The present work was conceived as a companion volume to *Constantine and Eusebius*, to argue in detail dates and facts which are there assumed and made the basis for historical interpretation and synthesis. It has inevitably also become an independent work of reference, for it sets out to establish the basic factual framework for a period in the history of the Roman Empire which is both obviously significant and notoriously obscure. Nevertheless, its scope continues to reflect its genesis. I have not attempted to solve all the problems posed by the imperial coinage or the legal sources, nor to draw up lists either of court and financial officials or of military commanders. The emphasis lies on emperors and imperial chronology (Part One), on the holders of the highest administrative posts and provincial governors (Part Two), and on the administration of the empire (Part Three)—and even within these restricted fields I have usually refrained from drawing general conclusions from the individual facts documented.

The work has been revised and largely rewritten several times, and I am most grateful to friends who have read one or more of the drafts, either in whole or in part, and proposed many improvements—Drs. A. K. Bowman, P. Brennan, and J. R. Rea, and Professors G. W. Bowersock, E. J. Champlin, H. A. Drake, J. F. Gilliam, C. Habicht, C. P. Jones, P. Kussmaul, F. G. B. Millar, and Sir Ronald Syme. Their comments, particularly those of Glen Bowersock, Christian Habicht, and Fergus Millar, have made the final version far more accurate than it would otherwise have been. Nonetheless, I am sure that many mistakes and omissions must remain, and I hope that readers who notice any errors or oversights will either inform me privately or publish the necessary corrections as rapidly as possible.

I must also express my gratitude to Donna Burns, Margaret von Sant, and Maria Pezzot for typing and retyping a difficult and complicated manuscript.
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OTHER ABBREVIATIONS

PART ONE

EMPERORS
Diocletian was proclaimed Augustus on 20 November 284 and in 285 defeated the only other emperor then reigning. The following lists provide the names, rank, and order of seniority of those emperors whom the senior emperor recognized as his colleagues between 285 and 9 September 337, when the three surviving sons of Constantine were proclaimed Augusti. Documentation is deliberately selective, concentrating on the evidence for the exact date at which each man entered and departed from the imperial college. For the full official names, only the cases where some uncertainty exists are documented or discussed.

1. For four of the eight colleges distinguished below, see the examples of the imperial titulature printed in Chapter III; for the others, see respectively ILS 657 (3), 663 (5), 712 (6), 724 (8).

The principles governing the order of seniority are inferred partly from the actual order of names, partly from explicit indications in ancient writers, principally Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 18.5, 25.5, 28.1, 32.3, cf. J. Straub, Vom Herrscherideal in der Spätantike (Stuttgart, 1939), 37 ff. There seem to be three main principles: (1) Augusti precede Caesars; (2) within each rank, precedence depends on the order of dies imperii, apparently regardless of the date at which a Caesar was promoted to Augustus; (3) seniority among two or more emperors of the same rank who have the same dies imperii is determined by age or antecedent seniority.

2. The Julian years are confirmed by a mass of papyrological evidence (Chapter III.3).

EMPERORS

1. The "First Tetrarchy"

Diocletian
(C. Aurelius Valerius Diocletianus)
Augustus 20 November 284; abdicated 1 May 305

Maximian
(M. Aurelius Valerius Maximianus)
Caesar 21 July 285; Augustus 1 April 286; abdicated 1 May 305

Constantius
(M. Flavius Valerius Constantius)
Caesar 1 March 293

Galerius
(C. Galerius Valerius Maximianus)
Caesar 1 March 293

2. The "Second Tetrarchy"

Constantius
Augustus 1 May 305; died 25 July 306

Galerius
Augustus 1 May 305


Diocletian's original nomen was Valerius (Victor, Caes. 39.1 ff.), while Maximian's was Aurelius (Epitome 40.10). I. Didyma 89, 90 (before 293) give Diocletian's praenomen as Marcus.

5. Maximian took the purple in 285, before his campaign against the Bagaudae (Pan. Lat. 10(2).3.1, 4.1), and he was a Caesar before becoming Augustus (Eutropius, Brev. 9.20.3). Hence the dies festus imperatoris vestri which the Passio Marcelli attests on 21 July 298 will be the anniversary of the day on which Diocletian created Maximian Caesar, as conjectured by J. Carcopino, Le Maroc antique (Paris, 1943), 378. (For editions of the Passio, see Chapter X.1; it should be observed that the natalis imperatoris of Recension M, 1a (H. Delehaye, Anal. Boll. 41 (1923), 260) occurs in a passage which is a manifest interpolation.) A. Rouselle, Dialogues d'Histoire Ancienne 2 (1976), 445 ff., argues that Maximian's dies imperii fell between 10 and 31 December 285.

6. Chr. Min. 1.229. A receipt dated by Maximian on 31 March 286 (BGU 1090, col. 4.34-39) was not necessarily written on that day, see Vandersleyen, Chronologie 36. The earliest indubitable attestations of Maximian as Augustus appear to be on 24 May (BGU 922) and 12 June 286 (P. Oxy. 1260). It might conceivably be relevant that there were ludi on 1 April (CIL 1 2, p. 262); they are conventionally interpreted as ludi votivi marking the birthday of Constantius one day late, see A. Degrassi, Inscriptiones Italiæ 13.2 (1963), 434.

7. Pan. Lat. 8(5).2.2-3.1; Chr. Min. 1.229. For Constantius' praenomen, both Gaius and Marcus are attested (PIR2 F 390); since Constantius was the adoptive son of Maximian, Marcus should be officially correct.

8. Pan. Lat. 8(5).3.1; Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 35.4. On the modern hypothesis that Galerius' actual investiture occurred on 21 May 293, see Chapter V, n. 73.

9. Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 19.1 ff. (the changes on 1 May 305); 46.8.

10. Pan. Lat. 6(7).8.2; Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 24.8; Origo 4; Victor, Caes. 40.4; Epitome 41.3; Zosimus 2.9.1 (Constantine proclaimed at his father's deathbed); CIL 1 2, pp. 268, 269; Chr. Min. 1.229, 234 (the day).
Severus (Flavius Valerius Severus) Caesar 1 May 305
Maximinus (C. Galerius Valerius Maximinus) Caesar 1 May 305

3. From the death of Constantius to the Conference of Carnuntum (November 308)

Galerius Augustus
Severus Augustus in place of Constantius;\(^{12}\) abdicated in spring 307\(^{13}\)
Maximinus Caesar
Constantine Proclaimed Augustus on 25 July 306 by his father's troops,\(^{14}\) then accepted appointment as Caesar from Galerius;\(^ {15}\) invested as Augustus c. September 307 by Maximian,\(^ {16}\) and

11. The name “Daia,” which Maximinus originally bore (Lactantius, *Mort. Pers.* 18.13; cf. *I. Ephesos* 311a), never formed part of his official name as emperor and is nowhere attested as such.
13. Lactantius, *Mort. Pers.* 26.5 ff. The date is deduced primarily from two facts: the consular date of 307 employed at Rome changed in April from *Maximiano VII et Maximino to post consulatum sextum* (Chr. Min. 1.66–67), and Galerius invaded Italy c. September 307. Severus continued to be recognized as emperor and consul in the East until his death, which was known in the Arsinoite nome of Egypt by 24 December 307 (*P. Merton* 31; *P. Col.* 138: contrast *P. Oxy.* 3192; *MPER* 1.291 = *Stud. Pal.* 20.77; *P. Mil.* 55, which include Severus' name in dating formulae on 9 May, 25 July, and 29 September). He died shortly before Galerius invaded Italy, probably on 15 or 16 September, see E. Groag, *RE* 14 (1929), 2433; W. Seston, *Carnuntina* (Graz and Cologne, 1956), 178, citing *Chr. Min.* 1.148: “Severus imp. ann. III m. IIII d. XV.”
14. *CIL* 1\(^{2}\), pp. 268, 269; *Chr. Min.* 1.231, 235 (the day); Lactantius, *Mort. Pers.* 24.8 f.; Origo 4; Victor, *Caes.* 40.4; *Epitome* 41.3; Zosimus 2.9.1 (the circumstances).

Constantine himself regarded 25 July 306 as his sole *dies imperii* from at least 310 (Pan. Lat. 6(7).9.2; Lactantius, *Mort. Pers.* 25.5), and there is no need to postulate an official *dies imperii* later than 25 July 306 in order to explain the attested examples of his imperial titulature (Table 3). That hypothesis (for which, see P. Bruun, *NC*\(^{10}\) 10 (1969), 177 ff.; *Arctos*, n.s. 9 (1975), 11 ff.) carries the corollary that at some date Constantine regarded himself as not yet an emperor in the intervening period—which is both improbable in itself and contradicted by the panegyric of 307: “cum tibi pater imperium reliquisset, Caesaris tamen appellatio contentus expectare malueris ut idem te qui illum declararet Augustum” (Pan. Lat. 7(6).5.3).
16. *Pan. Lat.* 7(6) celebrates both the investiture and Constantine's marriage to Fausta; hence, since the investiture was later than 25 July 307 (*RIC* 6.213, Treveri 744–746, cf. R. Strauss, *Rev. Num.*\(^{5}\) 16 (1954), 26 ff.), while the marriage coincided with Galerius' invasion of Italy (Lactantius,
subsequently (it appears) not recognized by Galerius as a member of the imperial college

4. From the Conference of Carnuntum to the death of Galerius

Galerius Augustus; died late April or early May 311

Licinius (Valerius Licinianus Licinius) Augustus 11 November 308

Maximinus Caesar; given the title filius Augustorum by Galerius early in 309; proclaimed Augustus by his troops in 310

Constantine a. In the East: Caesar; then filius Augustorum; then Augustus b. In the West: Augustus

Mort. Pers. 27.1), the date must be c. September 307.

17. Galerius and Maximinus alone appear as emperors on P. Cairo Isid. 87 (29 April 308), 88 (6 May 308), 125 (6 August 308); ILS 658 (Aquincum, undated), and no issue of coins in Constantine’s name from a mint of Galerius can be dated with certainty to the period between c. September 307 and November 308 (see C. H. V. Sutherland, RIC 6 (1967), 60).

18. A. Chastagnol, Aiôn: Le Temps chez les Romains (Caesarodunum 10bis, 1976), 228 f., has proposed that Galerius also proclaimed Candidianus Caesar between 29 August 310 and 10 April 311. He argues from the regnal years which appear in P. Cairo Isid. 51.7 (1 April 311) and P. Princeton Roll 2.5, 11 (17 June 312). The inference should be rejected: Lactantius is silent, there is no coinage in Candidianus’ name, he is missing from the documents which attest the imperial college in 310 and 311 (Chapter III, nos. 5-7), and all other papyri and ostraca of 310-312 omit the additional and aberrant regnal year (R. S. Bagnall and K. A. Worps, Regnal Formulas in Byzantine Egypt (BASP, Supp. 2, 1979), 34-36). Its probable origin is scribal carelessness, as argued by A. E. R. Boak and H. C. Youtie, The Archive of Aurelius Isidorus (Ann Arbor, 1960), 225.

It should be observed that, when Maximinus and Constantine were acknowledged as Augusti, they took precedence over Licinius (BCH 11 (1887), 69 no. 49 (Isaura); † P. Rylands 616, cf. R. S. Bagnall and K. A. Worps, BASP 17 (1980), 10 ff.)—although Galerius seems at first to have attempted to maintain the old order of names (Chapter III, no. 6).

19. Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 35.4 (the exact day in May 311 on which his death became known in Nicomedia is lost in a lacuna).


21. Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 32.1-5, confirmed by ILS 659 (Carnuntum); RIC 6.514 Thessalonica 31a, 38a; 535-536, Heraclea 38, 40, 45, 46; 562-563, Nicomedia 55, 60; 586-588, Cyzicus 43, 49, 52, 55, 61; 630-634 (Antioch), 677-679 (Alexandria) (all Caesar); RIC 6.514-515, Thessalonica 32a, 39a (filii Augustorum). That Maximinus was proclaimed Augustus precisely on 1 May 310 was conjectured by C. H. V. Sutherland, RIC 6 (1967), 15f. Maximinus and Constantine are still filii Augustorum on an Egyptian census declaration dated 27 February 310 (P. Strassburg 42 = P. Sakaon 1).

22. ILS 659; RIC 6.514-515, Thessalonica 31b, 38b; 633, Antiochia 118b (Caesar); Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 32.5; RIC 6.513-515, Thessalonica 28, 32b, 39b; 562-563, Nicomedia 56, 61; 631-632, Antiochia 104, 105, 111; 678-680, Alexandria 99b, 100b, 113, 117; P. Cairo Isid. 47, 90,
5. From the death of Galerius to the death of Maximinus

Maximinus
Constantine
Licinius
Augustus; died c. July 313
Augustus; declared to be the senior emperor by the Roman Senate in November 312
Augustus

6. From the death of Maximinus to the defeat of Licinius

Constantine
Licinius
Crispus (Flavius Julius Crispus)
Licinius (Valerius Licinianus Licinius)
Constantinus (Flavius Claudius Constantinus)
Augustus
Augustus
Caesar 1 March 317
Caesar 1 March 317
Caesar 1 March 317

91 (filius Augustorum); Chapter III, nos. 4-6; RIC 6.537-539, Heraclea 49b, 54b, 60b; 564-565, Nicomedia 65b, 66d; 589, Cyzicus 67b; 634-640, Antiochia 126, 127b, 129, 133d, 147d, 148d, 154d; 678-679, Alexandria 104, 106, 107, 118, 120 (Augustus).

23. R. M. Grant, Christianity, Judaism and other Greco-Roman Cults 4 (Leiden, 1975), 144, argues that Maximinus appointed his son Maximus and Candidianus emperors in 311. Although, like Chastagnol, he adduces P. Princeton Roll 2.5, 11 (above, n. 18), Grant relies principally on Eusebius, HE 9.11.7: οἱ Μαξιμίνου παῖδες, οὓς ήδη καὶ τῆς βασιλικῆς τιμῆς τῆς τε ἐν πίναξι καὶ γραφαῖς ἀναθέσεως πεποίητο κοινωνοὺς. But Eusebius knew only that Maximinus' children were depicted with the emperor on reliefs and pictures (cf. 11.2)—which by no means proves that they were formally invested with the imperial purple. Again, the silence of Lactantius (Mort. Pers. 50.2, 6, cf. 20.4), the vast majority of papyri from 311-313 (R. S. Bagnall and K. A. Worp, Regnal Formulas 35-37), and the complete absence of contemporary attestation on coins or inscriptions forbid the inference.

24. Maximinus was still recognized as emperor and consul at Oxyrhynchus on 23 July 313 (P. Oxy. 3144), but his death was known in Karanis by 13 September 313 (P. Cairo Isid. 103.20); the date of his death, therefore, is probably July or August 313, although late June cannot be excluded on present evidence.

25. Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 44.11: “senatus Constantino virtutis gratia primi nominis titulum decrevit, quem sibi Maximinum vindicabo.” For the order Constantine, Maximinus, Licinius in Constantine's territory, CIL 5.8021a, 8963, 11.6667. For the order Maximinus, Constantine, Licinius, ILS 663 (Asia); AE 1963.141 (Cyrene); ILS 664 (Noricum).

26. Origo 28; CIL 12, p. 272; Chr. Min. 1.232; Praxagoras, FGrH 219; Epitome 41.8; Zosimus 2.28.1.

27. Chr. Min. 1.232; Origo 19. For Crispus the names Claudius and Valerius are also attested in place of Julius (RIC 7.175, Trier 138-139; ILS 716 (Rome)), while Constantinus is occasionally Fl. Julius Constantinus (AE 1889.34 (Sbrangatu, Sardinia); AE 1938.85 = I. Ephesos 312, where the published supplement Con[stantia] is impossible, since the date is before 19 September 324).
EMPERORS

7. Constantine as sole Augustus

Constantine Augustus; died 22 May 337
Crispus Caesar; executed c. May 326
Constantinus Caesar
Constantius Caesar 8 November 324
(\textit{Flavius Julius} Constantius)
Constans Caesar 25 December 333
(\textit{Flavius Julius} Constans)
Dalmatius Caesar 18 September 335; killed between 2
(\textit{Flavius Julius} Augustus 9 September 337; died 3 November
Constans) 361
Dalmatius Augustus 9 September 337; killed shortly
(\textit{Flavius Julius} after 18 January 350)
(\textit{Delmatius})

8. The sons of Constantine

Constantinus Augustus 9 September 337; killed spring 340
Constantius Augustus 9 September 337; died 3 November
Constans Augustus 9 September 337; killed shortly

28. Hannibalianus, whom Constantine proclaimed king over territory outside the Roman Em-

29. Festal Index 10; \textit{Chr. Min.} 1.235; Eusebius, \textit{VC} 4.64; Socrates, \textit{HE} 1.39.2, 40.3.

30. Crispus disappears from the imperial coinage in the course of 326, see P. Bruun, \textit{RIC} 7

31. \textit{CIL} I^{2}, p. 276; \textit{Chr. Min.} 1.232; \textit{AE} 1937.119 (with plain \textit{idibus} \textit{Nob.} in error); Ammianus

32. \textit{Chr. Min.} 1.234.

33. \textit{Chr. Min.} 1.235. Both Dalmatius and Delmatius are attested. It may be relevant that the

34. On the date of his death, A. Olivetti, \textit{Riv. Fil.} 43 (1915), 67 ff. \textit{CTh} 13.4.2 shows Valerius

35. \textit{Chr. Min.} 1.235.
APPENDIX: AUGUSTAE

On the strictest definition, Augustae are not members of the imperial college, since their names never appear among those of the emperors who jointly issue imperial pronouncements. Nevertheless, an Augusta did possess at least some of the privileges of an Augustus: her name might appear in the nominative case on the imperial coinage, and at least one Augusta released prisoners from exile and the mines and had unfettered access to imperial funds (Eusebius, VC 3.44; 47.3). Between 284 and 337, the following Augustae are attested:

1. Galería Valeria, the wife of Galerius.

2. Flavia Julia Helena, wife of Constantius and mother of Constantine.

3. Flavia Maxima Fausta, wife of Constantine.
   Helena and Fausta both appear as Augustae on the coinage of Constantine immediately after the defeat of Licinius (RIC 7.116, 137, 203, 263–264, 325–326, 383, 447, 475, 514–515, 551, 612–613, 647, 709), and it is an attractive conjecture that both were proclaimed Augustae when Constantius became Caesar, i.e. on 8 November 324. Fausta died in the summer of 326 (Epitome 41.12; Philostorgius, HE 2.4; Zosimus 2.29.2), Helena in the summer or autumn of 327 (Eusebius, VC 3.46.2).

36. E.g., Chapter III, nos. 5–7, issued while Galeria Valeria was an Augusta; P. Oxy. 889 (re-edited below, Chapter XIV.3), probably issued when Helena and Fausta were Augustae.
38. P. Bruun, Numismatica e Antichità Classiche 8 (1979), 255 ff.
40. Helena made a pilgrimage to the Holy Land after encountering Constantine in Rome c. August 326 (Zosimus 2.29.2) and died in his presence (Eusebius, VC 3.46.2). Her death must fall before 7 January 328, when Constantine refounded Drepanum as Helenopolis in her memory (Chr. Pasch. 527, cf. Chapter V: Constantine).
Between 20 November 284 and 9 September 337, more than a dozen men assumed the imperial purple without the agreement (previous or subsequent) of the senior emperor then ruling. The following list (which is in the chronological order of their proclamations) states and documents succinctly (1) the names of the usurpers, (2) the dates of their proclamation and suppression, and (3) the territory which they controlled. Where ascertainable, their careers as private citizens are also noted.

Amandus

?Aelianus
Named with Amandus as if both were joint leaders of the Bagaudae (Victor, Caes. 39.17; Eutropius, Brev. 9.20.3).

M. Aur(elius) Maus. Carausius
Carausius' full nomenclature is imperfectly attested, the penultimate name always being abbreviated to the letter M (RIC 5.2.483 ff.: Colchester) or to Maus. (ILS 8928 = RIB 2291: near Carlisle).1 He was commissioned by Maxim-
ian to build a fleet and suppress German pirates, but rebelled against him (Victor, Caes. 39.19 ff.; Eutropius, Brev. 9.21). The date of his rebellion is only indirectly attested. Carausius was killed when Constantius attacked Boulogne shortly after his appointment as Caesar on 1 March 293 (Pan. Lat. 8(5).6.1, 12.2). Since later sources give the length of Carausius’ reign as either six or seven years (Victor, Caes. 39.40 (sexennium); Eutropius, Brev. 9.22.2 (septennium); Orosius, Hist. Adv. Pag. 7.25.5 (septem annos)), while a hoard of coins found in Sussex appears to establish that he was consul for the fourth time in 290 (RIC 5.2.497 no. 393),2 it may be deduced that he proclaimed himself Augustus during the course of 286 and had styled himself consul in 287, 288, and 289.

Carausius was recognized as Augustus in Britain and over a large part of northwestern Gaul: he minted coins, not only in Britain (RIC 5.2.463 ff.: London and Colchester), but also in Gaul, apparently at Rouen (RIC 5.2.516 ff.) and perhaps at Boulogne (RIC 5.2.523, nos. 702–705).3

Allectus

After Constantius recovered northwestern Gaul for the central imperial government in 293, Allectus murdered Carausius and replaced him as Augustus in Britain (Pan. Lat. 8(5).12.2; RIC 5.2.558 ff.). He was defeated and killed in 296 (Pan. Lat. 8(5).14–19; Victor, Caes. 39.40–42; Eutropius, Brev. 9.22; Orosius, Hist. Adv. Pag. 7.25.6).

Before 293 Allectus had served under Carausius, perhaps with the title rationalis summae rei: the speech of 297 styles him a satelles of the archipirata (Pan. Lat. 8(5).12.2), Victor describes him as having charge of the summa res by Carausius’ permission (Caes. 39.41), and the puzzling mint-mark RSR on coins of Carausius (RIC 5.2.508–516) has been interpreted as an abbreviation of some such title.4

L. Domitius Domitianus

Papyri and ostraca from lower Egypt register L. Domitius Domitianus as Augustus from late August to early December of a single Julian year (P. Cairo Isid. 139 (year 1, 24–28 August); 38, 39, 104 (November); P. Michael. 24.34 (2 December), etc.).5 The only two possibilities for the year are 296 and 297, and

2. For the date, P. H. Webb, NC5 5 (1925), 173 ff.
4. P. H. Webb, NC4 7 (1907), 48 ff.; RIC 5.2 (1933), 434. However, O. Seeck, RE 1 (1894), 1584, held that Allectus was Carausius’ praetorian prefect—which might appear preferable on a priori grounds (cf. Chapter VIII).
5. For a full list, R. S. Bagnali and K. A. Worp, Regnal Formulas in Byzantine Egypt (BASP, Supp. 2, 1979), 28 f.
the later year can be firmly established from close examination of contemporary Egyptian documents, and from the varied evidence for the movements of Diocletian. Domitianus minted both coins on the Roman imperial standard (RIC 6.661, 663, Alexandria 5, 6, 19, 20) and Alexandrian tetradrachms (J. Lallemand, *Revue Belge de Numismatique* 97 (1951), 94–99).

**Aurelius Achilleus**

Attested as *corrector* under the regime of Domitianus in September 297 (*P. Cairo Isid. 62*: Karanis; *P. Michigan 220* = *Sammelbuch* 7252: Philadelphia), but named in all the literary sources as leader of the rebellion (Eusebius, *Chronicle* p. 227 Karst; Jerome, *Chronicle* 226; Victor, *Caes.* 39.23, 39.38; Eutropius, *Brev.* 9.22–23; *Epitome* 39.3; Orosius, *Hist. Adv. Pag.* 7.25.4, 8; John of Antioch, frag. 164; Jordanes, *Get.* 110; Zonaras 12.31). The contradiction can be removed by the hypothesis that Domitianus died in December 297 and that Achilleus was in command during the siege of Alexandria (which lasted until at least March 298).

**Anonymous**

Eusebius alludes to an attempted usurpation near Melitene in 303 (*HE* 8.6.8), of which nothing further appears to be known.

**Eugenius**

Commander of a company of five hundred infantry at Seleucia in 303: saluted emperor by his men, he marched on Antioch and was defeated (Libanius, *Orat.* 11.158–162, 19.45–46, 20.18–20, cf. *Orat.* 1.3; Eusebius, *HE* 8.6.8).

**M. Aurelius Valerius Maxentius**

Maxentius, the son of Maximian, was invested with the purple at Rome on 28 October 306 and drowned in the River Tiber on 28 October 312 (*Pan. Lat.* 12(9).16.2; Lactantius, *Mort. Pers.* 26.1 ff., 44.3 ff.; *CIL* 1², p. 274).

6. J. D. Thomas, *ZPE* 22 (1976), 253 ff.; 24 (1977), 233 ff. The earlier date has often been argued, most fully and most recently by J. Schwartz, *L. Domitius Domitianus: Étude numismatique et papyrologique* (*Papyrologica Bruxellensia* 12, 1975), 94 ff.; *ZPE* 25 (1977), 217 ff. In refutation, it suffices to observe that Schwartz is compelled to date the deaths of Carausius and Allectus to 292 and 295 (*Domitianus* 102).

7. Chapter V: Diocletian. An allusion to an imperial victory in the speech of 297 provides a strong additional argument in favor of 297: "dent veniam trophaea Niliaca sub quibus Aethiops et Indus intremuit" (*Pan. Lat.* 8(5).5.2: delivered on 1 March 297). Only if the revolt of Domitianus had not yet begun could the orator use the phrase *trophaea Niliaca* without risk of ambiguity to refer to Galerius in Egypt before 296.

8. On the coinage of Domitianus, see A. Giessen, *ZPE* 22 (1976), 280 ff., Tafeln XVI, XVII.

9. *PLRE* 1.263.

At first Maxentius avoided the title Augustus: his earliest issues of coins from the Roman mint bear the legends *d. n. Maxentius princ(eps)* and *Maxentius princ(eps) invict(us)* (RIC 6.367–370). The title *princ(eps) invict(us)* also occurs on coins minted in Africa (RIC 6.432, Carthago 53), but the first issues in Maxentius' name there give him a title which he never officially assumed: *nobilissimus Caesar* (RIC 6.430–431, Carthago 47, 48a, 51a). Maxentius soon proclaimed himself Augustus, probably in the early months of 307, and his official style was then *imp. Caes. M. Aurelius Maxentiuspius felix invictus Augustus* (ILS 669, 670, 672; IRT 464). Now an inscription from Mauretania, which refers to Galerius as *divus Maximianus*, styles Maxentius *pius felix invictus et gloriosissimus semper Augustus* (ILS 671: Caesarea). That might reflect an official modification of his titles after the suppression of Domitius Alexander in 309.

Proclaimed at Rome, Maxentius was rapidly acknowledged as ruler in southern Italy, Sicily, Africa, Sardinia, and Corsica (cf. Pan. Lat. 12(9).25.2–3). He gained control of northern Italy early in 307, but lost control of the African provinces to Domitius Alexander for a period (probably 308–309). There is no reason to believe that Maxentius ever ruled Spain: the evidence indicates that in 305 Constantius added Spain to his portion of the empire, and that in 306 it passed peacefully under the sway of Constantine.¹²

**Maximian**

Maximian abdicated on 1 May 305 and retired to private life, taking up residence in Campania (Lactantius, *Mort. Pers.* 26.7) or Lucania (Eutropius, *Brev.* 9.27.2, 10.2.3). Not long after 28 October 306 Maxentius “sent him the purple and named him ‘Augustus for the second time’” (Lactantius, *Mort. Pers.* 26.7). In this capacity, Maximian helped Maxentius to defeat Severus (spring 307) and to secure an alliance with Constantine by giving him his daughter Fausta in marriage and investing him as Augustus (c. September 307). The following April he attempted to depose Maxentius (Lactantius, *Mort. Pers.* 28.1 ff.; cf. Chr. Min. 1.66, 231), then fled to Constantine and attended the Conference of Carnuntum in November 308 (Lactantius, *Mort. Pers.* 29.1 ff.), where he was forced to retire a second time (Pan. Lat. 6(7).14.6). He betook himself to Constantine in Gaul, against whom he rebelled and assumed the purple yet again (Pan. Lat. 6(7).14–20; Lactantius, *Mort. Pers.* 29.3 ff.). He was quickly suppressed and allowed (or encouraged) to commit suicide, probably c. July 310.¹⁴

¹¹. Maxentius could also be the *Herculi Caes(ar)* invoked on a brooch manufactured, or at least inscribed, in 306/7 (ILS 681, cf. Chapter III, n. 11).

¹². Chapter XI.


¹⁴. The date is inferred from Pan. Lat. 6(7), cf. Chapter V, n. 105.
L. Domitius Alexander

Inscriptions give the usurper's name and titles as L. Domitius Alexander invictus pius felix Augustus (ILS 674 = ILAlg. 2.580, etc.). Before his proclamation, Alexander had been vicarius of Africa (Victor, Caes. 40.17; Zosimus 2.12.2). He should probably, therefore, be identified with the Val(erius) Alexander attested as vicarius in 303 (AE 1942/3.81: Aqua Viva, in Numidia) and again under Maxentius (IRT 464: Lepcis).

Neither the beginning nor the end of Alexander's rebellion against Maxentius can be dated from explicit evidence; nevertheless, it almost certainly began between May and autumn 308, and had almost certainly been suppressed by the end of 309. Although African milestones indicate that Alexander recognized Constantine (ILS 8936: impp. dd. nn. L. Domitio Alexandro et Fl. Constantino Augg. — a peculiar order), it is neither attested nor probable that Constantine ever recognized Alexander as a colleague. Nor is there any ex-

15. P. Salama, Bulletin van de Vereeniging tot Bevordering der Kennis van de Antieke Beschaving 29 (1954), 73-74, conveniently prints the eight inscriptions of Alexander known to him, viz. CIL 8.7004 (= ILS 674); 21959, 22183 (= ILS 8936); ILAlg. 1.3921; BCTH 1901, ccxii, no. 3; Revue Africaine 95 (1951), 250; and two unpublished, one of which was subsequently published by E. Maree, BCTH 1955-56 (1958), 106, no. 3. Since then there has been the important discovery of a milestone of Alexander from the road between Caralis and Sulci in Sardinia: Sotgiu 1.372 = AE 1966, 169, cf. G. Sotgiu, Archivio Storico Sardo 29 (1964), 149 ff.

16. For the nomen Valerius as a status designation, J. Keenan, ZPE 11 (1973), 44 ff. Identity is, however, denied by L. Leschi, Études d'épigraphie, d'archéologie et d'histoire africaines (Paris, 1957), 52; Kolbe, Statthalter 67 n. 4. PLRE 1.43/4, Alexander 17,20, has separate entries for usurper and vicarius, with implicit appeal to G. M. Bersannetti, Epigraphica 5-6 (1943-44), 127 ff., who mistakenly dated IRT 465 (a parallel dedication to IRT 464) after the fall of the usurper.

17. An inscription from Numidia (ILS 668: “domino nostro Maxentio Augusto nobilissimo viro consuli”) appears to show that Maxentius was still recognized in Africa in May 308 or later, while Zosimus connects the proclamation of Alexander with Maxentius’ falling out with his father in April 308 (2.12). The precise date of the proclamation has been argued to be June or 28 October 308 (respectively, J. Maurice, MSNAF 61 (1902), 1 ff.; E. Groag, RE 14 (1930), 2440 f.). On the other hand, R. Andreotti interprets the revolt as a result of the Conference of Carnuntum in November 308 and hence adopts a date in 309 (Epigraphica 31 (1969), 158 ff.).

18. For modern estimates of the date, see especially G. Laffranchi, Aquileia nostra 9 (1938), 123 ff. = Numismatica 13 (1947), 17 ff. (309); Chastagnol, Fastes 55 (late 309 or early 310); P. Salama, Numario Hispánico 9 (1960), 176 (between 25 July and 28 October 310); J. Maurice, MSNAF 61 (1902), 9 ff. (spring 311); R. Andreotti, Epigraphica 31 (1969), 169 ff. (311); H. Schoenebeck, Klio, Beilheft 43 (1939), 74 (late 311 or early 312). The date 309 is here adopted on the following grounds. Alexander was defeated by Rufius Volusianus as praetorian prefect of Maxentius (Victor, Caes. 40.18; Zosimus 2.14.2). Hence the expedition to suppress Alexander should be dated either before or after Volusianus’ urban prefecture, which he held from 28 October 310 to 28 October 311 (Chr. Min. 1.67). By late 311, however, Maxentius was already embroiled in conflict with Constantine, while the coinage of Rome and Ostia seems strongly to imply that Maxentius won a victory during the course of 309 (G. Laffranchi, Numismatica 13 (1947), 17 ff.). Moreover, African coin hoards appear to confirm a date no later than the beginning of 310 (P. Salama, Libya Antiqua 3/4 (1966/7), 21 ff.).

plicit evidence that Alexander controlled the Mauretanias as well as Tripolitania, Africa proper, and Numidia, though a milestone now attests his control of Sardinia, for however brief a period (Sotgiu 1.372 = AE 1966.169).  

**Aur(elius) Val(erius) Valens**
Valens was *dux limitis* in Dacia when Licinius made him emperor after his defeat at Cibalae on 8 October 316 (*Origo* 16–17). He was deposed and executed before Licinius negotiated a peace settlement with Constantine in January/February 317 (*Origo* 18; *Epitome* 40.9; Zosimus 2.20.1; Petrus Patricius, frag. 15).

Although the literary sources describe Valens as a Caesar (*Origo* 17; Zosimus 2.19.2), what seem to be the only two genuine coins of Valens both style him Augustus (*RIC* 7.644, Cyzicus 7; 706, Alexandria 19).

**Mar. Martinianus**
Martinianus was *magister officiorum* of Licinius (*Epitome* 41.6; Zosimus 2.25.2; Johannes Lydus, *De Mag.* 2.25). Licinius put him up as emperor after the battle of Adrianople on 3 July 324, but Constantine deposed him and soon ordered his execution (Victor, *Caes.* 41.9; *Epitome* 41.7; Zosimus 2.26.2, 28.2). About his rank, the evidence diverges as it does for Valens: the majority of the literary sources explicitly style him Caesar, the coins Augustus (*RIC* 7.608, Nicomedia 45–47; 645, Cyzicus 16).

**Calocaerus**
There appear to be only three independent items of evidence concerning Calocaerus:

1. Victor, *Caes.* 41.11–12: Calocaerus *magister pecoris camelorum* seized Cyprus *specie regni*, and was rightly executed in a manner appropriate to a slave or brigand. Victor expressly dates the revolt immediately after the execution of Crispus in 326.
3. Theophanes, a. 5825, p. 29.28–31 de Boor = Philostorgius, p. 207.22–25 Bidez: (a) Dalmatius was proclaimed Caesar; (b) “Calocaerus who usurped power in the island of Cyprus succumbed to the Roman attack”; (c) “and

---

20. On the significance of this inscription, see especially G. Sotgiu, *Archivio Storico Sardo* 29 (1964), 154 ff.
22. Conceivably identical with the military officer Martinianus who visited the hermit Antony in 313 (Athanasius, *Vita Antonii* 48).
after his defeat he was executed with his accomplices at Tarsus in Cilicia, being burnt alive by the Caesar Dalmatius."  

The discrepancy over the date must be resolved by the hypothesis that Victor is mistaken or misinformed: Theophanes (or his source) has clearly confused the Caesar Dalmatius, proclaimed on 18 September 335, with his father, Dalmatius the censor, who was residing in Antioch in 334, apparently with wide executive authority (Athenasius, *Apol. Sec.* 65.1 ff., whence Socrates, *HE* 1.27.19 ff.). The insurrection occurred c. 334, and was presumably connected with the earthquake, registered by Theophanes under the preceding year, which destroyed Salamis (Theophanes, a.m. 5824, p. 29.23–25 de Boor = Philostorgius, p. 207.19–21 Bidez, cf. Malalas 313 Bonn).  

24. Theophanes is the source of Cedrenus 1.519 Bonn.  
The names and titles of the emperors between 284 and 337 are attested in their fullest and most official form in a small number of surviving documents, viz. in the headings of six imperial edicts or letters and two military diplomas, some of which are preserved only in a very fragmentary state. These documents emanate from the senior emperor, and may be regarded as authoritative statements of the emperors' titles in a way in which inscriptions and papyri of a less official nature cannot. Hence an exposition of the rules governing the imperial titulature should begin by presenting the evidence of this select group of edicts, letters, and diplomas. Printed below are the emperors' names and titles as they appear in each of the eight.

1. THE PRINCIPAL DOCUMENTS


2. For example, Diocletian's possession of the titles *Britannicus maximus* in 285 (*ILS* 615: Rome) and *Persicus maximus* in 290 (*ILS* 618: a dedication by the governor of Raetia) is chronologically incompatible with the official order of his victory titles in nos. 1 and 2. A rigid distinction must be drawn between the unofficial attribution of a victory title to an emperor by his subjects and his own adoption of it as part of his official titulature. Once this is done, there is no need to argue that Diocletian took a victory title like *Britannicus maximus* and later dropped it (e.g., Seston, *Dioclétien* 75 n. 9).
Emperors


   IIII Pers. m. II Brit. m. Carp. m. Aram. m. Med. m. Adiab. m. trib. [pot. vxiii cons. vii p. p. pros. et]

   [Germ. m. v Sarm. m. iii Pers. m. ii Brit. m.]
   Part. m. Arab. m. Med. m. Adiab. m. tri[b. pot.] VXI[i cons. vi p. p. pros. et]

   Medd. Adiabb. III cons. nob[b. Caess. dicunt]

The restorations are those printed in JRS 61 (1971), 172 (where a bracket seems to be omitted in line 7), with question marks and dots removed. Although the number of Maximian's tribunici potestas should be XVII (as in no. 2), the traces in line 5 impose the order VX. Aram. in line 3 and Arab. in line 5 are both errors for Arm(enicus); Part. in line 5 is an error for Carp(icus). Both in this inscription and in the Aphrodisias copy of no. 2, the stonecutter appears to be a Greek imperfectly familiar with Latin.

The date is deduced from the fact that the edict took effect "ex kal. Septembris Titiano et Nepotiano cons.," i.e. from 1 September 301 (JRS 61 (1971), 173, frag. b. = AE 1973.526 b).

2. Price Edict of 301 (between 20 November and 9 December). Only three of the many known copies preserve the heading: (1) from Egypt, now in Aix-en-Provence, transcribed by T. Mommsen, CIL 3, pp. 802–803; photograph in M. Giaccherò, Edictum Diocletiani 2 (1974), Tav. IV; (2) from Aphrodisias, published by K. T. Erim and J. Reynolds, JRS 63 (1973), 100, with photograph (Plate X); (3) from Ptolemais, published by G. Caputo and R. G. Goodchild, JRS 45 (1955), 112, fragment (N) = AE 1956.113. It should be observed that the edition of the heading in S. Lauffer, Diokletians Preisedikt (Berlin, 1971), 90, uses a fragment from Aphrodisias now known to belong to the Currency Edict (CIL 3, p. 2208, Aphrodisias I).

The text printed here reproduces the readings and abbreviations of the Egyptian copy, supplementing from the Aphrodisias copy, but disregards the lineation of both. Where these two copies overlap and present divergent

readings, I print the reading of the Egyptian copy (except in line 10) and note that of the Aphrodisias copy below the text. (Differing abbreviations for the same word are disregarded.) The copy from Ptolemais preserves only PF INV and ET IM[P] in lines 1 and 4-5 of the present text.


2 Germ. max. VI Sarm. max. IIII Persic. max. II Britt. max.


6 Germ. max. V Sarm. max. IIII Persic. max. II [Britt. max.]
[Carpic. max. Armen. max. Medic. max. Adiabene. max.]

Fla. Val. Constantius Germ. max. II Sarm. max. II Persic. max. II

Adiabene. max. trib. p. VIII coss. IIII noble. Caes. et

10 G. Val. Maximianus Germ. max. II Sarm. [max. ii] Persic. max. [iii]


1, 5 Aph. omits INV.
4 t]RIB POT VX CONS VII PP Aph.
8 trib. pot.] VX CONS VI PP Aph.

9-14 Aph. combines the titles of Constantius and Galerius and neglects their iterations.

9, 12 Aph. omits the title Sarmatici maximi for the Caesars.
10 Aph. also omits Britannici maximi.

10 CCPP Aph., SARM Eg.: all editors before 1973 emended to Carpic.

10, 13 ARAM Aph.

The date of the edict is established by the titles of Diocletian and the Caesars: Diocletian became imperator XVIII on 20 November 301, and entered on his nineteenth tribunicia potestas on 10 December 301, after which day the Caesars would have been tribunicia potestate X.

The text printed here comprises lines 1–5 of the exterior face of the diploma, with the emperors’ victory titles supplemented from nos. 2 and 4. I reject G. Forni’s reading of “[cos. i]III” before the clear “nomin(a) milit(um) qui militaver(unt)” in line 6. The portion of the emperors’ names and titles on the interior face (Rendiconti, etc., Tav. 2) shows Maximian as “[cos. v]III.”

The date can be deduced from the title Car(picus) m(aximus) V: since the emperors had only taken this title once before November/December 301, the date is more likely to be 7 January 305 than 7 January 304. This titulature differs from nos. 1 and 2 in that Diocletian and Maximian are each Ar(menicus) m(aximus) II: the position of the title, between Carpicus maximus (taken for the first time in 296) and Medicus maximus (298), is incompatible with the fact that Constantius and Galerius are Ar(menici) m(aximi) without iteration. The iteration, therefore, should be dismissed as erroneous.


Impp. Caess. Fl. Val. Constantius G. Val. Max-

Imp. Caess. Fl. Val. Constantius G. Val. Ma-

5. Fragment of an imperial edict or letter of late 310 (Sinope). Published by T. Mommsen from a report by Constantine Lanaras, *Ephemeris Epigraphica* 4 (1881), 31 no. 44. Mommsen reports "ectypum ut acciperem frustra laboravi": the publications in *CIL* 3.6979 and *ILS* 660 depend on the same report alone.

2 Imperator Caesar Galerius invictus Augustus pontif ex max.
6 pater patriae procons.

8 [Caes]ar Flavius Valuerius Constantinus

In view of the poor attestation of the text, I print it largely without restorations. Galerius' names and titles (lines 2-6) can be supplied from comparison with nos. 6 and 7. If the erasure in line 7 effaced the name of Maximinus (as seems likely on general grounds), then the name of Licinius must have stood either before the erasure (as in no. 6) or after Constantine (as in no. 7).


2 po[nt. max. Germ. max. vii Aegypt. max. Theb. max.]
Sar[m. max. v Persic. max. iii Britt. max. ii Carp.]
4 ma[x. vi Arm. max. Med. max. Adiab. max. trib. pot.]
XV[iii cons. vii imp. xiii p. p. procons. et]
tr[ib. pot. iii cons. imp. p. p. procons. et]
ma[x. trib. pot. vi cons. imp. vi p. p. procons. et]
po[nt. max. trib. pot. v cons. imp. v p. p. procons.]
12 p[iiissimi et fortissimi principes]

The form of the restorations is of course conjectural: nothing on the stone indicates how the titles in lines 1-11 were in fact abbreviated or how line 12 continued after *piissimi*. The substance of these conjectural supplements is, however, guaranteed by comparison with no. 7. The fragment, though exiguous, is important. The position of *Sarm(aticus) maximus* in line 3 confirms the attribution to Galerius of the titles *Aegyptiacus maximus Thebaicus* max-
EMPERORS

mus in no. 7. Lines 8-9 have been erased; the erasure indicates that the name of Maximinus, who suffered damnatio memoriae in 313, occurred in third place, and hence implies that Galerius continued for a time to treat Maximinus and Constantine as junior to Licinius even after he acknowledged them as Augusti.


\[
\text{Αὐτοκράτωρ Καίσαρ Γαλέριος Οὐαλέριος Μαξιμιανὸς ἐυσεβὴς εὐτυχὴς ἀνίκητος Σεβαστός, ἄρχιερεύς μέγιστος, Γερμανικὸς μέγιστος ἕπτάκις, Αἰγυπτιακὸς μέγιστος, Σαρματικὸς μέγιστος πεντάκις, Περσῶν μέγιστος τρίς, \(5\) Βρεττανῶν μέγιστος δές, Κάρπων μέγιστος ἕξάκις, Ἀρμενίων μέγιστος, Μήδων μέγιστος, Ἀδιαβηνῶν μέγιστος, δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας τὸ εἰκοστὸν, αὐτοκράτωρ τὸ ἐννεακαὶδέκατον, ὑπατὸς τὸ ὀγδόον, πατήρ πατρίδος, ἀνθύπατος, καὶ Αὐτοκράτωρ Καίσαρ Φλαύιος Οὐαλέριος Κωνσταντῖνος εὐσεβῆς εὐτυχῆς ἀνίκητος Σεβαστός, ἄρχιερεύς μέγιστος, δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας τὸ ἐκτὸν, αὐτοκράτωρ τὸ πέμπτον, ὑπατὸς, πατήρ πατρίδος, ἀνθύπατος, καὶ Αὐτοκράτωρ Καίσαρ Οὐαλέριος Λικίνινος Λικίνιιος εὐσεβῆς εὐτυχῆς ἀνίκητος Σεβαστός, ἄρχιερεύς μέγιστος, δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας τὸ τέταρτον, αὐτοκράτωρ τὸ τρίτον, ὑπατὸς, πατήρ πατρίδος, ἀνθύπατος, ἐπαρχιῶταις ἱδίοις χαίρειν.

The text printed here differs from the edition of E. Schwartz, *GCS* 9.2 (1908), 790-792, in four places. In Galerius' titles, I have supplied εὐσεβῆς εὐτυχῆς and ἕπτάκις,\(^6\) while H. Dessau, *ILS* 1, p. 151, proposed the necessary supplement of his victory titles (cf. no. 5). In Constantine's titles, I have supplied the number of his tribunicia potestas which harmonizes with imp. V. Licinius' name and titles, together with the following three words, are missing in some manuscripts, and were clearly deleted by Eusebius after Licinius' defeat by Constantine in 324.

It is not certain who deleted the name of Maximinus from the imperial col-

5. The proclamation has the form of a letter ("greetings to their provincials") and implicitly describes itself as one (*Mort. Pers.* 34.5 = *HE* 8.17.9), but Lactantius, who omits the protocol, twice styles it an edictum when recording its publication at Nicomedia on 30 April 311 (*Mort. Pers.* 33.11, 35.1). R. M. Grant, *TU* 115 (1975), 417, has recently emitted the strange theory that the emperor whose name stands first is Maximinus and that the date of the document is December 311. The titles of Galerius, Constantine, and Licinius are all consistent with the date attested by Lactantius and Eusebius (Tables 2-7).

6. Representing the five German victories attested in 306 (no. 4) plus the two which Constantine won between 306 and 310 (no. 8, cf. Table 8).
Although Galerius issued the proclamation in the name of both himself and his three imperial colleagues (Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 36.3), Maximinus did not in 311 officially publish it in his provinces (Eusebius, HE 9.1.1). Moreover, since Maximinus suffered damnatio memoriae in 313, his name may already have been removed from any copy which Eusebius was able subsequently to procure. Eusebius implies that he translated the Latin original into Greek himself (HE 8.17.11), so that the peculiar genitives in Galerius' victory titles may derive from his mistaken Greek expansion of an abbreviated Latin original which read “Pers. max. III, Britt. max. II, Carp. max. VI, Armen. max., Med. max. Adiab. max.” (cf. nos. 1–5, 8).


Imp. Caes. Fl. Constantinus
2 p. f. vict. ac triumf. August.
pont. max. Germ. max. IIII [S]arm. max. II
4 Gothic. max. II Dac. max. trib. potest. XXXIII
6 Fl. Cl. Constantinus Alaman. et
8 Constans et Fl. Iul. Dalmatius
nobb. Caess.

In line 5 Paribeni printed PP for the PPP which is clear on the photograph. In line 8 the erased name is totally illegible, but certain—see J. Gascou, MEFR 79 (1967), 620.

2. ELEMENTS IN THE IMPERIAL TITULATURE

The fullest form of the imperial titles in these eight authoritative documents is perhaps best exemplified in the Price Edict of 301, where the names and titles of Diocletian read as follows:

Imp(erator) Caesar C. Aurel(ius) Val(erius) Diocletianus P(ius) F(elix) Inv(ictus) Aug(ustus) pont(ifex) max(imus) Germ(anicus) max(imus) VI Sarm(aticus) max(imus) IV Pers(icus) max(imus) II Britt(anicus) max(imus) Carp(icus) max(imus) Armen(icus) max(imus) Medic(us) max(imus) Adiab(enicus) max(imus), trib(unicia) p(otestate) XVIII, coss. [i.e. consul] VII, imp(erator) XVIII, p(ater) p(atriae), procoss. [i.e. proconsul]. [no. I]

7. Millar, Emperor 579, assumes that the heading never named Maximinus.
Apart from the name, which is unique to each emperor, there are four different categories of title: (1) standard epithets, (2) imperial consulates, (3) *tribunicia potestas* and the title *imperator*, which are both renewed annually, (4) victory titles taken and renewed on the occasion of actual victories in the field. Each category must be considered separately.

**Standard Epithets**

The full official name of an Augustus includes a series of titles which normally do not change at either regular or irregular intervals: *imperator Caesar* before the proper name, *pius felix invictus Augustus* and *pontifex maximus* after, and *pater patriae proconsul* at the very end. A Caesar, in contrast, lacks the *praenomina imperatoris* and the honorific epithets, he is neither *pontifex maximus* nor *pater patriae* nor *proconsul*; usually he is simply *nobilissimus Caesar*, though other epithets may be added (e.g. *nobilissimus ac beatissimus Caesar, nobilissimus et fortissimus Caesar, nobilissimus et invictus Caesar*).  

Many minor variations are attested, and some epithets not yet noted are significant. Diocletian, Galerius, Maximinus, and Licinius and his son are all Iovii, Maximian, Constantius, Severus, and Constantine all Herculi, while after their abdication in 305 Diocletian and Maximian became *seniores Augusti* and "fathers of the Augusti and Caesars." Further, two changes in Constantine's titulature reflect specific political events. The title *maximus* advertises Constantine's standing as senior emperor: the *primi nominis titulus* was voted by the Roman Senate shortly after 28 October 312 and the epithet assumed in consequence (Lactantius, *Mort. Pers.* 44. II). Similarly, in 324, after defeating Licinius, Constantine took the title *victor* or *triumphator* (Eusebius, *VC* 2.19.2, naturally using the Greek equivalent *νικητής*).  

---

8. On the earlier use of descriptive epithets such as *felix* and *invictus*, see L. Berlinger, *Beiträge zur inoffiziellen Titulatur der römischen Kaiser* (Diss. Breslau, 1935), 1 ff.

9. For examples of these and other phrases, see *ILS* 3, pp. 304 (Constantius), 305 (Galerius), 306 (Severus and Maximinus), 309–310 (the sons of Constantine). In the following three footnotes, the documentation is deliberately selective.

10. *ILS* 634 (the “First Tetrarchy”); 621, 623, 659, 8930 (Diocletian); 661, 8931 (Galerius); *RIC* 6.636, Antiochia 134 (Maximinus); *RIC* 7.600–608 (Nicomedia), 676–682 (Antioch: the two Licini).  

11. *ILS* 622, 623, 659 (Maximian); *Pan. Lat.* 9(4).8.1 (Constantius); *RIC* 6.287, Ticinum 54a, b; 317, Aquileia 47a, b (Severus); *Pan. Lat.* 7(6).2.5, 8.2 (Constantine). In his attempts to present himself as a legitimate emperor, Maxentius too may have styled himself Herculeus, see *RIC* 6.367–368, Roma 137–139; 369, Roma 147; 373, Roma 171; 374, Roma 181–184. Hence “Herculi Caes, vincas!” on a brooch now in Turin (*ILS* 681, republished by R. Noll, *Bonner Jahrbücher* 174 (1974), 235/6) may refer to Maxentius rather than to Constantine.

12. *ILS* 645 (seniores Aug.); no. 4 (*patres impp. et Caess.*); *ILS* 646 (seniores Augg., *patres impp. et Caess.*).


Imperial Consulates

The identity of the consules ordinarii for any year normally admitted of no uncertainty and complete lists have survived from antiquity. At times of political conflict, however, different consuls were sometimes recognized in different jurisdictions. Such was the case in 284, 285, 307–313, and 321–324, but only in two cases between 284 and 337 is the actual date of an imperial consulate subject to any doubt. Galerius was cos. VII in 308, except in the territory of Maxentius where this consulate was not recognized, but where Galerius had been regarded as cos. VII from 1 January to April 307; Constantine was consul for the first time in 307, but this consulate was not recognized outside his own domains, while he refused ever to acknowledge the consulate with Licinius which Galerius, Licinius, and Maximinus attributed to him in 309.¹⁵

Tribunicia Potestas and Imperator

Both Augusti and Caesars received the tribunician power on the day of their proclamation as emperor and they renewed it on each subsequent 10 December. Diocletian, for example, who received the tribunician power on 20 November 284, renewed it for the first time on 10 December 284, and thus became trib. pot. II on that day, trib. pot. III on 10 December 285, and so on. The full titulature of an Augustus contains the word imperator twice: once at the beginning in the unvarying phrase imperator Caesar, once as an attributive title which follows the proper name and is renewed annually on the anniversary of his dies imperii, i.e. the day on which he took or was officially deemed to have taken the purple.¹⁶ Hence the titles of Diocletian, which show no irregularities, are numbered as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>trib. pot. imp.</td>
<td>20 November–9 December 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trib. pot. II imp.</td>
<td>20 December 284–19 November 285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trib. pot. II imp. II</td>
<td>20 November 285–9 December 285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trib. pot. III imp. II</td>
<td>10 December 285–19 November 286, etc.²⁷</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The titles of Licinius, who was appointed to the imperial college as an Augustus, without holding the rank of Caesar, are equally straightforward: he took the purple and received tribunicia potestas on 11 November 308, became trib. pot. II imp. on 10 December 308, trib. pot. II imp. II on 11 November 309, and so on.

The titles of Augusti who had previously been Caesars exhibit complexities, and even confusion. On the strictest definition, since a Caesar lacked the title

¹⁵. For consulates from 284 to 337, Chapter VI.1; Table 1.
¹⁶. H. Dessau, EE 7 (1892), 429 ff. No one has seriously challenged Dessau’s explanation of how the titles behave (though some have ignored it). The earliest apparent example of imperator renewed annually which I can find is a series of boundary stones in Rome where Hadrian in 121 is trib. potest. V imp. IIII cos. III ILS 5931).
¹⁷. Hence the edict on prices (no. 2) was issued after 20 November 301, when Diocletian became imp. XVII, but before 10 December 301, when his nineteenth tribunicia potestas began.
emperor (which well-informed contemporary writers use as a synonym for Augustus), an Augustus who had previously been a Caesar should reckon his possession of the title only from his promotion to the higher rank. Some inscriptions do indeed employ this computation. Two datable to 306 style Constantius imp. II; since he became Caesar on 1 March 293, Augustus on 1 May 305, this implies that he assumed the title imperator in 305 and renewed it on 1 May 306 (ILS 651; AE 1895.80: both Thibilis). On a broader definition, however, an Augustus may be counted as having possessed the title, not from his promotion to that rank, but from his earlier proclamation as Caesar. Thus in the letter or edict which Galerius promulgated in April 311 (no. 7), Constantine is imp. V, which seems to presuppose that he became imperator on 25 July 306, imp. II on 25 July 307, and so on.

The observable phenomena, however, cannot be explained in terms of the preceding rules alone. For three Augusti who had previously been Caesars are attested as possessing both one more tribunicia potentas and one more imperatorial salutation than a straightforward reckoning from their dies imperii would provide. The first case is Maximian, who was trib. pot. X imp. VIII in 294 (ILS 640: near Vitudurum) and trib. pot. XVII in late November or early December 301 (no. 2). Since Diocletian in both 294 and 301 regarded the dies imperii of Maximian as being 1 April 286, Maximian must have received an irregular renewal of both titles in or before 294; hence it is a plausible conjecture that both titles were augmented on 1 March 293, when Maximian invested Constantius as Caesar. (Even before 293, however, Maximian himself appears to have regarded his reign as beginning with his appointment as Caesar on 21 July 285 (Pan. Lat.10(2).3/4); and an inscription from Rome has imp. VIII cos. III (CIL 6.1124), i.e. seven renewals of the title imperator before 1 January 293.) The titles of Galerius and Constantine also exhibit the same apparent anomaly. Galerius was trib pot. XX imp. XIX in April 311 (no. 7); Constantine trib. pot. VII imp. VI on 9 June 311 (FIRA2 1.93), and trib pot. XXXIII imp. XXXII c. February 337 (no. 8). In both cases the numbers are correct if they are calculated from the initial dies imperii (respectively, 1 March 293 and 25 July 306), with an additional renewal of both titles on the promotion of the Caesar to Augustus in 305 and 307 (Table 2).

19. Chapter I, n. 6; below, section 3.
21. Chapter I, n. 6; below, section 3.
22. As proposed by W. Seston, REA 39 (1937), 203 (Galerius); T. D. Barnes, Phoenix 30 (1976), 190 n. 61.
THE IMPERIAL TITULATURE

Some examples of Constantine's titulature cannot be accommodated within the patterns described here, and the evidence appears to compel the hypothesis that his tribunicia potestas and imperatorial acclamations were reckoned in at least four different ways (Table 3).

Victory Titles

The rules which govern the assumption, order, and iteration of victory titles like Diocletian's Germanicus maximus VI in 301 must be inferred from observation and by an inductive argument. When the authoritative examples of the imperial titulature are analyzed, and unofficial documents disregarded, two rules can be seen to be paramount and invariable. No emperor between 284 and 337 officially assumed a victory title except for a victory which a member of the imperial college won on active campaign; and victory titles always appear in the order in which they were assumed for the first time, regardless of iterations. In some documents, however, the criteria for inclusion are stricter than others. At the one extreme, the titulature of the two edicts of 301 observes the principle of full collegiality, whereby all four emperors take and renew the titles pertaining to victories won after their dies imperii by any number of the imperial college; hence Diocletian is Germanicus maximus VI, while Maximian is Germanicus maximus V and the Caesars are Germanici maximi II (nos. 1, 2). At the other extreme, the letter of Constantine to the Roman Senate early in 337 records victory titles only for those victories which the emperor won himself: Constantine has four victory titles, the Caesar Constantinus one which his father lacks and the other three Caesars none at all (no. 8). An intermediate criterion for inclusion was also sometimes adopted. Some less authoritative examples of the titulature of Constantine exhibit a combination of titles which seems explicable only on the hypothesis that they reflect victories won by Constantine himself and by some, but not all, of his imperial colleagues (ILS 696 (near Sitifis); 8942 (Sema): Constantine and Licinius; ILAlg. 1.3956 (between Theveste and Thelepte): Constantine, Licinius, and Maximinus).

For reconstructing the military history of the period, three sets of victory titles are of central importance: those of Diocletian and his colleagues in late 301 (Table 4), those of Galerius in 301, 306, and 311 (Table 6), and those of Constantine c. February 337 (no. 8). When all the available evidence is collated and analyzed, the approximate chronology can be deduced (Tables 5, 7, and 8).

23. The collection of material in P. Kneissl, Die Siegestitulatur der römischen Kaiser (Hypomnemata 23, 1969), 238–240, is incomplete: of the eight examples of the full imperial titulature printed above, Kneissl omits nos. 3 and 5–7. On individual titles, see O. Seeck, RE 1 (1894), 1280, s.v. Alamannicus; A. Stein, RE 3 (1899), 1610, s.v. Carpicus; RE 7 (1912), 1251–57, s.v. Germanicus; 1683–85, s.v. Gothicus; RE 2A (1921), 15–23, s.v. Sarmaticus.
Egyptian regnal years observe principles of their own. The official year begins on 1 Thoth, which corresponds to 29 August (except in the Julian year preceding a leap year, when it corresponds to 30 August), so that an emperor's first year is the period (however short) between his dies imperii and the following 29 (or 30) August. On the latter day the emperor's second year begins, regardless of whether news of his accession had reached Egypt before 29 (or 30) August. Hence the following well-attested equations:

1 Diocletian = 20 November 284–28 August 285
2 Diocletian = 29 August 285–28 August 286, etc.
1 Constantius = 1 Galerius = 1 March 293–28 August 293, etc.
1 Severus = 1 Maximinus = 1 May 305–28 August 305, etc.
1 Licinius = 11 November 308–28 August 309, etc.
1 Crispus = 1 Licinius Caesar = 1 Constantinus Caesar = 1 March 317–28 August 317, etc.
1 Constantius = 8 November 324–28 August 325, etc.
1 Constans = 25 December 333–28 August 334, etc.
1 Dalmatius = 18 September 335–28 August 336, etc.

The regnal years of Maximian and Constantine as attested in contemporary documents import a complication. The dating formulae in papyri from spring 286 to late 303 consistently state the regnal years of Maximian as one fewer in number than those of Diocletian, which implies a dies imperii on or after 29 August 285; but papyri from the end of 303 consistently give Maximian exactly the same number of regnal years as Diocletian, which implies a dies imperii on or before 28 August 285. For Constantine, there is a formal and simple contradiction: his dies imperii was 25 July 306, but his first regnal year was equated with 15 Galerius and 3 Severus and Maximinus (P. Cairo Isid. 45, 46, 52, 116, etc.), i.e., with the Egyptian year which began on 29 August 306. Both cases can readily be explained. Until 20 November 303 Maximian's dies imperii was deemed to be his proclamation as Augustus on 1 April 286, but from 20 November 303 it was deemed to be his prior appointment as Caesar on 21 July 285. Although Constantine was proclaimed Augustus in Britain on 25 July 306, he then sought recognition from Galerius as the senior reigning emperor.

Lombardo 106 (1972), 28 ff.; Contributi di Storia antica in onore di A. Garzetti (Genoa, 1976), 175 ff.
27. U. Wilcken, Griechische Ostraka 1 (Leipzig and Berlin, 1899), 789; Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde 1.1 (Leipzig and Berlin, 1912), lvi.
The latter deliberated long before he recognized Constantine as Caesar, and, instead of acknowledging the proclamation of 25 July, he sent Constantine the imperial purple himself (Lactantius, *Mort. Pers.* 25.1–5). Hence, in Galerius' eyes, the *dies imperii* of Constantine was not 25 July 306, but subsequent to 29 August 306—presumably the day on which Galerius dispatched the purple, or, possibly, the day on which Constantine received it. Under the circumstances, it is perhaps surprising that Constantine did not revise the official computation of his regnal years when he gained political control of Egypt.

30. *Mort. Pers.* 25.3; "suscepit itaque imaginem admodum invitus atque ipse purpuram misit" (with my emendation *ipse* for the ms. *ipsi*).

31. News of Constantine's appointment had not reached Karanis by 17 November 306 (*P. Cairo Isid.* 115), but it was known at Oxyrhynchus by 30 November (*P. Oxy.* 1750).
The present chapter discusses the principal evidence for the families and private careers of the legitimate emperors from Diocletian to the Caesars whom Constantine created. Each emperor will be treated separately, in order of seniority in the imperial college, and each discussion will have approximately the same format: (1) date of birth and parentage, (2) career before accession, (3) marriages and progeny, (4) where relevant, details of life after abdicating the imperial power. Where the facts are clear and well attested, a summary statement with references will be given, extended discussion being reserved for matters of real doubt or obscurity.

**Diocletian**

Born on 22 December (P. Beatty Panopolis 2.164, 173, 181/2, 193/4, 262). Two sources give Diocletian's age: one written shortly after 395 implies that he died in the early months of 313 and states that he lived sixty-eight years (Epitome 39.7); another of the late sixth century estimates his age at death as seventy-two (Malalas 311 Bonn). Their testimony is normally rejected and Diocletian's birth has been dated as early as c. 225. But no positive reason exists for rejecting the explicit evidence, and of the two witnesses the earlier presum-

---

1. Seeck, *Geschichte* 13.437. Less extreme hypotheses are adopted by W. Ensslin, *RE* 7A (1948), 2421, who wished to emend *LXVIII annos* to *LXXVIII* (which implies birth c. 234), and in *PLRE* 1.253–254, Diocletianus 2, which argues that "the *Epitome* has perhaps confused his age on abdicating with his age at death."
ably deserves preference: it indicates (depending on the base date and method of computation) that Diocletian was born on 22 December 243, 244, or 245.

Diocletian originally bore the name Diocles (Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 9.11, 19.5, 52.3; Libanius, Orat. 19.45 ff.; Epitome 39.1), which he changed after he became emperor, though not immediately on his proclamation (P. Oxy. 3055 (7 March 285)).

About Diocletian's parentage and origins, the ancient sources exhibit vagueness or uncertainty: he came from Illyricum (Victor, Caes. 39.26) or, better, Dalmatia (Eutropius, Brev. 9.19.2; Epitome 39.1), his mother and birthplace were both called Dioclea (Epitome 39.1), and some thought that his father was a scribe, others that he himself was a freedman of the senator Anullinus (Eutropius, Brev. 9.19.2). How much of this rests on secure knowledge? Perhaps only Dalmatia as the province of origin. As for Diocletian's precise origin, Lactantius perhaps implies, and two late writers state, that he hailed from Salonae, close to Spalato where he built a palace and passed his years of retirement.

No valid evidence attests Diocletian's career before 284, when he was domesticos regens (Victor, Caes. 39.1; HA, Carus 13.1) or κόμης δομεστικών (Zonaras 12.31), i.e., commander of a special corps which always attended the emperor.

Diocletian's wife was Prisca, whose origin is unknown, and their daughter was Valeria, who married Galerius (Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 7.9, 15.1, 39.5, 51).

On 1 May 305 Diocletian abdicated at Nicomedia and retired to the palace which he had built at Spalato on the Dalmatian coast (Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 19.6; Eutropius, Brev. 9.27.2; Epitome 39.6). Only one subsequent political act is known: he attended the Conference of Carnuntum in November 308, but refused to emerge from retirement (Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 29.2, 43.5-6; Epitome 39.6). About the date and manner of his death, the ancient testimony is

2. T. C. Skeat, Papyri from Panopolis (Dublin, 1964), 146. E. Stein, Hermes 52 (1917), 576, preferred Malalas, and deduced that Diocletian was born in 244 on the grounds that he died on 3 December 316 (not 311, as argued here).

3. "Diocles" is the form which appears in Egyptian demotic, see J. Baines, Oxyrhynchus Papyri 47 (London, 1980), xviii.

4. R. Syme, Emperors and Biography: Studies in the Historia Augusta (Oxford, 1971), 211 f., 233. The present chapter (it may be noted here) discounts all inferences from HA, Probus 22.3 for the careers of Diocletian or any of his colleagues (cf. ibid. 213 f.).


EMPERORS

contradictory. Whether he killed himself deliberately (Lactantius, *Mort. Pers. 42*) or died of illness alone (Eusebius, *HE* 8, app. 3) was clearly a matter of uncertainty even to contemporaries. More serious, different dates are stated or implied:

1. Lactantius, *Mort. Pers. 42*: Diocletian starved himself when he heard that his name had become involved in the *damnatio memoriae* of Maximian. Since the latter belongs to the time of Constantine's war against Maxentius, a date in 311 or 312 is implied.

2. *Epitome* 39.7; Socrates, *HE* 1.2.10: Diocletian's death is linked to the marriage of Licinius and Constantia in February 313.

3. A date of 315 or 316 is stated by Jerome *Chronicle* 230 (from which derive Prosper Tiro (*Chr. Min.* 1.448) and a later Gallic chronicle (*Chr. Min.* 1.643)); Zosimus 2.8.1; *Chr. Pasch.* 523.

4. *Consularia Constantinopolitana* a. 316 (*Chr. Min.* 1.231); *P. Berol.* 13296: 3 December 316.

Lactantius' chronology should be preferred to the others, and, if the *Consularia Constantinopolitana* may be supposed to have confused the consular dates of 311 (*Volusiano et Rufino*) and 316 (*Sabino et Rufino*), then the day on which Diocletian died was 3 December 311.

**Maximian**

Stated to be *sexagenarius* at the time of his death (*Epitome* 40.11): therefore, born c. 250. A speech survives which was delivered on Maximian's birth-day in 291, but it does not disclose the day and month (*Pan. Lat.* 11(3)).

