

REV. TOMASZ SKIBIŃSKI¹

Institute of History

Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw

ORCID 0000-0001-5509-0865

ROMAN–BARBARIAN RELATIONS IN THE LIGHT OF THE COLLECTION *PANEGYRICI LATINI* (289-389 AD)

Relacje rzymsko–barbarzyńskie w świetle zbioru *Panegyrici Latini* (289-389)

Abstrakt

Artykuł omawia zagadnienie relacji rzymsko-barbarzyńskich w świetle zbioru *Panegyrici Latini* (III-IV w.). Poprzez analizę tych tekstów artykuł ukazuje zróżnicowane aspekty tytułowych relacji. Skrajną postawą Rzymian jest dążenie do wyniszczenia ludów barbarzyńskich lub przynajmniej ich podporządkowania Rzymowi. Liczne teksty ukazują jednak zróżnicowane formy integracji dwóch ludów. Droga do niej były deportacje barbarzyńców na tereny rzymskie wynikające z potrzeb personalnych Cesarstwa (koloni i rekruci). W artykule jest także omówiona rola *limesu*, który z granicy staje się stopniowo miejscem spotkania i poszerza pola kontaktu i integracji.

Słowa kluczowe: Panegyrici Latini, Panegyryki łacińskie, Cesarstwo rzymskie, barbarzyńcy, integracja

Abstract

The article discusses the issue of Roman-barbarian relations in the light of the collection *Panegyrici Latini* (3rd-4th centuries). Through the analysis of these texts, the article shows various aspects of these relationships. The extreme attitude of the Romans is the pursuit of the destruction of barbarian peoples or at least their subordination to Rome. However, numerous texts show different forms of integration of the two peoples, resulting from the deportations of barbarians to Roman territories for the personnel needs of the Empire (coloni and recruits). The article also discusses the role of the *limes*, which gradually becomes a meeting place rather than a border and expands the area of contact and integration.

Keywords: Panegyrici Latini, Latin Panegyrics, Roman Empire, barbarians, integration

¹ Rev. Tomasz Skibiński SAC, PhD, DSc, Associate Professor in the Department of Ancient History at the Institute of History at Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw; e-mail: t.skibinski@uksw.edu.pl.

The collection of laudatory texts in honour of Roman emperors from the last decades of the 3rd century to the late 4th century known as *Panegyrici Latini* provides insight into many issues concerning this period, including the question of the place and role of barbarians in Roman life and Roman–barbarian relations.² These works not only allow us to get to know the mentality and ideas of the epoch but also present them in the “official” version of the panegyrist and the imperial addressee, thus revealing the programmatic directions of activities and intentions of the imperial authority.

The aim of this article is to present Roman–barbarian relations in the light of the official propaganda of panegyrics from the years 289–389, and the timespan of the texts’ creation will allow us to see the transformations that took place.³ These panegyrics, although delivered by various speakers over a period of 100 years in the context of the changing relations between the Empire and the barbarians, constitute a homogeneous collection in terms of literary genre and were transmitted as such in the manuscript.⁴ They can, therefore, be accepted en bloc and, according to the preliminary research hypothesis, allow us to find an answer to the research problem.

Various aspects of this subject have been considered in previous publications, notably by authors such as Domenico Lassandro,⁵ Fanny Del Chicca,⁶ Natalia Lozovsky,⁷ Cathrine Ware,⁸ and Robert Stone.⁹ Panegyrics are also used in other detailed and more general studies of the epoch, which will appear in the article’s footnotes.

² It includes 12 panegyrics: a panegyric by Pliny the Younger in honour of Trajan delivered in 100 and serving as a model for the others, and 11 panegyrics delivered between 289 and 389 by speakers most likely from Gaul. The double numbering of the panegyrics is due to the different order and numbering in the editions. The article adopts the chronological numbering used in the edition of D. Lassandro and G. Micunco: *Panegyrici Latini* [Latin-Italian bilingual edition] introduzione, traduzione e commento a cura di D. Lassandro e G. Micunco, Torino 2013. The Latin quotations in the article are taken from this edition.

³ Panegyrists pay a lot of attention to barbarians. An exception in the collection, not directly addressing the topic of barbarians – but useful in the article for other reasons – is *Pan.* V[9] delivered by Eumenius in the spring of 298 at Autun.

⁴ The collection was discovered in a single manuscript in 1433; cf. C.E.V. Nixon, B. Saylor Rodgers, *General Introduction*, in: *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors. The Panegyrici Latini*, Latin Text R.A.B. Mynors, Introduction, Translation, Commentary C.E.V. Nixon, B. Saylor Rodgers, Berkeley–Los Angeles–Oxford 1994, p. 3–4.

⁵ Cf. D. Lassandro, *L’integrazione romano-barbarica nei Panegyrici Latini*, in: *L’Europa nel mondo antico*, ed. M. Sordi, Milano 1986, p. 153–159, where the author in a short but very concise article draws attention to the beginnings of Roman–barbarian integration as visible in *Panegyrici Latini*.

⁶ Cf. F. Del Chicca, *Panegiristi e barbari: tra convenzionalità e originalità di notazioni*, “Romanobarbarica”, 11/1991, p. 109–128. The author presents the attitude of the panegyrists towards the barbarians, grouping the texts around several leading themes, showing the traditional confrontation between Romans and barbarians on the one hand, and on the other hand, the symptoms of changes in Roman mindset.

⁷ N. Lozovsky discusses the use of cartography to illustrate power, analysing, among other things, the panegyric of Eumenius of 298 (*Pan.* V[9]); cf. N. Lozovsky, *Maps and Panegyrics: Roman Geo-ethnographical Rhetoric in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, in: *Cartography in Antiquity and the Middle Ages. Fresh Perspectives, New Methods*, eds R.J.A. Talbert, R.W. Unger, Leiden–Boston 2008, p. 169–188.

⁸ C. Ware, *The Severitas of Constantine: Imperial Virtues in Panegyrici Latini VII(6) and VI(7)*, “Journal of Late Antiquity”, 7/2014, p. 86–109. The author looks at panegyrics VII[6] and VI[7] in honour of Constantine in terms of their use of virtues (*virtutes*) to create and develop an image of the emperor Constantine, and the significance of the emperor’s *severitas*.

