

[This is the uncorrected AAM of an article which appeared in the *Journal of Roman Studies* 105 (2015), 203-226. The pagination of the print version has been inserted in square brackets throughout the article. Slight differences may exist between this and the final published copy].

[203]

**Dexippus and the Gothic Invasions: Interpreting the new Vienna fragment (*Codex Vindobonensis Hist. gr.* 73, ff. 192<sup>v</sup>-193<sup>r</sup>)\***

CHRISTOPHER MALLAN AND CAILLAN DAVENPORT

ABSTRACT

*This article presents an English translation and analysis of a new historical fragment, probably from Dexippus' *Scythica*, published by Gunther Martin and Jana Grusková in 2014. The fragment, preserved in a palimpsest in the Austrian National Library, describes a Gothic attack on Thessalonica and the subsequent preparations of the Greeks to repel the barbarian force as it moved south into Achaia. The new text provides several important details of historical, prosopographical and historiographical significance, which challenge both our existing understanding of the events in Greece during the reign of Gallienus and the reading of the main literary sources for this period. In this article we look to secure the Dexippian authorship of the fragment, identify the individuals named in the text, and date the events described in the text to the early 260s A.D.*

KEYWORDS

Dexippus, *Scythica*, Gallienus, third century A.D., Philostratus, *Historia Augusta*, Achaia, Goths.

One of the more exciting textual finds of the last decade is undoubtedly the identification by Gunther Martin and Jana Grusková of a series of fragments written in classicising Greek describing the barbarian invasions of the mid-third century A.D.<sup>1</sup> The fragments were preserved in what appears to be an eleventh-century

---

\* We would like to thank Professor Chris Pelling, Mr. Nigel Wilson, Mr James Morwood, and the anonymous reviewers for their comments on this article and/or on the text. Any mistakes are of course our own responsibility. We are grateful to Dr. Gunther Martin for drawing our attention to this new fragment and encouraging us to engage in this debate. It should be noted that Professor C. P. Jones has made available a translation and brief commentary of the fragment under discussion here on his academia.edu web site titled 'The New Dexippos', in which he reaches some of the same conclusions as we in this paper. We thank Dr. Christina Kuhn for drawing this to our attention. All dates are A.D. unless otherwise indicated. The translations are our own, except where noted.

<sup>1</sup> The first of these fragments (fol. 195<sup>r</sup>) was published by Grusková in 2010, and describes the movements of the Gothic king Cniva. The second, under discussion here, was published

palimpsest bound into *Codex [204] Vindobonensis Hist. gr. 73*, which resides in the collection of the Austrian National Library in Vienna.<sup>2</sup> With the aid of digital technology, Martin and Grusková have been able to read and transcribe the longest of these fragments, a continuous passage preserved on two leaves, which was published in 2014.<sup>3</sup> The fragment under discussion in this paper sheds new light on historical events during the sole reign of the emperor Gallienus (260-268), about which much still remains uncertain owing to the generally unsatisfactory nature of the extant literary sources.<sup>4</sup> In particular, it contributes significantly to the debate on the chronology and extent of the Gothic invasions of Greece in the 260s.<sup>5</sup> The fragment describes an attack on the Danubian and Greek provinces by a host of ‘Scythians’ and the attempts of the inhabitants of Thessalonica and the province of Achaia to repel the incursion. It is particularly notable for the detail it provides of the Greek resistance, including the fortification of the pass at Thermopylae against the barbarians, the election of three generals to supervise the Greek war effort, and the beginnings of a rousing speech in *oratio recta* delivered by a leader named Marianus.

Martin and Grusková have identified the author of this text as the Athenian historian P. Herennius Dexippus, who is best known for writing the *Scythica*, a now-fragmentary account of Rome’s Gothic wars in the middle decades of the third century.<sup>6</sup> This style and content of the Vienna fragment make the identification a compelling one. However, some of Martin and Grusková’s conclusions on prosopographical and contextual matters are less secure, including their identification of the general Marianus with Gallienus’ *dux* Aurelius Marcianus. Most importantly, Martin and Grusková argue that the fragment describes the events of the famous ‘Herulian invasion’ of 267/268, late in the reign of the emperor Gallienus. However, this dating is called into question when the Vienna manuscript is compared with parallel accounts of the 250s and 260s in the *Historia Augusta*, Zosimus and Zonaras.

The aim of this article is to examine the text and significance of the new Vienna manuscript, concentrating primarily on historical matters. In Section I, we present a Greek text and English translation, based entirely on Martin and Grusková’s published transcription of the palimpsest.<sup>7</sup> This is followed in Section II by a discussion of the authorship of the text, in which we endorse Martin and Grusková’s identification of the author with Dexippus, while also considering other possible

---

by Martin and Grusková in 2014a. A further publication (Martin and Grusková 2014b), which appeared while this present article was nearing completion, provides transcriptions of the already published fol. 195<sup>r</sup> and a new page (fol. 194<sup>v</sup>) from the codex. Since the acceptance of this article for publication in February 2015, Grusková and Martin have published one final fragment from the Vienna palimpsest (fol. 194<sup>r</sup>), which appears to cover the events around the siege of Philippopolis during the reign of Decius (Grusková and Martin 2014). We have endeavoured to take account of these new fragments, and the ideas raised in these publications where possible.

<sup>2</sup> For the dating of *Codex Vindobonensis Hist. gr. 73*, see Grusková 2010: 51.

<sup>3</sup> Martin and Grusková 2014: 106-7.

<sup>4</sup> The standard account of Gallienus’ reign is De Blois 1976. For more recent discussions of his reign in the context of the problems of the third century, see Drinkwater 2005: 41-8; John and Hartmann 2008: 1025-53; Ando 2012: 157-75.

<sup>5</sup> The studies of Alföldi 1939 and 1967 have underpinned much current scholarship on the Gothic invasions.

<sup>6</sup> Martin and Grusková 2014: 113-16. For Dexippus, see *FGrH* 100; Millar 1969 = Millar 2004: 265-97; Martin 2006.

<sup>7</sup> Although the text contains some deviations from that published by Martin and Grusková, (denoted by <...>), these conjectures are not based on any new readings of the MS.

authorial contenders. Section III examines the three individuals named in the fragment as generals elected to supervise the defence of Greece: Marianus, Philostratus and Dexippus. We shall argue that the identity of Marianus is crucial to the dating of the Scythian invasion described in the text, which is the subject of Section IV. We propose that the attack described in the fragment actually took place in the early 260s, several years before the ‘Herulian invasion’. When placed in this context, the Vienna manuscript makes a notable contribution to our understanding of historical events in the Balkans and Greece in the reign of Gallienus, as well as the manner in which they were portrayed by Dexippus.

[205]

## I TEXT AND TRANSLATION

### *Text*

NB vertical lines denote line breaks in the MS.

(1) ... <Θρά>|κην<sup>8</sup> καὶ Μακεδονίαν, καὶ ἐληίζοντο τὴν αὐτό|θι γῆν σύμπασαν. καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ τῇ Θεσσαλο|νικέων πόλει προσβαλόντες, ἄθρόοι ἐπεί|ραζον αὐτῆς τὴν ἄλωσιν· ὥς δὲ οἱ τε ἀπὸ| τοῦ τείχους εὐρώστως ἡμύνοντο, πολυχειρίᾳ| τὰς τάξεις ἀμύνοντες, καὶ προυχώρει οὐδὲν ἐς| ἐλπίδας, λύουσι τὴν πολιορκίαν. (2) καὶ γνῶ|μη <ή> πλείστη <ῆν><sup>9</sup> ἐπὶ τε Ἀθήνας καὶ Ἀχαιί|αν ὀρμηθῆναι τῷ στρατῷ, δόξῃ τῶν ἐν τοῖς| Ἑλληνικοῖς ἱεροῖς χρυσῶν καὶ ἀργυρῶν ἀνα|θημάτων καὶ ὅσα πομπεῖα· πλουσιώτατον| γὰρ ταύτῃ τὸ χωρίον εἶναι ἐξεπυνθάνοντο. (3) ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐς τοὺς Ἑλληνας ἐξηγγέλθη ἡ ἔφοδος τῶν| Σκυθῶν συνήεσαν ἐς Πύλας, καὶ κατὰ ταύ|τοθι στενὰ τῶν παρόδων ἐξείργειν αὐτοὺς ὥρ|μητο. ἔφερον δὲ οἱ μὲν δοράτια, οἱ δὲ πελέ|κεις<sup>10</sup>, οἱ δὲ ξύλα κατακεχαλκωμένα καὶ σεσι|δηρωμένα ἄκρα, καὶ ὅπως ἐκάστῳ ὀπλίσασθαι| δυνατὰ ἦν. καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἡθροίσθησαν τό τε διατείχισμα ἐξετείχισαν καὶ τῇ φυλακῇ προ|σεῖχον σπουδῇ. (4) ἐδόκει δὲ τὸ χωρίον καὶ ἄλλως| ἀσφαλέστατον εἶναι, οἷα δὲ τῆς ὁδοῦ διὰ δυσχωρί|αν στενῆς οὔσης καὶ ἀπόρου, ἢ φέροι ἐπὶ τὴν| εἴσω Πυλῶν Ἑλλάδα· παρατείνουσα γὰρ ἐπὶ μή|κιστον ἢ ἐπ’ Εὐβοίας θάλασσα τά τε ἀγχοῦ τῶν| ὁρῶν <δάπεδα><sup>11</sup> δυσεμβολώτατα διὰ πηλὸν| ἐργάζεται, καὶ ἐπιλαμβάνουσα<sup>12</sup> <ἐπὶ> τούτοις ἢ Οἷτῃ| τὸ ὄρος

<sup>8</sup> The restoration of <Θρά>κην seems straightforward, given the logical progression of the Scythians from the Danubian shores of the Black Sea through Thrace, Macedonia and to Greece proper. It is worth noting that Dexippus names these two provinces together in other contexts, as when he describes a certain Priscus as the ‘*harmostes* [sc. *praeses*] of the cities of Macedonia and Thrace’ (ἄρμοστής τῶν Μακεδονικῶν καὶ Θρακικῶν πόλεων) (*FGrH* 100 F 26.2).

<sup>9</sup> Following the suggestion of Martin and Grusková (2014: 109) we have emended the MS ηεσαν to read ῆν. This is not the only possible reading. Nigel Wilson has suggested ἦνεσαν as an alternative. The emendation is a delicate one, but we are not, however, able to discover any close syntactic parallels to support such the use of the verb αἰνέω in this sort of context.

<sup>10</sup> Martin and Grusková’s reading πελέκας (for the accusative plural) cannot be correct.

<sup>11</sup> The MS at this point is particularly uncertain, with only δ\*\*\*δ\*\*\* discernable. The context of the passage requires something like ‘flat lands’ or simply ‘ground’. δάπεδον, although not a common word, appears with sufficient frequency in good prose authors to make it a viable reading: e.g. Hdt. 4.200.1; Xen. *Anab.* 4.5.6, Xen. *Eques.* 1.3; Cass. Dio 40.18.2, 41.9.2. For the geography of the marshy alluvial plain which abuts the Malian gulf, see Cherf 1987: 138-9.

<sup>12</sup> The most natural interpretations of this participle are either in the sense of ‘reach’ or ‘occupy space’ (*LSJ* s.v. ἐπιλαμβάνω 2, 4). The only use of this verb with the dative cited by

\*\*\*\*\*α πεζῇ τε καὶ ἵππικῇ | διὰ τῆς ἐγγύτητος τῶν πετρῶν ἀπορώτατον  
ἐρ|γάζεται τὸ χωρίον. (5) στρατηγοὶ δὲ τοῦ παντὸς πολέ|μου αἵρετοὶ  
ἀπεφάνθησαν ὑπὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων· | Μαριανὸς τε ὃς δὴ<sup>13</sup> προαιρεθεὶς ἦν ἄρχειν  
τῆς | Ἑλλάδος ἐκ βασιλέως τῆς ἐντὸς Πυλῶν, | καὶ ἐπὶ τῷδε Φιλόστρατος τε  
Ἀθηναῖος ἀνὴρ λόγους | καὶ γνώμην κρατίστος, καὶ Δέξιππος ὃς δὴ πέμ|πτον  
εἶχε τὴν ἐν Βοιωτοῖς ἀρχήν. (6) ἐδόκει τὸ | συμφορώτατον εἶναι καὶ θαρσύναι  
αὐτοὺς λόγῳ | καὶ ἐς ἀνάμνησιν τῆς τῶν προγόνων ἀρετῆς ἀγαγ|εῖν ὥς ἂν  
προθυμότερον τοῦ παντὸς πολέμου | ἄπτοινο καὶ μὴ ἀπαγορεύοιεν πρὸς τὴν  
φυλα|κὴν <τὴν τε ἀθροωτάτην><sup>14</sup>, ἦν τε καὶ χρόνιος τοῖς | ἐναντίοις ἢ πείρασιν  
τοῦ τειχίσματος γίγνηται. καὶ συνελθόντων Μαριανὸς, ὧ κατ' ἀξίωσιν εἰπεῖν |  
ἀπεδόθη, ἔλεξε τοιάδε· (7) ὧ Ἕλληνες, ἡ τε πρό|φασις τῆς σωτηρίας ἡμῶν καθ'  
ἦν ἡθοροίσθητε καὶ | τὸ χωρίον ἐν ὧ παρατάσσεσθε, ἱκανώτατα ἄμ|φω μνήμην  
ἀρετῆς παρασκευασαί· οὐδὲ γὰρ οἱ πρό|γονοὶ ὑμῶν ἐν τῷδε [206] μαχόμενοι  
ἔσφηλάν ποτε τῆς | ἐλευθερίας τὴν Ἑλλάδα· ἐν τε γὰρ τοῖς Μηδικοῖς | ἄριστα  
ἠγωνίσαντο καὶ ἐν πολέμῳ τῷ Λαμῖακῷ | κληθέντι καὶ αὐτὸς Ἄντιοχον τὸν ἐξ  
Ἀσίας δυνά|στην ἐτρέψαντο Ῥωμαίοις ἄρχουσιν ἤδη συνιστάμενοι· (8) | ὥς που  
συνκληρωθὲν Ἑλλήσι κατὰ τὸ δαιμόνιον | τοῖς κατὰ τῶν βαρβάρων ἀγῶσιν ἐν  
τῷδε τῷ χώρῳ | ἐνευτυγῆται, ὑμῖν δὲ οἰκεῖται τῶν πολέμων ὑ|ποθέσεις πάλαι  
ἐξήκουσιν. ἀλλὰ θαρρεῖν ἐστὶ τῇ τε | ὑμετέρᾳ αὐτῶν παρασκευῇ καὶ τοῦ χωρίου  
τῇ ἰσχυί|, καθ' ἣν καὶ ταῖς προτέραις ἐφόδοις φοβεροὶ τοῖς | πολεμίοις ἐφάνητε,  
ἀφ' ὧν καὶ τὰ μέλλοντά μοι οὐ|κ ἀνέλπιστα εὖ γινώσκοντι, ὥς εἰς ἄμεινον α\*|  
\* \* \*

