

SOME PERSONS IN THE HISTORIA AUGUSTA

T. D. BARNES

AUTHORS OF WORKS OF REFERENCE often receive less gratitude than they deserve. When isolated mistakes or omissions are observed, it becomes all too easy to forget the vast amount of information faultlessly provided for the convenience of students. Let it be stated emphatically, therefore, at the outset, that the first volume of *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* (Cambridge 1971), initiated and supervised by the late Professor A. H. M. Jones, ought to presage and permit as much progress in our understanding of an important period of history as the *Prosopographia Imperii Romani* (the first edition of which was published in 1897/8) did for the first three centuries of the Roman Empire. It covers the years from 260 to 395—that is, though the starting point is nowhere explained or justified, from the capture of Valerian by the Persians to the death of Theodosius¹—and attains an overall standard of industry and accuracy worthy of its distinguished initiator and his many associates.

Although advertisements in scholarly journals describe the *Prosopography*, on anonymous authority, as “most satisfactorily comprehensive,” much labour remains. The mistakes and omissions are sometimes grave: no entry, for example, so it seems, for one of the Caesar Julian’s close intimates in Gaul (viz. Euhemerus: Eunapius, *VS* 7.3.8, p. 476), nor for a man who commanded part of Theodosius’ army at the Frigidus in

¹The choice presumably derives from the statement of Aurelius Victor that Gallienus ‘primus ipse . . . senatum militia vetuit et adire exercitum’ (*Caes.* 33.34; cf. 37.6). But the exclusion of senators from military commands was a gradual process, not a single act or imperial edict. For the long controversy on the question, see B. Malcus, *Opuscula Romana* 7 (1969) 213 ff.—who correctly and pertinently concludes that ‘il faut . . . se libérer finalement de cette obsession de l’édit de Gallien qui a, par ses conséquences mêmes, démontré son inexistence’ (*ib.* 232).

Something also needs to be said about the date of the capture of Valerian, for which both 259 and 260 find powerful advocates (see, for example, the survey of G. Walser—T. Pekáry, *Die Krise des römischen Reiches. Bericht über die Forschungen zur Geschichte des 3. Jahrhunderts (193–284 n.Chr.) von 1939 bis 1959* [Berlin 1962] 28 ff.). The date of summer 260 is here assumed throughout. On two principal grounds. First, Valerian was still recognised as emperor in Egypt after 29 August 260: J. Vogt, *Die alexandrinischen Münzen* 2 (Stuttgart 1924) 154—attesting the eighth year of the joint rule of Valerian and Gallienus; cf. *POxy.* 1201; 1476; 1563—proving that 253/4 was the first year. Second, the political and military developments consequent on the capture which can be independently dated only seem comprehensible if the capture belongs to 260: see A. Alföldi, *Berytus* 5 (1938) 55 ff. = *Studien zur Geschichte der Weltkrise des 3. Jahrhunderts nach Christus* (Darmstadt 1967) 180 ff. (cited henceforward as *Studien*).

September 394 (viz. Alaric the Visigoth: Socrates, *HE* 7.10.1); and it has been deduced from erroneous premisses that Constantinus (Augustus from 337 to 340) was not the son of his father's lawful wedded wife (223, 326, 1129). More serious, some whole categories of entry fall considerably below the level of expertise necessary to make the work a reliable tool for study or research. It is the purpose of the present essay (which is in no sense a review) to offer comment on those persons entered in—or sometimes omitted by—the *Prosopography* who appear in the *Historia Augusta* or to whose entry the *Historia Augusta* has anything of relevance. Many of the persons alleged by the *HA* to have been active in and after the sole reign of Gallienus are fictitious—and are rightly stigmatized by asterisks and exclamation marks. Yet others of equally doubtful historicity do not have their existence called in question. A similar inconsistency affects the six ostensible authors of the *HA* themselves, who purport to be writing at various dates in the reigns of Diocletian, Constantius, and Constantine: 'Aelius Spartianus,' 'Julius Capitolinus,' 'Vulcacius Gallicanus v.c.,' 'Aelius Lampridius,' 'Trebellius Pollio,' and 'Flavius Vopiscus'.² By what criterion do precisely two out of the six merit an entry? And by what further criterion has Aelius Lampridius (494/5) become more real than *!Fl. Vopiscus!* (981)? Surely both 'Lampridius' and 'Vopiscus' ought to appear together with the other four under the following rubric (xxii): "Names printed as, e.g., *!P. Datianus!* are persons known only from sources of doubtful reliability (principally the *Historia Augusta* and the *Acta Sanctorum*)."

The rubric itself, however, employs a method of classification which is open to serious objections.

The historian of the Roman Empire or of Christianity or of Latin and Greek literature in the third century must distinguish very carefully between those persons or writers mentioned in any source who are historical and those who are fictitious. For this necessary and significant distinction the *Prosopography* has substituted another: between persons attested by generally reliable sources and those attested only by generally unreliable ones. This latter distinction is far less useful to either the casual enquirer or the serious investigator. For there can clearly be individual cases both of fictitious characters who appear in normally sober and reliable sources and of historical personages now attested only in otherwise apparently unreliable documents. Naturally instances of the former will usually be difficult to recognize, of the latter usually

²It is misleading, therefore, to affirm that the *HA* "could have been written at the date its authors profess to have written it" (A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire* 3 [Oxford 1964] 1). The *HA*'s many professions about when and by whom it was composed cannot even be reconciled with one another, let alone with external evidence (R. Syme, *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta* [Oxford 1968] 180 f.).

impossible to prove. Nevertheless, the possibility that they exist must be conceded, and can at least be illustrated. On the one side, some of the names in the anonymous *Epitome de Caesaribus* written shortly after 395 can be impugned: namely, the Gallonius Basilius who allegedly brought 'indumenta regia' from the dying Gallienus to his successor Claudius (*Epit. de Caes.* 34.2), Dalmatius who devoted himself to gardening and was the father of the emperor Probus (37.1), and Dioclea the mother of Diocletian (39.1).³ On the other hand, a largely fictitious document may contain genuine names or describe remote historical events: for example, the *Vita Abercii* has preserved a memory of the wedding of Lucius Verus and Lucilla at Ephesus more than two centuries before it was composed,⁴ and the *Acts of Paul and Thecla* produce a 'Queen Tryphaena' with a daughter 'Falconilla' at Pisidian Antioch, whose own name alludes to a genuine Queen (of Thrace), and whose daughter's name alludes to a Roman senatorial family of Asia.⁵

The procedure adopted in the *Prosopography* has another disadvantage closely related to the first. The two named "sources of doubtful reliability" are far from being homogeneous. Sharp distinctions need to be drawn between the different parts of the *HA* and within the enormous and highly variegated category of *Acta Sanctorum*. In both cases the ore can (and must) be separated from the dross.⁶

Who doubts the existence of Aspasius Paternus and Galerius Maximus, proconsuls of Africa in 257/8 and 258/9 respectively?⁷ Yet both are attested only by the *Acta Cypriani* and by authors who derive their knowledge from these *acta* alone.⁸ It is a wholly different matter when

³R. Syme, *Emperors and Biography. Studies in the Historia Augusta* (Oxford 1971) 205; 232 ff. In registering these three (149, 240, 253), as elsewhere (e.g., 960, Victor 13), *PLRE* ascribes the *Epitome* to Aurelius Victor. That can hardly be; cf. Schanz—Hosius, *Gesch. d. röm. Litt.* 4.1² (Munich 1914) 75.

⁴*Vita Abercii* 44 ff. On some fictions in this work, cf. *JRS* 58 (1968) 39.

⁵R. A. Lipsius, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha* 1 (1891) 255 f. For the real Tryphaena, *PIR*² A 900; for this 'Falconilla' and historical Falconillae, cf. C. P. Jones, *JRS* 60 (1970) 103.

⁶For the *HA*, R. Syme, *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta* (Oxford 1968); *Emperors and Biography* (Oxford 1971)—cited henceforward as *Amm. and HA* and *Emp. and Biog.*; for hagiographical literature, H. Delehay, *Les légendes hagiographiques*⁴. *Subsidia Hagiographica* 18a (1955); *Les passions des martyrs et les genres littéraires*². *Subsidia Hagiographica* 13b (1966).

⁷*PIR*² A 1263, G 28: G. Barbieri, *L'Albo senatorio da Settignano Severo a Carino (193–285)* (Rome 1952), nos. 1455, 1590 (henceforward *Albo*); B. E. Thomasson, *Die Statthalter der römischen Provinzen Nordafrikas von Augustus bis Diocletianus* 2 (Lund 1960) 123 f.

⁸*CSEL* 3.3. cx-cxiv = R. Knopf—G. Krüger—G. Ruhbach, *Ausgewählte Märtyrerakten*⁴ (Tübingen 1965) 62–64, or better, R. Reitzenstein, *SBHeidelberg*, Phil.-hist.Kl. (1913), Abh. 14, 12 ff. = H. Musurillo, *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs* (Oxford 1972) 168 ff. Among later writers, note Augustine, *Sermo* 309, 'In natali Cypriani Martyris' (*PL* 38.1410 ff.), and an allusion to Paternus in the *Passio Eugeniae, Prothi et Hyacinthi* 22

Ado, archbishop of Vienne from 860 to 875, claiming to draw on *acta martyrum* which he has collected himself, produces a 'Plato' as a *praeses* executing Christians at Rome during the reign of Aurelian,⁹ or when the *Acts of St. Sebastian* produce two more prefects early in the reign of Diocletian.¹⁰ The rubric employed in the *Prosopography* puts on one level the valuable evidence of the *Acta Fructuosi* and the worthless testimony of a piece like the passion of Severus, Memnon, and their companions.¹¹ The former offers a *praeses* at Tarraco in 259, the latter a proconsul in Thrace perhaps late in the joint reign of Diocletian and Maximian, both of whom are branded as equally dubious: *!Aemilianus!* 1 and *!Apellianus!* (22, 80; cf. 1089, 1103). But the *Acta Fructuosi* have virtually always been accepted as being in essence an authentic record of the trial of Fructuosus.¹² Aemilianus therefore deserves a place as a genuine governor of Hispania Tarraconensis.¹³ In contrast, 'Apellianus' could profitably have been omitted. No useful purpose is served by cataloguing holders of invented offices in hagiographical fiction. The famous dossier of Procopius ought to be sufficient warning.¹⁴ Eusebius records that this martyr of the 'Great Persecution' was a simple lector, interpreter in Syriac or Aramaic, and exorcist in the church of Scythopolis.¹⁵ Byzantine piety transformed him into a 'dux Alexandriae' bearing the name 'Neonias' who killed six thousand Agareni, equipped him with a senator-

(PL 73.617)—which occurs, however, in a passage where another recension has 'Datianus'; cf. H. Delehaye, *Étude sur le légendrier romain*. Subsidia Hagiographica 23 (1936) 177 f.

⁹PL 123.283; cf. 143. For some other names in Ado, cf. T. D. Barnes, *Tertullian* (Oxford 1971) 266.

¹⁰Viz. 'Agrestius Chromatius' and 'Fabianus' (*Acta Sanctorum*, Jan. 2^s [1863] 629 ff.; 640 ff. = PL 17 [1879] 1114 ff.; 1145 ff.). PLRE omits the former but includes the latter (322, 1053). Both are clear inventions; cf. H. Delehaye, *Cinq Leçons sur la méthode hagiographique*. Subsidia Hagiographica 21 (1934) 33 ff.

¹¹For these two documents, see respectively P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *Note agiografice* 8. Studi e Testi 65 (1935) 127 ff., esp. 184–194 (the first critical edition of the *Acta Fructuosi*); H. Delehaye, *Anal. Boll.* 31 (1912) 192–194.

¹²E. Dekkers, *Clavis Patrum Latinorum*² (Bruges 1961) 470, no. 2056; H. Delehaye, *Les passions des martyrs*² (Brussels 1966) 246 ff. All the less excuse, therefore, for failing to stigmatize 'Antiochus,' *dux Augustoeuphratensis* 303/305 (PLRE 71), attested only by the *Passio Sergii et Bacchi* (*Anal. Boll.* 14 [1895] 175–194). Delehaye had no illusions about the fictitious character of this "passion épique" (*op. cit.* 177 ff.).

¹³PIR² A 319; *Albo* 1416; A. Degraffi, *Fasti consolari* (1952) 70 f.; A. Balil, *Emerita* 27 (1959) 289; G. Alföldy, *Fasti Hispanienses* (Wiesbaden 1969) 64.

¹⁴H. Delehaye, *Les légendes hagiographiques*⁴ (Brussels 1955) 119 ff.

¹⁵Eusebius, *Mart. Pal.* 1.1 ff. (long recension). This recension is now fully extant only in Syriac: for an English translation of both versions, see H. J. Lawlor—J. E. L. Oulton, *Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History* 1 (1927) 331 ff. For the chapter on Procopius, ancient translations in Latin and Georgian also come into the reckoning; cf. G. Garitte, *Le Muston* 66 (1953) 245 ff.

ial mother 'Theodosia,' and invented both a new governor of Palestine named 'Oulcion' and army officers 'Antiochus' and 'Nicostratus' whom Procopius converted in prison.¹⁶ The *Prosopography* rightly, if inconsistently, omits all these invented persons. Yet it registers Theodorus, another of the great Byzantine military saints, as in command of many soldiers near Euchaita in Pontus and as serving in the Persian War of Galerius (896). Analogy—and the facts of the case—indicate that, while the martyr Theodorus may be as real as the martyr Procopius (his cult is attested by a sermon attributed to Gregory of Nyssa), his high military office is equally bogus. The best evidence makes him a humble legionary recruit.¹⁷

Uncertainties of another sort surround the Fortunatus recorded as a provincial governor by the *acta* of the Christian centurion Marcellus. In the standard edition, one recension makes him Astasius Fortunatus and governor at Tingi, another Manilius Fortunatus 'apud legionem septimam geminam' (i.e., at Leon) as governor of Gallaecia.¹⁸ By a happy combination, the *Prosopography* enters the man as Astasius Fortunatus, *praeses* of Gallaecia, and does not stigmatize him (370, Fortunatus 2; 1090). Since the *Acta Marcelli* can be claimed as one of the only two genuine passions of soldier-martyrs,¹⁹ Fortunatus should be a historical character. His *nomen* and official post, however, are not easily deduced from the complicated textual tradition of the *acta* and the conflicting hagiographical evidence.²⁰ Nonetheless, one fact perhaps indicates that Fortunatus was in Spain rather than in Mauretania: when Marcellus declared himself a Christian, he sent him to appear before a higher official at Tingi, viz. Aurelius Agricolanus 'agens vice praefectorum praetorio' (*PLRE* 31, Agricolanus 2).²¹

¹⁶For one version, see A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, 'Ἀνάλεκτα ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς σταχυολογίας 5 (St. Petersburg 1898) 1 ff. (incomplete); H. Delehaye, *Les légendes grecques des saints militaires* (Paris 1909) 228 ff. (the missing parts); for a still longer one, A. Lipomanus, *Sanctorum Priscorum Patrum Vitae* 6 (Venice 1558) 107 ff.; *Acta Sanctorum*, Jul. 2³ (1867) 556 ff.