⁹ R. Stone (*Inviting the Enemy in: Assimilating Barbarians in Theodosian Panegyric*, in: *Imperial Panegyric from Diocletian to Honorius*, ed. A. Omissi, A.J. Ross, Liverpool 2020, p. 233–254) focuses on the techniques used by Temistius (*Oratio* 16) and Pacatus Drepanius (*Pan.* XII[2]) in depicting the integration of the Goths into the Empire.

Enemies

The dominant aspect of the relationship with the barbarians in the panegyrics is the portrayal of the barbarians as enemies¹⁰ and the propagandistic depiction of Roman domination.¹¹ This is evident in the two panegyrics delivered in 289 and 291 in Trier.¹² A long passus of the text of 289 is devoted to the defence against barbarian attacks on Gaul in the previous few years. As the author reports, of the tribes which attacked Gaul, the Burgundians and Alamanni, were vanquished by famine and the plague, whereas the Chaibones and Heruli were defeated in battle by a small group of Roman soldiers,¹³ whose struggle had been dictated by the need to provide them with appropriate military training and practice.¹⁴ The text emphasises the complete victory of the Romans consisting in the total destruction of their opponents,¹⁵ and the panegyrist stresses the wisdom of the emperor who understood that a full victory could only be achieved in the enemy's territory, where the opponents would lose not only their looted booty but also their loved ones: wives, children, parents, and everything else they held most dear.¹⁶ The defeat and slaughter of the enemies, sometimes described hyperbolically as innumerable, is a motif also present in later panegyrics¹⁷ and a practice attested by other sources as well.¹⁸

In a similar vein Mamertinus speaks in 291, presenting the trophies displayed in the midst of the enemies¹⁹ and the shifting of the frontier with Raetia²⁰ as signs of Roman domination.

¹⁰ Relationships with barbarians are closely linked to their perception. From the very extensive literature on the subject in the period covered by the panegyrics see A. Chauvot, *Opinions romaines face aux barbares au I^{er} siècle ap. J.-C.*, Paris 1998, p. 40-58 (panegyrics of 289-311), p. 87-90 (panegyrics in honour of Constantine of 313 and 321), p. 294-297 (panegyric in honour of Theodosius of 389); T. Skibiński, *Obraz barbarzyńców w Cesarstwie rzymskim w latach 376-476*, Warszawa 2018; see also the literature indicated in these studies.

¹¹ Cf. F. Del Chicca, op. cit., p. 113-114.

¹² Both texts were delivered by Mamertinus in honour of Augustus Maximian, but – in accordance with the rules of the tetrarchy system – he also addressed the other (albeit absent) Augustus, namely Diocletian.

¹³ Here, the panegyrist refers to the battles waged by Maximian on the Rhine frontier attacked by the aforementioned tribal coalitions in 287-288; cf. A.K. Bowman, *Diocletian and the First Tetrarchy, A.D. 284-305*, in: *The Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. 12, eds A.K. Bowman, P. Garnsey, A. Cameron, Cambridge 2008, p. 70-72.

¹⁴ *Pan.* II[10] 5,1-2. Panegyrics, as a rule, do not emphasize the threats by the barbarians, and when they do, they intend to show the greatness of the Roman rulers; cf. F. Del Chicca, op. cit., p. 114.

¹⁵ *Pan.* II [10] 5,3-4 (cf. especially: “cuncti Chaibones Erulique cuncti tanta interneccione caesi interfectique sunt;” *Pan.* II[10] 5,4, p. 61).

¹⁶ Mamertinus refers here to Scipio's experience in the Second Punic War; cf. *Pan.* II[10] 8,2.

¹⁷ In *Pan.* VII[6]12,3: “caesi igitur innumerabiles, capti plurimi.” Cf. C. Ware, *A Literary Commentary on Panegyrici Latini VI(7) an Oration Delivered Before the Emperor Constantine in Trier ca. AD 310*, Cambridge 2021, p. 219.

¹⁸ Cf. Iulius Caesar, *De bello Gallico* XLIII,2-3; Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res gestae* XVII,1,4.

¹⁹ *Pan.* III[11] 5,3; during the aforementioned campaign of Maximian on the border of the Rhine in the years 287-288 (cf. fn. 13), discussed in more detail in *Pan.* II[10]7,2-9,1; cf. *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors*, p. 89.

²⁰ Cf. *Pan.* III[11] 5,4; this is a reference to Diocletian's expedition (cf. *Pan.* II[10] 9,1) dated with high probability to 288; cf. *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors*, p. 66, fn. 31. The ravaging of Sarmatia and the capture of the Saracens have a similar effect and overtone of domination (*Pan.* III[10] 5,4). These campaigns are not mentioned in the Panegyric of 289, but Diocletian's invasion against the Saracens took place in 290, cf. T.D. Barnes, *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine*, Harvard University Press 1982, p. 51. The “Sarmatiae vastationem” listed before is more difficult to identify, but the victories are marked in the imperial title *Sarmaticus maximus* (before 291: Diocletian 285 and 289, Maximian 289, cf. T.D. Barnes, op. cit., p. 255); see P. Kovacs, *Sarmatian Campaigns During the First Tetrarchy*, “Anodos”, 10/2010, p. 144. A sign of Roman power is also – for the panegyrist – the fear aroused by the Roman army, as a result of which the Franks and their king ask for peace while the Parthians offer gifts (*Pan.* III[11] 5,4); barbarians as *supplices* is one of the topics of panegyrics as pointed out by F. Del

For the panegyrist, also the internal struggles of the barbarians indicate the empire's prosperity, while the devastating civil wars fought outside the empire befit the madness to which they succumb.²¹ This madness (*furor*) of the barbarians, together with the ferocity and cruelty (*feritas, ferocia*) noted in other panegyrics, belong to the set of topical terms most frequently attributed to the barbarians in the sources²² and, together with related expressions (*immanitas, vesania*) and accusations of adultery (*infidi, perfidi, lubrica ... fallaxque gens*), are also present in other panegyrics as traits opposing the Roman values.²³

Eumenius' panegyric of 298 falls into a similar rhetoric, but is distinguished by the means of expression. There, the author refers to a detailed map of the Roman Empire that was in the school at Autun.²⁴ The map has not been preserved, but we can guess from the panegyrist's words that it depicted the expanse of the Empire and was propagandistic in nature, confirming the traditional Roman ideas of conquest and world domination.²⁵

