
Francia. Forschungen zur westeuropäischen Geschichte

Herausgegeben vom Deutschen Historischen Institut Paris

(Institut historique allemand)

Band 26/1 (1999)

DOI: 10.11588/fr.1999.1.47292

Rechtshinweis

Bitte beachten Sie, dass das Digitalisat urheberrechtlich geschützt ist. Erlaubt ist aber das Lesen, das Ausdrucken des Textes, das Herunterladen, das Speichern der Daten auf einem eigenen Datenträger soweit die vorgenannten Handlungen ausschließlich zu privaten und nicht-kommerziellen Zwecken erfolgen. Eine darüber hinausgehende unerlaubte Verwendung, Reproduktion oder Weitergabe einzelner Inhalte oder Bilder können sowohl zivil- als auch strafrechtlich verfolgt werden.

ANDREW GILLETT

THE ACCESSION OF EURIC

Euric, ruler of the Gothic kingdom of Toulouse which controlled Aquitaine in south-western Gaul from 418 to 507, is best recalled as the most territorially aggressive of his line. Succeeding his father and two brothers to power, he extended Gothic rule across Provence and secured control of a large part of Spain, almost the last bastions of the Roman empire in the West. Euric's rule coincided with the deposition of Romulus Augustulus and the death of Julius Nepos, the last Roman emperors to rule in the West, and a policy of supplanting imperial authority has often been imputed to him¹.

This article concerns the beginning rather than the apogee of Euric's reign. The role assigned to Euric in most narratives, from Jordanes's *Getica* down to the present, does not sit well with the evidence for his earliest deeds as king, or with the part played by the Goths of Toulouse in the history of the West throughout the previous half century. Euric the Germanic predator of a sickening Roman empire is a convenient narrative device obstructing our vision of a more complex historical counterpart. The earliest record of Euric's actions appears in the *Chronicle* of the king's older contemporary Hydatius, a bishop in the western Spanish province of Gallaecia.

1 General accounts of Euric's times: Otto SEECK, *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt*, vol. 6, Stuttgart 1920, p. 361–364; J. B. BURY, *History of the Later Roman Empire*, vol. 1, London 1923, p. 341–346; ID., *The Invasion of Europe by the Barbarians*, 1928 (repr. New York 1963), p. 211–225; Ludwig SCHMIDT, *Die Ostgermanen*, 2nd ed. Munich 1941 (repr. 1969), p. 486–495, p. 502–503; E. STEIN, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, trad. J.-R. PALANQUE, vol. 1, Paris 1959, p. 388–393; A. H. M. JONES, *The Later Roman Empire*, p. 284–602: A Social, Economic and Administrative Survey, vol. 1, London 1964, p. 242–243, 246; Pierre COURCELLE, *Histoire littéraire des grandes invasions germaniques*, 3rd ed., Paris 1964, p. 175–181; Lucien MUSSET, *The Germanic Invasions: The Making of Europe AD 400–600*, trad. E. and C. JAMES, London 1975, 41; É. DEMOUGEOT, *La formation de l'Europe et les invasions barbares*, vol. 2, Paris 1979, p. 631–649; Michel ROUCHE, *L'Aquitaine des Wisigoths aux Arabes*, p. 418–781: naissance d'une région, Paris 1979, p. 35–43; Herwig WOLFRAM, *History of the Goths*, trad. T. R. DUNLAP, Berkeley 1989, p. 181–246, esp. p. 181–190, p. 193–202; Peter HEATHER, *The Goths*, Oxford 1996, p. 181–215. Specific studies of Euric: G. YVER, *Euric, roi des Wisigoths*, in: *Études d'histoire du moyen âge dédiées à Gabriel Monod*, Paris 1896, p. 11–46; Otto SEECK, *Euricus*, in: *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswiss. [RE]*, 2nd ed., ed. A. F. VON PAULY, G. WISSOWA, et al., vol. 6, Stuttgart 1909, p. 1239–1242; K. F. STROHEKER, *Eurich, König der Westgoten*, Stuttgart 1937; *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire [PLRE]*, vol. 2, ed. J. R. MARTINDALE, Cambridge 1980, s.v. Euricus, p. 427–428; D. CLAUDE, *Eurich*, in: *Reallexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde*, ed. Johannes HOOPS et al., 2nd ed., vol. 8, Berlin 1994, p. 17–19. Hereafter these works will be cited by short title. Abbreviations of titles of imperial offices follow PLRE 2, xxxiii–xxxiv.

I am most grateful for the comments of Walter Goffart, Antonina Harbus, and Alanna Nobbs on earlier versions of this paper.

Hydatius provides a unique, if brief, account of the Gothic king's accession². Like other sources, Hydatius records the fratricide by which Euric attained the throne, but the main feature of his narrative is the diplomatic flurry which followed the new king's rise: »Euric succeeded to the kingdom by an evil deed equal to that of his brother. Elevated by this office and this crime, he sent envoys to both the emperor and the king of the Sueves. Remismund [the Suevic king] hastily dismissed the Gothic envoys, and envoys of this king were sent, some to the emperor, some to the Vandals, others to the Goths«³.

Euric's seizure of power occasioned embassies throughout the West (and further, according to some). This nugget of information has often been incorporated into modern narratives of the last decade of the Roman empire in the West, as the earliest indication of Euric's expansionist policy. Closer consideration, however, suggests that this is not the appropriate use of Hydatius's evidence. Elsewhere in the *Chronicle*, Hydatius offers valuable testimony of the conduct of diplomacy throughout the post-imperial West; he shows the barbarian West as a political network in which diplomatic communication was ubiquitous, constant, and crucial. This pattern of communication, rather than the military take-overs of Euric's later career, provides the proper context for understanding the evidence for Euric's accession. Clarification of the chronology and sources for Euric's accession show him in a more modest light than he is often seen. At the outset of his rule, the Gothic king should be seen as a player in provincial, not imperial, politics. His initial actions are best interpreted as direct continuations of his predecessors' policies, supporting imperial interests, rather than sounding the deathknell of the western half of the Roman empire.

Date and Sources

There are, unsurprisingly, no extant sources which can be safely regarded as presenting a view close to Euric at the time of his rise. His aims can only be deduced obscurely, if at all, through the records of his deeds. It is therefore critical to establish the chronology of events firmly, before discussing the king's intentions at the time of his accession. Euric came to power by murdering his elder brother Theodoric II, himself a fratricide. The date of his accession is disputed; most modern students of the period

2 Hydatius Lemicus, *Continuatio chronicorum Hieronymianorum*, ed. Th. MOMMSEN, *Chronica minora*, vol. 2 (*Monumenta Germaniae historica. Auctores antiquissimi* [hereafter »MGH AA«], vol. 11), Berlin 1894, p. 1–36; Hydace: *Chronique*, ed. and trad. Alain TRANOY, 2 vols. (*Sources chrétiennes* 218, 219), Paris 1974; *The Chronicle of Hydatius and the Consularia Constantinopolitana: Two Contemporary Accounts of the Final Years of the Roman Empire*, ed. and trad. R. W. BURGESS, Oxford 1993, p. 69–123. Generally I follow Burgess's text, but for convenience references are given to Mommsen's chapter numbering first, followed by Burgess's numbering in square brackets. Euric's accession, embassies, and consequences: Hydatius, *Chron.* 237–238, 240, 242–246, 247 [233–234, 236, 238–240, 241].

3 Hydatius, *Chron.* 238 [234]: *Euuericus pari scelere quo frater succedit in regnum. Quo honore prouectus et crimine legatos et ad imperatorem et ad regem dirigit Sueuorum; quibus sine mora a Remismundo remissis eiusdem regis legati ad imperatorem, alii ad Vandalos, alii diriguntur ad Gothos.*

have accepted 466, while some prefer 467⁴. The date chosen shapes any assessment of the evidence for Euric's accession. Upon taking the throne, according to Hydatius, Euric dispatched envoys *ad imperatorem* and to other rulers. There was a lengthy interregnum in the Roman empire in the West between the death of Libius Severus on 14 November 465 and the accession of Anthemius on 12 April 467. If Euric became king in 466, he must, in the absence of a western emperor, have communicated with the eastern imperial court. Though this scenario has often been assumed, it has profound but unappreciated implications for our understanding of relations between the fifth-century barbarian kingdoms and the late empire. In it, Euric becomes the first western king to treat with the eastern half of the Roman empire as an equal sovereign, rather than negotiating locally with the western empire as, essentially, a constituent of provincial politics. Euric assumes an independence equivalent to that of the Italian kings Odoacer and Theoderic the Amal. The sources which have been claimed to support 466 as the year of Euric's accession are the *Chronica Caesaraugustana*, Jordanes's *Getica*, the so-called *Chronica Gallica ad a. 511*, and Isidore of Seville's *Historia Gothorum*; those which support 467 are the *Chronica* of Hydatius and that of Marius of Avenches. A review of these texts highlights how fragile modern reconstruction of fifth-century chronology is, and how methodologically tenuous it is to construct arguments of policy and motivation upon it – the more so as the evidence points to 467 rather than 466 as the year of Euric's seizure of power.

1. *Chronica Caesaraugustana*

The most explicit support for 466 as the year of Euric's accession is given by the *Chronica Caesaraugustana*, which sets the death of Theoderic II in the third con-

4 466: e.g. Eduard VON WIETERSHEIM, *Geschichte der Völkerwanderung*, 2nd ed., vol. 2, Leipzig 1881, p. 311; YVER, *Euric*, p. 13–14; Moritz SCHÖNFELD, *Goti*, in: *RE Suppl.* vol. 3, 1918, p. 840–41; BURY, *History LRE* p. 337; ID., *Invasion of Europe* p. 211; Ferdinand LOT, Christian PFISTER and François L. GANSHOF, *Histoire du moyen age*, vol. 1: *Les destinées de l'empire en occident de 395 a 888*, Paris 1928, p. 84; STROHEKER, *Eurich* 4 n. 1; SEECK, *Untergang* p. 362; ID., *Euricus* p. 1239; SCHMIDT, *Ostgermanen* p. 486; Louis HALPHEN, *Les barbares des grandes invasions aux conquêtes turques du XI^e siècle*, 5th ed., Paris 1948, p. 41; STEIN, *Histoire* p. 388; JONES, *LRE* p. 239, 242; Musset, *Germanic Invasions* p. 41; DEMOUGEOT, *Formation* 2:630; ROUCHE, *L'Aquitaine* p. 36; Marc REYDELLET, *La royauté dans la littérature latine de Sidoine Apollinaire à Isidore de Séville*, Paris 1981, p. 48; E. A. THOMPSON, *Romans and Barbarians: The Decline of the Western Empire*, Madison, Wisconsin 1982, p. 216; Roger COLLINS, *Early Medieval Spain: Unity in Diversity, 400–1000*, London 1983, x, p. 24; Suzanne TEILLET, *Des Goths à la nation gothique: les origines de l'idée de nation en occident du V^e au VII^e siècle*, Paris 1984, p. 162; WOLFRAM, *History of the Goths* p. 181; *PLRE* 2:427; H. S. SIVAN, *Sidonius Apollinaris, Theoderic II, and Gothic-Roman Politics from Avitus to Anthemius*, in: *Hermes* 117 (1989) p. 85; J. DRINKWATER and H. ELTON (eds.), *Fifth-Century Gaul: A Crisis of Identity?*, Cambridge 1992, XX »Chronology of Events«; Jill HARRIES, *Sidonius Apollinaris and the Fall of Rome, A.D. 407–485*, Oxford 1994, p. 142; CLAUDE, *Eurich* p. 17; HEATHER, *Goths* p. 189. The fullest recent argument in support of 466 is R. W. BURGESS, *Hydatius: A Late Roman Chronicler in Post-Roman Spain*, vol. 1, Ph.D. diss., University of Oxford 1988, p. 257.

467: Christian COURTOIS, *Auteurs et scribes: remarques sur la Chronique d'Hydace*, in: *Byzantion* 21 (1951) p. 54; TRANOY, *Hydace: Chronique* vol. 1, p. 90, 95; Steven MUHLBERGER, *The Fifth-Century Chroniclers: Prosper, Hydatius, and the Gallic Chronicler of 452*, Leeds 1990, p. 311.

sulate of the emperor Leo I, i.e. 466⁵. The *Chron. Caes.*, perhaps based on a work written in the early seventh century by Bishop Maximus of Saragossa, has been transmitted only as marginalia in Spanish manuscripts (now lost) containing several chronicles arranged in sequence: the epitome of the *Chronica* of Eusebius and Jerome made by Prosper, reaching to 376; Prosper's own continuation to 455; the *Chronica* of the African Victor of Tunnuna, overlapping with the last years of Prosper's account from 444, and then continuing independently to ca. 567; and a further continuation by the Spaniard John of Biclar, for the years ca. 568–590⁶. The exiguous notes of the *Chron. Caes.*, covering the period 450–568, appear alongside the account of Victor and the first year of John's work. The *Chronica* of Victor is primarily concerned with the ecclesiastical politics of the Three Chapters dispute, and focuses on Constantinople and North Africa. John of Biclar's narrative, which allows more room for secular affairs, also embraces the East and North Africa, but gives far greater attention to his native Spain, climaxing with the official conversion of the Gothic kingdom to Catholicism at the Third Council of Toledo in 589. The marginal annotations of the *Chron. Caes.* customise Victor's account for a Spanish audience by providing a brief outline of the history of the Gothic kingdom of Toulouse and Toledo (a topic given some attention by Prosper and much by John, but none by Victor) for most of the period covered by Victor⁷. Together, the entries in Prosper, the *Chron. Caes.*, and John of Biclar thus provide, inter alia, a brief history of the Goths of Toulouse and Toledo.

In addition to his Gothic notes, the compiler of the *Chron. Caes.* added two corrections to Victor's consular *fasti*, the chronological system used by the chronicles of Eusebius/Jerome, Prosper, and Victor. Under the years 462 and 463, where Victor had given only the eastern consul, the *Chron. Caes.* names both the western and eastern colleagues⁸. These are the only two additions the compiler made to Victor's consular list. In both cases, the western consuls were nominees of the emperor Libius Severus (they were Severus himself for 462 and his PPO *Ital.* Caecina Decius Basilius for 463). Neither Severus nor any of his consular nominees were ever recognized in the East⁹. The additions of the *Chron. Caes.* therefore appear to be

5 *Chronica Caesarugustana* [hereafter 'Chron. Caes.'], ed. Th. MOMMSEN (MGH AA 9), p. 222 s.a. 466. The *Chron. Caes.* states that Theodoric was murdered *a suis gladio*, without explicitly associating Euric with the crime.

6 Victor Tonnennensis, *Chronica*, and Iohannes Biclarenis, *Chronica*, ed. Th. MOMMSEN (MGH AA 11) p. 163–220. Maximus of Saragossa: MOMMSEN, Introduction to *Chron. Caes.* p. 221. On Prosper and Victor: Steven MUHLBERGER, Prosper's *Epitoma chronicon*: Was There An Edition of 443?, in: *Classical Philology* 81 (1986) p. 240–244; ID., *Fifth-Century Chroniclers* p. 276–77; Brian CROKE, Basiliscus the Boy-Emperor, *Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies* 24 (1983) p. 81–82.

7 MOMMSEN, *Subsidia critica and Introductions to Victor and John of Biclar* (as for previous note). The *Chronicle of John of Biclar* has been translated into English with a useful short introduction by Kenneth Baxter WOLF, *Conquerors and Chroniclers of Early Medieval Spain* (Translated Texts for Historians 9), Liverpool 1990, p. 1–11, 61–80.

8 *Chron. Caes.* s.aa. 462, 463.

9 Roger S. BAGNALL, Alan CAMERON, Seth R. SCHWARTZ, and K. A. WORP, *Consuls of the Later Roman Empire* (Philological Monographs of the American Philological Association 36), Atlanta 1987, s.aa. 459, 466, 469.

derived from a western source¹⁰. Almost all western sources which incorporate consular *fasti* concur with the *Chron. Caes.* in the inclusion of Severus's consuls for 462 and 463.

The inclusion of these corrective details appears to reinforce the claim of the *Chron. Caes.* to chronological accuracy – except that they are isolated examples. Whatever *fasti* source the compiler of the *Chron. Caes.* had, apart from the copy of Victor's chronicle which he was engaged in annotating, he did not possess a complete list of consuls for the second half of the fifth century, or even for the whole of the 460s. This is made apparent by examining the list of Victor's other omissions from the list of fifth- and sixth-century consuls, which his later annotator failed to correct. Though the *Chron. Caes.* provides the western consuls for 462 and 463, it does not (in the form in which it has been transmitted) record the western consuls missing from Victor's *fasti* for 451, 458 (the western emperor Majorian, taking the consulate the year after his accession), 466 (the year in which the *Chron. Caes.* places Euric's accession), or any of the consuls nominated by Odoacer. Neither does the compiler correct instances of inaccurately recorded names in Victor's *fasti* in 465 and 471–473. Moreover, Victor's chronicle totally omits eight years altogether (445, 452, 472, 478, 481, 493, 503, and 547); the compiler of the *Chron. Caes.* fails to provide the consuls for these years, or to give any indication of realising that several years had dropped out of the text he was supplementing. The absence of the second consul for 466 is striking. The second consul for that year, Tatianus, seems also to have been nominated by the emperor Severus, like the western consuls for 462 and 463, of whom the compiler of the *Chron. Caes.* was aware. Tatianus is recorded by several, though not all, other western sources¹¹.

The lists of consuls in surviving late antique chronicles are all idiosyncratic, the result of later scholarship rather than reflections of contemporary, »official« lists¹². It is highly unlikely that the compiler of the *Chron. Caes.* should have possessed a list covering any significant stretch of the late fifth century which agreed with Victor's faulty record in all details save for the western consuls of 462 and 463. What was the source for the two isolated corrections to Victor's *fasti*? Immediately before the consular additions of 462 and 463, the *Chron. Caes.* records the entry of the emperor Majorian into Spain in 460, and Majorian's murder at the hands of Ricimer the following year. These two entries are among the very few correctly-dated events in the

10 The consuls are given in eastern order, i.e. with the eastern consul first, probably to be consistent with the consular list of Victor. Victor's list swaps from western to eastern order several times (MOMMSEN, *Subsidia critica to Victor*, p. 180; Alan CAMERON and Diane SCHAUER, *The Last Consul: Basilius and His Diptych*, in: *Journal of Roman Studies* 72 [1982] p. 132); the period 458–500 uses the eastern order.

