ALTERNATIVES TO KINSHIP? TETRARCHS AND THE DIFFICULTIES OF REPRESENTING NON-DYNASTIC RULE

Abstract: Throughout Roman history, members of the imperial family featured regularly in central coinage, on reliefs and statues, and in inscriptions – both in Rome and the provinces. Roman emperorship was a de facto dynastic system, which explains the sustained emphasis on imperial fathers, mothers, wives and children. Only very rarely was lineage wholly ignored. This posed major problems for imperial representation under the so-called Tetrarchy; an explicitly non-dynastic imperial system, not organised by bloodline but governed through collegiate rule. How could such ‘corporate government’ present itself in a society that was used to dynastic terminology when indicating predecessors and intended successors? This article explores some of the alternative modes through which tetrarchic representation aimed to present non-dynastic rule, and shows how these alternatives proved ultimately unsuccessful. Apparently, the constraints of tradition in imperial imagery were too stringent to overcome.
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1. Introduction: Throughout Roman imperial history, family mattered when representing emperorship. Different members of the imperial family (especially fathers, mothers, wives and children) were emphasised at different times and in different regions, but only very rarely was lineage wholly ignored. This inevitably posed problems for imperial representation under the Tetrarchy. How could a non-dynastic imperial system, explicitly not organised by bloodline but governed through collegiate rule, present itself in a society that was used to dynastic terminology when indicating predecessors and intended successors? How could one ‘represent a collectivity of rulers rather than an individual, a collectivity in which no member was related by blood to another and all were mature men’? This article explores some of the alternative modes through which tetrarchic representation aimed to present non-dynastic rule, and shows how these alternatives proved...
ultimately unsuccessful. Apparently, the constraints of tradition in imperial imagery were too stringent to overcome.

2. Parents without wives or mothers:

Collegiate rule by four mature men was new and led to new modes of representation. The most-discussed alternative mode was the portrayal of the tetrarchs as a group of which the constituent members were difficult to distinguish. The well-known porphyry groups from Constantinople, now in Venice and the Vatican libraries (fig. 1) testify to the suppression of individual expression, and emphasise unity instead. Likewise, each of the different imperial mints issued coins showing not only the portrait of the ‘residing’ tetrarch, but of all four rulers, who resembled each other, though some individualised physiognomical features were recognisable. At least some of the similarities in imagery result from ‘obvious difficulties encountered at the level of manufacture’. There are not many ways to distinguish ‘one stubbled, short-cropped and square-headed tetrarch from another’. Nor was the homogeneity of tetrarchic images absolute. There were individualising characteristics, and many depictions show a hierarchy among the rulers. The south pier of the Arch of Galerius at Thessaloniki shows a sacrificing ruler in armour, doubtlessly Galerius, as distinctly superior to his peers (fig. 2). Likewise, in the now-lost frescoes from a chamber for imperial cult at Luxor, one ruler was systematically elevated over his fellow-tetrarchs, as he was depicted as taller (on the east side of the apse, on the south wall) or holding a staff or globe (in the apse of the south wall).8

These occasional differentiations aside, tetrarchic imagery was remarkably consistent. The oft-commented upon similitudo (similarity) between rulers is most obvious. But equally noticeable and less commented upon is the complete absence of imperial women from coins, sculpture and the epigraphic evidence. Up to 306 not a single coin was issued depicting a female member of the imperial household (s), none of the wives of the tetrarchs were made Augusta up to 308, and we are not even aware of the names of the different imperial mothers, with the exception of Galerius’ mother, Romula, after whom the city Felix Romuliana – in the diocese of Dacia, province of Moesia Prima – would be called.9 Up to about 308, the tetrarchs presented themselves as neither husbands nor sons. Even Maximian’s wife Eutropia, who had born him a son (Maxentius) and daughter (Fausta), was excluded from central imagery. The absence of mothers might be explained by the unremarkable ancestry of the tetrarchs (fathers, too, were excluded). But the numismatic and sculptural absence of wives and daughters was remarkable, and should be linked to the attempt to make emperorship non-dynastic. Third-century emperors of unremarkable descent emphasised the living members of their household, as is noticeable in the period immediately preceding the Tetrarchy. Carinus’ wife, Magnia Urbica, was Augusta and visible on about 10% of all central coin types.10

