

CHIRON

MITTEILUNGEN
DER KOMMISSION FÜR ALTE GESCHICHTE
UND EPIGRAPHIK
DES DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

BAND 13 · 1983



C. H. BECK'SCHE VERLAGSBUCHHANDLUNG
MÜNCHEN

Rufus Lollianus Avitus, anscheinend Statthalter von Africa.¹⁵ ALFÖLDY hebt das außerordentlich kurze Intervall von 13 Jahren zwischen Konsulat und Prokonsulat hervor und sieht den Grund hierfür darin, «daß die ehemaligen *consules ordinarii* bei der Vergabe der Prokonsulate von Africa und Asia bevorzugt behandelt wurden».¹⁶ Diese Bedingung trifft für den *consul ordinarius* Statilius Maximus in derselben Weise wie für seinen Kollegen Hedius Rufus zu, so daß man mit großer Wahrscheinlichkeit 157/158 als Amtsjahr für die Statthalterschaft von beiden ansehen kann. Marc Aurels Brief würde in diesem Falle vom 28. März 158 stammen; die Geburt des früh verstorbenen Sohnes fiel mithin in den Winter 157/158.¹⁷

Geht man dagegen vom folgenden Jahr 158/159 als Amtsjahr des Statilius aus, hätte Marc Aurel seinen Brief am 28. März 159 geschrieben; damit wäre die chronologische Reihenfolge der einzelnen Dokumente der Inschrift, die KRIEGER sicher zu Recht postuliert, durchbrochen.

Die Jahre 158/159 bzw. 159/160¹⁸ (in denen wohl zwei weitere Töchter geboren wurden; s. o.), kommen daher als Amtsjahre für den Prokonsul – und als Geburtsjahre für den früh verstorbenen Sohn – nicht mehr in Betracht. Vielmehr wird Statilius Maximus 157/158 in Asia – im selben Jahr wie sein Konsulats-Kollege in Africa – als Statthalter amtiert haben. Damit ist für die Prosopographie dieser Zeit T. Atilius Maximus zu streichen und der Platz für den Prokonsul von Asia im Jahr 146/147¹⁹ ist wieder unbesetzt.²⁰

¹⁵ ALFÖLDY a. O. 114,37; 208; 274.

¹⁶ a. O. 114. Im Einzelfall mögen auch noch andere Gründe (z. B. hohe Kinderzahl) für das kurze Intervall eine Rolle gespielt haben.

¹⁷ Möglicherweise ist auf Grund dieser neuen Datierung STRACKS Deutung von Münzbildern auf Domitia Faustinas Geburt im Jahr 157 (s. Anm. 10) zu modifizieren. Der zeitliche Rahmen für die einzelnen Typen, die nach seiner Meinung (a. O. 119) auf dieses Ereignis hinweisen, ist mehr oder minder vage; die ins Jahr 157 datierte Darstellung der Spes (p. 290f., Nr. 1138) mag sich nicht, wie STRACK annimmt, auf die bevorstehende Geburt der Domitia Faustina, sondern eben auf den in Smyrna erwähnten Sohn beziehen. Möglicherweise wurde Domitia Faustina, die ebenfalls nur kurz lebte, vor diesem Sohn (im Jahr 156?) geboren.

¹⁸ Terminus ante quem ist jedenfalls das Jahr von Marc Aurels drittem Konsulat (161); vgl. Z. 5 ὑπατος τὸ β'.

¹⁹ ALFÖLDY a. O. 270.

²⁰ Den von ALFÖLDY a. O. 274 ins Jahr 157/158 datierten Prokonsul von Asia [– –] Gratian kann man ohne Schwierigkeiten in das a. O. 143f. ebenfalls in Betracht gezogene Jahr 156/157 umdatieren. – W. ECK danke ich für Hinweise.

ROBERT A. KASTER

The Salaries of Libanius

For the history of education and society in the Eastern Roman Empire of the fourth century, we always come back to Libanius, the sophist of Antioch (314–393). Libanius' works pullulate with incomparably detailed evidence concerning the appointments, the salaries, the rivalries, and the patronage that made or broke the careers of *grammatici* and rhetors. This paper attempts to give an account of one corner of that great field of information, the salaries enjoyed by Libanius himself.¹

During most of his career Libanius was one of an elite class of teachers who throughout the imperial period had been marked by extraordinary privileges or material advantages because of their skills, or their social status and political connections, or both. We are here concerned with one of those advantages: the public salaries given to specially selected teachers, as payments distinct from, and more prestigious than, the gifts or fees from individual students and their parents on which the general run of teachers depended. Such public salaries were of two types, municipal and imperial. Municipal salaries were derived from a city's reve-

¹ For the sake of convenience I list here the most important works bearing on the topic, cited below by author's name (or name and abbreviated title): S. F. BONNER, *The Edict of Gratian on the Remuneration of Teachers*, *AJPh* 86 (1965), 113–137; H. F. BOUCHERY, *Themistius in Libanius' Brieven* (Antwerp, 1936); C. A. FORBES, *Teachers' Pay in Ancient Greece* (Lincoln, Nebr., 1942); J. H. W. G. LIEBESCHUETZ, *Antioch: City and Imperial Administration in the Later Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1972); A. MÜLLER, *Studentenleben im 4. Jahrhundert n. Chr.*, *Philol.* 69 (1910), 292–317; A. F. NORMAN, *Libanius' Autobiography* (*Oration I*) (London, New York and Toronto, 1965); P. PETIT, *Libanius et la vie municipale à Antioche au IV^e siècle après J.-C.* (Paris, 1955); IDEM, *Les étudiants de Libanius* (Paris, 1956); F. SCHEMMELE, *Der Sophist Libanios als Schüler und Lehrer*, *NJb* 20 (1907), 52–69; O. SEECK, *Die Briefe des Libanius zeitlich geordnet*, *TU* 30 (Leipzig, 1906); G. R. SIEVERS, *Das Leben des Libanius* (Berlin, 1868); H. SILOMON, *De Libanii epistularum libris I–VI* (Diss. Göttingen, 1909); J. W. H. WALDEN, *The Universities of Ancient Greece* (New York, 1909); P. WOLF, *Vom Schulwesen der Spätantike: Studien zu Libanius* (Baden-Baden, 1952). The following abbreviations are also used: JONES, *LRE* = A. H. M. JONES, *The Later Roman Empire, 284–602: A Social, Economic, and Administrative Survey* 2 vols. (Norman, Okla., 1964); *PLRE I* = IDEM, J. R. MARTINDALE and J. MORRIS, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire: Volume I. A.D. 260–395* (Cambridge, 1971). Unless otherwise stated, the dates of Libanius' letters are adapted from SEECK, *Briefe*.

nues,² and were paid to teachers appointed to a public «chair» by the local town council. Imperial salaries, on the other hand, were drawn from imperial funds, and by Libanius' time were paid in kind.³ At the earliest stages, imperial salaries were limited to teachers with special appointment in the imperial city, Rome, or in a city that might be the special object of the emperor's favor: in the fourth century, similar imperial salaries attached to public «chairs» are attested at Constantinople soon after its foundation as the second Rome.⁴

But in the fourth century it is also possible to see a significant extension of the salaries given teachers from imperial funds: as is especially clear in the evidence from the East, even teachers active at some fairly obscure cities far from the imperial center could hope to win a place on the imperial payroll. This late expansion of the central government's support of teachers further blurred the distinction (already somewhat effaced, from the second century onward) between local and imperial authority in the area of education: in this respect the expansion can be viewed as part of the changed relations between city and central government that distinguish the history of late antiquity more generally. We will not, however, be concerned here with the origins of this expansion, or with the other, broader questions that follow from it and concern the balance of power between the two spheres of government. Our goal is more modest: to examine as precisely as possible the ways in which one politically agile and well-connected teacher could juggle appointments in the two spheres, and use the advantages derived from his imperial connections to enhance his prestige in his native town.

The inquiry must be limited to a relatively well-documented span of fourteen years in the middle of Libanius' career, from his summons to Constantinople in 349, to a letter written in the Winter of 362/363. By the earlier date Libanius had put his education, at his native Antioch and at Athens, behind him, and had been teaching as a sophist for nearly a decade: after briefly holding an appointment at Athens (in 340), he had tried his luck as a private teacher at Constantinople; driven from the capital in 342/343 by a conspiracy of other teachers (jealous, Libanius says, of his success), he received a public appointment at Nicaea, and very soon thereafter at Nicomedia, where he later recalled having spent five of the most blissful years of his life (343–348).⁵ But no document tells us anything of his salaries at

² For the mode of payment (cash vs. kind), see below n. 61.

³ Calculated, as were most imperial salaries, with the *annona* (the yearly ration of a common soldier) as the basic unit of measure: see esp. CTh. 13.3.11 (with my discussion, «A Reconsideration of «Gratian's School-Law»» *Hermes* [forthcoming]); and on salaries in kind, JONES, *LRE* pp. 396 ff., and Parts I–III, *passim*, below.

⁴ For the existence of chairs at Constantinople, and the mechanics of appointment, see Part I below.

⁵ Athens: or. 1.25; 2.13–14. Constantinople: or. 1.37 (see below, Part I), Eun. v. soph. 16.1.6. From Constantinople to Nicaea and Nicomedia: or. 1.44–73 (cf. ep. 206, 557, 901), Eun. v. soph. 16.1.7.

Athens, Nicaea, or Nicomedia in that period; nor are we better informed about the period after our story ends, although Libanius continued to teach and write at Antioch for some thirty years.⁶

I have tried in the following pages to set out the evidence, and explore its difficulties, as fully as possible. It seemed advisable to proceed in this fashion, rather than more compendiously, for two reasons. First, earlier accounts have treated only part of the evidence, and have been only partially successful in teasing sure or probable conclusions from the evidence presented in Libanius' periphrastic and allusive style: so even the best modern account, the admirable synthesis of P. PETIT, is not as complete as it should be and is demonstrably wrong at several critical points. Second, I would not expect that all my own conclusions will find universal acceptance, precisely because the data are fragmentary and often ambiguous. I have thought it useful, therefore, to provide other students of late antique education with a full repertory of sources and argument. The presentation is divided for coherence' sake into four sections: Libanius' experience at Constantinople (Part I); the period when he was in suspense between Constantinople and Antioch (Part II); and his position at Antioch (Parts III and IV). There is a brief summary at the paper's end.

