praises the *fons Bandusiae,* the very heart of his estate, with words that preface Callimachus' celebrated entertainment scene, the centerpiece of his poem. As noted earlier, it is possible to read Horace's comparison as Callimachean without the *Hecale;* consideration of the epic, even in its fragmentary state, sheds new light on *splendidior vitro.*

Landscapes change, as do programs. Elsewhere in Book 3 Horace addresses public concerns in the so-called Roman Odes, wherein he expands his lyric horizon. In fact, *Ode* 3.13 itself diverges from the Callimachean aesthetic: the imminent blood sacrifice will make Bandusia more than a mere *fons* or λιβάς.[16] The ode is something of a farewell to the *locus amoenus* of Book 1, in which the poet took comfort from the things at hand: olives, chicory, and mallow. Whether this rustic fare intentionally recalls what Hecale served to Theseus is food for thought.[17]

DAN CURLEY
Skidmore College

16. A scholarly commonplace; compare Mader 2002, who finds the motif of blood in water suggestive of epic and panegyric, hence an "upsizing" (my term) of Horace's program. In a forthcoming article (see Literature Cited) I demonstrate that the *haedus* represents the poetics of Alcaeus, whose sacrifice transforms the Callimachean *fons* into something grander and more apt for the Augustan age.

17. I thank the editors and the anonymous referee. Any errors or omissions are of course my responsibility.

LITERATURE CITED

Cameron, A. 1995. *Callimachus and His Critics*. Princeton.

Coffta, D. J. 1998. Programmatic Synthesis in Horace, *Odes* III, 13. In *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History,* vol. 9, ed. C. Deroux, 268–81. Brussels.

Commager, S. 1962. *The* Odes *of Horace*. New Haven, Conn.

Curley, D. Forthcoming. The Alcaic Kid (Horace, *Odes* 3.13). *CW.*

Henderson, J. 1999. *Writing down Rome: Satire, Comedy, and Other Offences in Latin Poetry.* Oxford.

Hexter, R. 1988. *O Fons Bandusiae:* Blood and Water in Horace, *Odes* 3.13. In *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble,* ed. M. Whitby, P. Hardie, and M. Whitby, 131–39. Bristol.

Hinds, S. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Latin Poetry.* Cambridge.

Hollis, A. S., ed. 1990. *Callimachus* Hecale. Oxford.

Leach, E. W. 1993. Horace's Sabine Topography in Lyric and Hexameter Verse. *AJP* 114:271–302.

Mader, G. 2002. That St(r)ain Again: Blood, Water, and Generic Allusion in Horace's Bandusia Ode. *AJP* 123:51–59.

Porter, D. 1987. *Horace's Poetic Journey: A Reading of* Odes *1–3*. Princeton.

Thomas, R. F. 1993. Callimachus Back in Rome. In *Callimachus,* ed. M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, and G. C. Wakker, 197–215. Groningen.

Williams, F., ed. 1978. *Callimachus* Hymn to Apollo: *A Commentary.* Oxford.

Williams, G., ed. 1969. *The Third Book of Horace's* Odes. Oxford.

WHEN DID DIOCLETIAN DIE? NEW EVIDENCE FOR AN OLD PROBLEM

Late Roman chronology of the fourth century C.E. is a messy affair. The most basic dates are obscured in a muddle of sources, which one historian describes as

I am grateful to R. M. Frakes and J. Walker for their comments on an early draft of this paper. Special commendation must be given to R. W. Burgess and the anonymous referee of this journal, whose acumen saved the author from error and embarrassment on a number of points. Any remaining inaccuracies are my own.