### Translation

(1)[(they invaded?)...Thra]ce and Macedonia, and plundered the entire countryside therein. And then, making an assault upon the city of the Thessalonians, they tried to capture it as a close-packed band. But since those on the walls defended themselves valiantly, warding off the battle columns with the assistance of many hands, and as none of the Scythians' hopes came to pass, they abandoned the siege. (2) The prevailing opinion of the host was to make for Athens and Achaia, envisioning the gold and silver votive offerings and the many processional goods in the Greek sanctuaries: for they learned that the region was exceedingly wealthy in this respect. (3) When the approach of the Scythians was reported to the Greeks, they gathered at Thermopylae, and set about <the task of> blocking them from the narrow passes there. Some carried small spears, others axes, others wooden pikes overlaid with bronze and with iron tips, or whatever each man could arm himself with. And when they came together, they completely fortified the perimeter wall and devoted themselves to its protection with haste. (4) And it seemed that the area was otherwise very secure, since the road which led to Greece beyond the gates was narrow and impracticable on account of the harsh terrain. For the Euboean Sea, at its greatest extent, stretches up to the flat lands near the mountains and makes them most difficult to access on account of the mud, and adjacent to these extends Mt Oeta [, which ....] on account of the closeness of the rocks, makes the place almost impassable for both infantry and cavalry. (5) The generals elected for the entire war were proclaimed by the Greeks: first, Marianus, who had been chosen previously by the emperor to

*LSJ* is 'assist', which seems inappropriate in the context, and some corruption seems likely. We have therefore posited a missing preposition, ἐπί, to account for the case of τοῦτοιοις.

<sup>13</sup> One of the journal's reviewers has suggested that the use of ὃς δὴ here and later in section five could be a corruption of ὃς ἤδη.

<sup>14</sup> MS ἦν τε ἀθροωτάτη

govern Greece inside the Gates; in addition to him, Philostratus the Athenian, a man mighty in speech and thought; and also Dexippus, who was holding the chief office among the Boeotians for the fifth time. (6) It seemed that the most prudent course was to encourage the men with a speech, and to recall the memory of their ancestors' valour, so that they would undertake the entire war with greater heart and not give up either during an extended period of watch, or during an attempt on the wall, if such an attempt were to take place at some point in time. When the men had gathered together, Marianus, who had been given the responsibility of addressing them on account of his status, spoke as follows: (7) 'O Greeks, the occasion of our preservation for which you are assembled and the land in which you have been deployed are both truly fitting to evoke the memory of virtuous deeds. For your ancestors, fighting in this place in former times, did not let Greece down and deprive it of its free state, for they fought bravely in the Persian wars and in the conflict called the Lamian war, and when they put to flight Antiochos, the despot from Asia, at which time they were already working in partnership with the Romans who were then in command. (8) So perhaps it may be good fortune, in accordance with the *daimonion*, that it has been allotted to the Greeks to do battle against the barbarians in this region (indeed your own principles of fighting the wars have turned out to be valid in the past). But you may take confidence in both your preparation for these events and the strength of the region – as a result of which, in previous attacks you seemed terrifying to the enemies. On account of these things future events do not appear to me not without hope, as to better...

[207]

## II AUTHORSHIP

The style and content of the Vienna fragment suggest that the author of this text dealt with the Gothic invasions of the mid-third century in considerable detail. Martin and Grusková have adduced significant and convincing positive arguments in favour of the author being the Athenian historian P. Herennius Dexippus. These are the content of the fragment, the use of a speech in *oratio recta*, and the style, which they regard as particularly reminiscent of Thucydides.<sup>15</sup> We agree wholeheartedly with their identification, and will add further reasons of our own in favour of Dexippian authorship.

On the matter of the content, there can be no doubt that the new text reads like a narrative written by a near contemporary invested in the situation he describes. Dexippus wrote two works that dealt with events of the mid-third century: the *Chronicle* and the *Scythica*. According to the waspish remarks of Eunapius of Sardis, the former was little more than a jejune annalistic narrative.<sup>16</sup> The *Scythica*, on the other hand, was a detailed history of the Gothic invasions that beset the Balkan and Anatolian provinces of the Roman Empire in the mid-third century, and probably

<sup>15</sup> Martin and Grusková 2014: 114-16.

<sup>16</sup> *FGrH* 100 F1 = *ES* 'Eunapius' F 1 [Boissevain 71-5]. For a synopsis of the structure of the *Chronicle*, see Janiszewski 2006: 52-4; Martin 2006: 155-61. In Eunapius' opinion, the *Chronicle* was notable for the care with which Dexippus attempted to synchronise the Athenian archons and Roman *consules ordinarii*. Barnes 1978: 72 has argued that the archonships were prioritised in this equation, so that, for example, the archon year of 260/1 equalled the consular year of 261, but unfortunately the matter cannot be settled.

culminated with the victories of Aurelian.<sup>17</sup> The work was noteworthy for its elaborate siege narratives and long speeches, which attracted the attention of the tenth-century compilers of the *Excerpta Constantiniana*.<sup>18</sup> As with the surviving excerpts of the *Scythica*, the new fragment is clearly part of a much larger narrative history of considerable scope. In recounting the fortification and defence of Thermopylae, the author devoted time to describing the geographical situation, the weaponry of the defenders, and the different generals, before launching into an extended and impassioned pre-battle exhortation. We do not know of any other history of the mid-third century written in Greek that would have the scope to describe events of Gallienus' reign in such detail, apart from Dexippus' *Scythica*.<sup>19</sup>

The concordances between the author of the Vienna fragment and Dexippus run deep. Both are cautious in avoiding Roman terms or Latinisms.<sup>20</sup> When the former speaks of Achaia, he is referring clearly to the region of Achaia in the Peloponnese, not to the Roman province. The Roman province of Achaia is, instead, referred to as 'Greece inside the Gates' (τῆς Ἑλλάδος...τῆς ἐντὸς Πυλῶν) and the emperor's representative, Marianus, is given no official title. There is also a clear similarity in the way in which the Vienna fragment and Dexippus conceive of the relationships between the Greeks and the Roman imperial authorities. Neither author ignores Roman emperors or administrators, but much of their attention is drawn to regional or civic groupings, which fight in partnership with the Roman authorities.<sup>21</sup> In our text, the Roman [208] emperor's representative Marianus is portrayed as working in tandem with the Greek generals, Dexippus the Boeotian and Philostratus the Athenian.

The content and themes of Marianus' speech are firmly focused on the valour and achievements of the Greeks themselves.<sup>22</sup> His emphasis on Greek freedom recalls the *Scythica*'s famous 'Speech of Dexippus', which was delivered to rouse the Athenians to arms after the sack of their city by the Heruli.<sup>23</sup> In the Vienna fragment, Marianus recalls a series of notable occasions in which the Greeks had displayed their

<sup>17</sup> For the *Scythica*, see Millar 1969: 24-6 = Millar 2004: 288-91; Brandt 1999: 174-5; Martin 2006: 161-3; Janiszewski 2006: 109-13. Cf. Potter 2011: 336, who sees the work as projecting the propaganda of Aurelian.

<sup>18</sup> *FGrH* 100 F 25, 27, 29 (sieges), F 6, 26, 28a (speeches and letters).

<sup>19</sup> The *Suda* E 3952 [Adler 2.489] cites a historian called 'Ephorus the younger' who wrote about 'Galenos' in twenty-seven books (*FGrH* 212 T1). However, it is uncertain whether this refers to Gallienus the emperor (Banchich 2011).

<sup>20</sup> For this characteristic of Greek historiography in general, see Mason 1970: 151-2. Pertinent here is the discussion of Cameron 1970: 75-88, and especially 76-82.

<sup>21</sup> Millar 1969: 25 = Millar 2004: 288-9; Davenport and Mallan 2013: 71. A further example can now be found in *Cod. Vind.* fol. 194<sup>r</sup>, which features an individual called Ptolemaios the Athenian. He was sent by the emperor Decius to take charge of the Thessalians and defend the border with Macedonia (*Cod. Vind.* fol. 194<sup>r</sup>, ll. 5-9, with Grusková and Martin 2014: 38).

<sup>22</sup> The distinction is made clear in the speech, as Marianus speaks of 'our preservation' (τῆς σωτηρίας ἡμῶν), referring to their immediate common cause against the Scythians, but fires up the emotions of the assembled Greeks by referring to the achievements of 'your ancestors' (οἱ πρόγονοι ὑμῶν).

<sup>23</sup> *FGrH* 100 F 28a.6: καλὸν δὲ γνωρίσαι τὸ πατριὸν ἡμῶν σχῆμα καὶ αὐτοὺς τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ἀρετῆς καὶ ἐλευθερίας γενέσθαι παράδειγμα ('It is indeed noble to display our patriotic character and to become a model of excellence and freedom for the Greeks.') For the supposed role of Dexippus (the historian) in the events of 267/8, see *HA Gall.* 13.8; *FGrH* 100 F 28, with Millar 1969: 27-8 = Millar 2004: 293-5, Fowden 1988: 50-1, Paschoud 1991: 224-9; cf. the extreme scepticism of de Ste. Croix 1981: 654-5.

fighting spirit in the past, during the Persian wars, the Lamian war, and the conflict with Antiochus.<sup>24</sup> These sentiments have a greater impact precisely because they are delivered by a Roman representative admiring the past achievements of the Greeks. Marianus also alludes to the necessity of co-operating with the Roman authorities in his reference to the war against Antiochus, which was conducted under Roman leadership (‘Ρωμαίοις ἄρχουσιν ἤδη συνιστάμενοι).<sup>25</sup> Even in the ‘Speech of Dexippus’, the Athenians are advised to join together with the imperial fleet to attack the Heruli, for it is only then that they will be the most effective fighting force.<sup>26</sup> The conception that the Greeks and Romans are partners in the battle against the invading Scythians thus represents a striking consonance between our text and the *Scythica*.

In addition to the content of the fragment, there are several stylistic clues that can assist in identifying the author of the fragment. Martin and Grusková have drawn attention to his tendency to use stock commonplaces or banal phraseology to describe people and events, which is consonant with what we know of Dexippus’ prose.<sup>27</sup> There may also be several Thucydidean echoes in the fragment.<sup>28</sup> Dexippus’ debt to Thucydides is well noted in scholarship: in an oft-cited passage Photius remarked on Dexippus’ Thucydidean style, which was particularly apparent in the *Scythica*.<sup>29</sup> In this vein, the author’s use of the word πολυχειρία (‘many hands’) may owe something to a passage from Thucydides’ narrative of the siege of Plataea.<sup>30</sup>

Other verbal parallels point even more clearly to Dexippus as the author. At the conclusion of his account of the siege of Thessalonica, the Vienna text uses the expression καὶ προυχῶρει οὐδὲν ἐς ἐλπίδας (‘and none of their hopes came to pass’), [209] which finds a parallel in book six of Thucydides.<sup>31</sup> Yet even more significant is the fact that the near-exact phraseology resurfaces in Dexippus’ narrative of another failed siege, that of Pamphylian Side.<sup>32</sup> Furthermore, a variation of this formulaic

<sup>24</sup> The reference to the Lamian war is consonant with what we know of Dexippus’ historical interest in the events immediately following the death of Alexander: *FGrH* 100 F 32i, F 33a-1, F 34.

<sup>25</sup> The use of ἤδη may suggest that this functions as some sort of precedent for the present occasion.

<sup>26</sup> *FGrH* 100 F 28a.4. Note also the sentiments of Decius in his letter to the people of Philippopolis (*FGrH* 100 F 26.7-8).

<sup>27</sup> Martin and Grusková 2014: 114-15. Though note also the occasionally recherché vocabulary: ἐνευτυχέω (sc. ἐνευτυχήται) appears only in Aelius Aristides (*Panath.* 57) of authors writing before the Middle Ages.

