε καὶ σύνεσις τοῦ βασιλέως, ὅτι ὄρων ἐν τοῖς πολέμοις τοὺς δεινούς καὶ πολεμικούς εἶναι δοκοῦντας οἰομένους δεῖν τῷ μάχεσθαι νικᾶν, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ τῷ καλῶς βουλευέσθαι, οὐκ ἐμιμήσατο ἐκείνους . . . οἱ μὲν τὴν ἀνδρείαν ἐπὶ παντὸς καιροῦ καὶ πάσης προφάσεως ἀποδείκνυσθαι βουλόμενοι τυχόντες μὲν κατώρθωσαν, ἡττηθέντες δὲ συμφοραῖς μεγίσταις ἑαυτοὺς καὶ τοὺς φίλους περιβάλλουσιν, οἱ δὲ γιγνώσκοντες τὰ δέοντα καὶ λογιζόμενοι κατορθώσαντες μὲν τυγχάνουσιν οὐδὲν ἥττον ὢν ἐβουλήθησαν, διαμαρτόντες δὲ οὐδὲν βλάπτονται. ('He has performed many deeds of wisdom in his reign, but the most virtuous and valuable is the emperor's prudence (εὐβουλία) and discretion with regard to wars. He saw that those who seemed to be bold and warlike thought that they should win by fighting, not by wise deliberation: but he did not imitate them . . . (34) Those who want to display their courage on every occasion and at every excuse may happen to succeed, but if defeated throw themselves and their friends into the greatest disasters: but those who recognize and calculate what needs doing, if they succeed, achieve what they desired all the same, but if they fail they come to no harm'.) It is clear that, by contrast with his predecessors, the emperor has avoided meeting his enemies in the field and preferred diplomacy.¹²⁷ Aristides illustrates the dangers of rashness from the example of Xerxes, but his audience may have thought of other 'kings': Trajan, who died in the east after a protracted and difficult war with Parthia, and Hadrian, who personally conducted the bitter war against the Jews on his last absence from Rome. Pius, by contrast, remained in Rome and its vicinity for the length of his reign, relying on diplomacy and his legates to deal with his enemies.¹²⁸ 'Prudence' (εὐβουλία) seems to have been the slogan whereby the sharp break with previous policy was concealed and justified: it recurs in Appian's description of Rome's foreign policy, written about the end of Pius' reign.¹²⁹

35-6 καὶ μὴν οὐδ' ἐν ταῖς μάχαις καὶ τοῖς ὅπλοις αὐτὸν ἐμέμψαντο οἱ πολέμιοι, ἀλλ' ἐπέδειξεν αὐτοῖς οὐ μόνον συνέσει καὶ τῇ ἄλλῃ παιδείᾳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀνδρείᾳ κρατεῖν αὐτῶν δυνάμενος. ὅπου γὰρ Κελτοὶ μὲν οἱ μέγιστοι καὶ φονικώτατοι τῶν ὑπὸ ἡλίῳ πολλὰ δὴ καὶ παντοῖα τολμήσαντες νῦν προσκυνοῦσι τὸν δεσπότην, γνόντες τὸ τὴν ἡσυχίαν ἄγειν ὡς ἄμεινον ἦν καὶ ποιεῖν τὸ προσταττόμενον τοῦ πολεμεῖν (τοῦτο τὸ ὄνομα λείπεται μόνον τοῦ γένους), πᾶν δὲ ὅσον Εὐφράτου τε καὶ Τίγρητος ἐπέκεινα πρὸς ἀνατολὰς οἰκεῖ διακινήθην καὶ δὴ κατήρτυται τε καὶ πεπαίδευται τοὺς κρείττους εἰδέναι, ἡσυχάζει δὲ πᾶσα ἡπειρος, γῆ δὲ καὶ θάλαττα τὸν προστάτην στεφανοῦσιν, Ἕλληνες δὲ καὶ βάρβαροι ταῦτ' ἤδη φθέγγονται, ἢ δὲ ἀρχὴ καθάπερ ναῦς τις ἢ τεῖχος ἐπεσκεύασται τε καὶ ὠχύρωται καὶ τὸ αὐτῆς βεβαίως κεκόμισται ἀγαθόν, τίνα ταῦτα οὐχ ὑπερβέβληκεν ἀνδρείαν, ἢ τίς ἀμείνων καὶ λυσιτελεστέρα γένοιτ' ἂν ταύτης κατάστασις; ('And yet his enemies have not found fault with him in battles and arms. He has shown them that he can conquer them not only by discretion and his general wisdom, but also by bravery. For whereas the Celts, the greatest and most murderous people under the sun, after many outrages of every kind now worship their master, realizing that it is better to remain quiet and to perform his bidding rather than to make war—only the name of the race is left—, everything beyond the Euphrates and Tigris to the east, after being stirred up, is now at last chastened and has been taught to know its betters, every continent is quiet, land and sea crown their champion, Greeks and barbarians speak now with one voice, the empire like a ship or a wall is prepared, strengthened, and in firm possession of its benefits—what bravery is better than all this, what situation could be better and more profitable than this?') The sentence beginning ὅπου γὰρ . . . has been discussed above as an example of Aristides' cumulative style.¹³⁰ Since the previous one praises the emperor's ἀνδρεία, the following causal clause must introduce the rhetorical question, τίνα ταῦτα οὐχ ὑπερβέβληκεν ἀνδρείαν; Hence the usual punctuation, with a stop after εἰδέναι and a new sentence beginning at ἡσυχάζει, cannot be right. The parenthetical sentence, τοῦτο τὸ ὄνομα λείπεται μόνον τοῦ γένους, has also caused trouble. Keil assumed a lacuna before τοῦτο, both because of the asyndeton and because a race that has just been said to 'worship its master' cannot also be called 'only a name': in this lacuna there stood the name of another tribe alleged by the speaker to have been not merely reduced

