Karl-Joachim Hölkeskamp, Sema Karataş and Roman Roth (eds.), ***Empire, Hegemony or Anarchy? Rome and Italy, 201-31 BCE.*** Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2019. Pp. 258. ISBN 978-3515115247.

The edited volume features ten essays examining relations and connections between Italian communities and Rome from the conclusion of the Hannibalic War to the violent death of the free Republic. This timeframe is bookended by extraordinarily destructive wars, and Roman Roth offers an intriguing conceptual approach in his introduction by considering Italy as a "post-conflict zone" in two distinct phases, first following the Hannibalic War and again after the Social War and the iterative civil wars that ensued. Even as the Romans were conquering and administering an overseas empire, the Italian core was profoundly reshaped by the traumas and reverberations of warfare not simply in Italy, but between Italians.

John Patterson, "The Roman Conquest of Italy and the Republican City of Rome," considers the commemoration of Roman victories over various Italians peoples, especially monuments in the city itself. The associated monumental landscape was relatively sparse, and not necessarily enduring. While the *rostra* from Antium continued to be displayed, most monuments to the Italian wars seem to have either disappeared or lost their connotations with victories over the Italians; for example, the Temple of Jupiter Stator was vowed during a battle with the Samnites in 294 BC, but over time came to be associated with Romulus. While the loss of many of these monuments was likely routine, the result of fires, overbuilding and decay, political developments also played a role: monuments commemorating the Italian wars were neglected and forgotten as former enemies gained citizenship and the right to vote. By the first century BC, there was little electoral upside in bragging about the victories a distant relative had won over peoples who were potential constituents, nor with repairing or upgrading the monuments that celebrated them.

Clifford Ando, "Hannibal's Legacy," titled in appreciation of Toynbee's famous (if often under-read) work, considers the problem of Roman governance over Italy. Ando suggests that Rome effectively ruled Italy as a *de facto* territorial state, but one profoundly heterogeneous in composition, a jumble of citizen territories and colonies, Latin colonies and Italian communities with their own specific treaties with Rome. Governance required acknowledging but then eliding these differences to make Italian hinterlands legible to the metropole. In the realm of law, Ando notes the deployment of legal fictions, evident in the earliest statues from the late second century BC, that allowed Italians of various statuses to be treated by the court as if they were Roman citizens, and even demand the fiction that the case should be treated as if it were being heard in Rome itself. Meanwhile, Roman cadastral maps reduced the topographical complexity of Italian terrain into two-dimensional grid squares which made external territory superficially legible. Yet these simple grids ultimately proved inadequate, prompting the Romans to overlay illustrations of features like cities, mountains and rivers, adding complexity back into a graphic system inherently designed to suppress it.

Roman Roth, "The Expansion of the Citizenship and Roman Elite Interests in Regional Italy, c. 200–91 BC," notes that the decades following the Hannibalic War saw an expansion of Roman citizenship into Italy. This was facilitated through two mechanisms, firstly the plantation of citizens, both through the foundation of large citizen colonies in lieu of Latin ones (15 of 19 attested post-Hannibalic colonies were citizen colonies), and also through two major *viritim* assignations. Secondly, a number of municipal communities were promoted to full citizenship, thus gaining the right to vote. The switch from Latin colonization to citizen colonization has traditionally been explained by the notion that citizens were no longer willing to accept inferior status upon emigration; Roth considers this "plausible but unsatisfactory." Rather, he argues that Roman elites saw an expanded distribution of citizens as a fresh constituency for elite patronage, display and competition, including (controversial) censorial projects in colonies. As the tribal system atrophied over the course of the second century, promoted *municipia* and citizen colonies played a more prominent role in the administration of Rome's sprawling rural citizen body.

Marion Bolder-Boos, "Adorning the City: Urbanistic Trends in Republican Central Italy," synthesizes recent work on the urban fabric of Roman colonies and *municipia*. The paper rejects the notion that colonies were explicitly set up as little replicas of Rome (a notion derived from a misreading of Aulus Gellius (*NA* 16.13), which had informed previous interpretation of colonial sites as mini-Romes. Yet the diversity of colonial urban landscapes should not be read too far in the opposite direction: despite various idiosyncrasies (including pragmatic adjustments along topography), colonial sites might still contain a package of urban aspects that could be read as Roman, particularly the organization of the urban center around an elongated forum. Bolder-Boos also considers the popularity of monumental sanctuary complexes across colonies, *municipia* and independent cities, suggesting these were less an example of "self-Romanization," than the mutual exposure of both Romans and *socii* to eastern styles, the joint expropriation of imperial wealth, and the shared realization of new building technologies involving concrete (*opus caementicium*). The paper concludes that despite recursive influences between Rome and Italian cities, we should appreciate the agency of individual communities in structuring their urban fabric.

Stéphane Bourdin, "Les ligues italiennes de la soumission à Rome à l'intégration," discusses leagues of Italian cities and peoples before and after the Roman conquest. Ethnic confederacies of various degrees of formality and organization were a common means of organizing communities in Archaic Italy. While Rome's diplomatic strategy involved undercutting the unity of Italian connections, especially through bilateral treaties with individual cities, he suggests that Rome retained some league structures after the conquest out of administrative convenience. He argues this is reflected primarily in patterns of military recruitment: the Polybian roll-up for 225 BC (2.24) is organized by ethnicity, suggesting some means of correlating the numbers from various smaller communities. Moreover, he notes that while cohorts from Latin colonies are assigned to particular cities, cohorts from other Italian people are simply described as coming from the broader ethnic group: e.g. Paeligni, Vestini, etc. The archeological evidence from Pietrabbondante suggests that the Samnites were able to engage in monumental building that transcended the tribes and cantons. Bourdin sees the continuance of league structures into the Social War, and suggests these explain the topography of ethnic belligerents: Marsi, Paeligni, Vestini, Marrucini, etc., each described as having its own commander.

