

Appendix I

The contrast between slave and wage-labourer in Marx's theory of capital (see II.iii above)

We can begin with *Cap.* II.36-7 (cf. 83): in any social form of production, 'labourers and means of production' are separate elements which must unite in some way in order for production to take place. 'The specific manner in which this union is accomplished' is vitally important – so much so that it 'distinguishes the different epochs of the structure of society from one another'. Slave labour and free wage-labour, therefore, remain fundamentally different, even when they happen to coexist in one society.

We can turn next to the passages in which Marx deals with the labour of production as a social process. The labour power of the free worker (purchased by the employer for wages) is here carefully distinguished, in many passages, as 'variable capital', from the 'constant capital' comprising the means of production, themselves divided (when Marx, as in *Cap.* I.178-81; II.164-5, wishes to draw the quite different distinction between 'fixed capital' and 'circulating capital') into (a) the 'subjects of labour', such as raw materials and auxiliary materials like coal, gas or manure (which are 'circulating capital'), and (b) all 'instruments of labour' (which are 'fixed capital'), including land, buildings, plant, railways, canals, working animals (for the last, see *Cap.* II.163, 165; cf. *Grundrisse*, E.T. 465, 489) and, quite specifically, slaves (*Cap.* II.483; III.804), who, in contrast with free labourers, 'form part and parcel of the means of production' (*Cap.* I.714). In addition to the passages already cited it will be sufficient to refer to *Cap.* I.177-81, 208-9; II.160-8, 221-3, 440-1; III.814-16.

It is true that Marx often refuses, when he is being vigilantly accurate, to apply to the ancient world the terminology ('capital' etc.) which is strictly appropriate only to capitalist society: capital is 'not a thing, but rather a definite social production relation, belonging to a definite historical formation of society' (*Cap.* III.814). Now 'direct forced labour was the foundation of the ancient world' (*Grundrisse*, E.T. 245), and 'wealth confronts direct forced labour not as capital, but rather as a relation of domination [*Herrschaftsverhältnis*]' (*Grundrisse*, E.T. 326; cf. 513, and see also 464-5, and 465 on the serf). 'So long as slavery is predominant the capital relationship can only be sporadic and subordinate, never dominant' (*TSP* III.419). And so, in *Cap.* II.164-5, after recalling the division of 'means of production' (made in *Cap.* I.178-81) into 'instruments of labour' and 'subjects of labour', which he sees 'in every labour-process, regardless of the social conditions in which it takes place', Marx goes on to say that both instruments of labour and subjects of labour 'become capital only under the capitalist mode of production, when they become "productive capital"' (cf. *Cap.* II.170-1, 196, 208, 210, 210-11, 229-31); and he adds that the distinction between them 'is reflected in a new form: the distinction between fixed capital and circulating capital. It is only then that a thing which performs the function of an instrument of labour becomes fixed capital'.

Nevertheless, having closed the front door of any pre-capitalist society against 'capital' (in the strict sense of productive capital), Marx opens the back door to what he calls 'money capital' (for which see *Cap.* I.146 ff.; cf. II.57, 482-3 etc.); he can also say that 'in the slave system, the money-capital invested in the purchase of labour-power plays the role of the money-form of fixed capital' (*Cap.* II.483, *my italics*). In other words, the slaveowner

buys labour-power in the slave in a capitalised form, exactly as with working animals. The slave system, for Marx, of course resembles the capitalist system in forcing the direct producer to do unpaid labour; but his master purchases *him* instead of his *labour power*.

I may add that the analysis I have given here does not depend in any way upon the distinction (first worked out in detail by Marx, although it had appeared earlier in a less clear form and with different terminology in Ramsay: see *Cap.* II.394, 440-1) between 'variable capital' and 'constant capital'. The distinction between the free wage-labourer and the slave labourer, as drawn by Marx, can equally well be conceived in terms of the distinction between those familiar categories of Classical political economy: 'circulating capital' and 'fixed capital'. This is so, whether or not we include in our definition of circulating capital the raw materials and auxiliary materials used in the productive process, as Marx and Adam Smith did (see *Cap.* II.168, 204; and especially 297-9, where Marx distinguished between 'the variable and the constant part of circulating capital', as against 'fixed capital'), although others did not, in particular George Ramsay (see *Cap.* II.231, 394, 440-1). What is used in purchasing the labour-power of the free wage-labourer is certainly circulating capital (see e.g. *Cap.* II.168); but, as we have seen, the slave, as an 'instrument of labour' (just like a working animal), is purchased with fixed capital and himself becomes fixed capital.

Appendix II

Some evidence for slavery (especially agricultural) in the Classical and Hellenistic periods (see III.iv above)

There is more than enough evidence to show that in Attica agricultural slave labour was widespread in the Classical period. For large slave households see Xen., *Oecon.* VII.35, IX.5; and XII.2 to XV.5 on slave bailiffs (esp. XII.2-3, 19; XIII.6-10; XIV.6, 9; XV.3-5), showing that these men were indeed slaves and were intended primarily for supervising agricultural operations. These passages refer, it is true, to an exceptionally rich man, Ischomachus; but elsewhere too we find agricultural slavery taken for granted, e.g. in Aristophanes. In the *Plutus*, Chremylus the farmer, who is specifically described as a *πένης* (line 29) and is one of the *πέντε ἐπὶ τῷ οἴκῳ* of line 254, owns several slaves (lines 26, 1105), not only the Carion who is one of the main characters in the play, Jones, *AD* 12 and 138 n.54, treats Carion as just a stock comic figure; but the other slaves are certainly not that: they are not necessary figures and indeed would have spoiled the dramatic picture (in which Chremylus' poverty is an essential element) had they not been characteristic. See also Ar., *Plut.* 510-21 and *Eccles.* 651; *Peace* 1138-9, 1146-8; *Pa.-Dem.* XLVII.52-3; LIII.6; *Dem.* LV.31-2 (cf. 35); and other texts. I cannot accept the general assumptions of Ehrenberg, *PA* 165-91 (ch.vii), about the unimportance of slaves in Athenian economic life: they seem to me to be in direct conflict with the evidence he himself has produced. But perhaps the most telling argument for the importance of slaves in Attic agricultural life is the negative one: that hired labour, the only alternative way in which Athenian landowners could have made appreciable incomes out of their property (as we know they did), or indeed any profit at all (apart from leasing), was evidently rare and confined mainly to the seasons of harvest, vintage and olive-picking. (I have listed in III.vi n. 16 below the only passages I have been able to discover on the use of hired labour in Athenian agriculture.) Even the overseer or manager (*ἐπίτοπος*, occasionally *ἐπιτορῆς*, *οἰκοδόμος*, *οἰκονομικός*) of an estate in Attica (or elsewhere) would normally be a slave or a freedman: see Xen., *Mem.* II.viii, esp. 3-4 (noticed in III.vi above); *Oecon.* XII-XV, esp.

the passages singled out in the second sentence of this Appendix. Slaves and freedmen predominated also in other managerial capacities: see e.g. Xen., *Mem.* II.v.2; Aeschin., I.97; Dem. XXVII.19, 22, and XXIX.5, 25-6, 29-32 etc.; Ps.-Dem. XXXVI.28-30 and 43-4, with XLV.33; Ps.-Arist., *Oecon.* I.5, 134^a25-6; cf. Citrus in Isocr. XVII.11-16, 21, 27, 49 (contrast 14, 51); and the foreigners in IG I².1673.57-9. In Isaeus VI (*Philoc.*) 23-1 the woman Alee, who 'managed' Euctemon's house in the Cerameicus (whether in theory as leasehold tenant or not) was a slave or freedwoman; and her unnamed former owner who had similarly run a brothel in Euctemon's house in Peiraicus (§ 19), apparently as his tenant, was also a freedwoman. When Xen., *De vect.* IV.22, contemplates Athenians as well as foreigners taking managerial posts supervising slaves working in the mines, he is again not describing an existing situation – and anyway the managers would be working for the state, not private employers. (I have dealt with Xen., *Oecon.* I.4 in III.vi above.) See also Gert Audring, 'Über den Gutsverwalter (*epitropos*) in der attischen Landwirtschaft des 5. und des 4. Jh. v.u.Z.', in *Klio* 55 (1973) 109-16.

A text that is often misquoted is Thuc. VII.27.5: 'more than 20,000 slaves' escaped from Attica during the Spartan occupation of Deceleia. This is far too often represented as '20,000 slaves', as recently by Finley (*AE* 72, contrast 24) and even Dover. The latter (in Gomme, *HCT* IV.401-2) first gets it right on p.401, and then twice speaks merely of '20,000 slaves'; on p.402 he flatly contradicts Thucydides by saying '20,000 was the total number of deserters', and on p.401 he actually speaks of 'a precise number', which 'implies that he [Thucydides] has a certain point of time in mind! If I have laboured this point, it is because I wish to emphasise that Thucydides was obviously giving a rough estimate; he could not possibly have known, even within wide limits, how many slaves had escaped, and his 'more than 20,000 slaves' – more precisely, 'more than two myriads' (*πλέον ἢ δύο μυριάδες*) – indicates that he believed 20,000 to be a *minimum* (which may conceivably have been greatly exceeded); the *maximum* in his mind can hardly be put at very much less than 30,000, for the next step in the natural progression after 'more than two myriads' is either 'three myriads' or at least 'nearly three myriads'. And, as I have said in my review of Westermann, *SSGRA*, in *CR* 71 = n.s. 7 (1957) 54 ff., at 56, the statement that follows, 'and of these the greater part were *χειροτέχναι*', makes it unlikely that, as so many scholars have supposed, Thucydides is referring mainly to mine-slaves. The only other time Thucydides uses the word (VI.72.3) it means 'experts' – in war, as it happens. And that the artisans were indeed *skilled* men best suits Thucydides' meaning here, as the emphatic *καὶ πάντων* indicates; the loss was all the more keenly felt because the deserters were mainly skilled workmen – no doubt including agricultural specialists such as vine-dressers, who would have better opportunities for running away than e.g. mine-slaves. (The argument here is not affected if, with some scholars, we read *πολὸν μέρος* in VII.27.5, with most MSS, instead of *τὸ πολὺ μέρος*, with B; we then merely translate 'a great part' instead of 'the greater part'.)

I must add here that I know of only one recent treatment of Athenian agriculture in the Classical period which gives slavery its proper role and presents the essential evidence concisely and accurately: this is Michael H. Jameson's important article, 'Agriculture and slavery in Classical Athens', in *CJ* 73 (1977-8) 122-45, which I read only after Chapter III and this Appendix had been finished. I am glad to find that we are in substantial agreement; but of course there is much good material in Jameson's paper, going well beyond what I have been able to deal with in this book.

* * * * *

We can now leave Athens and look at the rest of the Greek world. For the fifth and fourth centuries see e.g. Thuc. III.73 (Corcyra: evidently many slaves in the countryside); VIII.40.2 (Chios: more *οἰκέται* than in any other Greek state except Sparta: they knew the country and must have been predominantly rural slaves, nor did Chios have any very developed industry); Xen., *HG* III.ii.26 (Elis: very many slaves, *ἀνδράποδα*,

captured from the countryside); IV.vi.6 (Acamania: numerous slaves, *ἀνδράποδα*, captured in 389; many of those not engaged in the production of crops may have been herdsmen); VI.ii.6 (Corcyra again: many slaves, *ἀνδράποδα*, captured from the countryside in c. 374; cf. §§ 15, 23, 25); VII.v.14-15 (Mantineia, 362: the *ἐργάται* are clearly slaves, as they are contrasted with others *τῶν ἐλευθέρων*). We sometimes hear of besieged cities arming slaves and using them to defend their walls: this happened, for example, at Cyzicus in 319 (Diod. XVII.51.3) and at Rhodes in 305-4 (XX.84.3; 100.1), but we do not know how many of these slaves were agricultural.

Various passages in Polybius either explicitly mention, or suggest the presence of, considerable numbers of slaves in the countryside of the Greek world in the late third century B.C. It is true that in Polybius the mention of *σώματα*, without qualification, as booty (or potential booty) can apply indifferently to slave and free (see e.g. II.vi.6; ixii.10; IV.xxix.6). But *τὰ δουλικὰ σώματα* were evidently an important part of the booty obtained by the Illyrians on the capture of the not very important city of Phoenice in Epirus c. 230 B.C. (II.vi.6); in at least one other case, Megalopolis, we hear of *σώματα*, some of which are specifically described as *δουλικὰ* and others as *ἐλεύθερα* (II.xcii.10); and when we are told of a raid by brigands on the fortified farmhouse 'known as Chyron's' in Messenia we find slaves, this time unmistakable as *οἰκέται*, forming a significant part of the booty (IV.iv.1). The large-scale plundering expedition launched by the Aetolians into Laconia around 240 B.C. (see Walbank, *HCP* I.483; cf. Will, *HPMH* I.305), which according to Polybius caused the enslavement of 'the perioecic villages' (IV.xxxiv.9), is said by Plutarch to have resulted in the carrying off of 50,000 slaves (*Clon.* 18.3) – and even if this figure is greatly exaggerated it is likely to include a considerable number of men and women who were already slaves, for the Perioeci had no Helots and the captured Perioeci themselves could hardly have numbered anything like so many. We also hear of cities in Asia Minor under siege promising freedom to their slaves, to induce them to join in their resistance (Abydos at the Hellespont, Polyb. XVI.xxi.2; Selge in Pisidia, V.lxxvi.5). In the light of these texts, and of Xenophon's statement quoted above about the many slaves in the countryside of Elis (at the very end of the fifth century), it seems very likely that when Polybius speaks of Elis in the late third century as being thickly populated and abounding in *σώματα* (IV.lxxiii.6, cf. lxxv.1-2, 7), he must have slaves as well as free in mind. Python of Abdera had a very large slave household in 170 B.C., if he is rightly credited with arming and using in defence of his city (until he decided to betray it) '200 slaves and freedmen of his own' (Diod. XXX.6). In 146 B.C. there is a mention in Polybius of an order sent to the cities of the Achaean League by the general Diaeus to free and arm no fewer than 12,000 slaves of military age, 'among those who had been born and bred at home' (*οἰκονοεῖς καὶ παράροχοι*, Polyb. XXXVIII.xv.3; cf. my discussion in IV.iii § 4 above).

For the Hellenistic period in general, see (on agricultural and sometimes other slaves) Rostovtzeff, *SEHWW* I.178, 203, 207 (with III.1366-7 n.32), 243, 517, 537-8; II.778-85 (with III.1514-16 no.47-51), 806 (with III.1521-2 n.76, and Rostovtzeff's article, *NEPPK*, esp. 377-9, 382-3), 942, 1106, 1111, 1116, 1158-9 (but cf. 1.523-4), 1182-96, 1258-63; III.1435 n.260, 1502 n.4. For Egypt, see id. I.321-2, with III.1393-4 n.119, and II.1099; also various works by I. Biczuliska-Mitdowist, esp. *EEGR* I (cf. III.iv n.32 below).

Such a large proportion of the texts illustrating the employment of rural slaves relate to their capture during an enemy invasion that we need not be surprised at finding so little evidence either way for most places.

As early as 400 B.C. we find a wealthy Persian, Asidates, who was possessed of an estate on the plain near Pergamum, in north west Asia Minor, employing slaves in quite large numbers (Xen., *Anab.* VII.viii.12, 16, 19). Xenophon, in the plundering expedition which he describes (without the least sense of shame) at the very end of his *Anabasis*, refers to these men as *ανδράποδα* even before their capture, and they must surely have been slaves

in the Greek sense, rather than dependent peasants. Some two hundred were captured and carried off (§ 19). Again, we happen to know of this set of slaves only because they became the object of a military expedition and are mentioned in one of our narrative sources. Except where special circumstances obtained, for instance at Heraclea Pontica, where the Mariandynoi formed a sort of quasi-serf population which could be profitably used by the Greek settlers (see III.iv and its n.3), I see no reason to doubt that Greeks who settled in new areas of Asia or Syria and became landowners would immediately buy slaves to work their farms, as in their homelands. Nothing prevented them from doing this, and since many slaves had been brought to Greece itself from districts in Asia Minor (especially perhaps Caria, Lydia and Phrygia) and Syria, slaves would probably not be exceptionally dear there. When Romans began to move into the East in considerable numbers (see e.g. Broughton, *RLAM*, and in *ESAR* IV), they too would certainly want to use agricultural slaves, except perhaps where a local peasant population could be severely exploited, to almost the same degree as slaves.

I have not tried to collect the material, and I will mention just three interesting pieces of evidence, the only ones I happen to have come across in which prices are given for the initial purchase of slaves on capture in bulk in the Classical and Hellenistic periods – far below the price at which they would eventually be sold, of course, in order to allow the dealers a profit. The first is Thuc. VIII.28.4: on the taking of Iasus in Caria by the Spartans in the winter of 412/411, the inhabitants, slave and free (and surely including women and children), were sold off to Tissaphernes at an agreed price of 1 daric stater per head (equivalent to between 25 and 26 Attic drachmae). The second piece of evidence is provided by II Macc. viii.11 (cf. I Macc. iii.41) and Jos. *AJ* XII.299, where the Seleucid army commander Nicanor in 165 B.C. announces that he will sell all the Jews he expects to capture in his forthcoming campaign at the rate of 90 per talent, or 66⅔ drachmae each. The third piece of evidence is in Plut., *Lucull.* 14.1 and *App., Mith.* 78: Lucullus' campaign against Mithridates of Pontus in 72/1 B.C. was so successful that slaves were sold in his camp for as little as 4 drachmae each – a suspiciously low figure, but perhaps not impossible, if there were large numbers of prisoners, for the slaves might have to be transported some way before they could be sold profitably in bulk. (I do not feel able to give any figure for the price of the Thebans sold off as slaves on the sack of Thebes by Alexander in 335: Diod. XVII.14.1.3 gives 440 talents for 'more than 30,000' Thebans; but his figure may well be a conventional one, and his probable source, Cleitarchus, *FGRH* 137 F 1, *ap.* Athen. IV.148d, gives the same figure, 440 talents, for the total sum realised on the sack of the city.)

