Die konkrete Auswahl der historischen Anspielungen durch die attischen Redner wird weiterhin völlig zu Recht mit dem Erwartungshorizont des Publikums verknüpft, auf das Rücksicht genommen werden mußte. Die in den Reden vorkommenden Inkonsistenzen werden dementsprechend nicht als bewußte Manipulationen der Geschichte durch die Redner wahrgenommen, sondern aus dem Wesen des (dynamischen) sozialen Gedächtnisses heraus erklärt; dieses habe wie ein Vorrat an Symbolen und Metaphern funktioniert, welche die Redner befähigten, ihre Analyse der Situation und Problemlösung anderen zu kommunizieren (142).

Lediglich zwei kleinere, aber grundsätzliche Kritikpunkte seien zum Schluß angemerkt. Bei der häufigen Besprechung des Spielraums, innerhalb dessen sich ein Redner bei der Darstellung von Geschichte bewegen mußte, um noch überzeugend zu sein, wird der Fokus ausschließlich auf die Zuhörerschaft gelenkt. Es hätte hier m.E. deutlich angemerkt werden müssen, daß bei der Vermittlung problematischer Sachverhalte ebenfalls das Ethos des Redners von Bedeutung war, dessen Persönlichkeit zur Glaubwürdigkeit des Vorgebrachten beitrug. Darüber hinaus scheint der Verf. bei seiner Kritik, die Reden von der Rhetorik aus begreifen zu wollen, zu pauschal ein rhetorisches Mittel mit einer hohlen Phrase gleichzusetzen (so z.B. 33). Die Funktionalität widerspricht allerdings der emotionalen Bedeutung des historischen Arguments (für Zuhörer und Redner) nicht; im Gegenteil vermag die große Rolle der Vergangenheit für die Identität der Athener überhaupt erst ihre gute Einsetzbarkeit als Überzeugungsmittel zu erklären.

Freiburg

Katharina Wojciech


Rita Mangiameli (henceforth M.) has provided a thorough reconsideration of the literary evidence for what must be one of the most extensively studied periods in ancient history. She is well aware, of course, of the huge body of scholarship that has been produced on the triumviral age and is not interested in offering yet another narrative account of that momentous period. The focus of the book is therefore thematic, although a general sense of chronological development is also preserved, and in an original fashion: what we are presented with is a comprehensive discussion of the evidence for dealings between senior military commanders and the soldiery following the Ides of March down until the time of Actium.

---

In this respect, this volume fills a conspicuous gap in scholarship. It is based on a Venice PhD thesis and appears in a new series on Roman history published by the Press of the University of Trieste, which is explicitly committed to showcasing the work of younger scholars and offers a commendable example of open-access publishing. It retains the structure and aspect of a doctoral dissertation, and there are occasional instances where M. has a rather didascalic allure (see p. xii, n. 2). Still, this does not undermine the intelligibility of the argument at any point – far from it. The book has a sound working hypothesis, which it develops with commendable clarity. The first two sections (1–272) adopt a largely narrative approach by discussing the evidence in chronological order; the third part (273–361) deals with the channels through with political communication is developed; a substantial conclusion (363–375) rounds off the proceedings.

M. builds on the assumption that the clash of the triumviral period was not based on an ideological opposition between the various factions, since these all had their origins in a shared ‘Caesarian identity’ (xiii). The armies should be understood as bodies of *clientelae* that were contested by the *duces* (a term that M. wisely prefers to modern labels such as ‘generals’ and ‘politicians’, but does not define formally); she explicitly develops an important tradition of work on the socio-economic aspects of this background. The interaction between *duces* and soldiers did have a range of possible ideological implications and was – this is a central contention of M.’s discussion – very much a two-way process. M. spells out right at the outset (xviii–xix) her indebtedness to modern scholarship on communication theory; some of the material she uses (notably R. Jakobson’s ‘Essais de linguistique générale’) might be rather superannuated (from this reviewer’s very limited grasp of current developments in that discipline), but it nonetheless makes a novel contribution to the study of an otherwise well-ploughed dossier.

