
An all-star team has gathered to pay tribute to the work of Peter Wiseman in this impressive collection of papers. There is no overarching theme, but the various contributions come together for a result that is much like Wiseman's scholarship: a blend of historiography, literature and thought practised in excellent fashion which does much to advance our knowledge of Roman culture. The title of the book emphasizes myth, history and culture, and its contents show some of the ways in which connections between them may be understood. Once more, this emulates the effect of a Wiseman book or article. The inspiration provided by the dedicatee is obvious throughout.

Following an introduction by the editors (1-11), there are thirteen papers, an appreciation of T. P. Wiseman by Elaine Fantham (320-5), and an autobiographical note (326-31). A useful bibliography of the dedicatee's works to 2002 (331-42) is followed by an index of ancient passages (343-52) and a general index (353-8). The editors have arranged the papers in broadly chronological order. Nicholas Purcell ('Becoming Historical: the Roman Case', 12-40) argues that it is possible to detect a historiographical consciousness at Rome as early as the fourth, and possibly the fifth, century BC. It is not, therefore, a sudden product of the early second century BC. Romans were conscious of different eras, and were marking their passing on the Capitol in particular, from a much earlier date. Rome did not produce extended historical narratives at this early date, but she was nonetheless in contact with Greek developments in this arena. Filippo Coarelli ('Remoria', 41-55) challenges a number of current theories, including several held by Wiseman himself, on the relationship between Romulus and Remus. He sees Remus as the founder of Rome's rural territory and his brother Romulus as the founder of the urban core. One result is a new understanding of the role played by Romulus and Remus in the rites of the Ambarvalia, whereby the rural territory was ritually cleansed. Michael Crawford ('Land and People in Republican Italy', 56-72) looks at the placement of sanctuaries and hillforts, and at evidence
for weight-standards in Italy, and concludes that patterns of settlement in Italy were unlike Greek models, in which regions centred on valleys are divided by mountain frontiers. Instead, Crawford believes that the Italian pattern, traceable back to the sixth or fifth century BC, was one in which communities were focused not on river basins but on lush summer pastures of relatively high mountains. Tim Cornell ('Coriolanus: Myth, History and Performance', 73-97) offers another paper which directly challenges ideas held by Wiseman, who is generally sceptical about the historical reliability of our literary evidence for early Rome. Cornell is inclined to be more generous in his assessment of it, as he demonstrates here in respect of the tradition about Coriolanus. However, he goes on to argue that the 'historical' elements which some historians have found so puzzling were probably handed down through the generations via epic poetry and stage performance. In other words, epic poetry and the dramatic stage are seen as mechanisms for the preservation of reliable evidence. Wiseman, of course, sees their aims as being so different from historical narrative that the result is the exact opposite. This is a stimulating paper but one fears that further debate will continue to be fashioned largely by the levels of optimism pre-existing in the participants.

Elaine Fantham examines the writings of the second century BC tragedian Pacuvius ('Pacuvius: Melodrama, Reversals and Recognitions', 98-118), in particular fragments from four of his plays: Atalanta, Medus, Iliona and Chryses. She finds a clear emphasis upon mistaken identity and timely recognition which averts an impending disaster. These are standard Hellenistic features, but a preoccupation with twins and the Trojan cycle seems attributable to Roman input. James Zetzel ('Plato with Pillows: Cicero on the Uses of Greek Culture', 119-38) probes Cicero's attitude to Greek literature, art and philosophy. The problem he faces is familiar to many: although he is highly hellenized, there are times when Cicero makes critical assessments of both Greeks and their cultural output. How can this be explained? Zetzel offers a decidedly utilitarian answer. Cicero is not being inconsistent; he is reflecting the usefulness of particular aspects or areas of Greek culture within the Roman social world, with its unique ethical standards and objectives. As a number of writers have come to feel, the answer seems to lie in the relative promotion of Roman power, both personally and nationally. Susan Treggiari
('Ancestral Virtues and Vices: Cicero on Nature, Nurture and Presentation', 139-64) exhibits a wonderful command of Cicero's writings in illustrating how Roman families went about inculcating certain attitudes and patterns of behaviour into their offspring. There was evidently a widespread belief that family characteristics, even ethical traits like social virtues, were inheritable; there was also, it seems, a parallel belief that such characteristics could be trained or induced. Cicero's speeches show that the *homo novus* was quite adept at exploiting for political or forensic gain the pronounced sense of family image at Rome, especially among the nobility. New men seem often to have set their personal virtues against the virtues and vices associated with the families of their opponents. Francis Cairns ('Catullus in and about Bithynia: Poems 68, 10, 28 and 47', 165-90) takes his cue from Wiseman's *Catullus and his World* (1985). He examines the four Catullan poems of the paper's title in a way which appreciates their literary qualities while simultaneously placing them within their social and historical contexts. Among other things, Cairns restates the traditional interpretation of poem 28 as a direct critique of Memmius the governor. A. J. Woodman ('Poems to Historians: Catullus 1 and Horace *Odes* 2.1', 191-216) analyzes two well known poems which are responses to named historians. Catullus' appreciation of the 'Callimachean' qualities of Cornelius Nepos's work is a way for Catullus to imply that his poem and his poetry share these admirable qualities. Horace's response to Asinius Pollio's lost history is more difficult to decipher. Whereas it is common to think that the poem alludes to the consulship of Metellus in 60 BC as the beginning of the Civil War, Woodman shows that there are allusions to earlier Metellan consulships and incidents, so that Pollio may have traced the causes of the Civil War back into the second century BC through the Jugurthine War to the destruction of Carthage in 146 BC.

