ROMANS, BARBARIANS AND THE POLITICAL HISTORY IN LATE ANTIQUITY[1]

Renan Frighetto[2]

Abstract

There are historiographical conventions that lead the work of the historian. Among them, the beacon of the historical chronology is, without a doubt, one of the most important to be offered more precise explanations over the short, middle, and longtime immersed on the scope of temporality of History. Inserted in the time spectrum situated between the Hellenistic Past and the Medieval Ages, the Late Antiquity (3rd –8th centuries) has been gaining prominence on the latest half-century since the renovation of the sociocultural studies proposed by Peter Brown. At the beginning of the 21st century, associated to the political and institutional movements occurred at the end of the last century, it was proposed a new "tour" around the study of political and institutional History that put on the center of the historiographical debate about the Late Antiquity put both the Roman Empire (3rd– 6thcenturies) and the roman-barbarians monarchies (5th –8th centuries) in the Roman Western territories. As these political-institutional entities were forged and which would be associated to the ones they constituted, issues that are pointed out in our study and which has the goths the most highlighted example of a roman-heathen monarchy heir to the Roman Imperial political-institutional tradition.

Keywords

Late Antiquity; Late Roman Empire; Roman-Barbarians Monarchies; Goths.

Resumo

Existem convenções historiográficas que guiam o trabalho do historiador. Dentre elas o balizamento da cronologia histórica é, sem dúvida, uma das mais importantes para que se possam oferecer explicações mais precisas sobre os tempos curto, médio e longo imersos no âmbito da temporalidade da História. Inserida no espectro temporal situado entre o passado helenístico e o medieval, a Antiguidade Tardia (séculos III – VIII) vem ganhando destaque no último meio século desde a renovação dos estudos socioculturais proposta por Peter Brown. No início do século XXI, associado aos movimentos políticos e institucionais ocorridos no final da centúria passada, se propôs um novo "giro" ao estudo da História política e institucional que colocou no centro do debate historiográfico sobre a Antiguidade Tardia tanto o Império Romano tardio (séculos III – VI) como as monarquias romano-bárbaras (séculos V – VIII) nos territórios romanos ocidentais. Como estas entidades político-institucionais foram forjadas e quais seriam os partícipes que as constituíram, questões que são apontadas em nosso estudo e que tem nos godos o exemplo mais destacado de uma monarquia romano-bárbara herdeira da tradição político-institucional imperial romana.

Palavras-chave

Antiguidade Tardia; Império Romano tardio; monarquias romano-bárbaras; godos.

1. The Late Antiquity and the political-institutional History

Age of changing, transformation and readjustments, the Late Antiquity is conventionally determined, in historiographical terms, between the 3rd and 8th centuries A.D (Carrié and Rousselle, 1999: 11; Cameron, 2002: 166 – 170; Brown, 2015: 1; Carrié, 2017: 179 - 182) involving varied discussions such as the ones that are about the "end" of the ancient world and the "decay" of the Roman Empire (Ando, 2009: 59 – 76). A complex debate and, in many cases, marked by contemporary ideological discussions and almost always so distant of that specific context just like the historical structure demarcated by those six centuries of history. An influence of the approaches of the present that end up exerting a weight over the analysis related to the past and may difficult our understanding and our knowledge of the own concept of Late Antiquity. Somehow, the historical point of view of the present becomes inevitable, according as we live and we are products of the contemporaneous, like Averil Cameron claims:

> "... Perhaps it is true that every age gets the history it deserves. At any rate I am willing to defend the idea that history itself is perceived in the mirror of the present, and that historians bring their perceptions of the present to their vision of the past...." (Cameron, 2002: 176).

With effect, the search for explanations of the past makes us associate certain contemporary events with those ancient events establishing nexuses between the fall of the Wall of Berlin or even the collapse of Soviet Union with the "fall" of Rome (Giardina, 1999: 161; Cameron, 2002: 175). However, these parallels may bring a degree of extra complication to late antique students, insofar as we must discuss the concept of "fall" that refers to other concepts such as "crisis" and even the concept of "decay", that must be problematized in the scope of the historical context of Late Antiquity to we know if *de facto* we can embrace them in our studies (Bravo, 2013: 22; Carrié, 2017: 175 – 178). Since Gibbon and throughout the 19th century and good part of 20th century, the relation established between *crisis – decay - fall* was used to explain the disappearance of imperial political power in the roman territories of the *Pars Occidentalis* and introduce an Eastern Roman Empire that hugely distanced from that "golden age" that marked the roman imperial world of the 1st and 2nd centuries A.D, the "Great Empire" that gained the most civilized highlighted complements before the "Sordid Empire" rude, violent and barbarian that lead to an Age of Darkness and Obscurity(Perkins, 2007: 9 – 10). Well, it was precisely the Late Antiquity that appeared branded with a complete negativity by historians that lived in Christianity and by the "arrival" of these heathens that made them the

true guilty of the end of the roman civilization being, this way, projected to a perfect and bizarre history (Carrié, 2017: 176). Perhaps because of these pessimistic and a bit misrepresented projection that we find in 1970 the return of the studies on Late Antiquity through the sociocultural passage presented by Peter Brown in its *The World of Late Antiquity. From Marcus Aurelius to Muhammad* on which reinforced the periodization of the late antique period between the end of the 2nd century and the 8th century, besides offering a highlight to the social cultural subjects that involved characters such as the bishop and the holy man, demonstrating that the Christianity contributed to the preservation and survival of classic culture opposing, therefore, the suggestion of the authors that pointed him out as the causer of the decay of roman civilization (Brown, 1971: 49 – 112).

On the pillar of research and results achieved by Peter Brown, a significative number of historians between 1980 and 2000 followed its steps developing interesting and robust investigations over the late-antique world, according to the sociocultural perspective. However, other subjects were forgotten and "numbed", this aspect criticized precisely by Andrea Giardina:

> "...the enrichment and maturation of the concept of late-antique (and periodization) saw a field of inquiry dominate over all the others, the one related to sociocultural processes in a broader sense. Periodization's based on these processes ended up hiding the other possibilities. And what suffered most was the history of institutions and politics: it will suffice to reflect on the fact that among the significant events that took place at this time, the one that has the least impact on the notion of late-antique and that is least considered when we talk about periodization, is the very fall of the Roman Empire (...). The resizing of this theme offers a less catastrophic view of the impact of the Germanic peoples on the Roman territories (according to largely pirennian assumptions) and of formulating in terms of late-antique ethnogenesis the process of building new political, administrative and social structures..." (Giardina, 1999: 172 – 173).

Among the several subjects that were relegated to a secondary plain in the studies concerning the Late Antiquity were, as pointed by Giardina, those facing the political and institutional history. It is likely, although hard to confirm, that the debates over the "fall" of Rome have caused this abandonment of the political and institutional subjects by part of the historiography. However, we must consider that much research differs from the concept of "fall" of the roman world indicating, thus, a preference for the pragmatic continuation, conservation, and preservation of Rome under a political and institutional perspective transformed and reshaped. Furthermore, we must remember of the several interactions that occurred between Rome, the provinces, and the "modern"

participants of the political scene of the 5[th]century A.D, the heathen groups gained roots in the roman imperial territories. By this sense, concurring with the observations of Giardina and expanding them, Averil Cameron indicated the need to revisit the study of political institutional history to know better a context that gained new shapes:

> "... We may see a return to institutional history, as called for by Andrea Giardina, and the political agendas which have been in eclipse may be waiting to be revived. But in the meantime this heyday of the late-antique studies has disrupted, the old certainties about our own historical development. It had substituted new questions for old ones and subverted traditional assumptions about the classical and medieval worlds..." (Cameron, 2002: 191).

