Fantasies' revisits the presence of Cleopatra as a guest of Caesar's in Rome, drawing on both mythography and established patterns of Hellenistic royal diplomacy. Galinsky, 'Greek and Roman Drama and the *Aeneid*' considers the relationship between theatre, poetry, and ideology, as well as their respective scholarly orthodoxies, and provides a compelling reading of Virgil as a dramatizer of a number of pressing ideological motifs; Champlin, 'Agamemnon at Rome: Roman Dynasts and Greek Heroes' takes us from Pompey to Nero and examines the meaning of heroic rôle models for Roman dynasts, beginning with the paradoxical identification of Pompey with Agamemnon. The volume continues with an appreciation of Wiseman by Fantham, an autobiographical note by Wiseman himself, and his bibliography (up to 2002), and concludes with an *index locorum* and general index.

Wiseman's short essay gives a thought-provoking insight into how what at the time seemed a series of serendipitous encounters with a range of recherché historical problems could amount, over a lifetime of energetic publication, to something like a personal methodological style capable, as in this volume, of producing work which demonstrates the influence of that style. Thought-provoking above all, of course, because methodology and theory are subjects which Wiseman's own work rarely directly addresses. There is no doubt, however, that there are concrete theoretical insights which, perhaps in the light of the wider theoretical evolution of classics and ancient history, can be derived from this collection. Most striking is the interdisciplinarity of the contributions; this itself rests upon a repudiation of notions of a hierarchy of texts, and a simultaneous freedom with the concept of history itself. Ancient history emerges from this volume as a dynamic and stimulating discipline combining formidable technical expertise with critical self-awareness. If we do not admit a Wiseman method, we can at least admire the Wiseman effect: this volume amply signals the potential excitement of Republican history. Editors and contributors alike have done a splendid job in drawing out the unity of the material while providing many moments of illumination in hitherto obscure details of far-flung material. The volume really does transcend the expected limits of its genre, and brings the Republic to life with a vigour which is the highest tribute to its honorand.

University of Birmingham MATTHEW FOX
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni334

POPULAR DECISION-MAKING

R. MORSTEIN-MARX: *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic*. Pp. xiv + 313, maps, ills. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. Cased, £50, US$75. ISBN: 0-521-82327-7.

M.-M. offers here a distinctive approach to the issue of the democratic element in the Late Republic. His focus is mainly on the process of popular decision making; in the course of his exploration of this problem he also provides some cogent observations on the composition and outlook of the contional audience, and on particular episodes of contional oratory.

M.-M.'s central thesis is that the *contio* is less a site of genuine deliberation than of the articulation and performance of consensus and the subsequent bestowal of political power. The *contio* is one of the opportunities within the Roman political system for the people to participate and express their assent to the measures being

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni335 Published online by Cambridge University Press

carried out in their name. At the same time, M.-M. argues convincingly that the level of civic knowledge among Roman citizens could have been fairly high, and that it is not necessary to posit a popular audience which in fact comprised only the relatively well-to-do. But the book's overall argument renders actual questions of composition tangential: if M.-M. is correct, then the bestowal of authority enacted at a *contio* depended simply on the impression of the whole people's involvement, which in turn was guaranteed by their presence in the audience of a *contio*: orator and listeners are bound together by a circular process of legitimation.

M.-M. starts with chapters describing the spaces in which *contiones* were held and the likely knowledge of history and law which the audience might possess. After this scene-setting, Chapter 4, 'The Voice of the People', considers the methods by which the audience might participate directly in the debate, through their own shouts and actions, and how orators could harness these utterances to their own causes. There is some enlightening discussion of the mechanism known as a 'clap-trap', by which an audience is set up to provide a response, and its operation is traced in a fragment of a speech of Carbo's from 90 and in the *Fourth Philippic* (137–43). M.-M. then considers the wider processes by which *contiones* can be seen as bringing public opinion into being rather than eliciting an opinion which is already present. In Chapter 5, 'Debate', M.-M. considers the extent to which *contiones* were sites of genuine debate between opposing points of view and concludes that even those immediately preceding a vote which did give time to the opponents of a bill were intended to scare off citizens who were opposed from attending the vote and encourage supporters to turn out. As he observes, relatively few occasions are known from the Late Republic where a tribunician bill was actually voted down; it seems to have been more common for the proposer to withdraw one that looked to be unsuccessful. M.-M. identifies only two occasions in the Late Republic where contional oratory immediately prior to voting led to a bill's defeat: one is the Papirian rogation in 130, where Scipio Aemilianus' intervention was decisive, and the other Rullus' agrarian legislation in 63. In the latter case, Cicero's tactics in opposition can be traced in the surviving parts of his three *Agrarian Law* speeches: M.-M. subjects them to detailed scrutiny, but even more valuable is his demonstration of how exceptional Cicero's success on this occasion was.

