

phenomenon of plebeian *gentes* with patrician *nomina gentilicia* — because it is ‘poorly understood’ and because it has not received ‘serious scholarly attention’.⁶

F. is not consistently critical when dealing with modern authors and he accepts Wiseman’s challenging, intricately woven and argued, and yet highly questionable account of Romulus’ slayed twin (93-6) without any reservations.⁷

It might be unfair to criticize F. for having failed to consult certain works which certainly would have enriched his own research, such as Giovannini’s article on the important role played by the rich salt deposits at the mouth of the Tiber in the history of early Rome,⁸ an element totally missing from F.’s narrative; or F. Zevi’s account of Demaratus.⁹ It is indeed practically impossible to keep abreast of the ever growing number of publications on early Rome written by archaeologists and historians in various languages. Yet, I find it hard to comprehend why F. chose to ignore completely Jacques Poucet’s work on the origins of Rome,¹⁰ an equally critical examination of early Rome, and of great relevance to his book. In fact, F. acknowledges, but does not really discuss, Grandazzi’s study, which is in many ways a reaction to Poucet’s work. Grandazzi indicts Poucet’s book as the ‘the modern version of hypercriticism’.¹¹ A discussion of the debate between Poucet and Grandazzi¹² by F. would have been useful and enlightening.

F.’s lucid style and sound exposition elegantly untangle intricate topics. His many digressions provide coherent information not always readily accessible to undergraduate and graduate students. See the short overview of the Phoenicians in the west and Greek colonization in the west (28-36); the alphabet (51-3); the history of the archaeology of early Rome (82-4); the use of tufa by the Romans in various periods (106-7); an explanation of the official religious calendar (129-35); a discussion of Roman chronology (155-7; 369-70) and explanatory notes such as the one setting out how modern scholars usually cite Festus (65, n. 15). The bibliography is sound (no works written after 1999 are cited), and the book is very well edited.

F. likens the ancient tradition on the regal period to a Hollywood blockbuster about a key historical epoch: ‘The script is a combination of Roman oral tradition and adaptations of Greek myths, all artfully woven together by generations of skillful Roman storytellers’ (78). F.’s thought-provoking and ‘critical’ script, which was ‘not intended as a deliberate criticism of Cornell’s fine work’, but woven according to ‘its own working hypothesis concerning the ancient sources’ (3) warrants a no less ‘critical approach’.

Rachel Feig Vishnia

Tel Aviv University

Liv Mariah Yarrow, *Historiography at the End of the Republic: Provincial Perspectives on Roman Rule*, Oxford: Oxford University Press: Oxford Classical Monographs, 2006. 416 pages. ISBN 978-0-1992-7754-4.

During the last few decades the study of major Roman historical writers has moved from a concern with their veracity to the more ‘literary’ assessment of the strategies and opinions contained

⁶ For a totally different view, see my ‘The *Transitio ad Plebem* of C. Servilius Geminus’, *ZPE* 114 (1996), 289-296, which is not cited by Forsythe.

⁷ T.P. Wiseman, *Remus: A Roman Myth*, Cambridge 1995. See N. Purcell’s review in *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 97.5.18.

⁸ A. Giovannini, ‘Le sel et la fortune de Rome’, *Athenaeum* 73 (1985), 373-387.

⁹ F. Zevi, ‘Demarato e i re “Corinzi” di Roma’, in A. Storch Marino (ed.), *L’incidenza dell’antico: Studi in memore di Ettore Lepore*, Naples 1995, 292-314.

¹⁰ J. Poucet, *Les origines de Rome: Tradition et histoire*, Bruxelles 1985.

¹¹ English translation, 27

¹² See Poucet’s review of Grandazzi in *Latomus* 52 (1993), 936 and ‘La fondation de Rome: croyants et agnostiques’, *Latomus* 53 (1994), 95-104.

in their texts. Beginning with such scholars as T.P. Wiseman, A.J. Woodman, and T.J. Luce, a host of others have analyzed and decoded the texts of Tacitus, Livy, Sallust, and Ammianus. Though this is old news for the canonical texts of Roman history, there is much to be done with less-known, even fragmentary, texts from the periphery of the Empire. Though some have already received monographic treatment, Liv Yarrow makes a valuable contribution in looking comparatively at a collection of six texts by provincial authors from the eastern and western Mediterranean. Her goal is not to establish the ‘accuracy’ of their histories, but to determine and compare their views of Roman power and Roman government.

