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Introduction

The appearance of the Huns on the farthest edge of eastern Europe, in the area north of the Black Sea, during the second half of the 4th century A.D. created a string of events that proved to be crucial for the history of the Later Roman Empire.\(^1\) Storming in like a blizzard from high mountains, as a contemporary historian put it graphically,\(^2\) these nomadic warrior horsemen of Mongolian descent first pushed into the Iranian Alans who lived in the area around the river of Don. Not long afterwards, in 370’s, the Huns successfully demonstrated their forcefulness against the Greuthungian Ostrogoths, partially conquering them as well as the Alans. Soon after this, the unstoppable Hunnic torrent swept over the Tervingian Visigoths who were defeated decisively and forced to retreat.\(^3\) The final breakdown of the Ostrogoths is usually dated as 375, and of the Visigoths as 376,\(^4\) although it seems quite appropriate to move the chronology back one year, at least in the case of the

---


Visigoths. One defeat after another which the Hunnic attackers inflicted on their enemies by their irresistible cavalry charges spurred the migration of peoples. A portion of the Goths sought refuge from the Huns on the Roman soil: the Tervingian-Visigothic group headed by Alavivus and Fritigern, the Greuthungian-Ostrogothic group with portions of the Alans and the Huns commanded by Alatheus and Safrax, and the Taifali-Gothic group led by Farnobius may have already crossed the lower Danube in late spring of 376. Among them, the most important for the purpose of this study is the Ostrogothic-Alanic-Hunnic group whose cavalry played a crucial role in the Roman defeat at Hadrianople in Thrace on August 9, 378. Namely, the Hunnic elements from the Alatheus’ and Safrax’ group were the first Huns who entered the territory of the Roman Empire. Soon, they would have great influence on the conditions in the Late Antique Pannonia.

The first Huns in Pannonia

SITUATION IN ILLYRICUM AFTER THE ROMAN DEFEAT AT HADRIANOPLE

The crisis which befell the Empire after the disastrous late summer of 378 seemed almost insurmountable. Neither the next year brought any significant improvement, although the new Emperor Theodosius I, who was nominated for the East and proclaimed at Sirmium on January 19, 379 with a single purpose of curbing the Gothic revolt, had a limited success in Thrace and Eastern Illyricum (the dioceses of Dacia and Macedonia respectively). Moreover, from late 378 and early 379, the bar-


6 For contemporary understanding of the migrational „mechanics”, as one German historian has put it (Demant 1989, p. 121), cf. a testimony of bishop Ambrosius of Mediolanum in the Expositio evangelii secundum Lucan, 10.10: Chuni in Halanos, Halani in Gothos, Gothi in Taifalos et Sarmatae insurrexerunt. A testimony for the Gothic fear of the Huns is provided by Eunap., fr. 42 (240.19-20): Περιεστήκε δὲ ἐξ Ἰον λόγον [the Gothic uprising in Thrace] καὶ Σκύθας [the Goths] Θύνων μὴ φέρειν ὀνόμα καὶ Ῥωμαίους Σκύθον.


8 Seeck 1913, p. 125; Schmid 1934, p. 259; Wolfram 1990, p. 138; Heather 1994, pp. 149-150. On November 17, 379, the imperial government announced the victories over the Goths, Alans and Huns, but the final peace was achieved in three-year time. Cf. Cons. Const., s.a. 380.2-3: Ipso anno multa bella Romani cum Gothis commiserunt. Deinde victoriae nuntiatae sunt adversus Gothos, Alanos, atque
barian invaders would spread throughout the provinces of the Balkan Peninsula, looting and ravaging all the way to the Julian Alps, i.e. in Pannonian regions also. So the first penetration of the Huns into Pannonia, that is, into both Southpannonian provinces and the Northpannonian province of Valeria, must have happened in late 378 and early 379. For their subsequent raids which reached the threshold of Italy, the invaders used the main Roman traffic routes in the Sava-Drava-Danube region. It is for that reason that this whole area came under particular pressure. The initial attacks on Pannonia were temporarily checked by general Maiorianus who, at the time, was in command of both Illyrici. Maiorianus led the operations from Aquincum in Valeria, but his command over the entire Illyricum was only of short duration. Afterwards, he held a command post in Eastern Illyricum, and he distinguished himself in fightings across the Danube.

---


9 Amm. Marc., 31.16.7: exinde digressi sunt effusoria per arctaeas provinciae, quas peragaveret licenter ad usque radices Alpium Siliarum, quas Venetas appellabat antiquitas. It seems only reasonable to assume that Ammiotus Marcellinus is here summarizing the events occurring over several years (378-380), and not dating them all as the winter of 378/379. In his poem entitled Precatio consulis designati pridie Kalendas Ianuarias fasceibus sumptis, which belongs chronologically to late 378, Decimus Magnus Ausonius also mentions the movements of the Sarmatians, Huns, Goths and Alans (cf. note 11). A testimony for an early penetration of barbarians into Illyricum is provided by Themistius in a speech he held in the spring of 379 (Oratio 14 [261, a, 4 - b, 91]).


However, after Theodosius I was taken rather ill in late 379, the situation became critical again. Fritigern's Goths launched new attacks in Illyricum in early 380, probably in the spring, and they were also joined by Alatheus and Safrax attacking Pannonia with their bands. It was at that time that the military commander of Western Illyricum (comes rei militaris or possibly magister militum) Vitalianus suffered what must have been a crushing defeat in an attempt to drive them out from Pannonian provinces. The magnitude of the disaster became obvious very soon.
because nothing stood in the way of Alateus' and Saphrax' forces anymore. All the Pannonian regions as well as the bordering territories of the neighboring provinces were now open for ravaging. The sources mention explicitly the heavy damage inflicted on Southpannonian towns of Mursa (Osijek, Croatia) and Stridon (presumably in the vicinity of Rijeka, Croatia), and it appears that Poetovio (Ptuj, Slovenia) was also taken and pillaged. The threat was so great that the Emperor Gratianus came down to Pannonia in person, after he had previously sent an army led by generals Bauto and Arbogastes to assist Theodosius who had been defeated in Macedonia, and the joint western and eastern forces managed to check Fritigern.

1252. Vitalianus is considered *magister militum* by ENDELL (1931) 133, idem 1961, 373 (*magister equitum per Illyricum*), DEMANDT 1970, 602-603, 716 (although with some reservation), and a military count (*comes rei militaris*) by ALFÖLDI 1926, p. 60, NAGY (1971) 318, PLRE I, 970, BARKÓCZI 1980, p. 117, FITZ 1994, p. 1252. It appears that the sources confirm both hypotheses. Amm. Marc., 25.10.9 states about Vitalianus: (...) Vitalianus (...) qui multo postea acutus comitis dignatus, male rem per Illyricum gessit. On the other hand, Zosim., 4.34.1 says: (...) Γρατιανος δ' βασιλεὺς ἐκπέμπει τοὺς κατὰ τὸ Ἡλληνικὸν κλίμα στρατιωτικοῖς τάγμασι στρατηγὸν Βιταλιανόν, ἀνδρα πεπονηκτάς τοῖς πράγμασι κατ' οὖν ἀρκέσαι δυνάμενον.


SETTLEMENT OF THE OSTROGOthic-ALANic-HUNnic GROUP IN PANNONIA

It seems that the situation in Pannonia could not be resolved on a battlefield for the sources, as traditionally interpreted in modern historiography, inform us of Gratianus concluding a treaty with the invaders there. So the Alatheus’ and Safrax’ Ostrogoths, Alans and Huns would be granted a permission to settle in the Roman territory, and obliged to accept the duties of the *foederati*, i.e. to protect the Roman frontier in return for a yearly pay and regular food supply, and, if required, to place their troops at Roman disposal for a limited duration. The new *foederati* would be settled primarily in the Northpannonian provinces, in Valeria and Pannonia Prima, but possibly also in the frontier Danubian section of Pannonia Secunda, notably in northern part of the province. It is quite

17 Jordan., Getica 141: (…) quod cum Gratianus imperator, qui tune a Roma in Gallis ob incursione Vandalorum [sc. Alamannorum; cf. SCHMIDT 1934, p. 107, note 2] recesserat, conperisset, quia Theodosio fatali desperatione succumbente Gothi maius saevisissent, mox ad eos collecto venit exercitu, nec tamen fretus in armis, sed gratia eos muneribusque victorius pacemque victualia illis concedens, cum ipsis inito foedere fecit; Getica 142: Ubi vero post haec Theodosius consuvaluit imperator repertique cum Gothis et Romanis Gratiano imperatore pegasus quod ipse opulater, admodum graio animo feros et ipse in hae pace consensit; Zosim., 4.34.2: Τοῦτον [Vitalianus'] ὑπὸ ἔγγυστον δυὸ μοίρα τῶν ὑπὲρ τῶν Ῥήνου Ηρμηνικόν ἔδωκεν, ἢ μὲν ἔγγυστον Φρυγίγειρον χρωμένη, ἢ δὲ ἕπειτα Ἀλλόθεον καὶ Σάφρακα τετομένη, τοῖς Κελτικοῖς ἔδωκεν ἐπεκείνα κατέστησαν εἰς ἀνάγκην τὸν Βασιλεία Γρατιανὸν ἔνδοθαν σφίξαν, ἀπολύοντας τὰ ἐν Κελτοῖς, διὰ τὸν Ἱστρον Παυνίαν καὶ τὴν ἄνω Μυστικν κατολαβεῖν.


19 Cf. S. SOPRONI, Die letzten Jahrzehnte des pannonischen Limes (= Münchener Beiträge zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte 38), München 1985, pp. 86-93; LOTTER 2003, pp. 72-74.
reasonable to assume that the imperial government would not allow the *foederati* who were bitter enemies of the Empire until just recently to settle in a territory vital for traffic communication between the Western and Eastern Roman provinces, i.e. in Pannonia Savia and Pannonia Secunda.\textsuperscript{20} In modern historiography, there are various opinions regarding where the *foederati* were actually settled. VÁRÁDY and BARKÓCCI maintain that they were settled in Pannonia Secunda and in a portion of Savia, WOLFRAHM has Pannonia Secunda, Savia and Valeria or just Valeria and Pannonia Secunda, ŠAŠEL sees the Hunnic-Alanic *foederati* settled in Pannonia Secunda and the Visigothic (!) *foederati* in Savia, BÔNA assumes that the area of their settlement was limited to the southern part of Pannonia, MÖCSY infers that the *foederati* were settled along the Drava valley in Savia, EADIE also has Savia, while NAGY deduces that the dwelling place of the *foederati* was in present day Hungarian counties of Baranya and Tolna, i.e. in northern section of Pannonia Secunda and southern section of Valeria, in any case, north of the Drava.\textsuperscript{21} VÁRÁDY even makes an attempt to pinpoint the area where the Huns were settled, and finds them north of the Sava, in northeastern part of the dwelling place of the *foederati*,\textsuperscript{22} although there is not any corroboration in sources or in archaeological finds for such an assumption. BARKÓCCI follows VÁRÁDY asserting that the *foederati* were at first settled in South Pannonia, while TOMIĆ, drawing from these assumptions, says that the Alanic-Hunnic *foederati* were settled in Pannonia Secunda, i.e. around Sirmium, and the Visigoths (!) in Savia, around Jovia Botivo and Poetovio.\textsuperscript{23} On the other hand, ALFÖLDI even discards the possibility that the Huns were settled in Pannonia as the *foederati*.\textsuperscript{24} SCHMIDT also believes that the treaty was concluded with the Ostrogoths and Alans, and omits the Huns.\textsuperscript{25} However, it

\textsuperscript{20} SOPRONI 1985, p. 88. The traffic importance of Southpannonian provinces is well illustrated by ALFÖLDI 1926, p. 91, note 3.


\textsuperscript{22} VÁRÁDY 1969, p. 522.


\textsuperscript{24} ALFÖLDI 1926, pp. 67-68. He says that sie [the Huns] *wohl nicht viel Lust hatten, sich and die Scholle zu binden; vielmehr streifen die Hunnen nach der Befriedung der Goten ungescheut weiter umher, oft in die Donauprovinzen des Ostreiches einbrechend, gemeinsam mit anderen germanischen Nachbarn.*

\textsuperscript{25} SCHMIDT 1934, p. 260.
seems that the subsequent use of Pannonian foederati, among which the Huns are mentioned specifically, and the archaeological finds in particular, strongly suggest that the Huns were also settled in Pannonia as part of the Alatheaus’ and Safrax’ tripartite group of peoples. It would seem that immediately afterwards, or in 381 at the latest, the imperial government ordered a Christian mission to be sent among the barbarian newcomers to effect their conversion, under direct supervision of Amantius, the Bishop of Jovia (Héténypuszta) in Valeria, and the auspices of the Aquileian metropolitan (Valerianus at that time). There is little doubt that the Roman authorities sought to assimilate the foederati into the Roman society by Christianization, but this did not have a permanent success as the future events would reveal.

