

Hermippus and Heraclides, two sources of Diogenes Laertius, did not transmit a certain fact; the alleged 'fact' may or may not be true, but what Diogenes Laertius, as cited by the author, actually shows is that they did transmit it. We are told, p. 66, n. 21, that 'after declaring himself and his son [Demetrius] king ... Antigonus recalled Demetrius from Cyprus ... This means that after declaring Demetrius as king, the latter went to Cyprus'. Despite the English, it seems fairly clear what the author is trying to say here; but there seems to be nothing to justify saying it. Names appear in two, once even three, different forms (e.g. Daisios, Daisos; Kassander, Cassander, Casander); there are carelessnesses about dates, such that we are told, p. 19, that Thoth 1 (the Egyptian New Year) occurred on 2 November in the years 285-282 BCE, while in the years 281-278 BCE it fell on 2 November. Problems with logic too: on p. 31 we have two alternative dates in our sources, and Collins tells us 'one of these facts [sic] must be correct', without considering the possibility that neither of these supposed 'facts' might be correct. The accuracy of two dates, one in Epiphanius and one in Eusebius, is 'confirmed by the fact that they ultimately agree' (56). The phrase 'it is reasonable to assume' occurs with worrying frequency. And we hear numerous times in the long last chapter that the translation is 'divine' (not, apparently, in the sense of 'splendid').

Even simple arithmetic here leaves the reader gasping for air: on pp. 82-3, 304 minus 283 is said to equal 23; and on p. 54, the 'time between summer 278 and 272 BCE' is described as 'this group of four [years]'. Of course it might be argued that arithmetic is not what a book about the translation of the Bible is actually about. Unfortunately, it is, for Dr Collins wishes to prove her thesis about the date of the translation by means of an exacting set of calculations of correspondences between Egyptian regnal years, Macedonian regnal years, Athenian archontal years, and the more normal BCE years which we (unlike most of those involved in her story) are so used to. Arithmetic is centrally important to such a task, if one is going to attempt it at all.

Archbishop Ussher makes for better, and more convincing, reading.

David J. Wasserstein

Tel Aviv University/Institute for Advanced Studies, Jerusalem

*Myth, History and Culture in Republican Rome; Studies in Honour of T.P. Wiseman*, Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2003. x + 358 pp., 30 illustrations. ISBN 0 85989 662 5.

With the passage of the centuries, academic honours change little — honorary degrees, collected essays, *Festschriften* — and for all that Peter Wiseman has done so much to upset conventional ideas about Roman myth, literature and popular culture, the laurels he quite rightly accumulates are perfectly traditional.

I do not offer detailed epitomes of the nine papers I read with sharp interest and much profit; the editors themselves offer ample 'digests', as seems to be — increasingly and perplexingly — current usage. In summary, though, note:

Nicholas Purcell (12-40) offers 'Becoming historical: the Roman case', while we wait for the published text of his engrossing Jerome lectures on the Rome 'of the Tarquins', and after. A fascinating case is advanced for the development of synchronic thought far earlier than hitherto suspected and P.'s argument for an intellectual development in central Italy not significantly slower or less exciting than in Greece (*pace* views conventional in antiquity and more recently) is advanced with abundance of learning and ingenuity. If some of his hypotheses should turn out less credible upon a second reading, we shall still be grateful for having been hauled so vigorously out of our conventional ideas.

In 'Land and people in Roman Italy' (56-72), Michael Crawford tries to reconstruct a pattern of archaic settlement in mountainous areas with a new emphasis upon high mountain sanctuaries and hill-forts upon watersheds that are not boundaries; an autobiographical vein of travel in these

remote, lovely and inaccessible areas gives these pages an added and unexpected charm. I have long worried about the strange boundaries of Sabinum, and of the Aequi, but now there is a thoughtful recognition of the problem and a real attempt to offer an explanation.

Tim Cornell (73-97) surveys Coriolanus, as an exemplary figure and one to be understood in the context of the aristocratic world of ca. 500 BC and the social structures familiar from the Satricum inscription. Only when he turns to possible means for the transmission of information about such a figure ('epic', 'drama', inevitably; vd. *infra*) does his meticulous and authoritative touch falter.

J.E.G. Zetzel (119-38) contributes 'Plato with pillows. Cicero on the uses of Greek culture'; it is a relief to discover Z. so well able to lay aside the vituperative mode and to survey helpfully the criterion — less familiar than we thought — of the public good as determinant in Cicero's variable Philhellenism.

Susan Treggiari (139-64), a century after Litchfield on *exempla* (whom she does not cite!) discusses with wit and authority Cicero's view of Ancestors (and, *passim*, descendants) and the uses to which appeal to them can be put, in all the divisions of his *opus*. More might have been said of the theme — linking *ILS*, Cicero, Sallust and Virgil — of surpassing your ancestors — but these pages are continuously and agreeably informative, and helpful.

Francis Cairns (165-90) has a great deal of fun on Catullus in and about Bithynia, fun above all with the identification of Porcius and Socraton (study of gastro-loidoria should be enriched by use of A. Corbeill's *Controlling Laughter*, s.v. 'political heavies'); C.'s Odyssey from generic analysis to culinary minutiae was always instructive and will now entertain amply too.

