



The Date of the Laterculus Veronensis

Clinton Walker Keyes

Classical Philology, Vol. 11, No. 2. (Apr., 1916), pp. 196-201.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0009-837X%28191604%2911%3A2%3C196%3ATDOTLV%3E2.0.CO%3B2-A>

Classical Philology is currently published by The University of Chicago Press.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/ucpress.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE DATE OF THE LATERCULUS VERONENSIS

BY CLINTON WALKER KEYES

The list of the Roman provinces usually called the *Laterculus Veronensis* was printed in 1742 in Maffei's *Opuscoli Ecclesiastici*, but remained entirely neglected by classical scholars until it was rediscovered and edited from the original manuscript by Mommsen in 1862.¹ Since that time the question of the trustworthiness of the document and the problems in regard to the mysterious province Arabia Augusta Libanensis mentioned in it have frequently been treated, but the question of the date of its composition has not been investigated since Mommsen's original article. It seems very generally to have been thought that Mommsen had proved that 297 A.D. was the exact date of composition, and this year has sometimes been so far taken for granted as the proved date of the document that the mention of a province in it has been accepted as conclusive evidence that this province existed in 297.² In actual fact, however, Mommsen does not claim to be able to fix definitely the year of composition. After proving that the document must be dated between 296 and 342, he continues:

Es ist nichts im Wege und vieles spricht dafür, dass es unmittelbar nach der Einrichtung der neuen Diöcesen, im J. 297 oder bald nachher, aufgesetzt und eben nichts anderes ist als das nach dieser wichtigen administrativen Umgestaltung officiell in Umlauf gesetzte neue Diöcesen- und Provinzenverzeichnis. . . . Auf jeden Fall ist das Veroneser Verzeichniss das älteste, das wir besitzen.³

Kuhn, in his attack on the trustworthiness of the *Laterculus*,⁴ did not question Mommsen's dating of the original document, but

¹ Mommsen, *Abhandl. d. Berl. Akad. d. Wiss.*, phil.-hist. Kl., 1862, pp. 419-518 = *Histor. Schriften*, II, 561-88. My references below will be to the *Histor. Schriften*.

² See, for example, R. Cagnat in *Melanges . . . Havet*, 1909, p. 70: "Entre 295 et 303 les documents nous fait défaut. Hereusement la liste de Vérone nous fournit une date moins reculée: 297. . . . La division de la Numidie se placerait donc entre 295 et 297."

³ Mommsen, *op. cit.*, p. 587.

⁴ E. Kuhn, "Über das Verzeichnis der röm. Prov. aufgesetzt um 297," *Neue Jahrb. f. Philol. u. Pädag.*, CXV (1877), 697-719.

asserted "dass das Verzeichnis . . . die Aenderungen in der Provinzeinteilung von 297 bis gegen 380 zum grössten Teil in sich aufgenommen hat," and "dass das Veroneser Verzeichnis als ganzes betrachtet für irgend eine bestimmte Zeit als zutreffend nicht erachtet werden kann."¹ As far as I know the first expression of doubt as to the accuracy of Mommsen's estimate of the date was made by Mispoulet, who stated the opinion² that the document could not be dated before the end of Constantine's reign. He added that he was preparing an article in which he intended to uphold this view; but it seems never to have appeared. More recently G. Costa³ expressed the opinion that Mommsen's date was too early and Mispoulet's too late. He did not discuss the question further, but said that his treatment of the epigraphical evidence for the provincial government of Diocletian might throw some light on the subject. In this I believe he was right, as will appear below.

What I wish to do in this paper is to attempt to fix the date of the Laterculus as closely as possible by the use of evidence which has become available since the time of Mommsen's article.

Mommsen found indications in the document itself which seemed to him to point to the reign of Diocletian. His most convincing arguments were drawn from the names of Egyptian, Pontic, and Numidian provinces, and these are the only parts of the empire which we need to consider here, as they give us our only good evidence as to the date of the Laterculus.

EGYPT

The former imperial domain of Egypt was divided into three provinces at the time of the Laterculus: Thebais, Aegyptus Iovia, and Aegyptus Herculia.⁴ The names of two of these provinces obviously refer to the titles Iovius and Herculus assumed by Diocletian and Maximian. At the time of Mommsen's article the names

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 701. Kuhn's theory has been refuted by C. Czwaliņa, "Über das Verzeichnis der röm. Prov. vom J. 297," *Progr. Wesel*, 1881, and W. Ohnesorge, "Die röm. Provinzliste von 297," Teil I, *Progr. Duisburg*, 1889. Mommsen's view that the only interpolations are the obvious ones mentioned by him, *op. cit.*, p. 576, seems now to be generally accepted.

