

## DISCUSSION



# Once again about Constantius heros – In response to J.P.W. Wijnendaele

Péter Kovács\* 

Pázmány Péter Catholic University, Kossuth Lajos utca 65, 2081 Piliscsaba, Hungary

## ABSTRACT

In his paper the author re-examines the lost funerary inscription of Constantius ‘dux’ following his earlier study and the subsequent study written by J.W.P. Wijnendaele and M. Hanaghan. In their study, the authors used the results of Kovács’s earlier paper but several times they misinterpreted the author’s conclusions. According to the author, their work was unnecessary and there is no need to re-evaluate the suggested date (420s) and identification given by him.

## KEYWORDS

Late Roman history, Pannonia, funerary epigraphy, Huns

Recently, in the latter place, I have dealt more with the mysterious funerary inscription (ILCV 66) of a late Roman general named Constantius, its manuscript tradition, the interpretation of the inscription, its possible dating, and the significance of the *gentes Pannoniae* mentioned there concerning the 5<sup>th</sup> century history of the province.<sup>1</sup> In the past year, a longer study has been published based on and partially refuting my research results by J.W.P. Wijnendaele and his co-author.<sup>2</sup> I am honored by the interest the authors take in my study, yet I cannot agree with their conclusions and arguments in many places. They repeatedly attribute statements to me that do not correspond to reality. Because of the latter, I again need to address the subject of the epitaph. I discuss the arising issues in points according to the structure of my original study.

## THE INTERPRETATION OF THE INSCRIPTION

There is a fundamental error made by the authors in the interpretation of the text. They did not take into account the fact that we face an inscribed relic, a tomb inscription from late antiquity and its tomb (it is only a contribution that the text has been examined omitting the consideration of the manuscript tradition entirely). The possible identification of the inscription medium was completely ignored as well. In such cases, the philological interpretation must also take into account that the author of the text is not necessarily someone with a high level of literary education, who can often err in the metrum as well (as can often be observed reading *Carmina Latina Epigraphica*). Thus, it is far from certain that the shortness and length of the vowel may be an exclusionary reason for interpretation, as in the present case in the last line (moreover, in Vulgar Latin such a difference has long since disappeared). Not being a *native speaker*, I myself left out the English translation from my earlier English version of my study, instead I attached only the English and German translations of O. Maenchen-Helfen. Wherever I interpreted the text differently, I gave detailed explanations. Although the authors did not refer to it, they used my interpretation in several places. I do not deal with the minor, more than once debatable fixes such as the translation of the verb *comprimere*, which in this case may mean either “stop” (hinder) or “down” (subdue). There are two questionable points in the interpretation of the inscription:

- a. How are lines 13–14 to be interpreted?

\*Corresponding author.  
E-mail: [kovacs.peter@btk.ppke.hu](mailto:kovacs.peter@btk.ppke.hu)

<sup>1</sup>Kovács (2020).

<sup>2</sup>Wijnendaele and Hanaghan (2021).

- b. Who was Theodora and what is the interpretation of lines 21–22 of the inscription?

In contrary to previous interpretations, I was the first to introduce the possibility, that in this case the *pictus participium* refers to the depiction of the general and his sons, which clearly may have been the scene of the tomb (sarcophagus?). The authors use my interpretation and reasoning without mentioning my name. Thus that is the only way that the mentioning of the grieving mother makes sense (*mater anxia, stupefacta, dolens*) who also had had to be present in the scene. The phrase *nescit quem plangat* refers to not the father rather one of his two passed sons, between whom the grieving father (*natorum medio pictus*) was also depicted.

b. It is clear from lines 19–20, that the wife who had erected the tomb for her husband rests in the grave as well. Thus it is likely that based on the request of the dux (*te cupiente*) the exception of the *sanctio* applies to his mother, Theodora as well. Meanwhile it is a fact, that the word *parens* beside being a noun as parent, as an adjective means obedient as well. In this case, Theodora could also be Constantius' wife, in which case the name Theodora is in the vocativus, and the personal pronoun *te* of ablativus absolutus would also apply to her. Based on all this, in theory, Theodora, as his wife, would have been buried in the common grave of her own free will. (see the 4 interpretations of Theodora of Th. Mommsen and PLRE II.)

