

MICHAEL PEACHIN

GALLIENUS CAESAR (?)

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 74 (1988) 219–224

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



GALLIENUS CAESAR (?)<sup>1</sup>

Four sources claim that when news of Valerian's acclamation reached Rome, the senate proclaimed Gallienus Caesar:

Aur. Vict. Caes. 32.1-3, At milites, qui contracti undique apud Raetias ob instans bellum morabantur, Licinio Valeriano imperium deferunt...eius filium Gallienum senatus Caesarem creat...

Eutrop. 9.7, Hinc Licinius Valerianus, in Raetia et Norico agens, ab exercitu imperator et mox Augustus est factus. Gallienus quoque Romae a senatu Caesar est appellatus.

Oros. hist. adv. pag. 7.22.1, Anno ab urbe condita millesimo decimo duo imperatores vicensimo septimo post Augustum loco creati sunt: Valerianus in Raetia ab exercitu Augustus appellatus, Romae autem a senatu Gallienus Caesar creatus...

Hier. chron. (ed. Helm) p.220, Valerianus in Raetia ab exercitu Augustus, Gallienus Romae a senatu Caesar appellatus.

For apparent lack of any corroborating evidence, these were long doubted.<sup>2</sup> There are, though, other documents which indeed might support the Latin epitomators; hence, H.-G.Pflaum has argued acceptance of a short term as Caesar for Gallienus.<sup>3</sup> Papyrologists also have taken interest in the regal statuses of Valerian and Gallienus at the beginning of their reign, particularly as regards P.Köln IV 196. But they seem not to have noticed Pflaum.<sup>4</sup> Although the evidence still does not allow iron-clad conclusions regarding a possible term as Caesar for Gallienus, it may be worth gathering and evaluating in one place what we do have.

First, a word as to the literary sources is in order. Comparison suggests that Orosius' account at this point derives from Eutropius, or more probably from a common source:

---

<sup>1</sup> This note was written with the aid of a Stipendium from the Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung, and in the stimulating atmosphere of the Seminar für Alte Geschichte in Heidelberg. I thank Professor G.Alföldy for comments on a draft.

<sup>2</sup> E.g.: R.Paribeni, *Diz.Epig.* III, 1922,425; L.Wickert, *RE* XIII.1, 1926,352-3; A.Alföldi, *CAH* XII, 1939, 169.

<sup>3</sup> Pflaum, *BAA* 2,1966-1967,175-82. Pflaum's opinion seems now generally accepted: L. de Blois, *The Policy of the Emperor Gallienus*, Leiden 1976,1; W.Kuhoff, *Herrschaft und Reichskrise. Die Regierungszeit der römischen Kaiser Valerianus und Gallienus (253-268 n.Chr.)* Bochum 1979,11; U.Schillinger-Häfele, *Consules Augusti Caesares. Datierung von römischen Inschriften und Münzen*, Stuttgart 1986,79.

<sup>4</sup> See the comments of the original editors ad loc. Also: P.J.Sijpesteijn, *ZPE* 54,1984,76-77; D.Rathbone, *ZPE* 62,1986,117.

Eutrop.

Valerianus in Mesopotamia bellum gerens a Sapore, Persarum rege, superatus est, mox etiam captus apud Parthos ignobii servitute consenuit. (9.7)

Nam iuvenis in Gallia et Illyrico multa strenue fecit, occiso apud Mursam Ingenuo, qui purpuram sumpserat...(9.8.1)

Alamanni vastatis Galliis in Italiam penetraverunt. Dacia, quae a Traiano ultra Danubium fuerat adiecta, tum amissa est. Graecia, Macedonia, Pontus, Asia vastata est per Gothos, Pannonia a Sarmatis Quadisque populata est, Germani usque ad Hispanias penetraverunt et civitatem nobilem Tarraconem expugnaverunt, Parthi Mesopotamia occupata Syriam sibi coeperant vindicare. (9.8.2)

