not, as Romm hopes, the study of Alexander can 'inform the difficult choices that lie ahead as America shapes its role in the world' is another question – the central one of another (very American) book on Alexander, Frank L. Holt's *Into the Land of Bones*.[6] Holt focuses on only one slice of the Alexander-story, the 'beating' he took in Bactria; he interweaves his account of Alexander's campaign with details of ill-fated British and Soviet interventions in Afghanistan – and of a third attempt to 'impose a new world order' on the region, that of the United States today. The overwhelming implication is sobering: that in the context of Afghanistan a 'cakewalk' too quickly becomes a 'death march', but Holt probably has no choice but to pull his punches. He leaves open (just) the possibility that a route could be found to avoid the mistakes of the past. US intervention in Afghanistan is presented as inevitable as soon as 'out of crystalline autumn skies four jetliners [screamed] on paths of unspeakable destruction'. And he is careful also to insist on the US troops' 'skill, dedication, honor [and] heroism'. While British and Soviet callousness/carelessness get given frank attention, Holt admits only 'a sniff of the same haughty attitude' in the assertions of American pundits – nothing here on the ethics of daisycutters falling from the clear sky of Afghanistan. Into the Land of Bones is well-paced, written with verve, and generally well-grounded (though it is hard to agree, for example, that Alexander was always intent on 'regime change' in the Persian empire). When Holt is most passionate – for example, over the destruction of Afghanistan's archaeology – it is a great read. In significant ways, however, its probing of contemporary parallels seems limited.

doi: 10.1017/S001738350600009X THOMAS HARRISON

[6] *Into the Land of Bones.* Alexander the Great in Afghanistan. By Frank L. Holt. University of California Press, Berkeley, 2005. Pp. 254, with 4 maps. Hardback £15.95.

Roman History

This review is quite an ark, as we shall see. Both chronological order and merit suggest that first entry must be accorded to a splendidly civilized and civilizing work, T. P. Wiseman's **The Myths of Rome*.[1] The author's aim is to prove that there were such things (not that R. Graves did not make an earlier effort). He succeeds brilliantly, necessarily throwing light on shifts in modern perceptions of the Romans. As it uses painting, notably that of Tiepolo, to demonstrate earlier interest in Roman myth, the book is lavishly illustrated, the more so because unearthing the stories involves archaeological finds. Ovid too provides material generously quoted in various translations. Piquant and illuminating observations from well outside Roman literature and Renaissance and Baroque painting, as well as a friendly style, will retain the interest aroused in younger readers when they open the volume. There is more still: political tendencies in the stories, especially those with a popular bent, are brought out and sympathy with the ordinary people of Rome allowed free play. Again, the author persuasively has the stories purveyed on the stage before they were read in the study – and, not surprisingly, given his earlier works, takes us into the theatre to hear some of them. The results are enriching and memorable. Now two quibbles. The first is with the current filmic fad of cutting into an on-going chapter, without warning, or even sufficient typographical distinctness, to insert boxes, a page or two of extraneous

[1] *The Myths of Rome*. By T. P. Wiseman. University of Exeter Press, 2004. Pp. xxii (including two maps) + 390, with 16 colour plates,109 figs. Hardback £45.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383506000106 Published online by Cambridge University Press

