



Women in the Days of the Empire

Author(s): Eli Edward Burriss

Source: *The Classical Weekly*, Vol. 16, No. 15 (Feb. 5, 1923), pp. 115-117

Published by: Classical Association of the Atlantic States

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4388455>

Accessed: 17/03/2009 10:56

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

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=classaas>.

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

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Classical Association of the Atlantic States is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Classical Weekly*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

by an elaborate system of arabesque ornamentation, enclosing a vignette portrait of King James. The ink is dark brown, but there are traces of gilt in the decorative flourishes. The parchment is in a good state of preservation except for a ragged hole near one edge, which, however, does not interfere with the writing.

The document is a patent of King James I, dated at Westminster, February 6, 1610. It confers upon Sir Robert Harley the right to establish and maintain a weekly market and an annual fair in the town of Wigmore, in Herefordshire, on the western borders of England. It recites in barbarous Latin that, after thorough investigation, the King is convinced that Wigmore is a desirable place for such market and fair by reason of its situation and commercial importance and its adequate supply of inns and taverns, and that no harm will result in this new departure either to the royal interests or to other communities and more or less distant fairs. Accordingly, to Sir Robert Harley is granted the right to institute and maintain such market and fair, and to enjoy the customary privileges of the overlord, which seem to have included every conceivable kind of toll, commission, fee, and rake-off, together with the right of administering speedy justice in disputes arising during the fair. The document closes with a special provision charging the Keeper of the Great Seal to exact no fee from Sir Robert.

Such markets and fairs, it may be remarked, were very common in England and were of great importance in the commercial and industrial development of the country. They brought considerable profit to those who had them in charge. For one thing, during the market or fair all trade in the town and the surrounding country was suspended except within the precincts of the fair; thus all business was forced to pay its percentage to the lord of the fair.

The manuscript, on the whole, is fairly legible. It is the work of a careful scribe; the letters are well-formed and fairly uniform. The lines drawn with a stylus to guide the writing are still visible in places. Our scribe was so anxious to keep his right-hand margin even that, when a word ended before the close of the line, he carefully filled in the remaining space with a few *m*'s or *n*'s. Conversely, if near the end of the line his next word was a trifle too long for the space, he sometimes omitted from it enough letters to bring the word into the available space. Thus, at the end of one line, *pmsom* = *praemissorum*. Other abbreviations appear, however, where the ending of the line does not make them necessary. *Concess* = *concessionibus*, *lias* = *litteras*, *nras* = *nostras*, etc. A macron over a letter indicates the omission of the *m*; the termination *rem* or *rum* is represented by a special sign; *cur*' stands for *curia*; and case-endings are often omitted.

Suus is written without compunction for *eius*, *existit* means nothing more than *est*, *quod* with a finite mode is always used for the classical infinitive with accusative subject, *hec* is written for *haec*, *Anglie* for *Angliae*, etc. *Coram* means 'under the authority of'; *infra villam* means 'in the town'; the preposition *in* is used with the ablative of time (e. g. *in die Martis*

means 'on Tuesday'). *Ipsa* seems sometimes to mean no more than *is*, and *unus* is nothing but the indefinite article. In one place I read *totum diem illam*, as if the writer was not sure whether *dies* was masculine or feminine and took no chances. *Absque*, 'without', and *super*, 'during', occur in legal and post-Augustan Latin and need not surprise us here. Eut the use of a clause as the substantive in an ablative absolute construction is worthy of comment. The writer wants to say, 'The fact that no definite mention is made herein of the exact amount of revenue does not invalidate this grant', or 'The fact that no definite mention is made to the contrary notwithstanding'. And he expresses it thus: *Eo quod expressa mentio minime existit non obstante*. A parallel to this is found in such passages as Horace, *Epp.* 1.10.50 *excepto quod non simul esses, cetera laetus*. But of course this formula and the phrases and meanings quoted above belong to the language of medieval law.

The vocabulary includes a great many legal terms which at best carry with them very little suggestion of Latin, and when shorn of case-endings according to the easy-going fashion of the law scribe they hardly seem words. A single line contains such forms as *tolnet*, *theolon*, *piccag*, *stallag*. These are English and French words made to serve in a Latin sentence by equipping them hastily with case-endings, in this instance invisible case-endings. *Tolnet* and *theolon* are the fees charged for a license to sell. *Stallage* is the rent for a stall in the fair. *Piccage* is the amount charged for digging post-holes in the fair-enclosure. The phrase *curia pedis pulverisati*, 'the court of dusty-foot', corrupted in English to *pie powder*, i. e. the French *pie poudreux*, is the name given to the court of summary jurisdiction in civil cases. The name 'dusty-foot' arose possibly because the informality of the proceedings excused disorder of dress, possibly because dusty-foot was for obvious reasons an appropriate designation of wandering traders and peddlers.

LOS ANGELES HIGH SCHOOL,
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA WALTER ALISON EDWARDS

WOMEN IN THE DAYS OF THE EMPIRE

Were we to envisage the women of the days of the Emperors, using, as our only sources, Dio Cassius, whose turn for a good story led to much garbling of the truth, or the slanderous Suetonius, or even Tacitus, the Caesar-hater, our picture would be inexact. Ferrero, in *The Women of the Caesars*, has tried to palliate the crimes of the infamous Messalina, Agrippina, and others. I desire merely to recall a few women of those black days, whose stories often lie unnoted in the works of the philosopher Seneca, Pliny the Younger, and Tacitus.

We read of the beautiful devotion of Seneca's wife, Paullina, when Nero's order came that his old tutor must die. The account of Tacitus (*Ann.* 15.63-64) begs translation. Paullina needed no pluming of her will to induce her to share her husband's fate. She called upon the *percussor* to address himself to his

duty. Seneca tried to dissuade her, but his love for her was too great to expose her to calumny after his death.

. . . Vitae, inquit, delenimenta monstraveram tibi, tu mortis decus mavis: non invidebo exemplo. Sit huius tam fortis exitus constantia penes utrosque par, claritudinis plus in tuo fine.

An incision was made in the arms of both. Nero, who entertained no dislike for Paullina, demurred, and had her wounds bound up. She lived for a few years

. . . laudabili in maritum memoria et ore ac membris in eum pallorem albertibus ut ostentui esset multum vitalis spiritus egestum.

Seneca himself records the affection of his wife (Epp. 104.1-6).

Tacitus remarks (Ann. 15.71) the love of Artoria Flaccilla and Egnatia Maximilla for their husbands, a love which led them to accompany their husbands into exile:

. . . Novio Prisco per amicitiam Senecae et Glitio Gallo atque Annio Pollioni infamatis magis quam convictis data exilia. Priscum Artoria Flaccilla coniunx comitata est, Gallum Egnatia Maximilla, magnis primum et integris opibus, post ademptis. . . .

Claudius, in the first year of his reign (41 A.D.), relegated the courtier-philosopher, Seneca, to Corsica, and banished Livilla on a charge of *liaison* with Seneca (Dio 60.4). No sooner had Seneca arrived at Corsica than his thoughts began to turn homeward. His first letter was a *consolatio*, addressed to his mother, apparently intended to be circulated at Rome, with a view to securing his recall. The letter is valuable as an autobiographical document, and no less so because of the information Seneca has given us about his mother, Helvia, to whom he seems to have been tenderly devoted. She had been brought up by a step-mother, who, unlike the step-mother of tradition, seems to have been a woman of sterling character, and genuinely fond of her step-children. Writing to Helvia, Seneca says (Ad Helviam 2.4):

Crevisti sub noverca, quam tu quidem omni obsequio et pietate, quanta vel in filia conspici potest, matrem fieri coegisti; nulli tamen non magno constitit etiam bona noverca.

Helvia was unlike other mothers whom Seneca knew (*ibidem*, 14.3):

. . . Tu patrimonium nostrum sic administrasti ut tamquam in tuis laborares, tamquam alienis abstineres; tu gratiae nostrae, tamquam alienis rebus uteris, pepercisti et ex honoribus nostris nihil ad te nisi voluptas et impensa pertinuit. . . .

Seneca tells us that his mother was keenly interested in his studies, and that she found delight in the company of her son. In recounting her virtues, Seneca, in words that have a strangely modern flavor, says (*ibidem*, 16.4):

. . . non faciem coloribus ac lenociniis polluisti; numquam tibi placuit vestis quae nihil amplius nudaret cum poneretur: unicum tibi ornamentum, pulcherrima et nulli obnoxia aetati forma, maximum decus visa est pudicitia. . . .

