Hasta—Summa Imperii

The Spear as Embodiment of Sovereignty in Rome

ANDREW ALFÖLDI

Hasta summa armorum et imperii est: this definition\(^1\) may come from Verrius Flaccus. It means that the most important weapon in early Rome became the expression of the ruling power. What were the manifestations and consequences of this overwhelming political importance of the spear-ensign? Modern scholarship has not concerned itself very much with the answer to this question. The entry “hasta” is entirely lacking in the register of Mommsen’s superb “Staatsrecht” and our great lexical surveys contain relevant data only on the spear of the state auction and on that of the praetor hastarius.\(^2\)

On the other hand, the whole significance of the problem was long ago revealed by Wolfgang Helbig,\(^3\) who was ahead of his time in comparing the archaeological evidence concerning the archaic Roman State with the literary sources. He wrote\(^4\) in 1908:

> Wie bei den Franken und Longobarden, war bei den prisci Latini der Speer ein Abzeichen der königlichen Gewalt. Die hasta symbolisierte in Rom zu allen Zeiten . . . in gewissen Fällen das imperium und stets das iustum dominium, welches letztere im Zivilrechte einen ähnlichen Begriff darstellte, wie das imperium im Staatsrechte. Da der Begriff des imperium bereits in dem rex verkörpert war, und es undenkbar ist, dass die Römer bei dem konservativen Prinzip, welches sie auf dem Gebiete des Staatsrechtes beobachteten, nach dem Sturze des Königums für jenen Begriff ein neues Symbol eingeführt hätten, dürfen wir mit Sicherheit annehmen, dass die hasta von altersher zu den Attributen der latinischen Könige gehörte.\(^5\)

Unfortunately, Helbig was not able to find any document for this discovery from the age of the Republic. And as he was also convinced that such documents could not have existed, he erroneously supposed—and everyone followed his lead—that the spear as attribute of sovereign power was replaced by a rather short staff, like a marshal’s baton or a scepter;\(^6\) he thought that only Augustus restored this baton to the original length of a spear and renewed its old function.\(^7\) The interpretation of the hasta donatica, i.e., the military award for bravery,\(^8\) by Varro, De gente populi Romani, as pura, id est sine ferro seemed to reinforce his assumption. But the irresponsible passion of Varro, the great connoisseur of the remnants of ancient Roman past, for etymological explanations can easily be disposed of in this case. The denarii of M. Arrius Secundus struck in 43 B.C.\(^9\) with the hasta pura, the corona aurea, and the phalerae show indeed a rod-like spear, yet it has been disfigured through an incorrect drawing in the survey of E. Babelon (taken from him also in the Dictionnaire des Antiquités de Daremberg-Saglio) into a commander’s baton. And the aurei of the same mint-supervisor, more carefully executed than the silver, show clearly the triangular point on the top, impossible on a wooden shaft without a metallic spearhead (pl. 1, 4); still more strongly accentuated are the spearheads of the hastae purae on the tombstone of a Roman officer from Amastris.\(^10\)

The existence of such a spearhead of considerable size on the hasta donatica is the easier to understand if we realize that this honorary weapon was never of wood, but always forged of metal.\(^11\) Our main fault of W. Helbig. The drawing by E. Babelon, Déscription historique et chronologique des monnaies de la République romaine 1 (Paris 1885) 220 n. 1 had already misled E. de Cuq, who describes (DarSag III 111 fig. 3733) the hasta pura represented there as “plus semblable à un sceptre qu’à une arme.”

\(^{10}\) CIL. III 13648. P. Steiner, BonnJb. 114/115 (1906) 35, fig. 23. DarSag III 41 fig. 3733.

\(^{11}\) The evidence available was discussed also by W. Helbig, op.cit. (supra n. 3) 39.
authority for this is Polybios\textsuperscript{12} who, in his account of the Roman awards for valor, does not render the name \textit{hasta donatica} with the usual Greek equivalents of the Roman spear, but with \textit{γαῖος}, which was the special weapon of the Celts of the Rhone valley;\textsuperscript{13} in the time of the Empire, the \textit{gaesum} still belonged to the national equipment of the \textit{Raeti gaesati}. Polybios who had keen eyes for technical details of warfare was well aware of this; he tried (though unsuccessfully) to catch the exact meaning of this Celtic term.\textsuperscript{14} Even if he uses this name for the Roman \textit{pilum},\textsuperscript{15} the reason for it is that iron was the material of both javelins: \textit{γαῖος ἔμβολον ὄλοροὶν} writes Hesychios. Furthermore, the coin-type of M. Arrius Secundus as well as the representation of the spearheads on the tombstone mentioned above reveal through the proportional difference of size between the \textit{hasta(e)}, the \textit{corona} and \textit{phalerae}, that no reduction in length existed for the former. The later development of the \textit{hasta pura} reinforces these results. The attributes and distinctions of the Republic show a hierarchic differentiation: the \textit{phalerae} on the trappings of the general are of gold, those of the nobility of silver; the finger-rings given for bravery are of gold for the aristocracy and of iron for the simple citizen.\textsuperscript{16}

In a similar way, the silver spears offered to the grandsons of Augustus\textsuperscript{17} as \textit{principes inventus} imply that the gold would be appropriate only for the \textit{princeps} himself. It may be that the spear-award distributed to officers from the \textit{primi pilii} upwards\textsuperscript{18} was wrought of iron, and that the \textit{hasta pura argentea} attested in the age of Severus\textsuperscript{19} used this precious metal only so late: but, in any case, it was always of metal. The royal staff of the Alban kings is also called a \textit{hasta pura} by Vergil,\textsuperscript{20} who seems to hint at a golden spear; whether \textit{pura} stands for ritual purity as e.g. \textit{herba pura},\textsuperscript{21} or for “of pure metal,” since the \textit{gaesum} was \textit{ὄλοροȋν}, we do not need to discuss. In any case, it is no baton, but long and strong: \textit{ille uides, pura iuvenis qui nititur hasta, Silvius, Albanum nomen} . . .

The supposition of Helbig that the spear-ensign was transformed under the Republic to a marshal’s baton, has no foundation whatsoever, as we see now. The gap in the archaeological evidence which prevented this great scholar from pursuing the fate of that \textit{signum praeципium} of the sovereign power through the course of the Roman history can now be bridged by hitherto neglected or misinterpreted Republican coin-types and by extremely small but no less conclusive representations used on the \textit{denarii} as mint-marks. The exploitation of this invaluable material for this and other related problems has been made possible for me by the generous help of the American Philosophical Society.\textsuperscript{22}

This new source material links up with the spear-attribute on some imperial monuments of art; and a large group of ornamental spearheads found in the provinces, the “Beneficiarlanzen” of the late Emil Ritterling, are revealed as ramifications of the same token of sovereignty—so also the spear as the basic part of most of the military standards is not independent of this concept. From these later aspects of the development we shall return to its beginning. First we shall find the idea of sovereignty of the spear in Rome illuminated by the corresponding implement of sovereignty—in early Greece, the royal scepter. Finally we shall try to grasp the magico-religious awe surrounding that most dreadful tool of killing in early Rome, which was never entirely replaced by the juridical interpretation of unconditional obedience in the face of the sovereign spear.

\textsuperscript{12}Polyb. 6.30.3.

\textsuperscript{13}The whole source material for the \textit{gaesum} is easily accessible in the \textit{Thei. I. Lat.} VI 2, 1667, v. 37 sqq.

\textsuperscript{14}Polyb. 2.22.1; 2.23.1; 2.8.3-8; 2.30.5; 2.34.2.

\textsuperscript{15}Polyb. 18.18.4.

\textsuperscript{16}Cf. A. Al földi, \textit{Der frührömische Reiteradel} (Baden-Baden 1952) 17 sqq.; 26 sqq.; 73 sqq.


\textsuperscript{18}F. Steiner, \textit{op.cit.} (supra n. 10) 81 sqq.

\textsuperscript{19}ILS 9194.

\textsuperscript{20}Aen. 6.756 sq.

\textsuperscript{21}Cf. M. Cary-A. D. Nock, \textit{CQ} 21 (1927) 132 sqq. etc.

\textsuperscript{22}My thanks are due to those colleagues and friends who willingly helped me by discussing details, gave me expert advice or called my attention to new material. Among these are: Prof. Luisa Banti and G. Caputo in Florence, Miss Rosanna Finelli and Prof. G. A. Mantuelli in Bologna, Mrs. Bruna Forlati and Prof. Michelangelo Muraro in Venice, Dr. Franco Panvini-Rosati, Mr. E. Nash and Miss H. Speier in Rome, Prof. Gianguido Belloni and Dir. E. Leuthold in Milan, Dr. H. Cahn in Basle, Prof. D. Schwartz in Zurich, Mr. N. Duerr in Geneva, Dr. M. Stettler in Berne, Dr. R. Fallmann in Brugg, Mr. J. Lafaurie in Paris, Dr. H.-J. Hundt, Dr. J. Menzel in Mainz, Prof. W. Schleiermacher in Frankfurt am Main, Dr. H. von Petrikovits in Bonn, Miss Margaret Thompson and Mr. Sawyer McA. Mosser in New York, Mrs. Vl. Clain-Stefanelli in Washington, D.C., Prof. H. Cherniss, Dr. S. Foltiny, Dr. Lucy T. Shoe, Prof. E. Kantorowicz and H. A. Thompson in Princeton. The librarian of the Institute for Advanced Study, Dr. J. E. Sachs, never failed to spot the rare books needed. For many photographs and for all his help on my journeys, I am indebted to my son, Dr. A. Al földi, Jr., and, for the careful preparation of my manuscript for printing, to Mrs. E. Baldwin Smith.
Hasta and imperium.

For many later centuries the sword was the vehicle of conquest, but for Greeks and Romans the spear preceded the sword. When epic poetry flourished, the expressions of this as δορυκτητός⁴⁴ were long ago established; and long after Homer, the objects of subjugation were called δορυκτήτους, δορυλάστουs and the like. This meant the terrible, but the only possible consequence of victory in war, as the poet of the Iliad depicts it:

καὶ τότε δὴ Μελέαγρον ἐυζώνος παράκοιτος λίσσετ' ὀδυρομένη, καὶ οἱ κατέλεξεν ἀπαίτα κήδε', ὥσ τοισπομισὶ πέλει τῶν ἄστυ ἀλώπη.

This solemn symbol of power does not belong, of course, to the subaltern officials who carried or stuck it in the earth, but to the highest authority in the state. One example will be sufficient to show this: Et si ab hasta—Cicero reproached Antony—valeat hasta, . . . modo Caesaris, non tua . . . Varro-nis quidem Caesinatem fundum quis venisse dicit, quis hastam illius venditionis vidit, quis vocem praeconis audivit? . . . iam intelleges aliam causam esse hastae Caesaris, aliam confiden tiae et temeritatis tuae.

This interrelation between imperium and spear-ensign is very old. That this ensign belonged to the kings must be postulated from the place where the sacred spears of Mars were guarded; it was not in the temple of Mars, but in the regia, the house of the king, stripped of his power, but not of all his religious duties. Vergil, who knew thoroughly the traditions of earliest Rome, certainly did not invent the idea that the kings of Alba Longa did not carry a scepter, but a hasta pura, as visible sign of their dignity. This is corroborated by the statement of Trogus Pompeius on the beginnings of the Roman history: per ea tempora adhuc reges hastas pro diademate habebant. As the Romans themselves declared that all paraphernalia of their own kingship were of Etruscan origin, it must be pointed out that the kings of the Etruscan populi also possessed this attribute. S. Mazzarino has discovered that an archaic tomb-relief from Chiusi and a terracotta relief from a sanctuary in Velletri represent a pictorial illustration of this.

No different is the brutal havoc wrought by the spear for the poets of Attic tragedy. Aischylus writes:

οίκτρον γὰρ πόλιν ἐδίογγίαν ἀλήδα προϊάφαί δορὸς ἀγναν δουλῶν υαφαρα ἀποδώ νπ' ανδρός Ἀχίλλου θέδεν περιθομέναν ἀτίμων,

and Euripides:⁴⁸

ἐπεὶ Φρυγών πόλιν κίνδυνος ἔσγχε δορὶ πετείν Ἐλληνικῷ.}

δούλη, πόλεως ἀπελαυνομένη τής Ἡλιάδος, λόγχης αἵμη δορὶ θήρατος πρὸς Ἀχιλλῶν . . . , and other examples are readily at hand. Also in Rome the spear is the instrument of irrevocable appropriation. Prisoners of war were sold standing under a spear: et captivi sub eadem (sc. hasta) veneunt, writes Festus⁴⁰ and a coin-type of 50 B.C. (pl. 2, 9) gives a pictorial illustration of this.⁴¹ The solemn forms of legal procedure, which developed from a contest of arms, employed the concept of imperio subiacere also on the legal transfer of possessions: and this happened also sub hasta, as we shall see. On the same ground, the spear became the insign of the auction executed on behalf of the State: hastae subiecit ea, quae publice venundabant, quia signum praecipuum est hasta. In general, the spear was regarded as a signum quoddam iusti domini.

This solemn symbol of power does not belong, of course, to the subaltern officers who carried or stuck it in the earth, but to the highest authority in the state. One example will be sufficient to show this: Et si ab hasta—Cicero reproached Antony—valeat hasta, . . . modo Caesaris, non tua . . . Varro-nis quidem Caesinatem fundum quis venisse dicit, quis hastam illius venditionis vidit, quis vocem praeconis audivit? . . . iam intelleges aliam causam esse hastae Caesaris, aliam confidentiae et temeritatis tuae.

This interrelation between imperium and spear-ensign is very old. That this ensign belonged to the kings must be postulated from the place where the sacred spears of Mars were guarded; it was not in the temple of Mars, but in the regia, the house of the king, stripped of his power, but not of all his religious duties. Vergil, who knew thoroughly the traditions of earliest Rome, certainly did not invent the idea that the kings of Alba Longa did not carry a scepter, but a hasta pura, as visible sign of their dignity. This is corroborated by the statement of Trogus Pompeius on the beginnings of the Roman history: per ea tempora adhuc reges hastas pro diademate habebant. As the Romans themselves declared that all paraphernalia of their own kingship were of Etruscan origin, it must be pointed out that the kings of the Etruscan populi also possessed this attribute. S. Mazzarino has discovered that an archaic tomb-relief from Chiusi and a terracotta relief from a sanctuary in Velletri represent a pictorial illustration of this.

No different is the brutal havoc wrought by the spear for the poets of Attic tragedy. Aischylus writes:

οίκτρον γὰρ πόλιν ἐδίογγίαν ἀλήδα προϊάφαί δορὸς ἀγναν δουλῶν υαφαρα ἀποδώ νπ' ανδρός Ἀχίλλου θέδεν περιθομέναν ἀτίμων,

and Euripides:

ἐπεὶ Φρυγών πόλιν κίνδυνος ἔσγχε δορὶ πετείν Ἐλληνικῷ.

