

# The Εἰς Βασιλέα of Ps.-Aelius Aristides

*Lukas de Blois*

THE AUTHENTICITY of a speech preserved under the title Εἰς Βασιλέα in most MSS. of Aelius Aristides (*Or.* 35K.) has long been questioned.<sup>1</sup> It will be argued here that the speech is a *basilikos logos* written by an unknown author of the mid-third century in accordance with precepts that can be found in the extant rhetorical manuals of the later Empire. Although I accept the view that the oration was written in imitation of Xenophon's *Agesilaus* and Isocrates' *Evagoras*, and was clearly influenced by the speeches of Dio Chrysostom on kingship and Aristides' panegyric on Rome,<sup>2</sup> I offer support for the view that the Εἰς Βασιλέα is a panegyric addressed to a specific emperor, probably Philip the Arab, and contains a political message relevant to a specific historical situation.

After a traditional opening (§§1–4), the author gives a comparatively full account of his addressee's recent accession to the throne (5–14). He praises the emperor, who attained power unexpectedly while campaigning on the eastern frontier, for doing so without strife and bloodshed, and for leading the army out of a critical situation back to his own territory. The author mentions in passing the emperor's education (11f) and refers to an important post he filled just before his enthronement—a post that gave him power, prepared him for rule, and gave him an opportunity to correct wrongs (5, 13). The author then sums up the emperor's peacetime deeds, his personal qualities, and his military achievements. These he arranges, following the recommendations of rhetorical handbooks such as that by Menander,<sup>3</sup> in the order of the virtues: in this case, δικαιοσύνη, φιλαν-

<sup>1</sup> See B. Keil, *Aelii Aristidis Smyrnaei quae supersunt omnia* II (Berlin 1898) 253–64. L. J. SWIFT, "The Anonymous Encomium of Philip the Arab," *GRBS* 7 (1966, hereafter 'Swift') 267–89, provides an English translation with commentary.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. A. Boulanger, *Aelius Aristides et la sophistique dans la province d'Asie* (Paris 1923) 384; C. P. JONES, "Aelius Aristides, ΕΙΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΑ," *JRS* 62 (1972 [hereafter 'Jones']) 134–52.

<sup>3</sup> L. Spengel, ed., *Rhetores Graeci* III (Leipzig 1856) 331ff; D. A. Russell and N. G. Wilson, ed., *Menander Rhetor* (Oxford 1981). See in general D. A. Russell, *Greek Declamation* (Cambridge 1983).

*θρωπία*, and *ἀνδρεία*. Under the first of these, the author praises the emperor's moderation when imposing burdens (16), his wisdom and skill when administering justice (17–19), and his respectful attitude towards Greek culture at a time when traditional Hellenic *paideia* and all else Greek had counted for little with rulers (20). Under the heading *φιλανθρωπία*, the writer praises the emperor for removing informers (21); he extols his humanity, friendliness, accessibility, and strength of character; and he commends the self-restraint and concern for his subjects that the emperor has cultivated in imitation of the divine ruler of the cosmos (22–29). By contrast, the Homeric heroes Agamemnon and Achilles and the Spartan general Pausanias, victor at Plataea, are mentioned as examples of a violent disposition in men of high position and great power. In §§30–36 the author deals with military prowess. He begins, notably, by emphasizing how well the emperor kept his men in check without giving them more than their due; he goes on to praise him for his prudence (*εὐβουλία*) in dealing with the enemy, recalling Themistocles' demeanor in 480 B.C.; only then does he refer briefly to wars in Mesopotamia and against *Keltai*. A peroration, modelled after Aristides' panegyric on Rome, concludes the speech (37–39) by urging the emperor's son to follow in his father's footsteps.

