
Francia. Forschungen zur westeuropäischen Geschichte
Herausgegeben vom Deutschen Historischen Institut Paris
(Institut historique allemand)
Band 17/1 (1990)

DOI: 10.11588/fr.1990.1.53869

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.

Forschungsgeschichte – Methodendiskussion – Miscellen

RALPH W. MATHISEN

EPISCOPAL HIERARCHY AND TENURE IN OFFICE IN LATE ROMAN GAUL: A METHOD FOR ESTABLISHING DATES OF ORDINATION¹

Many ecclesiastical documents, such as letters and the records of church councils, contain lists of the names of bishops, either in the addresses of the letters or in the subscriptions to the councils. The accompanying table (see p. 139) gives the lists of names found in ten such documents from Gaul, dated to the years 439 to circa 470. The names which appear in each document are listed vertically in the table, in the order in which they appear in their respective documents. For example, at the council of Riez in 439, Hilary of Arles subscribed first and Maximus of Riez signed last. Any blank space between names was inserted to facilitate readability, and does not indicate missing names. Any omitted names are indicated by ellipses: the list of 451/452, for example, has been shortened in order to save space. For the sake of consistency, variant spellings of names which clearly refer to the same individual have been standardized².

One immediately notices that the names which recur in more than one list tend to appear in the same relative positions from list to list. In the table, these names can be followed horizontally across the page, with the same names, presumably the same individuals, regularly appearing in the same order from one council, or letter, to the next. The occasional departures from this scheme, which will be discussed below, do not at all detract from the overall pattern. Clearly, the bishops were adhering to some kind of hierarchical principal in the location of their names. But just was the basis for this hierarchy? An analysis of several contemporary opinions and documents can help to indicate just what procedures were used for determining episcopal status.

1 A condensed version of this study was delivered at the Eleventh Annual Byzantine Studies Conference at Bryn Mawr, October 11, 1986. A preliminary version was presented at the Medieval Studies Congress at Kalamazoo, in May 1982.

2 E.g., Constantianus of Carpentras in a few manuscripts is cited as »Constantinus«. For the variant spellings of the names of Chrysaphius and Venantius, see n. 24 below.

1. Literary Evidence for Episcopal Status

Circa 470, Sidonius Apollinaris, in a letter to bishop Leontius of Arles, cited four attributes which could enhance episcopal status: »chronological age, tenure in office, status of see, and intellectual achievement«³. The last of these, however, would be difficult to measure objectively and probably did not usually affect hierarchical status directly⁴. But what of the other considerations?

In fourth-century Gaul, it appears that status to some extent had been determined by mere age⁵. Evidence from the fifth century, however, indicates that another method soon came to be used for establishing episcopal status. In 445, for example, Leo of Rome gave his opinion of what should happen if the bishop of a metropolitan see became unfit for office. The one who should become the new metropolitan, Leo opined, was »the one who within the province exceeds the others in episcopal tenure (*antiquitate episcopali*)«, and he concluded by saying that »it is indeed fair... if deference is given by the other bishops in their own provinces to those who have precedence in the antiquity of their episcopate (*sacerdotii vetustate*)«⁶. And in 462, Hilarus of Rome did the same, appointing a replacement metropolitan »because he is said to be first-ranking in his tenure in office (*aevo honoris*)«⁷. In these instances, episcopal status clearly was determined by length of service in office. But these two examples only applied to the choice of a replacement metropolitan. Did other Gallic bishops also determine their status in the same way?

Additional evidence comes from the council of Riez of 439, which condemned a bishop Armentarius to the loss of his status, and decreed, »nor is it permitted to any bishop who shall

- 3 *aetate vitae, tempore dignitatis, privilegio loci, laude scientiae*: Sid. Apoll. Epist. 6.3.1. See also Sidonius' reference to Agroecius, metropolitan bishop of Sens in Lugdunensis IV, as one *qui cum sit suae provinciae caput, sit etiam mihi usu institutione facundia privilegio tempore aetate praestantior*, »who is not only the metropolitan of his province, but also excels me in experience, education, eloquence, status, tenure in office, and age« (Epist. 7.9.6); analogy with Epist. 6.3.1 above suggests the respective translations here of *tempus* and *aetas*. Note also Sidonius' reference *ad honoris... praerogativam* (»to the precedence of rank«) in another letter (7.5.4) to the same bishop, and his comment to Basilius of Aix, *tu sacratissimorum pontificum, Leontii Fausti Graeci, urbe ordine caritate medius inveniris* (7.6.10).
- 4 Intellectual reputation could, however, influence episcopal dignity in other ways, as evidenced by the examples of Augustine of Hippo and Fulgentius of Ruspe in Africa. On the latter's increase in status, see Susan T. STEVENS, *The Circle of Bishop Fulgentius*, in: *Traditio* 38 (1982) 327–341 at pp. 327–328.
- 5 L. DUCHESNE, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule* (3 vols., Paris 1907, 1910, 1915) 1.91, notes that at the councils of Valence (374) and Nîmes (394/396), »on trouve, comme président, le plus ancien évêque, et non celui d'un siège déterminé«. At Valence (Corp. chr. lat. 148.37–41), the name of Phoebadius of Agen, who had been in office by 359, heads the list in the salutation, but is absent from the list of signators, which is headed by Florentius of Vienne (the metropolitan city); see E. GRIFFE, *La Gaule chrétienne* (3 vols., Paris 1965) 1.312, who suggests that Phoebadius presided. At Nîmes (Corp. chr. lat. 148.50–51), the subscriptions begin with the name of an Aprunculus, perhaps bishop of Auch (DUCHESNE, *Fastes* 1.93; J. GAUDEMET, *Conciles gaulois du IV^e siècle*, Paris 1977, 130). Aprunculus, however, is only given thirteen years in the extant *fasti*. The bishop of the metropolitan see of Narbonne at this time is unknown. See also J.-R. PALANQUE, *Les évêchés provençaux à l'époque romaine*, in: *Provence historique* 1 (1951) 105–143 at p. 117. In Africa, the metropolitan was the primate (i.e. the eldest bishop), not the bishop of any particular city, see B. KIDD, *A History of the Church to A. D. 461*, vol. III: A. D. 408–461, Oxford 1922, 393, and n. 10 below.
- 6 *is qui intra provinciam antiquitate episcopali ceteros praevenit... a vobis omnibus, quemadmodum vetustas eius et probitas exigit, honoretur, metropolitanis privilegii sui dignitate servata, aequum est enim... si his qui sacerdotii vetustate praecedunt, pro aetatis suae merito, in suis provinciis a sacerdotibus ceteris deferatur*: MIGNE PL 54.633, 635.
- 7 *quia aevo honoris primus esse dicitur*: MIGNE PL 58.24. See also the decree supposedly addressed to Gaul by Boniface of Rome (418–422), stating that if a metropolitan could not settle a dispute, *tunc primas illius regionis inter ipsos audiat*: MIGNE PL 20.789.

be elected even at some later time (*vel succedente aetate*), at the very beginning of his career, to yield to [Armentarius] in any way, as if out of respect for (Armentarius') *aetas*⁸. In its first appearance, the word *aetas* clearly refers to Armentarius' date of election, rather than his chronological age. Presumably, it also did in its second appearance, although one might wish to see some independent confirmation of this. What is clear, however, is that newly-elected bishops had the lowest status. Furthermore, in the early sixth century *aetas* also was used to refer to the status acquired from tenure in office by Remigius of Rheims, who wrote, »you ought to respect my length of service, even if [you do not respect] my accomplishments, because... it might be said, »I have held my episcopal see for fifty-three years...«⁹.

