

# The Anonymous Encomium of Philip the Arab

*Louis J. Swift*

THE RECENT DISCOVERY of the *Res Gestae Divi Saporis* has aroused new interest in the accession and character of Philip the Arab, and a contemporary eulogy of this emperor would claim a peculiar interest. The anonymous oration *Eis Βασιλέα* preserved in the corpus of Aelius Aristides (XXXV Keil),<sup>1</sup> after other attributions had been proposed, was identified by Groag in 1918 as an encomium of Philip the Arab. This identification, however, has recently been attacked.

The object of this article is to review the arguments, to show that Philip was indeed the emperor addressed, and to present the first complete translation of the oration into English, with a commentary.

Though prior to the study of Keil in 1905 scholars accepted *Eis Βασιλέα* as a genuine work of Aristides, they disagreed about the subject of the oration. W. Canter<sup>2</sup> believed him to be Marcus Aurelius, a view accepted by W. Schmid and by P. von Rohden, who suggested that the occasion of the panegyric was the Eleusinian festival of A.D. 176 which both Marcus and Commodus attended.<sup>3</sup> J. Masson and W. H. Waddington found the description of peaceful conditions in the

<sup>1</sup> Throughout the present work I have used the edition of B. Keil, *Aelii Aristidis Smyrnaei quae supersunt omnia* II (Berlin 1898) 253–264. Other editions which include this oration are the following: E. Bonini, *Orationes Aristidis* (Florence 1517) 88–90 (*editio princeps*); P. Stephanus, *Aelii Aristidis Adrianensis oratoris clarissimi tomi tres* I (Geneva 1604) 101–20; S. Jebb, *Aelii Aristidis Adrianensis opera omnia graece et latine* I (Oxford 1722) 56–67; W. Dindorf, *Aristides* I (Leipzig 1829) 98–112. To my knowledge the only translation of the entire oration is the Latin version of W. Canter (*Aristidis orationum tomi tres nunc primum latine versi* [Basle 1566]) which is reprinted in the editions of P. Stephanus and S. Jebb. I have used the translation in Jebb's edition throughout this paper. M. Rostovtzeff (*SEHRE*<sup>2</sup> I [Oxford 1957] 451–452, 454, 455) and E. Barker (*Social and Political Thought in Byzantium* [Oxford 1957] 220–222) have translated selected parts of the oration into English.

<sup>2</sup> See Jebb's edition (*supra* n.1) 56 and 67 n.1.

<sup>3</sup> W. Schmid, "Die Lebensgeschichte des Rhetors Aristides," *RhM* 48 (1893) 83; P. von Rohden, *RE* 1 (1894) col. 2301 s.v. ANNIUS.

oration inappropriate to the reign of Marcus and identified the emperor as Antoninus.<sup>4</sup>

B. Keil's close literary and historical examination of the text, however, proved not only that Aristides did not compose the oration, but also that it could not have been addressed to any of the emperors of his time.<sup>5</sup> The confused organization, the harsh constructions, and the rather slavish adherence to the standard format of the βασιλικὸς λόγος<sup>6</sup> are not characteristic of the famous second century orator. References to the violent accession of the emperor's predecessors, to a decline in Greek culture in the period before his reign and to the emperor's εὐβουλία in dealing with his enemies are among the telling arguments against earlier theories concerning the subject.

By means of fourteen criteria derived from the oration Keil narrowed the problem to a choice between Macrinus and Philip the Arab. The orator's obvious efforts to conceal the emperor's part in his predecessor's death, the description of conditions prior to the emperor's reign, and the way in which the new ruler handled the troops were among the factors that led Keil to favor the identification of Macrinus.<sup>7</sup>

This view was soon challenged by A. von Domaszewski,<sup>8</sup> who believed that the orator's remarks concerning the emperor's war with the Germani (Celti) and the period of cultural decline which preceded his reign were alone sufficient to exclude Macrinus. Von Domaszewski identified the subject as Gallienus and proposed that the oration may have been delivered at the festival of Demeter in Eleusis during a relatively peaceful period in the autumn of A.D. 260. Many of the points highlighted by the orator—the

<sup>4</sup> J. Masson, "Collectanea Historica ad Aristidis Vitam" in Dindorf's edition of Aristides, III, pp. lviii-lxi; W. H. Waddington, "Mémoire sur la chronologie de la vie du rhéteur Aelius Aristides," *MemAcInscr* 26 (1867) 255 and 259 n.3.

<sup>5</sup> B. Keil, "Eine Kaiserrede," *NA&G*, philol.-hist. Kl. 1905, 381-428.

<sup>6</sup> See the rhetorical treatise of Menander in L. Spengel ed., *Rhetores Graeci* III (Leipzig 1856) 368-377 (= C. Bursian, "Der Rhetor Menandros und seine Schriften," *AbhMünchen*, philol.-philol. Cl. 16, Abt. 3 [1882] 95-105).

<sup>7</sup> I. Turzewitsch drew the same conclusion at approximately the same time as Keil and, apparently, independently of him. His article in Russian appeared in *Nachr. des hist.-philol. Instituts des Fürsten Bezborodko in Nêzin* 23 (1907) 49-78. My knowledge of it is limited to P. Wendland's review in *BPW* 1907, pp. 1449-50 and to Keil's comment in *NA&G*, philol.-hist. Kl. 1913, p. 5n. A. Boulanger in his book *Aelius Aristide et la sophistique dans la province d'Asie au II<sup>e</sup> siècle de notre ère* (= *BEFAR* fasc. 126 [Paris 1923] 382 n.1) accepts Keil's identification. Since the appearance of Keil's article, the only scholar, to my knowledge, who has placed the oration in the second century is W. E. Heitland, who calls it a "fulsome panegyric on Marcus Aurelius" (*Last Words on the Roman Municipalities* [Cambridge 1928] 69).

<sup>8</sup> A. von Domaszewski, "Beiträge zur Kaisergeschichte," *Philologus* 65 (1906) 344-356.

emperor's mild treatment of his opponents, his education, phil-Hellenism, firm control of the troops, and his military accomplishments—supported this view. Von Domaszewski suggested that *Eis Βασιλέα* is the famous *προσφωνητικὸς Γαλιηνῶ* which is attributed to the Athenian sophist Callinicus of Petra.

Some years later E. Groag posed serious objections to this theory.<sup>9</sup> Not only would the years of strife prior to 260 make the orator's words extolling peace quite premature, but he also questioned whether the joy and tranquillity which are said to permeate the empire could have existed less than a year after the capture of Valerian. Groag also pointed out that Gallienus never formally concluded the Persian war with a treaty and that our knowledge of this emperor leaves little room for extolling his *εὐβουλία*.

