



<https://publications.dainst.org>

iDAI.publications

ELEKTRONISCHE PUBLIKATIONEN DES
DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

Dies ist ein digitaler Sonderdruck des Beitrags / This is a digital offprint of the article

Brian Croke A.D. 476: The Manufacture of a Turning Point

aus / from

Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **13 • 1983**

Seite / Page **81–120**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/1273/5622> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-1983-13-p81-120-v5622.4

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor

Redaktion Chiron | Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Amalienstr. 73 b, 80799 München

Weitere Informationen unter / For further information see <https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron>

ISSN der Online-Ausgabe / ISSN of the online edition **2510-5396**

Verlag / Publisher **Verlag C. H. Beck, München**

©2017 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Zentrale, Podbielskiallee 69–71, 14195 Berlin, Tel: +49 30 187711-0

Email: info@dainst.de / Web: dainst.org

Nutzungsbedingungen: Mit dem Herunterladen erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) von iDAI.publications an. Die Nutzung der Inhalte ist ausschließlich privaten Nutzerinnen / Nutzern für den eigenen wissenschaftlichen und sonstigen privaten Gebrauch gestattet. Sämtliche Texte, Bilder und sonstige Inhalte in diesem Dokument unterliegen dem Schutz des Urheberrechts gemäß dem Urheberrechtsgesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Die Inhalte können von Ihnen nur dann genutzt und vervielfältigt werden, wenn Ihnen dies im Einzelfall durch den Rechteinhaber oder die Schrankenregelungen des Urheberrechts gestattet ist. Jede Art der Nutzung zu gewerblichen Zwecken ist untersagt. Zu den Möglichkeiten einer Lizenzierung von Nutzungsrechten wenden Sie sich bitte direkt an die verantwortlichen Herausgeberinnen/Herausgeber der entsprechenden Publikationsorgane oder an die Online-Redaktion des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (info@dainst.de).

Terms of use: By downloading you accept the terms of use (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) of iDAI.publications. All materials including texts, articles, images and other content contained in this document are subject to the German copyright. The contents are for personal use only and may only be reproduced or made accessible to third parties if you have gained permission from the copyright owner. Any form of commercial use is expressly prohibited. When seeking the granting of licenses of use or permission to reproduce any kind of material please contact the responsible editors of the publications or contact the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut (info@dainst.de).

BRIAN CROKE

A. D. 476: The Manufacture of a Turning Point*

The minds of historians are tidy ones. Their research and teaching require them to circumscribe areas within chronological boundaries; so they are constantly inventing new period markers and disputing the merits of other similar inventions. Although human behaviour and human institutions can rarely be accurately confined within specific chronological parameters, something compels historians to keep on aiming to establish at what exact date a particular person or society took on or finally cast off its essential character. When considering an individual culture or empire the requirement appears doubly compelling. Does Byzantine history, for instance, properly begin in 330 with the foundation of Constantinople, in 395 when the Roman empire was partitioned administratively after the death of Theodosius I, in 527 with the accession of Justinian, in 610 with that of Heraclius or in 717 with that of Leo III? And does it end in 1204 with the sack of Constantinople by the Crusaders or in 1453 with its sack by the Turks? All these dates are seriously advocated on their unique merits. Opting for a particular one is predetermined in the final analysis by one's definition of 'Byzantine'.

When we turn to the history of the Roman world in the narrow sense we find almost unanimous agreement. The manuals of every generation ensure that students discover that Rome was born in 753 B. C. and was extinguished decisively with the deposition of the last emperor, the young Romulus Augustus nicknamed Augustulus, in A. D. 476. Even outside professional historical readership this is one of the few dates that readily spring to mind, like 44 B. C., 1789 or 1914. The trouble with convenient historical dates like these is that once established they pass into textbooks, regulate the scope of courses taught in schools and universities and, perhaps most seriously of all, are reinforced by appropriate anniversaries irrespective of their historical accuracy and significance.

No wonder 1976 was an *annus mirabilis* for Roman historians, particularly

* It should be noted that the arguments presented here were first outlined in December 1977 at the Third Annual Byzantine Studies Conference at Columbia University, New York, with a summary published in Third Annual Byzantine Studies Conference Abstracts of Papers (New York 1977) 55 cf. BZ 71, 1978, 442. Therefore, although some of my essential points correspond with those of some recent contributors, notably LUISELLI and CRACCO RUGGINI, they were arrived at independently and have now been refined in the light of these other studies.

those who take special interest in the late empire. On the one hand it marked the two-hundredth anniversary of the publication of the first volume of EDWARD GIBBON's «Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire», an event that spawned a series of conferences and promoted renewed interest in GIBBON.¹ Despite the fact that GIBBON himself was never committed to his original view that the Roman empire ended in 476, his own bi-centenary only served to reassure the conviction of those celebrating simultaneously the 1,500th anniversary of the deposition of Romulus Augustulus which itself inspired a flurry of conferences and publications.²

Although in 1976 the commitment to the significance of 476 as the traditional date for the cessation of the Roman empire intensified interest in the events of that year, it did not encourage the sort of atmosphere in which the accuracy of the date itself as a period marker could be assessed properly. Now that the dust has settled and in view of the renewed interest in 476 in recent years, especially and understandably so in Italy, the time has come for a more detached and analytical evaluation of the significance of 476. This involves not so much unravelling the political drama that culminated in the exile of Romulus in September of that year, but rather searching to discover the origins and development of the historiographical concept that the Roman empire ended neatly in 476. In this sense therefore it becomes more of a literary problem than anything else, one of orthodox *Quellenforschung*. We can be reasonably confident about how the date became entrenched as a meaningful one in modern textbooks. It was stressed by the humanist historian BIONDO, among others, but assumed particular influence from the significance accorded it by the great eighteenth-century Göttingen historians, particularly GATTERER, whence it passed to other German scholars in the formative period of academic history in the earlier part of the nineteenth century.³ What we still

¹ G. W. BOWERSOCK et al. (ed.), *Edward Gibbon and the Decline of the Roman Empire* (Cambridge, Mass. 1977), essays previously published in *Daedalus* 105 (1976); P. DUCREY (ed.), *Gibbon et Rome* (Geneva 1977); A. MOMIGLIANO, *Edward Gibbon fuori e dentro la cultura italiana*, *ASNP* 5, 1976, 77–95.

² 476 Segno di transizione (Istituto di Antichità Ravennati et paleobizantine), Ravenna 1976; *La fine dell' impero romano d'occidente* (Istituto di Studi Romani), Rome 1978; J. IRMSCHER, *La fine dell' impero Romano d'occidente nella letteratura bizantina*, *Ziva Antika* 27, 1977, 129–34 (= *Das Ende des weströmischen Kaisertums in der byzantinischen Literatur*, *Klio* 60, 1978, 397–401); E. DEMOUGEOT, *Bedeutet das Jahr 476 das Ende des Römischen Reiches im Okzident?*, *Klio* 60, 1978, 371–81.

³ M. A. WES, *La fin de Rome dans l'histoire de l'humanisme italien*, *Mededel. Nederl. Inst. Rome n. s.* 1, 1974, 113–22; H. J. HERRMANN, *Der Untergang des Weströmischen Reiches in der historischen Literatur des 18. Jahrhunderts in Deutschland*, *Klio* 60, 1978, 409–22; P. HÜBINGER, *Zur Frage der Periodengrenze zwischen Altertum und Mittelalter* (Darmstadt 1969); K. STROHEKER, *Um die Grenze zwischen Antike und abendländischen Mittelalter*, *Saeculum* 1, 1950, 433–65 (= *Germanentum und Spätantike* [Zurich 1965] 275–308); S. MAZZARINO, *The End of the Ancient World* (London 1966); L. VARADY, *Die Auflösung des Altertums* (Budapest 1978); W. GOFFART, *Rome, Constantinople and the Barbarians*, *AHR* 86, 1981, 275–306.

need to be more certain about, however, is how and at what point the tradition inherited by Renaissance historians originated. In other words, who first formulated the idea that the Roman empire, that is to say the western empire, ended in 476; what political and cultural perspective does it presuppose; how was the idea passed on from generation to generation?

I. Before and After Romulus Augustulus

‘Roma Aeterna’ was a cherished concept still in the fourth century.⁴ Yet at the same time it was widely apparent that the traditional and recognizable structures of Roman culture and government were experiencing profound transformations. Even a predominantly conservative observer like Ammianus was moved to remark that Rome was sliding into old age (14.6.3).⁵ The new ideals and patterns of social relations which were promoted by the empire’s conversion to Christianity, together with the social, administrative and political dislocation spreading in the wake of successive barbarian intrusions, both hastened and sharpened reflection on Rome’s fortunes and destiny. Many lamented the empire’s demise and searched for scapegoats, others regarded what was happening as the inevitable displacement of a pagan body politic by the new empire of Christ on earth.⁶

Politically speaking, the formal partition of the empire on the death of Theodosius I in 395 marked a decisive turning point in late antiquity. The latent divergence of East and West quickly intensified and consolidated this separation. Nonetheless an official political unity was maintained because of the focus of loyalty and legitimacy that was centered on the Theodosian dynasty.⁷ When the western emperor Honorius died in 423 he was replaced, after an interlude of usurpation, by his nephew Valentinian III who was then betrothed to the daughter of Theodosius II. When Valentinian III was murdered on 16 March 455 he was replaced by a shifty aristocrat named Maximus who ruled for only a couple of months until he fell from favour and was dismembered by a Roman mob on 31 May 455.⁸

⁴ F. PASCHOUD, *Roma Aeterna* (Bern-Rome 1967).

⁵ For this and other metaphors of ‘decline and fall’ see the most interesting article of A. DEMANDT, *Das Ende des Altertums in metaphorischer Deutung*, *Gymnasium* 87, 1980, 178–204.

⁶ R. P. C. HANSON, *The Reaction of the Church to the Collapse of the Western Roman Empire in the Fifth Century*, *Vig. Chr.* 26, 1972, 272–87; O. ZWIERLEIN, *Der Fall Roms in Spiegel der Kirchenväter*, *ZPE* 32, 1978, 45–80.

⁷ W. E. KAEGI, *Byzantium and the Decline of Rome* (Princeton 1968); L. CRACCO RUGGINI, *Pubblicistica e storiografia bizantina di fronte alla crisi dell’ impero Romano*, *Athenaeum* 51, 1973, 146–83.

⁸ For sources: Petronius Maximus, *PLRE*, 2, 751.

An uncertain interregnum followed the death of Maximus until 9 July when an experienced Gallic nobleman named Avitus was proclaimed emperor at Arles and marched to Rome.⁹ Although never recognised by the eastern emperor Marcian,¹⁰ Avitus ruled for a little over a year until he was deposed on 18 October 456 in a revolt led by the Italian general Majorian and the rising barbarian star Ricimer.¹¹ Another interregnum prevailed until April 457 during which Ricimer and Majorian tried to secure the support of the eastern emperor, first Marcian then Leo I, for Majorian's appointment. On 1 April 457 Majorian was appointed as emperor in the West but only as a Caesar to the Eastern emperor Leo.¹² Ricimer, now designated a *patrician* by Leo, was the effective power behind the throne and on 2 August 461 he had Majorian stripped of his authority and beheaded, following the failure of his expedition against the Vandals in Africa. Once again it was some time before another emperor was proclaimed in the west, until Ricimer cajoled the senate into electing Libius Severus on 19 November 461. Severus then ruled for four years, before Ricimer had him murdered also,¹³ but he was never recognised in the East as Augustus either.¹⁴ After Severus' death on 14 November 465 a year and a half passed without any western emperor at all.

By this stage the Vandals had begun to launch destructive raids along the Dalmatian coast and in Greece. This new threat finally inspired the eastern emperor Leo to realise the necessity for a reassertion of imperial prestige and influence in the West. Consequently, he sent Anthemius, the son-in-law of his predecessor Marcian, to Rome where he was proclaimed emperor on 12 April 467. The support of Ricimer was purchased by his marriage to Anthemius' daughter.

Relations between Ricimer and his imperial father-in-law had soured, however, by 470. The simmering feud finally erupted in 472 when Anthemius was besieged at Rome and captured by Ricimer's forces (11 July 472).¹⁵ Ricimer had, meanwhile, bestowed the purple on Olybrius the husband of one of Valentinian III's daughters. Olybrius only ruled for a few months (April–2 November 472) before dying of dropsy¹⁶ but he was never recognised by Leo.¹⁷

⁹ Eparchius Avitus, PLRE, 2, 198.

¹⁰ R. MATHISEN, Avitus, Italy and the East in 455–456, *Byz.* 51, 1981, 232–47.

¹¹ Fl. Iulius Valerius Maiorianus, PLRE, 2, 703.

¹² W. ENSSLIN, Majorianus, RE 14, 585–6; Leo I, RE 12, 1950–1; O. SEECK, *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt* (Stuttgart 1920 rp. 1966) 6, 339.

¹³ Libius Severus 18, PLRE, 2, 1004–5.

¹⁴ SEECK, 1920, 350 ff; S. I. OOST, D. N. Libius Severus P. f. Aug., CP 65, 1970, 233, except that from 462 Severus was recognised in the East as a *Caesar* (T. NAGY, *The Reoccupation of Pannonia from the Huns in 427* [Did Jordanes use the Chronicle of Marcellinus Comes at the writing of the *Getica*?], AAH 15, 1967, 180–4).

¹⁵ Anthemius 3, PLRE, 2, 98.

¹⁶ Anicius Olybrius 6, PLRE, 2, 797–8.

¹⁷ F. M. CLOVER, *The Family and Career of Anicius Olybrius*, *Historia* 27, 1978, 195 cf. J. B. BURY, *A Note on the Emperor Olybrius*, *EHR* 1, 1886, 509.

Yet another interregnum followed. Ricimer had predeceased Olybrius but his power and influence had passed to his nephew the Burgundian Gundobad. On 3 March 473 he proclaimed emperor the *comes domesticorum* Glycerius¹⁸ who also failed to secure recognition in the East.¹⁹ Meanwhile Leo sent a new emperor to the West, Julius Nepos, the husband of his wife's niece. When Nepos arrived in Italy he deposed Glycerius and was proclaimed emperor at Rome on 24 June 474.²⁰ Once more two *Augusti* reigned together: Leo in the East, Nepos in the West.

