

eher völlig weglässt, als auf die eben ganz der heidnischen Religion zugehörigen Beispiele vom Typ *vinum pro Baccho*, *Ceres pro frumento* zu rekurrieren⁵²⁾, diese Tatsachen zeigen den strengen Purismus und die naive Bibelbewunderung Bedas und machen es verständlich, dass ihm kompromissierische Werke wie B oder Julians *ars* mit ihren vielen Vergilzitaten nicht gerade sympathisch sein konnten.

Als Nebenquelle hat er sie dennoch herangezogen, hier aber nicht Julian oder B, sondern offenbar eine diesen beiden und ausserdem auch Isidor gemeinsame Vorlage, wie der Vergleich der vier Versionen klar gezeigt hat. Er hat diese Nebenvorlage ebenso wie Cassiodor bzw. dessen Quelle dann benutzt, wenn ihm ihre Definitionen deutlicher zu sein schienen als die manchmal etwas lakonischen des Donat; teilweise hat er die donatischen Definitionen ersetzt, teilweise sie erweitert und ergänzt.

Die These vom schnellen Vordringen der Julianischen *ars* von Spanien nach England innerhalb von 15 Jahren nach ihrer Entstehung ist dann wieder so strittig wie zuvor; and Hand von Bedas Schrift lässt sie sich jedenfalls nicht beweisen und bei Althelm sind die Zeugnisse für eine Benutzung ebenfalls schwach⁵³⁾.

Ein Ergebnis schliesslich hat die Untersuchung noch gebracht, das nicht vorauszusuchen war: dass es mit Beda in der Tat eine Version der Figurenlehre gibt, die Varianten aller drei verwandten Versionen, Isidors, Julians und B's, enthält und damit der einfachste Beweis dafür ist, dass die von mir an anderer Stelle rekonstruierte christliche *ars grammatica* des 5. Jh., eben die gemeinsame Vorlage β , wirklich existiert hat

⁵²⁾ Vgl. RLM 612/13 Beda beginnt mit der donatischen Definition, es folgen, wie bei Donat die beiden *species per id quod continet id quod continetur aut contra*. Dann folgen bei Donat die beiden *species per inventorem id quod inventum est ac contra*, bei Beda dagegen gleich die beiden *species per efficientem id quod fit, dirigitur*. B, Isidor und Julian erst nach den beiden donatischen Paaren stehen.

⁵³⁾ Vgl. M. ROGER, L'enseignement des lettres classiques d'Ausone à Alcuin 1905, 329 A. 6.

Chenon et Althelmus 29 (1968)

FACTIO, FACTIONES AND NOBILITAS IN SALLUST

BY
HANNE SMITH

We do not possess any systematic study of Sallust's sociopolitical terminology. An attempt without any pretensions to an exhaustive interpretation was made in 1945 by K. Hanell in a paper of a descriptive character only¹⁾. The appearance, however, of J. Hellegouarch's thesis marks a turning-point for the investigation of the political language of the Republic, including that of Sallust²⁾.

What follows is an attempt at a study of the synonymous use in Sallust of the words *factio* and *nobilitas* and Sallust's use of the plural *factiones*. The synonymous use of *factio* and *nobilitas* was pointed out by Hanell³⁾ who stated that "Die Nobilität ist nicht nur eine *factio*, sondern die *factio*"; this insight, however, was doubted by K. Vretska⁴⁾ in connection with the expression *factio nobilitatis* which was used by Sallust in the second letter to Caesar⁵⁾.

The synonymous use of the odious expression *factio* and *nobilitas*, not in the sense of a social class, that is, a concrete term denoting the members of the consular families, but as a term for a political organisation, is found in the *contio* of the tribune C. Memmius. The tribune addresses the people (Jug. 31,1) and as a preliminary he enumerates the facts

¹⁾ Bemerkungen zu der politischen Terminologie des Sallustius, *Eranos* XI, III, 1945, 263 ff.