In his own study of the problem Groag concluded that the orator's description of the emperor was essentially that of a man who rose to power "aus dem Privatstande" by violent means but who was officially thought to be blameless and to have reached the throne through the *consensus omnium*. By diplomatic rather than military action he concluded the war in the East that was raging during the time of his accession. For Groag, as for Keil, the choice lay between Macrinus and Philip the Arab, who ruled from A.D. 244 to 249.

To von Domaszewski's arguments against Macrinus, Groag added the observations that only a few months of this emperor's short rule could be considered peaceful; that the orator's reference to the annihilation of a race is nowhere attested in Macrinus' reign; and that after the peace with Artabanus, Macrinus was beset with trouble within his own army. These arguments, together with a close comparison between Philip's reign and the criteria established from the oration, led Groag to identify the emperor as Philip the Arab.

Groag is surely right in noticing, as did von Domaszewski, that the fairly good accounts of Macrinus' reign in Dio Cassius and Herodian provide no evidence for a war with the Germani. Nor is there any support for such a devastating conquest that the orator could say, "Only the name of this race survives." A more significant point, however, is the long period of peace during Philip's rule as contrasted with the few months of tranquillity during that of Macrinus. Although both emperors made treaties with eastern kings, the orator's eulogy of the harmony and prosperity in the empire seem much more

<sup>9</sup> E. Groag, "Studien zur Kaisergeschichte," *WS* 40 (1918) 20–45.

applicable to 247, when Philip had ruled successfully for three years, than to 218, when Macrinus was attempting to solidify the power which would so quickly slip from his grasp.

To my knowledge only two scholars have challenged the identification made by Groag. In a brief discussion of the oration S. Mazzarino attempted to place it in the reign of Decius during the first half of A.D. 250, before the emperor's second son became a Caesar.<sup>10</sup> He argued that the emperor of the oration was a traditionalist who returned to the 'Ελλήνων παιδεία, revived pagan religion and introduced more rigid discipline in the army—traits which Mazzarino felt were more applicable to Decius than to Philip. The orator's attention to the subject of peace might be justified on the grounds that Decius preserved Philip's treaty with Sapor, and the reference to the use of arms against one's own kind might be an obscure allusion to the battle of Verona.

Though some of these arguments seem plausible enough, the treaty with the Persians is, in the opinion of this writer, a crucial point. And it was Philip, not Decius, who put an end to the war with Sapor I.

Sir Ernest Barker has proposed that *Eis Βασιλέα* may be a Byzantine exercise composed in the ninth century or even later.<sup>11</sup> He sums up his arguments as follows:

- (1) The emphasis laid on the qualities of *philanthrōpia* and *eusebeia* is Byzantine in character; (2) the reference to the decay of Greek culture and to its revival by the king's patronage, which would be curious and inappropriate in the middle of the third century, fits naturally into Byzantine history; (3) the appeal to parallels from ancient Greek history would be curious and inappropriate in the days of the Roman Empire, but natural—and indeed a commonplace—in the days when the Byzantine Empire had become more and more Greek, and more and more conceived itself as resting on 'Hellenism'; (4) the preference of 'policy' to arms is a mark of Byzantine history rather than of the troubled times of the third century. These grounds receive further support from the facts (1) that the earlier manuscripts do not include the oration *eis basilea*, and that it appears for the first time in

<sup>10</sup> S. Mazzarino, *Trattato di storia romana* II (Rome 1956) 406–407.

<sup>11</sup> Barker, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) 220–225.

later manuscripts about the year 1100, and (2) that there is evidence to show that the genuine orations of Aristides were studied and imitated by Byzantine scholars.<sup>12</sup>

It cannot be denied that the virtues praised in *Eἰς Βασιλέα* continued to be honored in the Byzantine period. Both the format and the content of the βασιλικὸς λόγος appear in the literature of the Eastern Empire.<sup>13</sup> But if it can be demonstrated on other grounds, as Groag has done, that the oration belongs to the third century, must we not conclude that *Eἰς Βασιλέα* is a forerunner of the Byzantine style rather than an expression of its popularity in the Byzantine era?

Barker apparently finds the orator's remarks about the decline and revival of Greek culture "curious and inappropriate in the middle of the third century" because "there had been no decay of Greek letters (which had been vigorous from the reign of Hadrian onwards) during that period."<sup>14</sup> This statement is difficult to understand in light of the economic, political and military turmoil of the third century. But even if the orator's statement is exaggerated, behind his hyperbole there surely lies a change with the advent of Philip. Whereas Gordian's campaign in the East left little room for cultural pursuits, the arrival of peace at least provided the opportunity for a revival of interest in Hellenism.

Far from being "curious and inappropriate" it was commonplace for orators under the Empire to appeal to Greek history for parallels.<sup>15</sup> Indeed, the rules of Menander for the βασιλικὸς λόγος specifically call for classical parallels.<sup>16</sup>

It is true that εὐβουλία seems out of place during the third century. But the very fact of its being exceptional accounts in part for the orator's attention to it. If Decius were the subject of the address, surely it would be inappropriate to emphasize this virtue. But in the case of Philip, or even of Macrinus, what other tack was the orator to take when faced with the problem of handling the treaties which these emperors struck with eastern rulers?<sup>17</sup>

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.* 224.

<sup>13</sup> Consult P. J. Alexander, "Secular Biography at Byzantium," *Speculum* 15 (1940) 194-209 and R. J. H. Jenkins, "The Classical Background of the *Scriptores post Theophanum*," *DOPapers* 8 (1954) 13-30. See also the sixth century treatise of Agapetus in PG 86.1, 1163-1186.

<sup>14</sup> Barker, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) 221 n.2.

<sup>15</sup> See, for example, Aristides' *Eἰς Ῥώμην*.

<sup>16</sup> Spengel (*supra* n.6) 371, 3-8 (= Bursian 98, 13) and 377, 2-9 (= Bursian 104, 36).

<sup>17</sup> Barker's supplementary arguments do not seem to add much weight to his major

In sum, it seems to me that the theories of Mazzarino and Barker have failed to invalidate Groag's arguments and have been unsuccessful in establishing convincing alternatives. Philip the Arab must be the subject of *Eis Βασιλέα*.<sup>18</sup>

## TRANSLATION

### *To the Emperor*

A FESTIVAL DAY which occurs during a season sacred to the gods seems to me an especially appropriate time to remember the divine and beneficent Emperor in word as well as thought. There is no concern that after undertaking the task of acclaiming him we should then be at a loss what to say; it is rather a case of the Emperor's record being such that no one could do it justice. But encouraged as I am by the gracious and beneficent spirit he has exhibited in other affairs, I have no hesitation about speaking his praises.

