

## Jaroslav Šašel's *Antiqui Barbari* Half a Century Later. A Contribution to the Knowledge of the Late Antique Barbarian Settlement in Southern Pannonia

Hrvoje GRAČANIN

### Abstract

The paper discusses Jaroslav Šašel's approaches and results in his 1979 paper "*Antiqui Barbari*", which is devoted to the settlement history of eastern Noricum and Pannonia in the fifth and sixth centuries. Šašel's paper was one of the first in-depth studies, based on the literary sources, of the presence of various non-Roman groups in late antique Western Illyricum. The paper pays a particular attention to the term *antiqui barbari* found in Cassiodorus Senator's sixth-century *Variae epistolae*, and a leitmotif of Šašel's study. The paper's aim is to readdress the question of identification of the *antiqui barbari*, reassess the proposal made by Friedrich Lotter and Helmut Castritius in their respective 1968 and 1995 studies, and offer a fresh look at existing literary evidence, as well as bring the archaeological evidence into the discussion.

**Keywords:** *antiqui barbari*; barbarian settlement; post-Roman southern Pannonia

### Izvleček

#### *Antiqui Barbari* Jaroslava Šašla pol stoletja pozneje

Prispevek analizira pristope in rezultate Jaroslava Šašla v njegovem prispevku *Antiqui Barbari* iz leta 1979, ki je posvečen zgodovini poselitve vzhodnega Norika in Panonije v 5. in 6. stoletju. Šašlov prispevek je bil ena prvih poglobljenih študij, osnovana na literarnih virih, o prisotnosti različnih nerimskih skupin v poznoantičnem zahodnem Iliriku. Prispevek posveča posebno pozornost izrazu *antiqui barbari*, ki ga najdemo v spisih *Variae epistolae* Kasiodorja Senatorja iz 6. stoletja, in je vodilni motiv Šašlove študije. Cilj prispevka je ponovno pretresti vprašanja identifikacije skupine/skupin, imenovane/imenovanih *antiqui barbari*, presoditi predloga, ki sta ju podala Friedrich Lotter in Helmut Castritius v svojih študijah iz let 1968 oziroma 1995, ter ponuditi osvežen pogled na razpoložljive literarne dokaze, hkrati pa vključiti v razpravo tudi arheološko evidenco.

**Ključne besede:** *antiqui barbari*; naselitev barbarov; porimska južna Panonija

## A few introductory remarks

The present paper has a twofold purpose. Firstly, it is intended as a basic deconstruction of Jaroslav Šašel's study on the history of late antique barbarian settlement in eastern Noricum and Pannonia during the fifth and sixth centuries. And secondly, it ventures to reevaluate a proposal for the identification of *antiqui barbari*, a designation mentioned in one of the epistles of Cassiodorus Senator dealing with fiscal and judicial issues in the late Roman province of Savia under the Gothic rule (*Variae epistolae*, 5.14). Jaroslav Šašel himself needs no special introduction, as his work on the history of Late Antiquity Eastern Alpine, Northern Adriatic and Western Balkan areas is well-known. Šašel's 1979 paper, fully titled "*Antiqui Barbari: Zur Besiedlungsgeschichte Ostnoricums und Pannoniens im 5. und 6. Jahrhundert nach den Schriftquellen*", and which is under scrutiny here, was among the first historical reconstructions that provided an overall picture of the presence of various barbarian groups in eastern Noricum and Pannonia from the late fourth until the mid-sixth centuries. The intended deconstruction of Šašel's paper is focused on identifying his fundamental assumptions and analytical approaches, presenting the research topics he touched upon, and pointing out the findings he arrived at. Of particular interest is Šašel's identification of *antiqui barbari*, the designation which he understood as a cover term for various barbarian groups settled in the region.

The second aim of the present paper derives its subject of inquiry from the hypotheses put forward by Friedrich Lotter and Helmut Castritius, who in their respective papers examined the evidence for the settlement of Suebi in the late Roman and post-Roman Middle Danube region. Lotter's 1968 paper, "*Zur Rolle der Donausueben in der Völkerwanderungszeit*", first draw attention to several sixth-century narrative sources rendering the name of the former late Roman province of Savia as Suavia or indicating the existence of a Suebic land in the region along the River Sava. Further developing his argument for a significant presence of Suebi in southwestern Pannonia, Lotter inferred in his 1985 paper that during the Gothic rule the late Roman province of Savia was generally known under the name of Suavia.<sup>1</sup> Building upon Lotter's conclusions about the land of Suebi in southwestern Pannonia and Šašel's proposal for the identity of *antiqui barbari*, Castritius' 1995 paper, "*Barbari – antiqui barbari: Zur Besiedlungsgeschichte Südostnoricums und Südpannioniens in der Spätantike (Ende des 4. bis Mitte des 6. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.)*", adduced more examples from the late Roman literary sources, or better said their early medieval manuscript tradition, for the province of Savia being called Suavia in post-Roman times, and refined the interpretation about the reasons for this, arguing that the *antiqui barbari* of the *Variae epistolae* should be identified with

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Lotter 1985, 46. He incorporated these findings – boosted with Castritius' arguments – in his later book about movements of peoples and the collapse of the Late Roman administrative and ecclesiastical organization in the East-Alpine and Middle Danube regions: Lotter 2003, 28, 36, 122–123, 125.

the Suebi living in southwestern Pannonia. Taking Lotter's and Castritius' assertions as points of departure, the intention is to readdress the question of Suebic presence in southwestern Pannonia in the fifth and sixth centuries and review the related proposition about the province of Savia being officially renamed as Suavia in Gothic times. Apart from an inspection of the literary evidence that has already been more or less considered by both Lotter and Castritius, the present examination aims at bringing into discussion the possible archaeological evidence for the Suebi in southwestern Pannonia, as well as exploring the use of the term Pannonia in the fifth- and sixth-century narrative sources, in an attempt to shed more light on the apparent change in the late Roman provincial nomenclature from Savia to Suavia.

### Deconstructing Jaroslav Šašel's *antiqui barbari*

Jaroslav Šašel starts his relatively short but rich survey of the ethnic situation in the late Roman and post-Roman Western Illyricum with the year AD 377 and the federate treaty between the Romans and the groups of Huns, Alans and Visigoths (p. 125), and ends it with the year 548 and another federate treaty between the Romans and this time the Longobards (p. 139). For that time span of just above 170 years, he offers a coherent reconstruction of the regional vicissitudes brought about by the presence of various barbarian groups that were settled or passing through eastern Noricum and Pannonia. Basing his assumptions on the written sources, and drawing chiefly from German and Hungarian scholarship, Šašel makes lucid synthesizing observations, which reflect the then state of historical knowledge.

For his analysis, Šašel directly refers to a number of late antique and early medieval literary source, both Latin and Greek. His treatment of the literary evidence is rather straightforward, without taking into account their different genre characteristics, time of creation, or specific goals.

In his paper, Šašel touches upon a number of research topics. First he tackles the question of the settlement of the so-called Pannonian federates (Šašel never uses that historiographic label), who are said to have consisted of the Huns, Alans and Visigoths, and the effects that such an arrangement had on the provinces. Šašel remarks that the federate groups were settled in Pannonia, more precisely the provinces of Savia and Pannonia Secunda, on the strength of the testimony by Zosimos (pp. 125–126). Šašel connects the remark about Jerome's hometown of Stridon having been destroyed by Goths with the unruly behaviour of the federates, and believes their numbers to have swollen up due to passages of Theodosius I's troops through the region on his campaigns against Magnus Maximus and Eugenius, respectively, as the Emperor's army included many Germanic soldiers who may have also been recruited to some extent from among the federates (p. 126). In Šašel's view, Claudian's mention of General Stilicho's troubles with the barbarians on his move from Italy to Tessaly refers to Stilicho's having to deal with the Gothic federates in Savia (p. 126).

The second topic are the late fourth- and early fifth-century inroads and movements of various groups from across the Middle Danube or within the region. Šašel interprets Stilicho's designation by Claudian as the pacifier of the Rhine and Danube rivers to be an indication of the incessant pressure that the Germans exerted on the Roman frontier and the Danubian provinces with their inroads (p. 126). The first were the Vandals who are said to have been joined by the Alans in piercing the Danube limes, but were then persuaded by Stilicho to settle, probably in the province of Pannonia Prima, and assume protective duties. However, following the campaign of the Gothic King Alaric in AD 401, the Vandals attacked parts of Noricum and Vindelicia – Šašel never says that Vindelicia, i.e. the region of the Vindelici, had long since ceased to exist and was anachronistically used by the source for the province of Raetia Secunda – only to be persuaded again to accept the federate status, which Šašel interprets as a hint for a larger presence of the barbarian element in Noricum (p. 127). Next is the incursion in AD 406 of Radagaisus' army, whose defeat was in Šašel's view followed by another influx of barbarians in the region, as the remaining raiders were apparently stationed by Romans in Italy and Pannonia. Based on that, Šašel hypothesizes about the *hostes Pannonii* from Jerome's epistle as perhaps referring to those former raiders (p. 127). Alaric's campaigns of AD 401, 408 and 410 were facilitated by – as Šašel puts it – the Visigothic base in Savia, which was used by Alaric to impose the control over Dalmatia, Pannonia Prima, Histria, Noricum Mediterraneum and Noricum Ripense, while Savia was also the destination for a large body of Goths after they were expelled from Italy following Stilicho's demise in AD 408 (p. 127). An incursion of the Iuthungi in Raetia and Noricum in about AD 428 may have impinged on the local population not only in Noricum – General Aëtius is said to have had to deal with the rebellious Noricans in AD 429–431 – but also in the region between the Drava and Sava (p. 128).

