

Borrower: TXM

(TXM-TN: 138430)

Lending String: TMA,*TJC,XII,MUM,VYF

Trans.Date: 5/30/2007 11:46:20 AM

Patron: Clark, Victor

Journal Title: Hermes.

Volume: 88 **Issue:**

Month/Year: 1960

Pages: 361-370

Article: Patrick Bruun; The Battle of the Milvian
Bridge; The Date Reconsidered

Imprint: Stuttgart [etc.] F. Steiner [etc.]

ILL Number: 31053084



Call #: PA3 .H5

Location: CENTRAL 6TH-FLOOR

*Scanned
MW 6/4*

ODYSSEY: 161.45.205.112

Ariel

Maxcost: Free

Billing Category: Exempt

Charge:

Shipping Address:

Middle Tenn. St. Univ. Lib

ILL

Box 13/1500 Greenland Drive

Murfreesboro, TN 37132

****VIA ATHENA COURIER****

Fax: (615) 898-5551

Odyssey

ARIEL: 161.45.205.82 OK

Notes

TXM --- ATHENA

TJC-TN: 281489



Needed: 6/4



INHALT DES 88. BANDES

JEAN BÉRANGER, La Prévoyance (Providentia) impériale, et Tacite, Annales, I, 8 ... 475
S. F. BONNER, Anecdoton Parisinum ... 354
PATRICK BRUN, The Battle of the Milvian Bridge: The Date reconsidered ... 361
VINZENZ BUCHHEIT, Statius' Geburtstagsgedicht zu Ehren Lucans (Silv. 2, 7) ... 231
WALTER BURKERT, Platon oder Pythagoras? ... 159
ANNEMARIE CAPELLE, Bemerkungen zu Platons Theaetetus ... 265
H. EISENBERGER, Der innere Zusammenhang der Motive in Tibulls Gedicht I, 3 ... 188
HARTMUT ERBSE, Beiträge zum Pindartext ... 23
ULRICH FLEISCHER, Musentempel und Octavianehnung des Vergil im Proömium zum dritten Buche der Georgica ... 280
CHARAL FLORATOS, Veneralia ... 197
HANS PETER HARDING, Zum Text des Platonischen Philebos ... 40
ERNST HEITSCH, Drei Helioshymnen ... 139
UVO HÖLSCHER, Das Schweigen der Arete ... 257
BERNHARD KYTZLER, Beobachtungen zum Proömium der Thebais ... 331
OTTO LENDLE, Zu Thukydides 5, 20, 2 ... 33
HANS JOACHIM METTE, 'Roma' (Augustus) und Alexander ... 458
K. O'NOLAN, The Proteus Legend ... 129
LUKAS RICHTER, Die Beziehung zwischen Theorie und Praxis der Musik im aristotelischen Protreptikos ... 177
WERNER RUTZ, Amor Mortis bei Lucan ... 462
FELIX SCHEIDWEILER †, Schwierige Propterstellen ... 75
OTTO SCHÖNBERGER, Motivierung und Quellenbenützung in der Deciusepisode des Livius ... 217
KONRAD SCHUBRING, Übersene Zitate ... 451
OTTO SEEL, Zum Persius-Titel des Codex Pithoeanus ... 82
FRIEDRICH SOLMSEN, Zur Theologie im großen Aphrodite-Hymnus ... 1
HANS-PETER STAHL, Ansätze zur Satzlogik bei Platon ... 409
G. B. TOWNEND, The Sources of the Greek in Suetonius ... 98
JÜRGEN TRUMPF, Kydonische Äpfel ... 14
C. A. TRYPANIS, A New Collection of Epigrams from Chios ... 69
ERNST TUGENDHAT, Zum Rechtfertigungsproblem in Pindars 7. Nemeischen Gedicht ... 385

MISZELLEN

ADELMO BARIGAZZI, Nuovi Frammenti della Perinthia di Menandro? ... 379
T. F. CARNEY, The Death of Ancharius ... 382
CONRADO EGGERS LAN, Die OAIOS IOAYΦHMOΣ der parmenidischen Wahrheit ... 376
J. GWYN GRIFFITHS, The Flight of the Gods before Typhon: An unrecognized Myth ... 374
JOHANNES THEOPH. KAKRIDIS und S. G. KAPSOMENOS, Das Wespengleichnis im II der Ilias ... 250
FRIDOLF KUDLIEN, 'Ορθόκωλος oder ἀρθόκωλος? ... 502
WALTER MARG, Ovid, Heroides 10, 95/96 ... 505
HANS JOACHIM METTE, Zu Archilochos Pap. Ox. 2310 fr. 1 col. 1 ... 493
LIONEL PEARSON, Pausanias on the Temple of Poseidon at Isthmia (2, 1, 7) ... 384
WERNER PECK, Zu den Perser-Epigrammen ... 494
L. G. POCOCK, Note on 'ΑΨΟΡΡΟΟΥ ΨΕΚΕΑΝΟΙΟ ... 371
OTTO SCHRÖDER, Beiträge zur Wiederherstellung des Menandertextes ... 123
O. SKUTSCH, Horaz, Episteln, I, 6, 66/7 ... 121
KLAUS STIEWE, Zum Hesiodpapyrus B Merkelbach ... 504
... 253

also tells us this, giving Varro as his authority), and having in vain used medicaments to cure it, lost the use of his feet and became a cripple. Nemesis evidently followed him further, in removing his name from before that of Aelius in the Anecdoton!

