

encouraging fidelity in marriage and marriage (or remarriage) for the procreation of children. These attempts, which might appear to be a continuation of public moral positions staked out by generations of disapproving or hortatory Roman leaders (most famously, perhaps, in 131 B.C. by the censor Metellus Macedonicus *apud* Gell. 1.6.2), were instead, we are told (pp. 137–9), designed to weaken the aristocracy's ability to compete with the emperor's resources: the moral rhetoric is just canting persiflage to cover the unattested sinister purpose of breaking up family wealth by encouraging a situation in which multiple heirs would have to share smaller portions of a family's resources. The fallacy here lies in the assumption that because a political advantage (which Augustus may well have seen) accrued from the moral legislation (or any public act), that act must thus have been motivated by that advantage.

D. appears to me regularly to deduce Octavian/Augustus' motivations using the reductive rational actor model of human behavior to interpolate between the pieces of circumstantial evidence we possess. The reasoning goes like this: he must have wanted to do this or that, because it would have had that or this expedient effect on his self-interests which he knowingly pursued (cf. D.'s revealing fondness for the metaphor *Schachzug* to describe protagonists' actions—three times in ten pages: pp. 39, 45, 49). This model cuts a Gordian knot of complexities (real people do things with mixed motives, act from anger or other emotions, act carelessly, or sometimes act just to be doing *something*) and allows a neat reconstruction of the motivations behind the circumstances mediated by the historian's idea of rationality and appropriate motivating self-interest. Naturally, in making this criticism I am not tacitly advancing the equally untenable proposition that a historical protagonist acts only from irrational motivations; nor, indeed, that Octavian/Augustus was free of an at times ruthless desire to control.

No work on the Augustan principate after Zanker's *Macht der Bilder* can afford to ignore or downplay the monuments, and the one major flaw (besides method) in D.'s work is her blindness to the Augustan monuments. What references to monuments she makes are generally prompted by her reading of the ancient sources, but there is only perfunctory contact with such obvious, rudimentary works as Zanker's and none with *LTUR*. A very minor complaint is the lack of any chronological chart in a book dedicated to a diachronic presentation of its subject.

Despite my skeptical critique, I found the task of working diachronically through the material on Augustus with D. quite valuable, even when I was frustrated by leaps of intuition I was unwilling to follow. Her work on establishing connections between events and her minute scrutinization of Augustus' accumulation of power made me look at familiar material in a fresh way, and in a work on such a hoary topic as the first *princeps*'s reign that is no small achievement.

Creighton University

GREGORY S. BUCHER

POLITICS AT POMPEII

J. L. FRANKLIN JR: *Pompeis difficile est. Studies in the Political Life of Imperial Pompeii*. Pp. xiv + 225, ills. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001. Cased, £34. ISBN: 0-472-11056-X.

This book offers an analysis of politics at Pompeii during the imperial era, but its overall argument is disappointing, as is its surprising number of errors and its over-conjectural approach.

© The Classical Association, 2003

Franklin sets out to examine political factions at Pompeii. This is a strange approach given that the idea of party politics is no longer favoured, even for Rome. Although Pompeii's élite aligned itself in different ways with Rome and tried to win the support of various emperors, it does not follow that this represents the work of a political faction. In looking for alternative factions, a single seal-ring is not good enough evidence for saying 'There had besides been the city's supporters of Antony' (p. 17). Anachronistic language does not plug the gap in the evidence, whereby six *tribuni militum a populo* are 'the core of the Augustan faction in local politics', and Holconius Rufus is heading 'a coalition'. Nor was Holconius Rufus the 'presumed replacement of Marcellus as patron', since the town is unlikely only to have had one patron at a time (a Q. Sallustius is honoured as patron at roughly this time too). One may also doubt that the scale of building in Augustan times was unparalleled (p. 41), since colonization had heralded a similar level of activity.

Turning to Neronian times, F. makes D. Lucretius Satrius Valens the fulcrum of a faction. He is a perpetual *flamen* of Nero, but his other alleged links with Nero's court are unconvincing, largely depending on a fragmentary graffito and an inscription showing that L. Satrius Rufus was in an emperor's service. This is not necessarily of Neronian date, nor does Rufus necessarily have any connection with Lucretius Valens. References to *Augustiani*, possibly members of Nero's clique of theatrical supporters, seem a more promising way of tracing 'Neronians' (p. 115), until the revelation that *Augustianae* are classy prostitutes! References to Neroppaenses occur in graffiti whose meaning remains fragmentary and obscure. F. suggests (p. 147) that there was a web of interconnections between newcomers to Pompeii, who actively supported each other's political campaigns, and he comments on the language used in their electoral notices, arguing that their emphasis on respectability may seek to compensate for the newness of the candidate's family. But these two aspects are not unique to new families: compare the language used by the Cuspii Pansae (p. 172 n. 72).