²⁾ Le vocabulaire latin des relations et des partis politiques sous la république, Paris 1963.

³⁾ Op. cit. p. 271.

⁴⁾ C. Sallustius Crispus, *Invektive und Episteln*, Heidelberg 1961, Bd. I, p. 64. I regard the genuineness of the Episteln as an established fact; cp. now also W. Wisstrand, Sallust on judicial murders in Rome. A philological and historical study. (*Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia* 24). Göteborg 1968, passim.

that might deter him from further interest in the welfare of the people. Among these he mentions *opes factionis* and *vostra patientia*, the resigned submission of the people—not without reason, since what he has to contend with is the monopoly of political influence possessed by the clique of the nobility supported by a popular movement. At 31,4 he continues: “sed quamquam haec talia sunt, tamen obviam ire factionis potentiae animus subigit”, which means that he feels obliged by reason of his “studium rei publicae” (31,1) to oppose the *potentia factionis*. Introducing Memmius at Jug. 27,2 (cp. also 30,3) Sallust characterizes him as a *vir acer et infestus potentiae nobilitatis*. In both passages the object of Memmius’ hate and open opposition is the same, from which it appears that Sallust uses *factio* alternating with *nobilitas*⁶⁾. *Opes factionis* (31,1) therefore means the material power of the nobility corresponding with *potentia factionis* (31,4), that is, the political power of the nobility acquired through the means at the disposal of this social class. Another example can be found in the tribune C. Licinius Macer’s speech to the people which forms part of the efforts towards reestablishing the full power of the tribunate. At Hist. III,48,3 M. Macer says: “Neque me praeterit, quantas opes nobilitatis solus impotens inani specie magistratus pelleret dominatione incipiam quantoque tutius *factio noxia* (i. e. the nobility) agat quam soli innocentes”. The identity between *factio* and *nobilitas* is clearly seen ibid. 48,8 where Macer characterizes C. Cotta, the consul of 75 b. C., as *ex factione media consul* which must reasonably mean that Cotta was a staunch member of the *factio* whose power in § 3 was called *opes nobilitatis*⁷⁾.

In support of this not only the connection between the adjectives *nobiles* and *factiosi*⁸⁾ may be adduced, but also the fact that *factio*

⁶⁾ The comparison of these two passages is justified. Though the speech of Memmius is demagogic, the parallel between Memmius’ speech and Sallust’s own thoughts is obvious. Cp. e. g. Jug. 41,7 (the political excursus): “paucorum arbitri belli dominique agitabatur; penes eosdem aerarium provinciae magistratus gloriae triumphique erant . . .” and Jug. 31,20 (the speech of Memmius): “. . . regia provinciae leges iura iudicia bella atque paces, postremo divina et humana omnia penes paucos erant”.

⁷⁾ Cp. V. Paladini, C. Sallusti Crispi Orationes et Epistulae de Historiarum Libris excerptae, Bari 1957, ad loc.

⁸⁾ Cp. Jug. 15,4: 28,4; 77,1. In another way Cat. 18,4 *factiosus* means *seditionis* (cp. Cat. 51,32).

to replace *nobiles* as it does in Ep. II,6,4. In this passage it is said of the tribune Marcus Drusus that in the beginning of his tribunate he always worked in the interests of the nobility and never did anything without the assent of the nobility: “M. Druso semper consilium fuit in tribunatu summa ope niti pro nobilitate; neque ullam rem in principio curare intendit nisi ille auctores fuerant”. These *auctores*, that is, the nobles, Sallust in § 4 calls *homines factiosi*. Therefore in Sallust *nobilitas* can be replaced by *factio*; *factio* can mean *factio nobilitatis*.

