

Saint Louis University Interlibrary  
Loan

**Borrower:** TXM



**ILLiad TN:** 212709

**Lending String:** \*XII,VHC,VYF,ILU

**Patron:** Clark, Victor

**Journal Title:** Acta classica.

**Volume:** 23 **Issue:**

**Month/Year:** 1980**Pages:** 133-138

**Article Author:**

**Article Title:** Austin, N.J.E.; Constantine and Crispus,  
A.D. 326

**Imprint:** Kaapstad, A.A. Balkema.

**ILL Number:** 30158708

**Call #:** PA25 .A2 v.23 1980 ^

**Location:** Pius Library NOT  
CHECKD OUT

**OCLC # :** 1967547

**ARIEL**

**Shipping Address:**

Library - ILL Services Office  
Middle Tennessee State University  
1500 Greenland Dr., Box 13  
Murfreesboro, TN 37132

**Fax:** (615) 898-5551

**Ariel:** 161.45.205.82

**Email:** ill@ulibnet.mtsu.edu

16. Tac. *Ann.* 1, 27, 2 'nec multo post digredientem eum a Caesare ac provisu periculi hiberna castra repetentem'. No previous visit to this winter camp is recorded by Tacitus.

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.

18. Pace K. Wellesley, art. cit., 25.

19. *Ann.* 1, 24, 1.

20. Art. cit., 25.

21. Tac. *Ann.* 1, 14, 3.

LOIS DU TOIT

University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg

### 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.<sup>1</sup> He based his argument on the pervasive post-eventum theory of Eusebius that Constantine's central concern in his position as viceroy 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.<sup>2</sup> 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.

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.<sup>3</sup> 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, θεσμῶ φύσεως.<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup>

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.<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup> In any case, because of her humble origins, she was certainly kept in the background until her son created her Augusta in November 324.<sup>8</sup> 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.<sup>9</sup>

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*),<sup>10</sup> and achieved military success; in 324, he materially contributed to Constantine's last campaign against Licinius.<sup>11</sup> 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),<sup>12</sup> 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*

must be disposed of first. The real upshot of the Eusebius' presentation is that Constantine wields authority of his own and with his approval.<sup>3</sup> The transmission of this matter of concern to a ruler so distinctively marked otherwise of birth appears to pose no problem. Eusebius' view of nature requires dynastic succession, in that just as powers from his father, he is passing it on to his sons *κατὰ φύσιν*.<sup>4</sup> In practice, Constantine did not mean as restrictively meaning that only legitimate sons could inherit imperial power, since at his death divisions were administered by the three surviving sons, Constantine, Constans, and by his half-brother's sons, Delmatius and Nepotian (receiving the important client-kingdom of Armenia): the only of legitimacy here. It would be a surprising if it were solely on the grounds of illegitimacy that Crispus, a clearly-designated and apparently able and untested child in years younger.<sup>5</sup>

In any case, the next question is Constantine's attitude towards the career of Crispus. It is quite true that Constantine was concerned with surrounding family life: he shows it in the hard-line towards inheriting anything from their fathers, and the divorce legislation; his concern in both areas is the progressive Christianisation in Constantine's reign. On both these scores Constantine was personally concerned, we cannot be certain that his mother Helena was glorious, and even if she were, she would have had to be content to marry Theodora.<sup>7</sup> In any case, because of her position, she was certainly kept in the background until her son created Crispus in 324.<sup>8</sup> Dispute also exists over the legality of Crispus' position, with Minervina the mother of Crispus: whatever her status, she was not allowed to share in Constantine's rise and the family circle once he married Maximian's younger