USE OF THE PANNONIAN FOEDERATI

After the settlement of the Pannonian foederati, their cavalry units, especially the Hunnic ones, readily responded to the calls of the imperial government and its representatives for several times, but the presence of the foederati was constantly a potential threat to the peace of Pannonian regions. However, they did afford a brief respite from external danger to Pannonia as some source material would indicate. In early 384, the


27 Lotter 2003, pp. 73-74. As the recent research has shown rather convincingly, the see of the Bishop Amantius of Jovia should not be looked for in Jovia Botivo, the present day town of Ludbreg in Croatia, but in Jovia in Valeria, the present day Alsóhétény, i.e. Héténypuszta in Hungary, at about 50 km distance from the Balaton Lake, where a Late Antique fortress with a significant civilian settlement was discovered (cf. NAGY 1971) 320; SOPRONI 1985, pp. 21-23; LOTTER 2003, pp. 49, 56). According to B. Micotti, Evidence for Christianity in Roman Southern Pannonia (Northern Croatia). A catalogue of finds and sites (= British Archaeological Reports, International Series 684), Oxford 1997, p. 23, the question of identification of the see of Jovia is still unresolved (either Héténypuszta or Ludbreg). The first to identify Jovia with the town of Ludbreg situated south of the Drava was R. Egg in Historisch-epigraphische Studien in Venezien. Amantius, Bischof von Jovia, Jahreshefte des Österreichischen archäologischen Instituts 21-22 (1922-1924), Beiblatt, 309-344. It is worth mentioning that Egg has not included the Huns in the Pannonian foederati, but he says that the Alatheus’ and Saphrax’ peoples were settled in the territory of the episcopal diocese of Jovia (idem, 327ff). The subsequent researchers accepted Egg’s identification, which led them to place wrongly the settlement of the Ostrogothic-Alanic-Hunnic group in the province of Savia.

Western Roman general Bauto stemmed an incursion of the Alamannic Juthungi into Raetia with the help of Hunnic and Alanic horsemen, and it appears that he also tried to use the Hunnic foederati as to scare off the Western usurper Magnus Maximus, but had to discontinue this demonstration of force because of an inferior number of troops at his disposal, and was forced to induce the Huns by a payment of gold to return to their Pannonian settlements.29 And when the Sarmatians crossed the Danube and invaded Pannonia in late 384, they were most probably beaten off with an active help on the part of Pannonian foederati, too.30 However, the relationship of sensitive balance between the imperial authorities and the Pannonian foederati was soon to be spoiled for we discover that, in 387, the inhabitants of Pannonia found themselves threatened by the unnamed barbarians, which created a situation the usurper Magnus Maximus used for gaining an access to Italy.31 This could mean that the foederati did not


Valentinianus Hunnos atque Alanos approquinanties Galliae per Allemaeae terras reflexit. (...) et ideo adversus Juthungum Hunnus accursis est. (...) Tu [sc. Magnus Maximus] festeit incursarii Rhaetias, Valentinianus suo tibi avo pacem redemit.

30 SECK 1913, p. 208 (dated as 385); ALFÖLDI 1926, p. 63 (dated as 385); STEIN 1959, p. 204; VÁRADY 1969, pp. 39-40; MAENCHEN-HELFEN 1973, p. 40, 1978, p. 30 (dated as 384, but prior to the campaign against the Juthungi); BARKÖCZI 1980, p. 117 (dated as 385); DEMANDT 1989, p. 131; WOLFRAM 1990, p. 251 (dated as 385). VÁRADY 1969, p. 40 and BARKÖCZI 1980, pp. 117-118 maintain that the Sarmatians were joined by the Pannonian foederati in devastation of Pannonia, which would severely affect the economic situation in Pannonia, but this is a speculation without foundation in sources. The fact that the Sarmatians penetrated the times on the Danube does not necessarily mean that they were supported by the foederati who, at the Empire’s bidding, fought the Juthungi earlier the same year. Furthermore, it is hard to imagine that the victory over the Sarmatians could be won without military assistance of the foederati. A testimony for this victory is provided by Quintus Aurelius Symmachus, Relationes ad principes 2.47, who was a prefect of Rome in 384 and saw the victory celebration in Colosseum: Vitudus cate naturum agmen victae gentis induci illosque lam truces vultus misero pallore.


37
fulfill their duty as frontier soldiers, or even that they were themselves a source of disturbance, which is in any case an obvious indication of increased tensions between them and the imperial court at Mediolanum. The Pannonian foederati did not support Magnus Maximus as the new ruler of Italy, but showed open hostility toward him, and joined Theodosius I when he moved against the usurper in early summer of 388, marching through the Sava-Drava-Danube region. In the battle of Siscia, which was fought probably in July of 388, the Hunnic and Alanic horsemen had a decisive role in the defeat of usurper’s forces, whereas their part in a victory Theodosius won in the subsequent battle of Poetovio was apparently smaller. It seems that Theodosius I sent all the foederati back to their settlements soon after his victory over Magnus Maximus – of course, the Pannonian foederati were among them – because he did not want to enter Italy with an army made of barbarians but only with the Roman troops. Although the Pannonian foederati are not specifically

Μάξιμος [Magnus Maximus] τὸν Δομίνον [an envoy of Valentinian II] παραγαγεῖν ὡστε καὶ μέρος ἢς ἐξε περιστάσεως, συνοικίων εἰς ἐπικουρίαν τῷ βασιλείς κατὰ τῶν ἐπικεφαλίων τός ὑπὸ ὑπόν [Valentinian’s] Ποιοσα βαρβάρων. Zosimus does not say that the bárbaroi came from the area beyond the Danube, although this is quite possible giving the then situation along the Pannonian times. However, it seems that a danger from within is more likely since our source singles out the Pannonian subjects of Valentinian II who were threatened. Pacatus could also refer to the questionable behaviour of the foederati in his Panegyricus dicus Theodosio, 32.3 when he mentions „a suspicious troop“ (specta manus) which was removed from the frontier (limiti decedet) as to assist the army of Theodosius I (militi auxiliarii accedent). Due to the fact that Pacatus also mentions omnes Scythiae nationes, these would surely encompass the Visigothic foederati from the area along the lower Danube (cf. Nagy [1971] 323).

32 MÖCSY 1974, p. 342 suggests that Magnus Maximus had, as he puts it, considerable influence with the foederati in Pannonia, but this is erroneous.


mentioned by the sources, they probably took part in Theodosius’ campaign against the new Western Roman usurper Eugenius, who was decisively defeated in a battle fought in early September of 394 at the river Frigidus (Vipava in Slovenia), for the Emperor moved through the Sava-Drava-Danube region once again.\footnote{VÁRÁDY 1969, pp. 78-87; LOTTER 2003, pp. 85-86. The sources mention the Alanic chief Saulus who may have commanded the Alanic cavalry troops of the Pannonian foederati as a successor to Safrax (cf. Zosim., 4.57.2, John of Antioch, fr. 187 [FHG 4, 609], genis praefectus Alanae in Claud. Claudian., Bellum Geticum, 583).}

**Trouble with the Foederati**

Soon after Theodosius had died on January 17, 395, the foederati rebelled being displeased with how they were threatened by the Roman authorities during and after the campaign against Eugenius. The insurrection involved primarily the Visigoths (they were settled in the diocese of Thrace, more precisely in the provinces of Dacia Ripensis and Moesia Secunda),\footnote{About this cf. SEECK 1913, pp. 273-275; SCHMIDT 1934, pp. 425-432; J. B. BURY, History of the Later Roman Empire (from the Death of Theodosius I to the Death of Justinian A.D. 395 to A.D. 565) I, New York 1958, pp. 109-110; STEIN 1959, p. 231; DEMANDT 1989, pp. 140-141; WOLFRAM 1990, pp. 145-150; HEATHER 1994, pp. 199-206.} but it is quite reasonable to assume that the Pannonian foederati also rose since no one opposed or tried to stem the Marcomanni, Quadi, Vandals and Sarmatians who, probably in 395, crossed the middle Danube and raided Pannonia.\footnote{LOTTER 2003, pp. 87, 100. About this incursion in Pannonia cf. ALFÖLDI 1926, p. 63, SCHMIDT 1934, p. 428, idem, Geschichte der deutschen Stämme bis zum Ausgang der Völkerverwanderung: Die Westgermanen, München 1938\textsuperscript{2}, p. 184, BURY 1958, p. 110, note 2, STEIN 1959, 228.} This would mean that the Ostrogothic-Alanic-Hunnic foederati, to say the least, neglected their principal duty. Some historians doubt the possibility of simultaneous rebellion of the Pannonian foederati,\footnote{NAGY (1971) 328-329.} while the others, although believing that there was an insurrection, attempt to prove that the invasion of Pannonia in 395 did not happen at all.\footnote{VÁRÁDY 1969, pp. 87-94, 115-127.} However, it seems that the extant sources indicate otherwise. In one of his famous passages, Jerome enumerates the barbarian peoples (Goths, Sarmatians, Quadi, Alans, Huns, Vandals, Marcomanni) and the Roman provinces they devastated.\footnote{Cf. Hieron., Ep. 60, written in 396: (...) viginti et eo amplius anni sunt, quod inter Constantinopolim et Alpes Iulias cotidie Romanus sanguis effunditur. Scythiam, Thraciam, Macedoniem, Thessaliam, Dardaniam, Daciam, Epiros, Dalmatiām cum tasse Pannonias Gothos, Sarmata, Quadus, Alanus, Huni, Vandali, Marcomanni vassunt, trahunt, rapiunt.} Even though...
Jerome describes the events extending over two decades; there is not any known incursion of the Vandals and Marcomanni, which happened during that period of time, and prior to 395. We know of an incursion of the Quadi into Pannonia together with the Sarmatians in 374, but it seems that the Marcomanni were quiet at that time.\textsuperscript{42} Our only source for this invasion does not mention the Marcomanni attacking along with the Quadi,\textsuperscript{43} although is aware of the fact that both of these nations invaded the Empire together in the time of Marcus Aurelius (161-180).\textsuperscript{44} Further support for the hypothesis of the Marcomannic attack in 395 is provided by subsequent events: around 397, the Western Roman general Flavius Stilicho made a treaty with the Marcomanni who were settled in Pannonia Prima, which would presuppose their unrest along the frontier.\textsuperscript{45} As far as the Vandals are concern, we know that they invaded Pannonia, Noricum and Raetia in 401.\textsuperscript{46} It is also possible that yet another source refers to the crossing of the Danube and the invasion of 395.\textsuperscript{47} In our opinion, these

\textsuperscript{42} SCHMIDT 1938, pp. 182-184.

\textsuperscript{43} Amm. Marc., 29.6.1-14. VÁRADY 1969, pp. 94, 437, note 232 believes that the expression of Ammianus Marcellinus, 29.6.6 \textit{et gentes circumstisitas} with regard to the invasion of the Quadi in 374 includes also the Marcomanni and Vandals, although the Sarmatian peoples of Jazyges and Argaragantes are actually ment (SCHMIDT 1938, p. 182; contra VÁRADY 1969, pp. 121-122).

\textsuperscript{44} Amm. Marc., 29.6.1, cf. also 22.5.5.

