

REVIEW ARTICLE/DISCUSSION

LATE ROMAN PROSOPOGRAPHY: BETWEEN THEODOSIUS AND JUSTINIAN

T. D. BARNES

THE PUBLICATION OF THE FIRST VOLUME of the *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, by A. H. M. Jones, J. R. Martindale, and J. Morris (Cambridge 1971), was greeted with an immediate fanfare of eulogy from panegyrical reviewers,¹ and some can still assert that it "has unquestionably established itself as a magisterial work of reference for late Roman studies."² Mature reflection, however, and the disillusionment of scholars who tried to use the volume, soon brought to light not only a vast number of minor errors, but also fundamental flaws of approach and organization, surprising omissions and inconsistencies, and a pervasive lack of care and accuracy.³

The second volume of the *Prosopography*, covering the years A.D. 395 to 527, is now to hand (Cambridge 1980). Typographically, it is less attractive, with an unpleasant Greek font and the unjustified right margins which have disfigured so many British academic books and journals in recent years.⁴ In almost every other respect, however, there has been a marked improvement in quality, and the *quadriga* of Alan Cameron, J. R. Martindale, J. M. Reynolds, and E. A. Thompson (who jointly sign their names to the preface) deserves congratulation for rescuing this volume from the flaws which render its predecessor so unreliable. Since the following pages will catalogue and document imperfections, the basic honesty and trustworthiness of the second volume of the *Prosopography of*

THE PROSOPOGRAPHY OF THE LATER ROMAN EMPIRE 2: A.D. 395–527. BY J. R. MARTINDALE. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press. 1980. Pp. xliv, 1342.

¹The dust jacket of the second volume quotes the following: W. H. C. Frend, *JEH* 23 (1972) 172; *Times Literary Supplement* 3607 (16 April 1971) 444; H. Chadwick, *JTS* n.s. 23 (1972) 258; J. F. Matthews, *CR* n.s. 24 (1974) 97; P. Salmon, *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 51 (1973) 179; A. Demandt, *BZ* 67 (1974) 173.

²E. D. Hunt, *JTS* n.s. 33 (1982) 302.

³See especially T. D. Barnes, *Phoenix* 26 (1972) 140 ff.; 27 (1973) 135 ff.; 28 (1974) 224 ff. (none of which is, strictly speaking, a review); W. Eck, *Zephyrus* 23/24 (1972/73) 325 ff.; G. Alföldy, *Byzantinoslavica* 34 (1973) 234 ff. For corrections in the period 284–337, see now *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine* (Cambridge, Mass. 1982) 91 ff. (consuls and their careers); 123 ff. (praetorian prefects); 140 ff. (*vicarii* and provincial governors); 175 ff. (names in *acta martyrum*).

⁴There are also some loose ends, such as "See below, p. 0000" (1145, Valerius 8), where the cross-reference should be to the Addenda (xxxvii–xli), cf. 605, Joannes 45; 884, Photius.

the Later Roman Empire must be acknowledged, commended, and emphasized at the outset: although fault can be found with the treatment of problematical sources, with some of the fasti, and with many individual entries, even the most avid and demanding researcher into Late Antiquity will be able to use this volume with confidence and profit. It is totally dissimilar from its predecessor in achievement and reliability, and no one should be misled into thinking otherwise by the pious professions of the editors' preface or by the publishers' attempt to assimilate a pair of volumes as different from each other as Jacob and Esau.

I

The fifth century bristles with historical problems, many of them complex and intractable. It is all the more necessary, therefore, for a work of reference always to be clear and consistent, both in distinguishing what is explicitly attested from modern surmise (however convincing) and in stating explicitly what modern hypotheses about a text or author are being assumed as a basis for its use as historical evidence. Regrettably, the *Prosopography* often fails to explain, both in cases where the principles employed are valid and where they seem questionable. Moreover, an undertaking such as the *Prosopography* presupposes a multitude of preliminary studies of sources which present particular problems. If such studies are lacking, or have not been done well enough, dozens or even hundreds of entries can be vitiated through the mistaken evaluation of a single source.

Four collections of letters will illustrate the need for both clear statement and antecedent investigation. A large number of entries in the *Prosopography* state dates for Roman senators and officials known only from the letters of Ennodius and of Augustine of Hippo. The chronology of Ennodius appears to be firmly established even in detail, on the assumption that the extant manuscripts of his works derive from some sort of sketch-book which contained letters, tracts, speeches, and poems in strictly chronological order: the reader who wishes to check a date from Ennodius needs to know where to find the manuscript order of his works and the tabulated chronology offered by J. Sundwall,⁵ which must be regarded as the standard treatment of the subject.⁶ In the case of Augustine, by contrast, the order

⁵J. Sundwall, *Abhandlungen zur Geschichte des ausgehenden Römertums. Öfversigt af Finska Vetenskaps-Societeten's Förhandlingar* 60 (1917–18), Afd. B, No. 2 (Helsingfors 1919) 72 ff. There are two modern editions of Ennodius: that of W. Hartel, *CSEL* 6 (1882), retains Sirmond's division of 1611 into the four categories of *epistulae* (divided by Sirmond into nine books), *opuscula*, *dictiones*, and *carmina*, while that of F. Vogel, *MGH, Auct. Ant.* 7 (1885), reinstates the manuscript order, which intersperses Ennodius' works in all genres.

⁶*PLRE* 2.393–394, Ennodius 3, refers only to A. Benjamin, *RE* 5 (1905) 2629 ff.; Schanz–Hosius, *Gesch. d. röm. Litt.* 4.2 (Munich 1920) 131 ff.; B. Altaner–A. Stuiber, *Patrologie*⁷ (Freiburg–Basle–Vienna 1967) 478 ff.

of modern editions permits no valid inferences, for it merely reflects the opinions of the Maurist editors in the late seventeenth century, who printed two hundred and thirty-one letters (including more than fifty written to Augustine) in what they considered to be the correct chronological order, followed by thirty-nine which they considered undatable.⁷ The *Prosopography* seems to adopt, without deviation and without explanation, the Maurist chronology as revised and refined by A. Goldbacher, even where the content of the letters contradicts.⁸

The *Prosopography* itself draws attention to a whole category of entries which require revision. The main list of names includes a large number of officials or notables known only from the letters of Nilus of Ancyra: although doubts are sometimes expressed, most entries for such persons carry no hint or warning that the evidence may be doubtful.⁹ The essential preliminary scrutiny of the letters of Nilus of Ancyra was published in 1976: it showed that, while the letters themselves are authentic, their headings and the titles of Nilus' addressees have been systematically interpolated.¹⁰ The preface duly notes that study, and warns readers that "virtually all the addressees are open to suspicion" (xxxvi).

The correspondence of Isidore of Pelusium also presents serious problems. Perhaps inevitably, the *Prosopography* uses Migne's reprint (PG 78.177–1646) of Morel's edition (Paris 1638). However, forty-nine letters from the Greek collection of some two thousand also survive in an early Latin translation by the deacon Rusticus, who translated them for inclusion in a collection of documents relating to the Council of Ephesus in 431 (*Collectio Casinensis* 80.1–49).¹¹ The *Prosopography* appears to overlook this Latin collection, which contains letters to the *corrector* Dionysius (12 = *Epp.* 3.315), to the *comes* Herminius (14, 37–39, 42 = *Epp.* 3.370; 5.276, 299, 300, 400), to the sophist Harpocras (28 = *Epp.* 5.223) and to the *scholastici* Petrus (29 = *Epp.* 5.239) and Nilus (30, 31 = *Epp.* 5.240, 4.108). More important, there is no systematic discussion

⁷Their arguments are most conveniently accessible in *PL* 33.13 ff. (For letters discovered subsequently, J. Divjak, *CSEL* 88 (1981) ix ff.) On the relevance of ancient collections of Augustine's letters and the possibility of establishing a more secure chronology, see D. de Bruyne, *Revue bénédictine* 43 (1931) 284 ff.

