

# THE ENGLISH HISTORICAL REVIEW

NO. XXX.—APRIL 1893

## *The Emperor Zenon and the Isaurians*

THE history of the Roman empire at the end of the fifth century and the beginning of the sixth is a subject to which but little attention has been paid by historians. Gibbon, in whose pages the period is almost a blank, characterises it as follows :—

After the fall of the Roman empire in the west an interval of fifty years till the memorable reign of Justinian is faintly marked by the obscure names and imperfect annals of Zeno, Anastasius, and Justin, who successively ascended the throne of Constantinople.

But in spite of the opinion of Gibbon the subject is not without its special interest ; for during this period the power of the generals of barbarian birth, who had so long tyrannised over the empire of the east and at this very time destroyed the empire of the west, was overthrown by the mountaineers of Isauria, and an Isaurian chief reigned almost as a foreign conqueror over the eastern empire. These striking events are to my mind worthy of more attentive study than any that has yet been given to them ; though in justice to Gibbon it should be observed that the important fragments of John of Antioch were not known to him,<sup>1</sup> while in our own time much new light has been thrown upon the period through the publication of fresh fragments of this author and of John Malala by Müller in 1870<sup>2</sup> and in a more complete form by Mommsen in the 'Hermes' for 1872. Mr. Hodgkin, writing since the publication of these new sources of information, has made use of them in his account of the death of Odovacar and of the rebellion of Vitalian, but in his narrative of Isaurian affairs he has strangely neglected

<sup>1</sup> He knew only the excerpts *De virtute*, which do not bear upon this particular subject.

<sup>2</sup> *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, v. 27.

them altogether; <sup>3</sup> besides, as from the nature of his subject he relates the events only with regard to their effect upon Italian history, his account is necessarily an incomplete one. Mr. Bury, in his 'History of the Later Roman Empire,' has treated the Isaurian history of this period in a short and not altogether satisfactory manner; his account of the rebellion under Anastasius, in which he has trusted too much to a German dissertation by Rose, <sup>4</sup> is in particular full of inaccuracies, as I hope presently to show. No special work has, so far as I am aware, been written upon the subject of the Isaurian domination, and I have therefore thought it worth while to relate the events connected with it in some detail, so far as they can be made out from the original authorities, the fragments of Malchos, Eustace of Epiphaneia, and John of Antioch, the Epitome of Candidus, the Chronicles of Joshua the Stylite <sup>5</sup> and Marcellinus, and the Chronographies of John Malala and Theophanes, with occasional help from Theodore the Reader, Jordanes, Liberatus, Evagrius, and the later Byzantines.

The barbarians, who since the time of Constantine had formed an ever increasing part of the Roman armies, were in the middle of the fifth century already building kingdoms of their own upon the ruins of the western empire, and even in the east scarcely a general could be found who was not of barbarian origin; hence it might with good reason be expected that the empire of the east would in no long time suffer the fate of the west. Upon the death of the Emperor Marcian, the Alan Aspar, who played the same part in the east as Ricimer in the west, had placed his client Leo on the throne of Constantinople, and during the early part of Leo's reign, though the obscure Dacian bore the title of emperor, the imperial authority was in the hands of 'the patrician' (for in order to designate Aspar it was not necessary to mention his name), so that we actually find Pope Leo writing to the Arian barbarian to beg him to use his influence for the suppression of the disturbances directed against the faith of Chalcedon. <sup>6</sup> The emperor had even promised to bestow upon Patrick, the son of Aspar, the title of Caesar and to give him his daughter in marriage, <sup>7</sup> and it seemed but a step further to subject the eastern empire, like that of the west, to the avowed supremacy of a barbarian master.

But Aspar had mistaken the character of the man with whom

<sup>3</sup> *Italy and her Invaders*, vol. iii.

<sup>4</sup> Adolf Rose, *Kaiser Anastasius I.* Dissert. Halle-Wittenberg. 1852.

<sup>5</sup> Joshua the Stylite, whose work has been little noticed by historians, was a native of Edessa, and wrote a Syriac chronicle of the events of his own times down to the year 507. It deals principally with the Persian war under Anastasius, but has also some important notices of earlier events. It was published with an English translation by the late Professor Wright. (Cambridge. 1882.)

<sup>6</sup> Leo, *Ep.* 151, 153.

<sup>7</sup> Marcell. ann. 471. Cf. Jo. Mal. ap. Mommsen, *Hermes*, vi. 369.

he had to deal. Leo had, indeed, readily accepted the empire at the hands of the Alan, and, lacking any authority of his own, had been forced to submit to the dictation of his barbarian patron; but he chafed under the yoke, and soon began to look about for some means whereby he might make himself emperor in deed as well as in name. But the Goths, Alans, and other barbarians, who filled the Roman armies, were the devoted servants of Aspar,<sup>8</sup> and from the unwarlike Romans no help was to be expected; where then could the emperor find a weapon wherewith to overthrow the patrician? On the southern slopes of Mount Tauros there lived a race of hardy mountaineers, who in their native strongholds had for centuries defied the power of Rome. The victories of Servilius Isauricus and other Roman generals, if they ever penetrated the fastnesses at all, had been but passing occupations, and the Isaurians had maintained their independence against the Romans as securely as the Montenegrins against the Turks, supporting themselves, like the Highlanders of Scotland, by plundering raids into the plains below; and this independence had been so far recognised that they were designated as barbarians and seem never to have obtained the Roman citizenship. During the weakness of the empire after the death of the elder Theodosius they had extended their ravages over nearly the whole of Asia Minor, and a lively picture of the distress and terror caused by them at this time is preserved to us in the letters of John Chrysostom. These cruel inroads had never been forgotten, and Isaurian was still in Roman ears a name of abomination. The use which might be made of them as defenders of the sinking empire had not, however, been altogether overlooked, and in the reign of the younger Theodosius an Isaurian named Zenon had held the position of a Roman general and consul, and had become so powerful, probably by the support of his warlike countrymen, that the emperor's jealousy had been aroused, and he was preparing to make war upon the Isaurian, when his attention was diverted by the news of Attila's preparations against the west.<sup>9</sup>

It was towards this warlike people that Leo now turned his eyes. With the plan of an Isaurian alliance perhaps already in his mind, he had found courage to refuse a request of Aspar, whereupon the patrician treated him with the greatest insolence;<sup>10</sup> and from this moment Aspar's influence began to decline. A comparison of the passages in the so-called Leo the grammarian and Kedrenos with the

<sup>8</sup> See Jo. Mal. l.c.

<sup>9</sup> Prisc. *Fr.* 14; Jo. Ant. *Fr.* 199, 1. The latter passage is plainly a continuation of the former, and might well have been printed among the fragments of Priscus. This Zenon must, I think, be the 'great commander of the east' referred to by Damascius (ap. Phot.) *Vit. Isid. Fr.* 290 (*Vitae Philosophorum*, Didot); if so, he was a heathen.

<sup>10</sup> Cand. ap. Phot. (Müller, *Fragm. Hist. Graec.* iv. 185); Leo Gramm. 118; Kedr. 846 D; Zon. 14, 1.

epitome of Candidus and the code of Justinian<sup>11</sup> makes it probable that this scene is to be placed in 459. A few years later Leo sent for an Isaurian chieftain, Tarasikodissa of Rousoumblada,<sup>12</sup> and gave him his daughter in marriage, the daughter whom he had promised to the son of Aspar,<sup>13</sup> and the Isaurian on becoming the emperor's son-in-law changed his uncouth barbarian name for the Greek one of Zenon in memory of his countryman, the general. The date of this marriage cannot be fixed with certainty. Theophanes places it in 459, and Mr. Bury follows him, but the authority of Theophanes as a chronologist is notoriously worthless, and the date must surely be too early.<sup>14</sup> As the young Leo was seven at the time of his death in November 474,<sup>15</sup> and we hear of no other children of the marriage, we should probably not be far<sup>16</sup> wrong in placing that event in 466, though it may have been a year or two earlier. At the same time or shortly afterwards Zenon was made master of the soldiers in the east.<sup>17</sup> Henceforth there were two factions at the court of Constantinople, the Isaurian and the barbarian, which for convenience we may call the Gothic faction. For the next twenty years the history of the empire turns upon the struggle between these factions, which, as long as Aspar lived, took the form of secret intrigues for the possession of power at court and the overthrow of the rival party, but afterwards became a condition of intermittent warfare. The history of these intrigues can unfortunately be recovered only from detached fragments and notices in various writers, many of them of much

<sup>11</sup> *Cod. Just.* 1, 3, 26. Unless PP is to be changed to PU, the quarrel must have been about the praetorian prefecture, not the city prefecture, as stated by Leo and Kedrenos.

<sup>12</sup> This is how I should naturally have understood 'Ρουσουμβλαδέστου, and I see that Professor Ramsay (*Hist. Geogr. of Asia Minor*, p. 870 note) so understands it; other writers translate it 'son of Rousoumbladeston.'

<sup>13</sup> *Cand. ap. Phot.*; *Eust. Epiph. ap. Evagr.* 2, 25; *Jo. Ant. Fr.* 206. It can hardly have been Leontia who was betrothed to Patrick, as Tillemont thought, for she was not born till after her father's accession in 457; besides a marriage with the younger daughter would not have had the same significance.

<sup>14</sup> Not to mention historical considerations, as Leontia was not born before 457, it is not at all likely that Ariadne was of sufficient age to be married in 459.

<sup>15</sup> *Nestorian ap. Jo. Mal.* p. 876. The *Paschal Chronicle*, though copying John Malala, gives his age as seventeen, but this is impossible on any showing, besides being inconsistent with John's context (*ἦν δὲ παιδίον μικρόν*). It is plain, therefore, that the number in John's text is the right one.

<sup>16</sup> The fact that Zenon was not consul till 469 is in favour of placing the marriage as late as possible.

<sup>17</sup> *Cand. ap. Phot.* According to John Malala (p. 875) he was made *mag. in praesenti*, but *Jo. Ant.* 206, 1, and *Cod. Just.* 1, 3, 29, make it almost certain that he was *mag. per orientem*. As Ardaburius held this office in 459 (*Jo. Mal.* p. 369), he was perhaps removed in favour of Zenon. From *Cod. Just.* 1, 3, 29, it appears that Zenon was still *mag. per orientem* on 1 June 471. It would seem indeed from *Jo. Ant.* 208, that Jordanes held that office in 470; *βασις* is, however, sometimes equivalent to *ἀνὸς ἕδρας*. It is possible that Zenon became *mag. in praesenti* during the short interval between the death of Aspar and the appointment of Theoderic, and was then succeeded in the east by Jordanes.

later date, while for the chronology, as Marcellinus and the Paschal Chronicle have scarcely any mention of these events, we have to depend almost wholly upon Theophanes, who, writing history in annalistic form, was obliged to put each event under some year, whether he knew the date or not; hence, where he does not specially mention the year of the indiction, thereby showing that he obtained his information from some official source, his authority is worth next to nothing, and he must be used only for the order of the events, and even so with the greatest caution.

