persuasive argument leads him perilously close to contradicting his own published views, which presumably explains the uneasy position he ends up adopting: 240; cf. 320). Add discussions of Herodotus' written sources – archaic elegy (Bowie), mythography (Fowler), Hecataeus (Bertelli) – and rival accounts of ancient history – Hellanicus' construction of an alternative, Argos-centered, universal chronology (Möller), Thucydides' Archaeology (Nicolai) – and you have an impressive collection indeed. Herodotus, finally, also provides the title for [B]★★*Miletos, The Ornament of Ionia*[11] (5.28), an interesting but somewhat uneven local history of a city which certainly deserves a monograph to itself. A clue to its unevenness may lie in the book's own genesis: 'this whole project arose as a result of a seminar paper I wrote for Martin Ostwald about the Athenian Regulations for Miletos', then grew into a 'doctoral dissertation about fifth-century Miletos' (vii), and finally exploded into a volume covering a millennium's worth of the city's social, economic, cultural and political history, c. 1400–400 BC. The parts closest to the original focus work best. Here the author, Vanessa Gorman, really has something to say, as in her scholarly and often convincing reconstructions of Miletus' savage civil wars and obscure constitutional history during the archaic and classical periods (88–121, 216–36). The rest of the book contains very useful surveys of archaeological, epigraphic and literary evidence for the city, its cults, colonies and most celebrated citizens, but tends to give the impression of having been tacked on for completeness' sake. Miletus' roles in overseas settlement and in the Ionian Revolt, for example, are treated at length, but the discussion is half-hearted and marked by a notable reluctance to engage in the sort of source criticism which Gorman applies so successfully elsewhere. Thus, the Lelantine war counts as 'reliably recorded' (51) and literary evidence for foundation dates is also 'generally reliable' (65), so that we must accept even the very tenuously attested 'first foundation of Sinope before 756 BC' (71), while *à propos* of Herodotus' account of the meeting of Ionian tyrants on the banks of the Danube we are warned that 'if we start doubting reports about fairly recent times that are both detailed and plausible, we find ourselves on a slippery slope, not knowing when and how to stop' (131 n. 3; cf. 146). And here I was thinking that slippery slopes are the ancient historian's natural habitat, and the ability to totter down to the edge of the abyss without falling in the very essence of her skill.

HANS VAN WEES

[11] *Miletus, the Ornament of Ionia*. A History of the City to 400 BCE. By Vanessa Gorman. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 2001. Pp.viii + 304, with 7 maps. £42.50.

Roman History

These books enter two by two, but led by one for those discomfited by stress on Roman 'democracy'.[1] Henrik Mouritsen, in [B]★★*Plebs and Politics in the late Roman Republic*,[2] argues that meeting areas were exiguous (chapter 2, crying out for a plan); addressing a hostile crowd was nearly impossible; Roman practice contrasts with Athenian, lip-service with behaviour; there were conflicting claims on a 'respectable'

[1] E.g., F. Millar, *The Crowd in Rome in the late Republic* (Ann Arbor, 1998), and A. Yakobson, *Elections and Electioneering in Rome* (Stuttgart, 1999), both reviewed in *G&R*.

[2] *Plebs and Politics in the late Roman Republic*. By Henrik Mouritsen. Cambridge U.P., 2001. Pp. vi + 164. Hardback £55.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/49.2.254 Published online by Cambridge University Press

