

(18) 18.216.5

Κορινθίῳ ἀνδρί, ὄνομα Αἰσχύλῳ, παῖς ἦν Ἀκταίων...

Actaeon in the story is Corinthian Aeschylus' boyfriend, not his son. Read therefore παιδικὰ for παῖς, which cannot itself bear the required sense. Compare also the opening of the following, parallel story of Periander: Περιάδρῳ τῷ Ἀμβρακιώτῃ τυράννῳ παιδικὰ ἦν... (217.2-3).

(19) 20.254.6

(Darius robs the tomb; cf. Herodotus 1.187)...καὶ τὸν μὲν χρυσὸν οὐχ εὔρεν, ἐπίγραμμα δὲ ἔνδοθεν ἐπὶ τῷ ταφῷ ὃ νεκρὸς λέγει· ὡ πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἀπληστότατε...

The construction here seems very strained. The correction found in the sixteenth-century manuscripts and the *editio princeps*, to ὁ νεκρὸς λέγει, is easier. On the other hand, it is strictly the inscription that 'speaks', not the corpse (cf. Hdt 1.187: καὶ γράμματα λέγοντα τὰδε). Therefore delete νεκρὸς, as an illegitimate anticipation of νεκροῦ below in line 7.

King's College London

M. B. TRAPP

THE EARLY CAREER OF THE *MAGISTER EQUITUM* JACOBUS

Claudian's *carm. min. 50* which is addressed 'In Jacobum Magistrum Equitum' has recently been the subject of a detailed study by J. Vanderspoel.¹ In it he reviews what little we know about the career of Jacobus using as his second source in this matter the letter of Vigilius, bishop of Tridentum, to John Chrysostom, bishop of Constantinople, the heading of which reports that the relics of the martyrs Sisinnius, Alexander and Martyrius reached Constantinople 'per Jacobum virum illustrem'.² Whilst I am willing to accept the argument that the relics must have been delivered by about A.D. 400, if not earlier, and that Jacobus received the office of *magister equitum* subsequent to this, I have some misgivings about the treatment afforded the earlier career of Jacobus, and it is to this matter which I wish to draw attention here.

Whereas Vanderspoel is careful to distinguish between the rank attributed to Jacobus in the heading of Vigilius' letter to Chrysostom and the internal evidence of the letter itself in this matter he does not subject *carm. min. 50* to the same scrutiny.³ Nowhere does he explain why within this work entitled 'In Jacobum Magistrum Equitum' Claudian addresses Jacobus as *dux*.⁴ These were two distinct military ranks and some explanation ought to be forthcoming on this point. It seems to me that the most obvious explanation of this discrepancy lies in a distinction between the real and dramatic dates of this work. Claudian is addressing Jacobus at that stage in his career

¹ J. Vanderspoel, 'Claudian, Christ and the Cult of the Saints', *CQ* 36 (1986), 244-55.

² T. Ruinart, *Acta Martyrum* (Ratisbon, 1859), pp. 626-30.

³ J. Vanderspoel, art. cit., p. 248.

⁴ 1.2, 'ne laceres versus, dux Iacobe, meos', repeated again as 1.14. The matter is touched upon by G. Brummer, 'Wer war Jacobus? Zur Deutung von Claudian *C.M.* 50', *BZ* 65 (1972), 339-52, p. 349, but ignored by *PLRE II*, pp. 581-2. T. D. Barnes, 'Late Roman Prosopography: between Theodosius and Justinian', *Phoenix* 37 (1983), 248-70, p. 267 corrects *PLRE II* in the date it attributes to the translation of the relics by Jacobus but fails to tackle the more fundamental problems of Jacobus' rank and the exact nature of the role he played in this translation of relics.

when he is only a *dux*, although the work itself was composed when he had reached the rank of *magister equitum*.

This is surely also the logical conclusion of Vanderspoel's own beliefs concerning *carm. min. 50*. He believes it to have been composed in A.D. 403 in reply to an attack by Jacobus upon Claudian's earlier work *De Bello Getico*.⁵ The most obvious reply for Claudian to make was to attack Jacobus' performance during this war itself or in the period leading up to it. To attack his conduct presently in A.D. 403 would have completely missed the point. Thus the logic of the matter, disregarding totally the discrepancy in titles attributed to Jacobus, dictates that a distinction be made between the real and the dramatic dates of this work.

