Britannia XL (2009), 197-217

Saint Germanus and the British Missions

By ANTHONY A. BARRETT

ABSTRACT

Constantius' biography of Saint Germanus, written c. A.D. 480, includes accounts of two missions undertaken to counter the spread of Pelagianism in Britain. Germanus' first mission is also mentioned in the chronicle of Prosper, dated to A.D. 429. The second mission is undated, and is almost certainly a fantasy. Germanus' supposed initial victory by persuasion is implausible. Also, Prosper's account of Pope Celestine I's anti-Pelagian campaigns demonstrates that the heresy was suppressed in Britain in the first mission. The chronology of Tibatto's rebellion precludes a second mission, and its chronological anomalies arise from the need to accommodate just such a second mission.

Constantius of Lyon's biography of Saint Germanus of Auxerre is arguably our most important source for the shadowy history of fifth-century Britain. Generally dated to about A.D. 480, the *Vita Germani* includes detailed accounts of the missions undertaken by Germanus to counter the spread of Pelagianism in Britain in the first half of the century, and these accounts constitute the only broad narrative of events in the island during that period. It is understandable, then, that scholars have paid considerable attention to them.

We know frustratingly little about Constantius. He was evidently born around the beginning of the fifth century, and died in the last quarter. The *Vita Germani* may well have been his only major work. As we can tell from the correspondence of his close associate, Sidonius Apollinaris, Constantius was a highly educated and erudite man. But his literary sophistication affords no guarantee of his reliability as a historian, and the shortcomings of the *Vita* as an historical document are to be recognized. In fact Constantius' primary motive in undertaking the task of recording Germanus' life was not to write history, but to engage in hagiography. At this he succeeded admirably. His highly engaging account abounds in miracles and encomia on the virtues of someone who had clearly earned his biographer's admiration, someone who was saintly in every sense of the word. The *Vita Germani* thus has a lot in common with Sulpicius Severus' *Vita Martini*, and it has long been argued that the life of Saint Martin was consciously adopted by Constantius as his model.[1] The purpose of hagiography is to a large degree didactic, to present the life of a given saint as an *exemplum* for the community to emulate. It can also at times exercise a more political didacticism.[2] Wood, for instance, has suggested that the *Vita Germani* is a sort of handbook for bishops in the 470s or 480s, teaching episcopal behaviour in a time of crisis.[3] Objective truth was not the hagiographer's priority.

1 Levison 1904, 114; 1920, 231 was the first to make this suggestion.

2 Exemplified by the *Vita Antonii*: Brakke 1995, 258 and 264, while acknowledging that the primary purpose of that *Vita* was to inspire imitation, argues that it also sought to foster unity within the Egyptian church; Gregg 1980, 11–13, claims that Athanasius sought to align Antony with the orthodox in the Arian controversies.

3 Wood 1984, 9.

© World copyright reserved. Exclusive Licence to Publish: The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies 2009

https://doi.org/10.3815/006811309789785981 Published online by Cambridge University Press

There is another factor to be considered. Writing some half a century after the fact, Constantius expressed concern that there had been a long passage of time between the events he was describing and their compilation: 'tanta enim iam temporum fluxere curricula'.[4] It is not difficult to see the effect of this hiatus, especially on the sources that would have remained available to him. Thompson, in his lively study of Constantius' British sections, observed that the Gallic events in Germanus' career are described in considerable detail, compared to what we find in the British chapters.[5] But what is perhaps more significant is that for all their detail even the continental sections relate to very few episodes of the saint's life. If we trim away the lengthy descriptions of miracles and the extended praises of Germanus' virtues, we are left with a strikingly brief residue of extended historical incidents. After a cursory account of Germanus' early life, the *Vita* passes quickly to his ordination as Bishop of Auxerre, probably in A.D. 418 (*Vita* 2), and it is a sign of how little continuous information Constantius has on his subject that between the consecration and the mission to Britain, which, as will be shown, is securely dated from a different source to A.D. 429 (*Vita* 12), the only concrete information Constantius provides is that Germanus built a large monastery on the banks of the Yonne (*Vita* 6). The first British mission (*Vita* 12–18) is followed by the visit to Arles to reduce taxes (*Vita* 19–24), then a second British mission (*Vita* 25–27) is followed by Germanus' mediation in the Armorican rebellion and his death during that mediation (*Vita* 28–42); in other words, Constantius details only three or four extended episodes from Germanus' entire career. All of this suggests that he did not have a comprehensive body of source-data to draw upon, and that his information was very much hit or miss, sometimes detailed, sometimes very sketchy. We accordingly need to recognize that there are places in the *Vita* where historical accuracy and coherence are not to be expected. This article will consider the consequences of this intermittent incoherence, especially on the relationship of the two missions to one-another, and it will make a case for a re-assessment of the whole notion of a second, later, mission.

On one issue there is no disagreement: the Britain that Germanus visited in A.D. 429 had endured decades of chaos and uncertainty. Sources speak of barbarian raids during the late fourth century, and instead of receiving reinforcements the island had been gradually denuded of its troops. Matters came to a head during the first decade of the fifth century, when a combined barbarian force of Alans, Suevi and Vandals made a dramatic New Year's eve crossing over the frozen Rhine and pushed on into Gaul. The British legions elevated three usurpers in fairly rapid succession, the last of whom took the title of Constantine III and transported Britain's last remaining troops to Gaul to pursue his claims.[6] The Saxons seemingly exploited this dangerous situation to launch a devastating invasion, recorded by the *Chronicle of 452*.[7] Zosimus claims that the Britons, and some communities in Gaul, were driven in A.D. 409 to rebel against the Empire and no longer obeyed Roman laws.[8] The precise nature of this apparent rebellion is much disputed and few now accept the notion of a true independence movement and secession from Roman rule. Zosimus speaks of the emperor Honorius in A.D. 410 'sending letters to the British cities (*poleis*) telling them to look to their own defences'. This intriguing piece of information does not properly relate, either syntactically or thematically, to what precedes or follows it, and

4 *Praefatio* (Levison 1920, 250).

5 Thompson 1984, 13.

6 Zosimus 6.2; the sequence of the British usurpations and the barbarian crossing of the Rhine is much disputed and is dependent on the date of the crossing. The latter is usually assigned to the last day of A.D. 406, but Kulikowski 2000 has argued for A.D. 405; Kulikowski's plausible thesis, if correct, would resolve many of the problems. The *precise* details are not of great importance for the present topic.

7 'Britanniae Saxonum incursione devastatae': Mommsen 1892b, 660; Burgess 2001, 74.

8 Zosimus 6.5; the meaning of this passage of Zosimus, especially his phrase *kat' exousian*, is elusive; see Drinkwater 1998, 285 n. 109.

https://doi.org/10.3815/006811309789785981 Published online by Cambridge University Press

is awkwardly located in a context that is exclusively Italian.[9] But at the very least it implies an acknowledgement that Rome could no longer exercise authority in Britain. As an epilogue to these years Procopius observes that after the usurper Constantine III died in A.D. 411 the Romans were unable to recover Britain, which from then on was ruled by tyrants (he provides no further details).[10] There is much that is obscure and confusing in this picture but it does serve to show that in the years immediately preceding Germanus' mission in A.D. 429 Britain was apparently in many respects beyond Roman civil jurisdiction, exercising a fragmented form of self rule.

In the latter part of the fifth century, the very time when Constantius was writing the *Vita*, Britain was facing increasing Saxon domination and increasing threats against Christianity. Even so, the preoccupation of the Roman church was not with the dangers of paganism, but with the heresy of Pelagianism, so that Constantius could write, at a time when one might have feared for the very survival of the Christian religion in Britain, that thanks to Germanus' expulsion of the Pelagians the faith *still endured intact* in that part of the world: 'in illis locis etiam nunc fides intemerata perduret' (*Vita* 27).[11] Pelagius, whose name is attached by Constantius and others to what became second only to Arianism in the hierarchy of the church's most abominated heresies, was born, probably in the mid-350s, to parents wealthy enough to have afforded an education for him. His birth-place was Britain, as shown by several references to him as *Brit(t)o*, *Britannicus* or *Britannus*.[12] His British origins notwithstanding, he spent his entire career elsewhere, departing probably between A.D. 375 and 380 for Rome. Initially he enjoyed high regard and was praised by figures like St Augustine. But this did not last. Pelagius promoted the belief that humans were endowed with free will and with responsibility for their own ultimate destiny, and were capable of progressing towards salvation by their own efforts and their God-given nature. This was bound to bring him into conflict with St Augustine, who stressed dependence on divine will and God's *gratia* as the only route to salvation.

Alaric's imminent invasion of Rome in A.D. 410 drove Pelagius out of the city to Africa, and he later travelled to Palestine. The hostility of Augustine and the African church led to his excommunication and banishment from Rome, the process culminating in A.D. 418, coincidentally the year of Germanus' elevation to the episcopacy. Pelagius was subsequently banished also from Jerusalem, then from Palestine, and sought refuge in Egypt. There is little certain precise information about him after that. He might have gone to Britain, and certainly it would have seemed a logical place of refuge for him, since it would essentially have placed him beyond the reach of Roman authorities.[13] But Prosper of Aquitaine claims that Pelagianism was

9 Zosimus 6.10; on these letters, see especially Paschoud 1989, 57–9; Thompson 1977, 315–16. See Matthews 1975, 320 n. 7, for the suggestion that Zosimus' text should read *Brouttia* (Bruttium, in Italy) rather than *Bretannia*.

10 Procopius, *BV* 3.2.38.

11 An appropriate starting point for the phenomenon of Pelagius is the study by de Plinval 1943, followed by Ferguson 1956 and Rees 1988 and 1991. There is a detailed discussion of Pelagianism in Britain in Herren and Brown 2002, reviewed by Márkus 2005.

