LEXIS

Poetica, retorica e comunicazione nella tradizione classica

37.2019

ADOLF M. HAKKERT EDITORE

LEXIS

Poetica, retorica e comunicazione nella tradizione classica

SOMMARIO

ARTICOLI

Alessandro Barchiesi, *Un ricordo di Alfonso Traina* …….. 1

Carlo Franco, *Per Nicholas Horsfall* 9

Paul Demont, *Archaïsmes de prononciation et exceptions à la 'correptio attica' dans l''Ajax' de Sophocle* ……..... 19

Valeria Melis, Λαλεῖν *e* φιλοσοφεῖν. *Echi della critica ai 'logoi' dei personaggi femminili euripidei dall'età classica alla Seconda Sofistica fino all'epoca bizantina* ……... 27

Massimo Magnani, *Note in margine a Eur. 'Alc.' 305, 354-6 (~ Soph. 'OR' 980-982), 445-54.* 58

Raffaele Bernini, *Euripide, 'Elena' 639-42* ……. 73

Paola Ingrosso, *Il 'Fenice' di Euripide e la 'Samia' di Menandro* ……. 84

Federico Favi, *Tre note al testo dei 'Sicioni' di Menandro (47, 123, 376)* ……. 105

Matteo Varoli, *La 'Repubblica' dei Pitagorici. Il legame tra la 'Repubblica' di Platone e il sistema gerarchico presente in alcuni 'pseudopythagorica' dorici* …… 111

Paolo Scattolin, *Aristofane di Bisanzio e i diacritici 'sigma' e 'antisigma' in 'schol. vet.' Aristoph. 'Ran.' 152 Chantry* …….. 131

Alessandro Fusi, *Un nuovo frammento degli 'Annales' di Ennio in Orosio ('hist.' 3.9.5)?* ….. 140

Alessandra Di Meglio, *Le traduzioni ciceroniane di* συμπάθεια ……... 151

Alessandra Romeo, *Battersi la coscia: per un approccio filologico e antropologico a un gesto dell''actio' oratoria greca e romana* ……... 167

Alessandra Romeo, *Marco Antonio, un anti-oratore* …….. 183

Alessandro Fusi, *'Nil intemptatum linquere'. Sull'origine di un'espressione poetica (con qualche osservazione sul testo di Verg. 'Aen.' 8.205 s.)* ……. 206

Silvia Mattiacci, *'Ineptiae' e il lessico riduttivo in relazione alla poesia 'minore'* …… 236

Francesca Boldrer, *Ovidio e Properzio (4.1 e 4.2) nel proemio delle 'Metamorfosi' e un problema testuale in 'met.' 1.2 ('illas'/'illa')* …….. 256

Federica Galantucci – Melania Cassan, *Breve 'status quaestionis': Seneca, 'De ira' 2.4. 'Adfectus', 'uoluntas' e 'akrasia'* …… 280

Anthony R. Birley, *A New Dispute about Thule and Agricola's Last Campaign* ……... 299

Antonio Piras, *'Licet' concessivo in Tertulliano* ……. 310

Katia Barbaresco, *La terra e il sangue (secondo Quinto Smirneo)* …… 323

Claudia Lo Casto, *Il corpo vivente: tracce di biologia in Plotino* ……... 340

Ilaria Torzi, *'Aen.' 11.539-72. Tiberio Claudio Donato e un 'ragionevole dubbio' per Metabo* 354

Luigi Pirovano, *Nota filologica a Claud. Don. 'ad Aen.' 6.523-524*…….. 375

Massimo Manca, *La Roma antica del mitografo Fulgenzio: gli 'exempla' alla luce della 'vanitas'* ……... 377

Daniela Marrone, *L'edizione di Livio e le 'Brevissimae Annotationes' di Marcantonio Sabellico (1491)* ……... 392

