



Bestell-Nr: A120359944 PPN: 34888465  
Iok.Nr: ILL:GXI6B2PO  
Bestelldatum 31-01-2013:14:49

# ONLINE-BESTELLUNG GBV

Dieser Beleg muss bis zur  
Rücksendung im Buch bleiben

<38> Universitaets- und Stadtbibliothek Koeln

Bestellende Bibliothek<38>

Universitaetsstr. 33  
50931 Koeln

Universitaetsstr. 33  
50931 Koeln

Herr/Frau

B00449891#F/Ludwig Vones

Benutzer-Ausweisnummer



Lieferbibliothek: 700  
<700> Univ.-Bibliothek Osnabrück

Alte Münze 16

49074 Osnabrück

(0541) 9 69-4323 fernleihe@ub.uni-osnabrueck.de

- ☐ 14 Tage Leihfrist
- ☐ Keine Verlängerung möglich
- ☐ Nur für den Lesesaal
- ☐ Kopierverbot



## Unter Anerkennung der Benutzungsbedingungen wird bestellt:

**Verfasser:** Heinzelmann, Martin  
(Aufsatz)

**Standort:**

! B-Magazin ! 4757-494 2

**Titel:** The affair of Hilary of Arles (445) and Gallo-  
(Aufsatz) Roman identity in the fifth

**Seiten:** 239-251

**Band Heft** **Jahr**  
2002 00 00

**Titel** (Monographie/ Zeitschrift)

Fifth-century Gaul / a crisis of identity ; [ ... main contents  
derive from

**Lieferform:** Lieferart:

Cambridge [u.a.]

**Kopie** POST

Cambridge University Press

0-521-52933-6 ; 978-0-521-52933-

0-521-52933-6 ; 978-0-521-52933-

Lieferung erwünscht bis:  
31-03-2013

Bemerkungen: 8 EUR max-cost/Kosteninformation: max. 8 EUR

A120359944

1973). Nor, finally, does it seem likely that the southern part of Gaul should be considered just as an appendage of Italy in the fifth century (Van Dam, 1985: 2).

No, it would appear that after the revolts and barbarian invasions of the beginning of the fifth century, Gaul entered a period of transition. Gauls and the Gallic aristocracy now began to keep pretty much to themselves. Did they consider themselves part of the Roman empire? Administratively, as long as it was possible, they showed by their actions that, when it suited them, they did. But socially, their ties and activities became limited almost exclusively to Gaul. Even if they considered themselves to be 'Roman' in a cultural sense, as they certainly did (Mathisen, 1988), they did not cultivate this *Romanitas* outside of Gaul.

## CHAPTER 21

### *The 'affair' of Hilary of Arles (445) and Gallo-Roman identity in the fifth century<sup>1</sup>*

M. Heinzelmann

#### THE AFFAIR

The main sources for the 'affair' consist of the two legal instruments that brought it to its climax, and its conclusion. These, to be sure, and with great partiality, reproduce the point of view of Hilary's opponents. They comprise: (i) a letter written by Leo I, setting out his papal *sententia* in the matter of the bishop of Arles; and (ii) an imperial edict of 8 July 445, dealing with the same case (*PL* 54: 628–36; *Nov. Val.* 17.101–3). To judge from their contents, both documents appear to have been drafted in response to the overreaching activity of an ambitious metropolitan. Their particular stimulus was Hilary's acting outside the borders of his ecclesiastical province, Viennensis, against Chelidonius of Besançon, metropolitan of Sequanensis. Chelidonius, for his part, had journeyed to Rome to obtain from Leo (pope since 440) the lifting of the sentence (probably deposition) that Hilary, or a church council under his presidency, had passed on him. As soon as Hilary learned what was happening, he himself hastened to the Holy City. He participated in at least part of Chelidonius' retrial, but left Rome as quickly as he had come before the process was complete.