12 Bede, *HE* 1.10 *bis*; Augustine, *Ep.* 186.1; Prosper, *Chronicle* (Mommsen 1892a, 467, Item 1252), cf. *In Collatorem* 58, *De Ingratis* 1. 14; Orosius, *Apol. 12*; Mercator, *Lib. Subnot. in Verb. Iul.*; Gennadius, *De Vir.* 3.43. Jerome, in his commentary on Jeremiah (*Pref.Lib. 3 in Jerem.*), does not mention Pelagius by name, but claims that the devil 'habet progeniem Scoticae gentis, de Britannorum vicinia' ('has an offspring of the tribe of the Scots from the neighbourhood of Britain') and insists that he was 'Scotorum pultibus praegravatus' ('weighed down by porridge of the Scots'). This has led some to argue that Pelagius was Irish, but *Scotus* is a general term of abuse, almost synonymous with 'barbarian'. We cannot however rule out the possibility that Pelagius belonged to an Irish community on the west coast of Britain, or that he was born in Ireland but raised in Britain (Rees 1988, xii–xiii, summarizes current opinions). Morris 1965, 41, has speculated that Jerome's references may in fact be not to Pelagius but to his colleague Coelestius, whose nationality we do not know.

13 Hanson 1968, 39; Wermelinger 1975, 207, asserts that 'Pelagius mit seiner Heimat in Verbindung gestanden ist'.

https://doi.org/10.3815/006811309789785981 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in fact fomented in Britain by an otherwise unknown individual, Agricola (see below). In any case, by the time that Germanus was commissioned to deal with the heresy Pelagius himself had effectively quit the scene, and may have been dead. After A.D. 418 the leader of the movement was Julian of Eclanum, who with eighteen other Italian bishops refused to subscribe to the excommunications; they themselves were excommunicated and banished from Italy.

There have been efforts to identify a specifically British dimension of Pelagianism, beyond the more or less incidental fact that Pelagius happened to be born there.[14] There have also been attempts to identify 'British' Pelagianism as a social movement, a response to conditions in contemporary Britain. There is little support now for such theories.[15] At best it might be argued that because of its increasing remoteness, Britain in the late fourth century was perhaps relatively hospitable to less-than-orthodox beliefs and to ideas that were not alien to Pelagianism.[16] That such 'liberal' attitudes might all the same cause problems from time to time is to be expected, and such a situation might have prompted a visit to Britain shortly before A.D. 396 by Victricius of Rouen.[17] In that year Victricius apologizes to his community for his absence from Gaul and points out that he was called to Britain to act as a mediator (*pacis ... faciendae*) and that he stayed there some time (*ibi moratus sum*). The implied length of the visit suggests that the mysterious dispute was of some importance. Victricius would later himself be charged with unorthodoxy and be obliged to travel to Rome to defend himself. Pope Innocent supported him on that later occasion, using the opportunity to strengthen Rome's control over Gaul. He informed Victricius that it was not permitted to go to another province without the consent of Rome and that major disputes should be referred to the *sedes apostolica*.[18] There is nothing, however, to prove that Victricius' visit should be directly associated with Pelagianism, which at that time was still not a heresy.[19]

The first concrete evidence of Pelagian activity in Britain is provided by an important entry in the chronicle of Prosper, which attributes the growth of the heresy there to the activities of a single individual, and prefaces the notice about Germanus' first mission (in A.D. 429) with the information that 'Agricola the Pelagian, the son of the Pelagian bishop Severianus, corrupts the churches of Britain by the pressing of his own dogma'.[20] The sequence of events (discussed in more detail below) and the use of the present tense suggest that Agricola's activities did not long precede Germanus' A.D. 429 visit. We have no further information on Agricola or on his father Severianus. There is no reason to assume that Agricola was, like his father, a bishop. He was clearly old enough to be disseminating his views in the 420s at the latest and it is very possible that his appearance in Britain resulted from the anti-Pelagian legislation of A.D. 418–25. If his father's see was in Italy, the father might have been one of those who refused to subscribe to the excommunications after A.D. 418.[21] It might well have been thought by Severianus or

14 See *inter alia* the discussions at Caspari 1890, 4–167; Morris 1965; Evans 1968, 18–31; Rees 1991, 71–2, 105–6, cf. Bonner 1972, 5–6.

15 Myres 1960, argued that the Pelagian attack on *gratia* represented an attack on judicial corruption; he was soundly refuted by Liebeschuetz 1963. Morris 1965 and 1968 adapted Myres's thesis and identified Pelagianism as an egalitarian movement with a reformist agenda; he was in turn refuted by Liebeschuetz 1967. Further objections were raised by Evans 1968a, 90–121 and Cameron 1968. The general opposition to such views is summed up by Rees 1988, 112–13.

16 See especially, Markus 1986.

17 Victricius, *De Laude Sanctorum* 1 (*PL* 20.443); Clark 1999, 365 summarizes the argument for dating this document to A.D. 396, soon after Victricius' return from Britain.

18 See note 32.

19 On the speculation that Victricius went to Britain to deal with Pelagianism, and may have been British himself, see Grosjean 1945; Thomas 1981, 50–1, 55; Wood 1984, 6–7.

20 Mommsen 1892a, 472, Item 1301.

21 Wood 1984, 8, n. 63, notes that there is no Italian bishopric recorded for Severianus by Lanzoni 1923.

https://doi.org/10.3815/006811309789785981 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Agricola or perhaps both that by crossing the Channel to Britain they would put themselves beyond the reach of the imperial laws.[22] That said, it is also possible that Agricola may have sympathized with Pelagius' views at some earlier date, before they became illegal, and that Prosper's characterization was merely a smear on someone who did not subscribe to the strict notion of Augustinian grace.

The man chosen to deal with the challenge of Pelagianism in Britain was Germanus. Constantius introduces the topic of his mission abruptly and without preamble. After testifying to Germanus' exemplary conduct as bishop, he goes on:

> Eodem tempore ex Britanniis directa legatio Gallicanis episcopis nuntiavit Pelagianam perversitatem in locis suis late populos occupasse et quam primum fidei catholicae debere succurri. Ob quam causam synodus numerosa collecta est, omniumque iudicio duo praeclara religionis lumina universorum precibus ambiuntur, Germanus et Lupus apostolici sacerdotes, terram corporibus, caelum meritis possidentes. Et quanto laboriosior necessitas apparebat, tanto eam promptius eroes devotissimi susceperunt, celeritatem negotii fidei stimulis maturantes.
>
> During this period a deputation sent from Britain reported to the Gallic bishops that in its home territory the Pelagian heresy had seized hold of a broad section of the population, and that aid should be sent to the Catholic faith as quickly as possible. Accordingly a synod was called, attended by many bishops, and in a unanimous decision they prevailed as a single body on the two shining lights of the faith, Germanus and Lupus, apostolic priests, men bound to the earth by their bodies but who had attained heaven through their worthiness. And the more arduous the task seemed to be, the more eagerly did these most saintly paragons accept it, and under the stimulus of their faith they brought about a swift assumption of the task. (*Vita* 12)

This passage certainly meets the standards of hagiography, in that it enhances the virtues of its subject. But it is in some respects unsatisfactory as a part of an historical narrative. Constantius does not date the mission, and uses merely the vague temporal indicator 'during this period (*eodem tempore*)', an expression that does not convey proper chronology but merely provides a very loose link to the previous passage; such expressions are invariably indications that Constantius simply did not in fact know when a given episode had taken place, and are typical of the chronological imprecision of hagiography. There is the vagueness of the 'deputation'. We are not told who ordered it or which delegates took part in it, or where precisely they came from. We are then told that a synod was called, attended by 'many bishops (*numerosa*)'. There is no documentation for such a synod in the general period in any of the Gallic records, nor should we expect to find one, since the exaggeration of the attendant circumstances of a mission is part of the hagiographical tradition.[23] It is not until the next section (*Vita* 13) that Germanus is identified as the leader (*dux*), and Lupus, by implication, as his second-in-command. We are told nothing about the remaining members of the mission, nor what was planned for them when they reached Britain.

Despite these peripheral problems, however, the central core of the information is confirmed by a second version of the very same event, recorded by Prosper of Aquitaine under the year 429:[24]

> Agricola Pelagianus, Severiani episcopi Pelagiani filius, ecclesias Brittaniae dogmatis sui insinuatione corrumpit, sed ad insinuationem Palladii diaconi papa Caelestinus Germanum

22 Charles-Edwards 2000, 204.

23 On this, see Levison 1904, 124; Williams 1912, 224; one might see a parallel in the inflated account of the consecration of St David as bishop by the Patriarch in Jerusalem (Rhygyfarch, *Vita Davidis* 46).

24 Mommsen 1892a, 472, Item 1301.

https://doi.org/10.3815/006811309789785981 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> Autisidorensem episcopum vice sua mittit et de turbatis hereticis Britannos ad catholicam fidem dirigit.
>
> Agricola the Pelagian, the son of the Pelagian bishop Severianus, corrupts the churches of Britain by the urging of his own dogma, but at the urging of Palladius, the deacon, Pope Celestine sends Germanus Bishop of Auxerre as his representative and overthrows the heretics and directs the British away from them towards the Catholic faith.

Prosper's chronicle, the *Epitoma Chronicon*, covered the period A.D. 379–455.[25] He composed it first in A.D. 433, and updated it several times, completing the final version in A.D. 455. It is a source that commands respect for the factual reliability of its entries. The date it provides for Germanus' first mission, A.D. 429, has not been questioned. Prosper was certainly in a good position to know what had been happening in Rome. He visited the city in A.D. 432 with his friend Hilary to seek the support of Pope Celestine I against the Pelagian sympathizers. Possibly by A.D. 435, and certainly by 440, he had taken up permanent residence there in the employ of Leo I (A.D. 440–61), whom he served as *notarius*.[26] As a Gaul, and a deeply committed anti-Pelagian, he would have taken a keen interest in the progress of the heresy in Britain. He is thus one of our better-informed sources, who would presumably have made this A.D. 429 entry in his first edition, in A.D. 433, only four years after the event.