11 Erroneous names: Victor *Tonnennensis*, *Chronica s.aa.* 465 (»Hermia« for Hermenericus), 471/473 (the consuls for 471, Leo Aug. IV and Pronianus – misspelt »Probinus« – are duplicated for 473, in which year Leo Aug. V was sole consul; Victor omits 472); cf. BAGNALL et al., *Consuls LRE s.aa.* Victor's omitted years: cf. Mommsen's marginal notes to Victor, *Chron. s.aa.* Tatianus as western consul, nominated by Severus: BAGNALL et al., *Consuls LRE s.a.* 466. All other western literary sources concur with the *Chron. Caes.* in listing the western consuls for 462 and 463, Severus's earlier nominees, but the evidence for Tatianus is evenly split between inclusion and omission.

12 R. W. BURGESS, *Consuls and Consular Dating in the Later Roman Empire*, in: *Phoenix* 43 (1989) p. 153.

early decades covered by the annotations; they clearly do not come from the same source as that of surrounding material¹³. It seems likely that these two entries, together with the consular entries for 462 and 463, form a discrete unit, derived from a source which went little or no further than this date. The failure of the compiler of the *Chron. Caes.* to add the western consuls to Victor's entries for 458 and 466 may establish the extreme termini of this source.

In view of the list of uncorrected omissions in Victor's *fasti* before and after the early 460s, the most that can be said for the compiler of the *Chron. Caes.* is that he possessed an independent consular source with which Victor's *fasti* could be corrected for the period after 458 at the earliest and before 466 at the latest. There is no evidence that the compiler had access to a western source which dated Euric's accession by the consular year, or which enabled him to accurately coordinate events recorded in his other source with Victor's consular chronology.

Indeed, the compiler's dating of Euric's accession was not drawn from a source with consular dating, but appears to derive from some form of a Visigothic *laterculus*, a king-list including lengths in years of monarchs' reigns but not a consular or other dating system fixing their years of accession and death by an external chronology. The formulaic record in the *Chron. Caes.* of the accessions and length of reign of the Gothic kings to the mid-sixth century suggests such a source. Each entry begins with *his coss.* or *his diebus*, evidently words used by the compiler to link the entry with the appropriate consular-year entry in Victor's chronicle; the entry then gives a brief outline of the circumstances of the transition in rule; and concludes with a set phrase stating the number of years for which the new king reigned¹⁴. It was the length of kings' reigns which enabled the compiler to attempt to calibrate accession years with Victor's consular dates. The compiler of the *Chron. Caes.* coordinated at least three separate sources for the 460s: the *Chronicle* of Victor, employing a consular dating system from both eastern and western sources, but omitting eight years altogether; the second, western consular list, used to supplement Victor for the early 460s; and a regnal list of the Gothic kings of Toulouse. It is from the latter that the compiler of the *Chron. Caes.* drew the year of Euric's accession. The regnal years of the Gothic kings were used to date some official and unofficial documents in their kingdom from perhaps the time of Euric onwards; lists of regnal years may have been compiled as reference works, similar to the collections of consular *fasti* needed for dealing with documents dated by the names of consuls¹⁵. The details of the

13 Date of Majorian's entry into Spain: Hydatius, *Chron.* 200 [195]; of his death: *Fasti Vindobonenses priores* (ed. Th. MOMMSEN, MGH AA 9) s.a. 461; Hydatius, *Chron.* 210 [205]; Marcellinus comes, *Chron.* s.a. 461.2.

14 *Chron. Caes.* s.aa. 450–451, 457, 466, 485, 507–508, 513.2, 525, 544, 545, 552. Connecting phrases (*his coss.*, *his diebus*) cease with the end of the consulate in 541, and the lengths of reign of the penultimate kings Thiudisclus and Agila are given in months as well as years (s.aa. 545, 552), perhaps indicating the use of a different source. Accounts of Visigothic accessions in the *Chronica* of John of Biclar are not in the same formula, and lengths of reign are not given in the notices of either their accession or death; John of Biclar, *Chronica* s.aa. 568?.3 (cf. *Chron. Caes.* s.a.), 573?.2, 586?.2.

15 Dating by Gothic regnal years is firmly attested for Euric and Alaric II. CIL XIII.1 904 (Bordeaux) may be dated by regnal year of Thorismund, but is very fragmentary; as there is no other evidence of the use of the regnal years of the Gothic kings of Toulouse prior to the reign of Euric, the reading accepted by CIL may be doubted (cf. MOMMSEN, *Das römisch-germanische Herrscherjahr*, in:

lengths of kings' reigns in the *Chron. Caes.* may give a little insight into record-keeping in the Gothic kingdom of Toulouse and Toledo; but the coordination of these data with the *Chronica* of Victor does not provide a reliable chronology.

The compiler's method for recording the accessions of the first four Gothic kings, of whom Euric was third, can be set out as follows. He initially places Thorismund's accession (*recte* 451) against Victor's entry for 450, and notes that Thorismund ruled for six years¹⁶. Against Victor's entry for 457, the compiler enters the accession of Theodoric II (*recte* 453), noting that he ruled for nine years. The entry for Theodoric's death and Euric's accession is placed against 466. Euric is said to reign for sixteen years; his death is set against Victor's entry for 485 (*recte* 484). Though it is not obvious from translation into AD dating, the coordination of the king-list with the consular schema of Victor thus far maintains internal consistency. The compiler of the *Chron. Caes.* counts exclusively, and was not aware that Victor omitted a number of years entirely. So, beginning with the (erroneous) date of 450 for the accession of Thorismund, counting exclusively, and omitting the year 452 (missing from Victor's work), a six year rule gives 457 as the year of Thorismund's death and Theodoric's accession. For Theodoric, a nine-year rule, counting exclusively, gives 466 as the

Neues Archiv 16 [1891] p. 61 n. 2 = Id., *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 6 [1910, repr. Berlin 1965] p. 354). Euric: Gregory of Tours, *Historiarum libri X*, ed. B. KRUSCH and W. LEVISON, MGH *Script. rer. Merov.* vol. 1.1, Hannover 1951, II 20 twice dates events by Euric's regnal years and cites the total length of his reign. Notwithstanding Gregory's errors in handling this data (cf. PLRE 2 »Victorius 4«, 1162–64), this suggests the use of a source or sources from Clermont using Euric's regnal years. Alaric II: CIL XII 2700 (Viviers, A.D. 496) and XIII.1 1529 (Clermont, A.D. 503) attest the use of the regnal years of Alaric II on funerary inscriptions (MOMMSEN, *Herrscherjahr*, as above); cf. CIL XIII.1 497–499 and CIL XIII.5, p. 70 »Index IV: Reges,« funerary inscriptions from Auch dated by regnal years of unnamed kings. The prefatory *Auctoritas* authenticating the *Breviarium* of Alaric II (506) is dated by Alaric's regnal year (the form is reminiscent of subscriptions to imperial *constitutiones*: *Dat. IIII non. Feb. anno XXII Alarici regis Tolosae*; Theodosiani libri XVI, ed. Th. MOMMSEN, P. MEYER, and P. KRÜGER, 4th ed., Dublin/Zürich 1970, p. xxxiv). The subscription to the Council of Aige (also 506) is dated by consular year and regnal year; J. D. MANSI, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, 1759–98 (repr. Graz 1960–62), VIII 337 and cf. n. 33 below. Post 507: the Spanish church councils of the early sixth century are dated by the regnal year of Theoderic the Amal, although the Ostrogothic kings never dated documents by their own regnal years within Italy; the *acta* of the councils presumably reflect the practices of the court of Toulouse and Toledo rather than those of Ravenna (MOMMSEN, *Ostgothische Studien*, in: *Neues Archiv* 14 [1889] p. 241 n. 2 = *Gesammelte Schriften* p. 378). John of Biclar, *Chronica*, employs the regnal years of the eastern emperors and the Gothic kings of Spain (MOMMSEN, *Introduction to Iohannis Biclarenensis*, p. 209). Jordanes, *Getica*, may preserve traces of a regnal list of the Gothic kings of Toulouse; below, at nn. 22, 28. On the *laterculi* of the Visigothic kings attached to certain MSS of the Visigothic law codes: MOMMSEN, MGH AA 13, p. 461–69.

16 Mommsen's edition of the *Chron. Caes.* presents Thorismund's accession as recorded twice, s.aa. 450 (the battle of the Catalaunian Plains and death of Theodoric I) and 451 (recording the length of his reign). These two entries appear in fact to represent only one, divided for reasons of space. Victor's entries for 450 and 451 record, respectively, the death of Theodosius II and accession of Marcian, and the Council of Chalcedon. In Mommsen's edition of Victor, though Marcian's consulate of 451 is noted, it is not presented as a rubric, clearly demarking the following year entry, as other consulates are. Victor's entries for 450 and 451 therefore appear to form one block of text, not two. The same layout may have appeared in the MS used by the compiler of *Chron. Caes.*, causing the marginal notation of Thorismund's accession similarly to extend over two years of Victor's record.

The length of Thorismund's reign is calculated by counting (exclusively) from 450 (see below).

date of his death and the succession of Euric. For Euric, in turn, a sixteen-year reign, counting exclusively and omitting the years 472, 478, and 481 (all missing from Victor's *fasti*), gives 485 for his death and the accession of Alaric II. The dates given for the succession of the Gothic kings in the *Chron. Caes.* are the product of coordinating a Gothic king-list, which gave the number of years of each king's reign, with the faulty chronicle of Victor, without any third source to independently fix the dates of individual events¹⁷.

Unfortunately, the value of this exercise for establishing an accurate chronology of the Gothic succession is not great. The compiler's chronology depends, on the one hand, on a chronicle which omits two years entirely prior to the two putative dates for Euric's succession (and another six years thereafter); and on the other, on a regnal list which itself is at odds with all other sources for the length of the reigns of Thorismund, Theodoric II, and Euric¹⁸.

- 17 The internal accuracy of this coordination expires with the reign of Alaric II; he is given a twenty-three year reign from 485, but is recorded (accurately) as dying in 507. Given that Victor's Chronicle omits the years 493 and 503, the year of the death of Alaric II should be given as 510. The author of the *Chron. Caes.* perhaps had a second source which dated the death of Alaric II by consular year.
- 18 The lengths of reign of Thorismund, Theodoric II, and Euric are given by several sources: the *Chron. Caes.*; Jordanes, *Getica* (discussed below); Isidore of Seville, *Hist. Gothorum*; and the *Laterculus regum Visigothorum*, which appears in several MSS appended generally to the Visigothic laws (as at n. 15 above). Some MSS of the *Laterculus* offer variant years, probably derived from Isidore. The lengths of reign are given as follows:

	Chron. Caes.	Jordanes	Isidore	Laterculus
Thorismund	6 (15 MS E)	3	1	3 alibi 1
Theodoric II	9	13	13*	7 alibi 13
Euric	16 (18 MSS ES)	19	17 (18 MS P)	19
Alaric II	23		23	23

(*Isidore, *Hist. Gothorum*, 31 and 34; Isidore's reference to a thirteen-year rule is not taken from Hydatius, pace Burgess, *Hydatius* 257).

The figures in the *Chron. Caes.* for Thorismund and Theodoric II are incompatible with those of the other sources, which are in rough agreement. The year of Thorismund's accession is fixed by general attribution to the year of Attila's assault on Gaul, 451; the year of his death is fixed to 453 by the contemporary evidence of Prosper, *Chron.* 1371 (written in 455 or soon after). Whether this would count as a reign of one, two, or three years would depend on the counting system employed (i.e. from date of accession or from the Kalends of January) and the actual dates of his accession and death, for which there is no evidence. The length of reign of Theodoric II is fixed by the contemporary evidence of Hydatius (see nn. 48–54 below).

Though the figures in the *Chron. Caes.* for the individual reigns of Thorismund and Theodoric II are incorrect, the joint length of the two reigns is fifteen years, roughly in agreement with the other sources for the length of the two reigns (in one of the lost MSS of the Spanish chronicle collection of Victor, John, and the *Chron. Caes.*, the length of Thorismund's reign is given as *an. XV*). One possible explanation for the data in the *Chron. Caes.* is that the figure of VI for Thorismund was an early scribal error for III. A subsequent scribe may have changed the figure for Theodoric, perhaps originally XII, to IX in order to preserve a joint length of fifteen years for the two reigns, in agreement with some other source.

In the case of Thorismund and Theodoric II, the accession years presented in the *Chron. Caes.* are demonstrably wrong; it is odd that the date given for the accession of Euric has often been readily accepted. There is, moreover, a significant list of chronological errors in the first few decades covered by the *Chron. Caes.*, apart from those already noted as arising from two systemic faults, the compiler's failure to realise the omission of several years from Victor's record, and his own faulty king-list. At the outset of the annotations, the battle of the Catalaunian Plains and the accession of Thorismund is wrongly dated to 450, not 451, putting the regnal list off by one year; the Gothic assault on the Sueves in Gallaecia, ordered by the emperor Avitus, is placed late, under 458, not 456; and Euric's capture of Arles and Marseilles is set against 473, three years too early. These errors, arising from unidentifiable origins, give little reason to suppose that the date for Euric's accession may be a happy exception to a chronology which is almost constantly inaccurate, especially for fifth-century Gothic material. By contrast, as has been mentioned, entries for the years 460 to 463, drawn from a separate source with independent consular dating and not concerning Gothic material, are accurately dated. There is no clear pattern to the errors of the source for Gothic material, which could allow for its ›correction‹ and therefore the safe exploitation of the data it contains¹⁹.

The *Chron. Caes.*, though very brief, provides unique details of Gothic rule of Spain; it does not provide a reliable fifth-century chronology, or a means to establish the year of Euric's accession.

2. Jordanes, *Getica*

The second source cited to support 466 as the date of Euric's accession, Jordanes's *De origine actibusque Getarum* (better known as the *Getica*), in fact provides better support for 467. The *Getica* states that Theodoric II died in his thirteenth year of rule²⁰. Since the year of Theodoric's accession can be firmly dated from the *Chronicle* of Prosper to 453, this would seem to give 465 or 466 for the year of his death and Euric's accession²¹. But this shard of information cannot rightly be employed with mathematical exactitude. Difficulties attend this apparently helpful detail: what is the authority used by Jordanes for this fact, and is it reliable? and if it is, how should the regnal years be correlated with AD dating?

Jordanes records the length of Theodoric's reign in his account of the Visigoths, the middle of three main sections of the *Getica* (the first treating the Goths before their ›division‹ into Visigoths and Ostrogoths in the late fourth century, the last relating the history of the Ostrogoths). The detail is one of only three records of the length of reign of Gothic kings, given for the consecutively reigning kings Thorismund (three years), Theodoric II (thirteen years), and Euric (nineteen years)²². No

19 E.g. there is no apparent pattern in the use of the phrases *his diebus* and *his coss.*

20 Jordanes, *De origine actibusque Getarum* (*Getica*), ed. Th. MOMMSEN, MGH AA 5.2, Berlin 1882, 234 (*tertio decimo regni sui anno Theoderidus occubuit*), 235.

21 Prosper, *Chron.* 1371, cited by e.g. DEMOUGEOT, *Formation* 2:630 n. 35; PLRE 2, Theodericus 3, 1072; BURGESS, *Hydatius* p. 257 (all ignore the possibility that, by Jordanes's words ›in his thirteenth year‹, Theodoric II could have died in 465).

22 Jordanes, *Getica* 228, 234, 244.

lengths of reign are recorded for either previous or subsequent rulers of the Visigoths (including Euric's son and successor, Alaric II, whom Jordanes regards as the last Visigothic king). Indeed, any temporal detail is rare in the *Getica*. The work has no clear chronological system; temporal markers are few and sometimes wildly inaccurate, and much of the narrative is timeless. The same is not true of Jordanes's brief account of Roman history, which he says he had been engaged in composing when distracted by a request to write the *Getica*. The title of the work, *De summa temporum vel origine actibusque gentis Romanorum*, indicates the debt to late antique chronographic genres, and in the *Getica* Jordanes refers to his earlier work as *abbreviatio chronicorum*. Systematic chronological markers are used throughout Jordanes's Roman history²³. Of the three sections of the *Getica*, the Visigothic narrative has the largest number of chronological indicators, but most are inaccurate, and their inclusion seems motivated by literary rather than chronographic aims. Moreover, no single temporal marker is employed systematically. Indications of the length of reign of a few of the last Roman emperors in the West are given, but these are vague, and sometimes misleading or faulty. The details are not used as chronological markers, but are included to impress the reader with the »great chopping and changing« in Roman authority which permitted the regardful Euric to encroach upon Roman territory in Gaul²⁴. The rare use of consular dates, though accurate in themselves, are attended by striking inaccuracies, including the attribution of a twelfth year of reign to the Gothic king Vallia, who in fact died in his third year of rule²⁵. The deposition in 476 of Romulus Augustulus, the last Roman emperor to

23 Romana: ed. Th. MOMMSEN, MGH AA 5. Distraction from *abbreviatio chronicorum*: Jordanes, *Getica* 1. Chronography: Walter GOFFART, *The Narrators of Barbarian History (A.D. 550–800): Jordanes, Gregory of Tours, Bede, and Paul the Deacon*, Princeton 1988, p. 50, 63–64.

24 Jordanes, *Getica* 239: Olybrius (»not eight months in power,« almost correct), Glycerius (»barely a year,« in fact less than four months); 240: Avitus (»a few days,« in fact about fifteen months, transposed out of correct chronological sequence; his Gothic-backed usurpation in 455 clearly does not accord with Jordanes's historiographic schema). No details are given of the length of reigns for the other late western emperors. Euric: *Getica* 237, 240 (quotation in text: *tantas varietates mutationesque*), 244.

25 Consular dates are used twice, in Jordanes, *Getica* 166 and 176. Both passages are problematic. *Getica* 166: two separate events, the expulsion of Huns from Pannonia and conflict between the Goths of Toulouse and the Vandals in Spain, occur in the same year, »about« (*eo fere tempore*) the consulship of Hieras and Ardabures, i.e. 427. The *consular* dating of these events is correct, according to Jordanes's probable sources Marcellinus *comes* and Prosper (below), but Jordanes states also that these events happened in the twelfth year of the Visigothic king Vallia. Vallia ruled only for three years, from 415 to 418 (PLRE 2 »Vallia«, 1147–48). In fact, the twelfth year of his reign, had he lived that long, would have been 427. This is the sole instance of use of regnal-year dating of events in the *Getica*.