I. At Constantinople

After holding public appointments in Nicaea and Nicomedia, Libanius returned in 349 to Constantinople, where he had previously been active as a private teacher. Our picture of Libanius' position on his return must be pieced together from the clues provided by four passages in the «Autobiography»:

1) or. 1.35 describes a certain Cappadocian sophist appointed to his official chair by the emperor following the request of the Senate: ἦκοντα ἐπὶ θρόνον βασιλέως πέμποντος [«having come to his chair at the direction of the emperor»], καὶ γὰρ ἐτύγχανεν ἡ βουλὴ τὸν ἄνδρα ἡτηκυῖα, ῥήτορα ἄκρον ἐξ οἰμαί τινος ἀγῶνος ἐνὸς αἰτησαμένη.

2) At or. 1.37, the distinction between officially appointed and private teachers is expressed in terms of the possession or absence of an imperial salary (τὸ τῶν βασιλέως ἐσθίειν / ἡ τροφή παρ' ἐκείνου): imagining the account that a disinterested observer might give of his victories, while still a private teacher, in competitions with the official sophists of the capital, Libanius says that he would remark ὡς οὐδὲν ἐλάττωμα εἰς τὸν στέφανον τὸ μὴ τῶν βασιλέως ἐσθίειν. τοῖς μὲν οὖν ἡ τροφή παρ' ἐκείνου πολλή, πατέρες δὲ ἡμᾶς τῶν φοιτητῶν ἐβόσκον ...

⁶ Note, however, that Libanius' reflections on his career (the «Autobiography», or. 1) were set down in different stages, in his old age (cf. A.F. NORMAN, p. xiif; P. PETIT and J. MARTIN, *Libanius. Discours. Tome I. Autobiographie* [Paris, 1979], pp. 1–7): the passages adduced below all belong to that part of the work composed in 374, and thus offer the version of events that Libanius recalled, or chose to present, at that time.

3) or. 1.74: Libanius tries to persuade the praetorian prefect Philippus not to demand his return to Constantinople from Nicomedia, but yields to an imperial invitation: ἀπελθὼν [sc. ὁ ὑπαρχος] ὡς δὴ οὐκ ἐπαναγκάσων, ἀνάγκη μεταφέρει μείζονι, βασιλείοις γράμμασιν).

4) At or. 1.80, Libanius describes the favor he enjoyed from a series of proconsuls of Constantinople, culminating in special honors received in 352/353: τῶν γὰρ δὴ ἀρχόντων αἰ τοῦ δευτέρου τὸν πρότερον ταῖς εἰς ἐμὲ σπουδαῖς τε καὶ τιμαῖς παριόντος ὁ τέταρτος Φοῖνιξ ἀνὴρ ὑπὸ Χαρίτων κυβερνώμενος δόγμα ἡμελημένον ἀνανεοῦται τῆς βουλῆς, καὶ βασιλεὺς συνησθεὶς τῇ πόλει τοιαῦτα ψηφίζομένη μυρίαὶς με κατακοσμεῖ δωρεαῖς, ὧν αἱ μὲν ἀξίωσιν, αἱ δὲ πρόσδοτον ἔφερον, ὥστε ἄνευ τῶν περὶ γῆν φροντίδων τὰ τῶν γεωργούντων ἔχειν.

From these passages one can draw the following conclusions:

a) The imperial summons (βασιλεία γράμματα, or. 1.74) should in itself imply an official appointment for Libanius: that would seem to be the natural inference, especially in view of or. 1.35 (ἡκοντα ἐπὶ θρόνον βασιλέως πέμποντος).⁷

b) That in turn should imply that Libanius *qua* official teacher received an imperial salary (τροφή): such, again, is the natural inference, especially in view of the distinction drawn in or. 1.37 (above).⁸

c) The measures to which Libanius refers at or. 1.80 must therefore be distinguished from any regular appointment or salary: they are «exceptionnelles et honorifiques, comme il le note avec fierté.»⁹ But what exactly did those measures involve? It is perhaps possible to assume, with A. F. NORMAN,¹⁰ that «this patronage [sc. of the Phoenician proconsul] secures for [Libanius], besides his current professional salary, extra emoluments from the city, awarded by this decree [viz. the δόγμα ἡμελημένον], and from the imperial fiscus, in the form of revenue from land»: the substance of the δόγμα, which is the crux of the matter, is vague enough in all conscience, and may conceivably have involved some emolument. It is, however, very noticeable that Libanius speaks of financial benefit in the passage *only* in connection with the emperor's gifts (ὧν αἱ μὲν ἀξίωσιν, αἱ δὲ πρόσδοτον ἔφερον).

⁷ The Senate had the competence to request or advise (cf. or. 1.35), but the real power of appointment certainly rested with the emperor: thus we know that even after the law of 425 formally charging the Senate with the *aestimatio* of publicly appointed teachers (CTh. 6.21.1, cf. G. DAGRON, *Naissance d'une capitale: Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451* [Paris, 1974], p. 222 f.) the emperor on his own summoned or appointed teachers, cf. Ioan. Lyd. *de mag.* III.29, Agath. *Hist.* V.6,5 f. KEYDELL.

⁸ So, for example, P. PETIT, Libanius p. 409; the only alternative suggestion, that Libanius did not become an official, salaried teacher until the δόγμα mentioned in or. 1.80 (implied by A. MÜLLER, p. 296; JONES, *LRE* p. 1293 n. 47; J. H. W. G. LIEBESCHUETZ, p. 44 nn. 2,3), can hardly be correct: Libanius there speaks of «gifts», not a salary; and the revival of a «decree that had fallen into desuetude» (δόγμα ἡμελημένον) must certainly allude to some measure more exquisite than the ordinary nomination of a teacher (cf. or. 1.35) to an official post.

⁹ P. PETIT, Libanius p. 409; similarly G. R. SIEVERS, p. 38, A. F. NORMAN, p. 169.

¹⁰ Loc. cit. n. 9.

If, therefore, one is going to make any assumption about the δόγμα at all, it should be an assumption diametrically opposed to NORMAN's: that the δόγμα was purely honorific, that its renewal was part of and a climax to the «earnest regard» (σπουδαῖς τε καὶ τιμαῖς) in which Libanius was held by the other proconsuls, and that the honor was approved and amplified by the emperor, who added his own «countless gifts», both honorific (ἀξίωσις) and financial (πρόσδοτος sc. from land).¹¹ Whichever assumption one makes concerning the δόγμα ἡμελημένον, two points relevant to the subsequent discussion should be emphasized: 1) the measures described in or. 1.80 are extraordinary, and distinct from Libanius' salary; 2) the interpretation of the passage by P. PETIT is certainly wrong.¹²

The evidence thus far would suggest, therefore, that from his return at the imperial summons in 349, Libanius was an officially appointed sophist with an imperial salary, and that in 352/353 he received in addition, certainly (the income from) a property as a gift of the emperor, and possibly – but in my view not probably – some other emolument from the city. There is nothing in what we have seen which would allow us to speak of a purely «municipal» salary received by Libanius (or any other teacher) at Constantinople.

II. Between Constantinople and Antioch

The documentation for this episode is more extensive, the problems of interpretation more complex. The presentation is organized below according to the discrete phases that seem to be revealed by the evidence (§§ 1–8): questions are addressed as they arise, and the results are summarized at the conclusion.

1) Having spent the Summer of 353 in Antioch with a temporary leave from Constantinople, Libanius returns to the capital and his teaching in the Autumn (or. 1.86–92). Yet after several months (late Winter 353/354) Libanius again goes to Antioch,¹³ again with a temporary leave, granted by the emperor in response to claims of ill-health which Libanius later admits were fictive (or. 1.94–95). Al-

¹¹ Thus the accurate paraphrase in PLRE I, p. 505: «[Libanius] was highly regarded by a succession of proconsuls and obtained honors and property through the emperor's gift.»

¹² Libanius p. 409, «à son traitement régulier [cf. n. 8 above] s'ajoutèrent deux indemnités officielles, l'une de la ville, accordée par un «décret du Sénat», et une de l'empereur, toutes deux représentées par le revenu de propriétés, l'une municipale, l'autre impériale» (emphasis added): whatever «indemnité» one might imagine Libanius to have received from the «ville» as a result of the δόγμα, it is evidently impossible to deduce from the passage (specifically, from the ὥστε-clause) that it was a «propriété ... municipale», since the γῆ there mentioned can only refer to the emperor's gift; the misreading (followed by G. DAGRON, [op. cit. n. 7] p. 534, in whose argument all mention of the emperor disappears) fundamentally vitiates PETIT's explication of the problems involved in Part II below, see esp. at n. 27.

¹³ Certainly before March 354, cf. A. F. NORMAN, p. 173.

though still an officially appointed sophist at Constantinople,¹⁴ he is now clearly resolved upon remaining in Antioch: indeed, he begins to teach there, setting up first as a private instructor, and then receiving an official appointment from the city in the Autumn of 354.¹⁵

2) Libanius' correspondence refers thereafter to attempts to secure his return to Constantinople, taking the form of a friend's persuasion¹⁶ and letters from the emperor,¹⁷ and dating from the Spring through early Winter of 355. Resisting these attempts, Libanius insists that ill-health, formerly alleged as an excuse, is now a painful fact and would only be worsened by a return to the «chill north»;¹⁸ that his family needs him at Antioch (ep. 409); and that Constantinople is not in any case a congenial place for his talents.¹⁹ At the same time, he is found enlisting the support of a number of men with influence at court, in the «struggle» (ἀγῶλοι) against his recall and for his «release».²⁰

3) Toward the end of this period (viz. early Winter 355), the attempts to secure Libanius' return appear to increase in urgency and formality: so much is probably to be inferred from ep. 439.2, which refers not only to a second letter (sc. from the emperor) but also to a «decree» (sc. of the Senate);²¹ and possibly from ep. 440.3, which asks the courtier Palladius to help block his recall and «do the excellent emperor the favor that a man who has done much to sing his praises suffer nothing unworthy of his judgment.»²² Certainly, some formal measure appears to underlie the comment made by Libanius in a letter to Andronicus (ep. 446.4, early Winter 355), viz. «that I am stripped of my honors among you [= at Constantinople] and will be compelled to come to you [i.e. return to the capital]» (ὡς ἀφῆρημαι τῶν παρ' ὑμῖν τιμῶν καὶ ὡς ἀναγκαζοίμην παρ' ὑμῶν ἐλθεῖν: cf. n. 31 below).