By now Gundobad had become king of the Burgundians and his place as *magister militum* was taken by Orestes who had previously been a secretary to the Huns' king Attila. Orestes was dissatisfied with Nepos and just as his predecessors Ricimer and Gundobad had been able to make and unmake emperors, Orestes decided that his son should be emperor. Nepos was alerted to this and fled to Salona in Dalmatia on 28 August 475, and a few months later, on 31 October 475, the young Romulus was proclaimed emperor.²¹ Events were now quickly moving to a climax. In August 476 the barbarian troops under Orestes demanded land for themselves in Italy. He refused and rebellion ensued led by one of his chief officers: the Scirian, Odoacer. Orestes was put to death on 28 August and his son was deposed and sent into a well-subsidised exile on one of his family's estates in Campania, Lucullanum. Odoacer was now in complete control.²²

What followed is that an embassy was sent from the Roman senate to the emperor Zeno pointing out that there was now one emperor for the whole empire and there was no need for a separate ruler in the West any longer.²³ The paraphernalia of imperial power were now transferred to Constantinople.²⁴ At the same time an embassy was also sent from the exiled Nepos in Dalmatia.²⁵ Zeno certainly recognised Nepos' claim to the throne and encouraged his return but he was shrewd enough to acknowledge the political reality that Nepos' hopes would remain unfulfilled, that there was no longer an effective emperor in the West and that from now on he would have to deal with the brother of the man he recently had murder his own rival at Constantinople, Armatus.

The fact that the Roman senate conceded that one emperor was now sufficient is an indication of a sense of resignation in the West, that is to say, there the line of Roman emperors had come to an end as far as they were concerned, at least for

¹⁸ Glycerius, PLRE, 2, 514.

¹⁹ J. B. BURY, *A History of the Later Roman Empire*² (London 1923) 1,404.

²⁰ Iulius Nepos 3, PLRE, 2, 777.

²¹ Romulus Augustus 4, PLRE, 2, 950.

²² BURY, 1923, 1, 404–11; E. STEIN, *Histoire du Bas-Empire* (ed. J.-R. PALANQUE) (Paris 1959), 1, 396–9.

²³ Malchus, frag. 10 (FHG IV, 119)

²⁴ Malchus, frag. 10 (FHG IV, 119).

²⁵ Malchus, frag. 10 (FHG IV, 119).

the time being. Yet no western contemporary comments on the significance of the deposition of Romulus Augustulus. That is because its meaning was not immediately clear. Who could say that this would not be just another hiatus as had occurred so frequently in recent years? As time wore on it became clearer that Zeno had no intention of reappointing an imperial court in the West. Nepos had died in 480 and Odoacer continued to administer Italy satisfactorily. Further, as long as he was popular with the senatorial aristocracy there was no senatorial pressure on Zeno to send a new emperor.²⁶

The working relationship between Odoacer and the eastern court was jeopardised by the overtures of the king to Zeno's rebel courtier Illus in 486 and began to deteriorate after that. Zeno saw the opportunity to play off one threat against another and commissioned Theoderic and his Ostrogoths to replace the regime of Odoacer in Italy. By the time Odoacer was finally vanquished in 493 Zeno had been replaced as emperor by the elderly bureaucrat Anastasius. Envoys from Theoderic had failed to secure his recognition from the emperor. It was only in 497 that Anastasius finally conceded Theoderic's status in Italy, returned the imperial apparatus and allowed him to nominate one of the annual consuls.²⁷ Essentially both Odoacer and Theoderic ruled Italy as kings and viceroys of the emperor. In this confused situation in which some senators could speak officially of Theoderic as an *Augustus* (ILS, 827) it must have been difficult to decide whether there would ever be another emperor in the West at all, or indeed to conclude that Italy was no longer part of the Roman empire. After a half century of Gothic rule, by the 530s, the situation was much clearer. It was now quite obvious that a Gothic kingdom was not part of the Roman empire, so the agitation began for unification once more under a Roman emperor.²⁸

Before this attitude had crystallised, however, it had been plainly and publicly stated that the western empire no longer existed and had come to an end with the deposition of Romulus in 476. The earliest definite such statement occurs in the <Chronicle> written in Latin in Constantinople c. 518/9 by an Illyrian official at the court of Justinian, Marcellinus. Under the year 476 he writes: *Hesperium Romanae gentis imperium, quod septingentesimo nono urbis conditae anno primus Augustorum Octavianus Augustus tenere coepit, cum hoc Augustulo periit, anno decessorum regni imperatorum quingentesimo vigesimo secundo, Gothorum dehinc regibus Romam tenentibus.* (476.2) If we are to establish as best we can when and where this significant historiographical view originated then Marcellinus must be our starting point.

²⁶ A. CHASTAGNOL, *Le sénat romain sous le règne d'Odoacre. Recherche sur l'épigraphie du Colisée au V^e siècle* (Bonn 1966) 52–56.

²⁷ A. H. M. JONES, *The Constitutional Position of Odoacer and Theoderic*, JRS 52, 1962, 126.

²⁸ BURY, 1923, 2, 151 ff; STEIN, 1959, 2, 328 ff.; also of interest on this question is M. CE-SA, *La politica di Giustiniano verso l'Occidente nel giudizio di Procopio*, Athenaeum 59, 1981, 389–409.

The most urgent and fundamental questions to be asked concern Marcellinus and his chronicle. In what circumstances was his <Chronicle> written? What sources did he use? How did he use them? Above all, where did he find the view that the western empire ceased in 476?

II. East and West in Marcellinus' <Chronicle>

Marcellinus was a Latin-speaking Illyrian probably from somewhere in the vicinity of Skopje who, like so many of his countrymen including Justin and Justinian, sought to make his fortune in Constantinople where he arrived about 500. His chronicle was probably written for the predominantly Illyrian Latin speaking community of the capital at the time and composed not long after the last event it records, the death of Anastasius in 518. Further, it was perhaps as a result that Marcellinus came to acquire the post of *cancellarius* to Justinian while the latter was still a <patrician>, that is before 527. Some years later Marcellinus updated his chronicle to incorporate Justinian's African triumph in 534, as a gesture of honour and gratitude to the emperor.²⁹

The <Chronicle> has two predominant concerns which are reflected in the substance of its subject matter – Illyricum and Constantinople. For both Marcellinus and his audience these were the twin aspects of their experience. As part of the Eastern imperial court at one stage, Marcellinus' work reflects an eastern bias and is constructed on an eastern framework. Although written in Latin, his chronicle is essentially a Byzantine one in the same tradition as the <Chronicon Paschale>, Malalas and the <Consularia Constantinopolitana>. It is a failure to appreciate this fundamental fact that has led so many modern scholars astray.

That so much of the <Chronicle> should be devoted to the main public ceremonial events in the life of the capital – imperial births, deaths, marriages, accessions, victories, etc. – as well as other important urban happenings such as riots, earthquakes and reception of ambassadors, exposes not only the style and preoccupation of the capital but the nature of Marcellinus' main source, a local Constantinopolitan city chronicle.³⁰ Like other cities of late antiquity whose local chronicles are reflected in the works of different annalists, especially those of Ravenna, Arles and Antioch, Constantinople too possessed a local chronicle that lies behind the material common to the various early Byzantine chroniclers.³¹ This important con-

²⁹ Marcellinus 9, PLRE, 2, 710–11; M. SCHANZ, C. HOSIUS and G. KRÜGER, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* IV.2 (Munich 1920) 110–2; T. MOMMSEN, *MGH. AA XI* (Berlin 1894) 41–2; B. CROKE, *The Misunderstanding of Cassiodorus Institutiones* 1.17.2, CQ 32, 1982, 225–6. I shall be justifying many of these statements in a forthcoming book on Marcellinus.

³⁰ MOMMSEN, 1894, 44–6.

³¹ O. HOLDER-EGGER, *Untersuchungen über einige annalistische Quellen zur Geschichte*

clusion, carefully worked out in an age when scholars were inclined to such questions, must not be taken lightly. Since this is normally forgotten nowadays, it needs some explanation.

KAUFMANN appears to have been the first to analyse the relationship between Marcellinus and the other Late Roman/Early Byzantine chroniclers, and to highlight Marcellinus' fundamental dependence on eastern materials.³² Not long after HOLDER-EGGER published a more concentrated study of Marcellinus' sources illustrating by detailed example the extensiveness of Marcellinus' use of a local Constantinopolitan city-chronicle.³³

That much was easily agreed on. A more difficult problem, however, was to establish the origin of Marcellinus' information on events in the western empire which included his 476 entry. We know that the major events in the West – deaths and accessions of emperors, victories etc. – were publicly announced and recorded at Constantinople and other cities of the empire and so passed into the local chronicles.³⁴ So, as KAUFMANN (1876, 285–7) showed originally, it would not be unreasonable to find that the few western events recorded by Marcellinus are of such a basic character that they too would most likely have come from a local eastern source. At the same time, HOLDER-EGGER (1876, 251–2) argued that Marcellinus' information on western affairs was taken from the so-called Ravenna Annals. In reply, KAUFMANN sought to emphasize and expand this basic point – Marcellinus' western information was eastern in origin.³⁵ Likewise, SEECK too argued strongly for the availability at Constantinople of basic information concerning the western empire.³⁶ When MOMMSEN came to publish his edition of Marcellinus in 1894 he took for granted what his pupil SEECK and others had been able to demonstrate about the sources of Marcellinus. So when he pointed out the weakness of HOLDER-EGGER's argument about Marcellinus' use of the Ravenna Annals, it was done on the basis of solid research and a deep experience of the chronicles themselves. So convinced was MOMMSEN of the essentially Byzantine character of Marcellinus' work that for parts of the text he printed alongside Marcellinus corresponding sections of the *Chronicon Paschale* to emphasise the point.

des V und VI Jahrhunderts, NA 1, 1876, 13–120 and 213–368; A. FREUND, Beiträge zur antiochenischen und zur Konstantinopolitanischen Stadtchronik (Diss. Jena 1882); O. SEECK, *Consularia Constantinopolitana*, RE 3, 1899, 1254–60.

³² G. KAUFMANN, Die Fasten der späteren Kaiserzeit als ein Mittel zur Kritik der weströmischen Chroniken, *Philologus* 34, 1876, 235–95.

³³ O. HOLDER-EGGER, Die Chronik des Marcellinus Comes und die oströmischen Fasten, NA 2, 1877, 47–111 (complementing his attribution of Marcellinus' western notices to the *Ravenna Annals* in NA 1, 1876, 251–2).

³⁴ e.g. Socrates, HE 7.23 (announcement at Constantinople of victory over the usurper John in 425).

³⁵ G. KAUFMANN, Die Fasten von Constantinopel und die Fasten von Ravenna, *Philologus* 42, 1884, 471–510.

³⁶ O. SEECK, Idacius und die Chronik von Constantinopel, *Neue Jahrb.* 35, 1889, 601–34.

When we turn to the chronicle itself we can see clearly its eastern framework and how Marcellinus' notices of western events slot into this perspective. The author makes clear in the preface to his chronicle that his preoccupation is chiefly with the eastern empire – *Orientalis tantum imperium*. So we might expect to find little in the chronicle pertaining to western affairs and these only in so far as they affected Constantinople. Such is in fact the case. For Marcellinus the empire was divided into East and West. Not once after 395 does he refer to the Roman empire as a whole but only to its separate halves. Moreover, it is interesting that he seems to take the eastern empire for granted but has to particularise the western by a variety of designations,³⁷ and on the occasions he identifies himself as Roman it is as an East Roman.³⁸

The most obvious indication of Marcellinus' eastern source is the list of consuls he employs. Where two consuls are named for a particular year Marcellinus names the eastern one first. More significant, however, is the omission of western consulships not recognized by the eastern court.³⁹

In addition to the consular lists, Marcellinus' use of imperial titulature, though not entirely technical, clearly reflects the Eastern origin of his viewpoint and information. For the emperors of the West, Gratian is *Augustus* (379.1) and Valentinian II *imperator* (391.1, 392.1). Maximus is a *tyrannus* (388.1), so too Eugenius (394) except that he is also referred to as *Caesar* (392.1). In 424 Valentinian III is correctly styled *Caesar*. After his death in 455 there is the usurper Maximus (Avitus is ignored altogether) then Majorian consistently designated *Caesar* by Marcellinus (459.2, 461.2) since that is how he was so acknowledged by the eastern court. Following the death of Majorian there is the usurper Severus (461.2, 465.2) and after that Anthemius *Augustus*, again an indication of the sanction given by the eastern emperor to his legitimacy (467). Olybrius succeeded on the death of Anthemius and after him Glycerius consistently entitled *Caesar* (473, 474.2), that is, not as an usurper but as a subordinate emperor. Nepos and Augustulus are given no titles except *imperator* for Nepos, a candidate of Zeno.

From this list it is clear that Marcellinus, although not always strictly consistent and accurate, for the most part employs the conventional titles of *Caesar* and *Augustus* in their proper manner to illustrate the relationship between the western and eastern emperors but from the point of view of the East not the West. The eastern emperors are similarly cast. Theodosius is *Augustus* (383.2) but Arcadius only *Caesar* in 387 and Honorius *Caesar* in 392 and 394. This seems to mean that Mar-

³⁷ Western empire: *regnum occidentale* (424.3); *Occidentalis res publica* (434, 454.2); *Hesperium regnum* (454.2); *Hesperium Romanae gentis imperium* (476.2), cf. L. VARADY, *Das letzte Jahrhundert Pannoniens 376–476* (Amsterdam 1969) 282–5.

³⁸ e.g. *haec expeditio nostrorum* (529); *nostris ductores* (503) cf. *nostris* (447.2).

³⁹ Maximus (388), Eugenius (393), Nicomachus Flavianus (394), Tertullus (410), Heracilian (413), John (425), Avitus (456), Severus (462), Tatian (466), Decius (486), Venantius (507).

cellinus could envisage only one *Augustus* at a time so that before the death of Theodosius I his sons were only *Caesar*. Likewise Theodosius II becomes *Caesar* in 402.2 but after the death of Arcadius is entitled *Augustus* (431). Marcian is *Augustus* (452), so too Leo I (468), Zeno (483, 485, 487, 491) and Justinian (532). On the other hand Leo II is crowned *Caesar* by his father in 474, as the son of Aspar, Patricius, had been made *Caesar* earlier (471) and Marcus, the son of Basiliscus, soon after (475). The most interesting case of all, however, is Anastasius: never once does Marcellinus call him *Augustus* (except in the consular list) but always *Caesar*. The mere consistency of this (511; 512.2, 4 (bis), 7; 513; 515.3) suggests not so much carelessness or ignorance on the part of Marcellinus but a deliberate attempt to play down the legitimacy of an emperor who was detestable because of his harassment of the orthodox.