⁸E.g., 347, Darius 2; cf. A. Goldbacher, *CSEL* 58 (1923) 61 f.—whose dating of *Epp.* 229–231 to late 429 or early 430 was challenged by H. J. Diesner, *Kirche und Staat im spätromischen Reich*² (Berlin 1964) 91 ff. *Epp.* 229–231 are earlier than *Epp.* 228, written in summer 429 (Possidius, *Vita Augustini* 30.3 ff.), and the mission of Darius belongs in 428; cf. P. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo* (London 1967) 423 ff.

⁹Thus no doubts are expressed concerning the *patricius* Eurycles, "described as old, rich, treacherous and lecherous" (428). Contrast the strong reservations about the ex-consuls Aquila (124) and Nero (778–779).

¹⁰A. Cameron, *GRBS* 17 (1976) 181 ff.

¹¹Edited by E. Schwartz, *ACO* 1.4.9–25.

of the nature, arrangement, and chronology of the original Greek collection, whose order Rusticus scrupulously followed (*Collectio Casinensis* 80a). For persons known only from Isidore, the *Prosopography* usually contents itself with the imprecise notation "early or middle fifth century" (so 251, Callimachus 1 [from *Epp.* 1.316]; 365, Dionysius 12; 550, Herminus 2). Yet it offers an extended discussion of the date of the praetorian prefect Rufinus, to whom Isidore wrote and who is known also from Malalas (953, Rufinus 8, on *Epp.* 1.178, 489). Greater precision is attainable. The transmitted order of the letters, the latter half of which differs greatly from that of Morel's edition,¹² does not reflect arrangement by addressee or subject-matter: therefore, it is a legitimate initial hypothesis that the Sleepless Monks of Constantinople, who collected Isidore's letters (*Collectio Casinensis* 80a), adopted a roughly chronological order. Now two letters, to Cyril of Alexandria and to the emperor Theodosius, both about the Council of Ephesus, were clearly written in the summer of 431 (*Epp.* 1.310, 311 = *Collectio Casinensis* 80.3, 4), and the *Prosopography* notes the contemporaneity of two other letters which stand close to each other in the collection (953, on *Epp.* 1.483, 489). A thorough preliminary study was necessary. If the letters of Isidore are arranged chronologically, then the dates of more than a few men registered in the *Prosopography* can be defined quite precisely.

Ecclesiastical and hagiographical texts always require careful assessment, and the second volume of the *Prosopography* does not always display sufficient circumspection. Two examples will illustrate. The chronology of the *Vita Germani* written by Constantius of Lugdunum (*Clavis*² 2105), which describes how Germanus, the bishop of Auxerre, visited the imperial court at Ravenna, needed fuller discussion than it receives. The *Prosopography* justifies its acceptance of the traditional date of 448 for Germanus' journey to Italy with appeal to E. A. Thompson, *Britannia* 8 (1977), 311 n. 35 (1010, Sigisvultus; 1118–1119, Tibatto). That will not do. On this subject, the footnote cited says merely: "I am now sceptical of 445 as the date of Germanus's second visit to Britain, and would withdraw the suggestions advanced in *Analecta Bollandiana*, lxxv (1957), 135–138." To retract 445 is not the same as to establish 448, which date depends solely on the very late *Gesta episcoporum Autissiodorensium* (PL 138.224–228), whose dates for other early bishops of Auxerre are either mistaken or doubtful.¹³ A very powerful case has recently been stated for believing that Germanus, after mediating between the Armoricans and Goar, king of the Alans, travelled to Ravenna in 446, where he died on 31 July.¹⁴

¹²K. Lake, *JTS* 6 (1905) 274 ff.

¹³L. Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule*² 2 (Paris 1910) 439 ff.

¹⁴R. Mathisen, *Anal. Boll.* 99 (1981) 151 ff. The *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* states that Germanus died on 31 July and that his body reached Auxerre on 22 September (*Acta*

The *Gesta de Xysti purgatione* are a fabrication of the early sixth century and purport to describe the trial and acquittal of Xystus, bishop of Rome from 432 to 440, in which several prominent aristocrats and officials allegedly participated (*Clavis*² 1682).¹⁵ Sometimes the *Prosopography* adduces the *Gesta* without explicit identification and with no hint of caution (8–9, Adelfius 3; 53, Albinus 10), but sometimes strong doubts are expressed (723–724, Marinianus 4). Graduated variants of the same general justification are offered in different entries: “this document is a forgery from the time of Pope Symmachus but contains genuine historical material” (1010, Sigisvultus); it “names many persons who undoubtedly existed” (328, Crescentius); “some if not all of the names used are of real people” (56, Alexander 9; 530, Heliocarus; 933, Quintus); it “appears to have used the names of real people” (205–206, Auxentius 9).¹⁶ This seemingly innocuous assessment evades the real issue: are the names in the *Gesta* the names of men active in the middle of the fifth century (as argued in 567, Honoratus 1), or are the names, like the events described, for the most part retrojections? Some obvious anachronisms (e.g., Paterius, the consul of 443, as *ex consule*) and the large number of *patricii* (which reflects a cheapening of the honour in the later fifth century) surely counsel total distrust of the document as evidence for names and titles in the 430s and 440s.¹⁷

Horoscopes receive inadequate treatment, because the second volume of the *Prosopography*, like the first, fails to use the standard collection of Greek horoscopes.¹⁸ Fortunately, in this volume, no serious historical or prosopographical problem turns on technical, astronomical calculations,¹⁹ and the most important horoscopes and writers on astrology are duly adduced, listed and discussed (586–590, Illus 1; 818, ‘Palchus’; 825–828, Pamprepius; 915–919, Proclus 4; 941, Rhetorius). Yet there are some small slips. The date of the coronation of Illus is reported as 19 July 484 (589, 671), when the astrological details indicate rather 18 July (CCAG 1.107–108; 6.66.16–67.7),²⁰ and the horoscope of the emperor Valentinian III has

Sanctorum, Nov. 2.2 [Brussels 1931] 406, 521 f.). The year cannot be either later than 450, since Galla Placidia, who died on 27 November 450, was still alive (*Vita Germani* 35, 43), or earlier than 445, since Germanus participated in the deposition of Chelidonius (on which, see R. Mathisen, *Phoenix* 33 [1979] 160 ff.).

¹⁵P. Coustant, *Epistulae Pontificum Romanorum* 1 (Paris 1731) App. 117–124; J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio* 5 (Florence 1761) 1161–1168.

¹⁶The entries refer the reader to L. Duchesne, *Le Liber Pontificalis* 1 (Paris 1886) ccxvi f. See also W. Levison, *Aus rhenischer und fränkischer Frühzeit* (Düsseldorf 1948) 409.

¹⁷*Phoenix* 29 (1975) 163 ff.

¹⁸Viz. O. Neugebauer and H. B. van Hoesen, *Greek Horoscopes. Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society* 48 (Philadelphia 1959).

¹⁹Contrast *JRS* 65 (1975) 40 ff., on *PLRE* 1.1004, Anonymus 1; 1006–1008, Anonymus 12.

²⁰Neugebauer and van Hoesen (above, n. 18) 147 f. (No. L 484).

been missed (Vettius Valens, *Additamenta* 365.29–366.5 Kroll), as has the imperial infant who was born on 25 April 463 at Constantinople and died about 30 September of the same year (*CCAG* 8.4.224.21–225.5).²¹

Syriac sources are indispensable for the fifth and sixth centuries: not only texts composed in Syriac but also documents and literary works originally written in Greek which survive only in Syriac translations. In the former category, the most important is a chronicle written in the very early sixth century, traditionally ascribed to Joshua the Stylite,²² and in the latter the Syriac translation of the proceedings of the Council of Ephesus in August 449, prepared for the bishop of Alexandria and extant in a manuscript dated 535 (BL, Add. mss. 14530 = Syr. 905), which also contains a vivid account of events at Edessa in April 449.²³ The editors of the *Prosopography* have made admirable efforts to utilize the relevant Syriac material, and more than a few entries show that they have taken expert advice.²⁴ The preliminary work, however, was presumably performed by compilers who used the translations supplied by modern editors rather than the original texts, and too many relatively straightforward entries, especially from both the Acts of the Council of Ephesus and Joshua the Stylite, still bear traces, in the form of an English or Latin title immediately followed by its Greek original in brackets, where the Syriac has merely transliterated the Greek term and equipped it with a Syriac ending.²⁵ More serious, the use of G. Hoffmann's German translation of the Acts of the Council of Ephesus has caused the name of a prominent official to be misreported. The

²¹*Id.* 136 ff. (No. L 419); 141 f. (No. L 463). They identify the author of the horoscope in *CCAG* 1.171, 4.106–109 (152 ff., No. L 497) as the mathematician Eutocius (188 ff., cf. *PLRE* 2.439).

