

Cambridge University Press

0521521343 - Hispaniae: Spain and the Development of Roman Imperialism, 218-82 BC

J. S. Richardson

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## CHAPTER I

## Spain and Roman imperialism

The Roman senate first assigned Spain as a *provincia* in 218 BC. According to Livy, the meeting, held probably in March, ordered that *Hispania* should be one of the two areas named for the consuls of the year, the other being 'Africa with Sicily'.<sup>1</sup> Thereafter Spain appeared on the annual list of *provinciae* throughout the period of the republic, usually, after 197 BC, in the form of two areas, *Hispania citerior* and *Hispania ulterior*, nearer and further Spain;<sup>2</sup> and indeed remained under the control of Roman forces and Roman governors at least until the Vandal invasions in the fifth century AD.

The early part of this prolonged involvement of Rome in Spain coincided with the growth of Roman power throughout the Mediterranean basin, beginning in the third century with the wars against Carthage and reaching a climax in the middle of the first century in the wars of the imperial republic in East and West under the command of Pompey and Caesar. It is not surprising therefore that it is on this period in particular that attention has been focussed in the attempt to determine the nature of Roman imperialism.<sup>3</sup> Imperialism is not a static phenomenon, but a process of aggressive acquisition leading to the establishment of some type of domination by one national group over others. None would doubt that by the end of the republic Rome had acquired such domination over most of the peoples of the Mediterranean, and of some, notably in Spain, Gaul and the East, who lived a considerable distance from it. So obvious a growth might be expected to provide material for a straightforward analysis of the empire that it produced and of the factors which produced it. In fact the study of Roman imperialism has been beset by apparent contradictions and anomalies. Some scholars, impressed by the repeated

<sup>1</sup> Livy 21.17.1; on the debate and its date, see Rich, *Declaring war* 28–44.

<sup>2</sup> Occasionally, even after 197, the two *provinciae* were amalgamated (Livy 42.28.5–6; 43.15.3). It is probable that the first occasion on which Spain was absent from the senate's annual list of *provinciae* was in 54, following the assignment of Pompey to the peninsula for five years under the *lex Trebonia*.

<sup>3</sup> Thus, for instance E. Badian, *Roman imperialism in the late republic* (Oxford 1968); Dahlheim, *Gewalt und Herrschaft*; D. Musti, *Polibio e l'imperialismo romano* (Naples 1978); and Harris, *War and imperialism*. Each treats Roman imperialism in this period in a markedly different fashion.

Cambridge University Press

0521521343 - Hispaniae: Spain and the Development of Roman Imperialism, 218-82 BC

J. S. Richardson

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Spain and Roman imperialism*

withdrawals of Roman armies from Greece and Asia Minor after the completion of successful wars during the first half of the second century, have argued that Rome's apparent empire-building was the result of a policy of misguided self-defence against largely imaginary threats to her own security.<sup>4</sup> Others, and in particular W. V. Harris, believe that the Roman senate was determined, for motives of greed and the exercise of military power, to annex any territory it could.<sup>5</sup> J. A. Schumpeter saw Rome as a classic case of an aristocratic oligarchy needing to preserve its control of the machinery of the state by continually providing national glory,<sup>6</sup> while Paul Veyne finds the process by which the empire was won so dull and pedestrian as to make him wonder whether there was such a thing as Roman imperialism at all.<sup>7</sup>