<sup>28</sup> Martin and Grusková 2014: 115-16.

<sup>29</sup> Phot. *Bib. cod.* 82 [ed. Henry 1.188]. Photius may be referring to nothing more than the decision of an author to divide the work into seasons or to adorn it with rhetorical set-pieces, such as speeches or letters. Note Eduard Norden’s perhaps overenthusiastic support of Photius’ statement, especially in relation to the quality of speeches in Dexippus: Norden 1958: 398; *contra* Niebuhr 1829: xvii. For a detailed illustration of Dexippus’ adaptations of Thucydides, see Stein 1957: 8-71. But see also the nuanced discussion by Martin (2006: 210-56) of Dexippus’ direct and indirect borrowings from Thucydides.

<sup>30</sup> Thuc. 2.77.3. For the association of the word πολυχειρία with Thucydides, note Poll. 2.149. That Dexippus modelled his narrative of the siege of Philippopolis (*FGrH* 100 F 27.7-11) on Thucydides’ siege of Plataea (2.77) is clear: Stein 1957: 61-2; cf. Blockley 1972: 18-22.

<sup>31</sup> Thuc. 6.103.2: καὶ τὰλλα προυχῶρει αὐτοῖς ἐς ἐλπίδας.

<sup>32</sup> *FGrH* 100 F 29.4: καὶ οὐδὲν προυχῶρει ἐς ἐλπίδας. The connection between *FGrH* 100 F 29.4 and Thucydides 6.103.2 has long been noted, going back at least as far as Dindorf 1870: xxxix; cf. Stein 1957: 63. For Dexippus’ use of the so-called ‘*elpis* motif’, see de Blois 1998: 3392, 3403.

phrase may also be seen at the end of Dexippus' narrative concerning the embassy of the Juthungi to the emperor Aurelian.<sup>33</sup> It is possible to identify one final stylistic connection between the new text and the *Scythica*. The end of the surviving portion of Marianus' speech includes a mention of the *daimonion*, or 'the heavenly power' (τὸ δαιμόνιον). Although other imperial Greek historians make reference to the *daimonion* in their works, it was by no means a universally applied commonplace. It is, however, a noteworthy feature of Dexippus' prose – especially in his speeches.<sup>34</sup>

Such positive arguments are difficult to make about other possible authorial candidates. Although we know the names of several historians of the mid-third century, precious little is actually known about their works.<sup>35</sup> Indeed, it seems likely that the histories of such authors as Philostratus the Athenian, Eusebius of Nantes, and Nicostratus of Trapezus perished before the advent of the tenth and eleventh centuries – a period which was so crucial for the preservation of antique authors and to which the Vienna manuscript belongs.<sup>36</sup> Of later authorities, the sixth-century historian Peter the Patrician is known to have covered the period of the third century in some detail.<sup>37</sup> However, he must be dismissed on stylistic grounds since, unlike the author of the Vienna fragment, his works contained many Latinisms. For example, in a famous fragment dealing with events in the reign of Gordian III, the governor of Moesia Inferior, Tullius Menophilus, is described as δοῦξ...Μυσίας and the emperor himself is referred to as αὐτοκράτωρ, whereas the Vienna author uses βασιλεύς for the unnamed emperor in the fragment.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>33</sup> *FGrH* 100 F 6.15: καὶ ὥς οὐδὲν αὐτοῖς τῶν ἐς ἐλπίδας ἐπράττετο ('since nothing had concluded as they had hoped').

<sup>34</sup> *FGrH* 100 F28.6, 32a, 33a.

<sup>35</sup> See now the thorough treatment of Janiszewski 2006; cf. Janiszewski *et al.* 2015: no. 835 (Stebnicka).

<sup>36</sup> The historian Philostratus the Athenian, who lived during the reign of Aurelian, wrote a history that covered the Gallienic plague and the invasion of the eastern provinces by Shapur in 260, which may have been his main focus. Yet it is likely that this history disappeared early – the last citations of it date to the sixth century works of Malalas (12.26 [Thurn p. 229] = *FGrH* 99 F 1) and Evagrius Scholasticus (*FGrH* 99 T1, F1). For Philostratus and his work, see *FGrH* 99; Janiszewski 2006: 97-109; Jones 2011. The history of Nicostratus of Trapezus only covered the period from Philip the Arab to Valerian's Persian campaign and Odaenathus of Palmyra (*FGrH* 98 T1), which again suggests a possible focus on eastern affairs (Potter 1990: 71-2). Eusebius, who wrote a history from Augustus to Carus, cannot be the author as his account of the (first) siege of Thessalonica survives elsewhere (*FGrH* 101 F1): cf. Millar 1969: 15 = Millar 2004: 270-1; Potter 1990: 361; Janiszewski 2006: 54-77. For the importance of the tenth and eleventh centuries for the survival of texts, see Wilson 1983: 136-40; Kaldellis 2012.

<sup>37</sup> It is a matter of controversy whether Peter (*PLRE* IIIB Petrus 6) and the unknown author of the thirty-five excerpts that follow the extracts from Cassius Dio in the Vatican palimpsest (*Cod. Vat. gr.* 73) of the *Excerpta de Sententiis* (dubbed the *Anonymus post Dionem*) are actually one and the same man. The debate, a relic of the mid-nineteenth century, shows little sign of being resolved, although it falls outside of the scope of this paper. For the most recent summary of the debate, see Cataudella 2003: 437-441. Many scholars (Müller *FHG* 4.191-2; Potter 1990: 395-7; Treadgold 2007: 49; Cameron 2011: 659), argue that they are different authors, but there is far from unanimous consensus. See Niebuhr 1829: xxiv; de Boor 1892: 13-33; Bleckmann 1992: 32-53; Paschoud 1994: 74; Hartmann 2008: 22-23 for the opposite point of view.

<sup>38</sup> *FHG* 4.186 F8 = *ELGR* 'Petrus Patricius' F 9 [de Boor p. 392-393]. Note also *ES* 'Petrus Patricius' F 4 [Boissevain p. 241] where he employs the Latinism ληγᾶτα (sc. *legata* 'legacies'/'bequests'). For Petrus' occasional lapses from an appropriately Attic register, note



Therefore, we may be confident in accepting Martin and Grusková's identification of the author of the fragment as P. Herennius Dexippus. With the question of authorship largely [210] beyond dispute, we may now turn to the interpretation of the fragment's content, in particular to the key elements of prosopography and dating.

### III PROSOPOGRAPHY

The Vienna manuscript names three individuals selected by the Greeks to serve as their generals: Marianus, Philostratus, and Dexippus. Martin and Grusková proposed that Marianus, the emperor's representative in Greece, should be identified with the *dux* Mar<c>ianus of *HA Gallieni duo* 6.1. They suggested that Philostratus was a prominent sophist, perhaps even the historian of the same name. Finally, they argued that Dexippus could only be the Athenian archon and historian P. Herennius Dexippus.<sup>39</sup> All three individuals warrant further discussion and consideration, especially since they have a significant bearing on the dating and interpretation of the new fragment.

#### *Marianus*

Martin and Grusková have identified this man as Marcianus, one of Gallienus' generals, who was known to have fought against the Goths in the late 260s.<sup>40</sup> They have also suggested that the MS reading Μαρτιανός should be emended to Μαρκιανός accordingly.<sup>41</sup> Their argument rests on two points. Firstly, that the Marianus found in the Vienna manuscript is identical with the *dux* Marcianus attested in *Gallieni duo* 6.1. Secondly, they have suggested that the copyist of the Vienna MS substituted a familiar name (Marianus) for an unfamiliar one (Marcianus).<sup>42</sup> In contrast, we will propose that the text should not be emended, and that Marianus is a previously unknown Roman official, probably a governor of the province of Achaia.

The *dux* Marcianus initially appears to feature in the *Historia Augusta* in three key events: (i) he defeats a Gothic attempt to invade Achaia, which occurs early in Gallienus' sole reign in the *HA*'s account (*HA Gall.* 6.1); (ii) he leads the Roman forces against the Scythians, after they have been repelled from Athens by the historian Dexippus (the so-called 'Herulian' invasion of 267/8) (*HA Gall.* 13.10; *Claud.* 6.1, 18.1); and (iii) he participates in a plot to murder Gallienus in 268 (*HA Gall.* 14.1, 14.7, 15.2). This Marcianus is usually identified with Aurelius Marcianus, one of Gallienus' generals.<sup>43</sup>

Aurelius Marcianus was honoured with a statue by the city of Philippopolis, which acclaimed him as its 'saviour' in the inscription on its base. The text of this inscription reveals that he was a *vir perfectissimus*, *protector* and *dux* of Gallienus.<sup>44</sup>

---

Menander Protector's comments (F. 6.2 Blockley = *ES* 'Menander' F 11 [Boissevain p. 19]), with Cameron 2011: 660.

<sup>39</sup> Martin and Grusková 2014: 111-13.

<sup>40</sup> *PIR*<sup>2</sup> M 204; *PLRE* I Marcianus 2.

<sup>41</sup> Martin and Grusková 2014: 111-12.

<sup>42</sup> Martin and Grusková 2014: 112 n. 20.

<sup>43</sup> *PLRE* I Marcianus 2; *PIR*<sup>2</sup> M 204; Barnes 1972: 163; 1978: 69; Desbordes and Ratti 2000: 116.

<sup>44</sup> *AE* 1965, 114 = *IGBulg.* V.5409: τὸν διασημώτατον| Μαρκιανόν, προτήκτο|ρα τοῦ ἀνεκίχτου δεσπό|του ἡμῶν Γαλλιανοῦ Σε(βαστοῦ),| τριβοῦνον πραιτωριανῶν| καὶ δοῦκα καὶ

The identification of this man with the Marianus of the Vienna manuscript would seem secure, were it not the fact that the first appearance of Marcianus in *Gallieni duo* 6.1, is actually itself the product of an emendation.

[211] It is worth citing the relevant passage of the *Historia Augusta* in context, as it appears in Hohl's Teubner edition (*HA Gall.* 5.6-6.1):<sup>45</sup>

...occupatis T<h>raciis Macedoniam vastaverunt, Thessalonicam obsederunt, neque usquam quies mediocriter sal[u]tem ostenta est. quae omnia contemptu, ut saepius diximus, Gallieni fiebant, hominis luxuriosissimi et, si esset securus, ad omne dedecus paratissimi. pugnatum est in Ach<a>ia Mar<c>iano duce contra eosdem Gothos, unde victi per Ach<a>eos recesserunt.

...after Thrace had been seized, they [sc. the Goths] laid waste to Macedonia, and besieged Thessalonica; nowhere was there the slightest respite offering up salvation. All these things happened as a result of (as we have mentioned frequently) Gallienus' contempt for the situation, since he was a totally dissolute fellow, always prepared to undertake any shameful act, as long as he was safe. The battle in Achaia was fought by the general Mar<c>ianus against these very same Goths, and after their defeat, they retreated through the lands of the Achaians.

The correspondence between this passage in the *Historia Augusta* and the events recounted in the Vienna manuscript is striking. Both works describe the Gothic/Scythian sack of the provinces of Thrace and Macedonia, the attempted siege of Thessalonica, and the incursion into Achaia. The decision to emend the name of the *dux* from 'Mariano' to 'Mar<c>iano' in *Gallieni duo* 6.1, based on the appearance of Marcianus in later events in the *Gallieni duo* and *Divus Claudius*, has become entrenched editorial practice, originating in the *editio princeps* of Salmasius in 1620. But it is important to note that 'Mariano' is the reading of both the authoritative *Codex Palatinus* 899 (P), and its derivatives, as well as all the so-called Σ-group MSS.<sup>46</sup> We would argue that the emendation is now unnecessary, since both the *Historia Augusta* and the Vienna fragment describe the Roman leader as Marianus/Μαριανός.<sup>47</sup> He must, therefore, be disassociated with the Aurelius Marcianus, *protector*, *tribunus* and *dux*, who fought against the Scythians in 267/8, before he conspired to murder Gallienus in 268. This has significant ramifications for the dating of the events described in the manuscript, which we will discuss in detail in the next section.

---

στρατηλάτην ('the *vir perfectissimus* Marcianus, *protector* of our unconquered lord, Gallienus Augustus, praetorian tribune, *dux*, and general'). He may be identical with the Aurelius Marcianus, a third-century general attested on Rhodes (*SEG* 47.1256), or the *dux* L. Aurelius Marcianus, honoured at Termessus in Pisidia (*IGR* 3.436 = *AE* 1978, 802). For his career, see Gerov 1965, and for the position of *protector*, Christol 1977; Speidel 2008.

<sup>45</sup> Hohl 1971: II.85. The emendation can be also found in the most recent edition of Desbordes and Ratti 2000: 24.

<sup>46</sup> See the *apparatus criticus* of Hohl 1971: 2.84. For the MSS of the *Historia Augusta*, and a discussion of the relationship between P and the Σ group MSS, see Marshall 1983: 354-6.

<sup>47</sup> C. P. Jones has also argued that the name Marianus does not need emendation in his academia.edu article 'The New Dexippos'.