As previously mentioned Vretska in connection with the expression *factio nobilitatis* denies this synonymous use⁹⁾. However, we seem to find confirmation for this alternating use in the earlier letter to Caesar. In Ep. II 2,4 Sallust says: “Sin in te ille animus est, qui iam a principio nobilitatis factionem disturbavit . . .”. According to Sallust, Caesar already once thwarted the nobility, but since it soon raised its head again, it must thwart it once more: “. . . tibi cum *factione nobilitatis* haut mediocriter certandum est” (ibid. 8,6)¹⁰⁾.

The expression *factio nobilitatis* is used by Sallust only in these two passages. The problem therefore is whether Sallust employs *factio nobilitatis* as he can employ *factio* without attribute (identical with *nobilitas*¹¹⁾) or whether this is a way, as is maintained by Vretska, of denoting a dominating group within the nobility (*nobilitas* then means a social class), in this case the anti-Caesarian coalition of nobles. This interpretation is prevalent among scholars because it is based on theoretical facts, though it seems hardly tenable. In Ep. II,2,4 Caesar is called not only as the man who dispersed the *factio nobilitatis*, but also as the man who delivered the Roman people from slavery: “qui . . . nobilitatis factionem disturbavit, plebem Romanam . . . in libertatem

⁹⁾ Vretska loc. cit.

¹⁰⁾ Cp. ibid. 9,4 and 11,6. In another way 10,9: “. . . homines nobiles . . . curae laboris hostium militiae domi factione instructi per superbiam cunctis modis moderantur. Here *factio* reasonably must be taken in the abstract sense of the word (cp. Cat. 54,6 and below p. 193) since the opposing term *ignareti* denotes the sense of *instructi* as “instructed”, “well versed”; *factione instructi* determined will versed in party politics. (I owe this phrase to Professor Blatts Danish translation). Consequently the conjecture *factione instructa* proposed by Kroll, Hermes 1927, p. 391 is not acceptable as it breaks the parallelism *ignareti/instructi* or *chiasmus*.

¹¹⁾ Cf. Hanell op. cit. p. 271.

restituit . . .". The semantic value of *factio nobilitatis* is determined by the antithetical plebs, an antithesis, which must correspond with the usual Sallustian formula describing the two oppositional classes in the Republic, viz. *nobilitas/plebs*¹²). Sallust' wording at II,3 points in the same direction: the result of Caesar's struggle against the *factio nobilitatis* by means of political reforms will be a *minus potens nobilitas*.

Vretska raises a protest against this identity between *factio* and *nobilitas*: "Der daraus¹³) zu folgernden Gleichsetzung von *factio* = *nobilitas* widerspricht aber die Darstellung in Kap. 6; denn hier werden einem Caesar im Parallele zu Drusus, der sich anders als Caesar, sogar mit aller Kraft pro nobilitate mühte – und damit einem unzweifelbaren *nobilis* "tempestatates hominum nobilium" vorausgesetzt".

This argument, however, is not relevant. By mentioning the fact that Caesar himself was a *nobilis*, Vretska has introduced a point of view

¹²) On the antithesis *nobilitas-plebs* see Hellegouarc'h, op. cit. p. 438. At 44,40,5 the political implications of the words are emphasized while the social aspect recedes (cp. also § 3) "uti saepe nobilitatem sic ea tempestate plebem ex secundis rebus insolentia ceperat". Also Jug. 41,6 "ceterum nobilitas factioe magis plebis *vis soluta atque dispersa* in multitudine minus poterat". See further Jug. 16,2; 63,6 and 65,5.

