

THE ILLYRIAN PREFECTURE OF ANATOLIUS

During the last fifty years the history of the praetorian prefecture of Illyricum in the 4th century has been Tom Tiddler's ground for higher critics, and one of the chief points of controversy has been provided by the prefecture of Anatolius under the sons of Constantine. In the Theodosian Code an Anatolius appears as Vicarius Asiae in 339 (xi. 30.19; xii. 1. 28), and again as praefectus praetorio in 346 (xii. 1. 38) and in 349 (xii. 1. 39) — this last being notoriously doubtful of acceptance. From the Letters and Orations of Libanius it is known that Anatolius of Berytus was praefectus praetorio in Illyricum from early in 357, and from Ammianus that he died in office in 360. From Eunapius it is known that Anatolius, nicknamed Azutrio, of Berytus was praefectus praetorio in Illyricum and visited Athens at some unspecified date. It has always been assumed that these refer to one and the same Anatolius, and it was upon this assumption that Cuq and Seeck elaborated their views. Cuq was ready to believe that these two prefectures were held by the same man (*Mélanges Boissier* p. 149), and so was Seeck originally (*Briefe des Libanios*, 60 ff.), although there was a duplication of office enough to fill the career of two ordinary prefects. Dissatisfied with this, Seeck later solved the problem by proposing a wholesale redistribution of dates for the constitutions of the Code, so as to bring the various pieces of information into one coherent form by the total abolition of the earlier career. So, in the 'Regesten' (pp. 40—1; 119), Anatolius is presented as consularis Syriae, 349 (xii. 1. 39), Vicarius Asiae, 352 (xi. 30. 19; xii. 1. 28), and praetorian prefect, 357 (xii. 1. 38). This solution has found favour with most of his successors, so that the 'abolitionist' view now holds the field. Palanque commends it enthusiastically (*Essai*, p. 34), Piganiol accepts it as a matter of fact and without comment (*Emp. Chrét.* p. 322, n. 141), as does Petit in a variant form (*Libanius et la Vie Municipale*, p. 276), and even Ensslin omits all reference to the first prefecture (PW s. v. *Praefectura*). The purpose of the present article is to attempt to expose the weaknesses of this assumption and to offer a reconsideration of the problem.

Before this abolitionist argument can be accepted, the evidence of Eunapius has to be explained away (*V. S.* p. 483 ff.). This presents much more of a problem for Seeck's successors than they have recognized, for the detail is very circumstantial and, without doubt, favours the existence of the earlier prefecture. Eunapius' account of Anatolius is given in his story of the life of the sophist Prohaeresius, who was Eunapius' own teacher later and to whom he was genuinely devoted. Here, Anatolius of Berytus, nick-named Azutrio, a cultured lawyer who was trained first at Berytus and then at Rome, goes to court, holds a string of offices and finally becomes praetorian prefect of Illyricum (προϊὼν καὶ ἐς τὸν ἑπαρχὸν τῆς ἀδελφῆς ἤλασεν . . . τὸ γὰρ καλούμενον Ἰλλυρικὸν ἐπετέτραπτο). In this capacity he visits Greece and tests the proficiency of the professors in Athens, Himerius among them (cf. Himerius ed. Colonna, *Or.* 32). At this test the triumph is reserved for Prohaeresius, who not long previously had been summoned by the Emperor Constans to Gaul, where he had great success at court and had won the admiration even of the uncultured denizens of Gaul and the Rhineland for his eloquent address. Thereafter at the Emperor's bidding, Prohaeresius had gone to display his art in Rome and had had a statue erected in his honour (cf. Liban. *Ep.* 278), and finally, before returning to Athens had received from the Emperor the post of strategarch and the tribute of certain islands for the benefit of the food supply of Athens. "This grant the praetorian prefect, newly arrived from Gaul, had to confirm" (*V. S.*, pp. 490—2).