¹⁷For the fullest modern treatment of Theodorus, see H. Delehaye, *Acta Sanctorum*, Nov. 4 (1925) 11 ff. The account of the hagiographical evidence in *PLRE* is defective and misleading. Observe that even a passion composed in the tenth century still makes him a *τήρων* (F. Halkin, *Anal. Boll.* 80 [1962] 308 ff.).

¹⁸H. Delehaye, *Anal. Boll.* 41 (1923) 257 ff., reprinted in R. Knopf—G. Krüger—G. Ruhbach, *Ausgewählte Märtyrerakten*⁴ (Tübingen 1965) 87 ff.

¹⁹H. Delehaye, *Mélanges d'hagiographie grecque et latine*. Subsidia Hagiographica 42 (1966) 267.

²⁰On the textual problems, see F. Masai, *Byzantion* 35 (1965) 277 ff.; *Vivarium* 3 (1965) 95 ff.; *Scriptorium* 20 (1966) 11 ff. (with a list of MSS and editions). A recent "critical edition" of the *Acta Marcelli* neither uses nor ever refers to these studies, but reprints Delehaye's two recensions with "corrections" (H. Musurillo, *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs* [1972] 250 ff.).

²¹Musurillo prints the name in Recension M as 'Anastasius Fortunatus' and identifies

The distinction between historical and fictitious persons unfortunately does not neatly correspond to a distinction between reliable sources and those "of doubtful reliability." The following list accordingly applies a modified criterion: it encloses within single inverted commas those and only those persons whom the present writer considers definitely fictitious, whether attested only by the *HA* or not. Four categories of person are included:

- (a) all historical persons named in the *HA* as alive after the capture of Valerian by the Persians;
- (b) all fictitious personages of the same period attested only in the *HA*;
- (c) those literary authors named in the *HA* who wrote or allegedly wrote after the capture of Valerian;
- (d) historical persons discussed in the *Prosopography*, to whose origin, nomenclature or career the *HA* is relevant.

The list follows the alphabetical order of the *Prosopography*, the number in brackets denoting the page where the relevant entry occurs and an asterisk denoting omission. Summary annotation is provided—and only where the entry appears to need substantial modification.

ACHILLEUS

'*Parens Zenobiae*' (*Aur.* 31.2). *PLRE* (71, Antiochus 1: qualified with "presumably") identifies Achilleus with Antiochus, who was proclaimed emperor after Aurelian's first defeat of Zenobia (*Zosimus* 1.60 f.), and this Antiochus with a Septimius Antiochus seemingly attested as son of Zenobia (*IGRR* 3.1029 = *OGIS* 650; *PLRE* 73, Antiochus 16: "probably"). The former identification is required by the context in the *HA*: the Palmyrenes killed Aurelian's governor '*Achilleo cuidam parenti Zenobiae parantes imperium*.' But '*parens*' tells against the latter, if Septimius Antiochus really is the son of Zenobia.

In the interests of clarity, Achilleus probably deserves a separate entry: though its information is basically good, the *HA* may have distorted the name.²²

*'ACHOLIUS'

'*Magister admissionum*' of Valerian, who wrote his *acta*: the ninth book allegedly dealt with an (invented) event of 258 (*Aur.* 12.4 f.).

him as "*praefectus* of the *legio II Traiana* in Mauretania Tingitana under Diocletian" (*op. cit.* 250 f.). The combination is amusing and instructive. Antiquated texts of the *Acta Marcelli* constitute the sole evidence that the legion or any part of it was in Tingitana (E. Ritterling, *PW* 12.1489; 1491). Worse still, the mention of the '*legionis Traianae*' turns out to be a sixteenth century emendation of the very same word which Musurillo has emended to '*Anastasius*' (B. du Gaiffier, *Anal. Boll.* 61 [1943] 125 ff.).

²²Polemius Silvius has '*Antiochus*' (*Mon. Germ. Hist.*, Auct. Ant. 9.521).

L. MUSSIUS AEMILIANUS 6 (23)

The *HA* appears to set both the revolt and the suppression of Aemilianus in 261 (*Gall.* 4.2; cf. the consular dates at 1.2, 5.2). *PLRE* prefers 262 for his overthrow on the grounds that the next Prefect of Egypt was in office in August 262 (*PStrass.* 5). But 261 might be correct.²³

‘JULIUS AETHERIANUS’ (25), see ‘JULIUS ATHERIANUS’

NUMMIUS ALBINUS 9 (35)

PLRE makes him Nummius Ceionius Albinus on the strength of *Aur.* 9.2. In fact, the alliance between the families of Nummii Albini and Ceionii belongs to a later generation.²⁴

‘CEIONIUS ALBINUS’

Prefect of the City under Valerian (*Aur.* 9.2). An invented person whom it is methodologically unsound to identify with the known Nummius Albinus, Prefect of the City in 256 and 261–263 (*PLRE* 35, Albinus 9).²⁵

L. DOMITIUS ALEXANDER 17 (43): *Elag.* 35.6

ANTIOCHUS 1 (71)

Proclaimed emperor by Palmyrenes when Aurelian departed after his first capture of the city (Zosimus 1.60 f.). On overthrowing him Aurelian disdained to punish him ‘διὰ τὴν εὐτέλειαν’ (*ib.* 1.61.1). But Antiochus corresponds to ‘Achilleo cuidam parenti Zenobiae’ in the *HA* (*Aur.* 31.2): therefore not ignobly born. Accordingly, despite Zosimus, to be identified with (Septimius) Antiochus the father of Zenobia, who is securely attested by the Palmyrene inscription on a milestone of Vaballathus (C. Clermont-Ganneau, *Revue biblique*² 17 [1920] 394, 397).

‘SEPTIMIUS ANTIOCHUS’ 16 (73)

“Son of Septimia Zenobia.” However, the inscription which provided the sole evidence (*IGRR* 3.1029 = *OGIS* 650: [Ζενοβίας] βασιλίσσης [μ]ητρὸς τοῦ βασιλέως [Σεπτί]μ[ιου] Ἀντ[ι]ό[χου]) was reinterpreted over fifty years ago to give ‘Queen Zenobia the mother of the King, daughter of An-

²³At present, the latest known papyrus with Aemilianus as prefect bears the date 17 May 261 (*POxy.* 2710).

²⁴For earlier Nummii Albini, cf. E. Groag, *PW* 17.1408 ff.; T. D. Barnes, *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium* 1968/69 (1970) 58. (Henceforward the proceedings of the Bonn Colloquia on the *HA* will be cited as *BHAC*.) If this man’s son has Ceionius in his nomenclature (*CIL* 6.314), that does not guarantee it for the father.

²⁵R. Syme, *Amm. and HA* 154 f.

tiochus.²⁶ If correct, that abolishes the evidence for 'Septimius Antiochus, son of Zenobia.'

*'GALLUS ANTIPATER'

Bogus historian who wrote about Aureolus (*Claud.* 5.4).

*'ANTISTIUS'

Slave of Aurelian, manumitted after his death by decree of the Senate (*Aur.* 50.3).

APER 2 (81) : *Carus* 12 f.

'AURELIUS APOLLINARIS' 4 (84)

Iambic poet who wrote a life of Carus, outshone by the poetry of Numerianus (*Carus* 11.2). "Possibly fictitious" according to *PLRE*. But there should be no doubt: the fictitious 'Apollinaris,' who here is mentioned after the poet Nemesianus, owes his existence to Apollinaris the brother of Nemesianus who plotted the murder of Caracalla (*Carac.* 6.7).²⁷

'FL(AVIUS) ARABIANUS' (92) : *Aur.* 47.2; 4

'ARADIO' (93)

The emperor Probus defeated 'Aradio' in Africa and erected a monumental tomb for him two hundred feet high (*Prob.* 9.2). *PLRE* does not stigmatise, and identifies the Probus in question as Tenagino Probus.²⁸

*'SEVERUS ARCHONTIUS'

Friend of 'Vopiscus' (*Quad. Tyr.* 2.1).

*'ARTABASDES'

King of Armenia, writes amicably to Sapor after the capture of Valerian (*Val.* 3.1). Total invention: Sapor had some years earlier invaded Armenia, killed its Arsacid king Tiridates II, and driven his son to take refuge with the Romans, who restored him to the throne of Armenia ca. 287 (*PLRE* 915/6, Tiridates III).²⁹ 'Artabasdes' may derive from the writer's knowledge of Cicero (*Fam.* 15.2.2; *Att.* 5.20.2; 21.2).

²⁶C. Clermont-Ganneau, *Revue biblique*² 17 (1920) 406 ff., esp. 413 f.

²⁷A. Stein, *PIR*² A 1453.

²⁸On the name 'Aradio,' R. Syme, *Amm. and HA* 157; *Emp. and Biog.* 9; 140.

²⁹See M.-L. Chaumont, *Recherches sur l'Histoire d'Arménie* (Paris 1969), 49 ff. (the conquest); 93 ff. (Tiridates). But there is no need to search for a historical niche for 'Artabasdes' as a satrap preserving "une certaine autonomie dans les limites de ses domaines héréditaires" (*ib.* 86).

JULIUS ASCLEPIODOTUS (115/6)

Alleged to have been trained as general by Probus (*Prob.* 22.3). Although some of the names in the list of generals taught by Probus are authentic, the *HA* cannot count as genuine evidence that they were in fact disciples of Probus. Equally bogus is the *HA*'s appeal to Asclepiodotus in order to authenticate two remarks ascribed to Diocletian (*Aur.* 44.2 ff.).³⁰

'FULVIUS ASPRIANUS' (118) : *Carus* 17.7

'MAEONIUS ASTYANAX' (120)

Present at and reported the conclave where Ballista urged Macrianus to proclaim himself emperor in place of the captured Valerian (*Tyr. Trig.* 12.3). *PLRE* admits a slight and surely unnecessary doubt: "almost certainly fictitious."

ATHENAEUS 1 (121)

Of Byzantium, put in charge of restoring and fortifying cities by Gallienus, won a victory over barbarians 'circa Pontum' (*Gall.* 13.6; cf. Syncellus pp. 716 f. Bonn; Zonaras 12.26). *PLRE* suggests identity with the Panathenius who fortified part of the city wall at Athens (*IG* 2/3². 5201: undated): hence perhaps *dux* or *corrector Achaëae*, and "Panathenius was probably a *signum*." But the *HA* envisages a command in the Black Sea area. The Athenian inscription may refer to a different occasion, and Panathenius need not be a *signum*: observe that Athenais, the daughter of Herodes Atticus, appears in Philostratus as Panathenais (*VS* 2.1.10).

L. JULIUS AURELIUS SEPTIMIUS VABALLATHUS ATHENODORUS 2 (122): *Aur.* 38.1³¹

'JULIUS ATHERIANUS'

Wrote about the Gallic emperor Victorinus (*Tyr. Trig.* 6.5). *PLRE* emends the name to 'Julius Aetherianus' (25). 'Julius Haterianus' has also been proposed.³² But, since the character is fictitious, the MSS reading ought to stand.

ATTALUS (123)

German king (Victor, *Caes.* 33.6), or king of Marcomanni (*Epit. de Caes.* 33.1). The name presumably occurred in the second of the two lacunae at *Gall.* 21.3.

³⁰R. Syme, *Emp. and Biog.* 213 f.

³¹On Vaballathus, see now F. Millar, *JRS* 61 (1961) 8 ff.

³²*PIR*² J 349.

'GALLONIUS AVITUS' 3 (127) : *Quad. Tyr.* 15.5 f.

'AURELIANUS' 1 (128) : *Aur.* 42.2

L. DOMITIUS AURELIANUS 6 (129/30)

The *HA*'s account of Aurelian's career is rightly dismissed (*Aur.* 6.1 ff.); but its statements about his origin deserve no more credence (*Aur.* 3.1 f.). Aurelian became a prominent commander under Gallienus and was one of the conspirators who decided to assassinate him (Victor, *Caes.* 33.21; Zonaras 12.25). Further, he was in command of cavalry (Zonaras 12.25). The *HA* alone states that he commanded all the cavalry under Claudius (*Aur.* 18.1): whether that is authentic or not appears to be a nicely balanced question. Confidence in it may be diminished by a "letter" of Claudius which gives Aurelian charge of all the Thracian and Illyrian armies and the Danube frontier (*Aur.* 17.1 ff.). But Zonaras can be invoked in support (12.25).

AUREOLUS (138)

The *HA* has some authentic information about Aureolus, which need not, however, include the statement that, like Regalianus, Claudius, Macrianus, Ingenuus, and Postumus, 'qui omnes in imperio interempti sunt cum mererentur imperium,' he was promoted by Valerian not by Gallienus (*Tyr. Trig.* 10.14). Moreover, the *HA* produces and reiterates a story which at first sight appears utterly incredible: Aureolus rebelled against Gallienus in 261, but the emperor then made peace with him in order to attack Postumus with his help (*Gall.* 2.6; 3.1; 4.6; 7.1; 21.5; *Tyr. Trig.* 11.1 ff.; 12.2; 12.14; 14.1; 18.1 ff.; *Aur.* 16.1). Nevertheless, two Greek sources produce each half of the story separately: Zonaras has Aureolus serving as a general in a campaign which Gallienus waged against Postumus (12.24), and Zosimus puts the usurpation of Aureolus before that of Postumus, adding that, unlike other rebels who were quickly punished, Aureolus 'ἀλλοτρίως πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα διετέλεσεν ἔχων' (1.38.1).³³ Aureolus' career was, to say the least, abnormal: in 268 he was commander of all the cavalry (Zosimus 1.40.1; Zonaras 12.24). Yet it seems that he struck coins early in the 260's in his own name in the Balkans, with a legend read as '(IMP) CME AURPOLUS,' i.e., 'Imp. C(aes). M. (A)e(lius) Aureolus' (T. O. Mabbott, *Schweizer Münzblätter* 6 [1956] 49–51).³⁴

³³For discussion, A. Alföldi, *Zeitschr. für Numismatik* 37 (1927) 197 ff.; 40 (1930) 1 ff. (reprinted in *Studien* [1967] 1 ff.; 57 ff.); A. Stein, *PIR*² A 1672; E. Manni, *L'impero di Gallieno* (Rome 1949) 52 f.; 93 f.

³⁴*PLRE* cites only *RIC* 5.2.589—two coins apparently not inspected by any numismatist subsequent to Banduri (who published in 1718). It was highly advisable, therefore, to record that A. Alföldi defended one of them as a genuine coin of Aureolus minted at Milan in 268 (*Studien* [1967] 10 f.).

BALLISTA (146)

Ballista (a military engine resembling a catapult) is presumably a military nickname.³⁵ It is attested not only by the *HA* (*Val.* 4.4; *Gall.* 1.2 f.; 3.1 ff; *Tyr. Trig.* 12.1 ff.; 14.1; 18.13), but also once in Zonaras (12.23, but Callistus at 12.24; Syncellus p. 716 Bonn). The man, and perhaps also the nickname Ballista, are alluded to in the contemporary thirteenth book of the Sibylline Oracles (13.162 ff.).³⁶

*‘BASSUS’

‘Vopiscus’ dedicates the *Quadrigae Tyrannorum* to ‘Bassus’ (2.1), whom he presumably envisages as the anonymous friend of the final paragraph of the *Carus* (21.2 f.).

