

in the economic, monetary and numismatic spheres relating to the Roman army. It will surely be of value and importance to scholars and students of the period for many years to come.

Haggai Olshanetsky

Bar-Ilan University

Kaius Tuori, *The Emperor of Law: The Emergence of Roman Imperial Adjudication*. Oxford studies in Roman society and law. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2016. xiii + 482 pp. ISBN 9780198744450.

This monograph sets out to examine the formation and foundation of the role and function of the emperor as the final juridical authority since the dictatorship of Julius Caesar until the crisis of the third century. With an early reference in the introduction to an often-quoted letter of the young Alexander Severus to the Greek community in Bithynia, emphasizing the importance given to the function of the emperor as a permanent-presiding supreme court and an embodiment of sovereignty, Kaius Tuori (henceforth KT) wishes to demonstrate that the evolution of this aspect of the Roman emperor was the result of various events which occurred during early imperial era, and not a pre-determined policy. This he successfully achieves using five case studies, organized in five chapters, and a comprehensive appendix. The first considers early apprehensions of judicial power embodied in the person of Julius Caesar, and using Cicero's *pro Ligario*. The second chapter examines the jurisdictional role of Augustus during the formation of what will later be a principate, where the ruler acts both as an administrator and as a universal ruler. A following chapter examines the boundaries of imperial judicial authority through the image of Augustus' successors, and their actions as sovereigns. The fourth chapter looks into the consolidation of an ideal imperial sovereignty in the image of Hadrian, mainly — but not exclusively — using literary evidence. The final chapter is concerned with the legal function of the Severan emperors during the mature stage of Roman law.

The overarching contention of KT is to demonstrate the evolution of imperial sovereignty as a bottom-up phenomenon, created by events rather than imposed by Augustus and future emperors. KT's point of departure is Cicero *pro Ligario*, and an analysis of Cicero's portrayal of Caesar's judicial authority during his dictatorship. In fact, this first chapter is a detailed and impressively presented analysis of Caesar's legislative acts within its appropriate late Republican context. KT demonstrates Caesar's desire to consolidate Republican traditions with his dictatorial duties, at least as Caesar himself perceived them. KT is aware of the tension between Republican traditions and Hellenistic notions which were at play during Caesar's dictatorship and were used by Cicero. It is here that KT examines the role of Hellenistic traditions — both institutional and intellectual — on the legislation policy of Caesar as a dictator. KT argues that 'as a dictator Caesar was safely within the traditional Roman constitutional framework'. It is also convincingly argued that Caesar was conscious of this tradition and eager not to depart from it.

The second chapter is devoted to the function of Augustus as a sovereign and to his conduct as a judge. KT focuses on three case studies here which bring to light the new position of the princeps who was both a magistrate with a clearly defined set of responsibilities and a Roman leader entrusted with the Roman *mos maiorum* and moral conduct. The first of these case studies is the relegation of Ovid. Here the responsibilities of a princeps will have to be drawn. The two other case studies concern petitions from the provinces. In this chapter KT traces an evolution of a narrative which portrays imperial sovereignty. He explores the testimonies of Ovid (*Tr.* 2.121-40),

an anecdote by Seneca (*Ben.* 3.27), two remarks by Valerius Maximus (7.7.3-4), and those of two provincial inscriptions (*SEG IX 8, IG XII 3.174*). In addition KT uses the later testimonies of Suetonius (*Aug.* 33.1-3, 53.2, 97.3) and Dio (51.19.6-7, 55.33.5). It is the intention of KT to demonstrate that the undisputed and intentional Republican nature of Augustus' role as judge was clearer to later authors than to contemporaries. KT claims that Suetonius and Dio unjustly ascribed their present day perception of imperial sovereignty to the age of Augustus. Moreover, KT convincingly argues that Augustus' judicial actions rested on his executive power, his desire to display himself as the saviour of the Republic and not on a legal policy.

Chapter three is concerned with the consolidation of imperial adjudication in the period between Tiberius and Trajan and rests predominantly on the testimonies of Seneca, Pliny, and Tacitus. In this chapter KT demonstrates how dynamic and changeable imperial sovereignty actually was. He also emphasises how confusing the character of imperial sovereignty during this formative period actually was. The focus of this chapter is on Tacitus' portrayal of Tiberius and that of Trajan by Pliny. Expectedly, KT traces the emerging guidelines or criteria for benevolent and good emperors who used their sovereignty rightfully and the mad emperors who acted arbitrarily, exercised terror, and refrained from the rule of law. In this chapter, the author demonstrates that the judicial power of the emperor was unlimited, and that its exercise and its delegation to local communities was the *modus operandi* of all emperors, while the abuse of judicial power was predominantly a political tool. However, KT can conclude that during this period, while imperial power was unabridged, its formal justification was still missing.

