

**Borrower:** TXM  
**(TXM-TN: 138521)**  
**Lending String:** \*TJC,XII,VYF,TXH,IBS  
**Trans.Date:** 5/30/2007 11:41:48 AM

**Patron:** Clark, Victor

**Journal Title:** Hermes.

**Volume:** 84 **Issue:**

**Month/Year:** 1956

**Pages:** 372-381

**Article:** Thompson, E.A.; Constantine,  
 Constantius II and the lower Danube frontier;

**Imprint:** Stuttgart [etc.] F. Steiner [etc.]

**ILL Number:** 31089641



**Call #:** PA3 .H5

**Location:** CENTRAL 6TH-FLOOR

*Scanned  
 MW 6/4*

**ODYSSEY:** 161.45.205.112

**Ariel**

**Maxcost:** Free

**Billing Category:** Exempt

**Charge:**

**Shipping Address:**

**Middle Tenn. St. Univ. Lib**

**ILL**

**Box 13/1500 Greenland Drive**

**Murfreesboro, TN 37132**

**\*\*VIA ATHENA COURIER\*\***

**Fax:** (615) 898-5551

**Odyssey**

**ARIEL:** 161.45.205.82 OK

**Notes**

TXM --- ATHENA

TJC-TN: 281486



Needed: 6/4

## INHALT DES 84. BANDES

|                                                                                                                          |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| ADELMO BARIGAZZI, Mimmermo e Filita, Antimaco e Cherilo nel proemio degli Aitia di Callimaco .....                       | 162 |
| KARL BÜCHNER, Prälieden zu einer Lukrezausgabe .....                                                                     | 198 |
| HEINRICH DÖRRIE, Aristophanes' Frösche (1433—1467) .....                                                                 | 296 |
| HARTMUT ERBSE, Die Bedeutung der Synkrisis in den Parallelbiographien Plutarchs .....                                    | 398 |
| HARTMUT ERBSE, Über die Midiana des Demosthenes .....                                                                    | 135 |
| HELLMUT FLASCHER, Die medizinischen Grundlagen der Lehre von der Wirkung der Dichtung in der griechischen Poetik .....   | 12  |
| GIUSEPPE GIANGRANDE, Herodianismen bei Eunapios: ein Beitrag zur Beleuchtung der imitatio in der späteren Gräzität ..... | 320 |
| CHRISTIAN HABICHT, Über die Kriege zwischen Pergamon und Bithynien .....                                                 | 90  |
| UVO HÖLSCHER, Grammatisches zu Parmenides .....                                                                          | 385 |
| WALTER JENS, Libertas bei Tacitus .....                                                                                  | 331 |
| HANS ULRICH INSTINSKY, Herodot und der erste Zug des Mardonios gegen Griechenland .....                                  | 477 |
| DIETER KAUFMANN-BÜHLER, Hesiod und die Tisis in der Odyssee .....                                                        | 267 |
| RUDOLF KEYDELL, Zu den Hymnen des Synesios .....                                                                         | 151 |
| GODO LIEBERG, Der Begriff 'structura' in der lateinischen Literatur .....                                                | 455 |
| HANS JOACHIM METTE, Die 'Antigone' des Sophokles .....                                                                   | 129 |
| VICTOR PÖSCHL, Die Curastrophe in der Otiomode des Horaz .....                                                           | 74  |
| MAX POHLENZ, Furcht und Mitleid? .....                                                                                   | 49  |
| WILL RICHTER, Kritisches und Exegetisches zu Senecas Prosaschriften .....                                                | 182 |
| RAPHAEL SEALEY, The entry of Pericles into history .....                                                                 | 234 |
| BRUNO SNELL, Aeschylus' Isthmiastai .....                                                                                | 1   |
| RONALD SYME, Seianus on the Aventine .....                                                                               | 257 |
| PAUL THIELSCHER, Ist 'M. Manili astronomicon libri V' richtig? .....                                                     | 353 |
| E. A. THOMPSON, Constantine, Constantius II, and the lower Danube frontier .....                                         | 372 |
| H. D. WESTLAKE, Sophocles and Nicias as colleagues .....                                                                 | 110 |
| GORDON WILLIAMS, Some problems in the construction of Plautus' Pseudolus .....                                           | 424 |

## MISZELLEN

|                                                                            |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| W. S. BARRETT, Dactylo-epitrites in Bacchylides .....                      | 248 |
| J. B. BAUER, Boethius, Consolatio I, m. 3.3 f. ....                        | 253 |
| WALTER BRÖCKER, Heraklit zitiert Anaximander .....                         | 382 |
| A. Y. CAMPBELL, Aeschylea .....                                            | 117 |
| WERNER EISENHUT, Die Einleitungsverse der Elegie IV 6 des Propertius ..... | 121 |
| WILLY MOREL, Zum Culex .....                                               | 500 |
| A. E. RAUBITSCHKE, Die Verstoßung des Themistokles .....                   | 500 |
| OTTO SCHÖNBERGER, Zum Klagelied der Andromache .....                       | 254 |
| L. P. WILKINSON, The earliest odes of Horace .....                         | 495 |
| Register .....                                                             | 501 |

NOTICE: This Material May  
Be Protected By Copyright  
Law (Title 17 U.S. Code.)

