

MARCELLINUS ON DARA: A FRAGMENT OF HIS LOST
DE TEMPORUM QUALITATIBUS ET POSITIONIBUS LOCORUM

BRIAN CROKE

MARCELLINUS *comes*, AN OFFICIAL OF JUSTINIAN during the reign of Justin I in the early 520s and a fellow Illyrian, is best known for his chronicle continuing that of Jerome from the accession of Theodosius I (379) to the death of Anastasius (518), which he later updated to the reconquest of Vandal North Africa in 534.¹ The popularity and survival of the chronicle, an important source for the fifth and early sixth century especially for events in the Balkans and Constantinople, owe much to the fact that Cassiodorus recommended it in his monastic bibliography, the *Institutiones* (written in the 550s), as the most useful of the numerous continuations of Jerome's chronicle (1.17.2). Cassiodorus would have come across the chronicle during his interlude in the Eastern capital and brought a copy back to Italy with him.² In fact, the oldest manuscript of the chronicle (T) has long been associated with Cassiodorus. It is dated to the sixth century, was copied in Italy, and today forms part of the oldest Latin manuscript in the Bodleian Library,³ although its importance was assessed for the first time only in 1889 by Mommsen.⁴ It contains (folios 33r–145v) Jerome's chronicle to A.D. 378, then (146r–179v) Marcellinus'

¹Ed. T. Mommsen, *MGH.AA* 11 (1894) 60–104. For Marcellinus' career see Mommsen's introduction to his text (*MGH.AA* 11.41–43); *PLRE* 2 (1980) "Marcellinus 9," 710–711; M. Schanz, C. Hosius, and G. Krüger, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* 4.2 (Munich 1920) 110–112; V. Moricca, *Storia della letteratura latina cristiana* 3.2 (Turin 1943) 1361; B. Croke, "The Misunderstanding of Cassiodorus *Institutiones* 1.17.2," *CQ* 34 (1982) 225–226.

²For Cassiodorus in Constantinople: J. J. O'Donnell, *Cassiodorus* (Berkeley 1979) 131–136 in conjunction with Averil Cameron, "Cassiodorus Deflated," *JRS* 71 (1981) 184–185.

³J. K. Fotheringham, *The Bodleian Manuscript of Jerome's version of the Chronicle of Eusebius* (Oxford 1905) 25–26; E. A. Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores* 2² (Oxford 1972) nos. 223 a, b.

⁴T. Mommsen, "Die älteste Handschrift der Chronik des Hieronymus," *Hermes* 24 (1889) 393–401 (= *Gesammelte Schriften* 7 [1909] 597–605). The Bodleian purchased the manuscript in 1824 but it somehow escaped cataloguing and was only discovered in 1888 when it was brought by mistake to a German scholar who recognized what had happened. Thereupon the library concealed the manuscript's existence until Mommsen, who was working on his edition of the *Chronica Minora* at the time, could evaluate it (E. Hardy, "The Bodleian Manuscript of Jerome's Eusebian Chronicle," *Journal of Philology* 18 [1890] 277). Apparently Mommsen had made his peace with the Bodleian by this time. On his first visit, however, he was highly indignant to find the library closed when he turned up fresh for work at 7 a.m. (W. Warde-Fowler, *Roman Essays and Interpretations* [Oxford 1920] 252).

chronicle to 534 followed by an anonymous continuation to 548 where the manuscript breaks off, lacking a final folio. T is very close to the date of the original work itself and has even been held to be a Vivarium copy,⁵ although this claim cannot be sustained.⁶ Still, it does provide a sound basis for establishing the text of the chronicle.

Although not a terribly learned or polished writer, Marcellinus was clearly a productive one. In his section on "Christian Historians" Cassiodorus recommends the four-volume work of Marcellinus *De temporum qualitatibus et positionibus locorum*⁷ and in his section on "Cosmographers" another four-volume work which described *Constantinopolitanam civitatem et urbem Hierosolymorum*.⁸ Several scholars, including Mommsen, have thought that these two descriptions by Cassiodorus refer to one and the same work.⁹ This is unlikely. The titles of the works are quite distinct and denote entirely different contents: one confined to Constantinople and Jerusalem, the other far more extensive not only in its geographical scope but also in its content. In addition, Cassiodorus who had first-hand knowledge of the volumes in question placed them in entirely different categories in his *Institutiones*. The ensuing discussion presupposes that two separate works are meant. The work on Constantinople and Jerusalem does not survive and we have no indication of its use by any subsequent writer,¹⁰ while the other work *De temporum qualitatibus et positionibus locorum*, which forms the

