Surprisingly, the work falls short of these criteria:

1. It is unnecessarily unwieldy. M. numbers the items in the catalogue, but never refers to the numbers, instead citing a single publication of each inscription, meaning that in order to move from the discussion to the catalogue, one must pivot through the indices of sources and names.
2. Though most of these inscriptions have been anthologized and re-edited many times over, M.'s index of epigraphic sources includes only the single publication he cites in the text. This means that if researchers do not have that particular citation, they will have to use the index of names — but is it, for example, M. Plautius Silvanus, consul in 2 B.C., or his father? — or resort to the Epigraphische Datenbank Clauss-Slaby (www.manfredclauss.de) or another online database and, after finding the inscription, try different citations until they discover the one M. has chosen to use.
3. This arrangement seems to have been the source of problems for M. himself. The single inscription recording M. Plautius Silvanus, the father of the consul, for example, is cited one way at 103 and in the catalogue (217), and another at 33 and 99 n. 49, and in the index of epigraphic sources: one man, one inscription, two separate existences across the text and indices. Similar problems with internal references occur throughout.
4. The starting-point seems arbitrary and unhelpful. As M. demonstrates, the adoption of the full *cursus* was a gradual process. Within this process, the date 27 B.C. is of no significance whatever. M.'s choice means that comparable 'forerunner' inscriptions are both excluded from his catalogue and analytic tables and included in them (5–6, 33–6). Most unfortunately, it means that M.'s own example of the earliest surviving *cursus* inscription — that of L. Caecina, quoted above — does not appear in his catalogue and is cited only once, in his introduction (7), and then never mentioned again. Perhaps the better approach would have been to include all Republican inscriptions mentioning senators and their public offices, and then to let the birth and development of *cursus* inscriptions emerge from the discussion (principal texts already cited at 5 n. 27 and 6 n. 31).

Part of the explanation for the problems with the present work may lie in a peculiarity of the Finnish doctoral process, which requires publication of a doctoral thesis *before* its final public examination (the examination, with J. Bodel as 'opponent' and Salomies as 'custos', took place on 2 March 2013; the review copy was stamped as received at the Joint Library of the Hellenic and Roman Societies on 11 March 2013). It is to be hoped that in this case M. will be able to publish a revised and corrected edition. He has done so much, for the most part he has done it well, and, once he makes the necessary changes, he will have produced a very useful tool.

University of Victoria GREGORY ROWE
gdrowe@uvic.ca
doi:10.1017/S0075435815000192

A. BÉRENGER and F. LACHAUD (EDS), *HIÉRARCHIE DES POUVOIRS, DÉLÉGATION DE POUVOIR ET RESPONSABILITÉ DES ADMINISTRATEURS DANS L'ANTIQUITÉ ET AU MOYEN ÂGE: ACTES DU COLLOQUE DE METZ, 16–18 JUIN 2011* (Centre de recherche universitaire lorrain d'histoire, Université de Lorraine, Site de Metz 46). Metz: Centre de recherche universitaire lorrain d'histoire, 2012. Pp. 427, illus. ISBN 2857300530. €22.00.

This book places the Roman world and the Middle Ages side by side in a pragmatic exploration of the working out of delegated power. An alert editorial introduction is followed by eighteen papers, divided into five sections. Taken individually, these contributions will certainly hold the interest of readers in

their particular fields. The first section approaches the problem from a series of angles: we have Michel Sève on the *officium* of the governor of Asia at a time of war against Mithridates; Audrey Becker on delegation in fifth-century Romano-barbarian diplomacy; Pierfrancesco Porena on power and delegation in Ostrogothic Italy; and Ignazio Tantillo on the accumulation of powers by *comites* and *praesides* in the fourth century. The second section is more suggestive of a joined-up history: we begin with Michel Humm on the hierarchies of powers and magistracies under the Republic, which dovetails with Stéphanie Benoist on the notion of delegation from *princeps* to *legati* between Augustus and the fourth century. These are followed by two high imperial papers — Frédéric Hurlet on 'rituals of mediation' between emperor and governor, which dovetails with Agnès Bérenger on delegation from governor to legates. Historians of Late Antiquity will also want to turn to the book's fifth section — on the working out of hierarchy and delegation in the Church — which opens with François-Xavier Romanacce on the relation of bishop and deacon from the third to the fifth centuries.

Conversely, the main comparative effect of this volume across ancient and medieval history relies largely on the reader's willingness to move between sections and to ponder what their juxtaposition might show. The third part explores the oversight and accountability of administrators from the twelfth to fourteenth centuries in three papers. The fourth examines late medieval notions about office, also in three papers. The concluding, 'ecclesiastical' portion (four papers in all) takes the case of the Church up to the fifteenth century.

To the present reviewer, this juxtaposition seems entirely worthwhile. The most lasting impression with which these papers leave us is that the Roman Empire and the later Middle Ages are remarkably susceptible to mutual comparison. At the heart of this comparability is a peculiar nexus of evolving characteristics that shaped the delegation and exercise of power: (i) a monarchy with growing claims to absolutism; (ii) an increasingly developed court; (iii) a geographical compulsion to delegate administration; (iv) an ever more sharply perceived need to monitor and restrain the delegates of royal power; and (v) a concomitant tendency for aristocrats in the localities to see themselves, ever more self-consciously, in relation to central power. This nexus of qualities is, of course, particularly apparent in the age of Diocletian or Theodosius I; and we are accustomed to finding it in the seventeenth-century France of Louis XIV, or the eighteenth-century Russia of Catherine the Great. But precisely because the present volume stops short of the Baroque age of early modern absolutism, what it gives us is a refreshingly fluid view of the problems of power, delegation and supervision.

That these problems were already consciously diagnosed by those who lived with them is a point reinforced with great lucidity by Frédérique Lachaud's dissection (311–38) of *The Governance of England* (otherwise known as the *Monarchia* or *The Difference between an Absolute and a Limited Monarchy*) by Sir John Fortescue. Fortescue was a long-serving Chief Justice of the King's Bench under Henry VI. What was at issue in his contrast of 'dominium regale' and 'dominium politicum et regale' was a point that ancient panegyrists had sought to finesse — the question of rule by monarchical decree versus rule with the assent of the governed. The point was no mere abstraction. To Fortescue, the health of the state required effective counsellors and office-holders. As Lachaud teases out, he had some specific observations to offer. What one senses is that, were they placed in the same room, Fortescue and Ammianus Marcellinus would in many respects have conversed in the same language of power. Fortescue's was more of an insider's view looking out, while Ammianus looked inward towards the consistory. But they had both, in their different ways, 'kissed the purple' — and had both learned to scan, with a critical eye, their fellow agents of the throne.

University of Birmingham/Cardiff University ALEXANDER SKINNER
SkinnerAG@cardiff.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0075435815000416

T. T. TERPSTRA, *TRADING COMMUNITIES IN THE ROMAN WORLD: A MICRO-ECONOMIC AND INSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVE* (Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 37). Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2013. Pp. xiii + 244, illus., map. ISBN 9789004238602 (bound); 97890042451 36 (e-book). €96.00/US$133.00

A number of difficulties were inherent to pre-industrial trade, one of the foremost being the matter of long-distance communication. As Taco Terpstra states in his introductory paragraph, Roman trade operated in an imperfect system: both in terms of communication and with regard to a legal