All in all, the framework of Marcellinus' chronicle, its consuls and imperial terminology, reflects the eastern view and suggests that the western empire is only considered by way of its contact with the East. Indeed, very few if any of Marcellinus' western entries need derive from an exclusively western source. So it is that in the light of the most basic research on the chronicle of Marcellinus a *prima facie* case is established for arguing that his stated view that the western empire fell in 476 most probably derives from an eastern source and reflects an eastern, not a western, perspective. Unfortunately such a solution is not so simple, the chief complicating factor being that an identical statement turns up in both the <Romana> and <Getica> of Jordanes written in Constantinople in 550/1.⁴⁰

III. *The Independence of Jordanes*

Marcellinus' chronicle was available first of all to the Latin-speaking community of Constantinople and it is in this very community that we first find it being used by a subsequent historian – the Gothic notary Jordanes. However, the question as to where and how Jordanes used Marcellinus is by no means straightforward.⁴¹ That the chronicle was used in both the <Romana> and <Getica> is evident from the following comparisons:

⁴⁰ ed. MOMMSEN, MGH. AA., V.1 (1882).

⁴¹ The most concise comparison of Marcellinus and Jordanes is D. BARTONKOVA, *Marcellinus Comes and Jordanes' Romana*, Sbornik Prací Filosofické Faculty Brněnské University, rada E, 12, 1967, 185–94 (though unaware of the important study of ENSSLIN [next note]). A fuller and more reliable analysis is that of L. VARADY, *Jordanes-Studien. Jordanes und das Chronicon des Marcellinus Comes – Die Selbständigkeit des Jordanes*, Chiron 6, 1976, 441–87.

Marcellinus 395.3–5; 396.1–2; 399.1

Arcadius et Honorius germani utrumque imperium divisit tantum sedibus tenere coeperunt. Rufinus patricius Arcadio principi insidias tendens Alaricum Gothorum regem missis clam pecuniis infestum rei publicae fecit et in Graeciam misit.

Porro detectus dolo suo Rufinus ab Italicis militibus cum Gaina comite Arcadio missis ante portas urbis merito trucidatus est. caput eius manusque dextra per totam Constantinopolim demonstrata.

Rufini uxor et filia exulata.

Eutropius sacri palatii cubicularius omnes opes abripuit avaritiamque transgressus est.

Marcellinus 471

Aspar primus patriciorum cum Ardabure et Patriciolo filiis, illo quidem olim patricio, hoc autem Caesare generoque Leonis principis appellato, Arrianus cum Arriana prole spadonum ensibus in palatio vulneratus interiiit.

Jordanes Rom. 319

Archadius et Honorius fratres filii Theodosii imperatoris utrumque imperium divisit tantum sedibus tenere coeperunt, id est Archadius senior Constantinopolitanam urbem, Honorius vero Romanam. tunc Rufinus patricius Archadio principi insidias tendens Alaricum Gothorum regem, ut Grecias devastaret, missis clam pecuniis invitavit. porro detectus Rufinus ab Italiae militibus et Archadio cum Gaina comite missus, ante portas urbis detruncatus est caputque eius et dextera manus Constantinopolim ad ludibrium circumductum uxoremque eius exulatam opes cunctas Eutropius spado promeruit.

Jordanes Get. 239

Aspar primus patriciorum et Gothorum genere clarus cum Ardabure et Patriciolo filiis, illo quidem olim patricio hoc autem Caesare generoque Leonis principis appellato, spadonum ensibus in palatio vulneratus interiiit.

It is clear from these passages alone (and there are many other examples) that the similarity between them is best accounted for on the hypothesis that Jordanes used Marcellinus in both works. There is nothing in the «Romana» excerpt which is not also in Marcellinus and we should assume that Jordanes is here merely compounding and slightly abbreviating the entries of the chronicle. However, elsewhere there is much in Jordanes which, although it looks as if it should come from Marcellinus, does not but must derive from another source which (as will become evident) was used by both Marcellinus and Jordanes. One example will suffice:

Marcellinus 437.1

Valentinianus imperator Roma digressus ad copulandam sibi in matrimonium Eudoxiam Theodosii principis filiam, quam dudum desponsaverat, Constantinopolim advenit eaque sibi nupta apud Thessalonicam Italiam repetens hiemavit.

Jordanes Rom. 329

post haec III anno Valentinianus imperator a Roma Constantinopolim ob suscipiendam in matrimonio Eudoxiam Theodosii principis filiam venit datamque pro munere soceri sui totam Illyricum ...

Jordanes is here following Marcellinus because he places the marriage of Eudoxia and Valentinian in 437, that is three years after the banishment of Honoria to Constantinople dated by Marcellinus to 434. Yet Jordanes has information on the cession of Illyricum not recorded by Marcellinus.

In his edition of Jordanes MOMMSEN marked this and similar passages with a marginal «IGN», that is «IGNOTUS». The problem then is to define the IGNOTUS – the

common source (or sources) of Marcellinus and Jordanes. MOMMSEN (1894, 54–5) concluded from the fact that the majority of the entries marked <IGN> have to do with events in Constantinople and the eastern empire, that the common source was some sort of local Constantinopolitan chronicle. Jordanes had himself referred to the *annales consulumque series* (Rom. 388).

This opinion would still prevail were it not for the work of ENSSLIN who in 1948, through a thorough comparison of Marcellinus and Jordanes, proposed the idea that the <IGNOTUS> of MOMMSEN was not a local Byzantine source but the lost <Roman History> of Q. Aurelius Symmachus, the consul of 485, executed by Theoderic in 525.⁴² He argued that Marcellinus drew on Symmachus extensively and Jordanes, entirely. Moreover, the sources which Marcellinus, and especially Jordanes, purport to use – Eutropius, Orosius among others – were only used at second-hand, that is by way of Symmachus. Furthermore, Symmachus' lost history was also used by Cassiodorus in his lost <Gothic History> so that in the <Getica> Jordanes is using some sources at third-hand, previously worked over by Symmachus and Cassiodorus in turn.

ENSSLIN's case, it should be pointed out, was based (for the period from 379 onwards) entirely on a comparison of Marcellinus and Jordanes so that he made no use of the considerable body of research (KAUFMANN, SEECK and HOLDER-EGGER) on the sources of the chronicle discussed in the previous section. Had he done so he would have been forced to reconcile his thesis with the fact that Marcellinus' <Hauptquelle> (the term ENSSLIN uses to describe his use of Symmachus) was the *fasti* of Constantinople and not any western history. In any case, ENSSLIN's thesis was generally accepted. HARTKE⁴³ had reservations about it – at least he pointed to some definite indications of Jordanes' own independent technique – but MOMIGLIANO was convinced.⁴⁴

Among the entries common to Marcellinus and Jordanes, which on ENSSLIN's hypothesis must come originally from the pen of Symmachus, is the statement that in A. D. 476 the *Hesperium imperium* came to an end with the deposition of the emperor Romulus Augustulus by Odoacer. This led MARINUS WES to present, in 1967, an ideological context for this statement.⁴⁵ He argued that it was only natural that Symmachus, whose <Roman History> was not written before 519, should see in 476 a year of fatal significance. It was the view of the <Romans of Rome> who saw their senatorial traditions threatened by barbarian kings. This intolerable

⁴² W. ENSSLIN, *Des Symmachus Historia Romana als Quelle für Jordanes* (SBAW, Munich 1948).

⁴³ *Gnomon* 22, 1950, 414–5; *Römische Kinderkaiser* (Berlin 1950) 427–39. Doubts about ENSSLIN's thesis were also expressed by M. LAVARENNE, *Latomus* 9, 1950, 327–9.

⁴⁴ Cassiodorus and Italian Culture of his Time, PBA 41, 1955, 232 n. 56. The most recent example of a more or less unqualified reliance on ENSSLIN for a specific argument is J. SCHLUMBERGER, *Die Epitome de Caesaribus* (Munich 1974) 247–8.

⁴⁵ *Das Ende des Kaisertums im Westen des römischen Reichs* (The Hague 1967).

situation, so it was observed in retrospect, had begun in 476. Thereafter, there was no more empire in their eyes. Furthermore, it was to counteract this central thesis of Symmachus' history that Cassiodorus' lost history of the Goths was written. The perspective of Symmachus needed to be corrected in favour of the Goths.

WES' remarkably original book was enthusiastically received and the certainty of his thesis endorsed by, among others, BROWN,⁴⁶ BROWNING,⁴⁷ CHASTAGNOL,⁴⁸ COURCELLE,⁴⁹ KAEGI,⁵⁰ MATTHEWS,⁵¹ MOMIGLIANO⁵² and OOST.⁵³ It is by now conventional doctrine that the view of the western empire's fall in 476 originated in the lost <Roman History> of Symmachus and sprang from the wistful feelings of the Roman senatorial aristocracy under the overlordship of the Ostrogoths. However, it was DEMANDT alone who expressed fundamental doubts about the validity of WES' thesis,⁵⁴ while MATTHEWS observed WES' failure to use much salient research on the Roman senatorial aristocracy during the Ostrogothic period.⁵⁵ More recently a widespread scepticism has arisen about WES' essential argument and its basis in ENSSLIN, although no-one has yet tackled the thesis or sought to refute it in a systematic way.⁵⁶ Hence the necessity for the following analysis. Since, as DEMANDT pointed out,⁵⁷ WES' thesis stands or falls on ENSSLIN it is with ENSSLIN'S comparison of Marcellinus that we must begin.

In the biography of Symmachus contained in the <Ordo generis Cassiodororum> we learn that he wrote an <Historia Romana> 'in imitation of his forbears'.⁵⁸ This is probably a reference to Nicomachus Flavianus whose historical reputation (he is

⁴⁶ RSI 80, 1968, 1019–22 translated in: *Religion and Society in the Age of St Augustine* (London 1972) 221–34.

⁴⁷ CR 82, 1968, 336–8 cf. *Justinian and Theodora* (London 1971) 44.

⁴⁸ *La fin du Bas-Empire* (Paris 1976) 24.

⁴⁹ *Latomus* 27, 1968, 480–2.

⁵⁰ *Gli storici proto-bizantini e la Roma del tardo quinto secolo*, RSI 88, 1976, 5.

⁵¹ *JRS* 59, 1969, 274.

⁵² *L'età del trapasso fra storiografia antica e storiografia medievale (300–550 d. C.)*, RSI 81, 1969, 301; *La caduta senza rumore di un impero nel 476 d. C.*, RSI 85, 1973, 8.

⁵³ *CP* 63, 1968, 153–4.

⁵⁴ *HZ* 218, 1969, 654–5; *BZ* 62, 1969, 96–101 (not accepted as decisive by MOMIGLIANO, RSI 85, 1973, 8 n.4).

⁵⁵ *JRS* 59, 1969, 275.

⁵⁶ KAEGI, RSI 88, 1976, 6; L. CRACCO-RUGGINI, *Come Bisanzio vide la fine dell' impero d'Occidente*, in *La fine* (n. 2 above), 72; VARADY, 1976, 455 n. 13, 479 n. 20 and 1978, 112, 123–4 (n. 121); NERI, I 1 476 nella storiografia moderna, 476 *Segno di transizione* (n. 2 above), 13–14; B. LUISELLI, *Sul de summa temporum* di Jordanes, *Romanobarbarica* 1, 1976, 84–108; CESA, 1981, 399 n. 42; B. BALDWIN, *Sources for the Getica of Jordanes*, *RBPB* 59, 1981, 146; H. CHADWICK, *Boethius* (Oxford 1981) 8–9.

⁵⁷ *BZ* 62, 1969, 98.

⁵⁸ H. USENER, *Anecdoton Holderi* (Bonn 1877 rp. Darmstadt 1969) 4: *parentesque suos imitatus historiam quoque Romanam septem libris edidit*. (The most recent and convenient edition of this document is by A. FRIDH, *Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina*, XCVI (1973), V–VI.)

called *historicus disertissimus* on a contemporary inscription [ILS 2947]), rested on his *Annales* written in the late fourth century.⁵⁹ The size and scope of Flavianus' annals is a matter of controversy but the work seems to have been a large scale history dealing at length with the fourth century.⁶⁰ It is in imitation of this work that Symmachus composed his *Roman History*. If Flavianus' work was confined to the fourth century Symmachus' was of much broader design. It was in seven books and part of Book 5 covered the reign of Maximinus, as we learn from the fact that Jordanes quotes from it – *ut dicit Symmachus in quinto suae historiae libro . . . quod nos idcirco huic nostro opusculo de Symmachi hystoria mutuavimus* (Get. 83, 88).⁶¹

This is the only occasion on which Symmachus' history is referred to by Jordanes and it is only reasonable to believe his statement that he copied the Symmachus passage from the original work, not from some intermediate redactor. What is remarkable about this passage is that it closely resembles that of the *Historia Augusta* on Maximinus. Indeed, the resemblance is so close that, were it not for the fact that the *HA* is so firmly dated now to the late fourth century, one would be tempted to suspect that Symmachus was its author.

ENSSLIN took this passage as his starting point and compared it with Jordanes' account of Maximinus in the *Romana* (281), where, in the technique employed throughout the *Romana*, he simply blends Eutropius and Orosius except that he adds the statement attributed to Symmachus at Get. 83 on the Goth/Alan parentage of Maximinus. Rather than see this as an explicable gloss, as it were, for someone who was himself of similar parentage⁶² ENSSLIN argues that it can only come from a written source which had itself added the fact to the blending of Orosius and Eutropius and that the only such source can be the history of Symmachus. ENSSLIN therefore *assumed* that the Maximinus excerpts in both the *Romana* and the *Getica* derive from the same source – Symmachus; the former directly, the

⁵⁹ Observing that the *Ordo* speaks of the *parentes* of Symmachus, and that Flavianus is the only one of the Symmachan family known to have written a history, HARTKE (1950, n. 5) argued that the plural is explained by equating the younger Flavianus with the author of the *Historia Augusta*. This is hardly convincing yet the plural remains. Th. HODGKIN once suggested that the other ancestral historian was *the* Symmachus, the late fourth-century orator whom Olympiodorus dubs λογόγραφος, which can also mean historian (Italy and her Invaders, III [(Oxford 1885] 526, n. 4).

