

28 pages of translation are followed by 227 pages of commentary. Justin's narrative is divided into sections of a chapter or so in length, each of them supplied with an introductory note, citing other sources and a select bibliography. The actual commentary is a dense work, abounding in references to the material cited in those introductory notes and to much more besides—and, though users of this book do not need to know Latin (or Greek), many of the modern works cited are in German (especially), French or Italian. Heckel has written much on Alexander before, and is thoroughly at home with the sources and modern studies: what he has put together here will be extremely useful to advanced students and to their teachers, though readers at the lower end of the market envisaged for this series may find it intimidating.

At the end of the main translation, Yardley translates the Prologues of books XI and XII of Trogus. In appendixes he translates the fragments from those books, the end of Justin IX (cf. above) and Justin 10.3; and finally he collects expressions in Justin XI-XII which are common to Justin (i.e. Trogus) and Livy, those which are likely to be Trogan but not Livian, expressions apparently due to Justin himself and not to Trogus; and echoes of poetry in Justin. The book has three maps and an index.

This is a valuable addition to the range of books making it possible for those who do not read Greek and Latin to study Alexander seriously, and the commentary will be useful to all who work on Alexander at an advanced level.

University of Durham

P. J. RHODES

* * *

Mary Jaeger, *Livy's Written Rome*. University of Michigan Press (Ann Arbor, 1997). xii+205pp.*

Livy enthusiasts have been fortunate that there has been a substantial rise of interest in their author in the last few years and many major works of scholarship on the historian have been produced.¹ Mary Jaeger's book builds par-

* I thank the *Histos* team for help with presentation.

¹ Among the most notable: *Texts*: J. Briscoe (ed.): *Livius Ab Urbe Condita Libri xli-xlv* (Teubner, Stuttgart 1986); *Livius Ab Urbe Condita Libri xxxi-xl* (2 vols., Teubner, Stuttgart 1991). *Commentaries*: fundamentally historical is J. Briscoe, *A Commentary on Livy Books XXXI-XXXIII* (Oxford 1973); *A Commentary on Livy Books XXXIV-XXXVII* (Oxford 1981); less heavy-weight and wider-ranging are the workmanlike parallel-text commentaries of

ticularly upon the recent interest in the relationship between Latin literature and the city of Rome—how a literary text represents ‘spaces’ such as fora, roads, buildings, temples, even people, and explores or ‘transgresses’ these ‘spaces’.² One recently influential volume to explore this relationship is Catharine Edwards’s *Writing Rome* (Cambridge, 1995), in which, to the satisfaction of the Livy scholar, Edwards devotes an appreciable amount of attention to Livy. But Jaeger, already well established in her own right as one of the exciting new generation of Livian scholars, now goes one better and gives us a Livy-only treatment of the relationship.

Starting on page 7 she defines the book’s argument: ‘this book examines Livy’s use of the Roman world, particularly the city of Rome, as one of his primary organising devices’, and continues on page 8: ‘accordingly, this book is concerned with the representation of space, monuments and memory in the *Ab Urbe Condita* as a spatial entity, a monument, and a lengthy act of remembering’. As far as the Roman world as Livy’s main organisational device for the history is concerned, Jaeger is of course correct. Previous to this argument she points out that ‘books, pentads, and decades of his narrative correspond to [Roman] historical epochs’ (6). She is again correct, but this latter statement is more or less obvious: Livy is writing a Roman history with Romans as the central characters and with Romans as the intended readers. Therefore, the tendency of the Roman reader to consider himself to be at the centre of the world (as Jaeger notes on page 9) and of a Roman world-history is understandable. Jaeger is also correct in seeing the *Ab Urbe*

