Joseph C. Miller Memorial Lecture Series

9

eds. Abdelkader Al Ghouz, Jeannine Bischoff, Sarah Dusend

Andrea Binsfeld

Dominus and *Tyrannos*? Narratives of Slavery in the Political Discourse of Late Antiquity

EBVERLAG

Dominus and *Tyrannos*? Narratives of Slavery in the Political Discourse of Late Antiquity

Joseph C. Miller Memorial Lecture Series

eds. Abdelkader Al Ghouz, Jeannine Bischoff, Sarah Dusend

Volume 9

UNIVERSITÄT BONN

BONN CENTER
FOR DEPENDENCY
AND SLAVERY
STUDIES

Andrea Binsfeld

Dominus and *Tyrannos*? Narratives of Slavery in the Political Discourse of Late Antiquity

ebv BERLIN

EBVERLAG

Bibliographic information published by
the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at http://dnb.d-nb.de

Gefördert durch die Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) im Rahmen der Exzellenzstrategie des Bundes und der Länder – Exzellenzcluster Bonn Center for Dependency and Slavery Studies (BCDSS) EXC 2036/1-2020, Projektnummer: 390683433

Funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany's Excellence Strategy – Cluster of Excellence Bonn Center for Dependency and Slavery Studies (BCDSS) EXC 2036/1-2020, Project No.: 390683433

This book is available for free download in the Open Access section of the publishers' website. (https://doi.org/10.53179/9783868934021).

A print version is available for a fee from the publisher.
The page numbers in the print and in the online version are identical.

© EB-Verlag Dr. Brandt
Berlin, 2021

Coverdesign: © Rainer Kuhl, Berlin

ISBN 978-3-86893-384-0 (Print)
ISBN 978-3-86893-402-1 (Open Access)
DOI 10.53179/9783868934021

Dominus and *Tyrannos*? Narratives of Slavery in the Political Discourse of Late Antiquity

1. Introduction

Which impact has the world of slavery on ancient texts, especially on their narratives? This question has been widely discussed for fictional texts - as for example the ancient novels. Here, we find all kinds of slavery and slave characters. Slaves are not only an integral part of the novels, slavery is also the driving force behind the narration: The enslavement of the protagonists and descriptions of the hardships of slavery are used to visualize and to dramatize the social descent and the later liberation of the principal characters.[1] In this article however I will not write about fictional texts, but about the perception and representation of Roman emperors of the late antiquity. The basis for my analysis are definitely non-fictional texts, but also these authors do not simply document facts, but, as I will show, follow narrative strategies in their historical descriptions.

My objective is not to analyze the structure of a narrative, that means the sequence of events. I have chosen excerpts, small stories from historical narrations, that use slavery – or rather terms or practices of slavery – as a figure.[2] But as a figure for what?

In her book *Arbitrary Rule. Slavery, Tyranny, and the Power of Life and Death* Mary Nyquist analyses the interplay of slavery and freedom, of political freedom and oppression, of political rule and failure. She distinguishes narratives of "figurative, political slavery" from the institution of

1 For this aspect see for example Andrea Binsfeld, "Lebens 'wirklichkeiten' von Sklaven – Überlegungen zum Verhältnis von Gender, Macht und Status," in *Sklaverei und Identitäten,* ed. Andrea Binsfeld and Marcello Ghetta (Hildesheim: Olms, 2021), 36–41; see also *Slaves and Masters in the Ancient Novel*, ed. Stelios Panayotakis and Michael Paschalis (Groningen: Barkuis & Groningen University Library, 2019).

2 For the definition, I refer to Dietrich Weber, *Erzählliteratur. Schriftwerk – Kunstwerk – Erzählwerk* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 17–22. Weber describes this kind of narration as "miniature" and as "Porträterzählung."

slavery. She is wondering, why "radical Western European pamphleteers and theorists [do] represent their opposition to the existing monarchical regime […] as a form of slavery" [3] and why "ancient Greco-Roman literature associates political slavery with degradation and violence."[4] Therefore, Nyquist analyses how "slavery" had been used as a figure for political oppression since ancient times and how terms from the field of slavery were used by opposition groups to identify the tyrant. She also reveals the persistence of this concept and traces back its use in political philosophy and in literature from Greek and Roman antiquity to the early modern period.[5] Very instructive in this respect is the reference to Aristotle's *Politics*. In book 1, Aristotle is analysing the different kinds of power relations in the household and the city-state, the *polis*. He distinguishes the rule of the master over the slaves, the *despotike arche*, from the political rule, the *politike arche*. Whereas the *despotike arche* shall be limited to the household, the statesman shall govern free and equal people.[6] It is characteristic for the tyrant not to respect the boundaries between household and polis and to rule as a master over the state. Thus, Nyquist argues, political slavery became a motif relating to despotism.

In the following, I will shed light on Nyquist's idea of political slavery and analyse how metaphors, terms, and practices from the world of slavery are used to criticize an emperor's behavior, to illustrate his loss of authority or to characterize the relationship between two emperors. I will focus on the rule of late antique Roman emperors and especially the emperors of the tetrarchy at the end of the third century AD and the beginning of the fourth century. I have chosen this special time, because it is a time of multiple changes and challenges. Domination, tyranny, slavery – these three terms define the outline of the following paper.

The story that puzzled me so much that I decided to investigate further was an excerpt from a compendium of Roman history. The author is

3 Mary Nyquist, *Arbitrary Rule. Slavery, Tyranny, and the Power of Life and Death* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013), 1.

4 Mary Nyquist, *Arbitrary Rule. Slavery, Tyranny, and the Power of Life and Death* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013), 20.

5 Nyquist, *Arbitrary Rule. Slavery, Tyranny, and the Power of Life and Death* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013), 20–56.

6 Aristot. Pol. 1253b 1–20, 1255b 15–24.

Eutrop, a Roman historian of the late fourth century AD.[7] This excerpt brings us in the year 296 AD. The background is the conflict between the Persian king Narses and the Roman emperor Galerius.[8] In Carrhae, a town in nowadays Turkey, Galerius is defeated and takes flight to his co-emperor Diocletian. Instead of support, Galerius is facing another humiliation:

> "Galerius Maximianus at first suffered a defeat against Narses when he engaged him between Callinicum and Carrhae, although he had fought rashly rather than without spirit, for he joined battle with a very small force against an extremely numerous enemy. He was defeated, therefore, and set out to join Diocletian. When he met him on the road it is reported that he was received with such great insolence that he is said to have run beside Diocletian's chariot for several miles, clad in his purple robe."[9]

After having recollected his forces, Galerius fought a second time with Narses and this time with success: He puts Narses to flight, he captures his wives, sisters, and children, as well as a vast number of the Persian nobility and returns in triumph to Diocletian. This time Diocletian welcomes him with great honour. This episode has been adopted several times by other ancient authors, such as the historian Ammianus Marcellinus.[10]

---

7 I discussed this excerpt, especially the metaphors of slavery and the implications for the judgement on Diocletian's rule, in a colloquium in honour of Alexander Demandt "Das Zeitalter Diokletians und Konstantins. Bilanz und Perspektiven der Forschung. Late Antiquity revisited – the time of Diocletian and Constantine," held in Mainz from 27 to 28 October 2017. The title of the article is "Tyrannentopik und Sklavennarrativ zur Zeit Diokletians und Konstantins." The conference proceedings are in print.

