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 entities 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 labourer as a social process. The labour-power of the free worker (presumably 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 marl (which are 'circulating capital'), and (b) all 'instruments of labour' (which are 'fixed capital'), including land, buildings, plant, railways, animals, working animals (for the last, see Cap. II, 163, 165, cf. Grundrisse, E. T. 465, 469) and, quite specifically, slaves (Cap. II, 485; III, 904), 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, 206-9; II, 160-8, 227-8, 240-1; III, 814-16.

It is true that Marx often refuses, when he is being vigorously 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. 248), and 'wealth confronts direct forced labour not as capital, but rather as a relation of domination (Herrschaftsverhältnis) (Grundrisse, E. T. 336, cf. 513, and see also 461-5, and 465 on the sert). So long as slavery is predominant the capital relationship can only be sporadic and subordinate, never dominant' (ThSL, 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. I, 170-1, 196, 208, 210, 214-5, 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, 146-9; cf. II, 51, 892-3 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 capitalized 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 being 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. I, 160, 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. I, 160); 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., Orion, VII, 35, IX, 9, and XII, 2 to XV, 5 on slave householders (esp. XII, 2-3, 19, XII, 6-9, XIV, 1 to XV, 9-8), 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 Plato, Crito, the former, who is specifically described as a slave (line 329) and is one of the most-cited examples of line 254, over several slaves (lines 280, 3105), not only the Crito whose main character is the slave, Jotus, M 412 and 136 n, 54, treats Crito as just a stock comic figure but the other slaves are certainly not that they are not necessary figures and indeed would have spoken the dramatic picture (in which Crito's poverty is an essential element) had they not been characteristic. See also Ar., Pha. 510-1 and Ethic. 565; P. Pers. 138-9, 1346-8, Ph., Prod. XLVII, 21, 714, 21, 214, 2 Dem. LV, 31-2 (cf. 28); and other texts, I cannot accept the general assumptions of Ehrmann, PM, 566-91 (ch. vii), about the importance of slaves to 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 Athenian agriculture is the negative tone of the last Labour. The only alternative way in which Athenian landowners could have made appreciable increases out of their property (as we know they did), or indeed any profits at all (apart from leasing), was evidently rare and confined mainly to the seasons of harvest, vintage and olive-picking. (I have lived in H.V to H. below the only passages I have been able to discover on the use of hired labour are Athenian agriculture). Even the overseer or manager (besideous, occasionally overseers, especially in Xen. and Arist; these were in all probability able to be slaves or freedmen; see Xen., Mon. II, vii, 3, 34-5 (noticed in III, vi above); Great, X, XV, esp.
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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 5th-century Empire and in Asia Minor instead of renting their estates large or small, in pupils 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 Atalids 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 Praxag.), and it may be assumed to have prevailed on the holdings of free or of foreign settlers in the narf areas and cities created by the Hellespontic kings, and when these clients were not rented to local tenants... What was the influence of these progressive farmers 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.

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 the 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 over the Rhine and Danube frontier), 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 frontier. Apart from §§ 22 and 32 below, all I can do here is to refer to an impressive article which I have only after this Appendix had been written (P. D. A. Garsey, "Rome’s African Empire under the Principates", in Imperator in the Ancient World, edited by Garsney and C. R. Whittaker (1978) 223-54, at 231-3 (with 346-7 nn.39-49).

I have begun at c. 88 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 Samum in 110 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 too much value they apply particularly to the later period (after no. 23 below), for which the evidence is often unclear. I have also...
The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World

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 439. Many of the literary texts were first compiled by Zuelp (1845) and Huxley (1887), see Clavuing, 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, GAUV P.1.159-1, with n. 67-84. 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.5 §21 and 19 below, with its n. 26-36 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 army of Sarabi IV in m. 11. p. 194 (and presumably VIIb.3, p. 280), see Tac. Ann. XIX 27.1-2, VIII 57.4. Germ. 28.5. See Hermann Schmitz, Colonia Claudia Ara Agrippi- nemus (Cologne, 1956).

2. In 8 B.C. the future Emperor Tiberius, as general of Augustus, received the submission of the Suevi and Sambunari and settled 40,000 of them on lands west of the Rhine: see Tac. Aug. 21.1, with Tab. 9.2, Epitrop. VII 5; and cf. Augustus, Res Gestae 32.1. The number of 40,000 (Germani) appears also in Oros., IV xii.34.

3. It was almost certainly during the first few years of the first century B.C. that Sextus Aelius Caesar settled 50,000 ‘Getat’ south of the Danube, in what was later known as Moesia: Strabo VII m.10, p. 303. These people were in fact Dacians, see A. Alfeld, ‘Dacians on the south bank of the Danube’, in RSR 29 (1939) 26-31. He publishes a supposed military diploma of 7/8 November 88, of the auxiliary cohort Sitia, trib. 1, from Nicopolis in Bulgaria (which has since been shown to be a forgery), by H. N. Jesselhuen, in CIL XVI Suppl. (1955) 216, and refers to one or two similar documents (esp. CIL XVI 13). On the chronology of this settlement, see R. Syme, in RSR 24 (1934) 11-37, esp. 126-8 = Dacian Papers (Bucharest, 1971) 3-5.

When the German chieftains Maredus and Catullus were settled in A.D. 19 at Ravenna and Forum Julius respectively, the personal retainers (omnitas) 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, Vannus, on being seized by the Quadri, was settled by order of the Emperor Claudius in Pannonia, with his dèts: Tac. Ann. XXI 29-30, esp. 30.3. (See Moesy, POM 40-1, p. 57-61, n. 13.)

5. (a) In the 60s, in the reign of Nero, Ti. Plautius Silvanus Aelius claimed to have brought over into his province of Moesia and obliged to pay tribute ‘more than 100,000 Taunadiiarii’, with their wives and children and chiefs or kings’. ILS 986 = CIL XIV 3689. The most recent treatment I have seen is by T. Zawadski, in La parola del passato 181 (1975) 49-73.

(b) It is possible, as argued by Zawadski (op. cit. 72-3), that L. Tampus Hlumanaus (PVR III 294 no. 5), the leader of Pannonia in 69-70 (and perhaps earlier), performed a role resembling that of Plautius Aelius (see the preceding paragraph), since II 5865 = CIL X 6225, lines 6-8, as re-edited by Alfeld and Reddinger and reproduced by Zawadski id. 73, lines 7-9, is probably to be restored [multis] opudibus a Transtagani anvis acceptis. [multibus omnibus expoloratis hostibus?] ad vestigia laeta praestanda [traductis].

6. Some Celtic Cotini and perhaps Os (cf. Tac. Germ. 43:1-2) were apparently given land in Pannonia at some time during the first century: see Moesy, POM 57-64, and cf. § 7 below.
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There is then a long gap, until the reign of Marcus Aurelius (161-180). Appian, Prof. 7, reports to transfer barbarians 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 2.4-5, various barbarians (who certainly have included Quadi) were 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 see Oros., VII 57-66, xxviii.7; and cf. VII 8 above and its n. 30 below.)

(b) Dio Cass. LXXXI 11.1, esp. 2-3, the ‘Asterochi’ (= Aging 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 Cortes (cf. § 6 above) must also have been established in eastern Pannonia, apparently around Murza and Cibalae: see Moesy, POM 186-81, 159, 248. Cf. CIL VI 25421 d. 3-4. 3244 g. Dio Cass. LXXII 13.3, Tac., Germ. 43 (cf. Seeck, GAUV P.1.583-5). These settlements may also have occurred in 171.

(d) Dio Cass. LXXII 2.2 (A.D. 178), the Samatian laves 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 laves to their alliance, ex officio, and (I should have thought) one might therefore have expected them to be treated as foederati, rather than as an auxiliary unit of the Roman army, especially as we are not told 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 laves 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 Hildester, the ancient Bremenentemum (probably Bremerlandenhoek, Veternatorum), refers to a numerus equitum Samatani (Bremerlandenhoek), under a praepositus (numeri) (termini): RH 856 = CIL VII 2189; cf. prog. n. 1, reg. in RIB 580 = CIL VII 2192; cf. also CIL VI 1577-8. Richmond points out that this area (part of the Clyde, in the Ribble valley) is particularly well suited for maintaining the large horses needed for these ‘castrapact cavalry’, and that the original batch of laves is likely to have been settled here in bulk, on return from their service (doubtless in a whole group of numeri) about A.D. 200 (loc. cit. 22-3). How many were actually settled to the Clyde is not known. They may have been well set to drain and clear the land, as we know happened to veterans settled elsewhere, e.g. at Deurium Vetenatorum in Thirat (Pliny, NH IV 45; cf. Richmond, op. cit. 22) and probably in eastern Pannonia (see the preceding paragraph, and 14 below); cf. also Tac. Ann. 11.17-8. and CJ CI.X 3 (cited by Richmond, op. cit. 23) = Nov. Thes., XXIV 4, where the words ‘universal castrapact, domus populi’ suggest something better than ‘marshes’ (Jones, LRE 2,663, translates ‘water meadows’); also CJ VII 4.3 = Nov. Thes., XIX 5.

(d) Dio Cass. LXXXI xiii.3, 3,000 Nartacae received land, which must have been in
512
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Pannonia (cf. CIL III 4500), from Carinthunum; see again Swed., as cited in § 4 above). The date may be 179, see Birley, MA 285-6.

5) According to the Historia Augusta, Marcus settling infantus ex gentibus on Roman soil (Mar. 24 3), and in particular he brought to Italy a large number of surrendered Marcomannii (22 2). Cf. 14 1: various genres driven on by other barbarians were threatening to make war on the empire, which recovered.

8) It was presumably in 180, the year in which Commodus became sole emperor, that C. Vettius Sabinius Julius Hospes, as governor of the Tres Daciae (AE [1920] 45; see Wilkes, Dalmauta 447), promised land in Roman Dacia to 12,000 Dacians that had been driven out of their own land - see Dio Cass. LXXII 13.3.

