

Dariusz SŁAPEK, Ireneusz ŁUĆ (eds.), *Marcus Antonius. History and Tradition*, Lublin: Maria Curie-Skłodowska University Press, 2016, 290 pp., ISBN 978-83-7784-797-8, zł 35.70.

Among contemporary Polish researchers of antiquity, particularly with regard to Classical Studies, there are not many whose main area of investigation is the late Roman Republic. A series of conferences recently commenced by the scholars associated with the Department of Ancient History of the University of Maria Curie-Skłodowska in Lublin, however, offers a perspective of improvement in this field. The book co-edited by Dariusz SŁAPEK and Ireneusz ŁUĆ results from the second of the said events¹.

Famous individuals of ancient Rome hardly lack their modern biographers and biographies², but *Marcus Antonius...* was designed to be a product “of a collective authorship of a biography” (“Introduction”, p. 15). The collective authorship itself, perhaps, would not be anything out of the ordinary, given the general nature of joint publications. Nonetheless, in the case of a biography, in terms of the customary covering a person’s *vita* and *res gestae*, and introducing it by means of a coherent methodology, things look quite different. The scholars who started the series of conferences were undoubtedly not unaware of that and for them the character in question became a point of departure for discussing various aspects of republican (but not only) Rome. The editors of the present volume state that the least they wished to accomplish, therefore, was to present “the ending of the Republic from an original perspective of an outstanding, but after all defeated, leader and politician”. I cannot help but notice that the makers of the television series “Rome”, which is the subject of the last contribution (see below), a decade earlier must have had similar motivation. In a way, both enterprises were successful, but not without some weaknesses.

All the contributions, written either in English (thirteen) or German (two), are subdivided into four sections, which inform the reader about the contents of the chapters on the one hand, and, less obligatorily, determine the authors’ approach as belonging to one of the following domains: history or tradition. First, I shall briefly summarise each chapter, calling attention to some problematic issues where appropriate, and next I would like to discuss in more detail some points on which I hold a different view. The first section, “War and Politics. The Interchangeability of Roles”, is located on the former side of the spectrum, comprising three texts which consider Antony’s military and political career.

The joint monograph begins with Norbert ROGOSZ’s (= N.R.) chapter “Marcus Antonius as the Tribune of the Plebs (49 Year BC)”. The author observes (p. 20) that one cannot reconstruct in detail the activity of Mark Antony (henceforth A.) at the time when he held the office of the tribune of the plebs. Caesar probably helped him gain the *tribunicia potestas* in order to have someone to look after his affairs in the senate after one of his close adherents, C. Scribonius Curio, left the office. N.R. pays close attention to A.’s role in communicating Caesar’s proposals to the members of the senate, and then in providing him with a pretext to start the civil war. In conclusion he

¹ The conference devoted to Mark Antony was held on 8–9 December 2014, and was preceded by one dedicated to L. Cornelius Sulla (15–16 April 2013). Cf. D. SŁAPEK, I. ŁUĆ (eds.), *Lucius Cornelius Sulla. History and Tradition*, Lublin 2014. The idea was welcomed by the historians from the University of Silesia in Katowice, who took on the organisation of a conference on Pompey the Great (23–24 November 2015) and Julius Caesar (21–22 November 2016). The latest conference (“Spartacus. History and Tradition”) took place in Lublin on 5–6 June 2017.

² Cf. e.g. M. GELZER, *Cicero. Ein biographischer Versuch*, Wiesbaden 1969; E.G. HUZAR, *Mark Antony. A Biography*, Minneapolis 1978; R. SEAGER, *Pompey the Great. A Political Biography*, Malden 2002, to name but a few classic works, the very titles of which betray a biographical approach.

emphasises that this short period had a decisive impact on A.'s career. Contrary to what N.R. states at the outset, he manages to give quite a detailed account of this month in the life of the future triumvir.