The author of the panegyric of 297 in honour of Constantius Chlorus gives an extensive account of the victories won by the emperor over the barbarians: the expedition against the Sarmatians, led to their near total destruction,²⁶ and other battles made the Romans regain their former territories and conquer new ones, defeating the Alamanni, Sarmatians, Iuthungi, Quadi, Carpi, Goths, Persians.²⁷

Chicca (op. cit., p. 117-119). On the subject of the Franks, cf. *Pan.* II[10] 10, 3-5, where the name of King Genno-
baudes is given; he was restored to power by Maximian during the campaign in the summer of 288; cf. A.K. Bow-
man, op. cit., p. 72. Parthians (cf. *Pan.* II[10] 9,2 and II[10] 6-7): this is an exaggerated meaning of the gesture
of the Sassanid king Bahram II, with whom Diocletian negotiated terms of peace; cf. T.D. Barnes, op. cit., p. 51, cf.
also the commentary on the quoted texts: *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors*, p. 68-69, 89. Finally, the panegyrist
stresses that fear paralyses the barbarians even when the imperial troops retreat into Roman territory (cf. *Pan.*
III[11] 14,1).

²¹ Cf. *Pan.* III[11] 16,1, and also *Pan.* III[11] 16,3; *Pan.* III[11] 16,2. These thoughts briefly indicated here Ma-
mertinus continues and discusses in detail and with examples later in the text; *Pan.* III[11] 17,1-4; cf. also *Pan.*
III[11] 18,3, where he states that the emperors no longer need to fight, because the barbarians themselves defeat
their tribesmen.

²² Cf. Y.A. Dauge, *Le Barbare. Recherches sur la conception romaine de la barbarie et de la civilisation*, Bruxel-
les 1981, p. 428-431 i 437. Alongside these, panegyrists also accuse the barbarians of cruelty (*crudelitas, saevitia*)
and mindlessness (*amentia, dementia, mens vesana*). Cf. the set of topical enemy terms in the index accompanying
the edition of *Panegyrici Latini*, ed. D. Lassandro, G. Micunco (*Indice tematico, C. Topoi*, unnumbered pages).

²³ Cf. F. Del Chicca, op. cit., p. 111-112.

²⁴ This sole panegyric did not directly treat the issue of the barbarians, nor was it addressed directly to the emper-
or, but was delivered in the presence of the governor of the province of Lyons on the occasion of the restoration
of the city and the opening of its famous Maenian Schools after the destruction that took place during the uprising
of the Bagaudae (cf. D. Lassandro, G. Micunco, *Introduzione*, p. 3). The Maenian Schools were among the most
famous and prestigious schools of Gaul in the 1st-2nd centuries and the first half of the 3rd century. They were
already mentioned by Tacitus (*Annales* III, 43,1). On schools, cf. M. Albana, *Eumenio, un retore direttore di dipar-
timento ante litteram*, in: *Amicitia res plurimas continet. Omaggio a Febronja Elia*, a cura di M. Albana, C. Soraci,
Acireale-Roma 2018, p. 18.

²⁵ *Pan.* V[9] 20,2 and 21,1-3. This meaning and function of the maps is indicated by the words of a panegyrist
who states that attendants can see and admire on them the victories achieved by the rulers (cf. *Pan.* V[9] 21,3). It is
a pictorial representation of the power of Rome. Other panegyrists did this when, through geographical and ethno-
graphic references in their speeches, they verbally 'drew maps' of the Empire's expanse (cf. N. Lozowski, op. cit.,
p. 169-171).

²⁶ *Pan.* IV[8] 5,1, p. 104. This is rhetorical hyperbole, although the victory was indeed decisive. The several years
of fighting against the Sarmatians were crowned in 294 by the adoption of the title *Sarmaticus maximus* by all
the tetrarchs; cf. P. Kovács, op. cit., p. 146; T.D. Barnes, op. cit., p. 255.

²⁷ Cf. *Pan.* IV[8] 10,4. Here, the panegyrist attributes to Constantius and his fellow emperors some of the achie-
vements that took place during the reign of their predecessors; cf. *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors*, p. 124-126.

The author of this panegyric also devotes considerable attention to the revolt of Carausius and Allectus,²⁸ although he does not mention the rebels themselves by name.²⁹ Right at the beginning of this plot, he points out that the usurper enlisted barbarians in his army with the intention of plundering the Roman provinces.³⁰ In the description of Allectus' death, he praises the emperor for saving the Romans and for destroying the leaders of the revolt along with their subordinates.³¹ He points out that of this triumph of the Roman Empire it can be said that no Roman died in it, because, he heard, the fields and hills were covered with the bodies of barbarians and those who imitated their fashion by wearing barbaric clothes and long red-dyed hair.³² The panegyrist thus implies that although the fallen people all dressed and had long dyed hair according to the barbaric style, they were not all ethnic barbarians. This seems to indicate the influence of "barbaric fashion" in Allectus' army, and the testimony is not isolated.³³ This would contradict the dominance of the Roman army and its culture as proclaimed by panegyrists. However, perhaps the panegyrist is trying to suggest that barbaric conduct was also imposed on those followers of Allectus who were not barbarians.³⁴

However, not all the participants in the revolt were killed. Although the speaker praises the emperor for slaughtering all enemies, especially the Franks,³⁵ he points out that the Roman soldiers who reached London killed the barbarian mercenaries who had survived the battle there, and adds that the slaughter of some of them was carried out in a circus to provide entertainment for the inhabitants through this spectacle.³⁶

The same fate will also befall the prisoners captured during the Rhine expedition in the description of an anonymous panegyric delivered in 310 in Trier in honour of Constantine.

An analogous thought about the subjugation of barbarian peoples is also present decades later in a panegyric in honour of the Emperor Julian (*Pan.* XI[3] 3,1; 4,1-7).

²⁸ Carausius was a commander and then a usurper of Britain in the years 286-293. Constantius Chlorus contributed to the suppression of this usurpation. After Carausius' death, Allectus became the leader of the rebels and ruled Britain until 296 or 297 (on these characters cf. M.J. Leszka, *Karauzjusz*, in: *Słownik cesarzy rzymskich*, eds J. Prostko-Prostyński et al., Poznań 2001, p. 217-219; M.J. Leszka, *Allektus*, in: *ibidem*, p. 223-224).