For Martin and Grusková, however, it would seem to be a coincidence that both the *Historia Augusta* MSS and the Vienna fragment should name the Roman commander Marianus. This has led them to justify the emendation on the grounds of nomenclature. Since Marianus is a common name in the Byzantine Middle Ages, they argue that this resulted in the eleventh-century scribe committing a simple error, substituting a familiar name (Marianus) for an unfamiliar one (Marcianus).<sup>48</sup> It is true that Marianus was a common name during the period when the Vienna manuscript is believed to have been copied. However, it should be added that the name Marcianus was also not unknown during the tenth or eleventh centuries, so such a solution is inconclusive.<sup>49</sup> Perhaps more importantly, there is nothing implausible about Marianus being the name of the Roman commander. Marianus was a *cognomen* used by members of the senatorial and equestrian orders in the imperial age.<sup>50</sup> These included the third-century governor of [212] Pontus, [S]ept(imius) Maria[nus], and P. Vibius Marianus, procurator and *praeses* of Sardinia.<sup>51</sup> There is therefore no justification for emending the text on the grounds of nomenclature.

Indeed, it is probable that Marianus was actually a provincial governor. The text states that ‘he had been chosen previously by the emperor to govern Greece inside the Gates’ (προαιρεθεὶς ἦν ἄρχειν τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἐκ βασιλέως τῆς ἐντὸς Πυλῶν). This expression accurately describes the boundary of the Roman province of Achaia in the mid-third century.<sup>52</sup> The northern boundary of the province lay directly north of Thermopylae, probably at the Gorgopotamos gorge on the eastern face of Mt. Oeta.<sup>53</sup> The road station of Thapedon, which served as a suitable border crossing between the Roman provinces of Achaia and Macedonia, has been plausibly located at the base of the mountain.<sup>54</sup> We propose, therefore, that Marianus was a senator of praetorian rank, who had obtained the proconsulship of Achaia for the year.<sup>55</sup> The proconsul traditionally had limited auxiliary forces at his disposal, which accounts for the reliance on local men to defend the pass at Thermopylae in the Vienna text.<sup>56</sup> The fact that the emperor chose Marianus as his representative does not preclude him from

<sup>48</sup> Martin and Grusková 2014: 112, n. 20.

<sup>49</sup> For examples of the name Marianus, see *PMBZ* 2.4. pp. 362-73 (seventeen definite attestations). For Marcianus, see *PMBZ* 2.4. pp. 380-1 (four definite attestations).

<sup>50</sup> It was one of many *cognomina* derived from *gentilia*, in this case Marius (Kajanto 1965: 31-5, 150). For high status Mariani, note: Mes[s]ius Marianus, *curator rei publicae* of Tarraco (*CIL* II.14.2 1004), M. Caecilius Rufinus Marianus, *legatus legionis* of the XIII Gemina (*CIL* III 1142), P. Postumius Marianus, *curator rei publicae* of Augusta Taurinorum (*CIL* V 4192), C. Valerius Marianus, *eques equo publico* from Tridentum (*CIL* V 5036), L. Turpilius Victorinus Marianus, *eques Romanus* from Cuicul (*CIL* VIII 20162), Cassius Marianus, *procurator* of Narbonensis (*CIL* XII 671), Gallus Marianus, *epistrategos* of the Thebaid (Bernard 1989 no. 12), and M. Septimius Marianus, *agonothetes* in Ephesus (*I.Ephesus* 1130).

<sup>51</sup> [S]ept(imius) Maria[nus]: *CIL* VI 41231, cf. *AE* 1954, 71, a water pipe with the names Septimius Marianus and Septimius Iunior (see *PIR*<sup>2</sup> S 461, 469). P. Vibius Marianus: *CIL* VI 1636.

<sup>52</sup> This expression finds parallels in Hellenistic authors describing the lands south of Thermopylae. Polyb. 2.52.8, 10.41.5; Strabo 9.5.9. A similar expression can now be found in *Cod. Vind.* fol. 194<sup>r</sup>, line 15, with Grusková and Martin 2014: 38.

<sup>53</sup> Cherf 1987.

<sup>54</sup> Cherf 1987: 138-42.

<sup>55</sup> Achaia remained a public province until the reign of Diocletian. See Groag 1939: 157-61; Davenport 2013: 225-6.

<sup>56</sup> Sherk 1957: 60-2.

being a proconsular governor, although the proconsular position was traditionally selected by *sortitio*. Gubernatorial appointments to ‘public’ provinces made *extra sortem* are well attested throughout the imperial period, and such practices seem to have become particularly prevalent in the mid-third century.<sup>57</sup> Furthermore, the fact that the *Historia Augusta* gives Marianus the title of *dux* is not a serious impediment to this identification, since its author likewise routinely applies incorrect titles to senatorial and equestrian officers and administrators.<sup>58</sup> Given the geographical description of Marianus’ sphere of responsibility, the proconsulship of Achaia remains his most likely official post.

### *Philostratus*

Philostratus is described as ‘mighty in speech and thought’ (λόγους καὶ γνώμην κρατίστος), implying that he was famed for his particular philosophical, literary, or oratorical prowess. This suggests that he could be identified with a little-known historian of the late third [213] century, Philostratus the Athenian, mentioned above in Section II.<sup>59</sup> A second promising candidate is L. Flavius Philostratus, of the deme Steiria, who is attested as archon in Athens in the mid-third century, probably in 255/6.<sup>60</sup> He may well be identical with the historian, but this is far from certain, given the ubiquity of the name Philostratus in Greece, and most scholars have exercised caution.<sup>61</sup>

The Flavii Philostrati of Steiria was a politically distinguished Athenian family in the third century. Their most notable member was L. Flavius Philostratus, who was a hoplite general c. 205, and possibly a *prytanis* as well.<sup>62</sup> He is best known, however, as the Philostratus who wrote the *Lives of the Sophists*, the *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, and *Eikones*.<sup>63</sup> This Philostratus was well connected: he was an associate of Julia Domna, and of the consular Antonius Gordianus, to whom he

<sup>57</sup> Writing in the Severan period, Cassius Dio (53.14.3-4) states that provincial governorships were in the emperor's gift, even in the public provinces, which were traditionally selected by lot. See Talbert 1984: 348-53, 397-8 for full discussion, and Lo Cascio 2005: 161 for comments on the appointment of senatorial governors under Gallienus. Cf. *HA Trig. Tyr.* 19.1: ‘Valens was ruling the proconsulate of Achaia, having been given the office at that time by Gallienus’ ([Valens] *proconsulatum Achaiae dato a Gallieno tunc honore gubernabat*).

<sup>58</sup> For example, the *HA (Gall.* 13.4, 14.1) calls Aurelius Heraclianus a *dux*, even though he was actually Gallienus’ praetorian prefect. The usurper M. Cassianus Latinus Postumus is referred to as a *dux* and *praeses* (*Trig. Tyr.* 3.9), though scholars now think he was probably governor of Germania Inferior (Eck 1985: 222-3). In the mid-third century, the title of *dux* was given to commanders of detachments of the imperial field army (Smith 1979: 276-8; Speidel 2008: 675, 687).

<sup>59</sup> Martin and Grusková 2014: 113.

<sup>60</sup> *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 2245; Follet 1976: 243, 341-2, 510; Byrne 2003: 263 no. 155.

<sup>61</sup> *FGrH IIb*: 303 (Jacoby); Jones 2011; Frakes 2011. cf. Janiszewski 2006: 107-9, who is more certain of the identification.

<sup>62</sup> Meritt and Traill 1974 nos 447-8; Traill 1982 no. 34 = *SEG* 32.194. This supersedes Traill 1971: 324, who previously dated the post of hoplite general to the 220s.

<sup>63</sup> Bowersock 1969: 2-6; Follet 1976: 101-2, 520; Flinterman 1995: 15-19; de Lannoy 1997: 2385-6; Byrne 2003: 262 no. 152; Bowie 2009: 19-20. He is not to be confused with the Philostratus of Lemnos, whom the author of the *Lives of the Sophists* describes as one of his friends (Philostr. *VS* 628).

dedicated the *Lives of the Sophists*.<sup>64</sup> His presumed son, L. Flavius Philostratus the younger, is attested as a hoplite general c. 225.<sup>65</sup> This means that the Philostratus who was archon in 255/6 was probably his grandson.<sup>66</sup> The family tree of the author of the *Lives of the Sophists*, and especially the assignment of particular literary works to his various descendants, is a well-known prosopographical conundrum, which lies beyond the scope of this paper.<sup>67</sup> We do know that one of Philostratus' grandsons wrote a second *Eikones*, and he could possibly be the archon of 255/6.<sup>68</sup> It was not unheard of for sophists and rhetoricians to turn their hands to history, as in the case of Dio of Prusa's *Getica*, though the fact that a historical work is not ascribed to him in the *Suda*'s account of the Philostrati might count against the identification of Philostratus the historian with the author of the second *Eikones*.<sup>69</sup>

On current evidence, the Philostratus of the Vienna fragment could conceivably be identified with: (a) Philostratus the Athenian historian; (b) L. Flavius Philostratus, archon of 255/6; or (c) Philostratus, author of the second *Eikones*. They could all be the same man, or they could all be different men. What we can say is that our Philostratus numbered among a class of Greek notables, famed for literary and rhetorical talents, who held prominent local office and who – like Herennius Dexippus himself – took a leading role in mounting the defence of Greece in the face of barbarian invasions.

### *Dexippus*

The final figure is Dexippus, who 'was holding the chief office among the Boeotians for the fifth time' (ὅς δὲ πέμπτον εἶχε τὴν ἐν Βοιωτοῖς ἀρχήν). Martin and Grusková's suggestion that he should be identified with the historian Dexippus, who was an Athenian, is [214] unlikely.<sup>70</sup> Instead, he was probably a member of an eminent Boeotian family, either identical with, or related to, a certain Cn. Curtius Dexippus from Chaeronea.<sup>71</sup> Curtius Dexippus is known to have erected a commemorative statue of his mother, Flavia Lanica, a priestess in several local cults.<sup>72</sup> Although this monument was initially dated to the early third century, Fossey has assigned it to the mid-late third century on the basis of letter forms in the

<sup>64</sup> This man was almost certainly either the future Gordian I or II. For a reassertion of this orthodox position, see now Kemezis 2014: 294-7; Janiszewski *et al.* 2015: no. 832 (Stebnicka).

<sup>65</sup> Meritt and Traill 1974 nos. 449, 485; Follet 1976: 520; Byrne 2003: 263 no. 154. His brother was L. Flavius Capitolinus (*I. Erythrai* 63; Byrne 2003: 262-3, no. 153).

<sup>66</sup> Traill 1971: 324; de Lannoy 1997: 2420.

<sup>67</sup> See De Lannoy 1997; Anderson 1986: 291-6; Flinterman 1995: 15-19.

<sup>68</sup> Bowie 2006; Byrne 2003: 263. The proem of Philostratus *Eikones* II describes the author of *Eikones* I as 'my mother's father'. Janiszewski *et al.* 2015: no. 835 (Stebnicka) identifies the historian Philostratus the Athenian as possibly being the same as this younger Philostratus.

<sup>69</sup> Bowie 2004: 73; 2009: 25; Anderson 2005: 105-14.

<sup>70</sup> Martin and Grusková 2014: 112-3.

<sup>71</sup> *IG* VII 3426 = *SEG* 36.416. His name appears on the monument as Γν(αῖος) Κούρ(τιος) Δέξιππος, though Κούρ(νελιος) is a possibility for the *gentilicium*, as suggested by Harter-Uibopuu 2003: 216. We are not the only scholars to have reached this conclusion: Oliver Gengler made the same point at a workshop on the text held in Vienna in June 2014, according to Grusková and Martin 2014: 39 n. 30, as does C. P. Jones in his academia.edu site.

<sup>72</sup> Fossey 1979: 581.

inscription.<sup>73</sup> This inscription records that when the monument was erected, Curtius Dexippus was Boeotarch for the third time, high priest of the emperors for life, and *logistes* (*curator rei publicae*) of the city of Chaeronea.<sup>74</sup> The *curatores rei publicae* could either be senators or equestrians from outside the community, or members of the local aristocracy, as was the case with Curtius Dexippus.<sup>75</sup> The revival of the office of Boeotarch in the Roman imperial period was possibly inspired by other Greek *koina* who had similar offices (such as Macedoniarch or Asiarch), and it has been argued that it was now largely a religious and ceremonial post at this time.<sup>76</sup> Having held this position five times, the Dexippus of the fragment was undoubtedly one of the most prominent Boeotians of his era, and perhaps the leading citizen of Chaeronea.

### *The 'Greeks'*

All three men named in the fragment, Marianus, Philostratus, and Dexippus, are said to have been elected generals for the war against the Scythians by 'the Greeks'. The only Greek political institution in existence in the third century that encompassed both Attica and Boeotia was the Panhellenion. This league of Greek city-states and federations was established in the reign of Hadrian, but is attested epigraphically into the 250s.<sup>77</sup> Each of the elected generals represented a different region of mainland Greece. The Boeotians, who were represented by Dexippus, were one of the federal members of the Panhellenion, alongside the Achaeans, Phocians, and Thessalians.<sup>78</sup> The fact that Boeotia (and specifically the town of Chaeronea) was in the immediate path of the invading Goths may have ensured that one of their members was elected as a general. Athens, represented by Philostratus, was the capital of the Panhellenion, as well as being the intellectual and cultural centre of Greece. Marianus, as proconsul of Achaia, was based in the provincial capital of Corinth, and thus could be said to represent the Peloponnese.<sup>79</sup> Hitherto, the Panhellenion is not known to have elected 'generals' [215] (*strategoi*) among their regular roster of officials, but the Scythian invasion was surely an extraordinary circumstance, which required military leadership.<sup>80</sup>

## IV DATE AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT

<sup>73</sup> Fossey 1986: 258-9. Cf. *LGP*N IIIB, s.v. Δέξιππος (3), which assigns the inscription to the first part of the third century. Curtius Dexippus is the only third-century Boeotian Dexippus cited in the *LGP*N.

