

when B. was first publishing in this area — as historians and scholars of literature and philosophy have found a common ground, before B. little explored.

St John's College, Cambridge
 ms10001@cam.ac.uk

MALCOLM SCHOFIELD

doi:10.1017/S0075435814000392

D. J. MATTINGLY, *IMPERIALISM, POWER, AND IDENTITY: EXPERIENCING THE ROMAN EMPIRE*. Princeton/Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2011. Pp. 342, illus. ISBN 9780691146058. £27.95.

This book presents a collection of papers by Mattingly on the archaeology of Roman imperialism. Its genesis was the inaugural Miriam S. Balmouth lectures at Tufts University in April 2006, supplemented with additional papers either published elsewhere, or delivered in other contexts. The papers are arranged into four themes: imperialisms and colonialisms; power; resources; and identity. They are bookended by a newly written preface and afterword.

The opening section introduces M.'s arguments about the nature of Roman imperialism. The first chapter is the first of the Balmouth lectures, and represents a highly personal view about the violent character of Roman imperialism and parallels with modern imperialism. It concludes with a point-by-point repudiation of Romanization as a paradigm. This chapter is likely to provoke extreme reactions amongst its readers (possibly M.'s objective) depending on their view of Rome. Some of the modern analogies are rather clumsy, and the use of mortality figures is problematic. More reasoned is the second chapter, a reprint of a 1996 paper considering Roman and modern imperialism in North Africa. As M. states in the footnote, it was the point where his approach to the Roman Empire changed. It forms an interesting pair with the first paper, in that it illustrates many of the questions he raises in the first.

The second section deals with power, and is the least convincing of the four sections. The first chapter deals with the nature of Roman imperialism in the first century A.D., whilst the second deals with sexual violence as part of imperialism. M.'s discussion of the relationship between Britain and Rome adds little to the work of John Creighton (2000; 2006) and David Braund (1996). His discussion of sexual relations in Rome and the sexual violence which may have formed part of the conquest is provocative, but to my mind rests on a problematic interpretation of the textual evidence, and an androcentric reading of the possible scenarios. The discussion of women and the army focuses on women as prostitutes and concubines, using modern imperial contexts as a paradigm for thinking about the army and sexual exploitation. This opens an alternative and valuable view of Roman conquest, but reduces women to mere objects, denying them the ability to react and accommodate imperialism, an ability which he foregrounds for others in his sections on resources and identity.

The third section on resources is the strongest section within the book. The focus is on M.'s fieldwork in Africa and Jordan, and the impact of Rome on the economic production of these areas. Ch. 5 deals with the demands of the imperial authorities on the provinces, and the nature of knowledge they might have. Ch. 6 covers the agricultural productivity of Tripolitania and contrasts it with Greece. Finally, ch. 7 addresses the metal production of the Wadi Faynum in Jordan. The last chapter most eloquently expresses the impact imperial demands had on a single landscape, with an outline of the ecological destruction wrought on the vicinity of the mines and the impact on the health of the workers. The section as a whole demonstrates well the complexity of Roman economic imperialism and the impossibility of boiling this down to a single picture. Instead, M. fully justifies his argument for discrepant economies.

The final section is entitled identity, and sets out his argument for discrepant identities. The first chapter of this section is a reprint of his article in the *Journal of Roman Archaeology*, with an addendum dealing with discrepant in Tripolitania. The second, his paper on funerary art at Ghirza, with minor amendments. The afterword represents a short but sweet articulation of M.'s central theses. To a large extent, they are a response to the reviews of his previous book, *An Imperial Possession*, some of which focused on his apparent lack of appreciation of 'what Rome did for us'. They concentrate on the difficulties of providing a simple position on Roman imperialism, whether it is due to the way in which ancient and modern imperialisms are so intimately entangled, or the complexity of possible responses.