²⁹ Not only panegyrics do so. There is little information about these figures in texts contemporary with the usurpations of Carausius and Allectus and slightly later, but they appear in later sources. In the panegyric they are labeled as a fleeing pirate (*pirata fugiens*; *Pan.* IV[8] 12.2, p. 106) and a leader of bandits (*vexillarius latrocinii*; *Pan.* IV[8] 16.4, p. 108). This is in line with the practice at the time of avoiding naming enemies and criminals, of which *damnatio memoriae* is a very specific and extreme case; cf. P.J. Casey, *Carausius and Allectus. The British Usurpers*, London 2005, p. 36.

³⁰ Cf. *Pan.* IV[8] 12,1.

³¹ In accordance with the rules of the literary genre, the panegyrist attributes all glory and merits to the emperor, although the victory won over the forces of Allectus in Britain was largely due to the praetorian prefect Asclepiodotus; cf. J.P. Casey, *op. cit.*, p. 127-128.

³² *Pan.* IV[8] 16,3-4.

³³ The influence of "barbaric fashion" a century later was serious enough to require legal restrictions. An imperial constitution of 397 forbids the use of *tzangae* shoes and *bracae* trousers within the City (Rome), regarded as barbaric attire (CTh. 14.10.2), and another prohibition is repeated in 399 (CTh. 14.10.3); in 416, again, long hair and leather clothes were forbidden in the City (CTh. 14.10.4), also seen as barbaric; cf. T. Skibiński, *op. cit.*, p. 149-151.

³⁴ Cf. *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors*, p. 137, fn. 62.

³⁵ Cf. *Pan.* IV[8] 17,1, p. 108.

³⁶ "non solum provincialibus vestris in caede hostium dederint salutem sed etiam in spectaculo voluptatem" *Pan.* IV[8] 17,1. The text is not unambiguous and could be interpreted as information about the sending of prisoners to the arena (cf. *Panegyriques Latines*, ed. E. Galletier, vol. 1, p. 96; *Panegyrici Latini*, eds D. Lassandro and G. Micunco, p. 118), but it can also be said that the slaughter of the barbarians itself was a spectacle for the inhabitants of London (cf. *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors*, ed. C.E.V. Nixon, B. Saylor Rodgers, p. 138).

After depicting the emperor's sudden attack on the Brukterians in 308,³⁷ the panegyrist reports on the destruction and the slaughter of people and animals. He points out, however, that a very large group of enemies were captured and put to death in public games, justifying this by the fact that because of their infidelity (*infidia*) they could not be conscripted,³⁸ and because of their savagery (*ferocia*) they could not live in captivity.³⁹ The description may be terrifying,⁴⁰ but the opinion of a panegyrist who praises the emperor for having achieved victory by confronting his enemies rather than buying them and sparing their lives, also deserves to be quoted.⁴¹

In the description of the panegyric's author of 313,⁴² also Constantine's retaliatory expedition across the Rhine ended with the slaughter of the Franks and sending prisoners to the arena. In this text, the author, expressing admiration for the spectacle that combined the pleasure of the Romans and the slaughter of the enemies, also pointed out that the prisoners suffered not only death but also public humiliation.⁴³ Panegyrists do not report where these performances took place, but Trier, where the panegyrics of 310 and 313 were delivered, had an amphitheater that could accommodate 18,000 spectators,⁴⁴ so there were indeed possibilities to organize them. The destination of captured prisoners to the arena in order to kill them in a spectacle and provide entertainment to the Romans was not unusual and is also confirmed by other authors, such as Symmachus⁴⁵ or Zosimus.⁴⁶

Reading this and the earlier statements of the panegyrists, and following the emperors' actions, one can see in them not just cool calculation. The spectacular nature of many of the actions suggests that they were also about the need to compensate, to relieve fear or trauma, and to publicly humiliate the opponent, making him less threatening. This provided a sense of public security and strengthened the ruler's position, especially in the context of current threats or recent defeats.

Towards integration

Besides this negative and stereotypical representation, the panegyrics depict elements of the transformation of Roman society and Roman–barbarian integration.⁴⁷ The already

³⁷ Date cf. T.D. Barnes, op. cit., p. 70.

³⁸ The use of barbarians in the Roman army was a usual procedure at that time. Cf. A. Barbero, *Barbari. Immigrati, profughi, deportati nell'impero romano*, Roma–Bari 2006, p. 65–67 (tetrarchy), p. 76–87 (Constantinian dynasty).

³⁹ *Pan.* VII[6] 12,3, p. 171 (cf. *Pan.* X[4] 18,1). The described activities of Constantine – presented as incomparably greater than the achievements of his father – serve the panegyrist to show the virtues that an emperor should have, including *severitas*; C. Ware, *The Severitas of Constantine*, p. 95–97; also A. Szopa, *Wódz doskonały w świetle łacińskich panegiryków późnoantycznych*, „Vox Patrum”, 35/2015, vol. 63, p. 17.

⁴⁰ Cf. commentary in: *Panegirici Latini*, p. 192, fn. 43.

⁴¹ *Pan.* VII[6] 12,4, p. 171.

⁴² The campaign took place, immediately after Constantine's victory over Maxentius and the occupation of Italy and Africa, i.e., most likely in 313. Cf. *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors*, p. 289–290; cf. T.D. Barnes, op. cit., p. 71.

⁴³ *Pan.* IX[12] 23,3.

⁴⁴ Cf. *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors*, p. 235. For details of Constantine's whereabouts in 313, cf. T.D. Barnes, op. cit., p. 71.

⁴⁵ Cf. T. Skibiński, op. cit., p. 62–64.

⁴⁶ Zosimos, *Historia nova* II 15,1; cf. *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors*, p. 235.