Maria Giovanna Sandri, *Il* Περὶ συντάξεως λόγου *di Gregorio di Corinto nel ms. Barocci 131: un testimone riscoperto* ……... 420

RECENSIONI

Andrea Cozzo, *Riso e sorriso. E altri saggi sulla nonviolenza nella Grecia antica* (A. Taddei) 427

Dimitrios Yatromanolakis, *Greek Mythologies: Antiquity and Surrealism* (Th. Papadopoulou) 430

Dino Piovan. *Tucidide e l'Europa* (L. Porciani) …….. 432

Milagros Quijada Sagredo – Maria Carmen Encinas Reguero (eds.), *Connecting Rhetoric and Attic Drama* (E. Medda) …….. 435

Mario Lentano, *'Nomen'. Il nome proprio nella cultura romana* (A. Maiuri) …… 440

Matthias Haake – Ann-Cathrin Harders (hrsg. von), *Politische Kultur und soziale Struktur der Römischen Republik* (F. Santangelo) ……... 449

Francesco Cannizzaro – Stefano Fanucchi – Francesco Morosi – Leyla Ozbek (a c. di), *Sofocle per il teatro* (M. Treu) ……. 454

Anna Maria Wasyl, *Alcestis Barcelońska oraz centon Alcesta* (F. Cabras) 457

Direzione	VITTORIO CITTI PAOLO MASTANDREA ENRICO MEDDA
Redazione	STEFANO AMENDOLA, GUIDO AVEZZÙ, FEDERICO BOSCHETTI, ANTONELLA CANDIO, LAURA CARRARA, CLAUDIA CASALI, LIA DE FINIS, CARLO FRANCO, ALESSANDRO FRANZOI, MASSIMO MANCA, STEFANO MASO, LUCA MONDIN, GABRIELLA MORETTI, MARIA ANTONIETTA NENCINI, PIETRO NOVELLI, STEFANO NOVELLI, GIOVANNA PACE, ANTONIO PISTELLATO, RENATA RACCANELLI, GIOVANNI RAVENNA, ANDREA RODIGHIERO, GIANCARLO SCARPA, PAOLO SCATTOLIN, MATTEO TAUFER, OLGA TRIBULATO, MARTINA VENUTI
Comitato scientifico	MARIA GRAZIA BONANNO, ANGELO CASANOVA, ALBERTO CAVARZERE, GENNARO D'IPPOLITO, LOWELL EDMUNDS, PAOLO FEDELI, FRANCO FERRARI, ENRICO FLORES, SILVIA GASTALDI, PAOLO GATTI, MAURIZIO GIANGIULIO, GIAN FRANCO GIANOTTI, PIERRE JUDET DE LA COMBE, MARIE MADELEINE MACTOUX, GIUSEPPINA MAGNALDI, GIUSEPPE MASTROMARCO, GIANCARLO MAZZOLI, GIAN FRANCO NIEDDU, CARLO ODO PAVESE, WOLFGANG RÖSLER, MARIA MICHELA SASSI, PAOLO VALESIO, PAOLA VOLPE CACCIATORE, BERNHARD ZIMMERMANN

LEXIS – Poetica, retorica e comunicazione nella tradizione classica

http://www.lexisonline.eu/
info@lexisonline.eu, infolexisonline@gmail.com

Direzione e Redazione:

Università Ca' Foscari Venezia
Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici
Palazzo Malcanton Marcorà – Dorsoduro 3484/D
I-30123 Venezia

Vittorio Citti	vittorio.citti@gmail.it
Paolo Mastandrea	mast@unive.it
Enrico Medda	enrico.medda@unipi.it

Pubblicato con il contributo di:
Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici (Università Ca' Foscari Venezia)

Copyright by Vittorio Citti

ISSN 2210-8823
ISBN 978-90-256-1343-3

Lexis, in accordo ai principi internazionali di trasparenza in sede di pubblicazioni di carattere scientifico, sottopone tutti i testi che giungono in redazione a un processo di doppia lettura anonima (*double-blind peer review*, ovvero *refereeing*) affidato a specialisti di Università o altri Enti italiani ed esteri. Circa l'80% dei revisori è esterno alla redazione della rivista. Ogni due anni la lista dei revisori che hanno collaborato con la rivista è pubblicata sia online sia in calce a questa pagina.