matter and discussion. More important, what is myth? Wiseman's conception enables him to bring in the *Octavia* (AD 69). 'Legend' becomes redundant and Levi-Strauss' balance of myth and ritual illegitimate. Despite loose modern usage, it is reasonable to ask for the involvement of the divine. Embarking with Wiseman's book we find P.-A. Deproost and A. Meurant's *Images d'origines, origines d'une image*,[2] a title fitting for a tribute to Jacques Poucet, whose works are listed and evaluated at the beginning of the collection, with a *tabula gratulatoria* at the end. Also at the end is the *Table des matières*, but no index. The homogeneous first part, *Images des origines de Rome*, has elicited fifteen papers, divided into three groups of increasing size: Site, Sources, Institutions and Religion. This takes up 248 pages devoted to the Ficus Ruminalis, the 'Ramparts of Romulus', the Mundus (Site), Numa and Pythagoras, Dio Cassius, the fall of the Decemvirs, and so on, including the only paper in English, N. Horsfall's 'Arctinus, Virgil and Quintus Smyrnaeus' (Sources), and military power, the *curiae*, the Flamen Dialis, the Rex Sacrorum, etc. (Institutions). But to *Origines d'une image* belong twelve papers, unequally divided between Greece and Rome and 'Autres temps et autres lieux', a miscellany beginning with 'Aux Origines de Râma' and ending with 'Erasme et le généalogie du Christ'. Poucet is a disciple of Dumézil and the editors and contributors stress his concern with methodology, so such diversity is understandable; but as often with a *Festschrift* potential purchasers have to decide whether the material in the volume that is of particular interest to them is sufficient to justify the expenditure. From myth we pass to G. Forsythe's *A Critical History of Early Rome*,[3] a subject, in its first phases, not far removed. (One eminent sceptic has claimed that the only trustworthy conclusions are drawn from surviving institutions.) Unflinchingly, the author starts with prehistory (including the Alpine 'Iceman'), goes on to Archaic Italy (three centuries down to 500), then tackles the ancient sources, Rome during the regal period, archaic Roman religion, the beginning of the Republic, Rome of the Twelve Tables, evolution of the state, 444–367, the rise to dominance down to 300, and finally the conquest and unification of Italy, 299–264. He makes things easier for his readers by subdividing these chapters (thus 'Religion' has 'Important Roman divinities', the calendar, 'The religious priesthoods' – a strange title – and 'Religious practices and ideology') and by writing clearly. Almost every topic is controversial: Forsythe favours a moderate view of Rome's relations with the Etruscans, an evolutionary one on the origin of the patriciate, a cool one of the emergence of the plebeian tribunate, and an agnostic one on the Twelve Tables. He discusses alternative versions as well as over-arching conceptions of the longer period; his point of view is clear when he alludes (4) to T. J. Cornell's *The Beginnings of Rome* (London, 1995), demanding a 'critical' approach. Such controversies make the first seven chapters particularly engrossing. There is a list of works cited and a number of maps (one with an odd assortment of modern and ancient names, one presenting 'Yugoslavia') and illustrations. Up the gangway come further pairs: the first of collections, very diverse. One to be given an enthusiastic welcome is that of J. Edmondson and others, *Flavius Josephus and Flavian*

[2] *Images d'origines, origines d'une image*. Hommages à Jacques Poucet. Transversalités 4. Edited by Paul-Augustin Deproost and Alain Meurant. Bruylant-Academia s.a. and Université catholique de Louvain, 2004. Pp. 451, with unlisted plates. Paperback €51.

[3] *A Critical History of Early Rome*. From Prehistory to the First Punic War. By Gary Forsythe. University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 2005. Pp. xvi + 400, with 2 tables, 10 maps, 10 figs. £29.95.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383506000106 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Rome.[4] It brings together, even confronts, the historian and the particular context, receptive or otherwise, in which he was writing, and so performs a rare and, it is to be hoped, exemplary service to students of two strands of ancient history and social and intellectual life. The writers are distinguished and their contributions never less than thought-provoking; so with M. Goodman's chapter on the *Fiscus Judaicus*, interestingly sceptical of the attractions of Judaism to contemporary gentiles; his interpretation of Nerva's famous coin legend is not convincing. The editors have managed the difficult organization of the work adroitly: after a justifying and summarizing introduction, there are four chapters on the context, not necessarily in mutual harmony. D. R. Schwartz's paper on Herodians and *Ioudaioi* deserves special mention for its examination of what 'Jews' were at Rome after the destruction of the Temple. The next four chapters go on the impact of the Jewish War in Rome (the strength of that is rightly stressed throughout). The longest of the three sections is devoted to contemporary literature and historiography, and S. Mason's chapter on figured speech and irony in Josephus is particularly suggestive. Even with six chapters here the restriction to Latin of C. S. Kraus's essay on 'Writing history around the Emperor' is something to regret. There is a useful list of sources as well as of references and an index of modern authors. D. Fredrick's collection, which he also introduces, *The Roman Gaze*,[5] has a title that will turn off some potential readers, and should not. For there is a variety of articles here, many containing valuable insights and by no means all enmired in current jargon (solecisms are rare: 'optimate class'). The variety is due to the number of different objects gazed at by different spectators in media that are themselves diverse: so I particularly commend K. O. Eldred's revealing paper on 'Epic Vision in Lucan's Vulteius episode', Z. Newby's on the Spada reliefs, and J. R. Clarke's on 'Men and Women Viewers in the *Apodyterium* of the Suburban baths at Pompeii'. Behind the topics lie general questions: how different from Greek and modern gazing is Roman? What does it say for 'constructivism' or 'essentialism'? Is Roman society too complex to bear the simple 'penetration' model (29)? A. Sharrock's closing paper 'Can you resist a reading?' stabs suggestively and tantalizingly at these questions. It is a healthy if intellectually disconcerting sign that comfortingly neat binary oppositions are being eroded, but it is not helpful to propose, as the editor seems to, not only a third gender, boy, but a fourth, successful freedmen. Next come pairs of works linked by subject, the first on Cicero, the second on Pompeii. Those concerning Cicero, though on very different scales, have related and salutary aims: to show how Cicero constructed himself in what he wrote and published. One will not see Cicero in quite the same way again. It is only one point of this re-examination that Cicero has been naïvely attacked for his self-publicizing, and these books treat Cicero's position as a new man and a politician in danger, and his efforts to deal with it, with subtlety and sympathy. C. Steel's **Reading Cicero*[6] is short, crisp, and clear, though not always elegant or free from cliché: 'By breaking down the distinction between who does and who records by performing both roles he can control his image in a wide variety of texts'; 'staunchly optimate'. After a discussion of genre, the author goes on to Cicero as a public figure and, in the

