



The Emperor's Divine Comes

Arthur Darby Nock

The Journal of Roman Studies, Vol. 37, Parts 1 and 2. (1947), pp. 102-116.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0075-4358%281947%2937%3C102%3ATEDC%3E2.0.CO%3B2-X>

The Journal of Roman Studies is currently published by Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.

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/sprs.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 EMPEROR'S DIVINE COMES

By ARTHUR DARBY NOCK

No one has done more than Norman Baynes to clarify our thinking on the later Roman Empire and its spiritual atmosphere, to dispel the mirage of 'Orientalism', and to emphasize the sober continuity of Roman thought.¹ So he has stressed the emperor's conscious humanity and dependence upon the supernatural as against excessive inferences from the language of ruler-worship. May I offer to him a few remarks on a phenomenon which might seem to tell on the other side, the description of this or that deity as *comes Augusti*?

(i) Under Commodus we find a coin-type of 186-9, perhaps of about 189, HERCVLI c[OMIT]I.² After a considerable interval SOLI (INVICTO) COM(I)TI (AVGVSTI) appears on issues of Gallienus and Probus. Gallienus has also SERAPIDI COMITI AVG and Probus has Minerva (unnamed, but recognizable) as COMES AVG and COMITI PROBI AVG as well as Hercules (unnamed) with the latter legend. The emperors of Gaul employed the legend; Postumus for Hercules, Neptunus, Serapis, and Victoria; Victorinus for Mars and Victoria (both, it seems, unnamed); Tetricus for the same pair, again without names; Tetricus II for Hercules (named), Minerva, and Victoria; Carausius for Neptunus, Apollo, Minerva, Victoria, and Providentia (Apollo alone named); Allectus for Minerva and Victoria (without names). Constantius Chlorus has *comes* for Minerva and the Dioscuri (no names).³ After his death Sol as *comes* is frequent on the coins of the tetrarchy, and Hercules (named), Mars and Minerva also have the epithet. Sol still appears as *comes* under Crispus and Constantine II.

The details of the use and distribution of *comes* as a divine epithet might repay further numismatic study; clearly it is well represented on coins and rare on inscriptions, rare even in view of their relative paucity and the abundance of coins from the later empire.

'Deo Herculi comiti et conservatori dominorum nostrorum' at Rome is dated by Rostovtzeff as later than Caracalla⁴; does it belong to the time of the Herculi? 'Soli invicto comiti Aug. n.' at Interamna⁵ is hardly earlier than the third century. We have a firm dating for a text from Lambaesis, 'Iovi et Herculi comitibus Imp. n. Diocletiani et Maximiani Augg. Constanti et Maximiani.'⁶ Another dedication, certainly official, from Lambaesis, is assigned to the time of Constantine; 'Victoriae divinae Virtutis comiti Augg. (i.e. Augustorum) r(es) p(ublica) c(oloniae) L(ambaesis; or -ambaesitanae).'⁷ Finally Symmachus as Praefectus Urbis was responsible for 'Victoriae Augustae comiti dominorum principumque nostrorum,' the *domini* being Valentinian and Valens.⁸

These last texts indicate what the coins prove, that this use of *comes* in general (as distinct from its isolated appearance under Commodus) rested on Imperial usage and not on a passing mood, still less on the ingenuity of panegyric or the individual preference of local mint-masters.⁹

(ii) Various scholars explain the application of *comes* to deities by reference to its use to describe members of the emperor's entourage, or to that of *comitatus* for the Household

¹ e.g. in this *Journal* xxv (1935), 83 ff. My thanks are due to the Rev. M. P. Charlesworth and to Professors F. E. Adcock, A. R. Bellinger, C. Bonner, A. Cameron, W. S. Ferguson, G. M. A. Hanfmann, and F. R. Walton for friendly aid.

² H. Mattingly, *BMC Rom. Emp.* iv, CLXXVI, 816.

³ K. Pink, *Num. Z.* LXIV (1931), 26. For the other coin evidence, cf. Mattingly-Sydenham, *Roman Imperial Coinage*; J. M. C. Toynbee, *Roman Medallions*; J. Maurice, *Numismatique Constantienne*; H. Usener, *Weihnachtsfest* (ed. 2), 357, 363; W. Kubitschek, *Num. Z.* XLVIII (1915), 172 ff. (expressing reservation as to Sarapis medallion of

Gallienus); A. Alföldi's papers, e.g. *JRS* xxii (1932), and in *Pisciculi F. J. Dölger dargeboten* (1939), *Ant. u. Christ. Beih.* 1; O. Seeck in *P-W* iv, 629; F. Grossi-Gondi, *Diz. Epigr.* ii, 468; H. v. Schoenebeck, *Klio*, Beih. xliii (1939).

⁴ *CIL* vi, 305; *JRS* xiii (1923), 98.

⁵ *CIL* x, 5331.

⁶ *CIL* viii, 18230, reading with Costa, *Diz. Epigr.* ii, 1854, n for m.

⁷ *CIL* viii, 18240; *ILS* 3811.

⁸ *CIL* vi, 31403-4.

⁹ cf. Kubitschek, l.c., 170 ff. on 'deo et domino nato', as used of Aurelian.

Brigade of troops.¹⁰ This is a natural point of view and several considerations might seem to support it.

First, *comes* is an appropriate word for a minor deity in relation to a major one, and would correspond to πάρεδρος, πρόπολος, δορυφόρος.¹¹ Secondly, Juppiter, though commonly *conservator*, is never on coins *comes*¹²; did *comes* have a note of inferiority, unsuited to the Best and Greatest? Thirdly, incongruous as we may find the idea of giving to a deity the equivalent of a position at court or a decoration, there is something like an analogy at Pergamon. Attalus III says of Zeus Sabazios, 'whom, as he was our comrade and helper in many deeds and many dangers, we decided because of his manifestations of divine power to enshrine in the temple of Athena Nicephorus. This we thought would be a place suitable and worthy of him.'¹³ This god, like an earthly ruler, is thus given the position of *synnaos theos* in a temple possessing prestige, as a recognition of services rendered. Again, while the addition of the epithet 'Augustus' (more rarely Σεβαστός) or the genitive 'Augusti' to the names of deities or festivals should in theory mean that divine assistance is thus sought for the emperor, in practice the deity or festival became Royal, Imperial. Fourthly, Commodus lacked traditional reserve, and had at the end something like a confusion between himself and Hercules; also, when he made of Rome *Colonia Commodiana*, he might seem to himself to have the privileges of a founder, which were considerable.¹⁴ Fifthly, it is urged that increasingly the imperial position as such might seem to overshadow that of the gods; an oath which took the emperor's name in vain brought the penalties of *maiestas*, while perjury by the gods was not as such punished.¹⁵ Sixthly, Pacatus, when addressing Theodosius, raised the question: 'Vtrum tamen ipse te admones? An, ut illi maiestatis tuae participi deo feruntur adsistere fata cum tabulis, sic tibi aliqua vis divina subseruit, quae quod dixeris scribat et suggerat?' (*Panegyrici latini* II, 18, 4, p. 105, Baehrens).

These arguments are not decisive. For the first, we shall see that *comes* was used in other contexts without any sense of subordination. COMITATVS AVGG. is applied to Diocletian and Maximian, presumably to denote their mutual relationship¹⁶; and in general *comes*, like similar words (e.g. *consors*, which can, but need not, have the implications of Prince Consort or junior partner in rule; ἀκόλουθος, ὁπαδός, παραστάτης),¹⁷ is applied to equals also. Any such word, when used of a deity in relation to the emperor, denotes a relationship, and one vouchsafed by the deity, who could go with the emperor on his ways and who could guard him, on the march or on the seat of authority.¹⁸

¹⁰ So Seeck, l.c.; W. Weber, *Arch. f. Rel.* XIX (1919), 324; A. Alföldi, *A Festival of Isis in Rome* 17; W. Ensslin, *CAH* XII, 357 ff. On 360 f. E. brings out the other aspect of imperial authority here stressed. The question as a whole is one of nuances rather than of alternatives.

¹¹ e.g. Apul. *Met.* x, 31, 3, of Dioscuri in relation to Juno; *CIL* VII, 924 (as restored by Rostovtzeff, *JRS* XIII, 1923, 97 f.). So Calpurnius Siculus IV, 87, 'facundo comitatus Apolline Caesar', to which Professor P. W. Harsh drew my attention.

¹² Observed by Seeck.

¹³ Dittenberger, *OGI* 331, 51 ff.; C. B. Welles, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period* 267 ff., no. 67 (I borrow his translation). So in 332/1 B.C. the Athenians voted to Amphiarus a golden crown in recognition of his excellent care for their fellow citizens. (*IG* VII, 4252; J. Ziehen, *Leges graecorum sacrae*, 97, no. 31). The inscription is of the regular honorific type. As Ziehen remarks, the proposer Phanodemus received on the same day a crown of equal value (*SIG*³ 287). There is no question of secularism; Lycurgus was one of the *epimeletai* of the festival of Amphiarus in 329 (*IG* VII, 4254). It is one more illustration of the universal significance of the idea of honour, τιμή, in Greek religion and life.

¹⁴ cf. Gneecchi, *Medaglion* II, 54: HERC. ROM. CONDITORI; A. Aymard, *Rev. ét. lat.* XIV (1936);

cf. the honours paid to the sober Hadrian at Antinoopolis (H. I. Bell, *JRS* xxx, 1940, 140 f.).

¹⁵ Remarked by Minucius Felix, 29, 5.

¹⁶ Pink, l.c. 21. Does COMITES AVG. in Mattingly-Sydenham V, II, 527, refer to the wife and son of Carausius?

¹⁷ For *comes*, cf. Virg. *Aen.* VI, 292, 'docta comes' (of the Sibyl); *CIL* VIII, 9831, 'Dianae deae nemorum comiti' (in a dedication which has a suggestion of poetic language. The verbal quality of *comes* appears as in Lucr. V, 741); Claud. *Cons. Stil.* I, 80, 'comitata parentibus.' cf. Apollo as ὁπαδός of the Muses in Hom. *H. Herm.* 450; Artemis in Soph. *OC.* 1092, as ὁπαδὸν ὠκυπόδων ἐλάφων (as in the inscription about Diana; cf. Liddell-Scott-Jones, 1238); Athena Ergane as πάρεδρος in relation to the arts in Plut. *Fort.* 4, p. 99 B; Bacchus as ὁμόστολος of Maenads in Soph. *OT.* 212; and for ἀκόλουθος, Zosim. I, 2, p. 1, 17, θεοῦ βούλησιν τοῖς ἐφ' ἡμῖν μετὰ τὸ δίκαιον ἀκόλουθον οὔσαν.