To a considerable degree Constantius is corroborated by Prosper. Both sources agree on the basic notion that during the period in question the spread of Pelagianism in Britain posed a serious threat to the Roman church, and that Germanus undertook the task of extirpating it. They also both, by implication, suggest that however little influence the Roman civil authority exercised in Britain, the authority of the central church in spiritual matters was still considerable.[27] Thus Prosper's notice provides reassuring testimony to the reliability of Constantius' information that Germanus was sent to Britain. But that said, there are some major differences between the two accounts. Constantius claims that the mission was put in place in Gaul in response to a general request from the Britons, while Prosper says that it was commissioned by the Pope, prompted by Palladius, a deacon, in Rome. Constantius makes no mention of Palladius, who is surely the Palladius mentioned again in Prosper's chronicle, in an entry only two years later, under A.D. 431.[28]

Attempts have been made to reconcile the two accounts.[29] The different versions might reflect

[25] On Prosper, see Helm 1957; Muhleberger 1990, 48–135.

[26] Hanson 1968, 53; Muhlberger 1990, 52.

[27] Wood, 1984, 14.

[28] Mommsen 1892a, 473, Item 1307: 'ad Scottos in Christum credentes ordinatus a papa Celestino Palladius primus episcopus mittitur' ('Palladius is the first to be sent as bishop to those Irish who were Christian, after being ordained by Pope Celestine'). There is no definitive proof that we are dealing with only one individual, but it seems almost untenable that Prosper could have mentioned two different homonymous men in connection with Pope Celestine in two almost adjacent entries. Thus the first bishop sent to Ireland, the predecessor of St Patrick, was, according to Prosper, the instigator of Germanus' mission. Prosper also links Britain and Ireland in his attack on the views of John Cassian (considered in more detail below), when he states that Pope Celestine saved the British isles by banishing the Pelagians from the main island and appointing a bishop to the Irish (*In Collatorem* 21.1). This concatenation of references leads to the conclusion that Rome saw a close association between events in Britain and in Ireland in this period, and that Palladius' own appointment in A.D. 431 was closely associated with Germanus' 429 mission. Celestine had stated that his policy was not to send a bishop to a Christian group that had not previously requested it: 'nullus invitis detur episcopus' (Celestine, *Ep.* 4 [*PL* 50. 434]). This suggests that when he sent Palladius in A.D. 431 to the Christian communities already in Ireland there had been communications between Rome and Ireland preceding the appointment. Charles-Edwards 2000, 205, suggests that there could have been concern that the Pelagians, once dislodged from Britain by Germanus, might seek a refuge there. Palladius at any rate seems to have been a man with a very close interest in events in the British isles; Grosjean 1952 identifies him with St Patrick.

[29] See Levison 1904, 121–2.

https://doi.org/10.3815/006811309789785981 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Constantius' emphasis on the Gallic contribution to the mission, while Prosper would have wanted to give credit to his champion, the anti-Pelagian Celestine I. Perhaps the Britons appealed first to the Gallic church and subsequently to Rome. Germanus and Lupus might have been sent to Britain on the recommendation of the Gallic synod, with Palladius responsible for gaining Papal permission.[30] It has been argued that Palladius was deacon not in Rome but in Auxerre, on the grounds that an official in Rome would hardly be interested in affairs in Britain, and that Palladius must have been sent from Auxerre in about A.D. 428 to Rome to seek Papal authority for what would otherwise have been interference in the affairs of other bishops.[31] Certainly there is evidence that before this the central church was very nervous about local clerical interference in another province without permission from Rome, as Pope Innocent made clear to Victricius of Rouen in A.D. 404: 'nec alicui liceat sine praeiudicio tamen Romanae ecclesiae … ad alias provincias convolare' (see above).[32] But the fact that Prosper refers to Palladius in his role as advisor to the Pope in Rome simply as *decanus*, without qualification or explanation, suggests very strongly that Palladius fulfilled his duties in Rome. Moreover, if Palladius' role had been limited to little more than obtaining formal authorization, it is difficult to understand why Prosper would have assigned him such a central role.

Prosper assigns no role to Lupus, about whom we have some sketchy information, both from a *Vita Lupi* and from the correspondence of Sidonius Apollinaris.[33] Lupus, Bishop of Troyes, belonged to the same cultured Gallic circles as Constantius. Sidonius addresses a number of letters to him and admires him for his learning, describing Lupus as easily the foremost Gallic bishop of his day, 'facile principem pontificum Gallicanorum', and linking him and Germanus together as excellent bishops.[34] It seems inconceivable that Lupus would not at some point have made the acquaintance of Constantius, and he may well have been alive when Constantius wrote the *Vita*, although it cannot be assumed that he was drawn upon as a source. Constantius could hardly have invented a totally fictitious role for Lupus in Britain.[35] But, as Constantius makes clear, Lupus was present only at the outset of the campaign to rid the island of Pelagianism. He was no longer involved when that campaign reached its successful end. For that reason Prosper may well have omitted Lupus from what is in essence a very brief chronicle of the more significant events.

Prosper thus plays a very useful role in vindicating the *Vita Germani* as a potentially useful historical source, even if specific details raise concern. But there is another, previously overlooked, aspect of the relationship of Constantius and Prosper that grants some assurance about the working methods of both. In another work, to be considered in more detail below, the *In Collatorem*, dated to about A.D. 433 and referring to the events of A.D. 429, Prosper describes the role of Pope Celestine in ridding Britain of the Pelagians 'solum suae originis occupantes' ('who had taken possession of the land of their origins').[36] The use of the very same verb, *occupare*, is attributed by Constantius in the *Vita* to the British delegation, who report that Pelagianism had

[30] Wood 1984, 10.

[31] Hanson 1968, 54, outlines the arguments to be made for Auxerre.

[32] *PL* 20. 472–3: 'nor should it be allowed anyone without the prior ruling of the church in Rome to take himself to other provinces'.

[33] For Lupus see Griffe 1947, vol. I, 240–3; Chadwick 1955, 275–85. The *Vita Lupi* has survived in shorter and longer versions; the latter is generally deemed unreliable, but the reliability of the shorter version is also questioned by Levison 1899, 559–70; its authenticity and early sixth-century date are defended by Duchesne, 1910, 454, n. 1; Griffe 1947, vol. I, 240–1.

[34] Sid. Apol., *Epist*. 8.13, 15; Chadwick 1955, 282; on the date of Lupus' bishopric, see Stevens 1933, 206–7.

[35] Lupus' mission to Britain is recorded at *Vita Lupi* 4, but the entry is almost certainly derived from Constantius.

[36] Prosper, *In Collatorem* 21.1.

https://doi.org/10.3815/006811309789785981 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'late populos occupasse' (*Vita* 12). The verb *occupare* is found only once more in the *Vita*, in the past participle, where it conveys the abstract notion of the mental preoccupation of individuals who are wrapped up in their thoughts (*Vita* 20), and only once more in the *In Collatorem* (13), similarly in the past participle, of our rational element being taken over by faults.[37] That both texts use the identical verb in the same identical physical sense, otherwise unparalleled in both works, to describe the same event, can surely not be a coincidence. Moreover Prosper's 'solum suae originis', an allusion simply to Pelagius' birthplace rather than to an early British school of Pelagianism, almost certainly derives from the same source as Constantius' 'in locis suis'.[38] It seems that both Prosper and Constantius had access, directly, or possibly at some remove in the case of Constantius, to an official record of the process that led to Germanus' journey. This is a useful demonstration that for all its colour the *Vita* is not merely the product of an over-fertile imagination nurtured by a credulous tradition.

As related by Constantius, Germanus' first mission unfolds in a series of dramatic scenes. It begins with the stormy crossing of the Channel, described in great detail and with a vivid sense of narrative (*Vita* 12–13). We then reach Britain. We are told that such was the reputation of Germanus and Lupus that crowds came out to see them, and that eventually the Pelagians were foolish enough to be drawn into a contest, and turned up for it in expensive garb. In the debate between the two sides the orthodox got the upper hand, as was evident from the reaction of the crowd, until, as the final *coup de théâtre*, they cured the blind daughter of a man 'of tribunician authority' (*Vita* 14–15). At that point, Constantius assures us, the essential work was done and 'after that day the perverse belief was extirpated from the hearts of the people, who with thirsty desire pursued the teaching of the priests'. The remainder of the narrative has little to do with Germanus' central mission. He went to visit the shrine of St Alban, and on returning was ambushed and suffered a twisted ankle. While recuperating, he was almost engulfed in a blaze when the house in which he was staying caught fire, but he was miraculously rescued (*Vita* 16). He was also restored to health, and the cure was timely, since the British were caught off their guard by a joint raid of Picts and Saxons. Germanus took command, conducted a mass baptism of the troops during the Lent period, then led the British to victory with shouts of 'Alleluia' (*Vita* 17–18). The account ends almost anticlimactically:

> Conposita itaque opulentissima insula securitate multiplici, superatisque hostibus vel spiritualibus vel carne conspicuis, quippe qui vicissent Pelagianistas et Saxones, cum totius merore regionis reditum moliuntur. Tranquillam navigationem merita propria et intercessio Albani martyris paraverunt quietosque antistites suorum desideriis felix carina restituit.
>
> Thus this very opulent island found peace with security on several fronts, with the besting of the enemy both spiritual as well as visible in the flesh, in that they had defeated both the Pelagians and the Saxons. They now set about their return, to the grief of the whole country. Their personal merits and the intercession of Alban the martyr secured a calm voyage and the happy ship returned the bishops peacefully to their people, who had longed to see them. (Vita 18)

This account of Germanus' mission leaves very much to be desired. Of course, since it was not intended for the historian, its historical inadequacies do not undermine Constantius' achievement. But they do have to be confronted by the modern scholar. There is the frustrating absence of

[37] The noun *occupatio* is found twice in Constantius (*Vita* 9, 33), never in Prosper's *In Collatorem*; both Constantian examples have the abstract sense of 'pressing business'.

