

TRIBUNI SCHOLARUM PALATINARUM
c. A.D. 353–64: AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS AND
THE NOTITIA DIGNITATUM

In a recent article, Woods compiled what he called an ‘almost complete list of [*scholae*] commanders for the period c. 353–64’. On the basis of his premise ‘that there were only five *scholae palatinae* in existence for the period [c. A.D. 353–64]’,¹ he systematized the known tribunes of *scholae palatinae* and filled in the gaps, often by dramatic reconstruction of the uncertain or lacunose careers of individuals, particularly those whose fathers were recorded in military posts. He appended to his article a table of *tribuni*, which, if correct, would provide data both for the revision of *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* and for formulating views on the structure and sociology of the late-Roman army.² However, his premise that there were five *scholae* in this period is based on assumptions about the history of the *Notitia Dignitatum* which are currently under review and on the retrojection into this earlier period of the structure of the *scholae* as set out in the *Notitia Dignitatum*, which is a tralatitian set of lists, dating in its extant form from the end of the fourth century for the eastern lists and from later dates for the western lists.³ Further, his reconstructions of careers, built on assumptions about career patterns which are not substantiated, often takes legitimate conjecture beyond the limits of evidence into the field of historical fiction. This paper will investigate both the validity of the premises which underpin Woods’s paper, and the plausibility of his historical and prosopographical reconstructions. It will argue that his premise that there were five *scholae palatinae* A.D. 353–64 is false, that he is wrong to force the pattern of a later text, the *Notitia Dignitatum*, onto an earlier period of considerable flux for the *scholae*, and that his speculative identification of *tribuni scholarum* who are not named as such by Ammianus can rarely be sustained. It aims to set out an alternative framework for reconstructing the history of the *scholae* and their tribunes in this period, giving primacy to the narrative of Ammianus over what are at best dubious modern constructs. The resulting history may seem more jejune and will certainly be less dramatic, but it should provide a firmer basis for further enquiries.

¹ D. Woods, ‘Ammianus and some *tribuni scholarum palatarum* c. A.D. 353–64’, *CQ* 47 (1997), 269–91, at 269 and 270. For the *scholae palatinae*, *ND or.* 11.4–10; *ND occ.* 9.4–8. The major study is that of D. Hoffmann, *Das spätromische Bewegungsheer und die Notitia Dignitatum*, Epigraphische Studien 7, 2 vols (Düsseldorf, 1969–70), 1.279–303, 2.117–123. Other studies: Th. Mommsen, ‘Das römische Militärwesen seit Diocletian’, *Hermes* 24 (1889), 195–279, at 221–5; R. Grosse, *Römische Militärgeschichte von Gallienus bis zum Beginn der byzantinischen Themenverfassung* (Berlin, 1920), 93–6; O. Seeck, ‘Scholae palatinae’, *RE* 2A (1921), 621–4; R. I. Frank, *Scholae Palatinae. The Palace Guards of the Later Roman Empire*, Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome 22 (Rome, 1969) with the review by A. H. M. Jones in *JRS* 60 (1970), 227–9.

² A. H. M. Jones, J. Martindale, and J. Morris, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* 1 (Cambridge, 1971), hereafter cited as *PLRE* 1.

³ P. Brennan, ‘The *Notitia Dignitatum*’, in *Les Littératures techniques dans l’antiquité romaine*, Fondation Hardt, *Entretiens sur l’antiquité classique* 42 (1996), 147–78; C. Kelly, *CAH*² 13 (1998), 163ff. for an excellent, brief review of the state of scholarship. For new arguments dating the eastern list to 401, see C. Zuckerman, ‘Comtes et ducs en Égypte autour de l’an 400 et la date de la *Notitia Dignitatum Orientis*’, *AntTard* 6 (1998), 137–47, at 143–7.

ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT THE *NOTITIA DIGNITATUM* AND
THE *SCHOLAE PALATINAE*

In 364 the new emperors Valentinian and Valens created separate administrations and divided up military units (Amm. 26.5.1–3). Tomlin and Hoffmann, independently, developed a seductive hypothesis to show the mechanics of this division, an hypothesis that Hoffmann made the keystone for interpreting the history of the late-Roman field army.⁴ Noting the existence of homonymous military units differentiated as *seniores* and *iuniores* in the later *Notitia Dignitatum* field army lists, with *seniores* being preponderant in the west and *iuniores* in the east, they postulated that this division of military forces involved the halving or the doubling of many existing army regiments, including *scholae palatinae*, into *seniores* and *iuniores* units, the former going west with the Senior Augustus, the latter going east with the Junior Augustus. This has become the consensus. It has been applied to the *scholae palatinae*, to hypothesize that the *armaturae* and *gentiles* were duplicated into *seniores/iuniores* in 364, with the *seniores* in the west and the *iuniores* in the east; further extrapolation from the *Notitia* suggests that the *I* and the *II scutarii* were duplicated (though the units in the west and in the east were not differentiated as *seniores/iuniores* or in any other way, as far as is known) and the *scutarii sagittarii* and the *scutarii clibanarii* were retained undivided in the east. The only other *schola* noted in the *Notitia*, that is *III scutarii*, is seen as a later creation at a western court.⁵ Woods essentially joins this consensus, except at one point. In excluding *scutarii sagittarii*, which he sees as also a later creation, this time at the eastern court, he concludes that there were five, rather than six, *scholae* in existence at the time of the division of armies in 364: *I scutarii*, *II scutarii*, *scutarii clibanarii*, *armaturae* and *gentiles*.⁶ The explicit and cogent criticisms of such inferences from *Notitia* patterns in recent years, criticisms from which treatment of the *scholae* cannot be quarantined, are not easily set aside.

A sepulchral inscription found at Nakolea in northern Phrygia, dated to A.D. 356 and published subsequent to the work of Tomlin and Hoffmann, records the dead man's unit as NUMERUM IOCORNSEN. The name of this unit is generally and best expanded to refer to *io(v)ii* or *io(viani) cornuti seniores* and identified with the *cornuti seniores* in the *Notitia* (occ. 5.158); the implications are the same, even if the less likely rereading *eq(uites) corn(uti) sen(iores)* is accepted.⁷ The title *cornuti seniores* establishes that the generic distinction *seniores/iuniores* existed in Roman armies by 356 and

⁴ Hoffmann (n. 1), 1.122–30, 325–6; R. Tomlin, 'Seniores–Iuniores in the late-Roman field army', *AJPh* 93 (1972), 253–78. Hoffmann suggested the division of units, Tomlin the doubling; both agreed that *seniores* went west and *iuniores* east. Ammianus, whose imprecision on military terminology is well known, uses the term *iuniores* only once, of an event soon after the division of 364 (Amm. 26.6.12); on Ammianus' terms and their relation to technical usages, see A. Müller, 'Militaria aus Ammianus Marcellinus', *Philologus* 18 (1905), 573–632.

⁵ Hoffmann (n. 1), 1.289; D. Woods, 'The *scholae palatinae* and the *Notitia Dignitatum*', *JRMES* 7 (1997), 44.

⁶ Woods (n. 1), 269–70 and nn. 6–8. See D. Woods, 'Subarmachius, Bacurius, and the *schola scutariorum sagittariorum*', *CPh* 91 (1996), 365–371 on the creation of *scutarii sagittarii* in more detail; his view is rejected below in the section on this unit.