⁴⁷ Cf. D. Lassandro, *L'integrazione romano-barbarica*, p. 157.

mentioned panegyric of 297 in honour of Constantius Chlorus proposes a wide range of attitudes towards barbarians such as the already discussed victories and destruction of enemies,⁴⁸ the expansion of borders, the recapture of provinces, but also the novelty of deporting defeated enemies or settling them as coloni in Roman lands.⁴⁹ The author reports that after the fighting “between the two arms of the Rhine,”⁵⁰ those who were there were “forced into unconditional surrender and resettled with their wives, children, and a whole retinue of relatives to areas long abandoned, in order to restore – as slaves – to cultivation the lands they had perhaps once ravaged.”⁵¹ The greatness of the ruler, therefore, does not consist any longer in the destruction, but in the sparing of the captives and their deportation to Roman lands.⁵²

The process of deportation itself was successfully practised by Roman rulers of the imperial period, became a more massive phenomenon at least from the time of Marcus Aurelius,⁵³ and was also practised by the tetrarchs.⁵⁴ The panegyric of 297 is a testimony to the Gallic deportations during the reign of Constantius Chlorus⁵⁵ and their causes, namely the depopulation of Gaul following the civil wars and barbarian invasions of the 60s and 70s of the 3rd century, and the uprising of the Bagaudae.⁵⁶

According to the panegyrist, the effectiveness of the deportation was extraordinary and the abandoned territories in Belgic and Lugdonian Gaul flourished anew thanks to the Batavian barbarians settled there by Constantius.⁵⁷ The speaker also praises the emperor for the care and similar assistance given to the city of the Aedui⁵⁸ – Autun, Rome’s sister city – and, on behalf of the inhabitants, expresses special thanks to the emperor because, as he states, the city has gained many craftsmen resettled from Britain, particularly numerous there,⁵⁹ thanks to whom the city is being rebuilt anew, and the emperor is its new founder.⁶⁰ The author also recalls the deportations carried out by Augusti Diocletian and Maximian.

⁴⁸ The panegyrist presents victories extensively in: *Pan.* IV[8] 5-10.

⁴⁹ Cf. *Pan.* IV[8] 21,1, p. 110.

⁵⁰ The area in question is Batavia – between the Rhine and the River Waal, located in the Netherlands today.

⁵¹ Cf. *Pan.* IV[8] 8,4. This probably happened in 293; cf. *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors*, p. 120.

⁵² Such actions are an expression of the gentleness (*clementia*) of the emperors, which is also evident in the panegyrics; cf. F. Del Chicca, op. cit., p. 115-117.

⁵³ Marcus Aurelius begins the practice of resettling entire groups of the barbarian population to Roman territories; cf. A. Barbero, op. cit., p. 29-30.

⁵⁴ This issue is further analysed in D. Lassandro, *I “cultores barbari” (Laeti) in Gallia da Massimano alla fine del IV secolo d.C.*, in: *Conoscenze etniche e rapporti di convivenza nell’antichità*, ed. M. Sordi, Milano 1979, p. 178-188. Cf. D. Lassandro, *L’integrazione romano-barbarica*, p. 157-158; A. Barbero, op. cit., p. 58-67.

⁵⁵ Cf. *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors*, p. 121. On these deportations cf. A. Barbero, op. cit., p. 58-51.

⁵⁶ *Pan.* IV[8] 21,1, p. 110.

⁵⁷ Autun suffered greatly during the siege of 269 by Victorinus, who wanted to punish it for its support of Claudius II after the death of Postumus; cf. *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors*, p. 144.

⁵⁸ Also cf. *Pan.* V[9] 4,1. This is how Caesar described the Aedui (*De bello Gallico* I, 33, 2), though sometimes they stood against him. The partnership is also recalled by Tacitus (*Annales* XI, 25,1); cf. *Panegyrici Latini*, p. 144, fn. 5. The Aedui enjoyed privileges also in the later period; cf. *Eduowie*, in: *Słownik kultury antycznej*, ed. R. Kulesza, Warszawa 2012, p. 150.

⁵⁹ Bringing craftsmen from Britain to Autun may prove their shortage in this area, which seems to be confirmed by the fact that in 310 the reconstruction was not yet finished (*Pan.* VII[6] 22,4); cf. *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors*, p. 144.

⁶⁰ Cf. *Pan.* IV[8] 21,2.

Thanks to the former, the desolate areas of Thrace were populated with coloni transferred from Asia;⁶¹ thanks to the latter, the fields abandoned by the Nervii and Treveri were cultivated by the Laeti, and Franks.⁶²

In a characteristic passage of this panegyric, the author presents a picture of the Gallic cities after Constantius' deportations, with barbarian prisoners of all ages sitting "under the arcades of all the cities" awaiting transfer to their assigned provinces, where they would serve as coloni.⁶³ Firstly, with a sense of triumph and Roman superiority, he states: "The Chamavians and Frisians plough for me, while the vagabond and highwayman toil the soil for me, for me he goes to market to sell cattle, for me the barbarian peasant makes the price of grain fall."⁶⁴ The next part is an almost idyllic picture of the integrating barbarians who serve in the army not only with readiness and submission to military discipline, but with gratitude for this opportunity.⁶⁵ The text poses an idealised image and one can see here one of the most significant passages in the collection referring to the issue of the barbarians' integration,⁶⁶ and the propagandist significance of this narrative is perhaps further confirmed by its recording on the famous medallion of Lyon which may represent the course of the settlement of the barbarians in Gaul by Maximian and Constantius.⁶⁷

However, such actions were not a panacea for all problems and an obvious choice for rulers. This is noted by the same panegyrist in recalling the threat posed by the rebellious Franks previously deported to Pontus by emperor Probus,⁶⁸ but against this background, the more recent lauded deportations, according to him, are more successful.

Another motive for the deportations was the army needs of personnel, as the panegyric delivered in 310 in honour of his son Constantine notes with regard to the actions of Constantius, stating that in addition to agricultural labour the deportees were expected to provide soldiers.⁶⁹ Thus, the panegyrist partly follows the line of his predecessor, though he does so in a more documentary manner and without the pictorial presentations shown in the panegyric of 297.⁷⁰

⁶¹ Cf. *Pan.* IV[8] 21,1. It is not certain what deportation was meant; perhaps they were the Persians defeated in 287-288 (cf. *Panegirici Latini*, p. 124, fn. 65).

⁶² Cf. *Pan.* IV[8] 21,1. These deportations took place in the aftermath of the campaigns of 286-288. While the Nervii, Treveri, and Franks are unambiguous terms, it is uncertain who the *Laeti* stand for. V.A. Sirago (*Galla Placidia e la trasformazione politica dell'Occidente*, Louvain 1961, p. 377) notes, however, the expression "*Laetus postliminio restitutus*" and on this basis identifies them as the Bagaudae; cf. *Panegirici Latini*, p. 124, fn. 66.