Tum desperatis rebus et deleto paene imperio Romani Postumus in Gallia obscurissime natus purpuram sumpsit et per annos decem ita imperavit, ut consumptas paene provincias ingenti virtute et moderatione reparaverit. qui seditione militum interfectus est... (9.9.1)

Jerome belongs to the same tradition (loc.cit.):

Valerianus in Christianos persecutione commota statim a Sapore Persarum rege capitur ibique servitute miserabili consenescit... Gallieno in omnem lasciviam dissoluto Germani

Oros

Valerianus ilico, nefarii auctor edicti, a Sapore Persarum rege captus, imperator populi Romani ignominiosissima apud Persas servitute consenuit (7.22.4)

Igitur primus Genuus, qui purpuram imperii sumpserat, apud Myrsam occiditur. (7.22.10)

Germani Alpibus Raetia totaque Italia penetrata Ravennam usque perveniunt; Alamanni Gallias pervagantes etiam in Italian trans-eunt; Graecia Macedonia Pontus Asia Gothorum inundatione deletur; nam Dacia trans Danuvium in perpetuum aufertur; Quadi et Sarmatae Pannonias depopulantur; Germani ultiores abrasa potiuntur Hispania; Parthi Mesopotamiam auferunt Syriamque conradunt. (7.22.7)

Postumus in Gallia invasit tyrannidem, multo quidem rei-publicae commodo, nam per decem annos ingenti virtute ac moderatione usus et dominantes hostes expulit et perditas provincias in pristinam faciem reformavit; seditione tamen militum interfectus est (7.22. 10)

Ravennam usque venerunt. Alamanni vastatis Galliis in Italiam transiere. Graecia, Macedonia, Pontus, Asia depopulata per Gothos. Quadi et Sarmatae Pannonias occupaverunt. Germanis Hispanias optinentibus Tarracon expugnata est. Parthi Mesopotamian tenentes Syriam incursaverunt.

The account of Aurelius Victor is more elaborate, but may also be, at least in part, derivative from the same source. Victor relates the various invasions, for example, in much the same fashion:

...Thraciam Gothi libere pergressi Macedonas Achaeosque et Asiae finitima occuparent, Mesopotamiam Parthi, Orienti latrones seu mulier dominaretur, Alemannorum vis tunc aequae Italiam, Francorum gentes direpta Gallia Hispaniam possiderent vastato ac paene direpto Tarraconensium oppido, nactisque in tempore navigiis pars in usque Africam permearet; et amissa trans Istrum, quae Traianus quaesiverat. (33.3)

Eutropius, Orosius and Jerome, then, certainly represent a common source tradition; and for (at least) the events surrounding the accession of Valerian and Gallienus, Aurelius Victor probably belongs to the same tradition. Hence, we have in effect one literary tradition that claims Gallienus to have been named Caesar by the senate; we are dealing with Enmann's *Kaisergeschichte*.<sup>5</sup>

Moreover, we possess other literary sources that are not quite in accord with the EKG. The *Epit. de Caes.* 32.2-3 knows Gallienus only as Augustus.<sup>6</sup> Zosimus also says nothing of Gallienus having been named Caesar; only that when Valerian realized the omnipresent menaces to the Empire, he named Gallienus co-Emperor (1.29.2-30.1). And so far as Zonaras was concerned, the two came to the throne together (12.23). So, the evidence in support of the EKG's version will have to be rather strong.

Several milestones from Numidia attest Gallienus as Caesar, and these served Pflaum in his vindication of the account provided by the Latin epitomators:

CIL VIII 10132, P(ublio) Licinio Gal(lieno) nobili/ssimo Caes(ari) / Aug(usto).

CIL VIII 10141 = 22215, Imp(eratori) Caes(ari) / P(ublio) Licinio / Valeriano p(ri)ncipali Aug(usto) et / P(ublio) Licinio G(allieno) (sic) / nobiliss(imo) Caes(ari).

