

and does not simply sing as a chorus of Athenians at a festival.”¹ G. M. Sifakis explains an apparent contradiction between the piety of the song and the acquiescence of the clouds in Socrates’ denial of the gods’ existence earlier by insisting that “these invocations are not made by the chorus in character but in its capacity as comic chorus. . . . There is, however, nothing to prevent the chorus from momentarily changing its point of view in order to invite also . . . ‘our glorious father, most holy Aether.’”² Sifakis stresses that in such songs the chorus invites the gods to the actual, present performance, a task it can perform only as “comic chorus,” though license may allow traces of dramatic identity. Yet divinities may invite other divinities to dance with them, and the identity of this chorus is somewhat more complex than has been recognized.

In the ode (563–74), the chorus invokes Zeus, Poseidon, Aether, and Helios: Zeus as ὑψιμέδοντα . . . θεῶν τύραννον, Poseidon as steward of the trident and μοχλευτήν of earth and sea, Aether as not only their father but as βιοθρέμμονα πάντων, and Helios as he who covers the land with his rays and is great among both gods and mortals. In the antode also (595–606) four gods are invoked, in precise correspondence to the ode.³ Just where the ode presents ἡμέτερον πατέρ’, the antode shows ἡμετέρα θεός, Athena. If Aether can be “our father” only to clouds, Athena is “our goddess” only to Athenians. The rest of the antode shows another shift: Phoebus is invoked as lord of Delos, Artemis as the goddess of Ephesus, Athena as ἐπιχώριος and πολιοῦχος, and Dionysus is characterized by his connection with Parnassus and Delphi. The gods of the ode are gods of nature—Helios, Poseidon as god of earthquake, Aether—and are seen in relation to other gods—Zeus as king and Helios as honored by both gods and mortals. Those of the antode, on the other hand, are identified by cult-places and are associated with human worshippers, the κόραι Λυδῶν who honor Artemis and the Delphian maenads of Dionysus: the chorus of the ode sees the gods from a perspective appropriate to clouds, as cosmic forces, whereas that of the antode sees them from the point of view of human worshippers. The chorus is therefore not in character only “momentarily,” but throughout the ode. The antode, on the other hand, identifies the chorus firmly as Athenian singers, creating a clear distinction between the two choral personalities that seems to be unique in the Aristophanic corpus.

RUTH SCODEL

The University of Michigan

1. *Aristophanes: "Clouds"* (Oxford, 1968), p. 172.

2. *Parabases and Animal Choruses* (London, 1971), p. 57.

3. On the symmetries of the poem and its close relation to traditional cult-poetry, see E. Fraenkel, *Beobachtungen zu Aristophanes* (Rome, 1962), pp. 196–98.

THE THIRD REGNAL YEAR OF EPARCHIUS AVITUS: A REPLY

In an earlier number of this journal Ralph W. Mathisen presented a wide-ranging discussion of the end of the reign and life of the emperor Avitus and a

detailed analysis of the meager sources for this episode.¹ Though I should like to discuss many of the topics and novel conclusions presented in that paper, I shall confine myself to two: Avitus' alleged return to Arles in 456; and his survival, after his deposition on 17 October 456, until late January or early February 457. Both of these conclusions depend almost entirely upon two passages in the mid-fifth-century chronicle of the Spanish bishop Hydatius; consequently, any misinterpretation of the chronicle's content or structure can have an important effect on our understanding of these events. I offer the following discussion both as an alternative to that of Mathisen and as a basis for understanding certain aspects of Hydatius' chronicle, a source uniquely important not only for many episodes in imperial history but also for almost all of Spanish history between 417 and 468.

On 9 July 455 Eparchius Avitus, a Gallic senator, was proclaimed emperor just outside Arles in southern Gaul with the support of the Goths and the local Gallic nobility.² Arles remained his base for two months before he left for Rome, crossing into Italy on 21 September.³ Once in Rome he took up the consulship on 1 January 456.⁴ A famine in Rome, the city's discontent over his Gothic auxiliaries, and his lack of gold for pay forced Avitus to send his troops back to Gaul, an act that precipitated an open revolt by the two leading military figures of the time, Ricimer, the *magister utriusque militiae*, and Majorian, the *comes domesticorum*.⁵ In the face of imminent disaster Avitus quit the city in the late

I would like to thank J. F. Matthews and two anonymous referees of *CP* for their helpful comments concerning this paper.

1. "The Third Regnal Year of Eparchius Avitus," *CP* 80 (1985): 326–35.

