

Models (1985), 67–87) and realist theory does offer a plausible account, but to be effective as a model it needs also to explain the evident and extensive co-operation that existed among Greek states (cf. A. Giovannini, ‘Greek cities and Greek commonwealth’, in A. Bulloch *et al.*, *Images and Ideologies: Self-definition in the Hellenistic World* (1993), 265–86, and J. Ma, ‘Peer polity interaction in the Hellenistic Age’, *Past and Present* 180 (2003), 9–39). This latter is something that E. tends to sideline rather than incorporate into his picture.

E. is surely right to stress Rome’s capacity to assimilate others as a significant factor in its success, in particular the sharing of rights and even citizenship with other Italians; in spite of its importance, this section is surprisingly brief and it would be good if it were to be expanded in a future publication. At times E. seems overly schematic. Militarism may be a feature of all ancient states but it does not follow from this that it is largely irrelevant as an explanation for Roman success (236–7). Rome’s success may be as much to do with a distinctive form of bellicosity as an ability to assimilate. Nor should we ignore Rome’s determination to control. Its ultimate victory in both the Hannibalic War and the Social War may have been as much the result of strategically-placed Latin colonies securing the territory of Italy as assimilated Italians (S. Oakley, ‘The Roman conquest of Italy’, in J. Rich and G. Shipley (eds), *War and Society in the Roman World* (1993), 19).

Studies of Roman expansion have often become stuck in a rather sterile debate about whether Rome should be interpreted as defensive or aggressive in outlook, a debate that has tended to move in tandem with modern international developments. Is it a coincidence, for instance, that in Anglophone scholarship the defensive Rome gave way to an aggressive Rome around the time that the Vietnam War was ending? Now in an increasingly anarchic post-Soviet world E. has produced a clear and forcefully-argued book that breaks away from this debate and challenges scholars to look at Roman imperialism afresh.

University of Edinburgh

ANDREW ERSKINE

M. HUMM, *APPIUS CLAUDIUS CAECUS. LA RÉPUBLIQUE ACCOMPLIE* (BEFAR 322).

Rome: École Française de Rome, 2005. Pp. x + 779, 10 pls, 14 illus, 2 tables. ISBN 978-2-72830-682-4. €112.00.

Appius Claudius Caecus is the earliest Roman statesman whom we might know in some meaningful sense. As censor in 312 B.C. (his first major magistracy, which also saw a plethora of other initiatives, some obscure and controversial) he started the Aqua and Via Appia. He went on to hold two consulships, remaining a significant figure until his seminal speech in the Senate, when, blind and infirm, he succeeded in having Pyrrhos’ peace terms rejected. Caecus, who also wrote poems, *sententiae* and a juristic work (late sources credit him with introducing rhotacism into Latin, and banishing the letter ‘z’ from the alphabet), has some claim to be Rome’s first literary figure (521–39). Cicero mentions him more than a dozen times, and it is clear that by then his *exemplum* had a life, or lives, of its own: a distasteful radical to Livy, he nevertheless made it into the ranks of the Augustan *summi uiri*.

As Humm makes clear in this monograph, any scholar trying to do Caecus justice faces serious source problems; the evidence is not sparse, but infuriatingly contradictory, a trait which has led moderns to wildly differing interpretations. H., over some 600 pages, gives Caecus a sweeping, indeed dazzling, reassessment. One of its merits is its grounding in the political, social, and cultural developments of the age: H. exploits an impressive range of literary and material evidence from across Italy and beyond. The only disappointment is the treatment of the sources (35–97). H. knows the material well, and makes some important points, as on Claudian monuments, public and private (42–6). Elsewhere rather heavy weather is made of the obvious point, already noted by De Sanctis, that the multi-faceted presentation in the sources connotes contemporary and ongoing controversy about the man and his work, not an enigmatic individual. There is also more than a whiff of very old-fashioned *Quellenforschung*; repeated recourse to Walsh, *Livy. His Historical Aims and Methods*² (1989), and Mazzarino, *Il pensiero storico classico* (1965–6), is not matched by equal attention to more modern studies. H., rightly, does not seek a single author as the fountainhead of the ‘anti-Claudian strand’ in the sources; but even to talk of such a strand, or a ‘Fabian’ one, without some qualification, is problematic. Elsewhere, H. manifests an untoward concern with the sources of our sources, which leads him to overplay similarities between the texts of the *de uiris illustribus* and Appius’ *elogium* in the Forum Augustum, with Hyginus over-optimistically identified as the ultimate source for both; and to an over-speculative reconstruction

of elements of Caecus' speech against Pyrrhos (and the role of the *Ineditum Vaticanum* in its transmission) and of pontifical or Pisonian strands within the 'anti-Claudian' traditions. H. is right to start looking for the genesis of the Claudian family traditions soon after the censorship of Caecus, but his methodology is too blunt to succeed in dissecting this convoluted bundle of viewpoints.

