CORA Cork Open Research Archive
Cartlann Taighde Oscailte Chorcaí

Title	Ammianus and some Tribuni Scholarum Palatinarum c. A.D. 353-364
Authors	Woods, David
Publication date	1997-05-01
Original Citation	Woods, D., 1997. Ammianus and some tribuni scholarum palatinarum c. A.D. 53–364. The Classical Quarterly (New Series), 47, pp.269-291 doi:10.1093/cq/47.1.269
Type of publication	Article (peer-reviewed)
Link to publisher's version	10.1093/cq/47.1.269
Rights	© 1997 The Classical Association.
Download date	2026-11-05 22:36:54
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/160

UCC
University College Cork, Ireland
Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh

Classical Quarterly 47 (i) 269–291 (1997) *Printed in Great Britain*

AMMIANUS AND SOME *TRIBUNI SCHOLARUM PALATINARUM* *c.* A.D. 353–64

The *Res Gestae* of Ammianus Marcellinus is a major source of our knowledge of the late Roman army.[1] However, although himself a former army officer, it was not the intention of Ammianus to explain the institutions and organization of the late Roman army to his readers.[2] We learn about these only from the incidental pieces of information which are scattered throughout his text. It was not his intention either to present us with the regimental histories of any individual units, yet repeated references to the more prominent and prestigious units were inevitable in a history such as his. This was particularly true in the case of the *scholae palatinae* because of their role as the bodyguard units of the emperors. It is my intention here to draw together such information as Ammianus provides about the *scholae* in order to demonstrate how, in a number of cases in particular, it is possible to reconstruct an almost complete list of their commanders for the period *c.*353–64. I also wish to draw attention to the existence of some notable omissions in this respect, and the potential significance of the same.

A few brief introductory remarks are necessary, first, concerning the role and structure of the *scholae palatinae*. The *scholae* were all cavalry units, each containing about 500 men under the overall command a single tribune.[3] Our most important source for their number and seniority is the *Notitia Dignitatum*, a composite document whose description of the administration of the eastern empire was probably composed *c.*394, while that of the western empire was apparently composed at a somewhat later date, and subjected to periodic and partial revision into the 420s.[4] The eastern section shows seven *scholae palatinae* subject to the authority of the eastern *magister officiorum*, while the western lists only five under the command of the

[1] No treatment of any aspect of the late Roman army can fail to utilize this work as a primary source. More detailed treatments of Ammianus' role as a military historian include G. A. Crump, *Ammianus Marcellinus as a Military Historian* (*Historia, Einzelschriften* 27; Wiesbaden, 1975), and N. J. E. Austin, *Ammianus on Warfare: An Investigation into Ammianus' Military Knowledge* (*Collection Latomus* 165; Brussels, 1979). See also J. F. Matthews, *The Roman Empire of Ammianus* (London, 1989), pp. 279–303. The most comprehensive treatment of the late Roman army remains that by D. Hoffmann, *Das Spätrömische Bewegungsheer und die Notitia Dignitatum* (*Epigraphische Studien* 7; 2 vols, Düsseldorf, 1969–70) (*DSB* henceforth). More recent general works include P. Southern and K. R. Dixon, *The Late Roman Army* (London, 1996), and H. Elton, *Warfare in Roman Europe* A.D. 350–425 (Oxford, 1996).

[2] On the origin and career of Ammianus, see E. A. Thompson, *The Historical Work of Ammianus Marcellinus* (Cambridge, 1947), pp. 1–19; Matthews, op. cit. (n. 1), pp. 67–80. *Contra* Matthews see the review of this work by G. W. Bowersock, *JRS* 80 (1990), 244–50, esp. 247–8; T. D. Barnes, 'Ammianus Marcellinus and his World', *CPh* 88 (1993), 55–70, esp. 57–61; C. W. Fornara, 'Studies in Ammianus Marcellinus, I: The Letter of Libanius and Ammianus' Connections with Antioch', *Historia* 41 (1992), 328–44. In reply again, see J. F. Matthews, 'The Origin of Ammianus', *CQ* 44 (1994), 252–69.

[3] For a description of the early history and organization of the *scholae palatinae*, see R. I. Frank, *Scholae Palatinae: The Palace Guards of the Later Roman Empire* (*Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome* 23: Rome, 1969); also, more authoritatively, Hoffmann, *DSB I* (n. 1), pp. 279–303, and *DSB II*, pp. 117–28.

[4] On the dating of this document see most recently W. Siebt, 'Wurde die "*Notitia Dignitatum*" 408 von Stilicho in Auftrag gegeben?', *MIOEG* 90 (1982), 339–46; also, J. C. Mann, 'The *Notitia Dignitatum*—Dating and Survival', *Britannia* 22 (1991), 215–19.

western *magister officiorum*.[5] The most notable feature of these lists is the occurrence of several homonymous or similarly entitled *scholae* in both east and west. This has led scholars to assume that a number of original *scholae* were each divided at some point in time to create a pair of homonymous or similarly entitled units, one of which served in the west, the other in the east.[6] In so far as this seems to presuppose the division of a previously unified empire between western and eastern emperors also, it is generally assumed that this division occurred in 364 when the emperors Valens and Valentinian I divided their forces between them.[7] It is my assumption, therefore, that there were only five *scholae palatinae* in existence for the period to which this paper relates: the *schola scutariorum prima*, the *schola scutariorum secunda*, the *schola scutariorum clibanariorum*, the *schola armaturarum*, and the *schola gentilium*.[8] Furthermore, their occurrence in the *Notitia* suggests that this was their order of seniority also, with the *schola scutariorum prima* as their most senior, and the *schola gentilium* as their most junior.

Let us return now to the immediate subject of this paper, the tribunes of the *scholae palatinae* as preserved in Ammianus' text, beginning with the tribunes of the two *scholae scutariorum*.[9] The first *tribunus scutariorum* to make his appearance in the surviving books of the *Res Gestae* is Scudilo. In 354 he was accused with other Alamannic officers within the Roman forces of passing vital information to his fellow tribesmen against whom the emperor Constantius II was then campaigning (Amm. 14.10.8). If, as seems generally accepted, this Scudilo is identifiable as the Scolidoas

[5] *ND Or.* 11.4–10; *ND Oc.* 9.4–8. See D. Woods, 'The *Scholae Palatinae* and the *Notitia Dignitatum*', *JRMES* 7 (1996), forthcoming, for a fuller account of how individual *scholae* were transferred between the two halves of the empire at the turn of the fourth and fifth centuries, and how their total number rose from ten to thirteen during the same period. On the role of the *magister officiorum* see M. Clauss, *Der Magister Officiorum in der Spätantike (4.–6. Jahrhundert): Das Amt und sein Einfluss aus der kaiserliche Politik* (*Vestigia* 32: Munich, 1980), pp. 40–5.

[6] So the existence of the eastern *schola scutariorum prima* (*ND Or.* 11.4) and its western homonym (*ND Oc.* 9.4) point to the division of a single original *schola scutariorum prima*, while the existence of the eastern *schola scutariorum secunda* (*ND Or.* 11.5) and its western homonym (*ND Oc.* 9.5) point to the division of a *schola scutariorum secunda*. In the other cases the products of these divisions seem to have been distinguished by the addition of the titles *seniores* or *iuniores*. So the eastern *schola armaturarum iuniorum* (*ND Or.* 11.9) and the western *schola armaturarum seniorum* (*ND Oc.* 9.6) point to the division of an original *schola armaturarum*, while the eastern *schola gentilium iuniorum* (*ND Or.* 11.10) and the western *schola gentilium seniorum* (*ND Oc.* 9.7) point to the division of an original *schola gentilium*. The anomalous eastern *schola gentilium seniorum* (*ND Or.* 11.6) represents a transfer for a period to the east of the western *schola gentilium seniorum*. The original *schola scutariorum clibanariorum* remained undivided in the east (*ND Or.* 11.8).

[7] See R. S. O. Tomlin, '*Seniores–Iuniores* in the Late-Roman Field Army', *AJPh* 93 (1972), 253–78; Hoffmann, *DSB I* (n. 1), pp. 117–30. A more recent discovery reveals that undue importance has been attached to the division of the army between Valens and Valentinian I in 364, and that some *seniores–iuniores* pairs of units probably existed before this date. See T. Drew-Bear, 'A Fourth-century Latin Soldier's Epitaph at Nakolea', *HSCPh* 81 (1977), 257–74. This does not prove, though, that all *seniores–iuniores* pairs must have existed before 364, and in the case of the *scholae palatinae* at least the evidence seems as compelling as ever that it was that particular year which saw their division.

[8] On the origin of the *schola scutariorum sagittariorum* (*ND Or.* 11.7), see D. Woods, 'Subarmachius, Bacurius, and the *Schola Scutariorum Sagittariorum*', *CPh* 91 (1996), 365–71.

[9] In the absence of evidence to the contrary, I assume that when Ammianus refers to a *tribunus scutariorum* he means by this a tribune of either the *schola scutariorum prima* or the *schola scutariorum secunda*. Likewise, whenever I mention the *scholae scutariorum* as such, I refer to these last two units in particular, excluding the *schola scutariorum clibanariorum*.

whose action at the battle of Mursa in September 351 is described by the sixth-century historian Zosimus, then it seems probable that he had been *tribunus scutariorum* since September 351 at the latest.[10] Although Scudilo is the first *tribunus scutariorum* to be described as such during the course of the narrative, Ammianus reveals later that a certain Gomoarius had commanded *scutarii*, as *tribunus scutariorum* presumably, when he betrayed the usurper Vetranio to Constantius (Amm. 21.8.1). Since the betrayal of Vetranio occurred at Naisssus on 25 December 350, it is possible that Scudilo had succeeded Gomoarius during the period December 350–September 351. It is equally possible, though, that he commanded the other *schola scutariorum* instead, right from the time that Constantius had first set out against the Vetranio and Magnentius, and no progress in this matter seems possible at present. Whatever the case, Scudilo does not seem to have suffered any lasting consequences as a result of the accusations of collaboration made against him in early 354. Later that same year he was sent, still as *tribunus scutariorum*, to Gallus Caesar in Antioch (Amm. 14.11.11). His purpose was to persuade Gallus to obey the summons to return to Constantius, and in this he succeeded. Gallus left Antioch, was arrested in the Balkans, and met his death by execution on a Dalmatian island off Flanona shortly thereafter (*Cons. Constant.* s.a. 354).