In the next contribution, "Marcus Antonius as Commander and Comrade in Arms", I. ŁUC (= I.L.) succinctly sets forth M.A.'s course through life from the perspective of his military career. The author starts with an outline of A.'s background, including ancestors and his school years. The subject proper is brought to the foreground when A. travels to Greece in the year 58 BC (p. 37). What draws attention is that, according to Plutarch (*Ant.* 2, 4: καὶ διέτριβε τὸ τε σῶμα γυμνάζων πρὸς τοὺς στρατιωτικούς ἀγῶνας), he had started his military training at the age of 25, which seems late for a Roman from a noble family. His military service, on the other hand, began in the East, where he was a *praefectus equitum* under A. Gabinius. I.L. tries to explain the proconsul's indulgence towards A.'s resolute behaviour (p. 39) by the former's debt to the grandfather of the latter (M. Antonius the orator), which is chronologically impossible. HUZAR (*op. cit.* [n. 2], p. 27) quoted by the author in support of this view speaks of "an Aulus Gabinius" (emphasis mine) who "was quaestor [...] under Antony's grandfather". If this might be called a debt, it was one of Gabinius toward Antonii in general. The years A. spent in the East, and especially the conflict with Aristobulos II, gave him the opportunity to gain experience in combat and respect among soldiers. In the year 54 BC, he went to Gaul to serve under the command of Caesar, first as legate, and then, the author assumes, as a member of his staff. There follows a survey of A.'s activity in Gaul after taking the office of quaestor and during the civil war (pp. 43–47). We learn from Plutarch who, according to I.L., might have acquired the information from Asinius Pollio, that A. used to exercise, drink, and play the dice with soldiers. After Caesar's death and the battle at Mutina (pp. 48–53) A. found himself in a very delicate political situation. I.L. stresses that it was to a large extent due to his military abilities that the battle of Philippi was won, and that it is Cleopatra who should take the credit for the defeat at Actium. The fall of A., on the other hand, was caused by his love for the queen and disloyalty to the soldiers. Octavian's earlier tactical move – to take over Caesar's veterans – contributed largely to sealing his fate.

The paper by Michał Norbert FASZCZA (= M.N.F.), "The Problem of Mark Antony's *speculatores*", closing this section, focuses on one detail from A.'s military career, namely the use of the so-called *cohors speculatorum*. The author's aim is to explain the presence of the words *cohors speculatorum* inscribed on the reverse side of a *denarius* minted in Egypt in the years 32/31 BC. First, he expounds the differences between the *speculatores* and the *exploratores* (pp. 60–62). Next, he offers some hypotheses, i.e. either that in the republican times scouting units existed which were analogical to those of the Empire, or that A. had prepared such troop for his campaign in Parthia in the year 36 BC, or that those *speculatores* served a purpose in the navy (pp. 62–66). Without excluding any of the possibilities, M.N.F. ultimately stands for the third one.

Another section, "Between Religion and Ideology. Memory Creation?", is devoted to both A.'s use (or abuse) of religion and the view, held by his opponents and later generations, of the triumvir's (mis)conduct in the sphere of *sacrum*. The contributors' approaches range from ancient history and philology through numismatics to art history. This section opens with a contribution by Henryk KOWALSKI (= H.K.), "Mark Antony – *vir impius*?", concentrating mainly on the Roman religious system as part of the political propaganda. At the outset, the author sketches the dichotomy between *pietas* and *impietas*, and lists various meanings Cicero ascribed to the latter concept (pp. 75–77). H.K. starts the main part of his chapter by presenting the impiety of A. and his allies from a general perspective (pp. 77–79), and next he gives particular examples of religious negligence on his part. This includes above all the outrageous behaviour during the *Lupercalia*, and the participation in the process of Caesar's deification (pp. 80–82). The charges Cicero puts forward, namely that A. acts *contra auspicia*, seem to be the most important, especially as A. himself had been a member of the college of augurs since the year 50 BC. Moreover, in my opinion Cicero displayed bias when he referred to the outbreak of the civil war as an impious act on the part of A. H.K. rightly concludes (p. 87) that the invective resting upon impiety was inseparable from

the political propaganda in the times of the late Roman Republic. I would be personally inclined to think, however, that not only “[s]ome of the accusations may have been exaggerated”, but the majority of them.

