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Introduction

The aim of this thesis is to present the results of a study of the references to Roman private life, Roman religion, and Roman military antiquities found in the Noctes Atticae of Aulus Gellius. The Noctes Atticae contain many references which have to do with these topics, but the information which they give is much less detailed than one might be led to expect from such a miscellaneous collection of material. Gellius' primary interest was with words, as evidenced by long lists under such topics as weapons of war and boats. Nothing much beyond the name is given in such lists and it is quite probable that he had no very definite conception of the form or appearance of many of the various types which he mentions. Occasionally, however, he has discussed some article with considerable detail.

Generally speaking Gellius' work represents the observations of an undiscriminating collector of information, which prove the writer a man of eager enough interest but of only moderate intellectual ability. Hence less information on the topic studied is imparted than would be true in the case of a man with keener mind and less bookish tastes. It has been necessary, therefore, to draw upon numerous other sources for information as to details, since in many instances Gellius
has merely named a specific object or usage without any description. The commonly known handbooks and dictionaries have to a large extent provided the sources for references of this sort. The authors quoted are listed in the bibliography which follows. The references have in general been verified from the works cited except that in the case of Vegetius, Isidorus, and a very few others the quotations used have been taken from the Thesaurus Linguæ Latinae or other reference works, since the texts were not available. Use has been made of the Loeb edition of the Noctes Atticae.

Much that is of considerable value, especially in regard to forms in religious matters, has been preserved in the numerous quotations from earlier writers whose works have been lost. These quotations are, for the purposes of this study, among the most important contributions Gellius has made. In a few instances Gellius is our only authority for a particular usage or for the existence of a particular word. Many topics are only incidentally introduced and are therefore meager in information and sometimes vague and difficult of interpretation.
The House

In XVI, 5, Gellius discusses the location of two parts of the house, the vestibulum and the fauces. He says that some men who are not unlearned think the vestibulum is the front part of the house, which is usually called the atrium. He then proceeds to quote Aelius Gallus as stating in a book dealing with the meaning of words in relation to civil law that the vestibulum is not a part of the house but is an open space in front of the door, giving access from the street to the house and shut in by buildings, tecta, which extend to the street. The door itself is at a little distance from the street with a vacant space intervening. The tecta apparently are the extensions of the house in which shops were often located. Gellius goes on to explain that those who built large houses in early times left a space between the door and the street and that persons who came to attend the reception of the master of the house waited in this space instead of in the street or inside the house. This was accordingly a place to stand (stabulatio). Gellius thinks the attempts to explain the derivation of the word, vestibulum, so far as he has read are not very successful. He quotes Sulpicius Apollinaris as commenting on ve as a formative element but without seeming to arrive at any worthwhile conclusion.

In XIX, 13, 1, Gellius mentions an occasion when he was
standing with three others in vestibulo Palatii while a conversation on literary subjects was going on. The palace referred to was evidently the imperial residence on the Palatine. While it is possible that this conversation might have taken place in the open space to which according to Aelius Gallus the term vestibulum was properly applied, it would seem more natural for such a discussion to be carried on in a reception room, and one may wonder whether Gellius was not here following the usage of those whom he calls haudquaquam indoctos, who applied the term to the partem domus priorem (XVI, 5, 2). The palace would not necessarily be of the simple atrium-peristyle type, and a reception hall might quite naturally have been found in the front part.

Quoting Vergil's reference to the underworld, Vestibulum ante ipsum primasque in faucibus Orci (Aen. VI, 273) Gellius offers the explanation that by vestibulum and fauces the poet denotes two places outside the doors (XVI, 5, 12). Of these he calls vestibulum the place immediately before the house and the penetralia, while he applies the term fauces to the narrow passage through which the vestibulum is approached. Modern scholars believe the term fauces to have meant the passage inside the door leading to the atrium. That is, the door separated the passage leading from the street to the atrium into two parts, the vestibulum being on the outside of the door and the fauces on the inside. (Mau-Kelsey, Pompeii p. 248). Editors of Vergil usually
translate *fauces* by "jaws" in the passage quoted. (Greenough and Kittredge, Knapp, Fairclough and Brown, Roberts and Rolfe), indicating that they do not regard the word as here used to refer to the specific part of the house to which it was technically applied. There seems to be no indication in the remains of Roman houses that there was a difference in the width of the open space which would support Gellius' explanation of *fauces* as an *iter angustum per quod ad vestibulum adiretur* (XVI, 5, 12).

There is a noteworthy reference to the *impluvium* made by Gellius, I, 15, 8, in quoting the ceremonies and prohibitions in connection with the priest of Jupiter as recorded in the first book of Fabius Pictor. The flamen Dialis is required to loosen the bonds of a person who enters his home fettered and to draw the bonds up through the *impluvium* and from there to lower them into the street: *solvi necessum est et vincula per impluvium in tegulas subduci atque inde foras in viam demitti*. Gellius clearly indicates from the passage quoted above that he uses the term *impluvium* to denote the opening in the roof. This agrees with the use of the word by Plautus in the *Miles Gloriosus* (II, 2, 4), *per impluvium intro spectant*, and in another passage of the same play, (V, 19), *nescio quis inspectavit per nostrum impluvium intus spud nos*. Terence uses the word in the same sense in the *Phormio*, IV, 4, 26, when a snake is said to have fallen
from the roof per impluvium.

Vitruvius in discussing the various types of atria (VI, 3, 1) refers to the drainage by the rafters in medium compluvium, which might conceivably be interpreted as referring either to the opening in the roof or to the basin below. The next sentence, however, In Corinthis isdem rationibus trabes et compluvia conlocantur seems to indicate that he means by compluvium the skylight opening. In the following paragraph describing the displuviate type he mentions an advantage of this style of atrium for winter residences, quod compluvia eorum erecta non obstant luminibus tricliniorum. This last statement leaves no doubt that to Vitruvius the compluvium was only the opening in the roof.

Cicero in the Actio Secunda in Verrem, I, 23, 61, speaks of the statues quae nunc ad impluvium tuum stant, evidently meaning by impluvium the basin in the floor. In I, 56, 147 of the same speech he refers to columnae ad impluvium, apparently using the word in the same sense as above. Harper's Classical Dictionary assumes that in the first of these two passages impluvium means "The whole uncovered space in the atrium, and therefore the opening at the top as well as the cistern at the bottom." The Harper Latin Dictionary, however, quotes both these passages as illustrating the use of impluvium to denote the basin. The last named dictionary gives as one meaning for impluvium "the uncovered central space in the atrium" citing from
Livy XLIII, 13, Palmam enatam impluvio (or in impluvio) suo T. Marcius Figulus muntiabat. It is not easy to see why the word in question should be assumed to mean here anything more than the basin. That the tree took root in the center of the atrium is all that needs to be inferred from the statement.

Suetonius, Aug. 92, in telling of the emperor's attention to omens relates that he had caused a palm tree which sprung up in a crevice between the stones in front of the house to be transplanted in compluvium deorum Penatium. Westcott and Rankin in a note on this passage translate compluvium by "the inner court" and say that while strictly speaking compluvium denoted the opening in the roof through which the rain water fell into the impluvium, both words were sometimes employed less exactly to denote the whole uncovered space in the atrium. It seems doubtful just what the expression compluvium deorum Penatium here means. In view of the uncertainty of the sense it is questionable whether any conclusion should be drawn from the passage as to the general use of the word, compluvium.
Dress and Personal Appearance

In discussing the propriety of dress, Gellius says that the Romans originally wore the toga alone, without a tunic (VI, 12, 2). This statement does not appear to be supported by any other authority and the explanation has been offered that Gellius is referring only to public appearances (Becker's Gallus, Ex. I, 8). Gellius in recalling some remarks of Cato states that it was the custom to dress becomingly in the forum but at home to wear only sufficient clothing (XI, 2). Evidently Cato means by proper dress the wearing of the toga in public but not necessarily in private.

To only one kind of toga does Gellius make any allusion; namely, the toga praetexta worn by boys of free birth until they attained manhood (XVIII, 4, 1). This garb was puerilis, and had been laid aside by Gellius before he started out on his own authority to seek for teachers. The praetexta had furnished a surname, Praetextatus, to the young Papirius who had been granted the privilege of continuing to attend the senate with his father after other boys of his age had been excluded (I, 23).