δούλη, πόλεως ἀπελαυνομένη τής Ἡλιάδος, λόγχης αἵμή δορὶ θήρατος πρὸς Ἀχιλλῶν . . . , and other examples are readily at hand. Also in Rome the spear is the instrument of irrevocable appropriation. Prisoners of war were sold standing under a spear: et captivi sub eadem (sc. hasta) veneunt, writes Festus and a coin-type of 50 B.C. (pl. 2, 9) gives a pictorial illustration of this. The solemn forms of legal procedure, which developed from a contest of arms, employed the concept of imperio subiacere also on the legal transfer of possessions: and this happened also sub hasta, as we shall see. On the same ground, the spear became the insign of the auction executed on behalf of the State: hastae subiecit ea, quae publice venundabant, quia signum praecipuum est hasta. In general, the spear was regarded as a signum quoddam iusti domini.

This solemn symbol of power does not belong, of course, to the subaltern officers who carried or stuck it in the earth, but to the highest authority in the state. One example will be sufficient to show this: Et si ab hasta—Cicero reproached Antony—valeat hasta, . . . modo Caesaris, non tua . . . Varro-nis quidem Caesinatem fundum quis venisse dicit, quis hastam illius venditionis vidit, quis vocem praeconis audivit? . . . iam intelleges aliam causam esse hastae Caesaris, aliam confidentiae et temeritatis tuae.

This interrelation between imperium and spear-ensign is very old. That this ensign belonged to the kings must be postulated from the place where the sacred spears of Mars were guarded; it was not in the temple of Mars, but in the regia, the house of the king, stripped of his power, but not of all his religious duties. Vergil, who knew thoroughly the traditions of earliest Rome, certainly did not invent the idea that the kings of Alba Longa did not carry a scepter, but a hasta pura, as visible sign of their dignity. This is corroborated by the statement of Trogus Pompeius on the beginnings of the Roman history: per ea tempora adhuc reges hastas pro diademate habebant. As the Romans themselves declared that all paraphernalia of their own kingship were of Etruscan origin, it must be pointed out that the kings of the Etruscan populi also possessed this attribute. S. Mazzarino has discovered that an archaic tomb-relief from Chiusi and a terracotta relief from a sanctuary in Velletri represent a pictorial illustration of this. The solemn forms of legal procedure, which developed from a contest of arms, employed the concept of imperio subiacere also on the legal transfer of possessions: and this happened also sub hasta, as we shall see. On the same ground, the spear became the insign of the auction executed on behalf of the State: hastae subiecit ea, quae publice venundabant, quia signum praecipuum est hasta. In general, the spear was regarded as a signum quoddam iusti domini.
the consessus of the leading magistrates of their respective cities. In the case mentioned first (pl. 3, 1) the personality highest in rank—it is difficult to decide whether he is a Republican leader of state, as Mazzarino thinks, or the representative of a moderate concept of monarchy—is sitting between two augurs. In any case the attributes of these dignitaries did not change much even after the transition to a Republican form of government, and that of the most prominent of them is surely inherited from the monarchy; it is no scepter as Mazzarino thought, but a spear as Enrico Paribeni already correctly described it; our plate shows the spearhead clearly. As this group of magistrates sits on curule chairs in peacetime attire with their attributes of civilian rank and dignity, the spear is unmistakably a badge of sovereign power and has nothing to do with an actual weapon. The broken-up end of the staff of the corresponding personality on the relief of Velletri may also have been a spearhead. There is a third representation of Etruscan royalty with the spear in the hand of the sovereign, instead of a scepter. I am thinking of the famous wall painting of the tomba Golini (G. Q. Giglioli, L'Arte Etrusca [Milan 1935] pl. 245) where the queen of the nether world is solemnly enthroned with her long scepter fashioned on Greek models, whereas her husband, Hades-Eita, appears with the open throat of a wolf on his head and with the royal spear of the Etruscan ruler in his right hand. The Etruscan king or his Republican substitute from Chiusi with the spear (pl. 3, 1) dates from the second half of the sixth century B.C., i.e. from the epoch when Etruscan kings ruled in Rome.

During the Republic the gradual differentiation of the once global idea of imperium between the sphere of peace intra pomerium and that of war extra pomerium restricted the use of the spear as expression of the sovereign power to some special functions in the capital, but it remained the signum praecipuum of Roman might always and everywhere—outside the sacred boundary of the City. An important definition of it as expression of sovereign power is offered by a mint-mark of L. Papius from the years after the death of Sulla. This mint-supervisor, like another, L. Roscius Fabatus, reproduced the images of hundreds of objects as control marks on the denarii in a peculiar way: in order to facilitate the correct coupling of obverse- and reverse-dies, they earmarked them with the image of a pair of interrelated objects. This correlation helps us to a great extent to grasp not only the typological character of the things depicted, but also the religious, political, etc. sense of them. These representations have not yet been explored systematically. I think they have been considered negligible because they are very tiny. But bacilli are still smaller, nay immensely smaller, and nevertheless not negligible factors. Some examples of the military sphere will give an idea of the special character of these double marks. With a vexillum on the obverse goes, in one case, the attacking snake of Juno Sospita (pl. 4, 1-2), in another the wolf's throat and skin as head-gear of the standard-bearers (pl. 4, 3-4). With the eagle-standard on the obverse appears the altar of the signa militaria, venerated as divinities (pl. 4, 5-6); with the missile of a ballista, this machine itself; with a barbarian helmet with two horns is coupled a classical one (pl. 4, 8); similarly with a long Celtic sword a Celtic war trumpet (pl. 49). The square of the leather straps to be applied on the armor with the phalerae appears together with a phalera for the horse-trapping with its mounting (pl. 4,10). The pair, pl. 4,7, show a special spear-ensign discussed later (cf. pl. 5, 12,6-8) with a round medallion: as this spear is an attribute, not a weapon, so also must be the round medallion, which is, I think, one of the phalerae on the horse-trappings of high-ranking dignitaries. In another case (pl. 5,8), the same peculiar spear-symbol is accompanied by the outstretched right hand of the imperator, symbolizing the fides data, the guarantee of legal power. These examples illuminate the complementary meaning of the two obbietti di 'imperium.' StEtr ser. 2, 24 (1955-56) 19 sqq. with the previous literature. The representation of the old Sabine king Titus Tatius with the staff of the judge on the denarii of T. Vettius Sabinus (pl. 2, 8) is not founded on a realistic tradition, but resulted from a romantic glorification of the good old times; cf. also infra n. 44. 

40 That this relief has previously been interpreted as an assembly of deities was due first of all to the fact that in front of the seated row of personalities referred to above there are two much smaller standing figures, thought to be worshippers. But the latter do not bring offerings and make no gestures of adoration, and I am following the opinion of Miss Lucy Shoe that the disparity in scale between the standing and sitting men results from the isocephalism characteristic of early archaic art, the inability to represent the seated and standing figures in the same proportion. 

41 Cf. P. de Francisci, "Intorno all' origine etrusca del con...
jects, selected carefully for each of these double marks, of which we are concerned primarily with the securis and hasta as the two insignia of imperium (pl. 4,11-12). The heart-shaped spearhead is certainly not so big by chance: such an enlarged spear on an elongated shaft was certainly more apt to advertise the presence of the sovereign power than a marshal's baton.

The spearheads of the same type (pl. 2,1-4) used on the early silver coinage as the badge of some aristocratic clan or the pictogram of a cognomen could eventually represent the sovereign spear. But the earliest Roman example of this latter occurs on the reverse of the gold series struck in 209 b.c. representing king Latinus holding such an oversize spear-emblem in his right hand, and opposite him Aeneas with a normal spear-weapon far shorter (pl. 6,1-5); the evidence for the identification of both of these individuals will be discussed below.

No less instructive is the pictorial rendering of the spear of the sovereign power on the denarii of P. Porcius Laeca (pl. 5,4-5; pl. 9,3) from the end of the second century b.c., hitherto overlooked. They advertise the lex Porcia de provocatione which enabled Roman citizens residing in the provinces to appeal to the people, in criminal affairs, against the decisions of a governor. The Roman citizen who does this is standing on the left, as the inscription PROVOCO discloses. The magistrate who duly accepts his announcement holds his right hand over his head, facing him in the middle; his military attire signifies that the action represented happens extra pomerium. Behind this representative of the State stands a viator with the two rods (viraee) of his office in the left hand and with his right hand he raises vertically the spear-ensign of the imperium. We owe two more relevant details of information to this coin-type. First, the spear-ensign was not carried by the possessor of the sovereign power himself, but by his lower ranking subordinate; the idea of the "Vortragslanze" of early medieval German kings has consequently very old antecedents. Secondly, the restriction of the full military right of disposal to the juridical sphere outside of the sacred boundary of the city in the course of an earlier political evolution compels us to assume that the viator of the men in power carried the spear before them only outside Rome. Since the magistrate returning to the capital was obliged to take off his paludamentum and to put on the praetexta when he crossed the pomerium, he must also have ceased to be accompanied by the spear "at home."

Nevertheless, with the return to monarchy, this discrimination of the two spheres of domi and militiae was sometimes disregarded. Caesar apparently refrained from the use of the sovereign spear in the city and preferred to stress the religious symbols of his authority as pontifex maximus and dictator.

The spear-ensign of the imperium is possibly indicated by the staff—sometimes studded with globules—coupled with a legionary eagle, a vexillum and a plough on a denarius of Ti. Sempronius Gracchus, struck for Octavian in summer 43 b.c. and promising land in colonies to the veterans (pl. 5,10-11) who enabled the young pretender to capture the city without bloodshed. The globules, of course, make this staff resemble the scipio, but I do not find any reasonable identification of it other than the symbol of power of Octavian, the initiator or warrant of the deductiones hinted at by the standards and the plough.

An intaglio of the British Museum (pl. 5,1) offers an interesting problem. It shows the head of a youthful man behind which there is a very long
spearhead with a globular end, a rudder before his profile and a donkey above the head. The same curious spear-type appears as a mint-mark on the denarius of M. Volteius M.f. from 81 B.C. (pl. 5.2) and on that of L. Papius, struck not much later (pl. 5.7-8), so that we must wonder whether this peculiar spear could not have belonged to a definite magistrate cum imperio (e.g. to one of the praetors). Fortunately, we are in a position to establish the identity of the person who is represented on this sardonyx ringstone. The portrait has exactly the same style as the head of the praetor Livineius Regulus of 42 B.C. (cf. pl. 5.3), though the individual is decidedly different; the short oblique strokes of the hair, the modelling of the face and the cut-out of the neck are perhaps even from the same hand. The Spear as the badge of the imperium, the rudder as the symbol of luck or sign of aspiration to govern, bear witness that we have a leading personality before us. And the very Roman pictorial hint at the name, the asinus, tells exactly who he is. Just at this time, one of the key figures of the triumvirate is C. Asinius Pollio, with his strong army in Spain, consul designatus for 40, to whom, very soon after, Vergil dedicated his famous fourth eclogue. In 42, Pollio was 34 years old, which fits well the age of the gem-portrait. This series of well-defined documents on the spear as the badge of the imperium in the Republican epoch completes our evidence, eliminating the lacunae which misled Helbig and his followers. The testimony of two relevant, highly official monetary documents from the Augustan age bear witness to the continuity of the use of the spear-ensign. The first is the denarius of L. Caninius Gallus (pl. 1.2), noticed, but misunderstood, by W. Helbig. He interpreted the seat represented as a "Richterbank" and the spear—a very long one, which was no "Kommandostab"—as relating to a subbastatio, or the tribunal of the centumviri, mainly because we know how assiduous Augustus was in assisting the work of the courts and presiding over them himself. But the subsellium is defined, along with the spear, as an implement of the TR(ibunicia) POT(estas) through the letters inscribed just on the top of it. And the great scholar overlooked the fact that another coin gives an additional illustration of the same political device. This is the denarius of C. Sulpicius Platorinus (pl. 1.3; pl. 5.9) where Augustus and Agrippa are seated on the same subsellium tribunicium placed on a platform ornamented with rostra; their gestures show that they are discussing official matters. At their right, a full-length spear is set up, the globular end of which could be a simplified rendering of the type pl. 5.1 and 2. The spear as summa imperii referring to the tribunicia potestas has a momentous juridical significance. Since Mommsen, the potestas has been carefully distinguished from the concept of imperium. Quite recently, P. De Francisci advanced serious arguments to the contrary. We can now reaffirm his view and illustrate the basic fact that the attribution of the function of the tribunes to the Emperor meant power, power even intra pomerium! But besides this expression of potestas, it can be demonstrated that the spear continued to be the emblem of supreme power extra pomerium under the Emperors also. The first proof is offered by one of the reliefs found on the site of the Palazzo della Cancelleria in Rome, the scene of departure of Domitian to the Danube, accompanied by Mars, by his special divine protector Minerva, and by Virtus, further on by lictors and some cohortes praetoriae; the Genius senatus, the Genius populi Romani, with whom are some praetorians staying on in Rome, are bidding him farewell. The bearded soldier of the entourage of the departing Emperor, separated from

51 Walters saw a goat in it, but P. Corbett who kindly examined the representation upon my request confirmed my observation: the body of the tiny animal is as clumsy as that of a pony (which is excluded from the Roman iconography), but his long ears prove that only a donkey could be meant.

52 The date is given by the exact repetition of the head of Virtus-Bellona on an aureus of Sulla; cf. A. Alfoldi, Die trojanischen Urahnen der Römer, Rektorsprogramm Basel 1956 (1957) pl. 9, 1-2. Whether the same spearhead is meant with the mint-mark of the denarius (pl. 5, 7) of C. Calpurnius Piso is uncertain; perhaps someone knows another piece which could decide this.

53 Cf. J. André, La vie et l'oeuvre d'Asinius Pollion (Études et Commentaires VIII) (1949) 9 sqq. 17 sqq.

54 W. Helbig, op.cit. (supra n. 3) 33 sqq.

55 E. Babelon, op.cit. (supra n. 45) 2, 476 no. 11 does not mention the spear at all. H. Mattingly, BMCEmp I (1923) 23 no. 115, writes that Augustus and Agrippa are seated on a bisellium, and sees in the spear "an apparitor's staff."

56 P. De Francisci, StEtr 2. ser. 24 (1955/56) 40 sqq.

57 For further details cf. J. Béranger, Recherches sur l'aspect idéologique du principat, Basler Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 6 (1953) 96 sqq.

him by hierarchical considerations, who carries a big lance with an elaborate spearhead, looking back—surely saying goodbye to his comrades behind him—must retain our attention. Magi calls him "sottoufficiale" and rightly observes that the same spearhead occurs on provincial monuments, but he does not see the real significance of the hasta, nor do the other scholars who have discussed this monument after him.