That Aspar would not quietly submit to the ascendancy of Zenon was only to be expected; the first counter-move on his side was an attempt made by his son Ardaburius to gain the Isaurians for his own party and thus to leave the emperor more helpless than before;<sup>18</sup> but this plan was betrayed to Zenon by a certain Martin, and the general of the east was easily able to prevent its execution. Of the events of the next year or two we know nothing; but in 468 matters were brought to a climax by the great expedition against the Vandals. In this expedition no share was given to Aspar and his sons, but the command by sea was entrusted to Basiliskos,<sup>19</sup> the emperor's brother-in-law, and that by land to Marsus, an Isaurian, and Herakleios, son of Florus,<sup>20</sup> who, as he was afterwards murdered by the Goths, probably belonged rather to the Isaurian than to the Gothic faction. The expedition was ruined by the incapacity of Basiliskos, and it was said that he had been instigated by Aspar to betray the fleet under the promise of the empire.<sup>21</sup> Whether this really was so, or whether Leo made use of the opportunity to raise prejudice against Aspar, cannot now be determined; at any rate it is probable that it was at this time that the death of Aspar was resolved on. Not long after this a band of Isaurian pirates, who had been plundering the island of Rhodes, were brought to Constantinople by Zenon, where a riot followed,<sup>22</sup> for the Greeks hated the Isaurians even more than they did the Goths. This event seems to have been the first introduction of an Isaurian garrison into Constantinople, and was probably directed against Aspar. It was perhaps about the same time that Leo tried to lull the suspicions of the Alan by fulfilling his long-postponed promise of raising his son Patrick to the

<sup>18</sup> *Cand. ap. Phot.*

<sup>19</sup> *Proc. Bell. Vand.* 1, 6; *Theoph. AM* 5961, 5963.

<sup>20</sup> This Florus was probably the prefect and count of Egypt in 452 (*Prisc. ar. Evagr.* 2, 5).

<sup>21</sup> *Idat. Chron.*; *Theod. Lect.* 1, 25; *Proc. Lc.*; *Theoph. AM* 5961. The testimony of Idatius, who finished his chronicle in the very year of the expedition, is conclusive for the fact that the charge of treason was made against Aspar at the time, though he does not say that it was connected with Basiliskos. It is curious, however, that Priscus (*ap. Theoph. Lc.*), who wrote under Zenon, when there was every inducement to disparage Aspar, states positively that Basiliskos was bribed by Geiseric. From this we may perhaps infer that the charge against Aspar was without foundation.

<sup>22</sup> *Jo. Ant. Fr.* 206, 1.

rank of Caesar.<sup>23</sup> There is, however, no trustworthy date for this appointment; Victor of Tununa, whose authority is of the slightest, places it in 470, while Kedrenos puts it in 468, but apparently only from a misunderstanding of Theophanes, who mentions it retrospectively without date.<sup>24</sup> It may possibly have been much earlier, but, if so, we should have expected more notice of it in the authorities, as it would then have been of much more importance, whereas it is not at all improbable that the crafty Leo would fulfil his promise at a time when it could be of no real service to Aspar.

Shortly after the introduction of the Isaurians into Constantinople, and possibly in consequence of it, Anagast, master of the soldiers in Thrace, whose name shows him to have been a barbarian, revolted, and on being interrogated accused Ardaburius, the son of Aspar, probably not without truth, of instigating his rebellion, a charge which he supported by the production of letters from Ardaburius, which he sent to the emperor.<sup>25</sup> This event, as well as the coming of the Isaurians to Constantinople, is apparently placed by John of Antioch in the consulship of Jordanes, *i.e.* 470, but the passage is obscure, and, as the next event mentioned by him is definitely placed in 469, it is possible that *ὑπατον τιμην* is to be understood of an honorary, not an actual consulship. Not long after this the Goths under Theodemir, who were settled in Pannonia, perhaps taking advantage of Anagast's revolt, overran Macedonia and Thessaly, and were appeased only by the grant of settlements on the Thermaic Gulf.<sup>26</sup> It was perhaps in connexion with these disturbances that Zenon was sent to Thrace, where his soldiers, said to have been instigated by Aspar, made an attempt to murder him, and he with difficulty escaped to Sardis.<sup>27</sup> The doom of Aspar was now sealed; Herakleios and Marsus, who seem to have been still carrying on the war in Africa, were recalled, peace was made with Geiseric, and in 471 Aspar and Ardaburius were cut down in the palace.<sup>28</sup> Patrick the Caesar, though sorely wounded, is said to have recovered,<sup>29</sup> but he appears no more in history. Hermanric, Aspar's youngest son, was absent at the time, and so escaped. Ac-

<sup>23</sup> According to Zonaras it was the delay in fulfilling this promise which led to the scene with Aspar mentioned above; Leo the grammarian and Kedrenos, however, give a different reason, and they are supported by Candidus.

<sup>24</sup> Theoph. *l.c.*

<sup>25</sup> Jo. Ant. *Fr.* 206, 2.

<sup>26</sup> Jo. Ant. *l.c.*; Jord. *Get.* 56. I identify the wars mentioned by these two authors, for I cannot think that Jordanes' statement that Widemir's departure took place in the reign of Glycerius is to be pressed; it is not likely that Widemir's departure, his arrival in the west, his death, and the buying off of his son all occurred during the fifteen months of Glycerius' reign. At the same time the account of Jordanes cannot be reconciled with an earlier date than 471, whereas John of Antioch seems, though in vague language, to place it in 469.

<sup>27</sup> Theoph. *AM* 5962.

<sup>28</sup> *Erisc. ap. Evagr.* 2, 16; *Cand. ap. Phot.*; *Marcell. ann.* 471.

<sup>29</sup> So Candidus; Priscus and Marcellinus say that he was killed.

ording to Theophanes he had been warned by Zenon, and it is further asserted that he took refuge in Isauria, that he married a daughter or granddaughter of Zenon,<sup>20</sup> and that he returned to Constantinople after the accession of the latter ;<sup>21</sup> as in fact we find him afterwards serving under Zenon,<sup>22</sup> and even revealing a conspiracy to him,<sup>23</sup> it is not unlikely that these statements of Theophanes are true, especially as they are probably derived from Priscus. But the Gothic party in the empire did not disappear with the death of Aspar ; Theoderic, son of Triarius, a Gothic chief in Thrace, whose aunt was Aspar's wife,<sup>24</sup> on hearing of the murder of his uncle, rose against the emperor,<sup>25</sup> while Ostrya, a commander of Gothic mercenaries in Constantinople, raised a tumult in the city,<sup>26</sup> and, being driven out, took refuge most probably with Theoderic. After the Goth had taken Arkadioupolis and ravaged the suburbs of Philippi, Leo agreed to allow him 2,000 lbs. of gold yearly and to appoint him to Aspar's office of master of both services ; he was also to be recognised as chief of the Goths, and the emperor was not to receive any deserters from among his followers ; while Theoderic on his side was to be the ally of the emperor against all enemies except the Vandals.<sup>27</sup> This treaty was practically a compromise between the two factions ; by it Constantinople and the east were secured to the Isaurians on condition that the European provinces were abandoned to the Goths.

In this position affairs remained till the death of Leo in February 474,<sup>28</sup> the only event mentioned by the authorities being an obscure conspiracy on the part of Jordanes the Vandal, master of the soldiers in the east.<sup>29</sup> Leo's young grandson, who succeeded him, immediately associated his father Zenon with him in the empire, and, as the young Leo died in November of the same year, the Isaurian chieftain remained sole emperor of the east. Now, we may suppose, the Isaurian garrison of Constantinople was greatly increased ; certainly Isaurians of all kinds were summoned to court and appointed to high offices of state.<sup>40</sup> Conspicuous among these

<sup>20</sup> A daughter of Zenon's bastard son, according to the text of Theophanes, but this is hardly chronologically possible, and a bastard daughter of Zenon must, I think, be meant.

<sup>21</sup> Theoph. AM 5964.

<sup>22</sup> Jo. Ant. Fr. 214, 4.

<sup>23</sup> Damasc. (ap. Phot.) Vit. Isid. Fr. 290.

<sup>24</sup> Theoph. AM 5970. Under AM 5964 Theophanes' text has τῆς δὲ Ἀσκαρῶς γαμετῆς ἀδελφῆς, where we should probably read ἀδελφῶνας, as in the other passage.

<sup>25</sup> Malch. Fr. 2.

<sup>26</sup> Jo. Mal. p. 371 ; Theoph. AM 5964. These writers call him Ostrys, but he is no doubt the same as the Ostrya of Prisc. Fr. 89.

<sup>27</sup> Theophanes makes Theoderic attack Constantinople and be repulsed by Basiliakos and Zenon, but this is probably a confusion with the rising of Ostrya.

<sup>28</sup> Jo. Mal. p. 376.

<sup>29</sup> Jo. Ant. Fr. 208. As explained above (note 17), θραυός must be equivalent to ἀπὸ θράου, for Jordanes cannot have been *mag. per orientem* before 471.

<sup>40</sup> See especially Josh. Styl. 12, and cf. Anon. Vales. 40, *favens gentis suae*.

is the extraordinary figure of Illous, afterwards master of the offices, who for the next eight years enjoyed a power as great as or greater than that of the emperor himself, the two men standing towards each other not as Roman emperor and Roman magistrate, but as two Isaurian chiefs leagued together for the government of their Roman subjects. The hatred and contempt of the Romans for their Isaurian master knew no bounds. 'The officers of the palace,' says Joshua the Stylite, 'hated Zenon the emperor, because he was an Isaurian by race.'<sup>41</sup> Zonaras, who no doubt follows some contemporary writer, perhaps Eustace of Epiphaneia, describes him as follows:—

τὸν Ζήνωνα μὴ προσήκοντα τῇ βασιλείᾳ ἔκρινεν (ὁ Λέων), ὅτι μίση τὴν γνώμην εἶχε βασιλικήν, μίση μὲν εἶδος ἄξιον τυραννίδος· ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ὄψιν ἦν εἰδεχθέστατος καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν εἶχε τῆς ὄψεως χείρονα . . . ἦν δὲ ὁ Ζήνων ἐξ ἔθνους· αἰσχίστου τοῦ τῶν Ἰσαύρων, αἰσχίστος καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ τὴν μορφὴν καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν γεγονώς, καὶ οὐχ ὡς βασιλεὺς τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀνῶν ἀλλ' ὡς ἀντικρυς τύραννος.<sup>42</sup>

By Evagrius also, who certainly follows Eustace, his character is painted in the blackest colours,<sup>43</sup> and he is also by more than one writer taunted with the most abject cowardice.<sup>44</sup> But all these assertions must be taken for what they are worth; the Romans had now become the subjects of the robbers of Isauria, whom for more than five hundred years they had in vain tried to conquer, and their wounded pride found vent in heaping insults on the emperor whom they could not overthrow. Immediately after the accession of Zenon the Goths rose in rebellion<sup>45</sup> and seized Herakleios, who was now master of the soldiers in Thrace.<sup>46</sup> Zenon collected a ransom from the kinsmen of the general and paid it to the Goths, who took the money but immediately killed their prisoner; their ravages however were checked by Illous. But a determined and, for a time, successful effort was now made to throw off the Isaurian yoke. A court intrigue, headed by Verina, the widow of Leo, and her brother Basiliskos, was formed against the emperor:<sup>47</sup> Illous and his brother Trokoundes were persuaded, apparently by large promises on the part of Basiliskos, to join the plot;<sup>48</sup> Zenon was induced by means of a trick on the part of Verina to leave Con-

<sup>41</sup> Josh. Styl. *l.c.*

<sup>42</sup> Zon. 14, 1-2; cf. Leo Gramm. 117.