plebs between work and political activity; legislative *comitia* were acclamatory, elections not always 'political'. Mouritsen adroitly refuses to be swung back towards discredited ideas: patronage takes ritual knocks; controlled and independent crowds are replaced with politically active and passive sections of the population. Mouritsen has moved the argument on in a salutary way. Onlookers begin to wonder if the time has come for synthesis. The next two volumes, both from the same publisher, one in familiar livery, the other Leidenesque, keep us with political life in the person of Cicero. Both are translations with commentary, one, of a speech only 17 pages in translation, particularly vulnerable to objections previously brought against this format. The textual suggestions in [B]★★*Cicero's Speech* Pro Rabirio Postumo,[3] edited by M. Siani-Davies, are useful, but her Introduction does best service by putting a neglected speech in its context. A Ptolemaic stemma would be welcome, and it seems unkind not to provide a vocabulary, as J. M. May and J. Wisse have done in [B]★★*Cicero On the Ideal Orator (De Oratore)*.[4] She presents Ptolemy as 'not so much a pawn . . . as a ruler struggling to maintain his hold'. Is there a contradiction? But she makes a good job of Postumus and she is not taken in by Cicero. The Introduction has occasional slips and some notes come late, but the translation has few infelicities. (Amusingly, both Siani-Davies and May and Wisse deploy 'cheek', a gift of the original 'os', but has it kept good enough company for Cicero?) The commentary occupies 115 pages, with some repetition; there was little need to tangle with *aquae et ignis interdictio* or bribery as an element in C. Gracchus' law against judicial murder; could pages have been saved for Latin text? May and Wisse's work is necessarily more ambitious, but by assigning commentary to the footnote position they bring a plain and clear translation centre stage. Haunted by the absent Latin, they offer an Appendix of readings where they diverge from Leeman-Pinkster or from Kumaniecki. Their introduction is elaborate, including sections on such central topics as Rhetoricians *v.* Philosophers, and Cicero's position in the controversy. The editors put the work in its double context, with minimal slips; it is rather heavy to include a list of Cicero's extant works, and discussion of the pitfalls of translation. But there is no doubt of the usefulness of this volume in bringing us closer to Cicero and his extravagant claims for the orator. We pass from one of the most sophisticated and humane of the ancients to two works on lesser breeds without the Law. P. Wells' [B]★*The Barbarians speak*,[5] promises wide coverage ('peoples of temperate Europe'); a map reveals 'the region of principal concern' (mouths of the Rhine in the W., of the Elbe in the N., Carnuntum in the E., Lake Neuchâtel in the S.). His purpose is to focus on the impact of indigenous peoples on the societies that developed through interaction between 'Roman' and native. Wells has done good service in bringing together and interpreting inaccessible archaeological evidence, looking at imported 'Roman' artefacts from the point of view of the rôle they played. He draws thought-provoking conclusions about the impact of Roman power before Augustus' campaigns in Germany; it led even to the formation of new 'tribal'

[3] *Cicero's Speech* Pro Rabirio Postumo. Translated with introduction and commentary by Mary Siani-Davies. Clarendon Ancient History Series, Oxford, 2001. Pp. xiv + 282. Hardback £40.

[4] *Cicero On the Ideal Orator (De Oratore).* Translated with Introduction, Notes, Appendices, Glossary, and Indexes by J. M. May and J. Wisse. Oxford U.P., 2001. Pp. x + 374. Hardback £32.

[5] *The Barbarians Speak.* How the conquered Peoples shaped Roman Europe. By Peter S. Wells. Princeton U. P., Princeton and Oxford, 1999 (third printing and first paperback printing 2001). Pp. xii + 335, with 45 figs., 2 tables.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/49.2.254 Published online by Cambridge University Press

groupings (Wells offers New World parallels); he stresses the decline of *oppida* and 'serial production' but plays down migration. Roman history is treated with too broad a brush: the Varian disaster 'effectively ended Roman designs on territory further north and east'. Wells comes out with approved views on the relations of imperialists to their subjects; teaching that 'critical theory has been invaluable in showing that every text must be evaluated critically, and deconstructed', and that at Rome 'success in military ventures may have been a qualification for the top ranks' gives one a sense of being taught to suck eggs. Individual points are sometimes hard to document: instead of notes Wells has a 'bibliographical essay', largely of unpaginated references to items in the bibliography. 'Speak' is what the barbarians do not do, and Wells' assumption that natives' retention of fashions was a form of resistance, as if they were Amish, or nationalists against globalization, seems to be just that. The book falls between argued thesis and informative popularization, but it is readable and has valuable detail to offer.

