

HIPPARCHUS «THE TYRANT»

Tib. Claudius Hipparchus was one of the richest men in the Roman Empire during the Flavian period¹. He belonged to the Claudii of Marathon, a prominent family in Roman Athens which traced its pedigree to Miltiades and Cimon. Hipparchus' more recent ancestors could boast of friendships with Caesar and Cicero. The well-descended millionaire served as priest of the Pythian Apollo, and high priest of the imperial cult in the time of Domitian². According to Philostratus (*VS.* 2. 1. 547), the Emperor confiscated Hipparchus' property: ἐπὶ τυραννικαῖς αἰτίαις, ἄς Ἀθηναῖοι μὲν οὐκ ἐπῆγον, ὁ δὲ αὐτοκράτωρ οὐκ ἤγνόησεν. Philostratus does not define the tyranny, nor note how Domitian discovered it, or why the Athenians suffered through it silently. The aim of this paper is to analyze this alleged tyranny in the context of Flavian Athens, and to suggest that members of Hipparchus' own class, the Athenian aristocracy, charged him with tyranny. This essay will examine the role that the following three elements played in the affair — the Athenian masses, the Athenian upper class, and Domitian and his successors.

The Athenian masses

Philostratus' Ἀθηναῖοι apparently are the masses, the urban poor. The Roman civil wars of the first century B.C. passed repeatedly through Attica. The Romans partially destroyed the city, and ravaged the countryside³. Many peasants were forced to seek their livelihood in

1. Suetonius *Ves.* 13. P. Graindor, *Un milliardaire antique: Hérode Atticus et sa famille* (Cairo 1930), pp. 11-12.

2. Philostratus *VS.* 2. 1. 546. For a commentary on Hipparchus' ancestry and their public service, see Graindor, *Hérode*, pp. 5-12. Michael Woloch, «Four Leading Families in Roman Athens», *Historia* 18 (1969) 50 ff., discusses Hipparchus' family in relationship to other Athenian families.

3. Plutarch, *Sulla* 12, notes the extent of Sulla's destruction of Athens. W.S. Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens* (London 1911), p. 451, argues on the basis of Appian

the city. Athenian industry, damaged by the wars, could not absorb the displaced rural population¹. Thus a deracinated urban mob appeared in Athens. There seems to have been at least several thousand Athenians

Mithr. 38 that the city was pillaged, but that the houses were not destroyed. J. Day, *An Economic History of Athens Under Roman Domination* (New York 1942), p. 118, does not attempt to assess the amount of damage. Archeologists, however, in the last thirty-five years have revealed that Sulla did indeed destroy the city. J. Lawrence Angel, «Skeletal Material From Attica», *Hesperia* 14 (1945) 311, discovered a well filled with debris from the period of Sulla. Infants, dogs, and large domestic animals were in the well. They apparently were victims of starvation. T. Leslie Shear, «The 1930 Campaign in the Athenian Agora», *Hesperia* 8 (1939) 238, argues that Sulla's troops gratuitously destroyed classical art work. I. Perlzeig, *Lamps of the Roman Period First to Seventh Century After Christ*, Vol. 7 in the *Athenian Agora* (8 vols., Princeton 1961), p. 11, argues that Sulla destroyed the Ceramikus thus ruining the Athenian lampmaking industry. Homer A. Thompson, «Excavation of the Athenian Agora, 1947», *Hesperia* 17 (1948) 153, points out that the Tholos was destroyed by Sulla. Dorothy Burr Thompson, «Three Centuries of Hellenistic Terracottas», *Hesperia* 24 (1965) 50, argues that Sulla inflicted great damage on the residential area near the Agora. Homer Thompson, «Buildings on the West Side of the Agora», *Hesperia* 6 (1937) 195, maintains that the area on the west side of the Agora was levelled by Sulla. Homer Thompson, «Excavation of the Athenian Agora», *Hesperia* 17 (1948) 149-96, notes the general destruction which Sulla inflicted on the area west of the Areopagus. Homer Thompson, «The Excavation of the Athenian Agora», *Hesperia* 16 (1947) 205, explored the hollow between the Areopagus and the hill of the Nymphs. He points out that the main water channel in this section was destroyed. According to Rodney S. Young, «An Industrial District of Ancient Athens», *Hesperia* 20 (1951) 142, this hollow was the main industrial section of Athens. D. B. Thompson, «Three Centuries of Hellenistic Terracottas», *Hesperia* 24 (1965) 64, found that the water courses that ran to and from the southern slopes of the Kolonos Agoraios were ruined in the time of Sulla. It also seems that the residential area in this section was demolished. Evidence for Sulla's destruction of the countryside: Ulrich Kahrstedt, *Das wirtschaftliche Gesicht Griechenlands in der Kaiserzeit* (Bern 1954), pp. 42-76, made a study of over fifteen hundred inscriptions found in the rural areas of Attica. Only one-percent of the inscriptions date from the first century B.C. It is difficult to escape the conclusion that Sulla destroyed the countryside as thoroughly as he did the city. We know that he destroyed irrigation channels in the city; it is reasonable to assume that he did so in the countryside. For further devastation inflicted on Athens and Attica in the first century B.C., see Cassius Dio 42. 14; Appian BC 4. 122; J. Larsen, *Roman Greece*, vol. 4 of an *Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, edited by T. Frank (Baltimore 1938), p. 435; M. Rostovtzeff, *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* (Oxford 1959), III, 1581, n. 127; J. Day, *An Economic History of Athens*, pp. 120-175.

