

FLAVIUS CONSTANTIUS, GALLA PLACIDIA, AND THE
AQUITANIAN SETTLEMENT OF THE GOTHS

GEOFFREY D. DUNN

OLYMPIODORUS (FR. 33)¹ informs us that Galla Placidia, half-sister to Honorius, Roman emperor in the West from 395 to 423, resisted marrying Flavius Constantius (ὁ πολλὰ μὲν αὐτὴ ἀνανεύουσα), *magister utriusque militiae* and consul in 413, after she had been restored to Rome following the death of her Gothic husband Athaulf in 415.² Constantius had been instrumental in securing Galla's return by harrying the Goths for several years until they agreed to do so. Under pressure from her brother, Galla did marry Constantius on 1 January 417, on the day her brother entered his eleventh consulship and her new husband entered his second. We are told it was a dazzling event (τὸ λαμπρότατον).³ Constantius, a Roman from Niš (Naissus), in contrast with non-Roman predecessors like Stilicho, was the great hope of the empire and a man who, in the words of Orosius (*Hist. adu. pag.* 7.42.1–3), had dealt successfully with usurpers before turning his attention to barbarians.

The return of Galla was not the end of Constantius' interest in the Goths. Hydatius (*Chron.* 24.61[69]) reports that Constantius employed them in the Spanish provinces against barbarians there, after which the Goths were recalled (*reuocati*) to Aquitania Secunda and given homes (*sedes*) from Toulouse (Palladia Tolosa) in the province of Narbonensis Prima to the ocean. Prosper of Aquitaine (*Epit. chron.* 1271)⁴ states that it was Constantius who made this land deal with Wallia, giving him the province and certain cities to live in (*ad inhabitandum*), although he says nothing about the Goths being in Spain. I shall return to the statements of Hydatius and Prosper later to argue that the Goths were given land and not just tax revenue from them. Although the Gothic settlement of Aquitania has been the subject of much scholarly interest, particularly with regard to its date and the Roman motives and benefits to be derived from such a move,⁵ none of this interest has associated the Gothic settlement with anything relating to Galla Placidia.

¹The text of Olympiodorus is from Blockley 1981

²On Constantius, see Lütkenhaus 1998. On Galla, see Oost 1968; Sivan 2011; and Salisbury 2015.

³See also Hydatius *Chron.* 22.54(62). The text of Hydatius is from Burgess 1993. On Hydatius, see Muhlberger 1981: 193–266 and Kulikowski 2004: 153–156. The text of Zosimus is from Paschoud 2003. On Stilicho and his family, see Cameron 1970: 57–58 and Hughes 2010.

⁴The text of Prosper is taken from Mommsen 1892. On Prosper, see Muhlberger 1981: 48–135.

⁵See Thompson 1956: 65–75; Bachrach 1969: 354–358; V. Burns 1992: 362–373; T. S. Burns 1992: 53–63; Nixon 1992: 64–74; Scharf 1992: 374–384; Heather 1996: 181–187; Jiménez Garnica 1999: 93–128; Mathisen and Sivan 1999: 1–62; Schwarcz 2001: 15–25; Kulikowski 2001: 26–38; and Wood 2012: 29–31.

In this paper I shall investigate the possibility that the treaty between Wallia and Constantius that saw Galla returned to the empire in 415/416 might also have included some future provision for offering the Goths a place to settle, and that this settlement then took place in 418/419. This is suggested by Prosper himself (*Epit. chron.* 1271), who observes that Constantius “made peace” (*pacem firmit*) with Wallia when the land deal was implemented. A little earlier (*Epit. chron.* 1259), Prosper mentions that Wallia, “seeking peace” (*pacem . . . expetens*), had restored Galla to Honorius and that Constantius had then married her. It would be fair to conclude that in Prosper’s mind these two events (the return of Galla and the land deal in Aquitania) were linked as two chronologically distinct stages in a single peace settlement between Wallia and Constantius, and that in this instance *firmit* is to be understood in the sense of “confirmed” rather than “established” peace.⁶ In other words, I want to raise the possibility that the two events—as well as the grain the Goths received as reported by Olympiodorus (fr. 30) and their activity in Spain—were connected, even though separated temporally. I shall begin by outlining the events that led to the settlement, examine the settlement itself, then consider whether or not it can be linked with Galla’s return. Although the Aquitanian land settlement *per se* is not my focus here, it does need to be discussed, since it is such a controversial topic in scholarship and because my suggested link does influence how one interprets the land settlement itself.

Much scholarly interest in the Aquitanian settlement has centred on Roman motivations for organising it, in terms of their reasons for wanting the Goths out of Spain or into Aquitania. This article advances the notion that we also need to take into account Gothic motivation, and that the Aquitanian settlement had been proposed in 415 or 416 in connection with the return of Galla, when the Goths were in a better bargaining position than they were in 418 or 419. Perhaps this also better explains why Aquitania was chosen, since the Goths were closer to that territory in 415 or 416 than they were in 418 or 419. My argument is that the Goths had long been interested in finding land within the borders of the empire and that the return of Galla was their best leverage to make that a reality. I am not arguing that they were in the dominant position in negotiations, but having possession of Galla put them in the best position in years to get what they wanted from the empire.

CONTEXT OF THE GOTHIC SETTLEMENT

The Goths had been on the march through southern Gaul for several years after having left Italy, taking Galla from Rome with them in 410.⁷ During that

⁶I am grateful for the comments from one of the anonymous readers of this paper, which drew my attention more forcefully to the relationship between these two passages in Prosper.

⁷See Heather 2010: 9–35, about the challenges to old views of barbarian invasions or migrations. On the terms “Goths” and “Visigoths” and ethnic descriptors in general, see Wood 2012: 29–31; Collins 2004: 15–26; Liebeschuetz 2007: 341–355; and Pohl 2015: 247–263.

time Constantius had been asking for her return and holding up grain provisions for the Goths in an effort to force them to surrender her. Olympiodorus (fr. 22/1–3) attributed bad faith and deception to both parties. A famine in Gaul⁸ and dwindling supplies due to Heraclian's revolt in Africa⁹ complicated the relationship between Goths and empire. Under Athaulf, the brother-in-law and successor of Alaric who had died while they were in Italy,¹⁰ the Goths attacked Marseille (Massalia in the province of Viennensis) in 413 (where Athaulf was wounded),¹¹ and occupied Narbonne (Colonia Narbo Martius, capital of Narbonensis Prima). It was there that Athaulf married Galla Placidia in January 414¹² and it was from there that they were driven out by Constantius' naval blockade late in that year.¹³ They were probably responsible for taking Toulouse,¹⁴ a city that had recently been besieged in 409—as we learn from Jerome (*Ep.* 123.15.4)—by the Alans, Suebi, and Vandals who had crossed the Rhine at the end of 406.¹⁵ At least some of them ended up in Bordeaux (Burdigala in Aquitania Secunda), which they ransacked when they left, possibly in late 414 or early 415,¹⁶ before moving into Spain.¹⁷ Here Athaulf died at Barcelona (Colonia Iulia Augusta Faventia Paterna Barcino in Tarroconensis), probably in the middle of 415, and was succeeded a week later by Wallia (Olymp. fr. 26/1).¹⁸

⁸ *Chronicon Gallica ad annum ccclii* 72. The text is from Burgess 2001.