There is then another long gap, until the 260s, 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. #00 exceptionally 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 Attilius, for settlement: Vict. J. Epit. de Cass. 33.1, with Victor, Cass. 33.6, and see Mommsen, PUM 286-7, 239, who dates this 258-60 (in the joint reign of Valerian and Gallienus).

There are general statements by Zos. I.14.x:2 and Hist. Aug., Claud. 9.4, that the Emperor Claudius II Gothicus (268-70) settled many Goths as farmers in Roman territory.

10) The Emperor Aurelian (270-5) is also said to have settled some defeated Carpi Victor, Cass. 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 Euturia and settle there familiar captives, 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.11.3 (Burgundians and Vandals in Britain); I.11.1 (Bastarnae in Thrace); II.2.2 (Franks; cf. Paurg. Lat. IV [VIII] xviii 3); Hist. Aug., Prob. I (100,000 Bastarnae); 18 2 (many Gothic Cepids and Grotthungs, and Vandals). Unlike Gisler (ULGG 311-12 and mm. 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 & 8) 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 260 if.), whereas the letter to the Senate seems to belong, in the author's mind, to 277-8, and (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 in barbaris cohaerentes, etc.) of barbarians made tributary, and in 15.6 (possess complete barbari barbarus hububus etc.) of booty taken from the German. (Zos. I.14.3, 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), we especially a documentary part of particular value because of its early date (1 March 297; Paurg. Lat. IV [VIII]. The most important passages are:
[i] 1.4: 'tot excussae unisque barbaricae nationes, ut transient intro in Romaniae cultures.'
[v] 6: 'omnes [barbari] seque desedere cohaerentes et. . . ad loca alia deserti transirent, ut quae fortasse in quosdam depredatorum vastamenta, culta reddentur servanda.'
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In 3-1-4: captiva agmina barbarorum . . . atque hos omnes provinci liberauissent ad obsequiaorum distributum, donec ad destinatos sibi cultus solminiis deducerent . . . Ararater nunc multa Chamnav et Frisianis . . . et culto barbarum laborem asservabant . . . Qam existit ad dextrae centum quattuor, accurrat et obsequis tertium et tertio coherentis et servavit militia nomine gratias accepit.'

In 3-1, esp. 1: 'Statae sicut pridem tui, Diocletianus Augustus, in suo deserto Thraciae translatis sculptis scolia Asia complexerat, metu pestis tua . Maximianus Augustus, muta Neronorum et Terrae potestatis intentabat et receptum in leges Francor ossidem, ita nur se ventagia tua, Constanti Caesarus venisse. quidam infidelis Ambitaneus et Bellovaro et Tracciano solo linguatibus restabat, barbaro cultore revescitur.'

All the settlements in Gaul referred to in Paurg. IV must have taken place between 299—the date of the victory over the Chamnavi and Frisians (see 1-3), who had been allies of Carausius—and early 299, the date of Paurg. IV. We must note from 3-1.1 that whereas the settlement of the Franks is new (the Franks are seeking in leges, Jott of the latter must have been earlier, for the lateum in prostittua romanorum. If the word lateum here has the sense commonly attributed to it (see IV in § 19 above and its n.29 below), then this is the earliest known use of the word in this sense. There is nothing to show when the original settlement of these latei took place; it may have been one of the cases referred to above. Nothing seems to be known of Diocletian's settlement of Asiaticas in Thrace (3-1.1).

Another early documentary is Paurg. Lat. VII [VIII] vi.2 (cf. 3-1.9): 'Quid haud imputauit natione Frisonorum barbarorum . . . praepeper ex origine incribedit stipes alius barbarus, singulius as suas, ut in deserto Gallia regnavit vocatique et parenti Romanus ingens, cultu invnitius artus dollus.' This passage is sometimes taken to refer to settlements of Sulian Franks in Bavaria by Constantinos i. c. 297 (thus Julia, PCIG VII 85, 164 n. 10, 396-9); but that settlement has also been attributed to Cassianus in 341 (see n. 186.5, 146 n. 25 or the inscription of募sarius in 350-5 (Piegolani, ECI 158-6). This seems very likely that a hitherto unknown medallion of Lyons depicts one of the various settlements just mentioned. See Maria R. Allardé, "Zum Lyoner Blendenmedaillon", in Schweizer Musikblatter 8 (1996) 63-8, who suggests that it is the Emperor Maximinus and Constantius I who are shown receiving men, women and children in 285. In the inner scene on the medallion the migrants are also depicted as crossing a bridge over the Rhine, Flumen Rhumen, from Consobrinus, the modern Kessel to Mydonas (Michalek).

(b) More Carpi were settled in eastern Pannonia in 295-6. Ann. Marc. XXVIII 3.3; Victor, Cass. 39.43; Euseb. IX 32: 2. Oros. VII xxii 12; cf. Paurg. Lat. IV [VIII] viii 2 (where "illa rusticis Carpinis" is very recent); and see Mommsen, PUM 272. The date is 205, is given by Euseb. (Hieron.), Chron. p. 226 (ed. H. Hahn, 1969); Cass. Cassianus, in Chron. mant. L 240. Possibly drainage and clearance works were carried out by the settlers: see Victor, Cass. 40.9-10, with Mommsen, PUM 272.

(c) Bastarnae and Sarmatians are also said to have been settled on Roman soil in large numbers. Euseb. IX 25.3; Oros. VII xxii 12; cf. Usser., De Mart. Pers. 36.6, with the commentary of Jacques Morin, SC 39 (1994) 411-12, during the Sarmatian settlement in 303. For the Bastarnae (286), 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. Valer. 6.32; see Euseb., Vita Constant., IV vi 1-2; Ann. Marc. XVIII xxviii 17-19; Zos. II 31; Publius Optatianus Polybius, Cam. VII 20-2 (with 32). This is dated to AD 334. Euseb. (Hieron.), Chron., p. 253 (ed. Hahn), H. H. Cassianus, in Chron. mant. 1.144. The statement of Jordanes, Get. 22 119, that Constantine also installed Vandals in Pannonia, should probably be rejected; see Courtois, IA 34-5.

16. The Emperor Constantius II (337-361) is said to have made more than one settlement of barbarians in the empire:
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(a) Libanus, Osr. LIX, 83-5 (of A.D. 348-9) in Thraco.

(b) Amm. Marc. XVIII, xii, 17-20 and XIX, xi, 1-7 (esp. tectiturbation emerita... et nonem); cf. S-15: Sattamian Limagnates, A.D. 358-9. Cf. perhaps Auson., Mosell. 9, who speaks of Sarmatian coloni in the region of Tabernae (the modern Rhodopes), on the left bank of the Rhone - the journey in question was perhaps in 348. 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. Philostorgius, HE II, 5 (mosai... xalolos); Jordanes, Get. 51-267 (populus moesiacus); Auxentius, Epist. de fide; vita et opus Bisitis (Nov. 179). St. Benedict, Exercit. specul. WMG-1 (Winkler, Die altgermanischen Religionsgeschichte 1 (Strasbourg, 1894); cf. A. Thompson, VTO 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. XVIII, 84-5 (cf. XX, IV, 11); Libanus, Osr. XVIII, 75-82 (cf. Jul. ep. ad Athan. 2966); cf. Epist. 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) in Transylvania in north Italy: Amm. Marc. XXVIII, vi, 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 3,000, as stated by Amm. Marc. XXVI, vi, 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 in abeyance quam quantum fuerint, they being released by the cities for the opening of the Rhine: see Epist. 37: Zos. IV, x, 1-2 (clearly relying on Eutropius). Some of these Goths will doubtless have been turned into slaves, others perhaps into coloni.

(b) Valens in 367-8 settled very large numbers of Visigoths in Thrace: Amm. Marc. XXXI, vii, 1-11 (and cf. vi, 5); Epist. 82-3, Sect. IV, 4, 5-6; Sect. V, 1, 1-9, Eutropius.

(c) In 368 he is said to have instructed the emperors in Gaul to hold back those Goths who were being settled in Thrace. But since this had been done by Valens, this may be a case of the same sort as the cases already mentioned of the Visigoths and Sarmatians in Moesia Inferior. It is possible that the Goths were to be settled in the Balkans or in Thrace, but this is not certain.

20. Under Gratian in 377, his general Frigerid settled Visigoths and Sarmatians in Transylvania in north Italy, near the territories of three cities in Italy (Rutino, Reginum and Pavia), just south of the Danube: Amm. Marc. XXXII, iv, 4.

21. Alypius, Grat. Actio 58 (end of 379), speaks of "a tract of Alamanni captured by Gratian, and of Sarmatians 'countermanded and pardoned'"


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

(a) In 384 the Visigothic chief Athanaric (who immediately died) and some of his followers were received into the eastern part of the empire: Zos. IV, xxiv, 3-5; Sect. HE V, 10; Theol., Osr. XV. 194-5; Jordon. Got. 29, 142-5; Cons. Constant., in Chron. min. 1, 2, 443; Prosop. Taur. Epist. (m. 1177), in ib. 40; Hydr. 6, in Chron. min. 11, 17. Macedonius Comes, i.e. 381, in ib., in ib. 46. See Seck, GUAW VI, 1, 123. By a treaty dated 3 October 385 (Cons. Constant., in Chron. min. 1, 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. Got. 29, 144-5. For the other sources see Seck, GUAW IV, 109; Seck, MEBFV, 521-84; Jones, LRE III, 20, c. 456. Demougeot, MEFB 153. Niceph. Thracian, Osr. XVII, 211-12; Paneg. Lat. XIII, 114. 5 (Piacenza, A.D. 39). 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 (as seen in 20 above). For critical views see, e.g., Jones, LRE III, 157-8: Piganiol, ECT 235: contrast Demougeot, MEFB 532-7 (and cf. 147-50).

