should, perhaps, have stressed a little more that those attested are mostly high-level *equites*, either senators' sons, or themselves already senators. Wesch-Klein discusses epigraphic evidence for local euergetism, in inscriptions both by and in honour of the benefactors (most, but not all, involved in local public life), and discusses possible reasons for their willingness to undertake this form of public generosity.

A further group (Caballos Rufino, Lefebvre, Demougin) usefully collects and presents epigraphic evidence, much of it new, for *equites* in the provinces—Spain, Africa, and Asia Minor respectively. All three are accompanied by catalogues. Caballos Rufino supplements his paper, the most purely descriptive, with thirty pages of documentation to satisfy the most demanding of investigators; a catalogue with relevant bibliography, and numerical lists arranged by province, period (Julio-Claudians to Severi) and provenance, and also chronological distribution, shown by lists, bar-graphs and distribution maps. Lefebvre analyses honorific inscriptions from Africa concerning local and imperial officials, pointing out that, though equestrian status is always apparent, the basic concern is with the community's needs and the behaviour expected of public administrators. Demougin supplements her two important monographs on Julio-Claudian *equites* with a paper on 280 from Asia Minor. This embraces a number of important topics, such as bilingualism, and the problematic relationship between the holding of local Greek offices (particularly priesthoods) and aspiration to equestrian status. The main concern, however, is with the evolution of the *ordo*, and local attitudes to attaining it, compared with Italy and elsewhere. The paper is subtitled 'Histoire d'une romanisation'.

This links up with the two concluding papers, already discussed, by Christol and Lepelley. The whole is rounded off by a masterly survey of the achievements of the conference, as shown in the papers, and pointers to further research, by Nicolet. He rightly draws attention to the important prosopographical contributions.

This, indeed, is one of the book's most valuable features. More than 200 of its pages are taken up with catalogues and lists, amply documented. In addition, there is an *index nominum*, and one of the main inscriptional references from *AE* and *CIL*.

An important omission, however, is a consolidated bibliography. A few of the papers, but by no means all, have their own, and there appears to be no editorial consistency in the way in which certain frequently cited publications are referred to in footnotes. Nevertheless, this volume, besides the value of the individual papers, is also a useful tool for future research. Of the eighteen papers none is in English—one is in Spanish, three each in Italian and German, and the rest in French. Even for the linguistically challenged, however, it is worth the effort.

University of Reading JANE F. GARDNER

POOR SHOW

R. C. Beacham: *Spectacle Entertainments of Early Imperial Rome*. Pp. 306, 28 figs. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1999. Cased, £22.50. ISBN: 0-300-07382-8.

As Professor of Theatre Studies at the University of Warwick, Richard Beacham would seem ideally placed to write about theatre and spectacle in Rome. His interest in ancient and modern stage management (he has written *inter alia* on the Swiss stage designer Alphonse Appia) and his involvement in the Theatron company, which specializes in computer-generated reconstructions of ancient theatres, would seem to

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.117 Published online by Cambridge University Press

hold out the promise of unexpected perspectives and great illustrations. Unfortunately the book under review does not entirely live up to these expectations.

This is a traditional, chronological, and undertheorized account of political stagecraft from the late Republic to Nero. The book opens with a discussion of the 'setup': a brief account of spectacular occasions themselves, of the types of performance that might take place at them, such as animal displays and gladiatorial shows, and of certain other events such as triumphs and circus processions. Not all aspects of spectacle are dealt with in equal detail: the uninitiated reader would not learn much about exactly what went on in arenas and circuses. The discussion of traditional theatre (plays and setting) is more detailed, if not totally consistent. On pp. 8–9, for example, we are told that on the whole drama, as a foreign import, was of limited appeal and alienated the Roman public, whereas on p. 5 B. states that 'the restaging of time-tested works of serious drama reflecting traditional values still had popular appeal'.

Gladiatorial shows and chariot races were undoubtedly a huge draw, a fact of which Roman politicians and emperors were well aware. The rest of the book is taken up with a discussion of how they used and manipulated public spectacle. Chapter II deals with the Republican dynasts, all of whom seem to have displayed a 'keen sense of theatre', and whose actions are reviewed as a form of political stagecraft. The statecraft and stagecraft of Augustus ('a great imperial impresario') are considered in the thorough third chapter, which includes a discussion of seating arrangements in Augustan *auditoria* and an account of the dramatic literature of the Augustan age. The next chapter discusses more briefly how later emperors handled public spectacle in the city of Rome. The analysis centres around a traditional assessment of the imperial personalities ('morose' Tiberius, 'mad' Caligula, and 'learned but cruel' Claudius). The final chapter deals with the 'ultimate imperial showman', Nero, whose own interest in the theatre, and his desire to perform himself, have become part of popular mythology. We also read of Nero's well-publicized appearances at the Greek games. He was of course not the first Julio-Claudian to make such appearances (Tiberius and Germanicus had each entered a team of horses at the Olympic Games), but the literature presents Nero's activities as the most striking. The book ends, rather lamely, with an account of Nero's death, after which 'the spectacle entertainments that . . . he had come to personify, continued in Rome and throughout its empire for a further five centuries'. Well, quite.

