

Franz Steiner Verlag

Sonderdruck aus:

# Commemorating War and War Dead

## Ancient and Modern

Edited by  
Maurizio Giangiulio  
Elena Franchi  
Giorgia Proietti



Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2019

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface.....	9
Foreword.....	13
INTRODUCTIVE SECTION	
<i>Maurizio Giangiulio</i>	
Do Societies Remember? The Notion of ‘Collective Memory’: Paradigms and Problems (from Maurice Halbwachs on).....	17
<i>Elena Franchi</i>	
Memories of Winners and Losers. Historical Remarks on why Societies Remember and Commemorate Wars.....	35
<i>Giorgia Proietti</i>	
Can an Ancient Truth Become an Old Lie? A Few Methodological Remarks Concerning Current Comparative Research on War and its Aftermath.....	71
SECTION I	
WAR MEMORIALS: OBJECTS IN PERFORMANCE	
<i>Lilah Grace Canevaro</i>	
Commemoration through Objects? Homer on the Limitations of Material Memory.....	95
<i>Birgit Bergmann</i>	
Beyond Victory and Defeat. Commemorating Battles prior to the Persian Wars.....	111
<i>Holger Baitinger</i>	
Commemoration of War in Archaic and Classical Greece. Battlefields, Tombs and Sanctuaries.....	131
<i>James Roy</i>	
Memorials of War in Pausanias.....	147

## Table of Contents

<i>Nina Fehrlen-Weiss</i> The Thirty Years' War in German Commemorative Culture from the Beginning of the Holy Roman Empire to the Present – An Overview .....	157
<i>Simone A. Bellezza</i> Nation Building through Commemoration: Stalinism, WWII, and Holocaust Memorials in Post-Soviet Ukraine .....	171
SECTION II WAR DEAD: FROM CITIZENS TO SYMBOLS	
<i>Mirko Canevaro</i> Courage in War and the Courage of the War Dead – Ancient and Modern Reflections .....	187
<i>Blanka Misic</i> Cognitive Aspects of Funerary Commemoration of Soldiers and Veterans in Roman Poetovio .....	207
<i>Johannes Birgfeld</i> Commemorating War and War Dead in 18 <sup>th</sup> Century Germany .....	219
<i>Marco Mondini</i> (with the collaboration of Cecilia Cozzi) Brothers and Heroes. Literary Sources on Death in the First World War (the Italian Case) .....	239
SECTION III NARRATIVES OF WAR: HISTORIOGRAPHY, PUBLIC DISCOURSE, AND CULTURAL MEMORY	
<i>Roel Konijnendijk</i> Commemoration through Fear: The Spartan Reputation as a Weapon of War .....	257
<i>Elena Franchi</i> The Memory of the Sacred Wars and Some Origin Stories .....	271
<i>Mark Thorne</i> Caesar and the Challenge of Commemorating the Battle of Pharsalia .....	287
<i>Giuseppe Albertoni</i> <i>Heroes in aula Dei: Commemorating Wars and the Fallen in the Time</i> <i>of Charlemagne</i> .....	301

Table of Contents

*Alessandro Salvador*

Nationalism, the Politics of Memory and Revisionism:  
German World War I Veterans and their Transnational Relations ..... 319

CONCLUSIVE SECTION

*Mirko Canevaro*

Conclusive Remarks..... 337

Abstracts and Keywords..... 345

Contributors ..... 355

Index..... 359



## CONCLUSIVE REMARKS

*Mirko Canevaro*

Why is it so important to memorialise the war dead? Even at a summary glance, the thematic variety of the chapters of this volume suggests that, to the historian, the commemoration of the war dead has not to do exclusively, or even primarily, with war or with the war dead themselves. Commemoration of the war dead is fundamental to the survival of any community, because it justifies the private and individual sacrifice made by the individual members in the light of the higher interest of the community as a whole. Because of this, war commemoration is a particularly effective window into the self-representation of a community – into the community's own imagination of its collective history, values and historical purpose. War memorials, whether material or performative, attempt to (re)imagine and (re)represent a community worth dying for, and are therefore exercises in collective self-reflection. The image they conjure up can be more or less effective, more or less widely shared, and the study of the dynamics of commemoration, and of its occasional failures, allows the historian unique insights into the social and cultural dynamics of the relevant communities, as well as into its political developments and struggles. This volume offers a rich array of case studies that illustrate the potential of such a research agenda, how it is amenable to a variety of methodological and theoretical approaches, and how it is apt to illuminating very different historical realities, geographically and chronologically removed. It also illustrates its potential for comparative study – the recognisable regularity of the responses of war commemoration puts in stark relief the specificities of each case study, pushes the historian to engage with them, and to explain them.

The introduction of the editors to the volume does an excellent job of introducing the themes of the collection. This short conclusion, which expands slightly on the conclusive remarks that I was invited to deliver at the conference from which this volume originates, does not intend therefore to reduplicate the scope of the introduction. Sticking to the rather impressionistic nature of my original remarks, I rather want to reflect briefly on three separate yet interconnected issues that emerge from this collection of essays. First, the issue of the permanence of the memorial as guarantee of the permanence of memory. Second, in line with these initial observations, the issue of the kind of community that is 'imagined' through war commemoration. Third, the issue of the deliberate manipulation of memory through war commemoration for contingent political purposes, and its relationship with the wider dynamics of memorialisation.

## THE PERMANENCE OF THE MEMORIAL

How do I preserve the memory of war and the war dead? Many of the chapters in the volume address, in a way or another, this question. The underlying dynamic is the very human preoccupation with not being forgotten, and many of the case studies in the volume investigate the sheer inventiveness of the solutions devised in various contexts to ensure that memory of the war dead will not fade.

That this is a question that loomed large in the preoccupations of human communities from a very early stage in their development is suggested by Birgit Bergmann's and Holger Baitinger's chapters, with their investigations of relevant monuments and practices in Archaic Greece, and by Lilah Grace Canevaro's, which examines Homer's own reflections on the topic. Bergmann and Baitinger show that although evolution in the relevant customs and practices is undeniable, this is not a simple and linear development. The evidence rather suggests a wide range of solutions experimented at all stages of the development – the Greeks actively fought public forgetting through a variety of forms of memorialisation, always tweaking and improving on them in a constant battle against time. The overwhelming evidence for communal burials, 'state' burials and cenotaphs (much larger than that for private burials) from very early on also stresses the communal nature of the enterprise – commemorating the war dead had to do with the community affirming its unity and justifying its losses, and therefore creating its collective identity (see below).