(c) Theodosius also settled some Ostrogoths and Greuthungi in Pyligria, presumably after the defeat of the Ostrogothic attempts to cross the Danube in 386 (Zos. IV, xx, 1, with the double at xxvii, 2; Claudian, De Civ. Hon. 623-6; see Claudian, In Europ. I, 133-3; for a recent review in modern Asia Minor under Theodosius in the spring of 390 see Seck, HIFP II, 321-17, 17, Seck, GUAW IV, 126-11. It must have been this alarming reverse 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 Cyzicus to the Eastern Emperor Arcadius at Constantinople in 399 (MPC XVI, 189, 5-6); see supra, 8). In an English translation by Augustine Fletcher, The History and Hymn of Synesius of Cyzicus (CUP 1937), 108 ff., at 139-40. Calling the Goths Zacharites (with Herodotus in xxxv, 3), Synesius attacks not only their settlement on Roman soil by Theodosius (dei 1997AB 1-38), 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 (DHF 247).
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Illyricum. Sonomen himself saw many Scni farming in different places in Batuvia, near the Mytian Mount Olympus, south of Prusa, and says that some of the Scni had been sold off cheaply (and even given away) as slaves (HE IX, v, 5-7).

28. 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. Asting and Sighd Vandals, Burgundians, Suevi and Visigoths into various parts of Spain (Gallcia, Lusitania, Baetica). Hydatius 49, 60, 63, 67, 68; in Chron. min. II 18-19; Prosper Tiro, Epit. chron. 1290; in Chron. min. I, 467; Chron. VII 13t 1.

(b) Visigoths under Walla, 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; Philippostg., HE XI 4, iad.; Hist. Goth. 22, in Chron. min. II 276.

29. 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, 666) and of Burgundians in 443 (ibid., § 129).

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 Ostrogods, Sarmatians, Huns, Scyths, Alans and Rugians, and Burgundians. Our information comes mainly from Jordanes, Get. 50/263-6, 52/68; cf. Chron. Min. II 222, s.a. 456, I, 305, i.e. 457.

27. In 473-4 the Eastern Leo settled in Macedonia a large group of Ostrogods under Theoders (the father of the great Theodoric). Jodanis speaks of seven cities being handed over to them, nearly all of which they had occupied already (Get. 528/6-4). The Ostrogod occupation of the area, however, seems to have been brief.

28. In 483 the Emperor Zeno settled some of the Ostrogod followers of Theodoric in Lower Moesia and Lower Moesia (mainly northern Bulgaria): see Carullus 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 Raettia, in an area which might perhaps still be considered part of the Roman empire (Eunudou, Paneg. 72-3, in MGH, Aust. Antig. VII [1885] 212, ed. F. Vogel; Cassiod., Var. II, 41; Agath., 1, 6, 3-4; and see, Stein, HBE II, 147 and i).

(b) In 512, still under Anastasius I, there was a settlement of Herulians in Roman territory (presumably in northern Yugoslavia): see Procop., BELL VI = Goth. III, xvi, 32-34; Marcellinus Comes, s.a. 512 (11), in Chron. min. II 98 (in terram atque civitates Romanorum). Cf. perhaps Cassiod., Var. IV, 2 (perhaps of A.D. 511), and see Buur, HRLI 113, 300 (No people quite so barbarous had ever yet been settled on Roman soil”; Stein, HBE I, 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 neighborhood of Singiduntum (Belgrade). Procop., BELL VI = Goth. II, xiv, 33 ff.; VII = Goth. III, xii, 13 (cf. xxviii, 37), and other sources given by Buur, HRLI 11, 300 and n. 2, and Stein, HBE II, 1305 (ed. 151, 156).

(b) In 534 Justinian 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 Vandal Isturiers, to serve on the Persian frontier (see Procop.), BELL IV = Past. 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 Scariel, Audein) in western Pannonia and Noricum, giving them territory which included the town of Nocera (Neumarkt). Procop., BELL VII = Goth. III, xxix, 16-11.

Appendix III

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 Arasium (on the Upper Tigris), the Emperor Tiberius Constantine (576-582) settled large numbers of the population of that area in Cyprus: see John of Ephesus, HIC VI 15, cf. 27ff., 34: Enke, HICV, 19, p. 215; 18-26 ed. Buder/Patrumo: Thespeysth Simoqattia III xv, 15; ed. c. de Breet, 1887. A later settlement of Armenians in Thess, said to have been planned by the Emperor Maurice in 602, never took place: see Sebco XX, pp. 54-5 in the French translation by Frederic MacKry, Paris, 1904.

32. It appears from Greg. Magn., Ep. 173, of 591, that there had been a recent settlement of barbarian ‘dacti’ (suredly densities) on the coasts of the Roman Church in Africa.

33. It must have been in the 590s that the Emperor Mauricius settled some Illyrians 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 Syriac, Chron. X, 21, in the French translation from the twelfth century by J. B. Chabot, Vol. II (Paris, 1901-4), 364-5. (I am grateful to Michael Whobbs, who has been working on Theophylact, for drawing my attention to this material and some of that in § 30 above.)

Later transferts of population (although many of these peoples already inhabited 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 CSEF, 3 (1964), 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 Seckel (Berlin, 1876): Occ. XII 33-44 (various praefectus lictorum); 46-63 multi 66-70 (various praefectus Sarmatiorum gentilium); 6 (a praefectus Sarmatiorum et Tolitumorum gentilium). All these are found in the prefecture of the Gauls (in the provinces of Lugdunensis Superior, Lugdunensis II and III, Belgica I and II, Germania II, and Aquitania I), except nos. 46-63, which are in Italy. See also ch. 11 of the Venia List (ed. Seckel in the same volume, at pp. 251-2), in which we 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, Tifalci, Vandelleci.

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, Tifalci, Franks, Alamanni, perhaps Goths (see e.g. A. Grenier, in Frank. ESAIII, 398-9; also his Man d'arche, gallo-romains I [Paris, 1931] 398-402; and R. Käser, Untersuch. zur Geschichte der Civitates und Duktores Sarmatiae in romanischer und merowingerzeit [Bonn, 1973], as cited by Glauser, ULGG, 315 and no. 28-30). The same is true of modern Italy, Sarmatians, Alamanni, Suevi, Tifalci (see e.g. Stein, HBE I, 422, 1). I have not been able to investigate the growing body of archaeological evidence (in part concerning what is sometimes called the Late Roman Rheingebirgskultur” in northern and north-eastern Gaul), for which see the convenient summary by Günter, ULGG, and the many recent works there cited.
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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 limitarii, or some limitarii, were 'a kind of hereditary peasant military', who occupied heritable lands and performed military duties as a sideline: see Jones, LRE II 649-54, with III 2042-43, 27-4. The limitarii make their first appearance in the 390s, in CTH XII 1.86 (of 363 or 362) and Festus, Brev. 25 (perhaps 360-70), but cf. B. Baldus, 'Festus: the historian', in Historia 27 [1978] 197-217. Only in the fifth century do we find limitarii as such with lands to cultivate: C.G.I. 11.3 praef. 6 Nor. Thed. XXIV. 4, of 443: CTH VII xv. 2, of 423, referring to cattle ovina or territoria, to be occupied only by the saltatoriales militae, and see Jones, LRE II 853-4.

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 344 on hospitalia.

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 scattered and fragmentary and difficult to interpret if 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, 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. Roberts of the year's epigraphic publications which has appeared regularly as a 'Bulletin épigraphique' in RER, the many epigraphic papers by various scholars, especially by J. Roberts 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 (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), three admirable articles in RER 1989-1991 by K. Ley (EVMAM I-II), Victor Chappel's La province romaine du mont Pontine d'Aur (1904), esp. pp. 186-279, and other works, but even Jones does not give a complete consecutus 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 Schwaboda, GV = Die griechischen Vollbekenchtung "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.Lit. thesis, Changes in Political Life in the Greek City (ca. 60-15 B.C.) (1978).

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 Acts of the Fifth International Congress of Greek and Latin Epigraphy, Cambridge 1967 (Oxford, 1971) 271-4. The four volumes of Indexes (down to 1975) to the Roberts' invaluable 'Bulletins épigraphiques' (in RER, from 1930 on) are invaluable, prepared by L'Instiut Ferrand 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. Hellour's Études d'epigraphie et d'histoire bréviaire (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 protected (provided of course they were not anti-Hellenic, or patriotic or otherwise greedy), and help to suppress revolts. I will give the clearest example. In the revolt of the Latins and Campanians in 341-340 B.C., the Campanian envoys, to the number of one, kept absent from the war, and were duly rewarded by Rome, when the revolt was suppressed, with Roman citizenship and a pension to be paid by them by their countrymen (Liv. XVIII. 15-16, cf. xxv. 19). Similarly, after Capua in 216 had gone over to Hannibal, 200 Campanian youths who had been serving in Sicily came to Rome and were given the citizenship (XXII. xxii. 10-11); and in 213 another 112 equites nobles from Capua deserted to the Romans and were duly rewarded by them (XXIV. xxviii. 12-13). For the Campanian envoys, see Torrubi, H. 13.2-3, 401-3. At Arretium in 202 B.C. Rome intervened in favour of the joint Civic, the joint local family, who were in danger of being dispossessed, and rewarded them with their platei (Liv. X.82, v. 7; and see Harris, REU 3-5, 133). In 206, Livy recounts the submission among the Lucanians (who had entered into a treaty with Rome in 229-8: X-XVIII. xxvi. 7-8) of "the allies plebiers et aliegionibus clarioribus", by Q. Fabius Maximus, greatly to the great delight of the Lucanian epoiesis (XIX. 8). At Volturno in 263-4 B.C. Rome helped to suppress an insurrection of the serifi against their Eturscan masters Liv. X. 76; Flor. 1.26, ed. P. Jal (=1.21); Zonar. VIII. 7. Oros. V. 3-5. De civ. R. 56. John of Antioch B 90 (to 134, 4-5, ed. P. Jal (=1.21)), and see Harris, REU 15-15, cf. 36-4, 93-2. Another such case of the serifi, the rebels, in Etruria in 196, called by Livy a 'conquista meritoria' and a very serious (according to Livy it made "Etruriam imperium profere", was rather piously put down by a Roman army under M. Aulus Gabinius, who scourged and scarified some of the rebels and returned others to their former homes (Liv. XXIII. xxxiv. 1-3). Etruscan society, was deeply divided between a ruling class, described by expressions such as principalis, nobilitas, dominius, dominatio, dominus, dominatus, opima, and a subject class or classes, described as seres, scelus, servorum. The precise condition of the latter is uncertain, but was probably a form of servitude (see liv. iv. 1 below; and cf. Harris, REU 142 in the figures of 196, where the serifi were clearly members of the local serif class). There has been much dispute about Rome's attitude towards the Eturscan, but I have no doubt that Harris is right: except when Eturscan principalis showed disharmony to Rome, as occasionally during the Hannibalic war (208-203), the Romans supported them against their subjects, there was no alternative . . . which would not involve radical social change" (REU 19-41, x. p. 143).

