here for religion are also valid for other areas of life, such as the economy or social structures. This volume is therefore essential for anyone interested in Italy in the Republican period.

Saskia T. Roselaar

saskiaroselaar@gmail.com
doi:10.1017/S0075435816000174

J. CONNOLLY, *THE LIFE OF ROMAN REPUBLICANISM*. Princeton/Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2015. Pp. xix + 228, illus. ISBN 9780691162591. £27.95/US$39.95.

'It is not clear that the Romans who think constructively about politics … believe that politics can yield much to systematic analysis' (203). With this comment towards the end of *The Life of Roman Republicanism*, Joy Connolly begins to sum up this study of the way in which Roman thinkers engaged with some critical political questions. These issues include inequality, justice, individual identity and relationships, and how to deal with dissent and conflict in a society, and are examined by C. — and by the authors examined in this book — through the lens of citizenship and the question of how to be a good citizen. The ultimate goal is to encourage reflection on how their perspectives can illuminate problems faced by contemporary democracies — in particular the United States of America.

C. begins by looking at Cicero's *De republica* to explore the conceptualization of dissent. In Book 2's history, she sees the Republic presented as a community in which dissent is expressed, debated, decided upon and absorbed within a system that both enables and resolves dissent in a way that largely avoids violence but in which each 'win' is always temporary. C. turns to Sallust to explore the importance of justice within this process — to preserve the common good and to guard the 'losers' against abuse from the 'winners'. For C., Sallust's story of Jugurtha is one in which justice is withheld, deferred or incompletely executed, as a result of chance and corruption — greed, self-interest and the inability of the most impoverished to speak and be represented fully within the system — and it is symptomatic of the problems of the late Republic.

Ch. 3 continues with the question of judgement and the way people live with one another, but on a personal level, as C. examines Horace's *Satires* for what he has to say about how to be a citizen among citizens, an individual within a community. C. argues that Horace shows us that our judgement of others is about aesthetics, sentiment and taste, and our perceptions of the ways in which others are judging us — as well as reason — all of which have an impact upon our behaviour in political situations. For C., Horace's unstable voices remind us that judging others is uncomfortable because revealing one's judgement of others necessarily reveals oneself — and yet he also acknowledges that passing judgement on others is seductive, because it allows us a moment in which we know ourselves and possess power over those we judge. It is a satisfaction that is to be distrusted, because it alienates others.

Horace is not alone in this assessment of interactions between individuals and the individual and the community. C. makes it clear that Cicero and Sallust also reveal the way that appearance matters in politics. In Rome, aesthetic and moral judgement acts as a 'common sense' (140, 146) that keeps the orator honest by providing norms against which he must measure himself. The individual might seek an authentic self, but they must also be aware of what is seen as appropriate, decorous and right: that is, any political actor needs to be aware of their audience's limits in order to see his own point of view succeed, but also in order for the dissenters not to feel as if they are being excluded from the political community.

In the final chapters, C. returns to the question of dissent and harmony in the Republic, as she reads Cicero engaging with the ongoing political situation in the *Pro Marcello*, seeking to help Rome gain closure on the civil war and move towards a new future in which Caesar is the pre-eminent citizen. Here we see Cicero debating with himself as to how to deal with the current situation, acknowledging dissent — including his own, and Marcellus' — and trying to bring the dissenters back into the body politic of the *res publica*. As he does this, Cicero employs his imagination to encourage his senatorial peers into a new way of life. This might be *lesser*, perhaps, for those profoundly attached to the the old *res publica*, but it is essential that it be established if Rome is not to fall back into civil war.