The existence of conscious experimentation with commemoration, and of attempts to improve its effectiveness and durability is underpinned by explicit reflection on what the best instrument is to guarantee that the war dead will be remembered – Lilah Grace Canevaro shows that such reflections are central to the Homeric poems. Against simplistic accounts of Homeric society as a purely oral society in which memory is seamlessly reworked to reflect the present without awareness that stories change, Homer is clearly nervous about the permanence of memory, and alert to the fact that a lot has been lost and is no longer remembered. His conclusion is that epic poetry is the most durable means of commemoration, while material memorials are transient. Not everybody would have agreed, and the monumental experimentation with *tropaia* in sanctuaries, inscriptions, cenotaphs and public burials reviewed by Baitinger and Bergmann is evidence of this constant struggle with time and forgetting.

In this sense, and perhaps unsurprisingly, the ultimate solution is a typically Greek blend of orality, writing and materiality. This is most clear in the epigrammatic forms of public discourse matched by physical memorialisation typical of the Classical *polis*, and of Athens in particular, in which we can distinctly discern a process that preserves yet resolves the Homeric duality between epics and material memorial. The memory of the Persian Wars was fostered and developed in a mixture of monuments, inscriptions, pottery, rituals, and public discourse which in time shaped the social memory of the Athenians. Oral, discursive and physical memorialisation have all strong cognitive and mnemonic dimensions – commemoration strengthens memory and identity through the exploitation of different and complex media. This duality of public funerary rituals is further reflected in the very Athe-

nian form of the funeral speech, which seems rather concerned with the remote past as an instrument to cement the community's identity. And the glorious stories of Athens's past, once again, are performed in the funeral speeches, and monumentalised in the Athenian monuments, on Athens' temples, *stoai* and memorials.

These processes are so pervasive that by the time of Pausanias' writing, they had shaped the very monumental and mnemonic topography of the Greek cities – Pausanias' *Periegesis*, as shown by James Roy's chapter, remembers the Greek past, as it had been created and reimagined over several centuries, through a *tour de force* of monuments commemorating the many wars the Greeks had fought, with the stories and memories attached to these monuments. From the vantage point of the second century CE, the Greek landscape is one of memorials of wars of long ago, re-enacted and remembered through these memorials.

This stratified landscape very much resembles that of German commemorations of the Thirty Years' War investigated in Fehrlen-Weiss' chapter, and the variety of the commemorative forms equally displays a blend of monuments, literature, festivals, all interconnected and reinforcing each other (see below). Such diversity is even more evident in Birgfeld's chapter on German forms of war commemoration in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, which provide the background for Fehrlen-Weiss' analysis of the earlier stages of the commemoration of Thirty Years' War. Birgfeld adds a further dimension to the analysis of commemorative experimentation, by highlighting the links between social classes and different forms and foci of memorialization: from the focus on larger-scale military events and high-level 'heroic' victims sponsored by the courts, to the subversion of this potential hegemony by middle-class semi-independent commemorative forms. Different outlooks and perspectives – different purposes – found representation in commemorative forms "ranging from celebrations on the battle field, holding a *Te deum laudamus*, celebratory canon fire, and public displays of military trophies to honorary portals, equestrian statues, triumphal arches, armouries, tombs, paintings, vivat ribbons, medals, poems, epics, prose texts, and pamphlets". In all this, conspicuous by their absence were the lower-class and lower-rank war dead – forgotten because they were not effectively commemorated. The analysis of commemorative experimentation, across time and different communities, ends up highlighting stark differences, between the demotic commemorative forms of ancient Athens, concerned with preserving the memory of all war dead, and forms, such as those studied by Birgfeld, which 'institutionally' forgot the largest part of the war dead.

A concern with forgetting and an interplay of material and literary memorialisation – the same that we find in Lilah Grace Canevaro's chapter, and which underpin the variety and combinations of commemorative forms experimented by the many historical communities studied in the volume – emerge also from Thorne's chapter. Thorne demonstrates how Caesar's strategy for memorialising Pharsalus involved both memorialisation of the battle as the key moment of the Civil Wars in his *Bellum Civile*, and the construction of a temple to Venus Victrix/Genetrix as a monument to that victory. That the battle nevertheless soon lost its centrality in the memory of the Civil Wars, and was generally replaced by Actium as their decisive moment, is evidence of the very mechanism of public forgetting that the vast exper-

imentation in memorialisation attempts to counter. It is no chance that in the end it is epic poetry – Lucan’s *Pharsalia* – that undertakes the task of restoring that battle in public memory. Lucan, like Homer before him, entrusts memory to his epic, as the only real defence against forgetting.

Something that emerges very clearly from the volume is the inventiveness in the (combined) use of different media exhibited by human communities from antiquity to the present. The various case studies also highlight how this variety and inventiveness are (at least partially) a by-product of social struggles and diverse political arrangements, manifesting themselves in diverse commemorative forms, and in diverse combinations of these forms. The social and political forces behind the energy of this struggle against time and forgetting leads us to the second strand of these conclusive reflections.

### ‘IMAGINED COMMUNITIES’ OF COMMEMORATION

In my chapter, I have attempted to show that there is a clear agenda hidden in the heroic narratives of courage so typical of war commemoration. Death in war needs to be justified as the result of courageous acts performed for a higher end, in order for it not to be felt to be in vain. The lack of an adequate articulation of this noble end threatens the dissolution of the community. And this is why war commemoration is for us, as historians, a powerful means to access a society’s own articulation of its values, of its history, of its *ethos*, as the Athenians would say.

Many of the chapters in this volume do precisely this: they investigate the various forms war commemoration has taken in a variety of historical societies for the purpose of shedding light on societal and political dynamics, and on their development through time. Thus, Albertoni offers a case study in which political and social conditions – the volatility of the Carolingian army and the constraints (also religious) of the imperial ideology of the Carolingian court – made the commemoration of the war dead almost unviable within the standard martial framework. The Franks were mostly victorious, and yet, strangely, there were “no triumphal arches, no reliefs, no epigraphs, no statues”. To quote Albertoni, “to celebrate [war] would have meant to allow the possibility of something other than victory, and – since the actions of the King of the Franks and the will of God had become indistinguishable – this could not be done”. As a result, death in war was relegated, in the official rhetoric, to extra-military occasions such as ambushes and evil schemes. Albertoni’s discussion highlights the connection between the community’s self-image (however rhetorical) and the available commemoration forms and practices, even to the paradoxical point of a community’s self-image which prevents real commemoration of war and the war dead.