⁷ T. Drew-Bear, 'A fourth-century Latin soldier's epitaph at Nakolea', *HSCPh* 81 (1977), 257–74, at 267–8, 272–3; also M. P. Speidel, 'Raising new units for the late Roman army: *Auxilia Palatina*', *DOP* 50 (1996), 163–70, at 167–9. Drew-Bear (272, n. 64) considers and rejects the alternative reading *eq(uites)* for *io(viani)*. The name *io(viani) cornuti* might well point to the raising of this unit under the tetrarchy, but it is a giant leap to postulate a duplication already into *seniores* and *iuniores* and separate service in the east and the west from that time.

supposes a homonymous unit of *cornuti iuniores*. *Cornuti* are attested by Ammianus (15.5.30, 16.12.43 and 63) as active in the west in 355 and 357. They are most likely *iuniores*, contemporary with the epigraphically recorded *seniores* in the east, though it is possible that the *cornuti* involved in the usurpation of Silvanus in 355 were the *seniores* and had been transferred to the east as a punishment. There is no reason to regard *cornuti* as an isolated example of *seniores/iuniores* before 364 and Drew-Bear makes a case for other units, hard to reject in the case of *lanciarrii* and plausible for *ioviani*.⁸ There were also at least two *auxilia* named *batavi* in the west before 364, one associated with *heruli*, the other with *reges* (*regii*).⁹ How they were differentiated is unclear. In the *Notitia* they are both called *seniores* and it is pure guesswork whether the two units, both existing before 364, received *seniores* in their names before or after 364. The recording of both units in the *Notitia* can hardly be a reference to the same unit transferred from one part of the empire to the other, for the continuing association of one with *heruli* and the other with *reges* certifies the existence of two separate units. This is a major problem for the Hoffmann thesis.

The existence of *seniores* in the east before 364 casts into doubt the other major assumption which Hoffmann used as a fixed point from which to unravel the strands of the *Notitia*, namely that the *seniores/iuniores* distinction was essentially a duplication of units in 364 between the Senior Augustus (who took the *seniores* west) and the Junior Augustus (who took the *iuniores* east). This goes against a long history of the terms *senior* and *iunior* to refer to the seniority or age of soldiers at various times from Republican days to the fourth century A.D. *Iuniores* is still often used for recruits in the late empire.¹⁰ *Iuniores* may well have been formed from recruits, selected partly from utilizing the conscription mechanisms and partly from *adcrecentes* attached to the parent unit to fill out a new unit formed around a cadre of soldiers from the parent unit.¹¹ It is much more likely that the terminology *senior/iunior* continued to relate to the longstanding processes of unit formation than to the existence of senior and junior emperors; the latter was, in any case, a matter of seniority in date of appointment and was not otherwise reflected in the official terminology of the fictively equal and harmonious imperial college.

Since there were *seniores* in the east before 364, then no single date can be set for the formation of specific *seniores* or *iuniores*; further, it will have been the circumstances of the duplication, not the seniority of the emperor, that determined the army or armies in which the separate units were placed.¹² Once this is recognized, it lies open that the duplication of units into *seniores* and *iuniores* was an ongoing process, occurring before, in, and after 364. In that case the major mechanism of the division of armies in 364 may not have been the duplication of a single unit into *seniores* and *iuniores*, but the division of certain units in such a way that both Valentinian and Valens had homonymous units. That is, in substance, what is generally agreed to have happened to the *schola I scutariorum* and the *schola II scutariorum*, though the precise process is unclear. A similar duplication may have produced other homonymous units, whether *seniores* or *iuniores*, recorded in both eastern and western lists in the *Notitia*; this is an

⁸ Drew-Bear (n. 7), 273–4; *ILS* 2788, 2789.

⁹ *Batavi seniores* are paired with both *heruli* (Amm. 20.1.3, 4.2; *ND occ.* 5.162–3) and *reges* (Amm. 16.12.45; *ND or.* 5.49 and 6.49). On *batavi seniores*, Hoffmann (n. 1), 1.105 *et passim*.

¹⁰ Tomlin (n. 4), 261–2 for references.

¹¹ P. Brennan, 'The last of the Romans: Roman identity and the Roman army in the late Roman Near East', *Meditarch* 11 (1998), 191–203, at 196–8 with n. 32.

¹² R. Scharf, 'Seniores-Iuniores und die Heeresteilung des Jahres 364', *ZPE* 89 (1991), 265–72.

alternative to Hoffmann's view which saw them as transfers between the two parts of the empire, still recorded in the earlier eastern list, but also recorded in the later western one.

Although Woods recognizes that the scholarly debate has moved forward on this issue and that some *seniores/iuniores* existed before 364, he remains convinced that 'the evidence seems as compelling as ever' that *seniores* and *iuniores* in the *scholae palatinae* were created in 364.¹³ The evidence for the *scholae*, as for other units before the Nakolea inscription, is from silence and from an interpretation of patterns in the *Notitia*. Silence, granted the nature of our evidence, can only be a supporting argument. There were several occasions that were appropriate to the creation of secondary units, not only after 364, but also before that date. Current assumptions about patterns in the *Notitia*, particularly as they relate to its use for earlier history, have to be revised much more fundamentally than Woods recognizes.

Because of its tralatician nature, one extracts at one's peril earlier strands, such as the situation of the *scholae* in 364, from the tantalizing palimpsest that is the *Notitia*. There is a temptation for those who seek to retroject the situation of 364 from this document to minimize changes to the listing of units effected through political, military, and even bureaucratic contingencies: contingencies such as the existence of a third emperor 367–83 with a third court and presumably *scholares*; the military disaster at Adrianople in 378; the civil wars of 388 and 394. Hoffmann took a particularly minimalist approach to possible changes to the *scholae* after 364. He even considered that *III scutarii* may already have been in existence in 364.¹⁴ Only *gentiles seniores*, whose appearance in both eastern and western lists requires some explanation, was seen to have undergone change in this period. He explained its appearance in both lists, assuming that this was the same unit and not homonymous units, by a series of transfers. Since, on his hypothesis about the nature of the army division of 364, *gentiles seniores* was in the west in 364, its listing in the east required a later transfer there at some stage. Its continued place in the western list was explained by its return to the west in 394 and its re-entry in the western list; its retention in the eastern list was either due to the archival nature of the extant eastern list from 394/6, or to the expectation by the eastern court that the unit would return to the east. Since there still seem to have been seven *scholae* in the east in the fifth century, Hoffmann postulated its replacement by an unknown unit.¹⁵ Whatever the value of this complex argument, it should be, even if correct, disquieting for the current use of the *Notitia* as a fixed point for interpreting military history in 364 and the following decades; it may be only the visible tip of several changes in the structure or cross-posting of *scholae* in tumultuous times.

The signs of disruption in the *Notitia* text are greater than Hoffmann recognizes and Woods has sought to address them.¹⁶ The entry for the *magister officiorum* in both parts of the empire has an illustrated section (*insigne*), including military shields, followed by a text listing the elements under the authority of this official, including a list of *scholae* units. The eastern list has six shields illustrated in the *insigne*, but there are seven units listed in the text; the western list has seven shields in the *insigne*, but only five in the text.¹⁷ These anomalies, especially the evidence of the shields, suggest that at the date of the illustrations (and it seems that the illustrations and the texts were not always updated at the same time) there were six *scholae* (not seven) in the east and

¹³ Woods (n. 1), 270, n. 7.

¹⁴ Hoffmann (n. 1), 1.289.

¹⁵ Ibid. 1.325ff.

¹⁶ Woods (n. 5), 39ff.

¹⁷ Compare *ND* or. 11 with *ND* occ. 9; for the integrity of the illustrations and for further references, see Woods (n. 5), 39ff.; Brennan (n. 3), 159ff.

seven (not five) in the west. This should be related to another curious anomaly in the relation between shields and text, an anomaly which also suggests change within the *scholae* in this period. The first four *shields* in the western *insigne*—but not the latter three—parallel those in the eastern *insigne*, but the third and fourth *units* in the western list do not parallel the third and fourth units in the eastern list. The implication of the shields is that the first four units in each list were once parallel; when it comes to the units the parallelism only extends to the first two. It is hard to find an explanation which incorporates all these anomalies, given the bureaucratic processes involved in updating the items in the *Notitia* and given the multiple possibilities for cross-posting and creation of units in the history of the period 364–94.