Rather than emphasising kinship, Tetrarchs emphasised collegiate rule by referring to their joint experience throughout the empire. Surprisingly often all emperors were honoured in inscriptions, considering that they were (almost) never together in one place. Even when we do not have all tetrarchic names inscribed, the collegiate message can regularly be traced. Werner Eck has convincingly argued that the frequently found formulation d (evotus) n (umini) m (aiestati) q (ue) eor (um) (‘devoted to their spirit and majesty’) must imply, by the explicit use of the plural eorum rather than singular eius, that a great number of statues or altars were dedicated to the emperors as a group. There may have been a similar attempt to emphasise collegiate power on milestones. None of these inscriptions include kin terms to relate the four rulers to each other. Where we do have surviving statue groups, the absence of women among the statues is again noticeable. The notion of joint rule also became apparent through the practice to issue imperial edicts in the name of all tetrarchs (who also shared each other’s victory titles), occasionally testified in papyri and in the very few remaining military diplomas, but most famously in the ‘edict of maximum prices’ (November 301) and the ‘persecution edicts’ (the first of which issued in Nicomedia in 303). The former edict includes one of the few centrally put forward kin terms: ‘we, who are the parents of the human race (parentes generis humani)’.11 It is noticeable that there is no reference to kinship between the tetrarchs, but an attempt to place the emperors as a group above their subjects, as metaphorical ‘parents’.

After Diocletian and Maximian’s unprecedented abdication, presentation changed. It became difficult to keep kin terms out of imperial representation when succession was at stake. The old emperors needed new names. Diocletian’s contemporary Lactantius writes, in his On the Deaths of the Persecutors, that the former emperor gave up his imperial nomenclature in his retirement at Split to become, once again, Diocles. Yet a large inscription from the baths of Diocletian at Rome, set-up between the abdication of 1 May
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305 and the death of Constantius I on 25 July 306 starts a list of those in power with: DD (omini) mn (ostri) DIOCLETIANUS et ([Maximianus]) Invicti / Senioris Aug (usti) patres Imp (eratorum) et Caes (arum) (our lords, the invincible Diocletian and Maximian, senior Augusti, fathers of the emperors and Caesars). It then gives the names of the new Augusti (but without the adjective ‘senior’), and of the two men who were their second-in-command. Towards the end of the inscription, it is noted how Maximian named the complex after ‘DIOCLETIANUS Augustus, his brother (fratrisuis)’. A military diploma from 7 January 306 names the former emperors as patr (es) Augg (iurorum) et Caes (arum), and lists them after the (now) ruling emperors Constantius and Galerius, but before the Caesars. Diocletian and Maximian were (probably) the adoptive fathers of Galerius and Constantius, but the term ‘father’ had been noticeably absent from official nomenclature until 305. Moreover, a dedication to Diocletian by a veteran from Alexandria, dated (probably) to the same period, described the (former) emperor as ‘father of the emperors’ (pater Augustorum), although Diocletian certainly did not adopt Galerius and Constantius I Chlorus. Instead, one should perhaps see the use of paternal language as an attempt to reformulate the tetrarchs’ powers in familiar terms. They became the ‘Emperor Fathers’, comparable, perhaps, to how Elizabeth became Queen Mother when George VI died in 1952, or Joseph Ratzinger was renamed ‘Pope Emeritus’ in 2013. The reference to Diocletian as Maximian’s brother in the inscriptions from Diocletian’s Baths is also striking. When changing power relations needed to be expressed to the inhabitants of the Roman Empire, kin terms resurfaced rapidly.