<sup>74</sup> The *logistes* / *curator rei publicae* was an imperial official appointed to oversee the management of a city's finances for a short period. On the official's duties, see Burton 1979: 475-7. For the title *logistes*, see Mason 1974: 183 s.v. *curator rei publicae*.

<sup>75</sup> Camia 2007: 412. In Achaia, as with Asia and North Africa, the curatorship did not transform into a purely local office before the late third to early fourth century. See Camia 2007: 416-17; Burton 1979: 479-81.

<sup>76</sup> Harter-Uibopuu 2003: 216.

<sup>77</sup> For the foundation of the Panhellenion, see Spawforth and Walker 1985 and 1986; Jones 1996; Spawforth 1999; Boatwright 2000: 147-50. The evidence for the third century is collected in Oliver 1970: 129, 133.

<sup>78</sup> Oliver 1970: 130.

<sup>79</sup> For Corinth as the province's administrative centre, see Groag 1939: 23. Neither Athens nor Corinth had been a member of the earlier Achaian league, but were part of the Panhellenion (Oliver 1978: 189-91).

<sup>80</sup> For the known officials of the Panhellenion, see Spawforth and Walker 1985: 84-7.

The familiar story of barbarian invasion and local resistance described by the Vienna manuscript not only fits with what we know of Dexippus' *Scythica*, but also with our conception of the barbarian invasions during the 'third century crisis' and the reign of Gallienus in particular.<sup>81</sup> But determining precisely when these events took place in Gallienus' reign is a more challenging proposition. The view of Martin and Grusková is that the fragment belongs to the period of the Herulian invasions of 267/8.<sup>82</sup> There are, however, several problems with this dating. The Herulian invasion, which originated on the coasts of the Black Sea, is described in our sources as a predominately seaborne invasion.<sup>83</sup> In the new fragment, there is no mention of the Scythians being supported by an armada of any description. Furthermore, according to Zosimus, the sack of Athens by the Heruli actually preceded the siege of Thessalonica, which was lifted only by the timely appearance of imperial reinforcements.<sup>84</sup> In the Vienna fragment, however, the inhabitants of Thessalonica secure the safety of the city by their own force of arms, suggesting it should be identified with an earlier siege of the city. Finally, and perhaps most significantly, nowhere in the tradition concerning the Herulian invasion do we hear about the fortification of Thermopylae. Such discrepancies challenge us to consider alternatives. As we shall argue, the evidence leads us to suggest that the events described in the Vienna manuscript refer to an earlier invasion of Greece, which occurred *circa* 262.

There are grounds for suggesting that Marianus, our Roman governor, was in office in Achaia in 262. It is a rare thing for the later biographies in the *Historia Augusta* to offer illumination rather than obfuscation, but this most difficult of works may shed light on the dating of the events described in the Vienna fragment. Chapters 5.2-6.1 of *Gallieni duo* describe a series of events which leads up to Marianus' defence of Greece against the Goths. At the start of this section of the narrative, the author provides us with a verifiable date in the form of the consular pair of the year 262.<sup>85</sup>

*Gallieno et Faustiano cons. inter tot bellicas clades etiam terrae motus gravissimus fuit et tenebrae per multos <dies>...*

In the consulship of Gallienus and Faustianus, among countless military disasters, there was even a very serious earthquake and darkness for many days...

<sup>81</sup> Much has been written in the last two decades on the extent and even appropriateness of the term 'crisis' to describe the events of the middle decades of the third century. Here we use the term as shorthand to characterize the military and imperial instability precipitated largely by external threats to several of the European, Anatolian, and Eastern provinces of the Roman Empire. For recent overviews and discussions of this period, note Witschel 1999; Drinkwater 2005; Liebeschütz 2007: 11-20; Mennen 2011: 28-48; cf. Esmonde Cleary 2013: 18-41, for a perspective prioritising archaeological evidence rather than the literary record.

<sup>82</sup> Martin and Grusková 2014: 110-11. In their most recent contribution, Grusková and Martin 2014: 38-9 note that their suggested dating was questioned at the Vienna colloquium, and doubts have also been expressed by C. P. Jones at his academia.edu site.

<sup>83</sup> Zos. 1.43; Sync. *Chron.* 467.15-22 M; *FGrH* 100 F 28 refers to the imminent arrival of the imperial fleet in Athens. For the most detailed discussion of the invasion, see Kettenhofen 1992, with Wilkes 1989: 188-9; 2005: 227-8; Brown 2011: 82-8.

<sup>84</sup> Zos. 1.42-3.

<sup>85</sup> Following Barnes 1978: 72, this would correspond with an Athenian archon year of 261/2.

[216] Just as the MSS of the *Historia Augusta* are unanimous in their attestation of Marianus as the Roman commander at *Gall.* 6.1, the consular pair ‘Gallieno and Faustiano’ has the corroboration of P and at least one text in the  $\Sigma$ -group MSS.<sup>86</sup> In the past, the name of Gallienus’ colleague has often been emended to ‘Fausiano’ on the basis of an inscription from Ostia and the *Chronographer of 354*, which give his name as Nummius Fausianus.<sup>87</sup> Yet the publication of an inscription from Thugga in Africa Proconsularis in the 1990s has subsequently made it clear that the consul’s name is L. Mummius Faustianus,<sup>88</sup> thus vindicating the transmission of the name in the *Historia Augusta* MSS.<sup>89</sup>

The quality of the annalistic data provided by the pseudonymous *scriptor* of the *Historia Augusta* is noteworthy. It has long been recognised that the consular dates in the *Gallieni duo* (1.2, 5.2, 10.1, 12.1), as well as those in the *Maximus et Balbinus*, are authentic and probably derived from Dexippus’ *Chronicle*.<sup>90</sup> But of recent scholars, only Armstrong has accepted the possibility that there was an actual Scythian invasion of Achaia in 262.<sup>91</sup> The majority of scholars have tended to disassociate the vague catalogue of natural disasters,<sup>92</sup> plagues, and revolts of *Gallieni duo* 5.2-5, from the attack on Thessalonica and the invasion of Greece described in 5.6-6.1.<sup>93</sup> According to Barnes, the author of the *Gallieni duo* ‘has wantonly transferred the episode to a false date’.<sup>94</sup> However, this view is built on the assumption that the Marianus named in *Gallieni duo* 6.1 is in fact the *dux* Marcianus named at *Gallieni duo* 13.10 and elsewhere, and that the siege of Thessalonica described at this point occurred circa 268, rather than earlier. The appearance of the

<sup>86</sup> Hohl 1971: II.83 (*app. crit.*); and Desbordes and Ratti 2000: 23 (*app. crit.*).

<sup>87</sup> *CIL* XIV 5357; *Chron.* 354, ed. Mommsen *MGH AA IX* p. 59 (consular *fasti*), cf. p. 65 (*fasti* of the urban prefecture, which gives Faustinus); accepted by Barnes 1972: 157 n. 62; 1978: 110, citing ‘scribal corruption’. Other variations include Faustinianus (*Consularia Constantinopolitana*, ed. Burgess p. 233; *Chron. Pasch.* ed. Dindorf 1.507) and even Victorinus (Cassiodorus *Chron.* 970/262 [*Chron. Min.* 2 p. 148]). See now Christol 2006: 1848-9 for a full list of permutations.

<sup>88</sup> *AE* 1998, 1569: [*L(ucio)*] *Mummio Faustiano c(larissimo) v(iro) co(n)s(uli) ordinario*, discussed by Christol 2006. The same scholar had previously correctly identified Faustianus, rather than Fausianus, as the consul’s most likely *cognomen* (Christol 1986: 103-4). The fourth century consular list of the Alexandrian Aelius Theon also names the consul correctly as Φαυστιανός (*MGH AA XIII, Chron. Min.* 3, p. 378).

<sup>89</sup> The original manuscript reading of ‘Faustiano’ is now accepted in the Budé edition of Desbordes and Ratti 2000: 23.

<sup>90</sup> Mommsen 1890: 255, 261-2; Syme 1971: 170, 210, 235-6; Barnes 1978: 109-10; Armstrong 1987: 240-1; Paschoud 1991: 217, 220-2; Brandt 1996: 51-2; Janiszewski 2006: 41-2; McInerney 2011. Cf. Bleckmann 1995: 102-3, who argues against the *HA* using Dexippus directly.

<sup>91</sup> Armstrong 1987: 241; cf. Ridley 1972: 297. Barnes 1972: 163 initially appeared to accept the defence occurring ‘apparently as early as 262/3’, but later stated it had been transferred to a false date by the *HA* in Barnes 1978: 72.

<sup>92</sup> The series of disasters could be fictional. See Kelly 2008: 90 n. 170 on the tsunami possibly deriving from a fourth-century source.

<sup>93</sup> Alföldi 1939: 722-3 = Alföldi 1967: 438-9; cf. Mommsen 1909: 1.246 n. 1. Such a view has been generally followed or adapted, e.g. Straub 1952: 57-8, 60-74; Barnes 1978: 72-73; Bleckmann 1992: 192; Bray 1997: 11, 151-2; Desbordes and Ratti 2000: 116; Goltz and Hartmann 2008: 275-6, 284-6; Mennen 2011: 234.

<sup>94</sup> Barnes 1978: 72; cf. Barnes 1972: 163, where he appears to accept the date for Marcianus’ [sic] command ‘apparently as early as 262/3’.



Vienna fragment has undermined these assumptions, and such a conclusion is no longer inevitable.

How easily can we reconcile the dating supplied by the *Gallieni duo* 5.2 with our other evidence? It is worth noting that military activity in the Greek provinces is attested in the early 260s in the Latin chronographical tradition. Jerome notes that in 263, ‘Greece, Macedonia, Pontus and Asia were pillaged by the Goths’ (*Graecia Macedonia Pontus Asia depopulta per Gothos*).<sup>95</sup> The so-called *Consularia Constantinopolitana*, whose material seems to be independent of the Eusebius-Jerome tradition, notes a barbarian [217] incursion that began in 261: ‘many barbarians invaded Roman lands’ (*hostes multi intruerunt in Romania*).<sup>96</sup> More tellingly, there are important correspondences with the later Greek historiographical traditions.

Georgius Syncellus, in his *Selection of Chronography (Ecloga Chronographica)*, records the following events:<sup>97</sup>

Ἐπὶ Οὐαλεριανοῦ δὲ καὶ Γαλιηνοῦ πάλιν οἱ Σκύθαι διαβάντες τὸν Ἰστρον ποταμὸν τὴν τε Θράκην ἐδήωσαν καὶ Θεσσαλονίκην ἐπολιόρκησαν τὴν Ἰλλυρίδα πόλιν, οὐδὲν ἄριστον ἐπ’ αὐτῇ δράσαντες τῇ τῶν φυλάκων ἀνδρείᾳ. διὰ τοῦτο ταραχθέντες Ἕλληνες τὰς Θερμοπύλας ἐφρούρησαν τό τε τεῖχος Ἀθηναῖοι ἀνωκοδόμησαν καθαιρεθὲν ἀπὸ τῶν Σύλλου χρόνων, Πελοποννήσιοι δὲ ἀπὸ θαλάσσης εἰς θάλασσαν τὸν Ἰσθμὸν διετείχισαν, οἱ δὲ Σκύθαι μετὰ πολλῶν λαφύρων εἰς τὰ ἴδια ἦλθον.

During the reign of Valerian and Gallienus, the Scythians again crossed the Danube and ravaged Thrace and besieged the Illyrian city of Thessalonica. But because of the courage of those guarding the city, they achieved nothing great against it. Thrown into panic because of this, the Greeks stationed guards at Thermopylae, and the Athenians rebuilt the wall that had been taken down from the time of Sulla. And the Peloponnesians fortified the Isthmus with a wall extending from sea to sea. And the Scythians returned home with much booty. (tr. Adler and Tuffin, slightly adapted).

The events of this passage closely follow those described by the Vienna fragment and the *Historia Augusta*.<sup>98</sup> The Scythians follow the same route through Thrace to besiege the Macedonian city of Thessalonica, where the inhabitants successfully repel them. In response to this attack, the Greeks decide to strengthen their defences at Thermopylae in order to prevent the Scythians’ progress further into Greece. Syncellus then proceeds to give further details, which lie beyond the chronological scope of the surviving narrative of our new text, namely that the Athenians refortified their city, and the Peloponnesians built a wall across the Isthmus of Corinth. These last details can be found in Zosimus and Zonaras, both of whom describe the refortification of Athens after the previous wall had been dismantled by Sulla, as well

<sup>95</sup> Jer. *Chron.* p. 220 Helm. Near-identical descriptions in Eutropius (9.8) and Orosius (7.22.7) suggest a common ancestor, probably the *Kaisergeschichte* (Barnes 1970: 13-43; Burgess 1995 = Burgess 2011: no. V; 2002 = Burgess 2011: no. III). For epigraphic evidence of the Goths in Asia Minor in 262, see *AE* 1949, 255.

<sup>96</sup> Burgess 1993: 233.

<sup>97</sup> *Chron.* 466.1-7 M. For Syncellus’ life and work, see Treadgold 2013: 38-63; Alder and Tuffin 2002: xxix-xxx.