One of its topics is the meaning of the term 'Celt', and that is very much part of J. H. C. Williams' monograph, which originated in a doctoral thesis, [B]★★*Beyond the Rubicon*.[6] Williams' concern is the Gauls, who made an ineradicable impression by capturing Rome in 387 BC. He examines their presentation in classical writers, in particular the notion of Gauls as 'Celts', sharing Wells' doubts of the usefulness of that term, and concludes that ancient literary evidence and modern ethnic presumptions about 'Celts', are not a sound basis for reconstructing the history of the Romans' interaction with the people of northern Italy or for interpreting the material evidence. (As he points out, 'Celts' have done service both for European separatist movements and as founding fathers of the EU.) Williams' position is 'post-Celtic', avoiding the conflation of a term referring to an externally imposed ethno-linguistic category with one that would belong to a self-conscious community. The first chapter, on the discovery of Celtic Italy, takes the reader to Fabius Pictor, Polybius, Cato, and map-making. In the second, the author concentrates on what diverse writers thought that they had discovered. Then come two chapters on Myth and History: the first on the invasion and how 'Galli' could become Italians, the second on the sack, a 'Year 0' that was felt likely to be repeated at the hands of the undifferentiated masses of the North (the Germans became Rome's later nemesis). Finally, in 'Archaeology and History', Williams (like Wells) argues that investigation based on literary sources demands caution: the histories are not mere chronicles. In 'opening up an interpretative gap between literary narratives, ethnic categories, and material evidence' Williams aims at 'achieving a better understanding . . . of how history and archaeology might relate to one another . . . and . . . of what happened in northern Italy in the latter half of the first millennium'.

Now the army. A. Santosuosso's [B]*Storming the heavens*[7] tells a story 'of the Roman military machine'; rather, a number of stories: Marius, Caesar, more analytically, Augustus, and the battle of Adrianople. The sources invite it, and allow scope for an over-heated style. 'Armies of pillagers' explain (or characterize) the change that marked the late Republic. Little is new (E. Luttwak is criticized, and used)

[6] *Beyond the Rubicon*. Romans and Gauls in Republican Italy. By J. H. C. Williams. Oxford Classical Monographs, Oxford U.P., 2001. Pp. xvi + 264. 1 map, 1 fig. Hardback £40. (The reviewer examined Williams' doctoral thesis and gave some advice for its publication, and the notice here is purely descriptive.)

[7] *Storming the heavens*. Soldiers, Emperors, and Civilians in the Roman Empire. By Antonio Santosuosso. Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado, 2001. Pp. xiii + 265. 26 figs.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/49.2.254 Published online by Cambridge University Press

but readers will not suffer, unless they accept the statement that Claudius completed the conquest of Britain, or adopt a writer called Svetonius (*passim*); they may enjoy the high colour. Caesar's twenty-three wounds, only one fatal, brought in to no purpose, could at least have reinforced the idea that the weapons training of the upper class was deficient. Yet stories are insufficient, and the author admits anachronisms. For whom then is the book intended? It is part of a series, including *A Rocky Mountain Sailor in Teddy Roosevelt's Navy*, as well as R. Luginbill's *Thucydides on War and National Character*. Not perhaps for the knapsacks of readers of this journal. Students of the Roman People under arms will learn with satisfaction of the collection of Lawrence Keppie's papers, ★★*Legions and Veterans*.[8] Now they will have in handy form twenty papers, eleven of 1990 or later, from *CAH*[2] 10 and leading journals (all in their original format with double pagination), as well as three previously unpublished, from a writer who combines scholarship with clarity. The first group includes the well-known article on veteran settlement in Italy of the first century, and it starts with two surveys, the *CAH* paper and one on late Republican military service. The new papers are on Antony's legions, 'further thoughts' on settlement in Italy (there are also eight pages of addenda overall), and the closing paper, on veterans on the Roman frontiers. No mere assemblage, the book is divided into three parts: 'From Republic to Empire', 'The Imperial Legions', and 'Veterans'. It is something to cherish, and to have ready to hand. Finally, two books on late antiquity. Some readers may not know Count Marcellinus, a travelled Illyrian public servant in Constantinople (refugee or veteran?), author of the Latin Chronicle that continued Jerome's to 518 (concentrating on the East), was updated to 534, continued again by others, and became a source for Bede. Such readers have no excuse. B. Croke, in B★★*Count Marcellinus and his Chronicle*,[9] sets all out with judgment and clarity, in two parts: 'The World of Marcellinus' (going as far as one can) and 'The Chronicle and its transmission' (indispensable for anyone concerned with the diffusion of culture in late Antiquity). Croke's other purpose is the vindication of 'mere' chronicle as an intellectual activity: it has taken blows from positivists and narratologists alike. There is no doubt of Marcellinus' thinking – especially on Anastasius! – and world view, but this reader remains unconvinced of the chronicle's new status. Divine judgment is too all-embracing for a causal mechanism. Croke's chapter on the Continuator is masterly, and so is his delicate unravelling of the *Chronicle*'s use by Irish writers and its arrival in Jarrow, with a reassessment of Bede's knowledge of it. It is weird that there are no photographs of the Bodleian MS (produced within fifty years of the original) except the reproduction on the dust jacket. Cling-wrap it: its letter forms are vital to the argument. I have saved richest for last: J. H. W. G. Liebeschuetz's B★★*The Decline and Fall of the Roman City*.[10] In this book, a natural successor to *Continuity and Changes* as well as to *Antioch*, the author deals with the years *c.* 400–*c.*650 (750 on the jacket) and is justified in courting controversy with his title. The cities did not all survive, and in its heyday the

