mythologists, Euhemerus promoted a benign internationalism that knit the peoples of the world together in the worship of a single Zeus.[76] His theological explanations cannot be read without his utopian vision, and Panchaea is home to numerous peoples, ancient (Panchaeans, Oceanites, and Doians[77]) and modern (Panchaeans, Oceanites, Indians, Scythians, and Cretans[78]), from all over the world, who are unified through the worship of Triphylian Zeus. Perhaps Euhemerus self-consciously encouraged the syncretism of the universal Zeus with the Zeuses of local cults and with the chief gods of other nations; perhaps he sought only to explain the results of such syncretism, which had, by his day, been going on for centuries.[79] In either case, Euhemerus demonstrates a positive attitude to the religion of his time. He may have had little respect for traditional myth, and was willing to create "new myths"[80] to protect and promote traditional cult, but Euhemerus was not a destructive atheist, as he has often been portrayed by so many ancient and modern writers.[81]

Benjamin Garstad
Brooklyn College

---

who say that those gods from the human race were translated into the heaven not in fact but in belief only," *Nat.D.* 3.21 [53]). Our present investigation should have demonstrated that a discussion of many gods. with the same name *is* indeed a discussion of Euhemerism.

76. Whether this internationalism gave expression to ideas that had been fermenting throughout the fourth century B.C.E., or was inspired by the career of Alexander the Great, must await a lengthier discussion. See F. De Angelis and B. Garstad, "Excavating an Ancient Writer," read to CACW/CAPN (March, 2003).

77. Diod. Sic. 5.44.6.

78. Diod. Sic. 5.42.4.

79. Winiarczyk (*Euhemeros,* 107–17) argues that the *Sacred History* was intended to be an explanation of the origin of religion, and as such also a contribution to the discussion of early Hellenistic ruler cults. Winiarczyk is similarly unsure whether Euhemerus meant to promote, or simply to explain, the ruler cult.

80. An aspect of his writing sharply criticized by Plutarch (*De Is. et Os.* 23 [360A]).

81. This paper is gratefully dedicated to the memory of Rev. Charles Armour (1915–2004), minister, teacher, friend, *contubernalis secundum patriam*.

BEST OF BROTHERS: FRATERNAL IMAGERY IN PANEGYRICS ON MAXIMIAN HERCULIUS

> *Everyone likes flattery; and when you come to Royalty, you should lay it on with a trowel.*
>
> —Benjamin Disraeli

In 364, the new Augustus Valentinian raised his younger brother Valens to his own rank of Augustus. The contemporary observer Ammianus Marcellinus wrote of this the following:

> in hoc tamen negotio, Valentinianus morem institutum antiquitus supergressus, non Caesares sed Augustos germanum nuncupavit et filium, benevole satis. nec enim quisquam antehac adscivit sibi pari potestate collegam, praeter principem Marcum, qui Verum, adoptivum fratrem, absque diminutione aliqua maiestatis imperatoriae, socium fecit.[1]

The author is most grateful to C. E. V. Nixon for his advice on an earlier version of this article. It is the latest courtesy in a twenty-five-year association as teacher, supervisor, colleague, and friend. Thanks are also owed to the anonymous reviewer for alerting the author to further points of evidence.

1. Amm. Marc. 27.6.16.

> In this matter, however, Valentinian went beyond the custom instituted in antiquity, inasmuch as he named his brother and son—benevolently enough—not Caesars, but Augustus. For no one previously had taken a colleague of equivalent power, except for the emperor Marcus, who made his adoptive brother Verus his colleague without any lessening of his own imperial majesty.

This statement by an acute and well-informed observer of the imperial office is unequivocal in its conviction that Valentinian and Valens were the first equal partners in the Empire since Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus. Without investing Ammianus with an infallible political judgement, his statement nevertheless has particular implications for the way in which apparently equal collegial emperors are understood. While such a political arrangement occurred only occasionally in the first three centuries of the monarchic Empire, Diocletian's seizure of power, as well as his nomination of Maximian to the office of Caesar in 285, commenced a period of collegial rule that continued more or less unbroken until the brief reigns of Julian and Jovian. The first years of the collegial Empire are therefore particularly important in establishing the patterns and precedents that were drawn on in the following decades. The early years of Diocletian and Maximian, when the two ruled as joint Augusti, are as difficult and murky a period as any in Roman history and have been understood in a variety of ways by modern scholars. Most frequently this period is referred to as a "dyarchy," and in recent years it has been suggested with some authority that Maximian, contrary to Ammianus' statement, was coequal with Diocletian.[2] Terms like "dyarchy"—which is a relatively recent term and does not represent, in this context, a formal arrangement of power—are convenient but can also be misleading.[3] Contemporaries, of whom Ammianus was one, certainly did not think in these terms. As I shall argue, they preferred instead to employ the more conventional imagery of fraternity and dynasty, within which Diocletian was always represented as the senior ruler.