Crispus was from adolescence marked out for substantial success. In 317, he was created Caesar, along with his infant brother, Constantine II and his cousin Licinius II; in 318, 321 and 324 (at the consulship; he was nominal head of the government, professionally assisted by a *praefectus praetorio*),<sup>10</sup> and in 324, he materially contributed to Constantine's last years.<sup>11</sup> Crispus continued his rise in status, right to the top. He was prominently on both the gold and the bronze coinage and was manifestly superior to Constantine II. His whereabouts were clearly identified: he did not apparently return to the East. He accompanied Constantine and the court at the *vicennalia*

celebrations commencing at Nicomedia on 25 July 325. This would accord with the precedent of the *quindecennalia* when the Caesars had clearly joined their father at Sirmium in early 321 for the opening of their own almost overlapping *quinquennalia*.<sup>13</sup> 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.<sup>14</sup> 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 Adriatic, to be suddenly executed at Pola in Istria.<sup>15</sup> 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.<sup>16</sup>

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.<sup>17</sup> 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-plot theory superficially more attractive—apart from Crispus and Fausta, there are Licinius II and *numerosi amici*.<sup>18</sup> In Zosimus' embroidered and hostile account, clash of interest between Helena and Fausta is responsible for the subsequent elimination of Fausta.<sup>19</sup> 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.<sup>20</sup> The Crispus execution fits well into this scheme. Constantine's *vicennalia* were celebrated in 325 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.<sup>21</sup> 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 τῶν πρὸς

γένους ἕτεροι who were also caught plotting later—‘the other people from the family circle’, meaning Bassianus and Senecio whose efforts were revealed to Constantine by God through a dream in 316.<sup>22</sup> The impression created by the use of ἕτεροι 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.<sup>23</sup> 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.<sup>24</sup> 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);<sup>25</sup> 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.<sup>26</sup> 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 Ablabius as PPO of Italy in 329 and reached the consulship in 331. Much more rewarding is a fascinating hypothesis advanced by Barnes:<sup>27</sup> 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.<sup>28</sup> If it was represented as a plot, it required a rapid and secret response without trial.

Subsequent suspicions of Helena, revealed alleged fact that the execution characteristics of the se

\*I must acknowledge the made by Professor Averil Ca are my own responsibility.

1. ‘The execution of Crispus is important in establishing the Barnes, ‘Lactantius and Constantine’.

2. More modern views see New York (Dial Pr.) 1969 (1971 (adultery and palace plot).

3. *Vita Constantini* 1. 3;

4. *VC* 1. 9. 2; 21. 2. It is in his claim that the execution

5. Eusebius *HE* 10. 9. 6; will get to saying outright ‘

6. A.H.M. Jones, *Constantine* 231. *CTH* 3. 16. 1 (331); 4. 6.

7. Zosimus 2. 8. 2; Victor

8. P. Bruun, *Roman Imperialism*

9. J.R. Palanque, ‘Chronology of Minervina as a wife, basing relationship and calls it ‘ma

(a) how is Constantine able to c293 (cf. Palanque, 244

(b) if Minervina had died before avoided in the panegyric

(c) how far can a panegyric ‘matrimonium’ be regarded

marriage with Fausta Maximian, but was res

could be taken to mean was designated and co

universally attributed view of her as an *inae*

concubine?, *BAGB* (19

10. Cf. *AE* (1938) 85.

11. Palanque dates Crispus *und sein Jahrhundert*, Münch

12. Shown by the increase *RIC* 7, 28 etc.

13. Brunn, *Studies in Constantine* New York (American Num

14. Cf. Zosimus 2. 29. 2

15. Ammianus 14. 11. 2 chronology of court movem

66–7, and *RIC* 7, 71–2.

