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THE REFUSAL OF DIVINE HONOURS

AN AUGUSTAN FORMULA

I

In the worship of the Roman Emperors there were at the beginning at least two elements that stood in sharp contrast to each other. The Greeks had been accustomed for some three centuries to the rule of hereditary Basileis; a basileus during his lifetime was often entitled θεός and honoured as such, and this title and honour sometimes continued after death. In Rome the attitude towards an Emperor was different; strictly speaking there was at first no such thing as an 'Emperor,' but merely a citizen entrusted with great powers; writers of the imperial age are never weary of pouring scorn upon 'mores regii,' on the evils of a court and of despotic rule. Neither by tradition nor by education were Romans favourably disposed towards worship of a living man as a god. True, they were accustomed to the notion that every man had a genius, and the genius was entitled to sacrifice on that man's birthday; even so, the genius was hardly 'a god,' save in so far as men were liable to think of it as if it were that fundamentally different thing ἔστιν. The deification of Julius Caesar after his death gave a practical application, however, to a principle which had found acceptance by the middle of the first century B.C. that a life devoted to the service of the State entitled the liver, after death, to be enrolled among the ranks of the gods. The Senate, as the body that decided questions of religion and cult, had duly inscribed Caesar on the list of the gods, and so Divus Iulius took his place in the Roman Pantheon. Still, though a dead man might be deified by the State, Roman sentiment and tradition were against the deification of a living man, however great and powerful; by which I mean that, though writers might express themselves in flattering terms about a ruler, and though private citizens might begin domestic and unauthorised cults, there would be no public and state-recognised worship of him. But from 30 B.C. the position of Augustus was unexampled; no Roman had ever held such power. Now, though Augustus chose, wisely, the various studies by Prof. Nock and Prof. L. R. Taylor and Prof. K. Scott upon Roman Rule-Cult, to which my debt must be evident.
to abide by Roman custom and tradition and never countenanced officially any worship of himself alone—indeed, he even had images of himself in various parts of the city (which might have become objects of cult from enthusiasts) melted down and transformed into statues for dedication to Apollo—he might be placed in a quandary should he receive a request from Greeks asking him to authorise a cult of himself. For such a request was true to Greek custom and tradition, and it would be impolitic to refuse outright. What Augustus did we know from a passage in Suetonius, Div. Aug. 52; he allowed worship of himself only if it were in conjunction with that of Rome. Of what he said we have no record, yet we may be sure that a man at once so astute and considerate as Augustus, so tactful and understanding, would never have been guilty of a brusque refusal; while expressing his gratitude and pleasure at the offer, he would have declined gracefully and with reasons, reasons, too, that would be in the Greek tradition as well as suitable for home consumption. Unfortunately we do not possess (as far as I know) any such document. But we may be able to reconstruct the 'formula' that Augustus devised from an examination of some pronouncements that have survived, and such an examination should prove instructive.

II

We start with Augustus' successor, Tiberius. The literary sources for his reign depict him as one who was most anxious to tread closely in the footsteps of his divine father, and as 'validus spernendis honoribus.' Thus while he countenanced the erection of a joint temple to himself, Livia and the Senate (Tacitus Ann. IV, 15), he would not allow the province of Hispania Ulterior to dedicate a temple to himself and Livia (Ann. IV, 37, 38). On this occasion Tacitus puts into his mouth a noble speech: 'ego me, patres conscripti, mortalem esse et hominum officia fungii sitisque habere, si locum principem impleam, et vos testor et meminisse posteros volo . . . haec mihi in animis vestris templ, hae pulcherrimae effigies et manusae.' This evidence for his attitude is borne out by Suetonius, Tib. 26. Within recent years an inscription from Gytheum has brought corroboration to our literary sources. It contains practically complete a letter from Tiberius, datable with fair certainty to a.d. 15, replying to proposals made by the town of Gytheum 'eis evsebeian men tou lmon paxtropai timi D e the [my]metepov.' It is a reasonable

conjecture, supported by all scholars, that the town had, in some form, offered Tiberius divine honours (ἰσόθεσι τιμαὶ).

To this Tiberius replied as follows: "ἔφ' οἷς ὑμᾶς ἐπανύπνοις προσήκειν ὑπολειμμάνω καὶ κοινῆ πάντας ἀνθρώπους καὶ ἱδία τὴν ὕμετραν πόλιν ἐξισιρέτους φυλάσσειν τῷ μεγέθει τῶν τοῦ ἕμου πατρός ἐλς ἐπανά τὸν κόσμον ἐνεργεσίαν τῶν θεῶν πρεσβύοντας τιμᾶς, αὐτὸς δὲ ἄρκομαι ταῖς μετριωτέραις τε καὶ ἀνθρωπελείς."

At first sight the answer lacks precision: indeed Rostovtseff compares it unfavourably with the detailed and careful response that Claudius gave to the Alexandrians (see p. 4). Tiberius thanks the people of Gytheum and does not say "No" directly: what ruler could, without being offensive? He points out clearly, however, that τὰς θεῶν πρεσβύοντας τιμᾶς should be reserved par excellence (ἐξισιρέτους) for his father Augustus, because of his overwhelming benefits to the whole world, but professes that he is content with more modest honours such as may be given to a man; "ego me mortalem esse et hominum officia fungi ... et vos testor et meminisse posteros volo" could well develop out of this. Implicitly Tiberius does refuse τὰς θεῶν πρεσβύοντας τιμᾶς. And we may conclude that his attitude did have its effect. Doubtless there were many private offerings, or dedications by distant towns, to Tiberius as θεός; it was unavoidable. 3 But we happen to possess two public dedications made to commemorate a solemn occasion, (the delivery of Rome from the conspiracy of Sejanus in A.D. 31), one by the town of Interamna and the other by a governor of Crete. 4 Here the dedication is not to the god Tiberius, but to the numen and to the providentia of the emperor. 5 It is a prudent and clever formula, for it does for Tiberius exactly what Tiberius had done for Augustus, when he dedicated during the lifetime of his father an altar to the Numen Augusti and a temple to Concordia Augusta. In doing this both town and governor must have felt themselves absolutely correct, and we may assume that this formula was what Tiberius wanted.

So much for Tiberius' reply. By a remarkable piece of good fortune we possess a similar utterance from his adopted son Germanicus to the people of Egypt, preserved on a Berlin papyrus. 6 During the winter of 18/19 Germanicus was greeted by the people with 'divine acclamations' (Ἰσοθέσι ἕκαστροντες), which he thought he must check by edict. In this edict he first acknowledges gratefully their loyal welcome: "τὴν μὲν εὐνοίαν . . .  

---

3 A full list will be found in J. R. Rietra, C. Suetoni Tranquilli Vita Tiberii sua commentarii, Amsterdam 1928, pp. 13 ff.
4 Dumont, JLS, 157 and 158.

Perhaps because a golden statue should be for a god alone; see K. Scott in Trans. Amer. Phil. Assoc. LXII, 1931, p. 101.

His attitude here is consistent with what is related of him by Dio Cassius LX, 4, 4–6 (Boissevain).

See A. Cameron, The Letter of Claudius to the Alexandrians, in Class. Quaest. XX, 1926, p. 34. Cf. too Lucian, in De Inv. 1, where Polyclitus declares he burns, ἕνα τὰς ἐπιγραφὰς μὲ φορτίκος καὶ ἔπεμφετός τοὺς οἰκοδόμους τῆς ἱερατείας.
preserved at Lyons 'ne nimio insolentior esse videar.' To accept divine honours would be to arrogate vulgarly to himself what he did not deserve, just as in the Lyons tables the mention of bella might be thought to imply a boastful allusion to that great bellum in which Britain had been added to the Empire.

The three utterances that I have reproduced here all possess a certain fundamental likeness in their general attitude, in the reasons they give, and in the phrasing they employ. This likeness has, naturally, been observed before, and Miss Lily Ross Taylor has suggested that it may well be due to some Augustan model. With this suggestion I am in entire agreement, and I think we can add further evidence in support. In Inscript. Graecae ad res Rom. pert. IV, 1302, there will be found a long and interesting text from Aeolic Cyme, datable between 2 B.C. and A.D. 14, concerning honours which the people of Cyme had offered in gratitude to a Roman benefactor, L. Vaccius L. f. Aemilia Labeo. The offer included a temple, the conferment of the titles of κτιστης and σωρευτης, the dedication of golden statues 'as is customary to very great benefactors of the people,' and (after death) burial in the gymnasium. Labeo received the news of this offer with great emotion, but (says the text) 'was content to retain what he had already been granted, and to adapt his own fortune to what was accessible to a man.' With this in mind τὸν μὲν ὑπερβάραυ καὶ θεοίς καὶ τοῖς ἱεροθείοις ἁρμόζοισαν τὸς τέ τῶ ναὸν κατερώσας τὸς τῇ κτίστῃ προσωμομάσας τείμαν παρητήσατο, ἁρκέην νομίζου τὸν κρίσιν τῷ πλάθεος καὶ τῶν εὐδοκῶν ἐπιτεθωρήσῃν, ταῖς δὲ τοῖς ἁγιάοις τῶν ἄνδρων πρεποῖσαι δυσμενοῖσοι χάρα συνεπένευσε τείμασι.

As there are some doubts of interpretation I give my translation of this very interesting passage. Labeo 'deprecated the honour both of the consecration of the temple and of the title of Founder as excessive and suited only to gods and heroes, considering that it was sufficient for him to have witnessed the decision and the goodwill of the people; but he joined in assenting to the honours that were fitting for good men with welcoming joy.'

This inscription provides only what may be called the oratio obliqua of Labeo's reply, but it contains points of such relevance for the theme of this article that comment is demanded. Cyme had proposed to manifest its gratitude to a great benefactor in what was, by now, the normal Greek way; by consecrating a temple to him, by conferring the titles of Founder and Benefactor on him, and by dedicating golden statues—by what, in fact, would

11 See her article in Trava, Amer. Phil. Assoc. LX, 1929, p. 87.
12 This inscription was first published (as far as I know) by Boeckh, in C.F.G. II, no. 3542, then in H. Collitz, Sammlung d. griech. Dialekt-Inschriften, 1884, no. 311, and is reproduced in I.G.R.R. IV, no. 1302. Unfortunately there does not appear to be any detailed commentary upon it. It has been cited both by Prof. K. Scott (op. cit.) and by Prof. S. Estrem, in Symbolae Olausianae, XV and XVI, 1936, p. 111, but not for phraseology.
amount to deification. Labeo’s reaction to this offer is instructive: we may observe and compare with the imperial replies. He is content with what he has, content to limit his fortune by human bounds (‘τοῖς εὐρυκτοῖς ἀνθρώπω”) —‘ego me mortalem esse et hominum officia fungi . . . et vos testor et meminisse posteros volo,” said Tiberius, and prayed for a mind ‘quietam et intellegentem humani divinique iuris.” The honours proposed suited gods and demi-gods only; similarly Claudius regarded ‘temples and suchlike’ as marks of honour reserved for gods alone. Therefore Labeo deprecates a temple and the title of Founder: the word he uses, παρατίθεσαι, is that employed by Germanicus and Claudius. Sufficient for him (‘ἀξιοῦν, with which we may compare the Tiberian ‘αὐτὸς ὁ ἐρχόμεν’) is the knowledge of Cyme’s goodwill; ‘τὴν μὲν ἑνώσει, said Germanicus, ἑμποδεχόμεμ.” He accepts, however, with pleasure the honours that are suitable for good men (‘τοῖς . . . τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς τῶν ἀνδρῶν πρεπολοίς . . . τελείας’); similarly Tiberius claimed that he was content ‘μετριωτέρας καὶ ἀνθρωπίας πινακίς.’ To Labeo the honour of a temple appeared ὑπερβορής, to Germanicus ἱερών ἐκφώνησες seemed ἐποβόνοι, and Claudius feared that men would think him φορτικός if he accepted a temple.

This inscription is certainly the earliest of the four documents we have discussed. It is possible, of course, that Labeo had thought out his attitude for himself, and that the reasons he gives for refusal are his own reaction. Yet I find it more credible to assume that Labeo already knew of a model by which to frame his answer; taking it in conjunction with the answers of Tiberius, Germanicus and Claudius, I feel reasonably sure that Augustus had, before 2 B.C., already given in some pronouncement the ‘correct’ answer and shown what was the right attitude to adopt towards such offers from Greek or Greek-speaking peoples. As Miss Taylor wrote, ten years ago, about Tiberius (sp. cit. p. 98), ‘refusal of honours was part of the tradition of Augustus that he was faithfully following.’

If this is true, and if we possess vestiges sufficient for reconstructing the Augustan formula of refusal, we can assess more clearly the significance of a passage from the Alexander Romance. 12 The tradition set up by Augustus was polite refusal of ἱερών τιμῶν on the grounds that the emperor was only mortal, content with human honours, and that to accept divine ones would bring odium upon him, since the gods alone could fittingly receive them. The Alexander Romance is usually dated to the second century of our era—i.e., it is post-Augustan. In book II, 22, 7 ff. (ed. Kroll, p. 97) we are shown

---

12 This passage was first cited by Wilcken (sp. cit. p. 50), and later by Miss Taylor (sp. cit. p. 100) in this connection.
a letter from Rhodogune and Statira in which they declare that Alexander is equal to the Olympians in reason, wisdom and power, and that they have written to the Persians to ask their gods that he may be "συνθρωνισθήναι τῷ Διὶ καὶ προσκυνεῖθαι."

There then follows Alexander's reply (II, 22, 12):—

"Παρατόμαι τοῖς ἱσοθέους τιμῶς ἔγω γὰρ ἀνθρωπος φθαρτός γεγένημαι καὶ εὐλαβοῦμαι τὸ ποιότον κίβουνον γὰρ φερεῖ τὸν περὶ ψυχῆς ἐπαινῶ δὲ καὶ δέχομαι ὴμόν τὸ φρόνημα κτλ." No scholar accepts the Romance as historical, and we can be sure that Alexander never made any such pronouncement. The episode has been invented—and why? When we observe how closely 'Alexander' follows in phrasing and spirit the Augustan formula, the answer must be that the invention was deliberate, and intended to clear Alexander's memory from Stoic-cum-Roman attacks. To this I shall return in a moment, but first I must give Dr. W. W. Tarn's brilliant analysis of the passage, which he was kind enough to send me when I appealed to him for help.

"The letter is an inversion of what Timaeus wrote about Callisthenes and Alexander (Polybius, Böttner-Wobst, XII, 12b (12c))."

"§2. [Timaeus says that] Callisthenes deserved what he got for making Alexander a god, διεθαρκότα τὴν ἱκίνητα ψυχήν καθ' ὅσον οἶδος τ' ἡν. That is why Alexander says it would endanger his soul.

"§3. Praise of Demosthenes, etc. διότι ταῖς ἀλέξανδρου τιμαῖς ταῖς ἱσοθέοις ἀπέλαγον. Alexander here does what they had done; hence the same phrase with the definite article, τοῖς ἱσοθέους τιμῶς, though the princesses had not used that phrase in their letter, and Persis had already made him a full blown ἱερός (II, 21, 26).

"§4. Blame of Callisthenes for deck ing out with aegis and thunderbolt a "mortal nature," "nature subject to death" (θυμή φώσι). Hence Alexander calls himself ἀνθρωπος φθαρτός, "subject to perishing," though ἀνθρωπος alone was enough; and for φθαρτός compare διεθαρκότα above.