In the year 286, when Diocletian raised his friend and colleague Maximian from the rank and dignity of an imperial Caesar to that of a ruling Augustus, many must have puzzled at the time about what it meant.[4] Such an act, while not unprecedented in Roman political history, was at least rare and therefore called for some clarification. Moreover, Diocletian's motive for the appointment and intention for the appointee have never been unequivocally agreed on by modern students of the period, quite possibly because a policy devised to confront an immediate and urgent set of needs has often been misinterpreted as a long-term constitutional master plan.[5] There was a model in immediate experience from which to work. Diocletian's immediate predecessors had been a pair of brothers, Carinus and Numerianus. Carinus, appointed first, had been his father Carus' colleague and had been left to hold the fort in the

2. Kolb 1987, 95–98.

3. The word itself was devised in 1844 by Connop Thirlwall for his grand work, *A History of Greece* (8:318) and was employed by Mommsen for his analysis of the Augustan Principate. It was used in this context by Kornemann in his discussion of the joint rule of Diocletian and Maximian (1930, 110–17) and was subsequently deployed, with greater or lesser degrees of emphasis, by (among others) Seston (1946, 79, 231–32), Nixon (1981a, 160), Kolb (1987, 86–87), Chastagnol (1994, 24–26), Nixon and Rodgers (1994, 79–80), and Rees (2002, 1–95, passim). Williams avoids the term, but simply replaces it with the equally imprecise and misleading epithets "dual imperium" and "dual monarchy" (1985, 48–49).

4. Maximian's tenure as Caesar is poorly attested, although the meagre evidence is compelling; see Leadbetter 1998b, 216–21.

5. As I have argued elsewhere (Leadbetter 1998b, 213–28); cf. Kolb 1987, 37–67, and 2001, 27–31.

western provinces while his father went to fight against the Persians. On Carus' death outside Ctesiphon, the younger brother had succeeded to his father's dignity as Augustus. Such colleagues had kinship in common, as Marcus Aurelius did with his adoptive brother, Lucius Verus, alongside whom he reigned for the better part of a decade. Diocletian did not. He had chosen a colleague related only through profession, bound to him only through loyalty.

Diocletian therefore needed a political language that expressed a clear relationship between himself and his new colleague and one, moreover, that ensured the expression of his own seniority and therefore his deliberative role as the initiator of policy. In a previous age this had mattered less than it did by the end of the third century. As Fergus Millar has shown, the emperors of the High Empire were essentially reactive enforcers of law.[6] Diocletian, however, was one of a series of reforming emperors who used the imperial office to remake the state during the late third and early fourth centuries. In seeking to retain his seniority, however, he also needed to establish—both for himself and for the vast world of subjects whom he ruled—precisely what his relationship with Maximian was. Diocletian might have resolved this in one stroke by the adoption of Maximian—and the consequent generation of a new imperial dynasty in which Maximian's relationship with him was expressed formally through filiation. The only evidence to suggest that he did this is the very weak reed of John Malalas, whose feeble and fantastic narrative is well capable of misidentifying Aurelius Maximianus with Galerius Maximianus (who *was* adopted by Diocletian in 293).[7] There is, however, clear evidence to suggest that Maximian was adopted in some fashion by Diocletian, most particularly in terms of nomenclature. Maximian's regnal name was Marcus Aurelius Valerius Maximianus. Aurelius is clearly a traditional regnal name, but Valerius is not: it is Diocletian's own name.[8] Adoption there was, but as brother, not son. Such an adoption was not a legal act, but a carefully contrived fiction. Such an adoption more accurately reflected the kind of role that Diocletian had in mind for Maximian. He was always intended to be an active wielder of power—a commander of armies and an issuer of rescripts. Diocletian's model for this was fraternal, and so it was as a dynasty of brothers that he commended himself and Maximian to the Roman world as rulers.[9]