The only precise statement about Maximian's parents asserts that they were shopkeepers near Sirmium (*Epitome* 40.10: "exercebant opera mercenaria"). Otherwise there are vague allusions to Illyricum as his *patria* (Victor, *Caes.* 39.26), to his *Pannonia virtus* and upbringing "in illo limite, illa fortissimarum sede legionum" (*Pan. Lat.* 10(2).2.2 ff., cf. 11(3).3.9).


9. *JRS* 63 (1973), 34 f., 41 ff.

10. Both writers are probably dependent on Eunapius, see *CP* 71 (1976), 267.


13. *P. Beatty Panopolis* 2.164, etc., shows that Diocletian and Maximian had different birthdays (T. C. Skeat, *Papyri from Panopolis* 145 f.); the occasion of *Pan. Lat.* 11(3), therefore, is the *genuinus natalis* of Maximian alone, not a *geminus natalis* shared by both Augusti (Chapter V, n. 52).
THE CAREERS AND FAMILIES OF EMPERORS

11(3).5/6). The areas where he served can perhaps be deduced from an allusion to his military service before 285: "ibó scilicet virtutis tuae vestigiis colligendis per totum Histri limitem perque omnem qua tendit Euphraten et ripas peragrabó Rheni et litus Oceani?" (Pan. Lat. 10(2).2.6). Even without such testimony, however, it could reasonably be conjectured that Maximian was with Carus when he invaded Mesopotamia in 283 and present when Diocletian was proclaimed emperor at Nicomedia on 20 November 284.14

For Maximian, one wife is attested, and another must probably be postulated. The Syrian Eutropia, who was still alive after 324 (Eusebius, VC 3.52, cf. Sozomenus, HE 2.4.6), bore him both Maxentius and Fausta (Origo 12; Julian, Orat. 1, 6a; Epitome 40.12; Sozomenus, HE 2.4.6). It is normally believed that Eutropia had previously been married to someone else (often identified as Afranius Hannibalianus, cos. 292) and that Theodora, the wife of Constantius, was her daughter by her first husband, and thus the stepdaughter of Maximian.15 This view should be rejected. The writers who call Theodora the stepdaughter of Maximian (Victor, Caes. 39.25; Eutropius, Brev. 9.22; Jerome, Chronicle 2256; Epitome 39.2, 40.12) all derive their information from a single lost source written c. 337, whose testimony is not necessarily reliable.16 Other extant writers make Theodora the full daughter of Maximian; though fewer in number, they are superior in authority (Origo 2; Philostorgius, HE 2.16⁸).17 Their evidence should be preferred on the general ground that, when no decisive evidence exists, normally reliable sources deserve credit over those whose inaccuracy can be detected on other matters. Moreover, if Theodora was the full daughter of Maximian, then a more natural meaning can be assigned to the panegyrist of 289, when he declares that Maximian has bound his praetorian prefect to him by a marriage which produces "non timoris obsequia sed vota pietatis" (Pan. Lat. 10(2).11.4): the allusion is to Constantius as his son-in-law, not to Hannibalianus as the first husband of Eutropia.18 Hence Theodora was born no later than c. 275.

If Theodora was not the daughter of Eutropia, then she must be Maximian's daughter by a previous wife, whose name, origin, and existence are nowhere directly attested. It may be relevant, therefore that one of the sons of Constantius and Theodora was called Hannibalianus. That might indicate that

15. E.g., O. Seeck, RE 4 (1901), 1041; Geschichte 13.27 ff.; Stein, Bas-Empire 12.68, 435; W. Ensslin, RE 5A (1934), 1773–74, Theodora 2; PLRE 1.895, Theodora 1.
16. Viz. the lost "Kaisergeschichte," postulated by A. Enmann, Philologus, Supp. 4 (1884), 335 ff. For some of its errors concerning the reign of Diocletian, see Phoenix 30 (1976), 174; The Sources of the Historia Augusta (Collection Latomus 155, 1978), 92 f.
17. On their value, see, respectively, D. J. A. Westerhuis, Origo Constantini Imperatoris sive Anonymi Valesiani pars prior (Diss. Groningen, 1906); J. Bidez, in the introduction to his edition of Philostorgius, GCS 21 (1913), evi ff. In BHAC 1968/69 (1970), 25, I mistakenly followed the communis opinio, to the detriment of my own argument.
18. The passage is quoted and discussed more fully in Chapter VIII.1.
Maximian married a daughter of Afranius Hannibalianus (cos. 292), one of whose ancestors appears to derive from Tralles.19

The ages of Maxentius and Fausta are nowhere explicitly attested. Modern estimates for the date of Maxentius' birth have diverged widely, from c. 277 to c. 287,20 while the birth of Fausta has often been dated c. 298.21 But the latter date depends on the supposition that it was only in 298 or 299 that Maximian first visited Rome, where Fausta was born, according to Julian (Orat. 1, 5d). That premise is vulnerable.22 Probability, and the evidence of contemporaries, appear to indicate that Maximian's son and daughter were born c. 283 and in 289 or 290. The panegyric of 289, when interpreted strictly, seems to indicate that Maxentius has not yet reached his seventh birthday (Pan. Lat. 10(2).14.1: "felix aliquis praecceptor expectat"),23 while by 305 he was both married and a candidate for the purple (Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 18.9. ff.). Maxentius' mother, in November 312, swore that she had conceived him in adultery with a Syrian (Origo 12); that might imply that Maxentius was born, or at least conceived, in Syria—where Maximian would have been c. 283, serving under the emperors Carus and then Numerianus.24 As for Fausta, a mosaic in the palace of Aquileia, whose dramatic date was no later than 296 (and may have been 293) depicted her as a girl (Pan. Lat. 7(6).6.2), and the panegyric delivered at her wedding in 307 appears to assume that she is already of child-bearing age (Pan. Lat. 7(6).2.1 ff.; cf. 6.2: "sed adhuc [i.e. in the 290s] impar oneri suo"). Moreover, if Fausta was indeed born in Rome while her father was there, then the evidence for Maximian's movements appears to render it probable that she was born in 289 or 290.25

When Maximian abdicated on 1 May 305, he retired to Campania (Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 26.7) or Lucania (Eutropius, Brev. 9.27.2, 10.2.3), whence he issued forth late in 306 to help his son, again an Augustus, but never again recognized as such by the senior emperor.26

Maximian's posthumous reputation requires discussion. He suffered damnatio memoriae, not immediately after his death c. July 310 (cf. Pan. Lat. 6(7).14.3 ff.; 20.3 ff.), but probably in late 311, when Constantine was at war with Maxentius, who had proclaimed his father Divus Maximianus and professed to be avenging his death (Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 42.1 ff.; RIC 6.382, 6.383).27

20. Respectively, E. Groag, RE 14 (1930), 2419 f.; PLRE 1.571 ("probably born c.a. 287").
22. Chapter V, n. 49.
24. Numerianus was at Emesa in April 284 (CJ 5.52.2).
25. Chapter V: Maximian.
26. Chapter II. P. Cairo Isid. 8, however, dated 14 June 309, implies that Maximian was recognized as a member of the imperial college by Maximinus, cf. A. E. R. Boak and H. C. Youtie, The Archive of Aurelius Isidorus (Ann Arbor, 1960), 72 f.
When Maxentius was dead, however, his mother swore on oath that he was not Maximian's son (Origo 12, cf. Pan. Lat. 12(9).3.4, 4.3), and the memory of Maximian was rehabilitated: by 318 he was being commemorated as divus on Constantine's coinage, together with Constantius and Claudius, from whom Constantine had begun to claim descent in 310 (RIC 7.180, Trier 200–207; 252, Arles 173–178; 310–312, Rome 104–128; 395, Aquileia 21–26; 429/30, Siscia 41–46; 503, Tessalonica 24–26).

Two pieces of evidence may be argued to refer to the consecration of Maximian, which technically required a formal decree of the Roman Senate. First, Eutropius (Brev. 9.28) and Jerome (Chronicle 230), both probably dependent on the same lost source, report that Diocletian was consecrated. That is not only unattested, but highly improbable—presumably, therefore, a confusion with Maximian. Second, Athanasius refers vaguely to recent consecrations of dead emperors:

\[\text{ου πολλω πρότερον, ή τάχα και μέχρι νῦν ή των συγκλήτων τους πώποτε αυτών} \]

That is not only unattested, but highly improbable—presumably, therefore, a confusion with Maximian. The only emperors whom the Roman Senate consecrated as divi between 284 and 337 were Constantius in 306 (Pan. Lat. 6(7).3.3, 14.3; RIC 6.256, Lugdumum 202), Maximian and Galerius in 311 (RIC 6.382, Roma 243–255; 404, Ostia 24–31; ILS 671: Caesarea; 673: Rome), and Maximian again at some date after 28 October 312, if the apotheosis under Maxentius was regarded as null and void. It can be demonstrated, on philosophical grounds, that Athanasius wrote the Contra Gentes some years before 324. Hence an allusion to reports of the consecration of Maximian c. 317 seems probable.

Constantius

Born on 31 March (CIL 12, p. 255); the year is unknown, but Constantius' career and the age of his eldest son entail a date no later than c. 250. Constan-

27. On the date, JRS 63 (1973), 34 f., 41 f. C. H. V. Sutherland, RIC 6 (1967), 33, had proposed early 312.


29. For the Senate's role, E. Bickermann, Archiv für Religionsgeschichte 13 (1926), 1 ff.; AJP 94 (1973), 362 ff.

30. Viz. the lost "Kaisergeschichte" (above, n. 16).

31. Consecration cannot be inferred from Maximinus' words in May 313: ὑπὸ τῶν θειοτάτων Διοκλετιανοῦ καὶ Μαξιμιανοῦ τῶν γονέων τῶν ἡμετέρων (Eusebius, HE 9.10.8). Although Constantine showed respect toward Diocletian during his lifetime (Pan. Lat. 6.7(7).15.4), the damnatio memoriae of Maximian involved the destruction of Diocletian's pictures too (Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 42.1), and after 28 October 312 Constantine was bound to disapprove officially of Diocletian because of his legislation against the Christians (Oratio 25; VC 2.50).

tius' family appears to derive from the later Dacia Ripensis (Julian, *Misopogon* 348d), and his parents (so it has been conjectured) were perhaps a Flavius Dalmatius and a Julia Constantia.

A reliable source gives the outline of his career: "protector primum, inde tribunus, postea praeses Dalmatiarum" (*Origo* 2). The *Historia Augusta* dates the governorship in Dalmatia to the reign of Carinus (*HA, Carus* 17.6), which must be at least approximately correct. By 288 Constantius was praetorian prefect to Maximian in Gaul (*Pan. Lat.* 10(2).11.4, 8(5).1.5 ff.).

Constantius married twice. His first wife was Helena, the mother of Constantine. She is reported to have been of humble origin (*Origo* 2; Ambrose, *De Obitu Theodosii* 42 (CSEL 73.393); Zosimus 2.8.2, 9.2), and she was a native of Drepanum in Bithynia, which Constantine renamed in her honor (Jerome, *Chronicle* 231b; Philostorgius, *HE* 2.12; Procopius, *De Aedificiis* 5.2.1; *Chr. Pasch.* 527). Several writers allege that Helena was merely the mistress or concubine of Constantius (Jerome, *Chronicle* 228s, whence Orosius, *Hist. Adv. Pag.* 7.25.16; *Chronica Gallica* a. DXI 445 (Chr. Min. 1.643); Zosimus 2.8.2; *Chr. Pasch.* 516/7). But more and better evidence states that she was in fact Constantius' wife (*ILS* 708: Salernum; *CIL* 10.1483: Naples; *Origo* 1; Victor, *Caes.* 39.25; Eutropius, *Brev.* 10.2.2; Jerome, *Chronicle* 225s; *Epitome* 39.2). Since Helena was about eighty when she died in 327 (Eusebius, *VÇ* 3.46–47), while Constantine was born in 272 or 273, she must have married Constantius before c. 270, i.e., before he rose to the rank of *tribunus* in the Roman army.

An allusion in the panegyric of 310 may now be considered. The vital name is obscured by textual corruption: "te enim tantus ille et imperai or in terris et in cælo deus in primo aetatis suae flore generavit toto adhuc corpore vigens,ilia praeditus alacritate ac fortitudine quam bella plurima, praecipue campi videre Vindonii, as she was believed to have been (Ambrose, *De Obitu Theodosii* 42), could not contract a valid marriage with a senator or *vir perfectissimus* (*CTh* 4.6.3 (336), cf. *Dig.* 23.2.41–47). Observe also that the epitaph of a *protector Aureliani Augusti* at Nicomedia (*ILS* 2775) may imply that emperor's presence in Bithynia shortly after 270.


Thus E. Baehrens (1874), W. Baehrens (1911), E. Galletier (1952), and R. A. B. Mynors...
the orator is speaking of the time when Constantius sired Constantine, i.e. the early 270s. He ought, therefore, on general grounds, to allude to the campaign in which Aurelian defeated Zenobia. It was presumably to produce such an allusion that scholars of the fifteenth century who corrected two manuscripts of the speech conjectured *videre Sydonii*.\(^39\) Even though Zenobia fought near Antioch and at Palmyra itself, not near Sidon or in Phoenicia (Zosimus 1.50 ff.), *campi videre Sidonii* will supply exactly what the sense of the passage requires.\(^40\)

If these conjectures are well founded, the following career can be established for Constantius:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Born</th>
<th>c. 250</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protector with Aurelian in Syria</td>
<td>271/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribunus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praeses of Dalmatia</td>
<td>284/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praetorian prefect of Maximian</td>
<td>288–293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constantius’ second wife was Theodora, the daughter of Maximian, whom he had married before 21 April 289 (*Pan. Lat.* 10(2).11.4).\(^41\) They had six children, whose ages are in no case directly attested:

1. Flavius Dalmatius, cos. 333
2. Julius Constantius, cos. 335
5. Anastasia, married by 316 to the senator Bassianus (*Origo* 14)
6. Eutropia, mother of Nepotianus, who was proclaimed Augustus in 350 (Eutropius, *Brev.* 10.11; *Epitome* 42.3; Zosimus 2.43.2)\(^42\)

**Galerius**

Galerius’ date of birth is unknown; it might fall as late as c. 260.\(^43\) He was born (and subsequently buried) at Romulianum on the Danube, whose name

---

\(^{39}\) Reported by Mynors in his critical apparatus (p. 188.19).

\(^{40}\) G. W. Bowersock has suggested to me that the correct reading might be *videre Eoi*, which would avoid the apparent geographical imprecision.

\(^{41}\) Chapter VIII.1.

\(^{42}\) *PLRE* 1.316, Eutropia 2.

\(^{43}\) An inference (admittedly uncertain) from his long-standing friendship with Licinius (Lactantius, *Mort. Pers.* 20.3; Eutropius, *Brev.* 10.4.1). It is impermissible to deduce that Galerius
allegedly derived from his mother Romula, and his parents are said to have been peasants, Galerius himself once a shepherd (Epitome 40.15-16, cf. Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 9.9; Victor, Caes. 39.24, 40.1, 40.6; Eutropius, Brev. 9.22.1; Jerome, Chronicle 225). His father’s name is unknown, but Galerius himself originally bore the name Maximinus (Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 18.13).

Galerius’ career before 293 is also unknown; but he certainly served in the army, and it is a permissible conjecture that he was praetorian prefect to Diocletian.  

Galerius’ marriages and children present a problem, and much depends on Lactantius’ statement that Valeria, the daughter of Diocletian and wife of Galerius, had adopted Candidianus, her husband’s son by a concubine, ob sterilitatem (Mort. Pers. 50.2). Lactantius is normally taken to say that Valeria bore no children at all; hence Valeria Maximilla, who married Maxentius (ILS 667: near Rome, cf. ILS 671: Caesarea in Mauretania; Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 18.9), is deduced to be Galerius’ daughter by an earlier, otherwise unattested marriage. Lactantius, however, could be taken to mean that Valeria was unable to conceive any children except a single daughter. If so, then Valeria Maximilla may (as her names perhaps imply) be the daughter of Galerius and Valeria, whose marriage consequently occurred before Galerius became Caesar. 

Candidianus was born c. 296 and executed in 313 (Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 20.4, 35.3, 50.2 ff.).

Severus

From Illyricum (Victor, Caes. 40.1), of humble birth (Origo 9). No ancient source reveals anything about Severus’ career before 305 except that he commanded soldiers and was a friend of Galerius (Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 18.12; Origo 9). Nor is anything known of Severus’ family except that his son Severianus was aetate robustus in 313, when he fought under Maximinus and was executed by Licinius (Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 50.4). Nevertheless, a conjecture may be advanced, based on the phrase with which Lactantius makes Galerius

“served under Aurelian and Probus” (PLRE 1.574) from Victor’s remark that the concord of all four Tetrarchs showed how virtue could be attained by “ingenium usumque bonae militiae, quanta his Aureliani Probique instituto fuit” (Caes. 39.28). Besides being plural, the statement derives from Victor’s ratiocination rather than from precise information.

44. Chapter VIII.5.
45. W. Ensslin, RE 7A (1948), 2282; PLRE 1.937.
46. E.g., PLRE 1.575; Stemma 1.
47. The ancient statements that Galerius (like Constantius) divorced his first wife in 293 are of no weight, since they all derive from the lost “Kaisergeschichte” (Victor, Caes. 39.25; Eutropius, Brev. 9.22.1; Jerome, Chronicle 225). 
48. On the recent theory that Candidianus was proclaimed Caesar, Chapter I, n. 18.
commend him to Diocletian as a candidate for empire in 305: “militibus fideliter praefuit” (Mort. Pers. 18.12). Severus was perhaps the praetorian prefect of Galerius—or conceivably of Maximian. 49

Severus surrendered his imperial insignia to Maximian in spring 307 at Ravenna; he was then taken to Rome, where he was either forced to commit suicide or executed (Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 26.9–11; Origo 9–10; Chr. Min. 1.148, 231; Victor, Caes. 40.7; Eutropius, Brev. 10.2.4; Epitome 40.3; Zosimus 2.10.2).

Maximinus

Son of Galerius’ sister and originally called Daia (Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 18.13–14; Epitome 40.1, 40.18; Zosimus 2.8.1). Lactantius provides the only evidence for his career before 305: “sublatus nuper a pecoribus et silvis, statim scutarius, continuo protector, mox tribunus, postridie Caesar” (Mort. Pers. 19.6). When he died in 313, Maximinus left a widow, a son of seven or eight named Maximus, and a daughter aged six or seven who was betrothed to Candidianus (Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 50.6; Zonaras 13.1). 50

Maximinus’ birthday fell on 20 November (Eusebius, Mart. Pal. 6.1). The year is unknown. It has been argued, mainly from his iconography, that Maximinus was born c. 285; 51 if the inference were sound, then it would be an attractive conjecture that he was born on the very day on which Diocletian became emperor (20 November 284). However, the fact that Maximinus entered the army as a scutarius (i.e., an ordinary recruit in the ranks) suggests that his uncle did not yet hold high office; hence the hypothesis of birth c. 270, enrollment c. 285, may be closer to the truth.

Constantine

The son of Constantius and Helena, Constantine was born at Naissus (Firmicus Maternus, Math. 1.10.13; Origo 2) on 27 February (CIL 12, pp. 255, 258, 259) in 272 or 273. Although none states the exact year, the ancient sources do not diverge greatly on the date of Constantine’s birth. Eusebius assumes a date of birth c. 273 when he asserts that Constantine began to reign at the age at which Alexander died, that he lived twice as long as Alexander (VC 1.8), and that his life was about twice as long as his reign (VC 4.53). Later writers state Constantine’s age at his death (22 May 337) as follows:

49. Chapter VIII.5.  
50. For the correct interpretation of Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 50.6 (filium suum Maximum, not maximum), H. J. Lawlor and J. E. L. Oulton, Eusebius: Ecclesiastical History 2 (London, 1928), 304; R. M. Grant, Christianity, Judaism and other Greco-Roman Cults 4 (Leiden, 1975), 144 n. 6. On the hypothesis that Maximinus proclaimed his son Caesar, Chapter I, n. 23.  
Despite this approximate unanimity among the sources, modern scholars have often dated Constantine's birth between 280 and 288. But such a late date renders Constantine's career incomprehensible, and it has been deduced from evidence which is both imprecise and tendentious. Three categories of evidence are normally adduced: (1) Descriptions of Constantine as imperator adulescens in speeches delivered in 307 and 310 (Pan. Lat. 7(6).5.3, 6(7).17.1) and as adulescens and iuvenis by Lactantius when writing in 313/4 of events in 305/6 and 310 (Mort. Pers. 18.10, 24.4, 29.5). (2) Retrospective statements in panegyrical contexts to the effect that Constantine was very young at his accession in 306 (Pan. Lat. 4(10).16.4, drawing a comparison with the infant Hercules (321); Lactantius, Div. Inst. 1.1.14 (324); Firmicus Maternus, Math. 1.10.13 (337)) or shortly before his accession (Eusebius, VC 1.19 (337 or 338, referring to 301/2). (3) The words of Constantine himself, who many years later alleged that he was "still a mere child" in 303 when Diocletian decreed the persecution of Christians (Eusebius, VC 2.51: τότε κομιδή πως έτι υπάρχων—translating a Latin original whose precise wording is unknown).

All of these statements may be discounted. The clear contradiction which exists between most of the contemporary and all the narrative sources should be resolved at the expense of the former, not of the latter. Since Constantine's official propaganda emphasized and exaggerated his youthfulness, the contemporary writers who stress his youth are merely reflecting what the emperor wished to be believed. Nor can Constantine's own statement legitimately be regarded as decisive, for it occurs in a damaging context, where the victor over Licinius is reviewing the origins of the "Great Persecution" (VC 2.50/51). Although at the court of Diocletian in 303, the young Constantine had done
nothing to defend or protect those whose champion he proclaimed himself in 324; misrepresentation of his true age helps to dissociate him from the emperors who persecuted the Christians.\textsuperscript{55} It would, accordingly, be imprudent to trust such evidence completely, even if its accuracy were not belied by facts on independent attestation.

Constantine's career before 306 is known from a number of precise, though partial, allusions which complement one another very neatly:\textsuperscript{56}


2. \textit{Origo} 2: "obses apud Diocletianum et Galerium, sub iisdem fortiter in Asia militavit."

3. \textit{Pan. Lat.} 7(6).6.2: a mosaic in the palace at Aquileia depicted Fausta offering to Constantine ("etiam tum puero") a plumed helmet gleaming with gold and jewels.\textsuperscript{58}

4. Constantine, \textit{Oratio} 16.2: Constantine claims to have seen with his own eyes "the pitiable fate of the cities" of Memphis in Egypt and Babylon in Mesopotamia.\textsuperscript{59}

5. \textit{Origo} 3, cf. Lactantius, \textit{Mort. Pers.} 24.4: Constantine helped Galerius to win a victory over the Sarmatians. The context in the \textit{Origo} seems to imply a date of 305/6, but it would not be prudent to assume that the author in-

\textsuperscript{55.} J. Vogt, \textit{Rom. Mitt.} 58 (1943), 194. For examples of \textit{puer} used of full-grown men, P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, \textit{Constantiniana (Studi e Testi} 171, 1953), 62—to which add \textit{Eleg. in Maecenatem} 2.5 (\textit{Appendix Vergiliana} (O.C.T.), p. 94) (Augustus' stepson Drusus at the time of his death); \textit{HA, Clod. Alb.} 2.5 (a man over thirty); Rutilius Namatianus, \textit{De reeditu} 1.170, 470 (a proconsul of Africa and a \textit{praefectus urbi}).

\textsuperscript{56.} \textit{Phoenix} 30 (1976), 184; \textit{HSCP} 80 (1976), 250 ff.

\textsuperscript{57.} Moreau, \textit{Lactance} 313 f., argues that Lactantius has conflated Constantine's army rank of \textit{tribunus} with his rank at court as \textit{comes primi ordinis}. But Eusebius attributes the creation of three ranks of \textit{comites} to Constantine (\textit{VC} 4.1.2).

\textsuperscript{58.} It is necessary to distinguish between the mosaic, which presumably did depict the scene described, and the interpretation of that scene as representing a betrothal—which need be no more than a happy invention of the orator of 307, see E. Galletier, \textit{Panégyriques latins} 2 (Paris, 1952), 71.

\textsuperscript{59.} Constantine clearly claims to have seen the ruins of both cities; after claiming that Memphis and Babylon were destroyed because of their idolatry, he affirms: \textit{καὶ ταῦτα οὐκ ἐξ ἀκοῆς λέγω, ἀλλ' αὐτός τε παρὰν καὶ ἱστορήσας ἐπότης τῇ γενόμενος τῆς ὀκτράς τῶν πόλεων τύχης} (16.2, p. 177.3–4 Heikel). He then discusses Memphis, with mention of Moses and Pythagoras (16–17, p. 177.5–23), before turning to Babylon, whose fate he describes at some length, though without uttering the name of the city again (17, pp. 177.23–179.3). Constantine's argument would be clearer if modern editors divided the text logically, instead of slavishly following the ancient division into chapters which Eusebius or his literary executor has provided (on the origin of the chapter division and chapter headings, see \textit{JTS}, n.s. 27 (1976), 418 ff.). New paragraphs ought to begin at p. 177.5 (\textit{Μέμφις ἐρημος}) and at p. 177.23 (\textit{Δανιήλ δὲ ὁ θεσπίσας τὰ μέλλοντα}).
EMPERORS

tended to do more than situate the episode before Constantine's journey to
Britain to join his father (cf. Origo 2).
6. Eusebius, VC 1.19: Eusebius saw him traveling across Palestine with Dio-
cletian, and at the emperor's right hand.
8. Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 18.10, 19.1 ff.: in Nicomedia in April 305 and on
1 May 305.
40.2–4; Epitome 41.2/3; Zosimus 2.8.2 ff.: Constantine fled the court of
Galerius and joined his father in Britain.
10. Pan. Lat. 6(7).7.1 ff.; Origo 4: with Constantius on a campaign against the
Picts in 305.60

All these partial allusions can be combined as follows:

Leaves the West to serve as a tribunus in the East (1, 2, 3) 293
Serves under Diocletian and Galerius in Syria (2) 296/7
Accompanies Galerius on his invasion of Mesopotamia (4) 298/9
Accompanies Galerius to the Danubian frontier (5) 299
Accompanies Diocletian to Egypt (4, 6) 301/2
Is with Diocletian in Nicomedia (7) 303
Presumably accompanies Diocletian during his visit to
Rome 303/4
Is with Diocletian in Nicomedia (8) spring 305
Goes to Britain (10, 11) summer 305

This reconstruction of Constantine's career precludes a date of birth as late as
280, but is perfectly consistent with the explicit testimony for his age, which,
with only three exceptions (Victor, the Epitome, and Malalas), indicates that
Constantine was sixty-four or sixty-five when he died. It may be concluded,
therefore, that Constantine was born on 27 February in either 272 or 273.61

Constantine married twice. His first wife was Minervina, whose origin and
parentage are unknown, and she bore him the Caesar Crispus. The ancient
sources who name Minervina call her a concubine (Epitome 41.4; Zosimus
2.20.2; Zonaras 13.2), and many modern scholars have concurred.62 These

60. For the date, Chapter V: Constantius.
61. Burckhardt and Schwartz, it may be recalled, adopted the dates of 274 and c. 275: J.
Burckhardt, Die Zeit Constantins des Grossen (Leipzig, 1880; often reprinted), Chapter VIII; E.
Schwartz, Charakterköpfe aus der Antike (Leipzig, 1943), 235. E. Galletier, Panégyriques latins
2 (Paris, 1952), 45, implied that Constantine was born in 270; more recently, PLRE 1.223 states
his date of birth as "perhaps 272."
62. E.g., O. Seeck, Geschichte 1.477 f.; W. Ensslin, RE 15 (1932), 1807; J. Vogt, The Con-
flict between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century (ed. A. Momigliano, 1963), 46; X.
Lucien-Brun, BAGB 1970. 401 ff.
THE CAREERS AND FAMILIES OF EMPERORS

sources, however, depend on the hostile and inaccurate Eunapius. The panegyric recited at the wedding of Constantine and Fausta is quite explicit in the opposite sense: "Quomodo enim magis continentiam patris aequare potuisti quam quod te ab ipso fine pueritiae ilico matrimonii legibus tradidisti, ut primo ingressu adolescentiae formares animum maritalem, nihil de vagis cupiditatibus, nihil de concessis actati voluptatibus in hoc sacrum pectus admitteres, novum iam tum miraculum, iuvenes uxorius? sed, ut res est, mente praesaga omnibus te verecundiae observationibus imbuebas, talem postea ducturus uxorem" (Pan. Lat. 7(6).4.1). The past tenses (with *iam tum*), the contrast with Fausta ("talem . . . uxorem"), and Constantine’s age in 307 render an allusion to an earlier marriage certain. Further, the nature of the reference should indicate that Minervina had died without losing her husband’s affection.

Constantine’s second wife was Flavia Maxima Fausta, the daughter of Maximian and Eutropia. He married her c. September 307 (Pan. Lat. 7(6)), and they had five children whose names are known:

1. Constantinus, born 7 August 316
2. Constantius, born 7 August 317
3. Constantina, who married Gallus (Caesar 351–354)
4. Constans, born in 323 (or possibly 320)
5. Helena, who married the emperor Julian

The ages of Constantina and Helena are nowhere exactly stated. But Constantina was the elder (Philostorgius, *HE* 3.22), and she married Hannibalianus, the son of Flavius Dalmatius (cos. 333) and brother of the Caesar Dalmatius, before 337. Helena was not married in the reign of her father, presumably because she was too young. It may be suggested, therefore, that Constantina was probably born in 318 or 319, Helena after 320.

Licinius


63. *CP* 71 (1976), 267. Eunapius seems to have denied that any of Constantine’s sons were born in wedlock (Zosimus 2.29.1).
65. There may, of course, have been other children who died in infancy, as Seeck argued, *ZfN* 21 (1898), 40 ff. He adduced coins of c. 325 which show Fausta as Salus or Spes holding two babies in her arms (*RIC* 7.753, s.v. *SPES REIPUBLICAE* and Pan. Lat. 4(10).36.1: “Roma . . . haurit insuper ingenitis spei fructum, quam propositam sibi ex Caesari bus nobilissimis habet eorumque fratribus” (in 321).
66. For the two daughters, *PLRE* 1.222, Constantina 2; 409–410, Helena 2.
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Lactantius describes his relationship to Galerius as “veteris contubernii amicum et a prima militia familiarem” (Mort. Pers. 20.3). Eutropius is more specific: “notus ei antiqua consuetudine et in bello, quod adversus Narseum gesserat, strenuus laboribus et officiis acceptus” (Brev. 10.4.1). Other sources also have his friendship with Galerius (Victr., Caes. 40.8; Zosimus 2.11; Socrates, HE 1.2.1). In 307, Galerius sent him to negotiate with Maxentius (Origo 7)—which prompts a conjecture that he was his praetorian prefect.67

Licinius married Constantia, the sister of Constantine, in February 313; their son Licinius Caesar was born c. August 315 (Epitome 41.4; Zosimus 2.20.2). Licinius also appears to have had a bastard son by a slave woman, who was legitimized and given high rank by imperial rescript, but later (in 336) reduced to slavery (CTh 4.6.2/3).

After his defeat in 324, Licinius abdicated, and was sent to Thessalonica, where he was later put to death in the spring of 325 (Origo 28–29; Victor, Caes. 41.8–9; Eutropius, Brev. 10.6.1; Epitome 41.7/8; Chr. Min. 1.232; Socrates, HE 1.4.6; Sozomenus, HE 1.7.5; Zosimus 2.28.1; Jordanes, Getica 111).

Crispus
Son of Constantine and Minervina. Crispus’ date of birth is unknown, though it is usually assumed to be some years after 300.68 But if Constantine was born in 272 or 273, then Crispus could easily have been born as early as c. 295, and since he was already a young man (νεανίας) in 316/7 (Zosimus 2.20), he was certainly born no later than c. 300.69 His wife was called Helena (parentage unknown); they produced a child shortly before 30 October 322 (CTh 9.38.1) and were perhaps expecting another in 324 (Publilius Optatianus Porphyrius, Carm. 10, versus intexti).70 Now Justina, the wife of Valentinian, appears to belong to the Constantinian dynasty;71 it is legitimate to conjecture that her mother was the daughter of Crispus and Helena, her father Justus (Socrates, HE 4.31.11; John of Antioch, frag. 187) a son of Vettius Justus, cos. 328.

Constantinus
Born in summer 316 (Epitome 41.4; Zosimus 2.20.2), probably on 7 August (CIL 12.688 = AE 1952.107: Arles; ?ILS 723: from Noricum; Julian, Orat. 1, 9d; J. A. Cramer,

67. Chapter VIII.5. 68. J.-R. Palanque, REA 40 (1938), 245 ff. (303); J. Vogt, Constantin der Grosse und sein Jahrhundert (Munich, 1949), 143 (305); PLRE 1.233, Crispus 4 (c. 305); O. Seeck, RE 4 (1901), 1723 (307).
70. On the date, AJP 96 (1975), 181.
Anecdota Graeca e codd. manuscriptis Bibliothecae Regiae Parisiensis 2 (Oxford, 1839), 111.32–112.3; Theophanes, pp. 5, 19 de Boor). Proclaimed Caesar in infancy. Married before 336 to a wife whose identity is unknown (Eusebius, VC 4.49). No known issue.

Licinius Caesar
Born c. August 315 (Epitome 41.4; Zosimus 2.20.2). The son of Licinius and Constantia. At Sirmium in October 316 (Origo 17). Proclaimed Caesar on 1 March 317; deposed in autumn 324 (Origo 29), then executed (Eutropius, Brev. 10.6.3), presumably at the same time as his father.

Constantius
Born on 7 August 317 (CTh 6.4.10; CIL 12, p. 270; Eutropius, Brev. 10.15.2; Epitome 42.17; Socrates, HE 2.47). Son of Constantine and Fausta (ILS 730; Athanasius, Hist. Ar. 44, 64; De Syn. 18; Julian, Orat. 1, 9b; 2, 51c). Married in 336 to a daughter of Julius Constantius (Eusebius, VC 4.49; Julian, Ep. ad Ath. 272d; Athanasius, Hist. Ar. 69).

Constans
Son of Constantine and Fausta (ILS 725, etc.). About his date of birth, the evidence diverges; his age at death (shortly after 18 January 350) is given as either twenty-seven (Epitome 41.23; Malalas 325 Bonn) or thirty (Eutropius, Brev. 10.9; Zonaras 13.6). However, a medallion which clearly celebrates his proclamation as Caesar depicts Constans as significantly younger than his brothers (RIC 7.580, Constantinople 67), so that 323 should be preferred over 320 for the date of his birth. No known marriage or issue, though before 337 Constans was betrothed to Olympias, the daughter of Fl. Ablabius, cos. 331 (Athanasius, Hist. Ar. 69; Ammianus 20.11.3).

Dalmatius
Son of Fl. Dalmatius, cos. 333, the son of Constantius and Theodora. Date of birth unknown. Educated by the rhetor Exsuperius at Narbo (Ausonius, Professores 18(17).8 ff.). No known marriage or issue.

73. It is not known how or when the marriage ended: Constantius' other attested marriages are to Eusebia c. 353, and to Faustina in 361 (PLRE 1.300–301, Eusebia; 326, Faustina). His only known child was posthumous—Constantia, the wife of Gratian (PLRE 1.221, Constantia 2).
74. O. Seeck, ZfN 21 (1898), 38 ff.
**APPENDIX: MALALAS ON THE AGES OF EMPERORS**

Johannes Malalas, writing in the late sixth century, states the age at death of nine of the emperors discussed in the present chapter. His testimony has usually been disregarded, for it is late and of dubious provenance, and in some cases disproved outright by earlier and better evidence. Nevertheless, it deserves to be reported, on the chance that Malalas might sometimes be close to the truth where no decisive evidence exists. His evidence may be tabulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emperor</th>
<th>Alleged age at death</th>
<th>Implied birth date</th>
<th>Actual or probable birth date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diocletian (311.1/2)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>c. 240</td>
<td>c. 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximian (312.5/6)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>c. 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantius (313.21)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>c. 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galerius (313.3)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>c. 260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licinius (315.10/11)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>c. 265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine (324.10/11)</td>
<td>60 years, 3 months</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>272 or 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantinus (325.4)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantius (326.12)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constans (325.7)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>323 (or 320)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

75. For the age of Constantine, Malalas appeals to Nestorianus, who wrote in the late fifth century (324.11-13; cf. 376.19; Chron. Pasch. 599). It is flatly impossible that Galerius could have been older than Maximian (Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 18.1, 18.7).
The city of Rome ceased to be the normal abode of Roman emperors during the third century. Diocletian and his colleagues and successors visited the former capital only on rare and special occasions; they normally resided in cities nearer the frontiers, where they were free from the restraints which the survival of Republican forms still imposed on them in Rome itself. They were, moreover, often forced to undertake journeys through the provinces and along the frontiers in order to protect themselves and their subjects from internal rebellion and foreign invasion.

Imperial residences and journeys, therefore, are an important theme in the history of the Roman Empire. Yet the full evidence for the period of Diocletian and Constantine has never been gathered or deployed. In some areas, it is true, much has been done, and the present chapter is heavily indebted to two classic studies: Theodor Mommsen on the legislation of Diocletian and his colleagues between 284 and 305, and Otto Seeck's register of dates and dated documents from 311 to 476. But these two studies, though of superb accuracy and acumen, need to be supplemented by a similar study of the years between 305

1. On this aspect of the emperors' relationship to Rome, see J. Straub, *Vom Herrscherideal in der Spätantike* (Stuttgart, 1939), 175 ff.
4. For the years 311-37, *Regesten* 159-185. Seeck's first attempt at the chronology of Constantine's laws, thirty years earlier (ZSS, Rom. Abt. 10 (1889), 1 ff., 177 ff.), was not so methodical, and drew heavy criticism from Mommsen (*Ges. Schr.* 2 (1905), 397 ff.). The principal types of error in the headings and subscriptions of the *Codex Theodosianus* are briefly summarized by P. Krüger, *ZSS*, Rom. Abt. 42 (1921), 58 ff.
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and 311, and to be revised throughout in the light of new evidence and subsequent research.\textsuperscript{5} Presented below is a reconstruction of the movements of Diocletian and his recognized colleagues and successors from 20 November 284 to 9 September 337. For residences, a simple statement is given, based on the emperor's attested movements, and with references to other evidence and to modern discussions.\textsuperscript{6} For an emperor's attested activities or attested presence in a particular place at a particular time, the full evidence is normally adduced, but annotation and bibliography are deliberately brief and selective.

One matter requires prior discussion. Since imperial pronouncements were normally issued in the name of the whole imperial college,\textsuperscript{7} neither the original protocol nor the heading preserved in later compilations such as the \textit{Codex Theodosianus} and \textit{Codex Justinianus} shows which emperor actually uttered a document.\textsuperscript{8} That must be deduced from the date and place of issue, and from the identity of the recipient. Hence there is room for debate over which emperors were entitled to issue laws. Mommsen peremptorily denied that the Caesars Constantius and Galerius could issue even rescripts, and it has been argued that Licinius lost the right to legislate in February 317.\textsuperscript{9} This chapter, in contrast, does not exclude a priori the possibility that any emperor could issue any type of administrative or legal pronouncement. Legislation by an Augustus other than the senior emperor can be documented in the cases both of Galerius and Licinius,\textsuperscript{10} as well as for later emperors.\textsuperscript{11} As for Caesars, they issued at

5. Of especial importance are the excellent catalogues of imperial coins, \textit{RIC} 6 (1967), by C. H. V. Sutherland, covering the years 294 to 313, and \textit{RIC} 7 (1966), by P. Bruun (313–337). Too many modern scholars have drawn mistaken conclusions from the unreliable catalogue of J. Maurice, \textit{Numismatique constantinienne} (Paris, 1908–12) or even from the inaccurate and negligent compilation of H. Cohen, \textit{Description historique des monnaies frappées sous l'empire romain} 6–7 (Paris, 1886 and 1888).

For the years 314–317, Seeck's chronology was unfortunately constructed on an insecure basis, see P. Bruun, \textit{The Constantinian Coinage of Arelate} (Finska Formminnesföreningens Tidskrift 52.2, 1953), 17 ff.; C. Habicht, \textit{Hermes} 86 (1958), 360 ff.; P. Bruun, \textit{Studies in Constantinian Chronology} (NNM 146, 1961), 10 ff.

6. For a survey of imperial residences between 284 and 337, Millar, \textit{Emperor} 40 ff.

7. Chapters III, XI.

8. On the evidence of the Codes, see Seeck, \textit{Regesten} 111 ff. Rescripts of Diocletian and his colleagues suffered different fates in different compilations: although the \textit{Codex Justinianus} normally registers four emperors, the so-called \textit{Fragmenta Vaticana} omit Maximian and Galerius (22; 41; 270; 275; 297; 312; 338), while the \textit{Mosaicarum et Romanarum legum collatio} on one occasion omits both Caesars (6.4, of 295), on another Constantius alone (15.3, of 302). For the relevance of such facts to the genesis of these collections, E. Volterra, \textit{Mélanges W. Seston} (Paris, 1974), 500 ff.


10. Lactantius, \textit{Mort. Pers.} 21.7 (datis legibus); \textit{CIL} 3.12134 (Tlos in Lycia) = \textit{IG} 2/3\textsuperscript{2}.1121 (Athens), cf. E. Steinwenter, \textit{Studi in onore di E. Betti} 4 (Milan, 1962), 137 ff. (Galerius in 305/6); \textit{FIRA} \textsuperscript{2} 1.93, 94; \textit{CHTh} 8.4.3, 10.7.1, 10.20.1, 12.1.5, cf. Seeck, \textit{Regesten} 53 f. (Licinius: 9 June 311, 1 January 314, 21 July 317).

least some types of document on their own authority. Eumenius quotes a letter written by Constantius, in the name of the whole imperial college, which appointed him to teach rhetoric at Autun (Pan. Lat. 9(4).13–15), and it was by letters to officials that Maximinus in 306 ordained that everyone in his domains should sacrifice to the gods (Eusebius, Mart. Pal. 4.8: both recensions). Hence it is unwise to emend the date or place of issue of a law solely on the grounds that the emperor who is implied as its author lacked the legal power to issue it. Similarly, and again contrary to conventional doctrine, this chapter attributes some Diocletianic rescripts in the Codex Justinianus to western emperors.

**DIOCLETIAN**

**Principal Residences**

285–296 Sirmium and Nicomedia

296–299 In Syria and Egypt

299–302 Antioch

302–305 Nicomedia

**Attested Movements**

284, Nov. 20 Proclaimed emperor at Nicomedia

P. Beatty Panopolis 2.162, etc.; Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 17.1 (day);  

12. Eusebius also records similar letters directed against the Christians c. November 309 (HE 8.14.9/10; Mart. Pal. (S) 9.2).

13. Libanius, Orat. 59.46, seems to imply that even the Caesars of Constantine, who were completely dominated by their father, possessed the legal power to legislate.


20. Indirectly confirmed by Eusebius, Mart. Pal. 1.5 + 2.4. The Paschal Chronicle has 17 September (510), which many scholars preferred (e.g., Seston, Dioctétien 51) until Lactantius was vindicated by the papyrus from Panopolis (published in 1964).
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285, spring  Campaign against Carinus, ending in a battle near Viminacium

285, summer  Visit to Italy

285, Nov. 2  At Civitas Iovia (otherwise known as Botivo) and Sonista (on the road between Poetovio and Mursa)

?285, autumn  Campaign against the Sarmatians

286, Jan. 20–March 3  At Nicomedia

286, March 22  At Byzantium

286, May 31–  At Tiberias

Zosimus 1.73.2 = John of Antioch, frag. 163 (place)

Victor, Caes. 39.11 ff.; Eutropius, Brev. 9.20.1/2; Itinerarium Burdigalense p. 564.9 Wesseling

RIC 5.2.241 no. 203 (Ticinum: ADVENTUS AUG); Zonaras 12.31 (alleges a visit to Rome)

CJ 4.48.5 (Atubino); Frag. Vat. 297 (Suneata)

21. Also Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 19.2, as emended below, n. 73.

22. The two places are nine miles apart (Itinerarium Burdigalense p. 561.10–11). A. Mócsy, RE, Supp. 9 (1962), 570; 11 (1968), 1258, prefers to postulate an otherwise unknown Suneate.

23. The date depends on the Aphrodisias copy of the price edict, which styles Maximian Sarmaticus maximus III (Chapter III, no. 2; Tables 3, 4). Before its discovery, it was assumed that Diocletian and Maximian were both Sarmatici maximi IV in 301 (Mommsen's supplement in CIL 3, pp. 824/5), and hence the victory was dated to 289, as by A. Arnaldi, Rendiconti dell' Istituto Lombardo, Classe di Lettere 106 (1972), 40.

24. Frag. Vat. 280 = CJ 3.29.7 may also have been issued on 3 March 286, since its date is transmitted as “<Data> Nicomediae V non. Mart. Augustis et II consss.” (Frag. Vat. 280) and “pp. V id. Mai. Maximo II et Aquillino consss.” (CJ 3.29.7). Mommsen, Ges. Schr. 2.268 f., dated the rescript to 11 May 286 and questioned Nicomediae (also Byzantio in Frag. Vat. 281).

25. For discussion of Jewish evidence relating to Diocletian in Palestine, see H. Graetz, Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums 28 (1878), 5 ff.; A. Marmorstein, REJ 98 (1934), 26 ff. None of it is precisely dated, but it refers to Diocletian's arrival in the province, either in 286 or between 296 and 302, and to his presence at Tyre in Phoenicia and at Paneas: Jerusalem Talmud, Aboda Zara 5.4, 1.3; Berakot 3.1; Shebiith 9.2; Terumot 8.12 (translated into French by M. Schwab (Paris, 1871–90), 6.238, 185; 1.57; 2.415; 3.108). The second passage quotes an inscription recording that Diocletian dedicated the market of Tyre to the tutelary deity of his brother Herculius—which implies a date before rather than after 293, see M. Avi-Jonah, RE, Supp. 13 (1973), 408.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location and Event</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 31</td>
<td>1.51.1 M (July 14); 5.17.3 M (Aug. 31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286, Oct. 13</td>
<td>At Heraclea in Thrace; Negotiates with Persian ambassadors, presumably in Syria, and installs Tiridates as ruler in Armenia</td>
<td>Frag. Vat. 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pan. Lat. 10(2).7.5, 9.2, 10.6 f., 8(5).3.3, cf. ILS 618 (Persicus maximus) in 290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?287</td>
<td>Fortifies Circesium and reorganizes the Syrian frontier</td>
<td>Ammianus 23.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Campaign on the frontier of Raetia, and conference with Maximian</td>
<td>Pan. Lat. 10(2).9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?289, summer</td>
<td>Sarmatian campaign, defense of Dacia</td>
<td>Pan. Lat. 11(3).5.4, 7.1, 8(5).3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290, Jan. 11</td>
<td>At Sirmium</td>
<td>CJ 10.3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290, Feb. 27</td>
<td>At Adrianople</td>
<td>CJ 6.55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290, April 3</td>
<td>At Byzantium</td>
<td>CJ 2.4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290, May 6</td>
<td>At Antioch</td>
<td>Frag. Vat. 276M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290, May 10</td>
<td>At Emesa</td>
<td>CJ 9.41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290, ?May/June</td>
<td>Campaign against Saraceni</td>
<td>Pan. Lat. 11(3).5.4; 7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290, May 25</td>
<td>At Laodicea</td>
<td>CJ 6.15.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290, summer</td>
<td>Returns from Syria to Pannonia</td>
<td>Pan. Lat. 11(3).4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A dedication by a procurator could imply Diocletian's presence at Caesarea in 286 (AE 1966.494, reread by B. Lifshitz, Hommages à M. Renard 2 (Collection Latomus 102, 1969), 467; M. Christol, ZPE 22 (1976), 169 f.).

26. A. Honoré, Emperors and Lawyers (London, 1980), 111 n. 60, argues that the consular date of CJ 1.51.1 ought to be Tiberiano et Dione conss., i.e. 291. The mss. of CJ 4.10.3 also attest the diurnal date prid. k. Ian., i.e. 31 December 286.

27. For other evidence, and full discussion, see M.-L. Chaumont, Recherches sur l'histoire d'Arménie de l'avènement des Sassanides à la conversion du royaume (Paris, 1969), 93 ff. Observe also the possible occurrence of Armeniaci maximi before Persici maximi in the victory titles in P. Theadelphia 2.2 ff. = P. Sakaon 59.2 ff. (305).

28. The mss. have d. vii k. Iun. Laodiceae AA. conss. Mommsen construed the date intended as 293 and emended the place to Serdicae (Ges. Schr. 2.275), but he also considered emending the consular date to ipsis III et III AA. conss. (Ges. Schr. 2.232)—which P. Krüger, ad loc., rightly prefers.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>290, July 1–</td>
<td>At Sirmium</td>
<td>CJ 6.30.6; 8.54(55).3 = <em>Frag. Vat. 286</em> (Sept. 21); <em>CJ</em> 2.3.19 (Nov. 19), 2.28.1 (Nov. 22); 9.16.4(5) (Nov. 30); 3.28.19M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291, May 13</td>
<td>At Sirmium</td>
<td><em>CJ</em> 9.41.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291, Dec. 4</td>
<td>At Oescus (mss. have <em>Triballis</em>)</td>
<td><em>CJ</em> 8.47(48).5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293, Jan. 1–</td>
<td>At Sirmium</td>
<td><em>CJ</em>, p. 495</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293, March 1</td>
<td>Invests Galerius with the purple, probably at Sirmium⁵⁹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293, April 1</td>
<td>At Heraclea</td>
<td><em>CJ</em> 8.55(56).4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293, April 2–13</td>
<td>At Byzantium</td>
<td><em>CJ</em>, p. 495</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293, April 15</td>
<td>At Melantias</td>
<td><em>CJ</em> 4.49.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293, April 17–May 1</td>
<td>At Heraclea</td>
<td><em>CJ</em>, p. 495</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293, May 1</td>
<td>At Tzirallum (Tzurullon), near Heraclea</td>
<td><em>CJ</em> 2.3.21, 5.3.8, 6.30.7, 6.53.6M, 8.35(36).5M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293, May 10–13</td>
<td>At Adrianople</td>
<td><em>CJ</em> 7.16.16, 10.32(31).7M, 8.13(14).16 (May 12), 8.50(51).10M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293, May 17</td>
<td>At Beroea</td>
<td><em>CJ</em> 5.24.1M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293, May 25–June 17</td>
<td>At Philippopolis</td>
<td><em>CJ</em> 2.17(18).3M, 2.52(53).4M (May 25), 2.12(13).17 (June 5), 4.49.9M, 7.67.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293, June 21–28</td>
<td>At Serdica</td>
<td><em>CJ</em> 8.44(45).21; <em>Mos. et Rom. legum collatio</em> 10.3 (June 24); <em>CJ</em> 5.16.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293, July 2–15</td>
<td>At Philippopolis</td>
<td><em>CJ</em> 9.33.5; 5.12.14M (July 4), 5.34.7, 6.23.12 (July 6), 6.49.4 (July 10), 8.15(16).6 (July 11), 5.16.19M, 7.16.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293, Aug. 8–Sept. 1</td>
<td>At Viminacium</td>
<td><em>CJ</em>, p. 495</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁵⁹ Below, n. 73.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>293, Sept. 11-294, May 1</td>
<td>At Sirmium</td>
<td>CJ, pp. 495/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294, May 3</td>
<td>Near Sirmium</td>
<td>CJ 6.21.14³⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294, Sept. 8-12</td>
<td>At Singidunum</td>
<td>CJ 4.19.21M, 9.20.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294, Sept. 22</td>
<td>Demesso (mss.): not yet identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294, Sept. 26-Oct. 1</td>
<td>At Viminacium</td>
<td>CJ, pp. 496/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294, Oct. 5</td>
<td>At Cuppae</td>
<td>CJ 8.44(45).28M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294, Oct. 8-10</td>
<td>At Ratiaria</td>
<td>CJ 4.33.5(4)M, 6.59.8M, 7.60.3M, 8.13(14).21M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294, Oct. 11</td>
<td>At Cebrum</td>
<td>CJ 2.4.30M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294, Oct. 13</td>
<td>At Varianae</td>
<td>CJ 2.3.6, 8.37(38).9M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294, Oct. 17</td>
<td>At Appiaria</td>
<td>Mos. et Rom. legum collatio 10.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294, Oct. 18</td>
<td>At Transmarisca</td>
<td>CJ 6.42.28M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294, Oct. 21-22</td>
<td>At Durostorum</td>
<td>CJ 8.41(42).6, 9.22.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294, Oct. 25</td>
<td>Reginassi (mss.): not yet identified</td>
<td>CJ 4.20.8M, 4.21.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294, Oct. 26</td>
<td>At Marcianopolis</td>
<td>Consultatio 6.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. The mss. have Aurris, which Mommsen thought might conceal Turris Ferrata (Ges. Schr. 2.286). It might be better to consider emending to Fossis or Bassianis, places which the Itinerarium Burdigalense, p. 563.10–11, registers as the first two stopping points on the road from Sirmium to Singidunum (respectively, nine and nineteen miles from Sirmium).

31. The fact that CJ 6.59.2–4 bear earlier dates than 6.59.1 may indicate that the compilers dated 6.59.1 to 293: P. Krüger, ad loc., suggests that its original date may have been 18 December 293.

32. The geographical sources register only six stations between Singidunum and Viminacium, viz. Ad Sextum, Tricornia Castra, Ad Sextum Miliarem, Aureus Mons, Vinceia, and Margus. PLRE 1.950, Verinus 1, construes the date as 305.

It should be noted that Diocletian won a victory over the Sarmatians during the autumn of 294: Pan. Lat. 8(5).5.1; Chr. Min. 1.230; RIC 6.175–178, 281–282, 352–354, 459–461, 529–530, 555–556, 579, 616, cf. A. Alföldi, Arch. Ért. 2³ (1941), 49 ff.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>294, Oct. 28</td>
<td>At Anchialos</td>
<td>CJ 5.12.24\textsuperscript{M}, 5.51.11\textsuperscript{M}, 6.50.17, 8.31(32).2\textsuperscript{M}, 8.47(48).9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294, Oct. 29</td>
<td>At Develtus</td>
<td>CJ 6.36.5\textsuperscript{M}, 8.50(51).17\textsuperscript{M}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294, Oct. 31</td>
<td>At Adrianople</td>
<td>CJ 8.42(43).20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294, Nov. 1-3</td>
<td>At Burtudizum</td>
<td>CJ 5.16.23\textsuperscript{M}, 2.3.28\textsuperscript{M}, 8.35(36).9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294, Nov. 5-8</td>
<td>At Heraclea</td>
<td>CJ 7.48.3, 5.18.10 (Nov. 7), 2.3.27, 7.35.6\textsuperscript{M}, 8.27(28).19\textsuperscript{M}; Frag. Vat. 325\textsuperscript{M}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294, Nov. 9</td>
<td>At Melantias</td>
<td>CJ 2.4.33(34); Frag. Vat. 314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294, Nov. 10</td>
<td>At Byzantium</td>
<td>CJ 2.4.31\textsuperscript{M}, 8.27(28).20\textsuperscript{M}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294, Nov. 11</td>
<td>At Pantichium</td>
<td>CJ 4.29.18\textsuperscript{M}, 5.12.25\textsuperscript{M}, 6.22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294, Nov. 15- Dec. 30</td>
<td>At Nicomedia</td>
<td>CJ, p. 497\textsuperscript{33}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295, March 18</td>
<td>At Nicomedia</td>
<td>CJ 5.72.3\textsuperscript{34}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296, summer/ autumn</td>
<td>Campaign against the Carpi</td>
<td>Pan. Lat. 8(5).5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296, late</td>
<td>Goes to Syrian frontier and campaigns against the Persians</td>
<td>P. Argent. 480, 1 verso 1 ff.\textsuperscript{35}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297, autumn- 298, spring</td>
<td>Suppresses revolt in Egypt; long siege of Alexandria</td>
<td>Jerome, Chronicle 226\textsuperscript{c}; Eutropius, Brev. 9.22-23\textsuperscript{36}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. A law dated 23 February 295 states its place of issue as Trimontii (CJ 6.20.14). Mommsen construed this as indicating Philippopolis and rejected the date (Ges. Schr. 2.288, cf. 285). But Trimontii might conceal the name of a place close to Nicomedia.

34. Mos. et Rom. legum collatio 6.4 = CJ 5.4.17, issued at Damascus on 1 May 295, is here attributed to Galerius (below, n. 76).

35. Best edited by E. Heitsch, Die griechischen Dichterfragmente der römischen Kaiserzeit 1\textsuperscript{2} (Abh. Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Klasse\textsuperscript{3} 49, 1963), 79–81, no. XXII. The fragment is normally assumed to come from an epic poem (e.g., Phoenix 30 (1976), 182); perhaps rather from a panegyric composed for recitation before Diocletian while he was in Egypt in 298, as Corpus Hermeticum 18 may also have been, see R. Reitzenstein, Zwei religionsgeschichtliche Fragen nach ungedruckten griechischen Texten (Strassburg, 1901), 51; Poimandres: Studien zur griechisch-ägyptischen und frühchristlichen Literatur (Leipzig, 1904), 199; A. D. Nock and A.-J. Festugière, Hermès Trismégiste 2 (Paris: Budé, 1960), 244.

36. On Diocletian's presence in Egypt in 297–298, J. D. Thomas, ZPE 22 (1976), 273 ff.; A. K. Bowman, BASP 15 (1978), 28 ff. Both, however, follow Seston, Diocletien 153 f., in adducing the metaphorastic Passio Procopii (BHG 1578) as proof that Diocletian approached Egypt by way of Pelusium. Even if he did so, the passion is not good evidence, see H. Delehaye, Les légendes hagiographiques\textsuperscript{3} (Subsidia Hagiographica 18, 1927), 131 ff.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>298, May or June</td>
<td>Visits Oxyrhynchus and travels up the Nile</td>
<td><em>P. Oxy.</em> 1416; <em>P. Beatty Panopolis</em> 1.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298, summer</td>
<td>Reaches Elephantine and negotiates with Nobatae</td>
<td><em>Procopius, Bella</em> 1.19.27 ff.; <em>IGRR</em> 1.1291 = <em>Sammelbuch</em> 8393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299, Feb. 5</td>
<td>At Antioch</td>
<td><em>CJ</em> 8.53(54).24M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?299, late winter</td>
<td>Goes to Mesopotamia</td>
<td><em>Eutropius, Brev.</em> 9.25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?299, spring</td>
<td>Meets Galerius at Nisibis</td>
<td><em>Petrus Patricius, frag. 14</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300, Feb. 12-301, July 4</td>
<td>At Antioch</td>
<td><em>CJ</em> 9.21.1\textsuperscript{M}, 3.3.3\textsuperscript{M} (25 March), 7.22.2 (June 25), <em>Malalas</em> 310.7 ff. <em>Bonn</em> (300, July/August); <em>CJ</em> 3.28.25 (301, July 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301/2</td>
<td>Visits Egypt</td>
<td><em>Chr. Min.</em> 1.290; <em>Chr. Pasch.</em> 514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302, March 31</td>
<td>At Alexandria</td>
<td><em>Mos. et Rom. legum collatio</em> 15.3 (year not given)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302, ?autumn</td>
<td>At Antioch</td>
<td><em>Eusebius, Mart. Pal.</em> (L) 2.2 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302, late</td>
<td>Goes to Bithynia for winter</td>
<td><em>Lactantius, Mort. Pers.</em> 10.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


38. Also apparently alluded to in O. Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci* 3 (1856), 387.23-27.


40. Observe also the corrupt subscription to *CJ* 3.3.4: “d. X k. dec. dec hioppe diocl. VIII et cerio max. VII AA.” The law might have been issued at Joppa on 22 November 301. The edict on maximum prices may imply that Diocletian reached Alexandria before 9 December (Chapter III, no. 2), since it calculates the prices of sea transport from Nicomedia and Alexandria alone, see J. Rougé, *Recherches sur l'organisation du commerce maritime en Méditerranée sous l'Empire romain* (Paris, 1966), 370.

EMPERORS

303, Jan. 6–March 12 At Nicomedia  
CJ 2.30(31).4; Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 10.6 ff.; Constantine, Oratio 25 (late Feb.); Eusebius, HE 8.5 (Feb. 23), 8.6.2, cf. PO 10.14 (March 12)

303, June 8 At Durostorum  
CJ 5.73.4

303, summer/autumn ?Visits Sirmium  
Passio Quattuor Coronatorum 21 f.42

303, before Nov. 20–Dec. At Rome  
Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 17.1 ff.

303, Dec. 20 Leaves Rome  
Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 17.3

304, Jan. 1 At Ravenna  
Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 17.3

304, summer On the Danube; perhaps defeats the Carpi  
Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 17.4; Tables 6, 743

304, Aug. 28–305, May 1 At Nicomedia  
CJ 3.28.26; Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 17.4 ff.; Eutropius, Brev. 9.27.2; Jerome, Chronicle 228d; Epitome 39.5

MAXIMIAN44

Principal Residences

285–286 On campaign
286–2?293 Trier45
?293–296 Milan and Aquileia46
296–299 On campaign and at Carthage
299–305 Milan and Aquileia

42. Edited by H. Delehaye, Acta Sanctorum, Nov. 3 (Brussels, 1910), 765 ff. On the cult of these martyrs, see J. Guyon, MEFR (A) 87 (1975), 505 ff. Their Passio also states that Diocletian reached Rome by 8 November 303 (22). Both items are plausible—and may be true without being based on authentic information.

43. This may be the occasion on which Diocletian settled Carpi in Pannonia (Ammianus 28.1.6, cf. Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 38.6). The date of 295 given in Chr. Min. 1.230; Jerome, Chronicle 226b, appears to be too early, see P. Brennan, Chiron 10 (1980), 565. For what it is worth, Eutropius puts the settlement of Carpi and Basternae after the Persian war (Brev. 9.25.2).

44. For previous attempts to establish Maximian's movements, W. Ensslin, RE 14 (1930), 2489 ff.; T. D. Barnes, Phoenix 30 (1976), 176 ff.


46. Pan. Lat. 7(6).6.2 attests an imperial palace at Aquileia in the 290s. Victor names no city, but notes the resumption of imperial residence in north Italy in a difficult passage: "hinc denique parti Italicae inventum tributorum ingens malum. nam cum omnis eadem functione moderateque
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Attested Movements

285, July 21  Proclaimed Caesar, probably in Milan  Eutropius, Brev. 9.20.3 (Caesar); RIC 5.2.241 no. 203 (Ticinum: ADVENTUS AUG); Passio Marcelli 2 (day)

285, late summer  Campaign against the Bagaudae  Pan. Lat. 10(2).4.2 ff.

285, c. Sept.  ?At Boulogne  Eutropius, Brev. 9.21 (which strictly attests only Carausius’ presence at Bononia)

285, autumn  Repels a German invasion of Gaul  Pan. Lat. 10(2).5.1 ff.

286, Feb. 10  At Milan  CJ 8.53(54).6 + 3.29.4 = Frag. Vat. 282

286, June 21  At Mainz  Frag. Vat. 271

287, Jan. 1  At Trier (or possibly Cologne or Mainz)  Pan. Lat. 10(2).6.2 ff.

287  Expedition across the Rhine  Pan. Lat. 10(2).7.1 ff.

288  Conference with Diocletian  Pan. Lat. 10(2).9.1

288, late  Receives Gennoboudes and his Franci, presumably in northwestern Gaul  Pan. Lat. 10(2).10.3 f.

289, April 21  At Trier (or possibly Cologne or Mainz)  Pan. Lat. 10(2)48

ageret, quo exercitus atque imperator, qui semper aut maxima parte aderant, ali possent, pensionibus inducta lex nova” (Caes. 39.31). On the interpretation of parti Italice, conventionally but erroneously taken to denote the whole of Italy, see L. Ruggini, Economia e società nell’Italia annonaria: Rapporti fra agricoltura e commercio dal IV al VI sec. d. C. (Milan, 1961), 36.

On the literary, legal, and archaeological evidence for imperial palaces in Milan and Aquileia, see N. Duval, Aquileia e Milano (Antichità Altoadriatiche 4, 1973), 158 ff. In the same volume, M. Bonfioli chronicles imperial visits and periods of residence from Diocletian onward (Aquileia e Milano 125 ff.).

47. Mommsen emended Mediolani in all three places to Nicomediae (Ges. Schr. 2.268 f.). The emendation is defended by H. J. Wolff, ZSS, Rom. Abt. 69 (1952), 141.

48. The speech was delivered on the natalis Romae dies (1.4). As for the year, Mamertinus alludes to a barbarian raid which disrupted Maximian’s consular ceremonies in a year which cannot be earlier than 287, followed by an expedition across the Rhine (6.2 ff.) and almost a whole year building a fleet to attack Carausius (12.3 ff.), yet there is no reference to the quinquennalia—which would have been obligatory in 290. The place of delivery might not be Trier (as is universally
EMPERORS

?289 or 290 | ?Visits Rome | Julian, *Orat.* 1, 5d
290, early | Visits Lugdunum | *RIC* 5.2.222 no. 13, 261 no. 347 (ADVENTUS AUGG)
290 | Tours Gaul | *Pan. Lat.* 11(3).4.2
290, c. Dec. 22 | Crosses the Alps | *Pan. Lat.* 11(3).2.4
291, Feb. 18 | At Durocortorum (Reims) | *Frag. Vat.* 315
291, summer | At Trier | *Pan. Lat.* 11(3)
293, March 1 | Invests Constantius with the purple, presumably at Milan | *Pan. Lat.* 8(5).2.2 ff.; *Chr. Min.* 1.229 (day)

assumed), but could be Cologne or Mainz (cf. 6.4, 12.6).

49. Julian states that Fausta was born in Rome: if true, that should imply that Maximian visited the city no later than 290 (Chapter IV, at n. 25).

A passage in the panegyric of 310 appears to imply that Maximian never visited Rome before c. 299: “tu ferocissimos Mauretaniae populos...expugnasti recepisti transtulisti. te primo ingressu tuo tanta laetitia tanta frequentia populus Romanus exceptit ut etc.” (*Pan. Lat.* 6(?).8.6 f.). But *ingressus* perhaps here means specifically “triumphal entry,” with the orator deliberately ignoring earlier visits without a triumph.


51. The place of issue is emended from *Durocortoro* to *Durostoro* by V. Velkov, *Charisteria F. Novotný octogenario oblata* (Prague, 1962), 151 ff. His motive was to attribute the law to Diocletian. W. Ensslin had proposed *Durotinco* (*RE* 14 (1930), 2501), which lies between Grenoble and Briançon.

52. Although the approximate date of *Pan. Lat.* 11(3) seems clear from its references to Diocletian’s movements, the exact date and occasion have occasioned some perplexity: see especially O. Schäfer, *Die beiden Panegyrici des Mamertinus und die Geschichte des Kaisers Maximianus Herculius* (Diss. Strassburg, 1914), 34 ff.; A. Passerini, *Acme* 1 (1948), 184 ff.; S. d’Elia, *Annali Napoli* 9 (1960/1), 256 ff.

Mamertinus makes it clear that he is speaking on Maximian’s birthday (2.1: “dies...qui te primus protulit in lucem”; 19.1 ff., especially 3: “nascentes vos...bona sidera et amica viderunt”), not on his *dies imperii* or on the anniversary of his assumption of the title Herculis (as argued by W. Seston, *Historia* 1 (1950), 257 ff.). In 1.1, 2.2, 19.1, and 19.3 the text printed by modern editors describes the occasion as a *geminus natalis*, which would be a joint birthday of Diocletian and Maximian and imply a date of 22 December 291 (*Phoenix* 30 (1976), 177 n. 15). However, Dr. C. E. V. Nixon informs me that the British Museum manuscript Harleianus 2480 (H) has *genuinus* or *genui nus* (divided) in all four passages. This reading is stemmaically of equal value to the *geminus* of the other manuscripts, and deserves preference on historical grounds (E. Wistrand, *Eranos* 62 (1964), 137 ff.; T. C. Skeat, *Papyri from Panopolis* (Dublin, 1964), 145 f.). Mamertinus also reveals that he delivered the speech after Maximian’s *quinquennalia* (1.1) and apparently shortly after his *dies imperii* (2.1); unfortunately, it is not clear whether Maximian calculated his reign as beginning with his appointment as Caesar in the summer of 285 or with his proclamation as Augustus on 1 April 286 (Chapter I; Chapter III.2, 3).