Grammatically the above cannot be ruled out either, but it is more likely that Constantius' mother may have been buried in the tomb of her son and his wife at the request of her son. In this case the tombstone had been had made earlier by the wife and the inscription later by the mother. The subordinate clause beginning with the conjunction *at* can obviously refer to a person who is forbidden to bury him- or herself in the grave. In any case, the translation given by the authors (let no hand try to disturb this tomb of yours, except Theodora's, your mother, as you wish it) is certainly wrong, since Theodora's name can only be in nominative (or possibly vocative) and the possessive pronoun *tuum* can only refer to the *sepulchrum* (and not to the word *parens* that is feminine in this case), just as Theodora's hand does not play a role in the Latin text either.

## PLACE OF INSTALLATION OF THE INSCRIPTION

Since the tomb inscription was included in two Carolingian codexes along with the Ravenna epitaph of Doctron/Droctulf, I have come to the conclusion that the tomb, almost certainly originates from Italy, and was originally erected in Ravenna, less likely in Rome. The similar wording of the two inscriptions (e.g. Constantius 10 *tantum Pannoniis gentibus horror erat Droctulf* 12 ... *cunctis hostibus horror erat*) suggests that the maker of the inscription of tomb of the Langobard dux may have known that of Constantius. In order to prove the uncertainty of my last statement, Wijnendaele referred to the epitaph of Gerold, the Bavarian

Comes, a relative of the emperor (Charlemagne's brother-in-law) who died in 799 during the campaign against the Avars and was later buried in Reichenau, which also exists in the manuscript tradition and has nothing to do with Ravenna. The latter is certainly true, but only partially. The latter funerary epigram is found only in one of the codexes (the later codex G of Sanct Gallen), has a different manuscript tradition, and does not originate from Antiquity (dated after 799).<sup>3</sup> The epitaph can hardly be attributed to the circle of Paulus Diaconus, its author is unknown (but linked to the person of Walahfrid Strabo,<sup>4</sup> even if disputed), and it is one of the outstanding pieces of Carolingian poetry (PL 114, 1129–1130 = MGH Poet. Lat. I, p. 114). Even if the sepulchral inscription of Toctron (correctly Droctulf) is included in the early antique inscription collections (Sylloge Laure-shamensis or Centulensis: CIL XI 319 = ICUR II p. 76, 91 n. 55, 115, n. 89, 121 n. 5, 284–285) by means of a copy by Paulus Diaconus (Hist. Lang. III.19)<sup>5</sup> his epitaph was erected on his grave monument at Ravenna, as does that of Constantius. The only reason to deliberately mention the three epitaphs together, is to commemorate the leaders of the campaigns against the Danube barbarians.<sup>6</sup> Therefore nothing in my original statement needs to be clarified. The initial location of the inscription is most likely Ravenna (possibly Rome).

## IDENTIFICATION OF CONSTANTIUS, DATING OF THE INSCRIPTION AND ITS ROLE IN THE HISTORY OF PANNONIA

The paper references my work in several specific ways. Sometimes my research is taken over without reference, but sometimes claims are attributed to me that I never made.

This is also the case concerning the possible dating of the tomb inscription of Constantius. My own starting point was the remark of de Rossi (ICUR I p. 265–266) that the inscription could be connected with the person of Felix *magister utriusque militiae* (PLRE II, Felix 14), suggesting the date of the event as 427. The latter identification, however, is incorrect, since the name of the patricius was certainly Flavius Felix, and the name Constantius, known only from manuscript tradition, was only attached to him by mistake (a wrong medieval dissolution of the title v(ir) c(larissimus) on the lost inscription in the basilica of Lateran) (ILCV 68 = ICUR II p. 149 Nr. 17 = p. 307 Nr. 5 = CIL VI 41393, ICUR

<sup>3</sup>Kraus (1890) 38, Nr. 79; Ross (1945) 212–235. For the different manuscript tradition see Hennings (2021) 68, 133.

<sup>4</sup>Th. Mommsen's remarks seems to be founded: Walahfrid knew the text of the epitaph (cf. Visio Wettini 822–826, MGH Poet. Lat. II, p. 330) or he was the author: Mommsen (1854) 303, against Dümmler, E., MGH Poet. Lat. I, p. 101.

<sup>5</sup>Haubrichs (2016) 93–96; Kovács (2022).