We thus see that Aelius, Servius, and Varro were all well known to each other, and they form a closely-linked triad. In the critical annotation of their Latin texts, they used a common method (cf. the word *aeque* in our manuscript), derived from Aristarchus by Aelius, and transmitted by him to his son-in-law, Servius, and his most famous pupil, Varro¹, whose Plautine studies were probably much influenced by those of Aelius. As to Probus, supporting indications of his use of these *notae* have been adduced; for instance, Servius on Aen. 10, 444 refers to a use by him of the *alogus*². If the record of the Anecdoton is true as regards Probus, it is evidently true of the earlier scholars also.

But, it may be objected, this reconstruction would imply that a substantial number of 'critical editions', (of the scenic poets, of Ennius' Annals and of Lucilius), once existed, of which practically no trace has survived³. But it is not necessary to assume that the reference is to 'critical editions' in the sense of completed and published works. Here the comparison with Probus is again instructive. AISTERMANN (p. 80) has well argued that Probus' critical recensions were not originally intended for wide publication. They were his own private annotated texts, used in discussions with his immediate circle of friends and pupils (cf. Suet., De Gramm. 24). So Fronto (p. 190 N.) writes to Voluminius Quadratus: '*Ciceronianos emendatos et distinctos habebis; adnotatos a me leges ipse; in vulgus enim eos exire quare nolum. scribam diligentius.*' Evidently, also, the texts of Servius were not widely available, or Cicero would not have shown such eagerness to obtain the originals; and it may have been the same with these recensions of Aelius and even Varro⁴.

The University of Liverpool.

S. F. BONNER

¹ Although LEO (Plaut. Forsch.², p. 36) thought it improbable that Varro made a recension of Plautus, his deduction from L. L. 9, 106 does not seem conclusive.

² The *alogus* is last in the Anecdoton list and the explanation of it has fallen out, but Isidore says: '*alogus, nota quae ad mendas adhibetur*'. See also AISTERMANN, op. cit., p. 11.

³ As critical notes on the comedy-writers are demonstrably appropriate to all three scholars, I cannot deduce that *historiorum* refers only to Aelius, Lucilius only to Servius, and *Ennii* only to Varro. This method of interpretation, following the sequence of the names, is sometimes adopted, but Varro is probably named first in view of his pre-eminence.

⁴ Varro certainly regarded *emendatio* as an integral part of grammatical studies—cf. frag. 236 FUNAIOLI, where it is defined as *reorrectio errorum qui per scripturam dictio nemve funi*.

THE BATTLE OF THE MILVIAN BRIDGE: THE DATE RECONSIDERED

I

The date of Constantine's victory over Maxentius at the Milvian Bridge¹ has for a long time been one of the cornerstones of IVth century chronology. The more scholars have dealt with its various implications, the firmer rooted the year 312 A. D. has appeared to be in their minds. The only disagreement has concerned the day, October 27th or 28th. Yet, even well informed literary sources leave room for some doubt. Lactantius (*De mortibus persecutorum* 44.4) writes: '*... imminet dies quo Maxentius imperium ceperat, qui est a. d. sextum Kalendas Novembres et quinquennalia terminabantur*' (sc. Maxentii), but MOMMSEN in his comments on Philocalus' calendar (CIL I p. 405) explains away the difficulty with a '*scilicet postquam factus est Augustus a. 307 extremo*', assuming that the regnal years were counted from the day he received the title of Augustus.

Recent research, however, has shed new light on Maxentius' chronology and established that the usurper on the Italian bronze coins always wears the title Augustus², whereas the title *Princeps invictus* was restricted to early gold and silver pieces of Rome. In addition KENT³ supposes that bronze coining under Maxentius in Rome started in March 307. The Maxentian issues of Carthage, discontinued before March 31 st, 307, portray Maxentius as Caesar, *Princeps invictus* and Augustus (CHAOS p. 116). Thus he must have assumed the title of Augustus very early in his short reign; his regnal years must accordingly have been counted from October 28th, 306 and not from any later fictitious *natalis imperii*. The end of the *quinquennalia*, mentioned by Lactantius as the date of the battle, but explained by some scholars as a slip⁴, seems to point to a date earlier than 312. It might therefore be worth while reconsidering the literary sources.