[38] Translators of the *Vitae* have not realized that the *suis* of *in suis locis*, which is syntactically ambiguous and must be construed from its context, refers to the Pelagians, and have rendered the phrase as if it were otiose: Borius 1965, 10: 'de leurs régions', Hoare 1954, 295: 'of the country'.

https://doi.org/10.3815/006811309789785981 Published online by Cambridge University Press

any proper chronological framework. One can assume that the crossing took place early in the year (which suits the notion of the wintry weather), allowing enough time for the refutation of the heretics, the visit to St Alban's shrine, and the injury and recuperation of Germanus, all of this early enough for the Picts and Saxons to combine forces during Lent and to fight a battle on Easter Sunday. It seems very rushed, and de Plinval suggests that they did set out in A.D. 429, but in late summer, and stayed in Britain for several months, to go to battle in Easter of A.D. 430.[39] All this, of course, is an exercise in reconstructing, not history, but Constantius' *schema*, and that *schema* may have little to do with history. Also, pervading the whole episode is a frustrating geographical vagueness. Not a single place in Britain can be identified. At the outset, the heresy is said 'late populos occupasse', to have 'seized hold of a broad section of the population', but, when Germanus arrives, he seemingly restricts his activities to a small corner of the island.[40] Not a single bishop appears in Constantius' narrative, explained by Thompson on the grounds that they had gone over to the heresy *en masse*, and that Constantius discreetly suppressed this information.[41] But a wholesale diversion is unlikely, and certainly Constantius suggests that there were enough opponents to appeal to the church in Gaul in the first place. Equally frustrating is the absence of any reference to the political situation in Britain. We have only the vague allusion to the man 'of tribunician authority' (*Vita* 15), with no indication of his function. The absence of officials might presumably be explained by their expulsion some twenty years earlier. But what of Procopius' *tyrannoi*? They also are conspicuous by their absence. The explanation might be that the *tyrannoi* are pagans, not Christians, with little interest in the outcome of the theological contest. Certainly, the soldiers that faced the Picts and Saxons were apparently pagan, and candidates for conversion. Yet it is still surprising that the action could be played out as though the rulers of the island did not exist. Perhaps it is futile to attempt to explain away these curiosities in a work that is hagiographical, not historical. Apart from the simple phenomenon of Pelagianism, events in Britain were doubtless a *terra incognita* to Constantius. There is one small detail that might at first glance seem to throw a little light on social history. The Pelagians are finely dressed: 'they came forth conspicuous in their extravagance, in splendid garb, accompanied by the approbation of the mob' (*Vita* 14). The apparent presence of an affluent middle class in a period of supposed turbulence and anarchy is at first sight striking. It certainly accords ill with Morris' notion of an egalitarian revolution under Pelagian inspiration.[42] But his passage of the *Vita* has generally been misunderstood. In the hagiographical tradition the opponents of the saint muster materialism against sanctity, and this presumably is why the Pelagians are shown as wealthy. We should recall that the disciples of St Martin, many of whom were noblemen, dressed in rough camel skins after they joined him, in contempt for anything finer, and that Constantius himself tells us that Germanus possessed only two garments, which fell to pieces through constant wear.[43]

After the successful termination of the first mission, Germanus visited Arles to argue for a reduction of taxes. The journey was successful, and on his return to Auxerre a second (undated) appeal came from Britain.

> Interea ex Britanniis nuntiatur Pelagianam perversitatem iterate paucis auctoribus dilatari rursusque ad beatissimum virum preces sacerdotum omnium deferuntur, ut causam Dei, quam prius obtinuerat, tutaretur. Quorum petitione festinus occurrit, dum et laboribus delectatur et Christo se gratanter inpendit … Adiuncto itaque Severo, episcopo totius sanctitatis, mare Christo auctore conscenditur.

39 de Plinval 1950, 145–6.
40 Thompson 1984, 81.
41 Thompson 1984, 20–1.
42 See note 15.
43 *Vita* 4; Sulp. Sev., *Vit.Mart.* 10.18.

https://doi.org/10.3815/006811309789785981 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> In the meantime it was reported from Britain that the Pelagian perversion was being spread again through a small number of agents and once again the entreaties of all the bishops were directed to the most blessed man to defend God's cause, which he had undertaken on a previous occasion. On their request he hastened to be accommodating, since he delighted in toil and spent himself joyfully for the sake of Christ … And so, accompanied by Severus, a bishop of absolute sanctity, he went to sea under the guidance of Christ. (*Vita* 25)

The circumstances of this second request are even less precise than those surrounding the first. Constantius relates only that Germanus was prevailed upon by the appeals of 'all' the bishops (*sacerdotum omnium*), presumably the Gallic bishops, although even that would clearly be an exaggeration. We have no reference in any other source to this second mission, Prosper does not mention it, and Constantius feels no need to provide a date, any more than he did for the first, but unlike the first, this second one cannot be dated from an external source. His companion this time was a more obscure individual, Severus. Bede, who for the most part keeps to Constantius' narrative very closely, reports that Severus was a disciple of Lupus of Troyes and was later consecrated as Bishop of Trier.[44] But interestingly, the *Vita Lupi*, which may have been Bede's source, says nothing about Severus' going to Britain.[45]

The events of this second mission are described in a much more cursory fashion than were those of the previous visit, this time in three very short chapters. Germanus crosses over to the island, he treats the crippled son of a certain Elafius (the narrative of the miracle accounts for over half of the text of the second mission), the people realize the error of their ways, and the Pelagians are condemned and exiled. This narrative leaves many questions unanswered. The strongest concerns have been voiced by Chadwick, who in the 1950s argued that the second mission might have been no more than a doublet of the first.[46] She observed that the weather was noted at the outset of both missions. In both there was a story of Germanus curing the ailing child of a prominent individual. In the first trip, the *vir tribuniciae potestatis* and his wife bring their ten-year-old blind daughter to be cured. This takes place suddenly after the dispute with the Pelagians, in a chapter introduced by *cum subito* (15). In the second mission an Elafius, who also occupies a prominent position, *regionis illius primus*, presents his crippled son to be cured by Germanus in a chapter similarly introduced by *cum subito* (27).[47] In themselves, these objections are not compelling. Adomnán's *Vita Columbae* shows that the role of the weather in the seas around Britain was a preoccupation in the lives of the saints, or of those who recorded their lives. Also, we should note that on the visit to Arles that preceded the second mission, Germanus is welcomed by Auxiliaris, praetorian prefect in Gaul (see below), and cures his wife's illness. Clearly Germanus' miraculous healing powers were directed at the people who counted, whether in Britain or in Gaul, and a prominent parent in both missions is no serious cause for concern. He had an excellent precedent, given that Christ similarly healed the servant of a centurion and resurrected the daughter of Jairus.[48] Nor is the repetition of *cum subito* particularly significant; it could merely reflect Constantius' use of imprecise temporal adverbs to open chapters; *interea* performs a similar role in four chapters of the British narrative.[49] Chadwick is very cautious and even she seems reluctant to declare the second mission spurious. She limits herself to noting that it '*looks suspiciously* like a duplication of the first', that the two journeys are '*probably*

[44] Bede, *HE* 1.21.
[45] See Levison 1920, 269, n. 3 on the *Vita Lupi* as Bede's source.
[46] Chadwick 1955, 256, 9.
[47] Thompson's suggestion (1984, 12) that *primus* is purely chronological and does not indicate rank is not convincing; it goes against the natural flow of the Latin.
[48] Centurion: Matt. 8.5, Luke 7.1; Jairus: Luke 8:54.
[49] *Vita* 14, 17, 25, 26.

https://doi.org/10.3815/006811309789785981 Published online by Cambridge University Press

two variant duplicate accounts', and that the second journey is an '*apparent* duplication' that 'leaves the *impression*' of a doublet and which we should regard 'with great *suspicion*'. Despite their careful wording these modest doubts have not won over scholars.[50] In response, it has been argued that the lack of detail in the second episode may reflect the situation that Constantius had no information on it other than that it occurred.[51] It is pointed out that there are in fact differences in the accounts of the two missions. The weather is stormy at the outset of the first, calm before the second. There is no victory over the Picts and Saxons in the second. Following the second mission, the heretics are exiled. The accompanying bishops are different. But while the similarities are not proof of spuriousness, nor are the differences proof of authenticity. It will be useful to revisit this question, in particular to consider a piece of evidence not discussed by Chadwick when she raised her doubts.

There is something that is undeniably unsatisfactory about the second mission as reported, and the accounts of the two events seem hardly to come from the same hand. Whatever the shortcomings of the *Vita*, its qualities as a piece of vivid narrative, as exemplified in the first mission, are undeniable. Constantius loves dramatic detail: the pouring of the oil on the seas on the outward journey, the Pelagians in their fine clothes, the excitement of the great debate, the fire where Germanus almost lost his life, the Alleluia call in the Easter battle, and the battle itself, with the vivid scene of the Picts and Saxons drowning in the river. This kind of dramatic specificity is almost totally lacking in the second visit: the appeal for help is vague, the account of the journey is lifeless — 'the elements were in harmony for a calm journey. The winds, waves and breezes favoured the crossing' — in contrast to the brilliant account of the storm in the first. The narrative of the second mission is less than one quarter the length of the first. The miraculous cure of the son of Elafius is the only detail that engages us, and it is a generic event, a conventional miracle that could have occurred anywhere and at any time in Germanus' adult life. In fact, what is most striking about this miracle is the insipid response of the crowd compared to the reaction following the miracle of the tribunician's daughter during the first mission. The only concrete outcome of the second mission is the exile of the heretics.

