

group. The prosopographical excursus reinforces this impression. M.'s dossier is interesting but not because it shows the continuity of a nucleus. On the contrary, eleven of these eighteen *gentes* (tables E.1, E.3, E.5–11, E.13–14) either disappeared or faded from prominence before A.D. 284, perhaps most notably in the 240s. Conversely, three other *gentes* appear to have risen to prominence within the period (tables E.2, E.12 and E.15 — the last *gens* slipping again soon after). We are looking, therefore, at a significant turnover, much of it probably natural. M. might be right to emphasize the continuing significance of the senate; but that continuity was largely corporate, not biological.

Ch. 3 surveys the increasing rôle of equestrians as provincial governors, military officers and imperial secretaries, followed by a 'case study' on the praetorian prefecture. M. is alert to the fact that equestrians were frequently appointed, nominally, as deputies for absent senatorial officials (138–41). Conversely, she perhaps understates the significance of the elevation of praetorian prefects to the senatorial rank of *clarissimus* and, under Severan emperors, the practice of treating *ornamenta consularia* as equivalent to an ordinary consulship (177–9). Ch. 4 charts a contrast in military commands under Septimius Severus and Gallienus, highlighting 'two main developments': '(1) the rise of *equites* as leading men in military crises, and (2) a widening gulf between military power and senatorial status' (246). Both points have long been received wisdom but M. provides useful detail.

Two reservations about structure arise and a third about the theme of power and status. First, the book is a little slow to get going: both the introduction and ch. 1 cover territory which is likely to be largely familiar to most readers, yet neither says much about M.'s arguments, which receive by far their clearest statement only in her 'Conclusion' (247–54). Secondly, the layering of concluding observations within chapter sections plus conclusions to each full chapter and an overall conclusion to the book makes for repetition. Thirdly, M.'s development of the conceptual question of power and status is rudimentary. She summarizes Dahl's model of power and the subsequent work of Bachrach and Baratz, Lukes and Foucault. But while acknowledging the added sophistication brought by each new treatment, she expressly reverts to Dahl's 'basic one-dimensional view' (6) as her main point of reference (5–6, 46, 80, 188–9, 247). No one would doubt that the third-century evidence poses challenges for the elaboration of sophisticated conceptual models; but this use of political science is too limited for the historian's palate.

The present reviewer would close with one further observation. M.'s underlying concern is with 'the transformation from the early to late Empire' (1). This is a major historical problem and M.'s contribution deserves note. One leaves her book with the strong impression that — so far as senior civil and military service is concerned — the 'late' empire had already arrived in the 260s. Yet this is not really because of the ebb and flow of office-holding between senators and equestrians: matters would shift again in the fourth century with the senatorial 'revival' and the expansion of senatorial rank. Rather, what we are looking at are symptoms of a profound invasion of imperial government by provincial aristocracies. Senators and equestrians alike were increasingly recruited from the upper echelons of provincial aristocratic society. More widely, however, and no less decisively for the character of politics, society and economy, provincial aristocrats would also come to fill the ranks of the vast civilian bureaucracy that sets 'late' imperial government firmly apart from its 'high' forerunner.

Cardiff University
SkinnerAG@cardiff.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0075435812000913

ALEXANDER SKINNER

D. BOSCHUNG and W. ECK (EDS), *DIE TETRARCHIE: EIN NEUES REGIERUNGSSYSTEM UND SEINE MEDIALE PRÄSENTATION* (Schriften des Lehr- und Forschungszentrums für die antiken Kulturen des Mittelmeerraumes [ZAKMIRA] 3). Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 2006. Pp. 419, illus. ISBN 9783895005107. €39.90.

This volume presents fourteen papers arising from a colloquium of February 2004, which was itself inspired by a seminar series of 2002–3, organized by the Centre for Ancient Mediterranean Cultures of the Institute of Archaeology of the University of Cologne, on the broader theme of media in antiquity. Both editors were participants in the preceding venture and indeed the paper by Werner Eck included in this volume reprises one already published in the proceedings of the earlier seminar (*Medien in der Antike. Kommunikative Qualität und normative Wirkung*, ZAKMIRA 1,

ed. H. von Hesberg and W. Thiel (2003), 51–62). In turn the organizers of the seminar series have both contributed papers to this more focused project on the Tetrarchy as new political system and its representation in various media. The media considered range from literary and documentary texts of various types to coinage, architecture, and art. The regime established by Diocletian in A.D. 293, with its distinctive fourfold leadership, makes an excellent case study for examining the image propagated by the imperial court and its reflection in both public and private arenas. A better understanding of this environment also has wider significance since the events of this period provide the essential foil to, or foundation for, subsequent developments under Constantine, an emperor who continues to grip the public imagination.

