

about the restoration of Ptolemy Auletes that they closed their shops to hear C. Cato's interrogation of the *XVviri* on this issue? M.-M. notes that audiences generally backed the organizer whatever his political stance. Not only does that raise the question why no one turned up to heckle his opponents, but given the predictability of audience responses their profound impact on the 'Popular Will' also becomes puzzling. The problem is highlighted by the *rogatio Servilia*. According to M.-M., Rullus failed because Cicero's oratory had turned the *plebs* against the bill; that in turn allowed a tribune to announce a veto, which would otherwise have been unsustainable. But how could a single speech delivered, on M.-M.'s own view, to a group of Cicero's loyal supporters, followed by short public interventions, create such unstoppable momentum against a popular law? Rullus conducted his own counter-campaign, and we have no reason to believe that his audiences were any less supportive than Cicero's.

In the book's first half M.-M. takes the 'rehabilitation' of the *plebs* one step further. The notion of an ignorant or apolitical proletariat is dismissed and the Roman *plebs* emerges as an active and qualified participant in the political process. Thus, the high level of audience knowledge implied in contional speeches is construed as proof that the 'average Roman' possessed a detailed understanding of history, politics, and law. And observing that Cicero's speeches to the Senate, the law courts, and the *contiones* seem to imply the same level of knowledge, M.-M. concludes that Cicero did not 'dumb down' when he addressed the masses. Alternatively, these findings might, of course, suggest that the audiences were not really that different. Rescuing the working classes from the 'enormous condescension of posterity' is a commendable ambition, but the question is whether that is best done by leaving aside the stark social realities which constrained their lives and presenting them as model citizens.

This is a work driven by strong convictions and the tone is sometimes unnecessarily polemical. Thus, the dismissal of North's well-known dictum that 'the will of the people was expressed through elite division, and only through elite division' as a tautology — because the élite was always split — seems gratuitous, not least since North's observation that the *populus* had no means of promoting its own interests, could stand as a fitting conclusion to the second half of the book. However, these points of criticism should not obscure the fact that M.-M. has produced a valuable contribution to the debate about the political character of the Roman Republic.

King's College London

HENRIK MOURITSEN

R. COSÌ, *LE SOLIDARIETÀ POLITICHE NELLA REPUBBLICA ROMANA*. Bari: Edipuglia, 2002. Pp. 161. ISBN 88-7228-351-5. €18.00.

That private, or quasi-private, relationships were important in Roman public life is a piece of elementary understanding; most students will be well aware how pervasive were the vertical relationship of *clientela* and the horizontal relationship of *amicitia* — with the latter often only a euphemistic claim of parity, or even friendship. Così now offers us a brief but informative account of the less well known networks arising from the voluntary associations of *sodalitas*, *sodalitium*, and *collegium*, the physical *vicinitas* (neighbourhood), and the hereditary *tribus* (tribe). She traces these types of relationship from their earliest attestations (with due caution towards potential anachronism in Livy's first decade) to the end of the Republic; early developments under the Principate are also considered, in so far as they shed light on the preceding period. The approach is philological, and much of the evidence, perhaps the majority, is provided by Cicero.

C.'s discussion of *sodalitas* and its related terms is very helpful. It needs to be emphasized that these words should be treated carefully, since they are prone to metaphorical use and extension in meaning. For example, the use of *sodalicia* to describe the likes of Clodius' squads and the passing of the Licinian law *de sodaliciis* reflect the extension of an old word to include a new phenomenon, rather than a degeneration of the old associations, and the exceptions in the later measures Caesar and Augustus took against sodalities always differentiated between the illegitimate and the legitimate. The status of *vicini* in the hierarchy of a man's intimates should not be overlooked — Cicero (*Fin.* 5.65) placed neighbours below those joined to him in *amicitia*, but above *iis qui publice socii atque amici sunt*. Meanwhile, the duties of *tribules* included getting appointments for one another (Cic., *Q. Fr.* 3.1): P. Vatinius was the first member of the Sergian tribe not to receive its vote — an embarrassment upon which Cicero seized (*Vat.* 39).