Woods accepts the basic view of Hoffmann, retrojecting the structure of the *Notitia* back to 364, though he constructs a subsequent history of the *scholae* from 364 which, unlike Hoffmann, does seek to explain the range of anomalies in the *Notitia* entries. However, an alternative starting-point for the structure in 364 is worth considering. Accepting the shields as the oldest strand, one might speculate that in 364 Valentinian and Valens divided existing *scholae* between them so that each had homonymous units of *I scutarii*, *II scutarii*, *armaturae*, and *gentiles* (corresponding to the parallel shields of the two *Notitia insignia*). The three remaining shields in the western *insigne* would correspond to *armaturae iuniores*, *gentiles iuniores*, and *III scutarii*. All could go back to 364, but the latter three could also be later creations in different circumstances—the duplication of *armaturae* and *gentiles* into *seniores* and *iuniores* and the creation of a separate *schola scutariorum*. The two remaining shields in the eastern *insigne* would correspond to *scutarii sagittarii* and *scutarii clibanarii*, units also going back to 364, but not duplicated. To get from this to the *Notitia* list of units would simply require the later loss of the eastern *armaturae seniores* and the transfer to the east of the *armaturae iuniores* and *gentiles iuniores*; the latter two units could well have been transferred to the court of the new emperor Valentinian I (or created for him) and then fled with him to the east in 387 to be included among the eastern *scholae*. This reconstruction would allow an explanation of the discrepancies and anomalies in the *Notitia* entries. This view and that of Woods are both hypothetical, for the situation in 364 and for the subsequent history of *scholae* units. The advantage of our hypothesis is that it is more economical and, as will be shown, it fits better the information in Ammianus on the evolution of the *scholae* in the decade before 364.

The origins and development of the *scholae palatinae* are largely lost. It is reasonable to postulate that a new type of imperial cavalry bodyguard evolved under the tetrarchs and their successors to replace the *equites singulares*.¹⁸ Several cavalry units attached to emperors before Constantine may have served some of the functions of later *scholae*: e.g. *comites* and *equites promoti* with Galerius in Egypt in 295; *scutarii* among whom the later emperor Maximinus served; *comites* with an emperor in Italy in c. 307; *promoti* and *sagittarii* with Maximinus.¹⁹ Constantine is probably responsible for the foundation from which the permanent *scholae palatinae* were to evolve. There is evidence under him of *scutarii* and *scutarii clibanarii*, stationed in Constantinople. They presumably passed on to Constantius II, but nothing else is known about *scholae* at his court or at that of his brothers or of Magnentius before the narrative of Ammianus. The machinations of the House of Constantine and the volatile situation after 350 complicate the history of the imperial bodyguard, and we should expect

¹⁸ M. P. Speidel, *Riding for Caesar* (London, 1994), 72ff. with nn. 90–2 for references; Hoffmann (n. 1) 1.281–2.

¹⁹ *P.Oxy.* 43 (*recto*); *P.Grenf.* 2.110; Lact. *Mort. Pers.* 19.6, 40.5; *CIL* 11.6168.

formation and re-formation, detachment and re-connection, and mutation in name and status. Ammianus provides much information for the period 353–64: several *tribuni scutariorum*, *tribuni gentilium*, *tribuni armaturarum* as well as *scutarii et gentiles* at the courts of Gallus Caesar, Constantius Augustus, and Julian Caesar. It is assumed that all these units formed part of the *scholae* in this period, but that may again be merely retrojection from the structure in the *Notitia*. Ammianus, in his only use of the word *schola* before 362, seems to distinguish the *scutarii et gentiles* at Gallus Caesar's court from his *scholae palatinae et protectorum*.²⁰ Ammianus never uses *schola* for *armaturae*; more significantly the association of *armaturae* in battle in 355 with *comites* and *promoti*, the two top-ranking units among the *vexillationes palatinae* in the *Notitia*, may indicate that they were at that time classified in the same way, with the categorization of the court cavalry still in flux. The *scholae* in the form made familiar by the *Notitia* were a creation of this period, part of the restructuring of the field army which culminated in the distinction between *palatini*, *comitatenses*, and *pseudo-comitatenses*, first attested in 365.²¹

Thus, granted our uncertainties both as to the nature of the *scholae* in the 350s and to the value of retrojecting the *Notitia* material to the situation in 364, let alone earlier, we cannot begin with an assumption about a fixed number of *scholae* for the period 353–64. At any point there might be more than five *scholae palatinae* or less (including, for purposes of analysis, all those *schola*-type units which were later clearly part of the *scholae*). We must begin with Ammianus and an open mind. One example is instructive. From his text it is clear that both Julian (Amm 20.4.3) and Constantius II (Amm 20.8.13) had *gentiles et scutarii* in 360, even though it is not clear how the units at the two courts were related or what they were officially called. The existence before 364 of multiple units of *gentiles* by itself makes it hard to accept Woods's assertion that 'there was only one *schola gentilium* during the period c. 353–364, i.e. until the division of the *scholae* between Valens and Valentinian I in 364',²² and to accept his consequent massaging of the evidence to fit this assumption. Without the straitjacket of a fixed five *scholae* and a fixed five tribunes in the period, there is no tool for limiting the search for specific *tribuni scholarum*.

ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT THE MILITARY CAREERS OF *TRIBUNI SCHOLARUM PALATINARUM*

In addition, this search builds on another questionable assumption, that it is valid to seek these tribunates in the early careers of *magistri militum* or in the sons of those known in high military commands. There is little support for either assumption in known careers. That is not really surprising when one considers the place of the *scholae* in the military command structure, under the command of the *magister officiorum*, not of the *magistri militum*. *Schola* commanders may have gained promotion to *magistri* in exceptional circumstances, but such posts lay largely outside the conventional military commands in field units and regional armies. Only five *magistri militum* listed in *PLRE* 1 are attested as having served as tribunes of *scholae* or

²⁰ Amm. 14.7.9: *solisque scholis iussit esse contentum palatinis et protectorum cum scutariis et gentilibus*. The *schola(e) palatina(e)*, seemingly distinguished from the *schola protectorum*, may be a *schola scutariorum* or a *schola agentum in rebus* or both.

²¹ Amm. 15.4.10 (see below n. 36 for text); *ND or* 5.28, 6.28; *occ.* 6.43–4; A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1964), 1.125 on *C.Th.* 8.1.10 (A.D. 365).

²² Woods (n. 1), 280.

schola-type units and each became *magister* in exceptional circumstances. It was not a career path. Silvanus and Gomoarius were defectors to Constantius II in civil wars. So perhaps was Malarichus, who was in any case in retirement when he declined the post of *magister* offered by Jovian for specific political reasons. Agilo's promotion is marked out by Ammianus as *immodico saltu*. Equitius owed his post as *magister* to his roles in the elevation of Valentinian and in support of Valens against the usurpation of Procopius. Arinthaëus' path to *magister* may represent a normal career, but he is not actually recorded as commander of a *schola* in his own right, only as acting commander, perhaps as *tribunus vacans*. It is true that the earlier posts of *magistri militum* are rarely known (except that a large number had been *comites domesticorum*), but to assign them posts as *tribuni scholarum* is to create a career pattern and a statistic which is not justified by the evidence and which may lead to false sociology about the role of the *scholae* and their commanders. A similar danger lies in creating a career path through the *scholae* commands for the sons of military officers. Many are known as *protectores* and some as *scholares*, but only one, the emperor Valentinian, is recorded as a *tribunus scholarum*, and he, again, was given this post in exceptional circumstances. The son of the *magister militum* Ursicinus was *tribunus promotorum* (Amm. 31.13.18) and commands of such palatine units provide another, and perhaps more usual, option for such men.