<sup>98</sup> Grusková and Martin (2014: 39 n. 29) note that Bruno Bleckmann observed the same parallel at the 2014 Vienna colloquium.

as the construction of a wall across the Isthmus of Corinth.<sup>99</sup> The rebuilding of the Athenian walls prior to the Herulian invasion of 267/8 is archaeologically verifiable. The fortifications largely followed the course of the Themistoclean wall, but expanded in the eastern sectors in order to account for Athens' growth in the second century.<sup>100</sup> There is no extant archaeological evidence for the fortification of the Isthmus of Corinth, and it has been called into question whether it was actually built.<sup>101</sup> The crucial fact is that in all three writers, the building of the new walls is a reaction to a Scythian attack on Thessalonica.<sup>102</sup>

Here we encounter a potential hurdle. Scholars have traditionally identified two major sieges of Thessalonica in the literary sources. The second, it is clear, occurred during the Herulian invasion. The first attack appears early, seemingly in the joint reign of Valerian and Gallienus, before Valerian's departure to the east. This is at least how it is [218] presented in the accounts of Zosimus, Syncellus, and Zonaras.<sup>103</sup> Thus, the contention that the siege occurred in either 253 or 254 has become canonical.<sup>104</sup> This date is not unproblematic, for the evidence from which it has been derived is slender. Zosimus' unreliability in terms of chronology is well known.<sup>105</sup> Therefore, much rests on the interpretation of Syncellus' testimony. It seems doubtful whether we should regard Syncellus as referring precisely to the years 253-260 when he places events in the reign of 'Valerian and Gallienus'.<sup>106</sup> Unlike certain ancient biographers (or modern text books), Syncellus thought of the period from the proclamation of Valerian to the demise of Gallienus as being a joint reign totalling fifteen years.<sup>107</sup> As such, it is unwise to assume that the passage above fell into the early part of their reign, just because it is introduced that way in the text.<sup>108</sup> More worryingly, we cannot even assume that Syncellus presented his material in the correct chronological order. Indeed the slipshod nature of Syncellus' method of composition tells against such assumptions.<sup>109</sup> It is clear that Syncellus used several sources (or a tradition that drew upon several sources) for his material for the reign of Valerian and Gallienus, following, excerpting and abbreviating each in turn as it took

<sup>99</sup> Zos. 1.29.3; Zon. 12.23 [Dindorf 3.140].

<sup>100</sup> Wilkes 1988: 190-1; Frantz 1988: 1; Theodoraki 2011: 84.

<sup>101</sup> Brown 2008: 132, suggesting that the construction of the wall may have been inspired by accounts of similar fortifications in Herodotus for the wars against the Persians. See Hdt. 8.71-8.74, in which the Peloponnesians build a wall across the Isthmus after the defeat of Leonidas and the 300 at Thermopylae.

<sup>102</sup> Zos. 1.29.2-3; Zonaras 12.23 [Dindorf 3.139.26-140.5].

<sup>103</sup> This first siege of Thessalonica is presumably the subject of *FGrH* 101 (Eusebius), F 1. See Sivan 1992: 159; Janiszewski 2006: 67-9; Favuzzi 2011.

<sup>104</sup> For example, Oberhummer 1936: 149; Alföldi 1967: 322; Armstrong 1987: 240; Bleckmann 1992: 183-9; Paschoud 2000: 152; Wilkes 1989: 188; 2005: 226; Janiszewski 2006: 68-9; Goltz and Hartmann 2008: 233-4.

<sup>105</sup> Ridley 1972: 288-89, 90-1, 297-99 (for a list of chronological errors); cf. Paschoud 2000: lxxiv-lxxv. Zosimus' chronological unreliability was obvious to his earliest critics, e.g. Schoell 1824: 6.341.

<sup>106</sup> Sync. *Chron.* 466.1-7 M (discussed above).

<sup>107</sup> Cf. Sync. *Chron.* 465.6 M, 467.27-8 M. In this he was not alone: e.g. Cassiod. *Chron.* 953 [= *Chron. Min.* 2 p. 147]; Simeon Magister *Chron.* 80.1 [Wahlgren p. 101]. Hence, the confusion of Psellus (*Hist. Synt.* 47).

<sup>108</sup> Zosimus (1.49) puts the siege of Thessalonica immediately before Gallienus' elevation to Augustus in 253.

<sup>109</sup> For Syncellus' method of composition and use of sources, see now the detailed treatment of Treadgold 2013: 51-63.

his fancy.<sup>110</sup> For Syncellus it was sufficient to place the historical events in the reign of the correct emperor and nothing more.<sup>111</sup> Therefore, we need not (and perhaps should not) take his narrative of the Persian wars, which follow his account of the Scythian invasion, as the basis for reconstructing the chronology of these events.<sup>112</sup> One point is clear: in all these accounts of the siege of Thessalonica, including that of the new Vienna text, the barbarians are repelled by the inhabitants of the city. This firmly dissociates it from the later siege in the Herulian invasion, when the enemies leave only after hearing of the approach of the imperial fleet.

The correspondence between the narrative described in the *Gallieni duo* and the events of the Vienna manuscript, Zosimus, and Syncellus is striking and suggestive, so as to indicate they are describing the same events.<sup>113</sup> The discussion, so far, may be summarised by the following table:

[219]

	Vienna text	<i>HA Gall.</i>	Zosimus	Syncellus	Zonaras
Invasion of Thrace/Macedon	X	X		X	X
Siege of Thessalonica	X	X	X	X	X
Defence of Thermopylae	X			X	
Roman leader Marianus	X	X			
Fortification of Athens			X	X	X
Fortification of Isthmus			X	X	X

The Gallienic date for the first Scythian invasion of Greece finds circumstantial support in archaeological, epigraphic, and numismatic evidence. We know, first of all, from the literary sources, that Marianus and his forces were successful in their endeavours, even though the marauding Goths did seize some booty. One would expect such a victory to be commemorated with an imperial acclamation for the emperor Gallienus, even though he himself was in Byzantium in 262.<sup>114</sup> As is well known, there are numerous problems with dating the imperial acclamations of Gallienus in the early 260s.<sup>115</sup> Nevertheless, numismatic evidence

<sup>110</sup> Note, for example, Syncellus' comments on the dispute among his sources concerning the succession to Trebonianus Gallus and Volusianus (*Chron.* 465.20-25 M), and his inclusion of the Letter of Dionysius, the bishop of Alexandria, excerpted from Eusebius (*Chron.* 467.29-469.13 M; cf. Euseb. *HE* 7.10.2-9).

<sup>111</sup> The same applies to Zosimus: Ridley 1972: 289.

<sup>112</sup> Persian invasion: Sync. *Chron.* 466.8-467.1 M.

<sup>113</sup> The *HA* omits the fortification of Thermopylae on this occasion. However, the *HA Claud.* 16.1-3 features a fictitious letter of Decius, in which the emperor tells the governor of Achaia that he is sending the future emperor Claudius Gothics, then a tribune, to defend Thermopylae with a small force. Cherf 1993 and Paschoud 2011: 332-3 suggested that the incident could reflect events in the late fourth century, when the pass was defended against Alaric. Barnes 1978: 75 also made the plausible suggestion that it could be derived from the incident described by Syncellus *Chron.* 466.1-7 M. But the recent publication of *Cod. Vind.* fol. 194<sup>r</sup> now shows that there was in fact a defence of Thermopylae in the reign of Decius (Grusková and Martin 2014). The *HA*'s author probably used this the basis for the events described in the *Claudius*.

<sup>114</sup> *HA Gall.* 6.8, 7.2-4; Armstrong 1987: 241.

<sup>115</sup> Peachin 1990: 82-4.

indicates that he was named *imperator* for the sixth time either in 262 or 263, as shown by a gold medallion from Rome that bears the reverse legend PM TR P IMP VI COS V P P.<sup>116</sup> Since Gallienus' fifth consulship fell in 262 and his sixth in 264, we can safely date the sixth acclamation to either 262 or 263.<sup>117</sup> The number of acclamations rose steadily in this period, since the emperor was IMP XII by 265 and IMP XV by 268.<sup>118</sup> It could be the case that Gallienus' imperial titles increased on an annual basis and are not connected with specific victories.<sup>119</sup> If, however, they were assumed as a result of the achievements of his generals, then the defeat of the Goths by Marianus and the Greeks provides a plausible reason for one of the imperial acclamations in the early 260s.

If Marianus was, as we have argued, a proconsul of Achaia, it should be noted that there is sufficient space for him in the provincial *fasti* for the years in question.<sup>120</sup> A certain Valens is attested as proconsul by the *Historia Augusta* around the year 261, when he is said to have staged a revolt against Gallienus.<sup>121</sup> One might doubt this governor's historicity, were it not for the fact that he appears in both the *Epitome de Caesaribus* and Ammianus Marcellinus.<sup>122</sup> Valens' revolt was allegedly suppressed by a certain Piso, who was then himself proclaimed emperor.<sup>123</sup> Ammianus gives Valens the *cognomen* 'Thessalonicus', but does not specify how he earned this name, whereas the *HA* says Piso earned the name 'Thessalicus' after being acclaimed emperor in Thessaly.<sup>124</sup> The precise chronology of these events is beyond redemption, given the garbled narrative presented by our disparate sources. However, there is no proconsul attested later in Gallienus' reign, now that Panathenius' proconsulship, initially dated to 267, has been relocated to the fourth century.<sup>125</sup> Gallienus might have appointed Marianus proconsul of Achaia in the wake of the mutinies of Valens and Piso, though this remains speculative.

[220] Finally, we may note that a date in the early 260s dovetails neatly with recent archaeological conjecture. The construction of the third-century walls of Athens (the so-called 'Valerian' wall) has long been regarded as a response to the siege of Thessalonica and invasion of Achaia in the account of Syncellus, Zosimus, and Zonaras. These events, as we have seen, have traditionally been dated to 254. Very recently, however, it has been proposed that the 'Valerian' walls were actually built in the sole reign of Gallienus.<sup>126</sup> This conclusion is suggested by the vast outlay of new coinage minted in Gallienus' reign, which was necessary to pay for the construction of the walls.<sup>127</sup> The threat to Greece, and to Athens in particular, probably explains Gallienus' journey to the city in September/October of 264, which

<sup>116</sup> *RIC* 5.1 (Gallienus) no. 3.

<sup>117</sup> Kienast 2000: 219.

<sup>118</sup> *IRT* 456; *AE* 1959, 271.

<sup>119</sup> Peachin 1990: 84.

<sup>120</sup> Davenport 2013: 225-6.

<sup>121</sup> *HA Gall.* 2.2; *Trig. Tyr.* 19.1.

<sup>122</sup> *Epit.* 32.4 (placing him in Macedonia); *Amm. Marc.* 21.16.10 (giving him the *cognomen* 'Thessalonicus'). For his historicity, see *PLRE* I Valens 2; Alföldi 1967: 365; Desbordes and Ratti 2000: 97; Gerhardt and Hartmann 2008: 1080; Paschoud 2011: 137-8.

<sup>123</sup> *PLRE* I Piso 1; *HA Gall.* 2.2-4; *Trig. Tyr.* 19-21.

<sup>124</sup> *HA Gall.* 2.4. Barnes 1978: 72 suggests the correct reading of *Amm.* 21.16.10 should be 'Thessalicus'.

<sup>125</sup> Heil 1997. cf. Gerhardt and Hartmann 2008: 1080-1.

<sup>126</sup> Theodoraki 2011: 131-3.

<sup>127</sup> Armstrong 1987: 251-2; Theodoraki 2011: 131.

was clearly an expedition of importance, since it was the emperor's first foray outside Rome in several years.<sup>128</sup>

The evidence suggests that the events described by the Vienna fragment took place early in the sole reign of Gallienus. The new text certainly describes the same events as Syncellus, Zosimus, and Zonaras. But rather than dating the siege of Thessalonica and the invasion of Greece to 254, as has become the orthodox position, circa 262 seems a much more plausible date. This is suggested by the accurate consular date of 262 in *Gallieni duo* 5.2, which probably refers to the Athenian archon year of 261/2.<sup>129</sup> The HA cites this date immediately preceding the reference to the siege of Thessalonica and the invasion of Greece. The name of the Roman commander Marianus, accurately recorded in the Vienna fragment, connects the events described there to *Gallieni duo* 6.1 (and by extension the Byzantine Greek tradition of Zosimus, Zonaras, and Syncellus). The results of this discussion may be best summarised with the following table:

<b>Standard Chronology</b>	
<b>Sources</b>	<b>Date</b>
Zos. 1.29; Sync. 466 M; <i>FGrH</i> 101 (Eusebius) F 1	253/4
Zos. 1.43; Sync. 467 M; <i>HA Gall.</i> 5.6, 6.1, 13.10; Vienna fragment	267/8
<b>Revised Chronology</b>	
<b>Sources</b>	<b>Date</b>
Zos. 1.29; Sync. 466 M; <i>HA Gall.</i> 5.6, 6.1; <i>FGrH</i> 101 (Eusebius) F 1; Jerome; <i>Cons. Const.</i> ; Vienna fragment	c.262
Zos. 1.43, Sync. 467 M, <i>HA Gall.</i> 13.10	267/8

## V CONCLUSION

The relationship between our sources for the late third century is not a topic to be dealt with lightly. The place of Dexippus in the succeeding Greek and Latin historiographical traditions is especially uncertain. The foregoing discussion has identified several important parallels between Syncellus, the *Historia Augusta*, Zosimus and the new Vienna fragment, the author of which we have identified as Dexippus, building on the arguments of Martin and Grusková. This leads us to the conclusion that the Dexippus was probably the original source for the events described by these later writers, even if his account was mediated through, and perhaps even supplemented by the accounts of other historians. [221] But did these authors or their source follow the *Scythica* or the *Chronicle*? It seems likely that the Vienna fragment is from the *Scythica* for the reasons outlined in the previous section. Yet Dexippus presumably covered the same events in less detail in the *Chronicle* as

<sup>128</sup> Armstrong 1987: 242-3.

