

Erika Manders/Daniëlle Slootjes (eds.): *Leadership, Ideology and Crowds in the Roman Empire of the Fourth Century AD*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag 2020 (Heidelberger althistorische Beiträge und epigraphische Studien 62). 200 p. € 44.00. ISBN: 978-3- 515-12404-1.

The collective volume under review offers in revised format the results of a like-named conference that was held at the Georg-August-Universität Göttingen in 2015. The volume consists of a brief introduction followed by eleven contributions. The introduction clearly and incisively sets forth the aims and methodological underpinnings for this volume and offers a brief preview of each of the contributions. Dedicated to various topics that are clearly delimited for methodological purposes, the contributions are innovative and make for stimulating reading. Together they offer a rounded vision of the possibilities for future work. The case studies presented here cover a wide range of topics (architecture, panegyric, coins, legal sources, Jewish society, individual emperors and bishops, and collective representations of emperors and bishops as sociological categories and rhetorical types). In view of the importance and interest of all of the contributions, a brief description and critique of each chapter will be given in what follows.

This elegant volume opens with an introductory essay (9–18: “Introduction: Leadership, Ideology and Crowds in the Roman Empire of the 4th Century AD”), by Jan Willem Drijvers, Erika Manders, and Daniëlle Slootjes, that provides an overview of the aims, methods, and content of the volume. The fundamental premise is one to which most readers will likely subscribe: “Leaders are not born; they are made or make themselves” (10). The contributors have set themselves the task of establishing where and how leaders interacted with the masses in the fourth century, at a moment when the conversion of the Empire to Christianity further complicated the traditional social and economic relations of Graeco-Roman society, and in so doing they dedicate especial attention to the ideological matrix of these interactions. Ideology, as the authors of the introduction observe, was fundamental for the creation of societal consensus (13). There are two methodological approaches that are central to this volume’s approach to leadership, ideology, and crowds: systematic medium analysis and the combination of top-down and bottom-up analyses. The first of these two methods involves systematically examining a specific category or genre of evidence before combining it with other types of evidence. The second of these two methods

involves an ambidextrous consideration of alternative and opposing perspectives of the same phenomenon as it is to be found in the evidence. Together these methods serve to help the investigator avoid the pitfalls of cherry-picking and cognitive bias that have far too often plagued historical investigation.¹ This care for method is evident in the volume that follows and makes its contributions particularly valuable, not only for what is discovered but also as models for future investigation. The eleven contributions that follow are interconnected in terms of themes and chronology. While there is no apportionment of these pieces among different sections, a progressive, logical development is discernible as the volume moves from general considerations of context to specific case-studies and advances in a consistent manner with a chronological review of the revolutionary fourth century.

In the first contribution (19–33: “Architecture and Power: Defining Tetrarchic Imperial Residences”), Verena Jaeschke reviews the evidence for the residences of the Tetrarchs and offers a new identification for the recurring features of the principal residences where active emperors lived and conducted their business. In so doing, she persuasively highlights the role that the *Domus Augustana* on the Palatine hill in Rome played as a model for these residences scattered throughout the provinces. Standard features are clearly identified and presented in a table (23) that lists the candidates under consideration: Nicomedia, Antioch, Sirmium, Thessalonica, Serdica, *Augusta Treverorum*, *Mediolanum*, and *Aquileia*. From her discussion, it emerges that one might expect as a rule to find the presence of a palace, a circus, and a mint, whereas a mausoleum seems characteristic instead of minor residences meant for retirement. Moreover, each of these cities already served as the capital of a province, with infrastructure in place that would make imperial residence attractive and feasible. Therefore, the basic thesis of this piece is more than abundantly demonstrated. In view of the often “marginal” nature of these Tetrarchic residences (remarked by Jaeschke herself at 27), however, it might be worth inquiring whether the palace known as the *Sessorium* in any way influenced Tetrarchic architectural developments or

1 The methodology has come into greater use over the course of the past decade. So, for instance, the author of the review has done something similar in a re-examination of the evidence for the construction of the first basilica of St Peter in the Vatican; cf. Westall 2015. – For complete bibliographic information, see the bibliography at the end of this review (p. 368).

whether both are parallel responses to similar stimuli in similar historical and topographical contexts. There are only two cities that seem to be missing from Jaeschke's competent and thorough review: Carthage and Constantinople. Carthage was the principal residence of Maximian during his time in north Africa when not campaigning against the Berber tribes², and Constantinople (or rather Byzantium) may have been the chief residence of Licinius in the final years of his reign.³