2. The problems that deserve to be told: the share of power, the hereditarian succession and the political provincialism.

In the line of approach of traditional subjects, the remained untouched and shaded by the studies and investigations over the late antique world on the latest 50 years, we highlight the one that involved the practice of partition of the imperial power from the 2nd century A.D and that had a significative impact in the political-institutional of the Roman Empire and the roman-heathen monarchies that replaced them in the western roman territories from the 5th century A.D. Ergo, we are talking of long duration and structural historical process marked by continuities in the way of making this share of power and by ruptures, because in many cases the change of rulers was made by the use of force and usurpation. By analysing the share of imperial power since the beginnings of the rule of Marcus Aurelius (161-180), Valério Neri presents us both the scheme and the quantity of participants of that political division during great part of the 3rd century A.D:

> "...Starting with Marco Aurelio and Lucio Vero, we find imperial collegiates formed by two or three *Augustos*, as in the brief period between 209 and 211 with Septimio Severe and his sons Caracala and Geta. A duplicity of the Augustes is often witnessed in the third century: Septimio Severe and his son Caracala from 198 to 209; Caracala and Geta from 211 to 212; Pupieno and Balbino in 238; Felipe and his son Felipe *iunior* from 247 to 249; Decius and his son Herenio Etruscan in 251; Treboniano Galo and Décio's son Hostiliano, also in 251; Valerian and his son Galienus from 253 to 260; finally Caro and his son Carino in 283 and Carino and his brother Numeriano in 284..." (Neri, 2013: 659).

Proceeding with the analysis made by the Italian historian, the share of imperial power was properly marked by the practiced collegiality between the *Augustos* that exerted it, concluding by leading them to the

understanding that would have been the model of choice of a conjunct to make the government assignments applied by those *a priori* who could have withheld the power to itself individually. A transformation that took shape in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, always pointed out as the great defender of the stoic principles related to the personal merit and political adoption, responsible for the restitution of the principle of hereditary succession that seemed abandoned since the end of the 1st Century, A.D (Peachin, 2006: 129 – 130). By nominating and instituting his son Commodus, first as *Cesar* and then as *Imperator* in 176, Marcus Aurelius abandoned the principles that defined political adoption, lined in the association to the power of the one whom would be considered as the bearer of the superior conditions to rule, transferring to the choice of a natural and familiar successor not always seen as the most qualified to exercise it. An idol that fitted perfectly to Commodus, according to *Historia Augusta* (Matthews, 2007: 294 – 303; Den Hengst, 2010: 177 – 185):

> "... Such was Marcus' kindness toward his own Family that he bestowed the insignia of Every office on all his kin, while on his son, and na accursed and foul one he was, he hastened to bestow the name of Caesar, then afterward the priesthood, and, a little later, the title of imperator and a share in triumph and the consulship. It was at this time that Marcus, though acclaimed imperator, ran on foot in the circus by the side of the triumphal car in which his son was seated ..." (Julius Capitolinus, Marcus Antoninus thephilosopher, XVI, 1 – 2).

However, the change in the principle of the choice of adoption to that of hereditary succession also reveals to us the continuity of the process of institutional emptying of the Senate of Rome. If even Lucio Vero's association with imperial power was a consultation and the consequent ratification by the senatorial group of the appointment of his "brother" by Marcus Aurelius (Julius Capitolinus, Verus, III, 8), the choice and assumption of his son Commodus appear as a personal will of *princeps* who believed more in family fidelity than in that of a possible adoption. For this he counted, certainly, the unsuccessful attempt of usurpation carried out in 175 by the legionary commander of *Síria* and one of the most important Roman military leaders in the Hellenistic East, Avidius Cassius, who had received both from Marcus Aurelius and from the Senate the grant of the *Imperium Maius,* the supreme military command, on the legionnaire corps stationed in the eastern provinces (Dio Cassius, Roman History, LXXI, 2, 2). Declared by the Senate *Inimicushostes*, enemy of the Romans (Julius Capitolinus, Marcus Antoninus the philosopher, XXIV, 9), Cassius was quickly defeated and eliminated, but his example marked the spirit of Marcus Aurelius who preferred to share power with his son. In this sense informs us Aelius Lampridius in *Historia Augusta*:

"... While yet a child he was given the name of Caesar, along with his brother Verus, and in his fourteenth year he was enrolled in the college of priests (…). Ainda criança (Comodo) recebeu o nome de *César*, junto com seu irmão Verus, e no décimo quarto ano ele ingressou no colégio de sacerdotes (...). He assumed the toga on the Nones of July – the day on which Romulus vanished from the earth – at the time when Cassius revolted from Marcus. After he had been commended to the favour of the soldiers he set out with his father for Syria and Egypt, and with him he returned to Rome. Afterward he was granted exemption from the law of the appointed year and made consul, and on the fifth day before the Kalends of December, in the consulship of Pollio and Aper, he was acclaimed Imperator together with his father, and celebrated a triumph with him..." (Aelius Lampridius, Commodus Antoninus, I, 10; II, 1 – 5).

What we want to highlight with this information is that we found since last 2nd Century A.D a *terminus post quam*, or the beginning of the enforcement of this principle of choice by the hereditary succession alongside the roman imperial power that will gain breath and projection for the entire Late Antiquity[3]. Analyzing closely the information presented by documentation, we verify that between the 3rd and 5th Centuries A.D this tendency to hereditary succession consolidated itself of a full form, especially after the period of the Diarchy (285 – 293) (Zugravu, 2011: 285 – 288) and the Tetrarchy (293 – 311)stablished throughout the reign of Diocletian (284 – 305). During this quarter century the choice of imperial cove was given, especially, thanks to the military prestige held by the participants of puissance, as indicated by Aurelius Victor during the description of the Tetrarchy and those who shared it:

"... Proud for this (Carausio), as he had defeated many barbarians without having offered the return of the booty to the public treasury and for fear of Herculean (Maximian) who, as he knew, had given the order to kill him, he went to Britania afterwards to conquer power. At the same time the Persians violently agitated in the East (...). Furthermore, in Alexandria, Egypt, one named Achilles had taken the insignia of absolute power. For these reasons, they (Diocletian and Maximian) named Julius Constancio and Galerius Maximianus Caesars, whose name was Armentario, and became related to them (...). All were from Illyricum and, although little educated, they were educated by the difficulties of the field and the army and were very good rulers (...). But the concord of these emperors has shown, above all, that their natural talent and the experience of good military training (...) were almost sufficient to ensure their worth..." (Aurelius Victor, De Caesaribus, 39, 21 – 28).