8 Wolfgang Kuhoff, *Diokletian und die Epoche der Tetrarchie. Das römische Reich zwischen Krisenbewältigung und Neuaufbau (284–313 n. Chr.)* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2001), 168–172.

9 Eutr. 9,24: *tanta insolentia a Diocletiano fertur exceptus, ut per aliquot passuum milia purpuratus tradatur ad vehiculum cucurrisse*. Eutrop, *The Breviarium ab Urbe Condita of Eutropius*, trans. H. W. Bird (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2011).

10 Amm. 14,11,10; further examples: Hier. chron. olymp. CCLXX: *Galerius Maximianus victus a Narseo ante carpentum Diocletiani purpuratus cucurrit*; Fest. 25: *Sub Diocletiano principe pompa victoriae nota de Persis est. Maximianus Caesar prima congressione, cum contra innumeram multitudinem cum paucis acriter dimicasset, pulsus recessit ac tanta a Diocletiano indignatione susceptus est, ut ante carpentum eius per aliquot milia passuum*

Ammianus cites the story in a different context and at a later phase of the fourth century – main actors are the successors of emperor Constantine. He describes the episode as a not so old example to illustrate the subordinate position of the Caesars in relation to the higher-ranking emperors, the Augusti. According to Ammianus, emperor Constantius II asks his Caesar Gallus for support against the raids of Germanic tribes. Given his efforts for the unity and security of the empire, he reminds Gallus of the role of the Caesars in the first tetrarchy at the time of Diocletian. These had served the Augusti as *apparitores*, as official servants:

> "To this he added an example of not so very great antiquity, that Diocletian and his colleague [Maximianus] were obeyed by their Caesars as by attendants, who did not remain in one place but hastened about hither and thither, and that in Syria Galerius, clad in purple, walked for nearly a mile before the chariot of his Augustus when the latter was angry with him."[11]

Galerius between humiliation and triumph – this contrast has led researchers to the question, whether Galerius humiliation really took place or whether it could be a later invention or a misinterpretation of an imperial ceremony. In my opinion the more significant question is not whether this episode could have taken place but how the authors used this narrative and what they wanted to express with it. In this respect, is interesting that

a) Ammianus uses a term from the world of dependency, when he designates the subordinate emperors as *apparitores*.

---

cucurrerit purpuratus; Oros. Hist. 7,25,9: *ut per aliquot milia passuum purpuratus ante vehiculum eius cucurrisse referatur*; Theophan. chronogr. A.M. 5793 a. 293; Iord. Rom. 301: *Galerius Maximianus victus primo proelio a Narseo ante carpentum Dioclitiani purpuratus cucurrit.*

11 Amm. 14,11,10: *Quibus subserebat non adeo vetus exemplum, quod Diocletiano et eius collegae ut apparitores Caesares non resides, sed ultro citroque discurrentes obtemperabant et in Syria Augusti vehiculum irascentis per spatium mille passuum fere pedes antegressus est Galerius purpuratus.* Ammianus Marcellinus, *Ammianus Marcellinus*, trans. John C. Rolfe (London: Heinemann, 1963).

b) this story is indeed an example – it is a narrative element that does not only appear in late antiquity but also in much earlier texts.

With these two citations, I have moved deeply into the history of the fourth century AD. Before I go further into detail, I will recall shortly the historical context and above all the system of government, the tetrarchy: The tetrarchy developed in the late third century AD from the so-called crisis of the third century or the time of the soldier emperors. This period was marked by a multitude of problems with which the imperial central authority was confronted: increasing pressure on the borders of the Roman Empire, frequent changes of rulers and a large number of usurpations. The senate lost its importance, the emperors originated less and less from the senatorial order, but were often generals made emperors by their soldiers. Added to this were increasing tax pressures, currency decline, and inflation.

With emperor Diocletian the situation was consolidated. Diocletian was proclaimed Augustus on 20 November 284 in Nicomedia. Diocles, as was his original name, probably came from Dalmatia, from a humble background (son of a freedman?, himself freed man?),[12] he had been promoted to military service, then accepted into the knighthood before becoming emperor. Thus, he was a typical example of a soldier emperor.

With his name the political, administrative, military, and economic reorganization of the Roman Empire is associated. Due to the pressure on the borders of the empire as well as to internal uprisings (*bagaudae*) Diocletian appointed another ruler in the year 285. He gave military commands to friends and colleagues he trusted and appointed Maximian Caesar co-emperor in the west of the Roman Empire. Later – because of usurpations and constant invasions in the Rhine and Danube regions (Alemanni, Goths, Sarmatians, Saracens) – Diocletian appointed two

[12] Eutr. 9,19,2: *Dalmatia oriundum, virum obscurissime natum, adeo ut a plerisque scribae filius, a nonnullis Anullini senatoris libertinus fuisse credatur*; see Wolfgang Kuhoff, *Diokletian und die Epoche der Tetrarchie. Das römische Reich zwischen Krisenbewältigung und Neuaufbau (284–313)* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2001), 20–21.

more co-rulers: Constantius Chlorus, the father of Constantine the Great, and Galerius.[13]

2. A narration of domination, tyranny, and slavery

2.1 Loss of authority

After this historical excursus I come back to the episode described by Eutropius: The humiliation of Galerius by Diocletian. As mentioned above, some scholars were of the opinion that authors like Ammianus Marcellinus and Eutropius misunderstood the episode. According to them, the little story would have been evolved as follows: They propose that originally it would have been a description of an imperial ceremony.[14] William Seston for example is of the opinion that in times of the reign of four emperors, the protocol of the imperial court would have stipulated that the subordinate Caesar should not sit in the car next to Augustus, but accompany him on foot. This obvious subordination would have encouraged authors as Ammianus Marcellinus to compare it with the magistrate-servant relationship.[15] Later authors would have reinterpreted this ceremony as a humiliation of Galerius, possibly to disparage Galerius. However, the texts as well as the archaeological material show that it is rather unusual for a Caesar to accompany the Augustus on foot.[16] Again, I refer to an excerpt from Ammianus Marcel-

---

13 For a general overview see for example Wolfgang Kuhoff, *Diokletian und die Epoche der Tetrarchie. Das römische Reich zwischen Krisenbewältigung und Neuaufbau (284–313)* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2001) or Alexander Demandt, *Die Spätantike* (München: Beck, 2007).

