

Relief von Tell Halaf (Hdb. der Archäologie, 1. Tafelband, München 1939, Tafel 160 links unten) um 1000 a. Chr., aus dem heraldischen Schema des Siegels von Uruk (ibid. Tafel 121; dazu T. 133, 3 u. 4) aus dem ausgehenden 4. Jahrt., sowie aus dem elfenbeinernen Messergriff vom Djebel el-Arak (ibid. Tafel 56, 2: Mann zwischen 2 Löwen), ungefähr aus derselben Frühzeit wie das Uruk-Siegel. Dieser Griff ist in Ägypten gefunden, aber schon der „Turban“ des Mannes zeigt, daß er nach Mesopotamien gehört (A. Scharff, *ibid.*, Textband, 460 und E. Otto, *Ägypten*, Stuttg. 1953, 30—32). — Außerdem sind schon bisher folgende in Mykenai gefundenen Gegenstände als aus Vorderasien (Anatolien, Syrien) stammend erkannt: a) Der myken. Streitwagen (auf Reliefs): F. Matz, Hdb. d. Arch. 4. Lfg München 1950, 266². b) Das Silbergefäß in Form eines Hirsches: G. Karo, RE— Suppl. VI 1935, 585, 35. c) Der Silbertrichter mit Darstellung einer belagerten Stadt: Karo, a. O. 585, 38 (doch Matz a. O. 267). d) Zwei Bronze-*statuetten* von Kriegsgöttern: Alan J. B. Wace, *Mycenae*, Princeton 1949, 108. e) Drei Fayence-Cylinder: Wace, a. O. 108. d und e bezeichnet Wace als hurritisch; bei d hebt er die große Ähnlichkeit mit entsprechenden Figuren aus Ras Schamra hervor.

Würzburg

Franz Dirlmeier

PRAISE OF PERICLEAN ATHENS AS A MIXED CONSTITUTION

In this note the writer will take issue with the assumption that in the Thucydidean version of the Funeral Oration, Pericles praises Athens as a democracy. This assumption is usually made, for example, by the eminent scholars, Victor Ehrenberg, *Origins of Democracy*, *Historia* I (1950, published in 1952), 536, M. A. Levi, *In margine a Tucidide, La Parola del Passato*, XXIII (1952), 97, and J.A.O. Larsen, *The Judgment of Antiquity on Democracy*, *Classical Philology* XLIX (1954), 3. On the other hand, the writer also seeks to prove

(Alalach, nō. von Ugarit) berücksichtigen (Sir L. Woolley, *Ein vergessenes Königreich*, Wiesbaden 1954; 76, 107, 182). Sie scheinen die Vorstellung von der Autochthonie der kretischen Kultur stark zu erschüttern.

that in the Thucydidean version of the Funeral Oration Pericles was not at all on the defensive in reference to democracy, as has often been assumed and recently by J.A.O. Larsen, *Cleisthenes and the Development of the Theory of Democracy at Athens, Essays in Political Theory Presented to George H. Sabine* (Cornell University Press, 1948), 14.

Thucydides, II 37 (ed. Stuart Jones): Χρώμεθα γὰρ πολιτεία οὐ ζηλούσῃ τοὺς τῶν πέλας νόμους, παράδειγμα δὲ μᾶλλον αὐτοὶ ὄντες τισὶν ἢ μιμούμενοι ἑτέρους. καὶ ὄνομα μὲν διὰ τὸ μὴ εἰς ὀλίγους ἀλλ' εἰς πλείονας οἰκεῖν δημοκρατία κέκληται· μέτεστι δὲ κατὰ μὲν τοὺς νόμους πρὸς τὰ ἴδια διάφορα πᾶσι τὸ ἴσον, κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἀξίωσιν, ὡς ἕκαστος ἐν τῇ εὐδοκίμῃ, οὐκ ἀπὸ μέρους τὸ πλεον εἰς τὰ κοινὰ ἢ ἀπ' ἀρετῆς προτιμᾶται, οὐδ' αὖ κατὰ πενίαν, ἔχων γέ (τέ codd. Gomme) τι ἀγαθὸν δρᾶσαι τὴν πόλιν, ἀξιωματος ἀφανείᾳ κεκώλυται.

Pericles says first that the Athenian constitution is unique, is unlike the customs of neighboring states. When Xenophon, *Lac. I 2* claims that the Lacedaemonian customs are unique, Xenophon includes a constitution which to all represented a mixture, to many a mixture of the three basic constitutions ¹⁾. When Aelius Aristides ²⁾ says that Rome has a constitution not at all like any of those among the rest of mankind, he explains that up to the emergence of the Roman Principate there seemed to be but three constitutions, now there appeared something new combining the advantages and avoiding the defects of all three constitutions. Similarly Pericles means that the Athenian constitution does not fall into one of the three categories into which all other constitutions fall. He means that the Athenian constitution is neither a monarchy nor an aristocracy-oligarchy, nor a democracy.

Pericles goes on to say that, yes, the Athenian constitution ὄνομα-μὲν is called a democracy. Now he is clearly using the famous antitheses ὄνομα-ἔργον and κεκλήσθαι-πεφυκέναι³⁾. If so,

1) Aristotle, *Politics* 1256 b 32—40.

