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17. Tac. Ann. 1, 24, 1. They may well have been accompanied by some of the Praetorian
cavalry and the German bodyguards (Ann. 1, 24, 2). Wellesley (art. cit., 25) rejects the supposition,
also advanced by Brunt (JRS 51, 1961, 238), that the main body of troops left Rome before
Drusus. He believes that evidence of haste would have provided Tacitus with a gibe too good to
miss. Yet this is mere assumption; and there is nothing in Tacitus' narrative, which omits all
details of the journey to Pannonia, to prove that Drusus and the troops travelled together. Nor is
Wellesley convincing on the difficulties of arranging a rendezvous. For an answer to Wellesley's
final point—Tiberius' reasons for wanting Drusus to be present at the meeting of the senate—see
below.

19. 57, 3, 1.

University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg

LOIS DU TOIT

CONSTANTINE AND CRISPUS, A.D. 326

The execution of Crispus in 326 was an episode surrounded by obscurity in antiquity; it has received some attention from modern scholarship, but without much positive result. The discussion which follows attempts to break some new ground in proposing that the usual explanations of treason, adultery or palace plots do not meet the circumstances depicted by what evidence is available, but rather that Crispus was detected in the use of magic, and had his position and activities misrepresented to Constantine.

The starting point for this study was an article published in 1966, in which Patrick Guthrie advanced a novel if unconvincing explanation for the sudden removal of the Caesar.1 He based his argument on the pervasive post-eventum theory of Eusebius that Constantine's central concern in his position as vice-gerent of God on earth was the justification of the possession of his absolute temporal powers by exercising them in the interests of his subject. An important part of the justification, Guthrie suggested, would therefore rest on the transmission of the imperial powers to legitimate heirs; Crispus in his view was illegitimate and could not succeed, and because he would therefore be a very serious embarrassment to the legitimate sons, was executed in a dynastic murder.2 This kind of argument can only be sustained if it can be shown that the legitimate transmission of his powers did in fact exercise Constantine to the extent that his possibly illegitimate and very successful son would need to be got rid of in order to protect and advance the interests of the much younger but legitimate sons; further, evidence would have to be led showing that there is a direct connection between the Eusebian Constantine's ideological role as emperor and the record of his personal conduct—and such evidence does not exist.

133
The legitimacy problem must be disposed of first. The real upshot of the biographer-panegyrist Eusebius' presentation is that Constantine wields authority on earth on God's behalf and with his approval. The transmission of this authority clearly must be a matter of concern to a ruler so distinctively marked out, but legitimacy or otherwise of birth appears to pose no problem. Eusebius makes the point that the law of nature requires dynastic succession, in that just as Constantine received his powers from his father, he is passing it on to his sons and their descendants, θεσμὸς φύσεως. In practice, Constantine did not regard the θεσμὸς φύσεως as restrictively meaning that only legitimate sons descended from himself could inherit imperial power, since at his death divisions of the empire were to be administered by the three surviving sons, Constantine II, Constantius II and Constans, and by his half-brother's sons, Delmatius and Hannibalianus (this last receiving the important client-kingdom of Armenia): there is no close monopoly of legitimacy here. It would be a surprising inconsistency, moreover, if it were solely on the grounds of illegitimacy that Constantine were to abandon Crispus, a clearly-designated and apparently able successor-son in favour of untested children years younger. With that issue out of the way, the next question is Constantine's attitude towards his family and the career of Crispus. It is quite true that Constantine was interested in the problems surrounding family life: he shows it in the hard-line legislation preventing bastards from inheriting anything from their fathers, and associated with this is the divorce legislation; his concern in both areas is attributed by Jones to the progressive Christianisation in Constantine's thinking. But, ironically, on both these scores Constantine was personally on unsure ground. For instance, we cannot be certain that his mother Helena was married to Constantius Chlorus, and even if she were, she would have had to be divorced to allow Constantius to marry Theodora. In any case, because of her humble origins, she was certainly kept in the background until her son created her Augusta in November 324. Dispute also exists over the legality of Constantine's own first union, with Minervina the mother of Crispus: whatever her formal legal status, she too was not allowed to share in Constantine's rise and was definitively out of the family circle once he married Maximian's younger daughter Fausta in 307.

