

latter is a reflection on an earlier modelling study (S. Graham and S. Weingart, *J. Archaeol. Method Theory* 22 (2015), 248–74). Being familiar with the earlier versions of these models is highly beneficial, almost essential, for a thorough understanding of the discussions presented in this volume.

Over the last decades, a gap has begun to form between traditional historians and neoteric modellers. With the array of computational methodologies and techniques expanding rapidly, the gap is widening quickly. To avoid a rift within the field, both sides will need to make an effort. On the one hand, modellers need to keep on working hard to make their findings accessible to non-experts. This is a laborious but important endeavour. On the other hand, as also argued by Andrew Wilson in his concluding chapter, new generations of ancient historians and archaeologists should be exposed more formally during their education to the use of computational methods. This will make the classicist of the future more receptive to modelling studies. With the commitment of both sides, we can bridge the gap. The present volume serves as a guide for those scholars (present and future) who aim to reunite the field.

Groningen University  
b.danon@rug.nl

BART DANON

doi:10.1017/S0075435823000655

© The Author(s), 2023. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.

EMILIO ZUCCHETTI and ANNA MARIA CIMINO (EDS), *ANTONIO GRAMSCI AND THE ANCIENT WORLD* (Routledge monographs in classical studies). London and New York: Routledge, 2021. Pp. xiv + 387. ISBN 9780367193140. £120.00.

This collection is the outcome of a 2017 conference in Nottingham aimed at encouraging historians to take Gramsci more seriously than they have. Gramsci's interest in Antiquity was essentially political, but the essays here are not confined to his passing references to Roman history or the ancient world and draw more widely on key Gramscian notions, notably 'hegemony'. These are applied to a wide range of situations, from the power relations depicted in early Greek poetry to themes specific to Roman history.

E. Zucchetti's background paper sets the stage with a helpful introduction to the *Notebooks* in which these ideas were sketched as well as Gramsci's own uneven fate in the intellectual trajectories of post-war life. Paradoxically, in Italy itself, just as scholars of Gramsci were showing renewed interest in the philology of the *Notebooks*, this from the late seventies, among a younger generation of ancient historians there was declining interest in his work, with the *Grundrisse* displacing Gramsci as the text in which to look for Marxist ideas about Antiquity. That 'reaction' was probably best exemplified by Andrea Carandini.

M. Canevaro shows how the resilience of Athenian democracy, 'dominated by the lower classes', lay in a set of practices that fostered the political integration of the city, suffusing the whole of Athenian society with a 'common sense' committed to its continued functioning as a democracy. Following Demosthenes, Canevaro argues that it was through the honour system that the *demoi* chiefly maintained its power. M. Di Fazio demonstrates Gramsci's abiding interest in philology in a paper that looks at the (intensely political) debates around the origins of Etruscan and at Gramsci's assessment of the very different methods that were being deployed therein. E. Nicholson discusses Rome's rise to power in the Greek East through the prism offered by Polybius' life and work. Imperial consolidation was a cultural process as much as the expansion of empire had been a military one, and it crucially involved the assimilation and creation of more Greek intellectuals committed to Roman rule in the way Polybius was.

No fewer than three contributions discuss Gramsci's conception of the empire as a cosmopolitan regime. M. Balbo in a fascinating essay foregrounds a major passage of the *Notebooks* which spells out Gramsci's argument for a history of the Risorgimento that would trace its fatal division between the intellectuals and the masses back to the seminal moment of Caesar's creation of a class of 'cosmopolitan intellectuals' drawn from the empire as a whole. 'Caesar cuts the historical-political knot with his sword and a new era begins, in which the East gains so much importance that it overpowers the West and causes a rift between the two parts of the Empire' (187). This aspect of the Augustan Revolution, its 'denationalisation' of Rome and Italy, was thus profoundly