\textsuperscript{45} SCHMIDT 1938, pp. 184-185; STEIN 1959, p. 231; LOTTER 2003, pp. 100-101. A direct testimony for this is provided by Paulinus in the \textit{Vita Ambrosii}, 36, giving the important role bishop Ambrosius (died on April 4th, 397) had in this affair: (\textit{... Friligit quaedam regina Marcomannorum ...) Christo credidit ( ...) Qua accepta epistola [sc. Ambrosiana] mulier suasit viro, ut cum populo suo se Romanis traderet ( ...). Cf. also Claud. Claudian., \textit{De consilatu Stilichonis} 1.190-191: \textit{Non Marte Suebos [sc. Marcomannos] / contudimus, quis iura damus.}


\textsuperscript{47} Claud. Claudian., \textit{In Rufinum} 2.26-28: \textit{Alii per terga ferores / Danuvii solidata ruunt expertaque remos / frangunt stagna rotis.} In subsequent verses, Claudian refers to another barbarians (\textit{alii} in original text) who crossed the Caucasus and invaded the Eastern Roman provinces (idem, 28-30), VÁRADY 1969, pp. 90, 117-119 asserts that it is the Huns who are meant in both cases. However, at the beginning of the passage, Claudianus speaks of the peoples (\textit{gentes}) who were allegedly allowed by the \textit{praefectus pretorio Orientis} and Stilicho's bitter opponent Rufinus to invade the Empire (idem, 23), so it could not be just the Huns. Also, in the \textit{In Rufinum} 1.308-310 he says: (\textit{...}) \textit{iam Getas Histrumque movet Scythiamque receptat auxilio te (1.319-321) conturatus Getarum / distulit instantes eluso principe (sc. Árcadio) pugnas / Honorum latus (sc. Rufinus) open.} MAENCHEN-HELFEN 1973, p. 53, 1978, p. 39 dismisses the possibility that the Huns invaded Thrace in 395, while the invasion is accepted by SEECK 1913, p. 274, THOMPSON 1948, p. 26, STEIN 1959, p. 228, WIRTH 1999, p. 30. In the \textit{In Rufinum} 2.269-271, Claudianus surely does not mean the Huns and Alans that were already within the Empire, i.e. the Pannonian \textit{foederati}, when he says (in the words of the Eastern Roman soldiers whom Stilicho sent back to Arcadius at Rufinus' request): (\textit{...}) \textit{qui (sc. Rufinus) forte nefandas iam parat insidias, qui nos (sc. milites Romanos) aut turpibus Hunos aut impacatis famulos praebet Alani.} Cf. VÁRADY 1969, pp. 121, 445, note 297; LOTTER 2003, p. 87.
all strongly suggest that there was an invasion of Pannonia in 395, and that the Pannonian foederati failed to prevent it.

Stilicho managed to pacify the middle Danube area in 399 and made it liable for tax collection once again, but the peace did not last for long. Some historians even believe that Stilicho resettled the Pannonian foederati after he had made separate treaties with them: the Ostrogoths would be resettled to Italy and Pannonia Prima, the Alans to Valeria, and partially to Italy together with some Huns, while the majority of Huns would remain in Pannonia Secunda. Yet, this is a mere construction based on an erroneous interpretation of sources.

END OF THE UNITED OSTROGOTHIC-ALANIC-HUNNIC GROUP

It seems that, during the incursion of the Vandals (and Alans with them) into Pannonia, Noricum and Raetia in 401, there was a new insurrection of the foederati, this time the ones settled in Noricum and Raetia, which very likely affected the Ostrogothic-Alanic-Hunnic group, too. Such a situation enabled Alaric and his Visigoths to pass through the Sava-Drava-Danube region in the autumn of 401 without meeting any resistance, reach the Julian Alps and invade Italy. The Ostrogothic-Alanic-


49 The southwestern Pannonia must have been secure even before since St. Jerome could find a purchaser for his father’s estate at Stridon in 397 (Hieron., Ep. 66; cf. A. ALFOLDI, Der Untergang der Römerherrschaft in Pannonien I, Berlin – Leipzig 1924, p. 4; VÁRADI 1969, pp. 91, 124; MÓCSY 1974, p. 344; TOMKA 1996b, p. 90).

50 VÁRADI 1969, pp. 162-178. This is more or less accepted by BARKÓCSI 1980, p. 118 who says that the Alans were placed in Valeria and the Goths in Pannonia Prima, while the Huns remained between the two rivers, presumably meaning the Drava and Sava.


Hunnic group was not united anymore, and Alaric’s invasion triggered further separation of the foederati.\textsuperscript{54} The Hunnic warriors, together with the Ostrogoths, mostly chose to support Alaric, while only a small fraction of them joined Stilicho who, however, could count on significant support of the Alans.\textsuperscript{55} Alaric’s retreat from Italy to a distant border area between Pannonia and Dalmatia and a treaty Stilicho made with him in 405 did not save the Western Roman Empire from new disturbances since the middle Danube area was afflicted already in the autumn of 405 by the largest barbarian invasion so far. The barbarian multitude, headed by their war leader Radagaisus and composed chiefly of the Goths, penetrated the limes on the Danube, rushed through Pannonia and forced an entry into northern Italy and Raetia.\textsuperscript{56} This tribal avalanche pushed forward other nations who, on the last day of 406, crossed the middle Rhine and invaded Gaul (primarily the Vandals, Alans and Suevi, and they were followed by other groups).\textsuperscript{57} This was a new migrational impetus initiated by the Huns who were already approaching the middle Danube area by then.\textsuperscript{58}

\textsuperscript{54} VÁRADY 1969, pp. 210-213, LOTTER 2003, p. 89. A testimony for the conflicts among the Pannonian foederati is provided by Paul. Oros., 7.37.3: \textit{Taceo de ipsorum inter se barbarorum crebris dilacerationibus, cum se invicem Gothorum cunei duo, deinde Alani atque Huni variis caedibus popubabantur.}

\textsuperscript{55} LOTTER 2003, p. 89. These are the Goths and Huns who were already employed as the bucellarii or served in the Roman army. The Alans under Saulus helped Stilicho to overcome Alaric in Italy (the battle of Pollentia in April of 402). The relations between the Ostrogothic-Hunnic foederati and Alaric’s Visigoths could originate from the time they fought together Magnus Maximus and Eugenius for Theodosius I. It is possible that Athaulf commanded the Ostrogothic-Hunnic foederati even prior to 408 when the sources mention him to be the leader of the Goths and Huns in Pannonia (LOTTER 2003, pp. 89, 94ff; contra HEATHER 1994, pp. 343-344).

\textsuperscript{56} About Radagaisus’ invasion cf. SE Eck 1913, pp. 375-377, SCHM IDT 1934, pp. 265-267, STEIN 1959, pp. 249-250, BURY 1958, pp. 167-168, DEM ANDT 1989, pp. 142-143. It is usually believed that Radagaisus’ invaders were the Ostrogoths but probably there were some Visigoths among them also (MAEN C HEN-HELFEN 1973, p. 61, 1978, p. 45; LOTTER 2003, pp. 92-93).

\textsuperscript{57} Cf. LOTTER 2003, pp. 32, 90. A testimony for this is provided by Jerome in a letter written in 409 (\textit{Ep.} 123.16): \textit{Innumerales et ferociissimae nationes Gallias occuparunt. Quia quid inter Alpes et Pyreneum est, quod Oceano et Rheno concluditur, Quadus, Vandalus, Sarmata, Halani, Gepides, Heruli, Saxones, Burgundiones, Alamanni et o fugenda respublica! - hostes Pannonii vastaverunt.} The hostes Pannonii are not the Pannonian foederati as asserted by VÁRADY 1969, pp. 218-223 (cf. also BURY 1958, p. 167 who believes the hostes Pannonii to be \textit{the barbarians who were within}), because they were never assimilated, so Jerome would not consider them to be the Roman subjects in Pannonia, but provincial inhabitants who were set in motion under the pressure from the barbarians and who joined the invaders (SE ECK 1913, p. 377; ALFÖLDI 1924, p. 4, note 19, 1926, p. 70, note 2; STEIN 1959, p. 250; MÖC SV 1974, p. 347; DEM ANDT 1989, p. 143; LOTTER 2003, p. 32, note 190).

It is impossible to determine the attitude of the Pannonian foederati toward Radagaisus’ invasion, although one can assume that they did not offer a resistance. The Alans may have even joined the invaders since they are not mentioned in Pannonia after 405/406, while the majority of the Ostrogothic-Hunnic foederati presumably remained neutral. This crisis offered an opportunity for the so-called Great Huns to interfere in the Western Roman affairs for the first time. In order to oppose Radagaisus, Stilicho turned for help to the Hunnic ruler Uldin who undoubtedly passed, leading his forces, through the Sava-Drava-Danube region. Uldin and a Gothic leader Sarus who was in command of the Ostrogoths and Huns, those were already in Stilicho’s service, won a victory over

59 VÁRADY 1969, pp. 201, 390 speaks of a betrayal on the part of the Pannonian foederati, while BARKÓCZI 1980, p. 119 believes that Radagaisus’ invasion could not happen without the consent of the Hunnic foederati. The imperial edict from March 24, 406 provides a testimony for the abandonment of frontier defensive posts: Idem AAA [sc. Arcadius, Honorius, Theodosius Junior]. Longiniiano praefecto praetorio. Qui relictis militariibus castris se ad depredationes vel latrocinium contulissent, severitatem publicam non evadant. Datum viii kalendas Aprilis Ravenna Arcadio Augusto. VI et Proba v. c. consulibus (CTh. 7.18.15). The edicts from February, July and October of 403 also disclose the fact that the abandonment of military posts was a rather regular occurrence in the time of crisis at the frontier (CTh. 7.18.11.2, 12, 13, 14, 14.2).

60 LOTTER 2003, pp. 90-91, 93-94.

61 THOMPSON 1948, p. 33; MAENCHEN-HELFEN 1973, pp. 59-60, 1978, p. 44; BÓNÁ 1991, p. 20; WIRTH 1999, p. 34. Already in 400, Uldin assisted the Eastern Roman Empire to suppress the insurrection of general Gainas (THOMPSON 1948, p. 32; MAENCHEN-HELFEN 1973, p. 59, 1978, p. 44; BÓNÁ 1991, pp. 18-19; WIRTH 1999, p. 31). VÁRADY 1969, pp. 201-207 suspects the Uldin’s intervention on behalf of the Western Roman Empire. Zosim., 5.26.4 says that Stilicho used against Radagaisus, aside from his regular troops, ὅσον οἶς τε γεγονεν σωμαχικον ἑξ Ἀλανῶν καὶ Οὐννων περιποίησατο, but does not mention either Uldin or Sarus. VÁRADY 1969, p. 297 believes of Zosimus’ Alans and Huns to be the Pannonian foederati, but it is much more likely that they were Uldin’s troops.

62 Cf. LOTTER 2003, pp. 93-94 who believes that Sarus was Ostrogothic, probably relying on VÁRADY 1969, pp. 207-210, 217-218 who argues that Sarus was Ostrogothic, a leader of the Ostrogothic horsemen transferred from Pannonia to Italy, and the supreme commander of Stilicho’s foederati troops. NAGY (1971) 332-333 assumes that Sarus was Visigothic and rejects the hypothesis that he commanded the Pannonian Ostrogothic foederati. SCHMIDT 1934, p. 266 also infers that Sarus was Visigothic who may have separated from Alaric during the latter’s first campaign against Italy (A.D. 402) and went over to the Romans. WOLFRAM 1990, pp. 172-173 does not dwell on Sarus’ ethnic background, but tries to elucidate the reasons for implacable enmity between Athaulf and Sarus. He considers Athaulf to be a commander of Goths and Huns in Pannonia (pp. 161-162) and believes that he was sent there by Alaric as to bring the Goths with him, but does not see him as a leader of the Pannonian Ostrogothic-Hunnic foederati because they were allegedly settled in Lower Pannonia while the Athaulf’s troops were in Upper Pannonia (p. 171). However, the conclusion that Athaulf was indeed a leader of the Pannonian Ostrogothic-Hunnic foederati rather imposes itself (cf. LOTTER 2003, pp. 95-98). Therefore, it is possible that the conflict between Sarus and Athaulf originated from their days in Pannonia when they may have quarreled over leadership. To be true, another hypothesis seems equally probable, that
Radagaisus in August of 406. This employment of Ulbin by the Western Roman government clearly shows that the influence of the Great Huns already extended relatively close to the middle Danube area, although the center of their territory was still situated along the lower Danube.

Finally, when Alaric started for his second invasion of Italy in the autumn of 408 – naturally, he again moved through the Sava-Drava-Danube region – he was joined by a presumable leader of the Pannonian Ostrogothic and Hunnic foederati, Athaulf, who took mainly the Ostrogoths with him, while the majority of the Huns would remain in Pannonia.63 This was a final end of the once united group of the Ostrogothic-Alanic-Hunnic foederati who had so strong an influence on the conditions in Pannonia in late 4th and early 5th century.

Retaking of Pannonia from the Hunnic foederati

EARLY ROLE OF THE GREAT HUNS IN WESTERN ROMAN AFFAIRS

In the next two decades, almost nothing is known about the Hunnic foederati who remained in Pannonia. The Western Roman Emperor Honorius invited some Huns as allies against Alaric in the summer of 409, but these came from the area beyond the Danube.64 Of course, they had to pass through the Sava-Drava-Danube region on their way to Italy. We do not know exactly what had become of them, but it seems that they did not fulfill their task completely for Alaric was able to conquer Rome in August

Sarus actually separated from Alaric and that their conflict was then extended to Athaulf as Alaric’s brother-in-law (cf. Heatier 1994, pp. 197-198). Be that as it may, it is highly probable that Sarus commanded the troops of the Gothic foederati already stationed in Italy and composed primarily of the Goths (and Huns) from Pannonia.