2. Sid. Apoll. *Carm.* 7. 441–584; Hyd. *Chron.* 163, 183 (*Chron. min.*, 2:27, 30); *Chron. Gall. a. DXI* 623 (*Chron. min.*, 1:663); Theoph. *Chron.* A. M. 5947 (p. 109 de Boor); Paul. Diac. *H. R.* 14. 19 (*MGH:AA*, 2:207); *Auct. Prosp.: Epit. Vat. ad ed. a. 455* 4 (*Chron. min.*, 1:492); *Cont. Prosp. ad a. 462* (*Chron. min.*, 1:491); *Cont. Prosp. cod. Reichen.* 30 (*Chron. min.*, 1:490); Vict. Tonn. *Chron.* s. a. 455 (*Chron. min.*, 2:186); Cass. *Chron.* 1264 (*Chron. min.*, 2:157); Jord. *Get.* 240 (*MGH:AA*, 5:119); and Mar. Avent. *Chron.* s. a. 455 (*Chron. min.*, 2:232). For the date, see *Fast. Vind. prior.* 575 (*VI idus Iulias*) and *Auct. Prosp. Haun.* s. a. 455. 6 (*VII id. Iulias*; both *Chron. min.*, 1:304); the latter is usually accepted on the grounds that it is paleographically more likely that a "1" fell out than that one was added. While the support of the "Gallic nobility" can easily be exaggerated (it likely extended little farther than the neighborhood of Arles), the involvement of the Goths cannot be stressed enough, as Sidonius describes in detail (above) and Marius Aventicensis (s. a. 455) vividly implies: "leuatus est Auitus imperator in Gallias / et ingressus est Theodoricus rex Gothorum Arelatum cum fratribus suis in pace." Avitus was much more a Gothic than a Gallic choice.

3. *Auct. Prosp. Haun.* s. a. 455. 7 (*Chron. min.*, 1:304).

4. Sid. Apoll. *Carm.* 7. 7–13, 600–602; *Consul. Constant.* s. a. 456 (*Chron. min.*, 1:247), which is the work not of Hydatius but of a sixth-century Spanish compiler; *CIL* 13. 11208; *ICUR* 795–97. Avitus issued no known consular coins.

5. Joh. Ant. frag. 202 = Prisc. frag. 32 (R. C. Blockley, ed., *The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire*, vol. 2 [Liverpool, 1983], pp. 334–37). We possess but a fragment of an epitome of Priscus' history; nevertheless, the first part of the fragment, detailing these events in Rome, is supported not only by Hydatius (with regard to the loss of Gothic support) but by the coinage as well. In contrast to the massive output of *solidi* at Rome by Petronius Maximus during his two-and-a-half month reign in 455 (thirty specimens known to me so far, struck from six obverse and nine reverse dies) and at Arles by Avitus in mid- to late 455 (twenty-three known specimens, from ten obverse and eight reverse dies), there is but a single underweight (4.30g) specimen struck at Rome during Avitus' ten-month residence (British Museum 1896. 6. 8. 123). Stylistic differences between it and the issues of Arles and Milan (also an extremely low output: two obverse and three reverse dies from three known specimens) suggest that this specimen was issued much later, probably in mid- or late 456. This supports Priscus' claim that there was no gold in the imperial treasuries and suggests that he was relying on contemporary, if not eyewitness, testimony. This coin may even have been part of the pay for the dismissed Goths, struck from the gold purchased from bronze merchants. According to Gregory of

summer of 456 and fled to Arles.⁶ There he gathered his reserves and moved into Italy to reaffirm his position as emperor. He was met at Placentia by Ricimer, who defeated him in a battle and siege on 17 October 456 and then with the help of Majorian, having deposed him, had him ordained bishop.⁷ He survived in Placentia, still recognized as emperor in Gaul and the subject of a conspiracy to restore him to the throne, until late January or early February of 457, when he was put to death by Majorian as he tried to make his way back to Gaul.⁸ Such is Mathisen's account of the reign of Avitus, somewhat abridged.

In his paper Mathisen devotes a fair amount of space to the current orthodoxy, according to which Avitus returned to Arles and then reentered Italy, only to be intercepted at Placentia.⁹ This is based on a single statement in Hydatius' chronicle (177), "Auitum de Italia ad Gallias Arelate successisse," an account of a report from the tribune and legate Hesychius to Theoderic II, the Gothic king who was at that time campaigning against the Sueves in Spain. Out of context this seems conclusive; but it is strikingly at variance with the numerous other sources that mention or describe Avitus' flight and eventual downfall, not one of which states or even hints that Avitus got out of Italy. In the account of Gregory of Tours especially we would expect some mention of Avitus' return to Gaul before his final fall, and the detailed and surprisingly accurate account of John of Antioch ought to mention it as well. On the contrary, all other sources make it quite clear that Avitus was caught at Placentia on his way out of Italy. Yet, even though Hydatius' account flatly contradicts all other sources, it must be taken seriously.

The entry with which we are concerned (177) falls between the account of the sack of Bracara by the Goths on 28 October 456 and the death of Rechiarus that December (*Chron.* 174 and 178), when Theoderic was likely still in Bracara before heading for Emerita (*Chron.* 178). It can be shown from many other entries that Hydatius had access to sources concerning envoys, especially those sent to and from the Goths and Sueves.¹⁰ Moreover, the entire episode of the Gothic invasion (*Chron.* 173–86) is presented in far more detail than any other

Tours, Avitus was expelled *luxoriosae* [sic] *agere uolens* (*H. F.* 2. 11, *MGH:SSRM*, 12:60–61). Gregory refrained from reporting Avitus' alleged lechery, but Fredegarius (3. 7, *MGH:SSRM*, 2:94) and Aimoinus monachus Floriacensis (*H. F.* 1. 3, *PL* 139:640) did not share his scruples.

