In the agreement which followed the first war between Constantine and Licinius and Constantine’s victory on the Campus Ardiensis, Licinius was forced, as generally accepted, to surrender Illyricum where he was undisputed ruler until 316. However he was not neutralized politically and reigned together with Constantine between AD 316 and 324. Some kind of division of the sphere of interest seems to have existed between them. Constantine, whose movements in the Balkans are known from the places of editing laws, visited only the western half, i.e. Illyricum after 316. If we follow the evidence of the places and dates of the promulgation of Constantine’s laws, we can consider the line dividing the region controlled by Constantine and that under Licinius’ command, running from the North to the South and leaving Constantine the Pannonian provinces, Moesia I, Dacia Ripensis, Dacia Mediterranea and Dardania, as well as Macedonia, with the legionary camps on the Danube in Pannonia and Moesia I; the provinces on the East of that line, Moesia II, Scythia Minor and Thracia belonged to the region in which Licinius had command. However, there is evidence indicating that the territorial division of the Balkans between Constantine and Licinius after the battle of Cibalae was not strictly observed except on the Danube, in the zone where the military camps were located. In spite of Constantine’s presence in Illyricum, Licinius’s influence on the high commanders on the Danube never disappeared nor did his presence in the provinces he lost after the Bellum Cibalense. Licinius had the jubilee silver plates made for his decennalia in Naissus in Dacia Mediterranea. The silver plates which have been produced in Naissus, in the part of the Balkans which was under Constantine’s control, bear the inscription LICINI AVGVSTE SEMPER VINCAS. The co-operation between Constantine and Licinius concerned the defense of the frontiers and the administration in both parts of the Empire, but it was not based on the subordination of one to another as it was in the time of Diocletian who created the system tetrarchy.
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The struggle between Constantine and Licinius was fought for supremacy in the military command in Illyricum. Licinius became the undisputed ruler in the vast region which encompassed all of the Danube provinces after Galerius’ death in AD 311. From 311 to 316 the huge military forces on the Danube frontier from Vindobona to the Black Sea were under his command. He gained control of Asia Minor and the East by defeating Maximinus Daza in 313. Constantine came to power after his father’s death, by being proclaimed Augustus by the army in Britain. He inherited his father’s rank, position, army and the task of defending the frontiers in Britain, Gaul and Spain, but he would never be satisfied with being Augustus only in the western half of the Empire. His next step was to defeat other rulers and to be recognized in other parts of the Empire. He moved his troops further from Gaul and invaded Italy first where Maxentius, the son of Maximianus, had seized power. Constantine crushed Maxentius’ forces on the Pons Milvii in Rome in 312 and established control over Italy. From the military point of view it was not a great victory. The best army was located on the Danube under the command of Licinius. If Constantine wanted to gain control of the frontier on the Danube with its military strength camped here, it was necessary to neutralize Licinius in Illyricum.

Constantine’s relationship with Licinius was initially a friendly one. He met him in Milan in 313 and after making the agreement about the tolerance of the Christians, Licinius’ marriage with Constantine’s sister was celebrated. Their positions were unequal. Licinius retained his predominance in the balance of power since he had command over the massive military forces on the Danube. This represented the main obstacle to Constantine in his aspiration to be the sole ruler in the Empire.

The first disagreement between Constantine and Licinius was provoked by Constantine’s naming of Bassianus for Caesar.¹ In 314 or 316 Constantine invaded Illyricum and in the struggle near Cibalae he defeated Licinius.² Licinius


left the battlefield and escaped to the East, taking the treasure and his family from Sirmium with him. In the agreement which followed the second battle and Constantine’s new victory on the Campus Ardiensis, Licinius was forced, as generally accepted, to surrender Illyricum and to keep in Europe only Thracia and the provinces on the lower Danube, Moesia Inferior and Scythia Minor under his control. Zosimus and the author of the Origo Constantini, speak about reconciliation and the division of the Balkan provinces between the two. As Zosimus II 20 relates, both Constantine and Licinius agreed to cooperate and be allies; Constantine had command over Illyricum and the surrounding peoples, and the East and the peoples around belonged to Licinius: 