⁶⁰ PASCHOUD, REL 53, 1976, 93–4. Others (e.g. BARNES, CP 71, 1976, 268 and J. MATTHEWS, *Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court A.D. 364–425* [Oxford 1975] 231 n. 3) have considered the *Annales* in terms of scope and design as a continuation of Tacitus. Maybe the work was inspired, for whatever motive, by the contemporary history of Ammianus whose adverse picture of the Roman aristocracy may have prompted a senatorial response.

⁶¹ See B. LUISELLI, Note sulla perduta *Historia Romana* di Q. Aurelio Memmio Simmaco, Stud. Urb. 49, 1975, 529–35.

⁶² Get. 316. For a full but ultimately inconclusive discussion of Jordanes' nationality see N. WAGNER, *Getica. Untersuchungen zum Leben des Jordanes und zur frühen Geschichte der Gothen* (Berlin 1967) 3–17.

latter via Cassiodorus. Therefore, the blending of Orosius and Eutropius' account of Maximinus was the work not of Jordanes but of Symmachus. Then, armed with this hypothesis, he showed that throughout this part of the <Romana> Eutropius and Orosius were used to provide the account contained therein and that the person responsible for this redaction was not Jordanes himself but Symmachus. Jordanes had, therefore, merely copied Symmachus word-for-word.⁶³ Next, for the period beyond 379 where Jordanes and Marcellinus have much in common, ENSSLIN (68–88) extended his hypothesis to argue that the common source was here the same as that previously used – Symmachus. Therefore, Marcellinus must have made independent use of Symmachus in his chronicle whereas Jordanes merely plagiarized Symmachus. So, just as the <Getica> is taken to be Cassiodorus in thin disguise,⁶⁴ the <Romana> is to all intents and purposes the lost <Roman History> of Symmachus. It was on this basis that WES was able to exploit the <Romana> as a first hand guide to the political opinions and programme of the <Romans of Rome>.

According to ENSSLIN's reconstruction, Jordanes was a mere copier of no independent ability or opinions. Above all, he was a fraud for he claims (Get. 3) to have used sources at first hand (some even in Greek!) which he cannot possibly have done. This arbitrary evaluation of Jordanes as an historian stands at the centre of ENSSLIN's theory and any attempt to understand the meaning of 476 must begin with a more thorough appraisal of Jordanes' aims and technique in the <Romana>.

The assumption (it is nothing more) implicit in the work of ENSSLIN and his followers, that Jordanes was absolutely uncritical and incapable of collating different sources, is too extreme. To roundly assert that the written sources in the <Romana> are at second hand is preposterous unless it can be proved. To argue such on the basis of the lost <Roman History> of Symmachus is quite inadequate. Let us begin by examining the <Romana> from a practical point of view. How did Jordanes conceive the work? How did he put it together? Does it show traces of independent work in any way?

It is unfortunate that Symmachus' <Historia Romana> and the convenient designation <Romana> have come to be attached to Jordanes' work for it is more than

⁶³ ENSSLIN, 1948, 5–60. It would be unfair to oversimplify the basis of ENSSLIN's argument. The problem is this: the only known written source for the barbarian parentage of Maximinus is Symmachus (= HA) and the only certain instance of Jordanes' use of Symmachus is this statement. It is quite easy to see why Jordanes, himself part-Goth and part-Alan, should recall this single fact (either from his own memory or from Symmachus) as worth adding to his *abbreviatio chronicorum* (Get. 1) and not otherwise have needed to use the seven-volume history of Symmachus (cf. BALDWIN, 1981, 146). On the other hand, if we follow ENSSLIN and insist that the original combination of Orosius and Eutropius in the Maximinus excerpt of the <Romana> is the work of Symmachus, then we are obliged to ignore all Jordanes' statements of his method, which gives rise to many difficulties.

⁶⁴ e.g. MOMIGLIANO, 1955.

just a Roman history and is meant to be more. The manuscript title may well be original. It is, at least, an accurate summary of the work – *de summa temporum vel origine actibusque gentis Romanorum*. In the preface to the ‹Getica› Jordanes refers to the ‹Romana› (it would be perverse to call it otherwise at this stage) as an *abbreviatio chronicorum* (Get. 1), which must be taken as a precise description of his own concept of the work, that is, a compilation put together from previous chronicles and short histories in an attempt to reduce their bulk and span to manageable proportions. This is exactly the technique used by Isidore of Seville in his histories of the Goths, Vandals and Suevi, to adduce a parallel. The only sources actually named in the ‹Romana› are the chroniclers Eusebius and Jerome (11), the consular annals (388) and various earlier histories (2 *ex dictis maiorum*, 6 *ex diversis voluminibus maiorum*). There is no mention of Symmachus' history at all. Jordanes confesses that his aim is to reshape these sources into a sort of brief history (*storiuncula*, 6) comprising the sequence of passing time and the deeds of those men who fought on behalf of the empire (6). At the same time he intends to omit the names of the consuls to avoid tedium to both the writer and reader. His work will contain just the necessary facts (14). If Jordanes' own stated concept of his work is to be believed then we should not entertain more than modest expectations of the outcome.

In his preface Jordanes implies by his statement that he had long since laid his pen to rest when he finally succumbed to the badgerings of his friend Vigilius⁶⁵ – *quod me longo per tempore dormientem vestris tandem interrogationibus excitastis* (1) – that he had previously produced some sort of written work which prompted Vigilius to encourage Jordanes to fulfil a new commission. Further, Vigilius must have felt confident that Jordanes could provide the answers if he wanted, to quote Jordanes – *praesentis mundi erumnas cognoscere aut quando coepit vel quid ad nos usque perpressus est, edoceri. addes praeterea, ut tibi, quomodo Romana respublica coepit et tenuit totumque pene mundum subegit et hactenus vel imaginariae teneat . . .* (2).

Besides the preface, Jordanes refers to the overall design of the work on two occasions. After tracing the fortunes of the Ptolemies to the absorption of Egypt into the Roman empire after the battle of Actium (31 B. C.) Jordanes checks himself in an aside to Vigilius:

et quia Romanarum rerum ordine actosque inquirere statuisti et nos breviter tuis per-cun-ctationibus respondere sumus polliciti, necessarium est ergo nobis ea interim, que ad tempora Augusti imperatoris dicuntur, omittere et rursus ad Romanae urbis pri-

⁶⁵ Sometimes thought to be identical with Pope Vigilius (537–555) cf. Vigilius 4, PLRE, 2, 1166. The identification is unlikely: there is a difficulty in the way the Vigilius of the ‹Romana› is addressed; and it is hard to believe that someone of Vigilius' aristocratic upbringing should look late in life to someone like Jordanes for the basic facts of Roman history, at a time when he was in Constantinople preoccupied with serious ecclesiastical matters.

mordia repedare originemque Romuli eius conditoris exponere simulque successorum eius regum consolumque annos actosque ad liquidum demonstrare, qui sunt hi (86).

The «Romana» concludes with a brief summary of the work and a sort of reading list for those who wish to go beyond the textbook account of Jordanes (388).

Throughout the «Romana» the emphasis is on brevity (2, 3, 47 [*ter*], 86, 114, 358). To reduce the history of Rome from Aeneas to A. D. 551, to a brief summary account is Jordanes' paramount concern. It is interesting too that the author should regard his work as being of a practical and didactic nature rather than scholarly: *quod quamvis simpliciter reor dictum videri doctissimis, gratum tamen fore aestimo mediocribus dum et brevia sine fastidio legant et sine aliquo fuco verborum quae lectitaverint sentiant* (7). He implies thereby a very different audience from what we might expect to find in aristocratic emigre circles with whom Jordanes has been linked.⁶⁶

Jordanes sets out to describe the rise and fall of Rome in the simplest possible terms, with no pretensions of style and content. The «Romana» is on the author's own admission a textbook for the layman, and it is in these terms that we must evaluate it.

The structure of the work and the sources employed reflect Jordanes' purpose. From the foregoing remarks it will become clear that his basic method is to employ a small number (two or three) of sources for each period, using one, normally analistic, as the framework to be supplemented by others where necessary. For the sake of convenience, but also because it is important to my argument, the period to A. D. 378 (8–309) will be considered first and then the subsequent period to 551 examined in the light of the methods evident in the first section.

A maxim of an obscure writer, Iamblichus, serves as an introduction to the «Romana»⁶⁷ and then follows the period from Adam (for whom Jordanes reserves the Graecism *protoplastus*) to Abraham (8–10) based on Genesis. Section 10–86 cover the period from Abraham to Cleopatra with a brief summary of the kingdoms of the Assyrians, the Persians and the Greeks. This is copied entirely from Eusebius' chronicle, probably (but not definitely) in the translation of Jerome, except for the insertion of some personal comments (11, 39, 52, 84, 86) by way of connecting the different sections of his text; as well as brief extracts from a document similar to the «Origo gentis Romanae» (38, 51, 57) which Jordanes must have had at his disposal but which ENSSLIN took as an indication of the hand of a Roman senatorial writer, Symmachus, despite the fact that these sections contain very little Roman material.⁶⁸ Sections 87–209 from Romulus to the conquest of Macedonia are de-

⁶⁶ MOMIGLIANO, 1955, 276.

⁶⁷ The Iamblichus in question was probably some legal critic at Beirut who wrote in Greek (T. MOMMSEN, *Iamblichos bei Jordanes*, NA 8, 1883, 352 = *Ges. Schr.* 7, 519–20). Iamblichus' influence may also lie behind *Cons. imp. maiest.* (Krüger, XXI).

⁶⁸ LUISELLI, 1976, 87.

rived verbatim from the history of Florus except for some interpolations, again as connective comments (87, 105, 108, 114, 116), plus a brief word-for-word-extract from the ‹breviarium› of Festus inserted en bloc (111–113).

In Sections 210–235 Festus is used as the main source except for the insertion of a single connective (212) and a short excerpt from Florus (224). Throughout these sections Jordanes does, however, take liberties with the text of Festus summarising and paraphrasing it frequently but never adding to it information from any other source (211, 212, 213, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 221, 225, 227, 228, 229, 231, 233, 234).⁶⁹ For sections 236–254 he again returns to Florus as his main source copying him exclusively except for the insertion of three personal comments (238, 241, 251) plus two sections from Festus (239–240) and one from Jerome (250).

So far we have covered *more than half* of the ‹Romana› and reached the reign of Augustus for all of which Jordanes has used only five sources: Genesis, Festus, Florus, Eusebius (Jerome) and a document on the origins of Rome – copying them verbatim and combining them or inserting sections of one within the other whenever necessary. This ‹scissors and paste› technique Jordanes himself calls quite accurately *abbreviatio chronicorum* (Get. 1).

For the period from Augustus to the death of Valens Jordanes is simply copying from the chronicle of Eusebius (Jerome) except for personal additions (261, 265, 271, 274, 276, 280, 299) as well as supplementary information from Festus (269, 270, 272, 280, 290, 291), Eutropius (235, 257, 259, 264, 267, 282, 290, 294, 304) and Orosius (256, 260, 262, 263, 265, 281, 288, 300, 301, 305, 309). Besides these there are five extra details (relating to Greek translations of the O.T.) which cannot be definitely traced to any of the sources used by Jordanes thus far (268, 270, 276, 277, 280). MOMMSEN marked these with his marginal ‹IGN›. Since these entries do not occur in Eusebius-Jerome amongst which they are to be found in Jordanes, then, as ENSSLIN argued, they must be the work of a Latin intermediary source which had reworked Jerome and added these entries from somewhere else. This, according to ENSSLIN (37), is an indication of Jordanes' use of Symmachus to be explained by the fact that one of the translators was named Symmachus. On the other hand, MOMMSEN (1882, XVII–XVIII) shrewdly observed that these extra details are all (with one exception – Trajan's statue at the entrance to the Red Sea [268] for which there is no other evidence) to be found in Epiphanius, ‹de mensuris et ponderibus›, and the chronicle of Isidore of Seville. There is clearly a relationship between the Greek and the Latin versions of Epiphanius and Jordanes.

The obvious supposition would be that they were originally in Eusebius' chronicle, but this fails to account for their appearance in Isidore unless he had either a fuller or separate translation (from Jerome) of Eusebius. By the same token, if we accept ENSSLIN's conclusion that Symmachus added them to Jerome's translation of Eusebius in the ‹Historia Romana›, we are obliged to posit either the unlikely

⁶⁹ cf. LUISELLI, 1976, 91–5.

assumption that Isidore too copied Symmachus, or that he also added these same entries to the chronicle from the same source as Symmachus. If so, what was this source?

Given Jordanes' method of composition – *abbreviatio chronicorum* – as it has manifested itself thus far, an annalistic chronicle seems the most obvious source for this information. Therefore, either Jordanes himself added these entries from another chronicle or he had a version of Jerome's translation of Eusebius which was fuller than the text we now possess. MOMMSEN (1882, XXCIII) was inclined to believe that these entries derived from some lost Alexandrian chronicle probably the redaction of Eusebius by Panodorus and Annianus. If so, we must reckon with the possibility that Jordanes used the original Greek chronicle of Eusebius (or an Alexandrian redaction) rather than Jerome's Latin translation. There is in fact some strong evidence for this. Firstly, Jordanes has the Persian king Artaxerxes' nickname <Macrochir> (Rom. 64) that is <long-hand> in Greek. Jerome, however, translates the original μακρόχειρ as *Longimanus* (HELM 110.19). If Jordanes was merely copying Jerome and did not know Greek he will hardly have been able to conjure up such a pedantic alteration. According to ENSSLIN (15), this Graecism of Jordanes betrays the hand of Symmachus because Ammianus Marcellinus (30.8.4) also refers to Artaxerxes as <Macrochir> and Ammianus was traditionally popular in Roman senatorial society. This is absurd. Not only was Ammianus not an intimate of the Roman aristocracy⁷⁰ but it was surely only natural for this *miles quondam et Graecus* (31.16.9) to refer to Artaxerxes by the Greek form of his name. In any event, to quote Ammianus to support a sixth century usage is rather dubious.