Minervina's son though was from adolescence marked out for substantial advancement—at age 14, in 317, he was created Caesar, along with his infant half-brother Constantine II and his cousin Licinius II; in 318, 321 and 324 (at age 15, 18 and 21) he held the consulship; he was nominal head of the government of Gaul (obviously, professionally assisted by a praefectus praetorio), and achieved military success; in 324, he materially contributed to Constantine's last campaign against Licinius. Crispus continued his rise in status, right to the end of his life figuring prominently on both the gold and the bronze coinage (our only source), and manifestly superior to Constantine II. His whereabouts during 325 cannot be positively identified: he did not apparently return to the West, so presumably accompanied Constantine and the court at the vicennalia celebration.
must be disposed of first. The real upshot ofather was that Constantine wielded authority in and with his approval. The transmission of this matter of concern to a ruler so distinctively markedwise of birth appears to pose no problem. Eusebius of nature requires dynastic succession, in that just powers from his father, he is passing it on to his sons θεόν φίλης. In practice, Constantine did not θεόν φίλης. In practice, Constantine did not as restrictively meaning that only legitimate sons would inherit imperial power, since at his death divisions administered by the three surviving sons, Constantine's sons, and by his half-brother's sons, Delmatius and receiving the important client-kingship of Armenia: polity of legitimacy here. It would be a surprising if it were solely on the grounds of illegitimacy that don Crispus, a clearly-designated and apparently able fostered Christians years younger. the way, the next question is Constantine's attitude toward, and the career of Crispus. It is quite true that Constantine was surrounding family life: he shows it in the hard-liners from inheriting anything from their fathers, and the divo legislation; his concern in both areas is the progressive Christianisation in Constantine's on both these scores Constantine was personally on one, we cannot be certain that his mother Helena was Aulus, and even if she were, she would have had to be Tius to marry Theodora. In any case, because of her certainly kept in the background until her son created her 324. Dispute also exists over the legality of ion, with Minervina the mother of Crispus: whatever too was not allowed to share in Constantine's rise and the family circle once he married Maximian's younger was from adolescence marked out for substantial in 317, he was created Caesar, along with his infant I and his cousin Licinius II; in 318, 321 and 324 (at the consulship; he was nominal head of the govern- profession assisted by a praefectus praetorio), and 324, he materially contributed to Constantine's last. Crispus continued his rise in status, right to the omen of both the gold and the bronze coinage finesty superior to Constantine II. His whereabouts were identified: he did not apparently return to the impane Constantine and the court at the vicennalia celebrations commencing at Nicomedia on 25 July 325. This would accord with the precedent of the quinquennalia when the Caesars had clearly joined their father at Sirmium in early 321 for the opening of their own almost overlapping quinquennalia. Much the same can be said for the first half of 326, with the progress of the court westwards to Rome, where Crispus met and obviously impressed Helena, who had been living there quietly since 312. But at some point after the vicennalia year ended and the court had left Rome to return to Sirmium by way of Milan, Crispus was spirited away from court across the Adria, to be suddenly executed at Pola in Istria. Shortly afterwards followed the deaths of the empress Fausta and of others. But in a reign stigmatised by few such executions of high officials, Crispus' removal seems inexplicable.

Many explanations for his fall have been advanced, ranging from simple treason to more prurient combinations of adultery and palace plots. But basically all have to be speculative, since Crispus and (soon afterwards) Fausta met their ends without trial or publicity; both suffered a form of damnatio memoriae and were not rehabilitated in Constantine's lifetime. Eusebius, usually the most informed and detailed source, is here almost useless, while others give little enough solid fact under their cloaks of guesswork. Proven or plausible charges of adultery and/or treason are spectacular enough to have been made much of by contemporaries, since in one area Constantine's own personal morality and the moral legislation emphasise his attitudes, while treason detected and avoided would be a useful whipping-boy for panegyric. A few tempting suggestions are given by Eutropius, making the palace-polt theory superficially more attractive—apart from Crispus and Fausta, there are Licinius II and numerosi amici. In Zosimus' embroidered and hostile account, clash of interest between Helena and Fausta is responsible for the subsequent elimination of Fausta. The facts of the purge stop there. But if there had genuinely been such an intrigue against the emperor, why is Eusebius so vague, and why does he fail to elaborate material which can only suit his purpose?