The content and place of issue (Rome) of the imperial edict, which was addressed to the 'episcopi Gallicani et aliarum provinciarum',

<sup>1</sup> The author regrets that Mathisen, 1989 (see 1979d) was unavailable to him at the time of writing this chapter.

suggest that both this document and the undated papal letter were virtually contemporary: Leo might even have despatched the two texts together to Gaul (Langgärtner, 1964: 75). Leo justifies his intervention in terms of the *principatus* – the edict has *primatus* – of the Apostolic Prince, and hence of the see of Rome, over the whole Church. On this basis, he declares his desire to follow precedent and collaborate with the Gallic bishops in 'restoring the condition of the Gallic Church' ('statum vestrarum ecclesiarum componere', *PL* 54: 629). He will eschew all novelty; for it is novelty – 'nova usurpatio, nova instituentes, novis praesumptionibus, novitas' (*ibid.* 629, 630, 636) – that Hilary intends and, in doing so, jeopardizes the *status ecclesiarum*. According to Leo, Hilary's disobedience to papal authority was a means whereby he would subject all the Gallic bishops, in whose ordination he was falsely claiming rights of interference, to his power ('suae potestati'); and in aiming for such subjection he was grossly infringing upon the rights of his fellow metropolitans (*ibid.* 630). Contrary to 'Hilary's habitual lies' ('quod potest ... Hilarius pro suo more mentiri', *ibid.* 636), the Holy See desires the control of ordinations in Gaul not for itself, but for the Gallic bishops. To this end, Leo's letter strictly forbids bishops voluntarily to cede their prerogatives 'to others' (understand: 'to Hilary'): if a bishop wishes, as 'desertor honoris', to assign his prerogatives to some other person, to whom he is tied by personal obligation ('gratia personalis'), these should not pass to this person, but rather to the 'longest serving' bishop within his province (*ibid.* 634). Leo's letter also mentions that Hilary came to Rome uninvited, and that in the course of Chelidonius' appeal (*causa*) he was given the opportunity to speak on this matter. On this occasion, Leo says, he disputed the authority of the Holy See 'verbis arrogantioribus', declaring that the whole affair was the concern of none but himself and the bishops of Gaul. Subsequently, the letter relates, the earlier judgement against Chelidonius was reversed, and his office and rank were fully restored to him.

Once this first proceeding was over, Leo's letter continues, there followed the hearing of a complaint by bishop Projectus, according to whom Hilary, exploiting the former's illness, had 'invaded' his see (the identity of which is unknown) and transferred his episcopate to a successor without his approval. In this context, Leo's letter mentions the privileges earlier won by Patroclus, one of Hilary's predecessors, declaring that the prerogative in question, by which the bishop of

Arles was permitted to ordain bishops even beyond the borders of Viennensis, had in the meantime been withdrawn, 'melior sententia' (*ibid.* 632). When Hilary was finally summoned to speak on this matter ('quaereretur ad causam'), he seems to have fled. His biographer, a former pupil, explains this retreat by saying that Hilary had realized that he was now well on the way to being transformed from witness to accused (*Vitae Sanctorum*, ed. Cavallin, 1952: 99); and that this transformation was being hastened by the enmity of a group of *potentes*. (The attendance of Roman senators at Leo's episcopal court is, it may be noted, attested on other occasions: Ensslin, 1937: 370f.)

Obviously, however, Hilary's flight permitted his enemies to saddle him with still more charges, concerning which, in a manner quite different from the two preceding cases, no specific complaints had been laid. So, the papal letter complains, the bishop of Arles, while celebrating ordinations in the outlying provinces, was accompanied by an armed escort ('militaris manus'); and it was with the help of these troops that he perpetrated the over-hasty ordination of outsiders, while the communities concerned were still in mourning for the death of their former bishop (*PL* 54: 633). Leo reminds the recipients of his letter of the customary procedure for the election of a bishop, which required the endorsement of the clergy, the attestation of the *honorati* and the agreement (*consensus*) of the city council and population (*ibid.* 634). Besides contravening these regulations, Hilary was also accused of having too frequently excommunicated laymen (*ibid.* 635).

Given the accumulation of charges, Leo's judgement appeared entirely fitting: Hilary forfeited his rank as metropolitan, was forbidden to call any more councils, and lost his rights of participation in episcopal courts. He was also barred from attendance at ordinations (*ibid.* 634).