After the editors' introduction, which sketches out the themes of the volume very generally, follow two chapters that have a certain genetic relationship with contributions by the same authors in A. Demandt *et al.* (eds), *Diokletian und die Tetrarchie* (2004), the proceedings of a conference held in Split in the spring of 2003. First Hartmut Leppin outlines the trends in modern scholarship on the Tetrarchy from Jakob Burckhardt in the mid-nineteenth century to Frank Kolb and T. D. Barnes at the end of the twentieth. These latter he characterizes as the chief exponents, respectively, of contrasting interpretations of Diocletian's tetrarchy as reactive and intentional. In terms of influence on the papers here, looking at the separate bibliographies for each, it is clear that Kolb's *Diocletian und die Erste Tetrarchie* (1987) and *Herrscherideologie in der Spätantike* (2001) are common points of reference for most contributors. Secondly Simon Corcoran, in the sole contribution not in German, surveys tetrarchic policy and image as reflected in imperial pronouncements, arguing that these convey the impression of energetic and ambitious legislators, whose edicts and letters are couched in much more elaborate rhetoric and take on a sense of moral urgency and self-justification. At the same time an arch-emphasis on Roman tradition sees an aggressive and unprecedented promulgation to the population of the Greek East of imperial pronouncements in Latin. Next Klaus Maresch considers the presentation of the emperors in the papyri of the period. Here the emphasis is on the imperial titulature in the formulae of oaths and dating in the documentary material. Amongst other phenomena, he draws attention to the tendency for *δεσπότης* to replace *κύριος* as the equivalent of *dominus* but, perhaps because it is a change in practice rather than titulature, does not reflect on the widespread introduction of consular dating into general use (an innovation for Roman Egypt), which coincides closely with the establishment of the Tetrarchy.

Patrick Brosch treats the topic of the representation of the Tetrarchy in the later Latin panegyrics. As a prelude he examines the two examples from the joint reign of Diocletian and Maximian as Augusti (X[2] of A.D. 289 and XI[3] of A.D. 291) where the Jovian-Herculean imagery is already to be found and an emphasis on their brotherhood, which is chosen rather than accidental (XI [3].7.6). Discussion of the speeches of A.D. 297 and 298 is unfortunately marred by a consistent confusion in the references, which should be to VIII(4) and IX(5) respectively. Here, when members of the college are referred to together, it is notable that both speechwriters opt to adhere to the order of precedence of the imperial college (Diocletian and Maximian Augusti, Constantius and Galerius Caesars).

In his paper on the question of the balance of innovation and continuity in the Roman army of the tetrarchic period, Thomas Fischer sensibly eschews rehashing what might supposedly be derived from the much later *Notitia Dignitatum* for an analysis based principally on the much more secure footing of the archaeology of the *limes* of the Rhine and upper Danube. The footprints of excavated forts show unmistakable signs of the atomisation of the frontier forces into smaller units. In terms of equipment, he concludes that adoption of the so-called *pilleus Pannonicus* was more for symbolic effect than practical functionality. Henner von Hesberg examines new and traditional concepts of space in the tetrarchic capitals and their court infrastructure. This concentrates on circuses and amphitheatres, public baths, and audience chambers. He emphasizes how, unlike earlier examples of imperial beautification of provincial towns of origin (e.g. Lepcis Magna, Philippopolis), the anchoring of the dispersed imperial courts and their associated ceremonies in specific provincial locations transformed use of space in those cities, making real the claim that Rome, or more specifically the *palatium*, is where the emperor is. By contrast, Werner Oenbrink focuses on the Rome-based Maxentius as an example of an anti-type to the tetrarchic model. Here he focuses on the building programme in the centre of the city, which comprised work on the Temple of Venus and Rome, the vaulted basilica completed by Constantine, the circular vestibule for the seat of the urban prefect (the so-called Temple of Romulus), and the group of statues to Mars, Romulus and Remus, as founders of the city, erected near the *Lapis niger*, as central to Maxentius' legitimation.