Bellezza’s chapter is a particularly illuminating example of the role of war commemoration for the shaping of a community, particularly of a new and unstable ‘imagined community’, to use Benedict Anderson’s famous description of nation and nationalism. Bellezza, through the investigation of four Ukrainian *lieux de mémoire*, sheds light on the struggle of the (relatively) new Ukrainian state to define a national identity different from (and, given the current conflict, in opposition to)



Russian and Soviet identities and conceptualisations of the past. The context of an ongoing war, in modern Ukraine like in ancient Athens, casts in stark relief the centrality of commemorative practices to the definition of an ‘imagined community’ worth dying for.

Blanka Misis, in her discussion of commemoration practices in Roman Poetovio, complements these treatments by focusing on the cognitive features of communal mnemonic practices, and the effects these had on the community, forming ‘close-knit bonds’ between participants. She highlights how, in the varieties of ritual commemoration, ancient communities enlisted complex cognitive and mnemonic mechanisms to help the community come to term with death in war, and to strengthen their cohesion and identity. The mechanisms she identifies – akin to those enlisted by religious rituals, with due distinctions, can be applied to most of the case-studies of war commemoration studied in the volume, and explain how in practice, at the level of the micro mechanisms affecting the individual members of the community, the commemoration of the war dead contributes to creating an ‘imagined community’.

All these case studies demonstrate what a powerful instrument war commemoration is not only for societies to come to term with their identity and their values, but for us, as historians, to penetrate their specific political, ideological and social dynamics.

What the study of the commemoration of the war dead often leaves aside, however, is the real experience of the combatants, which is almost irrelevant, and certainly outweighed by the commemorative needs of the community (and of the institutional dimension of the community), and more narrowly of the relatives. For this reason, most war commemorative forms are very informative about the reference community’s self-representation, but very uninformative about the actual experience of war – the point of war commemoration is not in fact the actual commemoration of war (and the war dead), but the building of an ‘imagined community’. A significant exception to this trend is Mondini’s chapter, which concentrates on the veteran’s literary accounts of WWI. Mondini highlights various trends that attempt to move past the traditional heroicisation of war, the difficulty with coming to term and transmitting the real experience of war. It is remarkable that the way past these difficulties is once again the identification of a community of belonging, yet not the national community – the ‘imagined community’ of the nation at war – but the narrower small community of the combatants: the platoon, the group of companions in the trenches. Meaning, for the experience of war and for death in war, is found in that communal dimension.

## THE POLITICS OF WAR COMMEMORATION

As Franchi shows in her chapter, ancient authors such as Demosthenes were very much aware of the power of memory and war commemoration to cement a community, its identity, to underpin particular values, and even particular policy decisions. With such a level of awareness, it is unavoidable that ancients and moderns would

aim to enlist the power of war commemoration for particular, even contingent, purposes. And if the appropriate story, memorial, monument or text did not exist, or failed to conform to the particular needs of the moment, they would not shy away from rewriting existing stories, merge different events from different times, and even make up events or details, to serve their purpose.

It should however be stressed that what we are talking about here, whether it is the ‘invention’ of the First Sacred War or the memorials and tombs of mythical founders and heroes described by Pausanias and surveyed by James Roy, is not an ‘oral society’, according to the definitions of Goody or Vansina, in which the past is reshaped continuously and fluidly. The very evidence discussed by Franchi of an explicit recognition of this reshaping (in Demosthenes and elsewhere) shows that what we are seeing is something more conscious and deliberate. Lucan’s attempt to restore Pharsalus to its place as the most decisive moment of the Civil Wars of the first century BCE, as Thorne shows in his chapter, is a case in point. Actium had soon replaced Pharsalus as the key battle in the memory of the war, because the ultimate winner in these wars had been Augustus, not Caesar. But the centrality of the commemoration of Actium was a statement that the resolution of the crisis had been the Augustan *pax terra marique*. Lucan’s refocusing on Pharsalus, in Thorne’s interpretation, has the purpose of challenging this perception, and making the point, in public memory and consciousness, that the resolution of the crisis had in fact been the emergence of a *Caesar – a dominus*.

Ultimately, we are not simply talking of wide societal dynamics. We are talking of politics of commemoration, with a stress on politics. This is clearly what we take away from Salvador’s chapter, which analyses the politics of commemoration of the *Stahlhelm*, the most important veterans’ organization in Germany after WWI. Salvador discusses how defeat and occupation prevented in the 1920s and 1930s the establishment of joint memorials for the war dead of WWI, particularly French-German joint war commemorations. Division and difference were stressed in the 1920s by German veterans as a (nationalistic) means to restoring their pride. Once the occupation ended, the changed dynamics brought about a change in the politics of commemoration. Salvador highlights how the possibility of international dialogue was precluded as long as the *Stahlhelm*’s own ‘memory’ of the war was unacknowledged. When it eventually was acknowledged, dialogue started, and yet the recognition achieved by the *Stahlhelm*’s own ‘memory’ corresponded to a position of strength which facilitated growing German demands. The politics of memory proceeded side-by-side with power politics.

The stratification of such politics of commemoration over the centuries, is, moreover, at the roots of the occasional incongruities in Pausanias’ account of the Greek world and its history, which cannot be attributed, as Roy shows, to his sloppiness, but to the active and *political* reworking of memories that has in time created these incongruities. In a sense, these dynamics of commemoration remind us not much of the fluidity typical of oral societies, but rather of modern political dynamics that condition commemoration. To give a relevant example, the role of the Ukrainian *lieux de memoire* in defining the Ukrainian ‘imagined community’, as shown by Bellezza, unfolds through a series of deliberate political acts of manipu-

lation of the past, and the contingent political aims are found side-by-side with wider dynamics of national formation and definition.

Most of the examples analysed in the volume are concerned with inward-looking political manipulation of the past – the dynamics of commemoration pertain to the community, its self-image, and internal political aims that are pursued by deliberately reshaping the past. Konijnendijk's chapter reminds us that the same dynamics applied also to the wider international scene. Politics of commemoration could be at the same time inward-looking (as discussed above) and outward-looking, and what was internally the construction of an 'imagined community' worth dying for, externally could become a reputational weapon to wield against enemies. This is clearly the case with the Spartans' efforts to preserve untarnished the memory of the Spartan valour at the Thermopylai: this was not only a foundation story for Spartan military superiority, useful for creating expectations of martial prowess and courage among Spartiates, but also a reputation that could confer the Spartans a significant advantage in war, making the enemies fear the Spartans beyond what reality would have warranted. In this instance, the commemoration of the Thermopylai appears to be a 'conservative' one: the Spartans attempted over time, and despite some defeats and embarrassing episodes (such as Sphacteria), to preserve the centrality of their sacrifice at Thermopylai not only in their own self-image, but by extension also in the Greeks' general perception of their image. War commemoration assumes a central place both in the (inwards) politics of identity and in the (outwards) politics of reputation.