⁹ Halsall 2007: 225.

¹⁰ Zos., *Hist. nou.* 5.37.1.

¹¹ Olymp. fr. 22/2.

¹² *Narratio de imperatoribus domus Valentinianar et Theodosianae* 6 (MGHAA 9.630). For the date, see Halsall 2007: 225. On marriage between Romans and barbarians in late antiquity, see Sivan 1998: 189–203 and Mathisen 2009: 140–155. On the different situation of those marriages as a result of barbarian abduction and restoration *postliminium*, see Dunn 2007: 107–121.

¹³ Olymp. fr. 24; Oros. *Hist. adu. pag.* 7.40.2 and 7.43.1–2; Hydatius *Chron.* 19.47(55), 20.49(57), 22.52(60); Prosper of Aquitaine *Epit. Chron.* 1257; Philostorgius *Hist. Eccl.* 12.4; and *Chron. Gallica ad a. ccclii* 77). See Sivan 2011: 9.

¹⁴ Rut. Namat. 1.496.

¹⁵ See Rebenich 2009: 49–59. On Toulouse and the efforts of its bishop, Exsuperius, at this time, see Dunn 2014: 126–143. On the barbarian crossing, see Oros. *Hist. adu. pag.* 7.40.3; cf. Heather 2009: 3–29. The revision of the date from December 406 to December 405 offered by Kulikowski (2000b: 325–345) has been followed by Goffart (2006: 74) and Halsall (2007: 211), despite the fact that Kulikowski (2007: 217, n. 37), in light of the argument of Birley (2005: 455–460), was prepared to go back to the original date of December 406.

¹⁶ Paulinus of Pella *Euch.* 285–290 and 312. On Bordeaux, see Sivan 1992: 132–143. Burns (1994: 257) acknowledges that the details of Athaulf's career between 411 and 415 are confused, and the chronology particularly concerning Bordeaux and Toulouse is complicated. Orosius (*Hist. adu. pag.* 7.43.1) has the move into Spain being from Narbonne, as the result of Constantius driving them out of there. Prosper (*Epit. chron.* 1256) mentions neither point of departure nor motive for the move into Spain.

¹⁷ I am omitting any reference to Attalus, the puppet-Roman emperor the Goths had created, whom they had taken from Rome along with Galla.

¹⁸ Cf. Oros. *Hist. adu. pag.* 7.43.1–3; Prosper of Aquitaine *Epit. chron.* 1256–57); and Philostorgius, *Hist. Eccl.* 12.4. Jordanes (*Getica* 31.163), not unsurprisingly, saw Athaulf's move into Spain as being motivated by the desire to help the Spanish against the Vandals, rather than as his being

It seems that, at least for a while, Africa had been their destination.¹⁹ Constantius blocked their way when they tried to leave Spain,²⁰ while the Vandals of Spain were prepared to sell them grain, but only at an exorbitant price.²¹ This highlights the precariousness of the Goths' situation: they needed a more secure way of obtaining sufficient food than having money to pay exorbitant prices for it, or depending upon the Romans to supply it in exchange for their service; they needed their own land to produce it. One has the sense that neither the empire nor the Goths could achieve supremacy one over the other.

It was Wallia who, in late 415 or early 416, concluded a peace treaty with the empire, and in exchange for Galla received 600,000 measures of grain.²² The Goths were then deployed against the Silingi Vandals and Alans in the Spanish provinces of Baetica, Lusitania, and Carthaginiensis, before being moved to Toulouse.²³

The Goths had been a thorn in the side of both empires ever since they appeared in imperial territory under Alaric in 382 (*Zos., Hist. nou.* 5.5.4–8), even though they were working as agents of the empire and Stilicho had tried to harness them to assist with Rome's military needs. Despite the assistance they provided, this Gothic group continued to rebel against their imperial overlords, largely because the empire did not always fulfil its side of the bargain. Alaric's presence in Italy, resulting in the battles of Pollentia and Verona (both possibly in 402) and the capture of Rome in 410, needed a Roman response to bring the Goths back into line.²⁴ Such a response was what Constantius attempted to provide in Gaul. One may speculate that, in addition, he was obsessed with securing Galla's return in order to marry her, for, as Stilicho before him had realised (although ultimately unsuccessfully), marriage into the imperial family was a path to enduring power. Stilicho's two daughters, Maria and Thermantia, had been married to Honorius (*Claud. Fesc.* and *Epithal.*), and Stilicho's own wife, Serena, was a cousin of Honorius (*Zos., Hist. nou.* 5.4.1; *Claud. Carm. min.* 30 [29]), as well as his adoptive sister (and then mother-in-law). These connections had not protected Stilicho, who was a barbarian and could not be trusted because he was in league with barbarians like Alaric (*Zos., Hist.*

pushed there by Constantius. The text of Jordanes is from Mommsen 1882. On Jordanes, see Heather 1991: 34–67; Bradley 1993: 211–236; Devillers 1995: 111–126; Amory 1997: 291–307; Gillett 2000: 479–500; Christensen 2002; Croke 2003: 358–375; and Goffart 2005: 20–111.

¹⁹ *Oros. Hist. adu. pag.* 7.43.11.

²⁰ *Chron. Gallica ad a. ccclii* 78. The chronicle does not mention their destination.

²¹ *Olymp. fr.* 29/1. See McLynn 2009: 60–74 and Fielding 2014: 569–585.

²² *Olymp. fr.* 30; and *Oros. Hist. adu. pag.* 7.43.12.

²³ *Hydatius Chron.* 23.55(63), 24.59(67)–61(69); *Jordanes, Getica* 32.166 and 33.173. Gillett (2000: 479–500) dismisses Jordanes here. *Orosius (Hist. adu. Pag.* 7.43.13) presents the Goths as working on Rome's behalf, an opinion about which Fear (2010: 413, n. 530) is a little cynical, suggesting that they were fighting in Spain mainly for their own benefit. See Goffart 2006: 105–107. On events in Spain after the Gothic departure, see Kulikowski 2000a: 123–141.