According to Ammianus, the two important agents in the downfall of Gallus—Scudilo and Barbatio—paid with their lives for their involvement. Scudilo died because of an abscess of the liver, and Barbatio was found guilty of plotting against Constantius and executed accordingly, divine retribution allegedly (Amm. 14.11.24). Although in his account of the death of Gallus, Ammianus states that their deaths took place not long afterwards ('non diu postea'), his testimony elsewhere reveals that Barbatio only actually met his death in 359 (Amm. 18.3.1–4). So Scudilo may also have survived for several years longer. In order to determine the approximate date of his death we must turn now to the evidence concerning the other *schola scutariorum*.

A second *tribunus scutariorum*, Bainobaudes, was sent by Constantius to visit Gallus Caesar in Constantinople during 354 also, shortly after the earlier visit by Scudilo (Amm. 14.11.14). But was he the successor of Scudilo, or the tribune rather of the other *schola scutariorum*? Two arguments suggest the latter. Firstly, the time between the successive visits of Scudilo and Bainobaudes to Gallus was so short, i.e. the time it took Gallus to travel from Antioch to Constantinople, that it would have been impossible for Scudilo himself, or news of his death even, to have reached Constantius II in Germany and his successor, or news of his successor's appointment, to have travelled back to Constantinople again, all during this same period of time, which was probably little more than a month.[11] Secondly, Ammianus' own account makes it quite clear that Scudilo's death occurred after that of Gallus, and unless one wishes to suppose, for example, that ill-health forced Scudilo to retire early in favour of Bainobaudes, but that death itself did not occur until some time later, it is impossible to reconcile this account with the succession of Scudilo by Bainobaudes before Gallus' death. Indeed, if Scudilo had actually sickened and died within any short length of time at all of Gallus' death, it is difficult to believe that Ammianus would not have been a little more forthcoming on the subject. As it is, the lack of detail concerning Scudilo's death suggests that the causal connection between this and his deception of Gallus is no more convincing, chronologically at least, than in the case of

[10] Zos. *HN* 2.50.2–3; F. Paschoud (ed.), *Zosime Histoire Nouvelle I* (Paris, 1971), p. 258.

[11] See T. D. Barnes, 'Structure and Chronology in Ammianus, Book 14', *HSCPh* 92 (1989), 413–22.

Barbatio, and Ammianus curtailed any detail on the subject because he realised this himself also. It seems most probable, therefore, that Scudilo and Bainobaudes were *tribuni scutariorum* together in 354, each of a different *schola*.

One must turn next to the situation in 357. A *schola scutariorum* was present with Julian during his campaigning as Caesar in Gaul, and Bainobaudes seems to have been the tribune of this *schola* still in 357.[12] He was sent with the future emperor Valentinian to ambush some barbarian raiders who were returning from a surprise attack upon Lyons (Amm. 16.11.6–7). The raiders managed to escape unharmed because Valentinian and Bainobaudes were prevented from carrying out their commands by Cella, a *tribunus scutariorum* also. He was acting as second-in-command to the *magister peditum* Barbatio, and competition between Barbatio and Julian seems to have been at the heart of this dispute. Whatever the details, Bainobaudes was cashiered and returned in disgrace as a private citizen to his native land. It can be seen, therefore, that Bainobaudes was tribune of one of the *scholae scutariorum* for the period 354–7 at least. In 354 Scudilo was *tribunus scutariorum* also, but by 357 Cella was Bainobaudes' fellow *tribunus scutariorum*. The obvious inference is that Cella rose to command the same *schola* as Scudilo, although there is no requirement that he did so immediately upon Scudilo's death. We do not know that Scudilo died as *tribunus scutariorum*. As he had already held this post since 351 at latest, a further promotion may well have been due by the end of 354, especially since he had performed so well in the Gallus affair. In so far as Cella seems to have accompanied Barbatio from the start of his campaign in 357, he had presumably gained his appointment by the end of 356 at latest. He died in 359 near Acimincum in Valeria (Amm. 19.11.16). He had accompanied Constantius to a ceremony at which the emperor was supposed to accept the surrender of the Limigantes as tributaries of the empire. However, the Limigantes made a surprise attack against the tribunal where Constantius stood. Cella was one of the first to rush to his defence and paid the price of this bravery with his life. The important point as far as we are here concerned is that neither his length in office, nor his manner of leaving, require us to assume that he necessarily attained that post long before he is first known to have held it. Strictly speaking, therefore, it is possible that a third person was *tribunus scutariorum* between Scudilo and Cella, for a little over two years at most from the end of 354 until the end of 356.

Let us return now to the *schola scutariorum* which accompanied Julian in Gaul. Who replaced Bainobaudes following his dismissal in 357? Ammianus does not tell us directly, but in 358 Julian sent the *tribunus scutariorum* Nestica to capture an Alamann to act as a guide for his army against the Alamannic king Hortarius (Amm. 17.10.5). It is clear from the context that Nestica must have succeeded Bainobaudes as tribune of the *schola scutariorum* which was present with Julian. Unfortunately, no further mention is made of Nestica and his end must remain a mystery.

The next *tribunus scutariorum* of whom we learn is Agilo. He was an Alamann, and had been one of those accused with Scudilo of passing information to the enemy in 354, at which time he had been *tribunus stabuli*. During the spring of 360 he was promoted in replacement of Ursicinus to the post of *magister peditum in praesenti*. Ammianus describes his promotion as an extraordinary advancement, and in so far as he describes him only as a former tribune of the *gentiles* and *scutarii*, it would seem that he was promoted directly from *tribunus scutariorum* to *magister peditum*.[13]

[12] On Julian's *scutarii*: Amm. 16.4.1 (356); 20.4.3 (360).

[13] Amm. 20.2.5: 'Agilone ad eius locum immodico saltu promoto, ex gentilium et scutariorum

Unfortunately, Ammianus does not to provide any detailed information concerning the whereabouts of Agilo at the time of his promotion, or the identities of his predecessors or successors in either of his previous commands. We are therefore forced to rely upon indirect indications in order to determine whom Agilo replaced as *tribunus scutariorum*, Cella or Nestica.

The timing of the promotion from *tribunus scutariorum* to *magister peditum* provides us with our first clue in this matter. If Agilo had replaced Cella as *tribunus scutariorum* his tenure of the post could hardly have lasted a year before his extraordinary promotion as *magister peditum*. On the face of it, it does not seem particularly likely that having promoted him once already, Constantius should promote Agilo again, and to such a height, all within a space of approximately a year. It would seem much more probable, therefore, that Agilo was tribune of the other *schola scutariorum*, that which accompanied Julian, and that he had replaced Nestica. At least, then, he would have been nearer two years in his post, with growing expectations of future promotion. Indeed, the immediate presence and availability of Agilo supports this interpretation of events also. For he had been tribune of the *gentiles*, and as will be discussed in more detail shortly, the *schola gentilium* was present with Julian throughout the period 356–60 at least.[14] So it seems a simpler and more probable explanation of events that it was Nestica whom Agilo replaced.

Nestica was *tribunus scutariorum* in 358, but there is no mention of him after that date. It seems a not unreasonable assumption that he met his death shortly after his one mission which Ammianus records, probably during Julian's campaign that same year, although death through illness in the manner of Scudilo is a possibility that cannot be excluded. The latter would explain the absence of even a short notice to commemorate the death of this brave soldier. Whatever the case, we must now seek an explanation for the transfer of Agilo from the court of Julian to that of Constantius, if the sequence of events as already outlined is to seem at all credible. Fortunately, a clear explanation of this transfer does indeed present itself.

An important factor in the successful revolt by Julian in Gaul during the spring of 360 was the decision by Constantius to recall many of Julian's troops to assist him in his forthcoming campaign against the Persians.[15] It is important to note how it was proposed to perform this transfer of forces, which units first raised the standard of revolt, and why it was that these units revolted. It was the intention to accomplish the transfer of troops in two stages. The orders were that the *magister equitum* Lupicinus was to return to Constantius with the auxiliary forces, including the *Heruli*, *Batavi*,

tribuno'. The reading and interpretation of the text here is much disputed. See Hoffmann, *DSB I* (n. 1), p. 294, and *DSB II*, pp. 122–23, n. 850; also J. den Boeft, D. den Hengst, H.C. Teitler, *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XX* (Groningen, 1987), p. 21. The problem centres on the introduction of the word *et* between *gentilium* and *scutariorum*, an amendment to the manuscript reading. Three different interpretations are possible depending whether one retains this *et*. If one retains *et*, then it is possible to interpret this phrase in reference to the successive command of these *scholae*, i.e. command of the *schola gentilium* followed by command of a *schola scutariorum*, as I do here, or in reference to the simultaneous command of both, as Elton, op. cit. (n. 1), p. 91, n. 7, tentatively suggests. Those who reject the *et* prefer to interpret the *tribunus gentilium scutariorum* as that officer more usually described simply as the *tribunus gentilium*.

[14] On Julian's *gentiles*: Amm. 16.4.1 (356); 20.4.3 (360).

[15] For a detailed discussion of the circumstances of this revolt, see J. F. Drinkwater, 'The "Pagan Underground", Constantius II's "Secret Service", and the Survival, and the Usurpation of Julian the Apostate', in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History III* (*Collection Latomus* 180; Brussels, 1983), pp. 348–87.

Celtae, and *Petulantes*, but that Julian's *tribunus stabuli* Sintula was to lead back the best of the *scutarii* and *gentiles* (Amm. 20.4.3). Sintula left first with the *scutarii* and *gentiles*, and the rest were to follow. Since Lupicinus was in Britain at the time, further delay occurred while Julian decided how to proceed in his absence. Eventually, the auxiliary troops began their journey to the east, but their route led them via Paris. There they revolted and crowned Julian as Augustus. Their prime motivation seems to have been a reluctance to leave their native Gaul undefended once more and desert their wives, families, and property for what would undoubtedly be a prolonged and dangerous absence.[16] The revolt succeeded, Julian accepted his new role, and, according to Ammianus, Sintula returned to Paris with the troops under his command (Amm. 20.5.1). It is possible, however, that there was a great deal more to the events of this period than Ammianus' simple account would have us believe.