6. Hyd. *Chron.* 177.

7. Mar. Avent. *Chron.* s. a. 456. 1 (*Chron. min.*, 2:232); Cass. *Chron.* 1266 (*Chron. min.*, 2:157); *Fast. Vind. prior.* 580 (*XVI kl. Nov.*) and *Auct. Prosp. Haun.* s. a. 456. 2 (*XV k. Novemb.*: *Chron. min.*, 1:304; the former is usually taken to be correct; see n. 2 above); Vict. Tonn. *Chron.* s. a. 456 (*Chron. min.*, 2:186); *Auct. Prosp.*: *Epit. Vat. ad ed. a. 455* 6 (*Chron. min.*, 1:492); *Chron. Gall. a. DXI* 625, 628 (*Chron. min.*, 1:664); Theoph. *Chron.* A. M. 5948 (p. 109 de Boor: the text here is obviously corrupt but probably mentioned the ordination and the fact that Avitus was heading to Gaul); Hyd. *Chron.* 183; Jord. *Get.* 240 (*MGH:AA*, 5:119); Joh. Ant. frag. 202 = Prisc. frag. 32 (2:334–37 Blockley); Gregory of Tours *H. F.* 2. 11 (*MGH:SSRM*, 12:60–61); and Paul. Diac. *H. R.* 15. 1 (*MGH:AA*, 2:207). Avitus is also mentioned by Evagrius at *H. E.* 2. 7, though only inferior manuscripts state that he died of starvation (or the plague), a corruption obviously arising from the reading of John of Antioch or Priscus; see the apparatus of the edition by Bidez and Parmentier (London, 1898), p. 55.

8. Gregory of Tours *H. F.* 2. 11 (*MGH:SSRM*, 12:60–61). For the foregoing, cf. Mathisen, "Third Regnal Year," pp. 330–34.

9. "Third Regnal Year," pp. 329–30.

10. Goths, Sueves and Gallaeci: *Chron.* 170, 172, 192, 197, 205, 208, 219, 220, 226, 230, 231, 233, 237, 238, 239, 242, 245. Others: *Chron.* 11, 96, 98, 100, 101, 111, 121, 155, 161, 170, 177, 209, 224, 238, 240, 247, 251.

event or series of events in the chronicle. That Hydatius ventures to tell us who the legate was, what rank he held, and what he said—information that appears together for no other embassy—further demonstrates the accuracy of his knowledge. He also knew that the rest of what Hesychius reported, Ricimer's victory over the Vandals near Corsica, was already known to Theoderic (*Chron.* 176).¹¹ It is therefore almost certain that the legate's news is accurately reported and that he arrived when Hydatius claims he did, that is, sometime in late November or early December of 456. The information was therefore very old: news of Ricimer's naval victory had already arrived, and this victory must have occurred in August or September at the latest, since Ricimer and Majorian rebelled in September. Thus, by the time Theoderic received Hesychius' news, Avitus had already been deposed; but Hydatius obviously did not know that, nor did Hesychius.

But is it historically likely that Avitus deserted Rome, crossed the Alps, returned to Arles, and then, but a short time later, crossed the Alps again at the end of the year to launch a civil war as winter set in? The Goths had launched their campaign against the Sueves, "cum uoluntate et ordinatione Auiti imperatoris" (*Chron.* 173), rather late in the campaigning season (their first major battle did not occur until 5 October 456). The chronology of this campaign suggests that well on into the summer months Avitus had no hint of the impending calamities; for if he had known that he was going to need the Goths to defend his throne against uprisings by the Italian military establishment, it is unlikely that he would have encouraged and supported Theoderic in the Spanish campaigns. And since he was bereft of this support (as the sources tell us), why would he then launch himself back into Italy, across the Alps at the onset of winter, to certain defeat and death? Arles was certainly a most secure base to gather men, money, and supplies for any projected assault on Italy; it was against all reason to leave it under the prevailing conditions. By waiting until spring or summer of 457 he might even have obtained Gothic assistance, since Theoderic left Emerita for Gaul shortly after Easter (31 March) in 457.¹² It is also difficult to believe, given the potential power-base Avitus had in Arles, that Ricimer and Majorian would have allowed him to escape from Italy and thus have ceded to him every strategic advantage. And in view of Avitus' previous actions—which, before he was virtually forced by the Goths to accept the purple, show little more than a desire to lead a retired life in Gaul—is it really likely that he would have contemplated civil war to retain his throne? Yet if it is claimed that he did not, why did he return to Arles and then reenter Italy with troops, such as they were, in the face of a complete revolt by the senate and the army?