I conclude with a general argument for the great importance of slave labour in agriculture in the lands bordering on the Aegean and in the islands of that sea. In an article published in 1923 (*NEPPK* 377-8) Rostovtzeff pointed out that although the only treatises on agriculture to survive from the ancient world are by Latin writers, their authors undoubtedly based their work on Greek sources, many of whom are actually named, in particular by Varro, who speaks of 'more than fifty' Greek writers on different aspects of agriculture (*RR* I.1.7-10) and proceeds to give a long list of them. The majority, as Rostovtzeff remarked, 'were natives not of the mainland of Greece . . . but of the large and fertile islands (Thasos, Lemnos, Chios, Rhodes), of Asia Minor (Pergamon, Miletus, Cyme, Colophon, Priene, Soli, Mallos, Nicaea, and Heracleia), and of the Thracian coast (Maroneia and Amphipolis). Most of them belong to the Hellenistic period.' As Rostovtzeff says, 'we do not know the content of these treatises, but it seems evident that it did not differ very much from that of the treatises of Varro, Columella, and Pliny'; and he goes on to infer from this similarity that 'the main foundation of agriculture in the East, and especially of viticulture, horticulture, and cattle-breeding, was slave labour'. Rostovtzeff deals with the same subject in his *SEHAW* II.1182-96 (with III.1616-19): here he admits the lack of evidence concerning methods of cultivation in the Greek East, apart from Egypt, and is very cautious in drawing conclusions. I would accept the statement

which appears on p. 1196, following the admission that to various questions he has asked

no satisfactory answer can be given. No direct evidence is available. It is, however, certain that some of the landowners in the Seleucid Empire and in Asia Minor instead of renting their estates, large or small, in parcels to local farmers, cultivated them by means of slave labour and hired hands. We may conjecture that this was the method of cultivation adopted by the Attalids on some of their estates. There is evidence of the same practice on the estates of some rich landholders in the city territories (for example Priene), and it may be assumed to have prevailed on the holdings – *cleroi* – of foreign settlers in the *karoukias* and cities created by the Hellenistic kings, when these *cleroi* were not rented to local tenants . . . What was the influence of these progressive farms on their surroundings, on the peasant economy of their neighbours? No answer can be given to this question. The general impression left on the student is that the estates managed in the Greek manner remained scattered islands in the Oriental sea of small peasant holdings and larger estates, whose native owners had their own traditional methods of exploitation or cultivation.

Rostovtzeff is concerned here with the whole vast subject of the overall aspect of agriculture in Asia. I of course admit that the great bulk of agricultural production there, as in most parts of the ancient world at nearly all times (cf. esp. IV.i-iii above), was the work of small peasants, whether freeholders, leasehold tenants, or serfs in various kinds of dependence. But I have been concerned to investigate *how the propertied classes of the Greek world extracted their surplus*; and when we ask this question (a very different one), we can see that a very important part was played by slavery, not to mention debt bondage, e.g. that of the *obaerarii* (or *obaerati*) mentioned by Varro as still existing in his day in large numbers in Asia, and in Egypt and Illyricum (see III.iv above under its heading III, and its n.66).

Appendix III

The settlement of 'barbarians' within the Roman empire (see IV.iii § 19 above)

I give here as complete a list as I have been able to compile, with fairly full source references and a little modern bibliography, of those settlements of 'barbarians' within Roman territory which seem to me reasonably well authenticated, from the first century to the late sixth. I have felt obliged to take into account, as far as I could, settlements in the Western as well as the Eastern part of the empire, because I am interested in these settlements not from the cultural but from the economic point of view (see IV.iii §§ 17 and 19 above), and from that aspect their effects might be felt far outside their immediate area. I have to admit, however, a very inadequate treatment of Africa, where the literary sources are nothing like as abundant as for Europe and Asia (above all the provinces on or near the Rhine and Danube frontiers), and the epigraphic and archaeological evidence is often very hard to interpret and may sometimes refer to the control of nomads or semi-nomads or transhumants rather than to permanent new settlements inside the frontiers. Apart from §§ 22 and 32 below, all I can do here is to refer to an impressive article which I saw only after this Appendix had been written: P. D. A. Garnsey, 'Rome's African empire under the Principate', in *Imperialism in the Ancient World*, edited by Garnsey and C. R. Whittaker (1978) 223-54, at 231-3 (with 346-7 nn.39-49).

I have begun at c. 38 B.C. and have disregarded some earlier settlements, for example the removal of no fewer than 40,000 Ligurians and their installation on public land in Samnium in 180 B.C., a transplantation which, unlike the vast majority of the settlements I am going to mention, was against the will of the Ligurians (Livy XL.38.3-7). I have ignored a few texts which seem to me irrelevant or of no value: this applies particularly to the later period (after no. 23 below), for which the evidence is often unclear. I have also

ignored various treaties in the fifth century by which parts of the Roman empire were ceded outright to external powers, e.g. the surrender of part of the diocese of Africa to the Vandals in 435. Many of the literary texts were first collected by Zumpt (1845) and Huschke (see Clausen, *RC* 44-9, 57-61, 77-89), but I know of no work which sets out the essential literary material and adds some of the epigraphic and archaeological evidence, as I try to do here. (The fullest collection I know is that of Seeck, *GUAW* I⁴.ii.591-3, with i.407-8.) I may say that, for convenience only, I shall usually speak of 'barbarians' without the inverted commas which I normally employ. The whole subject seems to me to have much more importance than is commonly realised: see IV.iii §§ 17 and 19 above (with its nn. 28-36 below), where the subject is discussed and further bibliography will be found.

1. Octavian's general, M. Vipsanius Agrippa, probably in 38 B.C., transferred the German Ubii (at their request) to the left bank of the Rhine and settled them there, as a complete *civitas*: Strabo IV.iii.4, p.194 (and presumably VII.i.3, p.290); cf. Tac., *Ann.* XII.27.1-2; XIII.57.4; *Germ.* 28.5. See Hermann Schmitz, *Colonia Claudia Ara Agrippinensium* (Cologne, 1956).

2. In 8 B.C. the future Emperor Tiberius, as general of Augustus, received the submission of the Suevi and Sugambri and settled 40,000 of them on lands west of the Rhine: Suet., *Aug.* 21.1, with *Tib.* 9.2; Eutrop. VII.9; and cf. Augustus, *Res Gestae* 32.1. The number of 40,000 (*Germani*) appears also in Oros. VI.xxi.24.

3. It was almost certainly during the first few years of the first century C.E. that Sextus Aelius Catus settled 50,000 'Getae' south of the Danube, in what was later known as Moesia: Strabo VII.iii.10, p.303. These people were in fact Dacians: see A. Alföldi, 'Dacians on the south bank of the Danube', in *JRS* 29 (1939) 28-31. He publishes a supposed military diploma of 7/8 November 88, of the auxiliary soldier *Gorio, Stibi f., Dacus*, from Nicopol in Bulgaria (which has since been shown to be a forgery, by H. Nesselhauf, in *CIL* XVI Suppl. [1955] p.216), and refers to one or two similar documents (esp. *CIL* XVI.13). On the chronology of this settlement, see R. Syme, in *JRS* 24 (1934) 113-37, at 126-8 = *Danubian Papers* (Bucharest, 1971) 53-5.

When the German chieftains Maroboduus and Catualda were settled in A.D. 19 at Ravenna and Forum Julii respectively, the personal retainers (*comitatus*) of each were settled outside Roman territory, beyond the Danube, to prevent them from creating disturbances in pacified provinces (Tac., *Ann.* II.63, esp. § 7).

4. In A.D. 50, or soon after, Vannius, on ceasing to be king of the Quadi, was settled by order of the Emperor Claudius in Pannonia, with his *clientes*: Tac., *Ann.* XII.29-30, esp. 30.3. (See Mócsy, *PUM* 40-1, 57-8, 371 n.13.)

5. (a) In the 60s, in the reign of Nero, Ti. Plautius Silvanus Aelianus claimed to have brought over into his province of Moesia and obliged to pay tribute 'more than 100,000 *Transdanuviani*, with their wives and children and chiefs or kings': *ILS* 986 = *CIL* XIV.3608. The most recent treatment I have seen is by T. Zawadski, in *La parola del passato* 160 = 30 (1975) 59-73.

(b) It is possible, as argued by Zawadski (op. cit. 72-3), that L. Tampius Flavianus (*PIR*¹ III.294 no.5), the legate of Pannonia in 69-70 (and perhaps earlier), performed a feat resembling that of Plautius Aelianus (see the preceding paragraph), since *ILS* 985 = *CIL* X.6225, lines 6-8, as re-edited by Alföldi and Reidingcr and reproduced by Zawadski (id. 73), lines 7-9, is probably to be restored '[multis] opsidibus a Tran[s]danuvi[an]is acceptis, lim[en]itibus omnibus ex[ploratis] / hostibus(?) ad vectig[alia] praestanda [traductis]'.

6. Some Celtic Cotini and perhaps Osi (cf. Tac., *Germ.* 43.1-2) were apparently given land in Pannonia at some time during the first century: see Mócsy, *PUM* 57-60; and cf. § 7 c below.

There is then a long gap, until the reign of Marcus Aurelius (161-180). Appian, *Praef.* 7, refers to ambassadors from barbarian peoples whom he claims actually to have seen at Rome, 'offering themselves as subjects', but refused by the emperor on the ground that they would be of no use to him. This passage must have been written under Antoninus Pius, while 'a long period of secure peace' (as Appian calls it) still prevailed, and it seems to refer only to requests for annexation: nothing is said about entering into territory already Roman.

7. Various settlements of German barbarians are recorded, or can be inferred, during the reign of Marcus Aurelius. They will mostly have been made during the 170s.

(a) According to Dio Cassius LXXI.xi.4-5, various barbarians (who will certainly have included Quadi) received land from Marcus in Dacia, Pannonia, Moesia, Germany (i.e. the two provinces of that name) and Italy itself. (This may have happened as early as 171: see Birley, *MA* 231-2.) When an uprising took place at Ravenna, Marcus sent the barbarians out of Italy and brought no more in there. (For the depopulation of Italy by the plague of A.D. 166 ff., see Oros. VII.xv.5-6, xxvii.7; and cf. VIII.ii above and its n.10 below.)

(b) Dio Cass. LXXI.xii.1 ff., esp. 2-3: the 'Astingoi' (= Asding Vandals) were promised land if they fought against the enemies of Rome. (This also may have taken place in 171: see Birley, *MA* 232-3.)

(c) Further Cotini (cf. § 6 above) must also have been established in eastern Pannonia, apparently around Mursa and Cibalae: see Mócsy, *PUM* 189-91, 199, 248; cf. *CIL* VI.32542 d. 3-4; 32544 g; Dio Cass. LXXI.xii.3; Tac., *Germ.* 43 (cf. Seeck, *GUAW* I⁴.ii.583-5). These settlements may also have occurred in 171.

(d) Dio Cass. LXXI.xvi.2 (A.D. 175): the Sarmatian Iazyges gave to Marcus 8,000 horsemen, of whom he sent 5,500 to Britain. According to Dio, these men were provided under treaty (§ 1), as the contribution of the Iazyges to their alliance, *ἐσχηματισμοῦ*, and (I should have thought) one might therefore have expected them to be treated as *federati*, rather than as an auxiliary unit of the Roman army, especially as we are not told that they were to receive land within the empire. But the subsequent evidence concerning men who are generally (and probably rightly) considered to be among the descendants of these Iazyges suggests that they did in fact receive land for settlement and that they joined the regular Roman army, in the units known as *numeri*. A well-known inscription of A.D. 238-44, from Ribchester, the ancient Bremetennacum (probably Bremetennacum Veteranorum), refers to a *(numerus) equitum) Sarmatarum) Bremetennacensium*, under a *praepositus) (numeri) et (regionis)*: *RIB* 583 = *CIL* VII.218; cf. *praep. n. et regi.* in *RIB* 587 = *CIL* VII.222. The unit (presumably of a few hundred men) is referred to as an *ala Sarmatarum* on two tombstones, *RIB* 594, 595 = *CIL* VII.229, 230, and in the early fifth century it still existed as a *comes Sarmatarum* (*Not. Dig.*, *Osc.* XL.54). The whole subject has been discussed in detail in an able article by I. A. Richmond, 'The Sarmatae, Bremetennacum Veteranorum and the Regio Bremetennacensis', in *JRS* 35 (1945) 15-29. Richmond points out that this area (part of the Fylde, in the Ribble valley) is particularly well suited for maintaining the large horses needed for these 'cataphract cavalry', and that the original batch of Iazyges is likely to have been settled here in bulk, on retirement from their service (doubtless in a whole group of *numeri*) about A.D. 200 (loc. cit. 22-3). How many were actually settled in the Fylde is not known. They may well have been set to drain and clear the land, as we know happened to veterans settled elsewhere, e.g. at Deultum Veteranorum in Thrace (Pliny, *NH* IV.45; cf. Richmond, op. cit. 22) and probably in eastern Pannonia (see the preceding paragraph, and 14 b below); cf. also Tac., *Ann.* I.17.5; and *CJ* XLix.3 (cited by Richmond, op. cit. 23) = *Nov. Theod.* XXIV.4, where the words 'universis cum paludibus omnique iure' suggest something better than 'marshes' (Jones, *LRE* II.653, translates 'water meadows'); also *CJ* VII.xli.3.1 = *Nov. Theod.* XX.3.

(e) Dio Cass. LXXI.xxi.3,000 Naristae received land, which must have been in

Pannonia (cf. *CIL* III.4500, from Carnuntum: see again Seeck, as cited in § c above). The date may be 179: see Birley, *MA* 285-6.

(f) According to the *Historia Augusta*, Marcus settled *infinitos ex gentibus* on Roman soil (*Marc.* 24.3), and in particular he brought to Italy a large number of surrendered Marcomanni (22.2). Cf. 14.1: various *gentes* driven on by other barbarians were threatening to make war on the empire, *nisi reciperentur*.

8. It was presumably in 180, the year in which Commodus became sole emperor, that C. Vettius Sabinianus Julius Hospes, as governor of the Tres Daciae (*AE* [1920] 45: see Wilkes, *Dalmatia* 447), promised land in Roman Dacia to 12,000 Dacians who had been driven out of their own land: see Dio Cass. LXXII.iii.3.

There is then another long gap, until the 250s, apart from the minor settlement mentioned in § 9 below.

9. The Emperor Severus Alexander (222-235) is said by Herodian VI.4.6 (cf. Zonar. XII.15) to have settled in villages in Phrygia, to farm the land there. 400 exceptionally tall Persians who had been sent on a mission to him by the Persian king. This must have been in A.D. 231-2.

10. The Emperor Gallienus is said to have given part of Pannonia to the Marcomannic King Attalus, for settlement: [Vict.], *Epit. de Caes.* 33.1, with Victor, *Caes.* 33.6; and see Mócsy, *PUM* 206-7, 209, who dates this 258-60 (in the joint reign of Valerian and Gallienus).

11. There are general statements by Zos. I.xlvi.2 and *Hist. Aug., Claud.* 9.4, that the Emperor Claudius II Gothicus (268-70) settled many Goths as farmers in Roman territory.

12. The Emperor Aurelian (270-5) is also said to have settled some defeated Carpi: Victor, *Caes.* 39.43; cf. *Hist. Aug., Aurel.* 30.4; Lact., *De mort. pers.* 9.2. This was presumably in Thrace. The allegation in *Hist. Aug., Aurel.* 48.1-4, that Aurelian planned to buy uncultivated land in Etruria and settle there *familiae captivae*, to produce free wine for the Roman people, can doubtless be ignored.

13. The Emperor Probus (276-282) evidently settled many barbarians in Roman territory: see Zos. I.lxviii.3 (Burgundians and Vandals in Britain); lxxi.1 (Bastarnae in Thrace); lxxi.2 (Franks; cf. *Paneg. Lat.* IV[VIII].xviii.3); *Hist. Aug., Prob.* 18.1 (100,000 Bastarnae); 18.2 (many Gothic Gepids and Greuthungi, and Vandals). Unlike Günther (*ULGG* 311-12 and nn.3-4), I do not think we can make use of the fictitious letter of Probus to the Senate in *Hist. Aug., Prob.* 15 (esp. §§ 2 & 6) as intended to refer to the settlements just mentioned, since (a) the author does not give them until *Prob.* 18.1-2 and seems to put them later (in 280 ff.), whereas the letter to the Senate seems to belong, in the author's mind, to 277-8; also (b) *Prob.* 14.7 (whatever its historical worth) shows that the author cannot have meant 15.2-6 to refer to the settlements described in 18.1-2, but must be thinking in 15.2 (*omnes iam barbari vobis arant* etc.) of barbarians made tributary, and in 15.6 (*arantur Gallicana rura barbaris bubus* etc.) of booty taken from the Germans. (Zos. I.lxviii.3, however, seems to put the settlement of Burgundians and Vandals in Britain in 277-8.)