[4] *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*. Edited by Jonathan Edmondson, Steve Mason, and James Rives. Oxford UP, 2005. Pp. xvi + 400, with 8 figs.

[5] *The Roman Gaze*. Vision, Power, and the Body. Edited by David Fredrick. The Johns Hopkins UP, Baltimore and London, 2002. Pp. xiv + 335, with unlisted figs. £32.

[6] *Reading Cicero*. Genre and Performance in Late Republican Rome. By Catherine Steel. Duckworth Classical Essays, London, 2005. Pp. 176. Paperback £11.99.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383506000106 Published online by Cambridge University Press

core portion, 'Ciceronian communities', where she shows how Cicero in all his writing, when oratory did not serve, tried to link himself in the eyes of his readers with the eminent and the useful; finally, 'Failure', with a judicious discussion of *Pro Milone*. The author tackles the publication question and is aware that the most difficult part of her task, which she proclaims as comprehensive, lies with the letters. Here, despite vigorous argument, doubts remain. But this is a readable and informative volume. J. Dugan's *Making a New Man*[7] is a much larger book on the same theme, and mostly restricted to Cicero's rhetorical works except in the 'Afterword', for, as the author remarks, 'Cicero's emergence from the seclusion of rhetorical theorizing … provides an uncannily apt resolution to the strategies of self-fashioning that I have investigated'. After an introduction on scope and methodology, the chapters, conveniently subdivided, offer descriptive titles: the first is on '*Epideixis*, Textuality (a word favoured by the author), and Self-fashioning in the *Pro Archia* and *In Pisonem*'. This involves examining epideictic oratory at Rome, and arguing for the *Pro Archia* as an attempt to establish literary texts as a technology of self-presentation, as a bargaining counter against Archias – and a proleptic funeral oration. It is valuable for Dugan's case that Cicero lacked *imagines*. The second chapter, on the *De oratore*, through 'theatricality' and 'transgressive aesthetics' presents an oft-repeated charge, already suggested in the title, softness in oratory *à la* Caesar Strabo and Cicero's defence; a kindred topic emerges at the end of the book: relations with Tiro. Hence the punning title. In the third chapter, on *Brutus*, Dugan sets Cicero against two other literary figures, Brutus and Caesar, while the fourth, starting from the seemingly unpromising controversy over prose rhythm, comes to characterize the Ciceronian 'Sublime' in relation to Demosthenes. This is a rich and suggestive work, equipped with the full range of bibliography and an index of passages cited, of its nature profitable to historians as well as to students of literature. It is a pity, then, that Dugan writes of the 'equestrian class' as a 'business class'. It is slightly ponderous in style; 'edenic' took up a moment; and there might have been more critical scrutiny (is 'similem tui' necessarily 'your spitting image'?). It would have been unreasonable to expect Atticism. Our next pair of books, on Pompeii, are beasts of a different genus. The smaller, R. Ling's, with the subtitle **History, Life and Afterlife*,[8] is a snip at its price. It is neat but stout, generously and often colourfully illustrated, well and clearly written, and with a fresh and interesting angle. For, as the subtitle promises, it goes beyond the surface that Pompeii presents, one that almost baffles enquiry about history, to offer an account of the town through time, even of its vicissitudes since it began to be unearthed. The author's experience enables him to write with confidence and authority and, even more importantly, to draw back from over-confident assumptions – about population, for example, or (that favoured scholarly topic), brothel numbers; he considers that even the most recent estimates exaggerated. The book will be useful for students, for there is a restrained set of notes (7 pages); the equally restrained bibliography (3 pages) that follows is divided into topics; and there is an index to match. The other book, A. Butterworth and R. Laurence's **Pompeii, the Living City*,[9] also has a claim to originality – of approach and genre. This work