¹⁸ To be emphasized in view of Alföldi's observation (*Röm. Mitt.* XLIX, 1934, 44), that in certain scenes emperors are seated and gods (even Juppiter) stand; so it is with Juppiter and Diocletian on the Arch of Salonica (K. F. Kinch, *L'arc de Salonique* 26). G. Rodenwaldt has remarked (*Abh. Berlin* 1935, III, 17), that the emperor sits in the exercise of the virtue of *iustitia*.

The second point looks stronger. Nevertheless in an inscription quoted above Jupiter and Hercules are *comites*; and Sol, Sarapis, and Hercules, who are freely described on coins as *comites* were at this time notable modalities of 'quidquid divinitatis in sede caelesti'.¹⁹ Aristides, indeed, speaks of Zeus as accompanying ordinary mortals (n. 47 below), and Jupiter appears side by side with Postumus (n. 54). Yet in general now, as in Homeric story (and this analogy is important), Zeus acted through subordinates, or, if you will, through manifestations. The Sun, who shared his sovereignty (e.g. Julian, 136 A, 143 D, 149 C), did visibly cross the sky, did with his rays reach every corner of the world, was thought to see all and (like the emperor: Pliny, *Pan.* 80, 3), to hear the prayers of those wronged. Further, according to the widely accepted *théologie solaire*, the Sun represented the powerhouse of the universe. Sarapis in his turn helped by miracle and shared men's concerns. Hercules had, like the emperor, traversed the world, putting down injustice, and even now a representation of Hercules could guard the home, just as the emperor's statue afforded sanctuary. In addition, there was a widespread tendency towards a theoretical unification of godhead, and formulas such as 'There is one (Zeus) Helios Sarapis' had, outside philosophic circles, currency as words of power. Godhead was one; there were many telephone lines and they ran through a number, smaller but appreciable, of different switchboards. You used one or another according to what seemed appropriate for a particular purpose or place; a *comes* gave you the equivalent of a private line.²⁰

The third point needs no rebuttal, since it did no more than show a possibility. As for the fourth, the *comes* coin of Commodus antedates the full flowering of his peculiarities. Further, an issue of 191 shows Hercules with his arm on the shoulder of the emperor, i.e. as divine protector; it is certainly not the pose in which a Privy Councillor would be represented.²¹ In any event, *comes* enjoys its full development under rulers of an altogether different disposition.

On the fifth point, the argument about perjury is answered by the phrase of Tacitus, 'deorum iniuria dis curae.'²² To the wider question I return in a discussion of the religion of the Roman army, whose standards were, like the emperor, supremely venerated and admittedly perishable.²³ Here we may note that the scene accompanying HERCVLI COMITI AVG on medallions of Postumus is one of sacrifice to Hercules or one of emperor and god side by side (as jugate heads)²⁴; also that in the period in which the use of *comes* develops we see the gods at times regain their old position on the obverse of coins, the side of dignity.²⁵

¹⁹ Edict of Milan (Lactant. *Mort. Pers.* 48).

²⁰ Note A. Wifstrand's remarks, *Bull. Soc. Roy. Lund.*, 1941-2, 412, on Cels. ap. Orig. *C. Cels.* 1, 24, καὶ πλείον οὐδὲν ἔγνωσαν: 'Dieses πλείον, das sie hätten lernen sollen, war gewiss die Existenz der vielen Götter und ihr Verhältniss zu der einen grossen Gottheit'; also Festugière, *Rev. ét. gr.* LVII, 255 f.; Orig., *Mart.* 46, p. 42 K.; Macrob., *Sat.* 1, 17, 4 ff. on 'quo numine laeso' (admitting the unity of divine power, it had 'diversae virtutes'). Again Constantine on his Arch has Sol, and Licinius has Jupiter (H. P. L'Orange, *Der spätantike Bilderschmuck des Konstantinsbogens*, 141; ib. 142 on coins); there can have been no risk of Constantine being thought to have a minor patron. 'Divomque numen multiplex' (*Carm. lat. epigr.*, 111, 15) is the crucial phrase; the multiplicity was genuine (cf. Plotin. II, 9, 9, l. 37 ff., Bréhier), as well as the ultimate unity, when that unity was asserted in the name of philosophy (e.g. Sen. *Ben.* IV, 7 f.), or of the oneness of Isis; contrast this with the oneness of Jahve (Mal. I, 11; Acts 17, 23).

²¹ *BMC Rom. Emp.* IV, 746. Commodus appears with Hercules in a Janiform type (Gnechchi II, 66, no. 131; *BMC* IV, CLXXXI), which does not involve more than the idea of correspondence of emperor and god discussed later. He did, indeed, shock feelings (cf. O. Weinreich, *Arch. f. Rel.* XVIII (1915), 14). Yet there is no record of his having gone to the lengths of Caligula's appearance between the

statues of the Dioscuri (Suet. *Cal.* 22, 2), and even in 191 Jupiter, whom he had magnified as Exsuperator, is 'sponsor securitatis Augusti, defensor salutis Augusti' (*BMC* IV, CLXIX).

²² cf. Nock, *J. Bibl. Lit.* LX (1941), 94, on the axiomatic validity ascribed to religious sanctions.

²³ To appear in *Harv. Theol. Rev.* xli (1948).

²⁴ Toynbee, *Medallions* 162, 208. Incidentally, to put the claims of emperors into perspective, note that the deep theism of Apollonius of Tyana seemed compatible with the contention that sages in general and he in particular could properly be called gods; *Epist.* 44 might be genuine. cf. also *Corp. Herm.* x, 24 (man in a way superior to the so-called gods in heaven); IV, 5 (on some men); XII, 1 (Heraclitean remark, cf. x, 25, ascribed to Agathos Daimon); P. Vallette, *L'Apologie d'Apulée* 285, 'ni entre les démons et Dieu, ni entre l'homme et les démons, il n'y a de différence essentielle'; Galen, *Protr.* IX, 21-2, I, p. 117, 14 ff., Marquardt; Porphyry, *Marc.* 15-16. When Philostratus makes Apollonius say of Heracles (VIII, 7), 'I chose him as a fellow-worker,' his language goes far beyond the use of *comes*.

²⁵ Not only when jugate with the emperor (n. 54 below), or when Sol faces Carus (Toynbee, 158); but also above all under Aurelian with SOL DOMINVS IMPERI ROMANI, Aurelian being relegated to the reverse (Mattingly-Sydenham V, 1, 301).

On the sixth point, Pacatus speaks in a tentative manner; and *vis divina* is vague and not highly personalized, not as much so as 'angel'.

Nevertheless, does the religious use of *comes* reflect the secular use? Our answer must depend on the probabilities suggested by the relations of emperors and gods in general, and on other connotations of *comes* as applied to deities. Now J. Maurice was undoubtedly right in stressing the close connexion of *comes* and *conservator* (as in the inscription quoted p. 102, above).²⁶ On the one hand, the imperial dignity was extolled; Postumus and Carausius, who used *comes*, were the first rulers to appear on coins in what was nearly full face instead of the traditional profile, and the full face begins with Maxentius and Licinius.²⁷ So Charlesworth reminds us that 'devotus numini maiestatique eius' is more than a courtly phrase.²⁸ On the other hand, this *numen* and this *maiestas* were what they were because of the parallel higher permanent *numen* and *maiestas* above and behind them, because God's hand upheld God's Vicar.²⁹ PROVIDENTIA DEORVM QVIES AVGVSTORVM: 'la Providence des dieux assure le repos des Augustes.'³⁰ From Probus on, CLEMENTIA TEMP(orum) is accompanied by a representation of Juppiter handing the globe to the emperor.³¹ After all, SOLI INVICTO COMITI is commonest under Constantine, and the climax of imperial dignity was reached under Christianity. Even earlier the *pietas* of the emperor's upturned face is emphatic. His *felicitas* was something given, and it could be as a reward for his *pietas*.³² More and more his individuality was englobed in the charisma of office, as was his personal taste in the vestments of office and his personal speech in the solemnity of oracular utterance.

'Dis te minorem quod geris imperas' (Horace, *Carm.* III, 6, 5) was not so far from 'Deo te minorem quod geris imperas'. The emperor, however exalted, was *minor*; he was born; he came to the throne through the *providentia* of the gods or through the correlative lower *providentia* of his predecessor, commonly not as heir from birth to the empire, often as a mature man who knew responsibility but had not expected supreme power. In due time he died, and his *aeternitas* was not like that of the gods; he had to face the major risk of *damnatio memoriae* and the minor risk of missing apotheosis, to say nothing of the chance of his deification being later neglected. Even the most loyal subject recognized that fate brought bad emperors, many in fact.³³

(iii) Accepting in general the view that *comes* meant something like *conservator*, 'Schutzherr,'³⁴ let us pass to certain earlier uses of the word, and start with Cicero, *De natura deorum* II, 164 ff. Cicero is arguing that the gods are accustomed to exercise forethought not only for mankind as a whole but also for individuals; not only for this large island which we call the world but also for its parts, the continents, and for their parts, e.g.

²⁶ *Numismatique* II, XVIII (I doubt his interpretation of *Pan. lat.* V, 14, 4, p. 200; 'cum tu numinum nostrorum conservator advenieris et ille quasi maiestatis tuae comes et socius . . .'). 'Ille,' might, as Maurice suggests, be the sun, particularly if it is deictic, and the orator is thought to be pointing skywards. Yet the reference is probably to some human associate; so Baehrens, *Diss. Groning.* 1910, 56).

²⁷ A. Grabar, *L'empereur dans l'art byzantin* II, 152 f.; cf. a bronze disc showing the radiate Caracalla in full face (O. Brendel, *Antike* XII, 1936, 275, fig. 2).

²⁸ 'Virtues of a Roman Emperor' (*Proc. Brit. Acad.* XXIII, 1937), 22. cf. καθωσιωμένους in Herodian VII, 6, 4 and 9, 3.

²⁹ cf. Plin. *Pan.* 80, 4; A. v. Harnack, *Sitzungsber. Berlin*, 1927, 436 ff.; Alföldi, *Röm. Mitt.* LII (1937), 58; Toynbee, *Num. Chr.*, 1936, 328 f., on Juppiter handing thunderbolt to Trajan, interpreted by P. G. Hamberg, *Studies in Roman Imperial Art* (Copenhagen, 1945), 67, as a weapon given to the emperor for his campaign; Joh. A. Straub, *Vom Herrscherideal in der Spätantike* 76 ff.; Charlesworth, *Harv. Theol. Rev.* XXIX (1936), 118, etc.

³⁰ Maurice I, 23 f., II, CXVIII, 122, etc. cf. the sun

with AETERNITAS IMPERI (L'Orange, *Konstantinsbogen* 177); also TVTELA on coins of the Gallic emperors.