\[\text{Tē dē ύστεραιο γενομένης ἀνακωχής ἀμφοτέρους ἐδόκει κοινονίαν ἔχει καὶ ὁμαιχμίαν ἐφ’ ὁ τὸν μὲν Κωνσταντινὸν ἄρχειν Ἡλλαυρίῳ καὶ τῶν ἐπέκεινα πάντων ἔθνων, Λικίνινον δὲ Θρᾴκην ἄρχειν καὶ τήν ἐως καὶ τὰ ταύτης ἐπέκεινα}\]

and Excerpta Valesiana = Origo Constantini Imperatoris, ed J. Moreau, 18–19: Licinio postulante et pollicente se imperata facturum denuo, sicut ante, mandatum est Valens privatus fieret quo facto pax ab ambusus firmata est, ut Liciinum Orienten Asiam Thraciam Moesiam Minorem Scythiam possideret.

Both authors agree that Licinius lost Illyricum, what means the major part of the Balkans, with the Pannonian provinces, but kept Asia Minor and Oriens as well as Thracia, Moesia (Inferior) and Scythia Minor in the Balkans under his control. Some kind of division of the sphere of interest seems to have existed and the division appears to have been respected by both Augusti. Constantine, whose movements in the Balkans are known from the places of editing laws, visited only the western half, i.e. Illyricum after 316. In the year before the battle of Cibalae Constantine was in the western part of the empire, in Trier in Jan. 316, in Chalon sur Seone, in Vienna, in Arles and in Verona, as Chastagnol reconstructed his itinerary. After the battle of Cibalae on 8 October 316, he spent most of his time in the Balkans. His presence is attested by the dates of the imperial edicts and the literary source: Dec. 4 and 8, 316 at Serdica, Origo Constantini imperatoris 17–18 allows us to date his presence in Philippi in December 316, and in January 317 at Campus Ardiensisis where he fought the battle against Licinius after which he advanced toward Byzantium; in February 317 he returned to Serdica. He was still


3 Translated by F. Paschoud, Zosime, Histoire nouvelle, Paris, 1971, II, p. 91: Le lendemain, une suspension d’armes étant intervenue, les deux adversaires jugèrent bon de conclure une convention et une alliance stipulant que Constantin exercerait le pouvoir en Illyrie et dans toutes les provinces situées au-delà, que Licinius aurait la Thrace, l’Orient ainsi que les territoires situés au-delà...etc.

4 Rev. num. 4, 1962, 332.
here from March 1 to April 17 in the same year, as can be concluded on the grounds of Chr. Min.1, 232; Origo 19 and CTh VIII 12, 2 and IX 10,1. In the years that followed the first war with Licinius, Constantine spent many months between 315 and 321 in Sirmium after Licinius’ retreat to the East. Constantine spent the time from June 6 to August 7 317 at Sirmium (CTh XI 30, 7 and Iulian, Orat. 1, 5d) and on Dec. 27, 317 he was in Thessalonica (CJ VI 1, 4, emended). In Sirmium his presence is attested often later, in the time before the battle of Hadrianople: he was here in January, February and May 318 and again, in October of the same year; after a short stay in Milan in September and in Aquileia in October, in April 319, in May 320, in April, June and September 321, in April, May and July 322, in December 323 and in January 324. Between 320 and 325/326 he struck gold here; his presence in Serdica and even in Thessalonica has been confirmed in the same period of time.5

No constitution with Constantine’s subscription is placed in Licinius’s part of the Empire.

Imperial pronouncements of all types must have been issued in the joint name of all emperors, but the legal enactment of one emperor might not have been enforced or even promulgated by his colleagues.6 Licinius’s name is missing in the CTh and CJ. It is supposed in the constitution issued in Byzantium in the year 323, CTh I, 27, 1 (?) and 324, Ch. XI 30, 12 and XII 1, 8) i.e. after the break with Constantine.7

If we follow the evidence of the places and dates of the promulgation of Constantine’s laws, we can consider the line dividing the region controlled by Constantine and that under Licinius’ command, running from the North to the South, leaving Constantine the Pannonian provinces, Moesia I, Dacia Ripensis, Dacia Mediterranea and Dardania, as well as Macedonia, with the legionary camps on the Danube in Pannonia and Moesia I; the provinces on the East of that line, Moesia II, Scythia Minor and Thracia belonged to the region in which Licinius had command. This corresponds to the division as it appears in literary sources. Constantine had to fight against the Sarmatians, and Licinius’ task was to defend the provinces on the lower Danube from the Goths.8

There is no doubt that some sort of agreement concerning the division of the Balkans was concluded after Constantine’s victory. However, this may not necessarily have meant that the territories were divided by fixed frontiers between them. There is evidence indicating that the territorial division of the Balkans be-

6 Barnes, New Empire, 195.
7 Barnes, 82, note 149. Seeck, Regesten 166, emended Constantinopoli and attributed the law to Constantine.
8 Barnes, The New Empire, 82 and 234, assumes that Licinius fought against the Sarmatians in 318, basing this statement on P. Oxy. 889. Cf. his article Three Imperial Edicts, ZPE 211, 1976, 275–281.
tween Constantine and Licinius after Licinius’ defeat at Cibalae was not strictly observed except on the Danube, in the zone where the military camps were located. In spite of Constantine’s presence in Illyricum, Licinius’s influence on the high commanders on the Danube never disappeared nor did his presence in the provinces he lost after the Bellum Cibalense. His name appears on the vota inscriptions on the silver plates found in the region controlled by Constantine, in Moesia Inferior and Dacia Mediterranea. Licinius had the jubilee silver plates made for his decennalia in Naissus in Dacia Mediterranea. This could hardly have belonged to his part of the Empire. The plates found in Naissus bear the inscription LICINI AVGVSTEE SEMPER VINCAS. Between VINCAS and LICINI, is engraved NAISS in a small circle, and in a wreath SIC X SIC XX.9 Similar plates have been discovered in Červen Brjag and Svirko in northern Bulgaria. The plate from Červen Brjag bears the inscription LICINIVS INVICT AVG OB DIEM X SVORVM — FLAV NICANVS MBN and the graffito PRO GERONIVS.10 On the plates from Svirko the inscription LICINIVS INVICTVS AVGSTVS OB DIEM DECENNALIUM SVORUM is engraved on the border and SIC X SIC XX in the middle.11 The silver plates found in Naissus have been produced here. It is not known where the silver plates found in northern Bulgaria were produced. Flavius Nicanus could be the same person who appears on the silver bar produced at Sirmium.12 He appears in the seal of the bar found near the village of Svirko close to the river Maritza in Thrace.13

Propaganda inscriptions with wishes for victory are engraved also in the fibulae which were produced so as to be given to the high military commanders as presents.14

---

14 The one from Arezzo bears the inscription HERCULI AVGVSTE SEMPER VINCAS, and CONSTANTIE CAES VIVAS — HERCULI CAES VINCAS is inscribed on the fibulae in Turin. The fibula found in Niederemmel in Germany bears the vota inscription for the decennalia Jubileum of both Constantine and Licinius, VOTIS X D N CONSTANTINII — VOTIS X D N LICINI On this and
Licinius’ *decennalia* have to be dated either in 317 or in 318. He was proclaimed Augustus in Carnuntum in 307, as noted by Chron. Pasch. and Hieronymus or in 308, if we follow the date in Fasti Hydatiani. His first regal year runs from Nov. 11 to Dec. 10 AD 307 or 308. In 311, when he published the Galerius’s tolerance edict, he held *trubinicia potestas IV*, and was *imperator III*. That means that his *decennalia* began between Dec. 26 and 31, 318. The celebration of Licinius’ decennalia in northern Bulgaria, i.e. in Moesia Inferior and in Thrace is to be expected since that part of the Empire was also controlled by him after 316. The production of silver jubilee plates in Naissus, in the province of Dacia Mediterranea, which was in Constantine’s part of the Balkans, requires explanation.