Some of these anomalies respond to semantic investigation, both of ancient and of modern usages. Among the latter 'imperialism' itself, with its overtones of late nineteenth-century jingoism and early twentieth-century Leninism, is a notoriously difficult concept,<sup>8</sup> and simply to equate it with military aggression does little to clarify the issues involved. Athens in the fifth century BC, Britain in the nineteenth and Israel in the twentieth century AD may all be said to be militarily aggressive powers, but their imperialisms and their empires are substantially different. In the case of ancient usages, the problems are of another type, but not less daunting. For the age of Cicero and Augustus, there is enough evidence in the Latin authors to show that the extension of Roman power to the edges of the known world was an accepted, almost a commonplace, idea,<sup>9</sup> but, from the third century through to the early first century, it is only Greek sources, and most notably Polybius, which provide any contemporary comment. Such views, valuable though they are, cannot be taken without question to represent the opinions of the men who at this time were creating the Roman empire.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>4</sup> So Th. Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte* 1<sup>11</sup> (Berlin 1912) 699: 'Nur die stumpfe Unbilligkeit kann es verkennen, dass Rom in dieser Zeit [i.e. after the Hannibalic war] noch keineswegs nach der Herrschaft über die Mittelmeerstaaten griff, sondern nichts weiter begehrte als in Africa und in Griechenland ungefährliche Nachbarn zu haben.' For a history of this concept, see J. Linderski 'Si vis pacem, para bellum: concepts of defensive imperialism', in W. V. Harris (ed.), *The imperialism of mid-republican Rome* (Papers and monographs of the American Academy in Rome, 29, 1984) 133-64.

<sup>5</sup> Harris [n. 3].

<sup>6</sup> In his essay 'The sociology of imperialisms', in *Imperialism and social classes* (Oxford 1951) 68.

<sup>7</sup> P. Veyne, *MEFR* 87 (1975) 795-855, esp. 804ff.

<sup>8</sup> As seen by Musti [n. 3] 13-39, but missed, optimistically, by Harris, *War and imperialism* 4-5.

<sup>9</sup> P. A. Brunt, 'Laus imperii' in eds. P. D. A. Garnsey and C. R. Whittaker, *Imperialism in the ancient world* (Cambridge 1978) 158-91. On the difficulties of *imperium Romanum* as a geographical expression, see A. W. Lintott, *G&R* 28 (1981) 53-67; and in legal terms, D. Kienast, *ZSS* 85 (1968) 330-67.

<sup>10</sup> See my article in *PBSR* 47 (1979) 1-11.

Cambridge University Press

0521521343 - Hispaniae: Spain and the Development of Roman Imperialism, 218-82 BC

J. S. Richardson

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Spain and Roman imperialism*

For these reasons the investigation of what the Romans were in fact doing in those areas in which they were present in force is of particular importance. Not only are the patterns which may be discovered in such activity the surest indication of attitudes, both in the senate and in the field, to the growth of the empire; but also the way in which decisions were made and policy laid down in this first period of expansion outside Italy created the background of experience and expectation against which the development of the Roman empire must be seen. For such an investigation, the *provinciae* in Spain yield essential evidence. There the continuity of a Roman military presence allows scope for a comparison of the ways in which Roman aims and methods developed, and the extent of the alteration which that presence brought about in the two centuries which separated the beginning of the Hannibalic war from the subjugation of the north-west under Augustus demonstrates the process whereby such an area became part of the Roman empire.

When Roman forces first landed at the Massiliote colony of Emporion late in 218, the only links they had in the peninsula were with Saguntum, which had been destroyed the year before by Hannibal, and with the string of Massiliote trading posts down the east coast at Rhode (Rosas), Emporion (Ampurias), Hemeroskopeion (Denia) and Alonis (Benidorm). By the time the final conquest of Spain had been completed, with the subjugation of Cantabria and Asturia in the north and north-west two centuries later, and the three *provinciae* of Baetica, Lusitania and Tarraconensis established, the peninsula contained 26 *coloniae*, 24 *municipia civium Romanorum*, 48 communities holding Latin rights, 6 *civitates liberae*, 4 *foederatae* and 291 *stipendariae*. The whole area, with the exception of the newly conquered northern coast, was divided into *conventus* for the purposes of the administration of justice by Roman magistrates.<sup>11</sup> Moreover the regions which had been longest under Roman influence, in Baetica and Tarraconensis, were so far ‘Romanised’ that the Turdetani in the Baetis valley were said to have lost their own customs and speech in favour of Roman ways and the Latin language, while the Celtiberians in the Ebro valley modelled their life on an Italian pattern and wore the toga.<sup>12</sup> These areas at least had all the administrative apparatus and socio-economic structure that is associated with a fully-fledged, established Roman province. Of course much of this development

<sup>11</sup> For the administrative details, Pliny, *NH* 3.6–17 (Baetica); 3.18–30 (Tarraconensis); 4.113–18 (Lusitania); Marquardt, *Röm. Staatsverwaltung* 1<sup>2</sup>, 251–60; M. I. Henderson, *JRS* 32 (1942) 1–13; N. Mackie, *Local administration in Roman Spain AD 14–212* (BAR International Series 172, 1983). It is possible that Pliny overestimated the number of colonies by two (Henderson, *art. cit.*, 2–3).