P. G. Walsh: *Livy Book XXXVI* (Warminster 1990); *Livy Book XXXVII* (Warminster 1992); *Livy Book XXXVIII* (Warminster 1993); *Livy Book XXXIX* (Warminster 1994); *Livy Book XL* (Warminster 1996). C. S. Kraus, *Livy: Ab Urbe Condita, Book VI* (Cambridge 1994) sets a new standard for highly sophisticated modern literary commentary on Livy; the new Ogilvie is S. Oakley, *A Commentary on Livy Books VI-X Volume 1 introduction and Book VI* (Oxford 1997); *Volume II Books VII-VIII* (Oxford 1998). *Interpretative studies*: D. S. Levene, *Religion in Livy* (Leiden 1993); G. B. Miles, *Livy: Reconstructing Early Rome* (Ithaca 1995); C. S. Kraus and A. J. Woodman, *Latin Historians* (Oxford 1997), 51-81 (important and detailed survey treatment); A. Feldherr, *Spectacle and Society in Livy’s History* (Berkeley 1998); J. Marincola, *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge 1997) is also important; *Histos* contributions include: J. Rich, ‘Structuring Roman History: the Consular Year and the Roman Historical Tradition’, October, 1996 [now in revised form, *Histos* 5 (2011)]; J. Briscoe, review-discussion of V. M. Warrior, *The Initiation of the Second Macedonian War: An Explication of Livy Book 31*, *Histos* 1 (1998) 192-8; J. Moles, ‘Cry Freedom: Tacitus *Annals* 4.32-35’, *Histos* 2 (1999) 95-184, §3.1.6 (on the intertextual relationship between Livy’s *Preface* and the Tacitean digression).

² Cf. e.g. E. W. Leach, *The Rhetoric of Space* (Princeton 1988); A. Vasaly, *Representations: Images of the World in Ciceronian Oratory* (Berkeley 1993); C. S. Kraus, ‘No Second Troy: Topoi and Refoundation in Livy, Book V’, *TAPA* 124 (1994) 267-89; J. W. Burke, ‘Emblematic Scenes in Suetonius’ Vitellius’, *Histos* 2 (1999) 83-94.

Conditā as being itself a monument—it is not just a literary monument (an exhaustive history of Rome from the foundation), but we can go a step further and designate it a structural monument as well (the complete text would amount to at least 6,000 pages of Oxford Classical Text), a size which symbolises Rome’s prominence, as Livy himself reasonably thought. Jaeger’s insight that ‘various degrees of distance, familiarity and importance between centre and edge can be expressed by a series of concentric circles representing boundaries—for example, those of the city, of Italy, of the territory under Roman control, and then of the known world’ (9) is penetrating and thought-provoking, and provides yet further ammunition for those Livy scholars who argue for the complexity and multiplicity of meaning in the *Ab Urbe Conditā*. This insight is in itself an important contribution to Livian studies.

The structure of her book is both sound and intricate: after a preliminary chapter entitled ‘The History as a Monument’, Jaeger deploys her thesis on four parts of Livy’s history: ‘The Battle in the Forum’ (book 1), ‘The Rise and Fall of Marcus Manlius Capitolinus’ (books 5 and 6), ‘Memory and Monuments in the Second Punic War’ (the third decade) and ‘The Trials of the Scipios’ (the fourth decade). This inclusion of all parts of the extant text strengthens her argument, especially as the third and fourth sections discuss parts of Livy’s history in which events predominantly take place outside the city of Rome. So Jaeger starts where she is able, it appears, most strongly to buttress her case: the early, more overtly ‘Roman’, books of Livy. She cleverly counterbalances this logical inner structure with her outer structure: in the introduction her starting point is book 45, the final surviving book of Livy, then she opens her conclusion by citing the *Preface* (*facturusne operae pretium sim ...*).