In the next two papers Wolfram Weiser addresses the question of the image of the Tetrarchy in the coinage (with an appendix on the identity of the owner of the Beaurains hoard) and Peter Weiss similarly considers the lead seals produced by the imperial administration. Comparing the two, it is striking how the imperial quartet is regularly represented as a group, both as busts and standing figures, on the lead seals, while the obverse types of the coins remain almost exclusively individual with no more than two emperors at a time ever usually featuring in reverse imagery. Moving from the portable to the monumental, Wolfgang Thiel explores 'Pompey's Pillar' at Alexandria and other *tetrakionia* at Hermopolis, Antinoopolis, Oxyrhynchus (possibly), Luxor, and Ptolemais and Arae Philaenorum in Cyrenaica as expressions of a culture of representing the Tetrarchy in North Africa, building on an earlier article on the same subject that covered the whole of the Greek East (*AniTard* 10 (2002), 299–326). Of these, only the first, the last, and that at Luxor are securely linked by epigraphic evidence with celebration of Diocletian and his colleagues. There remains a certain danger of circularity in the argument in the other cases, though the pattern is indeed suggestive. Eck's paper addressing the idea of Diocletian's regime as reflected in the texts and images of public monuments follows on naturally. Here he explores numerous examples of the ubiquitous devotional formula *d(evotus/licatus) n(umini) m(aiestati)q(ue) e(ius/orum)*, showing that, even where only a single dedication survives, we may regularly assume that it formed part of a pair or group honouring the imperial college together, as exemplified by the porphyry statue groups preserved in St Mark's Square in Venice and in the Vatican. The paper of his fellow editor, Dietrich Boschung, on the tetrarchic regime as message of visual media, actually confines itself largely to the best preserved genres: statuary and relief sculpture. The Venice and Vatican groups feature again, as well as the arch of Galerius at Thessaloniki, the *vicennalia* monument from the Roman Forum, and, more unusually, the *Arcus novus* (demolished in 1491), with its elements cannibalized from the Claudian *Ara Pietatis* and the Aurelian Temple of Sol. In these last two monuments he reads a nod, in the face of the opposite reality, to the nostalgic idea of Rome as the centre of the empire and an appeal to the traditions of the earlier imperial period.

With Katja Sporn's paper, exploring the contemporary reception of the tetrarchic visual discourse, the discussion moves from the public to the private. She poses the question of whether the imperial self-representation had any resonance. She surveys sarcophagi, mosaics, wall-painting, private statuary, ivory carving, and miniature representations of the imperial image in glass and on lamps. Her conclusion is that the impact is distinctly limited, in contrast with that of imperially sponsored art in the Augustan period, which forms her counterpoint. The volume ends with an essay by Hartwin Brandt on the Tetrarchy as portrayed in the literature of the fourth century, which, he acknowledges, nicely complements the paper by Heinrich Schlange-Schöningen from the Split conference on the reception of Diocletian under the Constantinian dynasty. This interesting discussion could have been made more accessible had the reasonably extensive passages of Greek and Latin authors been provided with a vernacular translation. A contrast to the predictable negative impressions conveyed by hostile Christian contemporaries, such as Lactantius and Eusebius, is the attitude of the late fourth-century anonymous author of the *Historia Augusta* to whom Diocletian was 'the father of a golden age' (*vita Heliog.* 35.4) and he and his colleagues 'four rulers of the world ... of one mind with regard to the commonwealth' (*vita Cari* 18.4).

The undoubted strength of this volume lies in the tight thematic connection between the various papers. However, the 'light touch' approach to editing that has been taken does the volume overall a disservice. As a result, there is little feeling of dialogue between contributions, despite many points of connection, of which one obvious symptom is the repetition in different papers of images of the same artefacts: the porphyry group in Venice (125, 343, 352), the similar group from the Vatican (341, 356), and the same section of the arch of Thessaloniki (263, 387). The situation is exacerbated by lack of an index of any sort. Moreover, given the various overlaps, this is one multi-authored volume where a consolidated bibliography, at least of the works commonly enough cited to be given abbreviated forms separately in each paper, would actually have been helpful rather than simply fashionable. Again, although contrived links are to be avoided as a rule, in the absence of abstracts, a concluding section that highlighted the points of agreement and contrast between the separate contributions would have benefited the reader. Thus an opportunity is missed to reflect on the implications of aspects that might seem surprising, such as the fact that there is not more examination of Diocletian's palace-mausoleum complex at Split or Galerius' equivalent at Romuliana (Gamzigrad). That these do not feature more prominently underlines the fact that these monuments do not celebrate the collective and that, for all the emphasis on fictive brotherhood and parentage in the tetrarchic regime, in death individuality reasserts itself. On balance, despite

the shortcomings in its publication, this collection is certainly worthy of serious attention and will repay those persevering readers who take the trouble to explore it in detail.