A number of points are of immediate relevance here. Firstly, Ammianus' account of the return of Sintula to Paris is extremely brief, perhaps even deliberately so. He carefully fails to confirm whether Sintula returned with all his troops, and his failure to discuss how the news of Julian's accession was received in Sintula's camp contrasts noticeably with his detailed account of the support enjoyed by Julian from the auxiliaries. Secondly, the motivation which Ammianus, and others, impute to the auxiliaries for their revolt—their desire to remain in Gaul—simply was not valid in the case of the *scutarii* and *gentiles*, or of the majority of their number at least. The latter were élite troops recruited from throughout the empire, and did not suffer from any particular national or regional loyalties. Unlike auxiliaries such as the *Celtae* or the *Petulantes*, they were hardly likely to have had particularly strong feelings one way or another on the subject of their transfer. It is therefore my contention that there was dissension within Sintula's camp immediately upon receipt of the news of Julian's accession. Although some, including Sintula himself, wished to return to the assistance of Julian, many preferred to continue to Constantius. The opposition to Sintula was led, I believe, by Agilo in his role as *tribunus scutariorum*. He seems to have managed to detach himself and his adherents from Sintula, and hurried to Constantius, mindful no doubt of the phenomenal success which the latter had always enjoyed in civil wars (Amm. 21.7.3).

Strong circumstantial evidence in support of this reconstruction of events is provided by the career of Agilo. His unusual promotion from *tribunus scutariorum* to *magister peditum* no longer seems so mysterious. He was promoted on the basis of his proven loyalty to Constantius at a very dangerous point in time, and because he had deprived Julian of the support of some of the empire's élite troops. Indeed, it was this betrayal of Julian which provoked Ammianus to remark as sharply as he did on the immoderate nature of Agilo's promotion, although he omits any detail because that would reveal that his hero Julian was not quite as popular with the military as he would like us to believe.[17] Agilo's promotion is directly comparable to that of Silvanus who had been promoted from *tribunus scholae armaturarum* to *magister equitum* upon his defection from Magnentius to Constantius in 351, and at a remarkably young age (Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 42.15). Much more explicable also is the progress of Agilo's career under Julian following the death of Constantius. When Julian finally arrrived at Constantinople in December 361 he chose Agilo for an important mission (Amm. 21.12.16). Two legions, together with a cohort of archers, had been transferred by

[16] Amm. 20.4.10, 4.16, 8.7; Lib. *Or.* 18.95

[17] See J. den Boeft *et al.*, op. cit. (n. 13), p. 20, where this remark is also explained as a result of Ammianus' dislike of Alamanns and his admiration of Agilo's predecessor Ursicinus. All three factors were probably at play.

Julian from Sirmium to Gaul shortly beforehand, because he was unsure of their loyalty and did not want them at his immediate rear during his expected engagement with Constantius (Amm. 21.11.2). These units had revolted and seized Aquileia in the name of Constantius. Julian chose Agilo to persuade these units and the townspeople that Constantius was dead and any further resistance was useless. Yet he did so only after earlier attempts to take Aquileia by force had failed, and his commanders on the spot had been unable to persuade the defenders that Constantius really was dead.[18] Agilo seems to have succeeded in this task with relative ease. But why should the defenders have taken his word on the matter when others had failed before him ? Because they knew Agilo's background, that he had originally deserted Julian's cause, and had been richly rewarded as a result.[19] Such a man could hardly have been expected to welcome Julian's rule, and his appearance on Julian's behalf was a sign that resistance to Julian was truly at an end.[20]

More significant still is the quiet disappearance of Agilo from public life early in Julian's reign.[21] The last we hear of him before Julian's death is that he was a member of the so-called commission of Chalcedon during the winter of 361/62 (Amm. 22.3.1). It would have suited both Agilo and Julian that he should serve on this commission. He doubtless enjoyed the opportunity to revenge himself upon various of the former members of Constantius' court. He had probably been present, for example, during Constantius' visit to Amida in 360 when the *comes sacrarum largitionum* Ursulus, a victim of the commission, had made his ill-judged remarks concerning the bravery of the soldiers (Amm. 20.11.5). As for Julian, he was more than willing to let the senior military commanders take the blame for the purge necessary to remove Constantius' former officials from power (Amm. 22.3.8). Agilo's usefulness was at an end following the commission of Chalcedon, and he seems to have been forced to retire. The next we hear of him is that he was called out of retirement to assist Procopius' rebellion against the new emperor Valens in 365 (Amm. 26.7.4). His subsequent betrayal of Procopius during the battle of Nacoleia in 366 reveals the wisdom of Julian in dismissing Julian. He was ever ready for an opportunity to advance his career, and Julian could not have afforded to trust him.

We have now traced the identities of nearly all of the tribunes of both of the *scholae scutariorum* for the period *c.* 353–59. The last two tribunes whom we have identified are Cella who died in 359, and Agilo who was promoted during the spring of 360. Ammianus next mentions the *scholae scutariorum* in his account of the events at Antioch during the winter of 362/63 when Julian was preparing his expedition against the Persians. It is at this point that he reports in brief that Romanus and Vincentius, tribunes of the *schola scutariorum prima* and the *schola scutariorum secunda*

[18] The *magister equitum* Iovinus was originally charged with reducing Aquileia to surrender (Amm. 21.12.2). He may not have learned of the death of Constantius until his assignment elsewhere, but the order for his replacement by the *comes* Immo came from Julian in Constantinople after the death of Constantius (Amm. 21.12.3).

[19] Ammianus' description of Agilo seems to hint that his name had a certain news value at that particular point in time such as might well have been earned by his defection from Julian to Constantius (Amm. 21.12.16): 'Agilonem magistrum peditum ea tempestate probe cognitum'.

[20] *Pace* G. W. Bowersock, *Julian the Apostate* (London, 1978), p. 68, who claims that Agilo 'was a person who accepted with equanimity the fact of Julian's elevation'.

[21] This disappearance has been commented upon, for example, by W. E. Kaegi, 'Domestic Military Problems of Julian the Apostate', *Byzantinische Forschungen* 2 (1967), 247–64, esp. 254, where displeasure at his conduct during the commission of Chalcedon, or fear of his growing power, are mooted as possible reasons for his dismissal by Julian. In general on the trials at Chalcedon, see Thompson, op. cit. (n. 2), pp. 73–9.

respectively, were convicted of designs beyond their powers and exiled as a result (Amm. 22.11.2). Yet the nature of his testimony is such that it raises more questions than it answers. It is difficult to understand how exactly the fates of Romanus and Vincentius relate to other incidents of rebellion or dissension among the palatine units at Antioch during this same period.[22] In particular, it is tempting to identify Ammianus' tribune with a Romanus whose name occurs otherwise only in the ecclesiastical history of Theodoret, but as a participant in an incident whose occurrence seems well established.[23] A number of Christian soldiers, among them a Romanus, had apparently accepted the donative which Julian made to his forces during the New Year festival of 363. During their acceptance of the donative they had cast incense upon a thurible before a portrait of Julian in the company of several pagan gods. When Romanus and his companions realized that they had been tricked into seeming to offer sacrifice to these gods, they returned their donative to Julian, and so angered him that he ordered their execution, a command which was commuted to exile only at the last moment. So two independent sources both relate the punishment in a similar manner of homonymous soldiers, apparently at approximately the same time and place, such that presumption of their common identity becomes tempting indeed. Yet Romanus was an extremely common name, and, most importanly of all, a careful reading of Ammianus reveals that he does not in fact commit himself either to the date or location of the punishment of Romanus and Vincentius.

Ammianus' description of the punishment of Romanus and Vincentius forms part of a larger account of various executions and deaths which begins with a brief notice concerning the execution of the *notarius* Gaudentius and ends with a detailed account of the murder of the Arian bishop George of Alexandria. It is well accepted that George's murder actually occurred on 24 December 361, and that, for whatever reason, Ammianus has misplaced his description of the event, certainly so from a strictly chronological point of view.[24] So did he misplace his descriptions of the other deaths and punishments also? In so far as he specifically alleges that the son of the former *magister equitum* Marcellus was executed on the ground that he had aspired to the throne, one is tempted to associate this death with the political manoeuvrings which took place during the brief period between the death of Constantius on 3 November 361 and the final entrance of Julian into Constantinople on 11 December 361. Moreover, a neglected hagiographical account, the passion of the priest Basil of Ancyra, may well provide the most important evidence in this matter.[25] This alleges that a *comes scutariorum* by the name of Frumentinus participated in the trial and

[22] On the growing resistance to Julian's religious policies among the palatine regiments, and on Ammianus' concealment of this problem, see D. Woods, 'Ammianus Marcellinus and the Deaths of Bonosus and Maximilianus', *Hagiographica* 2 (1995), 25–55; idem, 'Valens, Valentinian I and the *Ioviani Cornuti*', in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History VIII* (*Collection Latomus*: Brussels, 1997), forthcoming.

[23] Theod. *HE* 3.12–3; Soz. *HE* 5.17; Greg. Naz. *Or.* 4.82–4. On the general background to this incident, see M. Gleason, 'Festive Satire: Julian's *Misopogon* and the New Year at Antioch', *JRS* 76 (1986), 106–19.

[24] See J. den Boeft, J. W. Drijvers, D. den Hengst, H.C. Teitler, *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XXII* (Groningen, 1995), p. 201; also D. Woods, 'The Final Commission of Artemius the Former *Dux Aegypti*', forthcoming.

[25] See D. Woods, 'The Martyrdom of the Priest Basil of Ancyra', *Vigiliae Christianae* 46 (1992), 31–9; also, for an opposed view, H. C. Teitler, 'History and Hagiography: the *Passio* of Basil of Ancyra as a Historical Source', *Vigiliae Christianae* 50 (1996), 73–80. I will only say here that we should not require of the author or editor of the surviving *passio* standards any different to those of the surviving historians of late antiquity. Fictitious speeches or miracles no more invitiate the *passio* of Basil than do the speeches and omens the *Res Gestae* of Ammianus.

torture of Basil at Ancyra until his death on 28 June 362. All the other officials named in this text are identifiable as historical persons who may well have participated in the events described, at the exact time and place described. Furthermore, while the description of Frumentinus' rank as *comes scutariorum* is probably anachronistic for 362, by the early fifth century at latest the commanders of the *scholae* did achieve this rank.[26] It seems probable, therefore, that Frumentinus' rank represents the work of a fifth-century editor who updated an original reference to a simple *tribunus scutariorum*.[27] Thus in so far as the account of Basil's martyrdom requires us to accept that there was another *tribunus scutariorum* by June 362, which coincides with the other indicators that Ammianus has misplaced the exile of Romanus and Vincentius, there seems a strong possibility that Frumentinus was the successor, in fact, of one of these officers.