4) Also in early Winter 355, Libanius writes urgently to his cousin Spectatus at court, ep. 449.2: «as for my fears, I know that you will relieve them, but let speed also attend the favor» (τοὺς φόβους δὲ ἡμῖν ὅτι μὲν ἀναιρήσεις οἶδα, προσέστω δὲ καὶ τάχος τῇ χάριτι). It appears that Spectatus could soon make a favorable re-

port: for Libanius, writing to his uncle Phasganius not long after (ep. 454.2–3, Winter 355/356), says, «I've received no unsettling letter, and Spectatus has good news to announce. That madman who is in the process of destroying the great city not only transferred to others, in accordance with the emperor's judgement, the sustenance which I was reaping from the city (ἦν ... ἐκαρπούμην ἐκ τῆς πόλεως τροφήν), but is actually trying to exact money from me (καὶ χρυσὸν εἰσπράττει δὴ με), having sent a dispatch to the ἄρχων. On account of these (measures) Strategius became so annoyed that he raised a hue and cry as never before. And indeed this business makes the man [= Strategius] well-disposed toward me: for he reckons that whoever is hated by that man [= the «madman»] ought to benefit from himself.»

The *dramatis personae* here are the «madman», that is, the proconsul of Constantinople;²³ an ἄρχων, probably the consular of Syria;²⁴ and the praetorian prefect Strategius. Acting on the γνώμη of the emperor, the proconsul had transferred Libanius' τροφή to others (presumably other teachers) and had taken the further step of attempting to exact some sort of payment from Libanius, evidently to be carried out through the office of the governor of Syria at Antioch: by the latter measure it was probably intended that Libanius should repay in cash (χρυσός) that portion of his salary in kind (τροφή) received since his remove to Antioch.²⁵ These punitive moves were apparently blocked by Strategius: at least, since Libanius is clearly pleased and relieved, we can reasonably assume that Strategius' intervention was not limited to mere βοή. But Libanius evidently was still not freed from his fear of being recalled to Constantinople (see § 6 below).

Ep. 454 thus shows that Libanius had, for the moment, survived a crisis which had begun to build in early Winter 355 and reached its peak several months later. To understand that crisis more fully, we must now pause to answer two questions: a) what exactly does Libanius mean by ἦν ... ἐκαρπούμην ἐκ τῆς πόλεως τροφήν, which the proconsul of Constantinople had attempted to transfer to others (ep. 454)? and b) what are the relations among the stages of the crisis noted in ep. 439, 446, 449, and 454 (§§ 3–4 above)?

As regards ep. 454 ἦν ... ἐκαρπούμην ἐκ τῆς πόλεως τροφήν, it is at first sight quite reasonable to take the words by themselves to mean that Libanius was drawing some part of his «sustenance» from municipal, as opposed to imperial, sources at Constantinople:²⁶ thus the attempt of P. PETIT to find a «municipal property»

¹⁴ Cf. or. I.100 and further below.

¹⁵ On Libanius' appointment at Antioch, see part IV below, at n. 62.

¹⁶ Implied by ep. 399.

¹⁷ See ep. 405.13; 432.8; 438.6; 439; cf. 435.12, 440, and below.

¹⁸ See ep. 405.13; 430.3 ff.; 434.4; 438.7; 440.2–3; 473; and cf. ep. 479.

¹⁹ See ep. 399.3–4; 434.4; 441.3–5; cf. or. I.76.

²⁰ ἄφεσις, ep. 439.1; for the pursuit of patronage, see his correspondence with Datianus (ep. 409; 441; and cf. or. I.94), Iovianus (ep. 411; 435.12 f.), Italicianus (ep. 413.3), Olympius (ep. 439, cf. 413.3), Anatolius (ep. 438), Palladius (ep. 440), Calliopius (ep. 442.2), Spectatus (ep. 449); perhaps also Bassus (ep. 467.1), and cf. below n. 36.

²¹ Ep. 439.2 ἴσθι δὲ καὶ δευτέραν ἡκεῖν ἐκείθεν ἐπιστολήν ταῦτά μὲν ἐπιτάττουσαν, μαθεῖν δὲ οὐ παρέχουσιν οὐθ' ὡς νωτέρα τοῦ ψηφίσματος οὐθ' ὡς προτέρα γένοιτο. Cf. on ep. 446 below.

²² Ep. 440.3 ἀλλ', ὦ πραότατε, μήτ' ἐμὲ περιτίδης ἐκ τῆς κλίνης ἀποσπώμενον τῷ τε ἀρίστῳ βασιλεῖ χάρισαι τὸ μηδὲν ἀνάξιον τῆς αὐτοῦ γνώμης εἰς ἄνδρα πράττεσθαι πολλά εἰς ἐκείνον ᾄσαντα (alluding to or. 59).

²³ P. PETIT, Libanius p. 409, says praetorian prefect, evidently a slip, see below. Of known proconsuls, the only likely candidate seems to be Iustinus (= Iustinus 2, PLRE I. p. 489), certainly in office as of 1 Sept. 355, cf. H. F. BOUCHERY, p. 93 n. 5.

²⁴ At this time Libanius' friend Gymnasium? Cf. PLRE I s. v. 2, p. 405.

²⁵ Cf. J. W. H. WALDEN, p. 176, P. PETIT, Libanius p. 409, J. H. W. G. LIEBESCHUETZ, p. 44 n. 2, and below.

²⁶ Cf. or. 31.20 ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δυοῖν εἵδεσι λημμάτων ἐκκαρποῦται τὴν πόλιν, of Zenobius and his municipal emoluments at Antioch (on which see further Part IV below).

among the «indemnities» granted Libanius in 352/353 (or. 1.80). But the fault in that attempt has been remarked;²⁷ and in fact any other attempt to find a reference to purely «municipal» funds in ep. 454 must overcome three obstacles. (a) No other source refers to teachers at Constantinople deriving their salary or enjoying a special grant from municipal, as distinct from imperial, funds. (b) Neither in or. 1 nor elsewhere does Libanius clearly or even very probably refer to any regular benefit derived from municipal funds at the capital: thus the official sophists at Constantinople are by definition those who draw an imperial salary («eat the emperor's bread», or. 1.37, Part I above); while the only reference from which municipal funds could possibly be deduced, the δόγμα ἡμελημένον of or. 1.80a would not seem on any interpretation to refer to an ordinary salary, but to some special gift or emolument. Yet (c) it is surely an ordinary salary, not a special gift or grant, that is concerned in ep. 454: thus Libanius' statement that the τροφή was «transferred» makes better sense if a salary is involved, and the attempt to exact repayment makes still better sense in that case. One should also recall here that Libanius commonly uses τροφή, with the kindred terms σῖτος and πυρός, to refer to a salary paid in kind – and an *imperial* salary at that;²⁸ and this in turn is eminently consistent with the other circumstances mentioned in the letter, viz. that the proconsul relied on the γνώμη of the emperor in making the transfer, that the repayment was to be made through the office of the governor of Syria, and that these measures were blocked by the influence of the praetorian prefect, through whose apparatus the imperial τροφαί were paid out. On the available evidence, then, it is very difficult to come to any conclusion save that the τροφή at issue in ep. 454 was Libanius' salary, as official sophist at Constantinople, from imperial funds.²⁹ One must then suppose that Libanius is using ἐκ τῆς πόλεως loosely, or in a purely locative sense: writing *at* Antioch, Libanius speaks of the «sustenance» which he was drawing *from* Constantinople, in connection with his position at the capital (ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ≈ ἐκεῖθεν, cf. ep. 439.2, 572.1).

Our second question, concerning the stages of the crisis, can be put as follows: were the actions of the proconsul mentioned in ep. 454 identical with the measures previously referred to in ep. 446.4 (ὡς ἀφήρηται τῶν παρ' ὑμῖν τιμῶν καὶ ὡς ἀναγκαζοίμην παρ' ὑμᾶς ἐλθεῖν)? So much seems to be suggested by the sequence of ep. 446, 449, 454 (§§ 3–4 above): in the first, Libanius speaks of steps taken

against him; in the second, he writes to Spectatus begging his swift intercession; and in the third he reports the good news received from Spectatus, the import of which has been discussed above.

Yet while this sequence makes good sense in itself, it does not quite fit the substance of Libanius' remarks: for the contents of ep. 446 and 454 do not square with each other as snugly as we should expect if they referred to the same measures. First, Libanius says in ep. 446 that he has been stripped of αἱ παρ' ὑμῖν τιμαί, while ep. 454 involves the loss of his τροφή: this is perhaps a relatively minor point, however, since it would be quite possible for Libanius to use the two terms, τιμή and τροφή, interchangeably.³⁰ More important, Libanius speaks in ep. 446 of his being compelled to return to Constantinople, whereas this provision is not mentioned among the measures described in ep. 454; and indeed that silence is understandable, since if those measures had been carried out – his salary taken away and repayment exacted – that would presumably have been tantamount to a severing of the ties that bound him to the capital (cf. on ep. 572, § 7 below). Conversely, the step which Libanius mentions with special emphasis (καὶ ... δὴ) in ep. 454, the exaction of repayment, is not mentioned at all in ep. 446.

