Justus was probably the son of Vettius Justus, consul in A.D. 328.[12] The above passage now reinforces his conjecture.

*University College Cork, Ireland* D. WOODS
d.woods@ucc.ie

[12] T. D. Barnes, *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine* (Cambridge, MA, 1982), 44.

## JULIAN'S BULL COINAGE: KENT REVISITED

It is well known that the meaning of Julian's bull coinage has been much debated but little agreed upon.[1] However, a new theory has recently been contributed to the debate by Woods.[2] He argues that the bull represents a solar symbol, and relates this to Julian's great devotion to the god Sol/Helios. The message that emerges from the coin then is that 'by his appointment of Julian as emperor in particular . . . Sol guarantees the security of his herds, the state'.[3] Woods adduces new evidence to support his theory, a coin issued by the third-century Emperor Gallienus (A.D. 253–68) as part of his animal series.[4] The coin honours Sol, who is represented by a bull (though also by a winged horse on a variant coin). In addition to his specific theory, Woods also usefully establishes methodological principles for the reading of the coin. These are: the better interpretation is the one that has the better parallel for the iconography, the more contemporary the better; the better interpretation is the one that better reflects Julian's priorities; and the reverse type 'should not be considered in isolation, but in its full numismatic context'. This last principle leads to interesting discussion of the stars, for single stars and groups of stars do feature on other fourth-century coinage. Thus, Woods argues, the stars 'have no bearing on the symbolism of the bull itself other than to signify a divine presence'.[5] Clearly this new theory will need to be digested. It certainly has strengths, especially the striking parallel with the Gallienus

[1] The large bronze coinage was struck in A.D. 362, and issued by all the mints of the empire except for Trier, Rome, and Alexandria. The obverse depicts Julian, head diademed, draped and cuirassed, and bearded, accompanied by the legend 'Dominus Noster Flavius Claudius Julianus Pius Felix Augustus'. The reverse depicts a bull, shown standing, facing right, with two stars above its head and back. The legend on this side is 'Securitas Rei Pub'. Unusually, the coinage is referred to in the literary sources, namely Julian's *Misopogon* (355D), Ephrem the Syrian's *Hymns against Julian* (1.16–17), and the church histories of Socrates (3.17.4–5) and Sozomen (5.19.2). The bull has been variously read as a sacrificial bull, the Mithraic bull, the Apis bull, a zodiacal representation of Julian, and a symbol of the emperor. For a review of the diverse theories, see D. Woods, 'Julian, Gallienus, and the solar bull', *American Journal of Numismatics* 12 (2000), 157–69 at 159–61. The mint of Arles also added an eagle to the design, on the bull's left; it perches on a victory wreath whilst offering another to the bull. I agree with Woods (157, n. 2) that the eagle has 'no bearing upon our interpretation of the central device of this type'. On the eagle, see also F. D. Gilliard, 'Notes on the coinage of Julian the Apostate', *Journal of Roman Studies* 54 (1964), 135–41 at 137–8; J. Vanderspoel, 'Julian and the Mithraic bull', *Ancient History Bulletin* 12.4 (1998), 113–19 at 117–19.

[2] Woods (n. 1). [3] Woods (n. 1), 168.

[4] On this coinage, see I. Carradice, 'Appendix 5: the animals on the "Cons Aug" coins of Gallienus', in E. Besley and R. Bland (edd.), *The Cunetio Treasure: Roman Coinage of the Third Century A.D.* (London, 1983), 188–94 and R. D. Weigel, 'Gallienus' "animal series" coins and Roman religion', *Numismatic Chronicle* 150 (1990), 135–43.

[5] Woods (n. 1), 164. P. H. Webb, 'The coinage of the reign of Julian the Philosopher', *Numismatic Chronicle* 10 (1910), 238–50 at 244, already noted the general existence of stars on coins.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.327 Published online by Cambridge University Press

coin, but, given the inconclusive nature of the evidence, it seems likely that the debate will continue. Indeed in this short note I will return to an earlier theory and suggest that it has virtues that have not been recognized. I will then conclude with some more general points about the debate.

The theory I am returning to proposes that the bull represents the emperor as leader of the herd, his subjects. It was formulated by Kent, who argued that the legend should 'by late Rome convention . . . refer to the Emperor himself or his Victory' and cited Dio Chrysostom (*Or.* 2.66–7) as the source of the symbolism.[6] Kent's theory has met with little favour on the grounds that 'the allusion seems far too obscure to be useful on coinage',[7] and that the metaphor is too inoffensive to explain the assault of the Antiochenes.[8] However, Kent's argument can be developed and strengthened, and the objections can be countered.

To begin with, it seems that the writings of Dio Chrysostom did influence Julian.[9] In particular Dio's four discourses *On Kingship* (*Or.* 1–4), for Emperor Trajan (A.D. 98–117),[10] find an echo in Julian's own imperial panegyrics on the Emperor Constantius II (A.D. 337–61), especially the second panegyric (*Or.* 2). It can also be argued that Julian's *Against the Cynic Heracleios* (*Or.* 7) owes a debt to Dio's *First Discourse on Kingship*. Thus it is likely that Julian was indeed familiar with Dio's image of the bull as leader in the *Second Discourse on Kingship*.