The dismissal of Romanus and Vincentius, whenever exactly it occurred and for whatever reason, points to a strong disagreement with some aspect of Julian's policy. It seems hardly likely, therefore, that it was he who had appointed them to their commands. They were appointees of Constantius II, and the timescale is such that one probably replaced Cella, the other Agilo. So by mid-360 both *scholae scutariorum* were present with Constantius again, and it was he who had chosen their new commanders. For if Agilo had left his *schola scutariorum* behind with Julian during the spring of 360, then Julian would have had the opportunity to promote someone whose views he knew to be far more in line with his own, particularly in the all-important matter of religion. Yet this obviously did not happen.

Our greatest difficulty at this point lies in distinguishing who succeeded whom. Did Romanus succeed Cella and Vincentius Agilo, or vice versa? There can be no certainty in this matter on the basis of the existing evidence. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, it seems not unreasonable to assume that, generally speaking, the senior *schola scutariorum* remained with the senior emperor, the Augustus, and that it was the more junior *schola scutariorum* which was normally assigned to his junior partner, the Caesar. Hence I have assumed that Romanus, tribune of the *schola scutariorum prima*, replaced Cella who died in defence of the person of Constantius Augustus himself, and that Vincentius replaced the newly promoted Agilo as tribune of the *schola scutariorum secunda* which had just returned from escorting Julian Caesar. This agrees with what we know of their later careers when the appointment of Romanus as the *comes Africae* and of Vincentius as his *vicarius* points to the seniority of Romanus over Vincentius.[28] Furthermore, in my appendix to this paper I have tentatively identified Frumentinus as the successor of Romanus, although for the sake of convenience only, since he may well have been the successor of Vincentius instead.

In this manner, it is possible to argue that we can identify nearly all of the tribunes of both of the *scholae scutariorum* from *c.*353 to early 362, using Ammianus alone as our guide. A noticeable omission then occurs. Ammianus fails to inform us of the identities of the two officers who succeeded Romanus and Vincentius, although a neglected Christian source does seem to preserve the name of one of these officers,

[26] C.Th. 6.13.1 (413); *PLRE II*, p. 582, Jacobus 2 (431).

[27] In Woods, art. cit. (n. 25), 35–6, I was unwisely tempted to identify the *comes scutariorum* Frumentinus with the *comes domesticorum* Dagalaifus. In doing so I placed too much emphasis, firstly upon the occurrence of the title *comes*, and secondly upon that phenomenon of late antique literature where an individual is preserved by one name in one source, but by another in a different source (e.g. Gintonius/Sintula of Jul. *Ep. ad Ath.* 282d/Amm. 20.4.3).

[28] See B. H. Warmington, 'The Career of Romanus, *Comes Africae*', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 49 (1956), 55–64, esp. 63.

Frumentinus. This is not in itself uncharacteristic of Ammianus' style. As already indicated, he did not directly inform us either, for example, of the officer who succeeded Bainobaudes when he was cashiered in 357. As I hope that I have already succeeded in demonstrating, however, as the narrative progresses, enough incidental information is usually revealed to enable us to recover more fully the details of such successions. But this does not occur in this case. A slight jump forward in time confirms this. In late 363, shortly after his accession, Jovian appointed the future emperor Valentinian as tribune of the *schola scutariorum secunda* (Amm. 25.10.9). Following the death of Jovian, one of those who was considered as a possible successor was Equitius, the tribune of the *schola scutariorum prima* (Amm. 26.1.4). So we know the identities of the tribunes of both of the *scholae scutariorum* in early 364. However, at no stage is it made clear when exactly Equitius received his commission as tribune of the *schola scutariorum prima*. It is theoretically possible that he directly succeeded Romanus, but it seems more likely that he was newly appointed to his post by Jovian at the same time that Valentinian received his appointment. Not only would it have been entirely natural for a new emperor to change his commanders in this manner, but one must also bear in mind that Equitius was a Pannonian (Amm. 26.1.6). As such he was a fellow provincial of Jovian, and his appointment would fit very well with Jovian's known preferment of his fellow provincials (*Epit. Caes.* 44.1). As far as Ammianus' text is concerned, therefore, we are unable to recover the names of the two *tribuni scutariorum* who accompanied Julian on his Persian expedition. Indeed, one of these individuals seems to have escaped the historical record altogether. But is any special significance to be attached to this fact?

One cannot help but feel that Ammianus has deliberately omitted all reference to the *scholae scutariorum* from his account of events in the summer of 363. It is more than a coincidence, one suspects, that his lengthiest and most detailed description of any imperial campaign should fail to refer even once to these élite units, which were particularly associated with the person of the emperor himself. His failure in this matter is all the more noticeable because of his naming of other, less prestigious units which participated in the same campaign.[29] And it is in the association of the *scholae scutariorum* with the person of the emperor that the answer to this problem may lie. We are fortunate that in his account of the circumstances surrounding the death of the emperor Julian, Zosimus refers specifically to the role played by the two *scholae scutariorum*. He describes first the death of the *magister officiorum* Anatolius in battle with the Persians, and then how, when the praetorian prefect Salutius fell from his horse and fled on a borrowed mount, he was accompanied by the two units of *scutarii* (Zos. *HN* 3.29.3). As Zosimus relates the tale of Julian's death, it would seem that Julian had already returned to his tent and died by the time that Anatolius was killed and Salutius and the *scutarii* were put to flight. He then proceeds to tell how sixty of those put to flight were brave enough to risk death and capture the fort from which the Persians were attacking. Let us consider also, though, the more detailed account by Ammianus.

Although Ammianus does not refer to the *scutarii* as such, it is possible to identify in his text all the other events which Zosimus describes.[30] He too describes the death of Anatolius, the lucky escape of Salutius, and the manner in which some sixty soldiers

[29] *Victores* (Amm. 24.4.23, 25.6.3); *Tertiaci* (Amm. 25.1.7); *Zianni* (Amm. 25.1.19); *Ioviani* (Amm. 25.5.8, 6.2); *Herculiani* (Amm. 25.6.2); *Iovii* (Amm. 25.6.3).

[30] The relationship between the similar but often divergent accounts in Ammianus and Zosimus of Julian's campaign has been discussed in detail, most recently by C. W. Fornara, 'Julian's Persian Expedition in Ammianus and Zosimus', *JHS* 111 (1991), 1–15.

and court officials took refuge in a small fortress (Amm. 25.3.14). More importantly for our reconstruction of the chronological sequence of events, Ammianus reveals that while on his deathbed in his tent Julian requested to speak to Anatolius and was told by Salutius that he had been killed (Amm. 25.3.21). So the encounter in which Anatolius was killed and the *scutarii* fled with Salutius clearly took place before the death of Julian. Indeed, although Ammianus so describes the whole sequence of events as to imply otherwise, much of the evidence can be read to suggest that it was at this very encounter that Julian was himself injured.

Firstly, where else ought the *scutarii* have been other than with the emperor himself? That they closely accompanied the emperor in the field is clear from the death of Cella in 359 in defence of Constantius as already described. On another occasion later, the emperor Valens was attacked while asleep by a certain Sallustius, one of his *scutarii* (Amm. 29.1.16). It is simply unthinkable that the *scutarii* would not also have accompanied Julian, both on and off the battlefield. A second consideration must be the death of Anatolius and the lucky escape of Salutius. These most senior officers should also have been immediately at hand to Julian. Indeed, the most reasonable explanation for the presence of Salutius in Julian's tent as he died is that he had never strayed far from his side in the first place. Furthermore, wherever Anatolius and Salutius were, one would have expected them to be extremely well guarded. The death of Anatolius suggests a severe failure in the performance and command of his escort, i.e. of the escort of headquarters command. In conjunction with the fatal wounding of Julian, this would suggest that there were two abject failures on the part of the empire's élite troops. It is simpler, and more credible, to suppose that there was but one failure, and that this resulted in the fatal injury of Julian in addition to the death of Anatolius and the near death of Salutius, who were in his immediate company, as would have been proper on such occasions. Our third consideration must be the bias of Ammianus. His treatment of Julian is extremely favourable.[31] It would have been entirely within character for him to exaggerate the personal courage of the emperor. His description of Julian's actions before he sustained his injury make it seem that he stood almost single-handedly against the Persians. Dare one suggest, not that Julian was so excited by the Persian attacks upon his army that he rushed to battle without first putting on his coat of mail (Amm. 25.3.3), but that he was so well escorted by his senior officers and the *scholae palatinae* that it had not seemed that he was in any particular personal danger, and that this was the real reason why he had neglected to put on his coat of mail?[32]

Despite the impresssion which Ammianus tries to give, Julian was not injured while rushing round with a handful of men to the location where the Persians were pushing his forces hardest. He was injured rather as leader of a strong body of troops together with his senior commanders who were attempting to reinforce those most vulnerable

[31] On the depiction of Julian as the ideal emperor, see R. C. Blockley, *Ammianus Marcellinus: A Study of His Historiography and Political Thought* (*Collection Latomus* 141: Brussels, 1975), pp. 73–103; also, T. G. Elliott, *Ammianus Marcellinus and Fourth Century History* (Florida, 1983), pp. 69–134.