3. Non-dynastic succession and dynastic rebellion

The abdication of Diocletian and Maximian caused more than the need for new names to describe emeritus emperors. Successors needed to be appointed to complete the tetrarchic system. In a massive, and oft-discussed, break with precedent Maximian and Constantius’ sons (Maxentius and Constantine) were ignored when the new Caesars were selected in May 305. Both were militarily experienced sons of rulers. Maxentius had furthermore married Galerius’ daughter Valeria Maximilla. The suggestion that Constantine was betrothed to Maximian’s daughter Fausta in the 290’s is a later fiction. Ancient (and modern) literature is divided about Constantine’s status as legitimate or bastard son. Constantius, in any case, had other sons from his undoubted marriage to Maximian’s (step)daughter Theodora.11 These sons (of unknown age, but not born before 293) were also ignored, as was Galerius’ bastard-son Candinianus (c. 9 years old in 305). These latter omissions could be easily explained by pointing at the children’s youth and inexperience. Not so the exclusion of Maxentius and Constantine I. The former was still assumed to be the obvious heir to the throne in 289, as is clear from the panegyric held in front of Maximian at Trier in 289: ‘soon will come the day that Rome see you victors, and alert at the right hand your son’.12

The slight will have been all the more substantial if it is true that one of the Caesars elected instead of Constantine I and Maxentius, known as Maximinus Daia, was a (close) relative of Galerius. That would have meant that kinship was not systematically used as an argument for exclusion. The evidence is, however, limited. Lactantius has Galerius describe Daia as ‘a relation of mine (meus affinis)’ and the unknown author of the Epitome de Caesaribus claims that he was the son of Galerius’ sister. There is no evidence at all that the other new Caesar, Severus II (305–307), was related to any of the other tetrarchs.13 The ancient evidence for the succession is, clearly, confused, complicated to interpret, and often contradictory. Two points seem to be beyond dispute. Firstly, kinship was not a deciding factor in selecting the new Caesars, though it may have been a reason for exclusion. Secondly, many authors, both at the time and afterwards, were surprised by this lack of dynastic succession.

It seems likely that other people will have shared the authors’ surprise. Dynastic claims would prove to remain important. Just over a year after Diocletian’s abdication, Maxentius and Constantine would be in positions of power. The omission of imperial sons turned out unsuccessful. Constantine I was proclaimed emperor by Constantius’ troops after the latter’s death at York in July 306, and in October 306, Maxentius took control of Rome, helped by the loyalty soldiers felt to his father, and shortly afterwards by his father too. Surprisingly enough, the apparent importance of their imperial sonship did not lead to kinship references in coins issued in the areas in which Constantine and Maxentius were in control, though ‘hilios’ did become part of Constantine’s nomenclature. In many ways, however, both adhered (more or less) to the tetrarchic system of representation.

Constantine was in a more advantageous position than Maxentius, as the death of his father had left a vacancy. His elevation could be seen as procedurally correct. He was apparently put forward by the Augustus Constantius before his death, and then approached the surviving Augustus Galerius for inclusion in the tetrarchy.14 The latter’s hand was forced, with Constantine I in effective command of a substantial part of the empire, but Galerius could acknowledge Constantine as Caesar without imposing a problem.
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on the tetrarchic system. Whether or not Constantine had aimed to become Augustus or not, and notwithstanding the importance of dynastic loyalty for his imperial acclamation, his formal presentation through coinage abided to Galerius’ rules. The mints from London and Trier, which were under Constantine’s control, systematically named him NOB (ILLESIMUS) CAES (AR), and issued coins for all four tetrarchs. Commemoration coins for divi Constantius were, furthermore, scarce between 305 and 307 (fig. 3), and were only issued in Lugdunum (Lyon). They became somewhat more common after 307, and were then also struck in Trier, though never in London. Even in this period, however, numbers were still relatively low; far more types had been coined for divus Carus only two decades earlier. This limited attention to his father’s deification on Constantine’s coins is striking. It should probably be explained as a decision by Constantine to cohere to tetrarchic (kinshipless) messages. Clearly, the tetrarchs did not wish to emphasize that one of their number was ‘son of a god’, and divus Constantius was not at all numismatically commemorated by the other tetrarchs. Still, the near-ignoring of Constantine’s father might have been construed at the time as a lack of piety.

