

Title	The Constantinian origin of Justina (Themistius, Or.3.43b)
Authors	Woods, David
Publication date	2004-05
Original Citation	Woods, D., 2004. The Constantinian origin of Justina (Themistius, Or.3.43b). <i>Classical Quarterly</i> , 54(1), pp. 325-327.
Type of publication	Article (peer-reviewed)
Link to publisher's version	http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=421916&fulltextType=RA&fileId=S0009838804000394-10.1093/cq/54.1.325
Rights	© 2004 The Classical Association
Download date	2025-05-21 13:35:34
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/28



UCC

University College Cork, Ireland
 Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh

David's point seems to be that the qualification is necessary because, if Sophroniscus had more than one son, then the description would refer to something like a *generic* son of Sophroniscus. This clearly suggests that the description at issue is 'the son of Sophroniscus', and that therefore David had *καὶ ὁ Σωφρονίσκου υἱός* in his Porphyry. So, I think, should we.¹¹

Università di Firenze

FRANCESCO ADEMOLLO

fademol@tin.it

¹¹ When this paper had already been submitted to *CQ* Jonathan Barnes published a new translation of the *Isagoge*, with a commentary (*Porphyry: Introduction* [Oxford, 2003]). I am glad to acknowledge that at p. 150 he mentions the variant in Boethius' translation and avers that 'This last text is surely what Porphyry wrote', referring to Arist. *An. Pr.* 43a35–6 and *Al. Aphr. in An. Pr.* 291.8. He translates accordingly: 'Socrates is said to be an individual, and so are *this* white thing, and *this* person approaching, and the son of Sophroniscus (should Socrates be his only son).'

THE CONSTANTINIAN ORIGIN OF JUSTINA (THEMISTIUS, *OR.* 3.43b)

καὶ διὰ τὸν ἡμέτερον οἰκιστὴν οὐ Γερμανοὶ καὶ Ἰάζυγες τοῖς πόνοις ἐντροφῶσι τῶν παλαιῶν Ῥωμαίων, οὐδὲ τὸ σεμνὸν καὶ μέγα τῆς Ῥώμης ὄνομα περιύβριστα παντάπασιν καὶ ἐξαλήλιπται, οὐδ' ἐς νόθους μετέστη διαδόχους καὶ παρασήμους, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸ γνήσιον αἷμα καὶ ἀκήρατον ἐπανήκει τῶν βασιλέων καὶ φυλάττεται ἡμῖν ἀλώβητος καὶ ἀκέραιος.¹

. . . and it is because of our [Constantinople's] founder that the Germans and Jazygi do not luxuriate in the labours of the ancient Romans and that Rome's proud and mighty name has not been utterly abused nor has been erased or falls to bastard and spurious successors but has returned once more to the legitimate and unsullied blood line of the kings and is preserved for us intact and undefiled.²

It is in this way that Themistius thanks Constantius II (A.D. 337–61) for his defeat of the western usurper Magnentius (A.D. 350–3) during his ambassadorial speech on behalf of Constantinople delivered before the emperor himself in Rome in May A.D. 357. As has been duly noted in Heather and Moncur's recent translation and commentary, the reference to the Germans and Jazygi is a development of the claim that Magnentius was of barbarian origin, allegedly having been born to a British father and a Frankish mother.³ Although doubt has rightly been cast upon the reliability of such claims, Magnentius was certainly of low and obscure origin for such propaganda to have gained the hold that it did.⁴ The significance of what Themistius says next, however, has passed unnoticed. Since Constantius saved Rome by defeating Magnentius, then the 'bastard and spurious successors' from whom he also saved it are recognizable as the successors of Magnentius, his future children. The interesting point here is their description as 'bastard' successors in contrast to the 'legitimate and unsullied blood line' represented by Constantius. This concedes

¹ Ed. H. Schenkl and G. Downey, *Themistii Orationes Quae Supersunt* 1 (Leipzig, 1965), 61.