[32] Libanius agrees that Julian wore no armour when he was attacked, claiming also that he was attended by only one bodyguard (*Or.* 18.269). Elsewhere, however, he tacitly admits the presence of more than one bodyguard because this suits his argument at that time: that the wounding of Julian alone proved that he had been deliberately targeted in an assassination attempt (*Or.* 24.17). The latter admission that Julian had in fact been accompanied by more than one bodyguard, which agrees also with Ammianus' claim that his *candidati* had been momentarily separated from Julian (Amm. 25.3.6), reinforces one's suspicion that more people had actually accompanied Julian on his last ride than either author wishes us to realize.

sections of the Roman lines. The guards whose alarm and confusion exposed him to danger were the very *scholae scutariorum* whose retreat with Salutius is described by Zosimus, in which retreat the injured emperor himself doubtless participated. Our two missing *tribuni scutariorum* must be held responsible for much of this disaster. That alone may explain why Ammianus fails to mention their names. He did not wish to immortalize their memory in his work. Furthermore, a more detailed account of their names and conduct would have drawn attention from his attempt to glorify the manner of Julian's injury and death. Nor must we forget the religious motivation behind Ammianus' presentation of these events. Ultimately, the gods were opposed to Julian's Persian expedition, and it was their opposition which mattered most. The exact names and circumstances of the human tools which they used to their deadly ends were of little consequence.[33]

Finally, perhaps, there remains the mystery concerning the exact identity of Julian's assailant. Ammianus records that he was hit by a cavalryman's spear, and also reports a rumour that it was a Roman weapon, although he is quick to dismiss the latter possibility (Amm. 25.6.5). If this were true, then it was most likely one of the *scutarii* who threw this weapon. Was this a fatal accident in the confusion of battle, or a deliberate assassination attempt? In either case, it would have been in the interest of all to prevent it becoming common knowledge that Julian had been killed by one of his own men. There was a very real danger of civil war had such knowledge become widespread. Was a cover-up instituted by those nearest to Julian, on his instructions even? Whatever the case, the poor conduct of the *scholae scutariorum* was sufficient justification to remove both their tribunes from command, even to discharge them from the army altogether. Julian himself had already taken strong disciplinary action against various tribunes at earlier points in the campaign.[34] The possibility is that our two missing *tribuni scutariorum* fell victims to some such action again, if they were not already dead as a result of that very engagement which they seem to have managed so badly.

It can be seen, therefore, that Ammianus provides us with a great deal of incidental information concerning the *scholae scutariorum* for the period *c.*353–64. Careful analysis of this information may provide further insight into several matters upon which Ammianus did not wish to dwell at length himself. Furthermore, the above reconstruction of the succession of tribunes to both of the *scholae scutariorum* has implications for our reconstruction of the succession of tribunes to command of the *schola gentilium* also. It is appropriate at this point, therefore, to turn to the command of that *schola*.

As stated earlier, there was only one *schola gentilium* during the period *c.*353–64, i.e. until the division of the *scholae* between Valens and Valentinian I in 364. The first *tribunus gentilium* named by Ammianus is the Frank Malarichus. He was present at the court of Constantius during the conspiracy against the *magister peditum* Silvanus in 355 (Amm. 15.5.6). Letters had been forged which purported to show that Silvanus who was then at Cologne in Germany, was plotting to overthrow Constantius. Malarichus strongly protested the innocence of Silvanus, and a forged letter was then produced in his name associating him with Silvanus' alleged plot. The fraudulent nature of these letters was soon discovered, but by then the damage had already been

[33] See J. H. W. G. Liebeschuetz, 'Ammianus, Julian, and Divination', in M. Wisseman (ed.), *Roma Renascens: Beiträge zur Spätantike und Rezeptionsgeschichte. Ilona Opelt von Freunden und Schülern zum 9.7.1988 gewidmet* (Frankfurt, 1988), pp. 198–213.

[34] Against two tribunes: Amm. 24.3.2; against five: Amm. 25.1.8–9.

done. Silvanus was provoked into genuine rebellion, and Constantius was fortunate to be able to quell it within twenty-eight days. Although the fate of Malarichus is not specifically described, there can be little doubt but that Silvanus' rebellion put an end to his career. He was engaged on private business in Italy when he was offered the post of *magister equitum* in Gaul by the newly appointed emperor Jovian in 363 (Amm. 25.8.11), which seems to confirm his dismissal by Constantius, probably during the investigations which followed the death of Silvanus (Amm. 15.6.1–4). He was simply connected too closely with the cause of Silvanus to have escaped the whole episode unscathed.

Again, we are not directly told who replaced Malarichus. Strong circumstantial evidence suggests that the future emperor Valentinian was tribune of the *gentiles* at the time of his dismissal in 357. His association as tribune with Bainobaudes, tribune of the *scutarii*, the normal association of the *scutarii* with the *gentiles*, the distinguished military career of his father, and his own appointment in late 363 as tribune of the *schola scutariorum secunda*, all point to this conclusion.[35] If so, the probability is that he had succeeded Malarichus to this post. Indeed, such a succession, of a Pannonian in replacement of a Frank, makes good sense in a context where the Franks at the imperial court had recently seemed to be acting together almost as a political party. So the appointment of the Pannonian Valentinian as tribune of the *gentiles* can be seen as an attempt to reinforce Roman authority over this unit in the face of a perceived threat, whether real or imaginary. Further evidence in support of this reconstruction of events is provided by the *Vita Martini* of Sulpicius Severus. Martin served in a *schola palatina*, but resigned by about August 356 while participating in Julian's campaign in Gaul.[36] He had delayed his resignation for almost two years after his baptism, at Easter 355 apparently, at the request of his tribune who wanted to complete his time as tribune before resigning with Martin as he had originally promised (Sulp. Sev. *Vit. Mart.* 3.5–6). He seems to have been a newly appointed tribune whose reluctance to carry out his original intention suggests an unexpected reversal of fortune, very like that experienced by Valentinian, who began 355 with no great prospects as the son of a disgraced former officer whose family-estate had just been confiscated (Amm. 30.7.3), but was the tribune of his *schola* by the summer of that year. Finally, the fact that Martin and Valentinian were both Pannonians adds to the plausibility of this conjecture in that their common background would have facilitated a relationship such as, according to the *Vita Martini*,[37] Martin seems to have had with his tribune.

But who replaced Valentinian following his dismissal in 357? We should bear in mind at this point that Agilo was present with Julian during his campaigns in Gaul, and, as earlier argued, had probably replaced Nestica as tribune of the *scutarii* following the latter's death in 358. Of Agilo's early career we know only that he had been tribune both of the *gentiles* and of the *scutarii*. Presumably these appointments followed one after the other without interval. If so, then it would appear that he was tribune of the *gentiles* in 358, at which time he was promoted to replace Nestica. It is most likely, therefore, that he was the immediate successor of Valentinian in the post

[35] For a more detailed discussion of this matter, see D. Woods, 'A Note Concerning the Early Career of Valentinian I', *Ancient Society* 26 (1995), 273–88.

[36] Sulp. Sev. *Vit. Mart.* 2.2. For an excellent discussion of the circumstances and timing of Martin's resignation, see C. Stancliffe, *St Martin and his Hagiographer* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 134–48.

[37] Martin was from Sabaria in Pannonia Prima (Sulp. Sev. *Vit. Mart.* 2.1); Valentinian was from Cibalae in Pannonia Secunda (Amm. 30.7.2).

of tribune of the *gentiles*.

As must be clear by this point, Ammianus provides far less direct information concerning the tribunes of the *schola gentilium* than he does concerning the tribunes of the *scholae scutariorum*. Indeed, although he specifically identifies twelve *tribuni scutariorum* as such for the period 350–78, he identifies only two *tribuni gentilium* as such during the same period.[38] It is therefore far more difficult to attempt to reconstruct the succession of tribunes to the *schola gentilium* than to the *scholae scutariorum*. Yet one further candidate does suggest himself in this matter, probably as the successor of Agilo when the latter was promoted to replace Nestica in 358.

In early 365 Charietto, the *comes per utramque Germaniam*, was killed in action by invading Alamanni (Amm. 27.2.1–6). His career had been somewhat unusual. He was originally a civilian who had decided to take the law into his own hands in defence of Trier and other cities of the Rhine frontier (Zos. *HN* 3.7), sometime before the arrival in Gaul in 355 of Julian as Caesar. His methods proved extremely effective, and Julian gladly availed himself of his services. Apparently Julian placed him in command of some forces, including Salii, but the exact nature of his command is not stated. Ammianus provides us with little further information, except that in 358 Charietto accompanied Nestica, the *tribunus scutariorum*, in his mission to capture an enemy for interrogation (Amm. 17.10.5). Although Ammianus does not state his rank, there can be but little doubt that his position had been formalized and that, as several years had since passed, Charietto was now a full member of the late Roman army.[39] More specifically, his association with Nestica suggests that he was an officer within the *scholae palatinae* also.

It seems hardly likely that Charietto's first official rank within the Roman forces was that of *comes per utramque Germaniam*. What was the military background of men normally appointed to such a post? Whom did Valentinian favour in the appointments which followed his accession to the throne? The tribune of the *schola scutariorum prima* who had been dismissed and exiled by Julian, Romanus, was appointed as *comes Africae*, a post which he retained until 373 (Amm. 28.6.5). The tribune of the *schola scutariorum prima* at the accession of Valentinian, Equitius, was rewarded for his support of Valentinian with the post of *comes per Illyricum* (Amm. 26.5.3). The pattern is clear. Former tribunes of the *scholae palatinae* were the favoured candidates in the appointment of regional military commanders. So the appointment of Charietto as *comes per utramque Germaniam*, a post comparable to that of the *comes Africae* or the *comes per Illyricum*, suggests a similar background of command within the *scholae palatinae*.

In this manner, two pieces of evidence suggest that Charietto rose to the rank of tribune within the *scholae palatinae*: his association with Nestica in 358, and his appointment as *comes per utramque Germaniam c.*364. It remains only to identify the *schola* to whose command he rose. As far as can be determined from the evidence of

[38] In addition to the *tribuni scutariorum* whom I have already mentioned, Ammianus names also Barzimeres (Amm. 30.1.11), and Cassio (Amm. 31.12.16), tribunes in 374–7 and 378 respectively.

[39] I disagree here with *PLRE I*, p. 200, where it is said of Charietto at the time of this mission that 'he evidently held no official rank', apparently because Ammianus refers to Charietto simply as a *vir* with no indication of rank (Amm. 17.10.5). Yet Ammianus often uses the term *vir* to describe various officers where a more precise term of rank would be much more welcome to the modern reader. He can avoid unclassical technical terms and still denote a more senior command relatively easily (e.g. Amm. 25.1.19), but such circumlocutions would have been much more difficult in the case of junior officers.

Ammianus, during his campaigning in Gaul Julian was accompanied only by *scutarii* and *gentiles*. We have already identified all the tribunes of the *scholae scutariorum* for the relevant period. So the assumption must be that Charietto was tribune of the *gentiles*. As already described, he cannot have held this post before 358. He only came to official attention after the appointment of Julian as Caesar in 355, and first Valentinian, then Agilo acted as tribune of the *gentiles* for Julian. It would appear, therefore, that Charietto replaced Agilo as *tribunus gentilium* when the latter was promoted to *tribunus scutariorum* in replacement of Nestica.