"Whoever wrote this passage of the Romance, wrote with Timaeus open before him at the famous passage about Callisthenes: Alexander was going to do better than that this time."

The writer, whoever it was, when fathering this letter on Alexander, gave it the spirit and phrasing of the Augustan formula, "παρατόμαι ... ἐπαινῶ δὲ καὶ δέχομαι." We may remark that παρατόμαι cannot have been a word often used in Hellenistic chancelleries: in Mr. B. Welles' admirable Royal Correspondence I can find only one instance cited, and that in a letter from a Parthian king. But in letters from Rome, where a princeps and not a king was speaking, it could be used with a greater appearance of naturalness. In the matter of the κιβουνος περὶ ψυχῆς I can find no parallel utterance from an
emperor, but the conscience of Rome was sufficiently alive to the dangers of
great power. Augustus apart, the emperor who warned his friends 'Quanta
belua estet imperium,' or who declared 'cuncta mortalium incerta quantoque
plus adeptus foret tanto se magis in lubrico' could not be unaware of the
dangers that lurked in the θέωσις of a ruler. That was precisely the danger
that overwhelmed Caligula—'ύπο μεγέθους τῆς ἄρχης ἐκείνης οὐκ έποτο' (Josephus,
Ant. Jud. XVIII, 256), and Caligula and Domitian remained as 'awful examples'
for writers and moralists. As for άνθρωπος θεοτός and έλαιβόμενοι—the speech
of Tacitus reported in Ann. IV, 37/38 and Labeo's anxiety to measure his
own fortune τούς έργοιον άνθρώπω both speak the same language. More
still; if Augustus did make a pronouncement which served as a model for
such refusals, it helps us to understand the vehemence which Livy puts into
his denunciation of Alexander the Great (IX, 18): there indeed was a ruler
'merus secundis rebus,' who could no longer measure his fortune by human
standards. The whole hostile portrait, misleading as we know it to be, must
have been most satisfying to Roman pride, and must have been drawn with
an implied comparison to the 'pater atque princeps.'

III

This, then, was the formula that Augustus had devised, in answering the
Greek communities. A courteous expression of pleasure at the offer made,
as evidencing the depth of their loyalty, coupled with deprecation of such
honours as excessive and suitable to gods only; he was a mortal, content with
such honours as are fitting for mortals. If our assumption is correct it
explains the singular resemblance that exists between the answers of Labeo,
Tiberius, Germanicus and Claudius, which can hardly be due to chance.
The formula seems to me typical alike of the prudence and the politeness of
Augustus: it was considerate to the Greeks, and it was true to Roman tradi-
tion. As such it was a formula that worked well, and Augustus' attitude was
followed carefully by the more thoughtful of his successors. 'Im allgemeinem
kann man sagen, dass die klugen Kaiser—hierin ebenso vorsichtig wie
Augustus handelnd—sich nie Gott nannten, wie oft auch die Untertanen
ihnen diesen Namen beilegen mochten.' 14 To call oneself god, or to allow
oneself to be called god, and to accept a temple would be overstepping the
bounds of human nature.

Our investigation has reached its close. Yet I must permit myself one

further remark, and that is to notice how curiously this attitude of Augustus is a reminder to the Greeks of what they would have been the first to admit in the fifth century. The Greeks of that time knew well the dangers that lay in a man seeking to become a god, or in arrogating to himself divine honours. Then had come the fourth and third centuries B.C., when men had argued with some show of reason—granted the ancient notions about godship—that if a man did things that only a god could do he ought to be greeted with honours that had hitherto been reserved only for gods. They had forgotten that though it might be a mark of honour to be offered such worship, to accept it must be dangerous for a mortal, and was liable to place him (like the Herodotean tyrant) ἢκτος τῶν ἐνθότων νομάτων. Here the utterance of Augustus was timely, and a prudent recall to the tradition of antiquity.

Yet, however much wise rulers might refuse, the danger still remained. It is perhaps one of the tragedies of such great power as lay in the hands of the Hellenistic monarchs or the Roman emperors that it must apparently be invested with some supernatural sanction; that the holder of it can never be regarded merely as a man, but tends to become something more than ordinarily human. When the great crisis of the Roman Empire in the third century had been weathered, Aurelian brought to Rome, from Persia, the idea of the emperor ruling by the grace of the highest god, of a god-favoured monarchy. This led on to the pomp and ceremonial of the Diocletianic Court, where the acceptance of Christianity by Constantine made little difference. The emperor was ruling by the grace of God, and as such something specially favoured, set apart, rarely to be seen by his subjects, living a life of isolated splendour.

Perhaps the process was inevitable; yet throughout the period occasional voices were raised against the inherent dangers in the system. We have studied at length the prudence and courtesy of Augustus and of his immediate successors; the sanity and good sense of such later emperors as Vespasian, Trajan and Hadrian kept them on the same track. Perhaps the last pagan expression of that spirit is from Marcus Aurelius, who in his ἐραὶ ἡ ἀποκαλυπτόμενη shows his dread of becoming a victim of the pomp and ceremony with which even in the second century the throne was being surrounded. But when, two centuries later, the Empire possessed a Christian ruler, and when the motive of Christian piety could powerfully reinforce that of pagan moderatio, Christian counsellors could from time to time, sometimes brusquely,
sometimes more diplomatically, remind emperors that they were but mortal, in spite of the blaze of glory amid which they sat. Hosius, the bishop of Corduba, appealing to Constantius in favour of the orthodox party, and deprecating Constantius’ support of the Arians exclaims, in words that would befit a Pindar or Herodotus, ‘παῦσε, παρακαλῶ, καὶ μὴ σηματί δι’ θυμῶν ἀνθρώπους τυγχάνεις,’ though he follows it up with a ‘φοβήσῃ τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς κρίσεως.’

St. Ambrose was ready not only by his writing, but also by action, to convince Theodosius that he was only a mortal, and a sinful one at that, but perhaps one of the latest echoes (apart from Byzantine times, into which I have not the knowledge to lead the reader) is to be found in the address of Synesius to Arcadius peri Basileias. In this daring and outspoken pronouncement Synesius asks for pardon if he should speak too freely to a ruler who has power and wealth surpassing those of a Darius, a ruler venerated by cities innumerable, who have never seen him, and who would count seeing him a boon beyond praying for. The speech proceeds as one might expect, but I cannot refrain from quoting one or two sentences which make a fitting conclusion to the general theme of this article; Synesius wishes the emperor to emerge from his seclusion, to show himself to his subjects and to his soldiers, and he proceeds:

‘ημι γὰρ οὗδεν οὕτως ἐμπροσθεν ἄλλο χείρος ποίησα τὰ Ρωμαίων ὡς τὴν περὶ τὸ βασιλείου σοὶ μετανοια καὶ χερσαίων, ἢν ὅσπερ ἑρωοργυγούσης ἢμι ἐν ἄπορρήτῳ ποιοῦται, καὶ τὸ βαρβαρικῶν ἐκτέλεσθαι τὰ καθ’ ὑμᾶς . . . τοιγαροῦν ἢ σεμνότης αὐτῆ, καὶ τὸ δεδενταὶ μὴ ἐξανθρωπίσθενε σύνθεν γενόμενοι θέμα, κατακλείστος ποιεῖ πολιορκομένως ύπ’ ευτωτῶν ἐλάχιστα μὲν ὄργινας, ἐλάχιστα δὲ ἄκουντας, ἐφ’ ὧν πρακτικὴ φρόνησις συναφροίστηται, μόνας ἡμοῦν τὰς τοῦ σώματός ἡδονάς, καὶ τούτων γε τὰς υλικώτατας, ὡσα ἂφη τε καὶ γεωργίας πορίζουσι, βίου ζῶντας θελαστίᾳ πνεύμωνος.’

Thus Synesius, and I could not forbear quoting the passage, because it forms an epilogue, albeit a rather melancholy epilogue, to the long history of the position of the ruler in ancient times. True, Arcadius was not claiming the old ‘divine honours,’ but in lieu of that the best the ancient world could offer in the end was a position of lonely isolation from subjects, awe-inspiring and inhuman. Such is the end of a long process of development that had gone on from Alexander the Great to Arcadius; in it the modest ‘refusal’ of Augustus plays a part that commands admiration by its sanity and moderation.

M. P. CHARLESWORTH

---

16 Hosius, in Athanasium (Migne, P.G. XXV, 745).
17 Synesius (Migne, P.G. LXVI, 1076–7).
18 A reference to Plato, Philæbus 21c.
PROCURATOR AUGUSTI

The origin of the imperial civil service is generally attributed to Augustus, and its development to Claudius; but a precise understanding of what were the original elements due to Augustus and what the additions of Claudius is to seek, despite much sound piecemeal work on the activity of the latter. The problem has not been tackled as a whole. To speak of the 'civil service' of Augustus is perhaps to use a metaphor of dubious value. The term 'civil service' implies a regular and highly organised body of bureaucratic officials forming an administrative and executive personnel which, under the general guidance of the Government, or, in classical terminology, of the Magistrates, manages, often in minute detail, the affairs of the country concerned. Such systems were not unknown in antiquity, notably in Ptolemaic Egypt, but such was not the system of the Principate in general, even at the fullest development of the procuratorial service. Still less was such a system originated by Augustus, despite the retention in Egypt of Ptolemaic methods.

It is true that Augustus entrusted certain tasks, for which he could not or would not employ senators, to persons drawn from the equestrian order. But unity of social status in the officials does not by itself imply the unity of their functions. The equestrian officials of Augustus fall into two rather different groups. The first group contains the great prefectures—the prefecture of Egypt, instituted in 30 B.C., and three other prefectures, which make their appearance only late in the reign. Two of these, the praefectura vigilum and the praefectura annonae, instituted between A.D. 5 and A.D. 9, are of normal civil service type; but the third, the praefectura praetorii, originally a purely military office which first became a permanent post in 2 B.C., ranks oddly in such company. The only connexion with the other three posts, of which the functions were properly administrative and governmental, is incidental. In the lack of senior military posts open to the equestrian order it was only within this group that a responsible eques, and one well known to the Princeps personally, could be found for the key position of praefectus praetorii.

1 Even Hirschfeld in his monumental work, Die Kaiserliche Verwaltungsbeamten (Berlin, 1904), which is the basis of all research, made no serious attempt to explain the gradual growth of the procuratorial cursus or the way in which it worked during the early Principate. That, and only that, is the object of this study. Throughout I owe a great deal to the advice and criticism of Professor Last on points of detail and doctrine.
3 Dio 55, 10, 10.
Apart from these prefects a few equestrian officials are known who are commonly grouped together as the 'procurators.' But, as Hirschfeld pointed out, it is necessary to distinguish in the early Principate between the procurators proper, the financial officials, and the so-called praesidial procurators—various military officers, ex-centurions and ex-tribunes, who acted as governors of small provincial areas under the title not of procurator but normally of praefectus. This distinction can be carried further. It is not merely titular. A careful comparison of the evidence, both literary and epigraphic, for the Principates of Augustus and Tiberius as a whole with that for the period of Claudius and his immediate successor suggests that the so-called praesidial procuratorship took shape but slowly, and differed widely in the earlier period from the guise which it eventually assumed. These governors were originally military officials—commonly of equestrian rank, but often only centurions—sent to deal with difficult regions in the course of their military duties. Hence comes the military title of praefectus, sometimes defined as praefectus civitatum, or praefectus civitatum et levis armatuarum, or praefectus cohortis et civitatum, with the very occasional variant praefectus pro legato.

This method of purely military administration was still common in the middle of Tiberius' reign, and out of it gradually developed the notion of appointing knights after their military career to the governorship of minor provinces on the analogy of the prefecture of Egypt. It is probable that the more important of the praefetti civitatum were granted regular powers of provincial jurisdiction in the earlier period, but the governmental procuratorship with the title 'procurator provinciarum' was not normal till the time of Claudius.

1 Hirschfeld, op. cit. 384 ff.
2 *Sertorius 4, 4, 1 (203 C) on the Maritime Alps: έστι δὲ τούτον αὐτόν ὑπέκειται τὴν ὁμολογίαν πῶς ἕναν πόλεμον ἔπεσε, *Cf. Dio 53, 28, 1, who says that Sardinia was overran by pirates in A.D. 6, ἀπὸ τὴν Σαρδηνίαν ἐσπερρησαί τὸ κράτους ἐπανεισάγησαν. G. M. Rinafort (Latin Historical Inscriptions, 40, Oxford, 1953) calls attention to a Republican parallel in Cic., *Ad Att. 8, 21, 6. But Q. Valerius was sent to administer justice to the resident Romans of Cyprus, not to control unruly natives. Mommsen (*St. R. I., 251 n. 3) suggests that he was praefectus fabrum.
3 The following prefects were of centurion's rank: C. Baebius Atticus, 'praefectus civitatum Moeniae et Traballiae' and 'praefectus civitatum in Alpibus maritimis' between his primipilate and his military tribunate: *ILLS 1349. Sextus Pedius Hieron, 'praef(ect) Rhetis Vindelicis vallis Poomiae et levis armatuarum': *ILLS 1689. Sextus Hufus, 'praefectus cohortis Cororom et civitatem Barbarie in Sardinia': *ILLS 1684. But Baebius Atticus was, in fact, before governing Notium under Claudius. L. Vibitius Patricius, an early praefectus of Cecina (CIL XII 2455) and Sextus Aurelius, 'praefectus levis armatuarum' and 'praefectus classis' under Augustus and Tiberius (*ILLS 2688), were of equestrian rank, at presumably was 'M. Iulius regis Domini. F. Cottini,' prefect of the Cotian Alps (*ILLS 94). The status of T. Procilius pro legato of Sardinia in A.D. 13 (12) 14 (*ILLS 103) on the analogy of *ILLS 253 would be praefectus, as was that of the praefectus Berrinius (*ILLS 2696). For principes et praefecti cf. A. von Domaszewski, *Die Rangeabgabe des römischen Heeres, 113 (Bonnra Jahresheft, Heft 117).

* Cf. n. 1, also Tac. *Ann. 4, 73, *Olmanni et primitatibus Fruiti impatatns.*
In the time of Augustus and Tiberius it is difficult to distinguish between the military and the procuratorial affinities of the equestrian governor. Only once is the term procurator used to describe what at first sight appears to be a governorship. Q. Octavius Sagitta calls himself 'procurator Caesarii Augusti in Vindalicis et Raetis et in valle Poenina,' but it is clear from the inscription of Sextus Hirruttus that praefectus was the proper title even in this area for military governors. Elsewhere praefectus is universal. Probably Sagitta was agent in this area when Raetia was a military district under legionary occupation and governed by a legatus Augusti. The duties of these military prefects were not always governmental. The praefectus Bernicidi was probably in general charge of the mines in that part of Egypt and discharged duties similar to those of the archimetaullarches metallorum omnium quae sunt in Aegypto. Both men were ex-tribunes, and the quasi-military character of their duties is obvious.