14. There is clear evidence of many barbarian settlements made by Diocletian and the Tetrarchs (285-306):

(a) For Gaul (and Thrace), see especially a document of particular value because of its early date (1 March 297): *Paneg. Lat.* IV[VIII]. The most important passages are:

(i) i.4: 'tot excisae undique barbarae nationes, tot translati sint in Romana cultores.'

(ii) viii.4: 'omnes [barbari] sese dedere cogrentur et . . . ad loca olim deserta transirent, ut, quae fortasse ipsi quondam depraedando vastaverant, culta redderent serviendo.'

(iii) ix.1-4: 'captiva agmina barbarorum . . . atque hos omnes provincialibus vestris ad obsequium distributos, donec ad destinatos sibi cultus solitudinum ducerentur . . . Arat ergo nunc mihi Chamavus et Frisius . . . et cultor barbarus laxat annonam . . . Quin etiam si ad dilectum vocetur, accurrit et obsequiis teritur et tergo cohercetur et servire se militiae nomine gratulatur.'

(iv) xxi.1: 'itaque sicuti pridem tuo, Diocletiane Auguste, iussu deserta Thraciae translatis incolis Asia complevit, sicut postea tuo, Maximiane Auguste, nutu Nerviorum et Trevirorum arva iacencia Laetus postliminio restitutus et receptus in leges Francus excoluit, ita nunc per victorias tuas, Constanti Caesar invicte, quidquid infrequens Ambiano et Bellovaco et Tricassino solo Lingonicoque restabat, barbaro cultore revirescit.'

All the settlements in Gaul referred to in *Paneg. IV* must have taken place between 293—the date of the victory over the Chamavi and Frisii (see ix.3), who had been allies of Carausius—and early 297, the date of *Paneg. IV*. We must note from xxi.1 that whereas the settlement of the Franks is new (the *Francus* is *receptus in leges*), that of the *laeti* must have been earlier, for the *laetus* is *postliminio restitutus*. If the word *laetus* here has the sense commonly attributed to it (see IV.iii § 19 above and its n.29 below), then this is the earliest known use of the word in that sense. There is nothing to show when the original settlement of these *laeti* took place: it may have been one of the cases referred to above. Nothing seems to be known of Diocletian's settlement of Asiatics in Thrace (xxi.1).

Another early document is *Paneg. Lat.* VII[VI].vi.2 (of 310): 'Quid loquar rursus intimas Franciae nationes . . . a propriis ex origine sui sedibus atque ab ultimis barbariae litoribus avulsas, ut in desertis Galliae regionibus collocatae et pacem Romani imperii cultu iuvarent et arma dilectae?' This passage is sometimes taken to refer to a settlement of Salian Franks in Batavia by Constantius I, c. 297 (thus Julian, *HG* VII.85-6, 146 n.2, 198-9); but that settlement has also been attributed to Constans in 341 (see *id.* 86 n.5, 146 n.2) or to the usurpation of Magnentius in 350-3 (Piganiol, *EC* 135-6).

It seems very likely that a famous lead medallion of Lyons depicts one of the various settlements just mentioned: see Maria R. Alföldi, 'Zum Lyoner Bleimedallion', in *Schweizer Münzblätter* 8 (1958) 63-8, who suggests that it is the Emperors Maximian and Constantius I who are shown as receiving men, women and children in 296. In the lower scene on the medallion the migrants are also depicted as crossing a bridge over the Rhine, *Fl(umen) Renuis*, from *Castel(lum)*, the modern Kastel, to *Mogontiacum* (Mainz).

(b) More Carpi were settled in eastern Pannonia in 295-6: *Amm. Marc.* XXVIII.1.5; Victor, *Caes.* 39.43; *Eutrop.* IX.25.2; *Oros.* VII.xxv.12; cf. *Paneg. Lat.* IV[VIII].v.2 (where 'illa ruina Carporum' is very recent); and see Mócsy, *PUM* 272. The date, 296, is given by Euseb. (Hieron.), *Chron.*, p.226 (ed. R. Helm, 1956); *Cons. Constant.*, in *Chron. min.* I.230. Possibly drainage and clearance works were carried out by the settlers: see Victor, *Caes.* 40.9-10, with Mócsy, *PUM* 272.

(c) Bastarnae and Sarmatians are also said to have been settled on Roman soil in large numbers: *Eutrop.* IX.25.2; *Oros.* VII.xxv.12; cf. Lact., *De Mort. Pers.* 38.6, with the commentary of Jacques Moreau, *SC* 39 (1934) II.411-12, dating the Sarmatian settlement to 303. For the Bastarnae (295), see Euseb. (Hieron.), *Chron.*, loc. cit.

15. The Emperor Constantine is said to have distributed 'over 300,000 Sarmatians in Thrace, Scythia, Macedonia and Italy': *Anon. Vales.* 6.32; cf. Euseb., *Vita Constant.* IV.vi.1-2; *Amm. Marc.* XVII.xii.17-19; Zos. II.xxii.1; Publilius Optatianus Porphyrius, *Carm.* VII.20-2 (with 32). This is dated to A.D. 334: Euseb. (Hieron.), *Chron.*, p.233 (ed. Helm); *Cons. Constant.*, in *Chron. min.* I.234. The statement of Jordanes, *Get.* 22/115, that Constantine also installed Vandals in Pannonia, should probably be rejected: see Courtois, *VA* 34-5.

16. The Emperor Constantius II (337-361) seems to have made more than one settlement of barbarians in the empire:

(a) Liban., *Orat.* LIX.83-5 (of A.D. 348-9): in Thrace.

(b) Amm. Marc. XVII.xii.17-20 and XIX.xi.1-7 (esp. 6: 'tributoriorum onera . . . et nomen'); cf. 8-15: Sarmatian Limigantes, A.D. 358-9. Cf. perhaps Auson., *Mosell.* 9, who speaks of Sarmatian *coloni* in the region of Tabernae (the modern Rheinzabern), on the left bank of the Rhine – the journey in question was perhaps in 368. But since Ausonius speaks of the *coloni* as 'recently' (*nuper*) planted, the settlement may have been a later one, effected by Valentinian I.

(c) It was presumably c. 348 that a certain number (perhaps not large) of Christian Visigoths, fleeing from persecution under the leadership of Ulfila, were settled by Constantius II near Nicopolis in Moesia Inferior: Philostorg., *HE* II.5 (πολὸν . . . λαόν); Jordanes, *Get.* 51/267 (*populus immensus*); Auxentius, *Epist. de fide, vita et obitu Wulfilae* 59-60, p.75 ed. Friedrich Kauffmann, *Aus der Schule des Wulfila = Texte u. Untersuch. zur altgerman. Religionsgesch.* I (Strassburg, 1899); cf. E. A. Thompson, *VTU* 96-7, with xi.

17. Julian in 358, while still Caesar, allowed the Salian Franks to remain where they had settled on Roman territory, near Tongres: Amm. Marc. XVII.viii.3-4 (cf. XX.iv.1); Liban., *Orat.* XVIII.75; XV.32 (cf. Jul., *Ep. ad Athen.* 280b); cf. Eunap. fr. 10; Zos. III.vi.3.

18. Valentinian I, c. 370, settled Alamanni (captured by the *magister equitum* Theodosius, father of the emperor of that name) as *tributarii* in the Po area in north Italy: Amm. Marc. XXVIII.v.15.

19. (a) The Emperor Valens in 366, after crushing the revolt of Procopius, is said to have disarmed a contingent of Goths, which had been sent to help Procopius (and which probably numbered c. 3,000, as stated by Amm. Marc. XXVI.x.3, rather than the 10,000 of Zos. IV.vii.2, with x.1), and then to have distributed the Goths throughout the cities (of the Danube area), to be held *ἐν ἀδέσμῳ φρουρᾷ ἢ φυλακῇ*; they were received by the cities *ἐς τὰς οἰκίας*: see Eunap. fr. 37; Zos. IV.x.1-2 (clearly relying on Eunapius). Some of these Goths will doubtless have been turned into slaves, others perhaps into *coloni*.

(b) Valens in 376-7 settled very large numbers of Visigoths in Thrace: Amm. Marc. XXXI.iii.8; iv.1-11 (and cf. v ff.); Eunap. fr. 42-3; Socr., *HE* IX.34.2-5; Soz., *HE* VI.37.2-6; *Cons. Constant.*, in *Chron. min.* I.242; Philostorg., *HE* IX.17; Jordan., *Get.* 25/131-3; Zos. IV.xx.5-6; xxvi.1; Isid., *Hist. Goth.* 9, ed. T. Mommsen, in *MGH, Auct. Antiquiss.* XI = *Chron. min.* II.271. For the whole story, see Seeck, *GUAW* V.i.99-103.

20. (a) Under Gratian in 377, his general Frigerid settled Visigoths and Taifali, to farm lands in the territories of three cities in Italy (Mutina, Regium and Parma), just south of the Po: Amm. Marc. XXXI.ix.4.

(b) Ausonius, *Grat. Actio* ii § 8 (end of 379), speaks of a *traductio* of Alamanni captured by Gratian, and of Sarmatians 'conquered and pardoned'.

(c) Gratian in 380 (with the subsequent concurrence of Theodosius I; Jordan., *Get.* 28/142) concluded a treaty with the Goths, allowing them to settle in Pannonia and Upper Moesia: Zos. IV.xxxiv.2; xl.1-2; Jordan., *Get.* 27-8/141-2; cf. Procop., *Bell.* VIII (*Goth.* IV).v.13. See Seeck, *GUAW* V.i.129-30, 141-2. Contrast Demougeot, *MEFB* 147-50. And see 21 b below.

21. Major settlements were made by the Emperor Theodosius I:

(a) In 381 the Visigothic chief Athanaric (who immediately died) and some of his followers were received into the eastern part of the empire: Zos. IV.xxxiv.3-5; Socr., *HE* V.10.4; Themist., *Orat.* XV.190c-1b; Jordan., *Get.* 28/142-5; *Cons. Constant.*, in *Chron. min.* I.243; Prosper Tiro, *Epir. chron.* 1177, in id. 461; Hydatius 6, in *Chron. min.* II.15; Marcellinus Comes, *s.a.* 381 § 2, in id. 61. See Seeck, *GUAW* V.i.130.

(b) By a treaty dated 3 October 382 (*Cons. Constant.*, in *Chron. min.* I.243) Theodosius installed a very large number of Visigoths in the Balkans, especially the lower Danube area. The number may have been at least 20,000: see Jordan., *Get.* 28/144-5. For the other

sources see Seeck, *GUAW* V.ii.495; Stein, *HBE* I².ii.521 nn.14-16; Jones, *LRE* III.29 n.46; Demougeot, *MEFB* 153. Note esp. Themist., *Orat.* XVI.211-12; *Paneg. Lat.* XII[II].xxii.3 (Pacatus, A.D. 389). The Goths were allowed to remain under the command of their own leaders and count as Roman *foederati*: this was perhaps the first time such a status had been conferred on barbarians settled within the empire; but a precedent may already have been set by the treaty of 380 (on which see 20 c above). For critical verdicts on this procedure, see e.g. Jones, *LRE* I.157-8; Pignaniol, *EC*² 235; contrast Demougeot, *MEFB* 152-7 (and cf. 147-50).

(c) Theodosius also settled some Ostrogoths and Greuthungi in Phrygia, presumably after the defeat of the Ostrogothic attempt to cross the Danube in 386 (Zos. IV.xxxv.1, with the doubler in xxxviii-ix; Claudian, *De IV Cons. Honor.* 623-36); see Claudian, *In Eutrop.* II.153-5. These men went marauding in central Asia Minor under Tribigild in the spring of 399: see Stein, *HBE* I².ii.521 n.17; Seeck, *GUAW* V.i.306-11. It must have been this alarming revolt in particular that provoked the passionate outburst against wholesale use of non-Roman troops in chapters 14-15 of the speech *On kingship* delivered by Synesius of Cyrene to the Eastern Emperor Arcadius at Constantinople in 399 (*MPG* LXVI.1053 ff., at 1088-97; there is an English translation by Augustine FitzGerald, *The Essays and Hymns of Synesius of Cyrene* [1930] I, 108 ff., at 133-9). Calling the Goths *Σκῆθαι* (with Herodotus in mind), Synesius attacks not only their settlement on Roman soil by Theodosius (*ibid.* 1097AB = 138) but also the general dependence of the empire on non-Roman soldiery. But, as Gibbon says, 'the court of Arcadius indulged the zeal, applauded the eloquence, and neglected the advice of Synesius' (*DFRE* III.247).

22. *CTh* XIII.xi.10, issued by the Western Emperor Honorius in 399, speaks of the necessity to give *terrae lactiae* to persons of many nations entering the Roman empire. (For the *laeti* and their lands, see IV.iii above and its nn.29 and 33 below. *Laeti* are also referred to incidentally in *CTh* VII.xx.12 *pr.*, of 400; and cf. VII.xviii.10, of the same year.)

I would not infer from Claudian, *Stil.* I.222-3 (A.D. 400), with Günther (ULGG 312), a recent settlement of Franks and Sygambri in Gaul. Claudian's words are too vague; and see Cameron, *Claudian* 96-7, 346-7, on Claudian's tendency to use well-known names indiscriminately, sometimes even resurrecting extinct ones from Tacitus (cf. *De IV cons. Honor.* 446-52).

A constitution of Honorius, of 409, *CTh* VII.xv.1, addressed to the vicar of Africa, mentions areas of land granted by the *antepo* to *gentiles* for the defence of the frontier (cf. XI.xxx.62, of 405, to the proconsul of Africa, mentioning the *praefecti* of the *gentiles*). I know of no evidence as to when these land grants were originally made, but the third century is quite possible: see Jones, *LRE* II.651-2, with III.201 nn.103-4. The term *gentiles* in these texts seems to be the equivalent of *habiti*, as in *CTh* III.xiv.1, of c. 370 (contrast XVI.v.46, where *gentiles* are those commonly called *pagani*, pagans). For the specialised use of *Gentiles* for a crack regiment of the imperial bodyguard and field army, from at least the time of Constantine if not Diocletian, see Jones, *LRE* I.54, 120; II.613-14, with III.183-4 nn.11-13.

In 409 Alaric, the chief of the Visigoths, made two successive demands of Honorius. The first was that both provinces of Venetia, as well as Noricum (also then divided into two provinces) and Dalmatia, be handed over to him (Zos. V.xlviii.3-4). When this and other demands were refused, Alaric made a more moderate one, for both provinces of Noricum, a good part of which the Visigoths seem already to have occupied; but this demand too was rejected (Zos. V.1.3; II.1). In the following year, 410, Rome was sacked by Alaric, but the Goths moved away from Noricum.

23. Under Theodosius II, by *CTh* V.vi.3, of 12 April 409 (addressed to, and no doubt originated by, the Praetorian Prefect Anthemius), the captured Scyrae (Sciri) are to be distributed to landowners *nunc colonatus*, tied to their fields, with a twenty-year exemption from conscription. They are to be settled in 'transmarine provinces', not Thrace or

Illyricum. Sozomen himself saw many Sciri farming in different places in Bithynia, near the Mysian Mount Olympus, south of Prusa; he also says that some of the Sciri had been sold off cheaply (and even given away) as slaves (*HE IX*.v.5-7).

24. Under the Emperor Honorius more than one settlement of barbarians took place in the years between 411 and 419:

(a) Between 411 and 418 there were several movements of Alans, Asding and Siling Vandals, Burgundians, Suevi and Visigoths into various parts of Spain (Gallaecia, Lusitania, Baetica): Hydatius 49, 60, 63, 67, 68, in *Chron. min.* II.18-19; Prosper Tiro, *Epit. chron.* 1250, in *Chron. min.* I.467; Oros. VII.xliii.1.

(b) Visigoths under Wallia, returning from Spain to Gaul, were settled, mainly in Aquitaine, in 418-19: Hydat. 69, in *Chron. min.* II.19; Prosper Tiro, *Epit. chron.* 1271, in *Chron. min.* I.469; Philostorg., *HE XII*.4; Isid., *Hist. Goth.* 22, in *Chron. min.* II.276.

25. During the reign of Valentinian III there were large settlements in Gaul of Alans in 440 and 442 (*Chron. Gall.*, ann. 452, §§ 124, 127, in *Chron. min.* I.660) and of Burgundians in 443 (*ibid.*, § 128).

26. In the reign of the Eastern Emperor Marcian (450-7), after the death of Attila in 453 and the disintegration of his empire, many Germanic, Hunnic and other peoples were given lands for settlement in devastated areas near the Danube from eastern Austria to Bulgaria, and in Gaul. Among other peoples, we hear of Ostrogoths, Sarmatians, Huns, Scyri, Alans and Rugians, and Burgundians. Our information comes mainly from Jordanes, *Get.* 50/263-6, 52/268; cf. *Chron. Min.* II.232, s.a. 456; I.305, s.a. 457.

27. In 473-4 the Emperor Leo I settled in Macedonia a large group of Ostrogoths under Theodemir (the father of the great Theodoric): Jordanes speaks of seven cities being handed over to them, nearly all of which they had occupied already (*Get.* 56/285-8). The Ostrogothic occupation of the area, however, seems to have been brief.