² *Acad. des Inscr. et Belles-Lettres, Comptes rendus*, 1908, p. 255.

³ De Ruggiero, *Diz. Epigr.*, II, 1833.

⁴ Cf. Mommsen, *op. cit.*, pp. 571-72.

of these two provinces were found only in the Veronese list. Now we have evidence from the papyri for governors of Aegyptus Herculia in 316 and 322.¹ Our earliest evidence for the province Thebais seems to be the governorship of Satrius Arrianus in 307.² The first change from the arrangement of the Egyptian provinces given in the Laterculus, as far as we know, was the formation of the province of Augustamnica, which occurred in 341.³ Thus the evidence from Egypt shows us merely that the Laterculus cannot be dated after 341. In fact, there is no actual evidence that any of these three Egyptian provinces existed in the reign of Diocletian at all; it is perfectly possible that they were formed after his abdication, and that two of them were then named after the two retired Augusti.

PONTUS

The name of the province Diospontus may also refer to Diocletian's title Iovius. The province was later named Helenopontus after Constantine's mother.⁴ The epigraphical evidence in regard to the matter is as follows:

	Date	Reference	Governor's Name and Title
I.....	293/305	<i>CIL</i> , III, 307, 13643, 14184 ²⁰ , 14184 ²¹ , 14184 ²² ; <i>AJA</i> , IX (1905), p. 328 = <i>L'An. Épig.</i> , 1906, N. 2.	Aur. Priscianus v.p. praes. prov. Ponti
II.....	317/23	<i>CIL</i> , III, 14184 ²¹ = <i>JHS</i> , XX (1900), p. 164	Val. CIIPVS—VR v.p. praes. provinc. Diospont[i]
III.....	333/37	<i>CIL</i> , III, 14187 ¹⁷ , 14187 ¹⁷	Fl. Iul. Leontius praes. pr. { Hecnop. } (= Helenoponti)

It shows that Pontus was not divided before 293. How much later in the reign of Diocletian this governor comes we cannot tell. There is no evidence whatever for the division of the province or the existence of the name Diospontus during Diocletian's reign.

¹ Pap. Oxyr., VI, 896, 28; Pap. Theadelph. (ed. Jouguet), 13, 11. Cf. Pap. Theadelph. 19, 1.

² Grenfell and Hunt, *Gr. Pap.*, II (1897), 78, 1; cf. Pap. Flor., I, 33, 9.

³ E. Schwartz, "Zur Gesch. des Athanasius," *Nachrichten d. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen*, phil.-hist. Kl., 1904, p. 354; cf. M. Gelzer, *Stud. zur byzant. Verw. Ägyptens*. Diss. Leipzig, 1909, pp. 5 f.

⁴ Cf. Mommsen, *op. cit.*, pp. 575, 586, 587.

II, which mentions Diospontus, shows that the name Helenopontus was not given to the province before 317 at the earliest, for it was called Diospontus at least up to that date.

III shows the existence of the title Helenopontus in the last years of Constantine. The province would hardly have been named after Constantine's mother before she became Augusta, which probably occurred in 325. Perhaps this change of name is to be connected with the foundation of Helenopolis (= Drepana) in Bithynia in 327.¹

The evidence from Pontus, then, gives us no reason for connecting the Veronese list with the reign of Diocletian rather than with that of Constantine. It merely proves that the list must have been drawn up before the end of Constantine's reign in 337.

NUMIDIA

In the large number of inscriptions containing the names of governors of Numidia we find evidence which enables us to date the Veronese list more closely. A list of the governors of that province from 303 to 314 follows:

	Date	Reference	Governor's Name and Title
I.	November 20, 303	<i>CIL</i> , VIII, 4764 = 18698	—regente p. N. vestra. Aurel. Quintiano v.p.
II.	304	<i>CIL</i> , VIII, 2345, 2346. Cf. 4334	Valerius Florus v.p. p.p. N.M.
		<i>CIL</i> , VIII, 6700 = 19353	—marturum qui sunt passi sub preside Floro in civitate Milevitana in diebus turificationis
III.	305-6	<i>CIL</i> , VIII, 4766 = 18700 (Diocletian)	Val Ant[oninus] v.p. p.p. N.C.]
		<i>CIL</i> , VIII, 5526 = 18860 (a. 306)	P Val [A]nton[inus] p.p.] N.C.
		<i>CIL</i> , VIII, 7965	Valerius Antoninus v.p. p. N.C.
		<i>CIL</i> , VIII, 7067	Valer[us Anton]inus v.p. [p.p. Numi]diar[um]
IV.	308/11	<i>CIL</i> , VIII, 7004 = 19419	Scironius Pasicrates v.p. [p.p. Numi]diar[um]
V.	314	<i>CIL</i> , VIII, 18905	Val. Paulus v.p. p.p. N.