³¹ Mattingly-Sydenham V, II, *passim*.

³² cf. *Pan. lat.* XI, 6, p. 279; IV, 16, 2, p. 169, 'mereatur'; IV, 18, 4, p. 171, 'subnixum deo'; SHA *Aurel.* 19, 4; L'Orange, *op. cit.*, 173, 176 (in spite of p. 156, 'diese Glücksmächte . . . ist es die Gottesmacht des Kaisers selbst, die in sie ausstrahlt und sich durch sie über die beglückte Welt ergiesst'); Charlesworth, *JRS* XXXIII (1943), 1 ff.

For the fluidity of thought and expression, cf. BMC IV, CLXVII, GEN AVG FELIC(ITER). The Genius of the emperor is a supernatural entity; yet you wish luck to the Genius, as being a channel of blessings to the emperor. S. Eitrem, *Symb. Oslo*. XXII, 1942, 62, regards the wide-open eyes of Constantine as superhuman; yes, but as the eyes of the man who could pierce the veil.

³³ For the disappearance of cult, cf. Charlesworth, *JRS* XXVII (1937), 58 ff.; for bad emperors, SHA *Elagab.* 34, 4 f., *Aurel.* 42, 3 ff.

³⁴ So Usener, Dölger, etc., and already W. Froehner, *Les médailles de l'empire romain* 226 f.

Rome, Athens, Sparta, and Rhodes. In these cities they love some men specially. Cicero mentions with affectionate pride Romans of the great past and continues :—

multosque praeterea et nostra civitas et Graecia tulit singulares viros, quorum neminem nisi iuvante deo talem fuisse credendum est. Quae ratio poetas maximeque Homerum impulit ut principibus heroum, Vlixi, Diomed, Agamemnoni, Achilli, certos deos discriminum et periculorum comites adiungeret.

‘ Discriminum et periculorum comites ’ ; that is the point ; Athena as invisibly or in human disguise she accompanied Odysseus (e.g. *Odyss.* XIII, 300 f., 393) or Telemachus, Athena as she speaks at the beginning of the *Ajax* of Sophocles, Athena as she helped Heracles while he was still on earth, for instance in the slaying of the Hydra.³⁵ (We have evidence of the continued popularity in art of this last scene.³⁶) An analogy involving Heracles is significant, since he had a place in men’s minds with far more than merely cultural value. He had his hagiography, if not his gospel,³⁷ and the choice of Herculi as a dynastic name must have corresponded to sentiment. In eulogizing one of the Herculi, Maximian, Eumenius speaks of ‘ Minerva socia ’ as well as of ‘ Iuno placata ’ (i.e. having laid aside her old grudge).³⁸

We are to consider later ancient comparisons between this assistance of Athena and the *daimonion* of Socrates ; meanwhile we may note that Philostratus represents Apollonius of Tyana as comparing Athena’s care for Diomede with her protection of Domitian (VII, 32). Minerva is not on Domitian’s coins called *comes*, but such she was, if without the parallelism which existed between Sol and the emperor.³⁹ Her prominence on Domitian’s coins is comparable with that of Hercules on those of Commodus in the last phase, and one type (Domitian between Minerva and Victoria⁴⁰) goes further than Commodus did. A relief found at the Cancellaria in Rome shows Domitian setting forth to war or returning from it ; Minerva is his closest companion.⁴¹ Martial’s ‘ coram Cecropia legat puella ’ (v, 2, 8), is familiar ; the relief shows Minerva as the emperor’s companion in war and not in literature alone.⁴²

In addition to the protection of kings as such by Zeus, many heroes, even Autolycus (*Odyss.* XIX, 398) had in epic divine companions, and the ordinary man had his share of such privilege ; and as a natural thing (not involving any analogy to the later magical proceedings to secure a familiar spirit, *paredros*, or union with the divine, *systasis*). The rights of any wayfarer could be supported by the belief that Zeus Xenios was the avenger of suppliants and strangers, Zeus who went along in the company of revered strangers (*Odyss.* IX, 270 f., ξείνοισιν ἄμ’ αἰδοίοισιν ὀππρδεῖ ; cf. VII, 165, 181 ; the coincidence shows that the phrase was current coin in epic style, as is illustrated by Plato, *Soph.* 216 A-B).⁴³

³⁵ cf. Sen. *HF* 900, ‘ laborum socia et adiutrix ’ ; Val. Flacc. III, 489, ‘ Pallada consortem curis cursusque regentem ’.

³⁶ cf. I. A. Richmond, *Arch. Ael.* 4 XXI (1943), 171, pl. x, A 2, for a representation at Corbridge of Athena (small, presumably for reasons of perspective) helping Hercules. For the relationship in general, cf. L. R. Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults* 304, 308, on Athena Aiantis, and Apollo Sarpedonios. cf. [Plat.] *Min.* and *Plut., Max. c. princ.* I, p. 776 E, on Minos as pupil of Zeus.

³⁷ cf. Cleomed. *De motu* II, 1, p. 168, 6. Against exaggerations, cf. H. J. Rose, *Harv. Theol. Rev.* XXXI (1938), 113 ff.

³⁸ *Pan. lat.* IX, 10, 2, p. 254.

³⁹ In spite of some identifications or assimilations which disregard a difference of sex (Suet. *Vit.* 15, 4 ; Nock, *JHS* XLVIII (1928), 32, n. 55 ; Alföldi, *Z. Num.* XXXVIII (1928) ; Eitrem, *Symb. Oslo.* x, 1932, 39 ff.), or of order of being (Nock, *Harv. Theol. Rev.* XXVII, 1934, 98).

⁴⁰ *BMC* II, xcvi, 404.

⁴¹ Van Buren, *AJA* 1940, 377 f., fig. 2 ; Hamberg, *Studies* 50 ff. Monument and literature alike I know

thanks to Prof. Hanfmann, who refers also to Petron. 29 (‘ Minerva leads Trimalchio into Rome ’ ; ‘ als die Verleiherin der Fähigkeiten denen er sein Fortkommen verdankt,’ remarks Friedlaender, ad. loc., p. 216). See also *JRS* XXXVI (1946), 179 ff.

⁴² cf. K. Scott, *The Imperial Cult under the Flavians* 166 ff. ; note ib. 178, Hercules and Domitian holding small statuettes of Minerva, i.e. with the thought discussed under (v), 186, on possible association of Germanicus and Fortuna Primigenia.

⁴³ The relevance of Homeric analogy is illustrated by Themist. XI, p. 147 f., Hardouin ; Th. cites *Il.* x, 279 f., 291, as setting forth the lesson of Prov. 21, 1, ‘ The king’s heart is in the hand of the Lord,’ quoted as Assyrian since that was an epithet more fitted to a cultural context.

For deities visiting men incognito, cf. J. E. Fontenrose, *Univ. Cal. Publ. Cl. Phil.* XIII, IV (1945), 93 ff. ; ib. 105, he speaks of Acts 14, 11–13. (Certainly relevant ; but hardly, as he urges, local folklore about divine visitants. Rather, a transformation of a story familiar in literature, to represent the Lycaonians as in effect saying ‘ We are not going to make the traditional mistake ’).

All men have need of the gods (*Odyss.* III, 48), and the gods helped. Athena and Hephaestus gave aid in the skills over which they were deemed to preside,⁴⁴ and the appropriate deities were present at a marriage, and so might be on other occasions any supernatural being whose coming and aid were entreated. (Thus the chorus in Sophocles, *Ajax* 702 ff., pray for the coming and continued presence of Delian Apollo.) The good man was at all times 'deorum comitatu vallatus'⁴⁵ (a phrase with a plural notable in a Platonizing context; cf. n. 20 above). Certain divinities were specially ready to aid and to participate; so Sarapis shared in all concerns and ventures and interests of men⁴⁶; and Aristides, who states this, speaks also of Zeus as present at every action, just as is teacher to pupil and as the *parabates* (the warrior who rides beside the charioteer) is to the charioteer.⁴⁷ If so pious a man could use this language of Zeus, and without apologizing for its boldness, we need not see anything overweening in the description of a god as *comes* of the emperor.

Private individuals might be thought to enjoy a special relation to a particular supernatural being such as Pindar craved of Apollo and the vine-tender in Philostratus claimed vis-à-vis Protesilaus,⁴⁸ such again as Isis promised to Lucius, and as various initiations were thought to convey. Nevertheless a relation of the type suggested by *comes* belonged, now as in Homer, to rulers above all. Zeus, occasionally specialized as *Seleukios* or *basilikos*, Apollo, Athena, and Dionysus protected Hellenistic kings.⁴⁹ The Roman emperors had their guardians, deities called Augustan or 'of Augustus', the gods of the Capitol, those of the Palatine, and those again of their individual preferences (e.g. the Liber and Hercules whom Septimius Severus brought from his home in North Africa). There is a wealth of meaning and sentiment in Horace's phrase 'te copias, te consilium et tuos praebente divos' (*Carm.* IV, 14, 33).

Moreover, just as Artemis left the dying Hippolytus and their long companionship (*Eur., Hipp.* 1441), so Dionysus departed from Antony,⁵⁰ Minerva from Domitian,⁵¹ and a figure in the shape of the Genius Publicus from Julian.⁵² (This figure had earlier threatened, 'tecum non diutius habitabo,' if Julian did not accept the throne.⁵³) A man's Genius did likewise (cf. p. 111, later, the observations of Ammianus about the supposed departure of something of the sort from Constantius), and so could the special power of *nous* (p. 112).

Supernatural companionship is well established. *Comes* could imply a yet more intimate relation; so when we see jugate heads of Postumus and Hercules (sometimes both on obverse and repeated with COMIT AVG on reverse), Postumus and Mars, Postumus and

⁴⁴ Max. Tyr. IV, 8, p. 49, 18, Hobein; cf. Plut., *Pericl.* 13, 12. cf. J. D. Beazley *Potter and Painter in Ancient Athens* (*Brit. Acad. Proc.* xxx), 8 f.

⁴⁵ Longinianus in Augustine, *Ep.* 234, 2; cf. Max. Tyr. VIII, 7, p. 94, 13; Julian, p. 233 D (personal), 275 B; and for an earlier time, when the gods were thought to give an added impetus to men for weal or woe, cf. Ed. Fraenkel, 'Aeschylus, New Texts and Old Problems' (*Brit. Acad. Proc.* xxviii (1942), 22, and Rose, *Harv. Theol. Rev.* xxxix (1946), 12). Such ideas are relevant to our understanding of what a Gentile might have made of Romans, 8, 28 (the pendant of I Cor. 3, 9).