11. There was only one naval victory over the Vandals (*pace* Mathisen, "Third Regnal Year," p. 330): Hydatius states that it was reported to Theoderic by two different envoys, first at some unspecified time (*hisdem diebus*) by an unknown legate (*nuntiator*), the second time by Hesychius (who was then told that Theoderic already knew, hence the separate entry at *Chron.* 176). The phrase *id quod supra* and the repetition of *multitudo (-inem) Vandalorum* make it plain that the five words following *supra* in *Chron.* 177 are but a précis of the previous entry. Corsica is an obvious staging ground *ad Gallias uel ad Italiam*.

12. See n. 27 below.

The account given or implied by the other sources makes much more sense in the circumstances. Without ever suspecting a revolt by the senate and people of Rome or an armed rebellion by the military, Avitus had encouraged and supported the Spanish campaign of Theoderic, who originally (at any rate) was acting for the emperor, to protect the Roman citizens of *Tarraconensis* and *Carthaginiensis* (*Chron.* 168, 170, 172, 173) by attacking the Sueves. When troubles began to mount, he tried to retain power in Rome as long as he could but eventually had to dismiss his Gothic auxiliaries. Finally, when he learned of the revolt of Ricimer and Majorian, of the murder of his Patrician Remistus in Classis on 17 September, and of the renewed hostilities of the Vandals in defeat,¹³ he had no option but to flee the city, heading for his sole sanctuary, Arles. At this point he was interested only in saving his life, not in attempting to consolidate his position or return for reinforcements. When Ricimer and Majorian realized that he was making a break for it, they knew that he had to be stopped before he crossed the Alps. Once in Gaul he could gather support and make himself very difficult to dislodge, especially if he maintained his Gothic support. He had to be forestalled, and full-scale war between Goths and Romans avoided. Ricimer and Majorian eventually caught up with him at Placentia, into which he withdrew to make his last stand.

Consequently, the message of Hesychius must rather be a report of Avitus' avowed intention to leave Rome and return to Arles, an intention probably first formed when Avitus realized the weakness of his position, without auxiliaries, in the face of riots in the city and Vandal attacks; the report itself (along with the outdated report of Ricimer's victory) was very likely brought to Arles by Avitus' former auxiliaries, who thought—or perhaps had been told—that he would soon follow them. Avitus probably made his decision two or three months before Hesychius reported to Theoderic, by which time the legate simply assumed that Avitus had already reached Arles—hence the perfect infinitive. In fact, Avitus had already been deposed and, I believe, assassinated.

If Avitus had already been in Arles, certainly Hesychius would have brought a report of his plight and his request for auxiliaries, supplies, and cash from his only allies. The silence on this count shows that by the time Hesychius departed, Avitus could not yet have reached Arles or even have fully recognized the great danger he was in; and this suggests that when the information contained in Hesychius' message was fresh, Avitus was probably still in Rome, before Ricimer's revolt. (Hesychius makes no reference to this revolt or to Avitus' consequent predicament—a silence that would have been extremely odd if his information were up-to-date, given the juxtaposition of his report concerning Avitus with the report of Ricimer's earlier victory.) Furthermore, Hydatius really had very little information about the circumstances of Avitus' downfall: he knew only that Avitus was deprived of promised Gothic support (i.e., in Rome),

13. That Avitus' downfall occurred so soon after Remistus' death certainly suggests a connection between the two; but the circumstances are completely unknown, and one can only postulate that Ricimer was directly responsible for the latter. Cf. Theoph. *Chron.* A. M. 5948 (p. 109 de Boor), *Fast. Vind. prior.* 579, and *Auct. Prosp. Haun.* s. a. 456. 1 (both *Chron. min.*, 1:304), all derived from the same source, with Mathisen, "Third Regnal Year," p. 331. The Vandals are mentioned by John of Antioch: see n. 5 above.

that he lost his *imperium*, and that he died, presumably at Arles. (Compare the meagerness of this account, *Chron.* 183, with the detail of Ricimer's involvement in Majorian's downfall, *Chron.* 210.) Because Hydatius' statement is contradicted, implicitly or explicitly, by the other sources, because the modern interpretation of Hydatius' statement is highly implausible, and because Hydatius' account cannot be explained in the context of this modern interpretation, I am inclined to accept all the other sources over Hydatius.

Of the thirteen sources that mention the downfall of Avitus,¹⁴ only five mention his death: John of Antioch, the *Chronica Gallica*, Hydatius, Gregory of Tours, and Paulus Diaconus. The rest simply leave him as bishop or without his *imperium*. The events surrounding his death, therefore, must not have been well known; I find it unlikely that they were known by some but not reported. Even the two sources that seem to follow very closely some sort of contemporary "official" *fasti* leave Avitus' ultimate fate unknown: one claims that he was captured (*Fast. Vind. prior.*); the other, in a more detailed account, omits enough to justify a charge of willful dissimulation and states that his life was preserved by his being made bishop (*Auct. Prosp. Haun.*). The reason may well be that Majorian, who was to become the next emperor, was responsible for his death, as John of Antioch and the *Chronica Gallica* state. It is this "official version" that is reflected in most of the other sources.

