

THE BYZANTINE CIVILIZATION

I



FELIKS KONECZNY

THE BYZANTINE CIVILIZATION

I

GENESIS

Translated from Polish by Maciej Giertych

Wydawnictwo ANTYK Marcin Dybowski

© Copyright of this translation by Maciej Giertych

cover design by Marcin Dybowski

© English edition: 2014

Wydawnictwo ANTYK Marcin Dybowski

ISBN

Wydawnictwo ANTYK – Marcin Dybowski

ul. Klonowa 10a

05-806 Komorów

tel/fax +48 22 7580359

antykwolfnet.pl

www.ksiegarnia.antyk.org.pl

www.antyk.org.pl

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWARD BY FR. WOJCIECH GIERTYCH O.P.	7
TRANSLATOR'S NOTE	15
THE BYZANTINE CIVILIZATION	17
INTRODUCTORY NOTE	19
VOL. I GENESIS	21
I THE ORIENT IN ANTIQUITY	23
II GREECE AND ROME (TO THE SECOND HALF OF THE IIIIRD C. BC)	47
III THE CIVILIZATIONAL BACKGROUND OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT	91
IV THE HELLENISTIC IDENTITY	117
V THE TRIUMPH OF CYBELE	153
VI REFORM COMING FROM THE ORIENT	195
VII ORGANISM AND MECHANISM	235

VIII WORLDVIEWS	275
IX CAESAROPAPISM	327
X THE END OF UNIVERSALISM	389
XI CASSIODORUS	427

FOREWORD

Why is that contemporary states are progressively increasing the field of their activity? Do they have to be responsible not only for foreign policy, defence and the judiciary, but also for the economy, for education, for health care, for sport and entertainment? Do they have to impose their ideologies on family life, on sex education, on social mores, on the understanding of human nature, its finality, dignity and its social involvement? Who has attributed to state bureaucracies the right to encroach upon such issues? On what basis government bureaucrats are often irremovable, omnipotent and endowed with the attribute of infallibility? Is the formulation of such questions a relatively recent phenomenon provoked by changes that have come about within living memory or have these questions, and also answers to them, not been with us for centuries?

Ultimately, these questions and their answers belong to the realm of ethics. They depend upon the general perception of social morality that a given society has. When a problem appears, is it to be resolved by those who perceive the problem and react to it with their personal generosity, cooperating at times with others who also perceive the problem, or is the issue to be met with passive indifference in the conviction that it is the unique responsibility of state to react? In most countries of the West

the state takes away a vast percentage of the income earned by individuals and then it expects only a passive uncritical reception of the services it guarantees. An attentive observation of society in these countries shows that the consequent reduction of the sphere of social responsibility of individuals is generally accompanied by an increased sense of entitlement. While with the wide access to information the perception of various social ills is growing and it generates a sense of moral abhorrence, this abomination is usually followed up by expectations that the state should do something about this, and the state is to offer its services free of charge. As a result more and more people are on the receiving end and those who contribute to this, not through personal generosity, but through imposed taxation are wondering where all this is going. It is easy to throw the increasing debt on the next generation, but will that future generation be willing to pay, and why should the young and the unborn incur debts? After all, St. Paul taught that “children are not expected to save up for their parents, but parents for children” (2 Cor 12, 14). Furthermore, the increasing of the competence of the states with the allowing of them to intrude into all walks of life is simultaneously and progressively lowering the moral standards of society. Since the states do not, like the Church, have access to the grace of God and to the living Word of God, and they only have their penal system and an invasive, heavy, expensive bureaucracy, the states can only expect and require behaviour that is in accord with a very low moral standard. They can also penalize those who expect higher moral standards, accusing them of not being sufficiently open-minded. The more all-encompassing is the modern state, the more with its mighty

power it is lowering the ethos of personal and social life. All this is usually done in the name of equal treatment of all by the state, but this means that the public ethos is constantly falling to the level of the lowest possible common denominator.

Feliks Koneczny, the author of this study was a Polish Catholic historian living in seemingly distant times (1862-1949). Due to the Nazi and Communist totalitarianisms his most important works had been unknown for half a century. He viewed universal history through the prism of social ethics. He was interested not so much in the ideas of ethicists but in the practical value systems that societies and peoples have. He observed that these value systems differ, generating profound differences between peoples, and at the same time these value systems are extremely resistant and are passed on from generation to generation. The understanding of how communal life is to be organized was described by him as a “civilization”. Koneczny tried to individuate the continuous thread of the fundamental value systems of civilizations and observe their interaction in history. His conclusion was that when differing civilizations meet, people either try to construct and defend a social context in which they can continue to live according to their own values, or they clash with those who have a different ethos, or they become bewildered and lose a focus in their own personal and social life. People need a focus, they need to know in the name of what values they are living out their lives, and if they fail to perceive these values lived out by others around them, they are then confused, their actions become impulsive, haphazard and ultimately void of any moral orientation. Such people suffer from a paralysis of moral responsibility and they end up being

in an a-civilized state. Since, these conundrums are real and of a social nature, they can be observed in society, both today and in the past. They can thus become the subject matter of the interest of a historian.

Koneczny differentiated between the private and the public law. The private law expresses the grass-roots organization of social entities, be they clans, families, legally endowed social classes described in mediaeval and post-mediaeval Europe as “estates”, self-governing associations of craftsmen, religious groups, religious orders, cities, universities, and local governments. The public law expresses the organization of the state as it imposes from above its authority and its agencies, in view of its own ends. The perception of how the private and public law meet and relate is essentially a question of social ethics, an opinion about what is deemed proper according to the value system of a given civilization, in which communal life is organized in a particular way.

In *The Byzantine civilization* Koneczny studied the historical interaction of various possible arrangements of the public and the private law. He individuated what he called the Latin civilization, which is characterized by the conviction that the public law must respect and even defend the rights of private law. This view has its origins in ancient, republican Rome and it was affirmed, developed and extended by the Catholic Church. Ultimately it affirms what is termed today as the principle of subsidiarity. A higher level institution should not interfere and impose its authority on issues that can be done on a lower grass-roots level. The Latin civilization is built upon personalism, upon respect for individual human

dignity and human rights, and on the fundamental conviction that the spiritual power is above the temporal. This means that morality is not to be reduced to the private sphere, but it is to illuminate and also influence the public sphere, meaning the state, its functioning, the economic system and foreign policy.

The Byzantine civilization is different, because it is built upon the conviction that the public law of the state is supreme and it can therefore reduce, limit, tax out of existence, control and abolish all grass-roots activities in the name of the dignity of the state. This view has its origins in the despotic states of the Near East of antiquity. It was adopted by imperial Rome and then transferred to Constantinople. The heavy, centralized, bureaucratic state of Byzantium with its fabulously rich capital surrounded by abject, enslaved poverty worked on the imagination of centuries, but also it was hated by those who had any direct contact with it. The Byzantine system denied personalism and human dignity. It became a synonym of complex legal procedures, contributing to abuses and corruption, intrigues, immorality, repression and a total subservience of the Church to the state, meaning that there was no place in this system for any assessment of the functioning of the state in the light of Gospel principles. Koneczny claimed that the Byzantine state served as a model for the European Holy Roman Empire, which, precisely for this reason was in permanent conflict with the papacy. Through the Teutonic Knights installed in Prussia and through the Reformation, Byzantinism had a continuation in the absolutist monarchies of modern Europe and in all the socialist expansions of the competence of states. For this reason, Koneczny

continued his reflection on the Byzantine civilization right up to his own times, to the Second World War.

While perceiving a profound impact of the Byzantine civilization on modern Germany, and thus on continental Europe, Koneczny surprisingly did not include Russia in the Byzantine civilization. He saw in history the presence of another model for the organization of communal life coming from Asia, which he described as the Turanian civilization. In this world there is no permanent public law, there is only the private law, but of one individual, the *khan*, the *tsar*, the *sultan*. All the people and all the wealth that passes through their hands are the private property of the supreme leader, who is not bound by any obligations, any acquired rights of private law, any consistency of public law, any moral rule whatever. The tyrannical rule that expresses his arbitrary whims generates fear, and in fact the more brutal he is, the more he is respected by his subjects. The Turanian civilization furnished the underlying ethos of the empire of Genghis Khan, of Muscovy and Russia and of Ottoman Turkey. Russia is therefore not to be viewed as a child of the Ruthenia of Kiev, but as the descendant of a former colony of the Mongolian *khans* of Saratov. In fact, the mediaeval Ruthenians of today's Ukraine and Belarus willingly aligned themselves first with Lithuania and then with Poland, because being on the watershed of conflicting civilizations, they looked towards Europe as they tried to escape from Mongolian and Muscovite brutality.

Koneczny's vision of universal European history that begins in antiquity and ends in the XX century is presented as an interaction of these three fundamental and contradictory views

about how communal life is to function. Koneczny amassed a wealth of historical material. In many details, he certainly may be corrected by more recent scholarship. The value of his work, however, lies primarily in the overall recognition of the importance of ethical ideals in history and the perception that these ideals are profoundly different among different peoples. Koneczny did not engage in philosophical ethics or in moral theology. He did not attempt to justify objectively, rationally or theologically the moral qualification of acts and the moral norms. He accepted Catholic ethics at face value. Furthermore, he noted the social dimension of Catholic ethics that dates not from Pope Leo XIII, but has been in existence throughout nearly two millennia of the Church's history. He saw the Catholic Church as the courageous defender of the dignity of the human person, of the autonomy of all grass-roots groups and as the educator of nations. With the eye of a historian he saw how with great difficulty the high standards of Catholic social morality were maintained and how they had to be defended against miscomprehensions and contrary visions. He observed that always this could be done with greater success, whenever the imposing power of the state was limited and subjected to higher moral criteria.

Koneczny learnt that all ideologies that promote the cosmopolitan integration of peoples living according to conflicting ethical principles will eventually have to crash. This is the experience of history. He distinguished between nationality and citizenship. He claimed that it is only within the Latin civilization that a consciousness of belonging to a given nation is born. This entails an allegiance towards the nation, its culture,

history and values. It involves a moral stance that generates moral responsibilities. These are distinct from being subject to a monarch or from citizenship, which express only a legal dependency towards some higher political power. Koneczny did not imagine that concern for the monogamous family as a fundamental social unit will also require a courageous and public moral stance similar to the moral responsibility for one's nation. After all, Koneczny died in 1949. He did, however, perceive that the emancipation of the family from the clan structure, and the affirmation of monogamy by the Catholic Church is a factor of fundamental importance conditioning the Latin civilization.

Koneczny perceived a basic difference between the Latin and Byzantine civilizations, consisting in the Catholic aloofness of the Church from the state and the Byzantine dependency and subservience towards the state of both Orthodoxy and major currents of Protestantism. In the light of Koneczny's perspective, it is not surprising that in states that function according to the Byzantine model, whether it is ancient and mediaeval Byzantium or modern Germany, where the state collects taxes for the Church and then administers the distribution of funds, the clergy has a deep anti-Roman complex. When the ecclesial structure is directly dependent upon the state, the clergy prefer not to stand up to it in the defence of moral values. But where the Catholic Church has the courage to maintain a counter-cultural stance, there the Gospel is preached in its fullness, and in time it may condition the social fabric.

Wojciech Giertych OP

Theologian of the Papal Household

TRANSLATOR'S NOTE

This translation was made from the Polish language edition of Koneczny's *Cywilizacja Bizantyńska* (London: Wydawnictwa Towarzystwa im. Romana Dmowskiego, 1973). This book was finished before the 2nd World War but some additions were made to it after the war and in particular the last chapter seems to be substantially revised based on the post war situation.

All notes coming from the translator are given in square brackets []

The author wrote this book for the Polish intelligentsia of his generation assuming a certain level of general knowledge of languages, culture and history, both Polish and universal. Where the translator considered it necessary to add some explanation this was done in square brackets.

Koneczny frequently includes words or phrases in foreign languages (Latin, German, French and Italian). These are given in italic, where necessary followed by a translation into English in square brackets.

Russian texts are frequently given by the author in the Latin alphabet in a Polish transliteration, usually quite understandable to Polish readers. Transliterating them into English would be of no use to English readers. Thus the texts are given in the original Russian with a translation into English in square brackets.

Koneczny used a number of special philosophical or sociological terms which he defined in his own manner. A glossary of these terms is given at the end of the book. The reader is advised to read this short glossary before embarking on reading the book as whole.

Maciej Giertych

P. S. When I left Poland in 1945 as a 9 year old child with my parents and siblings, I did not know that my father had recently met professor Koneczny, who gave him a type-written copy of his *Byzantine civilization* asking for help in the book's publication. Since my parents were fleeing communist Poland so as to live the life of political émigrés in Britain, and they did not know how the escape will work out, my father gave the copy of the book to a friend of his, an active member of the Polish underground movement, who had contacts with the British embassy in Warsaw. The plan was that some way would be found to send it to London. Unfortunately, my father's friend was captured by the communists and executed. It was only in 1962 in less dramatic times that I returned to Poland and settled there. I managed to find Koneczny's major works, which had been type-written by various people, including myself, who were not professional historians or editors. I had them transferred to London, where my parents published them (in Polish). It was only after the fall of communism that the most important works of Koneczny were reprinted in Poland. It is now my joy to offer an English translation of this important work of an outstanding Catholic social thinker.

THE BYZANTINE CIVILIZATION

VOLUME I

GENESIS



INTRODUCTORY NOTE

This book has been partially ready and already announced in 1935 in my book *On the Plurality of Civilizations* (in a footnote on p. 307). There I explained its genesis and motives. Over a period of more than 20 years various parts of the book have been written in multiple sequences. They were constantly corrected, edited and supplemented, but also shortened in places where this was needed for the sake of brevity and clarity, and even more had to be deleted for “technical” reasons. A long and tedious work conducted with almost stubbornness was first to convince me whether my method of studying civilizations is appropriate and when I attained confidence that it is, there began a second period of the work in which I tried to check out on the historical description of the Byzantine civilization how far my science of civilizations provides a truly “new view of universal history”. The Byzantine civilization is best suited for such a check because its history covers almost the whole of the history that we tend to refer to as universal; its roots are in distant antiquity among the pharaohs and its high branches only today are beginning dry up. Thus, something like an academic textbook resulted, which studies universal history from the point of view of the science of civilizations.

This new point of observation permitted many new things to be spotted. Beginning with numerous issues pertaining to

Church history one can also quote as an example the explanation of the ideological background to the efforts of Alexander the Great; new theses concerning the rise and fall of Rome; new views about the Hellenistic period as well as about the Germanic invasions etc. In mediaeval history, such questions as iconoclasm, the Apostles of the Slavs and even the Cluniac reform are viewed anew. The conflicts of emperors with the papacy are seen in a new light. In modern history we note the Byzantine poison almost throughout Europe. Even the Enlightenment becomes more pronounced against the background of Byzantinism, the greatest genius of which proved to be Bismarck and its grave-digger Hitler. A new light is also thrown on the modern history of England. What is perhaps most important, it becomes clear that always, since the days of the pharaohs until today, it is impossible to be civilized in two different ways, because civilizational mixtures lead to degeneration and finally to craziness bringing us all into an a-civilizational state.

May these few words encourage the reader to study the work all the way to the end not being discouraged by deficiencies in arrangement and in the writer's workshop. These were impossible to avoid, since the book was written too long and in a situation where there were shortcomings in the scientific apparatus. The work has been brought to some sort of end in spite of the fact that from 1939 onwards access to all scientific libraries was closed and it was announced with severity that "all scientific work of Poles is strictly forbidden". Nevertheless Polish scholars continued to work. They did not fold their hands, nor did they lose spirit.

Kraków, March 1947.

VOLUME I
GENESIS



THE ORIENT IN ANTIQUITY

I

The genesis of the Byzantine civilization belongs to a series of most important issues of universal history, particularly since it is closely connected with the “rise and fall of Rome”. Its genealogy is very long, longer than for any other civilization. Frequently one has to step back to the ancient Egyptian and Persian civilisations. One has to study the Hellenistic and Syrian civilizations and one has to acquaint oneself with the Roman and finally the Latin one. The Byzantine civilization is not a homogenous formation but a historical agglomeration that built up over many centuries from numerous peoples of various countries in three parts of the world.

The tendency towards emanationism, which is manifest in the Orthodox Church even today (Mereżkowski, Berdyjev), derives from the ancient Orient. It is also from there, from Babylon and Egypt that the idea of state universalism came to the late Roman Empire and to the Byzantine one. And the typically Byzantine ideal of uniformity that is felt so strongly that compulsion is used with conviction so as to impose it comes from ancient Iran. Thus we have to immerse even there into the past so as to reach to the roots of Byzantinism.

The view, even though it is universally held, that Byzantinism was born only after the fall of the Roman civilization and that it represents one of the two branches that grew on the ruins of the classical civilization, parallel with the Latin one is false. An even greater error is the view that Byzantinism is some kind of continuation of Hellenic Greek civilization. It was not born of the Hellenic but of the Hellenistic background, which is not a fruit of Greece but of Asia. Let us not be fooled by the affinity of terms.

Thus we have to consider both Hellenic Greece and the Hellenistic states from the viewpoint of the science of civilizations. Simple chronology of history indicates that Rome was drawing not from Hellenic Greece but from the Hellenistic model. Since the final ages of the history of Rome have so much in common with the Orient we have to study how this grew upon the “proper” ancient Rome, in the times prior to the *magnum delirium* of Horace. In this comparing and analysing, is it possible to avoid the immortal topic: “Greece and Rome”? This question studied here from a new vantage point will prove to appear very different.

All these issues strangely combine and interlock but as we shall see they form a consistent scientific whole. The science of civilizations brings with it a new view of the entire universal history.

In order to understand the most important historical moments it often proved necessary to explore deeply even into the notions about the relationship between the natural and the supernatural world. Not only in ancient history but also in the entire universal history we see emanationism and creationism facing each other. The classical world confessed creationism. The East (except for the

Jews) was emanationist. In both systems there can be competition between local and tribal deities as well as their hierarchy, eternal or temporal, unchangeable or conditional.

The relationship of man to God is variously understood. In the Brahman civilization only exceptional individuals can think of a direct relationship with the highest divine element, with Brahma. The general populace does not know Brahma; thus there are no temples for him, there is no cult, there are no priests. The majority only pays homage to a multitude of deities not being worried at all about their mutual relationships. Under creationism mythology is strictly hierarchical, whereas it is chaotic with emanationism.

Man wishes to approach God and rarely does he dare to suspect that he could do this directly. The vast majority of humankind is of the opinion that man is incapable of this (even in prayer) while being in a normal state; for this one has to bring oneself into an exceptional state, an extraordinary one. They are of the opinion that a normal person has no access to God, and that this can be obtained only through abnormality (the dancing dervishes, Korybantes, self-mutilations etc.). At a higher level this is manifest in the view that the approaching of God is possible only after exceptional, ingenious mortifications of the body, bordering on abnormality. This idea passed on from ancient Egypt to Eastern Christianity. (Among the Greeks such requirements were rare and among the Romans they did not occur at all). It is only Catholicism that allows a perfectly normal man to directly face God. In Catholicism this is simply recognized as a personal relationship (an idea which generates the horror of abomination among the Chinese).

The vast majority of peoples recognizes only a communal approach to God, excluding an individual direct access, requiring that it be through the mediation of the community of which the given individual is a member (for example, a Jew prays as a Jew and not individually). These views pass on into private and public life resulting in either communalism or personalism in the psyche of peoples.

Convictions, views and opinions are historical facts of first order importance, because it is abstracts that govern history.

One can detect religious influences in views about the nature of supreme state authority, thus these views are located in the very foundation of the intellect, in notions about the relationship between the natural and the supernatural world.

In ancient Orient the idea of a universal state had Babylonian traditions. As everywhere also there the notion of value was for a long time tied exclusively with physical force and from this the ideal of conquest and occupation developed. The local deity is the source and giver of strength. The gods are constantly in conflict with one another in support of their peoples; the god is either a winner or he demonstrates that he is not a true god. The world is conquered by the happy followers of the highest and the strongest of all the competing gods. As the ruler makes consecutive conquests he approaches the perfection of his god, for example of Marduk and he becomes as if a god himself. The rulers of Babylon call themselves gods (they even build temples for themselves), but only when they become the “rulers of the four quarters of the world”. Later however, “more subtle religious notions developed since between the gods and men an unfathomable abyss appears”

and then only symbols had to suffice. In the glorifying hymns of the period of Hammurabi only kings are compared with the gods but they are not considered as such (Jouguet 1926, 3, 7-9). In any case a Babylonian can approach his god but he is never consubstantial with it in an emanationist way. A Babylonian ruler is deified *a posteriori* and this is not emanationism.

This is not the case in Egypt. There “from the very beginning until the latest time the king was considered an incarnation of the deity” (Piotrowicz 1922, 4). Incarnation is a consequence of the emanationist doctrine held in Egypt and in India. It is not known where is its origin – it could have developed independently both here and there. The Hindu one is known to us very accurately (with the karma and nirvana); we know little about the Egyptian emanation apart from information about the incarnation of the bull Apis.

Emanationism holds that the entire universe was located at the beginning in the immortal being (Brahma) and from it, it gradually emerges in parts through emanation. Everything that exists is in connection with some emanation. The further from the Primordial Being the emanation takes place the less perfect it is in its products.

All deities derive from emanations of the primordial being, and the kings also, or at least they are descendants of one of the deities. *A priori* a king is an incarnation of a deity.¹

Belief in incarnation does not automatically exclude an invader. A god can transfer his incarnation onto someone else, be it even a foreigner. Obviously the god exits from the current incarnate

¹ The Hindu rajahs are held to be such until this day.

since he allows him to be beaten. In this way emanationism mixes with the lower notion of competition among the gods.

The socio-political results of emanationism (*a priori*) and of deification (*a posteriori*) are the same: the head of state deserves divine respect with all the accompanying consequences.

A people believing in emanationism cannot have above it any other governance than an absolute one. It will recognize only such a ruler in whom it sees an emanation of a deity, an incarnation. Such an individual is deified and from the moment he takes over the throne he becomes the unlimited master of the country, of everyone and of everything as a God on earth, as an incarnation of the deity. This personal right of the monarch, his right of universal ownership becomes the point of departure for all laws.

Where a single individual thinks nothing of himself and all value is said to derive from belonging to a community there develops a tendency to fix the features of communalism and to spread them compulsorily. Unity cannot be understood in any other way than as uniformity. And since there is no uniformity without compulsion the head of state is endowed with unlimited power. In the advanced statehood of Egypt statism, fiscalism and bureaucracy developed. Weaker rudiments of these three can be found everywhere where governance is considered to be an emanation of a deity. Besides this in Egypt and Asia Minor there was the binding of the peasants to the soil and in Egypt there was also a caste system.

The historical axis of Egypt is its aiming for universalism. It is not known whether this was understood there only physically, politically or also spiritually, or whether political universalism

was only to be an introduction to a higher spiritual one. We have too little data to answer a question posed in this way. However universalism is not a historical speciality of only the pharaohs.

After all, from China to Ultima Thule² universalism was for millennia considered a system of a higher order, a perfection of communal life, in other words: a political or social ideal frequently linking one with the other. Universalism is an essential motive of entire universal history. But there are various methods of universalism, various ways of understanding and applying it depending on the civilization. We shall often meet with this problem in discussing the themes of this book.

Egypt is the cradle of universalism by conquest. Already in the XIVth c. B.C., during the reign of Ramses Sesostris (1392-1328 B.C.) the realm of the pharaohs extended as far as the Euphrates River. This ideal passed on from the conquerors to the conquered, who later themselves became victorious conquerors. The Babylonians and Assyrians passed through the Egyptian school with high marks. In the time of the Assyrian Tiglet Pilezer III (745-726 B.C.) the whole of Asia Minor was under Assyria; and under Assarhaddon (681-668 B.C.) Egypt became a province of Assyria. Next the heritage of the idea of a universal state passed on to the Persians and in 525 B.C., Egypt, the originator of the idea found itself in Persian captivity.

In Egypt, ages ago political despotism was joined with economic despotism. The pharaoh was the lord of the land and of everything the land gives or hides (Jauguet 1933, 33). The peasants were formally permanent tenants in the possessions of kings,

² [The northernmost region of the habitable world].

temples and aristocracy; in fact they were serfs bound to the soil which they were not allowed to leave, neither, themselves or their progeny. Craftsmanship was as if “nationalized”; the craftsmen as a rule worked in workshops that were the property of the pharaohs and thus Egypt was a “classical country of monopolies” (Jauguet 1933, 34).

In even earlier centuries a monopoly for grain was introduced because the farmers were allowed to sell it only to the state at a price determined by the state. Great mines were the property of the state. Besides, there was a monopoly of salt and of some crafts. The entire population was in fact composed of slaves of the land or of crafts (Jauguet 1933, 76).

Statism requires an extensive bureaucracy. The population was under the constant control of the administration. Egypt is the cradle of bureaucracy. It was organised multilaterally and very strictly according to hierarchical ranks. Governance was organised in departments and the fiscal department excelled in matchless strictness and efficiency.

This was spoiled under Persian rule in the system of the satraps; in place of precision that was most severe for the population there appeared the arbitrariness of the satraps, which was doubled and tripled by the arbitrariness of their officials.

What was worse, the Egyptians suffered religious persecution under the Persians. The second Persian ruler, the son and successor of Cyrus called Cambyses (529-522), having conquered Egypt not only was guilty of many cruel atrocities, but, what more, he ill-treated the religion of the Egyptians and publicly committed profanations (Jauguet 1933, 35). During the days of his successor

Darius (son of Hystaspes) an uprising exploded in Egypt, which failed, but it prevented a third expedition of the king against Greece (the years 490-485); it was only his son Xerxes I who could attempt it in 480. During the days of the next king Artaxerxes (465-424) a second Egyptian uprising broke out, with some support from the Athenians, but it was also suppressed. The third one during the reign of Darius II Nothus (424-405) was finally successful and Egypt regained its independence, but only for 60 years, since it was conquered again by Artaxerxes III Ochos (359-338). 17 years later Alexander the Great entered the country.

The Persians did not confess emanationism or deification. Their religious dualism had to assess whether the religions of subdued peoples were generated by Ormuzd or Ahriman. Deification of the ruler was not a part of this religious system. This has nothing to do with the fact that they took over from Babylon the magnificence of court ceremonial, which was heavy and complicated, beginning with the dress down to the servility which included prostrating oneself with the face to the ground. With all due likelihood the Babylonians venerated in this way the deity to which height the king was elevated and this is how the Greeks understood this **proskynesis** [προσκύνησις – act of prostrating oneself before a person of higher social rank] because they had been practicing this only in front of the altars of deities. For the Persians this was a gesture of court homage. But they have adopted the Babylonian ceremonial because until Xerxes they permitted the fiction of Babylonian independence and the Persian kings annually went through the as if investiture made by Bel-Marduk. Later this changed and the Babylonians were even

forbidden to carry arms (Jouguet 1926, II, 5; Piotrowicz 1922, 9). What more, the Persians began persecuting the religions of subdued peoples. They must have assessed that they were the manifestations of Ahriman. Is it not then that Amon hid in Apis and the Syrian deities hid in stones (meteorites)? Since the Persian kings refused deification they could not be recognized as proper rulers in Egypt or anywhere else in Asia Minor. The deification of a monarch was a “state necessity” there; otherwise the ruler was deprived of a legal basis and the people had the right to profit from any opportunity to come again under the rule of incarnations of their own deities. In this manner the entire Persian state was ready for rebellion, if only the issue is considered from the religious point of view. This of course was known at the Macedonian court.

Probing deeper into the essence of things we see that we have here various methods of grasping the relationship between the natural and the supernatural worlds. We know three such methods and all of them were present in the universal Persian state, namely: the competition of deities, emanationism and the belief in the acts of creation. Iranian dualism represented the highest possible level of the doctrine of competition and it stood on the boundary between polytheism and monotheism. But in the Persian state emanationism was much more universal, together with the deification of the monarch, however, this did not affect the Persian religion.

Ethnographic Persia is only the province of Persis, with the coastal area of the northern part of the Persian Gulf and the Persian people consisted of ten tribes. This was minuscule with respect to the population of the enormous state. The Greek was surprised

how is it that so many different peoples could be within the same state; but he also knew that the rule there was always based on the sword alone and that everything depended on the state of the army.

The Persian kings did not care about being derived from gods; thus nowhere were they considered legitimate rulers. They never abandoned the Iranian dualism. Moreover they wished to make their religion into a universal one and they knew no other means to achieve this than by force; thus everywhere they persecuted the local religions and for this they were hated.

The Persian king was not an incarnation of the deity but an instrument of Ormuzd to combat Ahriman and for this purpose he had to be endowed with all the necessary means; otherwise he would not be able to perform his functions appropriately. Thus, he was an absolute ruler just as the Egyptian pharaoh. In order to spread the rule of Ormuzd on earth he had to, like the pharaohs, aim at conquering the four quarters of the world.

And so the idea of a universal state attained by conquest is of oriental origin. It is from there also, *ex Oriente*, that the superstition derives, which claims that the state is the more potent on the exterior the more power the head of state has in the interior. If a monarchy is to be threatening towards its neighbours the monarch should above all be threatening towards his own subjects. Such a line of thought established itself primarily in Asia. On this point the Syrian (Phrygian) and Persian civilizations were in agreement; the Egyptian took this up somewhat later.

Agreement on some points with the Egyptian and Syrian civilizations led the Persian outlook to some form of compromise. The ruler did not derive from the deity, but as the executor of

his will he is his deputy on earth and therefore he is close to the deity; by his merits he can even raise to the level where he becomes similar to the deity. Thus, this was as if deification *ex post, a posteriori*. And since no king was ever short of flatterers exalting his achievements, even if he had none, so after some time it became automatically understood that the Persian king is to be honoured as if he were a god.

Were it not for the religious persecutions the Persians could have made their state permanently universal. This however did not happen because they had all the subdued peoples in contempt and made them feel that they are captives.

Royal despotic autocracy is based on a permanent army. The administration must adapt to this. The Persian state was divided into large regions ruled by satraps who were the deputies of the king having also an unlimited power; they were as if provincial dukes “who frequently conducted an independent policy, hostile to other satraps” (Zieliński 1922, II, 29). For this reason it is difficult to judge who was more dependent on whom. The satraps depended upon the king or the king upon the good will of the satraps?

The second weak side of the statehood was that there was a uniformity of law in the entire state regardless of the multiplicity of social structures among the governed peoples and the great diversity in their level of civilization. Besides the primitive nomads the Persian state also included such peoples as the Lydians and the Chaldeans who had their own ancient legal systems not to mention Egypt; it is known that it was only Alexander the Great who reintroduced the old native laws there (Jouguet 1926, 85). Under Persian rule nowhere was there an appropriate law and an

improper law is a totally bad law. The population that is burdened with such a law only waits for an opportunity to shed it.

How different were the Greek notions, where every more significant city was a state to itself and could arrange its own law! There was no shortage of other contradictions; there was polygamy with eunuchs at least in the palaces of the king and notables who held whole harems and besides this there was the eastern abhorrence of the naked body (Zieliński 1922, II, 217). Forget the Persian attire with very wide trousers!

The social structure among the peoples of Asia Minor was more or less unitary. There were always big landowners there, who were in fact owners even though formally they were tenants of large regions leased to them by the rulers. They were the masters of the peasant people who were bound to the soil (Jouguet 1926, 404, *attachés au sol*). To the east of the Persian state nomadic pastoral peoples were dominant.

We find many of the Egyptian and Persian features later on in Byzantium: despotism, fiscalism, bureaucracy. Our investigations should establish whether we are dealing with the generation of similar symptoms in differing countries and times independently of each other, that is, with no historical relationship; or rather that there is such a relationship over centuries and distant countries, and if this is the case, we would have to recognise the influence of ancient Orient on the Byzantine civilization.

Iran can interest us here only from middle of the VIth c. B.C. when Cyrus (Kuruš, Korsh) the Elder imprisoned and beat the head of the Persians, the Median Astyages in 558 B.C. From that time the ancient Persian state begins, which was to last until 330.

The rule of the Persian Achaemenids spreading gradually over the whole of Iran was crowned in 538 by the conquest of Babylon. The coastal settlements of Greek Asia Minor were compelled in 546 to accept Persian domination and pay tributes. The son of Cyrus, Cambyses conquered Egypt in 525 and was hated there because he showed disrespect to the local religious cult. After his death turmoil results from which Darius (521-485), son of Hystaspes, also an Achaemenid emerges victorious. The Asia Minor Greeks had to supply him with a fleet for an expedition against the Scythians as a result of which Thrace came under the domination of Persia.

Thrace is much closer to Asia than Macedonia. This is a minor fact but it recalls the fact that Persians, clothed in their wide trousers that seemed so obscene to the Greeks had a pleasant surprise in Thrace, when they met a Thracian peasant also dressed in trousers (Parandowski 1933, 158). Thrace inclines geographically to Asia and because of the Thracian Khersones it is closer to it. This peninsula was known to Greek traders for long. They occupied it from the north where it linked with the Thracian continent and they fortified it with a thick wall so as to withstand attacks from Thracian barbarians.

Around mid VIth c. B.C. a major state centre developed there governed by the Athenian tyrant Miltiades the Elder. From there, across the Hellespont and then across the wider seas of Propontis [Marmara] the Greek settler reached further north to the Thracian Bosphorus (the very name is Thracian) that is even closer to Asia than Khersones. From there it is a stone's throw from Europe

to Asia. A suburb of Constantinople, Scutari, lies in Asia and in antiquity Khalkedon was there, a city of Bithynia³.

On the Asiatic mainland there were no Greek settlements anywhere nearer than the Aeolian ones on the Phrygian coast and the sea route to the Black sea was much easier for the Asia Minor Greeks than the land route.

At the southern end of Thracian Bosphorus stood the “fort of Byzas”, Byzantion. Who was he? Was he a Greek trader, explorer and of necessity a warrior, all in one person? Or was he a Phoenician, Punician or Carthaginian? Over the African Sirte Minor there was also a “Byzantium”, a larger settlement amidst the Libyan surrounding. Maybe Byzas (the same or some namesake) discovered the Thracian Bosphorus for the Phoenicians or the Punicians? It would be difficult to assume that he was some tribal prince of the Bosphorian Thracians.

With time this fort disappeared, but in 667 the trading value of this place was recognized by the Dorian traders from Megara. The number of settlers increased as they came from other regions, from Corinth, from the Boeotian Thebes and finally also from Asiatic Greece, even from the faraway Miletus. This second fort of Byzas was undoubtedly Greek and as it developed it generated the greed of the neighbouring tribes of Thrace. Somehow they managed with this.

But they proved unable to withstand the Persian onslaught. When Darius (521-480), the son of Hystaspes moved against the

³ During Roman times the city Byzantion together with its region was under the governor of Bithynia (Zakrzewski 1938).

Scythians he occupied Byzantium already in his first expedition in 515. When still during the reign of this very same Darius a Greek uprising broke out, initially in Miletus in 500, Byzantium joined. And when the Persians suppressed the uprising in land and sea battles (500-494), when Miletus was destroyed and a part of its inhabitants resettled at the mouth of the Tigris, Byzantium was subjected to an even harsher fate because the Persians dispersed its entire population. Some of them established a new settlement, Mesembria on the Black Sea: thus it is there that one should look for the descendants of the true Byzantines. The Persians built a fortress in Byzantium, which was to be a major support for their expansion onto the European side.

Later the help given by Athens and Erytra to their countrymen in Asia during an uprising against the Persians gave Darius an excuse for his and his son's Xerxes' expeditions against the Greeks, but these ended with a Greek victory at Salamis in 480.

Meanwhile the Persian rule over Bosphorus lasted 37 years. Since the city was populated anew thus, it can be said that a new Byzantium was established, a third one in succession. It was set up by the Persians but soon its occupying force represented only a small fragment of the new population. New traders came and continued to come and thus the most westerly post of Asiatic trade was established there. For 37 years traders of the whole Persian state, an enormous country indeed, benefited from the Persian expansion, but it was mostly the Ionian Greeks of Asia Minor who linked ever more with the new Empire on its European side. The Bosphorus Greeks, however, preferred not to belong to the state of the "kings", and when two years after Salamis, in 478, they

regained independence, they immediately joined the Athenian alliance.

Later the Athenians sent reinforcements to the insurgents rebelling against Artaxerxes (465-424) in Egypt whose rule was interrupted by many revolts and started to be based on mercenary forces. During the reign of Darius II Nothus (424-405) Egypt regains independence which however lasted only 60 years. At that time Byzantium belongs to the Hellenic political system. During the Peloponnesian war (431-404) Byzantium was either under Athens or under Sparta. In the year 405 (the battle of Aigospotamoi) began the decided hegemony of Sparta.

That same year Darius II Nothus died and of his two sons the elder sat on the throne, Artaxerxes Mnemon (405-359), while the younger one, Cyrus (Kuruš) known in history as Cyrus the Younger was made commander in Asia Minor. He supplied help from there to Sparta against Athens – as a result of which he obtained Spartan assistance when he started conspiring against his brother. It was at that time that Byzantium moved to the Spartan camp and obtained from Sparta in 403 Clearchus, a nauarch [admiral] as governor. He however used his military strength to make himself into a tyrant of Byzantium and cared not for other things. The Spartans themselves had chased him out. Clearchus tried his luck as an organiser of mercenaries and took up service with Cyrus the Younger. He was successful and in the triumphant march through Tarsus to Issus he reached as far as Cunaxa, 120 km from Babylon. The Greek soldiers fought bravely but the forces of Cyrus failed. This battle was lost by Cyrus, for which Clearchus paid with his head. Ten

thousand Greek mercenary soldiers were sent home having all sorts of trials during their retreat (“catabasis”). That was in 401.

For some time Greece was supplying mercenaries and the Greek condottieri were primarily from Sparta. In fact the true leader of Cyrus the Younger’s expedition was Clearchus who was a condottiere⁴. These leaders were developing the military art and this expedition was in fact the first such systematic endeavour (Zieliński 1922, II, 22). We can consider as the second one the expedition of Spartan Agesilaos against Persia in 399. When the Persians began punishing the Ionian cities in revenge for the participation in the action of Cyrus the Younger the Ionians called for help the Spartan mercenaries. Their third leader Agesilaos proved so brave and able that he moved victoriously deep into Asia. But the permanently full Persian treasury proved stronger. It is for Persian money that the Corinthian war was conducted which began with the battle of Cnidus (which will be discussed more, later) and which led to the renewal of Athenian hegemony.

Being mercenaries became for the Greeks the second main occupation, besides trade, and this was to remain so until the IVth c. A. D.

It is difficult to suppose that the mercenary Greeks were only from Greece proper. Taking various things into consideration one should rather suspect that not many were truly so, that there was more Greeks from the islands, from the Asia Minor settlements

⁴ The term is an anachronism, but the reality is the same. Mercenary business was also known in the history of Asia, particularly of China. There are still Chinese condottieri. No other European language has its own term to describe such a business.

and from the “barbarian” north of Greece, from Macedonia and possibly also Thrace.

Soon the Thracians matured to state unification. They had their own native civilization, a different one, which is acknowledged by all Greek sources but we know very little about their method of organization of communal life. We know that they had a clan system and that it developed into a tribal one; but this is a process that took place and takes place the world over; there are no communities which would not have passed through such a stage of organization. But the Thracians rose later to a higher level that not all communities attain, because their tribes joined together becoming peoples. The sources mention four of them: “The Odrysiens on the river Hebros (the Maritsa of today), the Bessers along the Rhodope Mts. and the Bistones and Cicones along the Aegean Sea; each of these peoples had their own king.” Finally, they have made a further progress in organization, being in this superior to the Greeks. Every Greek people, even the smallest, formed until the very end a separate political unit. The Thracians, after various conflicts and alliances finally united around 380 B.C. under a founder of a dynasty named Kotys forming thereby a united Thracian entity.

Actually not the “whole” of Thrace was involved because it did not include Byzantium and its region. After some time this city removed itself from all links with Greece and having resisted Epaminondas in 364 it did not belong from 355 to any Hellenic coalition or to any other union, maintaining a total independence, in all and everything, such that it was considered by the Greeks as

complete independence – those Greeks who unfortunately stopped short at the lowest political level of organization of communal life.

Meanwhile on the west a new power developed – the Macedonian one. The Thracians knew the Macedonians for a long time, from the various battles that they waged with one another with varying success. The period of Kotys was not favourable for Macedonia but then the fortune turned radically. All the Thracian peoples were conquered by Philip of Macedonia. However Byzantium defended itself resisting Philip in 340 and it was only Alexander the Great who became master of the richest city on the Bosphorus.

Both these civilizations, the folk Thracian one and the trading one, the oldest “Byzantine” were distinctly ... defective. The Thracians had nothing to pass on to the next generations apart from a memory of their great ability to form larger associations. Byzantium by any means did not belong to that civilization which is commonly referred to as “Hellenic” but which in fact was Athenian. The population was composed of arrivals from various parts of European and Asiatic Greece and they brought with them various Hellenic civilizations which did not produce a synthesis and instead formed a mechanical mixture that was oblivious to everything that was not connected with trade. The Corinthians and their descendants, also the descendants of Megara, Thebes and Miletus maintained in the second Byzantium or else in Mesembria and next in the third Byzantium some remnants of the civilizations of their old nests. The more they differed, the more the settlers coming from various civilizations had to be in contact with one another and become dependent upon one another (in trade), the

more they had to become indifferent to civilizational differences and incline increasingly towards an a-civilizational state maintaining only the material culture and trade customs. Not only did they not graft onto the settlement any method of organization of communal life from one of the cities of their origin, not only did they fail to invent a new one, but they became indifferent in many fields and issues that were not directly connected with the trading function of the settlement. This was the general picture in all these Greek settlements that accepted co-settlers from various parts of Hellas. On the other hand it is not possible to deny a civilizational outlook to settlements that were uniform. In particular, the Athenian settlements had a very clear civilizational type. One does not hear about any settlers from Attica among the population of Byzantium, which was of various origins.

All these circumstances point to the conclusion that Byzantium did not favour the maintenance of any civilization proper to the ancestors of the settlers, nor were there conditions for the development of a new one. In fact, the civilization known as Byzantine does not originate from this city or its environs. Thanks to its geographic position and to its trade-political role it was later to serve as a capital of a civilization that developed beyond it and was named after it due to a set of historical circumstances.

Macedonia, neighbouring Thrace from the west stood at a higher intellectual as well as economic level, because it was based ever more on Hellenic education and had more goods that could be exchanged by Greek traders.

But was Macedonia a Greek country? It did not belong to Hellas and for a long time it did not participate in the pan-Hellenic

Olympic Games. In fact, there is even no “absolute certainty” that the Macedonians were of Greek origin or that their language was a variant of Greek. The Greeks themselves variously judged the relationship of the language to Hellenism. They did not consider the Pamphylians as Greeks even though they spoke in pure Greek; they were always considered as barbarians. The cultural level also was not a criterion since the Cyprus Greeks were considered Hellenes as well as the Aeolians who were of very low culture (Wałek 1924, II 326).

It is possible that the population of Macedonia had a multiple genesis; it is also suspected that in various parts of Macedonia the population was of diverse origin, Pelasgian, Thracian, Illyrian, Phrygian and their union was strictly a question of statehood when they were conquered by the Macedonians, a mountain people from the upper Aliákmon river. Possibly only they were of Greek blood and later their descendants spread the Hellenic identity.

The hegemony of these Macedonians created the Macedonian state. This began already around the year 700 B.C. until the growth of the state was curtailed by the Persians during the reign of the Macedonian king Amyntas I (540-498), whose son Alexander I (498-454) even had to supply contingents in support of Xerxes. Later dynastic conflicts (not without murders) led to a division of the state into four districts until Perdiccas II (436-413) united them again into a single state.

It was already Amyntas who established relationships with Athens. The spread of Hellenic education on a major scale occurred during the reign of Archelaus (413-399) who called to his court a number of most eminent Greek poets, philosophers and artists. He

also adopted Greek military norms. At that time Spartan hegemony among the Greeks was beginning to weaken. In 394 Persia again interfered in Greek issues. One can question whether during the sea battle of Cnidus the Spartan fleet was defeated by the Athenian Conon or rather by his ally the satrap Pharnabazus. We know for sure that the “long walls” linking Athens with Piraeus were soon rebuilt with Persian money. Thus in the peace of Antalcidas (387) Persia not only regained Ionia of western Asia and Cyprus but also obtained legal influence on Greek issues as a guarantor of the independence of smaller Hellenic states.

Meanwhile the Macedonian king Amyntas II (393-369) was increasingly surrounding himself with Greeks. Nikomachos, the court physician, was a personal friend of his. But a new period of troubles and decline came which lasted till mid IVth c. It was only under Philip II (359-336) that not only a revival of the state occurred but also its great flourishing. The Macedonian kingdom became a great power. This is the same Philip who made a great imprint on the history of Greece; he was the victor at Chaeronea (338). He was very touched by the Greek mind and he called on the son of Nikomachos, Aristotle, to become the tutor of his son Alexander, who was 13 years old at the time.

Before we try to depict the civilizational background of the actions of Alexander the Great we have to look back, because this conqueror entered the great roads of history as an arch-strategist of the whole of Hellas. He included in it his own Macedonia. Let us consider therefore how much of the Hellenic identity was there in the Greek that he was spreading in the Orient.

Wishing to judge this we have to define the Hellenic identity itself and in this, the inevitable comparison between Greece and Rome returns.

GREECE AND ROME (TO THE SECOND HALF OF THE THIRD C. BC)

II

Following the thread of our investigation to the very root of the branched tree of historical problems that concern our topic we shall find the very old issue, known to us from school days and never obsolete, perpetually resuscitated and viable, namely the question of “Greece vs. Rome”.

Indeed the issue of “Greece vs. Rome” is truly immortal and it interests us not only as a scientific investigation but it also has a *praetium affectionis* [a price of love]. Each of us is personally interested in this issue which at the same time is the keystone of a field of universal history that is extensive in space and time and great in its significance. The problem is passed on as an inheritance of thought permanently knocking at the door of each generation. It is parallel to another one with which it is linked: the problem of the rise and fall of Rome. Both these fundamental questions enlightened by the study of civilizations will yield new secrets of their greatness and will show more accurately of what ribbed vaults they are a model of.

For a long time now the erroneous view is popularized that the classical world on leaving the historical scene left two parallel though different inheritances, two civilizations: the western

European one and the Byzantine, as if two branches of a previous universal classical civilization.

This sentence contains many notions and all of them are erroneous. The classical world, that is the Greek and Roman one, formed a single whole only in two categories of being, in the artistic and scientific, from which there is a long way to a common civilization. A civilization is a method of organization of communal life, in which art and sciences play an important part, but they represent only a part of the civilization. Thus even small Hellas does not constitute a civilizational unity because in the organization of communal life each petty Greek state held on to a different method with considerable diversity among them not only in the statehood but also in the social structures. The differences frequently amounted to contradictions which were at times as obvious as those between Athens and Sparta. What did Sparta add to the totality of the so called classical civilization? Did it really belong to the world we refer to as classical? It is necessary to distinguish several civilizations in the Hellenic world; and if besides that we take into consideration the state or society of Rome we must immediately ask when?, and in what period? In various periods the differences are so obvious, that it is not possible to resist the conclusion that the classical world had no unity apart from science and art. And did the Romans equal the Greeks in this? Seneca, the great Seneca saw in works of art only an object of affluence and he considered the artist to be a more qualified craftsman.

Roman art and science was nothing more than an expansion of the Athenian civilization. It would be more correct to refer to

this as the Attic education. Looking at the issue from this point of view one could add to the classical world also the Hellenistic civilization since is it not so that Alexandrian science and the art of Pergamon were based on old Athenian resources? Indeed this is so! If in the place of the nondescript “classicism” we wish to place a strictly defined value then we must call out: Athens! But at the same time we shall observe that due to the many-sidedness of life, there were not many things in this classical antiquity that were common. There was much less of it than appears to minds exalted by the beauty of the expression.

Truly, (in a later period) Roman universal law was common, however it was not a joint fruit of the peoples concerned but was imposed upon them by force. It was not even a common Greek-Roman achievement because with the growth of universality the Athenian and Roman spirit retreated rapidly in the statehood of this state¹, and an oriental one took its place which had nothing in common with the classical world even though it functioned within the same Roman state. The statehood and soon the whole public life escaped from the inheritors of classicism. The emperors, leaders, officers, administrators were all increasingly barbarians. The “classical” minds felt this disparity tragically as also later the complete separation between the intellect and the statehood.

The greatest association of the classical world, the common Roman Empire, with time became a foreign entity. Woe to reality when it is best described through a paradox!

¹ “Statehood” and “state” are not synonyms. The former refers to the organization of a state.

In this great common Empire in time Athenian education declined and in the shallowness of thinking also art and the sciences got lost. The classical intellect disappeared from the historical scene first and afterwards the universal state disappeared having by then nothing within it that derived from the ancient classicism.

Memories of the old Hellas became antiquarian values. If anyone one would like to explain this by the fact that Greece proper had for a long time lost its independence, let him consider that also the second besides the Athenian classical civilization, the Roman one, had also become antiquarian and this was so at the time when the frontiers of the universal Roman state were expanding most. Obviously there is no constant direct or even inverse relationship between a state and a civilization and the state itself may be a courageous promoter or a very dangerous enemy of a given civilization.

In an antiquarian mind, however, frequently there persists a miraculous potential for resuscitation! This was perceived in ancient centuries and in the more recent ones, from the regeneration of Persia all the way down to the rebuilding of the Czech nation. The Roman statehood washed out completely the Roman civilization, but there was never a shortage of Romans who maintained the tradition of their civilization in the restricted seclusion of domestic life; one could say that when it was no longer possible to follow the Roman civilization in practice it was cultivated at least theoretically. This was a true attachment to antiquity, and when at least in this form it was passed on from generation to generation, it turned out that the civilization survived the state and had in it so many creative elements, also in state-building, that from

the tatters of the old civilization it proved possible to generate a number of new systems. In this way the civilization which is commonly referred to as the western European one was formed. It is a daughter of the old Roman civilization.

The term “western-European” does not aspire to be precise. Even at our most extreme West there existed and still exist other civilizations: e.g. in Spain there was the Arab and the Jewish, in Germany and southern Italy the Byzantine, and everywhere, not excluding Britain there was always also the Jewish one. The use of geographic terms does not therefore identify the essence of the reality discussed. It would be more proper to refer to the civilization that grew out of the ruins of the ancient Roman one as the Christian-classical one, but it is best (also for brevity) to refer to it as the Latin civilization. After all, Latin has within it, not only a linguistic and liturgical meaning.

Furthermore – as if again for brevity – the first term “western” is frequently dropped and people speak of the “European” civilization. This is obvious nonsense. What civilizational affinity is there between England and Moscow? There are four civilizations in Europe: the Jewish, Turanian, Byzantine and Latin (all of them within Poland). Which one of them is to be considered to be the “European” one? Of these four, there is only one daughter of the classical world, namely the Latin one.

The Byzantine civilization from the very beginning had a rather meagre relationship with the Roman one. There were only erroneous appearances and this was due to the fact that the title of the Roman Empire was taken over by Byzantium.

Let us begin with the pre-Hellenistic times, because the civilizational links between Rome and the civilizations of ancient Greece began before the Hellenistic civilization developed in Asia.

The Graeco-Roman relationships began with Greek settlements in Italy the range of which extended all the way towards the vicinity of the city of Rome itself. The Roman civilization was not crystallized fully yet when it was being affected by influences of foreign civilizations. This is a normal state of affairs in universal history.

Also the Greeks earlier had learnt many things from foreigners: the oldest inscription in the (Spartan) Delphi is written from right to left; deep in the Delphic temple there was an altar of Zeus-Areios, “the stern god of bygone times” and besides on the throne there sat his sister-wife; also apart from the Delphic rituals there were many bloody sacrifices (Parandowski 1933, 89, 157, 164, 180, 264, 266) etc. How different all this is from the picture of developed Hellas, beaming with the Athenian civilization! But we are not concerned here with what was Hellenic from time immemorial, and what was a manifestation of the relationships with the civilizations of Asia and Africa. We only wish to establish what Greece brought later to other peoples in the world from its own achievements. Only after having arrived at maturity itself, did it start to have an influence on the Romans.

The oldest Hellenic influences did not enter Rome directly from the Greeks but they crept in through the mediation of Etruscan influences, which were considerable and potent. The most important ones were authentically Etruscan, but besides them others have moved in that were adopted from the Greeks.

The very system of having a double personal name, that is so characteristic for the Roman civilization and later for the Latin one, the *prenomen* and *nomen gentile* (name and surname), was adopted by the Romans from the Etruscans. Etruria and Latium bonded rather strongly since “a vast majority of surnames is of Etruscan origin” and the Etruscan names of “old, later extinct families have left their mark in the name of the village *tribus* [administrative unit]”. The surname system is one of the most important facts in the entire universal history, because double names have not been known among the Indo-European peoples of antiquity (Piotrowicz 1935a, 33, 79, 80). Let us add that throughout the world this was not present anywhere except for the Roman civilization and even today it does not exist anywhere except where the influences of the Roman or later the Latin civilization extended². Later a third part was added, which was a nickname or referred to a given location (it was not always hereditary), which was the *cognomen*. It appeared always where separate branches of a large family formed. This happened in Rome and this can be observed in each larger village in Poland that is of family descent; also all heraldry supplies many such examples.

The Romans adopted from Etruria the structure of a home with an atrium in the middle. It is also from there that they became acquainted with Greek art. What wonderful sculptures remained after the Etruscans! Were they the work of their own artists or of sculptors brought in from Greece? In any case they obviously enjoyed them and were connoisseurs. It was in Etruria that the

² The Greeks used the surname (*genca*) very rarely, and they always included the patronymic.

Romans learned portrait painting. After all, even the great Greek epic poems had been translated into Etruscan! But there are no signs of Etruscan literary influences in Rome. But they adopted from there all the sports events, even the fighting of gladiators and the presence of weepers at funerals.

The Etruscans did not base themselves on the Hellenic culture in all affairs. For example, the role of the woman was different. It has been pointed out that in Rome women had “a much more free and serious position than in the Greek world” and it was in Etruria that they participated in public ceremonies and sport events (Piotrowicz 1935a 50, 87, 123, 185).

We are interested to know what was it that the Romans were then introducing among other peoples regardless of whether it was something pre-Roman or a historical acquisition taken from other peoples. We know that what we refer to as the Roman civilization included elements that were Latinian, Etruscan, Oscan (Samnites) etc.

It is extremely interesting that the very name of Italy comes from Calabria. It is there that Greek settlers met with the mysterious Oenotrian people (possibly related to the Sicels), and the Italic tribe was a small offshoot of the Oenotrians. It is from them that the name Italy derives, first used to designate the south-western extremity of the peninsula (Piotrowicz 1935a, 18). It is unknown why, when and in what circumstances the expansion of the use of this name for a wider region occurred.

But is this the only riddle? Let us rejoice that their number declines, quite substantially and quite fast. Considering the issue of “Greece vs. Rome” in a summary manner we will study the

question in three basic fields: religion, statehood and social structure.

In the last generation science has studied the relationship between the Roman religion and the Etruscan and Greek ones. This is of primary importance for our investigations.

The initial Roman religion was “uncomplicated and impersonal”. It consisted in the “deification of abstract notions” such as *Fides*, *Spes*, *Victoria*; the latest to be included in the list in the year 233 B.C. were *Honor* and *Virtus*. The Greeks in their fantasies personified each deity, while the Romans deified functions and notions without attributing to their gods any human form” (Gumowski 1927, 6-8, 15).

This difference held within it seeds of long range consequences having great historical significance. The Hellenic gods were similar to people, thus there was an implicit suggestion that people could become gods. We have many of them: Heracles, Dionysus, Dioskuri, demigods, heroes who were later venerated as gods. Each Greek city paid homage to its founder as to a demigod. These were frequently mythical personages but with time it proved possible to point to truly historical individuals; these were also venerated as demigods. In a few generations this happened easily in various countries using the Greek language. But around 400 a living person was deified. In the Ionian cities the aristocracy deified the Spartan Lysander (because he gave them back their estates and power). This happened in Asia, but among the Greeks. In Asia the Greek traders and craftsmen were in daily contact with the local population. The first to attribute to himself a divine nature was Clearchus, the tyrant of Heraclea Pontica in

Bithynia, (a learned man but a cruel brute, who was murdered in 364) i.e. this happened also in the East. At the same time it is a fact that these ideas were picked up early and frequently on Sicily (Piotrowicz 1922, 10-12).

Thus the number of local deities was constantly increasing among the Greeks. Did not the Romans have them also?

In their very essence religions are of two types, explaining the relationship between the natural and supernatural worlds through creationism or emanationism. In terms of range they are of three kinds, local, tribal and universal.

If Jupiter, Mars and Quirinus, that “primary Roman triad” are to be considered as protectors of three bonded districts; the Palatine, the Capitoline and the Quirinal (Gumowski 1927, 7), then we have here a typically local religion, or rather local religions. At the same time there is an indication here that Roman religion formed as a syncretism of local religions becoming as it were a sum of them. The Palatine god became an all-Roman one just as other local deities. In this manner as a sum of local religions it became the tribal religion of the Romans. If we accept this hypothesis it will become quite natural that this sum kept on increasing, adopting other factors as the state was increasing picking up a growing number of local gods. Thus we will easily understand the practice of “evocation”, i.e. the calling on the local god of a besieged city and then the transfer of his cult to Rome; this would be only a consequent extension of this same line of development. Rome was becoming not only a capital of conquered neighbouring tribes but also of all their gods, who were venerated

with all due respect. The gods of Veii or from Praeneste etc. were becoming truly Roman.

It is not possible for a local or tribal deity not to be personified, because these are not abstracts but beings of a higher, supernatural order, although linked with human reality. But when more of them (from neighbouring regions) are gathered in the mind, the question must arise in what do they differ? Such considerations inevitably lead to personification. In this way mythological systems are generated, from the most primitive ones in which there is scarcely anything to the most magnificent Greek mythology.

The influence of Etruria here was decisive. The Etruscan Tarquinii (616-510) introduced the personification of their deities in place of elusive notions and the “attributing of a figure to the highest state deities was the first breach in the religious notions of the nation”. Later this happened on a much larger scale when Roman military expansion met the Greek gods.

The Delphi adopted Rome under its protection, since it was already under the Tarquinii that Rome “recognized Apollo and under his influence identified the Greek gods with its own, even adopting to a large extent their ritual”. The oracle of Cumaean Sibyl was transferred to Rome when the priests of Delphi succeeded in having the Sibylline oracle books sold to one of the Tarquinii. Separated priests were designated for the interpretation of the oracles, and they spread the Greek cults.

Religious syncretism however was halted in Rome. From the moment the state was to expand over Latium Rome started to behave in religious matters just as other ancient peoples. As a rule foreigners were kept at a distance from the “native” religion

and the natives as far as possible stayed away from foreign deities because “accepting a foreigner to citizenship and equalizing him with one’s own people would mean giving him access to privileges and in particular to the cult and worship of deities who find all contacts with a foreigner as repulsive”.

When in 340 the Latins demanded equal rights their leader Annius called before the gathered Senate: *Romani omnes vocentur!* [May all be called Romans!] The consul Manlius replied: “Have you heard Jupiter these godless words? Would you agree that a foreigner would sit in this temple as a consul or senator?” Religious issues were at stake, and when in 338 the Latin association was dissolved it was not affected at all as a religious body. The Latin gods were not affected, but the Latins were not allowed to worship those gods who were reserved only for the Romans (Morawski 1924a, 12).

Meanwhile in Greece the idea of a universal religion was emerging.

More recent investigations have shown that in the college of Delphic priests there were plans to turn the cult of Apollo into a universal religion. In the East, Croesus [king of Lydia] was gained for the project but attempts to involve the Persians proved futile even though Delphi spoke up against the “Persian wars”. The Delphic influences however spread throughout the entire Mediterranean region beginning with the IVth c. B.C. and on the Apennine Peninsula they spread from the Greek colony of Cumae. All Italics were subjected to this, not least among them Rome itself.

The gradual Hellenization of the Roman religion began and this happened all the more easily and promptly the more credence in the infallibility of the Sybil oracles was becoming well entrenched. Frequently advice was sought there in difficulties of public life such as plague, famine or military defeat. The cult of various Greek gods was adopted, but from the beginning of the Vth c. a pause in this occurred and it lasted for two centuries (Gumowski 1927, 9, 10, 57; Zieliński 1921, 74; 1922, I, 1, 139). It is very characteristic that the patricians upheld the original Roman cults, while the common people were favourable to the new cults of foreign deities (Gumowski 1927, 10)³. When Roman expansion reached the Great Greece [southern Italy & Sicily] “again a new string of deities moved in the direction of Rome”, who were always accepted there following the advice of the Sybilline books.

Thus the “classical” Greco-Roman mythology developed as the first element of the problem of Greece vs. Rome. Now let us move into the field of social structure and statehood beginning with the issue of war and peace.

It was not the Romans who first attacked Greece but on the contrary the Greeks attacked Italy. The Epirus kings were attacking Italy already since 342. They were seated just opposite the “Great Greece” and their interests were often involved; but what is interesting is that in these expeditions also Spartan kings took part. There were many opportunities to get to know one another.

For the Greeks who distinguished clearly between a monarchy, aristocracy and democracy Roman statehood appeared

³ We must note that the masses were originally of foreign origin and they were constantly supplemented with foreign elements; these were newcomers.

as something complicated in which there was a bit of everything. It was difficult for them to fathom the arrangements of the Roman republic (Piotrowicz 1935a, 127, 180).

The only similarity was that both here and there the kings had been removed and government was handed over to the communities, and these exercised it through administrators who were chosen for a short period of time. Every citizen had the right to participate in government and the extent to which this burdened him, for example in Athens, was calculated already 80 years ago by Fustel de Coulanges who exclaimed: “It is surprising how much work this democracy demanded of men!” These governments required much diligence. Just hear what an Athenian had to endure: “There were not many days without some meeting in the *demos*, in the *phyle* or *phratría*; it was necessary to dwell on religious or political matters, for example on the question of the organisation of a religious banquet, or the control of expenses, etc. Furthermore, three times a month there was a general gathering of the people at which absence was not permitted. It lasted from morning till the late hours and one had to listen to all the speakers. At issue may have been the annual choice of political and military leaders, taxation, some change in legislation, or questions of war and peace. And when his turn came he had to become the administrator in his *phratría* or *demos*. On the average every second year he would become a judge; at least twice in his lifetime he would become a senator and then he would sit at meetings day after day, listening to the reports of the administrators, voting on gratuities, instructions, preparing and studying all the motions proposed for the general gatherings. Finally, he could become an

administrator of the state, an archon, a strategist etc. by election or by drawing lots. There was much to fill the whole life and not much time was left for private and domestic life. That is why Aristotle very rightly remarked that someone who had to work for a living could not be a citizen” (Fustel de Coulanges 1923, 395, 396).

Both here and there the executive power was in the hands of the administrators (who however did not form any special class of bureaucrats). The offices followed various methods in government; however the method used in Rome was unknown in all the Greek city states, in Hellas or in all the settlements.

We perceive many differences, including such that indicate a different method of organization of communal life. In further chapters – having to deal with various countries and peoples – we shall have to note an increasing number of such differences. And if we are to arrive at an understanding of civilizational differences, we have to insistently study their differences, that is, what has divided people. The very origins of communal life are everywhere more or less the same, but at some level of development differentiation results.

Everywhere and always the origin of any community is alike⁴: a clan system. So far not a single exception to this rule has been found, but there are multiple varieties of the clan system and with time as the primary communities advance to a higher level of development the basis of private law is generated, that is, laws regulating the family, property and inheritance. The more differences there are in the clan system the greater variety is there in the triple law. All were organized in a clan system: the Syrians,

⁴ See chapter “Nuclei of all Culture” in Koneczny 1935.

Persians, Egyptians, Greeks and Macedonians, Latins, Samnites etc., but what a diversity in the triple law even among the Greeks themselves!

The history of the clan system is everywhere a weak point of historical investigations but this is perhaps studied best in the period of classical antiquity. We know this issue better for Rome than for Greece. We have no doubt as regards *gens* and *stirps*, but as regards the Greek *genos* and *phratria* ... “the relationship between them is not clear to us”. It is not at all clear since in another place we read that a *phratria* joins clans derived from a common (mythical) ancestor without a determined genealogy and yet in another place in the same author we read that “there is a higher unit linking several clans or *phratria* into a generation or *phyle*” (Zieliński 1921, 64; 1922, 32; Fustel de Coulanges 1923⁵, 110-136 *passim*). If it “links clans” it is a supra-clan tribe, but should the *phyle* cover several tribes it would amount to a people and if so the population of Attica would comprise of several peoples. This is not impossible but we cannot claim this one way or the other until we know accurately and for sure what the *phratria* and *phyle* were. Inaccuracy, imprecision and chaos in nomenclature hinders greatly a proper explanation of these facts; but something more is at stake here.

Since in Greece everything was so unlike can we suppose without proofs that the clan system was identical everywhere

⁵ This epic work had 28 editions over a period of 75 years. It will for ever remain a valuable collection of first order material presented scientifically in spite of the fact that one has to reject his interpretations derived from privileges of primogeniture and religious cults, because all of this can be explained from the laws of the clan system. More about this in Koneczny 1935.

there? Do *genos* and *phratria* mean the same in all Greek dialects, even in all the territorial associations of the same dialect? And were both notions known everywhere and applied to the same level of association and at the same period in time?

Obviously it is difficult to present the entire genealogy amongst the crowds of a large tribe; tradition only retains the memory of the originator of the clan from whom the whole tribe descends. Tradition frequently remembers the name of this ancestor and more accurate studies wherever they proved possible have often shown that these were not mythical personages.

The names of clans both in Rome and in Greece were patronymic. The names of the Athenian Phytalids, Butesids, Buselids, Lekids just as the Roman Claudiuses, Coeliuses, Calpurniuses, Cloeliuses and Juliuses are clear. These clans obviously descended from some Phytal, Butes, Calpus, Julius etc. There is no shortage of special cases, for example when the Athenian Amkadrids descend from Cerops. Probably many a genealogy was fabricated later (both in Athens and in the whole world). However the tradition generally is correct even when it assigns common ancestry to a whole *phyle*. "Here a relationship was also suspected though it was not possible to define it and the suspicion was based on the presumed common ancestor" (Koneczny 1935, 95).

Gens and *genos* rule themselves, remaining under the leadership of their clan elder. When the Sabinian *gens* Claudii moved with 3000 people to Rome all were obedient to one elder. Such an individual was at the same time the only judge for his clan members. The clan manages on its own, enjoying unlimited self

rule but also has a joint responsibility towards the outside world, being, for example responsible for the debts of one of its members. We have information about the Roman *gens* only from the times when it became “a shadow of its former self”, but even in later times a *gens* would collect money for the buying out of a prisoner, for the payment of a fine and it would bear the magistrate costs of its member (Fustel de Coulanges 1923, 112, 114).

The best proof that the clan system existed is the vendetta that is inseparable from it. It was sanctioned by the legislation of Draco; the *genos* does not allow the state to meddle with this; only members of the victim’s *genos* had the right to pursue the killer (Fustel de Coulanges 1923, 371).

The second major proof is supplied by laws pertaining to the division of inheritance among brothers. Thus, before that there were no such divisions; they did not exist because the entire clan property was administered as a single economic unit. As relationships developed the emancipation of the family from the clan resulted. In the Law of the XII Tables there is a rule indicating a possibility of such emancipation because the inheritance law is acknowledged when it concerns agnates, but when there are no agnates the inheritance does not pass onto cognates but to the nearest *gentilis* in general. Thus the property of a family can therefore be emancipated but not totally. When there is no male descendant the property returns to the clan from which it was separated out at some earlier time. Thus the clan bond does not have to be severed; it can be only temporarily and conditionally shed from one’s own family. The property can become that of an individual, and a will is allowed (according to Solon this was allowed only for the

childless). Also the Law of the XII Tables allows for the sale of land that had been extracted from the jurisdiction of the clan. But in Sparta a will was acknowledged only during the Peloponnesian war; in Corinth and Thebes even later (Fustel de Coulanges 1923, 74, 87, 366, 367, 373).

When clan law extended for too long it became a true tyranny in respect to the development of economic relations. Armed upheaval resulted in favour of the emancipation of the family, for example in Herakleia, on Cnidus, Istros and in Marseilles. The legislation of Solon consisted precisely in a peaceful introduction of this postulate. In Thebes and in Corinth the old clan law lasted longer and it persisted longest in Sparta (Fustel de Coulanges 1923, 304).

After the emancipation of the family a further consequent upheaval had to take place; the emancipation of son from the power of his father – this was later referred to as coming-of-age. Athens preceded Rome in this (Fustel de Coulanges 1923, 374). In the Roman law a father lost control over his son when he was sold three times; the *patria potestas* [paternal power] was abolished through such fictitious sales.

In Rome these relationships applied uniformly to all Roman citizens and the scope of a possibility of such citizenship was expanding rapidly and substantially – while in Greece as of old every few miles there were different laws in matters that are so fundamental. For example, in Corinth, Thebes, Sparta, Locris and Lefkada the sale of land was not allowed; in Athens this became possible at a later time, long after the times of Solon. Everywhere with time cracks appeared in the clan legislation, except for Sparta

where the father's property was always indivisible (Fustel de Coulanges 1923, 3, 73, 90).

Two principles were common to Rome and the whole of Greece: monogamy and private property. The former theory of Ihering about polygamy in the "heroic" period has been proved to be false. At one stage of his development Plato proclaimed communism but only for the select, for those destined to rule, that is, for a small group of people who were to be supported at public expense. Thus he proposed a compulsory communism for the officials. Apart from that, the whole society would remain with private property. Mommsen's claim that agricultural communism was the initial form of land management by the Roman *gentes* flowed from the ignorance (quite common in fact) of the laws of the clan system. Later there were upheavals in Rome about the division of land, but this concerned only land that belonged to the state (*ager publicus* [public land]). In Greece this was different. No Greek ever wished to deprive anyone of private property so as to make a public property out of it, but the state had the authority to change the private ownership of land; it was possible to expel one individual so as to introduce another as the owner of a given plot. The permanent revolutions in Greece never questioned the principle of private ownership, but they constantly questioned the rights of ... owners. This art was later learnt by Roman politicians, but this happened only in the period of triumvirates.

Until the IIIrd c. B.C. even the political republican system of Rome was to a large extent based on the old clan law. It evolved from it gradually over whole generations; all the more

the traditional clan consciousness and respect for the clan was maintained.

As everywhere, also in Greece and Rome the government in a group of related clans was maintained by a gathering of the clan elders of all the clans of the tribe. Who was not a member of any gens had for a long time no access to positions of authority even indirectly. In Rome there was a conflict over this issue between the plebeians and patricians which lasted for several generations. The fullness of rights the world over belongs initially only to the descendants of the originators of an association, to the descendants of the earliest natives. If some settlement begins drawing newcomers in great numbers and if these immigrants start attaining affluence then the natives separate themselves distinctly from these newcomers through laws and they establish a clan aristocracy. These are simply the “clan members”⁶ as distinct from descendants of immigrants who had come from various directions, irregularly and without any organization, sometimes even individually and unorganized into clans. The plebeians had no *gentem*. Only the natives were the “fathers” of Roman land – in Latin *patrici*. This is literally the same.

This same division into patricians and plebeians was in all the towns of Etruria, Latium and Sabinium. The elders of a *gentium* always ruled the tribe. In Athens they are known as *eupatridae* as distinct from the *thetes*. Similarly in Euboea we meet two classes

⁶ In somewhat analogous relationships, German settlers referred to this class in Poland as clan members using the German *slahta* word for them [this became the Polish word *szlachta* meaning “gentry”].

clearly separated from one another (Fustel de Coulanges 1923, 272).

There occur in some circumstances gatherings according to the designated formalities in which each member of a clan can participate. In Rome these were the *comitia curiata* [assemblies], clan gatherings concerning only one clan or else two or more clans that were in some way associated. There is no doubt about the fact that some of the preserved names point to a territorial nature of the *curiae*, e.g. the *Foriensis*, *Veliensis* etc. and this obviously indicates a *curia* from the Velian hill. After all, the clan managed jointly and they all lived together and later when they were larger in size, they were in the nearest vicinity. Each clan had at its disposal some terrain as its own property and this could not have been otherwise. While not every territorial organisation has to be of clan origin, a clan one has to be at the same time territorial. The clan organisation will loosen up when the members of the clan cease to live next to each other. The clan genesis of the *comitia curiata* is proven also by the circumstance that clan issues and sacral ones belonged to its competence to the very end; this was so even when they began to “have only a decorative function” (Fustel de Coulanges 1923, 71, 74).

To deal with state matters (together with the plebeians) the *comitia tributa* were called; they decided about the *tributum* (land tax) and the number of needed recruits. These were organized also on captured territories. The *comitia centuriata* were military organisations and for this reason they had to meet beyond the *pomoerium* (the space just outside the city walls). Within the “city” there could be only civil authority; the *lictors* [bodyguards] did

not carry their *fascēs* [bundle of wooden sticks] there (Piotrowicz 1935a, 75, 97, 100). Every Roman citizen belonged to some *tribus*; when of certain age and in some circumstances he belonged also to some *centuria*, but only the descendants of the old *patres* (and the *conscripti*) belonged to the *curiae*.

