and epigraphic evidence was encyclopaedic, and, like Rostovtzeff, he did refer to the results of archaeological excavations. However, there is a primacy of the textual over the archaeological evidence in his work. There was also little place for theories of interpretation in his work. Having said that, this volume remains the starting point for anyone wishing to study the settlements on the Bay Naples. The additional bibliography provided by the editor of this edition will also be valuable for those wishing to up-date the material published here. More importantly, an invaluable book, that has been out of print for so long, is now available at a very reasonable price, and it should appeal to all who teach and study the Bay of Naples at whatever level.

University of Birmingham RAY LAURENCE
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni336

SEXTUS POMPEIUS: A REHABILITATION

A. POWELL, K. WELCH (edd.): *Sextus Pompeius*. Pp. xviii + 285, map, ills, pls. Swansea and London: The Classical Press of Wales and Duckworth, 2002. Cased. ISBN: 0-7156-3127-6.

Several contributors to this volume reproach Syme for excessive generosity to Antony, yet show a similar readiness to think the best of Sextus. Ironically, the reason is the same: a commendable distaste for the obnoxious Octavian.

Three of the best papers deal with Sextus as a social and political phenomenon. Welch on Sextus and the *Pompeiani* highlights the unsuitability of that term as a label for many opponents of Caesarism. For Cicero the posthumous hero was Cato; another Pompey on the scene would complicate his plans to detach the Caesarians from Antony. Antony's own abusive use of 'Pompeian', facilitated by Cicero's rôle as opposition figurehead, made Cicero even more cautious in his exploitation of Pompey's memory. The crucial questions were how might the *res publica* accommodate Sextus and how might he affect it? The twin bases of Sextus' legitimation were his heritage and the senate's decree, but between these tension was inevitable.

On Sextus and the *res publica*, Welch pursues the question of legitimacy further. Octavian saw the undermining of Sextus as a primary objective. He was eager to drive a wedge between him and Antony, and the marriage to Scribonia was intended in part to win Libo away from Sextus. Misenum greatly weakened Sextus' position as Pompey's heir and defender of the *res publica*: he had to give up his father's house and it was certain that he would never again set foot in Rome.

Powell on strategy and imagery begins with sober reflections on Sextus' position in Sicily and its suitability for his purpose. After the failure of Misenum, Sextus was popularly perceived as better than Octavian; despite the suffering caused by the corn shortage, Sextus was neither blamed nor hated. In passing (p. 117), he unearths an indisputable instance of dishonesty in Velleius (2.67.2). Sextus' coinage stressed and ingeniously linked several major themes: safe haven for the victims of persecution, family piety, the legitimacy of his control of the sea, and divine approval of his actions. All this is sound and illuminating, as are the observations on the lessons Octavian learned from Sextus. But the allegorical interpretation of the legend of the Catanaean brothers verges on the fanciful.

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni337 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Narrower in focus are Lowe on Sextus in Spain, Stone on Sicily, and Lindsay on the fate of later members of the family. Lowe concludes that Sextus' activities in Spain were designed to prosecute the war and establish a position that would survive the move to Sicily, rather than to seek revenge for his father and brother. In practical terms this is fair enough, but to express it thus perhaps creates a false antithesis. What better vengeance could Sextus have devised than the success of those plans which circumstances were to frustrate? Stone demonstrates that Sicily prospered under Sextus and that he was popular there, as is shown by Octavian's harsh treatment of its cities (that of Morgantina is expounded in detail) as well as other evidence. His conclusion that subsequent neglect of the island's economy owed more to its unimportance than to Octavian's malevolence is therefore a little surprising, his concession that there was 'perhaps some spite' on Octavian's part unduly charitable. Lindsay has little new to say about Libo the conspirator or Camillus Scribonianus, but interestingly links the best portrait of Pompey (from the tomb of the Licinii) with that Cn. Pompeius Magnus, deprived of the *cognomen* by Gaius, who was son of M. Licinius Crassus Frugi.

Four papers deal with Sextus in literature. The broadest treatment is that of Gowing. He notes the strong tendency to suppress Sextus' name, observable in the *Aeneid*, the *Res Gestae*, the ninth *Epode*, and Valerius Maximus. Yet Seneca is quite favourable. For Gowing, Lucan is at least sympathetic, though not actually positive, seeing Sextus as more victim than villain. But in 6.419–24 Sextus is presented as betraying his father's heritage: that is, he should have fought Octavian in a last stand against the advance of Caesarism, but failed to do so. In terms of this book, one might say that Lucan pre-emptively rejects the views of Welch and Powell. The historiographical tradition maintains an ambiguous stance, but always inclines towards the negative: Sextus never lived up to his own early promise or the expectations aroused by his father's memory. Even his death, one might add, did not give rise to the purple passages it might have inspired.

In Watson's essay on *Epode* 4 the claim that *latrones* might apply to the activities of Octavian on land, though linguistically possible in theory, seems excluded by the reference to naval operations. Nor does the reaction of Sextus to the proscriptions necessarily disprove the claim that he was a pirate. Most interesting is the implication that higher standards might be expected of Octavian's side, whereas in fact both parties are equally dubious. But, as Watson notes, these views are ascribed to the passers-by; Horace does not commit himself to either view.

Tesoriero and Ogden deal with the witch-craft scene. Tesoriero asks why Lucan used Sextus at all when he was not at Pharsalus, and why his account is so hostile. His answer offers a practical reason for Lucan's adoption of the attitude he took towards Sextus. For him, Pharsalus marked the end of the republic and of genuine republican resistance. He therefore could not afford to portray Sextus in the positive character of a true republican. Ogden's interest is largely technical. He perhaps overstates the case for an established Pompeian link with necromancy, while in *Anth. Lat*. 402, though Magnus, as he says, surely refers to Pompey, the claim that the necromancer is Sextus himself is by no means proven.

All in all, then, an extremely stimulating and valuable end-product from what was clearly a rewarding conference. And perhaps in the end Sextus was too good for his own good and posterity's: if he had made those three knife-strokes, the world might have been a better place.

Liverpool ROBIN SEAGER
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni337

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni337 Published online by Cambridge University Press