<sup>12</sup> Strabo 3.2.15 (p. 151); 3.4.20 (p. 167).

Cambridge University Press

0521521343 - Hispaniae: Spain and the Development of Roman Imperialism, 218-82 BC

J. S. Richardson

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Spain and Roman imperialism*

took place at the end of the period, particularly in the founding of *coloniae* and the grants of the Latin right by Julius Caesar and Augustus; but the *ius Latii* was itself in part the recognition of a long process which had made certain Spanish communities appropriate recipients of this honourable and very 'Italian' status.<sup>13</sup> The geographer, Artemidorus of Ephesus, writing at the end of the second century BC, remarked on the use of the Roman alphabet among the Spaniards living on the seaboard,<sup>14</sup> and the outlines of the administrative arrangements had been laid down long before. The emergence of the Spanish provinces, as they were known in the late republic and early empire, was an extended and gradual process.

Yet although the Spanish provinces and their institutions were the product of a considerable length of time, the same Roman constitutional mechanism, the *provincia*, underlay the whole period. The *provincia* of Hispania existed from March 218. The next two centuries saw the change from the Roman presence being confined to a tiny enclave on the east coast between the river Ebro and the Pyrenees to its extension to cover the whole of modern Spain and Portugal; and within this Rome's network of alliance and dependence, and with it the fiscal and legal systems that embodied Roman control in the provinces, grew from nothing to cover the communities and peoples which the elder Pliny describes.<sup>15</sup> Throughout this time the formal procedures which set up the commands in Spain remained virtually unaltered: year by year the main, and often the only, business of the senate in Rome connected with the area was the naming of the *provinciae* of Hispania Citerior and Hispania Ulterior to be allotted, usually to praetors, for the exercise of consular *imperium*,<sup>16</sup> or the extension of the commands of such governors already present there. It was not until Pompey was assigned the whole of Spain for five years under the terms of the *lex Trebonia* in 55 BC that there was any major alteration in the process.<sup>17</sup>

This combination of development and conservatism, so typical of many areas of Roman life, can be seen also in the changing content of the idea of the *provincia*. Throughout the middle and late republic and the early

<sup>13</sup> Henderson [n. 11] 11–12; Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford 1973) 232–5; Galsterer, *Untersuchungen* 7–30.

<sup>14</sup> Artemidorus fr. 22: καὶ Ἀρτεμίδωρος ἐν δευτέρῳ τῶν γεωγραφουμένων γραμματικῆ δὲ χρῶνται τῇ τῶν Ἰταλῶν οἱ παρὰ θάλατταν οἰκοῦντες τῶν Ἰβήρων. Artemidorus' second book dealt with the area covered by the two *provinciae* of his day (fr. 21), excluding Lusitania, which was dealt with in bk 3 (fr. 31). It cannot be argued, however, (as F. Lasserre, *Strabo* II (Coll. Univ. de Rouen, Paris 1966) 193) that this passage shows the complete Romanisation of Turdetania in Artemidorus' time.

<sup>15</sup> Above n. 11.

<sup>16</sup> On this see further pp. 55–7, 75–7, 109–12 below.

<sup>17</sup> Dio Cassius 39.33.