The third topic, which is discussed by Šašel in detail, relates to the ethnic make-up of the fifth- and sixth-century population in the Pannonian Basin. In the early fifth century, Šašel notes a relatively dense barbarian settlement in southeastern Alpine and peri-Alpine regions (from the Julian Alps to the middle Sava Valley), which is identified as including the Gothic federates, Alaric's Visigoths, the groupings from Radagaisus' army, the Goths expelled from Italy and other splinter groups, as well as the old Suebic-Marcomannic tribes. In Šašel's opinion this may explain why a *magister militum* of barbarian descent was appointed in AD 409 with the authority over both Raetia and Illyricum, a move described as unusual from the administrative point of view (pp. 127–128). Those barbarian groups supposedly remained in the region – in their homes, burghs and forts as Šašel puts it – even afterwards, and this state of affairs continued to exist in Savia after the Romans ceded the provinces of Pannonia Secunda and Pannonia Valeria to the Huns in AD 433. Šašel places a particular attention on the regional ethnic picture after the collapse of the Hunnic-Germanic *Völkerbund* in AD 454 (pp. 128–133). Šašel lists various barbarian groups and their presumed footholds in the Pannonian-Carpathian area during the second half of the fifth and early sixth centuries: the Gepids in Transylvania and along the lower Tisza Valley, i.e. in western Dacia between the Tisza, Danube

and Olt, and the Carpathian Mountains, and, from AD 473, in Syrmia, too, as a result of the Gepids' local imperialist expansion, as Šašel terms it (p. 131), following the Ostrogoths' departure from Pannonia; the Slavs in western Dacia in the vicinity of the Gepids in AD 536, as well as close to Pannonia, as testified by Martin of Braga; the Sarmatians in the Great Hungarian Plain, where they clashed in AD 472 with the Ostrogoths on the latter's way to Lower Moesia (i.e. Moesia Secunda); the Sadagi in Pannonia northeast of Lake Balaton; the Herulians who were first located to the north of the Danube in Moravia and west Czechia, and Lower Austria as well, but after AD 505/508 and their defeat against the Longobards split into two groups, of which one reportedly returned to Scandinavia, while the other went to the Gepids and then, in AD 512, was settled in the Eastern Roman territory around Singidunum and in Pannonia Secunda; the Rugians who first lived west of the River Morava and in the Tull Basin but were vanquished by Odoacer in AD 487, after which the rest, as Šašel interprets it, joined the Ostrogoths under Theoderic in Moesia; the Scirians in Slovakia between the Váh and Ipel' rivers; the Suebi – said to have included the Alamanni, Quadi and Marcomanni – in western Pannonia between the Danube and Drava, and possibly Sava, of which the Quadi left for Hispania along with the Visigoths, while the Marcomanni let themselves be recruited in the Roman army and stationed in northern Pannonia, as shown by the *Notitia Dignitatum*, whereas the rest was eventually pushed into Pannonia Prima and Savia giving way to the Herulians, Rugians and Scirians to seize their former settlements, only to reappear in the second half of the fifth century under the leadership of Hunimund who tried to oppose the Gothic domination (Šašel never explicitly makes the connection in his text between the late fourth- and early fifth-century Marcomanni and Hunimund's Suebic group, but does so in the maps); and the Ostrogoths, who first dwelled in Pannonia between Lake Balaton and Slavonia and Syrmia in accordance with a federate treaty concluded with the Romans in AD 456, but obtained the control over an area toward Noricum Ripense – the peri-Alpine road, as Šašel refers to it (p. 131) – and then in AD 472 (*recte* AD 473) left Pannonia in two groups, of which one was headed west (to Provence and later Hispania), and the other east (Moesia Secunda). Šašel completes this ethnic picture for the first half of the sixth century by introducing the Longobards and Franks (p. 137). The Longobards are shown as occupying in the early sixth century the area once belonging to the Herulians before moving into Moravia, crossing the Danube and spreading all the way to the Sava, and eventually having been given the forts in Pannonia (for Šašel, Savia is meant by this) and the *pólis Nórikon* (which in Šašel's opinion should be identified either as Celeia/Celje or, more likely, Poetovio/Ptuj) as part of the agreement with the Eastern Empire in AD 548. On the other hand, the Franks emerged as powerbrokers in the bulk of Noricum Mediterraneum (excluding the portion handed over to the Longobards) and the whole of Noricum Ripense, the areas which they supposedly retained until the 570s. To additionally support such a distribution of various groups in the Pannonian Basin, Šašel adduces the testimony of Martin of Braga who is said to have preserved the memories of peoples with whom he apparently came into contact in his youth (p. 135). Šašel broaches the theme of the presence of the Roman

population as well, but unsystematically. He only points out that in the early fifth century the barbarians lived amongst the Romans (p. 127), mentions the resettlement by Odoacer of the provincial population from Noricum Ripense in AD 488 (p. 132), and defines the *Romani* in Cassiodorus Senator's *Variae epistolae* as "full-born Romanized natives" living in Pannonia, Dalmatia, Savia and Italy during the Ostrogothic rule in the late fifth and early sixth centuries (p. 135).

The situation in Noricum and Pannonia under the Ostrogothic rule is accorded special attention. After briefly outlining the extent of Theoderic's empire following his conquest of Italy, which included both provinces of Raetia, the whole of Noricum, Dalmatia (which, judging by order of mention in Šašel's text, was apparently captured even before the fall of Ravenna in AD 493), Pannonia Savia, and parts of Pannonia Secunda with Sirmium (the province is said to have been split between the Ostrogoths and the Eastern Empire), Šašel moves on to the legal and administrative as well as the social and ethnic identity labels found in the *Variae epistolae* in relation to Noricum, Pannonia, Dalmatia and Savia (pp. 134–135). Among the first group of identity labels Šašel lists the terms *provinciales*, *capillati*, *defensores*, *curiales*, and *possessores*, and believes them to be more or less self-explanatory, which is why he makes no attempt at defining them more closely. Much more focus is placed on the second group of identity labels mentioned in connection with Pannonia, Dalmatia, Savia and Italy, for which Šašel offers additional explanations. The *Romani*, as already indicated above, refers to the local autochthone Romanized population; the *barbari* denotes a category of inhabitants legally separated from the *Goti* and *Romani*, which appears to have been a newly formed non-Gothic and non-Roman group consisting in Šašel's opinion of the Suebi, Huns, possibly Scirians, and perhaps even the Slavs and other ethnic splinters, which all started to seep into the region after the Ostrogoths' departure from Pannonia in AD 472. The *Lucristani* signifies a precisely localized barbarian clan living in or above the Isonzo River Valley. The *Goti* relates to Theoderic's Ostrogoths. For the *extraneae gentes* Šašel offers no interpretation other than a hint to the label's connection with the Gothic empire in AD 526/7. A particular consideration is paid to the group marked as *antiqui barbari*. Šašel believes the adjective *antiqui* indicates that this group was older than the group classified only as *barbari*, which he interprets as signifying various Germanic-Hunnic ethnic fragments from Attila's *Völkerbund*, since the older splinters like the Marcomanni would have been fully assimilated by that time. Šašel suggests that some of the groups mentioned by Martin of Braga (*Alamannus*, *Saxo*, *Toringus*, *Pannonius*, *Rugus*, *Sclavus*, *Nara*, *Sarmata*, *Datus*, *Ostrogothus*, *Francus*, *Burgundio*, *Dacus*, *Alanus*) could have also been meant under the label *antiqui barbari*. With regard to the population in Noricum in Gothic times, Šašel only notes the passage in AD 507 of the Alamanni in the direction, as he interprets it, of Pannonia (pp. 136–137). As for the time of the Longobard presence in southern Noricum and Pannonia, Šašel assumes that as federates they only reinforced the groups of Goths, barbarians and old barbarians – possibly even including Alamanni and Suebi – still living in those areas (p. 137).

Šašel concludes his paper with two – as he puts it – provisional results, with a remark that the cultural-historical approach is an important component of both historical and archaeological reconstructions considering that the written sources are inconsistent and sporadically preserved. For the first phase (the late fourth/early fifth century), Šašel observes that the majority of the population comprised of Romans, but the interior of the provinces was to a large extent left to the federates who were given small settlements and hilltop places. The federates lived in isolation from the autochthone population not only due to political reasons, but also because of the mutual animosity between the locals and newcomers. For the second phase (the fifth to sixth centuries), Šašel stresses that, whereas Istria and Venetia as well as Dalmatia were not affected by barbarian invasions and wars, and thus remained firmly a part of the Roman world, which is also valid to some extent for both provinces of Noricum (less for Noricum Ripense than for Noricum Mediterraneum), Pannonia Savia and Pannonia Secunda underwent profound ethnic changes as the presence of barbarian groups was more pronounced, with a possibility in Šašel's opinion of the settlement of Goths and Suebi in a federate-like status in AD 377 or even earlier. Šašel posits that barbarian elements shrank with time due to assimilation, but they retained their strength thanks to new influxes and remained more or less in the same places. At the end, Šašel infers that the presence of Germanic groups in the region was constant and relatively intense, far from negligible, even though they were heavily intermingled with other barbarians and in a continuous rivalry with each other.