There can be no certainty as to how long Charietto retained his position as tribune of the *gentiles*. It is a distinct possibility, though, that he retained it from late 358 to early 364. His absence from our accounts of this period is easily understandable. His unusual background was such that there was little prospect of further promotion within a short period again such as would have brought him to the fore of events as one of the empire's leading commanders. As tribune of the *gentiles* he presumably accompanied Sintula in early 360 as he began his journey to the court of Constantius with the majority of the *gentiles* and *scutarii* who had formerly accompanied Julian. However, the probability is that he returned to Julian with Sintula, as opposed to Agilo who led his men on to Constantius. The reluctance to desert their native land, which Ammianus attributes to many of the soldiers who fought for Julian in Gaul, would have been particularly appropriate in the case of this man who had worked his way into the army almost accidentally through his irregular activities in defence of his native territory.

Charietto's continued presence with Julian as his *tribunus gentilium* explains why Ammianus does not record the exile of the *tribunus gentilium* as well as that of the two *tribuni scutariorum*, Romanus and Vincentius, in his description of events which, as already explained, seems to relate to Julian's arrival at Constantinople during the winter of 361/62. His omission of any reference whatsoever to the *schola gentilium* is noteworthy given the way he routinely associates the *scutarii* and *gentiles* in an almost formulaic manner. The most convincing explanation seems to be that Charietto had accompanied Julian from Gaul to Constantinople as tribune of the *schola gentilium*, which was the only full *schola palatina* then in Julian's hands. Once he arrived at Constantinople, Julian reorganized the *scholae* which had remained loyal to Constantius, replacing their officers with men loyal to him instead. This had probably been his intention always because the officers of one of these *scholae* at least had specifically rejected his authority during the spring of 360 when they had voted with their feet and followed Agilo to Constantius rather than Charietto back to Julian himself. It may be also that they really had engaged in designs beyond their powers, as Ammianus so vaguely alleges in the case of Romanus and Vincentius. Whatever the exact reason, the *scholae scutariorum* were subject to a purge during the winter of 361/62 which left the *schola gentilium* completely untouched, and this best explains Julian's relations with the *scholae* subsequently.

As contradictory as it first seems, much of the resistance within the army to Julian's religious policies seems to have originated with the *schola gentilium*. Two soldiers, Iuventinus and Maximinus, were executed at Antioch on 29 January 363 following rebellious remarks which they were alleged to have made during the course of a banquet.[40] The chronicler John Malalas specifically records that they were *gentiles*,

[40] Joh. Chrys. *In Iuventinum et Maximinum* (*PG* 50, 571–8); Theod. *HE* 3.15. On the date, see P. Peeters, 'La date de la fête des saints Juventin et Maximin', *Analecta Bollandiana* 42 (1924), 77–82.

members of the *schola gentilium*.[41] More significantly, perhaps, there is a strong case to be made that 'Sergius' and 'Bacchus', *primicerius* and *secundocerius* respectively of the *schola gentilium*, suffered at Antioch not under Galerius Maximianus as their passion alleges, but under Julian instead.[42] The exile by Julian of two such senior officers within the *schola gentilium*, and at such a late date, is best explained by the unique recent history of this unit. It had not been subject to the same purge as the other *scholae* during the winter of 361/62 when Julian replaced many of the more convinced Christian officers with those less so, or with pagans even, in full knowledge of the religious changes which he was about to initiate. Furthermore, the *schola gentilium* had committed itself to Julian during the spring of 360 when his ultimate religious objectives were still a well-kept secret. So it is not at all surprising that a strong Christian element should have survived among both the officers and the ranks of the *schola gentilium* only to meet their sad fates at Antioch during the winter of 362/63 when Julian finally revealed the true nature of his regime. Indeed, the fact that it was the *primicerius* of this unit, second-in-command to the tribune, rather than the tribune himself who was so exiled, coincides well with our identification of Charietto as the *tribunus gentilium*. Not only was he of Germanic stock from one of the less Christianized parts of the empire, but he was only a relatively recent recruit to the Roman forces, and then only at the court of Julian in the west. His exposure to any form of Christianity was probably minimal, and his paganism seems assured. It is not surprising, therefore, that he did not join his subordinates in their protests at Julian's religious policies.

It is appropriate at this point to turn our attention towards the *schola armaturarum* also. As earlier stated, there seems to have been only one *schola armaturarum* before the division of the *scholae* between Valens and Valentinian I in 364. Again, Ammianus provides us with relatively little direct information concerning the succession of tribunes to this unit. In his description of the revolt of the *magister peditum* Silvanus in Gaul in 355, Ammianus reveals that Silvanus had been tribune of the *schola armaturarum* in 351 when, before the battle of Mursa, he deserted the usurper Magnentius for Constantius (Amm. 15.5.33). Silvanus had been rewarded for his treachery with the post of *magister peditum*, but his successor to the command of the *schola armaturarum* is not directly named. The next tribune of the *schola armaturarum* named by Ammianus is Mallobaudes. He was among those sent by Constantius to Gallus in late 354 while he was in exile on the island off Flanona in order to force a confession from him concerning his actions earlier while Caesar at Antioch (Amm. 14.11.21). The next we learn of Mallobaudes is that he protested with the *tribunus gentilium* Malarichus at the intrigues against Silvanus (Amm. 15.5.6). His association with the cause of Silvanus suggests a friendship which was not the result merely of a

[41] E. Jeffreys *et al.*, *The Chronicle of John Malalas* (*Byzantina Australiensia* 4; Melbourne, 1986), 178. Malalas records local Antiochene tradition, a testimony that deserves serious consideration, therefore.

[42] See I. van de Gheyn, 'Passio Antiquior SS. Sergii et Bacchi Graece nunc primum edita', *Analecta Bollandiana* 14 (1895), 373–95. An English translation is now available in J. Boswell, *The Marriage of Likeness: Same-sex Unions in Pre-modern Europe* (London, 1995), pp. 375–90, although the *schola gentilium* was not a school in the modern educational sense as Boswell assumes, p. 377. That the passion of Sergius and Bacchus relates more to the era of Julian than of Galerius Maximianus was noted by P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, 'Dei ss. Gioventino e Massimino', in his *Note agiografiche* 9 (*Studi e Testi* 175: Rome, 1953), 169–200, esp. 194–9, although he argued that it was derived from a lost account of the martyrs Iuventinus and Maximinus rather than an independent account of two otherwise unknown confessors. See now D. Woods, 'The Emperor Julian and the Passion of Sergius and Bacchus', *JECS* 6 (1998), forthcoming.

common Frankish identity, but which resulted also from the loyalty of a subordinate to his former commanding officer. In short, the suggestion that Mallobaudes directly succeeded his fellow Frank Silvanus in command of the *schola armaturarum* merits serious consideration.

It seems unlikely that Mallobaudes could have escaped the revolt of Silvanus unharmed. Indeed, he seems to have been suspended from his post when Constantius was still campaigning in Raetia during the summer of 355. A certain Arinthaeus was the tribune and acting commander of the *schola armaturarum* at the height of that campaign (Amm. 15.4.10). Ammianus' description of the reaction of Constantius upon hearing news of the alleged plot suggests that the activities of all those upon whom any suspicion at all fell would have been severely curtailed. So Arinthaeus was made acting commander of the *schola armaturarum*. The subsequent rebellion of Silvanus, together with the high office which Arinthaeus later achieved, culminating in the consulship in 372, suggests that Arinthaeus was confirmed in his appointment.

It is difficult to tell who succeeded Arinthaeus as the *tribunus armaturarum*, or even when. Ammianus describes Arinthaeus' participation in Julian's Persian expedition without once defining his rank or title, and Zosimus' testimony is little better.[43] He describes Arinthaeus as στρατηγός, a vague term which could be used of a *dux*, *comes rei militaris*, or *magister militum* even, although it does suggest rank higher than that of a tribune.[44] However, both historians seem to suggest that Arinthaeus' rank during the Persian expedition was similar to that of the Victor whom Ammianus describes variously as *dux* or *comes*.[45] It would appear, therefore, that Arinthaeus was a military count by 363 at the latest, which was a step towards his further promotion as *magister equitum* by 367 (Amm. 27.5.4). Whatever the case, it is most unlikely that he remained tribune of the *schola armaturarum* for the whole of the period 355–62. As Ammianus reveals in his discussion of events immediately following the death of Julian, when the officers divided into two groups, Arinthaeus belonged to the party of the east, former officials of Constantius, as opposed to the party of the west, officers who owed most of their success to the reign of Julian (Amm. 25.5.2). Furthermore, Arinthaeus' sympathies can be accurately established from the phenomenal success which he enjoyed during the reign of Valens, who had himself suffered for his Christianity during the reign of Julian, and from the fact that he was baptized on his deathbed in 378 (Bas. *Ep.* 269). In brief, Arinthaeus was very much of the Christian party, and so it strikes one as most unlikely that he would have enjoyed the favour of Julian. Any promotion which came Arinthaeus' way following his appointment as *tribunus armaturarum* most likely occurred during the reign of Constantius rather than of Julian. Unfortunately, the next *tribunus armaturarum* whom we can identify with any certainty is Balchobaudes, who held this post in 366 (Amm. 27.2.6). One presumes that he was originally appointed shortly after the accession of Valentinian in 364. This being said, one name does suggest itself as a possible *tribunus armaturarum* also during the late 350s, a possibility that merits some brief consideration at least.

[43] Amm. 24.1.2, 7.2; 25.5.2, 7.7.

[44] Zos. *HN* 3.13.3; 4.2.4. In general, see R. T. Ridley, 'The Fourth and Fifth Century Military Hierarchy in Zosimus', *Byzantion* 40 (1970), 91–104. However, I remain unconvinced by R. T. Ridley, *Zosimus' New History: A Translation with Commentary* (*Byzantina Australiensia* 2: Canberra, 1982) where the στρατηγός of the above passages is rendered as *magister*.

[45] Victor as *dux*: Amm. 24.4.13, 6.13; Victor as *comes*: Amm. 24.4.31, 6.4. It is arguable that Victor was *comes* of two *auxilia palatina*, the *Iovii* and the *Victores*. See D. Woods, 'The Role of the *Comes* Lucillianus during Julian's Persian Expedition', *L'Antiquité Classique* 67 (1998), forthcoming.

