

“ROMAN STUDIES IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY” (1970)

In this, the first Lily Ross Taylor Lecture to be held without Miss Taylor, we meet in the shadow of a great sorrow and a keenly felt loss. Colleagues, students and other friends alike will long miss that vivid presence, the immediate impact of a personality so warm, eager, and full of vitality, and the person so generous in approval and so firm, frank and wise in criticism, who was ever a friend of all who sincerely strive for knowledge. We can still take some satisfaction and comfort in contemplating a life so rich and full in experience and honors, and so splendid an achievement in teaching and scholarship; and we can each cherish a memory that enriches us as we remember it.

My subject this afternoon is not concerned with Miss Taylor's honors, offices and personal distinction,—she did want the usual eulogies and memorials—but with the setting of her scholarly achievement, with the movements, and trends with which it was connected, the problems that were posed, and the advances to which she contributed. In these she spent a great part of her life. For her it was fun and recreation to tackle a tough scholarly problem, to analyze sources, to compare and test interpretations, and to us it was a rewarding experience to watch her mind in action as she did it. The attainment of truth was one of her most serious concerns. In the effort to attain it she spared no pains and was unremittingly strict in her criticism of herself and others. It is in this belief that she would approve of a discussion of these matters that I come to them, and will try to speak of them, and her part in them as best I can. May I begin with some remarks about the study of Roman History and Institutions in the early part of this century not far from the

time when Miss Taylor, then an undergraduate at Wisconsin, changed her major from Mathematics to Classics, and decided to become a graduate student at Bryn Mawr.

Since the latter part of the last century the dominating figure in the field of Roman History and Institutions has been Theodor Mommsen. One of the greatest of contemporary ancient historians, Arnaldo Momigliano, has thus characterized his contribution: "As for Roman History, it was put solidly on its feet a century ago by Theodor Mommsen and nobody has yet succeeded in turning it upside down." With Miss Taylor it was not a matter of turning it upside down, even on the infrequent occasions when she disagreed with his conclusions. For in the many volumes of his works (there are over 1500 items in his published bibliography) there was laid a foundation to which she kept returning with respect and admiration for his vast knowledge and his balanced critical judgments. You can imagine the mixture of startled amusement and admiration we felt in our turn when we discovered her using a period of enforced inactivity in the hospital to read through the three stout volumes in legal German (there is no translation into English) of Mommsen's *Roman Public Law*.

What was the nature of the foundation? Apart from the *Roman History to the Death of Caesar* which made him famous, Mommsen left us three great monuments. The first is *Roman Public Law*. In this he gathered the vast quantity of often minute pieces of evidence on all periods from early Rome until the fall regarding Roman practice (the Romans had many laws but no written constitution and they left us no specific treatises), and organized it in terms of political conceptions, such as *Imperium* and *Potestas*, and of continuing institutions such as magistrates, the senate and the assemblies. Such a work, comprehensive and descriptive, had only been partly done before, and has stood as a magnificent base for the study of political institutions and practices. The second, which had occupied him in some form almost all his active life, was the huge collection known as the *Corpus of Latin Inscriptions (CIL)*, for which he had been preparing in some sense ever since he was a student in Rome in 1844-1847.

From the publication of the first volume in 1863 until his death in 1903, volumes kept appearing (he called *CIL* his original sin), many of them prepared and all of them edited by himself, and issues have continued up to the present. In these sixteen folio volumes and their numer-

ous supplements are published copies of the Latin inscriptions from all the Roman Empire inscribed on stone, wood, metal and terra cotta, which have been preserved from antiquity or have been recorded by earlier travellers and investigators. The ancients committed more of their manifold record to such materials than we do. Here one finds the records of actions in public and private life, dedications to gods and emperors, sacred rites and festivals, laws, decrees of the senate, the titles, offices, and careers of imperial, senatorial, equestrian and municipal personages, minutes of societies and clubs, poems and epitaphs. Expressions of all the varied interests of literature, and only partly literate, humanity are represented there, ready for scholars to exploit.