⁴⁶ cf. Nock, *Harv. Theol. Rev.* xxxvii (1944), 150.

⁴⁷ *To Zeus* 26 (I, 10, Dindorf; II, 346, Keil); cf. J. Amann, *Zeusrede des Ailios Aristides* 95.

⁴⁸ *Heroicus*, *passim*; cf. Eitrem, *Symb. Oslo.* VIII (1929); Bonner, *Harv. Theol. Rev.* xxx (1937), 132 ff. We may perhaps compare *CIL* III, 897, 'Marti amico et consentienti', 898, 'Mercurio consentienti' (for *amico*, cf. n. 76); also the special Semitic linkings of man and god discussed by A. Alt, *Gott der Väter*, and texts in E. Dhorme, 'Les religions de Babylonie et d'Assyrie' (*Mana* I,

II), 15, 'Que mon dieu se tienne à ma droite; Que ma déesse se tienne à ma gauche! Que le dieu gardien se tienne à mon côté!' words to be used by an ordinary individual; 77, oracle to Asaraddon, 'Je suis l'Ishtar d'Arbèles; devant toi, derrière toi, je marcherai, ne crains pas; 263, complaint about a sorceress, 'Elle a éloigné de mon corps mon dieu et ma déesse' (cf. 268).

⁴⁹ cf. Nock, *JHS* XLVIII (1928), 41 f., and *Cl. Phil.* xxxviii (1943), 53, *Harv. St. Cl. Phil.* xli (1930), 29, 34, 57 ff.; also Zeus Philippos in Dittenberger, *OGI* 8 (with G. De Sanctis, *Riv. Fil.*, 1940, 9, n. 1). Nero expresses his gratitude to the Greek gods, *SIG* 814, 36.

⁵⁰ Plut. *Ant.* 75; cf. Rose, *Ann. Arch. Anthropol.* XI, and K. Scott, *Cl. Phil.* xxiv (1929), 133 ff.

⁵¹ Suet. *Domit.* 15, 3; cf. Scott, l.c., and in *Imperial Cult.*

⁵² Amm. Marc. xxv, 2, 3; 'Genius populi Romani' is prominent on the coins of the first decade of the fourth century.

⁵³ Amm. xx, 5, 10; cf. Plut. *Alex. M. Fort.* II, 13, p. 344 A, on Tyche as supposedly guardian of the Persian king, which belongs to the ideas discussed under (vi) below.

Juppiter, Probus and Sol, Sol and Victorinus, Mars and Victorinus, Sol and Diocletian⁵⁴; so above all Constantine and Sol.⁵⁵ The emperor is, as Piganiol says, 'comme un double du Soleil.'⁵⁶ For this there were antecedents in much earlier speculations about kingship and the sun (p. 114, later), and in a personal and ideal as well as adulatory assimilation of rulers to particular deities.⁵⁷ In its present form it involved nothing of blasphemous self-assertion, nothing that Constantine rejected before 323⁵⁸; no, it claimed a friend beyond phenomena for him who had so special a responsibility for phenomena.

So later God or Christ and the emperor were treated as analogous and correlative; 'ille (Christus) spiritalibus malis restitit, vos mala terrena vicistis . . . pro salute hominum Christo pugnante vicistis.'⁵⁹ The town of Pisaurum and its *curator* had made a dedication (*ILS* 583) 'Herculi Aug. consorti d.n. Aureliani invicti Augus(ti),' and occasional Byzantine language speaks of a joint rule of God and the emperor.⁶⁰ This is a figure of speech; parallelism, as in the names of the Jovii and Herculi, was perhaps the dominant mode of expression. So the eternity of Rome and that of the universe were correlates.⁶¹ Horace again said 'lucem redde tuae, dux bone, patriae' (*Carm.* IV, 5, 5); is not this the 'Romana lux' of *Panegyrici* IX, 18, p. 260; VII, 10, p. 239; XI, 13, p. 283, and its counterpart on the Arras medallion?⁶² This the emperor, under divine guidance, gave, even as the sun gave physical light.

Panegyric at times admitted extravagant language; the parallelism was extended to make the emperor *kosmokrator* (*IGRR* I, 1063, of Caracalla), or to say 'virtutibus vestris victa elementa cesserunt',⁶³ and the like. Men moved between an innocent belief in

⁵⁴ Toynbee, *Medallions* 157, 208, 'Postumus' divine companion—HERCVLI COMITI AVG—who deigns to appear on the obverse beside his devotee; Mattingly-Sydenham V, II, 358, 360; Carausius appears similarly with Sol.

For the issues of Diocletian and Victorinus, cf. Mattingly-Sydenham V, II, 239, 389. The nearest that I know to an early parallel is the coin of Dios Hieron with Nero and Zeus facing (F. Imhoof-Blumer, *Lydische Stadtmünzen* 63, pl. III, 9). That posture is seen later for Carus and Sol (Mattingly-Sydenham V, II, 146). cf. Maximianus and Hercules (287 f., sacrificing), Diocletian and Juppiter (247; sacrificing, with the legend CONSERVATOR AVGG). Jugate heads of Commodus and Roma appear on a medallion of 192 (Gnecchi II, 65).

⁵⁵ Maurice I, XC, 100; II, 154, 236 ff., cf. Alföldi, *JRS* XXII (1932), 13 (coin with *obv.*, Maximian as Sol, rev. SOLI INVICTO COMITI, A.D. 312-3).

⁵⁶ *L'empereur Constantin* 24. cf. *Pan. lat.* VI, 21, 5, p. 218, 'teque in illius specie recognovisti,' with the notes of Maurice II, XXXII, and H. Lietzmann, *Sitzungsber. Berlin*, 1937, 265 f.; also Alföldi, *Festival of Isis* 7, on 'the unconscious assimilation of the profile of the god to the customary object of their work by the die-sinkers'.

⁵⁷ cf. *Plut. Ant.* 60, on Antony's association of himself (προσώκειον δὲ ἐαυτὸν) with Heracles in lineage (36, 7), and with Dionysus in mode of life; also *Def. orac.* 21, p. 421 E, on theophoric names as ideally involving something in common with the deities from whom they were taken. Such names were literally *theophora* (Clearch. *ap. Athen.* X, p. 448 E); yet, in spite of the Christian analogues discussed by Jalabert-Mouterde, *Dict. arch. chrét. liturg.* VII, 636 f., and Leclercq, *ib.* XII, 1511, we must not make too much of them; cf. S. Dow, *Harv. Theol. Rev.* XXX (1937), 216 ff. Nevertheless, there was the possibility of an equivalent to a belief in patron saints, just as *daimon* implies something like a guardian angel.

For a ruler, parallelism easily passed into quasi-identity; Gallienus had Sol as *comes* and was assimilated to Sol (SHA *Gallien.* 18, 2). Toynbee, *Medallions* 211, explains IOVI DIOCLETIANO on an obverse

as *Iovi et Diocletiano*; now Diocletian had no mental confusion and he gave up his power before the statue of Juppiter; and yet the legend is accompanied by a single radiate bust (Gnecchi III, 78, no. 40). The thought is one of parallelism; cf. *Pan. lat.* X, 6, p. 268, 7, and the double herm of Saturn and Diocletian, meaning that Diocletian has brought back 'Saturnia regna' (H. Fuhrmann, *Röm. Mitt.* LIII, 1938, 44), as also the invocation of Juppiter as the Augustus of the Romans, in Dio Cass. LXXIX, 20, 2, a scene which anticipates the acclamatory prayers handled by F. J. Dölger, *Sol Salutis*, ed. 2, 60 ff.

At a lower level, the Greeks called the strong Sostratus by the name of Heracles and believed him to be H. (Lucian, *Demon.* I); cf. *Carm. lat. epigr.* 879, and Nock, *JHS* XLVIII (1928), 32 ff. and also *Cl. Phil.* XXXVIII (1943), 54 f. There were many forms of Zeus, with room for a Zeus Hadrianos, etc.; cf. *Lucr.* IV, 1185, 'Veneres nostras.'

⁵⁸ Constantine continued to find the piety of his father, Constantius Chlorus acceptable (*Eus. VC* II, 49, p. 62, Heikel; cf. Maurice II, LVIII, LXVI, 243, and Piganiol, *L'Empereur Constantin* 35).

⁵⁹ *Firm. Mat. Err.* 20, 7, p. 54; cf. *Pan. lat.* II, 6, 4, p. 94, 27 (to Theodosius) 'tibi istud soli pateat, imperator, cum deo consorte secretum.'

⁶⁰ cf. L. Bréhier-P. Batiffol, *Les survivances du culte impérial romain*; Grabar, *L'empereur*, 15, 19, etc.; E. Kantorowicz, *Laudes Regiae*.

⁶¹ cf. Maurice II, CXXXI; Claudian, *Bell. Poll. s. Goth.* 511, 'seu caelum seu Roma tonat.' The sober Pliny says of Rome, 'deorum quaedam immortalium generi humano portio' (*NH* XXXVI 118), to point a contrast.

⁶² cf. Kubitschek, *Num. Z.* LVII (1924), 84 f., and for earlier use, J. Stroux, *Philol.* LXXXIV (1929), 238 ff.

⁶³ *Firm. Err.* 28, 6, p. 76, 16; cf. *Pan. lat.* VII, 12, p. 230; VI, 13, p. 211; XI, 15, p. 286; II, 6, 4, p. 95 (prayer to Theodosius), and for extreme language, *CIL* VI, 1080 (with 31236), referred to Caracalla by Mommsen, *Ges. Schr.* IV, 509 n., and discussed by Kubitschek, *Num. Z.* XLVIII (1915), 172. cf. Ensslin, *CAH* XII, 359 f.

'Queen's weather' and something like the flattery ascribed to Canute's courtiers; but there is nothing new or surprising in this to anyone who remembers the thunderbolt of Alexander in the painting of Apelles or on the Porus decadrachm (C. T. Seltman, *Greek Coins*, 213). Nor was there any confusion of thought. A king was a man for a' that.

As for *comes*, after all a god could go with the emperor on his ways, unseen but strong to aid. The emperor could not go with gods on their ways until he died and, if approved, enjoyed apotheosis; in the meanwhile he was 'as it were, rising together with the luminary in heaven' (Eusebius, *VC* I, 43). Anything more was bold metaphor such as Horace used if he wrote *bibit*, and not as I believe *bibet*, in *Carm.* III, 3, 12.⁶⁴ Anyone might enjoy the nearness of a god through initiation or revelation or magic; the sage might through goodness; but to call him *comes dei* would have been bold.

(iv) Cicero has given us one hint for *comes*; Horace affords another. Why, he asks, are two brothers so different? Why does one prefer ease, and the other stretch every nerve for wealth?

