

## THE ROMAN GOVERNMENT IN GREEK SOURCES

### The Effect of Literary Theory on the Translation of Official Titles.

H. J. MASON

ποιήσομαι δὲ ὡς ἂν οἶός τε ᾧ τὴν περὶ  
τούτων διδασκαλίαν σαφῇ, ἀφηγούμενος  
τὰ νόμιμα τῇ τῶν Ἑλλήνων φωνῇ, εἰ καὶ  
οἶδα δύσφραστα εἶναι αὐτὰ νομιζόμενα  
πρὸς τὰς τοιαύτας μεταβολάς.

[Modestinus *ap. Dig.* 27.1.1.1]

THE APOLOGY REMINDS ONE of Lucretius (1.136–139). But the situation of the two writers is rather different. Lucretius was faced with a real linguistic problem of inadequate vocabulary, apart from the literary considerations of turning scientific Greek into poetic Latin. Modestinus, on the other hand, could draw on some four hundred years during which the Greek world had been subjected to Roman νόμιμα and documents in Greek were being published of a legal complexity that, if it did not equal that of a textbook on *excusatio* (the topic which the section introduces), at least offered the lawyer some precedent for his method. In fact, apart from a rather larger number of transcribed words, Modestinus' usage, and in general the Greek quotations in the *Digest*, do not differ from the bulk of official documents on stone or papyrus. Although there are problems, points not yet fully elucidated, it is clear that under the Empire at least, there existed a reasonably consistent, standardized Greek terminology,<sup>1</sup> drawing largely from familiar Greek official language, either of the Hellenistic states (e.g., ἑπαρχος) or of the *poleis* (e.g., δήμαρχος and ταμίας) in a process called by Magie *comparatio*,<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>A full discussion of the existence of an official "chancellery" Greek is out of place here. But the very existence of a large number of complex official documents, frequently dealing with fairly obscure points of the Roman constitution, and the *relatively* few problems that arise from them, point to the existence of a generally accepted system of translations. This is entirely what one would expect in a bilingual context.

<sup>2</sup>D. Magie, *De Romanorum iuris publici sacrique uocabulis in Graecum sermonem conuersis* (Leipzig 1905). It is opposed in Magie's system to *translatio*, the translation or calque of the Latin (*quaestor* expressed by ζήτητής) and to *transcriptio*, transliteration of the Greek word (κουαίστωρ).

Magie did not distinguish in this classification *what* Greek institution may be compared. Mommsen thought that the main source was Naples and Magna Graecia in general (*StR* 3.145, n. 1). But the bulk of terms belong to many Greek states and would be understood anywhere. The exception is ὑπατος. *ID* 1528, mentioned as a parallel

but employing other methods, such as transliteration, periphrasis, translation of the Latin word, when necessary. From a strictly legal point of view, Modestinus' use of Greek for fine points of Roman law is not surprising, and hardly required an apology in the third century of our era.

But Modestinus, in stating that Roman law *was considered* difficult to translate (i.e., this need not be his own view), is speaking more, one suspects, as a writer in a self-conscious literary age than as a lawyer. There is good evidence that many writers of his day intentionally avoided the "official" translations, and employed a terminology of their own, judging the suitability of a word by its literary respectability rather than by its precise legal reference. Such writers would probably consider fine points of law *δύσφραστα* in the extreme.

Some of the variants from the norm can be easily explained and justified. An author with any literary pretensions naturally sought some variety in his formulations. Diodorus, for example, giving consular dates for each year, employs thirteen different formulae of the type *ὁ τὴν ὑπατικὴν ἀρχὴν λαβὼν*.<sup>3</sup> Dionysius employs some half-dozen terms for *prōtixefex*, avoiding *πόντιφεξ*, the form which became usual in official documents.<sup>4</sup> Strabo and Appian, similarly avoiding *κολωνία*, employ a large number of terms such as *ἀποικία*, where the subtle distinctions of meaning that may be detected in the Greek context are only occasionally reflected in their Roman usage.<sup>5</sup>

The avoidance of actual Latin words is what one would expect, although the Attic sources on whom the writers based their literary judgment were less diffident in adopting Persian words when necessary. An amusing discussion in Athenaeus (3.121e) on the Latin loan-word

in the Ptolemaic world, is dated to 145–110, too late to explain the Roman use, attested 50 years earlier. Holleaux discussed the problem, but does not provide an answer (*Στρατηγὸς Ὑπατος* [Paris 1918] 126–127).