2. Establishing Chronology

One now can check to see whether this method for assigning status is consistent with the order followed in the extant lists of episcopal subscriptions given in the table. This can be done by inserting as many fixed dates as possible for the various bishops¹⁰. Some of these fixed dates will be the relatively few exact, or nearly exact, dates of ordination which are known, such as those for Julius of Apt, Rusticus of Narbonne, Maximus of Riez, Ingenuus of Embrun, Fonteius of Vaison, Mamertus of Vienne, Patiens of Lyons, Veranus of Vence, and Marcellus of Die¹¹. These dates are listed in roman type in the left column of the table, with dashed lines

8 *nec ulli episcoporum vel succedente aetate assumpto in rudimentis suis huic in aliquo quasi pro aetate reverentia cedere liceat*: Corp. chr. lat. 148.67.

9 *vos aetati meae, etsi non meritis, decuerat detulisse, quod... sit dictum: »quingenta et tribus annis episcopali sede praesedeo...«*: Epist. »Paulus apostolus« = Epist. aust. 3: MGH Epist. 3.114. My thanks to Dr. Martin Heinzelmänn for pointing out this passage.

10 Although the dates of ordination of the Gallic bishops of this period have not previously received focused attention, many past studies have discussed the dates of ordination of one or more of these bishops. See, for example, B. BRETHOLZ, *Die Unterschriften in den gallischen Concilien des 6. und 7. Jahrhunderts*, in: *Neues Archiv* 18 (1893) 527–547; M. CHALON, *A propos des inscriptions dédicatoires de l'évêque Rusticus*, in: *Narbonne. Archéologie et histoire* 1 (1973) 223–232; J. CHAMPAGNE and R. SZRAMKIEWICZ, *Recherches sur les conciles des temps mérovingiens*, in: *Revue historique de droit français et étranger* 49 (1971) 5–49; A. COVILLE, *Recherches sur l'histoire de Lyon du V^e au IX^e siècle (450–800)*, Paris 1928; L. CRISTIANI, *Liste chronologique des saints de France. Des origines à l'avènement des Carolingiens (Essai critique)*, in: *Revue d'histoire de l'église de France* 31 (1945) 5–96; DUCHESNE, *Fastes* (above, n. 5); F. L. GANSHOF, *Note sur l'élection des évêques dans l'empire romain au IV^e et pendant la première moitié du V^e siècle*, in: *Revue internationale des droits de l'antiquité* 4 (1950) 467–498; GRIFFE, *Gaule* (above, n. 5); C. GUARNIERI, *Nota sull'elezione episcopale in Apulia all'inizio del V secolo*, in: *Vetera christianorum* 17 (1980) 347–356; C. J. HEFELE and H. LECLERCQ, *Histoire des conciles*, Paris 1908; M. HEINZELMANN, *Bischofsherrschaft in Gallien. Zur Kontinuität römischer Führungsschichten vom 4. bis zum 7. Jahrhundert. Soziale, prosopographische und bildungsgeschichtliche Aspekte*, Munich 1976, and *Id.*, *Gallische Prosopographie*, in: *Francia* 19 (1982) 531–718; H.-I. MARROU, *Le dossier épigraphique de l'évêque Rusticus de Narbonne*, in: *Rivista di archeologia cristiana* 3–4 (1970) 331–349; PALANQUE, *Les évêchés provençaux* (above, n. 5); J.-R. PALANQUE, *Les premiers évêques d'Aix-en-Provence*, in: *Analecta bollandiana* 67 (1949) 377–383; J.-M. ROUX, *Les évêchés provençaux de la fin de l'époque romaine à l'avènement des Carolingiens (476–751)*, in: *Provence historique* 21 (1971) 373–420; E. VACANDARD, *Les élections épiscopales sous les mérovingiens*, in: *Revue des questions historiques* 63 (1898) 321–383; and H. WIERUSZOWSKI, *Die Zusammensetzung des gallischen und fränkischen Episkopats bis zum Vertrag von Verdun (843)*, in: *Bonner Jahrbücher* 127 (1922) 1–83.

11 Cassian's *Institutiones monachorum*, published in 424, were dedicated to Castor of Apt, but when Cassian published his first ten books of *Collationes* in 426, he noted that Julius' predecessor (i. e. Castor) was dead (see GRIFFE, *Gaule* [above, n. 5] 3.307–308). Julius, therefore, became bishop c. 425. Rusticus was ordained on 9 November 427 (C. I. L. 12.5336; DUCHESNE, *Fastes* [above, n. 5] 1.303; see entry »c« in the »Applications« section below). Maximus served as abbot of Lérins *quasi annorum*

connecting them to their respective bishops. For example, Rusticus of Narbonne was consecrated in the year 427¹². Furthermore, *termini ante quos* may be obtained by the consideration that any bishops writing or receiving a letter or attending a council necessarily must have been ordained by the date of that letter or council, and those near the end of a list would have been ordained closer to that date than those near the beginning¹³. These *termini ante quos* are printed in italics in the left column of the table, with dashed lines drawn underneath the names of the lowest ranking bishops who appeared in the respective documents.

When all such known dates are inserted into the table, one discovers that all the names to which dates can be attached do in fact appear in chronological order. Bishops who were ordained earlier appear higher up in their lists, and those ordained later appear lower. Moreover, the successors of bishops who died invariably appear near the bottom of the lists in which they first appear. Auspicius of Vaison, for example, last appears near the top of the list for 449, and his successor Fonteius is found near the bottom of the list for 450. Eutropius of Orange, the successor of Justus, first appears near the bottom of the list for 463. These observations are consistent with what already has been inferred from the other evidence: in Gaul, episcopal status normally was determined by length of service in episcopal office. Any of the words *aetas*, *aevum*, *antiquitas*, *tempus*, or *vetustas* could be used to refer to length of tenure in office.