Aurelius Victor (Caes. 40, 16—17), a fairly reliable source⁵, writes: '*Is (sc. Constantinus) ubi vastari urbem atque Italiam comperit pulsoque seu redemptos exercitus et imperatores duos, composita pace per Gallias Maxentium petit. 17. Ea tempestate apud Poenos Alexander pro praefecto gerens dominatui stolidè incubuerat, cum ipse debili aetate*' . . .

Victor's account suggests that at the time when Constantine planned his Italian campaign, Domitian Alexander still maintained himself in Africa, and

¹ This is not the place to discuss the controversy as regards the exact location of the battle (Pons Milvius or Saxa Rubra): cf. SEECK, *Geschichte* I⁴ p. 496f.

² CARSON-KENT, *Constantinian Hoards and Other Studies*—CHAOS—, Num. Chron. 1956 p. 112f.

³ The Pattern of the Bronze Coinage under Constantine I, Num. Chron. 1957 p. 21.

⁴ E.g. SEECK, *Geschichte* I⁴ p. 484.

⁵ Cf. Chr. HABICHT's recent paper in *Hermes* 86, 1958 p. 363.

that the very fact that Maxentius had his hands full elsewhere was of some importance to Constantine.

Eutropius is more explicit concerning the time of the Italian expedition (10, 4, 3): »*Quinto tamen Constantinus imperii suo anno bellum adversus Maxentium civile commovit, copias eius multis proeliis fudit, ipsum postremo . . . apud pontem Milvium vicit.*«

Constantine's fifth regnal year commenced on March 31st, 311¹.

The panegyrist of 313 (IX 16, 2, ed. GALLETIER) writes: »... *consumpto per desidiās sexennio² ipsum diem natalis sui ultima sua caede signaret, ne septenarium illum numerum sacrum et religiosum vel inchoando violaret.*« The meaning is quite clear: Maxentius was defeated and killed on the first day of his sexennial year, i.e. October 28th, 311: by commencing the following regnal year, the seventh in order, he did not desecrate the holy number of seven (that would have been the case had the battle been fought in 312)³.

The same panegyrist later (IX 20, 3) adds, when comparing the tyranny of Maxentius with the cruelties of the furious Cinna and the irate Marius: »... *qui non solo se Octavii consulis capite satiarunt, sed luminibus extinctis exempla, quae nunc toto sexennio passa es (sc. Roma), reliquerunt.*«

Nazarius, the other panegyrist dealing with the Maxentian war, is less explicit and his words rather suggest the year 312 for the battle (X 33, 6):

¹ The date of Constantine's *Dies imperii* is of paramount importance in this context, as is the date when he received the title of Augustus (they need not necessarily coincide). The time when the mint of Carthage ceased striking for Maxentius and was removed to Ostia has been determined by the fact that no obverses name Constantine Augustus. Similarly all but the very earliest bronzes of the mint of Rome portraying Constantine, name him Augustus (CHAOS pp. 113, 116). KENT in a special Appendix (Pattern pp. 74—77) discusses the various possibilities and, as Seston previously (REA 1937 p. 204 ff.), is inclined to accept March 31st, 307. The present writer agrees that the available material scarcely permits any other conclusion. Constantine's real and original *Dies imperii* was, of course, July 25th (306), but, possibly, in order to see his position legitimized and acknowledged, he married Fausta and received the title of Augustus from the hands of the old Hercules on March 31st, 307. At this juncture, then, he was still in a way dependent upon support, but after the death of Maximian and the defeat of Maxentius he was free to resume his old *Dies imperii*. Note that even if Eutropius counted the regnal years from July 25th, 306, Constantine would, indeed, have started his expedition in his fifth year, 311.—It may be added that the *Dies imperii* of the sons of Constantine was the day when they were elevated to the rank of Caesar, March 1st, 317.

² MOMMSEN, CIL I p. 405 comments: »*scilicet per annum lere in urbe dominatus fuerat Caesar.*« That is absolutely incompatible with the numismatic evidence.

³ This paragraph contains a logical contradiction. Maxentius' sixth regnal year commenced on October 28th, 312, i.e. this date was the day of his sexennialia (if such were celebrated). But before he arrived at his seventh year, before he was able to desecrate the holy number of seven, a whole year had to elapse. The panegyrist would, indeed, have made sense, had Maxentius been killed on the last day of his sixth year.

»*Nam quidquid mali sexennio toto dominatio feralis inflixerat, bimestris fere cura sanavit.*«

Socrates (H. E. I, 2, 7) dates the battle to the seventh regnal year of Constantine: »*ἤν δὲ τοῦτο ἑβδομον ἔτος τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ, ἥνκα τὴν Μαξεντίου ἧσανό ἔλασαν.*« In the opinion of TILLEMONT (p. 55, article XXIV) these words were the final proof for the year 312², although the words of Valesius seem to remove the obstacles for an earlier date³.