14 William Seston, "L'humiliation' de Galère," *Revue des études anciennes* 42 (1940): 515–519. John William Eadie, *The Breviarium of Festus. A Critical Edition with Historical Commentary* (London: Athlone Press, 1967), 147–148 also argues for a misinterpretation.

15 Amm. 20,8,6: *apparitor fidus*.

16 See Helmut Castritius, "Zum höfischen Protokoll der Tetrarchie. Introitus (Adventus) Augusti et Caesaris," *Chiron* 1 (1971): 365–376. Castritius shows that there is no evidence – neither in literature nor in Roman representational art – that the Caesar accompanied the Augustus on foot. This is also confirmed by the examples of the *adventus* or the *profectio* of the emperor Tonio Hölscher is providing in his study on *Victoria Romana: archäologische Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Wesensart der römischen Siegesgöttin von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des 3. Jhs. n. Chr.* (Mainz: von Zabern, 1967), 48–59. Castritius considers the humiliation of Galerius to be historical. For fur-

linus. Ammianus Marcellinus describes the proclamation of Valens by his brother, emperor Valentinian, as follows:

> "Then, on his arrival in Constantinople […] on the twenty-eighth of March he brought the aforesaid Valens into one of the suburbs and with the consent of all [for no one ventured to oppose] proclaimed him Augustus. Then he adorned him with the imperial insignia, put a diadem on his head, and brought him back in his own carriage, thus having indeed a lawful partner in his power, but, as the further course of our narrative will show, one who was as compliant as a subordinate."[17]

In the version of Ammianus, Valentinian proclaims his brother Valens Augustus, but at the same time expresses the subordination of his brother and co-regent Valens by calling him an *apparitor*: he brings him back in his carriage – Valens does not have to accompany his brother on foot. In comparison with this description, the episode passed on by Eutropius is rather an inversion of the ceremony of the proclamation of an emperor.

Textual as well as material sources illustrate on the one hand the fine gradation between the emperors, but on the other hand also the *concordia*, the harmony, between the four rulers. Most famous is the porphyry group of the four Roman emperors that is now in Venice dating from around 300 AD (fig.). The identification of the individual emperors is a much discussed topic. But it becomes quite clear that the group is a symbol for the harmony and unity of the four emperors: The tetrarchs look almost the same, without any individualized characteristics. The emperors are united is a gesture of embrace. The overall effect is that of

---

ther evidence see Wolfgang Kuhoff, *Diokletian und die Epoche der Tetrarchie. Das römische Reich zwischen Krisenbewältigung und Neuaufbau (284–313)* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2001), 172 n. 471 and Heinrich Schlange-Schöningen, "Felix Augustus oder autokrator deileios: Zur Rezeption Diokletians in der konstantinischen Dynastie," in *Diokletian und die Tetrarchie*, ed. Alexander Demandt, Andreas Goltz, and Heinrich Schlange-Schöningen (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004), 178, Anm. 39.

17 Amm. 26,4,3: … *in eodem vehiculo secum reduxit participem quidem legitimum potestatis, sed in modum apparitoris morigerum*… (trans. John C. Rolfe).

Fig.: Porphyry sculpture group probably representing the first Tetrarchy, now St Mark's Basilica in Venice

unity and stability. There is a hierarchy, but this hierarchy is expressed in a subtle way.[18]

[18] Frank Kolb, *Herrscherideologie in der Spätantike* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2001), 32–34, 146–153; Hans Peter L'Orange, *Das spätantike Herrscherbild von Diokletian bis zu den Konstantin-Söhnen: 284 – 361 n. Chr.* (Berlin: Mann, 1984), 3–10; Wolfgang Kuhoff, *Diokletian und die Epoche der Tetrarchie. Das römische Reich zwischen Krisenbewältigung und Neuaufbau (284–313)* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2001), 577–586. The relationship between Diocletian and Maximian is illustrated by an panegyric of the year 289, presumably held in Trier. Paneg. Lat. 10(2),9,3–5: "Both of you are now most bountiful, both most brave, and because of this very similarity in your characters the harmony between you is ever increasing, and you are brothers in virtue, which is a surer tie than any tie of blood. And so it happens that such a great empire is shared between you without any rivalry […]" (C. E. V. Nixon and Barbara Saylor Rodgers,

In this context, it is interesting that when Ammianus uses the term *apparitores* to designate the Caesares, he refers to a term that leads us to the world of dependency. The *apparitores* were servants of the Roman higher and lower officials, who helped them to carry out their administrative tasks. These were freeborn persons or freedmen who saw the opportunity for social advancement in this position.[19] In my opinion, one could also go a step further and interpret the description of how Galerius must run next to Diocletian's carriage as an allusion to the relationship between master and slave: Galerius runs alongside the carriage like a *pedisequus*, an accompanying slave, or in front of the chariot like a *praecursor*.[20] Such a scene is shown, for example, by a grave relief from Athens, which is now in the British Museum: Here the *pedisequus* runs after his master riding a horse and holds on to the animal's tail.[21] It is also significant that the allusion to slavery is used after the defeat of Galerius, since victory is an essential part of the imperial ideology. It is expressed in the representation of prisoners of war, in the power over slaves or in the representation of a triumph.[22] A fine example is a

In Praise of Later Roman Emperors. The Panegyrici Latini. Introduction, Translation, and Historical Commentary with the Latin Text of R.A.B. Mynors (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994)). See also Paneg. Lat 10(2),11,1–4.

19 Theodor Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht*, vol. 1 (Basel: Schwabe, [1887] 1963), 332–346; Nicholas Purcell, "The Apparitores: A Study in Social Mobility," *PBSR* 51 (1983): 125–173.

20 Josef Fischer, Stefan Knoch, and Agnes Thomas, "Begleitsklaven," in *Handwörterbuch der antiken Sklaverei (HAS)*, vol. 1, ed. Heinz Heinen (Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag, 2017), 350–357.

21 London, British Museum 1816,0610.384; figure: https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/G_1816-0610-384; Christoph W. Clairmont, *Classical Attic Tombstones I-IV* (Kilchberg: Akanthus, Verlag für Archäologie, 1993–1995), Kat. 2.209a; see also Agnes Thomas, "Begleitsklaven. III. Archäologie," in *Handwörterbuch der antiken Sklaverei (HAS)*, vol.1, ed. Heinz Heinen (Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag, 2017), 355.

