

## THE TWO FIFTH-CENTURY WARS BETWEEN ROME AND PERSIA

Geoffrey Greatrex

The fifth century was in general a peaceful period for Rome's eastern frontier. On just two occasions was this peace disturbed, and only one of these involved significant campaigning. Perhaps because of this comparative lack of conflict between Rome and Persia, these two occasions have attracted considerable scholarly attention.<sup>1</sup> The account of the church historian Theodoret of Cyrrhus has been at the centre of this discussion, and will be dealt with in detail below. This article will look first at Theodoret's account, and the problems arising from it, and then at the treatment of the wars by ancient authorities generally. First, however, it would be worth considering briefly the background and course of the two wars.

At the time of the death of the eastern Emperor Arcadius in 408, relations between Rome and Persia were remarkably good: Arcadius even ventured to make the Persian king Yazdgerd I (399–420) the guardian for his young son, Theodosius II (408–450), if Procopius may be believed. Even if his account is doubted, the church historians Socrates and Sozomen both make mention of a treaty concluded between the two sides in 408/9. But it was not long before relations deteriorated, most probably through the influence of Theodosius's sister Pulcheria.<sup>2</sup>

The first war broke out in 420, as a result of the refusal of Theodosius II to return to the Persians the Christians who had sought refuge from persecution in his empire. In addition, the Persians had proved unwilling to return to the Romans gold-miners who had been working in Persian territory; they had also despoiled Roman merchants of their goods. Consequently the Emperor despatched Ardaburius, a *magister militum praesentalis*, to the East, where he conducted an invasion of Arzanene by way of Armenia. Having defeated the Persian commander Mihr-Narseh, he foiled his opponent's attempt to ravage Mesopotamia, and laid siege to the enemy at Nisibis.

The conflict then escalated as Theodosius transferred further troops to the East, while the new Persian king Bahram V (420–439) took the field himself, supported by a large contingent of Saracen allies. He drove the Romans from Nisibis, but the Saracens were less successful in their attempt to take Antioch: they suddenly took fright, we are told, and many were drowned in the Euphrates. Presumably they were defeated as they manoeuvred to the southwest of the main Roman army in their march against Antioch. Another battle ensued between the two main armies, in which Areobindus inflicted a heavy defeat on the Persians; it was almost certainly in this engagement that he distinguished himself by defeating the Persian Ardazanes in single combat. Peace negotiations then ensued, although terms were not settled until the Persian Immortals had suffered a crushing defeat through the timely arrival of the recently appointed *magister militum per Orientem* Procopius.<sup>3</sup>

The story of the 440 war can be told more swiftly, since there were no major engagements between the two sides, and the Romans hastened to come to terms: the empire was beset by numerous invasions at this time, not to mention the fall of Carthage in October 439, which must have shaken the Eastern Empire as much as the Western. The Persians invaded in 440, apparently causing some damage in Armenia, but withdrew after the *magister militum per Orientem* Anatolius had bought them off.<sup>4</sup>

\* \* \*

On the face of it these wars appear quite uncomplicated, yet when the sources are scrutinized more closely, problems emerge. While these problems cannot be solved with certainty, this paper aims to provide a possible solution that takes into account all the ancient evidence.

The prime source of controversy is the account of Theodoret (v.37.4–10): he describes a Persian invasion that took place while the Romans were

occupied with wars elsewhere. The Persian advance was thwarted, however, by inclement weather, and Roman forces were able to deploy in time (v.37.5–6). He then refers to an unsuccessful siege of a city called Theodosiopolis by a Persian king Gororanes (Bahram), which he places in the course of the previous war (πόλεμος) (v.37.7–10). Two important questions arise from his account: (1) is he referring to *both* wars or only to that of 421–422? and (2) which Theodosiopolis was besieged by the Persian king? Bound up with the second question is the construction of the Armenian Theodosiopolis, for which numerous dates have been proposed.