This image of brotherhood has long been overshadowed by the other and more pervasive image that was constructed alongside it. As already noted, Diocletian was anxious that his priority in the Empire be formally recognized through some kind of regnal formula.[10] Initially, Maximian bore the title *nobilissimus Caesar,* as well as

6. Millar 1977, 271–72.

7. Malalas 12.38.1 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 167); see also Kolb 1987, 44, although cf. Chastagnol 1982, 94. Williams (1985, 43–44) argues, on the basis of very slender evidence, that Maximian was initially adopted as son, and then that shifted to brother. Such an argument is difficult to credit unless there was no adoption at all, merely the deployment of language that was altered to suit changed political circumstance. Unfortunately, the necessary evidence of filial language is missing. In essence, he is repeating the views of Seston (1946, 64–65), which are based on a misreading of *P. Lond.* 710 (Nixon and Rodgers 1994, 45).

8. See also Kolb 1987, 44–45.

9. Some brief discussions of the image of brotherhood include those of Rees (2002, 53–55), Kolb (1987, 16–17, 44–45; 2001, 27–28), Nixon and Rodgers (1994, 45–45), Williams (1985, 49), d'Elia (1961–62, 278–79), and Seston (1946, 217).

10. It is interesting also to note in this respect that, in the papyrus archive of Aurelius Isidorus the Procurator of the Lower Thebaid, Diocletian is referred to as senior (or elder) Augustus (Σεβαστὸς πρεσβύτερος) as a matter of course; see *P. Beatty. Pan* 1.10, 54, 111, 168, 174, 218, 221, 246; 2.163, 164, 170, 172, 182, 188, 193, 199, 200, 260, 261, 262, evidence unfortunately not discussed by Kolb (2001).

that of Augustus, to express his inferior rank. This was, perhaps, found to be unwieldy, since it was abandoned fairly swiftly, and the epithets Iovius and Herculius given greater currency. The divine *comites* both asserted a divine association and advertised the nature of the imperial power that the holders exercised: Iovius, the supreme lord who rules by his mighty nod; Herculius, the doughty servant who performs mighty tasks.[11] This imagery emerged very early in the joint rule, and there is some evidence to suggest the employment of Herculean images by Maximian from the very beginning.[12] This charismatic language provided a clear but mutually flattering device to differentiate the two rulers. It clarified through language that was neither constitutional nor dynastic but religious, which has led to uncertainty among those who expect precision in such matters. But if the two Augusti were differentiated and ordered by their divinely sustained roles, they were likewise united by their equally charismatic brotherhood.

Both kinds of relationships are set out clearly in the earliest discursive documents of the period: the two panegyrics on Maximian that commence Gallétier's edition, which he numbered II and III.[13] In discussion of these panegyrics, it must be understood that they are not official documents. They are formal expressions of praise for a specific recipient. Panegyrics of Maximian, therefore, concentrate on his perceived virtues and achievements, so, rather understandably, Diocletian's own role and martial achievements are de-emphasized in order to give proper glory to Maximian. No doubt Diocletian's own court panegyrists did the same but in reverse. Above all, panegyric was performance, and imperial panegyric was delivered to an educated and critical audience that understood its vocabulary and its rhythms. Such an audience appreciated sophistication and wit, and good speeches were well rewarded.[14]

The panegyric of 289 (Gallétier II) was delivered to Maximian on April 21st at an imperial residence in Gaul, possibly Trier.[15] The occasion was the festival Parilia, the celebration of the foundation of Rome itself. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that fraternity should be one of the themes of the speech. In myth, Rome was founded by twins whose mutual rivalry led (inauspiciously, in this case) to fratricide. The link between brotherhood and foundation is made evident by the panegyrist's declamation at 1.5:

> Re vera enim, sacratissime imperator, merito quivis te tuumque fratrem Romani imperii dixerit conditores: estis enim, quod est proximum, restitutores et, sit licet hic illi urbi natalis dies, quod pertinet ad originem populi Romani, vestri imperii primi dies sunt principes ad salutem.