1. P. Graindor, *Athènes de Tibère à Trajan* (Cairo 1931), pp. 134-35; Day, *An Economic History of Athens*, pp. 177-183; M. Rostovtzeff, *Social and Economic Hi-*

who depended on a dole. While the city did not have the wherewithal to provide for its indigent, certain rich citizens, particularly while serving as city magistrates, often provided free grain to the masses ¹.

Despite these benefactions the Athenian poor were not especially fond of the upper classes. Indeed class relations throughout the Greek world under Roman sway were not good ². Occasionally, the Athenian demos rebelled against the ruling class through riots and public disturbances. These outbursts were generally occasioned by grain shortages ³. But, by and large, the masses were kept in their place with the knowledge that the Romans would back the upper class in any dispute. It seems the only prerogative the *demos* had in Roman Athens was the right to support a motion in the *ecclesia* by acclamation. A member of the masses could not initiate a proposal ⁴.

story of the Roman Empire (SEHRE) (Oxford 1966), II, 652; C. Wachsmuth, *Stadt Athen in Altertum* (Leipzig 1874), I, 676. Recent archeological evidence supports their views: R. H. Howland, *Greek Lamps and Their Survivals*, vol. 4 of *the Athenian Agora* (Princeton 1956), p. 156, notes the dearth of lamps and terracotta figurines in Athens during the first century B.C. Perlzweig, *Lamps of the Roman Period*, pp. 3-4, maintains that in the first century A.D. Athenian potters not only lost the foreign market, but the domestic market as well. O. Broneer, *Terracotta Lamps*, vol. 4 of *Corinth* (Harvard 1930), pp. 26, 73, notes that the manufactured goods used in Greece in the first century A.D. came mainly from Italy.

1. According to Nepos (*Atticus* 25), T. Pomponius Atticus gave six midimni of grain to each Athenian, apparently soon after Sulla's invasion. A. Jarde, *Les céréales dans l'antiquité Grecque* (Paris 1925), p. 113, gives figures indicating that Atticus' gift was nearly a one year supply. M. Rostovtzeff, «Augustus und Athens», *Klio* 3 (1903) 311-313, notes regular distributions of grain in the time of Augustus. For the obligation of Athenian magistrates to provide grain, see T. Sarikakis, *The Hoplite General* (Athens 1951), p. 18, and D. J. Geagan, «The Athenian Constitution after Sulla», *Hesperia*, *Supp.* 12 (1967) 22.

2. C. P. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome* (Oxford 1971), pp. 110-121, cites passages from Plutarch and Dio Chrysostom indicating divisiveness within the Greek upper classes. J. H. Oliver, «The Ruling Power: A Study of the Roman Empire in the Second Century After Christ Through the Roman Oration of Aelius Aristides», *Tr. Am. Philosophical Society* 43 (1953) 954, discusses this subject. M. Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE* I, 142-50, II, 586-7, n. 18, gives sources for conflicts between the rich and poor.