²²Edited by W. Wright, *The Chronicle of Joshua the Stylite* (Cambridge 1882): he dates the chronicle to 507 precisely (ix).

²³Edited and published, with the German translation and notes of G. Hoffmann, by J. Flemming, *Abhand. Göttingen*, Phil.-hist. Klasse, N.F. 15.1 (1917).

²⁴E.g., 1, Abgarus 1, on the form of the name; 313–314, Constantinus 14, on Wright's inconsistency in translating *mdbrn'*; 473, Flavianus 1, suggesting (in effect) that *plwynwus* may be a corruption of *pwlwynwus*, i.e., Paulinus 8 (846–847). Observe, however, that the Acts of the Council of Ephesus consistently spell the name of Chaereas (282) with two final alaphs (*k'r'*), and that one passage has the transliterated *τάγμα* instead of the Syriac *sdr'* in rendering his title of *comes ordinis primi* (Flemming [above, n.23] 16.25). The same document discloses that Irenaeus 2 (624) was accused of having two wives (*ibid.* 73–75) and is every bit as specific as the Greek evidence quoted by the *Prosopography* on the official status of Zenon 6 (1199–1200: see *ibid.* 22.11, 22.35, 34.31–32, 46.34–35).

²⁵E.g., 1, Abgarus 1: "He was a *scholasticus* (σχολαστικός)," where the Syriac has *'skwlstyq'* and G. Hoffmann ([above, n. 23] 38.14 Syriac = 39.19 Gorman]) "der Rechtsanwalt (σχολαστικός)," 80, Anastasius 5: "the governor (ἡγεμών)," where the Syriac has *hgmwn'* and W. Wright "the governor (ἡγεμών)" (*Chronicle* [above, n. 22] 23.19 Syriac = 19.28 English); 481, Florus 1; 804, Olympius 14; 1119–20, Timostratus, in all of which "*dux* (δούξ)" corresponds to the single word *dux*. The same treatment is accorded the *scholasticus* Dionysius 9 (365, from Zacharias, *Vita Isaiae*, translated by E. W. Brooks).

Prosopography names the praetorian prefect of Illyricum in 449 as Salomo (973). Unfortunately, Hoffmann's translation ("Salomon") is misleading. The Syriac has *šlymwn*, which represents, as Hoffmann correctly observed in a note, the Greek *Σολομών*:²⁶ exactly the same form of the name is used later in the same document for the Old Testament king (p. 146.31 Syriac). The prefect of 449, therefore, should be styled Solomon, not Salomo, and, on grounds of nomenclature at least, he could be identical with the Solomon who was at the court of Constantinople in 431 and whom Cyril of Alexandria considered worth bribing (1019, Solomon, from *ACO* 1.4.224).

Joshua the Stylite has also caused problems on another level. For he has, in equal measure with Damascius, lured the *Prosopography* into lavish retailing of trivial information. It may be justifiable to devote most of a page to details of Areobindus' campaigns on the Persian frontier in 503 and 504, but why add that "he is mentioned by Joshua in an anecdote about a miraculous egg laid near Zeugma in March 504, which was presented to him" (144)? Similarly, why record that the *dux* Nonius (or Nonnosus) "raided a camel train carrying sacks of bread and discovered quantities of arrows concealed in the middle of the sacks" (787, from Joshua the Stylite)? If there can be no harm in reporting that the grammarian Ammonianus was "large and handsome, strong and healthy," the further statement that "he once had a donkey as a regular member of his audience when he was lecturing on poetry" seems designed to amuse rather than to instruct (70, from Damascius frag. 111). The philosopher Asclepiodotus "had exceptionally good eyesight and claimed to be able to read in the dark" and "he once saw a dragon in the sky" (162, from Damascius *Epit. Phot.* 139, 140), while Heraiscus was able "to recognize evil women by their speech" (544, from Damascius frag. 174). Isidorus "had charm, and was totally free from ribaldry and buffoonery," yet "his practice of imitating bird-calls troubled Proclus" (628–631, from Damascius frags 311, 135). The individual entries may be entertaining, but the accumulation of small biographical details has the serious effect of wasting a vast amount of space: if the eight lines of a single entry selected at random can be abbreviated without serious loss to the bare statement "*scholasticus*: Joh. Ruf. *Pleroph.* 38" (90, Anianus 1), that implies that consistent brevity and economy of presentation might have shortened the volume by several hundred pages.

II

The sixty pages of *fasti* (1242–1307) contain very disparate lists. Some, like the lists of ordinary consuls and praetorian prefects of the East are complete, or almost complete, while others are extremely sparse, some

²⁶Flemming (above, n. 23) 168, on 21.13.

provinces failing to notch up even a solitary governor for the relevant period of one hundred and thirty-two years. The fasti of the ordinary consulate, which are complete, except for consulates claimed or bestowed by usurpers whom neither the western nor the eastern Emperor recognized, and the proconsular fasti of Africa, Asia, and Achaëa present special problems which the editors of the *Prosopography* appear not to have considered adequately.

The consular fasti in the *Prosopography* correctly mark eastern consuls as eastern and western consuls as western (1242–45). Yet they fail to make the crucial distinction, which often has historical significance, between consuls proclaimed by one emperor who were recognized as consuls in the other half of the empire and consuls proclaimed in East or West who were not recognized in the other half of the empire. For example, the consuls for 398, 399, and 400 are presented as follows (1242):

- 398 Honorius A(ugustus) IIII (West)::Fl. Eutychianus (East)
- 399 Eutropius (East)::Fl. Mallius Theodorus (West)
- 400 Fl. Stilicho I (West)::Aurelianus (East).

The entries for these three years thus have an identical form. However, the reality differs in each of the three years. In 398, both consuls were recognized throughout the Roman Empire (*ICUR* 1.460–467; *AE* 1945.24 (Rome); *BGU* 940; Socrates *HE* 6.2.11). In 399, by contrast, Eutropius' eastern consulate was never recognized in the western empire (Claudian *In Eutr.* 2.1.23 ff.; *Cons. Stil.* 2.279 ff., 295 ff.; *ICUR* 1.471–483), and even in the East it was annulled after his fall from power in July (*CTh* 9.40.17: *consulatu a taetra inlucie et a commemoratione nominis eius et caenosis sordibus vindicato*), so that all the documents in the *Codex Theodosianus* from the year 399 bear the consular date *Theodoro v.c. cons.* (e.g., *CTh* 11.24.4, issued by Arcadius at Constantinople on 10 March). In 400 too, the eastern consul was not recognized in the West (*ICUR* 1.484–493; *CTh* 2.14.1, issued by Honorius at Milan on 27 November, and left unemended by the compilers of the Theodosian Code; *CCL* 149.194 [Carthage: 17 June 401]). In the course of the year, moreover, Aurelianus experienced remarkable vicissitudes of fortune: he was surrendered to the Goth Gainas, condemned to death, reprieved and exiled (*Zosimus* 5.18.7 ff.), yet he returned in triumph to Constantinople before his consular year had expired (Synesius *Prov.* 123D–124A).²⁷ That could imply that Aurelianus lost and later regained his consulate. Modern consular fasti ought to reflect the complexities of historical reality, and the ordinary consuls of 398–400 can (and should) be presented in the following more complicated, but far clearer, format:

²⁷On the career of Aurelianus, see provisionally *PLRE* 1.128–129, Aurelianus 3.

- 398 Honorius IV (West), Eutychianus (East)
 399 West Theodorus
 East Eutropius, Theodorus (January–July)
 Theodorus (July–December)
 400 West Stilicho
 East Stilicho, Aurelianus (in disgrace during the spring and summer).

