CHAPTER 1

Introduction

MONARCHY, CULTURE, AND EMPIRE IN THE ROMAN WEST

The Roman empire, like all empires, may be seen as a particular configuration of power. Controlled by an interlinked set of central institutions and layered aristocracies, this configuration of power reached its widest extent, deepest penetration, and greatest stability between the late first century BC and early third century AD. One feature of this 250-year period that distinguishes it from the previous two and a half centuries, when the Roman state was creating its overseas empire, was the existence of a single, empire-wide ruler, the emperor, who functioned in part as a unifying symbol for the far-flung territories and widely scattered inhabitants of the Roman world. There were no symbols of comparable resonance under the Republic. Two features of the period that distinguish it from the two and a half centuries that followed were, first, a broadly shared conception of the ideal emperor as an ethical and beneficent ruler, and second, the absence of competing symbols of equivalent distinction and empire-wide reach. For in the later empire, the emperor was often constructed as a distant and frightening autocrat, while the rise of Christianity brought with it a new and increasingly autonomous symbolic system that transcended the imperial order. As we will see, the significance of these distinctive features of the period between the late first century BC and the early third century AD went beyond the realm of symbols and ideas. Indeed, the existence of a single ruler, systematically represented as a moral exemplar who provided a range of benefits to his subjects, and standing alone as the only symbol of empire-wide scope, not only reinforced the power of the Roman imperial state, as I will argue, but also increased the collective authority of the local aristocracies upon which the empire's social and political order was based.

In order to sustain this argument, discussion will focus on the specific imperial ideals that defined the emperor as an ethical and beneficent ruler; on the mechanisms by which these ideals came to be diffused throughout

the empire; and on the reasons why the circulation of these particular ideals helped to underpin the empire's steep social and political hierarchy. Though some of the conclusions will pertain to the empire as a whole over the long term (*c.* 200 BC to AD 400), this study will concentrate, for reasons discussed below, on the western empire between AD 69 and 235. Before turning to the specific parameters of this study, however, and as a way of underlining the importance of unifying structures in the Roman world, we first need to consider the sheer size and diversity of the Roman empire at the peak of its power in the mid-second century AD.

Coming to grips with the size of the Roman empire is a constant challenge. Conventional metrics of the empire's magnitude, such as surface area (*c.* 2.5 million square miles in the mid-second century AD) or population (*c.* 60–70 million), are impressive enough, and standard cartographic depictions of the empire "at its height" – fixed, monochromatic, and stretching from the Atlantic to the Euphrates and from the Danube to the Sahara – are suitably imposing.[1] The effects of such distances on the experience of time and space in the empire can be difficult for the modern observer to appreciate. For even though the communications infrastructure of the empire was relatively advanced by the standards of the ancient world, it was limited by pre-modern technology.[2] It will be important to bear in mind just how slowly most persons, objects, and ideas circulated throughout this world.

More striking is the sheer diversity of the Roman empire. In geographical and ecological terms, the empire was deeply fragmented.[3] Stretching across four modern time zones, the empire embraced three continents and included multiple geological and climatic zones ranging from coastal plains, rugged mountain ranges, and high plateaus to fertile river valleys, deserts, and thick forests, all differentiated by temperature, rainfall, flora, and fauna. Nested within these broad zones were the countless microregions of the Roman imperial world, sometimes no larger than a single hillside or coastal inlet, within which the majority of the empire's inhabitants, more or less insulated from one another, spent most of their lives.

The human geography of the Roman empire was nearly as heterogeneous. The very different pre-conquest histories of the many areas brought under Roman imperial control gave rise to considerable internal diversity.

[1] Population: Scheidel 2007: 45–9.
[2] For the speed of communications, see e.g. Casson 1971: 281–99; Millar 2002–6 [1982]: 2.173–5; Duncan-Jones 1990: 7–29; Ando 2000: 121–2.
[3] Horden and Purcell 2000, with Shaw 2001; Potter 2004: 10–23.