22 See Henner von Hesberg, "Die Wiedergabe von Kriegsgefangenen und Sklaven in der römischen Bildkunst," in *Antike Sklaverei: Rückblick und Ausblick. Neue Beiträge zur Forschungsgeschichte und zur Erschließung der archäologischen Zeugnisse*, ed. Heinz Heinen (Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag, 2010), 183–188 and Michele George, "Archaeology and Roman Slavery: Problems and Potential," in *Antike Sklaverei: Rückblick und Ausblick. Neue Beiträge zur Forschungsgeschichte und zur Erschließung der archäologischen Zeugnisse,* ed. Heinz Heinen (Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag, 2010), 151–154; Hervé Huntzinger, "L'iconographie des captifs dans l'Antiquité tardive," in *Ubi servi erant? Die Ikonographie von Sklaven und Freigelassenen in der römischen Kunst*, ed. Andrea Binsfeld and Marcello Ghetta (Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag, 2019), 53–69.

mould from Olbia in Sardinia, which shows the joint triumph of Diocletian and Maximian. The emperors are sitting in a carriage drawn by four elephants surrounded by soldiers and senators. Wagons with prisoners of war are depicted below the imperial Quadriga.[23] The victoriousness of an Emperor is essential for the establishment as well as for the preservation of his rule. Conversely, a defeat indicates a loss of authority, which can be visualized through images that are known from everyday slave life. In our case, the defeated emperor is downgraded to an escort slave. This image is the opposite of the ideology of power, as can be found, for example, on the mould from Olbia or on the Arch of Galerius in Thessaloniki, which celebrates the victory over the Persians.[24]

The question is whether slavery narratives are used in this context only to underline the defeat and the loss of authority of Galerius, or more generally to draw a negative image of the tetrarchy. The later interpretation could be supported by a parallel to the episode of Galerius' humiliation. We find this narrative also in another emperor's biography – Suetonius' biography of the emperor Caligula. He passes on the following episode:

---

23 Matthias Haake, "Zwischen Severus Alexanders Triumph über die Sāsāniden im Jahre 233 und den Triumphfeierlichkeiten Diokletians und Maximians im Jahre 303. Zum römischen Triumph im 3. Jahrhundert n. Chr," in *Zum römischen Triumph in Prinzipat und Spätantike*, ed. Fabian Goldbeck and Johannes Wienand (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2016), 376–382 (DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110448009-015, 2.12.2020); Maria Letizia Gualandi, "Un trionfo per due. La matrice di Olbia: un unicum iconografico 'fuori contesto'," in *«Conosco un ottimo storico dell'arte ...» Per Enrico Castelnuovo – Scritti di allievi e amici pisani*, ed. Maria Monica Donato and Massimo Ferretti (Pisa: Edizioni ETS, 2012), 11–20. (https://www.academia.edu/6329983/Un_trionfo_per_due_La_matrice_di_Olbia_un_unicum_iconografico_fuori_contesto_). I would like to thank Christian Rollinger for drawing my attention to this exceptional object.

24 Frank Kolb, *Herrscherideologie in der Spätantike* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2001), 158–162; Michael McCormick, *Eternal Victory. Triumphal rulership in late antiquity, Byzantium, and the Early Medieval West* (Cambridge et. al.: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 1–46. McCormick studies the connection between the Roman emperor's authority, his military successes, and the visualisation of both by parades and triumphes. He also draws the attention to the humiliation of opponents and usurpers by so called „parades of infamy"; Hans Peter Laubscher, *Der Reliefschmuck des Galeriusbogens in Thessaloniki* (Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 1975); Wulf Raeck,"Tu fortiter, ille sapienter. Augusti und Caesares im Reliefschmuck des Galeriusbogens von Thessaloniki," in *Beiträge zur Ikonographie und Hermeneutik. Festschrift für Nikolaus Himmelmann*, ed. Hans-Ulrich Cain et al. (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1989), 453–457.

> "He was no whit more respectful or mild towards the senate, allowing some who had held the highest offices to run in their togas for several miles beside his chariot and to wait on him at table in short linen tunics either at the head of his couch, or at his feet."[25]

Part of the negative stigmatisation of emperor Caligula is his behaviour towards the senate – he degrades high ranking officials by treating them as slaves. As typical slave activities, Suetonius chooses the escorting slaves, the *praecursores* or the *pedisequi*, and the slaves attending during meals. According to Suetonius, the senators not only waited on Caligula like slaves, but also wore the short linen tunics typical for slaves (*succinctos lintea*).[26] The criticism of Caligula is based on a senatorial historiography that stigmatizes the behavior of the emperor as a violation of laws and customs when he is publicly dishonoring members of the aristocracy. On the other hand, the story not only describes Caligula's attitude towards the aristocracy, it can also be understood as an act of the senators opportunism and submissiveness.[27] As submissive can also be interpreted the behaviour of another – future – emperor: So Suetonius

---

25 Suet. Cal. 26 (*Suetonius*, trans. J. C. Rolfe (London: Heinemann, 1970)). Rolfe translates the passage *succinctos lintea* with "napkin in hand." He annotates his translation as follows: "Or perhaps, in short linen tunics." Following Konrad Vössing's analysis, I choose Rolfe's alternative translation: cf. Konrad Vössing, "Suet. Cal. 26,2: Senatorische Sklavendienste am kaiserlichen Speisesofa - Senators Serving as Slaves at the Imperial Banquets," *The Annals of University of Galati (History)* 1 (2002): 25–38.

26 Konrad Vössing, "Suet. Cal. 26,2: Senatorische Sklavendienste am kaiserlichen Speisesofa - Senators Serving as Slaves at the Imperial Banquets," *The Annals of University of Galati (History)* 1 (2002): 26–27. Vössing also distinguishes the different functions the slaves performed *ad pedes* or *ad pluteum* of the emperor's lounge. They acted like slaves who were owned by the guest and had to be at their master's beck and call or as slaves of the host who acted as cupbearers: Konrad Vössing, "Suet. Cal. 26,2: Senatorische Sklavendienste am kaiserlichen Speisesofa - Senators Serving as Slaves at the Imperial Banquets," *The Annals of University of Galati (History)* 1 (2002): 27–38. See also Patrick Reinard, "*In convivio puer est*. Die Darstellung von *ministri* in der literarischen Überlieferung und den Mahlszenen der Germania Inferior, Germania Superior und Gallia Belgica. Ein Vergleich," in *Ubi servi erant? Die Ikonographie von Sklaven und Freigelassenen in der römischen Kunst*, ed. Andrea Binsfeld and Marcello Ghetta (Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag, 2019), 195–232.