Lexis figura tra le riviste di carattere scientifico a cui è riconosciuta la classe A nella lista di valutazione pubblicata dall'**ANVUR** (*Agenzia Nazionale di Valutazione del Sistema Universitario e della Ricerca*). È stata censita dalla banca dati internazionale **Scopus-Elsevier**, mentre è in corso la procedura di valutazione da parte della banca dati internazionale **Web of Science-ISI**.

Informazioni per i contributori: gli articoli e le recensioni proposti alla rivista vanno inviati all'indirizzo di posta elettronica **infolexisonline@gmail.com**. Essi debbono rispettare scrupolosamente le norme editoriali della rivista, scaricabili dal sito **www.lexisonline.eu** (si richiede, in particolare, l'utilizzo esclusivo di un font greco di tipo unicode). Qualsiasi contributo che non rispetti tali norme non sarà preso in considerazione da parte della redazione.
Si raccomanda di inviare due files separati del proprio lavoro, uno dei quali reso compiutamente anonimo. Il file anonimo dovrà essere accompagnato da una pagina contenente nome, cognome e recapiti dell'autore (tale pagina sarà poi eliminata dalla copia trasmessa ai revisori).

Revisori anni 2017-2018:

Eugenio Amato
Giuseppe Aricò
Andreas Bagordo
Giuseppina Basta Donzelli
Luigi Battezzato
Graziana Brescia
Antonio Cacciari
Claude Calame
Alberto Cavarzere
Bruno Centrone
Ester Cerbo
Emanuele Ciampini
Ettore Cingano
Vittorio Citti
Paolo De Paolis
Arturo De Vivo
Carlo Di Giovine
Rosalba Dimundo
José Antonio Fernández Delgado
Martina Elice
Franco Ferrari
Rolando Ferri
Patrick Finglass
Alessandro Franzoi
Paolo Garbini
Giovanni Garbugino
Tristano Gargiulo
Massimo Gioseffi
Beatrice Girotti
Massimo Gusso
Pierre Judet de La Combe
Alessandro Lagioia
Paola Lambrini
Nicola Lanzarone
Liana Lomiento
Maria Tania Luzzatto
Giuseppina Magnaldi
Enrico Magnelli
Anna Magnetto
Massimo Manca
Claudio Marangoni
Antonio Marchetta
Rosanna Marino
Maria Chiara Martinelli
Stefano Maso
Paolo Mastandrea
Giuseppe Mastromarco
Christine Mauduit
Giancarlo Mazzoli
Enrico Medda
Luca Mondin
Simonetta Nannini
Michele Napolitano
Camillo Neri
Gian Franco Nieddu
Stefano Novelli
Giovanna Pace
Nicola Palazzolo
Paola Paolucci
Lucia Pasetti
Maria Pia Pattoni
Paola Pinotti
Luigi Pirovano
Antonio Pistellato
Giovanni Ravenna
Chiara Renda
Jean Robaey
Andrea Rodighiero
Francesca Rohr Vio
Alessandra Romeo
Amneris Roselli
Wolfgang Rösler
Antonietta Sanna
Stefania Santelia
Paolo Scattolin
Roberto Scevola
Kurt Sier
Raffaella Tabacco
Andrea Tessier
Giuseppe Ucciardello
Mario Vegetti †
Matteo Venier
Martina Venuti
Maria Veronese
Onofrio Vox
J.A. (Joop) van Waarden
Michael Winterbottom
Alexei Zadorozhny

Matthias Haake – Ann-Cathrin Harders (hrsg. von), *Politische Kultur und soziale Struktur der Römischen Republik: Bilanzen und Perspektiven*, Stuttgart, Franz Steiner Verlag, 2017, pp. 567; ISBN 9783515115988; € 82,00.

