

the importance of advocacy. To acquire skills in forensic oratory called for time, money, and contacts, and thus served as a useful mark of status for the élite. The monetization of the economy and the great increase in wealth available to the élite between the fourth and first centuries B.C. led to an increase in conspicuous consumption as a signifier of élite status. These points are well made, but another very relevant factor is not mentioned. During this period, Roman élite hunting, possibly influenced by Hellenistic royal practices, changed from a relatively egalitarian form conducted on foot with hounds that hunted by smell to an extremely expensive activity carried out on horseback with hounds which hunted by sight. An ideological link between hunting and war was widely recognized, and the new form of hunting continued into the principate as an aspect of an élite life style. A social history of hunting in the classical world, which could draw inspiration from R. Carr, *English Fox Hunting* (London, 1976) and supersede J. Aymard, *Essai sur les chasses romaines* (Paris, 1951) and J. K. Anderson, *Hunting in the Ancient World* (Berkeley, 1986), is much to be desired.

This engaging short work will be the first port of call for its subject, and should encourage further research.

Lincoln College, Oxford

HARRY SIDEBOTTOM

REPUBLICAN PERSONALITIES

R. J. EVANS: *Questioning Reputations. Essays on Nine Roman Republican Politicians*. Pp. x + 221, maps. Pretoria: Unisa Press, 2003. Paper, SAR 168/US\$23.60/£15.20/€23.60. ISBN: 1-86888-198-9.

In this engagingly written book, E. reassesses the historical accuracy of the current reputations of nine familiar figures from the late Republic. Each chapter challenges conventional wisdom: Chapter 1 argues that Marius' military capacities have been exaggerated (he was 'less than superlative in military terms', p. 36); the following chapter makes a similar case for Pompey in the seventies, but emphasizes as well his keenness to cooperate with the senatorial establishment during this same period, despite later and modern tendencies to tag him as a *popularis* at that time; Chapter 3 questions the *popularis* credentials of Caesar (on the grounds that his commentaries do not mention tribunes often enough, nor does he convey enough gratitude toward tribunes who fostered his career). Chapters 4–6, devoted to 'lesser figures' (p. 96), each deals with a pair of politicians: Saturninus and Glaucia are compared and contrasted, to the advantage of the latter, who, it is claimed, remains too little appreciated in modern accounts; Drusus and Sulpicius are subjected to a similar synkrisis, the result of which is that Drusus is judged comprehensively deficient, whereas Sulpicius' talent is deemed genuine but unfortunately blighted by the consequences of Sulla's march on Rome; and, finally, Milo and Clodius are set against one another, but found to be 'more equals than opposites' (p. 161).

Reappraisals are useful exercises, helpful both to professional historians and to those who must rely on their judgements. To his credit, E. makes many sound observations. His discussion of Glaucia's significance, to cite the best example in the book, is very much along the right lines (though I am not certain what in this instance can be done about the limitations of our sources). And E. is absolutely correct that 'it

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

is often with the slightest information that political sympathies in republican Rome have been assigned' (p. 7). On particular points, E. can be thought provoking in the best sense. Nevertheless, I regret to say that I found many of the contentions of E.'s book unconvincing, and it sometimes seemed to me that his reassessments were less than entirely novel.

Let me begin with Marius, on whom E. is a recognized authority. E. complains that Marius' political ability has been inappropriately overshadowed by his unmerited military glory (e.g. p. 13 and p. 57 n. 61). But Marius' acumen was appreciated in antiquity, and modern scholars, at least since Passerini (cited by E.), have displayed a keen awareness of it: e.g. Badian's *Foreign Clientelae (264–70 B.C.)* (Oxford, 1958), pp. 194–210, a book much cited here. E. is not at all satisfied with Marius' command against the Teutones and Ambrones, the success of which was based on 'two-and-a-half years in which to prepare his forces, the strategy and even his site of battle' (p. 32). There are military historians who would applaud Marius' patience and thoroughness in this crucial campaign on these very grounds: events might have worked out very differently for Pompey or for Brutus and Cassius if they had attended more carefully to such mundane matters and not allowed circumstances to rush them into pitched battle. Whether generalship of this variety merits the adjective 'superlative', I cannot say; but E.'s lengthy account of Marius' military career does not persuade me that the tradition got it significantly wrong.

Likewise Pompey in the 70s. E. is unimpressed by Pompey's performance in Spain, but this fails to appreciate the genuine difficulties of the war against Sertorius. Contemporaries recognized the hazards, which explains the absence not merely of senior men seeking the command (E. is good on this), but also, what is more revealing, the absence of young and noble officers (cf. Seager, *Pompey the Great* [Oxford, 2002²], p. 33). Pompey's commitment to the Sullan oligarchy, even while he attracted popularity with the masses, the other major concern of E.'s chapter, is well known.

So it goes in the remaining chapters, where provocative points do not always convince completely and where extensive revisionist arguments do not always seem necessary.

The book is not well researched. Reviewers can always find missed references, but here it is not a matter of mere pedanticism (that is perhaps the right category for, say, the observation that a long footnote on p. 173 questioning the authenticity of Cicero's *post reditum* orations includes no response to D. Berry, *PLLS* 9 [1996], 47–74). In important instances, the value of a chapter is diminished by its failure to engage substantial (and accessible) discussions of central issues: for example, E.'s chronology for Pompey's involvement in the Sertorian war is probably wrong, and at the very least should have taken into consideration the conclusions of C. F. Konrad (*Sertorius: A Historical Commentary* [Chapel Hill, 1994], pp. 146–8; id., *Athenaeum* 83 [1995], 157–87); E. makes much, in his chapter on Clodius and Milo, of the Bona Dea scandal, but with no reaction to P. Moreau, *Clodiana Religio. Un procès politique en 61 av. J.-C.* (Paris, 1982), so important on relevant political and legal topics. Examples could be multiplied.

In sum, then, an opportunity missed. Historians will naturally want to read this book with attention to particular points. But the book's larger and creditable ambition is unrealized. I should add that the author has not been well served by his press: there are many typos, though most are minor.

Florida State University

W. JEFFREY TATUM