Pallu de Lessert² puts Valerius Florus (II) before Aurelius Quintianus (I). The persecution of the Christians at this time

¹ Pauly-Wiss., s.v. "Helena," VII, 2, 2821.

² *Fastes des prov. Afr.*, II, 311-14.

consisted of two periods, the *dies traditionis* and the *dies turificationis*, with an interval between them. Diocletian's first edict ordering the persecution was issued at Nicomedia, February 23, 303, and was put into effect in Numidia, May 19, 303. According to the inscription cited above (II), Florus was governor of Numidia during the *dies turificationis*, and Pallu de Lessert, believing that he was succeeded by Quintianus (I) before November 20, 303, is puzzled to find time for the two periods of persecution between May 19 and November 20. It seems to me that Costa¹ is undoubtedly right in placing these governors in the order in which I have put them above. He argues plausibly that the "edict of amnesty" which came between the two periods of persecution was issued at the time of the celebration of Diocletian's *vicennalia* (November 20, 303).² But whether this is true or not, Eusebius tells us that the emperor's edict ordering the second period of persecution, the *dies turificationis*, was received in Palestine in the second year of the persecution; i. e., in 304.³ That this is the right chronological order of the two governors is also clearly shown by the fact that Quintianus (I) is the last of a continuous line of governors of the simple *provincia Numidia*, while the governorship of Florus (II) marks the beginning of a series of governors of one or both of the two provinces into which Numidia was divided. Also, we have definite evidence that this division took place while Florus was governor.⁴ During the *dies turificationis* he superintended the persecution at Milev, which is very near Cirta, and in the part of the province which became Numidia Cirtensis. But in the other inscriptions he is called *p(raeses) N(umidia) M(ilitiana)*. The natural inference is that during the persecution he was governor of the undivided province (as was Quintianus, his immediate predecessor), and that, after the division, he became governor of Numidia Militiana. And since one of the inscriptions⁵ in which he holds this title also mentions Diocletian as emperor, the division was made

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 1833 f. The arguments I give below for this arrangement of the governors and for the division of Numidia in 304 are for the most part Costa's.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 1860.

³ *De Mart. Palaest.* 3. 1; cf. A. Maranesi, *L'Imp. Rom. e il Cristianesimo* (Torino, 1914), p. 450 f. Cf. also Costa's argument from St. August. *Contra Cresc.* III. 27 (*op. cit.*, p. 1861).

⁴ Cf. Costa, *op. cit.*, p. 1834.

⁵ *CIL*, VIII, 2345.

before his abdication.¹ We can therefore fix this division of Numidia definitely in 304 or very early in 305.

Valerius Antoninus (III) governed Numidia Cirtensis under both Diocletian and Constantine; he was probably its first governor. Later he seems to have governed both of the provinces, though they were still formally separate, as did also Pasicrates (IV), whose governorship comes under the pretender Domitius Alexander.

The earliest governor of the reunited province whose date can definitely be fixed is Paulus (V), who held the province in 314. After that we find no further reference to a division of the province. The reunion of its two parts is doubtless to be connected with the rebuilding of Cirta, which was renamed Constantina,² after the overthrow of Alexander, which occurred in 311.

Since Numidia was not divided before 304, and the division did not last after 314, the *Laterculus Veronensis*, which lists the two provinces Numidia Cirtensis and Numidia Militiana, must have been drawn up between these two dates. I do not see how we can fix its date more closely. Of course the theory that it was drawn up about the time of Diocletian's retirement and represents his final arrangement of the provinces is a very plausible one, but we must remember that it is quite possible that the document dates from the time of Constantine and contains the names of provinces which were formed by him or some of his colleagues. As mentioned above, we have no proof whatever of the existence of the new Egyptian provinces or of Diospontus under Diocletian, and this statement applies to many other provinces. We can no longer accept the appearance of a province in the Veronese list as definite evidence that it existed in Diocletian's reign.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

¹ This is also proved by the inscriptions of Valerius Antoninus (III).

² Aurel. Victor *De Caess.* 40. 28.