<sup>3</sup>Diod. Sic. 10.26.1; 11.1.2, 38.1, 41.1, 48.1, 51.1, 53.1, 74.1, 99.1; 14.95.1, 99.1, 103.1; 20.37.1. There are other expressions for *trib.mil.cos.pot*.

<sup>4</sup>*πόντιφεξ*, *Ephesus* 2.21–22; *IG* 2<sup>2</sup> 4072; *SEG* 6.551. Dion. Hal. 2.73.3 lists as alternatives *ιεροδιδάσκαλος*, *ιερομνήμων*, *ιερονόμος*, *ιεροφάντης*, *ιεροφύλαξ*.

<sup>5</sup>*κολωνία*, *ILS* 9469, *AE* 1916.121, *IGR* 4.992 *et saepissime*; *ἀποικία*, Str. 12.5.6, App. *B.Civ.* 2.120; *ἔποικος*, Str. 3.1.8; *κατοικία*, Str. 6.2.5; *κατοίκις*, App. *B.Civ.* 5.19; *κληρουχία*, App. *B.Civ.* 2.119; *σύνοικος*, Str. 5.1.6. *ἀποικία* is occasionally found in official documents (*Hesp.* 28 [1959] 60, *Ann.Epig* 1966.165) usually of the first century in our era.

*ἐποίκις* in App. *B.Civ.* 5.137 refers to a non-colonial Roman settlement, as argued by G. W. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World* (Oxford 1965) 64—apparently the only attempt at differentiation between these terms. The various meanings in a Greek context are discussed by V. Ehrenburg, "Thucydides on Athenian colonisation," *CP* 47 (1952) 143–149.

δήκοκτα reveals literary attitudes towards such borrowings, and indicates how strongly they were felt.

But it should also be remembered that, even without the question of translation, there was a tendency, presumably going back to the school of Isocrates, to avoid the strict, precise technical term. When Theopompus called Nicostratus of Argos *προστάτης* (*FGrHist* 115 F 124), we do not learn what his actual position in the city was. Likewise Aratus, in his ninth *strategia* of the Achaean league, is called by Polybius *προεστώς* (2.45.6). A fragment of Posidonius (*FGrHist* 87 F 28.4) shows that he referred to the queen of Egypt as *ἡγουμένη* rather than with a derivative of *βασιλεύς*; he also calls *φύλακες τοῦ Ἀραβικοῦ μύχου* officials known from an inscription (*OGI* 186) to have been called *στρατηγοὶ τῆς Ἐρυθρᾶς καὶ Ἰνδικῆς θαλάσσης*. The practice continued in Roman contexts.

Most important, however, is the fact that we know from literary sources that many terms that were normal Greek were discarded because they did not belong to the classical Attic language. Galen gives a clear example. He speaks of a patient from the household of Charilampes, the imperial *cubicularius* (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> A 713), adding the comment *κοιτωνήτης, ὡς ἅπαντες οἱ νῦν Ἕλληνες ὀνομάζουσι, σωματοφύλαξ δ' ὡς οἱ περιέργως ἀπτικίζοντες* (14K 624). This is almost like Homer's "divine" and "human" names (*Il.* 1.403), but it is confirmed by the facts. *κοιτωνίτης* and the related *ἐπὶ κοιτῶνος* (i.e., *a cubiculo*) are normal in inscriptions and non-literary authors, and are found also in the Seleucid empire.<sup>6</sup> Significantly, Alcibiades, *cubicularius* of Hadrian (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> A 134) and named *ἐπὶ κοιτῶνος* in an inscription from Nyssa (*ILS* 8857), is called by Photius, epitomising Phlegon of Tralles, *εἰς τῶν εἰς τὴν φυλακὴν τεταγμένος τοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ* (*FGrHist* 257 F 3).<sup>7</sup> Galen's comment and Phlegon's usage are in turn clarified by Phrynichus who specifically condemned *κοιτών* and its derivatives: *τὸ μὲν κοιτῶν ἀδόκιμον* (*Epit* 252 Lob). The pattern is clear. *κοιτών* was denied Attic standing by the purists; as a result the useful and precise, semi-official *κοιτωνίτης* was replaced by the correct but indistinctive *σωματοφύλαξ*.