Scit Genius, natale comes qui temperat astrum,
naturae deus humanae, mortalis in unum
quodque caput, voltu mutabilis, albus et ater

(*Epp.* II, 2, 187 ff.). Here we have another *comes*, also free from any hint of subordination, just as 'animula vagula blandula' in SHA, *Hadr.* 25, 9, was in no sense inferior to the body of which it was 'hospes comesque'.⁶⁵ The Genius had, in fact, the *tutela* of an individual as of a place; ⁶⁶ ultimately like a divine protector, it left a man.⁶⁷

Genius acquired much of the range of meaning possessed by *daimon*,⁶⁸ and we must turn to this. Before the time of Plato, *daimon* was, as later, a word of literature rather than of worship, and, when not a synonym for *theos* endowed with a greater vagueness and a convenient vocative, usually meant a supernatural element incidentally impinging upon life; luck as it showed itself in crucial instances and tragic blindness; something which was in a way *ad hoc*.⁶⁹ Plato used *daimon* in the old way, but also (a) as a generic term for divine intermediaries between gods and men, and (b) as a destiny spirit somewhat like a guardian angel, and (c) as the highest and divine element in man, 'living with him' (*Tim.* 90 C, σύννοικος). The senses defined as (b) and (c) naturally run into one another; either way, *daimon* is now linked to the individual by a permanent and not an incidental relationship; so to speak, not *ad hoc*, but *huius*. The emphatic statement of such ideas in Menander

⁶⁴ cf. Herodian I, 5, 6, on Marcus Aurelius; *Pan. lat.* VII, 14, 3, p. 231, on the dead Constantius Chlorus, IV, 14, 6, p. 167 (military commander in heaven); Eus. *VC* IV, 48. In Themist. XI, p. 147 D ὁ ἀγαθὸς βασιλεὺς σύννοικός τε ἐστὶ καὶ ὁμοδίατος τῷ θεῷ —as enjoying the guidance of divine wisdom. A sage possessed that (cf. Porphyry. *Marc.* 16).

Pythagoras was, before birth, a companion of Apollo (Iambl. *VP* 8); cf. the soul in Plat., *Phaedr.* 249 C. See also F. Cumont, *Rev. ét. anc.* XLII (1940), 408 ff. on a possible representation of the sun accompanied by Trajan. Naturally poets were here and now companions of the Muses (Lucr. III, 1037). As for rulers, the full range of metaphor is early; cf. *Pan. lat.* II, 4, p. 93, 11, 'deum dedit Hispania quem videmus,' with Hor. *C* III, 5, 2, 'praesens divus habebitur.'

⁶⁵ συντεταγμένη in Plat. *Laws* x, p. 903 D, and προσγένηται in Albin. *Epit.* 25.

⁶⁶ cf. Censorin. 3, 1, and 3, 5, 'comitetur' 3, 8, 'adsiduus observator'; also 6, 2, 'potentia spiritus semen comitantis.'

⁶⁷ Ovid suggests (*Tr.* III, 13) that his *natalis* (corresponding to Genius; Cesano, *Diz. epigr.* III, 449), should have left him when he went into exile; cf. Plut. *Gen. Socr.* 24, p. 594 A, on the *daimon* as helping or leaving the soul. Plin. *NH* II, 28, knows heavenly bodies born and dying with the

individual, but Horace's idea of the mortality of the Genius is uncommon; the Genius of a dead man sometimes received worship.

⁶⁸ cf. Rose, *Trans. IV Congr. Hist. Rel.* II, 138 ff., *CQ* XVIII (1923), 57 ff. Roman feeling survived to a greater extent than strictly Roman concepts. The fullness of identification is shown by Pers. IV, 27, 'genioque sinistro,' meaning κακοδαίμων. Here we are concerned with the ultimate effects of a long and forgotten process of fusion; and, in considering popular and official thought, must always allow for the influence of classical poetry, as in the coinage relating to Saloninus (Alföldi, *N. Chr.* 1929, 270 ff.), and in EXPECTATE VENI (Mattingly-Sydenham V, II, 510, etc.).

⁶⁹ On *daimon*, cf. Andres in P-W, Supp. III; W. Nestle, *Gr. Relig.* III, 72 ff.; M. P. Nilsson, *Gesch. gr. Rel.* I, 201 ff., 348, 701, 713; Foerster in G. Kittel, *Theol. Wörterb.* II, 1 ff.

M. Pohlenz, *Vom Zorne Gottes* 133, n. 1, is probably right in postulating some popular ideas as lying behind Plato's notions; *Phaedo* 107 D professes to be quoting a current belief, which may after all represent literature under the name of Orpheus. cf. *Leg.* V, p. 730 A: ὁ ξένιος ἐκάστων δαίμων καὶ θεὸς τῷ ξενίῳ συνεπόμενος Διί. In Eur. *Suppl.* 592, δαίμονος τοῦτοῦ μέτα, *daimon* approximates to the later personal Tyche; cf. Pind. *Ol.* XIII, 28 (cf. 105).

shows that they were not confined to philosophical circles, and suggests that they may be linked with a rise of individualism and a temporary decline of belief in divine government. If *daimon* approximated to 'guardian angel', there was also always the Heraclitean formula (fr. 119), ἦθος ἀνθρώπῳ δαίμων, 'a man's character makes his luck,' followed in essence by Democritus, fr. 171, ψυχῇ οἰκητήριον δαίμονος (Diels-Kranz, *Vorsokratiker*, ed. 5, II, 179). *Daimon* alternates between an expression of the self, and something detached which stands beside you, συμπάριστται.⁷⁰

It tends to be the higher self. Whereas *indulgere genio* meant from of old 'to have a good time', *daimon* was much closer to 'the god within the breast', something external to the passions and appetites, something to be followed or even worshipped by right conduct; *nous* described in a religious way. This emphasis was not affected by the co-existence of the idea that you shaped your *daimon* by your actions, a development in a sense of the Heraclitean axiom, and present already in *Tim.* 90 C.⁷¹ In fact, a man's *daimon* or *daimones* or Agathos Daimon (which last could be shared by man and wife) was sometimes an object of worship after his death; this was the supernatural counterpart of the self.⁷²

Various as were the meanings of *daimon*,⁷³ it was a single word with a fluidity of usage and a capacity of bearing at one and the same time senses which we distinguish and of passing imperceptibly from one to another. Later, the revival of interest in Plato, which began in the second century B.C., and became conspicuous in and after the first, and the desire to safeguard divine dignity and goodness by the hypothesis of intermediaries, enlarged the place of *daimones* in thought. To Plutarch *daimon* was an *erlösendes Wort*; and we may recall that Plutarch knows also a theory of kingship in relation to the sun to which we shall revert (n. 107). Be it added that Genius, while regular—as *daimon* was not—in formal religious language, may have aided the popularity of speculation about *daimon*.

One man's *daimon* differed from another's; a soothsayer told Antony that his *daimon* was inferior to Octavian's and feared it.⁷⁴

. . . under him
My genius is rebuk'd: as, it is said,
Mark Antony's was by Caesar

So when the *daimon* of Plotinus was evoked in a séance, a god appeared.⁷⁵ Inevitably the *daimonion* of Socrates excited lively interest. Originally a sign warning him against actions which he should not undertake, it came to be thought an independent supernatural entity, attending him always (ἄει παρέπόμενον: Maximus Tyrius VIII, 1, p. 86), and capable of receiving worshipful homage from others ([Plat.] *Theag.* 131 A).⁷⁶

Apuleius wrote *De deo Socratis* and gave the following analogy:—

nec aliud in eodem Vlixē Homerus docet, qui semper ei comitem voluit esse prudentiam, quam poetico ritu Minervam nuncupavit. igitur hac eadem comite omnia horrenda subiit.⁷⁷

Comes is here twice used in the sense of the divine companion. Plutarch adduces the same parallel for the *daimonion* (*Gen. Socr.* 10, p. 580 C), and Maximus Tyrius VIII, 5, p. 90 ff.

⁷⁰ Menand. ap. Clem. Al. *Strom.* v, 14, 130, 3 (II, 414 St.). cf. Procl. in *Alcib.* I, 58, p. 165, Creuzer: καὶ γὰρ τὸν ἀγαθὸν δαίμονα σύμπορον ἡμῶν εἰώθασι λέγειν καὶ ἐπειθεῖν φασιν ἡμῖν αὐτὸν ἐκ θεῆς ὁμῆς.

⁷¹ cf. in general R. Harder, *Über Ciceros Somnium Scipionis* (*Schr. Königsberger Ges.* VI), 14, n. 4, on the identification of *daimon* with deity in itself rather than with subordinate deity.

⁷² cf. Pausan. vi, 6, 8 (with Frazer ad loc., IV, p. 24); L. R. Taylor, *Divinity of the Roman Emperor* 10, n. 22; Laumonier, *BCH* LVIII (1934), 366 f.

⁷³ Including always that of deity, major or minor, external to the self, and with the constant possibility of a recollection of Hes. Op. 122 ff. (cf. Max. Tyr. VIII, 8, p. 97 f.).

⁷⁴ Plut. *Ant.* 33; *Fort. Rom.* 7, p. 320 A (τύχη).

⁷⁵ Porphy. *V. Plot.* 10, τοῦ συνόντος αὐτῷ οἰκείου

δαίμονος καλουμένου . . . τὸν συνόντα cf. Plot. III, 4, 6, with Bréhier's edition, III, p. 61 ff., and Procl. in *Alcib.* I, 23, p. 73, Creuzer. cf. E. R. Dodds above, p. 60.

⁷⁶ Proclus in *Alcib.* I, 25, p. 79, Cr. says that Socrates rightly called his *daimon* a god, though (p. 70) he refuses to follow Amelius in describing some of the gods as *daimones*; cf. Apul. *De deo Socr.* 14, p. 23, 4, Thomas, 'deque eius amico numine,' cf. n. 48. For ancient theories on the *daimonion* of Socrates, cf. A. Willing, *Comm. phil. Jen.* VIII, II (1909).

⁷⁷ *De deo* 24, p. 35, 14, noted by Maurice II, CXI f. Such discussions, like Heraclit. *Qu. Hom.* 28, p. 43, 7, 75, p. 100, 1, imply an inkling of Nilsson's brilliant discovery, *Arch. f. Rel.* XXII (1923-4), 374 f.

refers to the advice of deities to heroes in general as analogous.⁷⁸ Further, Eustathius on *Iliad* I, 198, speaks of Achilles and Socrates as each said to have the otherwise unparalleled power to enjoy the use of his own *daimon* in contingencies, and adds that Odysseus and other Homeric characters should be included.

