linguistic developments which contributed to the institutionalization of the *domus principis*, considering the various terminology for that *domus*, looking particularly at the meaning—political and physical—of the word *aula*, and tracing the evolution of its use in reference to the imperial house. *Aula*, he argues, could refer not only to the physical structure of the *domus principis*, but to the mode of life practised there. While early in the Roman historical and literary record *aula* has a rather negative meaning, particularly in Tacitus, eventually the word came to have a distinctly neutral value. That is all well and good, but as I read this generally excellent chapter, I felt, particularly given the title of the work, that it would have been better placed at the beginning, since the central thesis of his study could then have been argued from the main point of this chapter: that the *aula Caesaris* represents not just a physical structure, but a distinct political and social institution.

On the whole, the study is well documented and authoritative, though not so exhaustive as to overwhelm the reader. Each chapter generally starts by exploring the history of the question; terms are defined, questions posed clearly, and issues explored chronologically. Included in the volume is an appendix exploring the connection between the word *Palatium* and 'Palace'; also welcome are the several indices, including a source index, and a useful set of maps which allows the reader to see the development of the Palatine over time. In sum, this well-produced study should find a place among indispensable social and political histories of the early Empire.

University of Maryland, College Park STEVEN H. RUTLEDGE

IMPERIAL CULT

M. Clauss: *Kaiser und Gott. Herrscherkult im römischen Reich.* Pp. 597. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1999. Cased. ISBN: 3-519-07444-3.

This is a lengthy and discursive study of ruler worship at Rome, with a particular focus on the western part of the Empire. The book is divided into three main sections: an introduction on methodology, a historical survey, and a thematic examination of major elements of ruler cult in the Roman Empire. The introduction attempts to define the worship of the emperor within the framework of Roman cult. The chronological survey begins with trace elements like the triumphal procession, and carries the story to Theodosius I. The portion arranged by topic deals with such standard themes as the worship of the Genius Augusti, imperial portraits, and *consecratio*. The book concludes with a lengthy set of indices of sources, names, places, and things. The indices take up fifty-three pages and are effectively useless, since they are not analytical. The diligent reader interested in Augustus and the ruler cult must look up seventy-two undifferentiated references; for Tiberius, fifty-one. To find out about Jupiter and the ruler cult, that same reader must plough through seventy-five citations with no guidance. These indices are symptomatic of this book: flawed in conception and execution.

Clauss's book is flawed in conception, because he presumes to write a history of Roman ruler cult by ignoring some of the most important parts of that history: the Greek background and the ruler cult in the Roman East. The book is flawed in execution by C.'s inadequate knowledge of the ancient sources and modern literature on ruler cult.

We start with the secondary literature. It is not easy to discern what C. has actually

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.319 Published online by Cambridge University Press

read. Despite its elaborate scholarly apparatus, the book has no bibliography. However, it appears that C. ignores some of the most basic reference works on 'Gottkönigtum' and 'Herrscherkult', even in such German publications as *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*.

What is most astonishing is that C.'s ignorance is wilful. He boldly tells us (p. 29) that his premise is not to read most of the scholarly literature, which he likens to toadstools popping out of the ground. As his excuse, he claims that 'die Literatur zum sogenannten "Kaiserkult" ist unüberschaubar'. In fact, few major areas of classical studies are easier to survey. We are well supplied with bibliographies. Again, C. ignores some of the most fundamental. He fails to cite at the appropriate place (p. 29 n. 51) the definitive bibliographical survey of the earlier literature by L. Cerfaux and J. Tondriau, *Le culte des souverains dans la civilisation gréco-romaine* (Tournai, 1957), or the much more selective and more recent guide to the literature in the article on 'Herrscherkult' in *RLAC* XIV (1988), 1090–3.

The results are apparent throughout the book, from his methodological introduction to his treatment of Christianity and the imperial cult.

Ruler worship is a characteristic form of Greco-Roman polytheism. It developed in Greece out of the hero cult, and throughout its history in the Roman Empire, Greek forms were determinative (see J. R. Fears, 'Ruler Worship', in M. Grant, R. Kitzinger [edd.], *Civilization of the Ancient Mediterranean* [New York, 1988], pp. 1009–25). Cicero, *De Natura Deorum* 2.60–2 is basic to understanding how an educated Roman conceived of the divinity of the ruler, whether that Roman was M. Tullius Cicero or Flavius Arrianus. It was, after all, such educated Romans in the Senate who consecrated the emperor. In the same way, Greek forms paved the way for the introduction of ruler worship in the Roman Republic. This was true in cult life, as in the worship of Genius Populi Romani. It was no less true in political ideology, as with Cicero's elevation of Pompey to divine status in *De Lege Manilia* (see J. R. Fears, 'A Note on the Origins of Dea Roma', *Mnemosyne* 31 [1978], 274–86, and 'Theology of Victory', *ANRW* II.27.2, 797–800).