Phrynichus is a useful check on the attitudes of the literary establishment; such words as *βασιλισσα* (225), *ἔκθεμα* (249), and *σιτομετρέισθαι* (383) were condemned. His correspondent Cornelianus, *ab epistulis Graecis* (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 1303), is engaged in *ἐξελληνίζων καὶ ἀπτικίζων τὸ βασιλικὸν δικαστήριον* (379 Lob), which would appear to indicate that there was an

<sup>6</sup>*IG* 14.1664, *IGR* 1.369, *AE* (1924) 103; *Act. Apost.* 12.20, *Act. Alex.* 3.28 (*P.Giss.* 46), Epictetus 1.19.17; *ID* 1547.

<sup>7</sup>The expression might of course be Photius' own, but does not really belong in the kind of language used in the patriarch's day, which would probably have employed a form like *κουβικλάριος*.

attempt to apply the same criteria of language to the official formulations of the government. It met with at least partial success.<sup>8</sup>

The authors were already heavily committed to Attic standards. Cassius Dio is at great pains to justify his employment of χρυσοῦν for the Latin *aureus*, a term which, as he hastens to inform his readers, could be found in the best of authors, ὧν τὰ βιβλία ἐπὶ τῷ ἀττικίζειν ἀναγιγνώσκωμεν (55.12.4): Attic stylists of the day, that is, not the classical Attic texts themselves.<sup>9</sup> It is instructive to see a major historian and a Roman senator and consul, who presumably had to handle the official formulations with some frequency, anxiously studying to make sure his terminology corresponded to literary standards.

This side of Atticism had a largely negative effect; useful words such as κοιτωνίτης and πόντιφεξ gave way to the vaguer φύλαξ or ιερέυς. ὑπατος could be employed, but its derivatives ἀνθύπατος and ὑπατικός could not. ἀνθύπατος could be expressed by something like ἀρχων; the objections to ὑπατικός led to an overuse of ὑπατος. (ὑπατος had started as an adjective, as in στρατηγὸς ὑπατος, and was so employed again, but with the sense *consularis*. The effect was to make ὑπατος ἀνὴρ mean both *consul* and *uir consularis*, with resulting confusion).<sup>10</sup> As πρεσβευτής came to take on the various meanings and formulations of *legatus*, such neologisms as πρεσβευτὴς λεγιῶνος and πρεσβευτὴς ἀντιστράτηγος would not be acceptable, and writers (and even some documents) came to prefer ἡγεμῶν.<sup>11</sup> These trends led to expressions that lacked constitutional precision, the fine distinctions of the Latin; but they were only incidentally misleading.

Frequently, however, the Greek author, because of his interest in the Attic texts, chose to employ terms with exact constitutional reference in fifth-century Athens or Sparta. The absence of any precise basis for comparison meant that these terms often gave a very false impression of Rome.

A good example of this technique may be found in Dionysius of

<sup>8</sup>Not with these words; ἔκθεμα occurs more often than Phrynichus' alternative πρόγραμμα. But the secretaries themselves became τὴν ἐξήγησιν τῶν ἐπιστολῶν πεπιστευμένους (*Ephesus* 2.26) instead of simple ἐπὶ ἐπιστολῶν; the senate is referred to by the full title σύγκλητος βουλή (*IG* 12.1.786; *Dig.* 16.1.2.3), a formulation employed by Philostratus and Herodian; and προστάτης gains ground from πατέρων around A.D. 200 (*IG* 14.1078; *OGI* 531.549). All these look like the influence of literary language.

<sup>9</sup>F. Millar, *A Study in Cassius Dio* (Oxford 1965) 41.

<sup>10</sup>E.g., in Philostratus, *V.S.* 1.8.(489), 1.27.(530), 2.6. (576).

<sup>11</sup>Important here is Strabo's account of Spain, 3.4.20 (166); ἡγεμῶν for a legate is opposed to στρατηγός for a senatorial proconsul. See also Arrian, *Exped. contra Alanos* 5, Joseph. *B.J.* 2.510, *Ev.Luc.* 2.1. Documents: *SEG* 18.557 (Claudius Charax), *IG* 5.2.151 (Pompeius Theophanes), *IGR* 3.174 (Julius Severus). Also in many documents of Thrace and Moesia (e.g., *IGR* 1.669–670).