Gedruckt mit Unterstützung der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft  
Printed in Germany



Theoderichs des Großen 489—526 n. Chr., noch hatte Gerbert = Papst Sylvester II. 999—1003 den Namen M. Manilius Boethius erfunden.

Wohl aber lobt Firmicus Maternus die *apotelesmata* eines sonst unbekannten Verfassers, den er einmal Navigius und ein anderes Mal Fronto nennt. Ich habe daher schon früher vorgeschlagen, zu fragen, ob unser [Ovid], [Manilius], [Aratus] nicht vielleicht ursprünglich <Navigius... Fronto> geheißen haben könnte. Den Namen Navigius hatte W. KROLL ursprünglich beanstandet, nachher aber als richtig vom *navigium* der Isis abgeleitet gelten lassen. Ich schließe mich KROLL an; denn ich finde es begreiflich, wenn der Sohn eines Isis-Anbeters, vom Vater her erblich belastet, ein Astrologe wird.

Daß das astrologische Gedicht sowohl in Bobbio wie vielleicht auch in Reichenau namenlos war, ist die Voraussetzung für Gerberts Irrtum. Der Verlust von Namen und Titel aber erklärt sich aus dem Geiste der untergehenden Antike, den wir an Firmicus Maternus beobachten können: erst Heide, dann Christ. Man wünschte das antike Schrifttum auszuwetten, und z. B. mit der Schrift des Porphyrios wider die Christen in fünfzehn Büchern ist es weitgehend gelungen. Über die Ausgrabung der kapitolinischen Venus heißt es in HELBIGS Führer I<sup>3</sup> 1912, 447, daß sie »wie ein Schatz eingemauert gefunden worden sei«. Entsprechend scheint man den heidnischen Namen Navigius samt dem ganzen Titel aus Vorsicht getilgt zu haben — waren »Ovids Metamorphosen« eine Tarnung? —, um den Schatz zu hüten, wenn es vielleicht auch keiner war.

Ich fasse zusammen: Richtig an dem oben in der Überschrift angezeigten Titel ist nur *libri*. Es waren deren ursprünglich 8, und Gerbert hielt sie noch in Händen. Und Verfassername und Titel lauteten vielleicht ursprünglich:

NAVIGII...FRONTONIS APOTELESMATICON LIBRI VIII

wobei ich mich auf Firmicus und Klaudios Ptolemaios stütze.

Berlin

PAUL THIELSCHER

# CONSTANTINE, CONSTANTINUS II, AND THE LOWER DANUBE FRONTIER

The evidence relating to Constantine's activities on the lower Danube frontier in the years 328—32 suggests three conclusions: (a) In 328 he built a stone bridge across the Danube between Sucidava (Celei in Rumania) and Oescus (near the village of Gigen in Bulgaria<sup>1</sup>). It is important to notice that

<sup>1</sup> Chron. Pasch. in MOMMSEN, Chron. Min. I, 233 s. a. 328, Aur. Victor, Caes. 41, 18 *pons per Danubium ductus*; *castra castellaque pluribus locis commode posita*, [idem]

anyone crossing the Danube from the Roman Empire by the stone bridge would find himself in the extreme south-eastern corner of Oltenia, which was occupied in the fourth century by the somewhat mysterious people known as the Taifali<sup>1</sup>.

(b) A milestone was discovered some years ago which marked the distance of one Roman mile on a road to the north of the bridge. It dates from the period 324—33 and shows that a road was built by Constantine in or after 328 from the bridge at Sucidava northwards presumably to Romula (Reşca on the Olt), and hence that Oltenia, or at any rate some territory on the lower Olt, was occupied by Constantine<sup>2</sup>. The occupation is said to be confirmed by archaeological evidence, and indeed it is referred to by several ancient authors<sup>3</sup>. (c) In 332 the Sarmatians in the Banat were attacked by the Visigoths and appealed to Constantine for help. Constantine's armies led by his son Constantine II intervened on their behalf and inflicted a very severe defeat on the Goths<sup>4</sup>.