Paulus Diaconus and Gregory also fall into this category. Paulus seems not to have known anything about Avitus' downfall; that he records Avitus' death before the accession of Majorian is likely to be the result of a guess (see below). The phrase he uses—*exempto . . . humanis rebus*—is vague enough to cover either natural death or murder. Both John of Antioch and the Gallic chronicler attribute Avitus' death to Majorian in Placentia. That this is in fact what happened can hardly be doubted. Thus Gregory's account of Avitus' setting out for Saint Julian's basilica in Clermont and dying of natural causes (*impleto . . . uitae cursu obiit*) on the way near Brioude is probably just a later local tradition to explain why Avitus was buried in Brioude at a church of St. Julian, a rather unusual place for an emperor to be interred. This tradition probably came into being because, as the versions in most other sources show, the story had no well-known ending.

Having set aside the accounts of Paulus and Gregory, we are left with only three: John of Antioch, *Chronica Gallica*, and Hydatius. None of these specifies the time that elapsed between Avitus' deposition, dated to 17 October 456, and his death. John of Antioch states that "Majorian and Ricimer attacked him on the road and forced him to renounce his throne, put off his imperial robe and flee to a shrine. Then Majorian's followers kept him under siege until he died of starvation. . . . Some say that he was strangled."¹⁵ The Gallic chronicler (620) wrote only "Auitus occisus est a Maioriano comite domesticorum Placentiae," while Hydatius reports "Auitus tertio anno . . . caret imperio Gothorum promisso destitutus auxilio, caret et uita" (*Chron.* 183). He could therefore have died at any time after his deposition.

14. See n. 7 above.

15. Frag. 202 (= Prisc. frag. 32), trans. Blockley, *Fragmentary Classicising Historians*, 2:335, 337.

Mathisen's *modus operandi* for sorting out this problem is to accept Hydatius and the *Chronica Gallica* "at face value" in order "to try to unravel the real or apparent inconsistencies in the sources."¹⁶ This is an extremely dangerous approach to such highly idiosyncratic sources as these. Nevertheless, Mathisen concludes that because the three regnal years assigned to Avitus by Hydatius correspond to the years 455–57, because Hydatius records Avitus' death just before the death of Marcian, and because the *Chronica Gallica* shows that Avitus died just after Marcian, both chroniclers must still have regarded Avitus as emperor after his deposition, and the date of Avitus' death must be closer to the death of Marcian than to his own deposition—that is, late January or early February 457.¹⁷

Let us begin with the *Chronica Gallica*. "Et post Auitus imperator" appears at the end of entry 623, after a notice of the sack of Rome by the Vandals. This is followed by entries 624, "Marcianus post V ann., quibus cum Valentiniano regnavit, aliis annis II," and 625, "Auitus cum eo anno uno et m. III." It is clear from this sequence that the chronicler's source regarded Marcian as ruling longer than Avitus after the death of Valentinian—not the other way around, as Mathisen infers from the fact that entries 627–30 read "Marcianus obiit / et Auitus occisus est a Maioriano comite domesticorum Placentiae / Leo Constantinopoli ann. XXI / Maiorianus Romae cum Leone regnavit ann. III m. VI." The length of reign given for Avitus in entry 625 is exactly correct for mid-July 455 to mid-October 456.¹⁸ This same tenure is specified by the *Cont. Prosp. ad a. 462*, which then states that the throne was vacant for fifteen months after Avitus, an important fact omitted by the *Chronica Gallica*.¹⁹ From October of 456, fifteen months take one to December of 457—the actual accession of Majorian occurred on 28 December 457²⁰—which proves that the length of reign given in the *Chronica Gallica* does cover the accepted period of Avitus' reign to October 456. There can therefore be no question of the chronicler's (or his source's) believing that Avitus' reign continued past 17 October.

But what of the positioning of Avitus' death after the death of Marcian? The problem arises because the Gallic chronicler did not know about any of the

16. "Third Regnal Year," p. 332.

17. *Ibid.*

18. For the dates, see nn. 2 and 7 above.

19. The *Chron. Gall.* used the *Cont. Prosp. ad a. 462* or its source, as is proved by four parallels. First, both give Valentinian a reign of thirty years: *Chron. Gall.* 611 ("Val. XXV") and 613 (plus five years); cf. *Hyd. Chron.* 162 ("Val. XXXI") and the date "Val. XXVII" (= 450) in *Chron. Gall. a. CCCCLII* 135 (*Chron. min.*, 1:662); 455 would thus be "Val. XXXII." Further, both give the same length for the reign of Avitus; and both give an almost identical length for that of Majorian (I believe that on this evidence the *m. VI* in *Chron. Gall.* should be emended to the *m. VII* of *Cont. Prosp.*; see n. 20 below). Finally, both claim that Severus was *imperator simul et consul* (*Chron. Gall.* 636 and *Cont. Prosp.*, *Chron. min.*, 1:491; Severus became Augustus on 19 November 461 and was consul in 462). Compare also Sanctus Benedictus Casinensis *Chron.* 24 (*MGH:SSRLang.*, p. 485), who gives a slightly corrupted version, *ann. I mens. V*.