Right at the beginning of her career in her dissertation on the *Cults of Ostia* Miss Taylor was plunged into this collection, for the evidence is almost wholly epigraphical. It is said that when she published her dissertation the Bryn Mawr copy of that volume of *CIL* was ready for rebinding. Her study is one example of the exploitation of the material in *CIL* which Mommsen himself knew he had merely begun when in 1885 he published the third great monument, *The Provinces of the Roman Empire from Caesar to Diocletian*, which opened up a new vista for Roman studies. From largely inscriptional sources, at that time familiar to few besides himself, he distilled a vivid description of the peoples of the Empire outside of Italy. There stood revealed the life of the peoples in all the variety of tribes and cities, customs and religions, the progress of romanization, and the changes in their relation to the Roman regime. Thus the Empire was presented to his time as a constructive and significant period of enduring importance in the shaping of the history of the West.

Mommsen's achievements in the *Roman Public Law* and in the *Corpus* were of immediate importance to Miss Taylor's work, but in the *Provinces* too there was implied a sentiment which was closely analogous to her own feeling. Mommsen turned away from the court historians of the emperors, the "dismal mendacity of our tradition for the third century and the barren inanity of the second" (I am translating his own words) and searched for a means of discovering "the history of mankind under the Roman Emperors." Through the inscriptions and the in the provinces he found it. Apart from and excursion into one aspect of Hellenistic backgrounds, Miss Taylor restricted her published work very largely to the period of the later Roman Republic and the Augustan Age,

and geographically to the Rome and Italy she knew and loved, but in all her research and writing, as in her personal associations, there was an abiding interest in the people, from senators to slaves, of every age and condition, and in the functioning of their social and political relationships. There was also the historical imagination necessary to present them truly within their setting. Hence, for example, such studies in her later career as "Foreign Groups in Roman Politics in the Late Republic" and "Freedmen and Freeborn in the Epitaphs of Imperial Rome." Consistent with this was her insistence in her writing and her teaching alike on conveying to readers and students the feeling that they were present at the scene of action. "My aim," she often said, "is to make my students feel that they are walking the streets of Rome and seeing and thinking what Romans saw and thought." Few have possessed the energy and vivacity, the combination of knowledge and imagination required to do this well, but in turning away from the massive, and fundamental, collections and the relatively schematic descriptions of Mommsen's work to a more dynamic emphasis, so entirely natural to her, on how institutions work and how people function and develop in them, she belonged to the generation of his successors.

It was with that generation that the development of a more sociological point of view, of newer interests in social and economic history, began to have a marked influence on Roman studies. The possibilities in the study of the inscriptions were more fully realized, while the then still infant study of papyrology, encouraged by Mommsen in his later years, joined with the former to produce a greater awareness of the interaction throughout the Empire, and particularly in the eastern provinces, of the differing customs and systems of law of the different peoples. The conclusions brought evidence of compromises between local and Roman law which were at variance with Mommsen's own emphasis on the supremacy of the Roman. The welter of varied, and sometimes conflicting, religions, religious rites and institutions called for collection of evidence and comparative methods. And the vast extent of new finds, archaeological and inscriptional, as exploration and excavation proceeded in Rome, Italy and the provinces of the Empire, kept adding to the evidence available and demanding evaluation.

At the beginning of Miss Taylor's career, the great scholar who directed her thesis, Tenney Frank, was rethinking the problem of Roman Imperialism (his book under that title appeared in 1914) and laying the

foundations for his *Economic History of Rome*, which was hailed as a pioneer work when it first appeared in 1920. Miss Taylor told me how questions on these matters came to mind as he and she reviewed together her work on the people of the port of Ostia. Rostovtzeff, after beginning with important archaeological papers on Syria, Egypt and Italy, rose to fame through his *History of the Public Lease in the Roman Empire to Diocletian* (1902) and his studies in the *History of the Roman Colonate* (1910) and, though interrupted by the Russian revolution, was working toward his great *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*. The splendidly comprehensive and critical history of Rome by Gaetano de Sanctis was in mid-career. The foundations for a study of the population of Italy had already been laid by Beloch, and for the historical geography of Italy by Nissen. Dennis' survey of the topography and monuments of Etruria had long since become a classic. Interest in the topography and monuments of the city of Rome had been greatly stirred by the vivid writings of Rodolfo Lanciani, and their study was firmly based through him and the topographical treatises of Jordan, Huelsen, Platner and Ashby. New finds were reported almost every day. In the field of Roman religion developments were no less impressive. Wissowa's *Religion und Cultus der Römer* appeared in its classic second edition in 1912, Warde Fowler's *Religious Experience of the Roman People* in 1911 and his *Roman Festivals* in 1916. Franz Cumont was already becoming famous for his studies of the Oriental cults, while his *Oriental Cults in Roman Paganism* first appeared in 1911. And the Director of the American School of Classical Studies, Jesse Benedict Carter, who suggested to Miss Taylor in 1910 her investigation of the cults of Ostia, was engaged in his studies of early Roman religion. It was an exciting period for the young student in Rome in 1909 and 1910, and, after the interruption of the First World War when she served with the Red Cross in Italy, for the Academy Fellow of 1919-1920.