53. The place seems not to be explicitly attested.
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### Imperial Residences and Journeys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?293, May 2</td>
<td>At Milan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293, May 19</td>
<td>At Verona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293, autumn</td>
<td>Visits Lugdunum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294, Oct. 27</td>
<td>At Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295, March 21</td>
<td>At Milan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295, Dec. 21</td>
<td>At Milan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296, March 31</td>
<td>At Aquileia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296, summer</td>
<td>On the Rhine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296, autumn</td>
<td>Fighting in Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297, March 1</td>
<td>On campaign in Mauritania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298, March 10</td>
<td>At Carthage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?298</td>
<td>Expedition to Tripolitania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?299</td>
<td>Goes from Africa to Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?299</td>
<td>Enters Rome in triumph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303, Nov.–Dec.</td>
<td>With Diocletian in Rome</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

- ?293, March 18 At Ravenna
- ?293, May 2 At Milan
- ?293, May 19 At Verona
- ?293, autumn Visits Lugdunum
- 294, Oct. 27 At Rome
- 295, March 21 At Milan
- 295, Dec. 21 At Milan
- 296, March 31 At Aquileia
- 296, summer On the Rhine
- 296, autumn Fighting in Spain
- 297, March 1 On campaign in Mauritania
- 298, March 10 At Carthage
- ?298 Expedition to Tripolitania
- ?299 Goes from Africa to Italy
- ?299 Enters Rome in triumph
- 303, Nov.–Dec. With Diocletian in Rome

---

54. The date is transmitted as *ipsis AA. cons.*, which could also signify 290. Mommsen pronounced *Ravennae* corrupt rather than attribute the law to Maximian (*Ges. Schr.* 2.279).

55. O. Seck, *Geschichte* 1.454, proposed to emend the day to 2 March.


57. Mommsen emended *Romae to Soatrae or Scatrae*, a place between Marcianopolis and Durostorum (*Ges. Schr.* 2.287).

58. Observe also that the confused version of the imperial titles of Diocletian in *IGRR* 1.1291 = *Sammelbuch* 8398 (Elephantine) includes the sobriquet *Ἰβηρικός μέγιστος*.


EMPERORS

304, ?after April 21 Leaves Rome  Pan. Lat. 7(6).8.8, cf. Passio Sabini (BHL 7451–54) 61
304/5, winter Meets Galerius at an unknown location Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 18.1.
305, May 1 Resigns the imperial power at Milan Eutropius, Brev. 9.27.2; Jerome, Chronicle 2284; Zonaras 12.32

CONSTANTIUS

Principal Residence
293–306 Trier 62

Attested Movements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>293, March 1</td>
<td>Proclaimed Caesar, probably in Milan</td>
<td>Pan. Lat. 8(5).2.2 ff.; Chr. Min. 1.229 (day) 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293, early summer</td>
<td>Expels troops of Carausius from northwestern Gaul</td>
<td>Pan. Lat. 8(5).6–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>Repels invasion of Batavia</td>
<td>Pan. Lat. 8(5).8–9, 7(6).4.2, 6(7).5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294, Aug. 5</td>
<td>At Cologne</td>
<td>CJ 5.12.21 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?295</td>
<td>Visits Italy, passing through Autun on his return to Gaul</td>
<td>Pan. Lat. 9(4).14.1 (letter of Constantius) 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>Recovery of Britain</td>
<td>Pan. Lat. 8(5).11 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297, March 1</td>
<td>At Trier</td>
<td>Pan. Lat. 8(5), especially 2.2 ff., 4.1 f. 66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

61. The relevant passages of three versions of the passio are printed in parallel by D. Liebs, Hermogenians Iuri Epitomae (Abh. Göttingen, Phil-hist. Klasse3 57.3, 1964), 32 f. F. Lanzoni, RQ 17 (1903), 1 ff., damned the Passio Sabini as historically worthless: I am grateful to Mr. W. Turpin for showing me the draft of an article which argues that that verdict may be premature.
63. The place is nowhere explicitly attested, but Pan. Lat. 8(5).6.1 implies that it was outside Gaul.
64. Mommsen attributed the law to Diocletian and asserted that Agrippinae designated a place near Sirmium (Ges. Schr. 2.286).
65. Constantius speaks of “meum Constanti Caesaris ex Italia revertentis...comitatum,” which suits an occasion c. 295 better than his initial arrival as Caesar in Gaul in 293 (the date assumed by E. Galletier, Panégyriques latins 1 (Paris, 1949), 114).
66. D. Kienast, JNG 10 (1959/60), 71 ff., dates the recovery of Britain to 297 — which entails a date of 1 March 298 for the speech.
### IMPERIAL RESIDENCES AND JOURNEYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300 or 301</td>
<td>Victory over the Franci</td>
<td><em>Pan. Lat. 6(7).6.2</em>&lt;sup&gt;57&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Victory over German invaders in the territory of the Lingones</td>
<td><em>Pan. Lat. 6(7).6.2</em>; <em>CIL</em> 10.3343 (date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>German victory near Vindonissa</td>
<td><em>Pan. Lat. 6(7).6.3</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304, late winter</td>
<td>Victory over German raiders who had crossed the frozen Rhine</td>
<td><em>Pan. Lat. 6(7).6.4</em>&lt;sup&gt;68&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Crosses from Boulogne to Britain, and campaigns against the Picts</td>
<td><em>Pan. Lat. 6(7).7.1 ff.</em>; <em>Origo</em> 4; <em>AE</em> 1961.240 (before 7 Jan. 306)&lt;sup&gt;69&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306, July 25</td>
<td>Dies at York</td>
<td><em>CIL</em> 1&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;, pp. 268, 269; <em>Chr. Min.</em> 1.231; Socrates, <em>HE</em> 1.2.1 (day); Eutropius, <em>Brev.</em> 10.1.3; Jerome, <em>Chronicle</em> 228&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; (place)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### GALERIUS<sup>70</sup>

**Principal Residences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>293–296</td>
<td>?Antioch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296–299</td>
<td>On campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299–c. 303</td>
<td>Thessalonica&lt;sup&gt;71&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

67. On Constantius' campaigns between 300 and 306, see *Phoenix* 30 (1976), 179, 191; Tables 4–7.

68. The titulature of Maximinus in an edict of 313 as quoted by Eusebius (*HE* 9.10.7: *Αὐτοκράτωρ Καίσαρ Γάιος Οὐαλέριος Μαξιμίνος, Γερμανικός, Σαρματικός, εὐσεβής εὐτυχής, ἀνίκητος Ἀναστάτος*) implies that Constantius' last German victory was won, or at least celebrated, after 1 May 305. But this abbreviated titulature cannot be regarded as authoritative, and *Sarmaticus* precedes *Germanicus* in Maximinus' victory titles as they appear on *ILAlg.* 1.3956 (near Thelepte), cf. *ZPE* 20 (1976), 155.


71. The dates of Galerius' residence at Thessalonica and Serdica are inferred from the trans-


EMPERORS

c. 303–winter 308/9  Serdica
winter 308/9–311  Thessalonica

Attested Movements

293, March 1  Invested with the purple by Diocletian, probably at Sirmium

293, Dec.  ?In Egypt

?294  Expedition to Upper Egypt

295, Jan.  ?In Upper Egypt

295, May 1  ?At Damascus

---

72. Residence in Serdica before the Conference of Carnuntum in November 308 is implied by Origo 8. It is a permissible inference that Galerius moved his residence back to Thessalonica as soon as the new emperor Licinius began to reside in Sirmium.

73. The place is inferred from Diocletian's movements in early 293 (above, at n. 29). Seston, Dioctétien 88 ff., argued that Galerius assumed the purple on 21 May at Nicomedia, from which it would follow that he was created emperor in the absence of Diocletian (so I. König, Chiron 4 (1974), 567 ff.). Seston adduced two items of evidence. First, the Paschal Chronicle, which states that Galerius and Constantius were made emperors at Nicomedia on 21 May 293 (521 = Chr. Min. 1.229). Second, Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 19.2: "erat locus altus extra civitatem (sc. Nicomedia) ad milia fere tria, in cuius summo Maximianus ipse purpuram sumpserat." But the dies imperii of Galerius was 1 March 293 (Pan. Lat. 8(5).3.1), and, even if artificial dies imperi are attested (as, e.g., for Aurelian), there is no close parallel or obvious motive for the artifice postulated in 293 (see Jones, LRE 3.3 n.4). Nor is the hypothetical investiture in absence convincing. Moreover, both items of evidence adduced by Seston are vulnerable. Lactantius is speaking both of Diocletian and of the place where Diocletian was proclaimed emperor; therefore, the name "Maximianus" should be deleted as a later gloss. The Paschal Chronicle is never authoritative for events in this period outside Egypt: either it is simply mistaken about the place, or 21 May may be the day on which the laureled picture of the new emperors arrived in Alexandria (for the laureata imago, see P. Bruun, Studia Romana in honorem P. Krarup (Copenhagen, 1975), 122).

74. The papyrus, in Latin and from Oxyrhynchus, appears to be a receipt and mentions "[equitibus promotis dd. nn. Diocteliani et Max[imian][i Augg.] et [Constantii et Maximiani] nobilissimorum Caesarum agi"—which indirectly implies the proximity of an emperor. (I am grateful to Dr. P. Brennan for drawing this evidence to my attention.)


76. The document describes itself as an edict (Collatio 6.4.1, 7, 8): according to conventional doctrine, therefore, it must be ascribed to Diocletian (Mommsen, Ges. Schr. 2.288). Admittedly, Diocletian's attested movements permit the hypothesis of an otherwise unknown visit to Syria in 295 (above, at n. 34), but geography and the division of the empire in 293 (Chapter XI) suggest
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?295</td>
<td>Campaign on the Persian frontier</td>
<td>Tables 4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296, late-</td>
<td>On campaign against the Persians; defeated between Carrhae and Callinicum</td>
<td>P. Argent. 480, 1 verso 1 ff.; Victor, Caes. 39.34; Eutropius, Brev. 25, Jerome, Chronicle 227c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297, spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>Collects a new army from the Danube</td>
<td>Victor, Caes. 39.34; Eutropius, Brev. 9.24; Festus, Brev. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>Successful campaign against the Persians: attacks through Armenia, marches down the Tigris through Media and Adiabene, advances to Ctesiphon, and returns up the Euphrates</td>
<td>Arch of Galerius at Thessalonica; Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 9.6; Tables 4–7; Victor, Caes. 39.34; Eutropius, Brev. 9.25.1; Festus, Brev. 25 (Armenia); Constantine, Oratio 16; HA, Carus 9.3 (Ctesiphon); Ammianus 24.1.10 (return)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298/9, winter</td>
<td>Negotiates with a Persian envoy in Mesopotamia</td>
<td>Petrus Patricius, frag. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299, spring</td>
<td>Meets Diocletian at Nisibis</td>
<td>Petrus Patricius, frag. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299 or 300</td>
<td>Campaign against the Marcomanni</td>
<td>Chr. Min. 1.230, cf. Tables 4–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?301, very late in the year</td>
<td>Campaign against the Carpi</td>
<td>Tables 4–7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

that Galerius was the emperor who issued the edict at Damascus—perhaps on the orders of Diocletian.

77. The chronology is established by two literary texts: Joshua the Stylite (translated by W. Wright (Cambridge, 1882), p. 6) dates the capture of Nisibis to year 609 of the Seleucid era, i.e. between 1 October 297 and 30 September 298; and Eumenius correlates Galerius’ activities with those of his colleagues, when he remarks that men’s minds contemplate “aut sub tua, Diocletiane Auguste, clementia Aegyptum furore posito quiescentem aut te, Maximiane invicte, perculsa Maurorum agmina fulminantem aut sub dextera tua, domine Constanti, Bataviam Britanniamque squalidum caput silvis et fluctibus exserentem aut te, Maximiane Caesar, Persicos arcus pharetasque calcantem” (Pan. Lat. 9(4).21.2). The revolt is over, but Diocletian is still in Egypt: therefore, Eumenius was speaking during the summer or autumn of 298 (above, at nn. 36–38).

78. Four victories over the Carpi are attested between late 301 and 7 January 306 (Table 6). In Phoenix 30 (1976), 193, 1 assigned them to 302, 303, 304, and 305—which might be correct. Moreover, any victory over the Carpi in 304 may have been won by Diocletian rather than Galerius (above, n. 43).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Campaigns against the Carpi and Sarmatians</td>
<td>Tables 4-7; Lactantius, <em>Mort. Pers.</em> 13.2; <em>RIC</em> 6.510, Thessalonica 10 (VICTORIAE SARMATICAE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>autumn Campaign against the Carpi</td>
<td>Tables 6, 7; Lactantius, <em>Mort. Pers.</em> 38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304/5</td>
<td>winter Meets Maximian at an unknown location</td>
<td>Lactantius, <em>Mort. Pers.</em> 18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>late, or early 307 Campaig against the Sarmatians</td>
<td>Tables 6, 7&lt;sup&gt;79&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>late summer/autumn Invades Italy</td>
<td>Lactantius, <em>Mort. Pers.</em> 27.2 ff.; <em>Origo</em> 6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>(or 309) Campaign against the Carpi</td>
<td>Tables 6, 7&lt;sup&gt;80&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>Oct. At Serdica</td>
<td><em>Origo</em> 8&lt;sup&gt;81&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>Nov. 11 At Carnuntum</td>
<td>Lactantius, <em>Mort. Pers.</em> 29.1 f.; <em>Chr. Min.</em> 1.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>Nov. Returns to Serdica</td>
<td><em>Origo</em> 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>late April or early May Dies in the province of Dardania, and is buried at Romulianum on the Danube</td>
<td><em>Chr. Min.</em> 1.148; <em>Epitome</em> 40.16 (places); Lactantius, <em>Mort. Pers.</em> 35.4 (date)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>79</sup> *ZPE* 20 (1976), 149 f.; *Phoenix* 30 (1976), 192.
<sup>80</sup> *ZPE* 20 (1976), 150; *Phoenix* 30 (1976), 192.
<sup>81</sup> *Origo* 8: “Galerius in Illyrico Licinium Caesarem fecit, deinde illo in Pannonia relict, ipse ad Serdicam regressus, morbo ingenti occupatus sic distabuit, ut... moreretur.” Observe that this passage does not (as is assumed by Millar, *Emperor* 52) state that Galerius died in Serdica.
SEVERUS

Principal Residence
305–307 Milan

Attested Movements
305, May 1 Invested with the purple by Maximian at Milan Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 18.12, 19.4, 26.10; Eutropius, Brev. 9.27.2
306/7, winter Confers with Galerius, and prepares to march on Rome Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 26.5
307, early Begins his attack from Milan Zosimus 2.10.1
307, spring Advances close to Rome, but is forced to retreat and flees to Ravenna, where he abdicates Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 26.8 ff.; Eutropius, Brev. 10.2.4; Zosimus 2.10.1

MAXIMINUS

Principal Residences
305–306 Antioch
306–308 ?Caesarea
309–311 Antioch
311–312 Nicomedia
312–313 Antioch

Attested Movements
305, ?May/June Goes to the East Eusebius, HE 9.9a.2

82. The subject of Maximinus' movements is not adequately discussed in the recent studies of H. Castritius, Studien zu Maximinus Daia (Frankfurter Althistorische Studien 2, 1969), and T. Christensen, C. Galerius Valerius Maximinus: Studier over Politik og Religion i Romerriget 305–313 (Copenhagen, 1974). The identification of his residences is largely conjectural.
83. G. Downey, History of Antioch 331 ff.
84. Note especially Eusebius, Mart. Pal. (S) 7.7.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Reference(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>305, Nov. 5</td>
<td>?At Apollonopolis in the Thebaid</td>
<td>CJ 3.12.1&lt;sup&gt;85&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306, Nov. 20</td>
<td>At Caesarea in Palestine</td>
<td>Eusebius, Mart. Pal. 6.1 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307/8, winter</td>
<td>At Caesarea</td>
<td>Eusebius, Mart. Pal. (S) 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308, spring or early summer</td>
<td>At Caesarea</td>
<td>Eusebius, Mart. Pal. (S) 8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Campaign against the Persians</td>
<td>Tables 6, 7; RIC 6.636, Antiochia 134 (IOVIO PROPAGAT ORBIS TERRARUM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311, spring</td>
<td>In Syria when he learns of Galerius' death (which occurred c. 1 May)</td>
<td>Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311, early summer</td>
<td>Crosses Asia Minor rapidly to Bithynia, and negotiates with Licinius at the Bosporus</td>
<td>Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 36.1 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311, summer</td>
<td>Returns to Nicomedia and resides there</td>
<td>Eusebius, HE 9.9a.4; cf. Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 36.3 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312, Jan. 7</td>
<td>At Nicomedia</td>
<td>Eusebius, HE 9.6.3; Chr. Pasch. 519–520 (place and year); PO 10.12; Acta Sanctorum, Nov. 2.2 (Brussels, 1931), 29, cf. John Chrysostom, PG 50.519 ff. (day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?312</td>
<td>Visits Stratonicea in Caria</td>
<td>Sylloge&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt; 900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312, autumn</td>
<td>Campaign against the Armenians</td>
<td>Eusebius, HE 9.8.4; ?RIC 6.594, Cyzicus 107 (VICTORIAE MAXIMINI AUG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313, Feb.</td>
<td>In Syria</td>
<td>Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 45.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>85</sup> The heading reads “Imppl. Constantius et Maximianus AA. et Severus et Maximinus nobilissimi CC. Verino,” the subscription (as restored by P. Krüger) “d. non...Apollonio superioris Constantio V et Maximiano V CC. cons.” On the place of issue, J. Morris, Klio 46 (1965), 363; PLRE 1.950, Verinus 1. Apollonopolis appears (in the locative case) as Apollonos superioris in the Notitia Dignitatum (Or. 31.34). As for the date, Nov. can easily be supplied after d. non.
### IMPERIAL RESIDENCES AND JOURNEYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>313, late</td>
<td>Crosses Asia Minor from Syria to Bithynia</td>
<td>Lactantius, <em>Mort. Pers.</em> 45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>winter/spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313, May 1</td>
<td>Crosses the Bosporus</td>
<td>Lactantius, <em>Mort. Pers.</em> 47.5&lt;sup&gt;87&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313, May 2</td>
<td>At Nicomedia</td>
<td>Lactantius, <em>Mort. Pers.</em> 47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313, May</td>
<td>Flees to Cappadocia</td>
<td>Lactantius, <em>Mort. Pers.</em> 47.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APPENDIX: EUSEBIUS' CHRONOLOGY, 311-313

Eusebius states no precise dates in the ninth book of the *Ecclesiastical History*, which concerns itself almost exclusively with the policies and actions of Maximinus between the summer of 311 and his death c. July 313. But several of the documents which he quotes contain chronological cross-references, and it ought to be clear that a consistent and accurate chronology underlies Eusebius' account.<sup>88</sup> The problem was solved, in all essentials, by N. H. Baynes, who took the crucial step of identifying the "most perfect law on behalf of the Christians" issued by Constantine and Licinius (*HE* 9.9.12, cf. 9a. 12) with the letter which Lactantius implies that Constantine wrote to Maximinus shortly after 28 October 312 (*Mort. Pers.* 44.11).<sup>89</sup> Nevertheless, some scholars continue to assert that Eusebius refers to a hypothetical "Edict of Milan," which Constantine and Licinius issued jointly when they conferred there, i.e. in February 313.<sup>90</sup> But this is chronologically impossible: in late spring or early summer 313, Maximinus described as written "last year" (*HE* 9.10.8) letters which

---

<sup>86</sup> On the site of the battle, H. Grégoire, *Byzantion* 13 (1938), 585 f. He emends "campus... quem vocant serenum" to "Ergenum" (*Mort. Pers.* 46.9).

<sup>87</sup> With the supplement of Tollius, accepted by J. Rougé: "at ille Kalendis Mais id est una nocte atque una die (ad fretum), Nicomediam alia nocte pervenit."

<sup>88</sup> For an attempt at elucidation, based on some doubtful assumptions, see H. J. Lawlor, *Eusebiana* (Oxford, 1912), 211 ff. The arguments which R. M. Grant, *TU* 115 (1975), 417 f., adduces in order to accuse Eusebius of falsifying the order of events fall very far short of proof.

<sup>89</sup> N. H. Baynes, *CQ* 18 (1924), 193 f. (disproving the chronology argued by H. J. Lawlor in 1912). When Lawlor reasserted his views in the following year (*CQ* 19 (1925), 94 f.), Baynes was allowed a rejoinder, to which G. W. Richardson added an exegesis of Eusebius' chronology in the *Martyrs of Palestine* (*CQ* 19 (1925), 95 ff.).

<sup>90</sup> E.g., M. V. Anastos, *REB* 25 (1967), 23 ff., who argues that Licinius was in Milan in January 313, perhaps even before the end of 312. But Theomnestus, *Hippiatrica Berolinensia* 34.12, establishes a *terminus post quem* of the beginning of February (below, n. 144).
he ordered to be dispatched after he received the “most perfect law” (9.12-9a.12), and the order to write these letters itself refers to his arrival in Nicomedia in summer 311 as occurring “last year” (9a.4). Moreover, the fact that Maximinus’ death was known in Karanis by 13 September 313 (P. Cairo Isid. 103.20) precludes an escape from Baynes’s conclusion by the hypothesis that Maximinus issued the latest document in the autumn of 313 and calculated by regnal years which began c. 1 September or c. 1 October.

Since Baynes’s brief note is sometimes still overlooked or ignored, a re-statement may be apposite. The following sections of Eusebius, HE 9 are either implicitly dated or datable from other evidence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1-7 May/June 311</td>
<td>Maximinus’ reaction to Galerius’ proclamation of toleration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>November 311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>26 November 311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7 January 312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3-14 summer 312</td>
<td>Rescript to Tyre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>autumn 312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>autumn 312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a.1-9 December 312</td>
<td>Letter to Sabinus (cf. 9a.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.7-11 May 313</td>
<td>Edict restoring privileges and property to the Christians (cf. 10.12: less than a full year after 7.3-14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONSTANTINE**

*Principal Residences*

306-316 Trier, and perhaps Arles

93. It is nowhere acknowledged in the long discussion of Eusebius, HE 9.9.12, by R. Klein, RQ 67 (1972), 1 ff.
94. For the year, Eusebius, HE 7.32.31 (in the ninth year of persecution); for the day, the Egyptian evidence (which deserves priority) indicates 29 Atyr, which, in 311, corresponds to 26 November, see B. Kettler, RE 19 (1938), 1283.
95. Eusebius, HE 9.6.3; Chr. Pasch. 519-520; PO 10.12; Acta Sanctorum, Nov. 2.2 (Brussels, 1931), 29.
98. Pan Lat. 6(7).14.6, 16.1 ff.; Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 29.5.
316/7 On campaign
317–324 Sirmium, Serdica, and perhaps Thessalonica
324–330 Nicomedia
330–337 Constantinople

Attested Movements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>306, July 25</td>
<td>Proclaimed emperor at York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306, autumn, or 307 early</td>
<td>Campaign against the Franci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?307, March 1</td>
<td>At Beauvais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>Visits Britain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307, c. Sept.</td>
<td>Marriage to Fausta and investiture as Augustus by Maximian, presumably at Trier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

99. Constantine used to call Serdica “my Rome,” according to Petrus Patricius, *Excerpta Vaticana* 190 = Anon. post Dionem, frag. 15.1 Müller. Cedrenus 1.496 Bonn asserts that Constantine resided in Thessalonica for two years before he defeated Licinius. Constantine delivered his *Speech to the Assembly of the Saints* in one of these two cities on a Good Friday shortly before making war on Licinius in 324, but I am no longer convinced that the exact year and place can be conclusively established (cf. *JTS*, n.s. 27 (1976), 414 ff., arguing for delivery in Serdica on 12 April 317).


102. As transmitted, the subscription reads “dat. kal. Mart. in civitate Velovocorum Constantino Aug. VI et Constantino [or Constantio] Caes. consss.,” i.e. 1 March 320. If the date is correct, then the *civitas Velovocorum* must be an unidentified town near Serdica (Millar, *Emperor* 122 n. 90). But the place ought to be the well-attested *civitas Bellovacorum*, i.e. Beauvais in northern France (Mommsen, ad loc.; Seeck, *Regesten* 106). If so, the date must be wrong and I propose, with due hesitation, that the correct date is 307, with the consuls originally named as Galerius for the seventh time and Constantine as Caesar (cf. Chapter VI.1; Table 1).

This law is of great significance for the interpretation of Constantine’s religious policies. Seeck, *Regesten* 176, emended the date to 326, and Jones, *LRE* 1.81, deduced that Constantine’s army was still pagan in 324. The argument ought to proceed in the opposite direction. If his soldiers greeted the emperor with the words “Constantine Auguste, de te nobis servent” (so *CTh*, but changed to “deus te nobis servet” in *CJ*), then the law should antedate his public profession of Christianity on 28 October 312.

103. The speech celebrates a double ceremony: the marriage of Constantine to Fausta, and his
308 Raids the territory of the Bructeri and builds bridge over the Rhine at Cologne

310, summer On campaign against the Franci

310, c. July Marches south to Massilia on receiving news of Maximian's usurpation

310, August At Trier

?310, late Visits Britain

311, ?spring Visits Autun

311, July 25 At Trier

312 Invasion of Italy and campaign against Maxentius' forces in northern Italy

investiture as Augustus by Maximian (1.1, cf. 2.1, 5.3, 8.1). The simultaneity of the two events disproves the dates of 31 March and 25 December 307 argued by W. Seston, REA 39 (1937), 197 ff.; J. Lafaurie, CRAI 1965.192 ff.; Mélanges A. Piganiol 2 (Paris, 1966), 795 ff. For Constantine appears still to have styled himself Caesar on 25 July 307 (RIC 6.213, Treveri 744-746, cf. R. Strauss, Rev. Num. 5 16 (1954), 26 ff.), and he married Fausta when Galerius was about to invade Italy (Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 27.1 ff.)—presumably, therefore, in the late summer or early autumn of 307.

104. On the date, ZPE 20 (1976), 150; Phoenix 30 (1976), 192.

105. The speech was delivered shortly after 25 July (2.3) on the natalis dies of Trier (22.4, cf. 1.1, 13.1)—perhaps 1 August, the birthday of the emperor Claudius, who made the city a colonia (E. Wightman, Roman Trier 40 f.). The year is deduced from the structure of the speech, which implies that Maximian has died very recently, see E. Schwartz, Gött. Gel. Nach., Phil-hist. Klasse 1904.522 f.

106. Eusebius, VC 1.25 speaks of a victory over barbarians on the Rhine followed by a visit to Britain, both before 312; either visit implied by the coins of London would suit the context.

107. The date is established by the following passage: “Quinque annorum nobis reliqua remisisti! O lustrum omnibus lustris felicius! O lustrum quod merito hanc imperii tua aequavit aetatem! Nobis ergo praecipue te principem di immortales creaverunt, quibus singulis haec est nata felicitas, ex quo tu imperare coepisti. Quinquennalia tua nobis, et iam [my emendation of the transmitted etiam] perfecta, celebranda sunt. Illa enim quinto incipiente suscepta omnibus populis iure communia, nobis haec propria quae plena sunt” (13.1/2). Since Constantine's dies imperii was 25 July 306, his quinquennalia were celebrated from 25 July 310 (quinto incipiente) to 25 July 311.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>312, Oct. 28</td>
<td>Battle of the Milvian Bridge</td>
<td><em>CIL</em> 1², p. 274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313, early Feb.</td>
<td>Marries his sister to Licinius at Milan</td>
<td>Lactantius, <em>Mort. Pers.</em> 45.1, 48.2; Eusebius, <em>HE</em> 10.5.4; <em>Origo</em> 13 (place); Theomnestus, <em>Hippiatrica Berolinensia</em> 34.12 (date); ¹⁰⁸ <em>RIC</em> 6.296, Ticinum 111 (FELIX ADVENTUS AUGG NN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313, Feb. 16</td>
<td>At Sirmio</td>
<td><em>CTh</em> 7.22.1¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313, March 10</td>
<td>At Milan</td>
<td><em>CTh</em> 10.8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313, spring</td>
<td>Goes to Gaul</td>
<td><em>Origo</em> 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313, May 28–June 16</td>
<td>At Trier</td>
<td><em>Frag. Vat.</em> 291¹; <em>CJ</em> 11.62.1¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313, summer</td>
<td>Goes to the lower Rhine</td>
<td><em>Pan. Lat.</em> 12(9).21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313, July 1</td>
<td>At Cologne</td>
<td><em>CTh</em> 11.3.1¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313, Aug. 3</td>
<td>At Trier</td>
<td><em>CTh</em> 1.16.1¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313, c. Aug.</td>
<td>At Trier</td>
<td><em>Pan. Lat.</em> 12(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>?Visit to Britain</td>
<td><em>RIC</em> 7.97–98, London 1, 2, 21 (ADVENTUS AUG N)¹⁰⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313, Nov. 3–314, June 1</td>
<td>At Trier</td>
<td><em>CTh</em> 9.40.1, 11.30.2, 11.36.1 (Nov. 3), 1.12.1, 1.12.3, 8.10.1, 10.15.1, 11.1.2, 11.7.1 (Nov. 8: some emended by Seeck), 11.29.1¹, 11.30.1¹ (Dec. 27); <em>CJ</em> 7.32.10 (314, Jan. 22); <em>CTh</em> 3.30.1 (March 26), 11.30.4, 13.5.2, 13.5.3 (June 1: all partly emended by Seeck)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(īam perfecta). The orator's references to a harsh census five years earlier (5.4 ff., 10.5) also indicate 311 as the year (Chapter XIV).

¹⁰⁸. Below, n. 144.
¹⁰⁹. Also implied by *ILS* 8942; 696 (discussed below, n. 145).
EMPERORS

314, August 1 Present at the Council of Arles Eusebius, VC 1.44; Optatus, App. 4, p. 208.16 Ziwsa (presence);110
HE 10.5.23 (date)

314, autumn German campaign Eusebius, VC 1.46; RIC 7.124, 163–164; 166–167; 362–364; Table 8

314, Oct. 29–315, April 28 Supervises the building of a fort on the east bank of the Rhine ILS 8937\textsuperscript{111}

314, Oct. 29–315, April 28 At Trier CTh 6.35.1 (Oct. 29); 1.2.1 (Dec. 30); RIC 7.164, Trier 12 (FELIX PROCESSUS COS IIII AUG N); Optatus, App. 8 (April 28, year not stated)\textsuperscript{112}

315, June 2 ?At Sirmio CTh 2.30.1 (emended)\textsuperscript{113}

315, July 18 At Aqua Viva CTh 8.18.1\textsuperscript{a}

315, July 21 (or 18) Enters Rome CIL 1\textsuperscript{2}, p. 268\textsuperscript{114}

315, July 21–Sept. 27 In Rome Frag. Vat. 33, 274 (Aug. 13); CTh 11.30.3, 1.2.2 (Aug. 25, 29), 10.1.1 (Sept. 13)

315, Sept. 27 Leaves Rome CIL 1\textsuperscript{2}, p. 272

110. The context of VC 1.44 ("How he was present at councils of bishops") indicates that the primary reference must be to the Council of Arles in 314, not to the Council of Nicaea in 325 (VC 3.11 ff.), cf. S. Calderone, Costantino e il Cattolicesimo 1 (Rome, 1962), 293.

The purport of VC 1.44 was seen by Cardinal Baronius in the sixteenth century (Annales Ecclesiastici, anno 314, § 53). Baronius, however, dated the Battle of Cibalae to 317 (anno 317, §§ 1–10). When the date of October 314 for the battle became canonical with Gothofredus' classic Chronologia Codicis Theodosiani, published in 1665, then Constantine's presence at Arles seemed to be precluded. O. Seeck, ZKG 10 (1889), 507 ff., accepted it, but as a corollary redated the council to 316—a hypothesis easily refuted by L. Duchesne, MEFR 10 (1890), 640 ff. The modern redating of the War of Cibalae to 316/7 removes any rational grounds for declining the clear implication of Eusebius.

111. On the inscription (known only from Renaissance reports), see O. Hirschfeld, on CIL 13.8502; A. von Domaszewski, Rh. Mus., n.f. 59 (1904), 379 f. A date c. 309 is preferred by D. Hoffmann, Das spätromische Bewegungsheer und die Notitia Dignitatum (Epigraphische Studien 7.1, 1969; 7.2, 1970), 1.178; 2.64 n. 190. But Constantine is styled maximus, which implies a date later than November 312 (Chapter III, at n. 13).

112. The year is certain, since Domitius Celsus is named as vicarius Africae (Chapter IX). RIC 7.162, Trier 1, probably implies Constantine's presence there on 1 January 315, cf. M. R. Alföldi, JNG 9 (1958), 109 f.

113. The manuscripts have "dat. IIII non. Iun. Sirmio Constantino A. IIII et Licinio conss.," which Seeck retained (Regesten 163). But in 315 Sirmium was under the control of Licinius: therefore, either Licinius issued the law (C. Habicht, Hermes 86 (1958), 370) or Sirmio must be emended to Sirmione (as in CTh 7.22.1, of 16 February 313).

114. The Chronographer of 354 records advent(us) divi on both 18 and 21 July; it is not cer-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>315, Oct. 19</td>
<td>At Milan</td>
<td><em>Frag. Vat.</em> 273 (Oct. 19, in either 313 or 315); Augustine, <em>Epp.</em> 43.7.20 (place, but not exact date)(^{115})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316, Jan. 11</td>
<td>At Trier</td>
<td><em>CTh</em> 1.22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316, March 21</td>
<td>At Cabillunum (Châlons-sur-Saône)</td>
<td><em>CTh</em> 9.40.2(^{4})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316, May 6</td>
<td>At Vienne</td>
<td><em>CTh</em> 2.6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316, Aug. 7</td>
<td>Presumably at Arles when his son Constantinus was born there</td>
<td><em>Epitome</em> 41.4; Zosimus 2.20.2; <em>CIL</em> 1(^{2}), p. 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316, Aug. 13</td>
<td>At Arles</td>
<td><em>CTh</em> 11.30.5, 11.30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?316, Sept. 29</td>
<td>At Verona</td>
<td><em>Frag. Vat.</em> 290 (the year is missing in the ms.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316, Oct. 8</td>
<td>At the battle of Cibalae</td>
<td><em>Origo</em> 16; <em>Chr. Min.</em> 1.231 (year wrongly given as 314)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316, Dec. 4</td>
<td>At Serdica</td>
<td><em>CTh</em> 9.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316, Dec. 8</td>
<td>At Serdica</td>
<td><em>CJ</em> 1.13.1 (emended)(^{116})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 316, Dec.</td>
<td>At Philippi</td>
<td><em>Origo</em> 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 317, Jan.</td>
<td>Fights at the battle of the Campus Ardensis, then advances toward Byzantium</td>
<td><em>Origo</em> 17–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317, Feb.</td>
<td>Returns to Serdica</td>
<td><em>Origo</em> 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317, March 1–April 17</td>
<td>At Serdica</td>
<td><em>Chr. Min.</em> 1.232; <em>Origo</em> 19; <em>CTh</em> 8.12.2(^{1}), 9.10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317, June 6–Aug. 7</td>
<td>At Sirmium</td>
<td><em>CTh</em> 11.30.7; Julian, <em>Orat.</em> 1, 5d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?317, Dec. 27</td>
<td>At Thessalonica</td>
<td><em>CJ</em> 6.1.4 (emended)(^{117})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{115}\) Constantine's visit to Milan is probably the occasion of the issue of *RIC* 7.368, Ticinum 53 (LIBERALITAS XI IMP IIII COS PPP). Constantine became *imperator XI* on 25 July 315 (Table 3).

\(^{116}\) The heading reads "Imp. Constantinus A. ad Protogenem episcopum"; the subscription, as transmitted in the manuscripts, "d. VI id. Ian. Sabino et Rufino cons." If Protogenes is (as seems likely) the known bishop of Serdica (Millar, *Emperor* 591), Ian. should be emended to Ian., and Constantine's presence in Serdica may be inferred.

\(^{117}\) As transmitted, the subscription reads "d. VI k. lul. Thessalonicae Gallicano et Basso conss." and the law is addressed *ad Valerianum*. Seeck, *Regesten* 180, identified the recipient as...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>318, Jan. 23</td>
<td>At Sirmium</td>
<td>$CTh$ 6.22.1 (emended)$^{118}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318, Feb. 7-9</td>
<td>At Sirmium</td>
<td>$CJ$ 3.11.3, 3.11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318, May 23- July 30</td>
<td>At Aquileia</td>
<td>$CTh$ 9.16.3, 11.30.9$^b$ (June 22), 12.1.6$^b$ (July 1), 7.22.2$^b$, cf. $RIC$ 7.396, Aquileia 27 (ADVENTUS AUGUSTI N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318, Sept. 7</td>
<td>At Milan</td>
<td>$CTh$ 8.18.2$^c$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318, Oct. 12</td>
<td>At Aquileia</td>
<td>$CTh$ 3.17.1$^c$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318, Oct. 24-</td>
<td>At Sirmium</td>
<td>$CTh$ 1.16.3$^c$, 2.6.2$^c$ (Oct. 24), 5.2.1$^c$ (Dec. 1), 14.25.1$^c$ (Dec. 12), 2.6.3$^c$, 8.11.35.1$^c$ (Dec. 19), 2.4.1 (319, Feb. 4), 11.29.2 (Feb. 10), 10.8.2 (March 11), 2.19.1 (April 13)$^{119}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319, April 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319, July 25</td>
<td>At Naissus</td>
<td>$CTh$ 2.15.1; 2.16.2$^c$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?319, Aug. 18</td>
<td>At Serdica</td>
<td>$CTh$ 5.10.1$^d$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?319, Sept. 29</td>
<td>At Serdica</td>
<td>$CTh$ 12.1.16$^d$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319, Nov. 1-</td>
<td>At Serdica</td>
<td>$CTh$ 2.10.1, 2.10.2 (Nov. 1), 9.37.1 (Nov. 26), 2.22.1$^d$; $CJ$ 6.7.2$^d$ (320, Jan. 30); $CTh$ 3.2.1, 4.12.3$^d$, 8.16.1, 11.7.3; $CJ$ 6.23.15$^d$, 6.37.21$^d$ (Jan. 31); $CTh$ 10.1.4 (May 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320, May 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320, May 22- Aug. 10</td>
<td>At Sirmium</td>
<td>$CTh$ 9.1.5$^e$ (May 22), 15.1.4$^e$ (July 22), 7.21.1$^e$ (Aug. 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320, Dec. 17-31</td>
<td>At Serdica</td>
<td>$CTh$ 16.10.1, 9.3.1$^e$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321, Feb. 6-27</td>
<td>At Serdica</td>
<td>$CTh$ 2.19.2, 9.42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321, April 17</td>
<td>At Sirmium</td>
<td>$CTh$ 11.19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321, May 21</td>
<td>At Viminacium</td>
<td>$CJ$ 8.10.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vicarius Valerianus who received $CTh$ 3.5.3 (29 April 330) and emended the date to Gallicano et Symmacho cons., i.e. 330 (accepted in $PLRE$ 1.938). But that necessitates the implausible hypothesis that Constantine left Constantinople shortly after its formal dedication on 11 May 330 and returned by 16 July. Accordingly, I retain the consular date, but emend the day, with hesitation, to VI k. Ian.

118. So $PLRE$ 1.836, Severus 25. The ms. has 321: Seeck, Regesten 173, preferred 324.

119. P. Bruun, $RIC$ 7 (1966), 76, deduces that Constantine was in Aquileia on 1 January 319 from $RIC$ 7.396, Aquileia 28 (FELIX PROCESSUS COS IIII AUG N). The inference is not imperative: the mints of Ticinum, Aquileia, and Sirmium all greeted the following New Year with the legend “FELIX PROCESSUS COS VI AUG N” ($RIC$ 7.375, Ticinum 104; 397, Aquileia 34; 467, Sirmium 1, 4)—but on 1 January 320 Constantine was in Serdica.

Seeck, Regesten 166, cf. 434, also lists $CTh$ 11.35.1 under 19 May 318.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>321, June 12-Sept. 14</td>
<td>At Sirmium</td>
<td>CTh 2.18.1(^1), 11.30.11(^s) (June 12), 13.13.1 (Aug. 1), 1.4.1, 9.43.1 (Sept. 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?322, April 11</td>
<td>At Sirmium</td>
<td>CTh 15.1.2 (emended: 321 mss.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322, May 23-July 20</td>
<td>At Sirmium</td>
<td>CTh 2.4.2, 2.18.2 (May 23), 4.8.4 (June 12), 4.8.3 (July 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322, Dec. 18</td>
<td>At Serdica</td>
<td>CTh 3.32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323, Feb. 15 or May 18</td>
<td>At Thessalonica</td>
<td>CTh 4.8.6 = CJ 8.46.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323, spring</td>
<td>At Thessalonica when Roman territory is invaded</td>
<td>Origo 21, cf. CTh 7.1.1, 7.12.1 (April 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323, summer</td>
<td>Campaign against the Sarmatians: successively at Campona, Margus, and Bononia</td>
<td>Publilius Optatianus Porfyrius, Carm. 6.16 ff. (places); RIC 7.115, 135, 201/2, 262, 475 (SARMATIA DEVICTA); Zosimus 2.21; Petrus Patricius, Excerpta Vaticana 187(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323, Dec. 25</td>
<td>At Sirmium</td>
<td>CTh 16.2.5(^s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324 (or 321), Jan. 19</td>
<td>At Sirmium</td>
<td>CTh 12.17.1 (emended)(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324, March 8-April 9</td>
<td>At Thessalonica</td>
<td>CTh 13.5.4; 2.17.1(^s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324, spring-summer</td>
<td>Prepares and begins the campaign against Licinius from Thessalonica</td>
<td>Zosimus 2.22.1 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324, July 3</td>
<td>Battle of Adrianople</td>
<td>CTh 7.20.1; CIL 1(^2), p. 268; Chr. Min. 1.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324, Sept. 18</td>
<td>Battle of Chrysopolis</td>
<td>CIL 1(^2), p. 272; Origo 27; Chr. Min. 1.232; Socrates, HE 1.4.2; Zosimus 2.26.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) On the date (and against the hypothesis of both a Sarmatian campaign in 322 and a Gothic campaign in 323), see H.-G. Opitz, ZNW 33 (1934), 139; T. D. Barnes, ZPE 20 (1976), 152.

\(^2\) The transmitted date is obviously corrupt: "dat. XIIII Kal. Feb. Sirmio Crispo III et Constantino II Conss." Mommsen, ad loc., and Seeck, Regesten 173, emend to "Crispo III et Constantino III conss." (324), but the emendation "Crispo II et Constantino II conss.," i.e. 321, may be preferable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>324, Sept. 19</td>
<td>Receives the surrender of Licinius at Nicomedia</td>
<td>Praxagoras, <em>FGrH</em> 219 = Photius, <em>Bibliotheca</em> 62; <em>Origo</em> 28; Zosimus 2.28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324, Nov. 8</td>
<td>Founds Constantinople and proclaims Constantius Caesar</td>
<td>Themistius, <em>Orat.</em> 4, p. 63a Dindorf; <em>CIL</em> 1, p. 276; <em>Chr. Min</em> 1.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 324, Dec.</td>
<td>Visits Antioch</td>
<td><em>RIC</em> 7.685, Antioch 48 (ADVENTUS AUGUSTI N); Constantine, Opitz, <em>Urkunde</em> 17.15 = Eusebius, <em>VC</em> 2.72; Malalas 318 Bonn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325, Feb. 25</td>
<td>At Nicomedia</td>
<td><em>CTh</em> 1.15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325, May 23–</td>
<td>At Nicaea</td>
<td><em>CTh</em> 1.2.5 (May 23); Eusebius, <em>VC</em> 3.10–14, cf. Schwartz, <em>Ges. Schr.</em> 3.79–82 (on and before June 19); Opitz, <em>Urkunden</em> 23.2, 25.2, 26.1, 27.13 (before and after June 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325, July 25–</td>
<td>At Nicomedia</td>
<td>Jerome, <em>Chronicle</em> 231 (July 25); <em>CTh</em> 12.5.1 (July 30), 9.1.4 (shortly before Sept. 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Sept. 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325, Sept. 17</td>
<td>At Nassete (between Nicomedia and Chalcedon)</td>
<td><em>CTh</em> 11.39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325, Oct. 13</td>
<td>At Constantinople</td>
<td><em>CTh</em> 7.20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325, Oct. 19</td>
<td>At Aquae</td>
<td><em>CTh</em> 7.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326, Feb. 3</td>
<td>At Heraclea</td>
<td><em>CTh</em> 9.3.2, 9.7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


123. Observe, however, that the mint of Antioch exhibits, in late 324, some clearly inappropriate and tralatician legends (*RIC* 7.682–684, Antioch 37–41).

124. On the interpretation of this document, *AJAH* 3 (1978), 54 ff. Preparations for an impending imperial visit to Egypt are attested in January and May 325 (*P. Oxy.* 1261; 1626 = *FIRA* 3.151).


126. Opitz, *Urkunde* 27.15, shows that Constantine was still in or near Nicomedia when he exiled Eusebius of Nicomedia, “three months” after the Council of Nicaea (Philostorgius, *HE* 1.10)—i.e., depending on the base date and method of counting, between late August and October 325.
326, March 5  At Heraclea              \( CTh \) 10.4.1\(^{1}\)
326, March 8  At Constantinople    \( CTh \) 2.10.4
326, April 1-4  At Aquileia        \( CTh \) 9.24.1\(^{1}\); 9.8.1\(^{127}\)
326, July 6    At Milan             \( CTh \) 9.21.3
326, July 18\(^{-}\) Aug. 3  In Rome (or 21) \( CIL \) 1\(^{2}\), p. 268; Jerome, *Chronicle* 231\(^{5}\); *Chr. Min.* 1.232 (July 25); \( CTh \) 10.8.3 (Aug. 3)
326, Sept. 25  At Spoletium         \( CTh \) 16.5.2
326, Oct. 23   At Milan              \( CTh \) 4.22.1
326, Dec. 31   At Aquileia          \( CJ \) 2.19(20).11 (emended)\(^{128}\)
327, Feb. 27   At Thessalonica      \( CTh \) 11.3.2
327, June 11   At Constantinople    \( CTh \) 2.24.2
327, July 30   At Nicomedia          \( CTh \) 12.5.1\(^{4}\)
327, Dec./328, Jan.  Attends church council at Nicomedia Opitz, *Urkunde* 31 (council); Eusebius, *VC* 3.23 (Constantine present); Philostorgius, *HE* 2.7, 7\(^{a}\) (date and place); Opitz, *Urkunde* 29 + Athanasius, *Apol. Sec.* 59.5 (date)\(^{129}\)
328, Jan. 7    Refounds Drepanum in Bithynia as Helenopolis *Chr. Pasch.* 527\(^{130}\)
328, March 1   At Nicomedia          \( CTh \) 14.24.1
328, May 18    At Serdica           \( CTh \) 11.7.4\(^{4}\)
328, July 5    At Oescus             \( CTh \) 6.35.5\(^{4}\)
328, Sept. 27  At Trier             \( CTh \) 1.4.2\(^{5}\)
328/9         Campaign on the Rhine Table 8

\(^{127}\).  *CTh* 9.7.2, posted at Nicomedia on 25 April, and *CJ* 5.26, posted at Caesarea on 14 June, are clearly fragments of the same law (Seeck, *Regesten* 63).

\(^{128}\).  The subscription, as transmitted, reads “d. X k. Oct. Aquileiae Constantino A. VII et Constantio cons.” Seeck originally emended the month from *Oct.* to *Dec.* (*ZSS*, Rom. Abt. 10 (1889), 236 f.), but later proposed to change the consular date to 340 (*Regesten* 189, reporting the ms. reading as “Constantio A. VII et Constantio cons.”). The address *ad Evagrium* pp. precludes a date after 337 (Chapter VIII).

\(^{129}\).  For the inference, *AJAH* 3 (1978), 60 f.

\(^{130}\).  The Paschal Chronicle dates the refoundation of Drepanum to 327, which can hardly be correct, since Helena was still alive in January 327; the day must have been the anniversary of the martyrdom of Lucian in 312 (*PO* 10.12; *Acta Sanctorum*, Nov. 2.2 (Brussels, 1931), 29).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>328, Dec. 29</td>
<td>At Trier</td>
<td>$CTh 1.16.4, 7.20.5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329, March 9– April 18</td>
<td>At Sirmium</td>
<td>$CTh 6.4.1^s$ (March 9), 2.16.1^s, 3.30.3^s; $CJ 5.72.4^s$ (March 15), $CTh 9.12.2^s$ (April 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329, May 13</td>
<td>At Naissus</td>
<td>$CTh 11.27.1^s$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329, May 29– June 19</td>
<td>At Serdica</td>
<td>$CTh 9.9.1^s, 11.30.18^s$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329, Aug. 3</td>
<td>At Heraclea</td>
<td>$CTh 11.30.13^s$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329, Oct. 18</td>
<td>At Bergule</td>
<td>$CTh 16.8.1$ (emended)$^{131}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329, Oct. 25</td>
<td>At Heraclea</td>
<td>$CTh 12.1.17$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330, Feb. 5</td>
<td>At Serdica</td>
<td>$CTh 16.2.7$; Optatus, App. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330, Feb. 22</td>
<td>At Bessapara</td>
<td>$CTh 2.26.1^s$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330, May 11</td>
<td>Formal dedication of Constantinople</td>
<td>$RicTh$ 7.756, Constantinople 41 (AD-VENTUS AUGUSTI N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330, July 16– 331, June 30</td>
<td>At Constantinople</td>
<td>$RicTh$ 7.626, Nicomedia 160 (AD-VENTUS AUG N)$^{132}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?331</td>
<td>Visits Nicomedia</td>
<td>$RicTh$ 7.576, Constantinople 41 (AD-VENTUS AUGUSTI N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331 Nov. 1</td>
<td>At Constantinople</td>
<td>$CTh 1.16.6, 1.16.7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331, c. Nov. 1– 332, Jan.</td>
<td>Tries Athanasius at Psamathia (a suburb of Nicomedia)</td>
<td>Athanasius, Apol. Sec. 60.4, 65.4 (place); Festal Letter 4.5 (date); Socrates, HE 1.27.10$^{133}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^{131}$: $CTh$ 16.8.1 = $CJ$ 1.9.3 has "dat. XV Kal. Nov. Murgillo Constantino A. IIII etLicinio IIII cons." (315). The place of issue has traditionally been identified as Mursella, in Pannonia Superior (M. Fluss, RE 16 (1935), 660 f., 677 f.), and Seeck emended the date to 13 August 339, taking $CTh$ 16.8.6 and 16.9.2 (transmitted date 13 August 353) as coming from the same original document (Regesten 187). But Evagrius, to whom $CTh$ 16.8.1, 8.6, 9.2 are addressed, was praetorian prefect before the death of Constantine (Chapter VIII). PLRE 1.284/5, Evagrius 2, emends the date to 329 ("Constantino A. VIII et Constantinio C. IIII cons.") and Murgillo to Bergulis, i.e., the town of Bergule, between Adrianople and Constantinople (E. Oberhummer, RE 3 (1899), 293).

$^{132}$: Constantine's presence in Nicomedia in 330 or 331 seems also to be implied by Epiphanius, Pan. 68.5/6.

$^{133}$: The Index to Festal Letter 3 states that Constantine tried Athanasius in 330/1 — whence it has been erroneously deduced that Athanasius was tried in both 330/1 and 331/2 (e.g., Millar, Emperor 602).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>332, April 12</td>
<td>At Marcianopolis</td>
<td>CTh 3.5.4, 3.5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332, April 20</td>
<td>Victory over the Goths</td>
<td>Origo 31; Jerome, Chronicle 233; Chr. Min. 1.234; Table 8; RIC 7.333, Rome 306 (VICTORIA GOTHICA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332, Oct. 17-</td>
<td>At Constantinople</td>
<td>CTh 4.8.8 (Oct. 26), 3.30.5 (333, April 18), 8.12.5 (May 4); Const. Sirm. 1 (May 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333, May 5</td>
<td>At Constantinople</td>
<td>CTh 1.32.1, 1.2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333, late Oct.-Nov. 11</td>
<td>At Aquae</td>
<td>CTh 1.22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>At Nicomedia</td>
<td>CTh 10.15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334, June 17</td>
<td>At Constantinople</td>
<td>CTh 12.1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334, July 5</td>
<td>At Singidunum</td>
<td>CTh 11.39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334, Aug. 4</td>
<td>At Viminacium</td>
<td>Chr. Min. 1.234; Table 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334, Aug. 25</td>
<td>At Naissus</td>
<td>Chr. Min. 1.234; Table 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>Campaign against the Sarmatians</td>
<td>CTh 10.10.3 (March 22); 8.9.1 (April 17); 11.16.6 (May 7); Chr. Min. 1.235 (July 25); CTh 16.8.5, 16.9.1 = Const. Sirm. 4 (Oct. 21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335, March 22</td>
<td>At Constantinople</td>
<td>CTh 10.10.3 (March 22); 8.9.1 (April 17); 11.16.6 (May 7); Chr. Min. 1.235 (July 25); CTh 16.8.5, 16.9.1 = Const. Sirm. 4 (Oct. 21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335, Oct. 23</td>
<td>At Nicopolis</td>
<td>CJ 1.40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335, Nov. 6</td>
<td>Returns to Constantinople</td>
<td>Gelasius, HE 3.18.4; Festal Index 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335, Nov. 7</td>
<td>In Constantinople</td>
<td>Festal Index 8; cf. Athanasius, Apol. Sec. 87.1 f.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

134. The Origo has per Constantium Caesarem, presumably using Caesarem in a non-technical sense (ZPE 20 (1976), 151 n.5).
135. CTh 3.5.6 may attest Constantine's presence in Constantinople on 15 July 332 (Chapter IX, n. 17).
137. For a cogent defense of the transmitted date (often emended to 5 February 336), see P. Peeters, Bull. Acad. Roy. de Belgique, Classe des Lettres 30 (1944), 131 ff.
EMPERORS

335, after Nov. 7
?336
336, July 25–337, April 3
In Constantinople
Visits Thessalonica
Campaigns north of the Danube, and recovers part of the lost province of Dacia
At Constantinople
Visits Aquae and Hele- nopolis
Dies at Ancyrona, a suburb of Nicomedia
Eusebius, VC 4.33, 46
RIC 7.527, Thessalonica 203 (AD- VENTUS AUG N)
Festus, Brev. 26; Julian, Caesares 329b-d; Table 8; RIC 7.221, Trier 578 (VICTOR OMNIUM GENTIUM)
Eusebius, Triac. 1–10, cf. VC 4.46; CTh 12.1.22 (Aug. 22); 3.1.2 (337, Feb. 4); Eusebius, VC 4.60.5 (April 3)
Eusebius, VC 4.61.1
Eusebius, VC 4.61.2, 64; Chr. Min. 1.235; Socrates, HE 1.39.2, 40.3; Festal Index 10; Chr. Pasch. 532

LICINIUS

Principal Residences
308–316 Sirmium and perhaps Naissus
316/7 On campaign
317–324 Nicomedia

Attested Movements
308, Nov. 11 Invested as Augustus at Carnuntum
Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 29.1 f.; Chr. Min. 1.231

138. On the speech to which Eusebius refers (not Triac. 11–18), GRBS 18 (1977), 343 ff.
139. For the date, H. A. Drake, Historia 24 (1975), 345 ff.
140. For earlier attempts to establish the movements of Licinius, see especially R. Andreotti, Diz. ep. 4 (1959), 981 ff.
141. Origo 8 (in Pannonia relicito in late 308); 16/17 (family and thesauri at Sirmium in October 316). The construction of Thermae Liciniianae appears to be proved by CIL 3.10107, cf. M. Mirkovč, Sirmium: Archaeological Investigations in Syrmian Pannonia 1 (Belgrade, 1971), 37, 59.
142. [Julian], Epp. 185–187 (in ‘Thrace’ c. 315), cf. GRBS 19 (1978), 102 ff. What appears to be the palace of a pagan Roman emperor built c. 300 and soon abandoned has been found at Gambisgrad near Niš, Illustrated London News, October 1975, 97–99.
143. [Julian], Epp. 184, 416d–417b; Socrates, HE 1.6.33; Sozomen, HE 4.16.6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>310, June 27</td>
<td>Victory over the Sarmatians</td>
<td><em>ILS 664; Tables 6, 7</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311, June 9</td>
<td>At Serdica</td>
<td><em>FIRA</em> 1.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313, early Feb.</td>
<td>Leaves Carnuntum and travels posthaste to Italy</td>
<td>Theomnestus, <em>Hippiatrica Berolinensia</em> 34.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313, Feb.</td>
<td>Marries Constantine’s sister at Milan</td>
<td>Lactantius, <em>Mort. Pers.</em> 45.1, 48.2; Eusebius, <em>HE</em> 10.5.4; <em>Origo</em> 13; Zosimus 2.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313, April 30</td>
<td>Defeats Maximinus near Adrianople</td>
<td>Lactantius, <em>Mort. Pers.</em> 46.8 ff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313, summer</td>
<td>Crosses Asia Minor</td>
<td>Lactantius, <em>Mort. Pers.</em> 49.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313 or 314</td>
<td>Campaigns on the Persian frontier</td>
<td><em>ILS 8942; 696</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

144. Edited by E. Oder and K. Hoppe, *Corpus Hippiatricorum Graecorum* 1 (Leipzig, 1924), 183. The emperor is not named, but the allusion seems certain, see M. Haupt, *Opuscula* 3 (Leipzig, 1876), 491 ff.

145. These two inscriptions attribute to Constantine a combination of victory titles so unexpected that they have been dismissed either as aberrant and unreliable (O. Seeck, *Rh. Mus.*, n.f. 48 (1893), 200 n. 2) or as a version of the titles of Constantius illegitimately transferred to Constantine (C. Habicht, *Hermes* 86 (1958), 371). But the victory titles run closely parallel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Title Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sar. max.</td>
<td>Sarm. max.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per. max.</td>
<td>Capp. max</td>
<td><em>ILS 8942: Semta,</em></td>
<td><em>ILS 696: near Sitifis,</em> 315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiab. max.</td>
<td>Arab. max.</td>
<td></td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the correspondence of titles is very close (*Aiab. and Arab. presumably being mistakes of transcription for Adiabenus*), each inscription tends to confirm the other, and, once the principle of collegiality in the taking of victory titles is recognized (Chapter III.2), it seems clear that the titles of Constantine reflect victories won either by himself or by his colleague Licinius, and hence that those relating to the East were earned by Licinius (*ZPE* 20 (1976), 154). The dates of the campaigns are fixed by *ILS* 8942 and by the fact that *Per(ticus)/Capp(adocicus) maximus* follows *Brit(tanicus) maximus*, thus implying that Licinius' campaigns are later than Constantine's expedition to Britain in autumn 313 (above, at n. 109).
EMPERORS

314 or 315 Campaigns against the Goths  *ILS 8942; 696

Between 314 and 316 At Tropaeum Traiani  *ILS 8938

316, Sept./Oct. At Sirmium  *Origo 16; [Julian], *Epp. 181, 449a

316, Oct. 8 At Cibalae  *Origo 16; Chr. *Min. 1.231 (year wrongly given as 314)

316, Oct. 9 At Sirmium  *Origo 16

316, after Oct. 9 Flees to Dacia and then to Adrianople  *Origo 17; [Julian], *Epp. 181, 449a

c. 317, Jan. Defeated at the battle of the Campus Adrianensis and withdraws to Beroea  *Origo 18

c. 318 Campaign against the Sarmatians  *P. *Oxy. 889

318, June 23 ?At Byzantium  *CTh 1.27.1

323, April 13 ?At Byzantium  *CTh 11.30.12*, 12.1.8*

324, July 3 Defeated at Adrianople  *Origo 24; Zosimus 2.22.4 ff., cf. *CIL 1*, p. 268; Chr. *Min. 1.232


324, Sept. Flees to Chalcedon  *Origo 27; Zosimus 2.25.1


324, Sept. 19 Abdicates and is then sent to Thessalonica  *Origo 28–29; Epitome 41.7; Zosimus 2.28

146. *CTh* 2.30.1 might attest Licinius’ presence at Sirmium on 30 June 315 (above, n. 113).
147. *GRBS* 19 (1978), 100 f.
148. Reprinted and discussed in Chapter XIV.3.
149. The subscription is transmitted as “data VIII Kal. Julias Constantinopoli A. et Crispo Caes. cons.” Seeck emended *Constantinopoli* to *ipso* and attributed the law to Constantine (*Regesten* 166). For ascription of the law to Licinius, Millar, *Emperor* 591 n. 7.
# CRISPUS

## Principal Residences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>317-318</td>
<td>With Constantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318-323</td>
<td>Trier&lt;sup&gt;150&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323-324</td>
<td>With Constantine and on campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324-326</td>
<td>Trier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Attested Movements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>317, March 1</td>
<td>Proclaimed Caesar at Serdica</td>
<td><em>Origo</em> 19; <em>Chr. Min.</em> 1.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?319</td>
<td>Campaign against the Franci</td>
<td><em>Pan. Lat.</em> 4(10).17.2, cf. 37.3; <em>RIC</em> 7.185, Trier 237–241; <em>P. Oxy.</em> 889&lt;sup&gt;151&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321, Jan. 1</td>
<td>At Serdica</td>
<td><em>RIC</em> 7.470, Sirmium 19 (FELIX ADVENTUS CAESS NN), Sirmium 20A (FELIX PROCESSUS COS II)&lt;sup&gt;152&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321, March 1</td>
<td>With Constantine, presumably at Serdica</td>
<td><em>Pan. Lat.</em> 4(10).36.4 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>Campaign on the Rhine</td>
<td><em>RIC</em> 7.196, Trier 362–363, 365–366; 475, Sirmium 49–52 (ALAMANNIA DEVICTA)&lt;sup&gt;153&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324, Jan. 1</td>
<td>At Sirmium</td>
<td><em>RIC</em> 7.476, Sirmium 57 (FELIX PROCESSUS COS III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324, summer</td>
<td>In command of Constantine's fleet: destroys Licinius' fleet at the Hellespont and then sails to the Bosporus</td>
<td>Publilius Optatianus Porfyrius, <em>Carm.</em> 19.35 f., with the <em>versus in texti</em>; Eusebius, <em>HE</em> 10.9.4–6; <em>Origo</em> 23–27; Petrus Patricius, <em>Excerpta Vaticana</em> 188; Zonaras 13.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>150</sup> Nazarius in 321 alludes to Crispus' normal separation from his father: "cui tanto inter vallo videre filium licuit" (*Pan. Lat.* 4(10).37.1).

<sup>151</sup> Reprinted and discussed in Chapter XIV.3. The date of the campaign is not certain: although Seeck once preferred 320 (*RE* 4 (1901), 1722), either 318 or, more probably, 319 appears to be established by the imperial coinage (P. Bruun, *RIC* 7 (1966), 76).

<sup>152</sup> Referred to Serdica on the grounds that Serdica had no mint, and Constantine seems to have spent the winter of 320/1 there, not at Sirmium.

<sup>153</sup> The inference is uncertain; but if it is correct, then Publilius Optatianus Porfyrius, *Carm.* 8.33, 10.24 ff., should refer to 323 rather than to Crispus' earlier campaign c. 319 (*AJP* 96 (1975), 180 f.).
EMPERORS

325, March 6 At Trier CTh 12.9.1154
326, c. May Executed at Pola Ammianus 14.11.20 (place); Epitome 41.11; Zosimus 2.29.2 (implied date)155

LICINIUS CAESAR

If Licinius Caesar was twenty months old when he became Caesar on 1 March 317 (Epitome 41.4; Zosimus 2.20.2), he was only a boy of nine when he was deposed in September 324; presumably, therefore, he normally resided and traveled with his parents.

CONSTANTINUS

Principal Residences

317–328 With Constantine156
328–340 Trier157

Attested Movements (to 337)

323 ?Takes part in Constantine's Sarmatian campaign RIC 7.195–196, Trier 358–361, 364, 364A; 204, Trier 446 (PRINCIPA IUVENTUTIS linked with SARMATIA)
330 Campaign against the Alamanni MAMA 7.305, col. 3.7 (Alaman(nicus) by 30 June 331); AE 1934. 158159

154. Seeck, Regesten 174, emends dat. to pp. in order to attribute the law to Constantine.
156. Pan. Lot. 4(10).37.3.
157. Constantine's journey to Trier late in 328 was presumably to set Constantinus up with his own establishment.
158. A conjectural inference: the Trier coins allude to the imperial visit to the West with the legend "AETERNA GLORIA SENAT P Q R," but depict a quadriga with only two emperors (i.e. Constantine and Constantius), and it may be relevant that Evagrius remained in Nicomedia as praetorian prefect (Chapter VIII.3).
159. The campaign is dated to 328 by O. Seeck, Geschichte 4.381; Regesten 178; P. Bruun, RIC 7 (1966), 78, 213 f. But Constantine himself does not have the title Alamannicus maximus on
332, July 27  At Cologne  
336, July 25  In Gaul  
337, June 17  At Trier  
337, c. Sept.  Confers with Constantius and Constans in Pannonia  

CONSTANTIUS

**Principal Residences**

324-c. 330  With Constantine  
c. 330–335  ?With Constantine
335–335  Antioch

**Attested Movements (to 337)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>324, Nov. 8</td>
<td>Proclaimed Caesar at Byzantium</td>
<td>Themistius, <em>Orat.</em> 4, p. 63a Dindorf; <em>CIL</em> 1, p. 276; <em>Chr. Min.</em> 1.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>Accompanies Constantine to Rome</td>
<td><em>RIC</em> 7.207, Trier 467–468, cf. 328, Rome 279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

160. In order to attribute the law to Constantine himself, Seeck emended the date to 313 (*Regesten* 92, 156).

161. The translation and commentary of H. A. Drake, *In Praise of Constantine* (Berkeley, 1976), 87, 159, does not bring out the full force of Eusebius' conceit, that, just as the rays of the sun illumine both east and west, so Constantine illumines the whole world through his Caesars, of whom one resides in the east (i.e. Constantius), another illuminates "the other race of men" (i.e. Constantinus in the far west), and a third is elsewhere (i.e. Constans).

162. Julian, *Orat.* 1, 11d–13d, alleges that Constantine gave Constantius charge of the Gallic provinces while still a boy, and later transferred him to stand guard on the eastern frontier. Hence Seeck, *Geschichte* 4.4, 382, argued that Constantius briefly replaced Constantinus in Gaul while the latter fought the Goths on the Lower Danube in spring 332. But *AE* 1934.158 does not give Constantius the title *Sarmaticus*: hence the Gothic victory of 332 was won by Constantine himself (Table 8). Moreover, Libanius implies that Constantius remained with his father until 335 (*Orat.* 59.42 f.). Nevertheless, Julian might be correct in asserting that Constantius resided apart from his father before 335.

163. For 335–337, Eusebius, *Triac.* 3.4; Julian, *Orat.* 1, 13b; Sozomenus, *HE* 3.5.1, and the division of the empire in 335 (Chapter XI); for the years after 337, see Seeck, *Regesten* 184 ff., with the minor modifications proposed in *Phoenix* 34 (1980), 160 ff.

EMPERORS

337, spring
In Antioch when he learns of Constantine's last illness
Zonaras 13.4

337, May
Travels to Nicomedia, but finds that Constantine is already dead
Julian, Orat. 1, 16d; Zonaras 13.4

337, shortly after May 22
 Escorts Constantine’s body to Constantinople and supervises the funeral
Eusebius, VC 4.70; Libanius, Orat. 59.74; Chr. Min. 1.236

337, c. Aug.
At Viminacium
Athanasius, Apol. ad Const. 5165

337, c. Sept.
Confers with Constantinus and Constans in Pannonia
Julian, Orat. 1.19a

337
Campaign against the Sarmatians
ILS 724 (Troesmis)166

Returns to Constantinople and convenes a council of bishops
Socrates, HE 2.7

337, late
Travels to Antioch
Julian, Orat. 1, 20c; Socrates, HE 2.7167

CONSTANS

Principal Residences

333–335 With Constantine168
335–337 ?Milan169
337–340 Naissus170

Attested Movements (to 337)

337, Aug. 29 ?At Aquileia
Frag. Vat. 35171

165. Athanasius was in Trier on 17 June (Athanasius, Apol. Sec. 87.4) and entered Alexandria on 23 November 337 (Festal Index 10), cf. AJAH 3 (1978), 65 f.
166. Phoenix 34 (1980), 162.
167. For the date, AJAH 3 (1978), 66.
168. Libanius, Orat. 59.42 f.
169. Inferred from the division of the empire in 335 (Chapter XI).
171. As transmitted, the subscription reads “Data IIII kal. Sept. a praefecto (praetorio) ad
337, c. Sept. Confers with Constantinus and Constantius in Pannonia

Dalmatius

Principal Residence
335–337 ?Naissus

Attested Movements
337, summer At Naissus

CJ 5.17.7

correctorem Piceni Aquilea. Accepta XIII kal. Oct. Albae Constantino Aug. III cons." (313). But sections 3–5 are virtually identical, word for word, with CTh 3.1.2, issued from Constantinople on 4 February 337 to Gregorius, praetorian prefect in Africa. The correct date, therefore, ought to be 337 (PLRE 1.1019, Anonymus 88). The presence of a praetorian prefect implies the presence of an emperor, who could only be Constantinus or Constans. Since Italy had been assigned to Constans in 335 (Origo 35; Epitome 41.20), he is here identified as the latter.