Gellius offers no hints as to the manner of wearing the toga but his reference, IV, 18, 9, to Scipio's taking a document from the folds (a sinu togae) evidently refers to the arrangement by which a sort of pocket was formed by the folds across the breast.
The fact that a proper regard for one's dignity made the toga the most appropriate outer garment for a Roman of senatorial rank when in public is illustrated by an incident which Gellius tells (XIII, 22) of one of his teachers, Titus Castricius. This man chanced to meet on a holiday some of his pupils who were senators, wearing lacernae and sandals. He told them that he would have preferred to see them wearing togas or, if that was not to be, at any rate it would be better to appear cincti et paenulati. According to Suetonius, Augustus once gave orders to the aediles not to allow anyone in the forum without his toga (Aug. 40). The paenula, which Castricius seems to have looked upon with a little more favor than the lacerna is described as a vestimentum clausum, which the wearer drew on over his head and which covered the arms, leaving less freedom of movement than did the lacerna. It was the ordinary cloak of the traveller of the better class, and perhaps for this reason Castricius thought it less objectionable in public than the lacerna. However, from his reference to the manner of the dress of the men whom he reproved as being de multo iam usu ignosciibilis (XIII, 22, 1), it would seem that the regulations of Augustus had to a large degree fallen into disuse at the time of this incident.

Whatever allowance might be made for the lacerna, Castricius could find no excuse for the wearing of sandals in a public place by his pupils. Apparently the sandals worn
in this instance were of the sort called Gallicae. Gellius quotes Cicero (Phil. II, 76) as condemning Antony for going about in gallicae and lacerna. By way of contrast Cicero refers to himself as having returned cum calceis et toga, nullis nec gallicis nec lacerna. It was the calceus, the red or black senatorial shoe, which Castricius evidently thought his pupils should have been wearing.

The tunics of early times, according to Gellius' description, were close fitting (substritae), short, and ending below the shoulders (desinantis citra umerum VI, 12, 3). This last phrase evidently refers to the sleeves. The long-sleeved tunics to which Gellius applies the Greek term chiridotae (VI, 12, 2) were, he says, regarded as unbecoming (indecorum) in Rome and in all Latium. Such a garment, long skirted as well as long sleeved, was appropriate for women. The criticism of the type of garment here described seems to indicate that standards of taste had not greatly changed since the time when Cicero denounced the followers of Catiline with their manicatis ac talaribus tunicis (Cat. II, 10). Gellius quotes the younger Africanus as mentioning the long sleeved tunic as the garb of the debauche (VI, 12, 5). He finds an opinion of Vergil to the effect that such garb was shameful (probrosa) in the speech of the Rutilian Numantus who in expressing his contempt for the Trojans declares Tunicae manicas habent (Aen. IX, 616). Further Gellius thinks a mention by Ennius of the tunicatam
iuventutem of Carthage is non sine probro (VI, 12, 7).
There does not seem to be any good reason to infer, however, that Ennius has in mind a particular form of the tunic in this last phrase. It may well have been merely a contrast to the togati Romani.

In a discussion of words either coined by Laberius or used in a way not in accordance with literary standards Gellius quotes: Induis capitium tunicae pittacium (XVI, 7, 9). The meaning of capitium is here a matter of controversy. In ecclesiastical Latin capitium appears to have meant the hole in the tunic through which the wearer passed his head in putting on the garment (Harper's Dictionary). This is the meaning given in the Thesaurus Linguae Latinae, but Rolfe in his translation of the passage above referred to renders the word "breast band." (Loeb Library translation, p. 155)

That it was the custom of persons under accusation to lay aside the white garments usually worn by the ordinary citizens is indicated in a reference to the younger Scipio. Gellius has found from books on the life of Scipio that when he was accused by the tribune Claudius Asellus, he did not give up the use of white clothing or take on the usual garb of persons under charges: neque desissete candida veste uti neque fuisse cultu solito reorum (III, 4, 1).

A reference to Scipio's continuing to shave regularly when under accusation (III, 4, 2) brings the comment from
Gellius that he was surprised to find that shaving was then usual for a man who was less than forty years old. He has learned, however, that other *nobiles viri* at the same age were in the habit of shaving (*rasitavisse*) and consequently numerous busts of men of earlier times who were not old but in *medio aetatis* are to be seen representing their subjects as beardless (*III, 4, 3*). Pliny the Elder (*N.H. VII, 59*) states that Scipio was the first of the Romans to shave every day and Livy says the Romans wore beards in ancient times (*Livy V, 41*). Cicero's mention of some of Catiline's followers as *bene barbati* (*Cat. II, 10*) indicates that the custom of shaving was not universal in his time. Gellius' statement clearly implies that he would not have been surprised to find a reference to elderly men who were beardless, but there seems to be no definite testimony from any other source to the effect that men began shaving after passing middle life. If Pliny's statement that daily shaving was an innovation of Scipio's is correct, Gellius seems not to have known of the fact. Gellius' comment on the fact that Scipio continued to shave while under accusation indicates that it was a common usage to permit the beard to grow in such circumstances.

A single mention of rings is found, *X, 10*, giving an explanation of the reason for wearing the ring on the third finger of the left hand. The *Aegyptians*, according to Apion, had found that a nerve ran from that finger direct to the heart, and so the Greeks and Romans regarded that as the
appropriate finger for the distinction of a ring. No mention is made of the wearing of numerous rings, such as appears to have been the custom in Quintilian's time (Becker, Gallus Ex. 1, 9).

The use of perfumes by the voluptuary of Scipio's time is indicated by his criticism, quoted by Gellius, of the individual who is *cotidie unguentatus* as he adorns himself before the mirror, *adversum speculum* (VI, 13, 5). Catiline's exquisites who were *unguentis obliti* (Cat. II, 5) apparently did not represent a new development.
Means of Transportation

Gellius' references to means of transportation are limited to casual references to the lectica and the arcera, a brief discussion of the petorritum, and finally a list of various kinds of boats and ships found in the books of early writers.

In discussing the provisions of the laws of the Twelve Tables, XX, 1, 29, Gellius refers to the arcera in which an ill or aged man might be taken into court. This vehicle was a covered wagon or litter, used only in very early times. It was enclosed on all sides like a great chest and spread with robes. At a later period the lectica came into use and arcera disappeared from the language. The arcera is said to have obtained the name from its resemblance to an arca.

In X, 3, 5 Gellius tells of a certain envoy returning from Asia in a litter who commanded that a peasant should be beaten to death for having asked jokingly whether a corpse was being carried in the litter. It seems evident from this incident that the lectica here spoken of was closed. We are told that the lectica was sometimes closed on the sides by windows made of transparent stone (lapis specularis) which might be opened or closed at pleasure. Juvenal refers to such a lectica, clauso latis specularibus antro, IV, 21,
and namque facit somnum clausa lectica fenestra, III, 242. Mention of a lectica aperta is made by Cicero, Phil. II, 24: inter quos aperta lectica Numa portabatur. It is possible that the adjective aperta may mean merely that the curtains were drawn up or back. The lecticae of all types were very much alike in their chief points. Gellius speaks of the thongs (struppi) with which one of the litter bearers beat to death the unfortunate peasant. Possibly the thongs served as supports across the framework upon which the mattress of the litter could be placed.

Gellius' mention of the term petorritum, XV, 30, is in connection with the etymology of the word. He discusses the statement made in his hearing by a man of superficial learning who assumed that the word was a hybrid, derived from the Greek verb πτερόν, to fly and the Latin noun, rota, wheel. He interpreted the word as meaning "flying wheels", assuming that the spelling was changed from petorrotum to petorritum. Gellius says that the speaker described a very different form of carriage from the petorritum but does not say of what sort it was assumed to be, nor does he himself give any details as to the actual appearance of the vehicle. He does assert that the Romans derived the name from the Gaels and that Varro speaks of petorritum as a Gallic term. From Festus, p. 206, who, in explaining the etymology of the word observes that petora meant four in Oscan, we know that it was a four-wheeled carriage: Petorritum vehiculum Gallicum aliud
Osce mutant dictum quod hi petora quattuor appellant; quattuor enim habet rotas. It was a heavy, covered vehicle, sometimes decorated with ornaments of silver, a type of luxury for which the Gauls seem to have set the example. It was used by travelers and is thought to have been large enough for a family. Harper’s Classical Dictionary (s.v. petorritum) states that on journeys the family usually rode in a rede and the servants in a petorritum. Its general use for servants seems questionable in view of the rather ornate character which the vehicle appears to have had.

In chapter 25 of Book X a list of ships and boats of various sorts is given as Gellius recalls them to memory from early histories. These may be roughly divided into three classes: first, trading or merchant vessels; second, lighter craft such as fishing smacks, spying boats and pirate vessels; third, ships of war and transports. The last class used only in time of war does properly belong with means of transportation.

The prosumia, a kind of small vessel mentioned also by Paulus (Ex. Fest., p. 226) and the catacscopium were used specifically as spy boats or vessels for reconnoitering.