To appreciate these dynamics fully, often a diachronic approach to the evolution and the changes in the commemoration of one event over a long period is particularly revealing. This is found to an extent in Konijnendijk's chapter, but more fully, for instance, in Franchi's and in Fehrlen-Weiss's. Franchi explores through a variety of sources the stratigraphy of stories about the Sacred Wars, and their centrality in shaping the identity (and the notions of the origins) of various Greek *ethne*. She also highlights how these were not seamless processes, but instances of conscious manipulation with precise political aims (and re-used later with other political aims). In Fehrlen-Weiss's chapter, the variety of commemorative forms about the Thirty Years' War over the *longue durée* allows the historian to appreciate the opposition of different narratives about the past that sustain a variety of political (and religious-political) commemorative needs. Memory of the Thirty Years' War feeds on its exploitation for nationalistic, political or confessional purposes: this war and its dead are remembered because – and as long as – they are significant within the framework of current political preoccupations. But the result is not complete fluidity – seamless reinvention – but rather the creation of a stratified, continuous and often contradictory memorial landscape which is itself the object of historiographical and public reflection, much like the commemorative landscape that gave rise to Pausanias reflection on the Greek past.

It is the study of such landscapes that this volume brings to the fore. War commemoration is not only, for the historian, a productive object of investigation in its own right. Mastering its analysis is also a powerful tool for practitioners of political, social and cultural history.

## ABSTRACTS AND KEYWORDS

### INTRODUCTIVE SECTION

Maurizio Giangiulio (University of Trento), Do Societies Remember?  
The Notion of ‘Collective Memory’: Paradigms and Problems  
(from Maurice Halbwachs on)

The notion of ‘collective memory’ was introduced by Maurice Halbwachs in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Nowadays, on the one hand the expression ‘collective memory’ resonates everywhere, from the field of historiography to the public use of history, from political discourse to scholastic and journalistic language. On the other hand, it is criticized according to arguments which seem to ignore decades of theoretical reflection, as well as historiographic and anthropologic practice. This paper deals with the most basic criticism of Halbwachs’ concept of ‘collective memory’, that he attributes a typically individual function – memory – to an alleged collective subject, and moves it too far out of the individual sphere. I first discuss the scholarly reception of Halbwachs’ ideas; then, through an in-depth analysis of Halbwachs’ three major works (*Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire* [1925]; *La topographie légendaire des Évangiles en Terre Sainte* [1941]; *La mémoire collective* [1950]), I show both the inconsistency of the abovementioned criticism, and the pivotal role of Halbwachs’ theorization in the field of the sociology of memory, anthropology and historiography.

COLLECTIVE MEMORY – SOCIAL FRAMES OF MEMORY – MNEMOTECHNICS –  
SOCIOLOGY OF MEMORY – CULTURAL MEMORY

Elena Franchi (University of Trento), Memories of Winners and Losers.  
Historical Remarks on Why Societies Remember and Commemorate Wars

Why do societies remember, and even commemorate, wars? Why do they insist on remembering instead of forgetting an event which is highly traumatic? In fact, our insistence on remembering wars goes against one of the basic tendencies outlined by polemology, according to which forgetting the suffering of war is structural and periodical. The question becomes even more puzzling when we think that the losers as well as the winners remember war, and not just in commemoration rituals for the dead, where the relevance of commemoration seems self-evident, since it ensures that the fallen are remembered and mourned (although, in fact, much more is actually going on), but in almost every figure of memory. This paper tries to solve this problem by investigating some historical case-studies. Issues such as post-war

trauma, collective memories, theories of nationalism, ways of expressing a sense of belonging, military reputation, future expectations and the sacred dimension of wars are addressed. The last part of the paper investigates some challenges facing scholars engaged with ancient sources, such as lack of evidence, remediation, intermediality, the risks of dealing with allegedly gendered narratives.

COLLECTIVE WAR MEMORIES – POLEMOMOLOGY – REMEDIATION – INTERMEDIALITY – GENDERED NARRATIVES

Giorgia Proietti (University of Trento), Can an Ancient Truth Become an Old Lie? A Few Methodological Remarks Concerning Current Comparative Research on War and its Aftermath

Explicitly comparative studies which analyse aspects of ancient history with reference to comparanda from the modern world are becoming more and more frequent in historical research. War and its aftermath have always been a favourite topic of comparative historical research, in the political, military and socio-economic spheres, and, more recently, in relation to collective emotions, psychological reactions and forms of commemoration. Serving, to some extent, as an introduction to the whole book, this essay discusses several case studies concerning the experience of war and post-war (commemoration of war and war dead in public discourse and monumentality; the multimedia representation of war; post-war trauma), which scholars have already approached from a relatively consistent comparative standpoint. Its aim is not to treat each case study in detail, but to comment on them from a methodological perspective, in order to show, through a few relevant examples, the need to avoid perfunctory comparisons between ancient and modern phenomena, and instead to pursue a coherent historical contextualization.

WAR MEMORIALS – WAR TRAUMA – PUBLIC DISCOURSE – COMMEMORATION – HISTORICAL CONTEXTUALIZATION

SECTION I  
WAR MEMORIALS: OBJECTS IN PERFORMANCE

Lilah Grace Canevaro (University of Edinburgh), Commemoration through Objects? Homer on the Limitations of Material Memory

Homeric women use objects to negotiate their agency, to express themselves and, as not conventionally spotlighted protagonists, to contribute to the action. Objects used by women in Homer can be symbolically significant and powerfully characterising. They can be tools of recognition and identification. They can pause narrative and be used agonistically. They can send messages and be vessels for memory. However, they are not infallible. This chapter considers the limitations of both women *as* objects and women *and* objects, in terms of the commemoration of the

Trojan War and its heroes. It looks at how Homer reflects on the limitations of objects; how the memories encased in objects are presented as transient; the gendered aspect of this transience; and how objects as commemorators of war are consistently presented as inferior to the medium of poetry. More generally, this chapter propagates what Vital Materialist Jane Bennett has called “attentiveness to things”. It constitutes a case study in a methodology: that of reading Homeric epic not primarily through narrative or character, but through the objects which punctuate the poems.