The proconsular fasti of Africa offer a unique challenge. The *Prosopography* lists no less than twenty-four proconsuls as holding office between 14 February 394 and 28 August 415 (1274). That number is close enough to one proconsul per year to excite suspicion—and encourage speculation. In the early empire, proconsulates were annual, and they continued to be annual (or approximately so) throughout the reigns of Diocletian and Constantine.²⁸ Had they ceased to be annual by the end of the fourth century? There are three strong reasons for believing that proconsuls of Africa at least continued to serve for a predetermined period of about twelve months. First, inscriptions from the reign of Theodosius and later use the abstract noun *proconsulatus* in the ablative with a proconsul's name in the genitive as a dating formula (e.g., *CIL* 8.24044: [*procons*]ulatu *Flavi Primi v.c. et inlustri*). Significantly, the word *praesidatu* never seems to be employed in this fashion. Second, Q. Sentius Fabricius Iulianus is attested as *iterum proconsul* (*ILS* 5731: Membressa): in earlier periods such an iteration reflected the prorogation of a proconsul's annual tenure for a second year. Third, and most important, it is possible to construct a list of proconsuls of Africa from 392 to 415 on the assumption that a proconsul normally served for approximately twelve months, with the proconsular year normally beginning about the middle of April until 407 and ca 1 October thereafter.²⁹ Very little of the available evidence runs counter to this hypothesis, provided that due account is taken of political events and their probable effects.³⁰

- 392–393 Aemilius Florus Paternus *CTh* 10.19.14 (16 March 393); *CIL* 8.1412 = 15204 (Thignica); Symmachus *Epp.* 5.59 (*iudex*, province not specified).

²⁸*New Empire* (above, n. 3) 157 f., 160, 168 ff.

²⁹For earlier fasti for this period, A. C. Pallu de Lessert, *Fastes des provinces africaines sous la domination romaine 2: Bas-Empire* (Paris 1901) 100 ff.; J. Sundwall, *Weströmische Studien* (Berlin 1915) 29 f.

³⁰The following list excludes three proconsuls listed in *PLRE* 2.1274: (1) Asconius, whose date and even attestation as proconsul are very doubtful (*CIL* 8.14780: Vallis); (2) Anonymus 41 = *PLRE* 1.1013, Anonymus 43 (*CIL* 6.32054a); (3) Marius Vindicius, apparently proconsul under two Augusti, but not necessarily between 395 and 402 (*CIL* 8.970 = 12449: Neapolis; cf. *PLRE* 2.1170, suggesting a date “later in the fifth century”).

- 393–394 Flaccianus *CTh* 1.12.4 (7 October 393); Augustine *CD* 18.23 (no date).

Both Paternus and Flaccianus were appointed, or at least recognized, by Theodosius.

- 394 Marcianus *Carmen contra paganos* 46; Symmachus *Epp.* 3.33.

Symmachus wrote to Ambrose to ask for his help in resisting demands that Marcianus repay the *annonarum pretia* which he had received from a usurper: it may be inferred that Eugenius appointed him proconsul of Africa for the proconsular year which began in spring 394.³¹

- 394–395 Fl. Herodes Augustine *Contra Cresconium* 3.56.62 (2 March 395).

Herodes presumably replaced Marcianus after the defeat of Eugenius in September 394. *CTh* 13.11.6 bears the date 14 February 396 and is addressed to Herodes, whose office is not stated: if the date is correct, then Herodes received the imperial constitution in another capacity (perhaps as *comes sacrarum largitionum*).³²

- 395–396 Ennodius³³ *CTh* 11.30.53; 12.1.141–145 (16 May 395); 11.1.24; 12.1.149; 13.5.25 (26 December 395).

- 396–397 Theodorus Augustine *Contra Cresconium* 3.56.62 (22 December 396)

- 397 Anicius Probinus *CTh* 12.5.3 (17 March 397); Symmachus *Epp.* 9.126 (undated).

CTh 12.5.3, issued at Milan, should come from instructions which Probinus received before he left Italy for Africa. His proconsulate was presumably cut short when Gildo seized Africa ca October 397.

- 397–398 Seranus Augustine *Contra Cresconium* 4.48.58 (under Gildo).

Seranus presumably replaced Probinus ca October 397 for the remainder of the proconsular year 397–398. He should be the proconsul whose name is erased on *IL Afr.* 296 (Thuburbo Maius, whence *PLRE* 2, Anonymus 40).

³¹J. F. Matthews, *Historia* 19 (1970) 470 f. The target and date of the *Carmen contra paganos* continue to be disputed: see recently L. Cracco Ruggini, *Memorie Lincee*⁸ 23 (1979) 3 ff.

³²*PLRE* 1.426–27, Herodes 4.

³³The name is usually transmitted as Ennoio in the Theodosian Code, but *CJ* 6.30.16 = *CTh* 12.1.149 has *Ennodio*—which is clearly preferable; cf. O. Seeck, *RE* 5 (1905) 2629; Sundwall (above, n. 29) 72.

- 398–399 Victorius *CTh* 9.39.3^s (13 May 398); 1.12.6 (21 May 398).

CTh 9.39.3 bears the diurnal date *III id. Mart.*, i.e., 13 March, which could be correct on the assumption that Victorius accompanied Mascezel to Carthage and received *CTh* 9.39.3 before he left Italy.³⁴

- 399–400 Apollodorus *CTh* 16.10.17, 18; 16.11.1 (20 August 399); 10.1.16 (20 November 399); 11.8.2 (14 March 400); *ILAlg.* 1.2107 (Madauros: between 395 and 402).

- 400–401 Gabinius Barbarus Pompeianus *CTh* 9.26.2 (31 May 400); 11.30.60 (1 June); 7.8.7 (8 June); 13.5.30 (15 June); 12.1.166 (30 June); 13.1.18; 16.2.36 (14 July: both dates emended); 1.12.8; 8.10.3; 11.1.28; 12.6.27 (31 December); 11.17.2 (13 February 401); 12.6.28 (26 February 401); 11.5.1 (28 March 401); *CIL* 8.969 (Neapolis: between 395 and 402).

CTh 13.1.18 and 16.2.36 present a problem, which led Otto Seeck into one of his rare lapses. Both fragments appear to be extracts from the same imperial enactment, but 13.1.18 bears the transmitted date 30 June 400, 16.2.36 the date 14 July 401. Seeck lists 13.1.18 twice, once under its transmitted date and once with the date emended to that of 16.2.36.³⁵ It may be better to emend the diurnal date in 13.1.18 from *prid. kal. Iul.* to *prid. id. Iul.*, and the year in 16.2.36, where the compilers may be supposed to have introduced an error in replacing an original *Stilicone v.c. cons.* (i.e. 400).

- 401–402 ? Helpidius Symmachus *Epp.* 5.94.

After returning to Rome from Milan in the late winter or spring of 402, Symmachus wrote to Helpidius acknowledging the receipt of *litteras tuas, quibus patriae communi largas rei annonariae copias polliceris*. It is a reasonable conjecture that Helpidius made such promises as proconsul of Africa.³⁶

- 402–404 Septiminus *CTh* 12.6.29 (20 February 403); 8.5.64; 13.1.19 (26 March); *Gesta Coll. Carth.* 3.174 (13 September).³⁷

³⁴On the date of the expedition, *Historia* 27 (1978) 498 f., arguing that it sailed from Italy ca February 398 rather than in October or November 397.

³⁵O. Seeck, *Regesten der Kaiser und Päpste für die Jahre 311 bis 476 n. Chr.* (Stuttgart 1919) 300, 304.

³⁶O. Seeck, *MGH, Auct. Ant.* 6.1 (Berlin 1883) clx.

³⁷Possibly also the fragmentary *CIL* 8.24595 (Carthage: a proconsul whose name ended in -inus, noted in *PLRE* 1.998).

- 404–405 ?Rufius Antonius Agrypnus Rutilius Namatianus *Red.* 1.173/4.
Volusianus

Volusianus was proconsul before 412: Rutilius Namatianus' emphasis on his youthfulness (*rexerat ante puer populos proconsule Poenos*) implies that he should be lodged in 404–405 rather than in 406–407—the only other year between 392 and 412 whose proconsul is not already known.

- 405–406 Fl. Pionius Diotimus *CTh* 16.11.2 (5 March 405); 11.30.62
(22 July); 16.5.39 (8 December); *CIL*
8.23878 (Bisica: between 401 and 408).

