

Eric Noah

03/10/17

Progress and Future  
- (2016-2017), (2017-2018) -

So far this year I have definitely made a great many advancements in the Graduate Program from the first semester of this course. The first semester I will admit I had some preliminary issues and it took a lot longer than intended to figure out the best ways to prepare for classes and write the best papers possible. The first semester was really an eye opener for me since I was still struggling to maintain the juggle of school and personal time. This semester I have been able to manage my time with a lot more precision, and it has drastically helped me in my preparations for my classes. The first semester I was taking classes that were the required for all the grad students entering history including a graduate level theory course which was a great deal of help moving forward as it allowed me to think about the articles I have read in different and innovative ways. The other course I took in my first semester was digital archeology and naval antiquities. Both these courses were challenging in their own ways yet I was able to learn a great deal from the courses and from my digital archeology I began the formation of my committee, which is something that will help me next year. With the previous semester I was able to hone in on what interested me the most in this graduate program, and with the additions of the 3D modeling courses, my plans have definitely shifted from the traditional academic standpoint. The current semester has been a great deal of experience for me, I feel I am able to better manage my time with a semester under my belt. This semester I was able to focus on picking courses that held desires for me and so far I have had no regrets in the courses I chose to peruse. Barring the unfortunate dropping of digital humanities 1, this semester has been a great opportunity for me to learn

more about the rigors of this program and I can maybe form more of a avenue for myself to study and eventually come up with a better topic for a thesis project. While my idea still stands of wanting to incorporate 3D modeling with history as well as the mass media outlet that I have taken up during my Film and Documentary course that I also have been taking this semester. As for the future plans for next year and the upcoming summer, I am currently working with the World War 2 History Archive helping them put together a list of testimonials from War veterans. This book is going to be published soon with my name in the credits, pressing forward in my hopes of being professional writer. I have spoken with the head of this archive Mr. Mark Zangara and he has mentioned to me multiple opportunities during the summer which I will follow up with him on as soon as I send in the transcripts I have been tasked with writing. At this moment I do not have any plans for trips that assist my future and at this moment I had originally planned to spend the summer writing all my projects that I have not had time to complete during the rigorous semester of graduate school. My summer plans seem to be tentative however since things have a habit of coming up, I am keeping my options open however I am interested in taking up something that helps my academic future. As for the next year of the graduate program, I would like to focus on the 3D archeology as well as trying to incorporate media into the historical field. While this is more of a generalized idea of what I am looking to do in the next year of grad school, I would like to move forward in my plan and actively try to come up with something on paper early on as to get into a rhythm sooner in the semester and not have to wait until the next spring to have a better handle on the rigor of graduate courses. I am looking forward to completing the courses this semester and moving on to my second year in the graduate program. Since I have learned a great deal already and a number of things I did not expect, I intend on making the most of my second semester and using all the positives I have learned from my first year and apply it to the next string of courses that are in front of me next semester.

- WRITING SAMPLE -

Eric Noah

Dr. Fontaine

HIS 6112

12/07/16

Investigating The Rule of Three  
An Analysis of the First Triumvirate

The history of the Roman Republic has always been of interests to students and historians alike and before the republic gave way to glory of the empire. Three men carved their way into the Roman political world changing the government in their wake. The First Triumvirate, the alliance between Julius Caesar, Gnaeus Pompey and Marcus Crassus, has been the topic of many conversations amongst historians and authors alike. The conversations regarding these men mostly involved the discussion of the Roman republic giving way to the Empire with the take over of Caesar. The narrative of the First Triumvirate seems to be set in stone, so much so that modern historians doing research may not have the luxury of opposing opinions regarding the alliance as the ancients sources do not debate one another. This paper will investigate these sources that cover the specific members of the First Triumvirate and how historians have written about these men going from the 1940's till the 2000's era. The investigation is in search of change in the narrative if there is one at all, and in learning how the sources have written about these men one can learn how the narrative had been formed for modern historians. Since there are many years between the writing of these books the narrative could have shifted in many different ways since these figure were first written about in ancient sources. This paper will investigate several monographs regarding the social, political and military manuevers of the first triumvirate. In order to investigate the narrative surrounding these historical figures, this paper will look into monographs that cover each of the members and discuss how the narrative regarding the men

involved has changed through the years.

