

this was a 'national insurgency' or rather a mutiny led by a former Roman commander. All this allows him to contribute to the debate on the historical relevance of the battle: was it the 'turning point' or just one battle gone wrong, one with no major impact on Roman policy? Unlike many recent studies, W.'s does not end in

tion and similar papers at core.ac.uk

broug

provided by R

insight and to put the events of A.D. 9 in a more sober perspective. Finally all that remains for W. to do is to explain how this recent interest in the battle can be understood: first he pursues the long and sometimes fierce debate on localisation, referring to 'more than 700 theories' advanced so far, including the Kalkriese hypothesis which has become so central for tourism in Lower Saxony. In light of the numismatic evidence, on which W. is a specialist, he remains prudently non-committal. A last and regrettably short chapter traces the myth of Arminius from early modern to recent times.

While many recent books on the battle published in the hope of attracting a wide readership tend to assume that it is possible to 'reconstruct' fully the events of A.D. 9, and while the present book is not free from minor errors and typos, W. has succeeded in presenting all the evidence in all its contradictions. Unlike most competing volumes, this up-to-date, sober, and highly readable study takes its audience seriously and makes it possible to see what conclusions the ancient evidence allows, and what remains unclear.

Given the attraction of 'Herman the German' for some nationalist groups, it is to the author's, and the original publisher's, credit that a short version of W.'s views was made accessible in 2009 in a booklet distributed by the 'NS-Dokumentationszentrum Köln', a centre for the documentation and study of Nazi ideology, which is part of the city museums in Cologne. Entitled 'Die Erfindung der Deutschen. Rezeption der Varusschlacht und die Mystifizierung der Germanen' ('The invention of the Germans: reception of Varus' battle and the mystification of the Germans'; note that English, unlike German, does not allow for a difference between the modern-day inhabitants of Germany and the ancient *Germani*), and edited by the director of the 'Kölner Info- und Bildungsstelle gegen Rechtsextremismus' ('office for information and education against right-wing extremism'), Hans-Peter Killguss (ISBN 978-3-938636-12-1), it studies and debunks the nationalist reading of the battle. Here, as in his major book, W. demonstrates how little we actually know, and how a careful and reasonable interpretation of both the material and the literary evidence must not be replaced by crude, ahistorical assumptions.

Universität Erfurt

KAI BRODERSEN
kai.brodersen@uni-erfurt.de

AUGUSTUS IN THE PRINCIPATE

LYASSE (E.) *Le Principat et son fondateur. L'Utilisation de la référence à Auguste de Tibère à Trajan.* (Collection Latomus 311.) Pp. 388. Brussels: Éditions Latomus, 2008. Paper, €57. ISBN: 978-2-87031-252-0.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X10002702

In 2005 Alain M. Gowing published a fascinating study of the representation of the Roman Republic in early imperial culture (*Empire and Memory*, 2005).

The Classical Review vol. 61 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2011; all rights reserved