The Roman Senate was an assembly of clan elders of the whole initial Roman tribe. These old families were dying out (particularly as a result of constant wars), so that from the initial 73 there remained by the end of the IIIrd c. only 20 of them. The Senate was replenished in various ways, amid peace, upheavals and civil wars, insidiously and violently, drawing from the great state administrators and their progeny, sometimes including also officers of the general who proved able to impose himself as the ruler of Rome – but always a senator had to be a possessor of land property. Later there were also consuls from the plebeians, but the plebeians were from the very beginning entitled to possess land property. Nowhere is there any sign that there was a need to attribute this right to the plebeians; obviously from the very beginning the newcomers were owners of agricultural plots, even though smaller ones. From them the largest class of peasants developed.

A new question arises here in the line of those that are most characteristic for the question of “Greece vs. Rome” – and at the same time one that is most useful to illustrate this question; apart from considerations about religion and state organisation, apart from issues pertaining to the clan system, let us now view the relationship between agriculture and trade. Everywhere this is a very interesting issue and in our analysis here it is all the

more interesting in that it is decisive. Let us move to the deepest difference, namely to the different social structure.

The difference between Greece and Rome, and not the smallest one, consisted in the fact that very early in Greece movable property had equal rights with real estate⁷, whereas in Rome to be important one had to own much land.

In Rome there was a fundamental rule that the state is defended with their own blood by those who possess land; only land owners were recruited to the army, all the way from the smallest farmer to the greatest estate holder. Whoever did not wish to serve in the army had to rid himself of land property (there were such instances). Since access to public functions began with officer ranks and ten years of service were required to be a candidate (in some sequence) for public offices, thus these positions as well as senatorial ones were open only to land owners. And since great estates developed only with time and slowly it can be said about a long period of Roman history that it was a peasant society and state. They went to war eagerly, because victory meant the acquisition of land which was mercilessly taken over from the defeated.

Thanks to this peasant army Rome became the greatest military power. Alexander the Great had for his Persian expedition 40 000 soldiers while Athens under Demosthenes had 6 000 fully armed men. But the army of Alexander the Great was a one time event, while the strength of Rome consisted not in the numbers themselves but in the constant possibility of renewing the army

⁷ Contrary to the wish of the philosophers, about which we shall write a little later.

every year with a new class of recruits. Rome thus had no problem in forming an army the size of Alexander's, and even greater ones, of 40-50 thousand men; the strength lay in the fact that in the Roman system it was easy to draw on reserves, always growing and always ready.

But there was no permanent army; when war broke out people joined the army, only for this particular war and after peace was agreed the soldier returned to his farm. As a rule he never ceased to be a farmer. The peasants held in contempt all other professions, but a great crisis did develop. The farmer discovered that tilling his land was not worth it, because grain imported from the provinces proved to be cheaper. Rich families started buying up farms "transforming them into suburban villas with gardens full of flowers, vegetables, fruit trees, vineyards and finally pastures". Cato the Elder (who died in 149) already noticed this and he wrote that "even meagre cattle farming was more profitable than the tilling of land".

Roman farmers were hit by the eminent position of traders in numerous Greek settlements on the Apennine Peninsula. For a long time the Roman peasant defended himself against the superiority of the urban element. At one time in the years 312-304 this order was seriously endangered, when after the rogations of Appius Claudius it became possible to sign into any *tribus* and the situation became similar to that of Athens, but this was rescinded after eight years of experimentation and in 304 those citizens who did not have land property were restricted again into the four urban *tribus* (Piotrowicz 1935a, 178).

It must have appeared strange for each Greek that the same social system operated over an enormous area in comparison with the tiny regions in which the Greeks held various methods of organisation of communal life with multiple varieties of private and public law. The Greek city states were in constant revolution concerning issues of private law and the triple law; it was never possible to be certain even of one's own property. The Greeks of all countries were permanently engaged in reforms, with the constant reorganization, thus at no time were they properly organized. In the meantime the citizens of the Roman state knew only one triple law, and everywhere the same private law was for all (see chapter III "The Triple Law" in Koneczny 1935).

Whereas in Greece what a great variety! For example in some city-states the constant readiness for war required a barrack system which led to common eating at public expense which was treated as something very normal. This was the case in Sparta, on Crete and on the Lipari islands (and there was no "socialism" in this). In Sparta and on Crete agricultural land was indivisible and it could not be sold, thus the sequence of inheritance was strictly determined. Is it possible to speak of agricultural socialism in VIth c. Attica because they determined a maximum size for land property? The legislation of Solon was undoubtedly revolutionary when it abolished debts using not only people as collateral but also the estates, because this pauperized the creditor and – as Aristotle already noticed – this amounted to a new distribution of property (Poehlmann 1925, I, 36-41, 46, 47, 56, 67, 70, 165). There were constant calls for new redistribution of property in Greece. Each generation criticized the regulations of the previous one and the

very diversity of systems in the near vicinity inspired imagination towards whims and caprices in ever more diverse combinations.

Legal meditational apriorism governed the minds producing magnificent literature from Phaleas to Plato. Already then the apriorists were characterized by a blind faith in the miraculous potency of legislation. Periander of Corinth can serve as a typical example. He forbade the buying of slaves so that all citizens would be obliged to work and so that no one would be unemployed. He also established an office which was to ensure that no one would spend more than he earns. He forbade peasants to transfer to the cities so as to avoid creating an urban proletariat (Poehlmann 1925, I, 122).

As a result of constant upheavals no one was ever sure whether it will be possible to assure an existence for children and even whether it will not be necessary at some time to wait with longing for the next redistribution of property. At least a Greek could speak up freely and influence the decision by his vote.

In three civilizations of the ancient world the issues of state and society were discussed publicly, with thinking out and criticizing, recommending and rejecting, even in writing. In other words three ancient civilizations had a political literature. These were China, Greece and Rome. I wrote elsewhere how this ended sadly in China of the IInd c. B.C. (Koneczny 1938a). Roman historians during imperial times wrote much “between the lines” and the lawyers were “accommodating”, but in spite of these safeguards quite a few Roman authors were victims of governmental violence; only in Greece there was full freedom to write not excluding derisions of the government and statehood.

Utopias developed there as well as jibes, sneers in jokes, fables and comedies. Kratinos (520-423), the author of Athenian political comedies described how in the state of Cronus bread grows out of the soil already baked. Telektides ordered the rivers to flow with milk and honey and he filled the canals with savoury sauces. Rye and wheat breads argue just in front of the mouth about the privilege of being consumed; roasted birds and cakes fall into the mouth by themselves and fish jump into houses in order to fry themselves and serve themselves at the table. Rivers flow with soups and with warm pieces of meat on the waves. According to Nikiron in happy distant countries snow falls with flour, dripping with buns and rain falls as a soup. Pherekrates, a little older than Aristophanes leads us to a country where there are no servants because automatic machines replace them and tables and kneading troughs, jugs and cups fulfil their functions by themselves on every request. Even in common speech the following expressions become popular: a hail of money, a sea of goods, mountains of gold – only about work there are no such phrases. Aristophanes attacks this mercilessly in his comedies and in his *Ecclesiazusae* [The Assembly Women] (around the year 399, shortly before his death). He even moves as far as proposing “women rule” together with the common use of women. This literary caricature soon stopped short (drawings were not employed at the time) and it disappeared for a long time. It was not known in Alexandria. Funny jokes circulated however by word of mouth, transmitted from generation to generation, from country to country, dressing in the form of every language and they survived till modern times, being popularized even in nursery rooms.

Plato (429-347) himself wrote three utopias giving free reign to imagination. In *Politeia* [The Republic] he is not at all democratic. He excludes the earning classes from participation in politics and he forms a caste of “state bodyguards” from the soldiers and bureaucrats and he requires of them that they live in communism. These leaders of public life are under constant surveillance and their children have to be brought up alike for the needs of the state. Even the impregnation of women in this caste is regulated by the state. Obviously Plato is joking writing that those who have made a name for themselves in the history of war or peace receive the privilege of more frequent marital pleasures (Poehlmann 1925, 307-320). The author himself warns the reader that all of this is only the figment of an imagination. Let us add that he chases out of this fancy state “a horde of useless people” and let us note whom he includes in this group. The following will be expelled: the hunters, sculptors, painters, musicians, poets, rhapsodists, actors, dancers, jewellers, traders in clothing, child guardians, wet-nurses, nannies, chamber maids, hat makers, barbers, cooks, confectioners, etc. Obviously he is joking and laughing at somebody’s calls to restrict demands and he is obviously writing a satire on the Spartan model. After all, elsewhere he exalts the influence of art on ideals (Poehlmann 1925 I 460, II 13-16, 22-24, 30, 113). In another of his works, the *Nomoi* (The Laws) he indicates clearly that he does not believe in the possibility of ideal communism and he recognizes private property because perhaps only the gods and the “sons of gods” can withstand living with a common usage of goods, women and children in an ideal state (Poehlmann 1925 I 570, II 166). Having made that reservation he

muses about a utopian city, two miles away from the shore forming with its region a purely agricultural state. The whole plan of this city is proposed, with the size of plots, 12 districts each with a total of 5040 plots. Each district of the region has its own hearth in its town, established in a manner akin to the capital. Each citizen receives two land units, one near the city and another further away in the region; he will also receive two houses, in the city and in the countryside (and the movables will be divided). In this state even the freedom of transfer and travel will be under control and it will be restricted. Marriages will be under the control of a separate group of ladies set up for this purpose. Every couple that for 10 years would remain childless will be forcibly divorced. Of special note is one more regulation; in order to eradicate what fancies the masses and the senses there will be special norms established in this city-state for poetry and music, so as to eliminate from them everything that would be contrary to the principles of the state; if necessary other people will be invited who would be willing to comply with the requirements of the state (Poehlmann 1925, II 178, 179, 195, 196, 204-206, 213). The same kind of reasoning was proposed in China! (Koneczny 1938a, 301-304). But in China this was treated seriously, while Plato was only joking.

The third utopian work of Plato is *Atlantis*. In the remote past Attica was organized on the model of the *Politeia*. This was looked upon with disfavour by Atlantis, which was enormous in size, too large to be uniform on the inside. But it was very rich because it was a great trading centre with the whole world, and the excessive richness resulted in luxuries and excesses. Atlantis waddled in corruption. Conversion could only come from some great divine

judgement ... Here the story ends. We have no description of the conflict between Atlantis and the old Attica (Poehlmann 1925, 274-282).

Plato, playing with utopias, has nevertheless great positive value in his writings, which were full of ideas and treated seriously.

Phaleas of Chalcedon was Plato's predecessor in views about the social system. He was the first theoretician who discerned the source of all evil in the unequal ownership of land; after its equalization all crimes against property will disappear because they all derive from "cold and hunger". Plato agrees with him saying that "no one is evil voluntarily". Thus, he expresses the opinion that an owner of considerable riches cannot be a moral person. It is the duty of the state to combat both poverty and wealth; property should not be too large or too small. In this he is referring always to real estate; he disdains trade and manufacturing and sees in them no benefit to society. He condemns democracy, blaming even the period of Pericles because at that time the state was concerned with building walls and ports and not with training in reason and justice⁸. Only agriculture leads to virtue, to the maintenance of simplicity and purity of manners; manufacture, trade and in general all other pecuniary businesses are unfavourable for physical goods and moral worth, thus they should not be developed beyond absolute necessity and should remain infrequent. He does not deny the need

⁸ Such naiveté repeats itself in history: for example in Spain some 50 years ago the absence of any sort of economic organization and the great poverty of the majority were justified by such phrases as: "We Spaniards do not have any riches, but we have honour and virtue..." The late Prof. Paciorekiewicz in his travels deliberately provoked conversations on this subject and he always met with the same kind of escapist daydreaming.

for trade, but trade should not go beyond the necessity of supplying what is truly needed; it is to satisfy the needs of the society but there should be no trading for profit alone going beyond the true value of the traded goods. Plato accepts the possibility that trade may be ethical but only to a certain level of its development. He directly excludes the circulation of precious metals, thus the local currency should have a value only within the country and foreign trade should be restricted only to objects of indispensable use. He would like to forbid the taking of interest; whoever practices this should lose the right to the borrowed capital. In general, the state is all the better the more it follows in its arrangements the “natural state” (Poehlmann 1925, I 450-458, 461-468, 472, 102).

Echoes of this went through the school of cynicism (414-324). Diogenes assured that love of one’s property is the source of all evil and virtue will not reside in a rich state or in a rich home. Thales repeated that immorality derives from riches and that people are destined towards virtue by birth (Poehlmann 1925, I 454).

For us, the most important fact is that Aristotle (384-322), so very different in his method from Plato, fully shared his dislike for trade. He points out that state intervention in property matters as suggested by Plato is impossible because “whoever wishes to determine some measure of permissible ownership by an individual should also determine by law the permissible number of children”. He enters even several details because “a state should take care that the bodies of young citizens be according to its wish and will”⁹. His advice has in it something of a utopian satire, as if

⁹ He is joking of course when he suggests that men be prevented from mar-

he wished to show on examples how senseless is the whole issue. We are indifferent to this banter in polemics (which is treated seriously!). Something greater is at stake. Aristotle also denies any morality to trade, because it degenerates into speculation “as if money was the aim of everything”, whereas it should only be a means of exchange and not a tool for enrichment. It should be forbidden to earn on money, to take interest (Poehlmann 1925, I 469-473, 486).

Thus Greek scholars condemned trade and they made fun of the awaiting for some general overturn of relationships. Thus they deplored the existence of affluence and poverty. Greek society however took a different road (this is not the only example in history of a contradiction between science and life). Trade became the main profession of the Greeks. In order to abolish affluence and poverty, the poor of each generation tried to rob the rich; after this the grandson of the robber himself became the object of robbery and so on without end. Taking turns the progeny of both attributed to themselves the right to the property of the predecessors¹⁰.

The constant changes in property laws in the Hellenic republics are said to explain the supremacy of traders in the majority of Greek societies. Property was hidden in trade. Traders of various environments, be they of the most diverse origin and having most contradictory opinions concerning real estate despite everything have to establish among themselves some trade law,

rying before the age of 37 etc.

¹⁰ Until this day social reformers have not found anything better in trying to abolish property differences and this lags on through all the ages. Catholic ethics recognizes differences in wealth as something normal. See chapter X in Koneczny 1938a.

because otherwise they would not be able to trade. Customary trading law held these people together, whose native civilizations did not have sufficient centripetal strength or at least they had a deficiency or underdevelopment of it. Obviously Greek trading law was the most universal factor of the Greek identity; in this respect the greatest degree of uniformity undoubtedly had to be achieved. This was the backbone of Greek expansion, because movables were better able to stand ground against the instability of Greek private law, and in particular its triple law that was permanently in a state of reform and reorganization. Roman expansion was different. It was based on a sure, characteristic and unchangeable triple law.

Thus in Greece from the beginning, the aristocracy of money owners competed successfully with the aristocracy of the sword. In Corinth the old original aristocracy was the first to enter trade and manufacturing. The taking over of Corinthian markets by Athens was to a large degree the cause of the Peloponnesian war. Greek trade had to be maritime; a trader travelled and for the needs of his trade he was frequently dispensed from military service. Also the Greek traders had greater enterprise than the eastern ones. Sparta was an exception of all this; there, trade was left to the *perioikoi* [the free, but not citizens].

The Romans were not highly educated in economic matters. Several great historical events directed them towards universal, international trade, but in vain! The weights and measures were in disdain as well as all pecuniary operations. Only the possession of real estate led to honours. When in 342 the taking of interest was totally forbidden the only result was that the prohibition

was bypassed. The only consequence of all these prohibitions was that a new class was enriching itself on trade (the later *equites*), becoming speedily ever more powerful and which it proved impossible to keep away permanently from government. A society that had established a great state and yet did not have its own currency until the second half of the IVth c. could not as a result excel economically. When the senators were forbidden to participate in maritime trade and in monetary operations in general, “this forced them to establish large land estates”, because they had to locate their capital in land. This prohibition was repeated again under Augustus! Thus it is easy to understand that Italian trade which had to develop even against the Italics was scarcely in the hands of the Italics and least of all in the hands of the Romans. It was dominated by alien elements. Even the Roman *equites* did not participate much in trade being engaged mostly in the lease of state income, customs etc. and also in public supplies. But since the world exists, traders always were and are the richest class and as a result the most influential, the riches gathered from Italy did not serve the Romans or the Roman civilization. The more Italy with time was entering international trade, the greater riches it was making available to traders, the more the superiority of eastern traders, primarily from Syria became apparent, – and the more the great trade was turning against the Roman civilization. The foreign character of this trade was later exploding this civilization from the interior and helping to mix it with the civilizations of the Orient thereby poisoning the Roman spirit. This comprises a major cause (so far unnoticed) of the fall of Rome, about which we shall have an opportunity to reflect later.

When the universal state of Alexander the Great and his successors, and then when the even more extensive other Empire, the Roman assured security of trade from the Pillars of Hercules to the Euphrates, from Britain to Africa, the Romans who made all this and ruled over it – had no desire for trade. The traders known as “Italics” came from southern Italy and were dealing in trade only for a short time and in certain periods only. Having made some money they abandoned the trading profession. Thus all the more trade was moving into the hands of traders from the East and from the times of Tiberius all the way to the Merovingians it remained in the hands of the Syrians and Jews. The Romans played no role in navigation; the ship crews were Greek, Illyrian or Egyptian. Traders followed the Roman armies, wandering from Gaul to Asia. The *Italici qui negociatur* [Italian traders] moved in the thousands, but these were small usurers giving week-long loans (Lot 1927, 87, 88, 93).

Compared with the political importance of Rome Roman trade is not even worth mentioning. In general, the West was poor in this field. There were trade missions from the East to West made by the Phoenicians, the Greeks, the Babylonians, the Egyptians, the Syrians and the Jews. The riches that they collected in the West they transferred to the East. And so, later the eastern part of the Empire was incomparably more affluent in comparison with the western half. This circumstance was to play an important role in historical events.

Had the Romans dealt with trade they would have excelled the Greeks in this field precisely because stability of relationships is the best basis for trade. But the Romans preferred to till the

land than to trade and they did not want to become traders even when they lost the land. Stability and the security of tomorrow are favourable to all professions. Among the Romans, the stability of human relationships which lasted for centuries favoured the multilateral development of the agricultural classes, because the capital was not running away from the land. Even when the relationships wavered and agriculture ceased to be profitable the Romans still did not move into trade.

The family law together with property and inheritance laws, that is, the Roman triple law developed peacefully by natural evolution in the Roman state. It then served as a model to the whole world.

We know that Rome did not impose its triple law on anyone. As long as recruits and taxes or donations were delivered, everywhere there was full freedom of self rule for all the Latins, allies or subjects, all cities and entire provinces; even the *dediticii* [lowest of the three classes of free men] for example in Sicily were entitled to it. Roman government did not affect legal arrangements in the provinces, their customs, religious beliefs and languages (Piotrowicz 1935a, 69, 162, 205, 303). This was so till the very end. But what is more important is that it was so from the very beginning. Rome did not impose anything, whereas it happened frequently, very frequently, that there were applications to become full Roman citizens, which required the acceptance or rather the acquisition of the Roman private law, and this was considered as a privilege. A *civis Romanus* was freed from the private laws of his native region and the state guaranteed him security of private property, the right to make a will and the right to inherit. Here lies

the secret of the drive towards obtaining Roman citizenship and the rapid Romanization of the western provinces, because all who were more intelligent and economically proficient tried to escape from clan property.

Self rule left the freedom to follow a “native” local law, which was different from the Roman one. Later this was described as the right of the people (*ius gentium*) and stressed in the sources. Obviously there was no shortage of cities that ruled themselves not according to Roman law; and this difference of the native law has been noted in nearer Italy (without Gaul on the Po river and without Great Greece in southern Italy), even before the expansion beyond Italy. The desire to obtain Roman citizenship must have been focused on some real value distinct from the right to vote in Rome (which was an almost impossible privilege, because one would have to be at the gatherings in Rome personally).

Probably there was no shortage of localities having a law that was very close to the Roman one or even exactly the same as the Roman one so self-rule meant for them nothing else but the right to elect their own officials and to have distinct local finances without any control from the leading city. But it has also to be said that in many localities Roman law was not followed. But when we confront this diversity with applications for Roman citizenship coming after some time, we must conclude that the Roman law was better, of a higher level of social development, while all these “native” laws had characteristics indicating that they were of a lower kind.

Rome moved at the head of development and the Roman triple law, in fact the entire Roman private law was most perfect in Italy and later in the whole Empire.

Greece, on the contrary was characterized by instability of relationships, with constant uncertainty about the future. This concerned also movable property. Plutarch describes how in Megara it was decided not only to abolish debts but also the creditors were told to pay back the interest that had already been paid. On Samos in 412 the people condemned 200 rich citizens to death and 400 were banished with their property and houses being shared among the people. Something similar was written about Messenia and about Chios. The rich were banished from Miletus and their children were sentenced... to be trampled by oxen. These rich however returned being armed better than before and they burned alive the children of the others, who originally were poor. Theagenes in Megara ordered that the flocks of the rich be slaughtered, Aristodemus abolished debts in Cumae and the properties of the rich were distributed among the poor; similar action was undertaken by Nicokles in Sikyon and by Aristonach in Argos (Fustel de Coulanges 1923, 400-402, 404).

Finally the stage was reached when all who were thinking about the future and wishing to work in peace – wanted Greece to be under Roman domination. Men such as Philopoemen and Polybius wished to maintain independence were it not for Greek democracy which never allowed anybody to sleep or work in peace. They preferred Roman domination to such social relationships. Thus Rome took over Greece without much effort (Fustel de Coulanges 1923, 440).

A most expansive state was to develop from Rome, but the ideal of grabbing was not born in Italy; it was grafted onto Italy from the East. It was there that invasions were systematically waged in all directions all the time, which led and must have led to the ideal of a universal state. Each historical people of the East aimed towards this supreme ideal. Some of them fell already in the early stages of this drive towards supremacy; others managed only to a certain extent, but all of them entered this competition often placing everything on one lot. For long – all the way to Alexander the Great – universalism consisted of conquests alone and then the suppression of the conquered peoples. The rule of the victorious people was everywhere understood as the imposition of the laws of the invader.

Rome for a long time knew nothing about this universalism but conquests, which were to lead Rome into this same historical cast, began early. As a definite date one has to adopt 396 B.C. the tenth year of the siege of Veii, which was destroyed. Next, after being defeated by the Gauls on the Allia River in 390, it was again necessary to impose obedience on the Aequi, Etruscans and the Volsci. In the years 367-345 the land of the Latins was forcefully reclaimed when they tried to break away from the alliance and in 343 the first Samnite war broke out. A new war with the Latins in 340-338 ended with the dissolution of their alliance. Three years before the death of Alexander the Great, in 326, the second Samnite war broke out.

The pugnacity and expansiveness of the Romans appeared to increase with each generation and having gone through hard

experiences it increased whenever each obstacle was overcome. But the great leap was only to take place later.

There were several alliances in Greece similar to the one of the Latins; the basic difference between the history of Rome and Greece lies in the fact the Greeks have never moved beyond such alliances. By no means were they deprived of invasive intent; after all the alliances were frequently made in order to engage in conquest together, and on the Peloponnesus conquests were practiced with the most severe suppression of the conquered. All of this was on a small scale, because there were geopolitical impediments. But these difficulties would have been broken or even overcome were there a need to live at the expense of others through conquests.

The notion of a universal state was well known to the Greeks as coming from Egypt. The Greeks went there as mercenaries and they also traded with Egypt. In the middle of the VIth c. Naucratis [a Greek settlement] was flourishing there (particularly under the pharaoh Amasis 570-526), but the Greeks wished no more. As we shall see later on, in no way did the Greeks belong to the Egyptian school whereas for the Romans this school proved to be decisive so much so, that one could divide the history of Rome into two parts: before and after subjecting to Egyptian influences.

The Greeks managed in a different manner by perfecting the technique of navigation. They enriched themselves by trade with foreign countries and this made it unnecessary for them to practice territorial invasions. This was because according to the relationships and circumstances of the times it was sufficient for them to establish a trading station in a foreign land and to

assure for its security of development. The Greeks were satisfied with trade and as a result they did not practice the conquering of neighbouring lands. No native Greek city state succeeded on a large scale in conquests (whereas voluntary amalgamation was made impossible by differences of civilization).

The Greeks however had also a second way of attaining affluence in a foreign land: since the Vth c. they organized units of mercenaries and they have learned and developed the military art so well that in the IVth c. they were much in demand all over the East and West.

The Romans were never mercenaries; they were soldiers only for themselves, while the Greeks were a military society – but on the outside, and at someone else's expense.

Finally there appeared Greek thinkers, who decided that such a situation is unnatural. Was it not absurd to build an army, have an army and an excellent one at that, but not for oneself? The Macedonians “dared to be wise” – and before Rome conquered Hellas the Greeks engaged in an enormous expansive conquest taking over territories of the Orient for themselves. Let us consider what they found there, what they brought in there, and what they brought out from there. We have to admit that while they finally espoused the political ideal of universalism taking it from the East, they did not learn it from the Egyptian school. At the same time they introduced into this ideal many of their own spiritual elements. This is how the Hellenistic identity was born.

It also has to be remembered that Romans had little contact with Hellenism but they adopted the Hellenistic ideal.

The Greeks and the Romans had this in common that they developed a notion of a non-sacral law that is completely independent of the priests. The Greek laws were very diverse frequently being contrary to what was the rule in the neighbouring city states. Not having identical notions about the law it was not possible to instil and maintain a sense of identity in an association, thus Greece bore the consequences of the underdevelopment of law. Trade law was an exception. In Rome there was the exact opposite. They lacked completely any indigenous trade because they did not wish to engage in trade. Thus, as a consequence the Greeks attributed primacy to movable property, while the Romans to real estate. The former were a trading society while the latter a peasant one. The Greeks had various private laws (particularly concerning property) which were constantly changing, while the Roman triple law covered extensive ever increasing areas and was always stable.

The second similarity between Greece and Rome was that neither here nor there was there any permanent army (except for Sparta alone); but the Greeks willingly and in large numbers hired themselves to others as mercenaries, while the Romans never did this. Thus they were different even in this similarity.

They were also similar in that both here and there they adopted personalism and had a sense for historicism. But the Roman social structure was less differentiated and this was so because there was no trading class. But the Romans excelled the Greeks in historicism. This feature requires a stability of relationships and this was lacking among the Greeks. The Greek world was constantly reorganizing itself and its lands were subject

to constant upheavals, while Rome developed peacefully, by way of evolution, at least until the period of the great civil wars. In the natural development of things an *a posteriori* law developed, whereas Greece always had a tendency towards legal apriorism. This method does not contribute to the development of the notion of a nation. Also, a universal sense of a nation cannot be established and it cannot mature, not having a proper territory which would be politically united, and which by its very extent would impose on the population an idea of a community of interests. It is this that generates a common history. A nation has to establish a common national state. The Greeks proved unable to do so and even the Macedonian wars did not bring them to this.

We shall study these issues more closely in the following chapters. Let us not regret time devoted to an analysis of the classical world, because it is the very truth that we are bound by antiquity; we understand one another due to antiquity. Other peoples do not understand us nor do they understand one another

THE CIVILIZATIONAL BACKGROUND OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT

III

Even if the hypothesis that the Macedonians were of Greek blood would be rejected, there was certainly no shortage of Macedonians around 330 (two generations after Archelaus) who considered themselves to be Greeks. But this question is not to be viewed as one concerning nationality, because among the Greeks this notion was dawning only among very few minds; the majority of the intelligentsia did not understand this question and if we were to transfer our notions back to the ancient centuries the Macedonian issue would serve well as proof that that the essence of nationality does not consist in race nor in language. Let us imagine that some day science will prove beyond doubt that the Macedonians were not of Greek origin or that their speech did not belong to the Greek language and that only later its upper classes adopted the Greek language. Well so what?

If they adopted Hellenic science because they themselves “did not have any beginnings of a native higher culture” (Walek 1924, 327, this author adds also the term “national”, see annex III, 323-328) and as a result they held onto, and had to hold onto, the Greek one, thus spiritually they were Greeks, even though of a lower rank. And when Hellenism dominated over almost the whole

world due to Macedonian military effort would they have fought to propose and promote something that was foreign to them? And when with the Macedonian soldier the Greek language was exported everywhere, were they spreading a foreign language? And where would they have learnt this language? Did Alexander the Great accept for his Persian expedition only those Macedonian soldiers who knew a foreign language? It seems rather that the Greek language was their native tongue, and so it is necessary to include within the Greek dialectology also the Macedonian dialect or dialects; the fact that we do not know them – proves nothing.

Probably the Assyrian language differed from the Babylonian one less than the Ionian dialect from the Dorian one, and yet the hatred between the Assyrians and the Babylonians was very great (Walek 1924, 325). Communal friendship or hatred always derives from civilizational differences, and very rarely from other reasons. Assyria and Babylon were two hostile civilizations because they were mutually exclusive. We have many such examples in history (see Koneczny 1935).

The use of the Greek language does not assert anything in terms of civilization because in tiny Hellas itself there were several civilizations. A separate Macedonian civilization could have existed within the Greek language. The “lack of any rudiments of a higher own culture” means nothing, because even a civilization lacking a “higher culture” remains a civilization, though of a lower rank and defective. The question is whether the Macedonians had any rudiments of their own method of organization of communal life.

They were monogamists and they recognized private property as all the other Greeks did, but they differed in that they did not organize social upheavals against this property. They differed also in knowing only immovable property, land and real estate; movable riches in general and in particular monetary richness was of so little importance in their society that in the general characteristic of the Macedonian system it can be ignored without deforming the general picture. As regards social structure the Macedonians were closer to the Romans than to Greeks. Free peasantry represented half of the population in Macedonia and they were dominant in the army. Conflicts between great and small landowners were unknown and there was no agricultural proletariat (Walek 1924, 9, 10).

When Philip II began his operation against Greece the complete peace in his own country gave him an advantage because the Hellenic cities had many social upheavals. As is known, Greek public opinion was divided about Philip. Both Demosthenes and Isocrates did not consider him to be Greek (Jouguet 1926, 79, 81), but Isocrates wished to see him at the head of the Greeks so that he would politically unify them. It was obvious that none of the Greek city states was strong enough to dominate permanently over all the others, thus even the Macedonians would have to be used for this end. In any case the pan-Hellenism of Isocrates was by no means “racial” because according to him “one is a Greek not by origin but by upbringing” (Henri Bert in introduction to Jouguet 1926, VIII). Today we would express this idea that one would have to be culturally a Greek.

The bonding force of pan-Hellenism was to be the continuation of the Persian wars in the name of retaliation and the finding of a “king” among the Macedonians. The Persian kings for a long time had held Greece in check intervening in the Greek conflicts and civil wars. This humiliation was finally felt, and so from the beginning of the IIIrd c. concrete plans of an expedition against Persia were considered. Isocrates was the proponent of these ideas calling for this over a period of 50 years. He searched and judged who could be made into the arch-strategist of the combined Greek forces. At first he thought of Athens, then he considered Jason of Pherae as a possibility and finally he focused his attention on Philip. In 346 he produced a political pamphlet on this subject in the literary form of a speech.

There are fragments in it which are very significant: he presents Philip as an example of the earlier heroes and suggests that should he conquer Persia he would become equal to gods. Eight years later, scarcely a few days after the battle of Chaeronea, he writes in a letter to Philip: “When you will force the barbarians to serve the Greeks ... and when you will cause that the one they now call a great king will fulfil your commands, there shall be nothing left for you but to become a god!” We shall consider how one is to understand this Hellenic deification after we have collected a few more examples, a few more facts, from which it will be possible to make an inductive conclusion.

A year after Isocrates’s pamphlet Philip organized the Corinthian League under his own hegemony and required that he be called the arch-strategist for the war against Persia (Jouquet 1926, 4-7; Piotrowicz 1922, 16).

In Isocrates's mind the result was to be pan-Hellenism. He imagined that all Greek cities in Asia will be included by force into the alliance and possibly new ones will be formed on the conquered territories with regions of the local population around them (Jouguet 1926, 86). But Philip had something else and larger in mind about which we learn *a contrario* [from the opposite side] because Aristotle advised him ... not to rule according to the Persian mode (Jouguet 1926, 86).

Philip had some reasons justifying his hope that he could take over the throne of the Persian kings. Information about all the Persian affairs was coming to Greece literarily on a daily basis because the trading movement was very intense.

There were constant sailings from the Aeolian and Ionian cities on the Asia Minor coast to the Peloponnesus, to Corinth, to Athens and to the Macedonian shores where Greek trading stations flourished. The merchants however represented only one transmission line for news; a second one, and in this case more important came from the soldiers. The Greeks were supplying mercenary soldiers to the East and West in great numbers; obviously the Greek soldier was valued. The Persian kings were hiring them all the time because their rule was based on mercenaries. Thus Greece was constantly supplying greater and smaller Klearchoses. It is impossible to imagine that among these there were no regiments from Macedonia; the plans of Philip required simply that volunteers from Macedonia would serve in the Persian army. The information obtained from them was most valuable. Thus there was knowledge about everything that was going on in Persia and particularly about everything pertaining to the army

and the roads. In this way over many years the court of Philip was gathering information and was making plans. The reopening of the Persian wars in the opposite direction was obviously not some improvisation.

It was known that the great Persian state was composed of peoples that had nothing in common apart from their compulsory belonging to that state in which the Persians themselves represented a scant minority. It was known that when a Greek arch-strategist would sit on that throne the size of his kingdom would increase substantially as well as the number of subject peoples. Contrary to Isocrates Philip was aiming at a universal monarchy that would extend over Europe and Asia.

The very idea of a universal state had nothing Hellenic about it; it was completely alien to Greece and taken from the East. This was as if the initial step towards the orientalization of the Greek mind.

Young Alexander was to become the executor of this idea. This student of Aristotle knew Homer by heart and he truly believed himself to be a descendant of Heracles and a successor to Achilles. He believed in his divine origin proudly claiming ancestry from Zeus himself (Jouguet 1926, 8, 88, 89). Thus let us give up asking whether he was a Greek; instead we note that the young Macedonian prince even at home in the court of his father nourished in his dreaming head ideas about self-deification.

He could have acquired them during his schooling under Aristotle. The lessons began in 343, but did they last till the day when he sat on the throne in 336? Was it possible in those days that a prince would be studying for full eight years, until he was

21? He probably had some lessons even earlier, and Aristotle was to complete his education. Surely the student was too young to discuss with him issues concerning the political system; but it was possible to imbue him with one's thoughts even though he understood then in a childish way.

In Aristotle's *Politics* we read that the best state would be such which would be governed by the most virtuous and wise ruler. Aristotle places such a person on par with the gods and he continues: "Were it to happen that one single person would be found that is so exceptional in virtues ... that the virtue and political abilities of all others could not be compared with his ... such an individual could not be made subject to the state; that would injure him, by placing him on par with others who would be so much unequal to him in virtue and political abilities. Such a man should be like a god among the people." Such an individual is not to be subjected to anybody's rule "because that would amount to ruling over Zeus" (Piotrowicz 1922, 15). Thus the Hellenes accepted the possibility of an *a posteriori* deification, i.e. that man may raise himself to equality with the gods.

The princely boy with a hot head told himself: that's me! But he reached in his youthful thoughts much further because he convinced himself that he descends from Heracles and later he assumed that he is a descendant of Zeus. Logically this would be emanationism, an *a priori* deification.

It happened in the previous generation that the island of Thassos decided to offer divine worship to the great Agesilaos II, the Spartan king famous for his military successes in Europe and Asia (he lived in the years 444-360). This was an *a posteriori*

deification. But Agesilaos replied to them: “You must first make yourself gods and only then I will believe you that you can make me into a god” (Piotrowicz 1922, 12). But after all Agesilaos at that time was not in his teens!

Thus Alexander moved onto Persia sure of himself, excited by his divinity. It needs to be stressed very strongly that in Macedonia there had never been any deification (Piotrowicz 1922, 23) neither *a priori* nor *a posteriori*.

It was known that Persia could be beaten. There was no indignation or surprise that Greek mercenaries remained in the service of the Persians; there were two thousand of them in the service of Darius until the very end (Jouguet 1926, 41). It is possible that Greek “opponents” facilitated the victory, the relative ease of which surpassed the wildest expectations. Probably some of the soldiers of Alexander the Great were not in Persia for the first time and the whole army knew what were the customs there. Possibly only some details could have been a surprise for those who stepped on Asiatic or Egyptian soil for the first time. After all Alexander ordered that all new for him countries would be studied systematically. It was not Napoleon I who discovered the value of having a team of scholars on a military expedition! Alexander the Great already did this and he ordered that this scholarly “military formation” collect information about geography, ethnography, zoology and botany. Their reports were to be held in the state archives in Babylon and Alexander himself studied extracts of them (Stadler 1921, 335).

We must first consider what Alexander the Great found in Persia so as to be able later to specify how he responded to that.

What civilization did he find there? It is not possible to answer this with one word. How many civilizations have developed between the Indus River and the Aegean Sea, and how many of them were there in the middle of the IIIrd c.? This we do not know. At the present stage of our knowledge we can only speak about the most important ones, the victorious ones which became historical. We shall meet however a dark mystery in the East which until now we are unable to resolve. Did Bactria and Parthia have only one civilization (with two cultural varieties), or were they distinct civilizations? If so, which of them is older? What were their mutual influences, in what fields they were weakest, where to search for the essential characteristic of this or the other civilization and what bonded them? We have no answers to all of this. But we appear to know quite a great deal about the Persian civilization, which was formed to the south of the Parthian one and far from it because it was separated by a desert.

This civilization had a great expansion and after some time the Parthians began to consider themselves as successors to the Persians and their continuators; but who can determine the extent to which this included notions about the method of organization of communal life, or were they not restricted only to state affairs? Further to the west, in Mesopotamia, the highest civilization of that part of Asia flourished, the Babylonian one, which was very expansive and traces of it are found on the Indus as well as in Palestine. To the west of Assyria, there is Syria. The Greeks used this short term to denote the whole western part of the Assyrian state. This can be considered as proof that Greek trade reached so far even during Assyrian domination.

Syria is a conglomerate of Semitic peoples none of which became historical. An eminent Semitologist wrote (more than 70 years ago) that a Syrian never had any political life but he possessed a particular tendency towards religious currents (Renan 1866, 300).

Syria is a country that is not strictly determined and thus we find great differences in various authors in designating its range. Some attribute to Syria a relatively small area, more or less from Damascus to Samosate on the upper Euphrates, while others extend this name over almost the whole of Western Asia. Frequently however the central part of Western Asia is referred to as Phrygia from the most important people living there, the Phrygians. There is no point in asking for precise borders. We know about civilizational issues among the Syrians or Phrygians only as much as we know about their religious cults. In both places they had a devotion to frenzy, in the belief that one can approach god only in some special (abnormal) disposition, some sensuous mysticism and a predilection towards blood offerings. In Babylon there was no religious frenzy, thus this appears to be a local invention but was it from Syria “proper” or from Phrygia? We do not know. Where was the centre and from where expansion? We do not know. There must have been some common civilizational features in Syria proper and Phrygia; thus we shall refer to this civilization as Syrian, employing the more general term; we shall refer to it as Phrygian only when we find symptoms of it only in geographic Phrygia without asking about the rest of greater Syria.

With these reservations it can be briefly stated that Alexander met the old Egyptian civilization in Egypt, in Asia remnants of

the Babylonian, rudiments of the Parthian, the flourishing and hegemony of the Persian civilization, an undetermined state of the Syrian civilization and also the Jewish one. It is probable also that a distinct civilization was developed by the Armenians, but this still remains for science a difficult to resolve tangle of unknowns.

All these civilizations looked favourably towards the Macedonian invasion with the exception of the Persian one. This remains in connection with religious issues from which emerged certain consequences as regards the nature of the highest state authority (as was already mentioned in chapter I).

The Egyptians had been meeting with the Greeks for quite some time. They saw them fighting both with and against the Persians. They knew that basically they were against the Persians and that in the wars of independence they have had more luck than the Egyptians, but in spite of the full respect for the tradition of the “Persian wars” they would serve as mercenaries for the Persian kings. There was no special respect for the Greeks; on par with other “infidels” who did not worship Amon they were considered as “unclean”. Herodotus had seen himself that a Greek was not kissed in the mouth and that table utensils were cleaned not only after a Greek had used them but also after he touched them (Jouguet 1933, 172).

But now, what a change! They were accepted with excitement as deliverers from the Persian yoke. With excitement! This was so because Alexander immediately adopted a theocratic position. He arrived as the new pharaoh who was to rule in the name of Amon, as his new incarnation. He appeared as a tool of the Egyptian religious system, not as an invader but as an element of

the Egyptian identity. He stayed in Egypt shorter than Napoleon later did, but he achieved a great deal that lasted for centuries. The offering of a sacrifice in the temple of Ptah in Memphis made him a pharaoh because he was allowed entry into the sanctuary. And later he did not stint time for a 12 day march across the Libyan desert. There, where in the past a whole division of the army of Cambyses sent to capture the Siwa oasis had perished in some mysterious way, there, where the main temple of Amon stood, there went Alexander the Great so as to present offerings to Amon and to obtain support of the local oracles. But at the same time he organized Olympic Games for the Greeks who had settled in Egypt. For them he appeared as the supreme commander of the Corinthian League (Jouguet 1933, 2, 3).

He gained the support of the Egyptians also by relaxing fiscal severity and reducing state control; it appears also that he abolished monopolies (Jouguet 1933, 34).

He did not have to invade Egypt because from the Persian side there was little resistance since they could not afford it and the locals accepted him as god. The war was waged only in Asia. There also he wished to be considered a Persian king so that the consequences of his expedition would amount to a change of the ruling dynasty. But his notion of statehood from the beginning was very different from the Persian one. Not only did he liberate several subdued peoples from Persian oppression, not only did he remove Persians from positions of lords over conquered slaves, but – and this is essential – he did not appoint his own lords in place of the previous ones. The subdued peoples welcomed him as their liberator and he reintroduced the Lydian law (after Croesus).

In Babylon he elevated importance of the Chaldeans, and brought back the cult of Marduk.

It needs to be strongly stressed that he did not join to the cult of fire and to the faith in Ormuzd and Ahriman. Thus the opinion that Alexander adapted himself to every religion wishing everywhere to be considered as a confessor of the one which was most common in a given country is erroneous. He wanted to be deified in Egypt and in Babylon only, standing by Amon and Marduk. Whoever wished to be deified (*aprioristically* or *a posteriori*) could not adhere to religious dualism.

But Alexander did approve of the Persian administrative system. Apart from Egypt and Phoenicia he left the satraps and often (after the death of Darius) he appointed Persians for these positions; in general he willingly made use of them in his government (Jouguet 1926, 85, 87, 88, 93, 96).

He accepted locals willingly into his army and mixed peoples in it. In his expedition to India his 60 thousands strong army was composed in half of locals of various blood. He valued those who learned the languages of Asia Minor and Iran, who studied and followed their customs. In the winter of 324 he gave gifts to 10 thousand Macedonians who married Asiatic women. He settled the legal status of the liaisons of his soldiers with Asiatic women in advance. Their children were to be children of the army (when they grew up they were to join the army as the so called *epigones*). Following his orders 30 thousand young Persians were studying Greek and what is more interesting is that, in spite of their number, he did not hesitate to train them in the Macedonian war crafts. In cities that he established he settled mixed populations and he

planned to transfer populations from Europe to Asia and in the opposite direction (Jouguet 1926, 51, 64, 92, 95, 103).

But the crux of the matter lay in something deeper.

Alexander only partially adopted the attire of the Persian kings and the turban; he never wore the tiara or the wide trousers (Jouguet 1926, 90). How noticeable are these details! They were symbols. It was not possible to ignore completely the opinions of the Greek soldiers. He did what he had to and initially he had no intention of orientalizing himself more than necessary, but he believed in his divinity while still at home (although as derived from different deities). When he permitted a divine veneration to be given to him the Greek and Macedonian soldiers were scandalized, then they sneered, but finally many of them understood what was at stake. Alexander excused his Greeks from participating in these ceremonies.

Having convinced himself that he descends from Zeus he identified with his own divinity and this implied that he was not subject to any laws of men and was not bound by any morality. He who always supported Greek cities, renovated the destroyed ones, introducing everywhere democratic arrangements and even avoided locating military units in Greek cities (Jouguet 1926, 99-102), this same Alexander orientalized himself immediately in the execution of his tasks as ruler. He behaved in a despotic way even towards the Macedonians and he tended to forget himself so much that he killed his personal friends with his own hand. Like a god from the Olympus he freely administered favours or exerted wrath.

We know that there were a number of riots among his Macedonian soldiers. They exploded for various reasons, but the

dislike of the orientalization of the Corinthian “arch-strategist” was present all the time. In the last riot in the city of Opis in the year 324, there were cries : “Let Alexander continue by himself marching further with his father Amon” (Jouguet 1926, 65).

It was not the question of military toils that the Macedonian soldiers were complaining about. This was a mercenary, professional soldier, gaining a career and wealth through military campaigns, prepared well for everything. There was no shortage of such soldiers in Asia before Alexander. Beginning with Alexander and in the next generations the population from the poor country migrated for spoils and honours in Western Asia and in Egypt to such an extent that “an unprecedented depletion of the population resulted” (Wałek 1924, 6). After all Alexander himself established no less than 70 Alexandrias, fortresses, ports and trade centres (Zieliński 1922) and the backbone of each of these must have been the Greek element. The locals could be transferred from elsewhere without asking for their consent but the Greeks and Macedonians had to be won over for such settlements and it appears that there were no problems with this. They came willingly. Obviously this must have been profitable. Why then did they riot?

The rebellion was against the son and successor of Alexander the Great.

Since Alexander wanted the eastern peoples to consider his rule as only a change of dynasty, justified by the will of the gods, he had even the more to think about his progeny. He arrived in Asia as a bachelor and in Asia he married twice. The Macedonian dynasty was to be from now on of mixed blood, Greco-Asiatic. Quite deliberately he wanted his successor to be a crossbreed so

that he would be good (so he reasoned) and pleasant to both Asians and Greeks.

The first wife of Alexander was Roxana, a famous for beauty “pearl” of the East, the daughter of Oxyartes, prince of Sogdiana who was defeated in 328; she was taken prisoner only to become in the next year the wife of the conqueror. Thus the wife of the ruler of the greatest state came from the most remote north-eastern corner, where on the Jaxartes “Alexandria Eschate” [Alexandria the Farthermost] was built, the name of which indicates that Alexander had no intention of moving further in that direction.

Alexander could have married a Persian princess. Five years back, at the battle of Issus (333) he deprived Darius of his rule taking his entire family prisoner. He had in his hands the daughters of Darius but he married the daughter of a second rate ruler. But four years after marrying Roxana, who was still childless, he married in 324 an older Persian princess Stateira. At the same time he ordered Hephaestion to marry the younger one. There is no doubt that Stateira meant more than Roxana when the intent of marrying into the Orient is considered.

It was not the political nature of these marriages that was at stake but the civilizational. He did not expel Roxana, thus he practiced bigamy, and this was with intent. For the Persians polygamy was normal, but for Greeks this was something unthinkable, even detestable.

Alexander encouraged his officers and soldiers to marry locally. He endowed these Persian, Bactrian, Median etc. girls; he ordered communal weddings with hundreds of pairs at a time. But soon after his death these Greeks and Macedonians abandoned

these wives. It seems that they were waiting for an occasion to get rid of them! The marrying of an Asian wife entitled one to marry a second one and then a third one. But the comrades of Alexander did not want this! These Asiatic wives prevented them from marrying Greek girls because “polygamy had not affected Hellenic women”. No Greek woman wanted to marry a soldier who already had a wife, even though only of foreign blood. There was obviously “something” that a Greek (or Macedonian) felt as repulsive in a union with an Asian and he considered that a true wife could only be from his native country. Thus even though it might have seemed at the beginning that on Alexander’s initiative monogamy would disappear among the Greek diaspora, soon however, as the pressure from above disappeared, the principle of monogamy again became a characteristic of the Greek islands located among the sea of barbarians (Zieliński 1921, 1, II 19).

It is most significant that with the death of Alexander the pressure to marry Asiatic women and polygamy ceased completely; it was not undertaken by any of his successors. It needs to be deduced from many circumstances that it was not only on this issue that Alexander’s generals, governors, viceroys and successors were not in agreement with him.

This was not a question of racial dislike because the whole of Iran as far as Sogdia and Bactria belonged to the Indo-European race and none of the peoples from these regions was stigmatized by some special physical feature that would be repulsive for the Greeks. It was the oriental civilizations that were being imposed upon them that they found repulsive.

Alexander wanted to merge into one the civilizations of Egypt, Persia, Babylon and Athens. He aimed at civilizational synthesis and historical reality was soon to demonstrate that this is a utopia.

The state of Alexander the Great would have fallen apart even if he did not die so prematurely. Had he lived longer he would have survived the product of his own making.

However in the work of this Macedonian king there is an element of greatness, greater than is generally imagined. Alexander is Great not because he invaded many territories, not because he made the Greek language into a universal one, but because he invented a new method for the idea of universality. This is where his greatness lies. By conquests and invasions he formed a state for himself, but having done this he rejected the method of violence and he did not wish to see Greeks suppressing other peoples; he wanted to base his universalism on friendly cohabitation. He proposed to History a new ideal. Who can deny greatness to this ideal? It will be attempted many a time in the future but always failing to attain this goal. Obviously it proved impossible to find an appropriate method. The history of this ideal is a chronicle of errors, and these errors begin with Alexander himself.

The great Macedonian understood his universal state in a quite different sense than the Egyptians, Persians or Babylonians. All the great Asiatic states before him had the common feature that one dominating people was suppressing all the others, yet in spite of that they all remained themselves, while Alexander the Great “dreamed of a coalescence of races into a universal state” (Jouguet 1926, 9).

This cannot be interpreted as a drive towards orientalization that went beyond the hitherto existing measure; not at all! This was a completely different concept, a new ideal. When we view his governance in this manner we shall understand why in the offices, in the army and in settlements he always required an ethnographic mixture and wished to breed a new Greco-Asiatic generation, in particular a Greco-Persian one.

To “breed”? Yes indeed, because all of this was to be attained artificially. No people had such a natural inclination. It did not generate organically anywhere, from any natural association. On the contrary, each one of these peoples, no matter whether they were the oppressors or the oppressed, they always and unchangeably cared to maintain their own natural condition. Alexander the Great was inspired by a great ideal, something so great that never before has human thought come up with such an all embracing idea for the whole of humanity. But the idea of mixing races was an artificial one. It was an *a priori* idea, a product of the meditational method. This was thought out, meditated out and the decision was made to artificially implement this idea, not having the slightest support for the project among the natural relationships of the entire surrounding, which had never ever appeared in any organism.

What Alexander was aiming at could not have been organic. It was mechanistic. He imagined the whole of Asia covered with cities and administrations functioning on the Greek model but with a population that was deliberately mixed (the capital of the state was to be Babylon). An aprioristic mechanism that was outrageously contrary to all the data of reality!

By rejecting compulsory hegemony Alexander did not imagine a plurality of distinct, equal, organisms. Instead, he imagined that these so very contradictory organisms will coalesce into some one universal organism if only appropriate measures will be undertaken in this direction. But an organism cannot be generated artificially, and from his dreams, his studies, his efforts and toils what was produced was a mechanism, something that can be sustained only through compulsion. Every organism can last for a long time due to a constant sequence of reasonable acts consisting in *a posteriori* thinking, based on the recognition of the natural features of the given organism; in this way the culture of action develops, the capability for continuity in useful acts that all the time are becoming increasingly constructive. No mechanism possesses a culture of action; not only does it not generate one, but also whenever it meets one, it represses it and finally it totally destroys it. The larger the association the greater culture of action is needed; in a great mechanism its lack is all the more obvious and the consequences are all the more dooming (see last chapter in Koneczny 1938a).

The universal state dreamt by Alexander that was to be based not on compulsion but on the coalescence of various factors into a new artificial whole, could not last for long; in fact it could not even begin to function properly.

Alexander the Great's state disintegrated not because its initiator died prematurely. It already wavered in the last two years of his life and it would have disintegrated even under his own rule.

I have written more extensively elsewhere about the civilizational causes of the formation and disintegration of great

associations. I would like however to explain why the Greeks themselves hindered the maintenance of the state that they had formed with their own blood. One should not blame the impulsiveness of Alexander for this, because it was countered by similar impulses. We know how much the discipline of his invincible army suffered as a result; in fact it suffered so much that symptoms of disintegration were beginning to be manifest within it. The very attribution of equal rights to the barbarians inspired the Greeks to riot. Every position, every salary given to a Persian infuriated all those Greeks who claimed that they had a right to something that was to the Persian.

But there were deeper causes which acted more potently. The Greek soldier realized that no one is asking about his opinion or his preferences as regards Greek traditions, that the leadership cares nothing about what he considers good or bad, valuable or obnoxious. There were orders which were hated by the Greek soldier; there were too many issues that he found strange and contemptuous. It can be seen in the chronicle of the last two years of Alexander's campaigns that the army was losing respect for its leadership.

The essential cause of the antagonism lay in the abandonment of personalism in favour of communalism. They were unable to name this but that is what they felt intensively. The great forces of history operate irrespectively of whether they are seen and understood.

The Greeks of Alexander the Great, at least those who imposed their characteristic on the whole expedition, were not from the Lacedaemonian barracks but they were the products of

Attic education. An Athenian, the greatest personalist in universal history was the model for them. He was to be pressed into a communal association deprived of its own will on issues that had nothing to do with the conduct of war, for example those concerning marriage. They were ordered to assimilate to those who had never dreamt about liberty and the dignity of a citizen. They did not wish to be mechanized on non-military issues. Communalism is on par with mechanisms, while organisms correspond to personalism.

This is what can be asserted and defined as what Alexander found in the East and how he reacted to it. The next question is: was he himself transformed by something from the East? We have seen that he came with the intent (against Aristotle) to make himself into a “king”, but his notion of a state was not an oriental one, neither Persian nor Chaldean, but of his own personal invention. When he arrived he was not a supporter of polygamy. At the Macedonian court he never dreamt of being entitled to dispose of other people’s lives, to decide about the life and death of his subjects, for whatever reason and at whatever time, regardless of anything, irrespective of anything, even of the greatest services; he never dreamt that it would be proper for him to kill someone whom only shortly before he considered his friend.

Auto-deification spoiled his character removing all principles from his mind; in place of auto-criticism came impulses; and impulsiveness, sooner or later deforms a man. In the East Alexander went through an evident school of cruelty which he attended diligently; also many a higher officer of his army allowed himself to become orientalized in this respect and became a brute – but the

majority of the army was sadly surprised and often painfully hurt by this. The admirer of Homer, the student of Aristotle – a brute!

When after the fall of Darius a Bactrian satrap Bessus tried to maintain the autonomy of at least his own province and hoped to regain the earlier independence of Bactria (the Bactrians managed to stand up to the Assyrians and the Medians and they fell only to the Persians¹) and when this failed and he was imprisoned, Alexander had him tortured and finally he was crucified in a Persian manner. The new “rulers of the East” were becoming accustomed to Asiatic court life which included secret killings, poisons, despicable insidiousness and ambushes, constant hypocrisy and the only one aim in life which was the gratification of the lust for power. Whoever succeeded in this was absolved of all his faults.

Around the supreme ruler and his main headquarters there developed an atmosphere of distrust and dislike, a contempt for other civilizations, and a regret about the decline of one’s own civilization. The fact that the Asiatic and Egyptian deification were ordered by military command to be taken seriously played an important role in this. The majority knew nothing about political necessities and the needs of the state and Alexander deified himself not only politically in cold calculation but he truly believed in his own divinity. This must have had an influence on his entourage. It reached the army lines, and could not be understood by Greek minds. At most, they could have considered their leader to be a hero, a demigod on the mode of Heracles. Alexander tried to

¹ The Bactrians settled in the extensive valley of the upper and middle Oxus and are said to have been of Indo-European origin. It is also said that Zoroaster, the initiator of this dualistic religion which was the state religion of the old (Achaemenid) and the later new (Sassanid) Persia was a Bactrian.

achieve this, but this was not enough for him – after all he was a descendant of Zeus!

A demigod hero was primarily the one who set up a city. Alexander is said to have set up 73 of them! These were of course military station posts, fortified strongholds etc., which were to develop into military settlements and from these in the future cities were to grow. They were established with great pomp as if something great was being achieved, because in this way Alexander was becoming a demigod – 73 times!! Did not the Seleucids act in a similar way later? They also were producing “cities” by the numbers.

Having prepared himself in this way, Alexander was negotiating with the Greeks in Hellas about his appointment as a god. This demand had no political cause, because deification was not needed for anything, neither in his home Macedonia, where it was completely unknown² nor in old Hellas, where it generated scoffing. At the most it was possible to declare some time after the death of a hero that he in his value was coming close to a god. The negotiations for his deification in Greece offer only a contribution to the study of the personal characteristics of Alexander, of his psychology and for this reason they can be mentioned at the end of our presentation of this exceptional Macedonian.

² It is not possible to consider as an indication of divine worship the fact that at the betrothal of the daughter of Philip II statues of 12 gods were carried and his own was the 13th (Piotrowicz 1922, 12). The processional carrying of statuettes (masks, portraits, tablets) during family ceremonies is known in various parts of the world, (e.g. in Congo). These could have been “divine predecessors” with Philip at the end as the father of the bride.

When he was asking for deification as the son of Zeus in Athens he met with the response that if he so wishes he can consider himself to be the son of Zeus or Poseidon. Zeus or Poseidon! The very way this jeering response was formulated manifests its clearly negative content. In Sparta the resolution was worded in the following manner: "If Alexander wishes to be a god, let him be one!" This was a contemptuous shrugging of the shoulders. But Alexander was insisting on having even such declarations. And when in 323 he ordered a gathering in Babylon as his capital, he ordered already in Babylon, that the Greek delegations dress as religious ones with garlands on their heads and with golden wreaths presented as offerings to gods (Piotrowicz 1922, 17; Jouguet 1926). The point was that the international court gathered in Babylon was to see that this god on their throne is also considered a god in his own country. Greek notions about this differed basically from the oriental ones and the very word *theos* meant in this context something else. The Greeks were ready to attach deification not only to a reigning monarch, but to anybody and such a notion derived from the utmost idealism, from respect to the human genius – such was the notion of deity (Piotrowicz 1922, 19), but only among Greeks. Their titles of demigods and gods can be best translated today with the term "genius"; the games were understood as ceremonies linked with national festivities which celebrated the geniuses; the offerings given to the living were treated as honorary rewards; those given to the dead were *post mortem* signs of respect for their achievements; thus the games in honour of the living ruler could be compared with

our “banquets”. Only occasionally was there a Greek, who would view these things differently, in an oriental fashion.

Let us then terminate our comments about Alexander and his expedition. He died early and so he was spared the experience of seeing the ruin of his own work. A synthesis of civilizations is an impossibility and even a universal state could not be maintained on the principles laid down by Alexander.

The idea of a governing people suppressing other peoples was not brought back. Instead, a system of distinct states, based on civilizational differences was established.

Alexander himself was proclaimed by the “voice of the people” to be a legendary individual. His tradition persists until today in the darkest corners of Central Asia, not only on the upper Indus River and Afghanistan but also – as recent travellers have discovered – in Darvaz and in the lower Pamir (Jerofiejew 1930 II, 75, 110).

THE HELLENISTIC IDENTITY

IV

The Hellenistic identity formed amidst the continuation of the Persian wars which did not end at all after the Greeks had expelled the “king” from Europe¹. The victors desired a revenge for the invasion and they did not rest until they conquered the Persians in their own country. The Hellenistic civilization is the fruit of these wars.

It is not in Hellas that the Hellenistic identity developed, nor even in the less educated Hellenic lands of northern Greece. It was not in Europe, but in Asia, and this was not in the Greek cities of coastal Asia Minor, but deep inland in territories that culturally were truly Asia, among the peoples of the Persian state, in Iran and also in Egypt.

Having these geographical delineations and limitations in mind we can speak of two currents of the Hellenistic identity: the Asiatic and the African.

The Hellenistic identity was born due to the occupation of the entire Persian state by the Greeks. It cannot be said that it arose from the encounters of the Greeks with the Persians and with the peoples subjugated by Persia, because these relationships

¹ Not all wanted to expel him; Thessaly and Thebes stood on the Persian side.

had existed long time before and there were no indications that a new civilization was to be born. Undoubtedly the Greek trader exported Greek objects to Asia and Africa but these were only articles to be bought or sold, having sometimes only an artistic value. A Greek trader – settled for many centuries on the Aegean shores of Asia Minor – could have made the Asian more elegant, he could have educated him in taste and raised his requirements, but he did not enter with him into any combinations pertaining to the organisation of communal life; never did either side come up with the intent to organize somewhere a common communal life; we do not hear about any such project. There was import and export – and nothing else.

There have been in universal history trading communities that developed a civilizing influence and worked out a political force but the Asia Minor Greek traders had not attained such a stage and as far as we know they did not aim for it. They were and they remained distinct from the locals. It could not have been otherwise because they themselves did not have any common civilization that could have influenced the barbarians and inspired them to copy it. Spiritual factors of communal life did not bind the Greeks. On the contrary they divided and diversified them; how then could they have influenced others? What bonded the Greeks in the settlements was their trading law and they preferred not to allow foreigners to enter into this community. In trade they aspired for monopoly, which of course is understandable. The only serious competition came from the Phoenician trade but they managed to dominate it completely, from Iran to the mouth of Rhone. They came to terms with the Persian and Armenian traders buying far

eastern goods from them. Trading spheres of influence developed each one for a different trader (which is a common feature in history). The Greeks did not organize trading expeditions to the East; the locals did not travel further westwards than to the Greek cities. There is no sign of an Armenian or Persian trader in Hellas or on the Aegean islands, and even less so in the Ionian Islands or in Great Greece (southern Italy); the omnipresent Phoenicians had to yield.

The spiritual influences of Greek trade in Asia Minor (as well as in Egypt) were meagre and superficial not affecting in any way the system of organization of communal life. A Greek trader never tried to have such an influence, nor has anything of that sort appeared as an idea². Even less did a mercenary soldier have an influence; he came and he went. They were hired early in Egypt. For example in the present day ruins of Tell-et Duffanah (Gravedigger's Mount), there was an old permanent military camp of Greek mercenaries who served under pharaoh Psamtik I (665-610) (Klippel 1940, 54). They went also to serve under the Persians. Probably they were not an exception to the rule that after great military invasions some local residue remains; but these are only individuals which soon are lost as they disappear in the sea of the locals. They are unable to follow or think about their own communal life.

The relationships of the Greeks with Iran, with Asia Minor and with Egypt were such that the development of some new civilization could not grow out of them. The Hellenistic identity was born uniquely as a consequence of conquests and the trend

² Some analogies can be found later with the mediaeval Hanseatic League.

towards a universal state. It is not necessary to prove that this was not in any way a Hellenic ideal; this did not derive from the native Greek spirit. It moved from the Persians onto the Greeks.

The search for a utopian synthesis terminated the universal Greco-Persian state. After the death of Alexander the council of generals knew that if the pregnant Roxana would give birth to a male child the boy would be the inheritor and successor to his father; it was decided that for the time of his childhood there would be a regency (of Philip Arrydeus, the step brother of Alexander the Great) and the governorship was divided. A part of the army however warned that they would not serve the “son of an Asian woman” but this was suppressed more by generosity than by severity. The Macedonian generals were loyal towards the posthumous child. But Roxana behaved in an Asiatic manner having Stateira killed, after which she left for Macedonia. Together with the mother of Alexander the Great Olympias they stood together competing in reprehensible deeds so as to obtain power for themselves, at least in Macedonia. They failed however to organize a party for themselves within the Macedonian environment. In Asia it would have been easier for Roxana because in Macedonia the rule of females was unheard of. Meanwhile wars between the diadochs began and in 316 both ladies were captured in Pydna by Cassander of Macedonia. Olympias was murdered at once. She was stoned (a form of death that was unknown in Greece), while Roxana was imprisoned in Amphipolis until the end of these wars (301), when she too was murdered together with her son (who by then

was already 22 years old)³. It seems that the policies of the now allied diadochs required the removal of this son; probably this was included among the conditions of peace established after the battle of Ipsus in Phrygia.

No dynasty was established after Alexander, thus the idea of a universal state crashed because in the East dynasty and state were the same. It was Alexander the Great himself who prepared the dismembering of his state. He appeared everywhere as the liberator of peoples who were oppressed by the Persians, he restored the old religious cults and the old local laws; thus there was to be a diversity of laws in his state. Later he moved away from this and at least in the administrative law he returned to the principle of uniformity organising satrapies on the Persian mode (although not always manned by Persians). But in other fields he did not return to uniformity and as a result a non-commensurability of laws ensued. Whether it was private or public law they both were at odds with the administrative method. Thus only in Persia there could be commensurability while in all the other provinces there must have appeared a clear dislike of the administration of the satraps. Contradictions that could not be reconciled emerged and as a result there was a tendency to shed the Persian system. Since the administration ceased to be the bonding force of the state, and on the contrary it contributed towards the centrifugal tendencies – a universal state became an impossibility. Thus it split more or less according to the legal notions of the main peoples. The wars of the diadochs were the result; they were struggles of centralization and

³ [According to official history this was in 310 when Alexander IV was only 13].

decentralization in respect to the principle of political universality. This principle was abolished, but this did not mean that within a given state carved out of the universal one, centralism without bounds would not be maintained.

The reasonable principle that each people should rule itself according to its own laws was as it were denied by improper state administration and it was only the splitting up of the state into several ones that returned a sort of autonomy to the peoples, that was however, understood in an oriental manner, i.e. with distinct rulers in separate countries. Since the nature of the problem was not understood they fought one another in earnest and for a long time. The wars of the diadochs lasted 22 years.

The locals supplied the forces to all fighting sides; each of the diadochs had in his army Asiatic or African units. Nowhere however was there any cry against the Greeks. Until the appearance of the Parthian Arsacids in 250 no one ever questioned Greek hegemony. And the Greeks did not allow the plans of the diadochs to fall, fighting for them as for their own interests.

For a long time there were wars over Macedonia as if it were a race for the glory of first place in the Hellenistic world; also non-European successors of Alexander the Great participated in this.

A certain period of these wars involved at the same time the first clash of the Hellenistic world, first with southern Italy and then with Rome. The Epirus and Spartan expeditions against southern Italy mentioned in chapter II began in 342; thus their beginning only slightly preceded Alexander the Great. They for a long time had no link to issues of the great world that had not yet entered the Ionian Sea. The period of the diadochs wars passed and it was

only 20 years after the battle of Ipsus that Pyrrhus II, the king of Epirus landed in Tarentum (280). By then he was playing a role in international affairs. He was able to make use of the squabbles and wars in Macedonia, he travelled personally to Alexandria and he married into the family of Ptolemy I (323-285) the founder of the new Egyptian state from whom he obtained much help (for 7 months he was even the master of Macedonia). After the “Pyrrhic” victories in southern Italy he gave his army to serve Syracuse against Carthage (an introduction to the first Punic war). When he was defeated by the Romans at Beneventum (275) he did not end his career; he again became the master of Macedonia but only for a short time until in 272 when he died in the Peloponnesus. This was a condottiere king on a large scale and akin to all the successors of Alexander the Great. His entire individuality belongs to the Hellenistic world.

From these and all the other battles over Macedonia it always turned out that these struggles were not worth the effort; the country was increasingly depopulated, increasingly less valuable, thus after some time the battling over it was left to the neighbouring competitors.

Thrace was considered most lucrative. At the first division of countries by the diadochs following the death of Alexander the Great it was given to Lysimachus who was from Thessaly. He made and often changed various alliances and in this he was lucky because after the final confrontation at Ipsus in 301 he obtained Asia Minor as far as the Taurus. Soon, as a result of crafty alliances he also became master of the whole of Macedonia. Finally however he calculated wrong when he abandoned the alliance

with the Syrian Seleucus; defeated, he was killed during a battle in 281. His Asiatic possessions were taken over by Syria and Thrace was joined to Macedonia which was given to the descendants of Demetrius Poliorcetes.

In fact this was only a nondescript supremacy over newly organized tribal principalities of the locals. Several times the Syrian Seleucids also hoped to take over the country because it had gold (near Philippi), but in vain. Invaders from a different direction appeared; in 280 Thrace was occupied by the Gauls who ruled the country till 220, that is, for 60 years, and they lived at its expense. Among these experiences and calamities even the tradition of Kotys was lost and when finally it proved possible to expel the invaders the Thracians organized themselves again into small tribal states. This was the condition in which the Romans later found them.

The Gauls – or rather speaking more generally the Celts – did not stop in Thrace. They crossed the straits and established for themselves a state in Asia Minor. They were known there as the Galatians. The Greek element found then support against them in the state of Pergamon.

When the relationships reached a certain stability, when from the long wars finally the settled Hellenistic states developed, there was a return once again to the ideal of Alexander the Great of merging the victors and the defeated into a new whole. They even moved bravely beyond the program of the great Macedonian. They touched upon a sphere which Alexander had considered untouchable.

For some time there was the idea that peoples, the Greeks and the barbarians, could be united through some religious bond, through a pan-Hellenistic state religion. Thus there was an increasingly deeper move towards a utopia! Alexander the Great restricted himself to the idea of producing a “new man”, but he submitted to the gods of each country. Those diadochs who out of the 22 years’ wars on the division of the heritage of their leader appeared as the winners, as the new dynasts at the contact lines of three parts of the world decided that it would be better if all their subjects would confess a single religion and they believed that this could be done. Recent studies have uncovered in greater detail an interesting experiment Lysimachus of Thrace tried with his father in law, Ptolemy I of Egypt.

This is the same Lysimachus of Thrace and Macedonia whom we have just mentioned and who ruled in the years 302-281 also over the whole of Phrygia, over Lydia and Mysia together with the Pergamon country. The latter was the richest and most cultural part of the Asiatic realms of Lysimachus. He separated it out in 283 by nominating a special plenipotentiary for Pergamon called Philetaerus, his earlier finance minister (a son of a Paphlagonian dancer), and as a result of this decision Pergamon was not occupied later by Seleucus.

After the murder of Seleucus Nicator Philetaerus maintained the distinctiveness of his country which was helped much by the fact his treasury was full: he had at the time 9000 talents. But the religious experiment began already during the life of Lysimachus.

It was in these countries that the Phrygian religious cults were centred; the most important shrine was at Pessinos, the seat of

Cybele, the great eastern mother of the gods. Lysimachus wished to Hellenize this cult; he wanted to make the obscene eastern sensuality that was associated with it less primitive so as to make the cult more acceptable to the Greeks. Timotheus the Eumolpid from Eleusis was called in to help. He was from an old Attican family who hereditarily acted as priests in Eleusis. This Timotheus became an eminent reformer of the mysteries and he remained in contact with the Delphic elders. Delphi was dreaming about the universality of the cult of Apollo as it already had a spiritual hegemony over the Roman state and it remembered that it had also gained Lydia during the reign of Croesus. Would not Delphi show an interest in profiting from the expansion achieved by Alexander the Great, would it not see a further chance for itself in the new kingdoms of the diadochs?

Thus there would be a concurrence of two universalisms: that gained by the sword and the peaceful propaganda of religious universalism. One would imagine that ... but we lack sources! If there was anything of the kind we would have to assume that Alexander the Great who had protected local cults everywhere did not share the Delphic plans and it is perhaps for this reason that we do not hear anything about the striving for religious syntheses during his lifetime. Later the long wars of the diadochs were not favourable to the spreading of such ideas. They appeared only when the relationships settled somewhat and there was peace.

We do not know whether the high priest Timotheus Eumolpid came to Asia Minor as a delegate from Delphi. Did he manage to obtain the support of Lysimachus or did Lysimachus himself call him in? The whole Greek ruling class already knew at this

time that nothing could be done in the East without a religious background⁴, and since this was noticed they bought the idea of unifying the religions of the East with the Hellenic one. It was believed that in this manner the program of Alexander the Great could be fulfilled. The mixing of peoples proved futile so maybe a religious synthesis would be an introduction and at the same time a basis for a synthesis of civilizations?

Thus a tendentious coupling was made and the Greek gods were compared with the eastern ones. This was often done by writers so as to facilitate for the readers an understanding of the East. This had already been done by Herodotus, who compared Isis with Demeter – and this linking was now employed in the court of Lysimachus and his lieutenants in Phrygia. In the Syrian state of Seleucus Apollo was perceived in the Persian Mitra, in the Babylonian Marduk, as well as in the various Baals of Syria. Finally in Antioch itself a magnificent temple of Apollo was built, but the locals did not visit it. Also the myth of Attis was used, searching for parallel elements that could inspire the imagination. Was it an accidental similarity of name or was it deliberate that the name Attis was attached to the Phrygian arch-priest who came from the group of priestly eunuchs known as the Galli? It is a fact that Timotheus worked in Pessinos around the cult of Cybele introducing elements of Eleusian mysteries into it. A stone symbolizing this goddess (a meteorite?) was to be transferred to

⁴ And so it is till this day. It has been said that inoculations against smallpox could be introduced in India, but only on the condition that they shall be presented as an element of a religious cult.

the Pergamon acropolis and the cult of Cybele became the official religion of the kingdom of Pergamon.

Next Timotheus operated in Egypt. There the cult of Apis appeared as something too primitive for the Greeks. The royal court however followed this religion publicly and maintained at great cost cemeteries of the holy bulls. There was great and intensive thinking and finally this or that pertaining to Osiris (User-Hapi) was worked out. The conclusion was arrived at that these are notions that had been known to the Greeks for centuries and are in fact in agreement with the cult of Zeus. In this way an Egyptian-Greek god was established, the Serapis, who had strong support from the governments. Sculptures of the deity accompanied the authorities everywhere and thousand-fold casts became a purchasable commodity to be found now at all the shores of the Mediterranean, so much so, that there could arise in science the impression that the religion of Serapis covered the whole of the Roman Empire.