⁶³ *Pan.* IV[8] 9,1; F. Del Chicca (op. cit., p. 122) draws attention to the imagery and power of this description, which stands out from other, poorer and simpler ones.

⁶⁴ *Pan.* IV[8] 9,3.

⁶⁵ *Pan.* IV[8] 9,4.

⁶⁶ Cf. D. Lassandro, *L'integrazione romano-barbarica*, p. 157.

⁶⁷ It is a hypothesis of M.R. Alföldy (*Zum Lyoner Bleimedallion*, "Schweizer Münzblätter", 8/1958, p. 63-68). Cf. *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors*, p. 110-111; 121-122.

⁶⁸ *Pan.* IV[8] 18,4. The deportation concerned several peoples defeated by emperor Probus (276-282), who relocated them to other lands to limit their prowess. Some of the Franks, settled in Pontus, revolted, captured ships, and started ravaging the Roman territories in the Mediterranean, and then returned to Gaul through the pillars of Hercules; cf. *Panegirici Latini*, p. 123, fn. 63. The rebellious Franks and their history are also reported by Zosimos (cf. *Historia nova* I, 81,2, and commentary by F. Paschoud, in: *Zosime, Histoire nouvelle*, vol. 1, ed. F. Paschoud, Paris 2000, p. 187).

⁶⁹ Cf. *Pan.* VII[6] 6,2. This was probably a different deportation than the one mentioned in 297 (*Pan.* IV[8] 8,4); perhaps – as Barnes proposes – of 300-301; see T.D. Barnes, op. cit., p. 61. However, this issue is a subject of discussion; cf. *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors*, p. 225-226.

⁷⁰ Cf. A. Chauvot, op. cit., p. 55.

He further states that the emperor relocated the defeated peoples into Roman territory in order not only to force them to lay down their arms, but also to induce them to shed their savagery (*feritas*)⁷¹ – which further broadens the outlook. For it is no longer just the Roman needs related to the lack of coloni and recruits that are noted here, but the panegyrist signals the prospects for the transformation of the barbarians themselves, aimed at their shedding the trait that is the quintessence of barbarism.⁷²

Pacatus Drepanius goes even further in a panegyric in honour of Theodosius the Great of 389, delivered after the emperor's victory over the usurper Maxentius a year earlier.⁷³ In this speech, the willingness of the Goths to provide recruits and coloni⁷⁴ is presented as proof of Theodosius' wisdom in allowing them to stay on Roman soil.⁷⁵ According to the panegyrist, such a policy strengthened the Empire and worked very well. However, the memory of past problems is still alive; so the speaker emphasises the transformation that took place in the Goths and stresses their loyalty:

“There was no confusion, no disorder, no looting on their part, as usually appear with the barbarians.”⁷⁶ This is a propagandist image, for the barbarian soldiers did not turn out to be so integrated or even disciplined, and, throughout his reign, Theodosius had to struggle to maintain control over the Goths who had settled in the Empire, though this does not prevent either the panegyrist or, a few years earlier, Themistius,⁷⁷ from portraying the emperor as an architect of the integration of a group of barbarians loyal to Rome and productive, whose accepting was beneficial to society.⁷⁸

Limes

The Roman–barbarian relations are inextricably linked to the border – *limes*.⁷⁹ *Limes* was, by definition, a border place, but it also became a privileged place of meeting and various exchanges, not only commercial but also social and cultural, and it was from there that the inspiration for social change came forth.

In a panegyric in honour of Maximian and Diocletian delivered in 289 in Trier, Mamertin emphasised the importance of Pannonia, from which the first of the panegyric's addressees

⁷¹ *Pan.* VII[6] 5,3.

⁷² *Feritas* is the most common description of a barbarian in ancient literary sources; see Y.A. Dauge, op. cit., p. 437.

⁷³ *Pan.* XII[2]. In comparing this text with the panegyrics of the Constantine era, it should be remembered that they are almost 80 years apart and the one in honor of Theodosius is proclaimed in a completely different social and political situation.

⁷⁴ D. Lassandro (*L'integrazione romano-barbarica*, p. 157ff.) emphasizes its importance as a sign of ongoing integration.

⁷⁵ Cf. *Pan.* XII[2] 22,4 and 32,3.

⁷⁶ Cf. *Pan.* XII[2] 32,3.

⁷⁷ This speaker delivered *Oratio* 16 in honour of Theodosius, in which he changed the traditional portrayal of the Goths that he himself had presented in *Oratio* 14 and *Oratio* 15. Cf. R. Stone, op. cit., p. 233-249.

⁷⁸ Cf. R. Stone, op. cit., p. 250-252.

⁷⁹ W. Del Core (*Limes e barbari nella panegiristica latina*, “Cultura giuridica e diritto vivente” 3/2016, p. 59-69) emphasizes the political importance of *limes* which became an object of concern for the emperors and an important part of the attempt to demonstrate the ability of the rulers. He also notes, though much less develops the idea, that it was a place of integration between the former inhabitants of the empire and the barbarians.

came,⁸⁰ and when writing of the emperor's merits and victories, he placed them "along the border of the Danube, along the whole course of the Euphrates, the banks of the Rhine and the ocean coasts."⁸¹ The very concept of *limes* is discussed more openly further on,⁸² where the panegyrist also presents changes in its perception. Having discussed Maximian's already mentioned victories over peoples located along the Rhine and the Danube,⁸³ he dwells on the significance of these rivers. In the past, he says, the river gave a sense of security and provided protection from "the cruelty of the barbarians."⁸⁴ The expedition beyond the Rhine undertaken by the Emperor, however, meant that the cruel and rebellious peoples beyond the Rhine were defeated,⁸⁵ and the Emperor could say: "all that I see beyond the Rhine belongs to Rome."⁸⁶ A few centuries earlier, when Caesar was planning to cross the Rhine and demanded that the Sugambri hand over those guilty of starting a war against him, he heard in reply that "the rule of the Roman people ends at the Rhine."⁸⁷ The panegyrist's words seem to be a response to that statement.⁸⁸ In addition to the obvious significance of Rome's dominance and power, the panegyrist's words reflect the consciousness of the inhabitants of Gaul, who regard as Roman both the lands on the western (traditionally Roman) and the eastern (Germanic) side of the Rhine, and feel that the distance between the two banks of the river has been significantly reduced.⁸⁹ The theme of the emperors' expeditions beyond *limes* and the shifting of the border recurs in several texts⁹⁰ and is interpreted as a sign of Roman rule. Significantly, however, Roman lands remain Roman only and the Rhine is an impassable border even for the subjugated Franks who dare not even approach it.⁹¹