We have grounds, then, for suggesting an alternative sequence. Ep. 446 means just what it says: Libanius has been stripped of *honors* – viz. the special honors alluded to in or. 1.80, received from a series of proconsuls and culminating in the Senate's revival of the δόγμα ἡμελημένον; and since it was a resolution of the Senate which had conferred the latter honor, one can also suggest that the Senate rescinded the same honor with the ψήφισμα mentioned in ep. 439 (§ 3 above). But although he had been thus «dis-honored», Libanius was still an officially appointed sophist and so under obligation to return.³¹ Ep. 454 will then refer to a separate and further stage in the proceedings against Libanius, which must have begun between the time of ep. 446 and that of ep. 449 or (perhaps less likely) between ep. 449 and ep. 454: this stage now involves the γνώμη of the emperor and entails the transfer of Libanius' salary and the still more galling step of exacting repayment. While these measures were blocked by the influence of Strategius, and Libanius thus saved the indignity and expense of reimbursement, he was still left without the desired release, which he did not receive until some months later (ep. 480, § 6 below).

²⁷ Cf. n. 12 above. PETIT's (somewhat circular) reading of or. 1.80 and ep. 454 was rightly rejected by S. F. BONNER, p. 131 n. 71.

²⁸ Apart from places where βασιλική or some comparable, specifying expression is used (or. 1.37, ep. 132, 207, 572; see also or. 42.26), see ep. 28 (τροφαί), 348 (τροφή), 740 (τροφή), with ep. 258 (σῖτος, perhaps referring to the same matter as ep. 28, 740, see below Part III, at n. 56), 356 (σῖτος), 545 (σῖτος), or. 1.110 (πυροί, cf. ep. 28, 800).

²⁹ And so the same as ἡ ἐκ βασιλέως τροφή in ep. 572 (on which see below, § 7): that the same salary is meant was assumed by J. W. H. WALDEN, p. 173 f. (while entertaining the possibility that it was paid partly from «city funds»); more equivocally, C. A. FORBES, p. 52.

³⁰ See ep. 740.1 κατήγαγεν ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν τιμὴν ὁ χρηστὸς Σαλούτιος (referring to Libanius' imperial τροφή, cf. n. 28 above and Part III below), and cf. ep. 132.3 τιμὰ τὸν παιδεύτην ἡμῖν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῇ βασιλικῇ τροφῇ; possibly also ep. 907.3 (the τιμαὶ παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως requested by the Antiochene curia for Eusebius, assistant teacher of Libanius, cf. S. F. BONNER, p. 130).

³¹ Cf. the full context of Libanius' remarks, ep. 446.4 σοὺ δὲ ἐθαύμασα λέγοντος ὡς ἀφήρηται τῶν παρ' ὑμῖν τιμῶν καὶ ὡς ἀναγκαζοίμην παρ' ὑμᾶς ἐλθεῖν, πλὴν εἰ τοῦτο λέγοις, ὡς τοῖς ἐκεῖσε ἰοῦσιν ἀτιμία πρέπει. τοῦτο δὲ ὁρθῶς ἀν' λέγοις: his correspondent Andronicus had evidently made some such comment as, «You've been stripped of your honors here and will be forced to return,» to which Libanius in effect replies, ««Stripped of honors» indeed! Everyone who goes there is dishonored.»

Of these two possible sequences, the first has the advantage of being more concise, while the latter seems to make a better fit with the available facts. Although I do not see how one or the other can be proved or disproved, I am inclined to think that the second is more likely to approach the truth.

5) Soon after the events described in ep. 454, Agroecius, acting as Libanius' agent, is in Constantinople to collect a cash debt,³² and bears letters to Themistius and Photius,³³ whose help in the same matter is sought (ep. 463, 464, Winter 355/356).

I have noted here the arrival of Agroecius in Constantinople, because others have regularly assumed that ep. 463 and 464 are involved in Libanius' struggles: thus, it has been suggested most commonly that Agroecius' mission was part of an attempt by Libanius to collect some «arrears» in his salary after the successful intervention of Strategius.³⁴ That assumption, however, seems unwarranted. First, it is evident that no arrears would have been owed to Libanius from the period *before* the action threatened by the proconsul Iustinus (ep. 454), because Libanius' τροφή must have been paid out to him the entire time that he had been in Antioch, as the very attempt to exact restitution shows. On the other hand, the time between the steps described in ep. 454 and the mission of Agroecius could *at most* have amounted to a couple of months: yet Libanius states (ep. 463.3) that the debt represents money «of which I have been deprived for a long time (πολὸν χρόνον).» In other words, it would appear that the inclusion of ep. 463, 464 in the discussion of Libanius' salaries has, in the past, been the result of trying to draw the net too tight: it is probably fortuitous that Agroecius' mission is found coming hard on the heels of ep. 454; and the debt in question probably belongs to the time when Libanius maintained a household in Constantinople.³⁵

6) In Spring 356, when Libanius is still concerned lest he be recalled to Constantinople (or, as he puts it, μή με ἀποστερήσῃ τῶν οἰκείων, ὧν ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν ἐνιαιτὸν ἤδη νοσῶ), he learns that «the emperor has resolved to let the valetudi-

³² Ep. 463.3 ἥκει δὲ [sc. Ἀγροίκιος] ἐπὶ τὸ χρυσίον, ep. 464.2 (addressing Photius) νῦν δὲ, οὐ πολὺν χρόνον ἀπεστέρημαι χρυσίου, τοῦτο εἰσπράξας ἀπόσπελλε.

³³ Proconsul of Constantinople (so PLRE I s.v., p. 700f., G. DAGRON, [op. cit. n. 7] p. 223), successor of Iustinus (cf. n. 23 above)? O. SEECK, Briefe p. 325, suggested consular of Europa.

³⁴ «Arrears»: see J. W. H. WALDEN, p. 176 (similarly C. A. FORBES, p. 52) and P. PETIT, Libanius p. 409; cf. also J. H. W. G. LIEBESCHUETZ, p. 44 n. 2. Another suggestion, that Strategius not only stopped the prosecution of Libanius but actually engineered an increase in his salary which it is the business of ep. 463, 464 to claim (O. SEECK, Briefe p. 325, followed by H. F. BOUCHERY, pp. 62, 93, 95), seems unlikely on its face.

³⁵ So PLRE I s.v. Photius, p. 701 (with reference to ep. 464), «a debt . . . , probably one incurred when he was still living in Constantinople»; and note ep. 464.2 (the preamble of the request to Photius) εἰ μὲν οὖν ἦν παρ' ὑμῖν, ψκοδόμησα ἄν [FOERSTER: ψκοδόμησαν libri] μοι: ψκοδόμησα scarcely seems intelligible in context; surely we should read ψκονόμησα ἄν.

narian go, and that the toil [sc. of teaching at the capital] belongs to another» (ep. 480.3 f.): he has gained the ἄφεσις that he has sought for at least a year, now just over two years since his second «temporary» return to Antioch (above, §§ 1–2). A group of letters follows (May 356), thanking some of the friends who have helped him in his «struggle».³⁶ But the story has an epilogue, attested perhaps by one letter (ep. 516) and more certainly by another (ep. 572).

7) A few months after his release, in mid-late Summer 356, Libanius attempts (ep. 516.4 f.) to gain the support of Araxius, proconsul of Constantinople, in redressing an «outrage» he has suffered (τῆς δὲ ὕβρεως ἦν ὕβρισμαί, πρὸς θεῶν, ἀπαίτησον δίκας), apparently connected in some way with a financial loss (οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε οἶσθω τὰ τῶν κακῶς πεπλουτηκότων ἀκούων ἐν πενίᾳ: on the possible relevance of the complaint to his salary, see below). More time goes by, until, ca. May 357, Libanius speaks as follows in a letter to Gymnasius at Constantinople (ep. 572.1–2): «I was not grieved when the sustenance (τροφή) from the emperor was transferred to others: for it was necessary that I be released completely thence, and this [release] was intimately connected with the transfer of the sustenance. I therefore regard as a benefactor the man who took [it] away – but I spoke to the official (ἄρχων) concerning the goods (χρήματα) which they had taken during the time before this and had not given back, and, although I added that I would be pained more by the insult than by the loss, I was wasting my breath. For he made no response, but was clearly disposed to place no blame on those who took [these things] away, but to fault those requesting [their] return.»

It is clear that this letter concerns the end of Libanius' connection, as an official sophist, with Constantinople; but the letter also clearly raises several questions. First, what is the relation between ep. 572, in which Libanius speaks of being «completely set free», and ep. 480 (§ 6 above), in which we first hear of Libanius' release from his πόνος as sophist at Constantinople? Second, what are the χρήματα of which Libanius claims to have been deprived in ep. 572, and what distinction is he making when he speaks, with relief, of the final transfer of his τροφή, but with complaint of the χρήματα previously taken and still withheld from him?

The answers to these questions depend on a point of chronology which must be discussed first. Ep. 572 can be dated to ca. May 357, that is, about a year after the emperor's decision «to let the valetudinarian go» (ep. 480, § 6 above). Now it is clear that the events mentioned in ep. 572 must to some extent antedate the time of the letter itself: note especially that Libanius begins without preamble (οὐκ ἡχθέσθην τῆς ἐκ βασιλέως τροφῆς ἐπ' ἄλλους μεταστάσης κτλ.), in a way that shows that he is responding to a comment or consolation offered by his corre-

³⁶ Ep. 489 to Olympius, ep. 490 to Datianus, ep. 492 to Anatolius, cf. n. 20 above. Ep. 491 thanks Barbatio as well: although ep. 436, to which allusion is made, contains no request for Barbatio's intercession, the placement of ep. 491 in the midst of a group dealing with this one topic suggests that Barbatio's assistance concerned the same matter.

spondent Gymnasius. But it is also reasonably clear that the events mentioned in ep. 572 cannot have occurred a very long time before the date of the letter. On the one hand, it seems unlikely that they were contemporary with the release mentioned in ep. 480 in the Spring of 356, and that Gymnasius would be learning of them and commenting on them only now, since Gymnasius had been with Libanius at Antioch as late as mid-Summer 356:³⁷ the latter date should rather be taken as a *terminus post quem*. On the other hand, Libanius speaks of the sequence of events (withholding of the χρήματα, transfer of the τροφή, dealings with the ἄρχων³⁸) and the sting of the official's refusal as things fresh in his mind. If those events, therefore, cannot be placed too long before the time of ep. 572, another conclusion would seem to follow. Although Libanius was «let go» from his πόνος in the Spring of 356, he remained on the books as the recipient of an imperial salary for almost a full year thereafter:³⁹ thus it was only when that τροφή was taken away (he claims) that he could feel relief at being «completely released» from Constantinople (τελέως ἐκεῖθεν λελύσθαι).