Similarly, early-Constantinian inscriptions that depicted all tetrarchs excluded references to divine sonship, and listed Constantine last, as junior member of the college of emperors. Titulature was different when Constantine was the sole recipient of an inscription. On almost all of the milestones from Constantine’s territory that can be dated between 306 and the end of 307 the Caesar Constantine was ‘son of the deified pious Constantius (divi Constantii piii Augustifilius).

Between 307, when Constantine married Maximian’s daughter Fausta, and 310, when Constantine fell out with his father-in-law and had him commit suicide, Constantine was furthermore systematically nepos (grandson) of Maximian (through the latter’s adoption of Constantius) and filius of divus Constantius (in that order) on milestones throughout his dominion, with a majority of inscriptions from the area surrounding Arles — possibly because that was where he may have married Fausta. The consistency of terminology and its widespread use make clear that this must have been the emperor’s official nomenclature. Fausta was, however, all but ignored, with only one very rare silver coin type issued with the name FAUSTANOBILISSIMAFEMINA (fig. 4). The marriage to Fausta and resulting allegiance to Maximian (and his son Maxentius) changed the political situation. Constantine no longer adhered to the tetrarchic emphasis on equality, and could promote his descent without hesitation. This explains the increase in commemoration types after 307. After 310, Maximian no longer formed a useful ancestor, and Constantine’s descent from Claudius Gothicus was ‘discovered’, as has been discussed above. Yet even before 307, divine sonship had been noticeably present on the milestones from Britain and France, even if coinage had been much less forthcoming. Different sources, it appears, put forward different messages.

Maxentius had less choice than Constantine I in the way he portrayed himself. He could not easily aspire to become a tetrarch. That would have only been possible by the exclusion of one of the existing rulers, or by becoming an additional member of a group consisting of four. The last strategy was the apparent aim of an earlier usurper, the ‘British’ emperor Carausius (286/287–293), who ruled Britain and northwestern Gaul whilst in control of two legions. In the years of his usurpation, of course, the only emperors were Diocletian and Maximian. Famously, admittedly rare, antoniniani under Carausius included a type with an obverse that showed Diocletian flanked by Maximian and Carausius and the legend CARAVSIVS ET FRATRES SVI (Carausius and his brothers) (fig. 5). The reverse proclaimed the PAX AVGGG (USTRORUM) (Peace of the [three] emperors). Carausius’ attempt to integrate himself into a ‘college of rule’ through fictive kinship. He failed. By the time Maxentius took power, the tetrarchic system had been established for longer, and taken on a more fixed form. It was unlikely that Maxentius would succeed where Carausius had not.

Maxentius’ coinage did use the curious title princepsvinicus in the first months of his reign. There have been various explanations for this extraordinary nomenclature, ranging from ambiguity to allow later inclusion in the tetrarchy, to purposeful exclusion from tetrarchic names to rise above the other rulers, or even a ‘stop-gap title’, awaiting bestowal of...
proper emperorship by Maximian, once the latter had come out of retirement and joined his son.18 An attempt to aim at collegiate rule seems implied by the reverse legend AVGG (VSTORVM) ET CAESS (ARVM)NN (OSTORVM) (‘of our emperors and caesars’) on coin types from the mints of Rome and Carthage, which were under Maxentius’ control. As Mats Cullhed pointed out twenty years ago, however, Galerius (and indeed Severus II, whose territory Maxentius claimed) were noticeably absent from these very coin types. Instead, Maxentius, Maximian, Constantine I and Maximinus appeared on coins, the last name only for a short while.19 The exclusion from Galerius was all the more notable as he was Maxentius’ father-in-law. Maxentius’ and Valeria Maximilla’s son Romulus even held a family name, as he was named after Galerius’ mother, Romula.20 None of these women appeared on Maxentius’ coinage, nor was his own descent from Maximian made visible. The visual language on Maxentius’ coins, then, stayed fairly close to that of the tetarchs, with the exclusion of women, and claims of cooperative rule.