There are similar overtones in the panegyrist's praise of Constantine in 310 for building a bridge over the Rhine so that he maintains control over the conquered peoples on the other side of the river and can at any time enter enemy's territory with a dry foot, even when the river is swollen and wide.⁹² Here, too, a parallel can be drawn with the conduct of Caesar, who – following the aforementioned response of the Sugambri denying him control of the territory on the eastern side of the Rhine – also built a bridge over the Rhine, although this was largely

⁸⁰ "Italia quidem sit gentium domina gloriae vetustate, sed Pannonia virtute;" *Pan.* II[10] 2,2, p. 59.

⁸¹ *Pan.* II[10] 2,6.

⁸² *Pan.* II[10] 7,1-7.

⁸³ *Pan.* II[10] 5,1. These are fights of 287-288; cf. fn. 13.

⁸⁴ "ab immanitate barbariae"; *Pan.* II[10] 7,3, p. 61.

⁸⁵ *Pan.* II[10] 7,6.

⁸⁶ "quidquid ultra Rhenum prospicio, Romanum est"; *Pan.* II[10] 7,7, p. 62.

⁸⁷ Iulius Caesar, *De bello Gallico* IV,16.

⁸⁸ Cf. *Panegyrici Latini*, p. 76, fn. 30.

⁸⁹ Cf. D. Lassandro, *L'integrazione romano-barbarica*, p. 158.

⁹⁰ These include, for example, the trophies exhibited among the Germans (*Pan.* III[11]5,3; during Maximian's campaign of 287-288, cf. fn. 19); the shifting of the border of the Recia after the defeat of the enemies (*Pan.* III[11] 5,4, cf. *Pan.* II[10] 9,1 during Diocletian's invasion, probably in 288, cf. fn. 20).

⁹¹ Cf. *Pan.* VII [6] 11, 1-6 (por. *Ibidem* II[10] 7). *Neuro hostis audebit uti vado* (*Pan.* VII [6] 11, 1) used by Martine again refers to Caesar (*De bello Gallico* IV, 16-19) who stated that the Roman army could and dared (*posse et audere*) to cross the Rhine, though it did not dare to do it before, and the Rhine was almost a "sacred" border. The Romans overcame this border, but the river became so important to the barbarians; cf. *Panegyrici Latini*, p. 192, fn. 39. This attitude of the barbarians is connected with the sense of terror that the mere presence and name of the emperor arouses in them; see A. Szopa, op. cit., p. 14ff.

⁹² Cf. *Pan.* VII[6] 13,1-5. The bridge in Cologne led to the fortress of Deutz (Castrum Divitia) on the right bank of the Rhine and dates back to 308 (cf. T.D. Barnes, op. cit., p. 70); cf. *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors*, p. 235.

a demonstration of Roman strength and possibilities, and the bridge was demolished on Caesar's order after one expedition beyond the Rhine.⁹³

The sense of dominance, however, does not exhaust the description of Rome's relations with its neighbors and the nature of the *limes*. A 307 panegyric delivered in Trier in honor of Maximian and Constantine⁹⁴ summarizes Maximian's victories and conquests and emphasizes that conquered Germania either accepts submission or shows joy, as if it were not about conquest but friendship.⁹⁵ Also the victories of Constantine, eulogized in 321, do not limit their effects to conquest, for Nazarius, enumerating the peoples on both sides of the *limes*, proclaims that there are no people on earth that either do not fear the emperor or do not love him,⁹⁶ and Pacatus Drepanius in 389, exhibiting the achievements of Theodosius depicts some peoples as living in service and friendship with Rome, and others in submission and peace.⁹⁷

* * *

Panegyrici Latini of 289-389 were delivered in various circumstances and at different times in terms of the Empire's relationship with the barbarians; four were written during the period of the first tetrarchy, six during the reign of the Constantinian dynasty (five under Constantine and one under Julian), and one under Theodosius. During this period, along with political changes, social transformations intensified, which over several hundred years led to the formation of a new society in medieval Europe and panegyrics are important testimonies of a certain period of these events.

When the panegyrists delivered their speeches, it was certainly difficult to imagine what the changes they signaled would lead to. However, one can observe in this period important harbingers of changes in Roman thinking and the opening to a new society that was the foundation of Europe. It was shaped over the centuries on the ruins of the former Empire with the complicity of the Roman population and barbarian peoples living outside the *limes* and flowing from there to Roman territory. This happened through seemingly minor innovations, the significance of which contemporaries may not have been aware of, and which, from a historical perspective, can be shown as a contribution to understanding the mechanisms of great and undeniable transformations.

⁹³ Cf. Iulius Caesar, *De bello Gallico* IV, 17-19; cf. *Panegyrici Latini*, p. 192, fn. 44 and 45.

⁹⁴ Maximian was a member of the first tetrarchy and abdicated along with Diocletian in 305, but joined the power struggle after the death of Constantius Chlorus. The panegyric was delivered in 307 to celebrate Constantine's marriage to Fausta, the daughter of Maximian, and Constantine's elevation to the rank of Augustus by Maximian. The political situation is thus very complex and difficult. For details cf. *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors*, p. 178-190.

⁹⁵ *Pan.* VI[7] 8,5. The discussion of victories is more extensive – cf. *Pan.* VI[7] 8,3-6. The speaker discusses Maximian's campaigns against the Bagaudae and Germans of 285-288 (date: T.D. Barnes, op. cit., p. 57). Despite the rhetorical exaggeration, it should be assumed that peace reigned at the time of the speech, although the panegyrist can be seen doubting the true intentions of the Germans (cf. *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors*, p. 201).

⁹⁶ *Pan.* X[4] 38,3.

