

had taken Cicero's metrical rhythms and reduced them to a handful of standard patterns.<sup>25</sup>

In conclusion, our earlier methodology for identifying the presence of the *cursus* is sound in some situations but weak, if not misleading, in others. Provided that the percentage of the three standard forms in a sample is high (say, above 80 percent), the method is reliable. When the percentage in a sample is lower, however, it is better to examine the individual clausular typologies, specifically the *tardus*, *trispondaicus*, and *miscellanei*. Testing these typologies against the normative values will more reliably detect the presence or absence of the *cursus* and allow us to evaluate the role of the *trispondaicus* in that author's work. This in turn will permit us to observe the writer's relationship to the two accentual systems used in late Roman prose.<sup>26</sup>

STEVEN M. OBERHELMAN  
Texas A&M University

25. Cf. L. P. Wilkinson, *Golden Latin Artistry* (Cambridge, 1970), pp. 158–59; see also Oberhelman and Hall, "Meter," p. 216, with n. 12.

26. I would like to acknowledge the helpful suggestions of the anonymous referee and the Editor.

### AN UNKNOWN GENERAL

Though well known to numismatists (and something of a numismatist himself), an officer who served for twenty-five years under Diocletian and his successors at the western court has so far escaped registration in any prosopography.

A hoard found at Beaurains (near Arras) in 1922 contained a number of multiples of aurei, obviously presentation pieces.<sup>1</sup> They form such a homogeneous series that it is difficult to doubt that they represent the collection of one man, donatives presented to him in person on a series of occasions between 285 and 310.<sup>2</sup> There are numerous die-links between the various specimens, suggesting that they were at once hoarded in mint condition.

For the list, it will be enough to quote Bastien and Metzger:<sup>3</sup>

The owner of the Beaurains hoard must have been an officer who shared in the following *donativa*: ROME, 285, occupation of Italy by Diocletian; ROME and TRIER, beginning of 294, first consulate of the Caesars; TRIER, beginning of 297, festivities celebrating the reconquest of Britannia in 296, fifth consulate of Maximian, second consulate of Galerius; *quinquennalia* of the Caesars on 1 March 302; *decennalia* of the Caesars; beginning of 303, eighth consulate of Diocletian and seventh consulate of Maximian; 20 November 303, *vicennalia* of the Augusti; beginning of 305, fifth consulate of the Caesars; 1 May 305, creation of the second tetrarchy; 25 December 307, promotion of Constantine to Augustus; 25 July 310, Constantine's *quinquennalia*.

1. For full details, see now the exemplary publication by P. Bastien and C. Metzger, *Le trésor de Beaurains (dit d'Arras)* (Wetteren, 1977).

2. It must be emphasized that many of the multiples were stolen by workmen on the day of the find, so that the series is probably no longer complete.

3. *Le trésor*, p. 215 (summary in English).

Bastien and Metzger further observe that the recipient of this largess must have attained fairly high rank by the end of his career. In 297 he “received a sum equivalent to 59 *aurei*, including 8 gold multiples . . . , but in 303, for the *vicennalia* of the Augusti, he collected at least 138 *aurei*.”<sup>4</sup> And it must be borne in mind that we have lost perhaps three-tenths of the original treasure. There cannot have been many officers presented with as large a donative as this on a single occasion.

The only clue to his identity is a gold wedding ring inscribed with the names PATERNA and VALERIANVS.<sup>5</sup> With commendable if perhaps excessive caution, Bastien and Metzger refused to exploit this item, concluding only that “l’hypothèse n’est pas à exclure *a priori* . . . que cet anneau de mariage soit celui du propriétaire du trésor.”<sup>6</sup> But one does not hoard one’s own wedding ring. It may have belonged to a deceased wife (Paterna) or parent, though it is possible (of course) that it was the deceased owner’s widow who buried the hoard. Since the ring has a diameter of 2.5 cm (see pl. VII, B<sub>12</sub>), a male owner seems more likely.

Bastien and Metzger remarked that both names were very common “dans tout l’empire romain.”<sup>7</sup> We can be a little more precise. A great many Paterni were consuls and prefects of Rome a generation earlier than the career of our officer: Paternus, cos. 267; Paternus, cos. II 268; Paternus, cos. 269; Nonius Paternus, cos. II 279; Paternus, PVR 264–66; Ovinus Paternus, PVR 281.<sup>8</sup> A rising officer at the western court in the 280s (apparently often in Rome) might well have married a daughter of such a grandee. A law of Constantine that cannot, unfortunately, be assigned a closer date than 312/337 attests a Paternus Valerianus serving as a governor in an area unspecified.<sup>9</sup> There is a good chance that he is to be identified with the *vicarius* Valerianus (diocese unspecified) of 330.<sup>10</sup> If so, he could be a son of the owner of the ring—or grandson, depending on whether the owner of the ring is the owner of the treasure or his son. Obviously this is a chain of hypotheses, but it is worth making an attempt to identify such a person. If we could go further and discover the successive ranks of the recipient of the Beaurains hoard, we would immediately gain an insight into the scale of imperial donatives at court.

ALAN CAMERON  
Columbia University

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid., p. 172.

6. Ibid., p. 209.

7. Ibid.

8. PLRE 1:671. The first three are presumably all different men, but the last three may be identical with one or more of the first three.

9. *Cod. Theod.* 6. 38, 1; see PLRE 1:939.

10. *Cod. Theod.* 3. 5. 3; see PLRE 1:938; T. D. Barnes, *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine* (Cambridge, Mass., 1982), p. 147 (cf. p. 73, n. 117). I should like to acknowledge a conversation with D. H. Wright that set me on the track here followed.