Honorius issued an edict against the Donatists on 12 February 405 (*CTh* 16.5.38; 16.6.3–5): *CTh* 16.11.2 directs Diotimus to publish it—and was presumably addressed to him before he set out for Africa.³⁸

406–407

- 407–408 C. Aelius Pompeius *CTh* 16.2.38; 16.5.41 (15 November
Porphyrius Proculus 407); *Const. Sirm.* 12 (5 June 408);
ILAlg. 1.263 = *ILS* 5907 (Calama:
between 402 and 423); *ILAlg.* 1.2108
(Madauros: between 402 and 408); *CIL*
8.25377 (Ain-Djal: between 408 and
423).

Porphyrius is epigraphically attested as proconsul both before and after news reached Africa of the death of Arcadius on 1 May 408: therefore, either his tenure was renewed for 408–409 (which is impossible) or Porphyrius stayed on in Africa beyond what had previously been the normal end of the proconsular year or else the beginning of the proconsular year had been changed from April to October before 407. The last hypothesis permits strictly annual proconsulates from 408 to 415 with the sole exception of 409–410.

- 408–409 Donatus *CTh* 9.40.19 (11 November 408);
16.5.44 (24 November); Augustine *Epp.*
100; 112.
409–410 Macrobius *CTh* 11.28.6 (25 June 410).
Palladius *CTh* 9.38.12 (16 August 410); 6.28.7
(25 September 410).

Even though *CTh* 9.38.12 has *Palladio p(raefecto) p(raetori)o*, Macrobius and Palladius seem equally well attested as proconsuls of Africa in

³⁸*PLRE* 2.244–246, Caecilianus 1, deduces from Augustine *Epp.* 86 that Caecilianus may have been proconsul in 405 (appealing to A. Goldbacher, *CSEL* 58 [1923] 26, for the date), after being *vicarius* of Africa (*CJ* 1.51.4: 8 April 404). The inference is insecure. Moreover, Pallu de Lessert (above, n. 29) 223 ff. argued that Augustine's letter should be redated to 413.

the summer of 410: therefore, since other proconsuls seem firmly lodged in the adjacent years, either Macrobius and Palladius are identical, or one of the pair is wrongly dated, or Palladius replaced Macrobius as proconsul between 25 June and 16 August 410. The disturbed political and military situation of 410 perhaps holds the secret to the apparent anomaly.

- 410–411 Apringius Augustine *Epp.* 133, 134 (late 411).
 411–412 Eucharius *CTh* 6.29.9; 8.4.23; 11.1.32; 11.7.19–21; 12.6.31 (29 February 412); 12.1.174 (10 March); 8.10.4 (8 August).
 412–414 Q. Sentius Fabricius Iulianus *CTh* 11.30.64 (15 October 412); 12.1.176 (27 January 413); 2.16.3; 4.22.6 (6 March 414); 16.5.54 (17 June); 16.5.55 (30 August); *ILS* 5731 (Membressa: between 408 and 423); *CIL* 8.25864 (Tichilla: undated).

Iulianus is styled *iterum procos.* in *ILS* 5731, and *II proc. Africae* in *CTh* 12.1.176, 2.16.3, and 4.22.6. Since the transmitted date of 12.1.176 falls in Iulianus' first year as proconsul, either the year should be emended to 414 or the iteration is erroneous.³⁹

- 414–415 Aurelius Anicius Symmachus *CTh* 11.30.65 (28 August 415); *CIL* 6.1193 (Rome: no date stated).

If the preceding reconstruction is valid, its underlying principle that attestation on a specific day entails a year-long tenure can be applied to the proconsular fasti of Africa both before 392 and after 415 no less than to the fasti of Asia and Achaea. Unfortunately, not much benefit accrues for the period covered by the second volume of the *Prosopography*, which lists but nineteen proconsuls of Asia and eight proconsuls of Achaea, even including those of extremely uncertain date (1280). Paradoxically, however, it offers no fewer than five proconsuls of Asia for the brief period of sixteen months between September 395 and January 397. That is not plausible. Aeternalis is attested by two fragments of a law dated 21 March 396 (*CTh* 4.4.3; 11.39.12), a mere four days before Simplicius (*CTh* 1.12.5): for one of the two men the consular year should be emended to 402.⁴⁰ Iulianus, presented as proconsul of Asia on 9 January 397, probably

³⁹Pallu de Lessert (above, n.29) 128 f. explained the iteration by supposing that Iulianus' proconsulate was interrupted during the rebellion of Heraclianus in 413—but he also postulated error in *CTh* 12.1.176.

⁴⁰Reading *Arcadio V et Honorio V AA. cons.* (402) for *Arcadio IIII et Honorio III AA. cons.* (395). O. Seeck, *Philologus* 52 (1894) 448 f.; *Regesten* (above, n. 35) 27, 305,

belongs elsewhere. Both his office and the place of issue of the constitution addressed to him seem dubious (*CJ* 7.45.12).⁴¹ Nevertheless, the fact that the constitution prescribed that *iudices tam Latina quam Graeca lingua sententias proferre possunt* shows that Iulianus governed a province whose inhabitants spoke Greek rather than Latin. Now the constitution, according to Godefroy's report of the reading of lost manuscripts, was issued at Milan: if that is correct, then Iulianus is surely the man whom Stilicho intended to install as proconsul of Achaea in 397 when he took a military expedition to the Peloponnese (hence proconsul designate for Achaea in 397–398). Uncertainty also attaches to the proconsul Aurelianus, normally registered as holding the post on 3 September 395 (*CTh* 16.5.28): the date of 3 February also has manuscript authority⁴²—and should be preferred.

The following sequence of proconsuls of Asia can thus be established:

394–395	Aurelianus	<i>CTh</i> 16.5.28 (3 February 395).
395–396	either Aeternalis	<i>CTh</i> 4.4.3; 11.39.12 (21 March 396).
	or Simplicius	<i>CTh</i> 1.12.5 (25 March 396).
396–397	Nebridius	<i>CTh</i> 11.30.56 (22 July 396); <i>CJ</i> 11.50.2 (no precise date, and with erroneous title).

III

The following list offers corrections and supplements to twenty entries in the second volume of the *Prosopography* not so far discussed. They are predominantly entries for western senators and holders of official posts in the fifth century.

Aetius 7 (21–29)

Despite the very varied evidence which bears on Fl. Aetius, much remains obscure in his long career. The present discussion will restrict itself to two topics: Aetius' years as a hostage with the Visigoths, and the two panegyrics of Flavius Merobaudes.⁴³

Gregory of Tours reports that Aetius was *tribus annis Alarici obses* (*HE* 2.8): the *Prosopography* argues that the three years run "from 405 to 408." It is preferable to suppose that Aetius need not have completed his three years

transferred Aeternalis to 402; against that view, and in favour of transferring Simplicius instead, see A. Cameron, *Claudian: Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius* (Oxford 1970) 393 n. 1 (deducing from Claudian *Carm. min.* 3 that Aeternalis was a westerner).

⁴¹*PLRE* 2.637, Iulianus 3.

⁴²See Mommsen's apparatus to *CTh* 16.5.28, line 5.

⁴³On which the *Prosopography* makes frequent (and critical) use of F. M. Clover, *Flavius Merobaudes: A Translation and Historical Commentary*. *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, N.S. 61.1 (Philadelphia 1971) 32 ff.

with the Visigoths before Alaric died, and hence that he was handed over to Alaric in 409 or 410. In 408, Alaric requested Aetius and Iason, the sons of Gaudentius and Iovius, as hostages (Zosimus 5.36.1), not because "he had a prior acquaintance with these two boys,"⁴⁴ but because their fathers had been Stilicho's trusted lieutenants. Since Merobaudes dates Aetius' surrender to a time when Alaric was directly menacing the city of Rome (*Pan.* 2.127 ff.), his three years as hostage among the Visigoths presumably began in 409 and ended in 411 or 412. Moreover, since Aetius became a hostage *vix puberibus . . . sub annis* (Merobaudes *Carm.* 4.42 ff.), he may have been born as late as ca 395, rather than ca 390.

The so-called first panegyric of Merobaudes is a puzzling and fragmentary text, various features of which, including the fact that Merobaudes wrote it in prose, resemble a *gratiarum actio* rather than a formal panegyric.⁴⁵ But for what is Merobaudes thanking Aetius? Two of the four fragments comprise mere generalities on Aetius' excellence as a military commander (frags 1A, 1B). The other two, however, permit some precise inferences. Merobaudes speaks of an honour conferred on him by the eastern emperor in the absence of the now present Aetius: *intellexit enim, qua fide eius praesentis gesta memorarem, qui de absentis meritis non tacerem* (frag. 2A.5–7).⁴⁶ It follows that Merobaudes (but not Aetius) accompanied Valentinian in 437 when he went to Constantinople to marry Eudoxia. Merobaudes describes this journey and relates to it victories won by Aetius: *euntes in Thraciam triumphum, qui consiliis tuis intra Hispanias . . .* (frag. 2A.22–23). In other words, shortly after leaving Constantinople in the late autumn of 437, Merobaudes learned of a victory over the Suevi won by a subordinate of Aetius (Jordanes *Get.* 176). Valentinian and Eudoxia spent the winter of 437/8 at Thessalonica (*Chr. min.* 2.79). The spring or early summer of 438, therefore, should be the date at which Merobaudes, still in their entourage, came to Salonae and heard of Aetius' great victory over the Goths at the Mons Colubrarius (frag. 2B.7 ff.). That victory, consequently, may be identified as the occasion when *Gothorum caesa VIII milia sub Aetio duce* (Hydatius 112, under 438). The speech perhaps celebrated Aetius' triumphant return from Gaul to Italy in 438 (cf. *AE* 1950.30).

Merobaudes' second panegyric is a consular panegyric delivered on 1

⁴⁴*Id.* 57.

⁴⁵F. M. Clover, *Historia* 20 (1971) 354 ff. = *Flavius Merobaudes* (above, n. 43) 32 ff.

⁴⁶I.e., "for he realised with what accuracy I should recount his deeds when he was present (sc. now in Rome or Ravenna), because I was not silent about his merits when he was absent" (sc. then in Constantinople). The suggestion made in *Phoenix* 29 (1975) 166 ff. that Aetius actually went to Constantinople in 437 is accorded undue respect at *PLRE* 2.25. *CJ* 12.3.1 may, nevertheless, indicate that Aetius' presence at the wedding of Valentinian and Eudoxia was considered possible by the eastern court.

January 446 to celebrate Aetius' third consulate. The *Prosopography* identifies some allusions in the poem in a way which runs counter to its apparent structure,⁴⁷ which may be analysed roughly as follows:

Exordium: Aetius' consulate brings peace throughout the world. (Vollmer supplied the missing first line as *Pacis adest regnum: pandit qui parvulus olim*,⁴⁸ and the exordium filled part of the 60 or so lines lost after line 49.)

Concilium deorum: A *diva nocens*, presumably Tisiphone, urges her sister Bellona to spread disorder in the world (50–95). A lacuna of about 115 lines intervenes, after which there survive the last seven lines of a speech of Orbis asking for a saviour (98–104)—who is immediately revealed as Aetius (104 ff.).

Aetius' origin, career and achievements: The poem now launches into the standard schema of a formal panegyric (112 ff.).⁴⁹

There is a lacuna of about 56 lines between lines 143 and 144, and an unknown number of lines are lost at the end of the poem. It is not certain, therefore, on literary grounds, whether lines 144–197 are part of the retrospective description of Aetius or part of the rescue for which Orbis appealed. The latter is the more probable view.⁵⁰ If it is correct, however, then the siege described (153 ff.) ought to be close in time to 1 January 446—and perhaps belongs to the campaign in which the future emperor Majorian fought with Aetius against the Franks at Vicus Helena (Sid. Apoll. *Carm.* 5.207 ff.).

Agapitus 3 (30–32)

Agapitus' urban prefecture and patriciate are also attested in G. Marini, *I papiri diplomatici* (Rome 1805) no. cxxxix.

Aggerius (33–34)

The *Prosopography* assumes that the senators whose names are engraved on the seats of the Colosseum belong almost exclusively to the reign of Odovacer and preponderantly to the years 476–483, and it consistently refers readers to the entry for Aggerius for the date of senators named therein.⁵¹ This assumption is vulnerable, for some pairs of names ought to belong to father and son rather than to approximate coevals (e.g., the two Fausti of *CIL* 6.32212, whence 456–457, Faustus 10, 11, both dated “? before 483”). Moreover, there has been some reengraving of names (which

⁴⁷*PLRE* 2.25 refers lines 19–22 and 153–195 to events of 439, following Clover (above, n. 43) 50, 58 f.

⁴⁸F. Vollmer, *MGH, Auct. Ant.* 14 (1905) 10.

⁴⁹Known to Merobaudes from Claudian; cf. L. B. Struthers, *HSCP* 30 (1919) 49 ff.; A. Cameron (above, n. 40) 253 ff.

⁵⁰So Clover (above, n. 43) 58.

⁵¹This view was propounded by A. Chastagnol, *Le Sénat romain sous le règne d'Odacre. Antiquitas* 3.3 (Bonn 1966) 24 ff.—who conveniently tabulates the previously attested names (*CIL* 6.32152–250) and publishes some new ones (67–73, nos. 1–38).

implies reallocation of seats), and at least one senator whose career is attested elsewhere was probably a mere boy in the reign of Odovacer (247–248, Marcus Caelianus). The frequent entry “senator (at Rome) ?476/483” (e.g., 246–247, Caecina 1–3) ought to be revised to read “late fifth or early sixth century.”⁵²

Albinus 7 (50–51)

Servius dedicated a treatise on Latin metre, to which he gave the title *Centimetrum*, to a Roman aristocrat called Albinus. The dedicatee has traditionally been identified as Caecina Decius Albinus Iunior, *praefectus urbi* in 402, and the composition of the work has traditionally been assigned to the years immediately after 400 (*PLRE* 1.36, Albinus 10).⁵³ That combination is impossible. If the traditional identification of Albinus is correct, then the date must be ca 380: if the traditional date, then the dedicatee must be Decius Albinus’ son, Caecina Decius Aginatus Albinus, who was *praefectus urbi* in 414.

Servius’ preface needs to be quoted in full, for it is both brief and revealing:

Tibi hunc libellum, praetextatorum decus Albine, devovi. nam licet patris avique, quibus maximam reverentiam litterae debent, cottidie urgearis exemplo ibique pubescas, quo velut ad Musarum sacraria venitur, non tamen caelo suo tantum numina perfruuntur, saepe humiles lucos ac vilia pauperum tecta subierunt. quare laboris mei velim faveas voto, indulgeas audaciae. quod si secus cesserit, in cupiditatem devotionis interpretabor eventum placendi. vale. (H. Keil, *Grammatici Latini* 4 [Leipzig 1864] 456)

Albinus is an adolescent who has not yet assumed the *toga virilis*, whose father and grandfather both merit respect for their literary achievements. Three considerations tell heavily in favour of identifying him as the *praefectus urbi* of 414 rather than his father. First, the father was normally styled Decius rather than Albinus (Symmachus *Epp.* 7.35–41; *CTh* 7.13.15). Second, Macrobius depicts both Decius and his father, the grandfather of Aginatus Albinus, as cultivated men, and he avers that the latter rivalled Symmachus himself in character and literary attainments (*Sat.* 1.2.2). Third, Macrobius depicts Servius in 383 or 384 as a learned young man, *inter grammaticos doctorem recens professus* (*Sat.* 1.2.15, cf. 7.11.2). If the dedicatee of the *Centimetrum* were Decius Albinus, then Servius would already have dedicated a work to an aristocrat who was almost exactly his own age several years before the dramatic date of *Saturnalia*—which is not an attractive hypothesis.

⁵²For a full statement of the case, see A. Cameron, *JRS* 72 (1982) 144 f.

⁵³E. Graf, *RE* 1 (1894) 1315; Teuffel–Kroll–Skutsch, *Gesch.d.röm.Litt.* 3⁶ (Berlin–Leipzig 1913) 304, 308; Schanz–Hosius, *Gesch.d.röm.Litt.* 4.1² (Munich 1914) 176; P. Wessner, *RE* 2A (1923) 1835.