⁵It has been proposed by P. Courcelle (*Late Latin Writers and their Greek Sources* [Cambridge, Mass. 1969] 374) that the combination of Jerome and Marcellinus in a single manuscript suggests a Vivarian origin. Further, Courcelle has proposed ("De la 'Regula Magistri' au corpus vivarien des chroniques," *REA* 56 [1954] 427–428) that T actually belonged to Cassiodorus since the Continuation of Marcellinus is in a different hand and must therefore have been added at Vivarium.

⁶A close examination of the manuscript shows that the hands are identical (A. Momigliano, "Gli Anicii e la storiografia latina del VI secolo d. C.," *Fondation Hardt, Entretiens* 4 [Geneva 1956] 271–272). My own inspection of the MS confirms this judgement.

⁷*Inst.* 1.17.1 *Marcellinus etiam quattuor libros de temporum qualitatibus et positionibus locorum pulcherrima proprietate conficiens, itineris sui tramitem laudabiliter percurrit, quem vobis pariter dereliquit.*

⁸*Inst.* 1.25.1 *Marcellinus quoque, de quo iam dixi, pari cura legendus est; qui Constantinopolitanam civitatem et urbem Hierosolymorum quattuor libellis minutissima ratione descripsit.*

⁹Mommsen, *MGH.AA* 11.42; Schanz-Hosius, *Geschichte* 112; *PLRE* "Marcellinus 9," 2.711.

¹⁰There is, nonetheless, a possible trace of the work. In a letter written to the abbot of the monastery of Tegernsee (48 km. south of Munich) in the twelfth century a request was made to send a copy of this particular work of Marcellinus: E. to B. (the names are omitted) *Rogo benivolentiam tuam, dilectissime, ut aliquos ex subiectis mihi transmittere digneris . . . Marcellinum de situ Hierosolymorum et Constantinopolitanorum (Epistulae ad Tegernseenses* 83, in *Codex Diplomatico-Historico Epistolaris [Thesaurus Anecdotorum* 6, ed. B. Pez, Augsburg 1729] 53). It may be, however, since there is no trace of such a MS in the relevant catalogues, that the Tegernsee library did not in fact possess a copy but that E. was simply hoping they might have one.

subject of this study, does not survive either, nor is there any indication of its use or even its existence in the period after Cassiodorus.

Precisely what *temporum qualitatibus* means is not immediately apparent, but it is somewhat imprecise to translate it as "the nature of events."¹¹ The plural *tempora* can of course mean "events, circumstances, etc." But the context of *Inst.* 1.17 suggests the more literal "times" (i.e., span of time). In *Inst.* 1.17 Cassiodorus begins *habent etiam post tractatores diversos relatores temporum et studia Christiana . . .*; ecclesiastical historians cover events *per tempora diversa*; Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* was translated and continued *cum adiectione temporum quae secuta sunt* by Rufinus; Orosius wrote of *Christianorum temporum paganorumque* and Marcellinus *de temporum qualitatibus . . .* It is clear from these examples that in the context of *Inst.* 1.17 *tempora* means "times" in the chronological sense, rather than simply "events," and this is confirmed by what Cassiodorus says explicitly about chronicles—*brevisssimae commemorationes temporum*—and by his statements that Jerome continued Eusebius' chronicle *usque ad tempora sua*, and that Prosper continued Jerome *ad Gaiserici tempora*. The *qualitates* are more elusive. In the plural *qualitates* can mean simply "nature," but that is hardly a constructive rendition in this case. Perhaps what *qualitates* signifies here is aspects of individual eras considered in the light of Christian chronology, their subdivision and comparison. This would not have been an unusual preoccupation for a chronicler and would at least account for Cassiodorus' inclusion of the work in his section on "Christian Historians."