¹³) That is, the passage Ep. II,2,4; 8,6; 9,4; 11,6; 5,2; 11,2. I do not agree neither with Vretska's interpretation of 5,2 (op. cit. vol. I p. 64), but take *nobilitas* as synonymous with *patres* in the sense of patricians, a contemporary term applied to the past. This is proved by the logical structure of the sequence 5,1 ff. I view the period "in duas partes ego civitatem divisam arbitror . . . in patres et plebs" as a superior gnome, the sense of which though it includes all the members of *civitas* corresponds with Cic. Sest. 96,1 "duo genera semper in hac civitate fuerunt populares . . . optimates" (Aliter Vretska ad loc.). Thus the following sentence starts with *antea*; it takes us back to the early republican period, from where we move to Sallust's own time in § 6: "Antea in patribus summa auctoritas erat, multa maxima in plebe". What time exactly Sallust designates by the loose *antea* is made plain in the following period: "Itaque saepius in civitate secessio semperque nobilitatis opes deminutae sunt et ius populi amplificatum". This applies to the era of the class struggles. The terms *patres-plebs* express the opposition patricians—plebeians; here in contrast to § 1 they are used in their primary and they describe historical facts. In former times (*antea*) *patres* possessed the greatest *auctoritas*, whereas *plebs* had the greatest *vis*, i. e. potential revolutionary strength by virtue of their numbers. As a consequence of this constellation of unequal political power of the patricians and the plebeians, expressed by Sallust as a decrease of *opes nobilitas* and an increase of *ius populi*. Thus *nobilitas* is employed as a synonym of *patres*, and consequently *plebs* as a synonym of *populus* (aliter Vretska op. cit. vol. II p. 106).

foreign to the text he is interpreting. Though Caesar was a *nobilis*, Sallust does not call him so, not even in the Bellum Catilinae.

This discretion about Caesar's social standing cannot be ascribed to mere coincidence; on the contrary, it was done deliberately. There were a good many opportunities for Sallust to state exactly the social status of Caesar, especially in connection with the famous *σὺνχερσις* between Caesar and Cato; in this passage (Cat. 54,1), however, he only tells us that " . . . iis genus aetas eloquentia prope aequalia fuere . . .".

It is not difficult to see why Sallust is reticent on the point of Caesar's social status as *nobilis*.

In his "Studien zu Sallusts Bellum Jugurthinum"¹⁴) Vretska claims that *nobiles* cannot be used as denoting the clique of the nobility, sondern bezeichnet auch im Plural einzelne Leute aus dem Adel, weist also auf die Herkunft hin mit lobendem (B. J. 25,3) oder – wie zumeist – mit tadelndem Nebensinn (B. C. 17,6)". Against this one may object that in Sallust *nobilis* always occurs with a negative value – except in the passages of theoretical reflections on the idea of *nobilitas* as a quality based on *virtus*.

In the passage adduced by Vretska (Jug. 25,4) Sallust describes how another group of *legati* are sent off to Africa: "legantur . . . in Africam maiores natu nobiles, amplius honoribus uti in quis fuit M. Scaurus, de quo supra memoravimus, consularis et tum senatus princeps". The fact that these nobles held high offices cannot from a Sallustian point of view be regarded as a recommendation. About Scaurus it is said that he was *consularis* and moreover *senatus princeps*; however he is introduced in Jug. 15,4 as a *homo nobilis in piper factiosus, avidus potentiae honoris desiderium, ceterum vitia sua callide occultans . . .*". This description speaks for itself. In this case, too, *nobilis* is not a positive quality, but as everywhere in Sallust, where used of a particular person or group, it is employed in *malam partem*.

This is the reason why Sallust does not mention Caesar's social status; in accordance with his political sympathies he could not describe Caesar as *nobilis*, because he consistently valued this quality negatively.

Incidentally it is worthy of notice that Caesar and Cato are the only

¹⁴) Wien 1955, p. 86.

contemporaries to whom Sallust ascribes *virtus* (Cat. 53,6), and further, that this quality at the time of the war against Jugurtha is admitted only in the case of Q. Caecilius Metellus Numidicus (Jug. 64,1). Here Sallust is consistent, since no more than Caesar is Cato in the *Catilina* described as a *nobilis* – though in fact he was a *nobilis* – and this quality is only indirectly ascribed to Metellus at Jug. 64,1: “*quoi quamquam virtus, gloria atque alia optanda bonis superabant, tamen inerat contemptor animus et superbia, commune nobilitatis malum*” (cp. also 73,4). At 43,1 Metellus is introduced with these words: “. . . Metelloque Numidia euenerat, acri viro et quamquam aduorso populi partium fama tamen aequabili et inuolata”. He is not explicitly described as a *nobilis*.