Now we have unmistakable proof that this officer does not bear the attributes of his own rank, but those of the monarch. Namely, he does not carry the shield on his right arm in the obvious way, as do his fellow-praetorians, but under the armpit; and the aegis of the divine patron of Domitian on this shield reveals to whom it belonged. Thus our man is the spear- and shield-bearer of the Emperor, an indispensable function in those times when the supreme commander came to such close quarters with the enemy in battle. The consul of the Republic had of course such a courageous and reliable armiger, whose duty was latera tegere of his general. This functionary was the of Caesar, his shield-bearer, mentioned on the occasion of his defeat at Dyrachium, as in the case of a certain Racilius who latus Cassi tegebat, or Dardanus, the of Brutus. A soldier of Augustus in this role states on his tombstone: merui post annos septemque in this role states on his tombstone: merui post decem nullo odio, sine offensa. Under Domitian the prefect of the guard could already be styled sacri lateris custos, as later, after Gallienus, the elite of the officers assembled around the Emperor were called protectores divini lateris. But besides this honorary and allegoric use of protegere, the armiger, in his practical function, remained beside the ruler in the field; he is represented on an aureus of Elagabalus.

On this evidence, we can confidently justify the bearded officer on the Cancelleria reliefs, surely a high-ranking centurio of the praetorians, with the armiger of Domitian. It may be that on the voyage to the frontier the same man was in charge of the hasta belonging to the possessor of the imperium and of his shield: but otherwise two officials must have been entrusted with the care of the spear-attribute and the shield of the Emperor.

Now it is an essential fact that the same sort of decorative spears were not only employed to mark the presence of the supreme commander during the profectio, but also during the fighting itself. F. Magi discovered this summa imperii on the two well known reliefs representing Trajan’s Dacian wars and later built into the middle archway of the arch of Constantine; we reproduce one of them (pl. 72; pl. 10, fig. 43).

In all these cases the unbroken line of continuity from the Republic to the Empire is attested, but it is nowhere so obvious as on the well known relief of Hadrian from the so-called arco di Portogallo (pl. 8,1). The Emperor standing on a suggestus accompanied by the Genius senatus and the Genius populi Romani holds an allocutio as usual upon return to the capital, before entering the city proper, i.e. still extra pomerium. By the side of the suggestus stands a military person who holds a spear. This is well ascertained, in spite of a series of restorations.

A. J. B. Wace may have hit the mark in identifying him as the trecenarius of the spectaliores of the bodyguard. This spear-bearer corresponds iconographically exactly to the viator of the promagistrate on the denarius of Porcius Laeca (pl. 9,3).

---

61 Liv. 22.6.4. Cic., De domo 5.13: (Sergius) armiger Catilinae, stipator tui corporis. Plaut., Merc. 852: egomet mihi comes calator equos agmo armiger (sum). Further quotations are to be found in E. Bickel, ThLL II 613, v. 77 sqq.


63 Plut., Caes. 39.2 (Vol. 2, 343 Ziegl.).

64 Bell. Alex. 52.2.

65 Plut., Brut. 51.5: 52.1.

66 CIL V 938 (Aquileia).

67 Martial. 6.75.6 sq.

68 A. Alföldi, CAH 12 (1939) 219 sqq. Cf. ibid. 378 (W. Ensslin) with references.

69 Catal. no. 15 of the Münzen und Medaillen A.-G., Basle, no. 816.

70 F. Magi, op.cit. (supra n. 58) 87.


72 One example: Cass. Dio 49.15.3.

73 A. J. B. Wace, BSR 3, 3 (1907) 258 sqq.

74 op.cit. (supra n. 73) 261; cf. H. St. Jones, BSR 3 (1926) 263 n. 1.2.

75 The presence of the viator defines the rank of the magis-
THE SPEAR OF SOVEREIGNTY ENTRUSTED TO LOWER OFFICIALS AND MANIPULATED BY THE AIDES AND STAFF

of the magistratus cum imperio

In order to enable the old-fashioned local magistrates of the city to cope with all the problems of a worldwide Empire, the use of delegated and mandatory power was an obvious practice. It is important to stress the point that this happened in Rome as well as in the provinces. In the later Republic, as is known to us in a somewhat concrete manner, the competences of the magistrates inside of the sacred precinct of the City and outside of its sphere were, as already stressed, differentiated and separated in a painstakingly exact way. But, as we pointed out previously, though the religious significance of that boundary was as old as the City, yet the juridical discrimination intra and extra pomerium did not emerge with the birth of the Republic, as Mommsen believed, but resulted from a gradual development. To the remnants of the older unbiased concept of sovereignty which I collected in an earlier paper, must be added the permanence of the spear of sovereignty in the city itself in certain state actions and judicial affairs concerning the right of property and the status of personal freedom. We have already mentioned the hasta of the auctions. The origin of this procedure in the sale of war booty was recognized by the Romans themselves. Sulla still boasted fiercely: est enim ausus dicere hasta posita, quam bono in foro venderet et honorum virorum et locupletum et certe civium, rei publicae.

praedam se suam vendere.” And this happened in the heart of the City, on the forum, in the same way that the possessions of Pompey were sold after Pharsalos pro aede iuvii Statoris. It goes without saying that the victorious general did not himself undertake such a business; this was done by the quaestor. But even the treasurer did not bother with such minima and sold the whole complex to be auctioned to a speculator (sector) for a round sum. And as the retail sale of the sector was still regarded as an official transaction, it is to be assumed that he was acting under the protection of the sovereign spear. The personal control of the hasta by the war-lord was still less the case in the proscriptions of Sulla when, amongst others, his triumviri coloniis deducendis were largely acting for him, with the hasta venditionis; or after the defeat of the Senate by Caesar.

During the sojourn of the dictator in Alexandria hasta posta pro aede iuvii Statoris bona. Pompei, says Cicero grudgingly, . . . voci acerbissimae subiecta praecoonis. It is certain that Caesar prescribed this, and that his magister equitum Antony implemented his order. But Antony was not in charge of this sectio because he was buying the property of Pompey. Thus, the transaction was carried out voce praecoonis, . . . exactione quaestoris. It is also evident that when the triumviralis hasta was swallowing the fortunes of the proscribed, the three men in power were but rarely present, and still less did the Emperors take charge of such trivial matters in later days. Sub hasta vendere had, therefore,
fore, long ago ceased to be a personal duty of the
men in power as it was in olden times. Still more
did subaltern officials replace the magistrates where
the location of the *vectigalia* for a censorial *lastrum*
was awarded to the highest bidder. This, though a
secondary development, also concerned state prop-
erty and needed the presence of the spear for the
*addictio sub hasta*.

The obligation of the *hastam ponere* was of
course there not only when property was publicly
dispersed, but also when a process concerning rights
of possession was conducted. Since before the First
Punic War no one but the praetor was entitled to
adjudicate a property and since, on the other hand,
the spear survived as a badge of this function until
the end of antiquity, we must confidently assume
that in those early days the praetor himself fixed the
*hasta* on the *forum* when deciding such matters.
By a happy chance we know the very archaic forms
of litigation on landed property of that early epoch.
Gellius extracted the description of this solemn act
from the writing of a jurisconsult88: *Nam de qua [re]
disceptatur in iure [in re] praesenti, sive ager
sive quid aliud est, cum adversario simul manu
prenderet et in ea sollemnibus verbis vindicare,
id est 'vindicia.' Correptio manus in re atque in
rem, de qua ageretur, vocaret atque profecti
sive quid aliud est, cum adversario simul manu
id est 'vindicia.'

The demonic power of the spear of sovereignty,
which we shall discuss below, makes it certain that
the *hasta posita* of the praetor was thought to pre-
side over and decide this ordeal, once a bloody duel,
later transformed into a ceremony symbolizing a
fight between the contestants.

Around the middle of the third century B.C. the
praetor acquired new aids for the formulation of the
verdicts on the right of property. Pomponius89 men-
tions the introduction of this innovation between
242 and 227 B.C.: *deinde cum esset necessarius
magistratus qui hastae praeesset, decemviri in litibus
indicandis sunt constituti.*91 As I see it, *hastae
praeesse* always has been interpreted in the later
sense, i.e. to preside over the *iudicium centumvirale*,
a court originated only a hundred years later,92 and
so the correctness of the statement of Pomponius
has been denied. But I think the obvious meaning
of this expression for the early epoch is "conduct the
litigation on the property," in all probability under
the supervision of a praetor; only a *magistratus
cum imperio* was qualified to decide on *legitimum
dominium*.

The same applies to the presidency of the *iudi-
cium centumvirale* constituted in the middle of the
second century B.C.93 The badge of this court was
the *centumviralis hasta*,94 centum gravis hasta vi-
rorum, the *centeni moderatrix iudicis hasta*.95 The
praetors seem to have been much overburdened
with the care of this court, because at the end of
the Republic its direction lay in the hands of the
proquaestors.96 This fact must be compared with the
imperium given to the men of the same stand-
ing in the same epoch in provinces of less impor-
tance; these latter display the spear as a sign of
their power—the evidence will be given below;
this convergence *intra* and *extra pomerium* is due
to no chance, it seems to me.

The first princeps was constrained to lower again
the rank of the presidents of the centumvirial court,
entrusting it to the *decemviri silitibus indicandis*97
who were also called *X vir ad hastam*.98 But at the
same time, Augustus seems to have reestablished the

---

88 E.g. Liv. 4.29.4.
89 Gell. 20.10.6-10.
90 Dig. I pt. 2. 2.29. The first epigraphical mention of the
decemviri is from 139 B.C. (CIL VI 1296; Dessau 6), but the
extreme scarcity of inscriptions forbids the use of this as an
argument for the late origin of this magistracy.
91 Cf. Kübler, RE 4, 2260 sq.
92 Mommsen, Röm. Gesch. II 359. Mommsen, Staatsrecht Ia
275 n. 4; IIa 231 n. 5 and 590 sq. M. Wlasak, Römische Prozes-
gesetze 1 (1888) 139 sqq. Id. RE 31, 1935 etc.
93 Cf. Mommsen, Staat, IIa 229, 608.
94 Suet. Aug. 36.1.
95 Stat. Silv. 4.4.41 sq.
96 Suet. Aug. 36.1: auctor et aliarum rerum fuit, in quibus
... ut centumviralem hastam, quam quaesturam functi sustinerat
cogere, decemviri cogere. For the meaning of cogere cf. M.
Wlasak, RE 3, 1938.
1911: *victor [or decuria] et X vir al hastam* qui a [d in di[ea centume]]-
ralia praesent, etc.
supervision of a praetor over this court.99 Though Novellius Torquatus Atticus, the first known special praetor of this new kind, the praetor ad hastam99a or praetor hastarius,100 held office at the time of Tiberius, we can confidently assume that this measure is one of those about which Augustus boasted101: legibus novis me auctore latis complura exempla maiorum exoescentia iam ex nostro saeculo reduxi.

It is essential for our problem that each of the decemviri presiding over the single chambers constituted ad hoc by the praetor hastarius had an upright spear of his own. This follows from the fact that when the centumviral judges were split into two parts, these were called duae hastae.102 It is nowhere explicitly stated, but is obvious that in the case of a quadripartition of the centumviri, normally practised by complicated litigations on heredity, four hastae distinguished the four tribunals, though all of them had their sessions in the basilica Iulia in the imperial epoch.103

The role of the praetor hastarius over these special judicial committees is clearly defined in a letter of the Younger Pliny104: Descenderam in basilicam Iuliam auditorum, quibus proxima compendiatione respondere debebam. Sedebant iudices, decemviri venerant, obversabantur advocati; silentium longum, tandem a praetore nuntius. Dimittuntur centum viri, eximetur dies me gaudente... hoc facto Nepotis (sc. praetoris qui legibus quaerit) commotus praetor, qui centumviralisibus praeidet, deliberaturus est sequeretur exemplum, inopinatum.

99 C. Mommsen, Staatsrecht II 225.
99a ILS 950, from Tibur.
101 Res gestae d. A. 8.5 (p. 86 Gagé).
102 Quintil. Inst. or. 5.2.1: Iam praetextorum vis omnis tribus in generibus versatur: aut cum de eadem causa pronuntiatur est, ut... paribus centumviralibus, quae in duos hastas divisae sunt. ibid. 11.1.78: Etiam, si apud alios indices agatur, ut... in centumviralibus iudicis duplicatis parte victa, etc.
103 Quintil. Inst. 12.5.6; Certe cum in basilica Iulia diceter primus tribunali, quos autem iudicium, ut moris est, cogerentur, autque omnium clamaribus fremerent; et audium cum et intellectum et, quod agentibus ceteris centumvireoismum fuit, laudatum quoque ex quatro tribunales memini. Plin. Ep. 6.33.2-5: Est haec pro Attia Viriolo... nam femina... exheredata ab octogenario patre... quadruplex iudicio bona paterna repetebat. Sedebant centum et octoginta iudices (tot enim quattuor consiliis colliguntur):... nam duobus consiliis vicimus, totidem victus sumus. Cf. Val. Max. 7.7.1.
105 Ad. Longpérier, “Recherches sur les insignes de la quæsture,” R. A. (1868) 67 sqq. W. Helbig, op. cit. (supra n. 3) 33 sqq. M. Grant, From Imperium to Auctoritas (Cambridge 1946) nonis oitium dedit. In spite of the complete right of control by the praetor, the praecipium insigne was delegated to his subalterns and consequently was multiplied in the same way as by public sales of property.

The mandatory role of the spear as emblem of power is still more obvious in the provinces where the government never lost its original character of conquest, the sign of which was the hasta.

There is a group of late Republican coins of quaestores who display the spear with their subsellium and fiscus.105 Helbig realized that the spear, which could not be used normally by a quaestor, who did not possess the imperium, as a badge of his office, denotes in the case of the quaestores of the first century B.C. that they have been invested with some sort of independent governing capacity. We know three such cases:

a) The small silver quinarius of L. SESTIUS PROQuaestor (pl. 1.5) was struck in Macedonia in 43-42 B.C.106 Though the obverse shows the name of Brutus as proconsul, the comprehensive character of his imperium maius allowed him to admit the hasta as sign of the restricted power of his subordinate.

b) Bronze coins of the quaestor pro praetore A. Pupius Rufus in Cyrene107 struck in the years immediately following Actium (pl. 1.10-11) display the same array of attributes. It has been observed from Longpérier on that the spear originally belonged to the praetorial imperium.

c) The anonymous bronzes pl. 1.6-7108 seem to be of the same age, having been issued in the mint

13 sqq. 244 sqq.
107 L. Müller, Numismatique de l’ancienne Afrique (Copenhagen 1860) 161 no. 422-423. Good reproductions also in W. Helbig, op. cit. (supra n. 3) pl. 1. 15-17. E. S. G. Robinson, BMC Cyrenaica (London 1927) CCXXII sqq. 17 sq. dates the governorship of A. Pupius Rufus between 30 and 27 B.C.
108 Die antiken Münzen Nord-Griechenlands III 1 (Berlin 1906) 74 nos. 226-227 and plate 3, 67; W. Helbig, op. cit. (supra n. 3) 35 and pl. 1, 18-19; M. Grant, op. cit. (supra n. 105) 13 sqq. 244 sqq. (with references to special literature) would like to recognize Caesar in the anonymous portrait which has been, in my opinion, correctly interpreted previously as Augustus. He thinks that the coins pl. 1, 89 with the same head, inscribed PRINCEPS FELIX only imitate the portrait of the anonymous issue, struck in Thessalonica in his opinion, and that they were struck in Asia Minor. He reads the monogram on them as ALE(X)andria. But the smaller anonymous specimens, pl. 1. 7, shows clearly that the peculiar style of the deteriorated portrait with PRINCEPS FELIX originated in the
of a *colonia Iulia secundorum urbanorum* (veteranorum?) with other types (pl. 1,8-9) calling Octavian PRINCEPS FELIX.\footnote{109}

So we have to do with a phenomenon of the decades of the transition between Republic and Empire. The use of the *hasta* by proquaestores may mirror the same aspirations of unimportant figures using the title of *imperator* in the provinces, as we know from the literary sources, until this depreciation of the supreme might was barred by the monopoly of the ruler.