Since the question of authenticity has been surveyed fully in recent papers,<sup>4</sup> I need only point out here that after Keil's rejection of the attribution to Aristides,<sup>5</sup> scholarly interest turned to the problem of the addressee. Groag concluded that Philip the Arab was the emperor in question, and this view was regarded as the *communis opinio* by Swift in his 1966 commentary. But in 1972 C. P. Jones defended the authenticity of the speech, maintaining that the manuscript tradition gives no cause for doubt, and that in idiom and style the *Εἰς Βασιλέα* is consistent with Aristides' usage. He attempted to prove that Aristides could well have given the speech at Rome in A.D. 144 for Antoninus Pius. Macmullen, Bengtson, and Stertz have pointed out, however, that this theory raises insoluble problems; Fergus Millar is virtually alone in accepting Jones' view.<sup>6</sup> In a recent response Jones

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Swift 269ff; Jones 134–52; S. A. STERTZ, "Pseudo-Aristides, ΕΙΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΑ," *CQ* n.s. 29 (1979 [hereafter 'Stertz']) 172–97.

<sup>5</sup> *Supra* n.1: 253, and "Eine Kaiserrede (Aristides R. XXXV)," *NAkG* 1905, 381–428; cf. E. Groag, "Die Kaiserrede des Pseudo-Aristides," *WS* 40 (1918) 21–45; Swift 269–72.

<sup>6</sup> R. MacMullen, *The Roman Government's Response to Crisis* (New Haven 1976) 219 n.32; H. Bengtson, "Das Imperium Romanum in griechischer Sicht," *Kleine Schriften* (Munich 1974) 565; Stertz 182–97; F. Millar, *The Emperor in the Roman World* (London 1977) 528f. The most important evidence against authenticity is found in §20,

has pointed out inaccuracies in Stertz's paper but has not fully succeeded in meeting other criticism.<sup>7</sup>

Stertz had chosen to elaborate a line of argument indicated briefly by Barker and Macmullen,<sup>8</sup> suggesting that the *Εἰς Βασιλέα* does not refer to an actual historical situation, but is a third- or fourth-century school exercise preserved in the corpus of Aristides in an age of philological naïveté. Stertz also linked the *Εἰς Βασιλέα* directly with Menander's rhetorical handbook, probably written between 250 and 300;<sup>9</sup> but there is no confirmation of this connection, and the suggestion must therefore remain hypothetical.

We may, however, view Menander's manual from another perspective: not as a direct source of influence upon the author of the *Εἰς Βασιλέα*, but simply as a guide to the kind of rhetoric displayed in the speech. For the *basilikos logos* Menander suggests the following arrangement. After the *prooemium* must come mention of the ruler's native city and his family, and then his *φύσις*, *ἀνατροφή*, *παιδεία*, *φύσις τῆς ψυχῆς*, and *ἐπιτηδεύματα*. These are to be followed by *ὁ περὶ τῶν πράξεων λόγος*, giving his military achievements under the heading *ἀνδρεία*, and his peacetime deeds under *δικαιοσύνη*, *σωφροσύνη*, and *φρόνησις*. After this, something should be said about the "third category of virtue," *φιλανθρωπία* (225), including a variety of traditional qualities of rulers. In Menander's plan this is followed by the peroration. The whole should be embellished with significant allusions to and comparisons with well-known personalities of mythology and history. The speaker is at intervals (215, 217, 219) reminded of the need to adapt his oration to the actual situation:

---

where the emperor is urged to stimulate Greek culture after a period of neglect. But both Trajan and Hadrian had admitted Greek-speaking notables and men of letters to their administration and to the imperial aristocracy, and Hadrian had been a decidedly philhellene emperor. See G. W. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford 1969) 43–58; Millar 83ff; Stertz 190ff; B. Forte, *Rome and the Romans as the Greeks Saw Them* (Rome 1972) 292–327. This estimate is in no way prejudiced by the occasional friction, especially towards the end of the emperor's life, between Hadrian and Greek artists and sophists. Only a handful of these were in fact treated badly, and difficulties of this sort were largely the result of Hadrian's personal interest in Greek art, letters, and philosophy. Even after his death, Aelius Aristides called Hadrian the best emperor up to that time (*Or.* 27.22), and over two centuries later Julian the Apostate characterized Hadrian as *οὐτὸς ὁ σοφιστῆς* (*Symp.* 311d).

<sup>7</sup> C. P. Jones, "The ΕΙΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΑ Again," *CQ* n.s. 31 (1981) 224f.