20. Cf. A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1964), p. 241. See *Auct. Prosp.: Epit. Vat. ad ed. a. 455* 8 (*Chron. min.*, 1:492) for the date, and Victor Tonnennensis, who makes his accession the first entry at *Chron. s. a. 458* (*Chron. min.*, 2:186). *Chron. Gall.* 630 and *Cont. Prosp. ad a. 462* (*Chron. min.*, 1:664 and 491) give a term of three years, six months, and three years, seven months, respectively, for Majorian's reign; Majorian reigned three years and seven months (28 December 457–2 August 461).

interregna after 425, including the fifteen months after the death of Avitus; he did not even know about any western emperors after Anthemius.²¹ News of a new emperor spread quickly; the fate of an old emperor was often left unreported or was suppressed. The fates of Avitus and Severus are perfect examples. Without actual dates or other explicit information, chroniclers could only assume that the death of one emperor immediately preceded the accession of the next. Thus the Gallic chronicler placed the death of Avitus right before the accession of Majorian, just as he later placed the death of Severus right before the accession of Anthemius, in this case further confusing the issue by placing the death of Theoderic and accession of Euric before the death of Severus (all in the same year: Leo X = 466).²² The fact that Majorian had assassinated Avitus made it all the more obvious to the chronicler that he immediately succeeded him. The juxtaposition of Leo and Majorian shows that the chronicler was following the tradition that the two became emperors at about the same time;²³ and so it followed that Avitus and Marcian must have died at about the same time. The order of deaths is quite deliberately set out in entries 627–30: Marcian (East) dies, Avitus (West) dies, followed by the accessions of Leo (East) and Majorian (West). The chronicler lived in a world where the eastern emperor was the only emperor of any consequence; and he was therefore given pride of place over the western emperors, who no longer mattered: thus Marcian and Leo come first in the lists, overriding the chronological details that appear to have had little importance by comparison.²⁴ If we are to accept this muddle “at face value,” are we also to accept the placement of Severus’ death and Anthemius’ accession in the same year, or Leo’s twenty-one-year reign, or the treatment of “Leo III,” according to which the events of several years all belong to one year?²⁵

21. Hydatius, though generally no better informed on chronological details such as interregna, did know about the interregnum of 465–67; but he did not know how long it was. As a result he treats it as lasting less than a year (*Chron.* 231–35). Compare the similar problems at *Chron.* 80–85 and in *Chron. Gall.* 576–79 (A.D. 423–25).

22. Severus died on 15 August (not 14 November) 465 (*Fast. Vind. prior.* 595); Theoderic was assassinated and replaced by Euric in 466 (see, e.g., *PLRE* 2:427); and Anthemius was proclaimed emperor in Rome on 12 April 467 (*Fast. Vind. prior.* 598).

23. As does the fact that Majorian dies in “Leo III,” not “Leo IV” or “V.” This dating shows the influence of a source other than *Cont. Prosp. ad a. 462*, which dated Majorian’s accession to 1 April 457 (cf. *Fast. Vind. prior.* 583)—perhaps, i.e., very close to the time that the proclamation of Leo’s accession on 7 February 457 was received in the West. Other sources also appear to date Majorian’s reign from 1 April, since they link the accessions of Leo and Majorian: *Auct. Prosp.: Epit. Vat. index imperat.* 7 (*Chron. min.*, 1:492), which (like *Chron. Gall.*) gives a length for the reign that presupposes it began in December but puts the accessions of Leo and Majorian together; *Cass. Chron.* 1268 (*Chron. min.*, 2:157); *Expos. temp. Hil.* (*Chron. min.*, 3:417); the *Laterc. imperat.* (*Chron. min.*, 3:423); and *Hyd. Chron.* 185. The latter two give Majorian a reign of four years, six months, and five years (*Chron.* 210), respectively; the actual total is four years and four months if calculated from 1 April rather than from 28 December. See Jones, *Later Roman Empire*, 1:241.

24. Paulus orders events similarly in *H. R.* 15. 1 (*MGH:AA*, 2:207): death of Marcian and accession of Leo (East), then death of Avitus and accession of Majorian (West). Note also that the Gallic chronicler uses only eastern regnal years from Leo on; and cf. the references to both eastern and western emperors together in one entry upon the accession of one or the other in entries 512, 518, 534, 550, and 579, compared with the two separate entries 613 and 614 (using for the first time the locatives *Romae* and *Constantinopoli*), for Valentinian and Marcian. This split continues in entries 624, 625, 629, 630, 636, and 645.

25. See n. 22 above for Severus and Anthemius. Leo ruled seventeen years, from 7 February 457 to 18 January 474. *Chron. Gall.* 633–36 fall under Leo III: entry 633 = the year 458/59 (cf. *Sid. Apoll. Carm.* 5—which was delivered late in 458 at Lyons—and *Nov. Maj.* 7 and 9); 634 = 460; 635 = 461; and 636 = 461–62 (cf. n. 19 above).

