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1. The difference between professor Roos and myself on this point is negligible. I regard it as an unprofitable attempt to determine the method of this arbitrary tenth century scholar on the basis of the study of that part of his excerpt the original of which has been preserved. This, in my opinion, is paying too great honour to this unmethodical Byzantine. In any case I wish to put on record that I did not advocate the suggestion that the epitomator altered the word Ἀθίσσε in νάυρος.

2. A comparison of Cassius Dio's phraseology (which is something different from his style) with that of Christian authors from the third century is certainly permissible. Only if it were certain from the outset that in the third century μαύρος was used exclusively by the man in the street, objections might be raised against the supposition that Cassius Dio used this word. But the assumption that in common parlance μαύρος was used instead of μέλας is only a petitio principii. I may well ask which of the two works in an 'utterly unmethodical' manner: he who supports his view on the phraseology of a third century author with evidence from contemporary writers—especially when the word in question can in no way be regarded as a vulgarism—or he who, like Roos on p. 161, draws on authors from the fifth and third century B.C. I may confidently leave this to the reader's judgment.

3. Professor Roos admits: "The author of the Vita does not say expressly that Lusius was a Moor himself". I am content with this conclusion by which the passage from the Vita as an argument for Lusius' Moorish descent has been ruled out. The question remains, whether the commander of the Moorish troops during all these years made himself so popular that the inhabitants of the region from which the major part of his troops originated should revolt, when their general fell into disgrace. My answer is in the affirmative.
When we take into account his great qualities as a commander, we can readily understand that Lusius was very popular and that the unjust verdict against him gave rise to a demonstration of solidarity and loyalty. We should, above all, remember that in Mauretania there was very probably unrest before Lusius was relieved from his command. The theory that the quiet Moors to a man rose to revenge their favourite chief is too simplistic. We rather have the impression that the emperor's attitude towards the popular general added fuel to a rebellion that was already on its way. As my opponent has mentioned the reaction in Mauretania, it may be worth while to discuss this point a little further.

Professor Roos takes it for granted that there is a close connection between Lusius' disgrace and the beginning of the Mauretanian mutiny. But this connection is far from sure. When dealing with Lusius' origin I did not look for an easy road by seizing this doubt as an argument in favour of my hypothesis. As moreover the point in question had no direct bearing on the subject of my first article, I only made a casual reference to it (Mnem. 1948, 337) and mentioned the names of some modern scholars whose opinions widely differ (Mnem. 1950, 266, note 5). All the same it may be useful to point out that the *Vita Hadriani* nowhere expressis verbis refers to the rise in Mauretania as a result of Lusius' disgrace. When summing up the difficulties Hadrian took over from his predecessor the *Vita* says (5,2): *Mauri lacessebant, Sarmatae bellum inferebant, Brittanni teneri sub Romana condicione non poterant, Aegyptus seditionibus urgebatur, Libya denique ac Palestina rebelles animos efferebant.* Therefore, according to some scholars (Henderson is one of them) Lusius' disgrace did not cause the mutiny. In a monograph on Lusius Quietus 1), at the end of a thorough discussion on the whole question, we find this conclusion: "En tout cas, une chose paraît certaine:

---

1) Aurel Iordănescu, *Lusius Quietus*, Thèse de doctorat (Bucarest, 1941). Only recently, after my two first articles on Lusius Quietus had appeared, I happened to come across the title of this book in *l'Année philologique*, 1948 (published in 1950). Owing to the assistance of Miss A. M. P. Mollema of the Government Information Bureau at The Hague, and the aid of our Foreign Office and our Legation at Bucarest, I have been able to get into contact with the author who has been kind enough to put a copy at my disposal. To him and to the Dutch authorities I express my best thanks.