This way, we can say that from the 4th Century A.D the succession to imperial power was lined by the relation established between the tenure

---

[3] The examples indicated by the study of Valério Neri shows the strengthening of this tendency throughout the 3rd Century A.D, since the succession of Septimius Severus (193-211) until the reign of Carus, Carinus and Numerian (282-284).

of the military prestige partially by the emperors and the consequent insertion of its children and successors in the structure of the imperial administration, according to the already traditional division between the *Augusto* and one or more *Caesars*. The ample period of the reign of Constantine (306 – 337) serves as an effective example of this way of sharing the imperial power. Having elevated its power after the passing of its father, the *Augusto* Constantius, in 306 (Cameron, 2013: 106) and having participated of the tetrarch system in its last period (Aurelius Victor, De Caesaribus, 40, 2 – 16; Eutropius, Breviary, X, 2 – 4), Constantine carried through nominating its children and a nephew, Dalmatius (Jones, 1971: 241) as its *Caesars* and successors to the imperial power, certainly influenced by the military and collegiate esprit of the Tetrarchy and proposing the unity ruled in one *Augusto senior* that would be supported by the further *Augustos* or *Caesars* that would be, effectively, its lieutenants (Silva, 2018: 103). An idea that was kept after the death of Constantine himself, as informed by Eutropius and the Christian Paulus Orosiusin its *Historia Adversus Paganus*:

> "... (Constantine I) He left as successors three sons and a son by his brother. But Dalmatio Caesar, of excellent character and nothing like his uncle, was eliminated not long after by a military insurrection and by Constancio (II), his cousin, who if not instigated at least allowed it..." (Eutropius, Breviary, X, 9, 1)

> "... In the year 1092 of the foundation of the city, Constancio (II), thirty-fifth emperor, obtained the throne in the company of his brothers Constantine (II) and Constans, keeping it for twenty-four years. Among Constantine's (I) successors were also Caesar Dalmatio, his brother's son; but this was immediately eliminated by a group of soldiers ..." (Paulus Orosius, Historia, VII, 29, 1).

It is interesting we ascertain, in both reports over the succession of Constantine, the prominence of the legionnaire forces both for the choice of the emperor as for the elimination of possible rivals demonstrating that the proximity of the holders of the imperial power to the roman army appeared as a *sine qua non* condition to its political conservation and material survival. That is why the *aclamatio imperii*, the plaudits made by the legionnaires and that gave recognition and support to the new emperor, kept being the main passage to the sustenance of the imperial power including, also, the indication of coves on which shared the power, both the heirs and the successors to the condition of *Caesars* and imperial *Augustos* (Escribano, 1990: 253). On the other hand, it is worth saying that the legionnaire appraisals could favor the rise of usurpers and tyrants that competed with the authentic emperors, reinforcing the assumption of powers of regional nature before the impartial power slope the political unit. During the 4th Century A.D we encounter several usurpatory

movements supported in the regional legionnaire where the usurper had a detached command role, events such as Magnentius and Vetranio (Jones, 1971: 532; 954; Mazzarino, 2007: 702 – 705) who were chosen by its legionnaires since the death of Constans in 350:

> "... After the death of Constans and that Magnentius gained control over Italy, Africa and the Galias, even Illyricum rebelled after electing Vetranio to the command in agreement with the soldiers. They named him emperor, because he was older and much loved by all due to the length and success of his military career, to defend Illyricum..." (Eutropius, Breviary, X, 10, 2).

> "... Magnentius took power in the city of Augustudono (Autun), a power that immediately extended to Galia, Africa and Italy. However, in Illyricum the soldiers named Vetranio as emperor, an old man, simple and pleasant to all ..." (Paulus Orosius, Historia, VII, 29, 8).

Both Vetranio and Magnentius were defeated and eliminated by Constantius II (337 – 361) (Aurelius Victor, De Caesaribus, 42, 1 – 10; Humphries, 2014: 158 – 160), but its usurpatory deeds, as well as other military chiefs, indicated a tendency of regionalization of political powers. For sure that these waded *paripassu* with the share of imperial power that gained a larger breath with the effective administrative and military division of the roman world from 364 when Valentinian I (364 – 375) and its brother Valens (364 – 378) effectuated those who were recognized as the Western Roman Empire and the Eastern Roman Empire (Drijvers, 2015: 94 – 95), thus presented by Ammianus Marcellinus:

> "... After matters had been thus arranged, the troops also were divided between the two emperors. And when after this the two brothers entered Sirmium, after sharing the places of residence according to the wishes of the superior, Valentinian went off to Mediolanum, Valens to Constantinople. The Orient was governed by Salutius with the rank of prefect, Italy with Africa and Illyricum by Mamertinus, and the Gallic provinces by Germanianus..." (Ammianus Marcellinus, Historia, XXVI, 5, 3 – 5).

3. The Barbarians and the contact with Rome: interaction, integration, and transformation of the Roman World.

The division between the Western and Eastern Roman Empires became, from then on, an irreversible political reality, besides a short period on which Theodosius (379-395) gathered the imperial power under its tutelage after defeating an usurpatory battle carried out by Eugenius and its frank allied Arbogast, on the year of 394-395 (Paulus Orosius, Historia, VII, 35, 11 – 19). Since the death of the Emperor Valens faced with the goths on the battle of Adrianople, in the year of 378, Theodosius was

associated by the Western Roman Empire, Gratian[4] (375 – 383), to succeed its deceased uncle and exert the imperial power over the East and the roman province of *Tracia* (Paulus Orosius, Historia, VII, 34, 1 – 3; Hydatius, Chronica, a.379 – 380). Like its predecessors in the roman empire sole, Theodosius associated its sons, Arcadius in 383 (Paulus Orosius, Historia, VII, 34, 9) and Honorius in 393 (Claudian, Panegyricof third consulateof Honorius, 83 – 88), as *Augustos* and its successors keeping, in this way, the principle of sharing the power by the heredity that was once common and attribute on the roman world throughout the entire 4th Century A.D.

However, the youth and inexperience of the *Augustos* now of Theodosius 'death, Arcadius had 18 years old and Honorius with 10 years, had emerged in the Roman imperial political scenario the images of two important characters, Rufinus and Stilicho enemies that acted as guardians of the callow emperors (Elton, 2018: 148 – 151) and that became the true holders of military power on the respective Western and Eastern portions of the Roman World (Eunapiusof Sardes, Historia, I, 63; ZOSIMUS, Historia Rea, V, 1). Rivals that are described by Claudian in the following terms:

> "... After the submission of the Alps and the liberation of the kingdom of Hesperia from the world, welcoming its emperor (Theodosius) in the place he deserved, it shone much more with the addition of a star; and then, Stilicho, the power of Rome and the government of the world was placed in your care; you are entrusted with the royalty of the two brothers (Arcadius and Honorius) and the army of both courts (eastern and western). Rufino (because his terrible crimes cannot stand the peace and his stained faces refuse to dry) begins to place the world again in frightful wars and to disturb the peace with his accustomed disorders ..." (Claudian, Contra Rufino II, 5, 1 – 11).