It is thus apparent that many tasks and posts which ended up as part of the procuratorial system began as an extension of the military duties of commissioned and non-commissioned officers, and are not to be reckoned as part of a systematised procuratorial career in the time of Augustus and Tiberius. Most of these posts passed early into the procuratorial system, but a few remained semi-military in character till the second century A.D. For example, equestrian officers were sometimes employed as censitores of special districts for the oversight of the provincial census, but not till the time of Trajan at the earliest were regular 'procuratores ad census accipiendo' established. Conversely the prefecture of the fleet, which under Augustus and Tiberius was either a purely military post, held normally after the praefectura castrorum or a domestic post held by freedmen, gradually lost its military associations and was added to the procuratorial career in the time of Claudius and Nero.

prefectures into procuratorships, and holds that the praefecti always remained distinct from procuratorial governors, although they were sometimes called procurator by courtesy. Hence his theory that procuratorial provinces proper were always and only frontier provinces with auxiliaries, but without legionary, troops does not correspond with the facts. Epitatis notably violates his axioms, as he admits, despite the plea that it became a frontier province when Nero freed the rest of Asia (ibid. 120 E.). Cf. also his views in Rev. belge de Philol. et d'Hist., 1918, 57 f., 77 f.

8 ILS 9207.
9 Ibid. 2669: above, n. 3.
10 Cf. above, n. 3.
11 Sagitta was appointed procurator in Raetia not later than 2 B.C.—fifteen years before A.D. 14 at latest, according to the inscription. But Raetia seems to have been under a legate till A.D. 9 (cf. R. Syme in CAG X 359 n. 7), if the archaeological evidence for a legionary camp at Oberhausen can be accepted as chronologically precise.

(F. Wagger, Die Bömer in Bayern, Munich, 1924, p. 9 and n. 4) and the arguments based on the disposition of the legions—posing two in Raetia—are just (cf. R. E. B. E. E. A. C. T. A. N. 2. 3. 4. A. Stein, Die römische Ritterstand, Munich, 1937, p. 526).

12 ILS 2698, above, n. 5.
13 OGIS 860. AE 1910, n. 207.
14 Cf. Tac. Ann. 11. 20. Mining and soldiering were close allies in the early Principate.
15 ILS 1338, 1394, are the first known censitores of the new type (cf. R. H. C. F. H. 5. 6).
16 Cf. Z. Domaszewski, op. cit. 111 f. E.g. ILS 2888.
17 The fleet at Misenum, being more concerned with the Court, remained under freedmen (Pliny NH, 9. 62. ILS 1996, 2815—A.D. 13 Tac. Ann. 10. 1. Tac. Hist. 1, 87) till Vitellius gave the charge to knights (Tac. Hist. 2, 100. Cf. below, n. 66). The view of V. Chapot (La Flora de Misene, 111 ff.) that the freedmen prefects were
THE BRITISH SCHOOL AT ROME

The term procurator in the time of Augustus and Tiberius was thus limited to the agents who administered the public revenues and the private property of the Princes. That this is the proper connotation of the term there is no serious doubt. The connexion of procurator with res Caesaris is regular even in the later imperial writers, and it was not till the time of Claudius at the earliest that the term was extended to cover more than financial affairs. The procurator at first possessed no judicial, governmental or military authority whatsoever. For Augustus this appears most clearly in the employment of the notorious freedman Licinius as the procurator of Gaul. Tacitus affirms the principle for the procurators of Tiberius in general, and implies that Tiberius was following the lead of Augustus. Tiberius himself laid down the rule in the case of a procurator of the public province of Asia. Augustus and Tiberius were simply following the system adopted by the Republican nobility of using members of the financially qualified equestrian order as their business agents. Whether they handled the private estates of the Princes in a senatorial province or his public revenues in his own provinces, they themselves remained private agents, irrespective of the status of the funds concerned.

The early form of their title shows this: procurator Caesaris Augusti is used equally by Q. Octavius Sagitta in Spain, and by M. Bennius Rufus in Italy. There were differences of function, especially that in the imperial provinces one of the duties of the procurator was to use the revenues which he collected to pay the troops. But, unlike the quaestor whom he displaced, the procurator of an imperial province had no complaints was a very rich man. For the use of the term res procurar, the imperial procurators, cf. the passages cited above, nn. 20, 21. Also Pliny (NH s, 999) uses res Nerois procuratas as a synonym for procurator Caesarii. The authenticity of the inscription comes from Vemuntrus, not Mienum (ILLS 2686), is not necessarily the prefect of Mienum.

18 Cf. nn. 20-23 and p. 21, below.
20 Tac. Ann. 4, 6. Hec sua spectatissimo cuique mandabat... si quando cum privatis discipulis forum acius.
21 Ibid. 4, 15. 'Non se iussi nisi in servitut et pecuniae familiares deinde: quod si vin praestas usurarum, manibusque milium usus fores spet nae, mo mandata sua.' Cf. Dio 17, 22, 7.
22 Cf. Cic. Ad Fam. 12, 24, 3 (T. Pliarius) procurator rationes negotiisque Diorum nostri.' Ibid. 13, 43, 1. "L. Oppius... neg漈us procurat L. Egnatii.' Also the general relation of Atticus to Cicero, who for all his
independent responsibility. Hence the connexions of the early procurators are with the household of the Princeps rather than the delegates of his imperium. Apart from Licinus in Gaul, Augustus employed indifferently for his public libraries grammatici who were freedmen, Hyginus and Melissus, and a Roman knight, Pompeius Macer. Conversely, Sextus Afranius Burrus served as the agent of Livia before becoming the procurator of Tiberius.

It follows from the above discussion that a strong distinction is to be drawn between the praefecti provinciarum or praefecti civitatum and the procuratores Augusti. Only the former possessed in any way an official or constitutional position in the earliest period, derived from their connexion with the army. Any unity which the so-called procuratorial career at this time possessed was derived merely from the unity of the common military origin and social status of the persons concerned.

This conclusion is reinforced by an examination of the known careers of Roman knights in the time of Augustus and Tiberius. There is no suggestion in the available evidence, which is not altogether meagre, of any concatenation or co-ordination of the three branches of the equestrian career discussed above. The custom—for there was certainly no rule—seems to have been to employ a man always in the same kind of job. C. Baebius Atticus held several posts as praefectus ending up under Claudius as governor of Noricum, but was never a financial procurator. Other praefecti are known who up to the date of their inscriptions were never procurators, and vice versa. Q. Octavius Sagitta, the only possible exception, was probably, as was argued above, always a financial officer, as he certainly was in Spain and Syria. Pompeius Macer, who was procurator of Augustus in Asia, was given charge of his libraries in Rome—which falls in the category of res Caesaris. Augustus seems in fact to have followed the rules of common sense in dealing with these posts. Doubtless if men had capacities in both directions they may have been used both as procurators and prefects. But present indications point the other way.

The known evidence concerning the group of senior prefectures, which had come into being by the end of Augustus' reign, produces even more curious results. It is usually said that only persons of great experience and ability were appointed to the prefecture of Egypt and the other great prefectures. This may be true in general, but it is not demonstrable. The evidence rather indicates that these offices were filled by men who had held no other civil posts. There is evidence for promotion within the group in the

---

Augustan and Julio-Claudian period. The prefecture of Egypt was commonly filled from the pretorian—a custom perhaps established by Augustus by the promotion of his first pretorian prefect, Ostorius Scapula, to Egypt—and the pretorian prefecture was sometimes filled from the praefectura vigilia or the praefectura annonae. There was evidently no hard-and-fast rule. When Augustus wanted a trustworthy man for the first praefectus annonae he seems to have chosen an ex-prefect of Egypt, C. Turranius. But there is no known evidence of promotion from outside this group, i.e., from procuratorships or minor prefectures, to any of these senior posts until the time of Claudius, and there are certain indications that such graded promotion through the procuratorial service was not normal even then. As late as A.D. 69 Lucilius Bassus expected to be appointed directly after his military service to the pretorian prefecture. Indeed, throughout the Julio-Claudian period, for which the evidence is comparatively abundant, appointments to the senior prefectures seem to have been achieved by personal and political influence rather than by merit. This is easily demonstrable for the Neronian period, both early and late. Not only did Caecina Tuscus, Tigellinus and Nymphidius Sabinus owe everything to court favour, but even Faenius Rufus, who performed his duties as praefectus annonae and praefectus praetorii so well, owed his position to Agrippina. In some at least of these instances it would appear from the not altogether meagre tradition that the persons concerned had not held any responsible posts before these important prefectures. Nor can the facts be dismissed as a peculiar scandal of the Neronian period. The appointment of Seianus to be pretorian prefect with his father in A.D. 14 was, according to Tacitus, due entirely to his personal influence with Tiberius. He had indeed

---

32 For Ostorius Scapula, cf. Dio 15, 10, 10: De Sanctis, R. Fil. 1937, 337: Lucius Geta, pretorian prefect with Crispinus till A.D. 31 (Tac. Ann. 12, 42) was prefect of Egypt in 14 (OGIS 664). The promotion of Macro by Caligula likewise was normal, despite Hirschi-
feld (op. cit. 147) precisely because it was a trick to get rid of him (Dio 19, 10, 6; Philo, In Flaccum, 16 ff.). Cf. below, nn. 36-41.

33 There is no reason to doubt the identity of the C. Turranius who was prefect of Egypt in A.D. (Hels
muth, Kleo Bithi, 34, 'The Prefect of Egypt,' 131) with the man who was prefect of the annonae in A.D. 14, and who apparently held that office since its institution in about A.D. (cf. Hirschi-
feld, op. cit. 240, n. 2).

34 That the prefect of Egypt Maximus to whom the Tarraconenses set up an inscription at Ascalon in Italy (CIL IX 1123) had been procurator in Spain, as Stein (in P.-W XIV, col. 422), suggests, is very far from certain. For the Vitratis Polliones cf. above n. 22.

35 Tac. Hist. 2, 106. Cf. Plotius Firmus, Otho's pretorian prefect (ibid. 1, 40) 'e manipularibus gaudiam, num vigiliae praepositiorum.' Conversely Graccinia Laco after being praefectus vigilia, was a procurator in Gaul (Dio 58, 9, 3; 60, 23, 3; ILS 1335-1337).

36 Caecina Tuscus, the son of Nero's nurse (Suert. Nero 35) had indeed been iuveridicus Alexandrinus in A.D. 51 (P. Ryl. 2, 119, 4). He was an established court favourite by 55 (Tac. Ann. 15, 20) when there was a rumour of his appointment to the pretorian prefecture, and became prefect of Egypt in A.D. 63 (Dio 67, 18, 1). Tigellinus' court connections are well attested (Schol. on Juvenal I, 135. Dio 59, 23, 9; Tac. Hist. 1, 72) 'praefecturam vigilium et praetorii et alia praemia virtutum ... vitiis adeptus' (cf. Ann. 14, 51 and Furneaux ad loc.). Nymphidius Sabinus, like Tigellinus (Tac. Ann. 15, 72)—'mater libertina ortus quæ corpus decorum inter servos liberto

taque principem vulgaverat ex C. Caesarre se gentium ferebat'—had a long standing connexion with the court before his preferment.

37 Tac. Ann. 13, 22; 14, 51.

38 Ibid. 14, 77. 'Percusso Seneta prompturn fuit Rufum Faenium immunam Agrippinae amicitiam in eo crimina
ntibus.'

been on the fringe of the imperial household from an early age. So too Avilius Flaccus, prefect of Egypt in A.D. 37, who had been brought up with the grandsons of Augustus and played a part in the downfall of Agrippina, owed his prefecture to the friendship of Tiberius. Likewise the powerful prefect of Claudius’ reign, Rufrius Crispinus, was noted for his social connexions. But most light is cast by the peculiar influence of the family of Seneca. An uncle, Galerius, was prefect of Egypt under Tiberius, and Seneca’s brother, Annaeus Mela, was noted for an ambitio praepostera which led him to prefer an equestrian career to the senatorial cursus, in the certain hope of achieving the highest posts open to knights. That he was relying upon his family connexions can hardly be doubted. It was perhaps a deliberate break with this tradition when at last a plain man of well tried ability, Afranius Burrus, was appointed pretorian prefect in A.D. 51 to replace the influential Rufrius Crispinus. Yet even Burrus was selected by the influence of Agrippina, and had been earlier a procurator of Tiberius, Livia and Claudius. It is precisely when there is evidence of such influence before appointment that one may suspect a lack of strict regard for merit. Once in office these prefects naturally took a leading place in society.

It would thus appear that the senior prefectures in the early Principate formed a series of prizes which fell to distinguished persons drawn from the most exalted circles, and were not necessarily the crown of a long and arduous career in the obscurer branches of the imperial service. At least, to gain these posts one had to attract the notice of the Princeps or to secure a court connexion. Such perhaps was the original meaning of the term amicus meus.
sometimes used by the Princeps of his procurators. Technical or professional qualifications were not required. Philo implies this when he says that Flaccus learned his job remarkably quickly, considering that even those occupied from their youth up in the administration of Egypt had difficulty in mastering their work—and Philo was not concerned to flatter the man. For the reign of Augustus there is indeed little evidence. The names of nine prefects of Egypt are known, but a study of their circumstances yields few results. Strabo describes them generally as σωφρονεις ἀνδρεῖς, and such they seem to have been. Even their descendants were mostly undistinguished. Not till Seius Strabo, who married a lady with senatorial connexions, does there appear a prefect of any social importance. The prefects under Augustus were thus kept in their place after Cornelius Gallus. But since the method of direct appointment without previous administrative experience was common in the following half century, it is unlikely that any other system was employed earlier. Until the creation late in Augustus' reign of three new prefectures, for the praetorium, vigiles and annona respectively, there could be no question of anything like a cursus honorum, and even then there was a distinction between the procuratorial system and the prefectures.

This failure to build up a system or to make use of experts is manifest in the evidence for the other posts of the Egyptian administration, notably the iuridicus and the idilogus, which so far have been left out of account. They were officers concerned with jurisdiction and finance respectively, and their duties seem to have been complicated; yet epigraphic evidence shows that Tiberius, at least, appointed men straight from their military tribunates to these posts. The idilogus had to guide him in his assessment of penalties a little handbook known as the Gnomon, compiled by, or at the orders of,
Augustus. Originally, however, his duties were less important than they eventually became. The *iniridicus* was left to his own discretion. This reliance on amateurs is partly explained, for the prefect and *idiologus*, by the existence of a numerous staff of Greek subordinates, who could guide them on points of detail. Yet the *iniridicus*, in the documents, seems to give his decisions out of his own head. Nor was their term of office long enough to enable them to become masters of the whole system: fourteen known prefects span the period from 30 B.C. to A.D. 40. Evidently neither prefects nor *iniri
dici* nor *idiologi* were required to be more than sound and trustworthy men. Their general efficiency was sufficiently tested in their military career. The refusal or failure to create a system is the more remarkable in Egypt, where all the elements of a hierarchy were to hand, prefect above, then *iniridicus*, *idiologus*, and, below them, the *epistrategi*. The latter post, which, like the two preceding, was taken over from the Ptolemaic system, was the lowest office held by Romans in Egypt. It illustrates the unpretentious nature of Augustus’ arrangements that at first a Greek was left in charge of the *epistrategia* of the Thebaid. Eventually he was replaced by a Roman, and with the creation of *epistrategiae* for the Delta and the ‘Seven Nomiae with the Arsinoite,’ these posts were regularly filled by knights. But not till the time of Claudius did the *epistrategiae* become stepping-stones to higher things.