### **The Suebi in Pannonia, or how to geographically place a people with much confusion**

When treating the topic of the Suebic presence in fifth- and sixth-century Pannonia, what inevitably comes to the fore is the fact that the Suebi only crop up in connection with the Middle Danube region in the late fourth- and early fifth-centuries Roman narratives. They seem to have been first mentioned in the relevant context in Claudian's *Panegyric on the Third Consulship of Emperor Honorius* (AD 395/396). Briefly touching upon Theodosius I's victorious clashes with the groups from north of the Danube, which is called Hister, a hydronym usually denoting the river's lower reaches, the poet refers to two pairs of barbarian foes: the Scythians and Gelonians, and the Dacians and Suebi (Claud. *Hon. cons. III*, 24–28).<sup>2</sup> The second pair may in geographical terms be brought into connection with the western part of the Pannonian Basin, which would place the Suebi close to the Middle Danube area if the likely listing of the groups in the east-west direction is assumed. Concurrently with Claudian's testimony, the Suebi figure in Ammianus Marcellinus' late fourth-century *His-*

---

<sup>2</sup> The Suebi mentioned in Claud. *Hon. cons. IV*, 652, 655, are those that crossed the Rhine in AD 406 and eventually settled in Hispania.

tory as raiders in Raetia during Emperor Constantius II's AD 357 stay in Rome, along with the Quadi attacking Valeria and the Sarmatians harassing Upper Moesia (Moesia Prima) and Pannonia Secunda (Amm. Marc. 16.10.20).<sup>3</sup> It is clear that Ammianus depicts the situation developing along the Middle Danube from west to east, but he appears to place the Suebi more to the west than Claudian, and much like Paul the Deacon in his late eight-century *History of the Longobards* (see below). The collection known as *Historia Augusta*, dating probably from the early fifth century, apparently also contains a reference to the Suebi in relation to the Middle Danube. In the *Vita divi Aureliani* the Suebi are recorded in a paragraph recounting the campaigns of Emperor Aurelian (270–275) against them and the Sarmatians as well as the Marcomanni, who are said to have attacked Italy (*Hist. Aug. Div. Aurel.* 18.2–3). The coupling of Suebi and Sarmatians points to their geographical proximity and is likely to have been intended to indicate the emperor's activity in the Pannonian Plain.<sup>4</sup> The next mention of the Suebi in relation to the Middle Danube area comes some half-century later in Sidonius Apollinaris' *Panegyric to the Emperor Majorian* (AD 458), which features the well-known catalogue of various groups that are presented as being in awe of the emperor's might (Sid. Apoll. *Paneg. Maior.*, 471–477). Although the groups seem to be listed rather haphazardly, the Suebi are positioned after the Bastarnae and before the Pannonians, which would again indicate their placement in the western part of the Pannonian Basin under the recurrent assumption of the listing of the groups in the east-west direction since they are all linked with the “seven-mouthed” Hister, i.e. the Danube Delta, as a starting geographical point. It may be that the Suebi in relation to Pannonia are mentioned in Cassiodorus Senator's *Variae* as well if one opts to accept a different interpretation of the relevant passage. A letter presumably from the autumn of AD 536 records the incursions in Venetia of the Suebi who are usually identified with the Alamanni, especially since another letter dated to the autumn of AD 537 mentions the recent raids into Italy of the Alamanni (Cassiod. *Var.* 12.7.1; 12.28.4).<sup>5</sup> Nevertheless, there is an opinion that since Cassiodorus usually refers to the Alamanni by their name those Suebi might be the Bavarians or the Germanic inhabitants of Savia, or most likely the Suebi settled in Pannonia and referred to by Prokopios of Caesarea.<sup>6</sup> Be that as it may, the first indubitable placement of the Suebi in Pannonia comes from two Eastern Roman authors writing in the mid-sixth century. Prokopios

<sup>3</sup> Ammianus Marcellinus tells later in his text about Constantius II's campaigns against the Sarmatians and Quadi, who raided Pannonia and Moesia Prima, but without any reference to the Suebi (Amm Marc. 17.12.1–21).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Hummer 1998, 13. The Suebi are also mentioned amongst a number of barbarians who were lead as captives during Aurelian's triumph, and recorded between the Franks and Vandals which would be more in accordance with an assumption that the western Suebi are actually meant (*Hist. Aug. Div. Aurel.* 33.4).

<sup>5</sup> The date of both letters: Krautschik 1983, 106. For the identification of these Suebi with the Alamanni: Stein 2023, 349, with note 1; with Marcone 2015, 253, note ad VII.5.

<sup>6</sup> Heuberger 1937, 92–93.

of Caesarea's *History of Wars* mentions the Suebi who dwell in the interior beyond Dalmatia, Liburnia, Histria and Venetia, and stresses that they are not those subject to the Franks (Prokopios knows of the Suebi and the Alamanni who live beyond the Thuringians), and distinguishes between those Suebi, Siscians, and Pannonians said to reside near the Danube to the east of the Siscians and Suebi and to hold the city of Sirmium.<sup>7</sup> Prokopios also speaks of places around Suavia (Σουαβία) from where the Gothic commanders recruited the unnamed barbarians before advancing toward Salona (Proc. Caes. *Bella* 5.12.11; 5.15.25–27; 5.16.9, 12).<sup>8</sup> Jordanes' *Gothic History* offers more details about the Suebi in and close to Pannonia. Jordanes first mentions the *gens Suavorum* in connection with what seems to be the Pannonian Plain when he briefly says that the Gothic king Hunimund successfully fought them but without specifying the time and place (Jord. *Get.* 250). Next the Suebi appear as participants in the battle at the Pannonian river Nedao (Jord. *Get.* 261), which is the first clear indication of their connection to Pannonia. A little later in his text, Jordanes narrates the raid carried out by Hunimund, the *Suavorum dux*, against Dalmatia that is said to be close to Suavia and not far from the regions of Pannonia, especially the place where the Goths lived at that time (Jord. *Get.* 273). On the way back from plundering Dalmatia the Suebi are intercepted near Lake Balaton and defeated by Goths, who captured Hunimund, now called *rex*, and his remaining army, but sent them all back to Suavia (Jord. *Get.* 274), which indicates the location of Hunimund's Suavia north of Lake Balaton. Since Jordanes also says that the *gens* of Scirians resided above the Danube at the time when they were incited by Hunimund to join him against the Goths (Jord. *Get.* 275) that places Hunimund's Suavia near the Danube as well. Jordanes additionally strengthens the impression of the Suebi residing close to Pannonia with the story about the great coalition of various groups (the Suebi, Sarmatians, Scirians, Gepids and Rugians) who fought the Goths in the battle at the river Bolia in Pannonia (Jord. *Get.* 277). Only a few paragraphs below, however, Jordanes locates Suavia rather away from Pannonia. The *regio Suavorum*, which for the first time Jordanes clearly situates north of the Danube by remarking that the Goths led by their King Thiudimir crossed the reportedly frozen Danube to appear in the rear of the Suebi, is placed between the Bavarians in the east, the Franks in the west, the Burgundians in the south and the Thuringians in the north (Jord. *Get.* 280). The Suebi are then brought directly into connection with the Alamanni, as Jordanes says that the latter were joined by and allied themselves with the Suebi, and that both groups were attacked by Goths who then returned to their own land of Pannonia after winning a victory, though not a sweeping one (Jord. *Get.* 281). It is obvious that Jordanes has confused the political geography of his own time and the region known in the sixth century both as Alamannia and Suavia with the situation in the second half of the fifth century and the

<sup>7</sup> In conjunction with the Pannonians, Prokopios mentions the Dacians, i.e. the inhabitants of the Diocese of Dacia, who are said to hold Singidunum (Proc. Caes. *Bella* 5.15.27).

<sup>8</sup> These barbarians are usually identified with the Germani settled in Savia (cf. Lotter 2003, 29).

Suebic land which he himself places in or close to Pannonia.<sup>9</sup> Jordanes is likely to have had before his eyes the same geographical arrangement as Prokopios of Caesarea, who describes the Franks as residing in Gaul, beyond them to the east are the Thuringians, not far to the south are the Burgundians, and the Suebi and Alamanni live beyond the Thuringians (Proc. Caes. *Bella* 5.12.8–11). Jordanes also mentions Suavia in his *Roman History*, where it is identified with the province of Savia (Jord. *Rom.* 218), when he gives a list of the provinces of the Late Roman Illyricum, which he took over from Rufius Festus' fourth century *Breviarium rerum gestarum populi Romani* (Ruf. Fest. *Brev.* 8.3). Finally, another testimony, albeit rather late, about the Suebi in or close to Pannonia is provided by Paul the Deacon's *History of the Longobards*. Paul has the Longobard King Wacho subjugating the Suebi (*Suavi*) after he expelled from the kingdom his predecessor's son, who fled to the Gepids (Paul. Diac. *HL* 1.21). Given the location of the Gepids, that would place the Longobards in the vicinity of Pannonia, all the more so as they are said to have been soon led by Audoin into Pannonia (Paul. Diac. *HL* 1.22).<sup>10</sup> Consequently, the Suebi that are meant must have been the ones close to Pannonia as well. The Suebi are also indicated as one of the groups (next to the Gepids, Bulgars, Sarmatians, Pannonians and Noricans) brought from Pannonia to Italy by the Longobard King Alboin (Paul. Diac. *HL* 2.26), which makes it clear that those Suebi are thought to have previously resided in Pannonia with the Longobards. It seems that the Byzantine general Drocton or Droctulf(t) was recruited from those Suebi as he is called *Suavus* and said to have first lived with the Longobards (Paul. Diac. *HL* 3.19). On the other hand, Paul also knows of other Suebi located more to the west, as he relates how the Frankish kings settled the *Suavi* in places which the Saxons left after they joined the Longobards (Paul. Diac. *HL* 2.6), and the same *Suavi* were later attacked by Saxons (Paul. Diac. *HL* 3.7). Furthermore, Paul defines the region called Suavia as the land of the Alamanni (*Alamannorum patria*) and places it north of the provinces of Raetia Prima and Raetia Secunda (Paul. Diac. *HL* 2.15). The same Suavia is described as bordering from the west the province of the Noricans where the Bavarians reside, which has Pannonia on the east, Italy on the south, and the Danube on the north (Paul. Diac. *HL* 3.30). Paul also mentions the Suebi in connection with the late antique Middle Danube area in his *Roman History* when listing the *gentes* that were under Attila's rule, among which he records the *Marcomanni Suevi Quadi* (Paul. Diac. *HR* 14.2).