11. Leadbetter 1998b, 222–25. There has been a considerable commentary on the names *Iovius* and *Herculius*. Much of it has noted Baynes' point that "they are not gods, but God's chosen agents for the restoration of the Roman world" (1935, 84); see also Seston 1950, 264–66; Nixon 1981a, 157–66; Nicholson 1984, 254; Kolb 1987, 88–114, esp. pp. 89–90, n. 263; and Nixon and Rodgers 1994, 44–45.

12. For a discussion of the different views, see Nixon's comments in Nixon and Rodgers 1994, 50–51. Despite the force of Kolb's arguments (1987, 63–66), the evidence for a very early date is unconvincing. Even the numismatic evidence does not provide any degree of certainty here, since the most that can be said is that Maximian's coinage employed the image of Hercules from his accession. That does not compellingly suggest the view that the Iovius/Herculius dichotomy was already in place.

13. Mynors preserves the order of the manuscript but numbers them X and XI (1964, 244–70). Nixon and Rodgers (1994) preserve the chronological order preferred by Gallétier.

14. On the audience of the panegyrist, see Nixon and Rodgers 1994, 27–33, and MacCormack 1981, 1–14. On the rewards, see August. *Conf.* 6.6.9; see also Nixon 1983, 91–92.

15. Nixon and Rodgers 1994, 42–43; Rees 2002, 35. Gallétier identified the panegyrist as Mamertinus (1949, 1.6–7; *PLRE* 1.539–40), although later commentators have been more cautious (Nixon and Rodgers 1994, 41–42; Rees 2002, 35–36).

> In truth, O most sacred Emperor, one might justifiably call you and your brother the founders of the Roman Empire, for you are what is the same thing—its restorers, and although this is the birthday of the city which marks the origin of the Roman people, it is the first days of your rule which mark the beginning of its salvation.[16]

This passage provides a conscious conceit in which the new imperial brotherhood is likened to Rome's mythological founders. In the rhetorical world of the panegyrist, such a comparison was an easy and an obvious one to make, most especially at Parilia. What it certainly did was put the metaphor in the minds of his audience, enabling him to return to it from time to time, rather like a composer teasing the listener and building to a great finale. With this image conjured, the speech slides into a description of the veneration of Hercules at Rome (2.1) and a short soliloquy on how best to begin to praise Maximian (2.2–6). Diocletian is then briefly reintroduced, and his kinship is noted (although not elaborated upon) as *numen cognatum* (3.1) before the panegyrist embarks on a short *synkrisis,* contrasting the trappings of power with the evidence of power well used (3.2–3). The panegryrist again returns to Diocletian, now as *frater optimus,* as the author of Maximian's power (4.1), beginning a long catalogue of Maximian's successes in which the image of Hercules recurs frequently (4.2–9.1). This catalogue concludes with praise of the conference of the two rulers at Milan in 288. Once the orator has brought the two emperors back into association, the speech can return to the theme of brotherhood. The conference itself was marked by *fides* and *fraternitas* (9.1) as the two men shared achievements and victories. Then the panegyrist states (9.3):

> ambo nunc estis largissimi, ambo fortissimi atque hac ipsa vestri similitudine magis magisque concordes et, quod omni consanguinitate certius est, virtutibus fratres.
>
> Both of you are now most bountiful, both most brave, and because of this very similarity in your characters the harmony between you is ever increasing, and you are brothers in virtue which is a surer tie than any tie of blood.

This is a neat way of dealing with the fictive fraternal adoption.[17] Brotherhood is conveyed by mutuality, rather than consanguinity. The rhetor reinforces the point through a comparison with more literal descendants of Hercules, the founding kings of Sparta. These, he states, were compelled to unity by the cunning of their mother, who refused to confess which of the two was the elder.[18] Diocletian and Maximian, by contrast rule in a genuine brotherhood that they have taken upon themselves, and over a mighty Empire rather than a postage-stamp polis (10. 1–2). This then allows the panegyrist to slide into another comparison with the *gens* of Hercules (10.3). Both Maximian and his *frater* Diocletian are then held to be greater than Alexander: Maximian for his grant of a kingdom to the Frank, Gennoboudes; Diocletian, for

16. Translation by Nixon (Nixon and Rodgers 1994, 54–55). Unless otherwise noted, all translations of the panegyrics quoted herein are those of Nixon and Rodgers.