Secondly, Jordanes reports (Rom. 31) the hostility at the time of the Assyrian king Bellepares of the Hebrew Judge Aod and the other tribes. Jerome uses the word *alienigenae* (Helm 49a.8). Eusebius read ἀλλόφυλοι.⁷¹ Jordanes, however, does not use Jerome's *alienigenae* but *allofili*, that is the Greek form. ENSSLIN (15) assumed that this alteration could not be due to Jordanes because he was *agrammatus* therefore it must have been a conscious alteration of Jerome's *alienigenae* by Symmachus. Again this is a quite arbitrary conclusion based on the *assumption* that Jordanes could not read Greek which is contradicted by his own statements (Get. 3).

Taken together, both these forms – Macrochir and *allofili* – suggest that Jordanes had in front of him the original Greek chronicle of Eusebius as well as Jerome's Latin translation. If so, then he probably had an Alexandrian version of Eusebius which contained the entries relating to the O.T. translators which MOMMSEN thought derived from such a chronicle and which ENSSLIN attributed to Symmachus. That is to say, for both puzzling deviations from the text of Eusebius (as it appears in Jerome) a single common source can be found. Moreover – and again

⁷⁰ ALAN CAMERON, The Roman Friends of Ammianus, JRS 54, 1964, 15–28.

⁷¹ MOMMSEN, 1882, V (app. crit.).

this was MOMMSEN's original suggestion – the other dramatic departure from Eusebius' chronicle is the super-imposition of the Four Kingdom schema of Daniel, as widely interpreted by Christians. Jordanes, therefore, dates the birth of Christ to the year A. M. 5500 and in doing so follows the traditional date not of Eusebius but of the Byzantine chroniclers.⁷² In addition, it is worth noting that Jordanes includes the 130 years for Cain allowed by the Byzantine chroniclers which MOMMSEN (1882, XVI, n. 34) took to be yet another indication of Jordanes' use of a version of Eusebius affiliated to the Byzantine (Alexandrian) tradition.

It must be considered a realistic proposition that the deviations from Jerome's translation of Eusebius which occur in Jordanes are to be explained by his use of the Greek original of Eusebius or at least a later redaction of it which incorporated into it the Christian interpretation of the book of Daniel. But Jordanes apparently did use Jerome's translation as well. In any case, we must be wary of attributing all these additions and alterations to a single previous Latin source (Symmachus) whom Jordanes merely copied. Certainly, the question needs more thorough investigation.

So far I have tried to explain Jordanes on his own terms, compiling a textbook of universal and Roman history by the uncomplicated method of 'scissors and paste' using only a limited number of manageable and obvious sources. In doing so he demonstrates a clear grasp of his material and structure, an independent design and independent work.

The latter part of the 'Romana' from Theodosius I to 551 (315–388) is what has received most attention, and it is here that the influence of Symmachus has been most taken for granted. MOMMSEN pointed out that Marcellinus and Jordanes clearly relied on a common source more extensive than either and, because of the bias and proportion of eastern information which both contain, concluded that it must have been an eastern chronicle of some sort.⁷³ ENSSLIN compared Marcellinus and Jordanes more thoroughly showing that each copied and abridged the common source. He proposed, however, that the source was the lost history of Symmachus. Although this thesis was not everywhere accepted,⁷⁴ WES took it as proven and constructed upon it an elaborate thesis on the origin and significance of A. D. 476 as marking the end of the western empire.

Besides ENSSLIN's unobtrusive rejection of his own argument⁷⁵ it has been attacked on various grounds. DEMANDT pointed out,⁷⁶ and this has now been devel-

⁷² C. MANGO, *Byzantium. The Empire of New Rome* (London 1980) 190 ff. cf. MOMMSEN, 1882, XVII n. 43.

⁷³ MOMMSEN, 1882, XXIX; 1894, 55.

⁷⁴ above n. 43.

⁷⁵ *Beweise der Romverbundenheit in Theoderichs des Großen Außen- und Innenpolitik, I Goti in Occidente* (Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano sull' alto medio evo III) Spoleto 1956, 509–36.

⁷⁶ BZ, 1969, 98 cf. LUISELLI, 1976, 88 with n. 12, 96–7.

oped at greater length by MARKUS,⁷⁷ that the precise correspondences between Marcellinus and Jordanes remain without any sign of discontinuity beyond the period when Symmachus can possibly have been a source (A. D. 519–534 = Rom. 360–366) and between the Continuator of Marcellinus and Jordanes for the period 535–548 (= Rom. 367–387). Since the common source from 519 to 548 resembles in character the source for the period prior to 519, and since this cannot be Symmachus, then why should it be Symmachus for the period before 519? MARKUS does not entirely exclude Symmachus as a source for Marcellinus and Jordanes but does incline to MOMMSEN's original suggestion that the source common to Marcellinus and Jordanes was, for the most part, some Constantinopolitan chronicle. VARADY (1976, 448), independently of MARKUS, does not exclude Symmachus either but does insist that the *«Romana»* is essentially the work of Jordanes himself and is not a plagiarization of a single source like Symmachus, while LUISELLI (1976, 98–107) shows how at least part of the *«Romana»* is compiled from more than one source. Even so he too still does not exclude Symmachus. I think we can now take the argument a step further and eliminate Symmachus altogether as a key source for the *«Romana»*, especially as a *«Hauptquelle»*.

The eastern, as opposed to the western, bias of the *«Romana»* is most evident not only in its content but also in the very structure of the work: the individual reigns, according to which the *«Romana»* is divided up, reflect an eastern point of view. Following the division of the empire in 395 Arcadius and Honorius are treated as a joint rule, then comes Theodosius II (323–331), Marcian (332–334), Leo I (335–339), Leo II (340), Zeno (341–353), Anastasius (354–359), Justin I (360–362) and Justinian (363–387). The western emperors from the death of Honorius to the deposition of Romulus Augustulus are only considered as part of the reigns of those in the east. If Jordanes was using Symmachus as his major source for the fifth century then he has carefully incorporated it into an overall eastern design of his own.

More instructive, however, is Jordanes' knowledge of western affairs in the fifth century. Following the death of Valentinian III in 455 Maximus is described as an usurper (334) and Avitus, not recognized by the eastern emperor Marcian, is ignored altogether. Marcellinus too designates Maximus an usurper and ignores Avitus. Next comes Majorian, designated *Caesar* by Jordanes (335). Majorian was recognised as *Augustus* in the west but was only acknowledged as *Caesar* by the eastern court.⁷⁸ Jordanes' *Caesar* suggests, therefore, an eastern source. Severus succeeded Majorian as *Augustus* in the west in 461, but Jordanes (336) and Marcellinus (461.2) refer to his accession *sine principis iussu* as an usurpation which is precisely how it was treated by the eastern emperor.⁷⁹ In addition, it is worth not-

⁷⁷ R. A. MARKUS, *Politics and Historiography in Ostrogothic Italy: The Chronicle of Marcellinus and its Continuation in the Light of Recent Work*, ANRW III (forthcoming).

⁷⁸ above n. 12.

⁷⁹ above n. 14.

ing Jordanes' use of <Severianus>, an eastern form of the name.⁸⁰ In 463, however, Severus worked out some sort of deal whereby Leo regarded him as a legitimate ruler in the west (although not as *Augustus*). It is this which explains Jordanes' statement that Severus died in the third (not fifth) year of his reign. This is a strictly eastern account of Severus' reign just as we find it in Victor of Tunnuna⁸¹ and Theophanes.⁸²

Before being sent to Rome by Leo in 467 Anthemius was designated *Caesar*⁸³ and this is precisely how Jordanes describes him (336). In the <Romana> Jordanes proceeds directly from Anthemius to Glycerius, omitting Olybrius altogether. Glycerius is simply another usurper (338) but Nepos is sent from the east to dispose of him and thereafter became a legitimate *Augustus (regno potitus legitimo)* recognised by the eastern court (338). The deposition of Nepos by Orestes in 475 brought Augustulus to the throne and when he was, in turn, stripped of the purple the *Hesperium imperium* ceased (344–345).

If Jordanes was relying exclusively on Symmachus' traditional senatorial history of the Roman empire he would hardly have called Maximus, Severus and Glycerius usurpers and have omitted Avitus and Olybrius altogether. His use of imperial titlature and length of individual reigns is more accurate from the viewpoint of Constantinople than from that of Rome. This must be the view of IGNOTUS for it corresponds exactly to Marcellinus' account of the last western emperors as noted in Section II above. This suggests that the common source originated in Constantinople and there is nothing remarkable in that; both Marcellinus and Jordanes wrote in Constantinople and it was the self-professed aim of the former to follow *Oriente tantum imperium* (Chron. praef). Imperial affairs in the west were only incidental to those in the east and were therefore described from the viewpoint of Constantinople.

Also worth remarking on as an indication of Jordanes' eastern perspective is the preponderance of eastern events in the <Romana> especially in the period from the division of the empire in 395 where he is meant to be following Symmachus most slavishly. Not only is the information organised under the individual reigns of eastern emperors but a glance at its contents is sufficient to indicate that the bulk of Jordanes' information is eastern not western. If he were merely copying Symmachus we might expect the exact opposite. Equally instructive in this respect is the character of the information for which Jordanes is our only source or is only otherwise known from eastern records: the banishment of Honoria (328), the cession of Illyricum to the east (329), Boniface's invitation to the Vandals (330), the Ostrogothic alliance with the Huns (331), Arnigisclus' departure from Marciano-

⁸⁰ e.g. Theophanes, A. M. 5965 (DE BOOR 119).

⁸¹ 463.2 (ed. MOMMSEN, MGH. AA.XI, 187).

⁸² A. M. 5947 (DE BOOR 109) with NAGY, 1967, 178 and VARADY, 1976, 468.

⁸³ STEIN, 1959, 1, 359.

ple (331), the marriage of Pulcheria (332), the Nobadai and Blemmyes under Marcian (333), Anthemius as son-in-law of Marcian (336), Bigelis' death at the hands of Ardabur (336), the connections of Nepos (338), the death of Theoderic Strabo (346). These examples merely cover the period for which Symmachus is assumed to be Jordanes' sole source. It is quite evident that all the entries suggest an eastern rather than a western origin.⁸⁴

Jordanes, we may recall, had set out to answer the request of his friend Vigilius to outline world history and the rise and fall of Rome (Rom. 2) which the author claimed to gather briefly into a *storiuncula* (6) for the use of the *mediocres* (6). He asserts that his sources are chronicles and annals and the technique of composition simply *abbreviatio chronicorum* (Get. 1). The identifiable sources (Eusebius (Jerome), Florus, Festus, Orosius, Marcellinus) all fit this pattern but a seven-volume senatorial Roman History might not lend itself as readily to the task Jordanes had before him. Jordanes' own description of the purpose and scope of his work and the techniques of its execution are a true and accurate reflection of his own statements.⁸⁵ It follows, therefore, that he must be held responsible himself for gathering and collating his material to form the brief textbook survey he set out to complete. The independence of Jordanes in the research and presentation of his history, as well as in the matter of style which is not so necessary for our present purpose, must be upheld against the view that he merely copied Symmachus.

IV. *Marcellinus and Symmachus*

As I have tried to demonstrate in the previous section (III), ENSSLIN's interpretation of Symmachus as the common source for Marcellinus and Jordanes rests on the assumption of total inability and dependence on the part of Jordanes which is demonstrably wrong. However, all arguments about Jordanes' relative independence are secondary to the more direct question: did Marcellinus use Symmachus? Since Marcellinus well precedes Jordanes and since Marcellinus is the first datable source to register the fall of the western empire in 476, then any assessment of the origin and historiographical significance of the notion that the western empire ended with the advent of Odoacer must depend on a critical evaluation of Marcellinus' sources.

First of all, some general observations. We saw in Section II (above) that Marcellinus' fundamental source was the local *fasti* of Constantinople and that his framework and information for western affairs were contained in the same source;

⁸⁴ In addition, it is highly unlikely that the history of Symmachus would have included the period from Adam through the Assyrian, Persian and Greek kingdoms to the age of Augustus (cf. LUISELLI 1976, 87).

⁸⁵ VARADY, 1976, 448.

that is to say, he was only interested in major western events – imperial accessions, usurpations and deaths – obvious and necessary for any eastern writer. Marcellinus, furthermore, uses more complex narrative sources (Orosius, Palladius, etc.) only in so far as they lend themselves to use in such a chronicle and then only sparingly. If we are to consider the possibility of Marcellinus having used Symmachus then it must have been as a supplementary source for western affairs. ENSSLIN, however, by comparing Marcellinus and Jordanes, assumes that they both used Symmachus extensively; in the case of Marcellinus, as the sole source for all western information and probably for the bulk of other entries as well.

However, not only is it unlikely that in compiling an avowedly eastern chronicle an eastern chronicler would turn to a Roman narrative history as his basic source; in the case of Marcellinus such an assumption is out of the question. Also out of the question is the necessity to assume that Marcellinus' information on such events as imperial accessions in the west can only have come from a western source. All eastern sources (including Marcellinus), both chronicles and histories, contain such basic information on the west, and this is drawn from eastern sources. Add to that the practical obstacle: the basic sources for Marcellinus or any other chronicler had to be previous chronicles or similar material arranged annalistically. Larger scale histories like that of Symmachus were only used to provide extra information to a given entry-witness Marcellinus' use of Orosius.⁸⁶ So, if Marcellinus did in fact use Symmachus' 'Roman History' he will have done so perhaps once or twice by way of adding a detail or two. That is to say, although Symmachus can be ruled out as a major source for Marcellinus it is still possible that the chronicler used him and that the entry under 476, for example, originally derived from Symmachus.