F.'s translations are not always reliable. The worst error is the mistranslation of [*Imp. Caesare XIII [M Plautio Sil]vano cos as 'Caesar (being) imperator for the 13th time, M. Plautius Silvanus being consul at Rome'* (p. 38). Also problematic is the interpretation (p. 178) of *Q S Caecili Iucundi* as 'Quintus and Sextus, slaves of Caecilius Iucundus', whereas this is a phrase in the nominative plural, referring probably to Iucundus' sons. Elsewhere, the translation is unhelpful: *ex rog-* is translated as 'in accordance with rog-' (p. 102); *cenacula* is 'quality dining areas' (p. 96), despite the comment (n. 117) that *cenaculum* means 'quality apartment'.

There are several other errors of fact, such as in discussion of the legacy left by Lucretius Rufus. The findspot of *CIL X.851* is given as the Temple of Isis, whereas it was found in the 'Samnite Palaestra'. This error presumably results from the use in *CIL* of the name 'Curia Isiaca' for the palaestra. Furthermore, the herm-shaft in the Temple of Isis was found reused. Holconius Rufus is described (pp. 42, 45) as serving his final, fourth term as *duovir* in 2/1 B.C., whereas he became *duovir* for a fifth time. F. even contradicts himself in discussing the career of Lucretius Valens, who is recorded as being granted equestrian rank by both Tiberius (p. 58) and Claudius (p. 82). It would also be possible to add much more detail to the family tree of D. Lucretius Valens (p. 130), in view of the discussion of his family tomb (p. 58). Epigraphy is not the only source to cause problems: (p. 66) the House of M. Pupius Rufus (VI.15.4) is to the immediate north, not south, of the fuller's house; the suggestion that the Lucretii were living on their estate outside Pompeii depends upon identifying an incompletely excavated villa near their family tomb in Scafati as belonging to them, for which there is no evidence other than proximity, and ignores their known town house.

F.'s mode of presentation gives a spurious sense of certainty to his reconstruction of family relationships, not least by his tendentious stemmata at the end of each chapter. Take Holconius Gellius as an example: 'There will have been a Cellia—probably daughter of this second *tribunus militum a populo*—married to Holconius Celer, and it must have been this further Augustan connection that was underscored in naming their son, Holconius Gellius' (p. 22). Even if Gellius is the son of a Cellia married to a Holconius, there is no reason to suppose that his father is Celer, let alone that his uncle is Cellius Calvus. Such relationships are purely hypothetical—their illusoriness emerges from the fact that F. now views Holconius Celer as the son of Holconius Rufus (p. 20), contradicting his own earlier work (n. 16) without explaining why. It is risky to build too much upon what appear to be such arbitrary reconstructions of families.

One of the main problems lies in the attempt to create a narrative from inappropriate source material: inscriptions simply cannot allow us to trace a town's political history in this way. As a result, we read a sometimes fanciful narrative based upon little evidence. For example, here is one fictional scenario, discussing the *duoviri* of A.D. 33/4 (p. 55): 'M. Vesonius Marcellus . . . is the only distinguished member of his family known, suggesting that Lucretius Epidius Flaccus intended to dominate this year with little interference from his colleague'. Similarly, (p. 145) F. plunges into an elaborate narrative of events after 'the earthquake of 62' on no evidence whatever.

Given these problems, the book should be handled with caution, but it does shed some light upon the rise and fall of families in local politics, notably the emergence of freedmen's sons, and the rôle of adoption in families' survival tactics. F. argues that M. Lucretius Manlianus may be earliest known freedman's son to become *duovir* (A.D. 31/2). He also identifies Q. Coelius Caltilius Iustus as another freedman's son, *duovir* in A.D. 52/3, whose father was an outsider to Pompeii. He suggests (p. 173) that the occurrence of filiation in electoral notices may be a reflection of a candidate's status, where he wishes to distinguish himself clearly from a freedman father.

University of Warwick

ALISON E. COOLEY

WOMEN AND THE LAW

J. EVANS GRUBBS: *Women and Law in the Roman Empire. A Sourcebook on Marriage, Divorce and Widowhood*. Pp. xxiv + 349. London and New York: Routledge, 2002. Paper, £17.99. ISBN: 0-415-15241-0 (0-415-15240-2 hbk).

Since the appearance of Jane Gardner's ground-breaking work on *Women in Roman Law and Society* (1986), legal sources have come into their own as documents of at least some of the realities of the lives of Roman women. Increased sophistication in their use in conjunction with other literary and documentary material combined with recent papyrological discoveries illustrating law in action make an attempt to synthesize the legal with some of the documentary material timely. Judith Evans Grubbs has a track record as a historian of law and society, with her work on Constantine's legislation on marriage (1995) and numerous articles on women and imperial law. Her collation of legal and other material on marriage, divorce, and widowhood is therefore both welcome and valuable.

The book is divided into five main sections, plus introduction and conclusion. Her