Notwithstanding the confusion of the late antique and early medieval authors about the Suebi in relation to the Upper and Middle Danube regions it seems fairly evident

<sup>9</sup> *Alamannia* was already mentioned by the anonymous author of the panegyric to Constantius Caesar in the late third century (*Incert. Paneg. Constant. Caes.* 8(5).10.4), then by Quintus Aurelius Symmachus (*Sym. or.* 2.6, 16) and Ammianus Marcellinus (*Amm. Marc.* 20.4.1) in the late fourth century, and again by Ennodius in the early sixth century (*Ennod. Paneg.* 15.72). For a somewhat different take on the relevant Jordanes' passages, cf. Hummer 1998, 21–22.

<sup>10</sup> For example, Seyer 1978, 590, counts with the possibility that the Suebi conquered by Wacho resided in present-day Slovakia. On the other hand, Jarnut 1982, 21, and Christie 1998, 32, place them in northern Pannonia.

from their combined narratives that they refer to three lands of the Suebi in Late Antiquity: one along the Upper Danube north of Raetia, which is identified with Alamannia, the other along the Middle Danube north of Pannonia, and the third within the confines of Pannonia, in its southwestern part. The Suebi residing in or close to Pannonia in the fifth century are usually interpreted as identical with the Marcomanni and Quadi who are believed to have preserved and revived the tradition of the Suebic name, as argued by Lotter.<sup>11</sup> The identification of the Marcomanni and Quadi, and the Longobards as well, with the Suebi has a long tradition thanks to Tacitus' *Germania*, composed at the turn of the second century.<sup>12</sup> Furthermore, Lotter also claims that the appearance of the Suebi in southwestern Pannonia might be due to their partial advance into the region in the 430s.<sup>13</sup> Finally, the number of the Suebi in Savia is thought to have been strengthened thanks to the settlement of a group of the Suebic Alamanni mentioned in Cassiodorus Senator's *Variae epistolae* (Cassiod. Var. 3.50.1–3) as passing through Noricum and in Ennodius' *Panegyricus to the King Theoderic* (Ennod. Paneg. 15.72) as being accepted within the confines of Italy, a proposal put forward by Lotter as well.<sup>14</sup>

### Suavia as an official name of Savia in Gothic times?

The assumptions laid out above have provided a cornerstone for an explanation of how the province of Savia came to be known in the sixth-century written sources as Suavia. The hypothesis of Savia as a Suebic land, which was officially acknowledged by the Gothic rulers by renaming the Roman province in accordance with the supposed ethnic situation, has been additionally worked out by Castritius. In his 1995 paper he argues that the usual emendation in the critical editions of Cassiodorus Senator's *Variae epistolae* of the name of the South Pannonian province from Suavia to Savia has been erroneous, as the existing manuscripts are consistent in rendering the name as Suavia or Su(a)evia, and to this effect he adduced more examples of the same name form in the early medieval manuscripts of other late antique works in relation to the province or the river after which the province was originally named.<sup>15</sup> To be sure, the way in which the names are recorded in manuscripts can depend on who created the manuscripts and where they were created. Castritius provides ample examples of how a local perspective may have influenced the recording of names. Rufius Festus' *Breviarium rerum gestarum populi Romani*, contained in the seventh-century manu-

---

<sup>11</sup> Lotter 1968, 279–283; with Lotter 2003, 99–100; Castritius 1995, 82; Hummer 1998, 16–17.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Seyer 1978, 50–51.

<sup>13</sup> Lotter 1968, 284; Lotter 2003, 102. Cf. also Hauptmann 1929, 331–333, who was the first to make such proposal. *Contra* Pohl 1980, 275, who believes the conjunction of the Suebi and Savia to be a result of two confusions: between Suavia and Savia where Theoderic the Great settled the Suebic Alamanni; and between the “Suebic” settlement area of the Alamanni and the Suebi of Hunimund.

<sup>14</sup> Lotter 1968, 278–279; with Lotter 2003, 125–128.

<sup>15</sup> Castritius 1995, 73–75.

script from the El Escorial monastery in Spain (*El Escorial R.II.18*), has the name of the province Savia as Suaevia, much the same as the ninth-century manuscript from Vienna (*Vindobonensis* 89), which descends from a lost archetype associated with the known Spanish manuscript, where the form Suavia is used.<sup>16</sup> Castritius rightly observes that the scribe who created the El Escorial manuscript might have had before his eyes the land of the Suebi in northwestern Spain when he recorded the name Savia as Suaevia.<sup>17</sup> This is further substantiated by the fact that another class of manuscripts descending from a different manuscript tradition, of which the earliest known is the ninth-century manuscript from Bamberg (*Bambergensis E.III.2*), has the form Savia.<sup>18</sup>

Unfortunately, the earliest manuscripts of the *Variae epistolae* date from the eleventh century (the *fragmentum Halense* and the *fragmentum Koppmannianum*), even though an attempt has recently been made to detect traces of the letters' use in the ninth-century Carolingian context.<sup>19</sup> That means that the current state of knowledge does not allow for a decisive claim that the archetype(s) of the *Variae epistolae* contained the form Suavia or Sua(e)via for Savia since such spellings may have all been later scribal conjectures, subsequently continuously copied. Prokopios of Caesarea associates the Suebi with the Siscians, i.e. the inhabitants of the city of Siscia, which was the provincial capital of Savia, and places at least one Suavia, i.e. the land of the Suebi, close to Dalmatia, and he does that more clearly than Jordanes who seems to be rather perplexed with the matter, even though Jordanes directly refers to the province of Savia as Suavia in his *Roman History*.<sup>20</sup> In any case, all these instances are most likely to have been the late antique authors' own deductions, and not based on some official record. Ultimately, it would be odd if the Ostrogothic authorities had intentionally adopted, with Cassiodorus' full consent, a provincial name that testified to a regional primacy within their own domain of another barbarian group. All things considered Castritius' claim that Suavia became the official name of Savia does not seem to hold up against scrutiny, even though it may well be that the province was indeed regarded by Goths as having something to do with the Suebi, notwithstanding the fact they are never actually mentioned in the *Variae epistolae* in connection with Savia. To add to this, the Anonymous Cosmographer of Ravenna, who is thought to have based his own work on writings of, among others, the sixth-century Gothic geographers, does not mention either Savia nor Suavia but only the region called *Valeria, que et Media Provincia*, which he distinguishes from Pannonia saying that it is located close to Pannonia and that it lies between the Upper and Lower Pannonia, and

<sup>16</sup> Castritius 1995, 73–74; with Eadie 1967, 21–23, 52, ad 7; Arnaud-Lindet 1994, xxx–xxxii, 13, ad 3.

<sup>17</sup> Castritius 1995, 74.

<sup>18</sup> Eadie 1967, 23, 52, ad 7; Arnaud-Lindet 1994, xxvi–xxvii, 13, ad 3.

<sup>19</sup> Cristini 2022. For an overview of the manuscripts containing the *Variae epistolae*: Mommsen 1894, lxxviii–cx, clxxxiv, esp. c–ci (the *fragmentum Halense*); Fridh 1973, xxxvii–xliii, esp. xxxviii for both the *fragmentum Halense* and the *fragmentum Koppmannianum*.

<sup>20</sup> Drawing from Rufius Festus (*Ruf. Fest. Brev.* 8.3), Jordanes apparently changed the name from Savia to Suavia.

in which he places the *civitates* that belonged to the Late Roman provinces of Savia, Valeria, Pannonia Secunda, and Noricum Mediterraneum (Anon. Rav. *Cosmogr.* 4.20).

### What and where is Pannonia in the fifth and sixth centuries?

It has recently been suggested that the joining of the province of Savia with Dalmatia in Ostrogothic times may have caused the term Pannonia to come to be used exclusively for the province of Pannonia Secunda, with a remark that such designation seems to have already appeared in the Western section of the *Notitia Dignitatum* as the province of the *consularis* of Pannonia Secunda is indicated only as Pannonia (*Not. Dign. Occ.* 1.51).<sup>21</sup> However, the province of the *corrector* of Savia is equally indicated as Pannonia as opposed to the province of Pannonia Prima which is listed under Illyricum (*Not. Dign. Occ.* 1.82, 87),<sup>22</sup> which would rather suggest that the process of identification of Pannonia Secunda with the term Pannonia indeed belongs to later times.

It is likely that this occurred due to the political-administrative separation of the Pannonian provinces in the 430s after those in the north were surrendered by the Western Roman government to the Huns, whereas those in the south were ceded to the Eastern Roman Empire, with Savia being effectively cut off after the Huns conquered Sirmium and the rest of Pannonia Secunda in 441, which prevented the Eastern Romans from ever gaining their grip on the entire region.<sup>23</sup> Polemius Silvius' list of provinces, created in AD 448/449, shows the provincial structure of the Prefecture of Illyricum that is believed to correspond to the time before AD 395.<sup>24</sup> However, its western perspective provides some interesting additions that perhaps reflect changing knowledge about the Middle Danube region. The list seems to arrange the provinces in four groups, here listed in the order of mention: 1. Dalmatia, Pannonia Prima, Pannonia Secunda, Valeria, Praevalis, Moesia Superior (i.e. Prima), Epirus Vetus, and Epirus Nova; 2. Noricum Ripense, Noricum Mediterraneum, and Savia; 3. Dardania, Haemimontus, Dacia (by the end of the fourth century there were two Daciae, Ripensis and Mediterranea), and Scythia (the province was actually in the Diocese of Thrace); 4. Creta insula, Achaia, Macedonia (by the end of the fourth century there were two Macedoniae, Prima and Salutaris or Secunda), and Thessalia (Pol. Silv. *Later.* II.5). If this proposed grouping is on the right track it would suggest that Savia was not perceived as part of the Pannonian group of provinces, but was instead attached to the westernmost section with both provinces of Noricum. Some of the provinces are additionally described: Dalmatia is *supra mare*, Pannonia Prima is the one *in qua est Sirmium*, and Noricum Ripense is *super Danuvium*. The mistake about the location of Sirmium may signify that by the

---

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Gračanin, Škrgulja 2014, 183–184; Gračanin 2016, 226.