The shape of Serapis was worked out by the sculptor Bryaxis, who was famous for his participation in work on the enormous tomb of king Mausolus in Halicarnassus (south of Miletus). Apart from this famous “seventh wonder of the world”, the Serapis of Bryaxis became a model type which was to have a great destiny in the East – as we shall see in the next chapter. He is similar to Zeus but ... melancholic. The melancholy derives from the Orient and Bryaxis captured and expressed this feature very well. The East has two basic psychical features: either licentiousness or melancholy. Timotheus also tried to combine the Greek fables about Zeus and Demeter with the Egyptian ones about Osiris and Isis, but the end

result was that the “defenders of morality not unjustly referred to the temples of both religions as seats of debauchery” (Zieliński 1922 II 50, 64; 1924a 72-75; Jouguet 1933, 38-40, 175).

The educated did not believe in artificial gods and so official mendacity increased. The masses succumbed to a state for which a proper word was found only in the Russian language: *двоеверие* [dual faith]. It turned out that a synthesis of religions is an absurdity (see other examples in Koneczny 1930).

Error followed error – nowhere was there any sign of a synthesis. Even in the state of the Seleucids, which encompassed the most eminent centres of civilization, nothing came out of the mixing. There, there was Babylon and Susa, Jerusalem, the ruins of Troy and Nineveh. The extensive country had many scattered military colonies, (with veterans who could be mobilized promptly) (Jouguet 1926, 433). The Greek element constituted the strength and culture of the country. Antioch established by Seleucus and named after his father is referred to by the Syrians as “a beautiful Hellenic town” (Zieliński 1922, II 16).

The Egyptian and Asiatic diadochs submitted unconditionally to the “necessities of the state”, to divinization, and even demanded it sternly. We have information from the years 311-307 that Antigonus was receiving far reaching signs of superhuman worship not only in Asiatic Ionia but even in Athens. This example was followed by Ptolemy, Lysimachus and Seleucus (Piotrowicz 1922, 20). And when finally more or less fixed “Hellenistic kingdoms” were formed they all accepted the theocratic foundations of their states. This was accepted as a rule first by the Ptolemys and soon

it passed onto the Seleucids and from there to Pergamon, Bactria and Parthia (Piotrowicz 1922, 22).

None of the Hellenistic states deprived the locals of their indigenous laws. Thus in the judicial law there was a duality. Dual law and dual legal processes! In Egypt the judges for the locals were called the *laocrites* and for the Macedonian-Greek population the *chremates*. The Egyptians had a written procedure and the Greeks an oral one with the possibility of substitution of sides. But one would err if one were to assume that the existence of these two types of judiciary procedures side by side led to a “consciousness of the superiority of the Greek one and its gradual victory” (Zieliński 1922, II 31).

Very rarely anyone from the upper echelons of the Egyptians or Asians Hellenized spiritually. Never was there any talk about the adoption of Greek institutions by the local population and the kings had to be very careful not to suppress in any way the local arrangements.

The same was the case in the Asiatic Hellenistic states. Dreams about coalescing the old population with the newcomers into some spiritual unity, based upon common legal notions that would be the foundation of communal identity, proved impossible.

There was a basic difference in social structure which is best seen in agriculture. In Asia Minor the Macedonian element dominated over the Greeks and as a rule the Macedonians did not deal with trade. There was a similarity between them and the inhabitants of Asia Minor in the understanding of communal life in that whoever had more land was considered more important. Both in Macedonia and in Asia Minor the social structure was

based upon the hegemony of the real estate owners. And yet, these were two distinct structures. Macedonia (as well as Rome) was characterised by having a free farmer while Hellenistic Asia was a classical domain of great landowners. This was so for ages and this system survived all political changes.

Later, the great trade directed by Greek settlements fell, but the great land estates survived.

The social structure of Asia Minor was becoming increasingly similar to that of Egypt. The country was characterized by increasingly extensive landed property of the king that was tilled by peasants who were hereditarily bound to the soil, and who were always sold together with the land (Jouguet 1926, 420).

In the period that we are discussing here there was still no sign of the decline of trade. In fact it flourished increasingly, becoming international on a scale much greater than during the Persian times. The traders did not participate in public honours. Throughout the period of the diadochs dynasties and later on under the Roman pro-consuls and Byzantine governors, throughout this long string of ages never do we hear of anyone who became a great individual in the administration of the state due to the fact that he was a rich trader; and how many of such traders could have bought land and turned into great landowners? There is no force in the world that could deprive trade of this natural privilege of always being the greatest economic force.

Thus it is clear for historical reasoning that Greek trade law also had to develop. Just as in Hellas (apart from the great Olympic games) it was a major pan-Hellenic issue, so also, or rather all the more so, it became a factor in the universal Hellenistic world.

By the term “Hellenistic” law, only trade law is to be understood. It was becoming universal from the Mongol-Chinese frontiers in the east as far as *Ultima Thule* [most extreme location] in the west. A wide and interesting field opens up here for historical studies only the rudiments of which can be found here and there.

The Roman trade law became as it were a branch of the Hellenistic one. This origin and influences are to be found in many a detail, particularly in the edicts of the *edils* who were administrators policing markets and the whole trade movement. It has been established that this was based on Greek law and thence it entered the Roman legal norms pertaining to buying, selling and renting, to remuneration of the dealer, to issues concerned with guarantors of contract conditions, to protection of property, particularly on the occasion of death, to inheritance, submitted to the care of the municipal authorities and following all this to some details of legal, primarily civil, processes (Partsch 1921, 121, 122). It is the trade profession that requires most legal protection and as a result it influences legal norms most.

Trade was the only sphere of life in which Greek law was imposed on all peoples with whom the trader from the Hellenistic countries had contact; usually he was a Greek himself. The Syrians only during Roman times entered the first league of international traders but they used the already multilaterally established Greek law.

In no other field was Greek law imposed upon the conquered peoples. Everywhere the locals were ruling themselves according to their own local laws. It is from the Hellenistic states that this duality derives, which was later described in Rome as the distinction

between the *ius proprium* and the *ius gentium* [proper (civil) law and the native law]. The very essence of this relationship became obvious to the successors of the diadochs much earlier than in Rome. The Romans found this duality in the East and having adopted it from there, they introduced it also in the West.

We see from this how great was the significance of the expansion of the Hellenistic identity for universal history.

But within these Hellenistic states the Greek was increasingly embroiled in “native” barbarity. Whether it was in Syria, in Pergamon or in Egypt the people submitted to the armies of new dynasts but these dynasts submitted to the likes and requirements of the Asians or Egyptians.

Let us take Egypt as an example. The locals lived in the norms of the old Egyptian civilization, while the new pharaohs, the Greek pharaohs, after short lasting efforts to introduce a new system finally surrendered and they preferred to pretend that they themselves belonged to these Egyptian norms – and after some time they degenerated in this hypocrisy.

The first of the Ptolemy dynasty (Lagides, year 285) wanted to introduce into Egypt something of the spirit of Greece and so he tried to reduce the extent of statehood in his state. Thus for example he maintained the ruling of Alexander the Great which abolished the monopolies. But his successor, Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285-247) submitted to the Egyptian custom. He reintroduced and expanded court rituals and as a proper pharaoh he married his sister, which was a custom that was later continued. He declared himself to be god, he demanded an apotheosis of his father and wife and he organized an official cult of his regal

person with a special gathering of priests. The old fiscalism of the pharaohs was expanded and deepened. It was Philadelphus who reintroduced monopolies (even of paper) and later a monopoly on olives was invented (organized in a manner as we grow tobacco now). Statehood was increasingly expanded until the situation was reached in which only sleep was permitted without the interference of the state and the accompaniment of its bureaucracy. Probably the Egyptian king was the richest monarch and the reserves of state treasury were enormous but the whole fiscal policy was constantly undercutting the branch on which the state was sitting. The great riches permitted the state to survive for a century, but already during the reign of Ptolemy IV Philopator (221-205) the state started to decline. A different country would not survive longer than one generation! Not only external but also internal custom duties were introduced. Soon all the banks were nationalized and next all the granaries. To engage in some handicraft it was not sufficient to pay for a licence but the state was to be given a part of the returns, and if necessary part of the produce. Agriculture fell under the control of the state to such an extent that even trees were counted not to mention domestic animals (including geese), all of which were subject to requisitions. The raising of horses and calves was under strict control. The tax on grain was paid in kind following the measure and whim of a state official. Tax on wine was paid in cash and besides as 1/6 of the produce. The tax on renting a house was 5% and the same amount for the transfer of ownership. The paying of major part of the taxes (an ever increasing part) in kind indicates that the monetary economy was declining. The excess of monopolies proves that there must

have been deficits which it was not possible to patch up in any other way than by raking an ever increasing part of production for the needs of the state. Mines, salt, soda, alum, paper, perfumes, incenses, oakum, leather, fisheries, the raising of pigeons, tanning industry and partially also beekeeping all were sacrificed to this behemoth. The making of beer was permitted, but only from barley supplied by the state. But all of this was not enough for the state. The population had to be engaged in public works and in subsidiary police tasks. There were also taxes for the maintenance of the police and the administrators; for the building of causeways and canals there were separate taxes.

Where did all these taxes and donations go since it was even not possible to maintain the canals in Egypt from these resources? It is a characteristic of all bureaucracy that it never becomes cheaper and on the contrary it becomes ever more expensive because it continues to expand day and night. The cost of maintaining the court and the offices reached such a level that in no way was it possible to collect from the country a sufficient amount of cash; even meat for the maintenance of the staff had to be supplied in kind (which resulted in each butcher becoming a slave of any official in his settlement). The second expense was the army. The army was the cement of the state based almost entirely on compulsion. The permanent army of the Ptolemy pharaohs was composed of Greeks; the locals served only in subsidiary formations. Greek military art still stood high and they continued to be invited everywhere as mercenaries. Greek soldiers found a true gold mine in the Hellenistic countries and so they themselves were interested in the maintenance of the locals in servitude.

Who then benefited from all this statehood? After all, the dynasty must have had some supporters. It had them because it paid them generously with administrative functions and with land. Basically the entire land of Egypt was the property of the king. In the times of the Ptolemy dynasty even the properties of the temples were administered by the king; that is, they served the needs of the bureaucracy. What was not the property of the king was given as the king's favour to notables, but not as something that was to be passed on to one's inheritance (Jouguet 1933, 34, 68, 69, 71, 76-83).

In this way during each reign a court party was formed and the king was sure of himself on the basis of the old tradition of the divine power of the pharaoh, as long as the court remained in agreement with the priests.

One further question remains: what did the current science think of all this and how was it reflected in the literature of the time? After all in Alexandria there was the "Golden Cage of Muses" composed of several monumental buildings, the world famous "Museion"; Alexandrian science represents one of the most important chapters in the history of learning. It was also accused of being closely attached to the court. What an interesting book would appear, if someone would take the trouble to analyse how artists, authors and scholars were supported materially in the past!

It can be said about Alexander the Great that he took with him to the East his ideas about himself, his lust for fame and dominance but besides that also something of the Aristotelian spirit, namely an interest in the sciences. One could ponder over the question

whether Hellenistic science was called into existence by Aristotle himself through the mediation of Alexander the Great. We know that on the request of his tutor Alexander ordered the collection of all sorts of materials, particularly in view of a book on animals prepared by the Stagirite. But we also mentioned above that these materials were to be gathered in Babylon where the new capital of the new much expanded universal state was to be.

It was there that some “Museum of Alexander the Great” was to be established, probably on such a scale that it would be a worthy memory of the greatest ruler. With some delay, caused by the wars between the diadochs, this idea was picked up by the first two Lagides, Ptolemy I Soter (323-285) and Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285-247). This was not an improvisation but a truly great historical work that grew gradually. The first organiser of this was a student of Aristotle, Demetrius of Phalerum, the famous and generous administrator of Athens and later in 307 a political exile whom Soter invited to stay with him (Zieliński 1922, II 36, 37).

The activity and productivity of the Alexandrian Museum lasted 950 years, because it began around 300 B.C. and operated till A.D. 646 when it was destroyed by the Arabs. Only the earliest beginnings of the “Alexandrian science” belong to this chapter. It appears that the first to flourish there was medicine because towards the end of the fourth century Herophilus of Kos was invited to stay there and he was the first to study anatomy (Natanson 1934, 6). It is known that exact sciences were most important in the Museum; in fact it was there that they were first conducted in a methodical

manner. There also developed special disciplines that are not dependent upon philosophy but are based on empirical induction.

Both the main trends in philosophy of Hellas passed onto the Alexandrian pool: the meditative Plato and the generally inductive Aristotle. But the Stagirite made one exception to induction. This giant of knowledge from whom so many sciences derive, the initiator of mechanics (he discovered the parallelogram of forces), the progenitor of ophthalmology and optics because he knew what kind of conductor of voice air is and he developed the theory of rays (Zieliński 1922, II 36-48), when he tried to understand the structure of the universe he began with arbitrary assumptions and then deduced conclusions that were not based on anything real, in other words he produced a meditative science. He taught that celestial bodies cannot be composed of the four “essences” of the lower world because as a higher world they have to have as a substance a fifth essence that is completely distinct, universal and eternal, free from earthly corruption. As the highest substance it is capable of perfect motion and the shape of perfect movement is a circle⁵. Thus all the celestial bodies move by a uniform central motion around the centre of the world, from which it can be deduced that the earth stands immovable at this centre and in view of the mechanics of the heavens it has to be motionless (Natanson 1934, 17, 18). This is a typical meditative dialectic (even not deductive). Respecting Aristotle very highly Alexandria however abandoned this part of his science; scarcely a generation passed

⁵ About this perfection of the circle there were musings for centuries and even today we have lovers of such meditations which could be referred to as artistically-scientific. By similar right one could lament on the circle in that it closes in on itself and leads to nowhere.

after the death of the Stagirite in 322 and interest in the essences was abandoned.

The definitive rejection of inventing fancies, even the most beautiful and pleasing, of “philosophising” is a great achievement of Alexandrian scholarship. The meditative philosophising was stopped. But will they produce a philosophy, even a deductive one that would be based on something proven?

A strange question arises (perhaps linked with the topic under discussion): will the arch-famous and so very deserving this fame Alexandrian scholarship enter into some contact with real life, and to what extent and how? After all, the works of Plato and Aristotle were full of links with communal life; will there be a continuation of this in Alexandria? The Alexandrians did not adopt *stoa* [stoicism, named after the portico where Zeno taught].

Meanwhile in Hellas the state and social issues were still dealt with and with humour. The very initiator of Stoicism, Zeno (340-260), who was so serious, did not shy from satire and mockery when he depicted a state without temples, without courts, without schools, with sex equality, with the joint ownership of women and above all with an identical mode of life for everyone (Poehlmann 1925, II 268-274). Fantastic countries were dreamt of which offer “free lunches”. Fanciful ideas abounded. Theopompus of Chios (around 360) fancied an extensive country, the Meropa, inhabited by Negroes in which there will be special separate penal colonies for culprits. Hecataeus of Teos described the strange marvels of a “Cimmerian” city. Amotheus wrote in the IIIrd c. about the Attacori people and Timocles about people who were snake killers. Euhemerus of Messina wrote (around 300) “a holy

chronicle” supposedly brought all the way from the shores of India (Poehlmann 1925, II 285, 289, 291-294, 305). Also there were various fables about the Scythians. They were to live with no envy, no vileness, because all were said to be related, as if brothers. There was a simple method for this, the common ownership of women. Already Herodotus (484-428) had mentioned this story and Echoros (d. 334) claimed that the Scythians had the most multilateral communism (Poehlmann 1925, I 91, 94).

Positive discussions of social issues moved seriously towards the left around the year 320. A disciple of Aristotle, Dicaearchus of Messana, considered the development of private property as a deviation from the laws of nature (Poehlmann 1925, I 87, 88). An idea was introduced into the Hellenic science which was opposed to the fundamental principle of the social structure of all Greek civilizations, namely the principle of private property. Thus, this was a revolutionary idea. The very suggestion of curing social ills by the abolition of private property is extremely primitive and it is based upon only meditative musings. This idea crops up in all times among ignoramuses who have no knowledge about the essence and conditions of development of communal life. This indicates that the social sciences in Hellas were not of high standard. The proposal of Dicaearchus was made more or less simultaneously with the death of Aristotle. Having attained its heights during the days of Aristotle this branch of sciences suddenly started to decline. Dicaearchus began using simplistic notions.

At the same time there was a strong reaction against simplistic superficiality in the natural sciences and an introduction of it into the social sciences. The former began in the Alexandrian Museum

and the latter in Sicily. Very soon Greek science became universal engaging scholars from all the Hellenic countries and from all the settlements; scholars know about each other which is proven by the ever increasing exchange of ideas and polemics.

It is a most noticeable fact that the social sciences were not studied in Alexandria. Possibly the Egyptian court did not allow for this in the name of the principle that politics is the exclusive responsibility of the king and his court advisors and not of the residents of the Museum. In this field “reliance on the court” proved to be extremely harmful. We shall be following this issue in further chapters.

The Hellenistic states lacked a certain condition that is necessary for the success of great associations, namely a free discourse about public issues. In these states society had no importance; it was suppressed by the statehood. These states were mechanisms based on the military strength of the mercenaries. The only purpose of the state was to maintain the dynasty and undertake conquests. Since there were no social sciences there was no social or political program. A program may be born only from criticism and this was forbidden in the East. The Hellenistic ideal is not a continuation of Hellas.

Let us now define the Hellenistic identity as a civilization on the basis of features and relationships that have already been established, i.e. inductively:

A civilization is a method of organization of communal life⁶. Civilizations are primarily divided into sacral and non sacral ones. All the Hellenistic states were based on the deification of the ruler, thus they had a sacral foundation, but the dominating elites, the Greek population that ruled did not recognize this foundation. No Greek, even from the lower classes believed that the king was a descendant of Marduk or Amon; not only did he not believe in this but he also mocked this when the Greeks were among themselves. Through mixed marriages this denial of the sacral basis was seeping also to the natives; this was happening insignificantly, slowly but persistently. In this languid but constant current the direct denial of the statehood was contained. The local population was not introduced to Greek education; not one of the peoples from Mesopotamia to Upper Egypt strove to acquire it. The idea that a state does not necessarily have to be of divine origin did not enter the heads of the oriental people; the criticism therefore stopped half-way, questioning only the divine ancestry of the given dynasty. Since in the East the dynasty and the state was one, the very existence of the state would be subverted should a substantial portion of the population reject the divine nature of the ruler. The course of all half-measures is such that they eventually lead to a denial.

The Hellenistic states weakened as they gradually ceased to be basically sacral. Nowhere was this sacrality publicly denied, neither politically or scientifically. The mockery was in secret as

⁶ The basic notions dealt with from this moment till the end of the chapter have been analysed systematically and in depth in two previous books (Konecny 1935 and 1938a).

was the resentment, but officially offerings were still being made to the descendants of the gods. This aspect of the Hellenistic civilization was at the same time a sheer mockery of Hellenism. A Greek in Asia or Egypt became a renegade of Hellas. Mendacious duplicity was as it were a common feature of communal life. Education, not even a half-hearted one, was capable of doubting and destroying but it was incapable of building. Sacrality was questioned and a vacuum resulted; the Hellenistic peoples of the East, who could not have an influence on their own countries, waited passively who will conquer them next. The roots of this state of affairs were already visible at the beginning of the IIIrd c. Spiritual paralysis must arise from mendacity.

Thus, the Hellenistic states could base themselves only on military power, on the mercenary forces; they were the pillar supporting everything so long as the royal treasury was rich enough to cover the costs of the maintenance of this pillar. The entire statehood was worked out quite logically. The state would have fallen had the mercenaries been unsatisfied, had the excellent conditions not attracted new recruits who would join the ranks. Macedonia was depopulating because thousands were emigrating to the armies of the Hellenistic states. Having served his time, a Greek soldier was given a piece of land of a size he could not even dream of in his native land. The soldiers of Alexander the Great hoped to go back home bringing with them the cash that they had saved. The new dynasts were rewarding the veterans with land, so they stayed. Seleucus alone established 75 settlements, some on a city model and some as villages. Greek settlements were lined up, right up to the Afghan border and they reached the boundary with

India. The Greek settlement was strongest in Egypt, particularly the agricultural one in the region of Fayum.

The bonds between the locals and the Greeks were strongest in the military profession. These Asians had been mercenaries since times immemorial (also in Egypt); obviously this must have been the most rewarding profession for men from the folk people and at the same time it released them from slave captivity and rural public works. It was only in the army that one could become a free person. It turned out in the future in Asia Minor that it is possible to have as many soldiers as one wished! The Hellenistic rulers satisfied themselves in normal times with small armies because they did not wish to have too many soldiers of Asian origin.

And were not Greeks also professional mercenaries? Even before Alexander the Great the entire East knew them well as hirelings running around the world in search for pay and spoils so as to have something saved for old age. These were old and traditional military comrades. Neither the Asians nor the Egyptians ever learnt the Greek military skills even though Alexander the Great ordered that they be trained in this. They must have lacked sufficient intelligence. After Alexander the Great Greek military training were no longer required of the subjects. It was discovered that it is better, safer and more convenient to keep them at their own level of military skills and to use them only as supplementary units for special needs. Thus the Greek soldier was not on an equal level with the local one.

The thrones of the Hellenistic rulers were based upon the Greek army; their governance was always a conquest apart from

Egypt where the population accepted the Ptolemies as their own dynasty of pharaohs; but even there the army was Greek.

The mercenaries had to be paid well and assured affluence for old age. This had to be done even if at the utmost cost, thus the government treasury had to be full even if it proved necessary to pauperise the people to the extreme. The entire state administration had to be focused on this one task and everything else was of secondary importance. It was not possible to give any rights to the people if this would mean that the treasury would lose even a penny. The state is always right whenever it acts in the interest of the state treasury. In this issue there was no place for ethics.

With this kind of reasoning and practice finally the moment must have arrived when everything was sucked out of the population and the taxing official had nothing more to collect; at that moment the only way out was to change the inhabitants into slaves, into personal slaves of the king.

It was imperative that no “wise men” or “philosophers” would have a voice. Some in the name of ethics, and others thinking of the interest of future generations would become an opposition. All the elements, of the Hellenistic state were therefore so bonded, so linked together because the elimination of one would break the whole chain. Wishing to maintain the dynasty it was impossible to allow for any opposition even if it be in writing only. The mendacity had to be maintained, because otherwise the days of the rulers would have been numbered.

Under such relationships and conditions there is no point in asking what forces are to be supreme, the physical or the spiritual ones? Should some spiritual forces arise in the field of statehood

and social life they would have been suppressed immediately. Physical force had a monopoly. This was not a Hellenic way of life at all; the Hellenistic civilization sank deeply into Orientalism. And then the situation was reached in which every inhabitant of the country had to do what the authorities ordered him to do in absolutely all walks of life and everyone became a slave of his ruler. Public life ceased to require any distinct public law because it was based uniquely upon the blown up private law of the ruler, on his personal right that encompassed all and everything. In this matter the Greeks had to go along step by step with the locals. The will of the king had to be everything for the Greeks also. If the king privileged the Greeks giving them better conditions he did this by his own grace which he could rescind at any moment. In the same way he could also give privileges to the locals.

All the Hellenic discussions about the state and society, about kinds of government and justice, became unthinkable during the Hellenistic period. In this respect the Hellenistic Greeks are not a continuation of Hellas. They became oriental. Initially, the Hellenic norms generated loud protests (there were revolts even against Alexander the Great), but later on they fizzled out, until they died out altogether. It was held that notions of citizenship and of slavery can coexist next to one another in the same state, at the same time. It was possible to be Greek and local, with equal rights. But the granting of equality to non-commensurable notions always ends with victory of the ones that are lower from the point of view of the civilization. Thus in the Hellenistic period the Orient was supreme and neither Greek trade nor Alexandrian science managed to question its primacy.

This is all the more intriguing because the very use of the Greek language attributed to one the features and privileges of members of the ruling class. The sons of veterans were sure to obtain affluent positions in the army or in some governmental office. For this reason Greek fathers in mixed marriages had to ensure that their children do not abandon the linguistic tradition. The Greek language survived in Egypt for a thousand years, but what else of Hellenic origin did survive there? Probably many of the locals also studied the Greek language but did they do this so as to read Sophocles? The Syrian civilization expanded widely after having adopted the cloak of the Greek language and the Egyptian civilization was re-emerging again, both of them unchanged as regards the method of organization of communal life, because in this regard the Greek rulers succumbed completely to the local oriental notions.

For a long time the Greek immigrants cared for their Greek customs, but mixed marriages were having an effect. Only the notables and officers could marry Greek wives because native Hellenic girls were moving to Asia and Africa for the sake of a higher career. Thus, the higher classes could maintain Hellenism in their homes and families but the lower classes were sinking ever lower into the Hellenistic identity which was closer to “barbarianism”. Thus Greek society in Asia and Africa split into two strata with no mutual bond of civilization between them. Greek social solidarity ceased to exist; how could these Greeks therefore exert any influence in the sphere of organization of communal life?

In the entire Greek immigration the influx of Macedonian peasants searching for a career in the army could have been most influential, since they were the most numerous. They differed from other Greeks in that they preferred a stability of relationships. While throughout the IVth, IIIrd and IInd c. B.C. there were constant social upheavals in Hellas, in Macedonia there was internal stability. This stability is all the more noticeable since in their country the situation was not positive. There were constant wars, external and internal, including the invasion of the Celts (in 279), which decimated the population pauperising it all the more. There was a constant need for military preparedness and at the same time the population was emigrating ever more numerously to Asia and Egypt to become mercenaries (Walek 1924, 7, 9, 10). This Macedonian peasant would have been an excellent material for the confirmation of the Greek element, were it not for the fact of mixed marriages. The mixed element gradually and unconsciously was becoming a destructive factor as is normally the case with children of parents who belong to differing civilizations.

The soldier or administrator who entered through marriage into association with a family of barbarians became acquainted with the local laws. These were always clan laws because nowhere among the Hellenistic peoples do we hear about emancipation of the family. What a great field for investigation here, almost untouched by science! How many kinds of clan systems existed there, how many variants of the triple law? Greek immigrants had to tolerate the religious beliefs of their wives and their sons were brought up in the "dual faith". In such a situation could the purity of legal notions be maintained? Did they not attach to the clan

mentality of the locals? If the Greek came from a Hellenic region in which the emancipation of the family had already taken place then he moved to a lower level of civilization. From personalism he sank into communalism. Thus the decline of personalism is a feature of this numerous, non trading Greek diaspora.

From generation to generation the mixture was becoming increasingly coarse; even instances of marrying one's sisters occurred. Only the upper more cultured classes were interested in schools, gymnasia and palaestra. Among the Greek masses the local custom was becoming more dominant until it completely extinguished the increasingly weakening Hellenic traditions (Jouguet 1933, 175, 177, 185). And whenever there are equal rights it is always the lower civilization that is victorious.

The Hellenistic identity emerged from the unsuccessful attempt at a synthesis of civilizations. What was to emerge from something that had failed? With equal rights everywhere the lower civilization had to be dominant; thus nowhere in the Hellenistic world did the Athenian civilization win over the local eastern civilizations. The Hellenistic mixture resulted in the fact that none of these civilizations became dominant over the entire region of the Greek governed East. Each civilization evolved freely in its own nest. No civilization was oppressed, thus each one could develop at will; the Hellenistic rulers were a guarantee of this freedom providing protection from violence imposed by other neighbouring civilizations. Greek rule, which gave protection from foreign hegemony ended the many centuries of wars the purpose of which till the days of Alexander the Great was to subdue all civilizations by the one which was espoused by the victors. The

Greeks did not follow this pattern. It can be said that they brought benefit to all local civilizations by providing conditions for their peaceful development.

But so what? Did the levels of these civilizations move higher up? Just the learning of the Greek language could not have accomplished this. None of the conquered peoples changed their views, customs or superstitions. The Hellenistic period did not affect the method of organization of communal life of the subdued peoples.

Thus everywhere, throughout the extensive realm of the Hellenistic world there was at least a duality and sometimes even a multiplicity of civilizations. Nowhere is there any sign of syntheses, which anyway by nature are impossible. The differences were not only quantitative but above all qualitative.

It is not possible to be civilized in two different ways. And when various civilizational currents meet development may result, but also degeneration is possible. When the civilizations that encounter one another are viable they do not cease to struggle against each other; but in the Hellenistic states they settled side by side in indifferent coexistence showing no vitality. A compromise resulted from this purely mechanical mixture.

False conclusions are often drawn from the study of Greek art of this period. Undoubtedly, at least in the first half of the period it was still great art and what more the Hellenic principle that Beauty should be an expression of Truth and Goodness was maintained. This elevated harmony of the categories of being was not affected and for this reason scholars frequently are inclined to consider the Hellenistic period as a continuation (or even a flourishing)

of Hellenism. This is the case particularly among those who measure a civilization only through the prism of art. The fact that Asia Minor was full of Greek sculptures proves only two things: first, that the Greeks even in the depths of Asia did not give up their aesthetic upbringing, and second, that these sculptures were appreciated also by the Asians. Thus the Greeks were spreading aesthetic education around them. But this does not constitute yet an expansion of Hellenism. Has anyone for the same reason proposed such a conclusion about the Hellenism of Etruria?

But, also there was no shortage of “barbarian” influence on Hellenistic art. It has been pointed out that the palaces of the Greeks were becoming similar to the eastern serays and kiosks and that the huge dimensions of the Alexandrian temples are the result of Eastern influence (Zieliński 1922, II 48).

Such were the influences of the Athenian, Egyptian, Persian and Syrian civilizations from which the phenomenon of the Hellenistic identity emerged. It represents a new civilization because it introduced a new method of organization of communal life. It manifested itself already in the first period of its history; it gave the subdued peoples the freedom to rule themselves according to their own laws and the government did not interfere directly into issues that did not concern the army and the treasury. New principles were worked out for a universal state: religious tolerance, the recognition of the local autonomy of the subdued peoples and a certain level (often substantial) of equal rights.

Byzantinism has a genetic relationship with the Hellenistic period, even though it is a distinct civilization. It adopted Hellenistic Orientalism. This Orientalism affected also Rome,

also through Hellenistic mediation. These issues and influences are so intertwined that the problem of the genesis of the Byzantine civilization is tied with the genesis of the orientalizing of Rome. To understand the Byzantine civilization one needs to understand the orientalizing of Rome.

THE TRIUMPH OF CYBELE

V

In mid IIIrd c. the greatest star of the Hellenistic constellation, the star of the Seleucids began to weaken. Above all, they failed to withstand the pressure of the Parthians.

Parthia is a wedge between eastern and western Iran; finally it took over regions between the Euphrates, the Euxine, the Caspian and the Indian Ocean. They were nomads of Turanian origin who adopted an Aryan language and were open to the Persian civilization. Being subdued consecutively by the Assyrians, Medians and Persians they finally fully adopted the old-Persian custom and decided to consider themselves as inheritors of Persia. They represented as it were the toughest opposition to Seleucid rule until they finally seceded from them in 247. This was a serious blow not only for the Hellenistic dynasty but for the whole issue of Greek settlement in Asia. Starting from the north this colonisation subsided submitting to the renewed progress of powerful barbarianism. Who today without special antiquarian studies knows that Kandahar and Herat in Afghanistan were established by Greek settlers? And when the Parthians took over Mesopotamia a clear decline of the Syrian state resulted.

In the IIIrd c. also Bactria was lost by the Seleucids. Having allied themselves with the Parthians the Bactrians helped them to gain Media. Under king Enthydemen (222-187) of the Bactrians Ecbatana was conquered. This represented a turning point in the relationships within the north-eastern part of Western Asia. The Greek element lost its hegemony there and soon it was pressed into a defensive stance.

The Asiatic Hellenistic world, however was to weigh soon upon Rome and this was through the mediation of Pergamon which was assuming a primary position there. The nephew and successor of Philetaerus, Eumenes I, was a great warrior and he even conquered Antioch of Syria. When in 241 his cousin Attalus took over he ruled over the whole western part of Asia Minor and he adopted the royal title. Having allied himself with the Romans against the Syrians he assured great progress for his state. He was famous for his support of the arts and he decorated the city of Pergamon with numerous buildings of great style. He gave a personal historical imprint to the Pergamon state, (he lived till 197), so much so that the whole dynasty is referred after him as the Attalids.

The Attalids had to be considered an emanation of the primary deity of Phrygia, Cybele. Otherwise they would not be able to establish a dynasty. The more the locals were immersed in barbarianism the less was it possible to do without deification (the dynasty even had its own priests) (Zieliński 1922, 442-445). But mixed marriages were avoided. Only Greeks were lords there and the locals were subjects. A considerable portion of the revenue of the ruler went towards the support of Greek science and art. It

can be said of Pergamon that of all the Hellenistic states it was the most Hellenic; in any case in respect to science it was just behind Alexandria and in art just behind Athens. Just as we speak of Alexandrian science so we speak of Pergamon art. The literary perfection and the specific literary-artistic atmosphere were to have an influence on the further fate of Rome.

Meanwhile in Europe the Hellenes already began inviting the Romans to enter militarily into Greek lands. A reverse wave took place 110 years after the first military escapade of Greece into Italy. In the year 232 the Acarnanians called Roman help against Aetolia – and this led to further links between the Aetolians and the Syrian Antioch against the Romans.

The political ferment lay primarily in the expansive aspirations of Macedonia.

Macedonia was experiencing in this time its final period of power and greatness in the full sense of these words. The crucial date is the year 221. The borders of the state extended from the Aegean Sea to the Adriatic and the Macedonian army was still universally believed to be characterized by its ancient bravery (Walek 1924 II). But from 218 the second Punic war broke out in which Philip III had the bad luck of allying with Hannibal. Rome organized against him a coalition of Greek states led by the Aeolians, which was joined by the Thracian princes and by king Attalus from Pergamon. Much depended on the decision of the island republic of Rhodes.

The island of Rhodes took on a significant position as something intermediary between Hellenism and the Hellenistic world. First of all Rhodes enriched itself enormously. In the III^d c.

it became a sea power and was able to compete with Egypt doing well in the process. The whole archipelago and the coast of the Black Sea were becoming the realm of exclusively Rhodes trade. Certain intellectual consequences flowed from the enormous affluence of the population. Among these riches and independence Hellenic public life thrived and for this reason Rhodes became the capital of oratory. Here was an open refuge for artistic speech. Aischines moved there from Athens and established his school there. Soon a certain style of speech was to develop there, a rhetorical oratory, very flowery but at the same time often notably artificial. This style was referred to as Asianism because the majority of its representatives came from Asia Minor (Zieliński 1924b, 234, 235).

The role of the island of Rhodes in the history of civilizations can be described in these words: there, the remnants of Hellenism were being transformed into the Hellenistic model.

Rhodes and Pergamon were to play an important role in the history of Rome. We are entering here a period in which the issue of “Greece vs. Rome” adopted a new and strange form. Exactly at the time when Rhodes called in Roman help one of the greatest intellectual transformations known to history was taking place. Before we return to the sequence of events let us list the symptoms of this transformation that had an impact on Rome and the East coming from the Rhodes challenge addressed to the Romans.

The Hellenistic identity hit at the gates with extreme strength because the circumstances were indeed exceptional. And it was not possible to have two worlds more different from one another in every respect.

Thus the coming of the Romans close to the Hellenistic ideal – and what is more – the falling of Rome under the spell of the Hellenistic East, presents a proof, perhaps the strongest in the entire universal history that there are no such things as constant and unchangeable “national characteristics”. Thus all reasoning based on this assumed unalterability has to be discarded as fairy tales. Nations are changeable.

The extraordinary change that Rome was to go through towards the end of the IIIrd c. B.C. took place on the literary field and resulted from the succumbing to Greek influences. This was an intellectual changeover, based on changes in thinking about the communal life. Since originally it was only strictly intellectual it must have had its basis and its opening in the works of the intellect, thus in science or art. Does not literature also belong to the fine arts?

It is known that Roman heads were being influenced by Greek notions. It has however to be determined precisely through what were they under Greek influences, what sort of Greek influences were they, and what Greek values had no impact upon them. The Hellenistic world had one great positive value, the dazzling Alexandrian science. It would not have been surprising had Rome tried to adopt it. But no one from the entire world outside the Greek rushed towards Alexandria. Rome succumbed only to a certain type of Alexandrian indirect and ... meagre thought.

We are stupefied by the greatness of the Museum in the IIIrd c. Hellenic poetry still existed even though it was already close to exhaustion and decline. It flourished around 270 in Theocritus, who divided his life between Alexandria and Syracuse; also in

Callimachus who was the director of the library in the Museum (a contemporary, he died in 240). And besides this how great was the development of science there! As was rightly pointed out there was a difference between Alexandria and Athens in that the Alexandrian scholars “did not try to deduce all phenomena from some freelance definitions”. Furthermore they were “no lesser than the great old Greek thinkers, yet they were more patient and more down to earth” (Natanson 1934, 8, 9).

The great Euclid, who at the beginning of the IIIrd c. in Alexandria worked out the first geometry teaching how to think in this new manner, had many followers worthy of him. In the second half of that century there was Apollonius of Perga, who worked in Pamphylia becoming famous during the rule of Philopator (221-205). He also stayed in 210 for some time in Pergamon where he worked on the trans-sections of cones. Mathematics soon led to the queen of all sciences, to astronomy! Aristarchus of Samos knew already in early IIIrd c. that the earth moves around the sun and when he was accused of blasphemy because of this, he found protection and peace for further work in Alexandria. Archimedes of Syracuse (282-212) basing on Alexandrian science discovered the laws of balance, the centre of gravity, the system of levers, the properties of an inclined surface and he worked out the number π ; he was also the father of hydrostatics and in optics he developed the theory of bent mirrors; in general he has the most prominent position in the study of physical laws. Eratosthenes (b. 276), educated by Callimachus in Alexandria itself, lived first in Athens, but he was brought back by Ptolemy Euergetes to become the director of the library; he stayed in Alexandria till about 194. He

measured the earth, arranged the system of longitudes and latitudes and calculated the circumference of the earth. At the turn of the IIIrd and IInd c. Hipparchus, the initiator of scientific astronomy coming from Bithynian Nicaea lived on Rhodes and from there he was brought over to Alexandria. He invented spherical trigonometry, measured the distance from the earth to the moon and sun and drew up the first atlas of the sky (with about 1000 stars). In the second half of the IInd c. Hero of Alexandria enriched mathematics with flat trigonometry and he discovered the laws of air pressure and that of steam. Heraclides of Pontus discovered the movement of the earth around its own axis and found that Mercury and Venus are satellites not of the earth but of the sun. The mechanic Ctesibius, following the works of Hero, already around 130 had in his laboratory a hydraulic organ, a water clock, a sucking and pressing pump, a siphon and a turbine. Besides all this medicine also flourished receiving until the very end a well deserved fame in Alexandria. This began about the year 300 with Erasistratos of Knidos who was called to Alexandria together with Hierophilus of Kos. They showed that there is a nervous system which is centred in the brain and they identified feeling nerves and motion nerves. Also musicology derives from Alexandria; there the first theory of music was developed by Aristoxenus, a student of Aristotle (Zieliński 1922, 36-48; Natanson 1934 5-9 passim, 17, 18). These are the main examples of Alexandrian empirical science in the IIIrd and IInd c. B.C. Would it be an exaggeration to say that we all derive from Alexandria? Not only from Athens, but also from Alexandria.

More detailed studies give long lists of names. All of this indicates that the Museum attracted scholars from all corners of the Greek colonies around the world, who came there frequently and tried to work there. Alexandria was so prominent and in so many fields that it is correct to speak of the “Alexandrian epoch”, in short about the “Alexandrian scholarship” because all were spiritually linked with Alexandria.

This science, full of discoveries produced also inventions. We are surprised to see how close were the ancients to many of our own inventions, and yet they faltered in this respect not having reached anywhere beyond the first step and never have they attained anything that would become part and property of the general public so as to raise its civilization. The cause lies in the disdain for physical work which prevented the development of manufacturing and as a result there was no proper development of what we describe with one term: technology (more about these relationships in Koneczny 1935, 270; 1938a, 58).

But all this, is only one half of Alexandria. The humanities were also practiced there though with far less notable glory; but the number of scholars engaged in these fields was much greater than in the mathematical-physical sciences. Philosophy ceased to be creative; old ideas were rehashed and one cannot mention even one new achievement; there were only commentaries, combinations, adjustments to the new times. There were some historians but none of them stood high enough to be able to teach later generations about universal historical issues because none proved capable of rising to such a level so as to be able to interpret current events according to measures suitable for earlier or later

generations. Maybe there were some who could this, but were they allowed to do it? History was deficient because it felt the imprint of the royal court. The old-Egyptian historiography was too crude for the Museum thinkers, or too naive; and did they have the freedom to look at the course of events in Egypt and in the whole Hellenistic world from the point of view of Herodotus or Thucydides? Were they allowed to do so? The science of history was deficient in Alexandrian scholarship and even though there was a whole series of historians there was no study that would represent some progress in comparison with Athenian historiography.

Inspired by respect for the discoveries and inventions in the field of the natural sciences, by the level of human thought in Alexandria and blinded by the praise and awe of progress, some scholars have gone so far as to admire also what did not exist and they claim that “a notable feature of the Hellenistic epoch is the constant intellectual activity in all fields of science”. This is an error! By no means in all fields! There was a very characteristic and notable lacuna. In Alexandria no one dealt with the field of law. The cause lay probably also in the pressure of the court of the pharaohs, even though they were Greeks. Sciences dealing with communal life, statehood and society were not studied, because the study of such issues is inevitably connected with criticism, and this was inadmissible in respect to the deified pharaohs, even though they were of Greek language and origin. The absence of political science was the breach through which Cybele entered the Museum.

But there was one science that expanded in the place of all the other humanities: philology. It was not only the most branched

tree there but it was a veritable mountain suppressing all other disciplines. The supremacy of philology is intriguing and in a certain sense worrying. The development of the Greek language, punctuation, syntax, grammar in general in the present sense of the word¹, the critical edition of texts, scholia, commentaries, encyclopaedias of authors, the history of literature – all of this appeared, was developed and not only did it flourish but it became general knowledge and was very popular. The teachers of the Greek language and literature had the whole world wide open before them; everywhere they were welcome with open arms and they were generously paid. Philology became profitable.

The turning point of philology was the critical edition of Homer made by Aristarchus of Samothrace, a scholar of the first half of the IInd c. He was the director of the Alexandrian library and a tutor of the royal sons, but later he had to flee from the wrath of one of his pupils (who took the throne as Ptolemy VII Physcon) and he found refuge in Cyprus. It appears that the pressure of the court was becoming heavier and more tedious as the dynasty of the Ptolemys was declining in strength; the lesser was their influence in the international political world the greater they felt themselves to be and the more they were unpleasant to those around them.

The life of Aristarchus was one generation later than some facts of the history of Rome to which I wish to draw particular attention here and which took place in the last years of the IIIrd c. The supremacy of philology was already obvious and literary education, exclusively literary education was the norm, without

¹ At that time the term meant more, including philology and the knowledge of literature.

any notions of history or law. Philology became the representative of all the humanities and it considered itself entitled to decide about everything. Let us also note that in studying the history of fine literature, one which had developed so magnificently as the Hellenic one, the “grammarian” of the time located himself on the border between science and art; while one was studying the language of the author and the dates of his life, another exalted his artistry in constructing sentences and self-expression. Those who studied the literary work as such naturally moved away from scientific rigour and entered courageously into the realm of art; obviously this was more pleasing and closer to the public at large. The artistic arsenal of poetry and prose includes above all the inventing of various literary themes with an unconditional, unlimited freedom (it could not have been otherwise). Such literary fictions at time have the misfortune of being treated seriously by the general public.

The Roman minds were beginning to assimilate the Greek mentality but they did not acquire a love for Alexandrian physics or astronomy. Instead, they exclusively received from the Greek mind its literature and they began with literary fiction. It became the fashion and a mark of higher education to be acquainted with Greek literary fiction. There was one kind of fiction that was particularly accepted as true: namely that the Sibyl who had inspired the holy books that were now the property of the Roman state was none other but ... the Trojan Cassandra. After the burning of Troy she found refuge in Italy in Cumae while Anchises and Aeneas in Latium; and Romulus and Remus derived from their loins. The spreading of the Greek rites could then be considered as

some form of archaeological patriotism. Every attentive historian is aware what great power lies in popular fictions. Was Rome to be any different?

Meanwhile a certain a-religiosity of the higher classes appeared, at least in respect to polytheism. No one thought of eradicating it or of popularizing some form of monotheistic philosophy. Thus the official cult of the gods continued as religiosity was considered useful for the purpose of the state. Among the masses a lowering of religiosity was also observed. The gods were not denied but the notion of some contract religion appeared.

The bloody and long lasting II Punic War (218-201) brought a religious upheaval. Already in the second year of the war this contract approach in religion became evident. After the defeat on the Trasimeno lake Quintus Fabius Maximus, the long term leader of the patricians became the dictator. For him religion was simply a political factor that was needed particularly so as to maintain order among restless minds.

In 217 a *ver sacrum* [a sacred Spring] was proclaimed for Mars. The offering of domestic animals was to be made five years later, thus the vow contained a logical condition: this would be done if the gods maintain Rome untouched during those five years. The text of this 217 vow was a truly formal legal-public contract made between the gods and the people. The contract was worded by the *pontifex maximus* [supreme priest] and it was written down in the presence of witnesses. Obviously this sort of thing was made for the benefit of the naive populace.

Something else is more important here. Until then Mars was an impersonal deity but in 217 his image was to be made visible for the first time and it was to be akin to the Greek god Ares. In that year a ceremony of a completely different kind was organized. It was a great *lectisternium* [a divine banquet] for six pairs of gods. Roman gods were given a different meaning, Hellenizing the religion and at the same time coarse fables from Greek mythology were introduced. It is clear that all this was focused upon the masses.

Among the innovations there was also the cult of Venus Erycina from Mount Eryx in Sicily, because that temple was said to have been established by ... Aeneas during his travels to Italy. Literary fiction entered ever more and more into Roman communal life.

But next year (216) the Romans suffered a most severe defeat at the battle of Cannae. About 70 000 of them were killed including about 100 senators and one consul. The other consul, Tertius Varro, who led the Romans in the battle, managed to salvage himself with a small group of soldiers by fleeing to Canusium. We need to stop here to consider one detail. The defeated consul was welcomed in Rome with great honours and gratitude because he “did not lose faith in the republic”. A Roman historian adds here a pertinent remark. Were he a Carthaginian leader he would surely have been sentenced to death (Piotrowicz 1935a, 228). How markedly a difference in civilization was pointed out here.

Difficult times came; after all in 211 Hannibal was *ante portas* [outside the gates]. These were the times of constant public prayers, generous bloody and bloodless sacrifices, processions

and supplications lasting many days. Deliberately, the masses were increasingly being obliged to participate directly in religious acts (contrary to ancient custom) and the masses had their own superstitions bringing coarse and materialistic notions into religion. Superstitions flourished among the Punic soldiers, among the Africans, Iberians and Gauls of Hannibal's army, and these soldiers met for many years with the lower classes of Italian society.

Hannibal was still in Italy. At cape Lacinium near Crotona he ordered that a great altar be built where he attached a long inscription in Greek and Punic glorifying his military prowess (Piotrowicz 1935a, 24). Meanwhile amongst the Romans the question was posed. Why do the Roman gods turn out to be weaker, and if they are not weaker why have they abandoned Rome? And when the masses did not know which god to address the Senate decided to send a legation to Delphi. It is then that the *apollinarian* games and festivities began, in honour of the Delphi Apollo. Rome submitted totally to Delphi. The Sibylline books were also looked into; they were interpreted by the most eager Hellenophiles (Gumowski 1927. 4, 14, 34, 36, 41, 46, 47, 51, 52, 56, 59, 63, 65).

Meanwhile the Trojan fiction had become popular. The poet Naevius (d. 201) in his poem about the first Punic war presented in the first book the story of a Trojan hero, Aeneas, his wanderings, his love for the Carthaginian Dido, and his later settlement and fate in Italy. In this story Aeneas is the grandfather of Romulus and therefore a forefather of Rome which in that case is a colony

of the once glorious Troy². Tales about the Trojan origin of Rome must have been particularly vibrant during the war with Hannibal “when so many Greek cults and rituals were introduced into the state religion and when the cult of Apollo, the ancient protector of Troy, was reigning to the full”. Thus “increasingly there was an interest in that part of north-western Asia Minor where the holy Iliion stood”. There on Mount Ida Cybele was worshiped, *mater deum magna idea* [the great Idean mother of the gods] and the Sibylline books declared that “the enemy will be chased out of the country only after the coming of the Ida goddess to Rome. And so twice delegations went to Delphi with great offerings” (Gumowski 1927, 68-72).

At that time Rome was already involved politically in Greek European affairs. The Aetolian alliance, which was allied with Sparta faced the Achaean alliance. But in Sparta since 240 there was the period of permanent unending social revolutions. The Macedonians reintroduced oligarchic rule, they forced Sparta to join the Achaean alliance and they took over leadership of the alliance. Soon however Sparta went through the severe revolution of Nabis in 207. Then it moved onto the side of the Aetolians and this alliance linked with Rome while Philip III joined with Hannibal. The first Macedonian war broke out (215-206). The Romans finally conquered Sicily and Spain and in the battle of Mantinea a strategist of the Achaean alliance, Philopoemen (known as the last Hellen) beat the Spartans in 206. In the next

² Later the following cities were said to be derived from the Trojan refugees: Mantua, Padua, Pisa, Verona, Piacenza, Aquileia, Parma and Modena (Porębowicz 1922, 19).

year 205 Philip made a separate peace with Rome, but Hannibal still held on in Brutium.

Let us stop at this date of 205. At that time there was the third legation from Rome to Delphi – and this time they went even further, to Pergamon. Let us note how the prophecy came to terms with Hellenistic Orientalism and what was read out of the Sibylline books at the time.

The Roman legates were told to travel to Pergamon so as to collect the holy stone, the symbol of the goddess Cybele, who in the eyes of the Romans was equivalent to Aphrodite, this special guardian of Troy known from the poetry of Homer as the lover of Anchises and the mother of Aeneas, the ancestor of the founders of Rome (Gumowski 1927, 72). Let us recall (from the previous chapter) how the cult of Cybele was made Hellenic by Timotheus the Eumolpid. Now this proved useful. Thus a magnificently equipped Roman flotilla sailed to collect Cybele, the ancient mother of Rome.

This is one of the gravest deeds of literature in history (see chapter “Mathematics and literary fiction” in Koneczny 1938a). This happened in 205, when Hannibal was still in Italy but Hasdrubal and Philip III were already defeated. We shall not know whether the Roman legation knew about these Roman victories when they arrived in Delphi. After all Hannibal was still in Italy occupying Brutium, and would not the fate of the war go through another change, who was to know? Delphi wished to see its cult becoming a universal religion and they were not scandalized by the Orient. Initially Delphi had been against the Persian wars but now they were engaged in thinking out supposed religious syntheses

and propagating Serapis in the East, while in Italy they wished to see besides Apollo a cult of the “great mother of the gods”. A third factor, and probably the decisive one was the Roman people, screaming for new gods, more powerful ones and acting on a more short term basis. It is a fact that the new cults were favoured by the masses. Maybe the third legation to Delphi was a third concession to the *plebs*? The extended trip to Pergamon could not have been an improvisation. Probably the first legation had already been given this suggestion and the third one executed it.

In this way the Romans fell into the Hellenistic-Oriental confusion. The goddess Cybele had already been “worked over” by Timotheus who tried to adapt its sensual cult to the Eleusinian mysteries of Demeter. The goddess was symbolized by a holy stone (possibly a meteorite) which endured various fates until it was brought over to Pergamon by Attalus I, an ally of Rome in its war against Philip III of Macedonia in the years 211-208. The friendly ally gave the stone to Rome. Decisions about the whole issue were made at Delphi. In Rome the masses greeted the overseas “ancestress” who arrived triumphantly in 204. The stone was placed within the sanctified *pomoerium* [city wall]; the Senate proclaimed at a special sitting a number of festivities as well as games (later known as the Megalesian) and the day of arrival of Cybele was declared an annual state holiday (Gumowski 1927, 72-75; date after Piotrowicz 1935a, 329).

The zeal for Cybele must have been growing since Hannibal proved unable to make any further military moves from Brutium and several months later, at the beginning of the 203 winter, he sailed back to Africa to meet his defeat there at Zama.

Everything can be explained by the psychology of Rome, just as the fiction of the Trojan origin. Troy together with Mount Ida were for the intelligentsia but the city people were gaining in importance, slowly becoming the dominant factor. A coarse religion and a sensuous cult appealed more to the masses; they enjoyed a large procession of colourful male and female *korybantes* performing orgiastic dances all the way to frenzy and even self-mutilating themselves in honour of the goddess. The masses did not philosophize about ascetics. Instead they had a pleasing spectacle, and many joined in the frenzy because frenzy in a crowd is contagious. Oriental religiosity was very frequently bonded with obscenity which favoured mass frenzy even more. Was some “religious consciousness” responsible for the popularization of the cult of Dionysus (Bacchus) in a very primitive form? They were so base that in 167 the Senate had to instigate a severe prosecution against the frolicking during the bacchanalia. (7000 were punished at the time and many were executed) (Piotrowicz 1935a, 329). It was not religiosity that attracted the masses but the obscenities that they found enjoyable.

In such times the two first Macedonian wars passed in connection with the political manoeuvres of a new strongman in the East, Antioch III (222-187). This Syrian Seleucid resuscitated the glory of the state of his forbearers. He found the state on the edge of a precipice, after the secession of the Parthians and Bactrians and on the other end the Egyptian Ptolemy were extending their domain at the expense of Syria through the annexation of Coele-Syria, Phoenicia, Palestine, Caria and Cilicia. Soon even the satraps of Persia and Media refused to obey. The war began

with the defeat of Antioch in 217 after which he had to cede some provinces. He was lucky however with his expedition to India, and even though it was only an incident it raised the spirits in the army and the court. (From the moment of that expedition Antioch adopted the title of “great”). In 205 Antioch decided on an alliance with the Macedonians against Egypt.

It was at that time that Rhodes was calling Rome for help against Philip and Byzantium stood on the side of Rhodes. The Macedonian army was defeated by the Romans. At the same time Antioch was winning in Asia and he regained Palestine. Soon he moved his military activities into Europe and in 196 he took the Thracian Chersonese. Then the Romans demanded that he unconditionally abandon Europe and return his acquisitions in Asia to Ptolemy and also that he would recognize the political freedom of all the Greek cities in Asia. In response Antioch called Hannibal to his side (195) and three years later he appeared in Greece as the protector of the Aetolians. The fate of the war continued to be changeable for another five years until in 190 Antioch met defeat at Magnesia.

The Roman legions had enough time and abundant occasions to become acquainted with the East and its mixture of civilizations. Only rarely somebody showed an interest in the Athenian elements; the majority of the Roman army was taking on the orientalizing Hellenistic world, while the common soldier who knew no Greek inhaled Syria with his senses; he looked at the eastern cults and took fancy to them. That, which was symbolized by Cybele, namely Orientalism was taking root in Roman minds

In this great and tedious war Cato the Elder made a mark for himself in 191. He is one of the most outstanding individuals in Roman history. This brave officer took part in the conquest of Tarentum in 209 and then in the victory over Hasdrubal near Metaurus in 207. From 204 onwards he was given a series of responsibilities all the way to becoming a consul in 195. Later in Spain acting as a proconsul he again gloriously showed his military talent. Then he took part in the war against Antioch. He was famous for military skills and even more for his righteousness; not only was he incorruptible but he also hated all depravity around him and in the provinces (in Sicily and Spain). The time of his censorship (184) is famous in history.

This censorship came at the time of ... the end of the world. This also touches on Troy. The great Eratosthenes of Alexandria who had measured the world studied also the date of the Trojan War. (He was not the only one to do so.) This was of interest to everyone. Eratosthenes calculated the siege of Troy (according to our time measurement) for the years 1193-1183 B.C. It was "universally known" that the Sibylline books prophesied great calamities that were to take place every thousand years. Possibly the genesis of this fable lies in the idea of Plato that the soul returns every thousand years. But Plato was read only by the members and associates of the Museum, while every simpleton knew about the Sibylline books and everyone thought in this way: Since Sibyl was the Trojan Cassandra, she prophesied for the thousand years from the time she had to leave Troy, and therefore the catastrophic year should be 184 or 183 (according to our dating). There were serious preparations for this. It was then that Cato expressed his surprise

at the two *augurs* [priests] wondering whether they do not laugh at each other when they meet (Zieliński 1924a, 102, 103, 109-112).

Cato personally managed his country estate and he wrote a study entitled *De Agricultura*. He still had time for historical studies. He arranged the annals from the establishment of Rome to his death (149) placing the greatest emphasis on the most ancient times and it is for this reason that he entitled this work *Orygines* (which unfortunately perished).

Cato was constantly engaged in public service and he had to deal also with Greece and the Hellenistic East. It was observed that “Greek translators had to employ whole sentences to render what Cato expressed in one word”. Such was the “force and clarity” of his Latin language, the language of “emblems and inscriptions” and these properties “became manifest even more in comparison with Greek speech that was inclined towards chanting” (Zieliński 1924b, 240).

This Cato was most opposed to Hellenistic influences. He was among those who were the first to note what public demoralisation comes from the Eastern cults. But the pressure from below was too strong to simply forbid the cult of Cybele. Thus the Senate only forbade the Roman citizens from joining the Idaean priests and the *korybantes*. “Phrygians and Galatians may castrate themselves, but Romans never!” (Gumowski 1927, 77). One perceives in these expressions a total awareness that these “Phrygians” represent an entirely different world with which Rome has nothing in common and from which it must separate itself. A decided opposition developed. From this moment Rome was divided into two camps: those who were friendly and those who were unfriendly towards

the influences of the East; let us name it symbolically: towards Cybele. The relationships and the dominance of this or that camp is the decisive factor for the further history of the ancient world.

The issue concerned not the “Phrygians”, because Phrygian questions were tied with the Hellenistic world. Political history itself tangled this into inseparable knots; everything depended on whether Rome will generate from itself sufficient spiritual forces of its own so as to withstand the pressure of the Orient. Will the Roman civilization prove capable of resisting the Hellenistic mixture, or will it sink into it?

But the Roman legionary did not in vain spend many years in Syria and in the other provinces of the old Persian state where the lower classes were by no means Hellenized. The soldiers were bringing back to Italy the cult of the Egyptian and Asiatic deities. Apart from Cybele what a great number of unofficial cults and superstitions! (Piotrowicz 1935a). In view of this how childish was the long standing prohibition in Rome against a permanent theatre and the fact that in 173 two Greek teachers of Epicurean philosophy were expelled (Piotrowicz 1935a, 333, 334). Even though after some time the holy stone was sent back to Pergamon (probably because it was requested there), the cult of Cybele remained and became even more popular. She was given a new temple and great games. Indeed she was becoming the mother of new gods in Rome. It proved impossible to weed out of Rome what Cybele had sown.

The Italian cults joined and supplemented one another because they came from various cultures of the same civilization; but no oriental cult could be joined profitably with the Roman

mentality because here there was a difference of civilization and syntheses between differing civilizations do not occur and cannot occur (more on this in Koneczny 1935). The cult of Cybele and of any other oriental deity could only have a negative influence.

The action of the Oriental poison was all the stronger because it met a weakened organism. Orientalism was to finish it off.

The difference of civilization obviously included a complete difference in the method of organization of communal life. No greater chasm was possible! In the Hellenistic states of Asia and Africa a villager was bound to the soil, while here the whole state was composed of free peasantry, there mercenary units ruled, here there were social militias.

Exactly in this moment Roman civilization was suffering from an economic problem, namely its agriculture became unprofitable. The ruin of the peasantry began.

After the second Punic war the adult population of Rome decreased by about a quarter. Also a demoralisation of the masses occurred on a large scale. People were no longer accustomed to systematic work and groups of bandits formed. Southern Italy became most desolate because it experienced the war most; thus this whole extensive land turned into an almost desert and this was for many centuries. Those who emerged alive from the war were given rewards in the form of war spoils and lots of land taken away from the conquered. Spoils after the Hannibal war? Perhaps they were in Spain and it was possible to think about the emigration of Italian peasantry there, but only after the next generation because the total overtaking of the country and the establishment of an administration took several decades. There was no room

for colonisation in Africa because even after the third Punic war and the destruction of Carthage (146) when a part of the country with its capital in Utica was incorporated into the Roman state, Roman rule was in fact restricted to the city and its vicinity. Great territorial gains were made by the Numidians whose friendship the Romans wished to maintain. Africa was to experience the most glorious period of the rule of Numidian kings which was to last until A.D. 43. What is characteristic about this period is the constant decline of the nomadic state which managed to survive only in the near vicinity of the desert; the rest of Numidia (greatly expanded) became agricultural (Piquet 1921). There was no room there for an Italian settler.

Meanwhile the Latium peasant moved from the war ravaged and unprofitable village estate to the capital. As a result of this transfer the city populace increased and there were more and more problems with them. In 187 12 000 Latins were chased out of Rome and in 170 it was decided that only he can move to Rome who has left a son working on his former estate (Piotrowicz 1935a, 325). But did all these Latium people return to the soil which no longer supported them? The very ordinance manifests that the land was being abandoned with nobody wanting it.

It has to be admitted that the problem of the peasantry was being dealt with by all and regardless of party allegiance there were attempts to save this social class and raise it. History testifies to this. But it has also been established that no one managed to introduce effective means that would resolve the problem. The error lay in the conviction that it is sufficient to satisfy the "hunger for land". What was the point of owning if it was not profitable?

But everywhere and always whenever the peasant issue comes up, the question of the hunger for land becomes the major issue and everything else is forgotten. It is easy to understand that at such time attention is drawn to those who possess most land. And there was in Rome a type of landownership which multiplied holdings at poor peoples' expense, namely the renters of public property, of state land. Throughout Italy a part of the conquered lands was taken over as state property to be rented out and the fortunes of landed magnates grew on these holdings. They formed a solid social grouping, in fact an alliance, and they did not like to see newcomers among them. *Ager publicus* [public land] became the feeding ground for a certain hereditary clique that resisted the appearance of new renters. A breach in this structure of the early great landowners was made once by the *leges Liciniae Sextae*, that is, the laws introduced by the tribunes Licinius Stolon and Lucius Sextius in 376. Among other things it was ruled that no one individual could rent from the state more than 500 *morgen* [a unit of land area one person can plough in a morning, another name for it is *iugera*]. After a decade of wars and struggles this finally became the law in 367, but soon various tricks were used to bypass this law and quickly the whole issue got forgotten even though the patricians shared the government with the plebeians. After 243 years there was an attempt to return to this same ruling, something unheard of in social history! In 133 Tiberius Gracchus demanded that the old legislation be reintroduced with some changes and

additions. The intent was to have an as large as possible number of small peasant agricultural holdings having 30 morgen each³.

In that same generation a new means of earning a living opened up before the Italian peasant. The state needed many soldiers; it needed several armies at once for the wars that were being conducted simultaneously in various parts of the world and normal recruitment proved insufficient. Let us have a look at all these wars restricting ourselves to the time prior to 133, when Gracchus came up with his proposals. We must bear in mind that the war efforts had an impact primarily on the peasantry.

It is at that time that the Roman people were required to make the greatest efforts and sacrifices. There were wars after wars, even simultaneously two at a time. As soon as the second Macedonian war (207-200) ended, which had forced Philip III to renounce his hegemony over Hellas proper, scarcely had the Roman consul proclaimed at the Isthmian games (196) the freedom of the Greek states, again a new war was imminent because Hannibal obtained a hearing at the Syrian court. On the Hellenic peninsula there was peace for some time. Did the Greek states (the cities in fact) really lose anything besides the right to organize wars at home and around themselves when they found themselves under Roman hegemony? And yet in spite of that new wars began again between the Greek alliances. In 189 the Aetolians lost their independence and when the Achaean alliance became the largest organisation covering the whole of the Peloponnesus Sparta had to be subdued

³ It is interesting how the concept of 30 morgen, as a holding for one family persists in history. The same land area was given by German laws and the same area was defined as the "peasant plot" in Poland.

by force and its walls destroyed. On that occasion the supporters of the reforms of Nabis were expelled, all the helots were scattered and the political refugees were invited to return. Meanwhile the war with Antioch of Syria was ending (192-189). He submitted to the Aetolian illusions and paid for this with great territorial losses. Six year later a new uprising took place in Messenia which ended with success. The contradictions that were impossible to overcome could only be calmed (not for long) by the constant intervention of Rome, which became a more or less constant condition. The Romans were being repeatedly called in against one another. It seemed that the third Macedonian war (171-160) removed any remnants of the possibility that any one of the Hellenic camps would find support in Macedonia. But after twenty years, simultaneously with the fourth Macedonian war (148-146) there occurred the so called Achaean war which ended with the sad destruction of Corinth in the same year as the destruction of Carthage (146). Scarcely three years later began the ten years' long Numantian war of sad memory for the history of culture, which also ended with the destruction of Numantia (133).

For all this normal recruitment was insufficient; thus conscription was declared. Scipio the Younger was the first to draft volunteers for the Numantian war. Such a soldier became a mercenary and when he enjoyed the profession he became a professional. Mercenaries had been used in the East for centuries. We know of no other soldiers there apart from mercenaries and all the eastern monarchies were based upon them. In the IInd c. the Romans had more than enough occasions to become acquainted with this system, particularly in the war against the Macedonian

king Perseus (179-168) whose military strength was based on the mercenary Bastarians⁴. But these draftees of Scipio were different. As was officially asserted earlier, a Phrygian or a Carthaginian was something different from a Roman. One could also add here that a Roman was not the same as a Bastarian. He was not a hired mercenary but a volunteer serving under a Roman general in the interest of Rome. But it was a first step on a slippery slope because this soldier did not return after the war to his homestead.

As before this soldier was given a plot of land that was taken away from those defeated. In this manner military agricultural colonies appeared, but beyond Italy, increasingly further away overseas, set up in line along the newly established military routes. Let us remember that throughout the Hellenistic world there was the tradition of such settlements dating back to Alexander the Great and the rewarding of soldiers with land was practiced in Syria of the Seleucids and in Egypt of the Lagids. The Romans did not invent anything new in this matter but they employed what they had encountered; they copied the Hellenistic example. But the Roman not seeing among his relatives a trader or a sailor was less suited for distant emigration than the Greek. Finally a point had to be reached that land could be obtained only far away, at the end of the world, so the soldier did not wish to settle there.

The soldier who spent so much time in the Orient found himself there in a bad school. But the rotting began from the top, from the generals, who were enriching themselves greatly in the rich eastern countries and they were personally interested in there being ever more spoils and from this a military cruelty resulted

⁴ In 169 he had four times as many volunteers as he needed.

that had been unknown among the earlier Romans. Carthage for example had much cruelty even in its religious cult, thus it is hardly surprising that they impaled their leader Hannon when he lost Messana and Hannibal when defeated had to flee his country.

The Romans got infected.

Already in 209 we have a horrible example of this. After the battle on the Metaurus River the consul Claudius Nero carried with him the head of the beaten Hasdrubal in order to throw it in front of the first lines of Hannibal (Piotrowicz 1935a, 199, 240). One generation later in 176 in Sardinia about 80 000 prisoners were executed or sold into slavery in order to make money on this trade. It is sad to read that in the land of the Molossians in 167 a unit of soldiers was quartered in each village, and then on a designated day they attacked the defenceless population murdering and robbing, and later the leaders of this expedition were given a triumphal welcome in Rome. It was no better when *praetor* Sulpicius enticed 7 000 Lusitanians with the promise of land grants, and then he had all of them killed or sold. Cato the Elder wanted to have him tried for this but it was in vain. Ten years later a treaty was made with Viriartes and he was murdered while asleep. That same year the famous perfidiousness was made in Numantia.

Brutality tried out mutually in Carthage was then employed in the same manner in Hellas. When in 146 the Achaean alliance decided in Corinth on a war against Sparta, at that particular moment (temporarily, as all Greek combination were) this was indirectly an act against Rome. Rome noticed this and took it seriously. The forces were obviously unequal and the result was predictable. Thus “when Mummius approached Corinth he found

the gates open, but fearing deceit he dared to enter the city only on the third day which he did without opposition. He treated the city as conquered and gave it to his soldiers who went on a rampage. The male population was murdered and the women and children were sold into slavery ... Corinth was turned into a pile of charred rubble. Polybius who after returning from the Carthaginian war was a witness to the sack of Corinth reports that he saw paintings of great masters abandoned in mud or serving soldiers as a board to play dice.” And all of this happened when since the IInd c. the knowledge of the Greek language was considered in Rome as an obligatory condition of the educated (Piotrowicz 1935a 300, 301, 330).

The compulsory transfer of populations was a norm of the laws of war in the East. The Romans learnt this. This began in 180 with the compulsory transfer of the Appuans to Samnium, and later this was done frequently. In 166 this method was employed in the war against Rhodes. The alliance with this insular state was no longer needed by the Romans and its power over the seas generated dislike. After a victory over the Macedonian Perseus they turned against Rhodes and took Delos from them offering this island to Athens for colonization. The indigenous population was totally removed from the island (Piotrowicz 1935a, 273, 283, 285, 287; Zieliński 1922, II 12).

That is not the end of the oriental schooling. Cybele continued to act! It was possible to learn a complex of various crimes from the Hellenistic courts and even more so from other eastern ones. These consisted of a certain atmosphere worthy of the expression “dynastic thuggery”. Family ties there meant the greatest danger.

The Macedonian court was already full of this. A son would wrench power from his father, a brother from brother. Philip III sentenced to death his younger son (after 181) and since then the dynasts seemed to be murdering one another in a whole string. The same was happening in the state of the Seleucids. In Bithynia king Prusias II was killed on order of his own son and in a temple at that to which he fled for protection (in 149). Among the Egyptian Lagids the mutual lurking for the life of close relatives became the norm. Having married one's own sister according to the Egyptian custom, this wife would be abandoned in favour of her daughter from an earlier marriage with another brother, etc. (Piotrowicz 1935a, 264, 277, 288, 502). How can one speak of moral characters here? What sort of wind was blowing from the East, since in 167 this Prusias II came willingly, on his own initiative to the Roman Senate dressed as a slave? He fell on his knees at the entrance of the curia and kissed the doorstep greeting the senators as divine saviours (Piotrowicz 1935a, 274). At first all Romans looked with disdain at such behaviour, but later not all of them.

In the times we are describing now, until more or less the year 133, the majority of Romans were still disgusted with all this. The superiority of the Romans is evident in the difference of their methods of warring and dealing with social upheavals. These occurred simultaneously in Pergamon and in Rome in 133.

Pergamon was in excellent progress and intellectually it was beginning to compete with Alexandria. Of all the Hellenistic cities it was the most Hellenic. The inhabitants claimed to descend from Arcadian settlers and it was said that since Persian times the Greeks represented the majority of the population. The rulers of

Pergamon were famous for having the wealthiest treasury. The happy tradition and heritage of Lysimachus and Philetaerus were upheld. Were the local people wealthier in Moesia than elsewhere? Or rather was the economic administration superior with fewer parasites near the public treasury? Whatever the reason, the treasury of the Pergamon acropolis was always full. Eumenes II (197-159) established a library and a school of sculpture, both very famous. Would a book and a sculpture determine a civilization!!! These were taken from the Athenian civilization and these fields were cultivated in Pergamon marvellously; but besides that oriental cults were practiced on the acropolis (and the cult of Cybele was not the most coarse one here), because the ruler had to be treated as an emanation of one of these deities. The approach towards the population was also completely “Phrygian”; all were the slaves of the throne and the degree and kind of serfdom depended on the person of the ruler who was the unique source of law (excluding the cult issues). Thus in Pergamon a mixture prevailed. It was quite mechanical, composed of several civilizations, the Persian, Syrian and Athenian, just as in the whole of Asia Minor.

The state expanded due to the friendliness of Rome. In 189 as a reward for his fidelity in the alliance against Antioch Eumenes II received the Thracian Chersonese and the regions before the Taurus taken over from Antioch, that is, a major part of Asia Minor.

Rome owed to Pergamon not only Cybele but also the first encouragement towards “grammar”, the first lectures in Hellenic literature. These were given by Crates of Mallus (in Cilicia), a member of the Pergamon library and an opponent of the

Alexandrian school of Aristarchus, when he visited Rome in 167 as an envoy of Attalus II (159-138), a great supporter of scholarship.

The next ruler, Attalus III (138-133) left behind him the opinion of a tyrant. Did he treat the Greeks on par with the locals? Both groups were dissatisfied, but the Greeks led the revolution that broke out on his death, and it had been prepared while he was alive. An interesting fact resulted; the dissatisfied quoted a Greek literary work.

In the second chapter we discussed a sarcastic type of literature with jibes and jokes, invented as all other types of writing by the Greeks. This was an abrasive mocking of radical movements and it included satirical utopias. This kind of literature disappeared during Alexandrian times, when all of a sudden it was brought back as the last Greek book in this series, namely the *Heliopolis* [sun city] of Iambulos. The author gathered in this book all the golden hills in all possible combinations. The following sample should suffice to show the extent to which he was writing with derision. All the inhabitants of the sunny city are strongmen with iron health and this is so because the physical worth of each newborn is tested in flight on the shoulders of a special bird trained for this purpose. In order to finally attain the brotherhood of all (and this was tried in many cities without permanent results) and so as to erase any social differences deriving from birth a method was invented in Heliopolis that was genial in its simplicity: infants were to be deliberately exchanged between mothers.

