emn discourse, which is actually nothing more than a rule of our own creation? Or can this question of usage be answered by adducing an alternative form, such as *dive,* on the basis of linguistic factors of which the speakers themselves were unaware?

Questions such as these serve to illustrate the problems inherent even in a seemingly simple question of usage and the corresponding limits of our own authority as scholars. But if we are to ask again, "What was the classical vocative of *deus*?", how are we to respond? The examples are few and uncertain, but this is no basis for claiming that the vocative was not occasionally used in classical times. Nor is there any way to determine whether *deus* was preferred over *dee,* or whether both were used. The form *dee* does appear, though infrequently, in early Christian writers. *Deus* was overwhelmingly favored in the Latin Bible and later Latin, but neither can be used to reach conclusions about usage in classical times. In the end it is necessary to recognize that for all the armament of scholarship that can be brought to bear upon it, the vocative of *deus* is a question that must be left open. All that we can do is say what the vocative of *deus* might have been. We cannot say what it was.[40]

JOHN RAUK
Michigan State University

40. I am grateful to the Editor and referees of *CP* for their help and comments, and special thanks go to my colleague, Wm. Blake Tyrrell, who read an earlier draft of this article.

THEMISTIUS AND THE SPEECH *TO THE KING*

Writing about Themistius nearly thirty years ago, Gilbert Dagron spoke of a revival of interest in this philosopher and orator of the fourth century. That process was strongly spurred by Dagron's own study of Themistius' political thought, and since he wrote there have been many other contributions, including the completion of the Teubner edition and John Vanderspoel's recent study of Themistius in relation to the imperial court.[1]

If Themistius has a favorite model, it is Dio Chrysostom; though in those places where he mentions Dio, he does so merely as one of several philosophers who received favors from kings.[2] The other author of the Second Sophistic whose work has survived in bulk, apart from its historian Philostratus, is Aelius Aristides, and Themistius speaks of him only once, in a passage that does not suggest a high regard: under attack from rhetorical critics, he complains about the misfortune of having to listen to the progeny of Aristides, and not being allowed to listen to Plato's.[3] Nonetheless, Dagron recognized Themistius' debt to one work of Aristides, the speech

1. G. Dagron, "L'Empire romain d'Orient au IV^{e} siècle et les traditions politiques de l'hellénisme," *TM* 3 (1968): 1–242; G. Downey and A. F. Norman, eds., *Themistii Orationes,* vols. 2 and 3 (Leipzig, 1970, 1974; vol. 1, by Downey alone, appeared in 1965); John Vanderspoel, *Themistius and the Imperial Court* (Ann Arbor, MI, 1995). I am grateful to a reader for *CP* for very helpful comments.

2. 5.63d; 11.145b; 13.173c.

3. 26.330c. H. Kesters, *Plaidoyer d'un Socratique contre le Phèdre de Platon* (Louvain, 1959), has contested the attribution of this work to Themistius.

To Rome (*Or.* 26), not a surprising choice given its political content and encomiastic form.[4]

Vanderspoel has now argued for Themistius' knowledge and use of another work attributed to Aristides, the speech *To the King* (*Or.* 35 Keil).[5] In the fifth oration, addressed to the emperor Jovian on 1 January 364, Vanderspoel sees a general similarity of structure and content to the earlier work. The present note is designed to show that another panegyric of Themistius, the *Speech of Thanks* (*Charisterios*) delivered on 1 January 383 (*Or.* 16), borrows from this same speech almost *verbatim,* and puts Themistius' knowledge of it beyond doubt. If that can be established, it has consequences for a long-standing debate about the date and authenticity of the earlier work.

The speech *To the King* is one of the most controversial in the corpus of Aelius Aristides. The manuscripts give no sign of doubting its authorship, and they were followed without question up to the end of the last century, though identification of the addressee fluctuated between Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius. Then in 1898 Bruno Keil athetized the work as an anonymous production of the third century, and in the following decades that view generally prevailed, though still with considerable disagreement about the addressee; an attempt to date it to the ninth century or later found little favor.[6] In 1972, I argued that the speech was in fact by Aristides and was addressed to Antoninus Pius, and since then the discussion has gone on (if anything) more heatedly than before, and no less inconclusively. The only novel positions, neither of which seems destined for permanence, are that the work is addressed to Trajan, perhaps from the pen of the sophist Isaeus, and that it is a rhetorical exercise of the third or fourth centuries not addressed to any emperor in particular.[7]

Themistius' subject in the *Speech of Thanks* is the peace that the emperor Theodosius had concluded in the previous autumn with the Goths through his *magister militum,* Flavius Saturninus. As a reward, the emperor made Saturninus one of the two ordinary consuls of the current year, and Themistius uses the occasion to congratulate the emperor and his old friend simultaneously.[8] Near the end, he recounts the blessings that peace has brought for the Danubian regions. The first part of this passage is borrowed almost word for word, the second rather more loosely, from a passage near the end of the speech *To the King* (sections 36–37, p. 263 Keil).[9] I give both in parallel columns:

4. Dagron, "L'Empire," p. 115, n. 180 bis; cf. p. 118, n. 197.

5. Vanderspoel, *Themistius,* pp. 9–10.

6. For Keil's views, *Aelii Aristidis Smyrnaei quae supersunt omnia,* vol. 2 (1898; reprint Berlin, 1958), 253, and at greater length in "Eine Kaiserrede," *NAWG* 1905, 381–428. Ninth century or later: Ernest Barker, *Social and Political Thought in Byzantium* (Oxford, 1957), 220–25.

7. C. P. Jones, "Aelius Aristides, Εἰς Βασιλέα," *JRS* 62 (1972): 134–52. For recent bibliographies of the question, A. Faro, "La Coscienza della Crisi in un anonimo retore del III Secolo," *Athenaeum* 58 (1980): 427–28; D. Librale, "L'Εἰς Βασιλέα' dello pseudo-Aristide e l'Ideologia traianea," *ANRW* II, vol. 34, 2 (Berlin and New York, 1993): 1271–75. The work by Isaeus: Librale, "L'Εἰς Βασιλέα'," 1303–10. A rhetorical exercise: Stephen A. Stertz, "Pseudo-Aristides, ΕΙΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΑ," *CQ* 29 (1979); 172–97, summarizing his views on p. 174.

8. On the background, Peter Heather, *Goths and Romans 332–489* (Oxford, 1991), 157–81; Vanderspoel, *Themistius,* 204–8. For Saturninus, *PLRE* 1:807–8, Flavius Saturninus 10.

9. Curiously, Dagron, "L'Empire," p. 106, n. 140 and p. 118, n. 197, cites this very passage of Themistius for the possible influence of Aristides, but overlooks the speech *To the King.*

Them. *Or.* 16, 212a–b	Ael. Arist. (?), *Or.* 35.36–37
καὶ νῦν καθέστηκε μὲν *ἅπασα ἤπειρος,*	ἡσυχάζει δὲ *πᾶσα ἤπειρος,*
γῆ δὲ καὶ θάλαττα τοὺς προστάτας	*γῆ δὲ καὶ θάλαττα τὸν προστάτην*
στεφανοῦσιν,[10]	*στεφανοῦσιν,*
	Ἕλληνες δὲ καὶ βάρβαροι ταὐτὸν ἤδη φθέγγονται,
ἡ δὲ ἀρχὴ καθάπερ ναῦς μυριοφόρος πολλὰ δὴ πονηθεῖσα ὑπὸ χειμῶνος καὶ τρικυμίας ἀναλαμβάνει *καὶ ὀχυροῦται.*	*ἡ δὲ ἀρχὴ καθάπερ ναῦς* τις ἢ τεῖχος ἐπεσκεύασταί τε *καὶ ὠχύρωται*
	καὶ τὸ αὐτῆς βεβαίως κεκόμισται ἀγαθόν· τίνα ταῦτα οὐχ ὑπερβέβληκε ἀνδρείαν, ἢ τὶς ἀμείνων καὶ λυσιτελεστέρα γένοιτ' ἂν ταύτης κατάστασις;
καὶ ἀνοίγνυνται μὲν ὁδοί,	οὐ πᾶσα μὲν ἄδεια πᾶσιν ⟨βαδίζειν⟩ ὅποι βούλεταί τις, πάντες δὲ [οἱ] πανταχοῦ λιμένες ἐνεργοί;
ἐλευθεροῦνται δὲ *ὄρη* φόβου,	οὐ τὰ μὲν *ὄρη* τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχει τοῖς ὁδεύουσιν ἥνπερ αἱ πόλεις τοῖς οἰκοῦσιν αὐτὰς ἀσφάλειαν,
πεδία δὲ ἔγκαρπα ἤδη,	χάρις δὲ πάντα ἐπέχει *πεδία,*
οὐδ' ὁ πρὸς Ἴστρῳ ἄλλεται χῶρος ἐπὶ πολέμων ὀρχήστρᾳ, ἀλλ' ἀνεῖται τοῖς σπέρμασι καὶ τοῖς ἀρότροις· σταθμοὶ δὲ ἐγείρονται καὶ ἐπαύλεις καὶ τῇ πάλαι καταπυκνοῦνται ῥᾳστώνῃ·	πᾶς δὲ διὰ πάντων λέλυται φόβος;
σύμπνους δὲ ἡ ἀρχὴ ἅπασα καὶ ὁμοπαθὴς ὥσπερ ἓν ζῷον καὶ οὐκέτι διέρρωγε καὶ διέσπασται πολλαχοῦ.	ποῖοι μὲν γὰρ πόροι ποταμῶν κεκώλυνται διελθεῖν, τίνες δὲ θαλάττης ἀποκέκλεινται πορθμοί; νῦν καὶ πανηγύρεις φαιδρότεραι καὶ ἑορταὶ θεοφιλέστεραι· νῦν καὶ ἡ Δήμητρος πῦρ λαμπρότερον καὶ ἱερώτερον.