Let us turn now to the subject matter of *carm. min. 50*. It is a criticism of the excessive devotion of Jacobus to the cult of the saints. Vigilius' letter to Chrysostom would seem to support this depiction of Jacobus in so far as it describes his role in the translation of relics to Constantinople. The question which we must ask ourselves here is whether in fact these two pieces of evidence are more connected than is usually assumed. It is not unreasonable to suggest that the subject matter of *carm. min. 50* was inspired by the knowledge of Claudian that Jacobus had been involved in the translation of the relics of Sisinnius, Alexander and Martyrius to Constantinople. Certainly in so far as all the saints he names in this work were stock figures whose names would have been familiar to all, pagan and christian, as symbolic of the cult of saints in general it cannot be argued that he had in mind some other particular event of Jacobus' life. In short there is the possibility that this poem is addressed to the *dux* Jacobus at the time of his involvement in the translation of the relics to Constantinople.

It is appropriate at this stage to consider in more detail Jacobus' rank of *dux*. Of where was he *dux*? As Sisinnius, Alexander and Martyrius were martyred at Anaunia in North Italy the most reasonable suggestion is that he was *dux* in the North Italian region. Strictly speaking Italy itself, including some of the Alps, was under the military control of the *comes Italiae*.⁶ However there was a *dux* in command of the forces within Raetia Prima, that province which borders on the central part of North Italy. In fact he held military command of both Raetia Prima and Raetia Secunda.⁷ Yet there is far stronger evidence for identifying Jacobus as the *dux* of these two provinces than that provided by a general geographical consideration of the problem. In his poem Claudian expresses the wish for Jacobus that the saints should defend the Alps from barbarian attack, and that those who dared to cross the Danube should perish like the forces of the Pharaoh.⁸ These wishes define the area under control of the *dux Raetiae Primae et Secundae*. The northern border of Raetia Secunda was defined by the path of the upper Danube. Raetia Prima was located centrally within the Alps. It is not unreasonable therefore to understand Claudian as addressing Jacobus in the role of *dux Raetiae Primae et Secundae*.

Reasoning in this manner the conclusion must be that it was as *dux Raetiae Primae et Secundae* that Jacobus arranged the translation of the relics to Constantinople. What, then, do we make of the following of Jacobus in the letter of Vigilius to Chrysostom, 'comitivam reclinatorum in Christi comitibus dignitatem'? Vanderspoel thinks these words imprecise but accepts that they indicate that Jacobus was a

⁵ J. Vanderspoel, art. cit., p. 254.

⁶ *Notitia Dignitatum*, Oc. V. 127; Oc. XXIV.

⁷ *Notitia Dignitatum*, Oc. V. 139; Oc. XXXV.

⁸ 5-8: 'sic ope sanctorum non barbarus inruat Alpes, / sic tibi det vires sancta Susanna suas / sic quicumque ferox gelidum transnaverit Histrum / mergatur volucres ceu Pharaonis equi.'

Christian officer of some type, possibly a *comes*.⁹ This is a little less rigorous than his predecessors who insist that he was a *comes*.¹⁰ However such a description is not incompatible with the assertion that Jacobus was a *dux* at the time of the translation of the relics. It may very well have been the case that he was *comes et dux*, a combination of titles which seems to have been in vogue at this period.¹¹

The identification of Jacobus as the military commander of the two Raetias casts new light also upon his supposed attack upon Claudian's *De Bello Getico*. It is possible, of course, that Jacobus fancied himself as a man of letters and that he had found fault with the literary quality of this work. It is much more likely, though, that he was offended by its contents. Among other things it describes a visit by Stilicho to Raetia during the winter of A.D. 401/2 in order to suppress a Vandal incursion and raise troops.¹² The obvious suggestion is that Claudian greatly exaggerated the part played by Stilicho in the suppression of this incursion, and that it was Jacobus to whom the credit was really due for the successful defence of Raetia. Suitably annoyed, therefore, Jacobus made his attack upon Claudian's work, the attack which prompted Claudian to respond with *carm. min. 50*.