Thus was laid the foundation for a group of scientific scholarly interests which continued and combined throughout her life with remarkable consistency. The most immediate interest was the religious institutions of the port of Ostia, and the city of Rome. Another was the people whom they served, Roman, Italian and foreign. A third was the topography and monuments of Rome. She was never tired of visiting and revisiting old and new among these. And a fourth is shown in her insistence on seeing them in their social and political setting, while keeping

the people of Italy in view. It was natural therefore for her to join in an American Academy enterprise for a series of regional studies of the cults of ancient Italy. The survey presented in *Local Cults of Etruria* involved thorough personal travel, with Dennis in hand, to sites and monuments, and the effort to reconstruct the religious history of Etruria, town by town, from the scattered and fragmentary literary, epigraphical and archaeological evidence. The whole was in its time (1923) a significant contribution to our knowledge of that still mysterious land and people, even though it demonstrated how little that was purely Etruscan actually survived.

During these years another problem had been coming to the fore. A series of books on the history and civilization of the Hellenistic East, studies by Kaerst and Wilcken, and, particularly in English, those of Tarn and Ferguson, had been drawing attention to the forms and the ideas connected with the worship of the kings as gods of the state. These in general had restricted their treatment to the ancient oriental background and the development of the divine monarchy among the successors of Alexander the Great. Of immediate interest to Roman studies was the question of the influence of the Hellenistic institution on Rome and the Roman adaptation of it, a process made evident by the deification of Julius Caesar and the gradual association of sacred rites with Augustus himself, even considerably before his death and deification. In several articles dating from 1914 and afterwards Miss Taylor analyzed particular institutions connected with the sacred honors for Augustus, such as the Augustales. But in 1919 Eduard Meyer's book *Caesar's Monarchy and Pompey's Principate* brought the question into sharp relief. It presented with full circumstantiality the controversial view that the acts performed and the honors accepted by Caesar at the end of his career in the years of his dictatorships deliberately looked to the establishment of himself in Rome, where so many of the old governing class had an ancestral hatred of the word *rex*, as a divine monarch of the Hellenistic type. Out of the controversy which arose came Miss Taylor's next book, *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor*. Characteristically, she took a firm, definite stand, with a clear view of the importance of the problem. "Caesar," she wrote, "was the first divine monarch in Rome, and Augustus gave the divinity of the ruler the form under which it was destined to endure for three centuries." It was also characteristic that she approached it as a study of process in the development of the feel-

ings and ideas of the people. What was the Roman background? Were there any signs of forerunners? How did Hellenistic influences come in? And among whom? What were the stages that led to the acceptance until Augustus, who claimed to be merely the first citizen of a restored *res publica*, was enshrined as one of the protecting gods of the Roman state? What did the place thus attained mean to the classes and masses of the Empire, grateful for the Imperial peace? And what was the model he created for future emperors? Her answers to these questions, based firmly on a skilled combination of religious, political, inscriptional and archaeological evidence, produced a book that has remained a notable contribution.

But enough was enough. Once the cult became a formal convention, used by courtiers and petitioners as a form of flattery, and for some emperors a source of delusion, Miss Taylor lost interest, even while recognizing how far that cult remained a symbol of imperial unity and how strong was the popular feeling that their welfare depended on the emperor's provident care: the responsibility which one emperor called a "noble servitude." "I have no interest," she said, "in cataloguing the forms of flattery," and "I abandoned the study of ruler-cult when it was in danger of affecting my sanity." Sane, above all, she remained.