²⁴ See Dunn 2009: 319–333; 2010a: 55–66; and 2010b: 243–262.

nou. 5.26 and 29; *Soz. Hist. eccl.* 9.4.4–8), but Constantius was from a purely Roman background and must have learnt from Stilicho's mistake of alienating significant elements within the court. It would seem that Constantius realised that, without a marital connection to the imperial family, his ambitions would be restricted. This would explain his desperation to marry Galla (Olymp. fr. 22), and this desperation on his part would be what would give the Goths the leverage they had previously lacked. Further, Galla was the key to the imperial succession to the childless Honorius, and Constantius knew that. Her removal from imperial control in Italy was the greatest threat to Honorius' throne.²⁵

Prosper (*Epit. chron.* 1271) dated the settlement to 419; Hydatius (*Chron.* 24.61[69]), to the in the regnal year of 418.²⁶ Although Mommsen's edition of Hydatius (1894: 19) placed the settlement in 418 (which date has been accepted in most scholarship on the topic), Schwarcz believes that, since the earthquake ought to be placed after Wallia's death, the victory over the Vandals must have been in the spring 419 and the Gothic settlement in the summer 419.²⁷ It could well be that both Hydatius and Prosper are correct, in that Gothic fighting against the Vandals finished late in 418 and the Goths made ready to or did leave Spain then, and that they arrived in Toulouse in early 419. As we shall see below, whether we posit 418 or 419 makes little difference to the argument advanced here that the settlement must be seen as connected with the agreement of 416.

We have to ask whether the settlement came before or after Honorius' constitution of 15 April 418,²⁸ which sought to re-establish imperial control over the civil diocese of Septem Prouvinciae, including Aquitania Secunda, through the re-introduction of the *concilium* of the diocese.²⁹ If the settlement came after the constitution, as it most probably did, then Toulouse and Aquitania Secunda, which was to become the Gothic capital, were not being handed over to the Goths as though somehow excised from the empire. Instead, the Goths were being settled in what remained normal Roman territory, administered by Roman officials as they had always been. The constitution makes this clear with

²⁵ Lawrence 2013: 126.

²⁶ On the problems of Olympiad dating, particularly given Mommsen's editing of the text, see Burgess 1993: 37–39. On the problem of dating Hydatius' list of events in this particular Olympiad, see Mücke and Meeus 1992: 160–161 and Schwarcz 2001: 17 (the solar eclipse); Dunn 2015: 1–13 (the succession of Eulalius as bishop of Rome); Burgess 1993: 29 and Ambraseys 2005: 329–340 (the earthquake in Jerusalem); the dates of Wallia's victory over the Silingi Vandals and of his death are also problematic.

²⁷ Schwarcz 2001: 17–18. For criticism of Schwarcz's chronology, see Halsall 2007: 228, n. 43. Kulikowski (2004: 168, n. 82) suggests that Hydatius (and Hydatius as arguing for 418) is to be preferred to Prosper. An unacceptably early date is offered in *Chronicon Gallica ad annum cccclii* 73, which places it in 414.

²⁸ *Liber auctoritatem ecclesiae Arelatensis, Ep.* 8 [MGHEpp 3.13–15]—*Saluberrima magnificentiae*.

²⁹ I follow Jasper (2001: 85–87) for the name of this collection.

specific mention of Nouempoulana and Aquitania Secunda, even though they were more remote areas within the province. What does seem unique about the settlement in Aquitania is that it marked the end of the Goths being employed in mobile service; from then on the service of those of military age would be within the region.

SCHOLARLY ARGUMENT ABOUT THE MOTIVES FOR THE GOTHIC
SETTLEMENT IN TOULOUSE AND AQUITANIA

Most scholarly comment on the Aquitanian settlement considers it from the Roman rather than Gothic perspective and is concerned with Roman motivation and benefit rather than with that of the Goths. Edward Thompson is typical when he states that, "It is of the first importance to understand that the settlement of the barbarians was an act of purely Roman policy. It was not an act of conquest: it was not imposed on the Romans."³⁰ Aquitania is explained as being Rome's choice, with the reason that it allowed the Romans to use the Goths to deal with rebellious peasants, the Bagaudae, or Saxon pirate raiders.³¹ For others, it was selected because it was far removed from Ravenna and would allow the Goths to take up the fight against the barbarians in Spain more easily in the future.³² Alternatively, the placement of the Goths in Aquitania is seen as creating a new imperial defence system that placed barbarians in internal buffer zones on the fringes of the empire,³³ or as a way of dealing with internal threats from future Gallic usurpers.³⁴ The evidence in Sidonius Apollinaris (*Carm.* 7.214–221) about hostages given to the Goths supports this interpretation, since requiring hostages was a traditional method of trying to prevent rebellion. Others have considered Rome to be motivated more by a desire to get the Goths out of Spain than by a desire to send them specifically to Aquitania.³⁵ As one of the most recent to examine this issue, Halsall sees merit in all the above interpretations, but he goes on to argue that none is entirely satisfactory. He does state, however, in agreement with all the other scholars mentioned, that we need to consider the empire's motives more than the Goths' and that the empire was not acquiescing to barbarian land demands.³⁶

Against this strong current of scholarly opinion (although I am not by any means dismissing it entirely), here I am arguing that the imperial regime did in fact accede to a request for land, even if in 418 or 419 the Goths were not as

³⁰Thompson 1982: 25.

³¹Thompson 1982: 251–255; V. Burns 1992: 362–373; Schwarcz 2001: 18; and Wallace-Hadrill 1961: 213–237.

³²Heather 2006: 242–243.

³³Bachrach 1969: 354–358; and Mathisen and Sivan 1999: 6–7.

³⁴Kulikowski 2001: 32 and 2004: 170.

³⁵Gillett 1995: 382–383. Cf. Lawrence 2013: 169–172.

³⁶Halsall 2007: 229–234.

powerful as they had once been. Indeed, the agreement had been reached several years before when they were more powerful. One could go further and suggest that the land settlement in Aquitania was not so much acceding to a request as it was belatedly fulfilling contractual obligations. Moreover, I would like to suggest that the settlement in Aquitania was the last step in a mutually (though not necessarily equally) beneficial agreement between Ravenna and the Goths for which the latter had been agitating ever since they entered the western empire in 401. The first stage had been actualised in 416 with the return of Galla and the granting of temporary food relief followed by Gothic military action against the barbarians in Spain.³⁷ It was the Gothic possession of Galla and the empire's failed attempts for half a decade to secure her return that finally motivated the empire to negotiate over what must have been a backlog of unaddressed Gothic claims.