Here the big divide was between east and west. At the dawn of Roman overseas expansion *c.* 240 BC, the Italian peninsula sat at the far western edge of a world-system centered on the eastern Mediterranean and running as far east as the Hindu Kush.[4] This was a world of large, centralized states, ruled, for the most part, by kings, and characterized by elaborate social stratification, economic complexity, technological innovation, widespread urbanization, and a highly developed historical consciousness based on authoritative literary texts. Most of the western Mediterranean and continental Europe, by contrast, stood as a tribal periphery of this world-system, with simple political structures, rudimentary social and economic organization, low levels of urbanization, and no literary tradition.[5] At the intersection of these regions lay a central zone, the "Hellenistic West," comprising southern Italy, Sicily, Punic North Africa, and the southern Iberian peninsula, which served as a sort of "gateway" for the spread of political structures and cultural forms from east to west.[6] These different regions of the Mediterranean basin, then, were at very different stages of political development in the last centuries of the first millennium BC, when all were simultaneously incorporated by the Roman state into a single imperial system.[7] And it goes without saying that within these broad zones, there was considerable diversity of historical experience prior to the Roman conquest. The Roman empire contained within its administrative boundaries a myriad of distinctive regional and local histories.

Historical variation meant cultural diversity. This could be illustrated in many ways. In the religious sphere, for example, countless deities, sacred objects and spaces, ritual practices, and beliefs co-existed in a profoundly pluralist imperial order.[8] Artistic diversity was perhaps less pronounced but significant nonetheless, with different traditions and styles, as well as different modes of artistic production and ways of seeing, prevailing in

[4] I use the term "world-system" to denote a large-scale, multipolar, and loosely bounded civilization characterized by broadly similar political, economic, and social structures. There are now many useful introductions to the historical evolution of the eastern Mediterranean – the "Hellenistic world" – prior to the Roman conquest; see, e.g., Erskine 2003, with full bibliography.

[5] For a broad overview of the pre-Roman, Iron Age western Mediterranean and temperate Europe, see Dietler 2007.

[6] On the "Hellenistic West," a rapidly developing field, see the papers collected in Prag and Quinn forthcoming.

[7] This is not meant to imply a crude, evolutionary model of development, but rather to point to varying levels of social and political complexity at different stages in the (variable) processes of state-formation in the ancient world; see briefly Goldstone and Haldon 2009: 24–7.

[8] Religious diversity: e.g. Turcan 1996; Rüpke 1997; Beard, North and Price 1998. For a recent attempt to delineate some of the unifying features of religion in the Roman empire, Rives 2007.

different parts of the empire.[9] Dietary patterns, too, were quite variegated across the empire, determined not only by the availability of specific crops, but also by regional and local preferences for different types of meat.[10] Perhaps the most obvious marker of cultural diversity in the Roman empire was language. We tend to think immediately, and too often exclusively, of the major Latin west/Greek east divide, but it must be emphasized that this bifurcation in the language of high culture in the Roman empire was only the most conspicuous crack in the linguistic façade of a truly polyglot realm that comprised scores of local languages and dialects.[11] It is probably safe to assume that most subjects of the Roman empire could not communicate with one another.

There were, of course, several unifying forces in the Roman empire, but all must be qualified in one way or another. The Mediterranean sea provided a measure of cohesion, especially as a catalyst for the communications that promoted local, regional, and interregional interaction between the geologically discrete, but functionally interdependent, microregions of the Roman world. But the sea itself was very large, extending some 2,300 miles from west to east, and very differentiated, effectively broken up into numerous separate waters by islands, peninsulas, a sprawling maze of disjointed currents, and a highly variable coastline. The economy of the empire as a whole was based on agriculture, and long-distance trade was substantial enough to ensure the regular movement of goods between regions, but there never emerged a single, fully integrated, market economy in the Roman empire.[12] Though the basic dynamics of the urban/rural dichotomy were roughly the same everywhere, the geographical distribution of cities and urban systems throughout the empire was rather lopsided, with much higher densities in the east and along the Mediterranean coast.[13] And while the Roman imperial state did impose a degree of administrative uniformity on its sweeping territories, this never approached the sort of homogeneity that we take for granted in a modern nation-state.[14] Indeed,

[9] Artistic diversity: e.g. Scott and Webster 2003; Brilliant 2007; for varieties of visual literacy, viewing, and subjectivity, see also Elsner 2007.

[10] King 1999.

[11] Linguistic diversity: Neumann and Untermann 1980; Harris 1989: 175–90. For bilingualism with Latin, see also Adams 2003, and for regional variation of Latin itself, Adams 2007.

[12] Agrarian economy: e.g. Horden and Purcell 2000: 175–297; Kehoe 2007: 550–9. On markets and degrees of economic integration in the Roman empire, see, e.g., Duncan-Jones 1990: 48–76; Howgego 1994; Hopkins 2002 (1995/96); Temin 2001; Morley 2007.