It has often been noticed that Eusebius becomes vague and unsatisfactory, or simply silent, when dealing with material that reflects disparagingly on his subject, e.g. Maximian's last desperate 'plot', justifying an official claim of suicide, and the execution of Licinius in Thessalonica, in spite of a promise of safety made at his surrender at Nicomedia. The Crispus execution fits well into this scheme. Constantine's vicennalia were celebrated in 312 in Nicomedia and in 326 in Rome, but Eusebius is much more interested in the religious side of the celebrations and deals only with the Nicomedia material, omitting completely the difficult Italian events. The deliberate nature of this silence suggests that, again, Constantine was in the wrong in the same way as in the earlier incidents. Coupled with the fact that no positively identifiable rehabilitation of Crispus was undertaken, it seems that the whole train of events was acutely embarrassing to the emperor, and silence was subsequently deemed the best course. It is possibly worth noting that in the comparable context of Eusebius' assertion that Maximian really did plot against Constantine's life, he alludes to τών προζ.
γένος ἔτερον who were also caught plotting later—'the other people from the family circle', meaning Bassianus and Senacio whose efforts were revealed to Constantine by God through a dream in 316. The impression created by the use of ἔτερον is suggestive, implying as it could do that there were no others who plotted against him to any dangerous extent. The palace-plot theory and charges of extensive conspiracy centred around Crispus therefore fall away.

Here perhaps it may be appropriate to bring up the matter of Constantine's shortness of temper when crossed: he could be irate on paper when dealing with intransigent people and intractable problems, and there is no doubt that a similar pattern of behaviour would have shown itself on occasion in day-to-day matters. In the aftermath of Nicaea with all its pressures and the hard search for unity, this seems particularly obvious. So, a palace row over an aspect of imperial policy or religious concerns may easily have erupted, and while it should have been transient, in the mind of Constantine it could have taken on the appearance of a plot against him, or been represented by others as one. Religion cannot be ruled out altogether in view of Orosius' remarks—he appends the executions to a passage dealing with measures taken to suppress Arianism, but confesses that the real reasons for the executions are unknown. It could have been a political matter seeing that the younger Licinius was in some way involved (he could have been no more than 11 years old, so that his role was not an active one); Crispus was by now 23, and had found his feet in the world, a man with brilliant prospects: an incident involving an unwise remark, that Constantine was now expendable, for example, would have been particularly enraging in that tense atmosphere.

It is clear that Eutropius' numerosi amici must be an exaggeration. The only known associates of Crispus were his supervisory praefecti praetorio, Vettius Rufinus and his successor in Gaul Iunius Bassus. Neither suffered any obvious impediment to his career: the former was possibly the consul of 323 and thus does not fall into the purview of this study; the latter succeeded Abbladius as PPO of Italy in 329 and reached the consulship in 331. Much more rewarding is a fascinating hypothesis advanced by Barnes: he posits some connection between Crispus' execution and the contemporary exile for adultery and magic of his co-eval Ceionius Rufius Albinus, who early in his exile was unexpectedly recalled and subsequently enjoyed rapid and sustained promotion. Barnes admits that solid evidence for such a connection is lacking. About the adultery, nothing fruitful can be guessed, but the circumstances and consequences of the charge of magic allow speculation that fits the available evidence well. It looks then very much as if a small group around Crispus had overstepped the mark by dabbling in magic to foretell his future career: this must have been discovered by Fausta, who saw the situation as favourable for advancing her sons and passed the information on to Constantine. The information was delicate and difficult to handle, but it appeared trustworthy: its source on an earlier occasion was reputedly instrumental in saving Constantine from her own father. If it was represented as a plot, it required a rapid and secret response without trial.

