the pacification of Lycia-Pamphylia (not by Probus himself), summarizing S. Mitchell, *Cremna in Pisidia* (London, 1995) on the Cremna siege and the inscription of 278 from the siege-camp, naming the *praeses* Terentius Marcianus (*AE* 1995.1541). On the coup by an unnamed governor of Britain, K. conjectures that its cause was a threat from the sea, 'im besonderen aber eine Durchbrechung des Hadrianswalls im Norden', citing British coin-hoards. This seems rather implausible. The four *tyranni* of the *HA*'s *Quadrigae* are dealt with sensibly enough, though K. could have made it plainer that 'Firmus' is purely fictional. Oddly, the usurpers known to other Latin sources are only Proculus and Bonosus, on the Rhine, and Saturninus, in the east, while the Byzantines (Zosimus, Zonaras, and other authors using the same source) ignore the first two, but have, as well as Saturninus, the unnamed governor of Britain whose coup was suppressed by his friend Victorinus, a Moor. Supposed coins of Bonosus and Proculus, including a new Proculus specimen (J. Nollé, *Antike Welt* 33 [2002], 669–74), are interpreted (p. 169) as barbarous copies of Gallic empire issues, not authentic coins of these usurpers. K. deals only briefly (pp. 182–3) with Probus' alleged statement, after his military successes, that soon soldiers would not be needed any more, mentioned by Victor, *De Caes*. 37.3 and Eutropius 9.17.3, and inflated in the *HA*, *Prob*. 20.3–6, 23.2–5, where, as Paschoud, ad loc., notes, the prophecy in Isaiah 2.4 ('swords into ploughshares') and its Christian exegesis are surely parodied. In Chapter 4 (pp. 187–242), K. covers 'Verwaltung und Innenpolitik', with sections on the Senate, lists of known magistrates and governors, and religious, economic, military and monetary policy. On the controversial post of L. Caesonius . . . Bassus, *electus a divo Probo ad pr(a)e[sid]endum iud.* or *lud. mag.* (*AE* 1964.223 = 1980.215), he favours, 189, *lud(is) mag(nis)* rather than *iud(icio) mag(no)*, although retaining the latter at 212. *Lud(is) mag(nis)* may be right (but the *procuratores ludi magni*, 'of the great training-school [for gladiators]', whom he adduces on p. 189 n. 15, are not evidence for the *ludi magni*). Finally come Chapter 5, a brief conclusion (pp. 243–5), a 'Zeittafel' (pp. 246–7), an appendix on Gallic hoards, closing with coins of Tacitus, Florian, and Probus (pp. 249–65; condensed from the version in the original dissertation), a 'Quellen- und Literaturverzeichnis' (pp. 267–90), the latter with well over 500 items, and an index of persons and places. All in all, this is a respectable piece of work, which will be regularly consulted.

Vindolanda Museum A. R. BIRLEY
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni147

LATE ROMAN LEGATIONS

A. GILLETT: *Envoys and Political Communication in the Late Antique West, 411–533.* (Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought, Fourth Series, 55.) Pp. xxiv + 335, maps. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. Cased, £47.50, US$65. ISBN: 0-521-81349-2.

The rôle of envoys in the western Roman empire has never really been recognized or appreciated, except, perhaps, by those very few brave souls who have read the chronicle of Hydatius, bishop of Aquae Flaviae until some time shortly after 468/9. Hydatius had been an envoy himself and relied on those from the more northern, central, and eastern parts of the empire to provide him with current information for his chronicle.

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni148 Published online by Cambridge University Press

As a result, he mentions over forty legates and legations in his chronicle between 431 (his own embassy) and 468. As Gillett makes clear, this is not a distorted or unusual situation in the late Roman west, but is simply business as usual, as emperors, military commanders, barbarian kings, provinces, and cities kept in touch with one another making requests or threats, promises or appeals, demands or presentations of power.

Because of the unique window Hydatius presents on the constant criss-crossing of the western empire by this multiplicity of delegations, G. devotes his first chapter to an analysis of his chronicle and the patterns and types of such delegations. In the next chapter G. moves to the first panegyric of Sidonius Apollinaris, that delivered before Avitus, in which Sidonius makes much of Avitus' earlier rôle as envoy to the Goths. So much in fact that this becomes Avitus' cardinal virtue in the panegyric. Sidonius is followed by the importance of the rôle of envoy in the written lives of a number of fifth- and sixth-century bishops, later made saints: Pope Leo, Germanus of Auxerre, Orientius of Auch, Vivianus of Saintes, and Epiphanius of Pavia. The religious dimension of the envoy is followed in the next chapter by the political envoy as seen through Cassiodorus' *Variae* and the epitaph of Senarius, as well as a number of letters written to Senarius by Cassiodorus. The final chapter, 'Negotium agendum', takes all the specifics and personal details of the previous chapters along with other evidence to create a synthesis of the legate and his rôle in the late Roman west: his dispatch and reception, his fellow legates and entourage, his journeys, protocol and ceremonial, dress, protection, and so on. Just about everything one could want to know about the job of being a legate at this time. The book finishes with a conclusion and four appendices. I mention the topics of the appendices here because most of those who would find them helpful or of interest would never think to look for a discussion of them here: the dates of Germanus' episcopate and death and the date of his *Vita*, the chronology of the life of Epiphanius, the text and a translation of Senarius' letter of appointment from Cassiodorus' *Variae*, and a note on the text of Senarius' epitaph, which depends upon a single transcription from the sixteenth century.