The fourth chapter is concerned with the image of Hadrian as an ideal ruler in general and as the emperor who brought Roman sovereignty, embodied in the princeps, into maturity and completion. KT examines the image of Hadrian depicted in Aristides' *Roman Oration*, his curtailment of excessive power held by the Roman ruling class, and his interference with an abuse of the *patria potestas*. The chapter extends to all Antonine emperors, and the central role they ascribed to petitions and *rescripta* as a means of exercising law and order. KT examines here carefully and convincingly the correlation between the increase of petitions in the form of letters and the systematization of imperial sovereignty.

The fifth and final chapter concerns the Severan period, with the rise of sovereign authority embodied in the emperor on the one hand, and the professionalisation of imperial government and adjudication on the other hand. The two prominent sources used in this chapter by KT are, expectedly, Ulpian and Dio. KT puts considerable emphasis on the conscious application of juridical hearings by the Severan emperors for self-promotion, the portrayal of imperial ideology, and other governmental applications.

These five narrative chapters are succeeded by an elaborate and detailed appendix of all known cases of imperial adjudication from Caesar to Alexander Severus. Each entry includes a short description of case and parties, as well as references to primary sources and research literature. The appendix is conclusive, thorough, and highly useful, and allows various applications.

To conclude, this monograph on the emergence of Roman imperial adjudication from Julius Caesar until the decline of the Severan dynasty aims to demonstrate that the nature of imperial adjudication was a gradual one, in which reality and ideology played important roles, and in which excess of imperial adjudication was severely frowned upon (as in the cases of Tiberius, Gaius, and others). The reliance of Tuori on literary sources — though not new — is responsible and convincing. The use of research literature is diligent and up-to-date. Needless to say, the reliance on literary sources is not without faults, such as whether they are representative, how many have

survived, and how many were there etc. Though KT does not allow much room for these queries, they are discussed at length by various others and should only be noted in this context. Finally, the book is very well written, well presented and edited and is a noteworthy contribution to existing scholarship. It is warmly recommended for students, as well as experts.

Ido Israelowich

Tel Aviv University

Benjamin Isaac, *Empire and Ideology in the Graeco-Roman World — Selected Papers*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017. 382 pp. ISBN: 978-1107135895.

This book consists of seventeen papers which had already seen the light of day between 1998-2014. Of these, two are lectures which have not before appeared in print. The remaining fifteen appeared in various journals and collections and, in a number of cases, have been rewritten to a greater or lesser degree. One originally appeared in Hebrew. No author is given for the translation so I assume it is Isaac's own.

I suspect I am not the only reviewer who, when confronted with a collection such as this, wondered if we are looking at a miscellaneous collection or if some overall theme is discernible. In the event Isaac tells us (30) that he is dealing with three broad topics, '(a) anachronisms in modern views of ancient empires; (b) problems in understanding the self-identification of ancient groups, views of others, and the role of religion in this sphere; (c) military matters'.

Within these broad parameters the variety of individual topics is great and I would suggest I am not the only reader who could not claim competence in all of them. However, thanks to Isaac's combination of erudition and lucidity, I would now claim to know more about issues in which I have but a passing interest. Notions of Core-Periphery (99-121) come to mind, for instance.

In a review such as this it would be possible to give comments on individual points, of greater or lesser importance. For example, I am not sure that in assessing the impact of veteran colonies, App. BC 5.12-14 should be invoked (262, n. 20) as this refers to an extraordinary time, the Triumvirate, when discipline was notoriously lax. However, a more fruitful approach seems to me to consider in detail four chapters in which I have an especial interest.

'Roma Aeterna' (1-32): Here Isaac examines the twin notions of an eternal city and empire. He traces the development of these notions starting with Cicero and notes they are found also (but not with great prominence) in Augustan literature and are also attested in inscriptions. Later, eternity is associated with the empire. Isaac concludes that the idea of Rome as an eternal city is not typical in the ancient world.

Yet down to our time Rome is still dubbed 'the eternal city' so I think it legitimate to ask what the phrase means for us? In the case of practising Roman Catholics it is bound up with the Papacy, an institution which has endured for two millennia. For others, I would guess it is no more than an affectionate nickname such as the Big Apple is for New York.

'Roman Victory Displayed, Symbols, Allegories and Personifications?' (45-68) begins by warning us that visual images of victory in the form of statuary and coinage could be misinterpreted. We tend to think in terms of personification, allegory and symbol. Isaac holds this to be mistaken and argues that we are looking at concrete specific images. He also reminds us that in the case of the Romans the empire, 'was not a single abstract entity' but either the *Imperium Romanum* or the *senatus populusque Romanus* in contradistinction to a monarchy (47-48). I would add Rome was once a *respublica* where every man belonged to a commonwealth and this may be