172. The law is addressed *ad Delmatium*, with the subscription *data... Naisso Feliciano et Titiano conss.* Seeck supposed that the Caesar Dalmatius was the recipient of the law (Regesten 127). That is impossible (cf. Chapter III, no. 8). The recipient ought to be identified as the Caesar’s father, Fl. Dalmatius, cos. 333, who was presumably killed with his son, i.e. between 2 August and 9 September 337 (Chapter I, at n. 34). Hence the emperor who issued the law should be Dalmatius Caesar, between 22 May and 9 September 337.
PART TWO

HOLDERS OF OFFICES
ORDINARY CONSULS

In the late Roman Empire the eponymous consulate retained and even increased its prestige, while the suffect consulate, though it continued to exist until at least 400, ceased to count as a real consulate and was no longer normally deemed worthy of record in the formal statement of a senator’s career. The names of the consuls of each year, therefore, have a clear historical importance: both imperial consulates and those of others often reflect political events, while the identity of private citizens who held an ordinary consulate is highly relevant to the political and social standing of individuals and families. Unfortunately, however, the ancient lists are all in some way incomplete or defective, while no modern list does full justice to the complexity of the available evidence. The present chapter attempts to remedy this lack. It falls into two parts: a list of ordinary consuls from 284 to 337, and prosopographical notes on consuls other than emperors.

1. ORDINARY CONSULS, 284–337

The basis for any modern reconstruction of the consular fasti must be the various lists of consuls which survive from late antiquity. Theodor Mommsen provided a synopsis of these lists (Chr. Min. 3.515–520, for a.d. 284–337), and


2. W. Liebenam, Fasti Consulares Imperii Romani (Kleine Texte 42–43, 1909), 31–36 (still useful for its references to epigraphic attestation of consular dates); A. Degrassi, I fasti consolari dell'Impero romano (Rome, 1952), 75–80, and PLRE 1.1042-44 all require revision for most years.
the following calendars, chronicles, and fasti are utilized below without individual acknowledgment:

2. Consularia Constantinopolitana and Paschal Chronicle (Chr. Min. 1.229–236)
3. Fasti Vindobonenses (piores and posteriores) (Chr. Min. 1.290–293)
4. Barbarus Scaligeri (A. Schoene, Eusebi Chronicorum libri duo 1 (Berlin, 1875), 230–240 = Chr. Min. 1.290–293)
5. Prosper Tiro (Chr. Min. 1.445–452)—the source of the consular lists in Victorius of Aquitania (Chr. Min. 1.708–712) and Cassiodorus (Chr. Min. 2.149–151)
6. Theo of Alexandria (Chr. Min. 3.379–380)
7. Fasti Heracliani (Chr. Min. 3.395–398)

Also used without acknowledgment are the index and the headings to the Easter Letters which Athanasius wrote to his Alexandrian congregation each year from 329 onward. Inscriptions and papyri which attest the consuls of individual years are adduced where (and only where) they supplement the more systematic evidence.³

Three features of the following list should be noted carefully: emperors are entered under their conventional modern names with iterations marked in Roman figures; in the years for which more than two ordinary consuls are attested (284, 285, 307–313, 321–325), the reconstruction offered sometimes goes beyond the explicit evidence; and the names of consuls other than emperors are entered in the fullest form which the evidence for the consular date attests, regardless of whether a more precise identification can be proved. It should also be observed that no attempt is here made to establish what consuls were recognized under the regimes of Carausius and Allectus in Britain (286–296) or of Domitius Alexander in Africa (308/9).⁴ Nor are datings by the post consulatum formula in Egyptian documents registered, except in 322 and 323.⁵

in which more than two consuls are attested. Mommsen was fully aware of both the difficulties and the importance of the task (Hermes 32 (1897), 538 ff., on the years 307–313).

3. For consular dates in papyri, see R. S. Bagnali and K. A. Worp, Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt (Studia Amstelodamensia 8, 1978), 103 ff., with addenda and corrigenda in their Regnal Formulas in Byzantine Egypt (BASP; Supp. 2, 1979), 75 f., and a series of articles with the collective title “Chronological Notes on Byzantine Documents.” Unfortunately, the list of consuls in Bagnali and Worp’s “Synoptic Chronological Table” is based too closely on Degrassi (Chronological Systems 69 ff.).

4. Carausius himself was consul at least four times, in 287, 288, 289 and 290 (Chapter II).

5. For use of the formula μετά την ὑπατείαν in other years, see F. Preisigke, Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden 3 (Berlin, 1931), 73 ff.; R. S. Bagnali and K. A. Worp, Chronological Systems 107 ff.; BASP 17 (1980), 27 ff.
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284  (a) Carinus II, Numerianus
     (b) Diocletian, Bassus (from 20 November)\(^6\)

285  (a) Carinus III, Aristobulus
     (b) Diocletian II, Aristobulus

286  M. Junius Maximus II, Vettius Aquilinus\(^7\)

287  Diocletian III, Maximian

288  Maximian II, Januarianus

289  M. Magrius Bassus, L. Ragonius Quintianus\(^8\)

290  Diocletian IV, Maximian III

291  C. Junius Tiberianus II, Cassius Dion\(^9\)

292  Hannibalianus, Asclepiodotus

293  Diocletian V, Maximian IV

294  Constantius, Galerius

295  Nummius Tuscus, Annius Anullinus\(^10\)

296  Diocletian VI, Constantius II

297  Maximian V, Galerius II

298  Anicius Faustus II, Virius Gallus\(^11\)

299  Diocletian VII, Maximian VI

300  Constantius III, Galerius III

301  Flavius Postumius Titianus II, Virius Nepotianus\(^12\)

302  Constantius IV, Galerius IV

303  Diocletian VIII, Maximian VII

304  Diocletian IX, Maximian VIII

305  Constantius V, Galerius V

306  Constantius VI, Galerius VI

307–313 Different consuls are attested for the following jurisdictions:
     (a) Galerius (until 311), Licinius (from 308), and Maximinus
     (b) Constantine
     (c) Maxentius (until 312)

6. The Paschal Chronicle (509 = Chr. Min. 1.229), followed by Syncellus (p. 725 Bonn),
   enters Διοκλητιανού καί Βάσσου between the consuls of 283 and 284: they could perhaps be
   regarded as suffect rather than as ordinary consuls, but the date of 284 seems certain (cf. PLRE
   1.151, 157, 254).

7. ILS 4936 (Rome).

8. ILS 4175 (Baiae); CIL 10.4631 (fasti of Cales).

9. ICUR 1.18 (of 291) has Tiberiano et Dione without the iteration (recorded in ICUR 1.17).
   A Roman epitaph from the period 311–320 has the names of the consuls of 291 in the fuller form
   Gaiο I[unio Tiberianio II et] Cassio Dione (ICUR 1.32).

10. P. Lips. 29; P. Oxy. 23 verso; 43 recto 6.25.

11. The nomina of both consuls are well attested in papyri, see R. S. Bagnall and K. A. Worp,
   Chronological Systems 104. ICUR 1.24 has Fausto et Virio Gallo.

12. The name Postumius is clearly attested by PSI 1037.36. Flavius and Virius can be docu-
    mented in the consular dating formula only by P. Flor. 3.23 = Chrestomathie 1.391: [ὑπατείας]
    Φλ. Ποστουμίου Tιτί[ανοὶ τὸ β']καὶ O[ἵριον Νεπωτιανοῦ] (see J. R. Rea, on P. Oxy. 3304.3).
307  
(a) Severus (until late September), Maximinus

(b) ?Galerius VII, Constantine (January–c. September)

   Maximian IX, Constantine (c. September–December)

(c) Galerius VII, Maximinus (January–April)

   post sextum consulatum (April–December)

308  
(a) Diocletian X, Galerius VII

(b) Diocletian X, Galerius VII

(c) consules quos iussi sunt dd. nn. Augusti (1 January–19 April)

   Maxentius, Valerius Romulus (from 20 April)

309  
(a) Licinius, Constantine

(b) post consulatum X et VII

(c) Maxentius II, Valerius Romulus II

310  
(a) Tatius Andronicus, Pompeius Probus

(b) II post consulatum X et VII

(c) Maxentius III

311  
(a) Galerius VIII (until May), Maximinus II

(b) Galerius VIII, Maximinus II

(c) consules quos iussi sunt domini nostri (January–September)

   Rufinus, Volusianus (from September)

13. Maximinus appears as sole consul in P. Merton 31; P. Col. 138 (both 24 December). That reflects the death of Severus, which probably occurred on 16 September (Chapter I, n. 13).

14. For Constantine's consuls in 307, before his open alliance with Maxentius, there are at least three possibilities:

   1. Severus and Maximinus, i.e. Galerius' consuls
   2. Galerius VII and Maximinus, i.e. the consuls proclaimed by Maxentius
   3. Constantine himself and a senior colleague from among the legitimate emperors

   It is arguable, therefore, that CTh 7.20.2 originally bore the consular date of 307 in the form "Maximiano Aug. VII et Constantino Caes. conss." (Chapter V, n. 102).

15. The Chronographer of 354 is most informative on 307: "Maximiano VII et Maximino. ex mense Aprili factum est (post) sextum consulatum quod est novies et Constantino" (Chr. Min. 1.66 f.). Two Roman epitaphs of December 307 confirm the lack of consuls during the latter part of the year (ICUR 1.29: post VI[ ; 30: ἐπί Μαξεντίω).


17. For the dropping of Galerius' name in papyri, R. S. Bagnall and K. A. Worp, Chronological Systems 106.

18. The order of names cannot be established with certainty. The Chronographer of 354 and the Consularia Constantinopolitana, which provide the only evidence for Maxentius' consuls in 311, present the date in three different forms:

   1. "consules quos iussi sunt dd. nn. Aug., ex mense Septembri factum est Rufino et Eusebio," where the second name appears to result from confusion with the consuls of 347 (Chr. Min. 1.67)

   2. "Maximiano VIII solo, quod fuit mense Sep. Volusiano et Rufino" (Chr. Min. 1.76)

   3. "Maximiano VIII, quod est Rufino et Volusiano" (Chr. Min. 1.231)

   (The omission of Maximinus reflects the damnatio memoriae ordained by Constantine and Licinius in 313.)
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312  
(a) Constantine II, Licinius II  
(b) Constantine II, Licinius II  
(c) Maxentius IV (until 28 October)

313  
(a) Maximinus III, Constantine III (January–April)  
    Constantine III (April–c. August)  
    Constantine III, Licinius III (c. August–December)  
(b) Constantine III, Maximinus III (January–May)  
    Constantine III (May–c. August)  
    Constantine III, Licinius III (c. August–December)

314  Rufius Volusianus, Petronius Annianus

315  Constantine IV, Licinius IV

316  Antonius Caecinius Sabinus, Vettius Rufinus

317  consules quos iusserint dd. nn. Augusti
    Ovinius Gallicanus, Caesonius Bassus (from 17 February)

318  Licinius V, Crispus

319  Constantine V, Licinius Caesar

320  Constantine VI, Constantinus

321–324  From 321 until the defeat of Licinius on 18 September 324, the consuls recognized by Constantine (a) were not acknowledged in the territory subject to Licinius (b)

19. The evidence for the consuls of 313 appears complicated, but readily falls into the following pattern:

1. In the early months of the year, Maximinus and Constantine were recognized as consuls everywhere, but Maximinus was the senior consul in his own territory (P. Oxy. 3144; P. Princeton Roll 3.1; PSI 1038), and presumably in Licinius’ too, while Constantine claimed seniority in the west (AE 1969/70.119: Caieta, 22 January; CIL 6.507: Rome, 14 April).

2. Constantine is attested as sole consul in his own territory by Frbg. Vat. 34 (21 July): IG 14.956, A 1; B 24/5 (Rome: no diurnal date). Note, however, that Augustine, Epp. 88.4 (15 April) probably originally had Maximinus as Constantine’s colleague (Chapter XV nos. 4, 5). As for Licinius’ territory, a fragmentary dedication near Carnuntum may attest Constantine as sole consul on 11 June 313 (W. Jobst, Sb. Wien, Phil.-hist. Klasse 335 (1978), 27 no. 4).

3. Licinius replaced Maximinus as Constantine’s colleague, and is attested as such on 13 September (P. Cairo Isid. 103.20). Hence the Fasti Heracliani appear to enter both Constantine and Maximinus and Licinius as consuls in 313 (Chr. Min. 3.397 – where Mommsen wished to remove the doublet by emendation).


21. Mommsen emended the first consul’s middle name to Caecina (Chr. Min. 3.397), but papyri consistently attest the form Caecinius, see J. R. Rea, JEA 60 (1974), 294; R. S. Bagnall and K. A. Worp, Chronological Systems 107.

22. P. Thedelphia 57 = P. Sakaon 50 has Gallicanus and Bassus as consuls on 8 January: it must have been written later and antedated. For the nomina of the consuls, P. Princeton Roll 8.20; P. Vindob. Worp 8.15; J. F. Gilliam, Historia 16 (1967), 252 ff. ICUR 1.33 (idibus Aug. Gallicano cons.) could imply that Bassus died before 15 August.

23. For the forms of dating attested by Egyptian papyri, see D. Hagedorn, ZPE 10 (1973), 121
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321  (a) Crispus II, Constantinus II
(b) Licinius VI, Licinius Caesar II

322  (a) Petronius Probianus, Anicius Julianus
(b) post consulatum Licinii VI et Licinii II qui fuerint (nuntiati) consules II

323  (a) Severus, Vettius Rufinus
(b) II post consulatum Licinii VI et Licinii II qui fuerint (nuntiati) consules III

324  (a) Crispus III, Constantinus III
(b) qui fuerint (nuntiati) consules IV

325  Proculus, Paulinus (January–May)

326  Constantine VII, Constantius

327  Flavius Constantius, Valerius Maximus

328  Flavius Januarinus, Vettius Justus

329  Constantine VIII, Constantinus IV

330  Flavius Gallicanus, Aurelius Valerius Tullianus Symmachus [Phospho]rius

ff.; R. S. Bagnall and K. A. Worp, Chronological Systems 108 f.

The Latin formula "qui fuerint (nuntiati) consules" is modeled on some later dates in the Codex Theodosianus (Seeck, Regesten 22). It corresponds more closely than Seeck's "consules quos iussisset domini nostri Augusti" (Rh. Mus., n.f. 62 (1907), 517; Regesten 170 ff.) to the attested Greek versions, viz.

- a. μέλλουσιν ύπάτοις δευτέρα άμοιβή
  τρίτον / τέταρτον μέλλουσιν ύπάτοις
- b. τοῖς ἀποδειχθησομένοις ύπάτοις τὸ β' / γ'
- c. τρίτον διομένοις ύπάτοις
  τοῖς διομένοις ἓκ τρίτον ύπάτοις
  τοῖς διομένοις ύπάτοις τὸ δ'.

24. ILS 6111 (Rome) shows Crispus and Constantinus as consuls on 13 March, but the fragmentary ICUR 1.34 has "Kal. Mar. Licino VI"—which implies that Constantine recognized Licinius and his son as consuls at the beginning of the year.

25. ILS 6111 = (Rome).


27. CIL 10.407 (Volcei).


29. P. Oxy. 3125 (between 27 March and 25 April); CTh 2.25.1 = CJ 3.38.11 (29 April). Perhaps also P. Oxy. 889 (Chapter XIV. 3).


31. Publilius Optatianus Porphyrius, Carm. 12.1, 18.2, seems to indicate that in 324 Constantine had been expected by some to assume his seventh consulate in 325, cf. AJP 96 (1975), 181, 182.

32. P. Col. 178; PSI 309; P. Flor. 53, cf. G. Vitelli, in his introduction to PSI 716.


34. The papyri which attest Gallicanus' nomen present his colleague's name in a variety of forms: Aurelius Symmachus (Sammelbuch 7666); Valerius Symmachus (PSI 224, as also the
### ORDINARY CONSULS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Consuls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>Junius Bassus, Flavius Ablabius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>Papius Pacatianus, Mecilius Hilarianus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>Flavius Dalmatius, Domitius Zenophilus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>Flavius Optatus, Anicius Paulinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>Julius Constantius, Rufius Albinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>Virius Nepotianus, Tettius Facundus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>Flavius Felicianus, Fabius Titianus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. THE CAREERS OF NONIMPERIAL CONSULS

#### 284 Bassus
If Bassus was Diocletian's colleague in his first consulate, then the pair must have assumed the *fasces* at Nicomedia on 20 November 284. Bassus, therefore, may be identified as the L. Caesonius Ovinius Manlius Rufinianus Bassus whose career is revealed by an inscription from Atella (*AE* 1964.223). Since the epigraphically attested Bassus was twice consul, *praefectus urbi* and *comes Augg.* (not necessarily in this temporal order or its reverse), it is an attractive conjecture that he accompanied the Persian expedition of Carus in 283, was still with the court when Numerianus died in 284, and was present when Diocletian was proclaimed emperor. It follows that Diocletian installed him as *praefectus urbi* in the summer of 285 after defeating Carinus, and it can be rendered probable that he left office c. February 286.

#### 285 T. Cl. Aurelius Aristobulus

---

35. The names of the consuls for 331–337 are relatively well attested in the papyri: R. S. Bagnali and K. A. Worp, *Chronological Systems* 109 f. (For 336, add *PSI* 804, cf. J. R. Rea, on *P. Oxy.* 3304.3.) The *nomen* of the second consul of 332 is Mecilius rather than Maecilius, see J. R. Rea, on *P. Oxy.* 3127.2.
36. Evidence is not normally adduced for posts which are documented and discussed in Chapters VII–IX—not nor are detailed cross-references given to those chapters.
HOLDERS OF OFFICES

286 M. Junius Maximus
Otherwise known only as praefectus urbi from 286 to 27 February 288.38

286 Vettius Aquilinus
Not otherwise attested.39

288 Januarianus
Clearly identical with Pomponius Januarianus, who became praefectus urbi on 27 February 288. Previously attested as prefect of Egypt in 283 and 284 (P. Theadelphia 18; P. Oxy. 1115; Sammelbuch 7206); in the interval he could have served briefly as a praetorian prefect.

289 M. Magrius Bassus
Not otherwise known.

289 L. Ragonius Quintianus
Not otherwise known.

291 C. Junius Tiberianus
Ordinary consul in 281, praefectus urbi from 18 February 291 to 3 August 292.

291 Cassius Dion
Proconsul of Africa for 294–295, praefectus urbi on 11 February 296.

292 Hannibalianus
Clearly identical with Afranius Hannibalianus, who is attested as praetorian prefect between 285 and 292 and as praefectus urbi in 297–298.40

292 Asclepiodotus
Julius Asclepiodotus, attested as praetorian prefect with Hannibalianus before 292; but not necessarily identical with the Asclepiodotus who was praetorian prefect of Constantius in 296.

295 Nummius Tuscus
Curator aquarum et Miniciae (ILS 643: Rome), praefectus urbi from 19 February 302 to 12 September 303.

295 Annius Anullinus
Probably identical with the Annius Anullinus who was praefectus urbi in 306/7.

38. For apparent ancestors, PIR² J 774/5.
39. The full name of the Christian poet Juvenecus, who wrote under Constantine, was Vettius Aquilinus Juvenecus v. c. (CSEL 24.v): presumably, therefore, a grandson of the consul of 286.
40. Perhaps the father of Maximian's first wife (Chapter IV, at n. 19).
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298 Anicius Faustus II
The iteration implies that Anicius Faustus was previously consul sufect in an unknown year. Subsequently praefectus urbi in 299–300. Faustus' full name probably included the nomen Junius and the cognomen Paulinus.41

298 Virius Gallus
Known otherwise only as corrector of Campania.

301 Flavius Postumius Titianus II
Clearly identical with the T. Flavius Postumius Titianus, whose career, as far as his proconsulate of Africa, is known from a Roman dedication by a protégé (ILS 2941). It can be supplemented from an acephalous Roman inscription (CIL 6.1419b). Titianus held the following known posts:

- quaestor candidatus
- praetor candidatus
- curator of Cales, Can[usium], Lugdunum
- suffect consul
- corrector Italiae (attested before 1 March 293)
- corrector Italiae regionis Tra[nspadanae] (?293)42
- corrector of Campania
- consularis aquarum et Miniciae
- proconsul of Africa in 295–296
- cos. II ord. 301
- praefectus urbi from 12 February 305 to 19 March 306

301 Virius Nepotianus
Career otherwise unknown. Presumably father of the consul of 336.

308, 309 Valerius Romulus
Son of Maxentius: he bore the title nobilissimus vir and died in the course of 309 (ILS 672: Sardinia; RIC 6.377 ff., 400 ff.).

310 Tatius Andronicus
Certified as praetorian prefect in the papyri which record his consulate; otherwise unknown.

310 Pompeius Probus
Also praetorian prefect in 310: presumably identical with the Probus whom Galerius sent to negotiate with Maxentius in 307 (Origo 7).


42. The post is possibly identical with the preceding correctura (Chapter IX.1).
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311 Rufinus
Conventionally identified as the Aradius Rufinus whom Maxentius appointed praefectus urbi on 9 February 312. He might, however, be Statius Rufinus, praefectus urbi from 13 April 308 to 30 October 309 (otherwise unknown).

311 Volusianus
The career of C. Ceionius Rufius Volusianus is known principally from a Roman dedication to him in 314 or 315 (ILLS 1213) and from literary sources (Firmicus Maternus, Math. 2.29.10-12 (without the name); Victor, Caes. 40.18; Zosimus 2.14.2 ff.). It can be reconstructed as follows:

- born c. 240/250
- suffect consul c. 280
- corrector Italiae c. 282–c. 290 (He was corrector for eight years (ILLS 1213, and was iterum corrector under Carinus and Numerianus (CIL 10.1655: Puteoli).)
- proconsul of Africa (?305/6)
- praetorian prefect of Maxentius in 309
- praefectus urbi from 28 October 310 to 28 October 311
- ordinary consul in 311
- comes of Constantine
- praefectus urbi from 8 December 313 to 20 August 315
- ordinary consul in 314
- exiled by senatorial decree (?315)

314 Rufius Volusianus
See 311.

314 Petronius Annianus
Attested as praetorian prefect from 315 to 317. Analogy suggests that he assumed this office before he became consul.

316 Antonius Caecinius Sabinus
No other office attested.

316 Vettius Rufinus
Clearly the C. Vettius Cossinius Rufinus whom the town of Atina thanked for protection during the reign of Maxentius (ILLS 1217). The dedication names the following posts:

43. Chastagnol, Fastes 59 ff.; PLRE 1.775, 1043.
44. For the identification and its implications, JRS 65 (1975), 40 ff.
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proconsul provinciae Achaiae sortito (The word sortito suggests that Rufinus was designated proconsul but never governed the province; if so, he will presumably have been prevented by the rupture between Maxentius and Galerius, and therefore proconsul designate for 307–308.)
curator of the Via Flaminia
curator alvei Tiberis et cloacarum sacrae urbis
corrector of Venetia and Histria
corrector of Tuscia and Umbria
corrector of Campania (between 306 and 312)
comes Augg. nn., i.e. of Constantine and Licinius
praefectus urbi (from 20 August 315 to 4 August 316)

317 Ovinius Gallicanus
The only offices attested for Ovinius Gallicanus are curator of Teanum Sidicinum between 293 and 300 (CIL 10.4785) and praefectus urbi from 4 August 316 to 15 May 317. The consul of 317 (rather than the consul of 330) may confidently be identified as the Gallicanus who donated Italian estates to the Church of Saints Peter, Paul, and John the Baptist at Ostia (Liber Pontificalis 34.29, p. 184 Duchesne). 45

317 Caesonius Bassus
Otherwise unknown, unless he can be presumed identical with Septimius Bassus, praefectus urbi from 15 May 317 to 1 September 319. It is possible that the consuls of 317 are brothers, and are the sons of L. Caesonius Ovinius Manlius Rufinianus Bassus, presented above as consul in 284.

322 Petronius Probianus
Symmachus' father saluted Probianus as Augustis notus et hospes (Epp. 1.2.6), but only two offices are attested for him besides the consulate: proconsul of Africa from 315 to 317, and praefectus urbi from 8 October 329 to 12 April 331. In addition, Probianus received an imperial letter issued from Serdica on 27 February 321 (CTh 9.42.1), which discloses no real clue to his official position at the time.

322 Anicius Julianus
The fullest known form of Julianus' name is Amnius Anicius Julianus (Symmachus, Epp. 1.2.5); he was the father of the consul of 334 (ILS 1220) and
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presumably a son of the Julianus proconsul of Africa in 301–302. Two posts are documented: proconsul of Africa in 320–321, and praefectus urbi from 13 November 326 to 7 September 329.

323 Severus
Presumably the Acilius Severus, praefectus urbi from 4 January 325 to 13 November 326.\(^{46}\) There is no valid evidence that he was a praetorian prefect.

323 Vettius Rufinus
Otherwise unattested.

325 Proculus
Proculus was dismissed from his consulate and disgraced, apparently shortly after April 325; the date suggests that he may have been implicated in the alleged plot of Licinius and executed at the same time as the former emperor. Proculus appears to have possessed the nomen Valerius;\(^{47}\) he is presumably identical with the Proculus who was proconsul of Africa in 319–320.

325 Anicius Paulinus
The praenomen Sextus is explicitly attested (CIL 6.1680), but he may also have borne the names Junius Caesonius Nicomachus, like other members of the same family.\(^{48}\) Only two posts are otherwise known: proconsul of Africa for two years (probably 322–324), and praefectus urbi from 12 April 331 to 7 April 333.

325 fioniust Julianus
The Julianus known as consul in 325 was identified by Otto Seeck as M. Ceionius Julianus, praefectus urbi in 333.\(^{49}\) Subsequently two papyri revealed Julianus' nomen, but in a corrupt form: ὑπατείας Ἀνίκίου Παυλίνου καὶ Ἰούλιου Ἰουλιανοῦ τῶν λαμπρότατων (P. Strasbourg 137, 138 = Sammelbuch 8019, 8020). Palaeographically, καὶ Ἰούλιον appears to be the easiest emendation. But M. Ceionius Julianus was proconsul of Africa after 325; therefore, he cannot be one of the consuls of that year. Hence it is more plausible to emend to καὶ Ἰουλίον and to identify the consul as Julius Julianus, the former praeto-

46. Chastagnol, Fastes 65; 77. However, neither of the items of evidence which he adduces to document the nomen Acilius has any probative force: the consul's nomen is lacking on CIL 10.407 (Volcei), and P. Geneva 10.20 attests the consuls of 316 (not 323).
47. D. M. Novak, Ancient Society 10 (1979), 306 f., argues that the consul of 323 belongs to the noble family of the Acilii Glabriones.
48. ZPE 21 (1976), 280, adducing P. Oxy. 889 (re-edited in Chapter XIV.3).
rian prefect of Licinius, whom Constantine is known to have maintained in a position of honor and respect (Libanius, *Orat.* 18.9). Julianus’ known career, therefore, comprises the following posts:

- Prefect of Egypt (attested between 15 January and 29 August 314)
- Perhaps *vicarius* of Oriens
- Praetorian prefect (attested in office from 28 April 315 to September 324)
- Consul in 325

327 Flavius Constantius
Attested as praetorian prefect from 324 to 327; perhaps identical with the Constantius whom Constantine used on a diplomatic mission in 315 or 316 (*Origo* 14).

327 Valerius Maximus
Attested as praetorian prefect in 327/8, 332/3, and 337; previously *vicarius Orientis* (325). It may be inferred, from a general statement in Eusebius, that Maximus was a Christian (*VC* 2.44).

328 Flavius Januarinus
Possibly identical with the Januarinus who was *vicarius* of the diocese of Moesiae in 319, and also apparently *vicarius urbis Romae* in November-December 320 (*CTh* 9.21.2, 9.34.3). The Christian sarcophagus of his wife, Marcia Romana Celsa, who died after 328, has been found at Arles.

328 Vettius Justus
Otherwise unknown.

330 Flavius Gallicanus
Nothing apart from the consulate is attested.

330 Aurelius Valerius Tullianus Symmachus [Phospho]rius
The consul of 330 is the grandfather of the orator Symmachus, and he has sometimes been claimed as a barbarian by birth whom Constantine advanced to the consulate and introduced into the Senate. But there are good reasons

---

53. Perhaps grandfather of Justina, the wife of Valentinian (Chapter IV, at n. 71).
for believing that the consul of 330 was a senator by birth.\textsuperscript{55} He can easily be identified as the Symmachus who received two imperial letters dated 319: one does not specify Symmachus' title or status but was received by him at Corinth (\textit{CTh} 2.4.1), whereas the other was apparently addressed either \textit{ad Symmachum vic.} or \textit{ad Symmachum v.c.} (\textit{CTh} 2.15.1). Hence Symmachus was either \textit{vicarius} of the diocese of Moesiae, or a \textit{vir clarissimus}, i.e., proconsul of Achaea.\textsuperscript{56} Now both the consul of 330 and his son, \textit{praefectus urbi} in 364/5, possessed the \textit{signum} Phosphorius (\textit{ILS} 1257), while two inscriptions, which on epigraphical criteria seem to belong to the early fourth century, attest a Phosphorius as proconsul of Achaea (\textit{IG} 7.96: Megara; \textit{AE} 1901.125: Argos); hence Phosphorius may be presumed identical with Symmachus, proconsul of Achaea in 319.\textsuperscript{57} As for the consul's origin and status in Roman society, he almost certainly comes from a well-established senatorial family. The Aristotelian commentator Elias records that the senator Chrysaorius to whom Porphyry dedicated his \textit{Isagoge} had an ancestor named Symmachus (\textit{In Porphyrii Isagogen}, pr. 15);\textsuperscript{58} the Symmachi of the fourth century were probably descendants of these senators of the third century.

331  Junius Bassus  
Praetorian prefect from 318 to 332.\textsuperscript{59}

331  Flavius Ablabius  
A Cretan of humble birth, Ablabius began his career on the staff of the governor of Crete (Libanius, \textit{Orat.} 42.23; Eunapius, \textit{Vit. Phil.} 6.3.1–7, pp. 463–464). The intervening stages are unknown, but Ablabius was \textit{vicarius} of Asiana between 324 and 326, then praetorian prefect from at least 329 to 337. His daughter Olympias was betrothed to Constans (Athanasius, \textit{Hist. Ar.} 69; Ammianus 20.11.3), perhaps before 333 (cf. \textit{Cons. Sirm.} 1). A Christian (Athanasius, \textit{Festal Letter} 4; \textit{Const. Sirm.} 1).

\textsuperscript{21.10.8, 12.25, on which he based the hypothesis, is rightly criticized and rejected by A. Cameron, \textit{JRS} 54 (1964), 21 f.}
\textsuperscript{55. G. Polara, \textit{PP} 29 (1974), 261 ff. The present paragraph is also indebted to an unpublished paper by Alan Cameron on the ancestry of Symmachus.}
\textsuperscript{56. Both Seeck, \textit{Regesten} 166, and \textit{PLRE} 1.863, Symmachus 1, opt for the vicariate, emending the date of one or both of the laws to 318.}
\textsuperscript{58. Edited by A. Busse, \textit{Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca} 18 (Berlin, 1900), 39. The passage is noted in \textit{PLRE} 1.204, Chrysorius; for its relevance to the later Symmachi, J. F. Matthews, \textit{CR}, n.s. 24 (1974), 101.}
\textsuperscript{59. Normally held to be a Christian (cf. Chastagnol, \textit{Fastes} 151). But R. von Haehling, \textit{Die Religionszugehörigkeit der hohen Amträger des Römischen Reiches seit Constantins I. Alleinherrschaft bis zum Ende der Theodosianischen Dynastie} (\textit{Antiquitas} 3.23, 1978), 289, argues from the pagan deities on the mosaics of the basilica of which \textit{CIL} 6.1737 = \textit{ILCV} 59 is the dedication that he was a pagan.}
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332 Papius Pacatianus
The praenomen Lucius is attested (ILT 814). Pacatianus' known career spans almost thirty years, even though only three posts can be documented apart from the consulate: praeses of Sardinia under Domitius Alexander (308/9); vicarius Britanniarum on 20 November 319; and praetorian prefect (attested from 332 to 337, but almost certainly appointed before 13 May 329).

332 Mecilius Hilarianus
Two posts are attested before the consulate: corrector Lucaniae et Bruttiorum on 20 January 316, and proconsul of Africa in 324–325. Hilarianus became praefectus urbi under Constans (13 January 338–14 July 339), and fifteen years later emerged from retirement as praetorian prefect (CTh 6.4.3, 4, 7).

333 Flavius Dalmatius
The consul of 333 was a son of Constantius and Theodora. He lived for a period at Toulouse in an honorable retirement indistinguishable from exile (Ausonius, Professores 17(16).11–12). When Constantine recalled him (perhaps during the summer of 326), he lived at court for some years (Ausonius, Professores 17(16).13 ff.). Between the spring of 333 and the spring of 334, Constantine revived the antique title of censor and bestowed it on Dalmatius (Athanasius, Apol. Sec. 65.1 ff., cf. P. Oxy. 1716). In 334, Dalmatius was residing at Antioch, apparently with wide executive powers: he investigated a charge of murder against Athanasius (Apol. Sec. 65.1 ff.; Socrates, HE 1.27.20 f.) and suppressed the revolt of Calocaerus in Cyprus, burning the insurgent alive at Tarsus (Theophanes, a. 5825, p. 29 de Boer). He presumably left Antioch when Constantius set up court there in 335. In 337, Dalmatius received an imperial letter, either issued or published at Naisus, whose author ought to be his son, the Caesar Dalmatius (CJ 5.17.7), with whom he perished in the purge of that year (Julian, Ep. ad Ath. 270d).

The Paschal Chronicle reports that Dalmatius (whom, like Theophanes, it confuses with his son) was στρατηγός 'Ρωμαίων και ύπατος (531.19 ff.). On the strength of this it has been argued that Dalmatius was praetor at Rome in 324 (adducing CTh 12.17.1) or the first known magister militum. It seems more prudent to disallow the evidence—even if it may derive from a much earlier and well-informed source.

60. Reprinted in Chapter VIII.4.
64. Chapter II.
65. On CJ 5.17.7, see Chapter V, n. 172.
66. Respectively, W. Ensslin, Rh. Mus., n.f. 78 (1929), 207 ff.; Stein, Bas-Empire 12.476 n. 144. PLRE 1.241 also makes Dalmatius the recipient of CTh 12.17.1, for which it adopts the transmitted date of 321.
67. As argued by P. Batiffol, RQ 9 (1895), 57 ff.; J. Bidez, Philostorgius Kirchengeschichte
HOLDERS OF OFFICES

333 Domitius Zenophilus

Three posts are explicitly attested for Zenophilus: he was *corrector* of Sicilia (*CIL* 10.7234: Lilybaeum), *consularis* of Numidia in December 320 (Optatus, App. 1; *AE* 1915.30: Lambaesis), and proconsul of Africa between 326 and 333 (*ILS* 5359: Thignica). He was probably also the recipient of the following acephalous dedication:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{eximiae potestas} & \\
\text{et moderatio-} & \\
\text{nis et bonitatis} & \\
\text{ac praedicabili c.v. post cor-} & \\
\text{recturas et consularem dig-} & \\
\text{nitatem Acaiae Asiae iterum} & \\
\text{et Africae IIII procos., sacro iudicio} & \\
\text{Constantini maximi victor-} & \\
\text{ris ac triumfatoris semper Au[g.]} & \\
\text{et beatissimorum Caes} & \\
\text{ENE AS[} & \\
\text{TUS A [} & \\
\text{(AE 1917/18.99 = ILAf. 456: Bulla Regia)} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

On the normal interpretation of the Latin, the honorand was proconsul of Achaea, proconsul of Asia for two years, and then proconsul of Africa for four years. Now the date of the inscription is between 324 and 337 (lines 8/9), and a proconsul of Asia could have become proconsul of Africa only before 306 or after 324. Hence the number of possible identifications is very small. A. Chastagnol considered five, of which he preferred the first: (1) Ceionius Julianus, who would then be proconsul of Africa from 327 to 331; (2) Mecilius Hilarianus, from 322 to 326; (3) Tertullus, from 325 to 329; (4) Zenophilus, from 326 to 330; and (5) an unattested proconsul from 332 to 336, who might be Antonius Marcellinus (cos. 341). Of these five, the *Prosopography* correctly eliminates Hilarianus who is attested as proconsul of Africa on 9 July 324 (*CTh* 12.1.9), and defines the choice as lying among the other four. Another three can be eliminated. If the consul of 341 is identical with the Antonius Marcellinus, *praeses* of Lugdunensis Prima in 313 (*CTh* 11.3.1): the mss. have

---


69. Chastagnol, *Fastes* 89. Marcellinus' proconsulate (attested by *CIL* 8.25524: Bulla Regia) need not belong to the reign of Constantine.

70. *PLRE* 1.1012, Anonymus 37.
then he held a post (namely *praeses*) not recorded on the inscription. And even if he is not, the Marcellinus who was consul in 341 is only attested as holding one of the six different posts which are recorded. Tertullus is attested as proconsul of Africa on 6 July 326 (*CTh* 9.21.3 = *CJ* 9.24.2): even if he was proconsul from 326 to 330, he cannot before 326 have been proconsul of Asia for two years. Ceionius Julianus was *consularis* of Campania late in 324 (*AE* 1939.151: near Abellinum) and became *praefectus urbi* on 10 May 333. Hence, if he were the subject of the inscription, the seven proconsulates would be of necessity run without any intermission (Achaea 325–326, Asia 326–328, Africa 328–332). Although that appears theoretically possible, in practice it is surely improbable. The career of the inscription can, however, be ascribed to Domitian Zenophilus without any apparent difficulty or implausibility:

*corrector* of Sicilia

*corrector* of another province

*consularis* of Numidia in 320

proconsul of Achaea no later than 323–324

proconsul of Asia from 325 to 327

proconsul of Africa from 328 to 332

consul in 333

### 334 Flavius Optatus

Although no precise official posts are attested, Optatus was an extremely important person. After serving as *grammaticus* to Licinius' son, be obtained high position and great wealth under Constantine (*Libanius, Orat. 42.26/7*), who created him *patricius*—the first bearer of the refurbished honor (*Zosimus 2.40.2*).

Since Optatus was killed in 337 (*Zosimus 2.40.2*), it is tempting to surmise kinship with the emperor, and allegations made about Optatus' wife may be significant. Libanius affirms that she was the daughter of a Paphlagonian inn-keeper and that her influence gained Optatus his position after the fall of Licinius (*Orat. 42.26/7*). Either Optatus or his wife might be a relative of Helena, who came from Drepanum (in Paphlagonia on a generous or tendentious definition) and who was alleged to be a *stabularia* (*Ambrose, De Obitu Theodosii 42*).

### 334 Anicius Paulinus

Called *Amnius iunior* and *Anicius Paulinus iunior* to distinguish him from his relative, consul in 325 (*ILS* 1221, 698; *CIL* 6.1142). His full name was Amnios Manius Caesonius Nicomachus Anicius Paulinus, with the *signum* Honorius, and an inscription describes his career (*ILS* 1220: Rome):

HO LDERS OF OFFICES

*legatus Carthaginis* while his father Anicius Julianus (i.e. the consul of 322) was proconsul of Africa

*proconsul prov. Asiae et Hellesponti*, probably c. 330

consul

*prefectus urbi* from 27 April 334 to 30 December 335

335 Julius Constantius
Son of Constantius and Theodora, father of Gallus and Julian; *patricius* by 335, created *nobilissimus* in 335 (Zosimus 2.39.2), and killed in 337 (Julian, *Ep. ad. Athen.* 270c; Libanius, *Orat.* 18.31; Zosimus 2.40.2).

335 Rufius Albinus
An inscription reveals that the consul of 335 was Ceionius Rufius Albinus, a philosopher and the son of Rufius Volusianus, consul in 311 and 314 (*ILS* 1222: from manuscript reports of an inscription seen by a pilgrim in Rome). Moreover, he was *prefectus urbi* from 30 December 335 to 10 March 337. These well-attested facts identify Albinus as the subject of a horoscope which Firmicus Maternus discusses in detail (*Math.* 2.29.10–20). 72 Mainly from this discussion, his life can be reconstructed as follows:

born on 14 or 15 March 303

tried by Constantine and exiled on charges of magic and adultery in 326

recalled from exile shortly thereafter

*consularis* of Campania

proconsul of Achaea

proconsul of Asia

consul in 335

*prefectus urbi* from 30 December 335 to 10 March 337

336 Virius Nepotianus
No career known except for a possible mention as a general in Phrygia in a hagiographical text which probably dates from the fifth century. 73 Nepotianus is presumably the son (or possibly the grandson) of Virius Nepotianus, consul in 301, and can be presumed the father of Julius Nepotianus, who briefly wore the purple at Rome in June 350. 74 If that inference is correct, the consul of 336 was a brother-in-law of Constantine, for the usurper of 350 was the son of Eutropia (Eutropius, *Brev.* 10.11; *Epitome* 42.3; Socrates, *HE* 2.25 Λ0; Sozomenus, *HE* 4.1.2; Zosimus 2.43.2).

72. *JRS* 65 (1975), 42 f., 47 f.


74. *PLRE* 1.625, Nepotianus 7.
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336 Tettius Facundus
Unknown except as a consular date.

337 Flavius Felicianus
Constantine allegedly appointed Felicianus, who was a Christian, as the first *comes Orientis* (Malalas 318–319 Bonn).

337 Fabius Titianus
An inscription from Rome gives Titianus' career as far as his first prefecture of the city (*ILS* 1227), and the other evidence is relatively abundant.75 The known career is as follows:

*corrector* of Flaminia and Picenum
*consularis* of Sicilia
proconsul of Asia
*comes primi ordinis*
consul in 337
*praefectus urbi* from 25 October 339 to 25 February 341
praetorian prefect in Gaul from 341 to 349
*praefectus urbi* for the second time from 27 February 350 to 1 March 351
envoy of Magnentius to Constantius in summer 351 (Zosimus 2.49.1/2)

The basis of any discussion of the praefecti urbis under Diocletian and Constantine must be the list of prefects from 254 to 354 which the Chronographer of 354 included in his almanac (Chr. Min. 1.66–68). There are also the modern fasti of A. Chastagnol, who furnishes a detailed discussion of the family and career of each prefect. The present chapter represents both an attempt to understand more fully the nature of the ancient list and a revision of Chastagnol's conclusions about some problematical careers and identifications.

1. THE TRANSMITTED LIST OF PREFECTS

284, 285
286, 287, until 288, February 27
288, February 27, 289
290, until 291, February 18
291, February 18–292, August 3
292, August 3–293, March 13
293, March 13–295, January 11

Ceionius Varus
Junius Maximus
Pomponius Januarianus
Turranius Gratianus
Junius Tiberianus
Cl. Marcellus
Septimius Acindynus

1. Both praefectus urbis and praefectus urbi are attested. Largely for the sake of euphony, I normally employ the dative with the singular, the genitive with the plural.

295, January 11–296, February 11
296, February 11–297, ?
297, ?–298, ?
298, ?–299, ?
299, ?–300, March 1
300, March 1–301, ?
301, ?–302, February 19
302, February 19–303, September 12
303, September 12–304, January 4
304, January 4–305, February 12
305, February 12–306, March 19
306, March 19–307, August 27
307, August 27–308, April 13
308, April 13–309, October 30
309, October 30–310, October 28
310, October 28–311, October 28
311, October 28–312, February 9
312, February 9–312, October 27
312, October 27–312, November 29
312, November 29–313, December 8
313, December 8–315, August 20
315, August 20–316, August 4
316, August 4–317, May 15
317, May 15–319, September 1
319, September 1–323, September 13
323, September 13–325, January 4
325, January 4–326, November 13
326, November 13–329, September 7
329, September 7–329, October 8
329, October 8–331, April 12
331, April 12–333, April 7
333, April 7–333, 10 May
333, May 10–334, April 27
334, April 27–335, December 30
335, December 30–337, March 10
337, March 10–338, January 13

Aristobulus
Cassius Dion
Afranius Hannibalianus
Artorius Maximus
Anicius Faustus
Pompeius Faustinus
Aelius Dionysius
Nummius Tuscus
Junius Tiberianus
Aradius Rufinus
Postumius Titianus
Annius Anullinus
Insteius Tertullus
Statius Rufinus
Aurelius Hermogenes
Rufius Volusianus
Junius Flavianus
Aradius Rufinus
Annius Anullinus
Aradius Rufinus
Rufius Volusianus
Vettius Rufinus
Ovinius Gallicanus
Septimius Bassus
Valerius Maximus Basilius
Lucer. Verinus
Acilius Severus
Anicius Julianus
Publilius Optatianus
Petronius Probianus
Anicius Paulinus
Publilius Optatianus
Ceionius Julianus Kamenius
Anicius Paulinus
Rufius Albinus
Valerius Proculus

2. ADDITIONAL NAMES

The Chronographer's list is clearly complete from 302 at the latest: for every prefect after Aelius Dionysius he conscientiously provides the exact days on which he entered and left office. It also seems probable that the list is com-
plete from 288, where the first diurnal date occurs. The earlier part of the list is another matter. Before 288 there are no diurnal dates, and the list appears to name the prefect in office on a particular day each year (perhaps 21 April, the natalis of Rome). Two names can be added from inscriptions. Pomponius Bassus, consul ordinarius in both 259 and 271, was also praefectus urbi (CIL 6.3836 = IG 14.1076 = IGR 1.137); since a literary allusion indicates that he was in office near the end of the reign of Claudius (Epitome 34.3: “sententiae in senatu dicendae primus”), his tenure can be dated to 270. Aurelian presumably replaced him very rapidly. L. Caesonius Ovinius Manlius Rufinianus Bassus has recently been revealed as both cos. II and praefectus urbis (AE 1964.223). If Bassus was consul for the second time with Diocletian for the last weeks of 284, then he presumably replaced Ceionius Varus as prefect of the city after Carinus was defeated and killed in the spring of 285.

3. PATTERNS OF TENURE

Prefects of the city of Rome did not serve for a fixed term; within the period 284 to 337 the attested length of tenure ranges from one month to four years. Nevertheless, certain patterns of appointment can be detected (Table 9). Maxentius clearly aimed at strictly annual appointments running from one dies imperii (28 October) to the next. The deviations from this pattern can be explained in political terms: Instieius Tertullus took office in August 307 when Galerius was about to march on Rome, and he left office in the same month as Maximian attempted to depose Maxentius, while Junius Flavianus, who left office on 9 February 312, a mere three and a half months after his appointment, probably did so after his wife committed suicide. Under Constantine, too, there is a tendency for appointments to last for approximately a whole number of years, despite some obvious irregularities. It may be legitimate, therefore, to project this tendency backward into the reign of Diocletian. Between 288 and 302, the Chronographer’s list shows that the office of prefect changed hands in the following months:

- 288 February
- 289 unknown
- 296 February
- 297 unknown

3. G. Tomassetti, Museo Italiano di Antichità Classica 3 (1890), 58 n. 1.
4. Ibid., 547 f.; G. Barbieri, Akte des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für griechische und lateinische Epigraphik (Vienna, 1964), 48; 50; T. D. Barnes, JRS 65 (1975), 46 n. 64. Although all three supposed that before 288 the list recorded the prefects in office on the Kalends of January, the facts set out in the present discussion make a later date preferable.
6. For the date, Chapter V: Diocletian.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Prefect</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>no new appointment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>August</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>no new appointment</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>January</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hence, if there was any regularity of tenure, the list of praefecti urbis from 284 to 304 can be conjecturally completed as follows (with unattested dates in italics):

- Ceionius Varus
  - autumn 283–summer 285
- L. Caesonius Ovinius Manlius Rufinianus Bassus
  - summer 285–c. February 286
- Junius Maximus
  - c. February 286–27 February 288
- Pomponius Januarianus
  - 27 February 288–c. February 290
- Turranius Gratianus
  - c. February 290–18 February 291
- Junius Tiberianus
  - 18 February 291–3 August 292
- Cl. Marcellus
  - 3 August 292–13 March 293
- Septimius Acindynus
  - 13 March 293–11 January 295
- Aristobulus
  - 11 January 295–11 February 296
- Cassius Dion
  - 11 February 296–c. February 297
- Afranius Hannibalianus
  - c. February 297–c. February 298
- Artorius Maximus
  - c. February 298–c. February 299
- Anicius Faustus
  - c. February 299–1 March 300
- Pompeius Faustinus
  - 1 March 300–c. February 301
- Aelius Dionysius
  - c. February 301–19 February 302

This reconstruction (it may be observed) is consistent with the hypothesis that the early part of the list names the prefects in office on 21 April in each year.  

4. PREFECTS WHO WERE CONSULES ORDINARII BETWEEN 284 AND 337

More than half the prefects who held office between 284 and 337 were ordinary consuls under Diocletian and Constantine. They are listed below with the date of their prefecture or prefectures preceding the name, and the date of their ordinary consulate or consulates following it.

8. Above, at n. 4.
9. On their careers, and problems of identification, see Chapter VI.
5. PROSOPOGRAPHICAL NOTES ON THE OTHER PREFECTS

283–285  Ceionius Varus
Nothing else known; presumably a relative of C. Ceionius Rufius Volusianus, cos. 311, 314, probably his uncle.

290–291  Turranius Gratianus
Gratianus' prefecture is also attested by an inscription of 290 (CIL 6.1128 + p. 845 = 31241). He is presumably to be identified with the L. Turranius Gratianus who, as corrector provinciae Achaeeæ, honored Diocletian at Athens (CIL 3.6103), probably very early in his reign. Identity with the Turranius who appears on a fragmentary list from Rome (NdS 1917.22) is less than certain.¹⁰

292–293  Cl. Marcellus
Nothing else is known about Marcellus' career.

¹⁰ E. Groag, Die Reichsbeamten von Achaia in spätromischer Zeit (Dissertationes Pannonicae 1.14, 1946), 14; Chastagnol, Fastes 16; PLRE 1.403, Gratianus 3.
¹¹ Below, Section 6(c).
293–295 Septimius Acindynus
Career totally unknown apart from his prefecture.

298–299 L. Artorius Pius Maximus
The prefect Artorius Maximus is clearly identical with L. Artorius Pius Maximus of Ephesus, whom inscriptions certify as legatus pro praetore of Diocletian and Maximian at Heliopolis (AE 1939.58) and as proconsul of Asia (CIL 3.14195.27; JÖAI 44 (1959), Beibl. 349/50 = I. Ephesos 307, 621).

300–301 Pompeius Faustinus
Previously corrector Campaniae (CIL 10.4785: Teanum Sidicinum); probably not identical with, but father of, the Pompeius Appius Faustinus attested as praetor urbanus (CIL 6.314 d).\(^\text{12}\)

301–302 L. Aelius Helvius Dionysius
Dionysius' career before his prefecture is known from a Roman inscription of which several seventeenth-century reports survive (ILS 1211), supplemented by other evidence relating to single posts. The attested career runs as follows:

\begin{itemize}
  \item curator operum publicorum (also ILS 621, 622)
  \item curator aquarum et Miniciae (also ILS 626)
  \item curator utriusque Italiae
  \item praeses of Syria Coele
  \item iudex sacrarum cognitionum totius Orientis
  \item proconsul of Africa from 296 to 300
\end{itemize}

Dionysius' name is erased on the three African inscriptions which record his proconsulate (CIL 8.12459; ILAfr. 441, 531), and L. Poinssot acutely conjectured that he was disgraced and executed after his prefecture.\(^\text{13}\) That conjecture would provide substance for Lactantius' charge that Maximian destroyed the lumina senatus through faked allegations of conspiracy (Mort. Pers. 8.4).\(^\text{14}\)

303–304 Junius Tiberianus
Previously proconsul of Asia (JÖAI 44 (1959), Beibl. 267/8 = I. Ephesos 305).

304–305 Aradius Rufinus
Conventionally identified with the Aradius Rufinus who was praefectus urbi in 312 and 312–313.\(^\text{15}\) He ought rather to be his father.

\begin{itemize}
  \item 12. Below, Section 6(a).
  \item 13. L. Poinssot, MSNAF 76 (1919–23), 316 ff.
  \item 14. Moreau, Lactance 253, argues that the charge on which Lactantius alleges that senators were executed ("qui... affectasse imperium dicerentur") is "un véritable τόπος de l'histoiregraphie."
  \item 15. Chastagnol, Fastes 41, 60 f.; PLRE 1.775, Rufinus 10. In favor of the identification, both
\end{itemize}
307–308 Attius Insteius Tertullus
Tertullus was appointed prefect when Galerius was about to attack Rome, and left office at the same time as Maximian fled to Gaul. His earlier career is known from a dedication by the corporation of magnarii for protecting them as prefect at a time of danger (CIL 6.1696). It runs as follows:

quaestor (restored)
praetor candidatus
consul, i.e. suffect consul
corrector of Venetia and Histria (the province is restored from CIL 5.2818: Padua)
praepositus fabri[---

The last post lacks any parallel in a senatorial career. Moreover, if the name of the factory (reading fabri[cae]) ought to be supplied, then there is no room on the stone for the proconsulate of Africa in 306–307, which some scholars have attributed to Tertullus (inferred from CIL 8.876: Insteius Tertullus v. c.).

308–309 Statius Rufinus
Otherwise unknown. Nevertheless, there is a chance that the Rufinus consul in 311 is Statius Rufinus rather than Aradius Rufinus.

309–310 Aurelius Hermogenes
Previously proconsul of Asia (CIL 3.7069).

311–312 Junius Flavianus
Otherwise unknown. But the apparent dismissal of Flavianus before his year of office expired may be significant: he can be identified as the unnamed prefect whose wife (it is alleged) killed herself to escape the lust of Maxentius (Eusebius, HE 8.14.15–17; VC 1.34).

312 Annius Anullinus
The Anullini of the late third and early fourth century present problems of identity which probably cannot be solved on the available evidence. For clarity, the attested bearers of the name in high office should be listed individually:

Chastagnol and PLRE adduce the fact that the Chronographer of 354 notes that Rufinus was iterum praefectus urbis (Chr. Min. 1.67). If relevant, iterum rather than tertio might tend to indicate the opposite. But the writer is surely doing no more than noting that Aradius Rufinus became prefect for the second time in 312 (after a mere month out of office).

16. Perhaps, therefore, an emergency appointment in 306/7 when Maxentius and Maximian were arming Italy to resist Galerius and Severus.

17. For discussion, Chastagnol, Fastes 49.

18. Chastagnol, Fastes 59. E. J. Champlin has suggested to me that Flavianus may be a brother of Anicius Faustus, cos. 298, whose full name is often presumed to be M. Junius Cae-
1. Annius Anullinus, consul, 295
2. C. Annius Anullinus, proconsul of Africa, 303–305
4. Anullinus, praetorian prefect of Severus, spring 307
5. Annius Anullinus, *praefectus urbi*, 312
6. Anullinus, proconsul of Africa, 312–313

The last is clearly a different person from any of the rest, but it has become conventional to identify the first three and the fifth. On this hypothesis, however, Anullinus would be a unique and anomalous case of a proconsul of Africa after 295 who had already been ordinary consul. By 303, the proconsulate normally preceded an ordinary consulate; therefore, either the identification is erroneous or Anullinus was appointed proconsul for a special reason (namely, to enforce imperial legislation against the Christians). Moreover, the *praefectus urbi* of 312 could easily be the praetorian prefect of 307, whom Maxentius appointed on the day before he fought Constantine for partially superstitious reasons. On present evidence, therefore, it is reasonable to distinguish four Anullini, of whom the first and second (or second and third) might be identical:

1. consul, 295; *praefectus urbi*, 306–307
2. proconsul of Africa, 303–305
3. praetorian prefect, 307; *praefectus urbi*, 312
4. proconsul of Africa, 312–313

317–319 Septimius Bassus

Bassus' prefecture is also attested by numerous laws. The man is otherwise unknown, unless he can be identified with Caesonius Bassus, consul in 317 (*P. Columbia inv.* 173).

319–323 Valerius Maximus Basilius

Maximus' prefecture is also attested by numerous laws, but he is otherwise unknown, unless he can be identified with Caesonius Bassus, consul in 317 (*P. Columbia inv.* 173).

---

Footnotes:


20. The fasti are complete or virtually complete from 290 to 305 (Chapter IX).

21. Compare the apparent demotion of Sossianus Hierocles from *vicarius* of Oriens to *praeses* of Bithynia and his later appointment as prefect of Egypt (*HSCP* 80 (1976), 243 f.).


23. See the lists (based on Seeck's *Regesten*) offered by Chastagnol, *Fastes* 71 n. 22; *PLRE* 1.157, Bassus 19.

24. Seeck, *Regesten* 115; Chastagnol, *Fastes* 72, proposed the identification before the consul's *nomen* was known.

25. Chastagnol, *Fastes* 73 n. 36; *PLRE* 1.590, Maximus 48 (largely based on Seeck's *Regesten*). But *CTh* 9.5.1 ought to be referred to a praetorian prefect of Licinius (Chapter VIII, at nn. 17–22).
unknown. The *praefectus urbi* is not identical with the Valerius Maximus who was consul in 327. A pagan (*CTh* 16.10.1).

323–325  Lucer. Verinus

Verinus' *nomen* is uncertain: the Chronographer has *Lucer* (nominative), laws *Lucrium* (accusative), *Locrio*, and *Lucrio* (dative). On this evidence, Chastagnol proposes *Lucer(ius)* for the name, while the *Prosopography* accepts Locrius, suggesting that Verinus may be the son of Sallustius Verianus and Locria Magna, who were Christians (*CIL* 11.2558, 2580: Clusium). Even if that is a sheer guess, the *nomen* is definitely Etruscan.

Apart from the prefecture (also *CTh* 2.17.1, 2.24.1, 14.4.2), only one post is securely attested for Verinus: he was *vicarius* of Africa from 318 to 321 (*CTh* 9.15.1, 9.21.1, 9.34.1, 3.19.1; Augustine, *Brev. Coll.* 3.22.40, 3.24.42; *Contra partem Donati post gesta* 31.54, 33.56; *Epp.* 141.9). Otherwise there are two problematical pieces of evidence. A law addressed to Verinus, with no office given, bears the publication date 30 January 314 (*CTh* 12.11.1): it might attest a governorship or an earlier vicariate. The father of Symmachus wrote a poem about the prefect:

> Virtutem, Verine, tuam plus mirer in armis,
> Eeos dux Armenios cum caede domares,
> an magis eloquium morum vitaeque leporem,
> et—nisi in officis, quotiens tibi publica curae—
> quod vitam innocuis tenuisti laetus in agris?
> nullum ultra est virtutis opus, quam si esset, haberes.

*(Symmachus, *Epp.* 1.2.7)*

When did Verinus fight in Armenia? Seeck argued that it was during Maximi

nus' Mesopotamian campaign of 312, Chastagnol that it must have been later than the defeat of Licinius in 324. Neither hypothesis is convincing. A conjecture can be made which will explain Verinus' documented career: if his service in Armenia belongs to Galerius' Persian War, then his association with

---

26. As Chastagnol supposes (*Fastes* 73).
27. Chastagnol, *Fastes* 74; *PLRE* 1.951–952, Verinus 2. This entry appears to be the work of J. Morris, see *Klio* 46 (1965), 363 f.
29. *PLRE* 1.952, rejecting Seeck's emendation of the date to 320 (*Regesten* 75, 169).
32. As proposed by H. Castritius, *JAC* 11/12 (1968/69), 102. A law dated 294 is addressed *ad Verinum praeidem Syriae* (*CJ* 2.12.20), while one of 305 addresses *Verine carissime* (*CJ* 3.12.1). There is no compelling reason to identify either with the Verinus who was *praefectus urbi*.  
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Constantine goes back to 298. The vicariate of Africa and the prefecture of the city each came at a significant time: between 318 and 321 Constantine was attempting to repress Donatism, in 323 he was preparing for war against Licinius.

329, 333 Publilius Optatianus Porfyrius
The career of Optatianus is badly documented, but the fact that he sent a cycle of twenty poems to Constantine in 324 begging to be restored from exile permits a tentative reconstruction of his life:

born, c. 260–270
proconsul of Achaea, before 306
sends poems (not extant) to Constantine with the extant Epistula Porfyrii
and receives in reply the extant Epistula Constantini, November/December 312
exiled (?at the same time as Rufius Volusianus), ?in 315
sends Constantine Carmina I–XX from exile, autumn 324
recalled from exile, early 325
praefectus urbi, 329 and 333

333–334 M. Ceionius Julianus Kamenius
Two earlier posts are definitely attested: Julianus was consularis of Campania in late 324 (AE 1939.151), and proconsul of Africa between 326 and 331 (CIL 8.14436 = ILS 5518; CIL 8.14431, 15269, 25525; ILAlg.1.4011 = AE 1922.16).

337–338 L. Aradius Valerius Proculus signo Populonius
Proculus’ career down to his ordinary consulate in 340 is well documented by several Roman inscriptions (CIL 6.1690–94):

praetor tutelaris
legatus propraetore provinciae Numidiae, i.e. legate of a proconsul of Africa, almost certainly of his presumed relative Proculus, who was proconsul in 319–320
perequator census provinciae Gallaeciae, during or soon after the census of 321
praeses of Byzacena
consularis Europae et Thraciae
consularis of Sicilia
comes ordinis secundi
comes ordinis primi

33. AJP 96 (1975), 174 ff. Observe that Carm. 2.31/2 ("Respice me falso de crimine, maxime rector, /exulis afflictum poena") implies that Porfyrius was not exiled by Constantine, but rather, like Volusianus, by the Roman Senate (cf. Firmicus Maternus, Math. 2.29.12).
proconsul of Africa in 332-333 and, for at least part of his proconsular year, concurrently praetorian prefect for all the African provinces comes iterum ordinis primi intra palatium praefectus urbi, from 10 March 337 to 13 January 338 consul, 340

Procclus probably retired after his consulate, but he emerged from retirement to be praefectus urbi for a second time under Magnentius (from 18 December 351 to 9 September 352).

6. SOME PROBLEMATICAL INSCRIPTIONS FROM ROME

The careers of men discussed in this chapter and the preceding one are very relevant to the dating of certain inscriptions from Rome and to the identification of the persons whom they name.

(a) *CIL* 6.314
An altar to Hercules is reported by two Renaissance antiquaries as exhibiting on its four sides dedications to Hercules by four urban praetors, viz. T. Flavius Iulian[i]us Quadratianus, M. Nummius Ceionius Annius Albinus, Jul[ius] Festus, and Pompeius Appius Faustinus. Both Chastagnol and the *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* date the altar to the late third century and identify the fourth man as the Pompeius Faustinus who was praefectus urbi in 300-301. But a closely similar dedication appears to belong to 20 September 321:

(front)  
Deo Herculi inv.  
M. Iun. Caesonius Nicomachus Anicius Faustus Paulinus  
c. v., p. u., d. d.

(side)  
d. d.  

(*CIL* 6.315 = *ILS* 3409)

The inscription on the side survives, but the front of the altar now bears merely the letters *D.O.M.* over an erasure. The inscription on the front is reported by the same two Renaissance antiquaries, of whom one reports it alone, the other with the inscription on the side. The conjunction ought to be accepted; there is no call to dismiss the date of 321 as irrelevant to the dedication on the front.

35. See W. Henzen, in annotation on *CIL* 6.315.
Moreover, M. Nummius Ceionius Annius Albinus possesses a set of names which appears to indicate that he is the brother of Ceionius Rufius Albinus, who was born in March 303. Accordingly, it is preferable to date the four praetors in the vicinity of 320, so that Pompeius Appius Faustinus will not be the praefectus urbi of 300-301, but an apparently otherwise unattested son.

(b) CIL 6.2153

Rufius Volusianus v. c. xv [s. f.
2 Rufius Festus v. c. xv s. f.
Sebasmius philos[opus
4 ///////////////pont
Brittius Praesens v. c. p. m[Fl.
6 Evagrius philosop[us
Fr. Atticus v.c.

The Prosopography dates the inscription c. 320. But if Rufius Volusianus is (as all agree) the consul of 311 and 314, then the inscription must antedate his exile in or shortly after 315 (Firmicus Maternus, Math. 2.29.10, 12). The other names afford no aid toward a precise dating. But the erasure in line 4 excites curiosity; it could conceal Helvius Dionysius, whose name is erased on African inscriptions. He is known to have been a pontifex dei Solis (ILS 1211), which can be restored in line 4. If his name did originally stand on the inscription, its date would be prior to 305.

The precise nature of the list has not yet received a satisfactory elucidation.

(c) Notizie degli Scavi 16 (1917), 22 = Bull. Comm. 45 (1917), 225

Turraniu[s]
2 Crepereius Ro[gatus
Publilius Optatian[us
4 Ceionius Rufius Volusi[anus
Jn. Anicius Paulinius
6 A[cilius
PR

Chastagnol dates the list c. 320. But if the third and fourth names belong to the poet Publilius Optatianus Porphyrius and the consul of 311 and 314, then the inscription must antedate their exiles, which can be dated (albeit tentatively) to 315 or shortly thereafter. Nothing precludes dating the inscription some years

36. As Chastagnol, Fastes 32 (identifying the praetor as Anicius Faustus, cos. II 298).
37. JRS 65 (1975), 45.
38. PLRE 1.123, Atticus 2, etc.
40. Chastagnol, Fastes 16, 57, 81, 92.
41. JRS 65 (1975), 47; AJP 96 (1975), 176, 186.
earlier than 315, and E. Groag attractively identified the names as belonging to members of a priestly college whom Maxentius compelled to contribute to the building or restoration of a temple. If that is so, the first name could be that of Turranius Gratianus, praefectus urbi in 290-291, the fourth that of the Anicius Faustus who was consul for the second time in 298—though in both cases alternative identifications are possible, such as L. Turranius Venustus Gratianus, attested as praetor urbanus, and Anicius Paulinus, consul in 325. The second, sixth, and seventh names do not aid in dating.

42. E. Groag, Wiener Studien 45 (1926-27), 102 ff.
43. PLRE 1.402, Gratianus 4, cf. 925.
44. F. Fornari, Nds 16 (1917), 22, read the first element of his name as “[l]un.,” but Chastagnol, Fastes 92, reads “[Am]n.” and identifies the man as Amniius Manius Caesonius Nicomachus Anicius Paulinus signo Honorius, cos. 334.
45. PLRE 1.767, Rogatus 2; 10, Acilius 1; 1001 s.v. PR (perhaps part of the name Apronius or Sempronius).
Augustus or Caesar, residing in his capital or touring the provinces, on campaign or in his cups, a Roman emperor of the late third and early fourth centuries was normally accompanied by a praetorian prefect.¹ The reign of Constantine also witnessed the first praetorian prefects who operated independently of the emperor and possessed a specific territorial jurisdiction.² There are, however, woeful gaps and uncertainties in documentation, and it is sometimes difficult to assign an attested prefect to the emperor whom he served or to the area which he administered. The present chapter adopts a rigorous prosopographical approach and attempts to establish the nature of the praetorian prefecture in the period of Diocletian and Constantine by tackling the problem in a strictly chronological order before attempting a synthesis.³

1. E.g., Pan. Lat. 12(9).11.4 (Constantine on campaign): Origo 11 (Galerius at dinner). The jurist Charisius declared that a prefect served his emperor just as the Republican magister equitum had served a dictator (Dig. 1.11.pr.).