Attalus III did not rule for long and he died childless. In his will he gave his state to Rome. The opposition claimed that the will was a fake, but it was procured somehow and the Roman Senate

took it as a legitimate title. Thus not only the Attalids considered the state to be their private property which they could then dispose of at will, but also the Romans accepted such a position, of course only with respect to foreign, eastern countries; Rome continued to be the property of the *populi romani* [Roman people]. The testament was known and legal only in respect to the Greek population of the Pergamon state. The locals did not know of it because there is no such thing as a testament within clan systems.

The only male member of the ruling family, the natural son of Eumenes II, Aristonicus spoke up against the testament. Here again we see differences in world views. According to the eastern understanding of things the claim of Aristonicus to the throne was perfectly legitimate, but according to the Roman understanding he had no rights because in the legal sense he was not even a member of the family.

Aristonicus found strong support in the lower classes because he was in solidarity with the revolution being prepared in Pergamon which broke out now and which placed him at the head of the state. We hear that he introduced radical reforms; if this was done according to the Greek point of view it amounted to distributing among the poorer what was robbed from the richer. That would not be anything exceptional. But there was something else that was specifically oriental; the revolutionaries referred to Iambulos and they seriously wanted to change Pergamon into the “sun city”. There were of course very few who knew the book; but the less anyone knew about the book the more he yelled for *Heliopolis*. The propaganda described the sun on earth, that which was favourable to it; some passages from Iambulos must have been

taken seriously since not only units of Greek city dwellers but also of the locals were fighting for this. This “sunny” rule lasted for three years (133-129) (Poehlmann 1925, 308, 311, 570⁵).

It was in that same year that the movement of the Gracchians began. Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus was not a revolutionist at all. He wished to strengthen the role of the *plebs rustica* [rural people], that is of the conservative middle class. He had no intention of organising some kind of proletarian class that would take over the government; he did not even try to abolish the state system which was aristocratic at the time [some reference here is missing].

Serious demands were made, namely to establish 30-morgen estates, but on the basis of state lands. No one ever thought of some new division of private property. No one in Rome as yet had come up with the idea that the state could dispose of private property. Already then a certain difficulty appeared which from that time onwards has accompanied all “agricultural reforms” the world over; land will be found but from where will those entrusted with it find resources for the livestock? At that time the news arrived about the death and will of Attalus III and Tiberius Gracchus immediately came up with the proposal that the resources of the Pergamon treasury be used for the livestock. Thus Gracchus was not in solidarity with Aristonicus. It is known that the agricultural proposals of Tiberius Gracchus were voted in and they were immediately implemented, at least partially. The

⁵ The publisher of the third edition, the distinguished Friedrich Certel does not believe that truly in Pergamon references to *Heliopolis* were made. And yet, is it not so that the political and social cult of nonsense is still with us?

struggles between the *optimates* and the *plebs* were breaking out due to other claims and the direct cause of the mass murder was of a formal nature (an informal candidature for the tribunate). Gracchus died with 300 of his followers.

As every distinguished Roman of the time Gracchus also had a learned Greek friend. That was Plosius from the not so distant Cumae; he left immediately to Aristonicus (Poehlmann 1925, I 406). It appears from this that the Greek “philosopher” was more radical and differently radical than his Roman friend; obviously Gracchus had no intention of following the Greek notions of his friend and after the fall and death of his Roman patron the Greek hid where he expected to find “his own”. Rome was still far behind Greek radicalism and looked with reserve at their line of thought and activities.

Soon this started to change for the worse; as if something that was suppressed in Pergamon seeped into Rome (Aristonicus was strangled to death in a Roman prison). When in 123 the younger Gracchus, Caius, came up with projects of new reforms he was visibly aiming at the transformation of the state in such a way that it would have a permanent head, an unchanging leader and that this supreme authority located in a single individual would be endowed with the power to decide on state issues by his own will. The projects of Caius Gracchus did not affect in any way the appearances of democracy, thus they emerged from some mental compromise between Roman and Hellenistic statehood. He tried to help the rural class introducing various exemptions in military service and some rulings concerning the establishment of colonies. (He travelled personally to Carthage to establish the Junon

colony.) He was killed on the Aventine in 122 together with many followers, also not because of the agrarian reforms but for trying to expand access to Roman citizenship. In 125 the first attempt was made by consul M. Flavius Fiacus who proposed that all Italians be given full rights as citizens and three years later Caius Gracchus came up with a more modest proposal that full rights be given only to the Latins, while the Italians were to be given the rights of the Latins. He fell on this in a very characteristic way, because a coalition resulted composed of the senatorial camp and the Roman plebeians.

It was Gracchus himself who had encouraged the plebeians; he changed the masses into a co-ruling class in Rome because he introduced the regular distribution of grain.

Grain was imported from the Bosphorus and in spite of the transportation cost it was cheaper in Rome than Roman grain. From this moment Italian agriculture was becoming increasingly unprofitable. The rural proletarians moved to the capital, because they were Romans having full rights. They were entitled to vote and soon voting would become a new profitable way of earning a living.

Against such a background let us note that since mid-IInd c. every respectable Roman knew Greek. Even Cato the Elder started to learn it in his old years. The Greek language entered the capital of the world, primarily in its Asiatic pronunciation, which Cato probably liked the least. The stylish form of residing in Rome had an attached content, namely the public life of a citizen. Similarly Caius Gracchus had a teacher who was an Asiatic Greek (Zieliński 1924b, 240).

The “Greek circle” of Scipio the Younger became famous and it was perceived as an example of culture. It is probable that Homer was recited there or Anacreon, but it was the Hellenistic world which was setting the tone to Greek culture. All of this waddling in Hellenic literature was only a bridge towards acquaintance with the Hellenistic methods of organizing communal life.

Not everything there was negative. Stoicism, which did not flourish in Alexandria, was grafted onto Rome very well and this can be considered a compliment to the Romans. The stoic Panaetius of Rhodes (b. 180) was a valuable acquisition and he belonged to this “Greek circle”. Scipio took him along to Carthage for the third Punic war and next to Egypt and to Hellenistic Asia Minor. These countries were known to so many Romans! Thus they also knew the methods of organization of communal life that were practiced there. Scipio wished to study this precisely and it is for this reason that he wanted a companion and first class guide in these studies.

Stoicism propagated the natural law. It is said that some later details of Roman law on property and proceedings derived from this source. But did not the Stoics have their own opinions about the general method of government? What could have derived from natural law better than the showing that people are to be left with their own laws? The thoughts of Panaetius established in Rome some sort of tradition, because it is possible to attach to his name the following theory of Augustus about the “monarchy of the Best”. He himself moved later on to Athens; there he ran a school of Stoicism. (He died in 110.) Posidonius was a disciple of his. He was a Greek from Syria, born c. 135, thus belonging to the next

generation after Scipio. Before Posidonius resided on Rhodes and ran a school of Stoicism there, the one set up by Panaetius, and in 51 he moved to Rome. It was he who drew the consequences of the law of nature and he taught the Romans how to distinguish between the *ius proprium* and the *ius gentium* [own law and the law of the peoples]. This was a Hellenistic viewpoint that the locals are to be left with their own laws.

Thus not everything that came from the Hellenistic world was bad, but it can be said about the large majority of the Roman worshippers of Homer that they were searching for Aeneas and they found Cybele.

The Hellenization of minds brought with it their orientalization. This happened all the more easily when superstition did not find a counterforce in science. Only literary training was adopted from the Alexandrian Museum and literature smuggled in the fiction about Cassandra and Aeneas, leading to the presumed original mother of Rome, to Cybele. The deity that was a symbol of Orientalism was to engage in battle with the whole tradition of Rome.

The customary way of organizing communal life was becoming oriental.

Let us begin with the most innocent symptom, with the erecting of statutes of living persons. To be just one has to point out that “classical” antiquity knew no other portrait than the sculpture. Thus one has to define as simple portrait making the large number of busts, herms and statues. But the simplest portrait acquires a different role when it is placed in a public building and especially on the street, or on the marketplace!

Around 300 B.C. statues of historical individuals start appearing in Rome, and this has to be considered a positive feature. This is a sign of respect for achievements, a cult of tradition etc. But under Hellenistic influence began the practice of erecting statues of living officials. This was an old Asiatic tradition that rulers would erect monuments of themselves with long inscriptions about their deeds. The Hellenistic world adopted this, changing the monuments, normally into statues. In this way they followed Hellenic artistic norms. By mid-IInd c. the Romans were already infected by this so far that in 158 a censor ordered the removal of all statues of officials if they had been erected without a decision of the Roman people or Senate. Cato the Elder used to say that he preferred people asking why there is no statute of him than asking for what he has one. In the eastern provinces there were statues even of women (Friedländer 1910, 242).

For a long time this had no greater importance than the present bestowing of an honorary order. But is not the love of parading an oriental acquisition? This is also from the spirit of Cybele! Rome had not known this from its own practice; on the contrary, it was simplicity that characterized the Roman civilization.

Besides that the entire everyday life of the more affluent was organized in a Hellenistic manner. For example the practice of lying during meals came from there (this was unknown earlier in Rome) and the *caena* (the evening meal) became the main one. These were just details. In themselves they were details, but they were external symptoms of something more negative. The issuing of rulings against excesses, particularly against big banquets was very symptomatic. Culinary excesses came exclusively

from the East and in general it was from the eastern campaigns that examples of banquets which became as if some ceremonies were brought. The times came when not every wealthy man had a library, but he made efforts to consume as much as possible of his earnings and he cared that this consumption would be organized in a public manner, among many witnesses and with a literary accompaniment, because a great banquet was becoming an event that was to be remembered. The number of wealthy people competing in the organisation of ever more expensive banquets increased. These were enriched army officers, men who were not attracted to books and sculptures. Life was becoming silly in the higher classes and wildly in the lower ones. Is it not so that always and everywhere these symptoms appear together? A shallow life becomes dirty and it spreads widely. Eastern debauchery entered into Rome. The love for exuberant and careless life had an obligatory consequence. Around mid-IInd c. the failure to marry became a common practice.

The Orient was appealing, it was attractive and magnetic because it dazzled with high material culture. The average Roman citizen transferred suddenly in a military operation to the Syrian lands looked with amazement at all the riches he never imagined existed in the world. He did not know how to behave among all these rich people, particularly since they were full of tact. The Hellenistic societies maintained an economic system based on the primacy of trade, thus affluence was a normal thing there. The daily life that was full of comforts appealed to the very poor Roman arrivals. They saw that what was considered as affluence in Italy was considered as verging on poverty in the region of Antioch.

It is hardly surprising that they envied and wished to copy this affluent lifestyle.

Soon the Romans were to learn government in Asia. These were the triumphs of Cybele!

REFORM COMING FROM THE ORIENT

VI

A general reform of the Roman statehood was needed, and necessarily one that would provide a single ruler at its head. The lack of a representative system closed the appropriate ways and the absence of political sciences did not permit the development of political creativity. Meanwhile Roman military commanders and statesmen were spending an increasing amount of time in the East and there they were learning about the Oriental methods of government. At the courts of the rulers there, both of the old states and the newly established ones that were friendly or antagonistic towards Greek culture, the very notion of political authority was always the same and the ways of attaining it were truly a race of thugs. (For this they were even willing to murder their own mothers.) Romans, who were making careers in the East were becoming increasingly cruel; for example it was in Cappadocia that they learned how to crucify (Friedländer, 1910, 407, 408).

And yet very soon they became the masters of these so very rich countries! First they marvelled at the wealth of Carthage and yet they destroyed it. They appeared overseas, beyond Europe, for the first time when Scipio landed in Africa in 204, and again in 190 when the second Scipio crossed the Hellespont following

Antioch. In 167 a Roman legate was already giving orders in Alexandria even though he had no army with him¹. At the same time the Romans were deciding about the affairs of Pergamon and Rhodes in Asia. Since 146 Roman officials and their army resided in the province Africa; in 129 the province Asia Propria was established. In 111 the Jugurthine war began and in 88 the great wars with Mithridates that affected the whole of western Asia. Thus in the period between 204 and 129, during 75 years the Romans established for themselves a permanent rule in Asia and Africa; one has to assume that there were at least 3000 Romans residing there in peace time and maybe even they had some permanent military base. Since an increasing number of countries were being taken over, soon five times that number of Romans had to be officially in Asia and Africa.

They came over as superiors, as masters of the riches of the East, as rulers who decided about the management of these properties; they were the arbiters, whose favour had to be paid for. Is there any easier route towards demoralization than to give unlimited and uncontrolled power over riches to the less affluent? One went there as a pauper and returned rich. Were these contests in virtue or the exact opposite? Whoever was less scrupulous the greater gains he attained and the higher position he had later in Rome because he was able to buy the favours of the proletarian co-citizens according to his needs. From the hideous sources of wealth one moved quite legally towards the holding of high offices.

¹ Antiochus IV Epiphanes of Syria (175-163) conquered a part of Egypt and imprisoned king Ptolemy Philometor; the Roman legate Popilius Lenas ordered him to leave Egypt immediately and he gave the order in an insulting manner; Antioch obeyed.

Since around 190, Hellenistic influences operated mainly from Syria, the source of the worst possible ethos. After the defeat of Antioch in the battle of Magnesia the state of the Seleucids ceased to be counted among the powers. Soon a true shake-over occurred there among the dynasts. The local people experienced this as the regaining of freedom; large areas emerged from under the power of the Hellenistic state returning to a statehood of the pre-Alexandrian times. Smaller states, some free cities, indigenous principalities and some tyrannies appeared (Piotrowicz 1935a, 279). An obvious free division occurred according to the distinct civilizations which were dominant in each region. (Who will decipher this today?) In all probability the new smaller states based themselves more on their own societies while the great Seleucid state was generally opposed to the society; it was based on it only to the extent that it exploited it mercilessly. But these peoples moved to an even more miserable fate. Even greater exploitation by Roman officers and dignitaries was to ensue.

The number of Argonauts was on the increase! It is not even difficult to understand this because in 104 tribune L. Marcius Philippus coming up with the increasingly frequent agrarian question could articulate it in such a way: *Non esse in civitate duo milia hominum, qui rem haberent* [In the state there are not even 2000 men who own property.] (Poehlmann 1925, II chap. VI). Scarcely 2000 native Romans owning property!

The rural property owners were becoming increasingly poor. Wishing to help them (during the war against the Cimbrians and Teutons around the year 100) Marius broke with obligatory military service of all who own land as had been the rule since the times

of the kings; from that time onwards the Roman army relied on free recruitment. Scipio earlier was the first to attempt a voluntary recruitment; Marius abolished the obligation of military service. The intent was to prevent the ruin of the peasant that resulted from imposed military service, but what resulted was something very different. The medicine proved worse than the malady. Not only did the truly Roman, civil, army cease to exist but it turned out that those who blamed their ruin on military duty were now even more eager to join the forces. But now they imposed their conditions on the recruiting general and they spelled out precisely what will be their dole in the sharing of the spoils after a victory, how much money per head, what land acquisitions etc. Voluntary military service became the main way of earning a living of the entire Roman population, from the peasant to the senator.

Something even worse took place. The army was becoming a professional association, bonded not with the fatherland, not with the state, but only with the person of the military commander with whom a recruiting contract had been made, a contract which was remunerative. Since the military commanders were politicians at the same time, they brought the army into political infighting. The army became a tool for the acquisition of power in Rome. From that moment each great politician had an army of his own. Civil war seemed to invite itself.

For a long time no one dared to incite a revolution in Rome, for a long time this remained a Greek-Hellenistic speciality. Mithridates VI Eupator, the king of Pontus, established the Bosphorus state, conquered Paphlagonia and Cappadocia, and also attacked Bithynia. When on his orders throughout his state and

the countries he ruled all the Romans [and their supporters] were murdered (the number of victims is given as 80-150 thousand), Greek reinforcements joined him. Several Hellenic cities linked up with him, but they wavered when Sulla landed in Epirus. At that time Mithridates proclaimed the old slogan of “reform” that was time proven among the Greeks. He proclaimed a total annulment of all debts, he gave citizen’s rights to the *metics* [resident aliens] in some cities, and finally (to gather more volunteers) he gave freedom to the slaves. This caused a grave social upheaval, but at the same time he attached to his cause the obviously most numerous classes. There was no shortage of Greeks at the time, who envied the Romans the stability of their private law. In the end the Romans conquered Athens by siege in 86 and soon after that the influence of Mithridates in Greece ended. His garrisons were expelled from Macedonia and Thrace and Sulla chased them further into Asia.

In this same year it appeared that rottenness was appearing at the root of the Roman political system. Simultaneously with the beginning of the great external war against Mithridates a great internal civil war broke out in Rome between the *optimates* and the democrats, between Marius and Sulla. In 86 consul Valerius Flaccus went to Asia in order to deprive Sulla of his command, at the time when Sulla was just crossing over to Asia. The consul reached Byzantium which remained neutral in the war and played no role. In order to assure for himself a transfer to Asia Valerius set up a garrison also in Chalcedon on the other side of the Bosphorus. Then, in 86, that is, in the third year of the war against Mithridates, he appointed Gaius Flavius Fimbria as his legate. He organized a

military putsch in Byzantium in which the consul was killed and having crossed over to Asia with the army that was subordinate to him, he won a number of victories. Fimbria ravaged Asia Minor right and left (at that time the new Ilion was destroyed), he gathered as much spoils as possible, enriched himself and his soldiers and perhaps he even dreamt of establishing a state for himself in which he would be supported by his legions eagerly. In this whole enterprise there is not a shade of public service. Fimbria acted for himself, worked for himself and not for Rome.

This lasted for two years until in 84, having forced Mithridates to accept peace requiring his total submission Sulla attacked Fimbria with full strength. He beat him primarily because he offered full impunity to his legions, i.e. he promised not to deprive them of their spoils; the soldiers expecting the superiority of Sulla's strength abandoned Fimbria.

Meanwhile civil wars in Rome itself were infecting it with decomposition. Slaughters and the banning of political opponents, quite unknown in earlier Rome, appeared in a manner akin to the worst Asiatic methods of rule. Sulla deprived the children of his opponents citizen's rights, and he extended this even to the grandsons of those proscribed, and there were 4700 of them. He wanted to exterminate the Samnites totally and he considered how to execute this plan. Are these not Asiatic methods, originally Assyrian and later Persian?

The Asian influence increased because there were more and more oriental religious notions. Cybele was helped by the appearance of Isis in Italy. She came from Egypt where the priests finally considered her to be the primary deity responsible for the

fate of the state. This however was how she was understood by the initiated only. The common people held her to be the deity of the moon, of the underworld, of cereals, of sailing, thus having diverse meanings. In Syria a new variety of Isis appeared, as the goddess of sensual love making her Syrian temples the privileged sites of debauchery. It is this type of Isis that was brought over to Italy by officials depraved in the east and by “Roman” officers who themselves were often of oriental origin. This all had begun already during the time of Sulla, but it was only an episode. The Senate expelled Isis from the Capitol. Her temple was destroyed and it was forbidden to honour her even in the privacy of homes. We shall see in what triumph Isis was to return to Rome.

There was a law in Rome forbidding the entry into the city with armed men. In the centre of the city, within the limits of the *pomoerium*, the *lictors* [bodyguards] carrying the Fasces did not precede the consuls. One had to wait with one’s legions outside the city walls before obtaining permission to celebrate a triumph. But Sulla stormed the city in 88 with six legions. These legionaries were not concerned with anyone or anything except for their leader. In the next year Marius did the same and his soldiers murdered and robbed in the capital for five days. And after that how many others did the same! Finally in 80 Sulla removed from the Capitol not only all the mementos of Marius’s victories, but he even ordered that his body be unearthed and thrown into the river Aniene.

Having at his disposal unlimited confiscated land properties, Sulla settled on it his veterans forbidding them at the same time to sell these properties. But the expulsion of the former owners to make room for the newcomers who were unaccustomed to

agricultural toil resulted in an even greater decline of agricultural production and the disappearance of the peasant class. Those who were expelled from the land only increased the crowds of the proletariat and the settled veterans very often soon abandoned the land selling it to large landowners in spite of the prohibitions. In order not to increase the numbers of the proletariat Sulla abolished even the supply of grain at a lowered price ... but all of this came to nothing; as we know soon grain was even distributed free (since 58).

Thus military issues mingled with many others; what more, they entered the organisation of the state, into politics and what is even worse into legal notions – destroying and not building.

Those in Italy who wished to cultivate their peasant patrimony were becoming increasingly poor. The rogation of tribune Servilius Rullus in 64 is very characteristic.

Since the distribution of leased land in Campania was sufficient for only 5000 holdings with 10 morgen each, an agricultural commission was established with unlimited power and 200 officials, which was to buy land in the whole of Italy; resources for that were to come from the sale of enormous domains in Asia, Macedonia, in Sicily, Spain and in Africa, as also the sale of all state property acquired after 88, both movable and real estate (unless it had already been distributed). Also a major portion of the tithes, custom duties and other taxes, as well as the remains of as yet undivided spoils from military operations of recent years were to be used for the purpose.

Cicero thwarted this project; he gave three speeches on the subject. He complained that the gatherings of the people

are increasingly taking on the features of the Greek agora and demagogues are speaking at the *Forum* as if they were Greeks speaking to Greeks.

Were they at least speaking with genuine honesty? Frequently, increasingly frequently, riots were deliberately provoked for any reason at all. They were paid so that the riots and murders would turn against one's political opponent. Finally, the two great parties, the *optimates* and the plebeians had in their pay some of the demagogues and a part of the masses. The *Forum Romanum* was for sale to the one who paid more. The *Forum* with all its gatherings represented only one kind of weapon in these civil wars.

Later Horace described these times as the *Magnum delirium* [Great madness]. Between the years 133 and 31 there were no less than 12 civil wars; the *bellum sociale* [social war], the wars of Sulla, Lepidus, Sertorius, Spartacus, Catiline, Caesar, the triumvirates, *bellum Octavianum*, the Perusian war, the naval war of Sextus Pompeius and finally the last war with Antonius; during these conflicts there were numerous political murders, often cruel, even bestial, beginning with the Gracchi and ending with Caesar and Cicero; apart from that mass murders were planned from the top: 3000 supporters of the Gracchi were murdered and later under Marius and Sulla 6000 Spartans were crucified along the road from Rome to Capua, 7000 Samnite prisoners of war were slaughtered in front of the gathered Senate, all the way to the last proscription organised undoubtedly following the suggestion of Antonius and subscribed after all by Octavian, the future Augustus.

This is a summary of the history of the next generation. Above all this there stood the old idea of C. Gracchus that the technique of the state must change, that the state must have a permanent head. The aptness of this program was felt by all thinking politicians although they were unable to spell this out clearly and precisely. This was aimed at when various means or semi-means were employed, such as, for example the extension of the consulate of someone, first by an annual re-election year after year and then by mandating the consulate for a number of years, for five and later even for ten years; the return towards a dictatorship and allowing it for increasing periods of time; the choosing of some powerful individual for a consul and adding him as a colleague somebody who was of no significance; a ruling person was chosen as the censor so that he could organize the Senate and the *equites* [knights] according to his political aims, etc. There were several candidates for supreme power. Since not one of them thought of depriving the masses of civil rights and they increased in numbers coming to the capital to be given *panem et circenses* [bread and circuses], the masses were dividing into parties that were killing each other in the streets of the city as if they were some politically motivated hired gladiators. There was recruitment to the army, but there was also recruitment to make revolutions.

There was universal agreement that it is necessary to place someone at the head of the state as an individual representing the state for life, but there was universal disagreement as to who that person should be. Did no one have a majority of the population behind him? Did no one have sufficiently strong and universal support?

We do not know this and there is no way to find out. The ancient organizations that gathered all the citizens, the *comitia centuriata*, lost their importance once military service ceased to be compulsory. The *curiata* were called only in exceptional occasions, and they restricted their activity to the settling of formalities of no interest to anyone apart from the curial clans; the *tributa* fell into complete disarray due to ochlocracy [mob rule]. The powers of the *comitiae* were being altered without end, as also the composition and the extent of the jurisdiction of the Senate. A rule weighed upon all of this that is quite incomprehensible for us, namely that rights could be executed only locally that is in the capital. As a result the vast majority of Roman citizens never voted, in fact they were deprived of their basic citizen's right which was open to Roman parasites who were selling their votes. What then remained of the Roman state system? The offices! Access to them as before was available through military service, but this service had now attained a very different meaning. Thus the maintenance of this old tradition was in fact injurious. Military service became for the officer, a future official, the worst possible school of public life. From this school emerged not a Roman citizen but a partisan of one of the political strongmen. And such a strongman could only be a very wealthy man because it was necessary to pay both the soldiers and the bands of the "Roman populace". Who did not have sufficient wealth at his disposal must have acquired the art of making appropriate enormous debts, of finding a guarantor for these debts and if necessary of accepting him as a partner. Thus there was no politics on a grand scale without big money, which implied the participation of hundreds of intermediaries and all

kinds of parasites. Rome had no trade of its own, or any industry; it was only by unjust methods that one attained wealth, that is, through military expropriations and spoils acquired even during civil wars. Thus, whoever wished to engage in state politics had to deal with people of lesser kind and be dependent on them; he had to place them in offices. Thus a political career became a race of an increasingly vulgar kind and public life became debased.

Considering the total disintegration of all state institutions in these times, which Horace rightly described as a *delirium*, the situation at the time can be described in the following terms: The Roman state lost its statehood; it became a state without a statehood.

All the more so the bonds of state moved over to the military camps. The state was being organized by the soldiers. It became the sphere of military careers of fortune. Government moved to the fist.

Since all admitted that the Roman state was outdated and that it could not be maintained in such a form, what ideas about reforming the statehood appeared? What were the programs? How were they trying to reach a situation where a single person would be the head of the state? How was the head of state to exercise supremacy over the statehood, so that it would bring some order into public affairs and allow for stability? What draws the attention of the historian is that there is no sign of any such programs for the statehood. The conflicts concerned the person of the future head of state, but that future authority had no thought out plans about the new functioning of the state.

There was no continuity of thought because there were no true scholars. In Alexandria there were no social sciences studying the state, nor were there any political sciences at all; thus there were no ideas and no exchanges of views. The defect of the Museum was wounding the antique world and it brought passive impotency to communal life. The cause of this insufficiency of the science of that period lay in the Alexandrian court that would not bear any discussion of state issues. In Egypt autocracy had to be synonymous with despotism – and nowhere in the entire *orbis terrarum* [world] was another program emerging. And Rome needed single rule badly.

Struggling for reform Rome engulfed into increasingly vicious civil wars and during these conflicts calls for aristocratic and for democratic rule resounded; but these were sheer slogans because at the base of everything there was plutocracy and the people of Rome to a large extent were not of Roman origin.

Considering the decline of the Roman statehood one arrives at the conviction that its primary dysfunction lay in the fact that whoever did not reside in Rome had no influence on the shaping and control of the statehood and thus had no influence on the fate of the state. Political reforms were impossible in Rome because of the absence of some representative system. This invention had not been made. Why? We do not know. It is very likely that should the Senate originate from Italian municipalities, some new statehood would have been found, with new arrangements suitable for the new times. But there was no program at all².

² A representative system would have saved the traditions of the old Roman state and would have granted superiority to the Roman civilization. This idea is

There was only a living example of how to place an individual at the head of a state; an example that the Roman soldiers observed day by day for many years: the oriental autocratic rule. Finally what was at hand (as indicated by Cybele) was taken.

Chronologically the first of the strongmen who entered the arena of the great civil wars was Gnaeus Pompeius, who was given command and unlimited power in Asia in 66, so as to end finally with Mithridates. In order to prevent a coalition between Mithridates and the Parthians he made an alliance with them himself promising them Mesopotamia. It was admitted that the Parthians were unbeatable. Pompeius judged even that it will not be possible to hold Mesopotamia. Thus, there were those who were drawing limits upon the universal state. This was after all a break with the oriental understanding of things because a state that is decidedly universal cannot restrict itself of its own will just as Pompeius had done. Of special note is the circumstance that the limits to universalism placed at the time follow more less the limit of the Hellenistic world, the boundary of the civilization. The Parthians not only did not belong to the Hellenistic civilization but were also its conscious opponent.

Meanwhile it is difficult not to count among the Hellenistic states the kingdom of Pontus and Mithridates VI himself with whom it proved necessary to hold long and persistent wars. The name of Mithridates reappears among the kings of Parthia, Bosphorus and Pontus and it is of Persian origin (actually Mithrades). Many

considered in historical sciences for the last three generations. This is a warning to all those who are now shattering the representative system. Are we not destroying some civilization again?

elements of the Persian civilization lingered on in the Pontus state; was it not so that the Persian civilization was also a component of the Hellenistic mixture? All of this was underlain by Syrian religious cults. The Roman soldiers were not yet adopting the cult of the Persian Mitra, they were not yet initiated into it, but they waddled in Syrian promiscuity. The wars with Mithridates extended over the whole of Asia Minor and the legions moved from country to country. The Romans were making geographic and cultural discoveries soaking in the Hellenistic worldview with the blessing of Cybele.

During the wars with Mithridates acquaintance was made with the wild cult of the Cappadocian goddess, renamed in Rome as Bellona (in the years 88-64). The priests of Bellona wearing black robes and fur caps would run around the temple in wild frenzy inflicting wounds upon themselves with swords and then they would sprinkle the crowd with their own blood so as to purify it. In fact the Romans did not treat these dervishes as priests; they called them *fanatici* from *fanum* (temple) – and with time this word started to mean any religious frenzy (Zieliński 1922, II 195). Indeed the Romans never treated these excesses seriously, but having acquainted themselves with them they ceased to take seriously any religion. Thus even their own Roman cults were becoming just a show for the Romans.

Having finished the wars with Mithridates and organized three provinces in Asia (Pontus, Syria and Cilicia) Pompeius returned with his great victorious army and on landing on Italian soil in Brindisi – he dismissed the army. He returned to the capital in 63 as a private person without an army and without an office,

but a rich man. He had no intent to take his own country by force³. What was he planning and did he have anything in mind apart from private life? We will never know this because we lack sources for this. However it is easy to imagine that he was in great demand from all sides; after all he was a great warrior, a great politician and a rich man.

There was one difficulty in receding to private life. Pompeius had duties towards his soldiers; it was necessary to claim donations for them. Should their leader be no longer needed by anyone, if he were unable to help or harm anybody, who would care for his veterans? Dissatisfied and disappointed they could easily be used against their former commander. Thus wishing only to fulfil his obligations Pompeius had to return to public life.

He met on the political scene a new individual of great magnitude, Julius Caesar. He was not sufficiently rich to decide about Rome alone and he could not believe in his success if he were to have Pompeius as an opponent, thus he preferred to come to an agreement with him. These two men, having made an alliance, received into their company a third, the richest man in Rome, Crassus. In this manner the first triumvirate was established in the year 60 B.C.

Caesar was decidedly less fussy than Pompeius in the choice of means. The use of professional demagogues was a common tool for him. He pretended to be a social radical so as to have at his disposal the “corrupted municipal masses acting as the representation of the whole nation and an exponent of its will”

³ Several years back Mommsen wrote contemptuously about him exactly for this reason.

(Piotrowicz 1935a, 338). He allowed them everything and always promised them whatever they wanted. He exerted vengeance on Cicero for his campaign against Catiline by condemning him to exile and having his house on the Palatine burnt. Cato the Younger, who had contributed greatly to the ruin and finally to the death sentence on Catiline and his main supporters, was also removed from Rome. But Cato was expelled in an honourable way being made the ruler of Cyprus. At the same time he was given an order pertaining to Byzantium. The city was undergoing internal troubles and the winning camp was condemning the losing side to exile (the common practice in Greece). Cato now brought these exiles back to Byzantium (Piotrowicz 1935a, 419). Rome always stuck to the policy of supporting the conservative party in all the Greek cities; both Roman parties were in agreement on this point.

This was in 58. In that very year Caesar became the governor of Gaul having in fact unlimited power that in 56 was prolonged for a further five years. What great and multilateral talent he had shown there is known to all and no one will ever deny this to Caesar. Historians are full of admiration for him and they view with understanding many things that do not bring him glory. Among the features of this idol of hundreds of writers there was also something that does not par with greatness: his lack of scruples and a proclivity to cruelty. For example, in Gaul he condemned the tribe of Eburones to complete annihilation and he turned their country into a desert. Thousands of Gauls had their hands chopped off and he watched indifferently at the death from hunger of numerous women and children that were deliberately starved. Caesar is praised and admired for the fact that he ruled Gaul and

maintained it in complete peace with minimal forces. Yes indeed! But that was only towards the end of his rule. It is forgotten that before that there was terror, not only of the normal wartime type, but a horrific, nightmarish terror when exterminating left and right he imposed peace, which was the peace of a cemetery. Only those tribes were spared which linked with the invader and this explains why in Caesar's army there were fewer Romans than Gauls – this also has been a surprise for two generations of scholars (Fustel de Coulanges 1922, 49). The free and willing association of the Gauls with the Romans belongs to the history of the times of Augustus; under Caesar Gaul was more than decimated and it was in fearful stupor and so it had no inclination towards Rome, whereas the Roman legionaries were in an increasingly worse school. They learnt how to practice similar methods against their Italian political opponents. A soldier changed into a thug.

The second of the triumvirate, Crassus was given the governorship of Syria. From there he organized in 53 a great expedition against the Parthians. Sulla was the first who had reached the Euphrates some time ago. Crassus, ambitious and understanding issues on a grand scale, hoped to maintain the limits of the Hellenistic world in the East and at least to regain Mesopotamia for the Greek world (there were Greek settlements there already). Rome supported the Hellenization of the East thinking this to be the best method of maintaining its own rule. As if an alliance was formed against the Semites, Iran and the Turanians. For a long time the Euphrates was the boundary between the Mediterranean world and what was the East proper for the Greek or Roman. In Mesopotamia itself the Greek element

persisted for a long time (most strongly in Babylon) (Piotrowicz 1935a, 278).

The antagonism against the Parthians was taken over from the Seleucids and we know that there was a boundary here and a civilizational chasm reappearing all the time and ever more clearly. It would be necessary to conquer all the countries of this civilization were all wars in this part of the world to end. It was already mentioned that it was observed in Rome that some limit to further expansion needs to be made; thus, in fact an opposition developed there against Crassus, not without prompting from Rome, and something unusual took place; a part of the Roman soldiers, particularly those who had earlier served under Pompeius betrayed Crassus following Quintus Labienus. Crassus suffered a heavy defeat in 53 in the battle of Carrhae in Mesopotamia for which he paid with his own head. Labienus on his part established closer relations with the Parthians and finally stood at the head of their army. He entered Syria and there even a part of the Roman army joined him. Labienus changed into a monarch; he minted coins on which he called himself *Particus imperator*. This lasted for a few years.

Let us remember this. In the East it was possible to become a king; it was possible to make territorial conquests using Roman armies but not in the interest of Rome but uniquely for oneself. In this case Rome was a means and the end for one's own person. It is also worth noticing that Labienus was the first to use the title "emperor" meaning a permanent head of state. The teaching of Labienus was not forgotten.

The third of the triumvirate, Pompeius, remained in Rome and he ruled both his Spanish provinces through legates. It is obvious that one of the three leaders had to care for affairs in Rome. Pompeius who had no dreams of greatness of the like of Alexander the Great and who did not have to earn money to pay his debts watched over the capital which was still full of riots. He succeeded in being nominated by the Senate as a consul without a colleague so that he could more successfully control the masses. This meant that he had dictatorial power. Crassus was dead. Caesar was busy in Gaul. Thus by this decision the Senate introduced one-man rule and Pompeius was to be the first one to hold it. Quite some fruit of the recently planned return to private life!

Caesar was ordered to disband his army. The conqueror of Gaul in fact had his own state there and probably he would not have been pushed out of there were he content with Gaul alone. But Caesar had ambitions on the scale of Alexander the Great and he crossed the Rubicon.

The civil war between Caesar and Pompeius in the years 49 and 48 moved substantially the ferments that accompanied the birth of a new statehood for the Roman state. This war took place in three parts of the world; at issue was the rule over the whole world known to the Romans and Greeks excluding any divisions. Both sides were fighting similarly in Spain and in Egypt for rule over Spain and Egypt. The universal Roman state was to be maintained as a whole, as a single state. Caesar's betrayal had to lead to various consequences, expected (it appears) by Caesar alone.

Internally the greatest problems were the growing demands of the soldiers. The army was recruited on increasingly more difficult terms. Caesar had to make deals with his legions when he was crossing the Rubicon. A rumour went around that he promised all his soldiers the rank of *equites* and a sum of 400 000 *sestertii* each. This was an exaggerated rumour, but let us not be surprised. If he was making senators out of his officers why not promote his soldiers to the *ordo equestris* [knighthood]? It is a fact that in this very year 49 Caesar had to increase his promises several times in order to incline his legions to race around Italy, Greece and Africa. Towards the end of that year there was even a military riot near Piacenza (Simanski, 1931,106, 107). A volunteer for a civil war could not be recruited with the promise of land without livestock in some far away country. He was demanding a ready, functioning farm, in Italy, only in Italy. This resulted in the decision that 18 Italian cities were to be designated together with their agricultural surroundings for the needs of the army. The local population was to be simply banished. This is it! Medium and small holdings were changing ownership depending on which side of the conflict had the upper hand (Piotrowicz 1935a, 486, 490). The entire stability, inviolability of the Roman triple law disappeared somewhere. Simultaneously in Rome itself Caesar was ready to organize all possible upheavals so long as he had the masses on his side.

The closer Caesar was coming to supreme power the more he linked up with the radicals, organising riots himself, when he considered them useful. In 48, in the year of great fluctuation of fortune (defeat at Dyrrhachium in Epirus, victory at Pharsalus in Thessaly) a professional demagogue, at that time still an

ally of Caesar, Coelius Rufus (who organized a riot of slaves) demanded that for a year rents for accommodation and all debts be abolished. Caesar himself was turning out to be increasingly cruel. Chasing Pompeius all the way to Africa he organized a perfidious assassination of him and did not refuse himself the pleasure of having the head of his murdered opponent brought to him.

The war continued with the sons of Pompeius. Moving from Egypt to Spain Caesar dropped into Rome, suppressed military riots in Campania and returned again to Egypt. Meanwhile debts and unpaid rent grew to unimaginable sums. Another supporter of Caesar, the tribune Dolabella wanted to see an insurrection in all of Italy; he brought back last year's proposals of Coelius (apparently himself being very much in debt) and provoked a bloody riot. This time rents for leases were also to be abolished. Caesar was staying in Alexandria while his demagogues in Rome were destroying the remnants of the conservative party. But a split appeared among the supporters of Caesar. Antonius wavered at first but finally he followed the Senate; Dolabella persisted, he set up barricades on the Forum which were dismantled by soldiers brought into Rome by Antonius. There were 800 killed in the operation. Having finally won his victory at the Thapsus in 46 Caesar returned to Rome and celebrated four triumphs. He introduced obligatory government loans, ordered the capitalists to locate a part of their wealth in land and he placed an annual moratorium on rents. He ordered that masses of the populace be brought to Rome. In 46 the number of people benefiting from the free distribution of grain was 320 000. All of this brought masses into Rome (the cost of it all amounted to 77 million *sestertii* (Simanski, 1931, 107, 108).

Caesar became even more dependent on the army than on demagoguery. The role of the army became supreme as a force not only serving the state as in the past, but as a factor that was above the commander and the government. Before the battle of Pharsalus Caesar promised “unlimited” benefits and even further monetary benefits for his expedition to Egypt following Pompeius. “As a result Caesar became an insolvent debtor of his soldiers.” Thus an interesting phenomenon resulted; the army elevated him to the pinnacle of power and it already then made him the supreme autocratic lord of Rome; and yet the greater was his prestige among peaceful citizens “the greater was his dependence on his soldiers”. In the summer of 47 new riots ensued, more serious than those which took place two years earlier near Piacenza. Instead of going to Africa the legions attacked Rome. He dismissed them immediately but he had to give each soldier financial support and a promise of land. After the African expedition and the battle of Thapsus in 46 common soldiers were given 20 000 and 24 000 *sestertii* each, the centurions were given double that sum and prefects four times as much. In spite of that the army was uncertain. To have it on his side Caesar started taking over land for them from private owners with no compensation for the latter ... “In fact he was totally dependent on his legions and on the staff of military favourites. At the highest point in his career he found himself in the strange position of having no base that would support him against the very element that gave him victory” (Simanski 1931, 107, 108). After Caesar and the triumvirates Rome had ... one more downward slope.

Increasingly Caesar represented an unlimited autocratic program. Pompeius had wanted to keep the old republican system. Even though this was a profound misunderstanding the republicans claimed that Pompeius was a defender of the old statehood. But in Rome itself the masses were talked into believing that Pompeius was a defender of the *optimates* and the *equites*, who in Greek rhetoric were called the aristocracy. By contrast Caesar was considered a defender of democracy.

After the death of Pompeius and the defeat of his sons Caesar's party won in Rome. But was it democracy? Let us follow its further development amidst the universal mendacity.

It began with Caesar introducing into the Senate a number of his officers. His agents were proclaiming at meetings of various kind that "he was forced to defend the republic against the tyranny of party politics". It happens frequently that the introduction of despotic rule is presented as the establishment of true freedom (Piotrowicz 1935a, 447, 469).

He was thinking about setting up a dynasty. He had been married for a long time but he had no son⁴ until his affair with Cleopatra who bore him a male child whom he called Caesarion (Kaisarion). According to Roman law this illegitimate descendant had no civil rights, thus he could not be the heritor.

Thus Ceasar prepared a formal wedding with Cleopatra and a special law was to be passed that would allow him to have any number of wives. Suetonius reports in his *Lives of the Emperors* that this liberty was to be made available to all citizens (Jouguet 1926, 156). Thus the introduction of polygamy was envisioned. These

⁴ His daughter Julia was married to Pompeius.

however were probably only ... rumours. Even if Caesar thought for some time about legitimising his liaison in Rome, he must have lacked the courage to orientalize the *ius connubii* [marriage law]; he was afraid that he might stumble on this and rumours must have been a warning signal. Cleopatra waited in vain for two years in Rome to have this issue settled. Apparently this was not so easy – not even for Caesar. Divorce was something common in Rome at the time, but never was it permitted to legally have two wives simultaneously. Roman law maintained monogamy to the end. It was not necessarily a lifelong monogamy since Cicero divorced three times and Sulla even five times (Jouguet 1926, 284). As regards Caesar there must have been some reasons why the issue was not moving forward. Possibly there was some uncontrollable dislike of Cleopatra in Rome, as many years back among the Greeks who were against the marriage of Alexander the Great with Roxana. Maybe Caesarion was also scorned, treated with contempt and hated as was the young Alexander [son of Roxana]?

Finally Caesar adopted such measures which made the Roman recognition of Cleopatra immaterial. The very essence of statehood was at stake. What was the Roman state to be under Caesar and his dynasty?

Coins appeared with Caesar's head. He was the first to do this in Rome, and this was done following the example of the East. Labienus had named himself *imperator Parthiae* and there in Parthia this must have obviously been understood in an oriental manner. Caesar announced the same in Rome and by this act he proclaimed that he planned to rule in an oriental manner. But was it already possible at that time to be ... an oriental ruler in Rome?

Thus he planned to transfer the capital to Alexandria (Piotrowicz 1935a, 474). After all, after Rome Alexandria was the second largest city in the world, numbering up to 300 000 inhabitants. The country was sparsely populated having no more than 7.5 million people generally not very affluent (Lot 1927, 81, 83). But the treasury of the ruler was always full and best endowed in the whole world thanks to fiscal extortion. Thus Caesar wanted to be a Pharaoh ruling the whole world from there. He wanted to become a despotic ruler on the Egyptian mode, without any pretence. There would be no longer any mendacity there. The issue of Cleopatra and Caesarion would be settled without any Roman interference.

This is how the Egyptian civilization entered the history of Rome!

Caesar's decision seemed quite simple and reasonable. If Rome is to maintain its rule over the East it must show itself to have a proper oriental title to maintain its power. Otherwise it will only be possible to rule there by compulsion and military terror. This would require the conduct of a permanent war in the East dealing all the time with rebellions. A Syrian or Egyptian will not however move when he will believe in the religious legality of the ruler, that is, when the ruler will be affiliated to his gods. If it will not be possible to say that the ruler descends from a local deity resistance against him will be a religious duty. And if at the occasion of such a rebellion the Syrians, Phrygians etc. link up with the Parthians? If they ally with the Egyptians?

Caesar knew very well that he faced the same problem that Alexander the Great had to deal with; the problem of deification. And similarly as Alexander he did not waver. The only difference

was that Caesar never believed in any divine origin of himself or of anyone else. How much older was he than Alexander and how much richer in experience! He was guided only by reason and he did not suffer from any mania to sit on a throne.

Deification was a means of keeping the Roman state together. It is a fact that in the East a divine worship was earlier offered towards various republican governors (Piotrowicz 1935a, 522), thus the initiative came from the local people in the Orient. The Asia Minor Greeks invented something intermediate between the establishment of a new deity or the proclamation of a new emanation of an older one and the public homage understood as submitting oneself under the protection of Rome. It was already in 195 that in Smyrna a “temple of the city of Rome” was erected, and this was later copied in many other cities. Apart from that the “Roman governors and military leaders were the objects of divine worship, they receive temples, sacrifices and games”. For example this was offered in Athens itself to Flaminius and later Lucullus and finally to Pompeius in gratitude for undertaking a great expedition against pirates. Even more so was Caesar deified in Asia, where he was seen as an inheritor of the monarchy and the divinity of Alexander the Great. He was worshiped in Ephesus and in other Asiatic cities already in 48 as the “son of Ares and Aphrodite, the god who came down on earth as saviour for the whole of humankind” And in 42 Antonius was welcomed there and in Alexandria as Dionysus (Haecker 1935, 30, 31).

It was impossible to convert the East from such an understanding of the state and statehood; it was necessary to convince Rome to pretend that it concurs with the view of the

Orient. Thus it was decided to place statues of Caesar in all the Roman temples and in all the cities of the entire state, to offer sacrifices on his birthday and to organize games every four years in his honour. A college of priests devoted to him was established, the *Luperci Iuliani* [the wolf-men of Julius] and finally towards the end of 44 he was simply proclaimed a god as *Iupiter Julius*⁵; he was given a temple and a distinct *flamen Iulianus* [Julius's priest].

None the less he planned to transfer the capital to Alexandria. The so-called deification in Rome was to convince the thousands of visitors coming from the East that this lord of the world is indeed counted among the gods and this can be ascertained in his own country.

If the unity of the Roman state was to be maintained, was it possible to govern it simultaneously according to two opposing methods, according to the contradictory principles of the West and the East? Roman traditions required that the state be based on society and that it be a tool of the Roman nation, while the East had no such ideas. According to the Roman tradition the government was to fulfil the aims of whole society and the leader of the state is the plenipotentiary of society, while in the East the ruler was an emanation of a deity. It was blasphemy to oppose the will of such a ruler.

It was clear that the officers of Caesar could not have believed in his divinity nor did Caesar expect or demand such a faith among the Romans. It was also not demanded of the Greeks in the Hellenistic countries. What was demanded however, was

⁵ Derived from Venus, because Julius was the first to be proclaimed a son of Aeneas.

that both there and now in Rome there would be no ridiculing of this “divinity” but just a quiet toleration of it. How low in the eyes of a visitor from the East would such a Roman descend together with his ruler if the latter were not an emanation of a god? To submit oneself to such a master would be shameful in the eyes of the Orient.

Having introduced a lie as a basis for state institutions it proved necessary also to hand over the Forum and the Senate to the most cunning liars.

That was the state of affairs in February 44 and on March 15th Caesar was murdered, jabbed 23 times with a dagger. In Athens a monument was erected honouring the assassins of Caesar who had searched for fame in the rebuilding of Corinth. What a classical example of the eternal inconsistency in Hellas! When there was a discussion about an heir of Caesar, no one mentioned Caesarion. The Roman notions of family law stood firm. A grandson of Caesar on the female line, who had earlier been adopted by him, C. Octavian had no competitor on the basis of his title in private law and the veterans of his grandfather, a strong party, also wanted to have him as an heir in the field of public law. From that time onwards he was to be called C. Iulius Caesar Octavianus. But he was only 18. Meanwhile consul M. Antonius raised his claim to supreme authority, and he understood it as unlimited power. The Mutinian civil war (near Mutina now Modena in Cisalpine Gaul) in the years 44 and 43 ended fatally for Antonius because he was even proclaimed an enemy of the fatherland.

In spite of that in that very year a second triumvirate was established composed of the now in agreement Antonius and

Octavian and they adopted Lepidus as the third person. It seemed that nothing had changed due to the death of Caesar and that this was a return to the year 60 in order to repeat the history of the period 60-44. They began with proscription which affected 2000 people. Later Octavianus-Augustus was ashamed that he signed this list for Antonius and he admitted having serious qualms, particularly since at that time Cicero was murdered because some time earlier he had opposed Antonius in his *Philippics*. Cicero's hands and head were chopped off the corpse and they were nailed high as a warning to the Senate, because this head dared to think and these hands dared to write against Antonius! "Lo, to what wretched state has civil discord brought us!" cried out Virgil in the first Eclogue written at that time (Haecker 1935, 30, 31).

This murder stands in history as a border post because from that time onwards increasingly frequently the best citizens of Rome will die from the hands of oriental despotism that settled in Rome, while at the same time increasingly frequently and with greater acceleration corrupt scum will be elevated.

The great sadness of Roman history consists in the fact that Rome was denying itself.

There is no better proof for the arrival of Orientalism than the peoples' gathering of 43 which gave the triumvirate the right to punish any citizen with death penalty without any court proceedings (Piotrowicz 1935a, 485).

We should consider this fact with great precision.

This was an ancient Persian law accepted by all the peoples of Asia Minor and later followed in all the Hellenistic states. Its essence lay in the conviction that all the people and all things are

a personal property of the king; thus if the king suddenly beheads someone even without any fault, he is entitled to do so because everyone is entitled to do what he pleases with his own property and this is nobody's business! This is a very consistent conclusion drawn out of universal royal ownership and it means therefore that the power of the king is unrestricted.

Neither in the Persian civilization nor in the Hellenistic one was there any duality of law, i.e. a theoretical distinctiveness of the private law set apart from the public one. The public law resulted from the amplification of the personal (property) law of the ruler. This was legal monism that appears in a number of oriental civilizations arising from Western and Central Asia, from the Old Persian one all the way to the Turanian cultures of the Middle Ages, to the Mongolian and Turkish civilizations. The same state of things, the identity of the basis for the entire issue, the immutability of the view on the relationship between the ruler and people in spite of the changes of several civilizations can be explained only by the fact that in these countries for centuries until even this very day the clan system is still functioning. The ruler is the arch-headman of all clan headmen. The position of the Chinese emperors was understood in a similar way. There is however a great difference between the Chinese civilization and the civilizations of western Asia, namely on the issue of deification. This had a primary role in western Asia, having a decisive impact on almost everything, whereas in a-religious China the deification of the monarch faded out losing its significance and the notion of the "son of the heavens" became only a title to which just a few sacral ceremonial relics were attached.

The legal monism of monarchic law moved then in 43 from the Hellenistic world to Rome. Thus from that moment all proscriptions and confiscations were to find justification. Even the punishing of grandchildren for the “sins of the grandfathers” introduced by Sulla became understandable. One can easily imagine what crowds of swindlers would run in from everywhere to this feeding ground of vileness shouting praises of the ruler and his court. The depravation of public life is the highest triumph of Cybele.

But this monism of private law took on a different quality in Rome. The Roman triple law, this truly immortal title of fame of Rome, proved so strong that it withstood the pressure of the oriental Hellenistic influence. The “peoples” resolution that granted the leaders the right to kill and rob was unfortunately to be put into practice in the following generations (adopting forms appropriate for the circumstances), but the principle of independence of private law was not affected in the least. The oriental worldview explained that a subject may have his private law because the clemency of the ruler allows him this; the will of the ruler is the unique source of the rights that could be attributed to an individual. In Rome however there was never any doubt that the private law has its own genesis and source that is unrelated in any way with the existence of the supreme authority. Thus a basic distinctiveness of the private law set apart from the public one existed. It was understood that the resolution of 43 and this entire legislative direction only granted the ruler the right to suspend the private law in certain circumstances that were indicated and

defined by the supreme authority. This is contrary to what existed in the Hellenistic East.

There the divine ruler would condescend to make exceptions in favour of the private law; here in Rome the *populus romanus* made exceptions in favour of the public law. Here the public law could in a given case absorb the private law. Monism of law would result, but monism of the public law, that is, contrary to the situation in the East.

In practice this could have the same consequences, especially during a reign of terror. But the progress of history is ruled by abstracts and this Roman abstract could always be a point of attachment for a reaction coming from the side of the Roman civilization.

In Rome the principle of legal dualism remained, thus there was a perplexity of thought and so conflicts were to appear, because from this moment the whole future of the Roman state was to consist in the struggle of this dualism against the expansive attempts of the monism of public law.

Rome fell into the net of Cybele but the indigenous civilization was sufficiently strong that it was capable of resistance against the Orient. A historian must render Rome this justice that this resistance never ended, that the conflict with the spirit of the East continued unceasingly in spite of the fact that the results of this conflict were very variable. From where did Rome have so much strength? After so many triumphs of Cybele will it manage to save its civilization?

This civilization was saved by the fact that it was based on personalism and therefore it was capable of generating organisms.

How magnificent was the organism flourishing in Rome before it was subverted by oriental influences!

Orientalism attacked the very bond tying the Roman state with its society composed of peasants and the army. These two professions were closely interlinked and the same people were interchangeably the bond of society as peasants and the bond of the state as soldiers. An organism of communal life developed from this, one of the most magnificent ones known to universal history. “Cybele” came to destroy; she attacked the peasant and the soldier disfiguring this relationship, introducing decomposition and anarchy, she loosened the factors of common interest and finally she destroyed all sense of being together. She eradicated tradition and directed hopes for the future in separate and opposing routes. A decomposition of everything! The organism ceased to function. The orientalized minds did not perceive what was happening to society and as a rule they had no idea of the essence and importance of society, because they were concerned only about the state.

Nowhere in the east was there any concern for society and nowhere did states rely upon it. This is the basic difference between an organism and a mechanism. “Cybele” was changing the Roman organism into a mechanism and was directing it away from the pathway of Roman civilization.

An organism is born of personalism and thus it is based on unity in diversity and in public life it holds onto legal dualism, whereas monism derives from communalism, requires uniformity and it introduces legal monism into communal life, namely the exclusiveness of public law⁶.

⁶ For an explanation of the intricacies of these two lines of communal life

Thus there was a clash not only of two parties in Rome but of two great historical currents in which these parties were only local and temporary manifestations. The resolution adopted in 43 on the Forum represents a turning point. This type of decision of “the people” must have brought to senses any thinking citizen. The “republican” opposition grew in strength and even though it was beaten at Philippi (in 42) it generated a certain factor, at some time very influential in Rome, and later in decline, but now suddenly revived, namely the public opinion. Young Octavian was growing up against this background and finally he turned away from Orientalism stressing ever strongly his Roman identity in contrast to the total national indifference of Antonius.

Constant misunderstandings between Antonius and Octavian followed. There were small civil wars crisscrossing in various ways. There were conflicts over endowments for the soldiers. In order to reduce the dependence on one’s own army there appeared in this period of the triumvirates a desire to hire barbarian mercenaries. This was by no means a Roman idea but again a simple copying of the practices of Hellenistic statehood, particularly in Egypt, where the system of mercenaries had developed multilaterally. Thus foreigners entered the Roman army, and in this period they were barbarians from the Orient.

It was becoming increasingly difficult to find a Roman volunteer and there was a growing need for larger armies. In Italy there was a certain return to the land when the wars moved to countries that were too far away and it was only possible to

see Koneczny 1939. [Koneczny also writes about this in his later work now available in English *The Laws of History*, 2013, in chapters IV and VII].

obtain endowments somewhere in Syria or at best in the Balkans. Unfortunately small holdings proved completely uneconomical, thus a peasant who did not wish to serve in the army hundreds of miles away, who did not decide that he will never return to his native region but will settle as a veteran somewhere in Armenia or on the Euphrates married to some Asian, such a peasant preferred to rent a plot from some great landowner as an hereditary rent holder (*colonus*) or for 1/6th, 1/7th or even 1/8th of the crops as a temporary *politior* [or *partiarus*]. He was happy when the landowner accepted him because normally a slave was cheaper. Already Cato the Elder worked with slaves. It was easy to get slaves and they were cheap because they were war prisoners that had been sold *en masse*. The wars in Liguria, in Sardinia and Corsica, partially in Spain, “were simply hunts for people” (Piotrowicz 1935a, 316). Both officers and soldiers enriched themselves on this.

Thus in that period there is an increase in the number of *colons* and a decrease of volunteers for the army. Military commanders conducting domestic wars and the politicians who did not understand government without compulsion liked the system of having foreigners in the army and the financiers were making ever greater profits on the army. This system had also some honest supporters. Until then there had been no place in Roman statehood for a standing army (Piotrowicz 1935a, 517) and the barbarian units seemed to be a good beginning for it.

Having armies of various origins the triumviri were moving across all the three parts of the world, either chasing one another or fighting the onslaught of neighbours on their provinces, such as each one received and accepted in the allotments. The third in

the triumvirate, Lepidus, fell out worst in the general commotion; being deprived of his own army he finally had to accept the title of *pontifex maximus* [highest priest].

When the triumvirate changed in this way into a dual rule no third partner was searched for and Roman rule was divided into two “spheres of influence” (if I may be permitted to use a contemporary term). The line of division was drawn through Scodra and Illyricum, thus it was a boundary between the Latin West and the Hellenistic East. This border was delineated so precisely that it persisted over centuries as a boundary between two worlds. This was done deliberately, sharing between West and East, establishing as it were two states. Antonius chose Athens as his residence in 39, later however following the footsteps of Caesar he decided on Alexandria.

Antonius was ambitious. He wished to enlarge his domain and to rebuild as a whole the state of Alexander the Great and for this reason he wanted necessarily to break the Parthians. But he was not successful in this attempt after which for a long time the idea of inciting a war against the Parthians was abandoned. The Roman state was to remain universal, but it was to decide on its own about its boundaries beyond which it had no intention of moving. The view of Pompeius was confirmed.

But Antonius managed to conquer anew Armenia. He celebrated a triumph after this expedition but in Alexandria and not in Rome. Undoubtedly this was to mark the “promotion of Alexandria to the role of the capital of Antonius’s monarchy” (Piotrowicz 1935a, 503). Let us recall that already Caesar had planned this. Following on the footsteps of Caesar Antonius fell

also into the problem of Cleopatra, but he went further than his predecessor. Wishing to marry into Egypt, into its divine dynasty, he publicly married the Egyptian queen and endowed her with Roman properties. When however he sent a divorce letter (another custom taken from the East) to his wife Octavia, the sister of Octavian, the latter pushed through a resolution at the peoples' gathering depriving Antonius of rule over the East and declaring war against Cleopatra. This amounted to a declaration of war against Antonius.

This was a war for the totality of the Roman state against the eastern separatism of Antonius. How much better it would have been had two distinct states ensued! In this case Antonius was historically correct and history confirmed this many times – but historians have not always noticed this.

This is how the *Bellum Actiacum* [Actium war] of 31 broke out. Having won a naval victory at Actium Octavian in the following year changed Egypt into a province of Rome and so he became a single ruler. He was not to share power with anyone.

At Actium Sparta sent support to Octavian and units from Messenia fought on the side of Antonius; Athens was on the side of Octavian. All the Romans joined around the person of Octavian.

By now there was universal agreement for the earlier concept of Caius Gracchus that there should be only one person at the head of state, endowed with great power – and finally there was agreement about the person of the ruler, but there was still a common discord about the type of this supreme authority and about the nature of the new Roman statehood.

Should there be a return to Roman notions, or should the oriental, Hellenistic trend be followed? How is autocracy to be avoided, when there is the desire to have a single ruler, and is this at all possible? Is there no other way apart from reform that followed the oriental model?

The entire life of Octavian Augustus was spent on trying to resolve this problem.



ORGANISM AND MECHANISM

VII

The pressure of the Orient was very strong, yet the self defence of the Roman civilization lasted long. What happened since the domestic wars of Marius and Sulla can be described in a short schematic way as a conflict between two systems of communal life: between an organism and a mechanism. According to what method will the *orbis terrarum* [the world] be governed? Will some compromise be achieved or will a split become inevitable?

The Orient was always mechanical, never permitting any organic element; it had at its disposal a sufficient material superiority so as to impose on Italy an increasing number of its mechanistic factors. The Roman Empire was becoming mechanistic as it subjected itself to Syrian and Egyptian influences. The decline of the Empire consisted in a permanent leaning towards Orientalism, and when it finally drowned in it, there came an end to the state, to the nation and to the civilization.

Over extensive regions of the East that were rich, developed in the material culture to a much higher extent than Rome and as a result very influential in the imposition on the state of their own general features, the population managed without having any participation in governance. It had no political ambitions and only

those who had some personal interest in this were interested in the concerns of the state. The countries of the East were eternal mechanisms and no one considered this as something bad or even inappropriate. No one wished to change this. Obviously mechanism must have been a sensible arrangement for these peoples. But it was inappropriate for Italy and for provinces that drew from Italy higher levels of a political system.

Amidst the ever increasing conflict between these two basic currents there formed a whirlpool within which the future Byzantine mechanism was to develop. Searching for the origins of Byzantinism one has to enter into the thickets of the history of imperial Rome and to face the question of the fall of Rome. The Byzantine civilization would not have grown to such historical potency had Rome not fallen.

During the times we are approaching now in our investigation a reaction favourable for the Roman civilization appeared which was against the Syrian and Egyptian influences. The Roman organism was enriched by a potent factor and ally: national literature. As a general rule literature originates from personalism, is based upon it and it is only in the presence of personalism that it can flourish. It is not within communalism that great epic poetry arises (as well as the plastic arts and sciences), but exclusively in a personal way, this exclusivity being such that the master avoids crowds so as to maintain his creative force. By the nature of things literature springs from personalism and strengthens it, thus it acts organically. Mechanistic literature, arts, or sciences are an absurdity. In a mechanism they have to stay stuck at a low level, without the possibility of development.

Where does the dignity of the pen derive from? Literary forms sometimes serve abuses, but more frequently they serve some elevated ideals. Adding personalism to society and training in it they help in the formation of a national consciousness. Literature itself will not achieve this but it helps in this enormously. Hellas is a negative example of this – it never produced a nation; but in Rome the circumstances were favourable thanks to the unity of the triple law, and thus as a result a national consciousness was born of the literature. This was a new treasure in the development of communal life and in the whole of antiquity it was found only in the Roman civilization. Later it was to become an exclusive property of the Latin civilization; it was never available to Byzantinism!

But it has to be remembered that one cannot base the practice of communal life on literature. That is not its purpose and history enlists several most terrifying examples, beginning with the importation of Cybele to Rome. But one has to assert however that the strongest reaction against the gifts of Cybele was soon born in literature when it developed to a higher level and took over a dominant role.

At the turn from republican to imperial Rome there blossomed a magnificent flower: the golden age of Roman literature.

It was mentioned already that Horace referred to the whole period after the Gracchi all the way to Actium with a single word: *delirium*. He lived to see the second half of this. He was born in 65 and was 7 when Cicero's house on the Palatinate was "officially" burnt. He was 22 when the severed parts of Cicero's body were exposed for public view, also "officially". When Caesar adopted the title of emperor which implied the joining of the military and

political power Horace was in Athens and it was there that he joined with Brutus following the murder of Caesar. He took part in the civil war serving as a military tribune. He was present at the battle of Philippi. He managed to escape back to Italy and he paid for his opinions only with having the property that he had inherited from his father confiscated. For a living he had to accept a modest office job with a *quaestor*. It is then that he embarked on a literary profession, and he began with satire.

The “golden age” of literature and poetry had already dawned in Rome. A group of writers gathered around the aged and wealthy Catullus, who was born in 87. He came from an old and famous family, but he shunned the customary right to a career because he was so disgusted with the *delirium* raging around him. He did not search for any office wishing to be as far away from public life as possible. He was also an opponent of Caesar; he was one of the personal friends of Cicero. In order to avoid terror he became silent and he even formally excused himself. The dictators empowered to kill and rob had little use for him and so he closed himself in private life, immersed in chants as the prime writer of love poems in Rome. Thanks to his wealth he was able to gather around him a circle of friends among whom of note was the hardworking Cornelius Nepos who was less disposed to represent an opposition.

Virgil, much younger than Catullus, was born in 70 *idibus octobris* [during the ides of October] which were later referred to as the ides of Virgil. He was of poor health, unsuited for military adventures and had no such inclination. He lived and wrote in Naples searching for a warmer climate than in his native Cisalpine

Gaul where he had inherited a peasant farm. The *delirium* deprived him of it in 42 when Octavian (after Philippi) needed land for his veterans; his entire property was taken away from him “officially”, by the law of robbery. He could be happy that the right to murder had not been employed against him.

All these four (and several minor names) have been known to Maecenas who acquainted them with one another. Maecenas was a politician and aesthete in one person. He was a decided supporter of Octavian. He joined his army and was at Actium; in political intricacies he was often the right hand of the youngest of the triumvirate; he managed the most difficult issues for him and sometimes even substituted him in governing, watching over Rome for him. He became the personal best friend of the first emperor and remained so, but after Actium this was only in a strictly personal sense; he did not wish to have any official contact nor did he accept any office. Making use of his considerable wealth he organized such a literary circle, that the previous one of Catullus seemed to be an insignificant trifle. Catullus was 57 when Maecenas abandoned politics. He abandoned it because even he was overcome by an opposition mood. Only personal relationships remained which he used to make sure the emperor would sometimes hear the truth expressed without restrictions but with good intent. He extended his *maecenate* [patronage] over literature till the year 8 B.C.

Just as one refers to the Scipionic circle in the IInd century B.C. so it is proper to speak of the circle of Maecenas. He attracted also younger writers of which we shall mention the three most outstanding: Tibullus, an elegiac poet born 54, impoverished by

the civil wars, an *eques*; Propertius born in 49, a lyricist of love songs; and the youngest of the three, Ovid born in 43, the only one to survive Maecenas, even though in exile. He was a poet of the most exquisite language, proficient in many literary forms, also an *eques*, but shortly without any property yet inclined to live at a high standard and later of necessity he was a minor office worker. He was raised up by Maecenas who however proved unable to free him from the penalty of exile when he was forced to live among the “savages” on the north-western coast of the Black Sea. Let us point out that at issue was not politics but Eros which involved him unnecessarily in some affair in the court.

This whole “circle” was inclined to be oppositionist even though the younger members came upon already existing facts and they really had no possibility to think about being a political opposition. Besides them, belonging only indirectly to the circle was Livy (b.59 BC, d. AD 17) who was writing his history. He admitted that he had immersed himself in the study of the past in order to forget about the ignoble current times. Only one of the distinguished writers Sallust (86-35) bonded with Caesar, and he enriched himself much as governor of Africa – but after the death of Caesar he became a historian and he was praised for his impartiality.

This whole “circle” followed Hellenistic theses just as earlier the companions of Scipio, but with a very different result. They also recited Homer! Even though they were modern to the core, they remained under the influence of Alexandrian poetry. Callimachus, about whom we wrote in the previous chapter was the master for Catullus and Propertius; and his poetry was known

to all. Actually not only Callimachus was being imitated, because the Alexandrian perception was very strong. These were followers, not simple copyists, followers who in many respects stood higher than their masters. Each one of them tried to spend a few years time in Athens and almost every one of them did some travelling across Hellenistic countries. They were all from the Greek school; but Roman poetry of the time stood not only much higher than the Alexandrian one but also showed many original elements.

What is interesting is that the whole circle of Maecenas learned only aesthetics from the Greeks without adopting anything of the Hellenistic communal life. Not even Sallust! Not one of them had the psychology of a courtier. They accepted even great gifts from Maecenas; Virgil made use of the obliging favours of Maecenas and thanks to him he obtained a small holding near Nola from the government. He received at the same time signs of friendliness from Octavian-Augustus who was interested in the writing of the *Aeneid* (which lasted eleven years); but that is all. Virgil lived between Naples and Athens far away from any officialdom; he had no function, no title. Similarly Horace accepted from Maecenas a large Sabine farm with luxury buildings but when the emperor wanted to have him as a private secretary he refused. In their private lives there was no lack of “customs and behaviours” that are not at all exemplary (Maecenas himself gave a bad example), but as regards public life each one of them was a man of character. They held themselves proudly, they considered the pen as at least equal to the sword and they were not concerned about what the higher elites thought of them. What more, they

expected the higher elites to take note of what they represented – and indeed they manage to attain this.

A sense of great dignity of the writing profession developed in this circle, together with responsibility, and there was also a consciousness of professional collegiality. They considered themselves to be equal to one another. This is worth mentioning because they came from various social classes. Virgil himself came from a peasant family. His father was a village stove-fitter. He was 19 when his distant region (Andes near Mantua) together with the whole Cisalpine Gaul received Roman citizenship; throughout his life he regarded himself as a *facie rusticana* [rural face] (Haecker 1935, 28-30, 39). Horace was from Apulia, a son of a liberated slave (though a wealthy one). He interacted collegially with other writers who were *equites*, such as the aristocrat Catullus.

The life of these men who shied from participation in public life became in spite of that a part of Roman public life. They took upon themselves the role of observing and criticizing which they expressed sometimes only through silence and by removing themselves from the public sphere, by ignoring it. The majority of the Roman intelligentsia understood this very well. Literature was generating public opinion. In this lies the significance of their capabilities and effort. There had been men of letters in Rome long before them but only they managed to establish a community, an environment which influenced public opinion consciously.

In what did their opposition consist? There was nothing of a republican in Maecenas; neither was Brutus a republican in the sense of old Rome! They were all in agreement that there has to be a single individual at the head of the state entrusted with

considerable power. When Octavian suspected that Livy disliked him, he considered him a supporter of Pompeius but never a republican. They were against Caesar because they were afraid of complete orientalization. They did not accept the laws permitting murder and robbery. Nor did they want the transfer of the capital to Alexandria and they were strongly against the division of the state into two parts, an eastern and a western one. How Virgil understood the battle of Actium is to be found in his description of the oracle shield of Aeneas; engraved on it were Egyptian deities, particularly the dog-headed Anubis, confronting Venus, Apollo and Minerva; this was a conflict of the East with the West! It has been pointed out incisively that without Actium there would have been no *Aeneid* (Zieliński 1924b, VI 235, 238, VII 54, 57), which means that the great poem was written as an attempt to oppose Hellenistic Orientalism.

This work became the national Roman epic poem and who would deny it this characteristic and role? It is very likely that it was written with this intent in mind. Until then the *Annales* of Q. Ennius were considered as having such a role. They described Roman history from Aeneas to the times of Scipio the Elder (with whom the poet was on friendly terms). Only fragments of the great poem survived, thus we do not know its moral content, the approach to the subject, nor its tendency. Did Virgil take on the task of writing the *Aeneid* so as to give Rome a work in better language and in more perfect form? Or was the underlying message at issue? Since we cannot compare the works we have to leave this question without an answer. Perhaps the *Annales* were not tendentious at all. But the *Aeneid* is decidedly tendentious. Cast over the same theme

it had decidedly different consequences. If a German scholar could refer to Virgil as to the *Vater des Abendlandes* [father of the West] (Haecker 1935), this was because the *Aeneid* is decidedly anti-Hellenistic. Where in the days of Ennius a model of progress was seen there Virgil and his friends saw backwardness, something lower in respect to the high level of the Roman spirit.

The notion of a fatherland is linked to the love of the mother tongue. The Romans took from the Greeks the consideration of speech as a possible expression of Beauty. It is in this period that the Athenian schools abandoned the puffed up Asiatic style, that is, a Hellenistic one, and promoted a return to the simplicity of Atticism, the language of the IVth c. The Roman intelligentsia was concerned about the conflict of styles. It appears that the magnificent development of Latin in the second part of the Ist c. B.C. owes much to this focus on the Greek language. In the last days of Cicero Atticism was already victorious. It is noticeable that both Caesar and Brutus were Atticists.

The retreat of literature from the Hellenistic world exposed all the more the Roman national consciousness. The stronger literature stressed Roman patriotism the more it opposed oriental despotism. In this very patriotism there lay also a certain error when in the name of national ambitions it demanded the most extensive borders for the state. Due to this ambition the literature was opposed to the separating out of an eastern state. They were moving away from the Hellenistic world in theory, but in practice they did not wish to part from it, wanting to maintain the political union. Yet the good of the Roman nation required allowing the East to become separate even if that meant the leaving of Asia as

spoils for the Parthians. The continued political unity with the East required an increasing number of concessions to the Orient underwashing in this way the foundations of national consciousness and generating cosmopolitanism. In the next generation Pliny the Elder will proclaim these words: “(The Italian country) chosen by the providence of the gods to make heaven itself more glorious, to unite scattered empires, to make manners gentle, to draw together in converse by community of language the jarring and uncouth tongues of so many nations, to give mankind civilization, and in a word to become throughout the world the single fatherland of all the races” (Morawski 1924a 7).

For the time being there was rejoicing that at Actium the oriental camp was defeated. Let us recall that in the year of Caesar’s murder Octavian was 18 years old and at the time of the battle of Actium he reached 31. These are years when one is most sensitive to literary influences. He had a high aesthetic education. He appreciated literature and understood it. As a ruler he did much to ensure that the poets were never against him. Literature has this merit that it made Augustus increasingly conscious of his Roman nationality.