There are other examples of the same Roman policy during the Hannibalic war. The defection of Crotum to Hannibal in 215 is described in more explicit terms by Livy in XXIV iv. 4, after two brief anticipatory passages: XXIII 3.12 and XXIV 3.9-7. He explains that 'all Italian cities were as if infected with a single disease' plebs and opesim were on opposite sides, with the seres favouring Rome in each case and the plebs Carthage (XXIV iv. 8). Under the leadership of Aulestratia, the principalis publici of Crotum, the city was surrendered to the Bruttii, allies of Carthage (and represented in XXIV 3.1 as hated by the Greek cities), while the opesim reiterated the stalemate, which they had fortified in advance (v. 6-13). The situation was much the same in Nola.
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216-214. Here again the local senators, especially their priestess, were faithful to Rome, while the plebs were wholly for Hannibal, and, as usual, wanted revolution, with some advancing defection to Hannibal [XXIX.xiii.7; cf. Plut., Mar. 10.2 ff.]. The senators, by cleverly distilling, managed to delay a revolt [Liv. XXIX.xiii.8-9]. A little later the priestess were again alarmed by the plebs for fear of losing their positions [Liv. xxi.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" [XXIX.xiii.9]. The situation at Locri in 215-215 is more complicated. As in the case of Croton, the revolt, described more fully in passages [XXIX.i.xii.12 and XXIII.xxx.8, the latter asserting briefly that the multitude were betrayed by their priestess, a statement not borne out by the more detailed later narrative; see especially XXIX.i.xxx.1-5, where the priestess Locriausia is said to have provoked an Assembly because they themselves were "overrun by fear," and there is emphasis on the fact that "laevius quisque non esse novumque societatem malunt," the decision to go over to Hannibal is represented as being virtually unanimous. In 215 we discover for the first time that there were localist principles with the Romans at Regium: they had been driven out by the opposite faction" which had surrendered the city to Hannibal [XXIX.xvi.5-9]. When Rome had regained control of the city the localist ambassadors naturally tried to pretend that the defection to Hannibal was "pro culposa consilia" and their return to the Roman fold due to its 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 [Hannibalric] war (with the upper classes favouring Rome and the lower classes Hannibal) truly 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 Clientels 147-8). Giving examples in which he thinks Livy occasionally contradicts his own main thesis, Badian finds, for Locri, only XXIII.xxx.8-9, ignoring the much more detailed narrative at the beginning of Book XXIII.5, 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.xviii.6) and apparently at Tarquinium (xii.3) the People-members of Rome. As for Arpi, all that Livy says in XXIV.xviii.6 is that during a successful Roman campaign on their own territory the individual Arpini complained that they had been kept in a state of subservience and oppression by a few and handed over to Hannibal by their principles. What else would one expect them to say, in their desire to exculpate themselves to the victorious Romans? And as for Tarquinium, XXIV.xiii.5 is a mere report of a statement made by a young Tarquin, presumably in the plebs of Tarquinum, who ruled the city, to be in patriae titumium, a large part of whom (§ 3) favoured Hannibal. In the subsequent narrative the capture of the city by Hannibal (XXIV.xxx-6) and its recapture by Q. Fabius Maximus (XXVxx-vii; cf. Plut., Fab. 21-2) we see no sign of any preparations by the part of the common people. At Syracuse, certainly, the common people were overwhelmingly hostile to Rome, while certain nobilissimus urbis (Livy XXV.xxxii.4) were pro-Roman and defected in 214 to Marcellus and see Livy XXV.xxxii to XXV.xxxvi, in particular XXV.xxxii.10-17; xxvii.1-3, 7-9, xxviii (esp. XXVxxxii.2, 9, 11-12, 19), with xxxii.1, 6, 7, 10-17. We have less information about other Sicilian cities in which hostility to Rome was strong, and pro-Roman factions may have been lurking in some of them; but Plutarch tells an entertaining story (from Pachymeres) about Nicos, the leading citizen of Enagryma who was also the main advocate of the Roman cause there and was duly rewarded by Marcellus for his services (Mar. 20.1-12). Badian cites no other evidence in favour of his thesis, and I know of none. He does not mention the cases of Arretium and Volsum, which I have quoted above, and he qualifies the Livy passage concerning Laisca with an 'if.' He does admit, however, that after 174 the Roman Senate intervened in an internal dispute at Potentia in Venetia [Cicero ... auterum bellum, Liv. XLI.xxxvii.3]."
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Constitutional details come either from inscriptions (which I have not been able to examine thoroughly) or from Cicero's Verres, esp II. Verres ii. 120-5. Constitutional changes were introduced in various places at different times: the most important were those made by the Lex Rustica (regulations imposed by P. Rusticus in 131 B.C., at the end of the First Sicilian Slave War) and those introduced by Augustus (43-12 B.C.). 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 gradually being eroded. 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. Verres ii. 120-1 (general), 122 (Halaea), 123 (Agrigentum), 125 (Heraclea). We hear of a property qualification for councilors (censura), § 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 affectus twice over in § 120, whether some form of election of councilors 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 councilors in §§ 120 (general), 122 (Halaea, revis.), 123 (Agrigentum) and 125 (Heraclea) suggests to me that councilors were chosen, in most cases anyway, not by popular election for a year at a time, but for life (which was the most important change), and in one or more of three ways: (1) what we should call 'cooption' properly: namely, election by the collective councilors themselves; (2) nomination by magistrates filling the role of the Roman censors; and (3) automatically, upon being elected to certain magistracies. What we know of Roman practice in Italy and in Illyria-Perusia (see § 3.4 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: sedita cooptatione censura). In order to make cooptare/cooptatio seem more appropriate, we might have been tempted to wonder, if Sicilian councilors were enrolled by magistrates of censorsial type (as they were in other places), whether any magistrates were chosen as councilors themselves; but against any such supposition is Cicero, II. Verres ii. 121-3, 126-9 (especially omisit nos praeest censurum ne simuladum quidem causa furnat, at the end of § 126). I would guess that in practice, as distinct from theory, magistrates performing censorsial functions would be bound to a considerable extent, in their actual recruitment for their Council, by the views of its dominant section. This would make the use of the term cooptatio for censorsial nomination peculiarly appropriate.

One remembers how insistently the Athenian democracy had been on the principle of public accountability; that every magistrate should be subjected to scrutiny at the end of his term of office (see V. 6 § D above). At Syracuse by the late 7ths, on the other hand, euthyonoi 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. Verres 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 were delivered was according to age and prestige (anta et honor), and the sequentia of the leading men, the principles, were entered in the public records (id. 142-3).

In spite of the fact that Halae was in the small privileged category of cities one foedere liberae et summae, I cannot agree with Gabb (SCSEV 312-13) that at Halae, unlike Agrigentum and Heraclea, the Assembly retained the right of electing councilors even in Cicero's time, for Cicero, recording the petition of Halae 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 councilors should be made 'ne suffragiis'; presumably elections had taken place down to 95 B.C. in the Assembly, but were now, by the new regulations given to Halae by C. Claudius Pulcher in 90, to be effected by the Council itself.

Appendix IV

At Halaeza, at any rate, there was not only a property qualification (eunus) and a minimum age of thirty for being a councilor, men practising a trade (a quinariae, e.g. auctioneers (praepos), were also declared (ii. 122). Similar provisions had earlier been included in the rules prescribed for the Council of Agrigentum by Scipio (§ 123, perhaps C. Cornelius Scipio, general in Sicily in 193 B.C. see Gabb, SCSEV 312), and probably in those laid down by Pupilli for Heraclea Minoa (§ 125).

In Sicily, it is likely, that we have the earliest evidence for the body of resident Roman citizens (comites, iudices in Romanorum) providing the judges in certain lawsuits, according to the Lex Papia Poppaea, but precisely which suits were involved is not clear from Cic., II. Verres ii. 1.2 (edem et in senatus, ne iudices in Romanorum ex consulis). Cf. ci. 33.4.70 (e consulis Sycarquiis, in 28 de convit). 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 Rustica, it was the 'senatus' of some other city in Sicily which appointed the judges (II. Verres ii. 32). It is also worth noticing the unique prius of Agrigentum, in 373, 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 koinokratia which is equated with senatus in a bilingual inscription from Naples, and which appears beside the Assembly (aia or hagias) in inscriptions, certainly at Agrigentum and Malia, and (later on as a quinquennasia) at Naples, and probably also at Syracuse, as anything but the Council of these cities, the koinokratia which appears once at Rhegium beside both aia and quaestor in unique (SIG25755 + IG XIV 612); see G. Forini, 'Intorno alle constituzioni di città greche in Italia e in Sicilia', in Romanas 3 (1967) 61-9, who gives the epigraphic evidence and bibliography, Robert S. Sherck, The Municipal Documents of the Roman West = (Artemis Monographs, no. 2), Buffalo, N.Y., 1970, i-15, is a useful sketch of 'The Senate in the Italian communities'.

