cultural texts that have created the iconic Alexander who still exists today'. All very fashionable. The problem is that this approach can divorce text from context, and where a particular story is coming from—which in turn might throw some light upon why a later author gives it the particular spin that he does. The Romans knew their way around the Greek Alexander traditions to greater or lesser degrees (in fact, one striking factor for me is just how pervasive this is in S.'s selections). It is clear that Seneca the Younger was pretty familiar with the Alexander sources; his story (*De Ben*. 2.16.1; see S. pp.74–5) of Alexander's gift of a city to an individual (Phocion) is also in Plutarch (*Phoc*. 18.7–8) and Aelian (*VH* 1.25); but it is also clear that he can make mistakes. For instance, S. (p. 111 with n. 32) suggests that Seneca's story (*De Ira* 2.23.2) about Alexander's trust in his doctor Philip despite a warning from his mother, reflects a topos which becomes attached to rulers—evocative in this case, of power-grabbing mothers like Agrippina. S. does not seem to know that Seneca (or his source) has merely conflated the tradition that Parmenion warned Alexander about Philip, with a story of Olympias advising Alexander to be wary, not of Philip, but of Alexander the Lyncestian (Diod. 17.32.1) (see E. Badian in A. B. Bosworth and E. J. Baynham [edd.], *Alexander the Great in Fact and Fiction* [Oxford, 2000] 63). If Seneca *has* given the story a twist to make his audience think of contemporary interfering imperial women, the background of this tradition could have been put to more forceful use.

There are other examples of this kind which the parameters of the review preclude noting; suffice to say that I found the consistent omission of Greek antecedents or parallel material (which in turn could only enhance the interpretation of the Latin selections, the so-called 'Roman' voice), one of the main weaknesses of this book. There are also some signs of hasty editorial preparation: a number of typographical errors, one or two misplaced references and bibliographical mistakes (E. Badian, *not* Bosworth, edited *Alexandre Le Grand* [Geneva, 1976]), and the Latin text of Statius' *Silvae* 4.6.43–74 (pp. 150–1) is riddled with misprints.

I do not wish to finish on a negative note. While the 'real' Alexander may remain as elusive as ever, S.'s thought-provoking study highlights the enduring, if peculiar choice of the Alexander phenomenon as a paradigm, whether for the Romans, the Victorian chief justice, or for the rest of us.

University of Newcastle, NSW ELIZABETH BAYNHAM

PANEGYRICS

R. Rees: *Layers of Loyalty in Latin Panegyric A.D. 289–307*. Pp. xv + 237, map, ills. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002. Cased, £40. ISBN: 0-19-924918-0.

The collection of twelve *Panegyrici Latini* transmitted to the modern world by a single manuscript (now lost) was put together by the Gallic orator Pacatus shortly after he delivered a panegyric of the emperor Theodosius in Rome. As a gesture of apparent modesty, Pacatus placed his own speech of 389 in second position, after Pliny's speech thanking Trajan for his consulate in A.D. 100, which he placed first as the classic exemplar of the genre of imperial panegyric in Latin. After Pliny and Pacatus come two speeches delivered by two famous Gallic orators of the fourth century outside Gaul, those given by Mamertinus before Julian in Constantinople on 1 January 362, and by Nazarius in praise of Constantine and his sons Crispus and Constantinus in Rome in March 321, and the collection concludes with a speech

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.1.118 Published online by Cambridge University Press

delivered before Constantine in 313, probably in Trier. Between the first four speeches and the last, however, Pacatus included an earlier collection (V–XI in the transmitted order) which the lost manuscript described as *panegirici diversorum vii* (p. 174 Mynors).

Roger Rees, whose book is a revised version of a St Andrews doctoral thesis directed by Roger Green, deals with five of this earlier collection of seven panegyrics. R. analyses the speeches of 289, 291, 297, 298, and 307, but not those of 310 and 311. He states that his study 'considers the five surviving panegyrics delivered in the time of Dyarchy and Tetrarchy' (p. 25). I find this puzzling. When the speech of September 307 was delivered, the official college of emperors included only three members (Galerius, Maximinus, and Constantine), the Caesar Severus having been compelled to abdicate several months earlier. But the speech of 310, which R. excludes, was delivered at a time of 'tetrarchy': since November 308 the four emperors Galerius, Licinius, Maximinus, and Constantine all recognized one another as legitimate emperors and colleagues, even if there had been dispute over the title and rank of the latter pair. Moreover, it would have been most illuminating to have the speech of 310, which tackled the difficult topic of the recent death of its addressee's father-in-law, analyzed along the same lines as the five speeches which R. does consider.