"notoriously exiguous, confused, and unreliable."[1] Fortunately, the Herculean efforts of a generation of scholars at the turn of this century have done much to clarify the sequence of events during the Late Roman empire.[2]

A crucial date that has eluded scholars, however, is the year of the emperor Diocletian's death. This fundamental date for one of the more important figures in Late Antiquity remains shrouded in uncertainty. The earliest ancient literary sources or accounts, which rely on the earliest sources, suggest a range of dates from 311 to 318, none of which has found universal acceptance. Our earliest and most important source is Lactantius' *De Mortibus Persecutorum* (henceforth *DMP*), which was composed at the latest in 314/15 and asserts that Diocletian died as a result of Maximian's *damnatio memoriae* imposed by Constantine, which occurred somewhere between 310 and 318.[3] The earliest fixed date is suggested by the *Epitome de Caesaribus* (written after 395), which states that the emperor took his own life slightly before February 313, the date of the marriage between Licinius and Constantia.[4] A later but more specific date of December 3, 316, is followed by a group of fifth- and sixth-century Latin chroniclers, all of whom derive their date from an early fourth-century version of a consular list called the *Descriptio consulum*.[5] This later date is also found in a number of later Greek sources, indicating ultimately a derivation from the *Descriptio*.[6]

1. T. D. Barnes, "Imperial Campaigns, A.D. 285–311," *Phoenix* 30 (1976): 174.

2. See T. D. Barnes, *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine* (Cambridge, Mass., 1982); R. S. Bagnall and K. A. Worp, *The Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt* (Zutphen, 1978); D. W. Rathbone, "The Dates of the Recognition in Egypt of the Emperors from Caracalla to Diocletianus," *ZPE* 62 (1986): 101–31; A. A. Mosshammer, *The Chronicle of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition* (Lewisburg, Pa., 1979); and R. S. Bagnall et al., *Consuls of the Later Roman Empire* (Atlanta, 1987). Recent scholarship includes S. Muhlberger, *The Fifth-Century Chroniclers: Propser, Hydatius, and the Gallic Chronicler of 452* (Leeds, 1990); M. R. Salzman, *On Roman Time: The Codex-Calendar of 354 and the Rhythms of Urban Life in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, 1990); D. Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle*[2] (Darmstadt, 1996); and the works of R. W. Burgess, *The Chronicle of Hydatius and the Consularia Constantinopolitana* (Oxford, 1993) and *Studies in Eusebian and Post-Eusebian Chronography* (Stuttgart, 1999).

3. Lactant. *DMP* 42. For the *DMP*'s date see J. L. Creed, *Lactantius,* De Mortibus Persecutorum (Oxford, 1984), xxxiii–xxxv. Maximian's *damnatio* lasted from shortly after his death in the summer of 310 until his rehabilitation and subsequent commemoration as a *divus* and REQUIES OPTIMORUM MERITOR in 317/18 on Constantine's coinage. See *RIC* 7.180.200, 204–5 (Trier); 7.252.174, 177 (Arles); 7.310.104, 107, 110, 113, 117, 120, 123, 126 (Rome); 7.395. 21, 24 (Aquileia); 7.429.41, 44 (Siscia); 7.503.24 (Thessalonica). In general, see P. Bruun, "The Consecration Coins of Constantine the Great," *Arctos* 1 (1954): 19–31.

4. *Epit. De Caes.* 39.7. For the date of Licinius' and Constantia's marriage see Barnes, *New Empire* (n. 2 above), 81, and Theomnestus, *Hippiatrica Berolinensia* 34.12. The details of the event are contained in Lactant. *DMP* 45.1, 48.2; Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* 10.5.4; *Origo* 13. For the sources of the *Epitome,* see T. D. Barnes, "The *Epitome De Caesaribus* and Its Sources," *CP* 71 (1976): 266–67; Barnes has argued convincingly that the author of the *Epitome* used Eunapius for events during the fourth century. Contra J. Schlumberger (*Die Epitome de Caesaribus* [Munich, 1974]), who maintains that the source must be the lost Latin *Annales* of Nicomachus Flavianus.