What she calls her ‘core’ texts are certainly a mixed bag. Her chronological limits are 146 BCE — the conclusion of Polybius’ *Histories* — and the end of the reign of Augustus (14 CE). Polybius had recorded the rise of Rome and its conquest of North Africa, Spain, and Greece, but it was for future generations to pass judgment on the results of Roman hegemony. Yarrow seeks authors from the provinces whose histories included at least some material from their own day — in other words, contemporary historians. The list includes three writers from the Levant: the anonymous author of *I Maccabees* (written first in Hebrew about 130 BCE and surviving in Greek); the philosopher Posidonius of Apamea in Syria, whose 52-book universal history (surviving in fragments) began from the end of Polybius and seems to have reached the 80s BCE; and Nicolaus of Damascus, who wrote his 144-book universal history at the court of Herod the Great. While little of this massive work survives directly, Josephus made much use of Nicolaus in his own treatment of Herod (Nicolaus’ panegyric biography of the young Octavian has survived). The other eastern author is Memnon of Heraclea in Asia Minor, who during the reign of Augustus wrote a history of his own city. Finally, Yarrow includes two western universal historians: Diodorus Siculus whose *Bibliothēke* (in Greek) reached 80 BCE, and the Romanized Gaul Pompeius Trogus whose ‘Philippic Histories’ was a Latin attempt to write a Greek-style universal history down to the time of Augustus. While 15 (out of 40) books of Diodorus survive, the period after 302 BCE is only treated in fragments, and Trogus survives in a late epitome or *florilegium* by Justin. Though Diodorus is far better known as a historian of the *Diadochi*, Yarrow makes excellent use of his surviving fragments on the Roman Republic.

This is a remarkably disparate collection of texts. Yarrow explains well why she has chosen them and, perhaps less convincingly, why she has excluded others. Much of the book is not about the texts *per se*, but such related topics as the function and status of Greek intellectuals, patronage, travel, and the audience for historical texts. On all of these she has interesting things to say, though her organization leads to some repetition. She does well to emphasize that ‘historian’ was not a profession, but that most such writers were engaged in public life. These writers — absent the anonymous author of *I Maccabees* and the almost anonymous Memnon — earned their living through patronage or other intellectual employment, as when Nicolaus uses his rhetorical skill in the service of Herod. Such patronage was not only useful for the necessities of life, but Yarrow rightly emphasizes the cost of travel, the use of libraries, political contacts, and introductions to individuals with private archives. This necessary social and political nexus is far from our modern conception of a historian’s milieu, but it is vital to our understanding of the cultural production of historians under Roman rule.

One of Yarrow’s major contributions is to provide connections between authors whom we usually read in fragments. Hence Posidonius, with his deep antagonism to the avaricious tax-collectors, is thought to provide (in a lost passage) a quite negative view of Gaius Gracchus whom he regarded as having empowered their equestrian employers. Likewise Diodorus, despite his favorable view of Tiberius Gracchus, follows Posidonius’ prejudice and portrays Gaius as driven mad by frustration at his political failure. Yarrow also uses the figure of Mithridates — who appears in Posidonius, Diodorus, and Memnon — to assess the role he is given in the provincial rebellion against Rome. While Nicolaus praises Lucullus, Diodorus condemns him and Yarrow comments: ‘one man’s vice can be another’s virtue’ (208).

The principal aim of Yarrow is to determine the overall views of the provincial elite toward Roman power. From the time of Alexander and his successors, kings had surrounded themselves with learned and talkative intellectuals, who would both entertain and inform them. In fact, the familiar topos of the ruler and his philosopher-friend occurs in Plutarch, often beginning with the freedman tutor of the young aristocrat. Thus educated freedmen like Alexander Polyhistor were treated with respect. The historian Theophanes, a local magistrate in Mytilene, received Roman citizenship from his patron Pompey, and then even adopted Pompey's Spanish client, Cornelius Balbus, who later became the first foreign-born consul. This intertwining of eastern and western provincials shows the degree to which their identity as Romans came to dominate. So too other 'provincial' writers like Diodorus and Trogus came to hold Roman citizenship.

Yarrow shows that these six 'core' historians were all essentially pro-Roman and they are writing for an audience who knows Rome — even that of *I Maccabees*. Of course they criticized individual Roman leaders and some Roman policies, but they recognized the advantages of Rome's rule. In fact, the earliest text is the most positive, since *I Maccabees* uncritically portrayed Rome as an ally of the Jews, who even made a treaty against king Antiochus. Since the Romans had rejected kingship, the Maccabees saw them as a natural ally. Of course, since the book was originally written in Hebrew, it was not intended for a Roman readership. But the other historians certainly expected Romans to read their books and so they hoped to influence policy. While they acknowledge the inevitability of Roman domination, they emphasize the importance of balancing the needs of provincial subjects with the desires of their Roman masters. They even point out that more *gloria* is likely to accrue to moderate Roman governors, and several make explicit their hostility towards Roman taxes and tax-collectors. For what alternative was there to Roman rule? The Hellenistic kings were generally despised. Diodorus praises the clemency of the Parthians, though Trogus is more critical. While some authors praise Mithridates, it seems to be that rhetorical glorification of the enemy is similar to what Tacitus provides to Calgacus in the *Agricola*. Such glorification inflates the impact of Rome's victory. There is occasional praise for a 'noble savage' — as Diodorus does to Viriathus — but that too seems more nostalgia than a genuine alternative. Rome has brought stability to the diverse cultures of the Mediterranean, and the intellectuals' role is to improve the administration of their new masters. So this group of historians have accepted the premise of Roman domination: Romans make reasonably good friends and very bad enemies.