Although, as indicated above, Constans is named only once as the reigning emperor, and that at the beginning of his account, Eunapius clearly implies that he was still on the throne at the time of Anatolius' descent upon Greece, and that the incident must therefore be dated to a time before 350. The notices of the Code are thereby strengthened. Nor does Eunapius leave it in any doubt that the office held by Anatolius was actually the praetorian prefecture of Illyricum. He is quite specific concerning the district, and his terminology for the office is confirmed by other examples (e. g., Ablabius, p. 463; Salutius and Auxonius p. 479). Hence, on the abolitionist argument, Eunapius must either be wrong in attributing this prefecture to the reign of Constans or so vague in his description of the incident that his readers are justified in telescoping it into the second prefecture of 357—60. Neither

argument can be regarded as at all acceptable. Eunapius has often, and with some exaggeration, been regarded as a careless and inaccurate authority, — for instance by reference to his casual omissions in the account of Libanius' career. There, however, he was dealing with someone he had never met and against whom he was prejudiced by his loyalty to his own master Prohaeresius. Here he is dealing with something very near and dear to him, the career of his master himself. Three times in these ten pages he states specifically that he has checked his own knowledge of the story of Prohaeresius by the evidence of eye-witnesses, and one of these occasions refers to the descent of Anatolius upon Athens (p. 491; ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ἐγένετο πρὸ πολλῶν χρόνων, καὶ οὕτως ἐξηκρίβου τὴν ἀκοήν ὁ συγγραφεύς. Cf. p. 485; εἰδώς τε ἀσφαλῶς καὶ ἀξιωθεὶς τῆς ἐκείνου γλώσσης καὶ ὁμιλίας: p. 488; ταῦτα δὲ ἀκριβῶς ὁ Λυδὸς παρῶν Τουσκιανὸς ἐξήγγελλεν).

The source of this information was Tuscianus, who is elsewhere cited by him for his hostile estimate of Libanius (*F. H. G. fr.* 25) and who may well be, despite Ensslin (*PW* s. v.) the Comes Orientis of 381. It is taken as an argument in favour of the abolitionist theory that Tuscianus is known to have been assessor to Anatolius in the second prefecture, when he was seconded for duty in Antioch (cf. *Liban. Ep.* 348). Yet it may be noted that Eunapius makes no mention of that position with regard to the present incident, which is surprising. If Tuscianus, his informant, had been assessor to the prefect Anatolius at the time of this inspection of the University of Athens, it would have been the most natural thing for Eunapius to have said so. The omission of any such mention may be of considerable significance, for Eunapius is not given to hiding the lights of his friends under a bushel. What Eunapius does say of him is that he was a pupil of Julianus, intimate with Prohaeresius, and a rhetor of high ability. That the evidence which Tuscianus provides is reliable is shown by the summaries of the rhetorical arguments which he gave to Eunapius orally years after the event. Eunapius incidentally points out the occasions when Tuscianus' memory failed him (p. 484) — occasions which, considering the lapse of time, were neither frequent nor important. It is clear that the information which he provided was both detailed and accurate.

The crucial passage for the date of the episode is p. 492, where we are told that "not long before" Prohaeresius had

been summoned to Constans' court in Gaul, and where his sophistic displays in the Rhineland district are mentioned. There is no record of Constans being in this area after 345. The abolitionist theory must therefore allow an interval of at least a dozen years between the bestowal of the grant and its confirmation by Anatolius. It justifies it by reference to the intervening revolt of Magnentius and the fact that it claims the prefecture of 357—60 to be the first example of the Illyrian prefecture (cf. Palanque l. c.), and therefore the first occasion when a senior official of Constantius' administration would have had need or opportunity to ratify such a grant made by Constans. It yet remains strange that Eunapius, after his repeated claims to have ascertained his facts, should have described this interval merely as οὐ πρὸ πολλοῦ χρόνου, and should have telescoped the incidents of two reigns.