But before we examine her treatment of Livy’s history, what of her arguments concerning history as a *monumentum* (15–29)? Her approach to the notion is interestingly complex. For example, one form of *monumentum*, a gravestone, has its obvious meaning (to remind someone of a deceased person), but also a symbolic one—that of mortality. She also claims that there is even a hortatory nature to monuments, in that they inspire the beholder to emulate the actions of the person for whom the *monumenta* are constructed. In the case of the gravestone, the recording of the life of someone worthy of remembrance because s/he was virtuous encourages the viewer to a life of similar achievement. This is a very exciting point, but can the argument be taken even further? It may well be possible to do so.

It is a pity also that she does not spend more time discussing the role of the reader and the act of reading a text, a complex process, much discussed nowadays, which she mentions in passing (21). She does pick up the idea (very briefly) again (26) when she mentions the historian’s creation of physi-

cal and metaphorical space, and the fact that the historian and the reader navigate this space—but that is as far as she goes. What of this joint journey? And what of the model reader to whom Jaeger refers (28)? To her credit, she frequently alludes to the connection in a passing fashion throughout her work, but one cannot help but feel that a brief but thorough discussion of this relationship in this chapter would have been highly germane—one cannot help but feel that brief comments such as ‘the narrator and the reader also work together to create meaning ...’ (54-55) just do not go far enough. Indeed, one feels that there is enough material here for a whole chapter, if not a whole book.

To discuss her detailed approach to Livy’s text, I focus on two chapters: chapter two (30-56)—where the narrative is largely confined to the city of Rome—and chapter four (94-131)—where events outside Rome play the central role. Her decision to begin her reading of Livy with book 1 (30-56) is appropriate, as she acknowledges its geographical importance: ‘book 1 introduces the major topographical features of the city proper: the Tiber, the Aventine, the Palatine, the Capitoline and the Forum’ (7). Further, she states: ‘several features of the episode make it a useful starting point for an inquiry into these relationships ... it presents a common aetiology for two landmarks that stood some distance apart: the Temple of Jupiter Stator ... and the Lacus Curtius’ (31). Jaeger then uses these two *monumenta* as the boundaries of her discussion of the episode which, as a result, proves the overall validity of the book’s argument. This chapter, in my view, is interpretatively very strong and very informative. Jaeger has not only a narrative space with which she can work but also the city of Rome itself, for in Livy’s first book the nation is largely focused on the small city. It is here that she acknowledges the potential problems between the city in the time of ‘Livy’s contemporaries’ and that of Romulus’ Rome: ‘Livy describes the battle taking place in a setting that no longer exists, one that he himself has of course never seen, as he is writing seven hundred years after a legendary event’ (32-33). Her discussion of the Roman–Sabine conflict is centred on movements within the ‘space’ of Rome, and she makes many interesting points: the idea of symmetry between the Romans and Sabines (and her men–women–men argument) (35) and the imaginary axis along which the Romans and Sabines fight (38) are some examples. But Jaeger does, in my opinion, go too far on occasion—for example, when she states her ‘Palatine up versus Capitoline down’ theory. Yet she makes many good points: the reader/Sabine women relationship where ‘the reader sees, but the Sabine women react’ (48) and the intervention of the Sabine women in the Roman-Sabine fight in the Forum (48).

Her discussion of the third decade in chapter four, entitled ‘Memory and Monuments in the Second Punic War’ (94-131), is most welcome as Livy

21-30 has, for the most part, not shared in the recent revival of Livian scholarship. She appears to acknowledge the importance of the third decade by analysing not one aspect, but three aspects, of Livy's Hannibalic War narrative: the battle of Cannae, Lucius Marcius and the shield of Marcius/the spoils from Syracuse. There is a clear logic to this arrangement: first, the city itself, then a citizen of that city, and finally (with the shield of Marcius) a monument to that citizen that represents both the citizen and his city. This speaks well of the third decade. Jaeger's section on Cannae is excellent—her discussion of Q. Fabius Maximus' restoration of order in Rome (101-102) after the battle and of the post-Cannae episode as a whole is especially noteworthy. The idea of Livy's use of ecphrasis in her discussion of Marcius' shield definitely warrants further attention—she mentions that Livy proffers a description of the shield (127), but she does not discuss the actual ecphrasis episode. This is a rather odd omission on Jaeger's part, as ecphrasis plays an important role in ancient historiography and the actual object that the historian describes is, without doubt, itself a *monumentum*. Jaeger seems to have forgotten this point, which could clearly have strengthened her thesis as she mentions that the reader 'receives a precise description of the shield; the thought of the shield recalls the story that preserves it in the *Ab Urbe Condita*' (127). The next logical step would appear to be to examine the events depicted on the shield and their relation to the actual events, highlighting the power of the mnemonic loci that she mentions on the previous page (126). Further, her contrast between Livy and Polybius (Livy's possible source for this episode) could have been carried out in somewhat more detail.