In October 2012 the University of Münster marked the seventieth anniversary of the death of Friedrich Münzer (1868-1942) with an international conference. Münzer, who taught at Münster for just over a decade, was a victim of the Holocaust: he died in the concentration camp of Theresienstadt/Terezín, shortly before his daughter Margarete could secure his release. Much of the work he had produced in the years immediately preceding his death was published only after the war, in several instalments of the Pauly-Wissowa, to which he contributed over 5,000 entries: a source of scholarly orientation that in itself would suffice to place him among the most important Roman historians of the twentieth century. There is a great deal more, though: Münzer also wrote a path-breaking book on Roman noble families and 'parties' in which he put forward a view of Roman politics that was both authoritative and controversial; a monograph on the sources of Pliny the Elder; and a set of papers on aspects of Roman history that were published in a *Kleine Schriften* volume, also edited by Haake and Harders, on the seventieth anniversary of his tragic death.

Inevitably, the conference volume has taken quite a bit longer in the making. It is ostensibly a collection of studies by Roman Republican historians that discuss aspects of the history of the period with a clear division of labour and some reference to Münzer's work. The title is broad and suitably evocative, and the introduction by A.C. Harders (13-26) states the general agenda in clear terms, positing the view that, while Münzer is hardly central to current debates on Roman politics, as so much of his working assumptions have been proven untenable, he remains a central vantage point on the social history of the Roman Republic. Whether Münzer would have in any way defined himself as a social historian is a matter for debate, albeit ultimately one of relative importance. Harders is undoubtedly right: social historians of ancient Rome can hardly afford to overlook his work. Hence the decision of the editors to host under the same roof political culture and social structures: a timely and important claim, although there does not appear to have been a clear steer on what should or should not belong in this book, and on what the coverage should be. The volume is divided into seven sections (*Friedrich Münzer – Leben und Werk*; *Grundlagen und Methode*; *Soziale Strukturen in Rom*; *Rom, Italien und das Reich*; *Die Formierung der Führung*; *Aristokratisches Agieren in gesellschaftlichen Kontexten*; *Politische Kultur in Rom – 'plebs' und 'ordo senatorius'*), which broadly follow the thematic divides of the topic, but are rather generically populated.

Joseph Wiesehöfer (31-7) revisits his distinguished work on Münzer's biography by focusing more specifically on the final years; much of the material is not new, but remains harrowing, and deeply worthy of attention and engagement. A letter of March 1935 to his old friend Michail Rostovtzeff, by then at Yale, conveys an arresting sense of Münzer's isolation and despair (31). The letters of Münzer to Ronald Syme, now at the Bodleian Library and due to be edited in the near future by A.R. Birley, are an equally stark testimony of the real consequences of the position he was in: unable to publish in Germany (his last article appeared in Italian in BCAR 67, 1939), increasingly unable to see any way forward in horrendously threatening times, and yet formidably helpful to others: he even agreed to go through the proofs of *The Roman Revolution* – a game-changing book that is very directly indebted to his work. In the following chapter of the collection, though, there is also room for a rather more heart-warming image of Münzer: a picture taken in July 1930 in a beer garden (67) where he sat down with other members of the "Geographia", a Münster walking society consisting mostly of academics and local notables. The severing of his ties with it in November 1938 was another factor contributing to the deep loneliness of his final years. Hans-Joachim

Böckenholt (39-75), a distinguished Münster local historian, charts the whole history of Münzer's involvement with the "Geographia", largely relying on previously unpublished records of the Society. The circumstances that led to Münzer's resignation are not adequately recorded, although the link with *Kristallnacht* is clear. Two moments stand out from the records of the following months: the first meeting after the departure of Münzer and another member of Jewish origin, Paul Litten, was taken up by a somber discussion «interner Angelegenheiten, die bei allen Anwesenden ein Gefühl der Trauer und Wehmut auslösten»; and when the Society met in November 1942, a month after Münzer's death, its president said «warm words» in his memory (72).