If Marcellinus used Symmachus then the 'Roman History' must predate the chronicle. Both ENSSLIN and WES merely took this for granted and proceeded to argue on that basis. ENSSLIN assumed that the 'Roman History' was written under Theoderic.⁸⁷ WES (173), however, chose to be more precise and argued that Symmachus' work probably extended to 519 and was therefore written in that year or soon after but modestly avowed that this was not absolutely certain, only a strong likelihood. Since Marcellinus' chronicle was probably written immediately after the last event it describes in 518, there is no room for modesty here. WES' whole thesis turns on the year 519 for it was the consulship of Eutharic in that year and the settlement of the Acacian Schism which gave rise to the political perspective which WES attributes to Symmachus. So, if it can be shown that Marcellinus wrote before Symmachus then all the arguments of ENSSLIN and WES evaporate at once.

Let us examine WES' arguments for the date of Symmachus' history more care-

⁸⁶ MOMMSEN, 1894, 44.

⁸⁷ 1948, 84. He did point out (83), nevertheless, that the length of Theoderic's reign, 30 years, could not derive from Symmachus.

fully and begin by stating two guidelines: (1) Marcellinus' chronicle was written in 518/519, and (2) the date of Symmachus' history is not known and can only be inferred. Therefore, if Symmachus was used by Marcellinus his work must pre-date 518/519. WES' argument for 519 for Symmachus' 'Roman History' is twofold: on the one hand he makes the circumstantial point that, since Cassiodorus in his 'Chronicle' written in 519 does not refer to the significance of 476 whereas in the 'Gothic History' (extant in Jordanes, 'Getica') he does, then the view of Symmachus cannot have been known in 519. This is based on questionable assumptions: (a) that the 'Getica' of Jordanes equals, without reservation or alteration, the history of Cassiodorus; and (b) that Cassiodorus would naturally have followed the view of Symmachus. The second aspect of WES' argument is this: at Rom. 349 Jordanes describes the victory of Theoderic over Odoacer in 493 and comments that Theoderic's rule continued from then *prudenter et pacifice per triginta annos*. Unless this is a rounded number it is inaccurate for Theoderic died in 526, that is 33 years from 493. Further, the judgement *prudenter et pacifice* is in the opinion of WES most un-Symmachan unless it refers to the period before 519. Since Symmachus' history ended, to all intents and purposes in 489 (because Marcellinus has nothing western after that date!) then the thirty years must be dated from then; therefore, neatly, 489–519. Writing in 551 Jordanes, however, knew that Theoderic had reigned 37 (not 30 years) but being *agramatus* he was not able to adjust the calculation. So the 'Historia Romana' ended in 519. Thus WES.

The facts are rather different: Jordanes calculates the 30 years from 493, not 489, so 30 as a round figure for 33 is acceptable. Moreover, under 489 Marcellinus does in fact mention the death of Odoacer in 493. If there is any *caesura* at all, of the kind WES thinks, then it must be 493. The net result of this mental gymnastics is that the 519 date for Symmachus' history is entirely without foundation.⁸⁸ But that is no real problem. It just means that the 'Roman History' was written earlier and could still have been used by Marcellinus. Still, the awkward fact remains that WES accepted the 519 date himself and argued his elaborate thesis without paying close attention to the fact that, according to his own chronology, Marcellinus and Symmachus wrote in the same year in different parts of the empire; indeed Marcellinus may even have written *before* Symmachus. Nonetheless the 'Roman History' was probably written a few years earlier.⁸⁹ Even though this detracts somewhat from WES' total case it does keep Symmachus in the picture.

It was ENSSLIN who first argued that the IGNOTUS was a western history rather than some eastern chronicle or complex of chronicles. The value of his contribution is that it enables us to see more precisely how Marcellinus and Jordanes drew independently on the same source. However, the fundamental link in the whole argument is this: what makes the IGNOTUS *specifically* western and *definitely not*

⁸⁸ DEMANDT, BZ, 1969, 99–100; VARADY, 1976, 453 n. 13.

⁸⁹ For such a suggestion: NAGY, 1967, 163 n. 13.

eastern? ENSSLIN's entire thesis rests ultimately on his interpretation of several key points, each of which is questionable. They are:

1. The Marriage of Eudoxia and Valentinian III (Rom. 329, Marc. 437)

Jordanes refers to the cession of Illyricum to the east and this claims ENSSLIN (71) was an especially live issue in Roman senatorial circles in the time of Symmachus because Cassiodorus (Var. 11.19) mentions it. However that may be, we can be certain that the question was equally, if not more, important in the east particularly since the Ostrogoths had taken control of Sirmium to which the east laid claim.⁹⁰

2. Boniface's invitation to the Vandals (Rom. 330, Get. 167, not in Marc.)

This is more complex. The fact of the matter is that, besides Jordanes, every source which repeats the accusation that Boniface invited the Vandals into Africa in 429 is eastern.⁹¹ The most natural assumption is that Jordanes' information comes from an eastern source as well. It has been argued, on the other hand, that the invitation was invented by Cassiodorus who simply coalesced two statements in the chronicle of Prosper, hence Jordanes simply copied⁹² but this fails to account for all of the other sources beginning with Procopius.

3. The Ostrogoth/Hun Invasion of Thrace (Rom. 331, Marc. 442.2)

Jordanes is the only source to actually state that the Ostrogoths accompanied the Huns in their Balkan invasions and this, according to ENSSLIN (73) must reflect a source written under Gothic rule – therefore Italy in the time of Theodoric. By the same token, it has been argued that Symmachus is not the source for this statement but that it was actually invented by Jordanes himself to clarify Marcellinus' entry and yet, by a remarkable co-incidence, it turned out to be a true statement.⁹³ The fact is that the other barbarian tribes in the Hunnic confederation (including the Ostrogoths) did join in the Hun invasion and this information was readily available in the east. All our information on these invasions does come from eastern sources (the *Chronicon Paschale*, Priscus, Theophanes and, of course, Marcellinus) or those based on eastern sources like the *Gallic Chronicle of 452*.⁹⁴

4. The Death of Basiliscus (Rom. 342, Marc. 476.1)

In describing the death of Basiliscus both Marcellinus and Jordanes refer to Basiliscus as *perfidia Nestoriana inflatus*. In view of the western objections to Basiliscus' Nestorianism and the Henotikon of Zeno *vor allem in römischen Krei-*

⁹⁰ STEIN, 1959, 2, 156 cf. the comment of ENSSLIN (98) on Jordanes' attitude to a united Illyricum (already noted by LAVARENNE, 1950, 328).

⁹¹ Beginning with Procopius (Wars 1.3.25). For later references and the suggestion that it may go back to Priscus: C. COURTOIS, *Les Vandales et l'Afrique* (Paris 1955) 156 with n. 1.

⁹² NAGY, 1967, 164.

⁹³ T. NAGY, *Les campagnes d'Attila aux Balkans et la valeur du témoignage de Jordanes concernant les Germains*, AAH 4, 1956, 251–9.

⁹⁴ O. J. MAENCHEN-HELFEN, *The World of the Huns* (Berkeley 1973) 456–7.

sen> there is no reason, according to ENSSLIN (79), why this should not derive from Symmachus. On the contrary, both Marcellinus and Jordanes were staunch opponents of Nestorianism in their own right; and anti-Nestorian feeling was just as strong, if not stronger, in the eastern capital. No western source is necessary for this opinion.

5. The Birth of Christ (Rom. 258)

To the text of Eusebius (Jerome) from which Jordanes copies he adds *carne pasus est, non deitate*, the so-called *Theopaschite formula*, which ENSSLIN takes as a singular indication of <die kirchlichen Interessen der römischen Senatskreise> (28) deriving therefore from Symmachus. To this may be added the fact, noted previously, that in the <Romana> Jordanes integrates into his work the Christian view of Daniel so that he places the birth of Christ in A. M. 5500 (Rom. 85). ENSSLIN (19) points out that this date occurs in an Italian chronicle thereby insinuating an Italian origin for Jordanes' information. However, as we have seen, this dating was originally worked out by Julius Africanus and prevailed mainly in the east. Certainly it cannot be taken as a sign of an exclusively western source. Nor can the expression of Christ's manhood be exclusively western. The Christological question was just as fiercely debated in Constantinople where Jordanes wrote.

6. Josephus and Claudian

At Get. 29 Jordanes quotes from Josephus as an *annalium relator verissimus* and adds from him to Rom. 57. ENSSLIN assumes (23) that the <Getica> reference derives from Cassiodorus despite Jordanes' own statement *haec vero quae diximus de gente Gothorum principia cur omiserit, ignoramus*. Ignoring this as mere pretence on the part of Jordanes ENSSLIN (24) then assumes that the Josephus addition in the <Romana> must come from elsewhere but close to Cassiodorus. This is a dangerous compound of assumptions. The simplest solution is to assume that Jordanes was telling the truth in Get. 29. Josephus was, therefore, available to him in Constantinople. Likewise Marcellinus' quote from Claudian (Eutr. 1.8) is taken as not his own but from some western source: <Man wird nicht glauben wollen, daß der Chronist dieses Zitat aus Eigenem beigesteuert habe, aber wohl nicht fehl gehen mit der Annahme, daß er es in einer auf Rom und seine Oberschicht weisenden Quelle gefunden haben konnte> (67). ENSSLIN should have looked further. Claudian was being read in Constantinople in the sixth century and there is no reason why Marcellinus did not know him (or at least this particular verse) at first hand. John the Lydian (mag. i. 1.47), for example, quotes Claudian.

When the details of ENSSLIN's case are distilled this is the residue and very slender it is too. In fact, these six points constitute the total substance of the argument that the *IGNOTUS* must be western.⁹⁵ In each instance an eastern source is equally, if

⁹⁵ I exclude the following points because the evidence for them adduced by ENSSLIN is so obviously weak: (1) other indications of Symmachus' use of the HA (39, 45–6, 52); (2) De-

not more, likely than a western one. Besides these points of subject matter ENSSLIN also adduces several philological details in support of his exclusively western source. Most of these are too trifling to merit serious consideration and ENSSLIN, to be fair, does not place much weight on them himself. Let us take the three most impressive examples: (1) *Macrochir*, (2) *Ariagne*, (3) *modernus*. The first, as noted previously, does not reflect Symmachian usage at all, especially not for the reason ENSSLIN cites – its occurrence in Ammianus. The second, *Ariagne*, is especially unconvincing because ENSSLIN (78) cites as its specifically western form the chronicle of Victor of Tunnuna written in Constantinople. Thirdly, the late Latin *modernus* is taken to be peculiarly western because it is used by Cassiodorus and Ennodius (57). ENSSLIN failed to add, however, that it is known for Constantinople where the *«Romana»* was written: e.g. Nov. Just. iv. 3.1 *in ordine moderno* (in Greek τῆς νῦν); Priscian, Gramm. III. 528.10 *apud modernos*. If anything is to be deduced at all from the language of Marcellinus and Jordanes about the origin of their common information it is probably the opposite of ENSSLIN's hypothesis. The very expression used to describe the fallen empire in 476 – *Hesperium imperium* – seems to me to be peculiarly Greek and to suggest an exclusively eastern origin for the Latin form.⁹⁶ So far as I can discover, except for Marcellinus and Jordanes, the only other (non-poetic) usage of the term is also to be found in a document written in Constantinople precisely at the time of Marcellinus and Jordanes: Nov. Just. 72 c. 1 (538) where *hesperia praefectura* is used for the Prefecture of Italy. The rarity of the *«Hesperian»* form in Latin is to be contrasted with its occurrence in Greek where it is the normal term used by eastern writers to refer to the western emperor and empire. A purely random search reveals:

(a) For the empire:

- τὸ κράτος τῶν ἑσπερίων (Socr., H. E. 1.1)
 ἢ τῆς ἑσπέρας βασιλεία (Thphn., chron. [DE BOOR 119.1, 94.2])
 τὰ τῶν ἑσπερίων Ῥωμαίων (Evagr., H. E. 2.16)
 τὰ τῆς ἑσπερίας βασιλεία (Jo. Ant., fr. 204 [FHG IV, 616])
 τὰ τῶν ἑσπερίων Ῥωμαίων (Jo. Ant., fr. 201 [FHG IV, 614])

(b) For the emperor:

- ὁ τῆς Ἑσπέρας βασιλεὺς (Agathias, 4.29.3)
 ὁ τῶν Ἑσπερίων βασιλεὺς (Jo. Ant., fr. 203 [FHG IV, 616])

cius' death *bellantibus Gothis* can only come from a Roman history written in the time of Theoderic (42); (3) since the passage on the statue of Trajan (Rom. 268) probably comes from Ammianus it indicates a Roman senatorial source (34); (4) the alternation of Florus' *Ianumque geminum* to Vergil's *Ianumque bifrontem* comes from Symmachus because he copied a manuscript of Macrobius (90); (5) mention of Crassus' Parthian defeat hints at an early sixth-century source because Anastasius went to war with Persia (103); (6) the following as examples of exclusively western Latin: *doctores fidei* (31), *idolorum cultura* (51), *Acholiis* (61); *utraque respublica* (64). For yet other points: LAVARENNE, 1950, 328.

⁹⁶ cf. VARADY, 1976, 478 and 1978, 112.

When all is said and done, ENSSLIN's case for Symmachus does not stand up to a rigorous examination. It is exaggerated and hypothetical and based on no firm evidence. He has demonstrated how Marcellinus and Jordanes drew on a common source but has offered not a single incontrovertible reason why the common source must have been western rather than eastern. This is a crucial and decisive weakness in his argument. It is not, perhaps, surprising to learn that he later ignored the theory he had painstakingly assembled.

Put bluntly, there is absolutely no reason or evidence for assuming that Marcellinus used Symmachus extensively in his chronicle, nor that Symmachus provided the *«Hauptquelle»* for the *«Romana»*. The relationship between Marcellinus and Jordanes must now be re-defined. Both VARADY and MARKUS have recently returned to MOMMSEN's original conclusion: Marcellinus and Jordanes both made use of the same eastern chronicle or complex of chronicles.⁹⁷ Neither VARADY nor MARKUS however, have completely abandoned Symmachus. The formulation of the end of the western empire in 476 by the *«Romans of Rome»*, as reconstructed by WES, has a powerful hold.

Eliminating ENSSLIN's theory seriously undermines the superstructure of WES although it remains possible, of course, that Marcellinus and Jordanes did use the *«Roman History»* of Symmachus and did draw from it their notices concerning the fall of the western empire in 476. Any approach to WES must, therefore, begin with his use of ENSSLIN. Was he aware of and did he seek to circumvent the weaknesses of ENSSLIN's arguments?