H. handles the source problems partly by stressing a distinction between a 'hard core' of facts which cannot reasonably be doubted, and the details of motivation and explanation which the sources present for them, about which he is sceptical (103–4). The remainder of the book is H.'s re-reading of the 'core', set against recent work on pivotal trends in the middle Republic. In sum, his claims are as follows: Caecus' *lectio senatus*, and the reaction to it, crystallized the composition and recruitment of the Republican Senate as we know it until the time of Sulla (185–226); his *recognitio* of the cavalry was essential in the formation of the equestrian order, modelled on a contemporary Capuan institution, the *equites Campani* (133–84); the adoption of the manipular organization in the legions found prompt reflection in a timocratic reorganization of the *classes* and thus the *comitia centuriata*, introducing what we think of as the 'Servian system'; in addition, Caecus extended membership of tribes to men of all social classes, transforming them from territorial into administrative units, which responded to the new demands which his other reforms made in the areas of the census, the levy, and taxation; with tribal reform went the creation of the *comitia tributa*, which naturally required the publication of a calendar (by Caecus' associate Cn. Flavius in his aedileship, 304 B.C.) to function efficiently (375–49). Beside this Roman Kleisthenes H. sets another model: focusing on evidence for increasing Greek influence on Italian thought and culture, and through minute analysis of evidence for Pythagoreanism at Rome and in Caecus' own life and output, H. proposes seeing him as nothing less than the Roman Archytas (483–638). This all amounts to a serious revision of Roman cultural and institutional history in this period, and gives a startling coherence to otherwise recalcitrant and scattered testimonies, one seconded by the broad sweep of H.'s comparative, Italy-wide, approach. It is persuasive; but is it convincing?

This reviewer thinks probably not. The decision to separate the hard core of 'facts' from their detailed treatment in the sources, is perhaps methodologically unsophisticated, and discourages comparative evaluation of the individual elements of the core: the obscure and doubtful are treated as almost equivalent to the certain and uncontroversial. H.'s vision is ingenious and well thought out, but ultimately what we might be able to know of Caecus' activity probably does not allow us to attempt reconstructions of this kind. What is important, though, is what we may learn about the 'cultural universe' of Mid-Republican Rome, and of its aristocracy. In a sense it is a shame that the work focuses on one individual, since while the broader trends of the period are used to good effect, other players and tendencies in politics appear one-dimensional and grey; and almost everything of consequence ends up as fathered on a single visionary individual, in a single decisive magistracy. Whether or not readers will accept the whole argument, it is incontestable that this is a very important contribution indeed. It seems impossible that anyone will read this volume without great instruction, pleasure, and admiration for the bold synoptic vision of the author.

Brasenose and St Anne's Colleges, Oxford

EDWARD BISPHAM

A. BELL, *SPECTACULAR POWER IN THE GREEK AND ROMAN CITY*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Pp. 289. ISBN 9-780-19924-234-4 (bound); 9-780-19929-827-3 (paper). £67.00 (bound); £24.00 (paper).

Bell has put together a work which can be difficult, but ultimately offers some genuinely interesting insights into the division of power between prominent politicians and their audiences in ancient cities. B. sets out the book's agenda in the first of six chapters. It begins with an engrossing account of a pivotal moment in the fall of Nicolae Ceauçescu, when, having lost control of his audience for the first time, he was unable to present himself as a powerful and visually impressive individual attended by cheering crowds. Focusing on the fact that Ceauçescu, despite his secret police and military forces, still felt it necessary to be seen as a political leader at the head of an appreciative crowd, B. introduces the theory that the ability to appear and be seen as a powerful individual is actually an integral part of power itself. In turning this theory to the ancient world, B. suggests that by studying the ways in which prominent ancient figures sought to