CIL VIII 22517, DD NN Imp(erator) P(ublio) Licinio Valeriano Aug(usto) et P(ublio) Licinio G(allieno) (sic) Caes(ari) Aug(usto) m(illia) p(assum) / [---].

AE (1967) 584, P(ublio) Licinio / Gallieno / nobiliss(imo) Caes(ari) / Aug(usto).

<sup>5</sup> It would seem now impossible to deny the existence and importance (as a common source of the Latin epitomators) of the EKG. See (e.g.): J.Schlumberger, *Die Epitome de Caesaribus. Untersuchungen zur heidnischen Geschichtsschreibung des 4. Jahrhunderts n.Chr.*, Munich 1974,9ff.; T.D.Barnes, *The Sources of the Historia Augusta*, Brussels 1978,90-4; H.W.Bird, *Sextus Aurelius Victor. A Historiographical Study*, Liverpool 1984,16-23.

<sup>6</sup> Schlumberger, *Die Epitome de Caesaribus*, 146-147 assumes here conscious correction of the EKG tradition by the author of the *Epit. de Caes.*

As Pflaum argued, these stones all certainly show Gallienus as Caesar.<sup>7</sup> However, it is possible that they represent, in this regard, the opinion of only a few people. With the exception of 22517, the inscriptions were found in the vicinity of Oum ei Bouaghi (on the road from Cirta to Theveste). It is also worth noting that these three lack a mileage indication, which might point to their having been produced under the direction of one person. The fourth stone was not distant, having stood originally 15 miles from Lambasa on the road to Ngaus. Its style is rather different from that of the others, and this stone seems just as likely to have been commissioned by a different official. Nonetheless, we are very possibly dealing with roughly the same phenomenon as in the case of the Latin epitomators. That is to say, we have the notion of one person (or here possibly a few people) regarding the proper titulature of Gallienus represented by a several witnesses. Nor should the notorious disregard of milestones generally for proper imperial titulature go unnoticed.<sup>8</sup> There is another stone from Numidia that should not go here unmentioned (CIL VIII 2482 = 17976 = ILS 531). Several soldiers of the legio III Augusta make a dedication to Victoria on behalf of Valerian and Gallienus, who are called co-Augusti; and this on 22 October 253. Clearly all of Numidia did not know Gallienus as Caesar in the Fall of 253.

Gallienus also appears as Caesar on a few coins from Asia Minor. But here as well, one is chary to accept such testimony.<sup>9</sup> Something more substantial is desired. Nothing is forthcoming.

The coins from the mints at Rome, Alexandria and Antioch do not know Gallienus as Caesar. And the first Egyptian document clearly to attest him, introduces him as co-Augustus along with his father.<sup>10</sup> Nor are the laws of any great help, nor does any other document (thus far) from anywhere else in the Empire show him as Caesar. One papyrus, however, has been brought to bear on the problem.

P.Köln IV 196 is a landlord's "Kontrollbuch", covering the period from 245/46 through June/July 257. In one instance that is certain (line 4), the papyrus mentions Phaophi (September/October) in year one of Valerian alone. This has been thought also to support a brief period when Gallienus was Caesar.<sup>11</sup> However, the papyrus is consistent in not mentioning Gallienus, even in the later years of the reign when we know him to have been co-Augustus of Valerian.<sup>12</sup> Moreover, although the exact method of composition of the document is not perfectly clear, it does seem certain that the dates given were copied from the

---

<sup>7</sup> It had previously been believed that the presence of the title Augustus meant that Gallienus was co-Emperor with his father. See Pflaum, art.cit.

<sup>8</sup> See (e.g.): E.Weber, JOEAI 49,1968-71,121; G.Walser, ZPE 43,1981,391.

<sup>9</sup> The coins are: SNGAu1 3055-6 (Mysa), 3298-9 and 8289 (Tralleis).

<sup>10</sup> P.Oxy. IX 1187.25-9, 20 June 254.