63 Lotter 2003, pp. 94, 98. Cf. also Várdy 1969, pp. 241-247. To Athaulf as a leader of the Pannonian Goths and Huns is referred by Zosim., 5.37.1: Επεξε δέ μεγίστος οὕτως [Alaric] πράγμασιν οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ ἱσοῦ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκ μείζονος ὑπεροχῆς ἑγχειρήσας διενοεῖτο, μετασέπεπται τὸν τῆς γαμετῆς ἄδελφον Ἀτάουλφον ἐκ τῆς ἀνωτάτῳ Παυσίας, ὡς ἐν αὐτῷ κοινωνίας τῆς πράξεως, Οὐννος καὶ Γόθων πλῆθος οὐκ εὐκαταφρόνησαν ἔχουν. To Alaric’s and Athaulf’s departure from Illyricum as an end to an epoch is apparently alluded by Jerome in his already mentioned letter written in 409 (Ep. 123.17): Olim a mari Pontico usque ad Alpes libias non erant nostra, quae nostra sunt, et per annos triginta facta Daniibii limite in medius Romani imperii regionibus pacnabatur. Arurunt vetustate lacrimae; praeter paucos semes omnes in captivitate et obsidione generati non desiderabant, quam non novarant, libertatem.

64 Cf. Seeck 1913, p. 402; Thompson 1948, p. 34; Bury 1958, p. 179; Stein 1959, p. 257; Demantt 1989, p. 145; Zosim., 5.50.1: μιρίους εἰς συμμαχίαν Οὐγνος ἐπέκαλεῖτο. In these Huns, Várdy 1969, pp. 254-257 wrongly sees the Pannonian Hunnic foederati (cf. Nagy (1971) 342). The number is undoubtedly exaggerated (Maenchen-Helfen 1973, p. 69, 1978, p. 50; Wirth 1999, p. 34). It seems more likely that these Huns arrived with the consent of their supreme King Uldin, as suggested by Wirth 1999, p. 34, and that they are not a group of Huns who defected from Uldin after his military failure in the diocese of Thrace (A.D. 408-409), as maintained by Maenchen-Helfen 1973, p. 69, 1978, p. 50.
of 410. However, the presence of these Huns must have influenced Alaric to mitigate the demands he imposed on Honorius’ government.\textsuperscript{65} Naturally, the Huns were employed for a limited duration, and probably for the primary purpose of defending the northern Italy where Honorius’ residence, Ravenna, was located. Perhaps precisely for that reason, that is, the desire to avoid the Huns, Alaric did not attack Ravenna but, instead, turned against Rome in late 409. The Huns probably returned to their territory already in late 409 or early 410, presumably after their mercenary contract had expired.\textsuperscript{66}

The situation in Pannonia, Noricum and Raetia where the \textit{foederati} – the Huns also – were settled possibly became more stable at that time, which was owing to the capable general Generidus who was appointed commander of the entire Western Illyricum in 409.\textsuperscript{67} The Huns from the area beyond the Danube were also recruited under the Honorius’ succes-

\textsuperscript{65} Cf. Bury 1958, p. 179; Stein 1959, p. 257.

\textsuperscript{66} It seems that the alleged contact of Honorius with the Hunnic ruler Charietto in late 412 or early 413 should be attributed to the Eastern Roman government (cf. Thompson 1948, p. 34; Böna 1991, p. 46; Wirth 1999, pp. 36-37), rather than the Western Roman government (so Maench-Helfen 1973, pp. 73-74, 1978, pp. 53-54; B. Croke, \textit{Evidence for the Hun Invasion of Thrace in A.D. 422}, Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 18 (1977) 353). The information of the embassy to the Huns is contained in the largely lost history of Olympiodorus (fr. 19 Blockley). The historian himself participated in the embassy, and he mentions a dangerous voyage across the sea, which, as argued by Maench-Helfen 1973, p. 74, 1978, p. 54, was the Adriatic Sea rather than the Black Sea. Croke (1977) 353 even says that the embassy travelled \textit{probably along the Dalmatian coast to Aquileia, thence to Pannonia overland}, but this does not make much sense. Namely, if this were a Western Roman embassy, the starting point would surely be Ravenna. It would be pointless to cross the Adriatic first and then to sail along the Dalmatian coast to Aquileia only to continue the voyage by land. Therefore, the direct Ravenna-Aquileia sea route along the west Adriatic coast would only seem appropriate. However, if this were the case, one could ask why risking an unsafe voyage by sea for such a short distance from Ravenna, and then taking the old Roman road that led to Pannonia anyway? These illogicalities could be avoided if we suppose that this was the Eastern Roman embassy that set out from Constantinople by sea, and out of necessity since a voyage by land was far unsafer. Namely, the diocese of Thrace was under constant threat from barbarian incursions at that time (cf. Thompson 1948, pp. 29-30; Maench-Helfen 1973, p. 74, 1978, p. 54; Böna 1991, p. 23; Wirth 1999, p. 36).

\textsuperscript{67} About Generidus’ command post in Western Illyricum cf. PLRE II, 500-501 s.v. Generidus, Demandt 1970, 646-647, Fitz 1994, p. 1392. Zosim., 5.46.2 says that Generidus commanded Upper Pannonia, Noricum, Raetia and the regions as far as the Alps at first, and afterwards received also the command over the troops in Dalmatia. Zosimus ended his passage on Generidus with a comment (5.46.5) that the general filled „the neighboring barbarians“ (τοῖς παρακάτω βαρβάροις) with fear and brought „complete security“ (πάσαν ἑσφέλειαν) to the provinces he watched over. Maench-Helfen 1973, p. 71, 1978, p. 51 believes that these „adjacent barbarians“ were actually the Great Huns, but it is possible that they were the \textit{foederati} (cf. note 30 for a similar situation in the time of Valentinian II). For the reorganization of the defence of Western Illyricum under Generidus cf. Soproni 1985, 104ff.
sor John, who had to face a military intervention from the East. The army that Theodosius II, acting in behalf of his aunt Aelia Galla Placidia and her six-year-old son Valentinian III, sent against John moved by way of Salonae in Dalmatia where it arrived in mid-spring of 425. Thence the cavalry went to Aquileia by land, crossing the Julian Alps, while the infantry was transported to Ravena by sea. This clearly shows that the Eastern Roman government considered South Pannonia insufficiently secure for passage of the troops, which made it necessary to choose more perilous sea route and then longer land route along the Dalmatian coast. There is no doubt that it was the proximity of the Huns that rendered the traffic communications in Upper Moesia and South Pannonia unsafe. In early 425, John ordered the future supreme western Roman general, Flavius Aetius, to go to the Huns and secure their help so he could muster sufficient troops to oppose the Eastern Romans. The choice of Aetius for this task was not unusual because he had spent some time as a hostage among the Huns some 15 years ago. A rich reward the Huns were to receive as a pay for their service guaranteed the success of the mission. On his way back, Aetius rushed through South Pannonia and soon appeared in Italy leading a large Hunnic army. Nevertheless, he came too late since John

---

68 It is not known precisely when Aetius lived as a hostage among the Huns, but his sending to the Hunnic court is usually dated as 409/410 (cf. O. Seeck, Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt VI, Stuttgart 1920, pp. 104-105; Thompson 1948, pp. 33-34; Stein 1959, pp. 257, 283; Bona 1991, p. 47; Wirth 1999, p. 34). However, some historians are somewhat vague: PLRE II, 22 s.v. Aetius 7 has some time afterwards, Demandt 1989, p. 151 wenig später, M. Šašel Kos, The Embassy of Romulius to Attila, Tyche 9 (1994) 105 several years later, i.e. after he had lived as a hostage in Alaric’s camp in 405-408. Bury says in one place (1958, p. 180, note 3) that Aetius was delivered as a hostage to Alaric possibly in 409, and in another (1958, p. 241, note 2) that this may have occurred either in 405-406 or after the first siege of Rome in 408. In any case, Bury also believes that Aetius was sent to the Huns several years after he was a hostage in Alaric’s camp. Maenchen-Helfen 1973, p. 68, note 266, 1978, pp. 50, 364, note 266 argues, relying on Alfred 1926, p. 87, note 5, that Aetius was a hostage in Alaric’s camp in 402-404/405 and that he may have been sent to the Huns already in 406 or some time afterwards. Alfred 1926, ibidem interprets Aetius’ stay as a hostage among the Huns in connection with his (erroneous) theory that Stilicho concluded a treaty with the Huns in 406 and settled them as the foederati in Valeria. Varady 1969, pp. 257-262 assumes that Aetius went as a hostage to the Huns as part of a Western Roman-Hunnic alliance concluded in 416, after a similar alliance was concluded between the Western Empire and the Visigoths. He argues that the relations between Aetius and the Huns had to be noch frisch und stark genug in 425 so he could successfully intervene with the Huns in John’s behalf, which would require a later date for his stay among the Huns (1969, p. 258). However, it is quite obvious that Aetius regularly kept in touch with the Huns for he sought help from them also in 432. Thus his contacts with the Huns must have extended over longer period of time, and it is equally possible that they originated from 409/410. After all, our source (Greg. Tur., 2.8) clearly states that Aetius and the Huns were bonded by a close friendship (familiares amicitia divinata). Undoubtedly, Aetius carefully nurtured this friendship. Even his son Carpilio spent some time as a hostage among the Huns (PLRE II, 262 s.v. Carpilio 2).
was already executed in Aquileia three days before, in early June, after being captured at Ravenna in late May. At first, Aetius engaged the Eastern Roman army, but then immediately struck an agreement with the new Western Roman government, while the Huns returned to their territory via South Pannonia after they had received their pay, delivered hostages and exchanged oaths.69

**REMOVAL OF THE PANNONIAN HUNNIC FOEDERATI**

The new agreement between the Western Roman Empire and the Huns rendered itself very useful because, for the next four years, Aetius campaigned against the Visigoths and Francs in Gaul chiefly with the aid of the Hunnic mercenaries.70 Also, the treaty had a favorable impact on the conditions in northern part of Western Illyricum, i.e. in Pannonia. It seems that, as a direct result of this amicable relations, the Western Romans succeeded in regaining temporarily the control over the Pannonian regions in 427. The contemporaries perceived the removal of the Hunnic foederati as a liberation of Pannonia after 50 years of foreign domination.71 Modern historians interpret variously this event and the historical circumstances that surround it. Seeck assumes that the then supreme Western Roman general Flavius Constantius Felix, aided by the Gothic troops, repelled the Huns from Pannonia. Bury believes that the Huns left Valeria which they held for 45 years after they concluded a treaty with the Western Romans in 425. Alfoldi speculates that the Eastern Romans out of Pannonia Secunda and Savia drove the Huns, after they had taken over these provinces by an agreement with the Western Roman Empire, while the Huns kept Valeria, which they held from 406; consequently, he rejects the 50 years date. Schmidt asserts that the Eastern Romans cleared Pannonia Secunda, which was ceded to them by the western Roman government and invaded by the Huns, and that the information provided by Jordanes about involvement of the Goths is arbi-

69 Seeck 1920, pp. 93-95; Thompson 1948, p. 35; Bury 1958, pp. 222-224; Stein 1959, pp. 283-284; Maenchen-Helfen 1973, p. 77, 1978, pp. 56-57; Demant 1989, p. 151; Bona 1991, pp. 47-50; Wirth 1999, pp. 41-43. The sources say that the Hunnish army numbered as many as 10,000 troops (Philostor., 12.14, 2-3; Socrat., 7.23, 25-26 has several tens of thousands), but the number is surely exaggerated.