We may reasonably suppose, then, that the first two volumes of this work provided a kind of manual of Christian interpretations of the characteristics of individual eras.¹² The other two books "On the Locations of Places" must have had a similar purpose. Otherwise it is difficult to see how the two segments could be so closely coupled as a work on "Christian History." Again, the content of the latter books can only be surmised. Perhaps they provided a sort of index of Christian (including Biblical) topography and onomastics. Or perhaps they merely listed cities founded in Christian times or by Christian emperors; or perhaps it was a layman's guide to bishoprics. In any case, it seems that the locations of the places were determined not only from reading but also from Marcellinus' own travels, and that what characterized each city in these books was its precise location, that is, its position in relation to other places. If this is an accurate assumption, then a typical example might be the entry on the foundation of Dara (or "Daras" in its Greek form) contained in editions of Marcellinus' chronicle. It begins *Daras civitate huiuscemodi condita in Mesopotamia. Daras quaedam possessio LX ab Amida civitate miliario ad*

¹¹As does L. W. Jones, *An Introduction to Divine and Human Readings by Cassiodorus Senator* (New York 1946) 116.

¹²Not unlike so many medieval works on chronology, such as the *De temporibus* of Bede (ed. Mommsen, *MGH.AA.* 13.247).

austrum sita et quindecim milibus a Nisibino oppido ad occasum distans (s.a. 518, *MGH.AA.* 11.100).

This entry on Dara certainly resembles what one would expect an account of a location to be. Indeed, as will be argued here, it does actually constitute a fragment of Marcellinus' lost books "On the Locations of Places." What is important to realize is that the Dara description does not belong to the chronicle itself but is contained only in a single 11th-century manuscript of the chronicle (*Codex Sanctomerensis* 697, hereafter simply S) from the Benedictine abbey of St. Bertin at St. Omer in northern France.¹³

Since the Dara entry is not to be found in any other manuscript of the chronicle, it is apparent that it was added at some point in the tradition represented by S, even though it is not possible to know precisely when. Likewise, it is clear that it did not form part of the original chronicle to be preserved in S alone; otherwise we would expect to find it located under a particular year, probably 507 or 508 when the new city was built. The fact that it is located awkwardly between the first (A.D. 379–518) and second (519–534) editions is an indication that the source from which it was copied contained no precise chronological statement except perhaps that, as the entry itself makes clear, the city was built by Anastasius. It was therefore appended to the reign of Anastasius.

There is one other such addition in S. Marcellinus' entry on the usurpation of Eugenius and Arbogast under the year 392 was expanded by adding extra details from Orosius whom Marcellinus was summarizing, although the interpolator carefully avoids repeating *invictasque*. The following comparison illustrates:

Marcellinus s.a. 392.1	Orosius 7.35.11–12	S (<i>MGH.AA.</i> 11.63, app. crit.)
<i>Arbogastes Valentiniano imperatore extincto et Eugenio Caesare facto innumeras invictasque copias undique in Gallias contraxit, Occidentale sibi imperium utpote vindicaturus.</i>	<i>Mortuo Valentiniano Augusto Arbogastes Eugenium tyrannum mox creare ausus est legitque hominem, cui titulum imperatoris imponeret; ipse acturus imperium vir barbarus, animo consilio manu audacia potentiaque nimius contraxit undique innumeras invictasque copias uel Romanorum praesidiis uel auxiliis barbarorum alibi potestate alibi cognatione subnixus.</i>	<i>Arbogastes Valentiniano imperatore extincto et Eugenio Caesare facto innumeras invictissimasque copias undique in Gallias contraxit, Occidentale sibi imperium utpote vindicaturus vir barbarus animo consilio manu audacia potentiaque nimius: contraxit undique innumeras copias uel Romanorum praesidiis uel auxiliis barbarorum alibi cogitatione subnixus.</i>

¹³On S see Mommsen, *MGH.AA.* 11.47 and 57. The manuscript is now dated to the late eleventh century (information courtesy of the Section latine, Institut de recherche et d'histoire des textes, Paris).

To compensate for this addition from Orosius the copyist shortened the following entry, a brief literary biography of Jerome compiled largely from Jerome's original *De viris illustribus*.¹⁴ It has been suggested that this shorter version was the work of Marcellinus and represents a revision undertaken when the chronicle was updated in 534.¹⁵ But that is to view it in isolation, since the shorter version of S is merely a summary of the original longer version of Marcellinus and made by some scribe in the S tradition in order to catch up the space lost by expanding the previous entry.