2. Note Cons. Sirm. 4 (21 October 336): “ad Felicem praefectum praetorii... volumus ut excellens sublimitas tua litteris suis per dioecesim sibi creditam commeantibus iudices monet.”

1. EMPERORS AND THEIR ATTESTED PREFECTS, 285–317

*Diocletian*

285 T. Cl. Aurelius Aristobulus, cos. 285
Praetorian prefect of Carinus, retained in office by Diocletian (Victor, *Caes. 39.14*).

Between 285 and 292 Afranius Hannibalianus, cos. 292
A dedication to Diocletian at Oescus attests Hannibalianus and a colleague: *Afranius Hannibalianus, Iul. Asclepiodotus vfvj. eemm. prae[ff. praet.] (ILS 8929)*. The inscription antedates 1 January 292, when the two prefects became consuls and hence *viri clarissimi*.

The inscription itself provides no explicit indication of which prefect belongs to which emperor; nevertheless, it may be argued that, since the order of names presumably reflects the order of appointment to office, the senior prefect is more likely to belong to the senior of the two emperors. In that case, Hannibalianus was the prefect of Diocletian, Asclepiodotus of Maximian.

302 Asclepiades
Prudentius presents the martyr Romanus as being tried and condemned at Antioch by the *praefectus* Asclepiades (*Peristephanon* 10.41 etc.), while Eusebius reports that Diocletian was in Antioch at the time of Romanus’ first trial, which occurred long before his execution in November 303, and he alludes to a magistrate without specifying either his name or his official post (*Mart. Pal. 2.2–4*: complementary details in each recension). Asclepiades, therefore, was the praetorian prefect of Diocletian in autumn 302.

*Maximian*

Between 285 and 292 Julius Asclepiodotus, cos. 292
Colleague of Afranius Hannibalianus (*ILS 8929*). Not necessarily identical with the Asclepiodotus known as praetorian prefect of Constantius in 296.

---

4. The fact that Diocletian is *Germanicus maximus*, but not *Sarmaticus maximus*, does not prove a date before 290, as urged in *PLRE* 1.407 (cf. Tables 4, 5).
5. *Pan. Lat.* 10(2).11.4 does not, as is often supposed, allude to Hannibalianus (below, at nn. 9–13).
7. Flaccinus, attested as prefect in 303, is assigned below to Galerius.
8. As often assumed (e.g., *PIR* 2 J 179; *PLRE* 1.115–116, Asclepiodotus 3).
Two Gallic panegyrics can be combined to render it highly probable that Constantius was praetorian prefect of Maximian for several years before his elevation as Caesar. The orator who addressed Constantius on 1 March 297 alludes to his first appearance before Maximian through the aid of Constantius: “praesertim cum favente numine tuo ipse ille iam pridem mihi, qui me in lucem primus eduxit, divinarum patris tui auriurn aditus evenerit” (Pan. Lat. 8(5).1.5). He then speaks of his experiences in an office to which Constantius appointed him, when he apparently accompanied Constantius on a campaign before 293: “Quamquam multa mihi ex illis quoque hoc in tempore necessario transeunda sunt ac potissimum ea quibus officio delati mihi a divinitate vestra honoris interfui, captus scilicet rex ferocissimae nationis inter ipsas quas moliebatur insidias et a ponte Rheni usque ad Danubii transitum Guntiensem deusta atque exhausta penitus Alamannia; nam et maiora sunt quam ut enarrari inter alia possint et, ne meis quoque stipendiis videar gloriari, sufficit conscientiae meae illa vidisse” (Pan. Lat. 8(5).2.1).

If Constantius could introduce the orator to the emperor’s presence, make or secure him an appointment and conduct military operations, he must have held high office under Maximian. An earlier speech, delivered before Maximian on 21 April 289, has an allusion which is both less and more specific: “tantum esse in concordia bonum statuis, ut etiam eos qui circa te potissimo funguntur officio necessitudine tibi et adfinitate devinxeris, id pulcherrimum arbitratus adhaerere lateri tuo non timoris obsequia sed vota pietatis” (Pan. Lat. 10(2).11.4). The most natural interpretation of the text is that Maximian has allied himself by marriage to his praetorian prefect. 9 Two explanations of the allusion have been advanced: either the prefect is Afranius Hannibalianus, and it is argued that Maximian’s wife Eutropia was previously married to Hannibalianus, 10 or the prefect is Constantius, whose marriage to Theodora is implicitly dated to 293 by several narrative sources (Victor, Caes. 39.24; Eutropius, Brev. 9.22.1; Jerome, Chronicle 2254; Epitome 39.2). 11 The latter identification is correct. The date in these narrative sources deserves no respect, for they de-

9. Seeck, Geschichte 13.452. Seeck, however, harmed his case by taking the plural literally and deducing that Diocletian and Maximian each had two prefects. The panegyric literature of the Late Empire is full of such hyperbolic plurals referring to a single person or episode (see, e.g., A. Cameron, Claudian: Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius (Oxford, 1970), 80).

10. PLRE 1.316, Eutropia 1; 407-408, Hannibalianus 3; 1128-29, Stemmata 1 and 2.

11. O. Seeck, RE 4 (1901), 1041; Geschichte 13.452. Seeck’s conclusions were rejected by L. Cantarelli, Memorie della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia 3.1.1 (1923), 31 ff., with the subsequent approval of most scholars (e.g., Sexton, Diocletien 89; J. Moreau, JAC 2 (1958), 158). But Cantarelli’s arguments have two fatal weaknesses: he assumed that it was impossible to take “qui circa te potissimo funguntur officio” to refer to a single person, and he felt compelled to interpret the office as “il tirocinio di due Cesari” (p. 35) – which corresponds exactly to the function of a praetorian prefect.
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rived from a single source written c. 337, which muddled the chronology of the 290s, and described Maximian's daughter Theodora as his stepdaughter. The reliable evidence indicates that Constantius was the praetorian prefect and son-in-law of Maximian by 288; the orator of 21 April 289 refers to a recent campaign waged by him against the Franks (Pan. Lat. 10(2).11.4 f). Constantius presumably continued in office until he became Caesar in 293.

Constantius
296 Asclepiodotus
Named as praetorian prefect and as responsible for recovering Britain in 296 (Victor, Caes. 39.26; Eutropius, Brev. 9.22.2; Jerome, Chronicle 227). He is normally identified with the Julius Asclepiodotus who was praetorian prefect before he became consul in 292. He might, however, be this man's son. In any event, this Asclepiodotus is the prefect of Constantius, not of Maximian.

Galerius
303 Flaccinus
Praefectus at Nicomedia in 303 (Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 16.4). Presumably the prefect in command of praetoriani who demolished a church in Nicomedia on 23 February 303 (Mort. Pers. 12.1 ff.), and hence praetorian prefect of either Diocletian or Galerius, who were both in the city.

310 Tatius Andronicus, cos. 310
Papyri of 310 attest Tatius Andronicus and Pompeius Probus as consuls and praetorian prefects. They should, therefore, be the prefects of Galerius and Licinius. Since the order of their names in consular dates presumably attests Andronicus' prior appointment to the prefecture, and Licinius had only been emperor since 11 November 308, Andronicus was probably the prefect of Galerius.

Severus
307, early Anullinus
Praetorian prefect with the army of Severus when he marched against Maxentius (Zosimus 2.10.1).

Maximinus
311, May-312, December Sabinus
Eusebius, HE 9.1.3, 9.9a.1.

12. Chapter IV, at nn. 15-18. The proclamation of the Caesars in 293 is stated to be the result of the revolt of Achilleus in 297 by Victor, Caes. 39.22 ff.; Eutropius, Brev. 9.22.1; Jerome, Chronicle 225.
13. For papyri attesting the consuls of 310, 327, 331, and 332 as praetorian prefects in office in those years, see R. S. Bagnall and K. A. Worp, Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt (Studia Amstelodamensia 8, 1978), 108 ff.
PRAETORIAN PREFECTS

Constantine
Before 314, 1 January—after 317, 1 March  Petronius Annianus, cos. 314
Attested in office on 28 April 315 (Optatus, App. 8), between 314 and September 316 (ILS 8938: Tropaeum Traiani) and after 1 March 317 (AE 1938.85 = I. Ephesos 312). Analogy suggests that Annianus became praetorian prefect before his consulate, and there is no obvious obstacle to identifying him with the prefect who was with Constantine at the siege of Aquileia in 312 (Pan. Lat. 12(9).11.4).

Maxentius
Shortly after 306 Manilius Rusticianus\(^{14}\)
Describes himself as v. em., praef. praet. on a dedication to Maxentius (ILS 8934: Rome).

309 C. Ceionius Rufius Volusianus, cos. 311, 314
Sent to Africa by Maxentius as praetorian prefect to suppress Domitius Alexander (Victor, Caes. 40.18; Zosimus 2.14.2 ff.)

312 Ruricius Pompeianus
Praefectus of Maxentius killed near Verona in 312 (Pan. Lat. 12(9).8.1, 10.3, 4(10).25.4 ff.).

Licinius
310 ?Pompeius Probus, cos. 310
Colleague of Tatius Andronicus as prefect and consul in 310. Since Galerius had used Licinius and Probus as envoys during his invasion of Italy in 307 (Origo 7), Probus must be the prefect of either Galerius himself or Licinius: the latter is here preferred because of Andronicus’ seniority. A law with the unusual heading Imp. Constantinus et Licinius AA. ad Probum (CJ 6.1.3) may have been addressed to Pompeius Probus as praetorian prefect in 310 or 311,\(^{15}\) but there is no reason to identify him as the Probus (office not stated) who received an imperial letter written on 1 April 314 (CTh 4.12.1).\(^{16}\)

314, January 1  Maximus
The Codex Theodosianus and the Codex Justinianus contain a law addressed ad Maximum p. u. and published on 1 January 314 (CTh 9.5.1 = CJ 9.8.3). Either the date or the office must be wrong, and it has been normal to emend

\(^{14}\) ILS 8934 has Manli(us): identity is here assumed with Manilius Rusticianus, who commanded the praetorian cohorts, probably before October 306 (CIL 14.4455 (Ostia): a. v. praef. praetorioj eemn. vv., cf. Chapter XIII, n. 61).

\(^{15}\) Compare FIRA\(^{2}\) 1.93 (issued in the name of Constantine and Licinius alone on 9 June 311). Although CJ 6.1.3 stands between laws of 294 and 317, P. Krüger, ad loc., proposed the date “a. 317–323.”

\(^{16}\) As do Seeck, Regesten 162; PLRE 1.740, Probus 6.
the date to 320, and to identify the recipient of the law as Valerius Maximus Basilius, praefectus urbi from 319 to 323. But the consular date is by nonimperial consuls (Volusiano et Anniano): therefore, of the contradictory elements, it is the designation of Maximus as p(raefectus) u(rbi) which must be regarded as the more liable to have been corrupted in transmission. Emendation to ad Maximum p(raefectum) p(raetori)o, with the consequent attribution of the law to Licinius, is recommended by three powerful considerations. First, the law survives not only in the law codes but also on stone: five copies are known, all from the territory of Licinius (viz. I. Cret. 1.226–228 no. 188: Lyttus; CIL 3.12133: Tlos in Lycia; CIL 5.2781: probably from Asia; AE 1957.180: Sinope; and an unpublished fragment from Pergamum). Second, the law prescribes crucifixion as a punishment for slaves who denounce their masters—a form of punishment which Constantine abolished on religious grounds (Victor, Caes. 41.4; Sozomenus, HE 1.8.13). Third, the content of the law, which refers to accusations for maiestas, fits appropriately into the circumstances following the defeat and death of Maximinus in 313.

315–324 Julius Julianus
Prefect of Egypt in 314 (P. Cairo Isid. 73), but attested as praetorian prefect with Petronius Annianus on 28 April 315 (Optatus, App. 8), and by two inscriptions, one earlier than October 316 (ILS 8938: Tropaeum Traiani), the other later than 1 March 317 (AE 1938.85 = I. Ephesos 312). He appears to have remained in office until Licinius abdicated in September 324 (Libanius, Orat. 18.9).

2. 317–324
Between 1 March 317 and his abdication, Licinius seems to have retained Julius Julianus as his praetorian prefect (I. Ephesos 312; Libanius, Orat. 18.9). The Caesars Licinius and Constantinus were both infants who resided

17. Seeck, Regesten 75, 169; Chastagnol, Fastes 75 n. 36; PLRE 1.590, Maximus 49.
18. As demonstrated in other cases by Seeck, Regesten 111 ff.
20. In ZPE 21 (1976), 275, I inexcusably overlooked the fragment from Sinope, which was originally published by J. Moreau, Historia 5 (1956), 254 ff. Professor Habicht most kindly showed me a photograph of the fragment found at Pergamum. It confirms the reading etiam ad praesides which I proposed in line 47. Observe the contrast between the plural ad praefectos nostros and the singular ad...rationalem et magistrum privatae (lines 46 ff.): the former reflects the fact that the law was issued in the joint name of Constantine and Licinius, the latter the fact that Licinius had one official bearing each of the titles.
21. On these grounds, A. A. T. Ehrhardt, TU 64 (1957), 117 f., also retained the date of 314 and attributed the law to Licinius—though he assumed that Constantine too must have promulgated the law in the West.
22. For the purge of prominent pagans in 313, Eusebius, HE 9.11.3 ff.
with their parents and hence had no separate establishment. The prefects of Constantine and the Caesar Crispus, however, present problems. The names attested and alleged will be considered in the alphabetical order of their last names.

1. Petronius Annianus, cos. 314
   Still in office after 1 March 317, with Julius Julianus as his only colleague in the prefecture (I. Ephesos 312).

2. Junius Bassus, cos. 331
   Attested as prefect by laws whose transmitted dates run from 18 March 320 (CJ 7.57.7) to 20 October 331 (CTh 1.5.3), and styled praetorian prefect by papyri which name him as one of the consuls of 331. Since an inscription records that Bassus was praefectus praetorio per annos XIII (AE 1964.203 = 1975.370: Aqua Viva, in Etruria), it may be inferred that Bassus was prefect from 318 to early 332. The date of his appointment suggests that he was praetorian prefect of Crispus in Gaul — where he may have remained during the war of 324.

3. Menander
   Five laws are addressed Menandro with no office specified (CTh 15.1.2 (11 April 321), 4.13.2 (13 July 321), 4.13.3 (1 August 321), 11.27.2 (6 July 322), 8.5.4 (22 June 326)). Since Menander is clearly in Africa and superior to provincial governors including the proconsul of Africa, it has been argued that he must be a praetorian prefect. But he could equally well be a comes with authority over the African diocese. If so, then the transmitted date of the earliest of the five laws will need to be emended to 11 April 322.

4. Petronius Probianus, cos. 322
   A praetorian prefecture has been inferred, albeit with hesitation, from a law of 27 February 321 which neither names his office nor gives any real clue to its identification (CTh 9.42.1). The inference appears to be contradicted by

23. Chapter V.
24. On the laws addressed to Bassus, see G. Evrard, MEFR 74 (1962), 641 ff.; PLRE 1.154-5, Bassus 14; A. Giardina, Helikon 11/12 (1971/2), 253 ff. Seeck, Regesten 52; 166 ff., had emended away all the evidence that Bassus was praetorian prefect before 329.
26. PLRE 1.1048.
27. So Seeck, Regesten 18. He accordingly emended the date of CTh 8.5.4 from 326 to 320.
28. So PLRE 1.595/6, Menander 2.
29. Locrius Verinus was still vicarius of Africa on 5 May 321 (Augustine, Contra partem Donati post gesta 31.54, 33.56).
30. Chastagnol, Fastes 84; PLRE 1.733–734, Probianus 3; 1048; D. M. Novak, Ancient Society 10 (1979), 298.
the silence of an inscription honoring his grandson as “nepoti Probiani, filio Probini vv. cc. praef[f]. urbis et cons.” (*ILS* 1266: Verona).

5. Vettius Rufinus, cos. 323

Several modern treatments register Vettius Rufinus as praetorian prefect from 1 December 318 to 10 August 320.\(^{31}\) The evidence comprises four laws addressed to a praetorian prefect named Rufinus, whose dates in the manuscripts of the Theodosian Code are, respectively, 1 December 319 (*CTh* 5.2.1), 27 April 319 (*CTh* 6.35.3), 21 May 326 (*CTh* 13.3.2), and 10 August 313 (*CTh* 7.21.1). A date in the vicinity of 350 seems probable for all four.\(^{32}\) There is no valid evidence, therefore, that the consul of 323 was ever a praetorian prefect.

6. Severus

One law dated 18 December 322 (*CTh* 3.32.1) and another dated 13 April 323 (*CJ* 3.12.3) are addressed *ad Severum* but do not give the title of his office. It has been conventional to identify him as a praetorian prefect and also as the recipient of a law which the manuscripts transmit as issued on 23 January 321 and addressed *ad Severum p. u.* (*CTh* 6.22.1: Seeck emended the year to 324).\(^{33}\) The Severus of the first two laws might equally well be a *vicarius*, and the Severus of the third the Julius Severus attested as *vicarius Italiae* at this period—indeed the first Severus and the second may be identical. In any event, it is not prudent to infer from these three laws alone that Acilius Severus, cos. 323, was praetorian prefect in 322–324.

7. Volusianus

A law of 1 August 321 or 324 is addressed *ad Volusianum* (*CTh* 13.3.1). The correct date has been suggested as c. 314 or 354, in order to make the recipient of the law either C. Ceionius Rufius Volusianus, cos. 311, 314, as *praefectus urbi* or a later C. Ceionius Rufius Volusianus as praetorian prefect of Illyricum.\(^{34}\) But emendation is not necessary: Volusianus could be either a praetorian prefect or a *vicarius* in 321 (the law deals with the immunity of doctors and teachers), and may be identified as a son of the consul of 311 and 314.\(^{35}\)

---


32. *PLRE* 1.774; 783.


34. So *PLRE* 1.831, Severus 3; 836, Severus 25.

35. Respectively, T. Mommsen, *Codex Theodosianus* 1.1 (Berlin, 1904), ccxvi; *PLRE* 1.978–980, Volusianus 5.

36. *JRS* 65 (1975), 47. The identification of this Volusianus as the consul of 311 and 314 holding a second praetorian prefecture (Seeck, *Regesten* 465; Chastagnol, *Fastes* 57 f.) is disproved by the allusions to his career in Firmicus Maternus, *Math.* 2.29.10, 12, cf. *JRS* 65 (1975), 47.
The results of the preceding discussion can easily be summarized: only three prefects are attested with certainty between 317 and 324, viz. Petronius Annianus (prefect of Constantine: length of tenure unknown), Julius Julianus (prefect of Licinius for the whole period), and Junius Bassus (?prefect of Crispus), whose prefecture probably began in 318.

3. SEPTEMBER 324–22 MAY 337

Toward the end of Constantine's life, Eusebius remarks, each of his sons possessed a separate imperial establishment of armies, military commanders, and civilian counselors to administer the territory which he had been assigned (VC4.51/52). It may be assumed that each Caesar also had a praetorian prefect of his own. At the same time, however, some prefects received a specific geographical area to govern—and others perhaps transferred their services from one emperor to another. The prefects from September 324 to May 337, therefore, will be discussed in the order in which they are attested for the first time.

1. Junius Bassus, cos. 331
Prefect from 318 to 332.37

2. Fl. Constantius, cos. 327
First attested by a law annulling the laws and constitutions of Licinius which bears the transmitted date XVII Kal. Ian., i.e. 16 May, of 324 (CTh 15.14.1), but which was presumably issued on 16 December 324 (XVII Kal. Ian.).38 Also attested as praetorian prefect on 29 August or 28 September 325 (CTh 1.5.1: the ms. has p. u.), on 7 October 325 (CTh 12.1.11 + CJ 11.68.1), on 28 April 326 (CTh 8.4.1: the ms. has 315), on 22 December 326 (CTh 4.4.1), and on 11 June 327 (CTh 2.24.2). One law specifically concerns the east (CTh 15.14.1), and another was probably published at Antioch (CTh 1.5.1).

3. Evagrius

Evagrius is attested as praetorian prefect at four different dates:

a. In 326, in the east while Constantine visited Italy. Named as prefect on 27 May (CTh 12.1.13) and 22 November (CJ 2.19(20).11), Evagrius also received two imperial letters dated to 326 which omit the title (CTh 9.3.2:3 February; 9.7.2: 25 April) and possibly two others.39
b. On 18 October 329 (CTh 16.8.1: date emended from 315).40

37. Above, at n. 25.
38. Seeck, Regesten 99.
39. Viz. CTh 12.1.1 (mss.: 13 March 313, emended by Seeck to 326); 7.20.7 (mss.: 11 August 353, emended by Seeck to 339, but assigned to 326 in PLRE 1.284/5, Evagrius 2). On the date of CJ 2.19(20).11, Chapter V, n. 128.
40. Chapter V, n. 131. PLRE 1.284/5 also dates CTh 12.1.1 (mss. 313); 16.8.6 + 9.2 (mss.
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c. On 4 (or 12) August 331 (CTh 7.22.3 + 12.1.19 (office not given) + 12.1.20).
d. On 22 August 336 (CTh 12.1.22).

It seems reasonable to infer a continuous prefecture from 326 to 336 and perhaps beyond.\(^{41}\)

4. Valerius Maximus, cos. 327

Maximus is attested as praetorian prefect at three separate dates:

a. Between 21 January 327 and 29 December 328 (CTh 1.5.2, 1.4.2\(^{s}\) (27 September 328), 1.16.4 + 7.20.5).
b. Between May 332 and 5 May 333 (CJ 7.36.7; CTh 8.1.3).
c. On 2 August 337 (CTh 13.4.2).

5. Aemilianus

Addressed as praetorian prefect in the heading to a document read at Rome on 9 May 328 (CTh 11.16.4).

6. Fl. Ablabius, cos. 331

Attested as praetorian prefect from 329 to 337 by abundant and varied evidence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>CTh 11.27.1(^{4}) (13 May: office not stated, the law concerns Italy), 16.2.6 (1 June), 13.5.5(^{5}) (18 September)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>CTh 16.8.2 (29 November)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>CTh 5.9.1 (17 April), 3.16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>Athanasius, Festal Letter 4.5 (at Constantine's court c. January)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>Const. Sirm. 1 (5 May); CTh 7.22.5 (13 November)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>AE 1925.72 = ILT 814 (summer); Eunapius, Vit. Phil. 6.3.9–13, p. 464 (dismissal by Constantius)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not precisely dated: Eunapius, Vit. Phil. 6.2.10 ff., p. 463 (at the court in Constantinople); Ammianus 20.11.3; Palladius, Hist. Laus. 56; Vita Olympiadis 2 (ed. A.-M. Milingrey, SC 13\(^{bis}\) (1968), 408); Zosimus 2.40.3

7. L. Papius Pactianus, cos. 332

Attested as praetorian prefect from 332 to 337:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>CTh 3.5.4 + 5 (12 April)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>CTh 14.4.1 (8 March), 10.15.2 (5 July)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>CTh 8.9.1 (17 April)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>AE 1925.72 = ILT 814 (summer 337)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{339}\); 14.8.1 (mss. 315) to 329.

\(^{41}\) W. Ensslin, RE 22 (1954), 2499 f.; A. Chastagnol, REA 70 (1968), 352.
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It should be noted that two of the laws specifically concern the city of Rome (CTh 14.4.1, 8.9.1).

8. L. Aradius Valerius Proculus, cos. 340

Two Roman inscriptions which record Proculus’ career disclose a very important fact about the praetorian prefecture:

proconsuli provinciae Africae vice sacra iudicanti eidemq(ue) iudicio sacro per provincias proconsularem et Numidiam Byzacium et Tripolim itemque Mauretaniam Sitifensem et Caesariensem perfuncto officio praefecturae praetorio (ILS 1240)

praefectus et idem
hic Libyae, idem Libyae proconsul et ante (ILS 1241)

Taken together, the two inscriptions indicate that Proculus became praetorian prefect of Africa while he was proconsul in 332-333.42

9. Felix

Attested as praetorian prefect of the African diocese from 333 to 336:

333  
CTh 3.30.5, 1.32.1 (18 April and October: neither gives the office)

334  
CTh 12.1.21 (4 August: concerns African curiales); 13.4.1(27 August: pp. Karthagine and contains the injunction “sublimitas tua in provinciis Africanis ad hoc studium impellat”); 13.5.6 (7 September: pp. Karthagine)

335/6  
Const. Sirm. 4 = CTh 16.8.5 + 9.1 (issued 21 October 335, published at Carthage on 9 March 336; contains the clause “volu-mus ut excellens sublimitas tua litteris suis per dioecesim sibi creditam commeantibus iudices moneat” etc.); CJ 4.62.4 (9 March 336)

10. Gregorius

Attested as praetorian prefect on 9 October 336 (CTh 11.1.3), and denounced by Donatus as dedecus praefectorum (Optatus 3.3, p. 73.22–23 Ziwsa). The other evidence does not record his office (CTh 4.6.3 (21 July 336), 3.1.2 (4 February 337); Optatus 3.10, p. 96.21: sub Gregorio). Presumably the successor of Felix.

42. No earlier year is open if Domitius Zenophilus was proconsul from 328 to 332 (Chapter IX).
11. C. Annius Tiberianus
Under the thirtieth year of Constantine, i.e. 335/6, Jerome notes, "Tiberianus vir disertus praefectus praetorio Gallias regit" (Chronicle 233m). The date is approximately correct, since Tiberianus is attested as praetorian prefect in summer 337 (AE 1925.72 = ILT 814), but the description of his functions could be anachronistic.

12. C. Caelius Saturninus
Saturninus' existence is known only from two Roman dedications in his honor by his son, of which one gives his career before he became praetorian prefect (ILS 1214), while the other describes him simply as v. c., praefecto praetorio (ILS 1215). The date of the first inscription is between 324 and 337; unless the hypothesis of an honorary prefecture is invoked, Saturninus can plausibly be identified as Tiberianus' predecessor.

4. THE COLLEGE OF PREFECTS IN 337
An inscription from Tubernuc in proconsular Africa preserves a list of prefects which requires close attention (AE 1925.72 = ILT 814). Since the date is important and the number of prefects has too often been miscounted, the text must be quoted:

```
Virtute clementia m[emor]ando pie-
tate omnes a[n]tecellenti d. n. Fl. Clau-dio Consta[n]tino iu[niori
Aug.
L. Pap. Pacatianus Fl. Ablabius ///////
C. Annius Tiberianus Neso-
to[u]s Timonianus viri cla-
```

The erasure after the name of Fl. Ablabius was originally believed to conceal a phrase describing his status, such as adfinis Caes(aris). It is more plausible to

43. The fullest discussion of Saturninus' long career remains that by T. Mommsen, Memorie dell'Istituto di Corrispondenza Archeologica 2 (Leipzig, 1865), 298 ff.
44. So PLRE 1.806, 1048. The first validly attested honorary prefect is Libanius in 383/4 (Orat. 1.219, 30.1, 45.1). The Suda alleges that Constantine made a certain Theon, who was a sophist at Sidon, καί ἀπὸ ὑπάντων καὶ ὑπαρχός (Θ 208, 2.702 Adler), but PLRE 1.906, Theon 1, rightly dismisses the titles as "probably fictitious." In Eusebius VC 4.1.2, although F. Winkelmann prints ὑπαρχικῶν δῆμωμάτων, the paradox is probably ὑπαρχικῶν: the former stands in one manuscript only, and that a manuscript which offers many conjectures (see Winkelmann's preface (GCS, 1975), p. xii).
45. L. Poinssot and R. Lantier, CRAI 1924.232 (publishing the inscription but not venturing a precise supplement); A. Piganiol, REA 31 (1929), 142 ff. (proposing that Ablabius was officially styled adfinis or necessarius Caesarius).
suppose that the name of a praetorian prefect has been erased. The inscription was first engraved after Constantine died (22 May 337) but before the younger Constantinus became Augustus (9 September)—or at least between the news of these two events reaching Africa. The text was subsequently revised, with Aug. engraved over the deleted nob. Caes. (line 4). It is easy to suppose that the name of the third prefect (lines 5/6) was erased at the same time. Hence the inscription originally listed a college of five praetorian prefects—not four, as some discussions of the prefects of Constantine have mistakenly assumed.

The erased name can be supplied. The prefects are clearly listed in the order of their entry into the college. That is the order in two similar inscriptions of 341 and c. 343, and Pacatianus (cos. 332) precedes Ablabius (cos. 331). (Hence, incidentally, it follows that Pacatianus became prefect before 13 May 329, when Ablabius is first attested as prefect.) Annius Tiberianus cannot have been appointed before 17 October 332, when he is attested as comes of Hispaniae (CJ 6.1.6); therefore, the third name is that of a prefect who had entered office between c. 325 (when Ablabius was still vicarius of Asiana) and c. 336 (when Tiberianus was appointed). Among the attested prefects the only candidates appear to be Evagrius, attested as prefect in 326, 331, and 336, and Valerius Maximus, attested in 327-328, 332-333, and 337, and of these Maximus deserves the preference because he is attested as prefect on 2 August 337—during the very months when the inscription of Tubernuc was engraved. The erasure in lines 5/6, therefore, conceals the name of Val. Maximus.

The functions of the prefects in 337 must be inferred from their number. Since the college of prefects numbers five, it is plausible to suppose that one prefect was attached to each emperor, while one administered the diocese of Africa. Furthermore, the evidence seems to permit the identification of the precise function of each prefect:

1. Papius Pacatianus: prefect of Constans, since he received two laws concerning Rome, which belonged to the territory formally assigned to Constans.
2. Fl. Ablabius: prefect of Constantius (Eunapius, Vit. Phil. 6.3.9-13, p. 464).
3. Valerius Maximus: prefect of Dalmatius. The erasure of his name implies that he suffered damnatio memoriae at the same time as Dalmatius was killed.

46. A. Chastagnol, REA 70 (1968), 330 ff.
47. E.g., N. H. Baynes, JRS 15 (1925), 204 ff.; Jones, LRE 1.102; PLRE 1.1048, etc.
48. In 341 the college of prefects comprised Domitius Leontius (cos. 344), Antonius Marcellinus (cos. 341) and Fabius Titianus (cos. 337) (ILS 8944: Traiana in Thrace), about two years later Domitius Leontius, Fabius Titianus, and M. Maecius Memmius Furius Baburius Caecilianus Placidus (cos. 343) (unpublished inscription from Delphi reported in PLRE 1.502, 705, 918).
49. On the date of CTh 3.5.6, usually assumed to attest Tiberianus as vicarius of Hispaniae in
If these identifications are correct, it follows that no regional prefectures other than the African existed in summer 337, and it should accordingly be doubted whether Constantine created any others.  

5. OTHER POSSIBLE PREFECTS

1. Ulpius Silvinus, attested as praetorian prefect (TAM 3.126: Termessus in Pisidia). Date uncertain, but possibly between 284 and 311.  

2. Pomponius Januarianus was prefect of Egypt in 283/4, ordinary consul in 288, and praefectus urbi on 27 February 288. Either his initial status or the rapid promotion demands explanation—and the possibility that he was praetorian prefect may be entertained.  

3. Allectus may have been the praetorian prefect of Carausius.  

4. Galerius' career before 293 is totally unknown; the parallel of Constantius suggests that he was Diocletian's praetorian prefect.  

5. In 299 Veturius ordered the soldiers under his command to sacrifice or be dismissed from the army (Eusebius, HE 8.4.3, cf. Chronicle 227 Karst; Jerome, Chronicle 227). Although Jerome calls him magister militiae and Eusebius applies to him a word which he elsewhere uses of a mere dux (viz. ὁ στρατοπεδάρχης, cf. HE 9.5.2; Mart. Pal. (S) 13.1–3), Veturius might be the praetorian prefect of Galerius.  

6. At least one version of the Passio Sabini, which has not yet been edited critically (BHL 7451–54), presents Hermogenianus as a praetorian prefect with Maximian in Rome in late April 304. It is not impossible that the jurist Her-
mogenianus, who must have been at the court of Diocletian while he compiled his legal code between 293 and 295, subsequently became prefect of the western Augustus. However, the Passio Sabini can hardly be regarded as adequate attestation of his prefecture.

7. The Caesar Severus commanded troops before 1 May 305 (Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 18.12)—conceivably as praetorian prefect of Galerius (or alternatively of Maximian).

8. Licinius may have been the praetorian prefect of Galerius. When Galerius invaded Italy in 307, he sent Licinius and Probus as envoys to Maxentius (Origo 7): the latter is next attested as praetorian prefect in 310.

9. On 9 June 311 at Serdica, Licinius wrote a letter bestowing tax privileges on soldiers and veterans of the armies of Illyricum (FIRA 2.193). Its recipient was a man whose full name and office are not stated, but who is twice addressed as Dalmati carissime nobis; he was presumably either praetorian prefect or vicarius of the diocese of Pannonia.

6. ATTESTED PREFECTS AND THEIR DATES

Ancient evidence and modern reconstructions must always be distinguished. To avoid confusion of the two, the following chronological list is provided; it comprises those praetorian prefects between 285 and 337 whose names are known and whose prefectures are explicitly attested by reliable evidence.

T. Cl. Aurelius Aristobulus, cos. 285 285
Afranius Hannibalicianus, cos. 292 between 285 and 292
Julius Asclepiodotus, cos. 292 between 285 and 292
Flavius Valerius Constantius 288–293
Asclepiodotus 296
Asclepiades 302
Flaccinus 303
Anullinus 307
Manilius Rusticianus shortly after 306
C. Ceionius Rufius Volusianus, cos. 311, 314 309
Tatius Andronicus, cos. 310 310
Pompeius Probus, cos. 310 310
Sabinus 311–312

which he defends Baronius’ version and argues that the passio incorporates authentic documents of the early fourth century.

59. A. M. Honoré, JRS 69 (1979), 58 ff.
60. D. Liebs, Hermogenians Iuris Epitomae (1964), 34 ff.
61. It was written no earlier than the late fifth century, see F. Lanzoni, RQ 17 (1903), 1 ff.; A. Dufourcq, Étude sur les Gesta Martyrum romains 3 (Paris, 1907), 87 ff.
62. E. Groag, RE 14 (1930), 2432, 2439, held that Licinius and Probus were colleagues in the praetorian prefecture in 307.
### Holders of Offices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruricius Pompeianus</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximus</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petronius Annianus, cos.</td>
<td>313-317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julius Julianus, cos.</td>
<td>315-324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junius Bassus, cos.</td>
<td>318-332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fl. Constantius, cos.</td>
<td>324-327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evagrius</td>
<td>326, 329, 331, 336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerius Maximus, cos.</td>
<td>327/8, 332/3, 337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aemilianus</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Papius Pacatianus, cos.</td>
<td>329-337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fl. Ablabius, cos.</td>
<td>329-337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Aradius Valerius Proculus, cos. 340 (Africa)</td>
<td>332/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix (Africa)</td>
<td>333-336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregorius (Africa)</td>
<td>336/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Annius Tiberianus</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Caelius Saturninus</td>
<td>before 22 May 337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nestorius Timonianus (Africa)</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. A Hypothetical Reconstruction

From 285 to 324 all the known praetorian prefects functioned as deputies of the emperor to whom they were attached. But when only eighteen prefects are indubitably attested over a period of forty years, for most of which at least four emperors ruled at a time, it is clear that many prefects must have vanished from the historical record. Accordingly, it becomes legitimate to speculate about the gaps, and this chapter has suggested that three emperors besides Constantius had served as praetorian prefect immediately before their elevation to the purple—Galerius with Diocletian before spring 293, Severus before 1 May 305, and Licinius with Galerius before 11 November 308. If these conjectures are well-founded, they will emphasize the importance of military affairs in understanding the achievement of Diocletian and his colleagues.

At the very end of Constantine's reign, likewise, all the praetorian prefects, except the prefect who administered the African diocese, were attached to emperors. Hence by extrapolation from an inscription which records the prefects in office in the summer of 337 (AE 1925.72 = ITL 814), the college of prefects can be reconstructed as it existed from the proclamation of Dalmatius (18 September 335) to the death of Constantine (22 May 337):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefect of Constantine</th>
<th>Evagrius (whose prefecture automatically lapsed when the emperor died)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefect of Constantinus</td>
<td>Annius Tiberianus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefect of Constantius</td>
<td>Fl. Ablabius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefect of Constans</td>
<td>L. Papius Pacatianus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
prefect of Dalmatius Valerius Maximus
prefect in Africa Felix, then Gregorius

The functions of the praetorian prefects of the intervening period are less clear.\textsuperscript{63} Too many are attested for all to be assigned to emperors,\textsuperscript{64} and at least one besides the prefect in Africa operated independently of an emperor: Fl. Constantius, who probably resided at Antioch between 324 and 326.\textsuperscript{65} But Constantine did not divide the empire permanently into regional prefectures, as Zosimus alleged (2.23.1 ff.);\textsuperscript{66} except in Africa from 332/3 onward, he gave prefects primarily territorial jurisdictions only as a temporary measure. The regional prefectures of the late fourth century came into permanent existence only after Constantine's sons frustrated his plans for the division and administration of the empire by a harmonious college of emperors.\textsuperscript{67}

\textsuperscript{63} The hypothesis of collegiate prefectures (invoked by W. Ensslin, \textit{RE} 22 (1954), 2499 f.) no longer needs to be considered seriously, see A. H. M. Jones, \textit{JRS} 54 (1964), 78 ff. = \textit{Roman Economy} (Oxford, 1974), 375 ff.

\textsuperscript{64} The attempt to do so in \textit{PLRE} 1.1048, etc., involves too many transfers from one emperor to another to be convincing.

\textsuperscript{65} Constantius' functions passed to Dalmatius, the half-brother of Constantine, who resided at Antioch with the title of censor (Chapter VI, at nn. 63, 64).

\textsuperscript{66} For modern formulations of the idea (which Zosimus has merely repeated from Eunapius), see O. Seeck, \textit{Rh. Mus.}, n.f. 69 (1914), 1 ff.; J.-R. Palanque, \textit{Essai} (1933) 14 ff.; Stein, \textit{Bas-Empire} \textsuperscript{12}.117 f.

\textsuperscript{67} Jones, \textit{LRE} 1.370.
The lists of provincial governors in the first volume of the *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* have been commended by a reputable historian as "a model of what can be achieved by the patient collation of all the primary evidence, combined with secure technical principles of interpretation."¹ That favorable verdict is not at all justified, at least for the reigns of Diocletian and Constantine, where the lists are not merely inaccurate in detail, but often misleading in principle: the editors have usually forgotten that proconsulates normally lasted for approximately a twelvemonth;² they enter many governors on the strength of dubious *acta martyrum* alone, even when they possess fictitious or anachronistic titles;³ and they fail to present some combined provinces (such as Phrygia et Caria) and some divided provinces (such as the two Numidias) as the separate entities which they really were.⁴ Revised fasti of *vicarii, comites,* and praetorian prefects in charge of dioceses and of governors of provinces are here offered for the period between Diocletian's accession (20 November 284) and the day on which Constantine's sons were proclaimed Augusti (9 September 337). Provinces are grouped by diocese, the dioceses are considered in the order in which they occur in the Verona List, and the provinces within each in a rough geographical order.

² See the fasti of the proconsular provinces, *PLRE* 1.1072–1077.
³ Chapter X.
⁴ Chapter XIII. Observe, however, the separate list of governors of Lycia et Pamphylia (*PLRE* 1.1100).
It should be noted that these lists are exclusive rather than inclusive. Although some names have been included on the basis of conjectural arguments or attributions, the underlying principles of compilation are moderately rigorous: bogus names are all excluded, while many officials whose date or precise post is uncertain have been either omitted or relegated to footnotes under the appropriate diocese or province. The lists are not intended to be definitive; their function is rather to provide a framework for interpreting doubtful cases and for studying imperial administration during a period of rapid change.\(^5\)

### 1. **VICARII AND COMITES OF DIOCESES**

**Oriens**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Official</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>Aemilius Rusticianus</td>
<td><em>P. Oxy.</em> 1469(^6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shortly before 303</td>
<td>Sossianus Hierocles</td>
<td>Lactantius, <em>Mort. Pers.</em> 16.4 (<em>vica-rius</em>); Eusebius, <em>Contra Hieroclem</em> 4, p. 373.10/11; 20, p. 386, 30/1 (date and diocese implied)(^7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Julianus</td>
<td><em>P. Oxy.</em> 2952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>?Festianus</td>
<td>Malalas 314 Bonn (confused and unreliable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326, April 17–Sept. 1</td>
<td>Dracilianus</td>
<td><em>CTh</em> 2.33.1(^1) (17 April), 16.5.1 (1 Sept.); Eusebius, <em>VC</em> 2.31.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^5\) For *duces* of provinces and other military commanders, see *PLRE* 1.1117 ff. (not wholly reliable).

In the following lists a date in the form, e.g., “293/305” means “at some time between 1 March 293 and 1 May 305” (for the relevant imperial colleges, see Chapter I), whereas a date in the form, e.g., “290–294” means “continuously from 290 to 294.” Detailed cross-references within this chapter or to Chapters VI–VIII, X, and XV are not given.


\(^7\) *HSCP* 80 (1976), 244 f.

\(^8\) Identity is assumed by A. K. Bowman, *JRS* 66 (1976), 162 n. 96.
HOLDERS OF OFFICES

Comites

?before 332

Flavius Felicianus  Malalas 318/9 Bonn

Malalas states that Constantine appointed Felicianus as the first comes Orientis in 335; either the date is wrong or Felicianus is probably not the first comes.

325, Oct. 7/

Januarius  CJ 11.68.2 (undated, but later than CJ 11.68.1, cf. CTh 12.1.11)

337

c. 330/336

Q. Flavius Maesius  Firmicus Maternus, Math. 1 praef.
Egnatius Lollianus  7; ILS 1225 (Rome)

Lollianus was subsequently proconsul of Africa, in 336-337.

Pontica

Vicarius

?  Lucilius Crispus  AE 1924.89 (Ancyra)

Crispus' dedication to a single Augustus seems strictly to imply a date of 324/337 or 350/361. Nevertheless, the correct date might be 311/313.

Asiana

Vicarii

324/326  Flavius Ablabius  ILS 6091 = MAMA 7.305 (Orcistus)

334, May 19–

335, May 7

Veronicianus  CTh 8.1.4 + 8.15.2, 11.6.6

Comes

330, Feb. 22  Tertullianus  CTh 2.26.1

Thracia

None attested

9. G. Downey, A Study of the Comites Orientis and the Consulares Syriae (Diss. Princeton, 1939), 8 ff. A law of 331 contains the clause “nec prius praefecti praetorio aut comitis Orientis vel alterius spectabilis iudicis imploret auxilium” (CJ 3.13.4). With appeal to T. Mommsen, Memorie dell'Istituto di Corrispondenza Archeologica 2 (1865), 306, Downey holds that the mention of the comes Orientis is there interpolated—so that he may sustain Malalas' date of 335 for the creation of the office. Archelaus, whom Downey dates to 335, was probably comes Orientis after 337, see PLRE 1.100, Archelaus 1.

10. PLRE 1.233, Crispus 5.
Moesiae

Vicarii

319 Januarinus CTh 9.1.2 (13 Jan.: office not stated, but acc(epta) V Kal. Aug. Corintho); CJ 6.1.5 (15 Feb.: ad Ianuarium, office not stated); CTh 9.37.1 (26 Nov.: ad Ianuarinum p. u.)

c. 321 C. Caelius Saturninus ILS 1214 (Rome)

Pannoniae

None explicitly attested

Britanniae

319, Nov. 20 L. Papius Pacatianus CTh 11.7.2

Galliae

None validly attested

Viennensis

None validly attested

Italia

Correctores Italiae

(a) active in the south

C. Ceionius Rufius Volusianus ILS 1213 (Rome); CIL 10.1655 (Puteoli)

(b) active in the north

284 M. Aurelius Julianus Victor, Caes. 39.10
Sabinus

Proclaimed Augustus cum Venetos correctura ageret: Zosimus 1.73.1 alleges that he was praetorian prefect.

11. Acacius is attested as comes Macedoniae on 27 February 327 (CTh 11.3.2). Not necessarily a comes in charge of a diocese (as PLRE 1.1081): rather, a comes in charge of confiscating temple treasures in the province of Macedonia (cf. Eusebius, Triac. 8.2)—a function he performed in Palestine (Eusebius, VC 3.53.2, 62.1).


13. The Dalmatius who received a letter of Licinius dated 9 June 311 could be a vicarius Pannoniarum (FIRA 2 1.93).

14. PLRE 1.474, Julianus 24; 480, Julianus 38, postulates two homonymous and contemporaneous usurpers. In favor of identity, PIR 2 A 1538.

143
HOLDERS OF OFFICES

286    Acilius Clarus       CIL 5.8205 (near Aquileia)
287    T. Aelius Marcianus   CIL 11.1594 (Florence)
289, Aug. 19-290, Feb. 14 Paetus Honoratus CIL 7.56.3 + 9.2.9, 2.10.1 (no office stated); ILS 614 (Patavium: 284/290)
290, Sept. 10 Numidius      CJ 7.35.3 (area of activity neither stated nor implied)
before 293, March 1 T. Flavius Postumius AE 1919.52 (Comum)
(c) corrector utriusque Italiae
?290/293 L. Aelius Helvius    ILS 1211 (Rome)
Dionysius
(d) regional correctores
?293    T. Flavius Postumius  ILS 2941; CIL 6.1419b (Rome)
Titianus
corrector Italiae Transpadanae (ILS 2941) / reg. Tra[ (CIL 6.1419b) 15

Vicarii 16

c. 300/c. 325 Caecilianus     ILS 1218 (Mutina)
?318, Jan. 23- Sept. 7      Julius Severus CTh 6.22.1 (emended), 6.35.4 
                              (emended), 11.30.9\textsuperscript{a}, 7.22.2\textsuperscript{a}, 8.18.2\textsuperscript{a}
                              The ms. attestation of Severus' date, name, and office is as follows:
                              CTh 6.22.1 23 Jan. 321 ad Severum p. u.
                              6.35.4 15 Mar. 321 ad Iulium Verum vic(ari)um
                              Italiae
                              11.30.9 22 June 319 ad Severum vic(ari)um
                              7.22.2 30 July 326 ad Severum
                              8.18.2 7 Sept. 319 Julio Severo

325, Feb. 25 ?Silvius Paulus CTh 1.15.1 (stating the office as the otherwise unknown mag\textsuperscript{i} Italiae)

15. A. Chastagnol, La Préfecture urbaine à Rome sous le Bas-Empire (Paris, 1960), 21 ff.; Fastes 43; Historia 12 (1963), 351, takes ILS 2941 and CIL 6.1419b to refer to the same post as AE 1919.52 (corr. Ital.), which he dates to 291. It is here proposed that Titianus may have been corrector in 293 when Diocletian divided Italy into provinces (cf. Chapter XIII).
16. CTh 9.8.1 (4 April 326) is addressed ad Bassum vic. Italiae. This is accepted by A. Chastagnol, Historia 12 (1963), 354, who also adduces CTh 2.10.4 (8 March 326: ad Bassum p. u.); 16.5.2 (25 September 326: ad Bassum). The recipient of all three laws is identified as the praetorian prefect Junius Bassus by PLRE 1.154.
For vicarii of the city of Rome, see A. Chastagnol, Préfecture 463 ff.
### Administrators and Governors

#### Hispantiae

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>306/337</td>
<td>Q. Aeclanius Hermias</td>
<td>CIL 2.2203 (Corduba)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7324/326</td>
<td>Septimius Acindynus</td>
<td>CIL 2.4107 = <em>I. Tarraco</em> 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7332, July 15</td>
<td>C. Annius Tiberianus</td>
<td><em>CTh</em> 3.5.617</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Comites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>316, Dec. 4-317, Jan. 19</td>
<td>Octavianus</td>
<td><em>CTh</em> 9.1.1, 12.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332, Oct. 17</td>
<td>C. Annius Tiberianus</td>
<td><em>CJ</em> 6.1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333, May 4-336, May 19</td>
<td>-us Severus</td>
<td><em>CTh</em> 8.12.5 + 11.39.2, 8.18.3 (30 March 334); <em>AE</em> 1915.33 = 1935.4 (Emerita: 333/335); <em>CTh</em> 13.5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Africa

#### Vicarii

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>303-308</td>
<td>Valerius Alexander</td>
<td><em>AE</em> 1942/3.81 (Aqua Viva: 303); <em>IRT</em> 464 (Lepcis: under Maxentius); Victor, <em>Caes.</em> 40.17; <em>Zosimus</em> 2.12.2 (the usurper L. Domitius Alexander as vicarius of Africa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312-313</td>
<td>Patricius</td>
<td>Eusebius, <em>HE</em> 10.6.4 (winter 312/3, implying appointment in Nov. 312)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314, spring</td>
<td>?Aelafius18</td>
<td>Optatus, App. 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. *CTh* 3.5.6 is addressed "ad Tiberianum vicarium Hispaniarum" and the subscription reads "dat. id. Iul. Constant(ino)(p)oll. accepta XIII k. Mai. Hispali Nepotiano et Facundo cons." Since the date of publication is given as 18 April 336, the year of issue would normally be assumed to be 335 (so Seeck, *Regesten* 183). But Severus is attested as comes Hispaniarum from 333 to 336 (though *PLRE* 1.831, Severus 4, emends the date of *CTh* 13.5.8 from 336 to 335), and the official in charge of the diocese was a comes in 337/340 (*AE* 1927.165, re-edited by A. Chastagnol, *MEFR (A)* 88 (1976), 260 ff.). It seems simpler, therefore, to postulate that, though published at Hispalis in April 336, the constitution was issued in July 332.

18. The name (attested by a single careless ms.) is "unmöglich," according to O. Seeck, *ZKG*
HOLDERS OF OFFICES

314, summer and autumn
Aelius Paulinus

315, Feb.
Verus

315, April 28–
316, Jan. 11
Domitius Celsus

316, Mar. 21–
Nov. 10
Eumelius

318, Nov. 16–
321, May 5
Locrius Verinus

Comites

321, July 13–
326, June 22
Menander

326, July 30–
327, Apr. 21
C. Annius Tiberianus

Praefecti praetorio (from Chapter VIII.3,4)

332/3
L. Aradius Valerius Proculus

333, April 18–336, Mar. 9
Felix

336, July 21–337, Feb. 4
Gregorius

337, June/Sept.
Nestorius Timonianus

DATED VICARI WHOSE DIOCESE IS UNKNOWN

314, March 6–
Ursus

315, Feb. 5

30 (1909), 200. L. Duchesne, MEFR 10 (1890), 645 f., had plausibly suggested that Aelafio is merely a corruption of Aelio Paulino (not noted in PLRE 1.16).
**ADMINISTRATORS AND GOVERNORS**

*Vicarius* of a western diocese, cf. Eusebius, *HE* 10.6.1 (*rationalis* of Africa in winter 312/3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>314 April</td>
<td>Dionysius</td>
<td><em>CJ</em> 7.22.3, 3.1.8 (office not stated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315 May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315, May</td>
<td></td>
<td>Probably <em>vicarius</em> of an eastern diocese&lt;sup&gt;19&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322 Dec.</td>
<td>?Severus</td>
<td><em>CTh</em> 3.32.1; <em>CJ</em> 3.12.3 (office not stated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323 April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330 April</td>
<td>Valerianus</td>
<td><em>CTh</em> 3.5.3&lt;sup&gt;20&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **PROVINCIAL GOVERNORS**

**Dioceae of Oriens**

*Libya Superior*
None attested

*Libya Inferior*
None attested

*Thebais* (praeses)<sup>21</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>295 Feb.</td>
<td>Herodianus</td>
<td><em>P. Oxy.</em> 43 recto, col. 6.3/4, 10/1, as revised by T. C. Skeat, <em>Papyri from Panopolis</em> (Dublin, 1964), xviii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298–300</td>
<td>Julius Athenodorus</td>
<td><em>P. Beatty Panopolis</em> 1 (Sept. 298), 2 (Jan. 300)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>19</sup> Seeck, *Regesten* 53, 162.

<sup>20</sup> Seeck, *Regesten* 180; *PLRE* 1.938, identify Valerianus as the recipient of *CJ* 6.1.4 (mss.: 27 June 317), whose date they emend to 330. But *CJ* 6.1.4 does not state its recipient’s office, and its original date may be 28 December 317 (Chapter V, n. 117).


The statement by Epiphanius that Culcianus was “prefect of the Thebaid” while Hierocles was prefect of Egypt, i.e. in 310/11, should be disregarded (*Panarion* 68.1.4). Anysius, whom *PLRE* 1.79 enters as “governor of the Thebaid ?c.a. 323,” is more probably a retired member of the governor’s staff (*P. Giessen* 117).
**HOLDERS OF OFFICES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>305/306–307, Feb./March</td>
<td>Satrius Arrianus</td>
<td>P. Oxy. 2665 (305/306); P. Grenfell 78 (Oasis Magna); P. Flor. 33 (Hermopolis Magna: 305/311)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313, Nov. 20–314</td>
<td>Antonius Gregorius</td>
<td>CPR 1.233 (Hermopolis Magna: 20 Nov. 313); P. Panopolis 23.12 (314 or later), 24.8 (undated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Aurelius Aeneas</td>
<td>P. Panopolis 25 (undated, but apparently early fourth century)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322, Mar. 29–326, Nov. 19</td>
<td>Valerius Victorinianus</td>
<td>P. Oxy. 3123 (29 March 322); P. Panopolis 27 (April or May 323); P. Strasbourg 296 (Hermopolis: 19 Nov. 326); P. Panopolis 24 (undated); P. Cairo inv. 10466; Stud. Pal. 20.100 (both from Hermopolis and undated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329, July 9</td>
<td>Flavius Gregorius</td>
<td>P. Panopolis 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332, July–Aug. 5</td>
<td>Flavius Quintilianus</td>
<td>P. Panopolis 29.4 (between Jan. and 24 July), 30 (5 Aug.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Aegyptus (praefectus)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>285 or 286, early</td>
<td>M. Aurelius Diogenes</td>
<td>P. Oxy. 1456 (Diocletian as sole emperor); P. Cairo inv. 10531, quoted by A. Stein, <em>Die Prätfektten von Ägypten der römischen Kaiserzeit</em> (Bern, 1950), 156 (undated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Peregrinus</td>
<td>P. Oxy. 2343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

22. On *P. Flor.* 33, see J. R. Rea, *CE* 46 (1971), 142 ff. Arrianus is also prominent as a persecutor in Coptic hagiography (Vandersleyen, *Chronologie* 86 ff.).


25. For prefects down to 299, G. Bastianini, *ZPE* 17 (1975), 318 ff. The following prefects should be removed from the list in *PLRE* 1.1083/4: Aurelius Mercurius, see J. D. Thomas, *JHS* 84 (1964), 207; A. K. Bowman, *BASP* 6 (1969), 35 ff.; Apollonius, who appears to result from conflating the martyr Apollonius with the unnamed prefect who tried him (*Historia Monachorum in Aegypto* [Greek] 19.9); 'Eustratius'; 'Armenius'; Titinnius Clodianus, cf. G. Bastianini, *ZPE* 17 (1975), 313 f. The present list excludes the prefects attested without a precise date by *P. Rein.* 51 (Aurelius Proculinus): *P. Amherst* 82 (-banus); *P. Oxy.* 1504 (anonymous); [Julian], *Epp.* 201 (Himerius, cf. *PLRE* 1.437).
### Administrators and Governors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Administrator(s)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>287–290</td>
<td>C. Valerius Pompeianus</td>
<td><em>P. Oxy</em>. 888 (before 25 Oct. 287); 2343 (287/8); 1503 (288/9); <em>P. Amherst</em> 137 (288/9); <em>P. Oxy</em>. 1642 (March/April 289); <em>P. Oxy</em>. 1252 (15 Sept. 289); <em>PSI</em> 461 (Feb./March 290); <em>P. Oxy</em>. 2612 (undated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291, June 10–292, Feb.</td>
<td>Titius Honoratus</td>
<td><em>P. Oxy</em>. 3296; <em>BGU</em> 2069 (Jan. 292); <em>P.Oxy</em>. 2704 (Feb. 292); <em>Sammelbuch</em> 7205 (Great Oasis; undated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292/3</td>
<td>Rupilius Felix</td>
<td><em>P. Oxy</em>. 2712 (292/3); <em>PSI</em> 298 (undated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297, Mar. 16</td>
<td>Aristius Optatus</td>
<td><em>P. Cairo Isid</em>. 1; <em>P. Oxy</em>. 2713 (undated)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the revolt of 297/8, a *corrector* is attested:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Administrator(s)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>297, Sept. 5–9</td>
<td>Aurelius Achilleus</td>
<td><em>P. Cairo Isid</em>. 62 (Karanis); <em>P. Mich</em>. 220 = <em>Sammelbuch</em> 7252 (Philadelphia)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the revolt, *praefecti* of undivided Egypt are attested until 314:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Administrator(s)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>298–299</td>
<td>Aelius Publius</td>
<td><em>P. Cairo Isid</em>. 66, 67 (Karanis: 298/9); <em>P. Oxy</em>. 1204 (autumn 299); <em>OGIS</em> 718 = <em>Sammelbuch</em> 8278 (Alexandria: after 298); <em>P. Oxy</em>. 1416, 2133; <em>P. Amherst</em> 82 (undated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Claudius Cleopatrus</td>
<td><em>P. Oxy</em>. 3301 (300), 3302 (29 Aug. 300/6 June 301), 3303 (undated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301, 6 June–307, Feb. 4</td>
<td>Clodius Culcianus</td>
<td><em>P. Oxy</em>. 3304 (6 June 301); 71 (28 Feb. 303); 2187 (Jan. 304); 895 (spring 305); 1104 (29 May 306); <em>PSI</em> 716 (?306); <em>Acta Phileae</em> (P. Bodmer XX: 4 Feb. 307); <em>P. Oxy</em>. 2558; <em>P. Amherst</em> 83; Eusebius, <em>HE</em> 9.11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>Valerius Victorinus</td>
<td><em>P. Oxy</em>. 2674 (308); <em>P. Lond. inv</em>. 2226 (Oxyrhynchus: before Sept. 308)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. G. Bastianini, *ZPE* 17 (1975), 320, n. 1. The papyrus was previously read as attesting a prefect whose name ended in “-elius” (so *PLRE* 1.998).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>308, Sept.</td>
<td>Aelius Hyginus</td>
<td>P. Lond. inv. 2226; P. Oxy. 2667, 2666 (undated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309, June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310, April</td>
<td>Sossianus Hierocles</td>
<td>P. Oxy. 3120 (April 310): P. Cairo Isid. 69 (310); P. Berol. inv. 21654 = P. Coll. Youtie 75 (Jan./July 311); <em>Eusebius, Mart. Pal. (L) 5.3; Epiphanius, Pan. 68.1.4</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312, Aug.</td>
<td>Aurelius Ammonius</td>
<td>P. Flor. 36 + Addenda, p. xi = Chrestomathie 2.64 (Theadelphia); PSI 886 (Oxyrhynchus: after 310-311), 449 (undated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314, Jan.</td>
<td>Julius Julianus</td>
<td>P. Cairo Isid. 73 (Karanis: 314); Sammelbuch 9192 (undated); Julian, Epp. 60 Bidez*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For Aegyptus Iovia (315-324)*

None attested

*For Aegyptus Herculia (315-324) (praeses)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>315, Dec.</td>
<td>Aurelius Antonius</td>
<td>P. Cairo Isid. 74 (Karanis: 27 Dec. 315); P. Merton 91 (Karanis: 30 Jan. 316); P. Oxy. 2113 (Jan. 316); 896, col. 2.29 (1 April 316); P. Oxy. 29 4B. 48/G(6-7)a (undated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316, April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318, April</td>
<td>Valerius Ziper*</td>
<td>Sammelbuch 9187 (Karanis: 13 April 318); 9188 = P. Cairo Isid. 76 (Karanis: 15 July 318); P. Rylands 653 (?Theadelphia: 3 June 318, 319, or 320); P. Cairo Isid. 77 (Karanis: 320); P. Theadelphia 13 (12 Dec. 321); P. New York 1a (Karanis); P. Theadelphia 19; CPR 5.7 (all three undated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321, Dec.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. On the date, H. Machler, *Collectanea Papyrologica: Texts Published in Honor of H. C. Youtie* 2 (Bonn, 1976), 531: the consular date presents Galerius as still alive, while the earliest known Egyptian document which reflects his decease is dated 12 July 311 (*P. Cornell* 13.24-26, cf. J. D. Thomas, *ZPE* 6 (1970), 181 f.).


29. For the name of the prefect, J. R. Rea, on *CPR* 5.7.2. *PLRE* 1.464; 993, registers Q. Iper and Valerius Ziper as separate governors (in 321-322 and 318-320 respectively).
**Administrators and Governors**

323, Aug. 17-  Sabinianus  
324  
Arabia Nova (315-324)  
None attested

P. Oxy. 60 = Chrestomathie 2.43  
(17 Aug. 323); P. Oxy. 3260 (324);  
PSI 452; P. Rylands 659 (undated)

*Aegyptus (reunited in or soon after 324)* (praefectus)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Prefect</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?c. 325</td>
<td>Caecilius -ultius</td>
<td><em>P. Strasbourg</em> 560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before 328</td>
<td>Aurelius Apion</td>
<td>PSI 685 (Oxyrhynchus)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apion is διασημότατος (as is the preceding prefect); all prefects after 339 were λαμπρότατοι and all prefects between 328 and 339 are probably known.

328, Aug. 19- 329, April 6  
Septimius Zenius  
P. Oxy. 3126; Athanasius, Festal Letter 1, heading

330, April 19  
Flavius Magnilianus  
Athanasius, Festal Letter 2, heading; P. Oxy. 2562 (undated)

331, April 11  
Florentius  
Athanasius, Festal Letter 3, heading

332, April 2  
Flavius Hyginus  
PSI 767 (Nov. 331 or 332); Athanasius, Festal Letter 4, heading (2 April 332); *P. Theadelphia* 17 (undated); Sozomenus, *HE* 2.25.3 (before 335)

333, April 15  
Paterius  
Athanasius, Festal Letter 5, heading; Opitz, *Urkunde* 34.43 (undated)

334, April 7- 336, Feb./March  
Flavius Philagrius  
Athanasius, Festal Letter 6, heading (7 April 334); 7, heading (30 March 335); Sammelbuch 8246 (Arsinoite nome: probably c. 334); Athanasius, *Apol. Sec.* 76.1 ff. (Sept. 335); *P. Oxy.* 3129 (Sept. 335), 1470 (Feb./March 336)

Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.* 51.1 ff., implies that Philagrius was out of office before 22 May 337.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Holders of Offices</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>284/305</td>
<td>Domitius Antoninus</td>
<td>CIL 3.14156.2 = I. Gerasa 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293/305</td>
<td>M. Aurelius Aelianus</td>
<td>AE 1957.272 (Bostra)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293/305</td>
<td>Aurelius Asclepiades</td>
<td>CIL 3.14149 (Kasr Bcher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293/305</td>
<td>Aurelius Felicianus</td>
<td>I. Gerasa 105, 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293/305</td>
<td>Aurelius Gorgonius</td>
<td>AE 1930.105 = I. Gerasa 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303, April-Nov.</td>
<td>Flavianus</td>
<td>Eusebius, Mart. Pal. (S) praef.; (L) 1.1, 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304, spring-307/8, winter</td>
<td>Urbanus</td>
<td>Eusebius, Mart. Pal. 3–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308, early-310, c. March</td>
<td>Firmilianus</td>
<td>Eusebius, Mart. Pal. 8–11, cf. (S) 13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310/311, c. June</td>
<td>Valentinianus</td>
<td>AE 1964.198 (Scythopolis)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. The Festal Index enters the prefects from Zenius to Theodorus under the following consular dates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Holder</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>328, 329 (praef., 1)</td>
<td>Zenius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330 (2)</td>
<td>Magnilianus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331, 332 (3, 4)</td>
<td>Hyginus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333, 334, 335 (5–7)</td>
<td>Paterius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336, 337 (8, 9)</td>
<td>Philagrius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338 (10)</td>
<td>Theodorus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Index appears to be based on (and to distort) the information in the headings, see E. Schwartz, Ges. Schr. 3 (1959), 15 ff. In addition, under Letter 3, of 331, the Index describes events connected with Letter 4, of 332 (cf. Athanasius, Apol. Sec. 60.1 ff.; Festal Letter 4.5: the names of Athanasius’ accusers), and under Letters 8 and 10 it describes events of 335 and 337, not 336 and 338 (for the dates, AJAH 3 (1978), 62 ff.). The heading to Letter 10 appears to imply that Theodorus had been prefect at the preceding Easter too.


32. The present list omits four names from that in PLRE 1.1108, viz. 'Severus', Anonymus 130 (? = Firmilianus), Delphinius (whose status is uncertain), and the anonymous governor attested in 326 (Eusebius, VC 3.31).
ADMINISTRATORS AND GOVERNORS

Phoenice

286/c. 295 L. Artorius Pius Maximus AE 1939.58 (Heliopolis) leg(atus) eorum (sc. Augustorum) pro pr(aetore)

292, Mar. 31 Crispinus CJ 1.23.3

CJ 1.23.3 names Crispinus as praeses provinciae Phoenices; he may also be the recipient of CJ 7.35.4 (26 Feb. 292), 9.2.11 (25 March 292), 9.9.25 (28 Aug. 293), 10.62.3 (undated)

shortly before Achillius AJP 3 (1906), 168 = P. Rylands 4, p. 104 (Hermopolis)

324 ήγεμ(ών)

328, Oct. 21–329, March 14 Flavius Dionysius CTh 9.34.4 (Tyre), 8.18.4; CJ 6.9.8 (Heliopolis)

Title not attested

334 Archelaus Socrates, HE 1.29.2

υπατικός

Augusta Libanensis (praeses)

293/c. 300 Sossianus Hierocles CIL 3.133 = 6661; AE 1932.79 (Palmyra)

Syria (praeses, after c. 325 consularis)

290, May 10 Charisius CJ 9.41.9, cf. 11.55.1 (286/293)

293, April 21/303, Dec. 31 Primosus CJ 7.33.6 (undated: date inferred from 7.33.5, 7)

33. The present list omits the governor apparently attested by a very worn milestone, from the road between Tyre and Sidon, published by R. G. Goodchild, Berytus 9 (1948–49), 222/3, with Plate XXII, 2; the words “CI MAXIMO,” from which PLRE 1.581 deduces that his name was Maximus, may be part of the emperor's name and titles. J. and L. Robert, BE 1956.335, argued that Aelius Statutus was a governor of Syria Phoenice; PLRE 1.852 identifies him as a censitor.


35. Socrates makes Archelaus governor when the allegedly murdered Arsenius was found alive: the date of that must be 334 (AJAH 3 (1978), 62).

36. J. F. Gilliam, AJP 79 (1958), 237 f. (to 305). The present list discards the following names from the list in PLRE 1.1105: L. Artorius Pius Maximus (see Phoenice); ‘Publius’; Anonymus 127 (who is the praetorian prefect Asclepiades); Anonymus 128 (Philostorgius, HE 3.15); and Dyscolius (P. Rylands 623; 4, p. 104: status uncertain); Plutarchus (Malalas 318 Bonn, on which passage see G. Downey, A History of Antioch in Syria (Princeton, 1961), 348, 622).

37. PLRE 1.725 assumes identity with the senator Latinius Primosus (CIL 6.37118).
HOLDERS OF OFFICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>294, Sept. 22</td>
<td>Verinus</td>
<td>CJ 2.12.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290/296</td>
<td>L. Aelius Helvius Dionysius</td>
<td>ILS 1211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329/335</td>
<td>Flavius Dionysius</td>
<td>Eusebius, VC 4.42.3; Libanius, Orat. 1.36; Socrates, HE 1.28.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Augusta Euphratensis*

None securely attested

*Cyprus* (praeses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>293/305</td>
<td>Antistius Sabinus</td>
<td><em>I. Salamis</em> 39, 40, 129–131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Isauria* (praeses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>305/311</td>
<td>Flavius Severianus</td>
<td>AE 1972.652 (Seleucia ad Calycadnum)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cilicia* (praeses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Mesopotamia*

None attested

*Osrhoene*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?309</td>
<td>?Mysianus</td>
<td><em>BHO</em> 363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?310</td>
<td>?Ausonius</td>
<td><em>BHO</em> 367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Diocese of Pontica**

*Cappadocia* (praeses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?316</td>
<td>Titianus</td>
<td>CJ 7.16.41 (undated, but issued by Constantine and Licinius)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. *PLRE* 1.499 argues that Leontius (*CTh* 8.1.1) was governor in 319, with appeal to A. H. M. Jones, *JRS* 39 (1949), 47. Seeck, *Regesten* 192, redated the law to 343.