Subsequent suspicions of Crispus, like that of Fausta, revealed allegations that the execution was not the result of religious motives and that the king was for the most part personal, reflecting his own will. In this, he was not infrequently supported by the local figures, who had long known and feared his temper. This, then, was the first of many signs that the king was becoming more man than god, and that the cult was not long for this world. The purge was thorough, and the king's desire to rule alone and through his own hands was only too evident. This was the end of the cult, and the beginning of the reign of the emperor.
Subsequent suspicions and investigations, perhaps prompted by the anger of Helena, revealed alleged misconduct by Fausta and other associates, and the fact that the execution of Crispus had been a mistake. Regret and silence are characteristics of the sequel: dynastic murder had not been the issue.

NOTES

1. I must acknowledge the generous and helpful criticisms of an earlier version of this paper, made by Professor Averil Cameron of King’s College, London; but the errors which may remain are my own responsibility.


4. Vite Constantini 1. 3; 1. 6; 1. 24; 2. 28. 2–29. 1; Laudes Constantini 3. 4–5; 5. 1 ff.

5. P.C. 1. 2; 21. 2. It is interesting that Zosimus 2. 29. 2 uses the same words, θεομόρφη φύσεως, in his claim that the execution of Crispus was contrary to the law of nature.

6. Eusebius HE 10. 9. 6. Crispus is τὸ πάντα τοῦ πατρὸς δόμου which is as close as Eusebius will get to saying outright ‘his successor’.

7. A.H.M. Jones, Constantine and the conversion of Europe, London (Eng. Univ. Pr.) 1948, 231. CTH 3. 16. 1 (331); 4. 6. 2. 3 (336).

8. Zosimus 2. 6. 2; Victor Caes. 41. 11.


10. J.R. Palanque, 'Chronologie constantinienne', REA 40 (1938) 245 f., and Jones, 60, regard the Minervina as a wife, basing their view on Pan. Lat. 7. 4. 1, which is the earliest reference to the relationship and calls it 'maritimum'. Three items may cast doubt on this:

(a) how is Constantine able to marry Minervina if he was already betrothed to the young Fausta c. 293 (cf. Palanque, 244, referring to Pan. Lat. 7. 6. 2 and 7. 17)?

(b) if Minervina had died before the marriage with Fausta, why is the blameless word 'widower' avoided in the panegyric?

(c) how far can a panegyrist's use, after the event, of the word 'uxoria', 'anima maritale', 'maritimum' be regarded as definitive? Palanque, 247 n.1, even suggests that the projected marriage with Fausta was abandoned during the alienation of Constantius Chlorus and Maximian, but was resurrected 14 years later. More likely is the view that Pan. Lat. 7. 4. 1 could be taken to mean that Constantine's marriageability to a girl of appropriate high rank was designated and committed for him in 293, but in order to safeguard the continentia universally attributed to him, the permanent liaison with Minervina was allowed, cf. the view of her as an inaequalis coniunx advanced by X. Lucien-Brun, 'Minervina, épouse ou concubine?', RAGB (1970) 403.

11. Palanque dates Crispus' birth to 303, most persuasively; J. Vogt, Constantin der Grosse und sein Jahrhundert, München (Münchner Verlag) 1949, 143, less convincingly to 305.

12. Shown by the increasing use of the broken obverse legends particularly after 324, Bruun, RIC 7. 28 etc.


15. Ammianus 14. 11. 20, in a striking collocation with the execution of Gallus in 353. The chronology of court movements around the time of the execution is suggested by Bruun, Studies, 66–7; and RIC 7, 71–2.

