

the prosecution of Manilius, had embarrassed Cicero at the time, he had been able to extricate himself and had further retrieved his position in 65.¹² He would like now, at the beginning of 63, to represent his stand on the agrarian law as consistent with a line of conduct since 66. If he dates the beginning of that line of conduct from any specific point, it is from the prosecution of Manilius rather than the time of the Manilian law. But he may be trying to re-create in people's minds a picture of his whole praetorship as a popular, pro-Pompey year, and both the beginning and the end of that year would be relevant: the support for the Manilian law and the "help" offered to Manilius the defendant. The language used by Cicero is more appropriate to the end of 66 than to the beginning of 66, but with Manilius being a common element in both situations people's thoughts could be expected to embrace the whole year. To promote this view of his praetorship Cicero would wish to stress

memories of his activities in the forum (on the *rostra*) rather than of his stand elsewhere. (On his defense of Cluentius in 66, see n. 8. Consistent with Cicero's praise there of the Luculli were his efforts later in 63 which succeeded in getting Lucius Lucullus his triumph—over Mithridates and Tigranes, the very enemies for whose defeat Pompey was to claim a triumph in 61!) He would hope too that for the intervening years people's thoughts would turn not to his intense, semiprivate lobbying in all quarters but to a public stand such as the defense of Cornelius. His language is appropriate to this end of presenting an "edited" version of his praetorship and the intervening two years. It was by drawing Pompey's name into the debate on Rullus' bill in 63 that Cicero hoped to justify to the people his present stand, as part of a consistent policy of protecting Pompey's *dignitas*.

BERYL RAWSON

AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

nings of the Catilinarian conspiracy to events of early 65. He therefore dated these beginnings later than he did in some other contexts—to a time not earlier than the end of 65. On this argument, Cicero would be using *biennium* with the normal meaning of "approximately two years." (This passage is cited, without discussion, in the new *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, Fasc. I (Oxford, 1968) as an example of the normal usage of *biennium*.)

12. He had escaped the necessity to defend Manilius (*pace*

E. Gruen, *CP*, LXIV [1969], 23), who had since left Rome and presumably faded from the public conscience, but he had defended Cornelius with great success. In defending Cornelius he had undertaken a popular cause, in which there was a number of distinguished citizens (five ex-consuls) ranged against him. The *Commentariolum petitionis* (sect. 51), written from the standpoint of early 64, assumes that Cicero's agreement to help defend Manilius had contributed to his popular support.

NOTES ON THE PEACE OF CALLIAS

I

According to Demosthenes (19. 273), Diodorus (12. 4. 5), and Aristodemus (13), the Persians agreed in the Peace of Callias not to sail beyond Phaselis, the Chelidonian Islands, and the Cyanean Rocks.¹ To confirm some such limitation on Persian naval activity supporters of the authenticity of the Peace usually cite Thucydides 8. 56. 4. Here Alcibiades, acting on behalf of Tissaphernes in negotiations with the Athenians, repeatedly raises the price for Persian assistance. The Athenians each time agree to meet the price until Alcibiades at

last ναὺς ἡξίου εἶν βασιλέα ποιεῖσθαι καὶ παραπλεῖν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γῆν ὅπῃ ἂν καὶ ὅσαις ἂν βούληται. Arguing against the genuineness of the Peace, David Stockton asks, "Are we to suppose that the Peace of Callias forbade the Great King to build ships, *tout court*?"² Perhaps what Alcibiades has in mind is an agreement by which the King was bound not to build ships *in a certain portion* of his Empire. We find in Xenophon (*Hell.* 1. 1. 25) that Pharnabazus "called together the generals and trierarchs from the cities and urged them to build at Antandrus as many ships as each had lost, offering money and telling them to get timber

1. See also Plut. *Cim.* 13. Other likely references to this clause of the Peace include Isocr. 4. 118, 7. 80, 12. 59; Lycurg. 73; and Aelius Aristides 13. 153 and 169, 14. 200; see also

section II below and H. Bengtson, *Die Staatsverträge des Altertums*, II (Munich, 1962), No. 152.