¹²⁷ Thus Keil 386, Groag 32-3.

¹²⁸ *HA Pius* 5, 4; 7, 11; 9, 6; cf. Schehl, *Hermes* 65 (1930), 193-208.

¹²⁹ Appian, *praef.* 26; 43. On Appian's date, E. Schwartz, *RE* II (1895), 216.

¹³⁰ Above, p. 137.

but annihilated.¹³¹ But these slight asyndeta within a sentence are characteristic of Aristides: compare 26, 16 πρῶτον μὲν τοίνυν . . . τοῦτ' ἦν ἀπλῶς τῷ βασιλεῖ θάλαττα, ἐνταῦθα ὠρίζετο ἡ ἀρχή . . . εἰς δέ γε τὴν Ἑλλάδα διαβῆναι ποτε ἐπιχειρήσας . . .¹³² Nor need the tribe be obliterated to be 'only a name': it sufficed that its warlike reputation be a thing of the past.

It follows, if this is right, that Aristides has selected two exploits as examples of the emperor's bravery, a defeat of the 'Celts' and a 'lesson' to those across the eastern border. Keil identified the Celts as Germans,¹³³ and that could be right: a German war is attested in the first years of Pius' reign.¹³⁴ But Aristides will simultaneously, perhaps chiefly, be referring to Pius' British victory of about 141, which figures so prominently in the propaganda of the time.¹³⁵ It seems likely that this was the occasion on which northern marauders broke through the Roman defences and had to be driven back by force of arms,¹³⁶ and this fits Aristides' reference to their 'many outrages of every kind'. The language in which he speaks of the east, however, seems rather to point to a diplomatic settlement:¹³⁷ and this again fits what is known of Pius' accommodation with Parthia and the eastern client-kingdoms in the first years of the reign.¹³⁸ Aristides' praise of the ensuing peace echoes Pius' coinage, which from 144 to 151 has this as one of its principal motifs, thus announcing a new era after the upheavals of the early years.¹³⁹ A similar panegyric of the Roman peace, and the same comparison of the empire to a walled enclosure, occurs in the Roman Oration delivered in 144.¹⁴⁰