The second contribution (35–48: “Rhetoric and Power: How Imperial Panegyric Allowed Civilian Elites Access to Power”), by Adraustos Omissi, reviews the ways in which the practice of panegyric enabled orators to pursue careers and acquire or exercise power that would otherwise have been beyond their purview. A refreshing re-examination of the orator rather than his art or the subject of that art, this piece illustrates the possibilities for success and disaster. Ranging from the anonymous pieces delivered before Constantine early in his reign to that composed by Claudian in honour of the consuls of AD 395, Omissi covers the full extent of the fourth century and makes specific, useful references to many of the fifty-one panegyrics that survive from the fourth century. Arguably on a par with the press conference of today's parliamentary democracies, the panegyric was a constitutive moment for the government of the later Roman empire.⁴ Accessible and penetrating in terms of insight, this piece will make a wonderful addition to many a course on Late Antiquity, whether it be dedicated to Roman history or the life and writings of individuals as different as Augustine of Hippo and Libanius of Antioch. In approaching panegyric from the perspective of the orator, Omissi offers useful insight into the nature of this art form and its potential – as well as its drawbacks – as a historical source. Comparable to the petitions that daily swamped emperors and their representatives⁵,

2 For his presence there during the winter of 297–298, see Roberto 2014, 125, 298 n.17; Kienast/Eck/Heil 2017⁶, 262; Barnes 1982, 59.

3 Cf. Stephenson 2009, 193–194; Barnes 2011, 112–113.

4 While the reviewer would hesitate to speak of proof of the equivalence between late antique panegyrics and post-modern news conferences, it does seem clear that panegyrics served their live audiences and their eventual readers in a manner akin to *litterae laureatae* (for the latter, see McCormick 1986, 192–193). Therefore, *mutatis mutandis* (e.g. the lack of television *vel sim.*) it does seem legitimate to compare them to today's news conferences.

5 The example of 1,804 petitions addressed to the prefect of Egypt in just three days is a dramatic illustration of what must have been common experience (38 n.20).

panegyrics offered speakers an occasion on which to represent not only their community and its needs, but also themselves and their own needs and aspirations. While Augustine eventually turned his back on this world and its hollow pretences, it was central to the effective functioning of government in the later Roman empire, and the sympathetic portrayal offered in this piece nicely sketches the various possibilities. As such, it offers a welcome complement to the classic discussion of panegyric published by Sabine G. MacCormack forty years ago.⁶

The third contribution (49–59: “Coins against Christianity? Maximinus’ ‘Persecution Issues’ in Context”), by Erika Manders, examines numismatic issues from Nicomedia, Antioch, and Alexandria that previous scholarship had identified as exemplifying the anti-Christian policies of the emperor Maximinus II (AD 305–313). This focus on numismatic evidence as a means of leaders’ communicating with the masses is extremely well conceived, and the close reading offered is by and large persuasive. The suggestion of Manders that this renewal of civic coinage is to be taken as a response to the *census* law that Maximinus issued in June AD 311 abolishing the personal tax levied on the urban population (58; citing Christensen 2012, 189–200) is quite convincing. However, there are at times problems with the argumentation of this piece and the presentation of the evidence. The table setting forth the numismatic evidence in question is beautifully executed, but the reviewer would have appreciated the addition of catalogue references and reproductions of examples rather than merely being told to consult a publication that appeared in print more than a quarter of a century ago. These coins are central to the contribution and ought to have been reproduced to facilitate verification on the part of readers. Indeed, it is to be observed that civic and imperial coinage are not quite the same thing. A second problem concerns the reference (or lack thereof) to figures: no reference is provided for the deities appearing on Constantine’s coin types (Figure 1 on p. 54) in the discussion on p. 53, whereas the reference to Figure 1 on p. 54 ought in fact to be a reference to Figure 2 on p. 55 (“Dominant themes on Maximinus’ coin types”). A third problem lies in the historical survey (50–51), which is meant to provide readers with the necessary context but actually

Readers will still find it useful to consult Millar 1977, 36, 59, 468–476, 618, for reflection on this fundamental issue.

6 MacCormack 1981.

misrepresents details and makes more obscure what was already a rather complicated situation. This is most unfortunate, for the author's reading of the numismatic evidence is convincing. Clarity on the circumstances and manner in which Maximinus and Licinius divided and then fought over the territories formerly subject to Galerius, abetted by an opportune reference or two to the standard reference works⁷, would have helped considerably.