First, does Theodoret deal with the later war? Croke has argued that he does not, while conceding that Theodoret was writing after it. Lee has responded that the events described by the historian could equally fit either war, pointing out that if the later war took place in 440, rather than 441 where Marcellinus places it, then the simultaneous conflicts against the Saracens, Tzani, and Isaurians reported by the chronicler may also have taken place in 440. Hence the Romans may well have been hard pressed in 440.<sup>5</sup>

But it is possible to push the argument further. It is surely the most natural interpretation of Theodoret to take him as referring to the most recent war against the Persians, even though Croke considers that his readers would have thought of the previous, more large-scale war.<sup>6</sup> First, the context of the passages in Theodoret should be borne in mind. The incursion of the Hunnic king Rua, which precedes the passages, took place in the late 430s, and it should further be noted that at the end of v.37 Theodoret concludes with the words ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ὕστερον ἐγένετο, referring both to the transfer of John Chrysostom's relics (in 438) *and* the other incidents illustrating the Emperor's piety — the repulse of Rua, and the intervention of the weather against the Persians.<sup>7</sup>

Second, if 37.5–6 refers to the earlier war, it must be supposed that it concerns one of the later campaigns: Croke argues that πόλεμος can be used in a wider sense, such as to mean skirmish rather than just war.<sup>8</sup> But according to our sources there was a Roman force in the East operating against the Persians right from the start of the 421–422 war, so it is difficult to see how there could have been no troops available to assist in the defence against the invaders. In 440, on the other hand, it seems clear that there certainly was a shortage of troops. It might be countered that at the very outbreak of hostilities in 421 the Romans might indeed have had a shortage of available troops, in which case the passage might refer to the earlier war. But since the siege of Theodosiopolis is said to take place before the

events of this passage, however the term *πόλεμος* is interpreted, the episode of the bad weather cannot possibly be placed right at the start of the war; moreover, the siege most probably took place toward the end of the 421–422 war in any case, when Roman forces had been fully mobilized.

Third, *Codex Theodosianus* xvi.10.25 of 14 November 435 should be taken into account. This decree orders the destruction of all pagan temples, and Otto Maenchen-Helfen has plausibly suggested that it is to this piece of legislation that Theodoret is alluding at 37.3: he held that the Emperor had been rewarded for the decree by the various successes narrated immediately afterward.<sup>9</sup> Assuming Maenchen-Helfen is right, then God's reward must postdate the decree, and therefore Rua's death and the thwarting of the Persians must be placed after this date; the incident of the siege, however, may be placed in the 421–422 war, since Theodoret clearly specifies that it took place *ἐν τῷ προτέρῳ πολέμῳ*. Presumably he inserted it since it was relevant to his general theme concerning the piety of the Emperor, and because he was dealing with the Persians at this point.

Fourth, a source for the 440 war that has often gone unnoticed is Eustathius of Epiphaneia, whose account has in this case been preserved by Evagrius and the fourteenth-century ecclesiastical historian Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopulus.<sup>10</sup> It would seem, however, that Eustathius made an error over the dating of the war: he dates it to the time of Yazdgerd I, the father of Bahram, adding that Socrates recounts that it was Bahram who broke the peace, rather than his father. Evidently Eustathius had in mind Socrates VII.18, where it is stated that Yazdgerd I never persecuted the Christians, whereas his son Bahram did. This initial dating by Eustathius must be wrong, however, and the text can easily be emended to place the war in 440, reading *υἱοῦ* for *πατρός*, making Yazdgerd the son, and not the father, of Bahram. For it is clear from other details in this passage that it is with the later war that Eustathius was concerned: he states that peace terms were agreed, which lasted until the twelfth year of Anastasius's reign. Moreover, it is clear from the passage that Valentinian III was on the throne at the time, which implies that the events must postdate 425, and there is mention too of the Vandal capture of Carthage, which took place in October 439.<sup>11</sup>

An important point that emerges from both Evagrius and Nicephorus is the difficulties faced by the empire at the time of the Persian invasion in 440, which fits well with Marcellinus's entry and Theodoret's first passage; and with the exception of Marcellinus, all these sources assert that the issue was resolved successfully. It is noteworthy, however, that though Nicephorus

reports a Roman victory, he provides no details, and mistakenly inserts Areobindus's duel with Ardazanes into this war.<sup>12</sup>

Thus Theodoret's passage fits the 440 context admirably, and it must surely be concluded that he is referring to this war until strong evidence to the contrary is produced.

\* \* \*

The second point to be considered is the matter of the construction of Theodosiopolis, and which city by that name was besieged by Bahram during the earlier war. The two candidates are Theodosiopolis in Osroene, which will henceforth be called Resaina, and Theodosiopolis in Armenia, to be referred to as Erzerum from now. While Resaina was definitely founded by Theodosius I, he has sometimes been credited with the foundation of both cities.<sup>13</sup> Hence the question arises: at what point was Erzerum fortified? If it was not in existence by the 421–422 war, then it must have been Resaina that was besieged by Bahram.