(Jordanes seems to have drawn the dating of these two events, the Hunnic expulsion and the Gothic/Vandal conflict, from two separate sources. Huns: Marcellinus *comes*, *Chronicon* s.a. 427, MGH AA 11; for commentary: Brian CROKE [trad.], *The Chronicle of Marcellinus*, in: *Byzantina Australiensia* 7 [Sydney 1995] p. 77. Gothic/Vandal conflict: cf. Cassiodorus, *Chronica* s.a. 427, MGH AA 11 [the faulty date for the Vandal crossing to Africa, 427 rather than 429, is taken from Cassiodorus's source, Prosper, *Chron. s.a.*, MGH AA 9]. Cassiodorus's *Chronica* appears never to have been suggested as a source for Jordanes; it is normally assumed that any relevant information in Cassiodorus's *Chronica* would have been duplicated in his lost Gothic history, and carried thence to Jordanes's work. The appearance of this little-attested conflict in Jordanes's *Getica*, combined with its erroneous dating, strongly supports the use of a Cassiodoran source; but is this pre-

rule in the West, is underscored with calculations of the length of Roman domination *ab urbe condita* and from the beginning of Augustus's reign, reflecting eastern chronographic traditions²⁶. These various chronographic indicators appear sporadically, and most are included for literary effect: to contrast the brevity of the reigns of the last western emperors with the longevity of the empire which they allowed to pass. The only systematic chronological indicators which have no evident literary purpose are the lengths of reign given for the Visigothic kings Thorismund, Theodoric II, and Euric.

The details of the length of reigns of the three kings are sufficiently in accord with contemporary sources to warrant serious attention, though Jordanes's general insouciance regarding chronology in the *Getica*, and his egregious errors in recording the length of reign of both western emperors and earlier Gothic kings, must act as warnings²⁷. The potential veracity of these figures, and their seemingly disinterested inclusion by Jordanes, suggests that they have been accurately drawn from an earlier source.

What this source was is unrecoverable. One possibility, at least, may be excluded. Claims have been made for the existence of an earlier, literary *historia* of the Goths, written by one Ablabius, underlying the lost *Gothic History* of Cassiodorus and thence of Jordanes's narrative. Ablabius, mentioned three times in the *Getica* in terms which give little support for this view, has been seen as an inhabitant of either Ostrogothic Italy or of Visigothic Gaul. His *historia* could well have been the source for the regnal years mentioned by Jordanes, if claims for its existence could be substantiated; but they cannot, and the sources for Jordanes's generally exiguous account of the kingdom of Toulouse remain unknown²⁸. It may be suggested that, as with the *Chron. Caes.*, the references to Visigothic regnal years were derived ultimately from a king-list or other non-literary reference work, containing an incom-

cise dating the sort of detail which would be recalled by Jordanes from his allegedly brief perusal of Cassiodorus's history? On the conflict in Spain prior to and perhaps precipitating the Vandal crossing to Africa, cf. *Chronica Gallia ad a. 452* [MGH AA 9] p. 107; Salvian, *De gubernatione Dei*, ed. F. DE PAULY (CSEL 8), Vienna 1883, VII 11.46, 12.53; SEECK, *Untergang* p. 111–112; STEIN, *Histoire* p. 320; the Goths were presumably auxiliaries to the ill-fated Roman forces mentioned by the *Chron. Gall.* and Salvian.)

Jordanes, *Getica* 176: conclusion of hostilities between the Goths of Toulouse and the western empire, correctly dated by consular year to 439 (compressing the events of three years). Again Jordanes introduces a second, wildly inaccurate chronological reference, making these events contemporaneous with the revolt of the Gothic general Gainas in Constantinople, 399–400. Yet in Jordanes's *Romana* 320, the revolt of Gainas is placed in its correct context.

26 Jordanes, *Getica* 243; cf. *Romana* 345; Marcellinus comes, *Chron. s.a. 476.2*. Brian CROKE, *A.D. 476: The Manufacture of a Turning Point*, in: *Chiron* 13 (1983) p. 81–119.

27 Contemporary sources for dates: see nn. 18 (above), 48–54 (below).

28 Ablabius as a writer from Ostrogothic Italy: MOMMSEN, *Introduction to Jordanes, Getica*, p. xxxvii–xxxix, xl–xliv; from Visigothic Gaul: Rolf HACHMANN, *Die Goten und Skandinavien*, Berlin 1970, p. 59–81, esp. p. 68–69, 75, and Appendix 3, p. 487–498; Peter HEATHER, *Goths and Romans*, p. 332–489, Oxford 1991, p. 62–65; ID., *Goths* p. 9. Rejections: Norbert WAGNER, *Getica: Untersuchungen zum Leben des Jordanes und zur frühen Geschichte der Goten*, Berlin 1967, p. 62–68, esp. p. 66 n. 23; WOLFRAM, *History of the Goths* p. 386 n. 36; Andrew GILLET, *Jordanes and Ablabius* (forthcoming in *Latomus*), with references. On Jordanes's sources for the *Getica*: Brian CROKE, *Cassiodorus and the Getica of Jordanes*, in: *Classical Philology* 82 (1987) p. 117–134; GOFFART, *Narrators of Barbarian History* p. 20–111.

plete *laterculus* of the Gothic kings, and circulating in Constantinople in the 550s when Jordanes was writing; but this is no more than a hypothesis.

What can be said for the chronographic value of the details of the length of kings' reigns in Jordanes's Visigothic narrative? Unfortunately, little. The attribution of a twelfth year of rule to Vallia, who ruled for only three years at most, inspires little confidence in Jordanes's accuracy. This erroneous detail, however, may well have been derived from a source other than that which provided the regnal years of the later kings. The reference is to a particular year of Vallia's rule, not to the total length of his reign, and appears in a different format from the record of the lengths of reign of Thorismund, Theodoric II, and Euric, which are similar, though not identical, to each other in formula. Jordanes includes no mention of regnal years for Theodoric I, who ruled between Vallia and Thorismund; Jordanes's source for lengths of reigns need not have extended back before Thorismund. The erroneous reference to Vallia may, then, have come from a separate source, leaving the details of the later kings' reigns uncontaminated. But even assuming that the figures for the later kings are correctly copied from an accurate source, they do not provide a secure dating system. Jordanes, although he uses imperial regnal years as the chronological structure of the *Romana*, does not appear to have intended the details of the length of the Gothic kings' reigns to serve a similar function in the *Getica*, for he offers no correlation of the accessions and deaths of the kings with any other chronological system. In isolation, the data is useless. Moderns exploit the Gothic regnal years as chronological indicators only by citing Prosper's *Chronicle*, which provides contemporary attestation fixing the year of Attila's invasion of Gaul (and so the death of Theodoric I and the elevation of Thorismund) to 451, and of Thorismund's death to 453²⁹. But this is not a straightforward process, and rests on questionable assumptions. Do we know how Jordanes's source calculated regnal years? What means are to be used to reconcile Jordanes's lengths of reign with Prosper's consular chronology?

Dating by regnal years is at best an awkward system. Thorismund died in his third year of rule, Theodoric II in his thirteenth: are the years involved dated from the anniversary of their accession, or do they refer to calendar years, i.e. commencing 1 January? If the latter, is the January concerned that of the year within which the king came to the throne (i.e. the January before his accession), or the January following? Each of these options is used in chronicle sources employing regnal years of the emperors as the basis of their chronology. Again, are transitional years (e.g. the year of Thorismund's death and the accession of Theodoric I) counted twice? And is the counting system employed inclusive or exclusive? Such technicalities frustrate attempts to use lengths of reign as a chronological system unless there are sufficient examples to demonstrate clearly the chronographer's method and to coordinate it with another, known chronology³⁰.

Thorismund became king after the death of his father in the battle of the Catalaunian Fields, sometime in 451. His death can be fixed to 453 by the contemporary at-

29 Prosper, *Chron.* 1364, 1371. Jordanes does not appear to draw his information on Thorismund from Prosper's *Chron.*, though he had access to the work.

30 On regnal years in the post-imperial kingdoms: MOMMSEN, *Herrscherjahr* (as at n. 15) p. 353–58, esp. p. 353 (doubts that regnal years of western kings were exclusively calculated from accession, rather than calendar years). On technical difficulties: BURGESS, *Chronicle of Hydatius* p. 39–46.

testation of Prosper. According to Jordanes, this was »in the third year of his reign«³¹. The usual interpretation of Jordanes's data is faulty in simply adding Theodoric's alleged thirteen years of rule to Prosper's date of 453, giving 466 as the year of the death of Theodoric II and Euric's accession³². By this same method of calculation, the year of Thorismund's death after three years of rule from Prosper's date of 451 for his accession would be 454, and the year of Euric's demise after nineteen years of rule would be 485, both demonstrably wrong³³. Jordanes indicates that Thorismund did not reign for three full years, nor Theodoric II for thirteen full years (if they had, the two kings' cumulative reign of sixteen years from 451 would simply give 467 as the year of Euric's accession). If Jordanes's figures are to be reconciled with Prosper's independent attestation of the dates for Thorismund's accession and death, they could be explained by calculation on either of two bases. First, Thorismund's three regnal years may have been calculated by calendar years, commencing from 1 January 451, the year he came to power, i.e. before his actual accession. His death at some date in 453 would then have occurred during the third (calendar) year of his reign. By this method of calculation, the thirteenth year of the reign of his brother Theodoric II, calculated from 1 January 453, the year of his accession, would have been 465. This supports neither of the dates suggested for Euric's accession. The second possible method of reconciliation is to calculate the regnal years from the anniversary of the kings' accessions. Thorismund's third year of rule would then have run from the second anniversary of his accession (during 453) to the third anniversary (during 454); if he was killed early in his third year, the *anno Domini* date could have been 453. For Theodoric II, the thirteenth year of his rule would run from the twelfth anniversary of Thorismund's murder and Theodoric's accession (provided the one happened immediately after the other, which is not stated by any source) in 465 to the thirteenth anniversary in 466. If Theodoric II died late in his thirteenth year, the *anno Domini* date could have been 466. In this way, Jordanes's data can be reconciled with a date of 466 for Euric's accession – but it need not give that date, for it just as easily favours 465. This explanation successfully reconciles the information of Jordanes and Prosper, but there is no control data to demonstrate that this method of counting was the one used by Jordanes's source, and it is merely an *a priori* assumption that Prosper should corroborate Jordanes for the accession and death of Thorismund. Without the verification of another independent source, the dates of 465 or 465/66, which the joining of Jordanes with Prosper appears to suggest for Euric's accession, cannot be taken as firm.

As chronological data, the lengths of kings' reigns in Jordanes's *Getica* lack value as self-sufficient testimony, for they cannot be employed without external corroboration.

31 Note that Hydatius, Chron. 152, 156 [144, 148] assigns only one calendar year to Thorismund's reign. Hydatius was a contemporary who may have written the first version of his Chron. in or soon after 456.

32 E.g. (among many examples) SEECK, Euricus p. 1239.

33 For Euric's death and the accession of Alaric II in 484: SCHMIDT, Ostgermanen p. 495–496 n. 5 (followed by STROHEKER, Eurich p. 128 n. 176; PLRE 2 »Alaricus 3«, p. 49); Concilium Agathense, in: MANSI (as n. 15) VIII, col. 337 and n. λ; Concilia Galliae a. 314–a. 506, ed. C. MUNIER (CSEL 148), Turnhout 1963, p. 213; with Knut SCHÄFERDIEK, Die Kirche in den Reichen der Westgoten und Suewen bis zur Errichtung der westgotischen katholischen Staatskirche, Berlin 1967, p. 56 n. 168.

ration, which is not available after 453; they must, moreover, remain suspect in view of the chronological errors elsewhere in the work. The *Getica* is often cited in conjunction with the *Chron. Caes.* as evidence for 466 as the year of Euric's reign, but these texts cannot be said to be in agreement, for the two sets of regnal years the works present are mutually irreconcilable³⁴.

In fact, the lengths of reigns in the *Getica* are a red herring, for Jordanes implicitly sets Euric's accession in 467. At *Getica* 235, Jordanes first mentions Euric's succession to Theodoric II. The remainder of that chapter and the next are devoted to a summary of foregoing events in western imperial history from the murder of Valentinian III in March 455 to the elevation of Anthemius in April 467, the »thick and fast turn-over of the Romans' emperors« which, according to Jordanes, set the scene for Euric's expansion³⁵. The order of the text implies that Anthemius's elevation, like all other events of these two chapters, occurred before Euric's accession. Jordanes had at least one good source for imperial events throughout this period, which enabled him to be accurate if he wished³⁶. Jordanes must, therefore, have believed that Euric became king after April 467.

Jordanes is not a stout ally in matters of chronology. It is clear, however, that he gives no firm support for 466 as the year of Euric's accession, and instead implies a date after Anthemius's elevation in early 467.

3. *Chronica Gallica ad a. DXI*

The so-called *Chronica Gallica ad a. DXI* is also cited in support of 466 as Euric's year of accession, but in fact it too dates the event to 467. The *Chron. Gall. 511* is a short work which briefly summarizes the *Chronicle* of Eusebius/Jerome, and then continues to the year 511. Despite its brevity, it is valuable as an independent western view of certain events of fifth-century imperial history, and for unique data in its final decades. Mommsen gave the work its current title because of an evident but complex relationship with two other works which appear to have been composed in Gaul, namely a brief narrative of the Valentinian and Theodosian dynasties, and a chronicle which continues the full text of Eusebius/Jerome to the year 452 (*Chronica Gallica a. 452*); he edited all three as the *Chronica Gallica*³⁷. It is possible, however, that the chronicle of 511 may have been composed in Spain, under Gothic rule³⁸.

The chronology of *Chron. Gall. 511* is treacherous. Flaws arise from the use of imperial regnal years as the main form of chronological reckoning: the author's list of

34 See n. 18 above.

35 Jordanes, *Getica* 237: *crebram mutationem Romanorum principum* (cf. 240, cited at n. 24 above).

36 Every event in western history in *Getica* 235–236 is recorded in Marcellinus comes, *Chron. s.aa.* 455–467, which was used by Jordanes, except for Majorian's alleged campaign against Alans in Gaul (for which Jordanes is the only testimony). Cf. Jordanes, *Romana* 334–336.

37 Edition: *Chronica Gallica ad a. 511* apud *Chronica Gallica*, ed. Th. MOMMSEN (MGH AA 11), p. 626–28 (introduction), 632–644, 647–663 (odd pp. only), 664–666. The entry relevant to Euric's accession is *Chron. Gall. 511* 643. On the *Chron. Gall. 452*: MUHLBERGER, *Fifth-Century Chroniclers*, chap. 4, p. 136–92.

38 See Appendix I.

the length of reigns of fifth-century emperors was erroneous, he seems to have lacked secure knowledge of when many emperors ceased to rule, and made no allowance for the interregna which occurred in the West³⁹. Other, individual errors also appear; the work is not a firm basis for any argument of chronology. Over and above the need to treat the work's data with caution, however, the *Chron. Gall. 511* in fact sets Euric's accession in the year corresponding to 467, not 466. The entry describing Euric's murder of Theodoric II is dated to the tenth regnal year of Leo I, who became emperor in February 457. Counting calendar years inclusively from the year of his elevation, Leo's tenth year is 466; the chronicle is thus cited in support of 466 as the year of Euric's elevation. But the *Chron. Gall. 511* does not count an emperor's year of accession as his first regnal year. This can be demonstrated by entries in the chronicle for imperial accessions, deaths, and other firmly datable events. The first year of Gratian and Valentinian II after the death of Valens (378) is 379, and their fifth year 383; the third year of Theodosius I after the death of Valentinian II (in 392) is 395; and the twelfth year of Theodosius II and Valentinian III (elevated 425) is 437⁴⁰. The tenth year of Leo, according to the chronology of the *Chron. Gall. 511*, is 467, not 466. Under the same year, the chronicler also sets the imperial accession of Anthemius, which occurred in April 467; and the chronology for events during Leo's reign is consistent in placing Anthemius's death in 472 at Leo's fifteenth year⁴¹. To the extent to which its evidence can be trusted, the *Chron. Gall. 511* supports 467, not 466, for Euric's elevation.

None of the main sources cited in support of 466 as the year of Euric's accession are firm. The author of the *Chron. Caes.* was not able to reconcile Gothic regnal years accurately with consular dating; Jordanes' information is unclear, but leans toward 467; and the *Chron. Gall. 511* in fact places the accession in 467, not 466. Examination of the relevant entry in Isidore of Seville's *Historia Gothorum* must be deferred until after discussion of the evidence of Hydatius, Isidore's sole source, and of Marius of Avenches.

4. Marius of Avenches, Chronica

The *Chronicle* of Marius of Avenches, written in Burgundy in the late sixth century, expressly dates Euric's usurpation to 467⁴². Marius employed consular dating as his chronographic framework, entering Euric's murder of Theodoric II under the con-

39 MOMMSEN, Introduction to *Chron. Gall. 511*, p. 627; Richard BURGESS, The Third Regnal Year of Eparchius Avitus: A Reply, in: *Classical Philology* 82 (1987) p. 341–342.

40 See Appendix II.

41 *Chron. Gall. 511* 645 (elevation), 650 (death). For the erroneous entry of Severus's death under the same year: BURGESS, Third Regnal Year p. 342. Other sources agree that the elevations of Anthemius and Euric happened in the same year, though usually in reverse order; see n. 54 below.

42 Editions: Marius of Avenches, *Chronica*, ed. Th. MOMMSEN (MGH AA 11); *La Chronique de Marius d'Avenches (455–581)*, ed. Justin FAVROD (Cahiers Lausannois d'histoire médiévale 4), Lausanne 1993. On Marius: MommSEN's Introduction to his edition (MGH AA 11), p. 225–31; Catherine MORTON, Marius of Avenches, the ›Excerpta Valesiana‹, and the Death of Boethius, in: *Traditio* 38 (1982) p. 107–136, esp. 108–115; Justin FAVROD, Les sources et la chronologie de Marius d'Avenches, in: *Francia* 17–1 (1990) p. 1–20.

sulate of Pusaëus and Ioannes, after the imperial elevation of Anthemius⁴³. Marius appears to have used earlier Italian and Gallic chronicles, which employed consular dating, and an eastern consular *fasti*⁴⁴.

Marius's date of 467 for the murder of Theodoric II has often been dismissed without fair trial. His most recent editor argues that Marius faithfully reproduces material from his consular sources without alteration or, indeed, comprehension; he nevertheless disposes of Marius's exactly-dated entry for Euric's accession by reference to a secondary authority who does not discuss the problem at length⁴⁵. In fact, there is no evident reason to discredit Marius's date. His fifth-century chronology is generally good, despite some isolated omissions⁴⁶, and his list of consuls is accurate – more so than that of his contemporary, Victor of Tunnuna (unlike Victor, Marius lists the consuls for 466). One, and probably both, of Marius's other entries for events concerning the Goths of Toulouse are correctly dated⁴⁷. There is no evident systemic fault in Marius's work which should automatically bring his dating of individual events into doubt. The work in fact has two indications of the date of the murder of Theodoric II: the consulate of Pusaëus and Ioannes, and the year of the accession of Anthemius (both 467). By itself, Marius's evidence is not sufficient to stand as conclusive proof. But unlike the dates which appear in the dubious chronologies of *Chron. Caes.*, Jordanes, or *Chron. Gall. 511*, Marius's precise dating may be considered sound unless proven otherwise.