The following contribution (61–80: “Moral und Rhetorik im Codex Theodosianus: Konstantins Strategien zur Beeinflussung der römischen Bevölkerung,”), by Elisabeth Herrmann-Otto, adopts an inductive approach to the analysis of Constantinian legal texts so as to establish the mechanisms and goals of the rhetoric and morality that are so distinctive and integral a part of this body of evidence. Seven examples culled from *leges generales* are presented as case studies and analysed (CTh 4.7.1 [321]; 4.43.2 [329]; 5.9.1 [331]; 9.9.1 [319]; 9.24.1 [320 or 326]; 12.1.6 [319]; 4.6.3 [336]). Susceptible of ethical formulation and innovation in a way that a rescript was not, a general law or constitution arguably allows for insight into the nature and aims of Constantinian justice. The pieces discussed cast light on two fundamental, related questions. Was Constantine attempting to reform social customs to reflect his idea of a Christian Roman empire? Were late antique emperors not only reacting to external stimuli, but also actively pursuing an agenda of social policy? Herrmann-Otto does not attempt to resolve these questions in the present contribution (66), but her work takes us far in the direction of establishing answers. Whatever the precise contribution made by Constantine to the formulation of the legal texts issued in his name, there clearly emerges a desire to innovate and expand Roman law as regards social issues. So, for instance, Herrmann-Otto pointedly contrasts Constantine's allowing parents to sell their newborn children into slavery (on account of poverty and inability to feed them) with Diocletian's refusing to countenance parents' alienating their children's liberty (67–68). Or, there is the example of the extension of capital punishment to any mistress found having sex with her slave(s) and the awarding of liberty to the slave who denounces such a depravity, whereby Constantine usurps what had been the prerogative of the *pater familias* (69–70). The augmented brutality of Constantinian justice also emerges from things such as the general law that prescribes pouring molten lead down the throats of compliant nurses and death by fire for any slaves

7 Barnes 1982 and Kienast/Eck/Heil 2017⁶.

involved in the theft of brides (70–71). More than a century after the *Constitutio Antoniniana* revolutionised matters by extending Roman citizenship upon an unprecedented scale, the social problems of the Mediterranean countryside at last enter into Roman law.⁸ Herrmann-Otto is indubitably correct in viewing the rhetorical and moral strategies of Constantine in his *leges generales* as aimed at influencing the populace. It is perhaps worth adding that the moralising and rhetorical features justly highlighted by Herrmann-Otto are equally prominent in such items as the preface to the Diocletianic edict on maximum prices. In short, Constantine can once again be seen to be following in the footsteps of his predecessor. Notwithstanding their antithetical religious positions, Diocletian and Constantine exhibit a striking degree of continuity and consistency in terms of administrative policy.

The fifth contribution (81–97: “His blood be upon us’: Protecting the Jews in Late Antiquity”), by John Curran, investigates the tension between Roman emperors’ ideology and their pragmatism as evinced in their treatment of a specific “crowd”, viz. the social entity constituted by Jews living within the bounds of the Empire. The role of leaders such as the Jewish Patriarch is reviewed in this survey that seeks to establish the relationship between legal rhetoric and historical, lived reality. The opening lesson in etymology will be of interest to many, and it is only to be regretted that the appellation *Ioudaios* is oddly misspelled in the transliterated version of the Greek and not provided with a capital letter to indicate that it is an ethnic (e.g. *Romanus*, *Graecus*, *Hibernus*). The ensuing discussion of the *adversus Iudaeos* literature nicely sets forth both the problems of interpretation and some of the more salient examples of this genre. There follows a discussion of the legal enactments of the first century of the Christian Roman empire and a consideration – probably too anodyne – of whether or not verbal hostility translated into legal persecution. Just as the Holocaust did not come to be implemented overnight, so the reduction of the recognised legal rights of the Jewish members of the Roman body politic occurred piecemeal: *divide et impera*. The final section deals with the figure of the Jewish Patriarch, highlighting the fact of a multiplicity of authoritative figures within the Jewish world. The lack of any significant impact by the Patriarch upon the Talmud is convincingly adduced as a sign of relative weakness (90), and the evidence for institutions such as the ἀποστολή likewise suggests, upon close examination, a relatively