28. In 483 the Emperor Zeno settled some of the Ostrogothic followers of Theodoric in Dacia Ripensis and Lower Moesia (mainly northern Bulgaria): see Marcellinus Comes, s.a. 483, in *Chron. min.* II.92.

29. (a) In 506, while Anastasius I was reigning in the East and Theodoric the Ostrogoth was ruling Italy (with the principal title of *rex*), Theodoric took under his protection a large body of Alamanni who had been defeated and driven south by Clovis the Frank, and settled them in Raetia, in an area which might perhaps still be considered part of the Roman empire (Ennodius, *Paneg.* 72-3, in *MGH, Auct. Antiq.* VII [1885] 212, ed. F. Vogel; Cassiod., *Var.* II.41; Agath. I.6.3-4; and see Stein, *HBE* II.147 and n.1).

(b) In 512, still under Anastasius I, there was a settlement of Heruls in Roman territory (presumably in northern Yugoslavia): see Procop., *Bell.* VI = *Goth.* II.xiv.28-32; Marcellinus Comes, s.a. 512 (11), in *Chron. min.* II.98 ('in terras atque civitates Romanorum'). Cf. perhaps Cassiod., *Var.* IV.2 (perhaps of A.D. 511); and see Bury, *HLRE*² II.300 ('No people quite so barbarous had ever yet been settled on Roman soil'); Stein, *HBE* II.151, 305.

30. Several settlements were made by the Emperor Justinian I (527-565):

(a) Early in 528, on the conversion to Christianity of the Herul king and his chiefs, Justinian gave the Heruls better lands in eastern Pannonia, in the neighbourhood of Singidunum (Belgrade): Procop., *Bell.* VI = *Goth.* II.xiv.33 ff.; VII = *Goth.* III.xxxiii.13 (cf. xxxiv.37), and other sources given by Bury, *HLRE*² II.300 and n.2, and Stein, *HBE* II.305 (cf. 151, 156).

(b) In 534 Justinian settled 'in the Eastern cities' a number of Vandals who had surrendered to Belisarius after his capture of Carthage in the previous year and had been formed into five cavalry squadrons, the *Vandali Iustiniani*, to serve on the Persian frontier: see Procop., *Bell.* IV = *Vand.* II.xiv.17-19. (There must have been at least 2,000 of these Vandals; 400 deserted and sailed back to Africa.)

(c) It must have been during the 540s (probably 546) that Justinian settled Lombards (under their king, Audoin) in western Pannonia and Noricum, giving them territory which included the town of Noreia (Neumarkt): Procop., *Bell.* VII = *Goth.* III.xxxiii.10-11.

(d) Justinian settled in Thrace, apparently in 551, some 2,000 Kotrigurs (a Hunnic people), with their families: see Procop., *Bell.* VIII = *Goth.* IV.xix.6-7.

Conquests made by the Frankish King Theudebert (533/4-547) of portions of Roman territory in Liguria, Venetia, the Cottian Alps, Raetia and Noricum (see Stein, *HBE* II.526-7) were apparently never recognised by Justinian: see Procop., *Bell.* VIII = *Goth.* IV.xxiv.11, 15, 27-9 etc., against VII = III.xxxiv.37.

There is a very interesting passage, *Bell.* VII = *Goth.* III.xxxiv.36, in which Procopius makes some Gepid ambassadors tell Justinian in 549 that his empire has such a superfluity of cities and territory that he is actually looking for opportunities to give away parts of it for habitation!

31. In 578, after Maurice (who became emperor four years later) had conducted a very successful campaign against the Persians in their Armenian province of Arsanene (on the upper Tigris), the Emperor Tiberius Constantine (578-582) settled large numbers of the population of that area in Cyprus: see John of Ephesus, *HE* VI.15, cf. 27 *fin.*, 34; Evagr., *HE* V.19, p.215.16-26 ed. Bidez/Parmentier; Theophylact Simocatta III.xv.15, ed. C. de Boor, 1887. A later settlement of Armenians in Thrace, said to have been planned by the Emperor Maurice in 602, never took place: see Sebeos XX, pp.54-5 in the French translation by Frédéric Macler, Paris, 1904.

32. It appears from Greg. Magn., *Ep.* I.73, of 591, that there had been a recent settlement of barbarian 'daticii' (surely *deditiici*) on the estates of the Roman Church in Africa.

33. It must have been in the 590s that the Emperor Maurice settled some Bulgars in Upper and Lower Moesia and Dacia (in the area of Belgrade in Yugoslavia and northern Bulgaria), devastated by the Avars in the reign of Anastasius: see Michael the Syrian, *Chron.* X.21, in the French translation from the twelfth-century Syriac by J. B. Chabot, Vol. II (Paris, 1901-4) 363-4. (I am grateful to Michael Whitby, who has been studying Theophylact, for drawing my attention to this material and some of that in § 30 above.)

Later transfers of population (although mainly those of peoples already inhabiting one region of the Byzantine empire to another such region) are listed by Peter Charanis, 'The Transfer of Population as a Policy in the Byzantine Empire', in *CSSH* 3 (1960-61) 140-54. He also mentions some (by no means all) of the settlements I have listed above.

* * * * *

Relevant here are a number of entries in the *Notitia Dignitatum* (*Part. Occid.*), including the following, which I give according to the edition by Otto Seeck (Berlin, 1876): *Occ.* XLII.33-44 (various *praefecti laetorum*); 46-63 and 66-70 (various *praefecti Sarmatarum gentilium*); 65 (a *praefectus Sarmatarum et Taifalorum gentilium*). All these are found in the prefecture of the Gauls (in the provinces of Lugdunensis Senonia, Lugdunensis II and III, Belgica I and II, Germana II, and Aquitania I), except nos. 46-63, which are in Italy. See also ch. xiii of the *Verona List* (ed. Seeck in the same volume, at pp.251-2). I know of no corresponding entries in that part of the *Notitia* dealing with the *partes Orientis*, although a few names of units there are those of Alamanni, Franks, Sarmatians, Taifali, Vandili etc.

Many of the barbarian peoples settled in Gaul have left their mark in various geographical names (mainly of villages) in modern France: Burgundians, Sarmatians, Alans, Taifali, Franks, Alamanni, perhaps Goths (see e.g. A. Grenier, in Frank, *ESAR* III.598-9; also his *Manuel d'archéol. gallo-romaine* I [Paris, 1931] 398-402; and R. Kaiser, *Untersuch. zur Gesch. der Civitas und Diözese Soissons in römischer und merowingischer Zeit* [Bonn, 1973], as cited by Günther, *ULGG* 315 and nn.29-30). The same is also true of modern Italy: Sarmatians, Alamanni, Suevi, Taifali (see e.g. Stein, *HBE* II.42n.2). I have not been able to investigate the growing body of archaeological evidence (in part concerning what is sometimes called the Late Roman 'Reihengräberkultur' in northern and north-eastern Gaul), for which see the convenient summary by Günther, *ULGG*, and the many recent works there cited.

I should perhaps mention here that I agree with A. H. M. Jones in rejecting the commonly held theory that in the Later Empire the *limitanei*, or some *limitanei*, were 'a kind of hereditary peasant militia', who occupied heritable lands and performed military duties as a sideline: see Jones, *LRE* II.649-54, with III.200-2 nn.97-109. The *limitanei* make their first appearance in the 360s, in *CTh* XII.1.56 (of 363 or 362) and Festus, *Brev.* 25 (perhaps 369-70; but cf. B. Baldwin, 'Festus the historian', in *Historia* 27 [1978] 197-217). Only in the fifth century do we find *limitanei* as such with lands to cultivate: *CJ* XI.1x.3.pr. = *Nov. Theod.* XXIV.4, of 443; cf. *CTh* VII.xv.2, of 423, referring to *castellorum loca* or *territoria*, to be occupied only by the *castellanus miles*; and see Jones, *LRE* II.653-4.

* * * * *

Some further bibliography on some of the subjects dealt with in this Appendix will be found in IV.iii §§ 17-19 above and its notes below, esp. 28-9; and see 34a on *hospitium/hospitalitas*.

Appendix IV

The destruction of Greek democracy in the Roman period

This Appendix is intended to be read as a supplement to Chapter V Section iii above.

The evidence for this subject is so scattered and fragmentary and difficult to interpret that in the text above (V.iii) I have given only a bare outline of what happened to democracy in the Greek world as a whole in the Hellenistic and Roman periods. There is a good deal of evidence which seems not to have been properly collected together yet, and I cannot pretend to have examined more than a part of it myself, although I think I have looked at enough to be satisfied that the picture I give below is correct in its broad outlines. I shall present here a series of not very well connected observations, with some of the most important references to the sources and a little modern bibliography, in the hope that others will soon undertake the task of marshalling all the available evidence and drawing general conclusions from it, with as much detail and as much chronological and topographical precision as the evidence allows. The mass of epigraphic material which has been accumulating during the past few decades needs to be combined with the previously published epigraphic texts and the literary evidence, into a significant whole, with variations and exceptions noticed. The volumes of *SEG* (27 up to 1980) and of *AE*; the critical summary by J. and L. Robert of the year's epigraphic publications which has appeared regularly as a 'Bulletin épigraphique' in *REG*; the many epigraphic papers by various scholars, especially by L. Robert in *Hellenica* (13 volumes up to 1965) and elsewhere; and a number of new publications of inscriptions (including a few relevant ones in Latin) – all these provide much material for a new synthesis. Of existing works, I have found most useful Jones, *GCAJ* (1940) and *CERP*² (1971), which can be supplemented, for Asia Minor, by Magie *RRAM* (1950, a gigantic collection of source material and bibliography, seldom exhibiting much historical insight),⁴ three admirable articles in *REG* 1895-1901 by Isidore Lévy (*ÉVMAM* I-III), Victor Chapot's *La province romaine proconsulaire d'Asie* (1904), esp. its pp.148-279, and other works, but even Jones does not give a complete conspectus in one place, and I have not been able to discover any general work dealing comprehensively with the subject as a whole. I have of course made use of the fundamental work of Heinrich Swoboda, *GV = Die griechischen Volksbeschlüsse. Epigraphische Untersuchungen* (Leipzig, 1890), and of other standard works, such as W. Liebenam, *Städteverwaltung im römischen Kaiserreich* (Leipzig, 1900). I am also most grateful to A. R. R. Sheppard for allowing me to read his Oxford B.Litt. thesis, *Characteristics of Political Life in the Greek Cities ca. 70-120 A.D.* (1975).

I warmly agree with Barbara Levick that there is an urgent need for at least a catalogue

or concordance of the inscriptions of Asia Minor: see her short paper, 'Greek and Latin epigraphy in Anatolia: progress and problems' in *Acta of the Fifth International Congress of Greek and Latin Epigraphy, Cambridge 1967* (Oxford, 1971) 371-6. The four volumes of *Indexes* (down to 1973) to the Roberts' invaluable 'Bulletins épigraphiques' (in *REG*, from 1938 onwards), prepared by L'Institut Fernand Courby and published in Paris between 1972 and 1979, have made it much easier to discover material published by the Roberts between 1938 and 1973; but they represent only a first step. I must mention also the analytical index by Louis Robert to the five volumes of M. Holleaux's *Études d'épigr. et d'hist. grecques* (ed. L. Robert), in Vol. VI of the *Études* (1968).

* * * * *

In Rome's relations with other states even in Italy itself there are many indications that she would naturally favour the powerful and the propertied (provided of course they were not anti-Roman, on patriotic or other grounds), and help to suppress revolutions. I will give the clearest examples: in the revolt of the Latins and Campanians in 341-0 B.C., the Campanian *equites*, to the number of 1,600, kept aloof from the rest, and were duly rewarded by Rome, when the revolt was suppressed, with Roman citizenship and a pension to be paid them by their countrymen (Livy VIII.xi.15-16; cf. xiv.10). Similarly, after Capua in 216 had gone over to Hannibal, 300 Campanian *equites* who had been serving in Sicily came to Rome and were given the citizenship (XXIII.xxxi.10-11); and in 213 another 112 *equites nobiles* from Capua deserted to the Romans and were duly received by them (XXIV.xlvii.12-13). For the Campanian *equites*, see Toyabe, *HL* 1.333-6, 401-3. At Arretium in 302 B.C. Rome intervened in favour of the *gens Clitina*, the richest local family, who were in danger of being driven out, and reconciled them with their *plebs* (Livy X.iii.2; v.13; and see Harris, *REU* 63-5, 115). In 296 Livy records the suppression among the Lucanians (who had entered into a treaty with Rome in 299-8; X.xi-xii) of 'seditiones a plebeis et egentibus ductibus ortas', by Q. Fabius Maximus, to the great delight of the Lucanian *optimates* (xvii.8). At Volturnum in 265-4 Rome helped to suppress an insurrection of the serfs against their Etruscan masters: Livy, *Per.* 16; Florus i.16, ed. P. Jal (= I.21); Zonar. VIII.7; Oros. IV.v.3-5; *De vir. illust.* 36; John of Antioch fr. 50 (in *FHG* IV.557), etc.; and see Harris, *REU* 115-18, cf. 83-4, 91-2. Another such insurrection in Etruria in 196, called by Livy a 'conjuratio servorum' and evidently serious (according to Livy it made 'Etruriam infestam prope'), was ruthlessly put down by a Roman army under M. Acilius Glabrio, who scourged and crucified some of the rebels and returned others to their *domini* (Livy XXXIII.xxxv.1-3). Etruscan society was deeply divided between a ruling class, described by expressions such as *principes*, *nobiles*, *daisimoi*, *domoi*, *δυνατοίτατοι*, *σφόροι*, and a subject class or classes, described as *servi*, *μισέριοι*, *περὲροισι*. The precise condition of the latter is uncertain, but was probably a form of serfdom (see III.iv above and its n.4 below; and cf. Harris, *REU* 142: in the rising of 196 'the rebels were clearly members of the local serf class'). There has been much dispute about Rome's attitude towards the Etruscans, but I have no doubt that Harris is right: except when Etruscan *principes* showed disloyalty to Rome, as occasionally during the Hannibalic war (218-203), the Romans supported them against their subjects; 'there was no alternative . . . which would not involve radical social change' (*REU* 129-44, at p.143).

There are other examples of the same Roman policy during the Hannibalic war. The defection of Croton to Hannibal in 215 is described in most explicit terms by Livy in XXIV.ii-iii, after two brief anticipatory passages: XXII.lxi.12 and XXIII.xxx.6-7. He explains that 'all Italian cities were as if infested with a single disease': *plebs* and *optimates* were on opposite sides, with the *romani* favouring Rome in each case and the *plebs* Carthage (XXIV.ii.8). Under the leadership of Aristomachus, the *princeps plebis* of Croton, the city was surrendered to the Bruttians, allies of Carthage (and represented in XXIV.i.1 as hated by the Greek cities!), while the *optimates* retired into the citadel, which they had fortified in advance (ii.10-11). The situation was much the same in Nola in

216-214. Here again the local senators, especially their *primores*, were faithful to Rome, while the *plebs* were 'wholly for Hannibal', and, 'as usual, wanted revolution', with some advising defection to Hannibal (XXIII.xiv.7; cf. Plut., *Marc.* 10.2 ff.). The senators, by cleverly dissimulating, managed to delay a revolt (Livy XXIII.xiv.8-9). A little later the *principes* were again alarmed at preparations by the *plebs* for betraying the city (xv.7; xvi.2,5-6). In 215 the *plebs* were inclining towards Rome (xvi.3) but by 214 Livy can describe them as 'for a long time disaffected towards Rome and hostile to their own Senate' (XXIV.xiii.8). The situation at Locri in 216-215 is a little more complicated. As in the case of Croton, the revolt, described more fully in XXIV.i.2-13, is anticipated in two earlier passages: XXII.lxi.12 and XXIII.xxx.8, the latter asserting briefly that the *multitudo* were betrayed by their *principes*, a statement not borne out by the more detailed later narrative: see especially XXIV.i.5-7, where the *principes Locrensiū* are said to have convoked an Assembly because they themselves were 'overcome by fear', and there is emphasis on the fact that '*levissimus quisque novas res novamque societatem mallent*': the decision to go over to Hannibal is represented as being virtually unanimous. In 205 we discover for the first time that there were Locrian *principes* with the Romans at Rhegium: they had been 'driven out by the opposite faction' which had surrendered Locri to Hannibal (XXIX.vi.5). When Rome had regained control of the city the Locrian ambassadors naturally tried to pretend that the defection to Hannibal was 'procul a publico consilio' and their return to the Roman fold due in no small measure to their own personal efforts (xvii.1-2).