A.J. Woodman (191-216) discusses Catullus' poem to Nepos and Horace's to Atticus, in very profitable tandem; Nepos would have been delighted at the tag 'historian', though I am not at all sure it is appropriate. The pages on Pollio's view of the origins of the civil war, Sallust, and Thucydides are of exceptional quality.

Erich Gruen (257-74) too quickly sets aside Taylor and Burton (Come; we have Syme on Yourcenar!) and re-evaluates the evidence for Cleopatra's sojourn(s) in Rome in Caesar's last years, in the context of Egypt's needs and diplomatic usage.

Lastly, Edward Champlin discusses (295-319) the use of references to the House of Atreus in Roman public life, from Cicero to Nero; an ample survey of idiom and insult, of drama and dynastic intrigue, curiously learned and intersecting fruitfully with the work of Coleman and Corbeill.

The contributions of Filippo Coarelli, on the Remoria (41-55) and of Mario Torelli on the frescoes of the great hall of the Villa at Boscoreale (217-26) are quite beyond my competence; the former, indeed, seems to have perplexed the editors too, to judge from the hesitant summary offered. That the volume also contains two papers of lesser interest is no great surprise; neither is actually weak, but the remainder are of such unusually high quality.

But let me grumble a little (this too is traditional), more generally: foreign words and names (in various languages) are not all printed correctly, the index is meagre, and the annotation of several papers is a little lightweight. That may be an editorial request, or a result of the Harvard system here used, or a generic tendency ('not too much learning in the papers of a celebration'). But whatever the explanation, readers wanting to pursue further some of the fascinating topics so ably discussed here are positively hindered, *passim*. A very few instances:

(1) Songs about Coriolanus (T.J. Cornell, 93): DH 8.62.3 also discussed by the reviewer, *Riv. Fil.* 122 (1994), 72, in other terms.

(2) Trojan legend in the West (Nicholas Purcell, 24): see now A. Erskine, *Troy between Greece and Rome* (Oxford 2001).

(3) Archias as improviser (J.E.G. Zetzel, 125): cf. A. Hardie, *Statius and the Silvae*, (Liverpool 1883), 22, 82f., Horsfall, *GR* 36 (1989), 79: perhaps distinctively Syrian.

(4) On virtues, Susan Treggiari might now have cited G. Thome's two vols. on *Zentrale Wertvorstellungen* (Bamberg 2000), not to mention the admirably informed Göttingen dissertations of H. Kornhardt, *Exemplum* (1936) and H. Roloff, *Maiores bei Cicero* (1938). *CIL* 11.600 would enrich amply her brief discussion of traditional virtues on humbler epitaphs (C. Castricius was a retired centurion) and on the whole question of ancestors and descendants in panegyric, Menander Rhetor remains of central importance, a century after Norden's definitive exposition, while, lastly, the theme of surpassing ancestors is naturally of special importance when we are discussing the protreptic application of *maiores* (some material gathered, *Prudentia* 8 [1976], 84).

(5) Close similarity between Nepos' *Chronica* and Atticus' *Liber Annalis* is claimed by A.J. Woodman (193), improbably, I should have said (Corn. Nepos, xvii, 99, 117, etc.), but then we also disagree on the relative dating of the two (Woodman, 194).

(6) Cleopatra smuggled into Caesar's presence in a carpet: a modern myth, alas (Gruen, 265). But whose? Cf. the Roman children told of 'Hannibal at the gate', Mommsen, *RG*, bk. 3, ch. 6: imagined, or 'cooked up'? Cf. too Nicholas Purcell on salt ploughed into the ruins of Carthage, in *Essays and Rhetoric* (Oxford 1995), 140: mediaeval and/or biblical, via Mommsen! Carpets do, though, naturally suggest Haroun al-Rashid.

(7) Ptolemaeus Chennus can hardly be cited as lightheartedly as Champlin does (299).

J.J. O'Hara summarises recent work, *TAPA* 126 (1996), 173ff., though in this intensely complex field, I disagree with his emphasis.

The slightly sketchy annotation of this volume can therefore lead the unwary reader *per ignis suppositos cineri doloso*: we are not here called upon urgently to decide — though cf. Purcell, 23 — between William Harris and his critics in *JRA* Suppl. 3 (1991), and indeed no one seems anywhere to have done so. But TPW's view of the transmission of early Roman culture is hardly uncontroversial; it rests often upon the pillars of drama and song but the former was criticised in minute detail by Harriet Flower at *CQ* 45 (1995), 170-90 and TPW's reaction in the first chapter of *Roman drama and Roman history* (1998) leaves the issue unsolved. Equally, the reviewer addressed the problem of *carmina convivalia* in *Riv. Fil.* 122 (1994), at 70-5, in answer to some inflated claims that have recently been made; TPW, in the same chapter (14) refers to this discussion, but offers not so much a detailed critique as a restatement of more optimistic views. Now, again at p. 23 of *Myth, history and culture* Nicholas Purcell refers enthusiastically to one of the champions of the New Orality (cf. too Cornell, 92). But is that really how things were? Were the breakfasts of Appius Claudius the Censor daily enlivened by song? Every step you take in this field, and in fields related, is intensely controversial, but I suppose that minute discussion of the problems is less fun than trying to build on the 'conclusions' apparently or allegedly already reached. Whether all such issues may with impunity be brushed aside, as here, I would seriously doubt. So too, Augustus' 'moral legislation of 28 BC' requires more than Cairns, 174 and a little tendentious footnoting before it can be considered to have recovered from E. Badian's tremendous assault in *Phil.* (129) 1985.