It appears, then, that two of our sources are definitely in favour of 311 as a date of the battle, Lactantius⁴ and Eutropius, and that Socrates, even if he was mistaken in the point from which he starts counting, did not err concerning the time of the conquest of Italy. Aurelius Victor provides the most interesting evidence: he is the only one who outlines the political situation, and the way he connects the expedition of Constantine with the happenings in Africa, is surely worth attention.

The panegyrists are contradictory; the anonymous speaker of 313 on the one hand assures us that Maxentius was killed on the anniversary of his usurpation before he had begun his seventh year. That leaves us only 311. On the

¹ Of course, the possibility of a confusion of the sixth anniversary of the *natalis imperii* with the six years of rule cannot be excluded. We find such a case in Euseb. V. C. 3, 15 where the church father speaks of the initial celebrations of Constantine's *vicennalia* in Nicomedia. He writes: »*κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ αὐτῶ καὶ τῆς βασιλείας ἐκδοσσεως ἐτήρησαν ἡμέρας*« (i.e. during the Nicaean Council). This seems to imply that twenty regnal years had elapsed, although in reality the feasting mentioned by Eusebius occurred on the first day of his twentieth year of rule (when 19 years only had elapsed).

² »... quelques-uns croient en effet qu'elle (i.e. l'expédition contre Maxence) a commencé dès cette année (i.e. 311); [ce qui revient mieux à l'expression d'Eutrope] que Constantin l'entreprit en la cinquième année de son règne [c'est à dire au moins avant la fin de 311, ce qui est certain], c'est qu'elle ne finit qu'en la septième année de ce règne [au mois d'octobre. C'est pourquoi nous réservons à en marquer les événements sur l'an 312].«

³ HUSSEY (vol. III p. 5f.) refers to the comments of Valesius in his edition of H. E. (Oxford 1853): »Constantinus victoriam de Maxentio retulit anno Christi 312... Hic erat annus sextus imperii Constantini... Quod si Maxentium victum esse dicamus octavo Kal. Octobres... tunc verum esse poterit, id quod ait Socrates, Constantinus septimo imperii sui anno victoriam de Maxentio retulisse. Quippe annus septimus ejus coeperat octavo die Kal. Augusti, anno 312. Turbat me tamen non mediocriter, quod Maxentius anno 6 imperii sui exeunte, pridie quam septimum inchoaret, occisus esse dicitur in panegyrico Nazarii. Atqui Maxentius paucis diebus post Constantinum imperare exorsus fuerat. Quod si octavo Kal. Octobris caesus fuit, necessario dicendum est eum septimo Kal. Octobris regnare coepisse. Atque ita Constantinus duobus mensibus ante Maxentium ad imperium pervenisset. Quod quidem minus probabile mihi videtur. Caeterum Socrates hic sibi ipse constat. Nam cum imperium Constantini ab anno Christi 305 exorsus sit, recte hanc victoriam refert anno ejusdem imperii septimo.«

⁴ SZECK (Geschichte I⁴ p. 484) refuses to believe Lactantius because he wrote *De mortibus* in the East and therefore had little chances of checking the accuracy of his writing. But the fact that he had spent some time in Gaul and had acted as Crispus' tutor, should surely have guaranteed him access to primary sources.

other hand, he twice asserts that Maxentius had ruled for six years (*consumpto sexennio, toto sexennio*) and Nazarius in his panegyric of 321 almost repeats his statement (*sexennio toto*) in very much the same context. One is almost brought to the conclusion that he was influenced by his predecessor.

How can this incongruity be explained? Were it not for the possibility that the panegyrists, working on the fact that Maxentius was killed on his sixth *Dies imperii*, concluded a rule of six years through gross rhetorical exaggeration, one could suggest that Constantine's readjustment of his own *natalis imperii* from March 31st, 307 to July 25th, 306 caused some confusion and was also likely to affect *ex analogia* the assessment of the reign of Maxentius.

Let us continue with the chronicles. Hieronymus (Eusebius Werke VII² p. 229), contradictory and confused on many points, records the ninth year of the persecution as the date of the battle (i.e. the period March—April 311/312), the *Chronica Urbis Romae* (Chron. Min. p. 148) gives Maxentius' VIth imperial year (i.e. 311 as the usurper was killed on the first day of that year). The main sources, the Chronographer of 354 and Consularia Constantinopolitana are more obscure. Cons. Const. (Chron. Min. p. 231) state: *Constantino II et Licinio II. His cons., quod est Maxentio III solo, victus et occisus est Maxentius Romae ad pontem Mulvium*. The Chronographer (Chron. Min. p. 67) has the following entry:

(311) *Consules quos iusserint dd. nn. aug*
ex mense Septembre factum est
Rufino et Eusebio