2. Mainland Greece (with Macedonia 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 Toulooumakos, Der Einfluss Roms auf die Staatsformen der griechischen Staatstaaten des Altertums und der Frühzeit im ersten und zweiten Jahrhundert n. Chr. (Diss., Göttingen, 1967); and Jürgen Denninger, Der politische Widerstand gegen Röm im Griechenland 217-86 n. Chr. (Berlin, 1971). The first is essentially an exhaustive collection of the evidence; see the review by F. W. Walbank in His 49 (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 Corinth 46 (1973) 576-80 (esp. 579); P. S. Derow, in Phoenix 26 (1972), 103-11, and especially John Briscoe, in CR 86 n.s.24 (1974) 258-61; and see also Brunt, RILCRE 173. The best modern treatment of the subject is by Briscoe, 'Rome and the class struggle in the Greek states 200-106 B.C.', in Past and Present 36 (1967) 3-20, reprinted in Sadas (ed. Finley) 53-73. His view of Rome's policy in the first half of the second century B.C. can 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, this was to the end that Roman policy was directed.' On the other hand, 'in this turbulent period (241-183) it is only rarely that Roman wishes 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
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The first known example of Roman interference with the constitutions of the cities of Old Greece (138 B.C. to 196 B.C.), when T. Quinctius Flamininus, in hissentiment of Thessalian affairs after the end of the Second Macedonian War, imposed property qualifications for councilors (probably federal only) and judges and made him to strengthen the control of the cities by (as Livy puts it) "part of the citizen population to whom it was more expedient to have everything secure and tranquil." (XCVXII, 14, 14, cf. Plut. Flam., 12.4) - the property class, of course. (We are not told that Flamininus imposed outright oligarchy by insisting on limitation of the right to attend the Assembly.) By 192, Livy tells us, it was generally realised among the revolution and their allies, that the leading men of the cities were pro-Roman and opposed to their condition of affairs, while the multitude wished for revolution (XCVXVII, 3-3). According to Caesar XXXIII 7, M. Munatius Quinctius in 168 Yea laws which it still uses (cf. Livy XLV, a very and XCVX, esp. xviii 16) "inimicis vulgi adventu alism of libertines salutare undulationem dat alius liberis pietate nomen traherunt". After crossing the revolt of the Ascalonian League and its allies in 146 B.C. L. Mummius (who incidentally destroyed Corinth and sold its population into slavery) is said by Pausanius to have "put down democracies and established property qualifications for holding office" (VI, XV, 19). Polybius XXXVII 5 speaks of the political and now given to the Greeks in 146-5 B.C. (cf. Pers. VIII, 7-9), in VII, 51 have mentioned the letter of Q. Fabius Maximus to Dyrrach in Asia; after a revolutionary outburst there towards the end of the second century B.C. (cf. this refers et al. the policies given to the Ascalon by Rome S.P.Q.R. 184 = A.D. 184, ibid. 55-42, 19-20). Nevertheless, we must understand the statement of Pausanius which have just quoted as a very qualified sense, as far as the destruction of democracy is concerned, for there is ample evidence of the continuing existence of democracies at least nominally democratic as in these cities e.g. too. (cf. S.P.Q.R. 111 F, XXIII, 3-11) 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, e.g., Caesar. CXXXVI 16, (with 331 n, 33) (169-169). This practice may have been extended (and it will at least have been encouraged) by the Romans see ibid. 179 (with 338 n, 28), 178-9 (with 346-1 pp. 45-45), 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 was 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. (IV, 133, II, 138) that some of these called ephors and all those called prochoi, resident in the cities 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 iv, 133, see the exhaustive commentary of A. Wilhelms. Urkunden aus Messenien, in JOA 17 (1919) 1-119, esp. 54 5, 46 9. 1 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 in above - that he 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 lies in the hands of the property class; the common people rarely show any capacity to assert themselves or even to exercise influence. The Hellenistic kings had merely 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 set of conquering Asia) or at any rate pretend to favour it or even what could be interpreted without any real justification - as sympathy towards the lower orders (like Ptolemies of Macedon, and Meleagrides VI Emperor of Pontus). Rome too was
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quite prepared to tolerate Greek democratic constitutions as long as the Greeks kept quiet; but it must soon have become obvious to both sides that this would involve too great a risk to every Greek state in the league, that they would not, therefore, be ready to support any movement for constitutional change 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 revolution of 88-86 B.C., led by Aristophanes and Ariadne, who of course are depicted in vases as tyrants in our surviving accounts. This movement could hardly have occurred but for the anti-Roman activities of Thucydides and Plutarch, which made many Greeks feel as if, as it turned out for, an end to Roman domination. The sack of Athens by Sulla and his army at the beginning of March 86, which put an end to the revolutionary movement, must have had a severely discouraging effect on any other potential trouble-makers. Yet there are indications of another upsurge at Athens in about 85/84. A good account of this neglected episode has recently been given by Bowdler, who sums up admirably.

The leaders were executed; the affairs are described variously as advanced, stasis, and odhnia. These descriptions are perfectly comprehensible, when one considers the danger the ancient statesmen faced. The movement had been suppressed in 88-86, for it is said that he might have saved Athens that were still in fact the same as those previously established by the Romans (App., lib. mor. 30; see Bowdler, "Athenian 86 & 87"). There were further constitutional changes at Athens in the late Republic and early Principate (A. C. C. Gragam, "Athenian 86-7"), but a certain democratic bias was preserved, and the Assembly continued to meet and pass decrees until at least the late-Septem period—the latest known from is ca. 200 an honourable decree in favour of M. Dulius Euboussus Leurus (see V. inabove and its n.25). The Assembly, however, had become the main public place, and there is now a public place 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 democrats institutions still working to function, as in the case of Hadrian concerning oil production in Attica provides that certain breaches of the regulations had been dealt with in the first place by trials in the Council if they involved no more than 50 amphorae; and otherwise in the Assembly (SEG, XV, 108 = IG, FF, 110 = AJ, 90, lines 46-47; see Oliver, "Athenian 86-7", Day, "Euthydaimon 86-7"). Indeed, perhaps also Hadrian's, lines 7-8, providing for trial by the Aragonios of offences against certain commercial regulations. An interesting specimen of an imperial directive (whether it is edict or a letter) from the Emperor Marcus Aurelius to the city of Athens (to be dated between 169-170) was published in 1976, with translation and commentary, by J. H. Oliver, "Marcus Aurelius: Aspects of Civic and Cultural Policy in the East = Hepp., Suppl. 13). It has already excited a good deal of discussion and reinterpretation, I will only mention the improved restoration and translation by J. H. Jons, to ZPE(1979) 161-83, of the largest plaque of the inscription (I = E), dealing mainly with judicial matters, and two subsequent articles: by W. A. Williams, in ZPE 17 (1978), 37-58 (of JRS 66 (1976) 76-9), and by Simon Fother, in Rev. riv. phil. 63 (1979) 294-93, with a complete text and French translation of the same portion. Marcus expresses his great 'concern for the reputation of Athens, so that he may recover her former dignity' (or grandeur, etc.).

Although he feels obliged to allow the sons of freedmen born after their fathers' manumission—non-freedmen, themselves—to become ordinary councillors (lines 79-81, 97-100), he asserts that members of the Areopagus must have both parents born in freedom (lines 81-84); and he expresses the fear that it were possible to reintroduce the 'Athenian' system, whereby Areopagites had to have not only fathers but also grandfathers of birth (lines 81-84). Obsession of this kind with the status of members of the Athenian governing class may excite our senses when its profound object is to enable Athens to recover her former glory...

The Athenians' agitation under the Roman Proconsuls 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 Pucher in Athenian 23 (1970) 851-853, and the monograph by Oliver (with modifications) mentioned in the preceding paragraph. I may be as un doubtless as Alexander C. (Proc., 153-83-7, 150-3, 4-5, and see Trench, PA, 176-8) participation in the struggle, available only to the well-to-do, but became an essential qualification for membership of the category of fully privileged citizens who alone were admitted to speak in the Assembly as well as to hold its sessions and vote in it (cf. the treatment of Tithos in § 38 of this Appendix, the latter group may be the same as those referred to as "cooperators" in Geagan's review in line 18 of a letter to Athens from Marcus and Commodus, now lost and to Oliver's inscription no. 9, pp. 85F, (cf. the backgammon 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 the going through the ephebe's gift was indeed a necessary qualification for the exercise of full political rights); would be possible only for the sons of men of some property; and again there is 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. nov., 149-199; Imag. magn., 6, 7, 16, 26; Deor. nov., 11; Calp., 26; Ner., 9-26; Nang., 24; so, etc. A. 12) can be treated as accurately reflecting contemporary practice. In W. Reid in IG, V, p. 137 (commentary on nos. 122-32, K. M. T. Chirita, Ancient Sparta (Manchester, 1945) 138-48. But if I think the course may be right in transferring the change to Cleonice III, in 226 B.C. According to Pausanias III, 6, 2, the Cariv is in 226. The Athenian inscriptions show (pp. 118-08) the situation in this way.