‘CERRONIUS BASSUS’ 13 (154)

Received “letter” from Aurelian, which *PLRE* too cautiously damns as only “probably fictitious” (*Aur.* 31.5 ff.).

L. CAESONIUS OVINIUS MANLIUS RUFINIANUS BASSUS 18 (156/7)

Full career known from inscriptions (principally *AE* 1964.223). The *HA* comes into discussion of one post held by Bassus, which the original editor read as ‘electo a divo Probo ad pres[ide]ndum iud. mag.’ Hence a *iudicium magnum* as proof that Probus really did permit the Senate ‘ut ex magnorum iudicum appellationibus ipsi cognoscerent’ (*Prob.* 13.1)³⁷ or else as an indication that behind the *HA*’s invention of Probus’ senatorial policy there lurks an element of reality.³⁸ *PLRE* accepts the reading and the existence of the otherwise unattested *iudicium magnum* (157 [j]). Unfortunately, ‘iud. mag.’ should be ‘lud. mag.’ i.e., ‘lud(is) mag(nis).’³⁹ These will be either the Ludi Romani or the special games in the Circus which the Senate supervised in the reign of Probus (*Mon. Germ. Hist.*, Auct. Ant. 9.148).

*‘BONITUS’

‘Stipator principis nostri’ in bogus letter apparently ascribed to the sole reign of Gallienus (*Tyr. Trig.* 10.11; cf. 1; 8 f.).

BONOSUS 1 (163)

PLRE retails without any sign of dubitation the account of the *HA*

³⁵*TLL* 2.1700 ff.

³⁶Rzach, *PW* 2A.2160; A. Stein, *PIR*² B 41.

³⁷G. Barbieri, *Akte des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für griechische und lateinische Epigraphik* (1964) 40 ff.; Plate I.

³⁸A. Chastagnol, *BHAC* 1966/7 (1968) 67 ff.; *Recherches sur l'histoire Auguste* (Bonn 1970) 33.

³⁹*CQ*² 20 (1970) 201.

(*Quad. Tyr.* 14.1 ff.)—which is total invention apart from the name of Bonosus.⁴⁰ Even the genuine detail that Bonosus rebelled with Proculus at Agrippina is there lacking, though it stands at *Prob.* 18.5 (cf. Eutropius 9.17.1; *Epit. de Caes.* 37.2).⁴¹ Further, *PLRE* cites coins of Bonosus (*RIC* 5.2.592). They have been suspected by competent judges.⁴²

‘JUNIUS BROCCCHUS’ (165) : *Claud.* 8.3 f.

*‘BURBURUS’

Famous drinker ‘de numero vexillariorum’ (*Quad. Tyr.* 4.4).

‘CAELESTINUS’ (167)

Bogus authority cited on Gallienus’ half-brother Valerian (*Val.* 8.1). *PLRE* doubts the statement attributed to ‘Caelestinus’ but fails to question his existence.

‘CALLICRATES’ 1 (173) : *Aur.* 4.2

‘JULIUS CALPURNIUS’ 1 (177) : *Carus* 8.4

‘CAMISOLEUS’ (178) : *Tyr. Trig.* 26.4

CANNABAS (179)

When Aurelian was journeying to fight Zenobia, ‘in Thraciis et in Illyrico occurrentes barbaros vicit, Gothorum quin etiam ducem Cannaban sive Cannabauden cum quinque milibus hominum trans Danuvium interemit’ (*Aur.* 22.2). A campaign against the Goths is reflected in Aurelian’s imperial titulature: he successively took the titles Germanicus Maximus (270 or 271), Gothicus Maximus (271), and Parthicus Maximus (272).⁴³ It would be rash, therefore, to dismiss the name of the Gothic leader or king (cf. 33.3) out of hand. Moreover, the form ‘Cannabas’ presumably goes back to an original ‘Cniva.’ Hence this man can be identified either as the Cniva who defeated and killed Decius twenty

⁴⁰A. Stein, *PIR*² B 146.

⁴¹And plausibly to be restored in Victor (*Caes.* 37.3) by emendation: ‘simul caesis, Saturnino per Orientem, Agrippinae Bonoso (Proculoque cum) exercitu’ (R. Syme, *Amm. and HA* 55 f.).

⁴²A Stein, *PIR*² B 146. For the coins in question, see H. Cohen, *Description historique des monnaies frappées sous l’Empire romain* 5 (Paris 1861) 315 (= *RIC* 5.2, Plate XX, 15; 16); E. Gnechchi, *Rivista italiana di numismatica* 27 (1914) 45 ff. (an entertaining and suspicious story). The third coin was seen once by Gnechchi, then disappeared; to judge from the photographs, the other two are likely to be genuine coins whose legends have been altered since antiquity.

⁴³On Aurelian’s titles, cf. G. Sotgiu, *Studi sull’epigrafia di Aureliano* (Palermo 1961) 18 ff. They are neither discussed nor recorded in *PLRE*.

years earlier (Jordanes, *Get.* 101 ff.) or, more probably, his son.⁴⁴ Why does the *HA* add 'sive Cannabauden'? Possibly a variant form found in a second source. But the author may have been influenced by the thought of one of two historical persons: the Gennoboudes who received a kingdom from Maximian (*Pan. Lat.* 10[2].10.3: not in *PLRE*) or the Frankish chief Genobaudes attested in 388 (Gregory of Tours, *Hist. Franc.* 2.9).

'CAPITO' 1 (180)

Pretorian prefect of Probus (*Prob.* 10.6): not to be identified with the undated pretorian prefect Κυντι[λίου Καπίτων]νος (*AE* 1958.189).⁴⁵

'CORNELIUS CAPITOLINUS' 4 (180) : *Tyr. Trig.* 15.8

*'JULIUS CAPITOLINUS'

One of alleged authors of *HA*: commended as a truthful biographer by 'Flavius Vopiscus' (*Prob.* 2.7), he is ascribed the lives of Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, L. Verus, Pertinax, Clodius Albinus, Opellius Macrinus, the two Maximini, the three Gordians, and Maximus and Balbinus.

M. AURELIUS CARINUS (181) : *Carus* 7.1; 10; 16.1 ff.

M. AURELIUS CARUS (183)

PLRE makes him "probably native of Narbonensis." In fact, 'Narbone natus' (Victor, *Caes.* 39.12; Eutropius 9.18.1; Jerome, *Chron.* a. 284; *Epit. de Caes.* 38.1):⁴⁶ the *HA* is deliberately misleading (*Carus* 4.1 ff.)—and cannot be used to show that "his career included both civil and military offices" (5.4; cf. 4.6). About Carus' proclamation as emperor, the sources disagree. According to Greek writers, Carus rebelled against Probus in Raetia or Noricum and overthrew him; so Zosimus (1.71.4 f.),⁴⁷ Zonaras (12.29) and, most explicitly, Petrus Patricius (*Excerpta Vaticana* 179).⁴⁸ The Latin epitomators, however, have Probus killed in a mutiny

⁴⁴On Cannabas, cf. R. Loewe, *Anzeiger für deutsches Altertum* 33 (1909) 260 f.; A. Stein, *PIR*³ C 1208; E. Demougeot, *La formation de l'Europe et les invasions barbares* 1 (Paris 1969) 429; 452 ff. If he is historical, it does not follow that he possessed a 'currus quattuor cervis iunctus' (*Aur.* 33.3, accepted by L. Schmidt, *Die Ostgermanen*² [Munich 1941] 221).

⁴⁵For discussion, D. M. Pippidi, *Philologus* 101 (1957) 158 ff.

⁴⁶For further evidence, P. Meloni, *Il Regno di Caro, Numeriano e Carino*. *Annali Cagliari* 15.2 (1948) 11 f.

⁴⁷Most of the relevant sentence is lost in a lacuna in the manuscript of Zosimus (see the editions of C. Mendelssohn [1887] 52; F. Paschoud [Paris 1971] 62), but can be restored from John of Antioch, *Excerpta de insidiis* 70 = fr. 160 (*Frag. Hist. Graec.* 4.600).

⁴⁸U. P. Boissevain, *Cassii Dionis Cocceiani Historiarum Romanarum quae supersunt* 3 (Berlin 1901) 747 = Anon. post Dionem fr. 11 (*Frag. Hist. Graec.* 4.198). For the ascription to Petrus Patricius, cf. G. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur*² (Munich 1897) 237 ff.

at Sirmium which has nothing to do with Carus (Victor, *Caes.* 37.4; Eutropius 9.17.3; Jerome, *Chron.* a. 283; *Epit. de Caes.* 37.4). The *HA* knew the version of the Greek writers, but indignantly rejected it in favour of the other (*Carus* 6.1 ff.; *Probus* 20.1; 21.2 f.).

CECROPIUS 1 (189)

Commander of the Dalmatian cavalry, murdered Gallienus (*Gall.* 14.4 ff.; cf. Zosimus 1.40.2 f., who does not name him). The *HA* calls the man 'quidam Ceronius sive Cecropius' (*Gall.* 14.4): the second name is plausible, the first baffling.⁴⁹

'CECROPIUS' 2 (189) : *Prob.* 22.3

AELIA CELSINILLA (191)

"Perhaps descended from Aelius Celsus, senator killed by Severus." The presumed forbear (attested only at *Sev.* 13.2) falls under heavy suspicion.⁵⁰

'CELSINUS' 1 (191) : *Aur.* 44.3

*'CELSINUS'

Addressed as a friend by 'Flavius Vopiscus' (*Prob.* 1.3).

*'CELSUS'

'Stipator principis nostri' in bogus letter apparently ascribed to the sole reign of Gallienus (*Tyr. Trig.* 11.10; cf. 1; 8 f.).

'CELSUS' 1 (193) : *Tyr. Trig.* 29; *Claud.* 7.4

*'HERENNIUS CELSUS'

Relative of dedicatee of lives attributed to 'Trebellius Pollio,' desirous of a consulate (*Tyr. Trig.* 22.12): the dedicatee was presumably named in the lost *Vita Philipporum* and perhaps in the lost preface to the *Vita Valeriani*.

*'RUFIVS CELSUS'

Friend of 'Flavius Vopiscus' (*Quad. Tyr.* 2.1).

'CENSORINUS' 3 (197)

Both details and person are pure invention (*Tyr. Trig.* 31.12; 33.1 ff.).⁵¹

⁴⁹R. Syme, *Emp. and Biog.* 210.

⁵⁰*Ib.* 74.

⁵¹H. Peter, *Abhand. d. phil.-hist. Kl. d. kön. sächs. Ges. d. Wiss.* 27 (Leipzig 1909) 199; 220.

'FABIUS CERYLLIANUS' (199) : *Carus* 4.3

'AELIUS CESETTIANUS' (199)

An invented character (*Tac.* 7.2). No point, therefore, in casting around for possible emendations of 'Cesettianus' or in suggesting that "an Aelius Cestianus of Volturnum is a plausible third-century senatorial name."

'MALLIUS CHILO' 2 (201)

Again a bogus letter, of Aurelian to 'Mallius Chilo,' is no more than "probably fictitious" (*Aur.* 23.4 f.).

'CLAUDIA' 1 (206) : *Claud.* 13.2

'CLAUDIA' 2 (206) : *Prob.* 3.4

M. AURELIUS VALERIUS CLAUDIUS 11 (209)

Claudius' origin is totally obscure: the *HA* refers to him as an Illyrian (*Claud.* 14.2), but had earlier presumed him a Dalmatian, though confessing that others believed him a Dardanian descended from Dardanus of Troy (11.9). It is bad method to combine these scraps of fiction into "he was an Illyrian from Dalmatia." On Claudius' career, however, the *HA* may have preserved an authentic and valuable fact: Gallienus fought a campaign against Postumus, accompanied by Aureolus and Claudius (*Gall.* 7.1). It would not be wise to insist on the accuracy of this item, but it deserved to be registered.⁶² A date in 262 or 263 is implied (note the consular dates at *Gall.* 5.2; 10.1).

All sorts of fictions were manufactured concerning Claudius.⁶³ He was claimed as a forbear of Constantine,—hence 'Flavius Claudius' twice in the *HA* (*Claud.* 7.8; *Aur.* 17.2)—, as a relative of Probus (*Prob.* 3.3), and as the son of Gordian by a mature woman who was giving the youth training for marriage (*Epit. de Caes.* 34.2). Further, his death from illness (*Claud.* 12.2) was transformed into a solemn *devotio* for the good of the state. Fiction has even obscured his position immediately before his accession. *PLRE* accepts Victor's assertion that at the time of Gallienus' murder the high-minded Claudius, a mere tribune, was on garrison duty at Ticinum (*Caes.* 33.28), relegating to a parenthesis Zonaras' more probably correct definition of his post as *ἱππαρχος* (12.26). But Zosimus states that Claudius was virtual deputy to the emperor, that Heraclianus brought him into the plot to assassinate him (he was therefore with the army besieging Mediolanum), and that he was the

⁶²Zonaras has Aureolus sent against Postumus, apparently soon after his rebellion (12.24).

⁶³For what follows, cf. R. Syme, *Emp. and Biog.* 203 ff.; 209 ff.; 215 ff.; 233 f.

conspirators' agreed choice as emperor (1.40.2 ff.). This version (not mentioned in *PLRE*) clearly deserves preference over the story that the dying Gallienus designated Claudius as his successor and sent the imperial regalia to the absent Claudius at Ticinum (Victor, *Caes.* 33.28; *Epit. de Caes.* 34.2). Zonaras agrees with Zosimus on the complicity of Claudius (12.25)—and so sometimes does the *HA*: 'Gallienum . . . , etiamsi non auctor consilii fuit, tamen ipse imperaturus bono generis humani a gubernaculis publicis depulit' (*Claud.* 1.3; cf. *Gall.* 14.2 'electus est, qui consilio non adfuerat'). Further, Claudius' importance under Gallienus appears to be confirmed by a fragment of Petrus Patricius (*Excerpta Vaticana* 164).⁵⁴ A Greek source might have inspired the *HA* to make Gallienus style Claudius 'parentem amicumque nostrum' (*Claud.* 17.2).

CLEODAMUS 1 (216)

Of Byzantium, together with Athenaeus 1 put in charge of restoring and fortifying cities by Gallienus, won victory over barbarians 'circa Pontum' (*Gall.* 13.6; cf. Syncellus pp. 716 f. Bonn; Zonaras 12.26).

'CONSTANTINA' 1 (222) : *Claud.* 13.3

FLAVIUS VALERIUS CONSTANTINUS 4 (223/4)

Addressed by 'Julius Capitolinus' (*Clod. Alb.* 4.1; *Maxim.* 1.1; *Gord.* 1.1; 34.6), 'Aelius Spartianus' (*Geta* 1.1), and 'Aelius Lampridius' (*Elag.* 2.4; 34.1; *Alex.* 65.1).

FLAVIUS VALERIUS CONSTANTIUS 12 (227/8)

Prob. 22.3 is not evidence for his career. But the *HA* knows that he had been governor of Dalmatia (*Carus* 17.6; cf. Anon. Val. 1.2; *CIL* 3.9860).

