I want to go into the matter of professor Roos' objections (Mnem. S. IV, Vol. III, 1950, 158 ff.) to my hypothesis that Lusius Quietus, Trajan's general, was an Abyssinian. His criticism centers round the reading μαυρος proposed by me in Cassius Dio LXVIII, 32, 4, and the translation of this word by 'dark' in the sense of μέλας.

Even if Roos' statement that μαυρος could mean 'black' only since Byzantine times were correct, this would not prove my hypothesis to be untenable, as we do not possess Cassius Dio's own text but no more than an extract from... Byzantine times! With regard to the 'eclogarius' Roos rightly remarks: "This man had often made smaller or greater alterations in the text of the passages he excerpted" (pp. 159/160). As in the 10th century A.D. no longer ἅθλος but μαυρος is the usual word for negro, one might imagine that the epitomator, of whom Roos, too, has a poor opinion on account of his altering the text 'in a rather clumsy manner' (p. 163), inserted in the text the word that was current in his day. I admit, of course, that I am unable to prove that the epitomator arbitrary altered the text with which we are here concerned and I have no desire to use an argumentation which is offered merely pour besoin de la cause. All I wish to point out is that the problem of determining at what point of time a word for the first time is used in a particular sense, a problem difficult enough in itself, is in our case rendered considerably harder by the fact that our text does not date from the third century but is merely an extract from the tenth century, prepared here and there in a rather arbitrary manner. This makes it impossible to determine whether a certain word used in the extract actually occurred in the original.

Professor Roos, however, is wrong in his opinion that in Cassius Dio's time, i.e. the third century A.D., μαυρος cannot have the meaning
of 'black'. The fact that he found his material only in pagan writers made him go astray. In the ancient Christian literature we find the following:

*Acta Petri et Pauli* 16 (Lipsius-Bonnet, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, p. 186, lines 3/5), where mention is made of a host of black ones (demons): καὶ κουμπθείς ἔκατι τὴν νῦντα ἐκείνην εἶδέν τινα καθήμενον εἰς καθήθραν χρυσῆν, καὶ παραστάμενον αὐτῷ πληθος μαύρων. The *Acta Petri et Pauli* are generally dated from the third century, occasionally from its first half. In any case they are pre-Byzantine.

*Passio Bartholomaei* 7 (Lipsius-Bonnet, *lib. cit.*, p. 146, line 22), in the phrase 'black as soot': Τὸτε ὑπέδειξεν αὐτοῖς τὸν δαίμονα τὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ κατοικοῦντα ὡς Αὐθίοπο μαύρον ὡς ἡ ἀσβολή.

*Ibid.*, 2 (Lipsius-Bonnet, *lib. cit.*, p. 131, line 18), in a description of a young man: ἔστι μαυρότριγχος, δισοκέφαλος κτλ. The *Passio Bartholomaei* is generally dated from the close of the fourth century or from the fifth century, but according to Smith and Wace is “based on a much older narrative”). I agree with Roos that the word μαύρος seldom occurs in pre-Byzantine Greek. This is another reason for allowing full weight to the passages just quoted in support. Yet is may have been used more frequently than appears from our literary tradition, since μαύρος ὡς ἀσβολή seems to be a well known proverbial expression. In any case, μαύρος occurred already in the compound μαυρότριγχος which may be an indication that it was not so unusual.

In view of the above I believe that my hypothesis has not been refuted by professor Roos. In my first article I called Lusius ‘a coloured person’. The meaning of μαύρος in the passages quoted from the apocrypha, however, makes it more probable that he was a black. I never intended to assert that Cassius Dio by the word μαύρος meant ‘the dark skinned complexion which is not scarce in


2) In either case this *Passio* is pre-Byzantine. For the beginning of the Byzantine period, dated from the sixth or even from the seventh century, see Norman H. Baynes, *The Byzantine Empire* (The Home Univ. Libr., Vol. 118), (1946), 8-9.