<sup>6</sup>The latter fact (two of the three are known to be real) also rules out theories that we would be dealing with a fictitious funerary poem from the Carolingian period: Treffort (2007) 91, 239–240.



658, ILS 1298, AĒp, 1905, 88), so that the inscription Constantius cannot be identified as any known 5<sup>th</sup> century person of the same name (PLRE II, Constantius 1–18; where Constantius 9 is the dux of the inscription in question).

As the identity of the general is only known from the inscription, we can only go by its text.

In any case, the common starting point must remain that Constantius was an accomplished general of the Western Roman Empire sometime in the 5<sup>th</sup> century and cannot be associated with any known Constantius. The inscription refers to Constantius as a general or dux or ductor (certainly a higher rank than a simple provincial governor), his senatorial rank is certain (see mentioning of the senatus, the *honores*, his role in the defence of Italia). To identify the dux, we can only start from the text of the inscription and look for a period when they fought successfully against the barbarians at least twice (within a relatively small period), as documented by sources. The two campaigns were as follows:

1. defeating (stopping) a people at sea who are unable to sail, and then preventing them from landing.
2. his success against *Pannoniae gentes*.

Based on the above, I have outlined two possible versions, of which I consider the earlier one to be more probable, while the authors argue for the latter one, excluding the latter dating alternative.<sup>7</sup>

The (not specifically named) people who travelled by sea but could not sail can be identified as the Vandals since O. Seeck (this is not necessarily certain, see below), while the Pannonian barbarians can be identified with the Huns, following de Rossi and Maenchen-Helfen.

1. Since Ravenna has had only few successful campaigns against the Huns, I have naturally associated the event with the enigmatic data of Marcellinus Comes and Jordanes for 427 (Chron. min. II p. 76, Jord. Get. XXXII.166), during which the Huns who invaded Pannonia were driven out by the Romani.<sup>8</sup> Examining the works of Jordanes it became clear that the main source of the historian was the Gothic history of Cassiodorus, as he mentions, but W. Enßlin also attempted to show that the main source of the Romana was the lost historical work of Symmachus mentioned above. As a side issue, they also tried to prove that Jordanes (possibly through Cassiodorus) would have used Symmachus in the present passage of the Getica, so that Jordanes' data would have been independent of Marcellinus' Comes. All that can be taken as highly probable is that Jordanes himself must have inserted the story into the story of the Visigoths the original works of Cassiodorus. The inclusion of the Goths in the story is also more like him than Cassiodorus (who also

liked to emphasise the joint Gothic-Roman action (as in the case of the Battle of Catalaunum), but never produced a complete fiction). If this were not the case, then Jordanes would have had to take the data from Cassiodorus, so we would have to look for a common source between Cassiodorus and Marcellinus (as T. Nagy did). Based on a stylistic analysis of the two sources, the more likely possibilities are that, as in other passages of the Getica, Jordanes used Marcellinus' work or that they shared a common source.<sup>9</sup> The latter, according to B. Croke, could have been an eastern, but definitely Latin Chronicon (Mommensen's Ignotus?), but we cannot rule out the possibility of a missing section of the Consularia Italica from the period in question. By Romani many people mean Eastern Rome, but Jordanes must have meant the western part of the empire because of the mentioning of the alliance with the Goths, so we should rather think of a military action (despite the treaty(s) of 425) led by Flavius Felix to drive the Huns out of the province, who were there perhaps already under an earlier treaty (406 or 409 AD) or who did not want to leave after the Italic campaign. The latter source is simply dismissed by Wijnendaele as unreliable (without further proof). This is a rather peculiar procedure, since we are dealing with the latest source indicating the existence of Roman Pannonia (the only one between 409 and 455), and since Seeck's opinion communis opinio of research is that Marcellinus Comes used reliable sources from court circles, so that his data on Pannonia is authentic (the passage on the fifty occupations may be a later entry). Based on the latter, no written source should be used for the history of Pannonia in the 5<sup>th</sup> century AD.