3. Philostratus (*VS.* 1. 23. 526), notes a bread riot in Athens in the first quarter of the second century A.D. Plutarch (*Quaest. conv.* 8. 3. 720d) witnessed a disturbance in the first century A.D. This, too, was probably related to bread. For a commentary, see Sarikakis, *Hoplite General*, pp. 40, 62-3 cf.; P. Graindor, *Athènes sous Hadrien* (Cairo 1934), p. 20.

4. For the status of Athens as a free city, see P. Graindor, *Athènes sous Auguste*

Hipparchus, by virtue of his wealth and birth, belonged to the Athenian upper class, the *πρωτοί*, who ruled Athens, a free city, in accordance to Roman wishes. Oliver suggests that the Hipparchus case was an attempt of the *πρωτοί* to encroach upon the rights of the masses. If Hipparchus was a leader of the Athenian aristocracy in such an effort we would expect some mention of it by Philostratus. Oliver argues that the Athenians, intimidated by Hipparchus, may have secretly protested against his autocratic policies, and that the biographer was aware of their discreet complaint, but he did not record it because he was biased in favor of Hipparchus' family. Philostratus dedicated the *Lives of the Sophists* to Herodes Atticus, the grandson of Hipparchus¹.

There are several weaknesses in Oliver's hypothesis. Philostratus (*VS.* 2. 1. 549), notes that the Athenians charged Herodes with tyranny. It is not reasonable to assume that Philostratus would cunningly omit an Athenian accusation against Hipparchus and not one about Herodes. Furthermore, it is unlikely that Hipparchus obtained silence through intimidation, for if Herodes was unable to keep the Athenians quiet why should we think that Hipparchus could have²? And we may also ask how could Hipparchus infringe upon the almost non-existent rights of the *demos*?

The Athenians would have considered Hipparchus derelict in his duty, indeed oppressive, if he had not fulfilled his basic obligation as member of the *πρωτοί*. Those who belonged to the Athenian ruling class were expected to hold the highest magistracies in the city — archon and hoplite general, and to grant a largess to the masses³. A wealthy contemporary of Hipparchus, Tib. Claudius Oinophilos, while serving as archon in ca. A.D. 75, distributed one *midimni* of grain, and fifteen drachmas to each Athenian citizen⁴. The wealth of Hipparchus obliged

(Cairo 1927), pp. 40-44; P. Graindor, *Athènes sous Hadrien* (Cairo 1934), pp. 97-111 J. Delz, *Lukans Kenntnis der athenischen Antiquitäten* (Freiburg 1950), pp. 41, 156-184. For the masses and the ecclesia, see D. Geagan, *The Athenian Constitution After Sulla*, pp. 33-34, 81-91.

1. Oliver, «Ruling Power», 954. Oliver is supported by H. W. Pleket, «Domitian, the Senate, and the Provinces», *Mnemosyne* 14 (1961) 305-6: Pleket argues that Hipparchus crushed the poor. For Philostratus' attitude toward Herodes, see A. Papalas, «Herodes Atticus and his Son», *Ιλάτων* 24 (1972) 250.

2. Philostratus *VS.* 2. 1. 549.

3. See above p. 51, n. 1.

4. *IG*, II², 3546, Sarikakis, *Hoplite General*, pp. 76-77.

him to match, at least, Oinophilos. There is, however, no evidence that Hipparchus served as archon or hoplite general. This is somewhat surprising, for his ancestors held these positions, and the fragmentary record of magistrates in Roman Athens indicates that these posts stayed within certain families¹. Hipparchus may well have been archon or hoplite general and performed the necessary liturgies, or he may have displayed his generosity, as his son did, in the capacity of a private citizen. When Domitian condemned Hipparchus, the millionaire suffered a *damnatio memoriae* in Athens, and his statues were overturned². Inscriptions recording his benefactions were probably also destroyed. While there is no solid proof that Hipparchus was beloved by the masses, there is no evidence to testify to his oppression of the *demos*.