- 2 Putting aside, then, all other things which speakers are wont to mention by way of preface and to plead by way of excuse—for some, the magnitude of the deeds performed; and for others, the little time for words—and without appealing to the Muses, as some of the poets do, or to any other outside help, I will turn my attention directly to extolling the Emperor. I proceed in this way not out of willfulness nor out of disdain for my task, but because I am aware that those who placate the audience from the outset and who plead excuses are themselves somewhat contemptuous of the subjects of their discourses. When they talk in this way, it seems to me they intimate that although they are speaking extemporaneously, they could produce orations equal to the magnitude of the deeds they describe if only they gave greater

---

points, nor does he push his theory very far. "It remains after all, a possibility, if only a possibility, that the pseudo-Aristides of the oration *eis basilea* was a Byzantine scholar" (p.225).

<sup>18</sup> The author is especially grateful to Professor James H. Oliver for many helpful comments. He is also indebted to Professors James W. Poultney, Romilly J. H. Jenkins, George L. Kustas, B. Raphael Sealey, and the anonymous readers for this journal. They are, of course, in no way responsible for errors or shortcomings that remain. Part of the research for this paper was made possible by a grant from the Research Foundation of the State University of New York.

time to reflection and preparation. They also credit themselves with the ability to speak on the greatest themes, thereby heaping praise on their own persons.

- 3 For my part I cannot imagine any length of time that would be adequate, nor any speech that would be worthy of the Emperor, nor any person who would be able to praise him sufficiently. Nonetheless, one must not hold back but try to speak as well as
- 4 he is able. When we sacrifice to the gods, it is not a case of doing what we recognize is worthy of their dignity, but of rendering to them as much thanks as is within our power. And so, those who set out to extol the Emperor should not shrink from the task but take heart and proceed to his praises. Although my address will probably not do justice to his talents, it will represent the full employment of my own.
- 5 First and most important, one thing that can be said of him is this: even before his accession to the throne he was worthy of the position. Some either have gained power through the help of others or have inherited it from their forebears. In the one case they have used force in place of justice; in the other they have acquired the office under the pretext of preserving the line of succession in a certain family. But for the man who has put himself at the disposal of those who needed him and who called upon him to become emperor, even though he did not seek the office nor request it himself—certainly, for such a man this recognition of his excellence is something long due him.
- 6 With other emperors many contested the throne; with this man no one does so. Whether they think it necessary to submit to him because of fear or because of respect for his superiority or, as I said, because of their own choice—which was as excellent as it was justified—surely he who was remarkable in all of these ways had to be emperor.
- 7 Indeed, by comparing him with his predecessors it is possible to obtain some idea of the degree to which he surpassed them on these very points. They came to power in the midst of wars and much bloodshed, losing a great number of men on the battle-lines, and becoming the cause of irreparable harm to many. In this way numerous cities under our control were brought to ruin, a great amount of land was laid waste, and many lives were lost. What happened in the case of these rulers was not wholly in

accord with justice, nor could they make such a claim on their own behalf.

- 8 But he came to power in a manner so just and proper that neither during his advent to the throne nor during the beginning of his reign was there any need for bloodshed. No one experienced any of the cruelty which commonly marks the change and establishment of a government. And none of the things which are perforce allowed to happen in such circumstances came to pass. Neither men nor cities nor nations suffered any disastrous or terrible fate. On the contrary, so concerned were the gods that he gain power in a just and god-fearing manner, that they allotted to others whatever was done out of passion or desperation; they reserved for this man whatever sprang from justice, clemency and a general spirit of reverence.
- 9 And even when he gained the throne, he did not commit any vicious act nor follow any such precedent; he showed no interest in conduct of this kind. He was not like some of his predecessors who brought charges against certain of their officials who they feared were plotting against them, punishing some of them with death and others with exile. This man did nothing of the sort. His character did not change; on the contrary, he was so averse to all such practices and so far removed from any desire to bring about slaughter and death, that even some of those who were plotting against him and who were openly convicted still live in our midst, thanks to his clemency.
- 10 These things indicate not only that he is gentle, that he respects everyone, and that he does not envy those in positions of honor and authority, but also that he has not been terror-stricken by fears for his sovereignty. They also show that he is not troubled about contingencies nor quick to give vent to anger or wrath, but rather that he is firm and serene in his dealings with all men.
- 11 And reasonably so. Since he had been taught and had mastered the essentials of a good education and had neglected none of its finer points, since he was not an uncultured man but one whose character had embraced every form of excellence, it was to be expected that he be devoid of any imperfection. Because the Emperor had received this training, because he shared in the finest endowments of natural ability and a good education—and this in no halfway measure nor in a manner like that of others,
- 12

but to an exceedingly high degree—he was of great assistance to the Empire even before he assumed power.

- 13 What is this pre-eminence found only in him or in a few emperors? Other rulers begin their care of official matters once they assume power; prior to that time they manage their own affairs. He, on the other hand, was so dedicated to the imperial duty that in his first association with it—in an office to which he happened to be appointed at a time of great uncertainty—when he recognized that many functions of the imperial service were not being decently or conscientiously administered but that a great deal of stubbornness, arrogance and lack of discipline had arisen, he did not permit the situation to continue or grow worse. Instead, like a physician healing the sores and ills of a huge, sick body, or like a rider attempting to control the wildness and recalcitrance of a strong and difficult horse that is bearing him off but whose ceaseless, impulsive and forceful thrusts he again and again restrains and checks, he worked on the realm effectively with an eye to its interest. Such, then, was the sort of man he was before he ruled.
- 14 From the time when divine providence, which disposes and directs all things, placed on the imperial throne this most just and god-fearing of emperors, which of the blessings that we enjoy by virtue of his good fortune and foresight could one call first and most important? When all mankind had been set in motion and, one might almost say, was on the move to another land; when the Empire was tossing as in a great storm or earthquake and then foundering like a ship being carried off to the ends of the earth where governors and kings had previously gone astray and had finally given up after they encountered, as in a labyrinth, many grievous difficulties and were cut off from the road back, unable to return, he it was who, seeing all this, did not, like an unskilled pilot, permit the Empire to be carried along at random and to run her dangerous course. Rather, as the most experienced of emperors and one of superior intelligence, he first checked and stopped the headlong rush in that direction, then brought her back and secured her at anchor.
- 15 And now, like a ship surviving a violent storm, the state lies at anchor in the greatest safety while he conducts and manages the affairs of the Empire in a way that is demanded of one who is not

only reverent toward the gods and just toward men, but who possesses temperance, self-control, prudence and all other virtues. He began, as was fitting, with reverence; but he passed through the other stages of virtue as well. What man has given evidence of justice, what man of clemency, what man of any other virtue that is comparable in degree and kind to the example provided by this Emperor?