[7] *Making a New Man*. Ciceronian Self-fashioning in the Rhetorical Works. By John Dugan. Oxford UP, 2005. Pp. x + 388. Hardback £65.

[8] *Pompeii*. History, Life and Afterlife. By Roger Ling. Tempus Publishing, Stroud, 2005. Pp. 188, with 75 figs., 31 colour plates. Paperback £19.99.

[9] *Pompeii, the Living City*. By Alex Butterworth and Ray Laurence. Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 2005. Pp. [xvi] + 354. with 2 maps. 27 colour plates. Hardback £20.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383506000106 Published online by Cambridge University Press

concentrates on the lives of the inhabitants in the last twenty-five years of the city's existence. Most significantly, we find passages in italics interspersed in thirteen thematic chapters (Arabic numerals) with titles such as 'Slaves and the territory' and 'Yours for two coins' and a dozen (Roman numerals) labelled with dates ('X. December AD 64—June AD 68'). These italicized passages are imaginative recreations. This is the equivalent of a television dramatized documentary, and, sure enough, the cover presents couches carrying fine twenty-first century specimens of humanity poised for a mild orgy. The knowledge of Pompeii that the authors display is prodigious; so is their skill in supplementing Pompeian material from elsewhere, and the final chapter is painfully vivid. Earlier, the wealth of information and complex approach is overwhelming, and the authors allow Nero to loom over-large. Carried away with these riches, they have not paid enough attention to style and spelling, notably of Roman names, occasionally to factual matters, such as where and when Vespasian died. Those who like a heavy diet will devour this volume. I could have done with less word painting and more illustrations, but it is a matter of taste. There is adequate help from the notes and bibliography. Pompeii points inevitably towards gladiators. F. Meijer's *The Gladiators: History's most deadly sport* ('sport'?)[10] was reviewed here in an earlier issue; the title is now fixed, some slips corrected, and the price is a little higher. The trouble with writing a successful biography of a controversial individual such as R. Seager's **Tiberius*[11] is that, when it is issued in a second edition after more than thirty years as standard reading on the subject, so much has been published that it is hard to strike the balance between revision and preservation. This is especially true when the main source (which the author followed closely in 1972, to the detriment of his subject's reputation), has been as extensively written over and re-imagined as Tacitus has. In fact, with what passes nowadays for a second edition, authors have little room for manoeuvre. Seager, pointing out the developments in his Preface, has provided additional bibliography and presents revisions in a 19-page afterword (with an admirable defence of Tacitus' chronology for the year AD 20). Readers of a new generation will appreciate his scholarship, fairness, and clarity. Byzantium is one of those fields of scholarly endeavour (such as gender or biography) that seem to demand regular apology. Timothy E. Gregory's defence of Byzantium itself and its study at both ends of his **A History of Byzantium*[12] is detailed, robust, and convincing. In a sense his central narrative (another object of suspicion, but that is what it is) offers a robust defence in itself, for it is a gripping read, carrying his reader on through a crowd of characters who up to then may have been only dimly known to them. In another sense Gregory hinders his own defence by relying so much on narrative; structure, society, and economy are given less emphasis. But he is particularly informative on relations with the West. As to the overall structure, the author starts with 'The Crisis of the Third Century' and finds the 'Beginnings of Decline' surprisingly late, at the opening of the fourteenth

[10] *The Gladiators*. History's most deadly sport. By Fik Meier. Translated from the Dutch by Liz Waters. Souvenir Press, London, 2004. Pp. xviii + 267, with about 50 figs, map. £10.99. See *G&R* 53 (2005) 115.