The oria and oriola, the second name being a diminutive form of the first, were used as fishing smacks. The former is mentioned by Non. 533, 20 in the phrase horia navicula piscatoria.
The **paro** was a type of row boat. It is represented in a Mosaic at Althiburus (modern Medeina) in Tunis "with a rounded front and a prow raised up like a shell" (Daremberg and Saglio, Vol. IV, p. 337). From a statement of Festus, p. 222, we assume that it was similar in some respects to the **myoparo**: *Parones navium genus ad cujus similitudinem myōparo vocatur*.

The **myoparo**, of Greek origin, was a light vessel mentioned by Cicero as used by the pirates when they raided the harbor of Syracuse (*Verres* IV, 116). Festus p. 147 says that the **myoparo** was a kind of vessel *ex duobus dissimilibus formatum*. *Nam et mydion et paron per se sunt*.

A peculiar kind of boat named by Gellius, the **calox**, was said by the Elder Pliny (*N.H.* VII, 208) to have been invented by the Rhodians. It was much used by pirates but was more especially employed as attendant on a fleet. Such boats seem to have been used for official purposes (*Plautus, Capt.* IV, 2, 93). According to Livy, XXI, 17, 3 like modern row boats they seem to have been pulled up on shore when not in use, as was frequently done even with larger Greek and Roman boats. Polybius says they had no decks and only one bank of oars (*Hist.* V, 62, 3).

From Caesar's statement in *B.G.* I, 12, *Id Helvetii ratibus ac lintibus junctis transibant* it appears that the *linter* mentioned in Gellius' list was used in river transportation or perhaps sometimes for constructing pontoon
bridges. It was a small flat bottomed boat. Hannibal in crossing the Rhone River conveyed the infantry in lintres and the cavalry in large boats, the latter crossing above the smaller lintres so as to break the force of the current: tranquillitatem infra traicientibus lintribus præ-bebant (Livy, XXI, 26).

One of the lighter type of boats which Gellius lists was the scapha. Shorey in his edition of Horace, commenting on Carm. III, 29, 62, calls it a light skiff or life-boat. Every ship of war seems to have had one of these small boats, probably towed behind. That the scapha was similarly used with other classes of ships seems to be indicated in Plautus Rud. pro. 75, de navi timidae desiluerunt in scapham. Caesar, B.C. III, 24, tells of Antony's stationing sixty scaphae along the shore at Brundisium. Libo noticing the ships and two triremes of Antony coming forth from the harbor sent five quadriremes to blockade them. Antony's ships then lured the vessels of Libo within the harbor and at a given signal the scaphae made an attack with disastrous results to Libo.

The placida seems to have received no mention elsewhere. We know nothing of its form and use.

The ratariae were small vessels made of logs fastened together according to Gellius X, 25. They also are called ratariæ in Servius ad Verg. Aen. I, 43.

The cydarum, like the placida, seems to be mentioned
in no other place.

The caudica is a boat made of rather heavy planks, according to Paulus (ex. Fest. p. 46). Isidorus (Orig. 19, 1, 24) applies the word to a sort of dug-out canoe: *trabariae naves ex uno ligno cavato factae et inde caudicae quia a quattuor usque ad decem homines capiunt.*

The stlata was a kind of piratical vessel. Festus, p. 312, describes this type of ship as follows: *stlata genus navigii latum magis quam altum et a latoriibus sic appellatum.* This explanation assumes that *stlata* was equivalent to *lata.*

The phaselus is described as a light vessel made of wicker work or papyrus or of burned and painted clay. Juvenal (XV, 127) refers to *fictilibus phaselis.* In the Fourth Georgic, 239, Vergil also mentions this vessel: *circum pictis vehitur sua rura phaselis.* Catullus' poem (Carm. 4) is addressed to the *phaselus,* a boat in which he returned to Italy from Bithynia in 56 B.C. or (as Merrill believes) to a model of it which had been made at Sirmio as a votive offering.

The camara sometimes called camera is next referred to in Gellius' list. Tacitus (Hist. III, 47) tells of its use by the barbarians on the Caspian Sea. It was constructed with narrow sides and broad bottoms joined together without fastenings of brass or iron. During storms the sides were said to be raised with additional planks until the vessel was covered like a house. These boats
might be rowed in either direction as they had a prow at each end and a convertible arrangement of oars. They were used in early times by people who inhabited the shores of Black Sea and Bosporus.

Not much seems to be known of the caupulus other than it was small. The gaulus is described by Paulus (ex. Fest. p. 96) as genus navigii paene rotundum.

Among the merchantmen of the larger class, Gellius lists the corbitae, so called because they hung out a corbis at the mast head for a sign (Paul. ex. Fest. p. 37). Paulus adds that they are called naves onerariae and Nonius says corbita est genus navigi tardum et grande, (p. 533, 10). The modern corvette which in the United States is called a sloop of war and is equipped with one tier of guns gets its name from corbita.

The last of the light and smaller type mentioned by Gellius is the lembus. It was a fast sailing vessel with a sharp prow and according to Fulgentius was sometimes called the dromo. (Fulg. Exp. Serm. 564, 6) quod et dromonis nomine appellamus. Plautus in the Mercator, I, 2, 81 says Dum haec aguntur, lembo advehitur tuos pater pauxil-
lulo, which seems to indicate they varied somewhat in size.

Among the vessels named by Gellius which would naturally be used in warfare are the ponto, actuariae, hippagines and cercurus.
The _ponto_ was a kind of a Gallic transport according to Caesar (B.C. III, 29) who says *pontones quod est genus navium Gallicarum Lissi relinquit*. According to Ausonius it was a term sometimes applied to a floating bridge. Possibly it may have been used in conveying horses, cattle or soldiers across a river. Our word, "pontoon" is from _ponto_.

The word _actuariae_ in Gellius' list is really an adjective and is usually explained as applicable to ships that are equipped both with oars and with sails (Isid. Or. 19, 1, 24). It does not seem to denote a ship of a particular form or type. The transports, which Caesar ordered constructed for the second invasion of Britain were _actuariae_. The decks were lower than those of the ordinary ship and also they were _paulo latiores quam quibus in reliquis utimur maribus_ (B.G.V, 1). The latter statement makes the translation "swift sailing" which is often given in textbooks as a definition of _actuarius_ seem rather inexact. These vessels of Caesar's were built for carrying cavalry and Caesar says their _humilitas_ made them easier to beach. They probably had rather flat keels and would be anything but swift.

_Hippagines_ were cavalry transports or vessels in which horses were carried (Paulus ex Fest. p. 101). Livy makes a reference to them in Book XLIV, chapter 28: _quinque et triginta naves quas hippagines vocant, ab Elea profectae, cum equitibus Gallis equisque._

The _cercurus_ was a light, swift, open vessel which was
used in the Persian Wars. It was propelled by oars. Livy, XXXIII, 19, says: _ad hoc levioribus navigiis cercurisque ac lembis ducentis proficiscitur._ It might be inferred from a statement in Plautus (Mercator, I, 88) that it was used for other purposes than for war: _aedificat navem cercurum et mercis emit._

The _lenunculus_ is referred to by Caesar B.C. II, 43: _pauci lenunculi conveniebant,_ and also by Sallust (Frag. ap. Non. 534, 32), _in lenunculo piscantes._ From the latter reference we assume that it was a small boat sometimes used in fishing.

The word _longae_ also appears in Gellius' list, evidently for _naves longae._ The Roman warships of various periods seem to have ranged from biremes to quinquiremes as regards rowing equipment. In the battle of Mylae in which Duilius defeated the Carthaginians a sort of bridge with a spike which served to make it fast to the enemy's deck was used to facilitate boarding. Grappling hooks to fasten together two ships were employed for a similar purpose. Caesar (B.C.III, 13) explains that the height of the Gallic vessels made the use of the grappling hooks impossible in the battle with the Veneti. Towers or platforms were sometimes constructed on the decks to enable missiles to be thrown more effectively on the ships of the enemy. In ancient warfare the use of rams played a rather large part, but the Romans seem to have preferred boarding tactics whenever possible. The comment of Caesar in connection with the de-
feat of the Veneti, Rostro enim noceri non posse cognoverant
B.G. III, 14, indicates that with a different type of
enemy ship than that of the Veneti the Romans would have
expected to rely upon ramming to some extent.
Food and Meals

The references which Gellius makes to banquets and articles of food are mainly in connection with legislation passed at different times in the effort to restrain luxury and extravagance. The fact that many sumptuary laws attempted to curtail the expenses of the table seems a sufficient proof of the prevalence of gluttony. For all the traditional simplicity of the life of the early Romans, legislative interference with the tendency to spend large sums for food and drink appears to have developed rather early. Athenaeus (Bk. VI, 274) dates this extravagance in dining from the time of Lucullus, whose name itself has continued proverbial for luxury. Gellius informs his readers (II, 24, 1) that frugality among the Romans and moderation in regard to food and entertain were secured not only by training at home but also by public penalties and the strict provisions of numerous laws.

