

"Caesar the Elephant against Juba the Snake", *NC* 169 [2009] 189–92), although one does note that her language carefully distances herself from both dating and interpretation in this case so that it is not really clear where she stands on either issue. Finally, one should note that the most original and important section of the book, that most likely to spark further debate, is probably her discussion of so-called 'triumphal paintings' in the fourth chapter where she demonstrates that the art works conventionally referred to as such were of two very different kinds, commemorative paintings produced after the event for display in a public place and, for use during the triumph itself, three-dimensional models or what was effectively stage-scenery as part of a dramatic re-enactment.

In conclusion, this is a thoroughly researched, user-friendly, and well-written book that will doubtless prove the standard reference work on its particular aspect of the Roman triumph for many years to come.

*David Woods*

ANN-CATHRIN HARDERS: *Suavissima Soror. Untersuchungen zu den Bruder-Schwester-Beziehungen in der römischen Republik*. Vestigia 60. Verlag C.H. Beck, München 2008. ISBN 978-3-406-57777-2. VIII, 344 S. EUR 70.

Since the emergence of modern studies on women in antiquity during the 1970s and the 1980s, the status and role of Greek and Roman women in the family has been one of the main topics in the field. Scholars have focused in particular on women's roles as wives and daughters. Ann-Cathrin Harders has chosen another focus, the role of woman as sister, a subject that has been much less studied. In her book she discusses the dynamics of the brother-sister relationship in Republican Rome in nine case studies, beginning with the mythical tale of the Horatii and the Curatii and ending with the emperor Augustus and the Julio-Claudian dynasty.

Harders is particularly interested in social relations and norms of behaviour concerning kinship and various grades of kinship. Most of her case studies are about well-known persons from the Late Republic. Thus, she discusses the era which was criticised by early imperial authors as an era of moral decay in which traditional family loyalties and social values were broken. Harders is looking for a pattern in the ideal relationship between brother and sister. Furthermore, she is interested in the double role of a married woman as wife and sister. Harders explains her interest in the brother-sister relationship by the fact that a relationship with a brother was usually the longest male relationship to a Roman woman, as Roman children could lose their fathers very young.

A Roman woman could create social relations that surpassed the limits of the nuclear family and benefited the family in which she was born. Before starting with her case studies, Harders discusses some anthropological theories about kinship, Lévi-Strauss in particular. The point relevant for her book is the notion that producing offspring is not the only function of marriage. A marriage also makes men brothers-in-law. Women are thus also links between two families. Harders also pays attention to Maurizio Bettini's structuralistic view of the family. Bettini has demonstrated that not only agnatic kinship but also cognatic kinship was regarded as significant in ancient Rome.

There has been a long tradition in classical scholarship in emphasising the role of marriage as a tool in strengthening and creating political alliances in ancient Rome. Kinship created

by marriage was called *adfinitas* and it meant certain social expectations for those concerned. Harders sees weaknesses in this traditional view. In many of her case studies, she points out how this model does not always work. She recognises, however, that the political significance of marriage was already clearly understood by the ancients. For example, it was said that if Julia had not died in childbirth, the war between Caesar and Pompeius could have been avoided.

Harders also gives an overview of the brother-sister relationship in Roman law. She points out that even if Roman law made a sharp distinction between agnatic and cognatic kin, the social reality might be different. Co-operation and intimacy seem to dominate many brother-sister relationships known to us.

Harders' case studies are mainly based on a systematic analysis of ancient literary sources. This also means that the cases she discusses represent ideals and values of the Roman elite. This can be considered a certain weakness of an otherwise exemplary book, but it also has to be kept in mind that due to the available sources, the values of the lower social strata in ancient Rome are, in general, hard to trace.

The first case study in the book deals with the relationships between three remarkable families of the Roman Middle Republic, the Cornelii, the Aemilii, and the Sempronii. The marriage between Scipio Africanus maior and Aemilia has been regarded as the beginning of the political alliance of the Cornelii and the Aemilii in older research. According to Harders, however, concrete examples of political co-operation between brothers-in-law are not so easy to identify. I find especially interesting Harders' discussion of the marriage of Scipio Africanus minor and his cousin Sempronia, sister of the Gracchan brothers. In some later sources, Sempronia is accused of having murdered her husband. Harders does not consider it essential if these stories are true or not. She points out how Sempronia is placed in a conflict over her roles as wife and sister in these stories and it is assumed that she is more loyal to her brothers than to her husband.

