

|                             |                                                                                                                       |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Title                       | The fate of the Magister Equitum Marcellus                                                                            |
| Authors                     | Woods, David                                                                                                          |
| Publication date            | 1995-05                                                                                                               |
| Original Citation           | Woods, D., 1995. The fate of the Magister Equitum Marcellus. The Classical Quarterly (New Series), 45(1), pp. 266-268 |
| Type of publication         | Article (peer-reviewed)                                                                                               |
| Link to publisher's version | 10.1017/S0009838800041963                                                                                             |
| Rights                      | © 1995 The Classical Association.                                                                                     |
| Download date               | 2026-09-25 06:28:52                                                                                                   |
| Item downloaded from        | <a href="https://hdl.handle.net/10468/100">https://hdl.handle.net/10468/100</a>                                       |

*omni* is certainly possible, but *omne* is (I now see) more elegant before another *ab*, and it should be preferred. If this is correct, the passage, like other early quotations, provides no evidence of any split into the two medieval families. At the same time, it shows how well transmitted our text of the *De Officiis* is, more convincingly than the quotations in Nonius (whose text is highly corrupt) or Lactantius (who seems to cite freely or carelessly).

My second footnote is a late suggestion for the correction of *Off.* 3.74: 'sed cum Basilus M. Satrium sororis filium nomen suum ferre uoluisset eumque fecisset heredem (hunc dico patronum agri Piceni et Sabini; o †turpe notam temporum nomen illorum†), non erat aequum principes ciues rem habere, ad Satrium nihil praeter nomen peruenire.' ζ gives *notam... illorum* as printed above, ξ merely *nomen illorum temporum*. In my view, the meaning should be that Satrius is a blot (*turpem notam*) on the times. But not *those* times, for the man is attacked in the same year in the *Philippics* (2.107). My apparatus suggested that one would expect *notam horum temporum*; but I should now prefer *notam temporum nostrorum*. *nomen illorum* would arise from a misunderstood abbreviation,<sup>3</sup> aided by the occurrence of *nomen* before and after the clause. For the order (avoiding *notam nostrorum*) cf. Tacitus, *Dialogus* 27.1. For the genitive cf. *Phil.* 11.36 'Antonios... non modo suarum familiarum sed Romani nominis probra atque dedecora.'

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

MICHAEL WINTERBOTTOM

<sup>3</sup> W. M. Lindsay, *Contractions in early Latin minuscule MSS.* (St Andrews University Publications v, Oxford, 1908), pp. 36–7. I have profited from discussion of this passage with Andrew Dyck.

### THE FATE OF THE *MAGISTER EQUITUM* MARCELLUS

In A.D. 357 while at Antioch the sophist Libanius wrote a letter to his friend Anatolius in which he congratulated him on his appointment as *praefectus praetorio Illyrici*.<sup>1</sup> He expressed his pleasure at the conduct of Anatolius in his new appointment, and related a story which he had heard at Antioch from Musonianus, the *praefectus praetorio Orientis*. On his appointment, Anatolius had promised Constantius II that he would not ignore the misconduct of any official, whether civilian or military, whatever his rank. This promise had been put into effect almost immediately when one of the military commanders who showed cowardice against the barbarians was arrested.

The identity of the military commander who was accused of cowardice is not revealed. We do not even know where the cowardice was alleged to have occurred. However, Libanius' description of the enemy as barbarians suggests that it is to the West that we must turn in our attempt to probe the events and personalities which lie behind his short anecdote. Fortunately we possess a relatively full account of the military campaigns of this period in the work of Ammianus Marcellinus.

Ammianus provides a detailed account of the activities of Julian Caesar in Gaul in A.D. 357 as well as of the activity of a second force of troops which had been dispatched from the imperial court to Gaul under the command of the *magister peditum* Barbatio (Amm. 16.11.1–17.2.4). It seems to have been the intention of Constantius II that

<sup>1</sup> *Ep.* 22 in the Loeb edition of A. F. Norman, *Libanius: Autobiography and Selected Letters*, vol. i (Harvard, 1992); *Ep.* 552 in the Teubner edition of R. Foerster, *Libani Opera*, vol. x (Leipzig, 1921). On the career of Anatolius see A. F. Norman, 'The Illyrian Prefecture of Anatolius,' *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 100 (1957), 253–9. The entry in *PLRE I*, 59–60, Anatolius 3, confuses different Anatolii.

Barbatio and Julian would coordinate separate attacks upon the Alamanni.<sup>2</sup> However, Julian concentrated his attention campaigning along the Rhine, while Barbatio was left isolated and was only able to make a limited attack into Alamannic territory opposite Raetia. Thus, a number of events occurred which were conducive to allegations of misconduct. Firstly, a tribe of barbarians by the name of Laeti passed between the two Roman armies and attacked the city of Lyons. Although forces sent by Julian managed to ambush and defeat some of the raiders, forces dispatched with a similar purpose by Barbatio failed to achieve their aim. Ammianus alleges that Barbatio's colleague, Cella, had ordered two tribunes to allow the raiders to escape. Secondly, Barbatio's attack into Alamannic territory ended in failure. A sudden counter-attack by the Alamanni forced a rapid retreat during which he lost most of his baggage and pack animals. After this, Barbatio dispersed his forces to their winter-quarters and returned to Constantius II in Sirmium.

It can be seen, therefore, that for Barbatio A.D. 357 was an inglorious year. Certainly Ammianus does not hesitate to interpret his actions as those of a coward and twice describes him as such.<sup>3</sup> However, a more detailed examination of the circumstances of Barbatio and our anonymous coward suggests that they are not to be identified.