University College London
r.salway@ucl.ac.uk

BENET SALWAY

doi:10.1017/S0075435812000925

S. MCGILL, C. SOGNO and E. WATTS (EDS), *FROM THE TETRARCHS TO THE THEODOSIANS: LATER ROMAN HISTORY AND CULTURE, 284–450 CE* (Yale Classical Studies 34). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. Pp. ix + 321. ISBN 9780521898218. £55.00.

The essays collected in this volume reflect on and develop subjects in the history of Late Antiquity which have preoccupied their honorand, John Matthews, over a distinguished and wide-ranging career. Although they tackle topics in the period from Diocletian to Theodosius II (as promised by the book's very title), two of their authors, Potter and Garnsey, range much more widely back in time. They demonstrate that, whatever the temporal limits one sets to Late Antiquity, to understand fully the continuities and transformations of this period requires one to take a relatively long chronological view. All the contributors appear to have taken seriously the editorial ambition (6) that this volume should reveal different transformations from those often explored by exponents of a 'transformation' view of the late classical world.

The first section of the book addresses subjects in political life, social life and law. Potter's opening chapter explores the background to and reasons for the dissolution of the Roman Empire. He identifies three phases of imperial self-definition, beginning in the fourth century B.C. with an ethical principle of *fides*, moving to a legal definition of *imperium*, and ending with an administrative definition in the post-Severan period. According to P., this administrative self-interest was ultimately responsible for the collapse of the western empire. P. sometimes asserts rather than demonstrates, but overall his ambitiously grand narrative moves successfully between the 'micro' and 'macro'. Garnsey also ranges from Republic to Late Empire in an exploration of the continuing but evolving importance of patronage in Roman society, and cleanly dispatches old and new orthodoxies along the way. Rather than accepting the eclipse of patronage in Late Antiquity by other practices such as the sale of office, he argues that it continued to flourish up to Justinian. He also shows ingeniously how Late Antiquity might showcase a 'norm' of patronage against the earlier distortions of the late Republic and early Principate. Sogno segues into a related sub-topic of patronage: matchmaking. She compares examples from Pliny's letters with those of Symmachus and Augustine to demonstrate how, despite differences in these correspondents' ideals, focus and purpose, matchmaking continued to be an important part of patronage. The last two chapters of this section take a legal turn. Harries explores two aspects of Constantine's testamentary legislation to show convincingly how, in this field at least, he was a traditional legislator tackling specific problems in conformity with precedent, despite the distorting effects of rhetoric and of the testimony of critics and supporters eager, for different reasons, to assert that he was in fact an arch innovator. Connolly homes in on an encounter documented in the Theodosian Code between Constantine and a group of disgruntled veterans. She identifies elements of continuity in the fact and shape of the exchange, but aspects of change in its ceremonial context.

The second part of this volume develops ongoing scholarly conversations on biographical writing and builds successfully on the work of another edited volume, now over a decade old, T. Hägg and P. Rousseau (eds), *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity* (2000), in bringing together the analysis of very different kinds of texts. Watts shows how, as the understanding of what constituted philosophy in Christian Late Antiquity widened, so biographies of a range of Christian figures came to adapt the narrative structures and rhetorical techniques of philosophical biography to similarly persuasive ends. Osgood focuses on Paulinus' verse autobiography and its debts to Augustine and Ausonius; although Paulinus' attitude to his formal education is apparently dismissive, he nonetheless pays homage to the classics in the very form and texture of his verse. McGill examines Phocas' use of Donatus in his hexameter *Life of Virgil* and identifies some significant departures from Donatus, particularly in the fabrication of new wonders and prodigies for Virgil. M. shows that these were derived from creative readings of Donatus and Virgil's fourth Eclogue, and from associative memories of stories told about Plato, and makes acute remarks about their likely