The two following contributions focus more specifically on the nature of M.'s contribution to scholarship. Wilfried Nippel (77-87) gives a fairly cursory, and on the whole rather feeble, overview of Münzer's work, which adds little to the discussions provided elsewhere by Ridley and Hölkeskamp. He is right, though, in defining Münzer as a «stiller Gelehrte» (77) that had no impact on the academic politics of his time and no school either: the influence he had on others was largely through his published work. It is rather more debatable that the *pièce de résistance* of Münzer's work are the articles in the Pauly-Wissowa. The recently republished *Kleine Schriften* show that short articles were a genre that was especially congenial to him. One of these, *Ein römischer Epikureer* (RhM 69, 1914, 625-9), is the starting point of one of the finest pieces in this volume, the study of Lucius and Appius Saufeius by Matthias Haake (429-53), an exemplary model of how prosopography, intellectual history, and political developments can shed light upon each other and feed into a discussion that reframes the terms of a problem (on L. Saufeius cf. also the recent paper by N. Gilbert, CPh 114, 2019, which Haake had a chance to see in draft).

Another firm highlight of the volume is a paper in which one of the most accomplished practitioners of prosopography of our time, Matthäus Heil, puts to the test the use of the prosopographical method by Münzer (91-110), effectively placing it into its historical context and providing a detailed and strikingly effective survey of the terminology he employed in *Romische Adelsparteien und Adelsfamilien* (98-99): as a gentleman «von deutschnationaler Gesinnung», he transposed the terms and the concept of Wilhelmine Germany onto late Republican Rome. Yet the potential opened by his work remains worth recognizing: if used properly, prosopography becomes a formidable tool to overcome the deficiencies and the bias of the literary evidence. That is more obviously the case for the imperial period, when substantial amounts of epigraphical material become available: yet the use of the prosopographical method can lay the foundations for provocative and demystifying accounts. There is, in this piece as well as in the rest of the volume, no discussion of what might have shaped Münzer's interest in prosopography, other than the invitation he received from Georg Wissowa to contribute to the *RE*; there is no reference to the work on elites that Gaetano Mosca, Vilfredo Pareto, and Robert Michels did between late nineteenth and early twentieth century, and on the influence that might have had on him; even the connection with Gelzer, whom Münzer taught at Basle, is hardly at all explored (with the important exception of 82 f.).

While there is no question that Münzer has been suitably celebrated in this book, there remains scope for a fuller assessment of his intellectual trajectory: a brief that the reserved nature of the man and the complete loss of his papers considerably complicate. A number of pieces in this volume engage with aspects of Münzer's work, sometimes using it as a starting point, sometimes as a polemical target. Francis X. Ryan (111-34) discusses at length a difficult prosopographical puzzle, on which Münzer of course put forward a view: the dating of the censorship of Acilius, known only from a letter of Fronto, which Ryan places in 64 BC, at the end of a lengthy, in places overly polemical discussion (the case against a 1979 paper by Monique Dondin is especially tiresome, and even C. Cichorius receives a stern telling off; I am not clear on what grounds one can claim that Sulla recruited too many young men in his

lectio, 127). Ann-Cathrin Harders (197-214) provides a thorough assessment of how Münzer's work has changed the way we study the history of the Roman family, built on a strong overview of the scholarly debate (although I missed some engagement with J.H. Richardson's work on the Fabii and the historiographical tradition, or indeed with A. Pistellato's study of the Sentii Saturnini). Harders explores the three principles on which kinship ties are built – *cognatio* (blood kinship), *gens* formation, and *agnatio* (kinship through marriage) – and draws attention to their complex interplay. The core point of the paper, that the Roman family is a political problem, is important, and Harders rightly draws attention to the decisive contribution of Münzer in sharpening minds on this issue.