A priori there is nothing surprising in the fact that Sallust identifies *factio* and *nobilitas*. As a consequence of his view of the aristocracy as a select and closed body, a compact clique¹⁵ it is easy for him to apply the expression *factio* to this class.

At Cat. 5,1,40 Caesar says: “*Postquam res publica adolevit et multitudine civium factiones valere . . . tum lex Porcia aliaque leges paratae sunt . . .*”. In the whole of the Sallustian corpus the plural *factiones* is found only here and at Jug. 41,1: “*Ceterum mos partium et factionum . . . Romae ortus est otio atque abundantia earum rerum quae prima mortales ducunt*”. In all manuscripts the transmitted text reads “*partium popularium*”, except m¹ (Mon. 14477) which has only *partium*. No more do the MSS agree about *factionum* Apart from N¹ (Pal. 889) and m¹ (Mon. 14477) the MSS have *senatus factionum* or the impossible *senatores factionum*. Recent editors reject *popularium*¹⁶ and *senatus*, rightly, because these words are obviously glosses. The expression *mos partium et factionum*, however, is difficult and needs close interpretation.

In his text Ernout reads *mos partium et factionum*, but obviously he regards the “interpretation” of the mediaeval scribes as correct. He translates “l’habitude des luttes entre le parti populaire et les classes

¹⁵ Cp. Jug. 85,10 where *nobilitas* is called *globus*.

¹⁶ The decisive argument against the reading *partium popularium* is the fact that Sallust nowhere employs *popularis* as a political expression. *Popularis* is found either in the sense of “*compatriot*” (Jug. 7,1; 35,9; 48,1; 111,2; 74,1; 58,4; 75,1) or in the sense of “*participant*” (Cat. 24,1; 22,1; 52,12).

dirigeantes”¹⁷). In his note ad loc. he gives his reason for his translation: “*Ici, comme souvent, factio désigne la classe dirigeante, et partes le parti plébéien*”. Hellegouarc’h rightly criticizes Ernout’s interpretation¹⁸ and refuses with great precision the parallel between *factionum* 41,1) and *factione* in the passus *nobilitas factione magis pollebat* 41,6), which Ernout endeavours to establish. Hellegouarc’h points out that it is *factio*, not *factiones* that means “la classe dirigeante”. The parallel between *factio* and *factiones* cannot be upheld, as can also be shown in another way. Hellegouarc’h himself¹⁹ has used the passage 41,6 as an example of the abstract use of *factio*, a use that is quite rare in classic Latin²⁰. The meaning of *factio* in the expression *nobilitas factione magis pollebat* is made clear by the antithesis *plebis vis soluta atque dispersa in multitudine minus poterat*. There is no doubt that *factione*, in so far as it is opposed to *multitudine*, must be taken as an abstractum, as already Jacobs-Wirz did in their commentary ad loc., interpreting *factione* as *vis paucorum in unum collecta*, in contrast to *multitudine*, which Ernout interprets as *les classes dirigeantes*, and thus rightly understands the expression as a concretum.

In my opinion Hellegouarc’h has at last arrived at the correct interpretation of the expression *mos partium et factionum*; while treating the word *partes*²¹ he translates *l’habitude des partis et des factions*. In *partes* are contained both *partes populi* (Jug. 43,1) and the Ciceronian *partes optimatum*, while *factiones* in the same way as in Cat. 5,1,40, means the number of groups formed around single individuals or coalitions of individuals who worked for their own political aims, employing their *factio* as a useful political instrument.