This paper seeks to answer the challenge put by Woods 'to integrate Ammianus' scattered evidence concerning the commands of the *scholae* into a coherent framework'.²³ In the end, little will be learned about the careers of individual officers, since the tribunes proposed by Woods rarely survive scrutiny. Some merely belong to a pool of candidates and, as such, are no better than other known contemporaries (e.g. Nemota, Victor, Bellovaedius, *insignium numerorum tribuni* in 363 according to Amm. 25.7.13) or the greater mass of unknown military figures of the time. Others run counter to alternative and better interpretations of scant evidence. In the process, however, a coherent framework will be provided for Ammianus' information and a firmer foundation on which to base further investigation of the history of the *scholae* and their tribunes in this period and later.

SCUTARII

The unit-type *scutarii* existed among *scholae*, *palatini*, and *comitatenses* (in central, regional, and provincial armies), so evidence of *scutarii* is not necessarily evidence of a *schola*, though *scutarii* closely associated with imperial courts are most likely to have been *scholares*. A late reference to a *schola scutariorum* shows that it existed under Constantine, who had established food rations for it at Constantinople.²⁴ The best starting-point for *tribuni scutariorum* is the cashiering of Romanus and Vincentius, named as tribunes respectively of *schola I* and *schola II scutariorum* by Ammianus (22.11.2), whose narrative places the event at Antioch in winter 362/3. Ammianus lists a number of punishments at this point and makes one of them, the execution of Artemius, lead on to the death of George, bishop of Alexandria. There is something wrong here; since George's death occurred on 24 December 361, it cannot have postdated Artemius' death, if the latter occurred in winter 362/63 (Amm.

²³ Ibid. 291.

²⁴ C.Th. 14.17.9 (A.D. 389): *annonas civicas in urbe Constantinopolitana scholae scutariorum et scutariorum clibanariorum divi Constantini adseruntur liberalitate meruisse*.

22.11.3–4).²⁵ Since Artemius seems to have outlived George (Julian, *Ep.* 60; *Chron. Pasch.* s.a. 362–3), Ammianus' error most likely lies in his chronology and connection of the two deaths.²⁶ Woods suggests an alternative error and posits that Ammianus has lumped together at this point in his narrative a list of punishments, which did not necessarily all occur at Antioch in winter 362/3. This would open up the dating of the various punishments, including that of the *tribuni scutariorum*, and Woods argues that their exile be redated to winter 361/362 and relocated to Constantinople.²⁷ His case rests on identifying a shadowy Frumentinus as successor by mid-362 to Romanus or Vincentius as *tribunus scutariorum*. Frumentinus raises a number of problems, not least whether he existed. Great weight is placed on a source of doubtful reliability, the *Passio* of Basil of Ancyra, the only source to mention him, with the title *comes scutariorum*. *PLRE* reasonably doubts his existence.²⁸ Even if Frumentinus existed, his title is anachronistic and created to give him requisite status in terms meaningful to a later age, regardless of the title of any actual judge, whether a *comes*, a tribune of *scutarii* (either a *schola* or a *vexillatio*), or another official. A trial may well have taken place before a high-ranking officer with Julian during his stay at Ancyra in 362 (Amm. 22.9.8), but even if Frumentinus were *tribunus scutariorum*, and tribune of *schola I* or *II*, rather than *III*, *scutariorum*, he could be slotted in as the predecessor of Romanus or Vincentius rather than the successor. Woods has introduced an important piece of evidence, hitherto ignored, but it is not solid enough to certify Frumentinus as *tribunus scutariorum* and certainly not to reject Ammianus' place and date for the exile of Romanus and Vincentius. It is tempting, as Woods admits, to link the tribune Romanus, whose exile Ammianus (22.11.2) dates at Antioch in winter 362/3, with the name Romanus given to a Christian soldier who was exiled under Julian at the same time and place (Theodoret, *HE* 3.12–13). The playing with the name/identity 'Romanus' in this story (the name Romanus made the soldier unworthy of martyrdom) moves beyond history to the longstanding *Romanus/Christianus, militia Caesaris/militia Christi* discourse, but the name may go back to a real event and provide support for Ammianus' placing of the exile of Romanus in Antioch in winter 362/363.

No successors of Romanus and Vincentius are named before Equitius, who was tribune of *schola I* at the death of Jovian (his appointment date is unknown and thus he may have succeeded Romanus), and Valentinianus, who was appointed tribune of *schola II* by Jovian soon after his accession. There is certainly one unnamed *tribunus scutariorum* in this period, for there is at least one tribune between Vincentius and Valentinian. It is possible, as Woods argues in an ingenious reconstruction of events surrounding the death of Julian in which two units called *scutarii* were involved, that both *tribuni scutariorum* were either killed or cashiered for the failure of their units to protect the high command at this time. We are unlikely ever to know.

There were certainly two *scholae scutariorum* in 362, but how much earlier? Scudilo was *tribunus scutariorum* at Constantius' court in 354. One cannot say whether he already held this post at the Battle of Mursa in 351, but if Zosimus is correct in giving

²⁵ See J. den Boeft, J. W. Drijvers, D. den Hengst, and H. C. Teitler, *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XXII* (Groningen, 1995), 196ff.; Hoffmann, (n. 1), 1.287.

²⁶ As in *PLRE* 1.112, s.v. Artemius 2.

²⁷ Woods (n. 1), 276–7.

²⁸ *PLRE* 1.375, s.v. Frumentinus. For the problems of using the genre of hagiography as history with special reference to this example, see H. C. Teitler, 'History and hagiography: the *Passio* of Basil of Ancyra as a historical source', *Vigiliae Christianae* 50 (1996), 73–80; Woods (n. 1), 276, n. 25) does not rebut the essence of this criticism.

Scolidoas (probably the same man) a special command over infantry at this time, it seems unlikely (Amm. 14.11.11; Zos. 2.50.2–3). It is possible that there was a second *schola scutariorum* at the court of Constantius already by 354. Assuming that Constantius' expedition against the western usurpers in 350 included the established *schola scutariorum*, the desertion from Vetranio of Gomoarius, who led *scutarii* at the time, may have led to a second *schola* being established in Constantius' army. Gomoarius' *scutarii* were likely to have been in origin a field-army vexillation (perhaps turned into a *schola* for the briefly usurping Vetranio), but both this unit and its commander may have been rewarded in the same way as Silvanus and his unit were rewarded for desertion at the Battle of Mursa (Amm. 21.8.1). Nothing is known of Gomoarius' career between his desertion and his brief, abortive appointment as Julian's *magister militum*, but Constantius' use of him in 361 to command *laeti*, a known recruiting source for *scholares* (Amm. 20.8.13), may point to an intervening command of a *schola* (Amm. 21.13.16). Woods's argument for a second *schola scutariorum* proceeds on a different basis. A certain Bainobaudes, named *tribunus scutariorum*, was sent by Constantius to the court of Gallus after an earlier mission by the *tribunus scutariorum*, Scudilo. Technically, this would allow him to be successor of Scudilo in his command, but Woods gives cogent, though not conclusive, reasons to doubt that Scudilo was replaced at this time. However, Bainobaudes' precise position is not clear. He did not go to Gallus with a *schola*, but apparently as a replacement commander, just as his two companions were sent to replace other officials *ut quaestor et . . . quasi domesticorum comes* (Amm. 14.10.8, 14.11.14). Thus, while his title *tribunus scutariorum* may indicate that he was commander of *scutarii* at Constantius' court, it is more likely that he was sent to command *scutarii* with Gallus. It is not known whether Gallus' unit of *scutarii* had been created *ex nihilo* as a separate unit or had been formed as a detachment from a *schola* at the court of Constantius. Gallus' unit will not have survived his execution and the subsequent punishment of his palace guards, and Bainobaudes' post as its commander will have lapsed.