It would seem, then, that in or before 328 Constantine decided to re-occupy part of Transdanubian Dacia which Aurelian had evacuated: the stone bridge was not designed and built for the use of traders, sightseers, and Gothic mercenaries. As for the date of the re-conquest, we might adopt either of two alternatives. (a) Although we do not hear of any military operations in connexion

Epit. 41, 14, Theophanes 28. 19 ff. (= Cedrenus, I, 517. 23 f., ed. Bonn). See also C. SCHUCHHARDT, Arch.-epigr. Mitt. 9, 1885, 229 f., A. ALFÖLDI, Zeitschr. f. Numismatik, 36, 1926, 161—74. (But S. KANITZ, Donaubulgarien u. der Balkan 2<sup>2</sup> [1882] 161 f., is not accessible to me). The castra castellaque mentioned by Aur. Victor are not said to have been on the Danube, and so I do not revert to them. Two inscriptions, IG. 4.1608; 7.96, relating to the fortification of Greek cities are associated with Constantine's activities in 328 by A. VON PRÄMERSTEIN, Zeitschr. f. deutsches Altertum, 60, 1923, 73—6, L. SCHMIDT, Gesch. d. deutschen Stämme: die Ostgermanen (Munich 1934) 227, O. FRIEBIGER, Inschriftensammlung, Neue Folge, no. 30, A. PICANIOL, L'empire chrétien (Paris 1947) 45. But they are dated to the time of Julian by C. PATSCH, 'Beiträge zur Völkerkunde von Südosteuropa, III', Sitzungsab. d. Akad. d. Wiss. in Wien: ph.-hist. Klasse, Bd. 208, Abh. 2 (1928), 39 n. 3 (which I cite hereafter as PATSCH, 'Beiträge'). M. FLUSS, RE 15, 2383, and to the years 379—82 by E. GROAG, Die Reichsbeamten von Achaia in spätrömischer Zeit (Budapest 1946) 54 f., H. VETTERS, Dacia Ripensis (Vienna 1950) 34 n. 315.

<sup>1</sup> C. PATSCH, 'Banater Sarmaten', Anzeiger d. Akad. d. Wiss. in Wien: ph.-hist. Klasse 62, 1925, 189 f., M. FLUSS, RE 4 A 2027. Germanic remains have been found in Oltenia, but I have not access to D. BERCU, Archeol. preistorică a Olteniei (Craiova 1939).

<sup>2</sup> D. TUDOR, 'Ein konstantinischer Meilenstein in Dazien', Serta Hofmilleriana (Zagreb 1940) 241—7, who supposes, *ibid.* 246, that Constantine occupied most of the Wallachian plain. Tudor has also set out his views in 'Constantin cel Mare şi Recucerirea Daciei Traiane', Rivista Istorică Română 11/12, 1941/2, 134—48, with references to further Rumanian literature.

<sup>3</sup> Eusebius, VC. I, 8, Julian Caes. 329 C, Theophanes and Cedrenus locc. cit. For the archaeology see the works of TUDOR already cited.

<sup>4</sup> Chron. Min. I, 234 s. a. 332, Anon. Vales. 31, Eusebius VC. 4, 5, Julian Or. I, 9 D, Eutropius 10, 7, Jerome Chron. s. a. 332, Orosius 7, 28, 29, Sozomen I, 8, 8 f., cf. DESSAU, 125 n. 820 with Add. III p. CLXXII. For numismatical evidence see O. SEECK, Zeitschr. f. Numismatik 21, 1898, 35—38.

with the building of the bridge, it may be that the Emperor overran the Taifali in Oltenia and built his road, or part of it, northwards from Sucidava in the same year 328, before leaving for the West in the autumn. (He appears to have been in Trier at the end of the year<sup>1</sup>). Accordingly, when the Visigoths attacked the Sarmatians in 332, the Romans were able to take them in the rear and destroy them in the Banat itself. (b) It would be possible, however, to argue that the building of the bridge in 328 was not immediately followed by the reduction of Oltenia. Constantine, we might think, was called away to the West before his work was finished. Now it was an event of great rarity in Roman Imperial history for the government to intervene in force in a war between barbarian and barbarian beyond the northern frontier. Indeed, it is difficult to think of any cases where they did so *except* when they had already decided to push the frontier forward and were merely looking for an excuse to do so<sup>2</sup>. We might suppose, then, that Constantine had not yet occupied Oltenia when the Sarmatians appealed to him for help in 332 and that he came to their assistance because he was looking for a pretext for pushing his frontier forward. The appeal gave him an excuse for seizing Oltenia.

