

genre (with over five hundred colour plates in each), are no exception. A certain diffuseness in approach is perhaps inevitable, and I suppose that one cannot leave the Capestrano warrior out — even though it is from the territory of the Vestini Cismontani, not the area of Pinna; but inclusion is justified by a fine account of the archaeological context of its discovery. A. La Regina usefully includes superb pictures of the inscriptions (mis-)described as ‘South Picene’, with transcriptions that need checking before using and rather imaginative translations. The chapter on military matters, on the other hand, hovers between discussing the Vestini and discussing war in ancient Italy. Chapters on glass and funerary beds by A. Martellone take us even further afield, as do S. Cosentino on the relief with a funerary procession from Amiternum and R. Tuteri on a fibula from Pizzoli, near Amiternum, interestingly showing typological links with material from Capua.

The chapter by A. R. Staffa could have done with some serious editing, repeating word for word information, in any case inaccurate, on the Città Sant’Angelo hoard (60 and 202); and on the Rapino bronze (34 and 40). T. Vetis is Roman on 41 (where the inscription is wrongly described as a fragment), Vestine in n. 66 (but perhaps in fact Paelignian: see *Imagines Italicæ*, Interpromium 4). The bracelet with a ‘South Picene’ inscription is not certainly from Monte la Queglia, near Pescosansonesco (*Imagines Italicæ*, Interpromium (?) 1). And it is interesting to find another Italic sanctuary ended, not by the Social War, but by Christianity, in the fourth century A.D. The sanctuaries discussed include that at Poggio Ragone, whose life was ended by a landslide.

Volume II is more focused, with a full account of the archaeology of the Roman period of Pinna, and a fine account of its rich Latin epigraphy by M. Buonocore. Pl. 19 d is a picture of the inscription TI. FOFICIS, the only known Italic inscription from Pinna, without any discussion that I have been able to find. And the caption to pl. 34 is unable to resist the introduction of the hoary canard of sacred prostitution.

University College, London

Imagines.Italicæ@sas.ac.uk

doi:10.1017/S0075435815000374

MICHAEL CRAWFORD

C. STOCKS, *THE ROMAN HANNIBAL: REMEMBERING THE ENEMY IN SILIUS ITALICUS’ PUNICA*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2014. Pp. xii + 276. ISBN 9781781380284. £75.00.

This book, as its title indicates, is centrally concerned with establishing and exploring Hannibal’s *Romanitas* or ‘Roman-ness’ in Silius Italicus’ *Punica* and, as such, challenges the view that Hannibal is, straightforwardly, a Carthaginian ‘other’ in the poem. Stocks’ study, as indicated in the introduction and ch. 1, takes its point of departure from pre-Silian literary traditions regarding Hannibal; as these are almost exclusively Roman or, when not, are shaped by Roman conceptions of the Carthaginian, it follows that Silius himself, drawing on them, produces a Hannibal who is likewise defined, even in his ‘otherness’, in Roman terms. And yet, as S. observes, Hannibal had not only been ‘Romanized’ long before Silius, but had become a locus or point of reference for the Romans’ exploration of their own *Romanitas* and not simply of his ‘Punic-ness’. S. supports these claims in ch. 2, which gives an overview of select, mostly prose treatments of Hannibal down to Seneca the Younger, and in ch. 3, which is devoted to Livy. In ch. 4, where she considers Hannibal’s relation to heroic epic antecedents, S. strays somewhat from the foregoing discussion, but in its final section helpfully connects the dots between the ‘Roman Hannibal’ as a construct of the pre-Silian Roman literary imagination and Silius’ Hannibal as a specific instance thereof. Here S. shows how Jupiter’s speech to Venus in Book 3 and Virtus’ to Scipio in Book 15 define a standard for ‘idealised *Romanitas*’ (78), a standard that is not only applicable to Hannibal, but is set by him through his early successes in the war. Hence, Hannibal ‘is a hero whose dynamism and epic credentials will set a benchmark for Silius’ Roman *uiri* on how to wage war, showing them how to be *real* men; showing them how to be Roman’ (75).