THE IMPORTANCE OF GALLA PLACIDIA AND GOTHIC
MOTIVES FOR THE SETTLEMENT

I would like to begin by suggesting that between 410 and 415 Galla ought not to be seen entirely as a victim but rather as an agent of some power, if not initially then at least over time. From the little evidence we have it would seem that she had been in no hurry to be returned to her former life in Rome.³⁸ Marriage to Constantius would take her to Ravenna, and it would seem that she had even less desire to be there than in Rome. The horror that we imagine she would have experienced at being abducted (and by barbarians at that) from a life of luxury and pampering to one of deprivation and hardship is perhaps somewhat misplaced, even granting Sivan's willingness to give some credence to the notion that Galla may have been a reluctant bride when she married Athaulf in 414.³⁹

We are not sure whether Candidian's advice and encouragement for the wedding, preserved in Olympiodorus (fr. 24), was directed towards Galla or Athaulf, and so cannot tell who was reluctant to enter this marriage.⁴⁰ There is a sense that Athaulf's change of perspective from one of trying to replace *Romania* with *Gothia* to that of reinvigorating *Romania* through *Gothia* (Oros. *Hist. adu. pag.* 7.43–46) was only arrived at somewhat grudgingly, that he was having second thoughts about marriage right before the wedding (even though he did appear as a Roman general at the ceremony), and that therefore it was not

³⁷ On the Goths prior to Athaulf, see, for example, Burns 1994: 148–246.

³⁸ As Sivan (2011: 13) points out, Galla did not live in the imperial court in Ravenna. Although Orosius (*Hist. adu. pag.* 7.40.2) connects her abduction to the 410 sack of Rome, Sivan (2002: 56–57) considers, on the basis of Zos., *Hist. nou.* 6.12.3, that she could have been taken as early as 408 or even handed over as a hostage.

³⁹ Sivan 2011: 14. Oost (1968: 128) is inclined to see Galla as more enthusiastic about this marriage.

⁴⁰ Oost (1968: 127) takes it that Galla needed persuading to marry.

Galla who was the hesitant party. Perhaps Galla was not as opposed to being abducted as we imagine, or perhaps she overcame any initial aversion to it when she realised the opportunity it offered her as the wife of a powerful figure. Here was her chance, through marriage, to do what others had failed to do, namely to solve the Gothic problem that had bedeviled the empire for decades. This marriage would make her an important player in future negotiations between the Goths and the empire.

Olympiodorus (fr. 24) describes the ceremony as an occasion for rejoicing by barbarians and Romans alike, and both he and Orosius present this wedding as a foretaste of a future profitable union between both peoples that, in Orosius' opinion (*Hist. adu. pag. 7.40.2*), was part of a divine, and even Roman, plan.⁴¹ Perhaps this reflects something of the propaganda released by Athaulf, newly enthusiastic about the benefits of this marriage, and presenting himself as thoroughly Romanised. The birth of a son, Theodosius, sometime late in 414 or early in 415 further cemented Athaulf's openness to the empire. The child died in Barcelona and Olympiodorus informs us that both parents grieved (Olymp. fr. 26). We do have a sense of Galla's influence and power under Athaulf in Orosius' statement (*Hist. adu. pag. 7.43.7*) that it was Galla's "persuasion and advice [that] guided [Athaulf] in all measures leading to good government" (*ad omnia bonarum ordinationum opera persuasu et consilio temperatus*). While we need not doubt Heather's contention that, as a hostage, Galla was exploited by Athaulf, the evidence suggests that Galla was more than willing to be exploited.⁴² Galla seems to have taken to her new role and to have exercised a considerable degree of policy influence while her first husband lived.

However, whatever Galla's own personal attitude to her situation between 410 and 416, as far as the empire was concerned she was a victim of kidnapping and needed to be rescued. Constantius' dogged determination to secure Galla's return and his pursuit of the Goths across southern Gaul revealed in fact that her value to the Goths still lay in her potential as a hostage, and that exploiting this advantage, rather than any military victory against the empire, would be the key to the Goth's ultimate success. Athaulf seems to have hoped that through marriage he might arrive at the same sort of recognition that Silicho had achieved, but Constantius would not accept this. According to Olympiodorus (fr. 26.1), Athaulf on his deathbed instructed his brother to hand Galla back to the Romans. Perhaps he realised that, given Constantius' determination, having Galla was now more of a hindrance than a help for future Gothic ambition or simply that it was time to utilize her hostage value. It seems that Galla had gone full circle, beginning as a hostage, becoming a potential means of entry into the imperial family, then going back to being a hostage again. Certainly Singeric, who succeeded Athaulf for a week, did not value Galla highly, shaming

⁴¹Hydatius *Chron.* 20.

⁴²Heather 2006: 239. Here I agree with Lawrence (2013: 156–159).

her by forcing her to walk with prisoners before his horse.⁴³ One could argue that, although Galla and Athaulf might have been happy with each other, the rest of the Gothic people realised that as long as they held her they were going to be harassed by Constantius. Restoring her to the Romans was thus good policy for the new Gothic leader Wallia, who might well have realised that if hanging on to her had not achieved the desired result, perhaps returning her would. Although Sivan (2011) shows little interest in Wallia and the Goths after Galla's marriage to Constantius, I suggest that we should not eliminate her from consideration as a factor in the events surrounding the Aquitanian settlement.

Despite the argument of some scholars to the contrary, I am of the opinion that the Goths' *desiderata* included not only money or provisions (as Goffart sees it),⁴⁴ but also land, not only to supply provisions, but also land upon which their veterans could settle.⁴⁵ Goffart is right in saying that there had to be a balance keeping both barbarians and locals happy, and he sees as central to the settlement the awarding of Roman tax proceeds in Aquitania rather than depriving incumbent landowners of their land.⁴⁶ However, the solution does not have to be an either/or decision between land and tax proceeds;⁴⁷ there could well be a both/and position, especially if one accepts that there were differing needs among the Goths. Those who had been in Roman military service for some time would want land upon which to retire, while those still on active duty would need income or provisions (e.g., *annona* from the tax allocation) and shelter until they too were ready to retire. The reality is that the Goths had to occupy some land, even if they were not billeted on Roman land. In this I am developing a brief suggestion made by Thomas Lawrence,⁴⁸ who argues that part of the negotiations included the restoration of Galla to a position of honour back in Italy as a Gothic queen rather than a Roman one (albeit one who then was to marry Constantius). He does not, however, develop the notion that land was part of the discussion,⁴⁹ which is what I entertain here. What I wish to do is connect the enduring Gothic desire for land not only to their acquisition of it in 418 or 419, but with their return of Galla in 416.⁵⁰

⁴³ Olymp. fr. 26/1. The view of Heather (2006: 241) that Athaulf fell due to an internal coup motivated by resentment at his over-reaching ambition has much to recommend it.

⁴⁴ Goffart 1980: 50–51.

⁴⁵ See Kulikowski 2001: 35 for the suggestion that some landowners were dispossessed to make way for the Goths, even though no evidence of any negative reaction by the affected landowners has been preserved.

⁴⁶ Goffart 2006: 119–186.

⁴⁷ This might have been true of soldiers on active, mobile duty (as the Goths had been until 418/419), but would not be true of veterans or of active-duty soldiers guaranteed a permanent station. In Goffart's estimation (2006: 143) the land given to the Goths came in the form of units of tax income, not as land for farming or ownership.

⁴⁸ Lawrence 2013: 173.