Overall the book is well researched and well written. I found that where G. disagreed with my published conclusions about Hydatius I tended to agree with him. Other sections show the same careful insight, and I find myself in no major disagreement with him concerning his treatment of envoys. The major drawback of the book is that some chapters do seem to be padded, especially with rather elementary literary analysis that does not really really contribute to the overall theme of the book.

My only major disagreement with G. concerns his claim that Julius Nepos was made caesar early in 474 before being made augustus in June. This interpretation depends entirely upon the word 'caesar' in Jordanes' *Romana* (not the *Getica* as G. states, p. 168 n. 227). But Jordanes calls a number of western emperors after Valentinian 'caesar'—Majorian (*Rom*. 335), Anthemius (*Rom*. 336), Nepos (*Rom*. 338), and Glycerius (*Get*. 239)—so his terminology, which contradicts all other sources, means nothing, especially since he uses the same sentence in both the *Romana* (336) and the *Getica* (236) to describe Anthemius' accession and in the former he uses 'caesar' and in the latter he uses 'princeps', one of his terms for 'emperor'.

The book is also well produced, though there are a number of worrying examples of sloppiness involving Latin and Greek: 'decennaliae' for 'decennalia' (p. 23), 'post quod propter quod' for 'post hoc ergo propter hoc' (p. 68), 'causae belli' instead of 'casus belli' (pp. 221, 263), a final sigma used at the beginning and in the middle of a word (p. 253 n. 153, 262), a Greek phrase in the accusative when it should be nominative (p. 259), 'terminus ante quam' for 'terminus ante quem' (pp. 278 [ter], 282, 283), 'Kalendarium Autissiodorensis' for '-ense' (p. 278), 'Gesta episcoporum

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni148 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Autissiodorensis' for 'Gesta pontificum Autissiodorensium' (p. 279), and 'Vetus missale Gallicanus' for 'Missale Gallicanum vetus' (p. 280). In English the slips are mostly small, but note 'begs the question' meaning 'prompts the question' (p. 161), 'staffs' consistently for 'staves' (pp. 258–9), and 'inscription evidence' for 'epigraphic evidence' (p. 280). The strangest error appears in n. 102 on p. 140 where the common words in two Latin passages are said to be printed in '*BOLD*', and they are indeed printed in majuscule italics.

These nits aside, this book provides a fascinating and long-overdue look at what G. for the first time demonstrates was an extremely important, and fascinating, aspect of the political, military, and civic history of the later Roman empire in the west.

University of Ottawa R. W. BURGESS
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni148

A POMPEII SOURCEBOOK

A. E. Cooley, M. G. L. Cooley: *Pompeii: A Sourcebook*. Pp. xiv + 254, maps, ills. London and New York: Routledge, 2004. Paper, £16.99. ISBN: 0-415-26212-7 (0-415-26211-9 hbk).

The archaeological site of Pompeii commands a central position in the presentation of the classical world to the public, whether via tourism, television, or the novel. It also occupies the central ground of the GCSE syllabus for classical civilization, and is the topic which always arouses fascination for the subject. A major weakness has been the inaccessibility of much of the material, most notably the inscriptions, graffiti, and electoral *programmata*. Cooley and Cooley have attempted to address this problem with a sourcebook of material that will be useful for both the undergraduate as well as the GCSE student. This is a very commendable undertaking and will be of great benefit to all who teach Pompeii. However, the sourcebook format utilized creates a rather strange view of the sources themselves. These are decontextualized from their original location, raising questions such as what other writing they were next to and whether the writing was later painted over, and numerous questions about the relation of these texts to the place where they were written and read in Pompeii. The recontextualization of the original sources, ably translated, in a book format in English raises a whole set of problems about the format of sourcebooks.

The most difficult decision for the composition any sourcebook is how to arrange the material. C. & C. set out a chronological division for the first three chapters: pre-Roman Pompeii, Roman colonization of Pompeii, and Destruction of Pompeii. The selections are thorough, drawing on both the discussion of matters in literature—whether Pliny on the eruption or Servius' commentary on the *Aeneid*—and inscriptions from the site itself. There is a nod in the direction of material culture in the discussion of pre-Roman Pompeii with the inclusion of the less well-known Sanctuary of Dionysius and the ever-reproduced House of the Faun with a photo of the Alexander Mosaic. Similarly, discussion of the earthquake in A.D. 62 is illustrated with photos of the Iucundus relief and repair of damage to the temple of Apollo. To raise a quibble, but an important one: the authors' division of pre-Roman Pompeii to the period before the arrival of the colonists falls back on an old fashioned invasionist theory of cultural change. However, as the texts demonstrate (A8–14), Pompeii was already in the throws of Romanization and Hellenization well before the arrival of the

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni148 Published online by Cambridge University Press