V kal. Nov. Iunius Flavianus
praefectus urbis

(312) *Maxentio IIII consule qui sunt*

Constantino II et Licinio II

V idus Febr. Aradius Rufinus
praefectus urbis

VI kal. Nov. Anninus Anulinus

d. XXXIII praefectus urbis

III kal. Decembr. Aradius Rufinus
iterum praefectus urbis

The text of the Chronographer does not seem to be faultless, and MOMMSEN (l.c.) expressed grave doubts as to the consulate of Rufinus and Eusebius¹. The entry for 312 also appears to be dubious: we have on the whole no other indication of a fourth Maxentian consulship, either on the coins or among the

¹ »... vereor ne aliquo errore haec indicatio ex anno 347 in hunc translata sit pro ea quae requiritur Rufino et Volusiano: nam et in laterculo episcoporum (Chron. min. p. 76) sic est: a consulatu Maximiano VIII solo, quod fuit mense Sept. Volusiano et Rufino et in fastis Hydatianis ad h.a.: Maximiano VIII consule quod est Rufino et Volusiano...⁴ SEECK in his Regesten (p. 157) has accepted MOMMSEN's views, whereas DEGRASSI (Fasti p. 78) prefers the reading Rufus of one ms, and identifies this Rufus with C. Caesonius Rufus Volusianus. According to him the name Eusebius was added by mistake.

inscriptions, although notes of all previous consulships have been preserved both on metal and on stone. In this case, had the battle been fought in 312, almost 10 months would have elapsed before his final battle. Admittedly such negative evidence is dangerous, and in no case conclusive, but we have another passage of uncertain authenticity: Aradius Rufinus is noted as *praefectus urbis* twice during the same year, for *III kal. Decemb.* as *iterum praefectus urbis*. Now Rufus Volusianus appears as *praefectus urbis* on *V kal. Nov.* 310 and for the second time on *VI idus Dec.* 313 without *iterum*. It has been argued that an omitted iteration indicates disapproval of the first appointment, in this case that the appointments of Maxentius not were acknowledged by Constantine¹. Had the battle of the Milvian Bridge been fought in 312, Aradius Rufinus' first urban prefecture should have been due to Maxentius, his second to Constantine. The fact that the first prefecture was accepted by Constantine therefore suggests that Rome was in his hands in January 312.

Without being able to restore the original text and with due appreciation of MOMMSEN's words about the reliability of the *Fasti* of the Chronographer², we note that the later records the II consulships of Constantine and Licinius and nothing else (Chron. min. p. 60), and we conclude that the troubled times of 311—312, with the late consulship of Rufinus and Volusianus, and with the frequent changes of urban prefects, could have lead the Chronographer to insert a fourth consulship for Maxentius for the year 311. Initially it was probably done *ex analogia* with the two preceding years, and accordingly the fourth consulship was probably thought to have commenced at the New Year. Then the recorder noticed the consulates of Rufinus and Volusianus, realized that they could not have been appointed consuls the same year as Maxentius, and duly switched the Maxentian consulate to the following year, 312, having inserted the words *consules quos iusserint dd. nn. aug.* in the beginning of 311. Now only the Cons. Const. record the defeat and death of Maxentius at the Milvian Bridge. The compiler, probably working on the earlier *fasti* noticed that a fourth consulate was assigned to Maxentius in 312, and concluding that Maxentius lived that year, altered the number of the consulate from IV to III (although Maxentius had been consul for the third time in 310) as no fourth consulate had ever been attested for the usurper, and consequently dated the battle as 312.

II

The texts, in the present writer's opinion, leave the question of the date of the battle open, but strong proofs for dating the conquest of Rome to 311 are given by some gold coins of Rome, Ticinum and Treveri.

¹ V. SCHOENEBECK, Klio, Beiheft 30 p. 73 f., note 2.

² Chron. min. p. 50: »ipsi fasti longe emendatissimi sunt omnium qui ad nos pervenerunt.

In a penetrating study of the gold issues of Ticinum Andreas ALFÖLDI (JRS 1932 p. 17) draws attention to the specimens with the wellknown reverse legends VICTORIAE LAETAE PRINC PERP either with VOT PR or with VOT X, and places them in Constantine's decennial year 315/316¹. Numerous coins, the date of which the reverse legends show to belong to Constantine's IVth consular year, have palpably larger flans. The same large flan size was maintained as long as the mint was working. The consular year began on January 1, 315, the decennial year on July 25th, 315. Now it is impossible that large size solidi could have been issued during the early part of 315, and subsequently small size and large size side by side during the later part of the same year, as the coin weights clearly prove all the coins in question to be of the same denomination, i.e. solidi.

