

Rome) from the German menace, eventually used Germans to conquer Gaul. In the Civil War, the cavalry were decisive in the almost bloodless victory over Afranius in Spain, and so highly did Caesar think of the *Doppelkämpfertaktik* that before Pharsalus he trained a new force — the Germans having been mostly left behind in Italy — to fight in this way. The African campaign of 49 B.C. is dealt with more from a literary point of view; the comparison drawn between Caesar's depiction of Sabinus' downfall (*B Gall* 5) and that of Curio (*B Civ* 2) is detailed and very interesting, though I should hardly have expected to find it under the title *Caesar zu Pferde*.

This raises a perplexing question: what is the unifying theme or subject matter of this book? It is hard to understand, as far as the historical questions are concerned, why the evidence of the pseudo-Caesarian corpus is so little exploited, especially when the *Spanish War* is preoccupied with cavalry matters; similarly, for what reason is Hirtius' *Gallia* 8 considered, but the *Alexandrian War* (possibly also written by Hirtius) overlooked?

Some obvious evidence is missed. For example, S. catalogues the thousands of kilometres Caesar journeyed to and fro as governor of Gaul, something which 'only an excellent rider with great endurance' could manage (19); yet Suet., *Iul.* 57, which indeed describes him as a skilful horseman, also tells us he 'travelled very great distances with incredible speed in a carriage'. Other evidence is over-interpreted. For example, *B Gall* 5.35 does not mention cavalry (185); similarly, the mixed force of Numidian infantry and cavalry (*B Civ* 2.25) are taken to be *Doppelkämpfer* (172 n. 173), whereas the source does not say this, and indeed the number of horse and foot does not match.

Still, there is much of value here. A self-contained 'equestrian precis' (262–302), dealing with ancient horsemanship and the most relevant aspects of equine natural history, is appended. One useful insight amongst many is that a relatively high level of remounts (i.e. extra horses beyond the number of troopers) was required in antiquity, because of the lack of iron horseshoes. This factor is often overlooked in the examination of the logistical requirements of ancient armies. Also of great interest are the author's successful experiments, illustrated by photographs, with the mounted use of the spear, which help elucidate certain aspects of the *Germania*, and the *Doppelkämpfertaktik* (with S. being pulled along by a galloping horse).

University of Manchester  
James.Thorne@manchester.ac.uk  
doi:10.1017/S0075435812000548

JAMES THORNE

S. KOON, *INFANTRY COMBAT IN LIVY'S BATTLE NARRATIVES* (BAR International Series 2071). Oxford: Archaeopress, 2010. Pp. ii + 149. ISBN 9781407306322. £34.00.

The rehabilitation of Livy as a historian has rested primarily on his substantial literary talent. A new line of enquiry is now beginning to emerge, initiated boldly by Miriam R. Pelikan Pettinger's recent volume on triumphs in Livy (2008), whereby scholars sift the *Ab Urbe Condita* for insights which the text may provide on Roman history. In this book Sam Koon explores Livy's representation of infantry battle. K. suggests that Livy had some military experience (23). K.'s Livy may not be an expert military historian, but he merits acknowledgement as an 'intelligent amateur' (26). This is an important assertion which challenges the assumption that Livy had little knowledge of the practical matters about which he wrote in his history.

Ch. 1 serves as a brief introduction. Ch. 2 constitutes the traditional literature survey in the form of Roman infantry battle as K. delineates theoretical issues and surveys the vast literature on Roman warfare. Ch. 3 provides context through general analysis of Livy as military historian with an overview of his representation of battles. Chs 4–6 provide the bulk of the analysis through close scrutiny of Livy's use of combat vocabulary: *currere* (or rather its compounds), *impetus*, and *inferre*, respectively. In these chapters K. methodically catalogues (twelve appendices may be found in this book) and explicates the very large number of instances of these terms, noting the historian's multi-faceted usage of each. The thoroughness of these chapters and the accompanying appendices is to be commended, since they will prove a valuable resource for further study of the representation of infantry battle in Latin historical narrative.

Two other historians who feature prominently in this study are Polybius and Caesar, the subjects of comparative analyses with Livy in chs 7 and 8, respectively; these chapters expand nicely upon analysis provided in ch. 3. In these chapters K. demonstrates that Livy effectively synthesizes the Greek and Roman literary traditions of narrating battle. Ch. 9 constitutes the conclusion of the

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