43 Marius, *Chron.* s.a. 467.

44 MOMMSEN, Introduction to Marius, *Chron.* p. 229–230; BAGNALL et al., Consuls LRE, p. 50–51. A recent attempt to assign the western material to separate sources, including a Visigothic source, has not been convincing: FAVROD, Sources et chronologie, p. 6, 12–13, 14–15. The argument rests on the absence of parallels between four entries in Marius, claimed as concerning the Goths in Gaul, and extant texts which, Favrod believes, employed a common source written in Ravenna (the entries are Marius, *Chron.* s.aa. 455.2, 456.2, 463, 467). One of the four entries (Marius, *Chron.* 456.2, concerning the occupation of *Lugdunensis Prima* by the Burgundians) does not in fact involve the Goths and could well have come from a source closer to hand to Marius. The remaining three Gothic entries display no common features which suggest a shared provenance. All have analogues in extant Gallic or Spanish chronicles:

– Marius, *Chron.* s.a. 455.2: cf. Hydatius, *Chron.* 163 [156];

– Marius, *Chron.* s.a. 463: cf. *Chron. Gall. 511* 638, Hydatius, *Chron.* 214 [218];

– Marius, *Chron.* s.a. 467.2: cf. *Chron. Gall. 511* 643, Hydatius, *Chron.* 238 [234]).

Cf. MOMMSEN, Introduction to Marius, *Chron.* 230. On Ravennan consular material: Brian CROKE, *City Chronicles of Late Antiquity*, in: *Reading the Past in Late Antiquity*, ed. Graeme CLARKE et al., Rushcutters Bay 1990, p. 188–190.

45 FAVROD, Sources et chronologie, p. 15 n. 55 and ID., *Chronique de Marius* p. 93 s.a. 467.2, citing DEMOUGEOT, *Formation* 2:581 n. 43, who in turn cites only Jordanes. On Marius's methods: FAVROD, Sources et chronologie, esp. p. 20–21.

46 BAGNALL et al., Consuls LRE 51. For sixth-century errors: MOMMSEN, Introduction to Marius, *Chron.* p. 228–229; for the dispute concerning the dating of Boethius's execution: MORETON, *Death of Boethius*; S. J. B. BARNISH, *The Anonymus Valesianus II as a Source for the Last Years of Theodoric*, in: *Latomus* 42 (1983) p. 572–96; FAVROD, Sources et chronologie, p. 15 n.53.

47 Marius, *Chron.* s.aa. 455.2, 463 (cf. Hydatius, *Chron.* 218 [214]).

5. Hydatius, Chronica

The clearest evidence of any source for the date of Euric's elevation is the *Chronicle* of Hydatius, author of the fullest extant fifth-century Latin chronicle. Like *Chron. Gall. 511*, Hydatius employs imperial regnal years, supplemented by a number of other chronographic systems, to structure his record of time⁴⁸. The notoriously tortuous chronology of the final years of Hydatius's work has been the subject of recent and important studies⁴⁹. Hydatius's authority for the date of Euric's accession, however, rests not on the imperial regnal year which he assigns to the king's elevation, but on his ordering of events. Hydatius places Euric's accession after the arrival of the eastern general and *patricius* Anthemius in Rome and his imperial elevation there on 12 April 467⁵⁰. Whatever the complications in Hydatius's chronological calculations, it is unlikely that he reversed the order of the elevations of Anthemius and Euric. He probably wrote the extant version of his chronicle soon after the final entry, ca. 468/469, very close to the events concerned, and he may well have recorded entries in the latter part of the work annalistically. Hydatius was well informed on the Goths in Toulouse, gaining information not only from the many formal embassies between the Goths and Hydatius's own rulers, the Sueves of Gallaecia, but also from other, unidentifiable sources.⁵¹ In the case of Euric's accession, Hydatius records that news of the murder of Theodoric II came to Gallaecia before the first formal embassy from the new king⁵². He is less well informed about Italian events, and communication between Gallaecia and Italy was demonstrably slow⁵³. Physical proximity and better channels of communication with Gaul suggest that Hydatius would have been more likely to date a Gallic event early and an Italian one late, than vice versa; indeed, Hydatius does place Anthemius's accession four months after it actually occurred. His ordering of Euric's accession after Anthemius's is some guarantee of accuracy. Most sources agree in placing Anthemius's

48 BURGESS, *Chronicle of Hydatius* p. 27–46.

49 MUHLBERGER, *Fifth-Century Chroniclers* p. 203–204, 279–312; BURGESS, *Chronicle of Hydatius* p. 27–46.

50 Hydatius, *Chron.* 234–235 (Anthemius), 237–238 (Euric) [230–231, 233–234]. The account of Anthemius's arrival in Italy in early 467 (*Chron.* 234 [230]) is displaced into the previous regnal year, »Severus IV«, to permit the rubric introducing Anthemius's regnal years (*Chron.* 235 [231]) to stand at the head of the entry for the calendar-year »Anthemius I« = 467 (*Chron.* 236–241 [232–237]); cf. BURGESS, *Hydatius*, p. 75–78). Had Euric become king in 466, before Anthemius's arrival in Italy and subsequent elevation, then the relevant entries in Hydatius's account (*Chron.* 237–238 [233–234]) must needs have been displaced in the opposite direction, from the regnal year »Severus IV« to »Anthemius I.« There is no evident reason why this should be true. Hydatius shows that Anthemius and Euric came to their respective thrones in the same year, probably in the order in which he presents them (Anthemius first, then Euric); cf. n. 54.

51 For Hydatius on Gaul: R. W. BURGESS, *From Gallia Romana to Gallia Gothica: the View from Spain*, in: DRINKWATER and ELTON, *Fifth-Century Gaul*, p. 19–27.

52 Hydatius, *Chron.* 237–238 [233–234]. This interesting detail, indicating the existence of informal as well as formal communications, may reflect a time delay between the murder of Theodoric II and Euric's consolidation of power.

53 Examples of delay in reception of information from Italy resulting in chronological error by Hydatius: THOMPSON, *Romans and Barbarians* p. 223–226; BURGESS, *Third Regnal Year*, p. 335–345.

and Euric's elevations in the same year⁵⁴. Hydatius offers solid, contemporary evidence for dating Euric's accession to 467.

6. Isidore of Seville, *Historia Gothorum, Wandalorum, Sueborum*

Isidore's history of the barbarian kingdoms in Spain sets Euric's elevation in the Spanish era 504 (= 466 AD) and the eighth year of the emperor Leo I (= 465 AD)⁵⁵. Despite the discrepancy between these two dates, Isidore has been cited as direct evidence both for 466 as the year of Euric's accession, and for the eastern emperor Leo I, who is explicitly named in Isidore's text, as the recipient of one of Euric's embassies⁵⁶. But Isidore's account has no independent value as testimony, for his sole source is Hydatius's *Chron.*, to which he has made minor but misleading additions and deletions.

The following sets out Isidore's adjustments to Hydatius's text (verbatim text from Hydatius, *Chron.* 235 [231] in bold, from *Chron.* 238 [234] in *italics*; deletions from Hydatius in square brackets):

Aera DIII anno imperii Leonis VIII Euricus pari scelere quo frater succedit in regnum annis XVII.⁵⁷ *in quo honore propectus et crimine statim legatos [et] ad Leonem*⁵⁸ *imperatorem [et ad regem] dirigit [Suevorum ...]*⁵⁹ *nec mora partes Lusitaniae magno impetu depraedatur*⁶⁰.

There are three potential indicators in Isidore's passage of the date for Euric's accession: the era date; the imperial regnal year; and the reference to Leo as the recipient of Euric's envoys, which implies that Anthemius had not yet become Augustus. All are derived solely from Hydatius, and are faulty, either because of Hydatius's errors or Isidore's. Throughout his history, Isidore begins every entry with the Spanish era

54 Date of Anthemius's elevation: Hydatius, *Chron.* p. 235 [231] (*mense Augusto*), recte 12 April; *Fasti Vindobonenses priores*, MGH AA 9, p. 305 s.a. 467. Otto SEECK, *Regesten der Kaiser und Päpste für die Jahre 311 bis 476 n. Chr.*, Stuttgart 1919, p. 414 interprets Hydatius's data as the date of the announcement of Anthemius's elevation in Spain. Other sources: like Hydatius, Marius places Euric's accession after Anthemius's, in 467. Jordanes also implies that Anthemius's elevation preceded Euric's; above, at n. 36. *Chron. Gall.* 511 643–644 puts both in the same year, 467, but sets Euric's first. Only *Chron. Caes.* sets the two events in separate years, the result of faulty calibration of two flawed sources. Cf. MOMMSEN, Introduction to Hydatius, *Chron.* 4: *notae annorum quas posuit etsi perturbatae non sunt contrariae*; MUHLBERGER, *Fifth-Century Chroniclers* p. 311. Contra BURGESS, Hydatius 89, p. 256–257 (the dating there of Hydatius, *Chron.* 236 [232] to 466 rests on a hypothetical and unattested expedition against the Vandals led by Ricimer without imperial sanction, and an argumentum e silentio from Sidonius Apollinaris, *Poèmes et lettres*, ed. André LOYEN, Paris 1970, Carm. II).

55 Isidorus Iunior, *Historia Gothorum Wandalorum Sueborum*, ed. Th. MOMMSEN, MGH AA 11, p. 34 (Isidore's regnal year count begins from the year after an emperor's accession, cf. 30).

56 E.g. BURGESS, Hydatius p. 257.

57 »XVIII« in Parisinus Lat. 4873, MOMMSEN n. ad loc.

58 Mommsen's edition erroneously attributes *Leonem* as well as the surrounding italicized words to Hydatius; it is not attested in any extant version of Hydatius.

59 The remainder of Hydatius, *Chron.* 238 [234] is omitted; it reads: *quibus [sc. legatis Eurici] sine mora a Remismundo [sc. rege Suevorum] remissis eiusdem regis legati ad imperatorem, alii ad Vandalos, alii diriguntur ad Gothos.*

60 Isidore's addition appears to be a general summary of Hydatius, *Chron.* 240, 246, 249, 250 [236, 240, 243, 244]; most of the vocabulary used appears in the relevant sections of Hydatius, with the exception of *impetus*.

date and the year of the eastern (not western) emperor. Almost totally dependent on Hydatius for events of the 450s and 460s, he calculated the Spanish era date for the year of Euric's accession from a reference to era 500 in an entry of Hydatius's *Chron.* set four regnal years before Euric's accession. Isidore was unaware of a fault in Hydatius's chronology at this point, which appears to set events occurring in the year of Anthemius's and Euric's elevations one year too early⁶¹. Isidore took his second chronological marker, the eastern imperial regnal year, from Hydatius's rubric for the beginning of Anthemius's reign⁶², which erroneously dated Anthemius's elevation as the eighth year of the reign of Leo I (which would be 465 AD)⁶³. Having decided to delete Hydatius's reference to the role of the Suevic king in the diplomatic exchange, and consistently omitting references to western emperors, it was a natural but false move by Isidore to expand Hydatius's ambiguous *ad imperatorem* by supplying Leo, the emperor who had just been named in the dating formula. Each of Isidore's chronological indicators may be discounted. Isidore has been characterized as »inclined to read his source [sc. Hydatius] too quickly and without adequate care«⁶⁴.

There is little to support the traditional date of 466 for the year of Euric's accession, and good reason to accept the evidence of Hydatius and Marius for 467.

The Embassies

Correctly dating the commencement of Euric's reign crucially affects interpretations of his subsequent actions. Euric did not become king in the absence of a western emperor, but after Anthemius's elevation. It is therefore unlikely that the emperor to whom Euric sent envoys was Leo I in Constantinople; rather it was Anthemius, who ruled from Rome⁶⁵. Though Anthemius is not named in the surviving versions

61 Hydatius, *Chron.* 214 [209], era 500, also the first year of Severus = 462 AD. Hydatius's entry for Euric's accession occurs four regnal years later, so Isidore is consistent in labelling the year of Euric's accession era 504. Hydatius's chronology is erroneous at this point; by his regnal-year counting, the elevation of Anthemius appears to be set in the year equivalent to 465; BURGESS, *Chronicle of Hydatius* p. 44–45. Though one other late user of Hydatius also gives a Spanish era date, for the year of Anthemius's accession (the *Chronicon Luxoviense*, erroneously dating the year era 503 = 465 AD), there seems no compelling reason to believe that Hydatius originally included an era date for either accession; cf. however BURGESS, *Chronicle of Hydatius* p. 34–35, 167.

62 Hydatius, *Chron.* 235 [231].

63 BURGESS, *Chronicle of Hydatius* p. 44–45, 118 and apparatus corrects this rubric to *anno Leonis imperii VIII*, attributing *VIII* to a false scribal »correction« of the Berlin MS of Hydatius. But no early user of Hydatius appears to have given the year of Leo's reign as *VIII*; most agree with the Berlin MS and Isidore in giving *VIII*; cf. *ibid.*, Appendix 4, p. 159, 167, 172.

64 THOMPSON, *Romans and Barbarians* p. 217–221, quotation at p. 218.

65 Emperor: most modern studies assume, like Isidore, that the emperor was Leo; e.g. YVER, *Euric* p. 16; STROHEKER, *Eurich* 9–10; BURY, *History LRE* 1:341 n. 1; SCHMIDT, *Ostgermanen* p. 487; STEIN, *Histoire* p. 389; SEECK, *Untergang* p. 364; *Id.*, *Euricus* p. 1240; DEMOUGEOT, *Formation* 2:631; Julio CAMPOS (ed. and trad.), *Idace: Chonicón*, Salamanca 1984, p. 206; PLRE 2 »Remisimundus«, p. 938; HARRIES, *Sidonius Apollinaris* p. 142. The emperor is understood as Anthemius by VON WIETERSHEIM, *Geschichte der Völkerwanderung* p. 311–312; TRANOY, *Hydace: Chronique* 2:124; F. M. CLOVER, *Geiseric the Statesman: A Study of Vandal Foreign Policy*, Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago 1966, p. 195 n. 2.

of Hydatius's *Chronicle*, the text assumes that he was the emperor in question. Hydatius's record of Euric's accession states that, simultaneously with his legation *ad imperatorem*, Euric sent envoys to other western rulers. These included Remismund, ruler of the Sueves in Hydatius's native province of Gallaecia in western Spain, and the Vandals in North Africa. Soon after receiving Euric's envoys, Remismund sent them back to Gaul and dispatched his own round of legates: to Euric, to the Vandals, and *ad imperatorem*, clearly the same emperor with whom Euric had communicated⁶⁶. Hydatius records stories which the Suevic envoys brought back to Gallaecia from the imperial court⁶⁷. Though the stories involve events at the courts

Rome: from the latter years of Valentinian III, ca. 450, onwards, most western emperors ruled from Rome, not Ravenna; the only clear exceptions are Majorian and Romulus. Cf. SEECK, *Regesten* p. 384–422; Andrew GILLETT, *Rome, Ravenna, and the Last Western Emperors* (forthcoming).

- 66 Hydatius, *Chron.* 238 (Euric's envoys to the Sueves and the emperor, and Remismund's envoys to the Goths, Vandals, and the emperor), 240 (return of Euric's envoys to the Vandals, not mentioned in 238), 244–245, 247 (return of Suevic envoys to the Goths and the emperor) [234, 236, 238–239, 241].

Several modern commentators, misled by the omission of the Gothic envoys to the Vandals from *Chron.* 238 [234], have construed *eiusdem regis* as referring to Euric, not Remismund, thus making Euric send two rounds of envoys: the first to the emperor and the Sueves; the second to the emperor again, to the Vandals, and *ad Gothos*, who must therefore be the [Ostro-]Goths of Theodemer living in Pannonia (VON WIETERSHEIM, *Geschichte der Völkerwanderung* 2:312 n. a; SEECK, *Euricus* p. 1240; PLRE 2:427). This misconstrues the text. The return of Suevic envoys from the Goths is described at *Chron.* 245, that of Suevic envoys from Rome at *Chron.* 247 [239, 241]. These are clearly the second round of envoys of *Chron.* 238 [234]. – CAMPOS, *Idace: Cronica* n 206, 207 makes *alii ... ad Gothos* an interpolation. He thinks that the envoys sent to the Goths cannot have been Remismund's since the Suevic king had already sent back Euric's men and would not have then sent his own men »uselessly.« In fact, rulers often sent their own representatives in response to a legation from another authority, rather than entrusting messages with the returning envoys of the other court; e.g. Hydatius, *Chron.* 226 [222]; Cassiodorus, *Variae*, ed. Th. MOMMSEN, *MGH AA* 12, Berlin 1894, X 19.4–5 (*Cui* [sc. the *magister officiorum* Petrus, sent as envoy to Theodahad by Justinian] *virum venerabilem illum* [name of the envoy deleted, as is usual in the *Variae*] *legatum nostrum adiungendum esse credidimus, ut non per occasionem legationis vestrae, sed propria potius destinatione nostra possitis vota cognoscere*); Procopius, *Wars*, trad. J. B. DEWING, London 1914–1940, V 6.13–14.

Hydatius, *Chron.* 240 [236], describing the return of Gothic envoys from the Vandals after hearing news of the planned imperial expedition against North Africa, continues: *Suevi qui post legatos more solito per diversa loca in praedam dispersi fuerant revocantur, sed paucis post mensibus ipse rex Suevorum ad Lusitaniam transit*. These Sueves are not the envoys to the Vandals, also fleeing before the arrival of the imperial navy, as has been assumed by several commentators (Ludwig SCHMIDT, *Die Ostgermanen*, 2nd ed., Munich 1941, p. 487; ID., *Histoire des Vandales*, trad. H. E. DEL MEDICO, Paris 1953, p. 111; CLOVER, *Geiseric the Statesman*, p. 195 n. 2; WOLFRAM, *History of the Goths* p. 182–183; MUHLBERGER, *Fifth-Century Chroniclers* p. 311). The section should be construed as follows. The news of the intended imperial assault against Carthage in 467 caused the Gothic envoys to Geiseric to withdraw suddenly. Similarly, this news prompted Remismund to recall Suevic forces throughout Gallaecia; they had recommenced harassing the provincials after Euric's envoys left, notwithstanding representations from both Theodoric II and Euric (cf. Hydatius, *Chron.* 233, 239 [229, 235]). Once it was clear that the Roman force would be approaching Africa via Sicily, not via eastern Spain as Majorian had done in 460 (Hydatius, *Chron.* 200 [195]), Remismund took up military operations again, expanding southwards into Lusitania in the mistaken belief that he was secure from assaults by either the empire or the Goths. Soon after, however, Euric launched a punitive attack on the Sueves (Hydatius, *Chron.* 245–246, 249–250 [239–240, 243–244]).