The πρώτοι

Hipparchus was a despot to certain members of his own class. The πρώτοι consisted of the rich and old families. The Romans relied on them to bring stability to the city, and in return promoted their interest. Members of this class were not always on good terms with one another, and disgruntled aristocrats occasionally appealed to Roman authorities³.

The Athenian πρώτοι experienced a crisis in the decade of the A.D. 80's. There were several years when no one served as eponymous archon. Apparently, some of the families which traditionally held the archonship no longer had the means to do so⁴. Many of the Athenian πρώτοι were victims of the same economic trends which had ruined the small

1. See above p. 49, n. 2.

2. For Atticus' generosity, see Philostratus *VS.* 2. 1. 549. A statue of Alcia, daughter of Hipparchus, placed at Eleusis was cast down after the ruin of Hipparchus, see *SIG*³, 853, 854, and Graindor, *Hérode*, p. 12. Presumably, every public mention of Hipparchus was obliterated.

3. Philostratus *VS.* 2. 1. 559.

4. There was no archon for A.D. 82/3 or A.D. 83/4. In A.D. 84/5 Domitian served as archon. The name of the archon in the following year is unknown. In A.D. 87/8 C. Julius Antiochus Philopappus, son of Epiphanes, the deposed King of Commagene, assumed the archonship. In the succeeding year, a certain Q. Trebellius Rufus held the office. For sources, see P. Graindor, *Chronologie des archontes athéniens sous l'empire* (Brussels 1922), pp. 95-100. One may conclude that had not these outsiders held the office the decade of the 80's may have been by and large an anar-

farmer. In Flavian Athens, as in Italy after the Hannabalic War, the decades following the destruction of the countryside witnessed the growth of large estates. Most of the land in Attica fell into the hands of a few owners. The number of *πρωτοί* able to afford the burden of public office had shrunk considerably¹.

The development of the Attic *latifundia* may have been connected to the rise of Athens as a banking center, and to the financial dealings of Hipparchus. While the kernel of his wealth probably came through marriage into one of the wealthy Italian merchant families residing in Greece, he made great sums as a banker². Hipparchus' banking interest are suggested in a piece of evidence that hitherto has not been given its full value: According to Philostratus (*VS.* 2. 1. 549), Hipparchus' son, Atticus, in ca. A.D. 140 bequeathed a considerable amount of money to each Athenian citizen. But Herodes, the son of Atticus, discovered a way to frustrate the will³. When the Athenians went to the banks to collect their bequest they were presented with *ζυμβολαία* indicating that their fathers and grandfathers were in debt to Herodes' parents. The debts of some were contracted in the days of Hipparchus, and the records were preserved for two generations. Some owed little and therefore received a small sum, others broke even, while some were detained as debtors. The arrested debtors had borrowed much money, probably from Hipparchus in an effort to maintain their estates. Some

chy. Sarikakis, *Hoplite General*, p. 23, lists Lucius Flavius Flammas as the only hoplite general of this period: perhaps no one stepped forward to assume this expensive office.

1. Rostovzoeff, *SEHRE*, I, 321, II, 581, argues that the general tendency throughout the Empire was the growing concentration of landed property in the hands of a few owners. G. F. Hertzberg, *Histoire de la Grèce sous la Domination des Romains* (Paris 1887), II, 191-2, compares conditions in rural Greece in the first century B.C. with those in the Italian countryside ca. 200 B.C. Kahrstedt, *Das Wirtschaftliche Gesicht Griechenlands*, pp. 42-76, notes the existence of *latifundia* in Athens during the first and second century A.D.

2. Larsen, *Roman Greece*, p. 472, notes banking activity in Athens. J.H. Oliver, *The Athenian Expounders of the Ancestral Laws* (Baltimore 1949), p. 97, speculates on the origin of Hipparchus' wealth. L. B. Urdal, *Foreigners in Athens: A Study of Grave Monuments* (Unpublished dissertation, University of Chicago, 1959), p. 99, points out that the number of marriages between Athenians and non-Athenians reached its peak in the first century A.D.