8 Cf. Evans Grubbs 1993, 137.

weak figure. Overall, Curran is persuasive in setting forth the argument that there was not an abrupt, precipitous change of fortunes for Jews with the conversion of the Roman emperors to Christianity, but it would be folly to claim that the situation of Jews in a Christian Roman empire remained as it was before the conversion of Constantine. Starting with Constantine, there are clear and unmistakable signs of a worsening of conditions. The thesis advanced by Curran that the discernible hostility is due to proselytism – feared or resented as a result of Christians’ curiosity about the religion of Jesus of Nazareth and his forefathers – has much to recommend it. To downplay such hostility and its real-life consequences, however, seems tantamount to ignoring dog-whistle instances of racism or analogous forms of hatred of the Other in the post-modern world.

The sixth contribution (99–116: “Imperial Leadership: Constantius II”), by Gerda de Kleijn applies the concepts and analytical categories of leadership studies to the figure of the fourth-century Roman emperor, utilising the figure of Constantius II as a case study. Not remembered as an example of leadership to emulate, Constantius II stands in marked contrast to his father Constantine I and his cousin Julian, offering de Kleijn an excellent opportunity to compare and contrast different styles of leadership and their reception in the ancient sources and modern scholarship. The survey of leadership studies (a field that burgeoned in the last decades of the twentieth century *pari passu* with the rapid growth of the managerial category) offers a welcome grounding in literature that will be foreign to most students of the Graeco-Roman world. According to de Kleijn, Roman emperors can be classified as autocratic leaders, and are potentially to be assigned to the sub-category of the warrior model (104). The ensuing analysis of the figure of Constantius II highlights both this ruler’s shortcomings overall in terms of classical criteria (courage, justice, temperance, and wisdom) and his behaviour as a transactional leader (as opposed to a transformational or charismatic leader). The ruler’s poor interaction with personnel and the population emerges as a constant from this individual’s reign. The case study offers a persuasive interpretation of the negative image to be had from pagan testimonies regarding the figure of Constantius II and de Kleijn is to be congratulated upon this insightful application of an innovative method to an old problem. However, the analysis tends towards a caricature in its hasty summarisation of complex historical events (e.g. Constantius II’s attitude towards the sharing of power as described at p. 106, where the reality of civil war in 340, 350–353, and

360–361 is altogether obfuscated). Moreover, the complete omission of Christian testimonies for a ruler who thought of himself as a Christian Roman emperor unduly prejudices the inquiry, giving the specious appearance of equanimity to hostile witnesses.⁹ Last but not least, the risk of circular reasoning is disconcertingly real, as the ‘post-mortem’ (or necrology) offered by Ammianus at 21.16 arguably cherry-picks and uses rhetoric to distort historical reality in order to provide an image of the failed tyrant (which is tantamount to that of a transactional leader who does not quite succeed as a ‘warrior autocrat’). In short, this contribution offers a welcome re-evaluation of Constantius II and invites a reflective re-reading of testimonies such as that of Ammianus, but the application of concepts and language borrowed from leadership studies must always be accompanied by care for the details of historical and philological context.

In the seventh contribution (117–133: “Damasus and the Charioteers: Crowds, Leadership and Media in Late Antique Rome”), by Marianne Sághy († 2018), the connection between the bloody urban warfare that resulted from a contested papal election and the commemoration of the saints and martyrs of Rome by pope Damasus is explored. Sághy makes a convincing case for Damasus engaging in the commemoration of the past heroes of the Christian community of Rome as a way of displacing the discourse regarding the questionable means by which he secured his hold on power. As such, this piece nicely draws a firm and persuasive connection between the three themes of the volume under review: crowds, leadership, and media. Sághy also adds an intriguing element to the mix by highlighting the apparent use of money as a means to obtain the public engagement of “charioteers and the ignorant multitude” (120, citing *Quae gesta sunt inter Liberium et Felicem episcopos* 5, translated by Sághy) on behalf of Damasus in the conflict of AD 366. Her discussion of this conflict (esp. 119–123) gives added piquancy to the well-known response with which Praetextatus allegedly teased Damasus: “Make me bishop of Rome and I’ll be straight away Christian” (Hier. c. Ioh. Hieros. 8, translated by Sághy). As is attested by the numerous dead at the *basilica Iulii* (S. Maria in Trastevere) and the *basilica Liberiana* (S. Maria Maggiore), Damasus would sooner have parted with both eyes than give up his position as the bishop of Rome. There are numerous other, similar jewels to

