

Theodora Hantos, *Das römische Bundesgenossensystem in Italien*. Vestigia 34. Verlag C. H. Beck, München 1983. xi and 196 pages.

The study of the constitutional mechanisms by which Rome extended and consolidated her power over the Italian peninsula between the fourth and second centuries B. C. is founded upon the systematic work of those scholars of the nineteenth century (in particular Mommsen and Beloch), who established the juristic and statistical bases upon which all subsequent examinations have built. Dr. Hantos is heir to this great tradition, and despite the differences which underlie her approach, the strengths and weaknesses of her work are related directly to that inheritance.

H.'s starting-point is a Weberian, or more properly post-Weberian definition of 'Herrschaft' in terms of the obedience by specified persons of a command with a determined content. Such 'Herrschaft' was established by the Romans over the Italians by means of five patterns, which she arranges under three headings:

- I. The filling of a power-vacuum through the use of a re-ordering of the area by the Romans, in one of two ways: (a) through Roman settlement, such that the area became part of the central core of the Roman state ('territorialintegrative direkte Herrschaft'), as with the settlement of the territory of Veii; (b) through Roman settlement, such that the area was not incorporated into the Roman state ('territorialintegrative indirekte Herrschaft'), as with the *coloniae Latinae* after the dissolution of the Latin league in 338.
- II. The leaving intact of the already existing non-Roman entity, which was then incorporated into the Roman state ('integrative direkte Herrschaft') as with Tusculum in 338 after the Latin wars.
- III. The leaving of the existing entity largely intact, but removing from it certain areas of responsibility, which took two forms: (a) partial integration into the Roman state, in a way which should exclude a further drawing of the entity into the governing system of the state ('teilintegrative direkte Herrschaft') as in the case of Caere, when it became a *municipium* in the mid-fourth century; (b) partial integration, which definitively excluded the possibility of further drawing in of the community, by means of a treaty which determined its place outside the Roman state ('teilintegrative indirekte Herrschaft'), as with the Italian *socii*.

Which of these methods was used at a particular moment was determined, not by the ethnic composition of particular people involved, nor by their proximity (or lack of it) to Rome, but by a Roman desire to dominate as effectively as possible, with the least disturbance to the internal structure of the Roman state. Hence II was not used for the large Latin states of Tibur and Praeneste in 338, because of the disruption which might have been caused by the incorporation of such large entities, and III (a) was largely replaced by III (b) in the third century, because the *foedus* more effectively distanced the Italian states from the centre of Roman power than the partial integration represented by the status of a *municipium* and the *civitas sine suffragio*, which was by its nature transitory and led eventually to fuller incorporation.

This scheme itself gives rise to certain difficulties. All five patterns are described not merely as forms of 'Herrschaft', but as 'integrativ'. Although H. spends some time (pp. 4-5 and 179) discussing the term 'Herrschaft' and her use of it, she does not do the same for the concept 'Integration'. This is unfortunate,

as the word 'integrativ', with various modifications, is used to describe the whole gamut of options from I (a) to III (b), which seem to be very different sorts of activity. The implication of the word is that Rome wished not simply to dominate but to unite the various peoples of Italy, an idea which belongs to a nineteenth century view of Roman policy which H. herself properly rejects (p. 185). The repeated use of such 'integrative' language gives a consistency to Roman policy towards Italy, which is important for H.'s view that the Romans were developing a system for the domination of the peninsula. It is a flaw in her presentation that she gives neither evidence nor argument for the use of such a description.

A further shortcoming of the scheme adopted by H. is its inability to account for distinctions which the Romans themselves drew between varieties of states. Thus she observes (p. 122) that an inhabitant of Italy from outside the Roman sphere would find it difficult to distinguish between 'territorialintegrative direkte' and 'territorialintegrative indirekte Herrschaft'. Whether such an individual could differentiate a *civis Romanus* from a Latin might indeed be open to doubt, but he would certainly have been able to tell whether a particular area looked towards Rome (as did the *ager Veientanus*, which is H.'s typical case of category I a) or towards a Latin colony as its centre. The observation is far more true of the distinction between Latin colonies and citizen colonies (which is in fact little discussed in this book), and in this case, the two categories are, in terms of H.'s classification, almost indistinguishable. To the Romans, however, there certainly was a difference, as the fierce senatorial debate in 181 about the status of the proposed colony at Aquileia (Liv. 39, 55, 5; 40, 34, 2) makes clear, at least for the last stages of colonial settlement. A slightly different form of this tendency on H.'s part to subsume heterogeneous groups under a single heading may be seen in her assumption that all the *socii* (i. e. all those Italians under Roman 'Herrschaft' who were neither Roman nor Latin in status) must have been bound to Rome by identical treaties, and moreover that those treaties must have been either of the type represented by the *foedus Cassianum* or that between the Aetolians and the Romans in 189 (pp. 150–168). No argument is adduced in support of either contention.

The underlying problem of which these difficulties are symptoms is the use of a classification which is quite unlike any which the Romans themselves employed. In itself, there is nothing improper in such a procedure, since, as H. points out (p. 4), not only are our sources, dating at the earliest from the first century B. C., bound to be anachronistic, but it may well be necessary to import other historical categories in order to understand the phenomena and the process of the extension of Roman power. However despite the introduction of a Weberian analysis, H. makes little of its potential. The problems which she seeks to answer were nearly all formulated by Mommsen, whose own framework was intended to be drawn from Roman ideas, and in particular from Roman public law. Thus, for instance, the section on 'teilintegrative direkte Herrschaft' is devoted largely to a discussion of the etymology and origin of the term *municipium* and of Mommsen's category of 'Halbbürgerrecht'. Consequently H.'s new classification does not allow her to escape from the limitations of the earlier approach. This has two results. Firstly it restricts her examination to those sorts of evidence, literary and epigraphic, which Mommsen had at his disposal. Recent archaeological work on the towns and countryside of Italy (on which, for instance, see the survey by M. H. Crawford, *Journal Rom. Stud.* 71, 1981, 153–160) is wholly absent. Consequently no account is taken of advances in the understanding of economic activity of the period (the discussion of the size of land allotments given to Roman settlers ignores the vital significance of *ager publicus*, on which see E. Gabba and M. Pasquinucci, *Strutture agrarie e allevamento transumante nell'Italia romana* [1979]); or of the growing size, prosperity and culture of the Italian towns through the third and second centuries. Furthermore, the surprising absence of any map of Italy in the period aggravates the problems of understanding the effects of these changes on the peninsula as a whole. Secondly, it does not allow her to ask what is perhaps the crucial question for a thesis of this type: does it make sense to talk of an Italian 'Bund', rather than a series of individual ad hoc arrangements? The presupposition of Mommsen and Beloch was that the answer to such a question was 'yes', but the systematic organisation which they believed to be present derived from the abstractions of a later period, which, as H. herself observes, are certainly anachronistic in the context of the early and middle republic (p. 4; 106–7).

The strengths of this book lie in two areas. Firstly, H. performs a useful work of synthesis on a series of well-known problems in early republican history, which will be of interest both to those who agree and who disagree with her particular conclusions. Secondly, because of her own classification of varieties of 'Herrschaft', she draws attention to the similarities between certain patterns in Rome's relationship with the other states of Italy, as for example between those involving settlement, whether Roman or Latin in sta-

tus, and between the different methods employed by Rome to establish her dominance by a limited control of the freedom of her associates. There is much here of value. However, before a real advance can be made in the comprehension of the growth of Roman power in Italy, it will be necessary not only to find new ways of describing Roman power but also of understanding the Italy she sought to control.

St. Andrews

J. S. Richardson