force (Diogenes Laertius 8.46–7) suggests, like the experimentation with diet, that competitors were becoming specialists, subjected to demanding regimes and in an altogether different league from the ordinary recreational wrestler or runner. (The boxer Pythagoras, incidentally, is surely more likely to have invented the meat diet than his namesake, the famously vegetarian philosopher and mathematician, to whom Porphyry attributed the innovation.) Such a development could hardly have failed to affect the image of athletes in some way, and may help account for what Xenophanes has to say about them.

In the same way, it is all very well for V. to point out that Euripides' *Autolycus* fragment is untypical and that Aristophanes is not especially critical of athletes, but one might have expected her to do more than merely list (under the heading 'athletics ain't what it used to be', pp. 378–83) the passages in Aristophanes which complain that the gymnasia and wrestling grounds lie abandoned as young men are seduced away by the sophists' mental gymnastics. However exaggerated these claims no doubt are, they point to another significant change in attitude towards sport and may provide a background to the fierce denunciation of athletes in *Autolycus*.

As far as the discussion of individual passages is concerned, V. is clear and competent, and she goes easy on the footnotes. Introductions and notes to French translations and editions of the texts are cited more often than relevant books or articles. The bibliography was up-to-date when some form of this book was presented as a PhD thesis in January 1993, but has evidently not been revised since, except for the addition of three articles by the author and one by her supervisor.

A major addition to the canon of studies of ancient sport this book is not, but it will have its uses as a work of reference (V. herself describes it as similar to a sourcebook, p. 12), and to the persevering reader it does offer those fascinating glimpses of ancient sporting practice. Note especially the marvellous 'splashing' exercise recommended by Galen, which involved walking on tiptoes while swinging one's arms very fast in opposite directions (p. 263). Sometimes, an ancient gymnasium must have looked like an aerobics class taught at the Ministry of Silly Walks.

University College London HANS VAN WEES

THE MIDDLE REPUBLIC

C. Bruun (ed.): *The Roman Middle Republic. Politics, Religion, and Historiography c. 400–133 BC. Papers from a conference at the Institutum Romanum Finlandiae, September 11–12, 1998*. (Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae 23.) Pp. x + 310, figs. Rome: Institutum Romanum Finlandiae, 2000. Paper. ISBN: 952-5323-00-5.

After the great exhibition 'Roma medio-repubblicana' (1973), it is not surprising that the period should have enjoyed renewed interest: the books of Hölkeskamp and Loreto, a workshop in London, and now this volume. There was evidently little attempt at coherence or coverage, and many of the articles could perfectly well have been published in refereed journals. There is an index of sources, bizarrely including modern authors, and of persons, places, and subjects. The principle according to which the index of sources has been compiled is not obvious, since it excludes Gellius

© Classical Association, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.2.331 Published online by Cambridge University Press

14.8.2, of which Cornell has an important discussion at p. 87 n. 77, but includes six references to passages of Gellius which are not discussed at all. (I think Cornell's interpretation to be excluded by Gellius 14.8 as a whole.) There are two things that shock: Cels Saint-Hilaire attempts to print Humbert's text of Livy 43.3.1–4 (actually twice printing *manumisset* for *manumisisset*, p. 181 n. 35); leaving aside the fact that Humbert's text is absurd from the point of view of the manuscript tradition, Latinity, and content, it is a disgrace not to cite Briscoe's Teubner text, published in 1986. Coarelli, dealing with the Pisaurum inscriptions, disclaims linguistic competence, but fails to cite either R. Wachter, *Altlateinische Inschriften* (Bern, etc., 1987) or B. Vine, *Studies in Archaic Latin Inscriptions* (Innsbruck, 1993). I do not know whether the editor is equally unaware of these basic tools of scholarship or chose not to draw them to the attention of his authors. Either way . . .

I shall list some of the chapters, then discuss those where I have something to offer. Forsythe surveys the Roman historians of the second century B.C.; Ridley defends the Livian narrative of the Hannibalic War, in excruciating English—I doubt if any non-English speaker will fathom the different levels of irony; Bruun suggests that Camillus is the Marce Camitlnas of the Vulci tomb—he observes that this has never been suggested before and I can see why; Ungern-Stergberg follows the evolution of the Roman tradition on the Gallic sack; Hölkeskamp on *fides* comes to the unsurprising conclusion that neither might nor morality can claim primacy; Vaahtera discusses Polybius' blind eye where religion is concerned.

Cornell has a lucid and persuasive account of the legislation of 342 and 339 B.C. (pp. 78–9)—intended to prevent the concentration of power—in the context of a discussion of the Lex Ovinia on the composition of the senate: according to C., Festus 290 L (the emendation of *iurati* for *curiati* is fully convincing) shows that before the statute, advisers were summoned *ad hoc* for each occasion; but the phrase *legere sublegere*, choose or choose in replacement, occurs also in the Tabula Heracleensis, ll. 86 and 106, where we are manifestly dealing with fixed lists of municipal senators, and Festus or his source was undoubtedly thinking of fixed lists also; the transition is not from advisers summoned for the occasion to a fixed composition, but from a composition fixed by favouritism to a composition fixed by rule, a passage, as it were, from status to contract. The transition remains, of course, of enormous importance in the history of the late fourth century.

