

ROMA, CONSTANTINOPOLIS, THE EMPEROR, AND HIS GENIUS*

THE purpose of the present paper is to examine one way in which divine being or divine existence was expressed in the Ancient World, and to see how in late antiquity the expression of some aspects of divine existence was abandoned, while others survived. The inquiry therefore seeks to contribute to the discussion on change and continuity, and, more specifically, to the problem of what may be understood by conversion from paganism to Christianity in late antiquity.¹

In antiquity, the existence of the divine was frequently expressed in terms of divine pairs or associates: sometimes, for example, one partner could be *σύνναος θεός* to the other—would share his temple.² This method of expression was typical of the Greco-Roman world. Thus, in the Romanized western provinces of the empire, one way of placing the indigenous religion of a province in step—in concord—with the religion of the empire, was to create divine pairs, such as Mercury and Rosmerta at Trier, and Sulis Minerva in Bath.³ These are not necessarily couples, but are linked by some more imponderable link than matrimony or kinship. In expression and content, the pairs conveyed something of what was most typical and most vital in the religious consciousness, or, rather, in the consciousness of the supernatural, of the people of the classical mediterranean world. One should perhaps point out immediately that terms like 'religious consciousness' or 'consciousness of the supernatural' are terms of convenience used by ourselves, to describe an experience and a consciousness which would never have used such terms or their equivalents. The terms, and the concepts they denote, were expressed on a different level, with a different vocabulary, and in different modes. The divine pairs which I shall study are one specific aspect of this mode of expression.

But pairs were formed not only so as to link together divine beings, but also to link the divine with the human. Thus, we are dealing with religious consciousness capable of seeing existence in terms of pairs which could transcend the boundaries set between the divine and the human spheres. The nature of these pairs varies enormously in different parts of the empire, and in different

* I would like to thank Peter Brown of All Souls College for his detailed comments on both the content and form of this paper. Also, I have learnt much from discussing it with Gervase Mathew.

¹ An introduction to the topic is provided by *The Conflict of Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century* (1963), ed. A. Momigliano; the question of the transposition of pagan modes of expression in art into Christian ones has been recently studied by A. Grabar, *Early Christian Iconography, a Study of its Origins* (1969); also below, p. 136 n. 2.

² See A. D. Nock, *Σύνναος θεός*, in *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, i (1972) = *H.S.C.P.* xli (1930).

³ On the temple of Sulis Minerva at

Bath, see J. M. C. Toynbee, *Art in Britain under the Romans* (1964), 130–8 (137–8 on the nature of the divinity); E. M. Wightman, *Roman Trier and the Treveri* (1970), 209, 210 f., 219; 225 on Mercury and Rosmerta and similar pairs; also J. Toutain, *Les Cultes païens dans l'empire Romain* iii (1917), Africa: 15 f., 133 f.; Spain: 136 f. for Netus–Mars, and Cosus–Mars; 141–3; Gaul: 197 ff. On Syrian gods in Roman guise, K. Latte, *Römische Religionsgeschichte* (1960), 345–8; F. Cumont, *Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism* (1911) is still important, and can now be supplemented by the series *Études préliminaires aux Religions Orientales dans l'empire Romain*, ed. M. J. Vermaseren (1961 f.).

periods. An example is the Imperial cult: the different cults of the emperor and of his genius, or of the emperor and some alternative, more than human, counterpart of the emperor were viable in all parts of the empire because they could be formulated in a way which gave expression to this special kind of religious consciousness, or, it might be truer to say, to this consciousness of living.¹

The pairs under consideration can be made up from two out of three categories—divine, human, or personifications. The fact that any two of the three could form a pair does not mean that thereby the individual being lost any of his distinctive characteristics. The very opposite was the case: the fact that the formation of such pairs was possible meant that ancient men could create from such a juxtaposition a kind of *concordia ordinum* among contrasting orders of being. Here, as so often elsewhere in antiquity, important aspects of experience and comprehension were stated in ways which are deliberately elusive and fluid in such a way as to allow to experience and comprehension that freedom to change which they needed so as to survive in the familiar modes. It was when such freedom and flexibility was no longer possible, that certain aspects of the particular set of pairs which I will examine died. Indeed, in this loss of flexibility we shall have one revealing indication of an end of ancient modes of thought.

So much for initially defining the subject. Further definitions I will leave to the future course of our treatment.

According to a law of 8 November in 392 A.D. the cult of the genius was still practised in the empire:

Nullus omnino . . . in nulla urbe sensu carentibus simulacris vel insontem victimam caedat vel secretiore piaculo larem igne, mero genium, penates odore veneratus accendat lumina, imponat tura, sarta suspendat. Quod si quispiam immolare hostiam sacrificaturus audebit aut spirantia exta consulere ad exemplum maiestatis reus licita cunctis accusatione delatus excipiat sententiam competentem, etiam si nihil contra salutem principum aut de salute quaesierit.²

We should note that, in this law, the genius, deity of the individual, is directly associated with the Lar, the deity of the family, and then with the Penates, whose significance, particularly in late antique Christian apologetic, could be a public one: they were regarded as the pagan gods of the state. Furthermore, from prohibiting the worship of this group of divinities the law goes on to prohibit practices of divination. A specific reference is also made to the *salus* of the emperors.³ Echoes of Horace and Virgil in the text of the law indicate the

¹ Cf. below, p. 139.

² *Cod. Theod.* 16. 10. 12.

³ See below, p. 141. For the loci of the horoscope see Riess, *R.E.* ii. s.v. Astrologie, cols. 1803–5; for the position of the genius in these loci Firmicus Maternus, *Mathesis* 2. 19, *de duodecim locorum potestatibus*; for instances of the *salus* of the emperors determining the *salus* of the state in astrology A. E. Housman ed. Manilius i. lxix ff. (cf. below, p. 141 n. 2); for the connection between lares compitales and the genius of the emperor,

below, p. 136, and for the penates of the state, K. Koch, *Religio* (1960), 163 f. The question of the Penates of Troy as the gods of the Roman state is taken up by Augustine, *C.D.* 1. 3 (cf. below, p. 133). The official, public lares and penates should be distinguished from those mentioned in *Cod. Theod.* 16. 10. 12, which refers to the domestic worship of a pagan household, but there did exist a direct correlation between domestic and public cult in Roman paganism (G. Wissowa, *R.u.K.* [1912], 161 f.,

cultural level on which part of the conflict between paganism and Christianity took place.¹ For this conflict is the background to our law. On 2 August 392, Eugenius was proclaimed emperor. In September 392, the pretorian prefect of the East, Tatian, a known pagan, was replaced by Rufinus, and Tatian's son Proclus was executed.² Then there follows our law of 8 November. Though it was issued in Constantinople and addressed to the pretorian prefect Rufinus, the mention of genius, Lar, and Penates points to the western milieu envisaged in this law, for it was in the West that this particular form of missionary thoroughness and circumstantiality could most hit home.³

What was understood by genius in late antiquity?⁴ There were, I think, two levels of comprehension, a learned and what may be called a practical or cultic one. The learned level in late antiquity came to be more typical of Christian than of pagan treatments of the subject, although Christian erudition was drawn from pagan sources. The practical level was not necessarily unlearned: but it was practical, not purely literary, in that it related to a specific way of practising one's religion, performing its rites.

From a learned level, Augustine's account of genius, taken from Varro, provides a good example.⁵ Augustine is concerned to show how on an intellectual, rational level, Varro's civic and natural theologies, in which he gave an account of the Roman gods, genius included, produced a series of absurdities and contradictions.⁶ Augustine was not here discussing merely the religious validity of Varro's system, but its intellectual foundations, on which, in Augustine's view, the religious validity of the system depended. Varro discussed the genius of the individual and the genius of the world. As regards the individual, genius is the deity of generation, and according to Varro it is the *anima rationalis* of each individual, which is the seat of intelligence.⁷ In the physical universe, the *mundus*, the *anima rationalis* corresponds to the *aether* which, in turn, is the seat of the world's genius; and this, at some level, can be equated with Iuppiter.⁸ What Augustine criticized in such a system, and what was essential to the pagan attitude, was the duplication of function in the roles that it attributed to the divine and human spheres. Yet it was precisely by means of this duplication, or, in terms more sympathetic to paganism, by this coalescence of the functions of divine and human beings that in paganism the individual

166 f.), especially through the household of the pagan emperor, and a fusion of one into the other, as the sequence of topics in the law indicates.

¹ *Mero genius* = Hor. C. 3. 17. 14 'cras genium mero / curabis'; *spirantia exta consulere* = Verg. Aen. 4. 64 'pectoribus inhians spirantia consulit exta.'

² E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire* i (1959), 210 f.; A. H. M. Jones, J. R. Martindale, J. Morris, *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* i (1971), Tatianus 5. See also A. Piganiol, *L'empire Chrétien*, ed. A. Chastagnol (1972), 288 ff.; 291-2 on the legislative context of *Cod. Theod.* 16. 10. 12.

