Review

Reviewed Work(s): Julius Caesar and His Public Image by Zwi Yavetz

Review by: Henry C. Boren

Source: *The American Historical Review*, Jun., 1984, Vol. 89, No. 3 (Jun., 1984), pp. 741-742

Published by: Oxford University Press on behalf of the American Historical Association

Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/1856135

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at https://about.jstor.org/terms

Oxford University Press and *American Historical Association* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Historical Review*

This content downloaded from
199.202.101.159 on Tue, 13 Apr 2021 13:56:43 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

to show that Sestius made a (business) trip to Marseilles and the second cited to show that Sestius owned ships. If the reader looks up these passages, he will find that the trip was made to visit a dying, exiled father-in-law, and the second passage may well refer to warships (*dicrota*) during the civil war, not cargo ships.

In sum, the reader may come away from this book feeling that he has been introduced to a wealth of tantalizing information, but that firm conclusions about the extent of the Roman elite's involvement in trade and commerce remain elusive.

RICHARD P. SALLER
Swarthmore College

KEITH HOPKINS. *Death and Renewal.* (Sociological Studies in Roman History, number 2.) New York: Cambridge University Press. 1983. Pp. xx, 276. $39.50.

Two thirds of this book are given over to an essay in two parts (Roman Republic and Empire) by Keith Hopkins and G. P. Burton. It seems fair to focus on this essay, partly because of its bulk but mostly because of its unusual approach. That is statistical, enucleated in thirty-odd tables. They are based very largely on other scholars' compilations of the raw data, but they are treated in novel ways and discussed in great detail. The authors have in effect taken the present state of Who's Who (Roman) and subjected it to sociological analysis. The angle of attack is no doubt Hopkins's choice, since he has in the past often displayed its possibilities. Here, the results are set forth with clarity and plain intelligence, on every page. They give us a senatorial elite far less sealed off and self-perpetuating than has always been supposed.

That is the authors' chief finding. In arriving at it, they subject the data to minute inspection. They ask what proportion of the elite lived long enough to qualify for high office, or had enough money, or even wanted to compete for it? What proportion were descended from consuls or praetors, over how many generations, or had consular or praetorian descendants, in how many degrees of descent? How many sons did they have, and what effect was felt from adoptions versus proscriptions, from the opening up of suffect consulships or the harrying of the senate by bad emperors? How much better chance at continued membership in the senate, or at a praetorship or consulship, did a descendant of many consuls have over someone of various degrees or lesser distinction? These and many other questions are themselves accompanied by probing discussion of the statistical assumptions involved.

The whole essay is tightly written, reasonable, and convincing. I except only the explanations offered for the diminishing eagerness among descendants of the elite themselves to seek office under the Principate. A short review is not the place to argue that matter. There remains, however, a more fundamental difficulty, regarding the usefulness of the authors' results. Is the book on a good subject? Clearly, we gain by knowing more about any cadre of, let us say, five hundred to a thousand adult males. But what if they were nailsmiths? No one would much value knowledge of them. The elite, on the other hand, are worth studying—because of their political power (and the authors are not interested in the economic or cultural role of the elite). It is not easy, however, to see what events or even what known patterns of behavior in Roman political history can be better understood, now, thanks to this book, than could be understood before.

The remainder of the book consists of an essay on gladiatorial combat by Hopkins alone and another, by himself and M. Letts, on burials, mourning, epitaphs, immortality, wills, infanticide, and legacy hunting. The former essay necessarily appears incomplete and superficial measured against George Ville's recent book on the subject (1981); the latter covers too many disconnected topics in too unfocused a way; but both have a characteristic vitality, trenchancy, and, at points, irreverance. For example, a quotation (p. 218 n. 24) on Hades as seen by an ancient satirist, for example, depicting some deceased and descending philosopher: " 'Good God, what pretensions he carries, what humbug, competitiveness . . . a lot of fuss about nothing and split hairs' . . . Not much changes, " says Hopkins, "in the world of scholarship."

Yale University
RAMSAY MACMULLEN

ZWI YAVETZ. *Julius Caesar and His Public Image.* Translated from the German. (Aspects of Greek and Roman Life.) Ithaca: Cornell University Press or Thames and Hudson, London. 1983. Pp. 286. $25.00.

Yet another book on Caesar. This one, with its emphasis on image and its focus on the latter years of the dictator's life—it is both less and more than a biography—well repays the reading. Zwi Yavetz's concern with image was apparent in his earlier book, *Plebs and Princeps* (1969); one of its chapters contained the embryo of this volume. In 1972, in the Loeb lecture at Harvard (included in an appendix), he examined the philological aspects of the question.