City Assemblies long continued, but there is no reliable literary evidence of genuine political activity, or any part in the Pristaeum (as there is for some of the cities of Asia Minor), and nearly all the inscriptions which survive record honorary decrees. The latest definitely datable decree from Greece is the address known to Swaddens, who published Die germanische Volksfeudalität 1800. was the one now republished as IG XII, 353, from Assos, on the island of Amorgos, which was passed on 12 November 242 B.C. as the Acts of Creticus III, an insinuated apology of the actions of the city (Swaddens, pp. 183-185), was intended in referring to Antikta, another city of Amorgos. I know of no definitely datable later material from the area with which I am concerned.
The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World here, but there are one or two known meetings of Greek Assemblies half a century later, from Asia Minor (as we shall see in § 58 below) and Egypt (cf. V.22 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 to late as late as A.D. 184 to have had its own magistrates, and at least one magistrate: (with a title often found in Macedonian cities), a polemarchos, and almost certainly no less: for the Assembly was summoned by the polemarchos; instructions for carrying out the decree (the operative part of which begins block no 138, but see note 238 on the preceding page) are given to the polemarchos; 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 1888, was re-published in a much improved form by A. M. Woodward in JHS 33 (1913) 257-66, but (it has not, I think, been re-published since). The community is not identifiable, but it may, as suggested by Woodward, be Etraetia, perhaps the place called Etraetia by Strabo VII vii.8.326. In spite of the "citizens" and their polemarchos (proven by lines 24-5 to be an annual magistrates), it is not entirely certain that the community was a "proper" poleis, as assumed by Woodward and others (including Rostovtzeff, SEHERR I 661 n.97). The alternative is to regard it as either as a smaller political unit within the other (referred to in line 33 in connection with an embassy to the provincial governor, to obtain his authorization of the decree), or as less well known to them). As Rostovtzeff says of Macedonia, "The impression one gains is that the economic background of the country continued to be the native tribe and the numerous villages, particularly the mountain villages, of peasants and shepherdesses" (SEHERR I 253). I wonder if perhaps the community on the site of the modern Sandanski in Bulgaria, in the valley of the Strhythm (now the Stremic) where in Macedonia, was not yet a fully independent A.D. 158, the date at which Antiochos I sent a letter to it, part of which was recently found in an inscription, RIBIV 2263 (referred to in V.6.1 below and in n.26). It has been assumed that the king was merely authorizing 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 acceptance of a true poleis? At any rate, the inscription published by Woodward should warn us to be prepared for possible variations from the usual pattern of poleis 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 (§ 58 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 those who in at least two cases, Pergamon and Damascus, were called "Persis", and in which we find mention (as "episkopos") at Athens, mentioned above, and an inferior category who evidently did not enjoy full rights in the Assembly, although at the two Pergamene cities they are called "demoi". The existence of these grades in Asia may help us to understand an inscription of the Antonine period from Hurra in the Doğubayazid, where, Aba, an outstanding female benefactor of the city (who may remind us of Memmius of Silvans), we see the main text of III vi above, just after its n.35, and § 58 below), receives a series of gifts on various different categories of inhabitants. Counsellors, members of the Gerousia and certain other groups head Aba's list; they receive 2 denarii each and must also in the future distribution of wine (ανεμοφορω) which was to be given to various less dignified categories, including those in the tribes (πόλει) who are organised in groups of fifty (περιπεννατος). In subsequent lines of the inscription (57-83) which cannot be restored with any confidence there are references to such and such a tribe. The inscription was published by E. Popescu, in MNG 11 (1904) 273-86; but it is best read in the slightly revised edition by H. W. Pleyker, Epigraphia II (Teutsche Merker XII) I, Leiden, 1907-8. Making use of the observations of and L. Robe in REQG 9, 1906, no.239, I am inclined to accept the acute observations of Pleyker, in his review of Duncan-Jones, EREQS, as Carnunt 49 (1977) 53-63, at pp.62-3, that those organised in phylist 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 Perga and Sillyon, and possibly at Athens, and who are distinguished, in the two Pergamene cities, from παλαιστοι. (Pleket goes on to compare the Hellenistic phylist with the African nozwe discussed by Duncan-Jones and others.)

Appendix IV

5A. 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. According to the last king of Pergamene, died in 133 B.C., leaving his kingdom by will to his wife. The gift was accepted by the Roman Senate, Aristonikos, a bastard son of King Eumenes II, claimed to be the heir of Attalus, and led a large-scale revolt which was 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 every "slave revolt", how far it was a "nationalist" or anti-Roman rising, and what precisely was the role of Aristonikos himself. I have nothing new to say on the subject, the best account of which seems to me the most recent one, that of A. V. Vatheknis, "Aristonikos of Pergamene: pretender to the throne or leader of a slave revolt", in Fimat 45 (1975) 491-502. Vatheknis, who had himself produced a book on the revolt in French nearly twenty years earlier (Le Revolte d'Aristonikos, Prague, 1957), gives an excellent review of the whole range of theories, including those of B. Bentar, Roman Ties, Dunant, and Vogt. That one cannot easily obtain Vatheknis's article and wish for a brief account of this subject would perhaps be best done, I think, by Rostovtzeff's SEHERR II 603-6; especially 801-7 (with ID 3218-8 mm.75-99), and Vogt (as cited in n.8) 1 will only add, for the specialist, a very useful article by C. P. Jones, "Diodorus Pappus and the Nekrophoros of Pergamene", in Chiron 4 (1974) 421-5, demonstrating that the activities of Diodorus Pappus of Pergamene were associated not (as used to be believed) with the war of Aristonikos but rather with the Mithraic wars from the eighties to the sixties B.C. I have already referred, in the introductory part of this Appendix and in § 1 (and referred to in § 5 below) to the bodies of Roman residence in various Greek cities. It is in particular in Asia Minor, and above all in the province of Magnesia, that we know of their presence and activities, mainly through inscriptions. The residence for Asia Minor, and much of the modern literature, is given by M. B. MAI 15.1 (with E. 1615-23, and 15.2 (with H. 1129-30). It is 1615.2 n.18, and see I. 15.2 n.18 for a list of some forty cities in Asia Minor where such inscriptions were known down to 1956. Among much further information that has come to light since Magic wrote a decision of Chios referring to a ιερωναποθηκη Pappus (line 29), to be dated hardly later than 180 B.C. (or just afterwards), and thus much earlier than any of Magic's examples: see Th. Ch. Saridakis, "Ο Χ Ι ΙΑρχοναποθηκης Παππους", in N. Mozier (1973) 12-27, with text p.19; Ronald Meller, "The Pappus. The Worship of the Goddess Dama in the Greek World (= Hypomnemata 42, Göttlingen, 1975) 60-4, on the date (cf. also J. and L. 188), and L. Robert, in RE 79 (1965) 234-6 and no.305 (the decree: "the death of Apameia"?); F. W. Walbank, in JRS 33 (1943) 184-6 and advocating a late-third-century date.

A. Bithynia-Pontus

Here we have to take account above all of the Lex Romana, known mainly from Phrygia's correspondence with Trajan in c. 110-12 (Phryg. X, 79). 1-4, 112.1 (71-4, 1-3, 115.c.f. D.L. Cass. XXXVII xx.2), which was still in force in the early second century, as slightly
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modified by Augustus. The Lex Pompeia embodied the settlement reached by Pompey in 60-5 B.C. after his victory over the Gauls. For its nature, see Sherwin-White, L1P 669-73, 718, 720, 721, 724-5; Jones, CERPI4 (56-602). 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 councilor, that councilors were to receive their posts by being enrolled by officials whom Pliny calls genros (this ancient title in Greek was genera); and that co-magistrates must automatically be enrolled, although eligibility was not confined to them. Augustus reduced the age for certain minor magistracies to 22. Pliny refers to this as "a local optimum, which he seems to share (it is true later, the citizenship 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 councilors, even though they had held no magistracies. And he adds a remark of great interest, giving the reason for this change: that it is much better to choose the sons of members of the upper classes for the Council than men from the lower orders" (bouzoprion, haimaton liberae quae a plebe, Ep. X: 79-3). From this statement three conclusions inevitably follow: (1) the young men whom it was considered desirable to enrol as councilors were already members of what we may now begin to call 'cultural families' (those which we may heartily serve 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 cultural families who could have filled a magistracy and thereby qualified themselves for a seat on the Council, had the local cultural families not objected to this broadening of their circle. (Tajan, incidentally, tells Pliny that no one under 30 ought to become a member of a local Council, except through holding a magistracy. In this connection I may also mention another letter of Pliny's, referring to the invitation for invitations for certain entertainments to the whole Council and even no small number from the lower classes' elantom helenom as et cetera plebe no exominous munobon; here again we see the emergence of a group of families of cultural status, distinguished from the plebeians (Ep. X: 16). - an early stage in the development of a fundamental division seem to be given constitutional recognition in various ways (see VIII: 414 above).

There is no proof of a property qualification for councilors or magistrates in the Lex Pompeia, but we must infer the existence of one from Pliny. Ep. X: 110.2 cf. 58.5 and 148.4, Sherwin-White, L1P 738.

The cures (cures), charged with the task of enrolling the councilors of the cities of Bithynia and Pontus (Pliny, Ep. X: 79.3, 112.1, 114.1), is official who do not seem to have turned up yet elsewhere in Asia Minor, except as nuncios at Aphrodisias and Pergamum and as episkopoi at Ancyra (see section B below). We find "curettes" in Bithynia, at Prusa (L1BW 1111), Prusa as a Hykim (SEG XIV: 773, 13-14 and 774.8, IGRR III 66.13, 61.4, 11.7, BCH 35 [1901] 61.5 307.10); Dia (BCH 25 [1901] 54-5 no. 196.6), and "episkopos" at Nicaea (IGRR III: 1371.11, of A.D. 268-9), as restored by L. Robert in BCH 51 [1928] 410-11. And as usual, we must be prepared to find exceptional procedures on occasion, as when Tajan allowed Prusa to elect no fewer than 100 councilors, evidently in the Assembly (Dio Chrys., XVL 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, except as nuncios at Aphrodisias and Pergamum and as episkopoi at Ancyra (see section B below). We find "curettes" in Bithynia, at Prusa (L1BW 1111), Prusa as a Hykim (SEG XIV: 773, 13-14 and 774.8, IGRR III 66.13, 61.4, 11.7, BCH 35 [1901] 61.5 307.10); Dia (BCH 25 [1901] 54-5 no. 196.6), and "episkopos" at Nicaea (IGRR III: 1371.11, of A.D. 268-9), as restored by L. Robert in BCH 51 [1928] 410-11. And as usual, we must be prepared to find exceptional procedures on occasion, as when Tajan allowed Prusa to elect no fewer than 100 councilors, evidently in the Assembly (Dio Chrys., XVL 3.7.9-10).