Humm has a lengthy demonstration that the *Xviri* did not as part of the Twelve Tables reform or publish the calendar; the same view is taken more briskly in *Roman Statutes*; but H. has much that is interesting and intelligent to say. On one point he is not to be followed, where he postulates a unique case of a second correction to the MS of the *De Re Publica* in order to get the figure he wants in Ennius; it would be hard to think of a better example of how not to do textual criticism; and anyone who thinks that his smudge on the palimpsest is a 'C' will believe anything.

Sandberg has identified an interesting phenomenon, namely that the sources for the middle Republic talk of curule magistrates generally as passing statutes, whereas tribunes go through the processes reasonably well known from the late Republic of promulgating and proposing (C. S.-H. seems to think that 'promulgation' = 'passage', p. 177); he concludes from this that when curule magistrates 'passed' statutes, they in fact got tribunes to do it; and that only the assembly of the *plebs* ever legislated in the middle Republic (pp. 128–9). (One worries about S., with the curious abbreviation [borrowed perhaps] At[eius] Cap[ito]; Gellius 10.20.9 does not particularly locate his *ueteres* in the late Republic [both p. 124 n. 13]; and it would be better to avoid the pseudo-Latin *promulgator*, used by Fronto of Numa and *feriae*.) I am not sure that S.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.2.331 Published online by Cambridge University Press

has really taken on board the extent of Livy's wanton insouciance about institutional terminology; or of the filtering of almost everything we know about the middle Republic through the experience of the late Republic (see p. 132: the problem is that our sources for pre-Sullan Rome are mostly post-Sullan [see below]). And there is a real problem: the *Lex Antonia de Termessibus* has tribunes proposing a statute to the *plebs*, the *Lex Quinctia* has a consul proposing to the *populus* (I am astonished that S. should say that the prescript of the *Lex Quinctia* does not survive [p. 129 n. 31]; I always thought that it was because of manuscripts that texts did survive). This difference of practice was hardly a construction of the late Republic or Augustus, it must be traditional. I would suppose, without having checked all of the material, that curule magistrates are not normally recorded as having promulgated or proposed for the middle Republic, because it was tribunician legislation that the late Republic regarded as controversial and as requiring an account of the various stages; and because we do not have the *contemporary* documentation that we have for the Ciceronian age. I fear that S.'s snark is a boojum.

Torelli returns to the inscription of *C. Genucio Clousino prai* from Caere, importantly observing that it was engraved in two moments, *C. Genucio* and *Clousino prai*; he does not go on to observe that the attempt to decide whether *prai* means *praetor* or *praefectus* is probably doomed to fail, since it is likely that the second half of the graffito is incomplete: we cannot know whether the author would have written *praif* or *praitore* or *praifecto*, if he had not knocked off for a drink. T. has two main suggestions to offer: (i) that the inscription is the dedicatory inscription of the underground chamber in which it was found: that this rôle should be fulfilled by a casual and incomplete graffito in plaster seems to me implausible; and (ii) that the chamber was a *mundus*: the thesis is ingenious and learned, and enlivened by some jolly use of Geographical Information Systems, but unconvincing.

There are three points to Coarelli's argument, which is largely independent of the problem of the dating of the Pisaurum texts, before the colony of 184 B.C., after it, or both; C. makes proper use for the first time of the votive material from the shrine, to show that it was attracting few if any offerings by the middle of the century, though such an argument is fragile in the absence of modern excavation. The first point is that the shrine from which the inscriptions come is that of the viritane settlers of the area before the colony, not of the colony; this must be largely true, partly for the archaeological reasons already mentioned, partly on the grounds of sheer scale. But the dedication of the *matrona(i) pisaurese(s)* does rather look as if it presupposes the colony. I am less happy with the notion that the cults are 'plebeian', a division which seems to me schematic; and, given the exiguous percentage of people of the period knowledge of whom has survived, to link Mania Curia with M'. Curius Dentatus and Polla Livia with a Livius Drusus invented as the person who recovered the gold from the Gauls near Pisaurum is to go way beyond the bounds of probability.

Wiseman's is a brave attempt by a historian to come to terms with the rich material represented by the Praenestine mirrors and toilet-boxes, ranging from the kings to Augustus. As for the gesture of Liber (p. 267), is he plucking Apollo's ear to enlist him as a witness (*Roman Statutes*, p. 584)? And I like the notion of *leges* (p. 282) as the rules of the game; presumably W. knows and does not esteem the article cited at p. 193 n. 95.

University College London M. H. CRAWFORD

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.2.331 Published online by Cambridge University Press