³ See W. Ensslin, 'Die Religionspolitik d. Kaisers Theodosius d. Gr.' *S.B. München* (1953), 83-4: 'Die fast im Ton einer Missionspredigt gehaltene Verschärfung früherer Erlasse [so Geffcken, *Ausg.*, 156 f.] hat

man, wenn auch etwas verfrüht, den Grabgesang des Heidentums genannt.'

⁴ For the background see W. Otto in *R.E.* vii², cols. 1155-70, s.v. Genius; Wissowa *R.u.K.* (1912), 175 ff.; K. Latte, op. cit. (p. 131 n. 3), 103 f.; and A. D. Nock, 'The emperor's divine Comes' in *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World* ii (1972), 653 ff. = *J.R.S.* xxxvii (1947). More recently, see Fishwick, 'Genius and Numen', *The Harvard Theological Review* lxii (1969), 356-67, and more generally, *Le Culte des souverains dans l'empire Romain*, Entretiens, Fondation Hardt xix (1972).

⁵ *C.D.* 7. 2, 13, 16, 23, 33.

⁶ Note for instance the procedure of the argument in *C.D.* 7. 13.

⁷ *C.D.* 7. 13 (cf. Censorinus, *De die natali* 3); 7. 23.

⁸ *C.D.* 7. 23. 1; 7. 13.

could see himself as being in harmony with the universe, as occupying a meaningful place, and at death as sinking back into its reassuring wholeness—as in the Latin epitaph:

Cara mieis vixi virgo vitam reddidi mortua heic ego sum et sum cinis is cinis terrast sein est terra dea ego sum dea mortua non sum.¹

If there is an issue over which a Christian writer such as Augustine differed *toto caelo* from his pagan contemporaries (and from many of the assumptions still made by many Christians) it is in his radical rejection of the idea of duplication. His arguments leave no room for that type of differentiation and correlation of levels of being which formed part of the religious atmosphere that ancient men had breathed. The starkness of Augustine's views merely serves to highlight the strength of the traditions which we shall follow through this paper; and it is for this reason, and not because he was necessarily representative of the average Christian attitudes, that one may here refer to the arguments deployed in the *City of God*.

To consider genius in its cultic aspect: in paganism, the concept of a person's genius serves to place that person in a context. A person is not merely an isolated individual, but has a double in another sphere of being. Here we have an instance of the pairs mentioned earlier. In the mid third century, Censorinus, viewing the question from a practical, cultic angle defined genius as follows:²

genius est deus cuius in tutela ut quisque natus est vivit.

The genius is with a person from the mother's womb until death, and so the celebration of a person's *natalis* is a *duplex officium*, because on that day both the person and his genius are honoured, the genius in the form of a libation of unmixed wine³—exactly as in the law of 392. An indication of how closely and intimately the link between a person and his genius was felt to exist, is Censorinus' observation that no outsider must partake of the sacrificial offering of an individual to his genius before that individual has done so himself.³

Through his genius then, although in pagan thought this genius is mortal, the individual is connected to a form of existence which is other than and beyond human existence, and so to regions beyond himself, where the genius dwells. The abode of the genius could be defined in astrological terms.⁴ Here, and in Augustine's refutation of the concept of genius, is to be seen the reason why the law of 392 proceeded without apparent connection from the cult of the genius to predictions of the future. The connection could be taken as understood in late antiquity. Astrology in late antiquity involved precisely that mixture of loose, though not random, explanation with precise statement that Augustine criticized in Varro. Firmicus Maternus described where in the heavens is to be found the *bonus daemon* or genius and the *malus daemon* (interestingly enough not called genius), and Martianus Capella names the celestial whereabouts of the various types of genius. In Maternus we see clearly that all this has the specific purpose of foretelling the future.

The huge string of meanings that the position of the genius in the sky could

¹ C.I.L. vi. 4². 35887, from an epigram of Epicharmos: εἰμὶ νεκρὸς νεκρὸς δὲ κόπρος γῆ δ' ἡ κόπρος ἐστίν· / εἰ δέ τε γῆ θεὸς ἐστ', οὐ νεκρὸς ἀλλὰ θεός.

² Censorinus, *De die natali* 3.

³ Censorinus, *De die natali* 2.

⁴ Firmicus Maternus, *Mathesis* 2. 19; Martianus Capella, 1. 45 ff., 2. 147 ff.

evoke became precise and definite when related to specific questions—and this is another aspect of the practical level of comprehension indicated above. Specific questions could be asked in connection with a person's *natalis*, the day when in some precise, actual way the individual and his genius became intimately associated; and so the whole weight of centuries of erudition could be brought to bear at that point in telling a person's future: hence Augustine's profound sense of outrage at the tyranny of the demons.¹ For as Augustine did not deny the existence of demons, he had to differentiate between demons, among whom he counted genius, and angels. This differentiation acquires a particular frame of reference when one realizes that genius and angels could be regarded as identical:

Genius tutelatur . . . et quoniam cogitationum arcana superae annuntiat potestati, etiam angelus poterit nuncupari

says Martianus Capella.² I think that this is an instance of pagans sharing ideas that also formed part of the Judaeo-Christian tradition, as known to Augustine; hence the need which Augustine felt to commit himself and his readers to a radical differentiation.

I will now look at a Christian manifestation of the pairing of representatives of different orders of existence. Augustine discriminated sharply between paganism and Christianity, deliberately leaving no room for a no-man's-land in between, that might become a new meeting ground. But in this rigorousness he was unique. For most Christians, in late antiquity as later in Byzantium, the language they spoke, the art forms they used, and, most important in the present context, the modes of thought that they employed, provided so much common ground with pagans past and present that the problems did not arise in the uncompromising manner in which Augustine presented them.

An example of the survival of pagan ways of thought within Christianity can be seen in the second-century *Shepherd of Hermas*. This account of visions and of their interpretation in a Christian milieu nevertheless uses much of the idiom of the classical religious world.³ In order to be reassured in the uncertainties and failures of his life, Hermas not only had visions, but in a very precise, intimate way, he acquired a set of protectors, of guardians, who came from orders of being other than the human. There are personified virtues who protected, but more important there is the ἄγγελος μετανοίας who at a specific moment⁴ came to live with him, as the genius in some specific way comes to join his human counterpart on the day of his birth. One should note here firstly that the term genius can be rendered by Angel and, secondly, that, in later Christian thought, a man's guardian angel joined him, not at birth but at the Christian's birth—baptism.⁵ We have here a careful transposition of a general pagan mode of thought into a specifically Christian world. Details of *Hermas*

¹ F. H. Cramer, *Astrology in Roman Law and Politics* (1954), 184–195; Augustine, *C.D.* 7. 33.

² 2. 152 (cf. the references given in A. Dick's Teubner ed. ad loc.); the word angel is used by Julian in a context which is relevant: *Letter to the Athenians* 275B: ἡγήσατο γὰρ (Athene) ἀπανταχοῦ μοι καὶ παρέστη ἀπανταχόθεν τοὺς φύλακας ἐξ

Ἡλίου καὶ Σελήνης ἀγγέλους λαβοῦσα.

³ On the date: S. Giet, *Hermas et les Pasteurs* (1963), 280–5; on the pagan idiom, E. Peterson, 'Beitr. zur Interpretation der Visionen im Pastor Hermas', in *Frühkirche, Judentum, und Gnosis* (1959), 254–70.

⁴ *Hermas* 30. 1.

⁵ See E. Peterson, *Das Buch von den Engeln* (1935), 68 f.

support this interpretation: There is an angel of justice and an angel of evil living within each individual;¹ and *Hermas*' angel appears in a *σχήμα* familiar from Hellenistic pastoral poetry—that of the shepherd.² A similar process of overlap and fusion between Judeo-Christian ideas and ideas originating in the classical world occurs in Origen:

The wise men of the Greeks may say that the human soul is allotted to demons from birth; but when Jesus taught us not to despise even the little ones in the church he said that 'They are angels continually beholding the face of my Father who is in heaven.'³

With this citation we catch a rare moment when the balance of pagan and Christian attitudes to a common human concern was sensed and held. How lasting the Christian solution was to be is shown in the theme of the Guardian Angel, as shown, for instance, in the Greek Orthodox liturgy:

Ἄγγελον εἰρήνης, πιστὸν ὁδηγόν, φύλακα τῶν ψυχῶν καὶ τῶν σωμάτων ἡμῶν, παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου αἰτησώμεθα.⁴

The Christian version of this preoccupation was elaborated on the fringe of ancient religious thought: the pairing of human and super-human which lay closer to the bedrock of pagan attitudes and which had received constant expression in Roman times was that between the emperor and his genius. Here a strong sacral and cultic element had existed—the genius was the recipient of the cult of the living emperor. While it may be the case⁵ that the idea of the 'worship' of an emperor's genius was not necessarily at stake, for instance, between Christians and the Roman authorities, nevertheless, the religious associations crystallized in the idea of the emperor's genius should not be underestimated as a force in the pagan world itself. The emperor's genius, like anyone else's, is one half of a pair, and in this way the imperial cult was articulated by and in turn helped to articulate this fundamental aspect of Greco-Roman paganism. In the first cult that was created for the genius of the emperor, that of Augustus, this genius was, furthermore, associated with the *lares compitales* of the reorganized *vici* of Rome. Thus, the genius was paired

¹ *Hermas* 36. 2: cf. Firmicus Maternus, *Mathesis* 2. 19. 12–13 on *bonus daemon vel genius* and *cacos daemon*; Capella 2. 162–3.