Woods argues that he is the same man as the tribune Bainobaudes who was acting as a cavalry commander on the orders of the Caesar Julian in Gaul in 357 and who was cashiered for his actions as a result of intrigues at the court of Constantius. That may be so, though Hoffmann disagrees, distinguishing him from the earlier noted Bainobaudes (and both from the Bainobaudes, *tribunus cornutorum*, killed in battle shortly afterwards) (Amm. 16.12.63).²⁹ His post in Gaul, however, is not clear. Ammianus does not specify his command. He may have been tribune of *scutarii* at Julian's court, comparable to his (or a different Bainobaudes') post at Gallus' court or a tribune of another field army unit or a *tribunus vacans*; the least likely alternative is that he was tribune of a second *schola scutariorum* based at Constantius' court. Thus, there is still no strong case for a second such *schola* attached to Constantius' court, alongside the *schola* commanded by Cella in 357 and at his death in action in 359 (Amm. 16.11.6–7, 19.11.16). We should discount Victor as tribune of any *schola scutariorum* in this period, for there is nothing to support the hypothetical career path through which Woods tentatively includes him in his register of tribunes.³⁰ There is no evidence for Cella's replacement in 359 at Constantius' court and the next direct evidence shows Romanus and Vincentius as tribunes of numbered *scholae scutariorum* at Antioch in 362/3. Woods fills the vacuum by extending the post of Romanus back to the death of Cella in 359.

²⁹ Hoffmann (n. 1), 2.123, n. 859.

³⁰ Woods (n. 1), 288.

Nestica, *tribunus scutariorum*, was taking orders from Julian in 358 and was surely in command of Julian's *scutarii* (Amm. 17.10.5). There is no way of putting secure limits to the period of his command. He may have replaced Bainobaudes, if the latter commanded *scutarii*. As Nestica's successor, Woods offers Agilo. That cannot be right. The Alaman Agilo held the court post of *tribunus stabuli* in 354 and nothing is known of his subsequent career before 360, when, described as *ex gentilium [et] scutariorum tribuno*, he was promoted *immodico saltu* to replace Ursicinus as *magister peditum* (Amm. 14.10.8, 20.2.5).³¹ Woods splits the command into two and has Agilo move from a command of the *gentiles* to a command of the *schola scutariorum secunda*.³² Apart from requiring an emendation of the text, such a listing of posts rather weakens Ammianus' point, for he is describing an exceptional promotion, not an exceptional career path; nor is there any parallel for such a career path showing movement between *scholae* (except for that conjectured by Woods for Valentinian). Agilo's post was most likely that of *tribunus scutariorum et gentilium* at the court of Constantius (and it will be discussed later under *gentiles*). If Ammianus did mean successive posts, then both should be sought in the *scholae* at Constantius' court. Agilo is an arguable, but unlikely, candidate as successor to Cella at Constantius' court, but he cannot have been successor to Nestica in Gaul.

Woods concocts a scenario which takes Agilo from *tribunus scutariorum* at Julian's court to *magister peditum* at Constantius' court. In this drama, on the news of Julian's usurpation Agilo was involved in a difference of opinion on how they should react with Sintula, the *tribunus stabuli* then charged with the removal of the most resolute of Julian's *scutarii* and *gentiles* to Constantius. In the aftermath Sintula returned to Julian with some soldiers and Agilo continued his march to Constantius in the east with the majority of soldiers and thus won promotion to *magister* on the basis of his act of loyalty to Constantius. There is none of this in Ammianus. He states unambiguously that the men who had been led away by Sintula returned with him to Paris freed from anxiety by news of the usurpation (Amm. 20.5.1). Agilo's presence on the march is a fiction. If he had been present, it was hardly likely that a *tribunus stabuli* would have led the troops under his command. Further, Sintula, who had ignored Julian's complaints while putting together the detachment, is hard to cast as the supporter of Julian in any scenario in which there was a dispute on whether to support Julian or Constantius (Amm. 20.4.5).

But the whole presumption on which the dispute is postulated is neither borne out by the evidence nor likely: the majority of *scutarii* and *gentiles* will have had different feelings about their transfer to the east from those of the rebel *auxilia* who had proclaimed Julian emperor. It was precisely on behalf of the *scutarii et gentiles* that Julian complained to Sintula about his choosing transrhene volunteers who had joined the army with an agreement that they should not be led beyond the Alps (Amm. 20.4.4). He clearly still had the wishes of these volunteers in mind when, after his usurpation, he offered to send Constantius for his *scutarii et gentiles*, recruits not from this source but from a different background, that is young *laeti*, the offspring of barbarians raised on the Roman side of the Rhine, or *dediticii* who had deserted. Thus,

³¹ *PLRE* 1.28–9, s.v. Agilo.

³² Woods (n. 1), 272–3, 281. The word *et* between *gentilium* and *scutariorum* is a textual emendation, in line with other texts in Ammianus which join these two words in this way, possibly to denote a composite entity. Woods takes it as strengthening the case for Agilo's 'successive command of these *scholae*' (n. 13). This is not so, see J. Fontaine, *Ammien Marcellin. Histoire* (Paris, 1996), 3.153, n. 20; Fontaine regards serial commands as possible.

there is no indication that the volunteers among his *scutarii* and *gentiles* were less tied to their 'nationality' than the auxiliaries. It should be noted that the Franks, from whom many *scholares* were recruited, retained a sense of 'national' identity, as Woods himself, somewhat inconsistently, allows among the Franks at Milan.³³ The evidence as it stands supports the conviction that the bulk of *scholae palatinae* in the west in this period were recruited from Germanic 'nationals' and commanded by Germanic tribunes.³⁴ Their 'Roman' identity did not preclude their strong retention of loyalty to one another and to their 'national' identities. Exclusive identity was not the Roman way, for better or for worse.

In any case, the later actions of Agilo do not need such a dramatic foreplay. There is no concrete evidence associating him with Julian Caesar's court in Gaul. Ammianus links his promotion explicitly with the downfall of Ursicinus, not with the usurpation of Julian (which occurred later than the promotion in the order of Ammianus' narrative). The special tasks given him later by Julian, that is to persuade some military units and the townsfolk blockaded in Aquileia to surrender (Amm. 21.12.16–18) and to be part of the crucial commission of Chalcedon (Amm. 22.3.1), are hard to reconcile with such a spectacular betrayal. They are perfectly explicable in terms of Agilo's military career at the court of Constantius, both as *tribunus stabuli* and later. Paradoxically, the prejudicial suspicion that he had abetted transrhene Alamans in their attacks in 354 (a suspicion he survived) may have stood him in good stead among the élite barbarians in Julian's army. One suspects that even the slipperiest of opportunists could not have survived the jumbled loyalties ascribed to Agilo.³⁵

In sum, there was certainly one *schola scutariorum* in Constantius' army from 354 till his death in 361 and perhaps a second, though there is no clear evidence for the latter until 362. The known tribunes, Scudilo in 354, Cella in 357 and 359, could be fitted into one *schola*, but they could also be part of a larger number of tribunes distributed over two *scholae*. There were *scutarii* with Gallus in 354, with Bainobaudes as their only attested tribune, and with Julian in Gaul, with Bainobaudes as a possible commander in 357 and Nestica as their only attested tribune in 358. It is possible that the tribunes with the Caesars commanded a composite unit of *scutarii et gentiles* rather than independent units of *scutarii* (alongside units of *gentiles* under their own tribunes); discussion of the fate of Julian's *scutarii et gentiles* will be postponed to the section of our paper on *gentiles*.

ARMATURAE

Armaturae should have some connection with the drill exercises recorded in armies of the principate, but the precise developments which culminated in a cavalry-guards

³³ Woods (n. 1), 281.

³⁴ In general see the prosopography in M. Waas, *Germanen in römischem Dienst* (1965; Bonn, 1971²); Hoffmann (n. 1). The incidence of 'barbarians' is minimized by H. Elton, whose ambitious attempt at quantification is flawed by a methodology that ultimately makes Germanic names signify Germans and Roman names Romans (*Warfare in Roman Europe, A.D. 350–425* [Oxford, 1996], 145–6, 151–2). Elton is aware of the problems of naming (p. 146) and that he nets 'barbarians' with Roman names in his category 'probably Roman', but he still includes them in his larger category 'Roman' in order to draw his conclusion (as Table 7, p. 273 is folded into Table 4, p. 148). Among those turned into Romans is Charietto (Table 9, p. 274)! Identity, especially in provincial societies, can be plural, both 'barbarian' and 'Roman', and the loyalty of Germano-Romans to each other and to their local communities can be strong, see J. Barlow, 'Kinship, identity and fourth-century Franks', *Historia* 45 (1996), 223–39.