The sad truth is that WES accepted ENSSLIN's case entirely and uncritically. His whole theory is based on accepting ENSSLIN as proven beyond doubt. WES dismissed the early objections to ENSSLIN's theory as inadequate and confessed puzzlement, though he did not take heed, at ENSSLIN's subsequent rejection of his own theory.⁹⁸ He consequently *assumed* that the *«Romana»* was Symmachus pure and simple, not Jordanes, and could be exploited as a repository of Roman senatorial attitudes. He did not, therefore, address himself independently and critically to the basic question: where did Marcellinus get his information on 476 from? In other words, what has research taught us about Marcellinus' sources? This omission by itself does not inspire confidence in WES' reconstruction of the cross-currents of aristocratic attitudes in Italy and Constantinople nor in his special thesis that in c. 519 a disillusioned Symmachus first expressed the notion that the Roman empire had ended in 476 and that this was copied by Marcellinus and Jordanes.⁹⁹

The core of WES' book (87 ff), to which most attention must be devoted, is his chapter on the sources for A. D. 476. Here he identifies four characteristic groups: (1) the *«weströmisches-legitimistisch»* viewpoint reflected in the so-called *«Ravenna*

⁹⁷ MARKUS (n. 77 above); VARADY, 1976.

⁹⁸ WES, 1967, 79 cf. VARADY, 1976, 455 n. 13.

⁹⁹ In addition to his uncritical acceptance of ENSSLIN there are several other theoretical shortcomings in his study many of which were pointed out by DEMANDT, BZ, 1969, 96–101.

Annals» which puts the end of the western empire in 480 with the death of Nepos; (2) those written in Constantinople (Malchus and Procopius) viewing the west as part of the united empire and who therefore saw no special significance in the events of 476; (3) those written in Ravenna who accepted the regime of Theoderic and the legitimacy of his position vis-à-vis the eastern court – Cassiodorus and the Anonymus Valesianus; (4) the Roman senatorial viewpoint reflected in Symmachus (= Marcellinus and Jordanes) who saw a clear rupture in the west in 476 and looked back with chagrin on their lost empire.

To isolate the point of view of Symmachus in this way and concentrate on developing it does lead to a possible explanation of its meaning but the differentiation of those four perspectives and the ideological groupings associated with them is itself highly questionable. DEMANDT (1969, 97) has already noticed that the «weströmisch-legitimistisch» view is a mirage in so far as the *Auctarium Hauniensis* does not equate the death of Nepos with the end of the western empire at all. To this may be added that WES' acceptance of HOLDER-EGGER's reconstruction of a monolithic «Ravenna Annals» without reference to the subsequent researches of KAUFMANN and SEECK (discussed in Section II, above) is a cause for concern. As for the other three groupings, the boundaries between them are not as clear as WES would have us believe. For example, the pro-Gothic view of Cassiodorus and the wistful anti-Gothic view of Symmachus which WES distinguishes between can just as easily be assimilated, as MOMIGLIANO (1956) has done, into a single milieu – the Anicii in this instance. Yet MARKUS has been able to show how inconsistent were the sympathies of the Anicii towards the Goths and we are aware of the dangers of using Jordanes' «Getica» as a guide to the opinions of Cassiodorus.¹⁰⁰ Perhaps the clearest indication, however, of the arbitrary nature of these categories as the embodiment of particular political groups and perspectives is that it has now been argued (taking WES as a basis!) that Procopius' and Eugeippius' treatment of the deposition of Romulus Augustulus also goes back to Symmachus so that WES' polarised eastern and western viewpoints are completely assimilated.¹⁰¹

The isolation of and concentration on the ideology of the «Romans of Rome» is based on Marcellinus' and Jordanes' statements that the *Hesperium imperium* fell in 476. If these statements do not derive from Symmachus then the whole ideological superstructure is meaningless and self-destructs. I have endeavoured to show above how Marcellinus cannot possibly have used Symmachus as extensively as WES insists, but left open the possibility that he copied the 476 entry from Symmachus. How does WES treat this specific point?

To begin with, he rather oddly places Jordanes *before* Marcellinus in his exposi-

¹⁰⁰ above n. 77.

¹⁰¹ H. CASTRITIUS, Das Problem des Epochenbewußtseins am Beispiel der Reaktion auf die Vorgänge des Jahres 476 n. Chr., *Mitteil. der Techn. Univ. Carolo-Wilhelmina zu Braunschweig* 10, 1975, 13–18, effectively rejected by VARADY, 1976, 480 n. 20 and 1978, 123–4.

tion of the texts thus obscuring the basic fact that Marcellinus, not Jordanes, first records the significance of 476. Then he proceeds to explain that Marcellinus, an easterner and admirer of Justinian, could not possibly have understood the meaning of the date in the way he expresses it.¹⁰² But this is self-contradictory. Whether Marcellinus invented it or not, the fact that he *chose* to include it implies that he understood what it meant. Moreover, the presupposition that Marcellinus and Jordanes simply reproduced Symmachus uncritically does not square with their contradictory treatment of the subsequent barbarian rulers of Italy. WES (155) contends that to mark 476 as the end of the western empire Symmachus must have seen Odoacer as a tyrant. Yet, Marcellinus and Jordanes do not view him as such.¹⁰³ To judge from Marcellinus' comment that Odoacer was killed *ab Theodorico . . . periuriis* (489) both viewed him positively. Marcellinus' attitude to Theoderic is consistently and violently hostile (479.2, 482, 483, 487, 489) while Jordanes is the opposite – *prudenter et pacifice* (Rom. 349). The most natural way to explain this contradiction is to assume that either Marcellinus or Jordanes (or both) possessed an independent and critical view of Theoderic which would, of course, concede to them a degree of independence in treating western affairs which they are not permitted in the WES hypothesis. WES tries to circumvent this by arguing that the positive attitude in Jordanes, which cannot be reconciled with the assumption of Symmachus' hostility to Theoderic in the 'Roman History', reflects an ambiguity in Symmachus' attitude to Theoderic, that is to say he viewed him favourably before 519 but not after. This rationalisation is unconvincing, and does not account for the fact that if Marcellinus' negative treatment of Theoderic cannot come from Symmachus then why should his comment on the significance of 476 for the west derive from Symmachus? This is simply shoddy logic and leads one to suspect that the most natural assumption – that Marcellinus and Jordanes must be taken as independent authors with at least some critical discretion – is actually correct.

The same inconsistency can be found in other rationalisations, for that is what they really are: that Cassiodorus' chronicle, the Anonymus Valesianus and Euegius mark no fall of the western empire in 476 reflects their sympathy for Theoderic (70,86); that Symmachus' consulship in 485 does not signify his acknowledgement of Odoacer but the fact that he simply had no choice (81), and that since the 'Getica' of Jordanes can be taken as entirely Cassiodorus, then because the significance of 476 is recorded in the 'Getica' Cassiodorus must have changed his mind – under the influence of Symmachus – since 519 (82).

All in all, WES' case for assuming that Marcellinus merely copied Symmachus uncritically for his entry on the year 476 is extremely shaky. From the evidence considered so far the most compelling explanation for its origin is MOMMSEN'S

¹⁰² 1967, 75, 79 cf. DEMANDT, BZ 1969, 97.

¹⁰³ As already observed by DEMANDT, BZ 1969, 100.

opinion that it must be derived from a Constantinopolitan chronicle, that is, it is an eastern not a western viewpoint. That this is in fact the case emerges most clearly from WES' treatment of the last western emperors where the inadequacy of his thesis is exposed most starkly when he is forced to produce an astonishing series of spurious explanations to argue away the patently eastern view of western affairs contained in Marcellinus and Jordanes.

To begin with, there is Aetius. Marcellinus offers the curious statement that the western empire fell not only in 476 but with the death of Aetius as well: *Aetius magna occidentalis rei publicae salus et regi Attilae terror a Valentiniano imperatore cum Boethio amico in palatio trucidatur et cum ipso Hesperium cecidit regnum nec hactenus relevari* (454.2).

This parallels the entry under 476 but how do you explain the fact that Marcellinus provides two separate dates for the fall of the *Hesperium regnum*? The statement at 454 would seem to be a totally positive and practical one – Aetius was the last western general strong enough to beat off the barbarians and without him the empire was helpless. This is precisely the sort of opinion that we expect from someone looking at the barbarised west from Constantinople. John of Antioch (fr. 201.2 = FHG, IV, 613) says much the same and Jordanes too (Get. 176, 191); while Procopius (Wars 1.3.15) described Aetius as 'the last of the Romans'.

According to WES, this must come from Symmachus, whose date of 476 for the fall of the western empire is a touchstone of imperial ideology. No such ideology, however, is thought to underline this 454 date. It is simply part of the 476 date in so far as it signifies 'the beginning of the end' (126). Moreover, it is Symmachus' view because Aetius was a friend of the aristocracy and an ally of Symmachus' father. In fact, Aetius and Symmachus' father were consular colleagues in 446. This, at least for WES, must have called for some special comment in Symmachus' history and he proceeds to uncover a trace of it in Marcellinus. Now the chronicle lists as the consuls of 446 *Valentiniani VII et Aetii III* which is erroneous since the elder Symmachus was most certainly consul in 446 with Aetius. By the same token, there is no doubt that Marcellinus wrote 'Valentinian' and not 'Symmachus'. It is not a scribal error.¹⁰⁴ Assuming that since Marcellinus is mistaken and that he must have meant to write 'Symmachus', WES observes that this is the only exception to Marcellinus' pattern of putting the senior consul first thereby confirming a pro-Symmachan source! Marcellinus' mistake suggests the precise opposite.

Faced with the fact that, according to his own interpretation, Maximus, the doyen of the mid-fifth century Roman aristocracy is represented as an usurper in the tradition of Roman senatorial opinion and is made responsible for the murder of Valentinian III, WES argues that he must have been so detestable and ambitious a character that even the senate was forced to disown him. WES overlooks the fact that Majorian is described by Marcellinus and Jordanes as *Caesar* and not *Augustus*—

¹⁰⁴ MOMMSEN, 1894, 57.

tus; and dismisses their description of Severus (*Augustus* in the west) as an usurper thus: «usurper is too strong a term for this straw man» (137). Olybrius elected, according to Malalas (375.5, DINDORF) μετὰ τῆς γνώμης τοῦ συνκλήτου Ῥώμης is ignored completely by Jordanes and WES takes this as a deliberate attempt by Symmachus to avoid having to mention the truth about Olybrius – that he was an ally of Gaeseric – but then goes on to concede (141) that this could be due to Jordanes' own editorial interference!

Although WES views Symmachus' history as an infallible guide to Roman views of their emperors he skips around the fact that Nepos was recognised in the west until 480 and that Odoacer continued to mint coins in his name;¹⁰⁵ that is, Nepos was surely regarded as a legitimate emperor by the senate as well. One would expect that if anything the Roman senatorial opinion would be that the empire ended in 480 but, since WES attributes the paramount significance of 476 to a Roman senatorial origin, he must explain away the legitimacy of Nepos in senatorial opinion. He does so by saying that since Nepos was of doubtful lineage – related to the former *magister militum* of Dalmatia as well as the eastern emperor (through Ariadne) – he was hardly an emperor «through and through» of the kind the Roman aristocracy wished (144–5).

From these examples alone it would seem that WES' special point, namely that the «Romana» is a repository of Roman senatorial attitudes, is without solid foundation and calls into question the basis upon which it is constructed. The argument proceeds on the assumption that the year 519 marked a rupture in Theoderic's relations with the senate and that their mutual latent ill-feeling erupted into violent hostility in 519 and it was only in 519 that the significance of 476 suddenly became crystal-clear (170–1). WES argues that the settlement of the Acacian schism and the consulship of Eutharic heralded a bright future for the Ostrogoths and caused the senate to reflect that the western empire was no more, that it had ceased with the advent of Odoacer and was now beyond restoration.

In addition to the doubtful reasons discussed above for positing 519 as the date for Symmachus' history – the calculation of the 30 years from 489, the fact that in his «chronicle» Cassiodorus does not dwell on the meaning of 476 – there is the more substantial point open to question: why did the significance of 476 only become clear in 519 and in the west rather than the east? To sustain his case WES (149 ff.) interprets the relationship between the senate and Theoderic (and Odoacer) as cynical and suspicious, a sort of latent power struggle with the Goths emerging victorious in 519. The plain fact is, however, that the senate enjoyed not an erosion but an increase in power and influence under Odoacer and Theoderic and WES (173) is himself forced to admit that the 30 year rule of Theoderic *prudenter*

¹⁰⁵ J.P.C.KENT, Julius Nepos and the Fall of the Western Empire, *Corolla Memoriae Erich Swoboda dedicata* (Römische Forschungen in Niederösterreich, 5) Graz 1966, 146–50.

ac pacifice (Rom. 349) is the view of Symmachus, so that the senate did view Theoderic's reign before 519 positively. Yet, at the same time, WES (155) seeks to de-emphasise the benefits Odoacer and Theoderic showered on the senate in order to stress the year 476 as a symbol of discontinuity. The considerable body of research on the position of the Roman senate under barbarian rule, much of it overlooked or underplayed by WES, demonstrates the positive respect Odoacer and Theoderic had for the senate and the extent to which they enhanced and consolidated its pristine status and privileges.¹⁰⁶ WES (155) is quite wrong and misleading, for example, to dismiss Odoacer's concessions to the senate as having only propagandist value. Taken together, WES' doubtful chronology and his over-stated interpretation of the senate's relations with the barbarian kings after 476 lead one to doubt whether the events of 519 had such repercussions in senatorial circles as he alleges. The facts themselves seem, at least to me, to suggest the exact opposite: that is to say, the union of east and west did not consolidate the Gothic regime but imperilled it. It was such a union which might encourage the Catholic senate to push for the removal of the Goths and the reinstatement of imperial rule in Italy and this is, after all, precisely what happened.¹⁰⁷ The soured relations between Theoderic and the senate, culminating in the executions of Boethius and Symmachus, stemmed from the king's isolated and precarious position in the wake of Justin's Arian persecutions and the desire of the emperor (and probably the senate) to unite east and west politically as well as religiously. There can be no doubt that 519 marked a turning point in relations between Theoderic and the emperor, but it did not signify the resignation of the Roman senate to the permanence of the Gothic regime. If anything, it denoted the necessary first step towards its replacement. Moreover, one would expect that, looking back from the vantage point of thirty years, a Roman senator would mark 480 as the end of the western empire, that is, the year in which the last emperor acknowledged by the senate died.