² *Hermas* 25; cf. Gregory of Tours, *Historia Francorum* 2. 7, the guardian angel of Aetius (still without wings, cf. *H.F.* 4. 5). Here and in the idea of Christ the Good Shepherd, there is a coalescence of O.T. and N.T. notions with Greco-Roman ones; for this process in art, see F. Saxl, 'Continuity and Variation in the Meaning of Images', in *A Heritage of Images* (1970), 21–5, on angels with and without wings. Concerning the image of the Good Shepherd, see T. Klauser, 'Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte der christlichen Kunst', *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* i (1958), 20–51; iii (1960), 112–33; v (1962), 113–24; vii (1964), 67–76; viii–ix (1965/6), 126–70; x (1967), 82–120. Nations, like individuals, each had a genius

(Symmachus, *Rel.* 3. 8), and, in Judaism and Christianity, a guardian angel: see E. Peterson, 'Das Problem des Nationalismus im alten Christentum', in *Frühkirche, Judentum, und Gnosis* (1959), 51–63. Something of this idea survived in Byzantium, supported by the convention of Byzantine art whereby angels were portrayed in courtly dress: see Oskar Wulff, *Die Koimesiskirche in Nicäa* (1903).

³ Origen, *Contra Celsum* 8. 34, translated and edited by H. Chadwick (1965), 477.

⁴ *The Divine Liturgy of John Chrysostom* (Faith Press, London, 1969), 32.

⁵ As recent scholars have pointed out, see e.g. Fergus Millar, 'The Imperial cult and the persecutions', in *Le Culte des souverains*, Entretiens Fondation Hardt xix (1972), 145–75.

twice over—with a person and with the life of a whole town. This explains why genius and lares were still associated in the law of 392.¹

In the West, the cult of the emperor and his genius in its various forms was created and understood in the framework of an already known religious system, and could therefore be taken seriously: as Tertullian bitterly remarked, people were more ready to perjure themselves in the name of the gods than in the name of the genius of the emperor.²

The appeal of the idea of the genius was that it linked man with his supernatural surroundings: but herein also lay its drawback. For, as was suggested earlier, the description and definition of these surroundings formed an essential ingredient in foretelling the future of a person on the basis of the day of his birth, the day, that is, when the individual and his genius joined forces. For the emperor, this raised delicate and dangerous problems. If the life of the emperor, like everyone else's, was predictable, defeats and other hazards of rule could easily be justified as the occasion of rebellion against the emperor, who, it might be argued, would predictably soon fall.³ At any rate, emperors acted on the basis that this was the case, in prohibiting certain forms of divination.⁴ A less practical, but also an important point, was that the traditional advice to rulers and panegyric praised rulers for personal endeavour; the myth of Hercules at the parting of the ways choosing the narrow path of virtue, for instance, is used by Dio of Prusa in an oration exhorting Trajan in the duties of kingship.⁵ Exhortation and the praise of personal virtue, and with that the idea that kingship and empire were perfectable institutions, would lose all point if the life of the ruler were predictable, and so rigidly predestined.⁶ Hence, Firmicus Maternus, when still pagan, exempted the emperor's fate from predictability.⁷ This resolution of the problem was more than an expedient answer to legislation against astrologers. For Firmicus Maternus was only one of the many to pursue the conviction that in some way the *fatum* or *τύχη* of the emperor was beyond that of ordinary mortals and was therefore governed by different laws, and subject to the highest god—the *summus Deus*

¹ Ovid, *Fasti* 5. 145–6, with Frazer's commentary ad loc., cf. on 2. 615, and the important assessment by K. Latte op. cit. (p. 131 n. 3), 306–9; 308 principally in agreement with the present interpretation; Wissowa *R.u.K.* (1912), 171–3. On the organization of the cult see also *C.I.L.* vi. 454 and commentary. The association of lar and genius in the law, however, is made on a basis which is not strictly imperial, although the *salus* of the emperors could be related to it: above, p. 132 n. 3; cf. Ovid, *Fasti* 5. 135 f. *lares praestites*: 'stant quoque pro nobis, et praesunt moenibus urbis et sunt praesentes auxiliumque ferunt.' Ammianus 16. 10. 13: 'Romam ingressus (Constantius II), imperii virtutumque omnium *larem*': in view of Ammianus' description of the Senate of Rome (16. 10. 5): 'asylum mundi totius', lar should not, I think, be understood to mean merely 'home', but something more ambivalent, with a religious undertone, even though no cult is involved; cf. below, p. 142.

² Tertullian, *Apologia* 28. 4.

³ See Gag , *Basileia* (1968), 222 ff.; Nilsson, 'Die babylonische Grundlage der griechischen Astrologie', *Eranos* lvi (1958), 1–11, on the emergence of the idea that the position of the stars caused human destinies.

⁴ Cramer op. cit. (p. 135 n. 1), part 2, 232 ff. See also Gag  op. cit., 237 ff.; 285 ff. for more indirect methods of bypassing conventional astrological necessity.

⁵ Dio of Prusa, *Or.* I. 65 ff.; cf. Marcel Simon, *Hercule et le Christianisme* (1955).

⁶ Augustine, who discussed the problem of predictability and predestination in paganism (*C.D.* 5 praef. 9–11), argued by means of the examples provided by history in general, and by the Christian empire in particular (*C.D.* 5. 11. 24–6), for predestination without predictability, or, as he put it in this particular context, for the operation of divine *providentia*: '(deus) qui dat potestatem volentibus' (5. 10).

⁷ *Mathesis* 2. 30.

alone. This point gains weight when one sees that Firmicus Maternus' resolution of the problem of the astrological definition of the emperor's *fatum* has an important parallel in contemporary Judaism: Babylonian rabbis of the third century thought that the destiny of Abraham had not been controlled by the stars, in that God had changed the position of Jupiter for him, so that he could beget an heir.¹ It was in accord with this belief that the people of Israel, descended from Abraham, should, unlike the other nations, have no star;² they should not be subject to the influence of the planets, and should have no guardian angel,³ for Israel, like Abraham and the emperor in Firmicus Maternus, was ruled directly by God.⁴

However, as the law of 392 showed, not everyone agreed with the view that the emperor could necessarily be treated as above fatality and his fate as automatically above divination.

Thus the concept of the genius remained a tangible and persuasive way of relating man to the rest of the universe and to the heavens in particular and thus of being able to have his future seen, by himself and even by others, faithfully mirrored in the stars—with all that this entailed in exposing the emperor's person to astrological predictions. It is partly as a result of this threat that the imperial cult from the late third century shifted its ground. The shift is toward seeing the emperor and his genius in terms that were less personal and less Augustan. For instance, there emerges on the coinage the genius of the Roman people which was a different matter from the personal individualized double of the emperor.⁵ In such a way the change in religious attitudes which reduced the importance of the imperial personal genius coincided with an important shift of emphasis connected with the rise of Christianity. For in Christianity, it was the institution, the specific office of emperor, that was honoured more explicitly than the individual emperor could be—given the pagan trappings of the cult of the emperor's genius. People were said to adore the purple, rather than its bearer.⁶ This way of seeing the emperor could converge with Christian-

¹ J. Neusner, *A History of the Jews in Babylonia*, ii (1966), 85.

² *Ibid.* 84.

³ See E. Peterson, *op. cit.* (p. 136 n. 2).

⁴ On the angels of the nations, see Peterson, *loc. cit.*; cf. Koran Sura 14. 4; 17. 72; 77. 10, on the apostles of the nations, a parallel to guardian angels, though a distant one, for Mohammed disallowed intercession on the day of judgement. On the star of Bethlehem, L. Koep, 'Astrologia usque ad Evangelium concessa', in *Mullus, Festschr. Th. Klauser* (1964), 199–208.