But this second hypothesis is perhaps the less likely. Constantine crossed the Danube several times in the period when the bridge was being built<sup>3</sup>; whereas we know that in 332 he entrusted the conduct of the Gothic war to his son Constantine II and himself stayed in the background at Marcianople<sup>4</sup>. It would hardly be consistent with our authorities to suppose that he crossed the Danube several times in 332; but he may well have done so in 328. However, that may be, it is probably with the conquest of Oltenia that we must associate the presence of Taifali in Phrygia. It would seem that after his conquest Constantine transported a considerable number of the Taifali to Asia Minor, where they are known to have revolted in the course of his reign. Otherwise, it is not easy to account for their presence there<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Cod. Theod. 1, 16, 4, 7, 20, 5. That he was at Trier in 328 is denied by PIGANIOR, op. cit. 46 n. 115, E. SREIN, *Byzantion* 9, 1934, 330, both following J. PALANQUE, *Essai sur la préfecture du prétoire du Bas-empire* (Paris 1933) 10. Observe that the fact that Constantine was in Oescus in July 328 (Cod. Theod. 6, 35, 5) does not necessarily prove that the bridge was completed then.

<sup>2</sup> See e. g. Tacitus Ann. 12, 40, 6. The civil war in which Fritigern is alleged to have fought against Athanaric and in which Valens is said to have intervened should be regarded as unhistorical: see 'The Date of the Conversion of the Visigoths', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* (April 1956).

<sup>3</sup> Chron. Pasch. loc. cit. <sup>4</sup> Cod. Theod. 3, 5, 4—5.

<sup>5</sup> Vita S. Nicolai 17, 20 (Migne, PG. 116, 337, 341). For another and less likely view see PATSCH, 'Beiträge' 30, who connects the Taifali in Asia with the raid mentioned in Zosimus 2, 31, 3. But the Taifali in Asia were clearly a strong force, whereas that raid was a small affair carried out by 500 men and is not said to have been unsuccessful. SCHMIDT, op. cit. 227, supposes that the Taifali were defeated and brought to Phrygia in 332; but we have seen that a conquest of Oltenia in 332 is unlikely.

But the main question which concerns us is, What was the fate of the re-occupied territory north of the Danube? When and in what circumstances was it lost to the Empire? If we compare conditions on the lower Danube in 332 with the position there in 367–9, when Valens fought his war against the Visigoths, we shall find that three noteworthy changes had taken place in the intervening 35 years. In the first place, it is clear that the Romans held no Transdanubian territory in Valens' time. When that Emperor set about attacking the Visigoths in 367, his first move was to build a bridge of boats across the Danube at Daphne; and in 368, when the river was abnormally flooded, the Romans were not able to enter Gothia at all<sup>1</sup>. This position of stalemate would scarcely have been allowed to arise if the Emperor had been in a position to strike eastwards from Oltenia. Moreover, in Valens' time the Taifali were no longer subject to the Romans: as early as 358 we find them independent Federates, and it follows that in that year Oltenia was no longer Roman territory<sup>2</sup>.

Secondly, it is distinctly implied by Eusebius that Constantine after his victory in 332 stopped the payment of annual subsidies to the Visigoths. He no longer required Federates in Wallachia because he himself now had a foothold across the river and his armies had inflicted a merciless defeat on the Goths there. Moreover, the Visigoths had shown how unreliable they were in 315 and in 323<sup>3</sup>; and it must be stressed—for the fact is often mis-stated—that Constantine did not give them the status of Federates after his victory in 332<sup>4</sup>. On the other hand, when Valentinian and Valens became Emperors in 364 the Visigoths were undoubtedly being paid by the Roman government<sup>5</sup>; and in 367 the Romans were making substantial payments of gold, silver, and clothing to them<sup>6</sup>. At that time they had long been the Federates of the Empire<sup>7</sup>. Indeed, in 369 Valens refused to make these payments any longer, just as Constantine had refused in 332. It is true that Visigothic raiding bands had often troubled the frontier districts of the Empire in the years preceding 367; but these bands seem to have been local or tribal levies, retinues of Gothic

<sup>1</sup> Amm. Marc. 27, 5, 2, 5f. <sup>2</sup> Idem 17, 13, 19f.

<sup>3</sup> On the invasion of 315 see FIEBIGER-SCHMIDT, *Inscriptensammlung* nos. 160–2, with the references cited by them.

<sup>4</sup> Eusebius VC. 4, 5. This is not contradicted by Julian Caes. 329 A, who does not specify the barbarians to whom he says that Constantine paid 'tribute': there is no reason to think that Julian has the Visigoths in mind, and, even if he has, he may be referring to the years before 332. Jordanes Get. 21, 111f. relates (not without inaccuracy) to the period before 332, and the Visigoths were undoubtedly Federates in 323–32. There was nothing unusual in the Romans attacking a Federate people in 332: Valens did so in 367. <sup>5</sup> Themistius Or. 8, 119 C. <sup>6</sup> Idem Or. 10, 135 AB.