EPIC – MATERIALITY – MEMORY – GENDER – ENTANGLEMENT

Birgit Bergmann (Universität Regensburg), Beyond Victory and Defeat.  
Commemorating Battles Prior to the Persian Wars

With the emergence of the polis in early Greece war with its potential for victory, land and booty or defeat, loss and even annihilation became one of the most vital common tasks. Commemorating battles, burying the war dead, and honouring the gods, therefore became a common task, too. The paper focuses on the question what was done in this respect in the time before the beginning of the Persian Wars in 500 B.C. First and foremost, the different activities of a commemorative nature that could follow a military conflict will be discussed for an overview of the variety of forms which the commemoration of battles could take in pre-classical times, namely the *tropaia*, the graves, the honours, the ritual acts, festivals, cults, cult statues and cult places, and – last but not least – the dedications. Next this paper will address the question of whether there are any observable changes in practice over time and, if this is the case, how these could be explained.

COMMEMORATION OF BATTLES – ARCHAIC TIMES – *TROPAIA* – DEDICATIONS –  
DEDICATORY INSCRIPTIONS

Holger Baitinger (Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum Mainz),  
Commemoration of War in Archaic and Classical Greece. Battlefields,  
Tombs and Sanctuaries

In Archaic and Classical Greece (late 8<sup>th</sup> – 4<sup>th</sup> centuries B.C.) war and commemoration of war were virtually omnipresent. Burial mounds and other grave monuments both in regular cemeteries and on battlefields remembered fallen soldiers. On the battlefields, the victors usually erected victory monuments (*tropaia*), in earlier times made of wood and captured weapons, since the Classical period more and more built of stone and therefore persistent. Besides that, arms and armour were dedicated to the gods in important sanctuaries of the city-states or in ‘international’ Panhellenic cult places like Olympia, Delphi or Isthmia, especially between the second half of the 8<sup>th</sup> and the second half of the 5<sup>th</sup> century B.C. Since about 500 B.C., spoils of war were increasingly replaced in sanctuaries by other long-living monuments like

statues (or groups of statues), treasuries, temples or other buildings financed by booty of war. In the 5<sup>th</sup> century B.C., captured arms and armour seem to have lost more and more their religious significance and to have gained an increased political meaning. Spoils and buildings financed by booty of war moved from sanctuaries to the political and administrative centre of the city-states, the agora.

ARCHAIC AND CLASSICAL GREECE – MASS BURIALS (*POLYANDRIA*) – VICTORY MONUMENTS (*TROPAIA*) – GREEK SANCTUARIES – DEDICATION OF ARMS AND ARMOUR

James Roy (University of Nottingham), Memorials of War in Pausanias

Pausanias offers extensive coverage of memorials and memories of war in the many communities of central and southern Greece, and clearly believed that war was a major and important element of the Greek past. Though his account of memorials at Olympia, Delphi, and Athens is rich, this paper concentrates on other communities. The wars concerned were, with rare exceptions, remote in Pausanias' day, and the time elapsed had allowed memories to be reshaped. Pausanias was well-read in Greek history, but took much of his information from local people in the communities visited, especially the local elite. In rare cases mistakes by Pausanias himself can be identified, but much more often the local tradition which he generally follows had reshaped events, frequently attaching the preferred version of history to visible monuments: some specific examples are considered in detail.

PAUSANIAS – WAR – LOCAL HISTORY – MEMORIALS – MEMORY

Nina Fehrlen-Weiss (Universität Tübingen), The Thirty Years' War in German Commemorative Culture from the Beginning of the Holy Roman Empire to the Present – An Overview

Germany now has quite a diverse and lively commemorative culture in relation to the Thirty Years' War, originating, on the one hand, in a long tradition and, on the other, in new initiatives: both are tied to the denominational 'heroes', to great battles and – inevitably – to the Peace of Westphalia. The emphasis of these commemorations has evolved over time, as when, for example, after the Coalition Wars and the subsequent end of the Holy Roman Empire, the Peace of Westphalia was no longer a constitutional reality. After World War II, the memorial landscape was divided, with West and East Germany making different commemorative choices. European politicians moved the Peace of Westphalia into the center of the shared memory. There is also, however, a rich, 'unofficial', commemorative culture surrounding the Thirty Years' War, which is mostly upheld by non-historians. The motives of those who cultivate the recollection of this war on the regional and local level have changed only slightly, if at all; their commemoration is primarily an expression of love for their native country. On the other hand, since the 19<sup>th</sup> century, commemorative forms have also aimed to attract tourism. Overall, the first half of



the 17<sup>th</sup> century was an important chapter in German history, which continues to reverberate now.

HISTORICAL CULTURE – COMMEMORATIVE CULTURE – MEMORIAL LANDSCAPE –  
PEACE OF WESTPHALIA – REMEMBERING PEACE

Simone Bellezza (University of Naples “Federico II”), Nation Building  
through Commemoration: Stalinism, WW II, and Holocaust Memorials  
in post-Soviet Ukraine

This essay illustrates the development of the politics of memory in post-Soviet Ukraine through an analysis of the building and/or adaptation of the main four memorials in the country: the Museum of the History of Ukraine in the Second World War, the Memorial of the Holocaust in Babyn Yar, the Memorial of the Victims of Stalinist Repressions in Bykivnia, and the Memorial of the Holodomor. Starting with a description of the univocal Soviet politics of memory of WWII (called the Great Patriotic War), I then describe the changes that occurred after 1991: the post-Soviet state was not able to elaborate a clear politics of memory in its first decade of existence and therefore followed the lead of the Ukrainian dissidents who, during the Soviet period, had commemorated Stalin’s purges as the nation’s greatest tragedy. A real turning point occurred in the Jushchenko presidency, which elevated the 1932/1933 famine to the status of national holocaust, promoting a specific memorialization both in Ukraine and abroad. The essay concludes by underlining the importance of building and exploiting victim memorials in the construction of an effective politics of memory.

POLITICS OF MEMORY – MEMORIAL – POST-SOVIET UKRAINE – HOLODOMOR –  
HOLOCAUST

## SECTION II WAR DEAD: FROM CITIZENS TO SYMBOLS

Mirko Canevaro (University of Edinburgh), Courage in War and the Courage of  
the War Dead – Ancient and Modern Reflections

Recent approaches to ‘courage’ in Athenian democracy and more widely in democratic thought have isolated a notion of ‘democratic’ courage involving rational deliberation and opposed it to more primitive forms of ‘courage’ fueled by shame and typical of ‘honor’ or ‘shame’ cultures. This chapter questions these approaches by stressing the cognitive elements of Homeric and archaic courage and, indeed, shame, and focusing then on Athenian representations of courage, particularly in funeral speeches for the war dead. It stresses the relevance of honor and shame in these representations, isolates the prototypicality of hoplitic courage, and ultimately



stresses that far from being primitive, notions of honor and shame were understood as fundamental to values of *parrhesia*, lawfulness and democratic courage.