## Marcus Licinius Crassus

Known to historians as one of the richest men in the Roman Republic, Marcus Crassus has been the subject of many sources. The narrative surrounding Marcus Crassus however is heavily tied to his military conquests most notably his victory over Spartacus in the Third Servile War. For the purposes of this paper, the investigation of the narrative will begin after this war had concluded. To begin this analysis one must start with the older sources and how they have explained the narrative of this historical figure. In the monograph titled *Marcus Crassus and the Late Roman Republic* by Allen Mason Ward, the book expresses the narrative of Crassus circa 1942. In this narrative Ward explains a deep rivalry between Crassus and Pompey that seems to always appear when the two attempted to work together.<sup>1</sup> When looking for evidence of this rivalry in other text, the research turned to another book dating back from 1976. The book titled *Crassus: A Political Biography* by B.A Marshall, Marshall at the beginning of his third chapter brings up the suspicions between Crassus and Pompey.<sup>2</sup> For the subject of the conflicts with Pompey, it seems the narrative of this instance had not changed in the 30 plus years that went by that separates these two works. A part of the narrative has been explained however both of these monographs take deep looks into the political savyness of Crassus. In the book by Ward he mentions a political alliance between Crassus and Caesar that was formed before the Triumvirate was formed.<sup>3</sup> Comparing this to the work from a more recent scholarship, the book by Marshall does not seem to emphasize on this alliance prior to the Triumvirate excluding a short part stating the two were in league with one another.<sup>4</sup> In these two instances the narrative regarding Crassus involvement with the figures of the Triumvirate is mixed as one text mentions certain information that is all but left out of the other monograph. Even with the narrative changing slightly in the years between

---

1. Ward, *Marcus Crassus and the Late Roman Republic*. pg. 100

2. Marshall, *Crassus: A Political Biography*. pg. 49

3. Ward, *Marcus Crassus and the Late Roman Republic*. pg. 171

4. Marshall, *Crassus: A Political Biography*. pg. 68

the books' publishment, the narrative of historians agree that the three men had many instances in the past in which they were accompanied by each other's presence. Moving on to the years of the Triumvirate, the narrative regarding Crassus in the book by Ward mentions Crassus' involvement leading up to the triumvirate alliance was far from well intentioned.<sup>5</sup> This point seems to be one that is better explained in the older monograph as the text by Marshall does not mention much in the ways of Crassus maneuvering against Caesar and Pompey. Marshall however does briefly mention a possibility of Crassus involvement in the political schemes.<sup>6</sup> The next comparison with the sources looks into the style of history in which these historians are looking at the figure of Crassus. Ward mentions towards the end of the book how to characterize the figure of Crassus.<sup>7</sup> This could be done in an attempt for other historians to be pressed in a certain direction. This seems to not be the case as the book by Marshall seems to form its own narrative regarding the maneuvers of Crassus. In the book by Marshall he talks about the previous narratives regarding Crassus just as Ward had done<sup>8</sup>. Both of these monographs have sections in both that mention the previous narratives of Crassus, bringing to light how important the analysis of these sources can be. While both of them have different ways they produce the narrative of Crassus, they both agree that the narrative has been skewed over the years by historians. Crassus was one of the less well known members of the First Triumvirate and since his death arrived before the other members. This truth has allowed the narrative to be constantly shifted by every historian who has studied this subject. In the end what you get is his narrative which has characterized Crassus by his wealth and what Marshall considers a classic downfall by means of hubris.<sup>9</sup> The narrative of Marcus Crassus seemed to be heavily connected to the other members of the First Triumvirate with most of the chapters in both books mentioning Pompey, Caesar or both. These two monographs seemed to wish to change the narrative of the figure of Crassus. Both mentioning