<sup>43</sup> Evagr. 8, 1.

<sup>44</sup> Malch. *Fr.* 16; Jo. Lyd. *De Mag.* 8, 45; Evagr. 8, 8; Zon. 14, 2; cf. Damasco. (ap. Phot.) *Vit. Isid. Fr.* 169.

<sup>45</sup> Malch. *Fr.* 4; Jo. Ant. *Fr.* 210.

<sup>46</sup> John of Antioch says that Theoderic held this office, but according to Malchos he was made *mag. in praesenti*.

<sup>47</sup> Malch. ap. Phot.; Cand. ap. Phot.; Josh. Styl. *l.c.*; Zach. *Myt.* 5, 1 (Land, *Anecd. Syr.*, iii.); Theod. *Lect.* 1, 28 ff.; Marcell. *ann.* 475, 476; Jo. Ant. *Fr.* 210; Proc. *Bell. Vand.* 1, 7; Jord. *Rom.* 841 ff.; Anon. *Vales.* 41-43; Evagr., 8, 8-8.

<sup>48</sup> John of Antioch makes Illous the chief instigator of the conspiracy, but this is scarcely credible, and is not borne out by the other authorities.

stantinople, which he did on 9 Jan. 475,<sup>49</sup> and the conspirators, supported by the people and favoured by the Goths, remained in possession of the city, where all the Isaurians who could be found were massacred by the mob. Verina and Illous intended to set up Patrick, master or ex-master of the offices, as emperor; but this was overruled by the imperial magistrates in the conspiracy, and Basiliskos was raised to the throne. But the exiled Zenon was in a different position from any other deposed emperor, for, though he had ceased to be emperor of the Romans, he still remained an Isaurian chief, and in his native mountains, whither he had fled, might defy any force that Basiliskos could bring against him. The latter, thinking perhaps that a successful campaign in Isauria could be conducted only by Isaurians, entrusted the command to the dangerous hands of Illous and Trokoundes, but, as he did not pay them what he had promised, these Isaurians went over to the side of Zenon, who thus became strong enough to advance on Constantinople. Either during this short campaign or more probably in Constantinople at the time of the emperor's flight, Illous seems to have got possession of Zenon's brother Longinus, whom he kept as a prisoner in an Isaurian castle for ten years,<sup>50</sup> and it may be conjectured that it was to this fact that he owed the extraordinary influence which he exercised over the emperor. Meanwhile, in Constantinople the people were not at all disinclined to receive Zenon, for the orthodox Kalchedonians, headed by Acacius the bishop, had been roused to fury against Basiliskos by the publication of his 'Encyclical,' in which he anathematised the synod of Kalchedon,<sup>51</sup> and, theological animosities prevailing over all other considerations, they preferred even Zenon the Isaurian to Basiliskos the Monophysite. Hence, when Armatius, the nephew of Basiliskos, who was sent to oppose the advance of the Isaurians, had been induced, by the promise of the mastership of the soldiers for himself for life, and the rank of Caesar

<sup>49</sup> This date, which is given by John of Antioch, is in accord with Malch. 10 (the elevation of Odovacar took place 28 Aug. 476 [Fast. Cuspin.]), with Marc. ann. 476, and with the twenty months of Procopius, as compared with the statement of John Malala (p. 379) that Zenon's restoration was in the fourteenth year of the indiction, i.e. before 1 Sept. 476. It cannot, therefore, be upset by the corrupt dates in the *Code*, especially as *Cod. Just.* 5, 5, 8, is suspicious on other grounds, since Epinikos was certainly prefect in 478.

<sup>50</sup> Marcellinus says that Longinus gained his freedom in 485, after a captivity of ten years; it has been commonly supposed that the number is wrong, but it agrees very well with the time of the war with Basiliskos, and it explains the strange ascendancy of Illous, and the fact that Longinus was not consul till 486. That he was in the power of Illous in 479 perhaps appears from Jo. Mal. p. 385. Mr. Bury thinks that Illous did not get possession of Longinus till his revolt in 483-4, and says that there is authority for supposing Longinus to have commanded against Illous. The authority is Kodinos. According to Theophanes (AM 5975) Illous had possession of Zenon's mother also.

<sup>51</sup> Zach. Myt. 5, 2.

for his son, to go over to Zenon, the cause of the usurper was lost, and Zenon entered Constantinople without opposition at the end of August 476 after an exile of nearly twenty months. Basiliskos was sent to Cappadocia and there beheaded.<sup>52</sup> The promise to Armatius was literally kept, but he was immediately afterwards assassinated and his son degraded.<sup>53</sup> But the real ruler of the empire was now Illous, who was perhaps at this time made master of the offices.<sup>54</sup> His extraordinary influence with the emperor earned for him the implacable hatred of Verina and her daughter the Empress Ariadne, who three times tried without success to procure his assassination. In the summer of 477<sup>55</sup> one of the emperor's slaves was sent to assassinate him, and, failing, was at once surrendered to Illous by Zenon. In the following year another attempt was made, the would-be assassin in this case being an Alan, who on being interrogated confessed that he had been sent by Epinikos the prefect, a creature of Verina. Zenon immediately deposed the prefect from his office<sup>56</sup> and gave him up to Illous, who sent him to one of his castles in Isauria. Illous then asked leave of absence on the ground of the death of his brother Aspalius,<sup>57</sup> and, going himself to Isauria, conferred with his prisoner, who admitted that Verina was at the bottom of the plot. Shortly afterwards, when Zenon required his presence in Constantinople,<sup>58</sup> he refused to enter the city, unless the empress were delivered over to him, a request which the emperor, who had crossed the straits to meet him, immediately granted. Verina was then given into the charge of Illous' brother-in-law, Matronian, who took her to

<sup>52</sup> This is the plain statement of Malchos (in Photius' *Epitome*), τὴν Βασιλίσκου διὰ ξίφους ἀναίρειται; of Candidus, ἀποσφάττειται; and of Evagrius (who, as usual, no doubt copies Eustace), ἀποσφάττειται (3, 8) (cf. also Theoph. AM 5969); and is to be preferred to the horrible story related by Marcellinus and the later writers; this story is not necessarily implied by Theodore.

<sup>53</sup> Malch. ap. Phot.; Proc. *l.c.*; Evagr. 3, 24. He is perhaps the τῖμος of Jo. Ant. 211, 1 *ad inii*.

<sup>54</sup> If the words of John Malala (p. 386), ἐγένετο συγλητικὸς καὶ ὕπατος καὶ μάγιστρος καὶ πατρικίος διοικῶν τῆν πᾶσαν πολιτείαν, are to be taken literally, he was not made *mag. off.* till after his return in 479; but the statement cannot be literally accurate, as he was consul in 478, and is probably to be understood retrospectively.

<sup>55</sup> Malch. ap. Phot.; Jo. Ant. *Fr.* 211, 1; οὕτω τοῦ πρώτου διαγενομένου ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκ τῆς ἐπανόδου Ζήνωνος.

<sup>56</sup> Jo. Ant. *Fr.* 211, 2. This was probably later than 1 Sept., for *Cod. Just.* 5, 5, 8, addressed to Epinikos, should, I think, be transferred to 478, since Basiliskos was reigning in 476. At any rate it was later than 1 March, for Sebastian was then prefect (*Cod. Just.* 5, 9, 7; 8, 58, 81), and had been since Feb. 477 (*Cod. Just.* 5, 27, 5; 8, 4, 0; 1, 2, 16; 1, 28, 7).

<sup>57</sup> Mr. Bury, confusing this retirement of Illous with that in 481-2, imagines a contradiction, which does not exist, between John of Antioch and Theophanes (rather John Malala) as to the reason alleged by him. John Malala (p. 386) on this occasion says that Zenon sent him to fetch Longinus; he also states, what is plainly false, that he brought Longinus back with him.

<sup>58</sup> Because of an earthquake, according to a defective passage in John of Antioch, but we may guess that the Gothic outbreak had something to do with it.

Tarsos, where she was forced to become a nun, after which she was kept in custody at Dalisandos.<sup>59</sup> Epinikos was then recalled on the intercession of Illous, and Pamprepius, a philosopher and magician in the following of the latter, was made quaestor.<sup>60</sup> The adhesion of Illous was, in fact, just now particularly required, for about the same time as the attempt upon his life, a more than ordinarily dangerous attack was made by the Goths,<sup>61</sup> who were also in constant communication with the Gothic faction at Constantinople.<sup>62</sup> The two Theoderics, who had hitherto acted as a check on one another, now united and ravaged Thrace and Illyricum without opposition. Zenon had announced his intention of taking command in person, but afterwards changed his mind, whereupon the army dispersed. Accordingly Malchos represents him as a coward, but cowardice is a strange charge to bring against an Isaurian, and the reason for his action seems to have been that, if he had withdrawn the Isaurians from Constantinople, the city would, especially considering the doubtful attitude of Illous, have risen in rebellion behind him, while without his Isaurians his life in the army would not have been safe for a day. We can hardly doubt that he had the natural courage of a barbarian,<sup>63</sup> but he probably lacked the power of making up his mind in an emergency. The indignation against him was, however, so great that during an assault upon the city of Thessalonike the citizens threw down his statues and transferred the keys of the city from the prefect to the bishop.<sup>64</sup>

The depredations of the son of Theodemir were at last checked by Sabinian, master of the soldiers in Illyricum, whom Marcellinus calls 'the great,'<sup>65</sup> though the war smouldered in Epirus<sup>66</sup> until Theoderic's great outbreak in 482 after Sabinian's death. The son of Triarius was for the time bought off,<sup>67</sup> but it was not long before an event occurred which brought him again into the field. For the banishment of Verina gave occasion for a second attempt to throw off the Isaurian rule. Marcian,<sup>68</sup> son of the western Emperor

<sup>59</sup> Eust. Epiph. ap. Evagr. 3, 27; Jo. Ant. Lc.

<sup>60</sup> Jo. Ant. Fr. 211, 8.

<sup>61</sup> Malch. Fr. 14-16; Jo. Ant. Fr. 211, 4.

<sup>62</sup> Malch. Fr. 11. This conspiracy was perhaps in 477.

<sup>63</sup> The Anon. Vales. (89) calls him *exercitus in arma*.

<sup>64</sup> Malch. Fr. 18.

<sup>65</sup> Marcell. ann. 479.

<sup>66</sup> Jo. Ant. Fr. 211, 4 *ad fin.*

<sup>67</sup> Malch. Fr. 17; Jo. Ant. Fr. 211, 2.

