neither a comprehensive history of allotment nor an attempt at a complete history of the senior magistracies at Rome.

Westonbirt School S. J. NORTHWOOD

AUTOCRATS AND ARISTOCRATS

M. B. ROLLER: *Constructing Autocracy. Aristocrats and Emperors in Julio-Claudian Rome*. Pp. x + 319. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001. Cased, £26.95. ISBN: 0-691-05021-X.

Matthew Roller, in a timely monograph based on a 1994 Berkeley dissertation, tackles the question of how the upper classes conceived the emperor's position during the foundation of the Principate, between Actium and the death of Nero.

> The emergence of an autocrat posed difficulties of comprehension not only for Roman aristocrats, but for everyone else in Roman society, including the emperor himself: how to understand the unprecedented concentration of power in the hands of one person, and how to articulate the relationships that such a person could and should have with others. (p. 129)

He contends 'that, in this period, the emperor was being invented on the fly, through various feats of imagination, as a social figure who related in particular ways to other members of society, and particularly to elites?' (p. 6). 'Elites' means individual members of the élite, according to the now ineradicable American usage: R. uses it and 'aristocrats' to cover senators and *equites*, including the authors studied. His aim is to see how socio-political change influences and is influenced by conceptual change (p. 9). He approaches this difficult task thoughtfully, making intelligent, light-handed use of anthropological and socio-cultural theories, interpreting his sources lucidly and plausibly. He focuses on literary sources, especially Tiberian to Neronian, with particular attention to Seneca, Lucan, and Valerius Maximus, although there are citations of texts from Ennius to Macrobius, and occasional judicious references to documents such as the *Res Gestae* and loyalty-oaths.

R. treats his topic in two parts, each consisting of two long chapters with many sections. My summary cannot do justice to his arguments. The first two chapters each focus on an author, Lucan ('The ethics of civil war . . .') and Seneca ('Ethics for the Principate . . .'). After a survey of the key Roman virtues of *virtus* and *pietas*, R. explores two viewpoints in Lucan, 'assimilating' (the enemy are fellow-citizens and the war civil), associated with the Pompeians, and 'alienating', voiced by Caesarians. Both are also expressed by the narrator. R. finds similar discourse in the period of the civil wars. He concludes that Lucan sees 'irreconcilable ethical discourses as the hallmark of the principate' (p. 63). Seneca, in contrast, uses Stoic ethics to propose a revision of traditional Roman values which will enable the ruling class, sidelined from the prizes of great commands, to reclaim an arena for the display of *virtus*. R. argues that Seneca recasts qualities such as *gratia* or *virtus* as an internal state of mind rather than observable action; he reassesses traditional *exempla*, stressing intention. Secondly, Seneca shows how his readers should speak frankly to the emperor, without adulation. For R., Seneca both responds to shifts in power and tries to 'shape that distribution of power and contemporary perceptions of it' (p. 126).

Part Two, 'Figuring the Emperor', begins with 'The Emperor's Authority: Dining, Exchange and Social Hierarchy', which puts exchange (rather than patron–client

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.316 Published online by Cambridge University Press

relations) in the foreground and includes the behaviour of hosts and guests at dinners, gift-giving, *beneficia*, ingratitude, clemency, legacies, and confiscation. Such exchanges, correctly done, legitimate the emperor's authority. The final chapter, 'Modeling the Emperor: the Master–Slave Relationship and its Alternatives', studies two metaphors the Romans lived by: *libertas*/*servitus* (e.g. *RG* 1.1) and the emperor as *dominus* or father. 'To participate in this collective process of paradigm setting was to help invent the principate' (p. 262). Seneca's concern with moral slavery is linked with aristocrats' anxiety about status and the possibility of degrading treatment. In conclusion, R. claims that aristocrats focused on 'situations in which ethics and power intersected' (p. 287), not on the emperor's constitutional position.

His nuanced, wide-ranging discussion, engaged with current scholarship, deserves to be read. His interpretation of some views of the emperor, as reflected especially in authors at the end of the dynasty, is often convincing. Much, naturally, remains to be said on how the emperor was imagined. Relations between oligarchs in the late Republic could be further explored.

Constitutional titles provide valuable information on negotiation between emperor and Senate, and the Augustan settlement is part of the background. One could think of the emperor as lawgiver, *princeps* (Seneca would be interesting here), *imperator*, and holder of *tribunicia potestas*. I miss full exploitation of the Augustans and of Cicero's speeches (e.g. *pro Ligario* for the metaphor of the ruler as indulgent father). Concentration on power short-changes etiquette (contrast Clement of Alexandria on table manners; *civilis princeps* is not in the picture here) or friendship (Cicero inviting Atticus for the pleasure of his company?). Anecdotes show, as R. wants, how people thought of the emperor, but for how people really behaved we long for 'more realistic' sources.

Quotations are accurately translated into readable English. (But the repeated 'ille' in Sen. *De Ira* 2.24 surely refers to a series of different men, not to one [p. 136]). R. unfortunately misrepresents Brunt at 197 n. 103: *Planc.* 69 is the source of Valerius Maximus 5.2.7. There is a useful *index locorum* and general index.

Stanford University SUSAN TREGGIARI

THE IMPERIAL COURT

A. WINTERLING: *Aula Caesaris: Studien zur Institutionalisierung des römischen Kaiserhofes in der Zeit von Augustus bis Commodus (31 v.Chr.–192 n.Chr.)*. Pp. x + 283, maps. Munich: Oldenbourg, 1999. Cased, DM 98. ISBN: 3-486-56195-2.

How did the imperial abode on the Palatine develop from Augustus' modest household to an entity that embodied the state itself? And how did that entity differentiate itself from other aristocratic households? Aulus Winterling has produced a fine, well-argued study examining these very questions.

W. begins his work with the subject's context and history, and the study does not really begin in earnest until Chapter 3, with a discussion of the Roman aristocratic household and its relationship to and distinction from the imperial house. Here W. (commendably) defines his terms, something essential when dealing with abstract social concepts such as the *princeps*'s *domus* and *familia*. He examines the physical appearance, social dynamics, and hierarchy of republican households, and asks how

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.316 Published online by Cambridge University Press