71 Marcelinus and Jordanes, who both lived in the 6th century, provide our only extant testimony for this. Marcellin., s.a. 427.1 says: *Pannoniae, quae per quinquaginta annos ab Hunnis retinebantur, a Romanis receptae sunt.* Similar information is offered by Jordan., Getica 166: *Nam duodecimo anno regni Valiae [A.D. 427], quando et Hunni post pene quinquaginta annorum invasam Pannoniam a Romanis et Gothis expulsi sunt (...) eo fere tempore, quo Hierius et Aradures consules processissent* [A.D. 427].
trary and worthless. THOMPSON speculates that the Eastern Roman troops retook Pannonia Secunda from the Huns. STEIN deduces that general Felix recaptured the northeastern part of Pannonia, which was already detached from the Empire since the days of Alatheus and Safrax, and kept by the Huns in recent decades, i.e. Valeria. MAENCHEN-HELFEN believes that the Western Romans defeated the Huns in Pannonia, i.e. the Hunnic bands that came to close to Noricum, which, regarding to him, was a testimony for a transient weakening of the Hunnic confederation due to unknown reasons. CROKE says that the Huns were driven back across the Danube, and assumes that this action was initiated by the Eastern Roman court, which was a direct consequence of an agreement concluded in 424 about a transfer of authority over Pannonia from the West to the East. POPOVIĆ asserts that this military enterprise was carried out by general Flavius Ardabur Aspar and that a starting point of the campaign was Sirmium. DEMANDT briefly states that general Felix succeeded in recapture of Pannonia from the Huns, while WOLFRAM mentions the forces of the Great Huns, general Aetius’ allies, which were repelled by the Romans across the Danube in 427. In most of these instances, it is presumed that the Huns that were driven back or expelled were the so-called Great Huns from the area beyond the Danube, which devalues the statement of the sources that these were the Huns who had lived in Pannonia for 50 years. The first who proposed that the Huns in question were the Pannonian Hunnic foederati was VÁRADY, but he went too far with his hypotheses, asserting that the Western Roman Empire revoked the Pannonian Huns’ status of the foederati, allegedly in keeping with the treaty of A.D. 425, and that Marcellinus’ expression Pannoniae could only refer to Pannonia Secunda. MÓCSY rejects the notion that the Huns who held Pannonia until 427 were the Hunnic foederati, and says that they were the Huns from the area beyond the Danube, arguing that, in 427, the Eastern Roman Empire most probably recaptured the parts of Pannonia from the Huns after a military intervention in the Sava-Drava region, i.e. Savia. Relying


73 VÁRADY 1969, pp. 278-299.

74 For refutation of VÁRÁDY’s arguments cf. NAGY (1971) 342-343. Unfortunately, NAGY’s paper that deals with Marcellinus’ record, Reoccupation of Pannonia from the Huns in 427, in: Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae 15 (1967) 159-186, has nothing to say about the event itself. Instead, it is devoted solely to the source analysis.

on VÁRÁDY’s arguments, POPOVIĆ assumes that the Eastern Romans expelled the Hunnic foederati from Pannonia, and BÓNA infers that the Eastern Romans, after they had received Pannonia Secunda from the Western Roman Empire, forced the Western Roman barbarian foederati, and the Huns also, out from Pannonia. It seems that, in recent times, the more logical assumption that the expelled Huns were the Pannonian foederati has prevailed. Such is also the argument of WIRTH who openly questions the involvement of the Goths, rejects the Eastern Roman intervention, strongly doubts that the Western Roman Empire would choose to follow an aggressive military solution, and suggests instead that the action taken was either political or diplomatic, while LOTTER says that the Western Romans, i.e. Aetius expelled the local Hunnic foederati from Pannonia. The assumption of SALAMON – SÓS that, in 427, Pannonia Secunda and Savia became part of the territory occupied by the Huns is erroneous and misleading. In our opinion, the Western Roman government succeeded in expelling the Hunnic foederati from Pannonia, undoubtedly with a tacit consent of the Great Huns, with whom a treaty was concluded in 425. This was probably carried out by general Felix since Aetius was chiefly in Gaul at that time, even though it is possible that he was in Ravenna in 427. The action was limited and presumably did not mean a large-scale military operation. The participation of the Goths is not likely, especially since the Western Romans fought them in Gaul at the same time. Although we can assume that there were a number of Gothic mercenaries in the Roman troops that may have been used for the operation in Pannonia, this is hardly what Jordanes had in mind when he credited this success to the Goths. Thus the history of the Ostrogothic-Alanic-Hunnic group that was settled in Pannonia under the leadership of Alatheus and Saphrax in 380 now came to its final end. We do not know what happened to the former Hunnic foederati. They may have retreated across the Danube and joined their ethnic brethren.

Surrender of Pannonia to the Huns

GREAT HUNS AS THE IMPERIAL FOEDERATI

The Romans did not retain the control over the Pannonian provinces for long. Aetius who found himself in a difficult position during the fight

77  WIRTH 1999, pp. 43-44; LOTTER 2003, pp. 33, 51, 98.
79  Cf. PLRE II, 22 s.v. Aetius 7.
80  WIRTH 1999, p. 44. VÁRÁDY 1969, pp. 300-303, 396-397 argues that the Hunnic (and Alanic) foederati were partially accepted in the Roman army, partially left in Pannonia, and partially selected for the buccellarii, but this is unfounded (cf. NAGY (1971) 343-344).
for supremacy in the Western Roman Empire was forced to escape to the Huns in 432. We know his itinerary: after he had left Rome, he crossed to Dalmatia in a boat, and then came to the Huns by the way of South Pannonia. Thanks to Aetius' good connections with the Huns, a large Hunnish army was placed at his disposal. Leading his troops, Aetius marched through the Sava-Drava-Danube region, appeared before Ravenna and forced Galla Placidia and Valentinian III to agree to his appointment as the supreme Western Roman general. In this new capacity, Aetius was in a position to further his dealings with the Huns and reward them for their support, thus binding them even more to himself. Consequently, he made a treaty with the Huns in 433. They became the imperial foederati under usual terms, and were granted the right to settle on the Roman territory with the obligation to provide a military assistance for the Empire, which Aetius would know how to use. The Western Roman-Hunnic relations were advanced to a new phase.

DATE OF THE TREATY

Modern historiography has more or less accepted the year 433 as a date for the conclusion of the treaty between the Western Romans and the Huns. It is maintained by ALFÖLDI, SCHMIDT, THOMPSON, STEIN, VÁRADI, MÓCSY who assert that it was only the Hunnic conquest that was sanctioned in this year, BARKÓCZI, SALAMON - SÓS, FITZ, WIRTH, ANDRÍC, and LOTTER. SZECK dates the treaty as 431, MÍRKOVIC as 432, and NIKOLANC as 430, MAENCHEN-HELFEN did not affix a precise date, even though he assumes that Priscus' barbarian with whom Aetius concluded a treaty was

82 PLRE II, 24 s.v. Aetius 7.
83 The Hunnic troops would make up the main Aetius' force with which he fought the Burgundians, Visigoths and Bagaudae in Gaul in the second half of 430's (cf. SCHMIDT 1934, pp. 466-468; BURY 1958, pp. 249-250; STEIN 1959, pp. 322-324; DEMANDT 1989, p. 154; WOLFRAM 1990, pp. 181-182). A testimony for the conclusion of the treaty with the Huns is provided by Chron. Gall., s.a. 434: Aetius in gratiam receptus. Rugila, rex Chonorum, cum quo pax firmata, moritur, cui Bleda succedit et Prisc., fr. 11.1, 2-5 Blockley: (...); σύν Ἑράτις, ὡς τοῦ Ῥωμαίου γένους ὤν ἄγει τὴν πρὸς τῷ Ἑλλάδος πολέμῳ Παιονίων χώραν τῷ βαρβάρῳ [Atila] κατὰ τὰς Ἀετίους στρατηγοὺς τῶν ἑπετάρμων Ῥωμαίων συνθήκας ὑπακούουσαν.
Attila (he says in another place that the Eastern Romans rather than the Western Romans concluded a peace treaty with the Hunnic king Ru/g/a), Wozniak dates the treaty as 435, Šašel Kos as 433/434, Popović and Tomičić both as 434, while Bona has 432/434 and 434/435. It can be assumed that Aetius made the treaty as soon as he acquired the leading position in the Western Roman Empire and while the Hunnic King Ru/g/a whom he also asked for help in 425 was still alive, and that the treaty was confirmed by Ru/g/a’s successors Bleda and Attila to whom a Western Roman embassy with Aetius’ son Carpilio and Cassiodorus, grandfather of the famous Flavius Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus Senator was sent in 434/435. There is another historiographic issue connected to the question of the treaty: Attila’s appointment as magister militum. Várady, Šašel Kos, and Lotter argue that Aetius had Attila appointed magister militum at the time of the conclusion of the treaty, while Wirth has initially assumed that Attila was appointed by the Eastern Roman Emperor after the settlement of Margus in 435, but afterwards proposed that he was appointed by the Western Roman Emperor. However, this is not very likely, since it would mean a devaluation of Bleda’s senior position. Maenchen-Helffen believes that Attila became a magister militum after 445, and that Aetius appointed him. A similar view is maintained by Bona.


86 Cf. Várady 1969, pp. 309-312. He asserts that only Attila dealt with the embassy, which cannot be right since Bleda was senior in their dual kingship. The assumption of Várady is based on Cassiodorus’ letter written in 507 (Variae, 1.4.10-12), our only extant source for this embassy, which has Attila as a sole recipient of the Western Roman envoys. It seems that this should be attributed rather to the fact that Attila later surpassed Bleda due to his legendary fame and historical significance, and that Cassiodorus sought to overemphasize the role and success of his grandfather in the embassy, thus portraying Attila and the circumstances much more difficult than they really were. Maenchen-Helffen 1973, pp. 105-107, 1978, pp. 78-79 argues that the embassy must have happened after the year 445, i.e. after Bleda’s death, and connects it to the deterioration of the relations between the Western Roman Empire and the Huns, but he never mentions Romulus’ embassy in 449. The deterioration of the Western Roman-Hunnic relations can be first detected in around 448 (cf. Várady 1969, p. 315ff; Bona 1991, p. 89ff; H. Graćanin, The Western Roman Embassy to the Court of Attila in A.D. 449, Byzantinoslavica 61 (2003) 54). After all, Attila would not have risked an open rupture with the West when he still waged war on the East in 447, although he may have contemplated a campaign in Gaul as early as 447.


who says that the Western Roman Emperor appointed Attila in 445/446.\textsuperscript{90} Attila’s \textit{magisterium militum} is mentioned by Priscus,\textsuperscript{91} in a passage that describes the Eastern Roman embassy to Attila in 449. Some historians believe that this was the year when Attila received an honorary \textit{magisterium militum} from the Emperor Valentinian III since Priscus was informed of this by the Western Roman envoys.\textsuperscript{92} But Blockley has already pointed out that Priscus may have equally meant Theodosius II when saying that the Emperor conferred the title on Attila.\textsuperscript{93} This seems even more likely if we bear in mind that Priscus explains how the fact of a tribute being paid to the king of the Huns was concealed by Attila’s appointment to the rank of a Roman general, and we know that it was the Eastern Roman Empire that payed the tribute. Demandt also accepts that Theodosius II bestowed the honorary \textit{magisterium militum} on Attila.\textsuperscript{94} The appointment must have occurred after Bleda’s death in 445, possibly in 447 when the Eastern Roman Emperor had to conclude a new peace treaty with the Huns and was forced to pay a considerably increased yearly tribute.

\textbf{Which Pannonian provinces were surrendered to the Huns?}

By the provisions of the treaty made with Aetius in 433, a large section of Pannonia, probably the provinces of Valeria and Pannonia Secunda, and possibly Pannonia Prima also were ceded to the Huns, but large towns were excluded from this, at least those in Pannonia Secunda. A testimony for cession of the Pannonian provinces is provided by Priscus who mentions “a region of Pannonia close to the river Sava which was subject to the barbarian by the treaty made with Aetius“.\textsuperscript{95} This could mean both Southpannonian provinces along the river Sava, i.e. Pannonia Secunda and Savia. However, such a solution is unlikely. The Huns were not masters of all the Pannonian provinces as we also discover from Priscus when he mentions certain Constantiolius who was “a man from the region of Pannonia subject to Attila“.\textsuperscript{96} The statement would only make sense if there were parts of Pannonia not subject to Attila. In any case, Priscus uses singular, “a region“, \textit{χώρα}. Consequently, it can be deduced that the Huns were given control over substantial part of Pannonia Secunda since this

\textsuperscript{90} Bôna 1991, pp. 81-82.
\textsuperscript{91} Prisc., fr. 11.2, 627-631 Blockley.
\textsuperscript{92} PLRE II, 182-183 s.v. Attila.
\textsuperscript{93} R. C. Blockley, Notes to \textit{Priscus rhetor Panites, Fragmenta}, in: The Fragmentary classicising historians of the later Roman Empire: Eunapius, Olympiodorus, Priscus and Malchus II, ed. R. C. Blockley (= ARCA. Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs 6), Liverpool 1983, p. 387, note 69.-
\textsuperscript{94} Demandt 1989, p. 168.
\textsuperscript{95} Prisc., fr. 11.1, 3-5 Blockley. For the text cf. note 83.
\textsuperscript{96} Prisc., fr. 11.2, 578-579: ἀνδρὸς ἐκ τῆς Παύσιων χώρας τῆς ὑπὸ Ἀττήλα ταττομένες.
was the closest region to the Hunnic territory across the Danube. Apart from large towns, the strategically significant traffic routes along the rivers Sava and Drava, which connected Italy and the eastern provinces may have also been excluded from the arrangement. Valeria was undoubtedly handed over to the Huns for the same reason as Pannonia Secunda: it was the closest region to the Hunnic territory across the Danube. With regard to Pannonia Prima, it is quite possible that this province was also surrendered, although there is not a direct confirmation for this in sources. However, it must be remembered that the Ostrogothic-Alanic-Hunnic foederati were also partially settled in Pannonia Prima. Such an assumption also seems to be supported by archaeological finds in the area.\footnote{Cf. Bôna 1991, pp. 200-202, Wirth 1999, p. 45.}