Jonathan Prag (287-307) presents an important position piece stemming from his project on Roman Republican imperialism, in which he makes a valuable case for putting the action of Rome in the Western provinces, rather than in the East. While his main, obvious reference point is William Harris, he also puts to the test the idea that aristocratic factions played a discernible role in the making of the empire, which was indeed launched by Münzer, and further developed by Scullard and Càssola (295 f.). Prag rightly notes that restoring agency to the individuals that were part of the Roman nobility and of their intellectual horizons is crucial to any study of the Roman imperial strategy. His integrative reading of Roman imperialism is based on very different premises from Münzer's: yet he himself recognizes that the need for a careful inventory of the evidence and a searching reconstruction of the basic categories is as pressing a need for his project as it was to Münzer's. An even warmer appreciation for Münzer's achievements and method comes from Henriette van der Blom (325-34), whose chapter on oratory and political career is a compact summary of her 2016 monograph, which will be a useful addition to undergraduate reading lists and ends with a note in which she records her «tremendous debt» to Münzer's prosopographical work. Christoph Lundgreen (335-60) presents a further development of his work on rules and decision-making in Republican Rome in which he focuses on the role of vetoes and interactions between families, and with the view that the power of veto was distributed among different families: a scenario that is here refuted after a thorough discussion. Münzer is avowedly peripheral to the argument: political theorists like Giovanni Sartori receive much greater attention. A paradigm in which power is handled by a clique of families and a series of widely agreed assumptions could not be further removed from a model in which the emphasis is placed on the role of structures and negative powers. Lundgreen is very clear, though, on how *Römische Adelsparteien und Adelsfamilien* remains part and parcel of any discussion of the problem through the wide range of material that it readily offers to the analysis; it also offers, as Lundgreen notes (352 n. 57), surprising insights into problems of political culture, and even into the integration between religious and political dynamics. Marlis Arnold and Jörg Rüpke (413-27) briefly bring another set of prosopographical insights to the debate – Rüpke's *Fasti sacerdotum* are a masterpiece of the genre – and effectively argue against the instrumentalist approach that informed Münzer's discussion and that still creeps in recent scholarly treatments (at 414 there is an amusing exegesis of a passage of Pina Polo's *The Consul at Rome*). Much of their analysis, though, is devoted to the limitations of the concept of civic religion to a holistic understanding of the religious experience of the Roman Republic. Temple building and construction offer valuable examples of the limitations of such perspective. The closing piece by Erich Gruen (553-67), based on the *Festvortrag* he gave at the Münster conference, is an elegant restatement of the main arguments of his great 1974 book *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*, suitably opened by an acknowledgement of his debt to Münzer. There is also a valuable attempt to identify some key developments in the historiographical debate of the last quarter of a century or so, and a valuable new point at the end of the paper. If it is true that the fall of the Roman Republic was not an inevitable outcome, Gruen concedes that it did have deeper roots than certain aspects of the argument of *LGRR* would suggest. Whatever motives the Social War

might have had, it was an historical experience that set against each other men that had long-standing connections. It opened new avenues of civil strife by alerting a generation to the potential of conflict and its rewards, and by revealing the impact of destructiveness on the internal front.