ALFÖLDI, aware of the difficulty if not of the implications, decided to place the *Victoriae laetae* in 314². Whatever the case is as regards bronze coins, gold coins with specified vota were regularly struck in connection with major anniversaries, presumably for the *largitiones*; a coin might have been struck with VOT X as *suscepta* to the *quinquennialia* or, more rarely, as *soluta* to the *decennialia*, but scarcely in the intervening period. The unspecified VOT PR was a legend for ordinary years. Thus we have to date the *Victoriae laetae* with VOT X to the quinquennial year March 31 st, 311 — March 31 st, 312.

The same type of coin was also struck in Rome after the conquest with obverses of Constantine and Licinius. Later it appeared in Treveri as a part of the wellknown billon triad with additional special types for Licinius and Daza³.

The connections between the mint of Rome (and Ostia) and that of Treveri, are highly interesting; many types are common to both mints, among them PRINCIPI IVVENTVTIS, IOVI CONSERVATORI AVGG and SPQR OPTIMO PRINCIPI. In a forthcoming survey of the Treveran gold issues (Roman Imperial Coinage VII), the present writer will endeavour to show that the earliest Constantinian gold pieces invariably have the obverse legend broken CONSTAN-TINVS PF AVG, and the switch to CONSTANTI-NVS PF AVG (accompanied by the corresponding development of the portraiture) was effected during Constantine's quinquennial year, March 31 st,

¹ Some time after the conquest of Italy the *natalis imperii* was reverted to the original date, July 25th (306): cf. Seston l.c. p. 206f. The argument of this paper is in no way affected—on the contrary, rather strengthened—if the reckoning with March 31 st as *Dies imperii* was still valid (i.e. if the decennial year had been 316/317).

² JRS 1932 p. 17: 'As in 315 quite a different kind of gold piece was struck, and as one series begins as early as 314.'

³ The resemblance between the gold issue of the early Sol type of Ticinum with the *quadriga* and the Treveran billon type of Daza may be noted in this context.

311/312¹. This switch is also illustrated by the SPQR OPTIMO PRINCIPI, struck in two stages,

- a) with one badge on the standard to the left, eagle on middle standard with flapping wings, obv. CONSTAN-TINVS PF AVG;
- b) with two badges on the left standard, eagle without flapping wings, obv. CONSTANTI-NVS PF AVG.

This very unusual reverse type and legend with its Trajanic echoes² was struck, except in Treveri, in gold and bronze in Ostia³, in bronze in Rome⁴ and, after the rupture with Daza, in bronze in Arelate⁵.

Mrs. ALFÖLDI (l. c. p. 107) correctly asserts that the Treveran gold coins served as models of the issues in Rome, Ostia and Arelate. We have March 31 st, 312 as an unquestionable *terminus ante* for the first issue SPQR OPTIMO PRINCIPI, and as both obverse breaks for Constantine occur during Constantine's quinquennial year, the issue with the earlier break can safely be placed in the earlier part of 311. This shows that Constantine acted, or pretended to act, under the auspices of the Roman senate a considerable time before he stood *ante portas*, probably when he launched his Italian campaign.

It is now highly interesting to find the same type, (without predecessors since Trajan) struck by Domitian Alexander in Carthage⁶. This can certainly not be pure chance, and, in fact, we have an inscription (DESSAU 8936 = CIL VIII 22183) on a *miliarium* proving the friendly relations between Gaul and Africa: *Imp. dd. nn. L. Domitio Alexandro et Fl. Constantino Augg. As* GROAG has pointed out (RE XIV 2441f., s.v. Maxentius) the usurper Alexander tried to find allies against Maxentius—if the initiative cannot be attributed to Constantine⁷.

In this context the coin legend SPQR OPTIMO PRINCIPI is very revealing, for it sounds like the typical battle cry of a liberator, implying that the campaign has been instigated by the suffering subjects of the tyrant. The texts quoted above have shown that Constantine began the war and, as GROAG points out (ibid. col. 2471), that is not contested even by the Christian writers. On the contrary, they say that the Romans had turned to Constantine and

¹ For a sound classification of the early Treveran gold portraits, cf. Maria ALFÖLDI, Die Constantinische Goldprägung in Trier, Jhrb. für Numismatik und Geldgeschichte 1958, pp. 99—139. ² MATTINGLY, Roman Coins p. 173.

³ The author's The Constantinian coinage of Arelate (Helsinki 1953) pp. 57. 59 ff.

⁴ MAURICE, Numismatique Constantinienne I p. 203 f. ⁵ Arelate pp. 16. 63.

⁶ MAURICE I p. 361 f. rev. VIII; KENT, Pattern no. 589.

⁷ GROAG puts his words too cautiously when he contends that Alexander was unsuccessful in his search. He continues: 'Indes wäre nicht ausgeschlossen, daß Konstantin, der sich gewiß schon mit dem Gedanken des Krieges gegen M. trug, vorübergehend daran gedacht hat, sich des Usurpatoren gegen M. zu bedienen'.

asked for support¹. Few or many, they were sufficient justification for a declaration of war.

