

repressive responses made by the Republican élite to any politician who took the side of the populace; and second to expose the extent to which modern historians have identified, often tacitly, with the interests and opinions of their élite sources. The first aim is less heterodox than P. claims and he fairly acknowledges those historians who have got there first, de Ste Croix above all but with words of praise for Keith Bradley, Moses Finley, and some others. Some non-Marxists may find the language of class war objectionable, but P. is a careful historian and the provocation is deliberate. I expected to be less convinced by the attack on historians of the twentieth century, but was surprised to find again and again respected figures convicted in their own words, mostly of unconscious bias but bias none the less. The treatment of writers of the 1970s on seemed least satisfactory: the works of Peter Brunt and Andrew Lintott seem to me to have been particularly misunderstood. Perhaps academic historians have taken the liberal consensus so much for granted that we no longer stress what we know about the social injustices of antiquity. Or maybe, our response to partisan history has been to evade passing judgements. Perhaps the most important lesson for academics is how easily we can be misinterpreted — even by an intelligent commentator such as P. — and how the citing of ancient testimony as authorities can seem to condone attitudes that are worse than outdated.

H.'s *Rubicon* comes with a raft of recommendations from academic and popular historians, journalists, and even a few novelists. It does not disappoint. Easily the best written of the three, enormous care has been taken over scholarly precision. At its heart is a gripping narration of the last fatal century, from the Gracchi to the death of Caesar as it were, with glances back to the early Republic and forward to the end of Augustus' reign. H. writes like an action movie, pulling back from the ferocious pace of events for the odd vivid sighting shot 'Set within its icy waters waited the fabulous island of Britain. It was as drenched in mystery as in rain and fog'. By contrast with novelizations of the same period, such as Phyllis Bentley's *Freedom Farewell!*, H. spends relatively little time in the heads of his protagonists, preferring to characterize Homerically, with epithets and snatches of dialogue. Keeping the pace going entails one necessary but drastic economy. H. cannot pause to debate alternative versions, and instead chooses where more than one ancient account exists. But his choices are always reasonable, and extensive research has ensured that his retelling of the fall of the Republic respects nuance as well as factuality. Such an exciting account has not been written of the Republic since Syme's *Roman Revolution*.

One obvious common theme emerges, and it is this: political narrative rules. The contrast with academic publications is striking. To paraphrase Eric Hobsbawm, we are all cultural historians now, so long as we allow that capacious label to include a return to the classics armed with critical theory, a fascination with issues of gender, identity and religion, and the growing fields of reception and material culture studies. Yet on station bookstalls and Amazon listings it is imperial biography and military history that represent our field most prominently. This is not a bad thing in itself, but the distance between research themes and public understanding is striking. No work of Roman cultural history has yet replicated the commercial success of James Davidson's *Courtesans and Fishcakes*. For those who want to take up the challenge of bringing current research to a general public, the three books under review provide abundant tips on how to cross that other Rubicon from academic publishing into trade. For university teachers, they also provide a reminder of what brought our students to the study of Roman antiquity in the first place.

University of St Andrews

GREG WOOLF

L. POLVERINI (ED.), *ASPETTI DELLA STORIOGRAFIA DI ETTORE PAIS*. Naples: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 2002. Pp. 352. ISBN 88-495-0535-3. €28.50.

This collection of twelve essays, with an introduction and concluding remarks, on the Italian historian of the ancient world Ettore Pais (1856–1939) originated in a conference held in Perugia in 1992. Other such meetings, also promoted by Leandro Polverini, have focused on individuals' work, such as Beloch (1990), Rostovzeff in Italy (1999), and, most recently, Momigliano (in press). What, however, sets the study of Pais apart is that he is a less well-known figure, especially outside of Italy, and that this lesser fame is inescapably bound up with a much-divided judgement on the value of his work, as Polverini acknowledges in the preface.