Interestingly Dio was not the originator of this image (as he admits) for he takes it from Homer's *Iliad* (2.480–3), where the poet describes Agamemnon as the bull in the herd of heroes. Dio quotes the lines, but then comments that Homer chose the comparison not just to emphasize the strength of the king but also 'to indicate the gentleness of his nature and his concern for his subjects' (*Or.* 2.66–7). In fact, the whole thrust of Dio's *Second Discourse* is to demonstrate the value of Homer for rulers. Thus there is an extra dimension to the imagery that Kent did not exploit, but which increases its relevance for Julian, whose enthusiasm for Homer is proverbial.[11] In his *Misopogon*, written in Antioch, he famously declares how he was imbued with the values, and love, of Homer by his tutor Mardonius, the Scythian eunuch. Homeric values and reminiscences permeate his work. In his panegyric on the Empress Eusebia (*Or.* 3), he casts himself as Odysseus to her Arete; in his *Consolation to Himself on the Departure of the Excellent Salutius* (*Or.* 8) Julian again casts himself as Odysseus, this time to Salutius' Hector; and in his second panegyric on Constantius II he recalls the quarrel between Agamemnon and Achilles, and compares Constantius to other heroes from the *Iliad*. Thus Kent could have argued that Dio's *Second Discourse on Kingship* would have been a text of particular interest to Julian given its subject of Homer, and that the symbolism of the bull would have had even greater attraction for the emperor given its Homeric origin.

[6] J. P. C. Kent, 'Notes on some fourth-century coin types', *Numismatic Chronicle* 14 (1954), 216–17 at 217.

[7] Vanderspoel (n. 1), 115.

[8] Vanderspoel (n. 1), 119; Woods (n. 1), 160.

[9] See L. François, 'Julien et Dion Chrysostome: les *Peri Basileias* et le second panégyrique de Constance', *Revue des études grecques* 28 (1915), 417–39; J. Bouffartigue, *L'Empereur Julien et la culture de son temps* (Paris, 1992), 293–4; and R. Smith, *Julian's Gods: Religion and Philosophy in the Thought and Action of Julian the Apostate* (London and New York, 1995), 186 and 274, n. 29. We can perhaps also note Julian's personal interests in Trajan and kingship generally.

[10] On Dio's kingship orations, see J. Moles, 'The kingship orations of Dio Chrysostom', in F. Cairns and M. Heath (edd.), *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* 6 (1990), 297–375.

[11] For example, P. Athanassiadi, *Julian: An Intellectual Biography* (Oxford, 1981[1]; London and New York, 1992[2]), 14 ff.; Bouffartigue (n. 9), 60–1, 143–56; Smith (n. 9), 24–5; Woods (n. 1), 167–8.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.327 Published online by Cambridge University Press

There is also another dimension to the text that might have had further resonance for Julian. The *Second Discourse* is presented as a dialogue between Philip of Macedon and Alexander the Great. Alexander is responding to Philip's enquiry as to why he is so infatuated with Homer. Some have argued that Julian had a pronounced interest in Alexander the Great,[12] and that Alexander was especially prominent in Julian's thoughts as the emperor was preparing for his own forthcoming Persian campaign. Julian even inserted Alexander into his satire on Roman emperors, *The Caesars*, written at Antioch in 362.[13] Thus it is possible that Dio's *Second Discourse* had even greater significance for Julian beyond his attraction to Dio and Homer.

Finally, in addition to the evidence of the *Second Discourse* itself, it can be pointed out that Julian was in fact compared to a bull in his own lifetime. The image surfaces in a speech to Constantius II by the sophist Himerius.[14] Alluding to both Gallus and Julian, Himerius describes the latter as 'shining forth from the herd of young men, like some high-spirited bull that leads the herd'.[15]

In general, then, there is more to Kent's citing of Dio than he seems to have realized himself. We have the additional factors of an author known to have influenced Julian; the Homeric origin for the imagery of the ruler as bull and the general Homeric theme of the *Second Discourse*; the featuring of Alexander the Great; and a contemporary panegyrical reference to Julian as bull/leader. All this surely adds weight to the argument of Kent. Whether this makes his theory right is another matter, and the objections of obscurity and inoffensiveness remain. I will, however, conclude with two more general points that have a bearing on the debate and will also address these objections.

First, perhaps the image was intended to have more than one meaning. Some have already been open to this possibility. For instance, Harl suggested that the 'very diversity of explanations suggests that Julian's bull . . . represented no one of these, but instead was a composite of them all'.[16] While I do not think we should go as far as Harl (there does seem to be good reason to reject some of the traditional theories, such as that concerning the Apis bull), I think we should be willing to consider that some could be valid simultaneously.[17] Since it seems probable that it was Julian himself who

[12] See e.g. Athanassiadi (n. 11), 192–3, 224–5. For Trajan's own interest in Alexander, see Moles (n. 10), 299–300. For a more tempered view of Julian's attachment to Alexander, see R. J. Lane Fox, 'The itinerary of Alexander: Constantius to Julian', *Classical Quarterly* 47 (1997), 239–52.