Cambridge University Press

0521521343 - Hispaniae: Spain and the Development of Roman Imperialism, 218-82 BC

J. S. Richardson

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Spain and Roman imperialism*

empire one element in the meaning of the word was that of a task or function assigned to a magistrate, in the fulfilment of which he would exercise the *imperium* granted to him by virtue of his election by the people in the *comitia centuriata*.<sup>18</sup> Such a function could comprise a command in a particular geographical area, but need not do so. Livy several times describes an Italian tribe as a consul's *provincia*.<sup>19</sup> During the second Punic war 'the fleet' or 'the war with Hannibal' could be the name of a *provincia*, and later the treasury for a quaestor, or the *urbana provincia* for a praetor marked the allocation of jurisdiction within the city.<sup>20</sup> The meaning is still clearer in the transferred uses of the word. Plautus uses it on ten occasions, always humorously, and usually in a context which makes explicit the comparison between the normal official and military use and the mundane and often underhand activities of the characters in his plays. The same is true of the two occurrences in Terence's comedies.<sup>21</sup> In all these cases the meaning of *provincia* is 'task' or 'undertaking', and in only one, (in which a bailiff's work on a farm is described as his '*provincia*') is there any territorial suggestion.<sup>22</sup> This strand of meaning ('task' or 'function') is still found in Cicero in a humorous context;<sup>23</sup> and in another place he describes the tendencies of falling atoms either to swerve or not to swerve as their '*provinciae*'.<sup>24</sup>

The *provincia* as an allotted task or function appears to be the original use of the word, or at least that usage is the earliest of which we have evidence. During the second half of the first century BC there are clear signs that the word could mean a geographical area equipped with the set of institutions that made up the provincial administration of the late republic: in other words, that *provincia* could also mean 'province'. The sense of a *provincia* being somewhere remote from Rome, where Roman magistrates acted, is found in the second century: both the elder Cato and C. Gracchus, in preserved fragments, spoke of being 'in provincia' in a way which could almost be translated 'on overseas service'.<sup>25</sup> By the time that Caesar was writing his commentaries on his campaigns in Gaul, he

<sup>18</sup> Mommsen *StR* 13, 51, 116–36, 468; *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, s.v. *provincia* 1. The etymology is uncertain (see A. Walde and J. B. Hofmann, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* II (Heidelberg 1954) 377–8).

<sup>19</sup> Livy 3.25.9; 6.30.3; 27.22.2.

<sup>20</sup> Livy 24.9.5. (*classis*) (cf. 44.1.3); 24.44.1, 25.3.3 (*bellum cum Hannibale*); *CIL* 12, 583.68 (*aerarium*); Cic. *I Verr.* 1.40.104 (*urbana provincia*).

<sup>21</sup> Plautus, *Capt.* 156, 158, 474; *Cas.* 103; *Mil. Glor.* 1159; *Pseud.* 148, 158; *Stich.* 698–9; *Trin.* 190. Terence, *HT* 516; *Phorm.* 72.

<sup>22</sup> Plaut. *Cas.* 103: 'abi rus, abi diirectus tuam in provinciam.'

<sup>23</sup> Cic. *Cael.* 26.63: 'non dubito quin sint pergraves qui...eam provinciam susceperint ut in balneas contruderentur.'

<sup>24</sup> Cic. *de fin.* 1.20.

<sup>25</sup> Cato fr. 132 (*ORF*<sup>3</sup>); Gracchus fr. 26 (*ORF*<sup>3</sup>). Cf. Catullus 10.19.

Cambridge University Press

0521521343 - Hispaniae: Spain and the Development of Roman Imperialism, 218-82 BC

J. S. Richardson

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Spain and Roman imperialism*