The analogy was natural. Athena was commonly allegorized as wisdom, and τὸ δαίμονιον, while used of the sign of Socrates, was also a traditional term for divinity in a general undifferentiated form.

The relevance of this material for our purpose is shown by the remarks of Ammianus Marcellinus on the departure from Constantius of his guiding spirit (xxi, 14, 3 ff.) :—

Ferunt enim theologi in lucem editis hominibus cunctis, salva firmitate fatali, huius modi quaedam velut actus rectura numina sociari, admodum tamen paucissimis visa, quos multiplices auxere virtutes. idque et oracula et auctores docuere praeclari, inter quos est etiam Menander comicus, apud quem hi senarii duo leguntur :

ἅπαντι δαίμων ἄνδρι συμπαρίσταται
εὐθύς γενομένῳ, μυσταγωγὸς τοῦ βίου.

itidem . . . sempiternis Homeri carminibus intellegi datur non deos caelestes cum viris fortibus conlocutos, nec adfuisse pugnantibus vel iuvisse, sed familiaris genios cum isdem versatos, quorum adminiculis freti praecipuis Pythagoras enituisse dicitur et Socrates, Numaque Pompilius et superior Scipio et (ut quidam existimant) Marius et Octavianus, cui Augusti vocabulum delatum est primo, Hermesque Termaximus et Tyaneus Apollonius atque Plotinus, ausus quaedam super hac re disserere mystica alteque monstrare quibus primordiis hi genii animis conexi mortalium eas tamquam gremiis suis susceptas tuentur, quoad licitum est, docentque maiora, si senserint puras et a conluvione peccandi immaculata corporis societate discretas.⁷⁹

I quote this in full, for we have here 'actus rectura numina sociari', which expresses the idea of *comes*; the citation of Menander; the analogy of Homeric myth as it should be explained; the *daimonion* of Socrates; the emphasis, as in Eustathius, on the rarity of the gift of knowing one's familiar spirit.

A man's *daimon* could be a god. It is not, indeed, said that such a *daimon* could be identified with a specific deity from the regular pantheon,⁸⁰ and certainly the emperor's Genius (as also the Genius Publicus or Genius Populi Romani) was too individual in its own rights for equation, however dignified. Nevertheless, a man's *daimon* was of the same kind as a nameable divine companion, and *daimon* was a word for either. Further, as Professor Campbell Bonner reminds me, a Roman was familiar with the Iuno of a woman. This term, as Seneca realized (*Ep.* 110, 1), denoted a minor power, but it would naturally suggest the great goddess.

Athena was thought to be wisdom, as Hermes was logos.⁸¹ So also it was widely held

⁷⁸ cf. Apul. *De deo* 6, p. 13, where, as in Max. Tyr. viii, 8, p. 96 f., reference is made to *daimones* in the sense of the *Symp.*, as intermediaries. Max. Tyr. viii, 8, p. 97, refers also to the Hesiodic *daimones* and represents *daimones* as corresponding to human occupations, etc. [Dion. Halic.] *Ars rhet.* 7, 2 (ii, 285, 12 Usener-Radermacher). ὁ δὲ (sc. Ἡρακλῆς) σύν τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ πάντα κατῳρῶσεν τὰ ἐπιταχθέντα: ἡ δὲ τί ἂν ἄλλο εἴη ἢ νοῦς τε καὶ λόγος; Coming as this does as a matter of fact statement in a rhetorical treatise, it is of particular significance.

⁷⁹ On the source problem, cf. R. v. Scala, *Festgabe Buidinger* 119 ff. (I would ask whether Marius Victorinus has in some way contributed to the knowledge of Amm. Marc.). For the dissemination of such thought, cf. also Aug. *Civ. D.* viii, 14, 'ex quo genere numinum Socrates habebat adiunctum et amicitia quadam conciliatum'; Philostr. *Ap. Ty.* i, 2; [Socr.] *Ep.* i, 8, 10.

Apul. *Apol.* 43 mentions *daimones* as intermediaries in what professes to be a court-speech, but cannot be taken as specific evidence of the intelligibility of the concept.

⁸⁰ In the way in which Zeus Olympios was the

Gad (Fortune) of Dura-Europos, and cf. Du Mesnil du Buisson, *Inventaire des inscriptions palmyréennes de Doura-Europos*, new ed. (1939), 65, on names interpreted as 'Le Soleil est Gad, ou mon Gad', 'Arsu est Gad'.

Dedications often couple the name of a specific deity with that of the Genius of a locality or of a group as distinct. Sometimes, however, there is identification; e.g. *CIL* viii, 11430 (with a *natalis*), 7956. cf. W. F. Otto, P-W vii, 1168. Genius is 'protettore, patrono' (Cesano, *Diz. Epigr.* iii, 481); cf. *CIL* v, 5112, 'Iunoni pagi Portuensis.' Sen. *Ep.* 110, 1, on the *daimon*, not so named, quotes as Ovid's 'de plebe deos.'

⁸¹ So Isis is wisdom (P. Oxy. 1380, 44, 124; Nock, *AJ Phil.* LXIII (1942), 478 f.). In Plut. *Is. Os.* 49, p. 371 A, Osiris is *nous* and *logos* of the universe. cf. Varro in August. *Civ. D.* vii, 13, on the mind of the universe 'tamquam universalis genius'; also O. Gross, *Diss. phil. Hal.* xix, iv (1911), 355, on Genius as meaning 'ingenium', also 377, on Minerva, 381 and 384, on Muses, 341, on Apollo as meaning 'indoles poetica'.

that the *nous* or higher intelligence in man was external to the body or to the lower soul or even to the soul as such. Various figures were used; *nous* is as it were the acropolis of the soul, in which God is enthroned (Maximus Tyrius xi, 8, p. 139; cf. Plato, *Tim.* 90 A, which Julian, p. 69 A cites), or again it is the doorkeeper of the soul and stands on guard (*Corpus Hermeticum* I, 22; Philo, *Quaest. in Genesim* IV, 1)⁸²—although at the same time, it, like the logos, is active within the soul (*Corpus Herm.* I, 6). This individual *nous* belongs to a higher order, being akin to the divine Nous, the soul or energy of God (ib. XII, 9; XI, 2), and it leaves the sluggish soul to its fate.

Such ideas were in the air; it was common to suppose that the best in any man was so to speak external to him and to his daily mode of life and that it involved the operation of a power not ourselves that made for righteousness. Ordinary men were guarded by minor supernatural beings; the emperor shared the secrets of the Supreme Being.⁸³

(v) Let us now recall a phrase of Virgil, 'hos cape fatorum comites,' spoken by Hector to Aeneas (*Aen.* II, 294). *Comites* here takes its sense from *fatorum*; the *sacra* are to share the destiny of Aeneas. Nevertheless the phrase may remind us of how men owned and cherished representations of deities and sometimes regarded them as talismans; and the habit is attested at a high social and cultural level. The doctor Nicias had and worshipped daily his Asclepius (Theocritus *Ep.* 8), as Chrysogona had her Aphrodite (ib. 13), Sulla his Apollo, Apuleius his mysterious 'king', Asclepiades his heavenly goddess (Ammianus Marcellinus XXII, 13, 3). Are not many extant statuettes to be explained as having this value and not only *objets d'art*?⁸⁴ Further, Epictetus II, 8, 13 f., contrasts the god within the breast (perhaps higher, but akin to the *daimon*) with tangible representations of deity.^{84a} Again, Nero had not only his Dea Syria, but also an 'imaguncula puellaris'; in his last days he found it impossible to offer acceptable sacrifice to his 'imaguncula' (Suetonius, *Ner.* 56), and this is parallel to the departure of a divine *comes* (p. 107 above).

Any householder had his *lararium*, and Alexander Severus is said to have had representations of Apollonius of Tyana, Christ, Abraham, Orpheus, and others whom he put in the same class, together with his ancestors in his *lararium*, and Virgil, Cicero, Achilles, and others in his second *lararium*.⁸⁵ There are also the deities called *domestici*, and 'Heracles dwells here; let no evil enter' (O. Weinreich, *Arch. f. Relig.* XVIII, 1915, 9 ff.).

Again, Octavian went to Actium 'cum patribus populoque penatibus et magnis dis', to face Cleopatra and the deities of her land⁸⁶; any ship in peace or war might have a deity as its figure-head, just as a military unit had its standards and representations of emperors both attached thereunto and as separate objects in its shrine. Rome had its palladium as well as its Vesta.⁸⁷ The emperor had not only his personal *lararium* but also,

⁸² cf. R. Reitzenstein, *Vorgesch. d. chr. Taufe* 76 ff.; N. Johansson, *Parakletoi* (Lund, 1940), 186; and for *nous* in more strictly philosophical contexts, Sallustius 8, p. 16, 6, with my notes (LXV ff.).

⁸³ *Pan. lat.* XII, 2, 5, p. 291 (note 4, I, p. 292, 'sua enim cuique prudentia deus est,' with perhaps a recollection of *Aen.* IX, 184 f.). cf. IX, 10, p. 254, 'ubi ex proximo iuvat mens divina' (note 4, 2, p. 292).

⁸⁴ On such statuettes, cf. Vallette, *Apologie d'Apulée* 310 ff., and Dölger, *Antike u. Christentum* IV (1933-4), 67 ff., 277 f., to which Fr. Festugière referred me; also the paper by E. R. Dodds above, p. 63 f. Protective value could be ascribed to a statuette which had not received any 'consecration', and which did not have the value of a specially secured *paredros*. Apuleius says (*Apol.* 63) that he always took with him on a journey some image—not the same always; ib. 55, he refers to the emblems kept and venerated by the initiates of Liber Pater. cf. Babrius 119.

^{84a} cf. ὁνοματοφορέω in Philo, *Opif. m.* 69 and Euseb. *Hierocl.* 6, of the carrying of Mind or God in the soul (in Philo *V.M.* II, 11, of patterns).

⁸⁵ I do not believe in the presence of Christ and Abraham; Moses would have been just possible. Fr. Festugière draws my attention to Plin. *NH* xxxv,

5 and Cic. *Fin.* v, 3, on representations of Epicurus. For the statuettes or painted figures of Pompeian *lararia*, cf. Boyce, *Mem. Amer. Acad. Rome* XIV (1937). For representations of the imperial family as so used, cf. Scott, *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.* LXII (1931), 107, and in particular the words of Ovid, *Ex P.* II, 8, 70 (with significant parallel to *aquila*).

⁸⁶ cf. W. Weber, *Herm.* I (1915), 55 ff., on the religious objects supposedly taken into court by Alexandrians and Jews in their case before Trajan. The Alexandrian delegation to meet Caracalla went forth μεθ' ἱερῶν τινῶν ἀπορρήτων (Dio Cass. LXXVIII, 22, 2 = vol. III, 400, 23, Boiss.). For gods taken to battle, cf. H. Bloch, *Harv. Theol. Rev.* XXXVIII (1945), 236; also Jos. *AJ* III, 103, on the Tabernacle.

