

12-20-2021

**Steele Brand, Killing for the Republic: Citizen Soldiers and the Roman Way of War. Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2019. Pp. 384. Cloth (ISBN 978-1-4214-2986-1) \$34.95.**

Anthony Smart  
York St John University, a.smart@yorksj.ac.uk

Follow this and additional works at: <https://crossworks.holycross.edu/necj>



Part of the [Classics Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Smart, Anthony (2021) "Steele Brand, Killing for the Republic: Citizen Soldiers and the Roman Way of War. Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2019. Pp. 384. Cloth (ISBN 978-1-4214-2986-1) \$34.95.," *New England Classical Journal*: Vol. 48 : Iss. 2 , 54-56.  
<https://doi.org/10.52284/NECJ.48.2.review.smart>

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by CrossWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in New England Classical Journal by an authorized editor of CrossWorks.

How many instructors are there today interested in or prepared to teach a class on Roman water law primarily as an exercise in legal reasoning? Water law, of course, is not a self-contained or coherent conceptual area of Roman law, like contract or delict: indeed, its second-order nature constitutes both its intellectual interest, representing the intersection of property, contract, procedure, and regulation over a vital but mercurial natural resource, and its weakness as an introduction to Roman law, at least to undergraduates. From a different perspective, the connections to contemporary (American) law and environmental regulation are not nearly robust enough for this book to find its way onto many law school syllabi with an interest in comparative environmental law. Yet the material is excellent and certainly graduate students and scholars studying the agricultural or environmental history of the Roman empire, or even the conceptual boundaries between *natura* and *cultura*, are likely to find these texts and problems interesting—provided that they either have the necessary background or sufficient interest and incentive to read up on Roman law along the way.

David M. Ratzan  
New York University  
david.ratzan@nyu.edu

Steele Brand, *Killing for the Republic: Citizen Soldiers and the Roman Way of War*. Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2019. Pp. 384. Cloth (ISBN 978-1-4214-2986-1) \$34.95.

There remain important questions that need to be asked about the Roman republic, and its rise to dominance across the Mediterranean world. Its political culture undoubtedly instilled a powerful sense of identity, one shaped both by defeat and victory, and, as the Roman writings so often tell us, a persistent need to defend themselves against other belligerent powers. Caesar presents the invasion of Gaul as a response to a genuine perceived threat, and a duty to defend allies. Cicero in his *De officiis* argued that Roman war was never harsher than necessary, and committed in defence of allies or to uphold the Roman sense of *imperium*. Even Sallust, who can often offer a more nuanced historical perspective, creates a bifurcated narrative of virtuous war in the mid-republic against great powers such as Carthage, set against a self-destructive instinct born through dominion and avarice in the late first century BCE. Defensive imperialism may have been, for the large part, dismantled and the aggressive nature of the Roman city and its emergent republic exposed (not just in the late republic as Sallust indicates), but this does not always leave us with a clear picture of how and why the Roman armies of the republic were so often victorious. Most modern treatments focus upon key shifts in Roman military thought and practice (e.g., Marius' Mules) or instead can suggest a logical (and sometime teleological) set of battles that create the shining early- and mid-republic we so often find in Roman historiography. This can reduce Roman military history to a series of snapshots that create a clear and logical narrative, but ignore the wider concerns, especially the social and political framework(s) that create these Roman and allied armies. What can we know about the ordinary Roman citizen soldier? How can we interpret their motives, and their beliefs? To what extent was Roman success in arms based upon the civic-ethos and belief of the ordinary legionary?

Steele Brand's book is in part a foray into this world. Pitched towards a general audience, this is a book that covers an impressive array of topics and ideas, but also one that does not fully answer the questions asked at the start. Brand sets out to show how Rome's farmers were transformed into highly competent soldiers, and how Rome "perfected civic militarism in a way no other civilization ever has" (9). This optimistic

<https://doi.org/10.52284/NECJ.48.2.review.smart>

interpretation of Rome's Republican armies is visible throughout, and in Brand's approach this has ramifications not just for the ancient world, but also for modern America. Brand identifies a connection between a "republican spirit" and the "citizen-soldier" and, in so doing, provides a clear narrative of the republic and its citizen armies. The crucial distinction between this and other popular military accounts is how often Brand weaves in discussion of American history and contemporary military service, leading to some far-reaching ideas in the final pages (e.g., 319-23).

The book is most useful as an entrance point into Roman military history. Brand has a clear understanding of ancient war, and the later structure of the book is geared around five important military engagements: Sentinum, New Carthage, Pydna, Mutina, and Philippi. Each of these are discussed with great precision, and the analysis in particular of Pydna and Mutina are useful in re-evaluating the traditional trajectory of Roman military supremacy. As an example, Brand shines an important light on Lucius Aemilius Paullus (later Macedonicus), the victor in 168 BCE, and notes quite rightly "something insidious lurking in the background" (197). This is the potential for military leaders to circumvent the normal constitutional confines of state. The observation is particularly astute as ordinarily we look later for the terrible seeds of military ruin and the rise of the military potentates. The flow of the battles, the possibilities for victory and defeat, are the strongest sections of the work. Alongside this, the book also delves into the link between the republic and early American political ideas (best seen in the passionate prologue), the ancient citizen soldier, federalism and civic beliefs and the decline in the dying years of the republic. A lot of ground is covered.

