points out that in the modern world too these islands have been used both as prisons and as exclusive holiday places. The harshness of exile he reckons as another topos.

A. Chauvot discusses detention under Tiberius. Exile to a fixed place and condemnation to forced labour are both found in his reign. Mommsen thought Tiberius introduced them as penalties (whereas I incline to think this was Claudius), but C. thinks that the cases are an exercise of *coercitio* rather than the development of lawful penalties. He holds that the shadow of Tiberius reached forward to Tacitus, Suetonius, and even Dio, rather than seeing a back-projection from the reigns of Domitian or Commodus.

E. Évrard looks at Seneca's treatment of confinement, using word counts of such terms as *vincula*, *carcer*, *exilium*, but his basic theme is Seneca's Stoicism. J.-M. Salamito, citing various twentieth-century biblical scholars, is concerned with whether St Paul's companions in captivity were fellows in their captivity to Christ, as philology might suggest, or literally in prison with him.

C. Bertrand-Degenbach writes on prison as deliberately a place of terror, both a literary topos and a reality. Its use suggested tyranny; it was rated by Seneca between exile and death. There is no trace of a pre-Christian Roman enduring prison's disgrace with fortitude, not even Socrates, because it was designed to strip the prisoner of all dignity. It was Christianity, and Stoicism, which supported Boethius.

Chauvot wrote the conclusions to the colloquium's set of papers. Prison is an aspect of the state. There is little on prisons and prisoners in ancient literature; indeed, a prisoner is invisible because of his condition. Physical suffering and psychological degradation, like categorical torture, were designed to produce confessions. The more involved the magistrate or official in the investigatory process, the more the use of prison.

There is an index of sources, and two of technical terms connected with the deprivation of liberty, Greek and Latin, and this is probably good enough for the proceedings of a colloquium. The footnotes are where they should be, at the foot of the page. There was a misprint on p. 169, but in general this was a very well-produced as well as a very interesting book.

University of Glasgow O. F. ROBINSON

AMPHITHEATRES

D. L. Bomgardner: *The Story of the Roman Amphitheatre*. Pp. xix + 276, figs, pls. London and New York: Routledge, 2000. Cased, £60. ISBN: 0-415-16593-8.

What do the Royal Fireworks of King George II, Spanish bull-fighting, Renaissance 'pageants' and courtly 'masques', and early Medieval circus troupes have in common? In a final flourish, Bomgardner suggests that all these may be considered in some ways as the heirs of the shows produced in Roman amphitheatres. This may give some sense of the wide range of material included in this book, which is, however, at the same time frustratingly limited in scope. Though ambitious in its chronological framework, it discusses only a limited range of amphitheatres, picking out some of the old favourites (the 'Colosseum', Pompeii, Puteoli, Capua, Verona, Arles, and Nîmes), before presenting a detailed analysis of the amphitheatres of North Africa. Admittedly, a work of this sort cannot aim to cover everything, but this concentration upon Gallia Narbonensis, Italy, and North Africa is not convincingly justified by

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.125 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the author. Nor does he consider what distortion his choice of case studies might have upon our overall picture of the development of the Roman amphitheatre. No mention is made, for example, of the significance of 'theatre-amphitheatres' in Gaul. In his own words (p. xv), 'the result must inevitably be a *mélange* of carefully chosen case studies, general principles, impressions and conclusions linked together by a running commentary'. The question remains to what extent he successfully maintains his focus on the 'story of the Roman amphitheatre'. That said, he does offer many insights into these long familiar monuments, and provides new technical descriptions of many of the North African ones.

The best parts of the book deal with architectural questions, and dissect the monuments with the aid of an impressive number of clear plans and photographs. One's appreciation of what to look for on a visit to the 'Colosseum', for example, is greatly heightened by first reading the relevant pages of this book. Another strength is that he also incorporates discussion of the shows within their architectural context. Probably the most important part of the book is its detailed discussion of the amphitheatres of North Africa, presented in a variety of ways. After analysing a few significant examples (Carthage, Thysdrus, Iol Caesarea, Lambaesis, and Tipasa), it provides a catalogue of all North African amphitheatres (including details of dimensions, seating capacity, dating, and municipal context), and a chronological table, ending with some general remarks.