The emperor Tiberius emphasized the need of such legislation (Tac. An. III, 53). Although to an extent he distrusted the efficacy of legislation, nevertheless he made regulations to check expenses on banquets (Suet. Tib. 34). Extravagance and luxury seemed to have made considerable advance in Rome as early as the time of Plautus (Cul. II, 9; Capt. IV, 2). "Sacrifices and the public banquets, (cenae populares Plautus Trin. II, 4) by degrees led to the introduction of better meals, and the acquaintance with the habits
of foreigners no doubt also exercised an influence." (Becker, Gallus, p.452) Tacitus (An., III, 54) believes that foreign victories taught the Romans to dissipate the property of others. With the wealth secured from the products of colonies pride and luxury were fostered.

Gellius (II, 24, 2) quotes from the Miscellanies of Ateius Capito a senatus consultum which enjoined on the principes civitatis an oath that at banquets given at the Ludi Megalenses the maximum expenditure, not considering the cost of vegetables, bread and wine, should be one hundred and twenty asses. This decree also forbade the use of more than one hundred pounds of silverware. That the government legislated in favor of home industries is indicated in the second clause of the decree which forbade the serving of foreign wines.

An outgrowth of this decree, the lex Fannia, the date of which is fixed by the Elder Pliny (H.N. X, 71) as 161 B.C. was somewhat more liberal in character in that almost the same outlay was permissible for a greater number of days (II, 24, 3). On the Ludi Plebeii, Ludi Romani, Saturnalia, and certain other days there was permitted an expenditure of one hundred asses; on ten additional days of the month a limit of thirty asses was set, while on the remaining days only ten asses were allowed.

It is Gellius' belief that the poet Lucilius makes an allusion to this law in Fanni centussis misellus, "the pet-
ty hundred asses allowed by Fannius". He states that commentators erred who thought the law of Fannius authorized a regular expenditure on any day whatever, inasmuch as the expenditure for meals for different occasions is clearly stated.

The next law restricting the expenses of the table was the *Lex Licinia* which was passed in 103 B.C. This law differs from the former one in prescribing not only the cost of eatables but also the nature. The provisions of this law permitted two hundred asses for marriage feasts in addition to the clause that authorized the expenditure of one hundred asses on certain designated days. A fixed weight of dried meat and salted provisions for each day was specified but no limitation was set on vegetables and fruits (II, 24, 7).

There came to be general neglect of the preceding laws and in consequence extravagant expenditure became common, inasmuch as such laws and decrees could not be enforced in any satisfactory way. A law proposed by the dictator Sulla in 81 B.C. made three hundred sesterces the maximum expenditure on a dinner on the Kalends, Ides and Nones, *dies ludorum* and certain regular festivals, with the limit of thirty for all other days (II, 24, 11). It should be remembered, however, that the change in the value of the as made necessary some modification of the laws in question.

The *Lex Aemilia* (II, 24, 12) also prescribed not only
a limit to expense of dinners but specified the kind and quantity of food. The Lex Antia which is not dated precisely but follows the one above mentioned is of interest from the fact that it limits the class of persons with whom a magistrate or a magistrate-elect may dine out, in addition to curtailing expenditure.

Next came the Lex Julia, 22 B.C. authorizing an increased expenditure of seven hundred sesterces at weddings and banquets following them (II, 24, 14). By its provisions the outlay of two hundred sesterces was made legal on working days while three hundred were permitted on the Kalends, Ides and Nones.

An edict either of Augustus or Tiberius allowed an expenditure on various festivals to range from three hundred to one thousand sesterces. This law legalizing such an increased amount was given as a concession in the hope that obedience to laws might be secured more easily and readily.

Innumerable delicacies were procured from distant lands at an enormous cost (Tacitus An. III, 55). Gellius gives a long list of these (VI, 16, 5) with the names of places where they are found: peacock from Samos, woodcock from Phrygia, cranes of Medea, kid from Ambracia, young tunny from Chalcedon, lamprey from Tartessus, codfish from Pessinus, oysters from Tarentum, cockles from Sicily, sword-fish from Rhodes, pike from Cilicia, nuts from Thasos, dates from Egypt and acorns from Spain.
As to the time of the cena, Gellius tells a story regarding the philosopher Taurus, who was entertaining some friends at dinner in Athens when evening had come on, and adds *Id enim est tempus istic cenandi* (XVII, 8, 1). The implication that the dinner hour at Rome was earlier is supported by Horace's *Post nonam venies*, Ep. I, 7, 71, and by Martial's *imperat extractos frangere nona toros* IV, 8, 6, both agreeing in setting the dinner hour at 3 P.M.

The dinner party was not only an occasion for pleasure, but with the serious-minded type represented by the authors whom Gellius often quotes, it was also an opportunity for intellectual improvement. Readings from literary works were likely to accompany the meal. Sometimes music was a feature of the evening's entertainment.

Gellius (XIII, 11) quotes Varro to the effect that the subject matter of the readings which followed dinners should be at once edifying and enjoyable. Varro adds that the number of guests ought to begin with that of the Graces and end with that of the Muses; that is, it should begin with three and stop at nine, so that when guests are fewest, they should not be less than three, when they are most numerous, not more than nine. It is disagreeable to have a great number he thinks, since a crowd is generally disorderly. Four features should be considered in planning a banquet: a congenial group, a well chosen place, suitable
time, and careful preparation. One's guests should not be too talkative or too silent; those of the former type are appropriate to the Forum and the courts, while silence belongs to one's own bedroom rather than to a banquet. Conversation should be of such matters that both profit and pleasure will be afforded.
Obligations to Kindred, Friends

and Dependents

By the time of Gellius the patria potestas of the early Roman family had become so far relaxed that the question as to whether a father should be obeyed could be made a topic for philosophical discussion. It is true that the discussion is largely the utterance of the Greek philosophers but there is not much hint of the absolute control which belonged to fathers in early times.

Gellius states three views concerning the question of obedience to a father which he says are recognized both by Greeks and Romans (II, 7). First, that all of a father's commands should be obeyed; second, that he should be obeyed in some things and not in others; third, that he need not be obeyed at all. For himself Gellius thinks the intermediate view best. If a father's commands to a son are right and honorable, as, for instance, defense of one's country or if they are neither base nor honorable, as pleading cases or marrying a wife, he should be obeyed. On the other hand, if his commands are dishonorable or base, such as the defense of a Catiline or a Clodius, he need not be obeyed. However, Gellius in quoting other writers on questions of duty says that should a son feel under obligation to refuse obedience to a command of his father, he should always decline in a courteous and respectful manner without uttering
any reproach for the character of a command which he refused to obey.

When father and son are together in unofficial relations whether talking in the home or walking or dining with friends, although the son may be a magistrate and the father a private citizen, all honor is due to the father. This was the reply made by Taurus to the father of the governor of Crete on the occasion of the visit of the governor and his son at the philosopher's home in Athens (II, 2, 10). The question of precedence arose on this occasion from the fact that the father of the governor granted the honor of the one remaining chair to his son on the ground that a magistrate of the Roman people should thus be honored. Taurus argued that the father should possess the honor since the acts and conversation of the father and son on this occasion were private. However, in public places or at public functions, the son as a magistrate should be honored in recognition of the dignity of his official position. Such an instance is cited by Gellius (II, 2, 13). A father who was a proconsul met his son who was a consul. The father who was mounted on a horse neglected to dismount. The lictor in attendance hesitated at first, but finally ordered the father to dismount, which he promptly did, commending his son for maintaining the dignity of his official position.

In V, 13 Gellius tells of a discussion by a number of prominent Romans regarding the order of obligations, in which it was agreed that honor and protection are due wards
next after parents; that second to wards are clients; next came hospites and lastly blood relations and relations by marriage. A speech of Cato against Lentulus is quoted in V, 13, as illustrating the relative claims of wards and clients. "Our forefathers", he says, "considered it a more sacred duty to defend wards than clients." That the client takes precedence over kinsmen is shown by the fact that one is under obligation to testify in a client's behalf against relatives. A patron comes next after the father, who holds first position of honor. Masurius Sabinus is quoted as assigning a higher position to a hospes than to a client. In addition he gives a woman the preference over a man and a ward under age takes precedence over a woman. When Julius Caesar as pontifex maximus was delivering a speech in defense of the Bithynians, he declared that he could not neglect this duty in consideration of his guest friendship with King Nicomedes or his relationship to those whose case was on trial. He stated (V, 13, 6) that clients, to whom we owe honor and protection over against kinsmen, cannot be forsaken without disgrace.