The other addition to S is the Dara entry inserted after the last entry in the first edition of the chronicle, the death of Anastasius (518). Once again the scribe felt obliged to make up for the additional entry, this time a more lengthy one, by abbreviating the next three entries, that is the first ones for the reign of Justin (519). The shortened entries were printed by Mommsen as if they were alternate versions of Marcellinus:

Marcellinus s.a. 519 (MGH.AA. 11.101)

S

Iustinus a senatu electus imperator continuo ordinatus est.

Iustinus imperator creatus.

2. *Amantius palatii praepositus, Andreas, Misahel et Ardabur cubicularii Manichaeorum fautores et Iustini Augusti deprehensi sunt proditores. quorum duo Amantius et Andreas ferro trucidati sunt, M̄sahel et Ardabur Serdicam in exilium missi. Theocritus Amantii satelles, quem idem Amantius praepositus ad regnandum dum clam preparaverat, comprehensus et in carcere saxis contusus ingentibus periit salsoque in gurgite iacuit, sepultura quoque cum imperio, cui inhīarat, caruit.*

Amantius palatii praepositus et Andreas cubicularius uterque regni eius inimicus in insula decapitatus est.

3. *Vitalianus Scythia Iustini principis pietate ad rem publicam revocatus Constantinopolim ingressus est septimoque receptionis suae die magister militum ordinatus.*

Vitalianus Scythia urbem data acceptaque fide accitus ingreditur statimque magister militum ordinatus.

It must be emphasised that the shorter versions represent nothing more than the expedient of a parsimonious copyist. One addition in S came from Orosius, but the crucial question is where the other, the entry on Dara, came from. Mommsen (MGH.AA. 11.57) suggested that it was added by a contemporary of Marcellinus rather than some later scribe, while Merten proposed that its detail was akin to that of an eye witness and that it must have been written immediately after the city's construction in 508.¹⁶

¹⁴Marcellinus s.a. 392.2. (MGH.AA. 11.63) from Jerome *De viris illustribus* 135. Nevertheless, the scribe of S again resorted to the original work adding the phrase *contra Porphyrium et Iulianum Augustum* from Jerome's preface.

¹⁵A. Vaccari, "Le antiche vite di S. Girolamo: I. La cronaca di Marcellino," in A. Vaccari, *Scritti di erudizione e di filologia* 2 (Rome 1958) 34.

Neither scholar suggested an origin for the entry. Although we cannot now reasonably expect to discover when the Dara entry was added to the S tradition, it may be possible to track down its source.

It is a fair enough assumption that the scribe who added the Dara material saw some special merit in its inclusion, and it will be observed that the introductory sentence—*Daras civitate huiuscemodi condita in Mesopotamia*—is unrelated to what follows and what precedes. In any event, as it stands the sentence is ungrammatical and incomplete with its hanging ablative. It looks as if the scribe has shortened an initial sentence of the source from which he took the entry, preserving only the necessary information that Dara was founded in Mesopotamia. But to what does *huiuscemodi* refer? Saying that Dara was a city “of such a kind” suggests that the source of the entry was a list of cities divided into particular categories.

What was so special about the entry which prompted a scribe to include it as an appendix to the first edition of the chronicle of Marcellinus? The most cogent explanation is, I would suggest, not its content but its authorship, that is to say the scribe copied it into his manuscript of the chronicle from another source because in that source the description of Dara was attributed to the very same person that wrote the chronicle—Marcellinus *comes*.

The nature of the Dara entry accords perfectly with Cassiodorus’ statement that Marcellinus wrote *de positionibus locorum* (*Inst.* 1.17.2). It is suggested, therefore, that the description of Dara contained in S constitutes the only fragment we possess of Marcellinus’ lost volumes on the locations of places. If this hypothesis is correct it would confirm the importance of the description as a contemporary source for Anastasius’ foundation of Dara, and it must accordingly be given full consideration in any discussion of the city. We might conjecture too that the detail of this entry, most of it unique, derives from personal witness, since, as Cassiodorus reports,¹⁷ Marcellinus’ volumes “on the locations of places” were based on his own travels and since the evidence of the chronicle suggests that his journey took him as far afield as Dara.¹⁸

Let us turn, then, to an analysis of Marcellinus’ description of Dara, first setting it out in full:

Daras civitate huiuscemodi condita in Mesopotamia. Daras quaedam possessio LX ab Amida civitate miliario ad austrum sita et quindecim milibus a Nisibino oppido ad occasum distans Amidensi ecclesiae reditum pensavit. huius ergo humilis villae casas

¹⁶E. Merten, *De bello Persico ab Anastasio gesto* (*Comm. Phil. Jenenses* 7.2 [1906]) 155.