⁹⁷ *Pan.* XII[2] 22,4, bearing in mind the temporal distance separating Theodosius' panegyric from others, and that Pacatus Drepanius programmatically depicts the well-developing integration of the Goths and Theodosius' successes; cf. above and R. Stone, op. cit., p. 250-252; on the subject of the friendship of conquered peoples towards Rome, cf. D. Lassandro, *L'integrazione romano-barbarica*, p. 158ff.

Bibliography

Sources

- Ammianus Marcellinus, *Rerum gestarum libri qui supersunt*, ed. W. Seyfarth, adiuvantibus L. Jacob-Karau, I. Ulmann, vol. 1 (XIV-XXV), vol. 2 (XXVI-XXXI), Leipzig 1978.
- In Praise of Later Roman Emperors. The Panegyrici Latini*, latin text R.A.B. Mynors, introduction, translation, commentary C.E.V. Nixon, B. Saylor Rodgers, Berkeley–Los Angeles–Oxford 1994.
- Julius Caesar, *De bello Gallico*, ed. W. Haynel, Berlin 1915; transl. E. Konik, Gajusz Juliusz Cezar, *Wojna Galijska*, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk 1978.
- Panegyrici Latini*, introduzione, traduzione e commento a cura di D. Lassandro, G. Micunco, Torino 2013.
- Panegyriques Latins*, ed. E. Galletier, vol. 1-3, Paris 1949-1955.
- Publius Cornelius Tacitus, *Annalen*, ed. E. Heller, München–Zürich 1982.
- Theodosiani libri XVI cum Constitutionibus Sirmondianis et Leges Novellae ad Theodosianum pertinentes*, ed. Th. Mommsen, P.M. Meyer, vol. I-II, Berolini 1905.
- Zosime, *Histoire nouvelle*, vol. 1 (livres I-II), ed. F. Paschoud, Paris 2000.

Literature

- Albana M., *Eumenio, un retore direttore di dipartimento ante litteram*, in: *Amicitia res plurimas continet. Omaggio a Febronia Elia*, ed. M. Albana, C. Soraci, Acireale–Roma 2018, p. 17-37.
- Alföldy M.R., *Zum Lyoner Bleimedaillon*, “Schweizer Münzblätter”, 8/1958, p. 63-68.
- Barbero A., *Barbari. Immigrati, profughi, deportati nell'impero romano*, Roma–Bari 2006.
- Barnes T.D., *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine*, Harvard University Press 1982.
- Casey P.J., *Carausius and Allectus. The British Usurpers*, London 2005.
- Chauvot A., *Opinions romaines face aux barbares au IV^e siècle ap. J.-C.*, Paris 1998.
- Corbier M., *Coinage and taxation: the state's point of view, A.D. 193-337*, in: *The Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. 12: *The Crisis of Empire. AD 193-337*, eds A.K. Bowman, P. Garnsey, A. Cameron, New York 2008, p. 327-439.
- Bowman A.K., *Diocletian and the first tetrarchy, A.D. 284-305*, in: *The Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. 12: *The Crisis of Empire, AD 193-337*, second edition, ed. A.K. Bowman, P. Garnsey, A. Cameron, Cambridge 2008, p. 67-89.
- Dauge Y.A., *Le Barbare. Recherches sur la conception romaine de la barbarie et de la civilisation*, Bruxelles 1981.
- Del Chicca F., *Panegiristi e barbari: tra convenzionalità e originalità di notazioni*, “Romanobarbarica”, 11/1991, p. 109-128.
- Del Core V., *Limes e barbari nella panegiristica latina*, “Cultura giuridica e diritto vivente. Rivista on line del Dipartimento di Giurisprudenza. Università di Urbino Carlo Bo. Materiali”, 3/2016, p. 59-69.
- Kovács P., *Sarmatian Campaigns During the First Tetrarchy*, “Anodos. Studies of Ancient World”, 10/2010, p. 143-154.
- Lassandro D., *I „cultores barbari” (Laeti) in Gallia da Massimiano alla fine del IV secolo d.C.*, in: *Conoscenze etniche e rapporti di convivenza nell'antichità*, ed. M. Sordi, Milano 1979, p. 178-188.
- Lassandro D., *L'integrazione romano-barbarica nei Panegyrici Latini*, in: *L'Europa nel mondo antico*, ed. M. Sordi, Milano 1986, p. 153-159.
- Lassandro D., Micunco G., *Introduzione*, in: *Panegyrici Latini*, introduzione, traduzione e commento a cura di D. Lassandro e G. Micunco, Torino 2013, p. 1-27.
- Leszka M.J., *Allektus*, in: *Słownik cesarzy rzymskich*, red. J. Prostko-Prostyński i in., Poznań 2001, p. 223-224.

- Leszka M.J., *Karauzjusz*, in: *Słownik cesarzy rzymskich*, ed. J. Prostko-Prostyński et al., Poznań 2001, p. 217-219.
- Lozovsky N., *Maps and Panegyrics: Roman Geo-ethnographical Rhetoric in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, in: *Cartography in Antiquity and the Middle Ages. Fresh Perspectives, New Methods*, ed. R.J.A. Talbert, R.W. Unger, Leiden–Boston 2008, p. 169-188.
- Sirago V.A., *Galla Placidia e la trasformazione politica dell'Occidente*, Louvain 1961.
- Skibiński T., *Obraz barbarzyńców w Cesarstwie rzymskim w latach 376-476*, Warszawa 2018.
- Słownik kultury antycznej*, ed. R. Kulesza, Warszawa 2012.
- Stone F., *Inviting the Enemy in: Assimilating Barbarians in Theodosian Panegyric*, in: *Imperial Panegyric from Diocletian to Honorius*, ed. A. Omissi, A.J. Ross, Liverpool 2020, p. 233-254.
- Szopa A., *Wódz doskonały w świetle łacińskich panegiryków późnoantycznych*, „Vox Patrum”, 35/2015, vol. 63, p. 307-329.
- Ware C., *The Severitas of Constantine: Imperial Virtues in Panegyrici Latini VII(6) and VI(7)*, “Journal of Late Antiquity”, 7/2014, p. 86-109.
- Ware C., *A Literary Commentary on Panegyrici Latini VI(7) an Oration Delivered Before the Emperor Constantine in Trier ca. AD 310*, Cambridge 2021.