The interesting remarks on the centrality of role-assignment processes in the political discourse (300) build on the work of A. J. Greimas and Paola Desideri; a useful comparison may have been found in the work of John Ma on Hellenistic Asia Minor, where the interaction between kings and cities is viewed precisely in terms of role-assignment strategies involving – to comparable extents – both parties.¹

The first chapter deals with the Ides of March, and is, predictably, the section of the book in which there is the strongest sense of being on well-trodden ground. M. does a good job, though, in conveying the central role that communication strategies played in the hours following the death of the dictator. The insistence on the ‘diversification’ (6) in the messages produced by Antony and Lepidus prompts intriguing analogies with the ‘market model’ of Roman religion developed by A. Bendlin, or with recent work by A. Russell on tribunician contentions that could not have possibly been known to M.² There is a sensible as-

¹ J. Ma, Antiochus III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor, Oxford 1999, esp. 179–242.
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assessment of Antony’s political strategy in those weeks; the reconciliation with Dolabella, however, receives little attention (cf. 65). At one point (11) Antony’s strategy is qualified as ‘political funambulism’; the underlying assumption, here and elsewhere in the book, seems to be that Antony’s attempt to accommodate incompatible interests was doomed to fail. This is debatable: the risk of reading events in light of the final outcome is always considerable, especially when one revisits stories whose outcome is well known, and the shape itself of the tradition has been irrevocably determined by Antony’s position as loser.

This is arguably one of the main shortcomings of this volume. Although M. is clearly aware of the complexity of the sources that she discusses, a critical overview of their reliability, or at least of the strands of earlier traditions that they reflect, is nowhere to be found. To what extent can we safely juxtapose the evidence of, say, Suetonius, Plutarch, Appian, and Dio and expect to come up with a viable synthesis? And, when there is substantial disagreement between two sources (or more), how can it be resolved? M. tends to avoid cutting these knots; she does discuss what the sources of the traditions might have been, but rarely addresses the issue of their historical accuracy. The fact that none of the extant literary sources mentions the first contio held by Octavian in Rome, which is attested by a letter of Cicero (Att. 16.20.5), does not prompt any discussion of the reliability of the literary evidence for this phase of the crisis or the extent to which the picture that emerges is in anyway complete. A partial exception is made for the speech of Cassius in App. BC 4.90–100; its sophisticated literary structure is correctly identified but this does not give rise to any suspicion. Indeed, a level of historical accuracy is identified, even though M. acknowledges that the speech is largely a free reconstruction of Appian (who is of course not new to these solutions: a comparison between his reconstruction of the Fifth Philippic in BC 3.52–53 and the surviving text of the speech is instructive). M. also argues (building on an argument of E. Gabba) that Appian’s interest in this line of argument is a symptom of his Republican sympathies. Even if one were to leave aside the problem of Appian’s debt to his sources, it remains to be established what a Republican allegiance might have actually meant in the mid-second century AD – quite possibly, little more than what a Jacobin or Bonapartist allegiance might mean in the early XXI century.

The discussion of Antony’s eulogy of Caesar is, however, remarkably perceptive; the involvement of the herald and the impact it must have made on the audience must have had is a symptom of the care with which the sources have scrutinised (and unfailingly in the Greek and Latin originals, it must be stressed). From this first case study M. sets out her valuable approach of discussing the communication strategies that were deployed both verbally and through other means: in that case, the display of an image of the wounded body of Caesar certainly played a very important role. Although much of the focus of the volume is on contiones and public meetings, M. also does justice to the circulation of information that took place at other levels. The incident in which Octavian is informed of the terms of Caesar’s testament by some unnamed people he meets at Lupiae


---

in late March 44 is rightly discussed as an instance of the complex web of knowledge that took shape at the time (22–23). Even those who do not accept the historicity of the event with the same confidence as M.’s will recognise the significance of this notice. It is not uncommon to find the same emphasis on the link between political prominence and control over knowledge in the sources from this period, such as the *Bellum Hispaniense*, in which the circulation of information towards Caesar is a central feature in the depiction of his comprehensive, uncharacteristically harsh victory. There are also interesting remarks on the role that the *domus* of the great late Republican warlords played in this period, especially in the case of Mark Antony, and on the circulation of written messages within and between the two camps, as late as in 30 BC (Dio 51.10.2–3; 270–271).

The main focus of the analysis is on Octavian; this is unsurprising, since the emphasis of the book reflects the bias of the literary sources. M. contemplates the possibility that Octavian exploited the weaknesses in Antony’s strategy for the sake of his self-representation. The discussion then takes a strong interest in the developments across Italy, where Octavian spoke to a large number of the veterans of his adoptive father, with the express purpose of securing his control over an important body of *clientelae*. Antony’s speeches to his soldiers, as conveyed by Appian, both in the summer of 44 and in that of 43, receive close and persuasive treatments (106–108). M. moves comfortably between the concepts of ‘vertical’ and ‘horizontal’ communication; the latter is rightly regarded as a central part of the problem. The very cohesion that the shared Caesarian allegiance had created among the various legions became eventually a powerful factor of mutual recriminations (115; if I understand the argument correctly). The Bologna agreement was the moment in which that impressive body of supporters was reunited, albeit temporarily. The new settlement, however, was not immune from problems; the deal reached by the triumvirs included action against some high-ranking figures who may have had influence on the troops and posed a threat to the new power arrangement.