COURAGE – DEMOCRACY – ATHENS – SHAME – WAR DEAD

Blanka Mistic (Champlain Lennoxville College - Bishop's University, Canada),  
Cognitive Aspects of Funerary Commemoration of Soldiers and Veterans in  
Roman Poetovio

The present paper employs cognitive theory, specifically Harvey Whitehouse's Modes of Religiosity theory, in order to examine funerary and commemorative practices among Roman soldiers and veterans during the first two centuries A. D. in the *colonia* of Poetovio (Pannonia Superior). By relying on inscribed funerary monuments in stone as primary evidence, the paper draws similarities between the transfer of religious and funerary ritual practices, arguing that funerary rituals were transmitted, learned, and kept alive through frequent repetition as well as through the close emotional connections between the participants. Since the funerary monument acted as a mnemonic device, it therefore became the primary medium through which the deceased's identity and memory were negotiated, constructed, preserved, and transferred. The funerary monuments of soldiers and veterans at Poetovio display how they navigated between the military and civilian spheres, helping to create a new imperial provincial culture.

PANNONIA – POETOVIO – FUNERARY COMMEMORATION – RITUAL – ARMY

Johannes Birgfeld (Universität des Saarlandes), Commemorating  
War and War Dead in the 18<sup>th</sup> Century German Speaking World

This paper presents a synopsis of the different strategies and practices of commemorating war and war dead employed in 18<sup>th</sup> century Germany. These acts of commemoration assumed very different forms, ranging from celebrations on the battle field, holding a *Te deum laudamus*, celebratory canon fire, and public displays of military trophies to honorary portals, equestrian statues, triumphal arches, armouries, tombs, paintings, vivat ribbons, medals, poems, epics, prose texts, and pamphlets. The paper also demonstrates how, although the courts had the greatest interest in, and funds for, staging and shaping the ways in which military events and victims of war were commemorated, the middle classes successfully managed to take part in, develop their own, and sometimes subvert, forms of public commemoration of war and war dead. However, those who suffered most on the battle fields, the lowest classes and ranks, hardly ever had the means to record their 'sacrifice' and commemorate it for posterity.

WAR MONUMENTS – COMMEMORATION – PRAYERS – SUBVERSION – LITERARY  
MEMORIALS

Marco Mondini (Fondazione Bruno Kessler, Trento – University of Padua),  
Brothers and Heroes. Literary Sources on Death in First World War  
(the Italian Case)

In Italy, from the 1920s, soldiers' autobiographical writings of the First World War represented the 'theatre of memory' to the next generation: they handed down their meanings of intervention, mobilization and sacrifice. These writings are characterized by two elements in particular. The first is the recurring theme of self-sacrifice. At the core of all war stories lies the experience of fighting and death; this is a liminal experience that fixes one's relation to war. The second characteristic is the author's profile. The narrator of the 'warrior phenomenon' is almost invariably a young reserve officer, which usually means a twenty-year old middle-class man, often a high-school graduate or university student, reasonably well-versed in the Classics. Thus, the wartime testimony of Italian writing is centered on a heroic collectivity. However, unlike the Classical prototype of Achilles, the Homeric triumphant hero who willingly accepts war and death in order to achieve eternal glory, the sacrifice of the modest Italian brother in arms is principally for his small community of fellow soldiers. They too, however, are to be remembered as great heroes within the context of this understated epic.

SOLDIERS' AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL WRITINGS – FIRST WORLD WAR – SELF-SACRIFICE –  
HOMERIC HEROES – BROTHERS IN ARMS

SECTION III  
NARRATIVES OF WAR:  
HISTORIOGRAPHY, PUBLIC DISCOURSE, AND CULTURAL MEMORY

Roel Konijnendijk (University of Leiden), A Terrifying Name:  
The Spartan Reputation as a Weapon of War

Part of the commemoration of war is the way the military achievements of an army or people are remembered by others. For the Classical Spartans, this form of commemoration proved a distinct advantage. Their famous ideal never to retreat or surrender, along with their reputation for military skill, made other Greeks afraid to face them in battle. Aware of the terror they inspired, the Spartans did their best to enhance the effect, introducing intimidating dress and drill to make their advance into battle a uniquely unnerving spectacle. Their efforts paid off; in several key engagements, their enemies refused to fight them, and fled before a blow was struck. This allowed the Spartans to gain victories at minimal risk, and to retain their hegemony against the odds. Two parallel narratives found in Thucydides and Xenophon reveal Spartan efforts to restore their reputation when it was tarnished, first on Sphakteria, and then at Leuktra – proof of their desire to protect their dreaded name as a potent weapon of war.

CLASSICAL GREECE – SPARTA – TACTICS – MILITARY HISTORY – HISTORIOGRAPHY

Elena Franchi (University of Trento), The Memory of the Sacred Wars and Some Origin Stories

According to a reconstruction that is partly ancient and partly modern, the First Sacred War broke out in the nineties of the 6<sup>th</sup> century BC, as Thessaly, Athens and Sycion, with the blessing of the Amphictyony of Anthela, attacked the impious (*asebeis*) Cirrhaians, who had cultivated the sacred land surrounding the sanctuary of Apollo in Delphi. In fact, different archaic and classical reports of attacks on Delphi were merged – at the time of the Third Sacred War and in the following decades – into one war, probably the first. However, this first war was not invented *ex novo*, as Robertson assumed. A reconsideration of the literary sources linked to the archaeological remains suggests that the archaeological case for locating a major horizon of violence and destruction in the years around and after the 580s is getting stronger and stronger, especially if one takes into account the dating of the first *peribolos* to the end of the 570s (at the earliest) and the destruction of the Maison Rouge c. 585–575. It was – in fact – the image of the First Sacred War which was heavily reinvented. The reinvention of this image shaped, in turn, the origin stories about peoples living in Central Greece: the origin of Phlegyans, Dryopes and Kragalidai was some way connected to places playing a key role in the Third and the Fourth Sacred Wars.

