

Polyperchon's attempt to return it in 319, though ineffectual, undoubtedly produced further tensions. The Athenians may even have attacked Samos in the years just before 307.⁷ All of which serves to dispel any thoughts that the brothers might have found security in the liberal atmosphere of the Lyceum prior to Demetrius' victory.

While Duris is silent, corroborating testimony from Lynceus demonstrates beyond doubt his presence in Athens only after 307. He mentions attending Antigonos' banquet to celebrate the festival of Aphrodite and the dinner which Lamia, the mistress of Demetrius, had given for the king⁸—reaffirming Samian–Antigonid propinquity. There can be little question, then, that Demetrius cleared the way for both Duris and Lynceus to come to Athens for their studies.

The *exact* year of Duris' arrival is, of course, still vague. Theophrastus' brief exile in 307/6 and the Four Years' War with

Cassander may have postponed his coming until after Demetrius returned from an extended absence to relieve the city in 304. This would be consistent with Plutarch's placement of Lamia's dinner, recounted by Lynceus, before Demetrius' departure again in 302 to aid his father in the coming battle at Ipsus.⁹ Presuming the brothers came together—it is likely given the conditions—304/2 is a good estimate of their arrival. Since Duris succeeded his father as tyrant and was given his grandfather's name,¹⁰ he conceivably was the eldest son. This, however, is of minor value in dating his birth since the age at which he went to Athens cannot be known. But if he was born *circa* 330, he would have been in his middle twenties, a reasonable age to pursue his higher education with Theophrastus.

ROBERT B. KEBRIC

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE

7. Habicht (n. 1), pp. 182–86 (Nos. 18–19). Cf. Barron, *Coins*, p. 136.

8. Ath. 4. 128A–B, 3. 101E–F; and Plut. *Demetr.* 27. 2.

9. Plut. *loc. cit.* (n. 8).

10. See n. 4.

HADES AS BENEFACTOR: PLUTARCH *DE ISIDE* 362D

Καὶ γὰρ Πλάτων τὸν Ἄδην ὡς †Αἰδοῦς υἱὸν† τοῖς παρ' αὐτῷ (Wytttenbach: αὐτοῦ codd.) γενομένοις καὶ προσηγῇ θεὸν ὠνομάσθαι φησί. This is W. Sieveking's text of 1935. The extant attempts at emendation of αἰδοῦς υἱὸν are either paleographically unlikely or semantically unconvincing. They are:

διδασκαλικὸν	[A. E. J. Holwerda, 1878]
ἀειδέσμιον	[W. R. Paton, <i>JPh</i> , XX (1892), 169]
αἰδοῦς κύριον	[L. Parmentier, 1913]
ὠφελήσιμον	[F. C. Babbitt, 1936]
ἀηδοῦς κύριον	[T. Hopfner, 1941]
αἰδέσμιον	[M. Pohlenz, 1959]

More recently, J. Gwyn Griffiths, in his major edition of the *De Iside et Osiride* (Cardiff, 1970), pp. 162 f., 406, prints εἰδήμονα (for αἰδοῦς υἱὸν) in his text with reference to Plato *Cratylus* 404B3 (where the name of Hades is deduced from εἰδέναι). The reviewer

of Griffiths' edition, R. E. Witt (*CR*, N.S. XXII [1972], 208) calls the emendation "convincing." Nevertheless, I find Griffiths' emendation paleographically impossible and linguistically wrong. He translates his text as follows: "For Plato (*Cratyl.* 404B) says that Hades has been called by his associates a knowledgeable and friendly god." Here ὡς has not been accounted for.

Even more recently, C. Froidefond (*REG*, LXXXV [1972], 63–65) suggests πλούσιον for the transmitted αἰδοῦς υἱὸν: "Selon Platon, si on a donné à Hadès son nom, c'est qu'à ceux qui sont venus résider auprès de lui il apparaît comme un dieu riche et bienveillant." Here again, the emendation is paleographically unlikely and syntactically weak. For the dative τοῖς γενομένοις followed by προσηγῇ θεὸν ("a friendly god toward the inhabitants of his realm") is not likely to be that of judgment (as Froidefond

takes it to be: "Hadès est riche et bienveillant aux yeux, d'abord, des habitants de l'au-delà. Il s'agit d'un simple datif de point de vue").

Bearing in mind that lacunae are the most common source of corruptions in Plutarch (and not only in Plutarch), I should suggest the following reading: *Καὶ γὰρ Πλάτων τὸν Ἄϊδην ὡς αἰδοῦς <μεσ>τὸν τοῖς παρ' αὐτῷ γενομένοις καὶ προσηνῇ θεὸν <οὕτως> ὠνομάσθαι φησί* ("In fact, Plato too says that Hades has been so named for being full of regard for those who have come to abide with him and for being a friendly god"). I adduce four arguments in favor of this reading.