- 16 First of all, then, let us examine his justice in matters of finance. When the rate of taxes earmarked for the imperial treasury was excessive, and even the additional taxes that were imposed did not suffice—but the treasuries everywhere were empty and fear for the future was continually growing—he did not ask for an increase nor demand it, nor did he become vicious over the question of money. Rather, since he was not only the most just but also the most beneficent of emperors when it came to the problem of taxes, he relieved and lightened the burden. Such is his attitude toward financial affairs.
- 17 Who could adequately praise his justice and clemency in the courts of law? What Rhadamanthus or what Aeacus ever remained so just in the eyes of every juror? Indeed, that which is just is not always nor in every way merciful. But having as sharp an eye for what is just as if he were himself the lawgiver and the author of justice, he did nothing that went beyond the limits of that virtue. He made it the basis of his mercy in such a way that the most exacting justice was tantamount to the most genuine clemency.
- 18 The reason for this is that he does not determine what is just by depending on other interpreters of the law. He himself by reason of his education possesses a knowledge of what is truly good and beautiful and has become so familiar with the law that none of the written statutes escapes him. With this competence he passes judgement in all cases.
- 19 Surely there is no one—whether he be the plaintiff who has lost his suit or the defendant who has been convicted and condemned—who has come away without receiving his due or who has complained of the Emperor's decisions. On the contrary, both victor and vanquished, concurring in his judgements, bend the knee in obedience and depart in contentment. If some do happen to incur a penalty, they do not think it a terrible thing to make

amends through suffering but consider it a boon that they do not undergo even greater torments. Punishments are not expressions of the Emperor's hatred for criminals but are intended primarily for the correction of the guilty if that is possible, and if not, they serve as a lesson to those who hear of them.

- 20 If to be a phil-Hellene is a fine thing and kingly, praise certainly befits this Emperor. For he is a phil-Hellene, indeed, and so abounds in this fine quality that when Greek culture had become neglected and despised and the honors attached to it had been annulled and all that was Greek had been pushed aside and went for naught, the Emperor was not remiss, but to the honors which belong to Hellenism he added still more. So much, then, about his justice.
- 21 When we turn to his beneficence, what act was greater or more remarkable than that by which he liberated all who were cowering in subjection and enslaved by fear? There were many spies circulating in all the cities, listening for anyone who passed remarks. The liberty to think or to speak openly—a freedom which is only reasonable and just—had been destroyed, and everyone was trembling at his own shadow. From this fear he delivered and freed the souls of all men, restoring to them their liberty whole and entire.
- 22 Now for the most significant and greatest example of the Emperor's beneficence. Though such a young man, he has so surpassed all rulers in being gentle and humane that it is small tribute to apply to him such epithets as "father" and "shepherd of his people" and all such terms as poets have used to celebrate princes in their commemorative hymns.
- 23 What kind of reasonable flexibility has he failed to display? Most affable is the manner in which he has shown his beneficence to all his subjects, especially those who approached him for any reason. How humane is the gentleness of the posture he assumes as well as the kindly manner in which he converses and the fact that it is not at all necessary to go to great trouble to obtain an audience. For those who have in mind even some small contribution it is possible to pass within the hallowed precinct, as it were. Do not these qualities go beyond what is everywhere recognized as gentleness and beneficence?
- 24 Not by holding himself aloof and being difficult of approach

does he believe that the fame of being a great and marvelous emperor, the like of whom has never been seen, will be spread abroad. He realizes that if he displays his good will and all-embracing beneficence to everyone in need, the recipients before all others will secure his reputation for being an outstanding ruler. He knows it is incumbent upon him who is truly emperor to pattern himself after the universal ruler in his beneficence and concern for all his subjects and not to exhibit a gracious and temperate disposition before assuming power but then, as emperor, prove to be cruel and violent toward his subjects. Such is not the outward form of a rule that is reasonable but the clearest sign of stupidity and lack of education.

25 Even the Lacedaemonian general who led the Greeks against the barbarians—I am speaking of Pausanias, the son of Cleombrotus—was a man with this weakness. He was able to practice self-restraint in his own land; but when he sailed to the Hellespont and grew unmindful of himself as well as of those at home, he resembled anyone but a Spartiate by being cruel and violent towards his allies, undisciplined and even wanton in his way of life and tyrannical in his manner.

26 But he of whom I speak showed that it is possible for a private individual to remain unchanged when he becomes emperor. Prior to ascending the throne he proved to be such a good man that he rightly was deemed worthy of the office. By maintaining the same disposition and character while on the throne—by not degenerating or pursuing dissolute ways, but by choosing a life of moderation and by hating insolence and lawlessness—he proved to be a paragon of self-control, with the result that those who were formerly licentious and arrogant changed their ways when they saw his self-restraint, put a stop to their lust for money, and directed their desires along a more moderate path.

27 Certainly whatever be the pleasures that dominate men, we know that the Emperor is slave to none of them. From the outset he avoided them to such a degree that the possession of every kind of self-restraint which is praised among men is credible when it is ascribed to this man alone. Who is so much in control of his desire for food, for sexual satisfaction, or for other pleasures? He did not, as I have just remarked, possess virtue in halfway measures nor in a manner like that of some rulers who appeared

to handle themselves well in matters of courage and beneficence but were manifestly licentious in their desires and pleasures.

28 It is such a man that Homer praises when he speaks of Agamemnon, the general of the Achaeans, as “both a good king and a stout warrior.” Yet in the poet’s account Agamemnon is plainly in love with Chryseis, passionately desires Achilles’ Briseis, and through this lust is responsible for many calamities befalling the Achaeans.

On his part, Achilles, the son of Thetis and Peleus, was so unbridled in his pleasure and so petty that the instant Briseis had left him and had remained some time with Agamemnon, he became so distraught that he cried aloud in anguish for his mother as he scanned the “wine-dark sea,” like a small child who had suffered this outrage from one of his peers. On her arrival he described the reason for his tears and bade her plead with Zeus to ally himself with the Trojans and to wreak untold havoc on the Hellenes. Later, when he saw that in each engagement many of the Achaeans were falling under the onslaught of Hector and the Trojans, and when some of his intimate friends and companions were dying, he, unchanging and unmerciful . . .

29 They fell far short of excellence, but he is “both a good king and a stout warrior.” Surely one who disdains pleasures to such a degree that he is subject to none of them is a man who is really brave, temperate and strong. Even depraved men have captured cities that time and again appeared impregnable, and I know many men even among the very good who are dominated by their appetites. Who is so courageous that he can easily live a life that is both frugal and contented?

30 Again, many have had the experience of proving themselves brave in the face of the enemy, but of being ruled by their own soldiers. But he commanded and marshalled the troupes so handily that even when he provided them with a great many—or rather, limitless—donatives, and although they become unmanageable and terrifying unless they receive these and even more, he not only did not increase their desires; but by limiting their needs, he made the troops better disposed towards physical hardship and training. He no longer permitted them to turn their attention to plunder but made military drill habitual with them. He no longer permitted them to spend their time in luxury and

wantonness but saw to it that they should have no opportunity for such pursuits. Doing this he provided for the needs of his subjects, saw to the good order of his troops, and made the revenue more secure. There could be no better proof of his courage and good judgement than these facts.