27 Aloys Winterling, *Caligula. Eine Biographie* (München: Beck, 2012), 127–139. Winterling describes the submission and the dishonouring of the Roman aristocracy by Caligula as the emperor's reaction on various senatorial conspiracies.

describes how Galba is running at the side of the emperor Caligula's chariot for twenty miles.[28] On the other hand, Claudian, a poet of the late fourth century, praises the *civilitas* of the emperor Honorius and criticizes Honorius' predecessors as tyrants (*domini*) because Honorius – unlike his predecessors – forbade the senators of Rome to march before his chariot during the festivities on the occasion of his consulship in the year 404.[29] And emperor Julian even changes places with the consuls when he is mixing with the crowd whereas he urges the consuls to take place in the litters.[30] All these examples illustrate what implication it had for a narration when a person is described as sitting, standing, kneeling, running or driving a chariot.[31]

By comparing the various excerpts, the episode of Galerius' treatment by Diocletian shows a crucial difference. In Diocletian's case, the aggression is not directed against the Senate, but against the co-emperor Galerius. The act means a gesture of authority, of degradation and subordination. Galerius running besides Diocletian's chariot is rather a caricature of an emperor's triumph; it resembles more a parade of infamy, as Michael McCormick is describing it with reference to usurpers and the emperor's opponents.[32]

---

28 Suet. Gal. 6,3: *etiam ad essedum imperatoris per uiginti passuum milia cucurrit.*

29 Claudianus, *Panegyricus de sexto consulatu Honorii Augusti 548–559,* vol. 2, trans. Maurice Platnauer, (London: William Heinemann Ltd, 1963), pp.: "Those who are young rejoice in an emperor of their own age, the old cease to belaud the past and count their destiny happy that they have lived to see such a day, blessing the kindly times when a prince so easy of access, so singular in courtesy, forbade the senators of Rome to march before his chariot. […] Bent age and upstanding youth alike are loud in his praises and, comparing the new with the ancient rule, recognize in Honorius a true citizen, in his predecessors tyrants (*hunc civem, dominos venisse priores*)."

30 Paneg. Lat. 3(11),30,1–3. This act however is criticised by some people as "affected and cheap": Ammian 22,7,1: "And so the first of January came, when the consular annals took on the names of Mamertinus and Nevitta; and the emperor showed himself especially condescending by going on foot to their inauguration in company with other high officials, an action which some commended but others criticised as affected and cheap (*quod laudabant alii quidam ut affectatum et vile carpebant*)." (*Ammianus Marcellinus*, trans. John C. Rolfe (London: Heinemann, 1963)).

31 Andreas Alföldi, *Die morachische Representation im römischen Kaiserreiche* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1970), 38–65.

32 Michael McCormick, *Eternal Victory. Triumphal rulership in late antiquity, Byzantium, and the Early Medieval West* (Cambridge et. al.: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 1–46.

2.2 Critique on the emperor: Diocletian a tyrant?

Emperor Caligula treats the senators in the same way as a master the servants of his household. By transgressing the boundary between his household and the political sphere, Caligula is acting in the way of a despot. As such, political slavery is used as a figure to characterize emperor Caligula's rule.[33] This leads me to the question, whether the story about Galerius' humiliation is clad in the robe of slavery in order to present Diocletian as a tyrant? Is it also a case of figurative, political slavery?

In order not to over-interpret the allusions to slavery, I will extend my analysis and put the little episode in a broader context of Eutropius' narration on Diocletian. Already at the beginning of his description of Diocletian's rule Eutropius stresses the emperor's low social origins: According to him, Diocletian was the son of a scribe or a freedman.[34] Then, Diocletian personally stabs the murderer of his predecessor Numerian[35] and distresses all Egypt with severe proscriptions and massacres. But on the other hand, he is said to have ruled with foresight and "made many judicious arrangements and regulations which remain to our own times".[36] An ambivalent, but also balanced characterization of Diocletian gives the following excerpt:

"Diocletian had a cunning disposition, as well as a sharp, subtle mind, and was the kind of man who was ready to transfer the odium for his own acts of severity (*severitam suam*) onto others (*aliena invidia*). Nonetheless he was a very industrious and capable emperor and the one who was the first to introduce in the Roman empire a practice more in keeping with royal usage than with Roman liberty, since he gave orders that he should be revered with prostration, although before him all (emperors) were simply greeted (*imperio Romano primus regiae consuetudinis formam magis quam Romanae libertatis invexerit adorarique se*

---

33 For the characterisation of Caligula and Domitian as tyrants see Ruurd R. Nauta, "Mali principes. Domitian, Nero und die Geschichte eines Begriffs," in *Nero und Domitian. Mediale Diskurse der Herrscherrepräsentation im Vergleich*, ed. Sophia Bönisch-Meyer, Lisa Cordes, Verena Schulz, A. Wolsfeld, and M. Ziegert (Tübingen: Narr, 2014), 25–40.

34 Eutr. 9,19,2: *virum obscurissime natum […] scribae filius*. See also note 12.

35 Eutr. 9,20,1.

36 Eutr. 9,23.

iussit). He had his clothing and shoes decorated with gems, whereas previously the emperor's insignia comprised only the purple robe, the rest of his dress was ordinary." [37]

This excerpt is stressing above all the opposition between the royal ceremonial and the Roman sense of freedom. The other tetrarchs are characterised by Eutropius in different ways: Maximianus as raucous (*ferus*), uncivilised (*incivilis*) and gruff (*asperitatem suam*); Constantius as an excellent man (*vir egregius*), of excellent affability (*praestantissimae civilitatis*) and modesty (*modicus*), as adorable (*amabilis*) and worthy of veneration (*venerabilis*). Galerius is considered a righteous and excellent military (*vir et probe moratus et egregious re military*).

For comparison, I want to add another example, the description of another historian of the fourth century: Aurelius Victor. In his book, the *Liber de Caesaribus*, he characterises Diocletian as follows:

> "[...] Valerius Diocletianus, the commander of the imperial bodyguard, an important man (*magnus vir*), was chosen by the decision of the troop leaders and tribunes, because of his prudence, but he was of the following nature: He was the first to wear a golden robe and asked for his feet silk, purple and precious stones. [...] after Caligula and Domitian, he was the first to be officially called 'Master' (*dominus*) and to be worshipped and called as a god. Because of these things [...] especially the lowest are, if they are brought into a high position, unrestrained in their self-confidence (*superbia*) and ambition (*ambitione*) [...] But in the case of Valerius this was hidden by the other good qualities, and while he was called 'master', he presented himself as a father (*parentem*). [...]."[38]

---

37 Eutr. 9,26: *Diocletianus moratus callide fuit, sagax praeterea et admodum subtilis ingenii, et qui severitatem suam aliena invidia vellet explere. Diligentissimus tamen et sollertissimus princeps et qui imperio Romano primus regiae consuetudinis formam magis quam Romanae libertatis invexerit adorarique se iussit, cum ante eum cuncti salutarentur. Ornamenta gemmarum vestibus calciamentisque indidit. Nam prius imperii insigne in chlamyde purpurea tantum erat, reliqua communia.*

38 Aurelius Victor, *Liber de Caesaribus* 39,1–8: […]*Valerius Diocletianus domesticos regens ob sapientiam deligitur, magnus vir, his moribus tamen: 2 quippe qui primus ex auro veste quaesita serici ac purpurae gemmarumque vim plantis concupiverit. 3 Quae quamquam plus quam civilia tumidique et affluentis animi, levia tamen prae ceteris. 4 Namque se primus omnium Caligulam post Domitianumque dominum palam dici passus et adorari se appella-*

As in the case of Eutropius' text, the ambivalence in Diocletian's characterization is striking: Diocletian is called master and god (*dominus et deus*), but also father (*parens*); he is characterized as haughty and ambitious. He was the first to wear a golden robe and precious silk and purple shoes. In this narrative on Diocletian, Aurelius Victor again uses terms and images that originate from the world of slavery: the slave master is referred to as *dominus*; Diocletian rules over his empire like a master over his slaves and like a father over his kin. That means that we have here a double characterization of Diocletian's rule: as master and father.