It ought, however, to be emphasized, that the compelling argument for this interpretation can be found in the very context. At Jug. 41 ff. we have a political digression of a theoretical character: “*Ceterum mos*

¹⁷ Salluste, Paris, Budé, 1962 p. 180. This interpretation is *opinio communis*, cf. e.g. S. L. Uttschenko, *Der weltanschauliche Kampf in Rom am Vorabend des Kaiserthums*, Berlin 1956, p. 110; Vitciska, *Studien* p. 56; L. R. Taylor, *Politics in the Age of Caesar*, Berkeley 1964, p. 191, n. 44.

¹⁸ Op. cit. p. 100. Cp. also p. 115.

¹⁹ Op. cit. p. 101

²⁰ Cp. Cat. 54,6 “*non divitiis cum divite neque factione cum factioso erant*” and Ep. II,10,9 “*homines nobiles . . . factione instructi*”.

²¹ Op. cit. p. 114.

partium et factionum ac deinde omnium malarum artium paucis ante annis Romae ortus est otio atque abundantia earum rerum, quae prima mortales ducunt. nam ante Carthaginem deletam populus et senatus Romanus placide modesteque inter se rem publicam tractabant, neque gloriae neque dominationis certamen inter civis erat: metus hostilis in bonis artibus civitatem retinebat. sed ubi illa formido mentibus decessit, scilicet ea, quae res secundae amant, lascivia atque superbia incensere. ita quod in adversis rebus optaverant otium, postquam adepti sunt, asperius acerbisque fuit. namque coepere nobilitas dignitatem, populus libertatem in lubidinem vertere, sibi quisque ducere trahere rapere. ita omnia in duas partis abstracta sunt, res publica, quae media fuerat, dilacerata." Mos partium et factionum is the superior expression, the terms of which are specified in the following sequence. Thus *partes* is specified in § 2 by *populus et senatus Romanus* and in § 5 by *nobilitas, populus*, while the individual political activities expressed by the plural *factiones* in § 1, are described in § 5 as taking the form of *sibi quisque ducere trahere rapere* once the *metus hostilis* was overcome; whereas the absence of these activities before the destruction of Carthage is formulated as *neque gloriae neque dominationis certamen inter civis erat*.

Not only the interpretation of the political terminology in Jug. 41,1 ff. has caused much trouble, but also the problem of Sallust's historical concepts in this passage. Is Gelzer right in stating in his dissertation²² that "Sallust vertritt in allen seinen Werken (Cat. 10,5, Jug. 41,1, Hist. I,12) die Auffassung, das Koterienwesen sei erst nach der Zerstörung Karthagos aufgekommen. Das ist nicht historisch. Die Faktionen treten uns als politische Mächte entgegen, sobald eine zuverlässige Überlieferung Einblick in die Einzelheiten der Vergangenheit gestattet". Hellegouarc'h²³ says with reference to Gelzer's arguments: "que Salluste ne dit pas exactement que les factiones sont nées à l'époque de la destruction de Carthage, mais qu'elles se sont accrues considérablement, justement sous l'influence des deux facteurs qui pouvaient le plus y contribuer: l'accroissement des richesses (Jug. 41,1) et l'augmentation du nombre

²²) Die Nobilität der römischen Republik, Berlin 1920, p. 103 (now in Kleine Schriften I, Wiesbaden 1962, 123). Cp. Ross Taylor, op. cit. p. 10 with note.
²³) Op. cit. p. 106.

is citoyens" (Cat. 54,1). This interpretation saves Sallust from contradicting himself at Cat. 51,40 where he makes Caesar state: "... postquam res publica adolevit et multitudine civium factiones valere ... in lex Porcia aliaeque leges paratae sunt"²⁴).

The important question, however, of Sallust's dating of the emergence of the *factiones* and consequently the interpretation of Jug. 41,1 ff. has not been answered by Hellegouarc'h. Gelzer's view has not even refuted. Moreover, elsewhere²⁵) Hellegouarc'h seems to accept Gelzer's argument when he translates our passage in this way: "l'habitude des partis et des factions ... naquit à Rome à la faveur de la paix ...". If, on the other hand, Sallust in this passage intends to say that the individual political groups (*factiones*) emerged at Rome after the destruction of Carthage, it follows that he refers to the emergence of *partes* (*partes* = *populus et senatus Romanus* and *nobilitas/populus*) to the same time, which is clearly absurd.