What, then, of the χρήματα? One cannot say for certain: but on the available evidence, and on the assumption that the χρήματα must have something to do with Libanius' position at Constantinople, the choices are very limited. Thus one possibility is that the χρήματα consisted of the (income from the) property once given him as the gift of the emperor (or. 1.80, Part I above), but now withheld from him. Yet Libanius' remarks and the sequence of events on which they are based seem to suggest a direct connection between the χρήματα and the τροφή, between the withholding of the former and the final transfer of the latter: the question concerning the χρήματα may therefore be answered by posing another. Libanius may have been on the books as the recipient of the τροφή for some months after being released from his πόνος in the Spring of 356: but was the τροφή actually paid out to him after that date? So much has been assumed,⁴⁰ but a full and economical reading of ep. 572 can reasonably be held to point in a different direction: between being «let go» and being «completely released», Libanius did *not* receive the χρήματα to which he was nominally entitled; the χρήματα were withheld (perhaps being diverted by the officials in charge for their own gain, see below); and Libanius was unsuccessful (as far as we know) in gaining their restoration.⁴¹

³⁷ Cf. O. SEECK, *Briefe* p. 330 (Gymnasius leaves Antioch and brings ep. 503, 504, 507 with him to Bithynia and Constantinople).

³⁸ Ep. 572.2 τὸν μὲν οὖν ἀφελόμενον εὐεργέτην ἡγοῦμαι, περὶ δὲ τῶν χρημάτων, ἃ τὸν πρὸ τοῦ χρόνον οἱ λαβόντες οὐκ ἀπέδωκαν, εἶπον πρὸς τὸν ἄρχοντα: the sequence is established by τὸν πρὸ τοῦ χρόνον, which takes the transfer of the τροφή as its benchmark.

³⁹ The reason is not clear: cf. P. PETT, *Libanius* p. 409, suggesting that the time-lag «prouve moins ici la négligence des bureaux que la mauvaise volonté de l'empereur à lui rendre sa liberté.»

⁴⁰ E.g. by P. PETT, *Libanius* p. 409, who does not broach the subject of the χρήματα.

⁴¹ Cf. J. W. H. WALDEN, p. 176.

Here, at least, we can speak of «arrears»; and here, perhaps, ep. 516 (noted § 7 above), may be relevant.⁴² In mid-late Summer of 356, a few months after being «let go», Libanius is found imploring the proconsul of Constantinople for help, οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε οἶσω τὰ τῶν κακῶς πεπλουτηκότων ἀκούων ἐν πενίᾳ: if the letter is in fact concerned with Libanius' appointment at Constantinople, it would fit neatly into the sequence of events just described.⁴³ «Let go» from his πόνος, but still nominally a recipient of his imperial τροφή, as of Spring 356, Libanius would be complaining a few months later of the non-payment (or diversion) of his salary (the «outrage» of ep. 516, involving πενία for Libanius and the illicit enrichment of others). Evidently failing in his appeal in Summer 356, Libanius would then be found, in the Spring of 357, still pursuing his claim at the time of and even somewhat beyond the formal transfer of the τροφή: οἱ κακῶς πεπλουτηκοίτες of ep. 516 would then be the same persons as those against whom the complaint is lodged in ep. 572 (περὶ δὲ τῶν χρημάτων, ἃ τὸν πρὸ τοῦ χρόνον οἱ λαβόντες οὐκ ἀπέδωκαν).

We can now summarize the results of the discussion above. Having taken up residence in Antioch not later than March 354 and having received an official appointment as sophist there in Autumn 354, Libanius resisted attempts made through friends' persuasion and imperial summons to impel his return to Constantinople, where he was still an officially appointed sophist and whence he still drew an imperial salary; the attempts and Libanius' resistance continued through 355. Toward the end of that year, however, formal actions against him began: by a decree of the Senate he was stripped of honors that he had been granted, also by a decree of the Senate, in 352/353 (ep. 439, 446, cf. or. 1.80); and he was still under order to return to the capital. Shortly thereafter, his imperial salary in kind (τροφή) was taken away by the proconsul of Constantinople, acting on the decision of the emperor, and an attempt was made to exact from him a cash repayment of that part of his τροφή that he had drawn since going to Antioch (ep. 454). Although these measures were blocked by the intervention of the praetorian prefect Strategius, Libanius had still not been given his release.

That release did not occur until the Spring of 356 (ep. 480). But while the emperor had decided at the latter date to free the «valetudinarian» from his «labor» as a teacher at Constantinople, Libanius appears to have remained the recipient of the imperial τροφή for another year, since the formal transfer of that salary did not

⁴² For ep. 516 the fullest earlier discussion is that of H. F. BOUCHERY, pp. 94–97: but his reconstruction is undermined by the assumption that at the time of the letter «matters stood precisely as they had two years earlier» (i.e., he seems to have been unaware of the important change signalled by ep. 480).

⁴³ Note, however, that the connection of ep. 516 with Libanius' appointment, while commonly assumed, cannot be demonstrated: the complaint could well involve a different matter (for example, the long-standing debt that is the subject of ep. 463, 464: see § 5 above).

take place until the early Spring of 357 (ep. 572). Or rather, Libanius appears to have been nominally a recipient of that τροφή: for the evidence suggests that from the time he was «let go» in Spring 356 he had not in fact received the payments to which he was still at least formally entitled, and that his unsuccessful attempts to secure these payments can be traced from the Summer of 356 down to and even beyond the formal transfer of the τροφή (perhaps ep. 516, more securely ep. 572). This drawn-out and unedifying episode in Libanius' career would thus appear to have ended as it began, with something less than candor on Libanius' part, and one last attempt to have his cake and eat it too. It should be added that, if the reconstruction above is correct, Libanius would appear to have retained the property he had received as a gift of the emperor in 352/353 (or. 1.80, cf. Part I above); or more precisely, if that gift was taken away, we do not know when it was taken away.

III. At Antioch (A)

Although Libanius sounded a note of relief at being «completely freed thence» when his imperial τροφή was transferred to others in the Spring of 357 (ep. 572), he appears to have regained a place at the imperial trough before too long, since another series of letters informs us of the vicissitudes of a new imperial salary.⁴⁴ The information at our disposal here is fairly straightforward; but we must begin with one problem, the extent of which has not fully been appreciated before.

The reconstruction of this episode depends upon the relation between two letters. In ep. 27, Libanius writes to Polychronius, chiding him for his silence as a correspondent and suggesting the following reason: τῶν τροφῶν ἡμῖν περικόψας αἰσχύνῃ καὶ διαζεύξας τῶν πυρῶν τὰς κριθὰς τοὺς ἵππους ἡδίκηκός οὐκ ἔχεις ὅ τι εἶπης. ἀλλὰ σοὶ λύω τὸν φόβον τὸ τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως εἰπῶν (Il. 1.335). οὐ σὺ τοῦτο λυπεῖς, ἀλλ' Ἀγαμέμνων. ὥστε θαρρῶν ἴθι καὶ γράφε. In ep. 740 (Summer 362) Libanius writes to Iulianus, the governor of Phoenice: κατήγαγεν ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν τιμὴν ὁ χρηστός Σαλούτιος, ἧς ἐτύγχανεν ἐξεληλακῶς ὁ σκαιὸς Ἑλπίδιος. ἃ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος ὑβρίζων ἀφείλετο, ταῦθ' οὗτος παύων τὴν ὕβριν ἀπέδωκε. τὸ μὲν οὖν ἡμῖς τῆς τροφῆς ἐνταῦθα φέρομεν, θάτερον δὲ ἐκ Φοινίκης ἐκέλευσεν ἔχειν ἐνθυμηθεῖς, οἶμαι, τοῦθ' ὅτι σοῦ τῆς Φοινίκης ἄρχοντος καλῶς μοι τὸ πρᾶγμα κείσεται.

It has uniformly been assumed that Polychronius' superior, the «Agamemnon» of ep. 28,⁴⁵ is the praetorian prefect Helpidius mentioned in ep. 740, and that both letters refer to an action taken by Helpidius to Libanius' disadvantage, but reversed by Helpidius' successor, Saturninius Secundus Salutius, in 362. This assumption has already caused one problem in the past: for while ep. 28 is preserved in the midst of a group of letters (ep. 19–30, 32–35) belonging to the period late

Summer 358 – Winter 358/359, and was thus dated to Winter 358/359 by O. SEECK,⁴⁶ it is clear on SEECK's own showing that Helpidius did not assume the prefecture until very early in 360.⁴⁷ Thus H. SILOMON argued that ep. 28 must have been misplaced in the collection of letters, and should be dated to the Winter of 359/360.⁴⁸

There is, however, a further point which has not been considered. On the one hand, it seems quite clear that ep. 28 must refer to a *partial* reduction of Libanius' τροφαί. So much is hinted in the first participial phrase (τῶν τροφῶν ἡμῖν περικόψας: περικόπτειν = «prune»), and is made explicit by the second: in saying that Polychronius «separated the wheat from the barley», Libanius must mean that only part of his allotment («the barley») was taken away, and (in saying that Polychronius thus «wronged the horses») may in fact allude more specifically to the fodder (*capitum*) which, with personal rations (*annona*), made up some of the imperial salaries paid in kind.⁴⁹ On the other hand, ep. 740 could be taken to mean that Helpidius' action was more drastic, amounting to a complete withdrawal of the salary: thus Libanius speaks of «the honor ... from which the wretched Helpidius happened to banish me»; and the care he takes to spell out the arrangements for the restoration ordained by Salutius makes it tolerably clear that these arrangements were in some way a new departure, a fact which would be consistent with (although it need not itself imply) a restoration of the salary completely *de novo*. The phrasing of the two letters could thus allude to two distinct acts, a diminution of Libanius' τροφή (ep. 28) and its cancellation (ep. 740):⁵⁰ if so, the «Agamemnon» of ep. 28 need not be assumed to be Helpidius; and the way would appear to be left open to date ep. 28 to Winter 358/359, with the letters with which it is preserved. But in fact, two obstacles to this dating remain. First, the praetorian prefect in Winter 358/359 was Hermogenes, with whom Libanius appears to have been on good terms and whose favor (praised as «mildness», πραότης) Libanius appears to have enjoyed at just that time.⁵¹ Hermogenes does not seem to be a likely candidate for the role of «Agamemnon». Second, Libanius alludes to his claim on his salary once more when writing to Polychronius (ep. 207, esp. § 6), at which time Polychronius is closely associated with Helpidius.⁵²

⁴⁶ Briefe pp. 350, 352, followed, e.g., by J. W. H. WALDEN, p. 176.