Valentian III's *lex edictalis* generally confirms Leo's decision, while pointing up certain aspects of the charge. It specifies that Leo's sentence *per Gallias* would have been valid, even in the absence of the *sanctio imperialis*; and it gives particular prominence to three points: (i) the confirmation of papal *auctoritas in ecclesias*; (ii) the general outlawing of the use of armed forces in church affairs; and (iii) the instructions to provincial governors to bring recalcitrant bishops before the Holy See. For failure to comply with these ordinances, the officials responsible were threatened with a heavy fine. The ostensible aim of the imperial edict was to bring to an end

the disturbances ('abominabilis tumultus') that had resulted in the Gallic provinces from the military occupation of cities. It is clear, however, that rather more was at issue: the author of the novella reckons with an important group of bishops likely to react to the content of his directives with something more than reluctance. One may identify these prelates with those reproached in Leo's letter for having allowed their personal links with Hilary to cause them to give up their prerogatives. In addition, and in similar vein, the edict anticipates the existence of imperial administrators disinclined to support combined papal and imperial intervention in Gallic affairs.

Though the novella lays great stress on the military element in Hilary's activities, further details in respect of the origin, quality and leadership of these troops ('*manus armata*') are missing. Since it is hardly likely that the bishop of Arles had a body of soldiers permanently at his disposal (Heinzelmann, 1976: 82, with n128), we should identify these men as a detachment from the regular army, under the command of either the *magister militum* of Gaul or the *magister militum* of the western imperial army, both of whom had their headquarters in Arles. In fact it was to the latter, the *patricius* Aëtius, that the imperial edict was addressed; that this involved the bypassing of the praetorian prefect of Gaul (with some probability, Auxiliarius, a friend of Hilary: Heinzelmann, 1982: 566) is perfectly understandable, given the patrician's superior rank and the application of the edict, which extended beyond the sphere of Gaul. Now, the early sixth-century Life of St Romanus of Condate reports that, at the time of his deposition of Chelidonius, Hilary enjoyed the favour of both 'the patrician' and 'the prefect' (Martine, 1968: 260; see 57 for the composition of the *Vita*); and, as far as the former is concerned, the only possible identification is with Aëtius (Heinzelmann, 1982: 546). It is consequently highly likely that the recipient of Valentinian's novella of 445 had afforded military backing to the policies of the bishop of Arles. In these circumstances, Aëtius' consulship of 446 may be regarded as an imperial reward for his acquiescence in the developments of the preceding year (Demougeot, 1983: 16).

THE BACKGROUND TO THE AFFAIR

Let us now turn to the events which led up to the arraignment of Hilary, as described in the papal letter and the edict, in order to reach an understanding of, on the one hand, such combined intervention by the western patriarch and the central Roman government and, on the other hand, Hilary's motives. I have first to set out those points that bear the main weight of my argument in this chapter, beginning with my main thesis. I would argue that after the bloody ruin of the usurpations of 411 and 413, both of which had been supported by the Gallic aristocracy, significant elements of this aristocracy sought, within the Roman imperial framework, to re-establish their own strong Gallic power-base, with which they might successfully counter-balance the particular interests of Italy and the centre (cf. Mathisen, above p. 237; Harries, below pp. 303f.). A main instrument of this 're-armament', which in character was both political and moral, was the significant development of the structures of the Gallic church. Particular stress was laid on the episcopal office which in Gaul, far more than in the other provinces of the Roman empire, came to be almost exclusively the preserve of the aristocracy, and which in the course of the fifth century had consistently gained in importance in the political and economic affairs of the Gallic *civitates* (Heinzelmann, 1988). It was in the context of this church-based enhancement of the Gallic position that Hilary was, with the support of a large section of the Gallo-Roman aristocracy, accorded a leading role. The most important weapons at his disposal were: the systematic placing of his 'own' people in vacant sees; an intensification of episcopal influence through the founding of new sees; and the regular holding of synods, with the aim of creating a more effective co-ordination of bishops' activities, especially with regard to their exercising political and social control over the *civitates* (cf. Loseby, above p. 147). This is to say that, contrary to Leo's polemic, Hilary was certainly no enemy of the established authority of metropolitan bishops in Gaul even though, in imitation of the secular civil administrative structure of the country, he sought to establish a primacy of the see of Arles.