³⁵ Woods (n. 1), 274–75.

unit with this name are not known. No unit is recorded before *armaturae* who deserted to Constantius with their Frankish commander, Silvanus, in 351. The unit may well have been created out of Franks for a western army. Its commander in 354 and 355 was another Frank, Mallobaudes, and the limited information extant on the unit can almost all be fitted into a Frankish context. Its desertion from Magnentius may represent its returned allegiance to the dynasty of Constantine in the person of Constantius; the significance of such allegiance is alluded to in Philippus' rebuke of Magnentius' troops for their disloyalty to the dynasty (Zos. 2.46.3). The Frankish officers at Constantius' court, associated particularly with the *armaturae* and the *gentiles*, continued to protest their loyalty to Constantius, even during, and despite, the usurpation of Silvanus. Julian's actions, in sending captured Franks to Constantius' court in 357 and in promising *laeti* and *dediticii* (Franks will have fitted both categories) for his *scutarii et gentiles* in 360 continued this tradition (Amm. 17.2.3, 20.8.13). A similar source may have supplemented Constantius' *armaturae*.

Only twice more do *armaturae* appear in the whole of Ammianus. This should warn against relying overmuch on silence in recreating the history of military units, for the continuing importance of *armaturae* is asserted by their place in the *Notitia*. There is no evidence for more than one unit of *armaturae* in the period 353–64. A case might be made for a second unit. During Constantius' campaign against the Lentienses in the summer of 355, the tribune Arinthaëus is attested as acting commander of *armaturae* serving alongside the commanders of two units listed in the *Notitia* as the leading *vexillationes palatinae*.³⁶ The natural interpretation of this is that he was *tribunus vacans* assigned a temporary command in special circumstances, acting in place of Mallobaudes, who was still *tribunus armaturarum* at Constantius' court in Milan during the intrigues that contributed to the usurpation of Silvanus on 11 August 355 (Amm. 14.11.21, 15.5.6). Mallobaudes may have been ill or engaged in the diplomatic duties that often fell to *tribuni scholarum* or temporarily removed from command under suspicion of involvement in Silvanus' plot at the time. A less economical alternative is that Arinthaëus was replacing a different *tribunus armaturarum*, one of the ten tribunes whom Ammianus records as killed in an ambush a short time before this battle without giving any indication of their names or units (Amm. 15.4.8). Since this is the only whiff of a second unit of *armaturae* at this time, it seems best to set it aside. It is not known whether Arinthaëus became commander of the unit in his own right, and, if so, for how long, since nothing is recorded of his career before his unclear, but major, military command in Julian's Persian war in 363. To make him commander of *armaturae* in 355 is a reasonable conjecture; to end his command in 358 is an arbitrary one.³⁷

No other *tribunus armaturarum* is attested for the period under consideration, the only other attested in Ammianus' whole history being Balchobaudes in the west in 366 (Amm. 27.2.6). Woods conjures up three more names to fill the gap: Nevitta; the anonymous son of Marcellus; and Merobaudes. None has much to be said for it. Nevitta first appears as *equestris praepositus turmae* in the army of Constantius' *magister peditum*, Barbatio, in Raetia in 358 and next with Julian's appointment of him as *magister equitum* soon after his own proclamation as Augustus in 361 (Amm. 17.6.3, 21.8.1). His intervening career is unknown, but it must involve his transfer from the

³⁶ Amm. 15.4.10: *tres simul exsiluere tribuni, Arintheus agens vicem armaturarum rectoris, et Seniauchus qui equestrem turmam comitum tuebatur et Bappo ducens promotos.*

³⁷ Woods (n. 1), 285.

army of Constantius to that of Julian at some point. Woods weaves a circumstantial scenario whereby Nevitta, having become *tribunus armaturarum* at Constantius' court, is engaged on a sensitive diplomatic duty to escort Julian's wife Helena on an unrecorded journey from Constantinople to Gaul; he is then identified with an anonymous *decurio palatii* who was caught up in a dramatic counter-coup against Julian; he is then promoted to *magister* as a reward for his support.³⁸ The only part of this in Ammianus, or anywhere else, is the anonymous figure. Nevitta had more likely been appointed to command one of the units in Julian Caesar's army and remained in that army to be promoted to *magister equitum* as part of the wider reorganisation of Julian's officials, noted by Ammianus, before his march against Constantius. His prior post among Julian's military commanders can only be conjecture; he is among the candidates as successor to Nestica as *tribunus scutariorum*.

The case for the anonymous son of Marcellus, Constantius' executed *magister equitum*, as *tribunus armaturarum* is another historical drama; its elements are an unsubstantiated career pattern, a conjectured association of his execution with the trial of Romanus and Vincentius (as redated and relocated by Woods from Antioch in 362/3 to Constantinople in 361/2), and an unconvincing psychological analysis of the supposed actions of both Julian and the son of Marcellus. The case for Merobaudes rests on the premise that Merobaudes' role in escorting Julian's body to Tarsus for burial is likely to have gone to an officer in the *scholae palatinae*. That may be so, but when Jovian escorted Constantius' body to Constantinople, he had been *protector domesticus* (Amm. 21.16.20). That is also much more likely to have been Merobaudes' status.

The sum of our actual knowledge of the *tribuni armaturarum* in this period is minimal: three tribunes, all Germanic, probably all Franks, and one acting commander. All others should be rejected. A unit of *armaturae* with its commander Silvanus came over to Constantius from Magnentius in 351. Julian (*Or.* 1.48B) is specific that only one unit deserted, so Mallobaudes is probably a successor of Silvanus rather than commander of a second unit. In the period between Mallobaudes, last attested in 355, and Balchobaudes, attested in 366, no tribune is known, but it is possible that Arinthaëus, acting commander in 355, became commander in his own right. Ammianus uses *armaturalarmaturae* several times, but none seems to refer to the *schola*. Most instances relating to the Roman army refer to infantry;³⁹ a number of instances refer to barbarian *armatura* outside the Roman world.⁴⁰

GENTILES

Like *armaturae*, *gentiles* do not appear as a unit-type in the field army before the narrative of Ammianus.⁴¹ The name should refer to non-Roman tribal peoples, but without any further specific ethnic identifier (as in *ND occ.* 42.34ff.) it would seem to distinguish 'barbarian' recruits from 'Roman' ones only in a general way, perhaps

³⁸ Ibid. 286–7. For a different identification of the anonymous figure as a palatine *decurio*, see *PLRE* 1.1032, s.v. Anonymus 187.

³⁹ Amm. 21.16.7 (for specific infantry drills; contrast 14.11.3 for multiple service drills); 24.6.9 (*auxilia* beside the emperor Julian, noted again at 25.3.5; 14.6.17 shows the generic nature of such usage).

⁴⁰ Amm. 17.12.1 (Quadi and Sarmatae); 23.6.83 (Persae); 31.2.17 (Alani).

