

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

NOVA SERIES

VOL. II

HELSINKI 1958 HELSINGFORS

INDEX

Pentti Aalto	Marginal Notes on the Minoan Linear B . . .	7
Patrick Bruun	The Disappearance of Sol from the Coins of Constantine	15
Johan Chydenius	Nathan the Prophet in Dante's Paradiso . . .	38
Reino Hakamies	Remarques lexicographiques sur le latin médié- val de Finlande	42
Karl-Erik Henriksson	Epigraphica Christiana Vaticana	52
Iiro Kajanto	Notes on Livy's Conception of History	55
Edwin Linkomies	De textu Petroniano recensendo	64
Eino Mikkola	»Schole» bei Aristoteles	68
Päivö Oksala	»Fides» und »Pietas» bei Catull	88
Erkki Palmén	Die lateinischen pronominalen Ortsadverbien in Kasusbedeutung.	104
T. Steinby	A Pontifical Document	143
Jaakko Suolahti	The Council of L. Cornelius P. f. Crus in the Year 49 B.C.	152
J. Svennung	Numerierung von Fabrikaten und anderen Ge- genständen im römischen Altertum	164
Holger Thesleff	On the Origin of the Genitive Absolute	187
Rolf Westman	Textkritisches zu Senecas Dialogen	208
Henrik Zilliacus	<i>Τραγωδία</i> und <i>δρᾶμα</i> in metaphorischer Bedeu- tung	217

A PONTIFICAL DOCUMENT

Torsten Steinby

Dionysios of Halicarnassus introduces his version of the year of the foundation of Rome with (1, 74, 3) οὐ γὰρ ἠξίουν ὡς Πολύβιος ὁ Μεγαλοπόλιτης τοσοῦτο μόνον εἰπεῖν, ὅτι κατὰ τὸ δεύτερον ἔτος τῆς ἐβδόμης ὀλυμπιάδος τὴν Ῥώμην ἐκτίσθαι πείθομαι, οὐδ' ἐπὶ τοῦ παρὰ τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσι¹ κειμένου πίνακος ἐνὸς καὶ μόνου τὴν πίστιν ἀβασάνιστον καταλιπεῖν, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἐπιλογισμούς, οἷς αὐτὸς προσεθέμην, εἰς μέσον ὑπευθύνους τοῖς βουλευθεῖσιν ἔσομένους ἐξενεγκεῖν.

The discussion around this passage has first and foremost sought to establish what Dionysios intended by ὁ πίναξ, what status this had in the pontifical writings, when it originated, what content it had, where Dionysios found his information about it, and what personal knowledge he had of it. In connection with these problems, there appears the importance it had for the Roman chronology. The conceptions of the problem have followed separate lines without unanimity being attained.

A number have wished to see in ὁ πίναξ a written memorial, with which Dionysios was personally acquainted. This induced HIRSCHFELD to assume that it must mean what are known as the Capitoline *fasti* inscribed on the walls of Regia.² This opinion has also met with approval among new research workers, amongst other things because in Dionysios' exposition of the year in which Rome was founded there has been seen an expression of the scholarship of the Augustan period, not that of the second century B.C.³ For reasons which are purely external, however, HIRSCHFELD's assumption cannot be maintained, since it has been made clear that the *Fasti Capitolini* were not engraved on the wall in

¹ The manuscripts have the inexplicable ἀγχιστεῦσι. The conjecture is made by NIEBUHR in his *Römische Geschichte*, and has been generally accepted. However, compare with L. CANTARELLI, *Origine degli «annales maximi»* (*Rivista di Filologia e d'Istruzione Classica* 26), 1898, 220 n. 2 (reprinted in *Studi Romani e Bizantini*, Roma 1915).

² O. HIRSCHFELD, *Die kapitolinische Fasten* (*Hermes* 9), 1875, 107; L. HOLZAPFEL, *Römische Chronologie*, 171.

³ M. GELZER, *Der Anfang römischer Geschichtschreibung* (*Hermes* 69), 1934, 52.

Regia, but on the Arch of Augustus.¹ This is not applicable to $\delta \pi \acute{\iota} \nu \alpha \xi$ which is said to have been in the custody — $\kappa \epsilon \acute{\iota} \mu \epsilon \nu \omicron \varsigma$ — of the pontiffs, that is to say inside a building.