Katarzyna BALBUZA (= K.B.) (“Das Feiern der Besiegung Armeniens durch Marcus Antonius in Alexandria: ein Triumph, eine dionysische Pompe oder eine Feierlichkeit *sui generis*?”) investigates the question of A.’s celebration of his victory over Armenia in the autumn of 34 BC. Sources on the campaign, as she remarks, are scant, and in the case of this “triumph” in Alexandria they are often self-contradictory and therefore require close inspection. B. first briefly outlines the accounts of Velleius Paterculus, Plutarch, and Cassius Dio (pp. 90 f.). She highlights the fact that most scholars accept the version by Plutarch, who explicitly speaks of a *triumphus* (*Ant.* 50, 6: εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν ἐθριάμβευσεν). The views of those who interpret the event as a Dionysian procession, known from the Ptolemaic tradition, are then summarised (p. 94). K.B. herself is keen to search for a middle ground, which is best rendered by Cassius Dio’s testimony: the celebration manifested a new concept of leadership, combining the features of the Roman triumph and of the Dionysian procession (hence “eine Feierlichkeit *sui generis*”).

For Agata KLUCZEK (= A.K.) a *denarius* minted by A. in the autumn of 42 BC became an object of research (“Marcus Antonius in the Space of ‘Oblivion’ or About the Representation of the Temple on the *denarius* RRC 496/1”). The reverse side of the coin features an image of the god Sol encircled by walls of a symbolically depicted temple. A.K. not only points out the unusual representation of the god, but pays attention to the fact that, apart from this case, there are no other architectural motives in the triumvir’s monetary programme. Perhaps it should be understood as a solar halo, portending a great future for an individual (pp. 103 f.). It does not, however, explain the meaning of the building. There is a possibility of linking it to a design for erecting a temple in honour of the divine Julius, but the author rejects this as lacking an analogy in Octavian’s mint (pp. 106–108). To A.K. the most likely solution seems to be that the image on the coin is the “first mention” of the temple of Sol *apud Circum Maximum* on the Aventine Hill, which A. has probably been reconstructing. The fact that A. lost the civil war, of course, prevented him from being remembered as a builder of public monuments.

Slawomir JEDRASZEK has chosen a subject which only indirectly relates to A., namely the propagandist character of some terracotta figurines found in Egypt. The possible influence of Egyptian and Hellenistic art on the Roman statuettes appears to be crucial. Since the objects cannot be precisely dated, we can only guess that those which probably depict the emperor Hadrian assuming the pose of an eastern monarch reflect Roman practice from the end of the first century BC, perhaps begun after Octavian’s victory at Actium.

The third section, “Family and Surroundings. From Solemnity to Eccentricity...”, comprises four chapters characterising A. in the light of his family connections, bringing his ancestors, wives, and brothers into the foreground. The aim of Tomasz ŁADON (= T.Ł.) (“Mark Antony’s Forefathers. Comments on the Role of the *gens Antonia* in the Final Period of the Roman Republic”) was to define the role the *gens Antonia* played in the late Roman Republic, especially during the first civil war, which means that he concentrated above all on A.’s father and grandfather (p. 132). The main portion of the chapter starts with a description of M. Antonius the orator’s political career from his taking the office of quaestor until his tragic death in the year 87 BC (pp. 133–138; personally, I would be more careful in using Val. Max. as a source of *historical* information; see esp. pp. 131, 133). One should appreciate T.Ł.’s considerations on the vague period of his censorship and absence from Rome (pp. 136 f.). After a brief outline of some minor figures of the Antonii, the author moves on to discuss the two sons of M. Antonius the orator: M. Antonius Creticus (pp. 140 f.) and C. Antonius Hybrida (pp. 141–143). From the conclusion we learn that the *gens Antonia*, not many adherents of which are mentioned in ancient sources, on the whole favoured the *optimates*, with the exception of M. Antonius the orator’s dealings with C. Marius. This policy changed in the sixties when, according to T.Ł., the house established relationships with the conspirators surrounding Catiline. It seems to me far-fetched, however, to speak of a collective conduct of the *gens Antonia*

(which applies to the entire chapter), especially as the author himself stresses that our knowledge of the activities of the respective late republican Antonii is based on the separate, individual “biographies” (this is also apparent when one looks at the attached genealogical tree: fig. 1). Finally, T.L. emphasises that the military campaigns led by the Antonii were generally successful.