5. The extant version of the *Descriptio* contains both the early Western portion of the *Consularia Constantinopolitana* (*Chron. min.* 1.231) covering 509 B.C.E.–342 C.E. and 389–468 C.E., and the Constantinopolitan material. See Burgess, *Chronicle of Hydatius* (n. 2 above), 176. It is likely that the Diocletianic material found in the surviving version of the *Descriptio,* Jerome's *Chronici canones* 230[d] and its two derivatives, Prosper Tiro (*Chron. min.* 1.448) and the Gallic Chronicle of 511 (*Chron. min.* 1.643), stem from an early recension of the *Descriptio* dated to 342. See Burgess, *Chronicle of Hydatius,* 193.

6. T. D. Barnes ("Lactantius and Constantine," *JRS* 63 [1973]: 32) proposes that the eastern sources mistook the number of years Diocletian spent as a private citizen for the length of the first tetrarchy, thus arriving at 316 counting inclusively. The *Descriptio consulum* and its Greek derivative *P Berol.* 13296 or the *Fasti Berolinenses,* published by H. Lietzman ("Ein Blatt aus einer antiken Weltchronik") in *Kleine Schriften,* vol. 1, ed. K. Aland (Berlin, 1958), 420–28, point to 316, as do the Byzantine authors John of Antioch (*FHG* 4.602) and Zosimus 2.8.1, and the later eastern chroniclers Leo the Grammarian (*Chronographia,* ed. I. Bekker, CSHB, 47 [Bonn, 1842], 82), and George Cedrenus (*Historiarum Compendium,* ed. I. Bekker, CSHB,

The date of December 3, 316, has been given the most weight in scholarly circles[7] until recently, when Timothy Barnes provided a compelling argument for an early date of December 3, 311.[8] Barnes' argument relies on a passage in Lactantius (*DMP* 42) that makes Diocletian's demise (*eodem tempore*) a direct consequence of Constantine's formal condemnation of Maximian.[9] Lactantius unfortunately does not give a precise date for Maximian's *damnatio memoriae,* nor does any other ancient account. Presumably, Maximian's condemnation occurred between his death in 310[10] and the rehabilitation of his memory by Constantine in 317/18.[11] Yet this gap of nearly ten years can be further narrowed by examining some clues within the *DMP* itself. A key passage (*DMP* 44) seems to imply that Diocletian was already dead before Maxentius' own demise on October 28, 312, but the context of this passage indicates that the author's account of Maxentius' war with Constantine was in the form of an aside in the story of Maximin's death (*Iam mota inter eos fuerant arma civilia*). Lactantius is more explicit when he narrows the range of dates further by including a proviso that Diocletian died before Maximin Daia, who expired in July 313.[12] Barnes would have the *damnatio* occur a year after the condemned emperor's death in 310, as a result of Constantine's propaganda war with Maximian's son Maxentius, thus

---

34 [Bonn, 1838], 472). Richard Burgess has argued that *P Berol.* 13296, the *Paschale Chronicle* (somewhat garbled), and the *Ecclesiastical History* of Socrates (*Hist. eccl.* 1.2.10) worked from a Greek translation of the 384/85 recension of the *Descriptio.* See Burgess, *Chronicle of Hydatius,* 197. The implication from Socrates' text in G. Hansen's new edition, *Sokrates Kirchengeschichte* (Berlin, 1995), 4, is that Diocletian's death occurred around the marriage of Licinius, as in the *Epitome*'s account. Socrates, however, places the emperor's demise vaguely between Licinius' wedding (313) and the beginning of the Licinian persecution (321), using the phrase ἐν τούτῳ between his account of the marriage and the beginning of the third chapter, in which he describes Licinius' persecution. For a detailed treatment of Socrates' sources, see F. Geppert, *Die Quellen des Kirchenhistorikers Socrates Scholasticus* (Leipzig, 1898), 40–41; and L. Jeep, "Quellenuntersuchungen zu den griechischen Kirchenhistorikern," *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie,* suppl. 14 (1884): 105–54. For recent general work on Socrates Scholasticus, see H. Leppin, *Von Constantin dem Grossen zu Theodosius II: Das christliche Kaisertum bei den Kirchenhistorikern Socrates, Sozomenus und Theodoret* (Göttingen, 1996); and T. Urbainczyk, *Socrates of Constantinople* (Ann Arbor, 1997).