31 Again, one could justifiably point to his control of the troops as a sign of his skill and wisdom. To accustom soldiers to remain content by applying force and compulsion is to produce this result through fear and not through superior intelligence. On the other hand, to persuade those who were insatiable about money and spoils to curb their desires was not, I think, readily within his power unless he surpassed everyone in intelligence and eloquence.

32 The Emperor has provided many other concrete examples of prudence during his reign, but the finest and most valuable is his good judgement and sagacity in war. Though he was aware that men who make a display of being formidable and warlike think it essential to conquer in battle and not by laying careful plans, he did not imitate or emulate them. He thought it right to employ arms against one's own kind—for it is a noble thing to conquer these by valor—but against the barbarians to use adroit planning.

33 He recognizes, I believe, that even the one who led countless hordes against the Hellenes and for whom neither land nor sea provided room enough was no match for the wits of a single man. Wherever it is possible to prevail by strategy, what need is there of running risks? Besides, victory in battle often comes even to men of no particular ability; but the power to prevail through prudence and wisdom belongs only to those who know how to deliberate.

34 Again, those who wish their valor displayed on every occasion and under every pretext prosper when they succeed; but when they are defeated, they plunge themselves and their allies into the greatest misfortunes. On the other hand, those who recognize and assess the demands of the situation obtain nothing short of their desires when they succeed; and when they fail utterly, they suffer no harm. Recognizing this fact the Emperor thinks it proper not to imitate those who are senseless and reckless, but to remain steadfast in the face of the barbarians through careful planning.

35 Yet the enemy found no fault with his conduct in war and the

use of arms. He demonstrated his power to prevail over them not only by reason of his intelligence and general education, but also by his valor. Wherever the Celts, the strongest and most bloodthirsty men under the sun, had the effrontery for all kinds of acts, they now make obeisance to their lord, realizing how much better it is to live in peace and to do what they are told than to wage war . . . Only the name of this race survives.

36 Though the whole area to the east beyond the Tigris and Euphrates was in a state of upheaval, it has now been subdued and taught to recognize its masters. The whole continent is at peace; land and sea pay honor to their ruler; Hellenes and barbarians live together in harmony. The Empire, like some ship or defensive wall, has been restored and fortified; its welfare has been securely provided for.

37 What measure of fortitude have these accomplishments failed to surpass? What state of affairs could be better or more advantageous than this? Is there not complete freedom for everyone to go wherever he wishes? Are not the harbors busy everywhere; the mountains as safe for travelers as the cities are for their inhabitants? Does not joy pervade the area of the plains? Has not all fear been completely wiped away? What river crossings have been closed to passage? What sea-straits have been shut? Now the festivals are more joyful and the feasts are more pleasing to the gods. Now the fire of Demeter is brighter and more hallowed.

38 O light of human happiness! It seems now that all men have found genuine happiness. O you who have outstripped all emperors! The wise you have surpassed in wisdom, the courageous in valor. In reverence you have surpassed those who excel in this virtue; in good fortune you have surpassed the most fortunate. For these things we could express no gratitude worthy of you, either by our praise or by any other form of honor.

39 May you, most noble son, walk in the footsteps of your father. Let these words stand as the most one can say in brief scope.

### COMMENTARY

If we follow Groag's suggestion that the subject of *Eis Βασιλέα* is Philip the Arab and examine the oration in the light of Menander's rules for the

*βασιλικὸς λόγος*, it is possible to see how commonplace was the orator's treatment of his theme and to what extent the events of Philip's life may have influenced that treatment.

1-4. The orator's assertion of his own inadequacy as well as the necessity of speaking *κατὰ δύναμιν* form the essence of the proemium prescribed by Menander (*Rhetores Graeci* III p.368,21-p.369,17 Spengel = *Περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν* 5.4-6, pp.95-96 Bursian). In disparaging other speakers who belabor the theme of their own insufficiency the author of *Εἰς Βασιλέα* is attempting, as T. C. Burgess noted ("Epideictic Literature," *ChiStCP* 3 [1902] 132), to enhance his reputation by reinforcing the impression of speaking impromptu.

If the feast in question is the Eleusinia, as Groag ("Studien" 21) suggests, Philip was not the first Roman emperor to take part in the sacred rites. See G. Gianelli, "I Romani ad Eleusi," *AttiTor* 50 (1915) 319-333 and 369-388. In this context the orator's reference to the "divine and beneficent Emperor" would seem very fitting, especially in light of the long-standing practice of conferring divine honors, as it were, upon a benefactor. See M. P. Charlesworth, "Some Observations on Ruler-Cult Especially in Rome," *HThR* 28 (1935) 9.

"Although my address will probably not do justice to his talents," etc. (K. 254, 5-6). Keil interprets the line to mean that the orator will not lack for subject-matter, although he omits many of the emperor's merits (K. 254, note to line 6). In view of the analogy already made of worshipping the gods *κατὰ δύναμιν*, it seems rather that the orator is reasserting his own inadequacy. 5. "First and most important, one thing that can be said of him," etc. (K. 254, 7-9). The worthiness of the emperor was a traditional theme throughout the first three centuries of the Empire. See M. P. Charlesworth, "*Pietas* and *Victoria*: the Emperor and the Citizen," *JRS* 33 (1943) 7; and J. Béranger, *Recherches sur l'aspect idéologique du principat* (= *SchweizAltWiss*, Heft 6 [Basel 1953]) 147 with nn.62 and 63.

If the facts of the case permit, Menander (*RG* III, p.369,18-p.370,15 Spengel = *Περὶ ἐπιδ.* 5.7-9, pp.96-97 Bursian) calls for a discussion of the emperor's ancestry and place of origin as testimony to his worthiness. Since Philip's *γένος* apparently contributed little on this subject, the orator seeks to establish the point on other grounds. This accounts in part for the digression in §§ 5-10 which actually anticipates much of the speech. Moreover, if the tradition of the Graeco-Latin writers concerning Philip's accession (see the commentary to §§ 13-15) were generally accepted, it is understandable why the orator at this early juncture should seek to allay the misgivings of the audience about a usurper from Trachonitis. The orator's adjustment to the realities of the situation actually lead him to commend Philip for not having an imperial ancestry.

The statement that Philip was summoned to power (K. 254, 12-15) is a

reflection of the long tradition that the truly good ruler commands willing subjects. On this point see E. R. Goodenough, "The Political Philosophy of Hellenistic Kingship," *YCS* 1 (1928) 89–90; and Béranger, *Recherches* 154 n.99. As in the case of Philip, the emperor traditionally is expected to refrain from seeking the throne himself (*cf.* Béranger, *Recherches* 139–40 and 158).

7–8. "Indeed, by comparing him with his predecessors," etc. (K. 254, 20–21). This is the first of many *συγκρίσεις* which the orator employs. For a detailed treatment of this rhetorical device, which Menander advises should be used throughout the encomium, see F. Focke, "Synkrisis," *Hermes* 58 (1923) 327–68.