Roman religious institutions, the priesthoods and the public cult, are so essentially a part of Roman public life that a transition to the general study of Roman politics was easily made. Nor should one forget her lifelong interest in political events and contemporary social and political developments. Moreover, there was the attraction of the dominating figure of Caesar among his contemporaries. Hence came the series of brief articles on such subjects as "Cicero's Aedileship" (1939), "The Election of the Pontifex Maximus in the Late Republic" (Caesar had won a surprising electoral upset in 63), and her presidential address (1942) to the American Philological Association on "Caesar and the Nobility". Then came the excitements of another new discovery. The long lists of the names of the highest magistrates of Rome and their triumphs through five centuries of the Roman Republic and the Augustan Age, fragments of which had been turning up since the Renaissance (many of us have seen them in Michelangelo's setting in the Palazzo dei Conservatori), and known from Mommsen's publication, were shown by both Miss Taylor and Professor Attilio Degrassi, working independently, to have once been displayed on the arch which Augustus erected in the Forum to

celebrate the return of the captured legionary standards from the Parthians. This discovery and Degraffi's splendid republication of the lists turned her attention strongly once more to the meaning of the great parade of names included there: patrician and plebeian families, new men and men ennobled generations before, who there and in Livy's history represented for us the governing class and the makers of Roman history. But I must now turn back to an earlier period and sketch another element in the background of her later work.

Studies begun early in this century had created a new, more social and dynamic conception of the composition and relationships of that narrow and exclusive governing class which managed through centuries to win elections, keep the control of the highest offices in the state, and the leadership of the senate, while new men remained exceptions who, like Cato the Censor, usually received their opportunity through noble support. The new point of view is best expressed in the works of Matthias Gelzer, who began it all with his *Nobility of the Roman Republic* in 1912. He wrote: "In his classic work on the *Roman Public Law* Mommsen presented the juristic forms and the presumptions of the political life of the Romans with unsurpassable mastery. But political life becomes fully understandable only through knowledge of the society that uses those constitutional forms. This is valid in general but quite especially so for ancient Rome." His discovery that the word *nobilis* was reserved for members of families that had held the consulship led to a better understanding of the power, influence and rivalries of the governing class, a deeper understanding of the significance of the conflicts for office. From this in turn evolved a picture of a society in which public as well as private life, and the whole process of attaining influence and power and winning support, depended on such largely personal relationships as friendship (*amicitia*), the performance of *officia* (the duties and attentions they owed each other), *fides*, *patrocinium* and *clientela* (the two aspects of the faithful interchange of service and protection between lesser and more highly placed men), and *hospitium*, the institution of guest-friendship which enabled leading families in Rome to extend their connections with leading families throughout Italy and the Empire. In a society with a governing class so structured the groups they formed resembled much more closely the groups within one of our modern parties, as rival candidates jockey for a nomination, than either of our great national parties. What then were the secrets of electoral success and leg-

islative leadership? This brings us to what has been called the prosopographical approach to history, a term more frequent among its critics than its practitioners. A careful analysis in detail of the relationships of individuals would provide the key to political leadership.

So Friedrich Münzer, building upon his invaluable biographies in our big classical encyclopaedia and on Gelzer's idea, saw in intermarriage between families the sign of political friendship, in collegiality in office a sign of political cooperation, as also in succession in office, since the magistrate who presided over an election had power to influence the result. Through this evidence he built up a picture of groups of families who pooled their influence, maintained inherited connections and endured for long periods as rivals of other such groups of families for the attainment of office. Münzer's study was an important contribution, but as Gelzer was one of the first to point out, he applied his criteria too rigidly, with too little regard for individual ambition, initiative, and independence. He had insufficient regard for the effect, as in the Hannibalic war, or in the civil war between Pompey and Caesar, of critical times or patriotic needs, of family solidarity and political cooperation. Families, especially in the late Republic, were demonstrably divided at times and alliances were temporary. Collegiality in office, if taken as a sole criterion, would have led us far astray on the careers of such enemies as Caesar and Bibulus. Yet the notion of a family structure supported by friendships, marriage alliances, and clientships has remained important because it is soundly based on the form and structure of Roman society, and, as recent studies by Badian and others have continued to show, it is especially rewarding when the course of history is so largely determined by a governing class. There is a striking analogy, in spite of some dissimilarities, with Sir Lewis Namier's picture of Parliament in eighteenth century England, it too based on a detailed study of personal connections, when groups in the establishment used a network of family and personal alliances to win place and office, the rewards of power. The prosopographers, as they were called, were charged with "Namierizing" Roman history. Yet a brilliant use of the method brought us in 1939 in Sir Ronald Syme's *Roman Revolution* a picture, convincing to Miss Taylor and to others, of the formation of the personal parties of Pompey, Caesar and Augustus. There were somber overtones while we read of the elimination of rivals until Rome became a one-party state