These chapters are on the whole clear and well-informed. The text contains many quotations from ancient literary sources, and the footnotes and bibliography abound with references to recent scholarship on the subject. Given that this book is so concerned with visual culture and with the physical setting in which historical drama unfolds, however, its own use of visual material is disappointing. Illustrations are few, inadequate, and not well integrated into the text. There is no proper map of the city of Rome, and few plans or maquettes of the buildings discussed (with the exception of the theatre of Pompey) are supplied. The discussion of the changes made by Augustus to the 'mise en scène' of the city of Rome, in itself not uninformative, is barely illustrated.

B.'s decision to present a straightforwardly chronological account whose focus is squarely upon the big names of Roman history, and upon the familiar entertainments of the city of Rome, is unnecessarily restrictive. A more thematic approach might have been more productive. B. is right, for example, to include in Chapter I a brief discussion of aristocratic funerals as an example of Roman spectacle even though the term 'entertainment' might not immediately seem appropriate. This point is not picked

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.117 Published online by Cambridge University Press

up in his later chapters, however, and he does not explore the fact that other aspects of aristocratic life were equally played out on a public stage, as recent studies of Roman housing have demonstrated. Even the *private* lives of Roman senators had to be stage-managed, and the same will have applied to the lives of the notables of the Roman *municipia*. A theatrical perspective on Roman history can be useful, and ancient spectacles deserve to be taken seriously by historians, as is demonstrated by the recent conference volume by B. Bergmann and Chr. Kondoleon (edd.), *The Art of Ancient Spectacle* (Washington, 1999). Unfortunately, the book under review does not do full justice to a fascinating subject.

University of Groningen ONNO M. VAN NIJF

CREATING A DYNASTY

F. HURLET: *Les collègues du prince sous Auguste et Tibère*. (Collection de l'École française de Rome 227.) Pp. 692. Rome: École française de Rome, 1997. ISBN: 2-7283-0372-X; ISSN: 0223-5099.

In outline it is a familiar story: Augustus first cloaked his despotism in Republican vestments; then gradually, through the mechanisms of adoption, dynastic marriage, curule acceleration, and extraordinary forms of *imperium* and *tribunicia potestas* for himself and his heirs, stitched up the fabric of hereditary imperial monarchy. Nevertheless, numerous problems of detail remain—for us as for Augustus himself: how precisely could he confine transmission of power to the *domus regnatrix* while maintaining the fiction of *Res publica restituta*? Hurlet's lengthy book studies specifically the processes by which potential successors were groomed and legitimated. After an introduction setting out aims and discussing methodology and sources (pp. 1–20), there are three main sections: (i) 'L'exercice de la "co-régence" ' devoted *seriatim*, with particular reference to 'official' powers and privileges, to the careers of Agrippa (pp. 24–78), Drusus the Elder, Tiberius (to his accession) and C. and L. Caesar (pp. 79–162), Germanicus (pp. 163–208), and Drusus the Younger (pp. 209–24)—all usefully summarized later in tabular form ('Annexe I', pp. 551–72); (ii) 'Le mythe de la *Res publica restituta*: les fondemonts juridiques de la "co-régence" ', examining the legal and constitutional basis of proconsular *imperium* (pp. 237–319) and *tribunicia potestas* (pp. 321–42), and the usage of the term *collega* in official and other contexts (pp. 343–62); (iii) 'Les *arcana domus*: la place du "co-régent" dans le nouveau régime', on '*Collega*, *Successor* ou *Adiutor*' (pp. 367–413) and, the essential core of the work, 'Le membre de la *Domus Augusta*: la primauté du facteur dynastique' (pp. 415–538), of which more anon. After a 'general conclusion' (pp. 539–49), *Annexes II–IV* catalogue dedications and statuary groupings discussed in Section (iii) and give a simplified stemma (pp. 573–613). There follow bibliography (pp. 615–41), and fifty-seven handsome plates illustrating relevant coins and monuments. Four indices conclude.

H.'s (lavishly produced) book is vastly learned in both ancient testimony and modern scholarship. He presents convincing arguments about the nature and extent of the *co-régents*' imperial and tribunician powers, e.g. for their consistent legitimation through comitial legislation as well as by the *princeps*' choice and senatorial decree (pp. 244ff., 324ff.), and for the development of a kind of 'super-*cursus*', wherein *tribunicia potestas* came regularly to follow *imperium proconsulare* after a five-year interval (pp. 329ff.). His general conclusions on the development of Julio-Claudian

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.117 Published online by Cambridge University Press