<sup>68</sup> Malch. Fr. 19; Cand. ap. Phot.; Eust. Epiph. ap. Evagr. 3, 25; Jo. Ant. Fr. 211, 8, 4; Theod. Lect. 1, 87; Theoph. AM 5971. The exact chronological order of these events is not quite clear. The second attempt on the life of Illous was in 478 (Jo. Ant. Fr. 211, 1), while the rebellion of Marcian was at the end of 479. The defeat of the son of Theodemir by Sabinian was in 479 (Marc.), while at the time of the peace with the son of Triarius, which was before the campaign in Epirus (Malch. 18), Verina had not been banished (*id.* 17). As the rebellion of Marcian seems to have followed closely upon the banishment of the empress, the latter event was probably not before summer 479. The absence of Illous will then have continued till

Anthemius, grandson of the Emperor Marcian, and like Zenon son-in-law of Leo, with the cry of vengeance for Verina raised a rebellion in Constantinople and claimed the empire for himself on the curious ground that his wife Leontia was born in the purple, while at the time of the birth of Ariadne Leo was but a simple tribune of the soldiers. Surrounded by a force of barbarians and assisted by the citizens, who hurled down missiles from the roofs of the houses upon the emperor's troops, he easily made himself master of the city, but postponed the attack upon the palace till the next day. This gave time to Illous to bring over a force of Isaurians from Kalchedon during the night, and on the following day, partly by bribes, partly by force, he succeeded in putting down the insurrection, though his own house was burnt by the mob during the fighting. Marcian was forced to become a presbyter and sent to Kaisareia in Cappadocia, while his brother Procopius and another leader in the revolt named Bousalbos escaped to the camp of Theoderic.<sup>69</sup> Shortly afterwards, Marcian escaped from his confinement at Kaisareia, and at the head of a rustic force made an attack upon Ankyra, from which he was repulsed by Trokoundes. Zenon, however, with extraordinary clemency still refrained from taking his life, but he was closely imprisoned in Isauria,<sup>70</sup> where he was still living four years afterwards.<sup>71</sup> It is curious to find the Isaurians taking the opportunity of these disturbances to sack two towns in Cilicia; the mountaineers were evidently not inclined to give up their plundering habits, even when their countryman was on the throne of the empire, and indeed they could live in no other way. The son of Triarius, who was in league with Marcian, arrived before Constantinople too late to support the insurrection, but he expected to get possession of the city without difficulty, 'for he thought,' says Malchos, 'that no one

that time. As he was originally intended to take command against the Goths, while we afterwards find Martinian in command, it is most likely that his departure took place in the meantime, perhaps summer 478. The treaty with Theoderic was, according to John of Antioch (*Fr.* 211, 2), made about the same time, but this is probably rather too early. John's synchronisms are not always exact; thus he places the capture of Dyrhachion by the son of Theodemir at about the same time as the defeat of Marcian, but clearly it was earlier, for Marcian's revolt was, according to John's own account, at the end of 479, while the victory of Sabinian, which must have been some time after the capture of Dyrhachion, was also according to Marcellinus in 479.

<sup>69</sup> Theodore the Reader adds another brother Romulus.

<sup>70</sup> At Tarsos, in Cilicia, according to Eustace, whose account of these events is slightly different from that of John of Antioch. I follow John, though a later writer, because his detailed account seems to show an accurate acquaintance with the facts, and because Eustace exists only in the epitome of Evagrius.

<sup>71</sup> At a later time Zenon was troubled by a certain Theosebius, who pretended to be Procopius ὁ Μαρκιανοῦ (*Jo. Ant. Fr.* 212), by which the brother of Marcian is probably indicated. Against the natural rendering 'son of Marcian,' we have to set the statement of John Malala (p. 875) that Marcian had only daughters; on the other hand, as no date is given, there is no serious chronological difficulty in supposing a son of Marcian to be meant.

would defend mere walls against him, since there was no bulwark or tower standing, and that, when he entered the city, all the people would join him out of hatred to the Isaurians.' And in fact a party in Constantinople seems still to have been in collusion with him, for Dionysios, the prætorian prefect,<sup>72</sup> Epinikos, the notorious accomplice of Verina, and Thraustila, a barbarian general, were about this time found to be conspiring against the emperor and executed. However the Gothic chief was disappointed in his expectation of taking the city, for he found the walls strongly guarded by Isaurian troops; so, pretending that he had come to help Zenon, he accepted the emperor's gifts and promises and went away without fighting.<sup>73</sup> He refused, however, to deliver up Procopius and Bousalbos, and, perhaps on this excuse, the office of master of one service, which had been conferred on him at the previous treaty, was, as soon as he was safely away, transferred to the Isaurian Trokoundes, who had previously been count of Isauria. He therefore still continued his ravages, and a year or two later again attacked Constantinople;<sup>74</sup> but, finding it impossible to take the city, owing to the precautions taken by Illous, he retired to Thrace, where he was accidentally killed by falling against a spear. As a few years afterwards his son Rekitach was murdered by the son of Theodemir,<sup>75</sup> the Goths were united under one leader, and the policy of playing off one chief against the other was at an end. It is, therefore, somewhat strange to find it stated that the murder was instigated by the emperor, but Illous was then in revolt and Zenon wished to make use of the Goths against him.

For, after the defeat of Marcian, the Isaurian rule was so strongly planted that it was able to survive even a civil war among the conquerors themselves. The Empress Ariadne<sup>76</sup> wished to obtain the recall of her mother Verina, but when she begged the emperor to grant it, he only answered, 'Ask the patrician Illous for her;' so she sent for Illous and with tears begged him to set Verina free. But he said, 'Why do you ask for her? Is it in order that she may again make another king in opposition to your husband?' Then Ariadne went back to Zenon with the ultimatum, 'Is Illous to be in the palace or I?' to which the emperor answered, 'If you can do anything, do it; I prefer you.' This ambiguous answer was naturally followed by a third attempt on the life of the patrician.

<sup>72</sup> The name of this prefect does not occur in the *Code*; if the dates are right, his prefecture must be inserted between 9 Oct. 479, and 1 May, 480 (*Cod. Just.* 1, 49, 1; 6, 28, 22).

<sup>73</sup> Mr. Hodgkin (iii. 119, note) has confused this attack on Constantinople with that of 481; the earlier one is not mentioned by Marcellinus.

<sup>74</sup> *Jo. Ant. Fr.* 211, 4, 5; *Marcell. ann.* 481; *Evagr.* 8, 25.

<sup>75</sup> *Jo. Ant. Fr.* 214, 8. The date seems to have been 484.

<sup>76</sup> *Jo. Mal.* p. 387; *Theoph.* AM 5972. The conversation seems to be genuine, but how did John's authority get his information? I can only conjecture that it came through Ariadne's eunuchs or slave women.

During some games in the circus<sup>77</sup> a scholarian named Sporacius struck a blow at the head of Illous with his sword, and the attempt was more nearly successful than either of the preceding ones, for the assassin actually succeeded in cutting off his ear. Sporacius was put to death, and the emperor took a solemn oath that he knew nothing of the matter; but it was, of course, hopeless to ask for the surrender of Ariadne,<sup>78</sup> so Illous begged for leave of absence, on the ground of requiring change of air, owing to his wound. This Zenon at once granted, at the same time appointing him master of the soldiers in the east in place of his former post of master of the offices. Illous then left Constantinople and took up his residence at Antioch. The date of his departure may be gathered from the story told by Liberatus to the effect that John Talaina, who had been elected by the Kalchedonians to succeed Timothy Salofaciolus in the see of Alexandria, sent a magistrian to announce his election to Illous, but the messenger on arriving at Constantinople found that Illous had gone to Antioch:<sup>79</sup> the death of Timothy is fixed by a letter of pope Simplicius to the winter or spring of 482.<sup>80</sup> With this agrees the statement of John Malala that Illous remained two years at Antioch,<sup>81</sup> for his open revolt is placed by Marcellinus and the chronicle of Edessa<sup>82</sup> in 484, and this date is confirmed by John of Antioch and Theophanes.<sup>83</sup> He was certainly in Constantinople in 481, for he defended the city against Theoderic; the consulship of his brother Trokoundes in 482 cannot perhaps be adduced to show that he was then still living at the court, for Zenon carefully avoided an open rupture for some time after his departure. That event may however be fixed with a fair degree of precision to the winter of 481-2; for the winter which he spent at Nikaia with Pamprepius, as related by Souidas,<sup>84</sup> was probably the winter of 479, or perhaps 480, not that of 481.

That a war between the emperor and his powerful minister was now imminent was a fact plain to all; certainly it was so to Illous himself, who had taken with him a large body of supporters,<sup>85</sup> the most prominent of whom were Matronian, his brother-in-law, Marsus, the Isaurian general who had commanded against the Vandals in 468, Pamprepius the quaestor, and an Isaurian ex-

<sup>77</sup> Eust. Epiph. ap. Evagr. 8, 27; Josh. Styl. 13; Jo. Mal. *l.c.*; Theoph. *l.c.*

<sup>78</sup> Jordanes (*Rom.* 849 ff.) has an extraordinary story that Zenon was instigated by Illous to kill Ariadne, and, the attempt failing, Zenon and Ariadne were reconciled and tried to kill Illous. Illous then went to the east and rebelled. I can only regard this as a blunder; we might think it a Gothic version intended to disparage the Isaurians, but Jordanes is not otherwise unfavourable to Zenon.

<sup>79</sup> Liber. 17.

<sup>80</sup> Simpl. *Ep.* 17.

<sup>81</sup> Jo. Mal. ap. Mommsen, *Hermes*, vi. 371.

<sup>82</sup> *Chron. Edess.* ap. *Assemanum*, *Bibl. Oricnf.* i. 405.

<sup>83</sup> Jo. Ant. *Fr.* 214, 4; Theoph. AM 5976.

<sup>84</sup> Souidas, s.v. Πάμπρεπιος.

<sup>85</sup> Eust. Epiph. ap. Evagr. 8, 27; Jo. Mal. *l.c.*

prefect named Kouttoulos, whom, considering the great similarity of Isaurian names, we must not identify with Indakos Kottounes, the brother-in-law of Trokoundes; this Indakos, as well as Trokoundes himself, was afterwards in the company of Illous, but does not seem to have been among those who followed him from Constantinople. Eustace and John Malala add the name of Leontius, but I shall presently show reason for thinking that it was at a later stage that Leontius appeared upon the scene. The emperor, on the other hand, was not at all ready for a war with Illous; for Theoderic, freed from his confinement in Epirus by the assassination of Sabinian, which Zenon out of jealousy had procured, was again ravaging Macedonia and Thessaly.<sup>85</sup> This fact, added to his fears for his brother, and perhaps a genuine disinclination for a war with Illous, probably induced Zenon to stave off the conflict by all the means in his power; he even added to the functions of Illous as master of the soldiers in the east the dangerous right of appointing dukes,<sup>87</sup> which was generally reserved to the emperor. But in the following year he succeeded in buying off the Gothic king by gifts of money and lands in Dacia and Moesia, the office of master of the soldiers, and the promise of the consulship for the next year,<sup>88</sup> probably not without an understanding that he should serve against Illous if required. If this was the case, the murder of Rekitach would be a necessary preliminary insisted upon by the Goth, for he could not go to the east and leave his rival in undisputed possession of the provinces of Europe. As Illous did not cease his preparations for war, but did his best to secure popularity by erecting public buildings and performing other services for the citizens of Antioch,<sup>89</sup> Zenon now took the first step against him by demanding the surrender of his brother,<sup>90</sup> and on his refusal, for, as the return of Longinus is placed by Marcellinus in 485, I assume that he did refuse,<sup>91</sup> appointed John the Scythian<sup>92</sup> to succeed him in his office of master of the soldiers in the east. At the same time he made speeches against Illous to the people of Constantinople, expelled his friends from the city, and confiscated their property; but, probably in order to avoid turning him into a national leader of the Isaurians, he adopted the ingenious plan of bestowing the confiscated property upon the Isaurian cities. These proceedings were

<sup>85</sup> Jo. Ant. Fr. 213; Marcell. ann. 481, 482.