40. On the date, Seeck, *Regesten* 53 f.; Millar, *Emperor* 336, arguing from *CTh* 8.5.2 (14 May 316: *ad Titianum*). It could also be between 310 and 312.
Administrators and Governors

Armenia
None attested

Pontus Polemoniacus
None attested

Galatia
None attested

Paphlagonia
None attested

Pontus, later Diospontus, from 328 Helenopontus (præses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>293/305</td>
<td>Aurelius Priscianus</td>
<td>CIL 3.307, 13643, 14184.20, 21, 39; BCH 33 (1909), 27; AE 1961.26 (all milestones)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317/324</td>
<td>Valerius CIIPUS ///</td>
<td>CIL 3.14184.31 = AE 1900.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333/335</td>
<td>Flavius Julius Leontius</td>
<td>CIL 3.14184.17, 37; AE 1908.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before 337</td>
<td>Claudius Longinus</td>
<td>CIL 3.14184.24 = AE 1900.149 (a fragmentary milestone)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pontus et Bithynia (consularis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>324/c. 338</td>
<td>L. Crepereius Mada-</td>
<td>ILS 1228 (Calama)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lianus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bithynia (præses, after c. 325 consularis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>303 or shortly</td>
<td>Priscillianus</td>
<td>Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329/c. 336</td>
<td>Julius Aurelianus</td>
<td>AE 1969/70.116 (Formiae)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41. Published by J. H. R. Munro, JRS 20 (1900), 159 f.: “jio[ / jio[ / [nobilissi]mis C[ae]ss. / Cl. Longinus v. p. / p. [p].”
42. Anonymous praesides are mentioned by Lactantius in 311/2 and on 13 June 313 (Mort. Pers. 40.1, 48.1).
HOLDERS OF OFFICES

DIOCESE OF ASIANA

Lycia et Pamphylia (praeses)
c. 275/c. 325  Terentius Marcianus  TAM 3.89 (Termessus); AE 1915.53 (Trebbenna); BCH 7 (1883), 268 no. 12 (Sagalassus)
c. 311, June 333/335  Eusebius  JRS 57 (1967), 44 no. 11 (Choma in Lycia)
Since the province is not named, it is possible that Lycia et Pamphylia had been divided before 335, and that Faustinus governed Lycia only.

Pisidia (praeses)
308, Nov./  Valerius Diogenes  ILS 8932 (Apamea: honors Valeria as Augusta); MAMA 1.170
311, May-  ?311 Nov./  (Laodicea Combusta: persecuted Christians, apparently under Maximinus);
313 May  CIL 3.6807 (Pisidian Antioch); Ramsay, JRS 14 (1924), 197 no. 25 (near Antioch: both undated)

Phrygia (praeses)
286/305  Ju-  IGRR 4.523 (Dorylaeum)
Perhaps governor of Phrygia et Caria

Phrygia et Caria
286/293  Priscus  CIL 14191.2 (Docimium)

43. On the date, see G. Bersanetti, Aevum 19 (1945), 384 ff.
44. Fl. Areianus Alypius (J. Side 54) is now attested as praeses of Augustamnica in 351 (CPR 5.12); he presumably governed either Pamphylia or Lycia et Pamphylia after 337.
45. W. M. Calder, Gnomon 10 (1934), 503 f. — contesting the claim of A. Wilhelm, Sb. Berlin, Phil.-hist. Klasse 1932.834 ff., that the tortures mentioned were merely mental or psychological ills. Millar, Emperor 576 n. 58, dates MAMA 1.170 to 305/6, adducing Eusebius, Mart. Pal. 4.8. The inference is illegitimate, since in 305/6 Asia Minor was under the control of Galerius, not of Maximinus (Chapter XI). However, έπί Μαξιμι’νου could be a mistake for έπί Μαξιμιανον (a common confusion — see JTS, n.s. 27 (1976), 420). If so, MAMA 1.170 attests Diogenes as praeses of Pisidia under Galerius, i.e. before May 311.
47. C. Roueché, JRS 71 (1981), 103 ff., publishes and discusses recently discovered inscrip-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Governor</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>293/305</td>
<td>L. Castrius Constans</td>
<td><em>MAMA</em> 6.94 = J. and L. Robert, <em>La Carie</em> 2 (Paris, 1954), 199 no. 123 (near Heraclea ad Salbacem); <em>ILS</em> 8881 (Eumeneia)* [48]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of consular rank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Nov. 301</td>
<td>Fulvius Asticus</td>
<td><em>JRS</em> 65 (1975), 160 = <em>AE</em> 1975.805 (Aezani in Phrygia); <em>CIL</em> 3.480 (near Alabanda in Caria: 293/305)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caria (praes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293/305</td>
<td>Aurelius Marcellus</td>
<td><em>ILS</em> 635 (Halicarnassus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>v. p. praes. prov. Caria[e]</em>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of consular rank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lydia</td>
<td>None attested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulae (praeses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294, Aug. 2</td>
<td>Diogenes</td>
<td><em>CJ</em> 3.22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293/305</td>
<td>Aurelius Agathus</td>
<td><em>CIL</em> 3.450 (Mytilene); <em>AE</em> 1947.57 (Cos)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293/324</td>
<td>Attius ?Epinicius</td>
<td><em>ILS</em> 3107; <em>CIL</em> 3.14199.1 (Samos: dedications to Juno and Jupiter by the governor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia (proconsul)*49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286/293</td>
<td>T. Flavius Festus</td>
<td><em>I. Didyma</em> 89, 90 (286/293), 159 (proconsul before Asia was divided)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286/305</td>
<td>Aurelius Hermogenes</td>
<td><em>CIL</em> 3.7069 = <em>I. Ilion</em> 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287/298</td>
<td>L. Artorius Pius Maximus</td>
<td><em>CIL</em> 3.14195.27; <em>JÖAI</em> 44 (1959), Beibl. 349–350 = <em>I. Ephesos</em> 307, 621</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


HOLDERS OF OFFICES

293/303
Junius Tiberianus  JÖAI 44 (1959), Beibl. 267 = I. Ephesos 305

293/305
An-? [Epi]phanius  I. Ilion 97

311–313, May
?Peucetius  Eusebius, HE 9.11.4

Eusebius reports that Maximinus appointed Peucetius δις ὑπατος καὶ τρῖς ὑπατος καὶ τῶν καθόλου λόγων ἐπαρχος. Since the Egyptian papyri (from Maximinus' domains) show no trace of Peucetius’ alleged three consulates, Eusebius has clearly misheard or misunderstood. Accordingly, a conjecture may be advanced: since the proconsulate of Asia was the only other office with a fixed (and therefore renewable) term which Maximinus could bestow, Peucetius may have been proconsul of Asia. If the conjecture is correct, the triennium 311–314 best fits the historical circumstances. Peucetius’ function as praefectus summarum rationum was presumably to raise money for the war against Licinius in 313; he was executed after Maximinus’ defeat (HE 9.11.4).

?325–327
Domitius Zenophilus  ILAG. 456 (Bulla Regia)
c. 330/334
Ceionius Rufius Albinus  Firmicus Maternus, Math. 2.29.10
c. 330/336
Fabius Titianus  ILS 1227 (Rome); I. Ephesos 666d

Asia et Hellespontus (proconsul)
c. 330
Amnius Manius Caes-sonius Nicomachus  ILS 1220, 1221 (Rome)
Anicius Paulinus

Hellespontus (praeses)
293/305
Julius Cassius  I. Ilion 97

DIOCESE OF THRACIA

293/305
Domitius Domninus  IGRR 1.789–792 (Heraclea)

vir perfectissimus and governor: presumably, therefore, praezes Europae

50. The inscription is known only from the report of J. B. Lechevalier, who gives the proconsular date as επιαν.... / φανετοι του λανπροτανο / ασιας (Voyage dans la Troade² (Paris, 1799), 256, no. 1).

51. The inscriptions imply that Hellespontus had been made a separate province again between Paulinus’ proconsulate and 334/5, see Chastagnol, Fastes 91 n. 107; A. H. M. Jones, Roman Economy (Oxford, 1974), 268.
shortly after L. Aradius Valerius  
324  Procclus  
*consularis Europae et Thraciae*

Moesia Superior
None attested

Praevalitana
None attested

Dardania
None attested

Dacia (praeses)
321, Feb. 6  Claudius  
*CTh 2.19.2*

Dacia Ripensis
None attested

Macedonia (praeses)
304, Mar.–Apr.  Dulcitius  
*Martýrhoν τῶν ἁγίων Ἀγάπης, Εἰρήνης καὶ Χιόνης (BHG 34)*

Epirus Nova (praeses)
324/332  Flavius Hyginus  
*CIL 3.7320 (Lychnidus: fragmentary)*

Epirus Vetus
None attested

Thessalia
None attested

52. Jones, *LRE* 3.11 n. 13, argues that *Thraciae* here means, not the province of Thracia, but “the rest of the diocese of Thrace” or “other provinces of the Thracian diocese.” But the fragmentary *CIL* 8.24521 (Carthage) has “consular. [prov. Europae consula]r. prov. Thrac.,” which might indicate that *ILS* 1240 runs together two separate posts.
HOLDERS OF OFFICES

Achaea (normally proconsul)\textsuperscript{53}

\begin{tabular}{lll}
?c. 285 & L. Turranius Gratianus & \textit{CIL} 3.6103 (Athens) \\
\textit{v. c., corrector} & & \\
293/305 & L. Sul. Paulus & \textit{Corinth} 8.2.23–25 \\
\textit{v. p., praeses} & & \\
?before 306 & Publilius Optatianus Porfyrius & \textit{AE} 1931.6 = \textit{SEG} 11.810 (Sparta) \\
?appointed for 307–308 & C. Vettius Cossinius Rufinus & \textit{ILS} 1217 (Atina) \\
318–320 & Aurelius Valerius Tullianus Symmachus Phosphorius & \textit{CTh} 2.4.1 (4 Feb. 319); 2.15.1 (25 July 319); \textit{IG} 7.96 = \textit{SEG} 13.297 (Megara); \textit{IG} 4.1608 = \textit{AE} 1901.125 (Argos) \\
?323–324 & Domitianus Zenophilus & \textit{ILAfr.} 456 (Bulla Regia) & \\
c. 330 & Ceionius Rufius Albinius & \textit{Firmicus Maternus, Math.} 2.29.10 &
\end{tabular}

Crete

\begin{tabular}{ll}
286/293 & Aglaus & \textit{I. Cret.} 4.281 (Gortyn) \\
Proconsul, presumably of the as yet undivided province of Crete and Cyrene & & \\
293/305 & M. Aurelius Buzes & \textit{I. Cret.} 4.282, 283 (Gortyn) \\
\textit{ηγεμών τῆς Κρήτης} & & \\
\end{tabular}

Dioecese of Pannoniae

\begin{tabular}{ll}
?316/324 & Valerius Catullinus & \textit{ILS} 704 (near Poetovio: under Constantine, who is not yet victor) \\
\textit{v. p. p(raeses) p(rovinciae) \{p\} P(annonniae) S(uperioris) } & & \\
?316/324 & Fabius Claudius & \textit{CIL} 3.5326 (Solva: dedication to Constantine, who is not yet victor) \\
\textit{v. p. p(raeses) p(rovinciae) N(orici) M(edieterranei)}\textsuperscript{54} & & 
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{53} E. Groag, \textit{Die Reichsbeamten von Achaia in spätromischer Zeit (Dissertationes Pannonicae} 1.14, 1946), 13 ff. The status and titles of two anonymous governors are important: a \textit{praeses et corrector} probably belongs to the reign of Diocletian (\textit{SEG} 11.887: Sparta), but Eunapius alludes to a proconsul who probably held office before 306 (Eunapius, \textit{Vitae Phil.} 9.2.3–30, pp. 483–485).

\textsuperscript{54} On governors of Noricum in the fourth century, see G. Winkler, \textit{Die Reichsbeamten von}
### Administrators and Governors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>296/305</td>
<td>Aurelius Arpagius</td>
<td>RIB 1.1912 (Birdoswald)</td>
<td><em>presumably of Britannia Secunda</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>Aurelius Proculus</td>
<td>ILS 640 (Vitudurum)</td>
<td><em>presumably praeses of Sequania</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298, late summer or autumn</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Pan. Lat. 9(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313, July 1</td>
<td>Antonius Marcellinus</td>
<td>CTh 11.3.1¹ (319 mss.)</td>
<td><em>praeses Lugdunensis primae</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312/324</td>
<td>M. Alfius Apronianus</td>
<td>CIL 12.1852 (Vienne)</td>
<td><em>v. p. praesae p(rovinciae) F(laviae) Vienne(ensis)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286/305</td>
<td>Attius Insteius Tertullus</td>
<td>CIL 5.2818 (Patavium); 6.1696</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 309</td>
<td>C. Vettius Cossinius Rufinus</td>
<td>ILS 1217 (Atina)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318/c. 327</td>
<td>L. Nonius Verus</td>
<td>ILS 1218 (Mutina)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


HOLDERS OF OFFICES

before 340  | M. Maecius Memmius  | ILS 1231 (Puteoli)
            | Furius Baburius Cae-
            | cilianus Placidus

Aemilia et Liguria (consularis)

321, July 1  | Junius Rufus (or Ru-
             | finus)  | CTh 4.13.1
323, May 21  | Ulpius Flavianus  | CTh 11.16.2
C. 327/c. 340| C. Julius Rufinianus Ablabius Tatianus | ILS 2942 (Abellinum)

Raetia (praeses)\(^{56}\)

290  | Septimius Valentinio  | ILS 618 (Augusta Vindelicum)
C. 275/c. 325 | Aurelius Mucianus  | CIL 3.5785 (Augusta Vindelicum)
C. 275/c. 325 | Valerius Venustus  | CIL 3.5862 (Zweifalten)

Alpes Cottiae (praeses)

286/305  | Aurelius Saturninus  | CIL 5.7248, 7249 (Segusio)

Tuscia et Umbria (corrector)

C. 310  | C. Vettius Cossinius Rufinus  | ILS 1217 (Atina)
C. 326/c. 340 | C. Julius Rufinianus Ablabius Titianus | ILS 2942 (Abellinum)

Flaminia et Picenum (corrector)

325, Nov. 8  | Claudius Uranius  | AE 1937.119 (Amiternum); CIL 9.4517 (Amiternum: undated)
or 13
before 330,  | M. Aurelius Valerius Valentinus  | CIL 11.5381 (Assisi), cf. CTh 16.2.7
Feb. 5
before 334  | Fabius Titianus  | ILS 1227 (Rome)
before c. 337 | L. Crepereius Madalianus  | CIL 14.4449 (Ostia); ILS 1228 (Calama)\(^{57}\)

---

\(^{56}\) The present list omits the anonymous v. p. praeses p(provinciae) R(aetiae) attested by CIL 3.14370.12 (Regina). PLRE 1.1020, Anonymus 92, dates him "before c. 314 when Raetia was divided into two provinces." The date of the division (attested for 354 by Ammianus 15.4.1) is unknown, see R. Heuberger, Klio 24 (1931), 348; A. Chastagnol, Historia 12 (1963), 358 n. 27.

\(^{57}\) M. Aurelius Consius Quartus was successively corrector of Flaminia et Picenum and of
**Campania** (corrector, *from late 324 consularis*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. 294</td>
<td>T. Flavius Postumius Titianus</td>
<td><em>ILS</em> 2941 (Rome)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293/298</td>
<td>Virius Gallus</td>
<td><em>ILS</em> 6310 (Capua)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293/300</td>
<td>Pompeius Appius Faustinus</td>
<td><em>CIL</em> 10.4785 (Teanum Sidicinum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 311</td>
<td>C. Vettius Cossinius Rufinus</td>
<td><em>ILS</em> 1217 (Atina)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 324</td>
<td>P. Helvius Aelius Dionysius</td>
<td><em>ILS</em> 1212 (Formiae)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324, Oct. or Nov.</td>
<td>L. Aelius Proculus</td>
<td><em>AE</em> 1969/70.107 (Puteoli: Constantine is victor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324, Nov. or Dec.</td>
<td>M. Ceionius Julianus</td>
<td><em>AE</em> 1939.151 (near Abellinum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325/337</td>
<td>C. Caelius Censorinus</td>
<td><em>ILS</em> 1216 (Atella)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325/337</td>
<td>?Junius Valentinus</td>
<td><em>CIL</em> 10.1482 (Naples: all letters in the name are dotted or supplemented)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?337</td>
<td>Julius Aurelianus</td>
<td><em>AE</em> 1969/70.108 (Puteoli); 116 (Formiae)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


58. One anonymous *consularis* is attested before 337 (*CIL* 9.2206: Telesia).


60. A. Chastagnol, *Historia* 12 (1963), 363, adduces *CTh* 8.18.4; *CJ* 3.1.8, 7.22.3 to establish a date of 314. But the first of these laws, dated 339 in the manuscripts, probably belongs to 329 (Seeck, *Regesten* 179; *PLRE* 1.259), while the second and third, both dated 314, are addressed “ad Dionysium vice praefectorum agentem” (*CJ* 7.22.3). Seeck held, very plausibly, that they are fragments of a law of Licinius (*Regesten* 53, 162).


62. *AE* 1969/70.108 honors a Caesar whose name has been erased: “Fl. Iulio [—nob]ilissimo ac [amant]issimo omnium Caesari.” The missing name is supplied as *Constanti* by E. Guadagno, *Rendiconti Lincei* 8 25 (1970), 119; as *Crispo* by G. Camodeca, *Atti dell’Accademia di Scienze morali e politiche, Napoli* 82 (1971), 24 ff. The latter is rendered virtually impossible by the fact that Aurelianus was *consularis* of Bithynia before he became *consularis* of Campania (*AE* 163)
HOLDERS OF OFFICES

?before 338  ?T. Antonius Marcellinus  ILS 6506 (Beneventum)

Apulia et Calabria (corrector)


Apulia et Calabria (corrector)


317/324  L. Nonius Verus  CIL 9.1115 (Aeclanum: 312/324),

317/324  L. Nonius Verus  CIL 9.1115 (Aeclanum: 312/324),

1116 (317/326);  ILS 1218 (Mutina)

317/324  L. Nonius Verus  CIL 9.1115 (Aeclanum: 312/324),

before 333  Clodius Celsinus Adelfius  ILS 1239 (Beneventum: corr. regionum duarum)

before 333  Clodius Celsinus Adelfius  ILS 1239 (Beneventum: corr. regionum duarum)

326/333  Volusius Venustus  ILS 5557a (Canusium: ddd. nnn. Constantino Aug. et filiis eius Caes.)

Lucania et Bruttii (corrector)

?before 306  -vius Bassus  AE 1975.261a (Paestum)

v. p. corr(ector) [re]gionum Lucaniae [et] Brittiorum: the fact that Bassus is a vir perfectissimus rather than a vir clarissimus probably points to a date before Maxentius or Constantine ruled Italy.

313, Feb. 16–Oct. 21  Rufinus Octavianus  CTh 7.22.1\(^{\text{s}}\) (319 mss.), 1.16.1\(^{\text{s}}\) (3 Aug. 315 mss.), 16.2.2\(^{\text{s}}\) (319 mss.)

313, Dec. 27–314, Feb. 6  Claudius Plotianus  CTh 11.29.1\(^{\text{s}}\) + 11.30.1\(^{\text{s}}\)

1969/70.116). On the other hand, Guadagno's arguments for a date in the summer of 335 are not compelling (p. 120 f.). The extravagant formula perhaps suggests rather the summer of 337 (cf. ILT 814, reproduced in Chapter VIII.4).

63. Known only from Renaissance copies (T. Mommsen, on CIL 9.1589): the date is obtained by emending the reported T anonio to T. Antonio and assuming identity with Antonius Marcellinus, cos. 341. PLRE 1.548/9, Marcellinus 16, 22, enters the consularis Campaniae as a different person from the consul.

64. For the identification of the regiones duae as the province of Apulia et Calabria, see Chastagnol, Fastes 133; PLRE 1.192–193, Celsinus 6; A. Chastagnol, Latomus 36 (1977), 801 ff. Beneventum was in the province of Campania by 333 (Itinerarium Burdigalense p. 610.8 ff. Wes-seling).

65. L. Turcius Apronianus has been deleted from the list in PLRE 1.1095: the Turciu[s] of CIL 10.407 (Volcei: 323) is a landowner, not a provincial governor, see E. J. Champlin, “The Volcei land-register (CIL X.407)” (forthcoming).
ADMINISTRATORS AND GOVERNORS

316, Jan. 16  Mecilius Hilarianus  
324/326  Alpinius Magnus  

CTh 9.19.1 + 12.1.3

Sicilia (corrector, after c. 324 consularis)

293/304  C. Valerius Apollinaris  

v. p.: all the other attested correctores are viri clarissimi

304, April 29—Aug. 12  Calvisianus  

Acta Eupli (BHG 629)

314, spring  Domitius Latronianus  

Eusebius, HE 10.5.21; ILS 677 (Panormus: 312/324); AE 1966.166 (Lilybaeum: 312/337); IG 14.296 (Panormus: undated)

before 320, 
Dec. 13  Domitius Zenophilus  

CIL 10.7234 (Lilybaeum: undated)

312/324  Betitus Perpetuus  

CIL 10.7204 (Mazara); ILS 8843 (Rome: undated)

293/c. 324  ?Zoilus  

CIL 10.7112 = AE 1959.23 (Catana)66

after c. 324  Alpinius Magnus  

AE 1966.167 (Lilybaeum)

υπάτ(ικός)

before 332  L. Aradius Valerius 

Proculus  

CIL 6.1690, 1691

c. 324/335  Fabius Titianus  

ILS 1227 (Rome)

c. 324/c. 335  C. Caelius Censorinus  

ILS 1216 (Atella)

Sardinia (praeses)67

286/305  Valerius Fl[. . .]nus  

EE 8.759 (Rotili Pioni)

Not necessarily a governor

66. L. Cantarelli, Studi e Documenti di Storia e Diritto 24 (1903), 278, argued that Zoilo corr. was an error for or contraction of Zenophilo corr. Identity is vigorously denied by S. Grasso, Epigraphica 15 (1953), 151 n. 4; G. Manganaro, Archivio Storico per la Sicilia Orientale 4 (1958), 13 ff.

67. P. Meloni, L'amministrazione della Sardegna da Augusto all'invasione vandalica (Rome, 1968), 229 ff. The present list omits one known anonymous v. e. pres. provine. Sard. (EE 8.764: Rotili Pioni), and Helennus, who was v. p., proc. between 335 and 337 (AE 1889.49: Telti).
### Holders of Offices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Holder</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>293/305</td>
<td>Aurelius Marcus</td>
<td>(EE\ 8.777, 778 = AE\ 1889.24, 30) (Sbrangatu); Sotgiu 1.388 (Olbia: name partly restored)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Valerius Domitianus</td>
<td>(AE\ 1948.178 = Sotgiu 1.241) (Turris Libisonis: before May 305); (CIL\ 10.8030) (between Caralis and Olbia: May 305/Sept. 306, apparently styling Domitianus (proc(urator)))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305/6</td>
<td>Maximinus</td>
<td>(EE\ 8.780 = AE\ 1889.25) (Sbrangatu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306, Nov./308</td>
<td>Cornelius Fortunatianus</td>
<td>(ILS\ 672) (near Terranova)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308/9</td>
<td>L. Papius Pacatianus</td>
<td>(AE\ 1966.169 = Sotgiu 1.372) (between Caralis and Sulci)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312/324</td>
<td>T. Septimius Januarius</td>
<td>(EE\ 8.783 = AE\ 1889.35) (Sbrangatu); (CIL\ 10.7950) (Turris Libisonis); 7974, 7975 (Olbia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319, July 29</td>
<td>Festus</td>
<td>(CTh\ 9.40.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335/337</td>
<td>Flavius Octavianus</td>
<td>(CIL\ 10.8015) (= (ILS\ 720), 8021 (milestones)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Corsica (praeses)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Holder</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?c. 300</td>
<td>-s Magnus</td>
<td>(AE\ 1962.144) d (Aleria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318, Oct. 24</td>
<td>Felix</td>
<td>(CTh\ 1.16.3^x = 2.6.2^*) (319 mss.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perhaps still governor on 28 July 320 if he is identical with the Furius Felix of \(CTh\ 2.11.1\) (no office stated)

### Diocese of Hispaniae

**Hispania Citerior (praeses)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Holder</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>286/293</td>
<td>Julius Valens</td>
<td>(AE\ 1929.233 = I. Tarraco 91)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

68. On the date, J. Jehasse, \(CRAI\ 1961.376\). \(PLRE\ 1.534/5\), Magnus 8, assumes identity with Alpinius Magnus and a date of 317/324.

69. A. Balil, \(Emerita\ 27\) (1959), 289 ff. (to 300). Two Spanish governors cannot be assigned to a specific province: Fortunatus in 298 (\(Passio Marcelli\)), and Exsuperius, between 335 and 337 (Ausonius, \(Professores\ 18(17).12–13\).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Governor</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>288 or 289</td>
<td>Postumius Lupercus</td>
<td><em>CIL 2.4104 = I. Tarraco 92</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>Valerius Julianus</td>
<td><em>CIL 2.4105 = I. Tarraco 94</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316, May 6</td>
<td>Julius Verus</td>
<td><em>CTh 2.6.1</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324/326</td>
<td>Badius Macrinus</td>
<td><em>CIL 2.4106, 4108 = I. Tarraco 95, 96 (324/337); cf. CIL 2.4107 = I. Tarraco 97 (?317/326)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hispania Tarraconensis (praeses)**

None attested

**Gallaecia (praeses)**

before 338 | Aco Catullinus | *CIL 2.2635 (Astruria: undated)*

**Lusitania (praeses)**

293/305 | Aurelius Ursinus | *CIL 2.5140 (Ossonoba)*

c. 300/c. 320 | Caecilianus | *ILS 1218 (Mutina)*

315/319 | C. Sulpicius -s | *CIL 2.481 (Emerita)*

336 | Numerius Albanus | *ILS 5699 (Olisipo)*

**Baetica (praeses)**

306/312 | Octavius Rufus | *CIL 2.2204 (Corduba)*

**Mauretania Tingitana**

None attested

**Diocese of Africa**

**Tripolitana (praeses)**

shortly after 300 | C. Valerius Vibianus | *IRT 577 (Lepcis); ILS 9352 (Tibubuci)*

---

70. Catullinus had become vicarius of Africa by 27 July 338 (*PLRE 1.187/8, Catullinus 3*).
71. An anonymous *praeses provinciae Lusitan[iae]* is attested between 333 and 335 (*AE 1935/4*).
73. The present list excludes at least two anonymous praesides who belong to the period 293-337: one before 305 (*AE 1954.184: Arae Philaenorum*), the other between 324 and 337 (*CIL 8.22767: Talalati*).
HOLDERS OF OFFICES

shortly after 300

Aurelius Quintianus  *ILS* 9352

Successor of Vibianus, and attested as governor of Numidia Cirtensis on 20 Nov. 303.

306, Nov./ 308, summer

Volusius Donatianus  *IRT* 465 (Lepcis: under Maxentius —a twin of *IRT* 464 which attests Valerius Alexander as vicarius)

324, Nov./ 326, summer

Laenatius Romulus  *IRT* 468 (Lepcis); 467 (312/337); 101 (Sabratha: undated); 574 (Lepcis: undated)74

*(Valeria) Byzacena* (praeses, after c. 324 consularis)

293/305 -cius Flavianus  *CIL* 8.23179 = *ILAlg*. 1.3832 (between Theveste and Thelepte)

293/c. 324 Vibius Flavianus  *AE* 1953.45 (Mactar)

313, Nov. 3- 314, April 17 Aco Catullinus  *CTh* 9.40.1 + 11.30.2 + 11.36.1 (published at Hadrumetum: Catullinus’ title is not stated)

312/c. 324 Agricola  *AE* 1946.45 (Chusira: v. c. praeses)

312/c. 324 -tianus  *CIL* 8.701 (Chusira: v. c. p(raesae))

321, Mar. 13- Aug. 29 Q. Aradius Rufinus Valerius Proculus  *CIL* 6.1684–1689 (partly reprinted as *ILS* 6111–6111 c)

321/c. 324 L. Aradius Valerius Proculus  *CIL* 6.1690 (= *ILS* 1240), 1691; 8.24521 (Carthage)

after 328 Cezeus Largus Maternianus  *ILAlg*. 1.4012 (Madauros), cf. *ILS* 5518 (near Vaga)

*Africa* (proconsul)75

285/290, for two years

Aurelius Antiochus  *ILAftr*. 513 (Thugga)


75. L. Poinssot, *MSNAF* 76 (1919–23), 264 ff. (295–307); T.D. Barnes, *HSCP* 80 (1976), 248 ff. (290–305). In these articles Poinssot assumed that the proconsular year began on approximately 1 July, while I entertained 1 June as a possibility. But Symmachus, *Epp.* 2.24 (a proconsul of Asia about to set out from Rome on 28 February 383) and the evidence relating to the African proconsuls of 315–320 imply that the proconsular year probably began at a variable date in the second half of April. Accordingly, the present fasti of Asia, Achaea, and Africa assume that the proconsular year began in April throughout the period 284–337.

The proconsul Claudius A— (*IRT* 522: Lepcis), who held office before 293, might belong to the reign of Diocletian rather than earlier —indeed, he might even be Aristobulus, proconsul
290–294 T. Claudius Aurelius Aristobulus  
ILAlg. 1.179 = ILS 5477 (Calama: attests four-year tenure); ILAlg. 1.1032 = ILS 5714 (Thagora); CIL 8.23413 + AE 1946.119 = Carthago 8 (1957), 100–103 (Mactar); ILAlg. 1.2048 (Madauros); CIL 8.11774 (Mididi) (all four before 293); ILS 637 (Mididi: 294); CIL 624 + 11782 (Mactar); ILAf.r.90 (Ksar-el-Hammam); CIL 8.23658 (Ksar Mdudja) (all three undated)

294–295 Cassius Dion  
Acta Maximiliani (BHL 5813: 12 March 295)

295–296 T. Flavius Postumius Titianus  
CIL 8.26566 (Thugga: 295), 26573 + 26567 + ILAf.r. 532 (Thugga: 294/6); CIL 6.1419b

296–300 L. Aelius Helvius Dionysius  
CIL 8.12459 (Maxula: procos. p. A. IIII); Frag. Vat. 41 (10 March 298); CIL 8.14401 = ILAf.r. 441 (Vaga: 298); CIL 8.26562 = ILAf.r. 531 (Thugga: undated)

300–301 or 302–303 M. Tullius T[...].nus  
CIL 8.1550 + 15552 (Agbia: 293/305)

301–302 Julianus  
Mos. et Rom. leg. collatio 15.3 (31 March 302, cf. Chapter V, n. 41)

303–305 C. Annius Anullinus  

305–306 or 306–307 C. Ceionius Rufius Volusianus  
ILS 1213 (Rome)

312, Nov.–313, April 15 Anullinus  
Eusebius, HE 10.5.15–17, 6.4, 7.1–2 (winter 312/3: 6.4 implies appointment by Constantine in Rome); Augustine, Epp. 88.2; Euse-

290-294. And an inscription of Calama records a proconsul whose name is lost, apparently in 325 or 334 (CIL 8.5357 = ILAlg. 1.270: v. c. procons. [...Flautino conss.).
### Holders of Offices

**Aelianus**

313–315

Aelianus is indubitably attested as proconsul only on 25 February 315, but the Theodosian Code contains eight fragments addressed to Aelianus and dated as follows:

- **10.15.1** dat. VI id. Nov. Trev(iris) Constantino A. IIII et Licinio IIII conss.

*CTh* 9.34.2 and 11.36.3 were probably published in 315, while all the other six fragments may come from a single imperial letter or rescript written in October or November 313.76

---

**Petronius Probianus**

315–317

Augustine, *Epp.* 88.4; *Contra Cresconium* 3.70.81; *Brev. Coll.* 3.23.41 (May 315); *CTh* 11.30.3 (25 Aug. 315), 11.30.5, 6 (13 Aug. 316); *ILS* 6809 (Vallis: undated)

---

**Aco Catullinus**

317–319

*CTh* 9.10.1 (17 April 317), 8.12.2 (20 April 317: the mss. have 316); *CJ* 3.11.4 (9 Feb. 318), 6.56.3 (27 July 318: the mss. have 315); *CTh* 11.16.1 (27 Aug. 318: the mss. have 319), 14.25.1 (12 Dec. 318: the mss. have 319; *CIL* 8.14453 (near Vaga), 24582 (Carthage); *ILAfr.* 269 (Thuburbo Maius: all undated)

76. Seeck, *Regesten* 161, 163. Augustine's undated references to Aelianus are listed in *PLRE* 1.17, Aelianus 2.
ADMINISTRATORS AND GOVERNORS

319–320 Proculus

CJ 8.52.2 (24 April 319); CTh 15.3.1 (7 May 319), 6.35.2 (27 July 319: the mss. have 315), 1.12.2 + 4.16.1 (26 Dec. 319)

320–321 Amnius Anicius Julianus

ILS 1220 (Rome)

?321–322 Domitius Latronianus

CIL 8.1016 (Carthage: before c. Nov. 324)

?322–324 Sex. Anicius Paulinus

CIL 6.1680, 1681 (Rome)

324–325 Mecilius Hilarianus

CTh 12.1.9 (9 July 324); CIL 8.1179 (Utica: after Sept. 324), 12524 (Carthage: undated)

326–327 Tertullus

CTh 9.21.3 = CJ 9.24.2 (6 July 326)

327–328 M. Ceionius Julianus

ILS 5518 (near Vaga: 326/333); CIL 8.14431 (near Vaga), 15269 (Thubursicu Bure), 25525 (Bulla Regia); ILAlg. 1.4011 (Madauros: all four undated)

328–332 Domitius Zenophilus

ILAfr. 456

332–333 L. Aradius Valerius

ILS 1240, 1241

Proculus

336–337 Q. Flavius Maesius

Firmicus Maternus, Math. 1, praef. 8

Egnatius Lollianus

Numidia (divided in 303) (praeses)77

?286 Flavius Flavianus

CIL 8.2480, 2481 (Ad Maiiores), 4325 (Casae); AE 1916.18 (Cuicul), 21 (Lambaesis); Kolbe, Statthalter 30 no. 6 (Henchir Tamarik)

All the inscriptions are dated 286/293: in CIL 8.4325, Diocletian is given the implausible titles t. pot. I, imp., cos., pro(consuli), which H. G. Kolbe has convincingly emended to t. pot. III, p(atri) p(atriae), cos., pro(consuli)

286/293 M. Aurelius Diogenes

CIL 8.2573–75 (Lambaesis); AE 1903.243 (Ain Karma)

77 Kolbe, Statthalter 28 ff. An anonymous v. p. praeses is attested between 286 and 293 (CIL 8.2718: Lambaesis).
HOLDERS OF OFFICES

?289/293  Aurelius Maximianus  *ILS 5786, 5787* (Lambaesis); *CIL 8.4224* (Verecunda), 7003 = *ILAlg. 2.579* (Cirta); 78 Kolbe, *Statthalter* 40 no. 3 (Thamugadi)

293/305  Aurelius Pi...nus  *AE 1917/18.30* (Lambaesis)

295, June 1  Valerius Concordius  *CJ 9.9.27* (28); *AE 1920.15* (Cuicul: 293/305)

303  Valerius Florus  *AE 1942/3.81* (Aqua Viva: 303); *CIL 8.6700* (executed Christians at Milevis); Optatus 3.8, p. 90 Ziwsa; Augustine, *Contra Cresconium* 3.27.30 (as persecutor); *CIL 8.4324* (Casae: 293/305)

v. p. p(raeses) p(rovinciae) N(umidiae) (AE 1942/3.81)

Numidia Militiana (303–314) (praeses)

303/305  Valerius Florus  *ILS 631–633; BCTH 1907.272* (Thamugadi); *AE 1955.81* (Lambaesis)

v. p., p(raeses) p(rovinciae) N(umidiae) M(ilitianae)

Numidia Cirtensis (303–314) (praeses)

303, Nov. 20  Aurelius Quintianus  *ILS 644* (near Macomades Minores) 79

305, spring–306  C. Valerius Antoninus  *CIL 8.1870* (near Macomades: before May 305); *ILS 651; AE 1895.80* (Thibilis: both after 1 Jan. 306); *ILAlg. 2.31* (Rusicade: undated)

Numidia (reunited in 314) (praeses, from 320 or earlier consularis) 80

314  Valerius Paulus  *CIL 8.18905* (Thibilis: 10 Dec. 313/c. Sept. 314, cf. Table 3); *ILS 688 = ILAlg. 2.582* (Cirta: 312/

78. The terminus post quem for Maximianus is deduced from the fragmentary victory titles of Diocletian and Maximian, viz. [Par]thicis Persicis Sarma[ticis]. Whether the first title is to be restored as [Par]thicis (so G. Wilmanns in CIL, H.-G. Pflaum in ILAlg.) or as [Go]thicis (W. Ensslin, RE 7A (1948), 2430; Kolbe, *Statthalter* 41 n. 1), Persicis should refer to the diplomatic triumph of 287, Sarma[ticis] following Persicis to Diocletian’s Sarmatian campaign in 289 (Chapter V: Diocletian).

79. On Florus and Quintianus, see especially the full discussion of Kolbe, *Statthalter* 48 ff.

80. The consulaires (of whom the earliest known belongs to 320) are listed and discussed by A. Chastagnol, *Mélanges J. Carcopino* (Paris, 1966), 224 ff.
324), cf. Optatus, App. 3, p. 205. 33/4 Ziwsa (Numidia still divided in spring 314)

\textit{v. p., \textit{praes} \textit{provinciae} \textit{N(umidiae)}}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{314/316} Iallius Antiochus \textit{CIL} 8.2241 (Mascula: before c. Oct. 316), 7005 = \textit{ILAlg.} 2.584 (Cirta)
  \item \textbf{?317/320} Aurelius Almacius \textit{CIL} 8.4469 (Nicivibus: fragmentary and with an erasure after [Fla]vi Valeri Constant]
\end{itemize}

\textit{v. p. \textit{praes} \textit{provinciae} \textit{N(umidiae)}}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{320, Dec. 13} Domitius Zenophilus Optatus, App. 1; \textit{AE} 1915.30 (Lambaesis: undated) consularis
  \item \textbf{330, Feb. 5} M. Aurelius Valerius Valentinus \textit{CTh} 16.2.7, cf. Optatus, App. 10, p. 215 (5 Feb., but without year or name); \textit{CIL} 11.5381 (Assisi)
  \item \textbf{333/337} Clodius Celsinus Adelfius \textit{ILS} 715 = \textit{ILAlg.} 2.587 (Cirta)
\end{itemize}

\textit{Mauretania Sitifensis (praeses)}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{after 293} Titus Atilius \textit{CIL} 8.8484 (Sitifis)
  \item \textbf{315} Septimius Flavianus \textit{CIL} 8.8476, 8477 = \textit{ILS} 695 (Sitifis: both style Constantine \textit{trib. pot.} \textit{X} and the latter alludes to his \textit{decennalia}); \textit{CIL} 8.8712 (Centenarium Solis: 312/324)
  \item \textbf{318} Flavius Terentianus \textit{CIL} 8.8412 = \textit{ILS} 696 (between Sitifis and Saldae: Constantine is \textit{trib. pot.XIII imp. XIII cos. IIII}, cf. Table 3)
\end{itemize}

\textit{Mauretania Caesariensis et Sitifensis (praeses)}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{324/337} Flavius Terentianus \textit{CIL} 8.8932 (Saldae)
\end{itemize}

\textit{Mauretania Caesariensis (praeses)\textsuperscript{81}}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{288} Flavius Pecuarius \textit{CIL} 8.8474 (Sitifis)
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{81} The present list omits an anonymous possibly Diocletianic \textit{v. p. p. M. Caes.} (\textit{CIL} 8.20964: Caesarea).
### Holders of Offices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>290–293</td>
<td>T. Aurelius Litua</td>
<td><em>ILS 627</em> (Auzia: year 251 of the provincial era), 628 (Caesarea: 286/305); <em>CIL</em> 8.8924 (Saldae: 286/305); <em>ILS</em> 6886 (Centenarium Aqua Frigida: 293/305); <em>AE</em> 1912.24 (undated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293/305</td>
<td>Ulpius Apollonius -ianus</td>
<td><em>ILS</em> 638 (Rapidum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?297</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>CIL</em> 8.21447–49 (Gunugu: three fragments which appear to show Diocletian as <em>trib. pot. XIX cos. VI</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305, May/306, July</td>
<td>M. Valerius Victor</td>
<td><em>AE</em> 1966.600 (Tipasa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311, May/312, autumn</td>
<td>Valerius Faustus</td>
<td><em>ILS</em> 671 (Caesarea)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?after 312</td>
<td>L. Junius Junillus</td>
<td><em>AE</em> 1975.882 (Urev, in Africa Proconsularis)*82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Dated Governors Whose Province Is Unknown83

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>286/290</td>
<td>Sallustianus</td>
<td><em>CJ</em> 9.41.18 (undated, but between rescripts of 286 and 290)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311/313</td>
<td>Theotecnus</td>
<td>Eusebius, <em>HE</em> 9.11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315 or 320, July 8–Oct. 1</td>
<td>Crispinus</td>
<td><em>CTh</em> 11.30.10 (mss. 315), 12.1.2 (mss. 320)*84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326, April 10</td>
<td>Florianus</td>
<td><em>CTh</em> 7.20.1 (318 mss.)*85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334, Aug. 25</td>
<td>Julianus</td>
<td><em>CTh</em> 11.39.3*86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335, Oct. 23</td>
<td>Pericles</td>
<td><em>CJ</em> 1.40.4*87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


83. The list of “provincial governors (province unknown),” *PLRE* 1.1110, contains men who are probably private citizens—and some who may be *vicarii* (such as Lucretius Paternus (*CTh* 12.1.17: 25 October 329)).

84. Seeck, *Regesten* 199 f., emended both dates to 353 (accepted hesitantly by *PLRE* 1.232, Crispinus 4). In favor of a Constantinian date, J. Gaudemet, *Iura* 2 (1951), 66 f.

85. *PLRE* 1.366, Florianus 2, adopts Mommsen’s emendation to 324.


87. P. Krüger, ad loc., emended *d. X. kal. Nov. Nicopoli to pp.*, on the grounds that Constantine was in Constantinople two days earlier (*CTh* 16.8.5, 9.1)—which would imply that Pericles was *praeses* of Moesia Inferior. Against the emendation, see Chapter V, n. 136.
CHAPTER Χ

NAMES IN ACTA MARTYRUM

More than a century ago, a scholar declared his intention of compiling a list of Roman officials named in hagiographical sources, but he was deterred by the magnitude of the task.¹ Something similar to part of this projected “Catalogus magistratum utriusque imperii ex Actis Sanctorum” is incorporated in the first volume of the Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire, but the execution manifests serious shortcomings. First, many entries rely on inferior texts, so that the best evidence is sometimes overlooked for such vital matters as a person’s name, status, or geographical location. Second, individual documents are sometimes treated capriciously: for example, the Acta Sebastiani name two bogus prefects of the city of Rome (PL 17.1114 ff.), but ‘Agrestius Chromatius’ is omitted while ‘Fabianus’ acquires an entry (322). Third, the editors fail to apply consistently the criterion for distinguishing between truth and falsehood which they announce at the outset.² Fourth, and most serious, the criterion of authenticity employed is inadequate. According to the list of “symbols and conventions” which prefaces the volume (xxii), a pair of asterisks and exclamation marks brands “persons known only from sources of doubtful reliability (principally the Historia Augusta and the Acta Sanctorum).” Yet genuine names can (and do) occur in “sources of doubtful reliability”; the distinction should be not between good and bad sources, but between genuine and invented persons.³

2. Thus Atharidus (121) and Rhothesteus (765), both known only from the Passio Sabae (BHG 1607) lack the stigmata, but a commentariensis has them even though an inscription is adduced (86, *!Apronianus!*). One entry also makes an explicit distinction between the genuine Acta Marcelli and the “spurious Acta Cassiani” (31).
3. Phoenix 26 (1972), 141 ff. Significantly, A. Chastagnol misreports the stated rubric as “en-
Deficiencies of this nature indicate a failure of organization rather than mere lapses in the execution of detail. The editors of the *Prosopography* have not consistently observed the principles of hagiographical method, which the Société des Bollandistes has developed over the course of three centuries, and to which Hippolyte Delehaye gave succinct, lucid, and classic expression. The purpose of the present chapter is to apply these principles to the problem of deciding which Roman officials and persons of high rank between 284 and 337 attested only by *acta martyrum* are genuine historical persons.

1. HAGIOGRAPHICAL METHOD AND PROSOPOGRAPHY

The relevant *acta martyrum* must first be classified according to their reliability and historical value. Delehaye made a sixfold division, which scarcely seems to admit of correction or refinement:

1. official reports of trials
2. accounts of eyewitnesses and of contemporaries reporting the accounts of eyewitnesses
3. *acta* of which the principal source is a written document belonging to categories 1 or 2
4. historical romances, including accounts plagiarized from the accounts of other martyrs
5. imaginative romances, in which even the hero has been invented
6. forgeries, i.e. legends composed with the conscious aim of deceiving readers

An obvious corollary can immediately be drawn. If a document belongs to either of the first two categories, then the names which it contains need no external corroboration in order to be presumed authentic. But which *acta martyrum* really belong to these first two categories? The number admitted has been continually diminishing, despite the publication of new passions and of more primitive versions of passions already known. For the years 284 to 337, T. cadrement par astérisque et point d’exclamation pour les personnages apocryphes ou suspects d’inauthenticité" (*REL* 50 (1972), 383).


6. For *acta* of the period before 250, *JTS*, n.s. 19 (1968), 509 ff. From the decade 250–260, the *Acta Acacii* (Knopf-Krüger 11 = *BHL* 25), the *Acta Maximi* (Knopf-Krüger 12 = *BHL* 5829) and the *Martyrium Cononis* (Knopf-Krüger 14 = *BHG* 361) must definitely be relegated from the highest two classes; see Delehaye, *Passions* 246 ff.; H. Leitzmann, *Kleine Schriften* 1 (TU 67, 1958), 241 ff.; A. Harnack, *Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius* 2 (Leipzig,
Ruinart's *Acta primorum martyrum sincera et selecta* (first published in 1689, and reprinted as late as 1859) offered more than fifty texts in all. The two most recent collections of *acta martyrum* contain, respectively, fourteen and twelve documents from the same period, and even some of the chosen dozen may need to be discarded before there remain only the completely reliable. The *acta* of Julius the veteran (*BHL* 4555), of Dasius (*BHG* 491), and of Irenaeus of Sirmium (*BHL* 4466) are all seriously vulnerable. Further, the *acta* of Crispina (*BHL* 1989a/b) contain some interpolations, while the most primitive version of the *Acta Eupli* (*BHG* 629) descends abruptly from reality to fiction (at p. 101.6 Knopf-Krüger = p. 312.16 Musurillo). On the other hand, the Donatist *Sermo de passione Donati* (*BHL* 2303b = *Clavis* 2 719) appears, on several criteria, to rank with authentic *acta* in the standard collections.

A definitive judgment is not always possible. Yet the two most recent collections of *acta martyrum* contain seven documents which the historian may legitimately trust as wholly authentic, provided that he takes into account the quality of the text and the available editions. They are the following:


104), 469 f. Between 260 and 284, recent collections contain only the *Acta Marini* = Eusebius, *HE* 7.15.


10. These *acta* belong to the troublesome third category, see Delehaye, *Légendes* 115. Musurillo prints a text (his 23) which he describes as "ultimately based" on Ruinart, *Acta primorum martyrum* (Ratisbon, 1859), 432–434: here, as elsewhere, he conspicuously fails to provide the "new critical edition" which his preface promises.


15. For a conspectus of manuscripts, editions, and studies, F. Masai, *Scriptorium* 20 (1966), 11 ff.; G. Lanata, *Byzantion* 42 (1972), 509 ff. It is not altogether certain that the extant recensions, which diverge substantially, permit the reconstruction of the original text undertaken by Lanata, see F. Dolbeau, *REL* 52 (1974), 572.  

16. On this *elogium*, see especially B. de Gaiffier, *Études critiques d'hagiographie et d'iconologie* (*Subsidia Hagiographica* 43, 1967), 81 ff. It contains the phrase “natalis genuini dominorum nostrorum eorundem Augustorumque Caesarum,” which was emended to “natalis gemini” and argued to be authentic by W. Seston, *Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne: Mélanges Goguel* (Paris, 1950), 239 ff.; *Historia* 1 (1950), 257 ff. But the reference to all four emperors together in the authentic part of the *Passio Marcelli* has the historically correct *diem festum imperatoris vestri* (2), i.e. the anniversary of Maximian’s proclamation as Caesar (Chapter 1, n. 5).  


Roman officials named in these seven documents (and also those named in the *Acta Eupli* and *Acta Crispinae*) deserve to be regarded as historical even if no confirmatory evidence exists.

An equally clear decision can be given on magistrates named in documents of the last three categories. Whether he intends to deceive or not, the hagiographer who composes a historical romance around a real martyr, or a romance with an invented martyr for hero, is unlikely to transmit genuine names. Admittedly, he might sometimes use a genuine name from a reliable source, and known historical characters do appear in hagiographical fiction; but they have often undergone changes of status, date, and place.\(^{21}\) The transformation of martyrs like Procopius and Theodorus suggests that genuine names and facts can be disengaged from thoroughly fictitious *acta* only with the aid of external evidence.\(^{22}\) Hence, if a document contains the name of an authentic magistrate whose title and historical setting have been changed, purely internal criteria will not suffice to detect and rectify the deformation.

There remains the large and difficult category of *acta martyrum* whose principal source is an official report or contemporary account, however often the text has been remodeled, expanded, or even interpolated. Literary analysis quickly reveals that the best texts in the category are but little inferior to contemporary accounts or documentary records, while the worst are almost indistinguishable from entirely fictitious compositions.\(^{23}\) Thus, at one extreme, the account of the trial of Agape, Irene, and Chione reproduces an official report without detectable alteration, but with additions at the beginning and end which can hardly be contemporary. Toward the other extreme, the version of the *Acta Felicis* printed by Ruinart illustrates the evanescence of genuine fact (*BHL* 2895). Anullinus, the proconsul of Africa, and the local *curator* Magnilianus survive unchanged from the more primitive *Acta Felicis*, which are clearly the main or only written source.\(^{24}\) But the legatus proconsulis is in the process of disappearing and being replaced by the proconsul himself, and a praetorian prefect has been invented, to whom Felix is dispatched from Africa and by whom he is executed at Venusia.\(^{25}\)

The literary classification of *acta martyrum* both reflects and indicates their historical reliability. But evidence external to the text must also be taken into ac-

---

\(^{21}\) Thus Annius Anullinus appears, not only correctly as proconsul of Africa (*BHL* 5809 = *Anal. Boll.* 9 (1890), 110–116; *BHL* 4279 = *Acta Sanctorum* Mai. 2 (Paris, 1866), 138/9), but also in northern Italy, where his alleged date fluctuates widely, see B. de Gaiffier, *Anal. Boll.* 72 (1954), 379.

\(^{22}\) For these two striking cases, see Delehaye, *Légendes* 119 ff.; *Saints militaires* 11 ff.

\(^{23}\) Delehaye, *Légendes* 114 ff.; *Passions* 260 ff.

\(^{24}\) Magnilianus should be the *curator* attested by *CIL* 8.23964/5, cf. R. Duncan-Jones, *JTS*, n.s. 25 (1974), 106 ff., who shows that the town cannot be Thibiuca, as is commonly supposed.

\(^{25}\) Ruinart, *Acta primorum martyrum* (Ratisbon, 1859), 290 f. I cite this notoriously inaccurate reprint rather than the editions of 1689 or 1713, on the grounds that it is more widely available.
HOLDERS OF OFFICES

count. The “hagiographical coordinates” of a martyr sometimes provide decisive proof that officials whom his acta name are unhistorical.26 For, if the cult of a martyr is attested at an early date in one place, while the extant passions or acta situate his trial and martyrdom elsewhere, then any Roman magistrates or officials whom they locate at a place where the martyr was neither tried nor executed are likely to be inventions.27

Two other types of criterion lend additional aid in exposing fiction. Hagiological inventions are often betrayed by obvious ignorance of specific historical details, as when the magistrate who tries a martyr bears an impossible or anachronistic title: for example, a praeses governing Corsica and Sardinia as a single province, a governor of Lycaonia decades before the province existed, or an otherwise unattested praefectus urbi at a date when the names of all the prefects are known.28

More serious, at least in its effects on modern comprehension, was the hagiographers’ overall conception of the period. Lactantius and Eusebius provide a clear outline of imperial policy toward the Christians.29 After the capture of Valerian (260), although Christianity probably remained in theory a capital crime, Christians were in practice left largely unmolested. Diocletian only attacked the church toward the end of his reign, and then under the influence of Galerius. Even though Christians in the eastern armies were ordered to sacrifice in 299, Diocletian did not promulgate the first general persecuting edict until February 303, and universal persecution was a brief episode. In the west, the edict ordaining universal sacrifice (spring 304) was never promulgated and persecution ceased altogether in 306. In the Danubian provinces, the persecuting edicts remained in force until 311, and in the Asiatic provinces persecution was finally halted by Licinius’ defeat of Maximinus (313). Finally, there were some executions of Christians under Licinius, between c. 320 and 324. These facts were too prosaic for generations of hagiographers, who replaced them with a “heroic age” of early Christianity in which Diocletian indulged in a vicious persecution throughout the twenty years of his rule. Many passions and acta martyrum depict Diocletian as ordaining persecution by imperial edict long before 303 — a fact which alone convicts them of invention and usually suffices to damn the magistrates whom they name.30

26. For the crucial importance of identifying saints by the day of their anniversary and the place of its celebration, see Delehaye, Méthode 5 ff.
27. E.g., ‘Pyrrhus’ (below, List C).
NAMES IN ACTA MARTYRUM

2. GENUINE AND FICTITIOUS NAMES

The three lists below attempt to apply sound principles of hagiographical method to the problem of segregating Roman officials attested by acta martyrum for the period 284–337 into the real and the bogus.

List A includes all persons appearing in the seven authentic acta martyrum listed above, and in the acta of Euplus and Crispina, who hold official posts in the Roman army or imperial administration or who possess senatorial status. They are listed whether their existence is confirmed by other evidence or not, and the list is intended to comprise all persons in this category.

List B contains holders of official posts in the Roman army or imperial administration attested solely by other acta martyrum who may be historical characters. This list is deliberately brief and select; some names in list C perhaps deserve promotion to list B.

List C contains names which the first volume of the Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire registers on the strength of acta martyrum alone but which should be rejected as fictitious.

The lists are thus diverse in both nature and comprehensiveness. Only the first aims at completeness; the second is by its very nature provisional; and the third is confined to existing entries in the Prosopography. Although a fuller collection of fictitious names could easily be compiled,31 its usefulness for study of the period of Diocletian and Constantine seems questionable. Furthermore, two deliberate omissions must be avowed: first, genuine officials or senators on independent attestation who appear in unreliable acta martyrum, unless they qualify for lists A or B; and second, genuine persons named only in other types of hagiographical documents, such as Eusebius' Martyrs of Palestine, the poems of Prudentius, calendars, and martyrologies.32

A. GENUINE PERSONS OF HIGH RANK

Aurelius Agricolanus (31)33

Agens vices/vicem/vice praefectorum praetorio, at Tingi on 30 October 298 (Passio Marcelli).

Anullinus (79)

Proconsul of Africa, from at least June 303 (Acta Felicis) to December 304 (Acta Crispinae).

31. E.g., by recourse to the excellent index in the reprint of B. Mombrtitius, Sanctuarium seu Vitae Sanctorum 2 (Paris, 1910), 761 ff.
32. For some important names in calendars, see B. de Gaiffier, Anal. Boll. 75 (1957), 17 ff.
33. The numbers in brackets supply the page reference in PLRE 1. Cross-references are not normally given to the discussions of posts, careers, and identities in Chapters VI–IX.
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Calvisianus (177)

ἀ λαμπρότατος κορρήκτωρ, at Catana in 304 (Acta Eupli), i.e. corrector of Sicilia. Calvisianus' title confirms the excellence of the source: after c. 324 the governor of Sicily bore the title consularis, not corrector.

Clodius Culcianus (233/4)

ήγεμών, at Alexandria (Acta Phileae). The date of Phileas' martyrdom is probably 4 February 307.34

Cassius Dion (253)

Proconsul, of Africa, at Theveste in March 295 (Acta Maximiliani).

Dulcitius (273)

ήγεμών, at Thessalonica in March 304 (Μαρτύρων τῶν ἁγίων Ἀγάπης, Εἰρήνης καὶ Χιόνης).

Fortunatus (370)

Praeses on 28 July 298 (Passio Marcelli). The version of the passion which presents Fortunatus as praeses at León, and therefore governor of Gallaecia (Recension N, ed. H. Delehaye, Anal. Boll. 41 (1923), 264–267), is secondary;35 hence Fortunatus' province is unknown. As for his name, the Prosopography enters him as Astasius Fortunatus (as in Recension M, ed. H. Delehaye, Anal. Boll. 41 (1923), 260–263). But Astasius is an unjustified emendation.36 Nor is the name Manilius (Recension N) adequately attested: in the edition by G. Lanata (Byzantion 42 (1972), 513–516), it occurs only in the interpolated letter of Fortunatus to Agricolanus (3a).

Maximus (not in PLRE 1)

ἀ λαμπρότατος, at Catana in 304 (Acta Eupli 1.2). Probably a member of the consilium of the governor Calvisianus.37

34. The day is attested by the Martyrologium Hieronymianum (Acta Sanctorum, Nov. 2.2 (Brussels, 1931), 77), while the year is inferred from the fact that Phileas wrote a letter from prison to Meletius which survives in a Latin translation (EOMIA 1.636/7, cf. K. Müller, Abh. Berlin, Phil.-hist. Klasse 1922, Abh. 3.12 ff.).
37. Or else a prominent local figure with access to the governor, see P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, Note agiografiche 7 (Studi e Testi 49, 1928), 6 ff.; G. Lanata, Gli atti dei martiri 226. The Latin version of the Acta Eupli printed by Ruinart styles Maximus unus ex amicis Calvisiani (Ruinart, Acta primorum martyrum (1859), 437 = p. 101.26 Knopf-Krüger = p. 314.7 Musurillo). The phrase appears to be an interpolation by Baronius, see Franchi de' Cavalieri, Note agiografiche 7 (1928), 37 ff.
Philoromus (698)
Executed at Alexandria with Phileas, the bishop of Thmuis (Acta Phileae (Latin) 7), probably on 4 February 307. About Philoromus' status, the evidence diverges. Eusebius states that he held "an office of no small importance in the imperial administration of Alexandria" (HE 8.9.7). In his translation, Rufinus seems to have misunderstood Eusebius' further remark that, in virtue of his rank, Philoromus was escorted by soldiers at his trial: hence he makes him vir turram agens militum Romanorum, and the Latin Acta Phileae may be dependent on Rufinus when they style him tribunus Romanorum, in a passage which is lacking in the Greek version and appears to be interpolated.³⁸

Pompeianus (712)
Advocatus at Theveste on 12 March 295 (Acta Maximiliani). Presumably an advocatus fisci.³⁹

?Valerius Quintianus (759)⁴⁰
Praepositus Caesariensis, at Theveste in March 295 (Acta Maximiliani 1.1). In the absence of a critical edition of these acta, neither the name nor the office can be regarded as certain.⁴¹

Anonymous (not in PLRE 1)
Legatus, at Carthage in July 303 (Acta Felicis 23 ff.). Clearly legate of the proconsul Anullinus.⁴²

B. Some Doubtful Cases

Ausonius (138)
Governor at Edessa, i.e. of Osrhoene, perhaps in 310 (Acts of Habib, BHO 367: English translation by F. C. Burkitt, Euphemia and the Goth (London, 1913), 112 ff.). The extant acta may be based on authentic information; hence the name of the governor may be genuine, even though its form is not unambiguously attested.⁴³

³⁸. Above n. 19.
³⁹. Delehaye, Passions 78.
⁴⁰. Valerius is an emendation: PLRE gives the first name as Valesianus following Ruinart, Acta primorium martyrum (Paris, 1689), 309 = (1859), 340, while Knopf-Krüger silently alter to Valerianus (p. 86.9).
⁴¹. For discussion, M. Durry, Mélanges Ernout (Paris, 1940), 129 ff.
⁴². Musurillo strangely alleges that he was "the legatus of the legio III Augusta, stationed at Carthage" (p. 269 n. 6).
HOLDERS OF OFFICES

Bassus (151)

The Prosopography registers two separate Bassi from acta martyrum: one as legatus in Moesia Inferior in 303 (from the Acta Dasii, BHG 491 = Knopf-Krüger 23 = Musurillo 21). The other as "governor in Thrace" c. 304 (from the Passio Philippi, BHL 6834). The date of 303 for the former depends on the assumption that he is genuine. As for the latter, the absence of Greek acta of Philippus is disturbing, and the Latin passion has some clearly invented characters (e.g., 'Mucapor,' cf. Victor, Caes. 36.2; HA, Aurel. 35.5 (the assassin of Aurelian)). Nevertheless, it is possible that there was a genuine governor named Bassus who persecuted Christians in the area in or soon after 303.

Dacianus or Datianus (244)

Prominent as a persecutor in several cycles of passions of Spanish martyrs, none of which merits any confidence. But acta circulated as early as c. 400 which named Datianus as the governor who had executed Vincentius (Prudentius, Peristephanon 5.40, 130, 422; Augustine, Sermo 276.4 (PL 38.1257)).

Heraclianus (not in PLRE 1)

Dux at Nisibis (Acts of Guriâ and Shamônä, BHO 363: English translation by F.C. Burkitt, Euphemia and the Goth (1913), 90 ff.). Not named in the main narrative, only with a list of martyrs outside Edessa. The source and value of this list remains problematical.

Lysias (523)

Lysias appears in a cycle of passions from Cilicia, which seem to have been composed no earlier than the division of Cilicia into two provinces some time after 381 (W. Lackner, Anal. Boll. 87 (1969), 115 ff.; 90 (1972), 241 ff.). Although the acta cannot be authentic (a date of 285 is alleged), local tradition may have preserved the name of a real governor who executed Christians in the region in the early fourth century.

Marcellinus (545)

The Sermo de passione Donati records events leading to the deaths of Donatist bishops, apparently on 12 March 317 (PL 8.752–758). The names of the persecutors are given thus: "Res apud Carthaginem gesta est Caeciliano pseud-episcopto tunc instante, assentiente Leontio comite, duce Ursatio, Marcellino

44. The entry invokes F. Cumont, Anal. Boll. 16 (1897), 8.
47. As in the Acta Claudii, p. 109.15 Knopf-Krüger—which were damned by P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, Nuovo Bollettino di Archeologia Cristiana 10 (1904), 17 ff. = Scritti agiografichi (Studi e Testi 222, 1962), 86 ff.
49. Migne prints the nonsensical Eudinepiso, from L. E. Dupin, Sanctus Optatus de Schismate Donatistarum (Antwerp, 1702), 191.
NAMES IN ACTA MARTYRUM

tunc tribuno" (2, PL 8.753). Two opposing views of the three officials are possible. Either the names and posts are all genuine (as the Prosopography assumes), or they are inventions based on three notorious enemies of the Donatists, who were active at different dates. Leontius and Ursacius are known from other evidence as persecutors of the Donatists (especially Optatus 3.1, 4, 10); while Ursacius cooperated with Domitius Zenophilus c. 320 (Augustine, Contra Cresconium 3.30.34), Optatus writes as if he and Leontius presided over different episodes (3.4, p. 85.3/4 Ziwsa: "sub Leontio, sub Ursacio... sub Paulo et Macario."). As for Marcellinus, the tribunus et notarius who presided over the Conference of 411 also bore the name Marcellinus—a coincidence which some have found not only suspicious but damning.

Mysianus (615)

Governor at Edessa, i.e. of Osrhoene, perhaps in 309 (Acts of Guria and Shamònà, BHO 363). As likely to be genuine as Ausonius.

C. REJECTED NAMES

The following names of persons attested as magistrates or possessors of high status between 284 and 337 only by dubious acta martyrum should be expunged both from the main section of the Prosopography and, if they occur there, from the fasti (1.1041–1127). The list normally enters (1) the name rejected; (2) a page reference to the first volume of the Prosopography; (3) a reference to the primary hagiographical document or documents which attest the name; and (4) the rank, title, or official position these allege (which is not necessarily that reported in the Prosopography). Where appropriate, brief annotation has been added.

50. PLRE 1.499-500, Leontius 4; 545, Marcellinus 3; 984, Ursacius 1.
52. Seeck, Geschichte 32, 517 f.
53. On the date and the form of the name, see Burkitt, Euphemia 29 f., 165.
54. Persons entered under the rubric "L III" are here included (e.g. ‘Acacius’). The following names from acta martyrum assigned to a date earlier than 284 should also be expunged: the consul ‘Agesius’ (PLRE 1.28); the former proconsul ‘Clarus’ (206); the conflated ‘Claudius Cleobulus,’ entered as a possible governor of Syria under Probus (216), cf. Phoenix 26 (1972), 172 n. 118; ‘Crispinus,’ praeses in Gaul under Aurelian (231.1); ‘Lampadius,’ consul three times (493.1); ‘Silvanus,’ comes in Bithynia under Aurelian (840).

On the other hand, the following persons whom the Prosopography stigmatizes (contrast 966, Vincentius 1) may be admitted as real persons whose status has been falsified: Mocius (604) is a genuine martyr whose cult is well attested, see H. Delehaye, Les origines du culte des martyrs (Subsidia Hagiographica 20, 1933), 233 ff.; Mustiola (614) is attested as a saint at Clusium (CIL 11.2549 = ILCV 4553), but the evidence that she was related to the emperor Claudius is worthless (BHL 4455/6); Theodorus (896) is a genuine martyr, who was in reality a humble recruit, not a Roman general (Gregory of Nyssa, PG 46.735 ff. = Acta Sanctorum, Nov. 4 (Brussels, 1925), 25 ff.). The doctor Aristo (105) named by Prudentius Peristephanon 10.896 ff., may also be historical (cf. Chapter VIII.1, on Asclepiades).
HOLDERS OF OFFICES

'Acacius' (6)  
BHG 279/80;  Father of 'Agilais'  
BHL 1413

'Agilais' (30)  
BHG 279/80;  Descendant of 'Clarus,' who is alleged to have been a proconsul, apparently in the middle of the third century  
BHL 1413

'Agrianus' (30)  
BHG 467;  Governor of Crete in 304

Argued to be authentic by P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, Note agiografiche 9 (Studi Testi 175, 1953), 210 f. The Latin passions of the same martyr place his death “sub Decio imp., agente Lucio duce” (BHL 2070).

'Alexander' (40)  
BHG 313y–318e;  Praeses of Cilicia c. 304

'Amandus' (50)  
BHL 7035;  Praeses of Pannonia Prima c. 304

Jerome, Chronicle 229v, dates the martyr's death to 307/8.

'Antiochus' (71)  
BHG 1624;  Dux of Augusta Euphratensis c. 304

The Prosopography enters 'Antiochus' as a genuine person, with appeal to A. H. M. Jones, JRS 44 (1954), 23 n. 32. But the passion of Sergius and Bacchus is clearly fictitious (Comm. Mart. Rom. 439), and the name 'Antiochus' is an obvious allusion to the Seleucid king of the second century B.C. against whom the Maccabees rebelled.

'Apellianus' (80)  
BHG 2399;  Proconsul, in Thrace

'Armenius' (108)  
BHO 107, 578, etc.;  Dux or comes of Alexandria c. 304

Vandersleyen, Chronologie 92, argues that 'Armenius,' who occurs often in the Coptic hagiography of Egypt, was dux of Egypt from 303 until 307 or even later, while the Prosopography states that “if he is genuine, he was presumably a comes sent by Diocletian or Galerius as an agent to prosecute the persecution.” In fact, 'Armenius' appears to be a double of the historical Satrius Arrianus, who also appears frequently in fictitious Egyptian acta martyrum (H. Delehaye, Anal. Boll. 40 (1922), 139, cf. 27 ff.).