⁴⁹ Lawrence 2013: 181–186.

⁵⁰ Or late 415, but I shall refer to 416 for the sake of convenience.

The statement by Orosius that the desired result the Goths had wanted ever since the time of Alaric was “peace on good terms and somewhere to settle” (*pacis copia negata, ad terendam rempublicam reseruauit*, *Hist. adu. pag.* 7.38.2) is a crucial piece of contemporary evidence. To that can be added the statements of Hydatius and Prosper offered at the beginning of this article. Their terminology seems specific; *sedes* and *inhabito* do not seem to refer simply to land whose income was to be assigned to their needs, but rather a place to dwell.⁵¹ Muhlberger places great faith in Hydatius’ superior grasp of these events.⁵² Further, we have Jordanes (*Getica* 25.131), who, in his discussion of the Gothic crossing of the Danube in 376, describes them as wanting parts of Moesia and Thrace handed over for them to inhabit (*traderet ad colendum*).⁵³ Ammianus (*Rer. gest.* 31.4.1) offers a similar reading of events in 376, writing of the Goths asking to be received (*suscipi se*) and promising to lead a peaceful life (*quiete victuros se pollicentes*). To that may be added what we learn from Themistius (*Or.* 16.211d) regarding Gothic integration, Pacatus (*Pan. Lat.* 2[12].22.3) on Gothic farmers as well as soldiers, and Synesius (*De reg.* 19 and 25) about the Goths’ *foedus* of 382 with Theodosius I in the time after Adrianople in 378.⁵⁴ Whatever may be said about the complexities of understanding the terms of the agreement of 382, in regard to military service, citizenship, and submission to or autonomy within the empire, the granting of land seems to have been part of the arrangement with some of the Goths.⁵⁵ Even before (Claudian *Cos. VI Hon.* 204) or after Pollentia (*Soz. Hist. eccl.* 8.25.3–4 and 9.4.2–3; *Olymp. fr.* 3), we know that Alaric had been prepared to enter into an agreement with the western empire. Zosimus too stresses this willingness, even though he does not have Pollentia in his narrative (*Hist. nou.* 5.26.1–3, 5.29.1–5.30.1, and 5.36.1). However, we are not told what the Goths were to have received in return for helping Stilicho reclaim Illyricum Orientale from the eastern empire.⁵⁶ During Alaric’s sieges of Rome, in addition to demands for money, corn, and military appointment (*Zos., Hist. nou.* 5.40.3 and 5.42.1), the Goths were interested in land (5.48.3).⁵⁷ In other words, Goffart’s point about some land being designated to provide supplies or income for the Goths is not wrong, for that would certainly have been true for those still on active duty, but does not take into account the veterans, who needed

⁵¹Goffart (2006: 137) refers to Hydatius’ term and notes rightly that one still has to ask about ways and means. What he has not considered is that one of the ways (and not at all the only way) that land was distributed to the Goths was as grants to veterans. His only alternative to tax grants is *hospitalitas*.

⁵²Muhlberger 1981: 219.

⁵³However, Jordanes (*Getica* 27.141), speaks of Gratian offering the Goths provisions, not land.

⁵⁴The text of Themistius is from Dindorf 1832, that of Pacatus from Mynors 1964, and that of Synesius from Lacombrade, Garzya, and Lamoureux 2008. See Nixon 1987; Heather and Matthews 1991: 7–26; Nixon and Rodgers 1994: 473, n. 67; Heather and Moncur 2001: 259–264.

⁵⁵Halsall 2007: 183–185.

⁵⁶On the dating of this *foedus*, see Ridley 1982: 215, n. 84.

⁵⁷See Dunn 2009 and 2010b.

land upon which to settle. Their need had been growing progressively more urgent as the empire neglected to deal with that part of its arrangements with the Goths.

Even though the Goths under Alaric were more a military force than a people,⁵⁸ Sivan's argument that the settlement of 418 was intended to be permanent seems to make the best sense of the evidence.⁵⁹ In Sivan's opinion, therefore, it was neither a type of *foedus*,⁶⁰ nor a form of *hospitalitas* (the billeting of soldiers),⁶¹ but rather the typical Roman granting of land to veterans, as exemplified by one of Constantine I's laws of 320 authorising the use of *uacantes terrae* (never occupied or deserted land) to veterans.⁶²

I would even go further than Sivan, who sees the grant of veteran status to the Goths as being due to their recent service to Rome fighting other barbarians in Spain.⁶³ Despite periods of rebellion, the Goths had been giving military assistance to the empire ever since their crossing of the Danube in 376. If we accept that the Gothic population had a variety of simultaneous and ever-recurring needs (land for veterans, provisions and pay for those still on active duty, etc.), then the situation in 418/419 was no different than in earlier years, except perhaps in scale. While some parts of the arrangement must have been honoured in the years that the Goths were in the West, it would seem that this was the first time the empire had granted land, even though land had long been part of the deal. We must see the events of 418/419 as the culmination of twenty years of Gothic frustration.⁶⁴

The situation in 418/419 seems to have been that the empire (no doubt provoked by an ever-escalating series of mutual recriminations and Gothic rebellions, including the Goths' presence in Italy and then Gaul) had been reluctant to fulfil their side of any bargain with regard to provisions or to veteran land grants for about a decade. Thus, the number of Goths needing somewhere to retire would have been large. The Goths could have been granted a variety of benefits (e.g., renewed military positions, *hospitalitas*, tax proceeds, land for veterans) in response to their differing needs over the years, with the question of land becoming an increasingly pressing one. The presence of Galla Placidia among the Goths was key, in my opinion, to breaking the stalemate in negotiations between Goths and empire.

⁵⁸Halsall 2007: 191.

⁵⁹Sivan 1987: 769–772; Mathisen and Sivan 1999: 14; and Elton 2015: 136–137. See Fear 2007: 452–453; Wesch-Klein 2011: 445; and Schmidt-Hofner 2014: 72–74. Cf. Gillett (2003: 56), who notes the permanent intent of peace settlements.

⁶⁰Sivan 1987: 761–766.

⁶¹Sivan 1987: 767–769. Cf. Cesa 1982: 539–552. Goffart (2006: 102) also rejects the idea of this settlement being a form of *hospitalitas*.

⁶²*Cod. Theod.* 7.20.2 and 3, to which may be added 7.20.8 and 11.

⁶³Sivan 1987: 770.

⁶⁴Matthews 1998: 319.