<sup>22</sup> The Pannonian province of Valeria is missing from the list as it was mistakenly struck out instead of the short-lived Italian province of Valeria (cf. Mann 1991, 217).

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Gračanin 2006, 49–61.

<sup>24</sup> Wesch-Klein 2002, esp. 64–66, 83.

mid-fifth century the term Pannonia had superseded the geographical difference between the two provinces. Another provincial list offering a decidedly Eastern Roman outlook, that of Hierokles from AD 527/535, records the following provinces within the Eastern Prefecture of Illyricum, which can be divided into two groups, the southern and northern: 1. Macedonia I, Macedonia II, Thessalia, Hellas (i.e. Achaia), Creta, Old Epirus (i.e. Epirus Vetus), and New Epirus (i.e. Epirus Nova); 2. Landlocked Dacia (i.e. Dacia Mediterranea), Riverside Dacia (i.e. Dacia Ripensis), Dardania, Praevalis, Moesia I, and Pannonia (Hier. *Syneke*. 638, 1a–b; 641, 1; 642, 1; 643, 6; 649, 3; 651, 3; 652, 8; 654, 2; 655, 1; 655, 7; 656, 3; 657, 1; 657, 7). Referring to the province where the cities of Sirmium and Bassiana are said to be located (Hier. *Syneke*. 657, 8–9) only as Pannonia is a clear sign that by that time the term Pannonia covered from the perspective of the Eastern Roman government solely the province of Pannonia Secunda. This is further confirmed by other examples from the official usage: Justinian's *Novel* 11 from 14<sup>th</sup> April 535 speaks of Pannonia Secunda which is in the city of Bacis (i.e. Bassiana), whereas the *Novel* 131 from 18<sup>th</sup> March 545 names only Pannonia (*Just. Nov.* 11; 131.3). This change of perspective in regard to the Pannonian provinces seems to have been in effect by the later fifth century. Priskos of Panion in his fragmentary preserved *History* mentions the land of the Pannonians close to the River Sava which was handed over to Attila and from where came Orestes, the secretary of the Hunnic king, and also the Pannonians near the Danube, which in both cases is consistent with the geographical position of Pannonia Secunda (Prisc. *Hist. exc.* 7.1–2). This *toto pro parte* approach is even more evident when Priskos defines Sirmium as a city among the Pannonians, and he also knows that Poetovio was a city in Noricum (Prisc. *Hist. exc.* 8.76–77). Priskos remarks that one of Attila's notables, Onegesios, had the stone for his bath brought from the land of Pannonians as there was no stone or timber in the area where the Huns lived, and then adds that the builder of the baths was a prisoner from Sirmium (Prisc. *Hist. exc.* 8.85–86). Finally, one Constantiolus, a Roman in Attila's service, is said to have been from the land of Pannonians that is subject to the Hunnic king (Prisc. *Hist. exc.* 135). On the other hand, Eugippius knows in the early sixth century of Pannonia Inferior as a place where the Goths dwelt, and from where they could pose a threat to the Rugians in Noricum (Eugip. *Vita Sev.* 5.1). Eugippius also speaks of two Pannoniae which, along with other areas bordering the Danube, fell into disarray following Attila's death, and of the border area between Noricum Ripense and the Pannoniae (Eugip. *Vita Sev.* 1.1). A somewhat different perception of Pannonia is offered in the letter of King Theudebert of Austrasia to Emperor Justinian I, in which the king describes the extent of his rule (*Ep. Austras.* 20).<sup>25</sup> The letter mentions among the regions purportedly under Theudebert I's control the northern part of Italy and Pannonia with the Saxons, and claims that his dominion extended over the Danube and the border of Pannonia.

Cassiodorus Senator's *Variae epistolae* provide testimony that only one Pannonian

<sup>25</sup> For the context and interpretation of Theudebert I's letters to Justinian I, cf. Gillet 2019, esp. 182–183, 186.

province was in Ostrogothic time referred to as such – Pannonia Sirmiensis, defined as a former seat of the Goths, and also known simply as Pannonia (Cassiod. *Var.* 3.23; 3.24; 4.13). Similarly, Prokopios of Caesarea distinguishes the Pannonians, associated with the Dacians, from the inhabitants of Siscia who are seen as a distinct group (Proc. Caes. *Bella* 5.15.26–27). Prokopios also mentions Pannonia as a region the Goths occupied after they crossed the Danube, and in connection with strongholds that were surrendered to the Lombards along with the Pólis Norikón (Proc. Caes. *Bella* 3.2.39; 7.33.10). Jordanes, on the other hand, uses the term Pannonia in different meanings which both reflect the sources from which he draws his information and the definition of the region in his own time. In his *Gothic History*, Jordanes defines Pannonia, which is said to have been given to the Goths by Romans, as a region bordered on by Moesia Superior on the east, Dalmatia on the south, Noricum on the west and the Danube on the north, with many cities of which the first is Sirmium and the furthest is Vindobona (Jord. *Get.* 264), and where the Goths dwelt in three distinctive groups (Jord. *Get.* 268). Pannonia is the area from which the Huns were reportedly expelled by Romans and Goths, and – along with Dacia – where Attila's Huns resided with their subject *nationes* (Jord. *Get.* 166, 226), as well as the scene of two battles, the first at the river Nedao and the second at the River Bolia (Jord. *Get.* 260, 277). The interior of Pannonia is the territory said to have been occupied by Sadages, and Pannonia is also where the city of Bassiana is located (Jord. *Get.* 272). Jordanes also remarks that the Pannonian regions, especially those where the Goths reside, are not far from Dalmatia, calls Pannonia the seat of the Gothic King Thiudimir, and says that Theoderic came to the vicinity of Pannonia through Sirmium (Jord. *Get.* 273, 281, 292). The last remark is especially interesting, since it could be construed as indicating that Jordanes does not see Sirmium as part of Pannonia. If we exclude the very likely possibility that the formulation is just a figure of speech or simply an inconsistency or unintentional inaccuracy, it might perhaps be explained as a hint to the fact that at the time when Jordanes was composing his work the city was not under Roman control and thus could be regarded as not belonging to (the Roman) Pannonia. Furthermore, when describing the extent of Scythia, Jordanes defines as its western border towards Germania the River Vistula in the north and the point where the River Hister (the lower course of the Danube) springs, and to which the Morsian/Mursian lake (apparently the wide floodplain stretching both north and south of Mursa/Osijek, including present-day Kopački Rit and the ancient Volcaean marshes) extends (Jord. *Get.* 30, 31). This seems to indicate that Jordanes understands Scythia as bordering Pannonia as well, especially since he never clearly defines Pannonia's eastern border except for remarking that it has Moesia Superior on the east, which would be consistent with the impression that he primarily has Pannonia Secunda in mind. In Scythia Jordanes places the Gepids (Jord. *Get.* 33), who are said to be closed off on the north by the River Tisza, and consequently he includes in Scythia the ancient Dacia, which he refers to as Gothia as well as Gepidia of his time, and which once bordered – Jordanes uses the past tense – the Jazyges in the east (Jord. *Get.* 74), who are known to have lived along both sides of the Tisza. This geographical arrangement suggests that Jordanes may have

believed Pannonia extended across the Danube towards the Tisza, although he is never explicit.<sup>26</sup> Jordanes also refers to Pannonia in connection with earlier events, once in the plural form as both *Pannoniae* (Jord. *Get.* 161) and thrice in the typical singular form (Jord. *Get.* 115, 140, 147). In his *Roman History*, Jordanes employs the usual singular form for a fifth-century event (Jord. *Rom.* 347), and the plural form when he refers to matters from more distant past (Jord. *Rom.* 216, 218, 287), except when stating that Emperor Marcus Aurelius died in Pannonia (Jord. *Rom.* 272) or remarking that Emperor Decius was born in Pannonia Inferior (Jord. *Rom.* 284). Additionally, Jordanes mentions the Pannonians on three separate occasions: the first time in referral to the defeat of the king of the Pannonians (Jord. *Rom.* 216), the second time in connection with their geographical position between the rivers Drava and Sava (Jord. *Rom.* 243), which is sort of an equivalent for the identical remark about where the Amantini live (Jord. *Rom.* 216), and the third time as an indication of the provincial origins of the emperors Valentinian and Valens, who are said to have been from Cibalae (Jord. *Rom.* 307).

All these examples show that by the second half of the fifth century Pannonia was more commonly seen as a single geographical administrative unit and primarily identified with the province of Pannonia Secunda, which in the early sixth century covered both (the Ostrogothic) Pannonia Sirmiensis with Sirmium as the long-established regional hub and (the Eastern Roman) Pannonia Secunda based on the city of Bassiana. To be sure, the term Pannonia could be also used to signify the northern Pannonia, which is understandable since the writers appear to have been aware of the existence of the province of Pannonia Prima. Furthermore, if we assume that the locations of the rivers Bolia and Nedao lie somewhere outside what the Roman Pannonia was then, it may be that Pannonia could also denote a larger area, much like Dacia, and could stand for the territory of the Gepids. What is however more important is that the term Pannonia seems to have completely ceased to be employed for the province of Savia, which apparently was associated instead with Noricum and Dalmatia.