The fortification of Erzerum is described by Moses Khorenats'i at III.59, carried out by the *magister militum per Orientem* Anatolius. Unfortunately this does not tie down the date of the construction, since Anatolius was in the East for much of the time from the 420s to the 440s, often as *magister militum per Orientem*. Although *PLRE* II does not credit him with the supreme command in the East at the time of the 421–422 war, Cyril of Scythopolis, writing in the sixth century, specifically refers to him as τῆς Ἀνατολῆς στρατηλάτης. It seems highly likely therefore that he succeeded Maximinus in the post, and his tenure at this time appears to be confirmed by the letter reported by Moses Khorenats'i.<sup>14</sup>

An early date is therefore possible for the construction of the fortress, and seems generally to be favoured by modern scholars.<sup>15</sup> If it is accepted, then work may have begun in 420, at the very moment when tensions were escalating between the two sides: a law of May 420 (*Codex Justinianus* VIII.10.10) permits land-owners along the eastern frontier to construct fortifications for their property; this applied in nearly all the provinces along the eastern border, though not Armenia.<sup>16</sup> It may be supposed that the imperial government was itself taking measures there, and was unwilling to allow the Armenian nobility to take matters into its own hands. Hence this context appears the most likely for the fortification of the city, and it is clear that Procopius considered it to have been fortified early in Theodosius's reign.<sup>17</sup> The various sources on the city's foundation are problematic.

and it would be worth while to examine them briefly before considering the matter of which city was besieged by Bahram.

Both Procopius and the *Narratio de rebus Armeniae* link the foundation of the city with the partition of Armenia (c. 387), which has led some scholars to regard Procopius's two mentions of the city in the *de Aedificiis* as inconsistent — the first passage referring to Theodosius II, the second to Theodosius I. But since he himself refers the reader back to the first passage in the second one, it is clear that the same Theodosius is meant in both cases — Theodosius II.<sup>18</sup> The connection made by Procopius and the *Narratio* between the partition of Armenia and the foundation of Erzerum is unconvincing, however. For although it has been argued that the establishment of a city could have been a necessary defensive measure for frontier defence once the boundary-lines were drawn,<sup>19</sup> it appears that the border did not instantly solidify following the partition. This is well shown by *C.J.* IV.63.4 (of 408/9), which makes Artaxata, well inside Persian Armenia, the only trading point permitted in the area. Had Theodosiopolis (Erzerum) existed then, or any sort of fixed boundary between Romans and Persians, such a choice would be difficult to explain.<sup>20</sup> Only gradually did the border become settled, reaching its conclusion in the events of the 420s, when not only did war break out between the two great powers, but the Persians also removed the last Arsacid king (Ardashir IV) of Persarmenia in 428.

Procopius's mistake, therefore, was not over the foundation of the city but in postdating the division of Armenia to the reign of Theodosius II. His account need not then be seen as a version different from the Armenian sources, necessitating the foundation of Erzerum in the 380s or 390s. It was doubtless taken from some Armenian source, possibly even one linked to the *Narratio*; his error in attributing the partition to Theodosius II may reflect a misreading of his source, since surviving Armenian writers are by no means unanimous in their dating of the partition in any case — Moses even puts it in the reign of Arcadius.<sup>21</sup>

\* \* \*

Modern opinion does not favour the view that it was Erzerum that was besieged by Bahram, even if it accepts that the fortress was in existence during the war; thus Holum claims that previous scholars have erred in assuming that Erzerum was invested, pointing out that according to Moses Armenia was in revolt at the time.<sup>22</sup> Yet in the translation of Thomson, we hear of a "peace in the whole (of our western [regions])" at the time, if in

any case a state of revolt would have deterred Bahram from making such an attack.<sup>23</sup>

Is there any positive evidence that Resaina was the victim of Bahram's onslaught? Since our only source for the siege is Theodoret, there is not: the fact that Michael Syrus specifies Resaina merely shows that this is how he interpreted Theodoret, for his account follows that of the ecclesiastical historian.<sup>24</sup> It is true that a siege of Resaina would fit in with what we hear of the 421 campaign, in which Bahram forced the Romans back from Nisibis: he could have proceeded into Roman territory at this point and laid siege to the city.<sup>25</sup> The difficulty with such a view is the non-appearance of the Roman army: in Theodoret none is mentioned either in the city or in the vicinity, while the other sources indicate that substantial numbers of troops were operating in the area at this time.

Is there on the other hand any positive evidence to favour the theory that it was Erzerum that came under siege in this war? It must be admitted at once that the evidence is not substantial, but a case can be made; it should not be assumed that Theodoret is referring to Resaina, and the likelihood is that it was Erzerum that was the target of a Persian attack in the 421-422 war.