<sup>87</sup> Theoph. AM 5972. Cf. Jo. Mal. p. 888.

<sup>88</sup> Jo. Mal. ap. Mommsen, *Hermes*, vi. 371.

<sup>89</sup> Marcell. ann. 488.

<sup>90</sup> Jo. Ant. Fr. 214, 1.

<sup>91</sup> The compound *ἐξαιτούμενος* in the middle voice followed by the infinitive (see Eur. *Hec.* 49) cannot in such late Greek be pressed as implying that the request was granted, and it may be balanced by the tense.

<sup>92</sup> *ἀποσσεύλας* according to John of Antioch, but it does not appear that he actually started before the expedition mentioned in 214, 4. Both Mr. Hodgkin and Mr. Bury call this man John the Goth, but there is nothing to show that he was a Goth. *Σκίθης* is quite indefinite.

accepted by Illous as a declaration of war, and he at once began to prepare more vigorously than before for the coming struggle. Leaving Antioch,<sup>93</sup> he went to Isauria to raise forces among his countrymen, perhaps also with some idea of counteracting the measures of the emperor; at the same time he sent envoys<sup>91</sup> to the king of Persia, the satraps of Roman Armenia, and Odovacar the king of Italy, as in default of any other title I am obliged to call him,<sup>93</sup> asking for aid against the emperor. The Persians and Armenians are said to have consented, and Odovacar to have refused; but oddly enough, though the Armenians were in active communication with Illous,<sup>93</sup> no help is stated to have come from Persia, while three years later we actually find Odovacar preparing to send assistance. With regard to the Persians, however, this is easily explained by the fact that in January 484 they were utterly defeated by the Ephthalites,<sup>97</sup> and their king Piroz slain.<sup>98</sup> The same fact makes it practically certain that the embassy from Illous is to be placed in 483 before his open rebellion, for to ask assistance from the Persians in 484 would have been useless, a consideration which induces me to place these embassies before the proclamation of Marcian, in spite of the order of John of Antioch, which, as I have before had occasion to notice, is not always strictly chronological. But, as it was unlikely that Illous would be able to rally all the Isaurians to his standard against the Isaurian emperor, and he wished to be something more than a captain of robbers, it was necessary for him to choose a rival emperor; 'for alone,' says Joshua the Stylite, 'he could not rebel nor make himself emperor, because the Romans hated him too on account of his race, and on account of his hardness of heart.'<sup>99</sup> His first choice fell upon Marcian,<sup>100</sup> but perhaps Marcian had had enough of rebellions, perhaps he was too proud to become the puppet of the Isaurian adventurer; at any rate this plan was soon given up, and Illous determined to make use of a more fitting instrument, which was at this time thrown into his hands by the action of the emperor. Joshua tells us that Zenon sent envoys to

<sup>91</sup> Jo. Mal. p. 388.

<sup>92</sup> Josh. Styl. 14; Jo. Ant. Fr. 214, 2; cf. Proc. *De Aedif.* 1.

<sup>93</sup> Cf. Vict. Vit. 1, 8, *Odoacri regi Italiae*.

<sup>94</sup> Proc. *l.c.* This passage shows that it is the Roman, not the Persian Armenians who are meant; the latter were in fact in rebellion against Persia at this time, and were not in a position to give help to anybody.

<sup>95</sup> The Persians promised help, *ἔπειθ' αὐτοὺς ἤξει*. The news of their defeat probably prevented Illous from making any serious attempt to effect a junction with them.

<sup>96</sup> Laz. Pharp. 70 ff.; Jo. Ant. Fr. 214, 9 (*Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, vol. v.); Proc. *Bell. Pers.* 1, 4. The date is fixed by an eclipse: see Nöldeke's *El Tabari*, p. 425. The short account in John of Antioch is, I think, retrospective, and it is the accession of Kavat, which he rightly places in 487-8, not the death of Piroz, but his expressions are, as usual in matters of chronology, very loose.

<sup>97</sup> Josh. Styl. 14.

<sup>98</sup> Jo. Ant. Fr. 214, 2.

Illous to induce him, if possible, to return to Constantinople, and, not succeeding in this, sent a certain Leontius (a native of Dalisandos<sup>101</sup> according to John of Antioch, and therefore not differing much from an Isaurian) with orders to bring him by force and in case of resistance to kill him. Illous, however, gained over the general by means of bribes, and the ultimate result was the proclamation of Leontius as emperor.<sup>102</sup> This version is corroborated by Jordanes.<sup>103</sup> Eustace of Epiphaneia on the other hand, a contemporary like Joshua, makes Leontius one of the original companions of Illous,<sup>104</sup> and the same account is given by John Malala.<sup>105</sup> Theophanes may be neglected, as there can be no doubt that he copies John Malala. John of Antioch being neutral, we have therefore a conflict of testimony between Joshua and Jordanes on one side, and Eustace and John Malala on the other. Now Jordanes is beyond doubt independent of Joshua,<sup>106</sup> whereas John Malala was certainly acquainted with Eustace,<sup>107</sup> and probably used him in this portion of his history as his principal authority; <sup>108</sup> it is most likely therefore that the authority for the second version is to be reduced to Eustace alone. On the other hand the account of Joshua is to some extent supported by the testimony of the African Liberatus, who, however, makes Leontius the rebel, and Illous the general sent against him.<sup>109</sup>

I have, therefore, little hesitation in deciding in favour of the Stylite, at least as to the fact that Leontius was sent by the emperor, though I should be inclined to reject his statement that Leontius came as a general at the head of an army, a detail upon which the hermit of Edessa would not be likely to have the best information, and scarcely consistent with the description of Leontius in John of Antioch. This assertion is indeed in some degree supported by Theophanes, who makes Leontius master of the soldiers in Thrace,<sup>110</sup> but this statement

<sup>101</sup> Πόλις Ἰσαυρικῆ, according to Capito the Lycian (ap. Steph. Byz. s.v.), but it follows from Josh. Styl. l.c. that he was not an Isaurian in the same sense as Illous. See Ramsay, *Hist. Geogr. of Asia Minor*, pp. 879, 895. There were two Dalisandoi (*id.* p. 866).

<sup>102</sup> Josh. Styl. l.c.

<sup>103</sup> Jord. Rom. 852.

<sup>104</sup> Eust. Epiph. ap. Evagr. 8, 27.

<sup>105</sup> Jo. Mal. p. 888; *id.* ap. Mommsen, *Hermes*, vi. 371.

<sup>106</sup> There is, however, a most extraordinary connexion between the two, which it would be interesting to investigate further (cp. Josh. Styl. 18 *ad init.* with Jord. Rom. 852 *ad fin.* and Josh. Styl. 23 [p. 18, l. 19, Wright], with Jord. Rom. 855 *ad fin.*). A use of Joshua by Jordanes is of course out of the question, and a use of a common authority is equally so, as Joshua plainly writes his own recollections

<sup>107</sup> See Jo. Mal. p. 899, and the preface in the old Slavonic translation (*Hermes*, xv. 235).

<sup>108</sup> See an article by Jeep in the *Rheinisches Museum*, 1882, 427 ff.

<sup>109</sup> Liber. 17. Mr. Bury here strangely throws over all the other authorities in favour of this blundering statement of Liberatus. Tillemont, to whom he refers, has great misgivings on the subject, and was besides not acquainted with Joshua.

<sup>110</sup> Theoph. AM 5972.

of Theophanes appears to be contradicted by John Malala, who, while assigning offices to the other companions of Illous, gives none to Leontius, and by John of Antioch, who simply describes him as *γονέων τε ἀφανῶν καὶ πόλεως Δαλισάνδου*. I therefore conclude that Theophanes has made some mistake, and I am inclined to combine the account of Joshua with that of John of Antioch,<sup>111</sup> and to suppose that the military force which accompanied Leontius was the force of Isaurians under Konon the son of Fuscian, the militant bishop of Apameia,<sup>112</sup> and Linges, the bastard brother of Illous, mentioned by the latter writer.<sup>113</sup> It was only natural that Zenon should send Isaurians to carry on a campaign in Isauria, and Isaurian troops could be commanded only by Isaurian leaders; Leontius therefore would have no control over the soldiers, but would accompany them only in the character of an envoy and would not lead them to follow him in his revolt. In order to give some semblance of legality to the elevation of his emperor of straw, Illous now chose the strangest of allies, the Empress Verina herself.<sup>114</sup> This turbulent woman was actually not unwilling to become his tool; in her desire to avenge herself upon her Isaurian son-in-law, who had handed her over to the mercies of Illous, she was ready to ally herself with Illous himself, whose life she had twice attempted; and this although it was his refusal to release her from imprisonment which had been the original cause of his quarrel with the emperor. She had previously been removed from Dalisandos to a well-known robber-fortress in Isauria called the castle of Papirius;<sup>115</sup> from this castle she was now brought out and taken to Tarsos, where she crowned Leontius emperor and in her own name sent a proclamation to the people of Antioch and to the provincial governors of the east and Egypt, announcing his accession.<sup>116</sup> The proclamation of Verina is so important and instructive a document that it will be well to give it in full; it ran as follows:<sup>117</sup>

We, Aelia Verina, the ever august, to our magistrates and to our Christ-loving peoples greeting: know that since the death of Leo of divine memory the empire is ours, and that we appointed Tarasikodissa emperor, who was afterwards called Zenon, in order to further the interests of our subjects and the whole military administration. But, seeing that the

<sup>111</sup> Jo. Ant. Fr. 214, 2.

<sup>112</sup> The name of his see is given by Evagrius (8, 85), and by John Malala (p. 898).

<sup>113</sup> For Linges see also Soudas, s.v. βλαῖοι.

<sup>114</sup> Theod. Lect. 2, 8; Jo. Ant. Lc.

<sup>115</sup> Theod. Lect. 1, 87; Eust. Epiph. ap. Evagr. 3, 27. For the history of this castle see Jo. Ant. Fr. 206, 2. According to Theodore (1, 37) Marcian also was confined there.

<sup>116</sup> Jo. Mal. ap. Mommsen, *Hermes*, vi. 371; Theoph. AM. 5974.

<sup>117</sup> I have combined the versions of John and Theophanes into the most likely form; the original would probably be in Latin, hence the baldness of the Greek.

commonwealth and our subjects are being ruined by his avarice, we have thought it necessary to crown for you a Christian emperor, distinguished for piety and justice, that he may preserve the Roman commonwealth, carry on war without distraction (*ἡσυχίας*), and protect all our subjects in accordance with the laws. So we have crowned the most pious Leontius, who will bestow forethought upon all of you.