Halicarnassus. In an account of the Roman dictatorship in *Ant.Rom* 5.73.3, he offers as a Greek parallel αἰσυνήτης, because οἱ αἰσυνήται καλούμενοι αἵρετοὶ ἦσαν τύραννοι, a statement for which he gives Theophrastus as his authority, but which eventually goes back to Aristotle, *Politics* 1285a32, αἰσυνητεία ἔστι δὲ τοῦθ' αἵρετὴ τυραννίς. Aristotle's term has become central in the modern discussion of tyranny, and is felt to refer to men such as Pittacus of Mytilene, who were elected to special offices to resolve political problems within the state. Elsewhere it may have been a regular magistracy.<sup>12</sup>

It is hardly necessary to point out that the Roman dictatorship bears only a slight resemblance to the institution Aristotle mentioned. Aristotle considered an office already two hundred years before his time and termed it an αἵρετὴ τυραννίς in the political language of his own day. Dionysius then, for whom Pittacus was still more distant, and with yet another series of associations for the word *tyrant*, thought that dictatorship was elective tyranny. Hence the old word αἰσυνήτης could be applied to the Roman position. Even if his Greek reader could follow him in this line of argument, such information as he might have had on Pittacus would scarcely enlighten him as to the nature of the Roman dictatorship.<sup>13</sup>

A similar case is provided by ἀρμοστής. Although the normal use of ἀρμόζω could justify the use of the participle and the noun by Appian (*B.C.* 4.7–8 [27]) for *IIIuiri r.p. constituendae*, and by Dexippus (*FGrHist* 100. F 26.3) for a *corrector* of free cities, the equation that is made by Aelian (*N.A.* 13.21) and Lucian (*Pereg* 9 [332], *Tox* 17 [256]) with *proconsul* rests on a facile comparison of two words which have the general reference "governor abroad"; the associations of the Spartan term with the occupation of various states after the Peloponnesian war distort the reference to a *proconsul*. Another Spartan term, Dio's ὑπομειolves applied to certain officers of the Roman army (38.35.3, 47.42.2, *et alibi*), is equally unfortunate. In each case the reader must deduce from the context what actual rank is intended, while the original Spartan sense, which is the only other context in which the term occurs, refers

<sup>12</sup>Modern discussions: A. Andrewes, *The Greek Tyrants* (London 1956) 96–97; Ehrenberg, *The Greek State* (Oxford 1960) 46f. Pittacus is not so named, but an *aesymnetes* of this type is found in Miletus, Nic.Dam., *FGrHist* 90 F 53. *Aesymnetes* as a regular magistrate at Megara, *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 463—Dittenberger there compares it with a *prytanis*.

<sup>13</sup>Once it is admitted that *tyrant* changed radically in connotation from one period to another, the basis of comparison is lost. The dictators appointed in most of D.H.'s account were to deal with military crises; other types of dictatorships were in order to carry out a specific task (e.g., *clauis fingendi causa*). Dionysius and his readers were more familiar with the dictatorships of Sulla and Caesar—but, though legally elected, could they be called "chosen" in the sense that Aristotle was applying to Pittacus?

to Spartans not of the rank of *homoioi*, as in the conspiracy of Cinadon (Xen. *Hell.* 3.3.6). This hardly enlightens us in the Roman context.

References to other Spartan institutions are vaguer and less misleading. If Aristides chose, in the colorful language of the speech *To Rome* (26K), to call the emperor *inter alia* an *ἐφόρος* and to state that peace was kept by *μόραι* alone (*cohortes* presumably) the meaning was fairly clear and the allusions suit the whole tenor of the speech.<sup>14</sup>

Sometimes an author, in attempting to translate a Latin expression, had the opportunity to use an Attic word which seemed to have the same meaning. Dionysius, translating *Xuiri agris diuidundis*, chose in 9.52.2, 10.38.4, to employ the word *γεωμόρος*. His preference, rather than the *γεωνόμος* employed by Dio 38.1.6, would seem to be caused by the existence of this word in the classical texts, at Samos (Thuc. 8.121) and Syracuse (Herodotus 7.155.2). The fact that in these contexts it is a term of party politics, referring to the party of the landed aristocracy, does not seem to have disturbed him—indeed he makes a Roman speaker allude to the fortunes of the Syracusan *gamoroi* as a parallel for Rome, using the same term (6.62.2). The same may be seen in the use of *ἵπποτρόφος* by the author of the *Corinthiacus* included as *Oratio* 37 of Dio Chrysostom. The reference is clearly to an *eques Romanus*; but in the Attic context the associations of the word are much the same as *γεωμόρος*.