[11] *Tiberius*. By Robin Seager. Second edition. Blackwell Publishing, Malden, MA, Oxford, and Carlton, Australia, 2005 (first ed. Eyre Methuen, 1972). Pp. xxvi (including six maps and stemma) + 310, with 16 plates. Hardback £55; paperback £16.99.

[12] *A History of Byzantium*. By Timothy E. Gregory. Blackwell History of the Ancient World. Blackwell Publishing, Malden, MA, Oxford, and Carlton, Australia, 2005. Pp. xiv +382, with 49 figs., 11 maps. 44 boxes. Hardback £55; paperback £15.99.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383506000106 Published online by Cambridge University Press

century. Some attractive items are enclosed in the more than forty irritating boxes mentioned above, which proffer tasty little gobbets of additional information, such as a story on the foundation of Constantinople from 'the famous British historian Edward Gibbon' – and repetition. One of them is ill-placed within eight lines of the end of its chapter. The phrase just quoted gives a hint of the intended audience and its level. The book is generously illustrated and well provided with maps and glossary, but the index is meagre, and more careful proof-reading and closer attention to style would have done the work a service. A revised edition could remove such blemishes and make it more useful. Boethius needs introduction just as much as Gibbon does.

doi: 10.1017/S0017383506000106 BARBARA LEVICK

Art and Archaeology

What, if anything, defines 'Roman taste'? Not long ago, some scholars might have laughed at the very thought of it, as if a contradiction in terms. If Vergil voiced a collective sentiment when Anchises tells Aeneas, 'let others make art . . . *our* vocation is to rule the world' (paraphrasing *Aeneid* 6.847–8), then many Romans themselves may have scorned the question. Currently, however, the trend is for art historians to take a more sympathetic approach: the books reviewed here are testament to that. To begin with, there is Christopher Hallett's awaited monograph, *The Roman Nude*.[1] This duly begins with the *apologia* that the entire category of 'the Roman nude' tends to be regarded as either repulsive or ludicrous, with statues such as the so-called 'Pseudo-athlete' from Delos appearing in every handbook of Roman as the predictable *exemplum* of Roman cultural uncertainty. As it happens, the apparently bizarre conjunction of middle-aged head with youthful body is, I think, largely the result of a single unfortunate photograph of this statue being too often reproduced: when one encounters the piece in Athens National Archaeological Museum, it seems rather fine work, with no striking disparity of bodily features. But Hallett's revisionary purpose goes further than simply denying the comic effect of Romans without clothes. Relying heavily upon Larissa Bonfante's concept of 'nudity as a costume', he sets out to show that the original Roman view of unclad or half-clad figures in art was basically disconnected from any social taboos concerning nakedness in life. A fragment of the Republican poet Ennius famously deplores *nudare inter civis corpora*, probably on the grounds of distaste for pederasty within the Greek gymnasium ambience; and there is little reason to suppose that Roman attitudes towards genital display relaxed during the Empire. But when an emperor appeared in statue-form as if wearing little or nothing, it was like an inversion of the fable of the Emperor's New Clothes. Claudius or Hadrian may have been represented as naked: but cognitively they were categorized as sculptural nudes, wrapped up in a body-type that lay beyond moral concern. Of course there were localized sensibilities in this matter, and the nudity-costume was not without particular associations (heroic, divine – either way, essentially implausible as a simulacrum of reality). Nonetheless it was a suspension of belief as much as *pudor* – and, for the Romans, an important mode of reconciling themselves to a Classical tradition that would divide 'civilization' and 'barbarism' according to fondness for trousers. Some would argue that a key moment in the Roman

[1] *The Roman Nude*. Heroic Portrait Statuary 200 BC–AD 300. By Christopher H. Hallett. Oxford UP, 2005. Pp. xxi + 391, with 160 figs.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383506000106 Published online by Cambridge University Press