Historically, the second issue of SPQR OPTIMO PRINCIPI is easily interpreted in the light of the favours by the Senate conceded to Constantine when he entered Rome, the *titulus primi ordinis*², and the promise to erect a statue in honour of the conqueror and liberator³, and to dedicate the temple of Romulus, son of Maxentius, to him⁴. This, however, did not necessarily mean that the initiative rested with the Senate⁵; Constantine would hardly have waited passively for the Senate to take steps towards hailing him as benefactor and liberator; the fruits of the victory had to be picked without delay and the legend SPQR OPTIMO PRINCIPI is without doubt Constantine's interpretation of the situation, or his advice as to how the situation should be regarded. Thus the two Treveran issues of SPQR OPTIMO PRINCIPI, one preceding, the other succeeding the conquest of Rome, illustrate a political programme carried to its ultimate consequences.

Numismatically, even other evidence supports the redating of the battle of the Milvian Bridge. The two Constantinian experts of the British Museum, Mr R. A. G. CARSON and Dr. JOHN KENT have been rather reluctant to accept the author's redating of the Civil War I to 316⁶. Dr. KENT maintains that the present writer has disregarded the literary sources⁷, but in addition their own thorough study of the tetrarchical bronzes and the early Constantinian issues made them unwilling to accept a transfer of the mint of Ostia to Arelate within the very short time allowed for in the author's study of the subject⁸. Therefore they suggest that large scale coining started in Arelate only in mid-314⁹; the Civil War I fought at the traditionally accepted time of 314, would therefore not have left its mark on the coinage of Arelate. They observe that the transfer of the mint of Carthage to Ostia required about a year¹⁰, and conclude that the same space of time must be allotted for the removal of the mint of Ostia. This can only be done if we assume the battle of Ponte Molle to have been fought in 311; that would allow sufficient time for the intensive striking of bronzes, at least during all the spring of 312, and abundant time for the transfer of the mint, and enable Arelate to resume striking in mid-313 when relations with Daza were broken.

¹ Eus. H. E. 9, 2 and V. C. 26, 32, 37 and particularly Zonar. 13, 1, 2.

² Lact., *De mortibus* 44.

³ Paneg. IX 25.

⁴ MAURICE I p. 204, ref. to DE ROSSI, *Bull. d'arch. chrét.* 1867 p. 67.

⁵ Thus Mrs. ALFOLDI (l. c. p. 107) interprets my words in Arelate p. 6.

⁶ CHAOS p. 117 f.; KENT, *Pattern* p. 30 f.

⁷ Num. Chron. 1954 p. 225 f.; this is no place for a discussion of details, but for a proper evaluation of the literary sources, clearly shown as corroborating the writer's theory, it is sufficient to refer to Dr. HABICHT's comprehensive paper in *Hermes* 86, 1958, particularly pp. 360—370.

⁸ Arelate p. 4.

⁹ CHAOS p. 117.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* p. 116.

III

This is not the place to discuss all the implications of the corrected date of the battle of the Milvian Bridge. Suffice it to say that a complete revaluation of the course of events is necessary and particularly of the mode of action of Constantine. The momentous year dawned on the tension between Maxentius and Constantine, subsequent to the violent death of the former's father Maximian at Massilia. The statues of Constantine in Italy were overthrown. The texts even suggest that the usurper threatened him with a war of revenge. In Africa Alexander conspired with Constantine, his coin type SPQR OPTIMO PRINCIPI can probably be dated to the spring of 311, and at this juncture, we may presume, Maxentius thought it wisest to repress the rebellion in Africa first before coming to grips with Constantine. Rufius Volusianus was accordingly sent to fulfil that task.

Surely Constantine was aware of what was going on and made his preparations (at a time when there were still two emperors in Italy and Africa¹). Moreover Galerius was seriously ill and the emperors in the East, Licinius and Daza, were each intent upon grabbing their part of the inheritance. Neither could therefore be expected to interfere in Italy.

The expedition of Volusianus against Alexander can apparently be placed in the spring of 311. The bronze coins show that the African victory was won in Maxentius' quinquennial year, and the issues celebrating the victory do not belong to the earliest ones of that year² struck for the *Dies imperii* in 310. Then Galerius died in late spring, Licinius and Daza were busy dividing the spoils, Maxentius was not as yet able to gather his forces; Volusianus might have been able to complete his errand but not to ship back the troops to Italy³. With a picked force, some 40000 men, Constantine struck like lightning, using this unique opportunity when all his rivals and fellow-rulers had their hands full. Northern Italy was conquered after hard fighting and the way was open to Rome—and the Milvian Bridge. It was probably now, when the capital was seriously threatened by Constantine, that Maxentius, in a last effort to consolidate his position, appointed Rufinus and Volusianus as consuls in September. This move can also be considered a counter stroke against the Constantinian propaganda manifest in the SPQR OPTIMO PRINCIPI coins,

¹ Vict. Caes., l. c. Constantinus *neomperit*... *imperatoribus duos*.