⁵ The genius of the Roman people appears sporadically on the earlier imperial coinage: *R.I.C.* i. 181–2, 184; ii. 51, A.D. 68–9; 94, A.D. 74–6; 130–1, A.D. 80–1; 355 A.D. 199–22; iii. 34, 116, 128 for Antoninus Pius; iv¹. 95, 97 for Septimius Severus; etc. Under Trajanus Decius the *genius exercitus* appears for the first time on the coinage, a means at the same time of stressing the composition of that army: *GENIUS EXERC. ILLURICIANI*, *R.I.C.* iv³, see Index iv. On the Tetrarchic coinage after the reform, the *GENIO POPULI ROMANI* issues

provide one of the chief themes, see *R.I.C.* vi, index ii, *GENIO POPULI ROMANI* etc. (on the re-emergence of the genius of the emperors after 305, when the Tetrarchic system was under attack, see *R.I.C.* vi. 53–73 *passim*, 110). During the Tetrarchy, the personality of the emperor was set back behind an imperial type, so that no longer are personalized virtues and character praised in panegyric, as for instance by Pliny (and Dio of Prusa), but virtues which are beyond direct personal control, such as *felicitas*, as in the panegyric of 291 (*Panegyrici Latini* 3, ed. Galletier); see on this question, H. P. L'Orange, *Art Forms and Civic Life* (1965). (As may be understood from that work, observations such as the above are a matter of nuance and degree: Cicero, in *De lege Manilia*, praised, among Pompey's other virtues, his *felicitas*; but it is the other virtues which determine the character of the *felicitas* in a manner they do not in the panegyric of 291.)

⁶ *Cod. Theod.* 6. 24. 3, 4; 7. 1. 7; 8. 1. 13; 8. 7. 4, 8, 9, 16; 12. 1. 70; *Code of Justinian* 2. 7. 25. 3; 12. 3. 4; 12. 17. 1; 12. 29. 2;

ity. In paganism the association of the emperor and his genius was to some extent supplanted therefore first by the association of the emperor with his divine *comes*¹ and then, in the fourth century, by the association of the emperor with *Roma*. In other words, two new sets of pairs, both connected more closely with the office of the emperor than with the emperor himself, came to the foreground in the late antique period.

I will first discuss the emperor and his *comes*. For this illustrates well how changes in pagan religious attitudes converged with the spread of Christianity. This can be seen in the case of Constantine. Here we find the emperor moving with ease from paganism to Christianity within a continuum provided by that one idea. To begin with, the *comes* of Constantine was Sol-Apollo. In 310 he had a vision of Apollo which illustrated very well the kind of bond that existed between the various pairs under discussion.

Vidisti enim . . . , Constantine, Apollinem tuum, comitante Victoria coronas tibi laureas offerentem, quae tricenum singulae ferunt omen annorum . . . Vidisti, teque in illius specie recognovisti, cui totius mundi regna debere vatum carmina divina cecinerunt. Quod ego nunc demum arbitror contigisse, cum tu sis, ut ille, iuvenis et laetus, et salutifer, et pulcherrimus, imperator.²

Particularly interesting in this description is the explicitly stated similarity between Constantine and Apollo.³ The similarity of protector and protected is a feature which we have seen in *Hermas* linking the individual to his guardian angel. It is therefore an idea with exact echoes in Christian thought. The association between Constantine and Sol-Apollo, though also made for earlier pagan emperors, facilitated for Constantine the transition to Christianity. For it was already a step towards the somewhat looser association between Constantine and Christ in his vision of 312 and later.⁴

I now come to the second pair, that of Rome and the emperor. Here we have an evolution from a different sector of the classical background. The cult of the emperor's genius belonged initially to the city of Rome, to Italy and the West in general. In the East, by contrast, the emperor was worshipped in the cult of Roma and Augustus. Already in the first century B.C., Greek cities had established cults of notable Roman generals by joining them up with the city or people of Rome,⁵ and it was on this foundation that Augustus definitively formulated the cult of Roma and the ruling emperor.

12. 33. 7; 12. 52. 1; 12. 53. 1; see also *Cod. Theod.* 6. 8. 1 'adoraturi imperium'; 6. 13. 1 'adorandi principis facultatem'; the exception: 6. 23. 1 'in adoranda nostra serenitate'; 10. 22. 3 'adoraturus aeternitatem nostram'; 15. 4. 1 *adoratio* of imperial images. Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *C. Iul.* 1. 80.

¹ A. D. Nock, 'The emperor's divine *comes*', in *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World* ii (1972), 653 ff., = *J.R.S.* xxxvii (1947).

² *Pan. Lat.* 7. 21. 4 f.

³ For the similarity between the individual and his genius in art see E. Rink, *Die bildliche Darstellung des römischen Genius* (Diss. Giessen, 1933), 17 f. On Constantine and Sol, see M. R. Alföldi, 'Die Sol-Comes Münze vom Jahr 325', in *Mullus, Festschr.*

Th. Klauser (1964), 10-16.

⁴ Cf. N. Baynes, *Constantine the Great and the Christian Church*, ed. H. Chadwick (1972), 7 f.

⁵ Plutarch, *Titus* 16, hymn to Flaminius: Πίστιν 'Ρωμαίων σέβομεν . . . Ζῆνα μέγαν 'Ρώμαν τε Τίτον θ' ἅμα 'Ρωμαίων τε πίστιν. See also F. F. Abbot and A. C. Johnson, *Municipal administration in the Roman Empire* (1926), no. 15c, p. 271, thanks offered Διὶ Καπιτωλίῳ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ τῶν 'Ρωμαίων; no. 17, p. 273. 30 offering a gold wreath on the capitol for the victory and leadership of the Roman people; A. D. Nock, *op. cit.* (p. 131 n. 2), 223 f.; F. Richter in Roscher's *Ausführliches Lexikon d. gr. und rom. Mythologie* iv, s.v. Roma, col. 131 ff.

To evaluate what this pair 'Roma et Augustus' signified let us look more closely at Roma. From the start, the idea of Roma was a very fluid notion, which only hardened at the end of its development. In the second century B.C. and later, Greeks, one of them Polybius,¹ thought that Rome was in some way exceptional: not only because of its successes, but also because of its constitution and the personalities it produced. This admiration came to be loosely stated in the first century B.C. in a series of cults to θεὰ 'Ρώμη.² At the same time a personification of sorts got under way, assisted by the interpretation of Rome's name meaning 'strength'. Thus Rome was not, and never became, the same as the Tyche of a Greek city. The proof lies in her appearance in works of art. She was consistently represented as helmeted and armed, sometimes as an Amazon, always clearly differentiated from the Tychai of cities, who appear wearing mural crowns, carrying cornucopiae and rudders.³ Θεὰ 'Ρώμη then, not Tyche. The divinity of Rome, therefore, never quite fitted into the framework provided by the category of personifications. Rome was too tangible, too present as a city. That was 'Rome' or 'Dea Roma' depending on one's religion, at her most powerful, undefined, and unclassifiable. As such she was joined in a cult with Augustus and with each of his successors until the empire became Christian. Until that time nothing barred Rome from being divine, not even the fact that she had a *natalis*, the Parilia, from Republican times⁴—for gods also had days on which they had been born.

Logically, therefore, Rome should have had a genius. Yet there is no mention of it until Servius' commentary on the *Aeneid*. There the genius of Rome, named in the ancient formula *sive mas sive femina*⁵ is said to have a shield with an inscription dedicated to it on the capitol.⁶ This mention brings us into the same milieu as that envisaged in the law of 392. The law, therefore, has a precise setting. But to treat it merely as a law for a specific time and place is subtly to parochialize its value as evidence for the end of paganism. It reveals a whole intellectual and religious climate, whose time-scale is more fruitfully thought of in terms of centuries. With Servius, the pairing process, in the case of Rome and her genius, can be seen to continue without loss of certainty into the late fourth century. The genius of Rome, probably a creation of that time, gives a certain logical completeness to the centuries-old idea of Rome as a city and deity rather than as a Tyche or personification—for with neither a Tyche nor a personification would a genius have been appropriate.⁷

Yet Rome had something more to her than a genius. The closest and most important link that was formed for Rome was the link with the ruling emperor. This pair had the greater power of survival. For even when the cult of such a pair had come to an end, they survived jointly in another closely related form; Rome acquired a special significance whenever the accession or the nomination of the emperor had to be expressed.

It is important to note the nature of this pair—'Roma et Augustus' in the

¹ Polybius 6. 7–8.

² Cf. above, p. 139 n. 5.

³ *R.E.* ii. 7 s.v. Tyche cols. 1682 ff., on Tyche in art. Cf. *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* viii, s.v. Fortuna. For the famous Tyche of Antioch by Eutychides of Sikyon, M. Bieber, *The Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age* (1967), 40.

⁴ Fink, Hoey, Snyder, 'The Feriale Dura-

num', *Yale Classical Studies* vii (1940), 102–12; S. Weinstock, *Divus Iulius* (1972), 188 f.

⁵ Cf. Cato, *De re rustica* 139 'si deus si dea es'; *C.I.L.* vi. 110, 111; Norden, *Agnostos Theos* (1912), 57 n. 1; Wissowa *R.u.K.* (1912), 36–8.