[8] *Legions and Veterans*. Roman Army Papers 1971–2000. By Lawrence Keppie. Mavors: Roman Army Researches 12, Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart, 2000. Pp. 339. Maps and photographs, unlisted. Hardback 83 euros.

[9] *Count Marcellinus and his Chronicle*. By Brian Croke. Oxford U.P., 2001. Pp. xvi + 300. 2 maps. Hardback £45.

[10] *The Decline and Fall of the Roman City*. By J. H. W. G. Liebeschuetz. Oxford U.P., 2001. Pp. xviii + 479. 3 plates, 22 maps and plans.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/49.2.254 Published online by Cambridge University Press

polis/*municipium*/*colonia* had distinct characteristics. Nor does Liebeschuetz accept them as a parasitic institution: town and country were intermeshed, making Liebeschuetz's task more complex. The book has two sections, 'The end of Classical urban politics' and 'A Society transformed'. The main factors and players of the first are post-curial civic government and the rise of the Bishop (most prominent of the 'notables' who succeeded the old authorities), civic finance in the East, and factions. Liebeschuetz exploits the geographical distinction to measure change, although it was partly dictated by the siting of the evidence. Literary testimony gives the East an advantage, and Liebeschuetz finds Anatolia wearing surprisingly badly compared with Syria. The second part brings famous names into court to attest the transformation of Greek literary culture under the influence of Christianity, conflict and disorder, and the beginnings of renewal. In the West the balancing theme is that of citizenship, and, correspondingly, the rise of ethnic solidarity. Here again Liebeschuetz carries readers beyond the worst. This work, the result of intense research, is a synthesis with attitude, pointillist, enthralling.

BARBARA LEVICK

Art and Archaeology

Herodotus 1.68 tells of a blacksmith in Tegea who set about digging a well in his backyard and came across a burial (*soros*) containing the remains of a body some seven cubits tall. Seven cubits (*heptapechys*) translates to some three metres, making this supposed prehistoric ancestor loftier than any of today's lords of the basketball courts. Respectfully, the Tegean blacksmith reinterred the giant bones. But word got out, and the site was revisited: Spartans, eventually, carried off what they deemed to be the relics of their hero Orestes. Before reading Adrienne Mayor's [B]★*The First Fossil Hunters*,[1] I had always taken this story as an example of the Herodotean tendency to exaggerate: in his day, 'six-footers' (*tetrapecheis*) were of sufficiently heroic stature (see Aristophanes, *Frogs* 1014). But the context of the anecdote is now demonstrated, within what Mayor calls 'the ancient bone rush'. Find skeletal parts of mammoths and mastodons, then claim them as objects of cult. We may know of Kimon's foraging for Theseus on Skyros, but that was only one of many such curious finds and missions. On the Troad shoreline, Pausanias relates (1.35.3), locals recovered an enormous frame which they took to be that of the hero Ajax. The patellae or knee-caps of the figure measured exactly the size of the discus for the boys' pentathlon. No need, says Mayor, to treat this too sceptically: that the *boys'* discus is specified gives a tone of fastidious accuracy. In any case, she points out, this part of the Turkish coast has yielded many large mammal remains from the Neogene-Pleistocene period; one of which (the rhinoceros) does typically show a patella about 5 inches in diameter – close, indeed, to the average boys' discus-size. The mix of expertise introduced for this analysis is unusual, and carried off in a sprightly style by Mayor: not only illuminating about the conduct of hero cults, but also making some intriguing connections between Greek mythology and natural history. Palaeontology evidently fascinated Greeks and Romans insofar as it

[1] *The First Fossil Hunters*. Palaeontology in Greek and Roman Times. By Adrienne Mayor. Princeton U.P., 2001. Pp. xx + 361, with black and white illustrations and 7 maps. Paperback £12.95.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/49.2.254 Published online by Cambridge University Press