

large one (Illyricum). Three legions garrisoned Pannonia (the ‘frontier’ province on the Hungarian Plain), and two more were stationed in Dalmatia, in reserve and to watch the natives (155). Only in the next decades can the full panoply of Roman provincialization be finally seen. The division of Illyricum separated the ethnic Pannonii (whoever they were) into two different administrations, and D. argues that this was intentional, to avoid a repetition of the unified Pannonian effort of A.D. 6–9 (160, cf. 181–2). Or was it simply that the Dinaric Mountains formed an obvious and defensible boundary between regions (161)? Extensive Roman road-building finally began in the hinterland after A.D. 10; this was important for military movement but also for a developing commercial network, including gold-mining in the Dinaric Alps (173). There was the beginning of selective distribution of Roman citizenship to co-operative members of the local élite, and a clear transition towards Greco-Roman urbanism: Salona and Narona became bustling (and self-governing) towns. D. does not skimp on the uglier side of the process: we also find forced resettlement of troublesome indigenous groups, forced removal of their youth through conscription into Roman auxiliary units, direct military administration of the more restless *civitates*, and numerous Roman fortifications in stone. There was a relatively large immigration of foreigners, too (including veteran settlements) — from the point of view of post-colonial theorists a dark development indeed.

D. rightly emphasizes (180) that we only have the Romans’ own imperialist discourse on the conquest of Illyria; we do not possess the narrative of the conquered (their victimhood, the great suffering caused by Roman armies, the loss of what were perceived as ancestral freedoms). But while the coastal towns became prosperous Greco-Roman cities, D. is unclear about how soon or how far the indigenous cultures in the hinterland were affected. Regarding the hinterland, he says on the one hand that increased trade ‘hastened [its] incorporation into the wider imperial macro-economic system’ (174) — yet he also indicates that up through the mid-first century cultural change is not very visible archaeologically (*ibid.*). He states that the Roman road network rapidly transformed the interior (182) — but then admits that the interior lacked urban units until the second or even the third century (182–3). Again, I do not see how one can have it both ways. But on the whole it looks as if for the people behind the coast incorporation into the wider imperial economic and cultural matrix came late. And this is because, despite D.’s assertion that Illyricum became ‘a crown jewel in imperial geopolitical structure’ (177), the region even in the second century A.D. was pretty much a backwater.

This book needed a much better copy-editor. Even the title is misleading: it is not about the rôle of Illyricum in Roman politics, but about the development of Roman policy (such as it was) in Illyricum. D.’s sometimes eccentric English has not been corrected, and it can result not merely in awkwardness but in unintentional historical errors, such as his (inadvertent) placement of the Scordisci at the mouth of the Danube (35), when he means where the Sava and the Danube meet. And D.’s Latin is sometimes eccentric as well: ‘Caius and Lucius Coruncanii’ (48). Finally, it is not acceptable that in a book published by Cambridge University Press we find consistent reference to the work on Polybius of ‘F. W. Wallbank’ (including in the bibliography).

University of Maryland
ameckst1@umd.edu

ARTHUR ECKSTEIN

doi:10.1017/S0075435812000135

J. RICHARDSON, *THE LANGUAGE OF EMPIRE: ROME AND THE IDEA OF EMPIRE FROM THE THIRD CENTURY B.C. TO THE SECOND CENTURY A.D.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. Pp. ix + 220. ISBN 9780521815017. £53.00/US\$99.00.

In this book Richardson takes us on a wonderful journey through the ways in which the Romans conceptualized the creation of their empire from the third century B.C. to the second century A.D. He does so by carrying out a judicious and highly calibrated linguistic analysis of the words *imperium* and *provincia*. At the time of the Hannibalic War, *imperium* meant an order, as well as the power to issue orders held either by a magistrate, a pro-magistrate, or by the Roman people, while *provincia* meant the sphere of influence within which the magistrate could exercise his *imperium*. In the course of the four centuries taken into account, *imperium* came to signify an entity limited by geographical boundaries under a unifying authority and constituted by territorial units, the *provinciae*. Key steps in the transformation of what R. vividly calls the biographies of these terms were the activities of Pompey in the 60s B.C. and Augustus’ rise to power. At the

beginning of the first century A.D., as Ovid's elegies attest, these conceptual changes were already in place, reaching full maturity in the course of the century, as an exhaustive analysis of the Julio-Claudian evidence shows.