This passage shows both the traditional and the new view of the Diocletian's reign: The proclamation of Diocletian and the additional legitimation by the sun god is in the tradition of the previous emperors. On the other hand, the emperor breaks with this tradition by adopting a new costume that is no longer neither the toga nor the military costume, but also by the being adressed as *dominus et deus*,[39] an address that is not compatible with the ideology and the representation of the soldier emperors. The emperor is presented as superior; his rule is defined by clear hierarchies and subordination – the dominant rule and the subordination are manifest in the allusions to the emperors Caligula and Domitian, and the allusions to the world of slavery. At this point I would like to come back again to the little story from the beginning: In Suetonius' biography of Domitian we find a very similar narrative:

> "He likewise designed an expedition into Gaul and Germany, without the least necessity for it, and contrary to the advice of all his father's friends; and this he did only with the view of equalling his brother in military achievements and glory. But for this he was severely repri-

rique uti deum 5 Quis rebus, quantum ingenium est, compertum habeo humillimos quosque, maxime ubi alta accesserint, superbia atque ambitione immodicos esse[… . 8 Verum haec in Valerio obducta ceteris bonis; eoque ipso, quod dominum dici passus, parentem egit; satisque constat prudentem virum edocere voluisse atrocitatem rerum magis quam nominum officere.

39 For the theocratic aspect of the Tetrarchy see Frank Kolb, "*Praesens Deus*: Kaiser und Gott unter der Tetrarchie," in *Diokletian und die Tetrarchie*, ed. Alexander Demandt, Andreas Goltz, and Heinrich Schlange-Schöningen (Berlin : Walter de Gruyter, 2004), 29–33; Frank Kolb, *Herrscherideologie in der Spätantike* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2001), 19–24, 35–46, 49–58. Kolb emphasizes the continuities, but also the innovative aspects of Diocletian's regime.

> manded, and that he might the more effectually be reminded of his age and position, was made to live with his father, and his litter had to follow his father's and brother's carriage, as often as they went abroad."[40]

In this excerpt, we find familiar motifs: Without a noteworthy military success, Domitian is reminded of his inferior status by his father and by his brother and he has to follow their carriage – at least not on foot but in his litter.

Although, as Mary Nyquist makes clear, the term *dominus* has negative connotations when used of a leader and forms an integral part of the Roman antityranny invective – I would not say that authors like Eutropius and Aurelius Victor go not so far as to simply stigmatise Diocletian as a tyrant, but they underline with the slavery narratives the superior authority that is characteristic for his rule. Nevertheless, as Andreas Alföldi already worked out, Eutropius and Aurelius Victor draw on long tradition that goes back until the fifth century BC: the allusions to slavery and the criticism of luxury, especially luxurious garments, are already part of the narration on the Greek-Persian relationship. In this context a set of stereotypes is used to form an antithesis between the Greek freedom and the Persian tyranny.[41]

Eutropius and Aurelius Victor are both historians who were writing their compendia of Roman history in the second half of the 4th century. Both were pagans, both share the conservative views of the senatorian order and appear to have used more or less the same sources, especially Suetonius and the now lost Enmannsche Kaisergeschichte. This explains the continuities, especially the reference to well-known motifs and narrative strategies to characterise and criticise an emperor. On the other hand, they use these strategies and motives in an innovative way to stress the peculiarities of a late antique emperor's rule and representation: for them these were rather royal than republican.

---

40 Suet. Dom. 2,1: *Ob haec correptus, quo magis et aetatis et condicionis admoneretur, habitabat cum patre una sellamque eius ac fratris, quotiens prodirent, lectica sequebatur*….

41 Andreas Alföldi, *Die monarchische Repräsentation im römischen Kaiserreiche* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1970), 3–25.

2.3 Tyrants and persecutors

In the last chapters, we have seen how historians use allusions to slavery. In the following, I will contrast their strategies with that of a Christian author.

The tyrant motives are more apparent in another work that is far less balanced in its statements than the narrations of historians such as Eutropius, Aurelius Victor and Ammianus Marcellinus. It is the work *De mortibus persecutorum* ("On the Deaths of the persecutors") of the early Christian author Lactantius. Lactantius, as a contemporary witness of the persecutions, has a clear agenda: For him, Galerius was responsible for one of the worst persecutions of the Christians. In Lactantius' version of the events Diocletian's activities were determined by greed or by fear. He presents Galerius as the driving force behind the persecution of Christians and behind the abdication of the emperors Diocletian and Maximian.[42] He uses all his rhetorical skills to portray Galerius' cruelty and arbitrariness in the darkest colors. Lactantius makes extensive use of images and practices that originate from the world of slavery. It becomes clear that Galerius wants to enslave the people:

> "So having obtained supreme power, he turned his mind to harassing the world which he had opened up for himself. Now that he had defeated the Persians, whose usage and custom it is to bind themselves over as slaves to their kings so that the kings use their people as though they were their own household, this evil man wanted to introduce this practice – which from the moment of his victory he used shamelessly to applaud – into Roman territory. He could not openly give orders to this effect; he merely acted in a way that actually deprived men of their freedom. In the first place he deprived people of their privileges. Not only city-council members, but leading figures in the cities who were of 'excellent' or 'most perfect' status, were subjected by him to torture

[42] Wolfgang Kuhoff, *Diokletian und die Epoche der Tetrarchie. Das römische Reich zwischen Krisenbewältigung und Neuaufbau (284–313 n. Chr.)* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2001), 269–271, esp. n. 734; Heinrich Schlange-Schöningen, "Felix Augustus oder autokrator deileios: Zur Rezeption Diokletians in der konstantinischen Dynastie," in *Diokletian und die Tetrarchie*, ed. Alexander Demandt, Andreas Goltz, and Heinrich Schlange-Schöningen (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004), 183–184.