3. Exceptions and Anomalies

There were, however, exceptions to this usual method for assigning episcopal status. One significant variation is that metropolitan bishops sometimes were granted extraordinary status. The name of the bishop of Arles, for example, almost always came first or second, and those of other metropolitans often followed, as in 441, 442, and 451/452. Additional status also could be granted for other reasons. At at least one council, in 442, the bishop of the host city was allowed the honor of signing first, and at another, circa 470, the most elderly bishop present

hebdomada (Faustus of Riez, Serm. 34: Corp. chr. lat. 101.401–412) as successor to Honoratus. If Honoratus became bishop of Arles in late 426, Maximus would have become bishop of Riez c. 433 (see DUCHESNE, *Fastes* 1.256, 283). Ingenuus would have been made bishop of Embrun in late 439, after his predecessor Armentarius was deposed by the council of Riez (Corp. chr. lat. 148.63–68). Fonteius was ordained bishop of Vaison in 449, or perhaps early 450, by Ravennius of Arles (see Leo of Rome, Epist. »Lectis dilectionis« = Epist. arel. 13: MGH Epist. 3.20–21; see also T. JALLAND, *The Life and Times of St. Leo the Great*, London–New York 1941, 130 and G. LANGGÄRTNER, *Die Gallienpolitik der Päpste im 5. und 6. Jahrhundert*, Bonn 1964, 80–81). Mamertus of Vienne and Patiens of Lyons would have been ordained c. 451/452: see entry »f« in the »Applications« section below. Marcellus was ordained bishop of Die in 463: Hilarus of Rome, Epist. »Sollicitis admodum« = Epist. arel. 21: MGH Epist. 3.30–32. For the last four of these, see also DUCHESNE, *Fastes* 1.262, 1.205, 2.163, and 1.234 respectively.

12 For the identification of this Rusticus as Rusticus of Narbonne, see entry »c« in the »Applications« section below and DUCHESNE, *Fastes* (above, n. 5) 369.

13 Along with the councils and letters cited at the top of the table, these documents include the following: 1) Boniface of Rome's letter »Valentinae nos« of 13 June 419: MIGNE PL 20.765. In this letter, the sees of the addressees are not given. The bishops include a Severus (5th), »Castorius« (presumably Castor of Apt) (8th), and a »Constantinus« (10th). Now, Severus cannot be Severus of Vence, for the latter ranked below Castor of Apt's successor Julius in 439 and 442 and therefore could not have outranked Castor himself. This means that one can identify Constantinus with Constantianus of Carpentras, who outranked Severus of Vence and whose tenure status is consistent with an ordination date of 419 or before. This variant spelling of Constantianus' name is attested elsewhere (see n. 2 above). 2) Celestine of Rome's letter »Apostolici verba« of c. 431, which includes among its addressees an Arcadius, perhaps the one who attended the council of Riez.

subscribed first¹⁴. On other occasions, however, metropolitan bishops subscribed only in their normal hierarchical position. In 441, for example, Eucherius of Lyons signed far down the list, and in 449 Rusticus of Narbonne subscribed only in his tenure position. Ingenuus of Embrun does not exhibit extra status until 463, and at Arles c. 470 all the metropolitans, it seems, signed according to their tenure status: Leontius of Arles may have subscribed second because he was the host bishop, not because he was a metropolitan.

In other instances, names could vary by a few positions from list to list. In 451/452, for example, Florus of Lodève appears a bit too high, as does Constantius of Uzès in 442. Similarly, Salonius of Geneva appears higher in 442 and c. 451/452 than he does in 441. Note, however, that in 442 the name of Augustalis, who precedes Salonius in 441, also appears higher, again next to Salonius. This could suggest that in the 442 list Salonius and Augustalis were transposed upward by a scribal error. In the table, bishops whose names occurred out of their expected positions are indicated by »***«. When one considers the vagaries of transmission, and the various stages which these lists may have gone through, such as recopyings back and forth between single and double columnar lists, it is all the more remarkable that as much order remains in them as there does¹⁵.

Along with scribal errors, there may be other reasons for these small differences from one list to another. It may be that bishops whose positions vary slightly from one list to another were ordained in the same year. This could explain the minor variations in the relative positions of Florus, Valerianus, Constantius, and Nectarius, of Ingenuus, Justus, Salonius, and Augustalis, or of Faustus and Auxanius. It also may be that some bishops, especially when at their first council, simply got in the wrong place in line, either by accident, by design, or as a courtesy of other bishops¹⁶. The »regulars« would have known their proper status; newcomers may not have been so knowledgeable. Constantius of Uzès, for example, perhaps was informed of his proper status, and thereafter routinely subscribed in the same, lower, position.

Even though such variations are isolated in nature, and do not detract from the overall validity of the hierarchical scheme, they do introduce some uncertainty into the application of the method. It therefore also should be noted that the more times a name appears in the same location, the more accurately that bishop's hierarchical position will be determined. The relative status of such bishops as Nectarius of Avignon or Asclepius of Cavaillon, therefore, would be established with a great degree of accuracy, whereas some doubt may remain about the exact status of bishops whose names appear only once.

4. Applications

Once tables of episcopal appearances such as this one have been constructed, they can be used for many different purposes, including the following:

Estimating Dates of Ordination and Tenures in Office

By aligning the names and known dates, as has been done in the table in the appendix, it now becomes possible to estimate with a relatively good degree of accuracy the dates of ordination

14 At the council of Arles of c. 470, Euphronius of Autun subscribed first (see n. 11 in the table) even though Autun was not a metropolitan see. At both this council and that of 442, however, the bishop of Arles then subscribed in second position, and the other bishops followed in their normal hierarchical order.

15 For such manuscript problems, see n. 3 on the Council of Orange of 441 below.

16 For such activities, see A. CRABBE, *The Invitation List to the Council of Ephesus and Metropolitan Hierarchy in the Fifth Century*, in: *Journal of Theological Studies* 32 (1981) 369–400.

of many bishops¹⁷. All the bishops who appear in any list between Rusticus of Narbonne and Maximus of Riez, for example, would have been ordained between 427 and 433 – or even between 431 and 433, if the Arcadius who attended the council of Riez in 439 is correctly identified as the Arcadius in Celestine's letter »Apostolici verba« of 431. The dates of ordination of all the other bishops whose names appear in the table can be established in a similar way, as has been done in the appendix for bishops whose sees are known¹⁸. This is a vast improvement on the earlier method for estimating dates of ordination, which was based merely upon the first attested appearance of a bishop¹⁹. Severianus of Thorame, for example, and Audentius of Die, who first appear at the council of Riez in 439, already were in office before 425. The table also gives the relative chronological order in which bishops were ordained. A bishop who regularly appears lower than another bishop on any list must have been ordained after him.

This approach also can give additional insight into representative lengths of episcopal tenures in office. In the table, minimum tenures in office are estimated on the basis of the estimated date of ordination and the last attested date for each bishop. There is no telling, of course, how much longer these bishops actually remained in office. Even these minimum tenures indicate that many bishops remained in office for a long time indeed, with tenures of twenty years and more not being uncommon. This observation would suggest that the competition for episcopal sees may have been even more fierce than usually is imagined, with sees becoming available only very infrequently.

Identifying Episcopal Sees

This method allows the sees of bishops whose sees are not given on one occasion, such as in a letter, to be identified if their sees are given on another, such as at a council. In the table, the episcopal sees are assigned on this basis²⁰. Several questionable cases, however, merit further discussion. It will be noted, for example, that Justus of Orange appears for the first time at the bottom of the list for 441. All of the bishops who subscribed to the council of Riez in 439, moreover, appear at later councils except for the bishop Arcadius, who never is seen again. It

17 In instances where the status of metropolitans was determined by the status of their sees, not by their tenure status, their position in the lists can say nothing about when they were ordained. The same goes for other bishops who were granted extraordinary status for one reason or another.