37 νῦν καὶ πανηγύρεις φαιδρότεραι καὶ ἑορταὶ θεοφιλέστεραι· νῦν καὶ τὸ Δήμητρος πῦρ λαμπρότερον καὶ ἱερώτερον. ('Now festivals are more cheerful and feasts more acceptable to the gods: now the torch of Demeter too is brighter and more sacred'.) Since nothing in the context requires the reference to Demeter, it has rightly been regarded as a clue to the occasion of the speech or the personality of the speaker. Those who saw Marcus as the emperor took it as a reference to the Eleusinian mysteries into which he and Commodus were initiated in 176.¹⁴¹ Groag used the passage to support the authorship of Nicagoras, since he was sacred herald at Eleusis.¹⁴² But the reference would fit Aristides equally well, since he may have been an initiate and was to deliver a famous threnody for the temple when it was sacked by the Costoboci.¹⁴³

38 ὦ πάντας βασιλέας παρεληλυθῶς, σοφία μὲν τοὺς σοφοὺς, ἀνδρεία δὲ τοὺς ἀνδρείους, εὐσεβεία δὲ τοὺς ἐπὶ ταύτῃ διαφέροντας, εὐτυχία δὲ τοὺς εὐτυχεστάτους. ('You that have surpassed all emperors, in wisdom the wise, in bravery the brave, in piety those who most excelled in this, in fortune the most fortunate'.) This sentence has been taken to indicate a third-century date on the ground that the express elevation of the emperor above all his predecessors is not found before Caracalla.¹⁴⁴ But the boasts of the third century had long since been anticipated by emperors like Nero and Commodus;¹⁴⁵ still less were panegyrists expected to confine themselves to the language of official titulature.¹⁴⁶

Aristides' reference to the emperor's piety, the fifth in the speech, again plays upon the title 'Pius'.¹⁴⁷

39 σὲ δὲ, ὦ παῖ γενναῖε γενναίων, κατ' ἴχνος εἶη βαίνειν τοῦ πατρός. ('And you,

¹³¹ Keil, app. crit. ad loc., and also 405; so also Groag 21; 34.

¹³² Keil adds ⟨η⟩ before θάλαττα, unnecessarily. Cf. also *Pan.* 11, ὥστε ἔοικεν, κτλ.

¹³³ Keil, app. crit. ad loc.; in his article 413, he thought of Britons.

¹³⁴ Above, p. 143.

¹³⁵ Above, p. 143. That is, Aristides uses Κέλτοι in preference to the unclassical Βρεταννοί, as he uses Γέται of the Dacians, 26, 70. For Κέλτοι cf. also 22, 8.

¹³⁶ Paus. VIII, 43, 4, of Pius, ἀπετέμετο δὲ καὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ Βριταννίᾳ Βριγάντων τὴν πολλήν, ὅτι ἐπεσβαίνειν καὶ οὗτοι σὺν ὁπλοῖς ἤρξαν ἐς τὴν Γενουσίαν μοῖραν ὑπηκόους Ῥωμαίων. It has been argued, however, that this refers to the campaign of Julius Verus about 158 (*PIR*² I 618): see the works cited above, p. 143, n. 76.

¹³⁷ Thus Keil 386; 405.

¹³⁸ Above, pp. 142-3.

¹³⁹ Strack, op. cit. III (1937), 58-9. Cf. *HA Pius* 9, 10; 13, 4.

¹⁴⁰ 26, 99-100 (peace); 82-4 (wall, cf. p. 143, n. 80 above). On the date of 26, below, p. 150 and n. 159.

¹⁴¹ *HA Marcus* 27, 1. Thus W. Schmid, *Rhein. Mus.* 48 (1893), 83; von Rohden, *RE* I (1894), 2301; against, Keil 382; cf. 426, n. 3, calling the theory of a connection with the Eleusinia 'bare Willkür'.

¹⁴² Groag 43. Cf. Philostr., *VS* 628; *Syll.*³ 845; see now F. Millar, *JRS* 59 (1969), 16-17.

¹⁴³ Initiate: Behr, *Aelius Aristides and the Sacred Tales* (1968), 110. Threnody: *Or.* 22 K., cf. now C. P. Jones, *GRBS* 12 (1971), 45-8.

¹⁴⁴ O. Hirschfeld *apud* Keil 418; Groag 22.

¹⁴⁵ Thus for Nero, cf. *ILS* 8794 = *Syll.*³ 814, lines 25-6; for Commodus, *ILS* 397.