17. Salway (1994, 139) refers to a "fictive brotherhood."

18. Hdt. 6.52; Nixon 1994, p. 67, n. 34. Kolb (1987, 104) has used this reference to support his contention that Diocletian and Maximian ruled as coequals; however, it cannot bear this weight. It is a literary conceit that emphasizes the *concordia* between the two, not their equivalence. Furthermore, the Delphic tradition recorded in Herodotus' account established a dual monarchy in Sparta, but with senior and junior lines. The panegyrist can thus use this story to praise the merit of Maximian, second man in the Empire, united in virtue with the first.

receiving the submission of the Great King of Persia himself (10.3–7). This leads the speaker into an extended passage praising the *concordia* between the two, as well as the undisputed consequent benefit of an "undivided Empire" (*imperium singulare,* 11.2), and a long passage on an (unidentified) imperial marriage (11.4–7).[19] He then turns to unfinished business: *ille pirata,* Carausius, forecasting his doom through the fleet that Maximian has been busy constructing, assisted by the divine gift of good weather (12.1–8). Then, returning to the theme with which he began, he arrives at the long-anticipated comparison of Romulus and Remus with the imperial brothers Maximian and Diocletian. Addressing the city of Rome itself, he draws a clear contrast between fraternity and fratricide and denounces the primitive division of the city through the jealousy of its founders (13.2). This is not how the new imperial brothers behave, he tells Rome, promising that when they return to live there they will triumph together and dwell together on this same hill. He concludes his address to the city by noting that, whereas Romulus and Remus had quarreled about whose name to give to the new foundation, the names Herculia and Iovia might now be employed interchangeably as the reflection of fraternal concord (13.3). The orator then returns to addressing Maximian, regretting that duty keeps him from being in Rome, and promises in the coda of the speech that one day the city would behold Maximian and a son being educated in the practical precepts of a mighty warrior (14.1–5).

The panegyric of 291 (Gallétier III) was delivered to Maximian on the occasion of an imperial birthday.[20] Like the panegyric of 289, it mentions victories and an imperial conference. The orator, identified by some as Mamertinus, is also anxious to employ contemporary political language to his subject's credit.[21] Here, Rodgers finds "subtle arguments for Maximian's equality with his colleague."[22] This is a telling observation, given that if Maximian and Diocletian were formally and actually coequal, subtlety would not be required. Certainly the orator places much emphasis, in the early part of the speech, on the significance of the divine *comites,* Jupiter and Hercules, as both imperial metaphors and literal sources of imperial power (3.2–8) before proceeding to the victories of the previous few years and the conference in Milan in 288 (4.1–5.4). Here, the orator turns away from praise for deeds and concentrates on qualities. Significantly, he begins with *pietas*—both in duty to the gods and, especially, to one another (6.3):

> Deinde id quod maxime deorum immortalium cum religione coniunctum est, quanta vosmet invicem pietate colitis! Quae enim umquam videre saecula talem in summa potestate concordiam? Qui germani geminive fratres indiviso patrimonio tam aequabiliter utuntur quam vos orbe Romano?
>
> Next, what is especially linked with the reverence for the immortal gods, with what great piety you honour each other! For what ages ever saw such harmony in the highest

19. Probably the marriage of Maximian's daughter Theodora with Constantius, at that stage perhaps praetorian prefect. See Barnes 1982, 33; Nixon and Rodgers 1994, 70; Leadbetter 1998a, 74–85.

20. This has been a matter of some dispute. The address is headed a *Genethliacus* in the corpus and thus clearly marks a birthday. Nixon (1981a) has argued that it was Maximian's actual birthday (*genuinus natalis*) (also see Barnes 1982, p. 58, n. 52), as opposed to a regnal day or the "twin birthday" (*geminus natalis*) of some traditions (e.g., see Seston 1950); see also Nixon and Rodgers 1994, 77–78; Rees 2002, 70–71.

21. On the identification with Mamertinus, see Gallétier 1949, 11–12; Nixon and Rodgers 1994, 76; Rees 2002, 71.

22. Nixon and Rodgers 1994, 79.

> power? What full or twin brothers share an undivided inheritance so fairly as you share the Roman world?