At this time the prefects of the camps had a certain peculiar spear, stuck in the earth as the badge of their position in the field. This is attested by Livy\footnote{110} for the year 11 B.C.: *in Germania, in castris Drusi examen apium in tabernaculo Hostili Rufi, praefecti castrorum, consedit ita ut junem praetendentem praefixamque tentorio lanceam ampleteteretur.*

We are able to push our ideas on the *hasta* as emblem of sovereign power a step further through the inclusion of a group of decorative spearheads, discovered in the ruins of military establishments of the frontier provinces (pl. 10, figs. 1-2), classified and interpreted by E. Ritterling in an admirable paper\footnote{111} and supplemented with new material in another brilliant study by G. Behrens\footnote{112} who discovered that besides the original spearheads and their representations on tombstones, there exists a rich series of miniature spears used as a device on fibulae, or as ornamental mountings on leather, as well as hanging ornaments. Sculptured tombstones enabled Ritterling to recognize that these spears belonged to certain ranks of subordinate officials, to the *beneficiarii consularis,*\footnote{113} *speculatores,*\footnote{114} (pl. 9,2), *frumentarii,*\footnote{115} etc. Ritterling also perceived that the group of officials in question belonged to the staff of the provincial governors.\footnote{116}

He thought that the standard-like spears were the attributes of these staff-officials and, though this proves to be wrong, he established the important fact that these spear-ensigns were carried anywhere where orders of the governor were to be carried out outside his headquarters.\footnote{117} A striking illustration of this fact is given by the tombstone of a *speculator* in Belgrade (pl. 9,2). He is certainly not making a tour of inspection, as has been supposed, but is acting in matters concerning the right of property, e.g. requisition of food, vehicles, etc., for the army, eventually enforcing the payment of duties. The spear-ensign of his function is carried by his servant, accompanying him on his trips, announcing thereby the state intervention. As the Roman antecedents of these spear-types were unknown to him and, on the other hand, the evident discrepancy between them and the tactical standards of the Roman army did not escape his attention, Ritterling saw in these standards derivatives of the standards of Hellenistic religious associations.\footnote{118}

But we know now that the big heart-shaped spearhead of Vössingen (pl. 10, fig. 7) with its greatly elongated rodlke point developed from the same type as that of Pollio (pl. 5,1-2; pl. 10, fig. 6); we know equally that the two oblique incisions on both sides of the spearheads of those staff-officials (pl. 10, figs. 13-15) are also on the imperial spear-attribute of Domitian (fig. 18); furthermore we saw that large standards with two superimposed big ornamental spearheads such as that of the *beneficiarius consularis* from Wiesbaden (pl. 10, fig. 42) were also employed in the Dacian battles of Trajan, just behind the fighting area—as it seems to me, in the presence of the Emperor himself (pl. 7,2; pl. 10, fig. 43). In view of all this evidence

\textbf{same mint as the pieces pl. 1, 6-7 with Q(maister); i.e. the same mint coined state and local issues. The style, as well as this double function, could very well fit a date just after the battle at Actium.}

\textbf{The legio II urbana was one of the civil wars. H. Gaebler, ZfN 23 (1902) 184 sqq. places this *colonia Iulia* in Asia Minor. He maintains rightly, with Ihmoh, Froehner and v. Sallet, that the head is that of Octavian.}

\textbf{Jul. Obseq. (132) 72.}


\textbf{G. Behrens, "Mars-Weiheimgen im Mainzer Gebiet," MZ 36 (1941) 8 sqq. Some fresh additions are made to the inventory of Behrens by H.-J. Hundt, Saalburg-Jahrbuch 14 (1955) 50 sqq.}

\textbf{E. Espérandieu, *Recueil général des bas-reliefs, statues ... de la Gaule romaine* III (Paris 1910) 35 no. 1785 (= CIL XIII 36)}

\textbf{Ritterling, op.cit. [supra n. 111] fig. 10} with the letters BF on the spearhead. \textit{CIL} XIII 7731 = E. Ritterling, \textit{op.cit.} (supra n. 111) fig. 3. Altar from Vinxtbach. \textit{CIL} III 12895 = E. Ritterling, \textit{ibid.} fig. 8 from Salonea. There are several votive \textit{arae} with the simplified representation of such a spear-emblem, one from Friedberg (\textit{Ritterling, ibid.} fig. 13. \textit{CIL} XIII 7400 = \textit{ILS} 4192 a); others were found in Stockstadt (\textit{CIL} XIII 6630 a-b; 6666 b.), Jagsthausen (\textit{CIL} XIII 6557 = Haug-Sixt, Steindenkmäler, 2nd ed. [1949] 649 no. 452) and Alexandria (\textit{CIL} III 6601); cf. \textit{Ritterling, ibid.}, 21 sqq. \textit{CIL} III 1650 = \textit{ILS} 2378 (Belgrade). Here reproduced on pl. 9, 2. Cf. M. Rostovtzeff, \textit{RM} 26 (1911) 268 sqq. Behrens, \textit{op.cit.} (supra n. 112) 20 n. B 1 and fig. 20 (Salonea).

\textit{CIL} III 5579 (Pons Aeni) = \textit{Ritterling, op.cit.} (supra n. 111) fig. 5.

\textit{Ritterling, \textit{op.cit.} (supra n. 111)} 23 sqq.

\textit{ibid.} 33.

\textit{ibid.} 30 sqq.
it cannot be doubted that those provincial spear-ensigns did not denote the subordinates, but the sovereign power of the Roman State for which they were acting.

It is likely that the material and execution of the spear carried before the Emperor was more precious than those of the subordinates: the hierarchy of metals was well established in the Rome of the Republic for such a use.119 Beside this the letters B-F on the representation of such an ensign in Lyon (pl. 10, fig. 12) prove that the rank of the officials to whom it was attributed was clearly indicated; whereas the tabulae anustae of these standards with the names of the men indicate rather the same practice as marked the possession of the State on weapons and other military property. It seems also that some differentiation between the spear-emblem of the magistrates had developed already in the late Republic: the long spearhead of Asinius Pollio (pl. 27, 31-41) could be perhaps the spear-standard of the praetor used intra pomerium. Nevertheless the typological congruence of the spear, borne before the monarch and the governors as well as before insignificant subaltern officials, points to a remarkable fact: it is a striking visual illustration of the idea of the global unity of the imperium amidst its manifold applications, stressed e.g. by E. Leifer and cherished by the eminent scholar and beloved friend to whom this paper is dedicated.

Later research will certainly establish an evolution in the shape and decoration of the spear as badge of power. The big heart-shaped spearheads of the Republican imperators (pl. 10, figs. 1-3) apparently had no elaborate decoration. The lateral incisions known from the first century A.D. (pl. 10, figs. 13-18) seem to be replaced by the “eyes” on the spearheads of the Middle Empire (pl. 10, figs. 19-27, 31-41). A variety of this insignie with a double spearhead occurs under Trajan (pl. 10, figs. 42-45). But we must limit our actual survey to these few general hints at the present.

**THE SPEAR OF THE TACTICAL SIGNA**

Apart from the eagle and a few other sacred animals on the top of the signa of the pre-Marian army, and besides those with the raised hand, all the military standards of the Roman army were nothing other than spears with a great variety of additional secondary features, a fact the importance of which has not yet been realized.120 The dona militaria of the troops, such as wreaths, paterae, clipei, decorate their standards, sometimes even surround the spearhead; but they are, even then, nothing else but spears of the legions121 (pl. 10, figs. 8-9), as well as of the cohortes praetoriae.122 Very clearly also the standards of the auxilia are spears: we illustrate this only with the signum of Pintaius123 (pl. 9,1; pl. 10, fig. 17), and mention as another example that of Oclatius.124

It may be assumed that in all those cases the spear meant power and command.125 It was gilded126 to catch the eyes of the soldiers who got the tactical orders through the signa and their movements. But at the same time, this visible expression of imperium was due to be split as many times as there were units. The flag-standards illustrate this perhaps best. The Roman vexillum is nothing other than a spear with a square piece of cloth just under the spearhead.127 The vexillum was the standard of every detached troop-unit,128 but other flags existed, too, which are not discussed in detail in the fundamental treatise of A. v. Domaszewski, *Die Fahnen im römischen Heere*.

To be sure, we must also mention with the category of the vexilla another kind of signum which also had a cloth-flag on it. This square piece of cloth

---

119 Alföldi, *op.cit.* (supra n. 16) 73 sqq.
120 A. von Domaszewski, *Die Fahnen im römischen Heere* (Wien 1885) 50, took notice of this without drawing any conclusions.
121 E.g. C. Cichorius, *Die Reliefs der Trajanssäule* (Berlin 1896) pl. 17, scene 52-53; pl. 20, scene 66; pl. 96, scene 346. A. v. Domaszewski, *op.cit.* (supra n. 120) figs. 21, 23-24, 26, 32.
122 Cichorius, *op.cit.* (supra n. 121) pl. 33, scene 132; pl. 39, scene 136; pl. 54, scene 194; pl. 72, scene 258; pl. 77, scene 275-276, etc. A. v. Domaszewski, *op.cit.* (supra n. 120) figs. 5, 12, 67-68, 73 and 75.
123 A. v. Domaszewski (supra n. 120) 73, fig. 86. *Altheräumlicher heidnischer Vorzeit* 1 (Heft 11) 6, 1, etc.
125 The *hasta* as *signum praeceptorium* by Festus (p. 90, 19 Linds.) has been supplemented with *bellum* by C. O. Müller. But *signum bellum* makes no good sense in this connection.
127 Cf. e.g. Cichorius, *op.cit.* (supra n. 121) pl. 9; pl. 65, scene 235. *JOAI Beibl. 1* (1898) 85 fig. 10 (CIL V 504). E. Petersen—A. v. Domaszewski—A. Calderini, *Die Marcussäule auf der Piazza Colonna in Rom* (1896) pl. 86, scene 77; pl. 104 B, 105 A, 106 B, 114 B. H. P. L’Orange—A. v. Gerkan, *Der spatantike Bildschmuck des Konstantinbogens* (Berlin 1939) pl. 13 a, 45 b, 46 b, 47 b, etc.
128 Cf. e.g. Mommsen, *Gesammelte Schriften* 6 (Berlin 1910) 135.
was in this case not applied under the spearhead, but further down, under the series of globular protuberances on the pole. Such were the standards of the manipuli reproduced on the denarii of C. Valerius Flaccus and the Pompeian consuls of 49 B.C. (pl. 1,1 and pl. 10, fig. 46; cf. also pl. 5,10-11) with the abbreviated inscriptions H(astati) and P(rincipes). Similar standards appear as mint-marks on the denarii of L. Papius and C. Roscius Fabatus (pl. 4,1-4 and pl. 10, fig. 48); on denarii of 43 B.C. (pl. 5,10-11) the same flag-standard belongs to veteran colonists.

There existed another sort of vexillum, bigger than the others, carried on a longer pole, with the name of the supreme commander and of the (expeditionary) army in purple letters on it. Such is the banner towering over the legionary signa on a relief-scene of the column of Trajan. A. v. Domaszewski and with him A. v. Premerstein thought that these great vexilla were not employed on the march and in the battle, but were used only in camp and decorated the tent of the commander-in-chief; but the description of such a banner of the army of Crassus concerns the army in movement.

On the other hand, the vexillum of the supreme commander, different from these big banners, was also employed in the fighting.

As just mentioned, besides these great banners, there was also a special one belonging to the imperator himself. Examples of this must be seen in the vexillum carried before the standards of the imperial bodyguard on Trajan’s column or displayed with the Emperor on the column of Marcus Aurelius. This flag of the supreme commander was displayed in the praetorium ordering the state of readiness for battle, but it was also used to give the signal for the start of the fighting both on land and for the beginning of a naval action. The hoisting of this belli signum was very old; the invocation of the popular assembly by the same act also signifies the same will of the sovereign power. The necessity of having this purple flag always at hand for the purpose of tactical commands explains why it was not deposited in the shrine of the signa, but was kept at night in the dwelling of the commander-in-chief. The flag of the generalissimo had a purple coat, and when Augustus honored Agrippa with a caeruleum vexillum after the victory of Naulochos, it was a first step towards the Byzantine hierarchy of colors, in the same way as


130 Domaszewski, op.cit. (supra n. 120) fig. 20. Chioriouis, op.cit. (supra n. 121) pl. 10, scene 24.

131 op.cit. (supra n. 120) 79 n. 1.


133 Supra n. 129.

134 It was of purple, consequently its inscription could not be written with purple letters, but surely with golden ones, cf. Arrian., Parth. frg. 154 (FGrHist II 156 Jacc.): αὕτη (ναύς) τὰ τέχνητον ἑλαφρὰ (χρωμα), καὶ ἐν’ ἀκρῷ τῇ οἰκίᾳ τὸ βασιλείου δῶμα καὶ δαῖμον ἄλλοις βασιλεῖς γεγονότις χρωμάτω καταραμένα. The σημεία βασιλείων (ibid.) were displayed in front of the tent of the imperator, and not the previously mentioned.

135 Chioriouis, op.cit. (supra n. 121) pl. 31, scene 103; pl. 37, scene 127; pl. 78, scene 279. A. Caprino—A. M. Colini—G. Gatti—M. Pallottino—P. Romanelli, La colonna di Marco Aurelio (Roma 1953) pl. 7, fig. 15 (vm); pl. 8, fig. 16; pl. 24, fig. 49; pl. 49, fig. 98; pl. 53, fig. 106; pl. A, E; where Claudius Pompeianus is also present with the Emperor, there are two vexilla displayed. The three flags on pl. 33, fig. 67 are due to the presence of the crown prince besides his father and his son-in-law.

136 Cass. B. Gall. 2.20.1: Caesari omnia uno tempore erant agenda: vexillum proponendum, quod erat insigne, cum ad arma concurrenti operi, ab opere revocandi milites, . . . acies instruenda, milites cohortandis, signum (ubi) dandum. Plutarh speaks of a purple xiphos exhibited on the tent of the commander-in-chief, but we think this means nothing other than the vexillum. Cf. Plut. Fab. 15.1: ἄκρις '教育部' . . . ἰπ'
the vexilla argentea as distinction of high-ranking officers under the Empire was second only to the golden banner-poles of the sovereign himself.