3. For the technical aspects of Herodes' manoeuvres, see R. Bogaret, *Banques et banquiers dans les cités grecques* (Lyden 1968), pp. 33, 358-9. Oliver, «The Ruling Power», 955, notes that «he ended up with the surprised Athenians in debt to him».

landowners probably sold their estates to Hipparchus to settle their debts. Plutarch, a contemporary of Hipparchus, expressed his contempt for bankers. The biographer, who spent much time with the *πρωτοί* in Athens, probably was reflecting the general attitude of the Athenian upper class to bankers, particularly to Hipparchus¹.

Some of the Athenian *πρωτοί* hoped to escape their debts and save their estates by ruining Hipparchus. Thus a faction was formed against Hipparchus sometime in the A.D. 70's or A.D. 80's. One of the basic problems that the anti-Hipparchus faction faced was that the Claudii of Marathon provided the Emperors with clients to carry out Roman policy in the east, and it seems that Hipparchus was one of Vespasian's men in Athens. Emperors, however, were known to punish clients who abused their power in the free cities². The Athenian *πρωτοί* complained to Vespasian, perhaps through the proconsul of Achaëa administering at Corinth, that Hipparchus was oppressing his peers in Athens. According to Suetonius (*Ves.* 13), Salvius Liberalis, an extremely successful advocate who made a profession of defending venal senatorial governors, while pleading an unknown case, remarked: «What does the Emperor care if Hipparchus is a multi-millionaire?» Vespasian expressed approval of this remark. Clearly, the Athenian enemies of Hipparchus had managed to make their case well known in Rome, and Vespasian, through Liberalis, was telling these *delatores* to desist in their efforts to subvert the millionaire.

Domitian and his Successors

According to Philostratus (*VS.* 2. 1. 547), ὁ δὲ αὐτοκράτωρ οὐκ

Philostratus *VS.* 2. 1. 549, however, is specific here: οἱ μὲν μικρὰ ἡριθμοῦντο, οἱ δὲ οὐδέν, οἱ δὲ συνέλιγοντο ἐπ' ἀγορᾶς ὡς καὶ ἀποδώσοντες. For a discussion for the date of Atticus' death, see I. Avotins, «Bradua Atticus, The Consul of A.D. 185, and Bradua Atticus, the Proconsul of Africa», *Phoenix* 27 (1973) 74.

1. Plutarch *de vitando aere alieno* 10.7.813A. Plutarch wrote some of his *moralia* in the reign of Domitian, though this work probably was written after A.D. 96, see C. P. Jones, «Towards a Chronology of Plutarch's Works», *JRS* 56 (1966) 68 ff. Plutarch's comment on bankers may well have been based on observations made in Athens during the A.D. 60's and A.D. 70's. For Plutarch's sojourns in Athens, see Jones, *Plutarch and Rome*, pp. 13-20.

2. For an example of how Augustus dealt with a «tyrant» in a free city, see G. W. Bowersock, «Eurycles of Sparta», *JRS* 51 (1961) 112 ff.

ἡγγόρησεν. Either Domitian would not tolerate what Vespasian had, or Hipparchus had gone too far. Indeed Domitian's knowledge of Athenian affairs is surprising, for Pliny (*Paneg.* 79) notes that this Emperor was not accessible to provincial embassies. Athens, however, was a special case. Domitian held the eponymous archonship, and was the first of the Emperors to display a genuine enthusiasm for the violet crowned city¹. Philostratus (*VA.* 8. 15. 2), relates that a youth from Athens stated that Domitian was greatly appreciated in the city. While the *Life of Apollonius* is a dubious historical source, Graindor accepts the historicity of this passage, and suggests that the youth was an Athenian aristocrat². Apparently, Domitian was popular with a segment of the Athenian *πρωτοι*. The fact that he served as a city magistrate alone would indicate this.

Shortly after A.D. 90 conditions were favorable for a second effort to destroy Hipparchus. The impoverishment of the *πρωτοι* had reached the point where, as we have seen, it was difficult to find men willing to assume the expense of the archonship. Furthermore, Antoninus' abortive coup had triggered off a reign of terror in Rome³. Thus some Athenian aristocrats, the caliber of Regulus and Fabricius Veiento, notorious *delatores* in the court of Domitian, dredged up the old case against Hipparchus which Vespasian had rejected. They, apparently, accused Hipparchus of tyranny in Athens, and connected him with the plots against the Emperor. Hipparchus was probably condemned for *maiestas*. Herodes Atticus, too, faced combined charges of tyranny and treason. Had he been condemned it would have been on the latter charge⁴.