The authors further note that there are no records of successes against the vandals during this period, so my dating is certainly wrong. However, this is not entirely true either. During the African Civil War of 427–428, Prosper Tiro notes that the two warring parties called in new barbarian foederati who could not sail, and in doing so, opened the sea route to them: Prosp. Tiro 1294 Chron. min. I p. 472 *exinde gentibus, quae uti navibus nesciebant, dum a concertantibus in auxilium vocantur, mare pervium factum est bellique contra Bonifatium coepti in Segisvultum comitem translata est.*<sup>10</sup> In 428, in contrast to his predecessors, Sigisvult, seeking to avoid a decisive confrontation (and willing to negotiate), was in any case successful (see the invasion of Carthage and Hippo), so that Boniface's overseas auxiliary retreating inland (Aug. Epist. 229.1), could hardly have arrived. It is a fact is that the continuation of the chronicle immediately mentions the crossing of the Vandals, while it does not mention them by name here. The problem

<sup>7</sup>It is rather peculiar that in their reference to the sources I have used, they think I would have excluded the latter possibility. This simply does not correspond to reality, I only consider this possibility less likely.

<sup>8</sup>Marcellinus Comes Chron. Min. II p. 76 *Pannoniae, quae per quinquaginta annos ab Hunnis retinebantur, a Romanis receptae sunt.* Jordanes Getica XXXII.166 *Nam duodecimo anno regni Valiae, quando et Hunni post pene quinquaginta annorum invasam Pannoniam a Romanis expulsi sunt . . .*

<sup>9</sup>See Kovács (2021a) 457–458.

<sup>10</sup>For an interpretation and commentary of the passage, see Prosper Tiro (2016) 240–243 n. 1293. The latter remark only confirms the suspicion was not unfounded that would have invited the Vandals to Africa (Proc. Bell. Vand. III.3.25, Jord. Get. 167, John Ant. Frag. XXXIII.196, Theoph. AM 5934 p. 94, Paul. Diac. Hist. Rom. XIII.10) as handed down by Procopius and several other Eastern historians (and Jordanes, who often spent time in Constantinople).



with the latter observation is that Tiro did not name any people, not even the Goths called in by the central government.<sup>11</sup> The question is, does this correspond to what is mentioned in the inscription? In my opinion, it does, because first they had to defeat the ships carrying the barbarian allies in a naval battle and then prevent them from landing. In this sense, it makes absolutely no difference whether we are to consider the latter as vandals or (as spread by the refutation of L. Schmidt<sup>12</sup>) others. The possibility of Goths also suggested by the author is hardly likely, since according to Possidius's vita Aug. 17 (*quodam Maximino cum Gothis ad Africam veniente*), and a letter preserved in the sacred collection of letters of Saint Augustine, it were overseas (*transmarinus*) Goths and Huns who served in the army of Sigisvult (Pseudo-Augustinus Ep. IV PL 33 (1805) col. 1095).<sup>13</sup> Obviously, the Visigothic allies called in by both sides at the same time fighting each other is unlikely (this does not, of course, exclude the Goths who had already served in Boniface's army in Africa),<sup>14</sup> so the few alternatives left are the Vandals.<sup>15</sup> Thus, a Roman success against them before 429 cannot be ruled out. Constantius Sigisvult (as *comes rei militaris*, or *Africae*?: see, Aug. Conlatio cum Maximino 1: CChr. SL 87a, 383,4–7 Hombert, PLRE II, Fl. Sigisvultus) may have been involved as a sub-commander in the successes achieved either against the Vandals or against other foederati called by Boniface.

2. According to the second possibility I have outlined, the successes would indeed have been achieved against the Vandals, when Constantius, as commander of Ricimer, achieved major successes against Geiseric in Sicily (Agrigentum) and Corsica (Hydat. 176, 177 Chron. min. II p. 29, Sid. Apoll. Carm. II,353, 367, Prisk. Frag. 31.1). At the beginning of the reign of Maiorianus (458 AD), after a long period, he also successfully opposed the Vandals and Moors who were ravaging Campania (Sid. Ap. Carm. V,388–440). Later, he defeated the probably Hun Tuldila (PLRE II, Tuldila), who rebelled in his rather ethnically mixed army (cf. Sid. Ap. Carm. V,472–479), gathered to recover Gaul, Hispania and Africa (Carm. V,483–510).<sup>16</sup> The latter,

according to Sidonius Apollinaris, arrived from the direction of the Danube, i.e. Pannonia (Carm. V,485–488): *quae nuper ab Histrio/rettulit indomitum solito truculentior agmen/quod dominis per bella caret, populoque superbo/Tuldila plectendas in proelia suggerit iras*. The latter could justifiably have been called Pannonians by the author of the poem, and the barbarians who settled in Pannonia and served in Maiorianus' army were also Pannonians in the enumeration of Sidonius Apollinaris (Carm. V,475).<sup>17</sup> However, this hypothesis, which Wijnendaele firmly believes, has several weaknesses.