There is also considerable implausibility in the events as they are described. We are meant to believe that by the end of the first mission Germanus felt that he had countered the heresy by the force of his debate and the wonder of his miracles. He left Britain feeling assured that his task had been accomplished. But Honorius' law of A.D. 418 had seen banishment as the solution for dealing with Pelagians, and the notion of Germanus dealing with heretics by tactics he might have used to convert heathens is unconvincing. The heretics were, by Constantius' account, still there after A.D. 429. How could they possibly have been expected to remain dormant? That certainly did not happen on the Continent even after the draconian laws of A.D. 418.

A major complication is the difficulty of dating Germanus' second mission. This issue has been much debated.[52] The only point on which scholars seem to agree is that the chronology of the second half of the *Vita* simply does not work. It is impossible to reconcile the chronological data as they have been transmitted.

50 Rees 1988, 109 and Stancliffe 1986, 607 seem to be alone in allowing even the possibility that Chadwick might be right in suspecting the second mission.

51 Hanson 1968, 50.

52 Levison 1920, 127 declined to commit himself on the date (see also Stevens 1941, 365, n. 10). Wood 1984, 15–16 (see also 1987, 253) placed the second visit in A.D. 435; Thompson 1984, 55–70, revising earlier views, argued that the second visit and death belonged to A.D. 437. Demandt 1989, 153 saw A.D. 437 as the latest possible date. De Plinval 1943, 382–3; 1950, 147 argued for A.D. 440 or a little later; Zecchini 1983, 206 supported A.D. 440/441, in which he was joined by Stancliffe 1986, 605–8 and Scharf 1991, 16–19. In his earlier work, Thompson 1957, 138, as well as Grosjean 1957, 185 and Mathisen 1981 supported A.D. 444, Thompson 1956, 167 and Hanson 1968, 50 suggested A.D. 444–5. Stein 1928, 492, n. 3 placed the visit vaguely after A.D. 446; Zecchini 1981, 263, revising his earlier views, was won over to A.D. 446/447. Demougeot 1979, 711, thought A.D. 447 most convincing.

https://doi.org/10.3815/006811309789785981 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The events as related by Constantius can be laid out in a simple scheme:

The first British mission (*Vita* 12–18)

The visit to Arles to reduce taxes (*Vita* 19–24)

The second British mission (*Vita* 25–27), followed immediately by the Armorican rebellion and Germanus' death in Ravenna (*Vita* 28–42)

We can assign some dates to this scheme. The first mission, as Prosper tells us, took place in A.D. 429.[53] The visit to Arles that followed the A.D. 429 mission took place when Auxiliaris was praetorian prefect in Gaul: 'regebat … apicem praefecturae' (*Vita* 24). Auxiliaris' prefecture in Gaul in A.D. 435/6 is attested on a milestone between Arles and Marseilles, and even if he was granted an extended tenure of office, we know that he had ceased to hold it by A.D. 439 at the very latest.[54] Thus the mission to Arles seems to belong broadly to between, say, A.D. 433 and 437, definitely not later than 439. While in Ravenna, just before his death and just after the second mission, Germanus brought back to life the son of the *cancellarius* of Segisvult. This last is described as *patricius* (*Segisvulti patricii*). By the Late Empire the designation of *patricius* was awarded very sparingly to those closest to the emperor. The Emperor Valentinian refers to Segisvult in two laws published in March and June A.D. 440. One describes him as 'comes et magister utriusque militiae' and the other as 'vir illustrissimus magister militum'.[55] He is designated as *patricius* in neither, leading us inevitably to conclude that he was not a *patricius* before mid-440 at least. If Constantius' language here is precise, the refence to Segisvult thus places Germanus' death in Ravenna *after* mid-440. We can narrow this limit further, from evidence provided by the *Vita Hilarii*, written probably in about A.D. 500.[56] Hilary, when Archbishop of Arles, brought a case against a bishop, Chelidonius, on the two grounds that he had married a widow while yet a layman, and had, as a lay magistrate, pronounced sentences of capital punishment. The *Vita Hilarii* reveals that Hilary often sought the counsel of Germanus and on this occasion he collaborated closely with him. Various informers brought information to both of them about Chelidonius, and on the basis of their testimony Hilary and Germanus ordered an enquiry.[57] Chelidonius was convicted, but appealed the verdict in Rome. Hilary went to Rome also, where he received a severe reprimand from Pope Leo I, published in the Pope's *Epistle* 10. The Emperor Valentinian III upheld Leo in a *novel* on the case on 8 July 445. This suggests that Germanus was involved in the campaign against Chelidonius in A.D. 444/5 (he then drops out of the narrative). Hence the *terminus post quem* for the death of Germanus, located after A.D. 440 by Segisvult's patriciate, can be further advanced by the evidence of Hilary to some time after A.D. 444. Finally, there is a *terminus ante quem.* While in Ravenna, shortly before he died, Germanus met Galla Placidia, the emperor's mother. She herself died on 27 November 450.[58] All of this means that on the basis of Constantius' narrative Germanus' death can be placed with some confidence between A.D. 444 and 450.

The record of the priests of Auxerre registers Germanus as dying on 31 July. This precise

[53] The *Chronicle of 452* provides another precise date, but it is not a helpful one. It records under the year 433 that 'Germanus the bishop of Auxerre is famous for his virtues and his rigorous way of life' ('Germanus episcopus Altisiodori virtutibus et vitae districtione clarescit') (Mommsen 1892b, 660; Burgess 2001, 78). Why this entry should have been assigned to A.D. 433 we have no way of knowing.

[54] *CIL* 12.5494 = *ILS* 806. In A.D. 439 Eparchius Avitus held the prefecture; see Martindale 1980, 197–8, citing Sid. Apol., *Carm.* 7.295–8 with Hydat., *Chron.* 117. Thompson 1957, 135–6, relates the episode to the reduction of taxes throughout Gaul recorded by Salvian for A.D. 439; see Scharf 1991, 4–5.

[55] *Novella Valentiniani* VI (20 March 440), IX (24 June 440); see Thompson 1984, 60–1; Barnes 1975, 158–9 suggests that the *patricius ignotus* in the *novel* of Valentinian of 13 March 443 may also be Segisvult.

[56] *PL* 50.1219–46; see Kolon 1925, 59–60; modern text: Cavallin 1952, 98.

[57] *PL* 50.1236.

[58] Mommsen 1982b, 662; Burgess 2001, 81.

https://doi.org/10.3815/006811309789785981 Published online by Cambridge University Press

day might provide a clue to the year also, when it is coordinated with the possible dates of his elevation to the bishopric. The record also states that Germanus held his episcopate for thirty years, twenty-five days.[59] This means that he would have been consecrated on 7 July. The death of his predecessor, Amator, is recorded as falling on Wednesday, 1 May. The only possible years that can accommodate the dates both of Amator's death on a Wednesday and of Germanus' consecration (which would have been on a Sunday) are A.D. 407, 412 and 418. This would accordingly necessitate a death for Germanus in either A.D. 437, 442 or 448. Hence, in light of the evidence provided by Hilary and Segisvult, which rules out A.D. 437 and 442, Germanus' death was, until the 1980s, placed in A.D. 448. If we are to accept the broad chronology of Constantius' narrative, this means that the second mission to Britain must have taken place shortly before that death, perhaps in A.D. 447. This reconstruction is admittedly dependent on the highly dubious account of Amator's life by Stephen, who alone provides the information that death occurred on a Wednesday.[60] But, as will be seen, the year 448 does accord well with other evidence, and in any case the precise year of the death after A.D. 444 is not crucial for the basic thesis of this paper.

We can now refine the outline laid out earlier:

> The first British mission (*Vita* 12–18), A.D. 429
>
> The visit to Arles to reduce taxes (*Vita* 19–24), between A.D. 433 and 437
>
> The second British mission (*Vita* 25–27), the Armorican rebellion and Germanus' death in Ravenna (*Vita* 28–42), after A.D. 444, possibly 447–8

This simple scheme runs into three obstacles. The first is relatively minor. Constantius informs us that, more or less immediately on his return from his second mission to Britain, Germanus received a deputation from the Armoricans asking him to intercede on their behalf. They had rebelled against Aetius, the powerful and ambitious *magister militum* in Gaul, and were being punished by the exactions of Goar, King of the Alani, who was now an ally of the Romans with orders from Aetius to suppress the rebellion, and was casting his greedy eyes on the territory. Constantius, who has contempt for the rebels, does not explain why they should have turned to Germanus. But in any case he responded to the appeal. Goar agreed to end his campaign, on condition that Germanus secure 'venia ('a pardon', whatever is meant by that) ab imperatore vel ab Aetio', whereupon Germanus made a journey to Ravenna to confirm the arrangements (and died on the trip). The presence of Goar at this time is problematic. He is first mentioned by Gregory of Tours, when as part of a barbarian invasion he crossed the frozen Rhine during the first decade of the century.[61] He would have had to be very elderly indeed, if the events in Armorica described by Constantius occurred in A.D. 447/448. But presumably a campaign by a, say, twenty-year-old Goar in A.D. 406 or thereabouts and a sexagenarian Goar in the 440s is not an impossibility.[62]

Thus the presence of Goar is far from fatal to the standard chronological scheme. The second objection is more substantial. The *Chronicle of 452* records that Britain fell under Saxon authority (*in ditionem Saxonum*) in A.D. 441.[63] The entry may be based on imperfect knowledge, but, all

[59] *Gesta Episcoporum Autissiodorensium*, Item 7 (*PL* 138.224–8).

[60] Acta Sanctorum, Maii 1, col. 50 & 59: 'Amator, Vita, Auctore Stephano Africano Presbytero, Cap. 5: Kalendarum Maiarum quarta feria'. Mathisen 1981, 152 questions the reliability of evidence of this type.

[61] Greg., *Hist*. 2.9 (see note 6).

[62] Constantius does not strictly record the activities of a 'Goar'. In the MSS of the *Vita*, the name is given differently as Gochar or Gobar.

