

book, where K. uses Livy to extrapolate a (new) model of Roman infantry combat, or rather to refine slightly the existing model. It is perhaps surprising that this discussion is brief, with a footnote indicating fuller discussion in a forthcoming article (which has now appeared in D. Hoyos (ed.), *A Companion to the Punic Wars* (2011)).

A few minor points of concern ought to be raised. The first is that one cannot shake off the perception of this work as a lightly revised dissertation; chs 2 and 3 still read very much as the obligatory ‘survey’ chapters of a technical doctoral thesis, which in revision perhaps ought to have been integrated into the argument in the subsequent chapters. My second concern has to do with approach to the topic. K.’s focus on terminology seems to remove individual battles from the larger context of the war narratives in which they appear. It is also unfortunate that K. does not make a stronger effort to place his work in the context of, and therefore build upon, recent scholarship on Livy. Battles are, of course, the great narrative set-pieces of ancient historical texts, and, as the author observes, Livy wrote about more battles than any other historian. The theoretical result of the synthesis between the technical analysis and the increasing corpus of sophisticated and nuanced literary analysis (especially the works of Kraus, Jaeger and Levene) would have allowed for a more complex portrait of Livy as a replicator of the Roman past to emerge. K. reveals that he is acutely aware of the psychological aspect of battle, and Livy’s apparent interest in the same. One more point: it is perhaps surprising that ancient military authors do not find a more prominent place in K.’s discussion, since at least some of them (e.g. Frontinus, Vegetius) no doubt used Livy as a source. The absence of an index locorum is a slight irritant.

These are minor criticisms which do not detract from the book’s value and it will no doubt contribute to the persistently popular field of Roman warfare studies. K. has demonstrated that Livy is indeed a viable historical source, and this book provides a useful foundation for further investigation of the representation of battle in Roman historians.

University of Manitoba
james.chlup@ad.umanitoba.ca
doi:10.1017/S007543581200055X

JAMES T. CHLUP

M. PITASSI, *ROMAN WARSHIPS*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2011. Pp. xii + 191, 24 pls, illus.
ISBN 9781843836100. £50.00.

In a 2009 book, Michael Pitassi narrated a history of the Roman navy, tracing Roman naval activity from 753 B.C. to the early fifth century A.D. In this new book P. attempts the task of writing a parallel, chronological history of the Roman warship. The concept of the work is novel, although at times the book falls short in the execution of its aims.

The book is divided into two parts. Part One consists of three chapters: ‘Sources’, ‘Interpreting the Sources’, and ‘Ship’s Fittings’. Part Two contains a chronological discussion of different types of Roman warship, divided into broad periods. This structure introduces some unusual features: for instance, ship’s fittings are discussed in Part One rather than in reference to specific examples of the ships on which they were used in the chronologically organized Part Two. This structure also means that triremes (having been in use by the Romans from the fourth century B.C.) are re-discussed in successive chapters of Part Two.

The book provides a general overview of different types of Roman warship; however, it displays some noticeable discrepancies in methodology. In particular, the discussion of ancient source material – literary, archaeological and pictorial alike – is inconsistent. Thus in ch. 1, under the subheading of ‘The Iconography’, depictions of Roman warships in ‘statuary, mosaics, coins and wall paintings’ are collectively described as all suffering, ‘to varying degrees, from a discernible lack of accuracy, being impressionistic or stylised’ (4). In ch. 2, under the same subheading, it is asserted that ‘it is not unreasonable to make the assumption that, [sic] those artists and craftsmen of old more or less knew what they were doing in representing warships’ and that ‘it is proposed that prime reliance should be placed on the “hard evidence” of contemporary pictorial representation’ (20). In this reader’s view P. wrongly conflates different sources of evidence: our interpretation of a fresco in a private dwelling, the design of a coin die, or the execution of a sculpture intended for public viewing, is not only affected by issues of different media, but of differing limitations on the detail, sets of symbols, purposes and audiences for which the depiction was intended. Similarly, P. asserts in reference to ancient literary sources that ‘it must be borne in mind that after some