The poem of Claudian shows us a canvasser and supporter of the cause of Stilicho, military of roman-heathen origin and one of the closest congregated of Theodosius that exerted until its death, in 408, the active power in the Western Roman Empire in name of the young emperor Honorius (395 – 423) (Gasparri& La Rocca, 2013: 68 – 70; Elton, 2018: 148). Withal, the information bequeathed by the poet reveals us the arrival to the condition of *magister militum*, military commander of the western roman imperial forces, of heathen leaderships that occupied throughout the 4th Century A.D a larger space inside the roman military structure (Blockley, 2008: 111 – 112). It is assured that the intense participation of heathen combatants in the entirety of the roman legionnaire army goes back to the condition of *dediticios* of heathen groups defeated by Rome

---

[4]Eldest son of Valentinian I and exalted to the condition of *Augusto* in the year of 367.

since the 2nd Century A.D that participated as auxiliary troops of the roman legions commanded by roman militaries (Wirth, 1997: 15 – 27). As the roman conquest reached territorial spaces beyond the Mediterranean, the contact, and the attritions with the heathen populations located in the closest regions to the roman outskirts alongside *Germania*, the *barbaricum* (James, 2011: 47; Gasparri& La Rocca, 2013: 75), became constant, as well as the interaction and the cultural and commercial exchanges expanded considerably. Movements that involved, also, the incorporation and adaptation to the respective roman and heathen realities of political power role assignments that had as primary role the insertion and the overture to the heathens of several institutional spheres, such as the participation in the roman legionnaire army that, gradually, propitiated the political and military promotion of the leaders of heathen tribes (James, 2011: 235 – 253). But since the mid-3rd Century A.D, with the military reforms carried out by Gallienus (253 – 268), the participation of heathen combatants alongside the roman legions increased exponentially propitiating to those a possible sociopolitical ascension by way of branch and military forces. The *fortitudo*, the strength and the military ability of the individual, earned the condition of political virtue of enormous spread (Rodríguez Gervás, 1991: 107; Elton, 2018: 105) and as a counterpoint of the simple *ferocitas*, the fierceness, pointed out as an inherent flaw to the heathens (Ware, 2014: 89). Perhaps we will find here a possible explanation to understand how it happened the principle of inclusion of these heathen groups within the roman society when they passed of a simple participation as combatants defeated by Rome to the condition of allies and defenders of the imperial authority (Elton, 2018: 91 – 100; Geary, 2005: 104).

Since the end of the 4th Century A.D and throughout the 5th Century A.D some strategies were utilized by the imperial authority to coopt the heathen kings to the roman cause, as a permission so that the heathen population could allocate inside the imperial *limes* receiving the statute of federate from the romans and certain advantages such as the receive of commodities to make the military defense of the imperial territories against potential external enemies (Díaz Martínez, 2008: 18). It is certain that these actions shook a possible and future integration of the heathens in the *romana ciuilitas*, but it would be insufficient before kings that desired possess to itself a similar authority to the one from the roman emperor and that simultaneously sought its proposition before heathen aristocratic groups that started to involve themselves in the disputes over the control of the reins of the political power inside its tribes seeking to take over the interlocution with the romans (Valverde Castro, 2000: 23).

For these reasons and to strengthen its position, the king appealed to the confrontation against the imperial forces in the attempt of taking profits that would increase its political position. To avoid the clash, that, in most of the cases, induced many human losses, loots and spoils inside the roman provinces, the imperial authority ended up conceiving to the heathen king the honour of bearing the title of *magister militum*, a responsibility that in the Western territories belonged to Stilicho since 395 (Cameron, 1998: 48; Jones, 1971: 853 – 858). We can think that the role fulfilled by the western roman military chief, a roman – a closest vandal to the emperors Theodosius and Honorius, served as a sort of desired reflex from other barbarian's leaders as possible route to reach the own imperial sole, were in the eastern territories, were in the western territories of the roman world.

4. The Goths and the shape of a roman-barbarian kingdom in Late Antiquity.

The relevance achieved by Stilicho in the roman political environment on the latest 4th Century A.D serves as a parameter so we can analyse a heathen leadership that struck the highest region of the political-military administration in the roman world, the king of the Goths Alaric (I) (395 – 410) (Martindale, 1980: 43 – 48; Valverde Castro, 2000: 24 – 36). Integrant of the *gens*of the Balt (Jordanes, Getica, XXIX, 146), Alaric was king of *its* goths (Paulus Orosius, Historia, VII, 37, 2), an information that reveals that its authority reached a significant portion of its heathen aristocratic groups, however without reaching all the goths. From another part, it is extremely complex we clearly stablish who were these goths, since their interactions with another heathen groups went back to the 2nd and 3rd Century A.D (Sanz Serrano, 2009: 66 – 71; Valverde Castro, 2000: 18 – 20). Furthermore, the establishment of the goths as *dediticios*in the closest areas to the roman world, alongside the Danuban *limes*, were realized by the romans since the reign of Claudius II (268 – 270) (Aurelius Victor, De Caesaribus, 34, 3 – 6; Eutropius, Breviary, IX, 11, 2), Aurelian (270 – 275) (Eutropius, Breviary, IX, 13, 1) and Constantine (I) (Aurelius Victor, De Caesaribus, 41, 12 – 13; Eutropius, Breviary, X, 7, 1 – 2). Soon, the presence and settlement of goth tribes in the frontier of the roman world occurred with anteriority to the big displacement that took several tribes of Goths, Sarmatians, Huns and Alans to join the territories of the Eastern Roman Empire in 376 (Ammianus Marcellinus, Historia, XXXI, 4; Eunapiusof Sardes, Historia, 55). It was the set of these heathen groups, lead by the chiefs of the tribes of the goths such as Fritigerno and Alavivo

(Ammianus Marcellinus, Historia, XXXI, 5) that defeated and eliminated in 378 the Emperor Valens and a significative portion of the eastern roman army in Adrianople (Ammianus Marcellinus, Historia, XXXI, 13). From this myriad of barbarian's clans and aristocrats Alaric has emerged, depicted by Zosimus this way:

> "... Since he plotted such perfidy, Rufino, as he saw Alaric starting a movement to rebel and turn his back on the laws (for he was dissatisfied for not displaying any military command, counting only on those barbarians who had delivered Theodosius to him when he was with him. slaughtered the usurper Eugene), secretly instructed him to advance, bringing the barbarians who were under his command and others who joined his own. Therefore, Alaric left the places he occupied in Thrace to launch himself on Macedonia and Thessaly, destroying everything he found in his path ..." (Zosimus, Historia Rea, V, 5, 3 – 5).

As observed in the report of Zosimus, Alaric gained projection thanks to its military actions that, directly, extended its importance before the combatants and tribes lead by him. By provoking a series of loots and havoc in the nearest provinces of Constantinople, the king of the goths showed himself before the imperial authorities and the heathen aristocratic leaders as a strong military chief, that counted with the support of its allies and that put himself as an interlocutor and negotiator recognized by the romans (Díaz Martínez, 1998: 177; Elton, 2018: 225). In other words, the permanent state of conflict against the romans generated by Alaric has strengthen its condition of king and reinforced the initial steps to the consolidation of the monarchic institution between the goths, to the point of Stilicho himself see him as a potential supporter in its private dispute with Rufino by political hegemony over the Eastern Roman Empire. It was in this moment, in the year of 405, that Alaric received from Stilicho the desired, and pompous, title of *magister militum per Illyricum* that gave the king of the goths an important role in the complex political chess of the roman world in the beginnings of the 5th Century A.D (Valverde Castro, 2012: 312 – 315):

> "... After devastating all of Greece, Alaric withdrew from the Peloponnese and the rest of the domains through which the river Achelous passes; and established in Epirus (...) he awaited a sign of Stilicho because of the following: seeing Stilicho that those who ruled the Empire of Arcadius (Eastern Roman Empire) were not attached to his person, he planned to avail himself of the support of Alaric to incorporate all the provinces of Illyria into the Empire of Honorius (Western Roman Empire); concluded with that (Alarico) pacts in such a sense, he hoped to carry out his company immediately. Alaric was waiting, ready to carry out his orders ..." (Zosimus, Historia Rea, V, 26, 1 – 3).