---

5. Ward, *Marcus Crassus and the Late Roman Republic*. pg. 231

6. Marshall, *Crassus: A Political Biography*. pg. 113

7. Ward, *Marcus Crassus and the Late Roman Republic*. pg. 290

8. Marshall, *Crassus: A Political Biography*. pg. 171

9. Marshall, *Crassus: A Political Biography*. pg. 171

how not to describe the man at the conclusion sections of the books. Within these two monographs the narrative regarding Crassus has changed in some regard as he is less characterized as diabolical and greedy, the figure depicted in Marshall's book better describes how historians have progressed the narrative of the historical figure. Since the narrative of Crassus is tied to the narratives of the other members of the Triumvirate, the topic of analyzation should not end with an investigation of the Triumvirate's less known figures. This topic should be continued by covering the known rival to Crassus according to these monographs. As these monographs have stated the rivalry between Pompey and Crassus had been something of note. The narrative in Marshall's book often makes mention of the coalition between Crassus and Pompey instead of a clear rivalry. While this point is mentioned in the book, it does not take over the narrative as it seems in other narratives. Further analyzation of the sources here will show that the texts regarding Crassus seem to follow a top-down approach to his political moves not showing much in the effects it had on the public. The narrative is characterized by the political movements of strong men and thus there is a glaring lack of social and cultural effects in the narrative. The monograph by Marshall states Crassus playing the political game in order to secure more power for the fellow members of the Triumvirate.<sup>10</sup> This section mostly mentions the coalition with Pompey, name that seems to inhabit much of Crassus' narrative. This is a big part of the narrative told in Ward's book, however the political ties between the two men are considered weak in this text.<sup>11</sup> as it has been proven that the narrative of Crassus is ever changing among these two authors, there is a clear importance to Pompey. The man seems to be placed into the narrative of Crassus due to political involvement. The next section shall cover the narrative regarding Gnaeus Pompeius Magnus, the man who would place a mark on Roman politics and the military itself. Much of the scholarship surrounding Pompey should involve sections regarding a partnership or even rivalry with Crassus. Since it has taken up a great deal of the narrative about Crassus it will be something of note if these two figures are not mentioned to have a political relationship and rival throughout the narrative as seen in

10. Marshall, *Crassus: A Political Biography*. pg. 64

11. Ward, *Marcus Crassus and the Late Roman Republic*. pg. 193

the monographs covering Marcus Crassus.

## **Gnaeus Pompeius Magnus**

Pompey was given a great deal of power by the Roman senate after his victory over Quintus Sertorius in Hispania. The Adolescent Butcher, as his rivals called him, would have an interesting narrative formed about himself as more than just a warrior. In the monograph titled *Pompey The Great* by John D. Leach, the book describes the political side of Pompey more than his military conquests. The first portion mentioned in this narrative dated at about 1978, the book mentions the a few military conquests however it also mentions how Pompey had formed long standing political alliances.<sup>12</sup> This narrative begins with the man himself making political moves before the introduction his triumvirate partners. There are other monographs describing the narrative of this figure is a book by Robin Seager titled *Pompey the Great: a Political Biography*, written in 2002. In this book Seager describes the figure of Pompey as one that was not as politically savvy taking years before becoming involved with figures like Cinna and Sulla.<sup>13</sup> The preliminary political movements of Pompey, in both these sources do not seem to be as well recorded yet there is clear change in the story. The monograph from the 70's mentions an early beginning for Pompey in Politics while the more recent text negates this claim. The narrative regarding Pompey's actions before the Triumvirate, like Crassus are still seemingly up for debate. This however is only one instance where the narrative had changed regarding Pompey and his life. Then next issue to cover is the idea that Pompey wanted to be like Alexander the Great. In the book by Leach, he mentions the figures wish to be like Alexander of Macedon when looking into the conquests in the east.<sup>14</sup> In the book by Seager this narrative does not seem to characterize this figure as another Alexander, more a patient leader waiting for his next command to arrive.<sup>15</sup> When analyzing the sources that are available about Pompey before his involvement in the first triumvirate seems like a