*'ANNIUS CORNICULA'

Falsely praised Gallienus for constancy (*Gall.* 17.2).

*'ULPIUS CRINITUS'

Descendant of Trajan (*Aur.* 10.2), suffect consul with Aurelian 'a die undecimo kal. Juniarum in locum Gallieni et Valeriani' (11.8), *dux Illyriciani limitis* in 258 (13.1), adopted Aurelian (14.4 ff.), and imagined as still alive after 270, since he receives a letter from Aurelian as Augustus, himself now being *ter consul* (38.2 ff.).

'CRISPUS' 1 (232) : *Claud.* 13.2; 9

'TATIUS CYRILLUS' (238) : *Maxim.* 1.2

⁵⁴Boissevain, *op. cit.* 734 = Anon. post Dionem fr. 5.3 (*Frag. Hist. Graec.* 4.194).

DALMATIUS 1 (240)

Father of Probus, gardening enthusiast (*Epit. de Caes.* 37.1). Quite possibly fictitious.⁵⁶ It is bad method to identify Dalmatius with 'Maximus' and then use the *HA* as evidence for his career (*Prob.* 3.1 f.).

P. HERENNIUS DEXIPPUS 2 (250/1)

Commander of Athenian forces which defeated Goths ca. 267 (*Gall.* 13.8; cf. *FGrH* 100 F 28). For his career at Athens, cf. *IG* 2/3². 2931; 3198; 3667; 3669–71.⁵⁶

C. AURELIUS VALERIUS DIOCLETIANUS 2 (253/4)

Prob. 22.3 and *Carus* 15.3 should not be used for Diocletian's career. The *HA* is, however, drawing on good information for his post in 284: 'domesticos regentem' (*Carus* 13.1; cf. Victor, *Caes.* 39.1; Zonaras 12.31).⁵⁷

DOMITIANUS 1 (262)

Usurper under Aurelian (Zosimus 1.49.2). A unique coin found in France, with the legend 'imp. C. Domitianus p.f. Aug.' (*RIC* 5.2.590) would, if genuine, correctly read, and correctly dated, place the usurpation in Gaul.⁵⁸ In fact, it is a genuine coin of Tetricus with the legends reworked in modern times.⁵⁹

*DOMITIANUS

General under Aureolus in Illyricum in 261 (*Gall.* 2.6 f.; cf. *Tyr. Trig.* 12.13 f.; 13.3; Zonaras 12.24). Alleged to be descended from Domitian and Domitilla (*Tyr. Trig.* 12.14). Presumably identical with the usurper Domitianus. Not entered in the list of 'Military Commanders, 260–284' (*PLRE* 1116).

EROS 1 (283)

Eros in Zosimus (1.62.1 ff.), 'Mnestheus' in the *HA* (*Aur.* 36.4 f.; 37.2). The latter is perhaps a distortion of 'μνηστής' (cf. Zosimus 1.62.1: "Ἐρως ὄνομα, τῶν ἐξωθεν φερομένων ἀποκρίσεων μνηστής τεταγμένος).⁶⁰

'CLAUDIUS EUSTHENIUS' (312) : *Carus* 18.5

⁵⁶R. Syme, *Emp. and Biog.* 232 ff.

⁵⁶See now F. Millar, *JRS* 59 (1969) 12 ff. *PLRE* cites Dexippus' inscriptions from *IG* 3¹, 714–717, and his writings from *Frag. Hist. Graec.* 3.666–687.

⁵⁷On the mention of *domestici*, A. H. M. Jones comments: "anachronistic no doubt, but if, as I believe, the *Historia Augusta* was written not later than Constantine's reign, *domestici* must have existed by then" (*The Later Roman Empire* 3 [Oxford 1964] 195).

⁵⁸For bibliography, cf. G. Barbieri, *Albo* 403, no. 12.

⁵⁹G. Laffranchi, *Rivista italiana di numismatica* 44 (1942) 19 ff.

⁶⁰E. Hohl, *Klio* 11 (1911) 285 ff.

‘EUTROPIUS’ 1 (316)

Noble Dardanian, husband of ‘Claudia’ the daughter of ‘Crispus’ 1, the brother of Claudius and Quintillus, and by her father of Constantius (*Claud.* 13.2). All invention: the father of Constantius is likely to have been a Flavius Dalmatius.⁶¹

NUMMIUS FAUSIANUS (326)

For the consular date of 262 the MSS have ‘Gallieno et Faustiano’ (*Gall.* 4.2). That might be a scribal corruption rather than a mistake of the writer.⁶²

FELICISSIMUS 1 (331)

Rationalis, instigated revolt of moneyers at Rome (*Aur.* 38.2 f.). For the date, cf. *Aur.* 21.5: ‘finito proelio Marcomanico . . . Romam petit vindictae cupidus, quam seditionum asperitas suggerebat.’ *PLRE* connects the revolt with “Aurelian’s closure of the mint at Rome in 270.”⁶³

‘AURELIUS FESTIVUS’ (334)

Freedman of Aurelian, wrote about Firmus (*Quad. Tyr.* 6.1). Not stigmatized.

FIRMUS 1 (339)

Ephemeral usurper in Egypt, after Aurelian’s second expedition to Palmyra (*Aur.* 32.2 f.; cf. Zosimus 1.61.1: *σὺν τάχει δὲ καὶ Ἀλεξανδρέας στασιάζαντας καὶ πρὸς ἀπόστασιν ἰδόντας παραστησάμενος* [sc. Aurelian]). Perhaps, as the *HA* alleges, ‘Zenobiae amicus ac socius’ (*Quad. Tyr.* 3.1). On his own profession, the author of the *HA* wrote the *Vita Aureliani* ‘prius quam de Firmo cuncta cognoscerem’ (*Quad. Tyr.* 2.3): he therefore supplied a full account with a wealth of invented detail (*Quad. Tyr.* 2.1 ff.).

‘FIRMUS’ 2 (339) : *Quad. Tyr.* 3.1CLAUDIUS FIRMUS 7 (341) : *Quad. Tyr.* 3.1

⁶¹A. Piganiol, *L'empereur Constantin* (Paris 1932) 32.

⁶²The proper form of the cognomen admits of no doubt; cf. *CIL* 14.5357; *Mon. Germ. Hist.*, Auct. Ant. 9.59. The matter is of historical significance, for Fausianus can be claimed as an Etruscan name (W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* [Göttingen 1904] 365; 555).

⁶³The closing, not precisely datable, is held to be the result, not the cause, of the revolt by P. H. Webb, *RIC* 5.1 (1927) 249.

M. ANNIUS FLORIANUS 6 (367)

PLRE apparently accepts the *HA*'s assertion that Florianus was the brother of (M. Claudius) Tacitus (*Tac.* 13.6; 14.4; *Prob.* 11.3; 13.3; cf. 10.8)—uterine (*Tac.* 17.4) rather than *germanus* (*Tac.* 14.1). The relationship seems, however, to be an error, first committed by Aurelius Victor, who assimilated Florianus' succession to Tacitus to that of Quintillus' to his brother Claudius (*Caes.* 36.2).⁶⁴ From Victor the error was eagerly taken over by the *HA*, and made its way into Polemius Silvius' list of emperors (*Mon. Germ. Hist.*, Auct. Ant. 9.522). Eutropius has simply 'Florianus qui Tacito successerat' (9.16). The Greek sources show no awareness of any kinship, but transmit the important fact that Florianus was Tacitus' pretorian prefect (Zosimus 1.63.1; Zonaras 12.28).

'M. FONTEIUS' (369)

'Amator historiarum' and friend of 'Flavius Vopiscus' (*Quad. Tyr.* 2.1). *PLRE* gives the date as "?IV," i.e., not certainly fourth century; but in the *Quadrigae Tyrannorum* 'Vopiscus' purports to be writing after May 305 (*Aur.* 43.2; 44.5; *Quad. Tyr.* 1.4 ff.; 15.10; *Carus* 13.3; 14.1; 15.1 ff.; 17.6; 18.3 ff.).

'ARELLIUS FUSCUS' 1 (376) : *Tyr. Trig.* 21.3; *Aur.* 40.4

'DAGELLIUS FUSCUS' 2 (377)

Reported that the younger Tetricus passed on his patrimony to his descendants (*Tyr. Trig.* 25.2). The *nomen* presents a problem. The Palatine MS of the *HA* has 'Dagellius,' the textual tradition independent of the Palatine 'Gellius,' and E. Hohl prints the emendation 'Arel-lius.'⁶⁵ In any event, it is highly unlikely that "the text may conceal a genuine name."

'MOESIUS GALLICANUS' 2 (383) : *Tac.* 8.3

* 'TURDULUS GALLICANUS'

Old and honest friend of 'Flavius Vopiscus,' wrote *ephemeris* on Probus (*Prob.* 2.2).

* 'VULCACIUS GALLICANUS'

v.c., alleged author of *Vita Avidii Cassii*.

* 'GALLIENA'

Cousin of Gallienus, proclaimed 'Celsus' emperor (*Tyr. Trig.* 29.2).

⁶⁴E. Hohl, *Klio* 11 (1911) 310 f.

⁶⁵E. Hohl, *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* 2² (Leipzig 1965) 124.

P. LICINIUS EGNATIUS GALLIENUS 1 (383/4)

The *HA* has much good information, which includes the statement that he was archon at Athens (*Gall.* 11.3). Indirect confirmation comes from his holding the post of archon at Traiana Augusta in Thrace (*IGRR* 1.759).⁶⁶ It would not be safe, however, to accept as Gallienus' own composition the fragment of an epithalamium which the *HA* quotes (*Gall.* 11.8)⁶⁷—and ascribes to the time when all the Greek and Latin poets delivered epithalamia at the marriage of Gallienus' 'fratrum suorum filios' (*Gall.* 11.7). Only one brother is attested, viz. (Licinius) Valerianus, of whom no sons are known.⁶⁸

The *HA* does not have the deification of Gallienus by Claudius (Victor, *Caes.* 33.27—confirmed by *AE* 1909.227 [near Theveste]; *Corp. Pap. Rain.* 9; *POxy.* 2711).

'GAUDIOSUS' (387) : *Prob.* 22.3

* 'GILLO'

Slave of Aurelianus, manumitted after his death by decree of the Senate (*Aur.* 50.3).⁶⁹

'AURELIUS GORDIANUS' 2 (398) : *Aur.* 41.3

'VELIUS CORNIFICIUS GORDIANUS' 3 (398)

Consul on 25 September, i.e., of 275 (*Tac.* 3.2). Since the man is fictitious, there can be little point in emending 'Velius' to 'Aurelius' (a genuine Velius Rufus occurs at *Comm.* 4.10). Further, *PLRE* elsewhere (873, Tacitus 3) lends some authority to the date of 25 September which, it here concedes, comes from "forged *acta senatus*."

* 'GRATUS'

In bogus letter of Gallienus to 'Venustus' (*Claud.* 17.3).

AFRANIUS HANNIBALIANUS 3 (407/8)

Service under Probus cannot legitimately be deduced from *Prob.* 22.3.

⁶⁶Equally interesting and significant, Gallienus wished to be enrolled as a citizen and participate in all Athenian sacred rites (*Gall.* 11.3). For discussion, A. Alföldi, *25 Jahre Röm.-Germ. Comm.* (1929) 11 ff. = *Studien* 228 ff.; M. Rosenbach, *Galliena Augusta* (Tübingen 1958) 28 ff.

⁶⁷The poem exists with two additional verses, independently of the *HA*: A. Riese, *Anthologia Latina* 2 (Leipzig 1879) 160, no. 711; E. Baehrens, *Poetae Latinae Minores* 4 (Leipzig 1882) 103 f., no. 113. One scholar suggested that this distich was a later addition which spoiled the beauty of the first three lines (C. Thomas, *SB München* [1863] 2.41 f.).

⁶⁸For Gallienus and his brother, see now *PIR*² L 197; 257.

⁶⁹The name might come from Juvenal 1.40; cf. R. Syme, *Amm. and HA* 97.

*‘HERACLAMMON’

Native of Tyana, betrayed the city to Aurelian (*Aur.* 23.2; 24.1). The name is Egyptian.⁷⁰

AURELIUS HERACLIANUS 6 (417) : *Gall.* 13.4 f.; 14.1 ff.

HERENNIANUS 1 (421)

Son of Odenathus and Zenobia (*Gall.* 13.2; *Tyr. Trig.* 15.2; 17.2; 24.4; 27; 30.2; *Aur.* 38.1). Normally regarded as invented,⁷¹ but possibly to be identified with the Septimius Herodianus attested at Palmyra as βασιλεὺς βασιλέων (*IGRR* 3.1032; H. Seyrig, *Syria* 18 [1937] 1 ff.; Plate 6.1/2).⁷²

‘HERENNIANUS’ 2 (421)

Son of the usurper Proculus (*Quad. Tyr.* 12.4). Not stigmatized.

‘HERENNIANUS’ 3 (421) : *Prob.* 22.3

*‘HERENNIANUS’

In bogus letter of Gallienus (*Claud.* 17.3).

‘VERCONNIUS HERENNIANUS’ 6 (421) : *Aur.* 44.2

HERODES 1 (426)

Eldest son of Odaenathus and killed with him, stepson of Zenobia (*Gall.* 13.1; *Tyr. Trig.* 15 ff.). *PLRE* holds probable his identification with the Septimius Herodianus who can perhaps more plausibly be identified with the *HA*’s Herennianus 1.

‘HUNILA’ (445) : *Quad. Tyr.* 15.3 ff.

INGENUUS 1 (457)

PLRE puts usurpation of Ingenuus in 260, after the capture of Valerian. This order of events is given by Aurelius Victor (*Caes.* 33.2) and Zonaras (12.24), and implied by Polemius Silvius (*Mon. Germ. Hist.*, Auct. Ant. 9.521). But it seems that the common source of Victor and Eutropius may have put the usurpation in the joint reign of Valerian and Gallienus (cf. Eutropius 9.8.1). Moreover, the *Epitome de Caesaribus* dates to the joint reign the revolt of Regalianus (32.3)—which followed that of Ingenuus (Victor, *Caes.* 33.2), and the *HA* gives the consular

⁷⁰R. Syme, *Amm. and HA* 65.

⁷¹*PIR*³ H 95; cf. *Albo* 1727.

⁷²A. Alföldi, *CAH* 12 (1939) 724; *Studien* 196 f.

date of 258 (*Tyr. Trig.* 9.1), which may derive from Dexippus and therefore be correct.⁷³

‘CEIONIUS JULIANUS’

Friend of ‘Flavius Vopiscus’ (*Quad. Tyr.* 2.1). Fictitious: there is no justification, therefore, for adducing the *HA* as possible evidence that M. Ceionius Julianus, Prefect of the City in 333, “was well educated and interested in history” (*PLRE* 476, Julianus 26).

‘JUNIUS’ (486) : *Carus* 4.6

‘AUTRONIUS JUSTUS’ 3 (490)

Senator, ill and absent from Senate in 275 (*Tac.* 19.1). The letter he receives from his son ‘Autronius Tiberianus’ is more than “probably fictitious.”