The Emperor had several motives for punishing the millionaire. According to Suetonius (*Dom.* 8. 2), Domitian administered the provinces justly. Presumably, this included the free cities, which were run by

1. See above p. 53, n. 4, and J.H. Oliver's comment in the discussion of R. Syme's, «Hadrian the Intellectual», *Les Empereurs Romains d'Espagne* (Madrid 1965), p. 251.

2. Graindor, *Athènes de Tibère*, p. 18. For the use of the *Life of Apollonius* as a historical source, see P. Grosso, «La vita di Apollonio di Tiana come fonte storica», *Acme* 7 (1954) 333 ff; and G. Bowersock in the introduction to the Penguin edition of Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius*, trans. by C. P. Jones (Penguin 1970), pp. 16-20.

3. Suetonius *Domitian* 10; and F. Grosso, «Aspetti della politica orientale di Domiziano», *Epigraphica* 17 (1955) 33 ff. For the date of Hipparchus' fall, see Graindor, *Hérode*, pp. 13-14.

4. Philostratus *V.S.* 2. 1. 559-560.

the Emperor's clients. Domitian, by ruining Hipparchus, broke the Athenian's economic stranglehold over many leading citizens. The *πρωτοί* assumed that their debts were cancelled, and they were now willing to undertake the costly liturgies of public office ¹.

Furthermore, Domitian coveted Hipparchus' extraordinary riches ². That the Emperor took much of Hipparchus' money is indicated in Philostratus *VS.* 2. 1. 548: Atticus found an enormous treasure in his house, and reported it to Nerva, who allowed him to keep the entire sum. Clearly, Hipparchus buried a portion of his money for his son to "discover" in better times. Hipparchus, however, could not hide a portion of his landed property, and it seems that Domitian confiscated his estates ³. There is a considerable degree of controversy and disagreement among modern historians as to which Emperor disposed of the land. Rostovtzeff argues that Trajan or Hadrian sold it to assist the yeoman farmer. Abbot-Johnson think it remained an imperial estate. Graindor followed by Day and Pleket maintain that Domitian sold the land ⁴. The latter view is the most persuasive. One would think that the Emperor who took Hipparchus' money would also wish to profit from his land ⁵. Domitian sold or leased Hipparchus' estates at very reasonable

1. The Athenians were surprised when Herodes presented them with the old debts, see Philostratus *VS.* 2. 1. 549. Apparently, they believed that Domitian had cancelled them.

2. R. Syme, «The Imperial Finances Under Domitian, Nerva, and Trajan», *JRS* 20 (1930) 65 ff., argues that Domitian followed a sound financial policy. C.H.V. Sutherland, «The State of the Imperial Treasure at the Death of Domitian», *JRS* 25 (1935) 150 ff., argues that Domitian was prodigal and virtually bankrupted the state. Whether Domitian confiscated money to hoard it or to spend it mattered little to Hipparchus.

3. *IG.* II-III², 1100, 3-5: οἱ τὰ Ἰππάρχου χωρία τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ φίσκου προθέντα κεκτημένοι. For a discussion of this decree, see P. Graindor, *Hadrien*, pp. 74-79; F.J. Abbot and A.C. Johnson, *Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire* 1926, pp. 411-43; J. Day, *An Economic History of Roman Athens* (New York 1942), pp. 189-192.

4. M. Rostovtzeff, *Studien zur Geschichte des römischen Kolonates* (Berlin 1910), p. 386; Abbot and Johnson, *Municipal Administration*, p. 413. Graindor, *Athènes de Tibère*, pp. 2-3, n. 4, thinks Domitian condemned Hipparchus for economic profit; Day, *Economic History of Athens*, p. 242, n. 372, expresses a similar view. Pleket cites the one-third and one-eighth clause in *IG.* II-III², 1100, to support his contention. This provision merely indicates that some one benefited from Hipparchus' estates; it does not reveal who benefited. Furthermore, there is no evidence pointing to a revival of the small yeoman farmer in Attica after Domitian.