Allowing his father to return to a position of power could have been portrayed as an action of filial piety by Maxentius, but there is no evidence that it ever was. Rather, it appears that in the period in which Maxentius and his father jointly ruled Rome, they tried to gain the aid from other tetarchs to get rid of Galerius and Severus II, and be included in the system instead. The marriage of Constantine to Fausta, as earlier tetarchic marriage links, would have been a step in the construction of this new college of rule. After 307, Constantine I recognised the imperial claims of his father-in-law. In this period, coins and inscription communicate through tetarchic language. In April 308, Maxentius and his father fell out. In November of the same year, the so-called conference at Carnuntum re-established Maximian’s retirement (and position as honorary ‘senior Augustus’). Alongside Galerius, Maximinus Daia and Constantine I, Licinius was elevated to the throne – again someone without kinship connection to the other members of the group of emperors. Maxentius was clearly excluded from shared rule. Maximian tried to establish himself at the court of Constantine I for a while, before he was forced to commit suicide in 310. The pressure exerted by Constantine’s and Maximian’s claims probably explains the extraordinary testimonies to a new title ‘son of the emperors (filius Augustorum)’. It can be found on inscription from the eastern part of the empire. Galerius apparently tried to find adequate formulations to respond to Constantine and Maximian, creating a rank between ‘emperor’ and ‘Caesar’. The absence of western parallels shows it was rejected. It is, however, striking that kin terms were now thought appropriate.21

Unfortunately, coin types from Rome and Ostia cannot be sufficiently closely dated to systematically differentiate between Maxentius’ numismatic imagery between April 308, the summer of 310 (when Maximian died), and Maxentian’s ultimate defeat at the hands of Constantine in October 312. Yet there seem to be no kinship references until after 310. Instead, shortly after the dramatic end of the co-operation between father and son, Maxentius’ own son Romulus was brought to the fore in other media. He was made a first-time consul on the 20th April 308, and the following day (Rome’s birthday) saw the dedication of a statue to Mars in the Forum Romanum. An inscription on the base of this statue explicitly honoured Mars pater, and Wrede has convincingly argued that on the sides of the base there were reliefs showing Mars with Romulus and Remus, and Maxentius with his Romulus. The base contrasts with the stylistically and topographically closely connected decennalia monument in the Forum, erected by the tetrarchs in November 303, the imagery of which excluded Maxentius. It is tempting to also link it to numismatical attention to Mars in the period between Maximian’s break with his son and his death. After the break with his father, Maxentius seems to have put forward his prospective lineage – though the evidence is meager, and Romulus was not portrayed on coinage until after his death and consecration in 309. The dominance of Mars on Maxentius’ coinage between 308 and 310 fits his much-discussed ideological emphasis on Rome, and shows a break with the earlier and later emphasis on Hercules on Maxentian coinage.22