While this most important passage has been understood as a clear statement of the equality of Maximian and Diocletian, it is actually about Maximian's submission to his brother's will.[23] It relates directly to the metaphor at the beginning of section 3, where the *comites* are referred to as *parentes*. Here the use of the word *patrimonium* develops the metaphor by likening the empire to an estate handed down to heirs. Given that training in rhetoric was also training in law, the panegyrist was well aware of the force of this conceit. Roman legal practice divided an estate among the heirs according to the formula of the testator. Yet the estate itself remained undivided until such a time as the heirs sought a formal division.[24] The force of the image is its familiarity to a legally trained audience: a joint inheritance is also an undivided one.[25] Through this passage, the panegyrist adroitly turns the lack of any formal division of the Empire to the credit of Maximian, who, it is implied, might have legitimately insisted on his portion but has preferred not to. Moreover, underlying the metaphor is the assumption of that fraternity of the emperors that makes them heirs of the imperial estate.

Again, at 7.4, the panegyrist returns to the theme of brotherhood, repeating and elaborating on the argument of the panegyrist of 289 that virtue and achievement, rather than consanguinity, have made the two emperors brothers of one another (7.6):

> Non fortuita in vobis est germanitas sed selecta; notum est saepe eisdem parentibus natos esse dissimiles, certissimae fraternitatis est usque ad imperium similitudo, quin etiam intervallum vestrae vincit aetatis et seniorem iunioremque caritate mutua reddit aequales.
>
> Your brotherhood is not of chance but of choice; everyone knows that unlike children are often born to the same parents, but the likeness of only the most certain brotherhood reaches all the way up to the supreme power. Indeed, it overcomes the difference in your ages and makes older and younger equals by your mutual affection.

The orator continues, outlining the strength of the fraternity and how each emperor inspires the other, leading to the explosion of fraternal affection at the Milan conference (8.1–12.5). Having dealt with Maximian's fraternal *pietas,* the orator turns to his subject's *felicitas,* which he expounds in a series of windy metaphors principally employing the Jovian/Herculian imagery (13.1–18.5) before a peroration (19) in which he joins *pietas* and *felicitas* as the guarantors of a great future. As with the orator of 289, fraternity is a basic theme of this speech, here principally expressed through the long *exordium* on *pietas* (6). This common theme cannot simply be regarded as an orator's trick or a neat means of making a point. It is fundamental to the way in which Diocletian and Maximian presented themselves to their courts and to their subjects.

It might be suggested that this theme of brotherhood has principally emerged for rhetorical events and was not of great moment to contemporaries. It fits the moment well and is dexterously exploited by both panegyrists. Certainly the occasion of the panegyric of 289 suggests the conceit of brotherhood, but it is a dangerous metaphor

23. Cf. Kolb 1987, 104.
24. Crook 1967, 119–21.
25. Leadbetter 1998b, 225.

in which to engage if it is not well understood by the audience. Panegyrists need to employ a vocabulary of power that meets the approval of their most important listener and that is comprehended by the court. The evidence of other contemporaries—Lactantius, Diocletian's most savage critic; that old British pirate, Carausius; and the panegyrists of the following decade—suggests that they too understood the relationship between the two emperors as one of metaphorical brotherhood.

Lactantius, both a disaffected subject and, briefly, a court rhetor in Nicomedia, refers to Maximian in this way:

> Quid frater eius Maximianus, qui est dictus Herculius? Non dissimilis ab eo; nec enim possent in amicitiam tam fidelem cohaerere, nisi esset in utroque mens una, eadem cogitatio, par voluntas, aequa sententia.
>
> What of his brother Maximian, who is called Herculius? He was not dissimilar to him [Diocletian]; for they could not combine in such friendship without having the one mind, the same considerations, an equivalent will and the same views.[26]

Lactantius here takes the fraternal unanimity of the Augusti and proceeds to turn it into an item of his invective. But he takes as his foundation the assertion of the fraternity of the two emperors. In the same way, Carausius sought to graft himself into the imperial brotherhood. After the failure of the naval expedition against Carausius, referred to in the panegyric of 289, a cold war of a sort followed. Carausius tried to use the cessation of formal hostilities to legitimize his rule by grafting himself into the imperial college. Not only do his mints strike for Diocletian and Maximian but in one highly symbolic issue a billon coin carried jugate busts of the three emperors, with the legend CARAVSIVS ET FRATRES SVI; the reverse proclaimed PAX AVGGG.[27] While this coin is important as evidence of the way in which Carausius sought to cement his position in relation to the continental Augusti, it is equally significant because of the way in which Carausius sought to express that position. His clear understanding was that the relationship between Diocletian and Maximian was fraternal, and fraternities are not inherently dual. A fraternity might admit any number of fictive brothers if unity of purpose were present.