First, Theodoret specifies that it was the Persian king, whom he calls Gororanes, who was in charge of operations. Yet in the account of Socrates it is Mihr-Narseh who commanded the Persian army, though the king later took matters into his own hands; it is quite possible, however, that the king campaigned in the north at some point during the war, either before coming to Mihr-Narseh's aid or afterward.<sup>26</sup> Second, and more important, Socrates speaks of Ardaburius invading Arzanene by way of Armenia (VII.18); yet Armenia stretches north of Arzanene and is not the most natural route by which to conduct such a raid. If Bahram were besieging a city that had only just been built, then this would provide a motive for Ardaburius to take this course; and Socrates refers to campaigning in Armenia again in the same chapter. Third, the gold mines referred to by Socrates at VII.18, which had helped to increase tensions before the war, almost certainly lay in Armenia: Malalas refers to king Kavadh (484-496; 498-531) refusing to pursue peace negotiations in 530 on account of the Romans having taken total possession of gold mines in Armenia and Persarmenia. Just as the Persians invaded Roman Armenia in 530, penetrating as far as Satala, so it is likely that they took measures in this war to take control of the riches in the borderlands of Armenia; hence Erzerum would present an obvious

target. It should be noted, moreover, that Kavadh opened his campaign in 502 with the capture of Armenian Theodosiopolis.<sup>27</sup>

The matter of which city was besieged by Bahram defies certain resolution. It remains possible that the king only took the field in 421 after Mihr-Narseh had suffered reverses at the hands of the Romans, rather than campaigning earlier on the northern front. It has been argued here, however, firstly that Armenian Theodosiopolis was in existence by this point, and secondly that it was this city that was besieged by the Persians in 421/422; in any case, even if it was not Erzerum which came under attack then, this need by no means imply that it was not being constructed around this time.

Moreover, if Anatolius, as *magister militum per Orientem*, was at Erzerum seeing to its construction at the time of the outset of war, this would explain why a *magister militum praesentalis* had to be sent to take charge of the war further south. The work of fortification was clearly a priority for the Romans, and hence it is unsurprising that Anatolius appears to play little role in the campaigning; he was replaced in 422 by Procopius, perhaps when the fortification had been completed and when the threat of the Persians had diminished. Whether or not he took part in the embassy to the Persians with Helio is questionable, for it may well be an interpolation by Theophanes, based on Procopius's story of the encounter of Bahram and Anatolius.<sup>28</sup>

\* \* \*

This brings us on to the last problem concerning the two wars: when did the meeting between Anatolius and the Persian king, described by Procopius (*Wars* I.ii.11–15), take place? Procopius states that at the encounter it was agreed that no more fortifications were to be built along the border, and this detail surely refers to the fortification of Erzerum. If, therefore, the fortress were constructed around 420, then the meeting must be assigned to the former war if this additional clause is to make sense; but, on the other hand, it is clear (from Elishē) that Anatolius also met Yazgerd II in 440, whatever we make of Procopius's account.<sup>29</sup>

The suspicion in fact arises that Anatolius may have met both kings on separate occasions, which Procopius has combined into one meeting. The detail on the retreat of the king accords with the 440 encounter, yet the agreement on forts fits better with the earlier war. Significantly, only Nicephorus among later historians refers to two wars in the fifth century;

and even he appears to have confused the events of the two. For while in general he follows Socrates regarding the earlier war, he attributes the single combat between Areobindus and Ardazanes to the second war: this episode is found in Malalas, where it is unclear to which war it refers, but since he claims that Areobindus received the consulship as a reward for his victory (and it is known that Areobindus was consul in 434), it may be inferred that the single combat took place in the first war. This is confirmed by Socrates, who refers to an episode in which a general defeated a brave Persian in single combat, though he forbears from providing any details.<sup>30</sup>

Thus from an early stage, perhaps even from the time of Eustathius at the start of the sixth century, confusion arose over the two wars, from which no later source completely escaped. Most resorted to reducing the two wars into one (such as Procopius and Theophanes), while the much later Nicephorus is an honorable exception, though he wrongly attributes the single combat to the second war.<sup>31</sup>

The Open University  
Milton Keynes, England

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> E.g., Croke, "Dating Theodoret's Church History and Commentary on the Psalms"; Lee, "Dating a fifth century war in Theodoret"; and now Schrier, "Syriac Evidence for the Romano-Persian War of 421-422." On Romano-Persian relations in the fifth century, cf. Whitby, *The Emperor Maurice and His Historian*, pp. 204-06, and Synelli, *Hoi diplomatikes skheseis Byzantiou kai Persias heos ton st' aiona*, p. 47.