In modern historiography, there are rather differing opinions on which Pannonian provinces were surrendered to the Huns by the treaty of 433. Some believe that it was the entire Pannonia,\footnote{Seeck 1920, p. 115; Schmidt 1934, p. 262, 1938, p. 185; Andrić (2002) 131; Lotter 2003, p. 16 and note 46, p. 51.} while others opt for Pannonia Prima, Valeria and Savia,\footnote{Mócsy 1974, p. 350; Wirth 1999, pp. 45-46.} Pannonia Prima and Savia,\footnote{Bôna 1980, p. 181.} Valeria and Pannonia Secunda,\footnote{Bury 1958, p. 272 and note 3; Stein 1959, p. 322; Šašel 1979, p. 128; Šašel Kos (1994) 105-106.} Valeria and Pannonia Prima,\footnote{Altheim 1951, p. 84; Bôna 1991, p. 52.} or Pannonia Prima.\footnote{Fitz 1994, pp. 1324, 1328.} One historian even doubts if Aetius surrendered the parts of Pannonia to the Huns at all, and argues that they were only acknowledged an official right to the Pannonian regions they already held,\footnote{Mirković 1971, p. 43; Wozniak (1981) 352.} although he also says that Aetius ceded the area along the Sava to Attila after the year 445.\footnote{Várady 1969, pp. 303ff, 397.} Yet another historian infers that Pannonia Prima and Valeria came entirely under the Hunnic control in 427, while Savia and Pannonia Secunda were surrendered to the Eastern Roman Empire,\footnote{Alföldi 1926, p. 90 who asserts that Priscus mistook the Sava for the Drava, Thompson 1948, p. 64, Mócsy 1962, p. 582, and Salamon – Sós 1980, p. 398 who believe that Pannonia Secunda and Savia were already ceded to the Huns in 427.} but this is an erroneous assumption.
Cession of Western Illyricum to the Eastern Roman Empire

It is not a coincidence that probably the only province that was not ceded to the Huns was Savia and that they were imposed certain limitations with regard to Pannonia Secunda. Both of these Southpannonian provinces were extremely important because of their traffic and strategic significance, and the Eastern Roman Empire was naturally very much interested in them. Thus it is possible to conjecture that Aetius did not have a full freedom of action in deciding which Pannonian provinces and in what extent would be ceded to the Huns, i.e. he could not surrender all the provinces even if he wanted to. It seems that in 424, while Aelia Galla Placidia stayed as a refugee in Constantinople with her son Valentinian who was then five years old, there was an agreement made between the East and the West by which the question of the supreme authority over the prefecture of Illyricum was to be finally resolved. In exchange for the Eastern military help, Galla Placidia renounced the Western Roman rights to Eastern Illyricum. On this occasion, Valentinian was betrothed to the two-year-old Licinia Eudoxia, a daughter of his cousin Theodosius II, which was probably also a part of the settlement. Thirteen years later, at the wedding of Valentinian III and Licinia Eudoxia in Constantinople on October 29, 437, the Western Roman renunciation of the rights to the Eastillyrian regions was not only solemnly confirmed, but the western Roman government surrendered officially a large portion of the Illyrian or Pannonian diocese, i.e. the Pannonian provinces, and perhaps even Dalmatia, to the East. By this, the West tried to avoid any possible complication with regard to the Huns and the middle Danube area in the future. Thus the dangerous proximity of the Huns and their growing appetite had an immediate effect on administrative and political changes in Western Illyricum. By acquiring the authority over Pannonia, reduced now in reality to Southpannonian provinces, the Eastern Roman Empire assumed control over the strategi-

110 About this cf. E. Stein, Der Verzicht der Galla Placidia auf die Präfektur Illyricum, Wiener Studien 36 (1914) 344-347.
111 Markovic 1971, p. 42 dates erroneously the betrothal of Valentinian III to Licinia Eudoxia as 426. Marcelin., s.a. 424.2 has it clearly under the year 424.
112 Seeck 1920, p. 121; W. Enblin, RE VII A, Stuttgart 1939, 2235 s.v. Valentinianus 4; Bury 1958, p. 225; PLRE II, 1139 s.v. Valentinianus 4; Demandt 1989, p. 150 (however, misdated as October, 28). The date was surely not accidental for Valentinian III was acclaimed Caesar in Thessalonica on October 23, 424, and Augustus in Rome on October 23, 425 (Seeck 1920, pp. 93, 97; Stein 1959, p. 284; Demandt 1989, p. 150).
113 A testimony for this is provided by Cassiod., Variae 11.1.9: Nurum denique sibi amissione Illyrici comparavit factaque est comitium regnantis divisio dolenda provincis, and Jordan., Romana 328: Post haec [A.D. 434] III anno Valentinianus imperator a Roma Constantinopolim ob susciendam in matrimonio Eudoxiam Theodosii principis filiam venit datamque pro munere socii sui totam Illyricum celebratis nuptiis ad sua regna cum uxore secessit.
cally vital area along the river Sava with Sirmium as a main defensive post.

The historians have variously sought to explain the assertion of sources that the Western Empire ceded Illyricum to the Eastern Empire. Stein assumes that the Western Roman government renounced its rights to Eastern Illyricum in 437, and ceded Sirmium to the Eastern Roman Empire at the same time. Such an assumption is accepted by Alföldi (Sirmium was ceded in 424), Schmidt (Sirmium and a part of Pannonia Secunda were ceded in 424), Enblin, Sara, Ferjančić (Pannonia Secunda), Várády (Sirmium), Moczy (Sirmium), and Lotter (Sirmium while Dalmatia, Raetia and Noricum were retained by the West). On the other hand, seeck maintains that the entire Illyricum was ceded in 427, which is followed by Demantd and Wirth (the entire Illyricum). Zeiller believes that the entire Western Illyricum was surrendered except the provinces of Noricum, and that Pannonia may have been ceded in 424, while Bury asserts that Dalmatia and Eastern Pannonia were surely surrendered in 424. The surrender of Western Illyricum together with Dalmatia is accepted by Wilkes (a substantial part of Western Illyricum and a major part, if not all, of Dalmatia was ceded), Mathisen (the West may have been left with only the provinces of Noricum), Wozniak, Popović (Dalmatia and Pannonia were already under the Eastern Roman control from 424/425), and Fitz (Dalmatia and Sirmium). Mirković speculates about a gradual diminishing of the territory under the control of the Eastern Roman government to only Sirmium, which is erroneous. In Croatian historiography, the researchers have opted for a surrender of only Dalmatia (Šišić relying on Gülndpenning), for a surrender of Dalmatia after some Pannonian provinces had already been ceded (Posavec), for a surrender of the entire Illyricum with Dalmatia (Novak), for a surrender of only Pannonia (Andreć, who leaves an open possibility for a cession of only a part of Pannonia, i.e. Pannonia Secunda or Sirmium with its environs), or have even expressed the opinion that a part of Western Illyricum was not ceded to the East at all but the East was

---


only recognized its rights to the prefecture of Illyricum, i.e. Eastern Illyricum, while Aetius surrendered Sirmium and Pannonia to the Huns, which is an altogether unacceptable assertion (ROGOŠIĆ). The hypothesis about the surrender of Dalmatia is maintained by FERLUGA and NIKOLANDI, too.

The interpretation of sources (Cassiodorus) that Illyricum was lost for the West has been usually seen as to reflect a disapproval of the Ostrogothic court with the former Western government ceding its rights to Eastern Illyricum, which would become a matter of contention between the Ostrogoths and the Eastern Romans with regard to Sirmium. The Ostrogoths recaptured Sirmium from the Gepids in 504, and the Gepids tried to win it back with the help of the Eastern Romans in 530, but suffered a defeat after which the Ostrogothic rule was consolidated in the Syrmian region. So when Cassiodorus speaks of a ruler (Amalasuentha) who defends the frontiers of her kingdom and who contra Orientis principis votum Romanum [i.e. Italian, Ostrogothic] fecit esse Danuvium, while another ruler (Galla Placidia) was to blame for the loss of Illyricum, he has primarily in mind the concrete possession of Pannonia Secunda and Sirmium (and also the middle Danube area), and not the rights to Eastern Illyricum. In another words, Cassiodorus essentially criticizes the surrender of the parts of Western Illyricum that de jure belonged to the Western Empire until 437. It also seems that he distinguishes between two events: the earlier one when the division of Illyricum was agreed upon (it was then that Galla Placidia ceded the Western Roman rights to Eastern Illyricum), and the later one when the agreement was finally realized with a further division of the Westlyrian provinces. Since Cassiodorus uses the plural (provinciis), it is clear that several provinces, and not just Pannonia Secunda with Sirmium must have been formally ceded to the East. The solution may be provided if we suppose that all the four Pannonian provinces were surrendered. It seems that the later events


122 For the text see note 113.

123 Cf. Stein (1925) 356-357; Alföldi 1926, p. 93, note 1.


125 Cassiod., Variae 11.1.10.
confirm this assumption. After the disintegration of Attila’s megastate, it is the Eastern Roman Emperor Marcian who concludes a treaty with the Ostrogoths and allows them to settle in Pannonia. The supposed intervention of the Western Emperor Avitus in Pannonia in 455, which is based solely on the verses of Sidonius Apollinaris, is by no means certain, and it is possible that Sidonius actually alluded to the western edge of the diocese of Illyricum, i.e. the provinces of Noricum that bordered with Pannonia and through which Avitus passed on his voyage from Gaul to Rome in July to September of 455. The assumptions that Avitus (or one of his generals) actually intervened in Pannonia and subdued it partially or even entirely to the West, or that he granted the Ostrogoths position of the foederati in Pannonia which then would be confirmed by Marcian cannot be accepted. Mócsy argues that Avitus was the last of the Western emperors who tried to win back Pannonia, but his „demonstration of force“ did not have any real effect, which is more or less accepted by Wirth. Lotter also believes that certain parts of Pannonia were reunited with the Western Empire thanks to Avitus’ intervention, and tries to substantiate this assumption by claiming that die italischen Konsularfasten hätten nämlich kaum die Zerstörung der Stadt Sabaria in der Pannonia I durch ein Erdbeben am 7. September 456 verzeichnet, wenn diese Stadt nicht damals noch bewohnt und civitas des weströmischen Reiches gewesen wäre. This is based on a chronicle record from the Fasti Vindobonenses priores. The same record has been used by Maenchen-Helfen for a similar argumentation, but this is not a sufficient corroboration since both eastern and western Roman chronicles and fasti often recorded events such as earthquakes

130 Cf. Schmidt 1934, p. 269.
132 Lotter 2003, pp. 20, 106.
133 Fasti Vindobonenses priores, s.a. 455: et eversa est Sabaria a terrae motu VII idus September, die Veneris.
regardless of which part of the Empire they had occurred in, i.e. an Eastern chronicle would record an event that occurred in the West, and vice versa. Thus the assumption that the Western Empire restored its control over the western part of Pannonia in 455 cannot be accepted but we have to assume that the authority over Pannonia rested with the Eastern Empire as established in 437. The fact that Majorian recruited an army in the middle Danube area in 458, for which a testimony is provided by Sidonius Apollinaris who singles out the Pannonians among various barbarian peoples (Bastarnae, Suevi, Huns, Getae, Dacians, Alans, Rugians, Ostrogoths, and Sarmatians), is not contrary to the assertion that Pannonia de jure belonged to the East, and thus it cannot be used as a supporting evidence for the assumption that the West ruled the western part of Pannonia once again. For Majorian enjoyed a partial recognition from the Eastern court, and he must have received a permission from Constantinople for the recruitment of troops, which is even more likely if we bear in mind that he was preparing for a campaign against the Vandals in North Africa. ANDRIĆ also suspects Avitus' intervention and rejects the possibility that there was a renewal of Western Roman authority in Pannonia. As to the assumption that Dalmatia was also surrendered to the East, this is based on Jordanes' narrative. He says that, in 437, "the entire Illyricum" (totam Illyricum) was surrendered, which some researchers discard as a chronicler's mistake, or that, by this expression, he actually means the ecclesiastical Illyricum, i.e. the prefecture of Illyricum divided in "the Justinianoprimic Illyricum in the diocese of Dacia" and "the Macedonian Illyricum in the diocese of Macedonia". However, it is quite possible that the West also ceded Dalmatia. This could additionally explain the special relations of the Dalmatian general Marcellinus and his successor in the command over this province, Julius Nepos, with the Eastern Roman court, i.e. the fact that they both recognized the suzerainty of the Eastern Empire.