If the territorial division between Constantine and Licinius after the battle of Cibalae was formally established, the production of the silver plates for Licinius’ jubilee in Naissus, as a kind of political propaganda, would be difficult to explain. On the other hand Constantine visited Naissus in the year 319, CTh II 15, 1 and II 16,2, that means that it belonged to his part of the Balkans. If the territorial division was strictly observed, of producing the silver plates with the Licinius Vota-inscription would not be possible. However, there is no evidence that the territorial division ever existed formally. What is crucial for the understanding of the relationship between Constantine and Licinius is Zosimus’ wording that Licinius and Constantine agreed after the battle of Cibalae to act as allies — κοινοβία και διαμαχών. Their cooperation after 316 can be proved. Political division was not based on the territories under somebody’s control, but on the army command. The army was located on the Danube. The division of the military command in the Balkans did not prevent Licinius from visiting Naissus since there was no military base. The production of the silver plates for Licinius’ Jubilee at Naissus or perhaps at Sirmium might mean that the agreement between Constantine and Licinius did not provide for the strict territorial division of the Balkans, but concerned the division of the military command, military and administrative staff and the army located on the Danube. This cooperation could have

---


16 Euseb. HE VIII 17,5 and the Table from Brigetio, e 1937, 232 = FIRA I, 455, no. 93.

17 W. Seston, Carnuntina, 176 ff. and J. Lafranchie, Remarques sur les dates de quelques inscriptions de début du IVe siècle, CRAI 1956, 163 ff.
concerned the administration (*koinonia*) in the whole empire and a military alliance (*homaihmia*) in the defense of the frontiers.

Direct evidence for the Licinius presence in Naissus is missing because his subscription disappears from the laws preserved in CTh and CJ; their common consulship and the promotion of Constantine’s sons and Licinius’ son to Caesares, however, point to the idea of common administration. Soon after the battle at Campus Ardensis and Licinius’ new defeat an agreement was concluded in Serdica at the beginning of the year 317, stipulating that Constantine’s sons Crispus and Constantine, and Licinius’s son Licinius, had to be Caesares. Vita Const. adds that Constantine and Licinius were elected consuls.¹⁸ In the year 318 Licinius was consul together with Constantine’s son Crispus, and in 319 his son was consul with Constantine.¹⁹

Theoretically speaking, the defense of the Danube frontier was considered the common task of both Constantine and Licinius. The victory titles observe the principle of collegiality. They were shared independently of their real participation in the event. The titles *Gothicus* for Constantine before the year 324, and *Germanicus* and *Sarmaticus* for Licinius before his final defeat, prove that they shared the success in defending the Empire. However, they could not be present in person in the part defended by their colleague. Licinius seems never to have returned to Pannonia and Moesia Prima after his defeat in the battle of Cibalae. However, he appears as *Sarmaticus* in the inscription from northern Africa, CIL VIII 22119, 22 176 and 22 259 and CIL IX 6061 = CIL X 6966 from Italy and as *Sarmaticus Maximus Germanicus Maximus* in CIL VIII 1357: The war against the Sarmatians in Banat was led by Constantine. During the campaign he was at Campona, at Viminacium (May, 321) at Margum and Bononia.²⁰ Licinius was also *Sarmaticus*,²¹ but his presence in this part of the Danube is not likely.

Common victory titles prove some kind of cooperation in the defense of the frontiers. Both Constantine and Licinius shared the responsibility for the whole Empire both before and after the battle of Cibalae. Constantine’s victory in the battle of Cibalae and on the Campus Ardiensis did not secure him primacy in the Empire. On the other hand, Licinius never lost his popularity in the army in the Danube provinces. They concluded peace on equal terms and on the basis of dividing tasks and command.

Constantine and Licinius both celebrated the victory on the lower Danube in 317, in the inscription from Adamklisi on the lower Danube in the year 317:


---

¹⁹ Seeck, Regesten, 166 and 167.
²⁰ Barnes, The New Empire, 73–75.
²¹ For the title *Sarmaticus* see P. Oxy. 889. Barnes, The New Empire, 234. *Sarmatikoi* for both must concern the imperial victory on March 1 317.
Adamklisi is on the territory under the military control of Licinius. There is no evidence that Constantine was in this part of the Balkan Peninsula before AD 324. However he appears as *Gothica maxima* on the inscriptions from northern Africa, ILS 8942, ILS 696.22