<sup>2</sup> Socrates, *Church History*, vol. 2, VII.8; Sozomen, *Kirchengeschichte*, IX.4 for the treaty; Procopius, *Wars* I.ii.1-10 for the adoption, discussed in detail by Cameron, "Agathias on the Sassanians," p. 149; and Greatrex, "Procopius and the Persian Wars", ch. 2 (b). On Pulcheria's role in the rising tension between the two sides, cf. Holum, *Theodosian Empresses*, pp. 97-102, and Blockley, *East Roman Foreign Policy*, pp. 54-55.

<sup>3</sup> Socrates (at n. 2), VII.18 and 20 provides the fullest account of this war; his account in no way suggests that it was the Romans who broke the peace, as Holum asserts in "Pulcheria's Crusade 421-2," p. 162, cf. Schrier (at n. 1), p. 78. On Areobindus's combat, see Malalas, *Chronographia*, p. 364 for the greatest detail; it is alluded to by Socrates VII.18.*fin.*, also *Chronicon Paschale*, p. 594 (a.464). For modern accounts of this war, cf. Rawlinson, *The Seven Great Monarchies of the Eastern World*, pp. 394-99; Blockley (at n. 2), p. 57; Synelli (at n. 1), pp. 52-56; and Shahīd, *Byzantium and the Arabs in the Fifth Century*, pp. 26-38.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Elishē, *History of Vardan and the Armenian War*, I [p. 6]; Moses Khorenats'i (*The Armenian History of Moses Khorenats'i*), III.67, p. 347; Marcellinus comes (in *MGH Auctores Antiquissimi* XI), a.441.1; Procopius's account at *Wars* I.ii.11-15

probably refers to this incident, although he believes that Anatolius met Bahram, rather than Yadzgerd II (the ruler in 440). Isaac of Antioch may also refer to an episode during this war — the sacking of the town Beth Hur, near Nisibis — cf. Nöldeke, *Geschichte der Araber zur Zeit der Sasaniden*, p. 116 n. 2, and Shahīd (at n. 3), p. 38.

That the war took place in 440 rather than 441 is demonstrated by Croke (at n. 1), p. 65; on the war cf. also Blockley (at n. 2), p. 61 and p. 204 n. 19; Synelli (at n. 1), pp. 66–69; Rawlinson (at n. 3), pp. 403–04; and Lee, *Information and Frontiers*, p. 122.

<sup>5</sup> See n. 1 for the articles of Croke and Lee; Lee's paper successfully demonstrates that Theodoret 37.5–6 *could* fit the war of 440, and hence his arguments will not be repeated here.

<sup>6</sup> Croke (at n. 1), p. 67; yet if one refers to the World War, then one would assume that World War II was being referred to rather than World War I, although the former was the bloodier. Croke's other argument there, that it would be odd for Theodoret to say that the removal of Roman forces led to the 440 war when by then the peace and the return of the Roman troops had happened twenty years previously, is also rightly rejected by Lee, since the troops could have been dispatched at any stage over the twenty years; Croke's argument is in any case somewhat unclear, as Lee recognizes.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Martindale, ed., *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, vol. 2, s.v. Rua, on his incursion between 435 and 440; see also below on this invasion.

<sup>8</sup> Croke (at n. 1), p. 68; Lee accepts this argument.

<sup>9</sup> Maenchen-Helfen, *The World of the Huns*, pp. 92–94; his interpretation of Theodoret is rejected by Croke in "Evidence for the Hun invasion of Thrace in A.D. 422," pp. 354–57, where he argues that Theodoret is merely alluding generally to the piety of Theodosius.

<sup>10</sup> Evagrius, *Ecclesiastical History*, I.19; Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulos, *Ecclesiasticae Historiae*, XIV.57 (col. 1272) in PG 146/2; Eustathius of Epiphaneia, frg. 1 *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, vol. 4, p. 138 (and cf. also PLRE II, s.v. Eustathius 10).

<sup>11</sup> Müller (in *FHG* IV, p. 139) fails to notice that this emendation does not solve the problem of Eustathius's mention of Socrates. But if the error goes back to Eustathius, then he may have been led astray by the name Yadzgerd, leading him to bring in Socrates although his History was irrelevant in this case. An alternative possibility is that Evagrius has inserted the reference to Socrates, whom he undoubtedly used, which has led to his garbling of Eustathius's account. Nicephorus was probably following Evagrius, rather than using Eustathius directly, considering that he praises Eustathius in exactly the same terms as Evagrius.