135 Sidon. Apollinaris, Panegyricus dictus Maioriano Augusto (= Carmina 5.470-488).
136 This is maintained by SCHWARCZ (1992) 52, and LOTTER 2003, p. 108.
139 For the text see note 113.
140 Cf. STEIN 1914, p. 314ff; ALFÖLDI 1926, p. 93, note 1.
141 ROGOŠIĆ 1962, p. 173.
142 Cf. NIKOLANCI (1985) 5ff.
The fall of Sirmium to the Huns

NEW WAR BETWEEN THE HUNS AND EASTERN EMPIRE

Just three years after the Eastern Empire took over Sirmium and other parts of Southpannonian provinces, the eastern Roman-Hunnic relations reached a critical point. According to the peace treaty concluded in 435 near the town of Margum in Moesia Prima (Orašje near Dubravica, Serbia), situated at the mouth of the river Morava into the Danube, the Eastern Roman government had to agree to double the amount of the tribute paid to the Huns in gold, abstain from conclusion of alliances with the "barbarian" enemies of the Huns, pay a ransom of eight solidi per head (which was a double yearly pay of a Roman trooper, and twice as much as it was paid before) for every runaway or delivered prisoner of war, open a marketplace for mutual commercial exchange whose safety would be guaranteed by both sides, and return all the fugitives who escaped from under the Hunnic authority into the Roman territory.\(^4\) However, in 440, the Huns decided that the Eastern Romans broke the conditions of the treaty and, taking advantage of the imperial army being engaged in the war against the Persians and in the preparation for the upcoming campaign against the Vandals, the Hunnic forces crossed the Danube under the leadership of both their kings, invaded the Roman territory, and took Viminacium (Kostolac, Serbia) in the autumn of 440. Following this, in 441, they continued advancing without meeting any real resistance, and captured Margum, Singidunum (Belgrade, Serbia) and Sirmium (Srijemska Mitrovica, Serbia) in one direction, and also penetrated through the Morava valley all the way to Naissus (Niš, Serbia) in another direction. At this point, the one-year truce with the Huns was arranged by *magister militum praesentalis* Aspar in behalf of the imperial government. This enabled the Eastern troops to be recalled from Sicily where they awaited for an order to attack the Vandals in Africa, and to be deployed in Illyricum and Thrace. At the same time, a peace was concluded with the Persians which was due to *magister militum per Orientem* Anatolius. Although these actions improved the Empire's military situa-

tion, the Huns were not at rest but attacked once again in 442 and ravaged both Illyricum and Thrace. Moving along the Danube, the Huns took Ratiaria (Arčar, Bulgaria) and Oescus (Gigen, Bulgaria) in Illyricum, and presumably a number of towns in northern Thrace, in the same direction of attack. Probably in late 442 (or early 443, at the latest), a new peace was concluded. *Magister militum praesentalis Australius*, one of the commanders in the never finished campaign against the Vandals, participated in the negotiations that led to a cease of hostilities, and a peace treaty was concluded by the newly appointed master of offices (*magister officiorum*) Nomus.144

**Hunnic conquest of Sirmium**

After the fall of Sirmium in 441,145 the Hunnic conquest of Pannonia Secunda was brought to an end. There is no doubt that, at the same time, the town of Bassiana (Donji Petrovići, Serbia) on the Roman road connecting Sirmium with Naissus via Singidunum, Margum and Viminacium fell to the Huns.146 However, there is no reason to suppose that the Huns captured Pannonia Savia as some historians maintain. So Šišić believes that, after the Hunnic conquest of 441, „only the environs of Siscia were still Roman“,147 and Posavec says that the Huns penetrated into Pannonia Secunda and Savia, and conquered both provinces, while the environs of Siscia and parts of Pannonia south of the Sava remained under the Roman control.148 It is quite clear from the course of the Hunnic campaign of 441 that their conquest followed the Danube upward, and that

---


145 The date of the fall of Sirmium as 441 is generally accepted, and the first to bring it up in Croatian historiography was Šišić 1925, p. 160. The fall of Sirmium is erroneously dated as 448 by Zeiller 1918, p. 146, idem, sur l'ancien évêché de Sirmium, Orientalia Christiana Periodica 13 (1947) 674, and Bury 1958, p. 276, note 1. By an unusual oversight, it is dated by Tomić 2000, pp. 266-267 as 442.

146 For the fall of Bassiana to the Huns cf. S. Dušanić, Bassianae and Its Territory, Archaeologia Ilugoslavica (1967) 74; Šašel Kos (1996) 106.

147 Šišić 1925, p. 160.

148 Posavec (1997) 11. He refers to Barczy 1980, pp. 117-119, but there is not any mention of these assumptions there. Tomić 2000, p. 266 asserts that, in 446, Valentinian III ceded Pannonia Savia to Attila, but does not say what his assumption is based on. He actually follows Bona 1991, p. 81, who erroneously assumes that Priscus' entry on Aetius' surrender of „a region of Pannonia close to the river Sava“ refers to the year 445/446 (see pp. 20-21). This was not possible since the West renounced its rights to the Pannonian provinces in favour of the East in 437.
Sirmium was the farthest point of conquest, i.e. there was no further advancement toward the west. To be sure, one should not think that the Huns firmly observed the Roman administrative division: the provincial borders did not mean much to them, as it is demonstrated by Attila’s request in 448 that an area five days’ journey wide and extending along the Danube from the edge of Pannonia to the town of Novae in Thrace (Svištov, Bulgaria) should be emptied, and that the new border point between the Huns and the Romans is at Naissus.\textsuperscript{149} In any case, the Huns would not gain much strategically by acquisition of Pannonia Savia since they had already interrupted the traffic communication between Italy and the prefecture of Illyricum by capturing Sirmium and the entire Pannonia Secunda. Up to that time, their raids were always directed against the lower Danube area (the prefecture of Illyricum and diocese of Thrace), which would make the annexation of the western part of the area along the Sava, whence no threat could come, indeed unnecessary and useless. A direct control over the middle Danube area was something different because the Huns could thus attack the Eastern Empire, setting out from its very territory, without any difficulty. Pannonia Savia must have remained as a sort of no man’s land, although under nominal Eastern Roman suzerainty.

\textbf{SIGNIFICANCE OF THE HUNNIC CONQUEST OF SIRMUM}

Sirmius gave in to the Huns after a siege but there is no reason to believe that it was exposed to a large-scale destruction.\textsuperscript{150} Some inhabitants of Sirmium escaped before the invaders, some were enslaved, while some remained in the town.\textsuperscript{151} It seems that the highest representatives

\textsuperscript{149} Cf. Prisc., fr. 11.1, 5-14 Blockley.

\textsuperscript{150} A testimony for the circumstances of the Hunnic attack is provided by Prisc., fr. 11.2, 332-333 Blockley (= \textit{Vizantiiski izvori za istoriju naroda jugoslavije - Fontes Byzantini historiam populorum jugoslavicae spectantes} I, eds. F. Barišić – M. Rajković – B. Krekić – L. Tomić, Beograd 1955, pp. 9-10): \textit{Kata δὲ τὸν χρόνον, ἐν ὕπο Σκυθῶν ἐν τῇ Παιόνῳ ἐπολιορκεῖτο τὸ Σίριμον (...) μετὰ τῶν τῆς πόλεως ἀνδραποδισμῶν (...)}, and Justinian, \textit{Novellae} 11.1: (...) \textit{postea autem Attilanis temporebus eiusdem [sc. Illyrici] locis devastatis (...)} (see also note 152). On the presumable extent of destruction cf. \textit{Andrić} (2002) 132. \textit{Fejandić} 1969, p. 40 assumes that the troops stationed at Sirmium offered virtually no resistance, so Attila easily captured the town, while \textit{Mirković} 1971, p. 48 believes that Sirmium was destroyed, which is followed by P. \textit{Mišetić} – R. \textit{Prlica}, \textit{Kroz vekove Sirmuma [Through the centuries of Sirmium]}, Sremska Mitrovica 1978, p. 11 who speculate that „the Roman civil and military government perished in the Hunnic slaughter and fire”, and Lj. \textit{Maksimović}, \textit{Severni Ilirik u VI veku [North Illyricum in the 6th century]}, Zbornik radova Vizantološkog instituta (1980) 21, who mentions the destruction of Sirmium. On the other hand, \textit{Rogošić} 1962, p. 133 speaks of „a mild conquest of Sirmium“ in around 433 or even sooner (!), in the time of the King Ru/g/a, i.e. that Sirmium was forced into surrender by starvation and that the Huns did not make any further conquest in Pannonia Secunda.

\textsuperscript{151} Prisc., fr. 11.2, 333-336 Blockley describes how, during the siege of Sirmium,
of civil and ecclesiastic authorities in Illyricum, i.e. the prefect of Illyricum and the metropolitan of Illyricum, were also among the refugees. The loss of Sirmium marked the final collapse of the Roman civil and military organization in the Pannonian provinces and the city remained under the Hunnic sway for more than a decade.

One particular matter in connection to the fall of Sirmium to the Huns has drawn attention of the researchers. It is the assertion of a single source that Sirmium was, in the time of the Hunnic conquest, the administrative and ecclesiastical capital of Illyricum, which has been variously interpreted. Stein rejects the possibility that the city was centre of the prefecture and see of the Illyrian metropolitan, which is accepted by Várady. However, Duchesne has already expressed the opinion that a previous transfer of the capital of Illyricum from Thessalonica to Sirmium may have really happened, although with some reservation. The flight of the prefect of Illyricum, i.e. a new transfer of the capital of Illyricum from Sirmium to Thessalonica in 441 is accepted by Šišić, Alföldi, Bury, Ferjančić, Mirković, Vickers, Maksimović, and Bratož, while the flight of the bishop of Sirmium is emphasized by Šišić, Ferjančić, and Andrić. Furthermore, Bury asserts that the capital of Illyricum was transferred from Thessalonica to Sirmium in 437, and then transferred the city bishop gave golden liturgical bowls to certain Constantius, a secretary of Bleda and Attila, for the purpose of ransoming him if he were to survive the siege, or, if he were killed, of buying the freedom of those citizens who were being led off into captivity. Priscus also records (fr. 11.2, 368-369 Blockley) that the builder of a bath that was commissioned by Attila’s closest confidant Onegesius was brought from Sirmium as a prisoner.

152 The only extant testimony for Sirmium as the capital of the prefecture of Illyricum is to be found in Justinian’s edict from April 14, 535 (Novellae 11.1 = F. Šišić, Prirođenik izvora hrvatske historije. Dio I. čest 1. (do god. 1107.) [A sourcebook for Croatian history. Part 1, section 1: to A.D. 1107], Zagreb 1914, p. 167): Cum enim in antiquis temporibus Sirmii praefectura fuerat constituta, ibique omne fuerat Illyrici fastigium tam in civilibus quam in episcopalibus causis, postea autem Attilanis temporibus eiusdem locis devastatis Aproaemius praefectus praetorio de Sirmitana civitate in Thessaloniacam profugus veneral, tune ipsam praefecturam et sacerdolalis honor secatus est, et Thessalonicensis episcopus non sua auctoritate, sed sub umbra praefecturae meruit ali quam praepositum.

153 Alföldi 1926, p. 97.
back in 441. On the other hand, Stein argues that a transfer of an administrative centre so close to the frontier area in those perilous times, rendered so especially because of the Huns, would make no sense. But Ferjančič has used the opposite argument: Theodosius II wanted to emphasize the importance of the city that once was the imperial residence, and so he ordered the transfer. This really seems probable if we bear in mind that peaceful relations between the Huns and the Eastern Roman Empire, which were established in 435, were not compromised in 437 nor it was expected that they would be in the near future. As far as the question whether Sirmium could have been a formal ecclesiastical capital of Illyricum from 437 to 441 is concerned, one has to bear in mind that the city was the ecclesiastical caput Illyrici in early 380's, while the bishops of Salonae and Thessalonica became the metropolitans of Western and Eastern Illyricum respectively not earlier than at the beginning of the 5th century.