18 The method also can be applied less rigorously to suggest some dates of ordination that are more approximate. Of the bishops attending the council of Arles of c. 470, for example, the eight bishops between Patiens and Marcellus must have been ordained between c. 451 and 463. One might suggest that bishops of this group appearing closer to Patiens, such as Faustus of Riez, were ordained closer to 451, whereas those appearing closer to Marcellus, such as Eutropius of Orange, would have been ordained closer to 463. Such suggestions, however, should only be made with great caution.

19 See references in n. 10 above.

20 The modern forms of Gallic placenames are used here throughout, and are given in the leftmost column of the table. Near the bottom of the table, names of sees are connected to their respective bishops by dots for the purposes of readability. A few variations between the sees used here and those used in other sources might be noted. GUNDLACH, for example, in MGH Epist. 3.17–20, identifies Ursus of 450 as bishop of Senez, presumably based on the worthless evidence of the *Gallia christiana* (see DUCHESNE, *Fastes* [above, n. 5] 293 n. 4). He also suggests that Nectarius may have been bishop of Digne and Asclepius bishop of Apt, but in 442 Nectarius was clearly identified as the bishop of Avignon, Asclepius as bishop of Cavaillon, and Julius as bishop of Apt (see DUCHESNE, *Fastes* 293 n. 1). GUNDLACH (MGH Epist. 3.15–30) also makes other unsupportable suggestions, such as that Constantianus may have been bishop of Uzès or Gap, that Auxanius was bishop of Aix, that Ausonius was bishop of Cimiez, that Paulus was bishop of Cavaillon, that one Leontius was bishop of either Apt or Fréjus, that Memorialis was bishop of Digne, and that Projectus may have been bishop of Die. For the last two of these, see DUCHESNE, *Fastes* 1.233 n. 5 and 1.293 n. 1. Gundlach's preference for obscure variant spellings of names can only be noted here.

may be, therefore, that Justus had succeeded Arcadius as bishop of Orange: the bishop of Orange seems regularly to have participated in Gallic episcopal activities at this time, and there are no other obvious unidentified possibilities. One notes, however, that between 441 and 450, Ingenuus outranked – barely – Justus, and Arcadius apparently was still alive when Ingenuus was ordained in 439. How, then, could Arcadius' successor outrank Ingenuus? This difficulty could be explained if Ingenuus and Justus both were ordained in 439; one notes that Ingenuus did in fact subscribe before Justus in 451/452.

The Superventor who subscribed to the council of Vaison in 442 is identified only as being from the province of *Alpes Maritimae*. He probably is to be identified with the Superventor who in 441 subscribed on behalf of his father and bishop, Claudius of Castellane; in 442 he again subscribed for Claudius, immediately after signing on his own behalf, but in the latter case he omitted the words *episcopus meus* presumably because he now was a bishop in his own right. Other known bishops of *Alpes Maritimae* at this time include Severianus of Thorame, Severus of Vence, and Ingenuus of Embrun. The bishops of Digne, Senez, and Glandève at this time are unknown²¹. Superventor presumably would have been the bishop of one of these three sees. Given that Senez was the closest of the three to Castellane, the see of Superventor's father, Senez might be marginally the most likely choice²².

Maximus of 450, who is to be identified with the first Maximus of 451/452, became bishop of a see which was vacant as of c. 427/433, Ursus of 451/452 of a see vacant as of c. 439, and Valerius of 451/452 of a see vacant as of c. 439/442. None of the sees attested c. 439–442, however, became vacant during these periods, so the most which can be said of these three individuals is that they were not bishops of any of the sees represented at the councils of Riez, Orange, and Vaison²³. If Arcadius were not bishop of Orange, one of these individuals probably would have been his successor.

A number of observations and suggestions also can be made about the sees of the unidentified, junior bishops of c. 449–452. In the lists from these years there appear several new bishops, including Antonius, Venantius and Chrysaphius (in 449), Palladius (450), Eulalius (451/452), and Zoticus (c. 451/452)²⁴. All of them were ordained c. 442/449. It may be possible to suggest sees for some of these bishops. Eulalius just may have been bishop of Viviers; no known bishop of Viviers appears in any of the documents under discussion, but Viviers certainly does appear to have had bishops at this time. An Eulalius does appear in some unreliable *fasti* of Viviers at about this time²⁵. Chrysaphius will be discussed below. Antonius, Venantius, Palladius, or Zoticus may have been the successors of known bishops who are not attested after c. 442, and had no known successors, such as Severianus of Thorame and Julius of Apt.

One also can observe a curious pattern involving the appearances of the bishops Florus and Chrysaphius: they only appear when Rusticus of Narbonne also appears, in 449, 451/452, and c. 451/452, never without him. This circumstance could lead one to suggest that they were Rusticus' suffragans. Regarding Florus, there would seem to be confirmation of this sugge-

21 DUCHESNE, *Fastes* 1.293–295.

22 For the suggestion that Senez was the see of the Ursus who appears in 451/452, see n. 20 above.

23 For the suggestion that Valerius was bishop of Nice, see J.-P. WEISS, *Valérien de Cimiez et Valère de Nice*, in: *Sacris erudiri* 21 (1971–72) 109–146.

24 The bishop listed in the table as »Venantius« appears in the source documents under several different variants: »Ynantius« and »Hymnatius« in 449; »Ynantius«, »Vnantius«, and »Hymnatius« in 450; »Ynantius« in 451/452; and »Enantius« or »Inantius« c. 451/452. Tenure status indicates that these individuals are the same person. Note that the name Venantius also could be spelled »Evantius« (Corp. chr. lat. 148A.127, 129). Chrysaphius appears as »Chrysantius« c. 451/452.

25 DUCHESNE, *Fastes* (above, n. 5) 1.237 n. 2; accepted by GUNDLACH, *MGH Epist.* 3.30.

stion in a medieval tradition that a Florus was an early bishop of Lodève²⁶. As to Chrysaphius, he too may have come from the eastern part of the province, perhaps Nîmes, or Béziers – the western part of the province, of course, was in the hands of the Visigoths²⁷.

Finally, the Paulus who appears in 463 and c. 470 probably is not to be identified as the Paulus, bishop of Chalon-sur-Saône, who, according to Sidonius (Epist. 4.25), was succeeded by a Johannes. The Johannes who attended the council of Arles c. 470 customarily is identified as bishop of Chalon²⁸. Note that the two bishops who ordained Johannes, Euphronius of Autun and Patiens of Lyons, also attended this council. As for Paulus, he perhaps is to be identified as the Paulus who was bishop of Saint-Paul-Trois-Châteaux at some time before the early sixth century²⁹.

Ordination Patterns

Investigation into patterns of the dates of ordination of these bishops also can give insight into contemporary ecclesiastical politics and affiliations. There seems to have been, for example, a rash of bishop making between c. 427 (or perhaps even 431) and 433. Several of these new bishops oversaw minor sees in *Alpes Maritimae* which seem not to have had bishops previously. Severianus and Claudius became the only known bishops of Thorame and Castellane, and Valerianus became bishop of Cimiez. The tendency for minor towns to gain their own bishops at this time, usually with the assistance of some powerful local prelate, even drew the attention of the bishop of Rome. In 418, for example, Boniface of Rome complained to the bishop of Salona about »our fellow bishops, who seek out the acclaim of the multitude, for they believe that from such a crowd they can acquire some kind of glory for themselves. Thence, here and there, the numerous supporters of such individuals are even found in those places where there is solitude, when they wish their parishes to be extended, or they bestow holy orders upon those whom they are not able to justify...«³⁰.