⁴⁷ Briefe p. 168 f., cf. PLRE I s.v. Helpidius 4, p. 414.

⁴⁸ H. SILOMON, pp. 23 f., 41 f., followed by FOERSTER in his edition and by P. PETIT, Libanius p. 409.

⁴⁹ Thus O. SEECK, Briefe p. 241, «entzieht [Polychronius] dem Libanius ... seine Capita.» The distinction appears to have been ignored in subsequent accounts.

⁵⁰ This might in turn account for the notable lack of agreement on this point in past discussions, which variously speak of the salary as having been diminished (e.g., P. PETIT, Libanius p. 409), or taken away (e.g., H. SILOMON, pp. 23, 41, S. F. BONNER, p. 127), or both (e.g., J. W. H. WALDEN, p. 176).

⁵¹ Cf. or. 1.115–116 and esp. ep. 40.4 f., with A. F. NORMAN, p. 179 f.

⁵² So much is clear when one reads ep. 207 and 208 together; the association of Polychro-

⁴⁴ Ep. 28, 740, 800; cf. ep. 207, 208, 289 (perhaps also ep. 258), and further below.

⁴⁵ On the position of Polychronius himself, see below n. 52.

The balance of probabilities therefore suggests that ep. 28 should indeed be dated to early 360, at the beginning of Helpidius' (= «Agamemnon's») prefecture. We are still left, however, with two possible alternatives: either Libanius' salary was first reduced early in 360, and then withdrawn entirely by Helpidius at some later date (as the phrasing of ep. 28 and 740 possibly suggests); or, as is usually assumed, ep. 28 and 740 refer to one and the same action. In the latter case, Libanius' salary would only have been reduced, and the wording of the later letter, which suggests a more drastic action, must be assumed to be the product of retrospective distortion,⁵³ perhaps intended to make the action of the current prefect, «the good Salutius», appear all the more gracious by contrast. I see no way of reaching a certain decision on the basis of the letters themselves: other facts connected with Libanius' position at Antioch do, however, suggest that he was still drawing an imperial salary in early 361, and so favor the second alternative. We will return to this point in Part IV.⁵⁴ For the moment it remains to be pointed out that we do not know why Libanius suffered his loss.⁵⁵

Libanius perhaps attempted to win restoration during the prefecture of Helpidius.⁵⁶ If so, his prediction of failure on that occasion proved correct, and it was not

nius and Helpidius is also evident from a joint reading of ep. 226 and 227. O. SEECK, *Briefe* p. 241, concluded that Polychronius was first consular of Phoenice and subsequently *vicarius Ponticae*, on the basis of some very questionable inferences (the latter conclusion already partially modified by H. SILOMON, p. 41 f.); PLRE I s.v., p. 711, is probably closer to the truth in arguing that Polychronius was on the staff of Helpidius, perhaps as *domesticus*.

⁵³ Cf. the picture of Zenobius' supposed malevolence in 354 drawn by Libanius at or. 1.100, 104–105, quite different from the references in the more nearly contemporary correspondence: see P. WOLF, p. 46, A. F. NORMAN, p. 173.

⁵⁴ See below, p. 58.

⁵⁵ At ep. 258.3 Libanius says that Helpidius had «sworn to wage war on the Muses» (if ὁ τοῦ δοῦναι κύριος here = Helpidius): this is of course only Libanius' interpretation (on the concerns of the letter, see n. 56 below), and is difficult to evaluate, since it involves a charge that could be expected by anyone who attempted to diminish the perquisites of Libanius or other literary men. A different nuance is insinuated in modern accounts, which almost invariably state that «Helpidius, a Christian hostile to Libanius, diminished his salary» (vel sim.), as though there were some causal connections, unstated yet evident, between the predicate and the appositional phrase: for the record, it is worth remarking that Libanius' relations with Helpidius were not uniformly hostile (cf. G. R. SIEVERS, p. 82, PLRE I s.v. Helpidius 4, p. 414), and that there is no evidence to indicate on which side the hostility began, much less that the hostility (or the diminution of Libanius' salary) was inspired by a difference in religion.

⁵⁶ Ep. 258.3 (January 361): ὑπὲρ δὲ τοῦ σίτου πάντα μὲν οἶμαι κινήσειν τὸν χρηστὸν Ὀλύμπιον, πράξειν δὲ ἢ οὐδὲν ἢ μικρόν, οὐ πολὺ τι βέλτιον τοῦ μηδενός. τὸ δὲ αἴτιον, ὁ τοῦ δοῦναι κύριος ὁμώμοκε πολεμήσειν ταῖς Μούσαις. The machinations alluded to have been thought to concern the σῖτος of Libanius himself (e.g., P. PETIT, *Libanius* p. 409); but the interested party may instead be the recipient of the letter, the ex-governor and sophist Demetrius (= Demetrius 2, PLRE I p. 247 f.), in whose behalf Libanius exerted his influence on other occasions, cf. ep. 109, 138, 774. For a certain allusion to Libanius' own loss from

until after the installation of the new prefect, Salutius, that Libanius regained what he had lost. The arrangement by which payment would be made is described in ep. 740 (Summer 362), quoted above: Libanius would receive half his τροφή at Antioch;⁵⁷ the other half would come to him through the consular of Phoenice. We do not know why the payment was thus divided, but the procedure appears to have remained in effect at least through the Winter of 362/363 (ep. 800): this letter also makes it clear that Libanius enjoyed the privilege of *adaeratio*, that is, of commuting into cash the salary in kind he received through the consular of Phoenice.⁵⁸ He presumably enjoyed the same privilege for the portion of the τροφή received at Antioch. Ep. 800 is the latest letter to give us any information of Libanius' imperial salaries.

Libanius thus received an imperial salary in kind while teaching at Antioch, beginning sometime after Spring 357 (the terminus post quem provided by ep. 572, see above) and before early 360 (the terminus ante quem provided by ep. 28): at the latter date the salary was reduced (and perhaps was later withdrawn entirely); full restoration was not achieved until Summer 362, according to the sequence and the arrangements described above. Can we say more precisely when Libanius began to receive this τροφή? One might conjecture that the τροφή was within his grasp no later than the period mid-358 – early 359, when Libanius is known to have been on good terms with the prefects Strategius and Hermogenes, the former toward the end of his tenure of office, the latter at the beginning.⁵⁹ But this point must remain very uncertain.

this period, see ep. 289 (Winter 361: the reference is surely to Libanius' more recent «deprivation», not his earlier experience at Constantinople, as suggested by O. SEECK, *Briefe* p. 41 n. 2).

⁵⁷ ἐνταῦθα: cf. S. F. BONNER, p. 127 n. 56; the view of J. W. H. WALDEN, p. 177, that this part of the τροφή was «derived from the city of Antioch», cannot be correct. Payment at Antioch was presumably made either directly through the financial apparatus of the praetorian prefecture (cf. JONES, *LRE* pp. 448 ff.) or through the office of the prefect's subordinate, the consular of Syria (cf. the text immediately following and Part IV below, on or. 31.19).

⁵⁸ So ep. 800.3, the consular Gaianus has the authority «to establish the value of my wheat and barley» (αἰσθάνομαι δὲ ὅτι γελᾷς ὑπὸ σαυτῷ με λαβὼν καὶ γεγονώς κύριος παίζειν τε καὶ τιμὰς τᾶττεν πυρῶν καὶ κριθῶν); allusion to the same procedure is probably also present *ibid.* 2, μικρὸς μοι σῖτος ἅπας καὶ χρυσὸς πρὸς τὴν ὥραν τῶν γραμμάτων [sc. τῶν σῶν], cf. P. PETIT, *Libanius* p. 409 f. For Libanius on the practice of *adaeratio*, see esp. ep. 132 (in behalf of Eudaemon, teaching at Elusa), with J. H. W. G. LIEBESCHUETZ, p. 88 f.

⁵⁹ Cf. or. 1.111–116; it is not clear what inferences (if any) concerning this question can be drawn from a letter to Strategius early in 358, which alludes to the desire of certain unspecified persons for a grant of σῖτος (ep. 356.1 f. ἢ δίδως αἰτηθεὶς ἢ τοῦ πράγματος οὐκ ἐῶντος ἀχθόμενος τῷ κεκωλύσθαι τοὺς οὐ τυχόντας εὐφραίνειν ὥσπερ λαβόντας. καὶ νῦν οἱ ζητοῦντες τὸν σῖτον ἀντ' ἐκείνου τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἔχοντες Αἴγυπτον ὅλην ἡγοῦνται κεκαρπῶσθαι κτλ.).