Hydatius cannot be accepted "at face value" either, as an obvious example proves.²⁶ Hydatius places the Battle of the Urbicus in "Avitus I"; this battle took place on Friday the fifth of October in 456. He places Theoderic's departure from Emerita in "Majorian I," or three regnal years later (see below); this departure he dates to shortly after Easter (31 March) 457.²⁷ Even if we were to accept Courtois' interpretation of the doubling up of years of imperial accessions and deaths (i.e., "Val. XXXI" and "Avitus I" = 455, "Avitus III" and "Maj. I" = 457), as Mathisen does, this discrepancy could not be eliminated.²⁸ Hydatius (*pace* Courtois) regarded each regnal year as a calendar year. This is proved not only by a number of references in the *Chronicle* to calendar years that correspond to regnal years,²⁹ but also by the practice of his inspiration and model, the *Chronici canones* of Eusebius and Jerome, which also treats each regnal year as a calendar year, with no doubling up in the years that saw the death of one emperor and the accession of another.³⁰ For chronological reasons that it is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss, Hydatius began to correlate the years of eastern and western emperors with the accession of Marcian (25 August 450; *Chron.* 154, 157, 162, 184, 211, 235) and also ended up placing the death of Valentinian (16 March 455) in the fourth year of Marcian (*Chron.* 162) instead of the fifth. Marcian died in his seventh year (*Chron.* 184). Thus, in order for Hydatius to maintain the correlation of East and West, Avitus had to have a reign of three years:

Marcian I = Valentinian XXVIII
 Marcian II = Valentinian XXVIII
 Marcian III = Valentinian XXX
 Marcian IIII = Valentinian XXXI
 Marcian V = Avitus I
 Marcian VI = Avitus II
 Marcian VII = Avitus III
 Leo I = Majorian I

26. I cannot accept any of the arguments or interpretations presented by C. Courtois in "Auteurs et scribes: Remarques sur la *Chronique* d'Hydace," *Byzantion* 21 (1951): 23–54; nor can I accept the reconstruction of A. Tranoy in *Hydace: "Chronique," Sources chrétiennes* 218 (Paris, 1974). Mommsen's text is still the most accurate representation of the *Chronicle*. I am myself working on a new text of the *Chronicle* with a full historical and historiographic study and commentary.

27. *V kal. Aprilis* (*Chron.* 186) is a corruption of *II kal. Aprilis*, the date of Easter in 457.

28. Cf. Mathisen, "Third Regnal Year," p. 332. Courtois tried to eliminate the discrepancy ("Auteurs et scribes," pp. 38, 45, and 53) by putting the Gothic invasion in 455; but 5 October and 28 October could have fallen on a Friday and a Sunday, respectively (*Chron.* 173–74), only in 456. Isidorus (*Chron.* 382, *Chron. min.*, 2:473) and the Spanish epitome of Hydatius (*Chron.* 173) provide independent corroboration, dating the invasion to "Marcian VI" (= 456).

29. Entry 192a states that Sabinus returned to Hispalis after twenty years in exile: the date is 458; he was exiled in 441 (*Chron.* 124). His exile therefore lasted seventeen calendar years; but it was twenty regnal years according to Hydatius' method of reckoning (fifteen years under Valentinian, three under Avitus, and two under Majorian). Leo and Majorian become emperor at the same time (*Chron.* 185), thus "Leo V" = "Maj. V" (*Chron.* 210–11); three regnal years later, in "Severus III," Anthemius becomes emperor in "Leo VIII" (*Chron.* 231, 235). Hilarus becomes pope in "Sev. I" and dies six years later in "Anthemius III" (*Chron.* 221, 248): i.e., Leo I = Maj. I . . . Leo V = Maj. V; Leo VI = Sev. I; Leo VII = Sev. II; Leo VIII = Sev. III; Leo VIII = Anth. I; Leo X = Anth. II; Leo XI = Anth. III. The *imperii sui anno IIII* of *Chron.* 231 is a red herring, since the "IIII" can be shown to have been introduced into a lacunose text by someone who knew how long Severus had reigned. Hydatius doubles up regnal years only in 395 (*Chron.* 26); but there the regnal years go directly from "Theodosius XVII" (395) to "Honorius II" (396), and Hydatius offers a full explanation of what he is doing.

30. For the 167 calendar years between 211 and 378, the *Chronici canones* of Eusebius and Jerome presents exactly 167 regnal years.

Furthermore, in manuscript B, our sole source for the chronological framework of the chronicle, "Avitus I" appears not at entry 165, as in modern editions, following Avitus' accession in mid-455, but at 169, right before events that must be ascribed to the year 456 (*Chron.* 170).³¹ Other events in "Avitus I" are securely dated to 456 (*Chron.* 173–74). As a result, "Avitus II" and "Avitus III" are nothing more than chronological props, inserted to make the eastern chronology work out correctly.