<sup>8</sup> E. Barker, *Social and Political Thought in Byzantium* (Oxford 1957) 220–35; Macmullen (*supra* n.6) 11; cf. Stertz 174ff.

<sup>9</sup> Stertz 176ff; on the dating of Menander see V. Nutton, "The Beneficial Ideology," in P. D. A. Garnsey and C. R. Whittaker, ed., *Imperialism in the Ancient World* (Cambridge 1978) 214 (ca. A.D. 270); Russel and Wilson (*supra* n.3) xl (ca. A.D. 300); and G. A. Kennedy, *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World* (Princeton 1972) 636f (third century).

should the addressee come from an insignificant city, for example, or from an unfavourable background, it is best not to mention them, or to do so in vague terms only.

This is in fact the procedure followed in speeches actually presented on specific historical occasions as early as Xenophon's *Agésilas*, and in Isocrates' *Evagoras* and *Nicocles*: Menander's elements are all more or less present, although in each case their order depends on the given situation. Similarly in the speeches Dio Chrysostom delivered in various cities (*Or.* 33–46), each contains a number of fixed elements, with different emphases in each case. Now, in a school exercise such variations are not to be expected. This kind of rhetorical prose is more likely to follow the book, unless the teacher has specifically required that the speech refer to a particular historical situation. Such instructions are in fact known to us from Philostratus' *Vitae sophistarum*, where Heliodorus is instructed by Caracalla to speak extemporaneously on the topic, "Having collapsed before Philip, Demosthenes defends himself against a charge of cowardice" (*VS* 626); Aelius Aristides composed five *μελέται* concerning the situation in Greece after the battle of Leuctra (371 B.C.), in two of which Athens is invited to support Sparta.<sup>10</sup> But since the *Εἰς Βασιλέα* was probably inserted into the corpus of Aristides before Libanius' time,<sup>11</sup> it must have been regarded as something more than a school exercise based on detailed instructions.

The *basilikos logos* is also dealt with in Demetrius' *Peri hermeneias* (287ff), where it is noted that in order to indicate their offenses when addressing a ruler, a proud and irascible *demos*, or someone who is *βίαιος*, one may feel obliged to use metaphors or other indirect speech. The object of this *λόγος ἐσχηματισμένος* (*sermo figuratus* or *coloratus*) is *εὐπρέπεια* and *ἀσφάλεια*. In his *De inventione* (259, p.205 Rabe) Hermogenes calls this phraseology *ἐσχηματισμένη ὑπόθεσις κατ' ἔμφασιν*. Philostratus mentions among specialists in this "exacting form of oratory" (*VS* 597) Scopelianus (519), Rufinus of Perinthus (597), and Hermocrates (609f).<sup>12</sup> Examples of expressing

<sup>10</sup> The sophists Lesbonax and Polemo produced similar writings: see G. J. D. Aalders H.Wzn., *Echt Grieks* (Valedictory Lecture, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, 17 October 1981) 12f.

<sup>11</sup> Jones 139 n.42: "It may be noted in passing that Aristides' admirer Libanius perhaps shows knowledge of the *Εἰς Βασιλέα*: cf. his *Laudatio Constantii et Constantis* 121-2 (vol. IV, p.268, 11–269, 5F.) with Aristid. 35, 27–9, 23–4."

<sup>12</sup> [Dion. Hal.] *Rhet.* 295–358; J. Penndorf, "De sermone figurato," *LeipzigStud* 20 (1902) 169ff; W. C. Wright, *Philostratus and Eunapius* (London/Cambridge [Mass.] 1968) 570 (glossary); Kennedy (*supra* n.9) 619ff. On Demetrius see D. M. Schenkeveld, *Studies in Demetrius On Style* (Amsterdam 1964), and D. A. Russell, *Ancient Literary Criticism* (Oxford 1972) 213ff; on Hermogenes see Russell 561ff.