² Trans. P. Heather and D. Moncur, *Politics, Philosophy, and Empire in the Fourth Century: Select Orations of Themistius*, Translated Texts for Historians 36 (Liverpool, 2001), 128.

³ *Epit. de Caes.* 42.7; *Zos. HN* 2.46.3, 54.1; *Zonar.* 13.6.1.

⁴ See J. F. Drinkwater, 'The revolt and ethnic origin of the usurper Magnentius (350–53), and the rebellion of Vetranio (350)', *Chiron* 30 (2000), 131–59.

that Magnentius' children would have been related by blood to Constantius. Since Magnentius was of 'barbarian' origin, this could only have happened through his wife at the time of his death, Justina. She was the daughter of one Justus, about whom all we know for certain is that he was the governor of Picenum under Constantius II,⁵ but it has long been recognized that she was probably of Constantinian descent. Her family nomenclature, such as the fact that she had a brother called Constantianus, suggests this, as does the fact that two western emperors, Magnentius and Valentinian I (A.D. 364–75), sought marriage with her, surely only to promote the legitimacy of their rule by using her to claim an association with the Constantinian dynasty.⁶ The above passage, however, constitutes the only ancient statement of her membership of the Constantinian dynasty, and confirms now what had been deduced from circumstantial evidence alone previously. It even adds a little to our knowledge in that it reveals that she was of illegitimate descent from the 'kings'. If we can assume that by 'kings' Themistius probably refers here to Constantine I (A.D. 305–6) and Constantine I (A.D. 306–37), so ignoring the fact that Constantine had at one time found it convenient to claim descent from Claudius Gothicus (A.D. 268–70) also,⁷ then Justina must have been descended from an illegitimate child of Constantine I, or, an important distinction, from someone whom Constantius II would have preferred to think of as illegitimate. Constantine I was actually married twice, first to a certain Minervina, who bore him his eldest son Crispus, then, in A.D. 307, to Flavia Maxima Fausta, who bore him five children, including Constantius II. It is only because of a chance remark in our earliest source, however, that we know that Minervina was Constantine's wife rather than his concubine.⁸ The latter slur presumably originated with Constantius II and his brothers as they sought to strengthen their own grip on power up to and at the time of their father's death in A.D. 337.⁹ The obvious interpretation of Themistius' statement, therefore, unless we are to invent offspring for Constantine I of whom we have no knowledge otherwise, is that Justina was descended from Constantine I by his eldest son Crispus who was illegitimate in the eyes of Constantius II.¹⁰ As it happens, Crispus was married to a certain Helena who seems to have borne him at least one child before his execution or suicide in A.D. 326.¹¹ This has led a normally acute commentator to conjecture that this child was the mother of Justina, since her father

⁵ Soc. Hist. Eccl. 4.31.11–12.

⁶ J. Rougé, 'La Pseudo-Bigamie de Valentinien Ier', *Cahiers d'histoire publiés par les Universités de Clermont-Lyon-Grenoble* 3 (1958), 5–15.

⁷ R. Syme, 'The ancestry of Constantine', *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1971* (Bonn, 1974), 237–53.

⁸ *Pan. Lat.* 7(6).4.1. For her description as a concubine, see *Epit. de Caes.* 41.4; *Zos. HN* 2.20.2; *Zonar.* 13.2.37.

⁹ The fact that Crispus had played a large part in the death of their own mother Fausta, even if posthumously, can only have added to the bitterness of Constantius and his brothers against this rival blood line. In general, see H. A. Pohlsander, 'Crispus: brilliant career and tragic end', *Historia* 33 (1984), 79–106.

¹⁰ The chronology and general circumstances also allow of an alternative possibility, that the western emperor Constans (A.D. 337–50) may have fathered Justina by adultery with her mother, that is, that Justus may not have been her biological father, even if fear for his life encouraged him to maintain the pretence otherwise. The most telling argument against this is that it was his love of young men which apparently turned his senior officers against Constans in the end, or so it was alleged. See *Aur. Vict. de Caes.* 41.24; *Zos. HN* 2.42.1; *Zonar.* 13.6.8.