5. See below p. 58, n. 2.

rates to Hipparchus' accusers as part of the informer's fee. This measure was calculated to assist the landed aristocracy rather than, as Rostovtzeff has it, the yeoman farmer.

Apparently, Nerva considered the condemnation of Hipparchus as partially unjust. Otherwise he would not have allowed Atticus to keep the money. Atticus reported his «find» before Nerva encountered economic difficulties, and established his Economy Commission. In A.D. 97, Nerva, who had become a *frugalissimus senex*, might have demanded the Emperor's share of Atticus' treasure¹. But Nerva did not give Hipparchus' land to Atticus.

According to Pliny (*Paneg.* 50. 2-3), Trajan restored, or sold property confiscated by Domitian. This Emperor, however, did not make restitutions to Atticus. Hadrian confirmed the privileges of those cultivating what formerly had been Hipparchus' property. According to the document referred to as Hadrian's Oil Law, those who produced olive oil on Hipparchus' former estate were obliged to sell one-eighth of it in Attica. Other cultivators had to sell one-third of their oil in Attica. Attic olive oil sold for more beyond the frontiers of Attica. Thus the cultivators of Hipparchus' lands made more money for their produce than their competitors².

Hadrian, a notorious philhellene and patron of Athens, knew the internal political situation in Athens better than any of his predecessors³. He, too, supported Domitian's Athenian policy, in part, by not giving Atticus the land of Hipparchus. Relations between Hadrian and Atticus were strained. Atticus, when he was *corrector* of the free cities of Asia, supervised the construction of an aqueduct at Alexandria Troas. He ran into construction delays and cost overruns which provoked a reproach from the Emperor. Atticus finished the aqueduct at his own expense⁴. One wonders what role the enemies of Hipparchus played in this affair.

1. For this institution, see Syme, «The Imperial Finances Under Domitian, Nerva, and Trajan», 59-61.

2. *IG.* II-III², 1100. For commentary, see Day, *Economic History of Athens*, pp. 189-192.

3. According to *Sylla* Had. 1. 5, Hadrian was referred to as *graeculus*, a contemptuous appellation. For the relationship of Hadrian with Athens, see Graindor, *Athènes sous Hadrien*, pp. 68-76.

4. Philostratus *VS.* 2. 1. 565; and Graindor, *Hérode*, pp. 47-8.

Hipparchus used his opulence to force the Athenian upper class to play a moderate role in the affairs of the city. Domitian rescued the Athenian *πρώτοι* by ruining Hipparchus, and by so doing filled the *fiscus*. Nerva, Trajan, and Hadrian partially corroborated Domitian's decision by not restoring the Hipparchus estate to his heirs. Nerva, however, tilted the balance of power in the favor of Hipparchus' descendants when he allowed Atticus to keep the «treasure»¹. Some of the Antonine Emperors, who had to deal with the exuberant Herodes Atticus, may have regretted Nerva's decision. Certainly, a segment of the Athenian upperclass, the Claudii of Melite, rued that Emperor's generosity.

East Carolina University

ANTHONY J. PAPALAS

1. Graindor, *Hérode*, pp. 20-23. Shortly after Atticus recovered a considerable portion of his patrimony, a *corrector*, Maximus, arrived in Athens. A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny: A Historical and Social Commentary* (Oxford 1966), p. 479, thinks that Maximus was sent to Athens to deal with problems caused by Domitian's Balkan campaigns. One might well conjecture that Maximus was dispatched to Athens to investigate Atticus' meteoric rise, and to prevent Atticus from becoming another Hipparchus. Tod, «The Corrector Maximus», *Anatolian Studies Presented to W. H. Buckler*, (Manchester 1923), pp. 333-38, suggests that Maximus was the grandfather of the Quintilii, the praetorian proconsul of Achaëa and the legate, who opposed Herodes, see Philostratus *V.S.* 2. 1. 559. If indeed there was such a relationship, and if Maximus did deal with Hipparchus' estate, it is easy to understand the hostility between Herodes and the Quintilii.