There are four issues that undermine Brand's argument and approach. First, the idea of a "republican spirit". The notion of civic responsibility is useful in any discussion of Rome's military prowess. We must remember, however, the sources that tell us this reflect the perspectives of the Roman elite, who were irrefutably bound-up with notions of republican political ideologies. They created them. We look at Cicero as the last great republican statesman, because that is what he tells us, and that is how he acts. It is worth remembering, I think, that Augustus' claims to restore the republic did not fall on deaf ears. The republic was always more an idea, than a reality, and moreover an idea created by the elite. Can we really trace the idealistic notions of Cicero into the lived behaviour and responsibility of ordinary Roman citizen-soldiers? When Sulla first marched on Rome, Appian is at great pains to tell us that no officers followed him (barring a single *quaestor*). That does not speak to republican virtue (220-21). Second, if the argument about civic belief is to stand up (albeit housed within sources reflecting the aristocracy), one way to supplement this would have been to engage with the Roman family in a much more detailed manner. The Roman family was the most crucial component in the complex network of republican society, where the past, and the achievement of those whose name you bore, always mattered. Third, the focus on Roman legionaries provides a good skeleton to the book, but a Roman army was always more than just legionaries (who, depending on when we are looking, may not have identified as distinctly, or solely, Roman). Much more could have been made of the auxiliaries and allies. Fourth, Brand also appears to suggest that modern republics (American included) have lost sight of some of their core ideals through the professionalisation of modern military forces. Brand is a former soldier as well as an academic historian, and this adds an interesting dimension to the book, where civic responsibility links both the author and the historical subject. Brand recognises that "[g]one is the sort of killing instinct among modern republics, and it is probably for the better" (321), but these ideas needed to be grounded in a much greater study of modern military theory and practice.

The book is best viewed as an informed and fluently written military history of the Roman republic, full of interesting tidbits and snapshots. Brand offers an interesting discussion around civic-responsibility and warfare. The arguments made are not entirely

successful, and should be challenged, to further recognise our understanding of the political and social realities that allowed Rome to succeed in matters of war, when so many others across Italy failed. Rome was built by (and upon) its political culture, its military might, and in the minds of some aristocratic writers perhaps also a wider sense of civic responsibility. It was also however built upon its cultural realities grounded in the Roman family, the backbone of the republic.

Anthony Smart  
York St John University  
a.smart@yorksja.ac.uk

James Uden, *Spectres of Antiquity: Classical Literature and the Gothic, 1740-1830*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2020. Pp. 284. Cloth (ISBN 978-0-19-091027-3) \$74.00.

In a way like the Gothic, James Uden's outstanding monograph (henceforth *Spectres*) may strike some readers as 'unclassical' in insight—and that is central to what makes the book so good.

On its surface, *Spectres* offers a series of case studies, moving chronologically from important precursors to the Gothic (Edward Young, Edmund Burke, Richard Hurd) through influential proponents of the genre's first wave (Horace Walpole, Ann Radcliffe, Matthew Lewis)—all British but not all English—to an intriguing American example (Charles Brockden Brown) before concluding with a crucial crossover with second-generation Romanticism (Mary Shelley, centrally but not only *Frankenstein*). Each of these studies is historically detailed and compellingly argued. Focusing of course on the writers' engagement with ancient materials, including but not limited to traditional scholarly approaches to the Classics like knowledge of Greek and Latin, Uden shows how they develop their own complex images of 'the classical.' That alone would make the book valuable: a significant study of classical receptions in English-language literature in a genre that has continued to play a role in more recent cultures and must therefore have an effect on modern understandings of ancient worlds.

What truly distinguishes *Spectres*, however, runs deeper, as Uden explores the possibility that the authors' Gothic visions of antiquity may be taken all together to suggest a way of theorizing engagement with the past that "go[es] beyond the somewhat bland metaphor of reception"—namely, 'haunting' (232, discussion 230-33; cf. 215-16). The book accomplishes this in a way that is coherent and meaningful but, fittingly, not simply classical: it does justice to its materials by gently evoking their own cherished aesthetic principles, above all the idea of an ancient but unclassical sublime. It is characteristic of Gothic works to locate the sublime at an intersection of the sensory and memory or elegy, a paradox in which present experience is most intense, even overwhelming, when centered on something past or otherwise lost.

Uden emphasizes forms of this idea throughout. For example, Shelley's patchwork creature, in *Frankenstein* an impossibly reanimated assemblage of bodies whose individual lives are past (194-95; cf. 208-11 on "Valerius: The Reanimated Roman"), may be read as a literalized embodiment of notions that Burke put more abstractly (39-46) and that Radcliffe made concrete in imagery of faded tapestries and formerly stately buildings gone to ruin (esp. 86-87). A central interest of the Gothic is thus the unbidden encounter with a remnant—sometimes a revenant—of the past that makes otherwise vague awareness of mortality especially vivid. The experience is sublime since it emphasizes the incomprehensibility of time, dwarfing human civilizations and *a fortiori* human lives. Even the sublimity of natural landscapes could be sharpened

<https://doi.org/10.52284/NECJ.48.2.review.stevens>