<sup>12</sup> See n. 3 on this duel, which took place during the first war (cf. Malalas, p. 364).

<sup>13</sup> See Chapot, *La frontière de l'Euphrate*, p. 361 for Theodosius I founding Erzerum; cf. also Weissbach, s.v. "Theodosiopolis" cols. 1922–23 on Resaina, col. 1924, for the discussion of the date of the foundation of Erzerum.

<sup>14</sup> Moses III.57, tr. Thomson, p. 328; on Anatolius cf. Croke (at n. 1), p. 70, where he criticizes the PLRE for being "irresponsibly sceptical" in doubting Anatolius's position, and Blockley (at n. 2), p. 200 n. 31. Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita S. Euthymii* 10 (in *Kyryllos von Skythopolis*, ed. Schwartz, p. 19) on Anatolius, clearly referring to the 421–422 war. The position of the episode in Moses, immediately after the death of Yadzgerd I, also points to a date around 420 for Anatolius's tenure of the office. Synelli (at n. 1), pp. 60–61, however, does not accept the presence of Anatolius in the war of 421–422.

<sup>15</sup> So Holum (at n. 3), p. 167 and n. 61; Croke (at n. 1), p. 69; also Weissbach (at n. 13), col. 1926, Grousset, *Histoire de l'Arménie*, p. 181, and Holum (at n. 3), p. 167 n. 61; Blockley, "The division of Armenia between the Romans and the Persians," p. 233, is willing to countenance a date in the early 420s, and argues that it must have been built by the 430s. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire*, p. 6 n. 2, regards 433 as the terminus for its construction.

<sup>16</sup> *Codex Justinianus* in *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, vol. 2. For a detailed consideration of the order of events in 419–421, cf. now Schrier (at n. 1), pp. 77–78.

<sup>17</sup> Procopius, *de Aedificiis* III.i.10; it is unclear to which war *Wars* I.ii.11–15 refers. The agreement on fortifications may well refer to the first war, even if the narrative concerns the second; the terms which ended the first war are reconstructed by Holum (at n. 3), p. 170; cf. Schrier (at n. 1), pp. 82–83. See also n. 4 above on this passage of Procopius, and below on the confusion among ancient historians surrounding these two wars.

<sup>18</sup> The two passages are III.i.8–13 and III.v.1–2. Weissbach (at n. 13), col. 1924, considers Procopius to be putting forward two alternatives, while Thomson (at n. 4, p. 331 n. 1 on Moses III.59) sees Procopius as asserting that Theodosius I founded Erzerum, citing Procopius's second passage on the city; cf. also Blockley (at n. 2), p. 200 n. 31, and *Narratio de rebus Armeniae*, ed. and tr. Garitte, pp. 4–9, on the partition of Armenia and the founding of the city, pp. 65–70 for his commentary.

<sup>19</sup> So Toumanoff, "Christian Caucasia between Byzantium and Iran: new light from old sources," pp. 130–31.

<sup>20</sup> So Blockley (at n. 15), p. 232.

<sup>21</sup> On Procopius using an Armenian source, see Blockley (at n. 15), p. 222 n. 3, who views him as "quite unreliable." Garitte (at n. 18), p. 69, on the possibility of a common source for the *Narratio* and Procopius; Moses (at n. 4), III.92, p. 304, for the partition under Arcadius. Procopius's account of the flight of Arsaces to the Romans and Tigranes's support for the Persians is difficult to reconcile with Armenian writers, especially the mention of Tigranes. No one by that name, let alone an Arsacid prince, is found in any Armenian source, but it is quite possible that Procopius has made an error with the name, just as in *Wars* I.v.10 he refers to Pacurius as king of Persia when Shapur is clearly meant (this episode is also taken from an Armenian source). The division of the kingdom between the two sons of Arsaces is also somewhat wide of the mark, but may reflect the division between the sons of Khusro III, who reigned briefly before Yazdgerd's son Shapur, and who succeeded around 415; cf. Justi, *Iranisches Namenbuch*, p. 325, s.v. 'Tigranes 15'.

<sup>22</sup> Holum (at n. 3), p. 168 and n. 62. Schrier (at n. 1), p. 80, reviews the most recent views on the debate.

<sup>23</sup> Moses III.58, tr. Thomson (at n. 4), p. 330.