[13] It is also worth noting that the multitude of cities, towns, and villages throughout the empire was organized in an intricate mosaic of varying formal status.

[14] Taxation, for example, was far from uniform, and even though the tenets of Roman law applied, in principle, to all Roman citizens throughout the empire, in practice it seems that local laws prevailed

the central state during the first two centuries AD never attempted direct rule over its widely dispersed subjects, channeling the bulk of its material and human resources into the armies stationed along the frontiers and devolving most of what passed for day-to-day administration onto semi-autonomous communities.[15] This, too, resulted in local and regional diversity. Finally, the diffusion of Roman citizenship from one end of the Mediterranean world to the other was a remarkable and characteristic feature of the Roman empire, but its spread was very uneven, both socially and geographically.[16]

Overall, then, the picture is one of diversity and fragmentation. One conspicuous exception to this empire-wide diversity was the Roman emperor. If nothing else, every inhabitant of the Roman empire shared a single ruler.[17] And the Roman emperor was no mere ornament in the Roman imperial superstructure. Partly as an important actor in his own right, and partly as a deeply resonant symbol, the Roman emperor had a deep impact on both the political system and the cultural fabric of the Roman empire.

It is surprisingly difficult to fit the Roman emperor neatly into standard typologies of rulership. On the one hand, the emperor served as something like a civilian magistrate, formally endowed by the institutions of the *res publica*, "commonwealth," with a collection of precisely defined constitutional powers. There was no public investiture or coronation ceremony for new emperors. In fact, most emperors made an elaborate show of initially refusing imperial power, subsequently rejecting all sorts of prerogatives and honors for the duration of their reigns.[18] At the root of this anomalous posture of monarchic *recusatio* was the venerable republican framework out of which Augustus and his successors had fashioned the political system known to later commentators and modern scholars as "the principate" (*principatus*). As is well known, Augustus in particular was careful to ensure

more often than not. On taxation in the empire, see, e.g., Neesen 1980; Brunt 1990 (1981): 324–46, 531–40; Corbier 1991; Lo Cascio 2000: 36–43, 177–203. On Roman law and local law, Galsterer 1986; Crawford 1988; Lintott 1993: 154–60.

[15] Accounts of different aspects of this arrangement in Jacques 1984; Garnsey and Saller 1987: 26–40; Reynolds 1988; Burton 2001.

[16] On Roman citizenship, see Sherwin-White 1973; Shaw 2000: 361–72; Inglebert 2002b; Garnsey 2004; for Roman citizenship as a benefit of empire, see below, 104.

[17] In some parts of the empire, especially in the east during the first century AD, many inhabitants actually lived under what Millar has called a "two-level monarchy," subject both to a local king and to the Roman emperor (2002–6 [1996]: 2.229–45). But the Roman emperor was clearly superior.

[18] On imperial *recusatio* at accession, see Huttner 2004; cf. Béranger 1953: 137–69 (note the long list of emperors, from Augustus through Theodosius, for whom this ritual is attested, 139–40); Wickert 1954: 2,258–64. See also Wallace-Hadrill 1982: 36–7 and Talbert 1984: 359–61 for imperial refusal of honors in general.

that each of the powers and honors voted to him could be represented as consistent with Republican precedent, and throughout the imperial period the emperor articulated his formal power largely through Republican symbols and titles.[19] In these respects, then, the Roman emperor does not look very much like a conventional "absolute monarch."[20]

On the other hand, the formal powers with which the emperor was invested were in fact absolute, and he was acknowledged by the Roman jurists as being, uniquely, "above the law."[21] Indeed, ultimate decision-making authority in the Roman state came to rest with the person of the emperor, as the multiple, discrete points of decision-making characteristic of the Republic were eventually subordinated to the will of a single ruler. The reigning emperor also normally controlled the transmission of imperial power. Though the Roman imperial monarchy is historically distinctive for its high degree of dynastic discontinuity, individual emperors nevertheless regularly designated their own successors – often, in the absence of direct male descendants, from outside the nuclear family – and for most of the period down to AD 235 these publicly named heirs acceded to the imperial throne without incident.[22] And finally, the emperor very nearly monopolized all the key symbols of political power, especially in the city of Rome.[23] Later observers were quite right to refer to the political system established under Augustus as a monarchy.[24]

[19] Different perspectives on the "emperor as magistrate," with references to earlier studies, in Veyne 2002a; Rowe 2007. For Republican elements in the emperor's titulature, prominent at least through the reign of Constantine (cf. *CIL* 5.8011 = *ILS* 697), see Hammond 1959: 58–91.