---

12. Leach, *Pompey The Great*. pg. 34

13. Seager, *Pompey the Great: A Political Biography*. pg. 26

14. Leach, *Pompey The Great*. pg. 78

15. Seager, *Pompey the Great: A Political Biography*. pg. 40

mixed review. The narrative seems to have changed drastically in the time between these two books being written yet this can help with seeing how much the narrative has changed since the scholarship of the 1970's. When looking into the narrative written about the figure's involvement in the Triumvirate, the narrative seems to be characterized by a rivalry yet again. In the text by Leach, the rise to power is written hand in hand with an alliance with Julius Caesar not with the assumed rival Marcus Crassus.<sup>16</sup> In the book by Seager the rivalry with Caesar is not as well documented as is the rivalry with Marcus Crassus.<sup>17</sup> This difference is not uncommon as these two books have shown a change in the narrative especially as the years pass. These two books describe two versions of a well known narrative and these texts express how much the narrative can change over the years. The narrative that describes the moves of Pompey are not heavily involving the other members of the triumvirate. This narrative would have the readers assume that Pompey was more of an individual more than someone looking to form an alliance. The narrative regarding Pompey is not one that has a lot to do with the Triumvirate as it is not really mentioned in Leach's text. However in the text by Seager it is emphasized that the three were in league with one another before the Triumvirate was formed.<sup>18</sup> The narratives seem to change in the manner that in the 1970's the narrative did not seem to add the importance of the alliance of three men, yet the text from 2002 makes a clear mention of the men having done business prior to the formation of the alliance. There is more to these narratives when looking to analyze these sources, the shock is to see how much of the narrative change within two years. The books in question were written in 1976 and 1978 respectively, in this time the narrative regarding the relationship of Crassus and Pompey seemed to disappear in favor for one with Caesar. This narrative is different from the previous book that dated only two years before, and in this text the rivalry between Crassus and Pompey is stuck at the forefront.<sup>19</sup> These two books produce different narratives regarding Crassus and Pompey, while one book makes a clear mention of how important one man was to the other the book that is

---

16. Leach, *Pompey The Great*. pg. 123

17. Seager, *Pompey the Great: A Political Biography*. pg. 78

18. Seager, *Pompey the Great: A Political Biography*. pg. 83

19. Marshall, *Crassus: A Political Biography*. pg. 65



written later, Leach's book, does not have much in the ways of Crassus' narrative. The narrative of Pompey told in the book by Marshall gives some information to the reader regarding who Pompey was. The book by Leach seems to focus on one man more than the influence he gained from the Triumvirate. The biggest difference in the narratives told by these books is the negation of this alliance between the three men. In the book by Marshall, the Triumvirate has a great deal to do with the narrative of Marcus Crassus and Gnaeus Pompey based on the name of the chapter.<sup>20</sup> yet it seems to be an background subject for Leach in his monograph. One would expect two books coming from the same time period would be similar in the writing style and even content, this is not the case with these two monographs, and this was not expected coming from two monographs that were printed a few years apart. This drastic change in the narrative shows how much historians have changed their writing on these figures and it shows how some historians chose to write about the figures. With the clear differences in the text, it is clear to see that the narrative of the First Triumvirate and the people involved is ever changing and this shows how often the scholarship seemed to change their mind. The changes in the narrative, while it was expected it is surprising to see how drastically the story regarding these men has changed in such a short amount of time. Even with the two texts covering different figures, this narrative that almost negates their presence is one that was not expected yet not unwelcome. The sources that cover Gnaeus Pompey seem to have different tendencies than the historians covering Crassus. These sources can present how much of the narrative has shifted, with this the narrative is formed through these texts and as the years go by it becomes clear to see all aspects of Pompey's life in the book dating at 2002. These books, while only a few years apart can show the amount of change that happens within history, even if two years go by there will be new information to glean. The older members of the Triumvirate may have been the subject of these narratives yet there is one man who rose above the rest. The narrative of both Crassus and Pompey are heavily influenced by the feats of their ally and partner in the Triumvirate, Gaius Julius Caesar. This next section of the paper

---

20 Marshall, *Crassus: A Political Biography*. pg. 63

will cover the narrative surrounding the soon to be Emperor of Rome.

## Gaius Julius Caesar

The third and most well known member of the Triumvirate has a great number of narratives surrounding the overall figure in Roman history. Much of Caesar's narrative comes from his books depicting the Gaulic wars and the Civil war with Pompey. For the purposes of the paper the analysis will begin with the narrative of Caesar in the political world, especially with his triumvirate allies. The first monograph discussed for this section was a book by Ernle Bradford titled *Julius Caesar: The Pursuit of Power*. This monograph was published in 1984, six years following the book by Leach, which can give a good idea of how the narrative regarding this figure has changed. In Bradford's book, he designates a few chapters towards the narrative regarding the relationship between Caesar and Pompey. In this section Bradford tells Caesar's narrative characterized by being in a sense Pompey's shadow.<sup>21</sup> This seems to follow the narrative of Pompey from Leach's monograph, this makes a great deal of sense, due to the books being written years apart. Surprisingly the books covering Crassus and Pompey that are a mere two years apart display a very different narrative from one another. Returning to Caesar, the relationship with Pompey seems to be written heavily into the narrative as it appears in another monograph published in 2007. In the book *Julius Caesar: The Life and Times of The People's Dictator* by Luciano Canfora, the author describes this pairing in a similar way. The first lines of the chapter regarding the Triumvirate begins with an explanation of Pompey's political moves.<sup>22</sup> The monograph describes the successes of Pompey before mentioning the moves of Caesar at this time. The narrative was stated at the beginning of the chapter as well and the story seems to not change in the years in which the monographs are written. The next major point in the narrative of Caesar is his election to the position of consul. The narrative expressed that Caesar was ready to make political compromises during his time as consul.<sup>23</sup> This narrative does not seem to be mentioned in the other

---

21 Bradford, *Julius Caesar: The Pursuit of Power*. pg. 74

22 Canfora, *Julius Caesar: The Life and Times of The People's Dictator*. pg. 63

23 Bradford, *Julius Caesar: The Pursuit of Power*. pg.82-83

monograph, even when they all are in conversation with the same figures in history. This narrative would not remain the same in the monograph by Canfora. Canfora describes this time in Caesar's career as a time where he took control of the office, performing all his moves alone.<sup>24</sup> These two monographs are similar and different from one chapter to the next, changing the narrative as each chapter moves forward through history. The narrative continues to tell less and less of the movements of the first Triumvirate. The narratives move in different directions as Bradford's book briefly mentions Crassus and Pompey. Crassus is described by his wealth and Pompey by military experience and lack of communicative skills.<sup>25</sup> As in the book by Canfora, Crassus and Pompey are described more or less as political allies to Caesar.<sup>26</sup> These two narratives have a great deal of change among them as the mention of the other members of the Triumvirate are not as mentioned as the other monographs. As mentioned previously the narrative of Pompey in Leach's book goes into detail on the partnership of Caesar and Pompey. There are many instances in which the two figures are in league with one another including the support of every political move.<sup>27</sup> This does not change when jumping six years to when Bradford's book was written in 1984. Caesar and Pompey are described to have supported each other politically in this narrative as well.<sup>28</sup> There is no change in the narrative between these two figures however there was a great deal of change when dealing with the narratives for Crassus. The sources all seem to follow a similar narrative when the monographs discuss the other figures in comparison to one. In the case for Caesar's narrative, there is not much change in the way he is described among the scholarship. The only change that is seen is the compromising nature of Caesar that changes from the monographs covering this figure. However they are similar when looking at the Leach's book which was written and published closer to Bradford's book. The narrative regarding Caesar's involvement in the first Triumvirate seem to end with the man's proconsulship in Gaul. the

---

24 Canfora, *Julius Caesar: The Life and Times of The People's Dictator*. pg. 79

25 Bradford, *Julius Caesar: The Pursuit of Power*. pg. 88

26 Canfora, *Julius Caesar: The Life and Times of The People's Dictator*. pg. 94-95

27 Seager, *Pompey the Great: A Political Biography*. pg. 124

28 Bradford, *Julius Caesar: The Pursuit of Power*. pg. 90

sources do not seem to continue the partnership with Pompey unless to mention the Roman civil war.<sup>29</sup> The mention of Crassus is all but nonexistent, the narrative of this figure is described briefly in the same manner that had been expressed against in Marshall's book.<sup>30</sup> The narrative regarding the Triumvirate seems to have many changes through the many authors that have written about this topic. The monographs are in some cases drastically different as Bradford and Canfora had written in their narratives regarding Caesar politically. The differences in these monographs has been a big surprise as the expectation for books in this scholarship is to remain similar, however these books take different paths. As one mostly talks of Caesar as a political mind, the other seems to give the perception of seeing a more personal account of Caesar in politics. These two monographs have more of a top-down representation of the Triumvirate and Caesar himself, since much of the sources for these monographs come from those scholarships. Since these sources cover a more political and military history, there is much about the narrative that can be learned. The scholarships of history regarding Caesar have all placed this lense on the figure from the 1980's to the 2000's era. This political look can be a limiting lense as there is much not covered regarding Caesar that is important to make more discoveries in the narrative. With each individual figure investigated, the narratives about all three are based around their involvement with one another. Each of the monographs provide a small addition to the narrative of the other figures, by reading all these testimonies a full narrative of this political alliance can be described. While all the sources offer an different interpretation regarding each of the figures, they all have something to bring to one another even if the books are not in conversation with one another. All the monographs progress the narrative and each of the texts add to each of the other figures narratives as well. Furthermore with continuing an analyzation of the all of the sources, the narratives can be seen to shift and twist as years pass and scholarship undoubtedly changes. With the narrative shift already clear from the initial analyzation of the sources, this can determine how far the narrative has shifted throughout the years of scholarship. This final section of the paper will cover all the instances in which

---

29 Bradford, *Julius Caesar: The Pursuit of Power*. pg. 190

30. Marshall, *Crassus: A Political Biography*. pg. 171

the narratives of these men are in conversation about the alliance of the three.

## **Analysis of Triumvirate**

The sources have all been in scholarship with the narrative of the First Triumvirate. All the sources seem to form their own idea of how each of the members dealt with their peers through the course of their alliance. In the first books mentioned by Marshall and Ward, these two monographs have a unique way of describing the narrative of the Triumvirate as a whole. They both have a mention of the alliance of the three men yet the importance is set to two people negating the involvement of the third. In the case of Ward's book the two men mentioned the most in the triumvirate is the rivalry with the political peer Gnaeus Pompey.<sup>31</sup> Whereas Marshall's book makes a clear mention of more of an alliance between Caesar and Crassus rather than Pompey.<sup>32</sup> The two narratives do not differ from their mention of the other Triumvirate members, it does give the impression of a constantly shifting narrative. The two narratives present stark differences that appear to readers and scholars alike causing the perceptions of the Triumvirate as a whole to shift in a similar direction. The sources are unique as they are the only ones to heavily mention all three of the Triumvirate members as the monographs regarding the other members leave Crassus all but out of their narrative. This turn has caused sparked inspiration to cover this subject, and to discover how the change has happened when some of the monographs are not many years apart. Both these sources present a conclusion section that states to not buy into a certain narrative regarding Marcus Crassus, as mentioned previously in the paper. However a source covering the political movements of Caesar describe Crassus with the simplest of terms, a millionaire.<sup>33</sup> While this is a clear violation of what both Ward and Marshall have suggested, it can bring to light that no matter how much monographs wish to alter the narratives and the scholarship, the narrative does not shift. The monographs regarding Crassus have much of the writing covering the coalition with Pompey over the alliance with Caesar. The alliances

---

31. Ward, *Marcus Crassus and the Late Roman Republic*. pg. 99

32. Marshall, *Crassus: A Political Biography*. pg. 82

33. Bradford, *Julius Caesar: The Pursuit of Power*. pg. 88

with Crassus are briefly mentioned in the books regarding Caesar and even less involved in the narrative regarding Pompey