In the introduction P. outlines Pais's long and multi-faceted career: the advanced study with Mommsen in Berlin and the ensuing life-long collaboration on the *CIL*; the academic career with chairs in Palermo, then Pisa, Naples, and Rome; the publication record of more than two hundred

titles, including (as his detractors underline) many slightly different and updated versions of his history of Rome, but also volumes on ancient Sardinia and Sicily; the experience as museum director in Sardinia and Naples; his visiting professorship in the USA in 1904–05; the 1922 election to life member of the senate for academic merit with the subsequent, much criticized, growing support for Fascist imperialism. P. also recalls the controversial reception of Pais: Benedetto Croce wrote of ‘disgust’ for Pais’s nationalist overtones and merely philological approach (*Storia della storiografia italiana nel secolo decimonono* (1947), II, 241–5) and Piero Treves described Pais as irremediably stuck in the contradiction between Risorgimento idealism and philological positivism (*Lo studio dell’antichità classica nell’ottocento* (1962), 1151–62). In contrast to this negative Italian tradition, or to the isolated case for the re-instatement of Pais’s status in the history of the discipline made some time ago by R. Ridley (see *Helikon* 15–16 (1975–76), 500–33), P. presents his approach of asking different scholars to explore specific aspects of Pais’s life and work, that resulted in the volume reviewed here.

Part I is dedicated to the intellectual and political biography of Pais and nationalism is the dominant theme. A. Marcone focuses on Pais’s relationship with German scholarship and brings out the contradiction between Pais’s much criticized philo-Germanism and his staunch nationalism. R. Ridley explores, through journal reviews and private correspondence, Pais’s reception in the English-speaking world, revealing the American as more appreciative than the British one. M. Cagnetta analyses the development of Pais’s ideological interpretation of Roman history, contextualizing his evolving nationalism within both broader European practices and Italy’s peculiarities from its national unification to attempts at imperial expansion. G. Bandelli describes Pais’s shifts of position on the north-eastern Italian border, from his first acquaintance with the region while working for the *CIL* to his interventionism in WWI and his deployment of Roman precedents in the 1920s propaganda for Italian imperial expansionism. P. Ruggieri examines Pais’s speeches in the senate, dating to 1926 his volte-face from liberal criticism to praise of Mussolini. R. Visser concludes Part I with a review of Pais’s correspondence with the secretary of Mussolini, in which he mainly sought to ameliorate his children’s positions.

Part II engages Pais’s academic publications and roles. M. Buonocore reviews Pais’s contribution to the *CIL* and other epigraphic studies, arguing for his crucial role in the formation of modern Italian epigraphy. N. Parise briefly surveys Pais’s less intensive engagement with numismatics, highlighting mistakes and original insights. Making use of archival material, M. Capasso provides a nuanced analysis of Pais’s controversial directorship of the Naples Museum — from which he was fired after only three years in 1904 — focusing on his relations with the museum papyrologists and revealing straight misunderstandings as well as the dynamics of local politics. A. Biraschi argues for Pais’s early and innovative interpretations of Strabo. A. Mastino closely, and at length, examines Pais’s 1923 *Storia della Sardegna e della Corsica durante il dominio romano*, identifying as dominant motives the justification of ancient Roman imperialism as well as his call for modern Italian imperialism, and measuring each chapter’s content by today’s academic standards. Analysing Pais’s other major regional interest, G. Salmeri contextualizes his 1894 *Storia della Sicilia e della Magna Graecia* within the previous historiographical tradition on Sicily (much richer than in the case of Sardinia) and shows Pais’s innovation owing not only to his German education but also to his typically Italian interest in pre-Roman elements and to his working in an antiquarian tradition entailing the close study of the territory and its topography.

In the brief concluding remarks, F. Cassola weaves together the various contributions, attempting to link Part I and Part II — the ideology and the scholarship. For example, he reads the contrast between Pais’s 1894 emphasis on the influence of Sicilian elements in the formation of Roman culture and his 1923 thesis of Roman civilizing imperialism in Sardinia against the crucial date of 1911, when Italy’s stronger commitment to colonial politics turned many nationalists into imperialists. Cassola also goes back to Pais’s work on the archaic history of Rome — a field of study that ends up somehow marginalized in this multifaceted volume — by highlighting how Pais’s hypercriticism gave way to a new interest in reconstructing historical narratives in parallel with his ideological turn to imperialist propaganda.

