

## PDF hosted at the Radboud Repository of the Radboud University Nijmegen

The following full text is a publisher's version.

For additional information about this publication click this link.

<http://hdl.handle.net/2066/102234>

Please be advised that this information was generated on 2019-04-24 and may be subject to change.

# Journal of Roman Studies

<http://journals.cambridge.org/JRS>

Additional services for *Journal of Roman Studies*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



---

**BERGMANN, *DER KRANZ DES KAISERS, GENESE UND BEDEUTUNG EINER RÖMISCHEN INSIGNIE*. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2010. Pp. xix + 515, illus. isbn 9783110202588. €99.95.**

Olivier Hekster

Journal of Roman Studies / Volume 102 / November 2012, pp 320 - 321  
DOI: 10.1017/S0075435812000196, Published online: 02 November 2012

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0075435812000196](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0075435812000196)

**How to cite this article:**

Olivier Hekster (2012). Journal of Roman Studies, 102, pp 320-321 doi:10.1017/S0075435812000196

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

the many constituencies whose support he sought and traces the evolution of his image in response to events both in and out of his control. There are excellent discussions of the symbolic significance of, for example, the conquest of Britain, Claudius' marriage to Agrippina and the advancement of Nero.

O.'s Claudius is an emperor of remarkable 'energy in governing' (16). Like Levick, O. seeks to reveal the rationality of Claudius' actions. He sees signs of consistent policy and strategic thinking in *inter alia* his annexation of Lycia, Thrace and Judaea, his generosity with the citizenship, and — last but not least — his preparations for a smooth succession (which O. sees as one of his most substantial achievements). His failings are attributed not to disability or weakness of character but to the precariousness of his political situation. Claudius was 'the prisoner of his position' (223, 258). Because of Gaius' failure to mark him as a successor, his lack of military and public experience and his relatively weak connection to the Julian family, Claudius was from the beginning more vulnerable than any of his predecessors. To consolidate his hold on power, he was forced to deal harshly with potential rivals, to take measures to re-establish a dynasty and to give more power and prestige to his family and freedmen — all of which inevitably alienated senatorial opinion. He was also driven to undertake even loftier projects than his predecessors, setting himself heroic goals which were all too likely to end in failure — as happened with his efforts to reform provincial government and his plan to drain the Fucine lake. This is surely right. The excesses of Claudius' regime are just one symptom of the disease of deficient legitimacy that afflicted the Roman principate (the diagnosis is Veyne's: *Le pain et le cirque* (1974), 719).

As the subtitle ('Image and Power') insists, this is a book that takes representation seriously. It recognizes that 'for many of his subjects the emperor was more a symbol, almost a fiction, but a powerful fiction' (26) and is always attentive to how that fiction was constructed through a complex and ongoing dialogue between the ruler and his subjects. But it does not quite have the courage of its own convictions. Despite disavowing biography (24), it repeatedly slips back into a biographical mode. There is much here on Claudius' remarkable 'energy' (11, 15, 16, 180, 190), his 'personality' (147, 154, 157), his 'strong concern' for justice (220, 201) and his 'tenacity' (114), thoroughness (119) and 'vigilance' (120). It is perhaps a pity that O. was not more radical in focusing on the emperor as image, fiction and fantasy — rather than perpetuating the ultimately futile search for the 'real' Claudius.

The book aspires to offer not just a narrative of Claudius' reign, but also new insights into the principate itself (27–8). Here it is less successful. O. has his sights on Fergus Millar's reactive model of imperial government. Again and again he insists that Claudius was not a 'passive' ruler, pointing to his decision to invade Britain and what he sees as clear and consistent policies on, for example, the frontiers, the imperial cult, the finances and the propagation and manipulation of his image. But even if we were to grant these points (and they are not uncontroversial), they would still not invalidate Millar's point that the vast majority of the emperor's activities — and the vast majority of administrative decisions — were reactive rather than active. Millar's model is vulnerable to other lines of attack, e.g. to the arguments that imperial decisions on particular cases could become general rules and that there is in any case a survival bias favouring evidence of the reactive and adjudicatory aspects of Roman administration over its active, policy-making activities (see Bleicken, *Zum Regierungsstil des römischen Kaisers* (1982) and Burton in *Chiron* 32 (2002), 249–80). I am not convinced there is much to be gained on this front by a study of a single emperor.

University of St Andrews

mpl2@st-andrews.ac.uk

doi:10.1017/S0075435812000184

MYLES LAVAN

B. BERGMANN, *DER KRANZ DES KAISERS, GENESE UND BEDEUTUNG EINER RÖMISCHEN INSIGNIE*. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2010. Pp. xix + 515, illus. ISBN 9783110202588. €99.95.