The elder Seneca was a man of inflexible severity,

especially in his attitude toward the higher education of women. Of him Seneca writes to his mother (*ibidem*, 17.3²4):

. . . quantum tibi patris mei antiquus rigor permisit, omnes bonas artes non quidem comprehendisti, attingisti tamen. Utinam quidem virorum optimus, pater meus, minus maiorum consuetudini deditus voluisset te praeceptis sapientiae erudiri potius quam imbui! . . . Beneficio tamen rapacis ingenii plus quam pro tempore hausisti; iacta sunt disciplinarum omnium fundamenta: nunc ad illas revertere; tutam te praestabunt.

If we turn to a later generation, we find a picture of inexpressible charm in the devotion of Calpurnia and her husband, Pliny. What can be more delightful than the letter of Pliny (7.5), addressed to his wife, beginning *Incredibile est quanto desiderio tui tener.* In *causa amor primum, deinde quod non consuevimus abesse?* He lies broad awake during most of the night, picturing to himself her image; and in the daytime he unwittingly looks for her in her room, and, not finding her there, is filled with grief.

The eighth letter of Book 3 is of a piece with this. Calpurnia is a woman of discernment, with a *penchant* for books. Her solicitude for her husband when he takes up a case is poignant. She dispatches runners to see how Pliny is received, and, when he gives a *recitatio*, she is within ear-shot, concealed behind the arras. In 6.4 Pliny urges Calpurnia to write to him every day, or even twice a day, so that he may be more easy in spirit. In 6.7 we learn that Calpurnia, during her absence in Campania, reads Pliny's works, since she cannot have Pliny himself, and he, in turn, reads her letters over and over again, letters which, he assures us, possess a charm all their own.

In 3.16 Pliny writes to Nepos about a conversation he had with Fannia concerning Fannia's grandmother, Arria. Arria's husband, Caecina Paetus, and her son were both seized by an illness which was fatal to the son. The mother managed the funeral of the son with such secrecy that the father was ignorant of the death. Arria pretended that her son was better. This was the Paetus who had taken part in the revolt of Scribonianus in Dalmatia in 42. The governor was killed, but Paetus was arrested and brought to Rome, found guilty, and ordered to take his life. When his last hour had come, his wife seized a dagger and plunged it into her heart, with the words, *Paete, non dolet!* After the arrest of Paetus, when his captors were going to put him on board ship, his wife tried to accompany him, but, having been refused, she hired a fishing smack and followed him. Pliny also tells us (3.16) that, when her son-in-law, Thrasea, tried to dissuade her from taking her life, she said: *Nihil agitis, . . . potestis enim efficere ut male moriar, ut non moriar non potestis.* As she uttered these words, she sprang from her chair and dashed her head against the wall.

In 7.19, a letter addressed to Priscus, Pliny expresses his distress at the ill-health of Fannia, an illness which she had contracted while nursing one of the Vestals. We learn the interesting fact that, when a Vestal was very ill, she was removed from the Atrium Vestae,

and was entrusted to the care of a matron, until she recovered. Of this Fannia, Pliny writes: *Quae castitas illi, quae sanctitas, quanta gravitas, quanta constantia!* Like many women of the first century A.D., she followed her husband into exile, and was banished once on her own account; for her husband, Senecio, when accused of writing a life of Helvidius, remarked in self-defense that he had written the work at the suggestion of his wife. Fannia made no effort to clear herself of the charge, and even had the temerity to preserve the book, and take it with her into exile.

Pliny has a good word (7.24) for the picturesque old lady Ummidia Quadratilla:

. . . *Vixit in contubernio aviae delicatae severissime et tamen obsequentissime. Habebat illa pantomimos fovebatque effusius quam principi feminae conveniret.*

She had the good sense to send her grandson to his studies while she <solebat> se ut feminam in illo otio sexus animum laxare lusu calculorum, <solebat> spectare pantomimos suos. . . .