Firstly, there is a chronological difficulty. The bearer of Libanius' letter to Anatolius was a certain Letoius who was acting as ambassador for his city of Antioch. He was travelling to Rome to congratulate Constantius II upon his Vicennalia.<sup>4</sup> Constantius spent a month in Rome, from 28 April to 29 May A.D. 357, during which time the Vicennalia were celebrated and Letoius successfully concluded his mission.<sup>5</sup> Although there is insufficient information to judge exactly how long it took for Letoius to travel from Antioch to Rome, if allowance is made also for the time it took for news of the arrest of the cowardly commander to reach Antioch, presumably from somewhere within Illyricum, then it is clear that this arrest must have taken place very early in A.D. 357. This does not agree with our knowledge of the whereabouts of Barbatio. Barbatio was still campaigning in Gaul when the Rhine was at its lowest ebb because of the heat of summer, presumably during early autumn (Amm. 16.11.9). Thus, he cannot be identified with our coward who had clearly been arrested by early spring.

A second consideration which prevents us from identifying Barbatio with our anonymous coward is the relationship which he enjoyed with Libanius. Libanius wrote several letters of praise and congratulations to Barbatio, and it seems hardly likely that he would have revealed such obvious enthusiasm for the action of Anatolius had it been against one of his circle of correspondents who had also acted as a powerful patron on his behalf (*PLRE I*, 146–7). It is clear, therefore, that the true identity of our coward is to be sought elsewhere.

A second possible identification presents itself in the person of Marcellus who succeeded to the post of *magister equitum* in Gaul during A.D. 356 (Amm. 16.2.8).

<sup>2</sup> The sequence and significance of the various military actions which Ammianus records have been disputed by, for example, G. A. Crump, *Ammianus Marcellinus as a Military Historian* (Wiesbaden, 1975), pp. 18–20.

<sup>3</sup> Amm. 16.11.7, 'magister peditum ignavus et gloriarum Iuliani pervicax obtrectator,'; also 17.6.2, 'ignavus sed verbis effusior.'

<sup>4</sup> On this embassy see J. H. W. G. Liebeschuetz, *Antioch: City and Imperial Administration in the Later Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1972), p. 266.

<sup>5</sup> For the imperial journeys and residences of Constantius II see T. D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire* (Harvard, 1993), pp. 218–24.

When, at the end of that year, Julian had distributed his troops to their winter-quarters, and had retired with a small force to the town of Sens, he was besieged there for over a month by a group of Alamanni (Amm. 16.3.3–4.3). Even though Marcellus was in a position to force the Alamanni to lift their siege, he failed to do so. Constantius soon learned of these events and discharged Marcellus from the army (Amm. 16.7.1–4). However, Marcellus was not prepared to let the matter rest at that. He hurried to the imperial court at Milan, and before the emperor and his consistory tried to explain his conduct by charging that Julian had been preparing to revolt against Constantius. Suspecting such a manoeuvre, Julian had sent his *praepositus cubiculi*, Euthorius, to the court in his defence. Euthorius was believed, and Marcellus returned to his native town of Serdica (Amm. 16.8.1).

Ammianus' testimony is supported by that of Julian himself and of Libanius also. Julian records that Marcellus fell under the suspicions of Constantius and was deprived of his command, although he charitably refrains from actually naming Marcellus or reporting on the nature of his conduct which led Constantius to act as he did (Julian, *Ep. ad Ath.* 278B). Libanius proves a little more forthcoming, and describes Marcellus as one who was afraid of the enemy but harmed only his own people (Libanius, *Or.* 18.48).

But when exactly did Marcellus' dismissal occur? In so far as the emperor was in Milan when Marcellus appealed against his dismissal, and the evidence supplied by the law codes shows that Constantius spent the period from approximately 10 November A.D. 356 to 19 March A.D. 357 at Milan, it becomes clear that Marcellus may have been dismissed as early as November A.D. 356 or by March A.D. 357 at the latest. It is perfectly feasible, therefore, that the story of his dismissal, if it occurred during the earlier part of this period, may have travelled first as far as Antioch, to be carried westwards again in a letter written by Libanius in early spring, say March A.D. 357. Thus, there ceases to be a chronological difficulty if the anonymous coward is identified with Marcellus rather than Barbatio. Moreover, in addition to the manner in which it disposes of the chronological problem, a positive argument in favour of this identification is provided by the fact that Marcellus returned to Serdica. This brought him within the jurisdiction of the *praefectus praetorio Illyrici*, Anatolius.

It seems a strong possibility, therefore, that Marcellus is to be identified as our anonymous coward. He compounded his misfortune in angering Constantius by returning to within the jurisdiction of the newly appointed *praefectus praetorio Illyrici* who was eager to prove himself to the emperor. Marcellus was a tempting target in that he had clearly exhausted his credibility with the emperor and his consistory by his wild allegations about Julian. Anatolius did not need to fear that this victim would succeed in an appeal to the emperor or any faction of the consistory should he decide to make an example of him. It is unfortunate that Ammianus does not provide us with any details concerning the eventual fate of Marcellus once he had returned to Serdica. However, some small insight into Marcellus' fate may be gained from Ammianus' description of the execution of Marcellus' son under Julian because he aspired to the throne. The fact that Marcellus was not himself executed at that time suggests that his circumstances were such that he could not reasonably be accused of complicity in his son's treason (Amm. 22.11.2). A continued condition of exile rather than any particular imperial benevolence may account for his survival.<sup>6</sup>

Mullingar

DAVID WOODS

<sup>6</sup> A fragment from Eunapius seems to attest to Marcellus' survival at this time, R. C. Blockley, *The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire* (Liverpool, 1983), vol. ii, p. 37.