B. The rest of Asia Minor

As early as Cicero's speech for Fuscus in 99 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 Tarentum 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 (De Finem 62-9). Jones goes too far, however, when he generalizes for this period from Tarentum to the Asiatic cities collectively (IGRR 62); and he himself realizes that the Councils of some 'free cities', in particular Rhodes and its former dependency Samos in Caria, and also Mylasa, long continued to change periodically - those at Rhodes and Samos are counted every six months. For evidence, it is sufficient to refer, for Rhodes and Samos, to Magic, RRAM 4112, no. 18; for Mylasa, see Mag. 51, 6th B.C. BCH 12 (1889) 33-4, no. 7. I know of no literary evidence for such a system, except perhaps Dio C. X, XXXIV 34-4, from which it appears that the magistrature at Taras in Dio's day served for six months only.

The evidence for the growth in Asia Minor of a "cultural order" (which by the late 4th century B.C. was substantially a cultural elite, see VIII: 114 above), is almost purely epigraphic, apart from Pliny's correspondence with Tajan concerning Bithynia-Pontus, noticed in A. above. The inscriptions concerned partly enable us to generalize, even for a particular area, and I shall make no attempt to sum them here. Perhaps it will be sufficient if I select one batch of inscriptions from Lyzia, which shows that during the second century the common folk, episkopi, were a recognizable distinct category from the bauerworn (as at Subynes, A.D. 295-292; TAM II 175 = IGRR III 537-4, with TAM II 175), from the chief of Osomucrae (IGRR III 529), doubtless the same as at Sardes near the Troad at the beginning of the 3rd century, of which we have no direct evidence but see the Persian inscription (Eph. Lett. 309). The latter shows some of the characteristic features of a magistracy (see also IGRR III 542) over a period of some 100 years.

The evidence for the growth in Asia Minor of a "cultural order" (which by the late 4th century B.C. was substantially a cultural elite, see VIII: 114 above), is almost purely epigraphic, apart from Pliny’s correspondence with Tajan concerning Bithynia-Pontus, noticed in A. above. The inscriptions concerned partly enable us to generalize, even for a particular area, and I shall make no attempt to sum them here. Perhaps it will be sufficient if I select one batch of inscriptions from Lyzia, which shows that during the second century the common folk, episkopi, were a recognizable distinct category from the bauerworn (as at Subynes, A.D. 295-292; TAM II 175 = IGRR III 537-4, with TAM II 175), from the chief of Osomucrae (IGRR III 529), doubtless the same as at Sardes near the Troad at the beginning of the 3rd century, of which we have no direct evidence but see the Persian inscription (Eph. Lett. 309). The latter shows some of the characteristic features of a magistracy (see also IGRR III 542) over a period of some 100 years.
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It would, I think, be universally agreed that election of councillors and of magistrates from below had caused everywhere, or virtually everywhere, before the end of the second century, and that those Councils which were not controlled by 'tacit' or 'express' appointees (as in other times) produced more independent councillors. The Assembly, even if it is merely to ratify a fait accompli, I would thus explain the inscription from Sinuessa, apparently of the early third century, which refers to the election of a prytaneis and his six (six) colleagues κατά τον τόμον ἐρωτηματοφοροῦν. (CIL II 3532, lines 16-19).

In conclusion, 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 drachmas 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 in the Ptolemaic army. (As Dio says it, it was outside the constitution throws the constitution, § 21; being regarded as foreigners (homoines allopatries, § 22) and suffering from some form of démerits, § 21), which apparently did not extend to dyers, shoe- or carpet-makers as such. (From the way Dio speaks, § 21), it seems that the linen-workers were permitted to 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, Perga (A/128 = ICR III 3:400) and Sillymen, men known as 'homoines' are distinguished as ordinary members (as well as from foreigners), and at Sillymen they receive the full status of citizens. Under the foundation of Medusa (ICR III 3803-1, cf. 802) the材质 officials are referred to as homines distincti. Our sources and the practice of the Assembly (cf. below) make us suspect that the Cumaean and Ascalonian Agora (ICR III 3803-1, cf. 802) had the right to the collection of the necessary registers (for example, see Magic, RRAM II 1803 n. 36). Here, again (cf. the passages of 3:4 of the Appendix dealing with Athens and Hesidus) we have examples of the division of the possession in a Cretan city, into grades, with the body of resident Cretan citizens. At Ephesian Attica (in the province of Asia, for example, a number of honorary decrees open with the words Ἐφεσιοὶ και Ἡλείοι και ό οἰκουμένης ἔργουσαν ἔργουσαν (ICR III 779, 384-6, 386-91, 793-4), in one case the world εἰς ἔργουσαν εἰς ἔργουσαν, (ICR III 3813, 284-6). In other cities too we find δικαιοσύνη joined with the παραπομπήσεις, e.g. at Athens (ICR III 2484), Cibyra (ibid. 6035-3, 913, 916-19, and elsewhere.

The Assembly had ceased by any rate at the middle of the second century to have any political importance. It is now considered a nuisance regulated by magistrates without whose consent nothing can be proposed and who usually presided at the meetings, with some such phrase as παραπομπήσεις or παραπομπήσεις ἐρωτήσεις, and with the concurrence of the Council. I agree with Isern, Lévy that we have to recognise the 'effacement de toute autorité' of Magic, RRAM I 53-54, II 1501 n. 5, 1506 n. 32. Among other decrees I would add the one published by Woodward in 1932 (cf. Woodward, r. 346-7, nos. 11, the appearance of the world ἐκ τοῦ θερμαντοῦ in a 3rd century decretal not much earlier than 160 AD, 292). We can indeed date the document during the Elenchus, in the years following March 290. (On my knowledge of this inscription to Barbara Levick, whose interest in Ptolemaic society 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 the Council and Assembly ratified by the provincial governor, I. H. Oliver, The Roman governor's permission for a decree of the polité, in Hesperia 24 (1954) 167-77, has given this fact considerable weight, citing six decrees (four from Ephesus and two each from Salamis and Smyrna) which bear on this question. Of Magic, RRAM I 53-54, II 1501 n. 5, 1506 n. 32. Among other decrees I would add the one published by Woodward in 1932, dated near the end of 282 BC, Plutarch, in a passage I have quoted in V, 83 above, depicted the practice of referring to the governor even minor matters, for which the governor's approval was deemed necessary. The constitutional necessity of referring to the governor does not affect the constitution of the Assembly of the city. In some cases, the issue is a clear survival of an earlier practice.

Revolutionary activity, of course, was almost inevitable. We do not even know of any surviving evidence that it was widespread, although we do occasionally hear of food riots, even Dio Chrysostom's Histories (see V, 83 above), and of an occasional unexplained outbreak of violence, as when Ptolemaic rule was restored in the 3rd century. (See Antony and Cleopatra, Vol. 2, 318-19. As an inscription of Eumenes II, of which there is no authority (in Hesperia 24 (1955) 167-77, has given this fact considerable weight, citing six decrees (four from Ephesus and two each from Salamis and Smyrna) which bear on this question. Of Magic, RRAM I 53-54, II 1501 n. 5, 1506 n. 32. Among other decrees I would add the one published by Woodward in 1932, dated near the end of 282 BC, Plutarch, in a passage I have quoted in V, 83 above, depicted the practice of referring to the governor even minor matters, for which the governor's approval was deemed necessary.

The evidence thus points strongly to the conclusion that it was the universal practice,Appendix IV

outside a few free cities where democratic tradition was strong, that magistrates should propose decrees, and that private members of the Council should frame them in their own name. The uniformity of practice, however, hardly justifies the assumption that the magistrates alone had the right of moving decrees.

Isern, Lévy, writing in 1895, could find no simple example in the second century of that hallmark of activity initiated in the Assembly itself, an amendment of a decree (EMMAM I 213), and knew of no evidence discovered since Lévy's time.

I would think it was safer to say that by the third century, even when decrees still use traditional formulae like όντι μὲν τῶν ἐν τῇ θυσίας, the Assembly of no Greek city should be regarded as having played any greater part, more than merely assimilating 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': cfr παραπομπήσεις (Ty. 3), ἱδρευσις (Chalke), ἐρωτήσεις, and cfr. OGIS 515 (= AJ 135), an inscription of about A.D. 210 from Mylasa in Caria, where in law 25 it finds the corresponding Latin term 'sustainemus acus'. In the long series of inscriptions from Rhodiapolis in Lycaia, recording the munificence of Ophramas, we find cfr. ἐπισχετήρια and ὲπαναστάσεως ἐπισχετήρια ἐπισχετήρια ἐπισχετήρια (TAM II 785, § 45, XII B 3-5 [= ICR III 793]), and cfr. ἐρωτήσεις (in the singular and plural) in cfr. IV 16, VI 13, XII 5, 12, and we Jean Colin, op. cit. (in V, n. 41 below, 816-17, for les dures vocables grecs de 'l'impasse'. For a long list of similar expressions in Latin, see W. Liebenau, Städteverwaltung im römischen Kaiserreich (Leipzig, 1909) 264 n. 7. And in the very latest record of a decree of a Greek Assembly that have been able to discover (with the possible exception of the one from Ophrynchos, in P. C. L., 110, quoted in V, n. 8, from Aphas, in Pisidia, we again find, written in Latin in the middle of a Greek inscription (unfortunately very fragmentary, the words οὗτος οὗτος [and in fr. 2] exist), the word οὗτος οὗτος added (cf. 371-374). In other cities too we find δικαιοσύνη joined with the παραπομπήσεις, e.g. at Athens (ICR III 2484), Cibyra (ibid. 6035-3, 913, 916-19, and elsewhere.