[63] Mommsen 1982b, 660; Burgess 2001, 79–80. The date A.D. 441 is considered safe; on the chronology of the *Chronicle of 452*, see Mommsen 1982b, 617–25; Muhlberger 1983; 1990, 148–51; Burgess 1990; 1994; 2001, 57–60; Jones and Casey 1988; 1991. Broadly speaking the chronology is highly suspect before A.D. 424, generally sound between A.D. 424 and 447, and reliable between A.D. 447 and 452.

https://doi.org/10.3815/006811309789785981 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the same, even allowing for considerable exaggeration, it is difficult to imagine that Germanus' second visit could have taken place after A.D. 441 under such general conditions.

The third objection seems all but fatal to Constantius' scheme. Immediately before the account of Germanus' death, Constantius informs us (*Vita* 40) that his efforts on behalf of the Armoricans would have succeeded had it not been for the *perfidia* of a Tibatto, who roused them into a repeat of their rebellion. Tibatto is recorded also in the *Chronicle of 452*, under year 435, as the leader of an independence movement instigated by the Bagaudae. The *Chronicle* says nothing of Tibatto in 436, but under year 437 records that he was captured and that the leaders were either executed or thrown in chains, and 'Bacaudarum commotio conquiescit'.[64] We have confirmation of this date from Sidonius Apollinaris, who reports that the rebellion was crushed by Litorius, who then went quickly to the Auvergne. A siege of Narbonne had begun in A.D. 436 and Litorius was able to raise it, an event dated by Hydatius to A.D. 437.[65] Thus the crushing of Tibatto's rebellion is placed securely in A.D. 437. But in our scheme Constantius seems to place it in A.D. 447/48, certainly in the 440s. This conundrum makes the date of Germanus' death, and consequently of the second British mission, the most controversial aspects of Germanus' career and of Constantius' text. All of our source information cannot be right. We have to assume an error somewhere.

There have been various efforts to solve the conundrum. It has been suggested that Tibatto lived on after the defeat of A.D. 437, escaped captivity and raised a second rebellion.[66] Another possibility would be that Constantius confused Tibatto with the leader of a later rebellion.[67] But the boldest attempts to square the circle have been those of Thompson and Wood, who independently moved the traditional dates of Germanus' second mission and death forward about a decade to bring them in line with Tibatto's rebellion as recorded in the *Chronicle*.[68] In so doing, they had to confront the difficulties posed by Segisvult and Hilary. Wood argued that the *Vita Hilarii* was a propagandist tract and that we should be very suspicious of any attempt by Hilary to justify his actions by adducing the complicity of Germanus. Thompson agrees, but in addition raises chronological issues.[69] While both Germanus and Hilary might well have collected evidence against Chelidonius, there is no clear indication how far ahead of Valentinian's *novel* of July, A.D. 445, their activities should be placed. The *Vita Hilarii* provides no dates. Leo denounced Hilary for more than the Chelidonius affair, and the *Vita* records that Hilary was taken to task also over his treatment of another bishop, Proiectus, and for the use of troops to establish priests in unoccupied churches (nothing more is known about these activities). It may have taken some time to amass the material, and Thompson points out that even after his return from Rome Hilary continued to communicate with the Pope in protracted negotiations through intermediaries. Thus the collaboration between Germanus and Hilary may have taken place many years before Valentinian's *novel*. We do know that Germanus enjoyed a warm visit with Hilary when he visited Arles following his first mission to Britain.[70] It might be argued that

64 Mommsen 1982b, 660; Burgess 2001, 78–9. These dates are considered safe (see previous note). The A.D. 437 entry actually records the capture of 'Batto', emended by Mommsen. Barnes 1974, 319 detects a possible reference to Tibatto in the panegyric of Merobaudes, and suggests that he might have been taken to Ravenna to be displayed in a triumph.

65 Sid. Apol., *Carm*. 7.246–50; Hydat., *Chron.* 107, 110. Hydatius attributes the raising of the siege to Aetius, not inaccurately, since Aetius had overall command in Gaul.

66 Most scholars seem to think that this solution is implausible; see, Levison 1904, 139; Thompson 1977, 311; Loyen 1972, 165–7.

67 Levison 1904, 138–9, 141.

68 Thompson 1984, 55–70; Wood 1984, 15–16.

69 Thompson 1984, 59–60; Wood 1984, 15. Langgärtner 1964, 67, n. 13 and Franses 1948, 36–7 argue that Germanus had in fact no role whatsoever in the case against Chelidonius.

70 *Vita Germani* 23.

https://doi.org/10.3815/006811309789785981 Published online by Cambridge University Press

their close collaboration dates to this time, thus to the mid-430s. This would allow Germanus' death (and his second mission) to be placed much earlier than A.D. 448, with death in one of the other two years allowed by the record of Auxerre, A.D. 442, or perhaps even 437.

Wood and Thompson argue also that Germanus could have made a mistake about Segisvult's supposed patrician status.[71] Constantius would probably not have known the precise details of Segisvult's career, and his reference to the patriciate could well be proleptic, or a mistake for the consulship. Only one other source attests the title, the *Gesta de Purgatione Xysti*, supposedly dating to about A.D. 445 but which scholars generally acknowledge to have been forged.[72] It is argued that it was the practice of Valentinian to grant patrician rank to no-one other than his senior commander, Aetius. Thompson adds the possibility that the title might have indicated a 'courtesy' rank, since sources would in fact commonly assign it to distinguished generals even when they did not hold the patriciate, as happened in the case of men like Stilicho.[73]

The Wood/Thompson thesis is ingenious, but it can barely survive Occam's razor. Since there were three charges against Hilary it would have done little good to fabricate a role for the respected Germanus when that could have helped with only *one* of the three charges.[74] Also, to assume a delay of eight years between the initiation of the case against Chelidonius and its resolution seems almost a counsel of despair, generating a protracted delay that could surely not have gone unmentioned. On balance, some year between A.D. 444 and 450 seems still to have the strongest claim to Germanus' death.

As observed earlier, there must be at least one mistake somewhere in Constantius' scheme, and the possibility that the error arose because of the suspect second mission should be seriously entertained. The key to the problem may lie in Prosper. His silence about the second visit speaks volumes. He had by A.D. 440 left Marseilles to assume his duties as *notarius* to Pope Leo. But he would still have had access to important information about events in Gaul. Certainly, after A.D. 440 he maintained an interest in the region. The chronicle contains two direct references to Gaul, in A.D. 452 (Entry 1367) and 453 (Entry 1371), and two indirect references via Aetius, in A.D. 454 (Entry 1373) and 455 (Entry 1375).[75] In any case, Prosper had almost certainly never had any serious interest in British affairs *per se* even in A.D. 429; his interest was in the danger of Pelagianism, and it is very unlikely that if there had been a second successful mission he would have passed over the opportunity to show the victory of the orthodox over the heretics.[76] *Argumenta ex silentio* can never be definitive, since the possibility of extenuating factors outside our range of knowledge must always be acknowledged, but it does seem remarkable that Prosper could have recorded an initial and ultimately unsuccessful mission, and have passed over a second and definitive one. Thompson's blithe explanation that 'he did not think the second visit worth mentioning or did not know that it had happened' carries no conviction.[77]

We might, however, go further. In reality, not only does Prosper not refer to a second mission, he all but precludes it. In A.D. 431, Prosper went to Rome to enlist the aid of Celestine in his campaign against the Pelagian sympathizers. On his return to Gaul, he alluded to Celestine's vigorous activities against the heresy in the *In Collatorem*, mentioned above. He gives full credit to the Pope for his achievement in the British isles, and notes:

71 Thompson 1984, 60–1; Wood 1984, 15–16.

72 Martindale 1980, 101 accepts the general view that it is a forgery of the time of Pope Symmachus but nevertheless contains genuine historical material; Scharf 1991, 10 claims that it contains 'echte Informationen'; Barnes 1975, 163 discounts it totally.

73 Thompson 1984, 60–1; Wood 1984, 38; Demandt 1970, 661–2.

74 See, in particular, the reservations expressed by Mathisen 1989, 149, n. 39 and Stancliffe 1986, 606–7.

75 Mommsen 1892a, 481–3.

76 See Muhlberger 1990, 85.

77 Thompson 1984, 3.

https://doi.org/10.3815/006811309789785981 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> Nec vero segniore cura ab hoc eodem morbo Britannias liberavit, quando quosdam inimicos gratiae solum suae originis occupantes, etiam ab illo secreto exclusit Oceani, et ordinato Scotis episcopo dum Romanam insulam studet servare catholicam fecit etiam barbaram Christianam.
>
> With as much vigour he [Pope Celestine] delivered the British isles of the same disease, in that he drove from that retreat of the Ocean certain individuals, enemies of Grace, who had taken possession of the land of their beginnings, and by ordaining a bishop for the Irish, while striving to keep the Roman island Catholic he also made the uncivilized island Christian. (*In Collatorem* 21.1)

It should be noted that this passage refers to events that are specifically assigned by Constantius to the end of Germanus' *second* mission. Constantius relates that, on the first visit, the Pelagians were refuted by argument and by example, but that when Germanus supposedly returned he took more concrete and sterner measures; this time the heretics were condemned and exiled:

> Inquirunt auctores inventosque condemnant … omniumque sententia pravitates auctores, expulsi insula, sacerdotibus addicuntur ad mediterranea deferendi ut et regio absolutione et illi emendatione fruerentur. Quod in tantum salubriter factum est ut in illis locis etiam nunc fides intemerata perduret.
>
> They sought out the perpetrators and when they had found them they condemned them … and by common agreement the agents of the depravity were driven from the island and handed over to the priests to be taken off to the Mediterranean area, so that the region could benefit from its deliverance and they could benefit from repentance. This was done with such healthy results that even now in those regions the faith persists unharmed. (*Vita* 26–27)

Prosper *de facto* rules out this second mission, since the concluding action of banishment that Constantius assigns to it is explicitly assigned by Prosper to the 'first'.[78] The relevant passage of the *In Collatorem* can be dated with some confidence to about A.D. 433, only four years after the 'first' mission of Germanus, since in that work Prosper refers to a lapse of over twenty years since the beginning of the Pelagian heresy, which he dates to A.D. 413 in his chronicle.[79] But in any case we know that Prosper securely dated the banishment of the heretics from Britain to some time *before* 6 April 432 at the very latest, since Celestine died on that day, leaving no time for Germanus to return and be involved in events in Gaul during Auxiliaris' prefecture and for the heresy to take hold once again and for preparations to be made for a second mission. Nor did Prosper later make any addition to his chronicle to accommodate the second putative mission.