[20] As exemplified, for example, by the absolutist kings of early modern Europe; for a recent overview of the scholarship on early modern absolutism, with a focus on the reign of Louis XIV, see Beik 2005, with abundant references.

[21] The emperor's absolute power is stated quite explicitly in the sixth clause of the *lex de imperio Vespasiani* (*CIL* 6.930 = *ILS* 244 = *RS* 1.39, ll. 18–20): *utique quaecunque ex usu reipublicae maiestate divinarum hum*[*an*]*arum publicarum privatarumque rerum esse censebit, ei agere facere ius potestasque sit* . . . For the argument that this clause means exactly what it says, and was intended to grant absolute power to the emperor, see Brunt 1977: 109–16; *contra*, Crook 1996: 120 ("residual emergency powers" only). The emperor's *imperium* was also formally superior to that of all other magistrates: cf. Dio 53.32.5; *CIL* 2²/5.900, ll. 34–6, with Eck *et al.* 1996: 158–61. Emperor "above the law:" *Dig.* 1.3.31 (Ulpian): *princeps legibus solutus est*; for the general perception that the emperor was above the law, see also Sen. *Ep.* 7.2, *Clem.* 1.1; Plin. *Pan.* 65.1; Suet. *Cal.* 14.1; Dio 53.18.1.

[22] In general on the transmission of imperial power, Hammond 1956. For Roman dynastic discontinuity in world-historical perspective, see Scheidel forthcoming; cf. Hekster 2001 on adoption and fictive kinship in the second century.

[23] See, e.g., Veyne 1976: 675–730; Zanker 1988a; Benoist 2005; Ewald and Noreña 2010.

[24] For explicit references to the Augustan regime as a monarchy, see, e.g., App. *Hist. pr.* 14 (τὰ Ῥωμαίων ἐς μοναρχίαν περιῆλθεν); Dio 52.1.1 (ἐκ δὲ τούτου μοναρχεῖσθαι αὖθις ἀκριβῶς ἤρξαντο). Implicit references abound, e.g. Sen. *Ben.* 2.20, 6.32; Suet. *Aug.* 28; Tac. *Hist.* 1.1, *Ann.* 1.1.1, 1.2.2, 1.3.1, 1.4.1, 1.9.4, 3.28, etc. No contemporary author referred to Augustus as a monarch, but many passages reflect a clear recognition of his monarchic power, e.g. Vitr. *pr.* 1–2; Hor. *Carm.* 1.12.49–52, 3.14.14–16,

It would be misleading, however, to conceptualize the emperor as an omnipotent monarch capable of dominating his far-flung empire. The structural limitations to the practical power of Roman emperors were simply too great. Aristocratic competitors could be very dangerous, especially those in command of legions stationed in the periphery. From such potential pretenders to the throne the threat of usurpation could never be extinguished entirely.[25] Less acute but more constant pressure came from those groups within Roman imperial society that were capable of meaningful collective action in the public sphere. Especially significant were the senate, the *plebs urbana* of Rome, and the legionary armies. With these influential collectivities the emperor was in constant dialogue, both real and symbolic, interacting with each in a highly prescribed manner calculated to elicit the public displays of consensus, or "acceptance," upon which imperial legitimacy ultimately rested.[26] And even when the emperor did decide to act, he faced the stubborn problems of time and space noted above – a constant challenge to the effective communications, mobilization of resources, and concentration of power necessary to achieve desired ends.

There were, then, multiple constraints on the independent power of the emperor. There was also real institutional continuity before and after Augustus.[27] This does not mean, however, that the transition from republic to monarchy made little difference to the political system of the Roman empire. No one will claim that the advent of monarchy at Rome triggered a fundamental redistribution of wealth and power throughout Roman society. But it did create a major new actor within the larger configuration of power that comprised the Roman empire. Part of this complex process was documented by Syme in *The Roman Revolution*, in which "the revolution" had less to do with the transition from republic to monarchy than with the extensive changes in the composition of the senatorial order brought about

4.5.1–2, *Ep*. 2.1.1–4; Ov. *Fast*. 1.531–2, 2.138–42, *Trist*. 4.4.13–16. On these passages, see Millar 2002–6 (1973): 1.267–70, arguing that Augustus' reign was openly monarchic and universally seen as such; *contra*, Gruen 2005. Further discussion of the distinctive nature of Roman imperial monarchy below, 315–17.