Among the shadowy figures who seem to have played a greater role than is openly acknowledged by Ammianus in the accession of Julian as Augustus during the spring of 360 was the German Nevitta. In the spring of 361 Julian appointed Nevitta as his *magister equitum* in replacement of Gomoarius, the former *tribunus scutariorum*, whom he considered untrustworthy (Amm. 21.8.1). As the career of Gomoarius himself illustrates, former tribunes of the *scholae palatinae* were the favoured contenders for such posts, although they usually spent some years first as *comites rei militaris* at a more intermediate level. It seems probable, therefore, that Nevitta was himself a former tribune of a *schola palatina*. Furthermore, bearing in mind that Julian had a restricted pool of talent from which to choose his commanders, Nevitta need not have been tribune of a *schola palatina* that much earlier than his final appointment as *magister equitum*. The only firm evidence for the earlier career of Nevitta is the statement by Ammianus that he served as the commander of a cavalry squadron under the overall command of the *magister peditum* Barbatio during a campaign against the Iuthungi in Raetia in 358 (Amm. 17.6.3). The fact that Nevitta commanded a cavalry rather than an infantry unit is of immediate significance. More importantly, though, one notes that during his campaign in Gaul in 357 Barbatio had operated with the assistance of a *tribunus scutariorum*, Cella, as already discussed above. Furthermore, he had returned to Constantius' court during the winter of 357/8, so there is no need to assume that he necessarily operated with the exact same palatine forces the following year (Amm. 16.11.15). Indeed, not only is it possible that Nevitta acted for Barbatio in 358 exactly as Cella had done a year earlier, but the controversial clash between Cella and the tribunes Bainobaudes and Valentinian, which had allowed a party of barbarian raiders to escape that year, may well have decided either Barbatio or Constantius that it would be better if Cella were kept under stricter supervision for a while at the imperial court itself. Therefore, not only does his subsequent career suggest that Nevitta was a former tribune of a *schola palatina*, but the evidence suggests that he may well have replaced the *tribunus scutariorum* Cella in his role in support of Barbatio. As we have already identified three of the tribunes of the five *scholae* in existence in 358, Nevitta can only have been the commander of either the *schola scutariorum clibanariorum* or the *schola armaturarum*. Yet the former required of its members a type of training or skill which one would more normally associate with those of eastern origin (see below), so it seems preferable to identify Nevitta as the tribune of the *schola armaturarum*.

One problem remains. How do we explain the transfer of Nevitta from the court of Constantius, that from which Barbatio operated in 358, to that of Julian by 361? This problem exists however we understand the career of Nevitta. In reality, though, it seems difficult to explain this transfer unless Nevitta really was an officer of the *scholae palatinae*. For during the relevant period Constantius did not reinforce Julian's forces, but depleted them rather, so it seems most unlikely that Nevitta could have achieved a transfer from the court of Constantius to that of Julian simply as the tribune of an ordinary frontline fighting unit.[46] The officers of the *scholae palatinae* were different in that they were also often engaged on sensitive diplomatic duties, or as the escorts either of senior officials or of members of the imperial family. So Nevitta may well have been engaged on some duty of this sort, and just happened to be at Julian's court when the storm finally broke and Julian was hailed as Augustus. Then, in the heat of the situation, he was forced to act and to commit himself either to Julian

[46] In addition to the forces which were requested of him in early 360, Julian had already supplied Constantius with seven infantry and two cavalry units (Jul. *Ep. ad Ath.* 280d).

or Constantius. He chose the former.

This much is plausible enough, but it may be possible to identify even more precisely the reason for Nevitta's presence at Julian's court, and the exact role which he played in Julian's rise to power. One notes that an anonymous military officer played an important role on the very night that Julian was crowned Augustus, when he revealed to Julian that supporters of Constantius were about to stage a counter-coup against him, and then roused other soldiers and civilians to his defence. Julian himself identifies this man as one of those who commanded his wife's escort, while the orator Libanius identifies him simply as a soldier.[47] Two questions need to be answered. Firstly, why did Julian's wife, Helena, have a separate military escort? One possibility is that she was newly arrived with Julian in Paris from the court of Constantius himself, and that her military escort for that trip had not yet begun their own return journey.[48] Secondly, how did the officers in command of her escort come to learn of the counter-coup against her husband which those loyal to Constantius were then planning? The most obvious answer is that they had themselves been invited to join the plot, and one of the reasons why the conspirators might have so invited them is that their recent arrival from the court of Constantius seemed to mark them out as the most trustworthy forces in this matter.

To recap, therefore, there is sufficient circumstantial evidence to suggest that Nevitta was tribune of the *schola armaturarum* from 358 at latest, when he acted in the field in support of the *magister peditum* Barbatio, until the spring of 360, when he was newly arrived in Gaul as a member of the guard which had just escorted the empress Helena from the court of Constantius to that of her husband Julian. If this makes his choice by Julian as consul for 362 seem somewhat surprising, then this only reinforces the present reconstruction. For it was Nevitta's relative lack of military experience, among other things, which led Ammianus to criticize his appointment as consul in 362 (Amm. 21.10.8). Obviously, once the full news of what had happened in Gaul reached Constantius in the east, a replacement was appointed to command the bulk of the *schola armaturarum* which had always remained with him. But whom did he appoint?

The strongest candidate in this matter seems to be the anonymous son of the former *magister equitum* Marcellus. As the son of a former senior officer, he had probably gained a position within one of the *scholae palatinae* in much the same fashion that the emperor Valentinian, Martin of Tours, and the usurper Silvanus, had all done so before him: by reason of their fathers' influence and service. Most importantly of all as far as Constantius was concerned, Marcellus' son had strong cause to detest Julian whom he undoubtedly held responsible for his father's disgrace during the winter of 356/7. As *magister equitum* in Gaul in 356, Marcellus had failed to assist Julian when he had been besieged by the Alamanni in the town of Sens (Amm. 16.4.3). Constantius learned of this and discharged Marcellus from his post, but Marcellus did not have the sense to leave things at that, and proceeded to bring counter-charges against Julian before the emperor himself (Amm. 16.7.1–3). Julian had anticipated this, and prepared his defence accordingly, with the result that Marcellus was sent

[47] Jul. *Ep. ad Ath.* 285b: τις τῶν ἐπιτεταγμένων τῇ προόδῳ τῆς ἐμῆς γαμετῆς; Lib. *Or.* 18.102: στρατιώτης.

[48] Very little is known about Helena's movements. However, she had returned from Julian in Gaul to the court of her brother Constantius on one occasion at least (Amm. 16.10.18), and a more prolonged visit is not out of the question. In general, see N. Aujoulat, 'Eusébie, Hélène et Julien I: Le témoignage de Julien', *Byzantion* 53 (1983), 78–103, and 'II: Le témoignage des historiens', ibid., 421–2.

home in even greater disgrace than before.[49] Hence Marcellus' son had strong cause to dislike Julian, and Constantius could be quite sure that he would never change sides during the coming civil war, no matter how critical Constantius' situation became. Indeed, it is even possible that Constantius intended the promotion of Marcellus' son to the command of a *schola palatina* as a back-handed apology to the family that he had not believed Marcellus' claims about Julian in the first place.

A further consideration must be the public execution of Marcellus' son by Julian on the grounds that he had aspired to the throne—an event that probably took place shortly after Julian's arrival in Constantinople in December 361 (Amm. 22.11.2). What sort of individual could even dream of succeeding at such a venture? The election as emperor in 363 of Jovian, the *primicerius domesticorum*, followed by that in 364 of Valentinian, the tribune of the *schola scutariorum secunda*, suggests that he had to be a senior officer, the commander preferably, of one of the units stationed at court. As the execution of Marcellus' son seems to be associated with the exile of Romanus and Vincentius, the tribunes of the *scholae scutariorum prima* and *secunda* respectively, one is tempted to assume that they had had a part in his attempt on the throne. He cannot have been tribune of the *schola gentilium*, which was present with Julian still, nor is he a likely candidate as tribune of the *schola scutariorum clibanariorum*. By a simple process of elimination, therefore, the *schola armaturarum* alone remains. Hence one interpretation of the present evidence is that it was the son of Marcellus whom Constantius appointed as his *tribunus armaturarum* to replace Nevitta during the spring of 360, and that it was as *tribunus armaturarum* still that Marcellus' son made his ill-fated bid for power following the death of Constantius.

A brief review at this point of those officers who came to the fore during the period between Julian's rise to sole power in 361, and the accession of the emperors Valens and Valentinian I in 364, suggests that Victor, appointed *magister equitum* by Jovian in 363 (Amm. 26.5.2), ought also to have held the post of tribune of one of the *scholae palatinae* sometime during the 350s. The fact that he attained the consulship before Arinthaeus, for example, in 369 rather than in 372, and that he seems to have attained a post of *magister* first also, tends to suggest that he was a little senior, and that his command of a *schola palatina* probably occurred a little earlier also, or simultaneously at least. Just like Arinthaeus, Victor was a strong Christian, and it seems probable that he had attained the rank of *comes rei militaris* which he held under Julian as a result of the favour of Constantius rather than of Julian.[50] This being said, it remains unclear which *schola* he most probably commanded, although there seems little room for him among the succession of tribunes as reconstructed here of either the *schola armaturarum* or the *schola gentilium*. In fact, the most promising conjecture seems to be that he was tribune of the *schola scutariorum prima* *c.*354–6, between the commands of Scudilo and Cella. So in so far as this seems perfectly reconciliable with all that we know about Victor himself, and provides the right progression *vis-à-vis* Arinthaeus, whose career does seem to have mirrored that of Victor, in its later stages at least, I have tentatively identified Victor as the tribune of the *schola scutariorum prima* *c.*354–56 in the appendix to this paper.