could refer to the decision of the Roman people in 121 BC not to reduce the conquered Averni and the Ruteni to a province, nor to impose a tax.<sup>26</sup> From then on the phrases ‘in formam...’ or ‘in formulam provinciae redigere’ are frequently used of generals turning areas already conquered into provinces,<sup>27</sup> and are used on a series of milestones from Arabia as a description of the official process by which the Arabian province was created.<sup>28</sup> This implies a set of norms, a ‘forma provinciae’, to which the administration of an area had to conform in order to be a province; but there remains a tension between this usage and the older meaning of ‘provincia’ which we have already noted. The tribes and peoples which Velleius, for instance, in listing the achievements of the republic in creating the empire, says were each ‘redacta in formulam provinciae stipendaria facta’,<sup>29</sup> had all of them been assigned as *provinciae* to Roman magistrates before this step was taken. More revealing still is the brief remark made by the epitomator of Livy, who summarises the work of Aemilius Paullus in Macedonia in 167 with the words ‘Macedonia in provinciae formam redacta’.<sup>30</sup> Though these words do not appear in the extant passages of Livy book 45 which deal with Paullus’ arrangements,<sup>31</sup> they are remarkable both because Macedonia was already the name of the *provincia* of Paullus,<sup>32</sup> and because the result of his work was *not* to turn the area into a province, but into four allegedly independent states. There was no *provincia* decreed by the senate in Macedonia after 167 until 149, when the praetor P. Iuventius went out to oppose Andriscus, the pretender to the Macedonian throne.<sup>33</sup> Here the epitomator must mean that Paullus set up the institutional framework that was to govern the administration and government of the four ‘republics’, and which indeed was used long after when Macedonia became a Roman province.<sup>34</sup>

The content of the word *provincia* can be seen to develop through the last two centuries BC, so that it came to acquire not only the meaning ‘task’ or ‘function’ when used of a magistrate, but also the geographical and institutional significance of a ‘province’ in the modern English sense. This development coincided with the emergence of those institutions

<sup>26</sup> Caes. *BG* 1.45.2: ‘neque in provinciam redigisset neque stipendium imposuisset’.

<sup>27</sup> Livy, *per.* 45; 134; Vell. 2.38.1, 2; 2.97.4; Tac. *Agr.* 14; *Ann.* 2.56; Suet. *Rhet.* 30; *Iul.* 25.1; *Aug.* 18.2; *Tib.* 37.4; *Cal.* 1.2; *Nero* 18; *Vesp.* 8.4.

<sup>28</sup> *CIL*, III, 14149.19, 21, 30, 39, 42, 50; 14150.11 all from 111 AD.

<sup>29</sup> Vell. 2.38.1.

<sup>30</sup> Livy, *per.* 45.

<sup>31</sup> It is possible that the epitomator was influenced by the words ‘Macedoniae formula dicta’ (Livy 45.31.1).

<sup>32</sup> Livy 45.16.2, cf. 44.19.1.

<sup>33</sup> Arrangements for Macedonia: Livy 45.29.4–30.8. For Iuventius, see Broughton, *MRR* 1, 458.

<sup>34</sup> Livy’s note that his laws stood the test of a long period of use must mean that they continued in use after the 30-year life of the four ‘republics’ (Livy 45.32.7).



Cambridge University Press

0521521343 - Hispaniae: Spain and the Development of Roman Imperialism, 218-82 BC

J. S. Richardson

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Spain and Roman imperialism*

which made up the provinces of the late republic and early empire. Moreover this is a change the importance of which is not simply semantic and philological. By the time of Augustus, at least, the provinces were seen as the central component of the empire; the gradual shift in the idea of the *provincia* marks the emergence of the Romans' own view of what their empire was.<sup>35</sup> For the study of this pattern of ideas and their development, the study of the early years of Roman Spain is of particular significance and fascination.

At the time of the first allotment of Hispania as a *provincia*, the institutions of 'provincial' rule in the later sense had scarcely begun to appear. The treaty drawn up in 241 between the Romans and the Carthaginians at the end of the first Punic war had laid down that the Carthaginians should evacuate Sicily and the islands between Sicily and Italy, and a similar clause ensured a Carthaginian withdrawal from Sardinia, following the Roman descent upon the island in 238/7.<sup>36</sup> In Sicily we have no evidence of a Roman presence for some 14 years. It is inconceivable that the Romans took no immediate steps to ensure at least the military security of the western part of the island following a war lasting for 24 years which had been fought specifically in order to wrest control from Carthage. There is no sign, however, that it was assigned as a *provincia* during this period. If a *provincia* was at this time a task given to a magistrate, the question which must be answered is 'Which magistrate?' Though our sources are scanty in the extreme, we know that for most of the 230s the consuls were occupied elsewhere, while the two praetors were primarily concerned with jurisdiction in Rome itself, and although they occasionally undertook additional responsibilities outside Italy<sup>37</sup> at this time, they can hardly have had a regular oversight of what must have been a sensitive area. It is possible that a non-magistrate was voted *imperium*, a method certainly used in Spain between 210 and 197, but there is nothing to suggest such a procedure in Sicily, nor any indication of the activity of the fairly substantial body of troops which, if the Spanish parallel were to be pressed, would be expected.<sup>38</sup> A more plausible guess is that the Romans relied on their ally, Hiero of Syracuse, supported at most by a naval squadron which may have been stationed at Lilybaeum; but there is no trace of such a force, nor of its commander,