2) *Roman Oration*, section 90 both in Keil's edition and in my edition, *The Ruling Power: a Study of the Roman Empire in the Second Century after Christ through the Roman Oration of Aelius Aristides*, *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, 43 (1953), Part 4. In Dindorf's edition it would be pp. 360—361.

3) F. Heinemann, *Nomos und Physis: Herkunft und Bedeutung einer Antithese im Griechischen Denken des 5. Jahrhunderts* (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 1 [1945]), 46—56 and 108 f.

he means that actually the Athenian constitution is not a democracy. He then points out that Athens does have the great advantage of democracy, namely *isonomia* or equality of law in their private disputes, but also the great advantage of aristocracy, namely the preference given to *ἀρετή* in promotions to public office⁴). Aristocracy and oligarchy are names for the same basic constitution; for as Aeschines, *Against Ctesiphon* 6 and Aelius Aristides, *Roman Oration* 90 say, one uses either word according to the view one takes of the character of the men in control. Thus Pericles is still thinking of the same basic constitution when he points out that the Athenian constitution is devoid of the great defect which adheres to oligarchy, namely the concentration of power in the hands of the rich. Athenian life, he continues, is characterized by public *ἐλευθερία* (the essence of democracy in a good sense) and by the absence of suspicion of those who live privately in a manner out of the ordinary (i.e. a suspicion which is a great danger in a democratic state controlled by the poor).

It appears therefore, that Pericles praises the Athenian constitution as a mixed constitution. The big difference between Pericles on the one hand, and Polybius, Cicero, and Aristides on the other, is that the latter treat the ideal mixed constitution as a mixture of three basic constitutions, whereas Pericles treats the Athenian constitution as a mixture of only two, perhaps because he cannot praise the contribution of monarchy without personal embarrassment. But Thucydides himself perhaps makes the point later in II 65, 9, when he says *ἐγγίγνετό τε λόγῳ μὲν δημοκρατία, ἔργῳ δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ πρώτου ἀνδρὸς ἀρχή*. One must take the two passages together and then one sees that the failure of Pericles to mention the third basic constitution does not indicate a belief, for example, that only two of the basic constitutions were civic. Conversely Thucydides in II 65, 9 does not at all mean that Athens had ostensibly a democratic but really a monarchical form of government. He means perhaps that it had the theoretical advantage of monarchy, the rule of the one best man⁵). This man *κατεῖχε τὸ*

4) For the meaning of *ἀπὸ μέρους* I am in agreement with A. W. Gomme, *Thucydides Notes*, Cl. Q., XLIII (1948) 10 f., against Ehrenberg.

5) Another explanation is possible: the disillusioned Thucydides meant „that the leading man in a State is incomparably more important than the constitution“ (so Ehrenberg, *Historia* I, p. 537; cf. p. 547). Both meanings may be present.

πλήθος ἐλευθέρως (II 65, 8) so that the great disadvantage of monarchy was avoided⁶).

In conclusion, it is indeed true that the historical Pericles was a champion of democracy at home and a sympathizer and supporter of democracy elsewhere. It is highly probable that on the historical occasion of the funeral oration he did exalt democracy and compare Athens favorably with Sparta in constitution and other respects. But when Thucydides came to recreate the atmosphere of an older Athens and to record for another generation and for eternity what Pericles had said, Thucydides knew that the label democracy had changed its meaning. In the Thucydidean version Pericles is not defending the democracy of his day from the abuse of the contemporary oligarchs; he is distinguishing it rather from the democracy of a later Athens. The ideal of the mixed constitution, an ideal in the mind, not of the historical Pericles, but of the historian⁷), has colored anachronistically the language in which the thought of Pericles is summarized and reproduced.

Baltimore

James H. Oliver

6) With this phrase compare the denunciation of the Theban *dynasteia* κατέχοντες ἰσχύϊ τὸ πλήθος (Thucyd. III 62, 4). And with the aristocratic democracy of Athens, which was a mixed constitution, compare the democratic oligarchy of Thebes, κατ' ὀλιγαρχίαν ἰσόνομον πολιτεύουσα (Thucyd. III 62, 3). For the meaning see G. Vlastos, *Isonomia*, *AJP* LXXIV (1953), 337—366.

7) It is difficult to connect Thucydides with any one political group such as that of Theramenes, whom he of course admired. See, for example, J. de Romilly, *Thucydide et l'impérialisme athénien* (Paris, 1947), 92, and Franco Sartori, *La crisi del 411 a. C. nell' Athenaion Politeia di Aristoteles* (Univ. di Padova, Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia, XXVI [1951]), 82. The difficult sentence in Thucydides VIII 97, 2 probably does not concern us here; I would translate it, „And particularly in the initial period the Athenians instituted good policies, as they seem today at least. For the principle of a mixture with respect to the Few and to the Many became acceptable to both sides, and it was this which first caused the state to recover.” But see G. Vlastos, *the Constitution of the Five Thousand*, *AJP* LXXIII (1952), 195 f.