If the flag with HIS (pania) on the denarii from 54 B.C. referring to C. Coelius Caldus, praenestin in Spain ca. 98 B.C. is his purple ensign, as we think, this flag also had the globular protuberances on its shaft, as the manipular standard had; in this case the mint-marks of the denarii from the seventies of the last century B.C. (pl. 4.1-4) could mean this purple vexillum. No doubt this is the flag in the hand of Victory on the coins celebrating Actium, or the journeys of Hadrian on the sea. This imperial flag was replaced by Constantine with his labarum.

The hasta was used also as standard of the manipuli. The ancient writers explain its origin as a handful of hay, bound to a pole: pwtica suspensos portabat longa maniplos, Ovid describes it. We see the simplest form of this ensign reproduced as mint-mark on the obverse of a denarius of C. Valerius Flaccus (pl. 1.1 and pl. 10, fig. 10); the globules on the shaft are only slight, and the tassel under them, always present on the manipul and many other standards, could preserve the form of the original bunch of hay. In view of the magico-religious atmosphere out of which these standards emerged, we agree with L. Renell that this hay must have been something like the sacred segmenta, taken from the Capitol for ritual purposes. The horse, man-headed bull, boar and wolf) but the essence of the standards is not due to any practical consideration. It is well known that not only the eagle had its own cult (and before Marius the horse, man-headed bull, boar and wolf) but the other standards too. We are reminded of two famous passages of Tertullian who testifies to this in full detail: Religio Romanorum tota castrensis signa veneratur, signa iurat, signa omnibus deis praeponit. Omnes illi imaginum suggestus in signis monilia crucum sunt; siphara illa vexillorum et cantabrorum stolae crucum sunt. And again: itaque in Victoris et cruces colit castrensis religio, si signa adorat, signa deierat, signa ipsi Iovi praeferit: sed ille imaginum suggestus et totius auri cultus monilia crucum sunt. Sic etiam in cantabris atque vexillis, quae non minore sanctitate militia custodit, siphara illa vestes crucum sunt.

When in the case of extreme peril the tumultus was proclaimed, the oath of the hastily assembled army was taken collectively before a vexillum as the divine witness of the coniuratio. The same act is often represented as the coniuratio of the peoples of Italy in the Social war (pl. 6.5-6, and pl. 10, fig. 47). Here the same oath is sworn in front of a huge pole of the same type as the Roman manipul standards, with a flying ribbon on its top, exactly as on the Roman parallels (pl. 1.1 and pl. 10, fig. 46).

THE SPEAR AS SOVEREIGN IN ROME AND THE SCEPTER AS RULING POWER AMONG THE MYCENAEAN GREEKS

The spear of sovereignty has its personality and still in imperial times it is characterized by expressions which depict it as an acting individual. When Valerius Maximus mentions the hastae iudicium or the Laus Pisonis has trepidos ad iura decem citat hasta viverum et firmare iubet centeno iudice causas, or Statius speaks of the centeni modera- trix iudicis hasta or Juvenal calls this spear domina hasta, it is not a rhetorical artifice but re-

---

144 P. Steiner, BonnJb 114-115 (1906) 39, assembled the mentions of them occurring since Domitian.
146 BMCREP III pl. 60.2. J. Liegle, Jdl 56 (1941) 91 sqq. The type was imitated frequently, e.g. under Sept. Severus (J. M. C. Toynbee, Roman Medallions [New York 1944] pl. 43(5)) etc.
147 BMRCP III pl. 63, 14-17.
148 P. L. Strack, Untersuchungen zur römischen Münzprägung des II. Jahrhunderts nach Christus 2 (Stuttgart 1933) pl. 16, 837, 839-840 etc.
150 Ovid. Fast. 3.117 sqq.
151 Chas. Renel, Cables militaires de Rome: les enseignes (Paris 1903) 238 sqq. 248 sqq.
152 Tac. Ann. 1.39.6 (in the mutiny at the Rhine in 14 A.D.}
flects an archaic conception. Similarly, when Martial\textsuperscript{161} writes: \textit{hunc miratur adhuc centum gravis hasta viorum}, when Seneca\textsuperscript{162} mentions \textit{hastam (Caesaris) consularia spolia vendentem} and Gaius\textsuperscript{163} declares that in \textit{centumviralibus iudiciis hasta praeponitur}—still other examples could be added easily—all this reveals the queer notion of the spear who acts as an active supreme ruler: a personified force on a superhuman level. This cannot be separated from the ritual imprecation of the sacred spears by the holder of the \textit{imperium} leaving for a war. These spears were guarded in the \textit{regia} and regarded as containing the might of Mars himself. They were addressed by the leader of the State with the words: \textit{Vigilasne Mars? Vigila!} In the same way, this concept cannot be isolated from the spear in the sanctuary of Jupiter Feretrius which witnessed and warranted the solemn act of the \textit{foedus} from time immemorial,\textsuperscript{164} as we shall see.

The spear of the legal authority in Rome which is obeyed as an animated being, but which is at the same time the materialization of the abstract idea of power, has a striking analogy in the scepter of the Mycenaean kings, the role of which is clearly mirrored in the Iliad, but which is vanishing in the fairy-tale world of the Odyssey,\textsuperscript{165} prolonging the epics into a period in which the kingship was dying away. To have the legal authority in public affairs, even the king is obliged to take into his hand the scepter, a sacred object, a unique gift of the gods. Agamemnon seizes the scepter of his ancestors, “imperishable ever,” when he assembles the Achaeans;\textsuperscript{166} he holds it when haranguing his people.\textsuperscript{166} The herald brings the scepter to King Menelaos on a similar occasion.\textsuperscript{168} When administering an oath, the king raises the scepter towards heaven showing it to all the gods, no doubt as warrant of the honesty of his intentions.\textsuperscript{169}

When the king wants to authorize someone to act in his name, the means of authorization is to hand the scepter over to him. Agamemnon does so when he entrusts authority to Odysseus, who addresses them by holding the royal staff,\textsuperscript{170} calling back the fleeing Achaeans from the ships,\textsuperscript{171} or when he sends the same hero to Troy.\textsuperscript{172}

It was indispensable for the administration of justice to hold the scepter upright; it was above all the symbol of justice\textsuperscript{173} already in the ancient Near East. If the king himself acted as a judge, he did it with his scepter in his right hand;\textsuperscript{174} if he delegated this power to others, the scepter was handed over to them in turn.\textsuperscript{175} This delegation of power became an empty ceremony in the Attic democracy where the judges nevertheless held a long staff as a badge of sovereign rights.\textsuperscript{176} This Greek tradition seems to have affected the Romans of later times who imagined their old kings with the staff in the hand, as judges; such a representation appears on the \textit{denarius} of T. Vettius Sabinus (pl. 2, 8) where Titus Tatius is depicted with the \textit{scipio}.\textsuperscript{177} The continuity of this token of the supreme authority in the Middle Ages cannot be discussed here, of course.\textsuperscript{178}
The scepter of the Homeric king is kept by his herald if the king does not use it, and he gives it to the king when a public function demands the sanction of his authority through it; he provides the judges with the royal staff, when in their turn they give their verdict. But the king can entrust his herald with important missions, and again he authorizes his envoy by lending him the σκήπτρον. No doubt the reverence with which the angry Achilles greets the duel of the mighty heroes, Hektor and Aias, the heralds of the Trojans and the Achaeans supervise with their undisputed orders, after they μέστρον δ’ ἀμφότερων σκήπτρα (i.e. the respective staffs of their kings) σχέδον. 

Here we must stress the fact that the long σκήπτρον in the hand of the public heralds belongs to their kings and has nothing to do with their own short rod (ράβδος), though these two things are often confused. The herald’s staff is the same as the wand of their prototype Hermes, the divine envoy of Father Zeus. When Poseidon strikes both the Aiaxes, he does not use a scepter, but a magic rod, a σκηπτάνων; Athene also has such a ράβδος in the Odyssey. The ancient authors realized this difference; Polygnotos, in the Lesche of Delphi, painted Agamemnon leaning his right arm on the long royal staff, but holding also a twig, in the Gorgias of Plato, Minos as king has the golden scepter, yet his fellow-judges in the nether world have only rods. It is essential to realize through this parallelism that the scepter has a different origin from the sorcerer’s rod. I think we find attributes both of the ruler and the herald on a well known monument of the 16th century B.C., namely the steatite cup (pl. 8,2) from Hagia Triada in Crete. The king holds out his staff, extending his right arm with an emphatic gesture towards a young man. Though this latter has a helmet on his head, he does not have the main weapon of those days, the spear. The staff with a round globule at the lower end, which he has in his right hand, has been considered to be a sword. Indeed, an officer of our days, reporting to his superior, would hold his sword in this way. But this staff is not a Mycenaean sword with its broad blade, but merely a stick. And, since the man who holds it has no spear, the absence of the main weapon makes the absence of the secondary one plausible. The strongly emphasized importance of the upright scepter exhibited by the king corresponds to the role of the royal staff among the Achaean of Homer, as does the role of the announcer with his rod who leads to his sovereign three men carrying gifts or bringing him tribute, exactly in the way the Iliad depicts it: έν δ’ ἄνδρες ναινοῦν πολύρρησες πολυβοῦται, οἳ κεί εὐστήρε τοίς νώμησιν καὶ ύπ’ σκήπτρων λεπαράς τελέουσαν θέματα. The helmet of the herald could well be Mycenaean Greek and even the Cretan features of the costume would not exclude the possibility of Greek origin. On this matter, I consulted Professor Luisa Banti who kindly gave me the following information.

“The cup you are interested in was found at Hagia Triada in one of the rooms of the South wing of the LM I villa, to the West of corridor 9 (see map: Pernier-Banti, Guida degli scavi italiani in Creta [Rome 1947] fig. 40; or L. Banti, ‘I culti minoici e greci di H. Triada,’ Annuario Scuola
archeol. ital. di Atene 1941-42, fig. 2). It was certainly used down to the destruction of the site which is contemporary to the destruction of the other Minoan towns and palaces. Being an object not easily breakable, it may have been in use for a long time. It certainly belongs to the Minoan stratification, i.e., before the LM III occupation of the site. If you read the study I wrote before Ventris' interpretation of Linear B, ‘Il sentimento della natura nell’arte Minioce e Micena,’ Γεράς Αντωνίου Κεραμοπούλου, Athens 1953, 119-127, you may read that I considered it (p. 123) to be imported from Cnossos, and belonging to the LM II trend of Cnossian art. At the time, I had no idea that LM II style belonged to a period of Greek occupation at Cnossos. You may see in this study that I had already noticed that Cnossian LM II was very near to the Greek mainland art and already showed the Greek classical spirit and characteristics. Ventris' interpretation completely confirmed my feeling. Now, knowing that Greek was written at Cnossos in LM II, my opinion on the H. Triada cup is that it was made at Cnossos during the Greek occupation and imported to H. Triada just before the LM Ib destruction of the site.”

Therefore, everything speaks for the Greek character of this scene. As in Homer, also on the rhyton of H. Triada the scepter carries the supreme might; even the king cannot act legally without it, its presence is the preliminary to all political actions. It is an eternal incorporation of sovereignty, similar to the bannière de France which is only slightly lowered when a king is buried and then erected again, because “la bannière de France ne meurt pas.”105 But whence comes this individuality, this superhuman vigor and supposed perpetual life of an inanimate object?

Epic poetry preserves the answer to this question which, no doubt, reflects the real religious sanction of Mycenaean kingship. Agamemnon's scepter in the Iliad106 is a masterpiece of art wrought by Hephaistos in heaven at the command of Zeus. Zeus sent it by Hermes to the founder of the dynasty of the Pelopides, whose rulers transmitted it to each other in their turn. So this scepter, πατρώων ἀδελφών ἀεί107 came down to the actual ruler “that so he might be the lord of many isles and of all Argos.” It is the token of the sanction of the king by the supreme god108 and no one but the σκῆπτρος can be the legitimate ruler.109 The visual expression of this investiture of the king with the symbol of power is the eagle, Zeus' envoy, sitting on the scepter.200 Conceptions of Near-Eastern kingship, transmitted by the Minoans to the early Greek rulers seem to me to have engendered this argument. But all this does not explain the necessity of having the staff; it is superfluous to document the approval of Zeus in the sense of Homeric mythology where the God-father either sends personal envoys to the kings dear to his heart, or visits them in person. It is obvious that the staff already had its decisive role when the myths in question were created, a role older than the Olympian gods.

We know another long staff, the Roman hasta, as the incorporation of the sovereign power. We saw that the spear representing the ruling power is stuck in the earth201 and sub hasta, i.e. under the sway of the spear, legal auctions are carried out.202 Sub hasta, “under the upright spear” corresponds exactly to the action ὑπὸ σκῆπτρῳ among the early Greeks. We have already quoted the expression ὑπὸ σκῆπτρῳ λίπαράς τελέοντι τέμιστας from the Iliad203 in which we read also:200 Ἡ θεὸς γὰρ ὑπὸ σκῆπτρῳ ἐδίμαισεν. Apolloion Rhodios depicts Alkinoos administering justice in the same way:205 ἐν δὲ ὧνε χειρὶ σκῆπτρον ἔχειν χρυσοῦ δικαιστόκον, ὡς ὑπὸ λαοῦ θεῖας ἀνὰ ἄντι διεκρινοτα ἡμίστας. 'Ὑπὸ σκῆπτρῳ is to be taken literally, as inscriptions from Western Asia Minor as late as the Roman Imperial Age attest. These contain judgments of courts on temple-estates with the statement: ἦ Ταξιναν κατοικία ἀδόξησα ἐπέτησε τὸ σκῆπτρον τοῖς κακῶς ἐος αὐτοὺς τῶν ἐκ μῆται καὶ ὡς ἐξ ἐξηγήσεως, ἐκολάζοντα καὶ διήφθειρα τους pl. 158. CVA France, Louvre III 1 c, pl. 43.4. R. Hirzel, op.cit. (supra n. 172) 72 explains plausibly the scepter of prophets and poets, who announced the message of the gods through their mouths, and carried the scepter as proof of their mission.200 The technical term is hastam ponere, e.g. Cic. Phil. 2.26.64. Quintil. Decl. 12.9 etc. 206 Cf. also expressions as sub vexillo hiemare, stay in service under the compulsion of the vexillum. 207 159. Herod. 1.195. Schol. Aristoph., Av. 510 and 512 (with a fragment of Sophocles on this topic). Pind. Pyth. 1.6. Furtwängler-Reichhold, Die antike Vatenmaleerei, pl. 6012; pl. 90;
[ἐπὶ]βουλεύσαντας αὐτοῖς κτλ and the representation of the upright scepter.206 Similarly they announce (A.D. 115) ἐπεστάθη ὁ ἄρης τοῦ σκῆπτρον καὶ τοῦ Κυρίου τοῦ Υἱοῦ του Θεοῦ207 and again ἡ ... Ταῦτα ἐπέτατταν τὸ σκῆπτρον καὶ ἄρας ἐθήκεν ἐν τῷ ναῷ. J. Zingerle has drawn attention to the parallelism of this procedure with a disciplinary paragraph of the statutes of the Jobackhoi:208 ἡκτόσιος δὲ κληρονόμος ἡ καθυστάθη ὑπὸ τοῦ ἵππου ἐπιφέρων τῷ ἀκοσμηνίῳ ἢ θηρυμοῦν τῶν θύρων τοῦ θεοῦ. ὃ ἢ ἀν παρατηθῇ ὁ θύρος, ἐπικρινόμενος τοῦ ἵππου ἢ τοῦ ἀρχιβάρχου ἐξερχέσθω τοῦ ἐστιατορείου, stressing also that the thyrsos represents the god himself.