> in trivial and purely civil cases. If they seemed to deserve death, there were crosses at hand; if not, there were fetters ready. Freeborn, even noble mothers of families were seized into the imperial wool-mill. If anyone was to be lashed, four stakes stood fixed in the yard, on which not even slaves would ever have been tortured in the past."[43]

Torture, crucifixion, chains and corporal punishment – these are practices that clearly belong to the world of slavery, things that stand as symbols for slavery. So, slaves were always questioned under torture, crucifixion was a typical slave punishment, slaves were prevented from escaping by chains, and corporal punishment or the tail were reserved for slaves.[44]

And to give you a brief outlook: With the exception of Constantius Chlorus, Lactanz also describes other tetrarchs, as for example Maximinus Daia, as Christian persecutors and tyrants. A popular tyrant motif is the dishonouring of free women. And this motif found in the description of Maximinus Daia; it is further emphasized by the fact that Maximinus Daia marries the dishonoured women to his slaves. This way, he crosses the line between the honour of the free woman and the sexual availability of the female slaves – the worlds of the free and the slaves mingle.[45] It also fits this picture of Maximinus Daia that he fled disguised as a slave after being defeated by his co-emperor Licinius: "A huge number had already been laid low when Maximin saw that things were not going as

---

43 Lact. mort. pers. 21,1–4 (trans. J. L. Creed (Oxford: Clarendon, 1984)).

44 Kaja Harter-Uibopuu and Markus Gerhold, "Strafe/Bestrafung," in *Handwörterbuch der antiken Sklaverei (HAS)*, vol. 3, ed. Heinz Heinen (Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag, 2017), 2954–2963; Jan Timmer and Keith Bradley, "Auspeitschung," in *Handwörterbuch der antiken Sklaverei (HAS)*, vol. 1, ed. Heinz Heinen (Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag, 2017), 315–320; Kyle Harper, "Fessel/Fesselung," in *Handwörterbuch der antiken Sklaverei (HAS)*, vol. 1, ed. Heinz Heinen (Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag, 2017), 928–931; Gerhard Thür, "Folter/Folterung," in *Handwörterbuch der antiken Sklaverei (HAS)*, vol. 1, ed. Heinz Heinen (Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag, 2017), 974–975; Leonhard Schumacher, *Servus Index. Sklavenverhör und Sklavenanzeige im republikanischen und kaiserzeitlichen Rom* (Wiesbaden: Steiner Verlag, 1982).

45 Kyle Harper, *Slavery in the Late Roman World AD 275–425* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 281–325; Sandra R. Joshel and Sheila Murenaghan, "Introduction," in *Women & Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture*, ed. Sandra R. Joshel and Sheila Murnaghan (London: Routledge, 1998), 1–21; Matthew Perry, *Gender, Manumission and the Roman Freedwoman* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

he expected. He threw off the purple, put on the clothes of a slave, fled, and crossed the straits."[46]

Obviously, the authors of late antiquity are in continuity with accusations of political slavery and tyranny expressed by representatives of a critical senatorial historiography who regret the loss of republican freedom. But the line of tradition of the tyrannical emperors is enriched by one further aspect: The tyrant not only threatens the political freedom, but also the religious freedom. This includes the persecutors as Galerius and Maximinus Daia.

3. Conclusion

These few case studies may have shown how images from the world of slavery could be used in different ways: to criticize an emperor's behaviour, to illustrate his loss of authority or to characterize the relationship between two emperors. Thus, slave narratives form part of a power discourse, a discourse on power relations: So, historians of the fourth century were well aware of the changed forms of rule and they used well known motives to illustrate these changes. Christian writers adopted the narratives to stigmatise the persecutors as tyrants and so, they take up an old tradition.

My analysis of the historical narrations on Diocletian and his co-emperors confirms what Hayden White says in his article on "The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality": "And this raises the suspicion that narrative in general, from the folktale to the novel, from the annals to the fully realized 'history', has to do with the topics of law, legality, legitimacy, or, more generally, *authority*."[47]

46 Lact. mort. pers. 47,4 (trans. J. L. Creed (Oxford: Clarendon, 1984)).

47 Hayden White, "The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality," *Critical Inquiry* 7 (1980): 17.

Bibliography

Ammianus Marcellinus. *Ammianus Marcellinus*, trans. John C. Rolfe. London: Heinemann, 1963.

Claudian. *Claudian*, vol. 2, trans. Maurice Platnauer. London: William Heinemann Ltd, 1963.

Eutropius. *The Breviarium ab Urbe Condita of Eutropius*, trans. H.W. Bird. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2011.

Eadie, John William. *The Breviarium of Festus. A Critical Edition with Historical Commentary.* London: Athlone Press, 1967.

Lactantius, *De mortibus persecutorum*, trans. J.L. Creed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1984.

Nixon, C.E.V., and Barbara Saylor Rodgers. *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors. The Panegyrici Latini. Introduction, Translation, and Historical Commentary with the Latin Text of R.A.B. Mynors.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.

Suetonius. Suetonius, trans. J.C. Rolfe. London: Heinemann, 1970.

Alföldi, Andreas. *Die monarchische Repräsentation im römischen Kaiserreiche.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1970.

Binsfeld, Andrea. "Lebens 'wirklichkeiten' von Sklaven - Überlegungen zum Verhältnis von Gender, Macht und Status." In *Sklaverei und Identitäten*, edited by Andrea Binsfeld and Marcello Ghetta, 29–44. Hildesheim: Olms, 2021.

Castritius, Helmut. "Zum höfischen Protokoll der Tetrarchie. Introitus (Adventus) Augusti et Caesaris." *Chiron* 1 (1971): 365–376.

Demandt, Alexander. *Die Spätantike.* München: Beck, 2007.

Fischer, Josef, Stefan Knoch, and Agnes Thomas. "Begleitsklaven." In *Handwörterbuch der antiken Sklaverei (HAS)*, vol. 1, edited by Heinz Heinen, 350–357. Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag, 2017.

George, Michele. "Archaeology and Roman Slavery: Problems and Potential." In *Antike Sklaverei: Rückblick und Ausblick. Neue Beiträge zur Forschungsgeschichte und zur Erschließung der archäologischen Zeugnisse*, edited by Heinz Heinen, 141–160. Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag, 2010.

Gualandi, Maria Letizia. “Un trionfo per due. La matrice di Olbia: un unicum iconografico ‘fuori contesto’.” In *‘Conosco un ottimo storico dell’arte …’ Per Enrico Castelnuovo – Scritti di allievi e amici pisani*, edited by Maria Monica Donato and Massimo Ferretti, 11–20. Pisa: Edizioni ETS, 2012.

Haake, Matthias. “Zwischen Severus Alexanders Triumph über die Sāsāniden im Jahre 233 und den Triumphfeierlichkeiten Diokletians und Maximians im Jahre 303. Zum römischen Triumph im 3. Jahrhundert n. Chr.” In *Zum römischen Triumph in Prinzipat und Spätantike*, edited by Fabian Goldbeck and Johannes Wienand, 376–382. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 2016.

Harper, Kyle. *Slavery in the Late Roman World AD 275–425*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

——. “Fessel/Fesselung.” In *Handwörterbuch der antiken Sklaverei (HAS)*, vol. 1, edited by Heinz Heinen, 928–931. Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag, 2017.

Harter-Uibopuu, Kaja, and Markus Gerhold. “Strafe/Bestrafung.” In *Handwörterbuch der antiken Sklaverei (HAS)*, vol. 3, edited by Heinz Heinen, 2954–2963. Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag, 2017.

von Hesberg, Henner. “Die Wiedergabe von Kriegsgefangenen und Sklaven in der römischen Bildkunst.” In *Antike Sklaverei: Rückblick und Ausblick. Neue Beiträge zur Forschungsgeschichte und zur Erschließung der archäologischen Zeugnisse*, edited by Heinz Heinen, 183–188. Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag, 2010.