<sup>35</sup> See my 'Polybius' view of the Roman empire', *PBSR* 47 (1979).

<sup>36</sup> Polybius 3.27.2 and 8.

<sup>37</sup> Thus P. Cornelius, said by Zonaras (8.18) to have died on service in Sardinia in 234.

<sup>38</sup> On the situation in Spain between 210 and 197 see below p. 66. These men certainly had *provinciae* and *imperium consulare* and commanded at least one legion.

Cambridge University Press

0521521343 - Hispaniae: Spain and the Development of Roman Imperialism, 218-82 BC

J. S. Richardson

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Spain and Roman imperialism*

who would presumably have been a *duovir navalis*.<sup>39</sup> Under such circumstances Sicily would not have been a *provincia*.<sup>40</sup>

In Sardinia, things were very different. After the first occupation of the island by Ti. Sempronius Gracchus, the consul of 238, we hear of campaigns fought there and in Corsica each year down to and including 231, always under the command of a consul.<sup>41</sup> On each of these occasions at least, Corsica and/or Sardinia must have formed a *provincia*, probably, if later practice may be taken as indicative, consisting of the two islands together.<sup>42</sup> Our record of military involvement only ceases with the outbreak of the Illyrian war in 230.

In 227 Rome took what proved to be the momentous step of increasing the number of praetors elected annually to four, two to continue as previously with primary responsibility for urban jurisdiction, two to be sent abroad, to Sicily and Sardinia.<sup>43</sup> This meant that thereafter the responsibility for these areas would be assigned as *provinciae* to magistrates of the city of Rome. It is interesting to note that Solinus, writing in the third century AD, regards this as the date at which each of the two islands (Sicily and Sardinia) became a *provincia*.<sup>44</sup>

It is impossible to be certain why this change was made at this point, but it is likely that it was in some way connected with the disruption caused by the war with Teuta and the Illyrian dynasts. Seen with hindsight, the Illyrian expedition of 229 looks like a relatively small-scale punitive raid, a natural stage in the development of Roman aggressive imperialism.<sup>45</sup> At the time the perspective will have been different. Polybius, writing in the next century, preserves something of the sense of surprise that must have been felt by the Greek world at this 'first crossing under arms of the Romans into Illyria and this part of Europe'.<sup>46</sup> For the Romans themselves, this was the first venture overseas since they

<sup>39</sup> On the *duoviri navales* see Mommsen, *StR* II<sup>3</sup>, 579–81; J. H. Thiel, *A history of Roman sea-power before the second Punic war* (Amsterdam 1954), 9–28, argues for the disappearance of the institution between 282 and 181.

<sup>40</sup> Cicero's remark that Sicily 'prima omnium, id quod ornamentum imperi est, provincia est appellata' (*II Verr.* 2.1.2) was not intended as a precise observation on the administrative machinery of the years 241–227, and should not be understood as such.

<sup>41</sup> For references, see Broughton, *MRR* 1, 221–6.

<sup>42</sup> Though the joint administration is only referred to in a remarkably unreliable passage of Festus (*Brev.* 4), the fact is confirmed by the practice of the early second century – cf. Livy 40.18.3, 19.6, 34.12; 42.1.3, 7.2; Marquardt *Röm. Staatsverwaltung* I<sup>2</sup>, 248.

<sup>43</sup> The increase in numbers is reported by Livy, *per.* 20, and connected explicitly with the government of the two provinces by Pomponius (*D.* 1.2.2.32) and Solinus (5.1).