There are a number of papers in this collection, though, that do not mention Münzer at all – not even in the bibliography – and whose inclusion seems to be justified merely by their being studies on Republican topics. Different readers will hold different views on whether this should be a sufficient criterion; yet it is undoubtable that there is much to learn from each of them, and that they warrant at least a brief discussion. Heikki Solin (135-53) provides a wide-ranging and rhapsodic treatment of the Roman naming system in the Republic, which works more as a series of tabular points than as a sustained argument, and has one mention of a *RE* entry by Münzer: a useful reference discussion, which overlaps with other contributions of the same author (esp. in P. Poccetti [ed. by], *L'onomastica dell'Italia antica*, Rome 2009). Reinhard Wolters (155-83) charts the presence of family themes in some aspects of the coinage of the late second century BC: a spirited contribution to the study of important aspects of the political practice and culture of the period, which is gaining increasing prominence in the debate. The limitations of the long-standing notion of *Familienpropaganda* to make sense of the Roman coinage of this period are effectively denounced, and attention is pertinently drawn to the references to ongoing political issues in the coinage in this period. The discussion also offers some welcome insights into how the law on the secret ballot of the 130s brought a change in the political culture: a greater sensitivity to the theme of publicity and the possibilities of political communication. Jochen Martin (187-95) gives a general survey of the evidence for agnatic and cognatic families, and through that discusses the position of the woman in the early Republican Roman family, and argues that it was more prominent than usually argued: the position of the wives of the holders of archaic priesthoods, such as the *flamen Dialis* and the *rex sacrorum*, is seen as a stronger pointer towards a scenario in which they may well not have been an agnatic family straightforwardly structured around the *paterfamilias*. Henrik Mouritsen (215-30) offers an important study of Cicero's *familia urbana*, in which much important evidence is discussed or helpfully listed: he is right in reminding us that Cicero, who had a substantial household, was by no means one of the richest members of the senatorial order. The main contention of the paper is that the households of the 'extended elite' made up a high percentage of the adult population (222), which Mouritsen quantifies to 120,000 people (it is unclear to what period the figure refers – the mid-first century BC?); it would have been interesting to see how he reads Sulla's manumission of '10,000' slaves of the proscribed (App. *BC* 1.100, 104) against that background. A key underlying assumption of the argument is that the elite had a «preference for tied labour» (223), and I do not think this central contention has been properly argued. The claim that there was no such thing as a discernible «separate category of working but independent, educated and materially comfortable Romans», and therefore no «politically active plebs» (226), requires more careful demonstration. Lisa M. Mignone (231-53) has a thought-provoking discussion of how space and politics are intertwined in Republican Rome, and specifically on the implications of the lack of long-term town-planning. There are a number of sophisticated theoretical insights and some valuable case-studies in this piece; yet the lack of engagement with Harriet Flower's work on *vici* in the Gracchan period and with Amy Russell's work on the politics of space in Republican Rome is a missed opportunity, which is not fully justified by the delay between the 2012 conference and the 2017 publication date of the volume. In a piece that is intended as a *Fortsetzung* of Welvei's *Sub corona vendere*, Yann Le Bohec (257-67) provides a short overview of the evidence for enslavement in the *De bello Gallico,* and concludes that the capture of large numbers of slaves was not a priority to Caesar: he makes much of the tendency in the *Commentarii* not to record and quantify the capture of prisoners. What is lacking,

though, is any discussion of the literary dimension of the work and of the criteria with which the material is selected and presented, on the one hand, and of the sources of the slave market in the late Republic, on the other. One also misses any mention of the exchanges between Cicero and his brother Quintus on the arrival of slaves from Gaul, and of the evidence for mass enslavement given by authors like Velleius and the Elder Pliny.