Since Servius addresses Albinus in the tones of one whose reputation is not yet secure, the *Centimetrum* should be his earliest work, and it may be that Servius was not only too young to play the role of established Virgilian scholar which Macrobius allots him in his *Saturnalia*, but also too young to have taken part at all. If the Albinus of Servius is an adolescent born between ca 390 and ca 395, then Servius will have composed the *Centimetrum* between ca 400 and ca 410—a fact which adds welcome precision to the uncertain chronology of his life (contrast *PLRE* 1.827, 2.997).⁵⁴

Apollinaris 6 (115–118)

The *Prosopography* fails to make enough allowance for the deliberate omission of the emperor Avitus from Sidonius Apollinaris' letters.⁵⁵ Sidonius writes to another Avitus that *isdem . . . principibus evecti stipendiis perfuncti sumus* (*Epp.* 3.1.1), whence the *Prosopography* infers that both held the post of *tribunus et notarius* under Majorian (117; 194–195, Avitus 1). If the plural can be taken seriously, then Sidonius and his friend will have held office under Avitus as well as under Majorian, and an appointment as *tribunus et notarius* in 455/6 would be entirely suitable for a young man of twenty-five who happened to be the emperor's son-in-law. (Another letter records the fact that Sidonius was a *comes* under Majorian [*Epp.* 1.11.13].)

Avitus 5 (196–198)

Sidonius' panegyric states that Avitus held three military posts before he became praetorian prefect, which office he apparently held in 439 (*Carm.* 7.462 f., 295 ff., cf. Hydatius 117). The *Prosopography* is commendably precise about the dates of Avitus' first two military posts, but agnostic about their titles and about the dates at which Avitus encountered Constantius and visited the Visigothic court at Toulouse (Sid. Apoll. *Carm.* 7.207 ff.).⁵⁶ The third military post may well have been *magister utriusque militiae per Gallias*, but that hypothesis is not an adequate basis for arguing that, when Avitus was appointed *peditumque equitumque magister* in 455 (377 f., 432 ff., 464 ff.), "in view of his rank and reputation he was presumably one of the two senior *magistri militum*" and hence *magister utriusque militiae praesentalis*. Avitus was in Gaul, and Petronius Maximus surely gave him a command in Gaul, whether or not the formal title included the words *per Gallias*. (It is hard to believe that the word *praesentalis* had completely lost its original meaning.)

⁵⁴Servius' birth is dated ca 370 by H. Georgii, *Philologus* 71 (1912) 518 ff., ca 372 by J. Flamant, *Macrobe et le Néoplatonisme latin, à la fin du IV^e siècle* (Leiden 1977) 79 ff. A. Cameron, *JRS* 56 (1966) 25 ff., proved that Macrobius wrote the *Saturnalia* ca 430.

⁵⁵Demonstrated by R. Mathisen, *TAPA* 109 (1979) 165 ff.

⁵⁶Contrast A. Loyer, *Recherches historiques sur les panégyriques de Sidoine Apollinaire* (Paris 1942) 207 ff.

Boethius 4 (232–233)

Nar. on the diptych commemorating Boethius' consulate in 487 (*ILS* 1301) is far less likely to be an abbreviation of *N(onius) Ar(rius)* than an engraver's error for *Mar(rius)*. His full name, therefore, was probably Marius Manlius Boethius.⁵⁷

Faustus 8 (452–454)

Also named in the heading of Merobaudes *Carm.* 3, as read by B. G. Niebuhr, *Fl. Merobaudis carminum panegyricique reliquiae*² (Bonn 1824) 3: [*vi*]ridiaris viri inl. *Fausti*.

Goar (514–515)

Goar is entered as "king of the Alans 410–442." But it seems hard to refer both *Chr. min.* 1.660 and Constantius *Vita Germani* 28 to the same episode in 442. Not only is the reported outcome totally different in the two cases, but Constantius presents Germanus' encounter with Goar as the immediate cause of his journey to Italy. A variety of considerations commend 445 as the most probable date for Germanus' mediation between Goar and the Armoricans.⁵⁸

Gratianus 1 (518)

The *Prosopography* omits the important fact that Gratianus is named by Ambrose *De obitu Theodosii* 40 (*CSEL* 73.392) as a son of Theodosius who died before him. He belonged, therefore, in the first volume.⁵⁹

(H)osius 2 (572)

He cannot be the dedicatee of Chalcidius' translation of and commentary on Plato's *Timaeus*, whose philosophical content and similarity to Constantine's *Speech to the Assembly of the Saints* indicate that it was written in the early fourth century.⁶⁰

Hunericus (572–573)

The *Prosopography* accepts the view, propounded most fully by F. M. Clover, that Hunericus was betrothed to Eudocia in 442/443.⁶¹ (Qualified with "possibly" here, with "probably" in 407–408, Eudocia 1.) Three passages of Merobaudes have been adduced. Two come from *Carmen* 1 (7–8, 17–18) and are only evidence if the *novus exul* of that poem is Huner-

⁵⁷A. Cameron, *ZPE* 44 (1981) 131 ff.

⁵⁸R. Mathisen, *Anal. Boll.* 99 (1981) 154 ff.

⁵⁹*Phoenix* 28 (1974) 226; cf. 227 f., arguing from Zosimus 4.57.3; John of Antioch frag. 187 that *PLRE* 2.594, Ioannes 3, died in infancy in 394.

⁶⁰J. Dillon, *The Middle Platonists* (London 1977) 401 ff.; J. M. Rist, *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic* (Toronto 1981) 153 ff.; T. D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, Mass. 1981) 74.

⁶¹Clover (above n. 43) 23 f., 28, 43.

icus,⁶² which is extremely unlikely.⁶³ The third passage indeed refers to Geiseric, the father of Huneric, but it too falls short of proof:

*nunc hostem exutus (sc. Geiseric) pactis propioribus arsit
Romanam vincire fidem Latiosque parentes
adnumerare sibi sociamque intexere prolem.* Pan. 2.27–29

Since hyperbole is so prevalent in the panegyric literature of late antiquity, it must be suspected that, if Merobaudes speaks only of Geiseric's aspirations to ally himself in marriage to Valentinian III, then no actual betrothal had yet occurred when he delivered the panegyric on 1 January 446. Moreover, at an unknown date before 455, when Huneric forcibly married Eudocia, he married a daughter of the Visigothic king Theoderic (Jordanes *Get.* 184).

Iacobus (581–582)

Vigilius' letter to John Chrysostom refers to Iacobus' taking to Constantinople the relics of the Anaunensian martyrs of 397 in terms which imply a date close to the martyrdom (*PL* 13.552: *sanctorum recentium et vapore fumantium reliquias*): not, therefore, "between 402 and 404," but shortly after 397.⁶⁴ Given the known enmity of John Chrysostom and Eutropius, the correct date must excite speculation about Iacobus' diplomatic activities in the East.

Maiorianus (702–703)

The *Prosopography* quite properly declines to hazard a guess about the age of the emperor Majorian, noting only that he was still a *iuuenis* in 458 (Sid. Apoll. *Carm.* 5.524). As a corollary, however, it becomes improper to argue that the battle at Vicus Helena, in which Majorian and Aetius both fought (*ibid.* 207 ff.), occurred "probably in 447 or 448," since that date was partly deduced from the supposition that Majorian was born ca 428.⁶⁵

In 455 Majorian was regarded as a candidate for the throne after the murder of Valentinian (*ibid.* 312 ff.). The *Prosopography* insists on retaining the transmitted text in John of Antioch frag. 201.6, which entails that in 455 there were two potential emperors markedly similar to each other: Maximianus, the son of the rich Egyptian Domninus, and a follower of Aetius (*PLRE* 2.373, Domninus 3; 739, Maximianus 5), and

⁶²As argued by S. I. Oost, *CP* 60 (1965) 4 ff.

⁶³*Phoenix* 28 (1974) 317 f. Andrea Jarmai has convinced me that the *novus exul* is the usurper Ioannes, as argued by J. B. Bury, *JRS* 9 (1919) 7 f., and that the whole of lines 1–18 describe a mosaic ceiling depicting the imperial family in 425.