oneself indirectly by shifting to a different period in history can also be found. The speech attributed to Maecenas in Cassius Dio 52.14–39, placed at the beginning of the reign of Augustus, was actually meant for the court of the Severi. The discussion between Euphrates and Apollonius in Philostratus' *Vita Apollonii* (5.36) is set on the occasion of Vespasian's elevation to the throne, but again was probably conceived for the Severi.<sup>13</sup>

In the *Εἰς Βασιλέα* we find a different form of *λόγος ἐσχηματισμένος*, viz., an exhortation in the form of praise. On this manner of speaking indirectly Clark rightly comments, "to praise a man is in one respect akin to urging a course of action. The suggestions which would be made in the latter case become encomiums when differently expressed. . . ." Klein has recently established that the *Εἰς Ῥώμην* implies a stand against men of influence at the court of Antoninus Pius who longed for more adventure after Hadrian's policy of consolidation.<sup>14</sup> In the *Εἰς Βασιλέα* we see something similar, which may explain its inclusion in the corpus of Aristides: in rhetorical language consisting of traditional clichés, concepts, and terminology common in the neo-sophists, a 'message' intended as advice to the emperor is inserted by means of certain emphases and arrangement of the topics. The placement and amplitude of the passage dealing with the addressee's rise to the throne during the war in the East (immediately after the *prooemium* and covering ten paragraphs) serves as the first indication of a special emphasis. A similar departure from normal arrangement occurs at the end of the speech, where the speaker lists the emperor's military deeds and stresses both his restraint of the soldiers and his *εὐβουλία* (with its reference to Themistocles). The author's suppression of the emperor's origin and native city is noteworthy, as well as the choice of peacetime deeds mentioned under *δικαιοσύνη* (16–20); one finds, moreover, a variety of references to and paraphrases of Dio Chrysostom, together with a hidden polemic aimed against him—to which I shall return presently—and a series of clever allusions to Xenophon's *Agésilas* and Isocrates' *Evagoras*, both concerned with the ideal prince.<sup>15</sup> The message emerges that the

<sup>13</sup> See J. Bleicken, "Der politische Standpunkt Dios gegenüber der Monarchie," *Hermes* 90 (1962) 445ff; E. L. Bowie, "Apollonius of Tyana, Tradition and Reality," in *ANRW* II.16.2 (Berlin 1978) 1660.

<sup>14</sup> D. L. Clark, *Rhetoric in Graeco-Roman Education* (New York 1957) 136; R. Klein, *Die Romrede des Aelius Aristides, Einführung* (Darmstadt 1981) 136–59, and *Historia* 30 (1981) 337–50.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. §5 with Xen. *Ag.* 1.5; 15 with *Ag.* 3.2 (*ἤρξατο . . . ἀπὸ εὐσεβείας*); 16 with *Ag.* 4.1; 20 with *Ag.* 7.4 (*εἶ γε μὴν αὐτὸν καλὸν Ἕλληνα ὄντα φιλέλληνα εἶναι*); 27–29 with *Ag.* 5.1ff and 10.2; 32–34 (*ἀνδρεία* with *εὐβουλία*) with *Ag.* 6.4 and 11.9. Cf. 1–4

present emperor has every right to the throne even though he comes from an obscure family and a relatively unimportant place, and has attained power rather unexpectedly in time of war. He did well to end the war in the East and is being encouraged to impose moderate burdens, to remove informers, to participate intelligently in the administration of justice, to stimulate Greek culture, to practise a restrained foreign policy, to keep the soldiers in check without bribing them with *donativa*, and to behave as a good king in accordance with the models set by Xenophon and Isocrates.