Even after the abdications of 305, the fraternal fiction persisted. A lost inscription from the Baths of Diocletian in Rome indicates just how durable it was. The Baths were dedicated between May 305 and July 306, according to Maximian's express command, in the name of "his brother" Diocletian.[28] Commenced in 299 after Maximian's return from campaigning against the Quinquegentiani in Africa, the complex took more than seven years to complete.[29] When it was finished and dedicated, the names of six emperors appeared on the dedicatory texts: two Augusti seniores; their sons, the ruling Augusti; and their sons, the Caesars. It was a proud assertion

26. Lactant. *De mort. pers.* 8.1–2.

27. Mattingly-Sydenham, *RIC* 5^2, 550; Nixon and Rodgers 1994, 107–8; Rees 2002, 69.

28. *ILS* 646 = *CIL* 6.1130; 31242. On the Baths complex, see Platner-Ashby 1926, 527–30; Claridge 1998, 352–54.

29. The chronology given by the inscription is that construction commenced after the return of Maximian from Africa: "quas Maximianus Aug. re[dien]s ex Africa sub [pr]aesentia maie[statis] disposuit ac fieri iussit et Diocletiani Aug. fratris sui nomini consecravit" ("which Maximian Augustus, returning from Africa, through the presence of his majesty [i.e., his literal absence] determined and ordered to be constructed and consecrated in the name of his brother Diocletian Augustus"). Barnes dates the visit to some time in 299 (1982, 59); Nixon has suggested that his visit to Rome was to take up his sixth consulship (1981a, 71). See also Nixon and Rodgers 1994, p. 201, n. 32.

of dynastic stability and continuity founded upon the fraternity of Diocletian and Maximian.

The later panegyrics also reflect this. In 307 a panegyrist delivered a speech in praise of both Maximian and his new son-in-law, Constantine.[30] By this time Maximian's status had become more than a little ambiguous. In May 305 he had ostensibly abdicated, but in the following year he had returned to power at the grudging request of his son Maxentius. Maxentius had seized power in Rome and, under challenge from Galerius, sought to bolster his regime by an appeal to his father to reassume the purple. Maximian complied but had no desire to be a mere ornament. The unenviable task of praising Maximian for this attempt to claw his way back to power fell to the orator of 307. Inevitably, the orator refers to Maximian's exercise of power with Diocletian, and when he does so it is in terms of brotherhood. At 8.5 the orator refers to the achievements of *huius cum fratre* in Germany, and at 9.2 he notes that Maximian's abdication was entirely through his brotherly devotion (*pietate fraterna*). At 11.4 he develops the metaphor:

> Imperasti pridem rogatus a fratre, rursus impera a matre.
>
> Aforetime you ruled at the request of your brother; rule again at the behest of your mother!

The orator of 310, whose praise was for Constantine alone, had nothing good to say about Maximian. That is hardly surprising in itself, since it is clear from the context that Maximian had recently died after a failed palace coup. In this circumstance, it was not Maximian's *pietas* that the orator sought to parade but his infidelity:

> Hunc ergo illum qui ab eo fuerat frater adscitus, puduit imitari, huic illum in Capitolini Iovis templo iurasse paenituit. Non miror quod etiam genero peieravit.
>
> So this fellow was ashamed to imitate that man who had adopted him as a brother, and regretted having sworn an oath to him in the Temple of Capitoline Jupiter. I do not wonder even that he betrayed his word to his son-in-law![31]

The orator here neatly turns the image of fraternity to the discredit of Maximian: a man who betrays his adoptive brother in the most sacred spot in Rome can hardly be trusted to be true to his son-in-law.