According to E. Badian, 'It is difficult to make out whether Livy's account of class divisions in Italy during the [Hannibalic] war (with the upper classes favouring Rome and the lower classes Hannibal) truthfully represents a state of affairs due to political affinity and collaboration or is a second-century myth, invented to uphold oligarchy in Italy'; and he adds, 'the latter seems more likely' (*Foreign Clientelae* 147-8). Giving examples in which he thinks 'Livy occasionally contradicts his own main thesis', Badian cites, for Locri, only XXIII.xxx.8, ignoring the much more detailed narrative at the beginning of Book XXIV, summarised above. I cannot, therefore, accept Locri as an example in favour of Badian's conclusion; and he seems to me to go well beyond the evidence when he claims that 'at Arpi (XXIV.xlvii.6) and apparently at Tarentum (xiii.3) the People favoured Rome'. As for Arpi, all that Livy says in XXIV.xlvii.6 is that during a successful Roman assault on their town certain individual Arpiini complained that they had been kept in a state of subjection and oppression by a few and handed over to Hannibal by their *principes*. What else would one expect them to say, in their desire to exculpate themselves to the victorious Romans? And as for Tarentum, XXIV.xiii.3 is a mere report of a statement allegedly made to Hannibal by five young Tarentine nobles, that the *plebs* of Tarentum, who ruled the city, were 'in potestate iuniorum', a large part of whom (§ 2) favoured Hannibal. In the subsequent narrative of the capture of the city by Hannibal (XXV.viii-x) and its recapture by Q. Fabius Maximus (XXVII.xv-xvii; cf. Plut., *Fab.* 21-2) I see no sign of any pro-Roman feeling on the part of the common people. At Syracuse, certainly, the common people were overwhelmingly hostile to Rome, while certain *nobilissimi viri* (Livy XXV.xxiii.4) were pro-Roman and defected in 214 to Marcellus: see Livy XXIV.xxi to XXV.xxxi, in particular XXIV.xxiii.10-11; xxvii.1-3, 7-9; xxviii (esp. 9); xxxii.2, 9; XXV.xxiii.4, with xxxi.3,6,8. We have less information about other Sicilian cities in which hostility to Rome was strong, and pro-Roman factions may have been lacking in some of them; but Plutarch tells an entertaining story (from Poseidonius) about Nicias, the leading citizen of Engyum who was also the main advocate of the Roman cause there and was duly rewarded by Marcellus for his services (*Marc.* 20.5-11).

Badian cites no other evidence in favour of his thesis, and I know of none. He does not mention the cases of Arretium and Volsini, which I have quoted above, and he qualifies the Livian passage concerning Lucania with an 'if true'. He does admit, however, that in 174 the Roman Senate intervened in an internal dispute at Patavium in Venetia (*sedina ... intestinum bellum*, Livy XLI.xxvii.3), of course on the side of the ruling class. I cannot see

why Livy's general statement about the nature of Italian class divisions during the Hannibalic war should be part of a 'second-century myth, invented to uphold oligarchy in Italy', or how such a myth would serve its alleged purpose; and to say that if two or three of the examples given are not true, 'they strongly suggest that before the war there had been little Roman interference on behalf of oligarchic governments' seems to me a *non sequitur*.

The tendency of upper classes to incline towards Rome is a very general phenomenon. We even hear from Appian (*Lib.* 68.304-5) that in the early second century B.C. there was a party at Carthage which *ἑπρωμαῖζον*, distinguished from those who *ἐδημοκρατίζον* (and another group which favoured Masinissa). Appian (*Illyr.* 23) also distinguishes between the respective attitudes of the *πρωτεύοντες* and the *δημος* of the Pannonian town of Siscia (the Segesta) when Octavian demanded its surrender in 35 B.C. The former group (the *θηναροί* of Dio Cass. XLIX.37.2) wished to comply with Octavian's demands for the installation of a garrison and the giving of hostages; but the common people would not receive the garrison, and they fought the Romans energetically until they were compelled to surrender. Certainly in their relations with the Greek states the Romans always and everywhere preferred to support the propertied classes, although, in their hard-headed way, they were quite prepared to depart from this policy when practical considerations made it necessary for them to do so (see § 2 below). Dealing with the year 192, just before the war with Antiochus III, Livy says it was generally agreed that the *principes, optimus quisque*, in each state were pro-Roman and were pleased with the present state of affairs, while the *multitudo et quorum res non ex sententia ipsorum essent* wanted a general revolution (XXXV.xxxiv.3; cf. xxxiii.1 on the Aetolians). In 190, during the war with Antiochus, we hear that the *multitudo* or *plebs* in Phocaea was for Antiochus, while the *senatus et optimates* wished to stand by Rome (Livy XXXVII.ix.1-4; cf. Polyb. XXI.vi.1-6). And in 171, at the outset of the Third Macedonian War, we find that in most free Greek states the *plebs* inclined towards Perseus, while the *principes* (and 'the best and most prudent section') preferred Rome (Livy XLII.xxx.1-7). Attempts have recently been made, in particular by Gruen, to belittle this evidence, but without success.²

* * * * *

I suspect that greater influence than has been generally realised may have been exercised upon the political life of some Greek cities by the bodies (*convventus*) of Roman residents established in many places throughout the Greek world: of *Ῥωμαῖοι* or *Ῥωμαίων οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες* or (more often) *πραγματευόμενοι* or (most commonly) *κατοικοῦντες*. The political influence of these resident Romans would be most in evidence when they participated in the administration of justice, as we know they did in Sicily and Cyrenaica (see §§ 1 and 5 below) and as they doubtless did elsewhere. Since we hear more about these resident Romans in Asia Minor than anywhere else I will give references for them in § 3 below. The standard book on Italian businessmen operating in the Greek East is still the admirable and comprehensive work of Jean Hatzfeld, *Les Trafiquants Italiens dans l'Orient Hellénique* (BEFAR 115, Paris, 1919).

1. Sicily etc.

It is easy to overlook the fact that a province containing many Greek cities was first acquired by Rome during the second half of the third century B.C., before she took over any part of Greece itself. This of course was Sicily, which, as Cicero put it, was the first foreign country to be given the name of a *provincia*, an 'ornament of empire'. 'She first,' Cicero goes on, 'taught our ancestors how excellent a thing it is to rule over foreign peoples' (*II Verr.* ii.2).

Sicily, with its several dozen Greek cities, came under Roman control and became a Roman province by stages, from 241 to 210 B.C. Differences of status among the Greek cities of Sicily do not concern us here. Most of our very scanty information about

constitutional details comes either from inscriptions (which I have not been able to examine thoroughly) or from Cicero's *Verrines*, esp. *II Verr.* ii.120-5. Constitutional changes were introduced in various places at different times: the most important were those made by the *Lex Rupilia* (regulations imposed by P. Rupilius in 131 B.C., at the end of the 'First Sicilian Slave War') and those introduced by Augustus.

The Sicilian cities, as inscriptions show, evidently retained their Assemblies for some generations after the Roman conquest; but evidently their Councils soon came to play an increasingly important part under Roman rule, with the powers and functions of their Assemblies steadily waning. By the time of Verres' governorship (73-71 B.C.), at any rate, the Councils seem to have been at least partly reorganised on a model nearer to that of the Roman Senate. Our principal source here is Cicero, *II Verr.* ii.120-1 (general), 122 (Halaesa), 123 (Agrigentum), 125 (Heraclea). We hear of a property qualification for councillors (*census*, § 120) and of Verres personally appointing men 'ex loco quo non liceret' (§ 121). It is a problem, especially in view of the use of the word *suffragium* twice over in § 120, whether some form of election of councillors by the Assemblies may not have survived, at least in some cities; but Cicero's regular use of the word *cooptare* for the appointment of councillors in §§ 120 (general, twice), 122 (Halaesa, twice), 123 (Agrigentum) and 125 (Heraclea) suggests to me that councillors were chosen, in most cases anyway, not by popular election for a year at a time, but for life (this would be the most important change), and in one or more of three ways: (1) what we should call 'co-optation' proper: namely, choice by the collective councillors themselves; (2) nomination by magistrates filling the role of the Roman *censores*; and (3) automatically, upon being elected to certain magistracies. What we know of Roman practice in Italy and in Bithynia-Pontus (see § 3A below) makes me inclined to think that in constitutional theory there existed a combination of the second and third methods rather than the first. Cicero himself could certainly use *cooptatio* of appointments made by censors (see *De leg.* III.27: *sublata cooptatione censoria*).³ In order to make *cooptare/cooptatio* seem more appropriate, we might have been tempted to wonder whether, if Sicilian councillors were enrolled by magistrates of censorial type (my second alternative), such magistrates were elected by the councils themselves; but against any such supposition is Cic., *II Verr.* ii.131-3, 136-9 (especially *comitia isto praetore censorum ne simulandi quidem causa fuerunt*, at the end of § 136). I would guess that in practice, as distinct from theory, magistrates performing censorial functions would be bound to a considerable extent, in their choice of recruits for their Council, by the views of its dominant section. This would make the use of the term *cooptatio* for censorial nomination peculiarly appropriate.

One remembers how insistent the Athenian democracy had been on the principle of public accountability: that every magistrate should be subjected to *euthyna* at the end of his term of office (see V.ii § D above). At Syracuse by the late 70s, on the other hand, *euthynai* were being conducted by the Council (a practice which had evidently been going on for some time); and this could even be done in secrecy (see Cic., *II Verr.* iv.140). And the procedure adopted by the Syracusan Council at the same period is indicative of an oligarchical atmosphere: the order in which speeches was delivered was according to 'age and prestige' (*aetas and honor*), and the *sententiae* of the leading men, the *principes*, were entered in the public records (id. 142-3).

In spite of the fact that Halaesa was in the small privileged category of *civitates sine foedere liberae et immunes*, I cannot agree with Gabba (SCSEV 312-13) that at Halaesa, unlike Agrigentum and Heraclea, the Assembly retained the right of electing councillors even in Cicero's time, for Cicero, recording the petition of Halaesa to the Roman Senate in 95 B.C. to settle its controversies 'de senatu cooptando', specifically mentions (at the end of ii.122) that the city had asked that its choice of councillors should be made 'ne suffragiis quidem': probably elections had taken place down to 95 B.C. in the Assembly, but were now, by the new regulations given to Halaesa by C. Claudius Pulcher in 95, to be effected by the Council itself.

At Halaesa, at any rate, there was not only a property qualification (*census*) and a minimum age of thirty for being a councillor; men practising a trade (a *quaestus*), e.g. auctioneers (*praecones*), were also debarred (ii.122). Similar provisions had earlier been included in the rules prescribed for the Council of Agrigentum by Scipio (§ 123, perhaps L. Cornelius Scipio, praetor in Sicily in 193 B.C.; see Gabba, SCSEV 310), and probably in those laid down by Rupilius for Heraclea Minoa (§ 125).

It is in Sicily, I think, that we have the earliest evidence for the body of resident Roman citizens (*conventus civium Romanorum*) providing the judges in certain lawsuits, according to the *Lex Rupilia*; but precisely which suits were involved is not clear from Cic., *II Verr.* ii.32 (*ceterorum rerum selecti iudices civium Romanorum ex conventu*). Cf. ii.33,34,70 (*ex conventu Syracusano*), iii.28 (*de conventu*). It is very likely that these judges would be chosen only from the wealthier residents, as we find later at Cyrene, where we know that in the time of Augustus the system was working badly (see § 5 below).

Among minor points, we may note that in a lawsuit between an individual and his city, according to the *Lex Rupilia*, it was the 'senatus' of some other city in Sicily which appointed the judges (*II Verr.* ii.32). It is also worth noticing the *quinque primi* of Agrigentum, in iii.73, who had been summoned by Verres, with the magistrates of that city, and with them had reported back to their 'senatus' at home.

Of the subsequent constitutional changes in the Sicilian towns I do not think we can be more specific than to say that they must have followed the general pattern observable elsewhere.

I see no reason to treat the *σύνκλητος* which is equated with *senatus* in a bilingual inscription from Naples, and which appears beside the Assembly (*ἀλία* or *δήμος*) in inscriptions, certainly at Acragas and Malta, and (later on as *πρόσκλητος*) at Naples, and probably also at Syracuse, as anything but the Council of these cities; the *ἔσκλητος* which appears once at Rhegium beside both *ἀλία* and *βουλή* is unique (SIG³ 715 = IG XIV.612); see G. Forni, 'Intorno alle costituzioni di città greche in Italia e in Sicilia', in *Κωκάλος* 3 (1957) 61-9, who gives the epigraphic evidence and bibliography. Robert K. Sherck, *The Municipal Decrees of the Roman West* (= *Arethusa Monographs*, no.2, Buffalo, N.Y., 1970) 1-15, is a useful sketch of 'The Senate in the Italian communities'.

2. Mainland Greece (with Macedon and some of the Aegean islands)

Roman influence upon the political life of Old Greece, and Greek resistance to it, around the time of the Roman conquest, have recently been treated extensively in two monographs: Johannes Touloumakos, *Der Einfluss Roms auf die Staatsform der griechischen Stadtstaaten des Festlandes und der Inseln im ersten und zweiten Jhd. v. Chr.* (Diss., Göttingen, 1967); and Jürgen Deininger, *Der politische Widerstand gegen Rom in Griechenland 217-86 v. Chr.* (Berlin, 1971). The first is essentially an exhaustive collection of the evidence; see the review by F. W. Walbank in *JHS* 89 (1969) 179-80. The second attempts much more in the way of interpretation, but its understanding of the political and social situation in Greece is gravely defective: see the critical reviews by G. W. Bowersock, in *Gnomon* 45 (1973) 576-80 (esp. 578); P. S. Derow, in *Phoenix* 26 (1972) 303-11; and especially John Briscoe, in *CR* 88 = n.s.24 (1974) 258-61; and see also Brunt, *RLRCRE* 173. The best modern treatment of the subject is by Briscoe, 'Rome and the class struggle in the Greek states 200-146 B.C.', in *Past and Present* 36 (1967) 3-20, reprinted in *SAS* (ed. Finley) 53-73. His view of Rome's policy in the first half of the second century B.C. can best be summarised in his own words: 'The natural preference of the Senate and its representatives was for the upper classes and for forms of government in which the upper classes were dominant. Other things being equal, it was to this end that Roman policy was directed.' On the other hand, 'in this turbulent period [200-145] it is only rarely that other things were equal. Rome's object was to win the wars in which she was engaged and to maintain the control over Greek affairs which her military successes bestowed on her. To

this end the Senate was glad to accept support from those who were willing to give it to her, irrespective of their position in the internal politics of their own states' (SAS 71-2). But 'under the Roman Empire the picture is very different. There was now no question of a struggle for leadership in the Mediterranean world – Rome's mastery was unchallenged. It is not surprising that under these conditions Rome's natural preferences came to the fore, and that both in Italy and in the provinces it was the richer classes who were dominant . . . The result of Rome's victory was indeed to stem the tide of democracy and the ultimate victory belonged to the upper classes' (SAS 73).

In the Hellenistic period, according to Alexander Fuks, although the Greek upper classes might have very different attitudes towards Rome, 'the *multitudo*, *plebs*, *demos*, *okhlos* was always and everywhere anti-Roman and reposed its hopes of a change in the social and economic situation in all who manifested opposition to Rome (Antiochus III of Asia, Perseus of Macedon)'; see Fuks, 'Social revolution in Greece in the Hellenistic age', in *La parola del passato* 111 (1966) 437-48, at p.445; and cf. 'The *Bellum Achaicum* and its social aspect', in *JHS* 90 (1970) 78-79. This forthright statement, which does go slightly beyond the available evidence, has recently been attacked by Gruen in relation to the events of the Third Macedonian War of 171-168 B.C. (see n.2 again). By carefully isolating the events in question, and by doing his utmost to play down inconvenient passages such as Livy XLII.xiii.9 (cf. App., *Maced.* 11.1; Diod. XXIX.33); xxx.1-7; Polyb. XXIV.ix.3-7; x.14; XXVII.ix.1; x.1.4; and Sherck, *RDGE* 40 (= *SIG*³ 643 = *FD* III.iv.75), lines 22-4, Gruen feels able to deny altogether for this period any 'attested connection between social conflict and attitudes toward or by the major powers' (op. cit. in n.2, p.47). In spite of the defects in his arguments,⁴ the general conclusions in his last two paragraphs are largely unobjectionable for this particular war: 'There seems to have been little genuine commitment to the side of either Rome or Perseus . . . The populace was not eager to fight and die in a cause not their own. Attitudes fluctuated with the fortunes of war . . . Security and survival were the dominant motives, not class consciousness' (op. cit. 48). I of course would say that anti-Roman feeling on the part of the masses in general would very often not be able to display itself in action, as it would tend to be overborne by other considerations, especially sheer prudence and recognition of the futility and even danger of outright opposition to Rome – which might have fearful consequences, as the fate of Haliartus in 171 showed (Livy XLII.lxiii.3-12). The Roman siege of Haliartus ended with massacre, general enslavement, and the total destruction of the city. That was in the first year of the war. The catastrophe at Haliartus would have been a most powerful deterrent against actually joining in anti-Roman activity, even for those who were most hostile in their hearts to Roman dominance. Earlier in 171, when the news spread throughout Greece of a Macedonian victory in a cavalry engagement with the Romans (for which see Livy XLII.58-61), the inclinations of *oi πολλοί, oi ὄχλοι* in Greece towards Perseus, hitherto mainly concealed, had 'burst out like a fire', according to Polybius XXVII.ix.1; x.1.4. The whole passage (ix-x) is fascinating; Polybius felt that Greece had suffered at the hands of the Macedonian kings but had received real benefits from Roman rule (x.3), and he is anxious to exculpate his fellow-countrymen from the charge of ingratitude to Rome. (Gruen of course attempts to discount the use by Polybius of the terms *oi πολλοί, oi ὄχλοι*, but see n.2 and 4 again.) Roman power could indeed inspire awe. A leading pro-Roman opposed to an incipient revolt might call attention not only to the benefits of peace but to the *vis Romana*; he could warn the young men of the danger of opposing Rome and instil fear into them – as Julius Auspex of the Remi does in Tacitus' narrative of the events in Gaul early in A.D. 70 (*Hist.* IV.69).