Significantly, if we are to believe Appian (BC 4.5.20), the soldiers were not told about the imminent drawing up of the proscription lists, which were going to include some notable figures in the very chain of command that had led them in the preceding months. It would be mistaken, however, to regard either the soldiers or the veterans as passive entities. Quite the contrary, they were a political force that could use its military might and expertise to pose a considerable threat to the agendas of the leaders (179–180), as Octavian learned during his round of land assignments in Italy in 43; if necessary, they were prepared to make their generals accountable (on 243 there is even a reference, which is surely to be intended as tongue-in-cheek, to «contrattazioni ‘sindacali’»). There is an original discussion of the glands that were found on site at Perusia, which provides a welcome shift from the literary evidence and gives further depth to the field of ‘political communication’ explored in this volume (197–201); I find the evidence for the ‘ideological and motivational weakness’ of Antony’s camp less compelling than M. does. Later in the discussion, the strong loyalty of Antony’s army is discussed in some detail and vindicated as a factor of considerable his-
historical importance; it may have been useful to clarify how this ties up with M.’s assessment of the conduct of the Antoniani at Perusia.

There is, on the whole, little attention to the role of the religious dimension in the dealings between the *duces* and their *clientelae*. The sacrifice with which Octavius’ assumption of the name of Caesar is marked does not receive any detailed discussion, although its general significance is acknowledged (25–26). The appearance of the *sidius Julium* at the *ludi Apollinares* in July 44 is overlooked altogether. It played a fundamental role not only in forging Octavian’s strategy of political communication but also in his positioning vis-à-vis the legacy of Caesar. It was also explicitly mentioned in the lost memoirs of the victor of Actium. The enigmatic episode of the *arae Perusinae* does not receive any discussion either. The ritual with which Octavian marked the beginning of the war against Cleopatra and Antony should have received some closer scrutiny; the resort to fetial law on that occasion has been the object of much debate, and should have been discussed here. There is no doubt that the ritual of 32 was an impressive ‘communicative strategy’, to use M.’s terminology; it would have been useful to assess both its precise quality and the extent to which it was indebted to invented traditions of antiquarian origin. The *lustratio classis* performed by Octavian before the war with Sextus Pompeius, however, receives a good discussion (223–224), as well as the use of augural symbols in RRC 533/2 and 540/1 (319, 322–323).

M. is conversant with modern scholarship in all the main academic languages; yet, the bibliography comes across as rather insular. The importance of the studies of some Italian scholars, notably P. Grattarola and R. Cristofoli, is rightly stressed; they get far more attention than, for example, A. Gowings’ fundamental volume on the ‘triumviral narratives’. There are some gaps in the coverage of scholarship in other languages. The most striking one is J. Osgood’s ‘Caesar’s Legacy’ (Cambridge 2006), where M. would have found a brilliant reconstruction of the triumviral period that is also very alert to the communication dynamics that underpin the politics of the age. M.’s detailed discussion of the interaction between commanders and soldiers should have also engaged with the important article by S. Chrissanthos on Caesar’s handling of the mutiny of 47 BC (‘Caesar and the Mutiny of 47 B.C.’, JRS 91 [2001], 63–75), which would have also provided a powerful model on the (im)balance of power between late Republican armies and dynasties, even if it falls just outside the chronological remit of this volume. Moreover, a book that places speeches in historiography at the centre of the discussion should have engaged with the ground-breaking, and highly controversial, thesis put forward by Tony Woodman in ‘Rhetoric in Classical Historiography’ (London and Sydney 1988). M. does make her views on the problem clear, but here discussion is rather thin on the ground (293–295): her confidence in the reliability of the evidence is apparent throughout the volume, and sometimes emphatically stated (124: ‘La situazione nel campo è ben delineata da Cassio Dione’; is it really?).