¹⁴⁶ Note Aristides 26, 107, of Pius: 'the present ruler, like a spotless competitor, so far exceeds his predecessors as, so one might say, he exceeds all others' (the text is corrupt, but the general sense seems clear). Cf. *ILS* 8794 = *Syll.*³ 814, lines 45-6 (Nero); *ILS* 374 (M. Aurelius).

¹⁴⁷ cf. above, pp. 138-9, 141.

boy, noble among the noble, may you follow in your father's footsteps'.) This sentence has also been used as evidence for a date after Aristides' lifetime: 'noble among the noble' is supposed to refer to the title of *nobilissimus Caesar*, which is not found before Geta, and γενναϊότατος is exclusively applied, in the papyri at least, to Philip II.¹⁴⁸ Again, however, such expressions are naturally found in unofficial parlance before they harden into formula. Marcus' ancestry was exemplary: apart from kings of legend and prehistory, there was his grandfather Annius Verus, thrice consul and prefect of the city, his maternal grandmother Domitia Lucilla, heiress of the powerful Domitii Tullus and Lucanus, and there was also a link with the family of Hadrian.¹⁴⁹ The young prince, combining great dynasties of Baetica and Narbonensis, had no match for his pedigree in a society dominated by provincial nobility and wealth—not even his adoptive father.

It is noticeable that there is no mention of the future Lucius Verus. Nine years younger than Marcus, Verus remained for a long time in his adoptive brother's shadow.¹⁵⁰ He does not appear to have entered public life before taking the *toga virilis*, perhaps in 145.¹⁵¹ By then Marcus had been Caesar for seven years, and was currently *consul ordinarius* for the second time with Pius.¹⁵²

Finally, two arguments from silence. Keil maintained that, since the speaker did not praise the emperor's descent, it must have been low or undistinguished.¹⁵³ Pius' ancestors, local nobility of Narbonensis, were not congenial material for a Greek panegyrist: in this, as in the quality of his education, Marcus would have provided a more tractable subject. The absence of all reference to an empress is more notable.¹⁵⁴ Groag was embarrassed, since Philip's consort Otacilia is prominent in the records of the reign.¹⁵⁵ Faustina, the wife of Pius, died in 140 or 141, and the emperor did not remarry.¹⁵⁶

It remains to fit the speech into what is known of Aristides' career, and to see what historical conclusions of a larger kind can be drawn from it. It is clearly delivered before the emperor himself.¹⁵⁷ It must therefore have been delivered in Rome or its vicinity, since Pius did not travel outside that area during his reign. Several indications point to a fairly early date: peace in Britain and accord with Parthia seem to have been only recently attained, Marcus appears still in his youth,¹⁵⁸ and Lucius is not yet a public figure. That conveniently fits the date of Aristides' only known visit to Rome in 144, when he delivered the Roman Oration.¹⁵⁹ The two speeches must therefore be close in date, and that is corroborated by the many resemblances between them.¹⁶⁰

¹⁴⁸ Thus Hirschfeld *apud* Keil 406; 418. On γενναϊότατος, P. Bureth, *Les titulatures impériales dans les papyrus* (1964), 114; 127; cf. M. Gelzer, *Kleine Schriften I* (1962), 150 (= *The Roman Nobility* tr. R. Seager, 1969, 157).

¹⁴⁹ On Marcus' ancestry, Syme, *JRS* 43 (1953), 155–6; Tacitus (1958), 605; 791–5; Pflaum, *Historia-Augusta Colloquium 1963* (1964), 107.

¹⁵⁰ *HA Verus* 3, 4, 'diu autem et privatus fuit et ea honorificentia caruit, qua Marcus ornabatur'; cf. T. D. Barnes, *JRS* 57 (1967), 68.

¹⁵¹ *HA Verus* 3, 1. On the date, G. Barbieri in De Ruggiero, *Diz. Epigr.* IV (1957), 846.

¹⁵² References in *PIR*² A 697.

¹⁵³ Keil 384–5, 405 (but 'niedriges Herkunft', 408).

¹⁵⁴ Keil, *Nachr. könlgl. Ges. der Wiss. zu Göttingen* 1913, 4, n. 3 (on p. 6).