⁶⁴Observe, however, the reception of the bones of certain unidentified martyrs in Constantinople between 400 and early 402: K. Holum, *Theodosian Empresses. Women and Imperial Dominion in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley 1982) 56 f.

⁶⁵Loyen (above, n. 56) 64 ff.

Majorian, a former subordinate of Aetius and the son of a man who had managed Aetius' finances (Sid. Apoll. *Carm.* 5.116 ff.). It seems an economical hypothesis to emend and identify the two men:⁶⁶ Sidonius' total silence about the origin of Majorian's father is perfectly consistent with his being Egyptian.

Majorian's status in 457 is a notorious problem.⁶⁷ Unfortunately, the *Prosopography* muddles the real issue with its naive argument that, because Majorian and Ricimer were appointed *magister militum* and *patricius* on 28 February 457 (*Chr. min.* 1.305), "the appointment must have been made by the emperor in the East, whether Marcian or Leo, since there had been no western emperor since the overthrow of Avitus" (also 943). Since Marcian died on 27 January 457 (Theodore Lector *Epit.* 367), the date of Majorian's "appointment" is highly suspicious: he and Ricimer surely usurped the titles of *magister militum* and *patricius*, just as in Gaul at the same time Paeonius usurped the title of praetorian prefect (Sid. Apoll. *Epp.* 1.11.6).⁶⁸

Majorian's official view of his status was that he was *magister militum* from 28 February until he was proclaimed Augustus on 28 December 457 (*Chr. min.* 1.492), shortly after which he wrote to the Senate to announce his accession (*Nov. Maior.* 1: 10 January 458). Sidonius Apollinaris echoes this view in his panegyric to Majorian in December 458. In 457 there was a raid into North Italy:

*felix te respicit iste
eventus belli: certatum est iure magistro,
Augusti fato. nuper ferus hostis aperto*⁶⁹
*errabat lentus pelago, postquam ordine vobis
ordo omnis regnum dederat, plebs, curia, miles
et collega simul.* *Carm.* 5.383–388

The Vandal descent on Campania belongs to 458: Sidonius' silence reveals that Majorian took no personal part in the fighting (389 ff., esp. 439: *agmina vestra*).⁷⁰ The *Prosopography* illegitimately combines Sidonius Apollinaris' misleading *et collega simul* with a notice in the *Fasti Vindobonenses priores* (*Chr. min.* 1.305) and deduces that Majorian "was acclaimed as emperor on April 1, 457, probably by the army and with the approval of the emperor Leo." But Majorian was never officially recognized in the East (*CJ* 4.65.31; 12.35.15; 8.53.30; 1.3.26; 2.7.11), and the notice in the

⁶⁶Sundwall (above n. 29) 69, 99; W. Ensslin, *RE* 14 (1930) 584.

⁶⁷For bibliography and discussion, see H. D. Meyer, *BZ* 62 (1969) 5 ff.

⁶⁸R. Mathisen, *Francia* 7 (1979) 603 f.

⁶⁹On the punctuation of this line, and the necessity of emending the transmitted *post* to *ferus*, see W. B. Anderson, *CQ* 28 (1934) 18 f.; *Sidonius* 1 (Loeb 1936) 94 f.

⁷⁰Note, however, the *suggestio falsi* in 489: *hic tu vix armis positis iterum arma retractas*.

Fasti Vindobonenses should either be rejected outright or diagnosed as a mistake for the official proclamation of Leo in the West on 1 April 458 (*Nov. Maior.* 3–11, cf. 2).

Marcellinus 6 (708–710)

Sidonius Apollinaris *Epp.* 1.11.6 attests a conspiracy of Marcellus, not of Marcellinus: the manuscripts read *coniuratio Marcellana* and *Marcelliana*, of which the former is not only better attested but also conforms to Sidonius' usage with adjectives formed from proper names. This *coniuratio Marcellana* cannot have been a movement "to put Marcellinus on the throne:" both the textual evidence and the historical context indicate a conspiracy to put up as emperor a Gallic Marcellus—perhaps the Marcellus who had been praetorian prefect in Gaul in the early 440s (*CIL* 13.5336 = *ILCV* 1806: Narbo).⁷¹

Namatianus (770–771)

The fragments from the missing part of the *De reditu suo* published by M. Ferrari, *IMU* 16 (1973) 29–30, confirm that Rutilius Namatianus left Rome in October 417. More important, they imply that he was returning to Gaul in order to assist Constantius in establishing the Visigothic kingdom of Toulouse: in north Italy, Namatianus met Constantius and the *comes* Marcellinus, who had formerly been a *protector* and *tribunus* (not noted in *PLRE* 2).

Pompeianus 2 (897–898)

The *Vita Melaniae* (19 Greek, cf. 2.1 Latin) brands Pompeianus as a rabid pagan. What then of Zosimus' statement that τὴν κρατοῦσαν κατὰ νοὺν ἐλάμβανε δόξαν (5.41.2)? It is not necessary to suppose that Zosimus "described him as a Christian." The whole sentence reads better with a different translation: "Since he took the prevailing belief into account, and wished to accomplish his aim safely, he referred the whole matter to the bishop of the city, who was Innocentius."

Saul (981)

If Saul is identical with the commander of the Alans in September 394 (Zosimus 4.57.2; John of Antioch frag. 187), as the *Prosopography* deems probable, then he should be the *gentis praefectus Alanae*, who perished in the battle of Pollentia (Claudian *Get.* 581 ff., whence 1236, Anonymus 117). Orosius blames the barbarian and pagan Saul for starting the battle (*Hist. adv. pag.* 7.37.2)—an action which corresponds to what Claudian says of the Alan leader. Not, therefore, "either *comes rei militaris* or *magister militum*."

⁷¹R. Mathisen, *Francia* 7 (1979) 598 ff.

Sigisvultus (1010)

The Gallic chronicle of 452 records that Sigisvultus hastened to Africa against Bonifatius in 424 (*Chr. min.* 1.658), Prosper Tiro that command in the war against Bonifatius was transferred to Sigisvultus in 427 (*Chr. min.* 1.472). The *Prosopography* assumes that the chronicle of 452 is in error. Yet two missions, in 424 and 427, need not strain credulity.⁷²

Not only does the *Vita Germani* attest Sigisvultus as *patricius* in 446 rather than 448 (38), but *Nov. Val.* 11 implies that he was already *patricius* by 13 March 443.⁷³

Symmachus 3 (1042–1043)

Nov. Val. 21.1 gives the name of the consul of 446 as Q. Aurelius Symmachus. Consequently, *CIL* 6.32162 may belong to him rather than to his son, consul in 485 (as 1044–46, Symmachus 9, dating *CIL* 6.32162 between 476 and 483, with a cross-reference to Aggerius).

IV

The criteria for inclusion in the second volume of the *Prosopography* must have been far harder to formulate than for the first, and the editors have rightly taken a catholic approach, not disdaining a king of Ethiopia (388, Elesboas), the inventor of the Armenian alphabet (759, Mesrop), King Arthur (156–157), or even Old King Cole (304, *!Coel(ius?)!*).⁷⁴ Moreover, atonement for past sins is offered by five pages on Augustine, who inexplicably escaped the first volume, despite his chair in rhetoric (186–191). Yet omissions can be detected, and an alert young historian has already supplied the names of more than one hundred eminent persons from Gaul who have failed to gain entry.⁷⁵ All the more reason, therefore, to conclude this review article as it began: with all its faults, the second volume of the *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* is an honest and serious achievement, and it will be used constantly and with gratitude by those who study the Roman Empire between Theodosius and Justinian.⁷⁶

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

⁷²S. I. Oost, *Galla Placidia Augusta* (Chicago 1968) 187, 222.

⁷³*Phoenix* 29 (1975) 158 f.

⁷⁴Also two abbreviations in the *Notitia Dignitatum*, discussed at some length, viz. 592–593, Fl. Intall.; 1135, Fl. Val.

⁷⁵R. Mathisen, *Historia* 31 (1982) 364 ff. A list of addenda has also been supplied by B. Baldwin, *Historia* 31 (1982) 97 ff.

⁷⁶The final form of this review article has benefited from the criticisms of John Vander Spoel and two referees of this journal.