7. For a review of older scholarship see Barnes, "Lactantius and Constantine," 33–34; and F. Paschoud, ed. and trans. *Zosime:* Histoire Nouvelle, *Livres I et II,* new ed. (Paris, 2000), 205–6.

8. Barnes, "Lactantius and Constantine," 35. In this article, Barnes also entertains the possibility of the year 312, but later reaffirms the earlier date of 311 in his *New Empire,* 32; Burgess, in an important review article, "History vs Historiography in Late Antiquity," review of *The Emperor Maurice and His Historian,* by M. Whitby, *AHB* 4 (1990): 121–22, supports Barnes' early chronology but also advocates the slightly later dates of 312 or 313 without detailed comment. Barnes' argument for a date earlier than 316 has been influential on recent scholarship: see Creed, *Lactantius* (n. 3 above), 117; S. Williams, *Diocletian and the Roman Recovery* (London, 1985), 200; F. Kolb, *Diocletian und die Erste Tetrarchie* (Berlin, 1987), 137; J. J. Wilkes, *Diocletian's Palace, Split: Residence of a Retired Roman Emperor* (Oxford, 1993), 11; Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle* (n. 2 above), 276; A. Higham, *Diocletian: The Tale of a Singular Man* (Chichester, 1995), 256; S. Corcoran, *Empire of the Tetrarchs* (Oxford, 1996), 7; R. P. Davis, "Diocletian," *OCD*[3] (1996): 471–72; B. Bleckmann, "Diocletianus," *Der Neue Pauly* 3 (1997): 584.

9. Euseb. (*Hist. eccl.* 8.13.15) also mentions Maximian's condemnation, but says nothing about Diocletian. For evidence of damage to Maximian's portraiture see E. R. Varner, "*Damnatio Memoriae* and Roman Imperial Portraiture," (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1993), 512–14.

10. For the date of Maximian's death, see the *Consularia Constantinopolitana* (*Chron. min.* 1.231) and the recent edition edited by Burgess, *Chronicle of Hydatius,* 235; see also the details in Lactant. *DMP* 30.6 and *Pan. Lat.* 6.14.3 and 6.20.3; see the words of caution by C. E. V. Nixon and B. Saylor-Rodgers in *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors* (Berkeley, 1994), 212–17.

11. See note 3.

12. Lactant. *DMP* 43.1. For the date of Maximin Daia's death, see Barnes (*New Empire,* 7), who argues that Daia died possibly in July at Tarsus. Cf. Lactant. *DMP* 49.1–7; Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* 9.10.13; Eutr. 10.4.4; Zos. 2.17.2. Word of Daia's death reached Egypt by September 13, 313, according to *P.Cairo Isid.* 103.20.

arriving at the year 311.[13] Barnes goes on to argue that since the author of the *Descriptio Consulum* confused the consular dates of 311 (with the accompanying consuls Rufino and Volusiano) with that of December 3, 316 (Sabino and Rufino), the correct month and day would then be matched with his proposed year: thus the date of Diocletian's death would occur on December 3, 311.[14]

In all serious discussions of tetrarchic history one must acknowledge Lactantius' *De Mortibus Persecutorum* as one of the seminal sources that has survived from the early fourth century. It is a unique document providing a detailed political narrative of the tetrarchic age encapsulated in a Christian interpretation of the past. As valuable as the *DMP* is, I think there is an overreliance on this source, particularly in determining the sequence of events during the fourth century. It is the cornerstone of Barnes' argument for an early date of Diocletian's death. Yet Lactantius is far from infallible in his exact reckoning of dates. He makes two errors in chronology concerning the date of the battle of the Milvian Bridge. Lactantius mentions that the battle occurred on October 27 at the end of Maxentius' quinquennalia (*DMP* 44.4), which would have extended from 310 to 311.[15] This would place the battle on October 27, 311. Evidence from the Codex-Calender of 354, however, definitively records Constantine's victory at the Milvian Bridge on October 28, 312. Lactantius gets not only the year wrong, but the day as well.[16]