Whilst overall M.'s work fully illustrates his stated themes, there are three aspects which jar slightly. The first is the question of identity and agency. M. acknowledges the overlap between his work and the theories of agency and structuration, but does not necessarily acknowledge the agency of all the players within his account. Women, where they appear, are a somewhat downtrodden and homogeneous group to whom imperialism happens. Secondly, Rome is rarely set in the context of contemporary geopolitics, such as the neighbouring empires of the Hellenistic successor kingdoms and Parthia. M.'s arguments raise the question of whether Rome was exceptional at the time, and if so, in what ways. The third is a more fundamental problem in recasting the paradigm of Romanization, which is not unique to M.'s work. Whilst we have deconstructed the 'native' part, we have not yet fully come to terms with where this leaves the 'Roman' half of the pair. In discussing cultural forms, M. still retains the idea of an homogeneous and unchanging ideal of Roman culture, such as in his discussion of funerary art in ch. 9. He sets out the apparent differences between 'Roman' art and art from Ghirza; the problem is that it is possible to find parallels between them, such as the *liberti* epitaphs at Rome as parallels for the size difference in family members in fig. 9.9. In evaluating the non-conformity to Roman cultural norms as the basis for discrepancy, the question is raised of what such Roman norms were.

Nevertheless, this is an excellent read. M. is one of the leading archaeologists of the Roman provinces, both in the quality of his fieldwork and his interpretive thinking. This book demonstrates why that position is fully deserved.

University of Southampton

Louise.Revell@soton.ac.uk

doi:10.1017/S0075435814000409

LOUISE REVELL

S. BÖRNER, *MARC AUREL IM SPIEGEL SEINER MÜNZEN UND MEDAILLONS: EINE VERGLEICHENDE ANALYSE DER STADTRÖMISCHEN PRÄGUNGEN ZWISCHEN 138 UND 180 N. CHR.* (Antiquitas. Reihe 1, Abhandlungen zur alten Geschichte 58). Bonn: Habelt, 2012. Pp. 371, illus. ISBN 9783774937697. €79.00.

Börner's publication of her doctoral thesis focuses on the coins and medallions struck for Marcus Aurelius by the mint of Rome. Bringing together the data gathered in existing coin catalogues (*RIC*, *BMCRE*, Gnecci, *Moneta imperii romani*), B. examines the iconography struck for Marcus Aurelius under the rule of Antoninus Pius, and then during his own reign. The book adopts a year by year analysis following Aurelius' tribunician power. For each year, B. examines the precious metal coinage, then the *aes* issues, followed by a discussion of the relevant medallions, contextualizing each numismatic motif within a broader historical context.

Though the year by year approach does allow readers quickly to find the period they are interested in, B. herself admits (154) that we cannot always know the broader context of each numismatic image, particularly in the poorly documented reign of Antoninus Pius. Consequently, some of B.'s conclusions remain more convincing than others (the suggestion that the prevalence of Minerva on Aurelius' coins while Caesar is linked to his philosophical leanings (153), for example, needs further substantiation). The format of the analysis also means that the largely undated coinage struck for the imperial women in this period does not form a significant focus of discussion.

The book arrives at several conclusions that are of interest to both numismatists and historians of this period. B. links the explosion of numismatic motifs struck for Aurelius in A.D. 149 with the birth of a son. She also suggests that the change in Aurelius' numismatic imagery from A.D. 152 might have been a reaction to an attempted coup the year before: Aurelius is represented as more formidable and militarily skilled as a result. Aurelius' transition from Caesar to Augustus after the death of Pius is accompanied by a complete change in numismatic imagery. During the co-rule with Verus, B. suggests that Aurelius' coinage bore more 'civil' motifs, while that of Verus had a more militaristic feel (192), at least until Verus' victory over the Parthians. At this point both Verus and Aurelius receive the title Parthicus, and from this stage onwards Aurelius' coinage carries more military themes. The numismatic image of Marcus Aurelius changes again after the death of Verus, with Aurelius abandoning the military titles of his previous coinage (a comparison with the relevant epigraphic record would be of interest here). Relevant issues of Commodus as Aurelius' Caesar are also discussed. B. sees Commodus' initial numismatic imagery as a reaction to Avidius Cassius; Commodus' coinage following this episode then conforms to the general types that graced