<sup>129</sup> Note that the *Consularia Constantinopolitana* gives the barbarian invasion of Roman lands under the year 261, but this should not be pressed too far.

well.<sup>130</sup> Given what we know of the *Chronicle*, with its abbreviated style but practice of naming the consuls, it seems likely that this was the source followed by the *HA*.<sup>131</sup> The similarities in the accounts of Syncellus, Zosimus, and Zonaras suggest that all three relied on the same source, either directly or indirectly, of which Dexippus' *Scythica* was perhaps the ultimate ancestor.<sup>132</sup> The Vienna manuscript will no doubt play an important role in ongoing scholarly investigations of the relationship between the different Greek accounts of the third century, a discussion that lies beyond the scope of this paper.

Martin and Grusková's discovery of the new fragment of Dexippus' *Scythica* is especially important for its potential to shed new light on historical events in the Greece and the Balkans early in the sole reign of Gallienus. The foregoing investigation of the historical context of the Gothic invasion leads us to propose a new reconstruction of these years.

Some time in late 261 or early 262, a host of Goths invaded and laid waste to the provinces of Thrace and Macedonia. Before long, the barbarians turned their attention to Thessalonica, capital of the Roman province of Macedonia. The valiant actions of the inhabitants of the city meant that their siege was unsuccessful and the Goths set their sights on the province of Achaia. Upon hearing the news of the attack on Thessalonica, the Greeks – probably through the Panhellenion – set about organising the defence of the ungarrisoned province under the supervision of Marianus, the Roman proconsul of Achaia. Together with Marianus, the Panhellenion placed Philostratus the Athenian and the Boeotarch Dexippus in command of a hastily organised militia.

The Athenians, probably on Marianus' orders, began rebuilding the walls at Athens, which had been destroyed by Sulla. To pay for these building works, a large quantity of bronze coinage was struck at Athens. By late 262 or early 263, the Goths had invaded the province proper but were turned back by Marianus and his Greek militia. Nevertheless, the Goths left Achaia with much plunder, taken from the Hellenic shrines, including perhaps from the great sanctuary at Eleusis. Some of the Goths, who may have broken away from the army immediately following the failed siege of Thessalonica, or after they ravaged Achaia, then attacked the province of Asia. Yet in Achaia at least, the Gothic threat had passed by the end of 263 and thanks to efforts of Marianus and the provincials, Gallienus was acclaimed emperor for the sixth time. As a mark of respect to the provincials, Gallienus toured Greece in 264, and held the archonship at Athens.

The author of the *HA* presents the emperor's visit as a largely frivolous exercise motivated by personal vanity, since Gallienus wished to become an Athenian citizen, archon, member of the Areopagus council, and asked to be 'initiated into all sacred rites' (*sacris omnibus interesse*).<sup>133</sup> But there may well have been legitimate strategic reasons for the journey, which were neglected by the author of the *HA* in the pursuit of his desire to portray Gallienus as an indolent ruler, neglectful of the

---

<sup>130</sup> For thoughts about the shape of Dexippus' entries in the *Chronicle*, see Potter 1990: 80-81.

<sup>131</sup> Dexippus' *Chronicle* has been posited as the *HA*'s main source from 238-270, but the *HA* may have also used the *Scythica* (Barnes 1978: 109-112).

<sup>132</sup> We know that Syncellus used Dexippus (*FGrH* 100 F22; Alder and Tuffin 2002: lxi). For Zosimus and Zonaras, see Blockley 1980; Potter 1990: 72-3. For the common source problem, see Potter 1990: 357-9; Paschoud 2000: 152-3; Banchich and Lane 2009: 108.

<sup>133</sup> *HA Gall.* 11.3-8. This is commonly thought to be a reference to the Eleusinian mysteries (de Blois 1976: 146; Bray 1997: 241-2; Drinkwater 2005: 46; Ando 2012: 173).

empire's security.<sup>134</sup> In December of 265, a year after his initial visit, Gallienus sent a letter to [222] the people of Athens concerning the fortification of Eleusis.<sup>135</sup> Armstrong suggested that Eleusis was fortified because it had been attacked by the Costobocoi in 170.<sup>136</sup> While the memory of this event undoubtedly lived on in the third century, the new fragment of Dexippus' *Scythica* suggests that there were more pressing reasons for such fortifications, namely the barbarians' desire to make away with the votive offerings and processional goods in the Greek sanctuaries. Gallienus' visit to Athens in 264 was therefore no whimsical tour by a dissolute emperor, but was motivated by defensive exigencies: he wished to ensure the security of the city following the earlier invasion of circa 262, which resulted in the construction of the 'Valerian' wall. If this reconstruction of events is accepted, it suggests that Gallienus may have been a more engaged and proactive emperor than traditionally supposed.<sup>137</sup> Several decades ago, Armstrong argued that the portrayal of Gallienus in Dexippus' *Scythica* was largely a positive one, as the result of personal contact with the emperor during his visit to Athens.<sup>138</sup> The speech of Marianus in the Vienna fragment certainly does not give the impression that Dexippus viewed the Roman Empire and its representatives as ineffective and indolent. Instead, in his vision, it was co-operation between Greeks and Romans that would ultimately lead to them surviving the dark days of the mid-third century.

Wadham College, Oxford  
christopher.mallan@classics.ox.ac.uk

The University of Queensland  
c.davenport@uq.edu.au

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler, A. 1928-38: *Sudiae Lexicon*, Leipzig.  
 Adler, W. and Tuffin, P. 2002: *The Chronography of George Synkellos: A Byzantine Chronicle of Universal History from the Creation*, Oxford.  
 Alföldi, A. 1939: 'The sources for the Gothic invasions of the years 260-270', *Cambridge Ancient History XII*, 721-723.  
 Alföldi, A. 1967: *Studien zur Geschichte der Weltkrise des 3 Jahrh. nach Christus*, Darmstadt.  
 Anderson, G. 1986: *Philostratus: Biography and Belles Lettres in the Third Century A.D.*, London.  
 Anderson, G. 2005: *The Second Sophistic: A Cultural Phenomenon in the Roman Empire*, London.  
 Ando, C. 2012: *Imperial Rome AD 193 to 284: The Critical Century*, Edinburgh.  
 Armstrong, D. 1987: 'Gallienus in Athens, 264', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 70, 235-258.

<sup>134</sup> See *HA Gall.* 4.3, 6.3-7, 7.4-9.8, 16.1-17.9.

<sup>135</sup> *SEG* 26.129 = *SEG* 37.99, following the interpretation of Armstrong 1987: 246-9.

<sup>136</sup> Armstrong 1987: 249. For these events, see Brown 2011: 80-2.

<sup>137</sup> See Ando 2012: 173-4, interpreting Gallienus' actions in the early 260s as attempts at consolidation.

<sup>138</sup> Armstrong 1987: 253-4.

- Banchich, T. M. 2011: 'Ephoros the Younger (212)', in I. Worthington (ed.), *Brill's New Jacoby*, Brill Online.
- Banchich, T. M. and Lane, E. N. 2009: *The History of Zonaras: From Alexander Severus to the death of Theodosius the Great*, London and New York.
- Barnes, T. D. 1970: 'The Lost Kaisergeschichte and the Latin historical tradition', *Bonner Historia Augusta Colloquium 1968/9*, Bonn, 13-43.
- Barnes, T. D. 1972: 'Some persons in the *Historia Augusta*', *Phoenix* 26.2, 140-182.
- Barnes, T. D. 1978: *The Sources of the Historia Augusta*, Brussels.
- [223]
- Bleckmann, B. 1992: *Die Reichskrise des III. Jahrhunderts in der spätantiken und byzantinischen Geschichtsschreibung: Untersuchungen zu den nachdionischen Quellen der Chronik des Johannes Zonaras*, Munich.
- Bleckmann, B. 1995: 'Zu den Quellen der *Vita Gallieni duo*', in G. Bonamente and G. Paci (eds), *Historiae Augustae Colloquium Maceratense*, Bari, 75-105.
- Blockley, R.C. 1972: 'Dexippus and Priscus and the Thucydidean account of the siege of Plataea', *Phoenix* 26.1, 18-27.
- Blockley, R.C. 1980: 'Was the first book of Zosimus' New History based on more than two sources?', *Byzantion* 50.2, 393-402.
- Blockley, R.C. (ed., trans. and comm.) 1985: *The History of Menander the Guardsman*, Liverpool.
- Blois, L. de 1976: *The Policy of the Emperor Gallienus*, Leiden.
- Blois, L. de 1998: 'Emperor and empire in the works of Greek-speaking authors of the third century A.D.', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.34.4, 3391-3443.
- Boatwright, M. T. 2000: *Hadrian and the Cities of the Roman Empire*, Princeton.
- Boissevain, U.P. (ed.) 1906: *Excerpta de sententiis*, Berlin.
- Boor, C. de, 1892: 'Römische Kaisergeschichte in byzantinischer Fassung', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 1.1, 13-33.
- Boor, C. de, 1903: *Excerpta de legationibus, pars II. Excerpta de legationibus gentium ad romanos*, Berlin.
- Bowersock, G. W. 1969: *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire*, Oxford.
- Bowie, E. 2004: 'The geography of the Second Sophistic: cultural variations', in B. E. Borg (ed.), *Paideia: The World of the Second Sophistic*, Berlin, 65-83.
- Bowie, E. 2006, 'Philostratus [8]', in H. Cancik and H. Schneider (eds), *Brill's New Pauly Online*, Brill Online.
- Bowie, E. 2009: 'Philostratus: The life of a sophist', in E. Bowie and J. Elsner (eds), *Philostratus*, Oxford, 19-32.
- Brandt, H. 1996: *Kommentar zur Vita Maximi et Balbini der Historia Augusta*, Bonn.
- Brandt, H. 1999: 'Dexip und die Geschichtsschreibung des 3. Jh. n.Chr.', in M. Zimmermann (ed.), *Geschichtsschreibung und politischer Wandel im 3. Jh. n. Chr.: Kolloquium zu ehren von Karl-Ernst Petzold (Juni 1998) Anlässlich seines 80. Geburtstags*, Stuttgart, 169-182.
- Bray, J. J. 1997: *Gallienus: A Study in Reformist and Sexual Politics*, Kent Town.
- Brown, A. R. 2008: *The City of Corinth and Urbanism in Late Antique Greece*. PhD dissertation, Berkeley.
- Brown, A. R. 2011: 'Banditry or catastrophe?: History, archaeology, and the barbarian raids on Roman Greece', in R.W. Mathisen and D. Shanzer (eds), *Romans, Barbarians and the Transformation of the Roman World*, Farnham, 79-96.



- Brunt, P.A. 1980: 'On historical fragments and epitomes', *Classical Quarterly* 30.2, 477-494.
- Burgess, R.W. 1993: *The Chronicle of Hydatius, and the Consularia Constantinopolitana*, Oxford.
- Burgess, R. W. 1995: 'Jerome and the *Kaisergeschichte*', *Historia* 44.3, 349-369.
- Burgess, R. W. 2002: 'Jerome explained: An introduction to his *Chronicle* and a guide to its use', *Ancient History Bulletin* 15, 1-29.
- Burgess, R. W. 2011: *Chronicles, Consuls, and Coins: Historiography and History in the Later Roman Empire*, Farnham.
- Burton, G. P. 1979: 'The *curator rei publicae*: Towards a reappraisal', *Chiron* 9, 465-487.
- Byrne, S. G. 2003: *Roman Citizens of Athens*, Leuven.
- Cameron, A. 1970: *Agathias*, Oxford.
- Cameron, A. 2011: *The Last Pagans of Rome*, Oxford and New York.
- Camia, F. 2007: 'I *curatores rei publicae* nella provincia d'Acaia', *Mélanges de l'école française de Rome: Antiquité* 119, 409-419.
- Cataudella, M.R. 2003: 'Historiography in the east', in E. Marasco (ed.), *Greek and Roman Historiography in Late Antiquity: Fourth to Sixth Century A.D.*, Leiden and Boston, 391-447.
- Cherf, W. J. 1987: 'The Roman borders between Achaia and Macedonia', *Chiron* 17: 135-142.
- Cherf, W. J. 1993: 'The Thermopylae garrison of *Vita Claudii* 16', *Classical Philology* 88, 230-236.
- Christol, M. 1977: 'La carrière de Traianus Mucianus et l'origine des *protectores*', *Chiron* 7, 393-408.
- Christol, M. 1986: *Essai sur l'évolution des carrières sénatoriales dans la seconde moitié du III<sup>e</sup> siècle ap. J.C.*, Paris.
- Christol, M. 2006: 'Remarques sur la carrière de *L(ucius) Mummius Faustianus*, consul ordinaire en 262', *L'Africa Romana* 16, 1839-1870.
- Davenport, C. 2013: 'The governors of Achaia under Diocletian and Constantine', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 184, 225-234.
- Davenport, C. and Mallan, C. 2013: 'Dexippus' letter of Decius: Context and interpretation', *Museum Helveticum* 70, 57-73.
- De Ste. Croix, G. E. M. 1981: *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World*, London.
- De Lannoy, L. 1997: 'Le problème des Philostrate (État de la question)', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.34.3, 2362-2449.
- Desbordes, O. and Ratti, S. 2000: *Histoire Auguste, Tome IV 2<sup>ème</sup> partie: Vies des deux Valériens et des deux Galliens*, Paris.
- Dindorf, L. 1868-71: *Ioannis Zonarae Epitome historiarum*, Leipzig.
- Dindorf, L. 1870: *Historici Graeci Minores, Vol. 1*, Leipzig.
- Drinkwater, J. 2005: 'Maximinus to Diocletian and the "crisis"', *Cambridge Ancient History XII*<sup>2</sup>, 28-66.
- Eck, W. 1985: *Die Statthalter der germanischen Provinzen vom 1.-3. Jahrhundert*, Cologne.
- Esmonde Cleary, A. S. 2013: *The Roman West AD 200-500: An Archaeological Study*, Cambridge.
- Favuzzi, A. 2011: 'Eusebios (101)', in I. Worthington (ed.) *Brill's New Jacoby*, Brill Online.