- 67 Hydatius, *Chron.* 247 [241]. He also recorded stories brought back by envoys to the Goths in Toulouse, *Chron.* 242–244 [238]. How Hydatius had access to news brought by the envoys of the

of both Rome and Constantinople, it is clear that the envoys had visited the western, not the eastern capital. The envoys accurately reported Ricimer's recent marriage to Anthemius's daughter in Rome (late 467), but were confused about events in the Constantinople concerning the fall of the general Aspar⁶⁸. They also described a Byzantine fleet sent to join forces with Anthemius against the Vandals in 468, and again their report indicates that they had visited Italy, not the East: »The envoys who had been sent to the emperor returned, announcing that in their presence a very large army against the Vandals, with three generals chosen by the emperor Leo, had arrived; Marcellinus was likewise dispatched, with a great force joined to him by the emperor Anthemius«⁶⁹.

This passage describes the fleet's arrival in Italy, not its departure from Constantinople. Both Marcellinus and Anthemius's own forces were already in Italy; their association with the eastern forces can only have occurred there⁷⁰. Remismund's legates travelled to the western emperor, not to his eastern colleague, to witness these sights; Euric's envoys likewise had visited Rome.

Euric and the Empire, 467–471

At his accession, Euric communicated with the emperor at Rome and other western powers. This clarification affects our understanding of the nature of political relations between the western kingdoms and the imperial authority. Hydatius's description of Euric's accession embassies has often been pressed into the service of a smooth narrative of growing Gothic aggression towards Rome, with the embassies as the first expression of a hostility toward the empire which had motivated Euric's fratricidal usurpation. Various combinations and permutations of the parties involved in the embassies – Goths and empire, Goths and other barbarians – are presented as alliances with or against the empire. Most often, Euric's actions are seen as

Suevic king is an intriguing and overlooked question; the tone of his work suggests that Roman provincials of Gallaecia had only hostile relations with the Sueves, but entries such as these suggest that Hydatius's description of relations may be misleading.

68 THOMPSON, *Romans and Barbarians* p. 223–226.

69 Hydatius, *Chron.* 247 [241]: *Legati qui ad imperatorem missi fuerant redeunt nuntiantes sub praesentia sui magnum valde exercitum cum tribus ducibus lectis adversum Vandalos a Leone imperatore descendisse directo Marcellino pariter cum manu magna eid. per imperatorem Anthemium sociata.* For *descendo* in the sense »to arrive«: *Thesaurus linguae Latinae* (ThLL) 5.1 s.v. »Descendo«, II.A.2, and contrast Hydatius's use of *ascendit* for the departure of Anthemius from Constantinople, Hydatius, *Chron.* 234 [230]. *Ascendo* was commonly used in ecclesiastical Latin in the sense of »departing by sea« (including Jerome's Vulgate, used by Hydatius: Carmen CARDELLE DE HARTMANN, *Philologische Studien zur Chronik des Hydatius von Chaves*, Stuttgart 1994, p. 207–209); *A Latin Dictionary*, ed. Charlton T. LEWIS and Charles SHORT, Oxford 1879, s.v. »Ascendo«, Iδ fin. p. 171; ThLL 2 s.v. »Ascendo«, I.2; *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, ed. P. G. W. GLARE, Oxford 1982, s.v. »Ascendo«, 4a p. 180. The translations of these two passages in the editions of BURGESS, *Chronicle of Hydatius* and TRANOY, *Hydace: Chronique* are misleading. Cf. CLOVER, *Geiseric the Statesman*, p. 195–196 n. 2.

70 Hydatius, *Chron.* 234, 236 [230, 232]; Priscus, *Frag.* 53.1 [42] in: R. C. BLOCKLEY, *The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire: Eunapius, Olympiodorus, Priscus and Malchus*, 2 vols. (ARCA Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs 6 and 10), Liverpool 1981 and 1983, vol. 2.

part of a grand conspiracy, »a Germanic and Arian coalition against the Roman empire«. To achieve such reconstructions, even the brief evidence Hydatius provides must be partially ignored. Explanations of the purpose of the legation to the emperor tend to ignore the missions to the barbarian kings, and vice versa; the simultaneity of Euric's embassies is regularly overlooked⁷¹. Such reconstructions are largely interchangeable and therefore unconvincing. Their assumption, that Hydatius records a decisive moment in which the political constellation of the West fatefully shifts, is at odds with the evidence of the source itself. However abrupt Euric's rise to power may have been, there is no indication, in Hydatius's text, that relations among the barbarian kingdoms and the empire suffered the slightest change as a result. In his first years of rule, Euric appears to have been intent on continuing his predecessors' policies towards the Sueves and the empire.

Hydatius most often portrays the Goths as brutal executors of the empire's will. From the 450s, they were used to check Suevic power, a role they appear to have played also in 417/18⁷². With the Gothic-backed usurpation of Avitus in 455, imperial military action in Spain was delegated to the Goths. The main imperial concerns regarding Spain which can be perceived in Hydatius's record were containment of Suevic ambitions to expand beyond Gallaecia into the rest of Spain, and mitigation of conflicts between the Sueves and Roman provincials within Gallaecia. Gothic military forces, as auxiliaries to imperial troops or by themselves, intervened in Spanish affairs to these ends. The most notable Gothic military intrusion into Spain

71 Interpretations of Euric's embassies have been central to many discussions of his later territorial expansion. In order to construe the evidence as a single, plausible sequence of events, Hydatius's text is used selectively. STROHEKER, *Eurich* p. 9–26 thinks that Euric's embassy to the emperor (Leo) was to break off the Roman-Gothic *foedus*, while the missions to the Vandals and the Sueves sought to establish a Gothic-Vandal-Suevic alliance (p. 12–13; cf. STEIN, *Histoire* p. 388–389 [quoted above]: »une coalition germanique et arienne contre l'Empire romain«; ROUCHE, *L'Aquitaine* p. 37); these plans collapsed before the imperial campaigns against the Vandals, and Euric decided instead to attack the Sueves, in support of the »old Gothic claim to Spain« (STROHEKER, *Eurich* p. 21–22). Stroheker makes Remismund's embassy to the Goths an attempt to mediate this threat, although Hydatius clearly indicates that Remismund sent his envoys soon after receiving the announcement of Euric's elevation, i.e. before the news of the imperial campaign or the Gothic attack on the Sueves. The Suevic embassies to the Vandals and to Rome are ignored.

Other modern accounts are also selective in their use of Hydatius's evidence: STROHEKER, *Eurich* p. 9–10 (review of earlier opinions); STEIN, *Histoire* p. 388–389 (ignoring the Suevic embassies); BURY, *History LRE* 1:341 and n. 1 (omitting the Gothic embassies to the Sueves and Vandals); SEECK, *Untergang* p. 364 (placing Euric's embassy *ad imperatorem* before Anthemius's accession, but the embassy to the Vandals afterwards; for ID., *Euricus* p. 1240, see n. 66 above); LOT et al., *Les destinées* p. 84–85 (making the Goths and the Sueves allies, seeking an alliance first with Constantinople then with the Vandals, ignoring the simultaneity of Euric's embassies and subsequent Gothic attacks on the Sueves); SCHMIDT, *Ostgermanen* p. 487–88 (embassy to Constantinople first, to seek recognition of Gothic sovereignty, then embassies to Sueves and Vandals to form anti-imperial alliance – ignoring simultaneity of Euric's embassies and hostility arising immediately from Gothic-Suevic contacts; the Suevic embassies *ad imperatorem* are to Anthemius, part of a general lining up of all military and non-military forces of the West into pro-imperial or pro-Gothic lines); ID., *Histoire des Vandales* p. 111 (making the imperial campaign against the Vandals a response to the barbarian embassies); CLOVER, *Geiseric the Statesman* p. 195–196 (ignoring hostile reaction to the Suevic mission to the Goths).

72 Andrew GILLETT, *The Birth of Ricimer*, in: *Historia* 44 (1995) p. 380–384.

came in 456. Following the failure of diplomatic approaches to the Sueves, Avitus ordered a major assault on Gallaecia by the Goths under Euric's predecessor, Theodoric II, to punish Suevic assaults on the provinces of Carthaginiensis and Tarracensis. The attack may have aimed at terminating the Suevic monarchy⁷³. If so, it was not successful. Fragmented but not disarmed, Suevic forces, now divided among rival leaders, again harassed the Gallaecian provincials and raided neighbouring provinces, after the departure of the main Gothic forces from Spain. Theodoric II continued to intervene. In the early 460s, he succeeded in installing Remismund, his own nominee as king of the Sueves, over several competitors⁷⁴. Remismund, however, proved unfaithful to his Gothic patron. Further conflict between the Sueves and Gallaecian provincials ensued, and when Theodoric sent envoys to complain to Remismund, they were »spurned« and sent smartly back to Gaul⁷⁵. An envoy subsequently dispatched by Theodoric to Remismund returned to Gaul to find that his king had been murdered by Euric⁷⁶.

Euric's accession made no evident change to this pattern of Gothic intervention in Spain on behalf of Roman provincials in Gallaecia and other provinces. Hydatius's narrative continues with familiar scenes: the Sueves harassed provincials in the Gallaecian region of Aunonensis, and began to raid Lusitania (only briefly curbed by rumours of an imperial campaign against the Vandals in North Africa; a previous campaign against Geiseric had passed through eastern Spain)⁷⁷. The provincials again petitioned Toulouse for aid⁷⁸. Remismund responded to Euric's accession embassy as brusquely as he had to Theodoric's. In turn, the response of Euric to the return embassy dispatched by Remismund was to send an army into Spain, as Theodoric had done twice, in 456 and 463. The Gothic force wrested control of Lusitania and eastern Gallaecia from the Sueves, to the discomfort of the local populations⁷⁹. Euric's campaigns in Spain are often seen as a prelude to his later conquest

73 Diplomatic approaches: Hydatius, Chron. 170, 172 [163, 165]. Military intervention: 173–175 [166–168]: *et cum voluntate et ordinatione Aviti imperatoris*.

74 Hydatius, Chron. 223, 226 [219, 222]. Avitus's delegation of military authority in Spain to the Goths appears to have been confirmed, after initial conflict, by Majorian: Hydatius, Chron. 197 [192]; Priscus, Frag. 36.1, 2 [27]; cf. PLRE 2 »Theodericus 3«, p. 1072.

75 Hydatius, Chron. 233 [229]: ... *legati... mittuntur in cassum spretique ab eo [sc. Remismundo] mox redeunt*. A slightly earlier Gothic embassy had perhaps complained about a Suevic assault on Combrica: 229–231 [225–227].

76 Hydatius, Chron. 237 [233].

77 Further conflict with provincials: Hydatius, Chron. 241 [237]. Previous imperial campaign against the Vandals via Spain: 200 [195].

78 Hydatius, Chron. 239 [235], a difficult passage: was the envoy Opilio sent by the Aunonian *plebs*, or by »the king« mentioned, and if the latter, then by Remismund, Euric, or even Theodoric II before his death? In any case, there was clearly an exchange of embassies, one group men »who had been sent with [Opilio]« (*aliquanti qui cum ipso missi fuerunt*), the other »dispatched with [Opilio] by the king« (*viri secum rege profecti*). The solution given in Burgess's translation of this passage is only one possibility. Earlier embassies of the Gallaecian provincials for help against the Sueves: 96, 98 [86, 88], to the MVM Actius in Gaul in 431; 219 [215], to Theodoric II in ca. 463.

79 Remismund's reply to Euric's envoys: Hydatius, Chron. 238 [234]: ... *[legatis Eurici] sine mora a Remismundo remissis* ...; cf. *mox* in Chron. 233 [229] at n. 75 above. Euric's army: Chron. 245–246, 249–250 [239–240, 243–244].

of Provence⁸⁰, but there is nothing to suggest, by the end of Hydatius's chronicle, 468/469, that Euric's rise had made any difference to the pattern of Gothic punitive interventions in Spain.

Similarly, there is no indication in Hydatius that Euric's accession had affected relations between the Goths and the western empire⁸¹. Anthemius had been installed as western emperor by Leo I in order to assist military operations against the Vandals in North Africa. Preparations for this campaign proceeded, unperturbed by the coup in Toulouse⁸². Another, well-informed source, composed in Rome in late 467, corroborates this impression. Sidonius Apollinaris declaimed a panegyric to celebrate Anthemius's consulate, on 1 January 468, and had good advice on its composition. The panegyric centres on the forthcoming major campaign against the Vandals. Although other barbarian groups are also mentioned, as secondary security concerns, the Gaul Sidonius makes no mention of the Goths of Toulouse as a potential threat, and may refer to them as allies against rebel Roman forces in Gaul⁸³.

These events are complex and Hydatius's description minimal. But there is sufficient information to perceive that the embassies sent by Euric on his accession need not be understood as interrelated, part of a single plan directed at alliance or subversion of the empire. The change of ruler at Toulouse seems to have been of no immediate concern to the imperial government, while the exchange of embassies between the Goths and the Sueves merely continued attempts begun by Theodoric II to intervene in the Sueves' conflicts with the provincials and to limit their attempts at expansion, in accordance with the Goths' delegated pursuit of imperial interests in Spain. Fratricide notwithstanding, Euric did not deviate from Theodoric's policies towards neighbouring powers at the outset of his reign. His embassies to Anthemius, Remismund, Geiseric, and probably other rulers, indicate not a »diplomatic offensive« against the

80 E.g. SEECK, *Euricus* p. 1240–1241 sees Euric's conflicts with the Sueves as a campaign to protect the Goths' southern flank in preparation for an assault on the empire (an improbable interpretation: the Sueves were a minor power, most unlikely to pose a threat to the security of the Goths, especially after the turmoil of the mid-450s/460s). STROHECKER, *Eurich* p. 22–26 (followed by WOLFRAM, *History of the Goths* p. 185–186) sees Euric's actions as conquest of imperial territories. Neither view takes into account the role of the Gallaecian provincials in petitioning Toulouse for assistance, or, in general, the continuity in Gothic/Suevic relations, before and after Euric's accession, assumed in Hydatius's account.

81 Between ca. 462 and 465, the Goths had supported Severus, Ricimer's nominee as emperor, by opposing the MVM Aegidius in Gaul (who threatened to depose Severus); Priscus, *Frag.* 39.1 [30]; Hydatius, *Chron.* 217, 218, 228 [212, 214, 224]. Gothic support for the imperial court continued in 467/468 against Syagrius, Aegidius's Frankish-backed successor; below, n. 83.

82 Hydatius, *Chron.* 234–236, 240, 247 [230–232, 236, 241].

83 Sidonius, *Carm.* II esp. ll. p. 348–386, 478–487, on which: André LOYEN, *Recherches historique sur les panégyriques de Sidoine Apollinaire*, Paris 1942 (repr. Rome 1967), p. 85–95. Advice on composition: Sidonius, *Ep.* I 9.2–6 (Basilus, of the *gens Deciana*, described by Sidonius as one of two figures who dominated the Senate; *patricius*, cons. 463, twice PPO Ital.; he arranged for Sidonius to deliver the consular panegyric); possibly *Carm.* I ll. 25–28 (Anthemius's *quaestor* Victor). Other barbarian threats: *Carm.* II p. 377–378 (Ostrogoths and Franks). Goths: there are two possible allusions to the Goths in the panegyric; both portray the Goths (if the identifications are correct) as imperial allies. *Carm.* II ll. 18–19: Anthemius's elevation is supported by, inter alia, *foedere iunctus*, presumably including the Goths. *Carm.* II ll. 378: Ricimer's alleged suppression of the Franks (*Rheni Mars*) is interpreted by LOYEN, *Recherches* p. 93–95, as continued Gothic opposition to the Roman rebel Syagrius, Aegidius's successor, on the empire's behalf.

empire, but the new king's active pursuit of Gothic interests with each of the major powers of the West, following a strictly domestic *coup d'état*⁸⁴.

There is no indication in Hydatius's account that Euric appeared hostile towards the empire at the time of his accession. Nevertheless, Euric was later to conquer large parts of Gaul and Spain. At what date can he first be seen to act aggressively towards the empire? At some time after 469/470, Euric defeated Riothamus, ruler of the Bretons in Armorica and, according to Jordanes, an ally of the empire⁸⁵. The

84 Quotation from WOLFRAM, *History of the Goths* p. 182. Cf. SEECK, *Untergang* p. 362: both Theodoric II and Euric succeeded by fratricide, »und jedesmal leitete der neue König auch eine neue Politik dem Reiche gegenüber ein«; ROUCHE, *L'Aquitaine* p. 36–37.

85 Jordanes, *Getica* 237–238; Gregory of Tours, *Hist.* II 18. Date: after Sidonius, *Ep.* III 9 to Riothamus, therefore after Sidonius's episcopal ordination in 469/470 (for which: LOYEN, *Introduction to Sidoine Apollinaire*, vol. 2, p. xiv–xv; PLRE 2 »Apollinaris 6«, p. 118). C. E. STEVENS, *Sidonius Apollinaris and His Age*, Oxford 1933, p. 138–139 sets Sidonius, *Ep.* III 9 after the Bretons' defeat, but this seems unlikely in view of the tone of Sidonius's letter and Riothamus's position then as refugee among the Burgundians. Gregory of Tours, *Hist.* II 18–20 provides only the termini of 464/465 (death of Aegidius) and 480/481 (downfall of the *dux* Victorinus), assuming that all the events of *Hist.* II 18–19 are correctly placed before the latest event of *Hist.* II 20. The entries of these two chapters, however, appear to be derived from separate sources employing different chronological systems; they need not be correctly correlated (*Hist.* II 18–19 perhaps from a chronicle composed in Angers, cf. MGH *Script. rer. Merov.* I 1 ad loc. p. 65 n. 1; *Hist.* II 20 apparently from a source composed in Gregory's native Clermont – this source is notable for its use of Euric's regnal years to date events, even if transcribed wrongly by Gregory). SEECK, *Euricus* p. 1241 makes the defeat of the Bretons very close in time with Euric's victory over an imperial army near Arles in 471 (next note). Though no source explicitly supports this, the date was probably not before 471, as the following discussion suggests.