This is not a particularly accessible volume for the generally interested reader: the readings are complex and presume a familiarity with the background contexts and an openness to an approach that makes use of a wide range of critical and theoretical approaches. Without that openness, a

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435816000563 Published online by Cambridge University Press

reader might suspect that C. over-claims for the illumination that the political thought of Roman republicanism can provide today. However, her priority is to challenge some of the common automatic assumptions in modern political thought and thus to impact the 'ethos of civic being' (207), by offering new readings of ancient texts to break through our 'routine' consciousness. In this way, the book reminds us that the individual and the community are not two separate entities, but that we need to choose between participants in a never-ending conversation about how to live together, and C. seeks to give us some critical tools for participating in it. This conversation, *The Life of Roman Republicanism* suggests will go better if citizens — including ourselves — accept that we act politically on the basis of more than our reason, and embrace emotion, aesthetics and imagination as a part of our political lives. The impact that this has is up to the individual reader.

Independent Scholar (London) HANNAH J. SWITHINBANK
hannah@swithinbank.org.uk
doi:10.1017/S0075435816000563

C. E. W. STEEL, *THE END OF THE ROMAN REPUBLIC, 146 TO 44 BC: CONQUEST AND CRISIS* (The Edinburgh History of Ancient Rome). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013. Pp. 284, illus. ISBN 9780748619443 (bound); 9780748619450 (paper). £95.00 (bound); £29.99 (paper).

Catherine Steel's new history of the later Roman Republic frames the narrative between two key episodes of violence: the destruction in a single year of Carthage and Corinth, and the assassination of Julius Caesar. The introduction outlines the Roman political system, and the remainder of the book is then divided into three parts, each of which sketches out the events of the period concerned (146–91 B.C.; 91–70 B.C.; 70–44 B.C.) and discusses their implications in terms both of domestic politics and foreign affairs. This works very successfully and reinforces a central theme of the book: how events at Rome, in Italy and overseas were closely inter-related. Beginning the narrative in 146 B.C. allows the upheavals of the Gracchan era to be set in the context of Rome's difficult Spanish campaigns in the 140s and 130s; S. similarly highlights how, in Cicero's view, the outbreak of the Social War was to be linked with Livius Drusus' efforts to gain support for his plan to reform the courts by introducing a land bill (41).

S. is well known for her previous work on Cicero, and as the bust illustrated on the front cover suggests, he plays a central rôle here too: not only is Cicero a protagonist in many of the episodes discussed, but his philosophical and rhetorical dialogues, frequently set in the late second century B.C., are used by S. to cast light on the history of that era. One of the strengths of the book in fact is its concern to give proper emphasis to the years between the Gracchi and Sulla's dictatorship, and rectify the tendency to focus more on the post-Sullan period because of the greater wealth of surviving textual material, or (as S. puts it), 'Cicero's logorrhea' (121).

Throughout the book, S. combines astute analysis with neatly phrased formulations: the dictatorship of Sulla, 'a baffling and unpredictable mix of the traditional and the unprecedented' (107), is seen as fundamental to explaining the end of the Republic. Having seized power at Rome by force, Sulla sought to restore traditional political structures, a project which however turned out to be impractical since the identity of the Roman people had been transformed by the admission of the former allies to the citizenship, while the character of the Senate had also changed as a result of his own initiatives. Pompey's career, too, had a transformative rôle in relation to the Republic: S. highlights not only the exceptional nature of his multiple tenures of *imperium*, but also that service as one of his legates acted as a kind of alternative *cursus honorum* for the ambitious in the 60s and 50s. The consulship of 59 B.C., with its populist agenda, is seen as the tribunate the patrician Caesar was unable to hold (165).

In a successful career that lasted fifty years, S. notes, senators might stand for election to office only three times — helping to explain why politicians frequently followed a *popularis* strategy early in their career before taking a more traditionalist approach later on (47). Indeed S. has a very keen sense of the experience of members of the Senate as that body was transformed over time; she observes that at the time of Sulla's dictatorship there were hardly any surviving consulars, as a result of the Social War (which saw the deaths in action of Roman commanders on a scale only paralleled by the Hannibalic War), and the executions and proscriptions of the years which followed (129–30); the subsequent disappearance of the rôle of *princeps senatus*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435816000563 Published online by Cambridge University Press