<sup>11</sup> P.J.Sijpesteijn, ZPE 54,1984,76-7 argues that the lack of Gallienus here demonstrates that he was not yet known in Egypt as co-ruler. Schillinger-Häfele, Consules Augusti Caesares, 80 n.1. uses Sijpesteijn's arguments to support the notion that Gallienus was Caesar from September through 9 December 253.

<sup>12</sup> See lines 16, 23, 32.

original contracts.<sup>13</sup> The person who drew up this "Kontrollbuch" was simply not interested to give exactly the original dating formulas. Rather, to say that such-and-such a room was rented in year so-and-so of Valerian was enough for his purposes. This document tells us nothing as regards the regal statuses of Valerian and Gallienus.<sup>14</sup>

For Gallienus as Caesar then, we have the author of the KG, someone (or possibly several people) in Numidia and a few coins from Asia Minor. On the other side, a few literary sources (the *Epit. de Caes.*, Zosimus, Zonaras) know Gallienus only as Augustus, and some soldiers in Numidia have him as Augustus very early in the reign. Hence, the sources that offer something like explicit testimony are: a) individually of questionable value, and b) contradictory. Otherwise, silence pervades. Is the silence in any way compelling?

One wants, of course, a likely date for Gallienus' promotion from Caesar (assuming him to have held this position) to Augustus, and the renewal of tribunician power on 10 December 253 has been put forward.<sup>15</sup> However, David Armstrong has argued recently that the tribunician power of both Valerian and Gallienus was calculated from the death of Trebonianus Gallus.<sup>16</sup> If he is right, then a date of 10 December for Gallienus' promotion should be abandoned. Armstrong's interpretation might indicate that Gallienus was associated initially as Augustus and was never officially recognized as Caesar, even if the senate's first impulse was to proclaim him such. It would also seem that the silence of the coinage at Rome, at least, does carry some weight. For example, it now looks as though Trebonianus Gallus initially associated himself with Trajan Decius' son Hostilian, and only later took his own son as Caesar.<sup>17</sup> Gallus came to the purple in about early June of 251, and it is almost certain that Volusian was Augustus before 29 August of the same summer.<sup>18</sup> If this is correct, then Volusian can have been Caesar for only a very brief time. Nonetheless, the mint at Rome produced coins of him as Caesar.<sup>19</sup> Hence, if Gallienus was Caesar from (say) September through December of 253, or even briefly in September and October, it would seem odd that the mint at Rome should not have reacted.

The situation is simply unclear. What evidence we have showing Gallienus as Caesar is not good. Documentation of an immediate rise to Augustus is, however, equally poor. For the sake of the argument, let us assume that the EKG author has not made a mistake. It may well be that the senate's initial reaction to the report of a new emperor was to proclaim the son Caesar. But such hasty action might just as well have been followed by cautious delay, waiting to see what the new ruler himself desired; or a second messenger might have come

---

<sup>13</sup> See the comments of the original editors, P.Köln IV, 200-201.

<sup>14</sup> P.Köln IV, 204. Also D.W.Rathbone, *WE* 62,1986,117 n. 1.

<sup>15</sup> Wickert, *RE* XIII.1, 352; Schillinger-Häfele, *Consules Augusti Caesares*, 80 n.1. Sijpesteijn, *ZPE* 54,1984,76 mentions this date, but with hesitation.

<sup>16</sup> D.Armstrong, *ZPE* 67,1987,215-23.

<sup>17</sup> J.R.Rea, *P.Oxy.* LI, 1984,19-21.

<sup>18</sup> Rea, *loc.cit.*

<sup>19</sup> *RIC* IV.3, nos. 129-137, 240-3.

before the initial decision could be announced in stone or metal. When word arrived, the son was to be called Augustus. I should like to suggest (tentatively) that Gallienus was never *officially* Caesar, only Augustus. News of the senate's initial reaction may have leaked out, thus inspiring the Numidian milestones, or the coins in Asia Minor. But those who called Gallienus Caesar probably did so erroneously.

Heidelberg/New York

Michael Peachin