[25] The political history of the first two centuries AD is punctuated by usurpers making violent bids for imperial power, some unsuccessful (e.g. Vindex in 68, Saturninus in 89, Avidius Cassius in 175), others successful (Vespasian in 69, Septimius Severus in 193); for analysis and discussion, see Flaig 1992.

[26] Flaig 1992, esp. 94–131 (senate), 38–93 (urban plebs), and 132–73 (army). For the workings under a single emperor, Trajan, of what Flaig calls an *Akzeptanzsystem*, see Seelentag 2004. On the connection between consensus and legitimacy, Weber 1968 (1921): 1,121–48, esp. 1,125–6, with Flaig 2010 ("acceptance").

[27] Legislative assemblies, for example, are attested as late as Nerva (*Dig*. 47.21.3.1), and electoral assemblies were still meeting in the early third century (Dio 37.28, 68.20.4).

by the violent triumph of Augustus' "party." Where Syme went astray was in his implicit disregard for the symbolic forms of political life, an interpretive stance signaled most clearly by a famous programmatic statement: "In all ages, whatever the form and name of government, be it monarchy, republic, or democracy, an oligarchy lurks behind the façade; and Roman history, Republican or Imperial, is the history of the governing class."[28] For despite the underlying continuity of political institutions, Republican ideology, and oligarchic power, the change in the "form of government" was in fact critical – if not for the reasons normally given.

One impediment to understanding has been a tendency to conflate the reigning emperor with the institution of monarchy. No emperor was as powerful as his public image would suggest, but the advent of monarchy was nevertheless a decisive moment in the political and cultural history of the Roman empire, above all because it brought with it the emergence of a new symbol, the emperor, a simple but potent idea with tremendous resonance. The very existence of this symbol, and the different uses to which it could be put by different actors, reconfigured several power networks within the Roman world, as I will argue, intensifying mechanisms of social control and solidifying the hegemony of the Roman imperial state. In the transition from republic to monarchy, that is to say, it was not so much the political dimension of the change that mattered, but the symbolic one. This has not been sufficiently emphasized in recent accounts of the impact of the Augustan revolution on the political system of the Roman empire.[29]

One clue suggesting that the advent of monarchy at Rome had far-reaching effects on the politics and culture of the Roman world is chronological. A number of broadly interrelated changes and processes converged in the decades straddling the turn of the first millennium, coinciding with the advent of monarchy under Augustus. Changes in the organization of state and empire were especially momentous. The explosive and ceaseless imperial expansion of the last two centuries BC decelerated rapidly. Henceforth conquest was sporadic and comparatively brief. The administration of the provinces was rationalized. New conceptualizations of imperial territory and administrative space came to the fore, road systems were systematically

[28] Syme 1939: 7.

[29] See, for example, Eder 2005 and Rowe 2007, both putting too much emphasis on institutional continuities between the Republic and Augustan/Julio-Claudian periods. And those studies that do focus on the cultural and symbolic aspects of the Augustan age (and of the early empire in general) do not draw enough attention to the effects of these changes on political structures and configurations of power; see below, n. 35 and 13–14.

developed, the provincial census was initiated, and the collection of tax regularized. In brief, an aggressive conquest state was replaced by a more stable tributary regime.[30] At Rome, several new discourses arose, on time, religion, law, science, and language, and as a result knowledge became increasingly differentiated and professionalized. Literature, art, architecture, domestic space, and forms of public display (especially oratory) were all developing rapidly and in dynamic ways. Together these changes amounted to what has rightly been called a "cultural revolution."[31] In the provinces, the processes of urbanization accelerated, especially in the west.[32] Indeed, the western empire experienced its own cultural revolution during this period, a process often described under the rubric of "Romanization," as many of the objects, practices, and beliefs characteristic of Roman Italy, from monumental architecture, public space, and religious ritual to clothing, tablewares, and nomenclature, began to be widely adopted – and adapted – throughout the western provinces. Rome had had an overseas empire stretching back to the mid-third century BC, but the formative period of provincial cultures in the west did not really take off until the late first century BC.[33]

All of these changes were chronologically coincident with the transition from republic to monarchy at Rome. It is naturally difficult to disentangle how, precisely, such political and cultural changes were related to one another, and to determine where ultimate causation lies. Too much was happening at the same time for this convergence to have been merely coincidental. It is equally unrealistic to posit Augustus himself as the architect of these empire-wide transformations. We must look for deeper causes. Some scholars favor political explanations, arguing (or implying) that the emergence of monarchy drove the cultural changes characteristic of the

[30] Deceleration of conquest: Gruen 1996; Rich 2003. Provincial administration: Eck 2000; Eich 2005. Conceptualization of administrative space: Nicolet 1991. Road systems: Rathmann 2003. Provincial census: Lo Cascio 2000: 205–19. Collection of tax: see above, n. 14. Imperial state as tributary regime: Bang 2008.

