

whose movements were highly regulated by the norms and social control of the theological authorities and the wider community.

The section on literary movement is primarily late Republican and Augustan in focus, and opens with Hammar's study of violence in the late Republic, although here movement is more in the sense of a narrative sequence of events than physical movement. Corbeill then takes the familiar *Satire* 1.9 of Horace, where the poet tries to rid himself of a hanger-on who ends up being dragged off to court, as a starting point to explore legally sanctioned self-help in Rome, highlighting the inequality of the legal system and the visibility of formal and informal justice in Republican Rome. Spencer's chapter considers Varro's tour of Rome (*Lingua Latina* 5.143, 145–68), while Sullivan provides a new analysis of the 'urban tour' poems of Virgil, Horace, Propertius and Ovid.

The next section focuses on processional movement both within and in and out of Rome. Iara, for example, considers religiously motivated movement between the *urbs* and the *suburbium*, while Lange focuses on Augustus' movements across the *pomerium* in triumphs and 'triumph-like celebrations', which marked his return to the city after 29 B.C. The final three papers here focus on the development of new patterns of movement in late antique and early medieval Rome, as Christian sites grew in importance. Dal Santo, for example, provides an evocative exploration of the ways in which Pope Damasus (A.D. 366–384) systematically mapped and monumentalized Christian martyr shrines in the catacombs, enhancing the sensory experience of a visit through the use of light and shade. Andrews explores the *laetaniae Septiformes* of Gregory I, processions in which seven groups classified by age, sex and ecclesiastical status gathered at designated churches throughout the city and processed to the Basilica of S. Maria Maggiore, an important development in the devotion to Mary in Rome. Finally, Mulyran considers the implications of the construction of a series of churches in Rome linked to events in St Lawrence's martyr narrative, which could potentially have formed a new devotional route.

The final section on movement and urban form opens with Laurence's analysis of movement shaped by theories of the spatial turn, emphasizing that the size of imperial Rome produced new concepts of space, limiting movement and locating people more in neighbourhoods or *vici* than we might expect in smaller towns. Malmberg's paper forms part of an ongoing project concerning the Tiber's impact on Rome, and provides a welcome new perspective on river traffic, suggesting that the differences in form between the northern and southern ports in the city reflect their different rôles in supplying the city, and consequently the different types of vessels that they were built to accommodate, be it *codicariae* from Ostia, or lighter crafts from the Tiber Valley. Finally, Touati explores the rôle of artistic depictions of movement on imperial monuments in shaping actual movement through the city, and Bjørnebye analyses the spatial organization of the cult of Mithras in Rome from the late second to the early fifth century, demonstrating that while the majority of mithraea most likely catered for local people in neighbourhoods, the three much larger mithraea at key nodes in the city probably welcomed a wider group of people.

Overall, the range of papers and topics within this coherent volume is impressive and should interest a similarly wide range of researchers, as well as providing useful material for undergraduate classes on subjects as diverse as Augustan poetry, late Republican politics, the supply of Rome and early Christian Rome.

University of Exeter  
c.holleran@exeter.ac.uk

CLAIRE HOLLERAN

doi:10.1017/S0075435817000120

C. H. LANGE and F. J. VERVAET (EDS), *THE ROMAN REPUBLICAN TRIUMPH: BEYOND THE SPECTACLE* (Analecta Romana Instituti Danici: Supplementum 45). Rome: Edizioni Quasar, 2014. Pp. 261, illus. ISBN 9788871405766. €32.00.

The papers gathered here emerge from a workshop held at the Danish Institute in Rome in January 2013. The workshop investigated how the Roman triumph evolved during a period when the Romans were preoccupied more than ever with war. Although I question the editors' premise that the uniquely Roman ritual of the triumph indicates that the Romans suffered from a 'victory disease' to an exceptional degree within the Mediterranean system they inhabited (the comparison with Classical Athens and Sparta (9) is beside the point; better would be a comparison with Rome's contemporaries, the constantly warring Hellenistic states and kingdoms), they have compiled an interesting, thought-provoking suite of papers.