9 For the “Dated Creed”, which is merely the most egregious example of what followed from Constantius II’s vision of himself as a Christian ruler, see Kelly 1999³, 288–291.

be found scattered throughout this highly readable contribution. Curiously, however, there is little of charioteers to be found in this piece. That is unfortunate, for the association of charioteers with the bishop of Rome is indeed “quite unusual” (122) and in fact extraordinary. The answer, the reviewer would opine, lies at the intersection of the polemical purpose of the author of the petition *Quae gesta sunt inter Liberium et Felicem episcopos* and the documented fact that it was the demonstration of the crowd at the Circus Maximus during the chariot races that elicited from Constantius II the promise of the return of the exiled bishop of Rome Liberius (Theod. hist. eccl. 2.17.5–6). The singling out of charioteers amongst those of Damasus’ supporters willing to utilise violence to decide an episcopal election not only seems to reflect what actually happened, but was also arguably committed to memory because it would associate Damasus with the infelicitous past of his predecessor. Of course, as numerous scholars have observed, charioteers were public figures who often served as lightning rods for the discontent of the masses in a world where individual redress depended on wealth and social affluence.¹⁰

The next contribution (135–149: “Venerabili episcopo atque doctissimo Nicetae: Niceta of Remesiana and Episcopal Leadership in Fourth-Century Illyricum”), by Carmen Angela Cvetković recovers the forgotten figure of a pro-Nicene leader of the Illyrian church who was active between the last years of the fourth and the first years of the fifth century AD. An older contemporary of Paulinus of Nola, whom he visited twice during his travels from Illyricum to Rome (AD 400, 403), bishop Niceta of Remesiana (near Naïssus) cuts an intriguing figure in the carefully reconstructed portrait furnished here by Cvetković. Active in the conversion of barbarians in the Danubian provinces to Christianity and the author of a six-volume manual for candidates for baptism, Niceta of Remesiana emerges as an ecclesiastical leader whose activities straddled the Greek-Latin linguistic divide and was in close touch with the authorities in Rome. Cvetković persuasively illustrates the ways in which Paulinus depicts Niceta as a bishop who, through his activities, embodied the spiritual and ascetic authority desirable in such figures. Duly cautious in interpreting the evidence, Cvetković refrains from pressing it beyond what is likely to be acceptable to a wide consensus. On the other hand, her analysis does open up the possibility of new interpretations. So,

10 See, for instance, Cameron 1973; Cameron 1976; Humphrey 1986; Meijer 2010.

for instance, one wonders whether there was not an intimate connection between Niceta's proselytism and his manual for baptismal candidates, whether in terms of experience or as regards audience or both. Or, to take another instance, one wonders whether the unusual decision to travel by winter was dictated by worldly affairs as much as by ecclesiastical concerns. It is just conceivable that the visit to Rome in AD 403, for example, was intended to coincide with the emperor's triumphal presence in the capital.¹¹

The shortest of the contributions (at less than nine pages of text), that (151–161: “Controllers of Crowds? Popular Mobilization and Episcopal Leadership in Late Roman North Africa”), by Julio Cesar Magalhães de Oliveira is arguably the most important and incisive in a crowd noteworthy for advancing our understanding of the three interconnected themes of this collective volume. Focussing on the two episodes of Bagaï in Numidia in 347 and Carthage in 401, Magalhães de Oliveira convincingly argues that in both instances the attentive observer is able to discern the mechanisms of mobilization and concordance operative amongst the crowd and thereby achieve a bottom-up perspective. The application of the insights of modern theoreticians and students of the sociology of crowds (e.g. Bourdieu 1977; Tilly 2003; Tarrow 2011) allows the ancient historian to identify and analyse the mechanisms and processes involved in collective action, and thereby to avoid the blind alley of a focus on leaders that posits the “fanaticism, irrationality, and deprivation of the masses” (152). Brilliant, accessible, and short, this is a piece that will be extremely useful not only in seminars (as is the case with the others in this volume), but also in survey classes for undergraduates. It unlocks a door and offers the possibility of significant advances in our understanding of mass movements in Graeco-Roman antiquity, from the crowd of Achaeans eager to abandon Troy and return home through to the Nika riots under Justinian. The reviewer expects to see much use made of this piece in the years to come. Which is not to say that there are no quibbles. The use of the adverb “spontaneously” (158) towards the culmination of the analysis of the second episode is infelicitous to say the least, as one never prepares something in advance spontaneously (Perhaps the author meant to write “carefully” or “to a certain degree?”). In fact, the slogan that was deployed by the protesters (*Quomodo Roma, sic et Carthago!* “As in Rome, so in Carthage!” translated by Magalhães de Oliveira) strikes the reviewer as