If the results of this research are not entirely unexpected, this is because R. himself has already done much to teach us that this may have been the likely outcome of this research. The methodology, on the other hand, is novel and, in my opinion, the true achievement of this work, which will stand the test of time. Very few ancient historians, and even less so in the Anglo-Saxon tradition, have carried out such a thorough lexicographic study in an attempt to reconstruct 'the general attitudes, as what might be described as "the mental wallpaper" of a section of society, which are not specifically argued about in our sources precisely because they are taken for granted by those who wrote and spoke at that time' (7–8). The enterprise requires a titanic effort and is a difficult one to carry out.

The basic idea behind the work is the analysis of all attestations in documentary and literary evidence of the two notions of *imperium* and *provincia*, in search of their common denominator, which could signal the general attitude of the Romans towards empire at that specific time. As R. states, essential to this kind of study is the support of electronic databases (such as Musaios, the Idealist, and those produced by the Packard Humanities Institute) which allow for a more thorough search and faster statistical analysis of words than the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* and the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* could provide. The two appendices, one on Cicero's and one on Livy's use of the words *imperium* and *provincia*, show some of the groundwork which could be done thanks to these electronic tools.

Although R. applies this methodology with the utmost care, giving, for example, full consideration to Cicero's context and rhetorical strategies or Livy's sources, personal ideas and use of language, this approach is not without its problems. The absence of the use of a word does not, necessarily, imply the absence of a concept. This word search will only highlight a specific moment in the biographies of these terms, that is when the concept and the word are one and the same. Equally, the search focus on two words, *imperium* and *provincia*, cannot allow a complete reconstruction of the Roman 'mental wallpaper' about the building of their empire — although it would certainly play a major rôle in it. It would be necessary to investigate systematically related terms, such as *dicio*, *orbis terrarum et similes*, which make only sporadic appearances in R.'s work. The application of this methodology also leaves unsolved the most dynamic aspects of this conceptual transformation. If the Roman and, to a certain extent, the élitist focus is clear, the rôle that the wider community of the language users played in its transformation is less evident. Would not the use that Roman soldiers in Gaul made of the words *imperium* and *provincia* play a part in Caesar's adoption of the term? The active engines of these conceptual changes end up in the background. To what extent are the conceptual modifications which R. identifies with Pompey's activities ascribable to the initiative of Pompey himself? Or was the Roman general responding to something? And if so, what? The broad chronological approach and the discussion on Augustus seem to suggest *prima facie* that the factors behind these conceptual transformations are to be found in changes of a socio-economic nature. However, R. also hints at the rôle played by cultural and intellectual factors, such as, for example, Greek philosophical ideas of the geographical nature of the world. However, neither this issue nor the question of how the status of polysemy is solved at a certain time is part of R.'s investigation.

However, these observations simply attest the value of this book, a mine of precious attestations, epigraphic as well as literary, and very perceptive interpretations (despite the odd case of disagreement, as in the case of Scipio's fragment at p. 54, where R. interprets the reference to *imperium* as that of the Roman people rather than of a single individual). The merits of this work are not limited to the light it sheds on the history of the concept *imperium* and its related term *provincia*, however laudable *per se* and intellectually self-sufficient. Mapping the work in the wider context of theoretical studies on the nature of empire, R. provides an excellent example of the most fruitful interaction between 'theory' and very close reading of ancient sources. Combining these elements, R. shows that 'in the taxonomy of the empires ... the distinction of the empires that the Romans were creating between the second century B.C. and the second century A.D. is that between power-by-conquest and power-as-possession' (193), offering also a very important contribution to the study of Roman imperialism.

University College London

v.arena@ucl.ac.uk

doi:10.1017/S0075435812000147

VALENTINA ARENA