¹⁵⁵ Groag 39–40, though he cites this as an argument against von Domaszewski's proposal of Galienus, 27. On Otacilia Severa, Stein, *RE* XIV (1930), 1607–8; H. Mattingly and E. A. Sydenham, *Roman Imperial Coinage* IV, 3 (1949), 54–65; note especially the coins of Philip II with the legend DE PIA MATRE PIVS FILIVS, *ibid.* 72, no. 30.

¹⁵⁶ *HA Pius* 6, 7 (*PIR*² A 715, G 34).

¹⁵⁷ Note especially sections 38–9.

¹⁵⁸ πᾶς, 39; so also Keil 406. In the sense of 'son', πᾶς is used of Marcus as late as 153: 50, 75.

¹⁵⁹ On this visit, see now Behr, *Aelius Aristides and the Sacred Tales* (1968), 23–4. Aristides started out for Rome in winter (48, 60; 50, 2); the journey took

three months (48, 62), and he remained there until about September (48, 67; cf. also 50, 31 referring to the *ludi Apollinares* in July). This visit took place 'in the tenth year', so nine years reckoned inclusively, before the Asian proconsulate of 'Severus' (50, 12); under the same proconsul, Aristides delivered his speech *To Athena* when he was 35 years, 1 month old (subscription to *Or.* 37 K.). Since he was born in late 117 or early 118 (Behr, *op. cit.* 1–3, n. 1; *AJP* 90 [1969], 75–7), he should have reached that age in the proconsular year 152/3, and that fits the evidence for the proconsulate of C. Julius Severus, who appears to be the Severus in question and was consul *ca.* 138 (Syme, *JRS* 43 [1953], 159; *REA* 61 [1959], 311; *PIR*² I 573 suggests 139 for the consulate, 151/2 for the proconsulate, but this is implausible, cf. Syme, *JRS* 43 [1953], 153). Hence the visit to Rome should have occurred in spring and summer, 144.

Behr, *op. cit.* 88–9, n. 92, arguing that Aristides was too ill for public speaking on that visit, has recently tried to revive the theory that the Roman Oration was delivered in the mid-150's, cf. Schmid, *RE* 11, (1895), 887; against, Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (1969), 45 and n. 4 there. Although Aristides is eloquent on the subject of his illness of 144 (48, 62–4), there is no sign that he was incapacitated throughout his stay. Elsewhere he artlessly claims that he launched his poetic career on the same visit by composing a paean to Apollo (50, 31).

¹⁶⁰ Cf. above pp. 138–9 on 35, 17–18; 36, 19; 35, 23; 35, 36–7.

The reference to 'a feast and a holiday' in the first sentence might suggest that the εἰς βασιλέα was delivered as an ἐπίδειξις at one of the great Roman festivals, perhaps the *ludi Apollinares* on the occasion of which Aristides composed a paean. The combative tone of the preface, however, though conventional, might suggest a different setting. It is well known that encomiography was one of the recognized classes of competition in Greek agonistic festivals.¹⁶¹ There were at this time three of these in Italy, all celebrated in Rome or nearby: the Sebasta at Naples founded in honour of Augustus, the Capitolia in Rome founded by Domitian, and the Eusebeia founded by Pius in honour of Hadrian at Puteoli. The first two seem to be excluded as the occasion of the εἰς βασιλέα, since they both fell in 142.¹⁶² It is uncertain what the cycle of the Eusebeia was: if they had their first celebration in 139 or 140, which seems in any case likely,¹⁶³ the second would have fallen in 143 or 144. If Aristides had delivered the εἰς βασιλέα on that occasion, the oblique criticism of the late emperor would be all the more remarkable.