ULPIUS CORNELIUS LAELIANUS (492)

Although there can be no doubt that Laelianus is the correct form of the name (*RIC* 5.2.373), its distortions in ancient writers may be relevant to the date of the *HA*. Laelianus easily became L. Aelianus: hence the Aelianus of the *Epitome* (32.4) and, at a further stage of corruption, Aemilianus in Orosius (7.22.11). Victor (*Caes.* 33.8) has the correct form, as Eutropius may have had (9.9.1). But the manuscripts and Greek translations of Eutropius offer three readings: one manuscript has ‘Laeliano,’ two and Paeanius’ fourth century translation attest ‘L. Aeliano,’ others and the translation of Capito ‘Lolliano’ (preserved in John of Antioch, fr. 152).⁷⁴ The *HA* consistently has the form Lollianus (*Gall.* 21.5; *Tyr. Trig.* 3.7; 4.1; 5.1 ff; 6.3; 8.1; 31.2; *Claud.* 7.4). As concerns Eutropius and the *HA*, two explanations of the facts are possible: either knowledge of the *HA* caused a corruption in the MSS of Eutropius, including that used by Capito,⁷⁵ or, perhaps more probable, the *HA*’s ‘Lollianus’ derives from a corrupt copy of Eutropius.⁷⁶

‘AELIUS LAMPRIDIUS’ (494/5)

One of the alleged authors of the *HA* to whom are attributed the lives of Commodus, Diadumenianus, Elagabalus, and Severus Alexander.

The entry in *PLRE* is peculiar in more ways than one:⁷⁷ ‘Lampridius’

⁷³For a full treatment of this intricate chronological problem, J. Fitz, *Ingenuus et Régalien*. Collection Latomus 71 (1966).

⁷⁴H. Droysen, *Mon. Germ. Hist.*, Auct. Ant. 2 (1879) 154 f. For the two translations and their dates (before 400 and ca. 500), *ib.* xxi ff.

⁷⁵E. Hohl, *Klio* 27 (1934) 151.

⁷⁶W. Schmid, *BHAC* 1963 (1964) 132 f.

⁷⁷The preface of *PLRE* provides an explanation: “we also owe most of the biographies

is not stigmatized by asterisks and exclamation marks as a name attested only by the *HA* should be (cf. xxii); he receives fuller treatment than most historical characters; the plausibility of his addresses to Constantine is discussed; no fewer than three articles in learned journals are cited, one for the statement that 'Lampridius' "refers to Christianity more often and in less hostile spirit than the other biographers;" and he is only "possibly . . . a pseudonym."

'LEONIDES' (499) : *Prob.* 22.3

VALERIUS LICINIANUS LICINIUS 3 (509)

Erased a (fictitious) inscription from the tomb of Gordian at Circesium at the time of his accession 'cum se vellet videri a Philippis originem trahere' (*Gord.* 34.5).⁷⁸ Also named at *Elag.* 35.6.

CASSIUS LONGINUS 2 (514/5)

The *HA* has valuable evidence for Longinus' involvement with Zenobia (*Aur.* 30.3; cf. Zosimus 1.56.2 f.), but it is necessary to disbelieve its further statement that he reputedly advised her to dictate the arrogant letter in Syriac which is quoted (*Aur.* 27.1 ff.).

LUCILLUS 1 (518) : *Gall.* 12.1 (consular date for 265)⁷⁹

'CORNELIUS MACER' (527)

From same family as Macrianus 2 and Quietus 1, alleged contemporary of 'Trebellius Pollio' (*Tyr. Trig.* 14.5).

FULVIUS MACRIANUS 2 (528)

As often elsewhere, the *HA* has genuine information (*Gall.* 1.2; 2.1 ff.; *Tyr. Trig.* 12.13 f.; 13.3) but interlaces it with a larger amount of fiction. Macrianus declined to seek imperial power for himself because his body was deformed (Euseb. *HE* 7.10.8) or because he was lame in one leg (Zonaras 12.24)—a fact also recorded by Petrus Patricius. The *HA* leaves out Macrianus' physical deformity and makes him decline the proposal of Ballista that he should rule on the grounds of old age, his inability to ride perfectly, his need to wash frequently and eat delicately, and his long retirement from fighting since he became rich (*Tyr. Trig.*

of literary persons to Mr. Alan Cameron" (vi). Presumably the editors rather than the contributor are responsible for the failure to stigmatize 'Lampridius.' However, Cameron now appears to believe that—or at least writes as if—'Flavius Vopiscus' too is a real author (*JRS* 61 [1971] 258).

⁷⁸On this inscription, in five languages, J. F. Gilliam, *BHAC* 1968/69 (1970) 103 ff. It may be relevant that Licinius was born in 264 (*Epit. de Caes.* 41.7 f.).

⁷⁹See now *PIR*³ L 398.

12.3 ff.). The riches may well have occurred in the *HA*'s source: Macrianus had been in charge of money and supplies for Valerian's Persian expedition (Petrus Patricius, *Excerpta Vaticana* 159).⁸⁰

T. FULVIUS JUNIUS MACRIANUS 3 (528)

The statement that the younger Macrianus had once been a *tribunus* occurs in a bogus letter and should therefore be discarded as evidence (*Tyr. Trig.* 12.10). Papyri attest Macrianus and Quietus as emperors in one Egyptian year (i.e., 260/1: proof comes from a horoscope, *POxy.* 1476) and as consuls for the second time (i.e., in 261, *POxy.* 2710).⁸¹ No Alexandrian coins are known for Macrianus' second regnal year, but there are some of their eighth year for both Valerian and Gallienus (i.e., 260/1).⁸² The usurpation lasted, therefore, from late summer or autumn 260 to late spring or summer 261.⁸³

'MAECIANUS' 1 (531) : *Quad. Tyr.* 12.7

'CEREIUS MAECIANUS' 2 (531) : *Tac.* 19.3

'MAEONIUS' (531) : *Tyr. Trig.* 15.5; 17

MARCIANUS 2 (553/4)

General in Achaëa against the Goths, apparently as early as 262/3 (*Gall.* 6.1; cf. 5.2; 10.1). He successfully defended Philippopolis and was honoured by its inhabitants (*AE* 1965. 114: *δοῦξ καὶ στρατηλάτης*). Otherwise, all the evidence relates to the conspiracy against Gallienus (*Gall.* 14.1 ff.) and to a defeat of the Goths shortly before (*Gall.* 13.10; *Claud.* 6.1; 18.1)—or to a campaign which he was waging at the time of the conspiracy (Zosimus 1.40.1 f.).⁸⁴

M. AURELIUS MARIUS 4 (562) : *Tyr. Trig.* 5.3; 8.1 f.; 31.2

'MATRONIANUS' (568)

Pretorian prefect of Carinus (*Carus* 16.4). Since 'Matronianus' is fictitious,⁸⁵ it is idle to speculate on the date of his (non-existent) prefec-

⁸⁰Boissevain, *op. cit.* 742 = Anon. post Dionem fr. 3 (*Frag. Hist. Graec.* 4.193).

⁸¹For other papyri, P. Bureth, *Les Titulatures impériales dans les papyrus, les ostraca et les inscriptions d'Égypte (30 a.c.–284 p.c.)* (Brussels 1964) 119 f.

⁸²J. Vogt, *Die alexandrinischen Münzen* 2 (Stuttgart 1924) 154. For the equation of the eighth year of Valerian and the first of Macrianus and Quietus, *PLips.* 57; *PStrassb.* 6.

⁸³For the coinage of Macrianus and Quietus, cf. H. Mattingly, *Num. Chr.*⁶ 14 (1954) 53 ff.

⁸⁴On his career, see further B. Gerov, *Athenaeum* 43 (1965) 333 ff.

⁸⁵So, rightly, L. L. Howe, *The Pretorian Prefect from Commodus to Diocletian (A.D. 180–305)* (Chicago 1942) 115 f.

ture. "If genuine, he would have preceded Aristobulus." On the other hand, one Sabinus Julianus (Zosimus 1.73.1) "could have been praetorian prefect between Matronianus and Aristobulus" (*PLRE* 480, Julianus 38), and is so entered in the list of prefects (1047).

M. AURELIUS VALERIUS MAXENTIUS 5 (571) : *Elag.* 35.6

M. AURELIUS VALERIUS MAXIMIANUS *signo* HERCULIUS 8 (573/4) : *Elag.* 35.4, etc.

C. GALERIUS VALERIUS MAXIMIANUS 9 (574/5) : *Ael.* 2.2, etc.

'MAXIMUS'

Father of Probus, first centurion, then tribune in Egypt where he died (*Prob.* 3.2). Fictitious: therefore not to be combined with Dalmatius (*Epit. de Caes.* 37.1).

'JUNIUS MESSALA' 3 (600) : *Carus* 20.4

'MNESTEUS' (604)

Invented name for genuine Eros (*Aur.* 36.4 f.; 37.2).

MUCAPOR (609) : *Aur.* 26.2 ff. (invented letter); 35.5

'NARSEUS'

Persian king, makes peace with Probus (*Prob.* 17.5 ff.). Perhaps the *HA* has "wrongly placed" the Narses, who reigned from 293 to 302, since Vahram II ruled from 276 to 293 (so *PLRE* 616, Narses 1).

On a better definition, this 'Narseus' is an invented person bearing the name of the Persian king whom Galerius defeated (Victor, *Caes.* 39.35; Eutropius 9.22 ff., etc.). 'Narseus' only occurs as the terrified recipient of a bogus letter and in connexion with a peace with Persia which may be invented (note its omission from the parallel account of Zosimus, 1.71.1).⁸⁶

M. AURELIUS NEMESIANUS OLYMPIUS (622)

A genuine poet, of whom *Cynegetica* and four eclogues survive;⁸⁷ political events presumably dissuaded him from fulfilling his promise

⁸⁶For discussion, G. Vitucci, *L'Imperatore Probo* (Rome 1952) 62 ff. He points out that Probus is Περσικὸς μέγιστος or Παρθικὸς μέγιστος in certain papyri (now listed by Bureth, *op. cit.* 124). *PLRE* accept the peace (945, Vararanes II).

⁸⁷E. Baehrens, *Poetae Latini Minores* 3 (Leipzig 1880) 176 ff.; J. W. and A. M. Duff, *Minor Latin Poets* (London 1934) 451 ff.

to compose an epic on the wars of Carinus and Numerianus (*Cyneg.* 63 ff.). The genuineness of his name, however, does not prove that Nemesianus competed with Numerianus; nor need he have written the *Halieutica* and *Nautica* ascribed to him (*Carus* 11.2).

‘NICOMACHUS’ (630)

Claimed to have translated a letter of Zenobia to Aurelian from Syriac to Greek (*Aur.* 27.6), which the *HA* quotes in Latin (27.2 ff.).

‘MAECIUS FALTONIUS NICOMACHUS’ (630) : *Tac.* 5.3

M. AURELIUS NUMERIUS NUMERIANUS (634) : *Carus* 11.1 ff.

SEPTIMIUS ODAENATHUS (638/9)

The *HA* has some genuine and important information about Odaenathus (*Val.* 4.2 ff.; *Gall.* 3.1 ff.; 10.1 ff.; *Tyr. Trig.* 14.1; 15). But there is also fiction: Odaenathus was never styled Augustus (*Gall.* 12.1), he never exercised a ‘totius Orientis imperium’ (*Gall.* 10.1; cf. 1.1; 3.3; *Tyr. Trig.* 14.1), and the final paragraph of the *Gallieni duo* is not good evidence that he and Gallienus “came to terms in 262/3.” *PLRE* fails to make use of all the available evidence outside the *HA* or to give essential bibliographical guidance.⁸⁸

‘ONESIMUS’ (648)

Allegedly wrote a life of Probus (*Quad. Tyr.* 13.1; 14.4; *Carus* 4.2); also about Carus and Carinus (*Carus* 7.3; 16.1; 7.6). Fictitious: therefore no point in discussing whether he can be identified with the obscure Onasimus of Cyprus or Sparta (*PLRE* 648, Onesimus 2.)⁸⁹

‘SUETONIUS OPTATIANUS’ 4 (649) : *Tac.* 11.7

‘PALFUEIUS’ (657) : *Prob.* 16.4

‘VIBIUS PASSIENUS’ (669) : *Tyr. Trig.* 29.1

*‘PINIANUS’

Friend of ‘Flavius Vopiscus’ (*Aur.* 1.9; cf. 43.1). The form of the name is not entirely certain; it might be ‘Pionius.’⁹⁰

PIPA (702) : *Gall.* 21.3 (Pipara)

⁸⁸See now F. Millar, *JRS* 61 (1971) 8 ff.

⁸⁹On whom, cf. T. Kotula, *Klio* 40 (1962) 175 ff.

⁹⁰E. Hohl, *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* 2² (Leipzig 1965) 150; R. Syme, *Amm. and HA* 193.

Piso 1 (703)

General under Gallienus, sent by Macrianus to Achaëa to suppress the proconsul Valens (*Gall.* 2.2). So much seems undoubtedly genuine.⁹¹ But the *HA* progresses from a real person to outright fiction: Piso was called Frugi, he traced his descent from the Republican Pisones, and after his death received a triumphal statue and chariot (*Tyr. Trig.* 21.1 ff.). Hence inadequate caution can lead to manifest absurdity: the person is stigmatized as *!Piso Frugi!*, but “if he was a real person he was descended from the Calpurnii Pisones.” Piso may have been noble (*Gall.* 2.2), or even of consular family (*Tyr. Trig.* 19.2: suspect), but a Republican pedigree is another matter. As for Piso’s activities ca. 261, he was a general for whom the *HA* has invented a usurpation. Piso marched against Valens, retreated into Thessaly and was killed by soldiers sent by Valens (*Gall.* 2.3 f.). It will not be believed that he proclaimed himself emperor with the title Thessalicus: the story is developed in the *Tyranni Triginta* (21.1 f.), but is a clumsy addition to the otherwise excellent narrative context in the *Gallieni duo* (2.4).

‘PISONIANUS’ 1 (703) : *Prob.* 22.3

‘FURIUS PLACIDUS’

Consulate recently witnessed by ‘Flavius Vopiscus’ (*Aur.* 15.4), who here purports to be writing between 1 May 305 and 25 July 306 (*Aur.* 44.5; cf. 42.3; 43.2). It is misleading to identify this invented consul with the Furius Placidus attested as consul in 343 (*PLRE* 705/6, Placidus 2).

*‘TREBELLIVS POLLIO’

One of the alleged authors of the *HA*, who wrote the lives of the emperors from Philip to Claudius (*Aur.* 2.1; *Quad. Tyr.* 1.3).

‘FABIUS POMPONIANUS’ 2 (715) : *Tyr. Trig.* 29.1

‘POSTUMUS’ 1 (720) : *Tyr. Trig.* 3.11; 4.1 f.