We must also consider the fact that Lactantius was not in a position to receive accurate information about Diocletian's last days. The emperor had spent his retirement in Split far from the tetrarchic capital of Nicomedia, where Lactantius was a university professor of Latin rhetoric. Lactantius' story that Diocletian grew so depressed at hearing word that his own statues were thrown down with Maximian's that he faded away and died conflicts with other accounts that the emperor apparently committed suicide fearing reprisals from Licinius and Constantine or was even condemned to death by the Roman Senate.[17] When word of the emperor's death reached Nicomedia, Lactantius probably fabricated the details to provide a suitable death befitting a persecuting emperor. The multiple traditions of the emperor's demise perhaps indicate that no one really knew how the emperor expired. Rumor and invention had replaced the facts of the incident. In this light, Lactantius' credibility as a reliable source falters, placing Barnes' early date in jeopardy. To solve the problem of determining exactly when Diocletian died, we must rely on "official" evidence from inscriptions and (especially) numismatic materials that have largely been overlooked.

13. Barnes ("Lactantius and Constantine," 34–35) argues that Maximian's *damnatio memoriae* must predate the Battle of the Milvian Bridge on October 28, 312, since the emperor's statue as a part of the tetrarchic Vicennalia monument is included on a relief on the arch of Constantine dedicated in 315.

14. Barnes, "Lactantius and Constantine," 35, and *New Empire*, 32. The day and the month found in the *Descriptio* ("diem functus Dioclitianus S⟨alon⟩a III n. Dec." [text taken from Burgess, *Chronicle of Hydatius*, 235]) are most likely derived from a calendar, which would include the day but not the year of particular imperial accessions or important events. The *Feriale Duranum*, the Codex-Calendar of 354, and the calendar of Polemius Silvius are good examples of this tendency. See Salzman, *On Roman Time* (n. 2 above), 5–16.

15. Lactant. *DMP* 44.4: "Imminebat dies quo Maxentius imperium ceperat, qui est a.d. sextum kalendas novembres, et quinquennalia terminabantur."

16. J. L. Creed in his edition of the *DMP* has also noticed Lactantius' error. See Creed, *Lactantius*, 118–19. The Codex-Calendar of 354 (*CIL* 1.274) records Maxentius' defeat and expulsion from Rome (*Evictio Tyranni*) on the 28th of October. See Salzman, *On Roman Time*, 141.

17. For Diocletian's suicide see *Epit. de Caes.* 39.7. The story of the senate's condemnation of Diocletian can be found in Gelasius of Caesarea frag. 5. Cf. C. Mango and R. Scott, eds., *The Chronicle of Theophanes the Confessor* (Oxford, 1997), 17.

Recent re-editing of a critical legal text suggests a date for the emperor's death later than Barnes' 311 date, but earlier than the 316 date endorsed by previous scholarship. An imperial rescript preserved in the *Codex Theodosianus* (13.10.2), which exempted the provinces of Lycia and Pamphylia from poll taxes, refers to Diocletian as still alive after 311.[18] According to Mommsen's critical edition, the manuscript bears the date June 1, 313, but recent re-emendations of the text by A. Demandt and S. Mitchell have redated the rescript to June 1, 312, superseding the more radical emendations employed by Otto Seeck in the late nineteenth century.[19] Although it would seem that this piece of legal evidence provides a strong case for establishing a *terminus post quem* of 312 for Diocletian's death, not all scholars have endorsed the re-emended version of the imperial rescript. Barnes, for example, has supported Seeck's previous emendation, which dates the *Codex Theodosianus* 13.10.2 to the summer of 311.[20] Presumably, when the emperor Maximin Daia invaded Asia Minor he alleviated the poll tax in Lycia and Bithynia in conjunction with a blanket suspension of the census in all of Asia.[21] Yet, a recently published inscription dated to April 312 has the emperor promising benefits to the cities of Asia Minor for carrying out his anti-Christian policies.[22] As S. Mitchell has shown, Maximin Daia's abolition of the poll tax three months later was the likely reward, providing a convincing historical context for the *Codex Theodosianus* 13.10.2. These implications of the 312 date of the *Codex Theodosianus* 13.10.2 for the problem of Diocletian's death have not escaped the notice of Mitchell and others.[23] But, as compelling as the legal evidence is, overlooked numismatic evidence must be brought to bear that reinforces the 312 date for the *Codex Theodosianus* 13.10.2 and also establishes a new *terminus post quem* for Diocletian's death to the autumn of 312, thereby undermining Barnes' early date of 311.