¹⁷*Inst.* 1.17.2, taking *itineris sui tramitem* literally rather than figuratively (as Jones [above, n. 11] 117 seems to do).

¹⁸The “journey” was probably a roundabout one from Constantinople to Jerusalem and back (cf. *PLRE* 2.711) but followed contemporary pilgrim routes which took in the Persian frontier region, as explained in my forthcoming book on Marcellinus.

Anastasius imperator ob condendam ibi civitatem dato pretio emit, missisque continuo praefabris construi praecepit: Calliopium deinde Antiochenae urbis patricium huic operi praefecit. nempe hic collem in planitiem desinentem mira sagacitate ob fundamenta locanda sulcum sarculo designavit, murisque firmissimis fascia tenus consummatis undique textit. rivum quoque, qui ex praedii nomine, iuxta quod nascitur, Cordissus nominatur serpensque murmurat, quintoque miliario eundem collem novamque dividit civitatem, concesso utrique ostio prolabantem inclusit. publicis praeterea moenibus decoratae civitati pristinum nomen villae reliquit. ingens huius frontispicium civitatis in editiori loco constructa murisque continuata turris Herculea sic nomine dicta suspicatur Nisibin quidem ad orientem, Amidam huius ad aquilonem respiciens. (s.a. 518, MGH.AA. 11.100)

Following the unsuccessful war against the Persians which ended in 505, the Roman generals explained to the emperor Anastasius that a decisive factor in their lack of progress against the Persians, and in their inability to recapture Amida, was the lack of a forward base camp for protection and supplies.¹⁹ In the light of their counsel the emperor resolved on the construction of a large walled city on the Persian frontier. The short list consisted of two villages not far from Amida—Dara and Ammudis. Engineers drew up a plan, the bishop of Amida was summoned to Constantinople for his opinion, Dara was agreed on and the city constructed.²⁰

Marcellinus' account begins by locating Dara in relation to Amida and Nisibis—sixty miles south (actually south-east) of the former and fifteen miles west (slightly north-west) of the latter. Next we are told that the village of Dara paid its dues to the church of Amida. This adds an extra detail to Zachariah's statement (*HE* 7.6) that Dara actually belonged to the Church of Amida—which helps to explain the involvement of the bishop and clergy of Amida in the planning and construction of Dara. Moreover, Marcellinus tells us (again confirmed by Zachariah *HE* 7.6) that Anastasius allocated funds to buy out the dwellings of the villagers and immediately despatched foremen to undertake the project of creating a new city.

Marcellinus alone informs us that Calliopius, a "patrician" at Antioch, was put in charge of the work. Calliopius had carried on the tradition of his family in fulfilling a distinguished career of civic and imperial service in the eastern Roman empire. In 494 he was stationed at Antioch as *comes*

¹⁹*The Chronicle of Zachariah of Mitylene* (tr. F. Hamilton and E. Brooks [London 1899, hereafter "Zach. Mit. *HE*"]) 7.6; *The Chronicle of Joshua the Stylite* (tr. W. Wright [Cambridge 1882, Amsterdam 1968; hereafter "Jo. Styl."]) 90.

²⁰Zach Mit. *HE* 7.6, Jo. Styl. 90. For detail on Dara and its foundation: C. Capizzi, *L'imperatore Anastasio* (Rome 1968) 216–221; C. Mango, *Byzantine Architecture* (New York 1976) 30 (with plates 28–41); J. Crow, "Dara, A Late Roman Fortress in Mesopotamia," *Yayla* 4 (1981) 12–20; and B. Croke and J. Crow, "Procopius and Dara," *JRS* 73 (1983), 143–159. There is far more than the title suggests in M. Mundell, "A Fifth Century Funerary Relief at Dara in Mesopotamia," *Jahrbuch des Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 24 (1975) 209–227.