16. E.g. Constantine’s c

17. *CIL* 3. 7172; *ILS* 707. The *abolitio* may not have

at plotting later—'the other people from  
s and Senecio whose efforts were revealed  
am in 316.<sup>22</sup> The impression created by the  
g as it could do that there were no others  
gerous extent. The palace-plot theory and  
red around Crispus therefore fall away.  
ate to bring up the matter of Constantine's  
e could be irate on paper when dealing with  
e problems, and there is no doubt that a  
have shown itself on occasion in day-to-day  
a with all its pressures and the hard search  
vious.<sup>23</sup> So, a palace row over an aspect of  
may easily have erupted, and while it should  
of Constantine it could have taken on the  
r been represented by others as one. Religion  
view of Orosius' remarks—he appends the  
h measures taken to suppress Arianism, but  
the executions are unknown.<sup>24</sup> It could have  
at the younger Licinius was in some way  
ore than 11 years old, so that his role was not  
ow 23, and had found his feet in the world, a  
incident involving an unwise remark, that  
, for example, would have been particularly  
.  
erosi amici' must be an exaggeration. The only  
e his supervisory *praefecti praetorio*, Vettius  
Iunius Bassus.<sup>26</sup> Neither suffered any obvious  
rmer was possibly the consul of 323 and thus  
his study; the latter succeeded Ablabius as PPO  
consulship in 331. Much more rewarding is  
ced by Barnes:<sup>27</sup> he posits some connection  
the contemporary exile for adultery and magic  
binus, who early in his exile was unexpectedly  
yed rapid and sustained promotion. Barnes  
ch a connection is lacking. About the adultery,  
but the circumstances and consequences of the  
on that fits the available evidence well. It looks  
p around Crispus had overstepped the mark by  
future career: this must have been discovered by  
s favourable for advancing her sons and passed  
line. The information was delicate and difficult  
worthy: its source on an earlier occasion was  
g Constantine from her own father.<sup>28</sup> If it was  
red a rapid and secret response without trial.

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

- \*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.
1. 'The execution of Crispus', *Phoenix* 20 (1966) 325-331; Appendix B to the article was  
important in establishing the legitimacy of Constantine II, now greatly strengthened by T.D.  
Barnes, 'Lactantius and Constantine', *JRS* 63 (1973) 36, 38.
  2. More modern views subsequent to those noticed by Guthrie: R. Macmullen, *Constantine*,  
New York (Dial Pr.) 1969 (treason); J.H. Smith, *Constantine the Great*, New York (Scribner)  
1971 (adultery and palace plot).
  3. *Vita Constantini* 1. 3; 1. 6; 1. 24; 2. 28. 2-29. 1; *Laudes Constantini* 3. 4-5; 5. 1 ff.
  4. *VC* 1. 9. 2; 21. 2. It is interesting that Zosimus 2. 29. 2 uses the same words, θεσμός φύσεως,  
in his claim that the execution of Crispus was contrary to the law of nature.
  5. Eusebius *HE* 10. 9. 6: Crispus is τὰ πάντα τοῦ πατρὸς δημοτός which is as close as Eusebius  
will get to saying outright 'his successor'.
  6. 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).
  7. Zosimus 2. 8. 2; *Victor Caes.* 41. 11.
  8. P. Bruun, *Roman Imperial Coinage* 7, London (Spink) 1966, 69.
  9. J.R. Palanque, 'Chronologie constantinienne', *REA* 40 (1938) 245 f., and Jones, 60, regard  
Minervina as a wife, basing their view on *Pan. Lat.* 7. 4. 1, which is the earliest reference to the  
relationship and calls it 'matrimonium'. Three items may cast doubt on this:  
(a) how is Constantine able to marry Minervina if he was already betrothed to the young Fausta  
c293 (cf. Palanque, 244, referring to *Pan. Lat.* 7. 6. 2 and 7. 1)?  
(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 'uxorius', 'animus maritalis',  
'matrimonium' 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, 'Minervine, épouse ou  
concubine?', *BAGB* (1970) 403.
  10. Cf. *AE* (1938) 85.
  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.
  13. Brunn, *Studies in Constantinian Chronology*, Numismatic Notes and Monographs 146,  
New York (American Numismatic Soc.) 1961, 59; Felix Adventus Caes. Nn.
  14. Cf. Zosimus 2. 29. 2.
  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 σύνεδρος Sopater: Eunapius *VSoph* 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* 712-4, 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* 1. 47. 1; 2. 18. Jones, 135.

21. *VC* 3. 16.