Starting from 309 and continuing until the battle of the Milvian bridge on October 28, 312, Maxentius issued a series of coins commemorating the memory of his son

18. *Cod. Theod.* 13.10.2: "idem A. ad Eusebium v(irum) p(erfectissimum) praesidem Lyciae et Pamfyliae. Plebs urbana, sicut in Orientalibus quoque provinciis observatur, minime in censibus pro captitatione sua conveniatur, sed iuxta hanc iussionem nostram immunis habeatur, sicuti etiam sub domino et parente nostro Diocletiano seniore A(ugusto) eadem plebs urbana fuerat. Dat. Kal. Iun. Constantino A. III et Licinio III Conss." Cf. *Cod. Iust.* 11.49.1, which repeats the same date as *Cod. Theod.* 13.10.2.

19. O. Seeck ("Die Schätzungsordnung Diocletians," *Zeitschrift für Social- und Wirtschaftgeschichte* 4 [1896]: 290–95, and *Regesten der Kaiser und Päpste für die Jahre 311 bis 476 n. Chr.* [Stuttgart, 1919], 52–53) was the first to observe that the date in the manuscript was erroneous since in 313 Constantine possessed neither the province of Lycia nor that of Pamphylia. Seeck proposed that the promulgator of the edict must have been Maximin Daia in 311, following the ruler's decision to abolish the census in Bithynia. The assumption that the rescript dates to 311 would, however, require a substantial emendation of the text to the eighth consulship of Galerius and the second for Maximin Daia hence, "Maximiano A. VIII et Maximo II Conss." A. Demandt (review of *Studien zu Maximinus Daia,* by H. Castrius, *Gnomon* 43 [1971]: 693), argued that the rescript could be redated to 312 with only the slight alteration, "Constantino A. II et Licinio II Conss." S. Mitchell ("Maximinus and the Christians in A.D. 312," *JRS* 78 [1988]: 122–23) arrives at a similar conclusion, followed by Corcoran (*Empire of the Tetrarchs* [n. 8 above], 151). J. F. Matthews (*Laying Down the Law: A Study of the Theodosian Code* [New Haven, 2000], 269) posits both dates as possible.

20. See the criticism of T. D. Barnes, "Emperors on the Move," *JRA* 2 (1989): 257, and the rebuttal by S. Mitchell, *Anatolia, Land, Men and Gods in Asia Minor,* vol. 2, *The Rise of the Church* (Oxford, 1993), p. 64, n. 68.

21. Lactant. *DMP* 36.1.

22. Mitchell, *Anatolia* (n. 20 above), 2:67. This edict would be Maximin Daia's famous rescript on the Christians, which survives in three copies: two in Latin issued at Sardis and Arycanda, and a third translated into Greek by Eusebius of Caesarea (*Hist. eccl.* 9.7.3–14). For an updated bibliography of these texts see Corcoran, *Empire of the Tetrarchs,* 149.