Orientis and a decade later was in Edessa in charge of the commissariat supporting the Roman army in the Persian campaign. In the latter part of 506 Calliopius was at the village of Dara where a peace settlement with Persia was agreed on. It is apparent (see below, Appendix) that Calliopius had already been stationed at Dara in order to supervise the construction of the mighty new fortress which commenced soon after. Indeed, Marcellinus informs us that it was Calliopius who took the very first step of tracing out the boundaries of the new city with a hoe. The statement of Marcellinus that Calliopius was placed in charge of the work at Dara appears to conflict with the evidence of Zachariah (*HE* 7.6) who makes Thomas the bishop of Amida chief foreman. Perhaps he was a subordinate of Thomas.²¹ Zachariah's preoccupation is with ecclesiastical matters, in this case the construction of the churches of Dara and the role of the clergy in the process. It is unlikely that the emperor would have entrusted the supervision of the design and engineering of an essentially military base to an ecclesiastic who paid only infrequent visits to the site from his see sixty miles away (*Zach. Mit. HE* 7.6). It is safer to assume that Calliopius was given overall on-site responsibility for the building of the city whereas Thomas and the clergy of Amida were entrusted with paying and caring for the peasant labourers and craftsmen who flocked to the site from all over the East.²²

Marcellinus goes on to describe how Calliopius blocked in a stream which originated nearby in such a way that it descended to Dara through a cleft in the hill upon whose slope part of the northern wall of the city was located. The stream thereby passed through two openings, on opposite sides, so that it could be said to divide the city. This channel is also referred to by Procopius in the same terms as Marcellinus, and the accuracy of Marcellinus' testimony is confirmed by Procopius' naming the stream "Kordes" ("Cordessus" Marcellinus) as well as his statement that it flowed from a "suburb" of Dara (*Aed.* 2.2.1–7, cf. *Wars* 8.7.7). As Marcellinus says, the suburb bore the same name as the river, and is therefore to be identified with the modern "Kurdis," 5 km. north of Dara.²³

Next we come to a more perplexing statement which might not deserve much attention were it not contemporary. Marcellinus tells us that when the city had been embellished with many public buildings (*publica moenia*) Anastasius permitted it to retain its original name—Dara. Yet Zachariah (*HE* 7.6) and Malalas (399.20) inform us that it was named "Anastasio-polis" and John the Lydian so refers to it (*De mag.* 3.47). Does Marcellinus call it "Daras" because, as Merten supposed,²⁴ he wrote so soon after its

²¹As suggested by Capizzi (above, n. 20) 218.

²²Jo. Styl. 90, *Zach. Mit. HE* 7.6.

²³E. Honigsmann, *Die Ostgrenze des byzantinischen Reichs* (Brussels 1935) 11, n.6.

²⁴(above, n. 16) 155.

construction that the name had not yet been changed? In any event, the name "Anastasiopolis" did not survive for long. When Justinian refashioned the city in the 530s he renamed it "Justiniana Nova." We learn this from the title of the bishop Stephen at the ecumenical council in Constantinople in 553 who is styled *episcopus metropoleos Justinianae Novae sive Daras*.²⁵

If "Anastasiopolis" was intended to replace "Daras," then it was not very successful since the original name soon crept back in again. John the Lydian tells us (*De mag.* 3.47) that the city founded by Anastasius is called "Daras" by the locals and "Anastasiopolis" by the Byzantines—that is to say, the city was legally entitled to both names. Naturally enough, the local and original name won the day. "Anastasiopolis" simply fell out of use, and "Justiniana Nova" was no more successful. Although in 553 "Dara" existed side by side with "Justiniana Nova," Procopius never once bothers to mention that it was known as "Justiniana Nova."²⁶ This is surely decisive evidence for contemporary practice. What a punctilious and conservative Lydian bureaucrat insisted on calling "Anastasiopolis" was simply "Daras" to everyone else, and so it remains. As an analogy, witness the case of Theodosiopolis in Armenia, renamed by Anastasius as "Anastasiopolis."²⁷ The former name was soon back in use. The same happened in the case of Selymbria. It was renamed Eudoxiopolis, but "Selymbria" soon prevailed once more.²⁸ Likewise, "Theoupolis" did not prevail over "Antioch."²⁹ Procopius' comment in this regard is enlightening: "for although familiar names are wont constantly to be changed by men for new, nevertheless the older names cannot be easily relinquished" (*Aed.* 3.5.5). Consequently, by calling the new city "Daras" Marcellinus betrays the fact that it was known under both names, the point being that Anastasius was granting it a special privilege in permitting it to retain its *pristinum nomen*.