At the time of his visit to Italy, Aristides was about 26: not yet fully formed as a speaker, therefore, and hence certain signs of immaturity in the speech, but on the threshold of a great career. He had friends at court who would have encouraged his efforts and prepared the way for his success, above all in his teacher Alexander.¹⁶⁴ The audience would have understood when he praised the emperor for giving unprecedented honours to Greek culture.¹⁶⁵

The success that Aristides enjoyed on that visit, and the influence of his friends, were to be useful later. Within a few years he was an orator of eminence, and his native and adoptive cities took advantage of their claims to nominate him to local office. If he was to avoid these burdens, influence had to be exerted. Letters protecting his immunity were duly procured from Pius and Marcus, as well as a testimonial from Heliodorus.¹⁶⁶ Aristides was not to see Pius again: but Marcus, the 'boy' of the speech *To the Emperor*, visited Smyrna in 176, a ruler in late middle age accompanied by his young son, and asked to see the orator, now the dean of his profession. Aristides consented to perform, and the speech is said to have disposed Marcus to be generous when, two years later, Smyrna was devastated by an earthquake.¹⁶⁷ Aristides, this time by letter, once more addressed the emperor and his son, and lived to see his city rebuilt at imperial expense.¹⁶⁸ He could claim to be called the founder of the new Smyrna: ¹⁶⁹ but the friendship with the emperor that made his petition successful had been founded long ago, when he addressed Marcus' father.

The larger contribution of the speech, if the new date is accepted, does not lie in the novelty of the facts that it contains about Pius; if it did, the speech would be almost impossible to prove written in his reign. There is scarcely anything that does not accord with what was already known from the other literary sources, principally the life of Pius in the *Historia Augusta*, and that that is one of the superior lives in the collection was already evident.¹⁷⁰ What is remarkable, however, is what Aristides appears to say obliquely about Hadrian: his immorality, meddlesomeness, and caprice, his secret agents, the burdens imposed by his rule, his jealousy of Greek *litterati*, his execution of eminent senators. Moreover, these criticisms are made by a Greek, one of those who might have been expected to remember the late emperor with particular gratitude.

On closer inspection this hostility is less surprising. It is well known how near Hadrian came to having his *acta* annulled and to being refused divine honours. The accounts of the first weeks of Pius' reign at many points resemble those of the beginning of Nerva's: the same fear of the soldiers, the same urge for vengeance on recent favourites, the same struggle of the new emperor against the forces of reaction. Nor was this hostility of the senate to

¹⁶¹ See especially L. Robert, *Études épigraphiques et philologiques* (1938), 21-30.

¹⁶² Sebasta: R. M. Geer, *TAPA* 66 (1935), 208-21; Wilcken, *Chrestomathie* no. 156. Capitolia: G. Wissowa in Friedländer, *Sittengesch.*⁹⁻¹⁰ (1921), 276-80.

¹⁶³ L. Robert, *CRAI* 1970, 10, dates the foundation to 138; L. Moretti, *Iscrizioni agonistiche greche* (1953), 215, is agnostic.

¹⁶⁴ Note Aristides' dream, 47, 23; and compare his tribute to Alexander, 32, 15. Pius' proconsulate could

also have brought him into contact with Aristides' family and friends.

¹⁶⁵ 35, 20. Cf. above, p. 145.

¹⁶⁶ 50, 63-93, especially 75; cf. Bowersock, *op. cit.* 36-40.

¹⁶⁷ Philostr., *VS* 582-3; cf. Bowersock, *op. cit.* 45-6; 49-50.

¹⁶⁸ *Or.* 19 K. (letter), 20 ('palinode'), 21 (letter of thanks to Commodus).

¹⁶⁹ Philostr., *VS* 582.

¹⁷⁰ See now Syme, *Emperors and Biography* (1971), 36-41.

Hadrian's memory temporary. Naturally it continues in the literary tradition, notably in the history of that proud senator Cassius Dio. It is also reflected in more dispassionate evidence. It is now known that in the Roman military calendar of the early third century, and probably in the official calendar of the Roman state, Hadrian was a second-class *divus* in that only his birthday, not his *dies imperii*, was celebrated: that is, among second century emperors he ranked with Commodus and Pertinax but behind Trajan, Pius, Marcus, Lucius Verus, Septimius and Caracalla.¹⁷¹ For the philhellene Julian in the fourth century, the emperors with the greatest claims on the remembrance of posterity are Julius Caesar, Augustus, Trajan, Marcus, and Constantine: not Hadrian, who is only mentioned once in the *Caesares*, and not flatteringly.¹⁷² The interest of the εἰς βασιλέα is that it shows this attitude to Hadrian already expressed in the literature of Pius' reign, and indeed clearly tolerated by Pius himself: ¹⁷³ that in turn recalls Pius' delicate position, obliged to defend the memory of his predecessor and at the same time to satisfy the aspirations of the senate, which contained Hadrian's bitterest enemies. The affinity between the attitude of a Greek orator and that of the senatorial class is not surprising. Again, it recalls Domitian, whose philhellenism did not save him from the obloquy of Greek authors after his assassination. Nearer to Aristides' time, the indirect calumny of Hadrian in the εἰς βασιλέα recalls the *Meditations* of Marcus in which, as has been seen, the terms in which the emperor praises his father often reflect criticism of Hadrian.¹⁷⁴