23. Mitchell, *Anatolia,* 2:64, and Corcoran, *Empire of the Tetrarchs,* 151.

Romulus (d. 308/9), and three of the deceased members of the first tetrarchy: Constantius (d. 306), Maximian (d. 310), and Galerius (d. 311).[24] Minted in Ostia and Rome, these coins refer to the rulers as *divi* (deified) and bear the reverse legend AETERNA MEMORIA or the dative form AETERNAE MEMORIAE. The obverse iconography usually depicts the emperor's head veiled, while the reverse contains a domed temple surmounted by an eagle. Curiously, the tetrarchy's founder, Diocletian, is absent from Maxentius' coins. The standard interpretation of these issues is that Maxentius, who was regarded as a usurper, claimed legitimization through these consecrated rulers in opposition to Constantine.[25] If Diocletian had died in 311, would not Maxentius have included the emperor in his AETERNA MEMORIA coinage along with Galerius who died in the same year?

Some studies have argued that Maxentius was attempting to revive the Herculian dynasty through his father Maximian and uncle (by marriage) Constantius; thus Diocletian would not be commemorated.[26] Yet this argument is unsatisfactory, since Maxentius included Galerius, who was a member of Diocletian's Jovian line and not the Herculian dynasty. Also, epigraphic evidence found in Rome attests to Maxentius' commemoration of Galerius as a *divus* along with Romulus and Maximian.[27] In his recent monograph, Mats Cullhed explains that by excluding Diocletian, Maxentius intended to celebrate members of the *gens Valeria,* or a "Valerian dynasty," which included family members directly related to him.[28] This explanation might suffice were it not for the fact that Diocletian was the progenitor of the *gens Valeria* and had adopted Maximian, Maxentius' father, as his brother.[29] By this relationship, Maxentius was technically Diocletian's nephew. It was indeed difficult for Maxentius to disassociate himself from his tetrarchic family connections and promote a monarchic lineage through his father. Constantine himself had to reach back to Claudius Gothicus to escape the family ties of the tetrarchy.[30]

Furthermore, the historical context of the AETERNA MEMORIA coins points to Maxentius' appealing to any source of legitimization, since war with Constantine loomed in the near future. The first tetrarchy was a respected institution and had been successful in ending civil war and promoting stability. Maxentius commemorated the

24. *RIC* 6.382.245–52; 6.404.27–29 (Constantius); *RIC* 6.382.243–44, 250–51; 6.404.24–26 (Maximian); *RIC* 6.328.246–48, 253–55; 6.404.30–31 (Galerius).

25. C. E. King, "The Maxentian Mints," *NC* 19 (1959): 73; C. H. V. Sutherland, *The Roman Imperial Coinage,* vol. 6, *From Diocletian's Reform (A.D. 294) to the Death of Maximinus (A.D. 313)* (London, 1967), 346–47 and 396–97.

26. A. Frazer, "The Iconography of the Emperor Maxentius' Buildings in Via Appia," *Art Bulletin* 48 (1966): 391; P. Bastien, "AETERNAE MEMORIAE GALERI MAXIMIANI," *Revue belge de numismatique* 114 (1968): 18–21; F. C. Albertson, "Maxentian Hoards and the Mint at Ostia," *ANSMN* 30 (1985): 121.

27. *ILS* 673=*CIL* 6.1138.

28. M. Cullhed, Conservator Urbis Suae: *Studies in the Politics and Propaganda of the Emperor Maxentius* (Stockholm, 1994), 76–78.

29. Maximian therefore acquired both Diocletian's clan and family names, Aurelius and Valerius respectively. For references to Diocletian's adoption of Maximian, see *Pan. Lat.* 6.15.6, and for fraternal references see *Pan. Lat.* 10.1.5; 10.4.1; 10.9.1; 10.9.3; 10.10.6; 10.13.2; see also the commentary on these references in Nixon and Saylor-Rodgers, *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors* (n. 10 above), 43.