It is probable that the deference paid to old age among the earliest Romans was an influence derived largely from the patria potestas. An illustration of this respect to old age is shown by the custom of the Romans, borrowed from the Lacadaemonians, of younger men escorting home older men from dinner parties (II, 15). Later, pri-
ority came to be given the married man and the father of children rather than the older man (II, 15, 4). By a provision of the Lex Julia, not the elder consul but the one who has more children under his control or who has lost more in war assumed first the official duties of his office. If they should happen to have the same number of children, the one whose wife was living or who was of appropriate age for remarriage was given the preference. In case both consuls have wives and the same number of children precedence was given on the basis of age. Gellius says the law makes no provision where both consuls are without wives and have the same number of sons or are husbands with no children. However, it seemed to be the practice to grant precedence to age, then to rank and then to an official entering upon his second term.

Gellius quotes from the writings of Theophrastus and Cato in regard to the last phase of this question, the obligations to friends (I, 3). Cato believed that an obligation to a friend extended to matters involving his life and character, on the expressed condition that disgrace does not follow.
In spite of the importance of slavery in the Roman social order, Gellius makes few references to the subject. An explanation of the cap put on the slave's head when he is sold is quoted (VI, 4) from Gaius Sabinus, a writer on civil law. The cap was an indication that the seller assumed no obligation as to the character of the slave. Further, the cap seems to have made it unnecessary to wait for a bill of sale, which would doubtless carry some reference to the slave's ability and character. Slaves sold in this way would probably be made a part of the chain gang, where there would be no opportunity to run away or to steal and where there would be sufficient compulsion to overcome any unwillingness to work. The commonplace fact that the slave in ancient times might be of high intelligence and personal integrity is shown by a reference to Phaedo of Elis, a slave, as a man of intellect and noble bearing (II, 18). Apparently it did not occur to Gellius to question the righteousness of a relationship in which Phaedo might pass his life under the control of a master of mentality inferior to his own. Prisoners of war could not be guaranteed, since their conduct in slavery was unknown, and hence their sale sub corona seems to have been of the same character as that of the slave who was sold pilleatus.
One mention of punishment is found (II, 19, 6). This is in a line quoted from Naevius: Extemplo illo te ducam ubi non despuas. This statement is explained as a reference to the furca a frame in the form of the letter V which was fastened over the back of the slave's neck and shoulders. His hands were bound to his thighs (or more probably to the ends of the fork) and he was compelled to walk about in this position as a warning to the other members of the household.
Religion

Gellius' references to religious matters are largely in connection with priestly orders or special attendants on the worship of certain deities. Of these orders the Vestal Virgins are discussed the most extensively. In I, 12, Gellius quotes at length the qualifications for eligibility as a Vestal, the exemptions, and certain forms in connection with induction into the order. Antistius Labeo is named as one of those who have written with most care (diligentissime) with regard to the selection of a member of the order, but Gellius does not indicate that Labeo is his specific authority for the statements made, with the exception of one point.

According to the general consensus of the authorities who have discussed the matter of eligibility, the successful candidate must not be under six years of age or above ten; both her father and mother must be living; she must not have defective speech or hearing or any physical blemish; neither she nor her father may have been freed from the patria potestas by emancipation; neither of her parents may have been a slave or engaged in occupations of low standing (negotiis sordidis). This last phrase is not defined or illustrated, but presumably it would include those engaged in handicrafts or in retail trade. Ateius Capito is quoted as stating that the father of a girl who is to be chosen must have his residence in Italy.
A Lex Papia (I, 12, 11) is quoted as providing that twenty girls shall be selected by the Pontifex Maximus and that one of these shall be chosen by lot to become a Vestal. Gellius remarks that this choice by lot is not usually necessary and that if a citizen of good social rank goes to the Pontifex and offers his daughter as a Vestal, provided the religious requirements are met, gratia Papiae legis per senatum fit; which seems to mean that the girl was accepted by a senatorial decree setting aside the necessity of drawing lots. The natural inference from this statement seems to be that families who could meet the requirements were not usually anxious to have their daughters enter the order of the Vestals. This inference is supported by the statement (I, 12, 9) that the daughter of a man who has three children must be excused. Since the father of three children was granted special privileges, the exemption of a daughter from the list of possible candidates must have been looked upon as a favor.

Further indication of this attitude is given by Suetonius who says in his life of Augustus that the unwillingness of parents to have their daughters become Vestals was so great that the emperor declared he would have one of his own granddaughters chosen if any of them were of legal age (Ch. 31).

As to the other specific exemptions, they included the sister of one who has already been chosen as a Vestal,
the daughter of a flamen or an augur, the daughter of any-one of the quindecimvirs in charge of the Sibylline Books or of the seven priests in charge of the banquets of the Gods (epulones), the daughter of a priest of the tubilus-trium or of one of the Salii, and the betrothed of a pont-ifex. It would seem that the priests may have had some-thing to do with the drawing up of this list of exemptions which favored their own families so largely, though it is not easy to see the basis on which the choice of priest-hoods for exemption was made.

When the Vestal had been selected, she was taken to the House of the Vestals and given into the charge of the pontifices. She was automatically freed from the patria potestas on being thus inducted into the Vestal sisterhood, and like any other citizen who was sui iuris, she had the right to make a will. To a ten-year old girl this privil-ege was not likely to be very important, but since she might receive bequests in the course of the years in which she was in the order she might ultimately have a fairly large amount of property to bequeath. The severance of the Vestal from her family was marked in particular by the fact that if she died without making a will her property went to the public treasury, and on the other hand she was not recognized as the heir to anyone who did not make a will. This statement is quoted by Gellius from Labeo's Commentar-ies on the Twelve Tables. It is followed by the comment,
Id quo iure fiat quaeritur, seeming to imply that the provision was not perfectly clear or that the source of Labeo's opinion was questioned.

Gellius appears to follow the same tradition as Livy in ascribing the founding of the Vestal priesthood to Numa (I, 12, 10). To his statement that Numa chose Vestals Livy adds a reference to the priesthood as originally coming from Alba (Alba oriundum sacerdotium) (Livy I, 20). This evidently refers to the legend of Rhea Silvia, as shown by the concluding words of the sentence, et genti conditoris haud alienum.

From Fabius Pictor, Gellius quotes the ritualistic expression used by the Pontifex Maximus in connection with the selection of the initiate; "I take you, Amata, as one who has best fulfilled the law, to be a priestess of Vesta and to perform the sacred rites which it is the duty of a priestess of Vesta to perform for the Roman people" (I, 12, 14). In the last section of the chapter above quoted Gellius says the name Amata used in this formula is explained by a tradition that this was the name of the first Vestal who was chosen. Modern scholars offer other explanations. One of these is that the name is from a Greek word meaning "unwedded", another, that it is not used as a name at all, but is merely an adjective used in address in the sense of "beloved" (Rolfe's translation, Leeb Series, ft. note, p.64, Vol. I). Plutarch in his life of Numa, ch.X, gives the names of four
Vestals who he says were the first chosen by Numa. No such name as Amata appears among them.

In VII, 7, Gellius mentions certain privileges which were bestowed on a Vestal named Gaia Taracia, also called Fufetia. By a special law which Gellius refers to as the Lex Horatia, she received the right of giving testimony, a right which Gellius says she was the only woman to possess. This statement is not easy to reconcile with the conclusions of modern scholars to the effect that Roman women had the right to give testimony in the courts. Possibly the life of Taracia, if she was actually a historical character, may have belonged to a period before this right was extended to women. This apparently is at least one source for the statement in Harper's Classical Dictionary to the effect that the Vestal gave evidence without the customary oath. But this acceptance of testimony without the oath is evidently not the meaning which Gellius attaches to the word testabilis, and in any case he regards the right as a special one, not a distinction of the entire order.

The second privilege which Gellius mentions as being granted to Taracia by the Horatian Law was that at the age of forty if she wished to withdraw from the order and marry she was privileged to do so. This again is not in accordance with the account of the Vestals as given by other ancient authorities. It implies that without special privileges the Vestal did not have the right to leave the
priesthood and reenter society in her life time. On the other hand the generally accepted theory is that she could terminate her period of service if she so desired after the lapse of thirty years from her entry into the order. If Taracia had entered at ten her privilege of withdrawal according to the law which Gellius quotes would come at the period when she had completed thirty years of service. Modern handbooks say the Vestals seldom took advantage of the right to withdraw. If this is correct the legal situation might have been somewhat uncertain in the minds of the public and the story of Taracia might have been fictitious, in spite of its seeming definiteness. On the other hand, if it is historical it might have set the precedent for a general regulation embodied in some later law which Gellius either knew nothing of or did not quote.