### **Can archaeology help find the Suebi in southern Pannonia?**

The search for the Great Migration period groups in the material record is sort of a holy grail for many a Late Antiquity/early Middle Ages archaeologist. Some time ago the matter seemed rather straightforward, as the culture-historical approach was the concept of the day, neatly arranging peoples and societies of the past into specific ethnic and cultural groups. However, the notion that an ethnicity could be recognized and identified solely on the basis of the typology of archaeological artefacts, no matter how elaborately and systematically worked out, has quite rightly been criticized and declared obsolete. In their attempts to define and sharply demarcate the material traces believed to represent movements and settlement of various distinctive groups, many archaeolo-

<sup>26</sup> For a full discussion, cf. Gračanin 2008, 19–22.

gists have often fallen into a fallacy of circular argumentation by first relying on the written evidence to specify the settlement area that is thought to have belonged to a given group of people, and then by using the artefacts unearthed in that area and seen as indicating that group of people to establish their presence in the same or any other area.

The material culture that is thought to indicate the fourth- and early fifth-century Suebic groups is traditionally located in Moravia, the Upper Danube part of Lower Austria, and western and central Slovakia.<sup>27</sup> It is believed that by the first decade of the fifth century a major shift in settlement structure occurred as a result of the mass relocation of population indicated by a significant drop in active settlements, even though some are said to have continued to exist until the first third of the fifth century.<sup>28</sup> In the second half of the fifth century, the Suebi are thought to have primarily resided in what is now western Slovakia before their polity was crushed by the Goths in the late 460s, after which they are assumed to have moved west and crossed the Danube, with a possibility that some Suebi remained in the old territory.<sup>29</sup> What may be deduced from what archaeology can tell about the Suebi is that after they are no longer tangible in the region where they are believed to have been more or less compactly settled, they cannot be traced among other so-called Germanic groups. Furthermore, it could be argued that what seems to have been a defeat against the Ostrogoths, even though Jordanes does not paint the Gothic victory as a smashing success, caused a serious blow to the inner cohesion of the Suebi, as they are never again directly referred to in the written sources narrating the events in the Middle Danube region. Therefore, it is likely that whatever of their group was left must have not amounted to much.<sup>30</sup>

Considering all that has been said it is extremely unlikely that any material evidence that could be linked to the Suebi might ever be detected in southern Pannonia. True, it has been remarked that some “Germanic” groups left very rare traces of their presence in the Western Balkans, among which the Vandals, Visigoths and Suebi have been named, but the inclusion of the Suebi in that list is rather tentative.<sup>31</sup> Thus it is no wonder that there has never been any attempt at finding the Suebi in the Great Migration period material record in southern Pannonia, as is exemplified in the latest overview of the finds of barbarian provenance, with only a small number of the fifth- and sixth century finds attributed generally to the “Germanic cultural circle” having been thus far uncovered, even though the author supports the strong presence of the Suebi,

---

<sup>27</sup> Stoklas 2022, 378.

<sup>28</sup> Stoklas 2022, 383–384.

<sup>29</sup> Ruttkay 2009, 277–278, 289. Steinhübel 2021, 17–18, describes a more elaborate extent of the territory of Hunimund's Suebi.

<sup>30</sup> Steinhübel 2021, 21, believes that after their defeat at the hands of the Ostrogoths, the majority of the Suebi fled to the Alamanni, giving them their name, while the remaining Suebi eventually moved into Pannonia after it was vacated by Ostrogoths.

<sup>31</sup> Vinski 1971, 47. Cf. also Sokol 1998, 1134.

who are even said to have controlled Savia.<sup>32</sup> To be sure, certain finds – tree-trunk burials and remains of metal pouches discovered in the cemetery at the Bošnjića Voće site south of Rakovčani near Prijedor in northwestern Bosnia and Herzegovina (the border area between Savia and Dalmatia), which has been dated to the period from AD 500 to sometime after 550 – have been ascribed to the Alamanni and interpreted as indicating the presence of a small Alamannic group in the region as a result of the Ostrogothic policy of settlement implied in Cassiodorus Senator's *Variae epistolae*.<sup>33</sup> However, not only is such an interpretation firmly embedded in the culture-historical approach, it also does not do much to help establish the presence of the Suebi in Savia, as is usually claimed.<sup>34</sup> One might be inclined to try to explain the absence of the archaeological evidence as a consequence of a far-reaching acculturation of the Suebi among other local populations, "Germanic" and Roman alike, but in that case one might equally pose a question why the Suebic identity would continue to exist, and in such a manner that the entire region eventually adopted the Suebic name.

Overall, it seems evident enough that in view of negligible quantity of material evidence that could be connected with various "Germanic" groups in the fifth- and sixth-century Savia, any attempt at identifying some of the archaeological finds as "Suebic" – notwithstanding the potential methodological pitfalls of such efforts – are not likely to bear fruit. Consequently, to answer the question asked in the title of this section: No, archaeology cannot help find the Suebi in southern Pannonia, at least not at the present level of knowledge.

### **The *antiqui barbari*, or a barbarian identity in flux**

The enigmatic expression in Cassiodorus Senator's *Variae epistolae* about the *antiqui barbari* has attracted a fair amount of scholarly attention. The paragraph in which they are mentioned deals with a fiscal matter: the *antiqui barbari* are said to have married Roman women and obtained estates but failed to start paying the taxes due (Cassiod. *Var.* 5.14.6). They seem to have been soldiers who used to be exempt from taxation because of their military service, but by having acquired land they were now counted among the class of *possessores* and became eligible for taxation.<sup>35</sup> There is some confusion in the scholarship as to the meaning of the word *antiqui*. Šašel understood it to mean "old",

<sup>32</sup> Rapan Papeša 2012, esp. 417, with 426–428 for the fifth- to sixth-century objects unearthed in southern Pannonia and ascribed to the Germanic cultural circle.

<sup>33</sup> Vinski 1971, 54; with Sokol 1998, 1134. *Contra* Miletić 1978, 102, who believes the objects to have been in use by Goths.

<sup>34</sup> Wolfram 1990, 301, 317; Castritius 1995, 82; Lotter 2003, 125. This has recently been fully accepted by Bratož 2017, 225. Gračanin, Škrgulja 2014, 185, and Gračanin 2016, 265, mention that as a possibility. The settlement of the Suebi in southern Pannonia was fully accepted in older Yugoslav historiography: Grafenauer 1952, 417; Kovačević 1960, 33.

<sup>35</sup> Gračanin 2016, 251, 259; with Castritius 1995, 83–84.

which is followed by Castritius, Lotter and the author of this paper.<sup>36</sup> However, Amory has thought that the word refers to their former status, i.e. they are “former barbarians”, which has also been adopted by Bjornlie in the recent complete English translation of the *Variae epistolae*.<sup>37</sup> The Italian translation, on the other hand, has *gli antichi barbari*.<sup>38</sup> It seems to be clear enough that those who were being referred to did not cease to be barbarians from the perspective of the Ostrogothic government, but only that they were now obliged to pay land tax, the same as all other *possessores*.

As for the identity of the *antiqui barbari*, there are so to speak two schools of thought. The first may be tentatively called Šašel's. As already mentioned, he believed them to be a group of barbarians who were not Goths and were older than other barbarians referred to in the *Variae epistolae* in connection with southern Pannonia (Cassiod. *Var.* 3.24; 8.21), and identified them as various Germanic-Hunnic ethnic splinters stemming from Attila's *Völkerbund*. He also accounted for the possibility that some of the groups mentioned by Martin of Braga could belong among the *antiqui barbari*, possibly, it seems, even the Alamanni and Suebi.<sup>39</sup> The other opinion has been expressed by Castritius who, though very much appreciating Šašel's efforts at the reconstruction of the ethnic picture in the fifth- and sixth-century Pannonia and approving Šašel's placement in Pannonia Prima and Savia of the Suebi (associated with the Marcomanni), identifies the *antiqui barbari* as the Middle Danubian Suebi, i.e. the Marcomannic Suebi who for their orthodoxy and good service were awarded by the Western Roman government the right to settle in the Roman provinces and the *ius conubium* at the time following the collapse of Attila's polity.<sup>40</sup> Castritius also associates the *antiqui barbari* with the category of *capillati*, mentioned in the *Variae epistolae* in connection with Siscia and Savia (Cassiod. *Var.* 4.49), which he defines as a leading socio-political class.<sup>41</sup>

However, the dominant impression is that the *antiqui barbari* was a cover term for various “Germanic” groups residing in the region from before the Ostrogothic rule and not only the Suebi, though they are also thought to perhaps have been meant.<sup>42</sup> I myself have opted tentatively for the identification of the *antiqui barbari* with the Suebi.<sup>43</sup> To be sure, there have been other opinions but they are either too general or appear to be erroneous.<sup>44</sup> From the perspectives of both Prokopios of Caesarea and Jordanes there is no doubt that Savia was inhabited by barbarians, and specifically the Suebi, as Proko-

<sup>36</sup> Šašel 1979, 135, 137; Castritius 1995, 77–78; Lotter 2003, 37; Gračanin 2016, 251, 264.

<sup>37</sup> Amory 2003, 53, note 31, 93, note 34; Bjornlie 2019, 215.

<sup>38</sup> Giardina, Cecconi, Tantillo 2014, 153.

<sup>39</sup> Šašel 1979, 135, 137.

<sup>40</sup> Castritius 1995, 84–85.

<sup>41</sup> Castritius 1995, 78. For a possible identity of the *capillati*, cf. Gračanin 2016, 234–235.

<sup>42</sup> Lotter 2003, 123, 125; Lo Cascio 2014, 423, note ad XIV.27.