9. The emphasis placed on the emperor's *φιλανθρωπία* here and in other parts of the oration (*cf.* §§ 15–17, 21–24, 27), an emphasis which goes beyond that proposed for the βασιλικὸς λόγος (RG III p.374,25–p.375,5 Spengel = *Περὶ ἐπιδ.* 5.27, p.102 Bursian), indicates the growing significance of this imperial virtue during the third century. It becomes especially important in the fourth century, when it is a recurrent theme in the orations of Themistius. See G. Downey, "Philanthropia in Religion and Statecraft in the Fourth Century after Christ," *Historia* 4 (1955) 199–208. Consult also Jürgen Kabiersch, *Untersuchungen zum Begriff der Philanthropia bei dem Kaiser Julian* (= *Klassisch-philologische Studien*, Heft 21 [Wiesbaden 1960]).

10. The emperor's respect for others, his confidence and lack of envy are traditional marks of the good king. See G. Barner, *Comparantur inter se Graeci de regentium hominum virtutibus auctores* (Marburg 1889) 15.

11–12. In discussing the emperor's *ἀνατροφή* or early life the orator returns to the format of the βασιλικὸς λόγος (RG III p.371, 18–p.372,2 Spengel = *Περὶ ἐπιδ.* 5.14, p.98 Bursian). His few vague statements indicate that he knows more about the rules of rhetoric than he does about Philip's training. However, the distinguished career of Philip's brother Priscus (*cf.* A. von Domaszewski, "C. Julius Priscus, der Bruder des Philippus Arabs," *RhM* 54 [1899] 159–160), as well as the emperor's own legal competence (*cf.* § 18), indicates that the orator's words are not without foundation. See L. L. Howe, *The Pretorian Prefect from Commodus to Diocletian* (Chicago 1942) 53–54 and 79.

13. In §§ 13 through 15 it seems that we have a very general and euphemistic treatment of Philip's part in the Mesopotamian campaign of Gordian III, of his treaty with the Persians and of his withdrawal and return to Rome.

"He . . . was so dedicated to the imperial duty that in his first association with it," etc. (K. 256, 7–9). For the translation of *τεταγμένος* compare Thuc. 2.63.3. The closing words of § 13 exclude the possibility that the phrase *ὥστε . . . ταχθείς* (K. 256, 8–9) refers to the imperial throne, and Canter's rendering (*cum forte summo loco constitutus esset*) misses the mark. Howe (*Pretorian Prefect* 80 and 110–111) believes that the office mentioned here is the vice-prefecture. But the vivid picture of turmoil surely reflects the military campaign of Gordian, and Groag ("Studien" 22 and 37) is right in

identifying the office as the pretorian prefecture, which Philip assumed after the death of Timesitheus.

“When he recognized that many functions of the imperial service,” etc. (K. 256, 9–16). The orator’s account seems to contradict the tradition of Graeco-Latin writers concerning Gordian’s campaign. Consult A. T. Olmstead, “The Mid-Third Century of the Christian Era” *CP* 37 (1942) 254 n.39 for references. According to them Gordian was on his way to total victory over Sapor I when he was struck down by Philip’s treachery at Zaitha. Quite a different account, however, and one that is more easily reconciled with the text of the oration is to be found in the so-called *Res Gestae Divi Saporis*, a trilingual inscription discovered near Persepolis, which records the achievements of Sapor I. For the Greek text consult A. Maricq in *Syria* 35 (1958) 295–360 (= *SEG* 20.324), and for an analysis see E. Honigmann and A. Maricq, *Recherches sur les Res Gestae divi Saporis* (= *MémAcBelg* [Lettres] 47 fasc. 4 [1953]). In this document (lines 6–10) Sapor claims to have destroyed the Roman army in a battle near *Misiche* in which Gordian was slain. There is no mention of Philip’s treason.

Olmstead (“Mid-Third Century” 255–56) discounts most of Sapor’s claim as specious propaganda. Noting that the contemporary *Sibylline Oracle* testifies that Gordian was betrayed, he also points out that *Misiche*, which nowhere fits into the Graeco-Roman account, is a good distance inland from Zaitha, where Gordian’s tomb was located. Thus, if Sapor did defeat the Roman army, it had nothing to do with Gordian’s campaign.

Nonetheless, Sapor apparently took great pains to immortalize his victory. If Girshman’s identification of the figures on the reliefs near Bishapur is correct, we see the body of Gordian prostrate under the hooves of Sapor’s horse and Philip kneeling before him in supplication (R. Girshmann, *Iran* trans. S. Gilbert and J. Emmons [London 1962] 152–157 and plates 196–199; 159 and plates 202–203). Cf. also the reliefs at Naqsh-I-Rustam (*Iran* 160 and plates 204–205) where, however, there is some dispute about the identity of the figures.

The majority of scholars, though understandably uncertain about the size and significance of the battle, seem to agree that Sapor’s claim is something more than an exaggerated boast. Among them are M. Rostovtzeff, “*Res Gestae Divi Saporis* and Dura,” *Berytus* 8 (1943–44) 17–60; G. Pugliese Carratelli, “*Res Gestae Divi Saporis*,” *Parola del Passato* 2 (1947) 209–39, 356–62; and W. Ensslin, “Zu den Kriegen des Sassaniden Schapur I,” *SB München*, phil.-hist. Kl. 1947, Heft 5 (publ. 1949) 96. Maricq (*Recherches* 116–18 and 123–30) points out that the *Sibylline Oracle* states that Gordian died in battle, and he identifies *Misiche* not with an inland town far from Zaitha but with Al-Anbar situated on the route to Ctesiphon not far from Gordian’s tomb. If this identification, which is accepted by G. Walser and T. Pekáry (*Die Krise des römischen Reiches* [Berlin 1962] 20), is correct, Maricq is perhaps right in suggesting that Sapor’s

account is the true one and that the Graeco-Roman tradition about Philip may have arisen as an effort to efface the memory of a military disgrace.

It is impossible to know for certain whether Gordian died in battle or was slain by his own troops (cf. S. I. Oost, "The Death of the Emperor Gordian III," *CP* 53 [1958] 106–07). Is it pushing the evidence too far to suggest that Philip took advantage of his opportunity at such a critical moment in the fighting with Sapor that both traditions contain the kernel of truth, if not the entire story?

It appears, at least, that the words of the *Res Gestae* fit in well with the orator's description. If Sapor won a significant victory over the Roman army, might not the stubbornness, arrogance and lack of discipline which the orator speaks of be that of the troops who were smarting under the sting of a military setback? If Philip commanded forces that had been badly beaten, he had little recourse but to conclude a treaty with Sapor. The *πρόνοια* mentioned in § 14 is the emperor's concern for saving what he could from a bad situation. That explains in part why the coins of his reign bear the title *Pax Fundata cum Persis*. See H. Mattingly and others, *The Roman Imperial Coinage* IV (London 1949) pt. 3, 76.