John of Antioch, *Historia chronica*, in: *Fragmenta historicorum graecorum*, ed. C. Müller, vol. 4, Paris 1851, 206.2 states that the outbreak of hostilities between the Goths of Toulouse and the emperor was contemporaneous with hostilities in the East with the [Ostro-] Goths of Theodemir. The passage is probably drawn from Priscus, a contemporary observer (Priscus, *Frag.* 59; BLOCKLEY, *Frag. Class. Hist.* vol. 1, 114, 122, 165 n. 12, 172 n. 70; vol. 2, p. 370–371). SCHMIDT, *Ostgermanen* p. 489 and n. 1 (followed by e.g. STEVENS, *Sidonius* p. 140 n. 4; PLRE 2 »Paulus 20«, p. 852; WOLFRAM, *History of the Goths* p. 183–184) interprets this as evidence that hostilities between Euric and the empire first broke out in Gaul, against the Bretons, in 469. Neither place nor date is secure. Place: τὸ Γόιθων ἔθνος Γαλατίαν τὴν πρὸς ἐσπέραν νεμόμενον, »the Goths living in Galatia in the West« [i.e. as opposed to Galatia in Asia Minor], is Priscus's standard appellation for the Goths of Toulouse (to distinguish them from the Goths of Valamir and Theodemir in the Balkans); this phrase is consistently reproduced in all sources which preserve fragments of Priscus (i.e. John of Antioch, and the *Excerpta de legatis gentium* and *de insidiis* of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus; the only exception is Jordanes, who programmatically expands the term »Goth« in all his sources to either »Visigoth« or »Ostrogoth«); cf. Priscus, *Fragg.* 20.1 [15], 20.2, 30.1, 32, 36.1 [27], 36.2, 39.1 [30], 45 [35], 49 [39]. The phrase does not specify the location of conflict, only which group of Goths was involved. Time: an earlier event in the same fragment of John of Antioch (= Priscus, *Frag.* 57) is dated to the first consulate of Zeno, 469, but it does not follow that all events in the fragment can be securely dated to this year. The fragment of John appears to be derived from Priscus, through an intermediary who condensed the information in chronographic style; events in the fragment may range from 467 to the early 470s (Priscus, *Fragg.* 51.2, 56–60; BLOCKLEY, *Frag. Class. Hist.* vol. 1, p. 114 and 165 n. 12, 122 and 171–72 nn. 69–71; vol. 2, p. 361 and 398 n. 181). The only indication of the date of the western conflicts is the statement that hostilities erupted in the East with Theodemir's Goths at the same time (τότε). Theodemir's assault on Illyricum occurred some time after the return of his nephew Theoderic (later king in Italy) from Constantinople where he had been a hostage, perhaps ca. 471/472; PLRE 2 »Theodericus 7«, p. 1078. The date of the eastern conflict may be as late as 473; Jordanes, *Getica* 283–288; PLRE 2 »Theodemir 2«, p. 1069–1070;

chronology of Euric's occupation of Narbonensis Prima and the Auvergne, and the commencement of the Goths' protracted, annual sieges of Clermont, is obscure, but no reference to these events in the letters of Sidonius Apollinaris can be dated before 471⁸⁶. In 471, Euric defeated an army sent into Provence by Anthemius; this is the first datable conflict between Euric and the empire⁸⁷. In 473, he made his first known conquests of Roman territory, taking cities in northern and eastern Spain and possibly parts of Provence; forces which he sent into Italy that year were defeated⁸⁸. In 475 he gained the Auvergnian region of Gaul by negotiation, apparently in exchange for Arles and Marseille (seemingly an unequal exchange), but regained the Provençal cities the following year⁸⁹. Some four years separate Euric's accession and the first datable record of conflict between his forces and the western empire.

The only suggestion of hostility prior to ca. 471 is a report by Sidonius Apollinaris of a letter written by the then PPO *Galliarum* Arvandus before 469. Arvandus allegedly urged Euric, inter alia, not to maintain peace with Anthemius; to attack the Bretons of Armorica; and to divide Gaul with the Burgundians *iure gentium*⁹⁰. Though often assumed to be a reflection of Euric's own aggression, Arvandus's letter – of which we have only an unclear, indeed paradoxical, report by Sidonius – need not be⁹¹. Sidonius described the suggestions in Arvandus's letter as »madness,

HEATHER, *Goths and Romans* p. 264. As the first datable hostilities between Euric and Anthemius occurred in 471 (see next note), Priscus or his user appears to have made only a general, not an exact, correlation of the timing of the Gothic conflicts in the East and West.

86 On the sieges of Clermont: STEVENS, *Sidonius* p. 140–160, 197–207 (204–205: sieges of Clermont began 471); LOYEN, *Introduction to Sidoine Apollinaire*, vol. 2, p. xiii–xxi. Euric's occupation of Narbonensis Prima and cities of Aquitania Prima other than Clermont is usually dated to 469, on three bases, all insecure: Schmidt's erroneous dating of the Gothic defeat of the Bretons to that year (STEVENS, *Sidonius* p. 140 and n. 4; LOYEN, *Introduction to Sidoine Apollinaire*, vol. 2, p. xv n. 4, xviii), for which see preceding note; Sidonius, Ep. V 3.1 (apparently referring to Gothic assaults on Nîmes), for which there is only the terminus post quem of Sidonius's undated episcopal election; and Sidonius, Ep. VII 5.3 (loss of all cities of Aquitanian Prima except Clermont to Goths), for the date of which there is no clear terminus.

87 *Chron. Gall.* 511 649.

88 *Chron. Gall.* 511 651–653 (Spain and Italy); *Chron. Caes. s.a.* 473 (Arles and Marseilles, but the date is open to doubt).

89 Sidonius, Ep. VII 7; *Auct. Hauv. ordo prior s.a.* 476.1, cf. *Auct. Hauv. ordo post margo s.a.* 476.1; *Chron. Gall.* 511 657. LOYEN, *Introduction to Sidoine Apollinaire*, vol. 2, p. xvi n. 1; WOLFRAM, *History of the Goths* p. 183–189; HEATHER, *Goths* p. 189–190.

90 Sidonius Ep. I 7.5, on which: SEECK, *Untergang* p. 372–173; STEVENS, *Sidonius* p. 103–107; STROHEKER, *Eurich* p. 26–29; STEIN, *Histoire* p. 390, 391–392; H. C. TEITLER, *Un-Roman Activities in Late Antique Gaul: the Cases of Arvandus and Seronatus*, in: DRINKWATER and ELTON, *Fifth-Century Gaul* p. 309–317; HARRIES, *Sidonius* p. 13–16, 158–166, 177–179. There is no evidence to support the often-repeated hypothesis that Arvandus was supported in his overtures to Euric by Ricimer; Stefan KRAUTSCHICK, *Ricimer – ein Germane als starker Mann in Italien*, in: *Germani in Italien*, ed. Barbara and Piergiuseppe SCARDIGLI, Rome 1994, p. 283 and n. 75 with references there.

91 Paradoxes: Sidonius's statements that the contents of Arvandus's letter could be considered *levis* (Ep. I 7.6 bis) and that Arvandus did not realise that the contents could be construed as treasonable (Ep. I 7.11) appear totally at odds with Sidonius's own summary of the letter. A rather different scenario is presented by Cassiodorus, *Chronica* (ed. Th. MOMMSEN, MGH AA 11) s.a. 469 and Paulus Diaconus, *Historia Romana* (ed. H. DROYSEN, MGH AA 2) XV 2: Arvandus was exiled *imperium temptans*, with no reference to collusion with Euric. Attempts to reconcile these apparent contradictions on the basis of internal evidence of Sidonius's letter alone (references as at preceding note)

which would rouse a fierce king to rage, and a peaceful one to shame⁹². Sidonius thus heartily condemns the letter, without showing any prejudice as to how Euric may have received it. Writing in late 468/69, at least a year after Euric's accession, Sidonius presents himself as undecided whether the Gothic king would show himself *ferox* or *placidus* in response to Arvandus's overtures⁹³. Not Euric but Arvandus, whose fault Sidonius apparently wished to minimize, seems to have initiated this ›conspiracy‹⁹⁴. There is no evidence that Arvandus's suggestions were invited by Toulouse, or that his downfall brought repercussions from the Gothic court⁹⁵.

None of the best-informed contemporary sources for southern Gaul – Hydatius, Sidonius, and the *Chronicle of 511* – suggest that Euric was hostile to the empire at the time of his accession or soon after⁹⁶. The earliest datable conflict between Euric and the western empire occurred in 471, some four years after Euric's accession, and three years after the failure of the joint imperial campaign against the Vandals in 468, which is often adduced as the catalyst setting Euric's expansionist cam-

have been unsatisfactory; it seems likely that Sidonius's description is very partial and perhaps intentionally misleading.

92 Sidonius, Ep. I 7.5: ... *insana quae iram regi feroci, placido verecundiam inferrent*. The gloss on *verecundia* by W. B. ANDERSON (trad.), *Sidonius: Poems and Letters*, Cambridge, Mass. 1936, p. 370 n. 5 (›i.e. make [Euric] ashamed of his inactivity, shame him out of his peacefulness‹) forces the sense of *verecundia*; the sense is more likely ›make a peaceful king ashamed‹ [of a disgraceful suggestion]; cf. Oxford Latin Dictionary, s.v. This is the only use of *verecundia* listed in the Index verborum to the edition of Sidonius by C. LÜTJOHANN et al., MGH AA 8, Berlin 1887, p. 483.

93 Cf. above, at n. 83: Sidonius, Carm. II, composed late 467, also fails to mention the Goths of Toulouse as potential aggressors against the western empire, in a context for which such comment would be expected.

94 Cf. Ian WOOD, *The Merovingian Kingdoms*, p. 450–751, Harlow, Essex 1994, p. 17. What context generated this remarkable letter from the senior civilian magistrate in Gaul to the Gothic king? As with Seronatus and other evidence for communication between senior civilian magistrates in Gaul and the Gothic court (below, n. 109), there is no suggestion that contact between the PPO Galliarum and the Gothic king was improper *per se*, only that the contents of the communications were objectionable. Arvandus's letter appears to have been written prior to the end of 468 (i.e. before the termination of Sidonius's tenure as *Praefectus urbis Romae*, perhaps early 469). His letter may even have been a response to Euric's accession embassies, a hortatory letter acknowledging the new king's assumption of power, comparable to the letter written to Clovis on his accession by bishop Remigius of Reims (ed. W. GUNDLACH [CCSL 117], Turnhout 1957, p. 408–409) – though far less pacific.

95 *Contra* SEECK, *Euricus* p. 1241. Note, however, that Ralph W. MATHISEN, *Roman Aristocrats in Barbarian Gaul: Strategies for Survival in an Age of Transition*, Austin 1993, p. 127 suggests that Vincentius, the recipient of Sidonius's letter describing the trial of Arvandus, is to be identified with Euric's general of the same name who, in 473, took control of several cities in eastern Spain but was later killed in battle attempting to invade Italy (cf. PLRE 2 ›Vincentius 3 and 4‹, p. 1168).

96 Euric's attitude to Roman civilization (as opposed to the Roman state) has been interpreted in diametrically-opposed ways. To Seeck, Euric's employment of Leo of Narbonne, his codification of Gothic laws in Latin, and his maintenance of imperial administration, make him ›schien ... dem Römertum näher zu stehen, als sein gutmütiger, aber noch ganz barbarischer Vorgänger‹ [Theodoric II] (SEECK, *Untergang* p. 362–363). To Stein, Euric's alleged lack of spoken Latin, and his Arian creed, show that ›personnellement Euric ... se montra bien plus étranger à la civilisation romaine que son prédécesseur ...‹ (STEIN, *Histoire* p. 388); cf. Pierre RICHÉ, *Education and Culture in the Barbarian West from the Sixth Century through the Eighth Century*, trad. John J. CONTRENI, Columbia 1976, p. 53–54: ›Rather than supporting scholars, [Euric] assigned them to military duties‹, surely a gross misrepresentation of the role of *paideia* in late Roman public life.

paigns in motion⁹⁷. Four years is a long time. It may be that the causes for Euric's eventual encroachment upon imperial territory should be sought not in his often-presumed innate hostility towards the Roman state, but in recent events and local politics. Closer in date to the recorded conflicts between the Goths and the empire are the attempt in 470 by one Romanus to usurp the imperial throne in Rome, and the consequential beginnings of civil war in Italy between Anthemius and Ricimer, an implosion of imperial authority which may have concerned the Gallic nobility⁹⁸. Over the previous two centuries, Roman citizens of Gaul had repeatedly looked askance at central imperial authority when the court was challenged by internal divisions, and was physically distant from Gaul⁹⁹. Sidonius's friend Arvandus was not the only senior imperial magistrate in Gaul who is known from the poet's letters to have been criticised for apparent preference for Gothic over imperial rule. Though Sidonius's personal attitude to Seronatus, perhaps *Vicarius septem provinciarum* before his execution for treason sometime after 469, was very different from his relations with Arvandus, both men may represent a shift in attitude among the Gallic ruling class which influenced the decisions of the court of Toulouse. Euric's reign offers almost the earliest evidence for Gallo-Romans occupying civil and military posts in the Gothic court. These signs of Gallo-Roman appreciation of Gothic power are valuable pointers towards Euric's motives in the early 470s¹⁰⁰.

The embassies dispatched after Euric's accession were parallel, not interconnected. Newly come to power, Euric pursued simultaneous, multilateral relations with several western powers, not a single policy directed towards, or against, the empire. This diplomatic activity was not an isolated occurrence. It must be set in the context of the on-going diplomacy which is a recurring motif in Hydatius's *Chronicle*. Hydatius pays considerable attention to embassies throughout the *Chronicle*,

97 E.g. most recently Peter HEATHER, *The Huns and the End of the Roman Empire in Western Europe*, in: *English Historical Review* 110 (1995) p. 35. That the failure of the Vandal campaign should fatally undermine Anthemius's position is not self-evident; see n. 117 below. The gap between Euric's accession and his first datable aggression is even greater with the traditional date of 466 for the king's rise.

98 Cf. PLRE 2 »Fl. Ricimer 2«, p. 944–945; »Romanus 4«, p. 947. The state of imperial power in Italy was monitored in Gaul: Sidonius, Ep. II 1.4. There is no cause to date this letter to 470 (LOYEN, *Sidoine Apollinaire*, vol. 2, p. 42, 246) or to 469 or before (HARRIES, *Sidonius* p. 7): the statement that Anthemius has no *opes* suits the later stages of the civil war between Anthemius and Ricimer in 472 better than the aftermath of the Vandal campaign; see below, n. 117. The destruction by Ricimer of the *Galliarum rector* Bilimer at Hadrian's bridge in 472 (Paul the Deacon, *Hist. Rom.* XV 4; Bilimer is interpreted by PLRE 2, p. 230 as »probably ... *magister militum per Gallias*«) has strong claims to have prompted Sidonius's comment: a critical moment for Anthemius combined with a Gallic connection. Mommsen suggested that Ep. II 1 was written after Anthemius's death (MGH AA 8 p. LI), but the letter appears to assume that the emperor was alive, though in dire straits.

99 Karl Friedrich STROHEKER, *Der senatorische Adel im spätantiken Gallien*, Tübingen 1948, p. 1–136; cf. Patrick WORMALD, *The Decline of the Western Empire and the Survival of Its Aristocracy*, in: *Journal of Roman Studies* 66 (1976) p. 220–221.

100 Seronatus: Sidonius, Epp. II 1, V 13, VII 7.2, and references as at n. 90 above. Gallo-Romans in Toulouse court: Peter HEATHER, *The Emergence of the Visigothic Kingdom*, in: DRINKWATER and ELTON, *Fifth-Century Gaul* p. 89–93; MATHISEN, *Roman Aristocrats* p. 125–128.

recording some forty diplomatic missions¹⁰¹. Hydatius's perspective was Gallaecian, and contacts between Suevic Gallaecia and Gothic Aquitania are the best documented in his record. The rulers of the Goths and Sueves had been in contact since the early fifth century, when the Goths were employed as imperial federates against other barbarian tribes in Spain and were later settled in southern Gaul. The subsequent history of Gothic-Suevic relations alternated between marriage alliances and open conflict. Euric's embassy to the Sueves in 467 belongs in this context, as a continuation of existing dialogue and hostility between Braga and Toulouse, for which Hydatius is almost the sole testimony. The embassies to Rome and Carthage, presumably, maintained on-going relations with those powers.

Hydatius was not omniscient. In his description of the embassies of 467, as elsewhere in the *Chronicle*, his view was largely restricted to Gallaecia. He knew and described only the effects of Euric's actions on the Suevic kingdom. There is no reason to believe that the diplomatic flurry after Euric's accession was limited to the recipients recorded in the *Chronicle*. Hydatius knew that Euric had sent embassies to the western emperor and to the Vandals because it was to these powers, as well as to the Goths, that the Suevic king consequently sent envoys. The Goths, Vandals, and the empire were the three powers neighbouring the Sueves, and it is natural that, facing renewed Gothic hostility, Remismund sought to canvass the latter two as potential allies¹⁰². But it would be odd if Euric, upon coming to power, communicated with the Sueves and Vandals to his south and either of the imperial courts, but not with other powers immediately impinging on Gothic territory: the senior Roman magistrates in Arles (the PPO *Galliarum* Arvandus), the independent Roman territories of northern Gaul under Syagrius, the Burgundians to the east, the Bretons in Armorica, and perhaps the Frankish rulers on the Rhine. Hydatius's account shows the limits of his provincial position.

Earlier in Hydatius's text, there is a parallel to Euric's multiple embassies. In September 454, Valentinian III murdered the general Aetius in the imperial palace at Rome. Of the several sources recording the aftermath of Aetius' death, only Hydatius notes the following: »After [murdering Aetius and his followers], Valentinian sent envoys to the *gentes*; Justinian was the envoy who went to the Sueves«¹⁰³.

Valentinian's contact with barbarian groups was necessary because Aetius had for so long been a general in the field. The role of the empire's representative on the frontier, which had been that of the emperors until the end of the fourth century, had been assumed by the long-serving *magister militum*¹⁰⁴. Like Valentinian's, Euric's em-

101 TEILLET, *Goths* (as n. 4) p. 222–223; MUHLBERGER, *Fifth-Century Chroniclers* p. 211; BURGESS, *Hydatius*, p. 69–70; Andrew GILLET, *Envoys and Diplomacy in the Early Medieval West*, 411–533, Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto 1994, p. 32–80.

102 Since 458, a Gothic army had controlled the southern Spanish province of Baetica, in close proximity to the Vandals in the north African province of Mauretania Tingitana; Hydatius, *Chron.* 192, 193 [185, 188]; Victor Vitensis, *Historia persecutionis Africanae provinciae*, ed. K. HELM, MGH AA 3.1, Berlin 1879, I p. 13.

103 Hydatius, *Chron.* 161 [153]: *His gestis legatos Valentinianus mittit ad gentes, ex quibus ad Suevos venit Iustinianus.*

104 SEECK, *Flavius Aetius*, RE 1.1 p. 702–703; O'FLYNN, *Generalissimos* (as n. 107) p. 86–87, 89–90. Cf. Sidonius Apollinaris, *Carm.* VII 357–394; Petronius Maximus, on his imperial accession in 455, dis-

bassies were *ad gentes*, sent to a wide range of friendly or hostile powers after a sudden change in rule. No single policy need have motivated the missions. Rather, Valentinian III and Euric pursued bilateral relations with several rulers concurrently. As with Euric's embassies, Hydatius appears to have known of these imperial legations only because one of them came to Gallaecia. The details Hydatius gives about both sets of multiple embassies must be recognised as only a few threads of wider connections, and not worked too tightly into a reconstruction of events.