11 Gillett 2001, 137.

likely one that was chanted in the circus and other public spaces of Carthage from time to time, much like the American slogan “Tastes great, less filling” that has found flexible application in similar contexts in the contemporary world. Overall, however, the piece is highly persuasive, and its going beyond the traditional focus on bishops and their rhetorical skills is a welcome addition to the scholarship.

The tenth contribution (163–179: “Keeping up Appearances: Evaluations of Imperial (In)Visibility in Late Antiquity”), by Martijn Icks, deals with the figure of the *princeps clausus* and the evolving relationship of emperors to crowds in the latter half of the fourth and early fifth centuries. The felicitous phrase of *princeps clausus*, which was coined by Sulpicius Alexander in the late fourth century, nicely evokes the new model: stricter control of access to and rarer sight of the emperor’s person. As Icks rightly points out, Tiberius and Domitian were the exceptions during the Principate, for even Caligula, Nero, and Commodus tended to commit their misdeeds in the full glare of the public gaze. By contrast, elevated to the status of deity and maintained secluded within the imperial palace like a cult statue within its temple, the emperor more rarely presented himself to the crowds, or so it would appear from the various statements made by late antique speakers and authors. Rapturous descriptions of the sight of an emperor and increasing criticism of those rulers who were hidden in their palace together reveal changing literary paradigms and the realities that they purport to describe. As Icks well concludes (177) power was now expressed by the monarch’s deciding when and where to show himself to the people. The piece is quite convincing and offers much food for thought. Yet, an observation or two seem in order. The “infantilization of the emperor”¹² has roots that go back beyond the purple-clad childhoods of Gratian and Valentinian II. To be precise, a similar phenomenon can already be discerned in the cases of Constantine II, Constantius II, and Constans – all of whom were ‘born in the purple’ and elevated to imperial honours at extremely young ages.¹³ Secondly, the lack of any reference to the avoidance of the crowd of Rome by Diocletian (esp. at 171–174) is an odd and unfortunate omission, as Lactantius’ account is the conscious inversion of the trope under discussion. Third, late antique authors’

12 An evocative phrase that Icks nicely borrows from McEvoy 2013.

13 For whom, see Maraval 2013, an item that is inexplicably missing not only from the bibliography of Icks, but also from that of de Kleijn.

emphasis on the godlike quality of the emperor's appearance nicely explains the oddly hieratic pose adopted by Constantius II, according to Ammianus, during his triumphal entry into Rome in AD 357. Last but not least, the reviewer does not see any attribution of the translations employed in this piece. One hopes that the language of "thy" and "thee" derives from a Loeb Classical Library volume, as contemporary users of English tend to confound these forms even when they do understand them.

The eleventh and final contribution (181–197: "An Imperial Jellyfish? The Emperor Arcadius and Imperial Leadership in the Late Fourth Century AD"), by Meaghan McEvoy, inquires into the nature of the rulership of the emperor Arcadius (393–408). Through a meticulous review of the evidence for the emperor's movements and actions, McEvoy demonstrates in clear and concrete fashion that, while he very rarely left Constantinople (184), Arcadius was not nearly so palace-bound and invisible as the unflattering remarks of Synesius of Cyrene and historians suggest. On the one hand, the criticism of Arcadius by Synesius was made by a provincial who had arguably met with a rebuff when visiting the capital in the hope of making a successful petition. On the other hand, there is plentiful evidence for occasions on which Arcadius made a public appearance or can be presumed to have done so: imperial accessions and anniversaries, consulates, imperial births, marriages, and deaths, victory celebrations, imperial baptisms, relic translations, monument dedications, and everyday activities such as physical exercise and attending public church services. Arcadius does not quite emerge as the *princeps civilis* of the first centuries of the Empire, but neither can he properly be described as a *princeps clausus* or a jellyfish. Indeed, as McEvoy persuasively argues (193), Arcadius compares favourably with Honorius and Theodosius II, who both fell foul of the populace of Rome and Constantinople respectively at critical moments in their own reigns. In the end, a strong case is made for imagining Arcadius (and his successors) as Constantinople-bound rather than palace-bound. A new equilibrium, comparable to that established under the Julio-Claudians once again identified the emperor with a single specific city after some two centuries of peripatetic existence. This naturally and inevitably had consequences for leadership, ideology, and imperial relations with the masses.