To appreciate the motives of the Gallic aristocracy we must go back still further in time, to the end of the fourth century when, even before the invasions of 406–7 and the usurpations of 411 and 413, the transfer of the imperial residence out of Gaul severely restricted the

opportunities of the great Gallic families for social advancement and self-enrichment (cf. Mathisen, above pp. 228f.). In the same period, in the distribution of high imperial posts, increasing consideration was given to the local interests of the aristocracy of each province, with the result that it was only occasionally that Gauls stood a chance of appointment to office outside their own country (Stroheker, 1948: 48f.). One direct consequence of this change of policy may well have been the diversion of many Gallic aristocrats into high office within the Church, not to mention the numerous monastic foundations of the early fifth century (Prinz, 1965: 62ff.). These monasteries served both as nurseries for the new aristocratic-ascetic spirituality (Heinzelmann, 1976: 49ff., 185ff.) and as recruiting agencies for appointments to the higher clergy. This was already the case in respect of Martin of Tours' monastery at Marmoutier, founded towards the end of the fourth century; according to Sulpicius Severus, 'multi nobiles' were to be found among those who dwelt there, 'pluresque ex eis postea episcopus uidimus' (V. *Martini* 10, 8). One of these future bishops was Heros, who, in 407/8, was installed by Constantine III as bishop of Arles, the usurper's new seat of residence, in the teeth of opposition from the clergy and people of the city (Griffe, 1964-6: II, 237). In the same period, Honoratus founded Lérins. Honoratus came of a family ennobled by its gaining of the consulship; other *patres* founded further monasteries in Marseille and its environs – a fact that even finds mention in the *Chronicle of 452* (86). That an increasing number of such people came from central and northern Gaul has led to the characterization of the Lérins monastery as the 'refugee-camp' of the north Gallic aristocracy (Prinz, 1965: 47ff.). On the other hand, in any assessment of this north-south movement one should take into account, besides flight from the barbarian invasions of 406-7, the positive attraction of the Gallic aristocracy to the court of Constantine III, exemplified above by the case of Heros.

Constantine III fell in 411, and took his bishop with him. Heros was replaced by Patroclus, a client of the victorious *magister militum*, Fl. Constantius. Arles had the latter to thank for its basilica Constantia (Benoit, 1951: 54f.). Above all, however, it is Constantius whom we must consider as having been behind pope Zosimus' (417-18) granting of unprecedented privileges to the see of Arles (Langgärtner, 1964: 26ff.; cf. Fuhrmann, 1953: 149ff.). By virtue of these prerogatives, Arles obtained metropolitan power over the provinces of Viennensis, Narbonensis I and Narbonensis II, the right

to issue letters of introduction (*litterae formatae*) to Gallic clergy for travel outside Gaul, and a primacy, albeit undefined, over all the Gallic provinces. The substantive administrative monopoly of the Arles church in the issuing of *litterae formatae* is specifically advertised in a civil law promulgated only a year later by the emperors Honorius and Theodosius at the suggestion of the prefect of Gaul (MGH, *Ep.* 3: 13-15; ed. 17 April 418). It is to be noted that this law concerned the re-establishment of the *Concilium septem provinciarum* in Arles, the aim of which was 'to focus the loyalties of the Gallic upper classes upon their new capital in the south' (Matthews, 1975: 334).

The particular papal regard for Arles in these years is probably attributable solely to the all-powerful influence of Patroclus' patron, Fl. Constantius; it speedily evaporated on the death of the latter. Only five months later, pope Boniface called upon the bishop of Narbonne not to tolerate any interference by the Arles church in his province (*Ep.* 12, dated 9 February 422; PL 20: 772-4). However, the see continued to enjoy the considerable political influence bestowed upon it by recent events, and by the residual favour of the civil and military administrations. In an edict of 425, again addressed to the Gallic prefect, and concerning the persecution of heretics, Patroclus was instructed to undertake corrective procedures against Gallic bishops suspected of heresy (Ensslin, 1937: 372); and the murder of Patroclus, in the following year – which Prosper (1292) laid at the door of the western *magister militum*, Felix – would likewise underline the political role of the bishop of Arles. In identical vein are the events that, in 427-30, led to the consecutive elections of Patroclus' two successors, the kinsmen Honoratus and Hilary (Heinzelmann, 1976: 76f.; and below).