The survey of A.’s ancestors is followed by a chapter by Hanna APPEL (= H.A.), “Fulvia and Antony”, which takes a closer look at the triumvir’s relationship with his third wife (for whom he was her third husband). The author first draws a sketch of her family background and undertakes a critical survey of the sources upon which the often prejudiced reception of this character by the modern scholars rests (pp. 147–150). She is mentioned in connection with A. for the first time as the forger of Caesar’s decree bestowing on Deiotarus the lands which he was previously deprived of. H.A. explains Fulvia’s support for A. in Brundisium and after the defeat at Mutina as evidence of her loyalty towards her husband (pp. 151–153). H.A. then considers Fulvia’s possible involvement in the proscriptions (43 BC), and her response to the protest by women, whom the triumvirs intended to tax heavily. Next, in a very transparent manner, the author determines Fulvia’s role in assigning land to the veterans, and in starting the so-called Perusian war (pp. 156–159). Although, whatever her own agenda, she did her best to grant A. supreme power in Rome, it was her death in Greece, after L. Antonius was defeated, that enabled A. and Octavian to restore peace. It follows from H.A.’s discussion that the hostile picture of Fulvia preserved by many ancient sources (Octavian’s propaganda aside) results from a conviction that a woman should not engage in politics.

D. SŁAPEK (= D.S.), who also wrote the “Introduction” to this volume, explores the gladiatorial imagery used by Cicero to depict L. Antonius in a study entitled “Lucius Antonius – *gladiator Asiaticus*. Gladiatorial Episode Seen Through the Eyes of M. Tullius Cicero”. The chapter opens with a short sketch of the state of research on the Roman invective, where D.S. calls special attention to the conclusions reached by Anthony CORBEILL, who urges that the criteria of plausibility should be appreciated when it comes to political arguments *ad hominem* (pp. 165–167). The author continues by enlisting all the passages in Cicero’s *Philippics* where an allusion to L. Antonius as gladiator occurs, and puts forward a general idea of Cicero’s rhetorical tactics resting on the comparison of the political situation to a gladiatorial competition (pp. 168–171). Getting to the heart of the matter, D.S. first analyses the speaker’s references to A. as gladiator, rightly assessing them as conventional; in the case of his brother, however, he argues convincingly that the amount of details and the way in which they are handed down to the audience is a solid argument in favour of the historicity of his gladiatorial episode (pp. 172–178). I think that the motif of L. Antonius’ scar / wound (pp. 177 f.) could also be seen as part of the argumentation called *signum*. Cicero himself listed “blood” as its constituent³. Additionally, the author tries to account for the expression *gladiator Asiaticus*, suggesting that it might refer to the gladiatorial *munera* organised outside Rome (e.g. in Mylasa, where L. Antonius was supposed to have engaged in such an event).

A similar subject was chosen by Agnieszka DZIUBA (= A.D.), who in her chapter (“The Effeminate Spartacus”. The Rhetoric [*sic*] Description of Marc Antony in Cicero’s *Philippics*”) focuses on a rhetorical image of A. as created by Cicero in his *Philippics*. Due to the scale of the problem, she confines herself to two motifs: his alleged effeminacy and his gladiatorial features (pp. 185–187). With regard to the former, she concentrates on A.’s “relationship” with C.

³ Cf. Cic. *Inv.* I 48: “signum est, quod sub sensum aliquem cadit et quiddam significat, quod ex ipso profectum videtur, quod aut ante fuerit aut in ipso negotio aut post sit consecutum et tamen indiget testimonii et gravioris confirmationis, ut cruor, fuga, pallor, pulvis, et quae his sunt similia” and Cic. *Phil.* 5, 20: “sanguinem nostrum sitiēbat [*scil.* L. Antonius], suum in illa gladiatoria pugna multum profuderat”. Belonging to the category of *probabile*, it would also conform to what A. CORBEILL postulates. One is also reminded of the scars of M.’ Aquilius, tried for extortion in the year 98 BC, exposed by M. Antonius the orator during the trial in a spectacular fashion (Liv. *Per.* LXX; Cic. *De or.* II 194–196 = *ORF*², pp. 227–229. See also Cic. *Verr.* II 5, 3; Quint. *Inst.* II 15, 7).