Perhaps the book's most serious weakness is the rather disjointed attempt to combine architectural and historical analysis. B. does raise several interesting historical issues: he argues that the *plebs* was only a relatively minor component of the audience in Rome; he also provides a balanced account of the many factors behind the decline of gladiatorial spectacles. Too often, however, he contradicts himself, does not engage with important recent scholarship, or fails to situate the amphitheatres within the historical context that he describes. Most striking is his potted history of North Africa at the start of Chapter IV, which is not subsequently related to discussion of the region's amphitheatres. In discussing Puteoli, he repeats the old orthodoxy of the town's decline in the first century A.D., even though this does not actually fit with the evidence he himself describes, with the corporations active in the amphitheatre in the mid-second century A.D.

Similarly, his discussion of Pompeii's amphitheatre provides interesting architectural insights into the building, but fails to explore its historical context fully. For example, he does not consider the potential significance of identifying one of its founders, Quinctius Valgus, with the *possessor Sullani* and father-in-law of the tribune Rullus made notorious by Cicero (H. Dessau, 'C. Quinctius Valgus, der Erbauer des Amphitheaters zu Pompeii', *Hermes* 18 [1883], 620–2; P. B. Harvey, 'Socer Valgus, and C. Quinctius Valgus', in E. N. Borza, R. W. Carrubba [edd.], *Classics and the Classical Tradition* [University Park, 1973], pp. 79–94); he does not discuss the possibility that the amphitheatre's dedication marked the completion of the census, as hypothesized by F. Zevi, 'Pompei dalla città sannitica alla colonia sillana . . .', in M. Cébeillac-Gervasoni (ed.), *Les élites municipales de l'Italie péninsulaire* (Naples and Rome, 1996), at p. 132; he misses the surprising social background of Alleius Nigidius Maius; and his analysis is crying out for a reference to the building inscription from the Stabian Baths for evidence regarding the compulsory presentation of *ludi* by local magistrates, which he wants to find (p. 41, with n. 42, p. 56) and which actually exists!

Despite the generally excellent illustrations throughout the book, it is puzzling why no map is provided indicating the locations of all the amphitheatres mentioned in the book. This would have helped to clarify, for example, B.'s analysis of the significance of

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.125 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the geographical distribution of amphitheatres in North Africa. His analysis of the reliefs found in Capua's amphitheatre reveals how the artistic evidence can significantly contribute to our reconstruction of the otherwise transitory ceremonies in the amphitheatre, so it is a shame that he does not include one or two illustrations of them.

B. claims that he is writing for both a specialist and a general reader. The book certainly contains sections of interest to both, and everyone will find many titbits of interest (the excellent index will prove an invaluable aid in this), but the book's claim in its title to provide 'the story of the Roman amphitheatre' does not entirely match its contents. The author makes a bold move at the start, beginning with the 'Colosseum' rather than with a speculative early history of Roman amphitheatres, and this will draw the reader into the book, but in the end the 'story' loses impetus from time to time.

University of Warwick ALISON E. COOLEY

THE ROMAN MEDICAL WOMAN

R. FLEMMING: *Medicine and the Making of Roman Women: Gender, Nature and Authority from Celsus to Galen.* Pp. v + 453. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2000. Cased, £55.00. ISBN: 0-19-924002-7.

Flemming's well-researched and authoritatively and scholarly written book contributes to filling voids in three areas of scholarship on the Roman imperial era of the first and second centuries A.D. On a general level her study broadens our understandings of Roman women and Roman medicine, but more specifically, and very much needed, she advances scholarship on women and their rôles in Roman medicine. Although there has been a great effort in recent classical scholarship to study the rôles women played both as practitioners and patients in medical care, most of the work has concentrated on Greek medicine with very few studies on the Roman era. Thus, it is encouraging to see not only a book that specifically examines the female in relation to Roman medicine, but also one that asks interesting and innovative questions about the part they played. In many previous studies on Roman medicine, not including specific examinations referring to female health care, women are either not mentioned, or simply added to the equation with discussions of childbirth and gynaecological problems. To realize the broader understanding of women in Roman medicine F. examines females in the context of both general Roman medicine and in the wider Roman cultural conception of female gender. This book is an important contribution to the subjects of medicine, gender, women and contextual studies of the Roman female, and is of use to anyone interested in the history of medicine, especially historians, philologists, anthropologists, and archaeologists.

F.'s study is mainly philological. Her examinations are based on Roman medical literary sources dating to the first and second centuries A.D., including some new translations, and inscriptions mentioning *medicae* and *ἰατρῖναι*, basically what are thought to have been general female doctors rather than doctors specifically concerned with childbirth and female complications. The questions asked of this evidence address a number of issues concerning the construction of the female body in the medical texts and locating the female voice as a practitioner and patient. She wishes to know if women were respected as practitioners, if the medical literature of the period

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.125 Published online by Cambridge University Press