Moreover, a further comment made by Eunapius renders the theory even more implausible. He refers in his account to Anatolius' coming — νεωστὶ γὰρ παρῆν ἐκ Γαλατίας ὁ ἑπαρχος. From the known facts of Anatolius' movements in the years before the prefecture of 357, it is difficult to fit in any occasion when he could possibly have been in Gaul. In 353, if he may be identified with the Phoenician of Liban. *Or.* i. 80, he was proconsul of Constantinople. This view receives some support from *Ep.* 552, where Libanius claims close personal acquaintance with him in the capital, i. e. in the period 350—3. In 354/5 he was offered a post in Rome which seems to have been that of prefect of the city, but he either refused it outright or relinquished it almost immediately (*Ep.* 391.13—14; 423.3). Later in 355, he paid a flying visit to the East and was welcomed at Seleuceia (*Ep.* 311). By the spring of 356 he was back at court in Italy (*Ep.* 391.16; 492), and at the turn of the year was still there, expecting to obtain office in the near future (*Ep.* 512.4), the appointment to the Illyrian prefecture being first mentioned in *Ep.* 549. In view of this, the question is obvious: when and why was Anatolius in Gaul before his prefecture? The court last appears in Gaul in 353 and in the German campaign of 354 (*Amm. Marc.* xiv. 5.1; xiv. 10.16); for the whole of 355 and 356 it was at Milan, except for the campaign in Rhaetia, which is not Gaul by a long way. Clearly, from the known facts, Anatolius' presence in Gaul just before the prefecture of 357 is, if not impossible, at least highly unlikely.

The abolitionist theory, in short, reaches its desired conclusion of a single prefecture commencing in 357 by a systematic explaining away of evidence. However plausible Seeck's suggestion of a confusion of imperial consulships may be elsewhere, the only one of these constitutions in the Code which is in any way demonstrably false is that of xii. 1. 39, and even this does not fall under that head (v. Mommsen ad loc.). It may be observed that Seeck's attempt to buttress his thesis here by referring to a remark of Libanius (*Ep.* 311, τῆς ὑπὸ σοῦ πόλεως κεκοσμημένης) as an indication of Anatolius' tenure of office as consularis Syriae at some time before 354/5, so lending plausibility to his suggestion of 349, is by no means conclusive. Libanius' words, while they indicate a previous tenure of some office in Antioch, do not make clear which it was; it could have been with no less possibility that of Comes Orientis, as Downey justly remarks (*Comites Orientis*, p. 21). Amid so much that is unknown, it is highly unlikely, to say the least, that two such disparate sources as Eunapius and the Code could both be wrong with their information about the same period and the same person. The evidence, however uncomfortable, must be kept, not scrapped. Where Seeck and his successors are right is in their refusal to accept this double career as appropriate to a single person, as Cuq had done, but their solution is even more improbable than the problem they attempt to resolve. An alternative solution is to distinguish Eunapius' Anatolius Azutrio of Berytus from the later Anatolius of Berytus of Libanius, and to allow that there were two prefectures held by persons of the same name a dozen or more years apart. This may look odd, but at least it is in line with the evidence available; and by refusing to accept the identification of the two, which is in any case pure assumption, the improbability of Cuq's duplicated career and Seeck's need to wrest the evidence forcibly to fit in with a preconceived thesis are both avoided. The possibility becomes less unlikely when the relative frequency of the name is noted. There are at least two other Anatolii to be found in Eunapius' *Lives*, and half a dozen in Libanius. It would not be out of the question, therefore, to see in the later Anatolius of 357 some relative of the Anatolius of the 340's, whose known offices would be those of vicar and prefect. The career of the later Anatolius would then be, in all probability, Comes Orientis

(or *Consularis Syriae*), *proconsul urbis* (Const.), *praefectus urbi* (Rome) and *praefectus Illyricum*.