30. For Constantine's fabricated lineage to Claudius Gothicus, see *Pan. Lat.* 6.2.2; and R. Syme, "The Ancestry of Constantine," in *Bonner Historia-Augusta Colloquium* 1971 (Bonn, 1974), 237–53. For more recent accounts of this matter see A. Lippold, "Constantius Caesar, Sieger über die Germanen-Nachfahre des Claudius Gothicus?" *Chiron* 11 (1981): 357–69. And now see A. Baldini, "Claudio Gotico e Constantino in Aurelio Vittore ed Epitome de Caesaribus," in *Costantino il Grande,* ed. G. Bonamente and F. Fusco (Mercerata, 1992), 73–89.

three deceased members of the original tetrarchy in his coinage, including the ruler's father-in-law Galerius, who had earlier excluded him from imperial succession and had later tried to depose him through force of arms.[31] Clearly, then, Maxentius intended to honor the first tetrarchy, as other scholars have argued.[32]

Yet, this still does not explain why Diocletian was missing from the commemorative coins issued during the later years of Maxentius' reign (310–11). If Diocletian had died in 311, as Barnes asserts, he would have been commemorated along with his deceased brethren—though not if he were still alive in 311. The evidence from Maxentius' AETERNA MEMORIA coins further extends the *terminus post quem* of Diocletian's death from the summer to the autumn of 312 and undermines any argument for an early date of the emperor's demise. This establishes a new *terminus* of October 28, 312, when the series of the AETERNA MEMORIA coins had ended. Now the next task is to determine how this legal and numismatic evidence coincides with ancient literary accounts, and if an exact date for Diocletian's death can be determined.

Although the connection between Diocletian's death and Maximian's *damnatio* in the *DMP* has been seriously undermined earlier in this paper, we know that Lactantius, writing in 314/15 at the latest, knew about the emperor's death and placed it before Maximin Daia's death in July 313 (*DMP* 42–43.1), which weakens any arguments for the later date of 316. Taking into account the numismatic evidence presented above, we know now that Diocletian must have died between October 28, 312, and July 313. Earlier in this paper we found that the *Epitome*'s account (39.7) dates the emperor's death to before February 313, which narrows the gap further, to late 312 or early 313. Here the final piece of evidence can be brought to bear. Given Barnes' observation that the compiler of the *Descriptio consulum* had provided the right month and day (December 3), probably derived from a calendar source, but the wrong year (316), it is a simple matter to take the correct portions of the *Descriptio*'s date and apply them to the year that corresponds to the new evidence presented above, namely late 312.[33] This points to December 3, 312, as the correct date of Diocletian's death, clarifying one more crucial detail in Late Roman chronology.

BYRON J. NAKAMURA
J. M. Dawson Institute for Church-State Studies, Baylor University
University of Washington

31. Lactant. *DMP* 18.8–12. See C. S. Mackay, "Lactantius and the Succession to Diocletian," *CP* 94 (1999): 198–209, for the underlying elements of Constantinian propaganda.

32. J. Maurice, "Les dernières monnaies de consécration des *Divi* émises à Rome par Maxence et les monnaies commémoratives de la dynastie solaire des seconds Falviens," in *Mélanges en hommage a la mémoire de Fr. Martroye* (Paris, 1940), 132, followed by A. Arnaldi, "Il motivo dell'aeternitas augusti nella monetazione di Massenzio," *NAC* 6 (1977): 279. Recently J. R. Curran (*Pagan City and Christian Capital: Rome in the Fourth Century* [Oxford, 2000], 54) argues that Maxentius was at first hostile to the tetrarchic system, but later tried to appropriate its legitimacy as his position began to erode.

33. There are two possible explanations for the incorrect year (316) in the *Descriptio* due to two Titivillian errors. The first is that the original compiler of the *Descriptio* could have obtained the month and day of Diocletian's death from a commemorative notice in a contemporary calendar, but derived the year of the emperor's death from an erroneous notion of a twelve-year retirement (304–316) found in later Greek sources. A second explanation is that in this section of the *Descriptio* after 304, there are only two errors, the date of the battle of Cibalae (314 instead of 316) and the date of the death of Diocletian (316 instead of 312). Since these two entries follow one another, it could well be that these entries were somehow transposed in the original source or an early recension of the *Descriptio*. If this is the case, then all later sources for 316 would ultimately depend on the *Descriptio*.