The Assembly had ceased by any rate at the middle of the second century to have any political importance. It is now considered a nuisance regulated by magistrates without whose consent nothing can be proposed and who usually presided at the meetings, with some such phrase as παραπομπήσεις or παραπομπήσεις ἐρωτήσεις, and with the concurrence of the Council. I agree with Isern, Lévy that we have to recognise the 'effacement de toute autorité' of Magic, RRAM I 53-54, II 1501 n. 5, 1506 n. 32. Among other decrees I would add the one published by Woodward in 1932, dated near the end of 282 BC, Plutarch, in a passage I have quoted in V, 83 above, depicted the practice of referring to the governor even minor matters, for which the governor's approval was deemed necessary. The evidence thus points strongly to the conclusion that it was the universal practice.
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 Republic.) From 48 onwards Cyprus was put under client rulers of the Proconsular royal house, but after Actium it was again annexed, and it was made a province on its own in 22 B.C. (Dio Cass. LII vv. 7. LVI vv. 1) or perhaps rather 23 B.C. (see Schlagh Jameson, 22 or 23rd in Historia 18 [1969] 204-29, 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 eparch (testablish: cf. § 3.4 above). One, from Cyprian Salamis, of the reign of Nero, describes its herondar as ἐπάρχοντας(ει); see T. B. Mitford and I. K. Nicolaou, Salamis, Vol. 6: The Greek and Latin Inscriptions from Salamis (Nicosia, 1974), 246-60, no. 11, line 5. In the other inscription, from Soili, also of the first century, the herondar is described as ἐπάρχοντας. προστάτης(ει) τῆς κράτους; see T. B. Mitford, in RAKA 42 (1947) 201-6, no. 1, line 9-10 (rather than IGRR III 930).

It seems to me quite possible that it was Augustus who provided for the election of councillors in Cyprian cities by an official corresponding to the Roman onus. 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 Scavia, "procons. iterum extra sortem autocratic Aug. Caesaris et ci. missus ad contendendum renum in reipublica Cypri" (LS 915 = CIL IV, 2865).

5. Cyrenaeia (and Crete)

I have already mentioned (in VII above) and see its 18.3) the very interesting constitution dictated to Cyrene by Ptolemy L. 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 356-60, with 396-7, no. 13-14. (This part of CERP 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. 388, with 497 n. 13, add Jan Machu, in RIt 205 [1951] 41-58). Although bequeathed to Rome by the will of Ptolemy Agathocles, the last son of Ptolemy VII Lagagenes II, who died in 165 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 397 n. 12, contrast W. V. Harris, Wok and Institutions in Republican Rome 302-70 B.C. [1979] 154-267). After further changes, it finally became part of the province of Cricote 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 (μαζωτικοι), merchants and Jews (a privileged class of merchants)." 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 Rostovzeff, SEHREx 1.309-10). I myself do not believe that it had ever done so, as I cannot accept the theory that the Ephesia of Hibs IV. 163-4 were a native Libys, in spite of the advocacy of this theory by such scholars as A. H. M. Jones (CERP 351), 359, cf. 497 n. 13 ad loc.), Bosio, and Lassau. See the discussion by F. Clarico, Cyrene unter la monarchie des Byzantins (Paris, 1953) 221-1, and the interesting suggestions made more recently by L. H. Jeffery, "The past of the first settlees in Cyrene", in Historia 10 (1961) 139-47, p. 142-4.
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There are a few scraps of information from inscriptions found on the sites of other cities in Cyrenaica. In SEG VII 772, a proximate decree of 350-320 B.C. from Eubeusperides, we find the Ephesos and Gerontes introducing a proposal to the Council, evidently the body, for the decree opens with the words, Εφεσον και Γερόντες τῶν οἰκίων ἐν τῷ ἔθνει ἔφεσιν, 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 mystery Toce (Tauchireia or Teuchireia, known in the Ptolemaic period as Arinose), which was passed by the Council and Council (there being 109 votes in favour), with a censure of other magistrates (Ephesos and Tamaz) but not of an Assembly: see Joyce M. Reynolds, "A civic decree from Toce in Cyrenaica", in Arch. Class. 25-26 (1973/74) 622-36; cf. E. Moretti, "Un decreto di Arsinoe in Cyrenaica", in RB 104 (1976) 385-98, esp. 389 (see nos. in line 15). I would draw attention to lines 11-14 of the Toce inscription, praising the honorand for the way he had conducted himself not as ἀθεός [nor as a god], and the words τὴν ἐπέμενεν ἐν τῇ νίκῃ of line 84: here we find a non-repetitive use of the term ἐπέμενε [in the plural, because, presumably, the man's generosity had not been confined to Toce], which occurs also in some village inscriptions of Asia Minor and Syrie see IV above and in n. 36 below. Even if, with Moretti, we keep μυθός in line 13 (as I think we probably should), and still more if, with Reynolds, we extend to μυθός, we shall be justified in finding in Cyrenaica, as in other areas, a privileged class of free citizens, contrasted with a larger number of others (the ἥνειοι) who had no political rights, or only very limited ones.

In the period of Roman rule one famous series of documents, the inscription recording five editors of Augustus dating from 7/6 to 4 B.C. EJ 311 = FR 4 41 no. 68 = SEG IX 8, cf. XIV 388; XVI 569; XVII 780, and see esp. Fr. De Visscher, Les élus d'Auguste des monastères de Cyrene (Louvain, 1940); cf. the long review by L. Wenger, in ZAS, 63 (1949) 425-36; and De Visscher's later article, 'La justice romaine en Cyrenaïque', in RDA 4/1 (1946) 331-33; abod. Zuckich and Nicholas, HSBV 171-4. For our present purposes it is the first and fourth of these editors which are relevant. Both carried the title "the participators in the contribution of resident Romans as immigrants at Cyrene." The first shows that when Roman magistrates had been chosen, they had been taken only from Romans with a census of at least 7.500 denarii, of whom there were 215 in Cyrenaica in 7/6 B.C. The second editor also affords evidence of complaints by the local Greeks of unequal 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, half that figure. The fourth editor leaves it to the provincial governor to decide whether to take capital cases himself or to have them tried as specified in the first editor, and adds that in non-capital cases the judge 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. 84. 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 matters still exist, as it is said that Crete is mainly administered by the Knossians of the Romans, as happens in the other provinces? (It is with this text that Schweda, GV 176, opens the ninth chapter of his book on the decrees of Greek Assemblies: Veränderungen unter dem Einfluß der Römer).

6. Massalia

Of Massala it is only necessary for me to say that the famous 'aristocratic constitution, as
536 The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World

we know it from the early Principate, was not a product of Roman influence but an indigenous growth. In the time of Aristotle, who wrote a Constitution of Messalia (see his fr. 149), it was not a democracy; two passages in the Politicus, taken together, show that an extreme oligarchy had merely become more moderate (V. 6. 1308B2-30; VI. 7. 1321B26-31). By 191 B.C., as we know from an inscription of Lampsacus of that date (SNG. B. 1941: lines 43-5, 47-9), the directing body at Messalia was already the Council of Six Hundred described by Strabo (IV. 5. 12, p. 179, very probably from Poseidonius) as consisting of tetrakos, who sat for life—and were presumably appointed by co-optation, as we hear of no general Assembly at Messalia, 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. xii. 7) and Sillius Italicus, speak well of it, using terms like pauperat and discipline. However, Cicero in De Republica, although prepared to say that Rome's 'chrest' the Messaliotes 'per delectoris or principis civis summa iustitia regunitur,' yet admits that 'most tam mitia conditio populi similis quaelam scripturas' (I. 27/48), 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 Messalia (now Massilia) had evidently become thoroughly romanised, with 'decumates' and the usual Roman municipal magistrates (dauenitz etc.).

7. Messopotamia 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 Seleucia 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. 4. 5, p. 758). Seleucia 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 Hermeius, 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 Mokon in 222-221 B.C. (Polycl. V. 54. 10-11). From just after the middle of the second century B.C. Seleucia was nearly always within the Parthian rather than the Seleucid or Roman sphere of dominance, but was evidendy allowed a considerable measure of independence and self-government. We hear of its being under a tyrant, Himerus, probably in the 120s. (Poseidonius, FGrH 87 F 13). According to Ptolearch, writing of Carus' campaign against the Parthians in 54-3, Seleucia had always been ill-disposed towards the Parthians (Cass. 17. 8).

In relation to the year A.D. 36 Tacitus speaks of faction at Seleucia between the common people (populus ore plebe) and the three hundred members of the Council, described euphemistically as 'chosen for their wealth or their wisdom to be a Senate' (opus aut sapientia electi aut senatus), a form of words which may indicate that the members of the Council sat for life. Factional disorder was particularly likely to occur in this city, because either party in a suit might call in the Parthians, as Tacitus notes in the same passage (Ann. VI. xiii. 1-3. 5). Before 36 the Parthian King Artavasdes III had put the commons under the primipores (presumably the Council of 300); in that year the situation was reversed by the pretender Tiridates, who had been the heir of the Emperor Tiberius and was welcomed by the populace of Seleucia but soon fled back to Roman Syria. Artabanus', successor Varanes, reduced Seleucia in 42 (Ann. X. viii. 4 to X. vii. 6). From that time on Seleucia was never again occupied by the Romans, be it noted, but by the Parthians. Seleucia now became increasingly orientalised.
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and we hear no more of it except in connection with Rome's Parthian war: it was briefly taken over by the Romans at the end of Trajan's reign, and sacked and partly destroyed by Verres' general Avidius Cassius in 165 (see Magic. RRAM II. 1351 n. 5). Dio Cassius in two passages in his narrative of the campaign of Crassus in 54-53 stress the Hellenistic character of Seleucia (XI. xvi. 3, xx. 5), and in the first of these he speaks of the city as in an existing polis still thoroughly Hellenic in his own day (ơsukhér ìan rirdíw rìw ìn Ynon); 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 971 (with bibliography); and M. Streck in RE II (1921) 1149-64.

* * * * *

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 Callistus. The most recent book is by J. B. Segal, Edessa. 'The Blessed City' (1970). Also see E. Mayer, in RE VI 2 (1908) 193-6. For what is known of the constitution, see C. B. Welles, in A. R. Bellanger and Welles, 'A third century contract of sale from Edessa in Ostraca', in YCJ 5 (1935) 88-94, at 91-42. I have no legitimate reason for mentioning it here, but there is an remarkable exchange of letters (bogus, of course) between Jesus and the then dyne 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. § 3) The Edessenes firmly believed that Jesus had made a promise to Abgar that their city would never be captured by an enemy (Joh. 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.