² GROAG l. c. col. 2447.

³ This interpretation closely corresponds to Zosimos' account (2, 14—15, 1) even if one wonders whether the African triumph really had been celebrated when Constantine launched his campaign. The successes of the aggressor are more easily explicable if we assume the main forces of Maxentius to have been engaged elsewhere. Zosimos writes (2, 14, 4): *ελοήγετο δὲ θύλακας εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην ἐκ τῶν ἐν Καρχηδόνι κακῶν*... (2, 15, 1) *Ὁ δὲ Κωνσταντῖνος καὶ πρότερον ὑπόπτως πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔχων, τότε μάλλον εἰς τὴν κατ' αὐτοῦ παρεσκευάζετο μάχην καὶ συναγαγὼν δυνάμεις*...

370 PATRICK BRUUN, The Battle of the Milvian Bridge: The Date reconsidered aimed at pacifying the Senate and gaining its support. Volusianus at least, as a former urban prefect, was a man of considerable standing in senatorial circles.

This is no place to dwell upon events subsequent to the decisive battle; little is known of what the Emperor did during his stay in Rome. SRECK's Regesten (p. 158f.) have no single event beyond dispute remarked for that year. We can, however, rest assured that the conqueror now opened negotiations with Licinius, resulting in the Milan conference of 313. We must, indeed, allow time for a creative pause in the Emperor's life; the three months traditionally allotted to Constantine's first stay in Rome make a far too short a space of time for the enormous activity (among other things the building programme) attributed to him.

Finally, just to hint at another side of the problem, how does the altered chronology affect our judgment of Maxentius? The fairly positive evaluation by GROAG and v. SCHOENEBECK is, among other things, based on the fact that Maxentius was reasonably tolerant towards the Christians and that the first peaceful Easter in Rome for a long time could be celebrated in 312¹. But now it appears that Constantine was responsible for this. Was Maxentius after all the hideous monster described by the pious Christian writers?

Helsinki

PATRICK BRUUN

¹ The impartial verdict of the Chronographer of 354 (Chron. min. p. 62; cf. GROAG l.c. 2464).

MISZELLEN

NOTE ON 'ΑΥΟΡΡΡΟΟΥ 'ΟΚΕΑΝΟΙΟ

This phrase occurs in Iliad Σ 399, Odyssey v 65, Hesiod, Theogony 776. The adjective is defined in LIDDELL-SCOTT-JONES as meaning 'backflowing, refluxent, an Homeric epithet of Ocean, regarded as a stream encircling the earth and flowing back into itself'.

For this meaning the word seems to me quite inappropriate. *Refluxens* has a very different meaning from *circumfluens*¹. The Ocean Stream encircling the earth could, at the most, be said to 'flow back into itself' only with reference to some point where its flow began, or its continuity was arrested; and even if any such point were imagined, the word *refluent* would still be hardly satisfactory. I would argue that the meaning conventionally ascribed by scholarship to the word *ἀυόρροος* was certainly not the meaning that the poet of the Odyssey had in mind, nor, probably, the poet of Iliad Σ either. The line in Hesiod, I imagine, will have been merely a repetition, probably unconsidered, of Iliad Σ, or possibly of some older source that the poet of the Iliad may have used.

I should make it clear that it is not to the concept of a circumambient river that I am objecting, but to the interpretation of the word *ἀυόρροος* in these passages. There was indeed nothing very mythical in the ancient idea of a river of Ocean surrounding the inhabited world of Europe, Asia and Africa. Its streams and subdivisions are somewhat complicated; but there, in broad outline, it may still be seen. It was natural also for the ancients to think of the sun as rising from the waters of Ocean in the distant east, and sinking in those of the west. We ourselves, with a wider scientific knowledge, still use a similarly unscientific terminology. We speak of the sun 'rising' above the hills, and 'sinking' below them, although we know that in reality he is doing nothing of the sort. So also we use the word 'heaven' sometimes in a physical, sometimes in a purely mythological sense.

It is not very surprising then, from that point of view, that we should find the poet of the Odyssey similarly inconsistent—speaking poetically of 'Ocean' in τ 433 and χ 197 as the stream from which the sun arises in the east; and elsewhere, in a different mental context, speaking of it as something altogether different.

It has been argued briefly in *The Sicilian Origin of the Odyssey*² and in greater detail in *Reality and Allegory in the Odyssey*³, that the site of the Nekyia and the Land of Dreams is at the foot of Punta Blanca (the *Λευκὰς πέτραι* of ω 11) some three miles to the westward of Ceuta; and that by 'Ὀκεανός

¹ See other compounds with *ἀυ-* in I.S.J.

² A. M. Hakkert, Amsterdam, 1959.

³ New Zealand University Press, 1957.