In the face of such a learned and illuminating book, it may seem churlish to find fault. But I do think that the author might well have given us more, and less. More, in that two major Greek authors have been excluded. Dionysius of Halicarnassus admittedly only wrote a history of early Rome, but he was writing in Rome about 30 BCE and his insistent praise of Roman virtue might contribute to Yarrow's picture. Strabo of Amaseia in Pontus is a more serious omission. His *Geographia* contains much history — he knew his Posidonius — and Yarrow is somewhat defensive (91) when she excludes him as (perhaps) writing under Tiberius. This inveterate traveler did comment on contemporary events and would certainly have been useful to Yarrow's general picture (but, admittedly, the book is already long).

But we might also ask for less. The author has much to tell us about her chosen authors and at times she cannot resist including information that is not really necessary. Some of this provides interesting comparisons, as when Diodorus (archons and consuls) and *I Maccabees* (Seleucid and Jewish calendars) have difficulty reconciling calendric systems. But other material is less relevant. Hence, a ten page digression on Ptolemy Physcon (292-302) is certainly fun but contributes little to the argument, except to show the depravity of eastern kings. Likewise, a detailed description of the content of the lost books of Posidonius is unnecessary. Yarrow's thematic organization also gives rise to repetition, as when we are told twice within a few pages (73, 80) of Josephus' opinion of Nicolaus' treatment of Herod. For readers who wish to follow up with the monographic literature on these authors — Sachs on Diodorus, Kidd on Posidonius, etc. — Yarrow's excellent footnotes and comprehensive bibliography will help. But she need not have included so much

detail in this book. These additions sometimes make it difficult to follow the thrust of her overall argument.

But these minor caveats are only concerned with organization. Yarrow's important contribution is to create from disparate and fragmentary sources a reasonably coherent view of what the provincial intellectuals thought about Roman rule during the first century BCE. In recent years scholars have demonstrated the double identity of many intellectuals of the Second Sophistic, and Yarrow brings together an earlier group of six provincial intellectuals who had two or perhaps even three (Nicolaus) vantage points: Roman, Hellenic, and non-Greek Semitic outsider. Just as Posidonius saw the horrors of the anti-Roman Athenian tyrant Athenion, all of these men accepted Roman *imperium* as the least bad option. In the history of empires, that is a considerable vote of confidence.

Ronald Mellor

University of California, Los Angeles

Sander M. Goldberg, *Constructing Literature in the Roman Republic*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. xii + 248 pages. ISBN-13 978-0-5218-5461-0.

The whole great panorama of the history of Latin literature, *ingentia bella* and all, has become strangely popular as a topic, perhaps in the wake of G.B. Conte's manual (1987; Eng. tr. 1994); thereafter we might note variously, and with varying degrees of unease, Fantham (1999), Dupont (1994; Eng. tr. 1999), and Habinek (1998 and 2005). Not to mention a *summa summarum* composed under the baton of S.J. Harrison (2005). Let us be clear that G(olberg) stands at the saner, more sober, scholarly end of the spectrum: much though I find to reprove in 'Constructing literature', it is lucid and agreeable to read and clearly would be stimulating to discuss with abler graduate students.

G. has a large appetite for modern critical theory, alongside, fortunately, much skill in digesting and regurgitating Fish, Bourdieu and Jauss. I do not complain of theory's presence, as G. so loudly does of its absence (*JRS* 94 [2004], 202f., at my own expense): we must for now agree to differ. G.'s principal line of argument is that it is the *readers* of Latin literature (actually, we would do better to say 'audience', for G. does consistently and misleadingly undervalue the various types of *hearer* outside the theatre proper) who created the history of Latin literature, as much as the writers, at the expense (oddly enough) of the audience inside the theatre. Fairly happy nuptials of theoreticians and scholars; *ulularunt vertice nymphae*. I share much of their pleasure. G.'s account of early work on Ennius and Naevius (24-6), of the transformation of a maelstrom of acting copies into our pre-Varronian corpus of Plautus and of the surprisingly comparable history of the transmission of Terence (52-86) is on first (and non-specialist) reading helpful and persuasive. We would agree entirely (*Culture of the Roman plebs*; G., 128) that comic audiences revel in tragic references. Ennius and Naevius survive through the work of their learned readers and editors to be re-born from the pens of Lucretius and Virgil. Cato, or rather, Cato's own image of Cato, is projected (just as intended, we might easily enough contend) to function as a principal element in Rome's own conception of *Romanitas* (20-51). Compare the *palliata* as an active element in the language of Catullus and in the arguments of Cicero (87-114; reading consistently and perplexingly, yet again, preferred to performance), or the living presence of Roman tragedy in the *Aeneid* (115-43, where the preference attributed to Virgil for reading over performance is, this time, demonstrably wrong, *infra*). Those sections of G. less close to my own (archaising) tastes I do not venture to (mis-)represent here, and D.C. Feeney's illuminating review of Goldberg in *BMCR* 2006 unfolds a whole range of intentions and strategies, unseen by me, in the text reviewed.

One of the joys of writing large commentaries on the *Aeneid* is, precisely, that you get to measure quite precisely what Virgil has been reading, and how thoughtfully. You even discover