Scribonius Curio, which served Cicero in undermining his opponent's credibility in order to eradicate him from public life (pp. 187–191). Then A.D. moves on to the Ciceronian description of A. as gladiator or, more precisely, Spartacus (pp. 191–193). In *Phil.* 4, 15 (“Est igitur, Quirites, populo Romano, victori omnium gentium, omne certamen cum percussore, cum latrone, cum Spartaco”) the author is unable to determine “the semantic context of the epithet *Spartacus*” and she rejects K. KUMANIECKI's view that “*Spartacus* was for Cicero a synonym for the *outlaw*” (p. 193). I think that in this passage Cicero refuses A. any signs of a conciliatory attitude, accusing him of the utmost cruelty and a lack of credibility (“*pacis vero quae potest esse cum eo ratio in quo est incredibilis crudelitas, fides nulla?*”). We know from Appian that M. Licinius Crassus rejected Spartacus' offer of a treaty⁴. Since the speech belongs to the deliberative kind, it could have been Cicero's aim to juxtapose his rival with the slave leader and thereby suggest a similar solution: A. is just another Spartacus, and the Romans should handle such men with arms and not with words⁵. In her closing remarks A.D. states that accusing A. of effeminacy was a conventional part of the political invective, but comparing him with Spartacus served a specific purpose, namely to suggest to the hearers that A. acted contrary to the Roman customs.

The last section, “After Actium. Memory in the Hands of Strangers”, is almost entirely devoted to the traditional as opposed to the historical side of the spectrum. Its scope is broad, covering the periods of the immediate aftermath of the defeat at Actium, the later Roman Empire and even the modern era. It begins with a chapter by Oleh PETRECHKO (= O.P.), “Mark Antony's *damnatio memoriae* and the Foundation of the Principate”. The author's research considers the question of A.'s *damnatio memoriae*, imposed on him by Octavian. First he introduces some modern interpretations of this procedure and its use in republican times (pp. 199–203). In O.P.'s view, the act of condemning the memory of the triumvir was passed by the senate in the time between the battle at Actium and A.'s death. It concerned above all his images and correspondence; it was forbidden, moreover, for anyone of the *gens Antonia* to bear the *praenomen* Marcus. There follows a list of particular cases of *damnatio memoriae* during the Empire, both among the emperors and their enemies (pp. 207–212). The author concludes that the procedure used in republican times was tried out and adjusted by Octavian to the new system. Although such was probably the intention, A. is only mentioned in this chapter.

Paweł MADEJSKI (= P.M.), on the other hand, himself emphasises (p. 215) that his considerations (“Marcus Tullius Cicero, the Avenger of His Father”) will only indirectly relate to A. and Cicero. He focuses on the political career of the son of the latter (pp. 216 f.), intending to explain the sources of a prevalent view among the ancients that his taking the office of *consul suffectus* in the year 30 BC was a sort of divine justice. P.M. first briefly surveys the character of vengeance in republican Rome in general (pp. 217 f.), and the potential motives of M. Tullius Cicero, the younger. Then he argues that the son of the great orator played a symbolical role in the hands of Octavian rather than acting on his own initiative (pp. 219–222). For the *princeps*, sharing the consulate with him might have served either to give the impression that the son of the defender of the republic was his ally, or to diminish the feeling of personal guilt about the death of Cicero the father.