It is clear that in southern Gaul the episcopal office played a preponderant part in the political and social life of the *civitates*, quite apart from its religious role. The political aspect of the episcopate is fully confirmed in a contemporary letter of pope Celestine (dated 25 July 428: PL 50: 429-36). According to this, there was in the territories of those to whom the letter was addressed – the bishops of Viennensis, Narbonensis I and Narbonensis II – a widespread abuse in that, contrary to the will of the local clergy and populace, bishops were being ordained in communities where they were not known (*ibid.* cap. IV-V: 431). Indeed, Celestine complained, a number of bishops had been enthroned who had no record of church service and

who had not even previously taken holy orders (*ibid.* cap. III: 430). Such prelates were frequently recruited from members of the laity who were embroiled in the political disputes of the day (*ibid.* 430: 'laicos ... quorum crimina ... per omnes pene sunt nota provincias'); others came so often as outsiders (i.e. from monasteries) that, to all appearances, 'novum quoddam, de quo episcopi fiant, institutum videatur esse collegium' (*ibid.* 431; cf. also cap. I: 430f.).

Honoratus certainly fits this picture: having previously held no clerical position at Arles, he was brought out of his monastery at Lérins and ordained bishop of that city. His first concern was, therefore, to reconcile himself with the populace of Arles, which had been opposed to his election ('prima ei cura concordiae fuit'); according to his biographer, Hilary, this is what he achieved (*Vitae Sanctorum*, ed. Cavallin, 1952: 69). The question as to actually who engineered Honoratus' elevation against the wishes of the local population finds answer in the events that took place at the end of his brief period in office. Then, the dying bishop, in the presence of the serving prefect of Gaul and certain of his predecessors (*praefectorii viri*), nominated Hilary as his successor (Heinzelmann, 1976: 77); and thereupon the Gallic *magister militum*, aided by his troops and a few citizens co-opted for the purpose, organized the 'election' of a man who was designated by his kinsman, Honoratus, and whose selection was obviously in full agreement with the thinking of the leading administrators of Gaul.

#### HILARY'S ACTIVITIES AND THE REACTION AGAINST THEM

Hilary would later himself intervene in the appointment of suffragan bishops, and in close collaboration with the military and civil authorities represented at Arles. On the other hand, it was the synodal activity of the metropolitan bishop that provided the first opportunity for the full development of an enduring interaction between the ecclesiastical and the secular power-structures, the more so since this activity was undoubtedly in accordance with the principles involved in the reconvening of the *Concilium septem provinciarum*.

If yearly attendance at the latter was required of representatives of individual *civitates* – *honorati* and *curiales* – so, according to a resolution of the synod of Riez, in 439, high-ranking officials

(*iudices*), *curiales* and *privati* had a duty (*oportet*) to make an appearance at ecclesiastical provincial councils, alongside the senior clergy (*Conc. Gall.* I, 73, can. 8). (This was still the case in 529, at a council in Orange, held in the presence of the prefect and seven *inlustres*: *MGH, Conc.* 44ff., 54f.) Furthermore, the attendance of laymen at Hilary's synods often followed from the need to deal on the spot with those of them subsequently sentenced to excommunication (*Conc. Gall.* I, 73, Riez, can. 7/8; 81, Orange, can. 10; 98, Vaison, can. 5). As we have already seen, according to Leo's letter of 445, Hilary availed himself all too frequently of excommunication as a weapon against the laity. Among other instances, he inflicted ecclesiastical punishment on those laymen involved in the election to the see of Embrun, on the occasion of the synod at Riez (*Conc. Gall.* I, 65, can. 1); and he generally threatened with such punishment anyone, lay or cleric, who opposed the Church or, especially, his own bishop, or who made common cause with the enemies of the latter (*Conc. Gall.* I, 73, Riez, can. 7; 99, Vaison, can. 6). That, in other respects, bishops were laying claim to an increasingly more influential position within city life (Heinzelmann, 1988: 37ff.) is indicated both by a resolution of the synod of Riez – concerning a bishop whose election was not in accordance with canon law – forbidding them to exercise their authority in the public *loci* of the *curia* and the *civitas* (*Conc. Gall.* I, 67), and by other resolutions of Hilary's councils dealing with the legal position as it related to asylum, manumission and adoption (can. 5–7, Orange; can. 9–10, Vaison).