Euric's embassies display the Gothic kingdom of Toulouse functioning as a participant of the western, provincial polity. Interpretations of Hydatius's text which make Euric communicate with the eastern emperor at Constantinople, with the purpose of creating or breaching an alliance, set the king inappropriately in a Mediterranean context; by analogy, explicit or not, with Odoacer's actions in 476, Euric thus appears to assert Gothic sovereignty, by ignoring the authority of the western emperor and senior western magistrates¹⁰⁵. In modern histories of the Goths, this is a significant step in achieving the realization of a proto-nation¹⁰⁶. But profound regional and historical differences distinguished Odoacer's Italy from the various post-imperial kingdoms of the fifth century. The Italian kingdom of Odoacer and the Ostrogoths directly inherited imperial political concerns: the machinery of central government, the Roman senatorial aristocracy, and the city of Rome itself. The kingdom of the Goths in Gaul, and the other mid-fifth century kingdoms, were, essentially, new constituents of provincial politics (the Vandals, because of their piratical raids throughout the Mediterranean, were a radical exception). Euric and Odoacer, though both employing the title *rex*, did not have the same relationship with the empire. Notwithstanding his barbarian ancestry, Odoacer was a commander of the Roman army who, like Ricimer and other *generalissimos*, deposed the ruling emperor of the West and usurped his authority. He declared himself *rex*, rather than elevating his own imperial puppet, in order to circumvent confrontation with the remaining emperor in Constantinople. Odoacer's use of the title *rex* was a novel exploitation of a formula drawn from the political lexicon of the day. The term would not have been available to an ambitious general a century earlier, before *reges* had been well established within western imperial territories, as figures of quasi-autonomous authority who performed Roman military and civilian functions at a provincial level. Odoacer's titulature was a bold attempt to deflect a military and political response from Constantinople by the power of analogy, disingenuously ignoring the fact that the region over which Odoacer asserted power was not a marginal province but the traditional heartland of the empire and home of the richest and most politically active aristocracy in the late antique world¹⁰⁷.

patched his newly-appointed *magister militum* Eparchius Avitus to deal with neighbouring peoples, including the Goths, Saxons, Franks, and Alamanni.

105 Analogy with Odoacer: e.g. YVER, Euric p. 8 and citations there.

106 E.g. SCHMIDT, Ostgermanen p. 487; WOLFRAM, History of the Goths p. 182–183.

107 Later, faced with hostility from the eastern imperial court through the agency of Theoderic the Ostrogoth, Odoacer seems to have abandoned his experiment and reverted to imperial titulature, proclaiming his son Thela *Caesar*; John of Antioch, Frag. 214a; Excerpta Valesiana, ed. J. MOREAU and V. VELKOV, Leipzig 1968, II 11.54.

On Odoacer: MOMMSEN, Ostgothische Studien p. 362–484, esp. p. 476–478; A. H. M. JONES, The Constitutional Position of Odoacer and Theoderic, in: Journal of Roman Studies 52 (1962)

Western kings such as Euric and his predecessors did not share Odoacer's access to the constitutional and political elements of imperial authority. The establishment of the Gothic kingdom of Toulouse, like other barbarian settlements throughout the first half of the fifth century, had been allowed by the western imperial court as a new constituent of provincial politics and administration. No official title or generalship, which could be construed as entitling participation in the imperial consistory or carrying the authority of official honour, had been granted to the Gothic kings¹⁰⁸. Communication between the Goths and representatives of the empire prior to 476 was not conducted at the level of heads of state, as representatives of empire and proto-nation. Rather, the Goths' points of contact with the empire were at a local level. The Gothic rulers are seen in contact with imperial and Gallic provincial authorities, some in public office, some not. These include magnates of the Gallic aristocracy; civil and military imperial officials in the provinces (the *praefecti praetorio Galliarum* and the *magistri militum per Gallias*, themselves often drawn from the Gallic aristocracy) and their agents; and provincial bishops. Direct communication between the Gothic kings and the western emperors is rarely attested, contact with the eastern emperor not at all – just as western emperors did not deal with troublesome components of the eastern empire, such as the Isaurians¹⁰⁹.

p. 126–130, esp. p. 130; M. McCORMICK, Odoacer, Emperor Zeno, and the Rugian Victory Legation, in: *Byzantion* 47 (1977) p. 212–222; THOMPSON, *Romans and Barbarians* 65–71; PLRE 2 »Odoacer«, p. 791–793; J. M. O'FLYNN, *Generalissimos of the Western Roman Empire*, Edmonton 1983, p. 129–149.

The title *rex* in the fifth century: like other fifth- and sixth-century barbarian rulers, when Odoacer used the title *rex*, he did so without reference to any tribe or region; GILLETT, *Jordanes and Ablabius* (forthcoming in *Latomus*), Appendix and n. 54. (Odoacer did not, however, always employ *rex* or any other title; THOMPSON, *Romans and Barbarians* p. 68; *Fontes iuris Romani antejustiniani*, 2nd. ed., ed. V. ARANGIO-RUIZ, Florence 1943, vol. 3, no. 99, 310 ll. 10–11 for the sole extant example of Odoacer's use of the title.)

108 HEATHER, *Goths* p. 186.

109 For contact between the Goths in Gaul and the empire to 467: WOLFRAM, *History of the Goths* p. 170–181; HEATHER, *Goths* p. 181–194.

»Official« contacts with imperial magistrates in Gaul: the Gothic settlement in Aquitania in 417/418 was arranged by the MVM Constantius (PLRE 2 »Constantius 17«, p. 323; on the purposes of the settlement: THOMPSON, *Romans and Barbarians* p. 23–37; GILLETT, *Birth of Ricimer* p. 380–384; HEATHER, *Goths* p. 181–182). Subsequent attested contact between the Aquitanian Goths and »the empire« was at the provincial level, largely with the senior military and civilian magistrates in Gaul: the MVM per Gallias, for whom the Goths acted ambivalently as auxiliaries or antagonists (WOLFRAM, *History of the Goths* p. 175, 180–181); and the PPO Galliarum (Avitus in 439; Ferreolus in 451/453; Arvandus, infamously, in 468; Sidonius, *Carm.* VII 295–315; *Epp.* I 7; VII 12.3). Lower-level civil officials also communicated with the Gothic court (e.g. Seronatus, possibly *vicarius septem provinciarum*; Sidonius, *Epp.* II 1.1; V 13.1: the letters suggest that Seronatus had paid at least two visits to the Gothic court while in office; notwithstanding Sidonius's personal animosity towards Seronatus, there is no suggestion that such visits themselves were unusual; cf. n. 94 above). Gothic assistance to the imperial defence of Gaul against Attila in 451 was gained by the joint persuasions of the MVM Aetius and the former MVM and PPO Galliarum Avitus, not by direct communication from the emperor Valentinian III (Sidonius, *Carm.* VII 316–356, contra Jordanes, *Getica* 186–190). In their support for Avitus as emperor in 455, and the subsequent delegation to the Goths of military operations in Spain against the recalcitrant Sueves under Avitus and Majorian, the Goths appear as somewhat volatile auxiliaries to the Roman army in the Gallic provinces, not as a sovereign power. In their civil as well as military functions, the Gothic kings continued Roman provincial administration: Cassiodorus, *Variae* V 39.13; JONES, *LRE* p. 257–259; P. S. BARNWELL,

To construe the embassies of 467 as part of a single plan by Euric is to miss the significance of Hydatius's evidence. Hydatius listed the missions, not as machinations of conspiracy and hostility, but because of his predilection for recording the ubiquitous political communication which was an integral element of fifth-century events. The custom of dispatching embassies at the commencement of a king's reign is attested, in the early sixth century, by Cassiodorus; the imperial tradition of publicly announcing accessions and other imperial occasions (*laetitiae*) may have been the precedent of this practice. Such embassies served to proclaim the new ruler's accession, while at the same time continuing on-going diplomatic relations¹¹⁰. It is no surprise that western kings sent out several simultaneous legations for this purpose. Surrounded by many neighbours, all western rulers constantly needed to sustain multiple relations simultaneously. Like Valentinian III in 454, Euric showed that, despite recent domestic upheavals, his realm would continue uninterruptedly to pursue its interests in regard to each of its neighbours. In the case of the empire, this was a policy of self-interested cooperation, exercised at the expense of reprobates in Spain and Gaul.

Emperor, Prefects and Kings: The Roman West, 395–565, London 1992, p. 71–81. The *Breviarium* of Alaric II, a re-issue of the Theodosian Code modified, inter alia, by omission of sections irrelevant to provincial administration, well illustrates the horizons of the kingdom of Toulouse.

›Private‹ contacts with Gallic aristocracy: the placement in Toulouse of hostages from the provincial aristocracy of Gaul, rather than from circles closer to the imperial court, implies that relations at a local level were acknowledged as an important part of the Gothic settlement (Sidonius, Carm. VII 214–229; PLRE 2 ›Theodorus 12‹, 1087; for a comparable case of hostages given by a provincial Roman community to barbarian rulers as part of a local settlement: Hydatius, Chron. 100 [91]); contrast the use of hostages close to the imperial consistory for peoples outside imperial territory or control (e.g. sons of MVMs to Alaric I in the 400s, and to the Huns later; PLRE 2 ›Aetius 3‹, 21–22; ›Carpilio 2‹, 262). The reinstatement of the Council of the Seven Provinces in 418, the same year as the settlement of the Goths, suggests imperial expectation of provincial involvement of some sort with the Goths (John MATTHEWS, *Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court AD 364–425*, Oxford 1975, p. 334–336; WOLFRAM, *History of the Goths* p. 173). The personal influence of Eparchius Avitus on the court of Toulouse is perhaps exaggerated in Sidonius, Carm. VII, but nb. Ep. III 1.4–5: Sidonius hopes that another Avitus, perhaps a relative of the former emperor, will be able to ameliorate hostilities with the Goths ca. 471. Theodoric I consulted with bishop Orientius of Auch when faced with an imperial army in 439; Vita S. Orientii Ausciorum, Acta Sanctorum 1 May, c. 3. The letters of Sidonius preserve glimpses of frequent close contact between the Gothic court and private individuals of Roman Gaul: the Gothic kings received petitions from Gallic citizens outside the area of their control, and appear in general as local magnates (Sidonius, Epp. I 2.8; IV 8.1, 5); for other examples: MATHISEN, *Roman Aristocrats* p. 67–76, 99.

Direct contact between emperor and king: the *pacis iura* sworn by Majorian and Theodoric II in 459 (Hydatius, Chron. 197 [192]) is the earliest attestation of formal contact between a Roman emperor and a Gothic king in Gaul (setting aside as historical fiction the letters in Jordanes, *Getica* [above] between Valentinian III and Theodoric I).

¹¹⁰ Cassiodorus: *Variae* VIII 1; X 1, 2 (*Novis regibus mos est per diversas gentes proventus sui gaudia nuntiare, ut adquirant affectum principis externi de ipsa communione regandi*; 2.1), 3, 4; X 32, 33. Proclamation and on-going negotiation: e.g. Priscus, Frag. 52 [40]. *Laetitiae*: Brian CROKE, *City Chronicles of Late Antiquity* (as n. 44) p. 190–191.

Jordanes's Euric

Behind most modern accounts of Euric stands the brief description of the king and his policies in Jordanes's *Getica*. Strict adherence to the evidence of contemporary sources undermines credence in Jordanes's account. In his narrative of the mid-fifth century, as elsewhere in his work, Jordanes should be understood not as a ›Gothic‹ historian but as a Byzantine contemporary of Justinian, intent on portraying that shambling decline of the western empire three-quarters of a century earlier, which necessitated the ›reconquest‹ of the 530s to 550s. Jordanes compresses all the ills leading to the collapse of the western empire, beginning with the assassination of Valentinian III in 455, into Euric's times. He characterizes Euric as an opportunist, exploiting every internal change in Italy to seize imperial territory, incited by the schemes of the Vandal king Geiseric¹¹¹. These barbarian kings are boldly-drawn literary figures whose purpose is to advance the plot of decline. Euric, the predatory complement to the hapless western empire, is an artificial construct. ›Taking a hard look at the thick and fast turn-over of the Romans' emperors‹ between Valentinian's death and Anthemius's elevation, Jordanes's Euric seizes the opportunity presented by the empire's anarchy to bring large parts of Gaul under his control¹¹². But it is hard to believe that the arrival of Anthemius in the West – proffered by Jordanes as the time of the beginning of Euric's expansionism – would have appeared an opportune moment for adventure even to an avaricious king. Though indeed five emperors had fallen in the West during little more than the last decade, the MVM Ricimer had been a constant presence, and had won several notable victories, not only over a number of the emperors he served but also against the Vandals (twice, in 456) and the Alans in Gaul (in 464); it is probable that he was at least instrumental in securing Majorian's victory over the Goths in 459 also. Ricimer's wealth enabled him to trump other imperial commanders in attracting the services of mercenary forces, and he enjoyed the support of the Burgundians, near neighbours and competitors to the Goths in Gaul¹¹³. Anthemius himself was a general with impressive victories to his credit, over the Ostrogoths and Huns in the Balkans. On reaching Italy, he was not only supported by a large eastern army provided by the emperor Leo I, and by the

111 Jordanes, *Getica*, 235–245. Portraits of Euric: 237, 240, 244. Geiseric: 244. Compression: Euric's elevation is recorded at 235, but the events of 235–236 in fact all occurred earlier, in the reign of Theodoric II (between March 455 and April 467; see above, at n. 36); at 240, Avitus's reign is also (inaccurately) made contemporary with Euric's.

112 Jordanes, *Getica* 237: *Euricus ... crebram mutationem Romanorum principum cernens Gallias suo iure nisus est occupare*. By contrast, other Byzantine writers of Jordanes's time, though recording the brief reigns of the later western emperors, give little or no attention to the impact of the western barbarians other than the Vandals on the fate of the empire; cf. Procopius, *Wars* III 7.1–17, V 1.1–8 (last emperors), V 12.12 and 20 (Visigothic expansion); Marcellinus comes, *Chron.* s.aa. 455–476; John Malalas, *Chron.* Books XIV–XV; similarly: Cassiodorus, *Chron.* s.aa. 455–476, and in subsequent centuries: John of Antioch, *Fragg.* 200–209; Paul the Deacon, *Hist. Rom.* XV.

113 Victories and Burgundian connections: PLRE 2 ›Ricimer 2‹, p. 942–945. Wealth: Priscus, *Frag.* 38.1 [29]. Majorian's defeat of Goths: Hydatius, *Chron.* 197 [192]; Priscus, *Frag.* 36.1, 2 [27]; and cf. PLRE 2, 943 (on *Novella Maioriani* 1 and Ricimer's military role). Constancy of Ricimer's presence in the West: Sidonius, *Carm.* II 352–386. On Ricimer: O. SEECK, *Ricimer*, RE IA.1, p. 797–799; PLRE 2 ›Fl. Ricimer 2‹, p. 942–945; O'FLYNN, *Generalissimos* p. 104–128; KRAUTSCHICK, *Ricimer*, p. 269–287.

forces of the sometime maverick general Marcellinus of Dalmatia, but was allied to Ricimer through well-publicised marriage ties¹¹⁴. The landfall of Anthemius's host, gathered to finish the threat of the Vandals in North Africa, was surely an ill-advised moment to aggravate the western imperial court. Indeed, Hydatius records nervousness on the part of the Goths and other barbarian powers in the West at this time¹¹⁵. It is only in the early 470s – after the failure of the imperial expedition against the Vandals and the murder of Marcellinus in 468, the attempted assassination of Anthemius in Rome in 470, and the eruption of civil war in Italy between Anthemius and Ricimer the following year – that contemporary sources begin to record conflict between the Goths and the empire¹¹⁶. Notwithstanding these reverses, Anthemius remained a force to be reckoned with, probably retaining considerable numbers of the troops mustered against the Vandals, and receiving full support from the eastern imperial court¹¹⁷. Whatever motivated Euric's expansionism of the 470s, he must be

114 PLRE 2 »Anthemius 3«, p. 96–98; Hydatius, Chron. 234, 247 [230, 241].

115 Hydatius, Chron. 240, 247 [236, 241]; see nn. 66, 77 above.

116 Cf. nn. 85–89 above.

117 Anthemius's forces ca. 471: Anthemius was dispatched to the West accompanied by substantial forces under his command (Hydatius, Chron. 234 [230]; Sidonius, Carm. II ll. 540–541). While the failed naval campaign of 468 against the Vandals was costly in money and men, the casualties, like the opprobrium of defeat, appear to have been borne by the eastern forces alone. Although Sidonius portrays Anthemius as an emperor who will »wage wars, not order them« (Carm. II ll. 382–385; cf. ll. 316, 540–541, 548), Anthemius is recorded only as contributing financially to the Vandal campaign (Candidus, Frag. 2, in: BLOCKLEY, Frag. Class. Hist. vol. 2; CLOVER, Geiseric the Statesman, p. 196–199, esp. p. 197 n. 1). It is not clear whether any of Anthemius's troops engaged in the battle (the identity of the force ἐκ τῆς ἐπιπέριου in Priscus, Frag. 53.1 = Theophanes AM 5961 is not clear; though the phrase could refer to an Italian contingent, it may also mean the followers of the Dalmatian general Marcellinus, who is not mentioned by this fragment of Priscus; cf. Priscus, Frag. 53.3 = Procopius, Wars III 6.1–25. No other western force is mentioned in other sources). Only the troops of the eastern generals Basiliscus and Heraclius, and of Marcellinus of Dalmatia, are recorded engaged in battle; and only Basiliscus, the supreme commander of the expedition, actually suffered defeat (Marcellinus and Heraclius both easily won their engagements with Vandal forces in Sicily and Tripolis respectively). Eastern sources place the odium of failure on Leo, not Anthemius (Priscus, as above; Procopius, Wars III 10.2; John Malalas, Chronicle, trad. Elizabeth JEFFREYS, Michael JEFFREYS, Roger SCOTT et al. [Byzantina Australiensia 4], Melbourne 1986, XIV 44). Western sources either do not associate the campaign with either emperor, recording only the death of Marcellinus of Dalmatia (e.g. Fasti Vindobonensis priores s.a. 468; Paschale Campanum s.a. 468; Cassiodorus, Chron. s.a. 468), or do not record the campaign at all (e.g. Chron. Gall. 511); an exception is Paul the Deacon, Hist. Rom. XV 2, describing the campaign as under the control of Basiliscus. A substantial army seems to have remained in the West after the return of Basiliscus and Heraclius to Constantinople and the murder of Marcellinus. At least five western generals are recorded serving Anthemius after 468 (his son Anthimolus, Thorisarius, Everdingus, Hermianus *comes stabuli*, Bilimer *Galliarum rector*; two other commanders of uncertain allegiance attested ca. 470 are the *comes* Paulus and the *comes et MVM* Fl. Valila *qui et* Theodovius; cf. PLRE 2, s.vv.). When Ricimer fell into dispute with Anthemius over the execution of Romanus in 470, he departed Rome »and summoned six thousand men who were under his command for the war against the Vandals«; Priscus, Frag. 62. Though he was supported by these troops together with the forces of Odoacer, Onulf, and the Burgundian Gundobad, Ricimer nevertheless did not think it prudent to besiege Anthemius in Rome for a year, until after Anthemius had lost the forces of his son Anthimolus and three barbarian generals against Euric in 471. Anthemius was still able to call on troops in Gaul in 472; Paul the Deacon, Hist. Rom. XV 4. Ricimer, after entering the city of Rome, required a siege of at least five months and a pitched battle to overcome Anthemius's forces; Priscus, Frag. 64.1 and nn. 198, 203. These are not indications that Anthemius was bereft of troops

seen to have acted boldly in confronting formidable military forces which were able, on several occasions, to check his advances; he did not step lightly into a vacuum. His aggression must also be recognized as contrary to the policy of his early years of rule. To accept Jordanes's glib and unpunctilious account of Euric as well-informed mimesis, rather than as the device of a fictive stratagem, is to collude with an ancient propagandist in rendering history into a satisfying, tendentious literary plot¹¹⁸.