under Augustus, since we had been watching a single party become the state in Italy and Germany.

The influence of these works, and of Hermann¹ Strasburger's study of the Optimates, forced even the students of the late Republic who had reacted against an overdose of prosopography to revise their political vocabulary. The notion of two opposing parties with opposing programs which, though with some support from Sallust, had come largely from Mommsen, who—rather ironically—had used the analogy of the two parties in the British parliament system, had to be scrapped. There was no organized popular party opposed to the self-styled “good men”, the conservative Optimates, each with a set of principles and a program, but, instead, the popular leaders too arose from the nobility, individually sought a rapid rise to fame by personal appeal to the people, and sometimes, after attaining it, relapsed into conservatism again. In this context aspects of the political development of the period of Caesar's rise to supreme power called for a fresh analysis.

This was Miss Taylor's task in her Sather Lectures on *Party Politics in the Age of Caesar*. She brought to it her power to recreate the feelings and atmosphere of a time when the older structures, though functioning, were breaking down as a the extension of Roman citizenship to the whole of Italy and the vast followings of the great military leaders were changing the picture, while political attachments or even expediency clashed with the claims of family solidarity and personal duty and loyalty. She brought also her insistence on seeing just how things worked. And she did not hedge in controversial matters, such as the authorship and value as evidence of the letters of Sallust to Caesar, in the application of her own views. The result is an outstandingly vivid and perceptive presentation of the political scene in the age of Caesar. I cannot attempt a review of her work, but I may perhaps state a few of the contributions she made. One of these was an analysis of the complex system of voting in the Roman assemblies to produce a clearer explanation than before of why election to office and programs of legislation usually had so little relation to each other. The assembly of the centuries, which elected the highest magistrates, was composed, it is true, of units which were themselves built up from the regional tribes or wards in which the

¹ MS: Heinrich.

Roman citizens in all Italy were registered, but in it the weighting of votes by five classes, each based on a property qualification, enabled relatively few well-to-do voters in the first two classes to control the elections. On the other hand the tribal assemblies, one of which elected the tribunes of the plebs, gave no such preponderance to wealth, since within the tribe one man's vote was as good as another's. Inequality arose rather from differences in numbers of the various tribes. Here I may perhaps quote her own words [*Party Politics* p. 71]: "Even after Pompey, Crassus and Caesar made their deal in 60, and attained supremacy as *populares*, the elections were not a struggle between *optimates* and *populares*. The 'Triumvirs' were themselves nobles, and they conducted their campaigns by the old methods of personal commendation, aided by bribery and violence. The optimates used similar methods, and the campaigns continued to be carried on with little or no emphasis on programs." But in the case of laws, "the most active legislative officer, the tribune of the plebs, who was usually in the service of the prominent leader, constantly stressed the program. The laws often included special inducements for the urban plebs, who provided the majority of the voters... The campaign for legislation, unlike that for election, depended largely on speechmaking. Tribunes and their supporters held public meetings from the Rostra and set forth to the people their view of the long complicated bills that had been posted up for people to read. The speeches were demagogic and were answered by opponents in rival speeches at other public meetings. The popular tribune and his associates would declare that this measure would liberate the people from slavery to an oligarchy, and the opposing optimates that the popular group was setting up a monarchy."