determinative of the entire course of Italian history. So Gramsci. M. Bellomo underscores Gramsci's refusal of any possible comparison between modern and ancient forms of imperialism and notes that if he was 'fully aware of the brutal aspects of Roman imperialism' (169), he also knew that Rome's successful integration of provincial elites was a unique feature of the empire that even Britain would signally fail to replicate. Santangelo in his chapter on 'Caesarism' notes that Gramsci took from G. Ferrero the idea of Caesar establishing a 'cosmopolitan bureaucracy' by entrusting many of his slaves and freedmen with important public duties. He notes that he took a keen interest in Tenney Frank's *Economic History of Rome*, which he read in an Italian translation from 1924, so one cannot help wondering how Gramsci would have reacted to Rostovtzeff's history of the Roman empire, had he had access to the revised version of that published in Italian in 1933.

In her chapter on the way Gramsci understood 'Caesarism', E. Giusti makes the point that 'what he is interested in is rather the idea of "Caesar" as it was later developed by Octavian Augustus' (243). This 'Caesar', a prefiguration of Machiavelli's Centaur, a bundle of 'force and consent, authority and hegemony, violence and civilisation' (Gramsci), is reflected in the subtle way in which Lucan's *Bellum civile* captures the malleable character of Augustan ideology. J. Paterson's essay is flawed by its odd notion of hegemony as flowing from some mysterious 'consensus' between rulers and ruled, reflecting the same conflation of consent with consensus one finds in C. Smith's chapter. 'The hegemonial narrative emerges from a dialogue between ruler and ruled' (258), writes Paterson, as if groups and series *ever* enter into a 'dialogue' in any society anywhere in history. This confusion apart, the substantive part of his argument suggests that no alternative ways of thinking ever emerged to challenge the legitimacy of the empire or undermine its 'hegemonic' narrative. The Christians were no exception, of course. The eschatology of the 'Kingdom of God' is most sensibly read as an implied statement of the Church's peaceful coexistence with the state authorities, a sort of division of kingdoms. 'Everyone must submit to the supreme authorities', says Paul in *Romans*.

With D. Nappo's chapter one turns to Late Antiquity and the 'fall of Rome'. He rightly underscores the element of originality in Gramsci's conception of history as a fusion of culture, society and economy. But here the pages on crisis/crises (279–83) yield precious little by way of any understanding of how Gramsci might have conceived the *internal* conflicts that were supposedly resolved from the outside by the invasions. That is because Gramsci's own scattered reflections on all of this add up to little. Gramsci, like the vast majority of Marxists of his generation (Arthur Rosenberg excepted), was a 'primitivist'. Nappo half-heartedly defends this stance but is wrong to endorse what he calls 'Gramsci's lucid interpretation of machines in the ancient world' (287), the idea that these were never labour-saving but merely facilitated the movement and transport of heavy objects. Andrew Wilson's seminal paper in this journal (*JRS* 2002, 1–32) showed how much more advanced the Roman use of machinery was in key sectors like mining.

In Zucchetti's concluding 'Afterthought' chapter, the claim that 'any hegemonic construction interests all the actors, including the masses, either as *cooperating with the construction*, or as negative symbols' (353) invites the perhaps not so obvious comment that *as masses* 'the masses' do nothing unless they are organised, that is, unless they function as (organised) groups. As inert serialities they are in no position to 'cooperate' in anything, much less 'consent' to anything. When Gramsci defines hegemony in terms of the 'spontaneous' consent given by the 'great masses of the population to the general direction imposed on social life' (*Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, tr. Hoare and Nowell Smith: 12) by ruling classes, 'spontaneous' has the sense of passive (cf. Lucy Grig in her introduction to *Popular Culture in the Ancient World* (2016), 'This idea of *imposing conformity* through cultural means rather than through outright coercion is also key to the work of Antonio Gramsci'). Moreover, every crisis of sovereignty is a crisis played out within and between *organised* groups. The term 'social group' that Zucchetti favours here does not help, because it obscures the distinction between groups as active, organised entities (the sort that brought about the Augustan revolution) and classes as inert ensembles that can only act and become effective through organised groups. Thus 'group' and 'class' are not substitutes; groups arise within the broad matrix of classes and classes only ever act through groups.