Augustus and Tiberius thus avoided the forms of bureaucracy even when they could not avoid the use of bureaucrats, and took special pains to avoid the extension of their spheres of activity. This is most notable in the lack of a regular secretariat. They had freedmen in plenty, but the advisory functions performed under Claudius by Pallas and Narcissus were done for Augustus and Tiberius by more dignified *socii laboris*, Maecenas, Agrippa and Seianus. Augustus trusted some of his freedmen as Cicero trusted Tiro, but he subjected them to a discipline which did not permit them to rise above the status of servants. When he required a confidential secretary for his private correspondence, Augustus invited the assistance of Horace. In the use of his friends he was a thorough Republican. They were not the *comites* of a court, nor the paid servants of a master, but stood towards Augustus in the relation of the earlier, including M. Clodius Postumus, A. Fulvius Crispus, Saturninus Celer, before T. Iulius Alexander, is known elsewhere in the imperial service or even mentioned in the extensive prosopographic material of the early Principate; yet their names suggest Italian rather than provincial citizens. Possibly they were recruited from the Egyptian legions, and so had no chance of promotion while the senior posts were filled from outside.

---

84 Cf. Stuart Jones, *Fresh Light on Roman Bureaucracy* (Oxford 1930), 117. For the original scope of the department cf. Strabo loc. cit.
85 Cf. Philo, *In Flaccum* 1, 3, above, n. 49.
86 Cf. Reitmuth, op. cit. 127. The average term of office was even shorter in the later Principate. Galerius’ sixteen years were quite exceptional.
87 *IGR R* 1352, in 17/16 B.C.
88 Martin, *Les Epistrateges*, 84 ff. Lists of *epistrategi* *ibid.*, also in J. G. Milne, *History of Egypt under Roman Rule*. Q. Corvius Flaccus was the first (known). None
90 Suet. *Horatius* 45 (p. 297).
that Balbus and Oppius held towards Caesar. In the administration of Italy also, the creation of a centralised bureaucracy was avoided even when some form of imperial interference became inevitable. Wherever possible Augustus and Tiberius preferred the appointment of senatorial curatores, nominally under the control of the Senate, to that of equestrian prefects responsible to themselves. Over against the equestrian praefectus annonae and the praefectus vigilum were the senatorial curator aquarum, the curatores viarum and the curatores alvei Tiberis. This tradition of respect for the forms of senatorial authority in Italy was maintained wherever possible in the first two centuries of the Principate.

**Claudius and Nero**

The evidence for the careers of Roman knights in the later Julio-Claudian Principates reveals an increasing complexity in the nascent bureaucracy. There is no violent break with the precedents of the earlier period, yet something more systematic is observable. First the three branches of the equestrian career appear to have been consolidated. This was achieved by two changes. First was the assimilation of the quasi-military governmental prefectures and the civil procuratorships. On the one hand the term praefectus was displaced by the title procurator. Henceforth praefecti civitatum appear only as subordinate administrators concerned with special areas within the regular provinces. That the change was completed by Claudius is proved most decisively by the fact that the governors of his new equestrian provinces in Thrace and Mauritania were known as procuratores from the beginning. The demilitarisation of the office may have commenced earlier with the grant of civil jurisdiction to the

---

61 Aulus Gellius, *NA* 17, 9, 1, refers to a collection of letters of Caesar to Oppius and Balbus 'qui res eius absintis curabat.' But one would hardly call them procuratores.

62 Cf. also the 'praefecti aetatis Saturni,' 'praefecti frumenti dandi,' and the 'praefecti aetatis militaris'—the latter a late creation of Augustus—all senatorial posts. Cf. Hirschfeld, *op. cit.* 260, 265. Augustus also experimented with senatorial commissioners of the annonae, before establishing the equestrian prefecture (Dio 51, 26, 21, 31, 4). Trajan left the oversight of his aediles to senatorial commissioners. This disguised centralisation, which increased at the end of Augustus’ reign, is the point of Tac. *Ann.* 1, 2, *muna senatus in se trahere,* cf. above, p. 11.

63 Cf. n. 5 for the earlier usage. In Raetia the transitional form procurator *ex pro legato,* a procurator in exceptional charge of legioary troops (Hirschfeld, *op. cit.* 350 ff.) appears under Claudius: *ILS* 1348 (Hirschfeld’s original view that this is Claudian by its spelling must be right; for procurator Augustorum at this period cf. *CIL* IX 3019, Pliny *NH* 2, 199). C. Baebius Atticus after several praefectus civitatum under Tiberius appears under Claudius as ‘procurator in Norico’ (*ILS* 1349). *Procurator* is found in Sardinia by A.D. 69: *ILS* 1347 (but the older title was combined with the newer in the formula procurator et praefectus by 83, cf. *ILS* 5570, 1358), and in Corsica by A.D. 72 (*CIL* X 8038). At Sparta C. Iulius Spartiaticus was styled ‘procurator Caesaris et Augustae’ by Claudius to regularise his position as the descendant of kings, instead of praefectus (*AE* 1927, n. 3). C. Cottius, above n. 5. Cf. also the probable application of the term procurator to the overseer of the mines in Egypt under Claudius, above n. 22. The title of the praefectus *Bereniceus* remained unchallenged (*ILS* 2699, 2700).

64 Hirschfeld, *op. cit.* 385. The earliest known Claudian procurator of Mauritania was *pro legato* (*AE* 1924, n. 66), as in Raetia, n. 65 above.
praefecti. A similar development affected the praefectura classis, which became a civil post and was inserted within the procuratorial career at this time. On the other hand, the financial procurators were assimilated to the governmental procurators late in Claudius' reign by the grant of certain powers of jurisdiction, for which previously they had been dependent upon the provincial governors. The second great change—if the suggestion of the admittedly scanty evidence for the earlier period be accepted—was the gradual development of the major prefectures into senior posts of a regular equestrian cursus. The prefects under Claudius and Nero begin to be chosen among the senior procurators instead of being appointed from outside, though this custom was very far from being an absolute rule. Notable but not isolated instances are the careers of Afranius Burrus, Ti. Julius Alexander, and possibly Ti. Claudius Balbillus. These men, whose careers are particularly well attested, proceeded from their military service through a series of procuratorial posts to the supreme prefectures.

---

66 Tac. Ann. 12, 60. *Mox alias per provincias et in urbe plerique consensu sunt, si illum a praetoribus nocebat,...* referring to the period between the institution of the prefecture of Egypt and the grant of jurisdiction by Claudius to the financial procurators, may well cover the grant of such powers, probably in Tiberius' reign, to the equestrian governors and the city officials such as the prefect of the corn supply; indeed there is nothing else to which this passage can refer, and of course Pontius Pilate had extensive powers (Hirschfeld, *op. cit.* 402 ff.). Cf. above, n. 5 and below, n. 67.

67 *ILS* 2702, Tac. Ann. 13, 30. Palpebiius Claudia Quiriniani held the post of *praefectus classis Ravennatis* after a procuratorship, at some date between a.d. 42 and 56 (trib. mil. leg. C.p.). By a.d. 69 the classis *Missinaris* was an equestrian procuratorship (Tac. Hist. 3, 103) held later by the elder Pliny after a procuratorship in Spain (Pliny, *Ep.* 3, 177; 6, 16, 4). Cf. n. 17, above. Chapot (op. cit. 111) seems to misunderstand this change, which corresponds to the increasingly civil character of the fleet's duties, and regards the fleet as a purely military unit.

68 Tac. Ann. 12, 60. *Ex anno saepius audita vox principis parem virum hancudam a procuratoribus suis legibus sui ipse status sui...* Comparison with *Ann.* 4, 6 *si quando cum privatis disceptatur (Tiberius) forum et ius,...* and 4, 15—the case of Lucullus Capito—shows that only equestrian procurators were concerned (above, n. 21), despite the misleading last sentence of the chapter, *Claudius libertus quo est familiae praefectus sibiique et legibus adaequaverat.* This title is extraneous, and cannot mean that any freedmen agents were given jurisdiction; for the freedmen were either the subordinates of the executive knights (below, p. 23) or were secretaries, not actual administrators of provinces. Felix' appointment to Judaea is not relevant here, cf. below, n. 89.

69 For Burrus, cf. above, n. 44. Whether the learned prefect of Egypt in a.d. 51–59 (Tac. Ann. 13, 22, *OGIS* 666 n. 3; Seneca, *Nat. Q.* IV, 2, 13), the Alexander friend of Claudius (above, n. 48), and the equestrian procurator of Asia, etc. (AE 1924 n. 78, below, p. 22), all known as Ti. Claudius Balbillus (or Barbillus, a frequent eastern variant for Balbillus: A. Stein, *Aegyptus*, 1931, 125 n. 3–4), are the same man or three different men, has been much disputed. The ground on which Stein (ap. cit. 123) rejects the identification of the procurator with the friend of Claudius is the best reason for accepting it, namely that Claudius' Greek friend had to go through the equestrian cursus from the beginning, despite his eminent position at Alexandria and his mature years. So had other Greeks of like status, Xenophon, Spartius, etc. (below, n. 69–70, 98). This was deliberate policy; cf. below, p. 25.

The identification of the procurator of Asia with the prefect of Egypt is disputed on chronological grounds. His inscriptions was set up at Ephesus after the death of Claudius late in a.d. 54, and the prefect sailed from Italy to Egypt in a.d. 55. But the inscription might well have been to honour his departure, and Pliny quotes Balbillus' voyage to Egypt as a record-breaking passage. So the time-table and the threefold identification is quite possible, and, as Stein admits, on all other grounds very probable. The Alexandrine legion contained persons whose identification with other famous scholars, including one other future librarian, Dionysius, (below n. 70) is reasonably certain (Bell, *Jews and Christians* 25). Why Stein says that Balbillus' writings—*perfectus in omnibus genere litterarum*—were in Latin is obscure (ap. cit. 123 n. 1).

Ti. Julius Alexander was *epistatevou* of the Thebaid in a.d. 42 (OGIS 665), procurator of Judaea in 45 (Jos. Ant. 20, 106), *inventor bellorum* under Corbulus in 63 (Tac. Ann. 15, 28), prefect of Egypt in 65 (cf. OGIS 666 n. 2 and *PIR 1:V.*). Cn. Vergilius Capito, like Balbillus, was (*Apol. Aegypt.* *v.terior* *Egypti* *AE* 1909 n. 136) and was later prefect of Egypt (OGIS 664). Less exalted but still complicated was the career of Sergius Proculus, who was *sacrisia Alexandri* and, under Nero, procurator of Cappadocia with Cilicia (AE 1914 n. 128). Cf. also Palpebiius Claudia (above n. 68) and Senecon's general reference to the procuratorial career, *promissiones officiorumque per officia processus* (Epp. 17–18, 101, 5, and ibid. 2, 19, 15).
The tradition of the procurator as a very senior official still held. That this was so is further demonstrated by the use which Claudius made of his freedmen. Few things have been so much misunderstood as this. That Claudius claimed for, or gave to, his secretaries a certain public position is not in dispute, nor that this represents an encroachment of the imperial household upon the res publica populi Romani. But the extent of this encroachment has been much exaggerated and its nature misrepresented. While a libellus, ab epistulis and a rationibus became recognised positions, nomina summae curae, under Hadrian (CIG 5900). The responses were the replies of the Princes to minor appellants but to the embassies and petitions of the cities and kings of the East (cf. SIG II* 804 n. 3). Dionysius was free-born and may be identified with the Dionysius of Claudius' letter to the Alexandrinus: l. 17 (though not with the Dionysius son of Themis: ibid. l. 76).

14 Cf. the appointment by Vitellius in A.D. 69 of Lucullus Bassus to the conjoint command of the fleets of Ravenna and Misenum, directly after his praefectura alas (Tac. Hist. 2, 100).

15 Tac. Ann. 13, 35. The charge was made against the elder Torquatus Silanus 'inter libertos habere quos ab epistulis et libellis et a rationibus appellaret, nomina summae curae,' and repeated against his nephew (ibid. 16, 6) 'tamquam disponebat imperii curas.' This suggests an emancipation of these posts from their domestic connections as normal positions in the service of any aristocratic family. Also the grant of armamenta quaesiternia etc. (Ann. 11, 38; 12, 53).
whose special standing was not seriously affected by the death of Claudius, no magisterial powers were actually conferred upon them, despite the misleading language of Tacitus in certain passages.⁷³ Not even the a rationibus received any measure of official authority. It was only external dignity which was conferred on the freedmen by the grant of e.g., the ornamenta quaestoria. Nor did Claudius claim anything for his secretaries at the expense of the Senate. The financial resources which the a rationibus handled were the same as those of which Suetonius states in dealing with the breviarium totius imperii left by Augustus: 'adiecit et libertorum servorumque nomina a quibus ratio exigi posset.' If Pallas enjoyed any independence it was only a practical independence at the expense of the Princeps himself. Instead of a domestic instrument the a rationibus, and to a slighter extent the other secretaries, tended to become public figures, but in a social, not a juridical sense. The limits of their importance were strictly maintained even under Claudius.⁷⁴ But all this affected the procuratorial system only indirectly as yet. The growing independence of the secretaries meant that in time they would acquire respectability, and be recognised as posts which a Roman knight, especially a Roman knight of Greek extraction, could hold without loss of dignitas. When that time came the secretaries went to swell the volume of the equestrian career. Even as early as A.D. 69 knights were found who were willing to take such service under Vitellius, though this was in the special circumstances of a civil war.⁷⁵ But it is absurd to suggest that Claudius gave posts to freedmen which he might have given to knights. Still less is this true of the executive positions held by freedmen, the origin of which seems to belong to the Claudian period, notably the posts of 'procurator aquarum,' 'procurator portus Ostiensis,' 'procurator a muneribus,' 'procurator XX hereditatum,' 'procurator castrensis,' 'procurator bybliothecarum,' 'a patrimonio' and the 'cura- tor de Minucia.' The truth is that these were very small fry, of whom it would have taken three or four to make one equestrian procurator Augusti, which title they did not bear, although they were the agents of the Princeps.⁷⁶ They

⁷³ Tac. Ann. 13, 14 on the retirement of Pallas is consciously satirical non absurde, 'in Pallantem ut estaret,' 'sane pelegaret Pallas ne culus facti in praeteri- num interrogaretur paresque rationes cum republica huberet.' Such terms were properly applicable only to magistrates. Contrast Augustus' behaviour (Suet. 101, 2) quoted in the text.

⁷⁴ Tac. Ann. 11, 23 shows that normally the limits of freedman authority were respected, 'Narcissus non aliam armis incoluit Caesaris adfuit, quam si ita militem uno illo die in aliquem libertorum transierit.' Tac. Hist. 1, 58. 'Vitellius ministeria principatibus per libertos solita agi, in equites Romanos disponit.' Cf. ILS 9474 for one of these. That this measure was taken solely because Vitellius was with his army is not a complete explanation, for the implication is that the knights were pleased to hold such posts.

⁷⁵ Cf. on these new posts, A. Momigliano, Claudius 46 (Oxford, 1934).

⁷⁶ Frontinus, De Aquis 105.

⁷⁷ ILS 1533.

⁷⁸ Ibid. 1567, cf. 1578, procurator ad elephanistan.

⁷⁹ Ibid. 1566.

⁸⁰ Ibid. 9027, cf. 1567.

⁸¹ Ibid. 1587.