⁴¹ The apparently earlier reference to a *schola gentilium* under the tetrarchy in the *Acta Sergii et Bacchi* seems to be a retrojection from the era of Julian, see D. Woods, 'The emperor Julian and the Passion of Sergius and Bacchus', *JECS* 5.3 (1997), 335–67.

barbarian and Roman units in the same army, perhaps barbarian and Roman elements in a composite unit, such as *scutarii et gentiles*. Such a composite unit seems to be paralleled in the *scholae scutariorum sagittariorum* and *scutariorum clibanariorum* or in the *cuneus Maurorum scutariorum* in the Thebaid (*ND or.* 11.7–8, 31.23). Perhaps such an early composite history of this unit explains why Ammianus, in referring to soldiers at the courts of Gallus Caesar, of Constantius, and of Julian Caesar in the period 354–60, never uses *gentiles* alone, but always in association with *scutarii* (see below). Hoffmann argues that the phrase *gentiles et scutarii* is a generic name for palace guards, but the phrase seems limited to Ammianus in this period and may refer to specific composite units or to separate units.⁴²

The only clearly named commanders of *gentiles* in this period are the Frank Malarichus, attested as *rector gentilium* in 355 (*Amm.* 15.5.6, 9–11) and the Alaman Agilo, attested as *ex gentilium [et] scutariorum tribuno* in 360 (*Amm.* 20.2.5). There were *gentiles et scutarii* at the court of Gallus Caesar in 354 (*Amm.* 14.7.9). There were *gentiles* and also *scutarii* with Julian Caesar in Gaul in winter 356—the separate quarters for *scutarii* and for *gentiles* are for commissarial reasons and neither prove, nor deny, the existence of independent units (*Amm.* 16.4.1). In 360 Constantius ordered Sintula, *tribunus stabuli*, to bring to him the best of Julian's *scutarii et gentiles* (*Amm.* 20.4.3), presumably to reinforce *gentiles et scutarii* explicitly recorded at his own court (*Amm.* 20.8.13). One must reckon on two units of/including *gentiles* during most of this period, one at Constantius' court, one at that of the serial Caesars.

None of the commanders of the Caesars' units is named. Ammianus' descriptions of Bainobaudes with Gallus and of Nestica with Julian as *tribunus scutariorum* may be truncated forms of the fuller title *tribunus scutariorum [et gentilium]*, if the Caesars did not have separate units of *scutarii* and of *gentiles*. Woods offers no candidate for tribune of Gallus' *gentiles*, but two candidates as tribunes of Julian's: Valentinian and Charietto (he does not consider Dagalaifus, who would seem to fit perfectly his normal criteria for a *tribunus scholae*).⁴³ The case for Valentinian stems from opportunity and deductions from a series of explicit and conjectured associations with *scholares* over his career. Valentinian certainly had a cavalry post in Gaul, in which he was associated with a tribune Bainobaudes, perhaps *tribunus scutariorum*. This much is known and Valentinian is a plausible candidate as *tribunus gentilium*, but he could also have been tribune of another major cavalry unit or even *tribunus vacans*. The rest of the argument is a long and twisted bow identifying Valentinian with a *schola* officer, argued to be *tribunus gentilium*, involved in the career of Martin of Tours.⁴⁴ It requires too many bold leaps of faith.

The conjecture that Charietto was *tribunus gentilium* in the period 358–64 runs along the following lines. First, because Charietto in 358 went on a mission with Nestica, an officer in the *scholae palatinae*, to capture an enemy Alaman as guide, it is argued that Charietto was himself an officer of a *schola*. One hardly needs two tribunes to capture a guide and Ammianus writes with significant omission of rank: *Nesticae tribuno scutariorum et Chariettoni viro fortitudinis mirae* (*Amm.* 17.10.5).

⁴² Hoffmann (n. 1), 1.290–1.

⁴³ On Dagalaifus' career, see *PLRE* 1.239, s.v. Dagalaifus.

⁴⁴ Woods (n. 1), 281; in detail, D. Woods, 'A note concerning the early career of Valentinian I', *Ancient Society* 26 (1995), 273–88. Valentinian's career is hard to demythologize from Christian sources and *PLRE* 1.933 is not helpful. Woods's article 'Valens, Valentinian I, and the *Ioviani Cornuti*', in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History IX* (1998), 462–86 adds nothing to strengthen his argument that Valentinian was *tribunus gentilium*.

Julian's selection of Charietto is explicable in terms of what he offered the mission as a German-speaking guerilla leader. Woods further argues that Charietto was unlikely to have been promoted *ex nihilo* to *comes per utramque Germaniam* and thus he must have had a significant previous official post.⁴⁵ Charietto's career is unknown between his mission in 358 and his death on service in 365 as *comes* of a special jurisdiction in the German frontier zone, a command that seems to have been created to exploit his prior knowledge and experience in this area, first as Rome's enemy and then as its friend. The creation of such a post is best assigned to Julian when he took so much of the western army to the east in 360. Rapid and exceptional careers for barbarians like Charietto are not unknown, but rarely easy to trace, for example that of his contemporary, Vadomarius.⁴⁶ Charietto's career should remain in the skeletal form left to history, not filled out with a dramatic reconstruction which makes him an unrecorded player in most scenarios known to involve *gentiles* across the Roman world from Paris to Antioch 360–362/3.⁴⁷ It is unlikely that he ever left the west, or ever commanded a *schola*.

The fate of the *scutarii et gentiles* in 361, both those with Constantius and those with Julian, remains conjecture. They were presumably reorganized in some way when the two armies were combined. One possibility is that they were rationalized into a single unit of *gentiles* and the existing unit(s) of *scutarii*, thus reducing the number of separate units to three *scholae*, that is *I scutarii*, *II scutarii* and *gentiles*. Indeed, *gentiles* may first have become technically an independent *schola* (that is, without *scutarii*) at this time. Such a basic structure in 361/4 may explain the anomaly in the *Notitia* that the *scholae scutariorum* are distinguished by numbers (*I*, *II*, *III*) and the *scholae gentilium* and *armaturarum* as *seniores* and *iuniores*. When the *scutarii* were duplicated (between western and eastern armies, probably in 364) they retained the same names; when the *gentiles* were duplicated (and probably *armaturae* at the same time) they too may have retained the same names in both western and eastern armies, but a later duplication of one of them in the same army required the distinguishing designation *seniores/iuniores*.

SCUTARII CLIBANARII

The only clear evidence for a *schola scutariorum clibanariorum* implies its existence at Constantinople under Constantine and still in the 380s.⁴⁸ It had presumably passed to Constantius and is very likely to be the *clibanarii* who starred in Constantius' procession into Rome in 357 (Amm. 16.10.8). There is some confusion in our literary sources in the use of the terms *clibanarii* and *catafractarii/catafracti* to refer to mail-clad cavalry. Ammianus uses the words interchangeably, but *catafractarii* may be the generic term, with *clibanarii* being the technical term for a particular type originating in Persian tactical formations.⁴⁹ The uncertainty makes it difficult to

⁴⁵ Woods (n. 1), 282.

⁴⁶ On promotion of barbarians, see D. Hoffmann, 'Wadomar, Bacurius und Hariulf. Zur Laufbahn adliger und fürstlicher Barbaren im spätrömischen Heere des 4. Jahrhunderts', *Museum Helveticum* 35 (1978), 307–18, at 308–9 for Vadomarius.

⁴⁷ Woods (n. 1), 283–4.

⁴⁸ *C. Th.* 14.17.9 (A.D. 389), see n. 24 above for text.