⁶ Auct. Serv. ad *Aen.* 2. 351.

⁷ Although possible in religious speculation: Varro in Augustine, *C.D.* 7. 13.

present context. The pagan pairs which have so far been discussed, the individual and his genius, the genius of the emperor with the *lares compitales*, the emperor and his *comes*, and finally the emperor and Roma, were all pairs in the context of a religious cult, and they were very precisely defined by that cult. This is not the case with the Christian pair of the individual and his guardian, nor with any Christian pairs arising from this. Nor is the pair 'Roma et Augustus' in the sense in which I will now discuss it in any way definable by a cult; but it is intelligible in terms of the attitudes that had found expression in cult—that is, the joining of two partners in the imagination gave heightened significance to both.

I come, then, to the pair of Roma and the emperor in a non-cultic context. It is in such a context, for instance, that they are represented on the Gemma Augustea. Here Augustus and Roma are enthroned side by side with the personifications of Tellus, Oceanus, and the Oikumene on the right and Germanicus, with Tiberius descending from a chariot, on the left. Between Roma and Augustus is to be seen Augustus' Capricorn and in the lower register are conquered foes and Roman soldiers.¹ The representation of Capricorn which dominates the whole suggests an astrological bond between Roma and Augustus, or, in more everyday language in terms of the period under discussion, hints at the dependence of the *salus* of all on the *salus* of the emperor.²

The Gemma Augustea stands at the head of a whole series of representations dating from the first to the third century where emperor and Roma are more or less precisely associated.³ The association, although fundamental, could often be implicitly rather than explicitly stated. An example is provided by the Tetrarchic panegyric of 289 on the occasion of the *natalis* of Rome.⁴ The religious roots of the Tetrarchy lay in the association of the emperors with Iuppiter and Hercules within the framework of third-century belief about the

¹ See H. Kähler, *Alberti Rubeni dissertatio de Gemma Augustea* (1968) for the identifications.

² The representation rests on the fact that when Augustus was born, the moon was in Capricorn (see A. E. Housman, *M. Manilii Astronomicon* i [1937], 93–6), so that, taken literally, Capricorn refers to Augustus only. But this reference is to be extended to the state, personified by Roma, whose *salus* depended on the *salus* of the emperor. Ritual expressions of this idea occur in the prayer formulae employed by the Arval Brothers on imperial feast days, *Acta Fratrum Arvalium*, C.I.L. vi. 1 p. 463, 4 Jan. A.D. 27; p. 465, 3 Jan. A.D. 36, etc. Cicero, *Pro Marcello* 32 'Nisi te, C. Caesar, salvo et in ista sententia . . . manente, salvi esse non possumus'; a similar interdependence of Theodosius and Rome, *Pan. Lat.* (ed. Galletier) 12. 1. 2 'ita mutuo ambo crevistis ut nec tu fueris adhuc maior nec illa felicior'; more poignantly, Sidonius *Carm.* 7. 102 f. The astrological connections between Roma and emperor could be explicitly and directly stated under Tiberius, for Rome was founded, and Tiberius born, when the moon

was in Libra: Housman, op. cit., 95. Cf. Kähler, op. cit. (above, n. 1), 26–9, on the date and import—highlighting Tiberius—of the Gemma Augustea.

³ See e.g. G. M. A. Richter, *Engraved Gems of the Romans* (1971), figs. 484–5, 501 (the Gemma Augustea), 599; P. G. Hamberg, *Studies in Roman Imperial Art* (1945), 56 ff., 80 ff. Two occasions in particular provided a meeting ground for Rome and the emperor, the Parilia or Natalis Urbis, and the Ludi Saeculares. On the Parilia cf. above, p. 140 n. 4; on the templum urbis, Nash, *A Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Rome* s.v. Venus et Roma, templum, and for late antiquity, the important contribution by N. Brodsky *L'iconographie oubliée de l'arc Ephésien de S. Marie Majeure* (1966), esp. 66–73. For the ludi saeculares, Gage, *Rech. sur les jeux séculaires* (1934); numismatic documentation: J. M. C. Toynbee, *Roman Medallions* (1944), 102 ff.; also Gneccchi, *I Medaglioni Romani* (1912), pls. 100. 1–2, 101. 9, 108. 9, 109. 5–6.

⁴ *Pan. Lat.* 2, ed. Galletier, with Galletier's introduction.

emperor and his divine *comes*. It is therefore significant that Roma could be woven into the Tetrarchic association of Maximian and Hercules.¹

With the fourth century the association between Rome and the emperor became more explicit. It was expressed in the particularly elaborate *Adventus* ceremonial that was employed when the emperor arrived in Rome. The *Adventus* in Rome was more elaborate than elsewhere, not only because it replaced the former triumph, but also for more important if more intangible reasons.² It was a linking of two fates. Roma and Augustus had been associated in cult and otherwise in order to give expression to a whole range of sentiments that stressed the dependence of the welfare of the state on the welfare of the emperor.³ For all their antiquity, such sentiments were as poignantly felt in the fourth and fifth centuries as ever before. They are expressed particularly colourfully in the panegyrics of Claudian and Sidonius. Sidonius calls Rome without an emperor the bereft and widowed.⁴ Claudian describes Honorius' arrival in Rome as a meeting of the emperor with Rome, his bride, who comes from her *thalamus*.⁵ Of the accession of Anthemius, Sidonius said:

Geminas iunxit Concordia partes,
electo tandem potitur quod principe Roma⁶

and here emperor and Roma are expressively stated to be partners. Claudian can still express partnership in a vocabulary, the origin of which lies in the Augustan cult of the emperor's genius and the *lares compitales* of Rome:

non alium certe decuit rectoribus orbis
esse *larem*.⁷

Elsewhere Rome says of the absent emperor:

Quem precor ad finem laribus seiuncta potestas
exulat, imperiumque suis a sedibus errat?⁸

The poet comments:

O quantum populo secreti numinis addit
imperii praesens genius.⁹

This is in perfect accord with the Augustan origin of the late antique terminology of 'Roma et Augustus'. Furthermore its cultic origin was still transparent. In the light of the anti-pagan attitudes crystallized in the law of 392, one of the great merits of Claudian's use of the Augustan vocabulary was that it was not cultic, even though it could carry conviction precisely because it fused with a past where the cultic expression of these ideas had still been possible. In short, pouring wine to one's genius or daimon was prohibited, although being learned about it was not.

¹ *Pan. Lat.* 2. 1-2. Note, in this context, the urban, almost antiquarian bias of the Decennalia Base in the Roman Forum, for which see H. P. L'Orange, 'Ein tetrarchisches Ehrenmal auf dem Forum Romanum', *Röm. Mitt.* liii (1938), 1 ff., now in his *Likeness and Icon* (1973), 131 ff.

² M. A. Wes, *Das Ende des Kaisertums im Westen des Römischen Reiches* (1967), 9-24.

³ Above, p. 141 n. 2.

⁴ Sidonius, *Carm.* 7. 102, 2. 341-2.

⁵ Claudian, *On the sixth consulship of Honorius* 331 ff., 356 ff.

⁶ Sidonius, *Carm.* 2. 522-3.

⁷ Claudian, *Sixth consulship* 39 f.

⁸ *Sixth consulship* 407-8; on Ammianus' similar phrase, above, n. 137 p. 1.

⁹ *Sixth consulship* 611-12.

Shorn though it was of its strong cultic undertones, the association of Roma and the emperor remained precarious and open to attack from Christianity. In this way of visualizing the empire, Rome was still unique, while Augustine, for one, denied that Rome was at all unique: although the emperor could be converted, as Constantine had been, notions about the conversion of Roma or the *res publica* were meaningless in Augustine's frame of reference.¹ This, if nothing else, disrupted the association between the emperor and Roma; for the one was an individual and the other, as seen by Augustine, a mere empty abstraction. For Augustine, the *res publica* for which Roma stood, was of relative, not absolute value, and for this reason alone could not be transposed, as it was in the pagan frame of reference, into a different order of being; while as a divinity, Rome was rejected by Augustine together with other divinities.