<sup>7</sup> Amm. Marc. 27, 5, 1, though there is no such indication in 22, 7, 7.

optimates, and so on<sup>1</sup>. They were not sent out by the central authority among the Visigoths, and their activities, although of course illegal<sup>2</sup>, were not inconsistent with the Federate status of the Visigoths as a whole.

A third difference between the conditions of 332 and those of 367 is this. When Valens won the war of 367-9 he imposed restrictions on the activities of Visigothic traders: in future they would be allowed to trade at two only of the Roman frontier towns. But before the war they had been able to trade indiscriminately along the whole frontier. The phrase which Themistius uses, *ἐν τῇς πορτέρας εἰρήνης*, is somewhat ambiguous<sup>3</sup>; it may mean 'in the days of peace before the war of 367', but it may also mean 'under the terms of the former peace-treaty'. In the latter case the Visigoths had not acquired permission to trade in the Roman cities merely as a result of Roman indifference or generosity: they had secured it under the terms of a clause in a peace-treaty with the Roman government. In any case, the fact that the Gothic traders had had indiscriminate access to the Roman frontier towns before 367 is very remarkable. Since the earliest days of the Roman Empire the Imperial government had been reluctant to give unrestricted access to the traders of a hostile, or potentially hostile, barbarian people. True, the Hermunduri had been subject to no restrictions for a while in the first century A. D.; but their case was unique in the first century, and it is thought that they did not enjoy their freedom of entry for very long<sup>4</sup>. We have many references in ancient authors to the restrictions placed by the Roman authorities on visits by foreign traders<sup>5</sup>, and some words of Tacitus show that this was not a matter on which

<sup>1</sup> Idem 22, 7, 7; 26, 4, 5 '*praedatorii globi Gothorum*', Themistius Or. 10, 136 C *καὶ λόγους καὶ οὐλαγωγίας* (cf. 8, 119 C). Zosimus 4, 10, 1 *μολαὶς τῶν ἐντὲρ τῶν Ἰστρον Σινδὲρ τὰ Πευκαίων ὅγια ταγατρούσης*, i. e. part, but not all, of the Visigoths, cf. Sæck, *Untergang 588*. On the other hand, the raids carried out on the Dobrogea in 337-40 (Dessau 724) were not the work of Federates. In 365 the Emperors ordered the construction of watch-towers on the frontier of Dacia Ripensis (Cod. Theod. 15, 1, 13); but unfortunately it is not clear whether these towers were to be erected on the part of the frontier facing the Taifali in Oltenia or on that facing the Sarmatians in the Banat.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Amm. Marc. 19, 11, 5.

<sup>3</sup> Tacitus Germ. 41, 1-2. (On the date to which Tacitus refers see Much's commentary p. 364, with the works cited by him.) Cf. J. Klose, *Roms Klientel-Randstaaten am Rhein und an der Donau* (Breslau 1934) 64f., and the works there cited.

<sup>5</sup> Tacitus Hist. 4, 64f., Dio Cassius 71, 11, 3, 15 (which shows that the Marcomanni had had unrestricted access to trading towns for a period in the second century), 72, 19, 2, Dessau 775, and for some new archaeological evidence see W. Schleiermacher, 'Nundnenses', *Germania* 32, 1954, 326-28, with references to further archaeological evidence. See also the conjectures of Patsch, art. cit. ('Banater Sarmaten') 189. Some also cite Tertullian adv. Iud. 7, but that passage has nothing to do with peace-time restrictions on crossing the frontier. References to restrictions on trade with Persia are frequent e. g. Amm. Marc. 14, 3, 3; 23, 3, 7. Peter the Patrician frag. 14, Cod. Justin. 4, 63, 4. Menander Protector frag. 11 (pp. 21f. ed. Dindorf). As for India, the entry in Itin. Hierosol. ed. P. Geiger p. 116, '*Ctesmai: qui portus mittit ad Indiam vel excipit venientes*

the government would display any laxity<sup>1</sup>. It can scarcely be doubted, then, that freedom to enter the market towns on the lower Danubian frontier was given to the Visigoths only with reluctance on the part of the Romans. The restriction imposed by Valens caused considerable loss to Roman as well as to Visigothic traders, for the trade had been a flourishing one<sup>2</sup>; but the government would hardly allow the interests of frontier traders to interfere with its frontier policy: the Visigoths were a powerful and dangerous people, and it is out of the question that Constantine after his great victory in 332 would have allowed them unlimited access to the Danubian cities. The Visigoths' right to trade freely in the cities was wrested forcibly from the Romans sometime between 332 and 367.