Chs 5–10 cover the *Punica* mostly in chronological sequence. Throughout, S.’s principal concern is Hannibal, and even when attention shifts to, say, Marcellus (ch. 8) and Scipio (ch. 10), S. is mindful of how they inform and are informed by Silius’ ‘Roman Hannibal’. But the guiding thread of this part of the book is another trend: Hannibal’s evolution from man into myth. Early in the epic, S. argues, Hannibal the man is in full view as he builds (or builds on) the myth of himself as a larger-than-life, superhuman figure, and even though there are signs of his declining effectiveness as early as Book 4,

he maintains a fearsome presence through his victory at Cannae in Book 10 (chs 5–6). But after Cannae, Hannibal's effectiveness as a general wanes, and his physical presence in the narrative diminishes, as Roman generals such as Marcellus and Scipio emerge and lead Rome toward final victory in the war; Hannibal the man thus becomes detached from Hannibal the myth, which, nevertheless, abides in the form of his reputation (*nomen*) and continues to instill fear and awe in the Romans (chs 7–10). S.'s reading accounts well for Hannibal's absent 'presence' late in the epic and, further, shows how influential on Silius the Roman mythologization of Hannibal was; after all, over the course of the epic, he morphs into his most recognizable form in the Roman literary tradition, not as a flesh-and-blood historical figure, but as a powerful, threatening idea, as Rome's ultimate bogeyman. S. concludes her study (ch. 11) with analyses of four episodes in which Hannibal addresses and defines his own legacy. Especially compelling is the discussion of his final speech in the epic (17.605–15), which, for S., is a moment of intense metapoetic self-reflection. This is evident not only in Hannibal's awareness of the Roman literary traditions that have constructed him, but in the way in which his fortunes and the poet's are linked: 'In his final speech Hannibal states his identity as a Silian hero and with the verb *sileant* (17.610) — a possible silent play on Silius and a *sphragis* — reiterates that it is the *Silian* conceived myth, a myth now sanctioned by the Carthaginian himself, that will survive to define Rome's Hannibals hereafter' (130). In my own work, I have read Scipio's triumph at the end of the epic as testifying to his Jovian paternity and proto-imperial status. But as S. has taught me, that is only part of the picture; in the end, Silius, Hannibal and Scipio are all in it together.

S. is a congenial, helpful and reliable guide: her prose is clear, unaffected and often delightfully conversational; chapters are of a reasonable length and are further divided into digestible subsections. S. eases us into her study in the introduction and ch. 1, and eases us out of it with a clear restatement of her principal arguments in the Conclusion. S. does a good job of staying on topic throughout; and Latin and Greek passages are translated into English for a wider audience. Classicists and Silianists, furthermore, will appreciate S.'s solid grasp of the ancient texts and extensive knowledge of secondary materials. In the final analysis, S.'s contribution is significant: this is not simply a character-study of Hannibal in the *Punica*, but a reading of the epic as a whole and of the literary traditions that shape the work.

University of Missouri
marksr@missouri.edu

RAYMOND MARKS

doi:10.1017/S0075435815001148

G. K. GOLDEN, *CRISIS MANAGEMENT DURING THE ROMAN REPUBLIC: THE ROLE OF POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS IN EMERGENCIES*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. Pp. xvii + 245. ISBN 9781107032859. £60.00/US\$95.00.

Gregory Golden introduces his study with a brief prologue describing the steps the Senate took in the winter of 44/43 B.C. to meet its growing conflict with Mark Antony before outlining the contents of the chapters that follow. The first of these defines a crisis as G. will use the term: an imminent threat that must be immediately addressed to a decision-maker (or makers) and/or something he (or they) value highly. So for G. the 'crisis of the Republic' was no such thing, if by the Republic one means the Roman people or even the institutions of government. Rather, the crisis involved a threat to the hold on power enjoyed by a small group of aristocrats and aristocratic families. The second chapter examines the dictatorship as a response to crises. G., while acknowledging that Cincinnatus is legendary, takes Livy's account of his appointment as paradigmatic for the steps taken when the decision was made to meet an external crisis by appointing a dictator. The Gallic Sack by contrast stands as an example of what happened when the Senate chose not to respond to a crisis in this way. Ch. 3 discusses the *tumultus*, a state of emergency that also involved a *iusstitium* suspending all public business in order to focus on meeting the crisis. A *tumultus* was more serious than a normal war in G.'s view because it permitted no exemptions when the consuls levied an army. Also, the senators signalled a crisis existed by putting on the *sagum*, a military cloak. G. then proceeds to discuss the several different types of *tumultus*. The following chapter takes up those *iusstitia* not connected with declarations of *tumultus*, of which only two are attested. He suggests these, too, were declared to further efforts to prepare for wars.