*

In the mid-470s, Euric annexed substantial parts of Gaul and Spain, most importantly Arles, the centre of imperial administration throughout the Gallic provinces, and Marseille, the conduit of trade and communication between the riverine system of Gaul and the Mediterranean. The motivating factors which prompted this expansionism are obscure. The earlier history of minor conflicts between the Goths of Toulouse and the empire should not create a presumption of inevitable hostility which preempts close attention to contemporary sources. Well-known shards of evidence – the presentation of petitions at Toulouse by Gauls still under Roman rule and by Gallaecians under the Sueves; the allegedly treasonous connections between the Gothic court and the imperial civil magistrates Arvandus and Seronatus; the service of Gallic aristocrats as civil and military officers to the later Gothic kings; even the apparent tendency of the western kingdoms in general to replicate the borders of imperial provinces – suggest that the ›pull‹ of at least part of the Roman population of Gaul, seeking strong local authority, may have been as important a factor as the ›push‹ of military ambition, in stimulating Euric's actions¹¹⁹. Nor should the relative poverty of evidence engender the easy assumption that a period of some four years, from the mid-460s when Euric came to power, to the early 470s when he first came into conflict with the empire, made little difference in political aims and relations. Euric's actions in 475/476 are no guide to his ambitions in 467. His aggression of the 470s appears to be not the realization of goals which prompted his usurpation of the throne, but a change from the policies of the initial years of his reign, the result of contingencies of which we have few indications.

as a result of the 468 campaign. – Support of eastern court: indicated by the marriage of Anthemius's son Fl. Marcianus to Leontia, daughter of the eastern emperor Leo, presumably in 471, and Marcianus's appointment as eastern consul the following year (for the second time; the first was in 469, following Anthemius's sole consulate the previous year); PLRE 2 ›Leontia 1‹, 667, ›Fl. Marcianus 17‹, 717; cf. Cons. LRE s.a. 472.

118 E.g. HEATHER, *Goths* p. 189: ›[Jordanes's account of Euric is a] striking description ... [which] captures rather well what it must have been like suddenly to realize that, after 400 years, the western empire was a spent force ...‹; ID., *Huns and the End of the Roman Empire* p. 35. Cf. J. B. BURY, *The Invasion of Europe by the Barbarians*, London 1928 (repr. New York 1963), p. 211: ›[Jordanes preserves a] general statement of Euric's policy ... borne out by the facts ...‹; WOLFRAM, *History of the Goths* 183: ›[Anthemius] was at first not taken seriously‹, a view presumably based on Jordanes.

119 WORMALD, *Decline of the Western Empire* (as n. 99) p. 221.

Appendix I

A Spanish Provenance for the *Chronica Gallica* a. DXI?

Though the *Chron. Gall. 511* has obvious Gallic connections in its use of *Chron. Gall. 452* and its independent entries for events in Gaul¹²⁰, the work also displays features which could suggest composition in Spain, under Gothic rule. These features concern the chronography and sources of the work.

i. Chronography

(a) *Spanish eras*: The *Chron. Gall. 511* concludes with four dating formulae, slightly out of synchronization: the nineteenth year of the emperor Anastasius (*recte* 510), the consulate of Felix and Secundinus (511), the fourth indiction (511), and »era 547«¹²¹. Era 547 can only be the Spanish era, corresponding to 509 AD. The use of this dating system was restricted to Spain, and suggests a Spanish provenance. It is possible, however, that the use of the Spanish era in *Chron. Gall. 511* was derived from one of the sources of the work, the *Chron.* of Hydatius¹²².

(b) *Regnal years*: The *Chron. Gall. 511* employs imperial regnal years as the main chronological system. Initially the chronicle, following its abridgement of Eusebius/Jerome, employs the joint reigns of eastern and western emperors, until the death of Majorian (461)¹²³. Then, for the last fifty years of the chronicle, only eastern regnal years are used. The chronicle records the elevation and deaths of the two western emperors following Majorian (Severus and Anthemius), but without employing their regnal years. No western emperors are mentioned thereafter. There is no indication in the language of the chronicle that Severus and Anthemius were not regarded as legitimate emperors.

An approximation of this idiosyncratic pattern exists in the legal collection published by Alaric II in 506, conventionally cited as the *Breviarium* of Alaric or *Lex Romana Visigothorum*¹²⁴. The *Breviarium* includes, besides a selection of constitutions from the *Theodosian Code* and other legal works, certain novels of the eastern and western emperors issued after the publication of the *Theodosian Code*. These novels continue only to the first constitution of Severus (February 463), issued to abrogate a particular law of Majorian. None of the later novels of Severus, nor those of Anthemius, the later western emperors, or the eastern

120 MOMMSEN, Introduction to *Chronica Gallica* (MGH AA 9) p. 628; MUHLBERGER, *Fifth-Century Chroniclers* p. 142–144.

121 *Chron. Gall. 511* c. 695.

122 *Chron. Gall. 511* c. 552 preserves one Spanish era date from the text of Hydatius (with a slight variation: the date is that of the entry into Spain of the Alans, Vandals, and Sueves, *era* 447 = 409 AD in Hydatius, *Chron.* 42 [34], but given as *era* 446 = 408 AD in both *Chron. Gall. 511* and Isidore, *Hist. Goth. Vandal. Suev.* cc. 72, 85; cf. MOMMSEN, nn. ad locc.). The *Chron. Gall. 511* maintains internal consistency in listing 101 regnal years between its record of *era* 446 and *era* 547. On the Spanish era in Hydatius: BURGESS, *Chronicle of Hydatius* p. 33–35.

123 I.e. after the death of Valens, the chronicle enumerates the joint reign of Gratian and Valentinian II until the death of Gratian; it then counts the joint reign of Valentinian II and Theodosius I until Valentinian's death; and then counts Theodosius's sole rule (the reign of Theodosius I prior to the death of Gratian, and the brief reigns of Constantius II and Petronius Maximus are noted but not used to calculate regnal years). This is somewhat different from the systems used in both the foregoing abridgement of Eusebius/Jerome, in which the death of an imperial colleague does not initiate a new count based on the surviving emperor's period of sole rule; and that of *Chron. Gall. 452*. Cf. BURGESS, *Third Regnal Year* 342 n. 24.

124 *Lex Romana Visigothorum*, ed. G. HAENEL, 1849 (repr. Aalen 1962).

emperors after Marcian, are included in the *Breviarium*¹²⁵. Both *Chron. Gall. 511* and the *Breviarium* were compiled in the early sixth century. The absence of the later western emperors' regnal years from the one, and of their laws from the other, may suggest that both came from the same administrative milieu.

ii. Sources

(a) *Hydatius, Chron.*: The *Chron. Gall. 511* is the earliest extant work to exploit the *Chronicle* of the Gallaecian Hydatius¹²⁶. Hydatius's *Chronicle* is not attested again until the seventh century, when it was used in Gaul by Fredegar. The extracts from Hydatius in the *Chron. Gall. 511* are selective, concerning almost exclusively the role of the Goths and Vandals in the control of Spain and Africa from the 410s to 430s. The author of the *Chron. Gall. 511* ignored a considerable amount of material in Hydatius concerning Gaul (which would have been pertinent to a work primarily concerned with the Gallic provinces), and totally omits details of the Sueves' ambitions to Spanish domination (which is clearly a major theme in Hydatius)¹²⁷. Information on the Goths in Spain and the Vandals in Africa was perhaps of particular interest within the Visigothic kingdom following the Goths' defeat by the Franks and Burgundians in 507, and their enforced retraction within the Spanish peninsula, with the volatile Vandals in close proximity across the straits of Cadiz.

(b) *Other Spanish information*: The entries for the final sixty years of the chronicle, many of which have no parallel in other extant works, are the most likely to include the author's independent information. Further details concerning the Visigothic control of Spain appear in this section, in the 470s (Euric's generals take control of the cities of Pamplona, Saragossa, Tarragona, and other cities in the province of Tarraconensis), and the final historical entry

125 This has been interpreted as a result of Euric's rejection of Roman sovereignty over Visigothic territory and the end of a *foedus* between the Goths and the empire: STROHEKER, *Eurich* p. 11 n. 25 (the end of the *foedus* must therefore have occurred by the beginning of Anthemius's reign); more cautiously, WOLFRAM, *History of the Goths* p. 183 (not specifying when Anthemius's *novellae* may have ceased to be accepted in the Gothic territory). But cf. SCHMIDT, *Ostgermanen* p. 492 n. 5.

126 See Mommsen's marginal notes *passim* to *Chron. Gall. 511*; BURGESS, *Chronicle of Hydatius*, Appendix 4, p. 167–168.

127 Spain and North Africa: *Chron. Gall. 511* cc. 552–554, 557, 559, 562, 564–565, 567–568, 584, 594 (other Hydatian entries concerning the generals Constantius [cc. 563, 569–570] and Boniface [c. 571] are directly relevant to the role of the barbarians in Spain and Africa); cf. Mommsen's notes *ad locc.* A few entries concerning imperial dynastic events are attributed by Mommsen to Hydatius (*Chron. Gall. 511* cc. 539, 611, 612; all references to Hydatius are slightly out), but the details are too widely known and the similarities between the two chronicles insufficient for this attribution to be reliable. Likewise, Mommsen's attribution of *Chron. Gall. 511* c. 634 (Majorian's abortive campaign against the Vandals) to Hydatius is not firm. The two chronicles provide quite different information (*Chron. Gall. 511* mentions that Majorian passed through Arles and that his fleet was lost near Cathago Spartaria; Hydatius reports neither detail, but gives May as the month for Majorian's entry into Spain, states that the imperial ships were taken by *proditores* rather than by the Vandals themselves, and provides other details without parallel in the *Chron. Gall. 511*) in different words (the main verbs of the *Chron. Gall. 511* report are *ingredior*, *proficiscor*, and *capio*; Hydatius uses *ingredior*, *pertendo*, and *abripio*). The entry in *Chron. Gall. 511* is much closer to that of Marius of Avenches, *Chron. s.a.* 460. Cf. BURGESS, *Chronicle of Hydatius* p. 168, but his attribution of *Chron. Gall. 511* c. 616 to Hydatius, *Chron. 151* [143] is also insecure: Hydatius cites a letter written by bishop Euphronius of Autun in 451, whereas the *Chron. Gall. 511* records the bishop's death in that year. In fact there is no clear evidence of use of Hydatius by the compiler of the *Chron. Gall. 511* after the 430s, and it is striking that Hydatius's relatively lengthy description of the Gothic assault of Gallaecia in 456–457 does not feature in the *Chron. Gall. 511*.

of the work describes the Burgundian sack of Barcelona and the retreat of the Gothic king Gesalic to Spain (presumably, west of the coastal plains of Barcelona)¹²⁸.

(c) *Arles material*: In this latter section, the city of Arles receives particular attention, which could support a southern Gallic origin for the *Chron. Gall. 511*¹²⁹. But Arles also had Gothic connections. The imperial capital of the Gallic provinces, Arles was the target of repeated attempts at annexation by the Goths; this is clearly shown by passages of the chronicle mentioning Arles, most of which concern the Goths¹³⁰. The city was taken by Euric in 476 and he died there eight years later. There is no evidence for his whereabouts in the interim, and he could well have ruled from the former provincial capital during this time¹³¹. Arles is not mentioned in the chronicle before the early 450s, although it withstood Gothic sieges in 425 and 430¹³². Nor is Arles referred to after Euric's death, notwithstanding the major siege by Franks and Burgundians the city endured before passing to Ostrogothic control in 509¹³³. This latter omission in particular militates against final completion of the chronicle in Gaul. Material relating to Arles is restricted to the period 453 to 484, and appears to mark the limits of a source, rather than the provenance of the *Chron. Gall. 511* in its final form. It is perhaps significant that the source is associated with a city which may have been one of Euric's centres of rule. The unique attestation in *Chron. Gall. 511* of the official titles of several of Euric's generals immediately prior to Euric's seizure of Arles (*comes Gothorum, dux Hispaniarum, quasi magister militum*) shows familiarity with Gothic administration during the period covered by this putative source¹³⁴.

The Gallic elements in the *Chron. Gall. 511* perhaps represent sources, rather than the provenance, of the work. Both the exploitation of Hydatius and the possible Arles source, and the unique information in the chronicle, indicate interest in the Visigothic kingdom in southern Gaul and Spain; the chronography also associates the work with Spain and the Visigothic kingdom. The final compilation of *Chron. Gall. 511* may have occurred in Spain, following the Goths' expulsion from southern Gaul by the Franks and Burgundians.

128 *Chron. Gall. 511* cc. 651–652, 691.

129 Cf. MOMMSEN, Introduction to *Chronica Gallica* p. 628.

130 *Chron. Gall. 511* cc. 621 (Gothic seige of 453), 633 (Majorian puts down rebellion), 635 (Majorian returns from Spain via Arles; BURY I 332), 649 (a base for military operations against the Goths under Anthemius), 657 (Gothic conquest), 666 (death of Euric in Arles).

131 Suggested by MOMMSEN, Introduction to *Chronica Gallica* p. 628: *Arelate ... saepissime memoratur utpote caput regni Wisigothorum ...* For an alternative interpretation: WOLFRAM, *History of the Goths* p. 190 and n. 167.

132 Siege of 425: Prosper, *Chron.* c. 1290; *Chron. Gall. 452* c. 102. Siege of 430: Hydatius, *Chron.* 92 [82]. The *Chron. Gall. 511* also fails to mention that Arles was the site of the imperial elevation of Avitus, accompanied by a Gothic army, in 455; cf. Hydatius, *Chron.* 163 [156]; Auctarium Prosperi Hauviensis s.a. 454.6 (MGH AA 9, p. 304); Marius of Avenches, *Chron.* s.a. 455; Sid. Ap. Carm. VII 519–80. Note that, in omitting these events, the author of *Chron. Gall. 511* appears to have chosen not to use material relating to Arles available in *Chron. Gall. 452* and Hydatius.

133 JOHN MOORHEAD, *Theoderic In Italy*, Oxford 1992, p. 183.

134 *Chron. Gall. 511* cc. 651, 652, 653.

Appendix II

Datable Events in the *Chronica Gallica* a. DXI

Following is a full list of firmly-dated events in the imperial succession which are recorded correctly by *Chron. Gall.* 511, according to the calculation of regnal years commencing from the year after the accession of the emperor concerned. (For attestation of dates: *PLRE* II s.vv.)

c. 513	I Gratian and Valentinian II (after the death of Valens, 378)	elevation of Theodosius I	379
c. 517	V Gratian and Valentinian II	death of Gratian	383
c. 523	V Valentinian II and Theodosius I (after the death of Gratian, 383)	death of Magnus Maximus	388
c. 533	III Theodosius I (after the death of Valentinian II, 392)	death of Theodosius	395
c. 543	VII Arcadius and Honorius (after the death of Theodosius I, 395)	elevation of Theodosius II	402
c. 593	XII Theodosius II and Valentinian III (after elevation of Valentinian III, 425)	marriage of Valentinian and Eudoxia	437
c. 599	XIV Theodosius II and Valentinian III	Eudoxia made Augusta	439
c. 611 c. 612	XXV Theodosius II and Valentinian III	deaths of Theodosius II and Galla Placidia	450
c. 623	V Valentinian III/Marcian (after the death of Theodosius II, and elevation of Marcian, 450)	death of Valentinian III	455
c. 645	X Leo (elevated 457)	elevation of Anthemius as Augustus	467
c. 650	XV Leo	death of Anthemius	472

The following errors on matters of imperial succession appear to be isolated, not systemic (see at n. 40 above):

- c. 529: death of Valentinian II, dated to 391, recte 392;
- c. 539: birth of Theodosius II, dated to 399, recte 401;
- c. 549: death of Arcadius, dated to 407, recte 408;
- cc. 569 and 570: birth of Valentinian III and imperial elevation of Constantius III, dated to 422, recte 419 and 421 respectively;
- c. 576: death of Honorius, dated to 426, recte 423;
- on cc. 624–628 and 644, see BURGESS, *Third Regnal Year* (as at n. 39) p. 341–342;
- cc. 635–636: death of Majorian and elevation of Severus, dated to 460, recte 461.

All entries under the reigns of Zeno and Anastasius, however, appear to be wrong. There are only two datable imperial entries under Zeno and Anastasius:

- c. 673: elevation of Anastasius, dated to 487, recte 491;
- c. 695: the final entry, dated to XIX Anastasius = 510 AD, recte 511 according to the consular and indiction dates.

But other datable events appear also to be erroneous:

- c. 666: death of Euric and elevation of Alaric II, dated to 481, recte 484, see PLRE II, »Alaricus 3,« 49;
- c. 670: the departure of Theoderic the Amal from the Balkans and the defeat of Odoacer, dated to 485, recte 488–493;
- c. 688: death of Alaric II, dated to 506, recte 507.

Prior to the reigns of Zeno and Anastasius, chronological errors arising from inaccurate lengths of imperial reigns do not appear to be compounded, i.e. events appear to be dated from the beginning of the reign of the current emperor.