In this volume, Yavetz concerns himself with Caesar's image not only in his time but also in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The modern scholars whose views are summarized are predomi-

This content downloaded from
199.202.101.159 on Tue, 13 Apr 2021 13:56:43 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

nantly German (for many German intellectuals of the last century, Caesar was a hero, the kind of leader that a prostrate and divided Germany needed). Yavetz first discusses "Caesarism" and then attempts to classify more recent Caesarian scholars as "minimalist," "revisionist," or "skeptics." The bibliography of this first and most interesting chapter includes works never given much notice among English-speaking scholars. Intended "for the educated reader, not the specialist" (note 229), it is a useful survey. A separate index of authors adds to its value. Next, three chapters review thirty-eight *leges* and other measures attributed to Caesar. The summary treatment here will provide students convenient starting-points for further study. Yavetz presents generally well-balanced judgments.

In the following chapter, "An Interim Statement," Yavetz asserts (p. 179) that "the real picture emerges" when one asks of the measures, *cui bono*; the conclusion? Caesar was not a revolutionary. That "real picture" may seem belied by Caesar's assumption of the title Perpetual Dictator, emphasized in usual fashion by Yavetz as a reason for his loss of support, but for him it is not real evidence that Caesar wanted kingship. Through rumor and open attack he suffered damage and distortion to his real image; he was "unable to avoid the impression that he put through his moderate policies by ruthless force" (p. 213).

It will not be difficult to criticize when so many matters are surveyed. Yavetz's bibliographic footnotes, though valuable, omit appropriate reference at times to English-language works even when they are cited elsewhere (especially, Lily R. Taylor and Ronald Syme). Some facts may be wrong: did Achaea have its own governor under Caesar (p. 110)? Relevant evidence is sometimes left out: he correctly says (p. 110) that Caesar never emphasized his title, pontifex maximus, in his works; yet both gold and silver coins of 47–46 B.C. emphasize his priestly offices, and one, Crawford 467, has the specific inscription, PONT MAX. This same coin, with Ceres on the obverse and a "D" on the reverse, usually taken to mean *donativum*, should have been brought into the discussion of the grain distributions of 46 B.C. (p. 156). He does not always exhibit thorough research: in reviewing Caesar's arrangements regarding debt he does not seem to understand the nature of the credit collapse at Rome; yet he refers to Tacitus, *Annals* VI. 16—when at VI. 17 Tacitus describes the collapse.

Yavetz's views are always tenable and well reasoned. This is a useful book that scholars will want to acquire and to recommend to advanced undergraduates and beginning graduate students.

HENRY C. BOREN
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

HENRIK LÖHKEN *Ordines Dignitatum: Untersuchungen zur formalen Konstituierung der spätantiken Führungsschicht.* (Kölner historische Abhandlungen, number 30.) Cologne: Böhlau. 1982. Pp. x, 166. DM 62.

The manner by which members of the Roman aristocracy distinguished themselves from the lower orders and defined their relationship to one another within their rank is one of the fundamental features of the imperial social order. Henrik Löhken, though not breaking any new ground, is well aware that the formal definition of status we find in the late Roman legal sources, especially in the *Codex Theodosianus*, represents the culmination of a process that began in the Republic. His subject, indeed, is not the characteristics of the developed system of the late fourth and fifth centuries, but, rather, its *formale Konstituierung* especially in the late third and early fourth centuries (372 is the terminal date); how, he asks, did this formal system of rank come into being and how did it function?

The aristocratic struggle for *dignitas* and *honos* was always the dynamic factor of Roman politics. The transition to the principate allowed one man to monopolize these qualities and, at the same time, to secure his control over the ruling class through the allocation of the appropriate offices and prestige. In other words, Löhken argues, the emperor secured his position by controlling the admission to and promotion within the governing class (*Führungsschicht*). The senate, however, did not offer a sufficient reservoir of personnel to satisfy the increasing needs of governance. The emperors turned then to the equestrian order (and to their own households) and, in doing so, freed themselves from the constraints of their nominal membership in the senate and their adherence to the senatorial system of values.

Diocletian and Constantine introduced new institutions (more provinces, more governors, a traveling court that was geographically and increasingly ideologically distant from the traditional one), which significantly increased the number of individuals with *honos* and *dignitas*, that is, institutions which served to enlarge the governing class. These reforms, Löhken continues, created the necessity to define formally the relationship between the various officials. The more formal the system became, the more successfully the emperors were able to use their authority to admit and to promote as a vehicle for solidifying their power. For its part, the aristocracy tolerated the situation because its superior position in respect to other groups was defined and guaranteed and because the relations between the various groups within the class were regulated.

The major difficulty associated with this book is its style. The author, especially in the first third and largely theoretical portion of his book, can hardly

This content downloaded from 199.202.101.159 on Tue, 13 Apr 2021 13:56:43 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms