Rethinking the Other provides both this and much more besides and for that reason it does not have to be 'right' in every respect. Its aim is to overturn traditional assumptions regarding the paradigmatic construction of polarities separating Greeks, Romans and Jews from barbarians, Gentiles and miscellaneous Others. It does so with magnificent erudition, gusto and panache.

University of Liverpool JOSEPH SKINNER
Joseph.Skinner@liverpool.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S007543581200010X

F. PINA POLO, *THE CONSUL AT ROME: THE CIVIL FUNCTIONS OF THE CONSUL IN THE ROMAN REPUBLIC*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011. Pp. x + 379, 2 illus. ISBN 9780521190831. £65.00/US$110.00.

It is good when a work on the Roman constitution appears in English; it is perhaps indicative that the author comes from abroad. After a helpful introduction to the subject, the work has two main sections. Roughly, the first two thirds are devoted to the period between the Licinian-Sextian laws and Sulla's dictatorship (367–80 B.C.), the remaining third to the late Republic. Within the sections the chapters are organized generically: in the first, religion, diplomacy, edicts and *contiones*, legislation, jurisdiction, public works, colonization and land-distribution, and elections, followed by a resumptive chapter. The second section begins with a discussion in which Mommsen's supposed *lex Cornelia de provinciis ordinandis* is rejected as a fiction. Then a long chapter reviews the topics of the first section in the context of the late Republic — Caesar's colonization coming under the heading of legislation. A further chapter looks at the shape of the post-Sullan consular year, when many consuls spent much of the year at home, and a brief conclusion summarizes the work as a whole.

The author, unlike T. C. Brennan in his massive work, *The Praetorship in the Roman Republic* (2000), has chosen to leave aside what was for most of the Republic the consuls' chief function, that of military commander. It is useful to focus on their non-military functions. Yet there is a danger that a close relationship between the two may be obscured. Diplomacy is often connected to subsequent campaigns, wars to subsequent land-distribution. The reader may lose the sense of consular authority which arose from the exercise of *imperium* at the head of troops. Further, one may question two aspects of Pina Polo's method. First, there is his rejection of theory. In his introduction he quotes the reviewer's observation (from *The Constitution of the Roman Republic* (1999), 8) that Mommsen's *Staatsrecht* was a theoretical analysis and states that by contrast he will study the consuls in their actual activities — one is reminded of Fergus Millar's 'The emperor is what the emperor does'. Just before the remark that P.P. quotes, I wrote about Polybius' analysis, 'Without such a (conceptual) framework we are likely to lose our way in a mass of data; with the aid of one we may make fruitful comparisons with other constitutions'. This comment is apt for the book now under review. One aspect of its refusal to conceptualize is the failure to discuss the status of the consul *vis-à-vis* the senate. The author presents this body (in the middle Republic at least) as taking the initiative (202; not really borne out by the analysis), treating the consul as subordinate (209), and deciding on all land-distribution (186; no mention of C. Flaminius or Curius Dentatus). Only in the section on the late Republic is this clarified when we are told that the consul was 'morally obliged to obey, at least formally, an order from the senate, even when … he disapproved of it' (306). Translation may be at fault here, but it is surely better to visualize the Republican senate giving authoritative advice to the magistrate who consulted it, rather than orders. A second problem arises from the generic division of the material. For example, Cicero's law about electoral bribery is discussed as an example of consular legislation (297), but it is also highly relevant to Cicero's conduct of the elections in 63 B.C. and their chronology (287) where it is not taken into account.

The book will be most valued for its treatment of particular issues — above all the rehearsing of the arguments of Balsdon, Valgiglio and Giovannini that Sulla did not pass a law separating the consul's provincial administration from his year of office at home, a belief unfortunately still widespread (225–48). If it is to be a reference book, some points of detail should be noted. First, topography. Should we regard the Graecostasis in the *comitium*, where foreign legates waited, as a tribunal (75)? Surely tribunals were on the one hand high to enable a seated magistrate to look down on those at ground level, on the other hand very restricted in space? The praetor performing jurisdiction originally had a tribunal in the *comitium*: why should the consuls not have used that