Hölscher, Tonio. *Victoria Romana: Archäologische Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Wesensart der römischen Siegesgöttin von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des 3. Jhs. n. Chr.* Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1967.

Huntzinger, Hervé. “L’iconographie des captifs dans l’Antiquité tardive.” In *Ubi servi erant? Die Ikonographie von Sklaven und Freigelassenen in der römischen Kunst*, edited by Andrea Binsfeld and Marcello Ghetta, 53–69. Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag, 2019.

Joshel, Sandra R., and Sheila Murenaghan. “Introduction.” In *Women & Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture*, edited by Sandra R. Joshel and Sheila Murnaghan, 1-21. London: Routledge, 1998.

Kolb, Frank. *Herrscherideologie in der Spätantike.* Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2001.

——. "*Praesens Deus*: Kaiser und Gott unter der Tetrarchie." In *Diokletian und die Tetrarchie*, edited by Alexander Demandt, Andreas Goltz, and Heinrich Schlange-Schöningen, 27-37. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004.

Kuhoff, Wolfgang. *Diokletian und die Epoche der Tetrarchie. Das römische Reich zwischen Krisenbewältigung und Neuaufbau (284–313 n. Chr.).* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2001.

Laubscher, Hans Peter. *Der Reliefschmuck des Galeriusbogens in Thessaloniki.* Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 1975.

L'Orange, Hans Peter. *Das spätantike Herrscherbild von Diokletian bis zu den Konstantin-Söhnen: 284-361 n. Chr.* Berlin: Mann, 1984.

McCormick, Michael. *Eternal Victory. Triumphal rulership in late antiquity, Byzantium, and the Early Medieval West.* Cambridge et. al.: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Mommsen, Theodor. *Römisches Staatsrecht.* Basel: Schwabe, [1887] 1963.

Nauta, Ruurd R. "Mali principes. Domitian, Nero und die Geschichte eines Begriffs." In *Nero und Domitian. Mediale Diskurse der Herrscherrepräsentation im Vergleich*, edited by Sophia Bönisch-Meyer, Lisa Cordes, Verena Schulz, A. Wolsfeld, and M. Ziegert, 25–40. Tübingen: Narr, 2014.

Nyquist, Mary. *Arbitrary Rule. Slavery, Tyranny, and the Power of Life and Death.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013.

Panayotakis, Stelios and Paschalis, Michael. *Slaves and Masters in the Ancient Novel.* Groningen: Barkuis & Groningen University Library, 2019.

Perry, Matthew. *Gender, Manumission and the Roman Freedwoman.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Purcell, Nicholas. "The Apparitores: A Study in Social Mobility." *Papers of the British School at Rome* 51 (1983): 125-173.

Raeck, Wulf. "*Tu fortiter, ille sapienter*. Augusti und Caesares im Reliefschmuck des Galeriusbogens von Thessaloniki." In *Beiträge zur Ikonographie und Hermeneutik. Festschrift für Nikolaus Himmelmann*,

edited by Hans-Ulrich Cain, 453–457. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1989.

Reinard, Patrick. "*In convivio puer est*. Die Darstellung von *ministri* in der literarischen Überlieferung und den Mahlszenen der Germania Inferior, Germania Superior und Gallia Belgica. Ein Vergleich." In *Ubi servi erant? Die Ikonographie von Sklaven und Freigelassenen in der römischen Kunst,* edited by Andreas Binsfeld and Marcello Ghetta, 195-232. Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag, 2019.

Schlange-Schöningen, Heinrich. "Felix Augustus oder autokrator deileios: Zur Rezeption Diokletians in der konstantinischen Dynastie." In *Diokletian und die Tetrarchie*, edited by Alexander Demandt, Andreas Goltz, and Heinrich Schlange-Schöningen, 172-191. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004.

Schumacher, Leonhard. *Servus Index. Sklavenverhör und Sklavenanzeige im republikanischen und kaiserzeitlichen Rom.* Wiesbaden: Steiner Verlag, 1982.

Seston, William. "L'humiliation' de Galère." *Revue des Études Anciennes* 42 (1940): 515–519.

Thür, Gerhard. "Folter/Folterung." In *Handwörterbuch der antiken Sklaverei (HAS)*, vol. 1, edited by Heinz Heinen, 974–975. Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag, 2017.

Timmer, Jan, and Keith Bradley. "Auspeitschung." In *Handwörterbuch der antiken Sklaverei (HAS)*, vol. 1, edited by Heinz Heinen, 315–320. Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag, 2017.

Vössing, Konrad. "Suet. Cal. 26,2: Senatorische Sklavendienste am kaiserlichen Speisesofa - Senators Serving as Slaves at the Imperial Banquets." *The Annals of University of Galati (History)* 1 (2002): 25–38.

Weber, Dietrich. *Erzählliteratur. Schriftwerk – Kunstwerk – Erzählwerk.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.

White, Hayden. "The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality." *Critical Inquiry* 7 (1980): 5–27.

Winterling, Aloys. *Caligula. Eine Biographie.* München: Beck, 2012.

List of figures

Fig.: Porphyry sculpture group probably representing the first Tetrarchy, now St Mark's Basilica in Venice (CC BY-SA 3.0 http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/, via Wikimedia Commons).

For further titles see: www.ebverlag.de

EBVERLAG DR. BRANDT
WWW·EBVERLAG·DE

Rainer Kuhl
Jägerstraße 47
13595 Berlin

Tel.: 00 49 30 68 97 72 33
Fax: 00 49 30 91 60 77 74
E-Mail: post@ebverlag.de

Late Roman authors give us many examples of how firmly images of slavery were anchored in the minds of contemporaries, and how these images were incorporated into literary tradition and political discourse. Images from the world of slavery could be used in a great variety of ways: to criticize an emperor's behavior, to illustrate his loss of authority, or to characterize the relationship between two emperors. The book will show how the presentation and perception of Late Roman emperors, such as Diocletian and his co-emperors, were influenced by narratives from the world of slavery. These narratives form part of a power discourse, a discourse on power relations. Or to speak with Hayden White, "And this raises the suspicion that narrative in general, from the folktale to the novel, from the annals to the fully realized 'history', has to do with the topics of law, legality, legitimacy, or, more generally, authority".

THE AUTHOR

Andrea Binsfeld has been Associate Professor for Classics at the University of Luxemburg since 2011. From 2003–2011 she was a research associate with the project "Forschungen zur antiken Sklaverei" ("Research on Ancient Slavery") at the Academy of Sciences and Literature in Mainz. She studied history, archaeology and classical philology at the University of Trier, where she received her PhD in 2002 (under the supervision of Heinz Heinen) on the topic of "The Graffiti in the early Christian Church of Trier". Her fields of research are social history, especially ancient slavery; the history and archaeology of Roman Gaul; epigraphy and late antiquity.