'Asterius' (118)  
BHL 8569;  Praeses and praefectus, at Massilia c. 304

'Barbarus' (146)  
BHL 2156; 7490/1;  Praeses of Corsica and Sardinia in 304

'Baudus' (159)  
BHG 2280/1;  Praeses, in Thrace shortly before 324

'Celsina' (190)  
BHG 2280/1;  Clarissima femina, at Beroea shortly before 324

'Claudius' (207)  
BHL 8354;  Dux or comes of Mauretania Caesariensis in 303 or 304
‘Crispinus’ (232.3)  \textit{BHL} 2911/2  \textit{Praeses}, at Vienne, no date stated

‘Delphius’ (247)  \textit{BHL} 5092  \textit{Praeses}, in Sardinia c. 304

‘Diogenianus’ (257)  \textit{BHL} 4566–4569  \textit{Praeses}, in Baetica, no clear indication of date

‘Domitianus’ (262)  \textit{BHG} 314  \textit{ Comes}, made \textit{praeses} of Lycaonia c. 304

Lycaonia did not become a separate province until c. 370 (Basil, \textit{Epp.} 138).

‘Doncius’ (269)  \textit{BHL} 8354  \textit{Praepositus}, at Tigavum in 303 or 304

‘Dulcitius’ (273.1)  \textit{BHL} 1543–49  Governor at Aquileia under Diocletian

Presumably inspired by a Latin translation (\textit{BHL} 118–120) of the \textit{acta} which record the genuine Dulcitius at Thessalonica in 304.

‘Euphrates’ (299)  \textit{BHG} 1298  Quaestor and praetor at Rome before 287/8

‘Eustathia’ (310)  \textit{BHG} 1298  Wife of ‘Euphrates’

‘Eustratius’ (314)  \textit{BHG} 1742  Governor at Alexandria c. 304

Delehaye assigned the \textit{acta} to the category of imaginative romance (\textit{Légendes} 113 ff.).

‘Euticius’ (316)  \textit{BHL} 8569  \textit{Praeses} and \textit{praefectus}, at Massilia c. 304

‘Eutolmius’ (316)  \textit{BHG} 39/40  \textit{ Comes}, in Bithynia and Thrace under Galerius

‘Eutychianus’ (319)  \textit{BHO} 578  Governor or \textit{comes} of Pchati, i.e. Nikiu, when Arrianus was governor of the Thebaid

Vandersleyen, \textit{Chronologie} 89 ff., argued that ‘Eutychianus’ was possibly prefect of Egypt in 308/9. That thesis being proven impossible (\textit{P. Oxy.} 2666/7), the \textit{Prosopography} suggests that he may have been governor of the Thebaid c. 306

‘Eutychius’ (321)  \textit{BHL} 8627–40  Son of the consul ‘Agesius’

‘Fabianus’ (322)  \textit{BHL} 7543  \textit{Praefectus}, at Rome in or shortly after 286

The name was inspired by that of Fabianus, bishop of Rome, whose death was celebrated on the same day as St. Sebastian (Delehaye, \textit{Méthode} 36).

‘Firmilianus’ (338)  \textit{BHG} 1250  \textit{Tribunus}, in Phrygia c. 304

‘Flavianus’ (343)  \textit{BHL} 2567  Deputy of ‘Julicus’

‘Gaius’ (381)  \textit{BHL} 108/9  \textit{Iudex}, at Augusta Vindelicum c. 304

‘Julicus’ (481)  \textit{BHL} 2567  \textit{Iudex}, in Sardinia c. 304

187
'Julicus' is the 'Oulcion' of Greek legends of Procopius, and his deputy 'Flavianus' the genuine Flavianus, governor of Palestine in 303 (Delehaye, *Légendes* 135 f.).

'Justinus' (489)  
 accordance to the *Passio Philippi*, successor of Bassus (List B).

'Laodicius' (495.1)  
 Proconsul of Europa in 287/8

'Laodicius' (495.2)  
 Praefectus urbis c. 304

'Leuco' (505)  
 Consiliarius of 'Maximus' (*PLRE* 1.580.3)

'Marianus' (559)  
 Palatinus, with Licinius in Thrace shortly before 324

'Maximinus' (576)  
 Proconsul of Europa in succession to 'Laodicius'

'Maximus' (580.3)  
 Praeses, in Campania, no clear indication of date

The martyrs in question belong in fact to Moesia (*Comm. Mart. Rom.* 224f.).

'Maximus' (580.4)  
 Praeses, at Durostorum tempore persecutionis

The *Acta Julii* are pronounced "bonae notae iudicio peritorum" in *Comm. Mart. Rom.* 212.

'Maximus' (580.5)  
 Praeses, at Siscia c. 304


'Fl. Gaius Numerianus Maximus' (588)  
 Praeses, at Tarsus under Diocletian

'Megetius' (592)  
 Augustalis, in Umbria under Diocletian 3001–6

The *Acta Firminae* appear to be no earlier than the seventh century and the martyr herself is fictitious (*Comm. Mart. Rom.* 542 f., 558).

\textit{"Olympiades" (642)} \textit{BHL, Supp. Consularis and augustalis, predecessor of ‘Megetius’}

\textit{Pancratius’ (664)} \textit{BHL 1637} Proconsul of Tuscia under Diocletian

The \textit{Acta Cassiani} seem to be a deliberate forgery, probably of the sixteenth century (\textit{Acta Sanctorum}, Aug. 3\textsuperscript{3} (Paris, 1867), 20 f.).

\textit{Philippesius’ (695)} \textit{BHG 1298} \textit{Praefectus}, at Heraclea in Thrace in 287/8

\textit{Philophron’ (698)} \textit{BHG 619} Senator under Diocletian

\textit{Plautianus’ (706)} \textit{BHL 3315} \textit{Praefectus} in Rome with Diocletian

‘Plautianus’ surely owes his name to Fulvius Plautianus, the praetorian prefect of Septimius Severus; the martyr Genesius seems to be bogus and his passion is a “roman d'imagination” (\textit{Comm. Mart. Rom.} 359; Delehaye, \textit{Légendes} 113ff.).

\textit{Possidonius’ (717)} \textit{BHG 2416} \textit{Praepositus} of the legion II Traiana, in Hellespontus under Licinius

Modeled on the \textit{ducenarius} ‘Possidonius’ in \textit{acta} of Theodorus (Delehaye, \textit{Saints militaires} 24ff., 128, 139 f.).

\textit{Priscus’ (729)} \textit{BHG 619} Proconsul of Europa c. 304

\textit{Probus’ (736)} \textit{BHL 4466; 6869} \textit{Praeses Pannoniae} c. 304

The \textit{Passio Pollionis} (\textit{BHL} 6869) is pronounced “bonae notae” in \textit{Comm. Mart. Rom.} 106. I suspect that ‘Probus’ owes his existence to the fact that the emperor Probus was killed at Sirmium.

\textit{Proculus’ (745)} \textit{BHL 8072} Proconsul at Alexandria c. 304

‘Proculus’ corresponds to ‘Eustratius’ in the Greek \textit{acta} of the same saints (\textit{BHG} 1742).

\textit{Publio’ (754)} \textit{BHG 1574; BHL 7981–85} \textit{Tribunus or princeps}, under Diocletian

\textit{Publius’ (754.1)} \textit{BHG 1761–1762d} \textit{Praeses}, at Antioch c. 304

The manuscripts of the earliest Greek version of the \textit{Passio Theodori} give his name as both ‘Publius’ and ‘Publius Strato’ (\textit{Acta Sanctorum}, Nov. 4 (Brussels, 1925), 32).

\textit{Publius’ (754.2)} \textit{BHL 6834 Assessor praesidis}, i.e. of Bassus (List B)

---

56. The historicity of Genesius (but not of the passio) is defended by A. Amore, \textit{I martiri di Roma} (Rome, 1975), 102 f.
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‘Pyrrhus’ (756)  

BHG 1250  Governor, at Cotyaeum c. 304

Menas, whose fictitious acta attest both ‘Firmilianus’ and ‘Pyrrhus,’ was an Egyptian saint whose cult was introduced to Cotyaeum toward the middle of the fifth century, see P. Peeters, Orient et Byzance: Le tréfonds oriental de l’hagiographie byzantine (Subsidia Hagiographica 26, 1950), 32 ff.).

‘Rictiovarus’ (766)  

Praeses and praefectus, in northern Gaul, c. 304

‘Rictiovarus’ appears in many passions of Gallic martyrs (C. Jullian, REA 25 (1923), 367 ff.), but Lactantius expressly denies that any Christians were executed in Gaul under Constantius (Mort. Pers. 15.6).

‘Severus’ (831)  

BHL 6702  Praeses, in Palestine under Galerius

‘Simplicius’ (843)  

BHL 1413  Iudex, in Cilicia in 290

Not named in the Greek acta (BHG 279/80).

‘Symphronius’ (871)  

BHL 156 = Clavis² 2159  Praefectus (urbi), some years before Constantine

‘Theotecnus’ (908)  

BHG 1782  Governor, in Galatia c. 304

Clearly modeled on the genuine Theotecnus (Eusebius, HE 9.2.2, 3.4, 11.5 f.).

‘Thrason’ (910)  

BHL 2062  Magister militum at Rome in 298/9

The Passio Cyriaci which makes ‘Thrason’ a magister militum appears to be based on bogus acta of Marcellus, bishop of Rome, but these attest no official post (BHL 2056–59, cf. BHL 5234/5; Comm. Mart. Rom. 24).

‘Zelincinthius’ (990)  

BHG 2416  Tribunus of the legion II Traiana, under Licinius

The Prosopography enters the name as ‘Zelicentius’ from the Latin translation of the Passio Theagenis (BHL 8106).

‘Anonymus’ 3  

BHL 2895  Praefectus praetorio in Italy in 303

(1005)

In a spurious addition to the genuine Acta Felicis.

‘Anonymus’ 4  

BHL 2275  Iudex, praefectus, and praeses Galliarum c. 304

(1005)


58. For proof that the Latin passio is a mere translation from the Greek, P. Franchi de’ Cavalieri, Note agiografiche 4 (Studi e Testi 24, 1912), 161 ff.
In epilogue, a note of caution must be sounded. The evaluation of *acta martyrum*, and of the historical information which they contain, must necessarily proceed from known and verifiable facts. Sometimes complete certainty can be attained, but the majority of cases fall far short of conclusive proof. The preceding lists attempt to apply general principles of hagiographical method to a large number of individual and varied problems. It cannot be assumed that the application will have been equally successful in every instance. The discovery of an inscription has sometimes confirmed the existence of a governor previously known only from late and unreliable documents whose debt to local tradition or a lost written source had passed undetected. Other *acta martyrum* whose testimony has here been rejected may await the same vindication.


60. Observe, e.g., C. Foss, *DOP* 31 (1977), 33 ff. (the hagiography of Ancyra); 86 (governors of Galatia and vicarii of Pontus from the *Vita Clementis* (*BHG* 353)). Elsewhere in the present volume, I have adduced the *Passio Quattuor Coronatorum* as putative evidence for the movements of Diocletian (Chapter V, n. 42), the *Passio Sabini* for the movements of Maximian (Chapter V, n. 61), and for a praetorian prefect (Chapter VIII, at nn. 58–61), and the hagiography of Myra for a governor of Phrygia (Chapter IX, n. 46).
PART THREE

THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE EMPIRE
Imperial pronouncements of all types were conventionally issued in the joint name of all the emperors who belonged to the imperial college; hence, for example, a letter of Constantius which speaks of "meus Constanti Caesaris ex Italia revertentis comitatus" can be described as "hae imperatorum et Caesarum litterae" (Pan. Lat. 9(4).14.1, 15.2). But a legal enactment of one emperor might not be enforced or even promulgated by his colleagues. The clearest case concerns the edicts which Diocletian issued against the Christians in 303 and 304: the first edict was promulgated throughout the empire, but Constantius declined to enforce it strictly in the territories which he ruled (Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 15.6-7), while the fourth and most severe edict was neither enforced nor (it seems) promulgated anywhere in the western half of the Roman Empire.¹ Since the identity of the emperor who exercised effective control over a particular area influenced the policies which impinged on its inhabitants, this chapter sets out to present as clearly as possible the evidence for the political divisions of the Roman Empire between 285 and 337.²

1. CHRONOLOGICAL SURVEY

285–293

Diocletian was proclaimed Augustus on 20 November 284 at Nicomedia and was at once recognized as ruler throughout Asia Minor, the east, and

1. G. E. M. de Ste Croix, HTR 47 (1954), 84 ff. Similarly, all the very numerous fragments the edict of 301 on maximum prices come from the eastern half of the empire, and there is no reason to believe that the edict was published in the west (J. and L. Robert, BE 1964.69).

2. Detailed cross-references are not given for statements based on Chapters I, II, and V.
He must also quickly have acquired the Danubian provinces closest to Asia. In 285, probably in the spring, Diocletian defeated Carinus and thus became recognized as ruler throughout the Roman Empire. On 21 July 285 he appointed Maximian Caesar and dispatched him to Gaul.

Maximian became Augustus on 1 April 286, but soon lost control both of Britain (which had its own emperor until 296) and of a large part of northwestern Gaul (until 293). A formal division of the empire between the two Augusti is nowhere explicitly attested, but the panegyrist of 289 may allude to such a division when he expresses the wish that “tuque potissimum (credo enim hoc idem Diocletianum Oriens rogat) has provincias tuas frequenter inlustres” (Pan. Lat. 10(2).14.4). If the empire was formally divided, then Maximian's portion comprised Italy, Africa, Gaul, and Spain.

293–305

Lactantius expressly states that the appointment of the Caesars entailed a fourfold division of the empire: “tres enim participes regni sui fecit [sc. Diocletianus] in quattuor partes orbe diviso” (Mort. Pers. 7.2). Aurelius Victor (Caes. 39.30) and Praxagoras (FGrH 219) provide details, which can be supplemented from elsewhere (Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 8.3; Pan. Lat. 8(5).6.1). In the west, Maximian held Italy, Africa, and Spain, while the Caesar Constantius received most of Gaul in March 293, won the rest of Gaul in summer 293, and added the still rebellious Britain in 296. In the east, according to Victor and Praxagoras, the Caesar Galerius was assigned the Danubian provinces, while Diocletian retained Asia Minor and the diocese of Oriens (which included Egypt). But Diocletian spent the years 293 and 294 on the Danube frontier, while Galerius appears to have gone to Egypt. Moreover, the Persian War of 296–299 and a revolt in Egypt in 297–298 necessitated the presence of both Diocletian and Galerius in the oriental provinces. Victor and Praxagoras, therefore, describe a situation which obtained only from 299 to 305. The contemporary evidence indicates that in 293 Galerius had received the diocese of Oriens, with Diocletian retaining the Danube area and probably the whole of Asia Minor.

Between 293 and 305, even if formally divided into four, the Roman Empire was in practice divided into two, but even this division was disregarded on
some occasions and for some purposes. Each Augustus and his Caesar coo-
perated in military and political crises, so that Maximian defended the Rhine
when Constantius invaded Britain (Pan. Lat. 8(5).13.3), while Diocletian and
Galerius not only acted together during the Persian War of 296–299, but also
conferred in Nicomedia in 303 and 305, while Diocletian probably campaigned
on the Danube in 304. But only two occasions are recorded on which an
eastern and western emperor entered the other half of the empire: Diocletian
visited Italy in 303/4 and Galerius had a meeting with Maximian late in 304 or
early in 305 at an unknown location. On the other hand, Diocletian is known
to have replied to a petition from Africa in September 293 (Epitome Codicis
Hermogeniani 2 (FIRA 2.266)) and to a letter from the proconsul of Africa on
31 March 302 (Mos. et Rom. legum collatio 15.3).

305–306

After the abdication of Diocletian and Maximian on 1 May 305, the existing
fourfold division was altered. In the east, Galerius took Asia Minor in addition
to the Danubian provinces, while the new Caesar Maximinus received the dio-
cese of Oriens (Eusebius, HE 9.1.1). In the west, Constantius added Spain to
Gaul and Britain, while the new Caesar Severus received Italy and Africa.

The evidence for the division of the west requires explicit discussion. Both
the emperor Julian and Orosius expressly state that Constantius ruled Spain
(Orat. 2, 51d; Hist. Adv. Pag. 7.25.15), and there is no reason to dispute their
testimony,6 since the panegyric of 313 fails to praise Constantine for liberating
Spain (Pan. Lat. 12(9).25) and thus implies that it was never subject to Maxen-
tius. As for Severus, one source attributes to him the diocese of Pannoniae as
well as Italy and Africa (Origo 9). But the same source elsewhere limits Severus
to “Italiani et quicquid Herculius obtinebat” (Origo 5), and no other writer
hints at his possession of Pannonia; therefore, Eutropius’ statement that Gale-
rius retained the whole of Illyricum (Brev. 10.1.1) should be correct.

306–313

When Constantius died, his domains passed to Constantine; from 306 to
312, therefore, the latter ruled Britain, Gaul, and Spain.8 On 28 October 306 a
revolt occurred at Rome; when Severus attempted to suppress it in spring 307,
he was deposed and Maxentius became the ruler of Italy and Africa. Maxen-

6. The standard edition of Orosius deletes Hispaniaque (K. Zangemeister, CSEL 5 (1882),
492). However, although Orosius has added the word to Eutropius, Brev. 10.1, which he is here
copying, he may, as a Spaniard himself, have derived his knowledge from valid local memories or
tradition.

7. The Maxentian coinage of Tarraco alleged by older scholarship belongs to Ticinum, see C.
H. V. Sutherland, RIC 6 (1967), 6 f., 43, 266 ff.; P. Bastien, Latomus 38 (1979), 90 ff.

8. Stein, Bas-Empire 1:83, 426, postulates a priori that in 306 Spain passed briefly under the
sway of Severus.
tius lost control of Africa to Domitius Alexander for a period (probably 308-309), and was defeated by Constantine in 312, who thus became master also of Italy, Africa, and the islands of the western Mediterranean.

Although Licinius became Augustus on 11 November 308, no formal assignment of territory is alleged in any source; he may have shared with Galerius the defense of the whole Danubian frontier, and hence the administration of all the Danubian provinces. On the death of Galerius in 311, Maximinus seized Asia Minor; in 313 he invaded Europe, but was defeated, with the result that Licinius became emperor in Asia Minor and Oriens.

313-324

The division of the Roman Empire between Constantine and Licinius from 313 to 316 was almost the same as the twofold division under Diocletian. After the war of 316/7 Licinius lost all his European territories except the diocese of Thracia (Origo 18). Constantine thus acquired virtually the whole of the Danubian area, mainland Greece, and most of the Aegean islands. On 1 March 317, three Caesars were formally proclaimed. Two were infants and presumably had no separate establishments. Although the third, Crispus, conducted military operations in Gaul independently of Constantine, it is unlikely that there was any formal assignment of territory.

324-337

In 324 Licinius was defeated and the Roman Empire united again. Toward the end of his reign, Constantine divided the empire among several Caesars, each of whom had a separate apparatus of government (Eusebius, VC 4.51/52). Three sources indicate the areas which each received (Eusebius, VC 4.51.1, deliberately confusing the divisions of 335 and 337; Origo 35; Epitome 41.20): Constantinus had Gaul, Britain, and Spain; Constantius, Asia Minor and Oriens; Constans, Illyricum, Italy, and Africa; Dalmatius, the lower Danube and Greece. Constantine himself, however, clearly retained overall control everywhere. In the summer of 337, after Constantine died, Dalmatius was killed and his territories were reapportioned: Constantius gained Constantinople and the neighboring provinces (Philostorgius, HE 3.14), while Constans appears to have acquired Macedonia and Achaea (Zonaras 13.5).

9. It is sometimes supposed that Licinius was formally appointed Augustus of the West (so, recently, A. Arnaldi, Memorie dell'Istituto Lombardo, Classe di Lettere, Scienzi Morali e Storiche 35 (1975), 217 ff.). That is a plausible, but not a necessary, corollary of the fact that he replaced Severus in the imperial college and was expected to suppress Maxentius (Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 29.2; Origo 13; Zosimus 2.11).

10. Zosimus 2.39.2 states that Constantinus and Constans jointly ruled Britain, Gaul, Spain, Italy, Africa, Illyricum, and the Danubian region, and he implies that Dalmatius controlled no territory. That probably reflects Eunapius' genuine ignorance of the difference between the divisions of 335 and 337.

11. Libanius, Orat. 59.46.
### 2. DIOCESES AND THEIR EMPERORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Emperor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oriens:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>284–293</td>
<td>Diocletian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>293–296</td>
<td>Galerius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>296–299</td>
<td>Diocletian and Galerius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>299–305</td>
<td>Diocletian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>305–313</td>
<td>Maximinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>313–324</td>
<td>Licinius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>324–337</td>
<td>Constantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>337–361</td>
<td>Constantius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asiana and Pontica:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>284–305</td>
<td>Diocletian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>305–311</td>
<td>Galerius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>311–313</td>
<td>Maximinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>313–324</td>
<td>Licinius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>324–337</td>
<td>Constantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>337–361</td>
<td>Constantius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thracia:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>284–299</td>
<td>Diocletian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>299–311</td>
<td>Galerius (from 308 with Licinius)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>311–324</td>
<td>Licinius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>324–337</td>
<td>Constantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>337</td>
<td>Dalmatius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>337–361</td>
<td>Constantius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moesiae:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>285–299</td>
<td>Diocletian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>299–311</td>
<td>Galerius (from 308 with Licinius)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>311–316/7</td>
<td>Licinius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>316/7–337</td>
<td>Constantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>337</td>
<td>Dalmatius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>337–350</td>
<td>Constans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pannoniae:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>285–299</td>
<td>Diocletian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>299–311</td>
<td>Galerius (from 308 with Licinius)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>311–316</td>
<td>Licinius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>316–337</td>
<td>Constantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>337–350</td>
<td>Constans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Britanniae:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>285–286</td>
<td>Maximian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>286–293</td>
<td>Carausius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>293–296</td>
<td>Allectus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>296–306</td>
<td>Constantius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>306–337</td>
<td>Constantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>337–340</td>
<td>Constantinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Galliae and Viennensis:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>285–293</td>
<td>Maximian (with northwestern Gaul under rebel control from 286 to 293)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>293–306</td>
<td>Constantius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>306–337</td>
<td>Constantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>337–340</td>
<td>Constantinus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### The Administration of the Empire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Emperors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Italia:</strong></td>
<td>285–305</td>
<td>Maximian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>305–306/7</td>
<td>Severus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>306/7–312</td>
<td>Maxentius&lt;sup&gt;12&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>312–337</td>
<td>Constantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>337–350</td>
<td>Constans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispaniae:</strong></td>
<td>285–305</td>
<td>Maximian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>305–306</td>
<td>Constantius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>306–337</td>
<td>Constantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>337–340</td>
<td>Constantinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Africa:</strong></td>
<td>285–305</td>
<td>Maximian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>305–306/7</td>
<td>Severus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>306/7–308</td>
<td>Maxentius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>308–309</td>
<td>Domitius Alexander&lt;sup&gt;13&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>309–312</td>
<td>Maxentius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>312–337</td>
<td>Constantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>337–350</td>
<td>Constans&lt;sup&gt;14&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>12</sup> Maxentius held some of the outlying provinces either more briefly or not at all: he probably never controlled Raetia, which was presumably administered with the diocese of Pannoniae from 307 until 312, and it seems that he lost the peninsula of Istria to Licinius in 309 or 310 (A. Je-jočnik, *The Čentur Hoard: Folles of Maxentius and of the Tetrarchy* (Situla 12, 1973), 163 ff.; V. Picozzi, *Numismatica e antichità classiche* 5 (1976), 267 ff.). Whether or not Maxentius ever recovered Istria, it appears to have been under the control of Licinius, not of Constantine, between 312 and 316 (*Origo* 15).

<sup>13</sup> Alexander also controlled, at least for a period, Sardinia, which belongs to the Italian diocese (*Sotgiu* 1.372 = *AE* 1966.169: undated).

<sup>14</sup> But Constantinus issued a rescript from Trier to the proconsul of Africa on 8 January 339 (*CTh* 12.1.27). He appears to have been accorded, at least for some time, preeminence in the imperial college, see O. Seeck, *ZfN* 21 (1898), 44 ff.
A seventh-century manuscript in the library of the cathedral at Verona preserves a list of the provinces of the Roman Empire which has obvious relevance to Diocletian's administrative reforms. It was first published by Scipione Maffei in 1742, but subsequently escaped scholarly notice until 1862, when Theodor Mommsen republished it under the title "A List of the Roman Provinces Drawn Up c. 297." Since then the document, conventionally styled the "Verona List" or the "Laterculus Veronensis," has been the subject of much discussion, both as a whole and in detail. This chapter offers a diplomatic text, a brief discussion of the date and nature of the list, and a reconstituted list of the provinces of the Roman Empire as they probably were when the Verona List was originally compiled.

1. DIPLOMATIC TEXT OF THE VERONA LIST

Manuscript
Verona, Bibliotheca Capitolare II(2), fols. 255-256. (For a description of the manuscript, see E. A. Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores* 4 (Oxford, 1947), 21, no. 477.)

Editions
F. S. Maffei, *Istoria teologica delle dottrine e delle opinioni corse ne' cinque primi secoli in proposito della divina Grazia, del libero arbitrio e della

Concerning these editions, it will suffice to say that the first is inaccessible, while the other three not only concur in several small errors (e.g. in reporting syrae cohele where the manuscript clearly divides the words syria ecohele), but also prejudice important historical questions, either by numbering the provinces, sometimes wrongly (Mommsen, Seeck), or by deleting parts of the text as interpolated (Riese).

Printed below is a transcript of the Verona List made from photographs kindly supplied by the Biblioteca Capitolare of Verona. The reports and emendations of earlier editors are deliberately ignored: I note only variants in the manuscript. (The stops printed here on the line (.) are raised in the manuscript (·).

fol. 255, recto

14 Incipit eiusdem nomina prouinciarum omnium.
15 Diocensis orientis habet prouincias numero
16 XVIII. libia superior. libia inferior. thebais.
17 aegyptus. iouia. aegyptus. herculea. arabia.
18 item arabia. augusta libanensis: palestina.
19 fenicen. syria ecohele, augusta eupatenses.3
20 cilicia. isauria. tupus. mesopotamia. osroena

fol. 255, verso

1 Diocensis pontica. habet prouincias. numero VII
2 bitinia. cappadocia. galatia. pâplagonia. nunc
3 in duas diuisas. diospontus. pontus polemiacus
4 armenia minor; nunc et maior addita.
5 Diocensis asiana. habet prouincias supra scribtas
6 VIII. phanfilia. frigia prima. frigia secunda.
7 assa lidia. caria. insuluae. pisidiae. ellespontus.
8 Diocsenis. tracoae. habet prouincias numero. VI
9 europa. rodo. petracia. emossanus. scitia.
10 misia inferiori4 Diocensis misiarum habet.
11 prouincias numero. XI; dacias. misia superior

3. Altered from eupatensis.
4. There is a deletion sign above the last letter of inferiori.
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12 margensis. dardania. macedonia. tessalia.
13 priantina. priualentina. epiros noua. epiros uetus.
14 creta Diocensis pannoniarum habet prouincias
15 numero VII. pannonia inferior. fauensis;
16 dalmatia. ualeria. pannonia. pannonia superior
17 noricus pariensis; noricus mediterranea
18 Diocensis brittaniarum habet prouincias
19 numero VI. primam secundam maxime caesariensis
20 aelauiae caesariensis Diocensis galliarum

fol. 256, recto
1 habet prouincias numero VIII. betica prima. 5
2 betica secunda. germania prima. germania secunda.
3 sequania. lubdunensis prima. lubdunensis secunda.
4 alpes graiae et poeninae; Diocensis biennensis
5 habet prouincias numero. VII. biennensis
6arbonensis prima.arbonensis secunda
7 nouem populi. aquitanica prima: aquitanica
8 secunda alpes maritimas; Diocensis italiciana
9 habet prouincias numero XVI. beteiam
10 histriam flaminiam. picenum tusciam
11 umbrenam. apuliam calabrium licaoniam
12 corsicam. alpes cotias. rectia; Diocensis
13 hispaniarum habet prouincias numero VI.
14 beticam. lusitaniam. kartaginiensis. galleria
15 tharraconensis. mauritania tingitania.
16 Diocensis africæ habet prouincias numero. VII.
17 proconsularis; bizacina. zeugitana. numidia cirtensis
18 numidia miliciana; mauritania caesariensis.
19 mauritania tabia; insidiana. felix saeculum;

2. THE DATE AND NATURE OF THE LIST

As the title of his article implies, Mommsen held that the Verona List is a homogeneous document datable c. 297. 6 Epigraphical discoveries have long rendered that view untenable, for it was during 303 that Numidia was divided into Numidia Cirtensis and Numidia Militiana (which both appear in the list). 7 Most scholars who have discussed the list during the present century adopt one

5. A probably contemporary half-uncial hand has added belgica prima above betica prima.
6. He argued that, apart from the two obviously later additions in fol. 255, verso, lines 2–4, the list had no features which were demonstrably later than 296 (Ges. Schr. 5.587 f.).
of two views. Some follow Mommsen in holding that the document is wholly homogeneous; on this basis its date has been argued to be c. 305 (G. Costa, E. Stein, H. Nesselhauf), between 304 and 314 (C. W. Keyes), between 308 and 315 (J. B. Bury), between 312 and 320 (A. H. M. Jones), between 312 and 314 (H. G. Kolbe), or 314 precisely (A. H. M. Jones). Others deny total homogeneity, but argue that both the eastern and the western halves are homogeneous; on this basis, the eastern half has been dated to 312–324, the western to 303–306.9

The postulate of total homogeneity has always been very fragile, for it requires the Verona List to be dated within an ever-narrowing slot of time. On the one side, while two separate Numidias still existed in the spring of 314 when Constantine summoned the Council of Arles for 1 August (Optatus, App. 3, p. 205.33/34 Ziwsa), they were united before the end of the year and probably before the end of summer 314 (CIL 8.18905, cf. Table 3). On the other side, no governor of Aegyptus Herculia is yet attested before 27 December 315 (P. Cairo Isid. 74), while Egypt was certainly still undivided after 15 January 314, when the praefectus Aegypti was still the governor at Karanis, in the territory of the later Aegyptus Herculia (P. Cairo Isid. 73).10 Hence, although the Verona List can theoretically be regarded as a wholly homogeneous document from the latter months of 314, more precise evidence for either the reunification of Numidia or the division of Egypt may at any moment disprove that view irretrievably.

The view that the eastern and western halves of the Verona List are each homogeneous, though different in date, requires, no less than the postulate of total homogeneity, that each separate diocesan list be internally consistent. The external evidence for the provinces of the diocese of Oriens appeared until recently to contradict this requirement. In the diocese of Oriens, there appear provinces called Arabia (arabia item arabia), Aegyptus Iovia, and Aegyptus Herculia. But while contemporary papyri indicate that Egypt was divided and that the Aegyptus Herculia and Aegyptus Iovia of the Verona List were created


9. A. Chastagnol, La Préfecture urbaine à Rome sous le Bas-Empire (Rome, 1960), 3 f. The much later dates advocated by J. Mispoulet, CRAI 1908.254 ff. ("la fin du règne de Constantin" for the whole list), and E. Schwartz, Abh. München, Phil.-hist. Abt., n.f. 13 (1937), 79 ff. (the eastern half between 328 and 337, the western after 364), are flatly impossible.
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no earlier than 314 (P. Cairo Isid. 73), the southern part of the Trajanic province of Arabia had been incorporated in Palaestina before 314. Writing in 311 and again in 313, Eusebius reported that in 307 the governor of Palaestina sentenced Christians to work in “the copper mines of Palaestina” or “the copper mines at Phaeno in Palaestina” (Mart. Pal. 7.2 (both recensions)). If Phaeno belonged to Palaestina in 307 (or even in 311), then one of the two provinces of Arabia in the Verona List (so it seemed) must have passed out of existence before Aegyptus Herculia was created, whence it would follow that neither the list as whole nor either half of it can be regarded as homogeneous.

An unpublished papyrus removes the basis of that attempt to disprove the homogeneity of the list of provinces in Oriens. For it reveals that there existed between 314/5 and 318 a province of Arabia Nova—which appears to be part of Egypt, where a nome called Arabia is well attested. Hence the words arabia item arabia in the Verona List do not reflect a Diocletianic division of Arabia into an Arabia east of the Jordan and an Arabia Petraea. They show rather that when the province of Egypt was divided in 314/5, it was not divided into two provinces (as has always been assumed), but into the three provinces of Aegyptus Iovia, Aegyptus Herculia, and Arabia Nova. The available external evidence, therefore, indicates that the Verona List depicts the eastern provinces of the Roman Empire as they were between 314/5 and 324, the western provinces as they were between 303 and 314.

3. THE PROVINCES OF THE LIST

In the first column of the list below are the entries in the Verona List as they stand in the manuscript; in the second column, the correct names of the corresponding provinces during the decade 310–320.

Oriens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oryens</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>libia superior</td>
<td>Libya Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>libia inferior</td>
<td>Libya Inferior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thebais</td>
<td>Thebais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aegyptus iovia</td>
<td>Aegyptus Iovia (created 314/5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aegyptus herculea</td>
<td>Aegyptus Herculia (created 314/5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. ZPE 16 (1975), 277 f.
15. I owe the interpretation of the new papyrus adopted here entirely to G. W. Bowersock.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>arabia</td>
<td>Arabia Nova (created 314/5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item arabia</td>
<td>Arabia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>augusta libanensis</td>
<td>Augusta Libanensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palestina</td>
<td>Palaestina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fenicen</td>
<td>Phoenice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syria ecohele</td>
<td>Syria Coele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>augusta eupatenses</td>
<td>Augusta Euphratensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cilicia</td>
<td>Cilicia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isauria</td>
<td>Isauria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tupus</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mesopotamia</td>
<td>Mesopotamia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>osroaena</td>
<td>Osrhoene</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pontica

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bitinia</td>
<td>Bithynia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cappadocia</td>
<td>Cappadocia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>galatia</td>
<td>Galatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paphlagonia</td>
<td>Paphlagonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nunc in duas divisa{s}</td>
<td>after 384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diospontus</td>
<td>Diospontus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pontus polemiacus</td>
<td>Pontus Polemoniacus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>armenia minor</td>
<td>Armenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nunc et maior addita</td>
<td>after 381</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asiana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>phanfilia</td>
<td>Lycia et Pamphylia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frigia prima</td>
<td>Phrygia Prima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frigia secunda</td>
<td>Phrygia Secunda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assa</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lidia</td>
<td>Lydia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caria</td>
<td>Caria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pisidiae</td>
<td>Pisidia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ellespontus</td>
<td>Hellespontus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thracia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>europa</td>
<td>Europa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rodope</td>
<td>Rhodope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tracia</td>
<td>Thracia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emossanun</td>
<td>Haemimontus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scitia</td>
<td>Scythia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misia inferior[]i</td>
<td>Moesia Inferior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### THE VERONA LIST

#### Moesiae

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dacia</td>
<td>Dacian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misia superior Margensis</td>
<td>Moesia Superior or Margensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dardania</td>
<td>Dardania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonias</td>
<td>Macedonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thessalia</td>
<td>Thessalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achaeas</td>
<td>Achaeas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praevalitana</td>
<td>Praevalitana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epirus Nova</td>
<td>Epirus Nova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epirus Vetus</td>
<td>Epirus Vetus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creta</td>
<td>Creta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Pannoniae

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pannonia Inferior</td>
<td>Pannonia Inferior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savensis</td>
<td>Savensis (later Savia)(^{16})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalmatia</td>
<td>Dalmatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valeria</td>
<td>Valeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pannonia Superior</td>
<td>Pannonia Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noricum Ripense</td>
<td>Noricum Ripense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noricum Mediterraneum</td>
<td>Noricum Mediterraneum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Britanniae

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Britannia Prima</td>
<td>Britannia Prima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britannia Secunda</td>
<td>Britannia Secunda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxima Caesariensis</td>
<td>Maxima Caesariensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flavia Caesariensis</td>
<td>Flavia Caesariensis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Galliae

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgica Prima</td>
<td>Belgica Prima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgica Secunda</td>
<td>Belgica Secunda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germania Prima</td>
<td>Germania Prima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germania Secunda</td>
<td>Germania Secunda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequania</td>
<td>Sequania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugdunensis Prima</td>
<td>Lugdunensis Prima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugdunensis Secunda</td>
<td>Lugdunensis Secunda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpes Graiae et Poeninae</td>
<td>Alpes Graiae et Poeninae</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

16. Athanasius calls it Siscia, presumably confusing province and metropolis (*Apol. Sec. 1.2; Hist. Ar. 28.2*).
**THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE EMPIRE**

**Viennensis**
- biennensis
- narbonensis prima
- narbonensis secunda
- novem populi
- aquitanica prima
- aquitanica secunda
- alpes maritimas

**Italia**
- beteiam histriam
- flaminiam picenum
- tusciam umbrenam
- apuliame calabrium
- licaoniam
- corsicam
- alpes cotias
- rectia

**Hispaniae**
- beticam
- lusitaniam
- kartaginiensis
- gallecia
- tharraconensis
- mauritania tingitania

**Africa**
- proconsularis
- bizacina
- zeugitana
- numidia cirtensis
- numidia miliciana
- mauritania caesariensis
- mauritania tabia insidiana

---
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CHAPTER XIII

DIOCLETIAN AND THE PROVINCES

Provinces cut up into tiny pieces; many governors and their still more numerous staffs watching over every region, almost over every city; troops of rationales, magistri, and vicarii praefectorum busy with perpetual condemnations and confiscations—so Lactantius bitterly described Diocletian’s administrative reforms as they affected the provinces of the Roman Empire (Mort. Pers. 7.4). The caricature is savage, but not altogether misleading: it is precisely during the reign of Diocletian that magistri privatae of provinces and dioceses and vicars of dioceses appear for the first time.¹ For the provinces, the Verona List and other evidence bring a welcome precision to Lactantius’ rhetoric, and enable the details of Diocletian’s administrative reorganization to be described province by province.

1. THE DIVISION OF SEVERAN PROVINCES

The individual discussions below present evidence for the division of the Severan provinces. They rely upon a rigorous sifting of good evidence from bad—a task all the more necessary since the standard treatment of the subject assumes that the Historia Augusta, in a fictitious passage (Tyr. Trig. 24.2), “probably refers to the position in the late third or early fourth century,”² and the fasti in the Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire are inflated by the inclusion of fictitious governors of provinces which either did not exist or may

¹. PLRE 1.1063; Millar, Emperor 628 ff.
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not have existed at the relevant date. The following items of evidence are employed without specific reference on every occasion:

1. the Verona List (Chapter XII)
2. the list of bishops who subscribed the Creed and Canons of Nicaea in June 325 (Tables 10 and 11)
3. the *Itinerarium Burdigalense* of 333, printed in CCL 175 (1961), 1–26, from the editions of P. Geyer, CSEL 39 (1898), 3–33 and O. Cuntz, *Itineraria Romana* 1 (Leipzig, 1929), 86–102 (the page and line numbers are those of P. Wesseling, *Vetera Romanorum Itineraria* (Amsterdam, 1735), 535–617, which are marked in all three modern editions)
4. the list of anti-Arian bishops who subscribed the Canons of the Council of Serdica in 343/4 (Table 12), and the list of provinces from which the Arian bishops came (Table 13)
5. the list of provinces in Festus' *Breviarium*, which describes the provinces of the Roman Empire as they were in 364 or slightly earlier
7. the *Notitia Dignitatum*, edited by O. Seeck (Berlin, 1876)
9. the lists of governors of provinces printed above in Chapter IX

The conciliar lists of 325 and 381 (nos. 2 and 6) are normally assumed to be "of particular value since they show which cities belonged to each province." Regrettably, that is not quite true even of the list of 381, which still shows a single Cappadocia, even though the secular province had been divided into Cappadocia Prima and Secunda in 371 (Gregory of Nazianzus, *Orat.* 43.58). Nevertheless, the conciliar list of 381 appears in general to reflect the secular administrative divisions of the eastern Roman provinces in 381, since it depicts a state of affairs slightly earlier than that presented in the *Notitia Dignitatum*, whose eastern sections describe the eastern provinces and armies c. 393. The Nicene

3. Chapter X.
6. It has been deduced that the Catholics deliberately retained the old ecclesiastical organization for some years after 371 because the Arian Valens had divided Cappadocia for partisan reasons (*EOMIA* 2.446).

The following Oriental provinces in the list of 381 are divided in the *Notitia Dignitatum*:
subscriptions, however, do not provide authoritative evidence for Roman provinces in 325: it was demonstrated long ago that the bishops’ names were not grouped in geographical order, province by province, until several decades after 325.  

It should be noted that minor alterations in provincial boundaries are normally ignored, unless they are obviously and directly relevant to the larger changes which form the subject of this chapter.

Achaea  
Governors of Achaea are attested throughout the third and fourth centuries; hence the province’s omission in the Verona List is presumably due to displacement by the meaningless priantina.  

Aegyptus  
The abundance of evidence for Egypt—not only papyri, inscriptions and Ammianus (22.16.1 ff.), but also documents from the Arian controversy and the writings of Athanasius—permits a degree of precision attainable for hardly any other province. The following Egyptian provinces are attested:

1. Aegyptus: continues, though with loss of territory to the new province of Thebais, until 314/5, when it is divided into Iovia, Herculia, and Arabia Nova, which are recombined in 324 (cf. Opitz, Urkunde 15)  
2. Aegyptus Iovia: no evidence except the Verona List, but the province is clearly the twin of Herculia  
3. Aegyptus Herculia: created after January 314 (P. Cairo Isid. 73) but before 27 December 315 (P. Cairo Isid. 74)  
4. Arabia Nova: attested between 314/5 and 318 (P. Oxy.: unpublished)  
5. Libya Inferior: first attested in early 309  
6. Thebais: a praeses of Thebais is certainly attested in September 298, and one is probably attested in January 295

Armenia, divided before 386 (CTh 13.11.2); Cilicia; Galatia, perhaps divided in 399 (Claudian, In Eutr. 1.585 ff., cf. Phoenix 32 (1978), 81 f.); Palaestina; Paphlagonia, divided between 384 and 387 (Libanius, Orat. 19.62); Phoencie; Syria Coele. On Theodosius’ policy of dividing provinces, A. Lippold, RE, Supp. 13 (1973), 914.

9. T. Mommsen, Ges. Schr. 5 (Berlin, 1908), 579 n.1.  
10. P. Oxy. 29 4B.48/G (6–7)a, of which Dr. J. R. Rea most kindly supplied me with a text in advance of publication.  
7. Augustamnica: created in 341 from the territory of Aegyptus (Festal Index 13), it corresponds to the earlier short-lived province of Arabia Nova Africa

Although a proconsular province of Africa still existed into the fifth century, it was far smaller than the Severan province. The permanent changes under Diocletian were two. The boundary with Numidia was modified (before March 295, when the *Acta Maximiliani* show that Theveste was part of proconsular Africa), and the new provinces of Byzacena and Tripolitana (for both of which governors are attested before 305) were carved out of the old proconsular province, splitting it into three.\(^\text{12}\)

The Verona List enters proconsularis *bizacina zeugitana* and omits Tripolitana. The omission clearly results from textual corruption: *tripolitana* has either dropped out through haplography or been displaced by *zeugitana*.\(^\text{13}\) The word *zeugitana* is in itself problematical, for it is hard to imagine how it could be a corruption for the required *tripolitana*. The transmitted text is normally construed as designating two provinces, viz. Proconsularis and Byzacena, with Zeugitana being either an additional title of the former or an alternative name which it briefly bore.\(^\text{14}\) It has also been suggested that *zeugitana* denotes a separate province—a hypothesis which would imply that the Verona List attests a short-lived division of the old proconsular Africa into four provinces.\(^\text{15}\)

Alpes Maritmae, Alpes Cottiae, Alpes Graiae et Poeninae

No change.

Aquitania

There appears to be no early evidence against which to measure the Verona List, which registers Novem Populi, Aquitanica Prima, and Aquitanica Secunda as three provinces. Novem Populi presents no problems.\(^\text{16}\) But Aquitanica was later a single province: a praeses provinciae *Aquitanae* is attested in the


15. T. D. Barnes, *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study* (Oxford, 1971), 86. But Zeugis was of old the name of the region around Carthage (*Pliny, NH* 5.23 f.; *Orosius, Hist. Adv. Pag.* 1.2.91), and Carthage must always have been in Africa Proconsularis.

16. E. Linckenheld, *RE* 17 (1937), 1181–85, s.v. Novempopulana. But *CIL* 13.412 (Tarbelli, in Aquitania) does not show that the province was created before Diocletian (as argued by J. B. Bury, *JRS* 13 (1923), 139).
340s (ILS 1255);17 Ammianus enters it as a single province in a complete enumeration of the Gallic provinces in 355 (15.11.1 ff.); and Hilary of Poitiers appears to know of only one Aquitanica in 358 (PL 10.479). Moreover, the entry (ex) provincia Aquitanica in the subscriptions to the Council of Arles (CCL 148 (1963), 15.47, 16.39, 18.34, 20.36, 21.34; may imply that Aquitanica was already reunited as a single province in 314.18

Arabia

The evidence for the provincial divisions of Arabia in the late third and early fourth centuries appears to exhibit confusion over the provincial status of the territory which eventually became Palaestina Tertia, i.e. the southern part of the old Nabataean kingdom, which was made a Roman province in 106.19 But the apparent confusion vanishes when the words arabia item arabia augusta libanensis in the Verona List are correctly interpreted. Some scholars have punctuated these five words as if they referred to two provinces only, viz. Arabia and Arabia Augusta Libanensis,20 while others have diagnosed interpolation, deleting either the two words item Arabia or the four words item Arabia Augusta Libanensis, in order to remove the historical difficulties which they perceive in the transmitted text.21 However, emendation is an arbitrary procedure when dealing with evidence like the Verona List, and a province of Arabia Augusta Libanensis is a geographical impossibility.22 The manuscript text should be accepted, and the five words interpreted as listing three provinces, viz. two called Arabia, and one with the name of Augusta Libanensis. Accordingly, so it has widely been assumed, the Verona List attests the division of the Trajanic province of Arabia into two parts, one the northern part, with Bostra as its capital, the other Arabia Petraea.23 A papyrus from Oxyrhynchus disproves this assumption: it attests the existence of a province named Arabia Nova between 314/5 and 318 and implies that a town called Eleutheropolis in

17. For the date, PLRE 1.814-817, Secundus 2.
18. For discussion of the division of Aquitania, see A. Chastagnol, BSNAF 1970. 272 ff. Two Aquitanicae are again attested from the late fourth century onward.
21. These deletions were first proposed by E. Bormann, De Syriae provinciae Romanae partibus capita nonnulla (Diss. Berlin, 1865), 30 (item Arabia); E. Kuhn, Neue Jahrbücher 115 (1877), 697 ff. (all four words). Riese's edition adopts Kuhn's deletion.
22. A. Alt, ZDPV 71 (1955), 173 ff.
23. J. Marquardt, Römische Staatsverwaltung 1 (Berlin, 1873), 268; 276 f. (retracted in the second edition); T. Nöldeke, Hermes 10 (1876), 166 ff. Their conclusion has recently been reiterated by A. Alt, ZDPV 71 (1955), 186; G. W. Bowersock, JRS 61 (1971), 242; T. D. Barnes, ZPE 15 (1976), 276.
Arabia Nova is close to Aegyptus Herculia. On the natural interpretation of all the evidence, therefore, the first *arabia* of the Verona List should be identical with Arabia Nova, and a subdivision of the earlier Aegyptus, not of the province Arabia.

The other evidence for the southern part of the Trajanic province of Arabia now falls neatly into place:

1. Eusebius' *On the Place-Names in Holy Scripture* contains four entries which give a provincial designation for Petra, the former capital of the Nabataean kingdom. Three entries describe Petra as being in Arabia (viz. those for Petra (Judges 1.36), Rekem (Numbers 31.8), and Kadesh-Barnea (Numbers 32.8)), while one describes Petra as belonging to Palaestina (that for Arkem (II Kings 17.30)). Since Eusebius compiled his biblical gazetteer by working through the text of the Bible, book by book (p. 2.17-20 Klostermann), the fourth of these entries (p. 36.13/14), though occurring before the other three in the completed work (respectively, pp. 112.8-12, 142.7/8, 144.7-9), must have been composed last. Consequently, it is possible that when Eusebius wrote "Petra, a city in Arabia" and "Petra, a famous city of Palaestina," both descriptions were accurate at the time of writing—that is, Arabia Petraea was incorporated in Palaestina while Eusebius was engaged on compiling the gazetteer in the 290s.

2. Both recensions of Eusebius' *Martyrs of Palestine* (composed in 311 and 313, respectively) state that the area around Petra belonged to Palaestina in 307 (7.2).

3. Eusebius' *Commentary on Isaiah*, written between 324 and 337, describes Petra as "a city of Palaestina" (p. 273 Ziegler). Similarly, the Nicene subscriptions list the bishop of Aila under Palaestina.

4. Palaestina was divided while Clematius, the correspondent of Libanius, was governor: in 357 his province included Elusa, in 358 it did not (Libanius, *Epp.* 315, 334). In 357/8, therefore, Arabia Petraea became a separate province as the Palaestina Salutaris of the *Notitia Dignitatum*.


25. The entry for Kadesh-Barnea (p. 112.8-12 Klostermann) is slightly problematical. The one Greek manuscript has ἐρήμος ἢ παρατείνουσα Πέτρα πόλει τῆς πόλεως Παλαιστίνης (sic), but Klostermann prints πόλει τῆς Ἀραβίας from Procopius of Gaza and Jerome's translation (*Petae in Arabia*). That Eusebius here assigned Petra to Arabia is confirmed by a Syriac fragment published by I. E. Rahmani, E. Tisserant, E. Power, and R. Devreesse, *Revue de l'Orient syrien* 23 (1922-23), 248, frag. 46.


Diocletian detached Arabia Petraea from the rest of the pre-Diocletianic province of Arabia and incorporated it in Palaestina in or not long after 293. He did not make Arabia Petraea a separate province, even for a brief period.  

Asia  
Between 293 and 305, governors of the following provinces carved out of the old proconsular province of Asia are attested:  
1. Asia, much reduced in territory but still governed by a proconsul  
2. Phrygia et Caria, attested in the winter of 301/2  
3. Caria  
4. Insulae, attested on 2 August 294  
5. Hellespontus  
The Verona List has seven provinces corresponding to pre-Diocletianic Asia, viz. Phrygia Prima, Phrygia Secunda, Asia, Lydia, Caria, Insulae, and Hellespontus. Since recent discoveries appear to establish that the province of Phrygia et Caria was not created by Diocletian, but in the 250s,  
it may be deduced that in 293 Diocletian divided the rest of the old proconsular province, adjusting boundaries (the proconsul of Asia, Festus, was active at Miletus, in the later Caria, between 286 and 293). Subsequently, after the winter of 301/2 and possibly before May 305, Phrygia et Caria was divided into the Phrygia Prima, Phrygia Secunda, and Caria of the Verona List.  
Although the earliest indubitable evidence outside the Verona List for two Phrygias belongs to 358 (Hilary of Poitiers, De Synodis 33 (PL 10.506 f.), the Nicene subscriptions, which have a single Phrygia, are probably in error. A joint province of Asia et Hellespontus is attested c. 330.  

Baetica  
No change.  

Belgica  
As provinces in the diocese of Galliae, the Verona List enters betica prima betica secunda, i.e. Belgica Prima and Belgica Secunda. No governor of either is attested before c. 340.  

30. W. M. Ramsay, Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia 1 (Oxford, 1895), 80 ff., argued from Gelasius of Cyzicus, HE 2.38.9, that there were two Phrygias in 325. Unfortunately, the evidence of Gelasius is worthless, since he also has two Macedonias in 325 (HE 2.38.8).  
31. The first is M. Aurelius Consius Quartus (AE 1955.150: Hippo), consularis of Belgica Prima; on the date, see A. Chastagnol, Libyca 7 (1959), 191 ff.
Britannia

Britain was divided into two provinces, Inferior (in the north) and Superior, early in the third century (Herodian 3.8.1 f. — slightly misdated). The Verona List has four provinces: Prima, Secunda, Maxima Caesariensis, and Flavia Caesariensis. The divisions were presumably made in 296, when Constantius reconquered Britain.

Cappadocia

The large Severan province of Cappadocia was divided into four main units: Pisidia, Cappadocia, Armenia Minor, and Pontus Polemoniacus. A part was also incorporated in a province which seems to have been called Pontus at its creation, then Diospontus (as in the Nicene subscriptions), and finally Helenspontus.

In this area, some division before Diocletian has long been attested: milestones found not far from Sinope bearing the date 279 (Probus is trib. pot. IIII) attest one Ael. Casinus Atianus as v. p., pr(aeses) pr(ovinciae) P(onti) (D. M. Robinson, AJA 9 (1905), 329 no. 78, with the corrections at AJA 10 (1906), 433; AJP 27 (1906), 449 no. 3, which was noted but not published as AJA 9 (1905), 329 no. 79).

Cilicia

Divided into Cilicia and Isauria (so the Verona List and the Nicene subscriptions).

Corsica

No change.

Creta et Cyrene

Divided into the provinces of Crete (in the diocese of Moesiae), Libya Superior, also called Pentapolis, and Libya Inferior (in the diocese of Oriens). The date of the division is indicated by the differing status of two governors attested in Crete: Aglaus was proconsul between 286 and 293, while M. Aur. Buzes was praeses of Crete between 293 and 305.

Cyprus

No change.

Dacia

Trajan's conquests north of the Danube were definitively abandoned by Aurelian, who appears to have established two new provinces south of the river: such at least is the implication of a bronze plaque which reads "Caro et Carino Augg. Gaianus preses finem posuit inter du[as Da]cias dilarf" (AE 1912.200:
near Serdica). Subsequently, the Verona List has *dacias* (plural), while an orator in 297 alludes to the singular (*Pan. Lat.* 8(5).3.3: *Dacia restituta*), and a *praeses Dacieae* is attested in 321. But this need not imply a single Dacia, since the two provinces are called Dacia and Dacia Ripensis in 343/4. On the available evidence, it seems most reasonable to conclude that two Dacias existed continuously from Aurelian onward. The name Dacia Mediterranea is first attested in the reign of Valentinian.

**Dalmatia**

Part of the Severan province was detached and combined with territory from the adjacent provinces of Pannonia Superior and Moesia Superior to form the new province of Praevalitana.

**Epirus**

Name changed to Epirus Vetus.

**Galatia**

The Severan province was divided into three parts: the new and diminished Galatia lost territory in the south to the new province of Pisidia, while the north of the old province was combined with some territory from Pontus et Bithynia to form Paphlagonia. A v. *p. praes(es) Pisid(iae)* is attested c. 310.

**Gallia Lugdunensis**

The Verona List divides Lugdunensis into two provinces, and a *praeses Lugdunensis primae* is probably attested in 313. A speech delivered before a governor at Autun in summer 298 is extant (*Pan. Lat.* 9(4)): unfortunately, the orator only addresses him as *vir perfectissime*, and the description of him in one manuscript as v. *p. Galliarum praeses* (*Pan. Lat.*, p. 230 Mynors) is clearly a fifteenth-century conjecture, so that the speech provides no evidence for his precise title. It seems that the division of Lugdunensis, once effected, was permanent.

**Gallia Narbonensis**

The Verona List has three provinces: Viennensis, Narbonensis Prima, and Narbonensis Secunda. The first of these was a permanent creation, and a *praee-
ses of the province Flavia Viennensis is attested between 312 and 324. The two Narbonenses, however, were subsequently reunited, since Ammianus (15.11.14, 18.1.4, 22.1.2), Hilary of Poitiers (De Synodis, praef. (PL 10.479)), and Festus record a single province of Narbonensis between 355 and 364. The Notitia Din- nitatum shows two provinces of Narbonensis again, as does the heading to a letter from the Council of Aquileia in 381 (PL 16.979).

Geographical considerations suggest that the later division was not the original one. Since the Narbonensis Secunda of the late fourth century was carved out of Viennensis (not out of Narbonensis), the choice of names seems explicable only if Narbonensis was originally divided into two parts, one of which was then incorporated in Viennensis before resuming a separate existence.36

Germania Inferior
Name changed to Germania Secunda.

Germania Superior
Divided into Germania Prima (in the north) and Sequania.

Hispania Tarraconensis
The Severan province was divided by Caracalla, but soon reunited, after which its normal designation became Hispania Citerior.37 Diocletian made a division, which underwent no changes until long after 337, into the three provinces of Gallaecia (in the northwest), Tarraconensis (the northeast), and Carthaginiensis.38 A senatorial leg. Augg. pr. pr. is attested as governor of Hispania Citerior in 283 (ILS 599: Tarraco), and governors styled v. p. praeses Hispaniae Citerioris after 286 and in 288 or 289, while the earliest praesides of the separate provinces are attested c. 300.

Italia
Before Diocletian, Italy was not a province of the Roman Empire and all its territory was exempt from provincial taxation. Its division into provinces can be dated quite closely from known senatorial careers. Until c. 290 there were two correctores Italiae, one in the north and one in peninsular Italy, while the first known corrector of an Italian province entered office no later than 294 (viz. T. Flavius Postumius Titianus in Campania). Between 290 and 293, L. Aelius Helvius Dionysius was corrector utriusque Italiae, while in or before 293 Postumius Titianus is attested as both corrector Italiae and corrector Italiae regionis Transpadanae (the two titles either refer to two separate, and presumably consecutive, posts or are variant descriptions of the same post).

The list of Italian provinces in the Verona List is very defective. Although the heading promises sixteen provinces in the *dioecesis Italiciana*, only eight appear in the manuscript:

1. Venetia et Histria, of which a *corrector* is attested before 305
2. Flaminia et Picenum, of which no governor is known before 325
3. Tuscia et Umbria, of which the earliest known *corrector* can be dated c. 310
4. Apulia et Calabria, of which a *corrector* is attested in 305/6
5. Lucania (et Bruttii), of which the earliest known *corrector* probably held office before 306
6. Corsica: the Severan province
7. Alpes Cottiae: the Severan province
8. Raetia: the Severan province

In addition, the following Italian provinces are attested before 337:

9. Aemilia et Liguria in 321
10. Campania, which came into existence no later than 294
11. Sardinia: the Severan province
12. Sicilia: the Severan province. 39

Lusitania
No change.

Lycia et Pamphylia

A *praeses Lyciae et Pamphyliae* is attested on 1 June 311, and it appears to have been the provincial council of a combined Lycia and Pamphylia which submitted a petition to Maximinus against the Christians, probably later in the same year (*CIL* 3.12132 = *TAM* 2.3.785: Arycanda). Although the Nicene subscriptions register two separate provinces, the phraseology of a letter probably written c. 320 suggests that they are anachronistic and that the division of the province into two separate provinces of Lycia and Pamphylia had not yet occurred (Opitz, *Urkunde* 14.59: καὶ Συρίας καὶ ἐτι Λυκίας καὶ Παμφιλίας). The Verona List has only the single entry *phanfilia*, which indicates either that an entry for a separate Lycia has been accidentally omitted or that the extant entry designates the still undivided province. 40 The earliest evidence for the separation of Lycia and Pamphylia comes from the 350s (Libanius, *Epp.* 366). 41

40. T. Mommsen, *Ges. Schr.* 5.577, opted strongly for the former alternative.
Macedonia
Divided into Macedonia, Thessalia, and Epirus Nova (all three in the Verona List).

Mauretania Caesariensis
Caesariensis was divided into two new provinces, of which the western one continued to bear the old name, while Mauretania Sitifensis is attested as the name of the eastern one as early as 315. The Verona List has mauretania caesariensis mauritania tabia insidiana. Although Tabia or Zabia has been claimed as the original name of Sitifensis, insidiana seems inexplicable except as a manuscript corruption, and it is possible that the original list called Sitifensis Mauritania Tubusuctitana. The date of the division requires discussion, for it has often been claimed that Diocletian divided Mauretania Caesariensis before 293. Positive testimony appears to be provided by the following inscription:

invictissimorum Aug[g(ustorum)]
2 tam ex Mauret(ania) Caes(ariensi) quam
etiam de Sitifensi adgres-
4 sus Quinquegentaneos
rebelles caesos multos
etiam et vivos adpre-
6 hensos sed et praedas
actas repressa despe-
ratione eorum victo-
10 riam reportaverit
Aurel(ius) Litua v. p. p(raeses) p(rovinciae)
M(auretaniae) Caes(ariensis)
(CIL 8.8924: Saldae)

The beginning can be supplied from a similar inscription from Caesarea (CIL 8.9324), which refers to "omnibus militibus dd. nn. Diocletianoi et Maximiani Augg." The absence of the names of Constantius and Galerius indicates a date earlier than 1 March 293 and thus (so the argument runs) attests the division of the old Mauretania Caesariensis into the new Caesariensis and Sitifensis before that date. The inference is not peremptory. The fact that Litua bears the title praeses of Caesariensis, while Saldae is in Sitifensis, implies rather that he governed a still undivided Caesariensis. Moreover, whereas the inscription quoted

42. C. Jullian, MEFR 2 (1882), 86 ff.; Stein, Bas-Empire 1, Carte II.
43. G. Costa, Diz. ep. 2 (1912), 1836.
uses the third person (*reportaverit*), the one from Caesarea records a dedication in the first person ("Aurel. Litua v. p. p. p. M. C. votum libens posui"). Taken together, the two inscriptions suggest that Litua's expedition began before 1 March 293 when Caesariensis was as yet undivided, but that the inscription from Saldae represents a later re-engraving of the original dedication after the division of the province.\(^45\) Indeed, it was argued long ago that the two dedications prove that Diocletian divided Caesariensis precisely in 293.\(^46\)

Mauretania Tingitana
No change, at least in theory, but the real extent of effective Roman control is not easy to gauge.\(^47\)

Mesopotamia
The eastern expeditions and policy of Septimius Severus and his son added the provinces of Mesopotamia and Osrhoene to the Roman Empire.\(^48\) Although their fortunes can only be traced with difficulty during the third century,\(^49\) two items of evidence indicate that both provinces probably existed in 293. First, the *Res Gestae Divi Saporis*, which list Assyria (i.e. Babylonia), Adiabene, Arabia, Armenia, and Albania as belonging to Persia, imply by their silence that the provinces of Mesopotamia and Osrhoene were in Roman hands when Shapur died (272). Second, an orator in 297 described Diocletian as having driven the Persians back beyond the Tigris in 287 (*Pan. Lat.* 8(5).3.3).

The Verona List agrees with Ammianus (14.3.2, 14.8.7, 18.7.3, 23.2.7, 24.1.2) and the conciliar list of 381 in recording Mesopotamia and Osrhoene as separate provinces. The Nicene subscriptions, however, enter only Mesopotamia, and that with Edessa, the capital of Osrhoene, as its metropolis. If the provincial designations for 325 were authoritative, that would imply that Osrhoene and Mesopotamia had been combined.\(^50\) But such a combination produces an excessively large province, when Galerius' conquests of 298 are taken into account.\(^51\) It is preferable to suppose that the rubric "Mesopotamia" in the Nicene subscriptions (which includes one bishop from Persian territory) does not correspond strictly with Roman provincial boundaries. Hence there is no reason to deny the existence of a separate Osrhoene in 325.

\(^{45}\) A. Pouille, *Annuaire de Constantin 6* (1862), 169 ff.; *Recueil de Constantin* 18 (1876/7), 495; 20 (1879/80), 263.
\(^{48}\) On the administration of these territories, see R. P. Duncan-Jones, *CP 64* (1969), 229 ff.; 65 (1970), 107 ff.
\(^{50}\) So Jones, *LRE* 3.390.
Moesia Inferior
The Severan province lost territory in the west to Aurelian's new Dacia, and was divided into two provinces, which the Verona List calls Scythia and Moesia Inferior (later Moesia Secunda). A dux limit(is) prov(iniae) Scyt(hiae) is attested between 293 and 305 (ILS 4103: Tomi).

Moesia Superior
Most of the territory of the new Dacia had formerly belonged to Moesia Superior; the remainder was then divided into two provinces eventually called Moesia Prima and Dardania. The Verona List has misia superior margensis: presumably Moesia Superior and Margensis are alternative names for the later Moesia Prima.

Noricum
Divided into Noricum Ripense and Noricum Mediterraneum; a governor of the latter is attested c. 320.

Numidia
By singular good fortune, the division and the reunification of Numidia can be dated precisely. In 303 Valerius Florus was still governing the whole of Numidia, in which capacity he enforced anti-Christian legislation promulgated in Nicomedia on 24 February 303. But Florus is also attested as v. p. p. p. N. M., i.e. as vir perfectissimus, praeses provinciae Numidiae Militianae before 1 May 305, whereas one Aurelius Quintianus is attested as praeses on 20 November 303 at Macomades Minores, i.e. as governor of Numidia Cirtensis. The division, therefore, occurred in 303, between c. June and November; Florus stayed on as the first governor of the new province of Numidia Militiana, and Quintianus came to govern Numidia Cirtensis. The reunification can be dated to 314: on the one hand an imperial letter of early 314 uses the words de Byzacenae, Trispolitanae, Numidiarum et Mauritaniarum . . . provinciis (Optatus, App. 3, p. 205.33/34 Ziwsa), and, on the other, Valerius Paulus appears as v. p. p. p. N., i.e. as praeses provinciae Numidiae, on an inscription which probably antedates c. September 314 (CIL 8.18905, cf. Table 3).

Osrhoene
See Mesopotamia.

52. On the boundary changes in both Moesiae, see M. Fluss, RE 15 (1932), 2359; H. Vetters, Dacia Ripensis (Vienna, 1950), 5 ff.
54. G. Alföldy, Noricum (London, 1974), 199, alleges that a governor of Noricum Ripense is attested in 304/5: he is the fictitious praeses 'Aquilinus' (Chapter IX, n. 54).
Palaestina
Enlarged by the addition of territory formerly belonging to Arabia (see Arabia).

Pannonia Inferior
Divided into Valeria (north) and Pannonia Inferior (later Secunda);\(^{56}\) the name Valeria was given in honor of Valeria, the daughter of Diocletian and wife of Galerius (Victor, Caes. 40.10; Ammianus 19.11.4). Aurelius Victor attributes the creation of Valeria to Galerius: if that were correct, it would entail a date no earlier than 299.

Pannonia Superior
Divided into Pannonia Superior (north) and Savensis. These are the names used in the Verona List; they were later changed to Pannonia Prima and Savia, of which the latter is attested in 343/4.

Phoenice
A single province of Phoenice is registered not only in the Nicene subscriptions and in 381, but also in Ammianus' account of the Oriental provinces in 354 (14.8.9), and in Polemius Silvius. The Notitia Dignitatum records both Phoenice and Phoenice Libanensis, which should be identical with, or at least correspond substantially to, Phoenice and Augusta Libanensis in the Verona List.

Pontus et Bithynia
The Verona List enters bitinia and paplagonia nunc in duas divisa\(^{\{s}\}}. The note of the division of Paphlagonia (by the creation of Honorias between 384 and 387 (Libanius, Orat. 19.62)) is clearly a later gloss. The single Severan province of Bithynia and Pontus was probably divided into two before 284 (see Cappadocia), while Diocletian further divided Bithynia into the separate provinces of Bithynia and Paphlagonia; the four praesides to whom Lactantius refers between 303 and 313 are presumably praesides of the reduced Bithynia (Mort. Pers.16.4, 40.1 — where praesidi \(\dagger\)eratineo may conceal praesidi Bithyniae;\(^{57}\) 48.1).

Raetia
A praeses p(rovinciae) R(aetiae) is attested in 290 and the Verona List enters only one Raetia. Division into two provinces is first attested for 354 (Ammianus 15.4.1).

56. On the boundaries of the new provinces, A. Mócsy, RE, Supp. 9 (1962), 585 ff.; Pannonia (London, 1974), 273. The old names Inferior and Superior were still normal in 333, but Secunda is attested before 352 (ILS 1253, cf. PLRE 1.637). PLRE 1.454, Ianuarius 7; 1117, registers a dux Pannoniae secundae Saviae in 305: the relevant letters in CIL 3.10981 (PSS) should probably be construed as pro salute sua, see E. Ritterling, RE 12 (1925), 1355.