M. CASSIANIVS LATINIVS POSTVMVS 2 (720)

Clearly a governor or military commander in Gaul under Valerian (Victor, *Caes.* 33.8; Zosimus 1.38.2; Zonaras 12.24), but not necessarily ‘Transrenani limitis ducem et Galliae praesidem’ (*Tyr. Trig.* 3.8—in a bogus letter). Note that the *HA* usually gives the name as bare Postumus, but once has ‘Julius Postumus’ (*Tyr. Trig.* 6.6).

⁹¹R. Syme, *Emp. and Biog.* 270. Piso was dismissed by H. Peter, *Abhand. d. phil-hist. Kl. d. kön. sächs. Ges.d.Wiss.* 27 (Leipzig 1909) 215 f.

The chronology of Postumus' reign has been a much debated problem.⁹² It lasted ten years (Eutropius 9.1)—coins attest Postumus' tenth *tribunicia potestas* (G. Elmer, *BonnJbb* 146 [1941] 54, nos. 590, 594–596)—, not seven as alleged in the *HA* (*Gall.* 4.5; *Tyr. Trig.* 3.4; 5.4). Now Alexandria still minted coins in the Egyptian year 260/1 in honour of the son of Gallienus whom Postumus killed (*Tyr. Trig.* 3.3; *Epit. de Caes.* 32.3).⁹³ Consequently, Postumus' Gallic Empire should begin in 260 (not 259).⁹⁴ If so, a corollary follows for the Gallic consuls of the 260's:⁹⁵ Postumus' second and third consulates will belong to 261 and 262, while three pairs of consuls must be assigned to 263–267 rather than to 262–266 (as in *PLRE* 1041, etc.): viz. Censor and Lepidus both for the second time (*ILS* 2548 = *RIB* 605; *CIL* 13.6779; *AE* 1930.35), Dialis and Bassus (*CIL* 13.3163), and 'Apr. et Ruf.' (*ILS* 4722 = *RIB* 1956).

M. AURELIUS PROBUS 3 (736)

The *HA* has both Aurelius Probus (*Prob.* 6.2) and Aurelius Valerius Probus (11.5). The latter presumably originates in the author's desire to link Probus to Claudius and Constantius (cf. *Prob.* 3.3)—and he is also a relative of Gallienus (6.2). It is misleading to cite the *HA* for Dalmatius as Probus' father (3.1 f.), and unsafe to use it for his career, either under Valerian (3.5—which makes him 'prope imberbis' in the 250's;⁹⁶ 4.2—in an invented letter) or later (6.1 ff.). *PLRE* fails to point out the discordant accounts of Probus' death: the Latin epitomators have him killed in a simple mutiny at Sirmium (Victor, *Caes.* 37.2; Eutropius 9.17.3; Jerome, *Chronicle* a. 283; *Epit. de Caes.* 37.4), Greek writers make his death consequent on a revolt by Carus (Zosimus 1.71.5; Petrus Patricius, *Excerpta Vaticana* 179;⁹⁷ Zonaras 12.29), the *HA* rejects the latter (*Carus* 6.1) in favour of the former (*Prob.* 20.1 ff.).

'FALTONIUS PROBUS' 4 (736) : *Aur.* 40.4

⁹²See G. Lopuszanski, *La date de la capture de Valérien et la chronologie des empereurs gaulois*. Cahiers de l'Institut d'Etudes polonaises en Belgique 9 (1951); J. Lafaurie, *Rev. num.* 6 (1964) 91 ff.; P. Bastien, *Le Monnayage de Bronze de Postume*. Numismatique Romaine 3 (1967) 13 ff.

⁹³J. Vogt, *Die alexandrinischen Münzen* (Stuttgart 1924) 1. 202 f.; 2.154. The known papyri do not go beyond 259/60 (Bureth, *op. cit.* 118 f.).

⁹⁴*PIR*² L 183.

⁹⁵See the list in E. Birley, *Roman Britain and the Roman Army* (Kendal 1953) 61.

⁹⁶Probus was apparently born 19 August 232 (*PIR*² A 1583).

⁹⁷Boissevain, *op. cit.* 743 = Anon. post Dionem fr. 11 (*Frag. Hist. Graec.* 4.198). Julian appears to have believed that Carus was implicated in the death of Probus (*Caes.* 314 b; 315 a).

[TE]NAGINO PROBUS 8 (740/1)

Assuredly the 'dux Aegyptiorum Probatus' who was ambushed and killed by Timagenes (*Claud.* 11.1 f.; cf. Zosimus 1.44.2; Syncellus p. 721 Bonn; Zonaras 12.27). An inscription gives the *nomen* and attests Probus as prefect of Egypt and victor over the Libyan Marmaritae under Claudius (*AE* 1934.257 = *SEG* 9.9). Further, he was previously governor of Numidia in 268/9 (*AE* 1936.58; *AE* 1941.33 = *ILAlg.* 2.24).⁹⁸ The *HA* appears, therefore, to transfer some details of this man's career to that of the emperor Probus (*Prob.* 9.1: 'pugnauit et contra Marmaridas;' 9.5—defended Egypt against the Palmyrenes). But there is still room to doubt the rebellion of 'Aradio' in proconsular Africa (*Prob.* 9.2 ff.).

PROCLUS 1 (745)

Usurper suppressed by Probus at Agrippina (Eutropius 9.17.1; *Epit. de Caes.* 37.2). The *HA* knew this (*Prob.* 18.5), but everything else it relates about Proculus is sheer fiction (*Quad. Tyr.* 12.1 ff.). *PLRE* marks no distinction between the genuine and the bogus details.

T. FULVIUS JUNIUS QUIETUS 1 (757/8)

The statement that Quietus was made a tribune by Valerian occurs in a bogus letter and may therefore readily be disbelieved (*Tyr. Trig.* 12.10).

M. AURELIUS CLAUDIUS QUINTILLUS 1 (759)

Two items in the *HA* concerning Quintillus, the brother and successor of Claudius, possess some relevance to the sources of the *HA* and Zosimus. First, after stating that Quintillus ruled sixteen days and was then killed for the same reason and in the same way as Galba and Pertinax, the *Vita Claudii* continues as follows: 'et Dexippus quidem Claudium non dicit occisum, sed tantum mortuum, nec tamen addit morbo, ut dubium sentire videatur.' (12.6) Now this is the first appeal to Dexippus as a source in the *HA* as extant since it was describing the troubled events of 238 (he was last cited at *Max. et Balb.* 16.6). Hence one reason (others can be added) for regarding Dexippus as the *HA*'s main source for the intervening period.⁹⁹ By 'Claudium' (it is normally held) the *HA* means

⁹⁸*PLRE* also assigns to Tenagino Probus *CIL* 8.2571 + 18057, which might belong to another. On that problem, and on Probus' title and status in Numidia, cf. B. E. Thomasson, *Die Statthalter der römischen Provinzen Nordafrikas von Augustus bis Diocletianus* 2 (Lund 1960) 225 f.; *Opuscula Romana* 7 (1969) 189.

⁹⁹E. Schwartz, *PW* 5.293; cf. F. Altheim, *Literatur und Gesellschaft im ausgehenden Altertum* 1 (Halle/Saale 1948) 175 ff. Both Evagrius and Photius record that Dexippus ended with Claudius (*FGrH* 100 T 5; 6).

Quintillus.¹⁰⁰ But why in that case 'nec tamen addit morbo'? The only versions of Quintillus' death given in other sources are murder by his troops (Eutropius 9.12; Jerome, *Chronicle* a. 271; *Epit. de Caes.* 34.5) and suicide (Zosimus 1.47; Zonaras 12.26) — both known to the *HA* (*Claud.* 12.5; *Aur.* 16.1; 37.6). For Claudius the divergence is far sharper: death by disease (the Greek tradition) or a selfless *devotio* (the Latin).¹⁰¹ Perhaps the *HA*, later realising the conflict of evidence, has inserted the sentence in the wrong place.¹⁰² Dexippus might have written something close to what Zosimus offers: ἀψαμένον δὲ τοῦ λοιμοῦ καὶ Ῥωμαίων . . . τελευτᾷ δὲ καὶ Κλαύδιος (1.46.2). That Claudius died of the plague is clearly implied, but it is not stated. If the *HA* really is reporting Dexippus on the death of Claudius, it will become easier to propound or defend the hypothesis that for events preceding 270 Zosimus drew, directly or indirectly, on Dexippus.¹⁰³

The second item is the statement that (as 'multi ferunt') Quintillus was guarding Italy when his brother died (*Aur.* 37.5: 'in praesidio Italico'). The apparent delay in his proclamation as emperor confirms the statement.¹⁰⁴

Where did the *HA* find this information? Perhaps in a Greek source, for there closely follows the story that Quintillus killed himself by cutting his veins (37.6; cf. Zosimus 1.47). However, in this section of the *Vita Aureliani* (35–39), the *HA* shows numerous affinities with Aurelius Victor and Eutropius; so numerous and suggestive, indeed, that these two extant authors can be claimed as the actual sources here employed.¹⁰⁵ Now the lost common source of Victor and Eutropius situated the death of Quintillus at Aquileia (as is stated by Jerome, *Chronicle* a. 271).¹⁰⁶ The *HA* too, therefore, may here have consulted the source of Victor and Eutropius, i.e., Enmann's *Kaisergeschichte*.¹⁰⁷

The length of Quintillus' reign poses a problem.¹⁰⁸ Most writers give a few days, usually sixteen or seventeen (so *Claud.* 12.5; cf. *Aur.* 37.6).

¹⁰⁰E. Schwartz, *PW* 5.292 (cited with approval by Hohl *ad loc.*); A. Stein, *PIR*² A 1480. So also *PLRE*.

¹⁰¹R. Syme, *Emp. and Biog.* 203.

¹⁰²E. Hohl, *Klio* 11 (1911) 202; P. Damerau, *Klio* 33 (1934) 81.

¹⁰³For the problem of the sources of Zosimus 1.1–46, see recently F. Paschoud, *Zosime* 1 (Paris 1971) xxxvii ff.

¹⁰⁴p. 181; cf. Damerau, *op. cit.* 88. Claudius died at Sirmium (Jerome, *Chron.* a. 271; *Chron. Pasch.* p. 508 Bonn; Zonaras 12.26).

¹⁰⁵A. Chastagnol, *Rev. phil.*³ 41 (1967), 85 ff. Substantially the same article appears also in *BHAC* 1966/67 (1968) 53 ff.

¹⁰⁶Also in the Chronographer of the Year 354 (*Mon. Germ. Hist.*, Auct. Ant. 9.148).

¹⁰⁷For this lost source, cf. *BHAC* 1968/69 (1970) 13 ff.

¹⁰⁸*Albo* 1470.

But Zosimus has several months (1.47), and the Chronographer of the Year 354 seventy seven days (*Mon. Germ. Hist.*, Auct. Ant. 9.148). *PLRE* fails to report the latter opinion—or to refer the reader to a recent treatment of the gold coinage of Quintillus (J. Lafaurie, *Rev. num.*⁶ 1[1958] 84 ff.; 102 f.).

P. C. REGALIANUS (762)

Nomen not known. It began with 'C' (*RIC* 5.2.586 f.): perhaps therefore Claudius. The *cognomen* appears as 'Regilianus' in the *HA* (*Tyr. Trig.* 10.1 ff., esp. 10.5), and presumably did so originally in the *Epitome* (32.3; the MSS. have 'religilianus' or 'religianus'): either deliberate distortion by the *HA*¹⁰⁹ or the vulgar pronunciation.¹¹⁰

The *HA* cannot be believed on Regalianus' origin (a Dacian and distantly related to Decebalus) or on his career (*Tyr. Trig.* 10.8 ff.). Even its definition of his post before his rebellion as *dux Illyrici* is an anachronism (*Tyr. Trig.* 10.1; 10.9).¹¹¹ The *Epitome* (not cited by *PLRE*) situates his usurpation in Moesia (32.3).

TITUCIUS ROBURRUS (767)

Prefect of the City in 283 (*Mon. Germ. Hist.*, Auct. Ant. 9.66). No-where else attested, and his name might in fact have been 'Tuticius Reburus' (cf. Ammianus 28.4.7). *PLRE* suggests, with commendable caution, "possibly identical" with an anonymous appointee of Carinus according to the *HA*: 'praef. urbi unum ex cancellariis (i.e., a door-keeper) fecit, quo foedius nec cogitari potuit aliquando nec dici' (*Carus* 16.3). The latter Prefect surely deserved a separate listing as a dubious Anonymus, as likewise did the Pretorian Prefect whom Carinus murdered and replaced by 'Matronianus' (16.4 f.: not registered in the *Fasti*, 1047). The list of two hundred and thirty-two Anonymi (*PLRE* 1004–1037), be it noted in passing, includes an indubitably bogus Pretorian Prefect from a late and interpolated version of the *Acta Felicis* (1005), but not the genuine legate of the proconsul of Africa in 303, who occurs in the recension commonly accepted as authentic (*Acta Felicis* 23; 26, cf. *PLRE* 1074 f.).

'FULVIUS SABINUS' (793) : *Aur.* 19.1

CORNELIA SALONINA CHRYSOGONE (799) : *Gall.* 21.3

¹⁰⁹D. Magie, *The Scriptores Historiae Augustae* 3 (London 1932) 86.

¹¹⁰W. Schmid, *BHAC* 1963 (1964) 131 f.

¹¹¹For discussion of Regalianus' post, A. Stein, *Die Legaten von Moesien*. Diss. Pann. 1.11 (1940) 105 f.

*P. LICINIUS CORNELIUS SALONINUS VALERIANUS

Younger son of Gallienus, still alive after the capture of Valerian according to 'Velenus rex Cadusiorum' (*Val.* 2.2) and Aurelius Victor (*Caes.* 33.3). The fact is confirmed by numismatic and epigraphical evidence. Alexandrian coins were minted in his name after 29 August 260,¹¹² and Valerianus was dropped from his nomenclature (*ILS* 558; *CIL* 9.2952; 3151) and in its place Gallienus sometimes appears (e.g., *RIC* 5.1.vii; 128).¹¹³ Hence the *HA*'s uncertainty whether to call the youth Saloninus or Gallienus (*Val.* 8.5; *Gall.* 19.1 ff.). Killed in Gaul immediately before Postumus proclaimed himself Augustus (*Tyr. Trig.* 3.1 ff.; *Epit. de Caes.* 32.3 [apparently meaning the other son Valerianus]; Zosimus 1.38.2; Zonaras 12.24).¹¹⁴

'M. SALVIDIENUS' (799) : *Quad. Tyr.* 10.4

SANDARIO (802)

Left by Aurelian in charge of garrison of six hundred archers at Palmyra after his first capture of the city, killed by the Palmyrenes (*Aur.* 31.2).¹¹⁵ Aurelian presumably did leave a garrison in Palmyra, and the details in the *HA* might be correct.¹¹⁶

'CLAUDIUS SAPILIANUS' (802) : *Tac.* 19.3

SAPOR I (802) : *Val.* 1.1, etc.

'SATURNINUS' 1 (805)

Usurper under Gallienus (*Tyr. Trig.* 23, also mentioned at *Gall.* 9.1; *Quad. Tyr.* 11.1). Not stigmatized.¹¹⁷

SATURNINUS 2 (805)

Consul with Gallienus in 264 (*Gall.* 10.1). Not to be identified with the bogus 'Saturninus,' whose invention he helped to inspire.