The first section of the book, 'Triumphal Conventions', examines the evidence for the 'rules' surrounding the triumph. Not surprisingly, as with most matters involving the aristocratic pursuit of *gloria* during the Republic, it seems the triumph was governed less by *ius* than by *mos* (though the authors are curiously reluctant to use this term; see below). Christoph Lundgreen's paper (titles may be found at [http://www.edizioniquasar.it/sku.php?id\\_libro=2041](http://www.edizioniquasar.it/sku.php?id_libro=2041)) on Valerius Maximus' *ius triumphandi* (2.8) divides Valerius' alleged *iures* into unbreakable 'rules' and more flexible 'principles'. Richard Westall's paper approaches the problem from a literary perspective, arguing that the triumph not only provided closure for the Roman military process, but also for Greek and Roman historical narratives, particularly in their religious aspects. Co-editor Vervae't's first essay in the collection, co-written with Christopher Dart, defends the basic meaning behind Valerius' statement that triumphs could only be granted to those commanders whose victories extended Roman territory rather than simply recovered that which had once been Roman. The authors argue that Valerius' term *ius* is too inflexible a term to apply to the set of rules governing a triumph, but was a 'principle' established over time as the nature of the Roman *imperium* evolved and the Senate in response determined the grounds upon which to grant or deny triumphs, which then became 'precedents'.

The next section on 'The Middle Republic' contains a pair of papers, one by co-editor Lange and the other by Matteo Cadario. The former argues that originally 'the Alban Mount triumph was a form of protest against the Senate's decision to decline a triumph' (68), but was transformed by Octavian into a legitimate, official triumph after Julius Caesar's and his own (jointly with Antony) Alban Mount triumphs (which lacked actual military victories to celebrate) in 40 and 44 B.C., respectively. Cadario's paper concerns the afterlife of plundered Greek artworks, arguing that victorious Roman commanders displayed 'connoisseurship' in their choice of, and decisions concerning, plundered artefacts. Some they plundered for display in triumphs and eventual display in Rome and other Italian cities; others they returned to their original owners to avert resentment; still others they sent to allied Greek cities; while *anathemata* (dedications, votive offerings) were typically left *in situ* and reinscribed with the victorious commander's name to display his piety.

The next set of papers on 'The Late Republic' begins with Jesper Carlsen's close study of Ahenobarbus' (cos. 122) triumph of 120 B.C. *de Galleis Arverneis*. Jesper Majbom Madsen in the following chapter discovers that the three generals who celebrated triumphs over Mithridates VI without vanquishing the king (Sulla, Murena and Lucullus) could do so because of political manipulations rather than rigid rules and conventions. Vervae't's second paper in the volume argues that Pompey's triumphs are yet another locus of the great general's overall subversion of Republican norms, which provided dangerous precedents for the breakdown of consensus that ultimately doomed the free Roman state. Rounding out this section is Josiah Osgood's paper, which follows on nicely from Vervae't's, in that it shows how Caesar's frustrated request for a triumph in 60 B.C., despite his doing everything necessary for gaining one — and then some — during his Spanish proconsulship of 61, determined his behaviour in the years leading up to the civil war. He would not be deprived of his triumph a second time.

The awkwardness of celebrating victories over fellow-citizens is discussed in the final section, 'Civil War and Triumph'. Wolfgang Haevener argues that Sulla, Pompey, Caesar and Octavian used different, innovative strategies to downplay the fact that their triumphs were, partly, over fellow-citizens while at the same time sending a message that order had been restored, that they were the victors who achieved this, and that their victories justified and consolidated their power. Ida Östenberg, by contrast, believes that the taboo of celebrating Roman victories over other Romans was never overcome; one could not parade Romans as defeated enemies, and so 'reality [Romans defeating other Romans] and representation [triumphs continued to celebrate Romans beating foreign others] simply did not match' (188). The Romans, therefore, developed two alternatives: the memorial monument (which was ultimately unsuccessful) and the calendar (which was very successful).

The final stand-alone chapter, 'the capstone and grand finale of [the] volume' (13), is esteemed scholar John Rich's exploration of the evolution of the triumph during the Republic, and its fluctuations in response to senatorial decision-making and military requirements. Rich provides a most valuable reconstruction and discussion of the triumphal list across 500 years of Republican history — a *ktēma es aiei* if there ever was one.