One theme the editors might have pursued was how far Mazzarino's famous essay on the 'democratization of culture' reflected his reading of Gramsci. It is hard to believe that Mazzarino would not have read Gramsci carefully. He was a close friend of Bianchi Bandinelli whose admiration for Gramsci was widely known (14). At any rate, Mazzarino's theme of the

great 're-awakening of nationality' in the late empire and his description of that as a 'democratization of culture' resonate strongly with Gramsci's interest in the way languages reflected histories of class.

University of London

jb67@soas.ac.uk

doi:10.1017/S0075435823000230

JAIRUS BANAJI

© The Author(s), 2023. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.

#### IV. LATE ANTIQUITY

LIEVE VAN HOOFF and PETER VAN NUFFELEN, *THE FRAGMENTARY LATIN HISTORIES OF LATE ANTIQUITY (AD 300–620): EDITION, TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020. Pp. x + 332. ISBN 9781108420273. £89.99.

PETER VAN NUFFELEN and LIEVE VAN HOOFF, *CLAVIS HISTORICORUM ANTIQUITATIS POSTERIORIS: AN INVENTORY OF LATE ANTIQUE HISTORIOGRAPHY (A.D. 300–800)*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2020. Pp. cxvi + 1079. ISBN 9782503552958. €295.

Glancing over the disciplinary parapet, students of the later Latin historians have recently had cause to envy their colleagues in other fields when it comes to fragmentary works. For those who labour away at Greek, there are the seemingly endless riches of Jacoby Online, with its texts, translations and extensive commentaries. For those interested in the Roman historians up until the third century A.D., there are the monumental volumes assembled under the direction of T. J. Cornell. For those, however, wishing to investigate the historians who wrote in Latin between Diocletian and Heraclius, there was long no single collection or work of reference that offered much aid — the material had to be ferreted out from disparate scholarly literatures and a broad overview of it could be obtained only at the cost of considerable time and effort. In remedying this very obvious deficiency with *The Fragmentary Latin Histories of Late Antiquity*, Lieve Van Hoof and Peter Van Nuffelen — the prolific Ghent-based impresarios of things late-ancient — have performed a magnificent service to the subject. Every student of later Latin literature and the later Roman Empire will wish to consult this volume regularly. Those interested in Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages more broadly will discover in it much to reward them, while those who work primarily on earlier periods of classical historiography now have a clear, accessible and expert introduction to a field where they will discover that a great deal is still to be done. The appearance of *FHistLA* (the authors' preferred abbreviation) ought to be greeted with very considerable enthusiasm.

V.H. and V.N. open with a substantial introduction, setting out the scope of their project and its methodology, before offering an analysis of the genre of the works they consider, their circulation and the social and political context of their composition. There is much good sense in what they say and a refreshing willingness to point out bluntly where received opinion is misguided. Their insistence on distinguishing between authors whose works survive in fragments that are explicitly attributed to them and hypothetical texts to which scholars have assigned material is entirely correct and particularly welcome. The same can be said of the firm reminders they offer that ecclesiastical history was a less popular genre in later Latin than its reputation would suggest and that the conflict between Christianity and Paganism rarely offers a convincing explanation (or indeed any explanation at all) for why this or that author set out to write history. After the introduction, there follow fragments of twenty historians, from Carminius (rather murkily located before the fourth century) to Maximus of Zaragoza, the contemporary of Isidore of Seville. Each is given a careful introduction, sketching biography, context and issues of debate. The *testimonia* and fragments are then provided, in both their original language and English translation, accompanied by generous commentary. Three authors to whom works of history have been wrongly or very doubtfully ascribed are included, equipped with the same scholarly aids. A bibliography, a usefully full *index locorum* and a disappointingly spare *index nominum et rerum* round out the volume.