[13] See G. W. Bowersock, *Julian the Apostate* (London, 1978), 101.

[14] See T. D. Barnes, 'Himerius and the fourth century', *Classical Philology* 82 (1987), 206–25 at 209, and Vanderspoel (n. 1), 115. But see also J. Bidez, *La Vie de l'empereur Julien* (Paris, 1930), 95.

[15] Barnes (n. 14), 209. A Homeric comparison follows too: Julian is compared to Achilles at *Il.* 9.443.

[16] K. W. Harl, *Civic Coins and Civic Politics in the Roman East A.D. 180–275* (Berkeley and London, 1987), 96. Vanderspoel (n. 1), 116–19, is open to the coexistence of meanings in the specific cases of the stars and the eagle, though this is to support his Mithraic reading.

[17] Another reading that has not been noted is that the bull could be a military symbol, for it was the emblem of several legions: see e.g. R. J. Brewer, 'Zoomorphic seal boxes: Usk and the twentieth legion', in M. Aldhouse-Green and P. Webster (edd.), *Artefacts and Archaeology: Aspects of the Celtic and Roman World* (Cardiff, 2002), 174–89 at 178–9. There is some similarity between the military image of the bull and that on Julian's coinage: see e.g. the shield plate of *legio VIII Augusta* in R. G. Collingwood and R. P. Wright, *The Roman Inscriptions of Britain* 2, fasc. 3 (Stroud, 1991), 48–9 and plate XI. If nothing else this might suggest that the zodiacal reading is strengthened, as the military symbol of the bull was 'the zodiacal sign associated with Venus' (Brewer, 178).

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.327 Published online by Cambridge University Press

decided to place the image of the bull on his coinage, given its unusual nature, the various meanings that can be attached to it and linked with Julian's personal interests make this all the more likely. Those who find the bull as ruler theory weak because of its obscurity seem to miss the point, for not only are we dealing with the issue of Julian's priorities[18] but also with a possible multiple meaning of the imagery. Thus it could be argued that Woods' suggestion that the bull is a solar symbol can happily coexist with the theory of the bull as symbol of the ruler. Interestingly, Woods explains the solar symbolism of the bull by recourse to the story of Helios' cattle in Homer's *Odyssey*.[19] Thus there is a Homeric root for both the bull as solar symbol and as ruler.

Second, we need to be more nuanced in our understanding of the documented reactions to the coinage. For instance, doubts are raised about the theories that the bull represented the emperor as leader or the starsign of the emperor on the grounds that such 'bland' metaphors would hardly have caused the objections voiced by the Antiochenes. But surely it should be appreciated that the contemporary reactions to the coin are not necessarily based on what the bull really meant.[20] Just as Ephrem credits the Jews with seeing in Julian's imagery the Golden Calf, it is possible that the Antiochenes deliberately interpreted the bull as they wished, in order to attack the pagan emperor. Bowersock famously remarks that 'the meaning of Julian's strange new coinage was quite unknown even then',[21] but it is possible that contemporaries may have understood it very well.[22] It is just that they were also able to interpret it in such a way as to suit their own purposes.

*School of History and Archaeology, Cardiff University* SHAUN TOUGHER
toughersf@cardiff.ac.uk

[18] As Kent (n. 6), 217, stressed himself.
[19] Woods (n. 1), 167.
[20] This is the position taken, for instance, by Vanderspoel (n. 1), 119.
[21] Bowersock (n. 13), 104.
[22] Vanderspoel (n. 1), 117, makes the same point, though to different effect.

## *ANTH. LAT.* 36 *DE EURYALO*: A SOLE SURVIVING SOLACE?

Unicus Euryalus †meruit† solacia matris;
ereptus matri est unicus Euryalus.

So reads the Teubner text of Shackleton Bailey,[1] who suggests, after explaining in his apparatus that *meruit* is without sense, either *fuerat* (which seems rather plain), or *vivus*, 'quod facile post *-lus* vel *-nus* excidere potuit'; but a second adjectival form seems rather excessive, while not having an expressed verb in the hexameter means that, despite its emphatic positioning at the beginning of the pentameter, *ereptus . . . est* is without much impact. Instead of *meruit*, I therefore suggest the palaeographically similar *mansit*, citing for contextual background Verg. *Aen*. 9.481–3 (words spoken by Euryalus' mother after learning of his death): *tune ille senectae/ sera meae requies potuisti linquere solam,/ crudelis?*[2] *Mansit* would give point to both the

[1] *Anthologia Latina* 1.1*: libri Salmasiani aliorumque carmina* (Stuttgart, 1982).
[2] Philip Hardie ad loc. (Cambridge, 1994) compares *Aen*. 12. 57–8 *spes tu nunc una, senectae/ tu requies miserae* (Amata to Turnus) and 8.581 *care puer, mea sola et sera voluptas* (Evander to Pallas); but perhaps also worth noting, mindful of *solacia* in our passage, is 8.514–5 *hunc tibi praeterea, spes et solacia nostri,/ Pallanta adiungam* (Evander to Aeneas).

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.327 Published online by Cambridge University Press