We can thus conclude with confidence, by correlating his two references to British Pelagianism, that Prosper is not only silent about a putative second mission but categorically indicates that the mission undertaken in A.D. 429 was the *only one*, leading as it did to the solution of the Pelagian heresy through the exile of the heretics.

This conclusion does leave us with the complication that Constantius must be in error when he states that there were two missions. He would hardly have had any incentive to fabricate the second, since the need for it, if anything, implies that Germanus was ineffective in dealing with the problem in A.D. 429. Hence he must simply be mistaken. We should perhaps not be too surprised. It has been shown that elements of even the 'first', well documented, mission, are

[78] Thompson 1984, 69–70 notes this but does not pursue the implications, suggesting that banishment might have followed the first mission as well as the second. He does not explain why it was not mentioned by Constantius and introduced as a novelty of the second mission.

[79] Mommsen 1892a, 467, Item 1252.

https://doi.org/10.3815/006811309789785981 Published online by Cambridge University Press

glaringly unhistorical. Clearly, Constantius' sources for Britain were scarce and confused. Any explanation for his error that goes beyond this can only be speculative. The answer may lie in a curious aspect of the two missions as reported. In the first, Germanus is accompanied by Lupus, not mentioned by Prosper. The two men seem to present a formidable team. But in the second supposed mission, despite his invaluable earlier contribution, the estimable Lupus is assigned no role whatsoever, for which no explanation is offered, and Germanus is instead assisted by the shadowy Severus. Now Bede perhaps gives us a clue, when he states that Severus was a *discipulus* of Lupus. It is possible that Severus replaced his master at some point during the A.D. 429 mission. The decision to exile the heretics would have had to be confirmed by authorities in Gaul in the absence of proper civil administration in Britain. In A.D. 425 Valentinian III had granted the Gallic church power to try Pelagian bishops, laying down that the synod of Arles would have the authority to expel from Gaul those who did not recant the heresy within twenty days of being charged.[80] It is unlikely that any such power resided with the church authorities in Britain. This would have provided a context for a senior figure like Lupus to absent himself to secure that authority. It could also be that they needed to secure the approval of Aetius, whom Constantius describes as *vir magnificus*.[81] Lupus may have gone to Gaul and not have returned, but have chosen to send Severus to Britain in his stead. It could also well be that Constantius' sources, whether written or oral, reflect institutional rivalry, and that major roles were given both to Lupus and to Severus to boost the contribution of Troyes.[82]

Since both Lupus and Severus seemingly played a role in countering the heresy in Britain, both as subordinates to Germanus, Constantius could well have been misled by the presence of Severus to assume a second, separate, mission. It might seem a major blunder, but we should keep in mind Constantius' own concerns when he acknowledges the difficulties of reconstructing events after so much time has passed: 'ut obscurata per silentium vix colligatur agnitio' ('so that knowledge, clouded by silence, can be retrieved only with difficulty').[83] The striking use of *silentium* here suggests that Constantius did not have information about the mission(s) directly from Lupus, if indeed Lupus was alive when the *Vita* was written. Frustratingly, at no point in the *Vita* does Constantius reveal the material that he drew on.[84]

In any attempt to understand why Constantius could have made a mistake, it is important to recognize that whatever was the source of his belief that there had been a second mission, its evidence must have been flimsy. Had he had any detailed archival source for that mission or that source, it would surely have made its way into the bald narrative. Moreover, while it may make us uncomfortable to contemplate Constantius retailing a fictitious second mission, the reality is that *some* element in his account of the latter part of Germanus' life must be in error. And if there was indeed a second mission, it means that Prosper also must be in error. The removal of the second mission, while at first sight radical, in reality involves the fewest problematic implications. If the activities of Goar and Tibatto took place shortly after the completion of Germanus' work in Britain, then they could be assigned without difficulty to the 430s, and the modest problem presented by Goar and the serious problems presented by the *Chronicle of 452* and by Tibatto would disappear. It is to be noted that this 'second' supposed episode of Tibatto shares something in common with the account of the second British mission, in that it is sparse and colourless, with no dramatic detail or elaboration. If we assume that Germanus' second mission is a doublet of the

80 Mommsen and Meyer 1905, Sirm. 6.

81 *Vita* 28; on Aetius' policy in Gaul, see Moss 1973. Casey and Jones 1990 argue that the famous appeal by the Britons to Aetius recorded by Gildas, *De Excidio* 20, could date to as early as A.D. 429.

82 See Chadwick 1955, 257; also Miele 1996.

83 Constantius, *Praefatio* (Levison 1920, 250).

84 Christensen 1988, 224.

https://doi.org/10.3815/006811309789785981 Published online by Cambridge University Press

first, we could then see the 'second' rebellion of Tibatto in the same light, that Constantius may similarly have allowed himself to split Tibatto's career into two sections, and the later Tibatto episode would similarly be a doublet of the first. There is in fact a later Bacaudic rebellion, unconnected with Tibatto, the rebellion of Eudoxius, recorded in the *Chronicle of 452* for A.D. 448, the traditional year of Germanus' death.[85] It seems very likely that Constantius has merged the details of two different uprisings, and has replicated Tibatto's activities in his account of that later one. And just as the first rebellion was preceded by Germanus' visit to Britain (in A.D. 429), it seems that Constantius has placed a second, supposititious, mission to Britain before the A.D. 448 rebellion. The activities of Goar have, in most likelihood, been similarly transferred from the first rebellion to the second. In any case, Aetius' position in Gaul was so powerful in the 440s that it is implausible that Germanus would have had to make the journey to Ravenna to confirm with the Emperor the supposed arrangements with Goar. The true reasons for the final trip to Ravenna are not now known to us.

The chronological scheme might therefore be emended as following:

> The British mission, A.D. 429
>
> The visit to Arles to reduce taxes, Germanus' involvement as a mediator for the Armoricans (compromised by Tibatto's rebellion), between A.D. 433 and 437
>
> Germanus' involvement with Hilary against Chelidonius, A.D. 444
>
> Germanus' visit to Ravenna for reasons unknown, a second Armorican rebellion unconnected to Germanus, Germanus' death in Ravenna, probably A.D. 447–8

It is clear that the *Vita Germani* is plagued by a number of internal inconsistencies. But there is no need to reject its historicity out of hand. Where a control is provided, in the form of Prosper's *Chronicle*, we see that Constantius' narrative was well founded, if in places shaky in its details. In trying to determine which details of any ancient text should stand and which are spurious, we must clearly resist the temptation merely to select those parts that best suit our thesis and to reject those that do not. One acceptable principle is to determine which of the inconsistencies does most violence to the coherence of the narrative as a whole. As I hope to have shown, the very notion of a second mission is the most troubling feature of the British chapters of the *Vita* and is almost certainly an historical fiction. It is not easy to explain why Constantius might have erred so egregiously. Perhaps we can do no more than acknowledge the jocular but well-founded request made by Constantius himself and see it as little more than conventional self-effacement. He reveals that he is fully aware that the *Vita* will not stand up to careful inspection, and he disarmingly asks his patron, Censurius, Bishop of Auxerre, to pray that readers will not scrutinize it too closely![86]

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am grateful to Dr Rosalind Love of Robinson College, Cambridge, for the helpful discussions of the issues raised in this article and for reading through an earlier version of it. I benefited greatly from her sound guidance and valuable insights.

Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge; Universität Heidelberg; University of British Columbia, Vancouver
aab@interchange.ubc.ca

[85] Mommsen 1892b, 662; Burgess 2001, 80.
[86] Levison 1920, 249: 'quatenus et legentum examen evadam'.

https://doi.org/10.3815/006811309789785981 Published online by Cambridge University Press