Later still are the times to which the chapter by Krzysztof KRÓLCZYK (= K.K.), entitled “Tiberius Iulius Sauromates (II), Freund der Römer und des Kaisers. Ein Nachkomme von Marcus Antonius auf dem bosporanischen Thron”, brings us. Ti. Iulius Sauromates II, a remote descendant of A., ruled in the kingdom of Bosphorus (*regnum Bosporanum*). The author presents his lineage

⁴ See App. *BC*. I 120: Διὰ δὲ τὴν χειροτονίαν τήνδε καὶ Κράσσοσ, ἵνα μὴ τὸ κλέος τοῦ πολέμου γένοιτο Πομπηίου, πάντα τρόπον ἐπειγόμενος ἐπεχείρει τῷ Σπαρτάκῳ, καὶ ὁ Σπάρτακος, τὸν Πομπήιον προλαβεῖν ἀξιώων, ἐς συνθήκας τὸν Κράσσοσ προουκαλεῖτο. ὑπερορώμενος δ' ὑπ' αὐτοῦ διακινδυνεύειν τε ἔγγνω. Cf. Cic. *Phil.* 13, 20 f.

⁵ I have discussed these issues in a more detailed manner on the occasion of the conference on Spartacus mentioned above (n. 1).

concisely and points to the difficulties in dating his birth (pp. 225 f.). At the time of his kingship (under the emperors M. Aurelius, Commodus, and Septimius Severus), K.K. continues, relations between Rome and Bosphorus were friendly, and he, on his part, probably fought against neighbouring peoples. It is hard to say anything certain about his policy after the assassination of Commodus and the outbreak of the civil war, but at that time, we read, he gained some land in the West, in Scythia, and in Tauris, without breaking the alliance with Rome (pp. 227–230). Next, K.K. carries out a meticulous inquiry into when and against whom the so-called *bellum Bosporanum* was waged (pp. 231–237). In his opinion, it was not against the Romans. Finally, he makes the case, mainly based on numismatic and epigraphical material, that Sauromates II wanted to and did pass as a friend of the Roman people, because he knew that the kingdom of Bosphorus would never be independent from the Empire.

The book closes with a chapter by Krzysztof ANTCZAK (= K.A.) (“The Portrayal of Marc Antony in *Rome* and the Testimony of Plutarch from [*sic*] Chaeronea”) who makes an attempt to investigate the reception of A. in popular culture. He bases his examination on the biography written by Plutarch and chooses as a case study the television series “*Rome*” (2005–2007). Right at the outset K.A. stresses that both the television makers and the Greek author are to some extent biased in their attitude. The former are led by their own vision in presenting history on the screen, and the latter focused on those episodes from A.’s life (this was a common trait of the *Parallel Lives* in general) which may have carried a moralising message (pp. 243–246). First the author looks at A. as the character on the screen through the 20th and 21st centuries and briefly describes the series “*Rome*” (pp. 246–248). In the main portion of the paper, A.’s political connections with Caesar, Cicero, and Octavian are put under scrutiny (pp. 248–252), and then his intellectual culture, as it were, and his relationships with women (pp. 253–255). According to K.A., the series maintains the stereotypical picture of A. preserved in the western tradition and tracing back as far as Plutarch. The reader gets the impression, however, that quotations from the biographer appear only casually, somewhat to confirm or complement the scenes from the series⁶. I think this does not prove that the television makers relied on his *Life of Antony* – Cicero’s *Philippics* would provide at least as much evidence to present him as a drunk and a brute. It seems to me that it would be more interesting from the sociological point of view to ask what they did not show in the movies, and why. Fulvia, the third wife of A., comes to mind immediately. Let me also point out that the name of the actor playing A. (James Purefoy) is not even mentioned anywhere.

Now, I would like to discuss a few points where the contributors’ and my own views are at issue. This has to be a selection, if only because of the limited space. On pp. 36 f., to begin with, I.L. writes: “he [*scil.* A.] started wearing a white toga (*toga virilis*) instead of a toga with a purple stripe on its border (*toga praetexta*)”. This is perhaps a slip, but I would opt to translate *toga virilis*, or *pura*, as “plain toga” rather than “white”, as opposed to the *toga candida*, for the whitening of which chalk was used⁷.

On p. 85 H.K. states that the poet Lucan offered an interpretation of the causes of the civil wars and “he regarded the gods as the driving force”. It seems to me, in the case of the poet, an overstatement, especially as Lucan is the only Latin author of a “heroic epic” who gave up the divine apparatus (VII 445–447: “sunt nobis nulla profecto | numina: cum caeco rapiantur saecula casu |

⁶ A valuable account, for instance, of Antony’s love affair with Cleopatra as depicted by Plutarch was recently given by B. BURLIGA, *The Spectacle of Love and Death in Plutarch’s Life of Antony*, *Scripta Classica* X 2013, pp. 107–127.