For the traditional kingly metaphors of physician, rider and pilot which are found in §§ 13 through 15 of the oration consult Béranger, *Recherches* 158 n.135 and Barner, *Comparantur* 9, 12–14, 28.

**14–15.** "From the time when divine providence . . . placed on the imperial throne," etc. (K. 256, 17–21). The divine appointment of kings and emperors is a theme which runs throughout the history of Greece and Rome. See L. Delatte, *Les traités de la royauté d'Éphante, Diotogène et Sthénidas* (= *BibFac-PhilLettLiège* fasc. 97 [Liège 1942] 144–158, 220 and 262) and M. P. Charlesworth, "Providentia and Aeternitas," *HThR* 29 (1936) 107–132. The intimate association of the *πρόνοια* of the gods and the personal *πρόνοια* of the emperor is more than a matter of imitation. It implies that in some way the emperor participates in the divine power and omniscience. On this point see L. Berlinger, *Beiträge zur inoffiziellen Titulatur der römischen Kaiser* (Breslau 1935) 80–86.

For the translation "most just and god-fearing" (K. 256, 19) consult M. H. van der Valk, "Zum Worte 'ΟΣΙΟΣ,'" *Mnemosyne* 10 (1942) 113–140, where the distinction between *ἴσιος* and *δίκαιος* is thoroughly studied.

Some of the virtues ascribed to Philip in §§ 14 and 15 are commemorated on the coins of his reign. For his *felicitas* see Mattingly and others, *RIC* IV pt. 3, 72, 75–80, 90, 99; for his *pietas*, *ibid.*, 72–73, 82–84, 86, 93–95, 101.

**14.** "When the rate of taxes earmarked for the imperial treasury," etc. (K. 257, 11–17). Alleviating the burden of taxes was a *τόπος* of the βασιλικὸς λόγος (RG III p.375,21–24 Spengel = *Περὶ ἐπιδ.* 5.30, p.103 Bursian) and a mark of *φιλανθρωπία* during the Hellenistic period (cf. Kabiersch, *Untersuchungen* 39). If the orator's words are more than a commonplace, the emperor's action must

have been confined to the early years of his reign, since his fiscal policies eventually involved him in considerable difficulty. See T. Pekáry, "Le 'tribut' aux Perses et les finances de Philippe l'Arabe," *Syria* 38 (1961) 275–283.

**17–18.** "Who could adequately praise his justice and clemency in the courts of law?" (K. 257, 18–19). Menander calls for a discussion of the emperor's justice *περὶ νομοθεσίας* (RG III p.375,24–p.376,2 Spengel = *Περὶ ἐπιδ.* 5.31, p.103 Bursian). It is clear, however, that the orator conceives of the emperor as the *νόμος ἔμφυχος* in the judicial rather than in the legislative sense. On this point see the helpful remarks of Delatte, *Traité*s 245–249.

**19.** "On the contrary, both victor and vanquished . . . bend the knee in obedience," etc. (K. 258, 1–3). For a good study of *προσκύνησις* in court ceremonial see A. Alföldi, "Die Ausgestaltung des monarchischen Zeremoniells am römischen Kaiserhöfe," *RömMitt* 49 (1934) 46–79. The practice seems to have been introduced into Rome about A.D. 39 and to have become part of the regular Roman practice after the time of the Antonines (cf. E. M. Smallwood, *Philonis Alexandrini Legatio ad Gaium* [Leiden 1961] 209–11 and M. P. Charlesworth, "Some Observations" 20).

At the end of this section the orator speaks of the two-fold function of punishment in much the same way as Plato (*Gorgias* 525b–c) and Philo (*De Confusione Linguarum* 34.171) do. On the former see the remarks of E. R. Dodds in his edition of the *Gorgias* (Oxford 1959) pp.254–255 and 380–381. On the latter consult H. A. Wolfson, *Philo* I (Cambridge [Mass.] 1947) 382–83.

**20.** "If to be a phil-Hellene is a fine thing and kingly," etc. (K. 258, 7–14). The orator's very general statement concerning the emperor's phil-Hellenism, which seems to have been a *τόπος* of the encomium (cf. Keil, "Kaiserrede" 391 n.1), suggests little more, perhaps, than that Philip put an end to Gordian's campaign, which must have made cultural pursuits very difficult. The orator's words would be most appropriate if the address were delivered at the Eleusinia.

**21.** "When we turn to his beneficence, what act was greater or more remarkable than that by which he liberated all," etc. (K. 258, 14–22). For the neuter adjective *ὑπήκοον* in the collective sense see a similar construction in Thuc. 6.69.3, and consult Jan Ros, S.J., *Die μεταβολή (Variatio) als Stilprinzip des Thucydides* (= *Rhetorische Studien, Ergänzungsband I* [Paderborn 1938]) 200.

The *κατήκοοι* are most probably the *frumentarii*, whose odious reputation (cf. Aur.Vict., *Liber de Caes.* 39.45) fits the orator's description. Consult P. K. Baille Reynolds, "The Troops Quartered in the Castra Peregrinorum," *JRS* 13 (1923) 180–187 and W. G. Sinnigen, "The Origins of the *Frumentarii*," *MAAR* 27 (1962) 213–224.

The orator's description of the fearful system of spies, which plagued much of the third century, is not unlike that which Dio Cassius (52.37) puts into the mouth of Maecenas in his advice to Augustus. Cf. Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE* II.

728–729 n.61. For a brief but valuable study of the word *παρρησία* see E. Peterson, “Zur Bedeutungsgeschichte von *Παρρησία*,” *Festschrift für Reinhold Seeberg I* (Leipzig 1929) 283–297. I have not been able to examine G. Scarpat’s *Parrhesia* (Florence 1964).

**22–23.** The orator turns now to the outward appearance of the emperor. For the importance of the ruler’s bearing as an indication of his interior state see Delatte, *Traités* 266–67. Menander (RG III p.375,8–18 Spengel = *Περὶ ἐπιδ.* 5.28–29, p.102 Bursian) calls for a description of the emperor as the refuge of the needy and specifically states that he should be praised for being *ἡμέρος* and *εὐπρόσδοτος*, characteristics that are typical of the good king (cf. Barner, *Comparantur* 20–21 and 29–30). The Homeric epithets “father” and “shepherd,” which are found in § 22, were applied to kings and emperors throughout antiquity. See Delatte, *Traités* 227 and L. K. Born, “Animate Law in the Republic and the Laws of Cicero,” *TAPA* 64 (1933) 131 n.26. Also consult J. Gaudemet, “Le régime impérial,” *SDHI* 26 (1960) 296–97.