The unspeakable Agrippina may have had one friend of genuine fidelity in the person of her maid, Acerronia. Modern writers are wont to belittle Acerronia's self-sacrifice, I suppose, on the grounds of its seeming to be an act of unreason that anyone would give her life for a woman of Agrippina's stamp. Santvoord (*The House Of The Caesars*, 146) thinks that her heroic action was little more than a dog-like devotion. Holland (*Seneca*, 90) says:

. . . *Acerronia either attempted to save herself at her mistress's expense, or else, her mistress at her own—it must ever be doubtful which.*

Nero had feigned a desire for a reconciliation with his mother, and had invited her to Baiae, ostensibly for this purpose, but really with murder in his heart. After unctuous attentions and honey words from her son, she went on board ship for the return voyage. Tacitus says (*Ann.* 14.5) that it was a starry-bright night:

. . . *Noctem sideribus illustrem et placido mari quietam, quasi convincendum ad scelus, dii praebuere.*

Agrippina had two companions:

. . . *Creperius Gallus haud procul gubernaculis adstabat, Acerronia super pedes cubitantis reclinis paenitentiam filii et recuperatam matris gratiam per gaudium memorabat. . . .*

Through the clever offices of a freedman, Anicetus, Nero had had the vessel so constructed that, at a given signal, the ceiling, weighted down with lead, would collapse, and the boat sink. The ceiling fell in as arranged, crushing to death Creperius, but by some good turn of fate Agrippina and Acerronia escaped. The boat failed to sink; so the oarsmen, who were privy to the scheme, capsized it by leaning on one side.

. . . *Acerronia, imprudentia dum se Agrippinam esse utque subveniretur matri principis clamittt, contis et remis et quae fors optulerat navalibus telis conficitur.*

REVIEWS

The Lupercalia. By Alberta Mildred Franklin. Columbia University Dissertation. New York (privately printed, 1921). Pp. 105.

Some twelve years ago Deubner emphasized the necessity of discussing the Lupercalia from the standpoint of its history and evolution, and himself set the example in an article which appeared in the *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 13 (1910), 481-508. Miss Franklin attempts, in this dissertation, to give a fuller discussion, following somewhat the same general method.

In mechanical make-up this is a model dissertation. No footnotes mar the neat page (the notes are assembled after each chapter); an excellent Bibliography (98-102) precedes the adequate Index Rerum (103-105). The place of a Table of Contents is taken by a synopsis of the ten chapters. It fills a little over a page, but in this small compass it sets forth the author's thesis and the steps by which she proceeds to demonstrate it.

Chapter I, Introduction (3-17), sets forth the background of the discussion, the contrast between the Mediterranean and the Aryan religions, the former with its stress on deities of the earth, the latter with its worship of sky-gods. The discussion is clear and illuminating; nowhere have I seen the outlines of the subject better sketched. The bibliography for this chapter is especially full (13-17).

Miss Franklin goes on to show that the Lupercalia, which is a cult complex, is not the product of any one period, but an epitome of the religious experience of the Romans (Chapter II, 18-20). The wolf-deity in Greece is Pelasgian. Absorbed by Zeus and Apollo and associated with Pan, he drops his wild and ravenous nature and becomes kindly and gracious (Chapter III, 21-28). The wolf-deity in Italy was preeminently the animal of magic and popular superstition. The wolf is associated especially with Soranus, a chthonic god of the Faliscans. Mars absorbed a wolf-god. Originally the god was the wolf; then he became the averter of wolves, Lupercus. The running of the Luperci around the Palatine Hill Miss Franklin connects with the ritual flight of priests who had slain an animal that was consecrated to the god and then returned to partake of the flesh sacramentally (Chapter IV, 29-48).

In Greece the sacred goat replaces the wilder wolf, particularly for sacrifices of an expiatory type, as the worshiper advances in civilization (Chapter V, 49-52). In Italy, it appears chiefly in the worship of Faunus, of Juno, and in the Lupercalia. Rejecting Faunus as the deity of the Lupercalia, Miss Franklin discusses Juno, a deity of the old Ligurian stratum, especially Juno Caprotina, in whose cult there was a ritual of blows, with a preliminary flight-ritual (Poplifugia). After the union with the Sabines and under the influence of Juno Lucina, the blows with the goatskin were added to the Lupercalia and the running of the Luperci became no longer a flight-ceremony, but a means of inducing fertility (Chapter VI, 53-66).

The sacrifice of the dog in Greece and Italy is an