That the Pontifex Maximus exercised special authority over the Vestals is indicated by the facts that the selection was made by him (I, 12, 11), that it was to him a citizen went with the offer of his daughter as a Vestal, and that it was he rather than the chief Vestal who pronounced the formula with which a new member of the order was received. As head of the state religion the Pontifex Maximus would naturally be supposed to exercise supervision over the various priesthoods, but there seems to be no indication that his authority was so extensive in any other priestly group. Gellius, however, makes no mention
of punishments inflicted by the Pontifex on the Vestals for failure to perform their duties properly.

The ceremonies and duties incumbent upon the flamen Dialis and the flaminica, the priest and priestess of Jupiter, and also certain restrictions to which they were subjected are discussed at length by Gellius in X, 15. We are told that these could be found in books dealing with the public priesthoods and also in the first book of Fabius Pictor.

The emblem of the dignity of the flamen Dialis was a white cap or *galerum*, white, according to Varro, because he is the greatest of priests or because a white victim should be sacrificed to Jupiter. The flamen was obliged to wear this always out of doors; in fact, he had originally to wear it indoors as well until a decision by the pontiffs which Gellius calls recent. He must never remove the inner tunic except under cover, that Jupiter may never see him nude in the open air. Only a freedman could cut the flamen's hair and the cuttings of hair and nails also were buried in the earth under a fruitful tree. He rarely held the office of consul, since they were entrusted with wars and a flamen was not permitted to see an army in battle array outside the pomerium, the religious boundary of the city.

The flamen Dialis was not allowed to spend more than
two nights away from home and no one was permitted to sleep in his bed. The feet of his couch were smeared with a covering of clay and at the foot there should be a box of sacrificial cakes. At the table no one except the rex sacrificulus could sit above him. His marriage relation could be terminated only by death, and he must abdicate his office in the event of his wife's death. Places of burial must never be entered by him nor must he touch a corpse. However, he was permitted to attend funerals. He must not mount a horse or touch a she-goat, raw meat, ivy, beans, or bread fermented with yeast. It was considered unlawful for him to take oath. Evidently he must not have near him or see anything which would suggest the shape of chain or bond; consequently, there must be no knots in his head dress, girdle or anything about his garments; the ring on his finger must be perforated and without a gem, and anyone who came into his house in chains must instantly be freed from his bonds. The bonds of such a person were lifted up through the impluvium and then lowered into the street. It was unlawful for fire to be taken from the flaminia, the home of the flamen, except for religious rites. A suppliant who fell at his feet went unpunished at least for that day.

The flaminica was the priestess of Jupiter. She had to appear in the insignia of her office, a dyed robe and a head dress containing a twig from a fruitful tree. She was
forbidden to go up more than three rounds of a ladder except the so-called Greek ladder, an enclosed stairway. On the days of her attendance at the Argei she must not comb her hair.

An account of the origin of the priesthood called the Arval Brothers which seems to prove its extreme antiquity is given by Gellius (VII, 7, 8), who quotes Masurius Sabinus in the first book of his *Memorialia*. According to the legend the institution of the Arval Brotherhood is ascribed to Romulus. It is said that when his nurse Acca Larentia lost one of her twelve sons by death he allowed himself to be adopted by her as a son and afterwards called the group consisting of himself and the eleven sons, the Arval Brothers. The insignia of their priesthood was a garland of wheat ears and white fillets.

Certain regulations as regards color, age, and maturity of victims sacrificed to certain gods and goddesses is indicated by Gellius' statement in *X, 15*. A white victim should be sacrificed to Jupiter, as white was emblematic of royalty (*IV, 6*). On the occasion of the moving of the sacred spears of Mars in the sanctuary in the Regia, the senate passed a decree during the consulship of Marcus Antonius and Aulus Postumius that the consul should make expiation to Jupiter and Mars with full grown victims, *hostiis maioribus*, and with unweaned victims, *hostiis lactantibus*, to such other gods as they thought proper, and
additional offerings should be made with red victims.

The term, bidentes, indicating the age of victims, is discussed at length in XVI, 6. All victims that are two years old are bidentes. Gellius says that Julius Hyginus wrote in his work on Vergil that a victim called bidens should have eight teeth but two must be more prominent than the rest, to make it plain that they have passed from infancy to a less tender age.

There were also other regulations regarding victims. For example, if expiation was not effected by the first victims, others were brought and killed after them. These were called succidaneae (IV, 6) since they were substituted for the sake of making atonement, after the first had already been offered. Gellius supports his explanation of succidaneae by a quotation from Plautus' Epidicus which he says is often questioned: ut meum tergum tuae stultitiae subdas succidaneum. In this quotation succidaneum is evidently used to mean substitute." Praecidaneae are victims which are offered on the day before the regular sacrifice.

The sow offered to Ceres before the harvesting of new crops was referred to as praecidaneae. This offering was made for the sake of expiation in case any had failed to purify a defiled household or had performed the rite of purification in an improper manner (aliter quam oportuerat, IV, 6, 8).

The Romans considered certain days more favorable than
others for sacrifices, regarding as illomened certain specified days of the month. Gellius (V, 17) quotes Verrius Flaccus as listing in the fourth book of his Дe Verborum Significatu the days immediately following the Kalends, Nones, and Ides as illomened. The reason was that sacrifices were offered at the Allia on the day after the Ides in anticipation of the battle and in the battle which followed the Roman army was cut to pieces and three days later the Capitol was taken. When this instance of ill omen was cited in the senate, a number of senators recalled the fact that whenever magistrates had sacrificed on the day after the Kalends, Nones, or Ides in the very next battle of the war the Romans had suffered disaster. The senate referred this to the pontiffs who decreed that no offering would properly be made on those days. Gellius says that many persons regarded the fourth day before the Kalends, Nones, and Ides as also illomened since the Battle of Cannae occurred on the fourth day before the Nones of August.

The interpretation of natural phenomena as indications of the displeasure of the gods, and hence requiring propitiatory offerings is illustrated by Gellius in reference to earthquakes (II, 28). Whenever the Romans felt an earthquake or received the report of one, a religious holiday was decreed. Since it was uncertain what force, whether god or goddess had caused the earthquake, they
forbore naming the god in whose honor the holiday was decreed (II, 28, 2). Accordingly with this uncertainty they offered victims appropriate both to god and to goddess. As an illustration of avoidance of the naming of a certain deity the inscription of an ancient altar which still stands on the side of the Palatine Hill may be cited: SIVE DEO SIVE DEAE.
Military Affairs

To our knowledge of Roman warfare Aulus Gellius has contributed information regarding the terms applied to the formation of the army, weapons of early times, prizes, punishment, booty, the military oath, formal declaration of war, and the manner of attack.

Gellius devotes a short chapter (X, 9) to listing certain military terms (vocabula) which he says are given to a battle line when drawn up in a particular way. He states that these terms are transferred from the objects which they properly name and that representations of what the words suggest are in each case shown in drawing up the army.

The first of the words given, frons, appears to mean nothing more than the foremost ranks in the battle formation. The only reason for citing it seems to be Gellius' fondness for word studies of every kind. Since the word commonly meant "brow" it evidently struck Gellius' fancy to picture the front lines as the "brow" of the army.

The second word, subsidia, seems equally unimportant. "Supports" or "reserves" do not suggest any very vivid picture. If one tries to go back to the root meanings of sideo and sub, it is doubtful which of the various meanings appeared in the earliest combination. "To crouch down" as if waiting to spring into action might be suggested by
the verb from which the noun comes and possibly the imago vocabuli which Gallius had in mind may have been something of that sort.

The third term, cuneus, should mean a pointed formation like the letter V with the apex forward. Hirtius, B.G. VIII, 14, refers to artillery missiles as being thrown in cuneos hostium and B.G. VII, 28, the Gauls in the siege of Avaricum are described as taking up their positions cuneatim. Livy (II, 50) has the expression rupere cuneo viae, seeming to indicate a sort of football tactics. All these are references to non-Roman armies. According to Vegetius (3, 19) the advantage of such a formation was quia a pluribus in unum locum tela mittuntur. Sometimes cuneus appears to mean nothing more than "column". Tacitus, Annals, I, 51, in describing the campaign of Germanicus in which the slaughter of Varus and his legions was avenged says: Avidas legiones, quo latior populatio foret, quattuor in cuneos dispertit. This was an organization for marching and plundering rather than for fighting.

The forcipes (scissors) is supposed to have been a formation by which the soldiers opened up a way for the advance of a hostile cuneus, falling back at the sides that they might afterwards close in when the cuneus had been allowed to advance far enough. Such seems to be the description given by Vegetius. Apparently only an enemy with an almost complete lack of military instinct could be
caught by such a trap.