⁴⁹ Amm. 16.2.5, 16.12.7 (*catafractarii*), 22 (*clibanario*), 38 (*catafracti*) all seem to refer to the same unit. On the unit-type, see M. P. Speidel, 'Catafractarii, clibanarii and the rise of the later Roman mailed cavalry. A gravestone from Claudiopolis in Bithynia', *Epigraphica Anatolica* 4 (1984), 151–6; it is tempting to reread EQQ(uitum) []CAT(afractariorum) CLIB(anariorum) in

identify literary allusions. There were *cataphractarii* with Julian Caesar in 356 (Amm. 16.2.5) and at the Battle of Argentorate in 357 (Amm. 16.12.7, 12, 38), but both are more likely units of the Gallic field army than a *schola clibanariorum*. No commander of the *schola* is recorded. Woods nominates as its commander the Persian prince Hormisdas, noted by Zonaras (13.5) as a cavalry commander under Constantius; he further conjectures that the *schola* itself was created at the time of Hormisdas' defection to Rome c. 324 and that he was its tribune from its creation until the Persian war of Julian, that is for nearly forty years.⁵⁰ None of this is impossible, despite the lack of any evidence and the circumstantial nature of the links in the argument. There were *clibanarii* with Constantius in Rome in 357 and so was Hormisdas; he may have been *schola* commander. There is, however, an alternative. In the *Notitia* (or. 5.29) there is a *vexillatio palatina* named *comites clibanarii*; its origins cannot be dated, but its listing as the second unit in its category suggests that it was a relatively early creation. Like other units named *comites*, it will have been specifically recruited from the noblest free-born barbarians; in other words, this unit was the sort of self-recruiting foreign corps that Woods postulates for the composition of the *scholae scutariorum clibanariorum* and *scutariorum sagittariorum*.⁵¹ If Hormisdas were tribune of *clibanarii*, the *vexillatio* is more likely than the *schola*. Constantine already had *clibanarii* in his army in 312 (*Pan. Lat.* 4 [10].22) and it was surely they who formed the basis of his *schola*, not any Persians defecting with Hormisdas c. 324; these latter may well have formed *comites clibanarii* under Hormisdas' command. The tribunes of the *schola* remain unknown. Granted that Hormisdas himself is not recorded as commander, it is perverse to deny the existence of any other commanders because of the silence of the record and to make Hormisdas tribune over the whole period.

SCUTARII SAGITTARII

The only unequivocal evidence for a *schola scutariorum sagittariorum* is its listing in the eastern *Notitia*.⁵² Its sequence in that list, before the *scutarii clibanarii*, suggests that it was created no later than that unit, which existed under Constantine I. Woods rejects the inference. While unit order is never conclusive evidence of priority, there is some inconsistency in ignoring it here but using it to determine the relative priority of *armaturae* over *gentiles* in the same lists.⁵³ He places greater weight on two omissions. The first is the absence of this *schola* from a law of 389 showing two *scholae* receiving civic rations at Constantinople from the time of Constantine to the present; its exclusion from the preserved text of this law, for which many explanations can be offered, either textual or historical, is not strong evidence that this *schola* did not exist in the time of Constantine. The second omission is the failure of Ammianus, or any other source, to note tribunes of this *schola*; such an argument from silence is never

this text as EQQ(uitum) [S]C<U>T(ariorum) CLIB(anariorum) and to see the unit as an early stage in the evolution of a field unit into a *schola* unit.

⁵⁰ Woods (n. 1), 290.

⁵¹ Amm. 18.9.4 (*comites sagittarii* at Amida in 360); Woods (n. 1), 289–90, and in more detail, Woods (n. 6), 365–71; Hoffmann (n. 1), 1.243–4.

⁵² or. 11.7. There is almost certainly a reference to this unit in Amm. 31.12.16: *sagittarii et scutarii, quos Bacurius Hiberus quidam tunc regebat et Cassio* (at Hadrianople in 378)—these men were most likely commander and lower officer of *scutarii sagittarii*, though they could be commanders of two separate units.

⁵³ Woods (n. 1), 270.

strong, but here Woods may be looking in the wrong place. The fact that Ammianus notes many more *tribuni scutariorum* than other *schola* commanders⁵⁴ may simply be because Ammianus sometimes uses this as a variation to refer to *scholae* which had *scutarii* as one element in their name.

The date of creation of this *schola* lies open, for both *scutarii* and *sagittarii* had long been part of the Roman army, indeed of imperial guards. Woods dates its creation to arrangements made by Valens and the Iberians in the wars of the 370s between Rome and Iberia and suggests a continuing recruitment of Iberians based on Roman–Iberian protocols. Such an arrangement is not implausible in itself; something not unlike it could underlie the creation of the *comites sagittarii Armeni* as part of the Roman settlement with Armenia, possibly under Theodosius.⁵⁵ However, Woods's case for such an arrangement with Iberia, resulting in a dedicated *schola* unit, is not strong.⁵⁶ It is based on a reconstruction of the careers of three Iberians of royal stock over fifty years (Bacurius, Pharasmanes, and Peter the Iberian) and a royal Colchian (Subarmachius, assumed to be Iberian, though Iberians are usually distinguished from Colchians), a reconstruction which places each in command of the *schola scutariorum sagittariorum*, though there is good evidence only for Bacurius in this command. This is not enough to question seriously the consensus that this *schola* existed under Constantine.

The *scholae palatinae* and their tribunes are of considerable interest to military, political, and social historians of the late-Roman Empire. The period 353–64 is a formative period in their history; that history is not easy to tell, but easy to invent. Hoffmann's careful, detailed research is an excellent starting-point, but his tools for interpreting the *Notitia* are no longer secure.⁵⁷ Woods's overambitious attempt to draw up a list of *tribuni scholarum palatarum* c. 353–64 is flawed; many of its basic assumptions are questionable and several of its conjectures spin history off into the aether of fantasy. We cannot be sure of the nature of the division of *scholae* in 364, let alone assume that there were a fixed five units in the preceding decade, a period of volatility and flux. We cannot assume career paths that are unsubstantiated. We must allow that there are large gaps in the history of the *scholae palatinae* and that the majority of their tribunes are lost to history. We must begin with the information in Ammianus, with due regard to his purposes and prejudices but without casting unreasonable doubt on his veracity and methods as a historian. The interpretation of his material must be open to the history of the *scholae* in this period, including the nature of the division of the *scholae* in 364. We have sought to show the weaknesses in Woods's interpretation and to set out an alternative view of the history of the *scholae* and their commanders c. 353–64. We have put Ammianus' material into a coherent framework without imposing on it anachronistic patterns or dramatic scenarios.

University of Sydney

JONATHAN BARLOW

PETER BRENNAN

peter.brennan@history.usyd.edu.au

⁵⁴ Ibid. 382.

⁵⁵ *ND or.* 6.31, but this unit may be a much earlier creation if it is the cavalry unit of Armenian archers fighting with Constantius against Magnentius (Zos. 2.51.4).

⁵⁶ It may well be these Roman–Iberian relations resulted in the *auxilia palatina* named *Hiberi* in the *Notitia* (*or.* 5.60), its place in the list suggesting that it was created under Valens or Theodosius; Iberians were certainly providing soldiers for the Roman army in this period.

⁵⁷ Hoffmann (n. 1), 1.279ff., esp. 285ff.

APPENDIX: *TRIBUNI SCHOLARUM PALATINARUM* c. A.D. 354–64

Schola scutariorum

Scudilo	354	(Constantius)
Cella	357–9	(Constantius)
Bainobaudes	354	(Gallus)
Nestica	358	(Julian Caesar)

Schola scutariorum prima

Romanus	to 362/3	(Julian Augustus, probably under Constantius)
Fl. Equitius	363–4	(Jovian, possibly under Julian and even Constantius)

Schola scutariorum secunda

Vincentius	362/363	(Julian Augustus, probably under Constantius)
Anonymus	363	(successor of Vincentius under Julian Augustus)
Valentinianus	363–4	(Jovian)

Schola gentilium = *schola gentilium et scutariorum*

Malarichus	355	(Constantius)
Agilo	until 360	(Constantius)

No *tribuni gentilium* of Caesars are known, unless Bainobaudes and/or Nestica (above) was *tribunus scutariorum* [et *gentilium*]

Schola armaturarum

Silvanus	until 351	(Magnentius, Constantius)
Mallobaudes	354–5	(Constantius)

Possible *tribuni scholarum palatinarum*

Gomoarius	351/361	(possible tribune of a <i>schola</i> of Constantius 351/361)
Arinthaëus	from 355	(acting-commander of <i>armaturae</i> 355)
Hormisdas		(possible tribune of <i>scutarii clibanarii</i> under Constantius)
Bainobaudes	357	(possible tribune of a <i>schola</i> of Julian in 357)