Furthermore, we possess some evidence for the spear as the sign of sovereign power in Greece. The earliest proof for this would be the display of epic heroes on the fragment of a proto-Attic krater from Micenean Greece, the original conception reappeared in Hellas after the arrival of the Dorians. Trogus Pompeius writes on the beginnings of Rome:214 per ea tempora adhuc reges hastas pro diademata habebant, quas Graeci 'sceptra' dixere; he may be right in the sense hinted at.

THE OCCULT POWER OF THE RAVAGING SPEAR

The prehistoric notion that the deadly effect of a spear-thrust does not derive from the force of the man who drove it, but from the immanent "mana" which is hidden in the weapon, is manifest in Rome:215 nam et ab origine rerum pro diis immortalius veteres hadates collusero.216 Varro thought in this sense that the hastae preserved in the regia must be reduced to one, incorporating Mars.217 The state-

207 J. Zingerle, JOAbibl 23 (1926) 5 sq. with an excellent commentary on p. 13 sqq. and ibid. 16 no. 2.
208 Dittenberger, Syllo.² 41 no. 1109 v. 136 sqq.
209 CVA Deutschland 2, Berlin 1, 1938 no. A. 42 pl. 31-33.
K. Kübler, Altattische Malerei (Tübingen 1950) 17 and fig. 48.
210 Eurip., Hekabe 9.
211 PrGrHist 115, frg. 331 (vol. 2.605) Jacoby = Plut. Dion. 24.10.
212 Plut. Polypeid. 29.7.
214 Justin. Epit. Trigi Pomp. 43.3.3.
215 C. Boetticher, Der Baumkultus der Hellenen (Berlin 1856) 233 sq. understood the main aspects of these beliefs.
216 The details are to be found in the following papers: Roscher, Mythol. Lex. II 2388 sq; Marbach, RE 14 (1923); L. Deubner, ArchW 8 (1905) Beiheft 74 sqq.; W. W. Fowler, The Religious Experience of the Roman People (London 1911) 142; Ed. Norden, Aus allrömischen Priesterbüchern (Acta Soc. hum. lir., Lund 29 [1930]) 215 sqq. 173 sq. More references infra.
217 Justin. Epit. Trigi Pomp. 44.3.3. C. Paul, exc. Festi p. 64, 6 Linds.: Delubrum dierabant jutem delubrarium, hoc est decorticatum, quem venerabantur pro deo, and the representations I φιλίπτων λαὸν εὐθύνων δορί, where the spear is the ἵθυντήριον instead of the scepter; as in Rome, litigation in early Greece seems to have been a mitigated form of a contest with arms. Theopompos211 states this: λόγχη δὲ παράσημον ἀρχῆς καὶ δυνα-

stías. The magistrates of the cities Meliboia and Skotussa wiped out by Alexander of Pherae are called ὁρυπόροι212 and also the Theban magistrates had the spear as attribute of their office.213 The traces of the cult of the royal spear discussed below point in the same direction. It seems therefore that though the Cretan influence replaced the sovereign spear by the sovereign scepter in Myce-

naean Greece, the original conception reappeared in Hellas after the arrival of the Dorians. Trogus Pompeius writes on the beginnings of Rome:214 per ea tempora adhuc reges hastas pro diademata habebant, quas Graeci 'sceptra' dixere; he may be right in the sense hinted at.

THE OCCULT POWER OF THE RAVAGING SPEAR

The prehistoric notion that the deadly effect of a spear-thrust does not derive from the force of the man who drove it, but from the immanent "mana" which is hidden in the weapon, is manifest in Rome:215 nam et ab origine rerum pro diis immortalius veteres hadates collusero.216 Varro thought in this sense that the hastae preserved in the regia must be reduced to one, incorporating Mars.217 The state-

211 Serv., Aen. 8.3. UTQUE IMPULIT ARMA . . . est autem sacrorum: nam is qui bellis suscepserat curam, sacrarium Maritis ingresemus primo ancilia commovebat, post hastam simulacri ipsum, diceni 'Mars vigilia' (Simulacri is a secondary addition). Plut. Rom. 29.1: en de τῇ Ρώμη ὑπὸ καθαρυδρᾶμαν "'></script>
ment found in several authors, that the god Quirinus is so called because quiris—curis means “spear” in the Sabine tongue, is embedded in a series of inconsistent combinations which also have the flavor of the style of Varro and no doubt come from him; the corresponding interpretation of Iuno Quiritis’ name has no different origin.

Consequently, though it is obvious that the inherent magic power of the spear has in some way been brought into connection with the two war-lords of early Rome, the wolf-god Mars and the boar-god Quirinus, the exact nature of this relation is somewhat obscured by the arbitrary reduction of the hastae Martis to one. Nevertheless, the broad concept of the supernatural virtues of the spear, not restricted to a unique specimen of heavenly war-lords or to a single spear of ancient fame, was most deeply rooted in Rome.

The plurality of the sacred spears in the sacra-rum, a small cabinet close to the living quarters of the pontifex maximus in the regia, is exactly transmitted to us by the lists of prodigia in Livy, of highly official provenience. The belief in the radiating immanent power of these sacred spears has been well elucidated by H. Wagenvoort. He stresses the fact that the careful observation of the spontaneous motion of the hastae Martis which originally, no doubt, foreboded an imminent war, reveals an archaic numer-belief, older than the personal and anthropomorphic divinity of Mars. Besides the spontaneous movement of the hastae Martis at the beginning of the war, the king and his successors respectively undertook the magic ritual to propitiate the numinous power of the spears in action. Here it becomes apparent that the “mana” was not confined to one sacred spear, nay, not even to all the sacred spears; since the ominous movement of the spears occurred and was keenly observed also with the sacred shields, the commander of an army moves not only the spears of Mars, but also the shields. Servius mentions this twice: . . . is qui belli susceperat curam, sacrum Martis ingressus primo ancilia commovebat, post hastam—(recte: hastas!) . . . dicens “Mars vigila” and again: nam moris fuerat indicto bello in Martis sacramento ancilia commovere. With these expressions of the ritual language Servius rightly explains Vergil’s words: Mos erat . . . in Latio, quem protinus urbes Albanae coluere sacrum, nunc maxima rerum Roma colit, cum prima movent in Roman Coinage, presented to H. Mattingly (Oxford 1956) 69.
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proelia Martem. But Servius feels correctly, too, that, when Turnus starting the battle had impulit arma, this means the same magic compulsion.\footnote{\textsuperscript{229} Val. Flacc. Argon. 4.279-281.} Still more obvious is this magic character of action by Turnus in \textit{Aeneid} 12.93 sq.: validam vi corripit hastam, . . . quassatque trementem, vociferans: "nunc o nunquam frustrata vocatus haste meos, nunc tempus adest." The same atmosphere is mirrored rather often by other poets. Valerius Flaccus\footnote{\textsuperscript{231} Stat. Achil. 1.485 sqq.} describes the pause for breath in a heroic contest as fixa silet Gradivus in hasta, and the raging of war as pugnas mota pater (sc. Gradivus) incitat haste.\footnote{\textsuperscript{232} Sil. Ital. Pun. 4.434 sqq. Cf. Livius 24.10.10: \textit{tam alia vulgata miracula erant: hastam Martis Praeneste sua sponte promptam.}} The same is expressed by Statius\footnote{\textsuperscript{233} Stat. Achil. 1.485 sqq.} with \textit{cum} Odrysiam Gradivus in hastam surgeret, and by Silius Italicus with quassat per auras . . . hastam (Mavors).\footnote{\textsuperscript{234} The \textit{ancilia} and the \textit{hastae Martis} stayed in their shrine in Rome, serving the defense of the city itself; they should avert evil and watch over the city.\footnote{\textsuperscript{235} Whether these were preserved in the \textit{regia} or in the \textit{curia Saliorum} is not quite certain. Cf. Deubner, \textit{op.cit.} (supra n. 215) 74 sqq. Ed. Norden \textit{op.cit.} (supra n. 215) 154. Marbach \textit{RE} 14.1922.}} The \textit{ancilia} and the \textit{hastae Martis} stayed in their shrine in Rome, serving the defense of the city itself; they should avert evil and watch over the city.\footnote{\textsuperscript{236} Cf. the splendid pages of Ed. Norden, \textit{op.cit.} (supra n. 215) 153 sqq.} But, as the quotations just given show clearly, the same complex of magic ideas was at work when the might of the spear was desirable for the purpose of the offensive.

We must stress the importance of the fact, emerging from our discussion, that the occult force immanent in the spear was not bound to a single god or a single venerable weapon, but was supposed to be at work almost everywhere where the \textit{hasta} was carried. This elucidates how the spear as the skeleton of the standards could have a religious touch everywhere and also how the mandatory use of the spear as \textit{summa imperii} was prepared by this magic concept, paving the way for the juridical expression of sovereignty for the awe-inspiring power of the dreadful tool of slaughter.\footnote{\textsuperscript{237} Cf. already L. Deubner, \textit{op.cit.} (supra n. 215) 75.} Not less important for our problem is the well-established fact that the kings had already watched over the sacred spears of Mars; no one will doubt that they were deposited in the \textit{regia} before the \textit{rex sacrificulus} took over from the real king the duty of watching over the behavior.

H. Wagenvoort made it plausible that the concept of the \textit{imperium} has something to do with the notion of the "\textit{mana.}" He thinks\footnote{\textsuperscript{238} Wagenvoort, \textit{op.cit.} (supra n. 164) 66 sqq.} that \textit{imperium} meant originally "chief's mana," \textit{imperare} to transfer "mana," and \textit{imperator} the "chief who transfers mana." The archaic notion of the \textit{felicitas imperatoris}\footnote{\textsuperscript{239} H. Wagenvoort, \textit{Mnemosyne} 4. ser. 7 (1955) 300 sqq.} proves that the general in charge was supposed to have such a magic power; but, beside this stood the \textit{hasta} incorporating the \textit{imperium}. The fact that the spear was carried \textit{before} the king or commander, and not \textit{by} him like all his other regalia, was originally due to this self-sufficient power of the spear. This custom and belief must be pre-Etruscan,\footnote{\textsuperscript{240} Cf. also P. de Francisci, \textit{StEtr} 2. ser., 24 (1955/56) 38 sqq. with n. 103-104 (Lit.).} as the \textit{hasta} as attribute in the hand of the Etruscan king of Chiusi (pl. 3,1) suggests, the Etruscan kings introduced the royal spear-attribute in Rome, which must be distinguished from the sovereign spear.

\textbf{THE DIVINE SPEAR PRESIDING OVER THE OATH}

We return now to the oath-scene on gold coins which were struck, as is today unanimously accepted, in the second half of the Punic war (pl. 6, 1-4). A bearded old man of imposing stature, naked to the waist and clad only in a skirt, holds the sign of the \textit{imperium}, a very tall spear; facing him, a younger man stands in a cuirass, with a shorter spear and a mantle on the left arm. Both point with their drawn swords to a pig held by a youth kneeling between them.\footnote{\textsuperscript{241} H. Willers, \textit{Corolla numismatica in honour of B. V. Head} (London 1906) 319 note 1 has shown that he must not be a \textit{camillus}, but could be a noble youth, quoting Cic. \textit{De inv.} 9.21.} At this period, realistic representation of a contemporary event is not yet possible; such an allusion would have been pictured only through scenes of myth and legend.\footnote{\textsuperscript{242} Cf. my remarks in the essays dedicated to H. Mattingly (supra n. 220) p. 66.} Thus an oath taken by an actual \textit{imperator} from a soldier is out of the question; and as the imitation of the types a hundred years later (pl. 6,7-8) puts the two main figures on an equal footing, we must focus our attention on federal oaths in the Rome of legendary times to which these two men certainly belonged.

But why is the old man half-naked and the young one in armor? The bearded Titus Tatius with the younger Romulus could in no case be pictured in such utterly different attire. But there is another solution easily at hand. I have proved in an earlier
The study that the patricians of early Rome wore only a loin-cloth in battle; thus the old giant can only be one of them, whereas the armored young man is of course no infantryman. The picture of this alliance is well known and often reproduced, as the occurrence of this composition on engraved gems shows. The preliminaries given above reduce the identification of our federal oath of ancient times to only one possibility. The mighty old representative of the autochthonous ancestors of the Romans is king Latinus, as Vergil depicts him on the ground of the myth-historical tradition in the Aeneid: he is iam senio or rather longaeus rex, maximus aevus Latinus, the venerable pater . . . . Latinus. He is of great stature, ingenti mole.

The younger man, armed in Greek fashion, is Aeneas. We know well how Trojans and Achaean heroes were confused in Italic legend as mutual friends and founders of cities, and there was a tradition which stressed the "Greek" appearance of Aeneas, clearly preserved, e.g. by Dionysios of Halikarnassos. King Latinus recognizes the newly arrived Trojans ἀπλωσάμενοι τε ὡς Ἐλληνας, and some divinity persuades him in a dream δέξεκαθα τῶν Ἐλλήνων τῇ χώρᾳ συνοίκους, nay, Aeneas himself tells him, they have come from Troy, πόλεως δὲ οὗ τῆς ἀδανστάχτης ἐν Ἐλληνον. So this is the famous foedus aequum between Latinus and Aeneas, the Romanae stirpis origo as Vergil calls it, describing the solemn promises of the Trojan leader to the Latins as follows: non ego nec Teucris Italos parere iubebo, nec mihi regna peto, paribus se legibus ambae invictae gentes aeterna in foedera mittant.