Another unfortunate use of etymology is Dionysius' offer of *τριτύς* as an equivalent for the Latin *tribus* (2.7.3); this occurs also in a fragment of Cassius Dio (5.8 Boiss.). In terms of institutions, this is of course incorrect—the *trittys* was a subdivision of the *φυλή* which is the element in Athens and many other states which corresponded to the Roman *tribus* and is the normal translation of that word. Apart from the apparent etymological similarity, the *trittys* would not mean very much to the average Greek; it is far from the clearest part of the Cleisthenic constitution, and even more uncertain in the earlier state.<sup>15</sup> Furthermore, recent linguistic studies have questioned the traditional etymology of *tribus* from *tres*.<sup>16</sup>

Even where there is a valid basis for comparison, it is not to be given too much weight. Appian's equation of the consulate with *ἡ ἐπώνυμος ἀρχή* (B.C. 4.49 [215]), is sound enough on the specific point of comparison, but beyond that there is little enough common ground between an Athenian *archon* and a Roman *consul*. Appian also employs *ἐτήσιοι*

<sup>14</sup>See J. H. Oliver, *The Ruling Power* (Philadelphia 1953).

<sup>15</sup>Some of the questions on the nature of the *trittys* are discussed by C. W. J. Eliot, "Aristotle *Ath. Pol.* 44.1 and the meaning of *trittys*," *Phoenix* 21 (1967) 79–84.

<sup>16</sup>C. Watkins "Italo-Celtic revisited," in H. Birnbaum and J. Puhvel, *Ancient Indo-European Dialects* (Berkeley 1966), 47–48, suggesting a possible Etruscan origin.

προσάται in opposition to the kings, to describe the first consuls (*Prooem.* 6); the language is parallel to a passage in Thucydides (2.80.5) describing the political situation among the Chaonians. Obviously, if it is not just chance that the expression occurs in these two places alone, all this means is that Appian discovered a phrase that suited his purpose in Thucydides, not that there is any real comparison between Chaonia and Rome. Nevertheless, it is curious to observe that Hammond, without a specific reference to the passage in Appian, compares the Chaonian officials with Roman consuls.<sup>17</sup>

The confusing effect of apparent similarities of constitution is nowhere more apparent than in the account of the relations between senate and assembly. The pattern of βουλή and ἐκκλησία, basic to the Athenian and to most other Greek constitutions, appeared to find a close parallel in the Roman state, and these terms are not unfittingly employed in the Roman context. But in Athens, the function of the βουλή was to prepare material for the assembly; material covered in committee in the βουλή was then presented as a προβούλευμα to the assembly. Any other procedure was regarded as unconstitutional. In some states, as apparently was the case in Corinth, the πρόβουλοι could thus effectively rule the state; certainly their existence was viewed by Aristotle as a mark of an oligarchical constitution.<sup>18</sup> In all the complex and turbulent relationships of senate, magistrate and people, the senate was never simply probouleutic. But unfortunately the theory of government and the terminology associated with it are frequently applied by Greek writers to the Roman context; πρόβουλος is used for a senator (App *B.C.* 2.131 [550])<sup>19</sup> and προβούλευμα for the senate's resolutions. It is not clear whether a *senatus consultum* or the *patrum auctoritas* is indicated at any given point by this term, which is frequently employed by Dionysius (e.g., 4.80.3, 5.70.4), but it is plain that Greek writers used it to present independent action by the assembly as unconstitutional, in the terms of *Attic* constitutional theory and practice.<sup>20</sup> This may be seen in Plutarch, *Coriolanus* 29(227), ὁ δῆμος ἄκυρος ἦν νόμῳ καὶ ψήφῳ τι ποιεῖν ἄνευ προβουλεύματος; what the practice actually was in this period can hardly be ascertained, but Appian employs the same language to describe a reform of Sulla's μηδὲν ἀπροβούλευτον εἰς τὸν δῆμον εἰσφέρειν (*B.C.* 1.59

<sup>17</sup>N. G. L. Hammond, *Epirus* (Oxford 1967), 501.