57. Moreau, Lactance 123.
Sardinia
   No change.

Sicilia
   No change.

Syria Coele
   From the middle of the fourth century onward, the evidence consistently shows that the former Syria Coele was divided into the two provinces of Syria Coele and Euphratensis (note especially Ammianus 14.8.7, describing events of 353: “Commagena, nunc Euphratensis”; 8: “dein Syria”; 9: “post hanc... Phoenice”). But the conciliar list of 325 enters only Syria Coele, while the Verona List enters both Syria Coele and Augusta Euphratensis. Two resolutions of this divergence are possible: either the province was divided, later reunited, and then again divided, or the Nicene subscriptions are again misleading.\(^{58}\)

Thracia
   The Severan province had surrendered territory in the northwest to the new province or provinces of Dacia, and by the fourth century was divided into four smaller provinces, viz. Thracia, Haemimontus, Rhodope, and Europa (as in the Verona List). Two of the new provinces (Europa and Rhodope) are attested in 333.

2. IMPERIAL POLICY

   Diocletian not only divided most of the provinces of the Roman Empire into smaller administrative units, but also grouped his new provinces into twelve dioceses. The dioceses were a new creation, and Diocletian created a new type of official to govern them: his title was vicarius or vices/vicem/vice agens praefectorum praetorio (i.e. a deputy of the praetorian prefects),\(^{59}\) and his functions were primarily judicial (Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 7.4, cf. 48.10).\(^{60}\) It follows that the creation of the dioceses, for which Lactantius implies a date later than 1 March 293 (Mort. Pers. 7.2 ff.), must precede the earliest attested vicarii. Two vicarii stand on incontestable documentation in 298: Aurelius Agricolanus as agens vicem (or vices or vice) praefectorum praetorio at Tingi on 30 October (Passio Marcelli), and Aemilius Rusticianus, apparently as vicarius of the dio-

58. PLRE 1.71, Antiochus 2; 499, Leontius 3, registers a dux and a governor of (Augusta) Euphratensis c. 304 and in 319 respectively. The dux is fictitious (Chapter X.2), and Seeck dated the governor to 343 (Regesten 192, on CTh 8.1.1). For what it is worth, Malalas attributes the creation of Euphratensis to Constantine (318 Bonn).
59. The equation of the two titles was established by E. Michon, MSNAF 74 (1914), 244 ff.
60. Also Eusebius, Contra Hieroclem 4, p. 373.10–11 Kayser; 20, p. 386.30–31. Jones was misled by the Passio Marcelli into thinking that vicarii were military officials (LRE 1.63).
DIOCLETIAN AND THE PROVINCES

W. Seston, therefore, argued that Diocletian created the dioceses all at once in 297/8, and other scholars too have written of "the great administrative reform of 297/8." But Seston's argument assumes a false chronology for the Persian War and related events. In 297/8, so far from having won that war and thus being free to initiate any general administrative reform, Diocletian was occupied with suppressing a revolt in Egypt, after which he traveled to Upper Egypt (summer 298) before going to Syria to negotiate with the Persians (spring 299).

If vicarii and dioceses existed in 298, they should be presumed to have existed already in 296 when the Persian War began. But if the dioceses existed in 296, then it becomes reasonable to regard their creation as part of a comprehensive plan which also included the proclamation of the two Caesars and the division of the provinces. Several decades ago J. G. C. Anderson argued that "the administrative re-arrangements [sc. of Diocletian] were made gradually, as circumstances suggested, and were not completed till the close of the reign." It is more probable that Diocletian ordained the division of provinces and the creation of dioceses in 293 at a single stroke, that his reforms were put into effect immediately, or at least with all deliberate speed, and that only minor changes were made thereafter.

61. Septimius Valentio, attested as v. p. a. v. praef. praet. cc. vv. at Rome between 1 January 293 and 31 December 295 (ILS 619), is not necessarily the vicarius of a diocese (Jones, LRE 3.4 n. 17) or a deputy praetorian prefect (Seston, Dioctétien 337 n. 4); he should be rather the commander of praetorian cohorts stationed in Rome, with the prefects permanently absent (A. Chastagnol, Ancient Society 3 (1972), 223 ff.).


64. Seston believed that the Persian War was finished by the spring of 298, the revolt of Egypt a year earlier (Dioctétien 137 ff.).

65. Chapter V: Diocletian.


67. For numismatic arguments in favor of the same conclusion, see M. Hendy, JRS 62 (1972), 75 ff.
CHAPTER XIV

THE IMPERIAL CENSUS

Roman taxation is an intricate and perplexing subject on which there has long been deep scholarly disagreement. Yet, by paradox, almost universal agreement exists on one central issue. Theodor Mommsen decreed that, before Diocletian at least, there was no imperial census in the formal sense of the word, and his verdict has normally been regarded as authoritative. This chapter will attempt to revive the earlier view (probably expounded best by J. Marquardt) that even before Diocletian the imperial administration conducted a regular census of all the provinces of the Roman Empire. Its principal aim, however, is to document the existence of a five-year cycle of empire-wide censuses between 284 and 337, and to apply this fact to the interpretation of several important items of evidence concerning taxation during the period.

1. The most helpful collections and discussions of material for the Late Empire are A. Déléage, La Capitation du Bas-Empire (Macon, 1945), and Jones, LRE 1.61 ff., 411 ff.; Roman Economy (Oxford, 1974), 228 ff., 280 ff. The novel conclusions of W. Goffart, Caput and Colonnate: Towards a History of Late Roman Taxation (Toronto, 1974) are unconvincing, and ignore (or misrepresent) much of the relevant evidence, see A. Chastagnol, REA 77 (1975), 390 ff.; R. Duncan Jones, JRS 67 (1977), 202; A. Chastagnol, Armées et fiscalité dans le monde antique (Paris, 1979), 279 ff.

2. T. Mommsen, Römisches Staatsrecht 2 (Berlin, 1887), 417: "es hat... einen Reichscensus im formellen Sinne des Wortes überhaupt nicht und am wenigsten in der Kaiserzeit gegeben."

3. J. Marquardt, Römische Staatsverwaltung 2 (Berlin, 1884), 204 ff. Unlike previous writers on the subject, Marquardt quite properly declined to claim support from late and dubious evidence (e.g., Cassiodorus, Variae 3.52; Isidore, Origines 5.36.4).
THE IMPERIAL CENSUS

1. THE FIVE-YEAR CYCLE IN THE EARLY FOURTH CENTURY

The Codex Theodosianus contains many laws relating to taxation and the census, from which Otto Seeck long ago demonstrated that the imperial government of the later fourth and early fifth centuries conducted an empire-wide census every five years. In two respects, however, Seeck's conclusions require modification. First, he dated the censuses to the first, sixth, and eleventh years of each fifteen-year induction period (i.e. 372-373, 377-378, 382-383, etc.). But much of the evidence he used concerns problems arising from a census which must have preceded the relevant law, and it will also support the more plausible conclusion that a census was taken every five years to come into effect at the start of the first, sixth, and eleventh years of each induction, i.e. on 1 September 372, 1 September 377, 1 September 382, etc. Second, Seeck believed that he could detect the cycle as early as 312/3 and 307/8, and he deduced that it originated with Diocletian. But the earliest certain evidence for the five-year cycle which he identified belongs to 362. There was indeed a five-year cycle in the early fourth century, but it fell one year earlier than the later cycle.

An empire-wide census was conducted in both 306 and 311. For 306 Lactantius provides an explicit description, or rather denunciation:

```
census in provincias et civitates semel missus. censitoribus ubique diffusis et omnia exagitantibus hostilis tumultus et captivitatis horrendae species erant. agri glebatim metiebantur, vites et arbores numerabantur, animalia omnis generis scribebantur, hominum capita notabantur, in civitates urbaneae ac rusticae plebes adunatae, fora omnia gregibus familiarum referta, unusquisque cum liberis, cum servis aderant, tormenta ac verbera personabant, filii adversus parentes suspendebantur, fidelissimi quique servi contra dominos vexabantur, uxores adversus maritos. (Mort. Pers. 23.1-2)
```

Whatever the nature of Galerius' innovation, Lactantius expressly depicts the census as embracing the whole of the Roman Empire (26.2: "cum statuisset censibus institutis orbem terrae devorare"): censusores were even sent to register the plebs of Rome (26.2). Other evidence corroborates Lactantius'

---

5. Note especially CTh 13.10.5 (7 June 367), 11.4.1 (4 April 372), 7.6.3 (9 August 377), 13.11.13 (6 June 412), 13.11.15-17 (14 March 417), 11.28.13 (20 February 422).
6. O. Seeck, Deutsche Zeitschrift 12 (1894), 284 f.
7. Sozomenus, HE 5.4.5, cf. CTh 11.28.1 (remission of arrears on 26 October 362). The earlier evidence which Seeck adduced is not probative. Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 26.1 ff. relates to 306, not to 307/8; CTh 13.10.1 (18 January 313) provides no precise date for the preceding census; CIL 10.407, dated 323, need not be "das Fragment einer Schätzungsliste der Stadt Volcei" (O. Seeck, Deutsche Zeitschrift 12 (1894), 283).
highly rhetorical description: early in 306 a register of the citizens was compiled at Caesarea in Palestine (Eusebius, Mart. Pal. 4.8), and in the same year a census was held at Autun (Pan. Lat. 5(8).5.4 ff., 13.1). Five years later, in 311, varied evidence either states or implies that a census was conducted in Gaul (Pan. Lat. 5(8).10.5 ff.), in Illyricum (FIRA 2 1.93), in Bithynia (Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 36.1), in Lycia and Pamphylia, and in the diocese of Oriens (CTh 13.10.2\( ^{2} \)). In both 306 and 311, therefore, a census was conducted throughout all the provinces of the Roman Empire, with the probable exception of Egypt.

Positive evidence can be produced for at least one other empire-wide census between 284 and 337. Eusebius phrases a charge of rapacity against Licinius in slightly different ways in two parallel passages:

What need is there to reckon up... the countless assessments that he devised against subject provinces, the manifold exactions of gold and silver, the revaluations of land, and the profit gained by fining men in the country who were no longer alive but long since dead? (HE 10.8.12)

Then he devised reassessments of land, so that he might reckon the smallest plot larger in the assessment, through an insatiable desire for excessive exactions. Then he registered men in the country who were no longer alive but had long lain among the dead, by this means providing himself with ignoble profit. (VC 1.55)

Eusebius clearly alludes, however tendentiously, to the taking of a census: on the easiest hypothesis it will be a census which Licinius conducted in his domains in 321. In the west, L. Aradius Valerius Proculus was peraequator census provinciae Gallaeciae shortly after 320 (ILS 1240-1242).\(^{8}\) It is legitimate to infer an empire-wide census in 321, and the evidence so far adduced indicates that there was an empire-wide census every five years at least from 306 onward.

2. THE ORIGIN OF THE FIVE-YEAR CYCLE

Was the five-year cycle introduced by Diocletian in order to raise imperial revenues more efficiently? That view was argued by Seeck and can, strictly speaking, not be refuted.\(^{9}\) Yet evidence exists, albeit scanty, that censuses were held at regular intervals at a far earlier date.\(^{10}\) And there is one well-known item

8. Chapter VII.5.
9. O. Seeck, Deutsche Zeitschrift 12 (1894), 285 ff., accepted by Stein, Bas-Empire 1\(^{2} \).74. A series of provincial censuses stretching from the 290s to 311 is envisaged by Seston, Dioclétien 284; Jones, LRE 1.62. That hypothesis cannot accommodate the evidence for the censuses of 306 and 311.
10. Regularity is assumed in CIL 3, p. 945 (a contract of sale dated 6 May 159); Dig. 50.15.2 (Ulpian); Eusebius, discussing Luke 9.7 (PG 24.548: written between c. 304 and c. 308).
of evidence which alleges an empire-wide census, on the same cycle, almost three hundred years before Diocletian: “In those days a decree was issued by the Emperor Augustus for a registration to be made throughout the Roman world. This was the first registration of its kind; it took place when Quirinius was governor of Syria” (Luke 2.1–2, as translated in the New English Bible). Luke here states clearly that in A.D. 6 a census was conducted throughout the Roman Empire. Mommsen disbelieved Luke, and derided his testimony as the misapprehension of an ignorant provincial. But why should Luke, who was probably writing no more than sixty years later, be mistaken about an institution which so directly affected provincials like himself? Even were he mistaken about the census of A.D. 6, the passage surely proves that Luke was familiar with an empire-wide census in his own day. Moreover, the census of A.D. 6 did not embrace the new province of Judaea alone: the fact that it was simultaneous with, and part of, a census of Syria (Josephus, AJ 17.355, cf. ILS 2683) tends to confirm, rather than to contradict, Luke’s explicit statement that a census was held throughout the Roman Empire.

In the nineteenth century, many scholars accepted the existence of an empire-wide census in the early empire. Savigny, for example, assumed that Lactantius could be used as evidence for earlier conditions and deduced from Ulpian that c. 200 the interval between censuses was ten years (Dig. 50.15.4: the census-return should include fields sown within the last ten years and meadows cut within the last ten years). P. E. Huschke collected most of the literary evidence adduced above and deduced that there was an empire-wide census every ten years, at least from the time of Domitian (he held that the interval may have been five years from Augustus to Domitian). It was the authority of Mommsen which caused a change of opinion. He asserted flatly that no respectable evidence existed for an empire-wide census before Diocletian, and that such a practice was “incompatible with the essence of the principate.” J. Unger then produced a hypothesis which can accommodate almost all the evidence, viz. that a fixed interval of fifteen years between censuses first became standard c. 100, but that there was no empire-wide census, because different regions or provinces employed different starting points for their cycles of fifteen years. But it is rash to reject Luke’s testimony out of hand. In the early

11. T. Mommsen, Staatsrecht 2 (1887), 1092 n. 1. For modern discussion of the passage, see H. Braunert, Historia 6 (1957), 192 ff.; E. Schürer, History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ 1, revised by G. Vermes and F. Millar (Edinburgh, 1973), 399 ff.
15. J. Unger, Leipziger Studien zur Classischen Philologie 10 (1887), 64 ff.
empire, the evidence for taxation is abundant only for Egypt, which was administered in a fashion unlike all other provinces, and where a census cycle of fourteen years is attested from 33/34 to 257/8. Although it is regrettably and undeniably true that "except for the fourteen-year cycle in Egypt [censuses] cannot be shown to have happened at regular intervals," lack of conclusive proof ought not, in this matter, to be regarded as decisive. Moreover, the hypothesis of an empire-wide census every five years might illuminate much sporadic evidence for census-taking before Diocletian.

3. NOTES ON INDIVIDUAL DOCUMENTS

Whether or not the five-year cycle of censuses which included those of 306 and 311 can be traced back to Augustus, its existence provides the background against which some important documents relating to taxation under Diocletian and his successors should be interpreted.

(a) The Edict of Aristius Optatus

Eutropius reports that Diocletian reorganized the administration of Egypt after the revolt of Achilleus (Brev. 9.23), and the activity of censitores can be documented in Egypt in 298–300 (and again in 309/10). Hence it seemed natural to interpret the edict of the prefect Aristius Optatus, which was issued on 16 March 297 and orders the taking of a census (P. Cairo Isid. 1), as introducing a permanent reform of taxation in Egypt after the revolt—until it became clear that the revolt began in the summer of 297, and hence that the edict preceded it. The edict may be construed rather as attesting an attempt to apply to the Egyptian census of 297 procedures and rules used in the census of the rest of the Roman Empire taken in the preceding year.

The substantive points of Optatus' pronouncement can be summarized succinctly. The edict orders the publication in every city and village of itself and

18. See, e.g., A. B. Bosworth, Athenaeum, n.s. 51 (1973), 49 ff. (71); J. Devreker, Latomus 30 (1971), 352 ff. (a survey of the territory of Pessinus in 216); Herodian 7.3.1 ff. (236).
19. Eutropius' translator Paeanius dates the introduction of an empire-wide census to this occasion: ἐκ ταύτης δὲ τῆς αἰτίας καὶ πάσης τῆς βασιλευομένης τάς εισφοράς ἐπέθηκε διαμετρησάμενος τὴν γῆν καὶ εἰς ἄπυγραφὴν ἀναγαγών ἀπάντα ἐς τὸ δέκατον (p. 165 Droysen). Paeanius may be the source of Lydus, Mag. 1.4: Διοκλητιανὸς δὲ πρῶτος... ἀνεμετρησάτο τε τὴν ἡπείρον καὶ τὸς φόρος ἐβάρυνεν.
21. On the date of the revolt, Chapter II. For exegeses of the edict based on the erroneous premise that it was issued after the revolt, A. E. R. Boak and H. C. Youtie, The Archive of Aurelius Isidorus (Ann Arbor, 1960), 23. For interpretations based on the correct chronology, see A. C. Johnson, CP 45 (1950), 17; Vandersleyen, Chronologie 58.
two appended documents, namely, an imperial edict and an attached schedule. The prefect describes the emperors' intent as being to stop the inequitable distribution of taxes by issuing a salutary rule, and he asserts that it is now "possible for all to know the amount imposed on each aroura in accordance with the character of the land, and the amount imposed on each head of the rural population, and the minimum and maximum ages of liability."22

What is the innovation? It may be suggested that the lost imperial edict did two things. First, it ordained that taxes in Egypt for the period 297-302 be based on a census to be taken between 16 March 297 and the beginning of the fiscal year 297-298.23 Second, it supplied a schedule for calculating the tax liability, perhaps expressed in uniform, theoretical units, on the area of land (expressed in arourae) and number of persons which each taxpayer reported in the census returns. The Syro-Roman lawbook attributes to Diocletian the introduction of the *iugum* as a theoretical unit equivalent to different amounts of different types of land (121, translated by C. Ferrini and J. Furlani, *FIRA*2 2.795-796), and a schedule which seems to be designed for such a purpose, the *Gallicani census communis formula*, is known to have existed outside the diocese of Oriens as early as 306 (*Pan. Lat.* 5(8)}.5.5). The edict of Aristius Optatus, therefore, seems indirectly to confirm the attribution of the fifth-century source. However, neither the prefect's edict nor the lost imperial edict of 297 can constitute the reform itself. For, if there were empire-wide censuses in 296, 291, and 286, then the schedule was presumably introduced and applied for the first time in one of those, perhaps in 291. Equally important, the taking of a census in Egypt in 297 proves that its tax system still differed from the rest of the Roman Empire.

(b) *Diocletian's Currency Reform*

In 301 Diocletian issued an edict which doubled the value of at least some imperial coins, including the *argenteus*, from 1 September 301, and decreed that from this date the revalued currency be used both for paying debts to the *fiscus* and in private contracts (*AE* 1973.526, from *JRS* 61 (1971), 172-174). This edict has recently been argued, on internal grounds, to be exactly contemporaneous with the edict on maximum prices, although the latter is firmly dated by its heading to November/December 301 (Chapter III, no. 2).24 Since the

22. In Lines 7-8, *πόσα ἐπέβληθη* could be translated as either "the amount assessed" or "the amount levied," see F. Preisigke, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden* 1 (Berlin, 1925), 543.


The beginning of the tax year is argued to fall in late May or June (not on 29 August) by J. D. Thomas, *Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Congress of Papyrologists* (London, 1975), 66; *BASP* 15 (1978), 133 ff.

Currency Edict refers forward to 1 September, it was issued in or before August 301. The date of 1 September 301 derives its significance from the census of 301: on that day the new assessments began to be used as the basis for taxation.\(^{25}\)

\((c)\) A Law of Maximinus

The Theodosian Code preserves the following extract of a letter addressed to the praeses of Lycia et Pamphylia, which, in the manuscript, bears the date 1 June 313: “plebs urbana, sicut in Orientalibus quoque provinciis observatur, minime in censibus pro capitacione sua conveniatur, sed iuxta hanc iussionem nostram immunis habeatur, sicuti etiam sub domino et parente nostro Diocletiano seniore A(augusto) eadem plebs urbana immunis fuerat” (CTh 13.10.2). Seeck perceived the correct date and attribution (though not all have been swayed by his arguments)—Maximinus on 1 June 311, as part of a policy which included canceling the census at Nicomedia (Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 36.1).\(^{26}\) In 306 Maximinus had followed the instructions of Galerius by including city dwellers on the tax rolls (Eusebius, Mart. Pal. 4.8).\(^{27}\) In 311 he exempted them again from taxation, first in the provinces of Oriens which he had ruled since 305, then in Asia Minor, which he acquired in early summer. Hence the references to the Orientaliae provinciae and to Diocletian: Maximinus is reintroducing a state of affairs which already prevailed in Oriens on 1 June 311, and which had prevailed in Asia Minor throughout the reign of Diocletian, until Galerius introduced a change in 306. In Palestine in 312, Eusebius implies that the census registers contained the names of the rural population, but not of city dwellers (HE 9.8.5). Fifty years later city dwellers in Asia Minor were still exempt from taxation on their persons (Sozomenus, HE 5.4.5).

\((d)\) The Brigetio Table

An inscription discovered in 1930 preserves a letter of Licinius written only a few days after the preceding document (AE 1937.232 = FIRA 1.93): it was issued at Serdica on 9 June 311 and is addressed to Dalmati carissime nobis, whose post is neither stated nor identifiable with certainty.\(^{28}\) The historical con-

---

27. Also Lactantius, Mort. Pers. 23.2: “in civitatibus urbanae ac rusticae plebes adunatae.”
28. PLRE 1.240, Dalmatius 2, asserts confidently that he was a military commander; he could be vicarius of the diocese of Pannoniae or Licinius' praetorian prefect.
text is crucial to understanding the document.\textsuperscript{29} To put the matter crudely, it sets out to bribe the soldiers of the Danubian armies to support Licinius and his ally Constantine against Maximinus—who is pointedly (and irregularly) omitted from the imperial college in whose name Licinius issued the letter.\textsuperscript{30} Soldiers in service (Licinius ordains) may exempt five \textit{capita} "from the register and from the normal obligations to make payments to the \textit{annona} (ex \textit{censu adque a praestationibus sollemnibus annonariae pensitationis}), and these same five \textit{capita} shall remain exempt from tax after the completion of the statutory term of service and an honorable discharge (lines 12–15). Soldiers already retired after twenty years of service, or discharged because of wounds before completing twenty years of service, by contrast, may exempt only two \textit{capita}, which are defined as those of the individual and his wife (lines 15–20).

What is the innovation here? The Brigetio Table, like a law of 325 (\textit{CTh} 7.20.4), assumes that soldiers were not totally exempt from taxation, but were merely allowed to deduct a standard amount, expressed in \textit{capita}, from their assessment.\textsuperscript{31} It may be suggested, therefore, that in June 311 Licinius raised the exemption for soldiers serving under his command from two \textit{capita} to five, and that two \textit{capita} had previously been the standard exemption. Whatever \textit{caput} may mean elsewhere,\textsuperscript{32} in the Brigetio Table of 311 it seems to denote both the tax assessment for a single individual exclusive of his property and its equivalent. Licinius writes as if the tax assessment of a soldier serving under him is to be obtained by subtracting five \textit{capita} from what would be the normal assessment of a civilian with the same family and property. By implication, therefore, total tax assessments were normally expressed in numbers of \textit{capita}.

\textit{(e) The Panegyric of 311}

The speech which thanks Constantine for alleviating the tax burdens of Autun (\textit{Pan. Lat.} 5(8)) can only be understood when it is correctly dated: it was not delivered on 31 March 312 (as has often been assumed),\textsuperscript{33} but in 311, probably on 25 July,\textsuperscript{34} and it alludes to the empire-wide censuses of 306 and 311.

On the unknown orator's presentation, the city of Autun was reduced to penury and despair by the \textit{novi census acerbitas} (5.4).\textsuperscript{35} Yet he has to concede

\textsuperscript{29} D. van Berchem, \textit{L'armée de Dioclétien et la réforme constantinienne} (Paris, 1952), 75 ff.
\textsuperscript{30} R. Egger, \textit{Römische Antike und frühes Christentum} 2 (Klagenfurt, 1963), 51 ff.
\textsuperscript{31} In the definition of the contemporary jurist Charisius, soldiers and veterans were exempt from \textit{munera personalia} and \textit{munera mixta}, but liable to \textit{munera patrimoniorum}, levied on their property, but not on their persons (Dig. 50.4.18.21 ff.).
\textsuperscript{32} Passages where \textit{caput} appears to be equivalent to \textit{iugum} are collected in \textit{TLL} 3.407.
\textsuperscript{34} Chapter V, n. 107.
\textsuperscript{35} Mynors prints Cuspinianus' unnecessary emendation \textit{enormitas} (p. 178).
that Autun had the land which was registered and, like other cities, was bound by "the common schedule of the Gallic census" (5.5: Gallicani census communi formula), or, as he expresses it a few lines later, "we have both the number of men who were entered and the quantity of farmland" (6.1). The "new census" should be that of 306: on the preceding arguments, the "harshness" will have consisted of adding the urban population of Autun to the land and rural population to produce a higher total assessment.

To remedy the situation, Constantine did two quite separate things (10.5 ff.). He reduced the assessment of Autun from 32,000 capita to 25,000 (11-12), and he remitted the arrears of taxation which the city owed for the last five years (13-14). That is, he remitted the arrears owing since the census of 306, and he reduced by 7,000 capita the city's assessment in the census of 311. The orator makes it clear that 32,000 capita represents the city's assessment in 306 still in force at the time of the speech: "nescit taxare indulgentiam tuam qui te putat septem milia capitum sola donasse: donasti omnia quae stare fecisti. quamquam enim adhuc sub pristina sarcina vacillemus, tamen levior videtur quia vicino <fine> perfertur; exonerandi praesumptio dat patientiam sustinendi" (12.1/2). In other words, Autun is still suffering from the "burden" of the assessment of 306, but it will soon be replaced by a lighter burden, when the new assessment takes effect on 1 September 311. How did Constantine hit on a reduction of precisely 7,000 capita? Comparison with Maximinus' actions in 311 suggests that the figure of 7,000 represents the plebs urbana of Autun, assessed for the first time in 306, but exempted again five years later.36

(f) An Edict of Constantine

In 1908 B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt published a fragmentary papyrus from Oxyrhynchus under the title "Edict of Diocletian and Petition" (P. Oxy. 889), Their statement of the date of the document remained unchallenged until J. D. Thomas and I independently realized that it must be an edict which Constantine issued in autumn 324. Thomas published a photograph of the papyrus and proposed revisions to Grenfell and Hunt's text of the first thirteen lines, while I attempted to deduce from the document some details of the fiscal policy of Licinius and the identity of the Proculus who was consul in 325.37 But we had worked in complete independence of each other, and neither of us proposed a full restoration of the imperial titles. Accordingly, I print below a text which results from my subsequent discussion of the document with Dr. Thomas and consultation of a photograph of the papyrus.38 The readings and supplements are those of Grenfell and Hunt unless otherwise stated.

36. Hence a valuable addition to the meager evidence for the size of city populations assembled and discussed by R. Duncan Jones, The Economy of the Roman Empire: Quantitative Studies (Cambridge, 1974), 259 ff.
38. Kindly supplied by Dr. J. R. Rea in advance of the publication of Ancient Society 7 (1976), Plate VI.
[Αὐτοκράτωρ Καίσαρ Φλαούιος Ουαλέριος Κωνσταντίνος Σαρματικὸς
μέγιστος Περσικὸς μέγιστος Γερμανίκος
καὶ Φλαούιος Ιούλιος Κωνστάντιος Σαρματικὸς Μεγίστος Γερμανίκος
μέγιστος Δεκεμβρίων Ἄνικίου Παυλίνου
c. 33 letters... έπιφανεστάτοις Καίσαρες
φιλανθρωπία κεκελεύκαμεν [ ]
]ου χρόνου τῆς πολυαιτίας α . [ ]
] καταλαμβανόντων διὰ τ [ ]
] έξακτορες και ἐπίσταθμοι κο [ ]
] όις ἐξηκονταετίς ώς εἰ ελα [ ]
]. ιρ τῇ α´ εἰδῶν Δεκεμβρίῳ [ ]
c. 41 letters... τοῖς ἐπιφανεστάτοις
Καίσαρ[σιν τὸ γ´ ύπατοις. ὑπατίας Οὐ[αλερίου
[Πρόκλου καὶ... c. 33 letters... Ἀνικίου Παυλίνου
tῶν λαμ]προτάτων Παχῶν κθ [ ]
] πόλεως διὰ τοῦ ἐνάρχου πρωτάν[εως
] τῆς] αὐτῆς πόλεως [ ]
] παρὰ τῆς] αὐτῆς πόλεως. τοῦ πρωτεταγ[μένου
] έξηκο]στόν ἐνιαυτόν ὑπερβεβήκοτ [ ]
] ἐβδομηκοστόν καὶ τρίτον ἐνιαυ[τόν
] περί τῆς] αὐτῆς πόλεως, τοῦ σώματος ἰσθένειαν
γνοὺςουσίαν μήτε κτήσιν [ ]
] ν ἐπιρωσθῆναι κάμοι τον . [ ]
] αι ἐπὶ τῶν ὁμοίων μοι φθασαντ . [ ]

1 Αὐτοκράτωρ... μέγιστος¹ supp. Thomas
2 μέγιστος Περσικὸς μέγιστος Barnes, cetera GH
3 Γερμανίκοι Thomas, cetera Barnes
4 μέγιστοι¹ Thomas
καὶ Φλαούιος Ιούλιος Κωνστάντιος οἱ Barnes, cetera Thomas, cetera GH
Μαξιμιανὸς οἱ GH μέγιστοι Thomas
8 έξακτορες Thomas προ[άκτορες GH
10 προσεδο ἐν Αλεξανδρίᾳ GH
ἐν Νίκομηδίᾳ Thomas dubitanter
11 τοῖς ἐπιφανεστάτοις sup. Thomas
Οὐ[αλερίου Barnes Ο[ Thomas Ὁ[ GH
12 sup. Barnes
18 τῆν corr. e τῆς
Commentary

1. For Constantine's first three victory titles in this order, *ILS 695* (Sitifis, 315); *CIL 2.481* (Emerita). Since Constantine became *Germanicus maximus* for the first time in 307, the preceding *Sarmaticus maximus* must derive in the first instance from a victory won by another emperor, presumably Galerius, late 306 or early 307 (Tables 7, 8). It follows that the victory titles observe the principle of collegiality—which is very relevant to the conjectural restoration of lines 2–4.

2. The division between lines is uncertain. I have placed the μέγιστος which must follow Γουνθικός in line 2 and supplied Περσικός μέγιστος from Table 7. There still remains a gap of c. 33 letters, which may be supplemented from comparison with *ILS 8942* (Semta, 315) and *ILS 696* (near Sitifis, 318), where Constantine seems to have the titles Adiab(enicus) max(imus), Med(icus) ma-x(imus) (*ILS 696* adds Armen(icus) max(imus)) in virtue (it appears) of victories won by Licinius in 313–315 (Chapter V, n. 145)). Presumably, therefore, supply here Α’Διαβηνικός μέγιστος Μηδικός μέγιστος.

3–4. Although in line 4 tau seems palaeographically preferable to sigma, it is historically impossible: appointed Caesar on 8 November 324, Constantius cannot have acquired any victory titles by 12 December 324 (line 10). Hence [Κωνστάντιος] should be restored: the space of c. 29 letters preceding his name will have been occupied by two titles reflecting victories won between 318 and 324 either by Constantine or by Crispus or by Licinius. Further, in order to respect the principle of collegiality, the Caesars Crispus and Constantinus cannot possess victory titles which Constantine lacks. Perhaps, therefore, either Γουνθικοί μέγιστοι or Περσικοί μέγιστοι should be supplied together with Α’Ρμενικοί μέγιστοι (a total of 33 letters)—which will imply victories of Licinius for which no explicit evidence appears to exist. The title Σαρματικοί μέγιστοι in first place must reflect an imperial victory won between 1 March 317 and Crispus' German victory c. 319—i.e. a victory won by Licinius c. 318 (Chapter V, nn. 147, 151). The space of c. 13 letters at the beginning of line 3 will presumably have been occupied by some phrase such as οἱ υἱοί αὐτοῦ (see F. Preisigke, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden* 3 (Berlin, 1931), 67; Supp. 1 (Amsterdam, 1971), 349).

5–9. See below, on lines 15–21.

10. The date of 12 December represents either the day on which Constantine issued the edict in Nicomedia (Thomas) or the day of its publication in Alexandria (Grenfell and Hunt). Since the traces before the iota are most uncertain, I suspend judgment.

10–11. The large space can easily be filled by supplying the names of the Caesars Crispus and Constantinus in full again.

11. Although Grenfell and Hunt printed *Οκά* they also stated that "Οβ[ [ may be read for "Οκά": hence the consular date may be 325 and the first con-
sul’s name Valerius Proculus. This identification was proposed in ZPE 21 (1976), 280 f., and is adopted above in Chapter VI.

12. The size of the space implies that the Sextus Anicius Paulinus who was consul in 325 possessed several names in addition to the three attested. It is tempting to supply Σέξτου Ιουνίου Καισωνίου Νικομάχου (31 letters).

13–15. On the destination of the petition of lines 15 ff., see J. D. Thomas, Ancient Society 7 (1976), 308.

15–21. The edict (5–9) and the petition which appeals to it (15–21) need to be considered together. Although the exact content of the edict appears to be irretrievably lost, enough survives to discern its main purport. It spoke of imperial generosity (5), of old age (6), of officials who collected taxes (8), and of persons aged sixty or more (9). Accordingly, in ZPE 21 (1976), 280, I adduced Eusebius, HE 10.8.12; VC 1.55 (translated above, section 1), and argued that Constantine is here reducing to sixty the age of exemption from the poll tax, which Licinius had raised in the census of 321. It follows from this interpretation of the edict that the petitioner is applying to have his name removed from the tax rolls forthwith (15–21). His age is now seventy-two: if the petition belongs to 325 (as seems probable), he was under seventy in 321, and the tax registers still contained his name among those liable to poll tax. A caveat must be entered. The papyrus has normally been taken to refer to exemption from liturgies (N. Lewis, Atti dell’ XI Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia (Milan, 1966), 519; A. K. Bowman, The Town Councils of Roman Egypt (American Studies in Papyrology 11, 1971), 167). If that is correct, then it may be inferred that in 321 Licinius raised the age of exemption from liturgy pari passu with the maximum age of liability to poll tax, and that Constantine reduced both in 324.
The early history of the Donatist schism is known almost exclusively from documents quoted by Eusebius of Caesarea, and from documents which Optatus of Milevis and Augustine of Hippo used in their polemical works against the Donatists. The single most important source of such documents is the collection which Optatus appended to his work. But a large part of this appendix has been lost in transmission, and it seems that in the early fifth century Augustine was still able to procure authentic documents of the Constantinian period not in Optatus' collection. Hence the reports of both Optatus and Augustine must sometimes serve in lieu of lost documents.

Many of the documents, extant and reported alike, have been claimed as bogus or interpolated at one time or another. But none of the arguments yet

2. As extant, Optatus' appendix comprises the following documents: App. 1, *Gesta apud Zenophilum* of 13 December 320, incomplete at the end; App. 2, *Acta purgationis Felicis* of 15 February 315, of which only the end survives; App. 3-10, various documents registered below as nos. 9, 11 a, 12, 15, 18, 14, 25, and 30.
advanced has been compelling, and the integral authenticity of all the documents is here assumed. There are real and serious problems on at least three levels. A genuine document is not necessarily a truthful one; Optatus' appendix survives only in a single manuscript of the eleventh century, which presents a corrupt text in several passages; and most of the documents lack a full and formal protocol and subscription, so that they must be dated from their contents and from general historical considerations.

A correct chronology for the crucial years between 314 and 317 was until recently precluded. For, if Constantine fought Licinius in 314 and was in the Balkans from September 314 to June 315, then he cannot have been in Gaul during these months—and the chronology of the Donatist dispute was deduced from this assumption. But if Constantine was in Gaul throughout 314 and 315, except for a journey to Rome in summer 315, and went to war with Licinius in autumn 316, then the chronology of his dealings with the Donatists must be constructed afresh on this basis. This chapter accordingly lists and attempts to date Constantine's recorded pronouncements which are relevant to Donatism. Although the dates in standard accounts need wholesale revision only for the years from 312 to 317, all the items of Constantinian date (i.e., between autumn 312 and summer 337) which H. von Soden included in his collection of documents relating to Donatism are for convenience listed and dated.

---

Donatistenstreites (313-315) und zum Prozess Athanasius von Alexandrien (328-346) (Antiquitas 1.21, 1975), 6 ff. (no. 5).

Some of these scholars blur a crucial distinction: if Constantine incorporated the suggestions of an ecclesiastical adviser into a document which he promulgated, that cannot be called an interpolation—a term which must be reserved strictly for insertions made after the document left the emperor (S. Calderone, Costantino e il Cattolicesimo 1 (Florence, 1962), 265 n. 2).

5. The conclusions of Seeck and Batiffol never won wide assent; in refutation of Frend and Kraft, see respectively H. Chadwick, JEH 5 (1954), 104; H. U. Instinsky, Gnomon 30 (1958), 132 ff. Girardet argues that Donatists cannot have called bishops of the opposing party episcopi, and that a request for plural iudices is impossible (Kaisgericht 21). Refutation of such a priori reasoning is not necessary—despite the apparent acquiescence of reviewers.

6. JTS, n.s. 26 (1975), 14 ff. (on the proceedings of the Council at Cirta quoted by Augustine, Contra Cresconium 3.27.30 = Soden, Urkunde 5).


These five documents must be considered together. The report of Anullinus quotes the preceding letter:

διόπερ εκείνους τοὺς εἴσω τῆς ἐπαρχίας τῆς σοι πεπιστευμένης ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἢ Καικιλιανὸς ἔφεστηκεν, τὴν ἐξ αὐτῶν ὑπηρεσίαν τῇ ἁγίᾳ ταύτῃ θρησκείᾳ παρέχοντας, οὕτως κληρικοὺς ἐπονομάζειν εἰώθασιν, ἀπὸ πάντων ἀπαξ ἀπλῶς τῶν λειτουργιῶν βούλομαι ἀλείτουργητος διαφυλαχθῆναι, ὡστε κληρικοὺς θείαις ἑρωσύλου ἀπὸ τῆς θεραπείας τῆς θειότητι ἀφέλκωνται, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ἄνευ τινος ἐνοχλήσεως τῷ Ιδίῳ νόμῳ ἐξυπηρετῶνται, ώστε μεγίστην περὶ τὸ θεῖον λατρείαν ποιομένων πλείστον ὅσον τοῖς κοινοῖς πράγμασι συνοίσειν δοκεῖ. (Eusebius, HE 10.7.2)

scripta caelestia maiestatis vestrae accepta atque adorata Caeciliano et his, qui sub eodem agunt quique clerici appellantur, devotio mea apud acta parvitas meae insinuare curavit eodemquehortata est, ut unitate consensu omnium facta, cum omni omnino munere indulgentia maiestatis vestrae liberati esse videantur, catholicae custodita sanctitate legis debita reverentia ac divinis rebus inserviant. (Augustine, Epp. 88.2)

Moreover, the first two letters are clearly earlier than the third. The exact date of Anullinus' report is subject to a slight uncertainty. As transmitted and printed by von Soden, the text gives 15 April 315 as the date of the petition rather than of the report: "transmissi libelli duo, unus in aluta suprascriptus ita: libellus ecclesiae catholicae criminum Caeciliani traditus a parte Maiorini, item alius sine sigillo cohaerens eidem alutae, datus die XVII Kalendas Maias Carthagine domino nostro Constantino Augusto III." Since Anullinus addresses three Augusti (Auggg. nnn. in the heading), the original consular date has clearly been altered by the deletion of the name Maximinus. In addition, the proconsul ought to date his letter—a matter of far more moment than the date of the Donatist petition handed to him. The original letter, therefore, probably read: "... alutae. Datum die XVII Kalendas Maias Carthagine dominis nostris Constantino et Maximino Augustis ter consulis."

6. Optatus 1.23 (not included by von Soden)
313, June
Constantine's reply to the Donatists

Optatus quotes only a brief clause or sentence (p. 26.7–9 Ziwsa) which closely resembles a sentence in Constantine's letter to the Council of Arles (App. 5, p. 209.22–23 Ziwsa).

7. Eusebius, HE 10.5.18–20 = Soden, Urkunde 12
313, June
Letter of Constantine to Miltiades, bishop of Rome, and Marcus

Constantine instructs the bishop of Rome to hear the Donatist appeal with three Gallic bishops, presumably as soon as he received Anullinus' report of 15 April (cf. Optatus 1.23).

8. Soden, Urkunde 13 = Optatus 1.23/24 + Augustine, Contra partem Donati post gesta 33.56 + Brev. Coll. 3.12.24, 3.17.31 + Epp. 43.5.16
313, probably September 30–October 2
Synod at Rome under Miltiades

12. No. 1 orders the speedy restoration of property to "the Catholic church," while no. 2 refers to instructions which Constantine gave to Anullinus in person (HE 10.6.4), i.e. at Rome very shortly after 28 October 312.
13. From A. Goldbacher, CSEL 34.2 (1898), 408.
14. The Maurist editors printed datum and punctuated accordingly (whence PL 33.303). Observe also that in Epp. 88.2 the Maurist editors correctly print "indulgentia maiestatis vestrae" where Goldbacher and von Soden read "indulgentiae."
15. E. L. Grasmiick, Coercido 254 f., assumes that Optatus is quoting (and altering) Optatus, App. 5.
16. G. Roethe, Synoden 65 n. 44, arguing that the date of 2 October (Optatus 1.23) should refer to the last, not the first day of the hearing, which lasted three days (Cap. Coll. Carth. 3.323).
    314, spring
    Letter of Constantine to ?Aelafius, *vicarius* of Africa

    314, spring
    Letter of Constantine to Chrestus, bishop of Syracuse

    Both these letters are concerned with transport to the Council of Arles, which met in August 314.

11. Soden, *Urkunden* 16, 17, 17a, comprising:
    a. Optatus, App. 4: letter of the bishops at Arles to Silvester, bishop of Rome
    314, August 1
    Council of Arles

    For the date, see Optatus, App. 3, p. 206.5 Ziwsa; Eusebius, *HE* 10.5.23; headings to the subscriptions, *CCL* 148.14-22.

12. Optatus, App. 5 = Soden, *Urkunde* 18
    314, August/September
    Letter of Constantine to the *episcopi catholici* at Arles

    The date of this letter is deduced from four facts:
    a. The council began on 1 August 314.
    b. Appended to the letter of the bishops (no. 11a) is the sentence: “tunc taedi-ans iussit omnes ad sedes suas redire,” where the subject of the verb appears to be Constantine.17
    d. The Donatists have appealed from the Council of Arles to the emperor (p. 209.13 ff. Ziwsa, cf. Augustine, *Epp. 43.7.20*).

13. Soden, *Urkunde* 19 = Optatus, App. 2
    315, February 15
    *Acta purgationis Felicis*

Augustine states the date as "Volusiano et Anniano consulibus XV Kal. Mart.," i.e. 15 February 314 (Contra partem Donati post gesta 33.56). But it has long been recognized that the year must be an error for post consulatum Volusiani et Anniani: the acta contain the reading of a document dated 18 August 314 (p. 198.19 Ziwsa).

14. Optatus, App. 8 = Soden, Urkunde 22
   315, April 28
   Letter of Petronius Annianus and Julius Julianus to Domitius Celsus, vicarius of Africa

15. Optatus, App. 6 = Soden, Urkunde 21
   315, c. May 1
   Letter of Constantine to the Donatist bishops

16. Augustine, Epp. 88.4 = Contra Cresconium 3.70.81 = Soden, Urkunde 20
   315, c. May 1
   Letter in the name of both Constantine and Licinius to Probianus, pro-consul of Africa

These three documents cohere very closely. The first is a travel pass issued at Trier on 28 April (p. 212 Ziwsa: "Hilarius princeps obtulit IIII Kal. Maias Triberis"): if the diurnal date is correct, then the year can only be 315. In the second document, Constantine informs the Donatist bishops that a few days earlier he had decided to allow them to return to Africa as they desired, but that now he wishes to keep them at court: the effect of the letter, therefore, is to cancel the travel pass of 28 April 315. The reason for Constantine's change of mind can be inferred from the third document, which is his response to receiving a report from the proconsul Aelianus that Felix had been vindicated at the hearing on 15 February 315. Both the letter to the bishops and that to the new proconsul Probianus refer to Constantine's desire to settle the dispute himself:

placuit mihi, sicut dixi, ut Caecilianus iuxta prius tractatum huc potius veniat, quem credo iuxta litteras meas mox adfuturum. polliceo autem vobis, quod si praesente ipso de uno tantum crimen vel facinore eius per vosmet ipsos aliquid probaveritis, id apud me sit, ac si universa, quae ei intenditis, probata esse videantur. (Optatus, App. 6, pp. 210.31-211.1 Ziwsa)

18. O. Seeck, ZKG 10 (1889) 516; Regesten 162 f.
19. Chapter IX. 1. Hilarius was presumably the princeps officii of the praetorian prefect at Trier (so PLRE 1.434); hence 28 April will be the day on which the Donatist bishops received the pass to return to Africa.
20. L. Duchesne, MEFR 10 (1890), 619 f.
unde volumus, ut eundem ipsum Ingentium sub idonea prosecuti-

ne ad comitatum meum Constantini Augusti mittas, ut illis, qui in
praesentiarum agunt atque diurnis diebus interpellare non desi-
nunt, audientibus et coram adsistentibus apparere et intimare possit
frustra eos Caeciliano episcopo invidiam comparare atque adversus
eum violenter insurgere voluisse. ita enim fiet, ut omissis, sicuti
oportet, eiusmodi contentionibus populus sine dissensione aliqua
religioni propriae cum debita veneratione deserviat. (Augustine,
Epp. 88.4)

The most natural deduction from their contents appears to be that the second
and third documents were written no more than a few days after 28 April 315.21

17. Soden, Urkunde 24 = Optatus 1.26
315, summer
Mission of Eunomius and Olympius

The mission of Eunomius and Olympius to Carthage is normally dated
no earlier than winter 315/6.22 However, in his letter to the Donatists of early
May 315 (no. 15), Constantine refers to a mission which either never occurred
or is otherwise unknown or was that of the two bishops: “hoc mihi placuerat,
ut ad Africam reverteremini, ut illic omnis causa, quae vobis adversus Caeci-
lianum competere videtur, ab amicis meis quos elegissem cognosceretur atque
finem debitum reciperet” (Optatus, App. 6, p. 210.20–23 Ziwsa). Moreover,
during the forty days which Eunomius and Olympius spent in Carthage, the
Donatists rioted (Optatus 1.26), and Constantine alludes to Donatist riots in a
letter to the vicarius Celsus: “Perseverare Menalium eum, quem iam dudum
susceperat insania, <et> ceteros qui a veritate dei digressi errori se pravissimo
dererunt, proxima etiam gravitatis tuae scripta testata sunt, quibus inhaeren-
tem te iussionem nostrae de merito seditionis ipsorum eoque tumultu, quem ap-
parabant, inhibitum esse memorasti, frater carissime” (Optatus, App. 7, p.
211.5–10 Ziwsa). The most economical hypothesis is to identify the two sets of
riots: hence, since the letter to Celsus can be no later than winter 315/6, the
mission of the two bishops should belong to the summer of 315.

18. Optatus, App. 7 = Soden, Urkunde 23
315, autumn
Letter of Constantine to Celsus, vicarius of Africa

22. Thus N. H. Baynes, Constantine 15, accepting Seeck’s date of 27 February 316 for Opta-
tus, App. 8 (no. 14).
Constantine refers to the flight of the Donatists from the imperial court at Milan c. October 315 (Augustine, *Epp.* 43.7.20) as if it were recent (p. 211. 10–13 Ziwsa). The date, therefore, is probably late in 315 (though it could be very early in 316).23

19. Augustine, *Contra Cresconium* 3.71.82 = Soden, *Urkunde* 25 (A)
   316, November 10
   Letter of Constantine to Eumelius, *vicarius Africae*
   
   The date is stated in Augustine, *Contra partem Donati post gesta* 33.56
   = Soden, *Urkunde* 25 (B).

   ?316, November
   Law of Constantine *ut loca congregationum vestrarum fisco vindicarentur.*
   
   Presumably to be dated shortly after Constantine's letter to Eumelius.

21. Soden, *Urkunde* 27
   317
   Repression of Donatists by Leontius and Ursacius24

   ?317
   Donatist petition to Constantine

   The reported content of the petition implies a date between the repressive measures of 316–317 and the recall of Donatist bishops in 321:25 "ibi dicunt nullo modo se communicatos antistiti ipsius nebuloni paratosque esse perpetui quidquid eis facere voluisset; quem Constantini antistitem nebulonem utique Caecilianum intellegi volebant."

23. Soden, *Urkunde* 28 = Optatus, App. 1
   320, December 13
   *Gesta apud Zenophilum*

23. L. Duchesne, *MEFR* 10 (1890), 620 f.
   321, May 5
   Letter of Constantine to Verinus, *vicarius Africae*

25. Optatus, App. 9 = Soden, *Urkunde* 31
   321, ?May 5
   Letter of Constantine to all the bishops throughout Africa and the laity of the *ecclesia catholica*

   The letter represents Constantine’s justification to Catholic bishops for the reversal of policy announced in the letter to Verinus, which allowed banished Donatist bishops to return from exile; it should, therefore, belong to the same date.26

   324, October
   Mission of eastern clerics to Africa27

27. *CTh* 16.5.1 = Soden, *Urkunde* 33
   326, September 1
   Excerpt from a constitution addressed to Dracilianus (*vicarius* of Oriens), restricting clerical immunity to Catholics alone28

28. Soden, *Urkunde* 34 = *CIL* 8.21517
   Inscription from Mauretania (found near Oran) honoring martyrs who died on 21 October: although the inscription is explicitly dated to 329, the year may be that of the construction of the *memoria* rather than that of the martyrdoms.29 Moreover, the martyrs are not certainly Donatist.30

29. *CTh* 16.2.7 = Soden, *Urkunde* 35
   330, February 5
   Letter of Constantine to Valentinus, *consularis* of Numidia

26. L. Duchesne, *MEFR* 10 (1890), 611.
27. H.-G. Opitz, in a note on his *Urkunde* 17.4, interprets the passage as a reference to events a decade earlier. That is impossible: “the common foe of the whole world, who set his own unlawful opinion against your holy councils” must be Licinius (H. Dörries, *Das Selbstzeugnis Kaiser Konstantins* (Abh. Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Klasse 3, 1954), 56), and later in the same letter Constantine alludes to the Donatist schism as continuing (*VC* 2.68.1).
30. A possibility exists that one or more of the martyrs has gained admittance to the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*, see H. Delehaye, *Acta Sanctorum*, Nov. 2.2 (Brussels, 1931), 565.
30. Optatus, App. 10 = Soden, *Urkunde* 36
   330, February 5
   Letter of Constantine to eleven catholic bishops of Numidia

   Constantine replies to a letter informing him that the Donatists had seized the basilica at Cirta (30) and issues instructions to officials in the light of this information (29).31

31. Soden, *Urkunde* 37 = Optatus 3.3
   336/7
   Letters of Donatus to Gregorius, who was then praetorian prefect in Africa

32. Soden, *Urkunde* 38 = Augustine, *Epp.* 93.10.43
   ?
   Donatist council held at Carthage some years before 347, in which 270 bishops took part

   31. The law is dated by day, month, and year, the letter to the bishops by day and month alone, both being issued at Serdica. *PLRE* 1.1020, Anonymus 95, deduces from no. 30 the existence of an otherwise unknown *consularis Numidiae* in 320 or 321.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>cos.</th>
<th>cos.</th>
<th>cos.</th>
<th>cos.</th>
<th>cos.</th>
<th>cos.</th>
<th>cos.</th>
<th>cos.</th>
<th>cos.</th>
<th>cos.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diocletian</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximian</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantius</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>306</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galerius</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>308</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severus</td>
<td>307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximinus</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>313</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>329</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licinius</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crispus</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licinius Caesar</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>329</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantius Caesar</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>329</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantius</td>
<td>326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalmatius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trib. pot. imp.</td>
<td>trib. pot. ii imp.</td>
<td>Irregularities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocletian</td>
<td>20.11.284-</td>
<td>10.12.284-</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.12.284</td>
<td>19.11.285</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximian</td>
<td>1.4.286-</td>
<td>10.12.286-</td>
<td>trib. pot. viii imp. vii,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>trib. pot. ix imp. viii,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3.293-31.3.293</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantius</td>
<td>1.3.293-</td>
<td>10.12.293-</td>
<td>imperator apparently computed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.12.293*</td>
<td>28.2.294*</td>
<td>from 1 May 305, but no additional renewal of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tribunicia potestas on that day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galerius</td>
<td>1.3.293-</td>
<td>10.12.293-</td>
<td>trib. pot. xiii imp. xiii,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.12.293*</td>
<td>28.2.294*</td>
<td>1.3.305-30.4.305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>trib. pot. xiv imp. xiv,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5.305-9.12.305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severus</td>
<td>1.5.305-</td>
<td>10.12.305-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.12.305*</td>
<td>30.4.306*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximinus</td>
<td>1.5.305-</td>
<td>10.12.305-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.12.305*</td>
<td>30.4.306*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine</td>
<td>25.7.306-</td>
<td>10.12.306-</td>
<td>trib. pot. ii imp. ii,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>trib. pot. iii imp. iii,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licinius</td>
<td>8.11.308-</td>
<td>10.12.308-</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.12.308</td>
<td>7.11.309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantin</td>
<td>1.3.317-</td>
<td>10.12.317-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.12.317*</td>
<td>28.2.318*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine</td>
<td>8.11.324-</td>
<td>10.12.324-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.12.324*</td>
<td>7.11.325*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constans</td>
<td>25.12.333-</td>
<td>10.12.334-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.12.334*</td>
<td>24.12.334*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Title imperator not used at the time, though its possession then is assumed in later computations, when the Caesar became an Augustus.

Evidence for irregularities: Maximian ILS 640; Chapter III, no. 2.
Constantius ILS 651; AE 1895.80 = Kolbe, Statthalter 55 nos. 1, 2.
Galerius Chapter III, no. 7.
Constantine Table 3, Computation A.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A: actual</th>
<th>B: no additional renewals</th>
<th>C: Galerius</th>
<th>D: imp. reckoned from promotion to Augustus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>trib. pot. imp.</td>
<td>25.7.306-</td>
<td>25.7.306-</td>
<td>c. Sept. 306-</td>
<td>trib. pot.: 25.7.306-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.7.307*</td>
<td>24.7.307*</td>
<td>c. Sept. 307*</td>
<td>c. Sept. 307*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trib. pot. iii imp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.7.308</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.12.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trib. pot. iii imp. iii</td>
<td>c. Sept. 307-</td>
<td>25.7.308-</td>
<td>c. Sept. 308-</td>
<td>c. Sept. 308-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trib. pot. iv imp. iv</td>
<td>25.7.308-</td>
<td>25.7.309-</td>
<td>c. Sept. 309-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.12.308</td>
<td>9.12.309*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Title imperator not used at the time, though its possession then is assumed in later computations after Constantine was acknowledged as an Augustus.

Evidence used:
- B: CIL 8.8477 = ILS 695; CIL 8.22017; 23116 = ILS 8942
- C: Chapter III, no. 7.
- D: CIL 8.18905; 23897 = ILS 8941.

Evidence rejected: CIL 5.8059 (trib. pot. XXIII imp. XXII cos. VIII; contrast ILS 697, etc. with cos. VII); 8.8476 (trib. pot. X imp. VI cons. IIII: the second numeral is probably incomplete, see H. Dessau, EE 7 (1892), 431).
TABLE 4. IMPERIAL VICTORY TITLES IN 301

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of times title taken by</th>
<th>Diocletian</th>
<th>Maximian</th>
<th>Constantius</th>
<th>Galerius</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germanicus maximus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarmaticus maximus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>[2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpicus maximus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>[1]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidence: Chapter III, nos. 1 and 2.
### Table 5. The Dates of the Victory Titles Attested in 301

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Diocletian</th>
<th>Maximian</th>
<th>Constantius and Galerius</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>Germanicus maximus</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>Sarmaticus maximus</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>Germanicus maximus II</td>
<td>Germanicus maximus</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>Germanicus maximus III</td>
<td>Germanicus maximus II</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Germanicus maximus IV</td>
<td>Germanicus maximus III</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>Sarmaticus maximus II</td>
<td>Sarmaticus maximus</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>Germanicus maximus V</td>
<td>Germanicus maximus IV</td>
<td>Germanici maximi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>Sarmaticus maximus III</td>
<td>Sarmaticus maximus II</td>
<td>Sarmatici maximi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>Persicus maximus</td>
<td>Persicus maximus</td>
<td>Persici maximi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>Brittanicus maximus</td>
<td>Brittanicus maximus</td>
<td>Brittici maximi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>Carpicus maximus</td>
<td>Carpicus maximus</td>
<td>Carpici maximi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>Armenicus maximus</td>
<td>Armenicus maximus</td>
<td>Medici maximi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>Medicus maximus</td>
<td>Medicus maximus</td>
<td>Medici maximi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>Adiabenicus maximus</td>
<td>Adiabenicus maximus</td>
<td>Adiabenici maximi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>Persicus maximus II</td>
<td>Persicus maximus II</td>
<td>Persici maximi II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299 or 300</td>
<td>Sarmaticus maximus IV</td>
<td>Sarmaticus maximus III</td>
<td>Sarmatici maximi II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 or 301</td>
<td>Germanicus maximus VI</td>
<td>Germanicus maximus V</td>
<td>Germanici maximi II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taken from *Phoenix* 30 (1976), 188, with three modifications:

1. The first three German victories are here identified as (i) Maximian's defeat of the Chabinones and Heruli, (ii) his repulse of a German raid on 1 January 287, and (iii) his expedition across the Rhine during 287. *Pan. Lat.* 10(2) speaks of a *triumphus* and *victoria* on 1 January 287 (6.4).

2. I no longer regard *ILS* 640 as sufficient proof that all four emperors had officially taken the title of *Persicus maximus* between 1 March 293 and the end of 294 (cf. *ILS* 618, with *Persici maximi* for Diocletian and Maximian in 290).

3. I no longer regard *Chr. Min.* 1.230 as sufficient for dating the fourth Sarmatian victory to 299, even tentatively: (i) the date is not certain, (ii) Diocletian may have celebrated the defeat of the Marcomanni by taking the title *Germanicus maximus VI*, not *Sarmaticus maximus IV* (P. Brennan, *Chiron* 10 (1980), 564 n. 36).
TABLE 6. THE VICTORY TITLES OF GALERIUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>20 Nov./9 Dec. 301</th>
<th>7 Jan. 306</th>
<th>April 311</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germanicus maximus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>[7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegyptiacus maximus</td>
<td>omitted</td>
<td>omitted</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thebaicus maximus</td>
<td>omitted</td>
<td>omitted</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarmaticus maximus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persicus maximus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britanicus maximus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpicus maximus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenicus maximus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicus maximus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adiabenicus maximus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidence: Chapter III, nos. 1, 2 (301), 4 (306), and 6-8 (311).
### Table 7. The Dates of Galerius' Victory Titles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>Germanicus maximus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293/4</td>
<td>Aegyptiacus maximus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293/4</td>
<td>Thebaicus maximus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>Sarmaticus maximus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?295</td>
<td>Persicus maximus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>Britannicus maximus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>Carpicus maximus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>Armenicus maximus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>Medicus maximus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>Adiabenicus maximus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 298  | Persicus maximus    | II
| 299 or 300 | Sarmaticus maximus | II
| 300 or 301 | Germanicus maximus | II
| 302, 303, 304 | Germanicus maximus | III, IV, V
| 301, 302, 303, 304 | Carpicus maximus | II, III, IV, V
| ?302 | Sarmaticus maximus  | III
| 305  | Britannicus maximus |
| 306/7| Sarmaticus maximus  | IV
| 307, 308 | Germanicus maximus | VI, VII
| 308/309 | Carpicus maximus | VI
| 310  | Sarmaticus maximus  | V
| 310  | Persicus maximus    | III

Taken from *Phoenix* 30 (1976), 193, with minor modifications.
### TABLE 8. VICTORIES OF CONSTANTINE REFLECTED IN HIS OFFICIAL TITULATURE C. FEBRUARY 337

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>Germanicus maximus</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>Germanicus maximus II</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 314</td>
<td>Germanicus maximus</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>Sarmaticus maximus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328 or 329</td>
<td>Gothicus maximus</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328/9</td>
<td>Germanicus maximus</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>Gothicus maximus</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>Sarmaticus maximus</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>Dacicus maximus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 9. THE DATES OF APPOINTMENT OF *PRAEFECTI URBIS*, 302–338

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidence: *Chr. Min.* 1.67–68 (Chapter VII.1).
TABLE 10. PROVINCES OF ORIENS, PONTICA, AND ASIANA IN THE NICENE SUBSCRIPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>See of the first bishop listed</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>See of the first bishop listed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ORIENS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PONTICA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegyptus</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Cappadocia</td>
<td>Caesarea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thebais</td>
<td>Schedia</td>
<td>Armenia Minor</td>
<td>Sebasteia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya Superior</td>
<td>Berenice</td>
<td>Diospontus</td>
<td>Armenia Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya Inferior</td>
<td>Paraetonium</td>
<td>Pontus Polemoniacus</td>
<td>Neocaesarea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palaestina</td>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>Paphlagonia</td>
<td>Pompeiopolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenice</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>Galatia</td>
<td>Ancyra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria Coele</td>
<td>Antioch</td>
<td>Bithynia</td>
<td>Nicomedia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabia</td>
<td>Bostra</td>
<td>ASIANA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesopotamia</td>
<td>Edessa</td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Cyzicus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cilicia</td>
<td>Tarsus</td>
<td>Lydia</td>
<td>Sardis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Paphos</td>
<td>Phrygia</td>
<td>Laodicea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isauria</td>
<td>Barata</td>
<td>Pisidia</td>
<td>Iconium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lycia</td>
<td>Patara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pamphylia</td>
<td>Perge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Insulae</td>
<td>Rhodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caria</td>
<td>Antiochia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taken from H. Gelzer, H. Hilgenfeld, and O. Cuntz, *Patrum Nicaenorum nomina* (Leipzig, 1898), ix-lxiv ("Index patrum Nicaenorum restitutus").
### TABLE 11. EUROPEAN PROVINCES AND SEES IN THE NICENE SUBSCRIPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Sees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achaea</td>
<td>Athens, Euboea, Hephaesteia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Carthage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calabria</td>
<td>Calabria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dacia</td>
<td>Serdica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dardania</td>
<td>Macedonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Heraclea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galliae</td>
<td>Divia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>Thessalonica, Stobi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moesia</td>
<td>Marcianopolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pannonia</td>
<td>Pannonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thessalia</td>
<td>Thessalia, Thebes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on H. Gelzer, H. Hilgenfeld, and O. Cuntz, *Patrum Nicaenorum nomina* (Leipzig, 1898), lxiv, and *EOMIA* 1.83–91. This section is very confused in the Latin versions; for Euboea and Thessalia, the index of Theodore Lector has Boeotia and Larissa (Gelzer, Hilgenfeld, and Cuntz, p. 70).
### TABLE 12. PROVINCES AND SEES IN THE ANTI-ARIAN (“WESTERN”) CONCILIAR LIST OF SERDICA (343/4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Sees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achaea</td>
<td>Thebes, Elatea, Macaria, Megara, Patrae, Asopus, Scyros, Naupactus, Elis, Ciparissia, Mothone, Corone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apulia</td>
<td>Canusium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Tenedos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campania</td>
<td>Capua, Beneventum, Naples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dacia</td>
<td>Serdica, Naissus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dacia Ripensis</td>
<td>Aquae, Castra Martis, Oescus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dardania</td>
<td>Scupi, Ulpiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatia</td>
<td>Ancyra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallia</td>
<td>Lugdunum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italia</td>
<td>Verona, Aquileia, Ravenna, Brixia, Milan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>Diocletianopolis, Philippi, Heraclea Lyncestis, Lychnidus, Thessalonica, Parthicopolis, Dium, Beroea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palaestina</td>
<td>Gaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savia</td>
<td>Siscia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spainia(e)</td>
<td>Corduba, Castalona, Emerita, Asturica, Caesaraugusta, Barcelona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thessalia</td>
<td>Thebes, Hypata, Larissa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thracia</td>
<td>Gannos, Hadrianople</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuscia</td>
<td>Luca</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The following entries are not incorporated in the table:

17 *Dioscorus de Terasia*
31 *Athanasius ab Alexandria*
39 *Eliodorus a Nicopoli*
40 *Euterius a Pannoniis*
41 *Arius a Palestina*
42 *Asterius ab Arabia*
The seventy-three subscriptions of the Arian bishops at Serdica are preserved (edited by A. Feder, *CSEL* 65 (1916), 74-78), but virtually none record the province in addition to the see. The provinces are specified in general terms at the beginning of their synodical letter (*CSEL* 65.49.1-6):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thebais</th>
<th>Cappadocia</th>
<th>Pisidia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palaestina</td>
<td>Galatia</td>
<td>Insulae Cycladon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabia</td>
<td>Pontus</td>
<td>Lydia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenice</td>
<td>Bithynia</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria (74: Syria Coele)</td>
<td>Pamphylia</td>
<td>Europa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesopotamia</td>
<td>Paphlagonia</td>
<td>Hellespontus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cilicia</td>
<td>Caria</td>
<td>Thracia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isauria</td>
<td>Phrygia</td>
<td>Haemimontus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This list appears to be both incomplete and slightly inaccurate:

1. The version of the letter quoted by Hilary of Poitiers, *De Synodis* 33 (*PL* 10. 506-7) (a) omits Isauria, but (b) adds Aegyptus, Moesia and the two Pannonias, and (c) has *Phrygiis duabus* instead of *Frygia*.
2. Theodoretus, *HE* 2.8.1, preserves a similar list of provinces from which the anti-Arian bishops came in 343/4: it includes both *Φρυγία* and *Φρυγία ἄλλη*. 

---
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STEMMATA

The following stemmata are based on the discussion of emperors and their families in Chapter IV.

STEMMA 1. DIOCLETIAN, GALERIUS, AND MAXIMINUS

Diocletian = Prisca

Valeria =

Galerius

(by a concubine)

Candidianus

b. c. 296

? = sister

? = Maximinus

Maximus

daughter

b. c. 305

Valeria Maximilla = Maxentius

b. c. 306

(betrothed to Candidianus)
Stemma 2. Maximian and Constantius

? = (1) Maximian (2) = Eutropia

Fausta = Constantine
b. 289 or 290

Maxentius = Valeria Maximilla
b. c. 283

Helena = (1) Constantius (2) = Theodora

Constantine
b. 272 or 273

Valerius Romulus
d. 309
(= alive in 312)

Fl. Dalmatius

Julius Constantius

cos. 333

d. 337

(marriages and issue
here omitted)

Hannibalianus

Licinius = Constantia

Licinius Caesar

Anastasia
= Bassianus

Eutropia

Fl. Dalmatius

Caesar 335

d. 337

Hannibalianus = Constantina

rex 335

d. 337

Julius Nepotianus
(proclaimed Augustus
and killed in 350)
STEMMA 3. THE FAMILY OF CONSTANTINE

Minervina = (1)
   d. before 307
Helena = Crispus
   b. ?c. 300
d. 326
child
   b. 322

Constantine
   b. 272 or 273
d. 337
(2) = Fausta
d. 326

Constantius
   b. 7 August 317
d. 361

Constantina
   (1) = Hannibalianus
   b. 320 or 323
   d. 350

Constans
   (2) = Gallus
   b. 320 or 323
   d. 350

Helena = Julian
The following is not intended to be a full bibliography of modern work on the Roman Empire under Diocletian and Constantine. It includes only works cited in the present book, and within this category I have set out to list only (1) all articles and reviews published in periodicals and Festschriften, whatever their subject; (2) books and monographs published in the proceedings of learned academies and similar series; (3) books, monographs, and even some encyclopedia articles which deal exclusively or mainly with the history of the period 284-337. In principle, books and monographs on different or wider subjects are excluded, and I have not deemed it necessary to include the "modern works most frequently cited," whose abbreviations are listed at the front of the book. Also omitted are unpublished articles for which I cannot yet give a precise reference.
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