Themistius' methods of adaptation are interesting. His first sentence, from καὶ νῦν to ὀχυροῦται, retains the form and much of the language of the earlier speech, but the singular "defender" (προστάτης) is made plural, since Gratian was still the senior Augustus; and he passes over the idea that "Greeks and barbarians now ring with the same sound," perhaps because it seemed out of place in a speech emphasizing the ferocity of the Goths, and the adroitness with which Theodosius and Saturninus had brought them to terms. Again passing over some of the next sentences, Themistius goes to the phrase, "Do not all have all security to go wherever they like?"; this he renders, "And the roads are opened." He similarly passes over the mention of harbors in his original, as he does again further down: his motive is clearly that, while his model was talking about the general condition of the empire, Themistius is concerned with the Danubian frontier, where any mention of "harbors" would be out of place. He then takes the next two clauses, "Do not the mountains provide the same security to travelers as the cities do to their inhabitants? Does not beauty inhabit all the valleys?"; this becomes, "The mountains are freed from fear, and the valleys are

10. The sentence γῆ δὲ. . . . στεφανοῦσιν was omitted by Harduin, but the Teubner editors do not report it as missing from any manuscript.

fruitful," which adds the point that the settlement of Goths on the Roman side of the Rhine had allegedly returned hitherto neglected lands to cultivation.[11] There is no equivalent in the original to Themistius' mention of "stables" and "folds," or to his thought, "The whole empire breathes and feels as one, like a single creature, and is no longer broken and torn in many places." This replaces the original reference to the rivers and harbors of the empire, and the all-too-obviously pagan mention of festivals, feasts, and "the fire of Demeter," the last doubtless alluding to the mysteries of Eleusis.[12]

It is of no less interest to ask why Themistius turned to this particular speech in composing his own of 383. The original praises an emperor who had dealt with Rome's enemies by diplomacy rather than war; the speaker is at pains to emphasize the superiority of "prudence" (εὐβουλία) to the rashness of the emperor's predecessors (he is perhaps thinking particularly of Trajan). This artful strategy suited Themistius' own aim, which is to exalt the peace of the previous year, and the superiority of diplomatic methods over military ones.

It is clear that Themistius knew and adapted the speech *To the King* in his own *Speech of Thanks,* and it remains to draw the consequences. One hypothesis can surely be eliminated, that the speech *To the King* was some rhetorical exercise: Themistius was surely too great a connoisseur of style to turn to a mere schoolroom piece in composing his formal oration for New Year's Day, 383. In 1981 Charles Behr, characterizing *To the King* as "clumsily written and bombastic" and its author as a "hack," suggested that he might have inserted it himself into the corpus of Aristides (presumably with the intent to deceive, though Behr does not say so); and he also expressed satisfaction with Edmund Groag's identification of Philip the Arab as the addressee.[13] More recently Behr has again characterized the author as one who wrote "consistently badly," having a "feeble intellect" and a "clumsy, repetitive style"; as for the addressee, however, Behr now admits to a "serious doubt about the rightness of accepting Groag's identification. . . . Perhaps the Greek panegyrist has distorted the truth, in order to ingratiate himself with his master."[14] But if the author was prominent enough for Themistius to use him in so important a speech, he should have been someone whom Themistius himself, perhaps also his readers and listeners, recognized as out of the ordinary. He might be some unnamed person writing at an unknown date between the second and the fourth century; whether that conclusion is easier to accept than that he is Aelius Aristides, others will have to judge.

CHRISTOPHER P. JONES
Harvard University

11. Cf. 16.211a–b.

12. On this passage, cf. Kevin M. Clinton in *ANRW* II, vol. 18, 2 (Berlin and New York, 1989), 1528, noting Antoninus Pius' favors to Eleusis. Demeter is mentioned at 211b, but only by metonymy for cereal cultivation (the Gauls "greeting Ares from afar pray to Demeter and Dionysus").

13. Charles A. Behr, *P. Aelius Aristides: The Complete Works,* vol. 2 (Leiden, 1981), 399–400.

14. Behr, "Studies on the Biography of Aelius Aristides," *ANRW* II, vol. 34, 2 (Berlin and New York, 1993), 1220–23. Behr does not repeat his suggestion that the same author inserted the work into the corpus of Aristides.