This is a well rounded volume that will indubitably be of interest to the vast majority of scholars working on Late Antiquity. It also has great potential for use in the classroom, both as a basic text for seminar discussion and as

a source of the single, occasional article for assigned reading by students in survey courses. The volume will spur further work and research and makes a welcome contribution to what has rapidly become a rather crowded field. Overall the volume shows much hard work and care on the part of the editors and has been beautifully produced by Franz Steiner Verlag.

Richard Westall, Rome
richard.westall@gmail.com

www.plekos.de

Empfohlene Zitierweise

Richard Westall: Rezension zu: Erika Manders/Daniëlle Slootjes (eds.): *Leadership, Ideology and Crowds in the Roman Empire of the Fourth Century AD*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag 2020 (Heidelberger althistorische Beiträge und epigraphische Studien 62). In: Plekos 22, 2020, 349–363 (URL: http://www.plekos.uni-muenchen.de/2020/r-manders_slootjes.pdf).

Bibliography

Barnes 1982: Barnes, T.D.: *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine*. Cambridge, Mass. 1982.

Barnes 2011: Barnes, T.D.: *Constantine. Dynasty, Religion and Power in the Later Roman Empire*. Malden, Mass. 2011 (Blackwell Ancient Lives).

Bourdieu 1977: Bourdieu, P.: *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Translated by R. Nice. Cambridge 1977 (Cambridge Studies in Social Anthropology 16).

Cameron 1973: Cameron, A.: *Porphyrus the Charioteer*. Oxford 1973.

Cameron 1976: Cameron, A.: *Circus Factions. Blues and Greens at Rome and Byzantium*. Oxford 1976.

Evans Grubbs 1993: Evans Grubbs, J.: *Constantine and Imperial Legislation on the Family*. In: J. Harries/I. Wood (eds.): *The Theodosian Code*. Ithaca, N. Y. 1993, 120–142.

Gillett 2001: Gillett, A.: *Rome, Ravenna and the Last Western Emperors*. In: *PBSR* 69, 2001, 131–167.

Humphrey 1986: Humphrey, J.H.: *Roman Circuses. Arenas for Chariot Racing*. Berkeley 1986.

Kelly 1999³: Kelly, J.N.D.: *Early Christian Creeds*. 3. ed., reprinted New York 1999 (orig. ed.: 1972).

Kienast 2017⁶: Kienast, D./Eck, W./Heil, M.: *Römische Kaisertabelle. Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie*. 6. ed. Darmstadt 2017.

MacCormack 1981: MacCormack, S.G.: *Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley 1981 (The Transformation of the Classical Heritage 1).

Maraval 2013: *Les fils de Constantin. Constantin II (337–340), Constance II (337–361), Constant (337–350)*, Paris 2013.

McCormick 1986: McCormick, M.: *Eternal Victory. Triumphal Rulership in Late Antiquity, Byzantium and the Early Medieval West*. Cambridge 1986 (Past and Present Publications).

McEvoy 2013: McEvoy, M.: *Child Emperor Rule in the Late Roman West, AD 367–455*. Oxford 2013 (Oxford Classical Monographs).

Meijer 2010: Meijer, F.: *Chariot Racing in the Roman Empire*. Translated by L. Waters. Baltimore, MD 2010.

Millar 1977: Millar, F.: *The Emperor in the Roman World, 31 BC–AD 337*. London 1977.

Roberto 2014: Roberto, U.: Diocleziano. Roma 2014 (Profili N.S. 61).

Stephenson 2009: Stephenson, P.: Constantine. Unconquered Emperor, Christian Victor. London 2009.

Tarrow 2011: Tarrow, S.: Power in Movement. Social Movements and Contentious Politics. 3. ed. Cambridge 2011 (Cambridge Studies in Comparative Politics).

Tilly 2003: Tilly, C.: The Politics of Collective Violence. Cambridge 2003 (Cambridge Studies in Contentious Politics).

Westall 2015: Westall, R.: Constantius II and the Basilica of St Peter in the Vatican. In: *Historia* 64, 2015, 205–242.