In the interval between the campaigns of Constantine and Valens, then, the Roman bridge-head across the lower Danube had been abandoned, the Visigoths had regained their status as Federates along with the payments of money and goods which that status entailed, and they had also secured, perhaps as a result of an explicit clause written into a treaty with the Romans, the unusual right to trade wherever they wished in the Roman frontier towns. These three facts suggest, I think, that the Romans had not abandoned their Transdanubian territory voluntarily: they had been beaten out of Oltenia and had made a most unfavourable peace-treaty with the Visigoths.

When did this war take place? It will hardly be thought that Constantine himself suffered a severe reverse on the Danube in 332-7. A major defeat of the great Emperor in his last years is unthinkable; and if he had been so defeated, he would not have been looked upon by the Visigoths with the deep respect which they are known to have felt for him<sup>3</sup>. As for the *terminus ante quem*, this is not 358 when the Taifali, as we have seen, were an independent

*naves de India: alibi enim nusquam in Romano solo accessum habent naves de India nisi ibi*, is a case in point only if some of the ships were Indian and not Roman. Conversely, Roman traders in India appear to have been obliged to confine their activities to specified ports: M. Charlesworth, 'Roman Trade with India', apud P. R. Coleman-Norton (editor), *Studies in Roman Economic and Social History in Honour of A. C. Johnson* (Princeton 1951) 140ff. For a case where Romans were actually obliged to beg the Germans for permission to trade see Eusebius Vita S. Severini 22. These references enable us to appreciate the astonishing power of Attila in 448 when he laid it down in a treaty with East Rome that trade should be carried on deep inside the Empire at Naissus, which lay at a distance of five days' journey from the Danube, though before 448 the Huns had been obliged to trade on the line of the Danube: see Priscus of Panium frag. 7 (p. 287. 3ff. ed. Dindorf).

<sup>1</sup> Tacitus Germ. 41, 2. We must disagree, therefore, with Sir R. E. M. Wheeler, *Rome Beyond the Imperial Frontiers* (London 1954) 9f., who writes, 'Whatever the custom on the Rhine, traffic across the Danube frontier would appear to have been substantially unregulated until the disturbances of the latter half of the second century': that is not proved by Dio Cassius 71, 15.

<sup>2</sup> Themistius loc. cit. <sup>3</sup> Eutropius 10, 7, John of Antioch frag. 170.

people. It is 353, for any major war on the Danube, if it had taken place after that year, would without question have been recorded by Ammianus Marcellinus. The Transdanubian territory was, therefore, lost between 337, when Constantine died, and 353, when Ammianus' narrative begins. Our sources for Roman political history in the years 337-53 are very meagre and broken; but is it the case that not a single ancient writer refers to what must have been a major war and a major calamity, involving as it did the loss of Roman territory? We may suggest that passages of three authors deserve examination.

John Lydus mentions three times an unfortunate action of Constantine: in his fear of the 'tyrant' (i. e. no doubt Licinius) he removed the garrisons of Scythia and Moesia and sent them to Asia, with the result that the barbarians beyond the Danube were able to invade the provinces without resistance; hence the taxes of Scythia and Moesia were lost to the government<sup>1</sup>. Now we know that enormous forces were engaged in the final clash between Constantine and Licinius<sup>2</sup>; and we cannot doubt John's statement that the lower Danube was largely denuded of troops. It would hardly be possible to interpret John's words as meaning that the Gothic invasion, to which he refers, took place in 332, that the Scythian and Moesian troops were stationed in Asia long after Licinius' defeat and were not returned to the Danube, and hence that the Goths were able to break into the Empire. There is no evidence whatever for a Gothic invasion of the Imperial provinces in 332 and we cannot doubt that John is referring to the Gothic invasion of the Thracian diocese which took place in 323. On the other hand, the Anonymus of Valesius says that this invasion occurred when Constantine was in Thessalonica and that it was quickly and successfully repelled, the Goths surrendering their prisoners<sup>3</sup>. But if John is referring to the Gothic invasion of 323, as he must be, then that invasion was a far bigger undertaking than the Anonymus of Valesius would have us believe, though the Anonymus' words '*per neglectos limites*' square well with John's account<sup>4</sup>. We must therefore revise our opinions about the outbreak of the final war between Constantine and Licinius. It follows from John's words that Constantine denuded the Scythian and Moesian *limites* of their troops, i. e. of troops who properly belonged to Licinius, the Goths then broke in '*per neglectos limites*', and Constantine repelled them. What Licinius resented and used as a *casus belli* was not only Constantine's entry into his territory for the pur-

<sup>1</sup> John Lydus de Mag. 2, 10; 3, 31. 40.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Szeck, Untergang I 175 f. with nn., E. Stein, Gesch. d. spätöm. Reiches I 159, both of whom omit to refer to these passages of John.