In the final struggle against Rome in 146 B.C. in particular we find great emphasis laid on the participation of the lower classes in the anti-Roman movement: in particular, Polybius speaks of the crucial meeting of the Achaean League at Corinth in the spring of 146, which declared war, as being attended by 'such a crowd of workmen and artisans [*ἐργαστηριακῶν καὶ βαναύσων ἀνθρώπων*] as had never assembled before' (XXXVIII.xii.5).

The first known example of Roman interference with the constitutions of the cities of Old Greece is from 196 to 194 B.C., when T. Quinctius Flaminius, in his settlement of Thessalian affairs after the end of the Second Macedonian War, imposed property qualifications for councillors (probably federal ones) and judges and did his best to strengthen the control of the cities by (as Livy puts it) 'that part of the citizen population to whom it was more expedient to have everything secure and tranquil' (XXXIV.li.4-6; cf. Plut., *Flamin.* 12.4) – the propertied class, of course. (We are not told that Flaminius imposed outright oligarchy by insisting on limitation of the right to attend the Assemblies.) By 192, Livy tells us, it was generally realised among the Aetolians and their allies that the leading men of the cities were pro-Roman and rejoiced in the present condition of affairs, while the multitude wished for revolution (XXXV.xxxiv.3). According to Justin XXXIII.ii.7, Macedonia received from L. Aemilius Paulus in 168 'the laws which it still uses' (cf. Livy XLV.xviii and xxix-xxx, esp. xviii.6: 'ne improbus vulgi adsentator aliquando libertatem salubri moderatione datam ad licentiam pestilentem traheret!'). After crushing the revolt of the Achaean League and its allies in 146 B.C., L. Mummius (who incidentally destroyed Corinth and sold its population into slavery) is said by Pausanias to have 'put down democracies and established property qualifications for holding office' (VII.xvi.9). Polybius XXXIX.5 speaks of the *politeia* and *nomoi* given to the Greek cities (in 146-5 B.C.; and cf. Paus. VIII.xxx.9). In V.iii I have mentioned the letter of Q. Fabius Maximus to Dyme in Achaia, after a revolutionary outbreak there towards the end of the second century B.C.: this refers twice to the *politeia* given to the Achaeans by Rome (*SIG*³ 684 = *A/J* 9, lines 9-10, 19-20). Nevertheless, we must understand the statement of Pausanias which I have just quoted in a very qualified sense, as far as the destruction of democracy is concerned, for there is ample evidence of the continuing existence of constitutions at least nominally democratic in these cities: see e.g. Touloumakos, op. cit. 11 ff. In many cities all over the Greek world a system had already become fairly generally established before the Roman conquest whereby proposals had to be approved by some body of magistrates, even before being submitted to the Council and Assembly: see Jones, *CCAJ* 166 (with 337 n.22), 168-9 (with 338 n.26). This practice may have been extended (and it will at least have been encouraged) by the Romans: see *ibid.* 170 (with 338 n.28), 178-9 (with 340-1 nn.43-4), where most of the examples, as it happens, are from Asia.

Throughout the cities of mainland Greece and the Aegean islands, in the early Roman period, there is surprisingly little in the way of identifiable constitutional change that we can confidently attribute to deliberate action on the part of Rome. When, for example, we find from a famous inscription of Messene of the last century B.C. (*IG* V.i.1433, lines 11, 38) that some of those called *τεχνίται* and all those called *χειροτέχναι* were outside the tribes composing the citizen body, and therefore cannot have been citizens at all in the proper sense, we need not suppose that the disfranchisement of these artisans was due to any outside pressure. (On this inscription and *id.* 1432, see the exhaustive commentary of A. Wilhelm, 'Urkunden aus Messene', in *JOAI* 17 (1914) 1-119, esp. 54-5, 69-70.) I believe that what we see if we take a very broad and general view of the political life of these cities is essentially a continuation of the process – sketched in V.iii above – that had already gone quite far under the Hellenistic kings: behind a usually democratic façade, with Council and Assembly passing decrees as in old times, the real power is in the hands of the propertied class; the common people rarely show any capacity to assert themselves or even to exercise influence. The Hellenistic kings had mainly been content to leave the cities alone, so long as they gave no trouble; but of course the very existence of the kings, dominating the eastern Mediterranean world, was a threat to democracy, which the kings at best tolerated, unless exceptional circumstances made them positively encourage it (like Alexander in the act of conquering Asia) or at any rate pretend to favour it or evince what could be interpreted – without any real justification – as sympathy towards the lower orders (like Perseus of Macedon, and Mithridates VI Eupator of Pontus). Rome too was

quite prepared to tolerate Greek democratic constitutions as long as the Greeks kept quiet; but it must soon have become obvious that she would intervene to protect her 'friends' among the leading citizens if they were threatened from below – as, needless to say, they rarely were now. And this naturally led to a further concentration of power in the hands of the propertied class. After 146 B.C., when Rome was very much the mistress of the Mediterranean world, we hardly ever hear of any upsurge from below. The most remarkable, in Old Greece, was the Athenian revolutionary regime of 88–86 B.C., led by Athenian and Aristion, who of course are depicted as villainous tyrants in our surviving accounts.⁵ And this movement could hardly have occurred but for the anti-Roman activities of Mithridates of Pontus in Asia Minor, which made many Greeks hope, vainly as it turned out, for an end to Roman dominance. The sack of Athens by Sulla and his army at the beginning of March 86, which put an end to the revolutionary movement,⁶ must have had a severely discouraging effect on any other potential 'trouble-makers'. Yet there are indications of another upheaval at Athens in about A.D. 13. A good account of this neglected episode has recently been given by Bowersock, who sums up admirably: 'The leaders were executed; the affair is described variously as *res novae*, *stasis*, and *seditio*. These descriptions are perfectly compatible: when an anti-Roman faction gains the upper hand, *stasis* becomes revolt' (AGW 105–8, at 107). One wonders what action was taken in Thessaly when a man named Petraeus was burnt to death, probably during the principate of Augustus (Plut. *Mor.* 815d; and see C. P. Jones, *PR* 40–1 and n.7). In the *Historia Augusta* (*Ant. Pius* 5.5) there is a bare mention of an alleged *rebellio* in Greece in the reign of Pius: see VIII.iii above and its n.2 below.

Some oligarchic modifications may have been introduced into the constitution of Athens at the very end of the second century B.C. (see Bowersock, AGW 101–2, esp. 101 n.3), and it was perhaps this regime which Sulla restored after crushing the revolt of 88–86, for it is said that he made laws for Athens that were 'substantially the same as those previously established by the Romans' (App., *Mith.* 39; see Bowersock, AGW 106 n.2). There were further constitutional changes at Athens in the late Republic and early Principate (see Geagan, ACS); but a certain democratic façade was preserved, and the Assembly continued to meet and pass decrees until at least the late Severan period – one of the latest known is from c. 230: an honorific decree in favour of M. Ulpianus Eubiotus Leurus (see V.iii above and its n.25). The Areopagus, however, had become the main political force, and there is no sign during the Principate of any real political activity in the Assembly, any more than in most other Greek states. At Athens, as elsewhere, we find much evidence of direct interference by the imperial power, through the provincial governor or even the emperor himself, yet sometimes we can see democratic institutions still permitted to function, as when a decree of Hadrian concerning oil production in Attica provides that certain breaches of the regulations there laid down are to be dealt with in the first place by trials in the Council if they involve no more than 50 amphorae and otherwise in the Assembly (SEG XV.108 = IG II².1100 = A/J 90, lines 46–9; see Oliver, *RP* 960–3; Day, *EHARD* 189–92); cf. A/J 91 = IG II².1103 (perhaps also Hadrianic), lines 7–8, providing for trial by the Areopagus of offences against certain commercial regulations. An interesting specimen of an imperial directive (whether it is an edict or a letter) from the Emperor Marcus Aurelius to the city of Athens (to be dated between 169 and 176) was published in 1970, with translation and commentary, by J. H. Oliver, *Marcus Aurelius: Aspects of Civic and Cultural Policy in the East* (= *Hesp.*, Suppl. 13). It has already excited a good deal of discussion and reinterpretation. I will only mention the improved restorations and translation by C. P. Jones, in *ZPE* 8 (1971) 161–83, of the largest plaque of the inscription (II = E), dealing mainly with judicial matters, and two subsequent articles: by Wynne Williams, in *ZPE* 17 (1975), at 37–56 (cf. *JRS* 66 [1976] 78–9), and by Simone Follet, in *Rev. de phil.* 53 (1979) 29–43, with a complete text and French translation of the same portion. Marcus expresses his great 'concern for the reputation of Athens, so that she may recover her former dignity' (or 'grandeur',

σεμνότης). Although he feels obliged to allow the sons of freedmen born after their fathers' manumission – not freedmen themselves – to become ordinary councillors (lines 79–81, 97–102), he insists that members of the Areopagus must have both parents born in freedom (lines 61–6); and he expresses the fond wish that it were possible to reinstate the 'ancient custom' whereby Areopagites had to have not only fathers but also grandfathers of free birth (lines 57–61). Obsession of this kind with the status of members of the local Athenian governing class may excite our derision when its professed object is to enable Athens to 'recover her former *σεμνότης*'!

The Athenian constitution under the Roman Principate presents many puzzles, and there are several questions I feel obliged to leave open, merely referring to the recent discussion by Geagan (ACS), the useful review of that work by Pleket, in *Mnem.* 4 23 (1970) 451–3, and the monograph by Oliver (with modifications) mentioned in the preceding paragraph. It may be that (as undoubtedly at Alexandria: C. P. Jud. II.153.53–7; 150.3–4; and see Fraser, *PA* I.76–8) participation in the ephebia, available of course only to the well-to-do, had become an essential qualification for membership of the category of fully privileged citizens who alone were qualified for the Council (now much more capable of independent action than in the Classical period) and perhaps the courts (see pp.64–5 of Oliver's monograph), and who may (as tentatively suggested by Geagan, ACS 86–7) have been the same group as those who alone were entitled to speak in the Assembly as well as attend its sessions and vote in them (cf. the treatment of Tarsus in § 3B of this Appendix); the latter group may be the same as those referred to as *ἐκκλησιαζόμενοι κατὰ τὸ νομιζόμενον* in line 18 of a letter to Athens from Marcus and Commodus, now best read as Oliver's inscription no.4, pp.85 ff. (cf. the *ἐκκλησιασται* in two Pisidian cities, mentioned in § 3B below). There may have been a property qualification for those entitled to become councillors; but equally it may have been felt that no quantitative assessment was necessary, having regard to the fact that going through the ephebia (if that was indeed a necessary qualification for the exercise of full political rights) would be possible only for the sons of men of some property. There is unfortunately some uncertainty about all these matters: the epigraphic texts are not absolutely decisive, and it is hard to say how much of the intriguing evidence provided by Lucian (e.g. in *Deor. conc.* 1, 14–19; *Iupp. trag.* 6, 7, 18, 26; *Demon.* 11; *Call.* 22; *Ner.* 19–20; *Navig.* 24; *His. aet.* 4, 12) we can treat as accurately reflecting contemporary practice.⁷

In many other Greek cities some of the old constitutional forms were preserved, even when they had become an empty shell. The Council of Carystus on Euboea was actually chosen annually by lot as late as the reign of Hadrian: see IG XII.ii.11. In Sparta, surprisingly enough at first sight, there was at least one change in a direction opposite to what we might have expected: the traditional Gerousia, consisting of men over 60 who were elected for the rest of their lives, seems to have become transformed, apparently by at least the last century B.C., into a Council of normal Greek type (sometimes actually called *ἀ βουλή*), consisting of men elected annually, with re-election possible: see W. Kolbe in IG V.1, p.37 (commentary on nos. 92–122); K. M. T. Chrimes, *Ancient Sparta* (Manchester, 1949) 138–48. But I think Chrimes may well be right in ascribing the change to Cleomenes III, in the 228 B.C. According to Pausanias III.ii.2, the Gerousia in his day was the *συμβούριον ἀκαταίμακτον κρινοτάτων τῆς πολιτείας*.

City Assemblies long continued, but there is no reliable literary evidence of genuine political activity on their part during the Principate (as there is for some of the cities of Asia Minor), and nearly all the inscriptions which survive record honorific decrees. The latest definitely datable decree from Greece or the islands known to Swoboda, when he published *Die griechischen Volksbeschlüsse* in 1890, was the one now republished as IG XII.vii.53, from Arcesine on the island of Amorgos, which was passed on 11 December 242, in the reign of Gordian III, an honorific *pséphisma* of the *dēmos* of that city (Swoboda, op. cit. 185, was mistaken in referring this decree to Aigiale, another city of Amorgos). I know of no definitely datable later material from the area with which I am concerned

here; but there are one or two known meetings of Greek Assemblies half a century later, from Asia Minor (as we shall see in § 3B below) and Egypt (cf. V.iii above).

I must add a word about the Balkans, an area in which city life was slow to develop except in a few centres. There is at least one Macedonian community which is proved by a very interesting inscription dated as late as A.D. 194 to have had an ἐκκλησία, πολεῖται, and at least one magistrate (with a title often found in Macedonian cities), a πολειτάρχης, but almost certainly no βουλῆ – for the Assembly was summoned by the πολειτάρχης, instructions for carrying out the decree (the operative part of which begins ἔδοξε τῶι τε πολειτάρχῃ καὶ τοῖς πολεῖταις δημογενομένοισι) are given to the πολειτάρχης, and he and a number of others are listed by name at the end of the decree; but there is no sign of a Council. The inscription, first published in 1880, was republished in a much improved form by A. M. Woodward in *JHS* 33 (1913) 337–46, no. 17. (It has not, I think, been republished since.) The community is not identifiable, but it may, as suggested by Woodward, be Erattyria, perhaps the place called Eratryra by Strabo VII.vii.8, p.326. In spite of the 'citizens' and their πολειτάρχης (proved by lines 24–5 to be an annual magistrate), I am not entirely satisfied that this community was a proper polis, as assumed by Woodward and others (including Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*² II.651 n.97). The alternative is to regard it either as a smaller political unit within the *ethnos* (referred to in line 33 in connection with an embassy to the provincial governor, to obtain his authorisation of the decree), as believed by Larsen and others (see Frank, *ESAR* IV.443–4), or as the *ethnos* itself. As Rostovtzeff says of Macedonia, 'The impression one gains is that the economic backbone of the country continued to be the native tribes and the numerous villages, particularly the mountain villages, of peasants and shepherds' (*SEHRE*² I.253). I wonder if perhaps the community on the site of the modern Sandanski in Bulgaria, in the valley of the Strymon (now the Struma), also in Macedonia, was not yet a full polis in A.D. 158, the date at which Antoninus Pius sent a letter to it, part of which was recently found in an inscription, *IGBulg.* IV.2263 (referred to in V.iii above and its n.26). It has been assumed that Pius was merely authorising an increase in the number of councillors (lines 8–12); but may he not have been referring to the creation of a Council, as part of the formal inception of a true polis? At any rate, the inscription published by Woodward should warn us to be prepared for possible variations from the usual pattern of polis development, as late as the beginning of the Severan period: that is why I have devoted some attention to it.

In the section of this Appendix dealing with Asia Minor (§ 3B below) I shall have occasion to refer to a distinction, in the Roman period, between citizens who were entitled to participate fully in the general Assembly of a city, and who in at least two cases, Pogla and Silyum in Pisidia, are called ἐκκλησιασται (cf. perhaps οἱ ἐκκλησιαζόντες κατὰ τὰ νομ[ιζόμενα] at Athens, mentioned above), and an inferior category who evidently did not enjoy full rights in the Assembly, although at the two Pisidian cities they are called πολεῖται. The existence of these grades in Asia may help us to understand an inscription of the Antonine period from Histria in the Dobruđa, where Aba, an outstanding female benefactor of the city (who may remind us of Metrodora of Silyum: see the main text of III.vi above, just after its n.35, and § 3B below), bestows a series of gifts on various different categories of inhabitants. Councillors, members of the Gerousia and certain other groups head Aba's list: they receive 2 denarii each and must also have shared in the distribution of wine (οἰνοπόσιον) which was to be given to various less dignified categories, including 'those in the tribes (φυλαῖ) who are organised in groups of fifty (πεντηκονταρχίαι)'. In subsequent lines of the inscription (37–43) which cannot be restored with any confidence there are references to ὁ δῆμος and τὸ πλῆθος. The inscription was published by Em. Popescu, in *Dacia* n.s. 4 (1960) 273–96; but it is best read in the slightly revised edition by H. W. Pleket, *Epigraphica* II (= *Textus Minores* XLI, Leiden, 1969), no.21, making use of the observations of J. and L. Robert in *REG* 75 (1962) 190–1, no.239. I am inclined to agree with the acute observations of Pleket, in his review of Duncan-Jones, *EREQS*, in *Cronica* 49 (1977) 55–63, at pp.62–3, that 'those organised in

phylai in groups of 50' are perhaps to be identified with the category of privileged citizens who have the right to participate fully in the Assembly at Tarsus, at Pogla and Silyum, and possibly at Athens, and who are distinguished, in the two Pisidian cities, from plain πολεῖται. (Pleket goes on to compare the Histrian phylai with the African *curiae* discussed by Duncan-Jones and others.)