Philostorgius, whose evidence admittedly is not unproblematic, reports that the barbarians were given grain and land to farm in exchange for Galla.⁶⁵ Thomas Burns argues that Philostorgius has conflated two agreements—one in 416 that saw the exchange of Galla for grain and one in 418 or 419 that saw the land settlement in Aquitania—but defends Philostorgius' basic point that the Goths were granted land.⁶⁶ However, we do not need to keep the two realities quite as distinct as Burns does. The argument advanced in this article is that the Goths had been negotiating for land even prior to 416, that the first part of a treaty (grain in exchange for Galla) was implemented in 416, but that, as a condition for further aspects of the agreement (the granting of land) being realized, the Goths would help the empire deal with Spain. Only after they had fulfilled this further condition of 416 was land awarded to them in 418 or 419. Thus, the two- or three-year separation between the return of Galla and the Goths' relocation to Aquitania does not mean that we must see them as two distinct, almost unrelated, events, but rather that they can be considered as two parts of the same pact, and Philostorgius may then be taken as evidence for my reading of events. My conviction is that if somewhere to settle had always been on the Gothic agenda, then surely it would have been part of the negotiations over the return of Galla in 416, even though the fulfilment of the Roman side of that agreement was delayed until 418 or 419.

Ever since entering the western empire at the end of the fourth century and the failure of Alaric to reach Africa from Sicily in 410, the Goths tried to go there the long way around via Gaul and Spain. Gaul seemed to have been an acceptable alternative for a while, until they were driven out by Constantius. Spain proved to be the place they were stopped once again and it was here that they made their treaty with Constantius. For quite a number of years they had been in search of land. Although Zosimus presents Alaric at the beginning of the fifth century as asking only for Roman generalship, he does reveal that land for settlement had been part of Alaric's demands all along, when he acknowledges that the barbarian leader was prepared to modify, though not entirely abandon, that position (*Hist. Nou.* 5.50.3). Claudian too, while seeming to focus on the destruction the Goths inflicted in Greece while they were there and on Alaric's desire for imperial recognition (*Ruf.* 2.70, 179, 186, *Eutrop.* 2.214–218, *Stil.* 1.275–299), admits that the Goths were in search of land when he emphasises the vastness of the land from which they had come and the limited opportunities they found in Greece (*Cos. IV Hon.* 474–477).

We know from Olympiodorus (fr. 22.1–3) that in the time before he married Galla, Athaulf increased his demands beyond the grain that the Goths needed, anticipating that Constantius would refuse him, giving Athaulf reason not to

⁶⁵ Philostorgius *Hist. eccl.* 12.4: ἐκ τούτου τὸ βάρβαρον πρὸς Ὀνόριον σπένδεται· καὶ τὴν οἰκείαν ἀδελφὴν καὶ τὸν Ἄτταλον τῷ βασιλεῖ παρατίθενται αὐτοί, σιτήσῃσι τε δεξιωθέντες καὶ μοῖρὰν τιῶα τῆς τῶν Γαλατῶν χώρας εἰς γεωργίαν ἀποκληρωσάμενοι.

⁶⁶ Burns 1994: 271.

return Galla and instead to marry her. Olympiodorus' silence on what the demands were does not mean that land was not one of them. But even if land was not such a pressing issue in 413 before Athaulf married Galla as it had been previously, since the Goths were occupying first Marseille and then Narbonne, one can postulate that in 415, when Constantius and Wallia were negotiating after several years of ongoing conflict following that marriage, land of some kind formed part of the bargaining once again (as did grain and money). Land had always been part, in some way or other, of the Goths' concerns.

Putting all of this evidence together, we find that the settlement of the Goths in Aquitania Secunda and Toulouse in 418 or 419 was the final piece of an agreement that had been a decade or more in the making. It was not entirely a Roman initiative, despite what some of the sources state, but had been the dream of the Goths since they entered Roman territory two generations previously.⁶⁷ One can agree that the Goths were not militarily as powerful in 418 as they had been at the battle of Pollentia in 402. However, given that the sources concur on Constantius' desperation for the return of Galla, it must be conceded that the Goths' ability to hold on to her (willing or not) put them in a solid bargaining position. That the Goths wanted both grain and land in exchange for the emperor's half-sister and that they got both, although not immediately, should not be surprising. Constantius' ability to squeeze several more years of military service out of the Goths in Spain in turn underlines the Goths' desperation for land and the inability of one side to dominate the other in their respective bargaining positions. Both Constantius and Wallia could be commended for finding a solution acceptable to both sides of the dispute. I suspect that Galla also needs to be given some credit for ensuring that the agreement worked, putting pressure on her brother and new husband to fulfil their promises.

The acquisition of grain in 416 could only ever have been a short-term solution to an interminable problem, one which could only be solved through long-term land settlement. Well aware of the objections raised by Goffart to the idea of land settlement (above, 384, note 45), I argue that the agreement would have entailed no established Roman farming land being handed over to the Goths if they were to be given unoccupied and uncultivated land. Further, I would argue that the province was not as a whole placed under Gothic administration, even if the Goths were almost completely independent within what was intended to be an enduring Roman provincial structure.⁶⁸ Our sources are silent on linking the return of Galla with the granting of land because the land grant did not happen in 416, since the need to deal with other barbarians in Spain intervened, and these terse chroniclers were interested in events, not intentions.

⁶⁷ Here I disagree with Kulikowski (2001: 29), whose view is that we cannot extrapolate from earlier demands because the circumstances in 418 were different.

⁶⁸ Diaz 1999: 321–372.

CONCLUSION

In essence, the argument of this paper is a simple one. If the statements of Prosper, Orosius, Zosimus, and Olympiodorus can bear the weight I am assigning them, as I believe they can, then the Goths had always been in search of land upon which to settle their veterans within the boundaries of the Roman empire in the time-honoured Roman military tradition. It would then be logical to assume that a land settlement had been part of the discussion in the negotiations about the return of Galla Placidia to the empire during the time of her “captivity” from 410 to 415. The single fragment of Olympiodorus which states that in exchange for Galla the Goths received grain should not be seen as the full extent of the deal struck between Wallia and the court in Ravenna. I want to give weight to Philostorgius’ comment that the Goths received both grain and land, admittedly not at the same time. Part of the deal must have involved the Goths putting themselves at the service of the empire once again to deal with other barbarians in Spain before the second part of the bargain (the granting of land) was fulfilled. The return of Galla Placidia to the Romans at the end of 415 and the subsequent granting of land in Aquitania to the Goths can therefore be seen as being intrinsically linked.⁶⁹

CENTRE FOR EARLY CHRISTIAN STUDIES
 AUSTRALIAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY
 P.O. BOX 456
 VIRGINIA, QLD. 4014
 AUSTRALIA

geoffrey.dunn@acu.edu.au

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ambraseys, N. 2005. “Historical Earthquakes in Jerusalem: A Methodological Discussion,” *Journal of Seismology* 9: 329–340.
- Amory, P. 1997. *People and Identity in Ostrogothic Italy, 489–554*. Cambridge.
- Bachrach, B.S. 1969. “Another Look at the Barbarian Settlement in Southern Gaul,” *Traditio* 25: 354–358.
- Barnish, S. J. B. 1986. “Taxation, Land and Barbarian Settlement in the Western Empire,” *Papers of the British School at Rome* 54: 170–195.
- Birley, A. R. 2005. *The Roman Government of Britain*. Oxford.
- Blockley, R. C. 1981. *The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire: Eunapius, Olympiodorus, Priscus and Malchus*, ARCA Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs 6. Liverpool.
- Bradley, D.R. 1993. “*In altum laxare vela compulsus*: The ‘Getica’ of Jordanes,” *Hermes* 121: 211–236.

