have followed him in taking an optimistic view of their reliability. W.'s careful discussion (pp. 42–50) brings out well the numerous problems of reliability and interpretation posed by these Livian notices. (One further point may be added to his observations: the capture of three Samnite forts reported at Livy 10.18.8 may well be a doublet of the captures narrated at 10.17.1–10.) W. rightly concludes that it is impossible to estimate the number captured and enslaved in this war, but that we can, nonetheless, be sure that the war (and in particular the invasions of the Samnite heartlands) yielded far more captives than any earlier Roman conflict, and that the majority of these ended up as Roman agricultural slaves.

Besides studying the captive reports, W. provides a more general discussion of the rôle of slavery and in particular of the enslavement of war captives in the Roman economy down to 201 B.C. He argues convincingly that enslavement through war will have been practised at Rome from very early times, and that there were sharp increases in the volume of such enslavements, first when the capture of Veii began Roman expansion and secondly with the Third Samnite War. The significant military rôle of slaves, as attendants, rowers, and emergency troops, in the Second Punic War confirms how numerous they had by then become at Rome. Peasants by origin, most of those enslaved in Roman wars will have ended up as agricultural slaves; not all of these will have worked for the élite, for farmers of quite modest means may have been able to afford some slaves. W.'s analysis provides valuable support for the now widely held view that the widespread use of rural slave labour was not a sudden new development of the second century B.C., but had from long before been a well-established feature of the Roman economy.

W. is inclined to take an optimistic view of the capacity of the slave population in this period to reproduce itself, and thinks that this may be the main way in which demand was met in 290–264 B.C., when he holds that the level of war enslavements will have been relatively low (pp. 62–4, 145–6). However, the shortage of captive reports for that period merely reflects the inadequacy of our sources resulting from the loss of Livy's account. Roman forces invaded the homelands of their enemies in southern Italy in 282 and frequently from 278 on. Dio (fr. 40.27) has Pyrrhus remark that his allies' lands had been so ravaged that one could not tell whether they had ever been settled, and it seems likely that the warfare of this period was no less productive of captives than the Third Samnite War.

W. has an interesting discussion of the practicalities of large-scale slave sales in a non-monetized economy (pp. 53–61). However, he may underestimate what was feasible in such a system: it seems unlikely that, as he maintains (pp. 35–8, following Clerici), the introduction of the 5% tax on manumissions should be downdated from the transmitted date of 357 to 241.

University of Nottingham J. W. RICH
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni133

PATER PATRIAE

B. SEVERY: *Augustus and the Family at the Birth of the Roman Empire*. Pp. xiv + 280, ills. New York and London: Routledge, 2003. Cased, £60. ISBN: 0-415-30959-X.

This book deserves the most careful reading. The author has two theses. The first is relatively uncontroversial: it is that Augustus made maximum use of members of his

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni134 Published online by Cambridge University Press

family in establishing his position. However, she elaborates on this by stressing that initially, at any rate, his efforts had nothing to do with securing the succession (p. 62, cf. p. 162). The second thesis is that Augustus managed city and empire 'as republican men managed their households' (p. 5), and this is more difficult. She is describing the change 'from a socio-political system of competing aristocratic families to the constant supremacy of one' (p. 3); Tiberius 'became the head of an imperial family, and thus the head of the imperial state' (p. 5). Then 'Eventually, out of a combination of the once conceptually distinct *res publica* and the family a whole new idea of the state would be born' (p. 32).

The author, recognizing the complexity of examining all the threads (she warns against repetition, but is sparing of it), sets about her task in a scholarly and methodical way. After introducing her theses in the context of recent research in the development of the Augustan Principate and in the Roman family (there is much on public space), she rightly surveys the relations of family and state in the late Republic. Then phases of the Augustan Principate are taken in order, firstly post-war politics of restoration, involving his 'experiments in image, order, and law'; it is hardly surprising that 'no evidence of a parental role, let alone any form of public role for his family, can be found for the first ten to fifteen years'. The third chapter focuses on the family of Augustus between 25 and 12 B.C., acknowledging a change after adoption of the Caesars (p. 62). With 'the military', Severy faces an obvious challenge, but much support is to be found in 'Cults of family and state . . . 12–7 B.C.E.'. The next period is ideally suited for discussion of 'the *familia* of Augustus', and S. then homes in on one year of celebration and deadly irony, 'The *Pater Patriae* and his family, 2 B.C.E.'. After that there was no escaping 'Inheriting the *res publica*'. Hence, it seems, 'The birth of the Roman empire'. All this is supported by notes at the foot of the page (a lesson to publishers), about fifty illustrations, bibliography, and index.