With the exception of the material in entries 166 and 169, Hydatius knew nothing about Avitus that did not somehow involve the Goths; and what he did know was extremely patchy. As was mentioned above, he knew nothing regarding the date of Avitus' death and very little concerning the circumstances surrounding it. As a result of this ignorance, like the Gallic chronicler Hydatius simply placed Avitus' death before the accession of Majorian, which he too associated with the accession of Leo, but he arranged the events of East and West in the reverse order: Avitus (West) dies, Marcian (East) dies, followed by the accessions of Majorian (West) and Leo (East). Since Hydatius was living in the western empire, it was the most important part, and so Avitus and Majorian come first.

Hydatius' actual account of Avitus' death (*Chron.* 183) implies that there was a close correlation between the loss of Gothic assistance, his loss of *imperium*, and his loss of life, but there are no chronological details. We must therefore fall back on the account of John of Antioch. Since this is only a fragment, we must not be surprised if it has suffered some loss of detail at the end; for it certainly does not mention Placentia by name or Avitus' ordination as bishop. But this must not deter us from regarding the account as accurate, for the details concerning Avitus' flight from Rome are supported by other evidence, and no other good source contradicts it on the fall of Avitus.³² The other sources, taken together, indicate that there was a battle and siege at Placentia, that Avitus surrendered, and that he was made bishop to protect his life. It does seem unlikely that either Ricimer or Majorian would have wished to keep him alive, for they had nothing to gain by doing so; rather, they had every reason to want him dead. As Mathisen pointed out, Goths and Gauls would want to put him back on the throne as long as he survived.³³ Letting Avitus live a free life in Italy on the borders of Gaul would have been the most politically and militarily inept move imaginable; even Julius Nepos sent the newly ordained Glycerius to Dalmatia in 474.³⁴ No doubt within a few days of Majorian and Ricimer's entry into Placentia Avitus was forced to flee to a shrine, where he was besieged; he could not have survived long. He probably was dead by the middle of November 456, if not before.

31. The manuscript must be correct, because entry 165 is still the fourth year of Marcian (cf. entry 162, where "Marcian IIII" = "Val. XXXI") and because in entry 165 Marcian gains a *monarchia*, an impossibility if he had a colleague (cf. entries 80, 82, and 84).

32. See above, n. 5. I do not consider Gregory of Tours a good source in this instance.

33. "Third Regnal Year," p. 333.

34. *PLRE* 2:514. If Malchus is to be believed (*Test.* 1, in Blockley, *Fragmentary Classicising Historians*, 2:402), not even this was sufficient to eradicate the threat of a deposed emperor who was still alive.

Thus there are no grounds for accepting Mathisen's interesting thesis concerning the late date of Avitus' death; and as a result, much else of what he presents has no foundation. But the general problems presented by the chronicle of Hydatius and the *Chronica Gallica* are by no means confined to this particular episode or to these particular chronicles; and they show that one must understand as much as possible about an entire chronicle before judgment can be pronounced upon a part of it.

R. W. BURGESS
St. John's College,
Oxford

APOLLONIUS TYRIUS 46 AND THE EDITORS

The passage in question is the following (p. 101. 1-4 Riese² = p. 158. 3-5 Tsitsikli):¹

... dixit Athenagora "Cives Mytilenae civitatis, sciatis Tyrium Apollonium huc venisse, et ecce classes navium properant cum multis armatis eversuris istam provinciam. ..."

properant A: om. P *eversuris* Riese²: *eversurus* AP: *eversuras* Riese¹, probavit Ring

The same passage appears as follows in the most recent edition, by G. A. A. Kortekaas (p. 394. 3-6):²

... dixit Athenagora: "Cives Mutilene civitatis, sciatis Tyrium Apollonium huc venisse—et ecce, classes navium properant cum multis armatis—eversurus istam provinciam. ..."

"*eversurus* i.q. *eversurum* (nom. in apposit.)" Kortekaas

The thought is perfectly obvious: Apollonius has arrived with his fleet, and now he is pressing forward with his troops to destroy the province. The manuscripts are manifestly corrupt; no editor prints an acceptable text. The version printed by Ring, with Riese's *eversuras*, is unintelligible (*classes ... properant ... eversuras*).³ All editions, whatever their differences, by printing *et ecce classes navium* give undue prominence to the ships; the emphasis should surely be on Apollonius. The same objection applies to the conjectures *eversuras* and *eversuris*, which, by emphasizing ships and soldiers respectively, deny Apollonius his

1. The relevant editions of the *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri* are those of A. Riese (Leipzig, 1871¹ and 1893²); M. Ring (Posen and Leipzig, 1888); D. Tsitsikli (Königstein, 1981).

2. *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri* (Groningen, 1984).

3. Riese¹ printed: "sciatis Tyrium Apollonium regem magnum huc venisse, et tēxea classes navium properantes cum multis armatis eversuras istam provinciam" (wherein *exea* was his misreading of *ecce* and *properantes* his conjecture in place of *properantur*—for so he misread *properant* in A). In his apparatus Riese remarked "ex ea A, om. B; puto eius," whence it appears that he at least envisaged a text which would construe. How Ring, who restored A's *properant* while retaining the conjecture *eversuras*, explained the syntax to his own satisfaction could now be discovered only by a visit to a νεκομπαντεῖον.