<sup>18</sup>*Attic probouleuma: Ath. Pol.* 44.4. Oligarchic: *Pol.* 1298b29, 1299b31. Corinthian *probouloi*: Nic.Dam., *FGrHist* 90 F 60.

<sup>19</sup>But also, by a *figura etymologica*, for *consul*, e.g., Plutarch, *Romulus* 14 (25). In specific situations it is not always clear which is meant; for example, App. *Mith.* 56 (228), ἐπὶ τοῖς Ῥωμαίων πρέσβεσι καὶ προβούλοις καὶ στρατηγοῖς κατηγορία.

<sup>20</sup>This is the subject of a special monograph by E. Bux, *Das Probouleuma bei Dionys von Halicarnass* (diss. Leipzig 1915), from which the main line of argument here is adopted.

[266]). ἀπροβούλευτος otherwise belongs to documents of classical Athens, occurring in speeches of Demosthenes and Hyperides, and in Aristotle *Ath. Pol.* 45.4, οὐδ' ἔξεστιν οὐδέν ἀπροβούλευτον ψηφίσασθαι τῷ δήμῳ. This paper does not plan to discuss what in fact Sulla's reform was, in what way prior senate action became necessary for popular legislation;<sup>21</sup> the point is that Appian's Attic, Aristotelian language, equating the senate's rôle with the necessary, built-in relation of *probouloi* and assembly at Athens, provides a distorted view of the reform.

The degree to which Attic terms replaced the normal Greek of the day may be seen in the army. Although transliterations such as λεγιῶν and κεντυρίων abound, there were a number of Greek words, coming largely from the Hellenistic armies, that enjoyed wide use and belonged to the standard official language. Both documents and literary texts use, for example, ἐκατόνταρχος for *centurio* and χιλιαρχος for *tribunus militum*.

These words were not, however, Attic. In Herodotus and the Attic writers they were terms used only to refer to the Persian army; it is clear from the narratives of Diodorus Siculus (18.48.4-5) and Quintus Curtius (5.2.2-3) that the office and the title were adopted by Alexander from the Persian army. It has recently been demonstrated that the words themselves are calques of an Iranian formation.<sup>22</sup> Fifth-century officers were λοχαγοί and ταξιαρχοί; but as there was little or no comparison between the armies of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. and the post-Marian Roman legion, these words have little or no meaning in a Roman context. They were nevertheless employed, to the confusion of the modern (and, one suspects, the ancient) scholar. ταξιαρχος appears to mean *legatus legionis* in Appian *Samnitica* 46.2. and Josephus *B. J.* 3.87; in Plutarch *Pomp.* 6 (621), Josephus *B. J.* 2.83, and many other places, the sense is rather *tribunus militum*; while in a passage of Plutarch's *Caesar* 20 (717), the narrative of Caesar himself, *B. G.* 2.25, indicates that the reference is to *centurio*, a meaning that also occurs in Polybius 6.24.3. In all cases, the scholar must decide for himself from the context or from external evidence; the Greek word itself offers no help.

The avoidance of the Persian/Macedonian χιλιαρχος seems particularly futile when we remember that Philostratus was willing to use the purely Iranian σατράπης for *proconsul*,<sup>23</sup> and that the strictly military writers tended to force the Roman army into the terminology of the

<sup>21</sup>E. Gabba, *Appiani Bellum Civile Liber Primus* (Florence 1958) makes the reference to a necessary *patrum auctoritas* in his commentary on this passage.

<sup>22</sup>E. Benveniste, *Titres et Noms Propres en Iranien Ancien* (Paris 1966), chap. 4, "Chiliarque," 67-71. I owe this reference and some discussion of the problem to Prof. D. G. Millar of the University of Southern Illinois.

<sup>23</sup>*V. S.* 1.22, 2.11. Presumably he felt the use of such a word was justified because of its occurrence in Attic sources; such is the attitude adopted by one speaker in the discussion of *decocta* in Athenaeus 3.121e.



Macedonian tactical handbooks, an attempt seen at its best in Arrian's *Expediitio contra Alanos*, which even transforms a numbered Roman legion into a Macedonian *φάλαγξ*.