<sup>24</sup> Michael Syrus, *Chronique de Michel le Syrien, Patriarche Jacobite d'Antioche, 1166–1199*, VIII.3, p. 14. Fedalto, *Hierarchia Ecclesiastica Orientalis*, vol. 2, p. 819, places the bishop Eunomius of Theodoret in Resaina in the fourth century, though he provides no evidence for such an astonishing claim. Schrier (at n. 1), pp. 79–81, notes the existence of a palace of Eunomius in Resaina, referred to in a much later Syriac account; but this is hardly sufficient to prove that it is Theodoret's Eunomius after whom the building was named.

<sup>25</sup> Holum (at n. 3), p. 168; Croke (at n. 1), p. 69.

<sup>26</sup> Rawlinson (at n. 3), pp. 395–96, prefers to place Bahram's attack on Erzerum after the events in Mesopotamia; it seems more likely, however, that it was the events in Mesopotamia (q.v. n. 3) that brought the war to a conclusion, and therefore that the siege preceded them.

<sup>27</sup> See Malalas (at n. 3), pp. 455–56, on the gold mines in Armenia, cf. Procopius, *Wars* I.xv.18, 26–30. At one point Malalas states that the mines had only been discovered under Anastasius, but elsewhere asserts that during his reign the Romans took over sole possession of the mines, implying that they had been known of previously; cf. Strabo on Syspirtis (XI.xiv.9), usually identified with Procopius's Pharangium; Adontz, *Armenia in the Reign of Justinian*, pp. 22–24; Bryer and Winfield, *The Byzantine Monuments and Topography of the Pontos*, p. 56 and n. 393.

<sup>28</sup> Theophanes, *Chronographia*, p. 87; Nöldeke (at n. 4), p. 116 n. 2 for the suggestion that Theophanes has inserted Anatolius's name into Socrates's account (VII.20 on Helio), cf. Synelli (at n. 1), pp. 60–61. Holum (at n. 3), p. 169 n. 66, accepts Anatolius's presence in the 422 negotiations, but therefore wants to rule him out from those in 441; yet there is no reason why the one should rule out the other, and there is clear evidence of his involvement in negotiations around 441 from both Marcellinus (at n. 4) (a.441.1) and Elishē (at n. 4), n. 3.

<sup>29</sup> See n. 4 above on the encounter of Anatolius and Yadzgerd in 440. Synelli (at n. 1), pp. 66–69, discusses this passage of Procopius at length and argues that it must refer to the 440 war only, although she is prepared to accept that Erzerum may have been fortified rather earlier.

<sup>30</sup> See notes 3 and 4 above on these events.

<sup>31</sup> Eutychius (PG 111, tr. Pococke) may also record two conflicts, but he too appears confused, since cols. 1050/1 essentially repeat what was said at 1030/1; he also refers to an agent of Theodosius sent to Bahram, a certain Estratius—presumably a garbled reference of some sort to Anatolius. Procopius I.ii.11–15 for his one war (followed by Agathias, IV.27.1), Theophanes, pp. 85–86. The sequence of Persian kings over the fifth century (Bahram [IV]–Yadzgerd [I]–Bahram [V]–Yadzgerd [II]) must have contributed considerably to the confusion, cf. n. 7 above on Eustathius and the emendation suggested there. No Greek or Latin source mentions Yadzgerd II, unless Eustathius/Evagrius's text is emended as suggested.

#### WORKS CITED

- Adontz, N. *Armenia in the reign of Justinian*. Tr. N.G. Garsoian. Lisbon: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, 1970.
- Agathias. *Historiae*. Ed. R. Keydell. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1967.
- Blockley, R.C. "The division of Armenia between the Romans and the Persians." *Historia* 36 (1987): 222–34.
- . *East Roman Foreign Policy: Formation and Conduct from Diocletian to Anastasius*. Leeds: Francis Cairns, 1992.
- Bryer, A. and D. Winfield. *The Byzantine Monuments and Topography of the Pontos*. Vol. 1. Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1985.
- Bury, J.B. *History of the Later Roman Empire*. Vol. 2. London: Macmillan, 1923.
- Cameron, A. "Agathias on the Sassanians." *DOP* 23–24 (1969–70): 69–183.
- Chapot, V. *La frontière de l'Euphrate*. Paris: Ancienne librairie Thorin et fils, 1907.
- Chronicon Paschale*. Ed. L. Dindorf. Bonn: E. Weber, 1832.