Despite having existed other goth kings and military leaders on that same context, case and point of Radagaiso (Paulus Orosius, Historia, VII, 37, 4 –

5), we see in Alaric the political figure of greatest relevance in the western roman world after the death of Stilicho (Testa, 2012: 87 – 91; Valverde Castro, 2012: 316), especially own account of the so known loot of Rome of 410. If the repercussion of such event was of an incalculable magnitude in all the roman world (Paulus Orosius, Historia, VII, 39; Augustineof Hippo, City of God, I, 1; Jerome, Epistle from Principia, 127, 12), it is also certain that the political projection of Alaric as a king and military leader gained significative shape, making him a character with a larger effective power than the power held by western roman emperor, Honorius. However, we think that with his practice Alaric sought to assume the imperial condition in the western territories is a possible hypothesis, even more possible if we take in consideration the affirmation made by Paulus Orosius over its following successor as king of the goths, Athaulf:

> "... that he (Athaulf) had ardently desired that the entire Roman Empire, taken from the name of Roman, should in fact and name only of the Goths, and that, speaking in ordinary language, what was once Romania was now Gothia, and what was before it was Cesar Augusto was now Athaulf; but that, when experience proved that not even the Goths, because of their unbridled barbarism could at all be subjected to the laws, should abolish the imperial laws, without which an Empire is not an Empire, preferred to seek its glory by means of full recovery and the aggrandizement of the Roman Empire with the strength of the Goths and being considered for posterity as the author of the restoration of Rome after not being able to replace it..." (Paulus Orosius, Historia, VII, 43, 5 – 6).

This information, bequeathed by the Orosian report, it reveals us the great interest of the goth kings, in this case Alaric and Athaulf, of constantly participating with its aristocratic supporters and members of the defence and keepers of the imperial institution in the western territories so that it was removed from them the semblance of belonging *barbarism* and that they could, from now on, join effectively in the scope of the *romana ciuilitas* (Valverde Castro, 2012: 331). In fact, replacing the roman imperial authority in a wider space as the one from the western Mediterranean, in the scattered provinces of *Hispania*, *Gallia*, *Italia* e *Africa*, would be a herculean task as much a military angle as an administrative angle and for which the insipient goth reality encountered still unexperienced and unqualified. However, this reconnaissance of the greatness of Rome partially by the goth kings reinforced the idea that these sought to emulate the imperial power to bond him and, simultaneously, reinforce its royal condition to a territorial and hegemonic space over which exerted its attributions (Díaz Martínez, 1998: 177 – 178; Hillgarth, 2009: 5 – 6). Indeed, a royalty of a nomad contour colligated itself with a barbaric past that the goth clans' leaders wished to abandon, being essential to the survival of the royal institution the

existence of a direct bond to a territory inside the roman world making it an allied and, at the same time, follower of the imperial political traditions and heathen ancestral mores (Díaz Martínez, 1998: 177). According to Paulus Orosius, in concord with the information presented in middle of the 6th Century A.D by Jordanes (Jordanes, Getica, XXX, 156 – 157), both Alaric and Wallia (416 - 419) tried to settle the goths in the territories of the roman *Africa*:

> "... Indeed, Wallia - fearful of God's justice since the previous year a great Goth army equipped with guns and ships that tried to pass through Africa, was sadly annihilated by a storm twelve miles from the Gulf of Cadiz and remembered the disaster that occurred at the time. of Alaric when the Goths tried to pass Sicily they were sadly swept away and sunk by the waves before the eyes of all ..." (Paulus Orosius, Historia, VII, 43, 11 – 12).

The frustrated attempts of establishment in *Africa*ended up being compensated in a short period of time by the authorization granted by the western *magister militum* Constantius, in the name of the roman imperial authority, of the settlement of Wallia and its goths in the province of *Aquitania secunda* in the year of 418, after these demonstrate its fidelity to the romans by facing the tribes of Sueui, vandals and Alans that generated loots and pillages in the Hispanic provinces since the year of 409. As indicated by Hydatius of Chaves and Isidore of Seville:

> "... Wallia, king of the Goths, at the service of the Roman Empire, causes numerous barbarian deaths within the Hispanias (...). Silingos vandals are exterminated by Wallia in Baetica. The Alans, who dominated the Vandals and the Sueui, are so beaten by the Goths that, having eliminated their King Adace, the few who were left, abolishing the title of kingdom, submit in favor of King Gunderic of the Vandals who was in Gallaecia (...). The Goths, interrupting their struggle, are called by Constancio the Galias and receive land in Aquitaine, from Tolosa to the ocean ..." (Hydatius, Chronica, a.417 – 419).

> "... For the cause of Rome great slaughters brought about among the barbarians (...). It was worth once the war in Hispania was over (...). He received Aquitaine secunda from the emperor on the merit of his victory, together with some cities in the neighboring provinces as far as the ocean ..." (Isidoreof Seville, History of Goths, 22).

Therefore, the year of 418 has marked the effective beginning of the existence of a goth kingdom established inside the western roman territories that became an authentic military-political potentiality over the Western roman throughout the 5th Century A.D (Díaz Martínez, 1998: 179 – 183):

> "... dead Euric, his son Alaric (II) is made prince of the Goths in the city of Tolosa and ruled over them for twenty-three years. The latter, who had spent his life

from childhood in idleness and at banquets, at last driven by the provocations of the Franks, offered combat against those in the region of Poitou and was annihilated. With the death of Alaric (II) the kingdom of Tolosa was destroyed, being occupied by the Franks..." (Isidoreof Seville, Historyof Goths, 36).

Before long, the internal disputes, the lack of a good relationship with the aristocratic groups in the hegemonic spaces of domination and the political dissent of the goth kingdom of Tolosa ended by weakening him and provoking its disappearance. However, in determined provinces where integrates of the goth aristocracy kept a strong presence since the 5th Century A.D, such as *Lusitania*, in *Baetica*, in *Tarraconense* and *Gallia Narbonense* (Hillgarth, 2009: 11 – 12), the renovation of the royal notional, anchored in the authority of a king that had an extensive territorial area over which would exert a political hegemony, started to gain shape in mid-6th Century A.D. Once again, the permanent state of conflict between goth and roman aristocratic groups, alongside a strong regionalization of the military powers, served as a match for the rising of a goth kingdom in ancient roman *Hispania*. The confrontation between the goth aristocratic factions led by Agila (550 – 555) and Athanagild (555 – 568), on which were involved both the aristocratic groups of Hispanic-roman originated from Cordoba and Seville and a small military force sent by the Eastern Roman Empire, Justinian I (527 – 565), gave birth to the union of the goths of *Lusitania* and *Baetica* in the name of only one king, the victorious Athanagild:

> "... Agila was elected king and reigned for five years. Taking the war against the city of Cordoba and out of contempt for the Catholic religion (...) in the combat he waged against the citizens of Cordoba, he paid the deserved punishment with which the saints punished him; for victim of the vengeance of that war, he not only lost his son, slain there with a great number of combatants, but also all the royal treasure, together with important riches. Agila himself, defeated and given up on his flight, imprisoned by lamentable fear, took refuge in Merida. After some time, Athanagild, who aspired to power, usurped his kingdom and, with his military valor, annihilated the army that Agila sent against him to Seville. Seeing the Goths destroy themselves in mutual devastation and more fearful of the soldiers (Eastern Romans) who invaded Hispania with the pretext of offering military aid, they assassinate Agila in Merida and surrender to the government of Athanagild ..." (Isidoreof Seville, Historyof Goths, 45 – 46).