It appears that while Maximian and Maxentius co-ruled Rome, they abided to tetarchic forms of communication, excluding references to Maximian as Maxentius’ father. During the years in which father and son were at odds, Maxentius’ son started to feature. Only after Maximian’s death in 310 would divus Maximianus appear on the coinage of Rome, with an explicit kin-legend that made him DivVs MAXIMIANVS PATER. He was accompanied in 311 by Galerius, who was honoured as DivVs MAXIMIANVS SOCERVS (deified father-in-law Maximian [= Galerius]). Divus Constantius had already been honoured between 307 and (probably) 310 on a coin type from Aquileia that copied Constantine’s post-307 commemoration types. After 310, he was explicitly included in the series that presented Maxentius’ descent from divi, with the unique legends DIVVS CONSTANTIUS COGNATUS and DIVUS CONSTANTIUS ADFINIS. It must have been important for Maxentius to include Constantius in his family: ADFINIS (or affinis) means ‘related by marriage’, but is
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mainly used to describe a relation between a son and father-in-law. Still, Constantius was the father-in-law of Maxentius’ sister Fausta, and his wife Theodora was the daughter or (more probably) stepdaughter of Maximian. The term cognatus, however, created a fiction. It might be translated as ‘kindred’, but emphatically describes those related by blood. After his death, the deified Constantius was made closer kin than he really was. The first of what could be called a family of divi will have been Maxentius’ son Romulus, whose death occurred in 309. A dedication to Romulus’ memory was formally reconstituted by including yet another non-kinsman, Carnuntum conference, Galerius’ wife Galeria Valeria was officially linked to Venus Victrix (as Fausta had been in the one earlier divi series, with the massive difference that where Decius suggested continuity, Maxentius claimed kinship. It will not be a coincidence that these same years saw the promulgation of Constantine’s descent from Claudius Gothicus. The abandonment of non-dynastic imagery from the part of ‘dynastic rebels’ against the tetrarchic system showed the limits of a representation of emperorship that excluded kinship. The ‘official’ Tetrarchs followed suit. Just before the also be dated to approximately the same years. Within the space of a few years, then, Maxentius created a family of divi, Constantine constructed ficive lineage back to Claudius Gothicus, and Galerius included references to his wife and kinship legends on coins that further showed the depleted number of tetrarchic colleagues. Apparently, non-dynastic emperorship had proved insufficient.

Figures credits:
1. Public domain, photo: Nino Barbieri (Creative commons license)
2. Public domain, photo: Tilemahos Efthimiadis (Creative commons license)
3. Courtesy of www.cngcoins.com
4. © The Trustees of the British Museum
5. Courtesy of www.cngcoins.com; www.wildwinds.com

References:
BARNES 2011
CAMBI 2004
CLAES 2013
Claes, L.: Kinship and Coins. Ancestors and Family on Roman Imperial Coinage under the Principate (PhD diss. University of Nijmegen).
CLAUSS 2002
CORCORAN 1996
CORCORAN 2006
Corcoran, S.: Galerius, Maximinus and the titulature of the third Tetrarchy, BICS 49, 231–240.
CORCORAN 2012
CRIMI/CICOGNA 2012
CULLHED 1994

25 Valeria: ILS 8932; IGR 4.1562; RIC 6, 478 no. 196, 479-480 nos. 204, 210-212 (Siscia); 499 nos. 22-24, 99 nos. 41-43 (Serdica); 513-514 nos. 29, 33-36; 515-516 (notes), (Thessalonica); 548, 650 no. 47, 562 nos. 53, 57-58 (Nicomedia); 626-629, nos. 80, 84, 91, 98, 631-633 nos. 107, 115, 121, 637 no. 13, 639 no. 151 (Antioch); 673-675 nos. 67, 74, 81, 677 nos. 95, 98, 679-680 nos. 110, 122, 128-129 (Alexandria); LEADBEITER 2009, 205, 215 n. 212. Constantine I: RIC 6, 562-563 nos. 56, 61 (Nicomedia); 631-632 nos. 104-105, 111 (Antioch); 679-679 nos. 99b, 100b, 113-117. These same years also saw a change in Galerius’ use of victory titles, emphasizing his seniority in the newly defined imperial college: CORCORAN 2006, 231-235.

CIL 6.1138 (= ILS 673), CIL 6.8.2, 4327-4328.