**24–25.** “He knows it is incumbent upon him who is truly emperor to pattern himself after the universal ruler,” etc. (K. 259, 13–19). For the ruler’s obligation in this regard see the comments of Delatte, *Traités* 210–217. Playing an intermediary rôle, the emperor imitates a more perfect model while himself becoming a *παράδειγμα σωφροσύνης* for his subjects (§ 26). The effect of the emperor’s good example on others is a point to be made in the *βασιλικὸς λόγος* (RG III p.376,2–9 Spengel = *Περὶ ἐπιδ.* 5.32, p.103 Bursian).

In the *σύγκρισις* involving the Lacedaemonian general Pausanias the orator seems to be following Thucydides’ description of events subsequent to the fall of Byzantium in 478 B.C. The Greek leader’s violent temper, as well as his aloofness and tyrannical manner, is specifically mentioned by the historian (1.95.1–3; 1.130).

**26–27.** It seems the orator is thinking not only of the troops when he speaks of the “licentious and arrogant.” See the complaint of the people from Arague in Asia Minor (*CIL* III 14191 = *OGIS* 519; cf. Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE* II.741 n.26). If the introductory words of praise here for the *μακαριώτατοι καιροί* are not wholly fictitious, Philip seems to have worked to alleviate some of the abuses in the provinces. However, the theme of just provincial administrators is a *τόπος* of the *βασιλικὸς λόγος* (RG III p.375,18–21 Spengel = *Περὶ ἐπιδ.* 5.30, pp.102–103 Bursian).

The principle that the true king must rule his own passions is a common one in antiquity. For bibliography consult Delatte, *Traités* 256; Barner, *Comparantur* 30; and Goodenough, “The Political Philosophy” 70.

**28.** The series of participles without a finite verb at the end of this section poses a problem. It has been suggested that *ἦν* (K. 260, 21) be emended to *ᾶν* and that together with all the subsequent participles in the sentence it be construed with *φαίνεται* (K. 260, 17). Though this emendation would effectively

eliminate any lacuna, Keil rejects it on the grounds that there is nothing in the text to balance *παραχρήματα* in line 23. However, it seems that *ἐλθούσης δὲ* (260, 25–26) fills this function quite well. Nonetheless, *τοίνυν* (260, 20) “marks a fresh beginning after a strong stop” (J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*<sup>2</sup> [Oxford 1959] 577). This fact, coupled with the length of the passage introduced by the particle, seems to favor Keil’s suggestion of a break in the text.

**30–31.** The “limitless donatives” mentioned here by the orator were at least partly responsible for the title *Liberalitas* which appears on the coins of Philip’s reign. See Mattingly and others, *RIC* IV pt. 3, 72, 74, 80, 90, 91, 97, 99, 103.

In the translation I have followed Keil’s analysis of a textual lacuna in line 16, p.261.

“He no longer permitted them to spend their time in luxury,” etc. (K. 261, 20–22). One way of keeping the troops occupied was to employ them in public works. On this point see R. MacMullen, *Soldier and Civilian in the Later Roman Empire* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1963) 32–36, and for the reign of Philip consult Groag, “Studien” 35 and E. Stein, *RE* 10 (1919) col. 766 s.v. M. IULIUS PHILIPPUS.

**32.** A discussion of the emperor’s virtues takes the orator back to Philip’s handling of the war with Sapor I. It is significant that he returns to the theme of peace before discussing Philip’s *ἀνδρεία* on the battlefield. Such a reversal of the normal order, particularly after the problem has been discussed in §§ 13–15, indicates the difficulty which the treaty posed for the orator. The long discussion of Philip’s *εὐβουλία* in §§ 32–34 is the closest thing to an *ἀπολογία* that we have in the oration (cf. Groag, “Studien” 33).

“He thought it right to employ arms against one’s own kind,” etc. (K. 262, 11–14). Though the term *βάρβαρος* frequently implies no contempt (cf. T. H. Haarhoff, *The Stranger at the Gate* [Oxford 1948] 51–59, 126, 216–221), it is clearly a pejorative term here, as is evident from the orator’s allusion to the Persian general Xerxes, whose vast army met its match in Themistocles.

**34.** “Recognizing this fact, the Emperor thinks it proper . . . to remain steadfast,” etc. (K. 262, 25–263, 1). *Securitas*, which became a growing problem during the third and fourth centuries, is commemorated on some of Philip’s coins (cf. Mattingly and others, *RIC* IV pt. 3, 73, 83, 85, 92).

**35.** Coming, as they do, only after a description of Philip’s accomplishments in peace, the brief references to his military victories are intended to show that he was not totally lacking in the traditional *ἀνδρεία* of the Roman Emperor. Since these victories play a minor rôle in this encomium, it is understandable that the orator ignores Menander’s suggestion that the emperor’s battles be described in some detail (*RG* III p.373,17–32 Spengel = *Περὶ ἐπιδ.* 5.22–23, pp.100–101 Bursian). The Celts mentioned here must be the Germani against whom Philip campaigned in 246. The annihilated race most probably refers to the defeat of the Carpi in 247. See Groag, “Studien” 34–35. For coins

of Philip's reign bearing the title *Victoria Carpica* see Mattingly and others, *RIC IV* pt. 3, 75.

**36–37.** The orator's description of peaceful conditions, which is patterned after that of Aristides in *Eis 'Pómhyn* (cf. Keil's ed. 263, note to line 16), follows the standard format of the βασιλικὸς λόγος (*RG III* p.377,10–24 Spengel = *Περὶ ἐπιδ.* 5.37–38, pp.104–105 Bursian). For coins commemorating the peace of Philip's reign consult Mattingly and others, *RIC IV* pt. 3, 73, 80, 81, 86, 97, 100, 103.

“Hellenes and barbarians live together in harmony,” etc. (K. 263, 11–12). On the figure of a chorus singing in unison see the comments of J. H. Oliver, *The Ruling Power* (= *TransAmPhilSoc*, n.s. 43, pt. 4 [1953]) 917.

“Does not joy pervade the area of the plains?” (K. 263, 18–19). See the coins of Philip's rule bearing the title *Laetitia Fundata* (Mattingly and others, *RIC IV* pt. 3, 72, 90).

**38–39.** “O light of human happiness!” (K. 263, 24). The image of light is found in Aristides' *Eis 'Pómhyn* (103), and “the brilliant light of the Roman Empire eventually became a *topos*” (Oliver, *The Ruling Power* 948). To the passages cited by Oliver add that found in Mamertinus' panegyric to Maximian (*Paneg. Lat.* III 15.3) where the context is not unlike that of *Eis Βασιλέα*.

The orator's closing remark to the emperor's son contradicts his earlier praise of Philip for not having inherited the throne (§ 5) and clearly indicates how closely the author of *Eis Βασιλέα* feels himself bound by the format of the βασιλικὸς λόγος (*RG III* p.377,28–30 Spengel = *Περὶ ἐπιδ.* 5.38, p.105 Bursian).

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO

April, 1966