¹¹ *C.Th.* 9.38.1 (A.D. 322).

Justus was probably the son of Vettius Justus, consul in A.D. 328.¹² The above passage now reinforces his conjecture.

University College Cork, Ireland

D. WOODS
d.woods@ucc.ie

¹² T. D. Barnes, *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine* (Cambridge, MA, 1982), 44.

JULIAN'S BULL COINAGE: KENT REVISITED

It is well known that the meaning of Julian's bull coinage has been much debated but little agreed upon.¹ However, a new theory has recently been contributed to the debate by Woods.² He argues that the bull represents a solar symbol, and relates this to Julian's great devotion to the god Sol/Helios. The message that emerges from the coin then is that 'by his appointment of Julian as emperor in particular . . . Sol guarantees the security of his herds, the state'.³ Woods adduces new evidence to support his theory, a coin issued by the third-century Emperor Gallienus (A.D. 253–68) as part of his animal series.⁴ The coin honours Sol, who is represented by a bull (though also by a winged horse on a variant coin). In addition to his specific theory, Woods also usefully establishes methodological principles for the reading of the coin. These are: the better interpretation is the one that has the better parallel for the iconography, the more contemporary the better; the better interpretation is the one that better reflects Julian's priorities; and the reverse type 'should not be considered in isolation, but in its full numismatic context'. This last principle leads to interesting discussion of the stars, for single stars and groups of stars do feature on other fourth-century coinage. Thus, Woods argues, the stars 'have no bearing on the symbolism of the bull itself other than to signify a divine presence'.⁵ Clearly this new theory will need to be digested. It certainly has strengths, especially the striking parallel with the Gallienus

¹ The large bronze coinage was struck in A.D. 362, and issued by all the mints of the empire except for Trier, Rome, and Alexandria. The obverse depicts Julian, head diademed, draped and cuirassed, and bearded, accompanied by the legend 'Dominus Noster Flavius Claudius Julianus Pius Felix Augustus'. The reverse depicts a bull, shown standing, facing right, with two stars above its head and back. The legend on this side is 'Securitas Rei Pub'. Unusually, the coinage is referred to in the literary sources, namely Julian's *Misopogon* (355D), Ephrem the Syrian's *Hymns against Julian* (1.16–17), and the church histories of Socrates (3.17.4–5) and Sozomen (5.19.2). The bull has been variously read as a sacrificial bull, the Mithraic bull, the Apis bull, a zodiacal representation of Julian, and a symbol of the emperor. For a review of the diverse theories, see D. Woods, 'Julian, Gallienus, and the solar bull', *American Journal of Numismatics* 12 (2000), 157–69 at 159–61. The mint of Arles also added an eagle to the design, on the bull's left; it perches on a victory wreath whilst offering another to the bull. I agree with Woods (157, n. 2) that the eagle has 'no bearing upon our interpretation of the central device of this type'. On the eagle, see also F. D. Gilliard, 'Notes on the coinage of Julian the Apostate', *Journal of Roman Studies* 54 (1964), 135–41 at 137–8; J. Vanderspoel, 'Julian and the Mithraic bull', *Ancient History Bulletin* 12.4 (1998), 113–19 at 117–19.

² Woods (n. 1).

³ Woods (n. 1), 168.

⁴ On this coinage, see I. Carradice, 'Appendix 5: the animals on the "Cons Aug" coins of Gallienus', in E. Besley and R. Bland (edd.), *The Cunetio Treasure: Roman Coinage of the Third Century A.D.* (London, 1983), 188–94 and R. D. Weigel, 'Gallienus' "animal series" coins and Roman religion', *Numismatic Chronicle* 150 (1990), 135–43.

⁵ Woods (n. 1), 164. P. H. Webb, 'The coinage of the reign of Julian the Philosopher', *Numismatic Chronicle* 10 (1910), 238–50 at 244, already noted the general existence of stars on coins.