It is most unfortunate that books 134-142 of Livy are missing. It would have been fascinating to see how Livy portrayed the Augustan re/construction of the physical city of Rome. Jaeger clearly understands the importance of this portrayal: 'in the decades after Actium, as the Romans tried to forget a century of civil war, and as the city underwent a comprehensive program of ideologically motivated construction and reconstruction, Livy produced his own morally charged model of Roman space' (13). Livy was not only affected by the Augustan re/building, but he re/presents that construction himself in the final books of the *Ab Urbe Condita*. To be able to discuss the relationship between the two would indeed have been fascinating and Jaeger acknowledges this lamentable situation by a brief and sensitive allusion in her discussion of the overall Augustus-Livy question, which is confined to part of the book's conclusion (182-183). This is, perhaps, the best place to discuss the necessarily indeterminate Augustus-Livy relationship, in a separate, appendix-like fashion to the proper text. While one generally feels that the Augustus-Livy question must always be addressed in some manner, it is best not to let such an awkward question confuse the main

text.³ Jaeger's decision to place her discussion of this point at the end of her work as if as a postscript, therefore, is a sensible one.

Finally, the matter of the citations from the *Ab Urbe Condita*. Since the subject of Jaeger's study is advanced enough to allow the presumption that the reader is at least fairly familiar with Livy's narrative (and here I mean the Latin text), I find the English translations somewhat redundant. On the occasions where she cites an extended portion of the text, then appends her English translation, she takes up a considerable amount of textual space, sometimes one whole page (e.g. 39, 42, 64-65)—is there an irony here whose precise implications I am somehow missing? Citing the English seems, in my view, to be rather superfluous, especially since when she turns to the particulars of the passage, she must focus on Livy's Latin, not her translation of it. But this is a very minor detail, one of personal predilection.

To sum up, Jaeger's four 'readings' of the *Ab Urbe Condita* are invigorating and interesting, especially the two chapters which I have highlighted. My main *caveat* is that on a few occasions she does not expand on a point that would at the very least have been an interesting avenue of discussion, and in my review I have mentioned most of these omissions. Perhaps she feared drowning in those ever-deeper waters that troubled Livy himself at the opening of Book 31. But my criticisms are indeed minor, and they do not infringe the positive overall impression that this book must make on any intelligent and committed reader. It is the primary duty of the reviewer to find at least something in a work that could be ameliorated to a certain degree or that warrants a more meticulous discussion.

To conclude, the final criterion of the success of any scholarly product is whether it has opened up enough questions to enable other scholars to build upon its ideas. To her immense credit, Jaeger has uncovered a rich intellectual vein for other Livian scholars to exploit and this makes her book a very fruitful contribution to the currently burgeoning field of Livian studies.

University of Durham

JAMES T. CHLUP

³ For *Histos* material on what remains after all a key question see Moles (above, n. 1) §§3.1.3.1 and 5.2.3, and nn. 35, 83, and 84, with discussion and bibliography; see also now A. Feldherr, 'Livy's revolution: civic identity and the creation of the *res publica*', in T. Habinek and A. Schiesaro (edd.), *The Roman Cultural Revolution* (Cambridge 1997), 136-57.