It is unlikely that Constantine was present in Adamklisi during the war or Licinius in the part of Illyricum which was controlled by Constantine in the war against the Sarmatians. Licinius was not expected to fight in person and with his army against the Sarmatians who occupied the left Danube bank opposite the big legionary camps in Singidunum and Viminacium, in Moesia Superior. That was Constantine’s task. On the other hand, the war against the Goths who pressed on the lower Danube was Licinius’s task. The personal appearance of Constantine on the lower Danube in 323 provoked a new war with Licinius. In the *Origo Constantini* Constantine’s military operation on the lower Danube was qualified as a violation of the agreement concluded after the first war between them and the reason for the next one, C. 21: Item cum Constantinus Thessalonica e esset, Gothi per neglectos limites eruperunt et vastata Thracia et Moesia praedas agere coeperunt.tunc Constantini terrore et impetu repressi captivos illi impetrata pace reddiderunt. Sed hoc Licinius contra fidem factum qaestus est, quod partes suas ab alio fuerint vindicatae.

It could be suggested that theoretically the rules in dividing the tasks between two Augusti and two Caesars which were introduced by Diocletian were respected in the political division between Constantine and Licinius. Formally and territorially, the Empire was not divided as it was not before. Diocletian had performed the division of military and administrative tasks between Augusti and Caesars. His system is described by Lactantius in De mort. pers. 7,2: *tres enim particeps regni sui fecit, in quattuor partes orbe diviso*. However, by appointing Maximianus co-regnant Augustus and two Caesares, Diocletian’s intention was not to create a system of political power division between two, four or more Augusti and Caesars, but to have partners capable of sharing the burden of the defense of the Empire with him. Aur. Vict. Caes, 39, 30 does not describe the division of territories, but the burden of war: *et quoniam bellorum moles, de qua supra memoravimus, acrius urgebatur, quadripartito imperio cuncta, quae trans Alpes Galliae sunt, Constantio commissa, Africa Italiaque Herculio, Illyrici ora adusque Ponti fretum Gallerio. Cetera Valerius retentavit*. As long as Diocletian had the whole Empire under his control, each Augustus and his Caesar had to cooperate in all military operations. Maximian and Diocletian’s common duty was to defend not only one specific part of the frontier, but also to help their senior co-emperor everywhere necessary. When appointed Caesars, Constantius and Gallerius ac-

---

cepted the defence of the frontiers as their immediate task, the former in Western Europe, in Britain and in Gaul, the latter in the Danube provinces, but also to help in other wars. The two Augusti cooperated with their Caesars. Diocletian spent the years 293 and 294 on the Danube, and the revolt in Egypt brought him and Galerius to the East in 297–298. Galerius took part in the war against Persia in 296–299 together with Diocletian. He was still there in 303–305, and Diocletian fought on the Danube in 304. At the same time he had the events in Italy and northern Africa under his control (305–306).23

The political division between Caesars and Augusti was also in force in the next generation of emperors. When Licinius was elected one of the Augusti in 308, he was not named to rule in a specific region, but to defend the Danubian frontier together with Galerius. After Galerius’ death in 311, and his victory over Maximinus Daza in 313, he had power in the Balkans and in Asia Minor.

The same model of power division was applied after Diocletian’s retirement and in the relationship between Constantine and Licinius, as well as after Constantine’s death. His sons and nephew had to divide the provinces and defend them.24 The agreement between the brothers Valentinian and Valens clearly shows the same schema in division.25 At first in Mediana not far from Naissus and thereafter in Sirmium, they met in 364 and divided tasks in the Empire as well as administration staff, palaces, commanders and armies, Amm. Marc. XXVI, 5, 2–6

...in Orientem vero secuturus Valentem, ordinatus est Victor... cui iunctus est Arintheus. Lupicinus enim pridem a Ioviano, pari modo promotus, magister equitum partes tuebat eos. 3. Tunc et Aequitius Illyriciano praeponitur exercitui, nonum magister, sed comes, et Serenianus, olim sacramento digressus, recinctus est, ut Pannonius, sociatusque Valenti, domesticorum praefuit scholae. Quibus ita digestis et militares partiti sunt numeri. 4. et post haec cum ambo fratres Sirmium introissent, diviso palatio, ut potiori placuerit, Valentinianus Mediolanum, Constantinopolis Valens discissit. 5. et Orientem quidem regebat potestate praefecti Salutius, Italian vero cum Africa et Illyrico Mamertinus, et Gallicas provincias Germanianus 6. agentes igitur in memoratis urbibus principes, sumpsere primitus trabeas consulares.