Most of Harders' case studies deal with the turmoil of the first century BC and, thus, with famous persons such as Caesar, Brutus, Cicero, Clodius and Octavianus (Augustus). Marriages of sisters served as resources for social and political networks for ambitious men seeking for high offices and political influence. Harders emphasises, however, that a brother-in-law was not automatically a political ally and the co-operation would not be certain. On the other hand, as can be concluded, e.g., on the basis of some of Cicero's speeches, it was considered natural that a man favoured his brother-in-law.

Even if loyalty to a brother-in-law was not regarded as unconditional, a man was expected to act like a good brother to his sister. He was supposed to look after his sister's best interests and to marry her off if the father was no longer alive. Furthermore, a good brother also took care of the children of his sister, especially if the sister was a widow. On the other hand, the case of P. Clodius Pulcher and his sisters shows that a too intimate relationship between brother and sister could lead to accusations of incest. The dynamics of complicated family relationships are also interestingly illustrated in Cicero's letters to his friend Atticus and his brother Quintus. Quintus was married to the sister of Atticus and the marriage problems of the couple are frequently discussed in the letters.

In her double role as wife and sister, a woman could successfully act as a mediator between her husband and her brother. The story of the Sabine women gives a mythical example of this kind of behaviour. Many women from the first century BC seem to have acted as mediators between several families. The most spectacular case discussed by Harders is probably

Octavia, the sister of the first Roman emperor Augustus. Harders emphasises that her brother was always the most important man in Octavia's life. In our sources, which actually highly idealise Octavia, she manages perfectly both her role as sister and wife. Octavia eventually failed in mediating a peace between her brother and her husband Antony, but according to the sources this was rather the fault of Antony and Cleopatra. Harders discusses widely the various activities of Octavia. It is interesting that Octavia is commemorated as Augustus' sister in her funerary inscription, not as somebody's wife.

In her conclusion, Harders sums up by claiming that Roman families could create networks only if women assumed a double role as wives and sisters. Behaving according to social norms and expectations was essential even if the law did not recognise this double role. The social expectations of a proper relationship between brother and sister remained intact even if a sister was married *cum manu* or the brother was adopted into another family. Personal emotions were not essential: a brother was supposed to act like a good brother irrespective of his personal feelings towards his sister. As for the relationship between brothers-in-law, Harders considers that the affinity enabled political networking but was not a guarantee of unconditional and close co-operation.

Harders' book is a thorough and systematic study of social relationships based on kinship in Republican Rome. Her argumentation is sound and easy to follow. Kinship can be regarded as a cornerstone of Roman society and it could certainly have political implications. This book deals with the ideals and values of the Roman elite, but it would of course be interesting if the mental world of the lower classed could also be studied. As for the woman's own point of view, one would have wished for a bit more, for brothers and brothers-in-law seem to dominate the book, though it is, of course, difficult for a classical scholar to change the nature of the available evidence. Nevertheless, Harders illustrates in an exemplary way the functions of family relationships in Roman public life and politics.

*Marja-Leena Hänninen*

MICHAEL DOBSON: *The Army of the Roman Republic. The Second Century BC, Polybius and the Camps at Numantia, Spain*. Oxbow Books, Oxford 2008. ISBN 978-0-521-88269-9. XII, 436 pp. GBP 40.

In his book, Michael Dobson approaches the Roman army of the Republic in the second century BC through the archaeological field work conducted in Numantia as well as through the works of Polybius. He aims to stimulate interest in the Roman Republican army through a reassessment of what happened at Numantia and Schulten's excavations. Much of Schulten's interpretation of Numantia is still part of the commonly accepted wisdom on the Roman Republican army.

The book is divided into four parts. The first presents Schulten's fieldwork conducted in Numantia from 1905 to 1912 with Dobson utilising even Schulten's century-old notes from the field. Schulten's work is held in high regard but it is evident that he often gave primacy to literary evidence over the archaeological record. The second part concerns itself with the structure of Roman armies of the period of the Numantine wars through a discussion of the information supplied by Polybius. This part is extremely useful in itself as an overview of the