But political universalism continued to spread. New provinces were gained in Europe: Raetia, Moesia, Noricum, Pannonia. In Asia, following a war with the Parthians, the Armenian kingdom returned to Rome.

The rule over Asia and Egypt always brought to the fore the problem of the deification of the ruler. When in 29 Augustus was celebrating a triumph following the acquisition of Moesia the Senate proclaimed for him a number of dignities that were proper

only for the gods (Piotrowicz 1935a, 521). Augustus refused to accept them. But the East would not recognize him without deification! His governors were receiving divine worship; how was this problem to be resolved? Augustus therefore introduced some modifications into the cult but he forbade Roman citizens to participate in it (Piotrowicz 1935a, 522, 523), (just as Alexander did with respect to Greeks). He absolutely excluded deification in the West. We should not be scandalized by the fact that in Rome there were about 80 silver statues of Augustus put up by the state and by private persons. He ordered that they all be melted and that from the money so gained a golden vessel be made for Apollo on the Palatinate. Then how many marble and bronze statues did he have? How many of them were in the whole state (Friedländer 1910, 261)? Let us keep in mind that in antiquity portraits were made through sculptures and today we also have plenty official portraits; they are wherever one looks, even in pubs. In the East these were monuments of the gods or at least of descendants of the gods, thus they were as if some kind of an altar, but in the West they were only portraits of the monarch. Trying to find a compromise Augustus attributed an official significance to the cult of Roma that had been conceived in the Greek cities of Asia Minor as a convenient and readily pliable notion. With this it was difficult to bypass the person of the ruler. Thus once a year, on the emperor's birthday, a ceremonial *votum* [solemn proclamation] was made *ad nomen Augusti* [to the name of Augustus].¹ This amounted to the

¹ Ferrero was in error when he claimed that Gaul *dalla tradizione celtica* [following the Celtic tradition] received deification in a completely Egyptian or Assyrian manner. He was also wrong in saying that the building of the temple of Roma in Lugdunum [Lyon] in the year 10 B.C. was the beginning ... of

same as our “national holidays”. Initially it was only on special request that some provinces were permitted to have a *templum Romae et Augusti* [temple of Rome and Augustus]; in time however all the provinces received such temples. In Egypt the temple that was being built to Antonius with the change of incarnation was finished by Cleopatra as one dedicated to Augustus (Piotrowicz 1922, 30, 31; Fustel de Coulanges 1922, 212). Each “temple of Rome” could be a public meeting place for the local Romans in which state affairs were dealt with and the person of Roma was treated as we treat a national emblem today; while in the East Roma immediately became a goddess.

Augustus defended what was Roman. He forbade the erecting of temples to foreign gods within the city of Rome. He did not like when foreigners were awarded citizenship and he forbade members of the senatorial and *equites* families to marry with freed slaves (who by the nature of things were always foreigners). In his testament he recommended care for the purity of race and warned that Roman blood should maintain a privileged position in the state (Piotrowicz 1935a, 542).

He himself felt increasingly more secure in his position as the single ruler. He held all the traditional republican offices but for a lifetime. On a bronze plaque he proclaimed to future generations that he never acquired any portion of his power against the laws of the fatherland. There was only a half-truth in this, and the erection of this plaque was made following oriental customs. In 28 he also

a European monarchy (Ferrero 1910, 179, 180)! It is of course true that for the national holiday the leaders of tribes from the whole region arrived, but this is far from the beginnings of a representative system. This same error is in Morawski (1924a, 27, 49).

became the *princeps senatus* [leader of the Senate]. This was an ancient title given frequently in an honorific sense. It gave the privilege to be the first to speak in the Senate. It was an honorific title and nothing else! But if the *princeps* was at the same time a lifetime *censor*, who has the right to introduce somebody into the Senate and to expel from it, and who furthermore had ... the army? In 27 he received the title of Augustus, which remained as a title of all his successors. In 23 he was given *imperium* over the entire state, in Italy and in all the provinces. Single rule was already fixed multilaterally and it linked ever more visibly with autocracy.

The changed state needed a new kind of administration that had to be invented and this issue is always closely linked with the problem of organism and mechanism. Administration can be either organic or mechanical.

What was to be the constituting bond of the new state? The remnants of the peasants were dying out; there were scarcely a few hundred large landowners; in the army even the majority of the officers were foreigners. Augustus decided to base his statehood on bureaucrats but he had no intention of copying the Egyptian model. The great Roman officials beginning with the *aedilis* [magistrate] were entitled to hire assistants according to their own choice. These were their own personal officials, temporary ones, hired only for a year because the mandate of their employers was also for a year. The imperial officials however were in principle becoming employees for life because the emperor was a consul for life, a *praetor* etc. Thanks to this stability they were becoming public officials, even though initially they were to be only observers who were to supply information to the central

chancellery in Rome, but they were not representatives of the state. The functionality, adroitness and accuracy of these offices were generally evaluated positively.

Only in peaceful provinces was such an administration introduced. Troublesome provinces were subjected to military rule and a war commander had to have extensive powers. Thus the military administration was decentralized while the civil one was organized centrally according to an aprioristic plan. Centralism leads to uniformity. But how was one to rule both the East and the West? When both this and that was to be dealt with by the same central chancellery of the imperial court issues that were tackled always in an identical manner started to be resolved inappropriately because in a manner unsuited for the local conditions. After some time a purely mechanical administration had to develop from this. The East required a different administrative method than the West. Thus centralism was a bad administration for the entire state and it became a mechanizing factor. The Orient was forcing a new entry.

After the death of Augustus a thought provoking concession was made to the Orient. It was considered that in the interest of the state it is necessary to build a temple to *divi Augusti* [holy August] and it was erected at the feet of the Palatinate (Piotrowicz 1935a, 582). Thus an unshaken inherent law of history was becoming manifest: when equal rights are introduced, it is always the inferior course that wins.

By the power of this law the civil administration yielded in the face of the military one. It was not Augustus's administration that became the bonding force of the statehood, but the army, in spite of all his efforts. Even though his first successor, Tiberius

(AD 14-37), declined divinity he promoted orientalism in another way. During his rule a privileged guard was established, the praetorians, who very quickly became the ones who designated the current incumbent of the throne. Caligula, Claudius and Nero all made use of this route. Rome found itself in the hands of two powers that were inimical to the state and yet maintained at its cost: the praetorians and the municipal plebeian masses. Soon after the death of Augustus terror ensued and it did not leave Rome. A process began “which consisted in the gradual replacement of the rule of law by the rule of the leader” (Simanski 1931, 116).

At the same time the social bond was shaken through the orientalization of family relationships. The eastern facility of obtaining a divorce met with appreciation. Here Augustus himself gave a bad example; he sent Scribonia a letter of divorce (a purely oriental practice) on the very day she gave birth to his daughter [Julia] (Piotrowicz 1935a, 576). And how extraordinary was the *domus Julia* [house of Julia]! It requires quite some patience to fathom the genealogical table of this house, which in fact was not a house, and so it did not have a genealogy. With the dissolution of the family criminal behaviour appeared in home relationships. Already Tiberius introduced court crimes into the art of government. He murdered five times within his own family. Soon Caligula warned his grandmother Antonia: “Remember I am permitted to do everything with respect to everyone” (Piotrowicz 1935a 591). His statues were placed among the gods in the subdued countries (Friedländer 1910, 235).

Parallel to this and simultaneously various streams of Orientalism were flowing in. In the days of Caligula a new temple

of Isis was erected on Campus Martius in contradiction to the earlier prohibitions of the Senate. This was the Isis of Syrian origin. The next emperor, Claudius (41-54) abolished the prohibition of the Senate allowing the eunuch priests to leave the fencing of the Palatinate. This same emperor in his letters to procurators referred to himself as the “lord and god” and he erected a temple to himself in Britain. This is the same emperor who received guests in a mirror hall so that no one would approach him from behind. He ordered his wife Messalina, the most promiscuous of the promiscuous to be murdered (Piotrowicz 1935a, 623, 635; Poehlmann 1925, 32). Fourth in that line, Nero (54-68) poisoned his step brother Britannicus, murdered his wife, sent thugs against his mother and ordered his teacher Seneca to be killed in prison. His love affairs resulted in several crimes within the court. This very Nero was the first to adopt the eastern crown with rays (Bidlo 1917, 17). Caligula and Nero titled themselves gods (Poehlmann 1925, 33). We see how multidirectional was the pressure of the Orient.

The praetorians however were loosing their monopoly. The legions fighting in the field and expanding the borders reasoned very correctly that it should rather be their prerogative to appoint emperors. After the suicidal death of Nero the army from Gaul imposed Galba upon Rome. The praetorians murdered him the following year. Almost simultaneously other armies proclaimed Otho and Vitellius as emperors but both of them died a violent death. Only the fourth chosen one survived, Vespasian. Straight from the camp, from the just started Jewish war this soldier nominee rushed back to the capital. Having overcome the resistance of Vitellius he found general sympathy as someone who is personally reasonable

and just. The military origin of his power however included a great danger, because during his reign there were practically no Italians in the army (Piotrowicz 1935a, 535).

The reign of Vespasian and of his son Titus (79-81) was truly a time of rest – together scarcely 13 years. Titus was the one to destroy Jerusalem but beyond the Jewish world he was referred to as *amor et deliciae generis humani* [love and darling of humankind]. A very intriguing comparison! Neither Vespasian nor Titus adopted a title from their victories in Judea and never was the cult of Jahveh transferred to Rome. The Romans found the bloody offerings in the Jerusalem temple repulsive considering them as something below human dignity.

But in spite of this blood offerings did reach Rome! They were to be introduced by the younger brother of Titus, Domitian (81-96) whose rule was not a continuation of his father's and brother's but that of the Nero line. In official documents he called himself lord and god. He ordered that blood offerings be made, and from whole herds in front of his statues on the Capitol. Pliny wrote that this was "so that the vile deeds of the despot be honoured with as much blood as he shed himself". Domitian was cruel. His method of warring was described by the words: *ubi solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant* [where they make a desert they call it peace] (Piotrowicz 135a, 623, 624).

Domitian was murdered. This time the deed has to be assigned to the patriotic party which proved able to utilize intrigues conducted by the emperor's wife and to gain (i.e. bribe) the commander of the praetorians for their cause. Their candidate was Nerva, an eminent lawyer. The throne was taken by someone who

was not a general! How strong was the reaction of the opposition! The opposition in Rome was ... the Roman civilization standing up to oriental influences. They did not wish to tolerate any longer – what the satirist Juvenal coined as – the flow of Orontes (the main river of Syria) into the Tiber.

The golden age of literature had already passed. It was history writing that cared for the national conscience. History flourished beginning with Sallust and reaching its heights with Tacitus (54-117). The duty of the historians had been perfectly described by Cicero: *ne quid falsi audeat, ne quid veri non audeat historia* [Let history not dare to say anything false, let it not dare not to say that which is true] to which Tacitus added another motto: *sine ira et studio* [without anger and partiality]. In this the Romans proved to be good disciples of the Hellenists transmitting historical truths to future generations the need for which is still not understood in the East (Morawski 1924a, 228, 229). Investigations of matters of state and statehood, when it was not possible to deal with them directly, were dressed in the form of historical studies. The observation that only the classicists discussed issues of state is correct; among the newer peoples only those who were formed on the basis of the classical world address issues of the state (Zieliński 1925, 88).

The science of history was linked with jurisprudence, the golden age of which began precisely at that time towards the end of the first century after Christ. Legal practice was frequently adopted from the Hellenistic world but it is the Romans who made a science out of law. It has been correctly said that the greatness of Roman law lies in legal thinking (Mitteis 1921, 113). Formal jurisprudence began in Rome under Augustus and immediately

two schools emerged: Capito and Sabinus (who appeared later during the times of Tiberius) held on to the letter of the law, while Labeo, together with his student Proculus, inquired into the spirit of the law, into the intent of the lawgiver. They were attentive to the internal essence of the issue and they considered natural legal consciousness as an argument, thus they respected ethics. Law however will not manage without formalities. The Proculians referred for their purposes to the old legal custom that the rulings of a given office lose their force if they are not repeated by the successor at the office. They held that a sign that laws enacted by an emperor are to maintain their validity after his death is given when the deceased is “consecrated”. This meant that it had to be announced that by his life he proved that he is equal to the gods; this was to be a sort of deification *ex post*. This was conducted though a ceremonial rite, the details of which have survived (Friedländer 1910, 225).

Domitian was not given a funeral with a proper ceremonial and there was a spontaneous reaction against his memory. His statues were destroyed and even inscriptions were obliterated. Nerva immediately abolished the law about affronts to the imperial majesty and he recalled back all exiles of the previous reign. The jurists continued to act: they pointed out that proper formalities were not followed during the funerals of other emperors and thus the following had not been “consecrated”: Tiberius, Caligula, Nero, Galba, Otho, and Vitellius (Fiedländer 1910, Claudius was missing in this register). Thus the new emperor was bound only to follow the laws enacted by Augustus, Vespasian and Titus. The Roman organism was gaining superiority over oriental mechanism; the

Roman civilization was regaining its position. This was indeed a bright moment in the annals of Virgil's tribe.

In order to fix this state of affairs it was declared that Nerva is the initiator of a new national dynasty. It proved possible to execute these plans. Throughout the state, among all the peoples and all social classes the principle was accepted that the throne is hereditary. This proved so for a whole century, 96-192, with son ruling after the death of his father, brother after a brother and the dynasty of Nerva becomes famous. In the whole of history this is the greatest ... juridical masterpiece. This was a dynasty that had been legally concocted by adoptions. Nerva, Trajan, Hadrian and Antonius Pius were childless. All the more the desire that a dynasty take over became manifest.

But both camps, the guardians of the West and the glorifiers of the East, wished to enlarge the state. Willingly the new province of Dacia was welcomed as well as the conquest of Arabia. There was also solidarity with the new war against the Parthians, this time a victorious one because it brought the Roman legions to the Persian Gulf. But Hadrian (117-138), the adopted son of both Nerva and Trajan, understood that it is finally necessary to designate boundaries and he by his own decision returned Armenia, Mesopotamia and Assyria to the Parthians, recognizing the Euphrates as the boundary of the Empire.² Because of that he became unpopular so much so that after his death he was declined a consecration.

² [Translator's note. He also built a wall, leaving Scotland outside his Empire.]

Hadrian joined the camp of the jurists. He broke with the practice that the only access to public service and high honours was through the officers' ranks. After all the number of Roman citizens in the army was declining. Legionaries originating even from beyond the Empire were on the increase, and they were given citizenship in order at least to maintain the legal fiction that this was a national army. The Italians were practically free of military service. "The dominant nation completely let go of its arms" (Simanski 1931, 670; Piotrowicz 1935a 535, 537, 618). But the limits of the state were so extensive that even the entire population of Italy would have been insufficient to man the army.

Hadrian understood that the army cannot be the unifying bond of the state since long past were the times when it was a citizens' army – and also that the excessively distant borders may again subject the statehood to a dependency upon a mercenary army for whom the interests of the Roman nation would be indifferent and incomprehensible. For this reason he appointed jurists for public offices. He established a senatorial *consilium principis* [imperial council] as the central administrative organ the members of which were financed by the emperor and always travelled with him. And Hadrian journeyed over all the provinces of his enormous Empire (Piotrowicz 1935a, 665, 666).

On the initiative and effort of the distinguished jurist Salvius Julianus an *edictum perpetuum* [perpetual edict] was compiled in 132. Roman law developed primarily through the edicts of the *praetors* which were binding only for a year when the given *praetor* was in office, after which the new *praetor* had to announce again whatever of the former edicts he wished to leave as binding.

The list of these “magistrates” was already too long; it was easy to overlook something, to proclaim it inaccurately or even inconsequentially. Salvius studied this entire material and drew a collection of laws from it, which he proclaimed to be valid for all times. He was appointed *praetor* specifically for the purpose. Of course he was authorized by Hadrian to do this.

This resulted in a continuous line of great jurists among whom the main ones were Julianus, Papinianus, Ulpianus, Paulus, Modestinus – all of them were Proculians. Gaius who was of the Sabinians became famous and he operated during the following reigns all the way up to Marcus Aurelius. Gaius was the author of a handbook on institutions which was adopted by all schools of law. He described the family law, the property law, the law on obligations and legal proceedings. His works were still in use even in the VIIth c.

During his travels Hadrian arrived at the conviction that there is no chance of Romanizing the East as had happened in Spain and Gaul, and that the unity of the East with the state can only be maintained through Hellenization. He dreamed of a complete Hellenization of the Orient. Linguistic appearances suggested that this was close! In fact the Asia Greeks were increasingly losing their identity in favour of the local Asian one and they were hoping that Rome will sustain them. A community of interest between the Greeks and the Romans appeared in Asia, which was quite genuine. The Greeks would not establish a great state against the Romans; in fact for them as traders the extensive *Pax Romana* was a blessing. A certain duality of the Latin state in the West and a Greek one in the East would be such that it would not endanger the

unity of the Empire. Hadrian had a Hellenic streak in his mentality, a respect for the ancient Hellas; he did not suspect that this was to be only an antiquarian ideology. He raised Athens, a city he loved and he ordered that some Alexandrian buildings be copied in his own Tivoli. He established a pan-Hellenic union of cities to which even new Asian cities had to join even though they were Greek only to a limited extent.

Hadrian was followed by the “times of the Antonines” (still by way of adoptions) which were cherished by the national camp and gave it hope. Antonius Pius (138-161) at first had a conflict with the Senate which refused to consecrate Hadrian. Finally, although with difficulty the Senate was pacified and this needed strong pressures. The new emperor did not delineate the boundaries of the state and his successor Marcus Aurelius (161-180) warred successfully against the Parthians and incorporated again a part of Mesopotamia.

However the time of Roman civilization was coming to an end terminating the domination of western currents on the throne. It did not survive even to the end of the “Nerva dynasty” because when after four childless emperors the fifth one Marcus Aurelius finally had a son, Commodus (180-192) – he was a disappointment. His father is recognized in history as a personification of nobleness but the son was a total contradiction and he began a new period, with a return to the customs of Caligula and Nero.

The backward movement towards orientalizing came quickly and easily. There were two reasons why the efforts of the adoptive dynasty could not be rooted deeply into the foundations of society. Their efforts were in vain, because the Orient won

anyway! The western or eastern focus depended as it turned out on the monarch, on the direction he chose to support. Is not this in itself an oriental feature?

We search therefore for the causes of the evil. The first one lies in the fact that it is impossible to be civilized in two different ways, thus there has to be a civilizational commensurability between the public and the private life. The “dynasty” operated in a Roman manner in public matters but in private ones it was oriental. Four childless emperors! Hadrian owed negative reactions against himself in a large measure to the fact that he travelled the world over with his lover Antinous – there were thousands of statues of the latter and after his death the emperor raised him to the rank of heroes. The bad example came from above. There were fewer embarrassing marriages *sub manu* [under the hand, with the wife handed over to the husband with all responsibility of the father being ended]. The majority went for easy life, thus the number of men of character declined. Life was being organized according to an oriental mode. In the IIIrd c. A. D. this was to bring terrible consequences.

Besides a strong material force was operating, namely the affluence of the East, while Italy was becoming increasingly pauperized. The creators of the universal state were becoming impoverished in their own Empire because they refused to deal with trade. It was already during the Punic wars that universal trade was knocking at their doors. Since they disregarded it, it went into foreign hands. There is no historical life without an exchange of goods, there is no country without trade, and when the local people are incapable of it or dislike it, a foreigner will come to

replace the locals. The foreign character of trade was breaking up both society and the Roman state. The great trade of the Roman state was directed against the Romans and their pauperization was pushing them to an increasingly backward position in respect to the East. Eastern traders were making profits and transferring them eastwards, and the West became only a terrain for exploitation. The absence of a Roman trading class constitutes an important cause of the fall of Rome. When tragically agriculture ceased to be profitable the Italians could not avoid a general impoverishment, falling all the more victim to foreign trade.

The nation composed of derailed peasants was falling into an abyss in spite of the fact that the patriotic camp made efforts to save the peasant class. Land was bought for 150 million *denarii* to set up peasant settlements (Piotrowicz 1935a, 636). It was bought, and not expropriated, in order to give it to others! During the reign of Trajan (98-117) the Italians were forbidden to settle in the provinces (and the emperor himself was descended from immigrants from Spain) and senators who came from the provinces were obliged to invest a part of their property in Italy. Obviously this was inspired by the “need to cultivate fallow land”. But these were artificial means, thus they did not achieve their aim. It is not possible to generate an organism in a mechanical way, nor will an organism be helped by mechanical means. Thus the peasant holdings continued to disappear which can be explained sufficiently by the increasingly dangerous depreciation of the currency.

As a consequence of the fall of the currency – particularly when there were attempts to save it through falsification, i.e. by

increasingly adding copper to silver – there were bankruptcies, particularly of those who were already financially weaker, that is, the peasants. They abandoned their farms en masse. There was not enough room for them all in the city living at the expense of the government. The large landowners received them willingly as small lease holders. It also happened that a farmer gave his farm to the large owner on condition that he will continue to till it as a lease holder. Thus the *colons* appeared, who already in the days of Hadrian represented the main kind of agricultural worker.

The colonate was also employed in state (imperial) holdings with whole patches of land being rented to the so called *concurctores* who in turn leased away small plots to the *colons*. They did not till the land themselves; they were only businessmen dealing with the splitting up of the land and the land itself, as well as the *colons* were the material capital of their businesses. The conditions of lease were various, depending on circumstances, usually for a period of 5 years with the proviso that unless notice was given it would be prolonged indefinitely. The rent was to be paid in cash or in goods; sporadically the *colons* accepted to work on land that remained in the direct hands of the owner (Stein 1928, 19, 20).

The situation of the *colons* deteriorated and quickly. They were given harder terms on each renewal of the contract and there was the tendency to change them into subject people (Piotrowicz 1935a, 686, 711, 712). The cause pushing both sides in this declining direction lay in the monetary situation. Depreciation of money was raging for quite some time and soon under Marcus Aurelius the level of copper in silver coins was 35%, while under

Septimius Severus it already reached 60%. When because of this an increasing amount of money was needed to pay for rent, and cash became in short supply, labour was therefore offered instead³ (Piotrowicz 1935b, 475, 476). Poor money generates poverty in all social relationships, a decline in crafts and techniques as well as in the sciences, literature and art⁴.

The experience was also made that soldiers are not a good element for the settling of land. Thus instead of settling veterans young volunteers at the beginning of their military careers were settled. This however happened only in the northern regions to which no Italian wished to go. Under Marcus Aurelius true military boundary regions were established with such settlers. They were not allowed to abandon their land and at the same time they were to be ready for military service on short notice. But was this emergency service Roman?

Also within the state German prisoners were settled because there was a shortage of hands to labour on the land. These were tied to the soil. They were referred to as the *inquilini*. In this manner the Roman society was gradually infiltrated by barbarian elements.

The greatest evil however lay in the fact that those who were enriching themselves were foreigners. The industrial wealth increased throughout the entire state because the addition of each province at the same time increased the region of peace: the *Pax Romana* was being born. Ancient Sidon and Tyre revived again because without any exceptional risk it was possible to export

³ The same sort of process took place in Poland.

⁴ The law of Copernicus.

to all the corners of the world in safe peace. Unfortunately the Romans themselves did not participate in this great movement; they remained only the consumers of trade and industry. Even in Gaul the Roman settlers were only farmers. In Spanish cities the majority of the population was not at all Roman. The proof lies in the fact that these cities were given Latin rights, obviously not to the Romans. The level of material affluence was raising but the money spent on this never returned; it drowned irreversibly in the pockets of the Greeks and Syrians. Numerous eastern traders and industrialists were acquiring Roman citizenship and settling permanently in Italy as *equites*. This class was operating with large sums of money and was therefore deciding about economic issues. They were Latinized linguistically, but in spirit they did not become Romans. These *equites*, some of whom originated from the East and who soon were to become the majority among them were the best line of transmission for all oriental influences. Every government could count on them as long as the *Pax Romana* was expanding. They were happy to see the acquisition of new provinces: Cappadocia in 17, Britain in 43, Mauretania Tingitana, Mauretania Caesariensis, Licia, Thrace, Judea (in the years 44-54). The sphere of economical unity of the state grew. Whole new countries were being opened up for business in the state and on the state, which was a speciality of the *equites*. The Orient was spiritually closer to them because it was incomparably richer and provided more, ever more, materials for speculation. Increasingly the *equites* were becoming less traders and industrialists and instead they became intermediaries between the East and the West.

For a long time the *equites* dealt with the leasing of taxes. With time from being the ones who leased and sub-leased and being various intermediaries in the process they turned into being state officials. The collection of taxes incorporated many other agencies which were included in the new system of statehood generating many new offices. During Hadrian's times the *equites* were as if designated to be administration officials; higher officials were appointed exclusively from this group of people (Piotrowicz 1935a, 666). Probably these were *equites* of Roman origin who turned into bureaucrats. Apparently, theoretically, the relationship of the officials to the citizens was of a wide nature but in practice it boiled down to the role of the tax collectors. This contact with the tax official became ever closer as the pressure of the fiscal policy increased and the pauperized population was increasingly in arrear in paying taxes.

Hadrian was right in abolishing the leasing of taxes and he adopted the system of a direct tax administration. This undoubtedly was a relief for the population. Who could predict how the "Nerva dynasty" would end and what would happen after that? Absolutely no one realized that engaging in trade has a direct impact on the standard of living.

Probably the affluence of Spain and Gaul served as an illusory example. Italian peasants emigrated willingly there because they experienced peaceful prosperity and generally had better conditions there than in Italy; but it was not that they were becoming rich there. They restricted themselves to the cultivation of olive trees and vineyards there (by the extent of these two

cultivated plants one judges the expansion of the Hellens and the Romans). The great affluence of Gaul was based on industry.

Besides Egypt and Syria Gaul was becoming the third most important industrial centre; there was the development of ceramics, glass works, metallurgy, textiles, dying, tin and silver coating as well as enamel coating. At the mouth of the Rhone industry had existed for ages. There were old Phoenician settlements there and Massalia was always an important industrial centre. Caesar wanted to weaken it because it was resisting him and the city had to be taken by force. Arles at the mouth of Rhone was to become a competitive city, but the rivalry did not develop. But in Marseilles and in its vicinity the Greek language prevailed “at sittings and in the streets” and it spread widely encompassing also Arles⁵ (Morawski 1924a, 34, 36).

We know what sort of terror Caesar used to pacify Gaul, all the way to the amputation of hands of a whole tribe, to the elimination of women and the deliberate provoking of famine. Augustus organized the province into 64 regions according to the tribes. Soon the more affluent Gauls started to move out of the clan system in order to adopt the Roman triple law. A part of property was offered to officials who decided about the acquisition of Roman law within which there was private property and the right to make a testament. Under Roman influence the emancipation of the family began in Gaul.

⁵ The Greek language remained there also after adopting Christianity, both in the Church teaching and in the liturgy. Even in the VIth c. the people of Arles (Arelate) sung holy hymns both in Greek and in Latin.

It is easy to recognize these new citizens because they had even “four-part” surnames. On the third place, the name of the *tribus* was placed, to which they were assigned in Rome. This can be found not only in Gaul and Spain but also in Asia, Greece, Moesia, Pannonia and even among the Germans and Britons.

Around the year 75 (that is in the days of Vespasian) Gaul was the most peaceful province. Josephus Flavius writes in his *The Jewish War* (which at that time he was translating from Chaldean to Greek) that the whole of Gaul “not because they are of effeminate minds or because they are of an ignoble stock ... are kept in servitude by twelve hundred [Roman] soldiers”. This was after the uprising (69-71) of Civilis, the prince of the Batavi. When a plan was proposed that the Romans themselves together with Gauls should establish an independent *imperium Galliarum* (so as to separate themselves from the orientalization of Rome), when the legions were turning to the side of the insurgents, the Gauls remained faithful to the central authorities (Piotrowicz 1935a, 612). Tacitus reported that at the time there was a meeting of the tribal leaders of Gaul at which they decided to remain faithful to Rome. But at the time – as Tacitus writes – all the important Gauls in the cities already had Roman citizenship. A poor man joined the army, was attached to a cohort as a *peregrinus* [free provincial subject, not a Roman] and after a 20-year service he obtained hereditary citizenship that was transferred onto his children. It was said about the relationship of Gaul to Rome that: “Rome allowed them to remain Gauls but they wanted to be Romans.”

All historians agree that Gaul constituted for Rome a counterbalance against the pressure from the Orient. At the turn

of the IInd and IIIrd c. the Roman intelligentsia started to emigrate there also, because the pressure from the Orient grew and it had an impact primarily in the capital of the Empire. The throne of the world was sinking quickly and deeply into Orientalism. Syrian influences were joined by Egyptian ones. The beginnings of the fascination with Egypt date back to the days of the triumvirates. The Egyptian statehood had a decisive imprint upon the Roman state at the turn of the IInd and IIIrd c. A. D.

When finally the fifth of the “Nerva dynasty” had a son of his own reality hit with the full strength of derision. Commodus (180-192), a lecher was cruel and in his court composed of freemen from the East one could obtain everything for money. He had the ambition to “shine with fame as an athlete and gladiator”. He must have been mentally deranged because he appointed as many as 25 consuls in the single year 189 (Piotrowicz 1935a, 690, 691). Finally he was murdered by his own entourage.

There was still something Roman in Rome because after the death of Commodus the Senate called for the destruction of all of his statues. Pertinax was proclaimed emperor in 193. He intended to return to the tradition of cooperation with the Senate. In Egypt at the time all went around with laurels for two weeks praying and making offerings. Was Pertinax so sympathetic, or was this only an occasion to expand the celebration for a whole two weeks? Egypt was full of celebrations, even on the occasion of some office changing its location (Gumowski 1927, 293).

The new emperor did not survive till the next year because he was murdered by the praetorians who complained that he was stingy. Let us mention here that thriftiness was the rule among

the emperors; only Caligula and Nero were reckless in spending. The only exception was readiness to construct extravagant buildings (Hadrian excelled in this) (Friedländer⁶ 1910, III 8). The praetorians put a wealthy man, Julianus Didius on the throne, who promised to pay them 7500 denarii per head. But the legions that were in the field proclaimed three different men at three different locations as emperor.

The closest one was Septimus Severus (193-211) who was in Pannonia, and he was the first to enter Rome. He quadrupled the praetorian guard and forced the Senate to recognize Commodus as god. Septimus was from a Punic family “in which it was said they still used the Punic language”. According to a serious scholar he was an avenger of Hannibal and so he “hated the Romans and despised them” (Meyer 1921, 99). He was married to a Syrian daughter of a high priest from Emesa. Thus “he was completely alien to the old Roman traditions”. What great egalitarianism! Since with equal rights it is always the inferior element that takes precedence, victory was assured for oriental mechanism over Roman organism, or what was left of it. Septimus Serverus decidedly broke away with the illusion of any respect for a rule of law. The dominant position of Italy was also irreversibly lost (Piotrowicz 1935a, 752, 753, 756). The complete ruin of the population ensued due to the extravagant economy of the officers, who had primarily been recruited in Illyricum, a province that

⁶ The opinion of this author is the more significant because he made comparative studies; in his universality he reached even Radziwiłł Panie Kochanku [a Polish XVIIIth c. bon vivant], Russian banquets, etc.

was culturally on the lowest level. The intelligence of the emperor himself is testified by what he did with Byzantium.

During the war over the throne this city was taken over by the counter-candidate Pescennius who was recognized at that time by the Asiatic provinces; after all Byzantium gravitated more to Asia than to Europe. The city defended itself heroically for three years. Septimus not only took revenge by mass murders, confiscations etc, but he changed the great city into a *kome*, i.e. a village, which he attached to the neighbouring region of Perinth. But Byzantium being a great trade centre had such an importance for the state that within a year it proved necessary to withdraw the unwise decision (Friedländer 1910, 256).

It is the arch of triumph of this Septimus that we admire on the *Forum Romanum*. He organized the triumph after a new war against the Parthians during which he reached as far as Babylon. It was then that the final decision was made to turn the Roman Empire into a mechanism.

In the administration of the new province of Mesopotamia Septimus abolished the method employed since the days of Hadrian and he introduced Egyptian statehood which was strictly bureaucratic. In the next generation this was to be extended over the whole state (Piotrowicz 1935a, 781).

But even in such times the jurists managed to do something good! The famous Aemilius Papinianus (b. 140) used his old personal acquaintance with the emperor. He accompanied him to Britain as a *praefectus praetorio*, [praetorian prefect] to obtain his agreement for the improvement of the judiciary. He was to be

the guardian of the emperor's sons, Geta and Caracalla⁷. The sons held onto the instruction given by their father who said: "enrich the soldiers and mock of the rest" (Lot 1927, 11). They however turned their armies against one another generating a terrible civil war which was won by Caracalla through much murder and assassinations. When Papinianus publicly condemned these crimes he was murdered. The works left by him formed until the days of Justinian the core of Roman jurisprudence. His place as the prime jurist was taken over by his assessor Ulpianus.

Caracalla erected a temple to Isis within the *pomoerium*, on the Quirinal hill. This meant full equality for eastern cults within Rome itself. Then the granting in 212 full Roman citizenship to all free people of the provinces was a consequence and a complement of the former decision. Mechanism and cosmopolitanism triumphed simultaneously.

Roman jurisprudence however assured that polygamists were excluded from citizenship and this was a great restriction. In some countries it meant the elimination of the locals. Old Roman views were also maintained in the fact that children of concubines were in no legal relationship to the father, not even after the father married later the mother; the children had to be adopted. In spite of all the promiscuity Roman disgust of bigamy prevailed to the very end, at least a rejection in the legal sense. For the jurists this was always a *crimen stupri* [crime of rape].

Macrinus murdered Caracalla (217) and having murdered him he decided to inscribe him among the deities (Fridländer 1910, 256). After less than two years the infamous Heliogabalus

⁷ About the horrible attitude to their own father see Burckhardt (1880, 11).

(218-222) became emperor, a 14-years old high priest of Elagabal, the sun god in Syrian Emesa, a most promiscuous lecher and madman. His deity lived, similarly as Cybele, in a holy stone. This was brought to Rome and placed in a temple on the Palatinate; legions were placed under this deity's protection and the Capitoline Jupiter and other Roman gods were made subject to it as servants. The emperor himself performed orgiastic ceremonies in the presence of the most important dignitaries. Continuing the words of Juvenal we can say that not only the Orontes flew into the Tiber, but it caused a veritable flood of Orientalism. This emperor was murdered by the praetorians because they were ashamed of him! Even for them it was too much when the emperor was giving highest honours to dancers, circus coachmen and barbers. Soon afterwards the holy stone was sent back to Emesa and the temple on the Palatinate was destroyed (Piotrowicz 1935a, 761).

Thus the Roman phoenix was still smouldering under the Syrian ash. Ulpianus managed to enter the court and he even became a teacher of Alexianus, the adopted son of Heliogabalus, who took the name Alexander Servus (222-235) when he was on the throne. For a few years the jurists Ulpianus and Julius Paulus stood at the head of the government. A "rapid restitution of the seriousness and importance of the Senate" resulted. A sector of the Senate composed of 10 people was to form a permanent council assisting the emperor. As if a return to the days of Hadrian! This would amount to the end of praetorian statehood. Thus for three days in 228 the praetorians fought on the streets of Rome against the senatorial party representing the West. This battle of the jurists with the marauding soldiers was the last battle for the Roman

civilization in Rome, the last uprising of an organism against a mechanism in communal life. Unfortunately in vain! Finally the praetorians set fire to the houses of the proponents of reform and Ulpianus was quartered in front of the emperor (Piotrowicz 1935a, 762, 764). All future emperors remembered the lesson.

The works left by Ulpianus comprised a third of the *pandectae* [compendium of Roman law]. With all respect to their civil and juridical achievements the accusation has to be made that it was during the life of Papinianus and Ulpianus that the principle of absolutism was formulated in the two universally known theses: *Princeps legibus solutus* [the prince is above the law] and *Quod principi placuit, legis habet vigorem* [what pleases the prince has the strength of law]. There is no proof than any one of these jurists is the author of these formulations, but were they able to combat them openly? Papinianus paid with his head for the condemnation of political murders. Ulpianus paid with his life for wishing to cut off the hydra's head of the praetorians. Is that not enough? The fact that they both came from Syria is of no importance here because they were not Syrian by origin but Romans, descended from Roman settlers.

After them juridical scholarship declined. Soulless and thoughtless commentaries replaced it. The interpretation of law became the sole responsibility of the administrators. Egyptian bureaucracy developed. The proponents of organism as a method of communal life were left with nothing else apart from the careful sheltering of tradition. Generally they shied from accepting any official functions (Boissier 1891, II 360).

At that time a new wave of Orientalism fell upon Rome, this time from Iran. The Parthians, under the Arsacid dynasty established a strong state and they separated themselves completely from any links with the Hellenistic tradition. They conquered the whole of Persia but later they were chased out by the Iranian Sassanids who considered themselves to be the successors of the Achaemenids. A neo-Persian state (226-636) was born which claimed all the countries that were once under ancient Persia, i.e. almost all Roman possessions in the East. And the military fortune was very variable.

Also Alexander Severus was victim of a murder plot and his successor by the will of the army was Maximinus (235-238), who was from Thrace. He never even bothered to visit Rome and he could not speak Latin properly. When amidst the general turmoil three Gordians were elevated to the throne (238-244) the right of the soldiers to name emperors was unquestioningly accepted. On the basis of this law in 244 Philip, an Arab, a son of sheik from Hauram was proclaimed emperor, and after him Decius (249-251), the first emperor from the primitive Illyricum⁸.

In the days of Decius there was the first universal persecution of Christians.

Christianity has been seeping for long into the countries and peoples of the *orbis terrarum* [the world]. We have not dealt with this issue so far so as to attach greater significance to it dealing with it separately. With the arrival of Christianity the problem of organism vs. mechanism deepened because this is related to the question of priority between the physical and the spiritual forces.

⁸ Burckhardt, 1880, claims that he came from Trans-Jordan.

Never before in history has this problem been so described in its deepest sense. A new worldview was born concerning all fields of communal life which were to form a new method for society and the state.

Christianity stood up to compete with other worldviews for the “governance of souls”. It will turn out that the Roman worldview by no means led to persecutions. They flowed from the hegemony of oriental worldviews, from the fact that Syrian and Egyptian mechanisms engaged in combat against the highest organism.

WORLDVIEWS

VIII

It is obvious there was no incident in universal history that was more significant than the transformation of the Gospel message into the Church. Notions about the relationship between the natural and supernatural world widened and deepened, encompassing basically all the manifestations of human life and this was later expressed more closely in the Catholic view that all work can be sanctified. Reflections upon God and His position with respect to nature and man led to an extensive theological science. There were some articles of faith in paganism, they exist in Brahmanism or in Islam, but Christianity introduced the reasoning mind into the field of dogma, generating by this a new philosophical [theological] science. Furthermore, Catholic theology has two other disciplines, namely ethics and ecclesiology. Some other Christian denominations have none of this, while others engage in them only in an elementary and fractional way (for example not touching upon the ethics of public life). The Roman Church directs her faithful towards the afterlife through the perfection of earthly existence, not only in its private aspect, but also in its public life. The eastern denominations do not engage in this at all.

In the history of the Church there is a great field to which the title could be given: the Church in the face of temporal issues. We shall be copiously drawing material from this field in the following parts of this study.

The superiority of Catholicism consists of the fact (among others) that it does not shy away from looking into the whirlpool of social, national and state issues. Against the background of this approach there arose the question of the supremacy of forces: which one, the physical or the spiritual is to have the highest role? Is supremacy to be left to the material forces that for centuries were organized by the states of the ancient world, or is it to be attributed to the spiritual realm? In pre-Christian times the sciences and arts occasionally did grow out of some spiritual forces, but all the others were left meandering with no direction. Spiritual forces – all and every one of them – were to be organized for the first time in history by the Catholic Church. This new issue for a long time was completely incomprehensible to entire generations. The role of the Church in history consists in defining this issue and in the defence of this position. When the history of the Church is studied from this point of observation it appears in a new light, more extensive than before. A great number of historical circumstances that had not been noticed so far and which are for the Church most honourable thus come to the fore.

The Roman civilization could be saved only by the cooperation of the tribe of Virgil with the spirit of Christianity. Why was this so difficult? What were the obstacles?

Several times the Church suffered from severe persecutions, beginning with the days of Nero. At that time Christians were still

confused with the Jews, but this does not explain the issue. The persecutions would have occurred anyway even without this error because the government at the time was against all those whose worldview opposed despotic rule, that is, every opposition that saw the basis of public life in legality and righteousness, in other words, all those who revered ethics more than the throne. Nero molested also the heathens and his greatest fury was addressed against the Stoics.

The second persecution broke out in the days of Domitian. He also persecuted both the Stoics and the Christians. The *rescriptum* [imperial constitution] of the year 93 covered both these groups. Teachers of this philosophy, among them the main representative of the Stoics, Epictetus, were banished from Rome and soon from the whole of Italy. That Christianity was already being adopted in the highest spheres is seen from the fact that in 95 the cousin of the emperor, consul Flavius Clemens was among the condemned; he was executed and his wife was condemned to exile (Piotrowicz 1935a, 635). Linked with this is the martyrdom of Pope Clemens I who was the second (or third) successor to St. Peter. There were conversions in the entire imperial family. Stoicism was an intermediary, it was a preparation. In any case the repeated simultaneous persecution of both groups is noticeable. Since this phenomenon occurred twice and will occur again the simultaneity was not from some accidental circumstances but had deeper causes.

These two currents met also later but without a mutual understanding and they never coalesced into a single worldview. A converted Stoic ceased to be a Stoic; there are no Christian Stoics.

The Stoic Roman heroes were often opposed to Christianity. Gradually however the currents approached one another.

The historical study of the first Christian centuries will have to deal with this problem more closely.

Obviously there must have been some commensurability. In both these currents there was some internal life on the basis of personalism; this must have led to converging points in ethics. A surprised Stoic was increasingly discovering that a Christian was behaving in some situations in the same manner as he would act himself and on the other hand the Christians were discovering much of Christian ethics in the stance of the Roman opposition.

The so called practical philosophy that derives from Rome was developed from the works of a reformer of Stoicism, Panaetius (a friend of Scipio Africanus). The purpose of life was a subject of consideration and this led to the problem how a man with a higher intellect was to organize his life. The earlier Greek *kalokagathia* [chivalrousness] was acquiring a more multilateral sense and it deepened in the Roman *humanitas* that required a balanced development that was intellectual, aesthetic and ethical (Piotrowicz 135a, 332). One has to admit that when there was a conflict the Stoics admitted the hegemony of ethics. Thus they attached the highest supremacy to spiritual forces¹, just as the Christians².

¹ This was manifest already in the old Hellenic philosophy but it was not generally accepted. I am not entering more deeply into this issue because I am not writing a treatise on the history of Greek philosophy.

² In the history of the Church the differences between Christianity and Stoicism are dealt with fully; I am only pointing out additionally the similarities with respect to ethics.

In these Roman-Christian relationships the question of monotheism was as if left in the second plan in respect to ethical issues; this is different from the approach of Greek friends of Christianity, for whom monotheism was decisive. Already in mid-Ist c. after Christ no one was persecuted for monotheism in the Hellenistic world. The Greek intelligentsia at the time was either atheistic or believed in one God (Piotrowicz 1935a, 623, 624). History places here before our eyes a peculiar fact that Greek monotheism did not devote much attention to ethics.

Stoicism, even though it originated from Greece, was as a rule held only by Latinized Greeks, and the Hellenistic world was indifferent to it. Whereas in Rome it became a national philosophy, constantly formulated and developed, but the Italian Stoics became acquainted more fully with the issue of monotheism only due to the mediation of Christians.

Stoicism however was exclusively for the elites; only Christianity became a religion available to all without losing anything from its high ideals. In this lies the fundamental importance of “the Church in respect to temporal issues” and the basic difference with Stoicism.

It was easy for a Roman official to put a Christian behind bars for an affront against the majesty when he refused to make offerings to a statue of the emperor. Various misunderstandings could have developed, as for example during a *concilium provinciale*. It was natural that it met by a temple of Roma and it began with the paying of homage to the state and to the head of state in a manner that was locally customary. Judging from the numerous cases of the persecution of Christians it appears that the authorities themselves

required only that some incense be placed before a statue³, just as we today place flowers in front of monuments. This act could be given various interpretations depending on the time, place and circumstances. The more public life in Italy was becoming oriental, the more easily could such an act mean the giving of an offering to a deity. Thus a Christian could invite persecution even when the government had no intention of persecuting Christianity; he would have been inviting the authorities to act against him.

Beginning with the days of Trajan, officials were required not to spy upon Christians nor were anonymous denunciations to be followed up. But a denunciation in which the denunciator exposed himself as a witness and took responsibility for his act was not to be ignored. In such cases it was required that the Christians would pay public homage to an image of the emperor. And since the deceased “consecrated” emperors were to be considered as gods the Christians were in a situation that led either to apostasy or to martyrdom. For this same reason a Christian frequently was unable to hold any office. The situation was all the more severe when the ruling emperor required that he be recognized as a god while he was still alive. In the East there was much bad faith in such situations whereas in the West the Stoics often helped the Christians to extricate themselves from collision with official formalities.

In the East Gnosticism was full of bad faith towards the Christians. These two extremes of worldviews, creationism and

³ The suggestions repeated by Fustel de Coulange [1923] that taxes were collected to maintain the cult of Roma prove all the more erroneous.

emanationism clashed violently. Gnosticism was never persecuted because being born of emanationism it favoured despotism.

Gnosticism spread in the West together with oriental industrialists and major traders who were settling there, and these benefited eagerly from every occasion to harm the Christians. As an example one can quote the serious incident of persecution that occurred during the reign of a noble Stoic Mark Aurelius. Eastern influences operated also during his rule and there was no longer any chance of eradicating the evil. Compromises were made to pacify something, weaken the evil or postpone it. This Stoic when he received the throne, had to make some concessions to the praetorians. He was the first to give them a *donativum*, a payment made after taking over office, *ex post*, thus maintaining some level of appearances. This did not exclude the possibility of making an earlier agreement about the size of this donation, and ensuring that it was not a hard condition for the continuation of the “Nerva dynasty”.

It was during his rule that in 177 in Lugdunum (Lyon) 48 Christians were martyred simultaneously. There must have been a signed denunciation. It is intriguing that the verdict of death was made under pressure from the population. Thus it was not the state authorities by their own initiative and wish that did this. The Lugdunum authorities were under some pressure coming from a part of the local population that was deliberately against the Christians. The population of Lugdunum was to a large extent of Asia Minor origin, using the Greek language. This was a distant trade and industrial centre on the mode of Massalia. Gnosticism was dominant there or at least held a very serious position since

the Christians invited to Lugdunum a learned specialist, namely St. Irenaeus, who had studied in Smyrna, so that he would combat Gnosis. The Gnostics called for the help of the authorities. They must have feared that Christian propaganda will win. St. Irenaeus arrived in this very year 177, became a bishop and lived in Lyon till his death in 202. Thus he had no intention of returning to Asia. In Lugdunum he wrote “five books” in Greek against the Gnostics. He must have had an opponent right there in Gaul. Very likely Gnosticism affected also the Romans and Latinized Gauls since the treatise of St. Irenaeus was translated into Latin (Poehlmann 1925, I 625).

This bishop claimed that “a truly Christian messianic state must come”. It is a pity that he lowered the subject by proposing a utopia above all utopias because he described life in such a country (Boissier 1891, I 277, 278, 286-288). From this we can see to what extent the Christians were basically unhappy with the Roman statehood and its social arrangements towards the end of the Ist c.

This has to be distinguished from the relationship towards the intellectual Greek and Roman culture. A good example is Minucius, author of the dialogue *Octavius* that was written around 180, in which the conversant defended the existence of God and Providence quoting ancient authorities in support for the new ideals. He searched for precedents for Christianity in ancient writings, and finding something he called in exaltation: *Eadem fere sunt ista, quae nostra sunt* [These are nearly the same as our own!]. It was necessary to show that Christianity was not a barbarian current aimed at the destruction of civilization but that it

could and wished to adapt should a place for it be found. He quoted Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, Cicero, Seneca; he commented and imitated them. “Their views are so close to ours that one has to believe that either current Christians are philosophers or that the earlier philosophers were Christians ... These philosophers, of whom we are so proud, can be quoted by us as authorities” (Boissier 1891, I 277, 278, 286-288).

But this very Minucius admitted that Christians distance themselves from the Roman statehood, they avoid offices, do not partake in games, and refuse public honours, but they do not remove themselves from performing the common duties of life (Boissier 1891, 286, 289). In other words: we are simply decent people and it is precisely for this reason that we stay away from your statehood because in our opinion it is not for righteous people. A new ideal arose from the new demands: the state should be ethical. It was this that led to fury all the official figures and all those who lived and enriched themselves on the ignoble statehood of the latter Empire. The tendency of Christians to absent themselves from public life is easier to understand because not only the Roman state but even the society in this state was now becoming a mechanism while Christianity is based upon personalism.

What was an important circumstance was the fact that among the peoples of Italy old pagan beliefs by no means had weakened. The Roman intelligentsia of the Ist c. was to a large extent atheist, but this Roman atheism exhausted itself in the IInd c. There was a time when Ovid said that “it is useful that there are gods”. Strabo argued that it is difficult to encourage people to be good through philosophy because they need legends and miraculous stories

for the fear of god. Pliny rejected the gods and deified nature. Quintilian wavered between polytheism and monotheism. Only two derided the gods, these were Lucian and Lucretius. As rule even the non-religious part of society held onto external forms of religion and in the IInd c. after Christ there was a return to faith among the Roman intelligentsia (possibly the source of this lay in patriotism). The people believed all along that Caesar had joined the deities. About Marcus Aurelius this was the belief of many people coming from all classes. What is interesting is that even the cult of Antonius became sincere in the second generation (for which we have evidence from the year 177) and this lasted at least until the IIIrd c. (Friedländer 1910, 122, 123, 125, 128, 134, 157, 163, 164, 257).

Roman literature was declining at the time, surprisingly quickly. “The last original individual of pagan Roman literature” is Apuleius, the son of the mayor of Madaurus in Numidia, born in 125. In his novel about *The Golden Ass* he wrote about the Hellenes but it is full of the Orient. Juno is the sister of Zeus but also his wife. Isis appears in a dream says “Ethiopians, Arabs and... Egyptians venerate me with appropriate cults” (Zieliński 1924b, 59; Apulejusz 1925, 129, 272). He must have been concerned about this Isis.

A strong bond that linked all the participants of Athenian education, that is of the whole Hellenistic and Roman area was art. But this was passing. Hellenic art fell into Hellenistic influences and it came to serve Rome when it was already in decline. Great traditions were held onto and after all, this art had sufficient strength for whole centuries of imitation. It still generated

magnificent works, but the spirit for major works declined and they were appearing with less frequency (even in Pergamon) and instead a time approached when “the main production consisted in imitation” (*Die Production wesentlich Reproduktion*, Friedländer 1910, 299-301). The stereotype dominated. This can be seen in the statues, mosaics and wall paintings. They are all the same and made in the same way, whether this be in Pompei or in Belgium [?]; only in Egypt and in Gaul there was some effort at originality.

To what extent the very notions of fine arts declined can be seen in the famous Philostratus of Lemnos towards the end of the IInd c. He was a biographer of Apollonius of Tyana, the famous “prophet” of Syrian Gnosis. Among the numerous writings of Philostratus there are also essays of art criticism. Goethe himself dealt with his two books, the *Imagines*. Among contemporaries he was treated with the greatest respect. And this famous Greek scholar who formed public opinion and wrote exclusively in Latin placed artists on the social scale together with sailors and peasants. The great Galen who practiced not only medicine but who also had among his achievements studies on Plato and philosophy in general, located the visual arts at the very end of the list of functions that an educated and respected man should deal with. This was the view of a native of Pergamon (Friedländer 1910, 313)!

At the same time imitations of the Greek utopian satires and jokes appeared and they flourished anew. At the very beginning of the “Nerva dynasty” Lucian was at the height of his fame. Around 125 he wrote his “true history” of the “Isle of Dream” and this theme became popular among the Roman intelligentsia.

His contemporary Plutarch followed the ancient utopians. Also for him richness and poverty were basic social inefficiencies thus the primary task of true statesmen should be the elimination of these symptoms. Against the background of such deliberations he wrote the biography of Lycurgus and of king Cleomenes (Poehlmann 1925, 455). This line of thought did not however catch on among the Roman intelligentsia which took on a more realistic view of great problems, the dimensions and reality of which the Greeks started to comprehend only under Roman rule. But this literary type did reach St. Irenaeus who was of Asiatic origin.

The Orient aspired for metaphysics and encompassed the old emanationism with new worldviews. Gnosticism became fashionable, so that soon it was to reach even the imperial throne. With time Alexandria was to become the focal point of this concave lens. Various currents emerged from there and among them the ever more branched Gnosticism containing several directions. In Alexandria a doctrine developed claiming that being consists of matter (*kenoma* [emptiness], i.e. unessential things) and a divine element of life (*pleroma* [fullness]). At the lowest level in the series of emanations the emerging entities are no longer capable of holding onto the divine path of life and they fall into chaos which is animated by this. The form of being multiplies but life that originates in this way is defective and it serves matter. The Syrian school saw pressure from the world of darkness upon the world of light out of which a mixture of divine and not-divine factors results. All views referred the material world to the demiurge, the generator of the world who is secondary in respect to god. Since the demiurge is related to the sensuous world he stands low, well

below the *pleroma*. A certain trend recognized the creation of the world and the rule of angels in it. Some recognized Christ as an eon, who is higher than the demiurges and angels. Still another trend claimed that the spirit is an emanating divine ray that is held captive in the world of senses. The granting of a soul to man takes place, when God sends down a “ray” of his own luminosity. The soul of Christ was considered to be the strongest of such rays (Straszewski 1905, 48)⁴.

The doctrine claiming that elements of the *pleroma* are arranged in twos emerged as dominant. The first factor is the duo, Abyss and Silence, which conceives the second duo, Intelligence and Truth, and this duo conceives the next pair, Words and Life, and it is only this latter duo that conceives the duo composed of Man and the Church. Out of these, eight other eons derive, and finally Jesus, who is the only one of the invisible *pleroma* who became visible. For some Gnostics Adam is the image of the man-eon as well as the visible Church (the one existing on earth) being an image of the Church-eon. For others a true and holy Church is the union of Father and Son and Christ (who is the son of Father and Son). For still others the Church is an archetype of the Virgin, the mother of Jesus and this through the action of the *Virtus altissimi* [power of the highest] which is a Man, an eon linked with the eon-Church (Batiffol 1927, I 259 – truly *capis qui potest* [let him understand who can]).

The cult of the Paraclete, most notably skewed in Phrygia became most famous. He spoke through new prophets: Montanus

⁴ “Rays” play also an important role in the beliefs of the Blue Mongols, probably thanks to Nestorian influences. See Koneczny 1917.

(from whom the sect of Montanists originated), Prisca and Maximilla, who prophesized the end of the world. The heavenly Jerusalem will appear in the clouds and will descend upon the earth on the plain near Pepiza in Phrygia. Crowds of Christians from Phrygia and Asia will run there in order to hear the Paraclete. From this view derived the sect of the Cataphrygians which for a long time drew numerous pilgrims to Pepiza where a strange local cult developed. It has to be pointed out that among the majority of Asian Christians Montanism was from the very beginning considered as nonsense (Batiffol 1927, I 261, 265).

The emanationists developed two currents. One group wanted to liberate itself from dependence on the senses through cognition (Gnosis) and asceticism. The other, on the contrary wanted to achieve this through complete, unlimited by anything gratification of all the senses.

The current proposed by Basilides, who taught in Alexandria around the year 130 attained the greatest expansion. According to him emanation encompasses seven divine forces of which four are intellectual: the *nous* [intellect], the *logos*, thought and reason, while the three other are: power, perfection and internal peace. In this way the holy eight (*ogdoas*) of the first kingdom of the spirits emerges. From it 365 states of the spirits emanated all of them being successively lower and each one produced seven eons. All the 365 are coalesced together in the mysterious term *abraxas* or *abrasax*. The seven eons from the lowest circle of heavens are the creators of the world (demiurges). The original emanation joined with Jesus, the most perfect of the humans. Jesus was not crucified

because he ordered Simon of Cyrene to replace him while he himself returned to the *pleroma*.

It is easy to recognize the genesis of such numbers as 7 and 365. After all from the *abraxas* there was to develop a new branch of Gnosis based on a veritable cult of numbers which was to flower eventually in the Cabbala. The Jewish cabbalists are the final manifestation of Gnosticism (in fact a whole species of Gnosticism is in constant link with Jewry⁵).

The followers of Basilides – the Basilidians – were a sort of secret organisation until the second half of the IVth c. They treated the Gospel stories about the life of Jesus as illusions or appearances. The cult of the deities was indifferent to them. They did not attach any significance to the fact of making offerings on some altar whether it were a mythological one, or an imperial one. For Christians this was a basic issue and usually it led to martyrdom.

Christian propaganda was on the increase but it was not the only one because oriental ones were for long time much stronger. The new god Mithra appeared who was brought in from the Iranian civilization. The increasingly stronger Persian state began to exert an influence, at first, a religious one. The essence of the Mithra cult consists in the old-Iranian struggle against Aryaman, and so, the followers were obliged to combat evil, thus at root there was an ethical element in the cult. Numerous Mithraic groups in the West are explained by the influx of traders and industrialists from the East (Ferrero 1910, 294). However it primarily spread through

⁵ The German swastika of today comes from the Gnostic cross. It used to be considered a symbol of the Templars as the so called sign of Baphomet.

soldiers returning from the Orient. It is noteworthy that it spread most among legions of European origin while the Asians were spreading the cult of Isis.

To what extent did the notion of Mithra change among its followers in the West is as yet a question that has not been studied. In any case Mithraism was something distant from the official Persian dualistic Mazdaism. In the new Persian state a religious fanaticism developed which found its base in the potent organization of the magi. In conquered lands, for example in Armenia, the Persians were destroying all temples and introducing their Mazdaism by force (Lot 1927, 11).

Mithraism was spreading not during the reign of the Sassanids. In fact it grew in strength under the rule of Roman governors. There was no shortage of attempts to devalue Mithra to the level of a deity of sensuous promiscuity, but not only this did not meet with acceptance among the wide masses, but in fact there was the opposite trend. Mithra was moving ever higher, frequently with a clear inclination towards monotheism. When one reads details about this one frequently gets the impression that perhaps some, as yet nondescript, influences of Christianity were being mixed with Mithraism (e.g. in Morawski 1924b, 227). In general, there were several varieties of Mithraism and since we are unable to distinguish them our opinions about this religion are only hypothetical. Let us add that there were seven grades of Mithraism. We know that it represented a port for many noble people, but on the other hand we also know the Commodus was a Mithraist, considering himself the “earthly influence of this Sun”, as its earthly incarnation (Morawski 1924b, 223, 226).

There was least of Hellenistic influence in the religious cults of Egypt. The old religion continued entirely and the priestly caste expanded because functions linked with service at the temples multiplied. The Ptolemaids made the high priest of their dynastic cult also the high priest of the entire country specifying that he was to reside in Alexandria. Roman rule sustained these arrangements and during the reign of Hadrian a Roman, Vestinus was such a high priest and at the same time the supervisor of the Museum. The emperors were “nationalizing” for themselves the Egyptian religion.

Egyptian religiosity however found itself a new path free of the links with the state. Already in the IInd c. B.C. there developed a community of hermits around the temples of Serapis, particularly in the vicinity of Memphis. They closed themselves in cells for life, and only through a small window was scant food supplied to them. By this ascetic life they wished not only to maintain the old Egyptian traditions in opposition to the new Olympians, but they also intended to impress the Romans.

Isis, Osiris and Anubis had temples throughout the country. In Alexandria and in several other cities Serapis was dominant, now as the deity of death. His temple in Alexandria consisted of a large complex of buildings which held scientific departments (after the fall of the Museum under Aurelian), and among them there was a great library. The Serapeum was replacing the old Museum (Burckhardt 1880, 169, 170).

For the wide masses Gnosticism and Mithraism were too abstract.

Syrian, and particularly Phrygian cults frequently deserve the designation “savage”, as was the case for example with the *taurobilium*. A “pit of purification” was dug which was entered by the one who wished to be reborn spiritually. He would wear special symbolic clothing and jewels; the pit was covered with planks with many openings and an ox would be slaughtered on the planks. The man showered with the dripping blood was considered *renatus* [reborn] (Zieliński 1922, II, 193). A similar *kriobolium* (with a lamb) was set up. It seems that the Vatican hill was the central point of these cults in Rome. The “reborn” had to wear this blood soaked dress for some time. In the IInd and IIIrd c. some submitted to this ceremony offering for the success of the imperial house or of entire cities; sometimes whole corporations offered themselves in the *taurobolium*. Information has reached us that among the followers of this cult there was also some proconsul from Africa and the prefect of the city of Rome. This shows how high the Syrian superstitions reached (Burckhardt 1880, 193, 104).

The capital of the Syrian cults was a holy city the name of which we know only in Greek – Hierapolis in northern Syria. In a sizeable temple with several atriums and courtyards Astarte was venerated. Among hundreds of bronze statues representing kings and great priests from the oldest times to the Seleucids there also stood a statue of Atlas, Hermes and figures from Homeric poems. Animals freely wandered over the courtyards, the bulls, horses, domesticated lions and bears consecrated to the gods. There was also a pool with consecrated fish and an altar in the middle which could only be reached by swimming. Around the temple there was a large settlement of flute players, priests, eunuchs called the *Galli*

(who earlier had been chased out), and women raging in noisy processions, dances and the crudest of exploits.

The greatest (spring) festival gathered pilgrims from the whole of Syria. At that time new *Galli* were initiated. Offerings were brought not only from Syria but also from Cilicia, Cappadocia, Phoenicia and Assyria. These were loaded in piles and burnt. In a certain place there was a colossal stone block as if a pillar. Every year some fanatic would climb to the top of it so as to spend seven days and nights there praying constantly without any sleep. Who wished for his intercession with the deities placed some offering at the foot of the pillar. There were more such stone blocks in the various temples of Asia Minor. The most obscene rites were conducted in the lone temple in Lebanon in a grove near Aphaca. Fornication and various perverse obscenities of the eunuchs went to extreme ends there. The most precious gifts were thrown into a lake in the vicinity of the temple. Each year on a certain day crowds awaited a miracle, which was to be a fiery ball above the mountains that was to fall into the lake. It was said that this was to be Urania herself. These temples still flourished in the IVth c. (Burckhardt 1880, 160, 162). Compared with this the cult of Isis was something very innocent.

Such religious savagery spread also in Europe and from the great capital of the world at the time, that is, from Alexandria the Gnostic worldview spread. But the Romans did not draw proper science from there. What represented the greatest value of Alexandria, its Museum, was ignored.

It is thought provoking how little Rome was interested in the greatest expansion of the natural sciences that was taking place

in Alexandria at the time. Ptolemy of Hermiou in Upper Egypt, a descendant of Greek settlers, developed mathematics, geography and primarily astronomy in the Museum and as a philosopher he wrote his *Megale Syntaxis* [The Great Treatise], one of those works which are written to be read over centuries. Later, the Arabs referred to this work as the *Al Majesti* (from which comes the term *Almagest* under which it is best known). But the Romans were not interested in him. Similarly no one heard in IIIrd c. Rome of Diophantus of Alexandria, the inventor of algebra.

One should not draw from this any negative conclusions about the intellect of the Romans. Definitely not! In our XXth c. Europe is the majority of the intelligentsia interested in scientific discoveries? Only to the extent when some invention is made on the basis of a discovery. Only then have we great trumpets and immediately at the highest pitch. Let us consider that the ancients were unable to develop technology and as a rule they made practically no inventions. Thus neither in Egypt itself nor in Antioch did the fame of Ptolemy or Diophantus spread, not to mention far away Rome.

The assimilated Galen from Alexandrian science in the IInd c., the great physician thought, studied and wrote also for centuries and was as it were the dictator for medicine until modern times. Claudius Galenus (131-201) was a Pergamon Greek who spent a short time in Alexandria and then he moved to Rome around the year 170. He willingly accompanied the emperor and the legions in war time because in this manner he had access to the largest clinics for his studies.

This is all, that pagan Rome gained from Alexandrian science. Christian propaganda however did not cease to advertise the Museum.

In the first half of the IIIrd c. Christianity undertook an intellectual struggle in the capital itself, in Alexandria.

A converted Stoic Pantaenus (d. 202) was the first to understand that for a victory of Christianity a Christian philosophy is needed and that it should be elaborated on the basis of Hellenism as its new branch. In other word he discovered that science should be a tool for Christianity. He established in Alexandria “a school devoted equally to philosophy and theology (in particular to exegesis)”, which later grew into a “school for catechists”. Clement of Alexandria (d. 220) was his disciple and successor, who also received baptism at a mature age. He was the author of a propaganda treatise addressed to the Greeks. From Hellenic paganism he retained the view that all calamities are caused by wealth and not by poverty from which he drew the radical conclusion that the Greeks had never allowed themselves to hold, namely that private property is by its nature an injustice; thus he advanced a position that was later rejected by the Church (Diehl 1933, 402; Poehlmann 1925, in 1st ed. II 615).

Then, the multilaterally educated Tertullian (160-230) spoke. He lived and wrote in the worst times, under Commodus, Septimus Severus, Caracalla and Heliogabalus. He had an impetuous nature, one of those who consider every concession as a weakness. His apologia was the first one to be written in Latin as distinct from those of earlier authors who wrote in Greek. The latter used a general, overall or philosophical argumentation addressed to

common sense, to reason, to humanity; Tertullian approached the issue in a Roman way speaking to the legalistic and political mind. His apologia was later translated into Greek.

His severity is evident in the treatise *De Idolatria* [On idolatry)]. He did not allow for the participation in any act during which it would be necessary to listen to heathen prayers. Thus a Christian was not permitted to hold any public office. He forbade the making of images of deities. Thus he deprived painters and sculptors of a source of inspiration and required a veritable proscription of art. He advised sculptors to make cupboards and chests. A Christian could not be an astrologer or a coach of gladiators, he could not lead a school nor be a teacher of literature (because that would require teaching about the genealogy of the gods). Finally he did not shy away from the question whether a Christian could be a public official at all; this would only be possible if perhaps he was exempt from judging and punishing, from participation in games etc. Even when visiting pagans, for example at family gatherings, one had to be very careful not to mention the name of any deity. Thus a Christian had to stay away from games, from honours, and from all public issues, that is, away from everything that according to Greek and Roman notions represented value in life. There was of course no shortage of Christian traders, bankers, artists, professors and even officials, and Tertullian thundered against them: *Nobis nulla res magis aliena, quam publica!* [For us nothing is more alien than what is public!]. During the persecutions he considered as sinful all precautionary measures aimed at assuring safety; on the contrary

one was supposed to desire persecution (Boissier 1891, I 222-235, 237, 238).

One day Tertullian discarded his toga and started wearing the *pallium*, a Greek cloak. It was a Greek custom to put on special attire when without ceasing to study the rules of a given philosophy one wished to follow it directly and felt more embarrassed in life. It was said of such a man that he *vestem mutavit* [changed his attire]. The same, as was said later of the monks. In this sense Tertullian, was as if forestalling the very existence of the religious, who as yet were unknown in Christianity. Such people were referred to as the *secessi de populo* [withdrawn from the people]. But he did not stay away from people. He only wished to introduce a new order in encounters with them. In his *Apologia* he entered the famous sentence *Neque enim brahmanae, aut Indorum gymnosophistae sumus silvicolae ex exule Vitae* [For we are neither Brahmans nor Indian gymnosophists, but woodsmen, exiles from Life] (Boissier 1891, I 240-259).

In his conclusions Tertullian could be terrible. For example he condemned second marriages and he did not recommend the first ones. When he conceded the having of a wife he congratulated those who had no children and wrote: “There are servants of God who believe that children are necessary as if they had not enough to do caring for their own salvation!” (Boissier 1891, I 236). The summit of his doctrinarism was in a polemic against Pope Callixtus I whom he criticized for having absolved sins, even those against the VIth commandment when there was sorrow and repentance (Batiffol 1927, I 346).

Indeed it is truly difficult to ascertain whether Tertullian more helped or obstructed the spread of Christianity. Many refrained from asking for baptism in order not to abandon noble intellectual recreations, in order not to sever themselves from philosophy, literature, art, etc, which were said by him to be incompatible with Christianity (Boissier 1891, I 288). The opinion was spreading that Tertullian was a barbarian who was suppressing the development of the intellect. This was an exaggeration! He allowed Christians to send their children to schools which were of course pagan, provided proper care was taken. And if in the process he was suggesting that Christian schools be organized – all for the better. It was necessary to provide books for the faithful (Boissier 1891, I 199, 204). But ultimately there were certain restrictions in Tertullian which were narrowing personalism, because they were obstructing the possibilities for its development. Finally he succumbed to Montanism (Batiffol 1927, I 317, 342).

The situation was even worse with another eminent Christian writer. Origen, a disciple of Clement of Alexandria, he did not understand the basic contradiction of Gnosticism and he commenced a line of scholars who were seeking some impossible synthesis through compromises. He also tried to interpret the Bible in an allegorical manner (which he took from the Jews). It is from him that the view about the supposed esotericism and exotericism in Christianity derives. He was the first to come up with the claim that sacraments administered by priests who are in mortal sin are invalid. Condemned by two Alexandrian synods of 231 and 232 he opened a school in Palestinian Caesarea and then in Tyre where he died in 251 (Batiffol 1927, 370, 371, 377).

As we can see the Christian intellectual combat was equally strong in negative and positive points and it was of no use for the thinning tribe of Virgil. The time for cooperation had not yet come.

We have not finished with the oriental worldviews of the IInd c. During the times of the Sassanids there was a revival of Persian dualism. Manichaeism is Gnosticism in a Persian mode decorated with refuse from erroneously understood Christianity. One synthesis more! Manes (215-276) himself turned up in 242 with a notion of the Paraclete, adapted for his purposes, that was to be later improved by Christianity. He had many enemies in Persia who persecuted him. Finally he was condemned to death, crucified and his skin was drawn from the corpse. The Manichaeans rejected the Old Testament and they used only a selection of texts from the New and this exclusively according to the interpretation of Manes. Manichaeism saw in evil a separate cosmic and metaphysical element that is equal to the good one. Christianity differed because it indicated the choice made by a reasonable being as the source of evil ... after all evil is not a blind necessity (Straszewski 1905, 62).

Gnosticism continued to develop because the Alexandrian intellectual movement was succumbing to it ever more. In 232 there opened the school of Ammonius Saccas (175-250) who is considered to be the initiator of a new movement known as Neo-Platonism. This was a mixture which consisted in the inclusion of the Platonic doctrine on ideas into emanationism. Just as Gnosticism proper, so Neo-Platonism split into a dozen or so of varieties which with time took on the form of sects.

The main representative was Plotinus (205-270), an Egyptian Greek who was a disciple of Saccas. Later he travelled to Persia

and India and finally he settled in 244 in Rome as a teacher of philosophy, himself conducting an ascetic life. He also held that there is derivative emanationism moving from the lowest to the highest levels. Basically he asserted the nirvana, yet he modified this teaching as the attainment of the direct unification of the human will with the divine one, in which an ecstatic union with God results; (he himself claimed to have been in such a state four times). He also took over from India the migration of souls which he mixed with Syrian demonology. In other words he proposed a synthesis of all the faiths and superstitions of the dying Hellenistic world (he even recommended *mantica* [divination]), except for Christianity which he avoided. He attained considerable influence, found an ear at the court of emperor Gallienus (261-268) and was promised help in the establishment of a commune modelled precisely on the principles of Plato. Some failed city in Campania was to be rebuilt and renamed Platonopolis. The most important disciple of Plotinus was the Syrian Malik, or Malchos, who called himself in Greek Porphyrios (233-304). He was born in Syrian Batanea. He studied in Athens and since 263 he settled in Rome aside to Plotinus, where he became his successor. He was the greatest enemy of Christianity; he wrote a book *Contra Christianos*, a treatise in 15 volumes (Diehl 1933, 411; Poehlmann 1925, I 585; Batiffol 1929, II 146).

What was happening in Egypt in the name of Christianity facilitated rather than hindered confrontation with it. An increasingly strange ascetic communalism was spreading there. It was to pass on to the local Christianity. The hermits of Amon or Serapis, the ascetics of Hierapolis and the Egyptian recluses

impressed the Egyptian Christians and thus among the Copts there developed a strong current that imitated them. Tertullian objected that “we are not as the Brahmins”, while in the meantime two settlements were set up of as if monks, composed of several thousand individuals following exactly the example of Brahmanism. Did Egypt influence India at the time or did Hindu influences reach Egypt? We do not know at the current state of our knowledge. And what seeds and possibilities existed in this movement we can see in the Brahman-Lamaic hermitages.

The decisive and most pugnacious enemy of Christianity was not paganism, nor Mithraism, nor Manichaeism but constantly Gnosticism. In 250 the persecution of Christians broke out again being severe and universal. It was not linked to the person of the emperor Decius (249-251) because it continued during the days of his successor Trebonianus Gallus (251-253). Their decisions are attributed to the tendency to have the cult of the Roman gods returned to their former glory. Was this persecution raging in the East also in the name of Roman mythology? We know that Gnostics had access to the ear of both of these emperors. Plotinus had settled in Rome sometime earlier, during Philip the Arab and he initiated the anti-Christian propaganda. Philip was not interested in this issue, but Decius was and Plotinus had free access to his court. After six years of the activity of Plotinus the persecution of the Christians began. Considering the various manifestations of this, such as the earlier incidents in Lugdunum in 177, one has to consider the persecution of Christians as a manifestation of the oriental tumour on the Roman body.