⁸² Ibid. 1487, cf. below, n. 85.

⁸³ Ibid. 6071.

⁸⁴ Ibid. 1407 reads 'Ti. Cl. Marcellinus (proc) Aug. a patrimonio.' This directly violates the normal rule of reserving the title of proc. Aug. for equestrian officials.
were plain freedmen procurators, and most of them were demonstrably the junior personnel that acted under the orders of equestrian or senatorial officials. When Nero gave a special commission to Arruntius Stella to take charge of the imperial games—a commission ranked with Tacitus with the prefectures of the corn supply, and of Egypt—it was precisely to the a munerebus and the ad elephantes that Stella would issue his detailed instructions. Likewise the freedman procurator bibliothecarum was the executive of the learned librarians of equestrian rank such as Balbillus, and the special agents of the vicesima hereditatim would be under the eye of the equestrian procurator or of the quaestor in each province. Even Frontinus, as late as the reign of Trajan, could insist that the junior staff—with particular reference to the procurator aqurum, by then an equestrian official—must be treated as ‘manus quaedam et instrumenta.’

There is nothing particularly significant about the increased amount of evidence which appears in the Claudian period for the household of the Princeps or the servile personnel of the various branches of the urban and provincial administration. The diverse officia existed earlier and were neither more nor less important, only less well testified at that period. It is, however, true that there was a continual tendency for these executive procurators of freedman rank to develop, like the secretaries, into public officials, although their domestic connexions were never entirely forgotten. The balance of these two forces is shown very neatly by the career of Ti. Claudius Bucolas, a freedman of Claudius or Nero, who was successively praegustator, trierarches, procurator a munerebus, procurator aqurum—under Domitian—and procurator castrensis. It was not until the final emancipation of these executive procurators from their domestic association with the palace service that the equestrian procuratorial system could absorb them, and so acquire a junior

(Hirschfeld, op. cit. 321 n. 4; 411 n. 4). Assuming the pre-Vitellian date Marcellinus must be, as is usually believed, a freedman, and the restoration should be not proc. but lib. (cf. n. 75).

Tac. Ann. 13, 32. Cf. also 11, 35 for an equestrian procurator ludi under Claudius.

The quaestor might replace the procurator as overseer in public provinces, though few were without their equestrian procurator by this time. E.g. for Achaea even earlier—whence comes the proc. XX hereditatim of ILS 1546—cf. n. 24, above. The procurator portus Ostiensei would function beneath the praefectus annonae, and the curatvm de Minerva beneath the senatorial praefecti framarii dandi, when such existed. Suetonius (Claudius 24, 1) shows that there was nothing tendentious in the abolition of the quaestor Ostiensei. The new procurator did not necessarily take over the quaestor’s work, but was perhaps more particularly connected with Claudius’ new harbours, portus. Cf. Momigliano (op. cit. 52), who, however, tends to an extremer view.


Nor should the appointment of Felix, the brother of Pallas, be interpreted to mean that Claudius treated Judea as a domestic affair. Suetonius (Claudius 38) ‘Felixem quem cohortibus et alis provinciae Judeae praeposuit,’ and (ibid. 25, 1) ‘libertinos qui se pro equitibus Romanis agerent publicavit,’ suggest that Felix had been given the aedile curiæ together with equestrian status in the fashion of the time, and his servile origin thereby virtually annulled, and that he followed the normal career of a knight, cf. A. Stein: Der römische Ritterstand, 114.

Cf. ILS 1588 for the a bibliothecae, 9028 for the castrensis department, 1114 for the bureau of the fiscus Gallienses under Tiberius, CIL VI 5962, 4014, and Gallienus (also Suetonius Langus 412 and the praefectus and hereditatim at an early date: cf. Hirschfeld [op. cit. 405]), the cura publica existed before Claudius, but no officials are known before the Flavian period (Hirschfeld, op. cit. 193), though tabellarii are testified from Tiberius on (op. cit. 199 f.).

ILS 1567, cf. 9504.
grade. Only then did the procuratorial career attain its full complexity, and the system which was finally organised by Hadrian emerge. But there is no sign of such emancipation till the reign of Trajan. At the period under discussion the equestrian system retained a considerable degree of flexibility. The direct appointment of men, whether court favourites or persons of special merit, without intermediate experience direct to the most senior posts was common, and though a hierarchy of office was beginning to emerge it was neither fixed nor rigid. Graecinius Laco held the post of procurator in Gaul after his praefectura vigilum. At the same time it is not perhaps accidental that the post ad responsa Graeca, in the three known instances, was held early, as also was that of iuridicus Alexandrius.

There is also an apparent tendency to pay more attention to professional experience in making appointments. Verginius Capito, Caecina Tuscus, and especially Ti. Julius Alexander—possibly also Balbillus—all had previous experience of Egyptian affairs before holding the prefecture there, while the appointment of the ex-Jew Alexander to the governorship of Judaea was an obvious—if misguided—attempt at an homoeopathic cure. The more important aspect of this tendency, however, is the increasing employment of Greeks with equestrian status in the branches of the procuratorial service to which they were suited. This begins under Claudius. It was a new development, and one which prepared the way for an altogether different attitude towards the oriental provinces. It is, however, to be noted that these Greeks had to enter the procuratorial service, like any other knight, through the army and the military tribunate. The normal procedure is shown most clearly by the titulus of C. Julius Spartianus: 'proc. Caes. et Augustae, trib. mil., equo publico exornato a divo Claudio.'

So, then, the equestrian administration grew up, if not haphazard, at least piecemeal, under Augustus and Tiberius. Officials widely differing in the duties which they performed and the authority which they wielded came into being as the need arose. There were three main divisions of the equestrian service before the Principate of Claudius, and in the formative period from

---

83 Cf. below, n. 104.
84 Above, n. 35-36.
85 Above, n. 35.
86 Above, n. 69-70.
87 Caecina Tuscus, iuridicus in 51/2, prefect in A.D. 61, above n. 36. Proculus, above, n. 68.
88 Also the iuridicus Proculus had served in the Egyptian army (above, n. 68).
89 Xenophon, Alexander, Spartiates, Felix and Balbillus—if he really was of Greek extraction—served or commenced their service, under Claudius: above, n. 61, 68-70, 89. Dionysius probably made his name known at this time, though his preferment came under Nero: above, n. 70. Caecina Tuscus and Nymphidius Sabinus seem to have had Greek blood in them (above, n. 56), but cannot be classed among the Greeks. Why Ponticus, prefect of Egypt in about 66, should be regarded as a freedman (Reinmuth, op. cit. 155) is not clear; Tac. Ann.
90 For Xenophon's military tribunate cf. SIG II, 804. Also Felix (n. 89, above) and Balbillus (n. 68), who, like Xenophon, was ad responsa Graeca after his military tribunate. For Nymphidius Sabinus, L.S. 132. Alexander had some military experience, for he was munecess bellum for Corbulo before his prefecture of Egypt (n. 68, above).
91 AÉ 1927, n. 2.
A.D. 41 to A.D. 69 these three branches were unified and welded into one system. From widely disparate elements there emerged something that is recognisably akin in some respects to the administrative systems of modern states. But only in some respects. Still the procuratorial system bore the traces of its origin, and long remained only in part mechanical and regular. It was created in the traditions of the old Republic as well as in the spirit of the new monarchy, and in its workings can occasionally be discerned the practical effects of that wilfulness and licence which were said by the ancients to be the main attributes of monarchy, but which were at times no less characteristic of the late Republic. This was, however, a delusive appearance. For finally, to controvert the ancient theorists, these traits vanished in the highly developed bureaucracy of the second century. To this end Claudius contributed more, by the establishment of a cursus and of the principles of recruitment and preferment, than any other individual Princeps between Augustus and Hadrian.  

A. N. Sherwin-White

Between Claudius and Hadrian it was Vespasian and Trajan who made the most important individual contributions to the development of the procuratorial system, if the indications of base epigraphy can be trusted. Briefly, the procuratorial career increased in complexity between A.D. 69 and 117 because of four factors:

i. The gradual accretion of equestrian officials for the supervision of taxation, such as the procuratores XX hereditatum and the nationalised promagistri and conductores vexatigiwm.

ii. The growing size and number of the imperial estates in the provinces led to the appointment of special procuratores indiciwm and regiom, and also of procuratores ferrariai, of equestrian rank, for their administration.

These two factors came about largely through the financial reforms of Vespasian; cf. Rostovtzeff, Geschichte der Staatswirtschaft der römischen Kaiserzeit, 381 ff., 432 ff. (Philologus S. IX), Hirschfeld, op. cit. 121 ff. H. Mattingly, The Imperial Civil Service of Rome, 76 ff.

iii. The conversion of freedman executive posts into junior equestrian posts. E.g., the procurator monetaia, ‘procurator aquarum’, and ‘procurator loricatae’ (the superintendent of the actual Fiscus).

iv. The conversion into senior equestrian posts of the secretariats. The ab epistulis, a nationibus

and a patrimonio were equestrian by Trajan’s time (JLS 1448 AE 1913, n. 1438).

These four tendencies were assisted by the increasing recruitment of the equestrian order from the eastern provinces and from the descendants of the imperial freedmen (cf. above n. 98; also Juvenal VII 14-16 and Stein, op. cit. 397 ff.). A large number of minor equestrian posts came into being and gave the service what it lacked under the Julio-Claudian, a junior division for the new men, the future procuratores seniores. So the known careers of Trajanic date represent a system not very different in essentials from that which was established by the Hadrianic reorganisation. Cf. in general R. H. Lacey, The Equestrian Officials of Trajan and Hadrian (Prowton, 1937). He rather underestimates the forces at work: cf. the cumulative effect of JLS 1358, 1370, 1371, 1374, 1419, 1435, 1448, 2728, 7193, and AE 1913, n. 1438, 1922 n. 19, 1934 n. 2.

Addendum. The clearest account of an equestrian procurator in the Republic (n. 22) is given by Cic. Pro Quinctio, 27-29; 61-73.

To the instances of favouritism collected in nn. 36-45 add the appointments in Tac. Ann. 13, 20—all are the friends of Agrippina mentioned in 21 as receiving rewards. So Balbillus (n. 68) was a courtier.

To the evidence quoted nn. 86-87 add Tac. Ann. 13, 1. 'P. Celer eque Romanus et Helius liberus, rei familiaris principis in Asia impress.'
MORS IN VICTORIA

The relief shown in Plate IA was among those transferred to the Terme Museum from the Villa Ludovisi, where, about 1460, Cassiano Dal Pozzo saw it immured in the wall of a small building to the right of the entrance. Its original provenience is unknown. In his catalogue of the Villa Ludovisi sculpture Schreiber describes it as representing 'a knight with two attendants...'. On the left a youth walks forward to the l. He wears a sleeved tunic girt at the waist, and shoes; and carries on his right shoulder a short stave which has been broken off where the relief border is damaged. He is represented almost en face, and turns his head backwards towards the knight. With his left hand he leads by the bridle a richly harnessed horse saddled with a panther-skin. On the horse rides a young (beardless ?) man in short-sleeved tunic and cloak, the latter falling over his left forearm. He is laureate, and holds the horse's rein in his left hand, while the right is raised to the level of his head. ... There follows a bearded man wearing tunic and shoes. In his left hand he holds the end of an object slung over his left shoulder (probably a sack...), and in his right hand he lifts up a hemispherical helmet (the left cheek-piece broken off), in the act of placing it on the knight's head.

Paribeni, for a reason discussed below, takes the rider to be an emperor, and suggests that the slab may originally have come from a triumphal monument. There exist, however, other examples of the same subject where the connection with a private citizen is confirmed by inscription.

The most notable of these is the relief of the knight T. Flavius in the Lateran Museum, (Plate II) on which the arrangement of the Terme relief is closely repeated, with the addition of two female figures on the left. Apart from these figures the only variation of importance is that here the knight is not yet crowned, but about to receive a laurel-wreath, instead of a helmet, from the pedisegus. The other features of the group remain un-

1 Schreiber, T., *Die Antiken Bildwerke der Villa Ludovisi*, p. 86, no. 36.
2 The object can only be a helmet, and is taken to be one by Paribeni (*Le Terme di Diocletiano e il Museo Nazionale Romano*, and ed., p. 134), as well as Schreiber. But the form is curious.
3 *Op. and loc. cit., no. 199.*

changed: the forward-stepping, backward-glancing *cursor* with stave, the rider with raised right arm, the richly harnessed horse with panther-skin saddle, and the *pedisequus* carrying a sack over his shoulder. Schreiber cites two further examples of the scene, the originals of both of which appear to be lost. The first, which was at one time in the Giustiniani Gallery, is illustrated by Inghirami ⁵; the other is described in the catalogue of the old Museo Kirchiano.⁶ Inghirami’s drawing (Fig. 1) shows a version in which the crown is held by the *cursor* instead of the *pedisequus*, but otherwise, so far as one can tell from such a reproduction, it follows the Terme and Lateran reliefs fairly closely. The Kirchiano example appeared on a sarcophagus-lid, to the left of an inscription which gave the name of the dead: Q. Vivius Lucianus, knight. "The scene", according to Ruggiero, "represented a young knight holding a crown in his hand. He was preceded by a youth carrying a crown in his right hand and a torch in his left, and followed by another also carrying a torch and an object difficult to distinguish on his shoulder." Schreiber had no hesitation in identifying this object as a "full wallet or sack," and adds that it was slung over the left shoulder. The sarcophagus of a knight, M. Mynius Lollianus, in the Louvre ⁷ provides an example in which both the attendants

---

*Ruggiero, Catalogo del Museo Kirchiano*, pt. I, p. 24, no. 91. I have to thank the Regia Soprintendenza alle Antichità, Rome, for information about the loss of this relief.

This relief, as far as I know, is not mentioned in any of the Louvre catalogues. It is in the Gallerie Mollien, and is said on the label to have come from Monticelli.
carry crowns; and finally it is probably right to see in the funeral relief of another knight, M. Aurelius Verianus, in the Conservatori Palace, the same scene curtailed by the omission of the pedisequus.

Four out of five of these reliefs are proved by their inscriptions to have commemorated knights, and the representation of a knight on horseback might fairly be said to explain itself. But I think Wilpert is certainly right when he sees in the scene not only an allusion to the status of the dead in this world, but a symbolic representation of the fate of his soul in the next. That a knight’s soul should prefer immum terrivem is not surprising.

Neither the idea nor the representation of the soul’s last journey originated in Rome. Greek funeral art, it is true, preferred to emphasise the leave-taking from this world rather than the journey to the next, but in Etruscan art the journey itself is represented with a great variety of symbolism, and the idea must have had a peculiar fascination for Etruscan eschatological thought. Its survival into Roman times is not surprising, for folklore of this kind lives stubbornly on among the people, undisturbed by the fluctuations of politics and philosophies. More unexpected is the fact that the Roman representation of the idea is so closely foreshadowed on Etruscan monuments that a continuous tradition must be supposed for the iconography of the scene no less than for the belief which inspired it. The Volterrana urn shown in Fig. 2 anticipates the whole scheme of the Roman reliefs: the cursor with forward step and backward glance leading the horse by the bridle, the slow-stepping horse itself with raised foreleg and, bringing up the rear, the pedisequus with a sack over his shoulder. There are, however, two notable differences, not of iconography but of content, in the Etruscan version of the scene. The cursor appears in the guise of the sombre psychagogue Charun, and the rider neither wears nor is offered a crown. The scene is closely repeated on other urns, and must have been a commonplace of the Etruscan funeral repertory. There are, too, many variations on the theme. On some, for instance, the attendants (they are here winged Lasas) carry torches, foreshadowing the Kircheriano version; on others they are armed with daggers and instruments of torture which find no place in the Roman versions. But all are clearly derived from a single iconographic type; and equally clearly this same type lies behind the Roman examples.