Another tendency² involved that $\delta \pi \acute{\iota} \nu \alpha \xi$ in Dionysios referred to *annales maximi*, the codification of the contents of the pontifical tablets, which took place during the pontificate of P. Mucius Scaevola, circa 123 B.C.³ As *annales maximi* must be regarded as a comprehensive book edition, it could not, however, acceptably be designated as »the single tablet», and thus it is out of the question that Dionysios was thinking of them.

Nevertheless, the idea of $\delta \pi \acute{\iota} \nu \alpha \xi$ as some form of annals, even if older in date than that of Mucius Scaevola, came to dominate the discussion. In the final event, it is intimately connected with the observation of MOMMSEN,⁴ that »die Grundzüge der Erzählung in der älteren römischen Geschichte und namentlich deren Quasichronologie mit unwandelbarer Festigkeit auftreten».

From this, he drew the conclusion that the picture of the most ancient history of Rome was necessitated by an editing of the fairy tale material of even before the beginning of the literary period, when the first historians started to work on it. He brought back this editing »auf die älteste im Schosse des Pontificalcollegiums entstandene und zu verschiedenen Zeiten ergänzte und umgearbeitete Stadtchronik».⁵ The theory of an early edition of the pontifical writings was then elaborated by ENMANN.⁶ He rejected the generally held opinion that Mucius Scaevola's edition of the pontifical records was to be considered the first and only official edition of the pontifical annals, and endeavoured to prove the necessity of assuming the existence of an earlier edition prior to the oldest of the private historical writings. Enmann imagined this edition as being in book form.

KORNEMANN developed the theory in another way. He called attention to

¹ Cf. A. DEGRASSI, *Inscriptiones Italiae* 13, Roma 1947, p. XIII.

² L. IDELER, *Handbuch der mathematischen und technologischen Chronologie* 2, Berlin 1826, 162 n. 2.

³ Cf. Cicero, *de oratore* 2, 12, 52—53; Servius Dan. ad Aen. 1, 373; Macrobius, *saturnalia* 3, 2, 17.

⁴ TH. MOMMSEN, *Die Römische Chronologie bis auf Caesar*, 2nd ed., Berlin 1859, 137; *Römische Geschichte* 1, 8th ed., 463. This theory has not found general acceptance: see, e.g., G. DE SANCTIS, *Storia dei Romani* 1, Torino 1907, 16; C. CICHORIUS, *Annales* (RE 1), 1894, 2255.

⁵ MOMMSEN, R. G., l.c., presumes a date at the end of the fourth century.

⁶ A. ENMANN, *Die älteste Redaction der Pontificalannalen* (*Rheinisches Museum* 57), 1902, 517. Earlier, O. SEECK, in *Die Kalendertafel der Pontifices*, Berlin 1885, 74, suggested a series of editions between the Gallic Fire and Mucius Scaevola.

ὁ παρὰ τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσι κείμενος πίναξ in Dionysios having a parallel in the known fragment from Cato's *Origines*, which is quoted by Gellius (2, 28, 6) *quod in tabula apud pontificem maximum est*¹, and explained that both of the quotations, which are in literal agreement, must mean the same thing.² Now he maintained³ that the *tabula* — ὁ πίναξ was the most ancient edition of the pontifical annals, and that it constituted a wooden codex consisting of separate *tabulae*.⁴ This reference to ὁ πίναξ as an early edition has, without sufficient reason, been adopted by some recent students.⁵ Nevertheless, the theory is undemonstrable⁶, and Dionysios knew nothing of such a pontifical chronicle. The argument with Greek parallels stated by KORNEMANN is not by any means convincing.⁷

The same must be said of the opinion pronounced on this question by LEUZE⁸ — without parallels with Cato's *tabula*. Certainly he considers that it is a matter of a piece of pontifical writing, not however a list expanded into a chronicle, but the first officially edited complete list of magistrates, »die reine Eponymenliste, die offizielle Aufzeichnung aller sich ablösenden Beamte».⁹ This list, which has not yet, with a view to chronology, been edited by means of adjustment of calendar years and years of office, he believes he has found once again¹⁰ in Dionysios (11, 62, 3) ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν τε καὶ ἀποθέτων βίβλων of which βίβλοι in its turn is generally regarded as identical with that mentioned by Livius (4, 7, 12) *lintei libri ad Monetae*.¹¹ This sign of equality between the »sacred, hidden books» and the one and only tablet deposited with

¹ H. PETER, *Historicorum Romanorum reliquiae* 1, 2nd ed., Lipsiae 1914, 73, fragm. 77.