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barnes, T.D. 1975: 'Patricii under Valentinian III', *Phoenix* 29, 155–70
Barnes, T.D. 1974: 'Merobaudes on the imperial family', *Phoenix* 28, 314–19
Bonner, G. 1972: *Augustine and Modern Research on Pelagianism*, Villanova, PA
Borius, R. 1965: *Constance de Lyon. Vie de Saint Germain d'Auxerre*, Paris
Brakke, D. 1995: *Athanasius and the Politics of Asceticism*, Oxford
Burgess, R.W. 1990: 'The Dark Ages return to fifth-century Britain: the "restored" Gallic Chronicle exploded', *Britannia* 21, 185–96
Burgess, R.W. 1994: 'The Gallic Chronicle exploded', *Britannia* 25, 240–3
Burgess, R.W. 2001: 'The Gallic Chronicle of 452', in R.W. Mathisen and D. Shanzer (eds), *Society and Culture in Late Antique Gaul. Revisiting the Sources*, Aldershot, 52–100
Cameron, A. 1968: 'Celestial consulates: a note on the Pelagian letter *Humanae Referunt*', *JThS* 19, 213–15
Casey, P.J., and Jones, M.G. 1990: 'The date of the letter of the Britons to Aetius', *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* 37, 281–90
Caspari, C.P. 1890: *Briefe, Abhandlungen und Predigten aus den zwei letztsten Jahrhunderten des kirchlichen Altertums und den Anfang des Mittelalters*, Christiana
Cavallin, S. 1952: *Vitae Sanctorum Honorati et Hilarii*, Lund
Chadwick, N. 1955: *Poetry and Letters in Early Christian Gaul*, London
Charles-Edwards, T.M. 2000: *Early Christian Ireland*, Cambridge
Christensen, A.S. 1988: 'The *Vita* of Saint Germanus of Auxerre and fifth-century history', in E. Christiansen, A. Damsgard-Madsen and E. Hallager (eds), *Studies in Ancient History and Numismatics Presented to Rudi Thomsen*, Aarhus, 224–31
Clark, G. 1999: 'Victricius of Rouen: *Praising the Saints*', *JECS* 7, 365–99
Demandt, A. 1970: 'Magister Militum', *RE* Suppl. 12, 553–790
Demandt, A. 1989: *Die Spätantike*, Munich
Demougeot, E. 1979: *La formation de l'Europe et les invasions barbares. De l'avènement de Dioclétien*, Paris
de Plinval, G. 1943: *Pélage: ses écrits, sa vie et sa réforme. Étude d'histoire littéraire et religieuse*, Lausanne
de Plinval, G. 1950: 'Les campagnes de saint Germain en Grande-Bretagne contre les Pélagiens', in G. Lebras and E. Gilson (eds), *Saint Germain d'Auxerre et son temps: communications présentées à l'occasion du XIXe Congrès de l'Association bourguignonne des sociétés savants réunis à Auxerre 29 juillet–2 août 1948*, Auxerre, 135–49
Drinkwater, J.F. 1998: 'The usurpers Constantine III and Jovinus', *Britannia* 29, 269–97
Duchesne, L. 1910: *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule*, Vol. II, Paris
Evans, R.F. 1962: 'Pelagius, Fastidius, and the pseudo-Augustinian *De Vita Christiana*', *JThS* 13, 72–98
Evans, R.F. 1968a: *Four Letters of Pelagius*, London
Evans, R.F. 1968b: *Pelagius. Inquiries and Reappraisals*, London
Ferguson, J. 1956: *Pelagius*, Cambridge
Franses, D. 1948: *Paus Leo de Groote en S. Hilarius van Arles*, 's Hertogenbosch
Gregg, R.C. 1980: *The Life of Antony*, London
Grosjean, P. 1945: 'S. Patrice et S. Victrice', *AB* 63, 94–9
Grosjean, P. 1952: 'Palladius episcopus … qui Patricius', *AB* 70, 317–19
Grosjean, P. 1957: 'Notes d'hagiographie celtique, 27–36', *AB* 75, 158–85
Griffe, É. 1947, *La Gaule chrétienne à l'époque romain* (2 vols), Paris
Hanson, R.P.C. 1968: *Saint Patrick: his Origins and Career*, Oxford
Helm, R. 1957: 'Prosper', *RE* 23A, 881–97
Herren, M.W., and Brown, S.A. 2002: *Christ in Celtic Christianity. Britain and Ireland from the Fifth to the Tenth Century*, Studies in Celtic History 20, Woodbridge
Hoare, F.R. 1954: *The Western Fathers*, London
Jones, M.G., and Casey, P.J. 1988: 'The Gallic Chronicle restored: a chronology for the Anglo-Saxon invasions and the end of Roman Britain', *Britannia* 19, 367–98
Jones, M.G., and Casey, P.J. 1991: 'The Gallic Chronicle exploded', *Britannia* 22, 212–15
Kohler, C. 1881: *Étude critique sur le texte de la vie latine de Sainte-Geneviève*, Paris

https://doi.org/10.3815/006811309789785981 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Kolon, B. 1925: *De Vita S. Hilarii Arelatensis. Eine eidographische Studie*, Paderborn
Kulikowski, M. 2000: 'Barbarians in Gaul, usurpers in Britain', *Britannia* 31, 325–45
Langgärtner, G. 1964: *Die Gallienpolitik der Päpste im 5. und 6. Jahrhundert. Eine Studie über den apostolischen Vikariat von Arles*, Bonn
Lanzoni, F. 1923: *Le origini delle diocesi antiche d'Italia: studio critico*, Studi e Testi 35, Rome
Levison, W. 1899: 'Zur Florians- und Lupus-Legende', *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde zur Beförderung einer Gesammtausgabe der Quellenschriften deutscher Geschichten des Mittelalters* 24, 533–70
Levison, W. 1904: 'Bischof Germanus von Auxerre und die Quellen zu seiner Geschichte', *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde zur Beförderung einer Gesammtausgabe der Quellenschriften deutscher Geschichten des Mittelalters* 29, 95–175
Levison, W. 1920: '*Vita Germani Episcopi Autissiodorensis auctore Constantio*' in *Passiones Vitaeque Sanctorum Aevi Merovingici* in B. Krusch and W. Levison (eds), Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum VII, Hanover, 225–83
Liebeschuetz, W. 1963: 'Did the Pelagian movement have social aims?' *Historia* 12, 227–41
Liebeschuetz, W. 1967: 'Pelagian evidence on the last period of Roman Britain', *Latomus* 26, 436–47
Loyen, A. 1972: 'L'œuvre de Flavius Merobaudes et l'histoire de l'Occident de 430 à 450', *REA* 74, 153–74
Márkus, G. 2005: 'Pelagianism and the "Common Celtic Church"', *Innes Review* 56, 165–213
Markus, R.A. 1986: 'Pelagianism: Britain and the Continent', *JEH* 37, 191–204
Martindale, J.R. 1980: *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, Vol. II, Cambridge
Mathisen, R.W. 1979: 'Hilarius, Germanus and Lupus: the aristocratic background of the Chelidonius affair', *Phoenix* 33, 160–9
Mathisen, R.W. 1981: 'The last year of Saint Germanus of Auxerre', *AB* 99, 151–9
Mathisen, R.W. 1989: *Ecclesiastical Factionalism and Religious Controversy in Fifth-Century Gaul*, Washington
Matthews, J.F. 1975: *Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court A.D. 364–425*, Oxford
Miele, M. 1996: 'La Vita Germani di Costanzo di Lione: Realtà storica e prospettive storiografiche nella Gallia del quinto secolo', *Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Memorie* 9:8, 141–245
Morris, J.R. 1965: Pelagian literature', *JThS* 16, 26–60
Morris, J.R. 1968: 'The literary evidence', in M.W. Barley and R.P.C. Hanson (eds), *Christianity in Britain*, Leicester, 53–73
Mommsen, T. 1892a: *Prosperi Tironis Epitoma Chronicon in Chronica minora saec. IV, V, VI, VII*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Auctores antiquissimi, Vol. I, Berlin, 341–499
Mommsen, T. 1892b: *Chronica Gallica, in Chronica minora saec. IV, V, VI, VII*. Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Auctores antiquissimi, Vol. I, Berlin, 615–66
Mommsen, T., and Meyer, P.M. (eds) 1905: *Theodosiani libri XVI cum constitutionibus et leges novellae ad Theodosianum pertinentes* (2 vols), Berlin
Morris, J.R. 1965: 'Pelagian literature', *JThS* 16, 26–60
Morris, J.R. 1968: 'The literary evidence', in M.W. Barley and R.P.C. Hanson (eds), *Christianity in Britain*, Leicester, 53–73
Moss, J.R. 1973: 'The effects of the policies of Aetius on the history of Western Europe', *Historia* 22, 711–31
Muhlberger, S. 1983: 'The Gallic Chronicle of 452 and its authority for British events', *Britannia* 14, 23–33
Muhlberger, S. 1990: *The Fifth-Century Chroniclers: Prosper, Hydatius and the Gallic Chronicler of 452*, Liverpool
Myres, J.N.L. 1960: 'Pelagius and the end of Roman rule in Britain', *JRS* 50, 21–36
Paschoud, F. 1989: *Zosime. Histoire Nouvelle, Livre VI. Edition Budé*, Vol. III.2, Paris
Rees, R. 1988: *Pelagius. A Reluctant Heretic*, Woodbridge
Rees, R. (ed.) 1991: *The Letters of Pelagius and his Followers*, Woodbridge
Scharf, R. 1991: 'Germanus von Auxerre: Chronologie seiner Vita', *Francia* 18, 1–19
Stancliffe, C.E. 1986: review of Thompson 1984, in *JThS* 37, 603–10
Stein, E. 1928: *Geschichte des spätrömischen Reiches I. Vom römischen zum byzantinischen Staate (284–476 n.Chr.),* Vienna

https://doi.org/10.3815/006811309789785981 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Stevens, C.E. 1933: *Sidonius Apollinaris and his Age*, Oxford
Stevens, C.E. 1941 'Gildas Sapiens', *English Historical Review* 56, 353–73
Thomas, C. 1981: *Christianity in Roman Britain to AD 500*, London
Thompson, E.A. 1956: 'Zosimus on the end of Roman Britain', *Antiquity* 30, 163–7
Thompson, E.A. 1957: 'A chronological note on St. Germanus of Auxerre', *AB* 75, 135–8
Thompson, E.A. 1977: 'Britain, A.D. 406–410', *Britannia* 8, 303–18
Thompson, E.A. 1984: *Saint Germanus of Auxerre and the End of Roman Britain*, Studies in Celtic History 6, Woodbridge
Wermelinger, O. 1975: *Röm und Pelagius: die theologische Position der römischen Bischöfe im pelagianischen Streit in den Jahren 411–432*, Stuttgart
Williams, H. 1912: *Christianity in Early Britain*, Oxford
Wood, I. 1984: 'The end of Roman Britain: continental evidence and parallels', in M. Lapidge and D. Dumville (eds), *Gildas*: *New Approaches*, Studies in Celtic History 5, Woodbridge, 1–25
Wood, I. 1987: 'The fall of the Western Empire and the end of Roman Britain', *Britannia* 18, 251–61
Zecchini, G. 1981: 'La politica religiosa di Aezio', in M. Sordi (ed.), *Religione e politica nel mondo antico*, Milan, 250–77
Zecchini, G. 1983: *Aezio, l'ultima difesa dell'occidente romano*, Rome

https://doi.org/10.3815/006811309789785981 Published online by Cambridge University Press