The Etruscan versions cannot well be later than the end of the second

---

8 BSR., Catalogue of the Sculpture in the Conservatori Palace, pl. 79, Tenea 13.
9 I Sarcofagi Cristiani, text p. 13.
10 Köste, I Ritreti delle Urtre Etrusche; III, LXX 2 = p. 83, fig. 14. Köste cites four similar examples in sculpture and one in painting.
11 Köste, op. cit., III, LXIX 5, LXX 4, LXXI 5, LXXII 7.
12 Köste, op. cit., III, LXIX 5, LXXI 6.
century B.C., while the Roman reliefs are probably all to be dated in the first half of the third century after Christ. The intervening gap of some three hundred years is bridged by no surviving monuments; and one can only suppose that during that long period the iconographic tradition was preserved in the popular but perishable art of painting on wood which handed down a repertory of illustrations not only for triumphs, but for funerals and many other occasions as well.  

And the same supposition must be made to explain why the composi-

Fig. 2.—Volterran Urn, after Körte, I Biliivi della Urne Etrusche, III, LXX, II.

tional scheme of these versions of the last journey is also used for imperial scenes of Adventus and Profetatio. The close relationship of these scenes, as they are represented on coin-types (Plate I, B and C), to the scene on the Terme relief led Paribeni to identify the rider on the latter as an emperor, but its even closer relationship with the Roman versions of the last journey—particularly the Lateran relief—suggests that here, too, it is not an emperor riding in triumph, but a dead knight riding to the underworld. But, emperor or knight, the fact remains that the same compositional scheme is used for a funeral and a

triumphal scene; and this is most easily explained if the scheme was part of the stock-in-trade of Roman popular art which provided illustration for funeral and triumph indifferently. One would, in fact, expect that, in a traditional and uncreative art of this kind, a scheme invented for one scene should, whenever convenient, be frugally transferred to another, without, however, implying any transference of ideas. The Etruscan prototypes prove that the cursor-knight-pedisseus arrangement was used to express the eschatological belief symbolised in the last journey long before it was used for Adventus and Prefectio scenes and its adaptation in Roman times to these scenes of triumphal character can have been no more than an insignificant borrowing. But as soon as the triumphal association of the scene became familiar, a new significance must at once have attached to its continued use as a funeral scene.

And this triumphal element (which was thus in a sense fortuitously introduced into the Roman version of the last journey) we find deliberately reinforced by a modification of the Etruscan prototype which must correspond to a modification of belief. The Etruscan soul, guided on its way by a malevolent Charun, rides as a reluctant victim towards an underworld threatening all the terrors of the Etruscan imagination. It is far from a triumphal progress. The Roman, on the other hand, rides sadly but in state, attended by servants and honoured with the symbols of victory, the crown, the helmet and the saddle of panther-skin. And on the Lateran relief we see that the end of the journey leads the soul into the presence of Proserpine.

14 The cursor in the Roman versions may be compared both in type and function to the Angiulus Bonus who leads Vibia into the garden of the blessed in the fresco of the tomb of Vincentius (Reinach, Répertoire de Piktures, p. 238, no. 2). He stands between Mercury and Michael.
15 The symbolism of the helmet is confused. On the Trajanic frieze of the Arch of Constantine (Rodenwaldt, Kunst der Äraite, p. 62) the emperor appears in battle with head uncovered, while an attendant carries his helmet. From this it seems that the emperor was conceived as being, as it were, a priori victorious; and that the helmet is there because it is a symbol of the imperial victory, but is not worn, because the imperial victory does not depend on arms or armor. (On the invincibility of the emperor see Rodenwaldt, Der belgrader Kameo, JDI 1932, XXXVII, 26 E.). Another instance of fighting bare-headed is provided by the Ludovisi battle sarcophagus, but here it is not an emperor, but a private citizen. And it is in virtue of his death (symbolised by the serpent above his head) and apotheosis that he can claim an invulnerability and invincibility which among the living can be properly predicated of the emperor alone.

16 For the helmet as one of the imperial insignia cf. those coin-types which substitute a helmet for a laurel-wreath on the silla curule, e.g. Mattingly and Sydenham, Roman Imperial Coins, pl. III, 51.
17 Visconti (Annali dell’Instituto, 1857, p. 304) identifies the seated female figure on the left of the Lateran relief as the Colonia Ostiensis, while Wilpert (J. Sarcophagi Cristiani, p. 18) takes her to be the knight’s mother, Vibhussa. But the ideal type of her head, the flowers in her lap and the basket of flowers held by the attendant behind her identify her certainly as Proserpine.
18 The Campagnol tablets. See J. Harrison, Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion, pp. 589-9 and 668-70.
It is this popular expectation of apotheosis after death which transforms the Etruscan version into the Roman and sets heaven in the place of hell at the end of the journey. And apotheosis also obliterates the distinctions which separate the emperor and commoner here on earth. In life the emperor alone is divine and entitled to the divine honours of a triumph, but death confers divinity on every purified soul and initiates a triumph in which commoners and emperors ride as equals. It is because they are 'gods, no longer mortals' that the knights on these reliefs are privileged to receive triumphal honours after death.

Eschatological beliefs of this kind were deeply influenced by the mystery religions, and particularly by Orphism, but their significance was too universal to be confined within the limits of any single body of doctrine. They represent an alteration in the attitude of a whole civilisation to life and death and the new outlook, whatever it owed to the mystery religions, became the distinctive encouragement of Christianity and Pauline mysticism.¹⁹

D. E. L. Haynes

¹⁹ Cum autem mortale inoduerit immortalitatem, tunc fiet sermo qui scriptus est: Absorpta est mori in victoria.
FORMAL ORNAMENT ON LATE ROMAN AND EARLY BYZANTINE SILVER

The silver plate of the late Roman and early Byzantine period is characterised by formal engraved ornament of an unusual and easily recognisable kind. The motives used in this ornament consisted at first of the quatrefoil diaper, several forms of rosette, strips of tongue pattern, heart-shaped leaves, and groups of leaves variously arranged. In later examples the characteristic motive is a pattern of palmettes, each unit joined to the next by the smallest side leaf, which surrounds a central panel or in one case (no. 6 infra) ornaments the body of a round vessel. This last stage has been dealt with by Matzulewicht; but as the examples of this type of plate have never been studied as a whole, they are collected here.


II. Silver. 2. Findspot: Ballinrees, near Coleraine, N. Ireland.
   a. Fragment of a dish, 8 × 7·5 cms.; quatrefoil diaper, rosette (pl. III, fig. 1).
   b. Similar fragment, 1·6 cms.; quatrefoil diaper.

3. Findspot: Traprain Law, Scotland.
   a. Fragment of a vase, h. 10 ins.; leaf pattern.
   b. Fragment of a basin, diam. 20 ins.; leaf patterns.
   Curle, op. cit., 32, no. 19, pl. XV.
   c. Dish, diam. 12 ins.; leaf and tongue patterns (pl. III, fig. 2).

For permission to publish the photographs which illustrate this article I wish to thank the authorities of the

1 Byzantinische Antike, 118 ff.
d. Fragment of a dish, diam. 11·5 ins.; quatrefoil diaper, leaf patterns.
   Curle, *op. cit.*, 39, no. 31, pls. XIX, XXXVII.

e. Fragment of a dish, diam. 17 ins.; quatrefoil diaper, leaf patterns (pl. IV, fig. 3).

f. Fragment of a square-topped vessel, c. 5·5 ins. sq.; leaf patterns.
   Curle, *op. cit.*, 40, no. 34, pls. XXII, XXXVI.

g. Fragment of a vessel; quatrefoil rosette, leaf patterns.
   Curle, *op. cit.*, 50, no. 45.

b. Fragment of a square vessel, c. 13·5 ins. sq.; leaf patterns.
   Curle, *op. cit.*, 59, no. 86, pl. XXXVIII.

j. Fragment of a square vessel; quatrefoil diaper, leaf patterns.
   Curle, *op. cit.*, 60, no. 87.

k. Fragment of a vessel; quatrefoil diaper, leaf and tongue patterns.

l. Fragment of a platter, l. 6·75 ins.; leaf pattern.
   Curle, *op. cit.*, 72, no. 108, pls. XXVII, XXXVIII.

m. * Corner of the mounting for a wooden box, l. 2·25 ins.; quatrefoil diaper, leaf pattern.
   Curle, *op. cit.*, 75, no. 110.

n. Fragment of a dish; quatrefoil diaper, leaf pattern.
   Curle, *op. cit.*, 82, no. 136.

a. Fragment of a dish; quatrefoil diaper, leaf pattern.
   Curle, *op. cit.*, 83, no. 139.

4. Findspot: Mileham, Norfolk. Square dish, 37·5 ins. sq.; leaf and tongue patterns.


a. Round dish, diam. 22·5 ins.; quatrefoil diaper, heart-shaped leaves, leaf patterns (pl. IV, fig. 4).

b. Round flat dish, diam. 10 ins.; rosettes and an engraved panel.

6. Findspot: Church of the SS. Quattro Coronati, Rome. Vessel known as the Reliquary of the Head of Saint Sebastian, h. 19 cms.; row of palmettes.
   Prussia Museum, Königsberg. Hirschfeld, Sitzungsberichte der Alterthums-

---

**Map to Show Distribution of Late Roman and Early Byzantine Silver Objects**
(for Numbers see Text)

---


11. Findspot; Moesia.
   a. Dish, diam. 32 cms.; rosette with units of leaf pattern (pl. VI, fig. 7).
   b. Dish, diam. 43.8 cms.; rosette.


13. Findspot; Botoschany, Rumania. Spoon; palmettes.

14. Findspot; Church of S. Sophia, Sofia. Found during excavations. Square box, h. c. 3 ins.; quatrefoil diaper, leaf patterns (pl. VI, fig. 8).

15. Findspot; Royal Palace, Athens. Found in the grave of a Priest of Isis. Six-sided box, h. 8 cms.; leaf patterns and engraved panels (pl. VI, fig. 9).

16. Findspot; Sludka, Govt. of Perm, Russia. Dish, diam. 41 cms.; palmettes, surrounding a central medallion with a scene of a horse.

17. Findspot; Kertch, South Russia. Vase; heart-shaped leaves, leaf patterns.
   Hermitage. Archäologische Anzeiger, 1905, 60, fig. 6.

18. Findspot; Antioch. Box, l. 10 cms.; quatrefoil diaper, rosette.

19. Findspot; unknown. Fragment of a dish, diam. 38 cms.; rosette.

20. Findspot; unknown. Three dishes; palmettes surrounding a medallion, cf. no. 16 (pl. VII, fig. 10).

The ornamental motives on these objects are of two distinct types. In date the groups overlap, but the first is centred in the fourth–fifth centuries, comprising nos. 1–5, 7, 9–12, 14, 15, 17–19; the second, nos. 6, 8, 13, 16, 20, in the sixth century.

* Dated by Ebert (op. cit., 170) to the fourth century.
The stamps on the back establish the Byzantine origin of no. 16, an origin which may be extended to the whole of this group. The Hammersdorf dish (no. 8) and the Botoschany spoon (no. 13) may be as early as the end of the 4th century; the remaining objects belong to the 6th or in the case of nos. 20a-c possibly to the 7th century. Four vases in the Nagy-Szent-Miklos treasure illustrate the same motive copied in a different technique; while another barbarian copy, dating from about A.D. 1000, is a dish from Zalesie in Galicia, also in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna.

The provenance of the first group is not so certain. While most authorities suggest a Western origin, under Alexandrian influence, for the Coleraine, Traprain Law, and Esquiline treasures, Pogloyan Neuwall argues for the Byzantine origin of no. 54; Sieveking regards the engraved ornament on no. 15 as Eastern; while Diehl seems to assume the Syrian origin of no. 18 to need no word of demonstration.

The whole character of the group, with its preference for geometric ornament used alone (the number of pieces on which it is combined with figure ornament is small), speaks against the Eastern theory. Why postulate an imaginary Eastern influence when a simpler explanation, for which positive evidence can be cited, is so much nearer at hand? The objects with a fourth-fifth century date in group one have an almost exclusively Western distribution; and though it may be objected that the Coleraine and Traprain Law objects are hoards and not treasures, the coin evidence points to Gaul as the place from which they were removed.

The form of no. 9 is one which was common in the Western Empire in the third-fifth centuries. Parallel examples in silver have been found at Chaource and in the Traprain Law treasure; one in bronze is in the Wallraf-Richartz Museum in Cologne. Pottery examples, possibly made at Worms, date from the end of the third century onwards; and there are numerous glass parallels dated to the fourth century. Two examples of a slight variant of the form, in silver, have been found at Aquincum and Apahida in Siebenbürgen. The body and handle of the Kertch vase, no. 17,

---

4 The silver amphora from Peredëpin (Matsulewitsch, op. cit., pl. 29, fig. 24) shows a contemporary and similar version of the motive.
5 Hampel, Der Goldfund von Nagy-Szent-Miklos, figs. 1, 8–9, 12–13.
6 Arceuth, Die Gold und Silber Monuments, 81, no. 115, pl. 5; Matsulewitsch, op. cit., 118; Jakschowitsch, Bulletin Archeologique Polonais, XII, 1933, 127 (French Summary).
9 See especially Ridgeway, op. cit.
10 Walters, op. cit., 39, no. 147.
11 Curle, op. cit., 13, no. 1. See also Matsulewitsch, Une Sceau d'un Roi Sabane en Epirse Orientale, 117 ff., pls. 1–6.
13 Id. p. 115 ff.
15 Hampel, op. cit., II, 39–40, III, pls. 32–33; Archaeologia Etruscii, 1889, 305–200; Odoñescu, op. cit., II, fig. 22.
are of this type; but the foot resembles that of a second vase in the same find,\textsuperscript{15} an example of unknown provenance in the Altes Museum, Berlin,\textsuperscript{16} and an example from Aeclanum in the Cabinet des Medailles, with a Latin inscription round the neck.\textsuperscript{17}

The ornamental motives of the first type point even more clearly to a Western origin. Three of the motives—the quatrefoil diaper, the rosette, the tongue pattern—though their origin was Eastern, were too widespread in Roman art for an argument on the provenance of an object to be based on the evidence of their presence alone. The quatrefoil and the rosette were favourite motives on geometric mosaics, and examples in this medium have been found in all parts of the Empire. The tongue pattern was common in various mediums, including metal-work. Of the two remaining patterns classified above, the row of heart-shaped leaves was a motive widespread in Sassanian art from the fourth century onwards.\textsuperscript{18} Its origin, however, is Mediterranean, and is rather to be sought in the row of ivy leaves, which was a variant of the more common ivy wreath.\textsuperscript{19}

The leaf patterns present a different problem. The origin of the simplest of them, which is the plain wreath, is obvious; parallel examples engraved on metal-work were popular at this period when craftsmen were ornamenting dishes with a central medallion surrounded by a wreath, on a plain ground.\textsuperscript{20} The other leaf patterns are of a freer and more flowing type, far removed from the exact formalism of the ornament of Roman mosaic pavements. It is this free character which gives the clue to the origin of this type of ornament as a whole.