The middle of the third century, rather than the second, would seem a suitable time for such a message: for this was a period of serious conflict along the northern and eastern boundaries of the empire; a period of fiscal problems, inflation, struggle for the throne, and lack of discipline in the army; a period in which rulers had little time for appreciating the pleasures of Greek culture, and young and inexperienced rulers alternated with soldier-emperors who had military training only, and seldom exhibited traditional virtues.<sup>16</sup>

The career sketched in the *Εἰς Βασιλέα* closely approximates that of Philip the Arab, member of an equestrian family from Bostra in Arabia, who became *praefectus praetorio* and subsequently emperor, after disillusioned and hungry soldiers had murdered Gordian III during his unfortunate campaign against the Persians (A.D. 244). Philip concluded a disadvantageous peace with the Persians and defeated the Carpi on the Danube or in Dacia. As I have demonstrated elsewhere, he attempted to conduct a conservative financial policy and sought to reintroduce the Antonine and Severan mode of government; he probably had some experience in law. In 249 he was swept away by the Pannonian legions in the tide of invasions and usurpations that beset the empire after 248.<sup>17</sup>

---

with Isoc. *Evag.* 1ff and 8; 8 with *Evag.* 25f (ὁ δὲ οὕτως καὶ καλῶς ἐπέστη τοῖς πράγμασιν); 15 with *Evag.* 23. In my view these allusions to the *Agesilaus* and the *Evagoras* serve to evoke two panegyrics on generals who fought the Persians, who had become a dangerous enemy of Rome in the period after A.D. 230. Both these generals had, moreover, kept their troops well in hand and were depicted by their biographers as both models of austerity and champions of Hellenism against the Persian empire.

<sup>16</sup> On the crisis of the third century see L. de Blois, *The Policy of the Emperor Galienus* (Leiden 1976) 9–20, and “The Third Century Crisis and the Greek Elite in the Roman Empire,” *Historia* 33 (1984) 363ff; R. Rémondon, *La crise de l’empire de Marc Aurèle à Anastase* (Paris 1964); G. Alföldy, “The Crisis of the Third Century as Seen by Contemporaries,” *GRBS* 15 (1974) 89–111. On the ‘exemplum Marci’ see Cass. Dio 72.1, 3f, 26–30, 32, 34; at 72.36.4 Dio considers his time a golden age that will be followed by iron and rust. Cf. Herodian 1.2–4.

<sup>17</sup> See J. M. York, “The Image of Philip the Arab,” *Historia* 21 (1972) 324ff; X. Lorient, “Chronologie du règne de Philippe l’Arabe,” *ANRW* II.2 (Berlin 1975) 789–97;

The message of the *Εἰς Βασιλέα* is related in tone and content to elements in the writings of Cassius Dio and Herodian—in particular their treatment of Marcus Aurelius—as well as of Philostratus and, as far as the fragmentary transmission of his work permits any conclusions, Dexippus. I have noted elsewhere<sup>18</sup> that these writers paint a black picture of the soldiers' greed, lack of discipline, and inclination to rebel. They warn against excessive fiscal pressure and show appreciation of emperors who participate intelligently in the administration of justice. They are particularly negative towards such 'tyrants' as Commodus, Caracalla, and Maximinus Thrax: these granted their soldiers everything and terrorised the notables; they showed little feeling for genuine culture, behaved unpredictably, and conducted a cowardly or reckless foreign policy. Commodus and Caracalla are criticized in particular for their decision to allow themselves to be worshipped as gods (Hercules, Sol)—an obvious parallel to the restraint praised in §§8, 14, and 24 of the *Εἰς Βασιλέα* regarding worship of the emperor.<sup>19</sup> Also noteworthy is their objection to the way in which Maximinus entrenched himself within his army and remained inaccessible to others. By way of comparison, these writers all mention Marcus Aurelius as the paradigm of a good ruler who held his soldiers in check, giving them only their due, and sold precious objects belonging to the imperial household rather than increase taxes; he paid full tribute to senators and sophists and was clement and approachable; his *paideia* was exemplary, and he energetically supported the traditional system of justice.

Two aspects of the whole we find mirrored in mid-third century petitions of rural communities in the Balkans and Asia Minor, as well as papyri of Egypt, namely, apprehension about heavy fiscal burdens and the misbehaviour of soldiers.<sup>20</sup> In this connection an edict of the emperor Alexander Severus of A.D. 222 is of interest: he apologises for being unable, given the state of imperial finances, to remit en-

L. de Blois, "The Reign of the Emperor Philip the Arab," *Talanta* 10–11 (1978–79) 11–43.

<sup>18</sup> "The Third Century Crisis" (*supra* n.16) 364ff, esp. nn.22ff.