⁷ See the remark of the scholiast to Cicero’s *Catilinarians* (*Schol. Clun.* p. 270 ST.): “Toga enim aut pura est aut praetexta, id est aut toga aut praetexta toga”. *OLD* s.v. *virilis* 3 reads indeed “the plain white toga worn by a Roman on reaching puberty”, but I think it still needs to be somehow distinguished from the one candidates for an office wore.

mentimur regnare Iovem”; 454 f.: “mortalia nulli | sunt curata deo”). The very lines which the author quotes in support of his argument (VII 447 f.) are thus meant to be ironic⁸. The passage cited on p. 87 (Cic. *Pis.* 46), on the other hand, does not refer, in my opinion, to punishment after death. Cicero, following a passage from Aeschines’ speech and alluding to tragedy, wants to say that the consequence of crime is madness: insanity instead of the torches of the Furies haunts impious men (“hae sunt impiorum furiae, hae flammae, hae faces”)⁹.

As regards “[t]he theme of dressing up in women’s clothes [...] present in the Roman invective” (A.D., p. 189, n. 16), the fragments of the speech *In Clodium et Curionem* should not be considered conventional, since Clodius *was* in fact dressed as a woman when he broke into Caesar’s house during the Bona Dea sacred rites¹⁰.

There are also certain formal failings as, for example, the lack of indices. As is usually the case, it will not bother someone who reads the book cover to cover, but would make it difficult for anyone searching for random information about A. It is regrettable as well that the editors did not encourage the contributors to exchange their papers before publication. Some of them at least could have benefitted from doing so. To give but two examples: both I.L. (p. 43) and T.L. (p. 140) speculate about Caesar’s possible service under M. Antonius Creticus; the articles by D.S. and A.D., on the other hand, are at some points devoted to the same subject (the gladiatorial imagery in Cicero’s *Philippics*). Every specialist kind of reader would appreciate such cross-references.

On the whole, despite the abovementioned flaws (obviously, it is not for me to judge the language of the contributions), the book serves its purpose well, offering a great deal of various approaches to all sorts of problems relating to the life and deeds of A. and the later reception of this fascinating character. What is more, when turning the pages, one is able to take a glimpse at many aspects of the history, politics, and religion of the late Roman Republic, and to become acquainted with some of its intellectual and artistic movements.

Damian Pierzak
University of Silesia in Katowice

⁸ See e.g. H.L. LE BONNIEC, *Lucain et la religion*, in: M. DURRY (ed.), *Lucain*, Vandœuvres–Genève 1970 (Entretiens sur l’Antiquité classique 15), pp. 161–195; J.H.W.G. LIEBESCHUETZ, *Continuity and Change in Roman Religion*, Oxford 1979, p. 148: “I think one can say that in most of these passages [including VII 445–459 – D.P.] the gods are introduced for a literary purpose”. Cf. P. ASSO, *A Commentary on Lucan, De bello civili IV*, Berlin–New York 2010, p. 13.

⁹ See A. WEISCHE, *Ciceros Nachahmung der attischen Redner*, Heidelberg 1972, pp. 24 f.; M.R. PETACCIA, *Der Orestes-Mythos in der lateinischen archaischen Tragödie und im politisch-religiösen Zusammenhang der römischen Republik*, in: G. MANUWALD (ed.), *Identität und Alterität in der frühromischen Tragödie*, Würzburg 2000, pp. 87–111; see also my discussion in „Eos” CIII 2016, 245–270.

¹⁰ See e.g. P. MOREAU, *Clodiana religio. Un procès politique en 61 av. J.-C.*, Paris 1982, *passim*; J.W. CRAWFORD (ed.), *M. Tullius Cicero. The Fragmentary Speeches*, Atlanta 1994, pp. 255 f. Cf. S. KOSTER, *Die Invective in der griechischen und römischen Literatur*, Meisenheim am Glan 1980, pp. 118 f.