This element is well known and often written about. The very energy which Augustine applied to demythologizing the idea of Rome shows how potent a force it had remained to his readers. Another question has not been so fully treated: how acceptable could the association between Roma and the emperor be for pagans, once the emperor had become Christian? Here, I think, we find a real dividing line between paganism and Christianity, a watershed. The pagan poet Rutilius Namatianus took the Christian empire, over-personalized as it had been by the Christian emphasis on the personal beliefs of the emperor, seriously. It drove him to a novel solution which we can see in his rendering of one theme: that of *Roma aeterna*. The idea of *Roma aeterna* had been stated repeatedly long before Rutilius, in art, in literature, and in propaganda;² but never was it treated as lucidly or as comprehensively, and never had Roma stood in such awesome isolation. Through that majesty, through being endowed with that unique *ordo renascendi, crescere posse malis*,³ Rome grew beyond what she had been before: she grew from being 'Mother of men and mother of the gods', law-giver, giver of peace, into a mediator for eternity; 'Through your shrines we are not far from heaven.' In this scheme, there is no room for the emperor, Christian and living at Ravenna. Rome commands the horizon:

Exaudi Regina tui pulcherrima mundi
inter sidereos Roma recepta polos,
exaudi genetrix hominum, genetrixque deorum,
non procul a caelo per tua templa sumus.
Te canimus semperque, sinent dum fata canemus,
sospes nemo potest immemor esse tui.⁴

I would suggest then, that between the Christian idea of a Rome safely paired with Peter and Paul, and a Christian-pagan and then precariously Christian pairing of Roma et Augustus, there stands Rutilius' *Roma aeterna*, Eternal Rome—Rome that is, without a double. Before the final transmutation of the Rome of the emperor into the Rome of the Apostles took place, the

¹ On the Christianization of the idea of Rome, see N. Brodsky, op. cit. (p. 141 n. 3); on Augustine's views, F. Paschoud, *Roma Aeterna* (1967), 234 ff., and, in particular, R. A. Markus, *Saeculum: History and Society in the Theology of St. Augustine* (1970).

² A collection of the sources is in F. Christ, *Die römische Weltherrschaft in der antiken Dichtung* (Tübinger Beitr. zur Alter-

tumswissenschaft xxxi), 1938; I have not been able to consult Gernetz, *Laudes Romae* (Diss. Rostock, 1918).

³ Rutilius 1. 140.

⁴ Rutilius 1. 47 ff. In the present context one could revealingly contrast 'inter sidereos Roma recepta polos', with mankind, controlled by their *fata*.

whole idea of Rome was transposed on to a level which was different from the level of the earlier fourth century. This transposition was achieved by radical pagan quite as much as by Christian thought: what these two had in common, in the present context, was the absence of one particular set of pairs. The Christian emperor of Augustine and the *Roma aeterna* of his exact contemporary Rutilius both stand alone.

But what exactly happened to pairs from the emperor's point of view? Did he pass on geniusless into the Middle Ages? I think not, and this is another instance of pagan-Christian convergence. First there is a lasting association of Rome and the emperor, which can be defined as starting with the moment of the emperor's accession. In the fourth century this moment had come to be regarded as specially significant in itself,¹ as in the context of the *Adventus* ceremonial.²

Yet, second, the moment of accession could be stated in other ways. One deeply pagan way is connected with the emperor Julian. Julian, a Greek from Constantinople, felt no particular link with the city of Rome, as is revealed in what contemporaries said of his accession. Ammianus records that before being acclaimed as Augustus in Paris, Julian saw the *genius publicus* in a vision, saying that unless Julian allowed himself to be proclaimed, he, the genius, would not continue abiding with Julian any more.³ The exact moment when the *genius publicus* actually joined Julian remains mysterious; theoretically it must have been when Constantius nominated him as Caesar; but it is in accordance with Ammianus' portrait of Julian that this moment is left obscure, for, according to Ammianus, Julian had long been destined for empire. One might say that, in the terms used by astrologers, Julian had a *genesis imperatoria*.⁴ A sense of destiny accompanied a large part of Ammianus' narrative on Julian: it emerges particularly strongly just before Julian's death, when Julian again saw the *genius publicus*, now in an attitude of mourning, and sadly passing away from him through the curtains of his tent.⁵ Next, Julian saw a star falling from heaven and was afraid that it should be the star of Mars, to whom, a little earlier, he had made sacrifices which had turned out inauspiciously.⁶

¹ The idea of marking the unique moment of the emperor's accession with the unique act of his coronation was new in late antiquity. Earlier, emperors and others were crowned for victory, an act which could be repeated indefinitely. The decisive step towards coronation for accession was taken during the reign of Constantine: at his accession he was clothed in the chlamys, but at his death, his insignia had become chlamys and diadem: Eusebius *V.C.* 1. 22 and 4. 64. For the further elaboration of the moment of accession see *De Cer.* 1. 91-6 (Bonn).

² Cf. above, p. 142. As a result of the disorders of the third century, and the proclamation of emperors on the frontiers, rather than in Rome, *Adventus* in Rome could become a form of accession ceremony, and the association of Roma and the emperor, because it could no longer be taken for granted, was highlighted. An early example occurs in Pliny's *Panegyricus* (20 f.) on

Trajan, who became emperor while absent from Rome.

³ Ammianus 20. 5. 10; cf. Julian, *Letter to the Athenians* 284c: about sunset, the soldiers began to shout for Julian to be made Augustus; he retired to an upper room: εἶτα ἐκείθεν ἀνεπέπατο γὰρ ὁ τοίχος· προσεκύνησα τὸν Δία. γενομένης δὲ ἐπιμείζονος τῆς βοῆς . . . ἤτέομεν τὸν θεὸν δοῦναι τέρας. αὐτὰρ ὁ γ' ἡμῖν δειξεῖ καὶ ἡνώγει πεισθῆναι . . . (cf. 285A): this τέρας, sign from heaven, i.e. star, was Julian's Greek way of expressing Ammianus' Latin and Roman *genius publicus*.

⁴ He himself, according to Ammianus, had an acute sense of being seized by a destiny: ἔλαβε πορφύρεος θάνατος καὶ μοῖρα κραταιή, Julian said, quoting *Iliad* 5. 83, after being made Caesar (Ammianus 15. 8. 17). Cf. preceding note and below, p. 146 n. 3.

⁵ Ammianus 25. 2. 3-4.

⁶ Ammianus 24. 6. 17 (cf. omens before the death of Pertinax, H.A. *Pertinax* 11. 2;

Here we have an insight into a very pagan world, opened up for us by Julian's association with the *genius publicus*. Yet, something of this world did continue in Christian Byzantium. It did so in the Byzantine conviction—which survived in a thoroughly Christian context—that the emperor had a Tyche which placed him outside a strictly human framework.¹ In this sense, Julian was a very Byzantine emperor: it was not just by a pious thought that his body lay in the church of the Holy Apostles; he belonged there, and his work survived in Byzantium, not so much because Byzantine humanism had room even for an apostate emperor, but because Julian's career highlighted an aspect of imperial power—its exalted nature, and therewith its precariousness—which was always acutely felt in Byzantium. In Byzantium, in this particular respect, the content of the idea survived; but the antique and late antique formulation of it—that is, the expression of it in terms of the pair emperor and *genius publicus*—did not.²

Earlier I referred to Constantine and to his divine *comes*, and to his vision of Sol-Apollo, soon to be followed by a Christian vision. It is this particular strand which determined Byzantine ideas about the emperor. On the one hand, the emperor had a Tyche, for which the charioteers raced in the hippodrome.³

14. 3; Septimius Severus had a dream of his death, which preceded other omens, H.A. *Sept. Sev.* 22). Here the emperor's *fatum* is understood as depending on forces beyond human control, exactly as astrologers maintained. Firmicus Maternus' reservation, that the emperor's fate was not predictable, does not quite apply, for Julian himself on the Persian campaign was constantly torn between seeking out diviners and then not listening to them: e.g. Ammianus 25. 2. 5 f.: but a distinction must here be made between astrology and the divinatory rites of the Roman state religion as used by Julian.

Julian, the partner of the *genius publicus*, was himself acclaimed as 'genius salutaris' in ceremonies of *Adventus*: see Ammianus 21. 10. 1, in Vienne: 24. 2. 21, in Pirisabora; he was also welcomed as 'sidus salutare': see 'Change and Continuity in Late Antiquity: the Ceremony of *Adventus*', *Historia* xxi (1972), 733-4.

¹ See Agapetus *P.G.* 86¹. 1164 ff., and below, n. 3.

² For the *genius publicus*, cf. above, p. 138 n. 5. The tenaciousness of certain pagan ideas, even their appropriateness, in public life is interestingly illustrated in late antique Constantinople. Pagan ideas manifested themselves in a certain pious antiquarianism, the import of which, as e.g. in Claudian, should not be underrated. Constantine was not shown as Helios on his column in Constantinople, this would have been too direct an association between pagan and Christian empire: see Karyannopoulos, 'Konstantin der Grosse und der Kaiserkult', *Historia* v (1956), 341-57. None the less, the column

became a cult-site of sorts, as is noted by Philostorgius, *H.E.* 2. 17. In its basic conception, the medieval legend that Constantine took the Senate of Rome with him to the East (cf. O. Treitinger, *Oströmische Kaiser und Reichsidee* [1938], 161-2) started early, for the Paschal Chronicle a.a. 328 Bonn p. 528 already notes that Constantine took with him the Palladium and placed it in the column-base of his statue: see also Procopius *B.G.* 1. 15. 9-14. For the inauguration of Constantinople the Paschal Chronicle notes unbloody sacrifices a.a. 328 *ibid.* (A related matter is the hieratic name of Constantinople, *Ἀνθοῦσα*, which was modelled on Flora, the hieratic name of Rome, a fourth-century production: Lydus *de mens.* 4. 25. 50; see Wissowa in *R.E.* i. 2393 s.v. Anthusa, with references; also *Chron. Pasch.* p. 528 (Bonn).)