FIRST SACRED WAR – PHOCIANS – PHLEGYANS – DRYOPES – KRAGALIDAI

Mark Thorne (Brigham Young University),  
Caesar and the Challenge of Commemorating the Battle of Pharsalia

While it was customary for successful Roman generals to commemorate their victories through statues or other building projects, the most crucial victory in Caesar's entire career, his defeat of Pompey at the Battle of Pharsalia in 48 BC, strikingly saw the least official commemoration of all his campaigns. The chief reason was that Pharsalia was specifically a victory in civil war, which made commemoration at the time by traditional means too controversial. The war's continuation for four more years also meant that by the end of the conflict other victories could be celebrated, leading to a series of triumphs and victory monuments which commemorated Caesar's victorious *status* generally but largely overlooked the key victory at Pharsalia that made everything else possible. Nevertheless, Caesar did succeed in commemorating Pharsalia in other ways: his Temple to Venus Victrix indirectly recalled its origin as having been vowed on the eve of that battle, the date of his victory there (9 August) was directly commemorated in the *fasti*, and finally his own written account of Pharsalia commemorated this decisive turning point in his career for future generations to a degree that no building program could equal.

CAESAR – MEMORY – ROMAN VICTORY – ROMAN CALENDAR – *BELLUM CIVILE*

Giuseppe Albertoni (University of Trento), *Heroes in aula Dei:*  
Commemorating Wars and the Fallen in the Time of Charlemagne

The age of Charlemagne was defined by war, and yet these wars never led to any particular forms of celebration: to celebrate would have meant to allow the possibility of something other than victory, and – since the actions of the King of the Franks and the will of God had become indistinguishable – this could not be done. For the Franks, therefore, the time before a war, or battle, was more important than the aftermath: it was before fighting that the sacred alliance with God had to be re-affirmed, through prayer, fasting and penitence. This meant that there was no space for a cult of the fallen because a victorious army had to be shown to be an army whose ranks included no fatalities. Losses could only be admitted off the actual battlefield, inflicted by ‘perfidious’ enemies. Anyone – of high rank – who died thus could be publicly remembered, but their achievements in battle were not commemorated: these men were celebrated as Christian heroes, figures in whom the bellic and moral virtues united. The Duke, Eric; the Prefect, Gerold and the seneschal, Eggihard: all three fell, all three were heroes *in aula Dei*.

AVARS – CAROLINGIAN WARFARE – CHARLEMAGNE – FRANKS – PIPPIN OF ITALY

Alessandro Salvador (University of Trento – Herder Institut Marburg),  
Nationalism, the Politics of Memory, and Revisionism in  
the Transnational Relations of German WWI Veterans

At the end of World War I, Germany was humiliated and punished by the post-war settlements. The country was considered solely responsible for the war that devastated Europe and was sanctioned accordingly. This narrative, however, was utterly rejected by political organizations, associations and pressure groups in Germany. The nationalist veterans, in particular, organized in the *Stahlhelm Bund der Frontsoldaten*, became political subjects and, throughout the inter-war period, fought for a politics of memory which rejected the premises of the post-war agreements. This paper analyzes this politics of memory in relation to the German veterans’ transnational activities and meetings with former enemies of the *Entente*. It also considers the German nationalists’ attempts to have the post-war agreements and order revised, both before and after Hitler’s rise to power. The ‘informal’ diplomacy of the war veterans is analysed in the context of Germany’s international relations in the inter-war period.

VETERANS – POLITICS OF WAR – MEMORY OF WAR – REVISIONISM – WEIMAR REPUBLIC

## CONTRIBUTORS

**Giuseppe Albertoni** is Associate Professor of Medieval History at the University of Trento. He studied History at the University of Bologna and his main research areas are early medieval politics and government, in particular the role of communities, aristocratic identity, kinships, and transmission of land in Carolingian and Ottonian society, subjects on which he has written extensively (his publications include *L'Italia carolingia*, 1997; *Vassalli, feudi, feudalesimo*, 2015).

**Holger Baitinger** studied Prehistory in Tübingen and Munich, where he obtained his PhD in 1995. Having received a travel grant from the German Archaeological Institute in 1995/1996, he worked on several research projects in Germany, Greece, Turkey and Italy. From 2000 to 2002 he was responsible for setting up the Hessian National Exhibition “Das Rätsel der Kelten vom Glauberg” in Frankfurt on the Main. He has been teaching at the Goethe-University in Frankfurt since 2008, where he became – after his habilitation – a *Privatdozent* in 2016. Since 2015 he has had a research position at the Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum in Mainz. His studies focus mainly on the Hallstatt and Early La Tène period in Central Europe, Greek sanctuaries and the interaction between Greek colonists and indigenous people in Sicily.

**Simone Attilio Bellezza** is Research Associate in Contemporary History at the University of Naples “Federico II”. He has completed two doctorates (Ca’ Foscari University of Venice, 2007; University of the Republic of San Marino, 2010). He specializes in Soviet and Ukrainian history. His current research topic is entitled “Ukrainian Transnational Activism: Human Rights and the End of the Cold War (1970s–1990s)”, the main objective of which is to investigate, through the study of the Ukrainian case, the importance of the relationship between diaspora communities and their original homeland in the emergence of human rights movements. His latest publication is *The Shore of Expectations: A Study on the Culture of the Ukrainian Shistdesiatnyky* (2018).

**Birgit Bergmann** studied Classical Archaeology, Ancient History and Latin Philology at the universities of Göttingen and Munich where she completed her studies with a dissertation on *Der Kranz des Kaisers. Genese und Bedeutung einer römischen Insignie* supervised by Luca Giuliani. Being awarded the ‘Reisestipendium’ by the German Archaeological Institute (DAI) she afterwards spent one year visiting archaeological museums and sites around the Mediterranean before taking up a position as ‘Akademische Rätin a. Z.’ at the Institute of Classical Archaeology at the University of Regensburg. Her current research interest centres on the commemoration of battles by Greek poleis in Archaic and Classical times, a work that will

culminate in a habilitation treatise to be handed in in 2018 whose final stage is funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgesellschaft (DFG).

**Johannes Birgfeld** teaches German Literature from the 17<sup>th</sup> century to the present at Saarland University in Saarbrücken, Germany. His main research interests are Literature in German from the 18<sup>th</sup>, 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries with specific focuses on literature in its historic contexts, on the relation between literature and war, and on the history of theatre and drama within the German-speaking world. His most recent publications include: *Krieg und Aufklärung* (2 vols., 2012), *Rimini Protokoll* close up: *Lektüren* (2015, co-editor), *Albert Ostermaier: Von der Rolle oder: Über die Dramatik des Verzetteln*s (2016, editor). He also co-edits the series *Kleines Archiv des 18. Jahrhunderts* (St. Ingbert).