2. *Historia*, VIII (1959), 67.

from Ida." So at any time it would be possible for the Persians to construct a fleet at Adramyttium or any other Aegean port under their control or in Lycia west of Phaselis. This seems to be the sort of activity contemplated by Alcibiades and feared by the Athenians rather than the delivery of ship timber from the Aegean area to Phoenicia. It is worth considering the possibility, then, that the Peace of Callias did explicitly forbid the Persians to construct a fleet in any port west of Phaselis. In giving only τὰ κεφάλαια Diodorus omits such an article, if it existed.

II

Recent discussions of the Peace do not include two important testimonia. First we have Livy 33. 20. 1–3:

Multa egregie Rhodii pro fide erga populum Romanum proque universo nomine Graecorum terrarumque ausi sunt, nihil magnificentius quam quod

3. Polyb. 18. 41a. 1, from the *Suda*, s.v. συνεπισχύσας.

ea tempestate non territi tanta mole imminentis belli legatos ad regem (sc. Antiochum) miserunt ne Chelidonias—promunturium Ciliciae est, inclutum foedere antiquo Atheniensium cum regibus Persarum—superaret: si eo fine non contineret classem copiasque suas, se obviam ituros, non ab odio ullo sed ne coniungi eum Philippo paterentur et impedimento esse Romanis liberantibus Graeciam.

We can compare this with a fragment of Polybius from the *Suda*:³ καλύειν δὲ τὸν Ἀντίοχον παραπλεῖν, οὐκ ἀπεχθείας χάριν, ἀλλ' ὑφορώμενοι μὴ Φιλίππῳ συνεπισχύσας ἐμπόδιον γένηται τῇ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐλευθερίᾳ. Did Livy know enough Greek history to insert a reference to the Peace of Callias into Polybius' narrative, or is Polybius himself responsible for it? I for one think that it must have been Polybius, who therefore accepted the authenticity of the Peace.

WESLEY E. THOMPSON

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS

SOME RECOLLECTIONS OF VIRGIL'S DRANCES IN LATER EPIC

It is probable that most readers of the *Aeneid* find the Heepish parliamentarian Drances the most repellent personage of the poem, and this was evidently the intention of his creator. His Homeric analogue is Thersites, and Virgil designedly evokes the fracas at the Homeric assembly that led to the wholesome drubbing administered to Thersites by Odysseus; but Drances is incomparably more sophisticated than Homer's ingenuously oafish antiwar protester, and correspondingly more odious. He first appears as spokesman of a delegation sent by the Latins to Aeneas to ask for a truce so that the dead slain in the great battle of the tenth *Aeneid* may be buried. In granting the truce Aeneas deplores the slaughter and suggests settling the conflict by single combat between Turnus the young champion of the Latins and himself. This proposal delights Drances. The poet prefates Drances' reply: "Tum senior semperque odiis et crimine Drances / infensus iuveni Turno sic ore vicissim / orsa refert" (*Aen.* 11. 122–24); Drances then engages

to do his utmost to persuade King Latinus to accept Aeneas' proposal and fawningly concludes "quin et fatalis murorum attollere moles / saxaque subvectare umeris Troiana iuvabit" (*ibid.* 130–31). Not long thereafter an embassy King Latinus has sent to Diomedes, now established in southern Italy, to ask for help returns with the report of Diomedes' refusal. Latinus at once convokes an assembly and proposes to come to terms with the Trojans and to grant them land where they may build a city. Drances, however, opposes this solution. Virgil characterizes him thus, as he rises to speak:

tum Drances idem infensus, quem gloria Turni obliqua invidia stimulisque agitabat amaris, largus opum et lingua melior, sed frigida bello dextera, consiliis habitus non futilis auctor, seditione potens (genus huic materna superbum nobilitas dabat, incertum de patre ferebat) surgit et his onerat dictis atque aggerat iras [*Aen.* 11. 336–42].