The aim of Mario Torelli ('The Frescoes of the Great Hall of the Villa at Boscoreale: Iconography and Politics', 217-56) is to understand the presentation mentality of a member of the local élite in the middle of the first century BC. He emphasizes that the villa is large but not grand, so that the owner was not one of the first class of aristocrats. Yet a tour of the villa's wall-paintings, relating them one to another, uncovers a special concentration upon Achilles and Alexander. It seems that the villa's owner was dreaming of himself as a heroic figure of the
Erich Gruen ('Cleopatra in Rome: Facts and Fantasies', 257-74) illustrates the pernicious power of Hollywood in a remarkable debunking of the idea that Cleopatra stayed in Rome between the years 46-44 BC as Caesar's mistress. There were, instead, two visits during this period and Cleopatra was operating primarily for the good of her kingdom. She needs to be appreciated in terms of power-politics rather than epic romance. Karl Galinsky ('Greek and Roman Drama and the Aeneid', 275-94) treats the Aeneid as a work of tragic problematization. Like Greek tragedy, it fashions universal significance out of specific social and cultural tensions of the period of its production. Aeneas’ hesitation before he kills Turnus is in line with tragic problematization of the revenge-theme. Finally, Edward Champlin ('Agamemnon at Rome: Roman Dynasts and Greek Heroes', 295-319) delivers a stimulating discussion of the ways in which figures from Greek myth and drama were used in the Republic and early Empire as vehicles for making coded statements about leading Romans. The statements could be positive and supported by the subject or they could be negative and potentially destructive. Tiberius' suppression of a playwright for an alleged slander against Agamemnon the king of kings shows something of the sensitivity which could be involved. It seems that there was a general awareness of the phenomenon and a rather high level of interpretation among the people of Rome.

In sum, these papers are a fitting tribute to Peter Wiseman's work. Many of the authors have interacted directly with his scholarship, some in opposition to well known theories. Yet even those who have not done so owe a clear debt to the dedicatee, for they all support and attempt to emulate the kind of interdisciplinarity which marks Wiseman's publications. This should not be taken for granted. There was far greater specialization and patrolling of the disciplinary boundaries at the commencement of Wiseman's academic career. Points were at times scored rather easily against (say) a historian who strayed leaden-footed into the world of literature, or into the world of a particular writer, and failed to appreciate the nuances of an extract.
lifted clumsily out of context. It needed scholars of Wiseman's learning and personality to break this mould and inspire others to emulate them. There can be little doubt that he is a pioneer and that the study of Roman culture is much the better for his example and leadership. In fact, we have to think in broad holistic terms of 'culture' when we read him.

On the other hand, the publication of such a book requires reflection on what has been achieved and on potential new directions. Here a crossroads might have been reached. Wiseman himself talks about the chimaera of 'total history' (327). He understands at this point in his career, with a certain resignation, that his youthful aim of writing 'the definitive book on late-republican society and politics' (326) cannot be achieved. There are too many angles from which one might approach the general field and so many more possibilities about which we know nothing. A writer can hardly hope to make sense of them all, or perhaps even of a sufficient number to produce a meaningful whole. This begs the question: where to? We have the disciplinary and the interdisciplinary models to guide us. There is great value in each of them. Yet even if it is concluded that every individual study will necessarily be partial, part of a process of construction, surely this collection of papers serves as an eloquent argument against any tipping of the balance in favour of the approach in depth. The approach in breadth can produce work of significant meaning, marked by powerful imagination, exciting connections and sensitive appreciation of the sources. Scholars might not always be able to do this at Wiseman's level of excellence but they can certainly seek to emulate his approach, as the contributors to this book have done. Very few scholars can claim to have inspired beyond the contents of their own papers. This is a mark of true excellence.
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