For the next 50 years there was no persecution, but during the next one in the days of Diocletian the same observation can be made. Unfortunately the strength of Christian propaganda seemed to weaken since its results for the time period concerned were rather meagre. The disintegration of Christianity as if from within was taking place. This derived from the consequences of the thesis of Origen that a sinful priest cannot administer the sacraments. St. Cyprian (d. 258) refused even to recognize the validity of baptisms administered by heretics and schismatics. The Papacy proclaimed that it will sever contacts with those who do not recognize such baptisms and indeed for a time there was a break between Rome and Alexandria on the one side and between Africa and Asia Minor on the other.

In this generation it was decided that the Roman statehood will be based upon the absolute supremacy of physical forces. Whoever had around him a proper size army did not need to worry about anything or anyone. How higher spiritually was the Iranian worldview! Also the new Persian state was growing in strength. Among the Romans however a split developed between the state and society which had to generate the action of unknown so far centrifugal forces.

The dependence of the state upon the army led to the situation that in 253, after the death of Trebonianus Gallus three armies were moving into Italy each one with an emperor proclaimed by it. Even the officers of these armies realized the absurdity of the situation and so they chose a common candidate, the 63-year old Valerian (Gumowski 1927, 336). In the 8th year of his reign he became a prisoner of the Persians. The war ceased but no efforts

were made to have the emperor released. While Valerian was in prison, and he remained there until the end of his life treated in a most despicable manner, the generals were tearing his heritage among themselves. There were so many counter-candidates against his son Gallienus that this period (260-268) is referred to as the times of the 30 tyrants. Gallienus fought them, beating some and murdering others.

He struggled with treasury problems, so he extended over the entire state the Egyptian method, which had been used already by Septimus Severus in Mesopotamia. Thus there was the maximum extension of the state. The bureaucracy suppressed all signs of communal life in society.

In Egypt the wealthier were responsible for ensuring that the poor paid the taxes; the whole barbarity of this institution was then transferred into the laws of the Roman state. How this worked in practice in Egypt is shown by an example transmitted by the sources. An old father, ruined by tasks that had been imposed forcibly upon him dies. After his death the fiscal authorities go for his daughter who is deprived of everything including her home. The hapless beg for postponement and permission to be left in the village. They ask the deity of the region whether they should stay or flee and what will happen to the whole family, will it be sold into slavery? They flee to the desert. As soon as they reach its edge they meet whole crowds of villagers and small townsmen who had been wandering there for a long time so as to be as far away as possible from the administration. The Empire was to reach the situation in which true Romans would also flee from the state administration. The tax system was devouring of course its own

substance and such a veritable aberration occurred not only along the Nile (Stein 1928, 18, 19). This policy was to encompass all the provinces thanks to the decree of Gallienus.

The Egyptian treasury system was a blow to the peaceful wealthy senatorial provinces. Their *concilia provincialia* were recognized already in the days of Nero as an administrative factor (Fustel de Coulanges 1922, 220,221). They should not be considered as an organ of some local government because they had no right of public governance, nor did they ever make any laws. They were allowed to comment about the order in the province in the previous year from which indirectly the right of appeal against the proconsul or *praetor* after a year of his functioning resulted. This was in accord with Roman legal customs. The *concilia* did not decide about taxes. They only divided the total sum that was imposed for the province by the proconsul onto the regions, tribes and clans (Fustel de Coulanges 1922, 218, 222, 223). Only Roman settlers paid taxes individually which was absolutely impossible with the clan system of the locals. The entire competence of the *concilia* consisted in this division of taxes, which was a way of ensuring that there would be fewer errors and injustices. From that time onwards therefore the population was left at the mercy of the bureaucracy which came to the province with the single purpose of plunder. Even wealthy provinces were doomed to pauperization with this system.

For a long time in Asia there still remained the appearances of prosperity. Large estates were disappearing there while they remained in Egypt and in Roman Africa. Since a free peasant population was not developing the disappearance of the large

estates amounted to a universal calamity. This had to lead to a decline of agriculture, the ruthless pauperization of villages and as a consequence also to the decline of the cities.

The bureaucracy was executing orders issued by the military. One could easily describe this period and the next one as that of the “state being the victim of officers’ statehood” or the “sword in the kitty”. In practice every officer had the right to plunder and murder in the imperial provinces. In order to remove any control over the army in 261 the senators were prohibited from even a momentarily presence in the camps (Piotrowicz 1935a, 779). However it was becoming increasingly more difficult for the military commanders to maintain fidelity in the ranks. When due to a fiscal crisis it proved necessary to give a part of the pay in goods the idea was proposed that soldiers would be allowed to marry. Such a soldier was given an individual house outside the camp and he was required to be present in the camp only during exercises. Thus entire colonies of small soldier agricultural households were growing (Simanski 1931, 124) which resulted in the barbarisation of extreme regions with an a-civilizational element, because there were no Romans or Italians among these soldiers.

True Romans were increasingly restricting themselves to private life but they strictly conserved the Roman triple law. Only this field remained from the old glorious past of the Roman nation. The polygamous system pressed on from the East yet in 258 the prohibition of bigamy for Roman citizens was strengthened. In the next generation, during Diocletian, in 285, the notion of stupri [disgraceful] due to bigamy was extended to all the citizens of the state. A great deal of evil was happening, but at least it was

recognized that it was evil. Also the power of the *patris familias* [father of the family] was loosening, this because of the long and distant military expeditions. The rule that a son (regardless of his age) could not marry without the permission of his father became illusory when the son was marrying hundreds of miles away; but then he married there not according to the Roman marital law. The son was also allowed to have personal property from his war spoils. These were influences of the Hellenistic law pertaining to Greek mercenaries. *Peculium castrense* [camp property] spread, extending to all endowments, rewards and spoils (Stein 1928, 34-37; Lot 1927, 156; Partsch 1921, 124). But the situation was not reached when it would be defined precisely when a son becomes of age.

Among factors undercutting the Empire in mid-IIIrd c. came a new one: the open tendency to split the universal state, a force that was in agreement with the spirit of history and the wellbeing of people in the three parts of the world. As if, to clearly stress that the Orient should be separated from the West, there appeared simultaneously both here and there attempts at separating out.

Beginning with 259 there appeared in Gaul a number of leaders, supported by the population of Gaul, Spain and Britain striving to establish a separate trans-Alpine state. This was not a question of independence of the subjugated peoples. These movements not only were not directed against Romans settled in the western provinces, but they were actually supported by them, and possibly they were its initiators. The colonies tried to liberate the fatherland and save the indigenous Roman civilization. Their aim was to shed the undesired statehood from the Roman state. The

locals undertook an effort to get rid of the abusive administration. The emperors of this new state resided as a rule in Trier. They were Posthumus, Lollianus, Victorinus. There was no shortage of scum and disturbances, and criminal grabbing of power in this Iberian-Celtic-Roman environment. The fate of Victorinus, his mother, son and grandson among the criminality and rebellions is characteristic. Finally power was taken over by their relative Tetricus, who ruled until 273.

Meanwhile in 262 Syria was taken over by Odonatus who conquered Mesopotamia from Persia. When he was murdered his widow Zenobia ruled in the name of their underage sons. Ruling with her “colourful court of Asiatic leaders” she expanded the frontiers of her country deep into Asia Minor and on the other side up to Alexandria. This lasted till 273 (Burckhardt 1880, 22). This state which had a capital in Palmyra was hostile to Rome; the idea there was to eliminate all Roman influences.

After emperor Claudius II (268-270) came Aurelian (270-275) during whose time in the same year 273 both these states ceased to exist. As a consequence of the efforts of this emperor he received the title *Restitutor orbis* [Restorer of the world] before he was murdered. Clio [the muse of history in Greek mythology] regretted that Aurelian was successful.

This emperor was *deus ex dominus natus* [god born of a lord] as we can read on his coins. He proclaimed also that he ruled the world as the *sol invictus dominus imperii romani* [the Sun, the invincible lord of the Roman Empire] and that the emperor is the deity’s emanation and representative on earth. A temple to the Sun was built on the Field of Mars. One can see in this a peculiar

mixture of emanationism and Mithraism. Thoughtlessly everything was drawn from the Orient. Since Persia was attaining increasing importance it became fashionable in spite of the fact that wars were waged against it. Aurelian introduced the Persian ceremonial; he placed a diadem on his head and wore a dress embroidered with gold and precious stones (Lot 1927, 11; Piotrowicz 1935a, 788). Under this extravagance there hid the nonentity of power. This can be judged through a certain notable fact that took place in 271. Aurelian wished to suppress some irregularities that were occurring in the mint, but when he introduced a more detailed supervision he met with a rebellion of the employees of the mint who declared their director Felicissimus ... emperor. In order to suppress this rebellion there were bloody battles in the streets for several days in which it is said that 7000 soldiers were killed (Piotrowicz 1935a, 789).

The sinking into orientalism was so deep that in the years of Aurelian appeared the beginnings of the caste system: the obligation to continue the profession of one's father (Baynes 1925, 12). Further governments were to consolidate and extend this Egyptian practice.

The lower the state fell the greater was the strictly administrative surveillance over the images of the emperor. The jurists were deliberating how to defend craftsmen who repaired damaged statues or melted old ones from the charge of desecrating them by the touch of their instruments! And statues were being erected to honour all administrators even the janitors. There were those who "accepting the honour dispensed from covering the costs" (Friedländer 1910, 264, 266, 272, 277). As we can see

already then there were those who knew how to erect their own statues.

With Aurelian being murdered within half a year his successor Tacitus was murdered too and after the next three months his brother Florian was murdered. Meanwhile the legions proclaimed their own emperors: the Syrian ones elevated Probus (276-282) while near Alexandria Saturninus was declared emperor. In the West in 280 Proculus was named and in the next year Bononus. They all died violent deaths. Finally Carus understood that it was necessary to separate the East from West. He devised this in such a manner so as to establish a dynasty: he placed his two sons at the head of each half of the realm with the title of Caesar maintaining the supremacy for himself under the title of August. Thus two lines of the ruling dynasty were to form in the universal state. Having decided this he went on a great campaign against Persia and he met death there after ten months of ruling. The sons tried to take over power in 283. In the East Numerian immediately fell dead under mysterious circumstances when the army raised Diocletian in his place, a governor of Moesia and one of the leaders in the war against Persia. The brother of the killed, Carinus gathered an army in the West but he was murdered. In spite of that Diocletian did not become a single ruler because in Egypt a native Egyptian was raised to the throne, even though he used a Latin name Elpidus Amiteus, who ruled in Alexandria for eleven years (286-296). In the south an uprising of the Blemmyes people proved successful. Already during the days of Probus they had taken Ptolemais and now they conquered the whole of Upper Egypt. During that time in Britain power was taken over by usurpers twice. In Gaul

there was an uprising initially only of the local people known as the Bagauds. They traversed the whole country plundering⁶. Gradually these rebels were directed towards the establishment of a distinct *imperium Gallicum*. Aelianus and after him Amandus were proclaimed Caesars there. They built their main strongholds already in 285 near the mouth of the Marne as it flows into the Seine, thus in a place where till our days the military fate of peoples was decided. Diocletian sent a general of his, Maximianus, nominating him Caesar in advance – similarly as was the case with Carus. He however preferred to proclaim himself Augustus. Diocletian consented to this and gave him power over the West. Carus had a plan in this, whereas Diocletian was led in the same direction uniquely by the force of circumstances.

Eventually Diocletian succeeded in inserting into this state dualism two of his sons-in-law as Caesars being beside the Augusts. Galerius was beside him and Constantius Chlorus beside Maximianus. Thus four districts were organized that were united by the highest authority of Diocletian. Maximianus ruled Italy, Raetia, Spain and Africa and he resided in Milan; his Caesar Chlorus had Britain and Gaul with the capital in Trier. Diocletian ruled directly over Thrace, Asia Minor and Egypt while his Caesar Galerius took over the Balkan provinces as well as those over Danube with a residence in Sirmium (today Mitrovica). Diocletian was recognized as having first place and overall supervision. The unity of the state was preserved because the later “reforms” of Diocletian were binding in all the provinces.

⁶ A subscript is missing here.

A notable, negative, feature of the Roman Empire was the lack of a dynasty. Imperial power was not hereditary and in fact all emperors for a long time had been military usurpers. A son could take over after his father if he had the support of the army, but as a rule he had counter-candidates who had similar military backing. Should someone prove able to set up a dynasty he would have been considered a benefactor of Rome. Diocletian had no son. It is difficult see why the adoption system of the “house of Nerva” was not repeated; it is all the more difficult to understand why Diocletian was in principle against a hereditary throne.

In Persia the dynastic mentality and the inheritance of the throne were so deeply rooted in the minds that in one case the tiara was placed over the pregnant body of a widow queen (Burckhardt 1880, 102). Diocletian liked to follow Persian custom; he preferred Persia to Egypt. He dressed in Persian royal attire and introduced prostrating face down to the ground before the throne (*Proskynensis, adoratio*); besides in the Egyptian manner he considered himself an emanation of a deity and he declared that everything that is connected with the person of the emperor is sanctified (*sacrum palatium* [sacred palace]) (Burckhardt 1880, 17). He adopted many monarchic forms from the Persians, but he did not accept the monarchic idea neither from Persia nor from Egypt. Instead an artificial system was worked out through which it was hoped to maintain a continuity of the highest authority.

This was to be achieved by the resolution that should an August die his Caesar would take over the throne and a new Caesar would be nominated by Diocletian. This was a strange system, truly bizarre and opposed to reason. By the exclusion of the sons

of a dead August from entering into the line of rulers reasons for civil wars were provided. The new August would also be opposed to the *a priori* exclusion from inheritance of his kin. In fact this artificial structure crashed already in the days of its proponent.

In 305 Diocletian abdicated and he imposed an abdication on Maximianus. This was caused by some circumstances that are unknown to us; we know however that this was not thought out deliberately and did not pertain to some system such as abdication after a period of time, like after 20 years of rule (Piotrowicz 1935a, 794, 795; Burckhardt 1880, 72, 73, 128, 129). Perhaps the Persian example impressed Diocletian, because four years earlier king Narsi abdicated (but he personally crowned his son Hoormuz) (Burckhardt 1880, 44, 45).

When new regulations were thought out there was no concern for historicism. Rome ceased to be the capital; Maximianus settled in Milan and when he wanted to show favour to Rome that was subject to him he built some edifices there including two temples ... of Isis and of Serapis (Burckhardt 1880, 52). Diocletian chose Nicomedia in Asiatic Bithynia as his main capital, on the Asiatic coast of Propontis (Sea of Marmara), on the Gulf of Astacus that cuts deep into land. It can be said that Nicomedia lies in Byzantine country; it is only 12 miles away, as the crow flies, from Byzantium. There must have been a consciousness that it is in this part of the world they the centre of gravity of the East lays. Is it not notable also that Diocletian included Thrace in his eastern domain?

Diocletian is credited with having introduced a reform of the administration; it consisted however only in the perfection of the bureaucracy, which was mechanical to the highest degree.

It is truly to his credit however that he separated in administration the military and civil authorities (Stein 1928, 105). Rife soldiery had pushed the administration much below the Egyptian or Persian one. But the observation is correct that in the reform “a military organization of the civil administration was maintained” because the civil administrators were truly organized in a military manner something which did not exist in Egypt and in Persia. The officials were set up in a truly hierarchical system with fixed salaries, ranks and titles; the entire administration was thought out aprioristically from above down to the smallest details. In this sense the Diocletian reform surpassed the Egyptian model. This was done so as to strengthen centralization. Even local municipal structures were made subject to the state administration; in fact local self-government was abolished with municipal functionaries being used for the collection of taxes (Zakrzewski 1938, 4; Piotrowicz 1935a, 797).

From that time onwards the administration became an incurable mechanism, completely bureaucratic. Throughout the state absolute uniformity was imposed (Burckhardt 1880, 61). The same regulations applied in Britain and in Syria. As a result the entire state was administered inappropriately and therefore badly. The division of the state into 12 dioceses divided into 91 provinces was completely artificial, adapted not to the needs of the people but to the mechanism of bureaucracy. Unfortunately this became fixed! At the beginning of the Vth c. there were 120 provinces. The new administration introduced extensive satrapies modelled on Persia and more detailed regions modelled on Egypt.

The quadruple rule of the Augusts and Caesars strengthened the bureaucracy even more. “Each of these four rulers held more soldiers for himself than any previous emperor did before him. The taxes grew immensely and the number of collectors surpassed the number of those paying to such an extent that the exploited colons were abandoning the agricultural land which turned into forests. In order to impose fear upon everyone the provinces were shred into pieces and each region, each city was overburdened with hordes of officials, tax-collectors, deputy-prefects and others with the result that there was little benefit from all of this, or rather no benefit at all and instead there were convictions, banishments, rip-offs without number and without end with the addition of unacceptable violence etc.” (Burckhardt 1880, 58).

The Senate, scattered over the whole country, remained the nursery of all dignitaries. Increasingly only the newly appointed (the *adlecti*) taken from among officers and court dignitaries participated in sessions. There was no lack of barbarians and eunuchs in the Senate (Zakrzewski 1938, 5, 6).

Diocletian was similar to many of his predecessors in that he was convinced of his divinity and omnipotence. In him the doctrine of the omnipotence of the state took shape. His contemporaries wrote with some sarcasm that in 302 “the emperor ordered that everything should be cheap” alluding to the great tariff (“of maximal prices”) that specified the price of all shop goods and which of course proved useless and had to bring results that were opposite to the intended ones.

The belief that he is an incarnation of a deity did not prevent Diocletian from being very superstitious. Many of the things he

did were the consequence of some oracle, magic, astrology or even common fortune-telling. One sometimes tries with great difficulty to discover the cause of some decision whereas at no moment can one reject the possibility that the only cause was some superstition (Burckhardt 1880, in many places).

The second achievement of Diocletian was to be the monetary reform. In mid-IIIrd c. there was scarcely 5% of silver in a denarius. Roman currency declined to such an extent that there was only copper money. Diocletian brought back golden and silver coins which operated “besides the depreciated copper ones” (Piotrowicz 1935a, 801). The bad currency was not revoked officially leaving both of them in circulation. It was hoped that the good currency would expel the bad one, but the opposite had to take place; the bad currency expelled the good one as is to be expected from the unshaken economic law (the Law of Copernicus). In this case the bad result was not culpable. It came from an error that was made later everywhere until the XVIIth c. After a temporary improvement of conditions an economic stagnation ensued, which was so profound that again the authorities had to collect taxes and benefits in goods. It was necessary to make this form of paying the foundation of the treasury system (Piotrowicz 1935a, 783). A unit of duty was described in natural goods as a poll tax combined with a land tax (*iugatio et capitatio*). It was calculated how many such units are needed for the maintenance of the court, army and administration; this was divided among the provinces, regions and settlements. The collection was handled in the counties by the more eminent dwellers, the *curiales et decuriones*, as well as by

landowners (Piotrowicz 1935a, 802; Bynes 1925, 102). All of this was adopted from Egypt (Bidlo 1917, 18, 4; Burckhardt 1880, 57).

The collection of duties in goods had happened before and we have pointed out that a prolongation of this state of affairs may result in the generation of castes. In fact during Diocletian the caste system that began under Aurelian developed even more. The whole population was to be composed of as if guilds to which one was bound to belong and this obligation was hereditary so that the state mechanism would not be deprived of services and payments of the given kind. The caste system had to mechanize the society, depriving it of industriousness and initiative (as every compulsion does!) thereby reducing the capacity for public life. The caste system had to lower the culture of action in society and finally result in stagnation.

Thus the military profession was first made compulsorily hereditary, which was followed by the militarization of all those who had anything to do with the needs of the army; this was a lifelong and hereditary militarization. Metallurgists (founders) had brands burnt out on their shoulders. Also labourers of state manufactories, particularly of weaving mills, were forced into this compulsory service. The mint workers became a hereditary profession and they were allowed to marry only among themselves. The miners were all slaves and convicts. The employees of water works were branded on their hands. Amongst the craftsmen this principle was first extended compulsorily onto the bakers because it concerned the supply of bread for the army and the offices. They were constrained even further in a true slavery because the Roman population was no longer supplied with flour but directly with

bread. How enormous the expansion of the administration had to be in connection with all of this! A “free” baker had to supply the authorities with a certain amount of bread for nothing. And later the builders had to give to the state some days of work for nothing, the fishermen were to supply fish for nothing and the sailors were to transport goods for the state for nothing. Did not such regulations lead in practice to a state monopoly of everything? An official supervised a workshop in the interest of the state and he could direct the workshop in whatever way he wished. The officials, who were paid in goods, were able to find for themselves additional earnings. Soon also lower officials became a hereditary caste obliged compulsorily to serve the state (Lot 1927, 116-119, 121, 122; Bidlo 1917, 7; Stein 1928, 22).

All the reforms of Diocletian led to stagnation. It is noteworthy that opposition and criticism was primarily among the Christians, while the pagans consoled themselves that the universal Empire was maintained. In 291 the famous Mamertinus presenting before Galerius in Trier a panegyric that praised all the reigning rulers said directly: “Now it is a pleasure to look at the map of the world because one does not see anything on it that is not ours” (Burckhardt 1880, 57). He exaggerated a bit because in Asia there were states that could stand up “to us”, and what was worse it was not noticed that the universal state was completely cosmopolitan, not at all nationally Roman and the Romans themselves became cosmopolitans.

It has been claimed that the system of Diocletian was a form of “theocracy” because the ruling individual presented himself in the role of a god (Zakrzewski 1938, 5). If this were so we

would have very many theocracies and semi-theocracies could be extended all the way up to modern times as a result of theories claiming that God was replaced by the throne. Let us stay with the older meaning of this term: theocracy is the organized rule of priests (e.g. Tibet, the Jesuit settlements in Paraguay etc.).

The position of Diocletian on the issue of religion was for a long time unexpectedly tolerant. In all probability he did not understand the true essence of religion. He did not have an abstract mind and one can even doubt whether he appreciated abstracts at all. During 18 years of his rule (until 303) he behaved with sympathetic neutrality towards the Christians. His court in Nicomedia had many Christian officials; the court youth were to a large extent Christians, particularly the pages. In view of this it seems appropriate to give credence to information that Christianity was seen with favour by the empress Prisca and their daughter Valeria. The courtiers together with their families participated in Christian religious services within sight of the emperor. Some Christians were even governors of the provinces and they were exempt from making official offerings to the gods. This was also not demanded from simple soldiers. Conversions reached the high dignitaries of the court and the direct vicinity of the emperor so that one can suspect there were even hopes of converting Diocletian himself (Burckhardt 1880, 295, 296 subscript). The Christian communes were expanding and in larger cities magnificent churches were built (Burckhardt 1880, 287, 288).

Manichaeism was in disfavour. This cannot be explained by bad relations with Persia because Manes was persecuted by the Sassanids and he met there a martyr's death convicted by

the authorities ten years before Diocletian. Thus the political moment was not at issue here. The Persian king did not promote Manichaeism on territories subject to the Roman emperor, but Manichaeans were seeking asylum there against Persian persecutions. In the teaching of Manes there was nothing that could be considered dangerous for the state, thus Roman governors left them in peace. From Asia they transferred their propaganda further into Africa. Thus Manichaeism was not a Persian national religion but considered itself to be a universal one. They spread particularly in Africa *proconsularis* [governed by a proconsul, formerly Carthaginian]. From the available (rather scanty) evidence we know that Manichaeism organized itself hierarchically, possibly following the example of Christians (?), and that under Roman rule they had an orderly hierarchy.

Suddenly, quite unexpectedly, a severe persecution fell upon them in 296. Diocletian not only ordered that they be imprisoned but he required that they be burned on the stake together with their holy books. Historians wonder what might have been the cause of this sudden and so severe persecution. The suggestion that it was to protect Roman polytheism does not hold because if that were so the persecution should have affected all who did not support such polytheism.

The suggestion comes to mind that this persecution was conducted not against the Persians but on the request of the Persian king, probably as one of the conditions of the peace treaty of 296. The Manichaeans disappear from the Empire until the Vth c., which is also a historical mystery. It may be possible to solve

it through archaeological expeditions to Central Asia; they hid themselves there in caves turned into temples.

The expulsion of the Manichaeans was a factor that was positive for the Christians because they then had at least one enemy less.

But seven years later came the persecution of the Christians. We know that this happened at the request of the Caesar of Illyria Galerius who came to Nicomedia with this purpose in mind. This ruler had the characteristics of a primitive barbarian. He was brave to insanity and thanks to his military prowess he made a career in the army moving from being a shepherd of cattle to that of co-ruler of the Empire when he managed to draw Diocletian's attention on him. Diocletian himself had no military skill and he saw in Galerius a useful tool (Piotrowicz 1935a, 795). It was Galerius who conducted the war against Persia. It is possible that the "primitive barbarian" was demanding a punishment of the Christians for the fact that they prevented his mother from daily participation in the cult of Isis. Rulers with an obtuse mind suspect antigovernment actions in every opposition to their private whims, thus one should not follow Burckhardt (1880, 290) in rejecting this traditional explanation as unlikely. One should also consider the fact that Diocletian needed Galerius as a warrior. It is also presumed that Galerius in order to maintain unity in the army began the persecutions by eliminating from it all those who did not follow the official cult (Batiffol 1929, II 159).

Also another reason for the source of enmity against the Christians is known. Not the entire court in Nicomedia was Christian. It included certainly a whole array of "faiths and cults";

was not Neo-Platonism, the greatest enemy of Christianity, present there also? At the time, the governor of Bithynia, the province with the capital city, was the faithful Neo-Platonic Hierocles of Alexandria (Burckhardt 1880, 292). Let us recall that Gnosticism was the background for the mission of St. Irenaeus. One has no reason to suppose that this dislike disappeared even for a moment. Emanationism could never be reconciled with belief in creation. Obviously the sympathy of Diocletian towards Christians was strong, while Neo-Platonism remained passive. But it would be quite incomprehensible for Hierocles not to support Galerius with all his might. And what were the sympathies of the oriental ruler? His lordly favour turned easily away from the Christians towards the Neo-Platonists. Let us add that Diocletian was very superstitious and the Neo-Platonists knew very well how to operate with this weapon.

This is how I understand the genesis of the four imperial edicts of the years 303-304. Some rioting in the Cappadocian region and in some parts of Syria was blamed upon the Christians and the emperor was led to believe this. Therefore an edict followed an edict each one being increasingly severe. These edicts were executed with greatest severity in Asia, that is, where Neo-Platonism was strongest. There the persecutions lasted for four years with great brutality and later with some wavering also for another five years. In Illyricum the number of Christians was smallest and when they were expelled from the army there were practically no others. The Italian August Maximianus joined in the persecutions willingly, but he did not find support among the population since in his provinces the persecution stopped already

in the year 307. The western Caesar Constantinus Chlorus, the ruler of Gaul and Britain, from the very beginning restricted himself to the closing of churches. The circumstance that the persecutions were losing in strength, as one moved from the East to the West, turning away from the nest of Gnosticism is very significant. In later years, after the abdication of Diocletian, the persecutions broke out to a highest degree under Caesar Maximinus Daza in Egypt and Syria, thus again where Gnosticism and particularly Neo-Platonism were strongest.

In all these oriental philosophies there was one power, due to which they could (or rather must have) led to the decomposition of every organism to which they became attached. In historical life they are a tool for the mechanisation of larger communities, which when they become disorganized seek the salvation of their existence in submission to mechanisation.

A crushed society weakened and to a large extent it perished. The view of the ancient East was accepted that everything and all are slaves of the state, which is represented uniquely by the emperor and all are to hand over the fruits of their efforts “to the insatiate behemoth of statehood” (Bidlo 1917, 7; Piotrowicz 1935a, 800).

“The state incarnated in the person of the emperor, based on the military and administrative force, became a purpose for itself, and it exploited in the unique interest of its own existence all the resources of its inhabitants up to their complete exploitation” (Piotrowicz 1935a, 759, 793).

A state that is “only for itself” contains within itself the supremacy over everything and all that is human, even supremacy over the human spirit. Could the Church agree to this?

Diocletian was as if ending the history of Rome; he shut the door over the whole Roman past. A nation composed of degenerate peasants entered such an abyss that it could not extract itself from it. The stage was reached as in Syria and Egypt where a caste system bound all to the soil. No society has ever been more an organism than the Roman one of bygone times as it held onto the aposterioristic method in the field of all law. In the days of Diocletian the process of mechanisation of everything was completed. The gifts of Cybele reached a culminating point. Oriental gods from the Hellenistic world reached Rome and they brought with them notions of emanationism until the supreme power based itself upon Egyptian and Persian models. The Roman state was developing in a direction that was quite opposite to that of the Roman civilization. The recognition and the nurturing of one’s own civilization in one’s own country became the activity of the opposition and it was frequently punished as a high treason.

The Romans recognized and fixed the duality of law, the distinctiveness of the public law from the private one. Their private law became a factor that Romanized peoples. The orientalized Empire aimed at the drowning of the private law in the monism of public law. But the Roman triple law survived. It influenced all provinces and it even reached Egypt. The military settlements there became hereditary; the inheritance was taken over not only by the son but also by any next of kin as long as he was suitable for military service. This became an intermediate factor towards

the bringing back of the notion of private ownership of land. Still in the IIIrd c. after Christ only the pharaohs or temples could be landowners, but in the IVth c. private ownership was being attributed to some even though only to the privileged (Jouguet 1933, 188).

At the meeting point between the public and private law there is a certain legal sphere that in various places and times had been treated by various civilizations as belonging either to the private or to the public law. I am referring to the law on marriage. The Romans were original in this that they had marriages on the basis of both of these laws. A fully valid original marriage (*sub manu*) was from public law and it was protected by public institutions. During Augustus there was much legislation against adultery. But it was also possible to marry *sine manu* and even to have legal concubinages. These in certain circumstances changed automatically into marriages, but marriages under the force of private law. One has to distinguish Roman marital unions in this manner; otherwise it is not always possible to understand the various complexities of the Roman marital law (*in manu, sub manu, iustum, concubinatus, contubernium*) [under the hand, wife handed over to the husband by the father; without the handing over; just; concubinage; union between the free and a slave]. Marriages which were not fully legal from the point of view of Roman law were maintained in spite of the total equal rights of the *plebs* because they were useful for those in the richer classes who wished to change their wives.

The bigamous system pressed on from the East, but the constitution of emperors Valerian and Gallienus of 258 forbade

the bigamy of Roman citizens. One generation later the constitution of Diocletian and Maxentius of 285 required the extension of the notion of *stupri* [disgraced] due to bigamy over “all the inhabitants of the state”. This was of course impossible to implement among the eastern civilizations but it indicates the exceptional strength of the principle of monogamy at least in the legal sense. In practice there was something else; a woman *unius viri* [of one man] was considered an exceptional phenomenon. However one should not underestimate this so very interesting legal side of the issue. At least private life was saved for notions of the Roman civilization.

Under Diocletian Rome was pushed aside; it was removed from the Roman state political system! National patriotism that was moved into a shadow had a declining number of followers and these restricted themselves increasingly to private life. Cosmopolitan universalism triumphed. Had the Empire split into an eastern and a western part the Roman civilization would have been saved. Finally historical necessity enforced such a division but even so there was resistance. Diocletian erred in that he opposed the hereditary nature of the supreme authority.



CAESAROPAPISM

IX

After the abdication of Diocletian, turmoil continued for 18 years. For 11 years Diocletian looked on passively from his Dalmatian (Spalato [Split]) refuge seeing how his possible inheritors were murdering one another, how there were three Augusts and three Caesars, and even six Augusts. The hypothesis about Diocletian's suicide was abandoned and the date of his death was 316.

Fate had chosen Constantine among a dozen pretenders. He took over the rule of Gaul and Britain after the death of his father Constantius Chlorus in 306. He inherited also some of the views of his father. He was a monotheist regarding Apollo as the only god (Zieliński 1924a, 13). This he mixed somehow with the Iranian cult of Mithra. He liked to express externally the cult of the Sun (Burckhardt 1880, 354).

The historical significance of Constantine lies in two of his decisions: he wanted to be the initiator of a dynasty and to make the August and Caesar functions hereditary (he had sons), and second he looked for the support of the Christians in order to engage them within the state system.

These efforts raised him in the pedestal of history and gained for him the term “Great”. He did not however realize the magnitude of the problem of how to arrange the relationship of the state with Christianity. The dilemma had to appear: either Christian ethics will be applied in matters of public life which as a result will have to transform completely or Christianity will withdraw from public life. The dynastic principle of a hereditary throne was not achievable while ignoring ethics.

He himself came closer to the Christians and obtained their support against his competitors. In the decisive battle that took place in 312 near Rome, in the space between Saxa Rubra and Ponte Milvio, about a mile from Rome (against Maxentius), a Christian regiment proved exceptionally useful.

As regards the legendary motto (*in hoc signo vinces* [in this sign you shall win]), it is a fact that also the pagans saw something supernatural in the defeat of Maxentius, something of a miracle beyond human calculations. Constantine did not profess the faith. He first had to convince himself about the efficacy of belief. And in the battle near the Milvian Bridge did not superstition also play a role? Who knows? (Boissier 1891, I 34, 35, 45).

Having made an agreement in 313 with the only remaining competitor Licinius about the division of the Empire, Constantine kept the West for himself. In that year both the Augusts (the Caesars were not appointed) gave the famous edict in Milan introducing tolerance and equality for all religious cults, thus also for the Christians. There is no doubt the edict was proclaimed in view of the Christians and for them because only they needed it. The edict contains however a reservation that the state authority will

by no means turn against paganism. The governors of the eastern provinces received special orders. The one dated June 313 sent to the governor of Bithynia survived. Thus Christians obtained full religious liberty throughout the Empire (Broel-Plater 1933, 16, 17; Stein 1928, 149).

At this significant moment in history let us look more closely at the state of Christianity at the time. Once again a conflict erupted over the validity of sacraments administered by a priest in a state of sin. The nest of the conflict formed in Carthage.

There in 311 Caecilius was elected bishop, but he was not recognized by all because it was said that his ordination was invalid because the one who conferred them on him lapsed from the faith during the persecutions. A division resulted, which after some time covered the whole of North Africa. At the head of the movement of those who had scruples about the validity of the sacraments there were two bishops, the later bishop of Cartage Donatus [Magnus] and a bishop of Casae Nigrae in Numidia with the same name. From their names the whole movement was referred to as Donatism. The issue was brought to Rome. Pope Melchiades recognized Caecilius and this was confirmed at the Synod of Arelate [Arles] in 314. It was obvious that he had to be recognized because otherwise the consequences would have been terrible. If the sacrament of orders is to be invalid because of the sinfulness of the one who administered it then all the sacraments administered by the so ordained would also be invalid. Since one never knows whether the one administering a sacrament is in a state of sin there would always be doubt about every sacrament. The only result would be the avoidance of receiving the sacraments,

and as a result their rejection. Why should the scruples stop here? In that case all priestly functions would be of doubtful validity and thus it would perhaps be better not to have any priests at all, etc. etc. And who is to decide whether a priest has any sins on his conscience? The Donatist doctrine generates an absurdity followed by absurdity from which Church anarchy had to ensue, and this followed by social and at state anarchy¹. Donatism was destined to find itself outside of Christianity.

It was in that very year 313 that a presbyter from Alexandria, Arius (who had studied in Antioch) came up with the claim that while Christ is similar to the Father he is different and created in time.

This doctrine had to lead consequently to the denial of Christ's divinity and thus it was destined to lead its followers beyond Christianity.

Thus the state of the Church was endangered by serious heresies. Also oriental expressions of fervour in faith did not help. The supposed hermitages cannot be considered as a sign of flourishing of Coptic Christianity. St. Anthony having settled on the right bank of the Nile in the ruins of fort Pispir lived there for 20 years with an increasing group of companions, as a result of which he finally fled to the Arabian desert where he died in 356 as an old man of almost 100. He was illiterate and he knew no Greek, the universal language of the intelligentsia of the East. He was full of admiration for the companions of another Coptic saint, Pachomius (d. 346) who required that his followers learn

¹ The same postulate of sinless priests destroyed Czech Hussitism in the XVth c., because it led to anarchy.

how to read. Of the three forms of life of Egyptian hermits: the absolute ascetics, the anchorites and the coenobites only the third group gathered around St. Pachomius (Diehl 1933, 425, 427, 428). There were up to 1300 of them including many craftsmen. The anchorites were dominant in the southeast from the Nile delta; in the west there were the coenobites, the majority of them working. These settlements were not monasteries because none of them had a rule; each one of them lived on his own (this was repeated on Mt. Athos).² Pachomius himself established nine such settlements, two of them for women; the centre was in Thebais. All these “hermits” living in great crowds considered themselves to be Christians; in fact they were on the borderline with ascetic paganism and the Syrian-Egyptian ideology. Let us add that there was hardly a priest among them.

At the basis of this lay the oriental view already known to us that man can approach God only in an abnormal condition. It is from there that the eastern extreme abstinence from food and living on a column etc. came from.

Besides, Gnosticism was flourishing which gained the vast majority of the intelligentsia of the Empire for Neo-Platonism. They explained mythology allegorically, added superstitions and oriental witchcraft and made “faulty tricks without thought and with magic” with the help of philosophy or religion (Morawski 1924b, 226). The famous disciple of Porphyry, Iamblichus of Chalcis in Coele-Syria, a master in demonology and theurgy was leading in

² [St. Pachomius wrote a rule for them which became a model later for St. Martin of Tours and for St. Benedict. Perhaps some of these monks were refugees from the Egyptian taxation system].

this. He linked Neo-Platonism with the old Pythagoreanism and he wanted to reach unity with God through mystical words, numbers and symbols. He claimed that with certain oaths it is possible to bring spirits and deities down to earth and even to take control over them (later the Jewish Cabbala taught this). His disciples believed that he levitated ten ells up during prayer and took on a golden complexion. In the warm baths of Gadara in Syria he evoked from two springs the geniuses of Eros and Acteros. His disciple Adesius saw and heard in his sleep some god proclaiming prophetic hexameters; he forgot them after waking up but then he noticed that he had them written on his left palm. From a biography of the “philosophers” of the time, written by Eunapius, “superstition bulges with a brownish smoke” (Burckhardt 1880, 277, 228, 260). We shall meet later another disciple of Iamblichus, Sopater, who found his way to the court of Constantine the Great and obtained considerable influence there (Piotrowicz 1935a, 818).

Among all this Constantine himself did not belong to any positive religious organization. He was a sort of monotheist wavering between Apollo and Mithra and having a liking for the Sun cult. His preferences were Eastern. He continued to develop the Persian ceremonial in his enormous court without objecting to divination. He had pictures of him made with a divine aureole, a halo circumscribing not only his head but also those of his family members. He had to justify this somehow before the Christians; therefore, for them not being able to be God, he was a vicar of God on earth. In any case everything in his palaces continued to be a *sacrum* and he himself was a *sanctus divinus* [holy divine].

One has to abandon the continuously repeated view of Boissier that the Roman emperors of that period were convinced that state order requires a single universal state religion. Constantine considered it the duty of the emperor to protect every religion which in his opinion could be useful for the state. He was not a Christian and he had no intention of becoming one, but he did not want to have Christianity against him and so he included it among the useful religions.

Someone's views can be judged with a high degree of certitude viewing the way in which he raises his children. The eldest son of Constantine, Crispus, prepared for military and administrative service in Gaul. He had a teacher (probably one of a number of teachers) Lactantius, a former rhetorician from Nicomedia, who was baptized a Christian already in the times of Diocletian and from the smoothness of his style he was given the nickname *Cicero Christianus*. Thus Constantine wished that his son would know Christianity well and it can even be suspected that he allowed that Crispus be baptized even though he did not receive baptism himself. The views of Lactantius about communal life have nothing to do with this because they were to be developed later. What is interesting is that Lactantius considered it proper to write a satire on the beliefs and wishes of the poorer classes: there will be a *vita copiosissima* [most plentiful life], honey will flow from rocks, the salty sea water will turn in lemonade etc. (Poehlmann 1925, I 625, 627; Zieliński 1921, VII 68). Thus the emperor was satisfied with the conservative attitude of the teacher and he would have considered it an error not to have some Christian factor in

the education of his son in spite of the fact that he himself did not attach to the believers.

Perhaps Lactantius contributed to the pact of 313. Crispus was 13 at the time, thus he was in his schooling age.

Meanwhile the agreement with Licinius turned out to be only a sort of suspension of arms. Constantine was removing him gradually. Having defeated him near Adrianople in 314 he degraded him to the rank of Caesar for Asia, Egypt and Thrace. In 317 he dared to come up openly with his own plan nominating as Caesars his two sons, the 17 years old Crispus and the newly born Constantine (II). He still tolerated Licinius in his province but he ruled and governed alone. When a few years later he decided he could completely dispense of Licinius, he did not waver to do so. A great war broke out. Near Adrianople where Constantine won again, 34 000 men were killed and soon near Chalcedon there was a true massacre in which 100 000 fell. It was then that Byzantium and Chalcedon that was on the opposite side submitted to Constantine. He promised to save the life of Licinius and of his Caesar Martinianus, but he held on to his word for scarcely a year. In 324 he ordered the former August to be strangled and the former Caesar to be cut to pieces.

Constantine became the sole ruler, holding the entire state in one hand (323-337). He was 47 then.

During these struggles for single rule the emperor ordered the persecution of the Donatists in 316. Their churches were closed and bishops exiled.

Two decrees of 321 that substantially strengthened the position of the Christians have to be attributed to the initiative

and will of Constantine. He gave Christian communes a legal status allowing them to accept inheritances and donations and he recognized Sunday as a holiday also for several state institutions, for the administration and the courts. A Christian administrator gained the right to close his office on Sunday. As the number of Christians was increasing, Sunday was becoming the most universal day of rest.

But at the same time what a surprise! Three times and unsuccessfully the Donatists were asking for favour from the throne. Suddenly in 321 Constantine revoked all his former decrees against the Donatists. Three years later having finally attained single rule he stopped in Milan and in 324 issued an edict for the oriental provinces requiring that not only full religious freedom of the Christians be respected but that also all damage done to the Church during the persecutions be recompensed (Burckhardt 1880, 353). Obviously Licinius had not executed properly the former edict of Milan in his provinces. After all it was more difficult to execute it in the East than in the West. Soon Constantine got embroiled there in difficulties from which he proved unable to disentangle.

Constantine was convinced that his rule was unlimited and that it extended further and higher than that of his predecessors. Not in vain did he use the title of *pontifex maximus* throughout his life. He was aiming at having supreme authority attached to this title and that this dignity would grant him supremacy not only over the pagans but also over all religious confessions, including the Christians. The more he recognized Christianity as a force, the more he wanted to have it in his service.

This was the first attempt of Constantine “trying to rule in the Church as he was ruling in his Empire”. The Church refused him the right to meddle in her internal matters while the Donatists wanted this and attributed to him the right to rule in matters of religion (Broel-Plater 1933, 20-23, 27, 33). Thus Constantine now took fancy towards the Donatists. It is difficult to suspect a sudden change of worldview in a period of five years, but are there many such men in history who would reject power “when it was willingly offered”?

The case with Arius was similar. The emperor himself opened in 325 the Council of Nicaea (the first ecumenical council). He spoke in Latin, in the language of the Roman Church and he ordered that his speech be translated into Greek (Bidlo 1917, 27). He submitted to the authority of the Council and accepted the “Nicene creed” which is a foundational text of Catholicism. This was the great work of a learned presbyter of Alexandria Athanasius, the true leader of that Council. The emperor was informed that all the supporters of Arius were deprived of episcopal dignity and he imposed a death penalty for all who would be keeping the writings of Arius. The emperor himself presided over the Council, thus he was acting against the Arians. But when Arius makes a recourse to his imperial authority, claiming that the emperor alone could determine the dispute between *homousios* [consubstantial] and *homoiousios* [similar], Constantine held onto this, called in Arius and required that he would present to the emperor in writing his own profession of faith. Then Constantine decided “that it agrees with the symbol of faith of the Nicaean Council”. Athanasius, (since 328 bishop of Alexandria), the author of that symbol

protested, but in vain. The Arian bishops returned from exile. The issue did not end there. The emperor himself called in 335 to Tyre a counter-council that was so artificially composed that it was said of it that it “with justification could be called a brigand council”. There Athanasius was condemned and in 336 the emperor exiled him to Trier where he stayed not for long, because with the death of Constantine relationships changed at least for a while (Broel-Plater 1933, 52-56).

The emperor decided even about theological intricacies. He had no fixed views leaning in this or that direction, but not because he was easy to convince or he allowed himself to be ruled by others (Broel-Plater 1933, 25, 34, 51, 52). The supposition that he was concerned about the unity of the Church in the name of uniting the state and thus he turned always against the one, whom he considered at the time to be the destroyer of unity, is also false. Would he then support the Donatists and Arians in the name of Church unity? Something else was at stake; he supported the one who at the given moment contributed to the increase of his power and the heretics excelled in this.

It is difficult not to see that due to him and during his time Caesaropapism was developing (Diehl 1924, 3, 4), welcomed by all the sects and sternly judged by the Roman Church. Thus Catholicism was against Caesaropapism – this was to be the feature of the days of Constantine and of his successors.

The linking of the supreme temporal and religious authority in one person was unknown to the ancient world. A new idea appeared here. The appearance of Caesaropapism is the first signal that a new civilization was being born.

Meanwhile Constantine continued to sink into orientalism. This is indicated not only by the organization of the court but also by its brigandage. A year after having presided at the council in Nicaea he issued a death sentence for his now adult son Crispus, who was already famous for his campaigns on the German border; Crispus was followed by one of the emperor's nephews and in 327 the emperor's wife Fausta was killed. Apparently the former fell as a consequence of her intrigues after which her turn came – according to well established eastern practices. For us it is sufficient to point out the fact that the rule of Constantine was a continuation of previous precedents and by no means does this prove his “greatness”.

It was the East that was governing the Empire because the East supplied the main resources for its support. The West was “as if a great village” where “the masses of the pauperized population were forced to restrict their needs to the lowest possible levels” (Bidlo 1917, 21). The western societies were in no way able to cover the costs of the state mechanism, whereas Syria, Asia Minor and Egypt were at the time very rich. Alexandria, Tyre, Antioch, Ephesus were market places of world importance. In the IVth c. there was an excess of grain, wine and oil in Syria and products of Syrian factories were sold worldwide. Their trade extended to Arabia and India and Gaul was flooded with Syrian products. In Alexandria Indian products met with products from the African interior; Egyptian traders met with their Greek, Arab, Italian, Syrian and Indian counterparts. Alexandrian and Sidonian glass found markets as far away as China and Alexandrian textiles throughout the East. Asia Minor was famous as the land of “five

hundred cities". Thus the taxes paid by these cities were the major source of state revenue (Bidlo 1917, 22).

In the East agriculture still flourished (with the famous irrigations), when in the West there was a complete decline of agricultural production. A peasant, if he still existed anywhere was "truly dying of hunger". From the IIIrd c. the state imposed upon the magnates the obligation to be great landowners and as a consequence the state had to assure workers for these lands. Thus the people had to be ascribed to the soil (Stein 1928, 22). Originally the freedom of resettlement was restricted only sporadically, for example to leaseholders of state domains in Egypt, but this became universal due to the taxation system that was imposed since Diocletian (Piotrowicz 1935b, 474-477). The colons were running away *en masse* from the beginning of the IVth c. Ever greater errors were made when "all the forces were centralized for the defence of the country" (Bidlo 1917, 23). Meanwhile all political forces were clubbed down by the fiscal ruin. "When society is unable to care for its own needs, soon it is unable to ensure its own defence" (Lot 1927, 27).

A colon was helpless in the face of the corrupt bureaucracy, but the official respected the magnate landowner from whom he could collect ... a permanent pay. Thus the colon started to place himself under the protection of the large landowner renouncing in this his own civil rights (for example it was the landowner who represented him in court). After a longer period something even more radical was thought out. The remainder of the peasants handed over the ownership of their plots to the great landowners. The colon renounced his rights stemming from the fact of being

a leaseholder and went to serve the landowner personally in exchange for a survival existence from his old plot. The taxes were paid for them all by the landowner. This sort of relationship was known as the *patrocinium* (Stein 1928, 20; Lot 1927, 151-153; Piotrowicz 1935b, 478, 479).

A fatal error was made in the assumption that the productivity of land depended on the number of people tilling it and thus the taxes were assessed according to the number of people working on a given plot. Thus efforts were made to assure that the colons would not abandon their land and so they were ascribed to the soil. This was probably first introduced under Diocletian and in the days of Constantine those who tried to flee were bound in chains (Piotrowicz 1935b, 477).

This is a contradiction with Christianity and thus it is obvious in many issues that certainly it was not the “reigning religion”. But there are other signs of Christian influence. For example Constantine tried to abolish the duels of gladiators, but the prohibitions were ignored (Poehlmann 1925, I 626, 627; Zieliński 1921).

Roman triple law continued to develop and frequently in a Christian manner. The Romans did not like to abolish ancient laws. Literally, from the legal point of view a father continued to be the owner of his children. Now this legislation was repealed. A father became responsible before the court for the murder of his child. In order to eliminate the selling of children among the poorer classes a state subsidy was provided for their upbringing. But no such support was given to illegitimate children. Those married were forbidden to practice concubinage and it was possible

to legitimize a child born out of wedlock only when one was single and only if the child was born of a free woman. Unilateral divorce was restricted only to cases of the most serious crimes and this was available also to the wife. Seduction was considered a public crime. The penalties included terrible tortures and they were imposed also on all the intermediaries. Adultery was to be prosecuted by the state; also the woman who freely offered herself was subject to prosecution. In the case of intercourse with a slave the woman was to be beheaded and the man burnt at the stake (the torturing of free men was abolished by Constantius). Thus the law differentiated between the free and the slave, treating the latter with greater severity, and these differences were specified with precision, but the decrees of Constantine the Great greatly improved the situation of the slaves (Stein 1928, 191, 192).

At the same time one sees some eastern influences in the penal code, such as the above mentioned tortures, beheadings and burnings. The most characteristic is the penalty designed for the murdering of a relative; the guilty were to be sewn in a sack together with snakes and dropped into water (Stein 1928, 192). This was probably taken from some customary Asiatic law where this penalty was employed even without the mediation of a court decision. Did Byzantine courts follow this usage? If so, then a major part of the Byzantine dynasts should have ended their careers in such sacks, beginning with Constantine the Great himself.

Thus one can perceive in this a strange mixing of currents, frequently opposed to one another. The laws were deriving from various sources, not necessarily commensurate with one another and so they cannot be referred to some common principle.

Christian notions next to the most barbaric pagan ones produced a mechanistic mixture. Christians were unsatisfied with this and having no confidence in the state legislation they demanded a judicial system dependent upon the bishops for civil cases and this was granted them in 333 (Stein 1928, 150, 190).

The reign of Constantine the Great merits praise for the introduction of a new monetary system that survived throughout the entire history of the Byzantine state³. The paying in goods was abandoned but soon it turned out that the rectification of the currency was insufficient when the taxation system was faulty.

Orientalization was also indicated in the choice of the capital. Constantine does not want to reside in Rome, in Milan, or even in Ravenna. He desired a capital that would be distinctly his, that would be established by him and that would be called by his name as Alexandria, Antioch etc. were named after individuals. For some time he promoted an old military settlement Arelate (Arles) in the valley of the Rhone which was becoming a rival to Massalia (Marseilles). He appeared and called a synod there (at which the Donatists were condemned). He decorated the city, extended it and made of it a capital of the Gaul province changing its name to Constantina (this however did not catch on). This city was to be his memorial in the West, however the true capital of his Empire would be in the East, but not in Nicomedia of Diocletian and Licinius; he wished to have one that was personally his own.

³ One [gold] *solidus* was worth 6000 [bronze] *nummi*. For a long time depreciation moved at a regular pace; towards the end of the IVth c. the *solidus* was worth 6500 *nummi*, in mid-Vth c. 7200; but in the second half of the Vth c. the depreciation became rapid so that at the beginning of the VIth c. there were 8750 *nummi* per *solidus* (Piotrowicz 1935a, 819).

His plan was grandiose: he wanted to resuscitate Troy. The new capital of the universal state was to be in the nest place of the Roman people, who derived from the Antizes of Troy. It was assumed to have been somewhere between Illion and Pergamon. Ultimately the struggle against Licinius in 324 drew the attention to Byzantium. Concrete facts manifested that not only the city had magnificent trade conditions, but also it had a great strategic importance as a bastion which allowed the control of both sides of the Bosphorus and the Propontis [Sea of Marmara]; in other words Byzantium could serve as a military key not only for the Balkans but also for western Asia. This was decisive. Special investigations have revealed that the decision was made suddenly, between the 18th of September and 8th of November 324 (Lot 1927, 41)⁴, that is at the time when Licinius was being beheaded. Thus Constantine did not establish a new city but he extended an ancient one that had been in existence since the VIIth c. B.C., that is, for a thousand years.

Immediately, new walls were built, encompassing an area that was four times the size of the existing city (Stein 1928, 193, 194). The building of the walls began in 326 and “the ceremonial inauguration of the new city” took place in 330. Sopater (Burckhardt 1880, 360) was involved in this because it was believed he had the ability to bring all possible successes to the new capital. In the middle of the city a column was erected on

⁴ It is difficult however to agree with the suggestion that this was to be a votive offering so as to thank God for the final victory, and that it was so far from Rome, because Rome was said to be insisting on continuing with paganism, while the new capital was to be exclusively Christian. It is time to abandon all the legends about Constantine’s Christian zeal.

which Constantine ordered to have his statue placed, representing him as Helios. He introduced also in the state the divine worship of the *gens Flaviae* [the nation of Flavians] among whom he included himself and in a message that has survived addressed to the Umbrians in Hispellum [now Spello] he specified the details of this cult (Piotrowicz 1922, 34). He also erected two new pagan temples: of the Mother of gods and of the Dioskours (Burckhardt 1880, 359). Nor did he bypass the Christians.

This was to be a “New Rome”. In this sobriquet there was the suggestion that the old Rome will never regain its rank as the capital of the state. From that time one consul was to be appointed for Rome and another for Constantinople. The maintenance of forms seemed to be the prime concern.

The idea was to stress the universality of the state as one entity with this disliked Rome and its western provinces. Constantine considered himself to be a Roman (and in fact he did not speak fluently in Greek (Lot 1927, 318)) and following his example his entire bureaucracy will insist that they are “Romaioi”. This term did not imply any nationality (there is no trace of this among them) but an association that aspired to govern over the heritage of Rome. They would continuously point out that there was no break in continuity in the existence of the emperor and the Empire. Senators were transferred from the old Rome and palaces were built for the old families whom Constantine attracted through compulsion and favours (Lot 1927, 43). Officially everything in the New Rome was Latin.

Panis et circenses [bread and games] were also introduced. And when unfavourable winds delayed the arrival of the fleet with

Egyptian grain they turned to Sopater ordering him to change the direction of the winds; and when he proved unable to do this he was not believed; it was considered that he does not want to help and so he was condemned to death by strangling (Burckhardt 1880, 361). In the entire reign of Constantine this is a most telling fact manifesting his so-called “greatness”.

Latin remained the official language of the administration of the entire state as well as the language of military command. The imperial government was recruiting the legions in the East from among the Bastams, Bithynians and Syrians. The officers were the Romaioi issuing orders in Latin. In the West the Roman army for a long time had been composed of Germans and there the Roman element was a rarity even among the officers’ corps. The state of the army was declining because it was possible to buy oneself out of military service. This had begun already under Diocletian. In Constantine’s time there were businesses that provided substitute recruits. But, every landowner had to provide a specified number of recruits from among his colons, and these were branded on the shoulder. Those supplied were the least valuable element, thus in mid IVth c. a legion was worth more the fewer it had such Romans and the more it had of barbarians. It is also a fact that from the IVth c. the word *barbarus* became a synonym of *miles* [soldier] (Lot 1927, 121, 278). But the military ranks were everywhere in Latin: *comes*, *dux* etc. (Piotrowicz 1935a, 833). In what language or dialect should the command be made: in Syrian, Germanic? Thus Latin remained. Even in Syria the soldiers had to understand something in Latin; and probably this was the only language in which they were able to converse with one another. For higher

promotions Latin was essential, thus the higher ranks of the officers Latinized and since they were attracted to the Roman material culture they were also influenced by the Roman custom and the superiority of the social order – thus the most distinguished of these barbarian officers were also becoming “Romans”. Roman inscriptions reach as far as Batanea which was inhabited by the Arabs. In Egypt inscriptions that pertained to soldiers were in Latin (Lot 1927, 318).

Let us describe this phenomenon as the taking on of Roman forms. These forms were considered a state necessity. In these circumstances the form took on the significance of the content. Thus the forms were adhered to with all might and every effort was made to consider them of first order importance. This was to have also further consequences.

The last decisions of Constantine the Great indicate that he was concerned not so much about single rule when he was fighting and betraying Licinius whom he finally beheaded, but that he intended to promote his family because he made his son and nephew into an August and a Caesar; later towards the end of his life he designated three Augusts (his sons) as well as two Caesars (his nephews).

The rule and the reforms of Diocletian and Constantine the Great sometimes moulded into a single whole and so one speaks of the “Diocletian-Constantinian monarchy”.

It has also been pointed out that this monarchy lasted until the VIIth c., thus it was of historic significance and even more viable than the early Empire (Zakrzewski 1938, V 464)⁵. If longevity is

⁵ Meyer said about the “reforms” of these two emperors that their *Neubau*

to be a measure of vitality the Hindu state of the rajahs would be the most viable. History teaches that one can subsist longest in stagnation, and a mechanism can be more durable than an organism because it puts itself less at risk. A mechanism frequently continues its movements and efforts in a blind manner even when the reason for them has ceased to exist.

Constantine the Great was baptized on his deathbed in 337 and immediately after his death he was “consecrated” as *divus* [divine] following the pagan custom (Piotrowicz 1922, 36). His sons and nephews had been baptized earlier. The middle son Constantius was an Arian. Could this have happened openly without the consent of the omnipotent father? Caesaropapism remembered about the interests of the dynasty ... just in case.

And immediately according to the old custom civil wars broke out, this time for 13 years. There were murders of at least 8 members of the family (Constantine II was killed) and usurpers appeared before the state was finally united again in 350 by the middle son Constantius (350-361). He established the rule in 357 that it was categorically forbidden to sell or give away an estate without the colon ascribed to it (Piotrowicz 1925b, 478).

The sons of Constantine the Great were decided enemies of paganism. A decree forbidding the pagan cult (“superstitions and senseless offerings”) was issued in 341 by the youngest brother Constans, the ruler of Illyria and Africa. This however was accompanied by a very characteristic fact. Immediately the next

[building anew] was *Notbau* [necessity building], which would have been impossible without the help of a mercenary, foreign army (Meyer 1902 8; 1921, 9).

year an “explanation” was given that suburban pagan temples, which had games and shows organized next to them were not to be destroyed, because it was not proper to destroy institutions from which the Roman people derived entertainment attached to their ancient festivities. The emperor abolished the pagan cult but he would not dare to touch the games! Later several times Christian emperors publicly confirmed that they will respect the games.

Ever since the Romans sacrificed their national identity on the altar of cosmopolitan universalism a terrible decline of the intelligentsia resulted. The higher minds fed themselves with antiquarian interests because the contemporary life ceased to be creative. In Athens orators were trained preparing speeches on fictitious topics. Even the fame of Alexandria dwindled in the IVth c. A handful of Romans managed to save only the Stoic philosophy from the general nihilism, while the majority sank in entertainment. The entire state was recreating day after day. Scholars specializing in this issue say that we moderns have no idea about the importance people attached to the games – and what great expense this meant for the state budget. *Praetors*, consuls and other similarly obsolete dignitaries with such *honores sine labore* [honours without labour] were responsible for the organization of the games. If some dignitary left his province after ending his term of office without having organized farewell games these were organized for him, in his absence, but at his cost. People were possessed by the need to have games to such an extent that no catastrophe could stop this. The popularity of a ruler depended on the games and the baths. Diocletian appeared in Rome only once in his 20 year rule, but already five years before

his arrival he erected the most magnificent baths there. Already at the time of Marcus Aurelius there were 135 holidays with games in a year. It has been said that this was a social calamity equal to the alcoholism of our times (Burckhardt 1880, 304; Boissier 1891, I 81; Lot 1927 119).

The Christians did not demand *panem* (bread) from the state and they shirked away from the *circenses* (games) and this for various reasons. The greatest accusation raised against the Christians was that they would abolish the games, if they would accede to power.

But they were coming to power in an ever more universal way. Constantius (an Arian) extended the decree of Constans over the whole state and in 354 he ordered that pagan temples be closed.

The court in Constantinople was still full of “ruling eunuchs and camarillas” (Piotrowicz 1935a, 828), thus it would be difficult to find some ideas among them. The purpose of such rule was the maintenance of the rule. Since the East was concerned only with confessional disputes and every political or social movement took on a religious garb and acted only when it was clad in such a way, the imperial government had to watch religious issues closely taking into account only the stronger camp and sympathizing with the one that agreed to Caesaropapism. This can be well observed studying the biography of St. Athanasius and his fivefold exile.

Immediately after the death of Constantine in 337 Athanasius was recalled from his exile in Trier. However when the whole of Syria moved against the main codifier of the Nicene decisions, and when the synod of 340 deprived Athanasius of the title of bishop,

he did not find any help in Constantinople. So he found refuge in Rome supported by Pope Julius I.

The eastern bishops called to Rome for a synod did not come. This was a notable forecast of the future schism. It was then that Athanasius brought to Rome two Egyptian hermits. Only then, in this year 340 Rome found out what was happening in Egypt for over a century. These hermits however did not generate any major interest (Boissier 1891, II 362).

Constantius the Arian took on the battle in favour of Caesaropapism but initially this was done less intensively than by his father. Christianity was already dividing into two camps, the papal and the imperial. Athanasius returned to Alexandria in 343 but he was not safe there. In that year two synods in Sardica and in Philopopolis threw anathemas on one another and also the followers of Arianism called a new synod next year to Caesarea. The Arians, the greatest opponents of the papacy, attributed to the emperor authority in religious matters. On the request of the emperor a new synod was called to Jerusalem which accepted the Arians to unity with the Church. The bishops gathered there sent a letter to the Christian communes in Egypt and Libya in which they stressed that the emperor had ordered reconciliation with the Arians and that he had recognized their orthodoxy. And when in 350 Constantius beat the usurper Magentius he moved more strongly against the supporters of the Pope. Also in the West the followers of Caesaropapism were organized, and Athanasius was condemned by the synod of Arelate in 353 and in Milan itself in 355; furthermore he was accused of high treason (as one who

refused the authority of the emperor) and again he was exiled from Alexandria.

Three years later, in 356 Hosius, the bishop of Cordoba, wrote to the emperor and in this letter he clearly distinguished between the two distinct powers, that of the Church and the temporal one. He denied the temporal power any right to intervene in Church matters. But by then Constantius considered himself to be the “bishop of bishops” and he demanded that the Church authorities would submit unquestionably to his will. He openly dictated what the synods were to enact. At that time he repealed the decision of the synod in Rimini that freed Church property from taxation (Broel-Plater 1933, 62, 63, 80; Diehl 1933, 420-424).

Athanasius temporarily hid among the Egyptian “hermitages”. He spent five years there and what he did had a first order historical significance. His activity is contemporaneous with that of St. Basil the Great (who died in 379), and who already in 362 had a Rule prepared specifically for the monastic state. The practice of the eremitical life moved from Egypt to Palestine and further on into Asia Minor, where, thanks to the strong hand of St. Basil, its more valuable part was framed into the Basilian Order. Others remained beyond the organized Church. Similarly St. Athanasius in Egypt directed the anarchic, chaotic and too numerous hermits, onto ways of a specifically designed mode of communal life within some frame of life. One could say that he tried to introduce there an element of western, Roman, thinking (Stein 1928, 227, 229; Diehl 1933, 409, 410, 417). But the very idea of monastic life was still for a long time alien in the West. The years that Athanasius spent in the hermitages, 356-360, were a time of Catholic propaganda.

Immediately after the death of Constantius in 361 Athanasius returned to Alexandria to witness something unspeakable; the erection anew of statues of pagan deities. Obviously he again fell into conflict with the new government.

Julian the Apostate 361-363 met in his youth with the worshipers of the Sun who for their own benefit pretended to be Christians. When he was visiting the presumed Troy (New Ilion) he was guided by bishop Pegasius who “became a bishop so as to protect with his authority the pagan temples from destruction. He worshiped the Sun and in secret he prayed to Helios”. Such things occurred among the eastern Christians, among the Arians, Donatists and Gnostics. There is no doubt that in the apostasy of Julian Neo-Platonism played an important role; the famous Maximus of Ephesus was considered to be his advisor. Also associated with Neo-Platonism was his sympathy towards the Jews; he began work on the rebuilding of the Jerusalem temple. The explanation of the apostasy as regret over the loss of the intellectual traditions of the classical world has to be abandoned. At that time such worries were already redundant (Morawski 1924b, 237, 245; Zakrzewski 1938, 8).

Julian was recognized by Constantius as Caesar of Gaul, but he was aiming higher and he rebelled. Before the decisive battle against his uncle, near Strasburg, he spoke to his “legions” probably being immediately translated. The soldiers responded by singing a German war song and declared him emperor raising him on shields as was their custom (Simanski 1931, 125). Already on January 6th 361 Julian was in Vienne in Gaul at a Christian service and in December of that year he publicly offered an ox to

the gods in Slavonia (Morawski 1924b, 242). His rule lasted only for several months from December 361 to June 363.

Christianity must have served well the social needs since Julian established philosophical monasteries and required that sermons be preached to the people. Paganism was to be organized into a Church following the Christian example; the emperor as the head of this Church sent pastoral letters to his subject priests (Piotrowicz 1935a, 830). Thus this was still Caesaropapism and nothing else but in pagan forms.

Julian encountered an alliance of Neo-Platonism with Mithraism (Morawski 1924b, 225) against the Christians and he served this alliance as a tool. He himself noticed well the meeting points between Christian ethics and the Roman practical philosophy of Stoicism and so he wanted to maintain many a thing from Christianity but in pagan forms. In his mind there was an excessive conviction about the basic significance of form. Just as Constantine the Great made efforts to maintain a Latin form in the East, so Julian the Apostate locked everything into the form of pagan cults. They both exalted form above content or rather they considered that they can violate the content with the help of forms, that they will make it subject to them through external forms. They both did not know that for content to persist and survive it specifically adopts various forms in various times.

Besides Caesaropapism a second feature of the beginning new civilization appeared; the primacy of form over content.

Christianity no longer feared negative influences coming from an intellectual encounter with the pagans. It absorbed whatever was best in the Athenian and Roman civilizations. The second

half of the IVth c. was marked by Gregory Nazianzen (c. 328-390) who declared: "I place science above all earthly treasures and I know nothing more precious on earth. Indeed intellectual effort brings us most closely towards heavenly bliss and to the desire of immortality" (Straszewski 1905, 78). The somewhat younger St Jerome (b. 340) believed in the possibility of a synthesis of the classical education with Christianity; he quoted on every occasion their authors, copied their style and expressions even when it was necessary to criticize their content. He noticed the literary beauty of the Sacred Scriptures, exalted the beauty of the Psalms, of Deuteronomy and the Prophets. He compared David with the greatest poets (Boissier 1891, I 207, 218, II 331).

Christian poetry appeared in the Latin language and already in the IIIrd c. its position was durable. In 330 Iuvenus wrote the Gospel in rhyme searching among the authors for proper classical terms (Boissier 1891, II 43) and around the year 350 he also wrote the Old Testament in Greek verse all the way up to Saul. Apolinaris of Alexandria wrote also tragedies, comedies and odes on biblical topics, in a manner akin to Euripides, Menander and Pindar. His son, Apolinaris the Younger arranged the Gospels and the Acts into dialogues on the mode of Plato. It was the principle in Christian literary circles that it is impossible to understand rhetoric without Cicero or grammar without Virgil (Boissier 1891, I 204, 214). Literature which fell in the second half of the IIIrd c. was reborn in the IVth c. primarily thanks to the Christians. Their language was poorer but they represented only the last link in the decline that had continued for three centuries (Boissier 1891, II 375, 378, 379). Their notion of poetry was lower, they frequently

took simple rhyming for poetry, but this was happening not only among the Christians – this was a literary characteristic of the period. Thus the struggles of Julian the Apostate had nothing to do with the so-called concern for the treasures of the “classical civilization”.

Julian died during a Persian expedition, having been wounded heavily in 363. Athanasius spent the time of his rule in his fourth exile. He was called back by Jovian (363-364), who restored to the Christians all the rights that they had under Constantine the Great. This new emperor died en route without having reached Constantinople.

To what extent the forms were adhered to, can be seen from the fact that Constantius, Julian and also Jovian were all deified after death. Such an act meant (as we know from previous discourse) that the decisions of the deceased were confirmed and included among the binding laws. In this case these laws were quite contradictory. Obviously the understanding of the legal significance of such consecration was diminishing. The pagan form was maintained by some force of inertia and with some superstitious fear that the abandonment of these forms may have some negative consequences. These deifications were to last until 375 (Boissier 1891, II 375, 378, 379).

The next choice of officers was Valentinian I (364-375). What sort of corruption he encountered in the administration can be seen from an incident that took place at the very beginning of his rule in 364. The city of Leptis in Tripolis refused to give a bribe to a general of the local regiment. As a result it was left three times to be pillaged by the local Libyans, and when complaints were made

those who dared to struggle against the corruption were beheaded (Stein 1928, 275-277).

Valentinian, in spite of being a Christian, restored the estates that had been taken away from the pagan temples. He punished private fortune-tellers but he maintained liberty for sacral horoscopes and in general for everything that pertained to the cult. Forbidding new cults he made an exception for the Eleusian mysteries. He restricted the right of asylum in Christian churches and incorporated into the *curiae* those who were ordained as priests in order to free themselves from municipal and *decurial* duties (about which there will be more below). He impeded the reception by the Church of testament donations etc. A contemporary historian Ammianus Marcellinus wrote about him that he was neutral among the diversity of confessions. This was a return to the policy of Constantine the Great who strove not to have any denomination against him.

Pagans held responsible functions during his days. Both sides make concessions and tolerated one another while in the middle there was a group of those who were indifferent or undecided. These were represented in the high world by the poet Ausonius who was entrusted with the function of educating the emperor's son Gratian (Boissier 1891, II 254-257). Obviously Valentinian himself must have belonged to the indifferent group and he evaluated religions only from the political point of view.

This time again the principle of universality failed. Valentinian chose as a co-ruler his brother Valens, who was a line soldier in the guard, giving him the title of August and he made him rule over Asia, Egypt and Thrace. At the same time he gave

him Constantinople as his capital, while he himself resided in Milan. The centre of gravity of the governing power moved again towards the West “but for the last time” (Piotrowicz 1935a, 832). Valens (364-378) was an Arian and he sent Athanasius into exile for the fifth time in 366. For a time the Arians became the masters of the East and Arian propaganda in the West was so successful that Valentinian had to take them into account. In Milan itself an Arian was the bishop. But the sympathies of Valentinian in the West turned towards Catholicism and when the bishopric became vacant it was given to the greatest defender of Catholicism, to St. Ambrose (340-397). Also Valens became more pliant. He allowed Athanasius to return to Alexandria where he could govern the diocese without interference until his death in 373.

The reigns of Valentinian and Valens manifest clearly that the East was distinct, both politically and in the religious sense. The division of the state between the brothers was based upon religious differences and the religious considerations served as a cover for the ends of dynastic policies.

Valentinian was the last emperor to be officially declared posthumously *divus* (Piotrowicz 1922, 35). After his death the division of the state into a Western and Eastern one was maintained. The West fell into the hands of the son of Valentinian Gratian (375-383), who appointed as his co-ruler his step brother Valentinian II (372-392), a four year old child, assuring in this way the reigning of his house.

During this unclear situation of the rulers truly significant changes were taking place. Let us start with the moves of Valens.

Since the bureaucracy thought up in such detail after some time proved again inadequate and faulty a new “reform” was introduced in 364. Since the government tax collectors (even though there were not hundreds but thousands of them) proved unable to gather taxes from the colons, the landowners were made tax collectors (with no remuneration). Landowners who possessed more than 25 morgen (or their procurators in larger estates) were ordered to perform the functions that were held by municipal councils and municipal administrators, together with the lower judiciary. Also in villages belonging to municipal regions it proved possible to function without state tax collectors. Compulsory tax collectors were designated, called the *decurioni* from among the municipal citizens, who had the right to sit in the municipal councils, the so called *curiae*. This *privilegium odiosum* [odious privilege] was imposed upon them hereditarily and when the *decurion* proved unable to collect the tax (increasingly frequently there was nothing to collect from) he had to pay from his own property. The people increasingly frequently fled, dispersed – but no matter! The treasury had to obtain the same returns, namely from the pocket of the *decurion*. Thus, after some time, these hereditary *decurioni* were completely ruined by the state. To prevent them from removing themselves from the function of tax collectors, they were forbidden to enter the army, government administration “or other professions”. Their only profession, hereditary at that, was that of a *decurion*. Those who fled were hunted out. Not infrequently the escaping *decurioni* hid among the Egyptian “hermits”. Emperor Valens required that they be fished out and in 375 he wanted to recruit all the hermits ... to the army

(Stein 1928, 230). The unhappy *curiales* remained tied hereditarily to their duty in the commune until the time the insatiate treasury consumed the last vestige of their property (Piotrowicz 1935a, 804, 808, 809; Stein 1928, 20, 22; Bidlo 1917, 79; Lot 1927, 132-146).