Augustine discusses the Penates, the conquered gods of Troy, as part of his argument to show that the Roman empire was not unique: *C.D.* 1. 2-3; cf. 3. 8; but it was precisely the uniqueness of the empire that, in Byzantium, was stated anew, see e.g. Cosmas Indicopleustes, *Christian Topography* ii. 69-70.

³ One of the ceremonial acts of Justin II at his accession was presiding at the hippodrome, which his panegyrist describes as an image of the world: Corippus, *Laus Justinii* ii. 314 ff. It should perhaps be stressed that the emperor in the kathisma was not in the centre, in the position of the kosmokrator, but had to expose himself to the forces at work within the city, as crystallized in the hippodrome. Thus it can be understood that,

On the other hand, the emperor was intimately linked with God and this link with God expresses the unique quality of his Tyche. The link between Christ or God and the emperor was never quite formed into a pair, although one can recollect the pagan association of two partners in an acclamation which was shouted before Anastasius became emperor:

Βασιλεῦ οὐράνιε, δὸς ἡμῖν ἐπίγειον ἀφιλάργυρον βασιλέα τῇ οἰκουμένῃ.¹

The linking of God and emperor was often stated. There is a vivid story to this effect in John of Nikiu. Before his election, the emperor Anastasius with some friends went to seek the blessing of the Egyptian holy man Jeremiah. The holy man blessed everyone except Anastasius, and when Anastasius thought that this was because of his sins, Jeremiah said:

No, on the contrary; as I have seen the Hand of the Lord upon thee, I have on this ground refrained from blessing thee. How should I, who have been guilty of so many sins, be worthy to bless him whom God has blessed and honoured; and He has chosen thee from amongst many thousands to be His anointed, for it is written 'The Hand of the Lord God is on the head of kings.' And He has set His trust in thee, that thou mayest become His representative on earth and strengthen His people.²

Two points should be noted here; firstly, the holy man states the link between God and the emperor in such a way that nothing and no one can intervene in it—such had also been the link between the individual and his genius and the partners in the other pairs. Second, from the point of view of function, the prophecy of the holy man can now fill the role of pagan astrology and other forms of divination; Jeremiah's statement is a correlative to Firmicus Maternus' statement that the emperor's *fatum* is controlled only by the *summus Deus*, and is therefore not predictable. But, to define this problem more closely, the correlation applies to the function of the pagan Christian statements only; that is, paganism and Christianity converge in this one respect of function.³ In the light of the converging function, Theodosius, before the battle of the Frigidus had resorted to the Egyptian holy man John,⁴ while his pagan adversaries had placed themselves under the protection of the ancient guardians of emperor and

when in 512 Anastasius during a revolt in Constantinople offered to abdicate, this was no mere theatrical gesture: Malalas pp. 407–8 (Bonn); Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire* i. 439. For the later period, see Peter Brown, 'A Dark Age Crisis: Aspects of the Iconoclastic Controversy', *E.H.R.* lxxxviii (1973), 29 and n. 8.

¹ *De Cer.* (Bonn), p. 419. The idea of the ruler of heaven and his counterpart on earth is explored by Eusebius, e.g. *V.C.* i. 1–6, 3. 12; cf. L. Delatte, *Les Traités de la Royauté d'Ecphante* (1942), 123–63, on the earlier roots. In Byzantium ideas—some of them philosophical—about heavenly and terrestrial rule became common property to such an extent that they could form part of an acclamation such as the one cited: i.e. they

acquired a practical, everyday validity.

² John of Nikiu, tr. R. H. Charles (1916), 89. 1; this is not merely the approval of a monophysite holy man for an emperor of his own theological views; cf. John of Nikiu 90, where 'Justin the Terrible' is vindicated by the holy man Quamos as being 'the emperor according to your hearts'.

³ But contrast the *content* of pagan and Christian predictions about future emperors, where the two different traditions may be clearly distinguished: e.g., for Marcian, there is still a pagan portent, involving an eagle, Procopius, *Vandal War* i. 4. 4; for Maurice, the portent is Christian, Evagrius *H.E.* 5. 21; likewise for Justin II, Corippus *L.J.* i. 32 ff.

⁴ Augustine, *C.D.* 5. 26. 1.

empire, Jupiter and Hercules.¹ The two aspects of the words of the holy man Jeremiah to Anastasius, the pairing and the prophecy, are put in a nutshell in the acclamation of Leo I at his accession:

ὁ θεός σε ἔδωκεν, ὁ θεός σε φυλάξει.²

Here, in a Christian world, transposed, diluted, and somehow changed in meaning, we none the less recognize the same connection between pairing and foretelling the future that occupies the legislator of 392.

What is different, however, is that with the Christian God the partners can no longer be thought of as on a footing of equality. Christ did not quite become the divine *comes* of the emperor. Yet what survived into Christianity of the process of pairing the emperor with a divine figure continued to fulfil one of the functions of such pairings in paganism: it gave the emperor a place in a hierarchy and it defined his position in spheres other than the merely human.

Pairing was still in the blood. For I now come to further creations of new pairs in late antiquity: initially, in the fourth century, the pair of Roma and Constantinopolis, and then the pair of Constantinopolis and the emperor. The final point of this discussion will be the association of Constantinople with her divine protectors. Constantinople, the eastern capital, was represented on the inauguration coinage of 330 in the guise of the Tyche of a Greek city, with mural crown, holding a cornucopiae, and her feet set on the prow of a ship.³ From Constantius onwards, Roma and Constantinopolis are shown on the coinage side by side, Roma armed as usual and Constantinopolis as the city Tyche.⁴ This difference is also made plain in the nomenclature of the two cities: when they appear on the obverse of coins, Rome is the *Urbs Roma*, the other is simply Constantinopolis (both are helmeted on obverses).⁵ Iconographically, the two cities are distinct, although they do belong together. This is also expressed in literature, as, for instance, by Themistius, in whose work, interestingly, Rome is at first the dominating partner but is supplanted under Theodosius by Constantinople.⁶ Then, once Rome was launched on her career of *Roma Aeterna*, the conceptual as well as the political destinies of the two cities became definitely dissociated from each other.

Constantinople came to be associated with the emperor, while, in due course, Rome in losing her emperor was constrained to become a lonely *Roma Aeterna*. Before the two cities became dissociated in this manner from each other and lost their parallel roles one can identify moments of equilibrium. For instance,

¹ Bloch, 'The Pagan Revival in the West at the end of the Fourth Century', in *The Conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century* (1963), ed. A. Momigliano, 201. M. Simon, *Hercule et le Christianisme* (1955), esp. 127-60.

² *De Cer.* p. 411 (Bonn). Cf. Breckenridge, 'The Numismatic Iconography of Justinian II', *Numismatic Notes and Monographs* no. 144 (1959).

³ See J. M. C. Toynbee, 'Rome and Constantinopolis in late antique art from 312-365', *J.R.S.* xxxvii (1947), 135-44; 'Roma and Constantinopolis in Late antique Art from 365-Justin II', in *Studies*

presented to D. M. Robinson ii (1953), 261-77.

⁴ e.g. J. M. C. Toynbee, *Roman Medallions* (1944), pl. 37. 3-8; Gneccchi, *I Medaglioni Romani* (1912), pl. 11. 5, 7; see also Toynbee *J.R.S.* xxxvii (1947), 138 ff.

⁵ *URBS ROMA*: e.g. Toynbee, *R. Medallions*, pl. 38. 6, 35. 4-9, 37. 1, 11; Gneccchi, op. cit., 132. 2-3, 138. 1-3, 140. 1, 7-8, 136. 7-8 *ROMA BEATA* and *URBS ROMA BEATA*; *CONSTANTINOPOLIS*: e.g. Toynbee, *R. Medallions*, pl. 38. 5 (helmeted); 37. 10 (bust, helmeted); Gneccchi, op. cit., pl. 135. 5.