The summa of this imperium sollemne, the spear, is in fact in the hands of Latinus. This definition of the old alliance could never be more actual for Rome than in 209 B.C. when the socii Latini wanted to abandon it, as Livy amply attests, especially since the same authority informs us that this coincided with a quite unusual drain on the gold reserve of the aenarium sanctum. H. Willers starting from entirely different premises, dated this gold issue exactly in this year. He made the fine observation that a descendant of the gens Veturia a hundred years later renewed this coin-type (pl. 6, 7-8), on the ground that in 209 B.C., when our foedus-scene reminded the Latins of their ancestral piety and duties, the praetor L. Veturius was one of the most important personalities. A coherent complement to the oath-scenes is given by the hitherto misunderstood obverse (pl. 6,1-4). The alliance with Latinus was imposed on Aeneas by the dii Penates; similarly a later coin-type with the sow of Lavinium shows on the obverse the heads of these D(ii) P(enate) P(ublici) with their laurel-wreath (pl. 6,9-10). In our case they are coupled as the two faces of a janiform head, a common practice of Greek iconography, combining two congenial persons or even an anthithetic couple into a double unit. The prominent role of this youthful double head, which appears also on the silver quadrigati in the Hannibalic war, is now easy to understand; the Penates were the most venerable protectors not only of Rome, but also of the Latins.

Vergil's picture of the foedus-ceremony has still another detail which must be discussed here. Latinus does not hold a spear but a scepter, like is well established.

243 Cf. Alföldi, Reiteradel (supra n. 16) 49 sqq.
244 Ad. Furtwängler, Beschreibung der geschlittenen Steine im Antiquarium (Berlin 1896) 74 no. 1135-1136. H. Willers, op. cit. (supra n. 241) 323.
245 Aen. 7.45 sqq.
246 ibid. 7.166.
247 ibid. 11.237.
248 ibid. 11.410 and 11.469.
250 Dion. Hal. 1.57-3. 251 ibid. 1.57-4.
254 Literature and details are to be found in: Aust, Roschers Mythol. Lex. II 1904 sqq. W. Schur, Kl. 17 (1921) 45 sqq. and W. Schur, RE 12.930 sqq. who thought this foedus was a late fiction. But we know now that the legend of Trojan origin was not only very old in Latium, cf. my paper Die trojanischen Uralten der Römer (Rektoratsprogramm der Universität Basel 1956 [1957]), but it was also used as a token of nobility by the Roman State at least since the attack of Pyrrhus; thus, the possibility of this allegory at the time of the issue of our coin-type sacra deosque dabo; socer arma Latinus habeto, imperium sollemne socer.

255 Cf. op. cit. (supra n. 241) 320 sqq.
256 Sydenham, op. cit. (supra n. 45) 6 nos. 69-70 and R. Thomsen, Actes du Congrès International de Numismatique, Paris 1953, II (1957) 193 sqq. would place this emission rather in the beginning of the Second Punic War; cf. also R. Thomsen, Early Roman Coinage I (Copenhagen 1957) 91 sqq. But I am not convinced that the Mars-eagle series (Sydenham 25 no. 256 sqq.) is later than the oath-scene issue, and I wonder whether the first one could not be, as Willers and others supposed, the earliest Roman gold emission.

257 Dion. Hal. 1.57-4. 258 I previously noted that Janus or Fontus are wrong explanations (Essays-Mattingly 68), but I overlooked the right solution given here.
Achilles in the Iliad: *dextra sceptrum nam forte gerebat.* The ancient commentators had already connected this passage with the staff preserved in the small temple of Jupiter Feretrius. Servius noted on this passage: *ut autem sceptrum adhibeatur ad foedera, haec ratio est, quia maiores semper simulacrum Iovis adhibebant: quod cum taediosum esset, praecipue quando fiebant foedera cum longe positis crum Iouis adhibebant: quod cum taediosum esset, Servius noted: *Feretrius luppiter festus* relies on the same source when he says: *Feretrius Iuppiter . . . ex cuius templo sumebant sceptrum, per quod iurarent, et lapidem silicem, quo foedus ferirent.*

But the oath-scene of the gold coins from 209 B.C. makes it certain that Latinus, in the older and better tradition, did not swear on a scepter, but on the spear. And it was not only Latinus who did so. When a staff was preserved for this purpose in the oldest sanctuary of Jupiter on the Capitol this was certainly not a *pars pro toto* of the attire of Jupiter, who had no image at all in this particular cult, but it was simply an archaic *hasta praestusa,* *igne durata,* consisting only of wood. We need not follow the cheap wisdom of the antiquarians who made a scepter of it. The venerable wooden spear belonged not to Feretrius, but to the war-gods;

Polybios attests that the Romans swore a treaty with Carthage invoking Mars and Quirinus besides Jupiter Feretrius as divine witnesses of their oath. Also because the ritual of the *spolia opima* connected with the same shrine is offered to the triad Jupiter-Mars-Quirinus, there can be no doubt about the antiquity of the participation of the gods of the spear in the archaic ceremony of the *foedus,* nor that the presence of the spear was due to their role.

The ritual object connected with Jupiter Feretrius was not the spear, but the *lapis silex,* with which the sow was killed. Servius (*Aen.* 8.641) explains this as follows: *a fetialibus inventum (est) ut (porta) silice feriretur ea causa quod antiqui Iovis signum lapidem silicem putaverunt esse.* This is only true in a special sense; they kindled the fire through sparks struck by this sort of stone and thus the silex was regarded as the source of lightning.

The *foedus,* on the other hand, invoked exactly the thrower of the thunderbolt: *audiat haec genitor, qui foedera fulmine sancti, King Latinus pronounces in Vergil,* and we know the old formula of self-execration, connected with this invocation of Jupiter Feretrius. "*Audi . . . Iuppiter, si (populus Romanus) prior defexit publico consilio dolo malo, tum tu ille Despiter populum Romanum sic ferito ut ego hunc porcum hic Hodie fieriam . . . Id ubi dixit porcum saxo silice percussit.*"

The spear watching over the oath is held by the king on the gold coins of 209 B.C.; but it could have this function also without such a human support, simply stuck in the earth. This must be the interpretation of the collective oath in front of a standard, the skeleton and essence of which was the *fasta* (pl. 6,5-6). Such is the ensign with flying ribbon, corresponding to the manipular *signum* of the Romans, under which the *conjuratio* of the peoples of Italy in the Social War is represented on their own coinage. I think we must ascribe the same role to the *vesillum* used when an unforeseen menace of war occurred, though Servius does not expressly mention it, when he elucidates the hoisting of the flag on the arch. *aut certe si esset tumultus, id est bellum Italicum vel Gallicum, in quibus ex pecori villiter eccidit timor multus, quia singulos interrogare non vacabat, qui fuerat ducturus exercitu ibat ad Capitolium et exinde proferens duo vexilla, unum russeum, quod pedites evocabat, et unum caeruleum, quod mat equitum exercitum ibat ad Capitolium et exinde proferens duo vexilla, unum russeum, quod pedites evocabat, et unum caeruleum, quod mat equitum* and *this function also without such a human support, simply stuck in the earth. This must be the interpretation of the collective oath in front of a standard, the skeleton and essence of which was the *hasta* (pl. 6,5-6). Such is the ensign with flying ribbon, corresponding to the manipular *signum* of the Romans, under which the *conjuratio* of the peoples of Italy in the Social War is represented on their own coinage.*
vexillum was fixed; the spear was in this case the superhuman witness and warrant of the sacra-
mentum militiae. We also know that the “mana” of the spear was linked with the war-gods in histori-
cal times: pro Marte Romanos hastam ~oluisse.~~~

We possess, I think, a third variety of the divine spear, watching over the sanctity of the oath: this
is the mosaic of the Villa Borghese, pl. 3,2, hitherto explained in another way.277 Three men278 stand
around a boar, holding it with their left hands, and pointing to its body with an arrow in their right
hands in the same way as do the patres patrati of the foedus with their swords on the oath-scenes we
have discussed (pl. 6,1-10). The arrows are to be pointing to its body with an arrow in their right
hands in the same way as do the patres patrati of the foedus with their swords on the oath-scenes we
have discussed (pl. 6,1-10). The arrows are to be

DIVINE SPEARS IN EARLY GREECE

Traces of the belief in the supernatural power of the spear in Greece have been assembled many
times since the days of C. Boetticher. But our leading
authority in matters of Greek religion, Martin Nilsson, denies them any significance.279 He is of
course right when he says that such a fetish had but very restricted importance in the classical epoch.
But to contest the religious awe for a spear invoked by an oath, to suppose that an incidental cultual
veneration of such a weapon in Hellenistic times is to be taken only as a late aberration without bearing
on the whole problem, or to impute the cult of a spear in Chaireonela solely to the superstitious feel-
ings raised by the incidental discovery of an old tomb—all these assumptions are not well enough
established and above all they disregard the evi-
dence for pre-classical times. This evidence alone concerns us here; it reveals common roots with
those of Rome for the occult force of the spear.

A testimony worthy of most serious consideration escaped the notice of Nilsson, whose brilliant
achievements no one holds in higher esteem than the writer of this study.280 The story about the spear-cult of Kaineus, known hitherto only from troubled sources in the scholia of the Iliad281 and
Apollonios Rhodios,282 is now attested by a papyrus-
fragment of Akusilaos of Argos, an authority of the
sixth century B.C.:283 Δέγει γάρ περὶ Καυνῆς οὖτως: Καυνή δὲ τῇ Ἑλλάτῳ μισθαγὲν Ποσειδῶν, ἐπει'α ... τοῦ αὐτὸν Ποσειδῶν ἄνδρα ἀτρωνον, ἱσχύν ἔχουσα μεγίστην τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν τότε, καὶ ὅτε ταύτων κεντούσῃ στήριξη ἡ καλκός, ἥλικεν καλμοῦτα χρημάτων. καὶ γίγνεται βασιλέως οὗτος Δασιβέως καὶ τοῖς Κενταύριοις πολεμεύσκει. ἐπει'α στήσας ἄκοντ' ἔν ἀγωρά
θεν ἕκλειεν ἄριμμεν. Θεοίζω δ' οὐκ ἤτιν [ἀρε-
stόν καὶ] Ζεὺς ίδων αὐτὸν ταύτα ποιοῦτα ἀπελεῖ καὶ ἐφορμᾶ τοὺς Κενταύρους, κάκενίν αὐτὸν κατα-
κόπτοντων ὅρθαι κατὰ γῆς καὶ ἀνώθεν πέτρῃ ἐπίθεται σήμα, καὶ ἀποβηνησκε. This story is a
moralizing tale condemning an archaic ritual and
admonishing the people to restrict their veneration
for the Olympian gods. This struggle of the classical
Greek religion against ancient beliefs in fetishes,
attested as early as the sixth century B.C. through
Aokusilaos, is a peremptory proof of the previous
existence of the spear-cult; the struggle continues
in later centuries. It must be stressed that not only
the ritual veneration but also the oath by the spear
was regarded in the classical epoch as ἔβρως, con-
tempt of the gods. Aischylus says of the Arcadian
Parthenopaios:284 ὅμως δ' αἰχμὴν ἓν ἔχει, μᾶλλον

---

278 Varro by Arnob. 6.11; cf. Trogus by Justin. 43.3.3 and our remarks above; cf. Friedr. Schwenck, ArchRW 20 (1920/21) 299 sqq.
277 R. Herbig, RM 40 (1925) 289 sqq. (with the previous literature) following a suggestion of W. Otto, takes the scene as the ceremonial goat-skin-beating by the Salii. He writes on p. 300: “zwischen sich . . . halten sie . . . ein dunkelbraunes Fell mit schwarzen Zotteln. Die herabhängenden Füße mit ge-
spaltenen Hufen zeigen, dass es ein Ziegenfell sein muss, wenn sie auch etwas wildschweinartig kurz geraten sind.” But the boar also has split hoofs and the skin is surely that of a boar. I think it is not a skin at all, but a boar, the sacrificial animal of the Latins (cf. the reverse of a denarius pl. 6,9-10), held by three
men. The men, on the other hand, do not move their hands as if about to beat the animal, but they are preparing to pierce it with the arrows which they hold. As E. Q. Visconti stated

280 I must admit that I missed this point, too, until my eminent colleague, Harold Cherniss, reminded me of the papyrus quoted
infra (n. 283).
281 Schol. in H. 1.264 (1 p. 40.11-12 Dind.).
282 Schol. in Apoll. Rhod. 1.57.
284 Aisch. Sept. 516 sqq.
The oath by the spear must have been a common practice in early Greece. Apollo, whose attributes are the bow and lyre, but not the spear, and who has nothing to do with the spear, swears on the κρανείων ἀκόντων in the Homeric hymn to Hermes;293 this can only be interpreted as a generally accepted procedure. It is essential to realize that this oath was regarded as a strictly religious endeavor, and therefore a sacrilege from the standpoint of piety toward the gods. We have already seen how the outrage of Parthenopaios is commented upon by Aischylos; in another version of the story of Kaineus, not the worship, but the oath on the spear is the outrage which inflamed the wrath of Zeus.294 The wantonness of Idas by Apollonios Rhodios295 belongs to the same category: ῥάτον νῦν δόρῳ θοῦρον, ὅφερ πείραις ἄνθρωπον κύδος ἐν πολέμοις αἰείμονα, οὐ δὲ μ' ὀφελείς Ζεὺς τόσον, ὀσσάτων περ' ἐμον δόρον, μὴ νῦ τι πῆμα λοίγον ἔσωσθαι, μὴ δ' ἀκραίαντον ἀέθλον Ἰθεόν ἐπομένου, καὶ εἰ θεὸς ἀντώρογον. Idmon296 reproaches him: οὐ δ' ἀτάρθαλα πάμπαν ἔσειται.297

One word must also be said about the oath on the scepter in Homer.298 Achilles certainly does not handle his scepter with awe when he swears on it,299 and when he dashes it down to earth it is not apparent whether this is caused only by his raging passion, as in the case of Telemachos in the Odyssey,300 or whether this, too, belonged originally to the ritual as in the oath on the lapis silex, dramatizing self-condemnation in the case of a perjury. Vergil's paraphrase (Aen. 12.206) interprets this oath thus, the loss of life in his staff representing the fate which would strike him if he violates the oath. But Achilles' swearing is deadly serious: καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὄρκον ὄρμοιμα .... οἱ δὲ τοῖς μεγάς ἔσωσθαι ὄρκος. And the scepter is a venerable object for

293 Ἡμερ. Ἱρμ. 460. Cf. L. Radermacher, Der homerische Hymenuss (SBWien 213 I 1931) 153 sqq. with more modern literature. His attempt to explain away the spear as the stick of a whip is not successful.
294 Ἡμερ. Ἱρμ. 1.57; ἡ Καινεύς ... ἔκλεισεν τοὺς παρὼντας ὄρμηναι εἷς τὸ δόρον αὐτοῦ.
295 Ἡμερ. Ἱρμ. 1.466.
296 Ἡμερ. Ἱρμ. 1.480.
297 Ἡμερ. Ἱρμ. 1.47.
298 Ἡμερ. Ἱρμ. 1.466.
299 Ἡμερ. Ἱρμ. 1.47.
302 Il. 1.233, 237 sqq., 239.
303 Od. 2.355 sqq.
It would be very attractive to pursue the role of the hasta in Byzantium too; that this continuation really existed has been recently underlined by J. Deeß. Such a new study could also decide the problem, whether the "Vortragslanze" of the medieval German kings and emperors was an independent phenomenon, as has been supposed, or was influenced—as I think it was—by the Roman hasta, the significance of which has not hitherto been realized. For such an analysis there is now an excellent new basis in the broadly conceived work of my dear friend Percy E. Schramm. A comparison of our results with the staff as symbol of royalty in the Near East would also not be without interest. But this task must be an enterprise of others who are better equipped for it than the writer of this modest sketch.