To deal with the subsidiary problem first, S., controverting works of M. Corbier, underestimates the importance of securing the succession to a system that Augustus intended to be permanent (Suet. *Aug*. 28). For one thing, having a convincing heir itself helped to perform that function: Agrippa on Lesbos in 23 was Augustus' life-insurance policy. We lack the evidence to take up a negative attitude on a delicate issue, already in people's minds then: Augustus offered on recovering from illness to open his will. In truth the family provided a nest for heirs. Failure to grapple with the succession and to recognize the *socii imperii* allows the author her Augustus dominating 'a household full of powerful men' (pp. 72, 75, cf. pp. 94, 163); *après moi le Déluge*!

My main difficulty with the second thesis lies in uncertainty whether it is to supplement or to supersede other interpretations of the Augustan Principate. The latter must be rejected; the former accepted to some extent, because paternal authority preceded and underlies all other authority—or has been seen as doing that. That perception was close to the surface at Rome, as the title *pater patriae* shows. But other forms of authority had become differentiated from that primeval form, achieving a distinct identity and even coming into conflict with it. For a son in the army, subject to *imperium* or exercising it, military discipline and privileges, such as that of making a will, were to come first; as a magistrate his *imperium* or *potestas* could not be circumscribed. The supremacy of the Emperor had to be expressed in the terms of the *SC de Cn. Pisone patre* 34–6: the *imperium* of Germanicus—the son of Tiberius!—was to be greater than that of governors of provinces he visited, but that of Tiberius was to be greater than his. Nor did the supremacy of one family mean the end of competition,

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni134 Published online by Cambridge University Press

as struggles for the consulship and praetorship show; Principate was superimposed on *res publica*.

To be sure, the metaphor of family was useful to the Princeps, subjects embracing it as a way of making their relationship to the autocrat acceptable (p. 114), as the Tsar was 'Little Father' to some Russians. It is a merit of the book to deploy the family metaphor in various ways. One of the clearest and most acceptable is S.'s presentation of it as a model to encourage Roman citizens to resume *mores* that Augustus, reassuringly for fearful society, wanted to inculcate. Perhaps the metaphor works in these ways, though not overall. There are neat points too: attempts to bring women back to the private sphere only politicized them further (p. 44); in defending the Roman family, Augustus undercut the prerogatives of real heads of households (p. 154).

Unease about the way the family metaphor is deployed overall corresponds with minor difficulties, some over use of words: reserving the public realm for free males is not quite 'gendering' (p. 7); Agrippa Postumus was not 'trained in the military', and 'border defense' was not what going on in Africa (p. 81); nor did L. Caesar die in the east (p. 94). Ovid, *Fasti* 3.427 and Festus 284 are slightly mistranslated (pp. 102, 194); certainly Tacitus meant more than 'serious' in calling Livia 'gravis' (p. 149), and the idea that Julia's return was voted on in assembly is implausible (p. 183). Generally, clarity would have been served if 'due to' and 'as such' had not been misused.

But S. has performed great service in attuning our ears to the family metaphor, even if we shrink from taking it for the main theme rather than as an introduction and accompaniment to that of future *principes*.

St Hilda's College, Oxford BARBARA LEVICK
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni134

IMPERIAL SPIN

G. WEBER, M. ZIMMERMANN (edd.): *Propaganda—Selbstdarstellung—Repräsentation im römischen Kaiserreich des 1 Jhs. n. Chr.* (*Historia* Einzelschriften 164.) Pp. 355, ills. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2003. Paper, €92. ISBN: 3-515-08251-4.

The way that Roman emperors were presented and presented themselves to the empire at large is a fashionable topic of research. The definition of terms like 'representation' and especially 'propaganda' in such research is often problematic. Indeed, many recent works have simply decided to dodge definitions altogether. It is, then, refreshing to encounter a volume that tackles the question head on. The result of an interdisciplinary colloquium at Tübingen in 2000, *Propaganda—Selbstdarstellung—Repräsentation im römischen Kaiserreich* consists of thirteen contributions, including an extensive introductionary article by the editors, in which the guiding principles of the volume are set out. This is followed by a large and heavily annotated paper by Armin Eich on 'Die Idealtypen "Propaganda" und "Repräsentation" ' (pp. 41–84), and two comparative studies by Ludger Körntgen and Michael Hochgeschwender, focusing attention on, respectively, the early Middle Ages (pp. 85–102) and nineteenth-century USA (pp. 103–24).

After thus setting out a theoretical framework, the remaining contributions focus on 'Wege und Medien'. This section incorporates general papers on 'Wege der

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni134 Published online by Cambridge University Press