Saskia Roselaar, "Between Rome and Italy: Hegemony, Anarchy and Land in the Late Second Century BC," explores the rising dissatisfaction of the Italians, suggesting that while Italians were concerned about abusive behavior by Roman magistrates, the key trigger point was land. In many instances, when *ager publicus* was mulcted from defeated Italian communities, the original Italian owners stayed on as occupants. Roselaar argues that the Gracchan land law in fact provided Italian occupiers of public land with surprisingly generous protections in theory, likely guaranteeing possessors of under 500 *iugera* continued access to those plots, the same benefit as offered to Romans. Elite Italians with large holdings nonetheless faced the possibility that what they still considered ancestral estates might be broken up and distributed. More seriously, all Italians were jeopardized by sloppy surveying and the hasty distribution process, which suddenly placed a premium on access to legal remediation in Rome. Thus, agrarian distribution programs coincided with halting attempts to grant legal concessions to the Italians, ranging from access to citizenship (including the introduction of citizenship *per magistratum* for Latins) to grants of *provocatio*. Livius Drusus' proposal to give citizenship to the Italians was tied to his own agrarian proposals, and his murder proved a major flashpoint for the Social War.

Guy Bradley, "State Formation and the Social War," discusses the epochal conflict that completely reshaped both the Roman state and Italian society, yet one whose military and diplomatic details are poorly understood. Bradley argues that Italian desire for citizenship should be seen as a major motivating factor, even if not necessarily universally shared. Indeed, Bradley stresses that the Italian cause was highly fragmented, suggesting that rather than viewing the insurgents in neat ethnic blocks (Samnites, Etruscans, Umbrians), we should see rebellion and loyalty to Rome as contingent, with communities and sometimes even clans, families and individuals all cross-pressured between various connections to both Rome and adjacent Italian communities. Bradley explicitly compares the situation to the jumble of Italians defecting or staying loyal to Rome during the Hannibalic War, especially since there was a rough correspondence to the Hannibalic defectors and Social War rebels. By the Augustan age, the war was increasingly seen in a favorable light: Ovid could brag about the honor of the Paelignian cause, and indeed the moniker *Bellum Sociale* eventually replaced terms like *Bellum Marsicum* or *Italicum*, reframing the war as an internal conflict rather than one against foreign enemies.

Wolfgang Blösel, "Die ‚politische' Integration der italischen Neubürger in den römischen Legionen vom Bundesgenossenkrieg bis zur Triumviratszeit," examines service in the Roman army as a primary interface between freshly enfranchised Italian citizens and the Roman state. The army was particularly important given that the political incorporation of Italians through the census and municipalization proceeded only haltingly and unevenly in the decades after the Social War. Nonetheless, Italian citizens were recruited into the legions immediately, now through large-scale regional levies directed by specific Roman commanders, rather than local cohorts raised by hometown officials. Military service was also a way for Italians to hold positions of authority and responsibility on behalf of the Roman state, especially the professionalizing cadre of centurions. Ominously, the fact that military service was the dominant way in which new citizens interacted with the *res publica* – mediated directly by powerful generals – increased the likelihood and intensity of the civil war.

Sema Karataş, "The Integration of *domi nobiles* at Rome," explores the municipal elites in Late Republican Italy. The term *domi nobiles* in the first century BC could describe both Italian gentry as well as foreign civic elites in the provinces, and thus imposed a taint of alterity on recently enfranchised gentry. Italian *domi nobiles* who sought political careers in Rome faced substantial hurdles, often despised as upstarts and outsiders. As a result, even when seeking careers in Rome, they leaned heavily on their hometowns as sources of financial, moral and especially electoral support. Karataş focuses on the case of Cn. Plancius, who was elected aedile in large part thanks to the exceptional turnout from his *praefectura*; it seems other Roman voters, despite their prejudices against these politicians, could be impressed by candidates able to mobilize the enthusiastic backing of their hometowns.

Federico Santangelo, "Municipal Men in the Age of the Civil Wars," continues on the theme of municipal elites in the Late Republic. The responses of the *viri municipales* to the conflict were diverse: Cicero found many indifferent during the civil war between Caesar and Pompey; others discovered later that they could continue to protect their personal and community interests under Caesar's autocracy. While some Italians recoiled at Mark Antony's luxuriant trip through Italy, others joined him in his entourage. Santangelo also discusses *municipales* seeking office in Rome itself, but notes other ways municipal men might exert themselves on a larger stage. Some deployed their wealth to act as regional (rather than merely local) patrons. Others sought service to the *res publica* outside of elective office, especially in the Roman army, where a number of attested *praefecti fabrum*, essentially the "chief of staff," are of Italian origin. Despite not holding elective office, these men could prove highly influential in the militarized politics of the civil war era.

Overall, the volume provides a highly satisfying set of discussions. The reader feels as if they have just attended a vigorous and illuminating conference. My short précis here elides the richness and nuances packed into each excellent chapter. A common theme is the heterogeneity of Italy and its constituent threads: peoples, elites, communities, each contained their own internal diversities even as Roman power loomed as a universal variable.

MICHAEL TAYLOR
UNIVERSITY AT ALBANY
mjtaylor@albany.edu