<sup>43</sup> Gračanin, Škrgulja 2014, 184; Gračanin 2016, 264, 265.

<sup>44</sup> Thus Moorhead 1997, 85, only says that they were not Goths, whereas Lafferty 2013, 226, believes them to be precisely that – the Goths. For an overview of scholarly opinions, cf. Gračanin 2016, 264–265, note 175.

prios clearly places them there and Jordanes also seems convinced that the province of Savia was at that time called Suavia, i.e. the Suebic land. Of course, they could have been simply wrong, that is to say, mistaken or ill-informed about the true provenance of the name of the province of Savia, especially as it resembles the Suebic name.<sup>45</sup> Having all that in mind, it seems prudent only to conclude that the *antiqui barbari* were indeed a distinct group of barbarians in the Ostrogothic kingdom, who were obviously thought to have lived in the province of Savia long before the Goths controlled the area. They were clearly not the Goths as the Goths are never referred to as barbarians in the *Variae epistolae* and other Ostrogothic official documents, but seem to have performed military duties. Although they married Roman woman their Romanness was not acknowledged by the Ostrogothic authorities. They may have included members of various “Germanic” groups as is generally maintained or, if we are to believe the sixth-century authors, primarily the Suebi, but the latter is at the current state of knowledge far from certain.

### Concluding remarks

In retrospect, Jaroslav Šašel is definitely to be credited for his attempt at elucidating, especially through the visual aids of maps, the complex ethnic picture of the fifth- and sixth-century Pannonia, principally its southern parts. He provided what may be termed as the first consistent historiographic narrative about the presence of various barbarian, primarily “Germanic”, groups in the area, which offered food for thought and instigated new research. That is his lasting contribution even though some of his assumptions and propositions have not withstood the test of time, while others are still debated.

The present examination has also shown that the identification of the *antiqui barbari* with the Suebi is rather speculative, and that the assumption of Savia becoming Suavia, that is a land of the Suebi, because the Suebi actually settled there is on shaky grounds since the identification of Savia with Suavia may have merely been an invention of the sixth-century authors stemming from sort of a misunderstanding and then appeared in the early medieval manuscripts of various Late Antiquity works as an educated guess based on the contemporary knowledge in local contexts. It is equally telling that the archaeological research, especially in works of scholarship that are heavily influenced by the culture-historical approach, has never detected the Suebic material culture in southern Pannonia, nor even attempted to do that, regardless of the fact that there is not much material evidence to work with. Thus it seems more likely that the Suebi never resided in Savia, at least not as the Suebi who would hold onto their identity name. Otherwise it would be quite odd that the Ostrogothic authorities, which are supposed to have introduced a new official name for Savia knowing that it was so full of the Suebi, never actually referred to them in the context of

<sup>45</sup> Sokol 1998, 1133, has suggested that the phonemic similarity between Savia and Suevi/Suevia might have confused the ancient writers.

southern Pannonia, but rather chose to hide them behind a somewhat enigmatic label of *antiqui barbari* when at the same time they had no problem with designating other barbarian groups by their names.

### *Bibliography*

#### *Primary sources*

- Amm. Marc.: *Ammiani Marcellini rerum gestarum libri qui supersunt* Vol. I: *Libri XIV–XXV*, ed. W. Seyfarth, with L. Jacob-Karau and I. Ulmann, Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1978.
- Anon. Rav. Cosmogr.: *Ravennatis Anonymi Cosmographia*. In: *Itineraria Romana*, vol. II: *Ravennatis Anonymi cosmographica et Guidonis geographica*, ed. J. Schnetz, 2nd ed., Stuttgart 1990, 1–110.
- Ep. Austras.: *Epistolae Austrasiacae*, ed. W. Gundlach. In: *Epistolae Merowingici et Karolini aevi* I, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Epistolae 3, Berlin 1892, 110–153.
- Cassiod. Var.: *Magni Aurelii Cassiodori Variarum libri XII*, ed. Å. J. Fridh. In: *Magni Aurelii Cassiodori Senatoris Opera Pars I*, Corpus Christianorum Series latina 96, Turnhout 1973, 1–499.
- Claud. Hon. cons. III: Claudianus, *Panegyricus dictus Honorio Augusto tertium consuli*. In: Claudianus, *Carmina*, ed. J. B. Hall, Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana, Leipzig 1985, 52–60.
- Claud. Hon. cons. IV: Claudianus, *Panegyricus dictus Honorio Augusto tertium consuli*. In: Claudianus, *Carmina*, ed. J. B. Hall, Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana, Leipzig 1985, 61–85.
- Ennod. Paneg.: Ennodius, *Panegyricus dictus clementissimo regi Theoderico*. In: Ch. Rohr, *Der Theoderich-Panegyricus des Ennodius*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Studien und Texte 12, Hannover 1995, 195–263.
- Eugip. Vita Sev.: Eugippius, *Vita sancti Severini*. In: Eugippe, *Vie de Saint Séverin*, ed. and transl. Ph. Régerat, Sources chrétienne 374, Paris 1991.
- Hier. Synek.: E. Honigmann, *Le Synekdèmos d'Hiéroklos et l'opuscule géographique de Georges de Chypre*, Corpu Bruxellense historiae Byzantinae, Forma imperii Byzantini 1, Brussels 1939, 12–48.
- Hist. Aug. Div. Aur.: *Divus Aurelianus*. In: *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* Vol. II, ed. E. Hohl, with Ch. Samberger and W. Seyfarth, Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana, Leipzig 1965.
- Incert. Paneg. Constant. Caes.: *Incerti panegyricus Constantio Caesari dicto*. In: *XII panegyrici latini*, ed. R. A. B. Mynors, Oxford 1964, 215–229.
- Jord. Get.: Jordanes, *Getica*. In: *Iordanis Romana et Getica*, ed. Th. Mommsen, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores antiquissimi 5.1, Berlin 1882, 53–138.

- Jord. Rom.: Jordanes, Romana. In: *Iordanis Romana et Getica*, ed. Th. Mommsen, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores antiquissimi 5.1, Berlin 1882, 1–52.
- Just. Nov.: *Iustiniani Novellae*. In: *Corpus iuris civilis*, vol. III, ed. R. Schoell, W. Krull, Berlin 1895.
- Not. Dign. Occ.: *Notitia dignitatum in partibus Occidentis*. In: *La Notitia dignitatum: nueva edición crítica y comentario histórico*, ed. Concepción Neira Faleiro, Madrid 2005, 311–493.
- Paul. Diac. HL: *Pauli Historia Langobardorum in usum scholarum ex Monumentis Germaniae historicis recusa*, ed. H. Droysen, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Hannover 1878.
- Paul. Diac. HR: *Pauli Historia Romana in usum scholarum ex Monumentis Germaniae historicis recusa*, ed. H. Droysen, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Berlin 1879.
- Pol. Sil. Later.: *Polemii Silvii laterculus*. In: *Chronica minora*, vol. I, ed. Th. Mommsen, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores antiquissimi 9, Berlin 1892, 511–551.
- Prisc. Hist.: Priscus Panita, *Excerpta et fragmenta*, ed. P. Corolla, Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana 2000, Berlin, New York 2008.
- Proc. Caes. Bella: Procopius Caesariensis, *Opera omnia* Vol. II: *De bellis libri V–VIII: Bellum Gothicum*, ed. J. Haury, Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana, Leipzig 1963.
- Ruf. Fest. Brev.: Rufius Festus, *Breviarium rerum gestarum populi Romani*. In: Rufije Fest, *Kratak pregled povijesti rimskoga naroda*, ed. and transl. H. Gračanin, Biblioteka Latina & Graeca 61, Zagreb 2011.
- Sid. Apoll. Paneg. Maior.: Sidonius Apollinaris, *Panegyricus dicto domino Imperatori Caesari Iulio Valerio Maioriano Augusto*. In: *Sidoine Apollinaire*. Tome I: *Poèmes*, ed. and transl. A. Loyen, Collection des universités de France, Paris 1960, 26–51.
- Sym. or.: *Symmachi orationes*. In: *Q. Aurelii Symmachi quae supersunt*, ed. O. Seeck, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores antiquissimi 6/1, Berlin 1883, 318–339.

### Secondary sources

- Amory 2003: P. Amory, *People and Identity in Ostrogothic Italy, 489-554*, Cambridge 2003.
- Arnaud-Lindet 1994: *Festus, Abrégé des hauts faits du peuple romain*, ed. and transl. Marie-Pierre Arnaud-Lindet, Collection des universités de France, Paris 1994.
- Bjornlie 2019: M. S. Bjornlie (tr.), *Cassiodorus, The Variae. The Complete Translation*, Oakland 2019.
- Bratož 2017: R. Bratož, Zur Präsenz und Mobilität ethnischer Kleingruppen im Alpen-Adria-Raum während der Ostgotenherrschaft. In: I. Dörfler, P. Gleirscher, S. Ladstätter, I. Pucker (eds.), *AD AMUSSIM: Festschrift zum 65. Geburtstag von Franz Glaser*, Klagenfurt, Vienna 2017, 215–248.
- Castritius 1995: H. Castritius, Barbari - antiqui barbari. Zur Besiedlungsgeschichte