⁶ Compare Themistius, *or.* 3 to Constantius in 357, with *or.* 14 (esp. 182B) to Theodosius in 379.

on the consular diptych of Constantius of 417 A.D.,¹ in the top register the two emperors, Honorius and Theodosius II, are shown enthroned between their capitals, Roma armed in the usual way and Constantinopolis nimbate with a radiate crown.² Constantinopolis affectionately places her hand on the shoulder of her young emperor, showing clearly how the patterns we have been examining are no mere stereotypes, but are the expressions of particular and deeply-felt convictions made plain in the occasional warm and intimate gesture.³

Themistius was the first to express clearly the association between Constantinopolis and her emperor, initially Constantius II, and he did so in terms of the age-old gesture of the city offering her ruler a wreath for victory, on the occasion of the collapse of the usurpation of Magnentius and Decentius.⁴ He went on to work out an association between Constantinople and the family of Constantine, an association between the city and her founder, still transposing to Constantinople the notions which had originally been formed for Rome.⁵ With Theodosius, this association between emperor and Constantinople was explicitly dissociated from dynastic ideas,⁶ and became therefore more universally valid, although articulated in the old vocabulary of accession and *Adventus*. In visual terms, a cameo, probably of the Emperor Julian, shows Constantinopolis, with sceptre and mural crown, wreathing the emperor, exactly as Themistius described it. The two are seen in an eagle chariot, and between them stands the Palladium, pledge of the safety, no longer of Rome, but of Constantinople.⁷

The image, literary and visual, of the city wreathing her ruler is thoroughly classical; like so many other classical images it was capable of expansion into new contexts and therefore survived in Byzantine art and thought.⁸ The association between Constantinopolis and the emperor, however, went deeper than could be conveyed in this image alone, for it was based not only on the functional partnership of the ruler and his city,⁹ but on a quality held in common, namely the quality of ruling. The emperor was βασιλεύς and after some fluctuation in nomenclature, Constantinople became πόλις βασιλεύουσα or *urbs regia*, the ruling city.¹⁰ Thus Constantinopolis, who had started her career, iconographically at least, as an ordinary city Tyche, towards the end of the fourth century began to transcend this restricted role; for she inherited

¹ R. Delbrueck, *Die Consulardiptychen* (1927), no. 2.

² Delbrueck, *op. cit.* (1929), 88–9, 91–2; for the (unusual) radiate crown of Constantinopolis cf. Sidonius *Carm.* 7. 426 ff. about Eos (Constantinopolis).

³ The association of the two capitals with their respective rulers is also shown on the column-base of Arcadius: see J. Kollwitz, *Oströmische Plastik der theodosianischen Zeit* (1941), 51 f.

⁴ Themistius, *or.* 3, 44B, and similarly for Theodosius, *or.* 14, 181C f.

⁵ 46D–48B; cf. 182A; cf. Wes, *loc. cit.* (p. 142 n. 2). On the founder and new founders of Rome, S. Weinstock, *Divus Iulius* (1971), 175 ff.

⁶ Themistius 182AB; the acquisition of empire by ἀπερφή is particularly appropriate

for the emperor who is associated with Constantinople. 182A, accession and *Adventus* in Constantinople; 183B f., request for honours for the Senate of Constantinople, τότε ἀληθινῶς ἔσται δευτέρα 'Ρώμη σὴ πόλις, εἰ γε ἄνδρες ἡ πόλις.

⁷ G. Bruns, *Staatskameen des 4. Jahrhunderts nach Christi Geburt* (1948), figs. 17–18, cf. 19–20; pp. 22 f. and n. 88, Julian places Constantinople under the protection of the gods = Julian 274B ff. Cf. p. 145 n. 2, above.

⁸ Cf. A. Grabar, *L'empereur dans l'art byzantin* (1936, 1971), pl. 7. 1; pp. 54 ff.

⁹ For which cf. Athanasius, *De Incarnatione* 9.

¹⁰ ἡ Καλλίπολις Themistius 44B, 181D, and elsewhere. Themistius 182A: προσήκει . . . τῷ βασιλεὶ τῶν πόλεων συνδέειν τοὺς βασιλεύοντας τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

some of the characteristics of Rome, in particular the capacity of being associated with her emperor.

The bond between Constantinople and her emperor continued to be stated,¹ but the association that gained real momentum and precision was that between Constantinople and the Theotokos.² This association was precise in a very classical, not to say pagan, way, in that one can see the Theotokos as the recipient of a cult or rather of different localized cults within the city. Here again, however, the antique mode of thought and of visualizing existence did not survive without diffraction and change: the Theotokos had her sanctuaries, her icons, her relics, with all that is meant in precise specific devotion, which related itself to a specific locale. But Constantinople was visualized in such a way that the classical concept of *σύνναος θεός* or any parallel or equivalent of it, such as could, in the past, apply to the emperor when related to Roma, and to Rome when related to figures like Venus Genetrix,³ could in no wise be applied to Constantinople when related to the Theotokos or any other protector.⁴ In short, the association between Theotokos and Constantinople was not cultic, but personal, and as a personal association it was most fervently expressed:

Τῇ ὑπερμάχῳ στρατηγῷ τὰ νικητήρια
 Ὡς λυτρωθεῖσα τῶν δεινῶν εὐχαριστήρια
 Αναγράφω σοι ἡ πόλις σου θεοτόκε.⁵

Thus the city addresses her protector in the prologue of the Akathistos hymn, the prologue composed probably after the Persian and Avar sieges of the early seventh century.

At the same time Byzantines, from Themistius onwards, developed a very deep sense of the unique dignity of their city, and created for it the vocabulary of the Queenly City, the ruling city, even the New Jerusalem,⁶ with which they gave expression to their experience of danger and of change. This giving form, however, unlike the idea of Roma Aeterna in the West, remained fluid, manifold, alive, and in a sense classical in a Christian context.

In the past, the Persian army was encamped under these walls and put into practice its threats of burning and destruction of houses. But they were destroyed themselves, and only their name is now remembered. As for the Roman empire (*βασίλεια*), it stood fast on its own foundation. But even

¹ e.g. George of Pisidia (ed. Pertusi, 1959), *In Heraclium ex Africa redeuntem* 25 ff.

² Baynes, 'The supernatural protectors of Constantinople', *Analecta Bollandiana* lxxvii (1949), 165-77. The association of Constantinople and the Theotokos was paralleled by the association of emperor and Theotokos e.g. George of Pisidia *P.G.* 92, 1749c = Theophanes p. 298 ed. De Boor. For the intercessory patronage of a saint, see also Howell, 'S. George as Intercessor', *Byzantion* xxxix (1969), 129-36.

³ As in Hadrian's *templum urbis*, cf. above, p. 141 n. 3. Cassiodorus, *Chron.* in *Monumenta Germaniae Historiae, Auctores Antiquissimi* ix. 2. 142 'Templum Romae et Veneris . . . quod nunc urbis appellatur'.

⁴ The tenth- or early eleventh-century

mosaic in S. Sophia, showing Constantine offering a model of Constantinople to the Theotokos, and Justinian a model of S. Sophia (J. Beckwith, *Early Christian and Byzantine Art* [1970], fig. 190), indicates how the visualization of Constantinople *qua* city although city personifications survived in Byzantine art (Grabar, loc. cit. above, p. 148 n. 8), became diffused. This did not mean, however, that the *concept* of Constantinople did not live on, cf. below. Also, Constantinople, home of relics gathered during centuries, became itself a holy city.

⁵ See C. A. Trypanis, *Fourteen Early Byzantine Cantica* (1968), 17 ff.

⁶ C. Mango, *Homilies of Photius* (1958), Homily 3.

before the Persians, the Avars, whose descendants you are . . . attacked this great city for a long time, this city which is the mistress of all and the chief general, and came to its very walls. But they also were destroyed, and nothing whatever remains of them, but the city still shines out in its glory and its dominion. Shall I describe to you another . . . attack? The Saracens, with countless ships, with horsemen and foot soldiers . . . for eight years surrounded this great city, this city which truly is the City of God . . . and very few of them lived to return to their homes. But the city remains and endures, and has from the beginning been protected by the wings of the Eudokia . . .

Thus Nikolaos Mystikos wrote to Symeon Czar of Bulgaria in 917 A.D.¹ At this time, when Constantinople was facing the threat of another siege, thoughts did not just turn to the Theotokos as protector, as they had done, for instance, in the time of Photius during the Russian siege, but to that much more classical personage, genius and guardian angel at the same time, Eudokia. And it is she who is represented, I believe, in the narthex mosaic of St. Sophia, together with the Theotokos.² In this mosaic, the old partners of the emperor and his divine protector have become dissociated one from the other: they are no longer juxtaposed directly or on the same level; this is the pictorial outcome of the Christian connection between God or Christ and the emperor, which I discussed above. The representation of the emperor making proskynesis before Christ is framed by the true pair of the Theotokos, guardian of the city, and Eudokia, the city's genius: one Christian, the other pagan, it might be said, but that would be something of a misnomer; at such a level, the problem of conversion, of paganism or Christianity, has been transcended.

Oxford

S. MACCORMACK

¹ *P.G.* III. 81C; F. Dölger, *Byzanz und die europäische Staatenwelt* (1953), 150.

² For this interpretation, I am indebted to Gervase Mathew. On the mosaic, see

Hawkins, 'Further observations on the Narthex Mosaic in S. Sophia at Istanbul', *D.O.P.* xxii (1968), 153-66.