It would be rash to suggest that nobody in Italy or among the senators at Rome in the time of Theoderic articulated the fact that, practically speaking, the western empire effectively ended with the deposition of Romulus Augustulus. However, as it appears in Marcellinus and Jordanes the significance of 476 represents the viewpoint of Constantinople. It was felt and said and recorded in the imperial capital

¹⁰⁶ MATTHEWS, 1969, 275 noted that WES did not use A. CHASTAGNOL, *La Prefecture Urbaine à Rome sous le Bas-Empire* (Paris 1960) and P. DE FRANCISCI, *Per la storia del senato romano e della curia nei secoli V e VI*, RPA 22, 1946/7, 275–317 and did not make <active use> of C. PIETRI, *Le sénat, le peuple chrétien et les partis au cirque sous le pape Symmaque* (498–514), MEFR 78, 1966, 122–39 although it is listed in WES' bibliography. BROWN, 1972, 232 likewise noted the omission of L. CRACCO-RUGGINI, *Economia e società nell' Italia annonaria* (Milan 1961). To these I would add not only the omission of the work of KAUFMANN, SEECK and HOLDER-EGGER on the relationship between Marcellinus and the local records of Constantinople but also observe that, although HOLDER-EGGER, NA, 1877 is listed in the bibliography, it is not properly exploited in the text (75 notes 8 and 9).

¹⁰⁷ A. VASILIEV, *Justin the First* (Washington 1950) chap. 6; CHADWICK, 1981, 45 ff.

that in 476 the *Hesperium imperium*, as it was called in the east, had ceased to be and had not thus far been re-established. The historiographical significance of 476 does not derive from and represent the ideology of the Roman senate at all. It was, at least as it appears in Marcellinus and Jordanes, a Byzantine perspective. This being the case we might expect to find similar statements noting the end of the western empire in 476 in other Byzantine records, just as Marcellinus' information on other events is clarified by comparison with other Byzantine sources, particularly the chronicles.

V. *The View from Constantinople*

When Odoacer sent the young Romulus Augustulus to Lucullanum in September 476 there was no question of this marking the end of the western empire. There was, after all, still a legitimate emperor (Nepos) in Dalmatia. Clearly, Odoacer did acknowledge Nepos as emperor and minted coins in his name.¹⁰⁸

In addition, assuming the revival of copper coinage to pre-date the death of Nepos in 480, he minted coins for Zeno as well.¹⁰⁹ As far as Italy and the senate were concerned there was still a western emperor until 480. Zeno too had continued to acknowledge Nepos as the rightful western emperor,¹¹⁰ although he did not, practically speaking, hold sway over Italy. Yet, Zeno was not prepared to undertake a campaign to restore Nepos to Italy and turned down Theoderic's offer to do just that.¹¹¹ The death of Nepos placed Odoacer in an ambiguous position. There was now no western emperor at all, but Zeno could still lay claim to rule the west. From now on, Odoacer was prepared to recognise, or to continue to recognise, Zeno and took it upon himself to name consuls annually.¹¹² As far as the east was concerned, Odoacer's rule in Italy dated from the death of Nepos in 480. That is how Procopius and Theophanes at least calculate it.¹¹³

Zeno, however, was only prepared to tolerate this situation as long as necessity demanded. In 489, therefore, he saw an opportunity to get rid of both Odoacer and the increasing nuisance of Theoderic by offering Italy to Theoderic. He was to conquer Odoacer and keep law and order until Zeno could arrive to re-establish imperial rule. Irrespective of the accuracy of our informants for these motives (chiefly Jordanes and the Anonymus Valesianus) it seems that, from the point of view of the east, it was still considered proper and possible to restore the western

¹⁰⁸ KENT, 1956, 146–50. The most authentic Italian source offers the curious information that Romulus ruled for 10 years (Anon. Val. 36).

¹⁰⁹ For details and a proposed date (477): CHASTAGNOL, 1966, 53 with n. 114.

¹¹⁰ Malchus, frag. 20 (FHG IV, 132).

¹¹¹ Malchus, frag. 20 (FHG IV, 132).

¹¹² CHASTAGNOL, 1966, 55.

¹¹³ PROC., Wars 1.1 with HODGKIN, 1885, 3, 129 to which add Theophanes, A. M. 5965 (DE BOOR 119.25).

throne. Yet the sort of interregnum which had prevailed before and after the reign of Severus (461, 465) was now so prolonged that it was questionable whether there was any need for an emperor at all in Italy. Moreover, the barbarian interlude had become consolidated by the partition of land.

Theoderic's regime merely reinforced the incorporation of the barbarians into Italian society but was scrupulously careful to preserve traditional Roman institutions and to conciliate those who cherished them most – the senatorial aristocracy. Theoderic was careful too in his relationship with Zeno and Anastasius (at least until 497), to ensure that the eastern emperor understood that Theoderic acknowledged him as emperor.¹¹⁴

By the turn of the sixth century it will have been obvious that however desirable and however often it was contemplated – Priscian (pan. Anast., 226) held out the hope – the restoration of the western empire was, practically speaking, a doubtful proposition. There was no longer a western emperor and there had not been an emperor in Italy since 476. It is perfectly understandable how this foreboding about the west should have arisen in Constantinople and the east. We simply have no evidence, unless we ascribe the statements of Marcellinus and Jordanes to Symmachus, of any westerner saying that their empire had ceased precisely in 476. This contrasts strikingly with the eastern reactions to the last western emperors.

In the life of Isidore written in Athens in the 520s by the neoplatonist, Damascius, the author comments (with reference to the reign of Anthemius) that the Roman senator Severus will return to Rome from Alexandria, with the favour of the emperor, to restore Rome which had already fallen (πεσοῦσα),¹¹⁵ and Malchus remarks with reference to a mutiny in Thrace in 478 that the lot of the Romans had diminished (ἐξᾰπόλωλε).¹¹⁶ Both these examples represent the expression of a feeling in the east that in the 470s Rome itself and the western empire had fallen beyond recovery. It is also worth adding in this context that it was in Constantinople at the turn of the sixth century that Zosimus (2.7, 3.32, 4.59) lamented the empire's loss of territories, among other things. He surely meant to include Italy and the west.

Given the fact that, as far as the Byzantines were concerned at the beginning of the sixth century, the west had been overrun by barbarians and the western empire itself had ceased to be, it is hardly surprising to find that they attempted to pinpoint its passing away. Marcellinus writing in Constantinople reflects this pragmatic Byzantine perspective when he offers the opinion (not necessarily his own invention therefore) that the western empire really fell with the death of Aetius. Thereafter there was no-one in the west capable of containing the barbarians. Marcellinus im-

¹¹⁴ JONES, 1962, 126 ff.

¹¹⁵ Damascius, *vitā Isidori*, fr. 64 (ZINTZEN) = Photius, *Bibl. Cod.* 242. 64 (HENRY 6,21).

¹¹⁶ Frag. 16 (FHG IV, 124). This and the Damascius passage are noted and discussed by KAEGLI, 1976, 5–9.

plies that had Aetius lived, or someone of his calibre replaced him, the western empire might still be functioning as such. For Theophanes, writing in the ninth century but drawing on fifth and sixth century sources, the western empire ceased not with Aetius but with Ricimer. After the death of Severus Ricimer held effective power so there was, to all intents and purposes, no emperor in the west after 465 (A. M. 5947, DE BOOR 109.12–13).

Into this category we can put Marcellinus' other statement for the fall of the western empire: *Odoacer rex Gothorum Romam optinuit. Orestem Odoacer ilico trucidavit. Augustulum filium Orestis Odoacer in Lucullano Campaniae castello exilii poena damnavit. Hesperium Romanae gentis imperium, quod septingentesimo nono urbis conditae anno primus Augustorum Octavianus Augustus tenere coepit, cum hoc Augustulo periit, anno decessorum regni imperatorum quingentesimo vigesimo secundo, Gothorum dehinc regibus Roman tenentibus* (476.2).

Drawing on the *IGNOTUS* some local Byzantine chronicle or official *fasti*, Jordanes expresses the same view although he does not reproduce the erroneous statement that Odoacer was king of the Goths (Rom. 344, Get. 242). Since both Marcellinus and Jordanes took their notices of the deposition of Romulus Augustulus from a Constantinopolitan source we should expect to find that the year 476 as marking the end of the western empire passed into the Byzantine historiographical tradition to the earliest stages of which Marcellinus stands in close proximity.¹¹⁷

The first statement to this effect occurs in the *«Ecclesiastical History»* of Evagrius (2.16) written in the late sixth century: [Νέπως] ἐκβάλλεται τε ὑπὸ Ὀρέστου, καὶ μετ' ἐκείνον ὁ τούτου παῖς Ῥωμύλλος Αὐγουστοῦλος, ὃς ἔσχατος τῆς Ῥώμης αὐτοκράτωρ κατέστη. μετὰ τρεῖς καὶ τριακοσίους καὶ χιλίους ἐνιαυτοὺς τῆς Ῥωμύλου βασιλείας. Μεθ' ὃν Ὀδόακρος τὰ Ῥωμαίων μεταχειρίζεται πράγματα, τῆς μὲν βασιλείως προσηγορίας ἑαυτὸν ἀφελῶν ῥῆγα δὲ προσεῖπῶν.

– Romulus Augustulus was the last emperor of Rome 1,303 years since the first king Romulus. He was replaced by Odoacer taking the title *rex*. This comment is probably not Evagrius' own but is normally taken to derive from the lost work of Eustathius of Epiphaneia who wrote just after Zosimus at the turn of the sixth century.¹¹⁸ If so, then this constitutes the earliest expression of the fact that the western empire ceased with Romulus Augustulus. Moreover, it predates Marcellinus' chronicle by up to 15 years, so that when Marcellinus came to record the fact it was known anyway at Constantinople whereas, if we accept *WES*, it was not a mental fact in Italy (whence it passed to Constantinople) before 519. However, I see no reason to assume that Marcellinus too copied this fact and much else from Eustathius in particular.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁷ CRACCO RUGGINI, 1978; IRMSCHER, 1977 and 1978.

¹¹⁸ HOLDER-EGGER, 1877, 106; VARADY, 1976, 466–9.

¹¹⁹ As does VARADY, 1976, 478; 1978, 112.

We noted above that Theophanes expressed the opinion that there was, practically speaking, no western emperor after Severus when Ricimer took charge. Yet, as so often with Theophanes, he offers an alternative account of the last western emperors – that is, he is drawing here on two separate earlier chronicles. This alternative source noted, like Eustathius, that Romulus Augustulus was the last western emperor who was deposed 1,303 years from the foundation of the city but, continues Theophanes (A. M. 5965, DE BOOR 119.20–2) και σημειωτέον, ὡς ἀπὸ Ῥωμύλου ἢ τῆς ἐσπέρας ἀκμάσασα βασιλεία πάλιν ἐπὶ Ῥωμύλον μετὰ τοσούτους ἐπαύσατο χρόνους.

Besides Theophanes, A. D. 476 is also noted as the end of the western empire in other Byzantine chronicles derived, like Theophanes and the *Chronicon Paschale* for example, from the same source or complex of sources – the *fasti* of Constantinople or some similar chronicle.¹²⁰ The mid-tenth century chronicle of Leo Grammaticus (115.13–16, Bonn), for example, states the fact quite plainly: Ἐπὶ Λέοντος μετὰ χίλια τριακόσια ἔτη τῆς τοῦ Ῥωμύλου βασιλείας τοῦ τὴν Ῥώμην κτίσαντος, βασιλεῦει Ῥωμύλος, καὶ κατέπαυσεν ἡ βασιλεία ἐπὶ Ῥωμύλου, ἀρξαμένη ἐπὶ Ῥωμύλου, Ὀδοάκρου Γότθου ῥηγὸς τὴν ἀρχὴν χειρωσαμένου.

The information preserved in Theophanes and Leo is combined, but not accurately, in the chronicle of Cedrenus (I, 614–83, Bonn) written in the twelfth century and the fact of the western empire's fall with Romulus Augustulus is also noted in the verse chronicle of Constantine Manasses (110, vv. 2532–6, Bonn), also written in the twelfth century. As a final Byzantine statement that the western empire fell in 476 we turn to the fourteenth century *Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἱστορία* of Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulos (15.11 = PG, 147, 37). Here we see the persistence, without embellishment, of the idea we first find stated eight centuries before: ὁ παῖς Ῥωμύλος, ὃς καὶ Αὐγουστοῦλος ἐκλήθη, διεδέξατο ὃ τελευταῖος αὐτοκράτωρ Ῥωμαίων ἐγένετο, ἀπὸ Ῥωμύλου τοῦ πρώτου τριῶν καὶ τριακοσίων καὶ χιλίων παρφοκηκότων ἑνιαυτῶν. Μετὰ δὲ τούτων Ὀδοάκρος τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίαν κατέσχε . . .

All these Byzantine records of the western empire's fall in 476 are far removed from the *Roman History* of Symmachus. If one is going to insist that the understanding of 476 as an end-point for the western empire originated in the history of Symmachus written in or after 519, as WES does, then one is obliged to account for the bridge between Symmachus and the Byzantine historiographical tradition. This WES does not do.

Research has long since taught us that Marcellinus' information is best understood and evaluated by comparing it with that of later Byzantine chronicles and histories. Marcellinus, although in Latin, is himself an early representative of the Byzantine chronicle tradition. As such, he took over into his chronicle the Byzantine view we first find in Eustathius in the early sixth century – the western empire

¹²⁰ KAUFMANN, 1884; HOLDER-EGGER, 1877.

fell in 476. From Marcellinus and/or his source it passed to Jordanes and through Paul the Deacon to the medieval chroniclers of Western Europe and thence to the Renaissance humanists and beyond. The historiographical significance of 476 became the common legacy of both Byzantium and the medieval Latin world and it originated, not in the ideological interplay of the Roman senatorial aristocracy under Ostrogothic domination, but in the local records of Constantinople. It was not, therefore, the view of the «Romans of Rome» but the «Romans of New Rome».