The final chapters turn to the ideological aspects of the contio. M.-M. offers a convincing reassessment of the use of *popularis* characterization, seeing conflict between speakers as something which is articulated through competing claims to represent the people's interest rather than by an opposition between being *popularis* or not. From this perspective, Cicero's assertions in his contional oratory to be a *popularis* are not simply to be dismissed as cynical short-term posturing. Rather, they reflect a consistent projection to the people of a benevolent persona: and crucially, his opposition to Rullus' agrarian law is expressed in terms of concern for the people's interests. The shared language of contional oratory is thus a further reason why debate at this level is so constricted: if every speaker claims to be the people's friend, then ideology is replaced by personality as a basis for decision making.

M.-M.'s *contio* is thus a paradox: a location is crucial importance in the operation of politics in the Republic and at the same time a space where genuine debate is rare. This approach has a great advantage, inasmuch as it sidesteps the problem of the written record of spoken words by resorting to the idea of exemplarity: provided that a written contional speech is an example of what was considered 'appropriate to that specific occasion and *its implied audience*' (p. 27, author's italics), then it can be used as evidence for the nature and operation of a *contio* even if it does not preserve the

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni335 Published online by Cambridge University Press

exact words said. This is convenient, but not necessarily wrong; and M.-M. provides many convincing readings of Ciceronian speeches using this model with its stress on performance over content.

What is perhaps less prominent in the book is the intersection of individual careers with the possibilities of popular oratory. M.-M. refers approvingly to John North's description of patron–client based approaches to the Republic as the 'frozen waste theory' (p. 6) but there is a danger that his own model might be so described, setting up public meetings as a location of similarly predetermined barrenness. But the relations between politicians and citizens which were made and maintained in these encounters mattered; and they were also the result of choices which aspirant individuals made about how they would conduct their public lives.

M.-M. has thus articulated a challenging and important view of what public meetings and popular oratory were for; working out its implications should be equally rewarding.

University of Glasgow C. E. W. STEEL
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni335

ROMANS ON THE BAY OF NAPLES

J. H. D'Arms: *Romans on the Bay of Naples and Other Essays on Roman Campania.* Edited by F. Zevi with a Preface by A. Tchernia. (Pragmateiai: Collana di Studi e Testi per la Storia Economica, Sociale e Amministrativa del Mondo Antico 9.). Pp. viii + 498, maps, ills, pls. Bari: Edipuglia, 2003. Cased, €40. ISBN: 88-7228-355-8.

John D'Arms's *Romans on the Bay of Naples* was first published in 1970. Its reissue in the *Pragmateiai* series with ten of his articles on Campania and in particular his pieces on Puteoli is most welcome. The book, for those unfamiliar with it, opens with a vivid account of the first villas on the bay those of Scipio Africanus, Scipio Aemilianus, Cornelia, and others. This section not only traces the development of the villa, but also evaluates the formation of the Roman concept *otium* and its location outside the city of Rome. The book moves on chronologically to the withdrawal of Sulla from the city and the development of a season for travel to the Bay of Naples during the period of the senate's recess. The association with *luxuria* is fully explored, alongside the health giving properties of Baiae and the use of thermal waters. The visits of emperors are covered, as is the culture of the region under the empire. There follows full catalogues of all owners identified by D. Of the ten papers, probably the most important is that on Puteoli in the second century A.D. (originally published in *JRS* 64 [1974], 104–24), which assesses the effect of the development of the harbour at *Portus* on Puteoli. Interestingly, the effect seems not to have been dramatic with Puteoli's continued prosperity and involvement in the *annona.* This raises questions about how we assess the wealth of such a port city with its wealth derived from numerous parts of the Mediterranean and even traders who had relocated to Portus itself. Other papers deal with specific inscriptions, provide additional material on the owners of property on the bay of Naples, discuss Roman attitudes to *viri municipales*, the linkages between the Holconii of Pompeii and Rome of the Augustan age, and finally the Collegium of Augustales from Misenum. D.'s knowledge of the textual

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni335 Published online by Cambridge University Press