Shortly after, simultaneous to the death of Athanagild, the aristocratic groups settled in the *Galia Narbonense* elected Liuva I (568 – 571) as king and with him it recovered a roman imperial political practice that was forgotten among the goths, the share of power between members of the same family and the establishment of a succession starting with that indication. By appointing his brother Liuvigild (569/571 – 586) as "king of the *Hispania* Iberia" (Johnof Biclar, Chronica, a.569, 4), Liuva paved

way to the basis of a future constitution of a kingdom of the goths over the spirited *Hispania* , also, by the unity realized between Liuvigild and the widow of Athanagild, Gosvintha (Johnof Biclar, Chronica, a.569, 4), gathering around him its northeastern and peninsular southwards aristocratic segments of goths establishing, from then onwards, a territorial base over which would exert its royal authority (Velázquez Soriano, 2003: 176 – 177). In this sense, we confirm the renovation of a *consortium monarchy*ruled by the share of consensual power between two or more political leaders (Díaz Martínez, 1998: 184), political practice in several moments resumed between the goths and so described by Isidore of Seville:

> "... after Athanagild was elevated to the rulership of the Goths in Narbonne, Liuva (I) reigned for three years. The latter, in the second year after reaching the principality, appointed his brother Leovigildo, not only as successor, as a participant in the kingdom at the head of the government of the Hispanias, contenting himself (Liuva) with the kingdom of Gaul..." (Isidoreof Seville, Historyof Goths, 48).

It is curious to notice that this kind of division of power, within a theoretical perspective, was seen negative and pejorative by the thinkers of the Late Antiquity. Isidore of Seville himself, in the beginning of the 7thCentury, extended these critics to this form of division of political power between two or more holders pointing out as a *bicephalous division* (Isidoreof Seville, Chronica, 405), a share that contradicted the principle of a royal unity, because "no power admits another shared one" (Isidoreof Seville, Historyof Goths, 48). But in practical terms this share of power brought to the goths more benefits than prejudices, although these last ones have existed by demonstrating, thus, elements of rupture within a process of political readjustments. Liuvigild himself has utilized of the same strategy that its brother by consorting and sharing with its sons, Hermenegild and Reccared I, the political power (Johnof Biclar,Chronica, a.573, 5; Valverde Castro, 2000: 181 – 182), an attitude that seemed to have boosted the development of the goth hegemony over a great part of the *Hispania* and takes us to call this kingdom as a Hispanic-Visigoth. On this way, the report of Isidore reinforce even further this impression:

> "... Liuvigild, having obtained the principality in Hispania and Galia, decided to expand his kingdom with the war and increase his assets. Indeed, having in his favor the surrender of his army and the favor that his victories won him, he happily carried out brilliant initiatives: he seized the Cantabrians, took Aregia and subdued the whole of Sabaria. Many rebellious cities in Hispania succumbed to their weapons. He also dispersed in various combats against soldiers (Eastern Romans) and recovered, through the war, some strongholds occupied by them (...). Finally, he took the war to the Sueui and reduced his kingdom with

admirable speed to the rule of the Goths. He seized a large part of Hispania, for before the Goths were reduced to narrow limits ..." (Isidoreof Seville, Historyof Goths, 49).

On this matter, the share of royal power partially by Liuvigild matches with the extension of the permanent state of conflict against several enemies, were they the heathens of the north, were the Eastern-roman in the uprising and in the peninsular south, or the cities of *Baetica*that counted with aristocracies of roman origin that were against the royal goth authority and the kingdom of the Sueui in the *Gallaecia*, that culminated with the extension of the hegemony of the kingdom of the goths, as well as the strengthening of the royal image before the aristocratic segments of goths and romans, above the Hispanic territories (Velázquez Soriano, 2003: 179 – 180). Even the arising problems of this share of political power among the goths, as the rebellion that opposed Hermenegild to its father and that unleashed a civil war won by Liuvigild (Johnof Biclar, Chronica, a.579, 3; a.582, 3; a.583, 1; a.584, 3; Isidoreof Seville, Historyof Goths, 49), caused a few impacts on that context on which the royalty was sustained in the constant martial action, by the principle of the successor hereditary and in the consensus with a significative portion of the aristocratic segments of the kingdom (Valverde Castro, 2000: 141 – 148).

5. Conclusion

After we analyse the baptized historical process between the eventual 2nd Century A.D and the end of the 6th Century A.D in the distance of the Western Mediterranean, we can say that from the historical and institutional perspective we find ourselves amidst a world marked by richer and dynamic transformations that differentiated from the Hellenistic reality that proceeded it. It is worth saying that the concept of Late Antiquity can be applied here without positive or negative exaggerations. We even believe that exist stronger indications to we split this long historic period in two defining moments, at least in the territories of the Western roman. A first moment is delimited by the 3rdand 5th Century A.D where we realize the existence of a Roman Empire that was divided in two new administrative and military realities, The Western Roman Empire and the Eastern Roman Empire. A split that was linked to a few political initiatives already present since the second half of the 2nd Century A.D, such as the share of the imperial power realized in a more academic way with the intention of consolidating the authority of the *princeps-imperator* in a roman world where the provinces started to

gain a sharper political-military visibility. The center/outskirts dichotomy, represented by the *ciuitas* of Rome and the aggregate of provinces extra Italian, was decisive the time to affect the share of imperial power, because the division of the military and administrative tasks would give, at least theoretically, a wider visibility and respect to the imperial authority. Even so, the share of imperial power would bring uncertainty as for the real intentions of the barbarians of the power, at the point of having to occur attempts of usurpation that counted with the support of legionary forces stationed in the provinces. The regional and legionnaire extension at any illegitimate raising would provoke internal instability and questions concerning the imperial power of the *Augusto* or the one that held the recognition of the set of roman imperial institutions. With the intention of reducing the negative impacts of usurpatory adventures the choice of a familiar cove on which could divide the huge administrative and military tasks would explain the imposition partially by the holder of a political-military power of a cove that, posteriorly, would succeed in the imperial throne. This way the hereditary succession of the imperial power in the roman world gained strength throughout the 3rd Century A.D and ended up structuring itself as an effective practice on the 4th Century A.D.

Thus, we can say the first stage of Late Antiquity was marked by the transformation in the related political practices to the division of power and the imperial succession that directly laid hands on institutional structures of the Roman Empire. If we look closely at the second stage, marked out between the 5th and 8th Century A.D, we will notice the relevance assumed by the barbarian's groups in the process of political-institutional readjustment that culminated with the disappearance of the Western roman imperial authority and the arise and strengthening of the roman-barbarian kingdoms in the Western roman territories. Starting from the permanent state of conflict, the heathen leaderships started to gain prestige and strength to establish an imitated and emulated monarchic institution of the Greek-roman tradition that made the royal image a permanent political being supported in the consensus established by the heathen aristocratic groups on the moment of its election. Besides, barbarian's groups such as the goths, after settling inside the roman imperial territories and there establishing a kingdom of its own, ended up incorporating on its political action the hereditary succession of the royal image, and from the 6th Century A.D and forth, the share of the royal authority amongst the king and its political heirs.