<sup>3</sup> Anon. Vales. 21, cf. Zonaras 13, 2 fin. The Sarmatian war described in Zosimus 2, 21, did not concern the Goths: see L. Schmidt, Ungarische Jahrbücher 5, 1925, 114 f. (though there is no need to suppose that Rausimod himself was a Goth).

<sup>4</sup> For an additional reason why the frontier was 'neglected' see Cod. Theod. 7, 1, 1.

pose of repelling the Gothic invaders<sup>1</sup>, but also the fact that *before* the invasion began Constantine had taken over substantial bodies of troops who belonged to Licinius' part of the Empire<sup>2</sup>. The reason why we hear so little of this from our authorities is, of course, that the extant authors, apart from Zosimus, strongly favoured Constantine and would not wish to draw attention to his act of aggression. We must conclude then that since John is referring to the aftermath of 323 and not to that of 332 he does not throw any light on the circumstances in which Oltenia was lost.

Olympiodorus of Thebes (frag. 27) says that he heard a curious story from one Valerius, who had been ἐν τῇ Θράκῃ ἀρχὼν<sup>3</sup> in the days of the Emperor Constantius. The details of the story do not concern us; but Olympiodorus says that when Valerius held his office the Goths overran 'the whole of Thrace', and 'a little later' the Huns and Sarmatians overran Illyricum and Thrace. The second of these inroads is undoubtedly the great invasion of 376, though it is inaccurate to say that this occurred 'a little later' than a Gothic war which is not recorded by Ammianus Marcellinus. But that is a detail. Olympiodorus wishes us to understand that the three statues, which he says were discovered by Valerius, portended invasions by the three barbarian peoples, the Goths, Huns, and Sarmatians. It would have spoiled the point of his tale if he had admitted that the Gothic raid took place a quarter of a century before the attack by the Huns. That Olympiodorus had in fact spoken to Valerius cannot well be doubted. The historian seems to have been born c. 365<sup>4</sup>, so that he cannot have heard the story from Valerius until 380 or 385 at the earliest. But, although we do not know the age at which a man would hold the office of *praeses* in the fourth century, there is clearly no chronological difficulty in a meeting between Valerius and the historian<sup>5</sup>. The passage, therefore, gives us good evidence for a large-scale Gothic attack on Thrace in Constantius' reign; and this attack took place before 353, for it is not mentioned by Ammianus.

Finally, in a speech delivered late in 348 or in 349 Libanius says that Constantius persuaded the Goths to lay aside their arms and make peace, although he was far distant from the Danube at the time and was in fact arraying his forces against the Persians<sup>6</sup>. Since the speech is a panegyric on Constantius and Constans, Libanius is obliged to say as little as possible about the victories

<sup>1</sup> Anon. Vales. 21, but this pretext for the war has already been thought inadequate by Patsch, 'Beiträge' 19.

<sup>2</sup> There is no evidence for the views that both Constantine and Licinius withdrew the Danubian troops (so Stein, Geschichte I, 158) or that Licinius alone did so (so Schmidt, Geschichte 225, Verrers, op. cit. 21).

<sup>3</sup> I. e. *praeses provinciae Thraciae*, as in Dessau 8944 of about this date.

<sup>4</sup> On Olympiodorus see Classical Quarterly 38, 1944, 43-52.

<sup>5</sup> I have not accepted the view put forward by W. Ensslin, RE 7 A 2298, that the Valerius from whom Olympiodorus heard the story is not identical with the *praeses* Valerius.

<sup>6</sup> Libanius Or. 59, 89.

which the Goths had won before Constantius 'persuaded' them to make peace. But even so, he does stress the severity of the Gothic attacks and the sharp contrast between them and the peace which the Romans were enjoying on the Danube at the time when he was writing<sup>1</sup>. He also distinctly implies that the Visigoths at the conclusion of the war became Federates of the Empire<sup>2</sup>, and says explicitly that a Gothic force went to Constantius' assistance against the Persians<sup>3</sup>. A phrase used by him shows that the Goths had invaded the Empire in winter, when the Danube was frozen over<sup>4</sup>; but unfortunately we do not know which winter he refers to. It will scarcely be thought, however, that the invasion took place in the winter of 347-8: this would not leave time for Constantius' negotiations with the invaders and for the despatch of Gothic Federate troops to the East in time to take part in the campaign of 348. It follows that the invasion took place not later than the winter of 346-7, and that Gothic troops arrived on the Eastern frontier in time to take part in the campaign of 348 or of some earlier year when Constantius was engaged with the Persians.