Another individual who merits some attention at this point is the Merobaudes, whom Valentinian I appointed *magister peditum* in 375 (Zos. *HN* 4.17.1). Together with Equitius, the former tribune of the *schola scutariorum prima* *c.*363–4, he helped organize the accession of Valentinian II (Amm. 30.10.2–4), and was consul for the

[49] See D. Woods, 'The Fate of the *Magister Equitum* Marcellus', *CQ* 45 (1995), 266–8.
[50] On his Christianity: Theod. *HE* 4.33.3; Bas. *Ep.* 152–3; Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 133–4.

first time in 377. It is his early career which is of interest to us here, about which nothing survives other than that he escorted the body of the emperor Julian for burial at Tarsus in the autumn of 363.[51] Unfortunately, the epitome of Philostorgius' ecclesiastical history is our sole source in this matter, and it does not preserve his rank or title at that time (Philos. *HE* 8.1). Yet the fact that it should name him at all is itself significant, since he was not a future emperor or a future usurper even, whose early career would have merited some small attention for this reason.[52] The preservation of his name suggests that he really did command the guard which accompanied Julian's corpse to its burial at Tarsus. His choice for such a mission, together with what we know of his later career, makes him a strong suspect as the tribune of a *schola palatina* at that time. So which *schola* did he command? According to the evidence we have been able to piece together so far, the tribunes of the two *scholae scutariorum* were either dead or in disgrace by the autumn of 363. As for the tribune of the *schola gentilium*, this was probably still Charietto. The tribune of the *schola scutariorum clibanariorum* remains anonymous, but he was probably of eastern origin (see below). This leaves only the *schola armaturarum*, and his identification as the tribune of this unit does have some small merit. It may explain, for example, why the *tribunus armaturarum* does not appear among those whose suitability for the throne was considered by the officers who met to decide this issue following the death of Jovian in February 364. The tribunes of the *schola scutariorum prima* and the *schola scutariorum secunda*, Equitius and Valentinian respectively, were both considered for the throne, while there is no mention at all in this context of the tribunes of the other three *scholae* (Amm. 26.1.4–5). Why not? The best explanation seems to be that their foreign blood automatically disqualified these men from the competition. Hence Merobaudes' German origin serves to explain why the tribune of the *schola armaturarum* did not receive any attention at that time, as does the origin of Charietto in the case of the *schola gentilium*. The sole distinguishing merit of Equitius and Valentinian was their Pannonian origin, but this was sufficient.

Some final words are necessary here concerning the *schola scutariorum clibanariorum* also. We know that the *schola scutariorum clibanariorum* existed as early as the reign of Constantine I when its members were granted the right at *annona civica* at Constantinople itself, and the *Notitia Dignitatum* confirms its continued existence by the end of the fourth century.[53] Yet Ammianus fails to describe even one tribune of this unit as such. This is in marked contrast to his treatment of the four other *scholae* in existence for the period *c.*353–64, whose tribunes all make their appearances at one point or other in his work. So why is this? What was so different about the tribunes of the *schola scutariorum clibanariorum* that they failed to make their mark upon the politics of the mid-fourth century?

The solution to this apparent anomaly lies, I suggest, in the origin and nature of this *schola*. The Romans associated the use of *clibanarii*, heavily armoured cavalry, with the Persians in particular, whom they considered to have a special expertise in this type of warfare.[54] Indeed, the *Notitia Dignitatum* reveals that the Roman heavy cavalry

[51] In general, see M. di Maio, 'The Transfer of the Remains of the Emperor Julian from Tarsus to Constantinople', *Byzantion* 48 (1978), 43–50.

[52] Ammianus treats the burial of Julian as if it were of interest solely because of the presence there of the future usurper Procopius (Amm. 25.9.12–13). Yet the two brief notices do not necessarily contradict one another, as Merobaudes was present in an official military capacity only, while Procopius was a relative of the deceased, present in a personal capacity.

[53] *C.Th.* 14.17.9 (389); *ND Or.* 11.8.

[54] See J. W. Eadie, 'The Development of Roman Mailed Cavalry', *JRS* 57 (1967), 161–73; also, Hoffmann, *DSB I* (n. 1), pp. 265–78, and *DSB II*, pp. 110–17.

was nearly all stationed in the eastern empire, obviously to counterbalance the perceived strength of the Persians in this area. Furthermore, there were only two units of *clibanarii* among the palatine forces other than the *schola scutariorum clibanariorum*, and these both included *Persae* among their titles.[55] This suggests that these units were recruited from Persians originally, which may well have been the case with the *schola scutariorum clibanariorum* also. One immediately calls to mind, therefore, that the Persian prince Hormisdas defected to Constantine I *c.*324, and that he was a cavalry commander under Constantius II.[56] He also commanded cavalry during Julian's Persian expedition, by which point he appears to have attained the rank of *comes rei militaris*.[57] It seems possible that he gained his first Roman military experience as commander of the *schola scutariorum clibanariorum*. He was certainly present with Constantius II at Rome in 357 when *clibanarii*, the *schola scutariorum clibanariorum* presumably, formed a prominent part of Constantius' escort.[58] Indeed, the failure on Ammianus' part to name any of the commanders of this unit suggests the possibility that it had actually had only one commander since its creation, and that this was Hormisdas himself. This was possible, or even necessary, because of Hormisdas' unique background. He was of great importance as a claimant to the Persian throne itself, and Julian may even have intended to instal him as his puppet there (Lib. *Ep.* 1402.3). He needed to be kept honorably occupied in his exile, but under constant close supervision also. Appointment as permanent commander of the *schola scutariorum clibanariorum* would have fulfilled both these requirements. Indeed, it would have been an entirely sensible appointment from a military point of view also, in so far as he had presumably received the same intensive training in cavalry warfare which all the young Persian nobility were accustomed to receive (Amm. 23.6.83). Furthermore, it allowed him personal access to the emperor himself, which he doubtless regarded as the natural prerogative of a man of his birth, while it also allowed the emperor to consult him on Persian affairs. This is my suggestion, therefore, that Hormisdas was permanent commander of the *schola scutariorum clibanariorum* until old age, or death even, finally prevented this, from the time of his first acceptance at the court of Constantine I *c.*324 until the end of Julian's Persian campaign in 363.[59] It is doubtful whether his formal status ever changed much, if at all, and he may well have attained the title *comes* right from his earliest entry into the empire, simply as a concession to his unique background.

[55] The *equites Persae clibanarii* (*ND Or.* 6.32), and the *comites* [*Persae*] *clibanarii* (*ND Or.* 5.29). The full title of the latter has to be restored from hagiographical sources, an anonymous *Life of Constantine* (*BHG* 364), and the *Passio Eusignii* (*BHG* 639). See D. Woods, 'Constantine I and the *Persocomites*', *Maynooth Review* 15 (1997), forthcoming.

[56] On his defection, see Zos. *HN* 2.27; Zon. 13.5. The latter describes his command of cavalry under Constantius II: ἄρχειν ταχθεὶς ἱππέων ἴλης πολλῆς.

[57] Not once does Ammianus refer to Hormisdas by a Roman title, despite frequent references to his exploits during the Persian campaign (Amm. 24.1.2, 1.8, 2.4, 2.11, 2.20, 5.4). The only source for his rank as *comes* is the *Passio SS. Bonosi et Maximiliani* (*BHL* 1427) which is probably to be trusted in this matter. On the value of this text, see Woods, 'Ammianus Marcellinus and the Deaths of Bonosus and Maximilianus', art. cit. (n. 22). Zosimus describes Hormisdas as στρατηγός (*HN* 3.11.3) or τῆς ἵππου στρατηγός (*HN* 3.13.3), which confirms that Hormisdas was a cavalry commander, but does not allow us to distinguish whether his correct Latin title was *dux*, *comes*, or *magister* even.

[58] Amm. 16.10.8–16. In general, see A. Cameron, 'Biondo's Ammianus: Constantius and Hormisdas at Rome', *HSCPh* 92 (1989), 423–36.

[59] Since Hormisdas' last recorded appearance was at that same battle which saw the death of the *magister officiorum* Anatolius, and the lucky escape of the praetorian prefect Salutius, one suspects that he himself was a victim of this same disaster (Zos. *HN* 3.29.2).

In conclusion, therefore, Ammianus has provided us with a great deal more information about the tribunes of *scholae palatinae* than immediately meets the eye. Careful analysis of the information which he provides allows us to reconstruct the succession of tribunes almost in full, not only of the *scholae scutariorum*, but of the *schola gentilium* and *schola armaturarum* also, from the beginning of his extant text in 353 until the accession of Valentinian I in 364. Furthermore, his omissions point to a unique situation in the case of the *schola scutariorum clibanariorum*. This is not to claim that all the conjectures within the present paper are of equal worth, or that they can be anything else other than conjectures, given the state of the surviving evidence. It was important, however, that some effort be made to integrate Ammianus' scattered evidence concerning the commands of the *scholae* into a coherent framework against which any further speculation, whether about the careers of individual officers or of the nature of the *scholae* themselves, might itself be tested. This I have tried to achieve here.

St Patrick's College (NUI), Maynooth DAVID WOODS

APPENDIX: *TRIBUNI SCHOLARUM PALATINARUM* c. A.D. 353–64

The names of those officers whose command of a *schola palatina* is not directly attested have been italicized.

Schola scutariorum prima

Scudilo	(*PLRE I*, pp. 810–11)	*c.*351–4
Victor(?)	(*PLRE I*, pp. 957–8)	354–6
Cella	(*PLRE I*, p. 190)	356–9
Romanus	(*PLRE I*, p. 768)	359–62
Frumentinus	(*PLRE I*, p. 375)	362–3
Equitius	(*PLRE I*, p. 282)	363–4

Schola scutariorum secunda

Bainobaudes	(*PLRE I*, p. 145)	*c.*354–7
Nestica	(*PLRE I*, p. 625)	357–8
Agilo	(*PLRE I*, pp. 28–9)	358–60
Vincentius	(*PLRE I*, p. 966)	360–2
?		362–3
Valentinian	(*PLRE I*, pp. 933–4)	363–4

Schola gentilium

Malarichus	(*PLRE I*, p. 538)	?–355
Valentinian	(*PLRE I*, pp. 933–4)	355–7
Agilo	(*PLRE I*, pp. 28–9)	357–8
Charietto	(*PLRE I*, p. 200)	358–64

Schola armaturarum

Silvanus	(*PLRE I*, pp. 840–1)	?–351
Mallobaudes	(*PLRE I*, p. 539)	351–5
Arinthaeus	(*PLRE I*, pp. 102–3)	355–8
Nevitta	(*PLRE I*, pp. 626–7)	358–60
Filius Marcelli(?)		360–2
Merobaudes	(*PLRE I*, pp. 598–9)	362–4

Schola scutariorum clibanariorum

Hormisdas	(*PLRE I*, p. 443)	*c.*324–63