a. the author generously assumes both a naval and land battle in the case of the Sicilian and Corsican wars (to be in line with Constantius' epitaph), although this is far from certain, and the written data contradict it. At Agrigentum the battles certainly took place on land: Sidonius Apollinaris Carm. II, 353 *proprio solus* (sc. Ricimer) *vix Marte repellit piratam per rura vagum*

367 *Agrigentini recolit dispendia campi*, i.e. they drove away the wandering pirate (sc. Geiseric) on the mainland, and Geiseric recalled to himself the losses he had suffered earlier on the battlefield of Agrigentum, or alternatively Chron. min. II p. 177 ... *in Corsica caesam multitudinem Vandalorum* ..., i.e. in Corsica and not by Corsica (in the latter case the *apud* praeposito should have been used) they slaughtered the multitude of vandals.<sup>18</sup> Moreover, the adjective *solus* explicitly refers to the fact that Ricimer defeated the vandals on his own initiative with his own non-regular troops (*buccellarii*).<sup>19</sup> The victory in Campania (probably at the Volturnus river) during the reign of Maiorianus (Sid. Ap. Carm. V,388–440) was also achieved on land (lines 392–397).<sup>20</sup> The development of the fleet planned under Maiorianus for the campaign against the Vandals is described only afterwards (V,441–469). Naval battle or stopping a fleet of ships cannot be the issue either.

b. It is even more problematic to identify Tuldila's troops with the Pannonian barbarians. There were never any Huns residing in Pannonia, only subordinate Germanic and Alanic ethnic groups, such as the Sadagari, who entered the province with the permission of Constantinople (foedus, and annual grants: Jord. Get. L.264, LII.268, 270–272). They had already left their former residence (*qui interiorum Pannoniam possidebant* (Jord. Get. LIII.272)) because of the threat of the Ostrogoths<sup>21</sup> and settled in Scythia minor (50.265) in 456.<sup>22</sup> The Pannonian campaign of Dengizik, who had come to their aid against the Ostrogoths was

<sup>11</sup>Muhlberger (1990) 95–97.

<sup>12</sup>Schmidt (1899) 449–462.

<sup>13</sup>Pseudo-Augustinus. Ep. IV PL 33 (1805) col. 1095 *Africae littus, ut audio, miles attigit transmarinus, sed huius militis dux* (sc. Sigisvult) *a catholica veritate dissentit* ... *Tui cordis intentio dirigitur ad Deum, non militem timebis, non Gothum, non Hunnum*. See, Clover (1983) 73–95; Clover, F.M. (1993). *The Late Roman West and the Vandals*. Variorum collected studies, 401. Aldershot, Nr. XII.

<sup>14</sup>The appearance of the Hun-ruled Ostrogoths is unlikely. Possidius' 28 Aug. v. data about the Goths defending Hippo (*comes quondam Bonifacius cum Gothorum foederatorum exercitu*), however, refers to later battles against the Vandals: Schmidt (1941) 465 Anm. 3. The allies who came here with Sigisvult could also have served in the army of the now legitimate comes.

<sup>15</sup>See de Lepper (1941) 47–50; Clover (1966) 20–27; Mathisen (1999) 173–196; Vössing (2014) 35–36; Wijnendaele (2015) 74–78; Selvaggi (2020) 59–61.

<sup>16</sup>Loyen (1967) 78, n. 3; Maenchen-Helfen (1973) 161–162, 405, 422; Oppedisano (2013) 262–263.

<sup>17</sup>Loyen (1967) 78–79; Mathisen (2011) 26–27.

<sup>18</sup>Loyen (1967) 93; Lacam (1986) 163–168; MacGeorge (2002) 184–188; Anders (2010) 89–92.

<sup>19</sup>Lacam (1986) 167.

<sup>20</sup>Loyen (1967) 76–77; Oppedisano (2013) 213–217.

<sup>21</sup>Schmidt (1927) 459–460; Ensslin (1928) 146–159; Schwarz (1992) 50–83; Siebigs (2010) 474, 911–914, Exkurs XXV; Gračanin and Škrulja (2014) 165–205; Kovács (2021b) 329–343.