For sure, the proceedings of Hilary's three councils held at Riez (439), Orange (441) and Vaison (442), and probably those of the second council of Arles (443/4?; *Conc. Gall.* I, 111ff. [442–506]), provide only a partial reflection of his activities in this regard: it is hardly likely that Hilary waited for ten years after his election before summoning his first council. That the known councils differed significantly in character is discernible from their attendance lists. In Riez, fourteen bishops from the area directly within Arles' sphere of influence (southern Viennensis, Narbonensis II and the Maritime Alps) came together to put right an uncanonical episcopal election. Orange, two years later, witnessed not only the presence of a representative of the see of Vienne but also that of the metropolitan bishop of Vienne in person, whose predecessors (and successors) bitterly resisted the claims of Arles. It may be that particular personal obligation – Leo's *personalis gratia* – was at work here as, for

example, it is patently demonstrable in the attendance of the second metropolitan, Eucherius of Lyon: a leading figure in the ascetic movement of the Gallic aristocracy, and a former resident of Lérins. The operation of personal ties is also strongly suggested by the fact that Eucherius was accompanied by his two sons, both former pupils of Hilary at Lérins: Salonus, bishop of Geneva, and Veranus, deacon of Lyon (*Conc. Gall.* I, 87). Links can also be established between Hilary's 'home-monastery' of Lérins and at least two other bishops on the Orange list: Maximus of Riez and Theodore of Fréjus (Prinz, 1965: 60). Hilary's personal admonition of absent bishops, proclaimed in canon 29 of the Orange council (*Conc. Gall.* I, 86), seems to have borne fruit in the following year at the council of Vaison, at which twenty-three bishoprics were represented (*Conc. Gall.* I, 102).

Hilary's relationships with the bishops of his episcopal province are retrospectively illuminated by a letter from nineteen prelates to pope Leo, written shortly after the death of the bishop of Arles (*MGH, Ep.* 3: 18–20; those who sent it are named in Leo's reply of 5 May 450: *ibid.* 20f.). In this document which, by reference to the *instituta principum* ('imperial prerogatives'), makes much of Arles' administrative function (mention is made of it as the seat of the prefecture and of other *potestates*), the nineteen bishops plead for the city's pre-eminence on the grounds that they, like their predecessors, were appointed to office by its bishop (*ibid.* 19). In some cases, indeed, and a possibility which up to now has been generally overlooked (though cf. Loseby, above pp. 144f., 147), the very sees themselves may have owed their creation to Hilary. Thus bishops of Thorame and Castellane (Maritime Alps) are attested only at Hilary's councils; and it was under Hilary that for the first time the neighbouring cities of Nice and Cimiez were each simultaneously provided with a bishop. In addition, the sees of Toulon, Antibes, Avignon and Carpentras could be foundations of the bishop of Arles; those of Vence, Apt and Riez, however, probably go back to his predecessors (Duchesne: 1907: I; Griffe, 1964–6: II, 120ff.; Duval, Février and Guyon, 1986; Biarne *et al.*, 1986). Very striking is the undoubted novelty of a bishop of Uzès, an *oppidum* that, according to the *Notitia Galliarum*, was at the beginning of the fifth century still classified as a *castrum* (*Not. Gall.* 15.10.609). This bishop, who as a close intimate of Hilary represented his case at Rome, was the sole representative of Narbonensis I both at Hilary's councils and among

the signatories of the letter of 450: it seems inexplicable that Hilary's opponents never objected to this. The diocese of Uzès must have been created out of the city-territory of Nîmes; and in this case, as in those of the other episcopal foundations, one must assume close collaboration with the civil authorities. Such a relationship found specific mention at the contemporary council of Chalcedon, as testified by the Latin translation of canon 17: 'Si qua vero potestate imperiali civitas nova constituta est, aut certe constituatur, civilibus et publicis formulis etiam ecclesiasticarum parrociarum ordo celebretur' (Mansi, 1901–27, VII: 397; read XVII instead of XXVI; Hefele and Leclercq, 1908, II: 801, can. 12; *ibid.* 805f., can. 17). As to other aspects of the administrative procedure involved in the foundation of church sees, the sources are silent.