² The identity had already been established by E. HÜBNER, *Die Annales maximi der Römer* (*Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* 79), Leipzig 1859, 414; 419. Cf. SEECK, *op.c.*, 64; PETER, *rel.*, p. XVIII.

³ E. KORNEMANN, *Die älteste Form der Pontifikalannalen* (*Klio* 11), 1911, 249; *Der Pristercodex in Regia und die Entstehung der altrömischen Pseudogeschichte*, Tübingen 1912, 11.

⁴ Cf. W. SOLTAU, *Die Annales maximi* (*Philologus* 55), 1896, 264; 274; *Das pontifikale Jahrbuch und seine Rekonstruktion* (*Historische Vierteljahrsschrift* 1914), 322.

⁵ R. LAQUEUR, *Lokalchronik* (*RE* 13), 1926, 1090; C. W. WESTRUP, *On the antiquarian-historiographical activities of the Roman pontifical College* (*Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser* 16, 3), København 1929, 34.

⁶ GELZER, *op.c.*, 54.

⁷ GELZER, *op.c.*, 51; J. E. A. CRAKE, *The Annals of the Pontifex Maximus* (*Classical Philology* 35), 1940, 382. Cf. F. LEO, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* 1, Berlin 1913, 43 n. 4; F. ALTHEIM, *Epochen der römischen Geschichte* (*Frankfurter Studien zur Religion und Kultur der Antike* 12), Limburg an der Lahn 1935, 312.

⁸ O. LEUZE, *Die römische Jahrzahlung*, Tübingen 1909, 157 n. 193; 197.

⁹ *Op.c.*, 198.

¹⁰ *Op.c.*, 190.

¹¹ Cf. Livius 4, 13, 7; 4, 20, 8; 4, 23, 2; 10, 38, 6.

the pontiffs is without a doubt precipitate. It is of course certainly correct that *libri lintei* also incorporated the eponyms¹, but in part *ὁ πίναξ* is not appropriate for these »linen books»; the latter were clearly not in the direct custody of the pontiffs.²

Just as diversified as the theories concerned with *ὁ πίναξ* really were, are the conceptions of which authority Dionysios actually had in mind.

To NIEBUHR, it stood out clearly that it was a question of Polybios. He assumed that this followed the pontifical time table in Roman chronology.³ This is the explanation of his conjecture. The word which Polybios uses for *pontifex* is *ἀρχιερεύς*.⁴ Dionysios never makes use of this term, but speaks of *ἱεροφάνται*⁵, when he wishes to translate *ποντίφικες*. NIEBUHR's conclusion that Dionysios was, in the place in question, basing his opinion on Polybios, appeared so self-evident that the common opinion among research workers earlier included this⁶, even in cases in which unhesitating acceptance was not accorded to Niebuhr's opinion of the basis for Polybios' Roman chronology. Nevertheless, Polybios' authority on this point has been violently disputed by several research workers.⁷ HIRSCHFELD reasoned thus⁸, that Dionysios distinguished between two different sources of information of the point of time for the foundation of Rome, that is to say the one given by Polybios, and that stated by *ὁ πίναξ*. His point of departure was that Polybios' dating did not originate from Roman, but from Greek sources. The supporting texts he quotes⁹ are nevertheless not convincing. LEUZE¹⁰ also considers that in

¹ F. CORNELIUS, *Untersuchungen zur frühen römischen Geschichte*, München 1940, 52; K. HANELL, *Das altrömische eponyme Amt* (Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Rom, Series in 8^o, 2), Lund 1946, 203 n. 129.

² Cf. CORNELIUS, *op.c.*, 52.

³ B. G. NIEBUHR, *Römische Geschichte* (Neue Ausgabe von M. ISLER 1), Berlin 1873, 198: »... Chronologie der Pontifices... Ich sage nach der Pontifices: denn ihre Zeittafel hatte Polybios für die römische Geschichte angenommen...»

⁴ Polybios 23 (22), 1, 2; 32, 22 (6), 5.

⁵ Not *ἱερομνήμονες*, as stated by NIEBUHR, *l.c.*, n. 56. Cf. Dionysios 2, 73, 3.