<sup>22</sup>Harmatta (1942) 17–28; Harmatta (1970) 56–57, 101, 107.





unsuccessful after his defeat at the Bassianas (the eastern-most part of Pannonia) in 459 (Jord. Get. LIII.272–273).<sup>23</sup>

The latter clearly shows that the center of Hun power in the west was already at the Lower Danube, and that the Goths were already the rulers of Pannonia, thus the term *gentes Pannoniae* is more appropriate referring to them.

Regardless of this, Tuldila may still have been the leader of a small Hun tribe near Pannonia, but Maenchen-Helfen's suggestion definitely has to be considered who rightly linked the statement of Sidonius Apollinaris' Panegyricus (the loss of their lords and the withdrawal of their troops from the Danube) with the Battle of Nedao and the end of Hun rule in the Carpathian Basin.<sup>24</sup> Thus, in his opinion, Tuldila could have come from the east, from the Moesia region. However, Sidonius Apollinaris' comment on the rebellion that broke out in Maiorianus' army is clear: Carm. V, 485 *obsequium gens una negat*, i.e. there was only one tribe in the army (not in plural, as in the inscription on the tomb of Constantius), led by Tuldila. Thus, it is far from sure whether Constantius could have been *Pannoniis gentibus horror* at all.

As we have clearly seen, both options have weaknesses, so neither can be ruled out (as I had assumed at the beginning), but I think the first possibility is more likely.

What else the authors have added to the identification of Constantius is hardly true. According to them, the name Theodora and the adjective *heros* suggest an eastern connection. However, this is wrong. Both the name Theodora (see ILCV III, p. 156, and 32 late Roman occurrences in the Clauss-Slaby Database, of which the rank of senator (knight) was one: ICUR 4166, 12295) and the Christian use of the *heros* adiectivum can be observed in inscribed epitaphs (e.g. ICUR I 3972, X 27632),<sup>25</sup> but also in literary circles (see e.g. the *heros* epithet of Bishop Germanus: Const. v. Germ. 12).<sup>26</sup> The use of the adjective hardly proves anything about the family's origins, at most that they were Christians. According to the authors, the biographical data of the epitaph must be interpreted as they would have been enumerated in chronological order, i.e. Constantius' marine campaign happened earlier than the Pannonian one. But this is a false presumption. Even in prosaic funerary texts, the offices and deeds (*res gestae*) of the deceased may have been of ascending and descending order but in verse inscriptions it was not necessary to follow this order. It can hardly be correct (and superfluous) to compare the data of a funerary verse inscription to a prosaic honorary inscription (as Aetius' statue base: CIL VI 41389). In Constantius' epitaph the biographical elements (as his deeds) are totally mixed with the exalting parts.

I have not yet dealt with the a phrase of the inscription concerning Constantius: *non fictae pacis amator*, i.e.

Constantius was the lover of fictitious peace, but of real peace. Correction of Maenchen-Helfen's translation is completely unnecessary here, since the translation "lover of true peace" is hardly different from "nor a lover of fake peace", which can be understood as a double negation (=strong statement). Maenchen-Helfen did not interpret the latter term, while Wijnendaele noted without explanation only that the latter is more applicable to the relations under Avitus and Maiorianus. But what peace treaties were concluded at that time?<sup>27</sup> There is also a possibility that fits the events concerning the Huns of around 425–427. Through Aetius, Iohannes summoned Hun auxiliaries against the Eastern Roman armies, who did arrive, but belatedly, and eventually were sent home, also thanks to Aetius and the generous gifts they received.<sup>28</sup> The latter meant the conclusion of at least two treaties (in this case *pax*) with the Huns, since after the death of the counter-emperor they must have concluded a new treaty in the name of the new ruler, Valentinian III. How much of a *pax ficta* this must have been, is shown by the fact that in 427 the nomadic tribal alliance had to be driven out of Pannonia. This makes the comment of the inscription as much, if not more, relevant to present events as to the second half of the 450s. In conclusion, there is not much novelty to be found in this work. In view of the above, despite the lengthy study by the authors, I need not change any of the main points of my earlier findings, and it remains the far more likely scenario that Constantius achieved one of his military successes against the Huns, most likely in 427 AD.

For my part, lacking new data, I consider the further debate pointless and thus closed.