C. JULIUS SATURNINUS 12 (808)

The exact extent of the *HA*'s knowledge of Saturninus can be defined

¹¹²J. Vogt, *Die alexandrinischen Münzen* (Stuttgart 1924) 1.204 f.; 2.154.

¹¹³A. Alföldi, *Num. Chr.* 9 (1929) 264 = *Studien* 107 f.

¹¹⁴For the full evidence on Saloninus, see now *PIR*² L 183. His brother, P. Licinius Cornelius Valerianus, died in 258 (*PIR*² L 184).

¹¹⁵Punctuate as follows: 'Sandarionem enim, quem in praesidio illic Aurelianus posuerat cum sescentis sagittariis, occiderunt etc.' (*Aur.* 31.2). E. Hohl puts a comma after 'posuerat' and not after 'sagittariis' (*Scriptores Historiae Augustae*² 2 [Leipzig 1965] 172).

¹¹⁶Accepted by E. Groag, *PW* 5.1389.

¹¹⁷Surely bogus; cf. R. Syme, *Amm. and HA* 56.

precisely: 'Saturninum qui orientis imperium arripuerat . . . (sc. Probus) superavit' (*Prob.* 18.4; cf. Victor, *Caes.* 37.2; Eutropius 9.17). Apart from Saturninus' name and the fact of his suppression by Probus the *HA's* account of his life is unadulterated fiction (*Quad. Tyr.* 6.5 ff.). He was clearly either governor of Syria (Zosimus 1.66.1) or an army commander operating in Syria (Jerome, *Chronicle* a. 281), but that affords no excuse for believing that Aurelian 'limitis orientalis ducatum dedit' (7.2) or that Saturninus may have been governor of Syria "275-81:" Tacitus appointed his relative Maximinus to that office (Zosimus 1.63.2; Zonaras 12.28).¹¹⁸

'AELIUS SCORPIANUS' (810) : *Prob.* 11.5

ULPIA SEVERINA 2 (830)

Wife of Aurelian. Name not known to *HA*: therefore, doubly implausible to suggest "possibly daughter" of 'Ulpian Crinitus.'

'ULPIUS SILANUS' 3 (840) : *Aur.* 19.3

*'FABIUS SOSSIANUS'

Friend of 'Flavius Vopiscus' (*Quad. Tyr.* 2.1).

*'AELIUS SPARTIANUS'

Alleged author of lives of Hadrian, Aelius Caesar, Didius Julianus, Septimius Severus, Pescennius Niger, Caracalla, and Geta.

'MANLIUS STATIANUS' (852) : *Prob.* 12.1 ff.

'PALFURIUS SURA' (861)

Wrote *ephemerides* of life of Gallienus (*Gall.* 18.6).

M. CLAUDIUS TACITUS 3 (873)

Aged seventy five at his accession, therefore born in 200 (Zonaras 12.28—not necessarily accurate). After the murder of Aurelian the troops proclaimed him emperor in absence: he happened to be in Campania, and went to Rome as a private citizen for his formal investiture

¹¹⁸ *PLRE* also has one 'Claudius Cleobulus' as governor of Syria in the reign of Probus (216, Cleobulus 2; 1105). It cites for evidence the 'Claudius et Cleobulus duo fratres egregii rhetores' present at a public dispute between Mani and Archelaus (*Acta Archelai* 12). On this document a patristic handbook delivers a forthright verdict: "with the single exception of Mani himself, there is no evidence for the historical reality of any of the participants in the debates" (J. Quasten, *Patrology* 3 [Utrecht/Antwerp 1960] 357). Pointless therefore to suggest that "possibly the original text referred to a Claudius Cleobulus *rector (Syriae)*."

(Zonaras 12.28).¹¹⁹ Soon Scythians invaded Asia Minor from the north and Tacitus marched against them. But his relative Maximinus, whom he had appointed governor of Syria, was killed by his soldiers, who, fearing vengeance, proceeded to kill Tacitus too, in the seventh month of his reign. Such is the version of Tacitus' reign in Zosimus (1.63) and Zonaras, who alone of the two gives its length (12.28). The interval between Aurelian's death near Perinthus and Tacitus' investiture at Rome can perhaps (it might seem) be computed from the Chronographer of the Year 354 (*Mon. Germ. Hist.*, Auct. Ant. 9.148): since he assigns Tacitus eight months and twelve days, subtraction would give approximately seven or eight weeks for the interval. But the numbers are not reliable.¹²⁰

All this evidence, with the sole exception of Zosimus on Tacitus' death, is ignored in *PLRE*.¹²¹ Instead it cites the meagre and confused Latin epitomators (Victor, *Caes.* 36; *Epitome* 36—omitting, however, Eutropius 9.16) and retails several patent inventions of the *HA*, whose *Vita Taciti* is almost total fiction.¹²² In fact, the Latin sources appear to add only one authentic fact to those outlined above: Tacitus was killed at Tyana (Victor, *Caes.* 36.2; *Consularia Constantinopolitana* a. 277 [*Mon. Germ. Hist.*, Auct. Ant. 9.229]; cf. a. 275: 'occisus est Aurelianus imperator Caenofrurio et levatus est post dies Tacitus Romae'). The *HA*'s ignorance is exemplified in its guess at the emperor's *nomen*: he was 'Aurelius Tacitus' (*Aur.* 41.4).

C. PIUS ESUVIUS TETRICUS 1 (885) : *Tyr. Trig.* 5.3; 24; *Aur.* 32.3; 39.1

C. PIUS ESUVIUS TETRICUS 2 (885)

The *HA* has some authentic information (*Tyr. Trig.* 5.3; 24.1; 25.1 f.; *Aur.* 39.1; cf. Victor, *Caes.* 33.14; 35.5), but it need not include the statements 'omnibus senatoriis honoribus functus est' (*Tyr. Trig.* 25.2) and 'Tetricorum domus hodieque extat in monte Caelio' (25.4).

'THEOCLIUS' (895) : *Aur.* 6.4 ff.

AURELIUS THEODOTUS 4 (906)

An Egyptian origin may not legitimately be deduced from Theodotus' fictitious brother 'Camsisoleus' (*Tyr. Trig.* 26.4). The *HA* knew that

¹¹⁹This version was known to the *HA* (*Tac.* 7.5 ff.). It also used a Greek source at 13.1 ff.; cf. R. Syme, *Emp. and Biog.* 242.

¹²⁰The Chronographer gives Gallienus fourteen years and almost five months, Claudius one year four and a half months, and Aurelian five years four months and twenty days. For better evidence, p. 181.

¹²¹For facts and inventions concerning Tacitus, see R. Syme, *Emp. and Biog.* 237 ff.

¹²²E. Hohl, *Klio* 11 (1911) 178 ff.; 284 ff.

Theodotus suppressed Aemilianus, the rebellious prefect of Egypt (*Gall.* 4.2; *Tyr. Trig.* 22.8) and succeeded him as prefect (that seems to lie behind *Tyr. Trig.* 22.10; cf. *BGU* 745; *POxy.* 2107; 1467; *PStrassb.* 5).

In *Gall.* 4.4 (cited by *PLRE* for a possible mission of Theodotus against Postumus) the original text clearly had Gallienus: some scribe supplied 'theodorus' as an erroneous supplement in the lacuna.¹²³

'AUTRONIUS TIBERIANUS' 6 (912)

Bogus senator, writes bogus letter (*Tac.* 19.1).

C. JUNIUS TIBERIANUS 7 (912)

Prefect of the city 12 September 303 – 4 January 304. Presumably therefore intended as the prefect of the city who conversed with 'Flavius Vopiscus'—at the feast of the Hilaria, on 25 March (*Aur.* 1.1).¹²⁴ *PLRE* refers the anecdote to C. Junius Tiberianus, Prefect of the City 28 February 291 – 3 August 292, because the later prefect was not in office on any 25 March. That is neither necessary nor advisable. The prefect and 'Vopiscus' talked about 'Trebellius Pollio,' 'qui a duobus Philippis usque ad divum Claudium et eius fratrem Quintillum . . . memoriae prodidit' (*Aur.* 2.1). But 'Pollio' states that he is writing when Constantius is Caesar, i.e., after 1 March 293 (*Gall.* 7.1; 14.3; *Claud.* 1.1; 3.1; 9.9; 10.7; 13.2). The opening of the *Vita Aureliani* happens to be one of the numerous passages where the author of the *HA* gives himself away.

C. JUNIUS TIBERIANUS 8 (912)

For *Aur.* 1.1 ff., see above. *PLRE* is excessively cautious: this anecdote is "very probably fictitious," his alleged relationship to Aurelian "suspect" (*Aur.* 1.3). The qualifications could have been omitted.

TIMAGENES (913)

Egyptian, helped Palmyrene forces to capture Egypt (Zosimus 1.44). The *HA* appears to imply, wrongly, that he was a *dux* of the Palmyrenes (*Claud.* 11.1 f.). Perhaps identical with an Aurelius Timagenes attested as an ἀρχιερεύς at Oxyrhynchus (*PSI* 1039).¹²⁵

¹²³See Hohl's apparatus (*Scriptores Historiae Augustae* 2 [Leipzig 1965] 83). Zonaras has a parallel narration (12.24); cf. A. Alföldi, *Studien* 70 ff.

¹²⁴On the Hilaria, note Herodian: "Free licence is given to all kinds of revels; anyone can disguise himself as any character he wants; there is no position so important or exclusive that someone cannot disguise himself in that dress and play the fool by concealing his true identity, making it difficult to tell the real person from the man in fancy dress" (1.10.5, trans. C. R. Whittaker). For the relevance of this to the *HA*, cf. R. Syme, *The Historia Augusta. A Call for Clarity* (Bonn 1971) 31.

¹²⁵J. Schwartz, *BHAC* 1964/65 (1966) 186. Timagenes may be *archiereus Alexandriae et Aegypti* (J. Schwartz, *Recherches de Papyrologie* 3 [1964] 96).

TIMOLAUS (915)

Son of Odaenathus and Zenobia, attested only in the *HA* (*Gall.* 13.2; *Tyr. Trig.* 15.2; 17.2; 24.4; 27.1; 28; 30.2; *Aur.* 38.1). Possibly to be identified as Vaballathus (i.e., *PLRE* 122, Athenodorus 2), even though the *HA* claims to distinguish the two (*Aur.* 39.1).¹²⁶

'TREBELLIANUS' (922)

Part of Eutropius' account of Gallienus reads as follows: 'nam iuuenis in Gallia et Illyrico multa strenue fecit occiso apud Mursam Ingenuo qui purpuram sumpserat et Trebelliano' (9.8.1).

The *HA* has a usurper 'Trebellianus' in Isauria, defeated by 'Camsisoleus' (*Tyr. Trig.* 26). 'Trebellianus' is nowhere else attested and should be pronounced fictitious.¹²⁷ But what of 'et Trebelliano' in Eutropius? Two explanations are propounded: either the *HA* has inspired a deliberate interpolation of the words in the MSS of Eutropius,¹²⁸ or his 'Trebelliano' is an ancient corruption of 'Regaliano' (cf. Victor, *Caes.* 33.2) which the *HA* transformed into yet another usurper.¹²⁹ The first explanation should be preferred, and the words 'et Trebelliano' deleted from the text of Eutropius: neither Paeanius who translated him within a generation nor Orosius who transcribed him within fifty years (*Hist. adv. pag.* 7.22.10) has anything to correspond.¹³⁰

VALENS 2 (929/30)

The Valens whom the *HA* mentions as a usurper under an earlier emperor is genuine (*Tyr. Trig.* 20; cf. Victor, *Caes.* 29.3; *Epit. de Caes.* 29.5).¹³¹ His reality does not, however, in any way indicate that he was uncle or great-uncle to this Valens.

Proconsul of Achaëa, rebelled when Macrianus 2 sent Piso 1 to suppress him (*Gall.* 2.2 f. [dated 261]; *Tyr. Trig.* 19.1 f.; 21.1). So much must be believed (cf. *Epit. de Caes.* 32.4), but when the *HA* states that 'brevi a militibus interemptus est' (*Tyr. Trig.* 19.3; cf. 21.3), it may be making an inference (plausible enough) rather than reproducing a source.

Ammianus Marcellinus reports that Valens bore the *cognomen* Thesalonicus (22.16.10). There is something analogous but different in the *HA*: Piso called himself Thessalicus (*Gall.* 2.4; *Tyr. Trig.* 21.1). It seems possible that the *HA* has the correct form but, through inadvertence or deliberately, has transferred the title from Valens to Piso.

¹²⁶A. Alföldi, *CAH* 12 (1939) 724; *Studien* 196 f.

¹²⁷G. Barbieri, *Albo* 410, no. 29.

¹²⁸E. Hohl, *Klio* 14 (1915) 380 ff.; A. Stein, *PW* 6A. 2262.

¹²⁹W. Schmid, *BHAC* 1963 (1964) 126 ff. The emendation 'et Regaliano' goes back to Salmasius.

¹³⁰For Paeanius, *Mon. Germ. Hist.*, Auct. Ant. 2.155.

¹³¹Viz. Julius Valens Licinianus (*PIR*² J 610).

*P. LICINIUS VALERIANUS

Augustus 253–260, stated to be still alive when Odaenathus attacked the Persians (*Val.* 4.2)—an attack which *PLRE* dates “c.a. 262” (638). If Valerian grew old in slavery (Lactantius, *De Mort. Pers.* 5.3 ff.; Eutopius, *Brev.* 9.7; Festus, *Brev.* 23; Jerome, *Chron.* a. 258; *Epit. de Caes.* 32.5), then he presumably lived on for several years after his capture.

(LICINIUS) VALERIANUS 14 (939)¹³²

Brother of Gallienus, but by a different mother (*Val.* 8.1). In discussing him the *HA* claims to have consulted consular *fasti* (*Gall.* 14.10).

VARARANES II (945)

King of Persia 276–293. The *HA* should not be cited without due warning for the proposition that he “made peace with Rome under Probus” (see the discussion of ‘Narseus’).

‘VELENUS’ (947) : *Val.* 2.1

*‘VELSOLUS’

King, writes to Sapor after the capture of Valerian (*Val.* 1.1).

VENERIANUS (948)

General of Gallienus, defeated Goths in sea battle (*Gall.* 13.7). Since Venerianus occurs in a good context, he may well be a historical character.¹³³

‘VENUSTUS’ 1 (948) : *Claud.* 17.3

*‘CELER VERIANUS’

Receives spurious letter from Gallienus (*Tyr. Trig.* 9.5 f.).

VICTORIA (961/2) : *Tyr. Trig.* 5.3; 6.3; 7.1; 24.1; 25.1; 31.1 f.; *Claud.* 4.4

‘VICTORINUS’ 1a (963)

Son of Victorinus 12, proclaimed Caesar and immediately killed by the soldiers (*Tyr. Trig.* 6.3; 7). Not stigmatized.

M. PIAVONIUS VICTORINUS 12 (965) : *Tyr. Trig.* 6.1 ff.

¹³² *PIR*² L 257.

¹³³ Cf. E. Manni, *L'impero di Gallieno* (Rome 1949) 35 f.