As for the monographs covering Gnaeus Pompey, they produce a different narrative over a longer period of time. The monographs date from 1978 to 2002 yet did not have as many differences among the scholarship. These two monographs however differed from the other books on several grounds including their involvement with one another. The monographs have brief sections that talk about Pompey's relationship with his fellow *triumvirs*. The rivalry between Crassus and Pompey is something that is a big part of Crassus' narrative yet it does not have the same importance. Leach's text has a section that briefly states a rivalry was present due to a contested victory over the slave rebellion.<sup>34</sup> The narrative of this rivalry written in Seager's book is much different from the last interpenetration. In this text Seager expresses that Crassus and Pompey were more allied in their political gains.<sup>35</sup> The narrative regarding rivalries between all the members of the Triumvirate dominates the older narratives and texts. This does not remain the same in the newer texts covering the men of the Triumvirate, it even changes to the point where Crassus and Pompey seem as allies and not enemies. There is a similar shift in narrative when covering Pompey's partnership with Julius Caesar. In the book by Leach the alliance with Caesar takes up a large part of the narrative as their alliance would turn into factions in a civil war. The alliance between Caesar and Pompey is explained in detail over the course of twenty plus pages as being strong, expressing that Caesar offered daughter Julia to Pompey.<sup>36</sup> This alliance between Caesar and Pompey seems to dominate the narrative more so than any alliance with Marcus Crassus. The shift provides a thought that the titled coalition between Pompey and Caesar begins to dominate the narrative right at the time the book was published. A similar narrative is present in the book by Bradford, which expresses a political alliance between the two men.<sup>37</sup> This shift seems to begin in the earlier book regarding Pompey and it follows into Bradford's monograph. This narrative

---

34. Leach, *Pompey The Great*. pg. 58

35. Seager, *Pompey the Great: A Political Biography*. pg. 36

36. Leach, *Pompey The Great*. pg. 126

37. Bradford, *Julius Caesar: The Pursuit of Power*. pg. 78

shift can be understood due to the proximity in which the works were written. This is not much different from the book regarding Pompey dated in 2002, providing proof that this narrative remained the same at a certain year in scholarship. In the book by Canfora, published in 2007, the author mentions a similar narrative regarding the the political alliance with Pompey. There is a major difference between this text and the others. This book describes Caesar and not Pompey or Crassus as the architect behind the Triumvirate.<sup>38</sup> While the other narratives do not describe anything like this, it is intriguing to see how much the narrative has shifted and whom the favor has shifted to. In the books covering Pompey there is a clear reference to an alliance with Caesar and this remains the same in the monographs covering Caesar. The shift in the narratives however seems to favor the accomplishments of Pompey and Caesar while slowly removing Crassus from the tale. This shift is not only seen the the texts that take a detailed look at Gnaeus Pompey. The texts that cover Caesar have a similar tendency to include the accomplishments with Pompey but not as many regarding Crassus.

In the monographs that cover Julius Caesar, as mentioned previously, there is a great deal of information regarding the partnership with Pompey. A partnership with Crassus is mentioned briefly in the text by Bradford, however Crassus is characterized by his wealth and the desire to buy into Roman politics.<sup>39</sup> While this point was brushed upon ealier in the paper regarding the narrative of Crassus when it had been mentioned at the end of Marshall's monograph. Even with warnigns posted, years later and the shift remains the same in place of historian's feelings towards the alliance with Crassus. In the book by Canfora the narrative of Crassus is overwhelmed by the understood rivalry with Pompey. This narrative, focusing on Caesar, does not describe Crassus as greed, yet it does relate him closely to his gold and financial hold over Caesar.<sup>40</sup> The narrative of the first triumvirate in this text seems to focus on two of the three as many of the monographs have done throughout the research. A large portion of both texts covering Caesar and Pompey constantly referenced an alliance between the