- Südostnorikums und Südpannoniens in der Spätantike (Ende des 4. bis Mitte des 6. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.), *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 29, 1995, 72–85.
- Christie 1998: N. Christie, *The Lombards: The Ancient Longobards*, The Peoples of Europe, Oxford, Malden 1998.
- Cristini 2022: M. Cristini, Cassiodorus' *Variae* in the 9<sup>th</sup> Century. In: F. Oppedisano (ed.), *Between Ostrogothic and Carolingian Italy. Survivals, revivals, ruptures*, Reti Medievali E-Book 43, Patterns of power and practices of government in the making of Carolingian Italy 2, Florence 2022, 109–125.
- Eadie 1967: J. W. Eadie, *The Breviarium of Festus. A Critical Edition with Historical Commentary*, London 1967.
- Fridh 1973: Å. J. Fridh, Praefatio. In: *Magni Aurelii Cassiodori Senatoris Opera Pars I*, Corpus Christianorum Series latina 96, Turnhout 1973, xxxvii–xlvi.
- Giardina, Cecconi, Tantillo 2014: A. Giardina, G. A. Cecconi, I. Tantillo (eds.), *Flavio Magno Aurelio Cassiodoro Senatore, Varie* Vol. 2: *Libri III–V*, Rome 2014.
- Gillett 2019: A. Gillett, Telling off Justinian: Theudebert I, the *Epistolae Austrasicae*, and communication strategies in sixth-century Merovingian-Byzantine relations, *Early Medieval Europe* 27/2, 2019, 161–194.
- Gračanin 2006: H. Gračanin, The Huns and South Pannonia, *Byzantinoslavica* 64, 2006, 29–76.
- Gračanin 2008: H. Gračanin, Slaveni u ranosrednjovjekovnoj južnoj Panoniji, *Scrinia Slavonica* 8, 2008, 13–54.
- Gračanin 2016: H. Gračanin, Late Antique Dalmatia and Pannonia in Cassiodorus' *Variae*, *Millennium* 13, 2016, 211–273.
- Gračanin, Škruglja 2014: H. Gračanin, J. Škruglja, The Ostrogoths in Late Antique Southern Pannonia, *Acta archaeologica Carpathica* 49, 2014, 165–205.
- Grafenauer 1952: B. Grafenauer, *Ustoličevanje koroških vojvod in država karantanskih Slovencev / Die Kärntner Herzogseinsetzung und der Staat der Karantanerslawen*, Dela – Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti 7, Ljubljana 1952.
- Hauptmann 1929: Lj. Hauptmann, Entstehung und Entwicklung Krains. In: A. von Jaksch, M. Wutte, L. Hauptmann, A. Mell, H. Pirchegger (eds.), *Erläuterungen zum Historischen Atlas der Österreichischen Alpenländer*, vol. I.4: *Kärnten, Krain, Görz und Istrien*, Vienna 1929, 305–484.
- Heuberger 1937: R. Heuberger, *Das ostgotische Rätien*, *Klio* 30, 1937, 77–109.
- Hummer 1998: H. J. Hummer, The fluidity of barbarian identity: the ethnogenesis of Alemanni and Suebi, AD 200–500, *Early Medieval Europe* 7.1, 1998, 1–27.
- Jarnut 1982: J. Jarnut, *Geschichte der Langobarden*, Urban-Taschenbücher 339, Stuttgart, Berlin, Köln, Mainz 1982.
- Kovačević 1960: J. Kovačević, *Arheologija i historija varvarske kolonizacije južnoslovenskih oblasti od IV do početka VII veka / L'archéologie et l'histoire de la colonisation barbare des territoires de Slaves de Sud du IV. au VII. s.c.*, Posebna izdanja Vojvođanskog muzeja 2, Novi Sad 1960.

- Krautschick 1983: S. Krautschick, *Cassiodor und die Politik seiner Zeit*, Habelts Dissertationsdrucke, Reihe Alte Geschichte 17, Bonn 1983.
- Lafferty 2013: S. D. W. Lafferty, *Law and Society in the Age of Theoderic the Great. A Study of the Edictum Theoderici*, Cambridge, New York 2013.
- Lo Cascio 2014: E. Lo Cascio, Commento ad 15.14. In: A. Giardina, G. A. Cecconi, I. Tantillo (eds.), *Flavio Magno Aurelio Cassiodoro Senatore, Varie* Vol. 2: *Libri III–V*, Rome 2014, 422–424.
- Lotter 1968: F. Lotter, Zur Rolle der Donausueben in der Völkerwanderungszeit, *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 76, 1968, 275–298.
- Lotter 1985: F. Lotter, Die germanischen Stammesverbände im Umkreis des Ostalpen-Mitteldonau-Raumes nach der literarischen Überlieferung zum Zeitalter Severins. In: W. H. Wolfram, A. Schwarcz (eds.), *Die Bayern und ihre Nachbarn, Teil I*, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, Denkschriften 179, Vienna 1985, 29–59.
- Lotter 2003: F. Lotter, *Völkerverschiebungen im Ostalpen-Mitteldonau-Raum zwischen Antike und Mittelalter (375–600)*, unter Mitarbeit von R. Bratož und H. Castritius, Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde 39, Berlin, New York 2003.
- Mann 1991: J. C. Mann, The Notitia Dignitatum – Dating and Survival, *Britannia* 22, 1991, 215–219.
- Marcone 2015: A. Marcone, Commento ad 12.7. In: A. Giardina, G. A. Cecconi, I. Tantillo (eds.), *Flavio Magno Aurelio Cassiodoro Senatore, Varie* Vol. 5: *Libri XI–XII*, Rome 2015, 253.
- Miletić 1978: N. Miletić, Reflets des grandes invasions en Bosnie-Herzégovine. In: D. Dimitrijević, J. Kovačević, Z. Vinski (eds.), *Probleme der Völkerwanderungszeit im Karpatenbecken. Mitteilungen des Symposiums 13.–16. Dezember 1976*, Novi Sad 1978, 97–108.
- Moorhead 1997: J. Moorhead, *Theoderic in Italy*, Oxford 1997.
- Mommsen 1894: Th. Mommsen, Conspectus codicum et reliquorum subsidiorum. Explicatio notarum. In: *Cassiodori Senatoris variae*, ed. Th. Mommsen, Monumenta Germaniae historica, Auctores antiquissimi 12, Berlin 1894, lxxviii–cx, clxxxiv.
- Pohl 1980: W. Pohl, Die Gepiden und die Gentes an der mittleren Donau nach dem Zerfall des Attilareiches. In: H. Wolfram, F. Daim (eds.), *Die Völker an der mittleren und unteren Donau im fünften und sechsten Jahrhundert*, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Frühmittelalterforschung 4, München 1980, 239–305.
- Rapan Papeša 2012: A. Rapan Papeša, Early Mediaeval Barbarian Elements in Late Antique Southern Pannonia. In: B. Migotti (ed.), *The Archaeology of Roman Southern Pannonia. The state of research and selected problems in the Croatian part of the Roman province of Pannonia*, BAR International Series 2393, Oxford 2012, 415–439.
- Ruttkay 2009: M. Ruttkay, The North of the Carpathian Basin in the 5th and 6th Centuries AD. In: D. Quast (ed.), *Foreigners in early Medieval Europe: Thirteen Inter-*

- national Studies on Early Medieval Mobility*, Monographien des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums 78, Mainz 2009, 273–294.
- Seyer 1978: R. Seyer, Antike Nachrichten. In: *Die Germanen. Geschichte und Kultur der germanischen Stämme in Mitteleuropa*. Band 1: Bruno Krüger (ed.), *Von den Anfängen bis zum 2. Jahrhundert unserer Zeitrechnung*, Veröffentlichungen des Zentralinstituts für Alte Geschichte und Archäologie der Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR 4/I, 2nd ed., Berlin 1978, 37–63.
- Sokol 1998: V. Sokol, Panonija Savija u Justinijanovo doba. In: N. Cambi, E. Marin (eds.), *L'Époque de Justinien et les problèmes de VI<sup>e</sup> et VII<sup>e</sup> siècles*. *Acta XIII congressus internationalis archaeologiae christianae*, vol. II, Studi di antichità cristiana 54, Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku, supl. vol. 88, Città del Vaticano, Split 1998, 1131–1143.
- Stein 2023: E. Stein, *Geschichte des spätrömischen Reiches / Histoire du Bas-Empire*. Band 2: *De la Disparition de l'Empire d'Occident à la Mort de Justinien (476–565)*, ed. H. Leppin, M. Meier, Darmstadt 2023.
- Steinhübel 2021: J. Steinhübel, *The Nitrian Principality. The Beginnings of Medieval Slovakia*, East Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages, 450–1450, Vol. 68, Leiden, Boston 2021.
- Stoklas 2022: B. Stoklas, Suebi in the Upper Elbe and Middle Danube Regions after Marcomannic Wars. In: M. Olędzki, A. Dubicki (eds.), *Rome and the Barbarians. An Interplay between two Worlds*, Łódź 2022, 363–387.
- Šašel 1979: J. Šašel, *Antiqui barbari*. Zur Besiedlungsgeschichte Ostnoricums und Pannoniens im 5. und 6. Jahrhundert nach den Schriftquellen. In: J. Werner, E. Ewig (eds.), *Von der Spätantike zum frühen Mittelalter: Aktuelle Probleme in historischer und archäologischer Sicht*, Vorträge und Forschungen 25, Sigmaringen 1979, 125–139.
- Vinski 1971: Z. Vinski, Rani srednji vijek u Jugoslaviji od 400. do 800. godine, *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu* 5, 1971, 47–71.
- Wolfram 1990: H. Wolfram, *Die Goten: von den Anfängen bis zur Mitte des sechsten Jahrhunderts. Entwurf einer historischen Ethnographie*, München<sup>3</sup> 1990.
- Wesch-Klein 2002: G. Wesch-Klein, Der Laterculus des Polemius Silvius: Überlegungen zu Datierung, Zuverlässigkeit und historischem Aussagewert einer spätantiken Quelle, *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 51/1, 2002, 57–88.

Hrvoje Gračanin  
Sveučilište u Zagrebu  
Filozofski fakultet  
Ulica Ivana Lučića 3  
HR-10000 Zagreb  
hgracani@m.ffzg.hr  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5018-6083>