Opposition could express itself through the veto of a colleague in office, although this too could raise the threat of violence, or through manipulation of the state religion, when observation of omens, through which the disfavor of Jove was revealed, could compel the postponement of an election or cause an assembly to disperse. Discovery of a mistake in ritual, and the possibilities were infinite, could force public games and ceremonies to be repeated and thus use up good election or legislative days in the process. "Lentulus is an excellent consul," wrote Cicero [*QF* 2.5.2-3] during the disputes of 56. "He has removed all assembly days, for even the Latin Festival is being performed over again, and there has been no lack of thanksgivings. In that way resistance is offered to

ruinous laws.” The augurs, who could judge formal religious validity of elections and laws, were the nearest Roman analogue to the justices of the Supreme Court. Miss Taylor has documented well the manipulation of the state religion in a period when there was still respect enough for the old rites to make religion an effective political weapon.

Then there were the courts, which were conducted in Rome with a freedom and publicity almost sufficient to satisfy the American press. The possibilities for entertainment and publicity were enormous as tribunals for murder, extortion, bribery, peculation or forgery, and civil cases might be proceeding simultaneously amid the crowds and hubbub of the Forum—and often justice was served as well. In the absence of any state’s attorney or publicly appointed prosecutor the responsibility for bringing malefactors to justice devolved upon the private initiative and the willingness of some private person to become the patron of the wronged. That initiative, from Aristotle on, and indeed earlier, was considered as a public service deserving of its reward. Miss Taylor’s contribution brought out more clearly than before how, amid not infrequent signs of some sense of personal responsibility such as Cicero felt toward the Sicilians, effective action in a prosecution gave the prosecutor among his spoils the rank and insignia of the accused. After the trial of Verres Cicero as aedile designate could speak among the men of praetorian rank. As Gruen’s recent book [*Roman Politics and the Criminal Courts, 149-78 BC* (1968)] reveals, Miss Taylor in discussing the political use of the courts contributed to one of the livelier subjects in Roman history today. But a dissertation completed at Bryn Mawr under Miss Taylor in 1952 was already developing the discussion of the problem.

Against this backdrop Miss Taylor traced a historical review which emphasized three major contrasts: first, that of Cato against Pompey, Caesar and Crassus, who became popular leaders in order to overcome the Senate; second, that of optimates against these dynasts while they were fomenting the divisions that led to the outbreak of civil war; third, Catonism against Caesarism, which looked forward to the creation of a legend, and to the ideologies of the early empire, when the lines of party conflict had completely changed. “My subject,” she wrote, “is the ideal of the Republic which became associated with Cato’s name, the conflict of that ideal with Caesarism, and the manner in which Augustus resolved that conflict by laying claim to the republicanism of Cato,” and, one might add, by exploiting fully his title as Caesar’s son. Using the

newer and more dynamic approach to the functioning of Roman social and political institutions and the material provided by prosopographical studies, she achieved an outstanding contribution to the history of the political structures and modes, the propaganda and the ideologies of the late Republic and the Augustan age.

I have lingered somewhat on Miss Taylor's book on *Party Politics* because her two later books are devoted largely to problems she encountered there. Study of the functioning of the Roman assemblies led almost inevitably to the old problem of the basic units which composed them, the local tribes or wards in which every Roman citizen, be he voter or soldier, had to be registered. Tenney Frank had encouraged her to consider the problem in connection with Ostia. She did not pursue it then, but now the new evidence in the bronze inscription in Heba, which had not yet been published when she gave the Sather lectures, regarding the complicated way in which tribes were combined in the voting in the Centuriate Assembly, and the anomalies in their scattered territorial distribution in Italy, raised anew the difficult questions regarding their origin, development and extension over the map of Italy. They had received no comprehensive treatment since Mommsen's youthful treatise in 1844 and Kubitschek's description in 1889, although Fraccaro had interpreted important individual points, and meantime masses of new inscriptional evidence had been discovered. In her book her familiarity with the land of Italy and her studies of practical political forces cooperated to produce a full scale history of the tribes from their first organization in the tiny Rome of the kings through increases in number and extent down to the registration of all Italy in a total of 35 tribes in the age of Cicero. From a study of the land arises the new and attractive observation that the early tribal territories were arranged in the counter-clockwise order of the religious processions, and that later extension for a time preserved, even over spatial intervals, the same direction from the center. The character and relative importance of the four city tribes is reassessed, that favorite dumping ground for freedmen. There is presented the first full list of the senators whose tribes and origin are known. The influences that governed the extension of Roman citizenship, the registration of freedmen, the changes in the tribal registration of numbers of senatorial families, sometimes an advance and sometimes a censorial mark of disgrace, are interpreted as responses to changing forces and needs, and in terms of the political factors involved.