The hollow square of military tactics in modern times was represented by the Roman orbis, which stands next in Gellius' list. A circle with shields affording protection from every side and ready to meet attack from any direction could face superior numbers for considerable time. When the Marini attacked Caesar's troops from the two transports which had been separated from the others in the return from Britain, the soldiers succeeded in holding their ground, orbe facto, until reinforcements came up. (B.G. IV, 37).

It may be doubted whether globus had any specific military significance beyond the general sense of "group" or "body". The word is often used where no formal organization could be meant. Thus Romulus plans to rescue Remus non cum globo iuvenum (Livy I, 5) and he attacks the Sabine leader during the battle in the Forum valley cum globo fercissimorum iuvenum (Livy I, 12).

In XVI, 4, 6, Gellius describes the alae as resembling in their position the wings of a bird, and hence he gives the word here (X, 9) among the terms of transferred meaning. The quotation from Cincius in the passage above referred to seems to indicate that alae was sometimes used to mean cavalry. In XV, 9, 5 a quotation from Cato's Origines is given which appears to distinguish between equites and alae: Peditatu, equitibus, atque alis cum hostium legion-
ibus pugnavimus. Perhaps this statement of Cato may refer to a period when the cavalry of the Roman army as well as the infantry were Roman citizens, and the alae may have been foreign troops, possibly auxiliary horsemen.

The serra is described by Paulus (Festus) as a constant advance and retreat, thus suggesting back and forward movement of a saw in use. In view of the many absurd etymologies of the Romans, one may perhaps question whether this is not a rather blind effort to explain a term without real knowledge of its original force. The effect produced by such tactics would be mainly at the end of the column thus advanced and withdrawn, as from a battering ram. The characteristic feature of the saw is the toothed cutting side. If the common representation of the triplex acies is correct, with four cohorts in front and three standing back of the spaces between the four, a serrated front would be produced. Some such feature of the battle formation would seem a more reasonable source of the term than the movement which Paulus mentions.

In chapter 25 of Book X, a list of weapons of war is given. Gellius explains that while sitting in his carriage he had reviewed these as given in ancient histories in order to furnish occupation for his mind. Of the weapons mentioned in this list the spear (hasta) and javelin (pilum) were the commonplace weapons bearing these
names. The *phalarica* was a heavy spear wrapped with combustibles and used to carry fire into an enemy's camp or city. It was thrown from a military engine, but Vergil represents Bitias as being struck down by a *phalarica* which apparently Turnus hurls (*Aen.* IX, 705). The *semi-phalarica* in Gellius' list evidently was a smaller weapon of the same sort. It does not appear to be mentioned elsewhere. The *soliferreum* was a missile weapon wholly of iron. It is mentioned by Livy, XXXIV, 14. The *gaesum* was a heavy Gallic spear to which Caesar makes reference in the description of the attack on Galba's camp, *B.G.* III, 4. The *lancea* is said to have been of Spanish origin. It is the *lancea* with which the Atrebatian Commius wounds Vélusenus in the battle described by Hirtius, *B.G.* VIII, 48. The *sparus* was a hunting spear. Part of Catiline's troops were equipped with *spari* and *lanceae* when they met the army of Petreius (*Sallust, Cat.* 56).

Very similar to the *sparus* of the Gauls was the *rumex*, a missile weapon. The *trifax*, next mentioned by Gellius is said to have been a missile three and a half cubits long discharged from a catapult. The *tragula*, a kind of javelin or dart with a strap or thong attached by which it was thrown, was used by the Gauls and by some other peoples. When Caesar sent a letter in reply to the plea of Quintus Cicero for help when his camp was be-
ing besieged the messenger tied the letter to the thong of a tragula and threw the weapon over the fortifications (B.G. V, 46). In the slaughter of the legionaries who died with Sabinus and Cotta a centurion, Balventius, was pierced by a tragula (B.G. V, 36).

Tacitus describes the framea in the Germania (Ch. 6) as a spear used by the ancient Germans. It had a narrow steel point, very sharp and advantageous for use, since it could be employed equally well at close range or in fighting at a distance. The mesancula, which is referred to by Paulus as well as Gellius, was a javelin with an attached thong, like the tragula.

The cateia, mentioned also by Vergil in the Aeneid, VII, 741, was a kind of spear, probably barbed. It was also called teutona from the fact that it was used by the Teutones, though it seems to have been employed by other nations also. The next weapon in Gellius' list is the rhompea or rumpia which was peculiar to the Thracians. It was characterized by prodigious length and by having, like the Roman pilum, a wooden shaft of the same dimension as the iron head affixed to it. The sibonis (also written sibina), was a type of hunting spear. The verutum was a dart or javelin. Paulus (ex. Fest. p. 571) attempts to explain the name as related to veru: quod velut verua habent praefixa. In the famous story of the two rival centurions who tried to prove which was the better man during the siege of Quintus Cicero's camp it was a verutum which fastened itself in the
sword belt of Pullo and rendered him for the time incapable of defending himself (Caes., B.G. V, 44).

The sica was a curved dagger. In Rome it was carried by the lower classes, criminals, and ruffians. In the Second Oration against Catiline, 10, 23, Cicero refers to the youthful followers of Catiline who have learned sicas vibrare. The Elder Pliny (H.N. XVIII) says the sica was shaped like a tusk of a wild boar. It was the national weapon of the Thracians and was used by a certain school of gladiators. The word machera (or machaera) seems to have been loosely used in early Latin literature to designate a sword, without a very definite notion as to its shape. The Homeric machaira appears sometimes to have been a large knife used for slaying sacrificial victims, sometimes a curved sword, like a scimitar. Suetonius, Cl. 15, 2, tells of a case in which a demand was made that a forger should be punished by having his hands cut off, whereupon Claudius ordered an executioner to be brought with a machaera and a butcher's table. The story would suggest that the term had come to be applied to some sort of heavy knife or cleaver. The spatha was a broad two-edged sword without a point. Tacitus mentions it in the Annals XII, 35, as used by the auxiliary troops in the army of Ostorius Scapula in Britain. From this word are derived Italian spada and French épée, seeming to indicate that the other words for sword were displaced by spatha.

Naevius, as quoted by Gellius in this chapter, refers
to the lingula, making a word play on lingula and lingua. The implication is that the lingula was a small sword somewhat resembling a tongue in shape. Finally there was the pugio, a short dagger, the exact form of which is not certain. Suetonius, Cass. 68, says that Caesar saw he was attacked from all sides strictis pugionibus. Cicero in the Second Philippic, 12, 28, refers to Brutus as cruentum alte extollens pugionem after the assassination of Caesar. In describing the proposal of Vitellius to abdicate Tacitus (Hist. III, 68) says: Exsolutum a latere pugionem, velit ius necis vitaeque civium reddebat. The pugio is regarded as having been the sign of emperor's power of life and death. When Galba laid claim to the imperial authority on the death of Nero he started for the city in his military cloak dependente a cervicibus pugione ante pectus. Suet. Galba. 11.

We are indebted to Gellius, V, 6, for a complete description of military crowns which were many and varied. The most highly regarded were the following: triumphal crowns, siege crowns, civic crowns, mural crowns, camp crowns, and naval crowns. Besides these there were ovation crowns, and the olive crown, which was regularly worn by those who had not taken part in a battle but were nevertheless awarded a triumph.

Triumphal crowns were of gold and were presented to
a commander in recognition of the honor of a triumph. This crown in early times was of laurel but later was made of gold.

The siege crown was presented by those who had been rescued from a state of siege to the general who rescued them. It was made of grass, and custom required that it be made of grass which grew in the place within which the besieged were confined. Such a crown the Roman senate and people presented to Quintus Fabius Maximus in the Second Punic War quod urbem Romam obsidione hostium liberasset (V, 6, 10). Since Rome was not actually invested by the enemy in this war, this statement seems to mean that Fabius saved the city from the peril of being besieged.

The civic crown was given by one citizen to another who had saved his life. It was made of the leaves of the esculent oak, because the earliest food and means of supporting life were furnished by the oak. It was made also from the holm oak, because that is the species which is most nearly related to the esculent oak. Masurius Sabinus is quoted as saying it was the custom to award the civic crown only when the man who had saved the life of a fellow-citizen had at the same time slain the enemy who had threatened him and had not given ground in battle; under other conditions he says that the honor of the civic crown was not granted. Tiberius Caesar was once asked to decide whether the civic crown might be given to a soldier who had
saved a citizen in battle and killed two of the enemy, yet had failed to hold the position in which he was fighting. The emperor ruled that the soldier seemed to be among those who deserved this crown, since it was clear that he had rescued a fellow-citizen from a place so perilous that it could not be held even by valiant warriors. It was this civic crown that Lucius Gellius, an ex-censor, proposed in the senate that his country should award to Cicero in his consulship because it was through his efforts that the conspiracy of Catiline had been detected and punished (V, 6, 15).