Valens was an Arian, thus all the more strongly he supported the principle of Caesaropapism in the East. On the contrary, Gratian removed all Arians from the western statehood and demoted their bishops. He rejected the title *pontifex maximus* and from 382 he abolished all state subventions for pagan cults (Boissier 1891, II 259). It looked as if they agreed about the division in religious policy. There must have been a growing conviction that it is not possible to keep the East within Catholicism.

The eastern Empire was falling at the time of Valens under military defeat. The loss of Mesopotamia to the Persians is of secondary importance compared with the invasion by the Goths whom the usurper Procopius invited in 366 to help him. It was necessary to give away to them whole countries for settlement (primarily Moesia) but this did not satisfy them. They wished to be fed by war. The Visigoths brought the Ostrogoths and the Huns and together they inflicted a major defeat upon the Empire at Adrianople in 373 (Valens was killed there). The conquest of the Balkan Peninsula by the barbarians began.

The remaining nephew Gratian was not interested in the eastern heritage and he appointed one of the generals, Theodosius (379-395) as a ruler there. He was a pagan who only later received baptism. But it was difficult to speak of any new hegemony of the West. Gratian was killed in 383 by his general Maximus [Magnus]

who proclaimed himself Caesar in Gaul and was recognized as such by Theodosius. He managed to rule there for five years. The former co-ruler of Gratian Valentinian II (378-392) was able to take over rule of western Italy only in 388.

Theodosius introduced a turning point in Byzantium. He did away with the Persian ceremonial and curtailed the soldiers. He was unable however to curtail the games! The great Symmachus himself encouraged the emperor to make them as magnificent as possible. Following his advice Theodosius sent elephants to Rome, where they were welcomed with applause. In 384 Rome received a group of Sarmatian prisoners to fight as gladiators. A few years later a Christian poet Prudentius spoke up sternly against this kind of “recreation” and towards the end of the IVth c. the fighting of gladiators ended. But all the other forms of games continued and matches between athletes were reintroduced in Africa by the pious Gratian (Boissier 1891, I 80-82, II 167-174). Theodosius did not lack the good will to abolish the games but he had to submit to them.

An emperor who decided about the religion of his subjects was unable to deal with the games! Theodosius resolved his religious doubts in favour of Catholicism. From then onwards it is to be the only recognized religion in the state. Theodosius called a synod in the capital which again condemned the Arians. The emperor ordered them to transfer all the churches back to the Catholics and he did not flinch to use force against the stubborn. He forbade all heretics from residing in the capital and he deprived the Manicheans of the right to leave testaments or receive legacies. He excluded the Arians and Manicheans from the

administration and the army, even in the provinces (Bynes 1925, 84). It is exceptional that Theodosius did not play political games in religious matters nor was he a supporter of Caesaropapism; he seems to have inclined towards the theses of bishop Hosius.

In these very years, in 385 and the following ones, the last great confrontation of pagan and Christian minds took place. At issue was the removal from the Senate curia of the last statue of a goddess, Victoria. Valentinian II was the nominal ruler who was 12 when he took the throne of the West, and he survived on the throne until he was 22 (d. in 392). The person of such a youngster could not have been decisive; the whole issue was obviously steered from the court of Theodosius.

The initiative has to be attributed to the bishop of Milan St. Ambrose. This father of the Catholic hymnology was well acquainted with and a lover of classical literature. He found so much goodness and truth in it that in his awe he assumed that some elect knew some books of the Holy Bible. He arranged his treatise *De officiis clericorum* [On the office of priesthood] strictly on the mode of Cicero. His sermons in Milan on the six days of creation, the famous *Hexaemeron* [six days], are as if the Bible illustrated with Virgil and Pliny. Undoubtedly Stoic ethics was the reason why the saintly bishop saw so many similarities and analogies (Boissier 1891, I 339-341, 281). Ambrose was completely formed according to the Roman humanistic heritage; after all he was descended from the ancient family of the Aurelians. His father had been a prefect in Gaul and he himself was a governor of northern Italy before he changed this lay office for the priestly garb.

The main opponent of St. Ambrose also descended from the same Aurelian family; he was Quintus Aurelianus Symmachus (340-402), who went through all the possible stages of a career until he reached the highest point in the days of Theodosius. Let us stress that he was highly respected by the Christians as a man of great knowledge and with no flaw on his character. This was all the more important because he was a wealthy man who could afford to organize games at the cost of a million *sestertii* only to celebrate the nomination of his son as a *praetor*.

Symmachus prepared a protest in the name of pagan senators, the so called *relatio*, against the removal of the statue of Victoria. This document has survived in its totality and it is a plentiful historical source of information on the mentality of the time. This writing was maintained in a serious tone and it had no negative remarks about the Christians. It was a long memorandum that was read publicly in the great hall of the *consistory* of Valentinian II in the presence of all the officials. Immediately afterwards the *protestatio* of St. Ambrose was produced, at first as a short version and later an extensive one. The whole case was treated against the background of the question wherein lies the supreme authority. St. Ambrose addressed the emperor in terms indicating that the bishop was “conscious of being an interpreter of the supreme authority, which was above that of the kings” (Dopsch 1921, II 273-278, 280).

The statue of Victoria was not brought back. Christianity won, and yet it failed to combat the games or social relationships that were so deeply anti-Christian, most fatal arrangements that were leading to depopulation!

How often accusations against Christianity were made on this issue! We cannot bypass this problem; it is our duty to look into it.

First, we have to ask what kind of Christianity? The eastern one, the Byzantine that itself was calling for Caesaropapism was as it were a branch of the state administration and it was always of the same opinion as that of the current ruler. Thus we have to ask more precisely: why did Catholicism not save the state and the society in the West?

In that generation matters were settled in the Church in favour of western views about asceticism and the communal “escape from the world”. The Egyptian “hermitages” were still attractive. The life of St. Anthony of Thebais was written by St. Jerome and when he sent this work to Rome (after 380) this was a true revelation. St. Jerome was a famous writer residing consecutively in Trier, Aquileia and Antioch, living in the great world and then suddenly he spent five years in the Chalcis desert⁶. He discovered Athos and was a forerunner of the later “monastic republic”. Next he spent two years in Constantinople and then three in Rome where he worked on the Vulgate. This man was impressed by oriental asceticism which in Rome was considered excessive and did not bring him friends. Discouraged, he left Rome in 385 and moved to the Holy Land. But he changed his views. In Bethlehem he established not a hermitage but a monastery in which he did not require training in eastern asceticism but demanded intellectual work.

⁶ From where did the supposition about a “Syrian desert” Chalcis come from? This is difficult to understand.

The writer Sulpicius Severus was also not impressed by the life of the eastern hermits and he proposed instead the life of St. Martin who established a monastery in Marmontiers near Tours in Gaul. This oldest patron saint of France, and in fact the first saint venerated publicly, came from Pannonia. He was a professional officer who after a varied life history became the bishop of Tours. He propagated the Gospel with much success. Sulpicius wrote that one such Martin was worth the whole of Thebais (Boissier 1891, II 53-57). The great Paulinus of Nola was a disciple of St. Martin.

Another saint imposed his mind on the end of the IVth and the first decade of the Vth c., namely St. Augustine. He began as an African Manichaean; born in 353 in Tagaste in Numidia, he was a professor in Carthage, in Rome and in Milan. In a villa of a friend Varecundus called Cassisiacum near Milan he gathered in 387 a group of people from the highest intelligentsia and it was there that St. Ambrose baptized him together with his friend Alypius and his son Adeodatus. He summarized the story of his conversion by St. Ambrose [in his *Confessions*] in the succinct words: “Along with the eloquence I prized, there also came into my mind the ideas which I ignored; for I could not separate them. And, while I opened my heart to acknowledge how skilfully he spoke, there also came an awareness of how truly he spoke – but only gradually”⁷. (Straszewski 1905, 140). Having returned from there he aimed to reconcile classicism with Christianity in philosophical dialogue; he strived for a certain purification of ancient knowledge so as to make of it a Christian knowledge. He wrote on grammar, rhetoric,

⁷ [Taken from the translation by Albert C. Outler: <http://www9.georgetown.edu/faculty/jod/augustine/conf.pdf>].

dialectic, a treatise on music and a kind of school encyclopaedia. He stayed some time in Rome but then soon returned to his native region. Since 391 he was in Hippo as a presbyter and since 395 as a bishop. There he had no time for the long reading of “authors” and *omnes illae deliciae fugere de manibus* [all those pleasures were flying out of hand], but he admitted that they were *deliciae* [pleasures] (Boissier 1891, I 294, 304, 313, 325, 336). There was no sign of eastern asceticism! And later in his *Doctrina Christiana* he explained that all the sciences may serve a better understanding of the Bible and claimed that in the pagan writings there is no shortage of maxims which are useful for an orderly life (Boissier 1891, I 208, 209).

Eastern and western views about holiness clashed strongly. The eastern view, even though numerically dominant was qualitatively poorer because it was passive. In the West it was required that a holy man would act, that he would battle externally in the name of Christ. Thus only in Catholicism did a culture of action flourish in the monasteries. Thanks to this a concrete program of rebuilding the state and society developed in Catholicism, something that was never produced by eastern Christianity.

However it was still a long way towards a program. At the moment there was no such program and everything was racing towards catastrophe along the slipway of more and more rigid mechanism. It was known that the *patrocinium* was not serving the people well. This was combated by Constantius in 360 and by Valens in 369; but the treasury was empty and the defence of the country so poor! The situation was reached that during the days of the Catholic Theodosius lawyers were forbidden in 384

to defend people of the lower classes before the courts when they were in conflict with the authorities, thus it ceased to be possible to complain against fiscal abuses. And when two years later the emperor encouraged the presentation of complaints against the abuses of the officials only few profited from this possibility so as not to be subjected to even worse abuses. In 393 this same Theodosius ordered that all those who had any property at all and who did not belong to some caste be obligatorily included in the class of the *curiales* (Stein 1928, 297, 298, 301, 302). Thus the last vestiges of personalism in society were being destroyed. Theodosius and Valentinian II directly referred to the colons as to “slaves of the land on which they were born” (Piotrowicz 1935b, 478).

If that was the situation in the West, what was happening in Asia? We have a classical testimony from a sermon by St. John Chrysostom in Antioch around the year 390 where he referred to the Asiatic estate owners: “For upon them that are pining with hunger, and toiling throughout all their life, they both impose constant and intolerable payments, and lay on them laborious burdens, and like asses or mules, or rather like stones, do they treat their bodies, allowing them not so much as to draw breath a little, and when the earth yields, and when it doth not yield, they alike wear them out, and grant them no indulgence. And what can be more pitiable than this, when after having laboured throughout the whole winter, and being consumed with frost and rain, and watchings, they go away with their hands empty, yea moreover in debt, and fearing and dreading more that this famine and shipwreck, the torments of the over-lookers, and their dragging them about, and their demands,

and their imprisonments, and the services from which no entreaty can deliver them!”⁸

The owners were usurers of the peasants for whom the only salvation lay in the *patrocinium*. The same was in Egypt. In the IVth c. there were still many free peasants there, but at the turn of the IVth and Vth c. almost all became slaves ascribed to the soil. The freedom of resettlement was constantly being restricted. Theodosius himself abolished it in 386 also for the Palestinian colons.

The Egyptian administrative methods are illustrated by a letter written by a woman from the turn of the IVth and Vth c. who was escaping from the authorities: “My husband who owed 300 solids in taxes that we arrear for two years, was flogged several times in prison and three of my beloved children have been sold; I fled and run from place to place. Now I wander in the desert being often caught and constantly flogged. At present, I am in the desert for three days with no food” (Piotrowicz 1935a 846, 852; Stein 1928, 302, 303). Similarly Christian rule did not prevent the calamity of depopulation. The five year censuses were consistently showing that the population was declining even in the richest provinces. And this began in the vicinity of Rome. The offices proved unable to maintain the aqueducts in order and allowed the bogging of Campania. All the offices were neglecting something and once they were allowed to operate the entire state was falling into neglect and ruin. Already Virgil noted the desertification of the vicinity of Rome. The same was observed by Livy and Propertius,

⁸ [This translation is taken from <http://www.catholicprimer.org/chrysostom/matthew/homily061.htm>, homily LXI on Matthew XVIII 21].

and in the IInd c. Lucan claimed that the whole of Italy was heading for desolation. With the beginning of the IIIrd c. it was noticed that the population of the largest cities such as Alexandria had halved. Is this not the explanation for the invitation of barbarians to settle in the depopulating provinces? How ludicrous is the accusation that the monasteries contributed to the depopulation!

Was this not the crown adorning the swelling product of fiscalism; the ultimate masterpiece of bureaucracy?

Only few Catholic writers noticed the sins of bureaucracy and no one proposed any remedy as a substitute. There were complaints about the abuse of power of the bureaucrats but no one ever pointed out that the very existence of bureaucracy is the source of evil. It was held that all would be well if only righteous people sat at the offices.

There was no reflection on the state as such, on statehood and government. Ever since theoretical investigations of public affairs ceased in Alexandria (because the Museum became a state institution), no one looked into these issues anew. The opposition of the jurists was increasingly weaker until it ceased to exist, suppressed totally and the entire political wisdom of the second half of the IVth c. could be condensed in the motto: *quod principi placuit...*[whatever pleased the ruler...].

One is stupefied by the picture of the total political and social thoughtlessness of absolutely all, pagans and Christians, Arians and Catholics. There were even some who considered that everything is fine. At the head of the satisfied (sic!) one finds the strongest head among the pagans, Symmachus himself. He left ten books of his correspondence, the last one of which contains

the *relationes*, that is, the exchange of letters and writings on official matters. He was an eloquent man of letters, a great orator, sometimes compared to Cicero and one who would copy Pliny the Younger. He corresponded with all the greats of his times, with Romans and with the Latinized dignitaries of barbarian origin. There are indications how quickly the Goths and Vandals adopted the customs and regulations of the classical world, how they educated themselves. What is strange however is that nowhere in his writings is there any inkling of the nearing end! He was impressed by the high standard of civilization. Schools were as numerous as possible, careers were open to those with merit, learning led to all public offices etc. He was fully satisfied; how little did he see!!! (Boissier 1891, II 156-157, 180, 184, 187, 191-193).

He could not visit the countryside because of banditry but he did not see that this meant the end of the *pax romana* (Roman peace). At another time when the emperor was short of soldiers he turned to the patriotism of the rich asking them to send their slaves to the army and he did not see the misery of the situation! The treasury was empty, the rich were running out of resources, the leaseholders had nothing from which to pay their dues and it was necessary to subsidize financially the agricultural estates. Symmachus saw all this but he was not alarmed. These shortcomings were ancient, they grew slowly and so gradually people adapted to them. But there was belief in the immortality of Rome and the final catastrophe came as a surprise. This is obvious from the letters of Symmachus. The politicians knew history; they knew well the old times but they had no clue what was happening

in their contemporary times. This was a sight deserving serious study; a society proud of its civilization, of its past which at the same time, step by step was approaching a precipice not realising that it will fall there (Boissier 1891, II 193, 194).

Symmachus was simply a naive person and political naiveté was a characteristic of the entire generation. No one had any inkling that the free discussion of public issues is the first condition for the prosperity of any association. They grew out of the custom and finally they forgot that one could criticize the government. And a program can only appear as a result of critique⁹.

The Catholics also had no political education because not one had it at the time. The Church restricted herself in her opposition to issues concerning faith and aimed at liberty that would allow the fulfilment of strictly religious functions. In this field however the Church practiced a direct opposition that was absolute and uncompromising. To those who were surprised by this or did not comprehend, the Church clearly explained that she has the right of highest supremacy. That was the only principle of opposition, the only theory that entered into the field of public life. From this Catholic theory later a Catholic program was to develop. In the motto of this supremacy there lay the embryo of salvation; but time was needed, a long time, for life to develop from these embryos. Were it not for this motto the whole world would have been overcome by decaying stagnation.

Let us constantly have in mind that the victory not only of Catholicism but of the whole of Christianity was not complete, because it did not cover the entire population. Around 390 in Rome

⁹ To use our current language political censorship is a crime against the state.

itself on the Vatican hill the *taurobolium* [bull slaying] was still practiced (Boissier 1891, II 235). In 391 Valentinian once again prohibited the practicing of pagan cults with great severity, but does not the very repetition of these prohibitions indicate that they were not successful? And this prohibition concerned the official pagan religion based on Greco-Roman mythology. It did not affect the diversity of all the remaining cults which were spreading without any obstacles.

The Catholics represented a minority compared with eastern Christianity and compared with all the other religions they were decidedly a minority. All the more it is necessary to point out the decisive position of the Church, her staunchness in the defence of Truth.

A magnificent witness of this fearlessness in the service of Truth is a fact dating from the year 391 linked with the person of St. Ambrose.

There was a revolt against Theodosius in Macedonia; a very normal event in the history of the Empire whose arrangements and “order” were based on foreign mercenary armed forces. Theodosius liked the city of Thessalonica. He resided there for over 12 years and he was baptized there. This did not alter the situation in respect to the treasury. Complaints did not help and active opposition resulted. Finally a revolt broke out. The emperor conceived a reprehensible trap. He organized games during which he ordered the mercenary Goths to slaughter the crowds in the circus. The numbers of those killed are given variously by different sources, but there were no less than 7000 victims. The killers did not discriminate according to age or sex. Soon afterwards the

emperor made a trip to the West so as to visit Valentinian in Milan. That was in 391 when the western August had just forbidden official pagan ceremonies. The bishop did not triumph because of this nor did he express thanks to the government, but instead he organized a new attack on the supremacy of physical forces.

He started to criticize Theodosius for the slaughter in Thessalonica considering it an immoral act. Thus St. Ambrose proclaimed that ethics are binding also in politics.

How many unethical acts in the daily functioning of public life would have to be pointed out, when viewed them from the angle of Catholic ethics? Obviously the bishop wished to profit from the presence of the ruler of the East in Milan, and thus he referred to a recent event known to all and as yet not obscured by time. Already while Theodosius was *en route* he sent him a letter telling him that he will not dare to celebrate a religious service in his presence. He warned Theodosius that he will exclude him from the community of the faithful unless he will make a Church penance for this slaughter. He forbade him entry into a church. And should the emperor attempt to enter a church without first showing contrition and subjecting himself to penance then he will announce an interdict and all religious services will be suspended. When Theodosius arrived in Milan he went to the church wearing a crown, together with his whole court. The bishop stopped him at the door of the church. The emperor submitted, performed the public penance ordered by St. Ambrose. He spent eight months in a monastery and in Thessalonica he erected a church as expiation (Grzelak 1922, 33; Risal 1917, 40).

For the first time the highest temporal authority bent before the ecclesiastical authority. Both emperors present in Milan, Valentinian II and Theodosius I recognized therefore the supremacy of the Church and accepted the postulate that ethics are binding in public life. These were further consequences of the theses of bishop Hosius.

These were the beginnings of a future program. The following year brought the last public pagan reaction. The uprising of Flavianus and Arbogast broke out which resulted in the killing of Valentinian II. Eugenius, named in his place, who was a teacher of rhetoric by profession, issued orders that a total restoration of the pagan cult was to resume in Rome itself. This conflict lasted for two years. It was only in 394 that the usurper was defeated by Theodosius in the battle on the river Frigidus, and he was sentenced to death. With him finally all remnants of paganism fell. But in this battle the emperor was supported by a 20 000 strong army of the Visigoths under the command of Alaric (Piotrowicz 1935a, 838, 839).

The victorious Theodosius joined the entire state in his single hand being the unique ruler but only for a few months in the years 394 and 395 because he was to die soon. The universal Empire was united for the last time. Officially it was still the Roman state with Latin as its official language and with the maintenance of many Roman forms. The years were still marked by the consuls one of which was always appointed by the Constantinople ruler and the other by the one from Milan. New laws were agreed upon by the emperors before enacting and this was done in Latin. The fact that Theodosius did not return to Constantinople but remained

in Milan indicates that he would have preferred to assure the hegemony of the West over the East. But this proved impossible. If only the feeble fiction of the unity of a universal state was to be maintained the predominance would have to be with the East as it was the richer part compared with the West. When Theodosius was to appoint his sons to the thrones he gave Byzantium to the older one Arcadius leaving Italy and the West to the younger Honorius.

The tendency of Theodosius to keep Byzantium within Catholicism and to aim at a civilizational supremacy of the West over the East was only an episode in the course of history; all his efforts in this direction did not succeed in even diminishing the gulf that existed between the East and the West.

A year after the death of Theodosius, in 395 Claudian, the last eminent pagan poet, arrived in Rome. He originated from Alexandria. He wrote first in Greek but later in Latin. A certain inscription praises him as a genius, a combination of Virgil and Homer. This author, very famous during his lifetime, was full of hatred towards Constantinople. For him this was a city of apostasy. Apostasy from what? From being Roman! *Unam pro mundo furiis concedimus urbem!* [We sacrifice one city for the frenzy of the world]. And the “*princeps* should remember that the Romans whom he commands were giving orders to the entire world”. He was shocked to the marrow and outraged on the news that in Constantinople, Eutropius, a eunuch, was named consul. But the poet knew who will revive the glory of Rome! It was to be Stilicho, the guardian of Honorius and the true ruler of the state, a Latinized Vandal. It was to him that Claudian extended his hands (Boissier 1891, II 238, 247, 249, 250).

The literature of the time often praised the integrated barbarians. A Greek, Libanius, a most famous teacher of rhetoric of the IVth c. praised the Germanic officials in general and St. Augustine wrote a panegyric honouring the German Flavius Bauto, who directed Valentinian II in the West and was consul in 385 when St. Augustine was in Milan. One often gets the impression that neither the Greeks nor the Romans proved able to manage themselves and as a rule, the bonds of both states rested on the shoulders of men of foreign blood. The situation was the same as with the mercenary Greeks in Persian service before Alexander the Great when it was finally decided: “why fight for the cause of others when it is possible to achieve something for oneself”. There was no shortage of predictions that the barbarian officials will cease to “serve” old or new Rome and instead will reach for power in their own name or in the name of their own people.

The eastern Empire at the time was losing its independence to the Visigoths, who were given two provinces, Moesia and Thrace and were paid a tribute. Formally there was a truce made by Theodosius that in return for sites and pay the Visigoths would defend the borders of the Roman state – in fact however the emperor Arcadius was a tributary of Alaric. And what will happen when there will not be enough money to pay the tribute? Particularly since the “Romaioi” had no military commander who could be compared with Alaric.

In that same year when Claudian was placing Rome under the protection of Stilicho, in Constantinople a bishop of Ptolemais, the Greek Synesius of Cyrene, good in rhetoric and an admirer of Plato, stood before the throne of Arcadius and presented the

emperor with a memorandum that was truly a manifestation of his opposition. He demanded (probably not uniquely on his own initiative) the expulsion of Germanic elements from the army, the reintroduction of municipal self-government and in particular the reintroduction of the influence of educated people on government, those who were brought up on Hellenic philosophy (Zakrzewski 1938, 22). Had all these demands been followed up, it would no longer be possible for the Byzantine civilization to develop, because the state would have to base itself on society and statehood would change from being bureaucratic to respecting civil society. If one were to return to an “indigenous Roman” army and cease to make “pastors out of wolves” (Morawski 1924b, 260) the army based upon citizens would finally want to know what it is fighting for. Let us add that a bishop coming up with such a memorandum could not have been a proponent of Caesaropapism and thus he did not fit within the framework of Byzantinism.

The next year was to show that it was impossible to do without Germanic military power, neither in the West nor in the East.

In the West, Stilicho had both military and civil power, officially and legally. The emperor Theodosius gave him that authority and also his niece Serena as a wife. On his deathbed he made Stilicho the guardian of his 11 year old son Honorius. Probably it was already the father of Stilicho, a Roman soldier, who Latinized and his son was already completely Romanized. In the Roman universality, in its political cosmopolitanism, Stilicho was a Roman of Vandal origin. There were thousands similar to him, and this indicates the attractive force of the Roman civilization

and there is no reason do doubt about the loyalty towards Rome of these adopted Romans. It seems however that this concerned only the “old Rome” while the “new” was not generating such attachment.

It was because of this problem with the barbarians that the Byzantine state was to shake exactly one year after the energetic memorandum of bishop Synesius. In 396 there was no money to pay the tribute. Alaric immediately moved forward to conquer further provinces. He took Illyria, Macedonia and unopposed, he reached the Peloponnesus. Byzantine rule restricted itself to the capital and its vicinity having no forces to defend even this remnant.

Then Stilicho decided to defend “new Rome” in the name of Romanism. In that very year 396 he chased Alaric out of Greece. The old Rome helped the new. The Byzantine court soon found a way of getting rid of Alaric without calling help from Stilicho. They advised Alaric, restricted to Moesia only, to move against Italy. This method of defending one’s own country appeared in history for the first time; this was a Byzantine invention. It proved how little Romanism there was in the “new Rome”! But Stilicho defeated Alaric in 403 and two years later he destroyed completely the new hordes which invaded under the leadership of Radagaisus.

The triumphant Stilicho lacked no competitors, but not all were opposed due to envy or private interests. It is at that time that the conviction developed that the person of ruler is immaterial, and it is more important who is the person, having the highest official position at his side, who rules in the name of the monarch? It is from the time of the underage sons of Theodosius that the real

struggle was waged not to change the occupant of the throne but to change the minister. In the West this competition (often bloody) was accompanied by political thought, while in the East there were individuals deprived of this instinct. In fact in Byzantium the eunuchs ruled.

Emperor Arcadius was married to Aelia Eudoxia, the daughter of general Bauto and the eunuch Eutropius was the matchmaker. Aelia and Eutropius having got rid of Rufin, the *praetor* they took over rule together and they conducted it in such a manner that the patriarch of Constantinople (since 398) John Chrysostom was compelled to criticize the empress publicly. He referred to her as the new Herodias. He was exiled in 403 for this.

St. John Chrysostom died in exile in 407 and a year after him emperor Arcadius died as well as Stilicho who was murdered in 408 in Ravenna (the capital city since 402) by his competitor Olympius. With his death Rome as if lost its defence; it became defenceless when there were no barbarians ready to defend it from other barbarians. “The Roman, Italian arm no longer held the sword nor did it hold the plough; such an arm is of no value in history and it must disappear from history” (Morawski 1924b, 260).

This verdict is basically correct. Let us restrict it to the fact that Italy was not supplying the officers, leaders and generals; as regards the foot soldiers the entire male population of Italy would not suffice to man the boundary line of the state. The root of evil lay in the massive disproportion between the boundary line and the size of the dominating population. The evil came from the fact that Pompeius was not listened to, and later Hadrian, who proposed to

limit the size of the Empire at some fixed borders. The opinion prevailed that the borders of the universal state cannot be limited, that conquests and acquisitions are to continue. The old Egyptian (later the Assyrian, etc.) ideal triumphed about rule over the “four corners of the world”. Such a state had to be based on mercenary forces, and since there was constantly an inadequate number of these it was necessary to accept anyone whoever applied, even if they were “wolves”. The second evil developing parallel with the former was the dominance of cosmopolitanism over the national current.

For these reasons the defences of Stilicho could in no measure be long term. The situation was finally reached when on August 24th 410 Alaric entered Rome through the Porta Salaria and the famous three days of plunder took place. He did not want this himself but he could not oppose his soldiers composed of various peoples and religions. The Goths themselves must have been most disciplined and moderate since St. Augustine recorded that “the Goths spared so many people that one is surprised that they killed anyone”. The great confidant of St. Augustine, the presbyter Paulus Orosius also spoke with respect about the Goths in Rome (Boissier 1891, II 298; Morawski 1924b, 264).

At that time St. Augustine was already bishop of Hippo in Africa. In 399 he was in Carthage at the time when the last statues of the gods were being pulled down. At that time an increasing number of refugees from Italy were arriving in Africa. We have very interesting information about them recorded by St. Augustine; the people who lost their fortunes and families in Rome never missed the theatre or the circus in Carthage. This is important information

because it indicates that not only the masses needed to have their *circenses* [circuses].

In any case it became a fact that Rome could be conquered. What importance the very name of the city had in the entire world, what prestige and appeal – is well known. St. Jerome who not so long ago was criticizing Rome and comparing it to Babylon now exclaimed that with this very city the whole human race is perishing: *Deus! Venerunt gentes in hereditatem Tuam* [God! Nations have come into Your inheritance] (Boissier 1891, II 299). It was true that the Roman civilization was perishing and this was being felt universally. What will come in its place? Could it possibly be Byzantinism? Will the eunuchs direct the civilization? Probably not in Italy where already Cato the Elder formulated the thesis that Romans cannot become eunuchs. This proved true. The opposition against Byzantinism was fundamental, but meanwhile the Roman identity was dying. What will happen then?

For the moment a great religious polemic developed over the ruin of Rome; Christians were accused of being responsible for the catastrophe because they deprived the city of the protection of the gods. It was then that St. Augustine entered the truly historically universal scene. First he advanced forward his presbyter Paulus Orosius, who was a descendant of Romans who had settled in Spain. On advice and insistence of the holy bishop he wrote a study entitled: *Historiarum libri VII adversus paganos* [Seven Books of History against the Heathens] which covered universal history from the creation of the world until 410 and presented an absolute condemnation of paganism offering an appropriate Christian apology. St. Augustine himself studied the entire

problem in greater depth locating it on the foundation of Christian philosophy; thus appeared the immortal study *De civitate Dei* [The City of God] written over 13 years in 413-426.

The work of Orosius was a historical event. The entire Middle Ages drew from it and then in the XVIth c. alone there were 26 printed editions of it. Orosius did not suspect that barbarians would become the rulers of Rome; their invasions were only an admonition on the part of Providence so as to correct the communal life. He recalled that the victories of the Romans were calamities for many peoples (for example he sympathised with Numantia against Rome); but on the other hand he acknowledged the benefit of having no borders, of the *pax Romana*, of the common law and common citizenship. Thus “Romania” (he first used the term) resulted. He did not wish it to disappear and begged God not to allow a final fall of the state (Boissier 1891, II 398-402, 406-408)¹⁰.

It is strange that the fall of Rome in 410 had no echo in the eastern Empire.

Not long before Byzantium was saved by Italy but now not even a single soldier from new Rome came to defend old Rome. Nominally Theodosius II (he was seven years old when he sat on the throne) ruled, but he never showed any interest in the matters of state. He spent his life redrawing and painting illuminations in manuscripts and for this he was named the “Calligrapher”. He was dominated by his sister Pulcheria, who was only two years older

¹⁰ It is worth noting that Orosius was the first to point to the importance of the Jews in history; he considered them to be the precursors of Christianity. Did Bossuet know Orosius?

than he. She organized a coup in 414 and took on the title Augusta. She devoted herself to the cause of the state and of Catholicism; she organized her court as if it were a rigorous convent indicating clearly that she wished to discontinue the management that had existed in the court during the time of Arcadius and she declared herself on the side of Catholicism against all the heresies. The religious conflicts were at the same time a conflict over Caesaropapism or the supremacy of the Church. Pulcheria followed the ideas of Synesius and of John Chrysostom – but even she surrendered. She fought vigorously only against heresy. The restrictions that Theodosius I had imposed upon the Manicheans and Arians were extended under Theodosius II to all the heretics (Baynes 1925, 84).

Meanwhile, after the death of Alaric his brother-in-law Ataulf (410-415) stood at the head of the Visigoths. A recent historian claims that he did not destroy the Roman identity but renovated and spread the Roman name on the basis of Germanic forces (Dopsch 1921, 23). Also the contemporary Orosius wrote about him, as about a dead person (thus he finished his work after 415), and he wrote interesting things. In Bethlehem, at St. Jerome's (who lived till 420), he met some dignitary from Gaul who recalled that Ataulf was ready to offer the forces of the Goths to the service of Rome so as to sustain the Empire. It is known that by diplomacy he was removed from Italy to Gaul where he remained on Roman pay, from where however he was pushed out into Spain. This dignitary from Gaul regretted this and complained that the death of Ataulf prevented him from executing his good intentions. Orosius however was hoping that others would do this.

Finally he lost hope for the Roman Empire aspiring only to save “Romania” (Boissier 1891, II 406-409). He would like to save the Roman identity, the universal civilization based on the Roman one and taken over by Christianity.

Was this possible? And was it possible in the entire Empire? Let us see how the situation developed in the eastern Empire.

In both Empires it was necessary to change practically everything. Evil reached the level of absurdity. Some historians like the fact that Byzantium had an administration that was sure of itself, inflexible and accurate. Indeed they could have had ideal order in the chancellery papers.

The administration of the eastern Empire had not changed since mid IIIrd c. The military and civil authorities were basically distinct. At the head of the civil administration there were two praetorian prefects. One was the *Orientis* and the other the *Illirici*. They had under them dioceses headed by vicars, two of whom were given higher titles, the *comes* of the *Orientis* diocese and in Egypt the *praefectus Augustialis*. Under these, there were provinces the governors of which were not of equal rank: the *consulares*, *praesides*, *correctores*; in Asia Proper and in Achaea there were even the proconsuls who were responsible directly to the emperor. At the court of the emperor there were ministers of various ranks, from the general controller of the entire administration, the *magister officiorum*, to the supervisors of parts of the palace and various regiments of the guards and palace security. The hierarchical arrangements were very detailed, the centralization was extremely exacting and the bureaucracy was

not worse than the Egyptian one, which was considered a model (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 3, 4).

Bureaucracy at any time and anywhere, from the first period of united Egypt all the way up to the XXth c. A. D. is constantly and unchangingly “a leprosy or mould” initially imposed upon society and after some time also upon the state. The bureaucratic hordes are as if “May beetles, devouring a tree” and when they function for too long a “bureaucratic sclerosis” affects all¹¹.

Against such a background Pulcheria tried to function. She was lucky that it proved possible to negotiate a peace treaty with Persia for a hundred years beginning in 422. The eastern boundary was settled; at least in that direction the universal ambitions were finally limited; that was a return to the ideas of Hadrian. Pulcheria could take care of internal problems. She imagined that she could put into practice at least one of the postulates of Synesius – that more educated people would be admitted into government. Since the level and custom of the court depended much on the empress she took care to marry the Calligrapher properly. Finally, she found an intelligent and even literate sister-in-law. This was Athenais, a daughter of a pagan professor from Athens whom it was first necessary to baptize. At baptism she received the name Eudoxia, but we shall continue to call her Athenais so as not to confuse her with other Eudoxias. This marriage took place in 421.

Athenais rendered fragments of the Old Testament in heroic Greek verse and besides she was the authoress of the so called *Homero-centra*, i.e. she arranged the life of Christ from Homeric

¹¹ A correct, very correct expression of Łoś (1938, 123, 139, 168, 172). However the author is wrong claiming that there was bureaucracy in Athens.

verses. The idea came from a contemporary bishop Patricius; she only continued his work. Furthermore, she composed a poem in three songs about St. Cyprian of Antioch, fragments of which have survived (Diehl 1906, 43, 48).

It is very likely that it was on her initiative that a Christian university was set up in Constantinople in 425, which is said to have existed in early form already in the IVth c., but only now it obtained regular income. There were 31 chairs: three chairs of Latin rhetoric and five of Greek, 10 each of grammarians, one chair of philosophy and two of law. After 20 years of irreproachable service a professor obtained the title of a first class *comes* with the rank of an *ex-vicarius* (Diehl 1906, 32; Zakrzewski 1938, 24; Boissier 1891 I 171, 172; Diehl & Marçais 1936, 9). Maybe under the influence of such an important cultural endeavour the emperor ordered in that year a restriction on the cult of the emperors' images "so as to preserve for God a homage that excels the dignity of men".

In that same year 425 Valentinian III took over the throne in the West. He was a child placed on the throne by the Byzantine army and the factual government was executed by his mother Placidia, the daughter of Theodosius I. He reigned for 30 years (till 455) but he never came of age in respect to the women¹². His mother ruled continuously somehow managing to deal with the intrigues of her daughter-in-law whom she herself had found and brought over. She was the new Eudoxia, the daughter of the Byzantine Athenais. Political dealings centred around Placidia.

¹² Such individuals do exist.

The foundations trembled when at the head of both Empires stood women: Pulcheria, Athenais, Placidia.

The whole world calling itself Roman was overcome by bureaucratic sclerosis. In the Vth c. the decline was even more profound leading to greater economic misery. Until the Vth c. the taxes and military and administrative pay were paid in goods.

In the second half of the IVth c. bribery was rampant and the greedy administrators established chancellery taxes for the handling of issues. When such “taxes” became the norm they were legalized – a part was for the state and a part for the official. Then the bureaucracy invented presents, the *munera*. These also were adopted by the state with the reservation that officers, soldiers and people with a certain educational level were to be exempt from this. Of course the taxes and presents depended on the affluence of the client and even more so on the cunning of the official, who with the payment in goods by the state and a small remuneration could somehow make his ends meet. The poverty in the country was so severe that the dole of an administrator was envied. They therefore enviously stuck to their meagre jobs and ensured that they were available for their sons. Eventually the subalterns of the administrative profession also became hereditary (Stein 1928, 23, 24) and therefore a caste.

The consequences of draining the population were simple. The number of businesses declined and everyone tried to have as few dealings with the administration as possible. With the overall poverty also the bureaucracy ended up with nothing.

Relationships in the western part of the Empire were no better. Already in the IInd c. under Marcus Aurelius Spain was considered

to be fully exploited and even the wildest bureaucracy was unable to extract anything more from the province. In all the provinces and in Italy itself, there was a great deal of fallow land and so the emperor Pertinax in 193 permitted anyone to occupy such land if he wished to make it productive. But all of this came to nothing! In the first half of the Vth c. a contemporary author wrote how due to the excesses of taxation, due to the corruption of the administrators and the dignitaries “the Spanish provinces were so destroyed that only their names remained, the African ones fell and Gaul was a desert”. A terrible ruin resulted in what formerly were flourishing cities, and now there were thousands of unemployed. And what did the government do? It became “almighty” and found a simple remedy for everything in ... compulsion. The government was powerful; it could force all and everything! “The entire society was reduced to the role of slaves of the state” and “the only class that prospered in these conditions was the bureaucracy and the decreasing in number large estate owners.” And what about the peasants? They took to brigandage in order to survive. Thus the state was hated and the barbarians were welcomed as saviours. Some even emigrated to them just to be beyond the borders of the Empire.

The contemporaries cared little about all this. There were very few who lamented over this; possibly they were less numerous than those who were satisfied with the times. Amidst the general thoughtlessness the paralyzed majority was not concerned with public matters. In the East however there was an exception: they were interested in everything that took on the form of religion. Byzantium was becoming oriental to such an extent that it basically

succumbed to the oriental law that everything must be sacral. They were interested in politics only to the extent that it was under the guise of religion. The dislike of Egypt and Syria against the “Greek world” and Byzantium was expressed in heresies.

Was religion reduced to the service of political aims? Something so monstrous and opposed to reason is possible as is indicated by the history of Byzantinism. Oriental opposition against the universal Empire dressed itself in religious garb because this was the only possible and available mode of expressing itself that it had.

THE END OF UNIVERSALISM

X

The East was rocked with religious conflicts. The Vth c. saw the greatest struggle about the two natures of Christ. For a long time this issue was also tied with the rivalry between the patriarchates of Alexandria and Antioch. Athenais supported Antioch while Pulcheria favoured Alexandria.

Already towards the end of the IVth c. the theologians of Antioch came up with the view that God descended to reside in the man Jesus. In this view they concurred partially with the Arians. It implied that the Holy Virgin Mary is the mother of Christ, but not the mother of God, she is not the *Theotokos*. The Alexandrian school stood by the thesis that God became man, with the reservation however that Christ had only one nature, the divine, which led to Monophysitism (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 22, 23). For the people the patriarch of Alexandria was a successor of the pharaohs and being sure of his authority over the people and the clergy he stood to compete for primacy against the patriarch of Constantinople not failing to resort to demagoguery in the conflict (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 25). Consecutively there were three very ambitious patriarchs: Theophilus (385-412) who was responsible for the fall of John Chrysostom, Cyril (412-444), his nephew, who

was even more ruthless and was believed to be responsible for the Nestorian conflict and finally Dioskorus (444-451) (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 26).

In 428 Theodosius the Calligrapher was forced to appoint on the vacant patriarchal see of Constantinople a presbyter from Antioch, a Syrian by the name of Nestorius. In his first sermon in the presence of the emperor he exclaimed: "Give me a land cleared of heretics and I shall give you heaven instead; help me to eradicate the renegades and I shall help you conquer the Persians" (Zakrzewski 1938, 25, Diehl 1933, 443). Fanaticism, fierceness and pertinacity became the mottos of the religious parties. Also Nestorius denied the Holy Virgin Mary the title of *Theotokos* but for a reason exactly opposite to the Alexandrian view; he wanted to see Christ as a man who became God and so he taught that in the Redeemer one must separate the divine person from the human one. He was countered by the Alexandrian Cyril who accused him of suggesting a dual personality and not insisting upon one nature. It was pointed out to the Nestorians that there would be no Redemption should only a man hang on the cross; on the other hand the Alexandrians were told that for suffering and death a human nature was essential (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 23, 24). From both these correct complaints there emerged by itself the Catholic thesis that one should confess jointly the two natures in Christ.

Did the genesis of many revolts, turbulences, civil wars and a general catastrophe of Christianity in the East lie in the intricacies of these disputes? Did the populace excite itself about these details which were understandable only to the most learned of theologians? This was only an appearance under which

completely non-religious motives lay. Monophysitism served as bridge towards the forming of a distinctive Coptic Egypt and Nestorianism was the lever setting the Syrian civilization more strongly against Byzantium.

The Copts, the indigenous element in Egypt, were increasingly coming to the fore. An intelligentsia cherishing its own language developed. Not only were they spreading in Alexandria itself (Diehl 1933, 481, 482) but also a Coptic theological literature emerged, which was exclusively Monophysite. Such a consciousness of being different and a desire of being distinct emerged that this has been understood to be a national spirit (Diehl 1933, 431).

The great Coptic eremitic life did not develop towards higher or deeper levels. Around the year 400 the Basilians reached Constantinople itself and the principle of common life in small groups according to a clear rule and with systematic work spread so much that it even had followers in the Egyptian “hermitages”. The so called hermitages were gradually changing into monasteries (Stein 1928, 228, 299). We know that this movement was started by St. Jerome in the latter years of his life and that he required that there be intellectual work in his Bethlehem monastery. In Africa they were wondering whether the monks should also work physically apart from praying and doing acts of charity. They had no qualms in referring to the example of the birds in the sky that do no work, but St. Augustine spoke up and replied quoting the words of St. Paul: “who does not work should not eat” – and that position prevailed. It was on this principle that in early Vth c. monasteries were being established in southern Gaul by [St. John] Cassian. If St. Augustine is considered the founder of monastic

life in Africa west of Egypt it is necessary to add that he did this clearly opposing the Egyptian method (Stein 1928, 239; Boissier 1891, II 364).

None of the Copts were concerned about the social structure of their people. Since 421 there is no longer any mention of regal estates in Egypt. They must have disappeared, divided among the dignitaries. Large estate owners were constantly growing in strength particularly since they could manage with the officials. The peasants escaped under their protection and the Copts were becoming colons in the Roman sense; entire villages did this. In vain did the Byzantine government try to oppose this. In 415 an imperial edict accepted what had already happened but forbade the establishment of new colons. It proved however impossible to stop the trend so long as the owner of the land was responsible for the paying of the taxes from his farmers.

No Copt was ever interested in any of these issues, being concerned exclusively with strictly theological topics. How different is the approach of St. Augustine!

In the central part of northern Africa – in the region for which the saint was responsible – Donatism was spreading more than Monophysitism. This sect, so very dangerous in its logical consequences, led to religious insanity and anarchy. The people bonded with armed brigands (the *circumcelliones*). Bands of Christian peasants, proletarians and slaves were forming. Soon the slogan of equality was announced and the religious conflict turned into a general revolt, which did not refrain from demanding communism in ownership of property. St. Augustine stood decisively against the onslaught and taught that only the sky and

the sun can be a common property. A general revolution of the “holy ones” (as they called themselves; this was to be repeated later) resulted, full of murders and arson. It was suppressed in a bloody manner, but the memory remained. The popularised superstition of Chiliasm contributed to the madness; the Donatists moved from the lower ranks of society directly from theory to practice (Pohlmann 1925, 639-642).

Even paganism was not yet completely eradicated. In the times when St. Augustine was studying rhetoric in Carthage great games and festivities would take place not excluding those that were in the honour of the “mother of the gods” with its Gallic priests. In 399 these cults were abolished but they moved to private homes and when also this was forbidden there were riots. In Calama, in the African province, a church was burnt and the priest was killed and the local authorities remained indifferent. Also later almost at every step pagan customs were found. Some of the baptized said: We are Christians for the eternal life, but we are pagans to profit from life in this world (Boissier 1891, II 317, 320, 321).

It is also necessary to consider the locals who by no means were a passive mass of people and many a tribe stood intellectually on a higher level than the Copts¹.

The former Carthaginian power was not based on a given territory and the interior was not colonized. This explains why in the Punic wars the Numidian kings had a decisive importance.

¹ The language of the Numidians (Mauri) has its own alphabet and a distinct mode of writing. French scholars refer to this as the Libyan alphabet. Currently it is used on the Algerian desert, in Tunisia, Morocco and among the pure race Berbers (Broel-Plater 1933, 27).

Later the Carthaginians disappeared almost without trace and the Numidians were playing a role in history that was increasingly eminent. They were always farmers and shepherds (just as their descendants the Kabyle people) (Piquet 1921, 16-18, 21).

Always in these countries there was a strong tendency to come up with heresies, both within Christianity and later in Islam. Arius was from Cyrenaica and Donatus was the bishop of Irosium in the province of Caesarea Mauretaniae. When the revolutionary riots of the Donatists broke out this became an occasion for an uprising of the Numidians against Roman rule. Both movements joined together against a common enemy, the Catholic “Romans”. Their leader Firmus was proclaimed king. Even though the uprising in Numidia was suppressed it simmered on for many years after the death of Firmus. Also the Mauri in the west rose and there was a moment when the brother of Firmus Gildo had 70 000 soldiers at his disposal. The regions of greatest resistance were the Djurdjura Mts. where for a long time centres struggling for independence continued (Broel-Plater 1933, 31, 32)².

Thus the Hippo diocese (west of Carthage) lay among unstable regions and the work *De Civitate Dei* finished in 420 was written in turbulent times. From an accidental treatise (written so as to counter the accusation that Christians are indirectly responsible for the Roman catastrophe of 410) a fundamental study emerged which was to inspire minds for long centuries. In the history of philosophy an eminent place must be given to the one who said: “If I am wrong this means that I am; because the one

² The highest Peak of this range is Djurdjura, 2308 m, now known as Fort National [Now Djurdjura National Park].

who is not, cannot err; thus from the fact that I err it follows that I am” (Boissier 1891, II 333). There is an obvious link with the later: *cogito ergo sum* [I think, therefore I am]. And only greatest minds accept the possibility of erring. This greatness is striking in a thinker who summed up his whole intellectual effort in the words: *Animam et Deum scire cupio* [I wish to know the soul and God] (Straszewski 1905, 212) and who demanded ethics in all state and political life. He also taught us to aim at treating the Good as something indispensable, showing that the most perfect state of a man is *felix necessitas boni* [the happy necessity of the good] (Straszewski 1905, 206). His reflections on the free will, on grace and other philosophical considerations were to be very relevant in later centuries.

His historiosophy is as follows: There is the city of God and the temporal city, the Church and the world. The ethnographic origin and the civilizational state or the barbarity of peoples is immaterial; all these are mixtures generated by history. What is at stake are the faithful and the unfaithful, because it is in this that lays the entire Goodness or Evil. All of history is elucidated by these opposites. In his major work St. Augustine presented an overview of religious problems from the beginning of the world to the day of judgement, from paradise, through biblical history which he explained; next he presented the theory of the consecutiveness of states. In the books of David, Solomon and the prophets he found prophecies of Christ and a confirmation of his doctrine. The two *civitates* [cities, states] begin from Abel and Cain, and the struggle persists and will continue to the very end.

The work ends with a long study on the end of the world and the final judgement (Boissier 1891, II 428).

Of immediate importance was something else; some views that had been expressed earlier by Orosius:

De Civitate begins with an analysis of Alaric's onslaught. The author points out that the Romans also had plundered conquered cities and tormented the population. Is it noble to take away the independence from peoples and to force them into submission? Is not this brigandage on a large scale? The conquering of the world is described as a *grande latrocinium* [great villainy] (Boissier 1891, II 390). Thus there were doubts about the legitimacy of the Empire, Christian doubts. By simple logic those who agreed with the line of thinking of the bishop of Hippo could not be supporters of a limitless universal state. Here we have not only religious criticism but also a political one derived from religious motives.

Had the work of St. Augustine become common knowledge the Christian opinion would favour the establishment of states in given lands and this would become the starting point of a program. But one should not derive too early conclusions about the rejection of political universalism. All these men, not excluding St. Augustine, were cosmopolitans. The national ideal had already died in Rome and it was never to be born in Byzantium.

Amidst the numerous toils of a learned writer and bishop of the struggling Church St. Augustine lived in Hippo to be 73 and already felt tired at that time. He asked that an assistant be chosen for him who would be his successor. A protocol survived from a gathering of the faithful on September 26th 426, which, following the wishes of their pastor, selected his successor. There is only

mention of the old age of the bishop and not a word about any political motives (Boissier 1891, II 393, 394). No one expected any war or invasion and least of all was there any reason to fear in the autumn of 426 of the appearance a people coming from Spain.

It happened however that in 428 the omnipotent Aetius present at the court of Valentinian III blamed Bonifacius a governor of the African provinces in front of Placidia. Bonifacius had no qualms to call for help the Arian Vandals who came from Spain under Genzeric. They arrived in 429 and for ten years they fought before they managed to occupy the country and organize for good a new state of their own which was to last a hundred years. During the invasion St. Augustine ordered all to stay in place. He himself remained in Hippo which the Vandals were besieging in 430. The siege lasted four months. The holy bishop prayed for death before the taking of the city and this prayer was heard (Boissier 1891, II 395, 396). He parted from his post at the age of 77.

The African Arians immediately joined with the Vandal coreligionists. The Donatists did not like the Arians, but they joined them against Catholicism (Boissier 1891, II 395). Genzeric appointed Romans as governors, but he persecuted the Church. He ruled himself only in the coastal region but remained in good terms with the locals whom he allowed to destroy Catholic cities in Numidia and Mauretania (the whole country is still covered with ruins). From all this, a general brigandage resulted. The army of Genzeric and his successors maintained in peace only the highlanders of the coastal region. In Carthage, conquered in 432, the Vandal kings kept for half a century a magnificent court. One

detail is worth noting: Genzeric closed all the brothels in Carthage (Piquet 1921, 34, 35; Boissier 1891, II 420).

Meanwhile on the European side the Visigoths had already conquered Barcelona and in southern Gaul a separate Toulousan state was formed that was independent in the years 415-507. History was operating against political universalism with increasing determination.

There are whole libraries about the movements, invasions and settlements of the Germanic barbarians on the lands of the Roman Empire. The earlier views on the issue fell and it turned out that these were “invasions” in a relative sense, since the vast majority of the invaders remained on Roman pay and at the head of the movements stood Roman generals. For a long time there was the infiltration of Italy, the Balkans and the provinces by the Germanic element. Starting from the IIIrd c. whole regions were occupied by Germanic colons and the *inquilini* [bound to the soil]. They took up positions in the army and administration, even the highest ones. At the same time they were servants, janitors, cooks and cellar-men. They entered the Roman state not as enemies but as the *foederati* and they were given whole regions for settlement so that they would defend the state against the enemies among whom these Germans were not included. As a rule they operated not in separated out regions but in constant interaction with the Romans and among them. They also occupied former Roman settlements where the poorer population survived (Dopsch 1921, 21). In such relationships many blood relationships must also have resulted and we know that examples were given by the imperial families.

All the Germans, whether the peaceful or the warring, were at first newcomers, and they had the clan system. This did not change when they permanently took over some region in order to settle there on their own terms with their women. These however were a minority. The majority came to the lands of the Empire without women and they remained alone throughout the state among the Roman population. They were therefore losing the connection with their own clans. Could the clan system have survived amidst all the movements, frequent battles when they were moving hundreds of miles from the Balkans to Spain? After such wanderings only fragments of the clan system could have survived. The clan organisation was replaced by the camp one. Members of various clans mixed permanently united now only by the person of the military commander. Regiments of wandering soldiers formed and whoever was able or had the luck to control a major part of them and imposed himself as a ruler and lord upon them making officers out of his cronies – he entered history as the leader of this or that Germanic people in the migration of nations.

As they moved out of the peripheries, by whatever means, towards the centre of both “Roman” states, the more they were losing their clan system and so they found themselves in the situation in which they were unable to exercise their clan rights. The following of the clan laws was becoming impossible and to a large extent their native Germanic clan laws had to be considered as non-existent. Necessarily the circumstances in which it would be possible to even superficially follow the clan laws diminished.

It is not possible to function for a longer period of time without law, that is, without some established legal system. War

systematically generates ... chaos and it is not possible to live in chaos. Even the most bellicose people must have some norms of existence at peacetime. The unnecessary extension of military law would be something dangerous even for the victors, dissociating the winning society all the way to its complete decomposition.

As a consequence of their situation, having lost their own law, they looked around to the existing Roman law, particularly since they entered blood relationships with the Romans. As they Romanized, even if unwillingly, it would be difficult for them not to notice the superiority of the Roman triple law (Koneczny 1935, chap. 2 & 3). The same that happened in Gaul at the beginning of the imperial era took place and had to take place in the late imperial period among the Germanic peoples and their legions. The adoption of the Roman law meant for them salvation from multiform difficulties and complications. The barbarians began being interested in the Roman law in their own interest. Eventually from this various *leges barbarorum* were formed, but there was still time for this. The Roman law had to influence them and enter their relationships for a long time, before they themselves sat down to codify their laws. The *Institutiones* of Gaius and the Theodosian code served as legal guide for them.

It is characteristic that this code was worked out and introduced precisely at the time when there was great confusion on religious issues in the eastern Empire. Thus there were attempts at introducing law and order in other fields. It is also possible that the undertaking of this codification was inspired by the needs and the wishes of the highest elites from among the barbarians, who have always had access to the imperial court. But this is only a

hypothesis. There is no doubt however that the codification was made primarily for material, juristic reasons.

Jurists have minds that historically are very interesting! Under all circumstances they will find a place for themselves and when necessary even a way out. Thus jurists, if they are good people, are always useful. They make a profession for themselves out of searching for paths in a labyrinth and they always aim at something. At that time Byzantium was lucky to have at least good ministers of justice, the prefects. Jurists who desired some order gathered around them. What resulted was that after many years, in 429 emperor Theodosius II permitted, probably on the advice of the prefect Antioch, to compile a set of laws that had been enacted from the days of Constantine the Great to the most recent times (312-437). These studies took nine years to complete and the results were announced in 439 as the “Theodosian” code following the ageless practice of attaching the name of the current monarch to it. And thus the Calligrapher entered the history of law as if he himself were a great and caring jurist.

This code represents as if the last effort of the idea of unity of the Roman Empire. It was promulgated in the name of both emperors, Theodosius II and Valentinian III, and the Roman Senate adopted it approving it in an official ceremony. It was decided also at that time that in the future should a law be enacted in one state it would be binding in the other, only if it had been officially sent and promulgated (Diehl 1933, I 10; Piotrowicz 1935a, 855).

Reality bypassed this. These forms aimed at maintaining union but they were only formalisms which the lack of legal unity had to break. This could not have been otherwise. The inevitable

non-fulfilment of these forms, their neglect regardless of anyone's good or bad will, underlined and with time made excessively obvious the separate nature of the two states, even though for formal reasons unity had to be recognized. This is an interesting example of how formalism leads to consequences that are contrary to the intentions. And bureaucratic rule has to be formalistic.

Let us also notice a certain detail. The Theodosian code was adopted by the Roman Senate in Rome. We know that at the time this Senate was composed primarily of barbarians and what is more the capital of the western state was not Rome, not Milan, but Ravenna. It was necessary to gather the senators from all places and bring them to Rome for the ceremonial session of approval. One can exclaim: What an attachment to tradition, what respect to tradition! The whole context of the history of the times indicates however that this was only a manifestation of formalism. Also in the code itself, formality towers over everything else. Despite this however this code was a blessing and at least a formal step towards some law and order.

One should also note that the Theodosian code is not at all uniform. Eastern and western elements neighbour in it – as one could say – in the raw. It served later as a basis for new codifications that were Germano-Roman in the first half of the Middle Ages (Stein 1928, 432, 433).

This code, aiming at the unification of the Empire, came at a time that was dangerous for the extensiveness of the Roman state. No effort was made from Ravenna to regain the lost territories. In Constantinople the centrifugal Egyptian and Syrian tendencies were treated according to the religious forms they adopted.

When Pope Celestine I (422-432) opposed strongly Nestorius the Alexandrian patriarch Cyril decided to take the issue into his own hands. At the Egyptian synod in Semala in November 430 he proclaimed the twelve “anathemas” requiring Nestorius to accept them. Even though the metropolitan patriarch this time had the emperor on his side, Cyril was supported by Pulcheria. A council was called to Ephesus in 431 at which Nestorius was deprived of his see. There was urgency in making the decision before the patriarch of Antioch arrived with his bishops. They appeared four days after the verdict and sure of the support of the emperor they now deposed Cyril from his Alexandrian see. But this very year in November a separate conference in Chalcedon condemned Nestorius to exile. The forces appeared to be equal because also the Alexandrian Cyril was deprived of his office. He however proved able to obtain the favour of the court not shying from giving presents to those around Theodosius and Pulcheria. Those from Antioch presented in 433 a confession of faith that was rather conciliatory and for a time peace ensued (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 26-28).

Soon however, in 436, Eutyches, a presbyter from Constantinople reflected upon the mystery of the Incarnation further than any of his predecessors. He came up with a truly original idea that the two natures should be differentiated only before the incarnation and that afterwards everything that was human dissolved in the divine nature of Christ, thus it is no longer necessary to consider his human nature. This was Monophysitism clearly voiced and when a large number of bishops joined the sect a new denomination resulted, that was organized hierarchically.

We shall not go into the details of this confusion because basically it does not introduce anything new to the issues discussed here. We only point out that the papacy reacted immediately in a stern manner as a schism was then already very close, particularly since for four decades suggestions had been made that the highest authority of the Church be located in Alexandria (Diehl 1924, 10).

Monophysitism was organizing itself ever more clearly and Jerusalem was emerging as the capital of the movement. It is there that its protectress Athenais went. On her way she stopped in Antioch. The old Hellenistic capital linguistically maintained an external Greek character. There, speaking to the notables of the commune, she expressed herself in these significant words: "I am proud to be of your race and of your blood." In 439 she returned to Constantinople where she was at the pinnacle of her influence, and then she started a conflict with ... Pulcheria over supreme authority. Losing it, she returned in 442 to Jerusalem and remained there for 18 years until her death in 460, surviving her husband by 10 years (Diehl 1906, 25-40).

Jerusalem, as the bastion of Monophysitism, did not fail and many a riot was organized from there with the participation of Athenais. In Syria already in 436 a political party of "Nestorians" was formed. The history of this movement covers whole centuries and remnants remain till this day usually referred to as the "Chaldean Christians".

While intrigues were devised how to make use of religious conflicts against one another in 441 Attila crossed the Danube and endangered the very capital itself. A tribute was paid to secure

peace. Six years later Attila again appeared south of the Danube, so the tribute was raised and it was paid until 450.

The minds of the rulers and their subjects were focused however on religious perplexities. The new Patriarch of Alexandria Dioskorus (since 444) had conflicts with the bishops in Syria and with the metropolitan patriarch Flavius, while the eunuch Chrysaphios who dominated Theodosius II supported Eutyches. The latter appealed to Rome. A new council was called to Ephesus for August 449. It is referred to as the “Robber council”. Papal legates were not allowed to speak. They had a letter from Pope Leo to Flavius which contained a condemnation of Eutyches. Instead Flavius and Domnus, the patriarch of Antioch were deposed and Eutyches was rehabilitated. Robbery there was literal. The discussions were accompanied by soldiers and crowds of monks brought over from Syria and Egypt. Patriarch Flavius, an opponent of Monophysitism, was beaten by the monks. The papal delegates escaped a beating only because they promptly went back to Rome. Pope Leo protested and severed relations with Dioskorus. Again a schism of the Churches was shown to the world; Dioskorus excommunicated the Pope (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 22-30; Zieliński 1924b, 27).

Theodosius II (in fact Chrysaphios) confirmed the decisions of this council. The Catholic Pulcheria submitted.

Next year Theodosius the Calligrapher died and at the same time the power of Chrysaphios ended. Emperor Marcian, one of the better and more reasonable generals and a Catholic took over the throne. How did he get it? Pulcheria took him as a husband – and so a new law of succession resulted, which was to be

followed more often later. This was a kind of coup d'état which proved successful. Maybe, because some sanction for the people was deemed to be necessary. This emperor, married into the imperial family, was the first one to be crowned by the patriarch of Constantinople (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 39).

Marcian refused to pay the tribute to Attila, but only because he advised him to attack the western countries (as had happened earlier with Alaric). Soon Byzantium was to give entire provinces to the Ostrogoths and to take them on its pay, which in effect was also a form of tribute. Tributes were being paid all around. Attila moved with the hordes of Huns westwards to be stopped with difficulty in 451 on the Catalaunian Plains (near Châlons-sur-Marne) by the Visigoths who were helped by the Burgundians and Franks. Then he moved against Italy, destroyed Aquileia and stood at the gates of Rome itself.

Meanwhile in the East a new Council was held in Chalcedon. In October 451 about 600 bishops gathered there, but few from Egypt. This time the Pope's legate managed to obtain support for the Pope's postulates because he had the support of emperor Marcian. Dioskorus was deposed from the patriarchal see and the "diophysitic" formula proposed by Pope Leo was adopted, defining the Saviour as having two natures in one person. Peace ensued between the Byzantine court and the papacy. At the council Marcian was acclaimed with eastern generosity of compliments as the new Constantine, the new Paul, the new David and flame of the orthodox faith. This council raised the importance of the emperor's authority in the Church at least to the level of the papacy (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 30-32).

The deliberations of the Council of Chalcedon in 451 were characteristic also for another reason. While the language of the Council of Nicaea was Latin and there were only translations into Greek, in Chalcedon only two individuals spoke in Latin, the Pope's legate and the emperor (Bidlo 1917). In spite of the fact that just recently the whole Theodosian code was edited exclusively in Latin, at the Council, the Greek language dominated over Latin. Equal rights for both languages were introduced in all the offices of the Byzantine state. Since Latin was used by less and less people in practice Latin was being gradually pushed out.

Attila backed out from Rome thanks to a happy personal intervention of Pope Leo I. Next year, after the death of Attila the Hun state disintegrated, but under the city walls new barbarians appeared, the Vandals.

It is impossible not to stop and consider one terrible detail: amongst the hordes of Attila there were Roman citizens who had fled there from ... taxes.

This horrid information comes from the famous Salvian, a learned presbyter from Marseilles, who, following the topic proposed by St. Augustine wrote around 450 a treatise entitled *De gubernatione Dei* (On God's rule). We know by now that people were escaping from the statehood of their own state. Here we learn also that people "voluntarily ceased to be Romans and scorned the name of Roman". In a Scythian village a Roman citizen was found who had fled there, married and preferred this to residence within the Roman state. There are many details there that we shall not go into because we know this state of things, the methods and the consequences of this statehood. The state was paying tributes in all

directions and “we are constantly in bondage of the barbarians in spite of paying them constantly”. Salvian also wrote with remorse about the “begging of the Roman state treasury” which was asking for donations for public needs. Meanwhile all the Roman prefectures were an organized robbery. Let us note the final conclusion of Salvian: the barbarians on the whole were better than the Romans. The Romans therefore deserved to be beaten and the barbarians deserved to be the victors. Thus Salvian was no longer interested in the Roman Empire (Boissier 1891, II 410, 419-421). Unfortunately a sizeable proportion of the population was also no longer interested. When everything and in all directions was being “nationalized” the masses of rural population lost interest in the support of the state, which for them was an executioner. In fact they hated it (Piotrowicz 1935b, 430). This judgment went far beyond the severe diagnoses of St. Augustine. There was a basic difference. The Church, attached to the state in spite of the condemned statehood began to arrive at the conviction that this despicable statehood can fall only together with the state. Strangely the support of the Church for the Empire lasted long, and it is only at the latter’s very end that the Church separated her cause from that of Rome (Boissier 1891, II 423; Stein 1928, 511-551). We observe a beginning of this change in Salvian.

How can we reconcile this with the fact that the barbarian leaders would like to maintain the Empire? That the Roman law was so desired by barbarians? Were the barbarians to enter the imperial system as *inquilini* or even as colons they would probably not be very happy with their situation; unless previously at home they also belonged to the lowest classes, to those trod upon and

on Roman soil they found better conditions. But no such people belonged to the victorious armies of the Alarics and Genzerics! The soldiers of these armies did not come to be colons because they were given whole regions. If they had to deal with Roman statehood there, (particularly with the eastern one), this always ended with a rebellion – and always a successful one. A whole series of such revolts is mentioned in every major textbook on the history of the latter Empire. Thus, the armed and victorious barbarians were not subject to Roman statehood. They governed themselves, forming previously a state within a state. They desired the Roman private law; they yearned for the Roman triple law, for the property and contract law but not for the state institutions. These truly grand arrangements of Roman law were frequently nullified by the excesses of the statehood, which however were not endangering the barbarians.

Meanwhile the East was shedding ever more energetically not only the Roman influences but even the Hellenic ones. Monophysitism continued to serve as a formula for centrifugal tendencies. The stern imperial edicts issued after the Council of Chalcedon provoked a storm in Egypt, and in Palestine they led to an armed uprising that was subdued only in 453. Not for long however. Soon another revolt broke out, clearly against the Byzantine state, “a war of the folk masses against the Empire and Greek culture”. Monophysite services were celebrated in Syriac and Coptic and theological writings in these languages increased (Zakrzewski 1938, 28, 29). The whole of the East from then on held to the Syrian theological current; in Egypt and Syria national churches developed and the Byzantine Empire had to break with

Rome to calm the opposition (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 33). Even the most Catholic emperor would be unable to sustain this pressure should he wish to maintain Byzantine universality. The Empire would disintegrate should the Monophysites not be calmed. Thus after the death of Marcian the new emperor Leo Thrax (458-474) relented greatly. He did not react when the Chalcedonian candidate for the patriarchal see of Alexandria was killed and an evident Monophysite Timothy was placed there in 457. After all the revolts in Alexandria lasted 8 years! Finally the government also abandoned its own patriarch of Constantinople; he was imprisoned and exiled to Khersones where he died in 460 (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 34).

Thus the Byzantine Empire was not more close-knit than the western one and its universality crumbled also succumbing to the demands of history. The difference was only that in the West this took place without any camouflage.

Rome again was to become the spoil of Germanic invaders. In 455 Valentinian III was killed by Petronius Maximus and his widow Eudoxia asked the Vandals for help. They came, but these were not the former Vandals of Stilicho. They killed Maximus and plundered Rome for two weeks. Since that time the factual ruler of Italy was Ricimer, the leader of the Suevi who was on Roman pay. After several episodic events Majorian (457-561) became the nominal ruler-emperor, a confidant of the Byzantine court.

The empty treasury was a problem for him. Thus the new “emperor” ordered the arrest of the escaping *curiales* (who preferred to become colons) so as to compulsorily force them back into their former positions so that they would again be engaged in

the collection of taxes. This was all that could be thought out to save the state! This was at a time when much land lay fallow and the colons were escaping beyond the limits of the state (Piotrowicz 1935a, 802-804; Stein 1928, 515, 557).

Simultaneously with Majorian the Byzantine throne was taken over by Leo I [Thrax] (459-474) the second crowned emperor. This was also a play of the barbarians. The leader of the eastern mercenary army, Aspar, became the Byzantine Ricimer and he placed a Thracian officer, Leo on the throne, in fact ruling the state in the emperor's name.

On the papal throne there was his namesake Leo I the Great (440-461). We have already observed the actions of this Pope with respect to Councils and the imperial courts during the former reigns of Theodosius and Marcian. He was the first to interpret the primacy of the bishop of Rome in a dogmatic manner, as a patrimony of St. Peter. Having against him a host of bishops from the East he considered that it would be better first to confirm the supremacy of Rome over the entire hierarchy of the Church and then to have the emperor on his side only to the extent that he would not demand a direct allegiance from the bishops and leave them to the Pope. Thus the Pope was also very submissive towards the emperors, tolerating their unilateral calling of councils and he even expressed himself in the sense that "the emperor does not need human advice because he draws the purest teaching from the plentiful gifts of the Holy Spirit".

The Pope took care that at least with the emperor the contact would not be broken. He undoubtedly preferred that Italy would become a Byzantine province and he welcomed imperial visits to

Italy. For him the only emperor was the emperor of the East and he had high hopes in Leo Thrax because he tried to defend Italy against the Vandals and in two expeditions fought them in Africa.

After all any Byzantine emperor represented a greater strength than the emperor of the West whose rule was in fact restricted to Italy alone. What importance could have such a person as Libius Severus (raised by Ricimer in the year of the death of Pope Leo I), who was soon abandoned because in 465 Ricimer took the rule directly in his own hands? The humiliation of this Ricimer was received with joy when in 467 Anthemius, a Byzantine patrician, nominated by Leo Thrax was recognized as August of the West.

In Milan Ricimer was removed and four years later also Aspar was removed in Byzantium. Both here and there, there was an attempt to shed the Germanic power. Emperor Leo ordered that Aspar be killed even though he owed his throne to him. It was decided that all Germanic staff be removed from the court and that there will be an end with Germanic mercenaries. Since 471 Leo based his rule on mercenaries from Isauria. This was a region in mid-Asia Minor, on the northern side of the Taurus Mts. inhabited by people making a living through robbing raids in all directions. They were the worst possible savages, decidedly much more barbarous than the Germanic peoples. The contemporaries however rejoiced that it was possible to get rid of the Germans. In the East it was said that now the army would be composed of local subjects. While Isauria is surrounded by lands that for many years have been a part of the Empire, Isauria itself had been under Roman rule only in the years 276-282 and it was never under Byzantium. But the formalistic Byzantines preferred to claim that

their army was composed of native “Romaioi” because formally Isauria was included within the Empire³.

In the West the illusion was shed already in 472. Ricimer conquered Rome and murdered Anthemius. Without any loss to this book we can forget the next five western Augusts whom Ricimer and his nephew Gundobad of Burgundy placed upon the throne and then deposed “sending the fallen luminaries into a prelature or to dark dismissal” – until finally in 476 the commander of the last “Roman” army (Roman, because paid by Rome) Odoacer gave the last emperor about 100 000 as retirement pay (Morawski 1924b, 262).

Byzantium also could not function without Germanic help. It was necessary to hire the Arian Ostrogoths under Theodimir. To assure his fidelity it was requested that he give his 8-year old son Theodoric as hostage. The latter for ten years (462-472) was raised in Byzantium – and as we shall soon see he was brought up magnificently. He was returned in 472. He accompanied his father on expeditions and soon after Theodimir’s death became the king of the Ostrogoths.

It was in those years, in 474 that the Vandals were allowed to hold their acquisitions and in 476 Odoacer became a patrician and a prefect of Italy, nominally in the name of the emperor. Formalism was to save pretences while history was burying ever more clearly the universal state.

Instead of the Empire kingdoms were appearing and this is how things had to be. Since the Romans proved unable to do this, it was done by the barbarians. Alaric had on his seal the words *Rex*

³ Some historians allowed themselves to be taken in by this.

Gothorum [King of the Goths] (picture in Piotrowicz 1935a, 848). But the seal was in Latin! Let us remember that the leading class among the barbarians was substantially Romanized and eager to have Roman arrangements in the private law. They were not interested in the destruction of the “Romania”; in fact they were thinking how to maintain it.

Thus in 476 the Roman Senate sent a delegation to Byzantium informing that it is abolishing the imperial dignity of the West. It would appear from this that Italy was becoming a province of only one emperor, the eastern one. The emperor came to terms with Odoacer. After some hesitation Odoacer sent the imperial insignia to Constantinople and erected statues of emperor Zeno in Rome. Similarly the rulers of the Vandals and Visigoths were to reign as imperial delegates (Zakrzewski 1938).

Odoacer was elevated to the rank of a patrician not by Leo Thrax but by Zeno (474-491). During two years of civil war he battled for the throne and the confessional issue was constantly mixed in with these struggles. Zeno was ... an Isaurian mountaineer, one of the leaders of the new mercenaries and a son-in-law of the emperor Leo. His son, also Leo and grandson of the Leo Thrax was nominated by the latter as his successor. The grandmother and mother of this child assured that soon after the death of emperor Leo Thrax Zeno was declared co-ruler with the child. Obviously complications were expected should it be in any other way. Leo the Little survived his grandfather by scarcely a few months and Zeno was suspected of having poisoned his own son. This is the sort of monarch that Isauria supplied.

A comparison of Odoacer with Zeno is needed here, the former formally acting in the name of the latter. Before, Zeno had also been a commander of a corps of barbarians. Both were men of the same profession but Odoacer was on a higher spiritual level.