However, we verify that the political-institutional elements that were analyzed in the present article and that involves the share of power and

hereditary succession, both in the roman imperial reality and in the kingdoms of Tolosa and the Hispanic-Visigoth kingdom of Toledo, were part of a historical process of long duration as was the Late Antiquity in its two stages and that are connected and interlinked. We must reinforce that this long duration was marked by common and inherent continuities to the dynamic historical process and of large temporal spectrum. Indeed, both the share of power and the hereditary succession officer in those movements that we consider as smooth, straight, and less critical, or on the ones that cause disorders and tensions, that occurred abruptly being tendency to chaos, that are common to the study of History. For these reasons we find connections between the successor actions and divisions of power lead by Marcus Aurelius, Constantine, and Theodosius, as well as Euric and Liuvigild. Distinct moments and contexts that find a common denominator on the tendency to diversity in the process of share and succession that were characteristic in that late-antique world, moving away from a unique common perspective to the Hellenistic period which, from the political point of view, was offered as a pragmatic alternative.

Such movements reached both the romans and the heathens that settled in the western imperial territories, contributing to the fissure of the roman imperial authority throughout the 5th Century A.D and, simultaneously, creating the necessary conditions to the arise of the roman-barbarian kingdoms inside that ancient scenario of roman power. Well, we can say that those kingdoms, such as the Visigoth kingdom of Tolosa or the Hispanic-Visigoth kingdom, were part of a long historical process of the share of the perceptible political powers since the 2nd Century A.D and incremented by the administrative and military reorganization of the 3rd and 4th Century A.D and that propitiated the integration of the heathens in the roman imperial world and the creation of future monarchies that catalysed the political, social and cultural roman and barbarian tradition in the western imperial territories.

This amalgam of several traditions leads us to question two of the great historiographical problems colligated to the late-antique world, the problem of the "fall" of Rome and the "end" of Roman civilization. It is possible to talk of a partial substitution of certain political, social, and cultural principles of the Hellenistic civilization that would make us suggest the existence of a late-antiquity civilization on which Rome never disappeared but changed its political *status*. It is certain that the Western Roman Empire as an administrative and military entity was replaced by the roman-barbarian kingdoms that preserved the nearest totality of the positions and functions that existed in the roman administration. For this reason, the "fall" of Rome must be revisited and analysed from the

political-institutional perspective, as defended by Giardina and Cameron, in order that we can offer an insightful and exempted analysis of ideological prejudices that harmed the political studies in Late Antiquity.

Documentation

AELIO LAMPRIDIUS, Comodus Antoninus = *Coleção Autores Gregos e Latinos. História Augusta. Volume I. Vidas de Adriano, Élio, Antonino Pio, Marco Aurélio, Lúcio Vero, Avidio Cássio e Cómodo.* Tradução do Latim, introdução, notas e índice Cláudia A. Teixeira, José Luís Brandão e Nuno S. Rodrigues. Coimbra: Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra, 2013.

AUGUSTINE OF HIPPO, City of God = *A Cidade de Deus. Santo Agostinho. Volume I (Livro I a VIII).* Tradução J. Dias Pereira. Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, 1991.

AMMIANUS MARCELINUS, Historia = *Ammiano Marcelino. Historias.* Edición Maria Luísa Harto Trujillo. Madrid: Ediciones Akal, 2002.

AURELIUS VICTOR, De Caesaribus = *Aurelio Víctor. Libro de los Césares.* Introducciones, traducción y notas por Emma Falque. Madrid: Editorial Gredos – Biblioteca Clásica Gredos 261, 2008.

DIO CASSIUS, Roman History = *Cassio Dio. Historia Romana. Libros L – LX.* Traducción Juan Manuel Cortés Copete. Madrid: Editorial Gredos – Biblioteca Clásica Gredos 395, 2011.

CLAUDIAN, Contra Rufino = *Claudiano. Poemas I.* Introducción, traducción y notas de Miguel Castillo Bejarano. Madrid: Editorial Gredos – Biblioteca Clásica Gredos 180, 1993.

CLAUDIAN, Panegyric of third consulate of Honorius = *Claudiano. Poemas I.* Introducción, traducción y notas de Miguel Castillo Bejarano. Madrid: Editorial Gredos – Biblioteca Clásica Gredos 180, 1993.

EUNAPIUSOF SARDES, Historia = *Digital Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum, volumen IV, Liber nonus*(http://www.dfhg-project.org/DFHG/index.php?volume=Volumen%20quartum)

EUTROPIUS, Breviary = *Eutropio. Breviario.* Introducciones, traducción y notas por Emma Falque. Madrid: Editorial Gredos – Biblioteca Clásica Gredos 261, 2008.

HYDATIUS, Chronica = *Idacio, obispo de Chaves. Su Chronicon.* Introducción, texto crítico, versión española y comentario por Julio Campos. Salamanca: Ediciones Calasancias, 1984.

ISIDOREOF SEVILLE, Chronica = *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Chronica Minora Saec. IV V VI VII. Auctorum Antiquissimorum Tomus XI. Volumen II*. Edidit Theodor Mommsen. Berlim: Weidmannos, 1894.

ISIDORO DE SEVILHA, História dos Godos =*Las Historias de los Godos, Vandalos y Suevos de Isidoro de Sevilla*. Estudio, Edición crítica y traducción por Cristóbal Rodríguez Alonso. Leon: Colegiata de San Isidoro, 1975.

JEROME, Epistle 127 (ad Principia), 12 = *Jerome. Select Letters*. Translation by F. A. Wright. Cambridge – London: Harvard University Press/ Loeb Classical Library 262, 1933.

JOHN OF BICLAR, Chronica = *Juan de Biclaro. Obispo de Gerona. Chronicon. Su vida y su obra*. Introducción, texto crítico y comentarios por Julio Campos. Madrid: CSIC, 1960.

JORDANES, Getica = *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Iordanis Romana et Getica. Auctorum Antiquissimorum Tomi V pars prior*. Recensvit Theodor Mommsen. Berlim: Weidmannos, 1882.

JULIUS CAPITOLINUS, Marcus Antoninusthe filosopher = *Coleção Autores Gregos e Latinos. História Augusta. Volume I. Vidas de Adriano, Élio, Antonino Pio, Marco Aurélio, Lúcio Vero, Avidio Cássio e Cómodo.* Tradução do Latim, introdução, notas e índice Cláudia A. Teixeira, José Luís Brandão e Nuno S. Rodrigues. Coimbra: Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra, 2013.

JULIUS CAPITOLINUS, Verus = *Coleção Autores Gregos e Latinos. História Augusta. Volume I. Vidas de Adriano, Élio, Antonino Pio, Marco Aurélio, Lúcio Vero, Avidio Cássio e Cómodo.* Tradução do Latim, introdução, notas e índice Cláudia A. Teixeira, José Luís Brandão e Nuno S. Rodrigues. Coimbra: Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra, 2013.

PAULUS OROSIUS, Historia = *Historias. Libros V – VII. Paulo Orosio.* Traducción y notas de Eustaquio Sanchez Salor. Madrid: Editorial Gredos – Biblioteca Clásica Gredos 54, 1982.

ZOSIMUS, Historia Rea = *Zósimo. Nueva Historia.* Introducción, traducción y notas de José Maria Candau Morón. Madrid: Editorial Gredos – Biblioteca Clásica Gredos 174, 1992.

References

ANDO, Clifford. Narrative decline and fall. In: ROUSSEAU, Philip (Editor). *A Companion to Late Antiquity*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2009.