(8) Discussion of Roman insults (Champlin, 295ff.) requires continuous reference to I. Opelt's *Schimpfwörter* (Heidelberg 1965).

Many readers of *SCI* will remember the preface of *Caesar Augustus* (Oxford 1984); Erich Segal and Fergus Millar in check before the first move, for Sir Ronald Syme 'was known to disapprove of Festschriften'. To TPW's *Roman Studies* (Liverpool 1984), Elizabeth Rawson contributed an admirable preface, in which eulogy was tempered, but also enhanced (as in the best ancient handbooks) by discreet criticism. *Sed haec prius fuere*; here taste and balance seem, *passim*, to have rested in less steady hands. But persevere, or skip the more breathless bits: at the end of TPW's autobiographical fragment (which might have been longer), he digresses to the Praenestine *cista* illustrated on the cover and at p. 329. The figures on the left are described as dancing, but should perhaps rather be considered as coupling; the man is labelled as 'Silanus': some outstanding member of the Iunii Silani (TPW) or a (Doric) young Silenus, perhaps easier in the

mythological context? The whole topic seems ideally suited to another (swift and penetrating) study from TPW himself, naturally. The quality of these essays, and my desire to continue the argument, on several fronts, are eloquent testimony to what TPW has done to enliven and invigorate Roman studies over the last thirty years.

Nicholas Horsfall

Stanton St. John, Oxon.

Greg Rowe, *Princes and Political Cultures: The New Tiberian Senatorial Decrees*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2002. 195 pp. ISBN 0 472 11230 9.

Greg Rowe's book is 'a study of how dynastic monarchy changed politics across the Roman Empire' (1), based, to a large extent, on a 'dossier of documents from the Tiberian Senate' — *Tabula Siarensis*, *Tabula Hebana*, *Senatus Consultum de Pisone Patre* and the funeral honours voted to the younger Drusus. These documents are said to show that 'what Augustus had established was the rule not of one man but of a dynastic house — a house that had a collective identity, in which women had public roles, and a house that promoted a series of young men as imperial successors'.

The Introduction sets out the 'Tiberian documents', with basic commentary touching upon some central themes of the study. This is followed by chapters dealing with the various 'key constituencies of the new order': the Senate, the *Equites*, the urban plebs, citizen communities (exemplified by Pisae and the decrees passed there in honour of Lucius and Gaius Caesar), Greek cities and the army. Each of them is described as joining the loyalist chorus that replaced free politics under the Principate. Collective expressions — formal and, increasingly, informal — of loyalty to the Emperor and the imperial house lay at the heart of the new political culture. Honorific decrees by the Senate in Rome and by local senates, equestrian parades and theatre acclamations, outbursts of popular enthusiasm for the Emperor or the princes, the rites of imperial cult in Greek cities — all this became the real stuff of public life under the Principate. The conclusion lists six basic traits of the Principate's political culture: each constituency rendered honours to the imperial family; this was often done informally; the princes' careers brought them into contact with each constituency; the dynastic principle and any dynastic changes were universally recognized; individual citizens came to dominate collectivities (especially in outlying communities that relied on diplomatic contacts with Rome); the constituencies fit together into a hierarchy.

The book provides detailed and often insightful discussions, with text and translation, of the major inscriptions of the period. The value of the most important of those inscriptions, the *Senatus Consultum de Pisone Patre*, is widely recognized; Rowe's idea of building his description and analysis of the political culture of the early Principate around these 'primary sources' (in the full sense of the term) is surely a good one. His main thesis is sound and convincing; so are his arguments on most of the particular issues he deals with. In what follows I take issue with two of his specific points. My remarks do not pertain to the main thesis of the book and do not derogate from its general assessment as a valuable contribution to the study of the political culture of the Early Principate.

In describing the way Piso's iniquities are listed in the *SC de Pisone Patre*, Rowe notes that the exact legal basis for Piso's (posthumous) condemnation is unclear, and doubts whether legal norms played any significant part in the Senate's proceedings. The Senate 'implies manifold crimes ... but cites only two statutes — and then with reference to Germanicus' imperium and to the punishment of Piso's associates ... Either the Senate did not communicate its legal standards or it did not apply any, in which case the long-standing scholarly search for the charges behind imperial trials has been misguided ...' (11-12).

Of course, the *SC* is far from being a purely legal document: throughout the text, legal charges and moralistic denunciations are intermingled, and it is not quite clear where misconduct ends and