The pointed references to the piety of Leontius contain an obvious allusion to the 'Henotikon,' issued by Zenon two years before,<sup>118</sup> by means of which he proposed to include the Monophysites within the pale of the church, probably in order to avoid driving them on to the side of Illous. Of course Illous cared nothing for the synod of Chalcedon, in fact the patron of Pamprepus was not without reason suspected of being a heathen; but the proclamation was a bid for the support of the fanatical Chalcedonians against the author of the 'Henotikon.' Whether any considerable number of adherents were thus gained, we cannot say, but that Zenon was afraid of the Chalcedonians seems probable from the statement of Theodore that during the troubles with Illous he made no attempt to force the 'Henotikon' on the bishops.<sup>119</sup> That the Chalcedonians were at any rate accused of taking the side of Illous we learn from the fact that Kalandion, bishop of Antioch, who was certainly on good terms with Illous, was afterwards deprived on this charge.<sup>120</sup> Illous too had already some personal connexion with the Chalcedonian faction through John Talasia, the Chalcedonian anti-bishop of Alexandria, who according to Liberatus had won his favour by many costly gifts, when sent by his predecessor Timothy on an embassy to Constantinople.<sup>121</sup>

When the proclamation was read out at Antioch, the people received it with the cries, 'Great is God,' and 'Lord, have mercy; give us what is good and beneficial.'<sup>122</sup> Theophanes assures us that they accepted it with approval,<sup>123</sup> otherwise we might have supposed that these words, preserved by John Malala, were meant as a token of dissent. After this Leontius went himself to Antioch, which he entered 27 June 484.<sup>124</sup> No opposition to his elevation is recorded except at Chalkis, where the people refused to receive his busts, thus necessitating his presence in the city for a month and a half,<sup>125</sup> and at Edessa, where Matronian, who appeared before the town with 500 horsemen, found the gates closed against him and was unable to effect an entrance.<sup>126</sup> The adhesion of Leontius and Verina had extended the rebellion over all the diocese of the east, and the Isaurians under Konon and Linges, who were sufficient for a moun-

<sup>118</sup> Zach. Myt. 5, 7-8 (Evagr. 3, 13-14); Liber. 17; Vict. Tun. ann. 482.

<sup>119</sup> Theod. Lect. 2, 1.

<sup>120</sup> Zach. Myt. 5, 9 (Evagr. 3, 16); Liber. 18.

<sup>121</sup> Liber. 16.

<sup>122</sup> Jo. Mal. ap. Mommsen, *Hermes*, vi. 872.

<sup>123</sup> Theoph. l.c.

<sup>124</sup> Theod. Lect. 2, 8; Jo. Ant. Fr. 214, 2; Jo. Mal. p. 883; Theoph. AM 5976.

<sup>125</sup> Jo. Mal. ap. Mommsen, *Hermes*, vi. 872.

<sup>126</sup> Josh. Styl. 16.

tain-campaign in Isauria, were no longer of any service against the insurgents. A larger force of imperial troops under the command of Theoderic and John the Scythian was therefore sent to the scene of action; <sup>127</sup> another Isaurian general named Kottais is mentioned by Theophanes as taking part in the war, <sup>128</sup> but whether he came now or at some later time there is nothing to show. These were opposed <sup>129</sup> by Artemidoros, a body-guardsmen of Trokoundes, and Papimos, the commander of the cavalry under Illous. In the battle which followed the emperor's troops gained a complete victory, and Illous summoned Leontius and Verina <sup>130</sup> to join him at once in Isauria, where they shut themselves up in the castle of Cherris, which seems to have been the same as that of Papirius. <sup>131</sup> This was probably in the autumn of 484. All chance of a general rebellion against the emperor was now at an end, and the war had been reduced to a revolt of a few Isaurian robber-tribes; accordingly the emperor, fearing perhaps that the presence of the Gothic king might have a bad effect on the Isaurians on his own side and bring about a national revolt under the leadership of Illous, recalled Theoderic and his Goths, <sup>132</sup> and sent some Rugians under Hermanric, the son of Aspar, to take their place. John of Antioch indeed makes Zenon recall Theoderic when he had only got as far as Nikomedeia, but according to his own account the Goths served in Isauria, <sup>133</sup> and it is very unlikely that they would do so after the recall of their king. Theophanes distinctly states that Theoderic took part in the campaign, <sup>134</sup> and from the epitome in Evagrius it is probable that Eustace gave the same account. <sup>135</sup> On the other hand, as there is no mention of it in the Panegyric of Ennodius, we must suppose that, perhaps owing to a division of forces, Theoderic was not present in the battle. After his recall his office of master of both services was transferred to an Isaurian named Kottomenes and another Isaurian, Longinus of Kardama, <sup>136</sup> was made master of the offices. <sup>137</sup>

<sup>127</sup> Eust. Epiph. ap. Evagr. 3, 27; Josh. Styl. 15; Jo. Ant. *Fr.* 214, 4; Theoph. AM 5977.

<sup>128</sup> Theoph. AM 5983; it is perhaps possible that he is the same as the Kottomenes of Jo. Ant. 214, 6, but John does not say that Kottomenes took any part in the war.

<sup>129</sup> Jo. Ant. *Fr.* 214, 5.

<sup>130</sup> Verina seems to have accompanied Leontius to Antioch in spite of the statement of Theodore (3, 3) that she was sent back to the castle of Papirius.

<sup>131</sup> This appears from Marcell. ann. 488, Eust. ap. Evagr. 3, 27, and Jo. Mal. ap. Mommsen, *Hermes*, vi. 872. Papirius is of course the name of a man, the father of Indakos (Jo. Ant. 206, 2), not of a place. The castle seems to have been used by Zenon as a treasure-house (Josh. Styl. 18; Jord. *Rom.* 852).

<sup>132</sup> Jo. Ant. *Fr.* 214, 4. Theophanes makes him return of his own accord (AM 5977).

<sup>133</sup> Jo. Ant. *Fr.* 214, 6.

<sup>134</sup> Theoph. *l.c.*

<sup>135</sup> Evagr. 3, 27.

<sup>136</sup> Or, as Mommsen reads it, Kardala.

<sup>137</sup> Jo. Ant. *l.c.* The date was not earlier than 1 Sept. 484, for a certain John was then master of the offices (*Cod. Just.* 12, 21, 8). It is strange that Mr. Hodgkin should identify Longinus *ὁ ἐκ Καρδάμων* with the brother of Zenon.

The position of Illous, besieged in his stronghold by his own countrymen, was now hopeless, and he had been obliged to dismiss a large part of the small force of 2,000 men which had followed him to Isauria, retaining with him according to John of Antioch only the most friendly; <sup>138</sup> this seems to show that the reason for his action was not merely the difficulty of providing for so many in the fort, but the fear of treachery, which, as the event showed, was not ill-grounded. Nine days after the beginning of the siege Verina died, <sup>139</sup> perhaps of shame and grief at finding herself thus shut up with the Isaurians in their robber-fastness. Thus the faint semblance of legality, which had been thrown over the elevation of Leontius, disappeared, and with it Illous' last hope of gaining allies in other parts of the empire. Thirty days later Marsus also died, <sup>140</sup> and Trokoundes, who had been sent out in the vain hope of collecting barbarian auxiliaries, was cut off by John the Scythian and put to death. <sup>141</sup> The philosophic Illous now abandoned all hope; he entrusted the defence to a notorious robber-captain, <sup>142</sup> Indakos Kottounes, son of Papirius and brother-in-law of Trokoundes, <sup>143</sup> and probably the former owner of the castle, while he gave himself up to reading, <sup>144</sup> a strange occupation for an Isaurian chief. Owing to this neglect an outwork (*ἀντικάσπελλος*) was betrayed to the enemy by its garrison, and it was perhaps about the same time that Longinus obtained his freedom and returned to Constantinople; <sup>145</sup> according to Theophanes, Illous set him free of his own accord; <sup>146</sup> if so, it must have been done in mere despair, or perhaps in the hope of influencing the emperor in his favour; possibly, however, the real fact was that Longinus contrived to escape owing to Illous' negligence. Thus Illous lost the last hold which he possessed over the emperor. Leontius, on the other hand, spent his time in fasting and lamentation, <sup>147</sup> the former perhaps not an altogether useless employment during a siege. Pamprepius, who had prophesied a successful issue to the war, was put to death as an impostor. <sup>148</sup> According to Theophanes this was done as soon as

<sup>138</sup> Jo. Ant. *Fr.* 214, 5. Joshua says 'chosen men and valiant' (Josh. Styl. 17) which comes to much the same thing.

<sup>139</sup> Jo. Ant. *Fr.* 214, 6.

<sup>140</sup> Damasc. (ap. Phot.) *Vit. Isid. Fr.* 290; Jo. Ant. *l.c.*

<sup>141</sup> Theoph. AM 5976.

<sup>142</sup> See Jo. Ant. *Fr.* 206, 2, and Soudas s.v. Ἰνδακός.

<sup>143</sup> Theod. Lect. 2, 4. His own syntax and a comparison with Theoph. AM 5980 make it clear that the words τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ have dropped out. He is certainly wrong in saying that the traitor was sent by Zenon.

<sup>144</sup> Jo. Ant. *Fr.* 214, 6.

<sup>145</sup> Marcell. ann. 485.

<sup>146</sup> Theoph. AM 5976, ἀπέλευσεν. He puts it before the battle, but his authority is worth nothing against Marcellinus, who places it in 485.

<sup>147</sup> Jo. Ant. *l.c.*

<sup>148</sup> Damasc. (ap. Phot.) *Vit. Isid. Fr.* 110; Jo. Mal. p. 389; Theoph. AM 5976; cf. Josh. Styl. 15.

they heard of the fate of Trokoundes, for whom they had been waiting four years in ignorance of his death, but this we can hardly believe, though we may perhaps draw the inference that the death of Pamprepius took place during the last days of the siege. How the besieged supported themselves we are not told, but probably owing to the nature of the country it was not possible to keep up a strict blockade. A short respite was now given to them by the rebellion of Theoderic in Thrace,<sup>149</sup> the Goth being probably indignant at his recall and his dismissal from office, as well by some attempts on the part of King Odovacar to send them aid.<sup>150</sup> Zenon, however, first distracted the attention of the Italian king by instigating the Rugians to attack him,<sup>151</sup> and then got rid of Theoderic, once for all, by sending him to west Italy from Odovacar.<sup>152</sup>

Having thus delivered himself from both his enemies at once by the ingenious device of setting them to fight one another, Zenon was able to devote all his attention to the siege of Cherris. After a vain attempt to negotiate, Illous, owing to the death of his daughter, neglected the defence more than ever,<sup>153</sup> and after a siege of four years the fortress was taken by the treachery of Indakos, who admitted the imperial troops at night by means of a rope; <sup>154</sup> he and his fellow-traitors were, however, among the first persons killed. Illous and Leontius, who were asleep at the time, were awakened by the well-known cry, 'Zenon Auguste, tu vincas,' which told them that the emperor's soldiers were within the fort, and took refuge in the sanctuary of a martyr named Konon, where Leontius wished to put himself to death but was prevented by Illous. They were then brought out and securely bound by the Isaurians in the emperor's service, among whom were two former slaves of Illous named Paul <sup>155</sup> and Illous; the request of Illous that his daughter should be buried at Tarsôs, that his wife should be well treated, and that the life of a certain Konon, who was perhaps his son-in-law,<sup>156</sup> should be spared, was granted, and then he and Leontius were beheaded.<sup>157</sup> According to John of Antioch, lightning, thunder, hail, and wind accompanied their death, and the executioner was struck mad and dumb on the spot. Strange as it may seem, we can hardly help concluding from this that they were

<sup>149</sup> Marcell. ann. 487; Jo. Ant. *Fr.* 214, 7-8 (Müller, *Fragm. Hist. Graec.* vol. v.); Proc. *Bell. Goth.* 1, 1.

<sup>150</sup> Jo. Ant. *Fr.* 214, 7.

<sup>151</sup> Odovacar defeated the Rugians 15 Nov. 487 (*Fast. Cuspin.*).