Whatever the correct date may be, the evidence of Olympiodorus and of Libanius shows that there was a heavy Gothic attack on the lower Danube frontier in the early or middle forties of the fourth century; and neither author suggests that this invasion ended in a military victory for the Romans. But we have already seen that just at this time Oltenia was lost to the Romans in precisely such a war. We may conclude that the war mentioned by Olympiodorus and Libanius was that in which Oltenia was wrested from the Roman Empire, and Constantine's bridge at Oescus may well have been destroyed in the course of it<sup>5</sup>. An inscription from Sirmium dating from 352 describes Constantius as *Gothicus* (sic) *maximus*<sup>6</sup>. We know of no later war as a result of which the Emperor could have taken this title; and we may assume that he became *Gothicus maximus* after bringing the war, with which we have been concerned, to a close, even though he did this by diplomatic rather than by military means and even though the war cost him Constantine's foothold across the Danube.

It would no doubt be our wisest course not to try to carry the matter any further but to admit our ignorance of the precise date of the war; but perhaps a somewhat tenuous argument may be put forward, for it is one which is not

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. 90 γνόντι δ' ἂν τις, εἰ παραθείη τῇ νῦν ἀπὸ Σκαυῶν ἀδεία τὰς προτέρας καταδρομὰς, πρὸς ἃς ἀντιβλέπειν μὲν οὐκ ἐξήν, μᾶς δὲ ἐνῆγε τυγχάνουσιν ἐγγίνετο σφύεσθαι, κτλ.  
<sup>2</sup> Ibid. τὺς ἂν ἐν θαυμάσει τῆς ἡσυχίας τὸ βέβαιον, ἐπειδὴν ἀκούσῃ τῆς συμμάχου τοῦ παρόντων, cf. 93 συμμάχους.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. 92f.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. 90.

<sup>5</sup> For other theories of how the bridge may have come to an end see PATSCH, 'Beiträge' 44.

<sup>6</sup> DESSAU 732, with Add. III, p. 172, cf. FIEBIGER-SCHMIDT, *Inscriptensammlung* no. 166. We can scarcely follow VETTERS, op. cit. 25, in supposing that Constantius took the title because of the entry into the Empire of Ulfila and his band of Christians.

wholly irrelevant to the career of Ulfila. I hope to show elsewhere that when the Visigoths engaged in a general war they chose an over-all military leader whom our authorities describe as a *iudex*, *δικαστής*, 'judge'<sup>1</sup>, and that no *iudex* held office when no general war was in progress or in contemplation. It will hardly be doubted that a *iudex* was elected in order to fight the war with which we have been concerned. But no *iudex* was in being in 348-9 when Libanius wrote *Or.* 59, 89: the war had then been over for some time. But, as it happens, we know that a *iudex* held office in the winter of 347-8 when he expelled Ulfila and his followers<sup>2</sup>. If then we suppose that the war against the Romans was fought in 346-7 we could assume that the one *iudex* both directed the war and enforced the persecution of the Christians in Gothia. Otherwise, we must suppose that two *iudices* were elected during the forties, the second of them for no very obvious purpose. If this hypothesis is accepted, the Gothic persecution of 347-8, like that of 369-72, followed immediately upon a war with the Romans, though the former followed a successful war, the latter an unsuccessful one. It is clear, however, that this argument can scarcely be pressed.

Nottingham

E. A. THOMPSON

<sup>1</sup> Amm. Marc. 27, 5, 6, 9; 31, 3, 4. Ambrose de Spiritu Sancto prol. 17 (Migne, PL. 16, 736). Auxentius p. 75, 21, ed. KAUFFMANN, *Themistius Or.* 10, 134 D.

<sup>2</sup> Auxentius, loc. cit. That the persecution took place in winter is suggested in 'Der gotische Bischof Goddas', *Zeitschr. f. deutsches Altertum* (forthcoming). The figures relating to the chronology of Ulfila's life as given by Auxentius are probably accurate, as he and Maximinus, who quotes him, wrote for publication and would scarcely have given critical readers so easy an opening for attack as an incorrect chronology: so H. GRIEßKE, *Die Ostgermanen und der Arianismus* (Leipzig and Berlin 1939) 10 n. 17. We must reject the revised chronology of Ulfila's life proposed by D. B. CAPELLE, 'La lettré d'Auxence sur Ulfila', *Revue bénédictine* 34, 1922, 224-33: see J. ZEILLER, 'Le premier établissement des Goths chrétiens dans l'empire d'Orient', *Mélanges G. Schlumberger* I (Paris 1924) 3-11. In fact, no valid reason for doubting Auxentius in this matter has ever been proposed.