In Gaul, this activity was going on at the very time that the bishops of Arles, first Honoratus (c. 426–429) and then Hilary (c. 429–449), were expanding the interests of the party of Lérins by appropriating episcopal sees throughout southern Gaul³¹. Eventually, in the mid 440s, complaints about Hilary's ordination practices aroused the ire of Leo of Rome, who went so far as to complain, »but... Hilary, intending to disturb the condition of the churches and the concord of the bishops by new presumptions... [has been] appropriating for himself ordinations in all the churches throughout Gaul... A military band, as we have learned, follows this bishop around the provinces, and he is assisted by the supporting presumption of an armed guard in his tumultuous invasions of churches which have lost their own bishops.

26 GUNDLACH (MGH Epist. 3.15) accepts the worthless attribution in the Gallic Christiana of Chrysaphius to Sisteron; it is rejected by DUCHESNE, *Fastes* 1.288 n. 1.

27 See DUCHESNE, *Fastes* 313–314 n. 5. He fails to note, however, Florus' anomalous appearance pattern and he rejects the tradition on the mistaken assumption that Florus »est surement un suffragant d'Arles et non de Narbonne.« Lodève is suggested by GUNDLACH, MGH Epist. 3.15.

28 See DUCHESNE, *Fastes* 1.370, 2.192–193, Corp. chr. lat. 148.237. Note that Paulus is omitted from Duchesne's list (*Fastes* 1.370) of those attending the council of Arles.

29 See DUCHESNE, *Fastes* 1.264 and the *Vita s. Pauli episcopi Tricastinensis*, in: *Analecta bollandiana* 11 (1892) 375–383, where Paulus is identified as a native of Rheims.

30 *facit hoc nimia remissio consacerdotum nostrorum, qui pompam multitudinis quaerunt, ut putant ex hoc turba aliquid sibi dignitatis acquiri. hinc passim numerosa popularitas etiam his locis, ubi solitudo est, talium reperitur, dum paroecias extendi cupiunt, aut quibus praestare non possunt, divinos ordines largiuntur* (Epist. »Exigit dilectio«: MIGNE PL 20.669ff.).

31 For Hilary's activities, see HEINZELMANN, *Bischofsherrschaft* (above, n. 10) 78–84; for monks of Lérins as bishops, see Eucherius, *De laude heremi* 42, as well as HEINZELMANN, *Bischofsherrschaft* 196–198 and F. PRINZ, *Frühes Mönchtum im Frankenreich. Kultur und Gesellschaft in Gallien, den Rheinlanden und Bayern am Beispiel der monastischen Entwicklung* (4. bis 8. Jahrhundert), Munich-Vienna 1965, 47–62.

Those to be ordained are dragged before this tribunal, unknown to those citizens whom they are to oversee. Even when a known and approved individual is sought peacefully, one who is brought forth as an unknown is of necessity imposed by force³².

In some cases, the ordination of such bishops was a direct challenge to the authority of some other prelate. The ordination of Valerianus of Cimiez, where there previously seems not to have been a bishop, would have undercut the authority of the bishop of Marseilles over the see of Nice, which was not even a *civitas*, and which was located in the territory of Cimiez. A related incident may have occurred in *Narbonensis Prima*. In 422, Patroclus of Arles had exercised metropolitan authority in that province by ordaining an unnamed bishop for Lodève, and afterward Boniface of Rome had rebuked Hilarius of Narbonne for not exercising his own metropolitan rights there³³.

Then, according to the table, Florus was ordained bishop of Lodève c. 427/433, apparently by the bishop of Narbonne, as suggested above. Now, this would have been immediately after the ambitious Rusticus became bishop of Narbonne in 427³⁴. Clearly, Rusticus did not intend to defer to Arles, and his immediate reassertion of his metropolitan authority could not have pleased the bishop of Arles, who seems to have responded by raising the *castrum* of Uzès to the status of an episcopal see and made Constantius its bishop. It already has been suggested above that Florus and Constantius may have become bishops in the same year, and in 449 Constantius was one of nineteen bishops who admitted to having been consecrated by the bishop of Arles³⁵.

Another round of bishop making by Hilary seems to have occurred circa 439. In that year, Hilary and his partisans interfered in a dispute at Embrun, and at the council of Riez deposed Armentarius, the local choice. Soon thereafter, presumably in the same year, Hilary's candidate Ingenus was ordained bishop by Hilary himself³⁶. At the same time, Superventor was named bishop of yet another see in *Alpes Maritimae*, and Toulon too, like Uzès not even a *civitas*, also gained its own bishop, Augustalis³⁷.

It cannot be mere coincidence that so many new bishops were ordained in *Alpes Maritimae* and elsewhere in southern Gaul at the very time that Honoratus, and in particular Hilary, were bishops. The more exact dating which now can be assigned to these bishops would tend to confirm suggestions that the bishops of Arles were attempting to consolidate their authority in southern Gaul by the naming of bishops in obscure rural sees³⁸. This would have given them additional control over the activities of the several church councils which shortly were to

32 *sed... Hilarius, ecclesiarum statum et concordiam sacerdotum novis praesumptionibus turbaturus... ordinationes sibi omnium per Gallias ecclesiarum vindicans... militaris manus, ut didicimus, per provincias sequitur sacerdotem et armati praesidii praesumptione suffulto ad invadendas per tumultum famulatur ecclesias, quae proprios amiserint sacerdotes. trahuntur ordinandi ante hoc officium, his quibus praeficiendi sunt civitatibus ignorati. ut enim notus qui fuerit et probatus per pacem petitur, ita per vim necesse est, qui ignotus adducitur, imponatur* (»Divinae cultum« ch.2, 6: MIGNE PL 54.628–635).

33 Epist. »Difficile quidem«: MIGNE PL 20.772–774.

34 Rusticus' pretensions are amply attested by his novel method of dating: by the years of his own episcopate (CIL 13.5336).

35 Epist. »Memores quantum« (MIGNE PL 54.966–970): *ab huius ecclesiae sacerdote tam decessores nostros, quam nos ipsos... consecratos.*

36 See n. 35.

37 It may be significant that, under September 7, the Martyrologium Hieronymianum notes that Augustalis died *Arelate civitate*, corroborating his ties to Arles. Moreover, some unreliable *fasti* begin the bishops of Toulon with an »Honoratus«, perhaps a doublet of the famous bishop of Arles (see DUCHESNE, *Fastes* 1.277).

38 See, for example, J. HARRIES, Church and State in the *Notitia Galliarum*, in: *Journal of Roman Studies* 68 (1978) 26–43.

be assembled³⁹. What has not been previously noticed, however, is that such ordinations seem to come in bunches, apparently at times when the bishops involved felt especially powerful – or especially threatened.