BLOCKLEY, R. C. The dynasty of Theodosius. In: CAMERON, Averil and GARNSEY, Peter (Editors). *The Cambridge Ancient History. Volume XIII. The Late Empire, A. D. 337 – 427*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

BRAVO, G. ¿Crisis del Imperio Romano? Desmontando un tópico historiográfico. *Vínculos de Historia*. Toledo: Ediciones Universidad de Castilla La Mancha, 2, 2013, p. 13 – 26.

BROWN, P. *The World of Late Antiquity. From Marcus Aurelius to Muhammad*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1971.

_____. *The Ransom of the soul. Afterlife and wealth in Early Western Christianity.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2015.

CAMERON, Av. *El Mundo Mediterráneo en la Antigüedad Tardía 395 – 600.* Barcelona: Crítica, 1998.

_____. The 'long' Late Antiquity: a late twentieth-century model. In: WISEMAN, T. P. (Editor). *Classics in Progress. Essays on ancient Greek and Rome.* Oxford: The British Academy – Oxford University Press, 2002.

_____. Il potere di Costantino. Dimensioni e limiti del potere imperial. In: MELLONI, A., BROWN, P. E HELMRATH (Edittores). *Costantino I. Enciclopedia costantiniana sulla figura e l'immagine del cosidetto Editto di Milano 313 – 2013*. Roma: Enciclopedia Italiana,2013.

CARRIÉ, J.-M. The historical path of 'Late Antiquity': from transformation to Rupture.In:TESTA, Rita Lizzi (Org.). *Late Antiquity in contemporary debate*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2017.

CARRIÉ, J.-M. & ROUSSELLE, A. *L'Empire Romain en mutation. Des Sévères à Constantin 192 – 337.*Paris: ÉditionsduSeuil, 1999.

DEN HENGST, Daniel. The discussion of authorship. In: BURGERSDIJK, D. W. P. and VAN WAARDEN, J. A. (Editors). *Emperors and historiography. Collected essays on the literature of the Roman Empire by Daniel den Hengst.* Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2010.

DÍAZ MARTÍNEZ, P. C. Rey y poder en la monarquia visigoda. *Iberia.* Logroño: Ediciones Universidad de La Rioja, 1, 1998, p. 175 – 195.

_____. El final de Roma y la génesis de la Europa medieval. In: *Fortificaciones, poblados y pizarras. La raya en los inicios del medievo.* Ciudad Rodrigo – Palacios de los Águilas: ATAEMHIS/USAL, 2019.

DRIJVERS, J. W. The *divisio regni* of 364: The end of unity? In: DIJKSRA, R., VAN POPPEL, S. and SLOOTJES, D. *East and West in the Roman Empire of the Fourth Century. An end to unity?* Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2015.

ELTON, H. *The Roman Empire in Late Antiquity. A political and military History.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

ESCRIBANO, M. V. Usurpación y religión en el s. IV d. de C. Paganismo, cristianismo y legitimación política. In: GONZÁLEZ BLANCO, A. y BLÁZQUEZ MARTÍNEZ, J. M. (Editores). *Antigüedad y cristianismo VII. Cristianismo y aculturación en tiempos del Imperio Romano.* Murcia: Universidad de Murcia, 1990.

GASPARRI, St. & LA ROCCA, Cr. *Tempi Barbarici. L'Europa Occidentale tra antichità e medioevo (300 – 900).* Roma: Carocci Editore, 2013.

GEARY, P. J. *O mito das nações. A invenção do nacionalismos.* São Paulo: Conrad, 2005.

GIARDINA, A. Esplosione di tardoantico. *Studi Storici.* Roma: Carocci Editore,40/1, 1999, p. 157 – 180.

HEATHER, P. *Foedera* and *Foederati* in the Fourth Century. In: POHL, W. (Editor) *Kingdoms of the Empire. The integration of barbarians in Late Antiquity.* Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997.

HILLGARTH, J. *The Visigoths in History and Legend.* Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2009.

HUMPHRIES, M. Emperors, usurpers, and the city of Rome. Performing power from Diocletian to Theodosius. In: WIENAND, J. (Editor). *Contested Monarchy. Integrating the Roman Empire in the Fourth century A D.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

JAMES, E. *I barbari.* Bologna: Società Editrice il Mulino, 2011.

JONES, A. H. M. *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire A. D. 260 – 395.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971, v. I.

MARTINDALE, J. R. *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire A. D. 395 – 527.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980, v. II.

MATTHEWS, John. The emperor and his historians. In: MARINCOLA, J. (Editor). *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography.* Oxford: Blackwell, 2007, v. II.

MAZZARINO, S. *L'Impero Romano 2.* Roma – Bari: EditoriLaterza, 2007.

NERI, V. Monarchia, diarchia, tetrarchia. La dialletica delle forme di governo imperial fra Diocleziano e Costantino. In: MELLONI, A., BROWN, P. E HELMRATH (Edittores). *Costantino I. Enciclopedia costantiniana sulla figura e l'immagine del cosidetto Editto di Milano 313 – 2013.* Roma: Enciclopedia Italiana, 2013.

PEACHIN, M. Rome the superpower: 96 – 235 CE.In: POTTER, D. (Editor). *A Companion to the Roman Empire.*Oxford: Blackwell, 2006.

PERKINS, B. W. *La caída de Roma y el fin de la civilización.* Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 2007.

RODRÍGUEZ GERVÁS, M. J. *Propaganda política y opinión pública en los panegíricos latinos del Bajo Imperio.* Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 1991.

SANZ SERRANO, R. *Historia de los Godos. Una epopeya histórica de Escandinavia a Toledo.* Madrid: La Esfera de los Libros, 2009.

SILVA, G. V. *A escalada dos imperadores proscritos. Estado, conflito e usurpação na Antiguidade Tardia (285 – 395).* Vitória: GM, 2018.

TESTA, R. L. Il sacco di Roma e l'aristocrazia romana, tra crisi politica e turbamento religioso. In: DI BERARDINO, A., PILARA, G. e SPERA, L. (Edittores). *Roma e il sacco del 410: realtá, interpretazione, mito.* Roma: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 2012.

VALVERDE CASTRO, M. R. *Ideología, simbolismo y ejercicio del poder real en la monarquía visigoda: un proceso de cambio.* Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 2000.

_____. El ataque de Alarico a la *Urbs Aeterna*: una medida de presión que terminó en catástrofe para los romanos. *Arys, 10.* Huelva: Ediciones Universidad de Huelva, 2012, p. 309 – 336.

VELÁZQUEZ SORIANO, I. *Pro Patriae Gentisqve Gothorum Statv* (4TH Council of Toledo, Canon 75, A. 633). In: GOETZ, H.-W., JARNUT, J. and POHL, W. (Editors). *Regna and Gentes. The relationship between Late Antique and Early Medieval peoples and Kingdoms in the Transformation of the Roman World.* Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2003.

WARE, C. The *Severitas* of Constantine: Imperial virtues in *Panegyric Latini 7 (6)* and *6 (7)*. *Journal of Late Antiquity, 7/1.* Washington: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014, p. 86 – 109.

WIRTH, G. Rome and its Germanic partners in the Fourth Century. In: POHL, W. (Editor). *Kingdoms of the Empire. The integration of barbarians in Late Antiquity.* Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997, p.13 – 55.

ZUGRAVU, N. La diarchia dei Fratelli nella tarda antichità: modelli mitici e storici. Dioclezianoe Massimiano. *Peuce*, 9. Tulcea: Institutul de Cercetari Eco-Muzeale "Gavrila Simion", 2011, p.283 – 290.