IV. At Antioch (B)

We have been concerned thus far with the imperial salaries in kind drawn by Libanius at Constantinople and Antioch; we must now look more closely at Libanius' position at Antioch. The most recent and complete studies of Libanius and his native city tell us that Libanius also enjoyed a salary paid yearly, in cash, from municipal funds at Antioch.⁶⁰ Our only source of information on this point is or. 31 (*pro rhetoribus*). The speech certainly shows that a municipal salary, termed a σύνταξις, existed at Antioch and was supposed to be paid out yearly: but the mode of payment does not emerge clearly;⁶¹ more important, the speech – with the possible exception of one passage – very strongly favors the conclusion that Libanius did *not* receive this municipal subvention.

⁶⁰ P. PETIT, *Libanius* pp. 102 (citing or. 31.20, which concerns Libanius' predecessor Zenobius), 409, *Étudiants* p. 92; J. H. W. G. LIEBESCHUETZ, p. 44 n. 2 («he held a civic appointment ..., therefore must have received a salary»); more cautiously J. W. H. WALDEN, p. 267 n. 1, S. F. BONNER, p. 131, and cf. M. PINTO, *La scuola di Libanio nel quadro del IV secolo dopo Cristo*, RIL 108 (1974), 157 n. 57 («la questione, nel suo complesso, appare difficile a chiarirsi»); see also n. 68 below. Payment in cash: P. PETIT, *Libanius* p. 299 f. (citing or. 31.19, with or. 48.9, 54.12), J. H. W. G. LIEBESCHUETZ, p. 84 n. 1 (citing or. 31.19, with or. 26.20 ff., 48.9); cf. the following note.

⁶¹ Although the notion that payment was made in cash is not unlikely in itself, there is no evidence to that effect in or. 31.19 or elsewhere in the speech, and our other evidence for Antiochene finances is too limited to allow generalization: the passages from other speeches adduced by P. PETIT and J. H. W. G. LIEBESCHUETZ (loc. cit. n. 60) all attest municipal payments in cash, but since the transaction in each case is termed a μισθός (μισθοῦν), not a σύνταξις, these passages may refer to a different and perhaps not strictly comparable category of expenditure (for teachers, certainly, μισθοί represented a type of compensation distinct from σύνταξις, cf. n. 68 below). It happens that the only such σύνταξις which we know in detail both suggests that payment in cash was expected and shows how practice could deviate from expectations: in P. Coll. Youtie II, no. 66 = P. Oxy. 47.3366 (A. D. 253/260), the δημόσιος γραμματικός of Oxyrhynchus, Lollianus *signo* Homoeus, states that his nominal σύνταξις was 500 den. (B 34), but complains, τὴν σύνταξιν τὴν εἰσθῦταιν οὐ πάνυ λαμβάνω, ἀλλ' εἰ τύχοι ποτὲ ἐν ὄξεσιν ἀγτὶ οἴνων καὶ σίτοις σιτη[ο]κόποις ... (B 29 f.: I take it that the force of his complaint, esp. τὴν εἰσθῦταιν οὐ πάνυ, derives not simply from the shoddiness of the goods received, but from the fact that he receives these goods instead of cash). On the other hand, the phrase used to describe the civic salary received by the philosopher Hermias in fifth century Alexandria, δημοσία σίτησις (Damasc. v. Isid. frg. 124 ZINTZEN), suggests payment in kind (the punning reference of the Alexandrian grammarian Palladas to his τροφὴ σύνταξις, Anth. Gr. 9.175,3, may point in the same direction). It is also conceivable that such a σύνταξις could be paid in a combination of kind and cash: note that Libanius mentions (only to reject) the possibility that members of the council might make personal contributions of wheat and wine as well as money to supplement his assistants' salary (or. 31.15 νυνὶ γὰρ ὑμᾶς οὐκ ἀργύριον ἀξιώσαμεν ἂν εἰσενεγκεῖν οὐδὲ πυροῦς οὐδὲ οἶνον ἐκ τῶν ὑμετέρων αὐτῶν κτημάτων, οὐ γὰρ ἀγνοῶ τὰς γιγνομένας ὑμῖν καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν ὑπὲρ τοῦ κοινοῦ δαπάνας), a notion which perhaps reflects the nature of the salary currently in force.

The background, briefly, is as follows. When Libanius had come from Constantinople to Antioch in the Winter of 353/354 (see above, Part II, § 1), it was with the expectation that he would succeed to the public appointment of his former teacher, Zenobius. In this he was at first disappointed: despite the assurances that Zenobius had given (Libanius says), the older man refused to yield his place, with the result that Libanius practiced as a private teacher, with less prestige and a smaller class. In the Autumn of 354, however, Zenobius fell ill and was forced to give up his teaching: Libanius then «stepped into Zenobius' shoes» as an officially appointed sophist; and Zenobius died soon after.⁶² As official sophist, Zenobius himself had received a municipal salary and had enjoyed, as an added privilege, the income from one of the civic estates of Antioch: so much is evident from or. 31, delivered by Libanius before the βουλὴ in behalf of his four assistant teachers, probably early in 361.⁶³

Libanius in this speech attempts to move the council to improve the income of his distressed assistants: two lines of persuasion are particularly relevant to the present question. First, Libanius emphasizes the iniquity of the assistants' lot by remarking that these four teachers now divide among themselves the *same* salary that Zenobius by himself used to enjoy.⁶⁴ Second, Libanius suggests that his assistants' position could be bettered if they were allowed to supplement their salary with the proceeds from civic lands as Zenobius had done:⁶⁵ for the precedent provided by Zenobius in this respect, Libanius says, is applicable to his own assistants as it is to no other teachers in the city;⁶⁶ indeed (it is argued a little further on), if Libanius

⁶² On the sequence of events leading up to Libanius' succession, see esp. P. WOLF, pp. 43–47, A. F. NORMAN, pp. 173, 175, 176.

⁶³ On the emoluments of Zenobius, see esp. or. 31.16–23, and further below. The speech must be dated to a time during the reign of Constantius when the memory of Zenobius was still fresh, cf. FOERSTER ed. vol. III, p. 119 n. 1: it cannot be dated before the very end of 360, if the sophist said to have lately been seduced from Antioch to Caesarea by a larger salary (or. 31.42) is Acacius – the only possible candidate among known sophists of this period, see P. WOLF, pp. 94–96, with PLRE I s.v. Acacius 6, p. 6; and at very least, it cannot be dated precisely to 355 (as by FOERSTER, loc. cit., and P. PETIT, *Libanius* p. 98, *Étudiants* p. 91), since it is clear from or. 31.19 (quoted below) that Libanius' assistants must already have had several years' experience in drawing their annual salary.

⁶⁴ Or. 31.23 τὴν γὰρ τοὶ σύνταξιν ἑνὸς ἀνδρὸς ἐκείνου τέτταρες ὄντες ἐνέμηνται, ὥστε καὶ τοὺς ἀγροὺς ὑπάρξῃ λαβεῖν, τῶν γε περὶ τὴν σύνταξιν ἐν ταύτῳ μενόντων οὕτω τὰ τοῦτων εἰς ἴσον τοῖς ἐκείνου καθίσταται (cf. also the phrase τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐκείνῳ τρέφεσθαι, referring to the σύνταξις in the preceding sentence): it is clear that the four did not simply share an amount equivalent to Zenobius' σύνταξις, but that σύνταξις itself.

⁶⁵ Or. 31.16–18; note that the grammarian Lollianus of Oxyrhynchus (above, n. 61) makes a similar proposal for similar reasons: see P. Coll. Youtie II, no. 66 = P. Oxy. 47.3366. B 31 ff., C 61 ff., with the remarks of P. J. PARSONS (P. Coll. Youtie II, p. 413 f.).

⁶⁶ Or. 31.35 τοῖς μὲν γε ῥήτορσιν [= Libanius' assistants, cf. or. 31.8] ἡ Ζηνοβίου συναγωνίζεται γῆ, πρὸ δὲ τῶν ἄλλων ἐτέρους ἐκ γεωργίας τοιαύτης ὠφελημένους οὐκ ἦν ἰδεῖν.

had wanted that income and made the same request for himself, no one would have refused.⁶⁷

We thus know the following for certain: Libanius assumed the position as official sophist at Antioch formerly held by Zenobius; but the municipal salary once drawn by Zenobius is now shared among Libanius' assistants, for whom Libanius seeks the supplementary income also formerly enjoyed by Zenobius – an income which Libanius could justly have claimed for himself (but did not) and to which his assistants, *qua* his assistants, are uniquely entitled. This set of facts points in one direction only: Libanius, on his succession to Zenobius' post, did *not* claim Zenobius' emoluments for himself; rather, the salary went to his assistants, and the additional income from civic land, while closely associated with his position by precedent, had been allowed to lapse.⁶⁸

This conclusion is further supported by another passage, the significance of which has previously gone unremarked. As part of the *captatio benevolentiae* at the beginning of his speech Libanius explains that he would not burden the council with this matter were he able to assist his teachers directly from his own pocket: but he cannot do so, «since,» he says, «the measure of my resources places me at equal remove from both *the need to receive* and the ability to give.»⁶⁹ This statement could – and no doubt does, in part – refer to Libanius' often stated indifference to the receipt of fees (*μισθοί*) from individual students or their fathers.⁷⁰ But in view of the occasion and subject of the speech itself, the primary reference must surely be to the receipt of payment from the city:⁷¹ when speaking before the council in

⁶⁷ Or. 31.46 ἃ λαβεῖν αὐτῷ μοι βουλομένῳ τῶν πάντων οὐδεὶς ἂν ἀντείπε κτλ.: the passage makes it clear that Libanius had *not* expressed the desire, see further below on or. 31.3.