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435812000111 Published online by Cambridge University Press

or something similar? To say that the temple of Bellona and the Villa Publica were 'very close to each other' (79) may mislead, if, as on the usual reconstruction, they were some 500 m apart. Second, epigraphy. The author (140) ignores the strong arguments advanced by Wiseman (in *PBSR* (1965), 21–35 and (1969), 82–91) that the Polla inscription commemorated T. Annius: he is attested at the southern end of the road from Rhegium to Capua and Forum Anni is close to Forum Popili. A further consul should be added to the roadbuilders — M. Aemilius Scaurus *cos.* 115 B.C. — from a milestone near Cosa (Fentress, *PBSR* (1984), 72–6). Third, interpretation of texts. A question-mark should at least be put against the identification (283) of Cicero's *Post Reditum ad Quirites* with the speech Cicero actually delivered on 7 September 57 B.C. about the corn crisis, see the reviewer's *Cicero as Evidence* (2008), 8–9. An old error is also repeated (302). The '*lex*' of Cotta and Octavius about the letting of taxes in Sicily was not a statute passed (*rogata*) in an assembly, but *dicta*: it was a regulation imposed by the consuls exercising censorial functions, like those in the *lex agraria* of 111 B.C. (*RS* I.2, lines 88–9) and in *The Customs Law of Asia* (ed. Cottier, 2008), lines 74–8. On constitutional matters, the author is right to reject De Martino's view that the consuls did not have civil jurisdiction in the city in the late Republic (122), cf. *lex agraria* lines 33–4, where some disputes at least would have come to magistrates in Rome. It is also perhaps relevant that Pompey as *proconsul ad urbem* in 52 B.C. was asked to act in two *actiones ad exhibendum* to secure the production of Milo's slaves (Asc. 34C). Later, the discussion of *professio* (205) would have benefited from reference to Levick, *Athenaeum* (1981), 378–88.

There is much valuable material in this work. As suggested earlier, there are problems with its presentation, but we should be grateful for what we have.

Worcester College, Oxford ANDREW LINTOTT
andrew.lintott@worc.ox.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0075435812000111

M. FRONDA, *BETWEEN ROME AND CARTHAGE: SOUTHERN ITALY DURING THE SECOND PUNIC WAR*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. Pp. xxviii + 374, illus. ISBN 0521516943/9780521516945. £60.00/US$99.00.

The aim of Fronda's book is to examine the Second Punic War from the perspective of Rome's Italian allies, and to identify the political, economic and military factors that led some of the allies to remain loyal while others defected (2–3). F. proposes that the actions of Italian states should be viewed from the perspective of realist politics or *realpolitik*, according to which states behave as rational unitary actors that pursue their own interests, and inevitably come into conflict with each other. In the political vacuum following the Roman defeat at Cannae, Italian states were free to decide on their own foreign policy for the first time in several decades, and in some cases over a century. F.'s main thesis is that long-standing rivalries and animosities between the Italian states ultimately determined their decision as to whether or not to defect to Hannibal.

The book begins with a discussion of sources and methods, followed by an overview of Roman-Italian relations in the centuries preceding the Second Punic War (ch. 1). F. is very much aware of the difficulties in reconstructing the point of view of Italian communities from the Rome-centred narratives of Livy and Polybius, which are the main surviving accounts of the period. F. distances himself from what he sees as an excessively sceptical approach, which assumes that such accounts are false unless proven otherwise (11). Throughout the book the reliability of individual passages is carefully assessed, with the aid of numismatic evidence and the results of recent archaeological research. This allows F. to gauge the motivations, internal divisions, and conflicting interests of Italian states in four key regions of south Italy: Apulia, Campania, western Magna Graecia, and south Lucania/eastern Magna Graecia (chs 2–5). There follows a discussion of the Roman reconquest of the peninsula in ch. 6. Finally, in ch. 7, F. draws together the results of the regional case studies, to argue that the high degree of interstate rivalry in Italy made it impossible for Hannibal to elicit widespread defection from Rome. Upon winning over key states in a region, Hannibal unwittingly prompted a number of rival states to side with Rome. The chapter ends with an interesting discussion of hypothetical scenarios of a Hannibalic victory.

F.'s analysis of developments in Campania lends especially strong support to his thesis (126–45). The fact that Atella, Calatia and Sabata joined Capua in defecting to Hannibal makes sense when one sees these four cities acting together earlier in the second Samnite war (*c.* 326–304 B.C.), even though on that occasion they sided with Rome. On the other hand, Naples and Nola, Capua's main rivals,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435812000111 Published online by Cambridge University Press