Odobesco,\textsuperscript{21} after examining the ornament on the gold dish no. 1 \textit{supra}, suggested that it was a barbarian copy of various types of Roman ornament. The suggestion, in this connexion, has been overlooked by the later scholars who have sought an exclusively Mediterranean origin. But comparison with another type of Romano-barbarian metal-work, the group of Kerbschnitt bronzes, suggests that Odobesco’s theory has a more general application.

---

\textsuperscript{15} Pharmakowsky, \textit{op. cit.}, fig. 8.
\textsuperscript{16} Zahn, \textit{Antische Berichte}, XXXVIII, 1917, col. 263 ff.; Peirce-Tyler, \textit{op. cit.}, 1, 33, pls. 84, 79.
\textsuperscript{17} Garnuci, \textit{Storia dell’Arte Cristiana}, VI, pl. 460: Odobesco, \textit{op. cit.}, II, fig. 18: Zahn, \textit{op. cit.}
\textsuperscript{19} A pottery fragment of the third century B.C. (Wilpert, \textit{Die Papyrusgräber}, 67, fig. 16) shows how this took place; the stem of the wreath has been omitted, and only the leaves remain. For examples of the row of leaves, see Gerhard, \textit{Ernstliche Spiegel}, pls. XXVI, CCCCLXXXVIII, CDXIV, CDXXXIX; Lane, \textit{Journal of Hellenic Studies}, 1917, 220 ff., pl. VII; Weeg, \textit{Ernstliche Malerei}, pl. 5. For Roman examples, a mosaic panel in the Museum at Nimes: a similar motive, explained in the text as a row of rose flowers, is in Wilpert, \textit{Pitture della Catacombe Romane}, pl. 52 (2). See also Goodyear, \textit{Grammar of the Lotus}, 163-65.
\textsuperscript{20} E.g. the examples in the Esquiline Treasure; Dalton, \textit{op. cit.}, 71-72.
The Kerbschnitt bronzes have been found in Britain, and on a line stretching along the *Limes* as far as Pannonia, the great majority of them in or near military stations. Examples from findspots outside the Empire are very rare. The motives they display are nearly all of classical origin—S rows, spiral waves, palmette motives, peltae, triskeles and tetrakses, quacrefoil diapers, rosettes, and tongue patterns (pl. VIII, fig. 11). Their dating is still somewhat vague; Riegl considers them middle rather than late Roman; Behrens would incline to date the group more to the fourth century, and the presence of Kerbschnitt pieces in both the Coleraine and Traprain treasures supports his view.

Supposing Behrens to be right, the silver and the Kerbschnitt groups would be contemporary. In the grave in which no. 15 *supra* was found there was a coin of Constantius II (A.D. 337–61); and no. 17 was found together with the deposit of the Coleraine and Traprain Law treasures to the earliest years of the fifth century; and the pieces in the Esquiline treasure are contemporary with them. Both groups have the same general character, the use of old motives in a new setting and technique. Further, the technique of the great majority of pieces in the silver group is such that a technical connexion with the Kerbschnitt group may be postulated. The characteristic of the technique of nos. 1, 2a–b, 3a–o, 4, 5a, 7, 9, 12, 14, 15, 18 *supra* is the use of a gouge. The units of the various patterns have been gouged and then outlined with a lightly used engraving-tool. The resulting effect, especially on the quatrefoil diaper, one of the most common motives on both groups, resembles a very flat Kerbschnitt cut surface.

As early as the third century, craftsmen were ornamenting objects with engraved motives only. These were frequently filled with niello. In the treasure of Chaource there is one fluted dish ornamented with a large six-foil rosette engraved in outline, and with a plain gouged line running along the inside of each of the outlines. Roman silversmiths' work of the later period provides no further examples of this technique. The disk of Theodosius, on which large surfaces are covered with geometric motives, does not display it. But two silver objects of Germanic origin show that it was practised by the
barbarians. A round ornamental disk on a spatha, found in Cologne, has one face covered with a quatrefoil diaper, gouged in this manner, and originally filled with niello; round the side-edge is a row of heart-shaped leaves, also niello-filled. A square plaque from Sackau, in a find dated to the late third or early fourth century, is ornamented with an identical diaper, gouged and niello-filled. The workmanship on this example is much more careful. These two objects would thus form a technical link between the Roman silver and the Germanic Kerbschnitt groups, and in the absence of contemporary Roman evidence suggest the latter as the source of inspiration for the former: a suggestion borne out by the fact that in both groups there are pieces on which the typical ornament is combined with figure representations on engraved panels, in the one case six examples cited by Behrens (e.g. pl. IX, fig. 12), in the other nos. 5b and 15 supra.

But further than this the evidence does not go. The pieces in this silver group are too scattered and too various in the character and standard of the work for it to be possible to name a centre from which the style might have spread. Nos. 2a–b, 3a–e, and 5a bear a close and obvious resemblance; no. 11a is closely connected with them, and the technical peculiarity of nos. 3b–e—that the gouged pattern has not been outlined—appears also on no. 4. These pieces are the most striking of the group, and are probably of Italian origin, as is no. 7. The remaining pieces are technically not nearly on the level of the Coleraine, Traprain Law, and Esquiline treasures, and illustrate how the style was adapted by the various provinces; except in the case of no. 17, there is no compelling reason for supposing that they have been imported, in the course of trade or otherwise, from a distant centre, and in each case they are probably local work. No. 15 displays a difference in technique. The leaves are not gouged, but engraved in outline and then girt. The engraved busts of the Deities of the Week, and especially the fact that here it is the figure ornament, instead of the geometric, which is the important feature, give this piece a different flavour from the others. Sieveking claims it as Greek work; and though he offers no more positive grounds than his own belief in the Greek genius, this difference in character as well as in technique suggests an Eastern origin, which is borne out by a comparison with a dish from Concesti with busts in medallions and the series of mosaic personification busts excavated at Antioch.

---

30 Kiss, Roman Jahrbücher, XCIX, 1896, 23, note 32.  
31 Linderholm, Alterthümer unter Heinricher Vorzüge, IV, pl. 57.  
32 Rosenburg, Niele um Jahr 1000, 36 ff.  
33 Cousin, La Rome Romaine, 409, fig. 185.  
34 Grumpler, Der Zweite und Dritte Fund aus Sackau, p. 14, pl. VII, no. 8: Lindenschmidt, op. cit., IV, pl. 57 (1092).  
35 Marnolevitch, op. cit., 156.  
36 Antioch on the Orontes, II, Catalogue of Mosaics.
The technical connexion with the Kerbschnitt bronzes to which the evidence points suggests that the origin of this type of formal ornament is to be sought in the contact of Germanic and Roman elements. The distribution of the examples of the first group coincides in general with that of the bronzes; the later examples of this group (nos. 14, 18, 19, 28) are Eastern. The connection between the groups is best seen in no. 8 which has the characteristic ornament of both; and it is clear that the palmettes of the second are a Byzantine development of the type of four-foil rosette, which appears on the first Coleraine fragment, the Antioch box, and the Moscow dish, which all belong to the first.

G. L. Brett

Postscript.

The excavation and publication of the Sutton Hoo barrow have taken place since this article was in proof. The process I have tried to trace here is another example of the change in the technique of Late Roman silver pointed out by Dr. Kitzinger (Antiquity, 1940, 43–4) in connexion with the 'Anastasius' dish from Sutton Hoo, a change which was in both cases (ibid., 46–7) the result of the contact of Germanic and Roman elements mentioned above. The set of small silver bowls from Sutton Hoo is specially interesting, as their main decorative motive is the quatrefoil, one of the most common motives of group one supra. Dr. Kitzinger implies (ibid., 53) that the quatrefoils on the two bowls with six-pointed stars belong to a series in which the earlier examples were embossed. As against this I would suggest that the technique of the other bowls points to the theory that the whole set is in the line of development of the Romano-Germanic examples of the pattern and their Kerbschnitt prototypes—that here, in fact, we see a new stage in the interplay of barbarian and Roman elements; the type of ornament developed by the contact of German and Roman is seen at Sutton Hoo and at Nagy-Szent-Miklos in the hands of other tribes who cannot have been German, and developed the original quatrefoil into something at first sight quite different.

34 Filow, op. cit., 72, n. 1 'approximately 6th century.'
35 See de Vogüé, La Syrie Centrale, 1865, esp. pls. 42, 45, 65, 76. Cabrol, Dictionnaire, art. 'Chiusa.'
36 On the back of which are stamps dated by Matzulewicz to the second half of the sixth century.
37 See also British Museum Quarterly, xiii, 118–26.
GILDAS: SOME TEXTUAL NOTES AND CORRECTIONS

1. De Paenitentia.

The Preface to the Penitential of Gildas has hitherto been found in only one MS., preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris (= Lat. 3182). This MS. is a large parchment codex of the tenth–eleventh centuries, containing a collection of canons, decretals, penitential fragments, etc. taken from many sources, e.g. the Collectio Canonum Hibernensis, the Lex Salica, etc. After an extract on pp. 279–80 headed 'Item synodus sapientia sic de decimis disputant', the Gildasian preface follows on p. 280 with 'Incipt prefacio Gildae de poenitentia', concluding on p. 281 with 'huc usque Gildas incipit nunc sinodus aquilonalis Britannae'. Most editions of this penitential are reprints of F. Wasserschleben's text. Based on a collation by Dr. Knust, it is defective from the standpoint of readings and palaeographical information.

The following collation has utilised, apparently for the first time, a newly-discovered MS. of the penitential, now in the Bibliothèque Municipale at Cambrai (= No. 625, ff. 52–53). If the catalogue date, viz. saec. ix, is correct, then this MS. is earlier than Paris Lat. 3182.
The Text.

*Incipit Praesatio Gildae de Poenitentia.*

(i) Presbiter aut diaconus faciens fornicationem naturalem sive sodomitam prelatò ante monachì voto III annis poenitent; veniam omni hora roget, superpositionem faciet in unaquaque ebdomada exceptis L diebus post passionem; pane sine mensura et ferculo aliquatenus butiro inpinguato die dominico, ceteris vero diebus paxmati panis mensura et miso parvum inpinguato, hortì holeribus, ovis paucis, britannico formello utatur, himina romana lactis pro fragilitate corporis istius aevi, tenuclae vero vel balchutae lactis sextario romano sitis gratia et aquae talimpulo, si operarius est. Lectum non multò feno instructum habet; per III XL mas superaddatat aliiquid, prout virtus eius admitterit. Semper ex intimo corde defleat culpam suam, oboedientiam pre omnibus libentissime exciptiat, post annum et dimidium eucharistiam sumat et ad pacem veniat, psalmos cum fratribus canat, ne poenitus anima tanto tempore caelestis medicinae intereat.

(ii) Si quis inferiore gradu positus monachus, III annis poenitent, sed mensura gravetur panis. Si operarius, sextarium de lacte romanum et alium de tenucla et aquam quantum sufficiat pro sitis ardore sumat.

(iii) Si vero sine monachi voto presbiter aut diaconus peccaverit, sicut monachus sine gradu sic poenitent.

(iv) Si autem peccatum voluerit monachus facere, anno et dimedio; habet tamen abas huius rei moderandae facultatem, si oboedientia eius placita fuerit Deo et abati suo.

(v) Antiqui patres XII presbitero et VII diacono poenitentiae statuere.

(vi) Monachus furatus vestem vel aliquam rem II annis ut supra poenitent, si junior est; si senior, anno integro. Si vero monachus non fuerit, aequo anno et maximo III LXsimus.

(vii) Si monachus exundante ventre evomerit sacrificium in die, cenam suam non presumat, et si non infirmitatis causa VII superpositionibus,
si infirmitatis et non voracitatis causa III superpositionibus deleat culpam.

(viii) Si autem non sacrificium, diei superpositione et multa inculpatione plectatur.

(ix) Si casu negligens quis sacrificium aliquod perdat, per III XXLmas peniteat, relinquens illud feris et altibus devorandum.

(x) Si quis autem ebrietatis causa psallere non potest stupens elinguis, cena privatur.

(xi) Peccans cum pecode, anno; si ipse solus, III XXLmas diluat culpam.

(xii) Qui communicaverit a suo abate excommunicato, XL.

(xiii) Manducans morticinam inscius, XL.

(xiv) Sciendum est tamen quod quanto quis tempore moratur in peccatis, tanto et augenda poenitentia est.

(xv) Si cui inponitur opus aliquod et contemptus gratia illud non fecerit, cena careat; si vero oblivione, demedium cotidiani victus.

(xvi) Si autem sumat alterius opus, illud notum faciat abati cum verecundia, excepto eo nullo audiente et sic peragat, si iubesur.

(xvii) Nam qui iram corde multo tempore retinet, in morte est; si autem confrictur peccatum, XL ieiunet, et si ultra in peccato persistat, II XXL, et si idem fecerit, absidatur a corpore sicut membris putredum, quia furor homicidium nutrit.

(xviii) Offensus quis ab aliquo debet hoc indicare abati, non tamen accusantis, sed medentes afectu, et abbas decernat.

(xix) Qui non occurrit ad consummationem, canat VIII in ordine psalmos; si excitatus veniat post misam, quicquid cantaverunt replicet ex ordine fratres. Si vero ad secundam venerit, cena careat.

(xx) Si quis errans commotaverit aliquid de verbis sacris ubi pericum adnotatur, triduam aut III superpositiones faciat.

(XXI) Si sacrum terra tenus negligendo ceciderit, cena careat.

(XXII) Si voluntate obsceno liquore maculatus fuerit dormiendo, si cervisa et carae habundat cenubium, III noctis horis stanno vigilet, si sae virtutis est. Si vero pauperem victum habet, XXVIII aut XXX psalmos canet stando suplex, aut opere extraordinario pendat.

(XXIII) Pro bonis regibus sacra debemus offerre, pro malis nequaquam.
(xxiv) Presbiteri vero pro suis episcopis non prohibentur offerre.
(xxv) Qui arguitur pro aliquo delicto et quasi inconsultans refrenatur, cena careat.
(xxvi) Qui sarculum perfrangit et ante fracturam non habuit, aut illud extraordinario opere restituat aut superponat.
(xxvii) Qui viderit aliquem ex fratribus abatis transgredi precepta, debet abatem non celare, sed ante admonet peccantem, ut solus quod male agit confiteatur abati, non tam dilator quam veritatis regulae executor inveniatur.

Huc usque Gildas.

**CONTRACTIONS.**

The more important are:

aliquid = aliqūd P; aliquid = aliqūd P; alīq C; autem = autē; deo = dō C; est = ē. P, ē C; episcopis = epīs; frattes = frs; mensura = msura C; nequaquam = nequaq P; non = nī; omnibus = omīb; P, omīb; C; opus = opī C; per- = p-; pre-(prae-) = p; presbiter = prbr C, prbi(gen.) P; priuatur = pruatūr C; pro = p C; quando = qndō P, qndi C (both = quanto); quasi = qsi P; quia = q C; quod = qūd; secundam = scdam P; sicut = sic C; super = sup; tamen = tam P, tam (once = tīn) C; ter = tī C; -tur = tū; uel = ü C; uero = ū C.