Exercise of Metropolitan Status

Further insight into ecclesiastical politics can be gained by observing just what bishops were granted metropolitan status at what times. In the letter to Leo of 451/452, for example, Venerius of Marseilles subscribed immediately after the elderly metropolitan Rusticus of Narbonne, and before such bishops as Constantianus of Carpentras and Armentarius of Antibes, who had been ordained long before him⁴⁰. This would indicate that the anomalous metropolitan status of the see of Marseilles, which had been recognized at the council of Turin but which should have lapsed at the death of Proculus of Marseilles, was still to some extent recognized⁴¹. On the other hand, the position of Ingenuus of Embrun in the middle of the lists from 441 to c. 451/452 would indicate that his metropolitan status was not recognized at church councils during that period; as of 463, however, it was.

Furthermore, the first four bishops who subscribed to the council on Mamertus in 463 all must have had some kind of metropolitan, or extraordinary, status, for only this can explain the high position of Eustasius of Marseilles, who could not have become bishop before 451/452, when his predecessor Venerius, as just noted, still was in office. Ingenuus, of course, was bishop of Embrun, metropolitan see of *Alpes Maritimae*, and Victurus may have been bishop of Aix, metropolitan see of *Narbonensis Secunda*. Hydatius just possibly may have been bishop of Tarentaise, which later, at least, was the metropolitan see of *Alpes Graiae*. This pattern, of the restraint of the authority of the minor metropolitans before 450 followed by their exercise of metropolitan authority afterwards, would seem to indicate the decline of the authority of the major metropolitans discussed above. Especially noteworthy is the revival of the authority of the minor metropolitans immediately after the death of Hilary of Arles.

Miscellaneous Identifications and Observations

This method also may be used to settle controversies over which bishops were in office when, over the proper identification of likenamed bishops who appear on the same occasion, and over the dating of sources in which these bishops appear. A discussion of several such specific applications follows.

a) It has been suggested that the Leontius named by Leo of Rome in 445 as the most senior bishop in southern Gaul is Leontius of Fréjus⁴². But this is impossible. Theodorus had been bishop of Fréjus at least since 433, and attended the councils of Riez (439), Orange (441), and Vaison (442).

b) The Armentarius who was deposed as bishop of Embrun in 439 (Corp. chr. lat. 148.61–70) cannot be the same person as the Armentarius of Antibes who appears at later church councils⁴³. Armentarius of Antibes already was in office by 427 and therefore could not possibly have been bishop of Embrun.

c) There is no need to suggest, as Langgärtner, *Gallienpolitik* (above, note 11) p. 79, that the Rusticus who helped to consecrate Ravennius of Arles in 449 is not Rusticus of Narbonne: Rusticus of 449 appears in the position which would have been assigned by Rusticus of

39 Such as the councils of Riez (439), Orange (441), and Vaison (442).

40 Constantianus was in office by 419, and Proculus seems still to have been active in the late 420s (DUCHESNE, *Fastes* 1.274).

41 See Corp. chr. lat. 148.52–58.

42 See JALLAND (above n. 11) 123 n. 38.

43 The identity has been suggested by GRIFFE, *Gaule* (above, n. 5) 2.157 n. 43, and LANGGÄRTNER (above, n. 11) 63–64 n. 4.

Narbonne's tenure in office. As noted above, metropolitan bishops did not always subscribe first. Indeed, on this occasion, the ordination of Ravennius of Arles, it would have been uncanonical for Rusticus to participate in a metropolitan capacity, for he was metropolitan of another province⁴⁴. Rusticus therefore appears just where he would be expected on the grounds of both his tenure and his status⁴⁵. This identification is very important, for it provides the first fixed date of ordination in the table.

d) The bishop Maximus who supported the rights of the see of Arles in 450 could not have been Maximus of Riez, as usually is assumed⁴⁶. The Maximus of 450, rather, whose see is unknown, and whose name precedes that of Asclepius of Cavaillon, must be the Maximus whose name also preceded that of Asclepius in the Gallic letter to Leo of 451/452, in which instance the name of Maximus of Riez followed that of Asclepius, as it did on other occasions. Yet a third Maximus, in office since c. 420, also signed the letter to Leo.

e) It always has been assumed that the Leontius who attended the council which considered the case of Mamertus of Vienne in 463 was Leontius of Arles⁴⁷. But this is impossible. The Leontius of 463 is to be identified with a second Leontius, whose see is unknown, who subscribed to the council of Arles circa 470 in the same hierarchical position as he had in 463. Leontius of Arles must be identified with the Leontius who subscribed second in 470.

f) The order of names for the council of Arles of c. 470 indicates that Mamertus of Vienne was ordained just before Patiens of Lyons. Mamertus was not yet bishop in early 451, when he was visited by Anianus of Orleans⁴⁸. Mamertus, therefore, and thus also Patiens, could not have been ordained before 451. This would indicate that the date of 449 for Patiens' predecessor Eucherius' death given in the *Gallic Chronicle of 452* (MGH Auct. ant. 9.662), and accepted by Duchesne and Griffe, is incorrect⁴⁹. This is not as awkward as might appear, for Gennadius of Marseilles also contradicts the *Gallic Chronicle*, and states (*De viris illustribus* 64) that Eucherius died *sub Valentiniano et Marciano principibus*, that is, between 450 and 455. Now, Patiens' name c. 470 appears immediately before that of Veranus of Vence, who subscribed to a separate letter to Leo circa 452 (»Recensita epistola«: Migne PL 54.887). Mamertus and Patiens both, therefore, would have been ordained circa 451/452. It may be that in the *Gallic Chronicle*, Eucherius' name was attracted to that of his more famous confrère Hilary.

g) The Viventius who attended the council of 463 cannot be Viventius of Grenoble, as usually is assumed⁵⁰. Viventius of 463 ranked ahead of several bishops who had been ordained by c. 452, at which time Viventius of Grenoble's predecessor Ceretius still was alive. The second Viventius who appeared at the council of Arles c. 470, therefore, must be Viventius of Grenoble, and Viventius of 463 came from an unknown see.

h) It reasonably has been suggested that Sidonius' Epist. 7.2.2 was written shortly after the ordination of its addressee, Graecus of Marseilles. If this is the case, Duchesne's date of c. 475 for the letter is much too late, for Graecus was in office by c. 463 or before⁵¹.

44 For the canonical regulations, see the council of Riez (Corp. chr. lat. 148.71–72) and Leo, Epist. »Divinae cultum«: MIGNE PL 54.628–635.

45 For this Rusticus as bishop of Narbonne, see DUCHESNE, *Fastes* 1.369.

46 As by DUCHESNE, *Fastes* 1.369, and GUNDLACH, MGH Epist. 3.17–20.

47 As by DUCHESNE, *Fastes* (above, n. 5) 1.130, 370, GRIFFE, *Gaule* (above, n. 5) 2.167, and LANGGÄRTNER, *Gallienpolitik* (above, n. 11) 99.

48 *Vita Aniani* 5: MGH Script. rer. merov. 3.110.