Francisco Pina Polo (269-85) puts forward the view, presented in greater detail elsewhere, that it is unhelpful to speak of Pompeian *clientelae* in Spain: the target of his somewhat laboured polemic is Ernst Badian, rather than Münzer. Michael Jung's brief piece (309-21) is largely a narrative account of the Civil War of 83/82, in which he identifies the important theme of the role of ethnic groups and corroborates a familiar point: identifying the Samnites as the main target of his offensive was central to Sulla's case for what was in fact a civil war. The extent of the impact of the war on the Samnites receives no attention: the focus is squarely on the literary representations of the conflict. Uwe Walter (361-79) offers a highly thought-provoking piece on the cultural construction of risk in the Republican elite and its ties with political choices, framed through five significant case-studies, ranging from C. Popillius Laenas' encounter with Antiochus IV in 168 to the actions of the tribune Q. Caecilius Metellus in January 62. The important message that this paper puts forward is that the internal competition within the elite is best understood against the wider backdrop of cultural constructions of risk. We could not be further afield from the orderly, predictable system of family-centered competition envisaged by Münzer. As Walter shows, though, the study of these elite cultures of risk must be steeped in the close engagement with specific case-studies; Münzer's work remains invaluable in that connection. Bernhard Linke (381-99) pursues a similar set of concerns from a less creative standpoint by providing a discussion of approaches to victory in the Republican nobility, with a special emphasis on the period between the Hannibalic War and Pydna (in fairness, he does quote Münzer's 1920 book, in n. 11): a period in which, as the predicament of L. Aemilius Paulus after Pydna poignantly shows, large-scale military successes turned into a major risk for the stability and cohesion of the nobility. Sumptuary legislation is of course an important feature of attempt to police competition within the Republican. Jean-Jacques Aubert (403-12) takes no interest in that, though, and frames his crisp discussion of the matter around economic problems; his short piece will be a valuable addition to undergraduate reading lists, for which good and brief discussions of sumptuary legislation are lacking. Karl-Joachim Hölkeskamp (457-95), whose preface to Münzer's *Kleine Schriften* has done much to illuminate his historiographical method, does not have any discussion of his work, except for a quick opening reference to his use of the notion of *Partei*. The focus of his extraordinarily dense discussion is on the concept of political culture, which he frames through a thorough engagement with theoretical literature; the Roman Republic comes into play only in the second part of the paper. Some of the ground that Hölkeskamp covers here will be reasonably well known to his readers – notably the emphasis on the performative dimension of triumphs and *contiones*, and the focus on «hierarchische und konsens-generierende Mechanismen». Yet he has never put forward quite as comprehensive an argument on this specific point, and this piece will have to be required reading for anyone who is interested in exploring the connections between Ancient History and modern political theory, as well as for those who have an interest in the historiographical trajectory of a scholar that has had such a central role in bridging German- and English-speaking debates on Republican Rome.

The papers that round off the collection have a broadly comparable interest in problems of political culture and their bearings on political practice: Alexander Yakobson (497-516) puts forward a new version of his familiar case in favour of the enduring weight of Roman public opinion, not least in the dealings with it of consuls and *consulares*; Egon Flaig (517-34) has a wide-ranging discussion of *contiones*, which does not yield ground-breaking points, but has

a valuable focus on the 130s BC; he has insightful comments on the impact of the introduction of the secret ballot in the role of the *contiones* (525 f.). In a piece that could largely be read as complementary to Flaig's, Martin Jehne (535-49) turns to the rule of the Roman people, first as an institution, and more broadly as a centre of power «im Alltag» (545) that no one could afford to circumvent. Not much of what is to be found in this final section on *Politische Kultur in Rom* will strike readers as fundamentally original; yet having this substantial suite of essays between the same book covers will greatly aid the work of advanced graduate students and historians of other periods seeking reliable orientation in the German-speaking debate on the Roman Republic.

This important and refreshingly diverse collection might be rather dispersive in places, but should feature in any serious Ancient History library, and firmly belongs on the reading list of any course on the Roman Republic. If there is a unifying message coming from it, it is a call to override narrow specialisms and engage in meaningful conversations between scholars working on areas that are usually seen in isolation from one another. The cumulative case it makes for integrating political and social history is very effective. The history of the discipline and its debates should never be far out in the background: in many ways, that is a precondition for asking effective questions. There is, quite simply, no such thing as a traditional way of studying the Roman Republic. – Students of the period will learn a great deal from this book. They would learn even more if it had indexes.

Newcastle University

Federico Santangelo
federico.santangelo@ncl.ac.uk

Finito di stampare il 30 agosto 2019