It may strike the reader as somewhat unusual that the commander of a frontier district, a *dux*, should abandon the area under his command and undertake a lengthy journey abroad, to the eastern capital Constantinople in this case. It should be pointed out, though, that there is no real evidence to support the contention that Jacobus personally escorted the relics to Constantinople. The title of Vigilius' letter merely states that it was through the agency of Jacobus that the relics reached Constantinople. The text of the letter itself is no more enlightening on this subject.¹³ We learn merely that Jacobus had requested the relics from Vigilius, and that he was, in a vague sense, responsible for their translation to Chrysostom. Nowhere is it explicitly stated that Jacobus himself travelled to Constantinople. Jacobus' role in this matter is, I believe, to be compared to that of Iunius Soranus, *dux Scythiae*, in the translation of the relics of the Gothic martyr Sabas to Caesarea in Cappadocia c. A.D. 372.¹⁴ He procured the relics, and arranged for their transportation, but did not himself accompany them on the journey to Cappadocia. Despite this he was still held fully responsible in this matter by Basil of Caesarea, and thanked accordingly.¹⁵ Vigilius' words concerning Jacobus are to be understood in the same manner.

There is absolutely no evidence to support the contention that it was as a reward for the translation of the relics to Constantinople that Jacobus received the office of *magister equitum*.¹⁶ It is just as probable that this was natural career progression totally unrelated to the matter in hand. It may even have been due to his successful defence of Raetia as already described. The underlying assumption of the reward theory is that the translation of the relics to Constantinople had been directly authorised by the emperor himself.¹⁷ Against this one must consider the absence

⁹ J. Vanderspoel, art. cit., p. 248.

¹⁰ G. Brummer, op. cit., passim; *PLRE II*, p. 581.

¹¹ *PLRE I*, p. 527, Macedonius 8, 'comes et dux Tripolitanae'; p. 570, Mauricius 2, 'comes et dux Thebaidos', A.D. 367/375; *PLRE II*, p. 779, Nestorius 3, 'comes et dux Tripolitanae', A.D. 406; p. 1101, Theodosius 10, 'comes et dux Thebaidos'.

¹² *De Bell. Get.* 278–403.

¹³ Ch. I, T. Ruinart, op. cit., p. 626.

¹⁴ *Passio S. Sabae*, ch. VI, T. Ruinart, op. cit., p. 619.

¹⁵ Basil, *Ep.* 165.

¹⁶ J. Vanderspoel, art. cit., p. 249.

¹⁷ T. D. Barnes, art. cit., p. 267, speculates even that Jacobus was really on a diplomatic mission of some sort.

within Vigilius' letter of any reference whatsoever to the emperor. Contrast this with the evidence concerning the translation of the relics of Luke and Andrew to Constantinople by Artemius at the command of Constantius II. It is the name of Artemius that the sources tend to omit, not that of the emperor.¹⁸ The lack of reference to the emperor inclines me therefore to believe that Jacobus' involvement in this affair was a purely personal matter.

That Jacobus' interest in the martyrs of Anaunia was personal rather than official helps explain an important problem. Anaunia lay within the Alpine region of the province of Venetia and Histria rather than Raetia Prima. Militarily it was under the jurisdiction of the *comes Italiae*. Accordingly if the emperor had wanted this matter attended to by the senior military commander it was upon the *comes Italiae* that he should have called, not the *dux Raetiae Primae et Secundae*. That Jacobus' interest in this matter was personal only explains away what would otherwise have seemed to be a procedural error, a deliberate snub even to the *comes Italiae*.

Last but not least we should consider *carm. min. 50* itself once more. Would Claudian have mocked Jacobus' devotion to the cult of the saints if it had seemed in any way to have gained the stamp of imperial approval such as indicated by official appointment to command the translation of relics to Constantinople? Surely not.

In this manner it can be shown that due consideration of Claudian's description of Jacobus as *dux* may lead to an entirely new understanding of *carm. min. 50* and the early career of Jacobus. Jacobus, it can be argued, was *comes et dux Raetiae Primae et Secundae* at the time that he arranged for the translation of the relics of the martyrs of Anaunia to Constantinople, and that he did so not because of any imperial commission in the matter but because of his personal devotion to the cult of the saints. The force of Claudian's attack upon Jacobus is that at a time when the commanders of the North Italian region should have been readying their defences for the eventuality of war he was wasting his time on matters of private concern only. The attack is a little unfair, based as it is upon hindsight, but no less effective for this.

The Queen's University of Belfast

DAVID WOODS

¹⁸ Jerome, *Chron. a. 357*; *De Vir. Ill. 7*.