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/52.2.317 Published online by Cambridge University Press

those relationships influenced the relationship of clients and functionaries later within the imperial house.

Chapter 4 traces the development of the imperial palace from its (aristocratic) republican origins, and argues that there was a great deal of social (and, in a sense, economic, given the *luxus* of the imperial house) continuity between Republic and Empire. W. argues his point effectively by following chronologically the physical development of the imperial palace complex (which, he argues, began with Augustus' Temple of Apollo on the Palatine) from Augustus to Domitian.

The next chapter examines the material culture of the imperial house; here W. elucidates an inherent contradiction between the desire of the imperial house (which acted as moral overseer) to promote frugality in the state and the luxury in which the imperial court was immersed by investigating the material culture of the individual emperors' courts. He considers the behavior of the imperial court, and argues that its display and luxury always had to outpace that of other aristocratic households—not a difficult thing to do, given the resources at the *princeps*'s disposal. The only reservation that one might have with W.'s discussion here is his occasional willingness to be less critical of our sources concerning consumption at the courts of Nero and Vitellius, although he rightly notes that the courts of supposedly 'frugal' emperors may have been anything but, remarking, for example, on Marcus Aurelius' sale of luxury items, which conceivably belie Antoninus Pius' reputation for thrift.

Chapter 6 brings together a good deal of evidence, particularly from the epigraphic record, in order to examine the organization of the imperial house. W. notes that scholars have divided their research in this area into three essential categories: the public versus private household; its political versus apolitical side; and free versus non-free members of the house. He concludes that the *domus principis* was essentially a state apparatus (as witness the sale of slaves through the *aerarium*) and that its functionaries, from the *cubicularii* to the *ab epistulis*, were all, in essence, state officials. Hence Claudius' freedmen became state officials, such as the *a rationibus* or *a libellis*, in their own right. W. further considers the continuity of personnel within the imperial house, using Claudius Etruscus' father, who served the imperial house from Tiberius to Domitian, to argue his point.

In Chapter 7 W. gives what is certainly one of the most informative discussions in the book, which concerns the morning *salutatio*. Tracing the evolution of the *salutatio* under individual emperors (starting with the same phenomenon in aristocratic households), W. argues that it became an important social (and political) ritual, which distinguished one's rank and relationship to the *princeps*. The next chapter follows the theme of how a social institution came to have political significance in the imperial house. According to W., the sharing of Caesar's table was an important test for the relationship of the aristocracy and Senate with individual emperors, and from Vitellius' reign in particular, banquets at the imperial palace became increasingly 'institutionalized'.

Chapter 9, a discussion about the *amici Caesaris*, starts with a critique of the terms and categories scholars have used in defining exactly what was meant by the term *amicus principis*. W. argues for three distinct categories in this area: senators and equestrians included in the morning *salutatio*; those with a close working relationship to Caesar and treated as equals insofar as they shared his table; and those who worked with Caesar on a daily basis, who were his *familiares*, attending him in public, during trips, and constituting, as it were, a part of his retinue.

Having considered the social, material, and political way in which the house of Caesar differed from other aristocratic households, he then goes on to explore the

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.317 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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/52.2.317 Published online by Cambridge University Press