---

38. Canfora, *Julius Caesar: The Life and Times of The People's Dictator*. pg. 72

39. Bradford, *Julius Caesar: The Pursuit of Power*. pg. 55

40. Canfora, *Julius Caesar: The Life and Times of The People's Dictator*. pg. 67-68

two men that overwhelms the narratives. In the book by Leach, he describes a different alliance between the two men as seen in both monographs covering Caesar. In the monograph by Leach, he describes the alliance as one of mutual benefit.<sup>41</sup> The monograph by Canfora characterizes Caesar being sound and quick to play the political sides.<sup>42</sup> These narrative shifts can be explained through different years and different figures in history. These men, however, are so close together in history that each narrative can speak volumes about the other men and how they were considered by sources that favored one or more members of the Triumvirate. The texts that focus on the narrative of Caesar mention an alliance with Gnaeus Pompey, and the story of how the two interact is far from the narrative described in the books by Seager and Leach. When comparing the monographs covering Caesar with those specializing with Marcus Crassus, there are clear difference with some key similarities. The monograph by Ward writes about an alliance between Crassus and Caesar based on Caesar's political move to *Aedile*.<sup>43</sup> This early narrative of Crassus describes a political alliance with Caesar, in the book by Canfora published in 2007, the alliance is described as something that kept Caesar protected.<sup>44</sup> These two texts are the farthest apart, the text from Ward as the earliest and Canfora with the latest version of the narrative. These two books have different ways of describing the alliance yet it is clear that both authors describe a solid alliance between Caesar and Crassus before one between Caesar and Pompey. The narrative regarding the Triumvirate has shifted many times throughout many different monographs yet there are some clear similarities between the books. All of them are clear on the rivalry between Crassus and Pompey, they all make mention of Caesar rising above the others and there is also a piece in all the monographs that tells of a time all three of these men come together. The Triumvirate does not have many conflicting stories regarding their political moves due to the ancient sources all but writing a similar narrative. The narrative regarding these men as told through the monographs has shifted over the years to where modern authors are writing a combination of all the

---

41. Leach, *Pompey The Great*. pg. 124

42. Canfora, *Julius Caesar: The Life and Times of The People's Dictator*. pg. 68

43. Ward, *Marcus Crassus and the Late Roman Republic*. pg. 125

44. Canfora, *Julius Caesar: The Life and Times of The People's Dictator*. pg. 67



information. This provides evidence that the narrative of the first Triumvirate is constantly changing with a focus on political and military history. With the scholarship changing as fast as the narrative of these men it is only a matter of time before historians can form a social or cultural history regarding the men of this political alliance.

## Conclusion

One thing that has caught the attention of many fans of history is the use of these figures in modern media. The major narratives that are known to most peers are the narratives displayed in television shows such as HBO's *Rome* and Starz hit drama *Spartacus*. In the narrative shown in *Spartacus*, Crassus seems to be in control of every political and military move he and Caesar make. This is culminated by Crassus himself using the term Triumvirate in the series finale of the show, him being the only character who uses this term. This point is much different from the monograph's interpretation which stated that Caesar was more responsible for creating the full alliance between the men. This narrative seems to drastically change from 2007 to 2013 when the show *Spartacus* began its final season. This television show does not reference the figures of Caesar, Pompey and Crassus until their final season, and Pompey is barely mentioned in this. The narrative seems to match the monographs regarding Crassus more than the others. The narrative of these men was very different in HBO's *Rome*, mostly the depictions of Caesar and Pompey. In this television show Caesar is the main figure and Pompey is displayed as an older man and not as the young politician described in the monographs. Pompey is not given much in the ways of military credit as he seems in over his head way too often, more so than the real man would have been. The narrative captured by this show seems to follow the books that cover Julius Caesar, more so than the others, granted the show obtained historical records from Caesar's works. A big difference in the narrative told by each show, Crassus does not appear in HBO's *Rome*, and does not have the same influence over the figures as the sources suggest. After investigating and viewing both of these shows the narrative shift moves in the opposite

direction of the narratives seen in the monographs. The narrative of the first Triumvirate is ever changing amongst both the textual sources and the visualizations of modern media. The narrative will continue to be a conversation within the field of history, and perhaps in the years to come there will be new information. Information that can enable historians to gain a new perspective on the formation of the Triumvirate on the cultural and social level. If this is to be discovered it could produce a monograph that could shift the narrative in a different direction yet again.

## Works Cited

Bradford, Ernle Dusgate Selby. *Julius Caesar: The Pursuit of Power*. New York: Morrow, 1984.

Canfora, Luciano. *Julius Caesar: The Life and times of the People's Dictator*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.

Leach, John. *Pompey the Great*. Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Littlefield. London: Croom Helm, 1978.

Marshall, Benjamin Arthur. *Crassus: A Political Biography*. Amsterdam: A.M. Hakkert, 1976.

Seager, Robin. *Pompey the Great: A Political Biography*. Oxford: Blackwell Pub., 2002.

Ward, Allen Mason. *Marcus Crassus and the Late Roman Republic*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1977.