In § 2, that is *ante Carthaginem deletam, partes in mos partium et factionum* is defined by *populus et senatus Romanus*. It is important to notice the striking change of order in *populus et senatus*, which emphasizes the two *partes* and the invariable duality inside the *res publica*²⁶). This duality, however, in the view of Sallust, was hardly perceptible before the fall of Carthage, in contrast to the period after this event, because these two main elements in the Roman state, *populus et senatus*, governed the state *placide modesteque*²⁷).

The key-word in this passage, then, is *mos*. *Mos* here is employed in a malam partem and is to be understood as odious practice, as it is in Hist. III,48,16 M. The emphasis in our passage is on *mos*. The practice, so to say, has always existed, but only a few years ago it has begun to be a nuisance. The juxtaposition of *partes* - *factiones*, however, is only partially parallel, because *partes* in this passage is a neutral expression for the existing duality, while *factiones*, as always in the political meaning of the word, is clearly negative.

²⁴) Cp Liv. X,9,4-5. Lex Porcia undoubtedly refers to the law about provocatio of 199 b. C. See A. H. McDonald, JRS 1944, p. 19.

²⁵) Op. cit. p. 114.

²⁶) See Jacobs-Wirz ad loc.

²⁷) It is very characteristic that the neutral pair *populus et senatus Romanus* in § 2 has been replaced by the strongly connotative *nobilitas/populus*.

The odious practice of *factiones*, rivalling political cliques, emerged after the fall of Carthago, before that time there was no *certamina gloriae/dominionis inter cives*. So far Gelzer is right. In the old days when according to Sallust concordia reigned everywhere (Cat. 9,1 there was no fertile soil for competition between rival cliques. With reference to Jug. 31,15 *haec inter bonos amicitia, inter malos factio et* one might say that according to Sallust, in the period after the fall of Carthago, amicitiae, political groups formed around individuals, & generated into *factiones*. So far Sallust is unhistorical.

THE "ABSOLUTIST" THEOLOGY OF VICTORY: ITS PLACE IN THE LATE EMPIRE¹⁾

BY

RUDOLPH H. STORCH

The imperial Roman conception of victory, or the theology of victory, underwent a series of changes from the time of Augustus²⁾, when the emphasis was on *felicitas* as the cause of victory, to the third century and the formulation of the absolutist theology involving the notion of an invincible (*invictus*) emperor, possessed of a supernatural *virtus*, procuring an eternal and universal Roman victory. On the one hand, this absolutist theology can be understood, as documented by Gilbert Charles Picard³⁾, in terms of the development of a mystical connection between an *énergie surnaturelle* and the *virtus* of the emperor. But it should also be seen in the light of trends of late imperial history by which the empire was abandoning legalistic, narrow, formulas of the principate in favor of unprecise, wider points of view. Indeed, the absolutist theology was intimately connected with (1) the use of INVICTUS as part of imperial titulature and with (2) developments on the third century coinage, namely, the appearance of wider claims by the emperors than ever before.

The rise of Octavian to power had affected the traditional concept of victory. In the earlier Republican period success on the battlefield had been intimately connected with the quality of the general and

¹⁾ The term "theology" as used in this essay and originally by JEAN GAGÉ is not used in the strict sense of a precise formulation of concepts of the Roman religion. Rather, it reflects the notion among the Romans that effective generalship was always related to the supernatural.

²⁾ This discussion was initiated by J. GAGÉ ("La théologie de la Victoire Impériale", *Rev. Hist.*, 1933, 1-43).

³⁾ *Les Trophées Romaines*, 1957, 466 ff. For background note the preceding section, "Invicto imperatori tropaea", 451 ff.