Other bibliographical omissions are of lesser import, but worth pointing out. Woodman’s commentary on Velleius’ triumviral narrative should have been engaged with; C. Pelling’s on Plutarch’s *Life of Antony* has also been overlooked. The contributions of Mark Toher on Nicolaus of Damascus should have also been taken into account; more work has been done on this author since the appearance of B. Scardigli’s Italian edition. M. often refers to the existence of an ‘Augustan’ tradition that was directly indebted to the autobiography of the princeps (*evulgata augustea*, 21); a discussion of this point would have benefited from the essays in C. Smith and A. Powell (eds.), The Lost Memoirs of Augustus and the Development of Roman Autobiography, Swansea 2009. The discussion of the use that Octavian made of drama shortly after his return to Rome should have engaged with the seminal work of T. P. Wiseman (Roman Drama and Roman History, Exe-
The volume is on the whole well produced; I noticed but a handful of typos, none of which hinder the understanding of the affected passages. There is good general index; an index locorum would have been very desirable, but the free availability of the PDF version on the publisher’s website will make searches reasonably straightforward.

Some ‘Kleinigkeiten’. Sir Fergus Millar is Scottish, not English (xx, 371). In spite of M.’s proviso at 1, n. 2, I still find the use of the term ‘partito’ in any discussion of Roman Republican history unhelpful at best. There is no compelling reason to argue that the generic reference to the σῆς of Octavian in App. BC 3.10 and Nic. Dam. 16 is a symptom of their dependence on the same tradition, ultimately going back to the autobiograpy of Augustus (17–18, n. 89); independent selection criteria of the authors may have played an important part (on Velleius’ strategy in the relevant section of the narrative cf. A. J. Woodman, Velleius Paterculus. The Caesarian and Augustan Narrative, Cambridge 1983, 115). The ἀπὸ τοῦ δῆμου τὸ ἄξιοκαρπῶρτον that congregate to Tibur along with members of the Senate and the equestrian order to greet Antony and convey their support to him are not «esponenti dei populares», but influential and reasonably wealthy residents of Rome who do not belong in the two upper orders (104); D. Magnino’s translation «i più influenti popolani», followed by M., is sound, but not entirely felicitous. At 129, n. 531 M. argues that Antony’s close relationship with his soldiers and his habit of granting them favours (Plut. Ant. 4) were felt by some to be symptoms of a debasement of his moral conduct. Some nuances may be in order here: Sallust offers a broadly comparable portrait of Sulla’s leadership qualities in BJ 95–96, where the then quaestor of Marius is portrayed in a strikingly positive light. The changes in the leadership paradigm of the late Republican period and the emergence of a new model of camaraderie between high-ranking officers and soldiers require further discussion. There are several references to the concept of bellum instum, not just with regards to the war proclamation of 32; it should have been taken into account that in the late Republican sources (notably in Cicero) that notion applies to a lawful conflict, not to one that is intrinsically just. The political significance of the augurate has found better discussions than P. Jal’s 1961 article on the ‘propagande religieuse’; J. Linderski’s full-scale study of augural law (ANRW 2.16.3, Berlin-New York 1986, 2146–2152) is the best starting point. Some aspects of M.’s treatment of the psychology of the crowd in the triumviral period does not strike me as clear (in the discussion on 347–348 there seems to be some contradiction); there is a reliance on Freud’s theory, but other assessments more thoroughly grounded in historical practice should also have been taken into account, such as L. Febvre’s ‘Foules révolutionnaires’ and (to stay within the boundaries of ancient history) of P. A. Brunt’s ground-breaking piece on the Roman mob.2

As is pointed out in the last few pages of the book (371–375), M.’s study may usefully be read as a contribution to the ‘democracy in Rome’ debate – a line of enquiry that s experienced a sort of lull in the last decade, but now seems to be undergoing a meaningful revival. Its central contention is that the soldiers of the triumviral armies were a political force with which their leaders constantly had to

---
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reckon; far from being passive recipients of messages, they had the capability of understanding what their interests were and developing strategies to pursue them. They engaged in a dialogue with their leaders that required the latter to adapt and refine their strategies. This is not an altogether novel point, but it is argued at a level of detail that is not to be found in the rest of the scholarship and with an emphasis that makes the discussion noteworthy. M.’s case for the fundamental significance and complexity of the interaction between leaders and soldiers is likely to persuade even those who will take issue with her take on the reliability of the literary sources on which this discussion is based. Even if one were not to hold high hopes for the value of the evidence M. employs, it is readily apparent that the process of securing an effective relationship with the soldiers was regarded in antiquity as a crucial test of a leader’s political qualities. The literary evidence – for good or for ill – reflects this assessment. Whatever their methodological persuasions and scholarly horizons may be, future students of the triumviral period will find plenty of judicious discussion of important material in this study.

Newcastle

Federico Santangelo