⁶ LEUZE, *op.c.*, 168 mentions Fischer, Mommsen, Nissen, Unger, Matzat, Seeck, Soltau, Ed. Meyer, Cichorius and Enmann. Further here can be quoted, e.g., F. LUTERBACHER, *Der Prodigien glaube und Prodigienstil der Römer* (Jahresbericht über das Gymnasium in Burgdorf), 1904, 10; H. A. SANDERS, *The Chronology of Early Rome* (Classical Philology 3), 1908, 329; G. COSTA, *I fasti consolari Romani* 1, Milano 1910, 1, 37 n. 2; PETER, *rel.*, p. XXIII; M. SCHANZ—C. HOSIUS, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* 1 (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 8, 1), 1927, 30; W. ROLLO, *Archivum Historicum Romanum*, London 1930, 167.

⁷ E.g. IDELER, *l.c.*; HOLZAPFEL, *l.c.*; LEUZE, *op.c.*, 168; KORNEMANN, *Die älteste Form...*, 245; WESTRUP, *op.c.*, 33; CRAKE, *op.c.*, 376.

⁸ *Op.c.*, 106.

⁹ Cicero, *de re p.* 2, 10, 13; Solinus 1, 27.

¹⁰ *Op.c.*, 169.

his statement Dionysios distinguishes between Polybios and *ὁ πίναξ*. The latter he regarded¹ as the pontifical eponym list, and, as Dionysios' authority for the chronological exposition he puts instead of Polybios the annalist L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi, with whose chronology Dionysios is in agreement on a number of points. As Piso has been considered as a main source for Dionysios' presentation of the time of the kings, this opinion has met with approval. In according this approval, however, one has overlooked that the agreement between the chronology of Dionysios and that of Piso in other connections than that in question does not need to be decisive as far as this point is concerned. The acceptance of Leuze's conception has in several cases led later research workers to presume that *ὁ πίναξ* was related to Piso.² HOLZAPFEL³ is in agreement that Polybios cannot be the authority in question, but shows convincingly that it cannot be Piso either. For his part, he is of the opinion, as concerns the designation *ἀρχιερεῦς* for *pontifex*, that Dionysios must have followed a publication in Greek which had made use of this word. Had Dionysios' example been in Latin, he would naturally have translated *pontifex* by *ιεροφάντης*⁴. His observation is correct, but the conclusion drawn therefrom, that Dionysios' authority was presumably the Greek-writing senator C. Acilius is even more undemonstrable than the theory of Piso. In any case, the result of the discussion appears to be that the most recent research workers have in general silently written off Polybios' authority.

LEUZE'S theory is in the last event dependent on the conception that it is »ein kardinaler Irrtum der vulgären Auffassung der römischen Chronologie, zu meinen, die Pontifices hätten die römische Zeitrechnung gemacht. Nicht die Priester haben das getan, sondern die Historiker».⁵ He certainly acknowledges that »die amtliche Registrierung der obersten Jahresbeamten ist wohl von Anfang an Sache der Pontifices gewesen und ist es immer geblieben»⁶, but sharply disputes the interpretation⁷ that the employment of the eponym lists for year calculations should have proceeded from the pontiffs. His view does not, however, coincide with the general picture⁸ we have of the pontifical

¹ See above, p. 145.

² KORNE MANN, *Die älteste Form . . .*, 247; WESTRUP, *op.c.*, 33; CRAKE, *op.c.*, 376.

³ L. HOLZAPFEL, *Zur römischen Chronologie (Klio 12)*, 1912, 99.

⁴ *Op.c.*, 101.

⁵ *Op.c.*, 197.

⁶ *Op.c.*, 275.

⁷ See, e.g., NIEBUHR, *l.c.*; MOMMSEN, *R. Chr.*, 210; SEECK, *op.c.*, 161.

⁸ HANELL, *op.c.*, 120; V. PÖSCHL, *Die Einigung Italiens durch Rom (Historia Mundi 3)*, Bern 1954, 459.

activity with a view to preserving the ancient tradition, let alone that the detailed working out of the Roman chronology hardly fell, as a rule, within this field of activity.

The various attempts to explain away Polybios' authority as regards Dionysios 1, 74, 3 have not been successful. An unprejudiced examination of the position of the text appears in fact to show that by *ὁ πίναξ* Dionysios actually had in mind something which Polybios quoted¹ as a support for his determination of the year of the foundation of Rome. That he does not go more deeply into this, is explained in full by the references therein made to the special chronological treatise, in which he had »shown how the Roman chronology is to be synchronised with that of the Greeks».² In this special treatise³, he has clearly in detail analysed the circumstances which constituted the basis for his synchronised table. In comparison with the previous flourishing contempt for Dionysios as a chronologer⁴, Leuze⁵ has pointed out his great chronological interest, and the care he exercised to attain exact chronological determinations. In this connection, it was thus completely natural that he gave special attention to Polybios' results. This contribution to Roman chronology was very highly valued, as is evident in Cicero (de re p. 1, 21, 34) *sequamur enim potissimum Polybium nostrum, quo nemo fuit in exquirendis temporibus diligentior*. Polybios himself bears witness of how for his historical work he also collected material in archives and libraries.⁶

Dionysios 1, 74, 3 indicates that Polybios also established acquaintance with original pontifical documents⁷, or at least knew of a *πίναξ* kept in pontifical hands, which gained a major importance in his determination of the year Rome was founded.

What this tablet had as contents cannot be decided. As the variation in the chronologies of Polybios and Dionysios only concerns the time before the Gallic fire, the information as to time which was to be obtained from *ὁ πίναξ* really must belong to this period. As LEUZE⁸ has pointed out, the difference between the two systems is ultimately relating to chronography and not to chronology. Both placed the establishment of the Republic as being in the

¹ Possibly in the lost parts of the sixth book of his work on history.

² Dionysios 1, 74, 2.

³ It is quoted as late as by Clemens of Alexandria, Stromateis 1, 102, as *Χρόνοι*.

⁴ Cf., e.g., MOMMSEN, R. Chr., 304.

⁵ Op.c., 178.

⁶ Cf. 10, 6, 7.

⁷ PETER, rel., p. XXII.

⁸ Op.c., 199.

Olympic year 68.1¹, but while Polybios in his synchronised table assigned this year to the time of the kings, Dionysios ascribed it to the Republic.

For that reason, Dionysios needed another consulate in his table. As for the time of the kings, both followed Q. Fabius Pictor's quasi-chronology, which comprised 244 years. Dionysios, thanks to the supplement in the eponym list, antedates the foundation date by one year.² In his calculation of the period between the Gallic fire and backward to the first consuls of Rome following upon the overthrow of the kings, Dionysios cites a censor's document³ which he states derives from an old family archive, and which contains dating after both consuls and the total of years after the expulsion of the kings. In his chronological survey in 1, 74—75, this document stands as a kind of parallel or counterpart to *ὁ πίνναξ* which Polybios had adduced.

The position which *ὁ πίνναξ* had within the pontifical manuscripts is difficult to settle. A popular juxtaposition is made by the *tabula apud pontificem maximum* mentioned by Cato.⁴ In the opinion of many⁵ it is, however, nothing other than the *tabula dealbata* of which Servius speaks.⁶ The thought is attractive, but can scarcely be proved.⁷ Neither can *ὁ πίνναξ* — for lack of more detailed information — be identified with the pontifical year-book⁸ or annals table — *liber annalis*⁹ — besides the *fasti consulares*, the existence of which has been supposed by a number of research workers.¹⁰ Much rather is it a question of an isolated document, to judge from the designation by Dionysios of the tablet as *εἶς* and *μόνος*.

It can in any case be positively laid down that in the archives of the pontiffs, in the middle of the second century B.C., there was in existence an obviously very old document in a tablet, which included a dating which could be utilised chronographically. This showed that the pontiffs were not unfamiliar with chronological calculations.¹¹ This would indicate that they possessed a synchronised table with dating not only according to eponyms but also to era.

¹ 507 B.C.

² 751 B.C., against 750 B.C. according to Polybios.

³ Dionysios 1, 74, 5—6.

⁴ See above, p. 145.

⁵ Cf. CICHORIUS, *op.c.*, 2248; ROLLO, *l.c.*; CRAKE, *op.c.*, 376.

⁶ Servius Dan. ad Aen. 1, 373.

⁷ KORNEMANN, *op.c.*, 246: »Damit kommen wir zu dem sehr interessanten Resultat, dass zwei Autoren (Cato and Piso) des zweiten Jahrhunderts den *πίνναξ* (*tabula*) zitieren.

⁸ SOLTAU, *Die Annales maximi*, 248 n. 3; 268.

⁹ MOMMSEN, *R. G.*, 463.

¹⁰ GELZER, *op.c.*, 54.

¹¹ See above, 147, with reference to LEUZE's disputing of this.

Which era this could have been in such a case is near to hand. It could not acceptably have been a question of a dating *ab urbe condita*, as various research workers have wished to assert.¹ Such a dating must in the main, when it appears, be late, at the earliest after the year of foundation had been fixed through the most ancient chronographers², and thus not before the second century. In any event, it is an era of secondary type.

The primary thing in a question of reckoning by the era is dating *post reges exactos*, of the type which Dionysios 1, 74, 5—6, quotes in connection with the censor record, or *post aedem Capitolinam dedicatam*, similar to Cn. Flavius' known dedication inscription³ from 304 B.C. After Dionysios there has been a desire⁴ to regard the first mentioned basis for calculation as a peculiarity in the censor's official documents.⁵ The material is nevertheless too scanty to permit of more than a guess. As far as the employment of the inauguration of the Capitoline Temple as an epoch date is concerned, the material is no richer.

First and foremost, it should however be established that both the indications of time *post reges exactos* and *post Capitolinam dedicatam* from a positive and a practical point of view coincide in time. The former can much rather be regarded as a kind of synonym for the latter, and presumably in order to substitute for the year of inauguration of the temple by an epoch date more outstanding politically. However, the dedication of the Capitoline Temple was in itself an epochal date in Roman history.⁶ As the eponym list beginning s connected hereto, the dedicator of the Temple, M. Horatius, also became the first eponym. At about the same time, there was also introduced the new

¹ SEECK, op.c., 65, cf. MOMMSEN, *Römische Forschungen* 2, 2nd ed., Berlin 1879, 65 n. 7; CICHORIUS, op.c., 2251; LUTERBACHER, l.c.; ROLLO, op.c., 167. Cf. E. LAMBERT, *La question de l'authenticité des XII tables et les Annales maximi* (*Nouvelle revue historique de droit français et étranger* 26), 1902, 191.

² LEUZE, op.c., 293.

³ Plinius, n.h. 33, 19. This dating takes up, exceptionally, only the Capitoline era without the names of the consuls. This was an exception, as HANELL, op.cit., 121, has shown, entailed by reasons of party politics.

⁴ LEUZE, op.c., 296.

⁵ LEUZE, op.c., 297. distinguishes, and rightfully, from this the datings *post reges exactos*, which are to be met in later authors such as Cicero, Varro, Dionysios and Tacitus. They cannot be regarded as remnants from an era from the time before the calculation *ab urbe condita* became common. They are all concerned with events which in time lay near to the expulsion of the kings, or where there was special interest in marking the lapse of time from the beginning of the Republic.

⁶ HANELL, op.c., 116: »Es wurde der neue Hauptkult des Staates inauguriert und zusammen damit eine neue Zeitrechnung eingeführt, die an den Tag der Dedikation anschliesst. Man kann in der Tat von einer wahrhaften kapitolinischen Ära sprechen.»

Roman pre-Caesar calendar.¹ The Temple, the calendar and the eponym list were in the custody of the Pontifical College. It would be almost remarkable if the pontiffs at a later time did not have a calculation in eras after this sweeping change in cult, time determination and administration. Another thing is then that on the basis of ordinary convention in times of classical antiquity, in everyday affairs calculations were not made in eras, but most generally after eponyms. But there was an era, and this was clearly *post dedicatam Capitolinam*.²

That in the care of the Pontifical College there was some old document, a *πίναξ* which adopted this era, is thus not surprising. It must have had a double dating, in using both the eponyms of the year, the consuls, and the year corresponding to era.³ This also means that it was an isolated monument, not a link in a series such as the above mentioned⁴ *tabula dealbata*. Otherwise, the designation of era would have certainly left several traces of itself in the writing of history as this came into existence.

¹ M. P. NILSSON, *Zur Frage von dem Alter des vorcäsarischen Kalenders* (Strena philologica Upsaliensis. Festschrift tillägnad professor Per Persson), Upsala 1922, 131.

² With reference to *clavus annalis*, and the exaggerated role ascribed to it in the calculation of the Capitoline time, see HANELL, *op.c.*, 140.

³ Cn. Flavius' temple dedication was, as regards the dating, unprecedented. In order to elicit the date according to the Capitoline era, one hardly needed, as has been assumed, to reckon it oneself (cf. HANELL, *op.c.*, 124). The sacred year of foundation must already have been discovered fixed by the pontiffs.

⁴ See above, p. 149.