(1) Plutarch is building upon Plato *Cratylus* 403E4: Hades is μέγας εὐεργέτης τῶν παρ' αὐτῷ . . . , "a great benefactor of those in his realm . . ."

(2) From the closely related passage, Plutarch *De superstitione* 171D-E (. . . τῷ

Ἄϊδι, ὃν ὁ Πλάτων φησὶ φιλόφρων ὄντα καὶ σοφὸν καὶ πλούσιον, πειθοῖ καὶ λόγῳ κατέχοντα τὰς ψυχάς, Ἄϊδην ὠνομάσθαι), we may deduce that ὄντα corresponds to ὡς in our passage, and that τῷ Ἄϊδι, ὃν . . . Ἄϊδην ὠνομάσθαι suggests τὸν Ἄϊδην . . . <οὕτως> ὠνομάσθαι in our text.

(3) Paleographically, the uncial abbreviation *Ō* for *οὕτως* was mistakenly dropped before *ω*-; and once *MEC* was dropped, the rest, *TON*, was misread as *YON*, as is the case in Hesychius *ΥΠΕΙ· φοβεῖται*, instead of *TPEÎ* (Ruhnken): cf. Hes. *τρεσάντων· φοβηθέντων*.

(4) Finally, as for the phrase *αἰδοῦς μεστός*, "full of regard for," cf. LSJ, *s.v.* *μεστός*; Plato *Plt.* 310D10, ἡ δὲ αἰδοῦς γε αὖ λίαν πλήρης ψυχῇ; Xen. *Cyr.* 1. 4. 4, αἰδοῦς δ' ἐνεπίμπλατο [*sc.* Cyrus].

MIROSLAV MARCOVICH

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA

A LAW OF JULIAN

Roman legislation is notoriously difficult to evaluate or even sometimes to comprehend precisely, not least in the Late Empire, when rhetoric and grandiloquence too often displace simplicity, exactness, and clarity.¹ It becomes all the more important, therefore, to avoid interpreting laws on the basis of a priori views either about the policy of the emperor who uttered them or of the historical development which they attest. And further dangers confront the exegete. It may even be hazardous to expound a law in the light of the reports or comments of fallible or biased contemporaries. Sometimes too (as in larger matters)² the whole interpretation depends on the understanding or correct translation of a single word or phrase. A law of Julian, preserved in the Theodosian

Code under the rubric "Si certum petatur de suffragiis," will exemplify:

Imp. Iulianus A. ad populum. Foedis commentis quae bonorum merito deferuntur quidam occupare meruerunt et, cum meruissent in re publica quolibet pacto versari, repetendam sibi pecuniam, quam inhoneste solverant, impudentius atque inhonestius arbitrantur: alii etiam, quae tunc donaverant vel potius proiecerant ob immeritas causas, invadenda denuo crediderunt. Sed quia leges Romanae huiusmodi contractus penitus ignorant, omnem repetendi eorum, quae prodige nefarieque proiecerunt, copiam prohibemus. Qui itaque repetere nititur vel repetisse convincitur, et quod dedit apud suffragatorem eius manebit vel extortum restituet et alterum tantum fisci viribus inferre cogetur. Dat. Kal. Febr. Constant(ino)p(oli), Mamerto et Nevitta cons. [*CTh* 2. 29. 1].

1. For some choice examples, R. MacMullen, "Roman Bureaucrats," *Traditio*, XVIII (1962), 364-78. I am grateful to Professor E. Weinrib for discussion of the argument presented here.

2. Note Zosimus' statement of his subject: ὅπως ἐν οὐ πολλῷ χρόνῳ σφῆσιν ἀποσθαλίῃσιν αὐτὴν διέφθειραν ἐρχομαι λέξων (1. 57. 1). This must mean, "I am going to tell how they (the Romans) ruined it (i.e., the Empire) in a short period by their own reckless folly." For Zosimus employs a different

word when he remarks that after ceding territory to the Persians in 363 the Romans "gradually also lost the majority of the provinces" (3. 32. 6: *προσπολέσαι*). The crucial word has, however, recently been mistranslated as "lost" by J. J. Buchanan-H. T. Davis, *Zosimus: Historia Nova* (San Antonio, 1967), p. 34, with startling consequences. This English version of the passage is quoted as the basis of a novel interpretation of Zosimus by W. Goffart, "Zosimus, The First Historian of Rome's Fall," *AHR*, LXXVI (1971), 412-41.