The final question is why this prefecture should have been instituted in the 340's. It is tempting to link it with the British expedition and the German campaigns of Constans, dating it to the period 343—5. During part of this time Constans was away in the remotest of Roman provinces for a while, Constantius was in the East, and there was the possibility of disturbance on the Rhine-Danube frontier. That this was a serious possibility has recently been shown by Thompson (*Hermes* 84 [1956], p. 379 ff.), who has demonstrated the existence of a crisis on the lower Danube by 346 at latest. This resulted in a complete upset in the relations of the Goths and Rome, and must have required some tightening of the civil administration of the Balkan area, which this appointment probably realised for a time. In addition, there was the important synod at Serdica in 343 which would require some supervision. A pagan lawyer might well be the best umpire in a heresy hunt. Prohaeresius' lecture tour in the West could well have been for the delivery of a panegyric on Constans' British expedition, occurring in the winter of 343; (Eunapius refers to the season of his visit). His visit to Rome followed soon after, and then his return to Athens, so that Anatolius' visit to Athens may reasonably be dated to 345 at latest. At any rate, from 346 (the normal dating of *Cod. Th.* xii. 1. 38), the prefecture of the West was split in other ways (cf. Palanque, *Essai* p. 29), and there is no good reason to refuse acceptance to this Illyrian prefecture as an almost contemporary example of the same tendency. Despite all the argumentation of modern theorists, the evidence for it has not been disproved, there were good grounds for its institution, and it is reasonable, considering the relative paucity of information concerning this period, to accept its existence. Its duration is uncertain: the constitution of 349 (xii. 1. 39) is wrong either in the place of origin (Antioch) or the year, according to Mommsen, or in the title of Anatolius, according to Seeck. As for the error of title, one may wonder why the compilers bothered to alter Anatolius' title here to 'praefect' while leaving that of 'vicar' unchanged in xii. 1. 28. As for the possibility of error in the year, it is something more fundamental than the alleged confusion of imperial consulships; since the next constitution also is in error in its dating, one may suspect here a faulty appli-

cation of the paste and scissors technique in the Code at its inception mentioned by Jones (*Historia* V, pp. 232—3). At all events, if Anatolius did remain in office as prefect until 349, his position was very soon removed by the revolt of Magnentius, the murder of Constans and the subsequent activities of Magnentius and Vetranio in the area, as a result of which the Illyrian region again became a centre of civil war.

University of Hull.

A. F. Norman

THE HISTORICAL DATE FOR THE FINAL MEMNON MYTH

It has escaped notice hitherto that the historical date for the creation of the final version of the Memnon Myth¹), as Greek and Latin authors and some archaeological monuments have preserved it, can now be established from Ancient Oriental sources which have emerged gradually during the last 50 years or so. In this final version of the Memnon Myth we find that Teutamios²), an Assyrian king, is the overlord simultaneously

1) Cp. for the Memnon Myth with bibliography Myth. Lex. art. Memnon (R. Holland), Tithonos (J. Schmidt); R. E. art. Ktesias (2042, 2048, F. Jacoby), Teutamios 2 (W. Goerber), Tithonos (E. Wuest); Oxford Class. Dict. art. Memnon 1 (Th. A. Brady); A. B. Cook, Zeus I—III (1914—1940), Indices s. v. Heos, Memnon, Tithonos; R. Graves, The Greek Myths II (1955), 313 f.; O. Gruppe, Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte I, II (1906), Index s. v. Eos, Memnon, Tithonos; M. P. Nilsson, Geschichte der griechischen Religion I² (1955), 195; C. Robert — L. Preller, Griechische Mythologie I⁴ (1894), 442 f.; III, 2, I (1923), 1175 f., 1180 f.; H. T. Wade-Gery, The Poet of the Iliad (1952), Index s. v. Memnon.

2) Cp. R. E. Art. Teutamios; F. Jacoby, F. Gr. Hist. I (1923), 530 ad 49,6; II A (1926), 441 f.; II B (1929), 1134; II C (1926), 296 f.; II D (1930), 819. It is worthy of note that the two earliest Assyrian kings in the two preserved Cuneiform copies are Tudja and Adamu. Teutamios is probably an erroneous contraction of these two names. They may have filled, as a pair, the same column as they still do in one of the preserved lists and ere read Tudjadamu as one name by a badly informed scribe of the first millennium B. C. Thereafter this fictional name was combined with a similar and genuine mythical Greek name from Asia Minor by a Greek mythological author who probably was the poet of the Aithiopiis or the Little Iliad. Cp. A. Poebel, the Assyrian King List from Khorsabad. Journ. Near East. Stud. 1 (1942), 251 f.; 2 (1943), 85; I. J. Gelb, Two Assyrian King Lists. Ibid. 13 (1954), 209 f.