Her book on *Roman Voting Assemblies*, The Jerome Lectures published in 1966, was a natural sequel to the *Voting Districts*, but it was the combination of her work in Roman political institutions and her long acquaintance with the problems of Roman topography that made the meaning of new evidence clear, and a fresh study of the locations and arrangement for voting significant. The recent splendid publication of the fragments of the ancient Marble Plan of the city had at last identified correctly a major voting area, the Saepta, and the Diribitorium, where the votes were counted, and made a new study of its physical arrangements possible. Moreover, the excavation and identification of the Comitium, the place of assembly, and of the Curia, the place of meeting of the council, in Cosa made possible a better reconstruction of the Comitium in relation to the Forum and the Curia in Rome. The bronze tablet of Heba supplied details of procedure for voting and the use of the lot to determine combinations of units and order of voting, while other details of procedure were supplied by the Spanish municipal charters, in which so many arrangements imitated Roman practice, and by scenes on coins. The aim was to secure a more precise definition of the procedures of the different assemblies as they exercised their electoral, legislative and judicial functions from the period before the introduction of the secret ballot (139) until they lost their importance under the dictatorship of Caesar, and to do it on the basis of the evidence about their location and context in the topography of Rome. Modern analogues were compared. Wherein did the effect of the speeches and the group voting by states in a modern party convention resemble or differ from the preliminary speeches and the group voting by tribes or centuries? Did the clear separation in the ancient gathering between speeches to a mingled audience before the vote and the departure from the public meeting to form the order of their voting units produce a different result? What of the shape and dimensions of the voting area? It was characteristic that this question led to a visit to the British House of Commons in order to see and feel the effect of an oblong space too small to hold all the members. Nor can one forget how many people at the American Academy shared with her the fun of testing the working of the lot by drawing wooden lots from jars of water themselves. A full review of the contributions in this book would be a long and at times very technical task. Perhaps I may be content to mention the separation in procedure of the public meetings for speeches from the place and

order of the voting, the determination of the working of the lot, the analysis of the actual voting procedures, and the rescue of the plebeian assembly from infiltration by patrician voters. The picture of the various assemblies in action as they performed their various functions had not been so clearly and vividly presented before. It is our great loss that these books will not be followed by the work she was planning on the Roman Senate, but at least a study of the places of meeting, in which she collaborated with Professor Russell Scott, will appear as evidence of what she had planned.

This review cannot do justice to many individual articles on separate problems, such as datings of Cicero's letters, opportunities for dramatic performance in the time of Plautus and Terence, or Lucretius on the Roman Theater. All made a new contribution and manifested her characteristic zest, curiosity and clarity of mind. While concentrating on her major works, I have tried to show something of the foundation that was laid for them in previous scholarship, how often they were a timely response to the challenge presented by developing trends, new evidence, and recently posed questions, and how well they reflected the tendency to consider institutions in terms of development and function. I have tried also to show how wide a command of disciplines and range of interests from her youth on were fused and combined in a consistent progression as she moved in her career from one major work to another.

This concentration to her scholarly achievement does not do justice to her eager interest in current issues, wherein present and past illuminated each other, nor can it do justice to her wide reading and her teaching of language and literature. She eagerly taught courses on the major Roman poets, and knew Horace almost by heart. It was a course on Lucretius at Wisconsin that led her to devote herself to classical studies. That poet remained the subject of a favorite course at Bryn Mawr which she gave also, after retirement, at Harvard and Wisconsin. The memory of her teaching, counsel, zest and enthusiasm, clarity of mind and warmth of personality will remain while we remain who knew her, but must largely pass with us. Her books will live on, in the phrase of Livy, another author whom she prized, as a "shining monument" for students of Roman history and institutions.