Some of the sources of this hostility are clear: the execution of consulars at the beginning and the end of the reign, the attacks on eminent senators and knights. But, and again this recalls Domitian, the key to this hatred may lie in the mysterious years between 134, when Hadrian left Rome for the last time, and his death in 138. These years saw Julius Servianus elevated to the pinnacle of a third consulate, and obliged to commit suicide with his grandson Fuscus; the unpromising Ceionius Commodus suddenly made Caesar, and after his death succeeded with equal suddenness by Aurelius Fulvus, the future Antoninus Pius. In the same period, the Jewish war became so grave as to require the emperor's personal attention, and war broke out on the Danube to which his adopted heir was sent, never to return.¹⁷⁵ There are also signs that it was a period of financial stringency, in which promised benefactions had to be suspended.¹⁷⁶ It is also possible that, just as this period saw the fall of Romans who had fancied themselves high in the emperor's esteem, so some, perhaps most, of the Greeks whom Hadrian threw over fell with them.¹⁷⁷ As the empire was faced with new and unexpected enemies, and the succession stood in doubt, Hadrian's unpredictability may have taken new and terrible forms. It is against this background that the two speeches of Aristides praising Pius and his empire must be seen: not a background of calm and immobility, but of crisis recently past.

Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton ; University of Toronto

¹⁷¹ A. S. Hoey, *Yale Classical Studies* 7 (1940), 181-7; J. F. Gilliam, *Harvard Theological Review* 47 (1954), 195-6; idem in *Hommages à Marcel Renard*, Coll. Lat. 102 (1969), 288-9.

¹⁷² Julian, *Caes.* 311 D.

¹⁷³ There may be a parallel in Fronto. Note Fronto's apparent discomfort over his speeches in praise of Hadrian still circulating under Pius (24, 13 ff. van den Hout), and his comparison of Hadrian's aloofness with Pius' affability (24, 17-23 van den Hout). The anonymous emperor criticized in Fronto's *gratiarum actio* to Pius for creating patricians from unworthy families (17, 11-13 van den Hout) could be Hadrian.

In the Cyzicene oration 27, 22, Aristides alludes to Hadrian as 'the best of emperors up to that time' (see Keil's *apparatus* and D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* [1950] II, 1472-3). However, that is no argument against the present interpretation of *Or.* 35, since Aristides obviously would not have spoken unfavourably of Hadrian when celebrating the re-

dedication of a temple to him. Moreover, in a context that includes lavish panegyric of Marcus and Lucius, this anonymous and perfunctory reference amounts to faint praise.

¹⁷⁴ Above, p. 141, n. 60, p. 145, n. 95.

¹⁷⁵ Jewish War: see especially Strack, *Unters. zur röm. Reichspr. des zweiten Jahrh.* II (1933), 132-9, showing that Hadrian was in the East from mid-134 to early 136. Pannonian War: A. Mócsy *RE Suppl.* IX (1962), 554-5; A. Dobó, *Die Verwaltung der römischen Provinz Pannonien von Augustus bis Diocletianus* (1968), 51-2.

¹⁷⁶ Note the series of inscriptions showing benefactions of Hadrian completed by Pius: *ILS* 334 (Ostia); 336 (Puteoli); 337 (Athens); Moretti, *Inscr. graecae urbis Romae* nos. 235-6 = *IGR* IV, 149, 146 (the association of *περιοδικαί* at Rome); also perhaps *ILS* 338 = *IGR* IV, 1397 (Smyrna: cf. C. J. Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna* 1938, 262-3); Philostr., *VS* 549 (Alexandria Troas).

¹⁷⁷ On these, see p. 145 above.