The effects of the Hunnic rule in South Pannonia

The appearance of the Great Huns in Pannonia marked a new period in the late antique history of that area. Apart from a single aggressive act in 441 (final conquest of Pannonia Secunda), the Huns restrained from any violent actions against Pannonia, so that modern historians have felt compelled to describe the period of the Hunnic rule in Pannonia as the pax Hunnica. This rather peaceful attitude of the Huns toward Pannonia is quite understandable since they did not actually have to conquer the entire Pannonian area but were primarily introduced to it as the imperial foederati. Finally, after the authority over Pannonia passed from the West to the East in 437, the Huns could finish the subjugation of Pannonia Secunda without breaching their agreement with the Western Romans. In late 4th and early 5th century, Pannonia suffered one blow after another, delivered by various barbarian groups that crossed the middle Danube in the given period. This spurred a massive flight of the romanized inhabitants, not the least from South Pannonia, eventhough that par-

159 Stein (1925) 358-359. Similar argument is used by Popović 1987, p. 108. V. Popović, Le dernier évêque de Sirmium, Revue des études augustiniennes 21 (1975) 103-106 suspects that this transfer ever happened, saying that our source refers to a so-called first conquest of Sirmium (after A.D. 379), but there was not such a conquest at all (cf. also Popović 1987, pp. 107-108, where it is stated that the expression Attilanis temporibus from the edict of Justinian actually alludes to the Huns of A.D. 376/380, and that the Syrmian prefecture of the second quarter of the 5th century is an invention of modern researchers).
162 Tomka 1996b, p. 90.
ticular region was not so strongly affected by the great migration of peo-

ple in early 5th century.\footnote{Lotter 2003, p. 166.} People escaped in three directions: to the
southwest (Noricum, Italy), south (Dalmatia), and later on to the south-
east (Eastern Illyricum).\footnote{Cf. Mócsv 1974, pp. 347-348, 353-354; Fitz 1994, p. 1325; Tomić 2000, p. 263. Among these refugees was probably also Tatulus, father of Attila's secretary in charge of the king's correspondence, Orestes, and grandfather of the last Western Roman Emperor in Italy, who, by his origin, was presumably from Pannonia Secunda (cf. Šašel Kos (1994) 109; contra Bóna 1991, p. 111 who believes that Orestes came from Pannonia Savia, and Tatulus from Noricum Mediterraneum, which is less likely).} and they took with them anything they
deemed of personal or communal value, such as the relics of saints.\footnote{Attested for St. Pollio of Cibala and St. Quirinus of Siscia (who suffered his martyrdom in Savaria), whose relics were transferred to Rome, and for St. Anastasia of Sirmium and St. Demetrius of Sirmium, whose relics were transferred to Thessalonica (cf. D. Basler, Kršanskija arheologiija [The Christian archaeology], Mostar 1986, pp. 34-36; Tomić 2000, p. 263).} It
might have been as a result of these depopulation factors and strategic
reasons that, in early 430's, a new province was created along the south-
western border of Pannonia Savia, probably around Poetovio – this was
the so-called Valeria Media – in an attempt to strengthen the Roman posi-
tions in south Pannonia and improve the defense of Italy.\footnote{Cf. E. Tóth, Provincia Valeria Media, in: Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae 41 (1989) 197-226.} A part of Southpannonian inhabitants fell under the Hunnic sway (conclusively
after the fall of Sirmium in 441), while some Pannonians later even served
under the Huns; either forced to do so or voluntarily. There are three
known examples from the sources: an anonymous mason who built a bath
for a Hunnic dignitary Onegesius believing that he would gain his free-
dom as a reward for his work, but was made the bath attendant instead
and had to wait upon Onegesius,\footnote{Cf. Prisc., fr. 11.2, 368-372 Blockley.} Constantiulus\footnote{Cf. Prisc., fr. 11.2, 578-579 Blockley.} who was in Attila’s
service, and Attila’s secretary Orestes\footnote{Cf. Prisc., fr. 11.21 2-5 Blockley.} who may have voluntarily enter
upon service of the king if we accept as reliable the expression of the
source that he had „joined“ the king.\footnote{Cf. Anon. Vales., 8.38. See note 173.} Undoubtedly, the Huns relied on
the services of many other Pannonians, particularly those with special
skills.\footnote{G. Schramm, Ein Damn bricht. Die römische Donaulinie und die Invasionen des 5.-7. Jahrhunderts im Lichte von Namen und Wörtern (= Südosteuropäische Arbeiten 100), München 1997, p. 97ff argues that the attendants that accompanied and waited the members of the Eastern Roman embassy to Attila in 449 and the inhab-

itants of the villages the envoys visited (Prisc., fr. 11.2, 277-280 Blockley) were also
Pannonians because they drank kámen, which is a Pannonian drink made from
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The Huns also exploited Pannonia economically. We know that the stone used for the building of Onegasus’ bath was brought from Pannonia. 172 It was probably transported from the Fruška Gora quarries by a water-way. 173 Many Pannonians surely found their economic interest in cooperation with the Huns, and „the Hunnic alternative“ 174 meant for some people a way to escape from the oppressive fiscal and governing system of the later Roman Empire. 175 Be that as it may, the Hunnic rule certainly had one major favorable impact on the conditions in late antique Pannonia: it offered two decades of respite from the barbarian raids.

The disintegration of the Hunnic rule in South Pannonia

After a rather intense and destructive war that the Huns waged against the Eastern Roman Empire in 447, Attila started shifting his expansionistic interest to the West. A clear sign of this was the stay of the Western Roman embassy at the court of the Hunnic king in the summer of 449. 176 This was caused by the affair with the golden ecclesiastic bowls that, in 441, the bishop of Sirmium entrusted with the secretary of the Hunnic kings, Constantius, who later pawned the bowls in Rome and received money from a banker named Silvanus. Although Constantius was subsequently executed by Bleda and Attila for treason, the Hunnic king (Attila was a sole ruler from 445) discovered about Constantius’ trade only several years later. Thus he demanded Silvanus to be handed over to him because he had allegedly kept the king’s own possession. The deterioration of the relations between the Huns and the Western Romans finally developed into an open war, with which Attila had already threatened in 449. 177 However, the Gallic campaign of 451 did not bring the mighty Hunnic king the outcome he had hoped for because he was forced to

barley, i.e. a sort of beer (on the drink cf. E. A. THOMPSON (1947) 62, MAENCHEN-HELFEN 1973, pp. 424-425, 1978, p. 288), but Priscus explicitly says that it is the barbarians (οἱ βαρβάροι) who call that drink kámon (fr. 11.2, 280 Blockley). Some believe that these were the Slavs, which does not seem so unfounded (cf. F. BARIŠIĆ, Prisk kao izvor za najstariju istoriju južnih Slovena [Priscus as a source for the earliest history of the South Slavs], Zbornik radova Vizantološkog instituta 1 (1952) 53ff). In any case, the envoys, having crossed the Danube, did not travel through the Roman Pannonia. Thus the inhabitants there could not be the romanized Pannonians; otherwise Priscus would not call them „barbarians“. 172


The expression by TÖMPI 1996b, p. 91.


retreat without accomplishing his objective. But the fierce Hun would not give up so easily. In late spring of 452, Attila directly attacked Italy, destroying Aquileia on July 18th. He moved through Pannonia, passing also through the Sava-Drava-Danube region. But neither the Italian campaign proved to be particularly successful since the final goal was not achieved. Although Attila returned to his Pannonian headquarters loaded with booty – undoubtedly, the same way he set out for the campaign – the circumstances changed completely: now he was in open hostility with both parts of the Empire. The outcome of the forthcoming struggle was decided by Attila’s sudden death in 453. His sons were not able to hold the vast tribal alliance together, and the Hunnic megastate fell apart in an insurrection started by their Germanic subjects. In 454, the Hunnic domination in Pannonia was utterly crushed, and their place was filled by the Germans.

Greg. Tur., 2.6 says explicitly that the *Chuni a Pannoniis egressi* as they set out for the Gallic campaign, which means that they also passed through Nortpannonian regions. Jordan., *Getica* 227 offers more details and says: *igitur ab Dacia et Pannonia provinciis, in quibus tunc Hunni cum diversis subditis nationibus insidebant, egrediens Attila in Alanos movit proiectum.*

Cf. Prosp. Tir., s.a. 452: *Attila redintegratis viribus, quas in Gallia amiserat, Italian ingredi per Pannonias intendit (…).*

About the Italian campaign cf. SEECK 1920, pp. 311-312 (the campaign misdated as the winter of 451), THOMPSON 1948, pp. 144-147, ALTHEIM 1951, pp. 143-146, BURY 1958, pp. 294-296, STEIN 1959, pp. 335-336, MAENCHEN-HLFEN 1973, pp. 132-141, 1978, pp. 99-106, Y.-M. DUVAL, *Aquilea sur la route des invasions (350-452), Antichità altoadriatiche 9 (1976) 291-296* (for Aquileia), DEMANDT 1989, p. 155 (for the date of the sack of Aquileia), BÖNA 1991, p. 98-99, WORTH 1999, pp. 105-111, BRATOŠ (2003) 512-517 (for Aquileia). This was the only time for certain that Attila came to Italy. Therefore, the entry in *Anon. Vales.*, 8.38 that the father of the last Western Roman Emperor in Italy, Romulus Augus tus(lu)s, was *Orestes Pannonius, qui eo tempore quando Attila ad Italiam venit se ili ivixit et eius notarius factus fuerat* is rather puzzling. MANCHEN-HLFEN 1973, pp. 106-107, 1978, p. 79 assumes that Attila really went to Italy on a previous occasion (before his Italian campaign) and then engaged in negotiations with Aetius, but does not provide any date for it. *PLRE* II, 811 s.v. Orestes 2 dates the entry as 452. However, it is much more probable that this is a mistake of the source. While the secretaries Constantius of Gaul and Constantius of Italy were sent to the Hunnic king by Aetius (cf. *PLRE* II, 319 s.v. Constantius 6-7), it seems that Orestes was a personal choice of Attila, presumably to serve as a counterbalance for Constantius of Italy who was Aetius’ choice. Orestes’ appointment must have occurred somewhere between 445 and 449.


About the end of the Hunnic rule and the rise of the Germans cf. SEECK 1920, pp. 314-315, ALFÖLDI 1926, p. 97ff, SCHMIDT 1934, pp. 268ff, 532ff, THOMPSON 19...
Conclusion

The first appearance of the Huns in Southpannonian regions is connected with the tripartite group of peoples headed by Alatheus and Saphrax in late 370’s. Probably not a single Pannonian province was spared their raids, nor were the parts of neighbouring regions (the raiding of Mursa, Stridon and Poetovio). Soon the situation abated, after Alatheus’ and Saphrax’ Ostrogoths, Alans, and Huns probably settled in Pannonia as the imperial foederati (in 380). Assuming the duties of frontier soldiers, they were able to provide a short respite from external dangers in Pannonia, although their presence was always felt to be a potential source of instability because of their violent bursts of dissatisfaction, their general unreliability and even their intercine feuds. From the second half of the 390’s, the crisis practically never ceased to exist in the middle Danube area, the Hunnic foederati largely contributing to such a condition. Their first significant withdrawal from Pannonia can be seen as a result of Athaulf’s joining in Alaric’s raid against Italy in 408. They were finally forced to abandon the area nineteen years later (in 427). That was the time when Pannonia was already under threat from the so-called Great Huns, who as early as from the beginnings of the 5th century (especially given the great barbarian invasion across the middle Danube in 405/406) were exercising a great impact on Pannonia. The year 433 was, of course, the crucial year, when the Western imperial government let the Huns take over probably three of four Pannonian provinces (Pannonia Prima, Valeria and Pannonia Secunda). The perilous vicinity of the Huns and the West’s interest in avoiding any conflict with them contributed significantly to the decision that the major portion of Western Illyricum (all the four Pannonian provinces, and perhaps Dalmatia as well) be surrendered to the Eastern Empire. It is possible that around that time, in early 430’s, a new province was established, the so-called Valeria Media, along the southwestern border of Savia, probably around Poetovio. It was to serve as the pre-Alpic portion of the defensive system of the Western

Roman Empire. A direct Hunnic impact in Southpannonian area was marked only once, in 441, when the Huns, having captured Sirmium, succeeded in their violent takeover of Pannonia Secunda. This also marked the end of the outstanding role this Southpannonian city had for a long time as an administrative centre in military and civil matters in the history of the Roman Empire. The transition of Attila’s forces in 452 through the Sava-Drava-Danube region did not leave any damage behind as no resistance was met in Southpannonian provinces. The fear of the Huns and other barbarian tribes as they stormed through Pannonia, sparked off as of the end of the 4th century, and especially in the first half of the 5th century, a massive flight of the romanized inhabitants to the southwest (Noricum, Italy) and south (Dalmatia), and later on to the southeast (Eastern Illyricum). The Pannonian area conquered not only served the Huns their military-strategic purposes, but it was also economically exploited. Although South Pannonia (the provinces of Pannonia Secunda and Savia) were only partially or marginally affected by the great migration of peoples in the first half of the 5th century and by the Hunnic raids, the circumstances still radically changed in the aftermath. The Hunnic impact indirectly influenced the fate of the Western Illyricum and opened the gate for the Germanic peoples who eventually captured Pannonia after the breakdown of the Hunnic megastate.
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