<sup>44</sup> Solinus 5.1: 'utraque insula in Romanum arbitratum redacta iisdem temporibus facta provincia est, cum eodem anno Sardiniam M. Valerius, alteram C. Flaminius praetor sortiti sint.'

<sup>45</sup> This is the view, for instance, of Harris, *War and imperialism*, ch. 5, esp. pp. 195–7.

<sup>46</sup> Pol. 2.12.7.



Cambridge University Press

0521521343 - Hispaniae: Spain and the Development of Roman Imperialism, 218-82 BC

J. S. Richardson

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Spain and Roman imperialism*

had driven the Carthaginians from Sicily and invaded Sardinia. In particular, it was an amphibious operation which involved both consuls, whose predecessors from 238 down to 231 had been largely involved with Sardinia; and, more importantly, it also required a fleet.<sup>47</sup> The consul, Cn. Fulvius Centumalus, commanded a fleet of 200 ships, a number only just short of the entire Roman fleet at the Aegates Islands in the battle that ended the first Punic war.<sup>48</sup> This must have emphasised the precarious nature of Roman control of Sicily, Sardinia and Corsica, which depended directly on the maintenance of a naval presence in the seas west and south of Italy, at least so long as their *military* presence was not continuous but consisted of troops sent to fight specific campaigns. If, as is probable, Roman ships stationed at Lilybaeum were withdrawn to fight in the Adriatic in 229, this might well have drawn attention to the need for a regular succession of magistrates with *imperium*, and thus led to the regular appearance of the two areas on the annual list of *provinciae*.

Whatever the reason, it was not until 227 that praetors were sent to Sicily and Sardinia. It was not until that date that the presence of Roman troops and a Roman commander, which is always essential to the notion of a *provincia*, was established on a permanent basis. The renewal of the war with Carthage, and the first assignment of Hispania occurred less than ten years later.

The *imperium* of a Roman magistrate is not a vague abstraction. Even though *imperium* itself is a word of uncertain origin, indefinable in content and at times almost magical in its connotations, it is always attached to particular individuals, holding particular offices or commissions within the state;<sup>49</sup> its application, that is to say, is usually precisely defined, and always in principle susceptible of definition. Central to this definition of application is the *provincia*. From the beginning of the emergence of the idea of Roman power, of the Roman empire, on a world-wide scale, the *provincia* described and defined the particular task given to a holder of *imperium*. The process by which the *provincia* became a province, with all that that word implies of legal, fiscal and administrative responsibilities, was not only the redefinition of the task of the holder of *imperium*, but also the formulation of what the empire was perceived to be.

The examination of this process as it took place in Spain between 218 and 81 BC requires an analysis of the activity of the men who commanded

<sup>47</sup> Already by 231, negotiations showed clearly the likelihood of war in Illyria (so Harris, *War and imperialism* 195).

<sup>48</sup> Polybius 2.11.1, cf. 1.59.8; Walbank, *Commentary* 1, 124; Thiel [n. 39] 93, 305 n. 786.

<sup>49</sup> On *imperium*, see the classic account of Mommsen, *StR* 1<sup>3</sup>, 22–4, 116–36; also E. Meyer, *Römischer Staat und Staatsgedanke*<sup>3</sup> (Zurich 1964) 117ff.

Cambridge University Press

0521521343 - Hispaniae: Spain and the Development of Roman Imperialism, 218-82 BC

J. S. Richardson

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Spain and Roman imperialism*

there in that period, and to whom the *provinciae Hispaniae* were allotted by the senate. For this reason, after an account of the state of Spain before the arrival of the Romans, this book consists of an investigation of the magistrates and pro-magistrates sent out by the senate to employ the power and authority given them by the senate and people of Rome within the confines of the Iberian peninsula. What they did there, and how they related to the peoples and conditions they found, as well as to the city which they had left and to which they would return, is a complex and interesting story in its own right; but it is also more than that. What happened in Spain reveals, in a way which is not true for any other part of the Mediterranean world at that time, the way in which Roman military aggression became, at the hands of the men who practised it, the source of the Roman empire, and how the institutions created by a city-state to wage war provided the structures of the provinces of the imperial republic.