Marcellinus' description of the foundation of Dara concludes with a difficult passage in which he treats of the "Herculean tower" (*turris Herculea*). It appears that a tower was constructed above the walls on the upper part of one of the slopes. This tower was an enormous lookout (*ingens frontispicium*)³⁰ for keeping watch over the neighbouring terrain, both north and east. If it had an unobstructed view, which seems to be implied in Marcellinus' account, then it must have formed part of the eastern wall. Although it has not previously been noticed, and no identifiable remains of it have been located, the "Herculean tower" is otherwise recorded. During the Persian siege of Dara in 573, King Chosroes realized

²⁵Mansi, *Concilia* 9.395A.

²⁶Although he does refer to it as "Anastasiopolis" on one occasion (*Wars* 1.10.13).

²⁷A. H. M. Jones, *Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*² (Oxford 1971) 224.

²⁸*Id.* 26.

²⁹G. Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria* (Princeton 1961) 529.

³⁰For this meaning of *frontispicium*: *ThLL* 6.1.1366.

that the siege was not going successfully and he decided to move his camp onto higher ground north of the city. John of Ephesus then reports that Chosroes had a tower built yet higher up "opposite a great turret which rose higher than the rest, and which they called Hercules" (*HE* 3.6.5). There is no reason to share Capizzi's uncertainty as to whether the tower formed part of Anastasius' original construction or not.³¹ Marcellinus' information implies that it did. Furthermore, the fact that the tower was still standing sturdy in 573, and is not attributed to Justinian in Procopius' account of Dara in his *Buildings*, suggests that perhaps the city itself had not fallen into decay as quickly as Procopius would have us believe (*Aed.* 2.1.7–10).

To sum up, the description of Dara in the chronicle of Marcellinus, placed incongruously between the first and second editions, does not belong to the original chronicle at all. Instead, it appears only in a single eleventh-century St. Omer manuscript (S) and was added to that branch of the tradition at some point by a scribe. The evidence suggests that the account originally formed part of Marcellinus' lost four-volume work *De temporum qualitatibus et positionibus locorum*. As a contemporary and perhaps eye-witness account it deserves thorough consideration in any study of the city and its history.

APPENDIX: CALLIOPIUS THE PATRICIAN

Identifying the Calliopius to whom Marcellinus ascribes responsibility for supervising the construction of Dara is a matter of considerable difficulty. One finds in *PLRE* 2 no fewer than five different Calliopii who held office in the East in the time of Anastasius. It is recognized, however, that such differentiation is hyper-cautious and that there may be only two Calliopii after all: (1) the son of Hierius³² who was *comes Orientis* when hunted out of Antioch in 494 and who later turned up in the service of the *magister militum* Areobindus at Nisibis in 503 and was quartermaster-general ("hyparch") at Edessa the following year ("Calliopius 3–5," *PLRE* 2.251–252); and (2) the overseer at Dara mentioned by Marcellinus who as *vicarius* of the *magister militum per Orientem* a decade later took an anti-Chalcedonian line in religious controversy although he later switched allegiance ("Calliopius 6–7," *PLRE* 2.252–253). Hence, a wedge is driven between the Calliopius last attested precisely at Dara in November 506 and the overseer of Dara at exactly this time. It is immediately obvious that this is a tenuous differentiation. To maintain it we must be able to exclude the

³¹(above, n.20) 219.

³²This is a problem in itself: "Hierius 6" and "Hierius 7" (*PLRE* 2.558) may be the same person.

possibility of the Calliopius involved in the Persian war (502–505)’s being responsible for Dara, so let us track his movements more closely.