## REFERENCES

- Anders, F. (2010). *Flavius Ricimer. Macht und Ohnmacht des weströmischen Heermeisters in der zweiten Hälfte des 5. Jahrhunderts*. Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe 3: Geschichte und ihre Hilfswissenschaften, Bd. 1077. Frankfurt.
- Clover, F.M. (1966). *Geiseric the statesman. A study Vandal foreign policy*. [PhD Diss.]. Chicago.
- Clover, F.M. (1983). The Pseudo-Boniface and the Historia Augusta. In: Straub, J. (Hrsg.), *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1977/1978*. Antiquitas, Reihe 4: Beiträge zur Historia-Augusta-Forschung, Bd. 4. Bonn, pp. 73–95.
- Ensslin, W. (1928). Die Ostgoten in Pannonien. *Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher*, 6(1927–1928): 146–159.

<sup>23</sup>Maenchen-Helfen (1973) 161–162.

<sup>24</sup>Maenchen-Helfen (1973) 162.

<sup>25</sup>Jones (2010) 88.

<sup>26</sup>Gillett (2003) 126–127.

<sup>27</sup>See the comment of Sidonius Apollinaris: Carm. II,355–356: *quis sufferat hostem* (sc. Geiseric)/*qui pacem pugnarnique negat*?

<sup>28</sup>See sources: Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. II.8, Chron. Gall. 100 Chron. min. I p. 658, Prosp. Chron. 1288 Chron. min. I p. 470, Cassiod. Chron. 1211 Chron. min. II p. 155, Philostorgius XII.14(=Olymp. Frag. 43.2), Socrates VII.23.8, Priscus Frag. 30.1.