Alive to the problems arising from the application of oversimplified periodisation and to the inherently unstable category identified by the term ‘Republic’ (see now H. Flower, *Roman Republics*, 2010, and note also the new edition of K.-J. Hölkeskamp’s *Reconstructing the Roman Republic*, 2010), G. offers a learned and inspiring reading of the various ways in which Romans of the first and early second century A.D. looked back to, constructed and made use of the memory of the pre-Augustan age. As he demonstrates (p. 2), ‘memory lay at the very heart of power under the Principate’. In 2008, L. published his 2002 Paris thesis on the use of the memory of Augustus (in French ‘la référence à Auguste’) from Tiberius to Trajan. He has produced a useful companion volume to Gowing’s study, but it is most unfortunate that when revising the original thesis for publication he was not able to make use of *Empire and Memory*. L.’s approach is strictly chronological, offering a run through each of the emperors in turn. Most readers will suspect trouble ahead when in the general introduction they encounter those staple features of the well-structured doctoral thesis ‘délimitation du sujet’ (p. 9), ‘principaux axes de la recherche’ (p. 20) and, scariest of all, ‘présentation des sources’ (p. 25). However, his slow and steady approach to a vast and complex topic has allowed L. to assemble a large quantity of interesting and relevant documentation and to present it in a clear and accessible manner. He looks in some detail at the organisation of the imperial cult and at the importance of the image of Augustus as victorious general, seeing these areas as the two ‘piliers du principat’ on which Tiberius from the outset builds his relationship to Augustus. But L. also gathers together less grand instances, discussing, for example, the way in which reference to Augustus could be used as an argument in such matters as judgement of the behaviour of provincial governors (p. 140). L. sees Tiberius imitating the Augustus of the later years, Caligula favouring the image of the young saviour of Rome, Claudius following a more ambiguous path, the younger anti-Augustan Nero adopting ‘un retour à Auguste à la fin de règne’, Vespasian as the founder of a new dynasty who seeks ‘en tout l’identification à Auguste’ (p. 301), and so on. Some may find in this approach a taste for overly complex categorisation, but L. argues each case with clarity; and one does not have to agree with his individual assessments of each emperor to find considerable value in the material he has collected. L. makes good use of imperial coinage, but does not look at the question of building programmes. He is aware of this gap (p. 274), explaining that he omits discussion of the construction of the *Domus aurea* because he prefers to be guided by ‘les allusions explicites ou potentielles à Auguste dans nos sources’. This is unfortunate, as comparison with Gowing’s excellent discussion of topography in his fifth chapter shows. For an example of the kind of advance that can be made in this field see P. Heslin’s brilliant investigation of Domitian and the *Horologium Augusti* in *JRS* 97 (2007), which obviously appeared too late to be consulted by L. For obvious reasons, given the nature of the sources as a whole (including the *senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone patre*) and the brilliance and power of Tacitus’ narrative in the *Annals*, Tiberius receives the greatest attention. Trajan is chosen as the stopping point of L.’s study because subsequently it would be necessary, he argues, to link the reference to Augustus to that of the *optimus princeps* (p. 362): after Trajan, he says, ‘la question de la mémoire d’Auguste n’est plus qu’une question parmi d’autres’. Gowing, who adopts precisely the same limit, agrees but puts it differently (p. 158): after Trajan, ‘the edge is gone’. Interestingly, the American scholar makes good use of French scholarship on history and cultural memory, citing Pierre Nora’s *Lieux de*

mémoire and Jacques Le Goff's *Histoire et mémoire*. One will look in vain for the inclusion of these names in the bibliography of the French classicist.

All readers should note that their copy of this book should be accompanied by a fascicule containing the corrected content of pages 363–72.

University of Geneva

DAMIEN NELIS
damien.nelis@unige.ch

EMPEROR AND SENATE

WINTERLING (A.) *Politics and Society in Imperial Rome*. Translated by Kathrin Lüddecke. Pp. 170. Malden, MA and Oxford: Wiley–Blackwell, 2009. Cased, £45, €54. ISBN: 978-1-4051-7969-0.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X10002714

How did emperor and senate interact in the early Roman empire? W. writes on the constitutional and social background to this and related questions, taking a theoretical, structural approach with deep roots in a tradition of continental scholarship. The seven essays of the book constitute an important survey of and contribution to scholarship on imperial political history, gathered and translated into English for the first time. The book covers the transformation of the republic into an empire and the first century or so of imperial rule, though there are occasional references to later events and developments.

The volume is divided into three sections. The first lays out the elements of W.'s theoretical approach in three essays on the idea of the political integration of 'state' and 'society', its impact on friendship and patronal relationships, and the meaning of the terms 'public' and 'private'. The second section contains a pair of essays, the first (particularly good) on the imperial court and the second on the madness or otherwise of the emperor Caligula. The third section's two pieces make the case that the problems that W.'s ideas address can be seen in the work of Mommsen and Meier.

The unifying theoretical thread is the tension between the 'old' structures of the republic and the 'new' role and powers of the emperor. W.'s focus throughout is deliberately limited to the emperor and his court, and the politically-active upper reaches of society at Rome. This excludes from consideration a number of constituencies – provincial elites, the army – that eventually intruded dramatically into these spheres, but W. is well aware of this and defends his choice of subjects as limited but 'privileged' by their status, role and proximity to the centre.

The mainspring of W.'s analysis is what he calls the 'political integration of Roman society'. In W.'s model state and society overlapped, with highly stratified social rank dependent on the holding of political office. This republican system ran into difficulty under the emperors, but could not be swept away: as 'the emperors themselves required high-ranking senators to command their legions and to govern the empire's provinces' they kept a version of the old socio-political system in place, defining the position of the *princeps*, paradoxically, through the republican titles and honours that its supremacy had supplanted. This compromise undermined both the emperors, forced to seek regular validation from the old senatorial aristocracy, and the senate, forced to subordinate themselves to emperors who were busy creating alternative mechanisms of actual political power. The semantics and conventions of