16. E.g. Constantine's successor Sopater: Eunapius V/Soph 462–3 and Zosimus 2. 40. 3.

17. CIL 3. 7172; ILS 708, 710; AE (1975) 135; as examples of deletion of one or both names. The abolitio may not have been extensively applied, cf. the retention of the name by the equites.
Crispiani in Britain, Not. Dig. Occ. 40, and a fair number of inscriptions, ILS 712–6, 716–7; AE (1975) 785c; PLRE Crispus 4. Fausta’s rehabilitation occurred soon after Constantine’s death, AE (1952) 107 (337–340), and was strengthened later, Julian Or. 1. 5D, 7D, 2. 51C, and particularly 1. 9B–C. Proven adultery on her part would not have allowed such favourable comment.

18. 10. 6. 3.
19. 2. 29. 2; also Epit. de Caes. 41. 11.
20. VC I. 47. 1; 2. 18. Jones, 135.
21. FC 3. 16.
23. Eutropius mentions the change from his well-known earlier favorabilis animi docilitas, io. 6. 3, as does Zosimus, 2. 29. 1. See in particular Sozomenus HE 2. 21. 3–5, 7–8, both ascribable to the immediate post-Nicaea period.

24. Hist. adv. paganos 7. 28. 23 f., misinterpreted by Guthrie, 329: sed inter hac latet causa, cur vindicem gladium et destinatam in impios punishmentem Constantianus imperat etiam in propriis egoi affectus. nam Crispum filium et Licitum sororis filium interfeci. The sentence nam ... interfeci shows rather than Constantine’s actions were inexplicably directed for the moment against members of the family, not against adherents of Arianism.


Massey University, New Zealand

N.J.E. AUSTIN

LUSTRUM ‘GLANZ’


M.E. bedeutet lustra hier vielmehr ‘Glanz’ oder ‘leuchtendes Vorbild’. Diese Annahme wird durch das ital. lustro ‘Glanz’ gestützt, vgl. Meyer-Lübke, Rom. etym. Wb. Nr. 5184 (wo lat. lustrum ‘Glanz’ merkwürdigerweise nicht mit einem Stern versehen ist; mir sind jedoch keine Belege aus dem oben genannten bekannt). Dieser Gebrauch des Wortes lustrum ist durch Anschluss an illustra. illustris leicht erklärbar; das Verb lustrare ‘illuminare’ wird von Arnaldi, Latinitiae Italicæ medii aevi ... lexicum imperfectum s.v. zweimal belegt. In denselben Acta S. 165 wird Birgitta (im Anschluss an Marc. 4. 4, 21 usw.) lucerna genannt und, was wichtiger ist, im oben zitierten Brief S. 55 ist vom Licht und Glanz der Birgitta viel die Rede; es heisst, der Papst möge sie kanonisieren und uelut ardentem lampadem tantis circumcinctam fulgoribus super candelabrum collocare, ut uelat omnibus et sub eius luminis claritate ... gradiatur.

BENGST LÖFSTEDT

University of California, Los Angeles

BERNADETTE COTTON

HERACLITUS

Callimachus’ epigram on his death:  

Εἰπὲ τις Ἡράκλει  

ἢ γαγεν, ἢ λοιπὸν ἐν λέσχῃ  

ἤλιον ἐν λέσχῃ  

ἔξειν ‘Ἄλλως  

αἰ δὲ τειλ ζώσωμεν  

ἄρα πατησθής

is well known in English from Cory:

They told me, Heraclitus, they told me  

They brought me bitter news, they wept

I wept as I remembered him

Had tired the sun with tears,

And now that thou art lying

A handful of grey ashes, lie,

Still are thy pleasant voices.

For Death, he taketh all away

This, however, loses the brevity with success, to retain in the face

Someone spoke of your death.

To think, my Heraclitus,

So often used to talk of the same

Somewhere some dust is lying

These long long years, Hail.

Yet still your songs are

Your nightingales, which I love

All mortal things from

Cory’s rendering requires that Callimachus had only just heard of Heraclitus’ death, but think it more likely that Callimachus had dissolved into tears on hearing the news, and that he reproduces the sigh with σποτηρία. This is reminiscent of the subject, which has the same simple

Atque in perpetuum, frater.

Could Catullus, an admirer of poetry here by Callimachus’ line?

Durban