⁸⁷ K. Gross, *Unterpfänder d. röm. Herrschaft*. (cf. the protective companionship given by the physical possession of relics of martyrs; e.g. Max. Taur. *Homil.* 81, *PL* LVII 428, and Delehaye, *Origines du culte des martyrs* 163. Here, however, there is also the older sentiment attached to the relics of heroes.) For the idea of a star coming to birth together with an individual man, cf. A. Amand, *Fatalisme et liberté dans l'Antiquité grecque*, 539, n. 7.

sometimes at least, a special *Fortuna Regia* in his bedchamber,⁸⁸ and Domitian had a *Minerva* in a private *sacrarium*.⁸⁹ Ovid could say 'et cum Caesarea tu, Phoebe domestice, Vesta' (*Met.* xv, 865)—with reference to the cults of the Palatine. Finally, on the Arch of Constantine soldiers carry small paired statuettes of *Victoria* and *Sol Invictus*, on poles; the *Sol Invictus* type is that of the *SOLI COMITI* coins.⁹⁰ Surely these are *comites*.

(vi) There were various possible supernatural *comites*. Caesar's *Fortuna comes* in Lucan v, 510, lacks the tangible quality of the *Fortuna* of the imperial bedchamber, but she sailed with him,⁹¹ and, in Lucan's rhetoric, she was the only person knowing his secret desires (v, 665 f.): not so different from Sulla's *Venus*. This *Fortuna* is, in fact, the individualized form of the celestial assistance vouchsafed to the man 'quem numina numquam destituunt' (v, 581 f.). *Felicitas*, like *Hercules*, 'lives here' (*CIL* iv, 1454), and various personified qualities are said to accompany a man. In fact, A. C. Pearson did well to draw attention to the analogy between many such personifications and *daimon*.⁹²

Greek and Latin had no distinction of capital and small letters as between *χάρις* and *Χάρις*, *cupido* and *Cupido*.⁹³ Just as qualities dwelt with a man, so did *Peitho* and even *Aphrodite*,⁹⁴ and in the same sense. So *Hermes* as guide in Galen's *Protrepticus* is very like the *Daimon* of *Cebes* (to say nothing of *κοινὸς Ἑρμῆς*, as luck). For rulers we must remember 'God does not suffer the great justice which is in you to lie dormant'.⁹⁵ Deities could be more abstract than we incline to think (so not only *Venus*, but also *Mars* as an expression of the military might of Rome), and personifications could be more concrete,⁹⁶ notably so at Rome.

Again, *Pax Augusta* and *Imperium Augusti* were entities receiving worship.⁹⁷ 'Virtues'⁹⁸ were used as titles⁹⁹ (just as *Holiness* and *Grace* are to-day), and some of them, as ascribed to the emperor, were artistically represented by types of *Hercules*, etc.¹⁰⁰ One personification was outstanding, *Victoria*, and she is a *comes* on coins (p. 102, above), as in *Pan. lat.* vi, 5, 4, p. 204, 'ita pervectus ut non comitata illum sit sed praestolata *Victoria*' (which has an element of victory with a small *v*, the individual success). Victory

⁸⁸ cf. W. F. Otto, *P-W* vii, 37; Alföldi, *Röm. Mitt.* L (1935), 122, n. 3 (unwilling to generalize on the practice). The *Tyche* of *Himer*, *Ecl.* 12, p. 196 Wernsdorf, was something visible to any visitor to the court.

⁸⁹ Scott, *Imperial Cult* 180 ff.

⁹⁰ L'Orange, *Konstantinsbogen* 55, 57, 126 ff. (representation shows as 37-8 cm. high), 132 ff.

⁹¹ *Plut. Caes.* 38, 5. cf. *Joseph.*, *Bf* vi, 413 (*Titus* Tyche as ally); *Dio Cass.* LXXII, 23 = vol. III, 304, Boiss. (his encourager in historical writing); *BMC* iv, CLXV, *FORTYNA MANENS*. 'Adsidere fata cum tabulis' in *Pan. lat.* II, 18, 4, p. 105 (p. 103 above) affords a parallel to the *FATIS VICTRICIBVS* of *Diocletian's* coins.

⁹² In *Hastings, Enc. Rel. Eth.* iv, 592. cf. A. B. Cook, *Zeus* II, 1041 ff., on the representation of projected emotions.

⁹³ On *Charis*, cf. *Farnell, Pindar* II, 461 (*Charites* in *Ol.* xiv, as cult-deities, whereas in *Pindar charis* is usually the quality in a man or thing which evokes in others a sense of pleasurable approval); *Plut. An seni* 6, p. 786, E; *Bonner, Hesperia* xv (1946), 56 f. It was the *Charites* who sought and found a fit precinct in the soul of *Aristophanes* (*Plat. Ep.* 14, Diehl; cf. for *Clementia*, *Stat. Theb.* XII, 494, *Claud. Cons. Stil.* II, 13). *Charis* and *Charites* remain personal; cf. *Theocr.* xvi, 109. On personifications in general from this point of view, cf. F. Stoessl, *P-W* xix, 1044 ff.; Nock, *J. Bibl. Lit.* LII (1933), 137. Latin poetry was freer even than Greek in the use of divine names by way of metonymy, and there was a basis for this in native ideas (*Gross, Diss. phil. Hal.* xix, iv, 311 f.).

⁹⁴ cf. *Aristoph. Ran.* 1045; *Plat. Phileb.* 12 B;

Lucian Demon. 10; *Carm. lat. epigr.* 1233, 6 ('in toto corde plicata inerat'); Nock, *Harv. Theol. Rev.* xxxiii (1940), 313.

⁹⁵ *Plut. Num.* 6; cf. Scott, *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.* LX (1929), 132; and note *Pind. P* viii, 70-1, on *Dike*.

⁹⁶ cf. the Jewish Wisdom as partner of God in *Proverbs* 8, 30, etc., and the various parallels for Logos from the Near East discussed by L. Dürr, 'Die Wertung d. göttlichen Wortes im A.T. u. im antiken Orient' (*Mitt. vorderas.-aegypt. Ges.* XLII, 1, 1938). Even Gnostic abstractions were not perhaps as thin as they look to us; they expressed the fundamental conception that universe and man, creation and redemption, were parallel, and that ultimate processes were psychological.

⁹⁷ A.v. Premenstein, *Vom Werden u. Wesen d. Prinzipats* (*Abh. Munich*, N.F. 15, 1937), 125, 127.

⁹⁸ cf. in general Charlesworth, cited n. 28.

⁹⁹ cf. also *Sen. Ben.* IV, 8, 3; Schoener, *Acta sem. phil. Erlangensis* II, 490; W. Schubart, *Klio* xxx (1937), 62 f.

¹⁰⁰ Under the tetrarchy *VIRTVS AVGG* (ET CAESS) is coupled with a *Hercules* scene or *Mars* or the representation of a ruler or a personified figure, cf. O. Voetter, *Num. Z.* LVI (1923), 3; A. B. Brett, *Num. Chr.* 1933, 294 f.; P. Damerau, *Klio*, Beih. xxxiii, 94 ff.; Toynbee, *Medallions* 162; Mattingly-Sydenham v, II, 360 (*VIRTVTI AVG* with jugate busts of *Postumus* and *Mars*). In general, on the representation of abstractions, cf. P. G. Hamberg, *Studies in Roman Imperial Art* 18 ff., 41 ff.; also cf. n. 81 above.

went before the emperor, προάγουσα¹⁰¹; she did not exactly guide him as Faith guided Abercius,¹⁰² but she went before. Victory is no stage-property; Gagé¹⁰³ and Alföldi¹⁰⁴ have taught us better. She was a real power, to whom you could address prayer (cf. Himer. *Orat.* xix, 3). For the emperor she was adjunct as well as attribute. The fact that subordinates fought under his *auspicia*, not their own, may well have implied from early in the principate that the ruler was credited with potentialities operating beyond the range of his presence and even of his directives.¹⁰⁵ So later he came to be credited with a continuous attribute of Victory, as distinct from whatever was seen behind this or that success in the field. This idea remained in Byzantine tradition and found a place in the new monarchy of the West, where 'Christ is victorious' became an integral part of coronation ritual and implied a parallelism and earthly analogy of royal victory.¹⁰⁶

(vii) For SOLI COMITI we should perhaps remember also a type of political theory, expressed in Hellenistic texts under Pythagorean names and echoed in Plutarch as later in Eusebius. According to this, the ruler is an earthly counterpart of divinity, and this divinity is commonly conceived as solar. Dignified as is the ruler's position, it involves a categorical imperative: he must imitate the excellence of his celestial model.¹⁰⁷

Such thinking no doubt ultimately derives from Plato, *Rep.* 508-9, where Helios, as child of the Good and in its likeness, corresponds in the visible world to the Good, and is king. Nevertheless, we should not find Neoplatonic influence in the solar view of monarchy. It is tempting, in view of the Neoplatonic theory of correspondences between the leading figures on different planes of being, in view again of the esteem in which Gallienus held Plotinus and of the prestige which his school continued to enjoy at Rome.¹⁰⁸

Yet, so far as I can see, neither Plato nor Neoplatonists extended the analogy of the Sun's position and made of it a type of earthly monarchy. To be sure, the wise ruler is above existing laws (*Politic.* 295 E), but this is not in virtue of any esoteric ideas; that is clear from the 'seeing law' of Xen. *Cyr.* viii, 1, 22, and Aristotle, *Pol.* iii, 13, p. 1284, a. 13, and even more from *Eth. N.* v, 14, p. 1128, a. 32.¹⁰⁹ So also monarchy can be called

¹⁰¹ P. Oxy. 1449, 2 n. with the comments of S. Eitrem, *Symb. Oslo.* x (1932), 45, and P. Oslo. iii, 99, on no 94; also *Corp. Herm.* xviii; G. de Jerphanion, *Mem. Pontif. Accad. Arch.* iii (1932), 112, 116, fig. 10 (Victory leading cortège, on Arch of Galerius).

¹⁰² F. J. Dölger, *IXΘΥΣ* ii, 484 ff. cf. Hope in Lucian, *Merc. cond.* 42.

¹⁰³ As in *Rev. Hist.* 171 (1933), 1 ff., and *Rev. Hist. Phil. Rel.* xiii (1933), 370 ff.