⁶⁹ An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 36th conference of the Australasian Society for Classical Studies at University of Adelaide in January 2015. I am grateful to those who have contributed to its improvement since then, particularly the anonymous reviewers for this journal, who offered insightful comments.

- Burgess, R. W. 1993. *The Chronicle of Hydatius and the Consularia Constantinopolitana: Two Contemporary Accounts of The Final Years of the Roman Empire*. Oxford.
- 1994. "The Gallic Chronicle," *Britannia* 25: 240–243.
- 2001. "The Gallic Chronicle of 452: A New Critical Edition with a Brief Introduction," in Mathisen and Shanzer 2001: 52–84.
- Burns, T. S. 1992. "The Settlement of 418," in Drinkwater and Elton 1992: 53–63.
- 1994. *Barbarians within the Gates of Rome: A Study of Roman Military Policy and the Barbarians, ca. 375–425 A.D.* Bloomington and Indianapolis.
- Burns, V. 1992. "The Visigothic Settlement in Aquitaine: Imperial Motives," *Historia* 41: 362–373.
- Cameron, A. 1970. *Claudian: Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius*. Oxford.
- Cesa, M. 1982. "Hospitalità o altro techniques of accomodation [sic]? A proposito di un libro recente," *Archivio storico italiano* 140: 539–552.
- Christensen, A. S. 2002. *Cassiodorus, Jordanes, and the History of the Goths: Studies in a Migration Myth*. Copenhagen.
- Collins, R. 2004. *Visigothic Spain 409–711*. Oxford.
- Coskun, A. 2002. "Chronology in the *Eucharisticos* of Paulinus Pellaeus: A Reassessment," *Mnemosyne* 55: 329–344.
- Croke, B. 2003. "Latin Historiography and the Barbarian Kingdoms," in G. Marasco (ed.), *Green and Roman Historiography in Late Antiquity, Fourth to Sixth Century A.D.* Leiden. 358–375.
- Devillers, O. 1995. "Le conflit entre Romains et Wisigoths en 436–439, d'après les *Getica* de Jordanès: Fortune et infortune de l'abréviateur," *Revue de Philologie* 69: 111–126.
- Diaz, P. C. 1999. "Visigothic Political Institutions," in Heather 1999: 321–372.
- Dindorf, W. 1832. *Themistii Orationes, ex codices Mediolanensi emendatae a Guilielmo Dindorfio*. Leipzig.
- Drinkwater, J. and H. Elton (eds.). 1992. *Fifth-Century Gaul: A Crisis of Identity?* Cambridge.
- Dunn, G. D. 2007. "The Validity of Marriage in Cases of Captivity: The Letter of Innocent I to Probus," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovaniensis* 83: 107–121.
- 2009. "The Care of the Poor in Rome and Alaric's Sieges," in G. D. Dunn, D. Luckensmeyer, and L. Cross (eds.), *Prayer and Spirituality in the Early Church 5: Poverty and Riches*. Strathfield, NSW. 319–333.
- 2010a. "Easter and the Battle of Pollentia," *Journal of Religious History* 34: 55–66.
- 2010b. "Innocent I, Alaric, and Honorius: Church and State in Early Fifth-Century Rome," in D. Luckensmeyer and P. Allen (eds), *Studies in Religion and Politics in the Early Christian Centuries*. Strathfield, NSW. 243–262.
- 2014. "Episcopal Crisis Management in Late Antique Gaul: The Example of Exsuperius of Toulouse," *Antichthon* 48: 126–143.
- 2015. "Imperial Interventions in the Disputed Roman Episcopal Election of 418/419," *Journal of Religious History* 39: 1–13.
- Elton, H. 2015. "Military Developments in the Fifth Century," in Maas 2015: 125–139.
- Fear, A. 2007. "War and Society," in P. Sabin, H. van Wees, and M. Whitby (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Warfare 2: Rome from the Late Republic to the Late Empire*. Cambridge. 424–458.
- tr. 2010. *Orosius: Seven Books of History against the Pagans*. Liverpool.

- Fielding, I. 2014. "Physical Ruin and Spiritual Perfection in Fifth-Century Gaul: Orientius and His Contemporaries on the 'Landscape of the Soul'," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 22: 569–585.
- Gillett, A. 1995. "The Birth of Ricimer," *Historia* 44: 380–384.
- . 2000. "Jordanes and Ablabius," in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* 10. Collection *Latomus* 254. Brussels. 479–500.
- . 2003. *Envoys and Political Communication in the Late Antique West, 411–533*. Cambridge.
- Goffart, W. 1980. *Barbarians and Romans A.D. 418–584: The Techniques of Accommodation*. Princeton.
- . 2005. *The Narrators of Barbarian History (A.D. 550–800): Jordanes, Gregory of Tours, Bede, and Paul the Deacon*. Rev. ed. Notre Dame.
- . 2006. *Barbarian Tides: The Migration Age and the Later Roman Empire*. Philadelphia.
- Gundlach, W. ed. 1978. *Epistolae Merowingici et Karolini aevi*. MGHEpp 3. Munich.
- Halsall, G. 2007. *Barbarian Migrations and the Roman West 376–568*. Cambridge.
- Heather, P. 1991. *Goths and Romans 332–489*. Oxford.
- . 1996. *The Goths*. Oxford.
- ed. 1999. *The Visigoths from the Migration Period to the Seventh Century: An Ethnographic Perspective*. Woodbridge.
- . 2006. *The Fall of the Roman Empire: A New History of Rome and the Barbarians*. Oxford.
- . 2009. "Why Did the Barbarian Cross the Rhine?," *Journal of Late Antiquity* 2: 3–29.
- . 2010. *Empires and Barbarians: The Fall of Rome and the Birth of Europe*. Oxford.
- Heather, P. and J. Matthews. 1991. *The Goths in the Fourth Century*. Liverpool.
- Heather, P. and D. Moncur. 2001. *Politics, Philosophy, and Empire in the Fourth Century: Select Orations of Themistius*. Liverpool.
- Hughes, I. 2010. *Stilicho: The Vandal Who Saved Rome*. Barnsley.
- Jasper, D. 2001. "The Beginning of the Decretal Tradition: Papal Letters from the Origin of the Genre through the Pontificate of Stephen v," in D. Jasper and H. Fuhrmann, *Papal Letters in the Early Middle Ages*. Washington, D.C. 1–133.
- Jiménez Garnica, A. M. 1999. "Settlement of the Visigoths in the Fifth Century," in Heather 1999: 93–128.
- Kulikowski, M. 2000a. "The Career of the *Comes Hispaniarum* Asterius," *Phoenix* 54: 123–141.
- . 2000b. "Barbarians in Gaul, Usurpers in Britain," *Britannia* 31: 325–345.
- . 2001. "The Visigothic Settlement in Aquitania: The Imperial Perspective," in Mathisen and Shanzer 2001: 26–38.
- . 2004. *Late Roman Spain and Its Cities*. Baltimore.
- . 2007. *Rome's Gothic Wars*. Cambridge.
- Lacombrade, C., N. Terzaghi, and J. Lamoureux (eds.). 1978–2008. *Synésios de Cyrène*. 6 vols. Paris.
- Lawrence, T. C. 2013. "Crisis of Legitimacy: Honorius, Galla Placidia, and the Struggles for Control of the Western Roman Empire, 405–425 c.e.," PhD diss., University of Tennessee. Knoxville.