<sup>152</sup> Anon. *Vales.* 49; Jord. *Rom.* 848; Proc. *Bell. Goth. l.c.*

<sup>153</sup> Jo. Ant. *Fr.* 214, 7, 9.

<sup>154</sup> Josh. *Styl.* 17; Jo. Ant. *Fr.* 214, 10.

<sup>155</sup> Paul was perhaps the imperial admiral (Jo. Ant. *Fr.* 214, 4), though *αβροῦ* in that passage would refer to Zenon more naturally than to Illous.

<sup>156</sup> This is the opinion of Mommsen (*Hermes*, vi. 380).

<sup>157</sup> *Damasc.* (ap. Phot.) *Vit. Isid. Fr.* 290; Cand. ap. Phot.; Josh. *Styl. l.c.* Jo. Ant. *Fr.* 214, 11; Marcell. ann. 488.

really looked upon as martyrs in the cause of the Synod of Chalcedon, though it is odd that the circumstance should be recorded only by a writer so free from theological bias as John of Antioch. Their heads were sent to Constantinople and exposed on poles, and all those who were taken in the castle had their hands cut off. Zenon, it is said, wished to spare the life of Konon, but he had already committed suicide. Artemidoros, the body-guardsman of Trokoundes, an unnamed son of a certain Longinus,<sup>158</sup>—whether to be identified with any other of the numerous Isaurians of that name we cannot say—and another Konon known as ‘the countryman,’ who seem to have had a share in the treachery of Indakos, all, as John of Antioch takes delight in telling us, perished miserably.<sup>159</sup> Of the fate of Matronian we hear nothing; after his repulse from the walls of Edessa, he appears no more in history, but, as the chronicle of Edessa makes the reign of Leontius last two years,<sup>160</sup> we may perhaps conjecture that Matronian continued the war in Mesopotamia, probably in combination with the Armenians, until 486, and then either died or escaped into Persian territory, for, if he had been killed or taken prisoner, it would most probably have been mentioned by the authorities. After the suppression of the revolt, which took place in 488, most of the castles in Isauria were dismantled.

The war with Illous had been mainly a war among the Isaurians themselves; but it was soon to be followed by one between Isaurians and Romans, in which the Isaurian rule was finally overthrown. On 10 April 491 Zenon died,<sup>161</sup> and, as he left no son, the Empress Ariadne and the eunuch Urbicius in concurrence with the senate and the army invested Anastasius, a silentiary of high character, with the empire in preference to Zenon’s unpopular and incapable brother Longinus. The Isaurians must have been greatly weakened by the last war, and were therefore not in a position to offer any immediate resistance to the new appointment in Constantinople; but a revolt at once broke out in Isauria,<sup>162</sup> headed by Linginines,<sup>163</sup> the count of the province, the fighting bishop Konon, who gave up his see in order to take part in the war, and a certain Athenodoros. Shortly afterwards a serious riot<sup>164</sup> took place in

<sup>158</sup> This is Mommsen’s reading: Müller has *Λογγίνος ὁ τοῦ Λογγίνου παῖς*. According to Mommsen’s reading he may perhaps be the same person as Konon.

<sup>159</sup> *Jo. Ant. Fr.* 214, 12; cf. *Josh. Styl. l.c.*

<sup>160</sup> *Assem. Bibl. Or.* i. 406. It makes him reign at Antioch two years, which is of course wrong; but the Edessenes would only know that he had been reigning at Antioch, and that Matronian was attacking them in his name.

<sup>161</sup> *Zach. Myt.* 7, 1. On the Wednesday before Easter.

<sup>162</sup> *Josh. Styl.* 23; *Zach. Myt.* 7, 2; *Jo. Ant. Fr.* 214 b. 3; *Jo. Mal.* p. 393 ff; *Theoph. AM* 5985; *Jord. Rom.* 354 ff.

<sup>163</sup> Mommsen, Müller, Rose, and Mr. Bury, all identify this man with Linges, who commanded against Illous, but the identification seems to me very doubtful.

<sup>164</sup> *Jo. Ant. Fr.* 214 b. 2; *Marcell. ann.* 491; *Jo. Mal. ap. Mommsen, Hermes*, vi. 373.

the circus at Constantinople; the origin of it is not clearly explained by John of Antioch, but it had very probably some connexion with theological differences, for Anastasius was a well-known Monophysite, and Euphemius, the bishop of Constantinople, had on this ground vigorously protested against his elevation to the empire. The Isaurians were, however, suspected of being implicated in the sedition, and it is not unlikely that the Chalcedonians would be ready to act even with these hated barbarians against their common enemy Anastasius. The emperor accordingly made use of the opportunity to take strong measures against the Isaurians.<sup>165</sup> Longinus was forced to become a presbyter and banished to the Thebaid, where he died eight years afterwards, while his mother, wife, and daughter took refuge on the Bithynian coast, where they subsisted for the rest of their lives on charity.<sup>166</sup> At the same time all the Isaurians in Constantinople were expelled, and the pay which Zenon had given them was withdrawn.<sup>167</sup> Shortly afterwards all their property, including that of the late emperor, was confiscated, even Zenon's imperial robes being put up to auction.<sup>168</sup> The castle of Papirius was also dismantled, though how this could be done while the Isaurians were in revolt it is not easy to see. Rose, indeed, holds that the dismantling of the castle was one of the causes of the revolt, but this, which is clearly inconsistent with John's account, is part of Rose's general theory as to the chronology of these events, and must, I think, stand or fall with it. Rose, followed by Mr. Bury, places this riot and the consequent expulsion of the Isaurians (with the exception of that of Longinus and a few others) after the battle of Kotyæion and identifies it, not with the riot which Marcellinus mentions as occurring in 491, but with that which he relates under the year 493. The former Rose will not allow to have been an ordinary riot at all, but, insisting upon the word *bellum*, says that it was a civil war and is the same as that mentioned by Theophanes under the year 492, in which year he would place the banishment of Longinus. But Theophanes simply says, *ἔστασίασε κατ' αὐτοῦ ὁ Λογγίνος*, an expression which certainly does not imply anything more than the riot related by John. Besides this, Rose's whole theory is in the most glaring

<sup>165</sup> Priscian. *Paneg.* pp. 52, 53; Theod. Lect. 2, 9; Jo. Ant. *Fr.* 214 b. 3; Theoph. AM 5984, 5985. According to Evagrius (3, 29), probably copying Eustace, the Isaurians were banished at their own request, so possibly they were really attacked by their enemies instead of being the aggressors.

<sup>166</sup> The daughter of Longinus was betrothed to a certain Zenon, son of Anthemius and Heraïs. A comparison with Jo. Lyd. *De Mag.* 3, 50, and Proc. *Hist. Arc.* 12, makes it practically certain that this Zenon was a grandson of the emperor Anthemius and nephew of Marcian; this has not, I think, previously been noticed.

<sup>167</sup> According to Jordanes (*Rom.* 352, 354) only the extra pay given them after defeat of Illous.

<sup>168</sup> Jo. Ant. *Fr.* 214 b, 4.

contradiction to the plain and circumstantial account of John of Antioch as well as to Theodore and Theophanes,<sup>169</sup> and is not supported by any other authority. The reasons given by him for the chronology which he adopts are two only: first, that in the riot described by John the emperor's statues were thrown down, and that the same thing is related by Marcellinus as having occurred in the riot of 498 but not in that of 491; and, secondly, that the words of John, *καὶ ταῦτα ἤδη ἀγγελθείσης τῆς κατὰ χώραν αὐτῶν ἀποστάσεως*, are inconsistent with the date 491. But the throwing down of the emperor's statues was one of the commonest incidents of riots, of which the reign of Anastasius was, owing to his theological opinions, an almost perpetual series. Rose might as well have identified John's riot with that of 512, at which also Marcellinus tells us that the statues of Anastasius were thrown down. On the other hand, as Mommsen notices,<sup>170</sup> the burning of the circus, a much rarer incident, is expressly connected by Marcellinus with the riot of 491 and not with that of 498.<sup>171</sup> As to the second objection urged by Rose, there is no reason why the revolt in Isauria should not have preceded the riot in Constantinople, even if the latter occurred in 491; the Isaurians would probably take up arms as soon as they heard of the accession of Anastasius. Besides, according to Rose, the battle of Kotyaeion had already been fought; as he must, therefore, reject altogether the account of John, he cannot rely upon a single expression like this, which is meaningless apart from the narrative in which it stands. The only argument that can fairly be alleged in favour of his chronology is the difficulty about the castle of Papirius alluded to above; but this is not adduced as an argument by him, and is plainly too weak to stand against the general consensus of authorities; if necessary, it would be better to reject John's statement on this point than to throw over his whole narrative, as is done by Rose. I have discussed this and another chronological theory of Rose's, to which I shall presently refer, at greater length than would otherwise have been necessary, because they have been adopted without comment by Mr. Bury in his 'History of the Later Roman Empire,' the only work which gives a narrative in any detail of the events of this much-neglected period of history. Mommsen in his article on the new fragments of John of Antioch follows his author closely, though he appears to hold that John has confused together the two riots of 491 and 498;<sup>172</sup> but since the

<sup>169</sup> Theoph. AM 5985.

<sup>170</sup> *Hermes*, vi. 840.

<sup>171</sup> To show how futile all such arguments are, it may be mentioned that even the burning of the circus was in part repeated in the riot of 507 (*Marc. sub ann.*). The riot described by John Malala (p. 894), copied by the Paschal chronicle, is probably the same in spite of the date (498) given by the latter, for the dates of the Paschal chronicle in the sections taken from John Malala are worthless.

<sup>172</sup> *Hermes*, vi. 840, note 8.

date of Mommsen's article (1872) the value of John's testimony has been considerably enhanced by the strong arguments adduced by Soteriades<sup>173</sup> to show that he wrote soon after the death of Anastasius, not, as previously supposed, in the reign of Herakleios.

Prominent among the Isaurians expelled from Constantinople were Longinus of Kardama, the master of the offices,<sup>174</sup> and a second Athenodoros; these men immediately put themselves at the head of their insurgent countrymen, and their united force is said to have amounted to ten thousand men,<sup>175</sup> among whom were many Romans, some serving under compulsion, some voluntarily, the latter probably zealous Kalchedonians. The distinction made between Romans and Isaurians is to be noted, as it seems to show that the latter were really regarded as semi-independent and, therefore, had not obtained the citizenship under the edict of Antoninus. With this army they advanced as far as Kotyaeion in Phrygia,<sup>176</sup> where they were met by an imperial force under John the Scythian and John the Hunchback,<sup>177</sup> with whom were associated Justin, afterwards emperor, Apskal a Goth, and two Huns named Sigizan and Zolbo. The Isaurians, who seem to have been little suited for fighting in the open field, were utterly defeated, Linginines being killed, and they took refuge in their native mountains. The battle was fought towards the end of 492.<sup>178</sup> The imperial generals had now before them the difficult task of overcoming the Isaurians in their own homes, and when we remember that Zenon with a force of native Isaurians had taken four years to reduce Illous, the difficulty of reducing the united forces of the mountaineers with Roman and barbarian troops may easily be imagined. It is indeed very likely that the destruction of the fortresses after the defeat of Illous had considerably lessened

<sup>173</sup> *Jahrb. für classische Philologie*, suppl. vol. xvi.