<sup>19</sup> By far the majority of Greek authors of the Second Sophistic were mistrustful of the imperial cult: see L. Cerfaux and J. Tondriau, *Un concurrent du christianism. Le culte des souverains dans la civilisation gréco-romaine* (Paris 1957) 435f; G. J. D. Aalders H.Wzn., "Grieks zelfbewustzijn in de Romeinse keizertijd," *Handelingen van het 34e Nederlandse Filologencongres* (Amsterdam 1976) 5; A. Wallace-Hadrill, "The Emperor and His Virtues," *Historia* 30 (1981) 316.

<sup>20</sup> See *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 888 from Scaptopare in Thrace; *OGIS* 519 (*CIL* III 14191) from Aragrae in Asia Minor; *Sel.Pap.* II 291 (*P.Graux* 4, *SB* 7464); P. J. Parsons, "Philippus Arabs and Egypt," *JRS* 57 (1967) 134ff; cf. Rostovtzeff, *Roman Empire*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford 1957) 495ff.

tirely or in part the debts to the treasury and the *aurum coronarium* that the cities were obliged to pay him on his accession to the throne. In language and style this edict resembles the *Εἰς Βασιλέα*, as J. Moreau has already observed.<sup>21</sup>

Another aspect of the *Εἰς Βασιλέα* compatible with these times is its concern with problems in the East (14f). Palm has pointed out the anxious preoccupation among Greek writers after about 160 with conflicts with the Parthians and, after 226, with the Persians.<sup>22</sup> There is, as a result, a revival of rhetorical commonplaces dealing with the Persian wars of 499–449 B.C. and with the life of Alexander the Great.

In content the *Εἰς Βασιλέα* does not fit in easily with the works of Dio Chrysostom, Aelius Aristides, and Plutarch—who, in particular, reflects the focus upon the old Greek polis found in the political works of Plato and Aristotle.<sup>23</sup> On the other hand there is little suggestion of the atmosphere surrounding such fourth-century writers as Themistius, Libanius, and Synesius. The question of one's position relative to the young Christian court at Constantinople and concern with the ever-increasing power of Germanic generals within the imperial government—themes typical of fourth-century Greek intellectuals—are not found in the *Εἰς Βασιλέα*.<sup>24</sup> It is clear, moreover, from 37 (*νῦν καὶ πανηγύρεις φαιδρότεραι καὶ ἑορταὶ θεοφιλέστεραι· νῦν καὶ τὸ Δῆμητρος πῦρ λαμπρότερον καὶ ἱερώτερον*) that the speech was written neither by a Christian nor for a Christian emperor.

Formally, the author of the *Εἰς Βασιλέα* depends greatly on Dio Chrysostom, from whom he gleaned a variety of terms and concepts. From time to time, however, he disassociates himself from Dio, particularly from his speeches on royalty. In 22 he takes issue with two Homeric metaphors for rulers that occur frequently in Dio, *πατήρ* and *ποιμὴν τῶν λαῶν* (*Orr.* 1.13, 19; 2.6, 65f; *cf. Iliad* 4.296). These he regards as too superficial to describe his ruler. We also miss some of Dio's favourite concepts and exempla, such as *καρτερία*, *φιλία πόνου*, Sol, Hercules, and Alexander the Great (the latter being a leading figure in Dio's fourth speech); nor is there any men-

<sup>21</sup> *Sel.Pap.* II 216 col. 2.1–16 (*P.Fay.* 20). See J. Moreau, *Scripta Minora* (Heidelberg 1964) 33–41; Bengtson (*supra* n.6) 565; J. H. Oliver, "On the Edict of Severus Alexander," *AJP* 99 (1978) 474ff.

<sup>22</sup> J. Palm, *Rom, Römertum und Imperium* (Lund 1959) 62ff. See Cass. Dio 80.3f; *cf.* Aalders (*supra* n.19) 5.

<sup>23</sup> See G. J. D. Aalders H.Wzn., *Plutarch's Political Thought* (Amsterdam 1982) 61–65.