3. Asia Minor

An episode of the very greatest interest to the historian is a revolt which took place in western Asia Minor at the very time when it began to pass under Roman rule. Attalus II, the last king of Pergamum, died in 133 B.C., leaving his kingdom by will to Rome. The gift was accepted by the Roman Senate. Aristonicus, a bastard son of King Eumenes II, claimed to be the heir of Attalus, and led a large-scale revolt which was not crushed until 129. This subject has been much discussed in recent years, and very different views have been put forward concerning the character of the revolt. There is still no general agreement on how far it should be considered primarily as a movement of the poor, with the slaves and serfs, a protest against the existing social order (and even 'a slave revolt'), how far it was a 'nationalist' or anti-Roman rising, and what precisely was the role of Aristonicus himself. I have nothing new to say on the subject, the best account of which seems to me the most recent one, that of Vladimir Vavřinek, 'Aristonicus of Pergamum: pretender to the throne or leader of a slave revolt?', in *Eirene* 13 (1975) 109–29. Vavřinek, who had himself produced a book on the revolt in French nearly twenty years earlier (*La Révolte d'Aristonice*, Prague, 1957), gives an excellent review of the whole range of theories, including those of Bömer, Corraia Thomas, Dumont, and Vogt. Those who cannot easily obtain Vavřinek's article and wish for a brief account of this subject would perhaps do best to read Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE* II.805–26, especially 807–11 (with III. 1521–8 nn.75–99), and Vogt (as cited in n.8). I will only add, for the specialist, a very useful article by C. P. Jones, 'Diodoros Paspáros and the Nikephoria of Pergamon', in *Cronica* 4 (1974) 183–205, demonstrating that the activities of Diodoros Paspáros of Pergamum were associated not (as used to be believed) with the war of Aristonicus but rather with the Mithridatic wars from the eighties to the sixties B.C.

I have already referred, in the introductory part of this Appendix and in its § 1 (and shall revert in § 5 below) to the bodies of Roman residents in various Greek cities. It is particularly in Asia Minor, and above all in the province of Asia itself, that we know of their presence and activities, mainly through inscriptions. The evidence for Asia Minor, and much of the modern literature, is given by Magie, *RRAM* I.162–3 (with II.1061–3 nn.5–13), 254–6 (with II.1129–30 nn.51–6; II.1291–2 n.44; and see II.1615–16 for a list of some forty cities in Asia Minor where *conventus civium Romanorum* were known down to 1950. Among much further information that has come to light since Magie wrote is a decree of Chios referring to οἱ παρεπιδημούντες Ῥωμαῖοι (line 30), to be dated hardly later than 188 B.C. (or just afterwards), and thus much earlier than any of Magie's examples: see Th. Ch. Sarikakes, 'Οἱ ἐν Χίῳ παρεπιδημούντες Ῥωμαῖοι', in *Καιὰ Χριστιὰ* (1975) 14–27, with text p.19; Ronald Mellor, *Θεὰ Ῥώμη. The Worship of the Goddess Roma in the Greek world* (= *Hypomnemata* 42, Göttingen, 1975) 60–1; on the date, cf. also J. and L. Robert, in *REG* 78 (1965) 146–7 no.305 (the decree 'doit dater d'après la paix d'Apamée'); F. W. Walbank, in *JRS* 53 (1963) 3; W. G. Forrest, cited in *SEG* XVI.486 as advocating a late-third-century date.

A. Bithynia-Pontus

Here we have to take account above all of the *Lex Pompeia*, known mainly from Pliny's correspondence with Trajan in c. 110–12 (Pliny, *Ep.* X.79. 1,4; 112.1; 114.1–3; 115; cf. Dio Cass. XXXVII.xx.2), which was still in force in the early second century, as slightly

modified by Augustus. The *Lex Pompeia* embodied the settlement effected by Pompey in 64-5 B.C. after his victory over Mithridates of Pontus. (For its nature, see Sherwin-White, *LP* 669-73, 718, 720, 721, 724-5; Jones, *CERP*² 156-62.) For our present purposes, the most important provisions of the *Lex Pompeia* were that there was to be a minimum age of 30 for holding a magistracy or becoming a councillor; that councillors were to achieve that status by being enrolled by officials whom Pliny calls *censores* (the actual title in Greek was *τιμηται*); and that ex-magistrates must automatically be enrolled, although eligibility was not confined to them. Augustus reduced the age for certain minor magistracies to 22. Pliny reports to Trajan a local opinion, which he seems to share (it must have been the opinion of the leading families, with whom he would associate), that it was 'necessary' to continue a practice that had grown up, of enrolling some young men aged between 22 and 30 as councillors, even though they had held no magistracy. And he adds a remark of great interest, giving the reason for this opinion: that it is 'much better to choose the sons of members of the upper classes for the Council rather than men from the lower orders' (*honestiorum hominum liberos quam e plebe*, *Ep.* X.79.3). From this statement three conclusions inevitably follow: (1) the young men whom it was considered desirable to enrol as councillors were already members of what we may now begin to call 'curial families' (those which had members serving on the Council); (2) but these young men were reluctant to fill one of the magistracies which would automatically have led to a seat on the Council, surely because of the expense involved; and (3) there were men of sufficient means outside the circle of curial families who could have filled a magistracy and thereby qualified themselves for a seat on the Council, had the local curial families not objected to this broadening of their circle. (Trajan, incidentally, told Pliny that no one under 30 ought to become a member of a local Council, except through holding a magistracy.) In this connection I must also mention another letter of Pliny's, referring to the issue of invitations for certain entertainments to 'the whole Council and even no small number from the lower classes' (*totam civem atque etiam e plebe non exiguum numerum*): here again we see the emergence of a group of families of curial status, distinguished from the *plebs* (*Ep.* X.116.1) — an early stage in the development of a fundamental division soon to be given constitutional recognition in various ways (see VIII.i-ii above).

There is no proof of a property qualification for councillors (or magistrates) in the *Lex Pompeia*, but some would infer the existence of one from Pliny, *Ep.* X.110.2; cf. 58.5 and I.19.2 (see Sherwin-White, *LP* 720).

The *censores* (*τιμηται*) charged with the task of enrolling the councillors of the cities of Bithynia and Pontus (Pliny, *Ep.* X.79.3; 112.1, 2; 114.1) are officials who do not seem to have turned up yet elsewhere in Asia Minor, except as *τιμηται* at Aphrodisias and Pergamum and as *βουλευγράφοι* at Ancyra (see section B below). We find *τιμηται* in Bithynia, at Prusa (LB/W 1113), Prusias ad Hypium (*SEG* XIV.773.13-14 and 774.8; *IGRR* III.60.13, 64.6, 66.7; *BCH* 25 [1901] 61-5 no.207.10), Dia (*BCH* 25 [1901] 54-5 no.198.6), and a *βουλευγράφος* at Nicæa (*IGRR* III.1397.11, of A.D. 288-9, as restored by L. Robert in *BCH* 52 [1928] 410-11).

As always, we must be prepared to find exceptional procedures on occasion, as when Trajan allowed Prusa to elect no fewer than 100 councillors, evidently in the Assembly (Dio Chrys. XLV.3.7.9-10).

We know of no special rules in the *Lex Pompeia* regarding the Assemblies or the courts of the Greek cities; and this subject can be treated for Asia Minor as a whole under B below, where I shall also occasionally deal with matters that affect the whole area, such as obtaining the provincial governor's authorisation of certain decrees, and his power to suspend Assemblies.

B. The rest of Asia Minor

As early as Cicero's speech for Flaccus in 59 B.C. it seems that the Councils of some Greek cities in the province of Asia were already permanent bodies, the members of

which were enrolled for life; Cicero actually speaks only of Temnus, in the Hermus valley, but the form of words he uses may suggest that the kind of Council he had in mind was not limited to that city (*Pro Flacc.* 42-3). Jones goes too far, however, when he generalises for this period from Temnus to 'the Asiatic cities' collectively (*CERP*² 61); and he himself realises that the Councils of some 'free cities', in particular Rhodes and its former dependency Stratonicea in Caria, and also Mylasa, long continued to change periodically — those at Rhodes and Stratonicea every six months. For the evidence, it will be sufficient to refer, for Rhodes and Stratonicea, to Magie, *RRAM* II.834 n.18; for Mylasa, see LB/W 406; *BCH* 12 (1888) 20-1 no.7. I know of no literary evidence for such a system, except perhaps Dio Chrys. XXXIV.34-6, from which it appears that the *prytaneis* at Tarsus in Dio's day served for six months only.

The evidence for the growth in Asia Minor of a 'curial order' (which by at least the early third century was substantially a curial class: see VIII.ii above), is almost purely epigraphic, apart from Pliny's correspondence with Trajan concerning Bithynia-Pontus, noticed in A above. The inscriptions concerned rarely enable us to generalise, even for a particular area, and I shall make no attempt to summarise them here. Perhaps it will be sufficient if I select one batch of inscriptions from Lycia, which show that during the second century the common folk, *δημόται*, were a recognisably distinct category from the *βουλευται* (as at Sidyma, A.D. 185-92; *TAM* II.176 = *IGRR* III.597-8, with *TAM* II.175), or from *στ.δ.* at Oenoanda (*IGRR* III.492), doubtless the same as *οι πεντακόσιοι* at nearby Temnussa Minor, who receive 10 denarii each at a distribution when the *δημόται* get only 2 denarii each (*BCH* 24 [1900] 338-41 no.1.25-7). At Xanthus we encounter claims to descent from a father, grandfather and other ancestors who are described as *βουλευται* (*TAM* II.305; and 303 = *IGRR* III.626; *TAM* II.308 refers to a father who was *βουλευτής* at Pinara too), it seems to be the same category, of councillors, which is referred to at Bubon as the *τάξις* of the *προσείσπτες* of the city (IG III.4380e,f), at Balbura as *τάξις ἢ πρωτεύουσα* or *οι πρώτοι ἐν πόλει* (CIG III.4380e,f) and at Phaselis as *τὸ πρῶτον τάγμα τῆς πόλεως* (*TAM* II.1202; and 1200 = *IGRR* III.764). At Xanthus, too, an athlete who is being honoured in *TAM* II.301 = *IGRR* III.623 is described in lines 3-7 as the son of an *ἀνδρὸς ἐπισήμου βουλευτοῦ τελευταῖος ἀρχίης, δημοτικὴν μὲν μίαν, βουλευτικὰς δὲ πάσας* (cf. Jones, *GCAJ* 180, with 342 n.47). And in other parts of Asia Minor we discover references to a curial order, as at Iotapa in Cilicia in the 170s (*IGRR* III.833 b.4-5; *βουλευτικ[ο]σὺν τάγμα[ι]ος*; cf. a. 2; *τάγμα[ι]ος [βουλευτικοῦ]*). Sometimes we find men boasting of descent from ancestors who were not merely councillors but magistrates (see Jones, *GCAJ* 175).

Outside Bithynia-Pontus (see A above) evidence does not seem to have come to light of Councils being enrolled by the Greek equivalent of Roman *censores*, except at Ancyra in Galatia, where the officials concerned are called *βουλογράφοι* (*AE* [1937] 89; *IGRR* III.206, and 179 = *OGIS* II.549), and at two cities in the province of Asia, where (as in Bithynia-Pontus) they are *τιμηται*: Aphrodisias (*REG* 19 [1906] 274-6 no.169.2; *τοῦ τεμμητοῦ*) and Pergamum (*IGRR* IV.445-6; *Ath. Mitt.* 32 [1907] 329 no.60). Elsewhere they probably came to be elected more and more generally by the Council itself, by co-optation (cf. § 1 above on Sicily). The statement by Hadrian, in a much-quoted letter of A.D. 129 to Ephesus, asking it to elect his *protégé* L. Erastus as a councillor, is sometimes taken to provide evidence of popular election there, because when the emperor promises to pay the fee required from a new councillor on election he says he will pay it [*τῆς ἀρχαι[ρ]εσίας [ἐ]μῆκα* (*SIG*³ 838 = A/J 85, line 14)]. However, since the letter is addressed not to the Demos of Ephesus but to the magistrates and Council only (line 5), I would infer that there was no real participation by the Assembly in the election. Nowhere, as far as I am aware, do we hear of a property qualification for membership of a Council; but, especially as being a magistrate and councillor came more and more to involve the expenditure of money, the non-propertied were automatically excluded in practice (cf. VIII.i-ii above).

It would, I think, be universally agreed that election of councillors and of magistrates from below had ceased everywhere, or virtually everywhere, before the end of the second century, and that those Councils which were not enrolled by 'censors' appointed their own members by co-optation. Where the Assembly joins in, it is merely to ratify a *fait accompli*; I would thus explain the inscription from Smyrna, apparently of the early third century, which refers to the election of a principal *ταμίης* and his (six) colleagues *κατὰ τὴν τοῦ δήμου χειροτονίαν* (CIG II.3162, lines 16-19).

For admission to the Assembly, at least as a full member, property qualifications were evidently sometimes imposed in one way or another. The example most frequently quoted is Tarsus, where a fee of 500 drachinae was exacted -- too large, according to Dio Chrysostom (XXXIV.21-3), for the linen-workers who formed a substantial section of the lower classes but remained (as Dio puts it) 'as it were outside the constitution' (*ὡς περ ἔξωθεν τῆς πολιτείας*, § 21), being regarded as foreigners (*δοκοῦντες ἄλλοτριοί*, § 22) and suffering some form of *ἀτιμία* (§ 21), which apparently did not extend to dyers, shoemakers or carpenters as such (§ 23). From the way Dio speaks (§ 21), it seems that the linen-workers were permitted to be present at the Assembly; we must surely suppose, however, that, as non-citizens, they could neither speak nor vote there. In two cities of Pisidia, namely Pogla (A/J 122 = IGRR III.409) and Sillyum, men known as *ἐκκλησιασταί* are distinguished from ordinary *πολίται* (as well as from *βουλευταί*), and at Sillyum they receive far larger sums than *πολίται* under the foundation of Menodora (IGRR III.800-1, cf. 802). Presumably the officials referred to as *πολιτογράφοι* in inscriptions had the duty of keeping the necessary registers (for examples, see Magie, RRAM II.1503 n.26). Here again (cf. the portions of § 2 of this Appendix dealing with Athens and Histria) we have examples of the division of the permanent residents in a Greek city into graded categories, with only a limited number entitled to exercise even the right of participating fully in the general Assembly.

Sometimes we find decrees passed not only by a Council and Assembly but also by the body of resident Roman citizens. At Phrygian Apanea (in the province of Asia), for example, a number of honorary decrees open with the words *ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες Ῥωμαῖοι ἐτείμησαν* (IGRR IV.779, 785-6, 788-91, 793-4); in one case the words *ἀγαμέτης πανδήμου ἐκκλησίας* are added (id. 791.5-6). In other cities too we find *ὁ δῆμος* joined with *οἱ πραγματούμενοι Ῥωμαῖοι*, e.g. at Assus (IGRR IV.248), Cibyra (id. 903-5, 913, 916-19), and elsewhere.

The Assembly had ceased by at any rate the middle of the second century to have any political importance. It is now convoked and presided over by magistrates without whose consent nothing can be proposed and who usually appear as the authors of motions, with some such phrase as *πραξαίνων (ὅτι στρατηγῶν) γνώμη*, and with the concurrence of the Council. I agree with Isidore Lévy that we have to recognise 'l'effacement de la notion des droits du peuple souverain. L'affaiblissement de l'ecclēsia, ou plutôt son annihilation, tel est, à l'époque Antonine, le phénomène capital de la vie constitutionnelle de la cité grecque. L'assemblée populaire est non seulement impuissante, mais résignée à l'impuissance, devant les usurpations de tout genre qui achèvent de la dépouiller' (EVMAM I.218, concluding the best account I have found of the degeneration of the Assemblies of the Greek cities of Asia, *ibid.* 205-18).

I would also draw attention to an excellent passage in Jones, GCAJ 179 (cf. 340-1 n.44, containing much interesting evidence):

Under the Principate the formal mover of a decree, if put on record at all, is almost invariably a magistrate or group of magistrates, and private members of the Council are stated merely to 'introduce the proposal' and to 'request a vote' on it, processes which were apparently preliminary to the formal motion: in a number of cases the introducer and his seconder, if he may be so called, are alone recorded, but in these it is probably assumed that the magistrates moved. Decrees of the people moved by private persons are recorded only at Athens and Delphi, both free cities. . . . The evidence thus points strongly to the conclusion that it was the universal practice,

outside a few free cities where democratic tradition was strong, that magistrates should propose decrees, and that private members of the Council should confine themselves to introducing proposals. This uniformity of practice, however, hardly justifies the assumption that magistrates alone had the right of moving decrees.

Isidore Lévy, writing in 1895, could find no single example in the second century of that hallmark of activity initiated in the Assembly itself: an amendment of a decree (EVMAM I.212), and I know of no evidence discovered since Lévy's time.