22. *VC* 1. 47. 2; cf. *Origo Const. Imp.* 14 and Chr. Habicht, 'Zur Geschichte des Kaisers Konstantin', *Hermes* 86 (1958) 374 n. 5.

23. Eutropius mentions the change from his well-known earlier *favorabilis animi docilitas*, 10. 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 haec latent causae, cur vindicem gladium et destinatum in impios punitionem Constantinus imperator etiam in proprios egit affectus. nam Crispum filium et Licinium sororis filium interfecit.* The sentence *nam . . . interfecit* shows rather that Constantine's actions were inexplicably directed for the moment against members of the family, not against adherents of Arianism.

25. Eutropius *loc. cit.*; cf. *Origo Const. Imp.* 29.

26. Vettius Rufinus: PPO 319/320 *CTh* 5. 2. 1, coinciding with Crispus' first command, Seeck, *Regesten*, 143 and Bruun, *Studies*, 34, 38. Iunius Bassus: PPO Gaul 320-326, *PLRE* Iunius Bassus 14.

27. T.D. Barnes, 'Two senators under Constantine', *JRS* 65 (1975) 48.

28. Lactantius, *Mort. Pers.* 30. 1 ff.; Barnes, 'Lactantius and Constantine', 41-2.

Massey University, New Zealand

N.J.E. AUSTIN

#### LUSTRUM 'GLANZ'

In den *Acta et processus canonizacionis beate Birgitte* (ed. I. Collijn, 1924-31) heisst es in einem Brief v.J. 1377 der Königin Joanna I. aus Neapel S. 55: *uiuít enim eius (sc. Birgittae) filia domina Katherina prosequens uita et moribus lustram matris.* Die Stelle wurde von Cavallin, *ALMA* 28 (1958) 12 besprochen, der sie folgendermassen übersetzt: ". . . imitant dans sa vie et dans ses moeurs les 'lustrations' de sa mère". Wie jetzt aus dem *ThLL* 7: 2, 1880, 9 ff. ersichtlich, wird *lustrum* 'Sühnopfer' aber nie mit bezug auf christliche Opfer verwendet, sondern das Wort bleibt ein Terminus technicus für das heidnische Opfer.

M.E. bedeutet *lustra* hier vielmehr 'Glanz' oder 'leuchtendes Vorbild'. Diese Annahme wird durch das ital. *lustró* '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 ausser dem oben genannten bekannt). Dieser Gebrauch des Wortes *lustrum* ist durch Anschluss an *illustro*, *illustri* leicht erklärlich; das Verb *lustró* 'illumino' wird von Arnaldi, *Latinitatis Italicae medii aevi . . . lexicon imperfectum* s.v. zweimal belegt. In denselben *Acta* S. 165 wird Birgitta (im Anschluss an *Marc.* 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 luceat omnibus et sub eius luminis claritate . . . gradiatur.*

University of California, Los Angeles

BENGT LÖFSTEDT

HERACLI

Callimachus' epigram on his de

Εἰπέ τις Ἡράκλε

ἤγαγεν, ἐμ

ἦλιον ἐν λέσχη

ξεῖν' Ἄλι

αἰ δὲ τεαῖ ζώουσι

ἀρπακτῆς

is well known in English from

Cory:

They told me, Heraclitus,

They brought me bitter ne

I wept as I remembered h

Had tired the sun with tal

And now that thou are lyi

A handful of grey ashes, k

Still are thy pleasant voice

For Death, he taketh all a

This, however, loses the brevity

with success, to retain in the fo

Someone spoke of your de

To think, my Heracleitu

So often used to talk the s

Somewhere some dust is

These long long years, Ha

Yet still your songs are

Your nightingales, which l

All mortal things from

Cory's rendering requires tha

Callimachus had only just hea

think it more likely that Callim

dissolved into tears on hearing

has reproduced the sigh with

σποδιῆ. This is reminiscent of

subject, which has the same si

Atque in perpetuum, frat

Could Catullus, an admirer of

here by Callimachus' line?

Durban