- Gillett, A. (2003). *Envoys and political communities in the Late Antique West*. Cambridge studies in medieval life and thought, Fourth series. Cambridge.
- Gračanin, H. and Škrkulja, J. (2014). The Ostrogoths in late antique Southern Pannonia. *Acta Archaeologica Carpathica*, 49: 165–205.
- Harmatta, J. (1942). Das Volk der Sadagaren. In: Ligeti, L. (Ed.), *Analecta Orientalia memoriae Alexandri Csoma de Kőrös dicata*. Bibliotheca orientalis Hungarica, Vol. 5. Budapest, pp. 17–28.
- Harmatta, J. (1970). *Studies in the history and language of the Sarmatians*. *Acta Universitatis de Attila József nominatae*. Acta antiqua et archaeologica, Vol. 13. Szeged.
- Haubrichs, W. (2016). Könige, Notare, Adel und ein Söldner. Onomastische Aspekte der Migration und Identität einer „gens“ im Spiegel der langobardischen Inschriften des 6.–8. Jahrhunderts. In: Giersiepen, H. and Stieldorf, A. (Hrsg.), *Über Grenzen hinweg – Inschriften als Zeugnisse kulturellen Austauschs*. Beiträge zur 14. Internationalen Fachtagung für mittelalterliche und frühneuzeitliche Epigraphik, Düsseldorf 2016. Paderborn, pp. 79–104.
- Hennings, T. (2021). *Ostfränkische Sammlungen von Dichtung im 9. Jahrhundert*. Nova mediaevalia: Quellen und Studien zum europäischen Mittelalter, Bd. 19. Göttingen.
- Jones, Chr. (2010). *New heroes in Antiquity. From Achilles to Antinoos*. Revealing Antiquity, Vol. 18. Cambridge/Mass. and London.
- Kovács, P. (2020). Constantius heros. Notes on the history of Pannonia in the 5<sup>th</sup> century. *Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 71: 71–88.
- Kovács, P. (2021a). Review of Jordanes, Romana and Getica. Translated with an introduction and notes by Peter van Nuffelen and Lieve van Hoof. Liverpool 2020. *Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 72: 453–458.
- Kovács, P. (2021b). Amissio Illyrici. In: Vizi, L.T. and Horváth-Lugossy, G. (Eds.), *A Magyarországi Intézet Évkönyve*, Vol. 2. Budapest, pp. 329–343.
- Kovács, P. (2022). *Droctulf sírfelirata, mint az avar történelem forrása [Droctulf's epitaph as the source for the history of the Avars]*. *Studia epigraphica Pannonica*, Vol. 13. Budapest (henceforth).
- Kraus, F.X. (1890). *Die christlichen inschriften der Rheinlande, I.: Die altchristlichen Inschriften von den Anfängen des Christentums bis zur Mitte des achten Jahrhunderts*. Freiburg.
- Lacam, G. (1986). *Ricimer. Un Barbare au service de Rome*. Paris.
- de Lepper, J.L.M. (1941). *De rebus gestis Bonifatii comes Africae et magistri militum*. Nijmegen.
- Loyen, A. (1967). *Recherches historiques sur les panégyriques de Sidoine Apollinaire*. *Studia historica*, Vol. 43. Roma.
- MacGeorge, P. (2002). *Late Roman warlords*. Oxford classical monographs. Oxford.
- Maenchen-Helfen, O.J. (1973). *The world of the Huns. Studies in their histories and culture*. Berkeley–Los Angeles–London = *Die Welt der Hunnen: Eine Analyse ihrer historischen Dimension*. Wien und Köln 1978.
- Mathisen, R.W. (1999). Sigisvult the Patrician, Maximus the Arian, and political strategems in the Western Roman Empire c. 425–40. *Early Medieval Europe*, 8(2): 173–196.
- Mathisen, R.W. (2011). Catalogues of Barbarians in Late Antiquity. In: Mathisen, R.W. and Shanzer, D. (Eds.), *Romans, Barbarians, and the transformation of the Roman World. Cultural interaction and the creation of identity in Late Antiquity*. Farnham and Burlington, pp. 17–32.
- Mommsen, Th. (1854). Zur lateinischen Anthologie. *Rheinisches Museum*, 9: 296–304.
- Muhlberger, S. (1990). *The fifth-century chroniclers. Prosper, Hydatius, and the Gallic Chronicler of 452*. ARCA, classical and medieval texts, papers, and monographs, Vol. 27. Leeds.
- Oppedisano, F. (2013). *L'impero d'occidente negli anni di Maioriano*. Saggi di storia antica, Vol. 36. Roma.
- Prosper Tiro (2016). *Prosper Tiro. Chronicon – Laterculus regum Vandalorum et Alanorum*. Ediert, übersetzt und kommentiert von Maria Becker und Jan-Markus Kötter. Kleine und fragmentarische Historiker der Spätantike (KFHist), Bd. G 5–6. Paderborn.
- Ross, J.B. (1945). Two neglected Paladins of Charlemagne: Erich of Friuli and Gerold of Bavaria. *Speculum*, 20: 212–235.
- Schmidt, L. (1899). Bonifatius und der Übergang der Wandalen nach Afrika. *Historische Vierteljahresschrift*, 2: 449–462.
- Schmidt, L. (1927). Die Ostgoten in Pannonien. *Ungarische Jahrbücher*, 6: 459–460.
- Schmidt, L. (1941). *Geschichte der deutschen Stämme bis zum Ausgang der Völkerwanderung, I.: Die Ostgermanen*. München.
- Schwarz, A. (1992). Die Goten in Pannonien und auf dem Balkan nach dem Ende des Hunnenreiches bis zum Italienzug Theoderichs des Großen. *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, 100: 50–83.
- Selvaggi, R. (2020). Erfolgreiche Vertragskonzepte oder foedera incerta? – Die weströmische Außenpolitik des 5. Jahrhunderts im Spiegel der römisch-germanischen Vereinbarungen. Hamburg.
- Siebig, G. (2010). *Kaiser Leo I. Das oströmische Reich in den ersten drei Jahren seiner Regierung (457–460 n. Chr.)*. Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, Bd. 276. Berlin and New York.
- Treffort, C. (2007). *Mémoires carolingiennes : L'pitaphe entre célébration mémorielle, genre littéraire et manifeste politique (milieu VIII<sup>e</sup>–début XI<sup>e</sup> siècle)*. Histoire. Rennes.
- Vössing, K. (2014). *Das Königreich der Vandalen. Geiserichs Herrschaft und das Imperium Romanum*. Darmstadt.
- Wijnendaele, J.W.P. (2015). *The last of the Romans: Bonifatius – Warlord and comes Africae*. Bloomsbury classical studies monographs. London et al.
- Wijnendaele, J. and Hanaghan, M. (2021). Constantius heros (ILCV 66): an elegiac testimony on the decline of the Late Roman West. *Chiron*, 51: 257–276.