The mural crown was awarded by a commander to the man who was first to mount the wall and force his way into an enemy's town. It was appropriately ornamented with representations of the battlements of a wall.

A camp crown was presented by a general to the soldier who was the first to fight his way into a hostile camp; this crown represented a palisade.

The naval crown was commonly awarded to the armed man who had been the first to board an enemy's ship in a sea fight; it was decorated with representations of the beak of ships. The mural, camp and naval crowns were regularly made of gold.

The ovation crown was of myrtle and was worn by generals who entered the city in an ovation. The ground for awarding an ovation instead of a triumph was that war had
not been declared in due form and so had not been waged with a legitimate enemy or that the adversaries' character was unworthy, as in the case of slaves or pirates or that because of a quick surrender, a victory was won which was "dustless" and bloodless. For such an easy victory the ancient Romans believed that the leaves sacred to Venus were appropriate, on the ground that it was a triumph not of Mars, but rather of Venus. When Marcus Crassus returned after ending the Servile War and entered the city in an ovation, he disdainfully rejected the myrtle crown and used his influence to have a decree passed by the senate that he should be crowned with laurel, not with myrtle.

Gellius says that Marcus Cato charged Marcus Fulvius Nobilior with having awarded crowns to his soldiers for the most trifling reasons possible for the sake of popularity. Fulvius had bestowed crowns, so Cato says, on his soldiers for industry in building a rampart or digging a well (V, 6, 24).

In regard to ovations Gellius says that ancient writers disagreed. Some of them stated that the man who celebrated an ovation was accustomed to enter the city on horseback. Masurius Sabinus said that they entered on foot, followed not by their soldiers but by the senate in a body.

Gellius, in citing a case of the recognition for bravery of Lucius Sicinius Dentatus, a tribune, names some special rewards. For instance, in addition to crowns and
other honors, he was the recipient of eighty three neck chains, one hundred and sixty armlets and eighteen spears.

In describing the bravery and courage of a certain tribune, Quintus Caecilius, Cato is quoted (III, 7) as comparing the case to that of the Spartan Leonidas, who because of his valor won unexampled glory and gratitude from all Greece and was honored by memorials of the highest distinction. The Greeks showed their appreciation of the deed by pictures, statues and honorary inscriptions in their histories and in other ways but the Roman tribune, who had done the same thing and saved an army gained from his fellow citizens small glory for his deeds.

Regarding the punishment of soldiers our information from Gellius is meager. He cites the fact that in older times a soldier was disgraced by a vein being opened (X, 8). This appears to have been not so much a punishment as a medical treatment at first, but later the same penalty was inflicted for many other offenses on the ground that all who sinned were not of sound mind.

In a long and wordy discourse of Favorinus which Gellius quotes in XIII, 25, the meaning of the words *praedia* and *manubiae* is considered. The discussion had its origin in the observation of the phrase *ex manubiiis* placed under certain statues and other ornaments on the colonnades of Trajan's forum. While Gellius was interested only in what he regarded as a wise distinction in word use, the topic
has some bearing on the disposal of booty taken in war. Since the decorations in question were, of course, not a part of Trajan's booty, but were paid for from the proceeds of its sale, Favorinus made the inscription the starting point for an argument as to the essential difference between praeda and manubiae. The latter word he believed was applicable only to the money received from the sale of praeda. The passage from Cicero on which he relied largely and which strongly impressed Gellius was quoted from the speech on the Agrarian Law and read as follows:

*Praedam manubias, sectionem castra denique On. Pompeii sedente imperatore decemviri vendent.* This passage could not reasonably be interpreted to support the contention of Favorinus unless *vendent* is taken in an unusual sense. Favorinus seems to regard it as a loosely used term for "make way with" (*ablaturos*, XIII, 25, 27).

Since the proceeds from the sale of military booty was regularly divided on the basis of one third going to the public treasury, one third to the soldiers, and one third to the general, most of the passages in which manubiae occurs in Cicero seem to allow of the word being understood as referring to the general's share. However, it is commonly regarded as having been employed in early times as a synonym of praeda, and it appears reasonable to assume that Cicero so used it here. In some instances the special
meaning upon which Favorinus insisted may have been uppermost in Cicero's mind as he used the word, but it is not easy to prove the distinction.

The form of the military oath taken by newly enlisted soldiers is given by Gellius, XVI, 4, 2, quoting from Cnicius' work De Re Militari. The first provision stating prohibitions and punishment of theft is particularly interesting. The oath, which was administered by the tribune, compelled the soldier to swear that as long as he was in the army of the consuls (names of the consuls are given) he would not, whether alone or in company with others, commit a theft of any article whose value exceeded a sesterce. Furthermore he swore that if he should carry off any object of greater value he would return it to the consul or someone appointed by one of the consuls or restore it himself within three days to its rightful owner or whomever he supposed to be the owner.

However, certain articles, including a spear, spear-shaft, wood, fruit, fodder, a purse, or a torch are enumerated as exceptions to the things which may exceed a silver sesterce in value. It is presumed that the theft of these received the stamp of approval because they might be advantageous or useful to an army. Another article named as exempt from the prescribed valuation is one called uter, which Rolfe translates as "bladder." The word is commonly
defined as a bag or bottle made from an animal's skin
(ox, pig, or goat), made tight by the application of pitch
or wax. Such an article was sometimes used as a container
for wine, oil, or water. According to Livy inflated utres
served as floats or "water wings" by means of which Hannibal's
Spanish auxiliaries crossed the Rhone River (XXI, 27, 5):
Hispani sine ulla mole in utres vestimentis conjectis ipsi
castris superpositis incubantes flumen tranaveret. The Roman
soldiers do not appear to have used floats of this sort, but
the utres were evidently so valuable a part of the soldier's
equipment that they might be appropriated without regard
for the limitations set for most other articles. Possibly
their value to the Romans in early times may have depended
on their use as containers.

While it is a commonplace fact that the armies of all
ages have been permitted more or less license in pillaging,
still it is interesting to find it formally approved in so
specific a way as by the provision of this oath, even
though rather narrowly limited.

The second provision of the oath refers to the sol-
dier's obligation to appear on the day appointed by the con-
sul, unless he was excused for certain reasons which Gellius
enumerates. He is not obligated if there be a funeral in
his family or a purification from a dead body, with the
specific provision however, that these were not arranged
purposely to prevent his complying with rules. Likewise,
a dangerous disease, an omen which requires expiatory rites, or an anniversary sacrifice requiring his presence to be rightly celebrated, excuse the soldier for non-appearance on this day. Violence or attack by an enemy and an appointment with a foreigner, are exceptions which conclude the list. If the soldier is excused for any of the above reasons, it nevertheless remains his duty to appear on the following day and render service to the one holding the levy. Should he fail to appear when not excused for any justifiable reason, he was adjudged a deserter.

That the custom of a soldier's giving bail (vadimonium) for the purpose of assuring his appearance at a trial was recognized in Rome is shown by an incident told by Gellius in VI, 1. A soldier who was on trial before Scipio inquired ex more where and when Scipio required him and his associates to give bail for his appearance.

Gellius, XVI, 4, 1, repeating the statement of Cincius in his third book on military science says that the war herald of the Roman people, when he declared war on an enemy and hurled a spear into their territory, used the following words: "Whereas the Hermandulan people and the men of the Hermandulan people have made war on the Roman people and have wronged them and whereas the Roman people have ordered that there be war with the Hermandulan
people and the men of the Hermundulans therefore I and the Roman people declare and make war on the Hermundulan people and men of the Hermundulans". This form of declaration of war is almost identical with the statement in Livy, I, 32, when he tells of the declaration of war of the Romans on the Latins.

Just as the spear was the sign of war, so the herald's staff (caduceus) was the token of a peaceful embassy (X, 27, 3). Gellius tells us that Quintus Fabius delivered a letter to the Carthaginians in which it was written that Roman people had sent them a spear and a staff, signs of war and peace respectively.

In connection with a discussion of the use of musical instruments in the army at the beginning of battle, as referred to by the Greek historians, Gellius makes mention of the Roman custom of charging with a yell. This, he says, was a customary feature of an attack, according to the early historians: quem (clamorem) in congressibus proeliorum fieri solitum scriptores annalium memoraverunt (I, 11, 9). He raises the question as to whether this was really in entire variance with the usage of the Greeks and other ancient peoples, or whether the quiet advance at a distance was appropriate, with the battle cry reserved for the moment of the charge. Caesar's criticism of Pompey for holding back his troops at Pharsalus (B.C. III, 92, 5) includes
a statement similar to that of Gellius: *Neque frustra antiquitus institutum est ut signa undique concinerent clamoremque universi tollerent; quibus rebus et hostes terreri et suas incitari existimaverunt.*
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