'VITURIGA' (972)

Wife of Proculus, changed her name to 'Samsō' (*Quad. Tyr.* 12.3). Not stigmatized.

L. PETRONIUS TAURUS VOLUSIANUS 6 (980/1) : *Gall.* 1.2 (consular date for 261)

'FLAVIUS VOPISCUS' (981)

Alleged author of lives of Aurelian, Tacitus and Florianus, Probus, the four usurpers Firmus, Saturninus, Proculus, and Bonosus, and Carus and his sons.

This entry improves on that for 'Aelius Lampridius,' but still errs on the side of caution: "his reality has been doubted and he may be an imaginary person." His conversation with Junius Tiberianus (*Aur.* 1.1 ff.) is here assigned to "303" (see above on Junius Tiberianus 7, 8). But the Constantius who was emperor when the *Vita Aureliani* was being written (44.5) is tentatively identified as Constantine's son (not father, as the context clearly requires)—on the strength of the recent consulate of 'Furius Placidus' (15.4). The author of the entry seems to forget that 'Vopiscus' also states that Diocletian had only recently sought in vain for a certain type of purple (*Aur.* 29.3).

'URSINIANUS' (987) : *Prob.* 22.3

SEPTIMIUS ZABDAS (990) : *Claud.* 11.1 (Saba); *Aur.* 25.2 f. (Zaba)

SEPTIMIA ZENOBIA (990/1)

Zenobia's estate at Tibur, not far from Hadrian's villa, is presumably fictitious (*Tyr. Trig.* 30.27). But the *HA* has a significant piece of information (not noted in *PLRE*), which is relevant to Zenobia's political ambitions and cultural pretensions: she styled herself Cleopatra (*Prob.* 9.5) and claimed descent from the Ptolemies (*Tyr. Trig.* 27.1; 30.2).¹³⁴ Apparent confirmation comes from a Byzantine lexicon: the sophist Callinicus of Petra composed 'πρὸς Κλεοπάτραν περὶ τῶν κατ' Ἀλεξάνδρειαν ἱστοριῶν βιβλία δέκα,' i.e., a history of Alexandria in ten books dedicated to Zenobia under the name or pseudonym of Cleopatra.¹³⁵ An inscription

¹³⁴Zenobia's descent from Cleopatra has recently been claimed as an invention by the *HA* itself, inspired by Ammianus Marcellinus 28.4.9 (G. W. Bowersock, *AJP* 90 [1969] 254).

¹³⁵*Souda* K 231 = *FGrH* 281 T 1a, as elucidated by A. Stein, *Hermes* 58 (1923) 448 ff.; A. Cameron, *CQ* 17 (1967) 382 f. *PLRE* fails to guide the casual enquirer to the most recent collection of evidence relating to this man, viz. that of F. Jacoby, *FGrH* 281 (173/4, Callinicus 2).

from Egypt whose date has long been disputed might also be adduced: it shows a queen and king (in that order) reaffirming the right of Jews to assemble for worship (*ILS* 574 = *OGIS* 129 = *CPJ* 1449).¹³⁶ As for Zenobia and the Greek world, the *HA* has Cassius Longinus as her minister (*Aur.* 30.3). It will not be forgotten that Longinus invited Porphyry to come to Phoenicia and bring with him the books of Plotinus (*Vita Plotini* 19).

So much for individuals. A list of the genuine persons other than emperors, usurpers and their immediate kin named by the *HA* in its account of events from 260 to 284 will not be long:¹³⁷

Gallieni duo: Athenaeus, Ballista, †Cecropius, Cleodamus, Dexippus, †Domitianus, Heraclianus, Marcianus, Pipa/Pipara, Piso, Theodotus, †Venerianus

Tyranni Triginta: Ballista, Domitianus, Piso, Sapor, Theodotus¹³⁸

Claudius: Marcianus, Tenagino Probus (as Probatus), Timagenes, Septimius Zabdas

Aurelianus: Antiochus (as Achilleus), †Cannabas, Felicissimus, Cassius Longinus, Mucapor, †Sandario, Septimius Zabdas

Tacitus: None

Probus: None

Quadrigae Tyrannorum: Claudius Firmus (not in the narrative)

Carus et Carinus et Numerianus: Aper, Nemesianus (in an entirely fictitious context).

The distribution reflects the *HA*'s use of its sources. After Herodian finished (in 238), the author could, and (it seems) did, employ Dexippus as his main source as far as Claudius (268–270).¹³⁹ For the subsequent emperors, Greek sources were available and used for substantial positions of the *Vita Aureliani*, but only occasionally in the lives of Tacitus, Probus, and Carus.¹⁴⁰ More was taken from the meagre Latin historical tradition and the author's own imagination.¹⁴¹

¹³⁶ Referred to Zenobia and her son by V. A. Tcherikover, *Corpus Pap. Jud.* 1 (1957) 94.

¹³⁷ Two categories of real persons are deliberately omitted: names in the consular dates in *Gall.*, *Tyr. Trig.*; and genuine characters of the Diocletianic period for whom the *HA* has invented something earlier, e.g., Asclepiodotus and Hannibalianus (*Prob.* 22.3). A dagger (†) denotes a person not named outside the *HA* whose reality has been defended above.

¹³⁸ Ballista and Piso are wrongly enrolled as usurpers (*Tyr. Trig.* 18; 21).

¹³⁹ See most recently R. Syme, *Emp. and Biog.* 184; 203; 210; 235 f.

¹⁴⁰ On these four *vitae*, see respectively W. H. Fisher, *JRS* 19 (1929) 125 ff.; E. Hohl, *Klio* 11 (1911) 178 ff.; 284 ff.; G. Vitucci, *L'Imperatore Probo* (Rome 1952) 139 ff.; P. Meloni, *Il regno di Caro Numeriano e Carino* (Cagliari 1948) 173 ff.

¹⁴¹ For the use of the lost *Kaisergeschichte*, *BHAC* 1968/69 (1970) 13 ff.

Besides providing many individuals for the *Prosopography*, the *HA* has unfortunately also provided some of its imperial chronology. The following dates are given by the entries for the separate emperors:

Gallienus:	killed 22 March 268 (384)
Claudius:	summer 268 to early 270, with the alternative 22 March 268 to 6 September 269 recorded (209)
Aurelian:	May 270 (or 3 November 269) to 275, with 23 March recorded as a possibility (130)
Tacitus:	25 September 275 to 7 June 276 (873)
Florianus:	7 June to 9 September 276 (367)
Probus:	June 276 to September 282 (736)
Carus:	September 282 to July 283 (183)
Carinus:	September 282 to July 285 (181)
Numerian:	May 283 to November 284 (634).

It will immediately be observed that the dates are not all consistent with one another. Further, uncertainties are admitted, and some of the above dates are not so much authoritatively stated as reported at second hand without explicit endorsement.¹⁴² Nonetheless, the *Prosopography* has at least countenanced acceptance of three clear fictions from the *HA*. First, the "alternative date" for the accession of Claudius (22 March) comes from the *HA*'s introduction to an invented debate in the senate: 'cum esset nuntiatum viiii Kal. Aprilis ipso in sacrario Matris sanguinis die Claudium imperatorem factum . . .' (*Claud.* 4.2). Second, Tacitus' reign computed from 25 September 275. That is the alleged day of a bogus debate in the Senate, with speeches by 'Velius Cornificius Gordianus' and 'Maecius Faltonius Nicomachus,' as a result of which 'Aelius Cesettianus' proclaimed Tacitus emperor in the Campus Martius (*Tac.* 3.2 ff.). Third, the six months' interregnum (23 March–25 September) between the death of Aurelian and the accession of Tacitus. Again fiction, but not this time due to the *HA* alone (*Aur.* 41.1 ff.; *Tac.* 1.1 ff.; cf. Victor, *Caes.* 35.12; 36.1; *Epit. de Caes.* 35.10).

The chronology of the period between the accessions of Decius and Diocletian (249–284) presents a notorious tangle of difficulties. To settle all the problems definitively or to date many major events precisely will probably always be impossible. But much progress can be made towards ascertaining the exact dates of imperial reigns, if the correct method is adopted. The *HA* must be set aside. Instead, heed should be paid to two invaluable indications of approximate chronology: imperial consulates and an emperor's regnal years in Egypt (which began on 29

¹⁴²Under the formula "For the dates . . . cf. *BSNAP* 1965, p. 153." The reference is to J. Lafaurie, "Chronologie impériale de 249 à 285," *Bull. Soc. Nat. des Ant. de France* (1965) 139–154.

August or, in the calendar year preceding a Julian leap year, on 30 August). Between 260 and 285, a ruling emperor held an ordinary consulate on the following occasions:¹⁴³

Gallienus: 261, 262, 264, 266
 Claudius: 269
 Aurelian: 271, 274, 275
 Tacitus: 276
 Probus: 277, 278, 279, 281, 282
 Carus: 283
 Carinus: 283, 284, 285
 Numerian: 284
 Diocletian: 285.

Once it is assumed that an emperor became consul on the first day of the year immediately following his accession (the invariable practice where verification is possible), then the Julian years of Claudius' reign are fixed: Gallienus died in 268 and Aurelian acceded during 270. The Egyptian evidence, both contemporary papyri and the coinage of Alexandria, then poses at least one conundrum: if Aurelian ruled from 270 to 275, and his seventh Egyptian year is 275/6, how can the evidence be explained which makes 270/1 his first year?¹⁴⁴ Care and alertness, however, can produce a solution which not only solves this problem, but also provides an almost exact chronology for the period between the death of Gallienus and the accession of Aurelian.¹⁴⁵ First, all documents which are not absolutely contemporary are disallowed.¹⁴⁶ Second, the attestation of Gallienus' sixteenth year (268/9) proves that he was recognized as emperor in Egypt after 28 August 268 and thus that he died long after 22 March 268.¹⁴⁷ Third, the attestation of Claudius'

¹⁴³A. Degraffi, *Fasti consolari* (1952) 71 ff.

¹⁴⁴Aurelian's seventh year is well attested: *POxy.* 1455; 2338. ii. 39; J. Vogt, *Die alexandrinischen Münzen* 2 (Stuttgart 1924) 163. For the equation of this Egyptian year (which is also 1 Tacitus, 1 Florianus, and 1 Probus) with 275/6, *POxy.* 2557; *PSI* 764 = O. Neugebauer—H. B. van Hoesen, *Greek Horoscopes* (Philadelphia 1959) no. 277. Hence 1 Aurelian has been equated with 269/70 (so P. Bureth, *Les titulatures impériales* [Brussels 1964] 122). But the accumulation of fresh evidence now makes that wholly impossible: see J. R. Rea, Introduction to *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 40 (forthcoming, 1972).

¹⁴⁵What follows is closely based on Dr Rea's as yet unpublished discussion, which he very kindly allowed me to read in typescript.

¹⁴⁶E.g., *POxy.* 1208 (of 291), which equates 2 Claudius and 1 Aurelian.

¹⁴⁷*PFlor.* 265; *PTebt.* 581. *PIR*² L 197 cites *AE* 1944.85 and *Claud.* 4.2 to prove that Gallienus was dead by 30 June 268, with appeal to J. Schwartz, *BHAC* 1964/65 (1966) 209. Schwartz argues from the absence of coins of 16 Gallienus that news of his death reached Alexandria by 28 August 268. Not a necessary deduction: the lack of coins need mean only that news arrived before minting began for that regnal year. Further, if

third year shows that he was still recognized as emperor after 28 August 270.¹⁴⁸ Fourth, let it be assumed that at some stage Aurelian antedated his *dies imperii* from the day on which he was acclaimed Augustus to the day on which Claudius died, thus changing the reckoning of his Egyptian regnal years. Hence the following chronology:

Gallienus: killed after 28 August 268

Claudius: acceded ?September 268, died shortly before 28 August 270 at Sirmium

Quintillus: guarding Aquileia when his brother died, so that he was saluted emperor after 28 August 270

Aurelian: regarded as emperor from autumn 270 only after Quintillus had been widely acknowledged, died no earlier than August 275

Tacitus: invested as emperor in September 275 or later.¹⁴⁹

The documentary evidence (be it clearly observed) contradicts and disproves the *HA*. The precise date which the *HA* offers in narrating the accession of Claudius is several months wide of the mark (March against September or possibly October), and no room can be found for an interregnum of six months between Aurelian and Tacitus. Moreover, even if Tacitus did become emperor at a date not far removed from 25 September 275, that will not rescue the credit of the *HA*'s story that the Senate spontaneously acclaimed him emperor during a debate on that day in the 'curia Pompiliana' (*Tac.* 3.2 ff.). The date deserves no more credence than its context: a fictitious debate in a fictitious building with fictitious participants, except for Tacitus himself—who was in fact absent from Rome at the time of his proclamation (Zonaras 12.28). If the date proffered by the *HA* chances to be close to the truth, that will be no more than a happy accident.

Gallienus died before the end of June 268, then 1 Claudius would be identical with 15 Gallienus—which it was not (*POxy.* 2338; *PStrassb.* 7; 11). As for the other two items, the *HA* has already been discounted, while the inscription will not bear the weight put upon it. A. Alföldi reread *CIL* 3.14092 so that it apparently shows the legion II Adiutrix with the surname Claudiana on 30 June 268 (*Budapest Régiségei* [1943] 35 ff.; 489 ff., whence *AE* 1944.85). Observe, however, the exact wording; 'thermas maiores leg. II Adi. Claudianae... [pri]us refecit exhiberi inde [inc]lepis militib(us) [iuss]it [pr]idie Kal. Juli. . . . Paterno II et Mariniano cos.' If the inscription was engraved as little as three months after the action recorded for 30 June, then time enough would have elapsed for the legion to acquire its surname from the new emperor Claudius.

¹⁴⁸*POxy.* 1646.33; *PStrassb.* 7.21; Vogt, *op. cit.* 159 f.

¹⁴⁹If the delay before Tacitus' investiture really was six or seven weeks (p. 173), then September may be too early. A. Stein put the death of Aurelian in October or November 275, the investiture of Tacitus in November or December (*Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 7 [1924] 46 ff.; *PIR*² C 1036, D 135).

Many other faults could be found in this "vast mine of information impeccably collated,"¹⁵⁰ this "achievement meriting *proskynesis*," this "triumph of dedicated learning and organization."¹⁵¹ The preceding pages have deliberately concentrated on one small but important category of person in the *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*. They do not pretend to be free of errors of fact or judgment. Such perfection is unattainable for a single scholar working alone. A danger exists, however, that the eminent authority of the contributors to the *Prosopography* will encourage the timid, the indifferent, and the unwary to continue to blur the very necessary distinction between truth and falsehood in an important historical source. Since the *HA* itself set out to blur this distinction, it becomes all the more needful that it be consistently reinstated and reaffirmed—*ut fidelitas historica servaretur, quam ego prae ceteris custodiendam putavi*.¹⁵²

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, TORONTO

¹⁵⁰W. H. C. Frend, *JEcclHist* 23 (1972) 172.

¹⁵¹H. Chadwick, *JTheolStud* N.S. 23 (1972) 258.

¹⁵²*Tyr.Trig.* 11.6.