<sup>24</sup> See A. B. Breebaart, "Het Hellenisme van de vierde eeuw en het nieuwe Rome," *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis* 91 (1978) 1–19.



tion of the monarch's φίλοι, an important topic with Dio.<sup>25</sup> The absence of Alexander the Great is particularly surprising in a speech that deals at length with problems on the Eastern frontier; possibly the author wished to avoid the comparisons with Alexander found in eulogies of Caracalla and Alexander Severus, who had met with little success in that region.<sup>26</sup>

There are also major discrepancies with Aelius Aristides' panegyric on Rome, which, as Oliver and Klein have shown,<sup>27</sup> must have been delivered in A.D. 143. In this speech Aristides had praised the Roman army as a well-trained and disciplined organisation, capable of protecting the empire from barbarians; he had also described the situation of the empire and the imperial administration as in all respects in good order and friendly even to Greek-speaking notables who were given citizenship and received into the imperial élite (29–39, 58–70, 92–106). The author of the *Εἰς Βασιλέα* paints quite a different picture, as we have seen.

We may conclude, therefore, that the *Εἰς Βασιλέα* is a *basilikos logos* written in *sermo coloratus* in accordance with rhetorical precepts known to us from manuals like those of Menander, Demetrius, and Hermogenes, and exemplified in the *Vitae Sophistarum* of Philostratus. It appears, moreover, that the speech was composed in the middle of the third century by an unknown author whose ideas on kingship and politics were congenial to those of Cassius Dio, Herodian, and Philostratus. The speech is not simply a school exercise but contains, in an exhortation in the form of praise, a 'message' for an emperor—probably Philip the Arab—in a specific historical situation.

Two potential obstacles to this identification are easily resolved. The first is that Philip's wife, Otacilia Severa, is not mentioned in the speech although she figures on Philip's coins and in his inscriptions, with titles and effigies reminiscent of the empresses of the house of the Severi.<sup>28</sup> But this need not be a decisive objection, as the occasion for which the speech was written may not have required that she be mentioned. In point of fact, her name is absent from almost all coins and inscriptions that mention both Philip and his son, just as it is

<sup>25</sup> On wise government see *Orr.* 1.12, 37ff, 61.1; 2 *passim*; 3.34ff (*cf.* Philostr. *VA* 5.36); on καρτερία and φιλία πόνου, 1.21, 3.83ff. On Hercules and Sol, see 1.22, 30; 3.86ff.

<sup>26</sup> See Herodian 4.8 and Cass. Dio 78.6f (Caracalla); Herodian 5.7.3 (Alexander Severus).

<sup>27</sup> J. H. Oliver, *The Ruling Power* (= *TransAmPhilSoc* N.S. 43.4 [1953]) 887; Klein, *supra* n.4.

<sup>28</sup> See *RIC*<sup>2</sup> IV.3 39, 64, 104; *cf.* 131, 135, and *ILS* 507, 509, 513 (*mater Augusti et castrorum et senatus et patriae*).

missing in the Εἰς Βασιλέα itself, which is addressed to an emperor and his son (39).<sup>29</sup> The second problem concerns the last paragraph (39) and the form of address, ὦ παῖ γενναῖε γενναίων. This title, a paraphrase of the title *nobilissimus Caesar*, which was used officially of the successor-designate to the throne from the reign of Septimius Severus on,<sup>30</sup> may have been in common use for much longer. Was this appropriate for young Marcus Aurelius in 144, but excessive for Philip *junior*? I think not. In the mid-third century the title had been in use for more than four decades; Philip the Arab placed his son in the forefront on coins and in inscriptions (sometimes with this very title), and made him co-emperor at an early age.

KATHOLIEKE UNIVERSITEIT, NIJMEGEN

June, 1986

<sup>29</sup> See P. Bureth, *Les titulatures impériales dans les papyrus, les ostraca et les inscriptions d'Égypte* (Paris 1964) 113ff; *ILS* 505ff; *RIC* IV.3 68ff.

<sup>30</sup> See Bureth (*supra* n.28) 93ff, 100ff, 114, 127; Groag (*supra* n.5) 22.