**ORTHOGRAPHY.**

P accussantis Pb, caelestis, cēna, cēnubium, cummunicauerit, dilator, dimedium (and -io) and demedium (once), eui, inpingato (once), misam ('mass'), monacus (twice, once = manacus, Pā), negligens, oboedientia, poeniteat (pen-Pb, once), poenitus, possessus, praebiter (once), putredum, summam and sumam (once), superpositionibus, suplex.

C affectu, cēteris, deluat, dilator, dimedium and demedium (once), eui, imperio, misso, negligens, obedientia, oleribus Cā, penitentia (mostly) and poen-, prespyter (once), putredum, Sodomittam, summam, suplex. e, with or without the cedilla (= ae, etc.), occurs in both.

**GENERAL NOTE.**

The script of C is a fine Carolingian minuscule, with the uncial forms of n and disappearing here and there. The open form of a also occurs a few times,

L. 1 suisom. M. L. 5 fratibus C. L. 7 quod)pro(d = t for Q) C. L. 8 dilator) CP, delator EDD.
once like a double e. For *miso* in section (i) McNeill, following M, reads *misera* (= 'a dish enriched with a little fat': cf. Du Cange, *missus* and *misculus*. Williams = 'broth'). Perhaps the MSS. represent an original corruption like 'misera oculos paruum' (vid. app. crit.). McNeill, following Wasserschleben, reads *e linguis* for *elinguis* in sect. (x), translating 'being benumbed in his organs of speech' (vid. op. cit., p. 176 n. 22. Williams = 'without speech'); but cf. Thes. Ling. Latinae Vol. V *elinguis*.

2. *De Excidio Britanniae*: Mommsen's H.  

Mommsen (Mon. Ger. Hist., Auct. Ant. Tom. xiii, Chr. Min. iii, 1894–8, pp. 20–1) describes the work indicated by the letter H as follows: 'Heidelbergensis bibliothecae publicae exempli editionis Josselinianae quas manus aequalis adscripsit, maxime in parte priore nec multis locis, varias lectiones, eorum partem certe profisci ex libro scripto dubitari non potest: adsunt orthographica ... et aperte corrupta ... ipse codex is, quem adnotator adhibuit, videtur perisse; sed adnotata tam prope accedunt ad codicum D, ut coniceret possis eum non ipsum descriptum esse ex Cottoniano, sed archetypum eius et ex eo archetypo pendere adnotatorem Heidelbergensem. ...' Seven readings from his apparatus criticus are then given to illustrate his point.

This copy of Josseline's edition of 1568 is now in the University Library at Heidelberg (B. 7751. 4). It contains upwards of sixty-five marginal readings and alterations in the text, chiefly in the first twenty pages (i.e., Ch. 1–24). Some of these are obvious corrections and need postulate no manuscript authority, being found in other volumes of the same edition (e.g., p. 138, Ch. 14 gemitur). An analysis of the rest reveals that H agrees some seven times with P (e.g., Ch. 1 mihimet aio tibine miser) HP, (m. aione miser) tibi Q; Ch. 17 patrum) ACDXQ, matrum HP.); seven times with X (e.g., Ch. 1 alii enim acque c. A, alii enim c. P; Ch. 3 molitionibus) HX, munitionibus APQ.); perhaps once with C alone (Ch. 43 effatur) C(?)H, affatur DQ); four times with A (Ch. 1 omittenda), PQ, omittit AH; Ch. 1 inolitorum) AH, inolitorum PQ; Ch. 3 serratarum) QX, serat. AH, om. P; Ch. 43 incurvabit (-avit D)) DQ, incurvabitur AH (a biblical quot.)); and twenty times with D or its marginal readings, generally introduced by 'alii ...'. Three of the nineteen variants unaccounted for are merely orthographical, two are the result of alterations influenced by DP, and one is an addition from the Vulgate. The remainder are:—

* The other sigla used by Mommsen and in the above note are: A (Ayrshire, Public Library, No. 162, twelfth century); C (British Museum, Cotton Vitellius A VI; eleventh century); D (Cambridge, Univ. Lib., Dd. L 17, fourteenth century); X (Cambridge, 4th.

Ff. 1. 27, 1, thirteenth century); P (Editio Princcps of Polydore Vergil, London, 1538); Q (Edition of Ioannes Iosselinus, London, 1568). I have used my own collation of these.
1. Ch. 1. sexcentorum milium) Q, sexcent. trium milium A, 303 millium H, omnem ad unum P.
2. ib. intensa) PQ, inconcussa A, incusa (? mensa) H.
3. ib. ob peccata) PQ, super peccatis A, peccatis H.
4. ib. eosdem) PQ, cedem H.
5. ib. contra hunc) PQ, c. hos H.
6. ib. interrupte) APQ, indirupte H.
7. ib. serves . . . taceas) PQ, An serus tacens d.r.c.A, seruans H.
8. Ch. 5. primam Parth. pacem Ind. confinium) primâ P, Ind. c. pace (sic) H, prima p. pace ind. con. DQ, prima partorum pace indorumque conf. X, prima P.I. conf. parta pace P.
9. Ch. 11. diu) AXPQ, d iii (? domini) H.
10. Ch. 19. tithicam) X, aticam D¹, ticam (marg.) D², sciticam H, styticam PQ.
11. Ch. 19. inhabilis ad fugam) X Geoff., om. D¹, inhab. ad pugnam (marg.) D² Q, inhab. ac. P, inhab. ad pugnandum H.
12. Ch. 21. rapacibus) H, capacibus ADXPQ.
13. Ch. 42 ab omni natione) CDQ, abominationi H.

Now, none of these variants is such as to warrant the existence of independent MS. authority. Seven of the thirteen occur in Ch. 1, the greater part of which depends only on Q: nos. 5, 6, 7 represent the writer's drastic attempt to simplify the passage; 'scythicam' is found elsewhere (cf. Monumenta S. Patrum Orthodoxographa, vol. 2 (J. J. Grynaeus, 1569), p. 835); no. 8 is manifestly a remoulding based on P—in a word, this group of variants merely represents the critical judgment of an early emender supplemented by a knowledge of early editions. The same may also be said of the trivial similarities with A and C: 'affor' is not found elsewhere in the De Excidio, 'effor' occurs twice again (Ch. 41, 54); and the variants of both A and H from CQ are in the direction of a simpler, more intelligible, and, in the Biblical quotations, more orthodox text.

With the group PXD it is quite different. It is quite clear that the writer drew frequently upon Polydore Vergil's edition (the fly-leaf, = p. 1000–v, actually quotes him) and the text of X, the latter quite possibly through Gale's edition. These are his main sources for Ch. 1–3. For Ch. 4–24 H resembles D in such important details that we must postulate MS. authority for the

¹ For a parallel cf. Grynaeus ib. p. 832; T. Gale, Historiae Britannicae . . . Scriptores xv (Oxford 1691), p. 11 (Ch. 32, exitialibus for specialibus). The eclectic character of the variants is illustrated by the absence of any reference to Ch. 6 ut alienant) AEP, ut agabant, DQ, ut alint X.
² Cf. note 7. Palaeographically H cannot be restricted to the sixteenth century (cf. Mommsen, 'manus aequalis' above).
readings. According to Mommsen’s conjecture, the latter were taken from a (lost) derivative of C. There is, however, a much simpler explanation. It is evident from the critical apparatus that where D¹ and D² differ H often agrees with D², but never gives a third variant (for instances such as Momms. ib. P. 36, L. 16, Ch. 21 hyberni) CPQ Bede, hit A, hyberni** D, hybernis H, ad hibernas X are not true variants). Hence all the readings common to H and D, which form the majority, could be the direct result of a collation of Ch. 4–24 with Camb. Dd. I. 17 (D).

So far, then, the analysis has shown that all the variants can be rationally explained with reference to existing MSS. The question now is, how could the ‘adnotator Heidelbergerensis’ have known D so intimately and perhaps X directly? The explanation is simple. This copy of Josseline was annotated in England, most probably at Cambridge itself. During the last century it came into the possession of a London bookseller, Nicolaus Trübner, who was born at Heidelberg in 1817 and died in London in 1884. By his will he left a large number of books to Heidelberg University, our volume apparently among them—a fact commemorated by a plate on the inside and obviously overlooked by Mommsen or his correspondent.

It is clear, therefore, that the readings of H need not represent independent manuscript authority. Conjectures apart, they may be eliminated without loss from the apparatus criticus of the De Excidio. And, of course, all reasonable hopes dwindle of tracking a phantom manuscript of Gildas among the Codices Palatini of the Vatican Library.

W. H. Davies.
A NOTE ON MILTON'S ANNOTATED COPY OF GILDAS IN
HARVARD UNIVERSITY (WIDENER) LIBRARY

On pages 75–80 of the Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature, Vol. XX (1938), is an article (with facsimiles) by Mr. J. Milton French entitled 'Milton's Annotated Copy of Gildas'. It deals with a copy, in the Widener Library (shelf number Br. 98,319 F), of H. Commelinus' Rerum Britannicarum ... Scriptores Vetusiores ac Præcipui, Heidelberg (1587), given to the library about 1765 by Thomas Hollis. This book contains on pages 113–146 the 'De Excidio et Conquestu Britanniae Epistola' of Gildas. A former owner has inserted thirteen brief marginal notes on pages 114–123, i.e. explanatory comments on various matters in Ch. 1–33 of the 'De Excidio' (numbered according to Mommsen's edition; Mon. Germ. Hist., Auct. Ant., XIII, Chron. Min. iii, Berlin 1894–8). The remainder of the book, containing Geoffrey's 'Historiae Regum Britanniae' (pp. 1–92), the 'Historia Britannica' in six books of Ponticus Virunnius (pp. 93–112), Bede's 'Ecclesiastical History' (pp. 147–280), a 'De Gestis Anglorum Libri Tres' (pp. 281–348), William of Newburgh's 'Rerum Anglicarum Libri Quinque' (pp. 353–496) and Froissart's 'Historiarum Epitome' (pp. 497–568), has no marginalia.

To anyone familiar with the early editions of Gildas it is at once obvious that all the 'Miltonic' marginalia are mere transcriptions of the printed marginalia in Josseline's edition of the 'De Excidio Britanniae' (London 1568)—an edition which, owing to its readings from a MS. represented now by the fragmentary Brit. Museum Vit. A. VI, is of primary importance for establishing the text. This will be amply shown by a few comparisons—there is no need to give all the thirteen—between the 'Miltonic' marginalia and those found in the volumes of Josseline's edition in the British Museum (C. 76. a. 12) and Cambridge University Library (Syn. 8. 56. 73). The numbers are those of Mr. French.¹

'Miltonic' Marginalia.

1 P. 114. l. 21: i. frustra.
i. perspicie.

2 P. 116. l. 2: Bunduica siue Voadicia 80000.

Josseline's Marginalia.

P. 42: dixisse pedi. i. frustra dixisse: manus fateri
proverbialis oratio, ut manu docere, i. aperte et
perspicie docere.

P. 8b: Hae viriles femina Bun(d)uica siue Voadicia
nomine apud Dionem Cassium 60000 Romanorum
70000 apud Tacitum regnante Nerone
dicitur interemisse.

¹ For Nos. 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12 vide Josseline, pp. 12b, 16b, 16b, 20b, 21a, 25a respectively.
The article by Mr. French opens by assuming, without any reservation, that 'one further book from Milton's library has very recently been discovered', and then proceeds to describe 'its precious cargo of notes' and 'Miltonic comments' (ibid., pp. 75, 78). Later it is asserted that the notes 'in several ways . . . show the influence of the English translation of Gildas which appeared in that year' (i.e., 1638: ibid., p. 79) and illustrates 'Milton's habitual citing of the truth of the printed statement . . . his keen relish for minute shades of meaning and for the flavors of unusual words' (ibid., p. 80). It concludes with the sentence (ibid., p. 80): 'In a very minor fashion, these marginalia in the Gildas volume are chips from the same workshop that fashioned the satirical invectives against Salmassius and the heavenly discourses of Raphael.' In the light of the analysis of the marginalia already given, no detailed comment is necessary on these deductions.

Two points, however, remain to be examined. 'The handwriting', says Mr. French on page 76, 'is most convincing . . . I see no reason to doubt that the writer of the annotations in the Pindar, the Euripides, the Lycephon, and the Bible in the British Museum, to say nothing of the Cambridge Manuscript and the Commonplace Book, was one with the writer of these marginalia.' Here opinions must greatly differ. The script of most of the works mentioned which is accessible for comparison in facsimiles shows a preponderance of cursive forms very unlike the rather set minuscules of the notes under consideration. A close comparison of the letters reveals
as many differences as similarities. Nor are our 'Miltonic' marginalia of a clear-cut distinctive type, for manuscripts utilised from the sixteenth century onwards often have marginal notes in this style of hand. It would be interesting to know, too, how often Milton used the four diamond-shaped dots as a reference mark in the text to his marginalia, for I have noted only a rough cross in the facsimiles and the Pindar.

The second point is, as Mr. French points out, that a quotation in the Commonplace Book (f. 195) is given from page 119 of Gildas—a reference applicable only to Commelinus' volume. This would indicate that Milton used a copy of Commelinus. But supposing he owned such a copy—and the contents of his Commonplace Book and History of Britain indicate his familiarity with the histories contained in this work—is it likely that he would have chosen certain parts of Gildas only for marginalia? And could not many other historians, earlier and later, have used such a handy compendium? Again, the copyist of marginal note 5 did not even check 'stemmata' with Geoffrey's text in the same volume (p. 39, Bk. VI, Ch. 2, where 'stigmata' is quite plain). Milton's own dating of the Battle of Badon is A.D. 527 (Hist. Brit., Bk. 3; cf. marg. note 2 above). His translation of '(de) curucis' (vide marg. note 6) as 'gorroghs' is not so curious as Mr. French would suppose, for 'carroghs' occurs in a similar passage in Holland's Camden of 1610—which Milton had read; and 'currok', in the sense of the Irish 'curach', meaning a 'little ship', is found about A.D. 1450. The presumed influence on Milton of the English translation of 1638 is largely discredited by the analysis given earlier; nor must it be forgotten that Milton utilised the historical works of Camden, Buchanan, etc., and that his command of Latin was combined with a remarkable flair for translating it into terse, vigorous English.

All these considerations, together with the absence of Milton's signature—'the page (which presumably it formerly had) containing his signature' being lost (Mr. French, p. 78)—make any definite, not to say probable, ascription to Milton a matter of keen dispute. Convincing proof is as yet lacking. What is certain is that the notes in themselves, as a contribution of 'Milton', are worthless. And we are far from sharing Mr. French's conviction that 'one further book from Milton's library has very recently been discovered'.

W. H. Davies.

---

* The distinctive Anglo-Saxon script of 'nest' in marginal note 10 is also found in Josseline's marginalia.
* Vide Oxford English Dictionary under 'curach'. Cf. Welsh 'corog' = coracle. Probably 'carroghes' is a misprint for 'carroghes' (ibid.). On the question of Milton's sources for the History of Britain, vide H. Glicksman in the University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, No. 11, 1930, pp. 105-114 (and the references there given). It is noted that Milton made great use of Gildas, but no full details are given. Milton's extensive use of original authorities is also indicated.

* Vide preceding note.
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