The editors have assembled a thought-provoking and persuasively argued set of papers. At the risk of essentializing, however, I wish the authors and editors could have torn themselves more fully away from the Anglo-Germanic legalistic scholarly traditions surrounding such socially- and

culturally-specific Roman rituals as the triumph. They all seem to accept, rightly in my view, that *ius* is too inflexible a concept to apply to the Roman triumph, preferring such terms as ‘conventions’, ‘regulations’, ‘criteria’, ‘norms’, ‘conditions’, ‘qualifications’, ‘rules’, ‘principles’, ‘prerequisites’, and even ‘customary law’ (136 n. 25, 144), but most eschew the terms the Romans themselves would have used. *Mos* governed whether a triumph was granted; when the conditions under which it was granted changed, for whatever circumstantial (mostly political) reason(s), *mos maiorum* was updated to reflect this, as the sources amply attest (cf. Livy 31.20.3 (*exemplum a maioribus*), 5 (*mos maiorum ... exemplum*), 49.10 (*maiores*); 39.29.5 (*exemplum ... mos maiorum*); Dio 36.25.3 (νενομισμένον); 37.22.4 (ἔξω τῶν πατρίων)). Some authors’ failure to recognize this invariably leads to terminological confusion, as well as hair-splitting and special pleading. So, for example, despite Lundgreen’s assertion that his division of Valerius Maximus’ *iures triumphandi* into unbreakable ‘rules’ and more flexible ‘principles’ is a ‘heuristic instrument [that] allows us to account for all sources combined’, a glance at his table on the same page (24) shows the ‘rules’ were anything but: one was gone by 326, another by 200, and the third by 81 B.C. The last case, Pompey’s famous request for a triumph without actually having held command as a magistrate, Lundgreen insists ‘is no counter-argument’ (23) since he is the exception that proves the rule. But *mos maiorum* was built upon such exceptions; they are indeed its very essence.

The volume itself is well-presented with relatively few typos and few slips (‘Perseus’ for ‘Philip V’ (58), ‘Massalia’ for ‘Massilia’ (106, 112), ‘Black [sc. Sea]’ (120), ‘*honus novus*’ (126), ‘*veni, vidi, vinci*’ (129)), though the folio format makes it a bit unwieldy and difficult to read (especially on public transport), and the lack of a consolidated bibliography seems an odd editorial decision.

The Australian National University  
paul.burton@anu.edu.au

PAUL BURTON

doi:10.1017/S0075435817000028

A. H. LUSHKOV, *MAGISTRACY AND THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE ROMAN REPUBLIC: POLITICS IN PROSE*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015. Pp. xi + 201. ISBN 9781107040908. £65.00/US\$99.00.

The subtitle of this book, ‘politics in prose’, foreshadows the author’s intent to pioneer a new approach to the topic of magistracy. A study like F. Pina Polo, *The Consul at Rome: the Civil Functions of the Consuls in the Roman Republic* (2011), or the recent edited volume, *Consuls and Res Publica: Holding High Office in the Roman Republic* (2015), provides prosopographical data, articulates stages of development and explicates the system underlying individuals’ behaviour. By contrast, Ayelet Haimson Lushkov argues, literary analysis of historiographical narratives provides the material for an investigation of moral and political complexities, and enriches our understanding of Roman political culture. In the epilogue at the end of the book, L. turns to drama as an analogue for history in order to explicate her methodology: historiography, like tragedy, often gives us ‘a vivid depiction of conflict and resolution, action and reaction, causes and motivations, emotional choices, and a didactic framework to leverage the aesthetic into the morally useful’ (172). Stories about magistracy provide a different kind of evidence than historical data, and thus allow L. to shed new light on magistracy, in L.’s words, ‘as a textual phenomenon’ (3). L. particularly selects passages which illustrate how conflicting interpretations of how a candidate or an elected magistrate ought to behave arise, and how those conflicts are ultimately resolved. Almost all of these case studies come from Livy, and almost all have to do with consuls or consular candidates, especially episodes in which a candidate’s or a consul’s claim to legitimacy or authority is challenged.

L. proposes reading magistracy through the heuristic of exemplarity, invoking the models of M. Roller (*C.Phil.* 99 (2004), 1–56) and J. Chaplin, *Livy’s Exemplary History* (2000) in particular. She suggests that magistracy has a ‘triple valence when it comes to exemplary discourse’ because it ‘participates in the construction of other *exempla*’, provides a vehicle for individuals to act in a conspicuously exemplary way, and acts as a microcosm of sorts for the Republic as an ideological construct (4). L.’s definition of exemplary discourse seems to encompass individual magistrates’ attempts to assert moral excellence of various kinds (that is, exemplary qualities) as well as historians’ use of individual characters to prove more general points or illustrate moral truths. Her operating definition of exemplarity is thus broader than either Roller’s or Chaplin’s, sometimes stretching too far: not every event or personality trait