The importance of the recurrent motif of fraternity is one that cannot be sufficiently underscored. In 285 Diocletian did not have a model of a "dyarchy" from which to commence the construction of his own imperial relationship with Maximian. This word is a term of convenience employed by contemporary scholars to such an extent that it looks like a constitutional arrangement. It never was: it was a private matter between Diocletian and Maximian that was then publicly expressed in the only language that could cope adequately with such an event—that of dynasty. Diocletian and Maximian expected their servants and subjects to imagine them as brothers, seeing the new regime in familiar terms as a family. Moreover, this imagined family (despite its proclaimed unity) explicitly consisted of an older brother and a younger brother. This clearly indicates Diocletian's own intention—to create his own dynasty with himself at its head. Without a male family of his own, however, he had to invent one. He was more successful in this than he has been given

30. On the date and circumstance, see Nixon and Rodgers 1994, 179–85.
31. *Pan. Lat.* 6.15.6.

credit for. Not only did the image persist beyond Diocletian's abdication but his new dynasty of Jovians and Herculians ruled the Empire until the death of Julian, Maximian's great-grandson, in 363—although by then it had become expedient to forget the origins of the family and invent a new one.

Bill Leadbetter
Edith Cowan University

LITERATURE CITED

Barnes, T. D. 1982. *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine*. Cambridge, Mass.
Baynes, N. H. 1935. Review of *Römische Geschichte,* by J. Vogt and E. Kornemann. *JRS* 25:81–87.
Chastagnol, A. 1982. *L'évolution politique, sociale et économique du monde romain,* 284–363. Paris.
_____. 1994. L'évolution politique du règne de Dioclétien. *L'Antiquité Tardive* 2:23–31.
Claridge, A. 1998. *Rome: An Oxford Archaeological Guide*. Oxford.
Crook, J. A. 1967. *Law and Life of Rome*. London.
d'Elia, S. 1961–62. Ricerche sui Panegirici di Mamertino a Massimiano. *AnnNap:* 121–391.
Gallétier, E. 1949. *Panégyriques Latins*. Paris.
Jeffreys, E., M. Jeffreys, and R. Scott. 1986. *The "Chronicle" of John Malalas: A Translation*. Melbourne.
Kolb, F. 1987. *Diocletian und die Erste Tetrarchie: Improvisation oder Experiment in der Organisation monarchischer Herrschaft?* Bonn.
_____. 2001. *Herrscherideologie in der Spätantike*. Berlin.
Kornemann, E. 1930. *Doppelprinzipat und Reichsteilung im* Imperium Romanum. Leipzig and Berlin.
Leadbetter, B. 1998a. The Illegitimacy of Constantine and the Birth of the Tetrarchy. In *Constantine: History, Historiography and Legend,* ed. S. N. C. Lieu and D. Montserrat, 74–85. London.
_____. 1998b. *Patrimonium Indivisum?* The Empire of Diocletian and Maximian, 285–89. *Chiron* 28:213–28.
MacCormack, S. 1981. *Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity.* Berkeley and Los Angeles.
Millar, F. 1977. *The Emperor in the Roman World (31 BC–AD 337)*. London.
Mynors, R. A. B. 1964. *XII Panegyrici Latini*. Oxford.
Nicholson, O. 1984. The Wild Man of the Tetrarchy: A Divine Companion for the Emperor Galerius. *Byzantion* 54:253–75.
Nixon, C. E. V. 1981a. The "Epiphany" of the Tetrarchs? An Examination of Mamertinus' Panegyric of 291. *TAPA* 111:157–66.
_____. 1981b. Maximian's Visits to Rome and the Panegyric of 307. *Phoenix* 35:70–76.
_____. 1983. Latin Panegyric in the Tetrarchic and Constantinian Period. In *History and Historians in Late Antiquity,* ed. B. Croke and A. M. Emmett, 88–99. Sydney.
Nixon, C. E. V., and B. Saylor Rodgers. 1994. *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors: The Panegyrici Latini; Introduction, Translation and Historical Commentary.* Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Oxford.
Platner, S. B. 1926. *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome.* Rev. T. Ashby. Oxford.
Rees, R. 2002. *Layers of Loyalty in Latin Panegyric*. Oxford.
Salway, B. 1994. What's in a Name? A Survey of Roman Onomastic Practice. *JRS* 84:124–45.
Seston, W. 1946. *Dioclétien et la tétrarchie.* Vol. 1, *Guerres et réformes*. Paris.
_____. 1950. Iovius et Herculius ou "l'épiphanie" des tétrarques. *Historia* 1:257–66.
Williams, S. 1985. *Diocletian and the Roman Recovery.* London.