The disjuncture between Part I and Part II — both thematic and methodological, as most papers in Part II adopt an internalist approach to the history of the discipline — remains, however, the weak point in this very rich volume. There is much new material for a fascinating case-study on interaction between politics and the practices of the study of ancient history, but one wishes that, for example, the tensions between the international scholarly community and

scholars' national allegiances, or the very controversial reception of Pais in the Italian intellectual community, were more explicitly addressed, historically contextualized, and theoretically framed. On a more practical level, a stronger general framework might have prevented the numerous repetitions of episodes from Pais's life in different papers, and collecting together each chapter's bibliography into a single one would have provided a more useful research tool. Having said that, it is precisely the multifocal approach chosen by P., together with the dissonances that this entails, that succeeds in raising questions of interest not only relating to Pais's biography, but also concerning nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century historiography of the ancient world *tout court*.

Stanford University

GIOVANNA CESERANI

II. HISTORY

C. EDWARDS and G. WOOLF (EDS), *ROME THE COSMOPOLIS*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. Pp. xv + 249. ISBN 0-521-80005-6. £45.00.

'This book is for Keith Hopkins' (xiii). As this review was being completed, news of Hopkins' untimely death added resonance to so many of the contributions, whose authors seem to have kept his quizzical scepticism ever before their minds during the writing. The editors determined that this was not to be a conventional 'festschrift', but 'a real book' (xiii) on a subject of interest to Hopkins. One of the key themes underlying the work is the important question of why Rome continued to flourish and play a central role in people's minds long after it had ceased to be the main administrative centre of the Empire. The answer was summed up by Ovid (*Fasti* 2.684), 'Romanae spatium est urbis et orbis idem' ('The world and the city of Rome occupy the same space'). The booty, the art, the wealth, the food, and, above all, the peoples of all parts of the Empire flooded into Rome and made it the 'epitome' of that empire (Athenaeus, *Deip.* 1.20 b-c); as the editors argue, 'Rome the City was so deeply inscribed in the master texts of empire that it could never safely be erased' (19). Another approach which binds many of the contributions together is a shared emphasis on the varied and shifting perspectives of the viewer of the city and its monuments and activities and on the 'Romes of the mind' conjured up in ancient writing about Rome, a topic on which Catherine Edwards has already given the lead in her *Writing Rome* (1996).

Several essays seek to explain some of the processes by which Rome became this unprecedented cosmopolis. Walter Scheidel builds on his earlier important work on disease and demography to present a picture of Rome as the disease capital of the ancient world. The numerous immigrants brought with them their own diseases to add to the hyperendemic malaria of the city. Scheidel offers a gloomy estimate of life expectancy at birth in Rome, which meant that the huge population of the city could only be sustained by continuous large-scale immigration. Willem Jongman agrees with this and offers a useful model for what was happening in the Italian countryside in the last two centuries of the Republic. This rightly dismisses all notions of agrarian crisis and emphasizes the 'pull' factors of Rome, rather than the 'push' of rural upheaval. At long last Hopkins' much-quoted, but misguided, first chapter of *Conquerors and Slaves* can be laid to rest. Neville Morley provides a useful collection of passages and commentary illustrating the varied experiences of the immigrants; this is presented as a script for a TV programme *à la Hopkins*' *A World Full of Gods* — as with Hopkins' experiment the format adds nothing. The rather dire picture of life in Rome which emerges from these essays needs to be balanced with at least some recognition of the real attractions of Rome: the possibilities of employment, of social mobility, greater variety and excitement of life. However, the impact of this picture of restless mobility, an ever-changing population, and fluid social groups, rightly emphasized by Purcell in *CAH IX*², 644–88, has yet to be fully absorbed into studies of Roman political and economic life.

The cosmopolitan nature of Rome's population is a key factor emphasized in the excellent essays by Edwards, Vout, and Elsner on various aspects of art in the city. What was a visiting Jew to make of the triumphal scenes on Titus' arch? Catharine Edwards considers the varied and ambiguous responses to the statuary that flooded into Rome as a result of its imperial conquests — along with the conquered peoples who came as slaves, immigrants, envoys, and visitors. Caroline Vout in a very thoughtful piece considers the nature of 'Egyptianizing' monuments and