In contrast with his activity in his own province, Hilary's plans with regard to the rest of Gaul remain unclear, given the lack of detail provided by our sources. According to his *Vita*, he often (*saepius*) sought out Germanus of Auxerre in order to discuss with him the personal problems of the senior clergy (*Vitae Sanctorum*, ed. Cavallin, 1952: 98; ch. 21). It was on the occasion of one such visit, we are told, that nobles and *mediocres* brought to his attention the delicts of the metropolitan of Besançon – the marriage of a widow and, in an earlier capacity, probably that of provincial governor, the imposition of death sentences (Mathisen, 1979a: 164). Hilary and Germanus are supposed thereupon to have taken counsel of each other, sat in judgement on Chelidonius, and declared him guilty. The relationship between Germanus and Hilary is incontrovertible (*V. Germani* 23), but the role of the former in the Chelidonius affair has recently been questioned (Thompson, 1984: 57ff.; Wood, 1984: 15). Most recently, it has been very plausibly argued that Germanus' final trip to the empress Galla Placidia in Ravenna, in 445, should be placed in the context of an attempted mediation during the proceedings of Hilary in Rome: Scharf, 1991). On the other hand, it seems plain that this affair on its own would hardly have led to Hilary's downfall. In this respect, further damage – unexpected by Hilary – was done by the taking up of Projectus' complaints which, in Roman eyes, could stand proxy for a whole series of identical goings-on that had not resulted in the wave of protest so much desired by Rome. Projectus' protest provided the long-awaited opportunity to be shut of Hilary and his *monarchia* (*V. Romani* 18).



All of this occurred, without doubt, at a time when Hilary was unable to count on his usual political support: scholars have, with good reason, drawn attention to the diversion of Aëtius' interests towards Italy during the 440s (Zecchini, 1983: 239; Demougeot, 1983: 11ff.). Furthermore, Hilary's links with Gallic prefects could not always be relied on. To be sure, probably during the first half of 445 and *after* his flight from Rome, he received aid in his dealings with Leo from the prefect Auxiliarius (Heinzelmann, 1982: 566); but it seems that two other prefects who held office in Gaul: the Italian Albinus (quarrelling with Aëtius in Gaul in 440: Prosper 1341; cf. Scharf, 1991: cap. ix, indicating that this same Albinus was Italian prefect during the process of Hilary in Rome) and Marcellus (441–3), should be counted as belonging in the enemy camp. The latter is in fact mentioned in an inscription set up by bishop Rusticus of Narbonne in 445 (*CIL* XII, 5336 – see: Chalon, 1973: 223ff.; Atsma, 1976: 10ff.). The inscription celebrates the completion of the reconstruction of the cathedral of Narbonne, begun in 441, and names those persons who had contributed to the work. Amongst these we find, in pride of place, Rusticus himself, who identifies himself as the son and nephew of bishops and who (as in three other inscriptions) employs a system of dating based on his own years in the episcopal office (Heinzelmann, 1976: 197f.; also 108f.). This self-confident metropolitan bishop of Narbonensis I never attended any of Hilary's councils, and, in the building of his cathedral church, was supported by another leading opponent of Hilary's pretensions, bishop Venerius of Arles. According to the evidence of the inscription in question, both came from the same monastery in Marseille, where they both had served together in the clergy (Atsma, 1976: 11f.). The first contributor on the list, Orosius, is probably also to be connected to Marseille, where already in the fourth century we find a bishop bearing this otherwise only rarely attested name. To this group was now attached the prefect Marcellus who, in each of the two years of his period in office – which fell, without doubt, during the first years of the reconstruction: 441–3 – made available from public funds the considerable sum of 1,600 solidi (Heinzelmann, 1988: 34 and n48). His connection with Narbonne, as attested by the inscription of 445, deserves to be regarded as equal in significance to that of the *magister militum* Fl. Constantius – founder of the basilica Constantia and patron of Patroclus – with Arles.

## CONCLUSION

One is bound to relate the important group with common anti-Arles interests of the Rusticus inscription to Projectus' appeal to Rome, whenever this occurred, and so to the fall of Hilary in 445. Thus Hilary failed to achieve his political aim of creating a pan-Gallic solidarity. As had already been the case in respect of the support or opposition shown to the usurpations at the beginning of the century, dissension within the Gallic ruling-class was too great for the creation of a common viewpoint. Such disunity may be seen as proof of the continuing influence of a significant group of conservatives within the Gallic aristocracy, who favoured the traditional imperial structure and strong central government, and who were hostile to more recent thinking regarding the likely advantages of increased political independence on the part of the Gallic administration. Without doubt, these opposing conceptions reflect different strands in the conception of Gallo-Roman identity in the fifth century.