APPENDIX

DESCRIPTION OF THE TYPES OF HASTA AS EMBLEM OF POWER (pl. 10, figs. 1-48)

Our pictorial survey of types needs only a few remarks with indication of provenience.

Fig. 1: The divine spear in the hand of king Latinus on the gold coins struck during the Second Punic War (pl. 6,1-4) and the spearhead on early denarius.804

Fig. 2: Spearhead as monetary mark on an early denarius (pl. 2.1-4).

Fig. 3: The spear as summa imperii, a mark of control on the obverse, with the scepter on the reverse of a denarius of L. Papius, dated by H. A. Grueber805 to the year 80 B.C., by Babelon806 to 79 B.C. and by E. A. Sydenham807 to 78-77 B.C.

Fig. 4: The spear as badge of power with the rudder as symbol of felicitas on an engraved gem with the head of Asinius Pollio, ca. 42 B.C.808

Fig. 5: The same as control mark (pl. 5,2) on the obverse of a denarius of M. Volteius M. f. aedilis in 82 B.C.809 Another spear of the same shape is on the denarius of L. Papius (pl. 4,7), also as control mark, with a phalera on the reverse.

Fig. 6: The spear as badge of imperium with the litus on both sides of the head of DIVOS IVLIVS on the concave reverse of a projected coin-issue in Bologna, with the head of the

801 Hom. II. 10.319 sqq. 328 sqq. Arist. Polis. 3.9.7 (1285 B) had in mind this passage mentioning that δ' ἔδωκεν ὑπὲρ τοῦ σηματου ἑκάσταρι in the case of the ancient kings.
802 BZ 50 (1957) 427 sqq.
804 Sydenham, op.cit. (supra n. 45) nos. 152-153 and 222-224.
805 Grueber, op.cit. (supra n. 305) I 388 sqq. places this series in the year 78 B.C., Babelon, op.cit. (supra n. 45) II 582 in 88 B.C., Sydenham, ibid. (supra n. 45) 127 no. 774 sqq. DIVI FILIVS on the concave obverse. This type certainly existed, as the next drawing shows; however, the representation on a coin-die which we intended to reproduce proved to be not only different, but also fictitious. Cf. n. 46.
806 E. Babelon, op.cit. (supra n. 45) II 279 no. 1.
807 Sydenham, op.cit. (supra n. 45) 127 no. 773.
808 Cf. pl. 5,1.
809 Grueber, op.cit. (supra n. 305) I 388 sqq. places this series in the year 78 B.C., Babelon, op.cit. (supra n. 45) II 582 in 88 B.C., Sydenham, ibid. (supra n. 45) 127 no. 774 sqq.
810 C. Cichorius, Die Reliefs der Trajanssäule (Berlin 1896-1900) Bild no. 346.
811 ibid. Bild no. 66.
812 Grueber, op.cit. (supra n. 305) II 388 sqq. Babelon, op.cit. (supra n. 45) II 513 no. 4. Sydenham, ibid. (supra n. 45) 120 no. 747 sqq. I wish to return to the chronology of this rich series.
813 A. Alfeldi, Die Kontorniaten (Budapest 1942/43) pl. 42, 10.
Fig. 12: Similar spear on the conical top of a grave-monument in Lyons. The spearhead was, we think, only painted and not cut in low relief like the other parts of the object, but could not be absent, being the most essential part of the emblem. The two circular discs under the spearpoint of figs. 10-11 reveal themselves as containing the two letters B(e)C(iarius) (cos(Rul)) or a similar abbreviated rendering of the rank of the official to whom it belonged.

Fig. 13: Ovoid spearhead with an oblique incision on both sides, diagonally opposed to each other and with a little round hole on their inner ends. Original length ca. 60 cm. It was found in a sanctuary with two other still bigger spearheads and with a huge tabula in Kleinwinterhein with the inscription of A. Didius Gallus Fabricius Veiento, consul the third time under Domitian. This colossal spear was not intended for practical purposes, but was a votive offering. Its type with the incisions is the same as that of the imperial spear-attribute of Domitian himself, fig. 18. Thus this votive spear imitates the præcinctio insignis of power, in this case that of the governor.

Fig. 14: Bronze fibula with silver coat, found in Mainz, with the same lateral incisions on the spearhead.

Fig. 15: Big iron spearhead with a prolonged rod-like point and the same incisions, from Noricum; found in St. Peter in Holz, preserved in the Museum of Klagenfur.

Fig. 16: Spearhead in miniature, in which two broader lateral incisions are cut, on leather. It was found in Vindonissa and is preserved in the Vindonissa-Museum at Brugg, Switzerland.

Fig. 17: Spearhead with oblique incisions on the top of the standard of an auxiliary troop represented on the tombstone of Cancelleria in Rome.

Fig. 18: The spear-attribute of Domitian departing on a northern campaign, pl. 7. Relief found in the Palazzo della Cancelleria in Rome.

Fig. 19: Silver fibula from Weisenau, Germany. Under an anchor—a nice allusion to advancement in the army—a spear is represented between two swords. The spear has a horizontal rod over the point, two round holes in the middle of the laurel-leaf-shaped spearhead and a small tabula ansata. The type of the swords indicates (in the sense of the argument of J. Hundt) a date around 200 A.D., the more important because details of the type just described occur on a number of the varieties known (figs. 23-24, figs. 31-36, 45 show the horizontal strokes for the visible "bâtonnet" of the shaft and of Ritterling who describes the "Stange."


319 This against the opinion of Esperandieu who mentions the visible "bâtonnet" of the shaft and of Ritterling who describes the "Stange."

320 Behrens, op.cit. (supra n. 112) 8 sqq.; fig. 18, 11; cf. fig. 16 (the inscription just mentioned).

321 ibid. 19 no. 2 and fig. 18,4.

322 ibid. 19 no. 1 and fig. 18,2.

323 ibid. 5 and fig. 18,6.


325 Cf. supra. Further literature by Behrens (supra n. 112) 19 no. 4 who wrongly describes it as "die Lanze eines Centurionen."

326 Wiedutsche Zeitschrift 10 (1891) 399 with pl. 513. Behrens (supra n. 112) 20 no. C. 1, who takes the anchor as "dachförmi ge Spitze, die dem Aufbau Halt gibt."


328 Cf. fig. 2,39 and CIL VII 517; Behrens (supra n. 112) above the point. Fig. 24 and figs. 28-36 have the tabula ansata. Figs. 21-24 and figs. 24-45 have the two holes. The small tablet below the spearhead was regarded by Behrens as bearing the name or rank of the official to whom it belonged, an attractive hypothesis indeed. The two holes occur also on the spearheads of standards. This type generally belongs to the middle Empire.

Fig. 20: Fragment of a decorative spearhead of iron, found in the Roman fortress of Niederbieber; the exact form is unknown.

Fig. 21: Spear-ensign of a speculator pl. 92 from Belgrade. The execution of the relief makes it unlikely that the spear would be an exact typological reproduction.

Fig. 22: Big iron spearhead from the limes-fortress of Pflündern in Germany.

Fig. 23: Reproduction of the decorative spear-emblem of the speculator L. Valerius Augustalis on his tombstone, from Salona. We find here, instead of the horizontal stroke above the point, two short thorns directed obliquely upwards on both sides.

Fig. 24: Decorative spear of a similar type, carved on one of the lateral slabs of the grave-ediculum of an unknown official (likely of the legio II adiutrix).

Fig. 25: Spearhead, engraved on the left side of the altar of Clodius Marcius, fragmentarius of the legion VII Gemina, from Ponc Aeni (Pfaffenlohe).

Fig. 26: Official with spear-ensign from Perinthus, first half of the third century A.D.

Fig. 27: Miniature spearhead, Museum in Olten, Switzerland. It shows "wings" under the laurel-shaped point and besides the two round holes, triangular and round openwork-decoration (imitated).

Fig. 28: Miniature spearhead from Cannstadt, likely to have been an ornament fixed on leather. I doubt that the two scrolls under the socket belonged to it; I suspect this is an irresponsible addition which has nothing to do with the spear-type.

Fig. 29: Miniature bronze spear-emblem, with abnormally elongated point. The horizontal rod above the laurel-leaf-shaped blade has a lateral volute on both sides; below the blade is a tabula ansata.

Fig. 30: Similar spearhead of the same provenience, without the tabula ansata, but with a crest on the top.

Fig. 31: Miniature spear-head from Versec-Vlaëc in Yugo-

328 Catologo dell' Museo dell' Impero Romano. Supplemento al Catologo della Mostra Augusta della romanità (Rome 1943) 95 no. 15. F. Magi, op.cit. 85, with the inexact drawing fig. 63. Behrens, op.cit. (supra n. 112) 20 no. B. 1 and fig. 20.

329 Behrens, ibid. (supra n. 112) 20 no. B.2 and fig. 21.

330 CIL III 5579; the special literature is to be found in Ritterling (supra n. 111) 13 with fig. 5.

331 IOAlBeibl 1 (1899) 117 fig. 28; Ritterling (supra n. 111) 13 fig. 4.

332 Historisches Museum in Olten. Published by Behrens, op.cit. (supra n. 112) 21 no. 14.

333 OQL 59, p. 27 and pl. 8,23. G. Behrens, op.cit. (supra n. 112) 21 no. 10 and fig. 22,15.

334 Behrens, ibid. (supra n. 112) 21 no. 13 and fig. 22/18; Museum in Portogruaro.

335 ibid. fig. 22,19.
slavia,\footnote{ibid. fig. 22,17.} found in Pálánka (Banat). We find a small lanceolate point above the blade; besides the horizontal rods above and below the blade, there is one more stroke under the latter. The two "eyes" are also to be mentioned. The same general type is represented also by our types nos. 32, 33 and 35.

Fig. 32: Miniature spearhead, found in Wallstadt (Museum Mannheim), originally suspended on a ring as a hanging ornament.\footnote{ORL 74 pl. 22 and pl. 4,13. Behrens, ibid. (supra n. 112) 21 no. 11 and fig. 22,16. Cf. also H.-J. Hundt, op.cit. (supra n. 342) fig. 1,4.} Similar pieces were noticed by G. Behrens from the fortress Zugmantel,\footnote{Behrens, ibid. (supra n. 112) 20 no. 8 and fig. 22,13.} from the Saalburg,\footnote{ORL Abteilung A II 200 and pl. 17,12. Behrens, ibid. (supra n. 112) fig. 22,9.} from Stockstadt\footnote{ORL Abteilung A II 199 and pl. 17,12. Behrens, ibid.} and from Osterburken.\footnote{ibid. fig. 23,12.}

Fig. 33: Similar miniature hanging ornament from Heddernheim.\footnote{ORL 74 pl. 22 and pl. 4,13. Behrens, ibid. (supra n. 112) 21 no. 11 and fig. 22,16. Cf. also H.-J. Hundt, op.cit. (supra n. 342) fig. 1,4.}

Fig. 34: Similar miniature spearhead, without the second blade on the top, from the fortress of Kösching.\footnote{ibid. fig. 22,17.}

Fig. 35: Similar miniaturesp-ornament from Osterburken.\footnote{ibid. fig. 23,12.}

Fig. 36: Similar piece ending in a pelta-shaped ornament on the top, known from the Wetterau-limes and Osterburken.\footnote{ibid. fig. 23,12.}

The following types have a broader, circular contour instead of a laurel-leaf-shaped blade. They seem to represent a secondary development.

Fig. 37: Open-work bronze ornament, once applied on leather, from Zugmantel.\footnote{ORL 74 pl. 22 and pl. 4,13. Behrens, ibid. (supra n. 112) 21 no. 11 and fig. 22,16. Cf. also H.-J. Hundt, op.cit. (supra n. 342) fig. 1,4.}

Fig. 38: Spear-ensign of a beneficiarius consularis from Vinxtbach.\footnote{ibid. fig. 22,17.}

Fig. 39: Top of a vexillum of similar shape from Zugmantel, wrought of iron, with an iron cross-bar. Ritterling may be right that it did not belong to a military formation but to a collegium.\footnote{ibid. fig. 22,17.}

Fig. 40: Standard of a collegium, based on the same round ornamental spear-type with two eyes as above, from the Musée Calvet, Avignon.\footnote{ibid. fig. 22,17.}

The following drawings exemplify another shape of these spear-ensigns with two superimposed blades.

Fig. 41: Similar standard from Alcudia, Mallorca.\footnote{ibid. fig. 22,17.}

Fig. 42: Spear-ensign found in Ehl an der Ill and preserved in Wiesbaden. It is of iron and bronze,\footnote{ORL 74 pl. 22 and pl. 4,13. Behrens, ibid. (supra n. 112) 21 no. 11 and fig. 22,16. Cf. also H.-J. Hundt, op.cit. (supra n. 342) fig. 1,4.} 91 cm. high.

Fig. 43: Spear-ensign of same type as fig. 42, on a relief illustrating Trajan's Dacian victories built into the triumphal arch of Constantine in Rome, pl. 7,2. The spear-ensign is engraved in outline in the background of the battle scene, i.e. it is not employed in the actual fighting and it does not follow the Emperor himself, but is carried some distance from the battle. There is another corresponding spear engraved in outline on the other slab of the same battle relief, mentioned by Magi, but not visible in the photographs.\footnote{ibid. fig. 22,17.}

Fig. 44: Original iron spear-ensign from the Roman fortress of Weissenburg a.S.; length 44 cm.\footnote{ibid. fig. 22,17.}

Fig. 45: Similar spear with two superimposed heart-shaped blades, reproduced on the grave-altar of a beneficiarius consularis from Salona.\footnote{ibid. fig. 22,17.} The type with the horizontal rod on the top of the upper blades reminds us of the types nos. 31-35; it could mark the transition from these shapes to the rounder doubled ones in nos. 42-44.

Fig. 46: Manipular standard represented on the coins of C. Valerius Flaccus (pl. 1,1) and on those of the two Pompeian consuls of 49 B.C.

Fig. 47: Similar standard used by the Italians in the Social War (pl. 6,5-6).

Fig. 48: Vexillum with spearhead on its top; mint-mark on the denarii of L. Papius and L. Roscius Fabatus (pl. 4,1-4).
1. Cippus from Chiusi

1. Relief found under the Palazzo Cancellaria, Vatican

2. Trajanic relief in the Arch of Constantine
1. Relief from the Arco di Portogallo

2. Steatite cup from Hagia Triada

3. Proto-Attic vase, Berlin
2. Tombstone of a 'speculator' in Belgrade

3. Denarius of Porcius Laeca

1. Tombstone of Pintius in Bonn
Figs. 1-48. Types of *hasta* as emblem of power