<sup>174</sup> Mr. Bury calls this Longinus 'master of the soldiers'; but *μαγιστρος* always means 'master of the offices,' and his appointment is mentioned in *Jo. Ant. Fr.* 214, 6 (cf. *Cod. Just.* 12, 23, 8). A certain Longinus indeed seems to have been *mag. mil.* under Anastasius (*Cod. Just.* 12, 37, 16), but this may be the brother of Zenon, who, according to John Malala, was made master of the soldiers about 490 (*Jo. Mal.* p. 886). As Eusebius was *mag. off.* on 1 Mar. 492 (*Cod. Just.* 1, 80, 8), we may probably assume that the banishment of the Isaurians had taken place before that date.

<sup>175</sup> *Jo. Ant. Fr.* 214 b. 5. Hostilities seem to have been expected as early as 1 Jan. 492 (*Cod. Just.* 12, 85, 18).

<sup>176</sup> *Theod. Lect.* 2, 9; *Jo. Ant. l.c.*; *Marcell. ann.* 492; *Jo. Mal.* p. 894.

<sup>177</sup> According to Theophanes both the Johns were masters of the soldiers in Thrace; but John Malala makes John the Hunchback *mag. in praes.*, and that one of them held the office appears from *Cod. Just.* 12, 85, 18. John the Scythian probably still held his former post of master in the east. John of Antioch's text says that they had only 2,000 men, and this is repeated by Mommsen and Mr. Bury; but surely the number is corrupt, as Müller supposes.

<sup>178</sup> *Διήμενον τὴν τοῦ χειμῶνος ἔραον* which Mommsen and Bose understand as above; but it is possible that it was at the beginning of 492, and the generals waited till the winter was over before undertaking a mountain campaign.

the resisting power of the Isaurians, but even so the task was a most formidable one.

In the following year the Isaurian city of Klaudioupolis, lying in a plain between two mountain-ranges, was taken by Diogenes, a kinsman of the Empress Ariadne,<sup>179</sup> whereupon the Isaurians came down from their mountains and completely surrounded his army so that it almost perished of hunger; but from this position he was released by John the Hunchback, who succeeded in penetrating the passes and by a sudden attack routed the Isaurian forces. In this battle Bishop Konon was mortally wounded. Henceforth the war was confined to the mountain fastnesses, and the Isaurians, unable any longer to plunder the plains, were supplied with food by another Longinus, known as the Selinountian, who contrived to bring in provisions by sea.<sup>180</sup>

The emperor's attention was now distracted from the Isaurian war by a serious incursion of barbarians in Thrace, in which Julian, the master of the soldiers, was killed; <sup>181</sup> perhaps also by a dangerous riot in Constantinople, in which the statues of the emperor and empress were dragged through the streets, probably by the Kalchedonian faction, who, as in the case of Illous, were accused of being in league with the Isaurians, a charge on which Bishop Euphemius <sup>182</sup> was two years afterwards deprived. Thus the war in Isauria dragged on for some years without any events being recorded; at last, probably in 497, Longinus of Kardama and Athenodoros were taken prisoners by John the Scythian <sup>183</sup> and their heads sent to Constantinople, where they were exposed on poles, ἡδὺ θέαμα τοῖς Βυζαντίοις, says Evagrius, who probably copies Eustace, ἀνθ' ὧν κακῶς πρὸς Ζήνωνος καὶ τῶν Ἰσαύρων ἐπεπόνθησαν. Marcellinus says that the head of Athenodoros was exposed at Tarsos; <sup>184</sup> if he is referring to the other Athenodoros, there is no certain date for the event related by Evagrius, and it will only be an inference from the strong expression of Marcellinus, *bellum Isauricum hoc sexto anno sedatum*,<sup>185</sup> that it took place at the same time; otherwise we must suppose that Evagrius has made a mistake as to the place where the head of Athenodoros was exposed; he may easily have thought that both heads were sent to Constantinople, when in fact only that

<sup>179</sup> Theoph. AM 5986. He places it in the year after Kotyaeion, i.e. between Sept. 498 and Sept. 494.

<sup>180</sup> Theoph. AM 5987.

<sup>181</sup> Marcell. ann. 498.

<sup>182</sup> Theod. Lect. 2, 9-12; Marcell. ann. 495; Theoph. AM 5987, 5988. I am not prepared to abandon the date of Marcellinus, though the account of Theodore would place it not earlier than 497. Victor of Tununa gives 496. Zachariah of Mytilene (7, 1) makes the episcopate of Macedonius last fifteen years, which is roughly consistent with any of these years, for Macedonius was deprived in Aug. 511 (Zach. Myt. 7, 8; cf. Marc. *sub ann.*).

<sup>183</sup> Evagr. 8, 35.

<sup>184</sup> Marcell. ann. 497.

<sup>185</sup> The consulship of John the Scythian in 498 is also in favour of this date (see below, p. 237).

of Longinus was sent thither. Longinus the Selinountian,<sup>185</sup> with a certain Indes and a brother of the latter, held out at the Isaurian Antioch for a year longer, after which they were taken prisoners by Count Priscus, an officer serving under John the Hunchback,<sup>187</sup> and sent to Constantinople, where they were exhibited to the mob in chains and then tortured to death at Nikaia.<sup>188</sup>

Rose here rejects the chronology of Marcellinus, placing the end of the war not in 498 but in 496. He also transposes the captures of the two Longini, putting that of the Selinountian in 495 and that of Longinus of Kardama in 496, thus crediting Marcellinus with an error of no less than three years in his dating of the former event. In both these theories he is followed by Mr. Bury. For the antedating of the end of the war Rose appeals to Theodore and Theophanes. Of these writers Theodore distinctly says that the war lasted at least five years (*τοῦ δὲ πολέμου ἐπὶ πέντε ἔτη κρατήσαντος Ἀναστάσιος, κ. τ. λ.*)<sup>189</sup> that is till 497, and says nothing as to how much longer it continued. Theophanes does certainly place the end of the war in 496, or rather perhaps we should say in 495, since he makes it last three years after the battle of Kotyaeion,<sup>190</sup> but why should Theophanes, who wrote in the ninth century, be preferred to Marcellinus, who wrote in the sixth? It is indeed most probable that the account of Theophanes is drawn indirectly from the contemporary Eustace, but, as there is no reason to think that Eustace was a chronographer, the dates are no doubt the invention of Theophanes himself, or of his intermediary, John Malala.<sup>191</sup> For the transposition of the captures of the Isaurian leaders Rose gives no reason, and I have not been able to find any; it is true that Evagrius does not say that he is relating the events in chronological order, but in default of any evidence to the contrary it is surely reasonable to assume that he gives them in the order which he found in Eustace, especially as

<sup>185</sup> Marcell. ann. 498; Evagr. 8, 85; Jo. Mal. ap. Mommsen, *Hermes*, vi. 878.

<sup>187</sup> This is the most obvious way of reconciling Marcellinus with Evagrius.

<sup>189</sup> Müller (*Fr. Hist. Gr.* v. 80) and Rose most strangely identify the Indes of Evagrius and John Malala with Linginines, and Rose says that the battle of Kotyaeion is referred to, although that battle was fought six years before the capture of Longinus (three according to Rose's chronology), and in it Linginines was not taken prisoner, but killed: besides Linginines is actually mentioned by John Malala, and his death at Kotyaeion related. We can hardly help asking whom these authors suppose the brother of Indes to be; as Indes was Linginines, and Linginines was Linges, and Linges was the brother of Illous, the answer seems naturally to follow that the brother of Indes was Illous himself. If this somewhat startling conclusion be rejected, we are confronted with an array of no less than five brothers, Illous, Trokoundes Aspalus, Linges, and the unnamed brother of Linges, surely an improbably large family for these times.

<sup>190</sup> Theod. Lect. 2, 9.

<sup>191</sup> Theoph. AM 5985, 5988.

<sup>191</sup> There can be little doubt that John's work was originally a chronography, as it is in fact called, though the dates are not given in the existing form of the work, which is merely a series of extracts.

the same order is found in John Malala and in Theophanes;<sup>192</sup> besides the transposition necessitates, as I have already noticed, an extra year's divergence from the chronology of the accurate Marcellinus, a divergence which is the more gratuitous because, if Theophanes was to be followed at all, the captures of the two chiefs might just as well have been placed in the same year, as is done by him. The chronology of Marcellinus on the other hand, besides being supported by Theodore, is corroborated by the dates of the consulships of the two Johns; for Theophanes says that they were rewarded with consulships, and it was a common practice to make a general consul in the year following a victory gained by him; accordingly we find that John the Scythian, who took Longinus of Kardama in 497, was consul in 498, and that John the Hunchback, who took Longinus the Selinountian in 498, was consul in 499. I have therefore no hesitation in accepting the date of Marcellinus, though, as he seems to reckon by the years of the indiction, an event referred by him to one consulship may have taken place during the last four months of the previous one.

The exhibition of Longinus and Indes is said by Evagrius to have done more than anything else to reconcile the people of Constantinople to their Monophysite emperor; for at the actual sight of the Isaurian leaders any temporary alliance which may have existed between the Kalchedonians and the Isaurians disappeared at once; in fact seventeen years later we find the Isaurian defending Constantinople for Anastasius against the Kalchedonian champion Vitalian.<sup>193</sup> All chance of a fresh revolt was avoided by the wholesale transportation of Isaurians to the wasted lands of Thrace, where they might be usefully employed against their natural enemies, the barbarians of the Danube. Thus the Isaurians, though their time of mastery was over, still remained useful servants of the Romans, and in this way the great scheme of Leo was of permanent benefit to the empire. But the cause of the mountaineers as a political power was overthrown at Kotyæion, and they do not again play a prominent part in politics till the accession of the Isaurian dynasty of emperors in the eighth century.<sup>194</sup> In fact their work was done, for the danger which Leo called them in to combat was already past. There were, indeed, many barbarian generals in the Roman service after this date, but these were all men of the stamp of John the Scythian, obedient servants of the emperor; with the partial exception of Vitalian<sup>195</sup>

<sup>192</sup> Jo. Mal. p. 394; *id.* ap. Mommsen, *Hermes*, vi. 373; Theoph. AM 5988.

<sup>193</sup> Jo. Ant. *Fr.* 214 e. 17.

<sup>194</sup> A serious Isaurian war in the time of Herakleios is mentioned by Soudas (s.v. Ἡράκλειος), but I cannot find any other notice of it.

<sup>195</sup> Whether Vitalian was himself a barbarian may be doubted, but at any rate he was a leader of barbarians. It is not quite certain that even John the Scythian was a barbarian, as *Σκύθη* might mean an inhabitant of the province of Scythia (cp Marcell. ann. 514 with Jord. *Rom.* 357).

none ever attained to the position of Aspar, or even of Theoderic. Leo had taught the Romans to look at home for defence from their enemies, and in this way, too, his Isaurian policy must be pronounced to have been a complete success; nor can seventeen years' subjection to the Isaurians be thought too high a price to pay for the deliverance thereby gained. But for Leo the barbarians would in all probability have reigned in Constantinople as they did in Rome, and the ultimate results of his policy cannot be better observed than in the contrast between the African expedition of Leo, undertaken while Aspar was still powerful, and that of Justinian; for there can be little doubt that the comparatively efficient state of the army in the time of the later emperor, when it was largely composed of, and officered by, Armenians and Isaurians, was in great measure due to the policy introduced by the earlier.

E. W. BROOKS.