**Lilah Grace Canevaro** is lecturer in Greek at the University of Edinburgh. Her research centres on ancient Greek hexameter poetry, with a focus on gender. She is pioneering new-materialist approaches to classical study, and has published also in the areas of classical reception, comparative literature, and cognitive humanities. Her first book *Hesiod's Works and Days: How to Teach Self-Sufficiency* was published by Oxford University Press in 2015; her second, *Women of Substance in Homeric Epic: Objects, Gender, Agency*, in 2018.

**Mirko Canevaro** is Reader in Greek History at the University of Edinburgh, and a winner of the Philip Leverhulme Prize from the Leverhulme Trust, and of a Thomas Reid Medal from the Royal Society of Edinburgh. Among his main publications are *The Documents in the Attic Orators. Laws and Decrees in the Public Speeches of the Demosthenic Corpus* (2013) and *Demostene, Contro Leptine. Introduzione, traduzione e commento storico* (2016). He is the co-editor (with E. M. Harris) of the *Oxford Handbook of Ancient Greek Law*, and with B. Gray of *The Hellenistic Reception of Classical Athenian Democracy and Political Thought* (both with Oxford University Press).

**Nina Fehrlen-Weiss, M.A.**, has studied in Tübingen, Germany (early modern and modern history, political science and philosophy). Her current dissertation “The recollection of the Thirty Years’ War in Germany from 1945 till the present day” is being supervised by Prof. Dr. Matthias Asche in Tübingen. Since 2018 she has been employed as an archivist at the Landesarchiv Baden-Württemberg.

**Elena Franchi** is Research fellow in Greek History at the Department of Humanities of the University of Trento (2018–). She received her PhD at the University of Genova (2008). She was a Von Humboldt fellow at the University of Freiburg i. B. (2011–2013) and won a Europa-fellowship to join the excavations at Kalapodi (Greece – Deutsches Archäologisches Institut) (2012). In 2017 she received the “abilitazione nazionale” as Associate Professor. Among her latest publications is the monograph *Die Konflikte zwischen Thessalern und Phokern. Krieg und Identität in der griechischen Erinnerungskultur des 4. Jahrhunderts* (Munich 2016).

**Maurizio Giangiulio** is Full Professor of Greek History at the Department of Humanities of the University of Trento. He is also Coordinator of the Center of Advanced Studies in the Humanities (CeASHum) and Director in charge of the “Bernardo Clesio College”. Among his main research interests are the Western Greeks, ancient Pythagoreanism, and Herodotus. His latest books are *Memorie coloniali* (2010) and *Democrazie greche. Atene, Sicilia, Magna Grecia* (2015). His current research focuses on the processes of construction and transmission of historical traditions in Archaic and Classical Greece, and he is working on a book on oracular tales in Herodotus.

**Roel Konijnendijk** is a Marie-Curie Postdoctoral Research Fellow at the University of Leiden. After completing his PhD in Ancient History at University College London in 2015, he was awarded a *Past & Present* Junior Research Fellowship at the Institute of Historical Research, and a Teaching Fellowship at the University of Warwick. His work is focused on Classical Greek tactics and tactical thought, its complex relation to the values and institutions of Greek culture, its modern historiography, and its frequent encounters with the Persian tactical system. His latest publication is the monograph *Classical Greek Tactics: A Cultural History* (2017).

**Blanka Misic** obtained her PhD in Ancient History at Royal Holloway, University of London in 2013. She is currently a Faculty Member in the Department of Ancient Civilizations at Champlain College in Lennoxville and in the department of Classical Studies at Bishop’s University in Canada. Her research centres on exploring religious and cultural identities in the Roman provinces, with a particular interest in Roman Pannonia. She has previously published on the Mithraic cult at Poetovio, and is currently working on the cult of the Nymphs at Aquae Iasae.

**Marco Mondini** studied at the Scuola Normale Superiore of Pisa, where he got his PhD in Contemporary History. He has been a Research Fellow at the Scuola Normale Superiore, and a Visiting Professor at the École Normale Supérieure of Paris, the University of Lille 3 and the University of Paris-Diderot. Currently, he is a researcher at the Istituto Storico Italo Germanico-FBK in Trento and an Adjunct Professor in Military History at the University of Padua. He is a member of the *Historial de la Grande Guerre*, based in Péronne (France), and section editor for “14–18 online. International Encyclopedia of the First World War”. His main publications are *La guerra italiana* (2014) and *Il Capo. La Grande Guerra del generale Luigi Cadorna* (2017).

**Giorgia Proietti** is a Postdoctoral Research Fellow in Greek History at the School of Humanities of the University of Trento, where she has been teaching first and second level MA courses since 2014. She has studied in Athens and London, and published several articles on national and international journals. Her research interests focus on Athens and the Greek world in the Classical period, especially on political and military history, and its social, memorial, and psychological implications. She is also interested in war and post-war from a comparative standpoint



between ancient and modern times. She is currently working on her first monograph on the memory of the Persian Wars before and in Herodotus, stemming from her PhD thesis (Trento 2014).

**James Roy**, after studies in the Universities of Edinburgh and Cambridge, held posts in the Universities of Sheffield and Nottingham until retiring in 2004, since when he has been an Honorary Research Associate of the Department of Classics in the University of Nottingham. He has published extensively on Greek history from the archaic period to the Roman, especially on the history of Arkadia and the history of Elis, including the sanctuary at Olympia. These studies, especially those on Arkadia, have involved a continuing engagement with Pausanias.

**Alessandro Salvador** studied contemporary history in Trieste and obtained his Ph.D. in Trento with a thesis on National Socialism and the radical right in inter-war Germany. He has been a Postdoctoral Fellow at the Herder Institut in Marburg, and at the University of Trento, and a Visiting Researcher in Munich (*Institut für Zeitgeschichte*), Berlin (*Freie Universität*) and Vienna (*Universität Wien*). His main research interests are the history of veterans and political radicalism in inter-war Europe, the various nationalisms involved in the dissolution of the Central Empires, and German occupation policies in World War II. His most recent publication is *New Political Ideas in the Aftermath of the Great War* (2017), co-edited with Anders Kjøstvedt (Oslo).

**Mark Thorne** is a Visiting Professor at Brigham Young University, where his research focuses on the intersection of Roman literature, history, and memory studies. He is particularly interested in the Roman epic poet Lucan, with publications on the role of memory in Lucan's *Bellum Civile* and on the aesthetics of traumatic representation in both Lucan and literary portrayals of the Rwandan genocide. He also has forthcoming articles on the evolving meaning of Cato Uticensis in Roman cultural memory and on the theme of triumphal anxiety in Neronian literature. He is currently at work co-editing a volume that explores points of connection between Lucan's epic and its contemporary historical, social, and literary contexts.