The co-operation between Constantine and Licinius concerned the defense of the frontiers and the administration in both parts of the Empire, but it was not based on the subordination of one to another as it was in the time of Diocletian who created the system of coregency. Constantine and Licinius were former enemies and after the reconciliation in AD 317 equal in rights. The division of the

23 Barnes, New Empire, 197.
25 A.H.M. Jones, Later Roman Empire, 158.
Balkans between them in 317 AD concerned administration, army and command, but not necessarily the territories. The army in the Balkans and the command remained a crucial factor in the struggle for power, as it was before Diocletian and also after Constantine’s death. Both the usurper Magnentius and the legal emperor Constantius in the 50s of the 4th century endeavored to conquer the mutineer Vetranio who had command of the army in Pannonia. The rebel Magnentius invaded Illyricum, like Constantine before him, but was defeated in the battle of Mursa in the year 350; 26 Julian's first step after debackation in Bononia on the Danube in the year 361 was to force the military commanders in Sirmium to surrender. Thereafter he succeeded in gaining control over the vast region from Sirmium to Asia Minor. After his death in the East in 364 the new emperor Jovian, soon after coming to the throne, sent an emissary to Sirmium in order to secure the support of the military commander there. 27
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SAVLADARI: KONSTANTIN I LICINIJE
I PODELA BALKANSKOG POLUOSTRVA


Princip podele vojne komande i upravnog aparata zadržali su i vladari posle abdikacije Dioklecijana. Sukob izmedju Konstantina i Licinija 316. nije doveo do konačne pobede jednog ili drugog. Rat je u prvoj fazi vodjen za Ilirik. U dogovoru postignutom posle bitke kod Cibala i ponovnog poraza Licinija na Campus Ardenesis izvršena je podela na Balkanu. Licinije se morao povući iz Ilirika. Zadržao je u Evropi Trakiju i provincije na donjem Dunavu, Moesia Inferior i Scythia Mi-
nor i preuzeo zadatak odbrane granice na donjem Dunavu. Teorijski, odrmana Podunavlja se smatrala zajedničkim zadatkom Konstantina i Licinija.

Konstantin i Licinije su ostali savladari od 316. do 324, godine. Granica izmedju oblasti pod kontrolom Konstantina i onih koje je branio Licinije dala bi se približno odrediti na osnovu mesta izdavanja Konstantinovih zakona u godinama od bitke na Kampus Ardiensis do 324. U sferi Konstantinove uprave nalazile su se, osim panonskih provincija i Mosia I i Dacia Ripensis na Dunavu, Dakija Mediteranea sa Naisom i Makedonija u unutrašnjosti. Medjutim, teritorijalna podela nije u prvom planu i savladari je se nisu striktno pridržavali. Time se može objasniti da su za proslavu Licinijevih decenala 317. ili 318. proizvedene u Naisu srebrne fiale s vota-natpisom. Pobedničke titule stečene u ratu od jednog ili drugog nosila su oba savladara. Princip podele vojnih i upravnih zadataka izmedju Avgusta i Cezara koji je uveo Dioklecijan, poštovan je i u potonjim generacijama. Pobedničke title Sarmaticus i Gothicus su respektovale kolegijalitet obojice, nezavisno od ličnog učešća u pohodima. Ipak, lično učešće Konstantina u ratu protiv Gota na donjem Dunavu 324. kvalifikuje se u izvorima kao povreda ugovora sklopljenog 317. godine i povod za novi rat.

Formalno i teritorijalno Carstvo nije bilo podeljeno izmedju Konstantina i Licinija, kao što nije bilo ni u vreme Dioklecijana i njegovih savladara. Medjutim, za razliku od sistema koji je funkcionisao u vreme Dioklecijana, vlada Konstantina i Licinija nije bila zasnovana na subordinaciji mladnjeg Avgusta starijem, već na njihovoj dogovorenoj saradnji.