- Liebeschuetz, W. 2007. "The Debate about the Ethnogenesis of the Germanic Tribes," in H. Amirav and B. ter Haar Romeny (eds.), *From Rome to Constantinople: Studies in Honour of Averil Cameron*. Leuven. 341–355.
- Lütkenhaus, W. 1998. *Constantius III: Studien zu seiner Tätigkeit und Stellung im Westreich 411–421*. Bonn.
- Maas, M. ed. 2015. *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Attila*. Cambridge.
- . 2009. "Poetic Creativity and Political Crisis in Early Fifth-Century Gaul," *Journal of Late Antiquity* 2: 60–74.
- Mathisen, R. W. 2009. "Prouvinciales, gentiles, and Marriages between Romans and Barbarians in the Late Roman Empire," *JRS* 99: 140–155.
- and H. S. Sivan. 1999. "Forging a New Identity: The Kingdom of Toulouse and the Frontiers of Visigothic Aquitania (418–507)," in A. Ferreiro (ed.), *The Visigoths: Studies in Culture and Society*. Leiden. 1–62.
- and D. Shanzer (eds). 2001. *Society and Culture in Late Antique Gaul: Revisiting the Sources*. Aldershot.
- Matthews, J. 1998. *Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court A.D. 364–425*². Oxford.
- McLynn, N. 1995. "Paulinus the Impenitent: A Study of the *Eucharisticos*," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 3: 461–486.
- Mommsen, T. ed. 1882. *Jordanis. Romana et Getica*. MGHAA 5/1. Berlin.
- . 1892. *Chronica Minora saec. IV, V, VI, VII* 1. MGHAA 9. Berlin.
- . 1894. *Chronica Minora saec. IV, V, VI, VII* 2. MGHAA 11. Berlin.
- Mucke, H. and J. Meeus. 1992. *Canon of Solar Eclipses, –2003 to +2526*². Vienna.
- Muhlberger, S. 1981. *The Fifth-Century Chroniclers: Prosper, Hydatius, and the Gallic Chronicler of 452*. ARCA Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs 27. Liverpool.
- Mynors, R. A. B. 1964. *XII Panegyrici Latini*. Oxford.
- Nixon, C. E. V. 1987. *Pacatus: Panegyric to the Emperor Theodosius*. Liverpool.
- . 1992. "Relations between Visigoths and Romans in Fifth-Century Gaul," in Drinkwater and Elton 1992: 64–74.
- and B. S. Rodgers. 1994. *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors: The Panegyrici Latini*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Oost, S. I. 1968. *Galla Placidia Augusta: A Biographical Essay*. Chicago and London.
- Paschoud, F. ed. 2003. *Zosime, Histoire nouvelle*. 3 vols. Paris.
- Pohl, W. 2015. "Migrations, Ethnic Groups, and State Building," in Maas 2015: 247–263.
- Rebenich, S. 2009. "Christian Asceticism and Barbarian Incursion: The Making of a Christian Catastrophe," *Journal of Late Antiquity* 2: 49–59.
- Ridley, R. T. 1982. *Zosimus: New History*. Canberra.
- Salisbury, J. E. 2015. *Rome's Christian Empress: Galla Placidia Rules at the Twilight of the Empire*. Baltimore.
- Scharf, R. 1992. "Der spanische Kaiser Maximus und die Ansiedlung der Westgoten in Aquitanien," *Historia* 41: 374–384.
- Schmidt-Hofner, S. 2014. "Ostentatious Legislation: Law and Dynastic Change, A.D. 364–365," in J. Wienand (ed.), *Contested Monarchy: Integrating the Roman Empire in the Fourth Century A.D.* Oxford. 67–99

- Schwarcz, A. 2001. "The Visigothic Settlement in Aquitania: Chronology and Archaeology," in Mathisen and Shanzer 2001: 15–25.
- Sivan, H. 1985. "An Unedited Letter of the Emperor Honorius to the Spanish Soldiers," *ZPE* 61: 273–287.
- 1987. "On *foederati*, *hospitalitas*, and the Settlement of the Goths in A.D. 418," *AJP* 108: 759–772.
- 1992. "Town and Country in Late Antique Gaul: The Example of Bordeaux," in Drinkwater and Elton 1992: 132–143.
- 1998. "The Appropriation of Roman Law in Barbarian Hands: 'Roman-Barbarian' Marriage in Visigothic Gaul and Spain," in W. Pohl and H. Reimitz (eds.), *Strategies of Distinction: The Construction of Ethnic Communities, 300–800*. Leiden. 189–203.
- 2002. "From Athanaric to Ataulf: The Shifting Horizons of 'Gothicness' in Late Antiquity," in J.-M. Carrié and R. Lizzi Testa (eds.), *Humana sapit: Études d'antiquité tardive offertes à Lellia Cracco Ruggini*. Turnhout. 55–62.
- 2011. *Galla Placidia: The Last Roman Empress*. Oxford.
- Thompson, E. A. 1956. "The Settlement of the Barbarians in Southern Gaul," *JRS* 46: 65–75.
- 1982. *Romans and Barbarians: The Decline of the Western Empire*. Madison.
- Wallace-Hadrill, J. M. 1961. "Gothia and Romania," *BJRL* 44: 213–237.
- Wesch-Klein, G. 2011. "Recruits and Veterans," in P. Erdkamp (ed.), *A Companion to the Roman Army*. Chichester. 435–450.
- Wolfram, H. 1988. *History of the Goths*. Tr. Thomas J. Dunlap. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Wood, I. 1990. "Appendix: The Settlement of the Burgundians," in H. Wolfram and W. Pohl (eds.), *Typen der Ethnogenese unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Bayern 1*. Vienna. 65–69.
- Wood, J. 2012. *The Politics of Identity in Visigothic Spain: Religion and Power in the Histories of Isidore of Seville*. Leiden.