How do symbols gain and change their meanings? The question is an important one, and oddly neglected in most analyses of Roman emperors. The monumental *Die Strahlen der Herrscher* (1998) by Marianne Bergmann aside, there has been little attention for ways in which specific symbols of imperial power changed significance and function over time. Bettina Bergmann's ambitious monograph, an adaptation of her 2006 dissertation, focuses on the functions of Roman wreaths and their depictions and descriptions in the late Republic and early Empire, to find out how this particular symbol of status could end up denoting imperial power.

Half of the book comprises actual text (1–220) and substantial endnotes (223–77), with the other half a detailed catalogue of the material evidence used in the text, often with further discussion of details (279–390), tables of depictions of wreaths and of Jupiter on Republican coinage (based on *RRC*) and of Jupiter on non-numismatic evidence (based on *LIMC*) (391–473), and indices of images, textual and epigraphic evidence, names, places, and monuments (475–515). The analysis, in short, is based upon painstakingly assembled source material. This analysis, in turn, is divided into four parts. A fairly short first chapter (5–35) deals with the wreath in cult, followed by a longer one (37–108) analysing the rôle of wreaths during triumphs. By far the longest chapter (109–83) looks at the function of the *corona graminea* (112–34) and the *corona civica* (135–83) in a military context, after which B. discusses (185–205) how the *corona civica* became an important symbol for the princeps outside of its original military context.

The very evidence-based approach of this book works well. B. rightly observes that in a ritual context there was no general regulation about wearing wreaths, and that depictions of wreathed participants could therefore be used to indicate status, as she shows by a fresh reading of the *Ara Pacis* (18–35). Likewise, meticulous attention to the evidence concerning the laurel and gold wreath worn by the triumphator leads to suggestive views on the Boscoreale Cup and Trajan's Palestrina relief (98–108). Unfortunately, however, B. has not made use of Mary Beard's important observations in *The Roman Triumph* (2007) about the reliability of triumphal accounts and depictions in this section, nor of Ida Östenberg's thorough analysis of depictions of Roman triumphal processions in *Staging the World* (2009). B.'s suggestion, in her valuable third chapter, that Caesar is shown wearing the *corona graminea* on coinage from 44 B.C., convinces again through the systematic combination of all literary and material (numismatic) evidence (114–31). Finally, a detailed account of the development of the use of the *corona graminea* and *corona civica* by individuals in late Republican times makes clear how Octavian consciously made the former a '*corona non grata*' (202) as a result of the specific historical development of that particular wreath. He instead chose the latter as the wreath with which he was to be depicted post 27 B.C. The *civica*, as B. shows, was less 'tainted' than the *graminea* by Caesar and the civil wars.

There is, then, much of value in this book. More importantly, the clear way in which the evidence is assembled, made accessible and interpreted will make this solid work of great use for a long time to come, especially for scholars interested in the construction of the image of the first princeps. It is, however, not always easy to read, especially as some of the detailed discussions do not seem to lead to a development of argument, but are rather tangential. Still, they are always interesting, and through its methodical eye for detail the book shows how much can be learned from systematic study of one symbol. One can only hope that an analysis of the ways in which wreaths changed meaning in the post-Augustan period will follow soon.

Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen  
o.hekster@let.ru.nl

OLIVIER HEKSTER

doi:10.1017/S0075435812000196

C. MAZZONI, *SHE-WOLF: THE STORY OF A ROMAN ICON*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010. Pp. xiv + 282, 19 illus. ISBN 9780521145664. £17.99.

In 296 B.C. the curule aediles Cn. Ogulnius and Q. Ogulnius set up at the Ficus Ruminalis 'images of the city's infant founders under the she-wolf's teats' (Livy 10.23.11–12); a 'bronze group of old-fashioned workmanship' showing the wolf suckling the twins was still to be seen in the Augustan age, in a precinct close to the Lupercal 'on the street leading to the Circus Maximus' (Dion. Hal., *Ant. Rom.* 1.79.8). The reverse of an early didrachm issue (*RRC* 20.1), often dated to Q. Ogulnius' consulship in 269 B.C., presumably reproduces the form of the statue-group, and other coin issues from the late third and second centuries B.C. (*RRC* 39.3, 183.1–6, 235.1, 287.1) show the same iconography: the wolf is standing, but turning her head back and down to attend to the twins.

There was another such statue-group on the Capitol, which in 65 B.C. was struck by lightning and thrown down from its pedestal in a portentous storm (Cic., *Cat.* 3.19; *Div.* 1.19–20; 2.45 and 47; Dio 37.9.1; *Obsequens* 61). Since Cicero says the wolf 'left her torn-off footprints' (*De consulatu suo* 46 Courtney), we may infer that there too she was represented standing. Virgil (*Aen.* 8.631), however, offers the more realistic scene of the she-wolf lying down to feed the twins, and that is how we see her in the earliest visual evidence, a fourth-century B.C. bronze mirror, probably from Praeneste, showing