⁶⁸ From or. 31.23 (n. 64 above) F. SCHEMMELE, p. 57, already inferred that Libanius had renounced his civic salary; the import of or. 31.46 (above, n. 67) was stressed by S. F. BONNER, p. 131 n. 73. It is appropriate here to draw attention to a point which Libanius himself could hardly make, given the turn of his argument: despite the pitiable picture Libanius draws of his assistants' circumstances, it must follow that they were better off than the assistants of Zenobius had been, since the latter would appear to have received no income at all from civic funds (cf. the query of P. WOLF, p. 63 n. 14) and so must have relied entirely on fees (for the fees, *μισθοί*, of Libanius' assistants, see or. 31.25–33): although P. PETIT (Étudiants p. 92) imagined that Zenobius used the returns from civic land to supplement his assistants' income, there is nothing to support that belief, and what evidence we have tells distinctly against it (Libanius' remarks at or. 31.20–23 imply that Zenobius' use and profit from his various emoluments was purely personal, cf. esp. § 20 [καὶ οὐδεὶς ἀνεβόησεν· ὃ Ἡράκλεις, ἀνθρώπος οὗτος δυοῖν εἶδεσι λημμάτων ἐκκαρπιοῦται τὴν πόλιν] and § 23 [above, n. 64]; while or. 36.11 suggests that Zenobius' relations with his assistants were hardly warm and generous).

⁶⁹ Or. 31.3 ἐπεὶ δὲ τῶν ὄντων μοι τὸ μέτρον ἴσον ἀφίστησιν με τοῦ τε δεῖσθαι λαμβάνειν τοῦ τε δοῦναι δύνασθαι.

⁷⁰ And, cognately, his preference for regarding as gifts such payments as he received: for the waiver of fees (or the like), see, e.g., or. 36.9, 38.2, 62.19f., ep. 140, 466, 1539 (similarly or. 1.109), with P. PETIT, Étudiants pp. 144–145, J. H. W. G. LIEBESCHUETZ, p. 84.

⁷¹ With λαμβάνειν in § 3, compare, e.g., § 19 ἀλλὰ νῦν μὲν ἔλαβον, νῦν δὲ οὐδεὶς ἔδωκε

the attempt to squeeze a little bit more from municipal funds, Libanius could hardly strike that pose if every member of his audience knew that he was in fact receiving a municipal salary himself. The passage combines with those already discussed to show Libanius in the honorable position of a man who practices his skill, to the benefit of his native city, «without salary and fee».⁷²

Libanius, then, did not receive a municipal salary, or other income from civic resources, at Antioch: so much emerges, with unusual clarity, from Libanius' statements in the speech. There is, however, one important passage (or. 31.19) which promises to obscure this clarity. By way of forestalling an anticipated objection ('τί δαί;' φήσιν οἱ, 'οὐχὶ τὰς συντάξεις οὗτοι καθ' ἑκάστον ἐνιαυτὸν φέρουσι;'), Libanius says: πρῶτον μὲν, οὐ καθ' ἑκάστον, ἀλλὰ νῦν μὲν ἔλαβον, νῦν δὲ οὐδεὶς ἔδωκε, νῦν δὲ μέρος, νῦν δὲ βραδέως. καὶ σιωπῶ τὰς πραγματείας αἷς ὑπὲρ τούτου χρώμεθα πρὸς τοὺς ἄρχοντας, πρὸς τοὺς ὑπηρέτας, πρὸς τοὺς ἀποδέκτας, πρὸς τὸν αἰεὶ σοβούντα, ὃν ἀνάγκη προκυλινδεῖσθαι ῥήμασι καὶ σχήμασιν ἀλλοτρίοις ἐλευθέρων κολακεύοντα τοὺς αὐτοῦ χείρονας. ἃ τοῖς σεμνοτέροις, οἷον εἶναι προσήκει τὸν διδάσκαλον, παντός, οἶμαι, λιμοῦ βαρύτερα. The first sentence registers the irregularity with which Libanius' assistants have received their salary, the second, the humiliating dealings in which the teachers must engage with the imperial officials (ἄρχοντες), the members of their staffs (ὑπηρέται), and the curial officials charged with collecting and supervising the store of imperial levies in kind (ἀποδέκται).⁷³ Leaving aside for the moment the substantive questions raised by the second sentence, we can remark first the problem implied by the wording of the passage, the shift from third person plural (ἔλαβον) to first person plural (χρώμεθα). With the second verb Libanius appears to associate himself with his assistants as the recipient of a salary; and that, in turn, appears to controvert the conclusions drawn above.

We are faced, then, with a clear-cut choice: either the conclusions already reached are incorrect, and Libanius did receive a municipal salary; or those conclusions are correct, and the present passage must be brought into harmony with them. I simply do not see a reasonable alternative to the inferences drawn from the clutch of passages discussed above. On the other hand, one can easily overcome the

(of his assistants' receipt of their salary), § 46 ἃ λαβεῖν αὐτῷ μοι βουλομένῳ κτλ. (above, n. 67). Libanius' rejection of civic emoluments may also be alluded to at or. 1.92 (of the Antiochenes' offer at the end of his sojourn there in Summer 353): ἀλλὰ καὶ μεγάλα ὑπισχνούντο δώσειν εἰ διαπραξαίμην τὸ παρὰ σφίσι ζῆν. ἐμοὶ δὲ ὃν ὑπισχνούντο τῶν μεγάλων μείζον ἦν τὸ οἶκοι ζῆν.

⁷² As is recorded, e.g., among the claims of honor for an archiatros of Hiera (Lesbos), IG 12,2.484,28 f. ἀνευ συντάξιος καὶ μισθοῦ (= no. 59 in the catalogue of V. NUTTON, Archiatri and the Medical Profession in Antiquity, PBSR 32 [1977], 223). To the question, «What benefit then *did* Libanius derive from being an official sophist at Antioch?», the answer is, «Prestige and immunity» – of which the latter would, in the long run, have been more important financially than any direct subvention he could draw from civic funds.

⁷³ On these last, see JONES, LRE p. 456 f.

difficulty in the present passage by taking into account both the substance of the second sentence and the very shift in verbal person that takes place.

Libanius says: *they* receive the municipal salary – sometimes, or partially, or with delays; and in addition (ὕπὲρ τοῦτου) *we* – my assistants and myself alike – have to grovel before the imperial officials, their aides, and the ἀποδέκται.⁷⁴ The shift from «they» (and their municipal salary) to «we» (and our embarrassing transactions) is explicable, if Libanius is including himself in (only) the second sentence because of his receipt of an *imperial* salary. As J. H. W. G. LIEBESCHUETZ has remarked, the passage shows that the municipal salaries themselves were not paid out directly by the civic authorities but were handled by the same organization as imperial salaries, so that the central government might exercise tighter control over municipal expenditures:⁷⁵ it is for this reason that the assistants must deal with the persons mentioned. In drawing his imperial salary, Libanius would of course deal with the same persons.

Indeed, if this reading of the passage is correct, it would not only strengthen the interpretation of LIEBESCHUETZ, but also resolve another question. Since or. 31 is probably to be dated to early 361, during the prefecture of Helpidius, it could definitely be said that the latter had only reduced, not completely withdrawn, Libanius' imperial τροφή, at least by the time of the speech: the usual belief that ep. 28 and 740 refer to one and the same action would more likely than not be correct.⁷⁶ The passage would thus be consistent both with what we otherwise learn from or. 31 and with what we can gather of Libanius' position from other documents of the same period. I would conclude, then, that at least during the period covered by our documents Libanius derived no salary or other income from the funds of Antioch.

We can now summarize the main points of the discussion above. (I) From his return to Constantinople in 349 Libanius held an official appointment as sophist in the capital, and so an imperial salary; this salary was supplemented by a special gift of the emperor, involving income from land, in 352/353. (II) He continued to receive his salary after his supposedly temporary return to Antioch in 354; and in Winter 355/356, in the face of his repeated refusal to return to the capital, an attempt was made to strip him of that salary and exact a partial repayment. That attempt was blocked, and the salary was in fact not formally taken from him until sometime in the Spring of 357, a full year after he had been released from his obligations in Constantinople (Spring 356): there are indications, however, that he had not actually received the salary since the time of that release and that in the

Spring of 357 he still sought – unsuccessfully, it would appear – to obtain the amount that was «due» him. (III) At some point between the Spring of 357 and the beginning of 360 he again began to receive an imperial τροφή: for reasons unknown to us, however, the amount of the τροφή was reduced early in 360, and Libanius did not achieve restoration until the Summer of 362, when arrangements were made for him to draw half the salary at Antioch and half from Phoenice. (IV) Although from the Autumn of 354 Libanius had also held an appointment as official sophist at Antioch as successor of his former teacher Zenobius, he did not claim for himself the income associated with that appointment. The salary previously enjoyed by Zenobius was shared by Libanius' four assistants, while Zenobius' supplementary income from civic land had been allowed to lapse: Libanius attempted early in 361 to gain restitution of that income, also for his assistants' benefit.

Thus at no time covered by our documents can Libanius be said to have drawn a «municipal salary»: at Constantinople, no salary from purely «municipal» (as distinct from imperial) funds can be shown to have existed; while such a salary certainly existed but was not drawn by Libanius at Antioch. In his native town he preferred to assume the role of an honorably independent citizen, free of «the need to receive»: one can suggest that this role was made at least slightly easier to sustain by the imperial subsidy he received at the same time. This is perhaps the most important general conclusion to emerge from the preceding analysis, and should throw new light on the frequently ambiguous posture of Libanius, the spokesman for the ancient idea of the city and its autonomy who was at the same time so often concerned to win for himself and his friends the honors and privileges bestowed by the state. But that is a subject for a different essay.⁷⁷

⁷⁷ It is a pleasure to thank the National Endowment for the Humanities, for the Independent Study and Research Fellowship during tenure of which I prepared this paper.

⁷⁴ With the humiliation lamented here, compare Libanius' joke to Gaianus, consular of Phoenice, in ep. 800.3 αἰσθάνομαι δὲ ὅτι γέλῳς ὑπὸ σπαντῶ με λαβῶν (how easy was it for Libanius to make that joke?). For the context, see above at n. 58.

⁷⁵ J. H. W. G. LIEBESCHUETZ, p. 152 f.

⁷⁶ See Part III, p. 52 above.