- Codex Justinianus*. Ed. P. Krueger. 15th edn. Dublin and Zurich, 1970.
- Croke, B. "Dating Theodoret's Church History and Commentary on the Psalms." *Byzantion* 54 (1984): 59–74.
- . "Evidence for the Hun invasion of Thrace in A.D. 422." *GRBS* 18 (1977): 347–67.
- Cyril of Scythopolis. *Vita Euthymii*. Ed. E. Schwartz. *Texte und Untersuchungen* 49.2. Leipzig: J. Hinnichs Verlag, 1939.
- Elishē. *History of Vardan and the Armenian War*. Tr. R.W. Thomson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1982.
- Eustathius of Epiphania in *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*. Ed. C. Müller. Vol. 4, pp. 138–42. Paris: Ambrosius Firmin Didot, 1851.
- Eutychius. *Annales*, in PG 111. Ed. J.P. Migne. Tr. E. Poccocke. Paris: J.P. Migne, 1863.
- Evagrius. *Ecclesiastical History*. Ed. J. Bidez and L. Parmentier. London: Methuen, 1898.
- Fedalto, G. *Hierarchia Ecclesiastica Orientalis*. Vol. 2. Padova: Edizioni Messaggero Padova, 1988.
- Garitte, G. *Narratio de rebus Armeniae*. Ed. and comm. G. Garitte. *CSCO subsidia* vol. 132, tom. 4. Louvain: Imprimerie Orientaliste, 1952.
- Greatrex, G. "Procopius and the Persian Wars". Unpublished D. Phil. thesis, Oxford 1994.
- Grousset, R. *Histoire de l'Arménie*. Paris: Payot, 1947.
- Holum, K.G. "Pulcheria's Crusade, 421–2." *GRBS* 18 (1977): 153–72.
- . *Theodosian Empresses*. Berkeley-London: U of California P, 1982.
- Justi, F. *Iranisches Namenbuch*. Marburg: N.G. Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1895.
- Lee, A.D. "Dating a Fifth Century War in Theodoret." *Byzantion* 57 (1987): 188–91.
- . *Information and Frontiers*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993.
- Maenchen-Helfen, Otto. *The World of the Huns*. Berkeley/London: U of California P, 1978.
- Malalas. *Chronographia*. Ed. B. Niebuhr. Bonn: E. Weber, 1831.
- Marcellinus comes in *MGH Auctores Antiquissimi*. Vol. XI. Ed. Th. Mommsen. Berlin, 1894.
- Michael Syrus. *Chronique de Michel le Syrien, Patriarche Jacobite d'Antioche, 1166–1199*. Vol. 2. Ed. and tr. J.B. Chabot. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1901.
- Martindale, J., ed. *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1980.
- Moses Khorenats'i (*The Armenian History*). Tr. R.W. Thomson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1978.
- Müller, C., ed. *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*. Vol. 4. Paris: Ambrosius Firmin Didot, 1851.
- Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopulus. *Historia Ecclesiastica* in PG 146. Ed. J.P. Migne. Paris: J.P. Migne, 1865.
- Nöldeke, T. *Geschichte der Araber zur Zeit der Sasaniden*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1879.
- Procopius. *Bella*. Ed. J. Haury, rev. G. Wirth. Leipzig: Teubner, 1962–64.
- . *De Aedificiis*. Ed. J. Haury, rev. G. Wirth. Leipzig: Teubner, 1964.

- Rawlinson, G. *The Seven Great Monarchies of the Eastern World*. Vol. 3. Chicago, 1875.
- Schrier, O.J. "Syriac Evidence for the Romano-Persian War of 421-422." *GRBS* 33 (1992): 75-86.
- Shahîd, I. *Byzantium and the Arabs in the Fifth Century*. Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1989.
- Socrates. *Historia Ecclesiastica*. Ed. R. Hussey. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1883.
- Sozomen. *Kirchengeschichte*. Ed. J. Bidez and G. Hansen. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1960.
- Strabo. *Geography*. Vol. 5. Tr. H.L. Jones. London/New York: Heinemann, 1928.
- Synelli, K. *Hoi diplomatikes skheseis Byzantiou kai Persias heos ton st' aiona*. Athens: D. Basilopoulos, 1986.
- Theodoret. *Kirchengeschichte*. Ed. L. Parmentier. Rev. F. Scheidweiler. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1954.
- Theophanes. *Chronographia*. Vol. 1. Ed. C. de Boor. Leipzig, 1883.
- Toumanoff, C. "Christian Caucasia between Byzantium and Iran: new light from old sources." *Traditio* (1954): 109-89.
- Weissbach, F.H. *RE* entry on "Theodosiopolis." Vol. II.5, cols. 1923-1928. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1934.
- Whitby, M. *The Emperor Maurice and His Historian*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1988.