49 DUCHESNE, *Fastes* 2.163; GRIFFE, *Gaule* (above, n. 5) 2.288.

50 As by DUCHESNE, *Fastes* 1.231.

51 DUCHESNE, *Fastes* 1.274 n. 10.

5. Conclusion

It is necessary to note, finally, that this method cannot be applied with equal success to all lists of bishops, anywhere, at any time. If the method is to be used, it is necessary to have 1) lists in which status normally is determined on the basis of tenure in office, 2) several lists, not too chronologically separated, which can be compared, in order to confirm that the ordering of names does in fact remain essentially the same, and 3) several known dates of ordination for some of the bishops named. This situation does exist to some extent, for example, for the Gallic councils of the sixth century, although there it appears that at large councils bishops sometimes also signed in regional groups⁵². It also, perhaps, could be applied to the Italian councils of the fifth and sixth century, but only if good editions of those councils were to be made available⁵³. And it might be useful for the African councils, for which good editions are available⁵⁴. It would be more difficult, however, to apply this method to eastern councils, where such rigorous adherence to tenure status in subscription lists seems not to have been maintained⁵⁵.

52 For the sixth-century Gallic councils, see C. DE CLERCQ ed., *Concilia Galliae A. 511–A. 695* (Corpus christianorum, series latina 148A), Turnholt 1963, and BRETHOLZ, CHAMPAGNE, and VACANDARD in n. 10 above.

53 The Italians presumably followed the policy applied by the bishops of Rome to Gaul above, based upon tenure in office. There currently is no standard, modern edition of the Italian councils. They can be found, for example, in G. MANSI, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, Florence-Venice 1759–1798 (repr. J. B. MARTIN, L. PETIT eds., Paris 1901–1924); J.-P. MIGNE, PL; C. S. E. L. vols. 35 and 82; and A. THIEL, *Epistolae romanorum pontificum genuinae*, Brunsberg 1867.

54 See C. MUNIER ed., *Concilia Africae A. 345–A. 525* (Corpus christianorum, series latina 149), Turnholt 1974. The bishop of Carthage customarily presided and subscribed first, but the second position, at least, seems to have been taken by the most elderly bishop present: see the council of Carthage of 397, where the subscription of Aurelius of Carthage is followed by *et manu senis Mizonii*, the primate of Byzacena (p. 29); the council of Carthage of 25 May 419, where Aurelius was followed by *Valentinus episcopus primae sedis provinciae Numidiae* (p. 150, cf. pp. 152, 156; when the subscriptions were entered on 30 May, however, Valentinus' name was mysteriously absent [p. 232, cf. p. 230 where his name also is missing from the list of legates of Byzacena: had the elderly bishop died?]). At the provincial council of »Thela« in 418, the primate of Byzacena himself presided: *beatus pater primae sedis episcopus Donatianus civitatis Theleptensis* (p. 58, see discussion p. 55–56), but at the council of Carthage of 418, he took second place to Aurelius of Carthage, and subscribed, *cum Donatiano Teleptensi primae sedis episcopo provinciae Bizacena* (p. 69). It remains to be seen, however, on what terms the other bishops established their status.

55 See CRABBE, Invitation List (above, n. 16).

APPENDIX

Approximate Dates of Ordination of Bishops of known Sees

Name and See	Approximate Ordination Date	Last Attested	Minimum Tenure
Agrestius of Lugo in Galicia (Spain)	419/425*	441	16 yrs.
Arcadius of ?Orange	c. 427/431	439	8 yrs.
Armentarius of Antibes	419/425	451/452	26 yrs.
Asclepius of Cavaillon	427[431]/433*	451/452	18 yrs.
Audentius of Die	419/425	450	25 yrs.
Augustalis of Toulon	439/441	450	9 yrs.
Auspicius of Vaison	427[431]*/433	449	16 yrs.
Basilus of Aix	463*/470	^a	—
Ceretius of Grenoble	427[431]/433*	c. 465 ^b	32 yrs.
Chrysaphius of ?Narbonensis I	442/449	c. 451/452	2 yrs.
Claudius of Castellane	427[431]*/433	442	9 yrs.
Constantianus of Carpentras	by 419	451/452	32 yrs.
Constantius of Uzès	427[431]/433	462 ^c	29 yrs.
Crocus of Nîmes	463*/470	^a	—
Eucherius of Lyons	427[431]/433	c. 451 ^b	18 yrs.
Eulalius of ?Viviers	442/449	463	14 yrs.
Eutropius of Orange	451/463*	c. 470	7 yrs.
Faustus of Riez	451*/463	c. 490 ^d	27 yrs.
Florus of ?Lodève	427[431]/433	451/452	19 yrs.
Fonteius of Vaison	449/450	c. 470	20 yrs.
Graecus of Marseilles	451/463*	475 ^e	12 yrs.
Ingenuus of Embrun	439	465 ^f	26 yrs.
Johannes of Chalon	463/470*	^a	—
Julianus of Avignon	463/470	506 ^g	36 yrs.
Julius of Apt	c. 425	442	17 yrs.
Justus of Orange	433/439	451/452	13 yrs.
Mamertus of Vienne	c. 451	c. 470	19 yrs.
Marcellus of Die	463	510 ^h	46 yrs.
Maximus of Riez	433	451/452	18 yrs.
Megethius of Besançon	451/463	^a	—
Nectarius of Avignon	427[431]/433	451/452	18 yrs.
Patiens of Lyons	c. 451	c. 470	19 yrs.
Paulus of Trois-Châteaux	451/463	c. 470	7 yrs.
Petronius of Die	c. 449/450	463 ⁱ	13 yrs.
Rusticus of Narbonne	427	460 ^j	33 yrs.
Salonius of Geneva	439/441	c. 452	10 yrs.

* = probable date closer to which.

Name and See	Approximate Ordination Date	Last Attested	Minimum Tenure
Severianus of Thorame	419/425	450	25 yrs.
Severus of Vence	427*/433	442	9 yrs.
Superventor of Alpes Maritimae	441/442	451/452	9 yrs.
Theodorus of Fréjus	427[431]/433*	451/452 ^k	18 yrs.
Theoplastus of Geneva	463/470	a	—
Ursicinus of Paris	463/470	a	—
Valerianus of Cimiez	427[431]/433	451/452	18 yrs.
Veranus of Vence	c. 451	c. 470	19 yrs.
Viventius of Grenoble	463/470	a	—

a No dates available; beyond the range of this study.

b Date at which this bishop was succeeded.

c Constantius was still alive, and was primate of *Narbonensis I*, in late 462, see Hilarus, Epist. »Quamquam notitiam« = Epist. arel. 18: MGH Epist. 3.25–28 (3 December 462).

d Faustus was still alive in the 490s when Gennadius of Marseilles published his *De viris illustribus*, see Vir. ill. 86.

e Graecus was still alive in 475, when he served on an embassy to Euric, king of the Visigoths (Sid. Apoll. Epist. 7.7); HEINZELMANN, Prosopographie (above, n. 10) p. 618, suggests that Graecus still was alive c. 492/496.

f Ingenuus of Embrun was still alive in late 465, when he was healthy enough to attend a council in Rome (THIEL, Epistolae no. 15 p. 159–165).