At the other end of the chronological scale, C. gives the reader little indication of the profound influence of the ruler cult upon the forms, rituals, and even theology of Christianity. Hercules is the model for the emperor. The son of god by a mortal woman, he carried out great labors for the benefit of mankind, suffered, and was taken up into heaven, where he continued his work as the savior of the human race (cf. Dio Chrysostom 1.49–84 with Fears, 'Optimus Princeps—Salus Generis Humani', in E. Chrysos [ed.], *Festschrift J. Straub* [Athens, 1989], pp. 88–105). No less seminal was the influence of hero cults and ruler worship on the cult of saints in Christianity. Again, we miss an extended discussion of this controversial topic in C.'s highly conventional section on 'Das Christentum und der Kaiserkult'.

In drawing his portrait of ruler cult in the Roman Empire, C. relies largely on a selective use of the literary sources and on inscriptions. He gives little evidence of a first-hand knowledge of the numismatic or archaeological material. It is indicative of his approach that his list of inscriptions cited runs to eighteen pages, his list of coins to half a page. When he does combine literary, numismatic, and archaeological sources, the result is often only to rehash such untenable views as the solar monarchy of Nero (pp. 107–11; cf. Fears, *Historia* 25 [1976], 494–6).

The consequences of such selectivity are apparent in his oft repeated statement that 'Der römischer Kaiser war Gottheit' (pp. 16, 26, 246 and elsewhere). Despite his assertions to the contrary (p. 13), C. is hardly the first to emphasize the religious as compared with the political interpretation of ruler worship. The reviewer has long

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.319 Published online by Cambridge University Press

argued that the ruler cult was above all a religious phenomenon. However, was the emperor a divinity to Arrian (*Anabasis* 4.10), Curtius Rufus (8.5.5–20), or Cassius Dio (52.35)? It is a serious and inexplicable omission that, despite its length and repetitiveness, the book has no detailed discussion of such ancient critics of ruler worship.

In an effort to show how seriously the Romans took deified rulers, C. discusses pilgrim sites (pp. 354–5). However, his selective approach to the literary sources leads him to miss the two most instructive of such pilgrimages: the visit of Augustus to the tomb of Alexander and Trajan's sacrifice to Alexander in the room where Alexander died in Babylon (Suetonius, *Augustus* 18; Dio 58.30). 'Antike Religion', C. tells us, 'ist Handlung, nicht Haltung' (p. 23). He is not the first to see cult action as the definitive mark of the worship of a ruler (cf. Fears, *RLAC* XIV, 1047). However, in the story told by Suetonius, it is the attitude of Augustus that makes Alexander an object of reverence and the rest of the Ptolemies a bunch of stiffs. Suetonius understood the primacy of belief over cult action. In describing the deification of Caesar, he writes: 'in deorum numerum relatus est, non ore modo decernentium sed et persuasione volgi' (*Caesar* 88; cf. 85). The deification of a Roman emperor expressed the inextricable nexus between religion and politics that characterized the Greco-Roman world. C. fails to understand the inapplicability to Rome of our modern separation of religion and state (cf. Fears, 'The Cult of Jupiter', *ANRW* II.27.1, 7–9). In these terms, his persistent translation of 'divus' as 'Staatsgott' is more than inaccurate. It is nonsense.

In recent years, archaeology has made the most important accretions to our knowledge of the ruler cult. To be used intelligently, such archaeological material must be studied at first hand. The frescoes of Vespasian and Titus as Hercules in the Collegiate House of the Augustales at Herculaneum may be our most important single source for understanding the theology of ruler worship. The temple of the Flavian family erected by Domitian at Misenum has revolutionized our understanding of sacred space in ruler worship and provides a most dramatic instance of *damnatio memoriae* (J. R. Fears, 'Herculanensium Augustalium Aedes and the Theology of Ruler Cult', in R. F. Docter, E. M. Moormann [edd.], *Proceedings of the XVth International Congress of Classical Archaeology* [Amsterdam, 2000]). The frescoes from Herculaneum are apparently of no interest to C., who seems to think that the temple at Misenum is Trajanic (p. 410). Quite apart from such new material, we looked to C. in vain for a discussion of even the best-known artistic and monumental sources for ruler worship. At the high end of the scale, the Pantheon is of primary importance for Hadrian's vision of his relationship to the divine world. The Igel Column outside Trier is hardly less significant for our knowledge of the impact of the theology of ruler cult upon the religion of private individuals.

Written without adequate knowledge of the ancient sources and modern literature, and lacking insight into Greco-Roman religion, C.'s *Kaiser und Gott* is a step backward in the study of ruler worship in the Roman world.

University of Oklahoma J. RUFUS FEARS

DELATORES

S. H. RUTLEDGE: *Imperial Inquisitions: Prosecutors and Informants from Tiberius to Domitian*. Pp. xiv + 416. London and New York: Routledge, 2001. Cased, £55.00. ISBN: 0-415-23700-9.

Delatores loom large in first-century historiography. For Tacitus, they actualized all

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.319 Published online by Cambridge University Press