C. concludes that ties of loyalty might pull an individual in different directions simultaneously, since the various networks of *necessitudines* — intimates, to whom reciprocal duties were owed — were superimposed but overlapping. The recognition that contradicting liabilities of *officium*

could only cancel each other out makes the idea of allegiance to monolithic factions implausible, and it leaves the field of Roman politics open to issues of programme, the credibility and prestige of competing candidates (*existimatio*), and to decisive action in the ‘comitial moment’: bad news for any remaining adherents of what North once called the ‘frozen waste’ theory. (North’s article in *CP* (1990) would, incidentally, be worth adding to C.’s bibliography.)

The index locorum, and separate indices of names and of Latin terms make the book very easy to refer to. Like the rest of the University of Bari’s *documenti e studi*, of which this is no. 33, its inexpensiveness reminds us how well Italian publishers serve us in this regard.

University of Manchester

JAMES THORNE

B. DREYER and H. ENGELMANN, *DIE INSCHRIFTEN VON METROPOLIS, T. 1, DIE DEKRETE FÜR APOLLONIOS: STÄDTISCHE POLITIK UNTER DEN ATTALIDEN UND IM KONFLIKT ZWISCHEN ARISTONIKOS UND ROM* (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 63). Bonn: Habelt, 2003. Pp. v + 134, 2 pls, 1 map. ISBN 3-7749-3203-4. €49.00.

In the course of excavations conducted in 1999 by Recep Meriç at the site of ancient Metropolis, a marble base was discovered. On it were inscribed the two civic decrees that Dreyer and Engelmann present in this volume. E. is responsible for the Greek text and facing German translation; D. for the commentary, which is presented in two sections, a line by line commentary and a historical discussion.

Both decrees honour Apollonios son of Attalos grandson of Andron, a prominent citizen of Metropolis. The earlier decree (or what D. and E. call the ‘Dekret der Nebenseite’ and presented second by them) honoured him in c. 145/4 or 144/3 B.C. for several significant benefactions up to that point: for defending the city’s interests before the Attalid crown in a boundary dispute with a neighbouring city; for making up the city’s loss when a contract concerning the collection of transport duties went awry and undertaking the resulting legal battle on the city’s behalf; and for a subvention of oil for the city’s youth. The details are complicated and the language technical, but all is explained with admirable clarity.

More attention is given to a decree on the same stone from a dozen or so years later, referred to as the ‘Dekret der Hauptseite’. The events recounted here are highly important: in the aftermath of the death of Attalus III Philometor, Rome freed all Attalid cities; when Aristonikos attempted to seize the kingdom and strip the cities of this freedom, Apollonios led Metropolitan troops to Thyateira and fell in the fighting that followed. This later decree is obviously very interesting to historians of the late Hellenistic period or Roman Republic, since it belongs to the critical period in which Asia came under Roman rule, a period about which so many details are uncertain.

There are, of course, other interesting facts in these texts: we learn, for example, that Metropolis introduced a priest of Rome (ll. 1–2), and that the Romans, who are referred to as ‘the common saviours and benefactors’, freed ‘all of the cities subject to the kingdom of Attalos’ (ll. 13–15). This last point deserves emphasis: we can now see that the Romans reacted more quickly to events in Asia than previous evidence had suggested. These points and many others are discussed in detail by D., with up-to-date bibliography and formidable learning.

The text is well-preserved and almost wholly complete: only a few words at the margins of a few lines require supplements. There is only one place where significant editorial intervention is necessary. At l. 26, Apollonios is said to have led his troops to join Πόπλιον καὶ Γάϊον καὶ ΠΑΠΙΟΝ, who are described as in charge of the camp at Thyateira. This illustrates again the Greek practice of referring to Roman officials by *praenomen* only, and the discussion by D. (72 n. 285) of this phenomenon should now become standard. The third name, however, is problematic, since unlike the first two it is not a *praenomen*. Πάπ<1>ον is printed, but no specific identification is offered (cf. p. 73 with n. 283); nor does the name offer any Republican resonances. It is better to suppose, I suggest, that Πάπον is a corruption of the *praenomen* Ἀππιον, the only Roman *praenomen* that is close. (The difference between my emendation and that of D. and E. is a mere inversion of the first two letters.) This would present us with a list of three *praenomina* and a very likely identification — this is probably the man who was to become the *consul suffectus* of 130 B.C., Ap. Claudius (probably) Nero (see E. Badian, ‘The consuls, 179–49 BC’, *Chiron* 20 (1990), 402 n. 10), grandfather of the moneyer of 79 B.C., Ti. Claudius Ti.f. Ap.n. (Nero) (M. H. Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage* (1974), no. 229).