R. has produced a good study of what he aptly characterizes as 'the imaginative fantasies which talented panegyrical orators constructed out of the capricious realities of political circumstances' (p. 186). His five main chapters consider the speeches transmitted as *Panegyrici Latini* X, XI, VIII, IX, and VII in this order, which is the chronological order of their delivery. R. first sets out the precise historical context in which each speech was delivered (the dates of all five can be established either exactly to the day or with reasonable precision), then describes and analyses what is unique to each in terms of presentation, imagery, literary conceits, and political message. These analyses are well grounded in the text and considerably advance our understanding of these speeches both as literary artefacts and historical documents. Hence anyone who studies them seriously in future, whether from a literary or a historical point of view, would be well advised to read R. carefully before drawing any significant conclusions from these slippery texts.

Despite a generally favourable verdict, however, I feel compelled to sound three notes of caution. The first is perhaps purely terminological. R. uses the word 'metaphysical' in an idiosyncratic way. For R., all invocations of an absent emperor are 'metaphysical' because 'they function at a level of discourse irrespective of geographical proximity between orator and addressee/s' (p. 38). I cannot see how this novel use of the word helps us to understand these speeches better, especially since each individual member of the imperial college from 285 onwards always acted in his official capacity in the joint name of all members of the college. The second caveat concerns a tendency to grandiloquent phrasing whose meaning is hard to pin down. In illustration, let me quote a single passage on the speech of 287:

> This ambition is reflected in the dynamics of vocative address across the whole speech . . . the ratio between the literal and the metaphysical modes of address indicates a conscious concern to embrace both the present emperor and his absent colleagues . . . there was a potential for greater sophistication in the application of the metaphysical mode. (p. 118)

My third reservation is that over-interpretation sometimes produces doubtful conclusions. Thus R. argues that the speech of 307 'can reasonably be seen to document a state of cold war which characterized relations between Maximian and

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.1.118 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Maxentius in late summer 307' (p. 182). That seems implausible. The speech was delivered on the occasion of the marriage of Constantine to Fausta, the daughter of Maximian and sister of Maxentius. Maximian brought Fausta to Gaul to cement an alliance between himself and his son, who were at this time ruling Italy jointly, and the ruler of Britain, Gaul, and Spain at a time when Galerius was about to invade Italy in order to suppress their regime by force (Lactantius *Mort. Pers.* 27.1–2).

R. is not a historian, but a student of Latin literature who has made good use of historians who have written recently about the Diocletianic period. Nevertheless, as one familiar with the literature of the period he should know that contemporaries who spoke of two emperors in the same breath never reversed their order of seniority in the imperial college, as he sometimes does (pp. xv, 13, 53, 56).

University of Toronto T. D. BARNES

THE *HISTORIA AUGUSTA*, NICOMACHUS FLAVIANUS, AND PETER THE PATRICIAN

F. PASCHOUD (ed.): Histoire Auguste. *Tome V, 2ème partie. Vies de Probus, Firmus, Saturnin, Proclus et Bonose, Carus, Numérien et Carin* (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé). Pp. xli + 442. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2001. Cased, €60. ISBN: 2-251-01426-8.

Publication of the Budé edition of the *Historia Augusta* began somewhat inauspiciously in 1992 with the lives of Hadrian, Aelius Caesar, and Antoninus Pius, edited by J.-P. Callu and prefaced by an introduction of more than 100 pages devoted largely to the genesis of the whole work, its author, and its reception. (There were hardly any reviews of this volume: note, however, the discussion of Callu's volume together with the next volume to appear, Robert Turcan's edition of the lives of Macrinus, his son Diadumenianus and Elagabalus, published in 1993, by Marc Mayer, *An. Tard.* 4 [1996], 340–4.) The fifth and last section of the edition, comprising the lives which bear the name of 'Flavius Vopiscus of Syracuse' as their ostensible author, was put in the capable hands of the Swiss scholar François Paschoud, who had already produced the Budé Zosimus in several volumes (1969–89; 2nd edn of Volume I, 2000).

P.'s edition of the lives of the emperors Aurelian and Tacitus, which formed the first part of the fifth volume of the Budé *Historia Augusta* (1996; apparently not reviewed in the present journal), contained an explanation of the editorial and interpretative principles according to which P. produced his text, his French translation, and his commentary on all the lives included in both parts of Volume 5. In addition, it contained a general introduction discussing the date, authorship and literary genesis of the *Historia Augusta* as a whole and the historical sources used by the author for the period after 270, when he could no longer draw on Dexippus.

P. begins the introduction to his edition of the *Vita Probi*, the *Quadriga Tyrannorum*, and the lives of Carus, Carinus, and Numerianus with an explicit declaration that he has proceeded on exactly the same basis as in his preceding volume, to which he refers the reader. As concerns the text of these lives, therefore, and P.'s commentary on them, I shall content myself with a summary evaluation. P.'s Budé text is far easier to read than the typographically complicated Teubner of Ernst Hohl (Leipzig, 1927), which it

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.1.118 Published online by Cambridge University Press