I think it would be safe to say that by the third century, even when decrees still use traditional formulae like *ἔδοξεν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ*, the Assembly of no Greek city should be regarded as having played any greater part than merely assenting by acclamation to decisions taken by the magistrates and/or the Council. From about the middle of the second century onwards, inscriptions recording decisions in which an Assembly participates will sometimes use a word signifying merely 'acclamation': e.g. *ἐπεφώνησαν* (Tyre), *ἐβόησαν* (Chalcis), *ἔεβήσαν*; and cf. OGIS 515 (= A/J 133), an inscription of about A.D. 210 from Mylasa in Caria, where in line 55 we find the corresponding Latin term 'succlam(atum) est'. In the long series of inscriptions from Rhodiapolis in Lycia, recording the munificence of Opramos, we find e.g. *ἡ κρατίστη τοῦ ἔθνους βουλὴ ἐπεβόησεν τὸ ἔθνος διαγραφῆσαι* (TAM II.905, § 45, XII B.3-5 [= IGRR III.739]); cf. *ἐπιβόησις* (in the singular and plural) in e.g. *ibid.* § 16, IV G.13; § 43, XII A.2. And see Jean Colin, *op. cit.* (in V.iii n.41 below) 112-16, for 'les divers vocables grecs de l'ἐπιβόησις'. For a long list of similar expressions in Latin, see W. Liebenam, *Städteverwaltung im römischen Kaiserreich* (Leipzig, 1900) 248 n.1.

And in the very latest record of a decree of a Greek Assembly that I have been able to discover (with the possible exception of the one from Oxyrhynchus, in P.Oxy. I.41, quoted in V.iii above), from Antioch in Pisidia, we again find, written in Latin in the middle of a Greek inscription (unfortunately very fragmentary), the words 'succlam(atum) [est]' (fr. 1.5). This inscription must record a decree of the Assembly, since it almost certainly refers to a *δήσιον* (fr. 1.11), entered in the Minutes (*ἀπομνημόνων*, fr. 1.12), with a copy deposited in the archives (*ἀρχειογράφου ἀποκειμένου*, fr. 1.13), and in fr. 1.2 we have [*καὶ δήμῳ*] and in fr. 1.11 [*τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου*]. Anderson, who published the inscription in *JRS* 3 (1913) 284-7, no. 11, takes the appearance of the word [*ἐ*]αἰσώσις in fr. h.3 as an indication of a date 'not much earlier than about A.D. 295'. I think we can indeed date the document during the Tetrarchy, in the years following March 293. (I owe my knowledge of this inscription to Barbara Levick, whose interest in Pisidian Antioch is well shown in her book, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor*, 1967.)

Evidently in some cases it was essential for a city to have a decree of its Council and/or Assembly ratified by the provincial governor. J. H. Oliver, 'The Roman governor's permission for a decree of the polis', in *Hesp.* 23 (1954) 163-7, has discussed this question, citing six decrees (four from Ephesus and one each from Sidyma and Smyrna) which bear on this question; cf. Magie, RRAM I.641-2; II.1504 n.29, 1506 n.32. Among other decrees, I would add the one published by Woodward in 1913, discussed near the end of § 2 above. Plutarch, in a passage I have quoted in V.iii above, deplored the practice of referring to the governor even minor matters, for which the governor's approval was clearly not a constitutional necessity: he points out that this obliges the governors to become the *δεσπόται* of the cities beyond the degree they themselves desire.

Revolutionary activity, of course, was almost inconceivable: it could have no chance of success, and I do not even know of any surviving evidence that it was attempted, although we do occasionally hear of food riots, as in Dio Chrysostom's Bithynia (see V.iii above), and of an occasional unexplained outbreak of violence, as when Petreus was burnt alive in Thessaly (see § 2 above). An inscription like that of Cibyra in honour of Q. Veranius Philagrus (mentioned in V.iii above), with its mysterious reference to the suppression of a very harmful 'conspiracy', may or may not betoken active discontent on the part of the non-privileged; it may equally well refer to some factional struggle involving mainly the interests of a dissatisfied element among the local propertied class.

4. Cyprus

Cyprus was first annexed by Rome in 58 B.C. and attached to the province of Cilicia. (The letters written by Cicero during his governorship of the joint province in 51-50 B.C., some of which relate to Cyprus, are among our most informative sources for Roman provincial administration during the late Republic.) From 48 onwards Cyprus was put under client rulers of the Ptolemaic royal house, but after Actium it was again annexed, and it was made a province on its own in 22 B.C. (Dio Cass. LIII.xii.7; LIV.iv.1) or perhaps rather 23 B.C. (see Shelagh Jameson, '22 or 23?' in *Historia* 18 [1969] 204-29, at p.227).

I know of only two clear pieces of evidence about innovations in the constitution of any Cypriot city which can with confidence be attributed to Roman influence. Both are inscriptions referring to men who had occupied the position of *τιμητής* (*ensor*, cf. § 3A above). One, from Cyprian Salamis, of the reign of Nero, describes its honorand as *τιμητεύσα*(s): see T. B. Mitford and I. K. Nicolaou, *Salamis*, Vol.6: *The Greek and Latin Inscriptions from Salamis* (Nicosia, 1974), 24-6, no. 11, line 5. In the other inscription, from Soli, also of the first century, the honorand is described as *τιμητεύσας, τὴν βουλὴν [κατα]λέξας*: see T. B. Mitford, in *BSA* 42 (1947) 201-6 no. 1, lines 9-10 (rather than *IGRR* III.930).

It seems to me quite possible that it was Augustus who provided for the enrolment of councillors in Cyprian cities by an official corresponding to the Roman *ensor*. This innovation cannot be dated, but it may conceivably be connected with the sending to Cyprus by Augustus, for a second and extraordinary proconsulship (probably in the last two decades B.C.) of P. Paquius Scaeva, 'procos. iterum extra sortem auctoritate Aug. Caesaris et s.c. missus ad componendum statum in reliquum provinciae Cypri' (*ILS* 915 = *CIL* IX.2845).

5. Cyrenaica (and Crete)

I have already mentioned (in V.iii above; and see its n.8) the very interesting constitution dictated to Cyrene by Ptolemy I, probably in 322/1 B.C. For the subsequent very chequered history of Cyrenaica down to its organisation as a Roman province I will merely refer to Jones, *CERP*² 356-60, with 496-7 nn. 10-14. (This part of *CERP*² was revised with the help of Joyce M. Reynolds.) Before Rome took over there was evidently a good deal of interference by the Ptolemaic rulers (see id. 358, with 497 n. 13; add Jean Machu, in *RH* 205 [1951] 41-55). Although bequeathed to Rome by the will of Ptolemy Apion (a bastard son of Ptolemy VII Euergetes II), who died in 96 B.C., Cyrenaica was not organised as a Roman province until at least 75-74 and perhaps even later (see the works cited in Jones, *CERP*² 497 n. 12; contrast W. V. Harris, *War and Imperialism in Republican Rome 327-70 B.C.* (1979) 154, 267). After further changes, it finally became part of the province of Crete and Cyrenaica under Augustus.

There is hardly any evidence for political conditions in the cities, apart from a brief statement by Strabo, preserved by Josephus (*AJ* XIV. 114-15), to the effect that Cyrene itself contained four categories of inhabitants: citizens, farmers (*γεωργοί*),¹⁸ metics and Jews (a privileged class of metics).¹⁹ From this we can infer that in the early years of the first century the old native rural population did not enjoy the citizenship of Cyrene (and see Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*² 1.309-10). I myself do not believe that it had ever done so, as I cannot accept the theory that the *περιούχοι* of Hdts IV. 161.3 were native Libyans, in spite of the advocacy of this theory by such scholars as A. H. M. Jones (*CERP*² 351, 359; cf. 497 n. 13 *ad fin.*), Busolt, and Larsen. See the discussion by F. Chamoux, *Cyrene sous la monarchie des Battiades* (Paris, 1953) 221-4, and the interesting suggestions made more recently by L. H. Jeffery, 'The part of the first settlers at Cyrene', in *Historia* 10 (1961) 139-47, at 142-4.

There are a few scraps of information from inscriptions found on the sites of other cities in Cyrenaica. In *SEG* XVIII. 772, a proxeny decree of 350-320 B.C. from Euesperides, we find the Ephors and Gerontes introducing a proposal to the Council, evidently the ruling body, for the decree opens with the words, *ἐφόρων καὶ γερόντων ἐπαγόντων, ἀδελφοὶ βωλάει*, and there is no sign of a general Assembly. Similarly, we have a recently published decree, almost certainly of the second or the fairly early first century B.C., from the modern Tocra (Taucheira or Teucheira, known in the Ptolemaic period as Arsinoe), which was passed by the Gerontes and Council (there being 109 votes in favour), with a mention of other magistrates (Ephors and Tamiai) but not of an Assembly: see Joyce M. Reynolds, 'A civic decree from Tocra in Cyrenaica', in *Arch. Class.* 25/26 (1973/74) 622-30; cf. L. Moretti, 'Un decreto di Arsinoe in Cirenaica', in *RF* 104 (1976) 385-98, esp. 389 (on *πόλις* in line 13). I would draw attention to lines 11-14 of the Tocra inscription, praising the honorand for the way he had conducted himself *πρὸς τὸν ὄχλον* [*καὶ πόλις*, and the words *ἐπὶ τῶν ὄχλων σωτηρίαν* in lines 53-4: here we find a non-pejorative use of the term *ὄχλος* (in the plural because, presumably, the man's generosity had not been confined to Tocra), which occurs also in some village inscriptions of Asia Minor and Syria: see IV.ii above and its n.35 below. Even if, with Moretti, we keep *πόλις* in line 13 (as I think we probably should), and still more if, with Reynolds, we emend to *πόλις*, we shall be justified in finding in Cyrenaica, as in other areas, a privileged class of full citizens, contrasted with a larger number of others (the *ὄχλοι*) who had no political rights, or only very limited ones.

In the period of Roman rule one famous series of documents stands out: the inscription recording five edicts of Augustus dating from 7/6 to 4 B.C.: E/J²311 = *FIRA*² I no. 68 = *SEG* IX. 8; cf. XIV.888; XVI.866; XVIII.728; and see esp. F. De Visscher, *Les édits d'Auguste découverts à Cyrène* (Louvain, 1940); cf. the long review by L. Wenger, in *ZSS. Röm. Abt.*, 62 (1942) 425-36; and De Visscher's later article, 'La justice romaine en Cyrénaïque', in *RIDA*³ 11 (1964) 321-33; also Jolowicz and Nicholas, *HISRL*³ 71-4. For our present purposes it is the first and fourth of these edicts which are relevant. Both demonstrate the participation of resident Romans in lawsuits at Cyrene. The first shows that when Roman judges had been chosen, they had been taken only from Romans with a census of at least 2,500 denarii, of whom there were 215 in Cyrenaica in 7/6 B.C. The same edict also affords evidence of complaints by the local Greeks of unjust behaviour on the part of Roman judges. Augustus gives to Greeks accused on capital charges the right to choose whether to be tried by Roman judges or by an equal number (twenty-five each) of Romans and Greeks, both Romans and Greeks to be drawn from those with a census of at least 7,500 denarii, or, if there are too few men with such a qualification, then at least half that figure. The fourth edict leaves it to the provincial governor to decide whether to take capital cases himself or to have them tried as specified in the first edict, and adds that in non-capital cases the judges are to be Greeks unless a defendant or accused prefers to have Romans. (I omit some minor provisions.)

* * * * *

I do not propose to treat Crete separately. However, there is one passage of exceptional interest which we cannot afford to miss: Strabo X.iv.22, p.484. At the end of his very muddled and inadequate account of Cretan institutions, derived mainly from Ephorus (and therefore very much out of date), Strabo adds that not many of these *νόμμοι* still exist, but that Crete is 'mainly administered by the *διατάγματα* of the Romans, as happens in the other provinces'! (It is with this text that Swoboda, *GV* 176, opens the ninth chapter of his book on the decrees of Greek Assemblies: 'Veränderungen unter dem Einflusse der Römer'.)

6. Massalia

Of Massalia it is only necessary for me to say that the famous 'aristocratic' constitution, as

we know it from the early Principate, was not a product of Roman influence but an indigenous growth.¹¹ In the time of Aristotle, who wrote a *Constitution of Massalia* (see his fr. 549), it was not a democracy: two passages in the *Politics*, taken together, show that an extreme oligarchy had merely become more moderate (V.6. 1305^b2-10; VI.7. 1321^a26-31). By 197 B.C., as we know from an inscription of Lampsacus of that date (*SIG³* II.591, lines 43-5, 47-9), the directing body at Massalia was already the Council of Six Hundred described by Strabo (IV.i.5, p.179, very probably from Poseidonius) as consisting of *πμοῖχοι*, who sat for life – and were presumably appointed by co-optation, as we hear of no general Assembly at Massalia, and two passages in Cicero, *De republica*, quoted below, would seem to exclude its existence. This constitution was much admired by Strabo; and several Roman writers, including Cicero (*Pro Flacc.* 63), Livy, Valerius Maximus (II.vi.7) and Silius Italicus, speak well of it, using terms like *gravitas* and *disciplina*. However, Cicero in the *De republica*, although prepared to say that Rome's 'clients' the Massiliots 'per delectos et principes cives summa iustitia reguntur', yet admits that 'inest tamen in ea condicione populi similitudo quaedam servitutis' (I.27/43); and a little later he compares this 'paucorum et principum administratio' with the rule of the Thirty at Athens (28/44)!

By the second half of the second century of the Christian era, the constitution of Massalia (now Massilia) had evidently become thoroughly romanised, with 'decuriones' and the usual Roman municipal magistrates (*duumviri* etc.).¹²

7. Mesopotamia and beyond

We have only a few scraps of information about the constitutions and political life of the various Greek cities of Mesopotamia and farther east. The most easterly of all these cities about whose internal political affairs we have any evidence that is relevant for our present purposes is Seleuceia on the Tigris, an exceptionally large town: with a population put by Pliny the Elder at 600,000 (*NH* VI.122, on what authority we do not know) and believed by Strabo to be comparable with that of Alexandria and rather larger than that of Antioch (XVI.ii.5, p.750). Seleuceia was for a time the main Seleucid capital. It must have been a flourishing city in the late third century B.C. if it is true that Hermeias, the chief administrator of Antiochus III, could impose on it a fine of a thousand talents (reduced by the king to 150 talents) for having taken part in the revolt of Molon in 222-220 B.C. (Polyb. V.54.10-11). From just after the middle of the second century B.C. Seleuceia was nearly always within the Parthian rather than the Seleucid or Roman sphere of dominance, but was evidently allowed a considerable measure of independence and self-government. We hear of its being under a tyrant, Himeras, probably in the 120s B.C. (Poseidonius, *FGrH* 87 F 13). According to Plutarch, writing of Crassus' campaign against the Parthians in 54-3, Seleuceia had always been ill-disposed towards the Parthians (*Crass.* 17.8).

In relation to the year A.D. 36 Tacitus speaks of faction at Seleuceia between the common people (the *populus* or *plebs*) and the three hundred members of the Council, described enigmatically as 'chosen for their wealth or their wisdom to be a Senate' (*opibus aut sapientia delecti ut senatus*), a form of words which may indicate that the members of the Council sat for life. Factionous disorder was particularly likely to occur in this city, because either party in a *stasis* might call in the Parthians, as Tacitus notes in the same passage (*Ann.* VI.xlii.1-3.5). Before 36 the Parthian King Artabanus III had put the commons under the *primores* (presumably the Council of 300); in that year the situation was reversed by the pretender Tiridates, who had the backing of the Emperor Tiberius and was welcomed by the populace of Seleuceia but soon fled back to Roman Syria. Artabanus' successor Vardanes reduced Seleuceia in 42 (*Ann.* XI.viii.4 to ix.6), and that may well have been the end of popular government in Seleuceia – brought about not by the Romans, be it noted, but by the Parthians. Seleuceia now became increasingly orientalisised,

and we hear no more of it except in connection with Rome's Parthian wars: it was briefly taken over by the Romans at the end of Trajan's reign, and sacked and partly destroyed by Verus' general Avidius Cassius in 165 (see Magie, *RRAM* II.1531 n.5). Dio Cassius in two passages in his narrative of the campaign of Crassus in 54-53 stresses the Hellenic character of Seleuceia (XL.xvi.3; xx.3), and in the first of these he speaks of the city as an existing *polis* still thoroughly Hellenic in his own day (*πλείστον τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν καὶ νῦν ἔχουσα*); but this statement may have little foundation – there is certainly no evidence that Dio himself was ever in or even near Mesopotamia (see Millar, *SCD* 13-27).

For the history of the city, see *OCD*² 971 (with bibliography); add M. Streck in *RE*² II.1 (1921) 1149-84.

* * * * *

Another Mesopotamian city about which a good deal is known is Edessa (the modern Urfa in Turkey, not far from the Syrian border), which is always known by that name rather than the one given to it as a Seleucid foundation: Antioch by Callirhoe. The most recent book is by J. B. Segal, *Edessa. 'The Blessed City'* (1970). See also E. Meyer, in *RE* V.ii (1905) 1933-8. For what is known of the constitution, see C. B. Welles, in A. R. Bellinger and Welles, 'A third-century contract of sale from Edessa in Osrhoene', in *YCS* 5 (1935) 95-154, at 121-42. I have no legitimate reason for mentioning it here, but there is a remarkable exchange of letters (bogus, of course) between Jesus and the then dynast of Edessa, Abgar, in Eus., *HE* I.xiii. (Eusebius, who thought the letters genuine, says he had them translated from the originals in Syriac in the public archives of Edessa, § 5.) The Edessenes firmly believed that Jesus had made a promise to Abgar that their city would never be captured by an enemy (Josh. Styl., *Chron.* 5, 58, 60, ed. in the original Syriac, with an English translation, by W. Wright, Cambridge, 1882). It was in fact captured more than once by the Sassanids, and in 638 by the Arabs.