two thousand years, original copies have long gone and what survives is the result of successive copies [sic] with all the consequent possibilities for errors and mistranslations to have corrupted the original text' (17). Such a line of argument is tantamount to dismissing the validity of almost all ancient literary material on the basis that it has, by necessity, been reproduced. Archaeological evidence is surveyed in ch. 1 (10–14), but throughout much of the remainder of the work, the discussion depends primarily upon depictions of Roman vessels and the diagrams which P. has extrapolated from them. Conspicuously, finds of Roman ships or their contemporaries are little used: there is little discussion of those found at Nemi (needlessly destroyed in 1944 but preserved in documentation), those discovered in 1981/82 during the construction of the Mainz Hilton, or the Punic vessel discovered off the coast of Marsala in Sicily, to name but a few well-known examples. In reference to ancient naval terminology, it is argued that 'translation and transliteration of terms relating to ancient warships is an area littered with academic argument, but one which, without "hard" evidence — that is to say the real thing or more definitive discoveries, at least — remains largely speculative' (17).

The book's distinctive feature is presented in Part Two, which is organized as a chronological account of the development of Roman warships. The chapters in Part Two are arranged according to five general periods, with the text in each chapter sub-divided according to the type of ship being discussed. The result is a sequence of case studies of general vessel types or of specific examples. Previous works on the Roman navy and Roman naval history have frequently debated the mechanics of Roman warships and here P. offers distinctive interpretations on a number of common problems. P.'s references to modern scholarship, however, are often vague and footnotes consistently omit page numbers. Conspicuous omissions are Thiel's two important works on the Republican navy and Christa Steinby's recent *The Roman Republican Navy* (2007).

The University of Melbourne
cdart@unimelb.edu.au

CHRISTOPHER J. DART

doi:10.1017/S0075435812000561

N. MORLEY, *ANTIQUITY AND MODERNITY*. Malden, Ma. and Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009. Pp. xiv + 182. ISBN 978140513147. £40.00/US\$89.95.

Compact, inquisitive, and useful, this book surveys the use of Greek and Roman antiquity by modern (particularly nineteenth- and early twentieth-century German) thinkers. Morley has read his sources carefully, sometimes providing his own translations, and he uses them in fresh and interesting ways.

'Interesting' is the operative word. M.'s six chapters summarize 'modern' views of antiquity, covering ancient economics, sociology, aesthetics, history, and rhetoric. The book's richness and vivacity grows out of its lattice-like structure, which in each chapter examines the same more or less unchanging group of modern thinkers: Schiller, Marx, Weber, Hegel, Mill, Nietzsche, Adam Smith, Richard Wagner(!) and others. Thus in the first chapter we see Hegel insisting, against the grain of his time, that modernity appears 'lively and free', and antiquity 'insipid': 'Modern times ... have worn out the Greek and Roman garments of their childhood.' In subsequent chapters, Hegel's views about historical stages, ancient art and drama, the historical irrelevance of non-European cultures, the anxieties produced by historical study, 'the limits of empiricism', and 'reason' in history are taken up and aligned or contrasted with contemporary opinion. M. deftly alludes to several Hegelian writings. The analysis then deepens and broadens as each additional thinker enters.

The book opens with a start, by quoting Gramsci, for whom its very *lack* of connection with the present made Latin worthwhile: Latin will 'accustom children to studying, to analyzing a body of history that can be treated as a cadaver but returns continually to life'. M. then poses Finley against Rostovtzeff, as 'primitivist' and 'modernist' historians. Finley had firmly criticized 'primitivism', and 'pre-modernist', though less catchy, serves better: but M. summarizes the issues succinctly and well. The chapter concludes with Nietzsche, as always a perceptive outlier, insisting 'that "antiquity" was as unstable a concept as "modernity"'. (In chapter after chapter, it will be Nietzsche who provides the provocative, often productive, insight.) The next chapter turns to economics, beginning with Marx's demonstration of the power of modern capitalism, then showing, intriguingly, how long it took other thinkers to realize that modernity was economically superior to 'ancient times'. Max Weber, overlapping with Marx in some respects, noted the increased modern emphasis on technology, free labour, state policy, the rule of law, rationalized