¹⁰⁴ *Röm. Mitt.* xlix (1934), 97. cf. L. Berlinger, *Beitr. . . . Titulatur* (Diss. Bresl., 1935), 16, 19 f., 95; Scott, *Imperial Cult* 177 f.; Grabar, *L'empereur* 31 ff.; W. Otto-H. Bengtson, *Z. Gesch. d. Niederganges d. Ptolemäerreiches* (Abh. Munich, N.F. 17, 1938), 236, s.v. Nike, etc.; R. O. Fink, *Yale Classical Studies* viii, 99, etc.; P. G. Hamberg, *Studies* 20, 59; Birt's ed. of Claudian lxi.

¹⁰⁵ cf. *Pan. lat.* vii, 14, p. 231; viii, 14, 2, p. 241; x, 11, 5 f., p. 272; also xi, 13 f., p. 285 f. And yet Rome is where the ruler is; Herodian i, 6, 5.

¹⁰⁶ cf. Kantorowicz, *Laudes Regiae* (Univ. California, Publ. Hist. xxxiii, 1946).

¹⁰⁷ A crucial text is Plut. *Ad princ. inerud.* 3, p. 780 f.; cf. *Themist.* 27, 4. In general, see Goodenough, *Yale Class. St.* i, supplemented by his *Politics of Philo Judaeus* (e.g. 91, a king is not whoever has royal power, 96, on parallelism), and by Berlinger, *Beitr.* 92. Straub, *Vom Herrscherideal*, in his valuable treatment of the theme, suggests (101) that Constantine's objection to sacrifice on the Capitol would have been comprehensible in view of the idea that sacrifice was not appropriate to the 'deus summus'. Such a view was doubtless not uncommon outside inner philosophic circles, and daily worship by hymns and incense had gained in popularity (Nilsson, *Harv. Theol. Rev.* xxxviii, 1945); but

would senators have applied it to traditional Roman cult?

¹⁰⁸ cf. Nock, *AJA* 1946, 155; add Claud., *Pan. Manl. Theod. Cons.*, e.g. 253 f.; Augustine *Ep.* 118, 33, 'Plotini schola Romae floruit habuitque condiscipulos multos, acutissimos et sollertissimos viros,' to say nothing of the possibility that the Hosius to whom Chalcidius dedicated his work on the *Timaeus* was the bishop who enjoyed Constantine's confidence and the certainty (Zosim. ii, 40, 3) that Sopatros was for a time an intimate of Constantine's.

Note, however, that Plutarch distinguished between the visible sun and Apollo (*Def. orac.* 42, p. 433 D-E); cf. 7, p. 413 C, *Pyth. orac.* 12, p. 400 D), as a Pergamene distinguished between the visible sun and the god Helios (H. Hepding, *Ath. Mitt.* xxxii, 1907, 357 ff.).

The significance of the physical sun as such in figurative language has been noted, p. 108 above; cf. Stat. *S.* iv, 1, 3, 'atque oritur cum sole novo.' The Sol who was *comes Augusti* had various associations; the physical sun; the sun of philosophical speculation, and of its larger background (Ensslin, *CAH* xii, 359); the sun-god of oaths; the Syrian worship from which Aurelian made a new cult, Roman, and possessed of tremendous emphasis; the solar piety of Illyricum and Gaul; the sun from whom good kings came (Nock, *JRS* xxx, 1940, 195, n. 32); and for some, though not for official purposes, Iranian ideas associated with Mithraism (*Soli socio* in *ILS* 4233, Cumont, *Textes* ii, 143, *inscr.* 336, 339, and 162, *inscr.* 486; it refers to the myth of the alliance of Mithras and the Sun).

¹⁰⁹ cf. L. K. Born, *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.* lxi (1933), 128 ff., esp. 131, n. 26, for the wide dissemination of forms of 'speculum principis'.

the one true form of government (*Polit.* 300 E), but its exercise is a skill, the art of giving commands (*Polit.* 260 C), inferior to the functions of the 'divine shepherd' (*Polit.* 275 C). Rule is a function which the wise man will not wish to perform (*Rep.* 540 C; cf. Albin., *Epitome* 2, and Themistius v, p. 66 D, Hardouin), and which he undertakes as a 'liturgy', from a sense of duty. This corresponds to what Eunapius said of Julian; 'he came to rule, not as in love with rule, but as seeing that the human race needed to be ruled.'¹¹⁰

Julian himself speaks gratefully of the care of Helios for his line (p. 229 C), of the light promised to him upon earth (p. 234 A), and of the divine assistance promised to him. Like Constantine, he believed himself to have received special mercies. Yet in his prose hymn to Helios—and to King Helios—while (in Constantine's style) he calls himself 'servant of the god Helios' (p. 131 D),¹¹¹ he says nothing of any intrinsic relationship of earthly kingship to Helios. He felt the sacerdotal obligations of kingship,¹¹² but for him as for other Neoplatonists the sage and not the king was the summit.¹¹³ Neoplatonism was interested in the individual rather than the community, in the contemplative rather than the active life. All good souls, not just royal souls were of the nature of the gods. So the promise of Mithras to Julian was to Julian the man and Mithraist, not to Julian the king (*Conv.* 336 C), and Julian, like Sallustius, was hostile to the deification of kings.¹¹⁴

On the other hand, the idealization of kingship was widely known. Menander Rhetor says that you can speak of the ruler as an effluence of higher powers, and, ironically but significantly, this is a topic to be employed when praising one who cannot claim distinguished descent.¹¹⁵ The panegyric which has come to be attached to the *Corpus Hermeticum* as tractate XVIII¹¹⁶ gives an elaborate development of the idea of the correspondence of heavenly and earthly ruler, together with an enthusiastic statement of the 'theology of victory'.

(viii) The Antiochene (but not the Roman) account of the martyrdom of Ignatius includes an exchange of argument, after Ignatius has called himself a God-bearer.

TRAJAN. And who is a God-bearer?

IGN. He who has Christ in his breast.

TRA. Do you not think that we have in our mind gods whose alliance we enjoy against our adversaries?¹¹⁷

This is a late text and depends probably not on any specific knowledge of paganism but on the desire to make a verbal point out of *theophoros*, familiar from the saint's letters.¹¹⁸ Nevertheless Trajan's words correspond to belief, and to belief which was modified and not abandoned when Christianity triumphed.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁰ C. Müller, *FHG* iv, 23. cf. Julian 260 C; J. Bidez, *Vie de Julien* 204 ff. For the ideal, cf. Dio Prus. 1, 23.

¹¹¹ To some extent Julian may have sought to be a pagan counterpart of Constantine; his hymns and publicist utterances correspond, even in the midnight oil (Eus. *VC* iv, 29, p. 128). 'A beast but an effective beast.' cf. Bidez, *JRS* xxiii (1933), 64, on the similarity of the two temperaments, e.g. in irascibility.

¹¹² Bidez, *Discours* 139, n. 4.

¹¹³ In spite of the fact that theories of monarchy were produced under the broad shield of Pythagorean names, the representatives of religious Neopythagoreanism, e.g. Apollonius of Tyana, thought like Neoplatonists. So does the *Corpus Hermeticum*, apart from the accidentally appended xviii.

For Julian, note *Ad Themist.* 264 C (contrast of Alexander and Socrates, much to Alexander's disadvantage).

¹¹⁴ cf. *Conv.* 330 D, 332 D, 335 C (ἀνδρες); Sallustius 18, p. 34, 11, with Nock, lxxxix; Baynes, *Historia Augusta* 120, 128 (restriction of homage). *Pan. lat.* iv, addressed to Julian, is conspicuous for moderation.

¹¹⁵ p. 97, Bursian (p. 370, Spengel).

¹¹⁶ With its opening, cf. Themist. xv, p. 185 C.

¹¹⁷ Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers* II, II, 1, 478.

¹¹⁸ For a possible parallel, cf. Ruinart, *Acta Martyrum* (ed. 1859, 519; the *Acta Phileae et Philoromi*): 'Qui immolat diis eradicabitur nisi soli Deo. Culcianus dixit, Immola ergo deo Soli.' Delehay, *Anal. Boll.* xl (1922), 304, argues against the idea of a pun, as incidentally implying a Latin original. This is not decisive, since a Latin adapter could introduce a verbal point (cf. ib. 328, on the rewriting of an Egyptian tale at Constantinople). His other contention, 311, that the text shows a pagan approximation to monotheism, is stronger, and the Christian is made to object to any notion of sacrifice; but I incline to think that there may be the pun as a subsidiary motif.

¹¹⁹ cf. *C. Theod.* xv, 4, 1 (A.D. 425): 'ludis quoque simulacra proposita tantum in animis concurrentium mentisque secretis nostrum numen et laudes vigere demonstrent; excedens cultura hominum dignitatem superno numini reservetur'; which shows how pale *numen* could be as applied to the emperor. However, for surviving strength of feeling, cf. Vegetius 2, 5. In general, see K. M. Setton, *Christian Attitude towards the Emperor in the Fourth Century* (e.g. 72 f., parallel in Athanasius for *Corp. Herm.* xviii). As in Mycenaean times, the pattern of monarchy was transferred to the world above. Just

Any such intimate divine ally could be called *comes*. We have reviewed various ideas which may in various degrees at various times be supposed to underlie the formula ; the protective companionship given in epic by deities to heroes ; the *daimon*, and occasionally the *nous* as something like a guardian angel ; the statuette or other visible representation of deity which served as talisman ; the personified attribute, especially Victory ; the concept of ruler and sun as correlates. *Comes* could imply one or more of these somewhat linked associations. Just how and why the formulation took place we cannot say. *Comes* was perhaps endowed with a wider range of suggestion than other possibilities such as *socius*, *consors* ; it was *conservator* at a more intimate level. Its use corresponds to that genius for definition which is Latin and not Greek,¹²⁰ and is one manifestation of the growth of a theology of imperial rule. As has been remarked, this is attached to the throne rather than to the individual ruler. The picture is that of the hieratic dignity of Constantius as he was borne into Rome, wholly impassive, ' tamquam figmentum hominis,'¹²¹ even as the Eleusinian hierophant of later days shed his name when he assumed his office.

as earlier various gods assumed Hellenistic royal military dress, so now the type of barbarians bringing gifts was used for the scene of the Adoration of the Magi ; Cumont, *Mem. Pontif. Accad. Arch.* III (1932), 81 ff.

¹²⁰ cf. in general, Nock, *Harv. Theol. Rev.* XXXII (1939). I cannot imagine a Greek equivalent ;

also, no Greek monarch save Alexander was universal as the emperors were.

¹²¹ Amm. Marc. xvi, 10, 10 ; discussed by Baynes, *JRS* xxv (1935), 87. Coins ceased to give portraits (Grabar 9). Cf. M. P. Charlesworth above, p. 36.