[31] Knowledge and discourse: Wallace-Hadrill 1997, 2005, 2008: 213–58; Moatti 1997; on time and calendrical reform, see also Feeney 2006. Literature: Galinsky 1996: 225–87, 2005: 281–358 (essays by Barchiesi, Griffin, White, and Galinsky). Art and architecture: Zanker 1988a; Hofter 1988; Galinsky 1996: 141–224. "Cultural revolution" at Rome: Wallace-Hadrill 1989, 1997, 2008; Habinek and Schiesaro 1997; cf. Gruen 1990, 1992.

[32] Cf. MacMullen 2000: 7–10, 30–5, 51–5, 93–9, with references to earlier studies.

[33] Studies on the meaning and usefulness of the term "Romanization" continue to proliferate at a dizzying pace; Woolf 1998: 1–23 offers a sensible introduction. Adoption of Italic "way of life": MacMullen 2000; cf. Ward-Perkins 1970 for architectural change in the western provinces, and Wallace-Hadrill 2000 and 2008 for changes in material culture more broadly. "Formative period" of provincial cultures: Woolf 1995.

period.[34] Some have suggested that cultural change was primary, and that the transition from republic to monarchy should be seen as a product of that change.[35] Others have sought to dissolve the dichotomy between political and cultural change altogether, arguing that each was part of the same "process."[36] Consensus remains elusive.

One approach is to see these broadly simultaneous changes – the shift from a republic to a monarchy and from conquest state to tributary empire, the cultural revolution at Rome, and the cultural transformation of the western empire – as the product of a more general convergence of "social power" in the Roman world.[37] As a measure of the capacity to control territory, resources, and persons, social power arises from a number of different sources, especially control over meaning and values, material resources, physical force, and administrative infrastructure.[38] These various sources of power are organized and actualized in different ways, and are usually controlled by any number of different social actors. In the Roman empire, the key actors were the institutions and associated personnel of the central state; the most influential collectivities within the empire, especially the senate and the army; and the layered aristocracies of the Roman world, both imperial and local.[39] In attempting to situate the changes summarized

[34] Syme 1939 is still the best-known politics-driven account of this transformative period. Zanker 1988a is a celebrated overview of the visual sphere in the Augustan age, but art and architecture are seen throughout as the products of – and therefore secondary to – underlying political and social conditions.

[35] This has been the dominant approach of the 1990s and 2000s, very much a product of "the cultural turn" of these decades (cf. Steinmetz 1999b: 1–3). Representative works include Galinsky 1996 and Habinek and Schiesaro 1997, who write of "the centrality of culture, both as an explanatory phenomenon and as an analytical category" (xvi); the primacy of culture also characterizes much of Woolf's work (1995, 1996, 1998, 2001, 2005), e.g. 2005: 110: "The shift to autocracy at Rome, in other words, was *just another component* of the cultural transformation of the Mediterranean world" (author's emphasis).

[36] E.g. Wallace-Hadrill 2005: 81: "The present argument neither explains political change by cultural change, nor the opposite. It attempts to show that the two processes of change were deeply enmeshed with each other, indeed *were one and the same process*" (my emphasis).

[37] For what follows, see Mann 1986 (esp. 1–33 for the general model of "social power") and 1993; further discussion below, 322–3.

[38] These represent what Mann calls, respectively, "ideological," "economic," "military," and "political" power (1986: 22–8).

[39] There was, of course, substantial overlap between these three categories (a senator from Baetica serving as a provincial governor in Asia Minor, for example, or an equestrian from North Africa serving as a legionary officer on the Rhine frontier, simultaneously belonged to all three). I follow Bendix in characterizing the aristocracy as that segment of society that controlled landownership and monopolized a position of honor and prestige through claims to superior birth and morality (1978: 106), and Kautsky in stressing aristocratic participation in imperial administration and warfare (1982: 79–98, 144–66); cf. Trigger 2003: 147–54. The aristocracies (or "elites") of the Roman empire were "layered" in the sense that there always existed important subdivisions within this larger ruling class; the most important for our purposes was the division between an upper tier of "imperial"