The Isaurian friendship did not help to strengthen Byzantium nor did it eliminate the hated Germanic issue. Not all of the Germanic staff left the borders of the state and those who remained – leaderless and jobless increased the ranks of the brigands (*bucelari*) waiting for someone to hire them. Their exploits reached Constantinople itself. By a sneer of history soon new Germanic troops were to appear within the boundaries of the state, the Ostrogoths.

The Ostrogoths were a part of the army of Attila and after his death they took over Pannonia. In 475 the supreme authority among them went to Theodoric. Zeno called him in to help against the rebels and indeed the emperor owed the Ostrogoths his remaining on the throne. But as a consequence he had to bear the fact that in 479 Theodoric (a recent hostage) was ransacking Macedonia and endangering Thessalonica (Diehl 1924, 8). While the state was troubled by religious wars it had two virulent cancers: the Isaurians and the Germanic peoples.

It has been said that during the reign of Zeno Monophysitism became omnipotent (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 34). The religious dissidents even proposed their own candidate for the throne, Basiliseus. Zeno tried to pacify the storm with a religious decree, the so called *henotikon* proclaimed on the basis of the principle of Caesaropapism in 482. The imperial formula ran: “One God in the Trinity, the Logos became man.” He considered this to be

a compromise that also Rome would accept. But as always in all religious compromises an even greater embitterment resulted and riots because of this were to continue until 518. The Monophysite hierarchy now recognized by the emperor was ready to accept the *henotikon* but a radical movement against it appeared that was willing to function without a hierarchy, the so called *akefaloi* [headless].

The rebellion in Antioch had to be suppressed with the help of the Ostrogoths. The insurgents called for the help of Odoacer, which meant that Syria would be happy to dissociate itself from Byzantium. While Odoacer remained, indifferent mistrust towards him developed in Byzantium (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 35; Zakrzewski 1938, 33; Diehl 1924, 8). A plan was devised to send the Ostrogoth Theodoric against Odoacer and to get rid of both of them in the process.

It was becoming increasingly clear on the historical horizon that these Germanic peoples will ultimately want to fight in their own interests and establish their own states. Which civilization will they join? Will they introduce some civilization of their own or will they shift the balance between the Roman and the Byzantine one?

During the second part of the rule of Odoacer Felix III (483-492) was the Pope, who acceded to the see of Peter a year after the *henotikon*. This Pope was ready to recognize the emperor as the “superior of human-kind” and that imperial power derives from God, but he insisted that in the Church he cannot be a superior because he is only a member of the mass of faithful, thus he is subject to priestly authority and should follow the Church’s rules.

In matters of religion the emperor is to learn and not to teach. Thus Felix III declared that royal and priestly functions are distinct (Grzelak, 1922, 76, 77). At issue was the strict independence of the Church from the state. At the same time the Pope excommunicated the Byzantine patriarch who had agreed to the *henotikon*. Thus the so called first schism resulted, which continued over the years 484-518.

The western course was not totally lost yet in Byzantium. Since 464 there were the “Studites” among the Basilians, called also the *akoimetoï* i.e. the sleepless, because interchangeably they prayed the whole night. Their monastic rule insisted upon intellectual effort. Their monasteries attained later a respectable position in the history of the Orthodox Church – but unfortunately they fell to the level of a voice crying out in the wilderness. From the other side, the oriental mechanical understanding of holiness, such as the Egyptian stylites was pressing upon Byzantium, even on the capital itself. It is in that time that Symeon the Stylite showed off not far from Constantinople. He erected for himself a very narrow pillar high on a rock outside the city. He was venerated there by two emperors, Leo and Zeno who deliberately came to visit him there. This is worth noting as a religious characteristic of the “New Rome” (Zakrzewski 1938, 35; Stein 1928, 228).

Meanwhile plans matured to send Theodoric against Odoacer in Ravenna following the example of Alaric and Attila.

This war took place in the years 489-493, that is in the final years of Zeno’s reign (he died in 491) and in the beginning of his successor Anastasius (491-518). He was an Illyrian from Dyrhachium, a secretary of the imperial consistory who acceded

to the throne also through marriage (an intrigue organised in the interest of the religious dissidents) (Diehl 1906, 21, 22). The new emperor sent a letter to the Roman Senate on the issue of Theodoric “who was given authority and to whose governmental care you have been committed” (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 38).

After a rebellion of the Isaurians and two rebellions of the mercenaries the new emperor engaged in confessional difficulties. In order to keep Asia and Egypt within the state he made a decisive step, namely he openly took the side of the heretics. Thus he abandoned Catholicism.

The new Pope Gelasius (492-296) sent a stern response: “The emperor should not make any claims that are contrary to the order established by God ... He should not usurp the right which does not belong to him but to others.” According to him the temporal authority is obliged in the matters of faith to follow the bishops and in particular the bishop of Rome. Gelasius compared the proclamation of the *henotikon* to the arrogant act of Ozias who usurped the function of a priest. Should an improper interference of the temporal authority into ecclesiastical matters repeat itself the Pope ordered the bishops to defend the right of the Church and he quoted in a memorandum edited by himself the brave examples of ecclesiastic authorities standing up to the temporal authorities (among others he quoted the example with the emperor Theodosius). But the Pope required even more from the state than just obedience in the matters of faith; he demanded the support of the state in the combating of heresy (Grzelak 1922, 79, 81, 82, 85).

The question of spiritual supremacy was articulated clearly while Byzantium attributed the supreme authority to the state. In

the East the state was an end in itself, while in the West it was beginning to be a means to achieve an end. With the passage of time the demands of the religious dissidents were increasing. The Nestorians went the furthest: they abandoned the veneration of the icons. Being persecuted, they sought at first refuge in Persia, but since the synod in Seleucia in 498 they clearly placed this issue in the forefront. In spite of the greatest pliancy of Anastasius the religious wars did not end and the constant demotion of the patriarchs generated a hopeless confusion.

In this turmoil the abilities of Anastasius were being wasted. It is not possible to deny him talent for government or good will. Reason in the governance of the state is indicated by the fact that the voice of the long-lasting prefect of the diocese of the East, a Syrian called Marinus was recognized, who came up with the proposal to ... abolish some taxes. The relationship between the rate of productivity and the condition of the state treasury is simple and thus the treasury must suffer when taxes hinder productivity. Marinus obviously must have noticed this relationship. In 498 the tiresome special tax on crafts and small trade was abolished. A true eruption of joy resulted. It was ruled also that taxes are to be paid in cash. But the greatest benefit to society came from the freeing of the *curiales* from the duty of collecting taxes. There were to be separate tax collectors for this, the *vindices*. In the face of these reforms it is strange that the landowners were made responsible for fallow land and a special tax was imposed on uncultivated land (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 44; Zakrzewski 1938, 36).

However the discovery of Marinus was wasted. Almost every year the treasury was in a dire need of money, so urgent that there

was no other possibility but to collect from wherever possible without considering the future. This impossibility to introduce a treasury reform clearly indicated the impossibility of maintaining a universal state, be it even only the eastern one. In comparison, the bloody revolts in the capital (491-493 and 498) were insignificant. The regiments of the Isaurians had to be transferred to Thrace. There was a whole series of attacks by the Bulgarians in the years 493-499. Furthermore, the Persian king broke the century long armistice (20 years ahead of time) and attacked in 502. Byzantium was able to raise only 15 000 soldiers. How was it possible not to lose war in such circumstances? Let us add that a simultaneous new raid of the Bulgarians ravaged Macedonia and Thrace (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 42-44). The Persian war was to linger on for thirty years.

The Byzantine Empire lost strength, the state was contracting and yet it was still considered a power and such an opinion was spreading in the West. The new kings of the West were full of superstitious respect for Byzantium. Probably *aliquid singulare* [something unique] was operating as it used to be said at the time. Constantinople was impressive and they judged the entire state by the capital, particularly since the enemies approached the capital but they never attempted to besiege it. Indeed Constantinople was the largest and most potent stronghold of the world at the time. The foreigners on the whole did not know the Byzantine state, they knew only Constantinople.

This “New Rome”, established as a Latin city was soon to be filled with Greek population coming from its geographical

surrounding – thus it was necessary to make constant concessions to the Greek language at the expense of Latin (Risal 1917, 27).

The city of Byzantium grew to become the golden capital of the world. Scarcely a hundred years after Constantine the Great the population numbered a quarter of a million and when the VIth c. began, this number doubled twice. Till the middle of the VIth c. there were 372 streets and even 7-storeyed houses were built. The city was more populous than Rome ever was. The constant invasions of the Balkan peninsula from the north by the barbarians made it even more populous, because the population sought refuge in the capital by the thousands. How attractive was the free distribution of grain! Also industrial production on a large scale favoured the growth of the city to an extent that Rome had never known (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 9; Stein 1928, 195-196⁴). Those who admire constant expansion, at least in ever growing cities, let them marvel at this “flourishing of the eastern Empire”.

It was here that the bias in favour of a large capital which plagues Europe till this day was born. Even if the whole state was in a bad condition, even if the state were falling, the capital must be magnificent! Byzantium was the first of these blood sucking capitals.

Until the first quarter of the VIIth c. Byzantium had resources from which it could draw revenue. The Balkan peninsula was truly a sad picture of destitution with countries ravaged by constant raids and civil wars. But after all, the city had as it were turned its back on the European part of the state and it was facing towards

⁴ Diehl gives the size of the population for 403 as almost a million. I followed the more conservative figures of Stein.

Asia. It was an Asian city at the very tip of Europe. It was Asian historically and sociologically. And there in Asia what great riches were available! Asia and Egypt had riches that could be plundered in favour of the capital and no complaints were heard because of this. And who would not be proud when arriving in the capital in which he felt dazzled, speechless and enchanted?

For the Germanic arrivals the declining Rome was a wonder of the world; how much more in comparison was the flourishing Byzantium! During the most extravagant times of Rome they had no idea about the possible extravagancies that would reign in Byzantium. The relationship was such as between the modest toga worn by the Roman dignitaries, the entire richness of which consisted in the beautiful, precious material, and the complicated attire of the Byzantines, made not only from the most precious materials but also embroidered with silver, gold and precious stones so much so that it was not possible to move around in it freely because of its weight. The oriental fancy to precious things was everywhere and in everything, and primarily on oneself. The shoes of a medium rich industrialist in Constantinople were more expensive than the whole attire of a Roman dignitary. There were expensive monuments, sculptures in whole groups, with numerous gold surfaces, and of what dimensions! Not many Roman buildings could compare with the magnificent structures of Byzantium. Besides valuables there was admiration for size in Byzantium – both one and the other indicates that Asia dominated the minds there. We are full of wonder reading today about the court and public festivities in Byzantium. The imperial palace was a complex of palaces much greater than the Spalato of Diocletian.

The arrangements were such that a large topaz or emerald was, as if, a small insignificant coin. The ceremonial was exquisite and much more superfluous than the Persian one. The local people shuddered in delight when they could see the imperial procession moving from the palace to the patriarchal church because the very view of such luxury raised the viewer in his own eyes. They loved luxury and did not understand beauty in any other way than linked with wealth. One can judge about the riches that passed through the Byzantine treasury from the sums it was possible to save when there was a more frugal minded ruler. Anastasius was such an emperor and he ordered that the expenses of the court be curtailed. From this he collected a reserve of 32 000 pounds of gold (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 44; Zakrzewski 1938, 36).

Every Germanic individual, from the East or West, every Slav or Bulgarian who had the privilege of visiting this city, even as a prisoner or slave was enchanted for life and he shared this experience with all around him, thus the fame of the golden city went the world over. This was all the more so if someone arrived there as a commander of the palace guard or having some other similar position, if he was a member of this entourage and participated in its activities. And what if someone was a legate in Constantinople, a guest of the court or of some dignitary, when the extravagant wealth was deliberately showed off before him? The higher anyone stood in Byzantium, the more he saw, the more he was to experience and he left full of the greatest admiration.

There is also another point. Wealth is power. Today we add: on the condition that it derives from production. A part of the population in Byzantium was undoubtedly productive and

faired well. These however did not acquire extravagant riches and their wealth was poverty compared to the extreme affluence of the consumer classes. This was the main sin of Byzantium that the producer did not enter the leading class that was composed of consumers only. Where things are so arranged the demonstration of affluence amounts to the wastefulness of social wealth and the end of the parade must be pitiful.

At the time nobody knew or thought about this condition pertaining to productivity in the relationship between wealth and power. The further to the East even today the more all manifestations of wealth are identified with power. There is a certain naiveté in this proper to primitive people. But were not all these kingdoms forming in the West in place of the Empire also primitive in many ways? This explains why the whole of Europe for a long time, for a very long time continued to be deeply convinced about the exceptional power of Byzantium.

The city of Byzantium was a wonder which grew from generation to generation. Did any of the foreigners travel to the provinces, to the Balkans? And wonder has a tremendous power of inertia. In itself it is multiplied and it expands on its own. Around a wonder a tradition is formed that is easy and faithful because people always liked and still like to talk about and amplify all extraordinary wonders.

One of our contemporary French authors, a good observer of life wrote such an invocation for Constantinople: "Byzantium! The name full of wonder of this capital of tremendous riches was repeated in legends circulating the world from the icy realms of Scandinavia to the sunny regions of Africa! This Byzantium

which pulled towards it as a shining mirror all the seekers of adventure and all the regiments of victorious mercenaries paid with precious gifts and enticed by wonderful spoils. Byzantium with the beauty of its women, with its softness, with its affluence, with its refinement and with its misdeeds – it contained in it all the raptures of the East and was as if an idol for the barbarians, full of the numerous pleasures that were brought there.” Each word is true and well written.

But the French author adds also another sentence: “Byzantium which through its religious colleges, its scholars, diplomats, philosophers and theologians was made into a capital of knowledge and of the spirit of subtlety” (Psichari 1925, at the beginning). Here we diverge from the French scholars. The Byzantine religious institutions served civilization very badly and their subtlety ended only in useless theologising. We already know quite a great deal about the Byzantine spirit and there was nothing positive in it. We shall still have to look into its knowledge without backing out of the principle *suum cuique* [to each what he deserves].

It was necessary to devote a fair passage to this city in order to understand Byzantine influences at the turn of the Vth and VIth c., which reached as far as the Franks in northern Gaul. The expansion of Byzantinism had already begun.

But the universal imperialism ended. All admired Byzantium but no one wished to bring Byzantine domination on his own country, or the “Roman” one as it was still officially called at the time.



CASSIODORUS

XI

The opposition against the universalism of the “Roman” state was spreading primarily among those who were the truest descendants of the Romans, among the Italian Catholics. The Christian intelligentsia for a long time earnestly desired to save the Empire. But once the statehood of this state reached such a “development” that the population welcomed the barbarian invaders as saviours from a vile administration it was not possible not to dissociate oneself from such a state. People of higher spiritual value distanced themselves from the affairs of the state because it consisted only in atrocities. Only those were engaged in the affairs of the state, who as parasites could make a profit on it.

If the state is not based upon the society it becomes something negative, oppressive; this is the western thesis, the Catholic one. In the Empire as it actually existed, that is in the Byzantine one, society was consumed by the statehood to such an extent that a Polish scholar described it as state socialism (Zakrzewski 1935, 464).

The spiritual antagonism between the West and East was seen for a long time in that the oriental provinces were separating themselves from the Empire whenever the emperor declared

himself in favour of Catholicism. The oriental outlook however was spreading thanks to the great heresies of the East because they all accepted Caesaropapism. The Germanic invaders imbibed Arianism in the Balkan peninsula and then they were transferring it to Italy, southern Gaul and Spain. And yet the inheritors of the Roman civilization preferred the Arian barbarians to the elegant Byzantines.

Already at the turn of the IVth and Vth c. the conviction was spreading in Italy that the barbarians are closer by way of civilization than Byzantium. The Germanic regiments were adopting Roman education and for a while their leaders thought about the resurrection of the Western Empire. The West was exerting a substantial influence upon them, while the East was not teaching them anything. They were masters in the Balkan peninsula before they conquered the Apennine one and they served as ministers and governors more frequently and earlier in the Eastern Empire than in the Western one. The Germanic troops however did not pick up in Byzantium anything that would raise them to a higher level of civilization. As they conquered the West they abolished all the Byzantine institutions there. Thanks to the barbarians the beginning of a caste system disappeared in the West and they also eradicated all remnants of oriental cults.

At the same time in the IVth and Vth c. there was a great move in the West to spread education. Textbooks, summaries, popular encyclopaedias etc. are not typical of “the activity of a crew just before a ship wrecks”. In fact, they served to bring science to such a level that it would “serve as food for people of a low cultural level” (Zieliński 1922, II 205). They manifested an educational

activity on a grand scale and this feature was lacking in the eastern part of the Empire.

Germanic officers were attracted to Roman education and the Italian Romans saw in this a sign of hope for the salvation of “Romania”, that is, of the Roman civilization. Once Odoacer enforced the transfer of one third of all land to his soldiers and the emperor, to maintain pretences, recognized him as his plenipotentiary, it had to be finally accepted that it was no longer possible to expel the barbarians from Italy, and therefore they had to be gained for the cause of “Romania”. They had to be assisted in the process of becoming Roman. Above all, it was necessary to prevent the disappearance of native Italian traditions within the administration. Thus the rule of Odoacer was recognized and there were attempts to attain as many administrative positions as possible within his government.

The first to represent this line of approach was Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus, a member of the aristocratic family of the Aurelians, estate owners from Calabria, a great connoisseur and lover of classical literature. He belonged to Odoacer’s court in Ravenna, where he became his chancellor (*comes rerum privatarum*) and his minister of finance¹. It proved possible to at least maintain the Roman administrative units and the invaluable treasure that was the Latin language. The Arianism of the newcomers in no way was in conflict with the Catholic locals. Not only did the invaders show no interest in promoting Arianism, but

¹ It is not known in which year he joined Odoacer. In any case the date of birth of Cassiodorus “around 468” has to be moved back, before this date, to probably around 460.

they even adopted the policy of religious tolerance. In Ravenna the principle was followed which later was expressed in the words of Cassiodorus: *Religionem imponere non possumus, quis nemo cogitur ut credat invitus* [We cannot impose religion, because no one is to be forced to believe against his will] (Manitius 1911, 7). Thus Caesaropapism was not introduced in Italy. This remained also during the second period of Arian rule. In 489 Byzantium directed the Ostrogoth Theodoric to Italy against Odoacer. When after a severe three years' war Theodoric became the master of Italy (since 493) he kept Cassiodorus in his functions. He immediately became the prefect of southern Italy and then a quaestor and finally a *praefectus praetorio*, thus, as if, a viceroy. Under Theodoric Cassiodorus furthered the studies of Roman law. In Rome itself a higher school was established with chairs for lawyers financed from the state treasury (Straszewski 1905, I 396).

The emperor had ordered Odoacer to render in the insignia of the western emperors and these were now returned to Theodoric (Zakrzewski 1938, 36). This implied an encouragement for Theodoric that he would proclaim himself an August being accepted as a co-ruler. He however remained a "king of the Goths". He erected monumental buildings in Ravenna employing Byzantine architects for this (not in vain did he spend his early youth in Byzantium), – but he had no use for the imperial insignia. Obviously this indicated that he wanted to sever political links with the Empire.

At the same time there was an increasing expansion of Roman private law and this was done by the Germanic barbarians. The influence of the triple law reached even the Salian Franks

still when they were pagans as is indicated by the *Pactus*, which dates from before 486. Already in the formulation of the famous *Lex Salica* missionaries operating among the Franks were at work, because there was a need to regulate the legal relationships between the earlier inhabitants who were using the Roman law and the Franconian invaders who remained as masters of the land. When Clovis I became the single ruler of all the Franks Christianity was already spreading in his country. In the south, the Burgundians had received baptism earlier, but they were Arians, just as the Italian and Spanish Goths. When Clovis became a son-in-law of the Burgundian king Gundobad there was the possibility that he would also become an Arian. But he received baptism as a Catholic in 496. This was a great triumph of bishop Remigius from Reims. Clovis was also anointed by him as king; thus a sort of coronation took place. Bishop Remigius imitated the Byzantine patriarch (to the extent that it was possible in Reims); we know that by then already two emperors had been crowned. All were looking up towards Byzantium and Clovis was proud that he was given a purple tunic by the emperor Anastasius as well as symbols of the consulate (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 38). Probably Remigius himself was the intermediary. After all the highest throne of a Christian monarch was there, the unique emperor. At that time no one realized that a split was inevitable and that it will have to develop into hostility.

In spite of all this Clovis belonged to the Roman camp in Europe and on many issues he was a tool of the Church, particularly when in 507 he beat the Arian Visigoths at Vouillé near Poitiers. This war lingered on and in a certain moment the Visigoths were

assisted by the Ostrogoth king of Italy, Theodoric. These were the decisive moments for us.

All the three sides participating in this conflict were already becoming Roman. At Vouillé the Visigoth king Alaric II fell, with whose name the *lex romana Visigothorum* [Roman law of the Visigoths], the so called *Breviarum Alarici* was associated. It was edited in 506 with a clear participation of Roman jurists and it contained also extracts from the *Institutiones* of Gaius. This functioned among the Spanish Visigoths till the mid-VIIth c. and it also took on an importance in the Frankonian state under the successors of Clovis.

From bishop to bishop, from country to country the fame of the new successful warrior spread and the fact that he was a Catholic king. As regards the person of Clovis this was truly a baptism of water and nothing more. The biography of Clovis and of his choice of political tools are not edifying and his reign was indeed a *grande latrocinium* [great villainy], perhaps worse than the worst examples in Roman history. But this was another issue; after all from where could the Church choose pious rulers? His Burgundian father-in-law Gundobad was on a higher spiritual level. Gundobad managed to arrange political peace between his Arian and Catholic subjects. Catholicism soon moved to the first plan and the next king Sigismund adopted Catholicism.

The introduction of Catholicism was always associated with the furthering of Roman law, as in the *lex* of Gundobad (before 516). Since then all the Germanic peoples that have had an opportunity to encounter “Romania” were working towards codification. Among the new rulers of Italy, the Ostrogoths, this

began already at the beginning of the VIth c. and until 515 the edicts of Theodoric were enacted as common for the Germanic and Roman people. The *leges barbarorum* [laws of the barbarians] were beginning and they were based on the Theodosian code.

Thus the Germanic invaders were inclining not towards the Byzantine civilization but towards “Romania” presenting themselves as the inheritors of the civilization of the Romans. The history of Clovis is very interesting. The beginning of his rule was at the same time the beginning of the expansion of the Byzantine civilization, but then the historical role of Clovis changed decidedly in the Roman direction, and thus against Byzantinism. Some external features of Byzantine statehood were adopted such as the court proceedings, but the content was soon adopted from the remnants of the Roman civilization having as a background Catholicism. Not only the Franks and the Burgundians but also the Arian Ostrogoths were sailing between these two civilizations moving increasingly clearly in the direction of Catholic “Romania”.

Having won over the Franks and the Burgundians the Church became the victor in the most important part of Europe. The successors of Pope Gelasius, Symmachus (496-514) and Hormisdas (514-518) were rooting their teaching on an increasingly widening base as they continued the Catholic notion concerning the ultimate supremacy.

From the year 511, the emperor Anastasius was supporting extreme Monophysitism, not restricting himself now only to the *henotikon*. He appointed the Monophysite Severus as the patriarch of Antioch and ordered him to call a synod in 513 in Tyre at which the entire Council of Chalcedon was condemned. The emperor

ordered that a Monophysitic clause be added to a hymn that was sung during the consecration at Mass since the IVth c. This was a liturgical confession of the Holy Trinity (the *trishagion* [thrice holy], *hymnus angelicus* [angelic hymn]). This move was the last drop to fill the jug.

There still was a Catholic camp in Constantinople, suppressed but not conquered. Its leader was Justin, the commander of the personal guard of the emperor. Turmoil broke out in the city and the Catholic side was supported by ... the Bulgarian mercenaries under Vitalian. The troubles spread to Asia Minor. In 514 emperor Anastasius promised to join the Catholic side (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 35, 36, 45).

In that year the emperor gave Cassiodorus the title of a patrician and even a consul. Were they afraid that Theodoric might send assistance to the rebelling mercenary forces? Cassiodorus received these *honores sine labore* [honours without work] which only a Roman emperor was entitled to give. He accepted them of course with the permission of Theodoric. The king of the Goths had no intention to intervene and he continued to maintain proper relationships with Byzantium. Cassiodorus preparing a letter to Anastasius in the name of Theodoric used the most flattering language. Among others he declared that a *singulare aliquid* [something singular] resides in the very institution of the emperor which results in the fact that all recognize themselves as being inferior to him (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 38). This singularity was the charm about which we wrote at the end of chapter X.

Anastasius having recognized that the rebellion does not have an international basis made a rapprochement with Vitalian.

When Pope Hormisdas, deceived by the imperial promise sent a delegation to Constantinople in 517, his legates were within days forced to get back on the ships for their return journey (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 36, 37).

In the next year, 518 the days of Anastasius ended and Justin who was already 70 at that time managed to seize the throne by some dark intrigue (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 47). This time the Catholic camp was engaged in the intrigue, and successfully. A radical change took place.

The new reign began with the sending of official letters to Pope Hormisdas calling him to send to Constantinople plenipotentiaries with whom it would be possible to come to terms as regards the elimination of heresy. The reception of the papal delegates was magnificent and the synod organized this very year deposed all the Monophysite bishops. Next year the metropolitan patriarch signed the Roman profession of faith after which not only the names of the five patriarchs suspected of heresy, but also the names of the emperors Zeno and Anastasius were erased from the Church diptychs. Severus, the patriarch of Antioch was excommunicated and deposed together with 50 bishops. Monasteries were closed and hermitages disbanded.

But Egypt was left untouched, where Monophysitism strengthened even more, because a large number of those persecuted including Severus found refuge in Egypt. Soon a strong reaction developed from there and in a short period of time Syria, Palestine, Mesopotamia and Armenia were regained for

Monophysitism. Such a strong coalition was made against Justin that a state within state resulted (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 49, 50)².

The issue with heresies became even more complicated. There was a move against the Arians which inevitably affected the question of Italy. Soon Pope John I (523-526) was invited to Constantinople and he was given a triumphal reception. Justin eliminated Arians from offices and the army and he ordered the Senate to call for the dethroning of Theodoric in Italy. The Italian Catholics divided. A part joined the imperial camp and conspired against Theodoric. Something was uncovered in Ravenna itself. It was during the papal journey that two Catholic members of the government (Boethius and Symmachus), that is the colleagues of Cassiodorus were beheaded. He himself had nothing to do with the conspiracy and he declared himself to be on the side of the Goths against the Byzantine camp.

Under such a set of complications Theodoric died in 526 and a year after him so did Justin. Without difficulty the Byzantine throne was taken over by the latter's nephew Justinian, who had been adopted and for a long time prepared to be next to the throne. The new emperor assumed that he would soon be able to attack Italy that was in turmoil over the succession to the Ostrogoth throne. Finally, it was taken by Theodat who was a candidate of

² Even in the most serious works there are still true fables about Justin being a simple Illyrian peasant who supposedly had no idea about government but who cared for the education of his nephew etc., and that from the very beginning Justinian ruled for his uncle. Justin had for several decades held military and court functions, thus he had time to learn everything. He was grooming his nephew because he himself was 70.

Cassiodorus. The latter remained the main minister and ruled until 538.

Justin was a Catholic almost to the core, but Justinian had no decided religious views³. He was concerned that he might lose Asia and Africa should he confess Catholicism. On the other hand having the prospect of a war with the Arians in Italy he had to present himself as a devout Catholic. He issued an edict which still excluded the heretics not only from state functions but also from the free professions. They were deprived of some civil rights because according to the emperor “it was sufficient for them that they were alive”. He persecuted also the Jews and the Samaria uprising of 529 only worsened their position. He had no doubts in introducing into his collection of laws the clause that “it is just to deprive people of their land who do not worship the true God” (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 104; Zakrzewski 1938, 38).

Not only did Justinian wish to maintain unconditional control over Egypt and Asia Minor, but the preparations for war with the Ostrogoths in Italy pushed him further. He dreamt about regaining the whole former universal Roman Empire from Britain to Mesopotamia.

With this objective in mind it was necessary to be a Catholic in the West and an opponent of Catholicism in the East.

Thus Justinian divided work in the political game underpinned with religion with his wife Theodora. He was to play the Catholic tune and she was to play the Monophysite and at times the Arian tune. He was to operate in the West, and she in the East. Only

³ His presumed authorship of some polemic-didactic treatises is a very free presumption.

in this way can one solve the fascinating riddle of their marriage which is an interesting enigma for historians.

One has to add here that Roman law which was binding in Byzantium did not know of morganatic marriages. Theodora was the daughter of some circus functionary, an actress and a public dancer. She moved up in the world in search for a career and after having returned from Alexandria with an out of wedlock daughter, she was already sufficiently wealthy to conduct a decent life. When she was about 40 years old she won over Justinian. That was still during the life of Justin. For his nephew to be able to marry Theodora Justin abolished the law that forbade dignitaries marrying servants, actors and courtesans and furthermore he gave her the title of a patrician. They were married in 527 and Theodora was crowned together with her husband, not in the palace as was the custom so far for the wives of emperors but in the patriarchal cathedral. Her illegitimate daughter was given a serious position in the court, as later her husband and son were given. In her further life Theodora behaved impeccably, which is admitted even by her greatest enemies. It was on her initiative that the law gave major concessions to actresses and fallen women. Also thanks to her the legal protection of badly treated wives was introduced and also the rules about divorce and adultery were stiffened.

How many oriental notions in the history of this marriage! Justinian not only loved her but he respected her greatly. Not only did he refer to her as “my sweetest charm” but also admitted that he did not undertake anything without the knowledge and approval of his “most respectful, God given wife”. She herself admitted her co-rule in a letter to a minister of the Persian king Khosrau in

these words: “The emperor never decides about anything without first consulting with me.” He swore on her name when it was a question of assuring most solemnly about the truth (Diehl 1906, 51-67; Diehl & Marçais 1936, 50)⁴.

One should not however imagine an idyll. Theodora knew not only how to operate with intrigue, but she also did not shun court villainy. Of little concern is the fact that she promoted the scandalous Antoine, the wife of the great military leader Belisarius whom she held in check in this way. Theodora had murders on her conscience – the imperial nephew Germanos, the secretary Pliscus and Belisarius’s son-in-law Tocius (Boissier 1891, I 215-217). These were dark incidents that have not been explained, either in reference to a cause or to an end. In general the problem of Theodora even though honoured with the best of pens still remains open for studies. All we know is that Justinian adored her always.

This crowned empress took upon herself the role of a Monophysite and she looked after the East so as to facilitate the emperor who was acting as a Catholic because this was needed to take care of the West. The circumstances however were such that the Italian escapade from which he intended to start his reign could take place only after a delay of 13 years.

⁴ This marriage stupefies historians. And yet in our times a number of blue blooded princes have married practitioners of bawdy entertainment. Just recently a president of a republic married frivolously. Justinian did not descend from any historical family and he did not do anything that would be contrary to oriental notions. There were no actresses in the antique world in our understanding of the term. They were more like our cabaret or circus actresses. Let us add that Theodora did not commit adultery once she was married. I wrote about various notions of virginity in my other works (Koneczny 1935, 1938). A mosaic representation of Theodora with a halo is found the church of San Vitale in Ravenna.

Justinian began his reign with a great peace initiative about which he must have thought long before, since he was able to undertake it already a few months after taking the throne. This must have been his dream for a long time and it derived from an authentic and deep passion for Rome in a truly Roman, Latin form. In this he followed Constantine the Great and exceeded him in that he did this from true attachment to things Roman and not from mere calculation. It is on this background that the *Corpus Iuris* [body of law] was formed, the greatest codification of law in the whole of universal history. Its main part is called the *Codex Justinianus* not only because it was promulgated during his reign (as the Theodosian one), but it very correctly bears his name because he was its initiator and participated actively in its preparation.

In 528 the emperor appointed a commission of 10 members composed of high officials and professional jurists. The main participants were Theofilos, a professor of the University of Constantinople and the famous Tribonian. The latter came from a Roman settlement in Paphlagonia and he was an able barrister there famous also for his knowledge of law. Justinian called him to the codification commission and nominated him in 520 as the *quaestor* of the “sacred palace”, then as the *magister officiorum* and prefect of the *praetorium* and finally as consul. Thus he reached the highest offices. Unfortunately he was greedy to the highest degree. For money, he was capable of doing anything, including trading in justice and “correcting the laws” (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 63). Very likely he represented in the commission the personal wishes of Justinian.

The emperor himself was involved in the work of the commission. We have a definite clue in one negative symptom, namely that the work was done in haste, with negative consequences as a result. The commission decided that it was appropriate to look back much further into the past than the code of Theodosius, namely to the times of Hadrian. This great work was done so quickly that already on the 7th of April 529 the *Codex Justinianus* was promulgated. Altogether 14 months of work! It seems that somebody was hastening the commission, and this was obviously not Tribonian.

The *Digesta*, that is, the *Pandektae*, the opinions and decisions of earlier jurists continued to be collected. About 2000 books and treatises had to be checked. Here, also speed was imposed. The emperor himself described the situation in these words: “No one would dare to undertake such a task because it was very difficult for everyone, or rather impossible. But raising our hand towards the heavens and calling for God’s help we undertook this task trusting the Everlasting One who with His omnipotence can help untangle even the most hopeless situations.” In mid-December 530 a commission of 16 members was set up which split into three sub-commissions and exactly three years later it was possible to promulgate the famous *Pandektae*. At the same time (actually a month earlier) in November 533 the *Institutiones* were produced, that is, a textbook for law schools, compiled by Theophilus and his colleague Dorotheus.

Obviously the hastily prepared Code did satisfy the jurists because they decided that it was appropriate to withdraw it in so accurate a manner that not a single copy of it has survived and

only some *disiecta membra* [scattered parts] have been found on an Egyptian papyrus. In 534 a second edition was produced. The excuse was that new imperial decrees from the years 529-534 had to be introduced. This could have been done without making corrections or even reworking the cod. The first edition was done in only 14 months, but work on the second edition took four years. The former was an imperial effort, the latter that of jurists.

Only Justinian himself can be attributed with the stern prohibition of changing anything in the code in the future. Also the writing of commentaries and critical studies was prohibited – only translations and synopses were allowed. Such nonsense could not have been proposed by any jurist. Only a ruler could make such a decision, a ruler convinced of his own holy perfection and of the untouchable quality of his imperial work. (This was a purely oriental notion.)

Later, in the years 534-565 this work was supplemented with amendments, that is, with new statutes of Justinian, 154 of which were enacted during a period of 31 years. Tribonian participated in this work until his death in 545. The amendments were published in Greek even though all the preceding documents were in Latin. The introduction of Greek in the current, most recent statutes was obviously a concession on the part of the emperor who wished to be a Latin emperor in everything.

Would this *Corpus iuris* exist, this treasure of jurists and historians, had not Justinian had an almost maniacal tendency to impose Latin on countries in which the universal language was Greek? Those who compiled this codification were also “Romans” and they were Roman, not Greek jurists.

Such is this work, which has survived till this day and was named in the XIIth c. by the Italian jurists as the *Codex iuris civilis*. This was not a code in the current understanding of this word but an enormous collection of materials that by no means were properly codified. Also this second edition manifests haste. In spite of that how grateful are we for this even improperly executed work, indeed of monumental size! It is exceptionally comprehensive. The *Code* contains the private and public law, civil and penal law, the court process, the state law and ecclesiastical law to the extent that it was recognized by the state (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 83-85).

The Code and the amendments are full of regulations pertaining to the organization of the clergy, their moral way of life as well as concerning the administration of Church property, monastic foundations and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The legal practice followed by Justinian turned out to grant the emperor the right to appoint and depose bishops, call councils, preside over them and grant the council decrees his sanction, modify or even abolish altogether the conciliar canons (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 103). In other words the emperor was the decisive authority in religious matters. This principle of Caesaropapism gave a strong imprint on the Justinian legislation. This is clear Byzantinism that is evident not only on this part of the *Code*.

This was the last codification of Roman law. It was made rock solid by this *Corpus*. Basically it was the Roman law with only some Byzantine veneer. Entire sections of it are purely Roman, belonging to the Roman civilization. The Code of Justinian was unsuitable for the Byzantines. At the beginning,

the incommensurability emerged weakly, but with time, with the development of relationships it became increasingly evident.

The *Corpus* could not have been without Greek influences. Since we had noticed them long before, the more so they appeared in the Justinian code. After all Roman law had to be adapted to new relationships (Partsch 1921, 120⁵) but these had no link with the Hellenic tradition⁶. The language that was used was Greek even though long past were the times when people thought in a Hellenic manner. In Berytus in Western Asia there was a “Greek” school of law, which was Greek only in the sense that the students were trained in Greek grammar and rhetoric, but the lectures were in Latin (Lot 1927, 18). The practical knowledge of the teachers however, was based on jurisprudence among the population that did not understand Latin and was using Greek⁷. But the influence of Greek trade law did not cease because the life of the economically rich Asia Minor was still based on principles established after the wars of the Diadochs. Apart from that, all agree that the reception of Roman law in the Greek East met with resistance. Since however the legal verdicts of all types concerned mainly with the richest provinces, provinces that had passed through the Hellenistic period, this explains sufficiently why in the notary formulas there were so many Greek legal customs (Partsch 1921, 126, 128).

⁵ This however was not “late Hellenic culture.”

⁶ [The text has “Hellenistic” here, an obvious typing error.]

⁷ How distant was this from perceiving in this jurisprudence, be it only for the Vth c., the *Nachblüte griechischer Kultur* [symptom of decline of Greek culture] (Partsch 1921, 125).

The Justinian code was binding in the entire state for Roman citizens, thus among those who lived in monogamy, at least officially. Besides, the non-citizen population (those who were not the *cives*) lived according to the *ius gentium* [law of the land], that is, the clan law that was specific for the given region. These laws began to interact. In Egypt for example property relationships between spouses were according to the old law while the marriage law itself was becoming Roman. Thus various systems of law intermingled from which only negative consequences could be expected, because this increased the possibilities for abuse, various legal tricks and lawlessness.

It is here that the famous amendment 118, erroneously considered to be an evolution of inheritance law belongs. It was caused by the collision of clan laws with the Roman law among the mixed population. The right of agnates to inheritance was abolished when cognates could be found, even distant ones. Agnates are those who in Polish clan law were referred to as the “clan uncles”. Thus the clan inheritance law was abolished in favour of family law, of the emancipated family.

The codification was in Latin because material was drawn from Latin sources. But the Latin language was declining, and since the Vth c. dramatically, even during the reign of the “Latin” Justinian. The common language was Greek. The emperor himself justified the enacting of amendments in Greek “so that everyone would understand them” (Lot 1927, 320, 321). But no one felt any bond with Hellas. In the days of Justinian the name “Hellen” was a synonym of “pagan” and was almost an insult. The Greeks referred to themselves as to the “Romaioi”. In fact the true lingua

romana [Roman language] persisted in the eastern state only in parts of Illyria precisely from where Justinian had come from. In other places only Greek was common and as a consequence it was the official language in Thrace and Moesia and in Constantinople itself Greek became dominant (Lot 1927, 319, 320)⁸.

Latin and Greek were after some time to become the external features of the West and the East. Justinian, a lover of Latin, had no doubt that Latin would maintain its primary role because he believed in the reactivation of the universal Roman Empire composed of both its old halves. His ideas were turned towards the past; this was the whole nature of Justinian. He tried to move against the reason of history, thus he had to lose.

Quite contemporaneously with the great *Code* an institution was appearing that was devoted to ideals turned towards the future. In 529 St. Benedict established in Nursia his monastery at Monte Cassino which was to become a bastion of the new civilization that was to manage without Caesaropapism and without state universalism covering the three parts of the world.

The great plans of reactivating the old Roman Empire in its totality were hindered by the protracting Persian war and revolts in the capital. The Persians occupied Syria, sacked Antioch and Justinian could afford only to conduct a “lazy” war. It was only in 530 that a military talent was discovered not among the barbarians but among the native Byzantines, in Belisarius. He was winning battles but his victories remained unexploited, until finally also he was defeated. He could have undone the defeat had he fought

⁸ Even today common people use the term *Romios*. The Arabs and Turks refer to Constantinople as to the *Roum*.

on, but suddenly he was recalled to Constantinople to suppress a revolt.

During the Persian war the great Arian and Monophysite groups behaved ambiguously and so the emperor began working towards an agreement. He recalled from exile all the heretical bishops that he had deposed not so long ago. This sudden turnover brought forth a sharp opposition from the Catholic camp. Even the capital reacted. The throne of Justinian was endangered because the candidacy of Hypatos, a nephew of emperor Anastasius was put forward. It was demanded that in particular two ministers be deposed, John from Cappadocia and Tribonian. Since no source spells out clearly what were the reasons for the revolt we have to formulate a hypothesis basing ourselves on the fact of the sudden radical change of attitude towards the heretics and on the characteristics of these two ministers whom Justinian had greatly praised.

All sources are in agreement that Justinian led the fiscal tyranny to an absurdity. The evidence of his *Code* should suffice since it is full of concessions made to fiscalism. There is much of that also in the amendments (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 97, 98). All this can be summarized in the following words: the supreme end and the most holy duty of the subjects is the paying of taxes at the rate that has been ordered. Any excuse from this or delay is simply an insult to God. A tax collector who would take into consideration some unfortunate circumstance of the taxed is a criminal. The taxes are collected regardless of the consequences and there can be no exemption from this rule. The legislation of Justinian led fiscalism to truly demonic perfection! The discovery of Marinus? If he was

remembered his suggestions of treasury policy were considered an aberration not worth thinking about. The considerable reserves amassed by the two predecessors were squandered in a short time. The frugality and economizing of Anastasius was ridiculed three times in the *Code* as a *parca subtilitas* [frugal subtlety].

John from Cappadocia was an able statesman. According to the opinion of a contemporary historian (the spiteful but truthful Procopius) he was “capable of assessing all the opportunities and resolving all difficulties”. But he was also a greedy brute when it was a question of money, whether it was for him, or for the treasury. He was omnipotent for 14 years “because he constantly worked for the increase of public revenue”, because “the good of the emperor and his treasury was so much in his heart”. Justinian praised Tribonian in a similar way.

Thus a great revolt broke out, known in history as the *nike*, from the motto of the insurgents (*nike* meaning victory). The revolt turned towards the tradition of emperor Anastasius (raising his nephew to the throne), that is, it favoured economising and the termination of the fiscal tyranny.

It is very likely therefore that *nike* in 532 was organized precisely over these issues. The Catholic camp profited from the resentment against the government over the taxation policy.

It seems also that the final revolt in the capital itself was a completion and as it were a crown of an effort that had started a long time earlier and encompassed the Catholic provinces of the state. The court obviously must have been aware of the scope and the importance of the conspiracy because it decided to settle peace with the Persians at whatever price and to bring Belisarius back to

the capital. To end the war at any cost they agreed to dishonourable peace terms in 532 which included the paying of a tribute (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 6, 66).

Belisarius returned to the capital in the last moment. Justinian was already preparing to flee convinced that this was the end of his reign, but Theodora decided that she was staying. Through her presence of mind and decisiveness she saved the throne. Belisarius killed 30 000 insurgents within nine days and he caught and beheaded Hypatos.

This was a victory of the heretics and the extortionists. John of Cappadocia remained in power for another ten years. Fitting edicts were issued in 535 and 536, which reminded the bureaucrats that they are to be virtuous and which raised their pay so that they could have “clean hands” (later this expression entered all European languages). And if ever someone met with injustice, he could courageously go to the emperor himself and place his complaint at the foot of the throne ... in Constantinople. Of course things were getting worse all the time. And when as a consequence also the treasury was suffering, a reduction of expenses was introduced through the abolition of the consulates (in 541), the reduction of the free distribution of food to the population in the cities, the trimming of funds for circus games and a partial reduction of military parades in the capital.

The heretics immediately benefited from the suppression of the *nike*. Justinian called an assembly so as to “restore unity” and came up with a formula that was referred to as the “new *henotikon*”. He gave the Monophysites the liberty to promote their ideas even in the capital and finally in 535 he placed the Monophysite

Anthimos on the metropolitan patriarchal throne. The rumour was spread the world over that Theodora was responsible for this, and that she had gone so far as to hiding the leaders of the heretics in the palace. She offered one of the palaces as a hermitage for the Monophysite monks and “Justinian knew nothing about this”. Contemporary voices indicate that this whispered propaganda was believed (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 67, 106).

From that time onwards Justinian put on the cloak of orthodoxy. Not in vain did he include the entire text of the Nicene Creed in the introduction to his *Code*. His dreams about the reactivation of a universal Empire required this. First however, it was necessary to wage wars against the Arian states in Africa and in Italy. It is not known for what causes he began with Africa and not with Italy (as he had originally planned).

In Africa the Vandals were externally becoming Roman but they could not come to an agreement with Catholicism. On the contrary, they persecuted Catholic organizations. Because of this they lost support of the best elements among the population and so they did not bond with any local class. They followed an easy life for three generations as owners of the captured lands which had to be tilled by the former owners who were now reduced to colons. They themselves did not work out any serious state organization, thus their state wavered at the very foundations already from the beginning of the VIth c. and the prospect was that they will change the African provinces into states of united Berbers, Numidians and Moors. Such a development was not favoured by the “Roman” population, that is, by the Catholics (because by then the terms were synonymous). They therefore sent delegations to Byzantium

asking the emperor that he would profit from the weakening of the Vandals and regain this ancient province of the Empire. Nobody expected that Justinian would have to spend 15 years fighting with the Berbers to gain control over Africa. When Belisarius landed in 533 he dealt with the Vandal king Galimer in a matter of weeks, but this was not tantamount with the taking over the whole country, because a Numidian king, Antalas came to the fore. The Donatists supported him as well as the united remnants of all the other heretics.

War between completely different civilizations ensued, which at the same time was a war between peoples being at a completely different level of civilization. At that time the Moors still did not know how to bake bread. And when in 534 it was pointed out to the Berbers that they were endangering their children taken as hostages, they replied: “That is different among you because you are allowed to have only one wife, whereas we can have as many as 50, thus we are never short of children.” Belisarius tried diplomacy with their tribal princes. He gave them precious gifts, sometimes symbolic ones (such as a silver cap in the shape of a crown), but he failed to establish any new *foederati* (allies) in Africa. Already in 534, they took up arms against Byzantium and the first part of this Numidian war lasted until 539.

Meanwhile Belisarius had great difficulties with his undisciplined army. The soldier wished to settle as soon as possible on the land taken over from the Vandals having Vandal slaves, both male and female. Only the more distinguished Vandals managed to avoid being reduced to slavery, provided they “converted” to Catholicism. Thus, the emperor even reinstated the former official

titles, at least initially; he later stopped doing this due to objections coming from the bishops and the Pope himself. The Arians, that is, the Vandal population joined with the Berbers to generate further resistance. From these alliances an interesting residue remained. Still at the end of the VIth c. Donatism had supporters in southern Numidia and in the VIIth c. numerous Sahara tribes practised Judaism because the Jews were fleeing from the Byzantine authorities southwards. Everywhere there remained groups that could initiate further uprisings, the course of which however we shall not be following here (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 21-50 passim, 309, 310, 326-329, 592, 594).

Meanwhile the Romaioi organized their own administration in the regained province. Justinian wavered whether he should combine the civil and military authority in one hand or whether he should separate them. There was mixing in this, changes and hesitations with no end. When the first exarchate was established at first this was to be only the military authority, but when the exarch (“for the needs of state defence”) started to meddle into everything his intrusions “because of military necessity” were resisted. The prefect became his subordinate and so it remained until the end (Diehl 1896, 97-106, 116-118, 471, 474, 480-501; Diehl & Marçais 1936, 83, 89, 98). We know that there is no greater plague than a military administration during peace time. Thus Justinian had many opportunities to repeat his decrees, which taught administrators that they should be virtuous (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 99).

In the African province the *Corpus iuris* was introduced. According to Byzantine notions unity required uniformity. This

time however it was decided to allow for two exceptions due to the specific circumstances of the province. Already in the first years of his reign Justinian did not see any difference between the slaves and the colons. Long lost was the view that a colon is personally free and that he can decide about his hands and those of his family (Piotrowicz 1935b, 478; Diehl & Marçais 1936, 120; Lot 1927, 92). But in Africa even the *servi rustici* [peasant serfs] were liberated if they had fled before the arrival of Belisarius's army. This was done in the conviction that they were the descendants of the former Roman *possesores* [owners] who were fleeing from Vandal oppression. It was also forbidden to search for and bring back the Catholic escapee colons because their very faith indicated that they were of Roman descent. In general the idea was to restore the property to the descendants of the former Roman landowners. The complicated relationships forced also another correction of the *Code*. A son of a free woman was considered free even if the father was an *adscriptus* (a man ascribed to the soil) because there was the possibility that he might have been of Roman origin. This exception was needed for some time, for one generation and it was changed in 570 (Diehl 1896, 394-398).

As soon as the organisation of an administration began in Africa the capital again became the scene of riots and again they were under a Catholic banner. In 536 there were violent riots against the patriarch Anthimos and Justinian who himself had nominated this Monophysite abandoned him officially. Furthermore, he rapidly called a council to Constantinople, inviting also Pope Agapitus. Under the Pope's leadership this Council (not an ecumenical one) deposed Anthimos, excommunicated the heretics and Justinian

nominated the Catholic Menas as patriarch. In spite of that Theodora continued to give asylum to heretics and facilitated the maintenance of a secret hierarchy by the Monophysites (Diehl 1906, 9; Diehl & Marçais 1936, 104, 107, 108; Zakrzewski 1938, 52).

However let us look into the Catholicism of this new Catholic patriarch. Menas declared publicly in front of the bishops that “nothing should be done in the holy Church against the convictions and orders of the emperor”. The Byzantine theologians announced that “the emperor is predestined in God’s plans to rule the world, just as an eye is natural for the body, which it leads; the emperor needs only God, and there is no intermediary between him and God”.

Thus a Catholic Caesaropapism was born in Byzantium! Indeed the construction of Caesaropapism was completed, led to its summit!

The Catholicism of Menas cared only for dogmatic orthodoxy. Two other fields of theology, ecclesiology and the ethics of communal life were left to be decided exclusively by the temporal authority. Thus it was a Catholicism that was almost without ethics, dealing only with its minor aspect pertaining to private life.

Justinian told Pope Agapitus who was present in Constantinople directly: “Follow my opinion, because if you will not, I shall send you into exile” (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 103, 104).

Having dealt with the Arians in Africa the emperor sent Belisarius in 536 against the Ostrogoths (in Africa he was replaced

by Solomon,⁹ who just about managed to deal with the Moors and Berbers). The victorious Belisarius occupied Naples and Rome in the first year of his campaign, but during the entire next year he had to bear a siege of Rome by the Ostrogoth Vityges. Having all the Catholics behind him in Africa Belisarius imagined that the same will happen in Italy. But there was an unpleasant surprise.

During the campaign of Belisarius “Cassiodorus gathered in Ravenna the supporters of cooperation with the Goths” (Zakrzewski 1938, 41). He realized that there was a chasm between “Romania” and Byzantinism, that these “Romaioi” were something quite different, that it was not possible to treat both as co-heirs of the Roman civilization and that it was easier to win over the barbarians for the Roman tradition than the Byzantines. The two could not be reconciled nor could there be a friendly agreement, because between the Roman legacy and that of Byzantium there could at best be indifference so long as they remained far from one another and foreign. But if they were to meet on any common ground, or in connection with some common issue, dislike and even hostility had to emerge.

Cassiodorus understood that Caesaropapism could not be reconciled with Catholicism and as a consequence a split had to result and there had already been examples of this. He understood that in order to maintain the Roman traditions Catholicism was indispensable and that it was the Roman Church that could and wished to retain from the Roman civilization whatever could be reconciled with Christianity. The barbarians could become

⁹ According to some he was an Armenian, and according to others an eunuch from Mesopotamia (Zakrzewski 1938, 41).

Catholics, the Goths could convert but Caesaropapism could never be Catholic and thus Byzantium will fail to preserve the Roman heritage.

Some compromise was possible with the descendants of the barbarians but not with Byzantium. Cassiodorus, a minister of long standing and knowledgeable in the relationships of the West with the East knew very well to what extent the Byzantine state was dependent on the East, and thus it could not become Catholic and could not continue the Roman civilization.

As if to confirm the views of Cassiodorus no one had ever shown so much brutality against the papacy as Belisarius and Justinian himself (Lot 1927, 345). The successor of Agapitus, Pope Silverius was imprisoned and exiled from the capital and in 537 Vigilius (it is said that he was selected by Theodora) was appointed to the Apostolic See. And even he had doubts as to Caesaropapism. Cassiodorus therefore acted quite openly against Byzantium and in the defence of Ostrogoth rule. But he lost this campaign. When in 538 it became obvious that Belisarius will occupy the whole of Italy, Cassiodorus removed himself from politics and established a monastery in Vivarium near Scylletium in his native Calabria. He lived there for the next 30 years and died in 562 being almost 100 years old.

Cassiodorus lost the military encounter but in spite of that he became a vanquisher of Byzantium for further generations. His stance against Byzantium shines on the whole horizon of universal history. It became one of the most important moments of history.

The receding to a monastery does not necessarily mean the removal from public life. It can be so but it does not have to be

so. The work initiated in Vivarium ... is functioning till this day. Cassiodorus imposed upon the Benedictines the duty to study and copy also the works of lay authors, so that they would further the knowledge of Roman literature. The example given from Vivarium was copied in Monte Cassino where initially intellectual work was not obligatory (Manitius 1911, 4).

Even without Vivarium Cassiodorus would have had a prominent place in history as the long term minister, who Romanized the Ostrogoth authorities and as a defender of Catholicism, which through his connections he defended against the Arians. These indeed were outstanding merits. Besides, there is a second series of his merits. He was a man of letters, a grammarian, a historian of first class importance for his generation and also for the later ones because he collected his official letters which are an important source for the history of his times.

For Cassiodorus it was clear that the knowledge of the literary heritage of Rome is an indispensable foundation for the Catholic intelligentsia and that this intelligentsia is called to continue the Roman civilization. But he did not accept all of it or without changes. He understood the proper relationship of Catholicism to classicism – this is his greatest contribution. All of us in the Latin civilization, we are his descendants.

According to him classicism had to be corrected by Catholicism. He gave an inkling of this in his plans of reforming education. The schools were still based on traditions dating back to pagan times and they held on to them blindly. Cassiodorus was in consultation with Pope Agapitus about a plan to establish in Rome a school of a new type (that would be financially supported

by private sources), which would be based on the Graeco-Roman legacy but inspired by the Christian spirit. He was not short of collaborators. An opinion on this issue was presented very well by bishop Ennodius of Pavia who said that “the art of the beautiful word” (thus poetry in particular) should govern minds as a means operating against the rampage of brutal forces (Boissier 1891, I 215-217). The sad fate of Pope Agapitus and the further unfortunate circumstances of the time did not allow Cassiodorus to execute these schooling projects, but Vivarium (Vivarese) became a great school of future teachers. There and in so many other Benedictine monasteries the tribe of Virgil was being reborn.

The Latin civilization was forming in opposition to the Byzantine one. Beginning with Cassiodorus we can admit that this movement, which wished to remain within the limits of the heritage of the Roman civilization, was decidedly opposed to Byzantinism and ever more clearly sided with the papacy recognizing the supremacy of the spiritual forces over the physical ones. This movement was the core of a new civilization. Simultaneously two new civilizations were forming, that were opposed to one another. We shall call the new western civilization of Cassiodorus the Latin civilization. Its starting points were with Orosius, but it formulated itself in Vivarese.

The first years at Vivarese were politically very turbulent. How sad for Cassiodorus was the incident of 539! When Milan went to the side of Justinian the Ostrogoths and the Burgundians who were called by them to help, having conquered the city they plundered it in a manner that was worse than anything that had been experienced earlier in Rome or anywhere else (Zakrzewski

1938, 44). In 540 Belisarius conquered Ravenna (by deceit) and took Vityges, the Ostrogoth king prisoner. But in that very year the leader was recalled and the Ostrogoths under their new king Totila regained supremacy in the major part of Italy.

The victorious general was needed for a new war against Persia, but even that one he was not permitted to bring to an end. He was recalled again in 542 to Italy to fight against Totila. The Persians occupied Commagene, Armenia and Mesopotamia (in 544). They were not interested in peace and they only agreed to a five year armistice and this for a sizeable tribute (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 69, 70; Diehl 1924, 26). At the same time a people from Mongolia (they were again referred to as the Huns) ravaged Moesia and they reached the Isthmus of Corinth in 546 (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 72). It was only a question of time before the barbarians would set up their own state in the Balkans. Italy was being conquered by Byzantium, while at the same time whole provinces were being lost in the centre and in the East.

The more Justinian was concerned about Italy the more ostentatiously was he manifesting his orthodoxy. Suddenly in 538 the shocking news spread that in Syria, Armenia and Mesopotamia heretics were being burned at the stake (Lot 1927, 345; Diehl & Marçais 1936, 107, 108). Maybe again the Manicheans were being rounded up? Theodora was secretly taking care of the Monophysites, and it was only an external effect that was sought for. If in 540 even the Egyptian hermits agreed to the Chalcedonian formula, and what more, if in 543 it was noted that there were only three Monophysite bishops in the entire East – then it is clear that we are dealing here only with some official reports. The

severe imperial edicts of 541 could not have remained ineffective! And when the emperor ordered in 542 that there would be mass conversions of pagans in Asia the whole of Asia Minor was given only Monophysite missionaries who were numerous.

The Monophysite theologians then concocted a certain ruse. They discovered in the book containing the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon three “articles”, or rather small treatises, which according to them were inspired by Nestorianism. Justinian, on the authority of his Caesaropapism condemned these “articles”. Thus, he helped the Monophysites in the undermining of the authority of the Council of Chalcedon. The conflict over these “articles” was to last for 12 years and it is interesting that it began exactly in the same year (543), when supposedly there were to be only three Monophysite bishops in the world.

Pope Vigilius did not want to accept the Justinian condemnation and so the emperor ordered the Pope to present himself at his court and he forced him to undertake this journey. Vigilius delayed the trip as long as possible and so he reached Constantinople only in 547. The struggle over who had supreme authority broke out with passion becoming an obvious confrontation of two civilizations.

When the Pope arrived in Constantinople the news came that Rome was conquered again by Belisarius. This was after a three years long war. At that crucial moment however the general had a financial problem and therefore he could not support a large army, thus the war turned into a “lazy” one in the following years. But the regaining of Rome was after all a triumph. At the same time other news were arriving. In that very year there was a renewed invasion of the Slavs and the years 545-548 were occupied with a

new Numidian rebellion. This uprising resulted in such desolation that the African province turned into a ruin.

Justinian was busy with the “three articles”. With his brutality he forced the Pope to temporary submission, because he was in his hands at the time. He also exerted pressure on the Council of Constantinople of 553. In these years the western provinces opposed Vigilius twice, who was not disposing his own will. This factual captivity of the Pope lasted eight years. It was only in 555 that he was allowed to return. He died on his way back, reaching only as far as Syracuse.

Caesaropapism was winning in the entire state except for Italy. At one moment the Italian bishops even broke off relations with Vigilius and a local schism resulted which was to extend for the next two generations (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 100-111; Zakrzewski 1938 53). But in the East it was Monophysitism that reigned. Since 549 Justinian began negotiating with them and as a result they again had their patriarch in Antioch. This was the famous Jacob Baradaeus from whom the term “Jacobites” derives, which is still used. His opponents, the Melchites were given the name “the Church of the emperor”. The Jacobites organized themselves very well as a hierarchy and this has survived for long centuries.

In 550 there was again a Persian war as a result of which Belisarius was recalled from Italy in 552. He left behind remnants of the Ostrogoth state. It was greatly reduced but it continued to exist. Apart from the Italian and Persian wars there was another invasion of the Slavs who reached as far as the Aegean. In 552 they started to rule in Thessalonica (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 72).

The consequences of the constant wars, rebellions, uprisings and riots of all kinds were terrible. Military successes in Africa as well as in Italy, interrupted by periods of “lazy” wars and even defeats have finally led to the regaining of these two provinces but it is worth noting at what cost. Let us consider the background of the exploits of Narses, the successor of Belisarius. But first let us see what happened to Africa after the Numidian uprisings the suppression of which proved impossible because the treasury and the army were too poor.

The ancient, sometimes magnificent Roman cities were being rebuilt and 150 of them were counted (Diehl 1896, 386, 387), probably together with larger “Justinian mini-camps” around which township settlements formed. But shortly afterwards, what a great ruin! The contemporary Procopius described how over great distances it was possible not to meet a single person. The villages were abandoned because the villagers fled to the cities and the wealthy fled to Sicily or Byzantium. The country was incapable of any production, the more so because the Moors constantly organized killing raids and robberies. Procopius blamed the emperor that after having defeated the Vandals he had not assured fully his dominion over the land. Not only he proved unable to stabilize the relationships, but he also behaved “as though he had a preference for turmoil and revolutions” and at the same time his administration robbed and exploited the province. One has to admit however that Justinian was earnestly concerned about the deserted land and tried to undo the losses. Thus Africa rose again. After all in the great cities of Byzantine Africa the last glimmers of the Roman civilization and sciences shone with their final brightness.

Cassiodorus imported books from Africa for his Vivarium. In the next generations affluence returned. Africa produced much grain and fruit and apart from agriculture, pasturing and animal husbandry flourished. Byzantine Africa also was forested more than Tunisia is today. The Romans covered the whole of Africa with miracles of hydraulics and the Byzantine government cared for the conservation of this; the canals were repaired and they were so well placed that in spite of being frequently damaged by wars they survived to a large extent until the Arab times.

One should not conclude from this that Justinian prolonged the Roman civilization in Africa for two centuries. Ergology, even the most magnificent and ingenious such as the canals made by the Roman engineers in no way decides about a civilization. We have sufficient indication that the Latin language did not return to its former prominence under Justinian and that Greek started to spread and simultaneously the cult of eastern saints was coming to the fore. The Byzantine custom was spreading and what is characteristic the Byzantine method of calculating had come in (Diehl 1896, 382-384, 390-393, 401, 404, 405, 407, 594).

It was during the days of Justinian that ruin occurred. The return to affluence came in the next generation. The Italian campaign which was to represent the greatest triumph of the ambitious emperor coincided with the times of these upheavals and the “robbing” of the country by the Byzantine administration, as described by Procopius.

In other provinces things were even worse. Even in Tyre and in Berytus (Beirut) factories had to be closed “because the state considered that it would be better to exchange private

manufactures with state monopolies”. The entire Syrian industry, yes even Syrian, was very much endangered (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 94).

The source of all this was fiscal tyranny. The successor of John of Cappadocia, Peter Barsymes for 17 years (until 559) shamelessly conducted trade in offices and he practiced scandalous speculations in grain, but the emperor saw no fault in him so long as he supplied income whenever asked. It is easy to imagine what the subalterns of such ministers did, what extremes they went to so as to “dig up from the ground the hidden obol [small coin]” to use the expression of his contemporary John Lydus and which entered the languages of all peoples who are gifted with an oppressive bureaucracy. According to this author the taxpayers considered “an enemy raid to be less horrifying than the arrival of a fiscal functionary”. Further Lydus wrote that there were instances “when “the tax collectors found no more money that they could hand over to the emperor, because there were no more people to pay the taxes”. Fiscal tyranny ruined to the extreme whatever the Persians proved unable to ruin in Asia and various barbarians in the Balkans. As a result depopulation was on the increase. “Then they came up with the idea that abandoned land should be attached to tilled areas forming cadastral and fiscal units the members of which were jointly made responsible for the taxes imposed on the entire group.”¹⁰

We already know the long list of taxes, direct and indirect, donations, services and charges that were binding during the reign of Justinian. There were plenty new ones imposed during his

¹⁰ Is that not similar to the Russian *mir* [мир – farming community]?

reign. In particular the charges multiplied and grew. The number of monopolies also increased. As soon as private sericulture was introduced, immediately it was turned into a new monopoly.

State control was in all directions. The size of wages was regulated, the state entered in-between the debtor and creditor, goods in marine trade were under control etc. There was no shortage of maximum tariffs. The property and domains of the treasury increased endlessly. And yet there was constantly a shortage of income except for luxuries. Thus all peace or military initiatives had to contend with difficulties and the contemporaries were perfectly aware of this. A new edict of 556 again called on the bureaucrats to be virtuous, but it proved of course to be irrelevant (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 51, 53, 63, 96-99, 120; Zakrzewski 1938 50).

This explains why there was no delight among the contemporaries as a result of the conquest of Italy ... after 15 years of efforts. This was finally achieved in 552-555 by Narses (about whom Zakrzewski 1938, 42 wrote that he was an eunuch). An effort was made to eliminate Arianism by confiscating their lands (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 105) and Byzantine administration was introduced according to the latest “improvements”, that is, in the form of exarchates as in Africa.

The first consequence of Byzantine rule in Italy was a schism in the Church. The weed of Caesaropapism, foreign to Roman traditions provoked a spontaneous reaction. Facundus from Hermianum proclaimed that “only Christ is king and priest” and that “it is the duty of the emperor to follow the canons of the Church and not to determine or transgress them” (Diehl & Marçais

1936, 112). There was also opposition against despotism and centralization (Zakrzewski 1938, 53). There came times when the Popes were selected under pressure from the exarchate. Pelagius (555-560) and John III (560-573) were occupied with problems associated with the dwindling of the Roman obedience not only from the Balkan side but even in northern Italy, because there was no support for the dependence of the papacy on secular rule (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 112).

The Byzantine Empire was ruling in Rome and Ravenna but it had less force against the Persians. In 557 another armistice for five years was negotiated with new acquisitions for the Persians. And next year the new Huns were again in Thrace (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 71, 72). How great would it have been if the whole of Asia were abandoned and all effort placed in the West! But the ambition of Justinian was to hold both East and West ruining the issues of East and West in the process.

Against such a background it becomes understandable that in the years 553-562 almost each year there were bloody riots in Constantinople. In 562 there was a plot against the life of the emperor and that year it was again necessary to beg the Persians for an extension of the armistice which was obtained for another five years, but with a permanent tribute (Diehl 1924, 31).

Three years later in 565 Justinian died. The day after his death it was announced that “due to the lack of everything that was essential the army is in total disarray, so much so that the state is exposed to constant invasions and affronts from the barbarians”. This is a sad testimony to the hundreds of bastion citadels, to these rows of “Justinian mini-camps”, sometimes triple in number and

which are admired by some historians. They did not stop the Persians, or the Numidians, or the Slavs in the Balkans. They were always in disorder, either in disrepair or without a garrison etc. (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 79, Diehl 1924, 33). Dark clouds gathered over all the borders and in the interior there was decline of respect for public authorities. “People lived only through tricks and the contemporaries marvelled where all the riches of Rome had gone” (Diehl 1924, 29). Suddenly all the political and military achievements of Justinian vanished, as if they never had existed.

A serious chronicler Evagrius concluded the description of this reign with these words: “And so died the ruler who filled the world with turmoil and upheavals: and having received at the end of his life a payment for his misdeeds he went to seek the justice he deserved in the tribunal of hell.” For his death was received throughout the country with a general feeling of relief and joy (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 121).

Recent historical science tries to defend Justinian against the devastating judgement of his contemporaries. He is glorified for having regained some provinces, for doubling the size of his state and even for the supposed prolongation of the Roman civilization etc. Let us consider what remained from the efforts of Justinian, what survived him?

The *Code* and the Hagia Sophia. These are his monuments. Both are the fruits of his initiative. Two masters from western Asia, the main architects Isidore of Miletus and Anthemius of Tralles in Lydia (who was also a sculptor) were ordered to build in haste. This temple was raised in scarcely six years (532-537). When in 538 the dome collapsed, the building of only the new

dome took the same amount of time (558-563). The situation was quite similar to the history of the second edition of the *Code*.

More recent research has demonstrated that the Byzantine style is to a large extent of oriental origin. Only the heaviest of fine arts, namely building construction, developed. Apart from that only “small art” flourished: goldsmithery, ivory products, textiles, illuminations in precious manuscripts, etc, all of which was characterised by great luxury.

The most fleeting of fine arts, poetry, produced its Byzantine master during the previous generation, during the reign of Anastasius. At the very beginning of the VIth c. there was the famous inspired poet, the hymnologist Romanos, referred to as the prince of melodists. Apart from religious poetry there was no other poetry in Byzantium of the time.

Byzantine science itself, apart from the theology, was to come only in the future. At that time there was only history, but how distant were these scribes compared with the great Greek and Roman historians! Even universal histories were being written, but without much of a horizon and with no talent. Yet they had substantial influence on the historical notions of the West. Thus from many sides simultaneously it was visible that the expansion of the Byzantine civilization was beginning.

What was considered as the pinnacle of science came from the Orient and was engulfed in oriental methods. Alchemy competed and frequently combined with neo-Platonism, there was astrology, magic, theurgia etc., and similar “mirages of the soul, fainting of the mind, and a relish in absurdities spread, a sickly search for the mysterious” (Przychocki 1929, 77, 90; Natanson 1934, 10). It is

difficult to imagine that this general lowering of standards had no effect on the ageless philosophical school in Athens. When this school was closed in 529, sciences probably lost much less than is universally held and lamented about.

The professors who were expelled from there went to Persia. Anushiravan the Just (referred to as Khosrau in Greek) established for them a new centre in Gundeshapur, but we do not hear anything about them influencing the Persians with Hellenic notions. There are no syntheses of civilizations, there never were and cannot be (see Koneczny 1935). If it is true that there they were digesting elements of Persian, Greek, Syrian, West-European, Hebraic and Hindu thought (Zakrzewski 1938, 51, Natanson 1934, 16), it is obvious that the net result must have been zero. Most probably they were invited to Persia because at the time Persia was at war with Byzantium. Asylum was given to the persecuted that is to the enemies of Justinian.

At each step we meet with orientalism and Syria as always stood at the head of this, thus the large number of Syrians and Palestinians in the intellectual culture is noticeable. Not only Alexandria but also Antioch declined spiritually “from the moment Monophysitic separatism appeared” (Diehl 1924, 19-23). This current did not abound in creative elements.

Much that is negative can therefore be said about the reign of Justinian. We also know well what a conceited dilettante he was and how he liked to brag. He would say that his subjects should feel incomparable happiness in that they were born in his times. He considered himself to be the elect of God, who should be venerated accordingly (Diehl & Marçais 1936, 115; Zakrzewski

1938, 54, 56). We could even elaborate on the negative influence he had exerted on the work on the *Code* and on the Hagia Sophia. But let us be reasonable! Let us ask whether both the *Code* and this church would have appeared were it not for his wish and initiative? He proved able to execute his initiatives and we have no right to demand perfection. His culture of action as a rule was defective, but he was not deprived of it. He hesitated much, but how could he reconcile his dream of unity of the whole Empire including the West and the East, with his love of Latin and Roman culture, even though he understood it erroneously? He confessed utopias and for this reason he often wavered as if [he were lost] between two civilizations [something is missing in the original here].

His nephew and successor Justin II (565-578) never wavered and sailed full wind onto the waters of the Orient.

We shall describe briefly the political events of these years. In 568 the Longobards were beginning to make incursions into Italy and it proved possible to arm and send against them only two exarchs, the ones from Ravenna and from Africa, and this proved insufficient. In 572 the Persian wars began anew and their course was unfortunate. In order to ensure an army for himself Justin appointed as his co-ruler and successor – the commander of the palace guard, Tiberius, who ruled in the years 578-582. For a while he proved able to withhold the Persians and he regained Armenia. He nominated his son-in-law Maurice (582-603) as successor. This one tried once again to reform the administration and in particular he tried to economize. He made a “reorganization” which resulted in a new division of the provinces (with Sardinia and Corsica) (Diehl 1896, 466-469). During his reign the invasions of the Slavs

resumed and in 591 they managed to come close to the capital together with the Avars. The Slavs were given land and they were permitted to settle, but the Avars were expelled and chased so successfully that Byzantine military power reached as far as the river Tisza in 601. During one of the anti-Avar campaigns the soldiers rebelled and they elevated to the throne their leader Phocas (603-610). The people of Constantinople welcomed him eagerly. Only later did they realize what kind of crook they had welcomed.

At that time however everything was accepted in Byzantium... everything that succeeded. The supremacy of the physical forces over any spiritual considerations was already an established fact.

After Justinian – wrote an eminent French specialist – the New Rome had nothing Roman about it except the name. Since mid-VIth c. the links with the West disappeared and Roman traditions were lost. From then on, the term “Byzantine” is the only proper term¹¹.

From that moment there is no doubt that there existed a distinct Byzantine civilization that was opposed to the heritage of Cassiodorus and the Latin civilization¹². From that time onwards,

¹¹ Lot (1927, 359) errs stating that this was an amalgamation with Hellenism. One has to reject also the claim that Byzantium managed with extreme effort to expel from Syria and Egypt the competing Iranian civilization. Some emperors copied the Persian administration and the Persian ceremonial. Apart from that, there was no trace of the Iranian civilization. Nor was there any trace of Persian dualism in these countries of emanationism.

¹² Baynes (1925, 7-10) was of the opinion that “the last Roman emperors disappear and Byzantium begins in mid-VIIth c. and that it was then that the culminating point of the long process took place” which had begun at the end of the IIIrd c. The genesis of Byzantinism dates back much further, but Baynes was correct in claiming that Byzantium being a branch of Christianity could

the history of Europe will consist primarily in the expansion of these two civilizations, their mutual competition and the impossibility of generating a synthesis of them.

be formed only after the reception of Christianity. In the period from the mid-VIth to the mid VIIth c. it is difficult to find anything Roman there. The Islamic invasions altered the map of the Orient, but they met with an already mature Byzantine civilization.