In July 503 Calliopius was in the army of Areobindus near Nisibis, whence he was despatched to Amida to seek the support of the other two generals Hypatius and Patricius (Jo. Styl. 55). Areobindus subsequently abandoned the siege of Nisibis and retreated to Edessa where Calliopius was appointed in May 504 to succeed the Egyptian Apion as “hyparch,” that is quartermaster-general for the eastern army during the war with the honorary title of “Praetorian Prefect.”³³ As “hyparch” he was responsible for providing wheat for the baking of “soldiers’ bread” (*bucellatum*) and it is reported that in 505 under Calliopius’ tutelage 630,000 *modii* of wheat were baked (Jo. Styl. 77). In addition he was charged with organizing the billeting and sustenance of the troops in Edessa itself, for example when the *dux* Romanus and his Gothic contingent arrived in Edessa later in 505/6. Since Anastasius had remitted taxes for the whole of Mesopotamia the locals complained that they should not be required to make room for the rapacious and unpopular Goths but the landed gentry should instead. The “hyparch” stepped in, so we are told, and ruled accordingly. This probably refers to Calliopius.³⁴ When hostilities closed and the arrangements for peace were being worked out, the need for the quartermaster-general for the war lapsed. So Calliopius was free to leave Edessa. He went first to Hierapolis (Jo. Styl. 87) and by the autumn (September) of 506 was with the *magister militum* Celer at Dara.³⁵ Here the peace was finally agreed on and the Persian envoys returned home. Slightly later, in November, an edict arrived from Anastasius requesting Celer and Calliopius to remit taxes where necessary (Jo. Styl. 99). Soon after that, Celer returned to Edessa. Joshua the Stylite (100) does not state that Calliopius also returned. This may well suggest that he in fact remained at Dara. It was at precisely this time, with the Persian war finally wound up, that the construction of Dara was under way.³⁶ It would appear too that Calliopius had been in Dara since he was last heard of in Hierapolis in mid-505.

³³Jo. Styl. 70. The title of rank of “Praetorian Prefect” had come to be conferred on the chief of the commissariat for particular campaigns (*PLRE* 2.111–112 “Apion 2” and *PLRE* 2.850 “Pentadius 2” with A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire* [Oxford 1964] 231, 273, 535). It was a very prestigious position, for, to judge by the examples of Apion, Calliopius, and Archelaus (*PLRE* 2.133–134 “Archelaus 5”), its holders were ranked among the *patricii* (cf. *CJ* 11.8.2).

³⁴Jo. Styl. 92–93—the item is attributed to *PLRE* 2.1212 “Anonymous 9” but should probably be part of *PLRE* 2.252 “Calliopius 5.” The context suggests that “hyparch” denotes the commissariat officer, not the Praetorian Prefect of the East invariably confined to Constantinople by this time.

³⁵Jo. Styl. 97. Celer had been in Edessa since April, for a period of five months (Jo. Styl. 95). It was therefore September when he left.

³⁶Capizzi, (above, n. 20) 220. *PLRE* 2.252 errs in claiming that Calliopius returned to Edessa in November 506 with Celer.

Therefore, it appears almost impossible to deny that the Calliopius responsible for the construction of Dara in 507 was the same officer last attested in Dara in November 506. Furthermore, it would be a natural promotion for this Calliopius, responsible for the commissariat at Edessa during the Persian war, to be put in charge of the construction of a new city designed to provide the exact same function, instead of Edessa, in future wars with Persia. What appeared to be five Calliopii thus turns out to be just one.³⁷

It should also be pointed out that there is no evidence to substantiate the claim that although the "hyparch" Calliopius was born in Beroea (Aleppo), the foreman of Dara came from Antioch ("Calliopius 5 and 6," *PLRE* 2.252). The evidence adduced is (a) Malalas (401.19) who refers not to Calliopius, but his son, and (b) Marcellinus (*s.a.* 518, *MGH.AA* 11.100) who suggests that Calliopius was *patricius* at Antioch but not necessarily born there. The various pieces of evidence can easily be reconciled on the presumption that Calliopius came from Beroea but served out his career in the nearby metropolis of Antioch where his son was born.

MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY, SYDNEY

³⁷A single Calliopius was the considered opinion of G. Downey, *A Study of the Comites Orientis and consulares Syriae* (Princeton 1939) 14.