g Julianus of Avignon was represented by the priest Pompeius at the council of Agatha in 506 (Corp. chr. lat. 148.214), perhaps because he was elderly. Sidonius Apollinaris, moreover, corresponded (Epist. 9.5) with a bishop Julianus who lived near Lyons, in a barbarian kingdom other than the Visigothic kingdom, probably the Burgundian kingdom. This would be consistent with the see of Avignon. The very junior bishop Julianus who attended the council of Arles c. 470, therefore, may have been bishop of Avignon, and still alive in 506.

h According to his *vita*, Marcellus was bishop for forty-six years, see AASS April I pp. 824–826, F. DOLBEAU ed., *La vie en prose de saint Marcel, évêque de Die. Histoire du texte et édition critique*, in: Francia 11 (1983) 97–130 at p. 117–120, and G. KIRNER, *Due vite inedite de s. Marcello vescovo di Die*, in: Studi storici 9 (1900) 289–327.

i Petronius was succeeded by his brother Marcellus in 463 (above, n. 11).

j Rusticus was succeeded by Hermes in 461, it seems: see Hilarus of Rome, Epist. »Quamquam notitiam« = Epist. arel. 18: MGH Epist. 3.24–28, which indicates that Rusticus was succeeded by Hermes at just about the time that Leo of Rome died (viz. in 461); see also DUCHESNE, *Fastes* 2.303 and HEINZELMANN, Prosopographie 685.

k Theodorus was the subject of the council of Arles c. 451/452, and he wrote a letter of his own to Leo of Rome at about the same time (see Leo, Epist. »Sollicitudinis quidem«: MIGNE PL 54.1011); HEINZELMANN, Prosopographie 704 suggests that Theodorus still was alive after 455.

Known/estimated dates and names of sees	Attended council of Riez (439) ²	Attended council of Orange (441) ³	Attended council of Vaison (442) ⁴	Consecrators of Ravennius of Arles (449) ⁵	Arles privilege supporters (450) ⁶	Signed letter to Leo (451/452) ⁷	Attended council of Arles (c. 451/2) ⁸	Letter of Ceretius et al. (c. 452) ⁹	Attended council on Mamertus (463) ¹⁰	Attended council of Arles (c. 470) ¹¹
450 -- (Supporters of Arles) -----						...				
451/452 -- (Letter to Leo) -----						Venantius				
<i>Vienne</i>									Mamertus	
<i>Lyons</i>									Patiens	
<i>Vence</i>									Veranus	
c. 451/452 -- (Ordinations of Mamertus, Patiens, Veranus) -----										
c. 452 -- (Letter of Ceretius et al. to Leo) -----								Veranus		
<i>Riez</i>										
<i>Trois-Châteaux</i>										
<i>Besançon</i>									Faustus	Auxanius
<i>Marseilles</i>									Auxanius	Faustus
<i>Orange</i>									Proculus	
									Ausonius	
									Paulus	Paulus
									Memorialis	
									Caelestius	
									Projectus	
463 -- (Council on Mamertus) -----										
<i>Die</i>									Eutropius	Megethius
463 -- (Ordination of Marcellus) -----									Avitianus	Graecus
<i>Nîmes</i>									Ursus	Eutropius
<i>Aix</i>									Leontius	
										Leontius
										Claudius
										Marcellus
										Crocus
										Basilius
										Claudius
										Ursicinus
										Praetextatus
										Pragmatius
										Theoplastus
										Leucadius
										Viventius
										Julianus
										Amicalis
										Johannes
										Opilio
										Licinius

***** = Name appears in list, but not in expected hierarchical position.
 #/# = Represented at a council, but did not actually attend.

1 For the sees of these bishops, see, in general, DUCHESNE, *Fastes* (above, n. 5) *passim* and the section *Identifying Episcopal Sees* above. Of these ten documents, only the councils of Orange (441) and Vaison (442) give the bishops' sees.
 2 Council of Riez (adjourned 29 November 439): Corp. chr. lat. 148.71-72.
 3 Council of Orange (convened 8 November 441): *ibid.* pp. 87-90. The list of subscriptions of this council survives in at least six different orders in at least nine different manuscripts. Comparison with the lists of other councils (see table above) indicates that the double-column list of ms. P (Paris, late ninth century) is correct. In this list the copyist inserted the name of Auspicius out of place above the second column, but its correct position is given in some of the other manuscripts. The confusion seems to have arisen when double-column lists were recopied into single-column form. For discussion, see R. MATHISEN, *A Reconstruction of the List of Subscriptions to the Council of Orange* (A. D. 441), in: *Annuaire historique conciliaire* 20 (1988) 1-12.
 4 Council of Vaison (convened 13 November 442): *ibid.* p. 102.
 5 Ravennius' consecrators (assembled soon after 5 May 449, the date Hilary died): Leo, Epist. »Iusta et rationabilis« = Epist. arel. 9; MGH Epist. 3.15 (sent 26 August 449).
 6 Response of Leo of Rome to the Gallic letter in support of the rights of Arles: Leo, Epist. »Lectis dilectionis« = Epist. arel. 13; MGH Epist. 3.18-20 (5 May 450). The Gallic letter may have been written as early as late 449.
 7 Gallic response, sponsored by Ravennius of Arles, to Leo of Rome's »Tome«. The names appear both in the letter of the Gallic bishops to Leo (Corp. chr. lat. 148.107-110: probably late 451) and in Leo's response (Epist. »Optasemus quidem«, Migne PL 54.984: 1 February 452). The first nineteen names appear in the same order in the salutation and subscription of the Gallic letter and in the salutation of

Leo's response. The remaining twenty-five names, however, have serious problems; they not only appear in different orders, but most of these individuals also are otherwise unknown, and, indeed, may not even actually have been present. Therefore, only relevant names from this second group are included here, with omissions indicated by ellipses. The order used is that of the subscriptions to the Gallic letter.

8 Council of Arles of c. 451/452: Corp. chr. lat. 148.133. This meeting seems to have occurred at the same time that the Gauls wrote the aforementioned letter to Leo; note the anomalous appearance of Rusticus of Narbonne, and, it seems, some of his suffragans, on both occasions.

9 Letter sent by Ceretius of Grenoble, Salonius of Geneva, and Veranus of Vence to Leo of Rome commenting on the latter's »Tome«, presumably at the same time as the similar letter sent by other Gallic bishops, that is, c. 452 (Migne PL 54.887).

10 Council considering the case of bishop Mamertus of Vienne (October or November, 463). The attendees are listed in the addressees of Hilarius of Rome's Epist. »Sollicitus admodum« = Epist. arel. 21: MGH Epist. 3.30-32, dated 25 February 464. A bishop Antonius of an unknown see, who reported to Hilarius, also attended, but does not appear among the addressees. He perhaps is the Antonius who appears among the consecrators of Ravennius in 449. The council presumably had met late in the previous year, the customary time for councils to meet.

11 Council of Arles (c. 470): Corp. chr. lat. 148.159; C.S.E.L. 21.165; MGH Auct. ant. 8.290. Two manuscripts have Euphronius first followed by Leontius, whereas another has this order reversed. The principle of *lectio difficilior* would suggest that the name of Euphronius should take precedence.