One final example of the confusions created by this Atticizing tendency, and the dangers it creates for historical reconstruction, may be provided by the term *ἐξηγητής*.

The normal procedure observed in official documents when dealing with the Roman priestly colleges, for which no Greek state offered an exact parallel, was either a straight transliteration (*αἰγούρ*, *πόντιφεξ*) or an explanatory periphrasis, the best example of which was created by the sophist Damianus for a *sodalis Antoninianus Verianus*, *ILS* 8830, *Ἀρτωνεινιανὸς Οὐηριανὸς ἐκ τῶν συνκατηξιωμένων φιλτάτων ἱερέως*. But as so often, Dionysius took an independent path; for *pontifex*, as observed above, note 4, he supplied a rich array of alternatives, for *augur* a similar variety of terms comparable to *οἰωνοσκόπος* (3.70.1). He also employed *ἐξηγητής*; once (4.61.1), the reference appears to be to an *haruspex*, a sense that is also found in Epictetus (1.17.20). In 8.56.4, the context suggests a *pontifex*; in 3.67.3, an association with the Sibylline books points to the *IIuiri sacris faciundis*. But the context in the regal period and the demonstrated vagueness of Dionysius' terminology in this as in other areas, hardly inspire confidence.

Oliver's study of the Athenian *ἐξηγηταί*<sup>24</sup> nevertheless employs this last sense in the interpretation of *IG* 2<sup>2</sup> 4072, where Herodes Atticus terms himself *ὑπατος* and *ἐξηγητής*. Oliver, faced with many problems in making Herodes an exegete of Athens, suggests, on the basis of Dionysius 3.67.3, and an elaborate comparison of Athenian and Roman priesthoods, that by *ἐξηγητής* Herodes meant *XVuir sac.fac.*

The observation of Dionysius' method of dealing with Roman officials does not encourage much faith in any theory that is based on a term used by him. Furthermore, the interpretation ignores a basic distinction between the language of inscriptions and literary usage. *XVuir sac.fac.* is most frequently expressed by *εἰς τῶν πεντεκαίδεκα ἱερέων* or something similar, twice by *κυνδεκίμουρ*.<sup>25</sup> This pattern is as consistent as that for any other important priesthood. There is, on the other hand, no evidence that *ἐξηγητής*, in any sense, was employed in the official language of Rome; and Herodes in his own inscriptions does not differ radically from official documents, as may be seen, for example, in *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 858. *IG* 2<sup>2</sup> 4072, a monument base, is no less formal a document. Whatever Herodes may have written on a verse inscription or in a speech, *even if*

<sup>24</sup>J. H. Oliver, *The Athenian Expounders of the Sacred and Ancestral Law* (Baltimore 1950), 109–119.

<sup>25</sup>*πεντεκαίδεκα ἱερεῖς uel sim. ILS* 8830, *Epigraphica* 20 (1958) 32; *DC* 42.51.3 *et al.*; *κυνδεκίμουρ IGR* 3.618, 4.372.

ἐξηγητής could mean *XVuir sac.fac.*, he would not have placed it on a stone of this nature.

The Greek writer of the Roman period chose his vocabulary with an eye to literary respectability rather than political aptness. His audience, well acquainted with Rome and the official equivalents of Roman institutions,<sup>26</sup> could be counted on to perceive the Roman reality under the Attic façade, which was the product of a literary fashion that considered long familiar Roman expressions as "difficult to translate" (difficult, that is, without offending literary sensibilities). But the modern historian who attempts to construct solid historical facts out of these products of a literary theory should realise the uncertain nature of the foundation on which he is attempting to build.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, TORONTO

---

<sup>26</sup>The point is an important one; the existence of monuments with full *cursus honorum* in Greek, of rescripts and decrees likewise published on stone, implies that there was an audience to read them, capable of understanding the terminology and the legal points. It is false to explain a difficulty in terminology by alluding to the ignorance among Greeks of certain Roman terms or institutions. We must look for the explanations of such difficulties in the preoccupations and concerns of the Greek who created them; and in the imperial age, these are more likely to be literary than anything else.

The foregoing article developed from a Harvard doctoral thesis written under the supervision of Glen Bowersock; the writer has benefited further from discussions with his colleague E. J. Weinrib.