- Flinterman, J.-J. 1995: *Power, Paideia and Pythagoreanism: Greek Identity, Conceptions of the Relationship between Philosophers and Monarchs, and Political Ideas in Philostratus' Life of Apollonius*, Amsterdam.
- Follet, S. 1976: *Athènes au II et au IIIe siècle. Etudes chronologiques et prosopographiques*, Paris.
- Fossey, J. M. 1979: 'The cities of the Kopais in the Roman period', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.7.1, 549-591.
- Fossey, J. M. 1986: 'Some imperial statue bases from the South West Kopais', in H. von Kalcyk, B. Gullath and A. Graber (eds), *Studien zur alten Geschichte. Siegfried Lauffer zum 70. Geburtstag*, Rome, 245-260.
- Fowden, G. 1988: 'City and mountain in late Roman Attica', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 108, 48-59.
- Frakes, R. M. 2011: 'Philostratos of Athens (99)', in I. Worthington (ed.) *Brill's New Jacoby*, Brill Online.
- Franz, A. 1988: *Late Antiquity: A.D. 267-700. Volume XXIV*, Princeton.
- Gerhardt, T. and Hartmann, U. 2008: 'Fasti', in K.-P. Johne, U. Hartmann and T. Gerhardt (eds), *Die Zeit der Soldatenkaiser: Krise und Transformation des Römischen Reiches im 3. Jahrhundert n. Chr. (235-284)*, Berlin, 1055-1198.
- Gero, B. 1965: 'La carriera militare di Marciano generale di Gallieno', *Athenaeum* 43, 333-354.
- Goltz, A. and Hartmann, U. 2008: 'Valerianus und Gallienus', in K.-P. Johne, U. Hartmann and T. Gerhardt (eds), *Die Zeit der Soldatenkaiser: Krise und Transformation des Römischen Reiches im 3. Jahrhundert n. Chr. (235-284)*, Berlin, 223-295.
- Groag, E. 1939: *Die römischen Reichsbeamten von Achaia bis auf Diokletian*, Vienna and Leipzig.
- Grusková, J. 2010: *Untersuchungen zu den griechischen Palimpsesten der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek*, Vienna.
- Grusková, J. and Martin, G. 2014: 'Ein neues Textstück aus den "Scythica Vindobonensia" zu den Ereignissen nach der Eroberung von Philippopolis', *Tyche* 29, 29-43.
- Harter-Uibopuu, K. 2003: 'Kaiserkult und Kaiserverehrung in den Koina des griechischen Mutterlandes', in H. Cancik and K. Hitzl (eds), *Die Praxis der Herrscherverehrung in Rom und seinen Provinzen*, Tübingen, 209-231.
- Hartmann, U. 2008: 'Die literarischen Quellen', in K.-P. Johne, U. Hartmann and T. Gerhardt (eds), *Die Zeit der Soldatenkaiser: Krise und Transformation des Römischen Reiches im 3. Jahrhundert n. Chr. (235-284)*, Berlin, 19-44.
- Heil, M. 1997: 'Panathenios, Statthalter von Griechenland', *Klio* 79, 468-78.
- Henry, R. (ed. and trans.) 1959: *Photius. Bibliothèque*, Paris.
- Hohl, E. (ed.) 1971: *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, 3rd edition, Leipzig.
- Janiszewski, P. 2006: *The Missing Link: Greek pagan historiography in the second half of the third century and in the fourth century A.D.* trans. D. Dzierzbicka, Warsaw.
- Janiszewski, P., Stebnicka, K., Szabat, E. (eds) 2015: *Prosopography of Greek Rhetors and Sophists of the Roman Empire*, trans. D. Dzierzbicka, Oxford.
- Jeffreys, E. 1990: 'Malalas' sources', in E. Jeffreys, B. Croke, and R. Scott (eds), *Studies in John Malalas*, Byzantina Australiensia 6, Sydney, 167-216.
- Johne, K.-P. and Hartmann, U. 2008: 'Krise und Transformation des Reiches im 3. Jahrhundert', in K.-P. Johne, U. Hartmann and T. Gerhardt (eds), *Die Zeit der Soldatenkaiser: Krise und Transformation des Römischen Reiches im 3. Jahrhundert n. Chr. (235-284)*, Berlin, 1025-1053.

- Jones, C. P. 2006: 'The Panhellenion', *Chiron* 26, 29-56.
- Jones, C. P. 2011: 'The historian Philostratus of Athens', *Classical Quarterly* 61, 320-322.
- Kajanto, I. 1965: *The Latin Cognomina*, Helsinki.
- Kaldellis, A. 2012: 'The Byzantine role in the making of the corpus of Classical Greek historiography: A preliminary investigation', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 132, 71-85.
- Kelly, G. 2008: *Ammianus Marcellinus: The Allusive Historian*, Cambridge.
- Kemezis, A.M. 2014: *Greek Narratives of the Roman Empire under the Severans: Cassius Dio, Philostratus, and Herodian*, Cambridge.
- Kettenhofen, E. 1992: 'Die Einfälle der Heruler ins Römische Reich im 3. Jh. n. Chr.', *Klio* 74, 291-313.
- Kienast, D. 2004: *Römische Kaisertabelle*, Darmstadt.
- Liebeschuetz, W. 2007: 'Was there a crisis of the third century?', in O. Hekster, G. de Kleijn, D. Slootjes (eds), *Crises and the Roman Empire. Proceedings of the Seventh Workshop of the International Network Impact of Empire (Nijmegen, June 20-24, 2006)*, Impact of Empire, Volume 7, Leiden, 11-20.
- Lo Cascio, E. 2005: 'The government and administration of the empire in the central decades of the third century', *Cambridge Ancient History XII<sup>2</sup>*, 156-169.
- Marshall, P.K. 1983: 'Scriptores Historiae Augustae', in L.D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics*, Oxford, 354-356.
- Martin, G. 2006: *Dexipp von Athen. Edition, Übersetzung und begleitende Studien*, Tübingen.
- Martin, G. and Grusková, J. 2014a: "'Dexippus Vindobonensis'? Ein neues Handschriftenfragment zum sog. Herulereinfall der Jahre 267/8", *Wiener Studien* 127, 101-120.
- Martin, G. and Grusková, J. 2014b: "'Scythica Vindobonensia" by Dexippus(?): New fragments on Decius' Gothic wars', *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 54.4, 728-754.
- Mason, H.J. 1970: 'The Roman government in Greek sources: The effect of literary theory on the translation of official titles', *Phoenix* 24.2, 150-159.
- Mason, H.J. 1974: *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions: A Lexicon and Analysis*, Toronto.
- McInerney, J. 2011: 'Dexippos (100)', in I. Worthington (ed.), *Brill's New Jacoby*, Brill Online.
- Mennen, I. 2011: *Power and Status in the Roman Empire, A.D. 193-284*, Leiden.
- Meritt, B. D. and Traill, J. S. 1974: *The Athenian Councillors. The Athenian Agora XV*, Princeton.
- Millar, F. G. B. 1969: 'P. Herennius Dexippus: The Greek world and the third century invasions', *Journal of Roman Studies* 59, 12-29.
- Millar, F. G. B. 2004: *Rome, The Greek World, and the East. Volume 2: Government, Society, and Culture in the Roman Empire*, eds H. M. Cotton and G. M. Rogers, Chapel Hill.
- Mommsen, T. 1890: 'Die Scriptores Historiae Augustae', *Hermes* 25.2, 228-292.
- Mommsen, T. 1909: *The Provinces of the Roman Empire*, trans. W. P. Dickenson, London.
- Müller, C. 1851: *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum, Vol. IV*, Paris.

- Niebuhr, B.G. 1829: *Dexippi, Eunapii, Petri Patricii, Prisci, Malchi, Menandri, Historiarum quae supersunt*, Bonn.
- Norden, E. 1958: *Die antike Kunstprosa: vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*<sup>5</sup>, Darmstadt.
- Oberhummer, E. 1936: 'Thessalonike', *RE* 6 A1, 143-163.
- Oliver, J. H. 1970: *Marcus Aurelius: Aspects of Civic and Cultural Policy in the East*, Hesperia Supplement XIII, Princeton.
- Oliver, J. H. 1978: 'Panachaeans and Panhellenes', *Hesperia* 47, 185-191.
- Paschoud, F. 1991: 'L'Histoire Auguste et Dexippe', in G. Bonamente and N. Duval (eds), *Historiae Augustae Colloquium Parisinum*, Macerata, 217-269.
- Paschoud, F. 1994: 'Nicomaque Flavien et la connexion Byzantine (Pierre le patrice et Zonaras): à propos du livre récent de Bruno Bleckmann', *Antiquité Tardive* 2, 71-82.
- Paschoud, F. 2000: *Zosime: Histoire nouvelle, Tome I*, 2nd edition, Paris.
- Paschoud, F. 2011: *Histoire Auguste: Tome IV 3<sup>e</sup> partie: Vies des Trente Tyrans et de Claude*, Paris.
- Peachin, M. 1990: *Roman Imperial Titulature and Chronology, A.D. 235-284*, Amsterdam.
- Potter, D. S. 1990: *Prophecy and History in the Crisis of the Roman Empire: A Historical Commentary on the Thirteenth Sibylline Oracle*, Oxford.
- Potter, D.S. 2011: 'The Greek historians of imperial Rome', in A. Feldherr and G. Hardy (eds), *The Oxford History of Historical Writing*, Oxford, 316-345.
- Ridley, R.T. 1972: 'Zosimus the Historian', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 65.2, 277-302.
- Roberto, U. 2009: 'Byzantine collections of late antique authors: Some remarks on the *Excerpta historica Constantiniana*', in M. Wallraff and L. Mecella (eds), *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur: Die Kestoi des Julius Africanus und ihre Überlieferung*, Berlin, 71-84.
- Schoell, M. S. F. 1824: *Histoire de la littérature grecque profane, depuis son origine jusqu'à la prise de Constantinople par les Turcs*, Paris.
- Sherk, R. K. 1957: 'Roman imperial troops in Macedonia and Achaea', *American Journal of Philology* 78, 52-62.
- Sivan, H. 1992: 'The Historian Eusebius (of Nantes)', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 112, 158-163.
- Smith, R. E. 1979: 'Dux, Praepositus', *ZPE* 36, 263-278.
- Spawforth, A. J. 1999: 'The Panhellenion again', *Chiron* 29, 339-352.
- Spawforth, A. J. and Walker, S. 1985: 'The world of the Panhellenion I: Athens and Eleusis', *Journal of Roman Studies* 75, 78-104.
- Spawforth, A. J. and Walker S. 1986: 'The world of the Panhellenion II: Three Dorian cities', *Journal of Roman Studies* 76, 88-105.
- Speidel, M. P. 2008: 'Das Heer', in K.-P. John, U. Hartmann and T. Gerhardt (eds), *Die Zeit der Soldatenkaiser: Krise und Transformation des Römischen Reiches im 3. Jahrhundert n. Chr. (235-284)*, Berlin, 673-690.
- Straub, J. 1952: *Studien zur Historia Augusta*, Bern.
- Syme, R. 1971: *Emperors and Biography*, Oxford.
- Theocharaki, A. M. 2011: 'The ancient circuit wall of Athens: Its changing course and the phases of construction', *Hesperia* 81.1, 71-156.
- Thurn, J. (ed.) 2000: *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia*, Berlin.
- Traill, J. S. 1971: 'Greek inscriptions honoring prytaneis', *Hesperia* 40, 308-329.
- Traill, J. S. 1982: 'Prytany and ephebic inscriptions from the Athenian agora', *Hesperia* 51, 197-235.

- Treadgold, W. 2007: *The Early Byzantine Historians*, Basingstoke.
- Treadgold, W. 2013: *The Middle Byzantine Historians*, Basingstoke.
- Wahlgren, S. (ed.) 2006: *Symeonis Magistri et Logothetae Chronicon*, Berlin.
- Wilkes, J. J. 1989: 'Civil defence in third-century Achaia', in S. Walker and A. Cameron (eds), *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire*, BICS Supplement 55, London, 187-192.
- Wilkes, J. J. 2005: 'Provinces and frontiers', *Cambridge Ancient History* XII<sup>2</sup>, 212-268.
- Wilson, N.G. 1983: *Scholars of Byzantium*, London.
- Witschel, C. 1999: *Krise – Rezession – Stagnation? Der western des römischen Reiches im 3. Jh. n. Chr.*, Frankfurt.